An ELISA protocol with resolution at high sample concentration reveals reactive antibodies to SARS-CoV-2 in unexposed individuals

Rachel R. Yuen[1], Dylan Steiner[2], Riley M.F. Pihl[3], Elizabeth Chavez[2], Alex Olson[4], Lillia A. Baird[4], Filiz Korkmaz[4], Patricia Urick[4], Manish Sagar[4], Jacob L. Berrigan[1], Suryaram Gummuluru[1], Ronald B. Corley[1,5], Karen Quillen[4], Anna C. Belkina[3,6], Gustavo Mostoslavsky[7], Ian Rifkin[5], Yachana Kataria[6], Amedeo J. Cappione III[8], Nina H. Lin[4], Nahid Bhadelia[4,5], and Jennifer E. Snyder-Cappione[1,3*]

[1]Department of Microbiology; Boston University School of Medicine, Boston, MA, USA

[2]PiBS Program, Boston University School of Medicine, Boston, MA, USA

[3]Flow Cytometry Core Facility, Boston University School of Medicine, Boston, MA, USA

[4]Department of Medicine, Boston University School of Medicine, Boston, MA, USA

[5]National Emerging Infectious Diseases Laboratories (NEIDL), Boston University, Boston, MA, USA

[6]Department of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine, Boston University School of Medicine, Boston, MA, USA

[7]Center for Regenerative Medicine, Boston University School of Medicine, Boston, MA, USA

[8]MilliporeSigma, Burlington, MA, USA

***Correspondence:**

Jennifer E. Snyder-Cappione

cappione@bu.edu

Words: 7,214; **Figures:** 6; **Supplemental Figures:** 4, **Tables:** 1

Keywords: SARS-CoV-2, Receptor Binding Domain, Nucleocapsid Protein, COVID-19, asymptomatic, antibodies, IgM, IgG, IgA, ELISA, pre-pandemic, pandemic

Abstract

The COVID-19 pandemic has significantly impacted work, economy, and way of life. The SARS-CoV-2 virus displays unique features including widely varying symptoms and outcomes between infected individuals. Sensitive measurement of SARS-CoV-2 specific antibodies would provide new insight into virus transmission dynamics, pre-existing cross-reactive immunity, and the nuances of SARS-CoV-2 pathogenesis. To date, existing SARS-CoV-2 serology tests have limited utility due to insufficient detection of antibody levels lower than what is typically present after several days of symptoms. To measure lower quantities of SARS-CoV-2 IgM, IgG, and IgA with higher resolution than existing assays, we developed a new ELISA protocol with a distinct plate washing procedure and timed plate development via use of a standard curve. This 'BU ELISA' method exhibits very low signal from plasma or serum samples added to uncoated wells at as low as a 1:5 dilution. Use of this method revealed circulating SARS-CoV-2 receptor binding domain (RBD) and nucleocapsid protein (NP) reactive antibodies from blood samples drawn prior to May 2019. Of our pre-pandemic cohort, no SARS-CoV-2 RBD-reactive IgG antibodies were detected in subjects over 70 years of age, and SARS-CoV-2 NP-reactive antibodies were present at similar levels to infected subjects in some individuals and very low in others. Also, samples drawn in May 2020 from two individuals with no symptoms or no known virus exposure contained SARS-CoV-2 RBD-reactive antibodies at intermediate amounts compared with other subject groups (higher than pre-pandemic and lower than confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infected). The one asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 convalescent subject in our study possessed comparable amounts of SARS-CoV-2 NP-specific IgM and IgG but drastically lower IgA than the symptomatic counterparts. Also, our assay detected positive signal from samples that gave negative results in a commercially available Lateral Flow Device (LFD) and the EUA approved Abbott IgG chemiluminescent microparticle immunoassay for SARS-CoV-2 antibody detection. We propose that this improved ELISA protocol, which is straightforward to perform, low cost, and uses readily available commercial reagents, is a useful tool to elucidate new information about SARS-CoV-2 infection and has promising implications for improved detection of all analytes measurable by this platform.

Introduction

From the first reported case of COVID-19 caused by the virus SARS-CoV-2 in December 2019 [1,2] there have been more than 28 million reported cases and 900,000 deaths worldwide as of September 11, 2020. Common symptoms of SARS-CoV-2 infection include fever, cough, myalgia, and fatigue and these symptoms vary widely in magnitude, nature, and duration between individuals for reasons that are not clear to date [3,4], with some individuals with confirmed infections remaining asymptomatic [5]. Epidemiological evidence indicates silent viral spread via asymptomatic individuals within communities and the extent of this form of transmission is currently unclear [6]. SARS-CoV-2 has homology to other alpha and beta 'common cold' coronaviruses in circulation, and cross-reactive T cell immunity to SARS-CoV-2 spike and nucleocapsid proteins are present in a substantial percentage of unexposed individuals [7-10]. It is postulated that this cross-reactive immunity may influence the nature and severity of COVID-19 symptoms upon infection and impact disease course [11].

Sensitive and accurate detection of virus-specific immune factors, such as antibodies, is imperative in order to measure rates of SARS-CoV-2 infections within communities with greater accuracy, to more fully define cross-reactive immunity in unexposed individuals, and to gain new understanding about the nature of effective versus potentially deleterious immune responses upon SARS-CoV-2 exposure. Antibody measurements are of particular importance, as pathogen-specific immunoglobulins are a known first line of defense upon exposure and can prevent new infections. Antibody titers are used to assess both likelihood of protection from re-infection and general vaccine efficacy [12]. A variety of SARS-CoV-2 serological assays have been developed by multiple manufacturers and academic institutes and many are CE-marked and granted emergency use authorization (EUA) from the US Food and Drug Administration (FDA). Varieties include point-of-care rapid lateral flow assays, chemiluminescence immunoassays (CLIA), and enzyme-linked immunosorbent assays (ELISA)[13-16]. These tests detect antibodies that primarily target the nucleocapsid protein (NP) or the spike (S) protein of SARS-CoV-2, and specifically the Receptor Binding Domain (RBD) of spike which is an immunodominant surface protein targeted by neutralizing antibodies and a main target antigen for vaccine development [16-18]. Some of these tests possess high sensitivity and specificity for detection of SARS-CoV-2

antibodies 14 days after diagnosis and/or symptom onset [19-22]. However, others report negative results from individuals who are asymptomatic, mildly symptomatic, or symptomatic for less than 14 days, even when SARS-CoV-2 infection is confirmed [15,23,24]; whether such individuals possess antibodies below the limit of the detection of the particular test used or lack these antibodies altogether is unresolved.

To enable detection of low levels of SARS-CoV-2-reactive antibodies, we modified the standard ELISA procedure, particularly the plate washing method, to improve sensitivity. Our protocol (the 'BU ELISA') allows clear SARS-CoV-2-reactive antibody signal resolution at sample dilutions as low as 1:5. Using this protocol we were able to detect low levels of SARS-CoV-2-specific IgM, IgG, and IgA with low background:signal ratio from plasma or serum from three groups of individuals: (1) subjects that varied by age, HIV infection, and systemic lupus erythematosus (SLE) disease status with all samples collected before November 8th, 2019 ('pre-pandemic'); (2) eight individuals with no symptoms or known exposure to SARS-CoV-2 with samples collected in the spring of 2020 ('pandemic'), and (3) five subjects with confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection ('SARS-CoV-2 infected'), including one asymptomatic individual and one who was hospitalized and received two convalescent plasma infusions. In addition, the BU ELISA measured signal that was not detected with Antagen's IgM IgG Lateral Flow Device (LFD) test and/or the Abbott IgG chemiluminescent microparticle immunoassay (CMIA). Our results demonstrate the exceptional sensitivity of the BU ELISA protocol for the detection of low levels of SARS-CoV-2 reactive antibodies.

Results

A modified ELISA protocol demonstrates low noise from high concentration human serum and plasma samples. The Enzyme-Linked Immunosorbent Assay (ELISA) is a commonly used method for the measurement of analytes in a suspension sample. While low cost and easy to adapt in most lab settings, a limitation of this platform is high background from some biological samples at low sample dilutions. Specifically, optical densities (ODs) from sample dilutions lower than 1:100 is often sizeable and can mask the analyte of interest. This issue is particularly germane to serologic testing for SARS-CoV-2, as antibodies that

are cross-reactive in unexposed individuals, newly generated in asymptomatic and/or recent infections, induced from an encounter with low viral dose, or waned post convalescence may be missed because the antibody levels are below the limit of detection of current assays. To address this issue, we have developed an ELISA protocol with unique steps to reduce non-specific signal at low sample dilutions. One change is the plate washing procedure, which is performed manually by an operator using a multichannel pipettor and includes agitation and soaking steps with repeated complete removal of residual fluid as described (Methods and Supplemental Figure 1). ELISAs were performed that compared uncoated well OD values of five human plasma samples with plates washed with our method or an automated plate washer and the total levels of non-specifically bound IgG was determined. The manual washing procedure resulted in a notably lower average and range of ODs at 1:5, 1:10, and 1:25 dilutions as compared with the automated washer (Fig. 1A). This BU ELISA protocol was run on samples from a total of 40 pre-pandemic and 13 healthy or SARS-CoV-2-infected pandemic subjects (Table 1), with paired antigen coated and uncoated wells for seven sample dilutions (plate map shown in Supplemental Figure 2) for all but one subject (CONV1). The average ODs for uncoated, 1:5 diluted sample loaded wells from all 53 subjects were 0.16, 0.09, and 0.068 for IgM, IgG, and IgA respectively (Figure 1B). Given these low background OD values and the results from the wash method comparison, it's possible that details of our protocol other than the washing method may contribute to these low background ODs, such as the type of plates, the blocking buffer/sample diluent used, and the number and placement of washing steps (Methods and Supplemental Figure 1). This no coat 'noise' is remarkably consistent between multiple runs of a given sample (Supplemental Figure 3) and appears to be due to components within the sample, such as IgG and inflammatory factors[25] and not due to assay variability. Importantly, when ODs from uncoated wells with the same dilution of sample are not measured and properly subtracted, incorrect interpretation of results as positive can occur [26]; therefore, the no coat values were subtracted from coated OD results for all results in this manuscript with the exception of one subject (CONV1). Next, to determine if age or disease status impacts background signal in our assay, we compared the results from uncoated wells for the 1:5 and 1:10 dilutions between younger (<34 years old), older (>64 years old), HIV+, SLE, pandemic, or SARS-CoV-2 infected groups and found no significant differences in signal with the exception of IgA between SLE and two other groups (Figure 1C).

Modification of ELISA development duration based on standard curve signal detection enables accurate comparison of antibody levels between experimental runs by minimizing impact of OD drift. During assay development we noted differences in OD values in different experimental runs even with strict adherence to all procedures and length of steps. Therefore, for all sample runs, we included a standard curve using recombinant monoclonal IgM, IgG, and IgA antibodies that recognize SARS-CoV-2 RBD for each of the respective isotype assays and stopped the development reaction when there was a visible difference between the seventh dilution (1.37ng/ml) of the standard and the 'zero' (sample diluent only) well. Addition of these standards and timing of development in this manner helped to ensure accurate calculation of the relative antibody levels (Arbitrary Units, as described below) between samples run on different days, plates, and/or by different operators. The OD values of the standard curves following this development procedure for the IgM, IgG, and IgA assays for 17 representative runs are shown (Figure 2). The development time of these runs to complete visualization of the standard curve development ranged from ~8-20 minutes, demonstrating the need to adjust substrate incubation time per experimental run to maximize signal detection.

SARS-CoV-2 RBD cross-reactive antibodies are present in some unexposed individuals. SARS-CoV-2 RBD IgM, IgG, and IgA ELISA assays were performed on 40 pre-pandemic samples (Table 1) using the BU ELISA protocol. For these experiments, in addition to the recombinant antibody (standard) controls mentioned above, a dilution series from a COVID-19+ subject (CONV1) was included on each plate as a biological positive control. CONV1 was hospitalized due to COVID-19 complications and received two convalescent plasma infusions four weeks prior to the collection of sample used in these assays. After first subtracting the average ODs of the blank wells with the same coat from the sample wells, and secondly subtracting the OD of the dilution-paired sample in uncoated wells, several subjects exhibited a clear positive signal to the SARS-CoV-2 RBD coat, with a linear loss of OD with sample dilution, such as subjects Y3, Y6, H3, S3, S8, and S9 (Figure 3A). To determine positive signal, we did not use a set cut-off value but instead developed a metric based on the relationship between no coat and coated OD values from individual subjects. This metric, called

Metric 1, is comprised of the following: (1) the OD from the RBD-coated well must be ≥2.5x the uncoated well from the paired sample dilution for at least two dilutions in the series, and (2) the OD from the RBD coated well must be ≥0.1 for at least one dilution. Following this guideline, roughly half (18/40) of the unexposed pre-pandemic individuals possessed reactive antibodies of at least one isotype to SARS-CoV-2 RBD, albeit often at very low levels compared with the CONV1 sample (Figure 3A).

Unlike younger counterparts, no IgM or IgG SARS-CoV-2 RBD reactive antibodies were detected in unexposed individuals >70 years old. We noted the low frequencies of subjects with SARS-CoV-2 RBD reactive antibodies in the older pre-pandemic subject group (Figure 3A); therefore, to further investigate the potential impact of age on the presence of these antibodies, we re-classified the 40 pre-pandemic subjects into one of three age groups (less than 50, between 50-70, and greater than 70 years old) and calculated the total number of subjects that possess SARS-CoV-2 RBD reactive antibodies according to Metric 1 to each or any of the three isotypes in these groups. We found similar percentages of subjects with SARS-CoV-2 reactive antibodies in the <50 and 50-70 age groups; however, among those over 70 years old, only one of the nine individuals possessed detectable levels of SARS-CoV-2 RBD reactive antibodies, and only of the IgA isotype (Figure 3B).

Samples collected in May 2020 from two subjects with no symptoms or known exposure to SARS-CoV-2 contained SARS-CoV-2 RBD-specific IgG at levels higher than unexposed individuals. Samples from eight subjects collected in May 2020 with no symptoms or known SARS-CoV-2 exposure were tested for reactive antibodies to SARS-CoV-2 RBD using the BU ELISA protocol. Surprisingly, two of the eight subjects had SARS-CoV-2 RBD-specific IgG OD values over 3.5 at 1:5 dilution and ≥2.5 times higher than the corresponding no coat well for at least five dilutions (Figure 4), a magnitude of antibody concentration not found in any of the 40 pre-pandemic samples (Figure 3A). These two subjects, C1 and C5, also showed significant levels of IgA SARS-CoV-2 RBD-reactive antibodies with ODs as high as only two of 40 pre-

pandemic subjects (Y6 and H3, Fig. 3A). Also, positive signal for SARS-CoV-2 RBD IgM reactive antibodies was found in subject C1; C1 was positive for all three isotypes tested (Figure 4).

Positive IgG, IgA, and IgM results for SARS-CoV-2 RBD antibodies from five confirmed COVID-19+ subjects using the BU ELISA protocol. Plasma or serum samples from five subjects with confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection were tested with the BU ELISA protocol. Four of these subjects were infected at a biotechnology conference in Boston, Massachusetts in March of 2020. Three of the four were symptomatic with length of symptoms ranging from 10 days (subject B1) to 61 days (subject B4), and one was asymptomatic (B2). Samples from these four subjects were collected during May-June 2020 more than 30 (range 36-59) days since the resolution of symptoms. The fifth subject, CONV1, received two transfers of convalescent plasma three days apart four weeks prior to sample collection and remained symptomatic at the time of sample collection. Clear positive signal was detected from all five subjects for all three isotypes (Figure 4). CONV1 possessed the highest levels of IgM and IgA, and the highest SARS-CoV-2 RBD reactive IgG levels in this group was found from subject B03 (Figure 4).

Determination of the relative amounts of SARS-CoV-2 RBD reactive antibodies in different samples via Arbitrary Unit (AU) calculations reveals reactive IgM and/or IgA in three pre-pandemic subjects at levels greater than or similar to SARS-CoV-2 convalescent subjects and a gradation of IgG among positive samples in the pre-pandemic, pandemic, and SARS-CoV-2 infected groups. To determine the relative amounts of SARS-CoV-2 RBD reactive antibodies between samples tested during different experimental runs, with different operators, and/or on different plates, we calculated the arbitrary units (AU) within each sample extrapolated from the standard curve from each individual run as described (Methods). This analysis yielded some surprising results; for example, the pre-pandemic subjects H3 and S3 possess SARS-CoV-2 RBD reactive IgM antibody levels higher than subjects B1, B2, and B4 from the SARS-CoV-2 infected group (Figure 5A); also, subjects Y6 and H3 possess IgA levels similar to B1, B2, B3, and B4 (Figure 5B). IgG results yielded a different pattern of antibody levels between the groups; pre-pandemic subjects were found to

have the lowest quantities, followed by intermediate amounts in the pandemic group (driven by C1 and C5 results), and the highest IgG levels were present in the five SARS-CoV-2 infected subjects (Figure 5C). We performed further analysis, where we included the AU values from only subjects determined to have positive signal by both Metric 1 and Metric 2 (AU values greater than 30, 28, and 27 for IgM, IgG, and IgA as described in Methods and depicted as dotted lines on the graphs in Figure 5A, B, and C). From subjects determined to have positive signal by both metrics, a statistically significant difference was found between both the pre-pandemic and pandemic groups as compared with the SARS-CoV-2 infected for SARS-CoV-2 RBD-reactive IgG (Figure 5D).

A COVID-19 lateral flow rapid test detected SARS-CoV-2 RBD IgG and IgM in 4/4 and 2/4 of the SARS-CoV-2 infected samples tested, respectively, with no signal measured from pre-pandemic and pandemic subjects. Samples from our pre-pandemic, pandemic, and SARS-CoV-2 infected groups were tested with a lateral flow rapid test (Antagen Pharmaceuticals) for the qualitative determination of IgM and IgG antibodies to SARS-CoV-2. The test detected SARS-CoV-2 RBD reactive IgG exclusively in the confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infected group, with all four tested subjects showing clear IgG positive bands (Figure 5E). SARS-CoV-2 reactive IgM was detected from subjects B3 and B4, but not B1 or B2, which were found to have very low but positive SARS-CoV-2 RBD reactive IgM levels in the BU ELISA protocol (Figures 4, 5A). Pre-pandemic subjects H3 and S3, both found to have higher levels of IgM than subject B4 by the BU ELISA had negative results using this test (Figure 5E). Also, none of the pandemic samples had positive results for IgG in this assay, including subjects C1 and C5 (Figure 5C, Supplemental Figure 4), where clear positive results were measured using the BU ELISA protocol (Figures 4, 5C). These incongruent results could be due to differences in portions and/or presentation of the RBD antigen in the different tests.

The vast majority of pre-pandemic samples contained circulating IgG and IgA antibodies reactive with SARS-CoV-2 nucleocapsid protein (NP) with bimodal levels (high or low) found among the non-autoimmune subjects. Using the BU ELISA protocol, we measured IgM, IgG, and IgA levels reactive with

SARS-CoV-2 nucleocapsid protein (NP) from 20 subjects from our pre-pandemic cohort, all eight pandemic subjects, and B1, B2, B3, and B4 from the SARS-CoV-2 infected group. Seven dilutions were run for all samples with and without NP coated wells as with the SARS-CoV-2 RBD assays; sample dilution curves were generated and positive results were determined using Metric 1. To our surprise, all but one of the 20 pre-pandemic subjects possessed IgG antibodies reactive with SARS-CoV-2 NP (Figure 6A). The one negative subject, O4, is 95-100 years old. Only 5/20 pre-pandemic subjects scored positive for IgM, while 4/5 pandemic and 3/4 of the SARS-CoV-2 infected were positive for this isotype (Fig. 6A). The majority of subjects in all groups possessed SARS-CoV-2 NP-reactive IgA (Figure 6A). As with the SARS-CoV-2 RBD results, relative antibody levels between subjects were quantified using Arbitrary Unit calculations from recombinant antibody standard curves. Two pre-pandemic subjects, O1 and S3, possessed equivalent or higher levels of SARS-CoV-2 NP reactive IgM as subject B3, the SARS-CoV-2 infected subject with the highest level of NP-reactive IgM of that group (Figure 6B). The SARS-CoV-2 NP IgG and IgA from the pre-pandemic group possessed levels in a large range between different subjects, with no observable association with age (Fig. 6B). Among the non-SLE pre-pandemic subjects tested in this assay, there appears to be bi-modal presence of antibody levels, with seven of the 15 subjects with levels all below 154 AU and the other eight with AU of at least 738 for IgG (Figure 6B). Also, the one SARS-CoV-2 infected subject with no symptoms (B2) possessed a level of SARS-CoV-2 NP reactive IgA dramatically lower than any of the other three subjects included in this assay from this group (Figure 6B).

The EUA Approved Abbott IgG chemiluminescent microparticle immunoassay detected SARS-CoV-2 NP reactive IgG in all four SARS-CoV-2 infected subjects tested and none of the pandemic controls. The Abbott chemiluminescent microparticle immunoassay (CMIA) IgG antibody test used for the detection of SARS-CoV-2 infection was performed on all eight pandemic subjects and subjects B1, B2, B3, and B4. All eight pandemic samples scored negative by this test, and all four from the SARS-CoV-2 infected group scored positive (Red symbols, Figure 6B, and Supplemental Figure 4).

Discussion

A variety of SARS-CoV-2 serological assays have been produced in record time as antibody testing has the potential to play a pivotal role in combating the COVID-19 pandemic. Specifically, accurate and sensitive measurement of virus-specific antibodies: (1) could complement diagnostic testing, (2) provide information about the true prevalence of infection, (3) provide insight into anti-viral immunity, (4) help assess vaccine efficacy, and (5) will serve as a screening tool of convalescent plasma for clinical use. However, a lack of required sensitivity and specificity of many of the SARS-CoV-2 antibody tests available to date have led some to conclude that they have limited clinical utility in combating COVID-19 [27]. Here, we present a modified ELISA protocol with exceptional sensitivity with high concentration samples that enables the detection of low levels of antigen-specific antibodies in human specimens.

The BU ELISA is straightforward, comprised of reagents that are readily available from commercial vendors and can easily be adapted for other applications and analytes. However, a major limitation of this assay is that it is currently considerably lower in throughput compared to other serological platforms. This protocol requires an operator for the manual wash steps, limiting the number of plates that can be run compared to automated methods. There is potential for throughput increase if automated washers/ELISA systems can be adapted to more closely mimic this protocol.

Other important features of our approach include the inclusion of paired sample dilutions with uncoated wells to enable detection of true antigen-reactive signal and adjustment of the length of substrate incubation based on standard curve development for OD standardization to enable direct comparison between samples on different plates. Quantification of relative antibody levels via Arbitrary Units (AU) or a similar method will be imperative for determining which convalescent samples have antibody levels sufficient for effective plasma transfer as well as other applications. However, while we believe this is a preferred approach for determining of relative output values within all samples, it is critical to note that the unique dynamics of the panoply of

antibodies of varying affinities and isotypes within a given specimen causes inherent confounding factors to serologic readouts. Specifically, all isotypes that bind a given antigen may be present in a specimen and there will be competition and steric hindrance that skew the accuracy of the final signal for a given isotype. For example, a specimen with a high level of SARS-CoV-2 RBD reactive IgM antibodies could have a lower detected signal for IgG and IgA due to IgM's pentameric conformation blocking many binding sites. Also, higher affinity antibody clones (IgG and IgA vs IgM, for example) may outcompete for binding sites of the coated antigen and thereby be detected more readily than others. We can account for this issue to some extent via measurement of all three major isotypes in all samples; however, for this reason we do not attempt to quantify antibodies as the number of molecules per sample in this report.

Direct comparison of our ELISA protocol with two commercially available serological assays for SARS-CoV-2, Antagen's DISCOVID LFD test and Abbott's CMIA IgG assay, yielded thought-provoking results. Both the LFD and CMIA tests performed well in identification of the confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infected subjects via detection of SARS-CoV-2 IgG to RBD (Antagen test) and NP (Abbott test). The BU ELISA protocol detected signal from many pre-pandemic and pandemic samples which all scored negative in the Antagen and Abbott tests (Figure 6 and Supplemental Figure 4). We postulate that these tests contain manufacturer-curated portions of the RBD and NP proteins that have epitopes recognized by antibodies selectively found in SARS-CoV-2 infected individuals. In addition, low frequencies of B cells were found in unexposed subjects that bind SARS-CoV-2 spike at a lower affinity and with lower levels of clonal expansion and somatic hypermutation than a SARS-CoV convalescent subject [28]. These results support our findings and taken together, underscore the value of comprehensive testing of antibody reactivity to SARS-CoV-2 proteins in different subject groups to gain new insight into how pre-existing and newly primed immune responses interplay to impact infection outcomes.

Our results from pre-pandemic samples show that roughly half of the subjects tested possessed antibodies that bind to SARS-CoV-2 RBD, albeit at very low levels on average, as determined by our Metric 1 cutoff and via AU calculations (Metric 2) (Figures 2, 3). These results are in contrast with the conclusions of other reports,

which state that RBD-reactive antibodies are not detected in unexposed individuals [13,16]. However, in these studies the assays were run at higher sample dilutions and therefore low signal may have been missed or misinterpreted as noise. The clinical significance of these antibodies is unknown and while the levels are low in the blood, it is possible if they are present in higher concentrations in other sites, such as the mucosa. Also, none of the nine pre-pandemic subjects over the age of 70 possessed antibodies of the IgM or IgG isotypes that recognized SARS-CoV-2 RBD, with one of nine positive for reactive IgA (Figure 3C). As individuals over 70 are more likely to present with serious COVID-19 complications [29-32] future research investigating connections between age and the levels of these RBD-reactive antibodies in a larger pre-pandemic group is warranted. Also, as antibodies to RBD as associated with virus neutralization both in vitro and in animal models, [14,33-35] performing detailed functional analyses of plasma samples from pre-pandemic samples with RBD-reactive antibodies is an important next step. Preliminary experiments from our group indicated that neutralization activity was not present in subjects C1, C5, H3 and S3 (data not shown) but future experiments are needed to more thoroughly address this question.

To our surprise, high quantities of reactive antibodies with SARS-CoV-2 NP was present in some of the pre-pandemic samples tested, with some subjects possessing levels similar to what was measured from confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infected subjects (Figure 6). These results complement recent reports of high percentages of unexposed individuals with circulating T cells reactive with SARS-CoV-2 NP peptides [7-10]. We found it of particular interest that among the non-autoimmune pre-pandemic subjects screened for anti-NP reactive IgG antibodies, there is bimodal expression of signal, with roughly 7/15 possessing very low/no antibodies (highest AU 154) and 8/15 with AU values all over 738 (Figure 6). These results could reflect infection history in recent months/years with common cold coronaviruses in the circulation in the United States with homology to SARS-CoV-2; next steps include measurement of both SARS-CoV-2 and seasonal common cold alpha (NL63 and 229E) and beta (OC43 and HKU1) coronavirus antibodies in individual pre-pandemic subjects for comparative analysis. Importantly, as with the recently reported cross-reactive T cell immunity, the role of the SARS-CoV-2 NP reactive antibodies reported here in unexposed individuals is unknown. This reactive immunity could be

helpful to the host, preventing symptoms upon infection and/or lessening the severity of COVID-19, as such a phenomenon been reported with influenza [36-39]; alternatively, this immunity could lead to worse infection outcomes. This latter possibility is of particular interest in light of a recent report of the higher in vitro assessed functional activity of anti-NP antibodies among hospitalized individuals with COVID-19 who later died as compared with surviving counterparts [40]. Gaining insight into the role, if any, of this cross-reactive immunity to SARS-CoV-2 in unexposed individuals could reveal why diverse disease outcomes exist upon viral exposure.

Our 'pandemic' subject group was comprised of eight subjects who self-reported no symptoms or viral exposure and donated blood at Boston Medical Center in May 2020; and surprisingly, two of the eight subjects (C1 and C5) possessed SARS-CoV-2 reactive IgG at concentrations higher than any of the 40 pre-pandemic samples yet lower than all five confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infected subjects, including one asymptomatic (Figures 3,4). C1 and C5 also possessed anti-RBD antibodies of other isotypes as well (Figures 3,4). As it is becoming evident that dose of SARS-CoV-2 exposure is a putative critical factor driving productive infection and COVID-19 onset and progression [41-44], we speculate that this intermediate level of RBD-reactive IgG could be due to exposure to a low innoculum of virus. As individuals with mild or asymptomatic infection develop less robust antibody responses and may have a more rapid decline of antibody levels as compared with symptomatic counterparts [24,45] these results could reflect another, even lower dose of virus exposure and response that is not measurable by other assays and could potentially reveal new information about viral transmission and immunity. Also, the gradation in SARS-CoV-2 RBD IgG antibody level between pre-pandemic, pandemic, and our confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infected subject groups indicate the possibility of using antibody levels as a tool for diagnostics.

Another notable result in this report is the SARS-CoV-2-NP specific isotype signature from the asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 convalescent subject (B2) (Figure 6). This subject's specimen possessed levels of NP-specific IgM and IgG comparable to the other infected subjects, yet uniquely displayed extremely low levels of NP-reactive IgA (Figure 6). IgA is a major isotype produced in the mucosa, and it is known that gastrointestinal

issues such as diarrhea are a hallmark symptom of COVID-19. The lack of IgA in this subject leads one to speculate if the gut was specifically not infected and/or inflamed in this subject and if such gut leakiness, classically linked to chronic inflammation [46-48], plays a significant role in COVID-19 pathogenesis as some reports are suggesting [49-51].

The BU ELISA protocol enables the measurement of low levels of antigen-specific antibodies within high concentration human specimens. Use of this assay could provide new insight into viral transmission and help elucidate the nature of the virus-specific antibody response. Also, this protocol may complement other tests for diagnostics, measurements of COVID-19 vaccine responses, screening of convalescent plasma for clinical use, and perhaps most importantly, to accurately determine a history of exposure to SARS-COV-2.

Material and Methods

Participants: Pre-pandemics: Samples were collected for unrelated studies prior to December 2019. SARS-CoV-2 infected: Subjects B1-B4 were recruited by contacting individuals who had been confirmed to have SARS-CoV-2 infection through their exposure at a biomedical conference in March 2020. None of the four were hospitalized. Three (B1, B3 and B4) of the four convalescent subjects reported symptomatic disease in early to mid-March 2020, whereas one (B2) reported being asymptomatic. CONV1 was hospitalized due to COVID-19 and received two convalescent plasma treatments four weeks prior to sample collection. This subject remained symptomatic at the time of sample collection. Pandemics: These subjects were recruited as healthy controls who denied having any symptoms of or exposures to SARS-CoV-2 via an email to a community of Boston University employees. Samples were collected and/or used in this study with proper IRB approval from the Boston University Institutional Review Board.

The BU ELISA Protocol: Antibodies reactive to SARS-CoV-2 RBD or NP were assayed from sera or plasma as described in accompanying SOP (Supplemental Figure 1). Briefly, wells of 96-well plates (Pierce 96-Well

Polystyrene Plates; cat#15041, Thermo Fisher Scientific) were coated with 50µl/well of a 2µg/ml solution of each respective protein in sterile PBS (Gibco) or with PBS only for 1 hour at room temperature. Coating solution was removed manually by a swift flick of the plates into a biohazard waste container. Next, 200µl per well of sterile PBS was added with a multichannel pipettor and liquid was removed via swift flick and the plate was banged on absorbent paper towels to remove residual liquid; this washing procedure was performed three times. Next, 200µl of casein blocking buffer (Thermo Fisher Scientific, cat#37528) was added to wells at room temperature for 1 hour. Next, plates were washed three times as previously described. Subject samples and monoclonal SARS-CoV-2 RBD reactive antibodies (IgG, clone CR3022, gift from the Ragon Institute; IgA, clone CR3022, Absolute Antibodies; IgM, clone BIB116, Creative Diagnostics) were diluted in Thermo Fisher casein blocking buffer, and 50µl of each were added to the plates for 1 hour at room temperature, with dilution buffer only added to blank wells. After incubation, samples were removed by a swift flick into a biohazard waste container. The plates were again washed three times with PBS containing 0.05% Tween 20 (PBST) and banged on absorbent paper towels, and immediately anti-human horseradish peroxidase (HRP)-conjugated secondary antibodies for IgG (cat#A18817, Thermo Fisher, 1:2000), IgM (cat#A18841, Thermo Fisher, 1:8000), and IgA (Jackson Immunoresearch, cat#109-035-011, 1:2000) diluted in casein blocking buffer were added to the plates at 50µl per well for 30 minutes at room temperature. Next, plates were washed four times with 0.05% PBST as described, and 50µl per well of 3,3',5,5'-Tetramethylbenzidine (TMB)-ELISA substrate solution (Thermo Fisher Scientific, cat# 34029) was added and incubation occurred in the dark until a visible color difference between the well with the seventh dilution (1.37ng/ml) of recombinant antibody and the diluent only 'zero' well appeared, this time ranged from ~8-20 minutes. The reaction was stopped by adding 50µl of stop solution for TMB (Thermo Fisher Scientific, cat#N600) and the optical density was measured 450 nm (OD 450nm) on a SpectraMax190 Microplate Reader (Molecular Devices). Seven-point sample dilution curves were run in uncoated wells and paired antigen coated wells (SARS-CoV-2 RBD and NP). An example of a plate map shown in Supplemental Figure 2.

Antigens: SARS-CoV-2 RBD was a gift from the Schmidt lab at the Ragon Institute and was expressed and purified as previously described [52]. SARS-CoV-2 NP was purchased from Sino Biological, (Cat# 40588-V08B).

Determination of Arbitrary Units: Data were analyzed using GraphPad Prism 8. Arbitrary units (AU) were calculated from the optical density (OD) values according to standard curves generated by known amounts of monoclonal anti-SARS-CoV-2 RBD IgG, IgM, or IgA. The OD values of blank (diluent only) wells with the same coat and secondary detection antibody were averaged and subtracted from the OD values of each respective sample well and then the ODs were logarithmically transformed. Next, a non-linear regression of the sigmoidal standard curve was used to extrapolate a "concentration" for the patient samples, which was then inverse log transformed and multiplied by the respective dilution factor. AU values for each sample were chosen from the linear portion of the dilution curve for the coated wells, and the paired no coat value was subtracted to determine the net AU amount.

Determination of the presence versus absence of SARS-CoV-2 reactive antibodies in samples and of Arbitrary Unit Values: First, the average ODs of corresponding 'blank' wells (coated with PBS alone vs PBS + antigen) on a given plate was subtracted from all wells with samples. ODs for blank wells was consistently ~0.05 regardless of coat. Metric 1: Signal was considered positive from a given subjects if (1) the OD values from the SARS-CoV-2 RBD or NP coated wells was a minimum of 2.5x higher than that of the paired no coat well for at least two sample dilutions and (2) one antigen-coated well OD value was over 0.1, after the average OD values of the respective blank wells were subtracted. Metric 2: After calculation of net Arbitrary Units for all samples, the cut-off value for positivity is the inverse of the most negative AU for all samples for a given isotype. Samples with AU values above the dotted lines in the graphs in Figures 5 and 6 are positive by this criterion.

LFD tests: Antagen's DISCOVID IgM IgG LFD test was used to detect SARS-CoV-2 RBD specific IgM and IgG antibodies following manufacturer instructions. Briefly, 20µl of plasma or serum was added to the

indicated sample port, immediately followed by provided diluent, and incubated at room temperature before reading at 45 minutes. The results were scored as positive or negative for IgM and IgG by two independent readers blinded to donor sample status.

Abbot Serology Test: The SARS-CoV-2 IgG assay is a chemiluminescent microparticle immunoassay (CMIA) used for the detection of SARS-CoV-2 nucleocapsid protein-specific IgG in human samples. The assays were performed according to manufacturer's protocol.

Automated Washer: Plates were washed with Molecular Devices SkanWasher 400 microplate washer with three rounds of aspiration and wash with a final aspiration step for each run. This protocol was run twice after the coating, blocking, and sample incubation steps and three times after the addition of the secondary detection antibody step in the experiment shown in Figure 1A. Plates were rotated 180° between each run. Residual wash buffer was left in the plates (plates were not blotted post-wash) to mimic a fully automated system.

Author Contributions

JES-C conceived of the experimental plan, RY and JES-C designed the approach, AJC, RY, JES-C designed experiments; RC, NL, KQ, PU, NB, GM, IR, MS, JES-C contributed to study subject specimen collection/use, provided reagents, and/or funding; RY, RP, DS, EC, JES-C, AO, LB, FK, JB, AB, YK performed experiments; RY, DS, EC, JB, SG, AB, GM, YK, and JES-C analyzed data; and RY and JES-C wrote the manuscript.

Data availability

The raw data supporting the conclusions of this manuscript will be made available by the authors, without undue reservation, to any qualified researcher.

Conflict of interest statement

The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any personal, professional, or financial relationships that could potentially be construed as a conflict of interest.

Competing Interests

Boston University filed for patent protection of this method on August 12, 2020.

Acknowledgements

We thank Dr. Aaron Schmidt/Dr. Jared Feldman and Dr. Galit Alter from the Ragon Institute of MGH, MIT, and Harvard for the gifts of the recombinant SARS-CoV-2 RBD antigen and monoclonal SARS-CoV-2 RBD IgG antibody, respectively. We also thank Dr. Andrew Lodge at ThermoFisher Scientific for his advice regarding initial reagent selection and protocol steps.

Funding

This work was supported by the Boston University's National Emerging Infectious Diseases Laboratories (NEIDL) Director's Fund.

Table 1: Subject characteristics

Figure legends

Figure 1. The BU ELISA protocol exhibits low background signal from uncoated wells with human serum and plasma samples added at high concentrations. (A) Uncoated well OD values from five donor samples after using an automated plate washer or the BU ELISA method of multichannel plate washing. Experiment was performed once. (B) ODs of no coat wells from sample dilutions from 52 subjects; IgM, IgG, and IgA were detected in individual assays. One value from the 3,125 dilution of IgG from one sample was

removed as it was presumed to be due to a pipetting error. (C) No coat OD values from the groups in this study, which includes pre-pandemic subjects sub-grouped via age, HIV, and SLE status as well as pandemic and confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infected subjects. 1-way ANOVA tests found no significant differences of 1:5 dilution OD values between the groups for all isotypes except IgA SLE versus pandemic (p=.0255) and IgA SLE versus SARS-CoV-2 infected (p=0.044).

Figure 2. SARS-CoV-2 RBD-recombinant antibody standard curves from 17 experimental runs. IgM, IgG, and IgA curves are shown. The average of all runs shown in red.

Figure 3. Detection of SARS-CoV-2 RBD-reactive antibodies in pre-pandemic samples. (A) Dilution curves of 40 pre-pandemic samples (n=10 per group) with a representative dilution curve of the positive biological control CONV1 (black curve) shown in each graph. CONV1 was run with each set of samples. OD values shown are the SARS-CoV-2 RBD-specific signal that was calculated by subtracting the blank and dilution paired no coat values, except for CONV1. Open and solid symbols represent negative and positive results, respectively, as determined by our Metric 1 described in Methods. A graphic summary of the determined positive or negative result for each subject is shown in the boxes to the right. (B) The percentages of pre-pandemic subjects re-categorized by age and determined to be positive for SARS-CoV-2–RBD reactive IgM, IgG, and IgA as determined by Metric 1. yo = years old.

Figure 4. SARS-CoV-2 RBD reactive antibody dilution curves in pandemic and SARS-CoV-2 infected subject groups. As in Figure 3, OD values show the SARS-CoV-2 RBD coat-specific signal and were calculated by subtracting the blank and dilution paired no coat values. Open and solid symbols represent negative and positive results, respectively, as determined by Metric 1. Note the dramatically different scale of the pandemic IgM graph. A graphic summary of the determined result for each subject is shown in the boxes to the right.

Figure 5. Quantification of the relative levels of IgM, IgG, and IgA-reactive SARS-CoV-2-RBD antibodies measured by the BU ELISA protocol and comparison of results with Antagen's lateral flow rapid test. Arbitrary Unit (AU) values were calculated as described in Methods. Each subject ID is labeled below the corresponding bar on the graphs, with panels A, B, and C showing IgM, IgG, and IgA results, respectively. The solid bars represent a positive determination of signal as determined by Metric 1. The cut-off for positivity as determined by Metric 2 is shown as the dotted lines on each graph and is 30, 28, and 27 IgM, IgG, and IgA, respectively. (D) Subject results determined to be positive by both Metrics 1 and 2 were graphed for each isotype and the results were statistically compared for IgG using a Mann-Whitney t-test. (E) Results from Antagen's LFD test for subjects B1, B2, B3, and B4. Determination of band presence for each test was determined while blinded to sample status and the results from all samples tested is shown as red symbols in (A) and (B).

Figure 6. Quantification of relative IgM, IgG, and IgA SARS-CoV-2-nucleocapsid protein antibody levels and comparison with the EUA approved Abbott IgG chemiluminescent microparticle assay. (A) Dilution curves of 20 pre-pandemic, eight pandemic, and four SARS-CoV-2 infected subjects was performed; OD values show the SARS-CoV-2 NP coat-specific signal and were calculated by subtracting the blank and dilution paired no coat values. Open and solid symbols represent negative and positive results, respectively, as determined by Metric 1. A graphic summary of the determined result for each subject is shown in the boxes to the right. (B) Arbitrary Unit (AU) values were calculated as described in Methods. The cut-off for positivity as determined by Metric 2 is shown as the dotted lines for IgA and is 27. IgG and IgM values above zero are considered positive by Metric 2 in these analyses as the coat- no coat AU values were never below zero.. Red symbols represent results of the same samples run on the Abbott IgG CMIA; actual calculated values from this assay are shown in Supplemental Figure 4.

Supplemental Figure 1. Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) of the BU ELISA protocol.

Supplemental Figure 2. Example of a SARS-CoV-2 RBD BU ELISA plate map. Three-fold serial dilutions starting from 1000 ng/ml (dil 1) was used for the recombinant antibody. Wells designated as no coat (PBS only) or antigen coated (SARS-CoV-2 RBD or NP) are indicated as white and blue, respectively. The zero standard and blank wells were loaded with only sample diluent (casein blocking buffer) at the sample addition step.

Supplemental Figure 3. The OD values from subject samples from uncoated wells is highly consistent between experimental runs. OD values of a 1:5 sample dilution from 34 subjects for IgM, IgG and IgA from two different experimental runs with the BU ELISA protocol are shown. Linear regression analysis was performed and R squared and p values are shown.

Supplemental Figure 4. Results of Antagen's lateral flow rapid test (LFD) and the Abbott IgG chemiluminescent microparticle immunoassay.

References:

1. Zhu, N., *et al.* A Novel Coronavirus from Patients with Pneumonia in China, 2019. *The New England journal of medicine* **382**, 727-733 (2020).
2. Wu, F., *et al.* A new coronavirus associated with human respiratory disease in China. *Nature* **579**, 265-269 (2020).
3. Huang, C., *et al.* Clinical features of patients infected with 2019 novel coronavirus in Wuhan, China. *Lancet* **395**, 497-506 (2020).
4. Grant, M.C., *et al.* The prevalence of symptoms in 24,410 adults infected by the novel coronavirus (SARS-CoV-2; COVID-19): A systematic review and meta-analysis of 148 studies from 9 countries. *PloS one* **15**, e0234765 (2020).

5. Wu, Z. & McGoogan, J.M. Characteristics of and Important Lessons From the Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Outbreak in China: Summary of a Report of 72314 Cases From the Chinese Center for Disease Control and Prevention. *JAMA* (2020).

6. Gao, Z.*, et al.* A Systematic Review of Asymptomatic Infections with COVID-19. *J Microbiol Immunol Infect* (2020).

7. Grifoni, A.*, et al.* Targets of T Cell Responses to SARS-CoV-2 Coronavirus in Humans with COVID-19 Disease and Unexposed Individuals. *Cell* **181**, 1489-1501 e1415 (2020).

8. Le Bert, N.*, et al.* SARS-CoV-2-specific T cell immunity in cases of COVID-19 and SARS, and uninfected controls. *Nature* (2020).

9. Braun, J.*, et al.* SARS-CoV-2-reactive T cells in healthy donors and patients with COVID-19. *Nature* (2020).

10. Mateus, J.*, et al.* Selective and cross-reactive SARS-CoV-2 T cell epitopes in unexposed humans. *Science* (2020).

11. Sette, A. & Crotty, S. Pre-existing immunity to SARS-CoV-2: the knowns and unknowns. *Nature reviews. Immunology* **20**, 457-458 (2020).

12. Plotkin, S.A. Vaccines: correlates of vaccine-induced immunity. *Clin Infect Dis* **47**, 401-409 (2008).

13. Amanat, F.*, et al.* A serological assay to detect SARS-CoV-2 seroconversion in humans. *Nature medicine* **26**, 1033-1036 (2020).

14. Robbiani, D.F.*, et al.* Convergent Antibody Responses to SARS-CoV-2 Infection in Convalescent Individuals. *bioRxiv* (2020).

15. Okba, N.M.A.*, et al.* Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2-Specific Antibody Responses in Coronavirus Disease Patients. *Emerg Infect Dis* **26**, 1478-1488 (2020).

16. Premkumar, L.*, et al.* The receptor binding domain of the viral spike protein is an immunodominant and highly specific target of antibodies in SARS-CoV-2 patients. *Sci Immunol* **5**(2020).

17. Salvatori, G., *et al.* SARS-CoV-2 SPIKE PROTEIN: an optimal immunological target for vaccines. *Journal of translational medicine* **18**, 222 (2020).

18. Ravichandran, S., *et al.* Antibody signature induced by SARS-CoV-2 spike protein immunogens in rabbits. *Sci Transl Med* **12**(2020).

19. Horber, S., *et al.* Evaluation of three fully-automated SARS-CoV-2 antibody assays. *Clin Chem Lab Med* (2020).

20. Theel, E.S., Harring, J., Hilgart, H. & Granger, D. Performance Characteristics of Four High-Throughput Immunoassays for Detection of IgG Antibodies against SARS-CoV-2. *J Clin Microbiol* **58**(2020).

21. Montesinos, I., *et al.* Evaluation of two automated and three rapid lateral flow immunoassays for the detection of anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibodies. *J Clin Virol* **128**, 104413 (2020).

22. Whitman, J.D., *et al.* Test performance evaluation of SARS-CoV-2 serological assays. *medRxiv* (2020).

23. Deeks, J.J., *et al.* Antibody tests for identification of current and past infection with SARS-CoV-2. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* **6**, CD013652 (2020).

24. Long, Q.X., *et al.* Clinical and immunological assessment of asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infections. *Nature medicine* (2020).

25. Guven, E., *et al.* Non-specific binding in solid phase immunoassays for autoantibodies correlates with inflammation markers. *Journal of immunological methods* **403**, 26-36 (2014).

26. Terato, K., Do, C., Chang, J. & Waritani, T. Preventing further misuse of the ELISA technique and misinterpretation of serological antibody assay data. *Vaccine* **34**, 4643-4644 (2016).

27. Bisoffi, Z., *et al.* Sensitivity, Specificity and Predictive Values of Molecular and Serological Tests for COVID-19: A Longitudinal Study in Emergency Room. *Diagnostics (Basel)* **10**(2020).

28. Wec, A.Z., *et al.* Broad neutralization of SARS-related viruses by human monoclonal antibodies. *Science* **369**, 731-736 (2020).

29. Garg, S., *et al.* Hospitalization Rates and Characteristics of Patients Hospitalized with Laboratory-Confirmed Coronavirus Disease 2019 - COVID-NET, 14 States, March 1-30, 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep* **69**, 458-464 (2020).

30. Stokes, E.K., *et al.* Coronavirus Disease 2019 Case Surveillance - United States, January 22-May 30, 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep* **69**, 759-765 (2020).

31. Onder, G., Rezza, G. & Brusaferro, S. Case-Fatality Rate and Characteristics of Patients Dying in Relation to COVID-19 in Italy. *JAMA* **323**, 1775-1776 (2020).

32. Zhou, F., *et al.* Clinical course and risk factors for mortality of adult inpatients with COVID-19 in Wuhan, China: a retrospective cohort study. *Lancet* **395**, 1054-1062 (2020).

33. Deng, W., *et al.* Primary exposure to SARS-CoV-2 protects against reinfection in rhesus macaques. *Science* **369**, 818-823 (2020).

34. Rogers, T.F., *et al.* Isolation of potent SARS-CoV-2 neutralizing antibodies and protection from disease in a small animal model. *Science* **369**, 956-963 (2020).

35. Tan, C.W., *et al.* A SARS-CoV-2 surrogate virus neutralization test based on antibody-mediated blockage of ACE2-spike protein-protein interaction. *Nature biotechnology* **38**, 1073-1078 (2020).

36. Mandelboim, M., *et al.* Significant cross reactive antibodies to influenza virus in adults and children during a period of marked antigenic drift. *BMC Infect Dis* **14**, 346 (2014).

37. Gou, X., Wu, X., Shi, Y., Zhang, K. & Huang, J. A systematic review and meta-analysis of cross-reactivity of antibodies induced by H7 influenza vaccine. *Hum Vaccin Immunother* **16**, 286-294 (2020).

38. Chen, Y.Q., *et al.* Influenza Infection in Humans Induces Broadly Cross-Reactive and Protective Neuraminidase-Reactive Antibodies. *Cell* **173**, 417-429 e410 (2018).

39. Hancock, K., *et al.* Cross-reactive antibody responses to the 2009 pandemic H1N1 influenza virus. *The New England journal of medicine* **361**, 1945-1952 (2009).

40. Atyeo, C., *et al.* Distinct Early Serological Signatures Track with SARS-CoV-2 Survival. *Immunity* (2020).

41. Liu, Y., *et al.* Viral dynamics in mild and severe cases of COVID-19. *Lancet Infect Dis* **20**, 656-657 (2020).

42. Iversen, K., *et al.* Risk of COVID-19 in health-care workers in Denmark: an observational cohort study. *Lancet Infect Dis* (2020).

43. Pujadas, E., *et al.* SARS-CoV-2 viral load predicts COVID-19 mortality. *Lancet Respir Med* **8**, e70 (2020).

44. Chen, D., Hu, C., Su, F., Song, Q. & Wang, Z. Exposure to SARS-CoV-2 in a high transmission setting increases the risk of severe COVID-19 compared with exposure to a low transmission setting? *J Travel Med* **27**(2020).

45. Zhao, J., *et al.* Antibody responses to SARS-CoV-2 in patients of novel coronavirus disease 2019. *Clin Infect Dis* (2020).

46. Hansen, I.S., Baeten, D.L.P. & den Dunnen, J. The inflammatory function of human IgA. *Cell Mol Life Sci* **76**, 1041-1055 (2019).

47. Buford, T.W. (Dis)Trust your gut: the gut microbiome in age-related inflammation, health, and disease. *Microbiome* **5**, 80 (2017).

48. Brenchley, J.M., *et al.* Microbial translocation is a cause of systemic immune activation in chronic HIV infection. *Nature medicine* **12**, 1365-1371 (2006).

49. Xiao, F., *et al.* Evidence for Gastrointestinal Infection of SARS-CoV-2. *Gastroenterology* **158**, 1831-1833 e1833 (2020).

50. Mao, R., *et al.* Manifestations and prognosis of gastrointestinal and liver involvement in patients with COVID-19: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Lancet Gastroenterol Hepatol* **5**, 667-678 (2020).

51. Yang, L. & Tu, L. Implications of gastrointestinal manifestations of COVID-19. *Lancet Gastroenterol Hepatol* **5**, 629-630 (2020).

52. Kaneko, N., *et al.* Loss of Bcl-6-Expressing T Follicular Helper Cells and Germinal Centers in COVID-19. *Cell* (2020).

Table 1

	Subject ID | Age Range | Sex (M/F)														
	Younger (Y)			Older (O)			HIV+ (H)			Systemic lupus erythematosus, SLE (S)			Pandemic (C)		
	Y1	20-25	M	O1	70-75	F	H1	30-35	M	S1	25-30	F	C1	30-35	M
	Y2	20-25	M	O2	70-75	M	H2	30-35	M	S2	20-25	F	C2	20-25	F
	Y3	25-30	M	O3	75-80	M	H3	25-30	M	S3	65-70	F	C3	30-35	M
	Y4	30-35	M	O4	95-100	F	H4	25-30	M	S4	20-25	F	C4	20-25	F
	Y5	20-25	M	O5	60-65	M	H5	35-40	M	S5	50-55	M	C5	60-65	F
	Y6	25-30	M	O6	80-85	F	H6	60-65	M	S6	50-55	M	C6	45-50	F
	Y7	20-25	M	O7	70-75	F	H7	50-55	M	S7	30-35	F	C7	70-75	M
	Y8	30-35	M	O8	70-75	F	H8	70-75	M	S8	35-40	F	C8	60-65	M
	Y9	25-30	F	O9	80-85	M	H9	50-55	M	S9	30-35	M			
	Y10	25-30	F	O10	65-70	M	H10	65-70	M	S10	40-45	F			
Age (average, range)	26.8 (21-34)			74.7 (64-96)			46.2 (29-73)			39.4 (23-69)			44.63 (23-71)		
Sex, M (%)	80%			50%			100%			30%			50%		

SARS-CoV-2 Infected	Age Range	Sex	Symptomatic (Y/N)	Length of Symptoms (days)	Days post Last Symptom at Sample Collection
B1	30-35	F	Y	10	59
B2	60-65	F	N	N/A	N/A
B3	75-80	M	Y	11	44
B4	40-45	F	Y	61	36
CONV1	70-75	M	Y	46	0

Figure 1


A
IgG
automated wash
multichannel wash
(BU ELISA method)
OD @450nm
2.0
1.5
1.0
0.5
0.0
1
10
100
1000
10000
100000
recriprocal sample dilution


B
IgM
IgG
IgA
OD @450nm
Avg: 0.16
Range: 0.01-0.68
Avg: 0.09
Range: 0.01-0.46
Avg: 0.07
Range: 0.01-0.22
5
10
25
125
625
3125
30125
recriprocal sample dilution


IgM
IgG
IgA
C
pre-pandemic
Younger
Older
HIV+
SLE
Pandemic
SARS-CoV-2
infected
OD @450nm
0.8
0.6
0.4
0.2
0
1:5
1:10
recriprocal sample dilution

Figure 2


IgM
IgG
IgA
OD @450nm
0
1
2
3
4
1
10
100
1000
clone:
BIB116
CR3022
CR3022
SARS-CoV-2 RBD-specific recombinant antibody (ng/ml)

Figure 3


A
IgM
IgG
IgA
SARS-CoV-2 RBD-specific signal
CONV1
Subject Group
Younger
Older
HIV+
SLE
OD @450nm
recriprocal dilution
subject IgM IgG IgA
Y1 - - -
Y2 - + -
Y3 - + +
Y4 - - -
Y5 - - -
Y6 - - +
Y7 - - -
Y8 - + -
Y9 - - -
Y10 - - -
O1 - - -
O2 - - -
O3 - - -
O4 - - -
O5 + - -
O6 - - -
O7 - - +
O8 - - -
O9 - - -
O10 - - -
H1 - - -
H2 + - -
H3 + + +
H4 + - -
H5 - - -
H6 - + -
H7 - - -
H8 - - -
H9 - - -
H10 - + -
S1 - + -
S2 - + -
S3 + + +
S4 + - -
S5 - - -
S6 - - -
S7 - - -
S8 - + -
S9 - + -
S10 - + -


B
Percentage of samples with SARS-CoV-2 RBD reactive antibodies
IgM
IgG
IgA
Any isotype
Age group (y.o.) n=
<50 22
50-70 9
>70 9

Figure 4


IgM
IgG
IgA
SARS-CoV-2 RBD-specific signal
Pandemic
SARS-CoV-2 infected
OD @450nm
recriprocal dilution
subject
IgM IgG IgA
C1 + + +
C2 - + -
C3 - - -
C4 - - -
C5 - + +
C6 - - -
C7 - + +
C8 - - -
subject
days symptomatic
IgM IgG IgA
B1 10 + + +
B2 0 + + +
B3 11 + + +
B4 61 + + +
CONV1 46 + + +

Figure 5


A
IgM
pre-pandemic
younger
older
HIV+
SLE
pandemic
SARS-CoV-2 infected
Arbitrary Units
B
IgG
C
IgA
D
IgM
IgG
IgA
p=0.0043
p=0.036
pre-pandemic
pandemic
SARS-CoV-2 infected
E
B1
B2
B3
B4
C
G
M

Figure 6.

A



SARS-CoV-2 NP-reactive signal

subject	IgM	IgG	IgA
Y3	-	+	-
Y5	+	+	-
Y6	-	+	+
Y7	+	+	+
Y8	-	+	+
Y9	-	+	-
O1	+	+	+
O2	-	+	+
O3	-	+	+
O4	-	-	-

subject	IgM	IgG	IgA
O6	-	+	-
O7	-	+	+
O9	-	+	+
H3	-	+	+
H10	-	+	+
S3	+	+	+
S5	+	+	+
S7	-	+	+
S8	-	+	+
S9	-	+	+

subject	IgM	IgG	IgA
C1	-	+	+
C2	+	+	+
C3	ND	+	+
C4	ND	+	+
C5	+	+	+
C6	+	+	+
C7	ND	+	+
C8	+	+	+

	# days symptomatic	IgM	IgG	IgA
B1	9	+	+	+
B2	0	+	+	+
B3	10	+	+	+
B4	60	-	+	+

B