Clinical, laboratory, and temporal predictors of neutralizing antibodies to SARS-CoV-2 after COVID-19

Authors:, Jim Boonyaratanakornkit[1,2,3*†], Chihiro Morishima[4†], Stacy Selke[4], Danniel Zamora[1,2], Sarah McGuffin[1], Adrienne E. Shapiro[1,5], Victoria L. Campbell[1], Christopher L. McClurkan[1], Lichen Jing[1], Robin Gross[6], Janie Liang[6], Elena Postnikova[6], Steven Mazur[6], Anu Chaudhary[4], Marie K. Das[4], Susan L. Fink[4], Andrew Bryan[4], Alex L. Greninger[4], Keith R. Jerome [2,4], Michael R. Holbrook[6], Terry B. Gernsheimer[1,3], Mark H. Wener[1,4], Anna Wald[1,2,7†], David M. Koelle[1,2,4,5,8*†]

Affiliations:

[1]Department of Medicine, University of Washington, Seattle, WA 98195, USA

[2]Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center, Seattle, WA 98109, USA

[3]Seattle Cancer Care Alliance, Seattle, WA 91809, USA

[4]Department of Laboratory Medicine and Pathology, University of Washington, Seattle, WA 98195, USA

[5]Department of Global Health, University of Washington, Seattle, WA 98195, USA

[6]Integrated Research Facility, Division of Clinical Research, National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases, National Institutes of Health, Frederick, MD 21702, USA

[7]Department of Epidemiology, University of Washington, Seattle, WA 98195, USA

[8]Benaroya Research Institute, Seattle, WA 98101, USA

[†]These authors contributed equally.

24 ***Address for correspondence:**

25 Jim Boonyaratanakornkit

26 Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center

27 1100 Fairview Ave N, Mail Stop E5-320

28 Seattle, WA 98109

29 1 206 667 2379

30 Email: jboonyar@fredhutch.org

31 or

32 David Koelle

33 University of Washington

34 750 Republican Street Room E651

35 Seattle, WA 98109 USA

36 1 206 616 1940

37 Email: dkoelle@medicine.washington.edu

38

39

40

41 Running head: Antibody responses after COVID-19

42 Type: Research article

43 Word count abstract: 249

44 Word count main text: 3,835

45 References: 29

46 **ABBREVIATIONS**

47 DMSO	dimethylsulfoxide
48 PCR	polymerase chain reaction
49 EDTA	ethylenediamine tetra-acetic acid
50 SARS-CoV-2	severe adult respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2
51 COVID-19	coronavirus disease 2019
52 OR	odds ratio
53 CI	confidence interval
54 IgG	immunoglobulin G
55 BSL-3	biosafety level 3
56 nAb	neutralizing antibody
57 ROC	receiver operating curve
58 S1	spike protein domain 1
59 NP	nucleoprotein
60 PBMC	peripheral blood mononuclear cells
61 ACE2	angiotensin converting enzyme 2
62 CE	Conformité Européenne
63 ELISA	enzyme linked immune sorbent assay
64 ODR	optical density ratio
65 FRNA	fluorescence reduction neutralization assay

ABSTRACT

Background: SARS-CoV-2-specific antibodies may protect from reinfection and disease, providing the rationale for administration of plasma containing SARS-CoV-2 neutralizing antibodies (nAb) as a treatment for COVID-19. The clinical factors and laboratory assays to streamline plasma donor selection, and the durability of nAb responses, are incompletely understood. **Methods:** Adults with virologically-documented SARS-CoV-2 infection in a convalescent plasma donor screening program were tested for serum IgG to SARS-CoV-2 spike protein S1 domain, nucleoprotein (NP), and for nAb. **Results:** Amongst 250 consecutive persons studied a median of 67 days since symptom onset, 243/250 (97%) were seropositive on one or more assays. Sixty percent of donors had nAb titers ≥1:80. Correlates of higher nAb titer included older age (adjusted OR [AOR] 1.03/year of age, 95% CI 1.00-1.06), male sex (AOR 2.08, 95% CI 1.13-3.82), fever during acute illness (AOR 2.73, 95% CI 1.25-5.97), and disease severity represented by hospitalization (AOR 6.59, 95% CI 1.32-32.96). Receiver operating characteristic (ROC) analyses of anti-S1 and anti-NP antibody results yielded cutoffs that corresponded well with nAb titers, with the anti-S1 assay being slightly more predictive. NAb titers declined in 37 of 41 paired specimens collected a median of 98 days (range, 77-120) apart (P<0.001). Seven individuals (2.8%) were persistently seronegative and lacked T cell responses. **Conclusions:** Nab titers correlated with COVID-19 severity, age, and sex. Standard commercially available SARS-CoV-2 IgG results can serve as useful surrogates for nAb testing. Functional nAb levels were found to decline and a small proportion of COVID-19 survivors lack adaptive immune responses.

88 **INTRODUCTION**

89 Since its emergence in late 2019, Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-
90 CoV-2) infection has spread globally, with devastating effects in many communities. At this
91 time, no vaccines or therapeutics for the prevention or treatment of SARS-CoV-2 infection have
92 been approved by the Food and Drug Administration (FDA). Passive immunotherapy with
93 convalescent plasma, hyperimmune gamma globulin, or monoclonal antibodies is beneficial for
94 treatment or prophylaxis of several infections(1), and these approaches are under investigation in
95 patients with COVID-19. Both single donor and pooled immunoglobulin products currently
96 prioritize collection of convalescent donor plasma with high levels of neutralizing antibodies
97 (nAb).

98

99 NAb assays are challenging to perform and have biosafety concerns. A better understanding of
100 the predictors and correlates of high nAb titers could be useful for improving access to high
101 quality therapeutic plasma products. In addition, it is uncertain how durable acquired immunity
102 will be in response to SARS-CoV-2 infection. Protection from several other respiratory viruses
103 after natural infection is temporary and incomplete(2, 3) and longitudinal information concerning
104 nAb levels may assist modeling the future of the outbreak until effective vaccines become widely
105 used. We evaluated antibody levels in candidate plasma donors recovered from virologically-
106 documented SARS-CoV-2 infection and examined the trajectory of antibody levels in a subset of
107 donors over time. Further, we compared nAb titers with two rapid commercially available assays
108 to determine whether these assays could substitute for time- and labor-intensive nAb
109 measurements that require a BSL-3 facility.

110 **RESULTS**

111 **Participant characteristics**

112 We enrolled 250 consecutive persons interested in convalescent plasma donation with a median
113 age of 51 years (range 19-91); 48% were men (**Table 1**). The median duration of COVID-19
114 symptoms was 15 days (range 0-49), and the median number of days between positive PCR
115 testing and initial antibody testing was 61 days (range 14-112). Eighteen (11%) of participants
116 reported hospitalization including 9 (4%) who received ICU-level care. The most common
117 symptoms reported were fatigue (86%), fever (74%), muscle aches (73%), cough (72%),
118 anosmia/ageusia (61%), and headache (60%) (**Supplemental Figure 1A**). The most commonly
119 reported underlying comorbidities were lung disease (14.4%), heart disease (13.6%),
120 hypertension (12.8%), cancer (12.8%), hyperlipidemia (9.6%), and diabetes (9.6%)
121 (**Supplemental Figure 1B**).

122

123 **Clinical correlates of neutralizing antibody response**

124 Among the 250 participants, 12.8% had nAb titers below 1:40, 27.6% had titers of 1:40, 34.4%
125 had titers of 1:80, and 25.2% had titers of 1:160 or greater (**Figure 1)**. Next, we examined the
126 clinical correlates of nAb titers of 1:80 or greater, as this group was eligible for donation to a
127 pooled immunoglobulin product protocol. In a univariable analysis, older age (OR 1.04 per year,
128 95% CI 1.02-1.06), male sex (OR 2.27, 95% CI 1.35-3.82), the presence of fever (OR 3.12, 95%
129 CI 1.73-5.61) or difficulty breathing (OR 2.12, 95% CI 1.26-3.54) during the acute illness
130 episode, hospitalization denoting more severe disease (OR 9.98, 95% CI 2.31-43.16), and having
131 diabetes (OR 5.36, 95% CI 1.55-18.48) were significantly associated with higher nAb titers
132 (**Table 2**). In a multivariable analysis, older age (adjusted OR [AOR] 1.03 [95% CI 1.00-1.06]),

133 male sex (AOR 2.08 [95% CI 1.13-3.82]), the presence of fever during the acute illness episode
134 (AOR 2.73 [95% CI 1.25-5.97]), and hospitalization (AOR 6.59 [CI 1.32-32.96]) remained
135 significantly associated with higher nAb titers (**Table 2**). A longer interval in time between the
136 diagnostic PCR and antibody testing was also associated with lower nAb titers (OR 0.97 [CI
137 0.96-0.99]) **(Table 2)**.
138
139 **Comparison of anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibody measurements**
140 Circulating IgG antibodies against SARS-CoV-2 antigens were measured using IgG
141 immunoassays for anti-S1 (Euroimmun) and anti-NP (Abbott). Amongst the 250 sera analyzed at
142 the initial time point, 23 (9.2%) of samples were negative by the manufacturer's criteria versus
143 11 (4.4%) by a z-score threshold of 3.0 for the Abbott assay. For the Euroimmun assay, 20
144 (8.0%) were negative by a z-score threshold of 3.0 versus 30 (12.0%) by the manufacturer's
145 criteria. A minority of samples demonstrated discordant results (**Figure 2**); overall, 15 (6%) were
146 discordant for seropositivity using z-score thresholds of 3.0 versus 19 (7.6%) using
147 manufacturers' thresholds.
148
149 Quantitative assay results were generally concordant. Neutralizing antibody titers correlated with
150 z-scores from the anti-S1 Euroimmun assay (Pearson correlation of 0.49, $P<0.001$) and with the
151 Abbott anti-NP assay (Pearson correlation of 0.39, $P<0.001$) (**Figure 2A, B**). Z-scores of the
152 Euroimmun and Abbott assays also correlated with each other (Pearson correlation of 0.69,
153 $P<0.001$) (**Figure 2C**). Receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curves were generated to
154 summarize the sensitivity and specificity of the Abbott and the Euroimmun assays for detecting
155 nAb titers ≥ 1:40, ≥ 1:80 and ≥1:160 (**Supplemental Figure 2**). The area under the curve (AUC)

156 for the Euroimmun assay was slightly greater than for the Abbott assay across all three nAb
157 levels.
158
159 The criteria for positivity in the binding IgG tests was subjected to further analysis focusing on
160 nAb cutoffs of ≥ 1:80 or higher. A z-score of 3.0 in the Euroimmun assay had a sensitivity of
161 99% and specificity of 17% for a nAb titer ≥ 1:80 (**Table 3 and Supplemental Figure 2B**). To
162 estimate optimal cutoffs, we used Youden's index(4), which indicated that at an optimized z-
163 score cut-off of 34.2, the Euroimmun assay had a sensitivity of 78% and specificity of 72%. A z-
164 score of 3.0 in the Abbott assay had a sensitivity of 100% but a specificity of only 11%. Using an
165 optimized z-score cut-off of 32.6, the Abbott assay had a sensitivity of 77% and specificity of
166 81%. Because the optimal therapeutic titer of convalescent plasma is unknown, we also
167 calculated the sensitivity and specificity of both IgG binding assays to predict nAb titers ≥ 1:160;
168 as expected, these z-scores were higher (**Table 3**).
169
170 **Antibody titers over time after recovery from COVID-19**
171 Lower nAb titers were associated with a longer time after symptom resolution according to our
172 multivariable analysis (**Table 2**). In a cross-sectional visualization of serologic data from persons
173 with a nAb titer of 1:40 or greater at the initial blood draw, nAb titers, anti-S1 IgG, and anti-NP
174 IgG levels all demonstrated trends towards lower antibody levels with increased interval between
175 symptoms and blood sampling (**Supplemental Figure 3**). To further investigate this initial
176 observation, 41 participants enrolled during April 2020 who had nAb titers of 1:40 or greater
177 returned for a second blood draw to examine antibody kinetics. Neutralization titers decreased
178 over time in all but four participants. From these data, nAb half-life was calculated at 66.2 days

179 (95% CI 55.5-82.5) (**Figure 3A**). A decline in anti-S1 IgG and anti-NP IgG levels over time was
180 also observed in 83% and 98% of participants, respectively (**Figures 3B and 3C**). Given our
181 observation that compression of ODRs and resultant z-scores occur at higher levels of IgG, half-
182 life calculations were not performed for these latter assays.
183
184 **Clinical characteristics and repeat serologic results from seronegative participants**
185 We identified seven participants who lacked circulating antibody responses by all three assays,
186 despite having documented SARS-CoV-2 infection. Amongst these, one had been asymptomatic
187 and one had been hospitalized for COVID-19 (**Table 4**). Five (71%) were women with a median
188 age of 48 (range 40-62). The median time between positive SARS-CoV-2 PCR and antibody
189 testing was 42 days (range 30-87). The previously hospitalized participant with consistently
190 negative antibody results across all three antibody tests had received infliximab for vasculitis one
191 week prior to becoming infected with H1N1 influenza, followed one week later by infection with
192 SARS-CoV-2. Six seronegative participants had a repeat blood draw, a median time of 43 days
193 (range 20-55) after the first. Serologic test results remained negative in all individuals by all
194 three assays (**Table 4**).
195
196 To further investigate the immune status of the seronegative individuals, we performed IFN-γ
197 ELISPOT using PBMCs from follow-up samples of the six persons with repeat blood draws, and
198 peptides from SARS-CoV-2 structural proteins. Previous work has shown that the majority of T
199 cell responses in COVID-19 survivors recognize these viral proteins(5). As comparators, we
200 tested a subset of seropositive persons and pre-2019 healthy donors. We detected robust T cell
201 responses in convalescent PBMCs from convalescent SARS-CoV-2-seropositive individuals,

202 whereas responses from SARS-CoV-2-seronegative patients were similar to healthy donors

203 (**Supplemental Figure 4**).

204

205 **DISCUSSION**

206 Our characterization of a large cohort of potential SARS-CoV-2 convalescent plasma donors
207 provides several useful observations relevant to protection after natural infection or vaccination
208 and the manufacture of antibody-based therapeutics. We found that a significant proportion
209 (40%) of persons failed to meet a protocol-driven nAb threshold (≥ 1:80) for contribution to a
210 pooled immunoglobulin product. Clinical factors associated with higher levels of nAb,
211 specifically male sex, older age, higher disease severity, and shorter interval from recovery, were
212 identified; this information could streamline future donor recruitment. Repeat testing
213 demonstrated a decline of functional nAb over time, suggesting that these clinical characteristics
214 are most valuable when used early after recovery. We also found that anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgG
215 results from two widely accessible and commercially available immunoassays could reliably
216 predict high nAb titers when used relatively early after COVID-19. Test cutoffs were
217 empirically derived that can assist in selecting donors with increased likelihood of having high
218 nAb titers. Finally, approximately 3% of our cohort, all with documented SARS-CoV-2
219 infection, did not exhibit adaptive immune responses in multiple antibody and T cell assays.
220

221 Pending full approval of antiviral drugs or a preventative vaccine, much effort has focused on
222 passive immunization for the treatment or prevention of COVID-19, ranging from single-donor
223 plasma and pooled immunoglobulin products to recombinant antibodies(6-8). Pooled products
224 have a track record of safety and efficacy for other pathogens including respiratory viruses(1),
225 and are most efficiently manufactured from plasma containing higher amounts of functional
226 antibody. While the immunoglobulin isotypes and functional activities associated with improved
227 COVID-19 outcomes remain an active area of investigation(9), neutralization of viral entry is

228 thought to be a desirable attribute that corresponds to protection. Thus, qualifying plasma
229 donation for NIH hyperimmune globulin protocol NCT04344977 has focused on high nAb titers.
230 Observational data from a single donor plasma program generally support the premise that
231 neutralizing antibodies are desirable, with lower mortality rates noted for persons receiving
232 plasma containing the top quintile of anti-S binding antibodies(6). A small randomized
233 controlled trial also found a trend towards a shorter time to clinical improvement and lower
234 mortality with convalescent plasma(10). We therefore sought to identify clinical characteristics
235 associated with plasma neutralizing antibodies and compared two widely used SARS-CoV-2
236 antibody tests for ability to predict nAb titers of 1:80 or greater.
237
238 Our clinical findings of an association between higher nAb titers with male sex, older age, and
239 hospitalization are consistent with a recent report from another convalescent plasma candidate
240 donor study(11) and other reports concerning recovered individuals(12-14). The relationship
241 between greater infection severity, and presumably greater antigen load, with higher acquired B
242 cell responses is paralleled by data by others showing an association between more severe
243 infection with higher T cell responses in general, and, in particular, circulating CD4+ T follicular
244 helper (cT_{FH}) responses(15). T_{FH} cells provide critical positive signals to antigen-specific B cells
245 in lymph node germinal center (GC) reactions promoting avid and long-lasting antibody
246 responses.
247
248 Our cross-sectional analyses also found a trend towards lower nAb titers with increased elapsed
249 time between antibody testing after symptom resolution. This was confirmed in longitudinal
250 analyses of 41participants re-evaluated approximately 3 months after their first test. A quarter of

251 the re-evaluated participants had nAb titers below 1:40 at the second time point, and declines in
252 circulating anti-S1 and anti-NP IgG levels were found in >80% of participants over the relatively
253 short period of time between the two blood draws. A critical and currently unresolved issue for
254 SARS-CoV-2 infection is the extent to which prior infection prevents or ameliorates various
255 characteristics of re-infection, including disease, viral shedding, and transmission potential. It is
256 likely that protection efficiency will vary according to clinical characteristics of the host and of
257 the initial infection, with time after initial infection, and with the virologic or clinical endpoint
258 under consideration. The issue of antibody durability has been addressed in prior cross-sectional
259 and longitudinal studies, obviously limited by the recency of the pandemic. Decreases in SARS-
260 CoV-2 nAb titers have been observed in some prior studies(13, 16, 17) but not others(18). The
261 decline of nAb titers over time and the low somatic hypermutation in immunoglobulin genes
262 recovered from SARS-CoV-2-specific memory B cells(19) both suggest that ineffective help
263 from T_{FH} CD4 T cells is occurring in germinal centers. While circulating T_{FH}-like SARS-CoV-2-
264 reactive CD4 T cells have been detected in the blood(15), autopsy data from fatal COVID-19 is
265 consistent with poor germinal center reactions(20). Overall, waning immunity after natural
266 infection raises concern for re-infection over time as observed for other respiratory viruses,
267 including the endemic coronaviruses(2, 3). Data on protection from re-infection with SARS-
268 CoV-2 are incomplete at this time, with case reports of re-infection(21) contrasting with cohort
269 data from an occupational outbreak in which persons with baseline SARS-CoV-2-specific
270 circulating antibody were protected from infection(22). Additional research will be required to
271 address the immunologic and clinical parameters associated with protection from re-infection
272 after SARS-CoV-2 infection.
273

274 With regard to test performance, we found a slightly stronger correlation between nAb titers and
275 anti-S1 IgG levels using the Euroimmun assay compared to anti-NP IgG levels determined using
276 the Abbott assay. We were able to establish cutoffs using z-scores for each assay that had good
277 performance for predicting nAb titers of 1:80 or greater, or 1:160 or greater, which should be
278 useful as the clinical efficacy of single-donor and pooled immunoglobulin products continue to
279 be defined. The superior performance of the anti-S1 assay is not unexpected given that
280 antibodies that neutralize SARS-CoV-2 bind to the S protein present on the surface of infectious
281 virus. This finding is also consistent with studies that have shown that the detection of NP-
282 binding antibodies does not always correlate with the presence of nAb(23).
283
284 In the present study, we used z-scores to standardize serologic results to the same scale and to
285 account for local test performance characteristics(24). Despite using a relatively conservative
286 positivity threshold of 3 standard deviations above our assay-specific negative control means,
287 these z-score positivity thresholds were lower than manufacturer-recommended thresholds for
288 both assays. Accordingly, a larger number of samples were considered "negative" by both assays
289 using manufacturer-recommended thresholds compared to z-scores. Although continuous values
290 are obtained and accessible for both Abbott and EU assays, it is worth noting that both are EUA-
291 approved as qualitative and not quantitative assays. Although the Euroimmun assay appears to be
292 have a wider analytic range in comparison to the Abbott assay, both assays yield results that
293 plateau at different thresholds. Thus, values at higher levels for both assays would require
294 dilution of high-titer sera to achieve linear results. However, even in the absence of re-assay after
295 dilution, however, we were able to discern declines in binding IgG titers over time within-
296 subjects, similar to our observations for nAb.

297

298 A small proportion (3%) of participants tested negative on all three antibody assays despite
299 SARS-CoV-2 RNA detection in previously collected respiratory specimens. Each seronegative
300 COVID-19 survivor tested also had low T cell responses, similar to pre-2019 healthy controls,
301 while seropositive subjects had abundant interferon-gamma producing cells in the blood, similar
302 to other reports(25). While false positive PCR results are possible, all subjects except one, who
303 was a household contact of a person with symptomatic and PCR-confirmed COVID-19, had a
304 clinical syndrome consistent with COVID-19. Asymptomatic and mildly symptomatic patients
305 with COVID-19 have been found to have lower antibody levels and also were more likely to
306 sero-revert in the early convalescent phase(14). Discordance between positive PCR and negative
307 circulating antibody may be related to timing of the blood draw after illness, milder symptoms
308 correlating with lower or briefer antigen exposure, and/or an unrecognized immune suppression.
309

310 Our study has some limitations. First, although our sample population included a clinically
311 diverse population with respect to age, sex, and clinical presentation, the cohort was
312 predominantly white. Additional studies in minority populations at risk for worse outcomes will
313 be needed to determine the generalizability of these results. Second, our study was mainly cross-
314 sectional, and longitudinal data were obtained on only a subset of the cohort. Third, in analyzing
315 the decline of neutralizing antibody titers, a titer of 1:20 was used as a surrogate for all titers
316 <1:40, since this value was the next serial 2-fold titer below the lowest positive result. We chose
317 this conservative surrogate value to avoid the possibility of over-estimating the rate of decline in
318 neutralizing antibody titers. Fourth, we focused on blood immune responses. It is possible that
319 the seronegative individuals in our study mounted a mucosal humoral or T cell response that

320 could provide protection against re-infection. Probing mucosal and T cell immunity may be
321 important in understanding the immune response of subjects with milder infection.
322
323 In summary, our data provide important information regarding the predictive value of clinical
324 factors and commercially available immunoassay results for high nAb titers. This information
325 could aid in streamlining the selection of potential convalescent plasma donors and increase
326 access to and efficiency of donor sample testing. Since transfusion of plasma with higher
327 antibody titers has been associated with improved outcomes(6), and since higher titer plasma is
328 the most suitable for the creation of pooled products, our data further suggest that plasma
329 donations should be sought closer to the resolution of symptoms, rather than later, to optimize
330 yield. A minimum level of nAb necessary for protection has not been established and it is
331 unknown whether persons with low titers will boost their immune responses upon re-exposure.
332 However, our data raise concern that functional antibodies show a quantitative decline over a
333 relatively short period of time after recovery in those with relatively mild infections. Further
334 insight into these issues is critical to monitoring herd immunity and implementation of
335 immunization programs.

336 **METHODS**

337 *Study description*

338 Seattle-area participants were recruited for potential donation of single donor plasma units
339 (NCT04338360), and plasma for manufacture of a pooled anti-SARS-CoV-2 product
340 (NCT04344977). Both studies required age 18 or greater and PCR-positivity to SARS-CoV-2;
341 criteria for donation for the pooled product also included a nAb titer of ≥ 1:80(26). Participants
342 provided demographic and clinical information, including positive SARS-CoV-2 results, and a
343 blood sample.

344

345 *Serologic assays*

346 Plasma from EDTA and heparinized blood and serum were prepared within 12 hours of
347 collection. Serum and plasma for IgG assays were stored at 4°C and assays performed within 72
348 hours of sample processing. PBMCs were isolated from heparinized blood within 12 hours of
349 phlebotomy using standard Ficoll-Hypaque density gradient centrifugation and cryopreserved in
350 liquid nitrogen in 90% fetal calf serum/10% DMSO. EDTA plasma was stored at -80°C for
351 neutralization assays.

352

353 Serologic testing was performed using two FDA-authorized (via Emergency Use Authorization),
354 CE-marked immunoassays; both are approved to provide qualitative results, although both yield
355 quantitative values. The anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgG ELISA from Euroimmun (Lubeck, Germany)
356 measures antibodies to recombinant spike protein (S1 domain), containing the receptor binding
357 domain that interacts with ACE2(27). All testing and analyses were performed according to the
358 manufacturer's protocols, with the OD ratio (ODR) calculated using the kit calibrator. The

359 manufacturer-provided reference range is as follows: ratio <0.8 (negative), ratio ≥ 0.8 to <1.1
360 (borderline), and ratio ≥ 1.1 (positive). The Abbott SARS-CoV-2 IgG chemiluminescent
361 microparticle immunoassay (Abbott ARCHITECT, Abbott Park, IL, USA) measuring antibodies
362 to the SARS-CoV-2 nucleoprotein (NP) was performed per the manufacturer's instructions.
363 Equivalent to an ODR, the kit calibrator was used to establish the assay index result. Index
364 values ≥ 1.4 are considered positive by the manufacturer.
365
366 To standardize results and facilitate comparisons, ODR scores for each sample were converted to
367 z-scores (number of SDs above the negative control mean) as follows: z-score = (Test ODR –
368 Mean negative control ODR) / Mean negative control standard deviation (SD)(24). Negative
369 control sera had been collected between 2015 and 2019 from healthy community blood donors
370 and from patients tested in the clinical laboratory by western blot for potential HSV infection
371 (N=78 for Euroimmun and N=136 for Abbott). ODR were converted to z-scores as follows: For
372 Euroimmun, z-score = (ODR – 0.26)/0.13 and for Abbott, z-score = (index result – 0.08)/0.14).
373 A conservative z-score ≥ 3 was considered positive to minimize false positive results.
374
375 Neutralizing antibody titers were performed using a fluorescence reduction neutralization assay
376 (FRNA) with authentic SARS-CoV-2 (2019-nCoV/USA-WA1-A12/2020 from the US Centers
377 for Disease Control and Prevention, Atlanta, GA, USA) at the NIH-NIAID Integrated Research
378 Facility at Fort Detrick, MD, USA. In these experiments, a fixed volume of diluted virus was
379 incubated with an equivalent volume of test plasma for 1 hour at 37 °C prior to adding the
380 suspension to Vero E6 cells (ATCC, Manassas, VA, USA, #CRL-1586). The virus was allowed
381 to propagate for 24 hours prior to fixing the cells. Following fixation, the cells were

382 permeabilized and probed with a SARS-CoV-2 nucleoprotein-specific rabbit primary antibody
383 (Sino Biological, Wayne, PA, USA, #40143-R001) followed by an Alexa594-conjugated
384 secondary antibody (Life Technologies, San Diego, CA, USA, #A11037). The total number of
385 infected cells in four fields per well with each field containing at least 1000 cells was quantified
386 using an Operetta high content imaging system (Perkin Elmer, Waltham, MA, USA). Plasma
387 was tested using two-fold serial dilutions from 1:40 to 1:1280 with four replicates per dilution.
388 Results are reported as the highest dilution of plasma leading to at least 50% reduction of SARS-
389 CoV-2 titers. Each assay was controlled with internal addition of an S-specific neutralizing
390 polyclonal antibodies. If a 1:40 dilution did not lead to at least 50% reduction of viral titer,
391 results were reported as <1:40 even though some inhibition of virus propagation may have been
392 present. To enable analysis of nAb kinetics over time, a value of 1:20 was used as a surrogate for
393 results <1:40 since this value was the next serial 2-fold titer below the lowest positive result.
394
395 *T cell assays*
396 To measure T cell responses to SARS-CoV-2, PBMCs were thawed and plated at 2.5-3 X 10^5
397 cells/well in duplicate. Stimuli were 9 pools of SARS-CoV-2 peptides (Genscript, Piscataway,
398 NJ, USA) corresponding to the S, membrane (M), and NP proteins of SARS-CoV-2 strain
399 Wuhan (Genbank MN908947.3) in pools of 50-56 peptides/pool. Peptides 13 amino acids long
400 and overlapping by 9 amino acids were used at a final concentration of 1 μg/mL for each peptide
401 and 0.2% DMSO. Negative control was 0.2% DMSO; positive control was 1.6 μg/mL
402 phytohemagglutinin (PHA-P, Remel, Lenexa, KS, USA). Interferon-gamma (IFN-γ) ELISPOT
403 was performed as described(28). All subjects appropriately had too-numerous-to-count positive

404 responses to PHA. Results are reported as spot-forming units/10^6 PBMCs for the background-
405 subtracted response to SARS-CoV-2 peptide pools.
406
407 *Statistics*
408 Univariable analysis was performed using a t-test for continuous variables and Chi-square test
409 for categorical variables. Variables with $P \leq 0.2$ in univariable analysis were candidates for
410 multivariable models using logistic regression and were retained in the models if they remained
411 significant or substantially modified the effect of another factor. Statistical significance was
412 defined as two-sided $P<0.05$. The sensitivity and specificity for high nAb titers by the Abbott
413 and the Euroimmun assays were plotted by generating a receiver operating characteristic (ROC)
414 curve. SPSS software (IBM, Chicago, IL, USA) was used for statistical analysis and to generate
415 ROC curves, the latter with default parameters. Youden's index was calculated for all points of
416 the ROC curves, and the maximum index value was used to select the optimal z-score cut-off(4).
417 Longitudinal analysis of nAb levels was performed using linear mixed effects models with the R
418 package *lme4*(29).
419
420 *Study approval*
421 Institutional Review Board approval was obtained from the University of Washington and all
422 participants underwent informed consent form.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

J.B., C.M., M.K.D., D.M.K, and A.W. wrote the manuscript with input from all co-authors. A.W. and T.B.G. conceived the study. J.B. and A.W. wrote the IRB protocol. J.B., D. Z., S. McGuffin, and A.E.S., recruited participants. S.S. managed the data. V.L.C., C.L.M., and D.M.K. processed specimens. C.M., A.C., M.K.D., A.G., K.R.J., S.L.F., L.J., C.L.M., and M.W. characterized and performed antibody and ELISPOT immunoassays. M.H., R.G., J.L., E.P., and S.M. performed the neutralization assays. J.B., C.M., S.S., M.W., A.W., and D.M.K. performed statistical analysis and generated tables and figures. The order of the first author is alphabetical.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We are grateful to all study participants. We thank Angela LeClair, Miko Robertson, Mark Drummond, Kirsten Hauge, Isabelle Hwang, Kristina Chaffee, Avery Forrow, and Tanvi Aggarwal for support in recruiting and enrolling subjects. We thank the members of the University of Washington Clinical Immunology and Virology Labs for conducting the serological testing.

FUNDING

This work was supported by the Fred Hutchinson Joel Meyer's Endowment (J.B.), Fast-Grants (J.B.), a new investigator award from the American Society for Transplantation and Cell Therapy (J.B.), NIH contract 75N93019C0063 (D.M.K), NIH T32-AI118690 (D.Z.), NIH T32-AI007044 (S.M.), NIH K08-AI119142 (S.L.F.), and NIH K23-AI140918 (A.E.S.).

The content of this publication does not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the US Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) or of the institutions and companies affiliated with the authors. This project has been funded in whole or in part with Federal funds from the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases, National Institutes of Health, Department of Health and Human Services, under Contract No. HHSN272201800013C. R.G., J.L., and M.R.H. performed this work as employees of Laulima Government Solutions, LLC. A subcontractor to Laulima Government Solutions, LLC who performed this work is: E.P., an employee of Tunnell Government Services, Inc.

COMPETING INTERESTS

A.L.G. reports consulting fees from Abbott Molecular, outside of the submitted work.

456 **REFERENCES**

457

458 1. Casadevall A, and Pirofski LA. The convalescent sera option for containing COVID-19. *J*
459 *Clin Invest.* 2020;130(4):1545-8.

460 2. Boonyaratanakornkit J, Englund JA, Magaret AS, Bu Y, Tielsch JM, Khatry SK, et al.
461 Primary and Repeated Respiratory Viral Infections Among Infants in Rural Nepal. *J*
462 *Pediatric Infect Dis Soc.* 2020;9(1):21-9.

463 3. Kiyuka PK, Agoti CN, Munywoki PK, Njeru R, Bett A, Otieno JR, et al. Human
464 Coronavirus NL63 Molecular Epidemiology and Evolutionary Patterns in Rural Coastal
465 Kenya. *J Infect Dis.* 2018;217(11):1728-39.

466 4. Youden WJ. Index for rating diagnostic tests. *Cancer.* 1950;3(1):32-5.

467 5. Weiskopf D, Schmitz KS, Raadsen MP, Grifoni A, Okba NMA, Endeman H, et al.
468 Phenotype and kinetics of SARS-CoV-2-specific T cells in COVID-19 patients with acute
469 respiratory distress syndrome. *Sci Immunol.* 2020;5(48).

470 6. Joyner MJ, Senefeld JW, Klassen SA, Mills JR, Johnson PW, Theel ES, et al. Effect of
471 Convalescent Plasma on Mortality among Hospitalized Patients with COVID-19: Initial
472 Three-Month Experience. *medRxiv.* 2020.

473 7. Kreye J, Reincke SM, Kornau HC, Sanchez-Sendin E, Corman VM, Liu H, et al. A SARS-
474 CoV-2 neutralizing antibody protects from lung pathology in a COVID-19 hamster model.
475 *bioRxiv : the preprint server for biology.* 2020.

476 8. Focosi D, Anderson AO, Tang JW, and Tuccori M. Convalescent Plasma Therapy for
477 COVID-19: State of the Art. *Clin Microbiol Rev.* 2020;33(4).

478 9. Atyeo C, Fischinger S, Zohar T, Slein MD, Burke J, Loos C, et al. Distinct Early
479 Serological Signatures Track with SARS-CoV-2 Survival. *Immunity.* 2020.

480 10. Li L, Zhang W, Hu Y, Tong X, Zheng S, Yang J, et al. Effect of Convalescent Plasma
481 Therapy on Time to Clinical Improvement in Patients With Severe and Life-threatening
482 COVID-19: A Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA.* 2020;324(5):460-70.
483 11. Klein SL, Pekosz A, Park HS, Ursin RL, Shapiro JR, Benner SE, et al. Sex, age, and
484 hospitalization drive antibody responses in a COVID-19 convalescent plasma donor
485 population. *J Clin Invest.* 2020.
486 12. Gudbjartsson DF, Norddahl GL, Melsted P, Gunnarsdottir K, Holm H, Eythorsson E, et al.
487 Humoral Immune Response to SARS-CoV-2 in Iceland. *N Engl J Med.* 2020.
488 13. Zhao J, Yuan Q, Wang H, Liu W, Liao X, Su Y, et al. Antibody responses to SARS-CoV-
489 2 in patients of novel coronavirus disease 2019. *Clin Infect Dis.* 2020.
490 14. Long QX, Tang XJ, Shi QL, Li Q, Deng HJ, Yuan J, et al. Clinical and immunological
491 assessment of asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infections. *Nat Med.* 2020;26(8):1200-4.
492 15. Meckiff BJ, Ramirez-Suastegui C, Fajardo V, Chee SJ, Kusnadi A, Simon H, et al. Single-
493 Cell Transcriptomic Analysis of SARS-CoV-2 Reactive CD4 (+) T Cells. *SSRN.*
494 2020:3641939.
495 16. Wang K, Long QX, Deng HJ, Hu J, Gao QZ, Zhang GJ, et al. Longitudinal dynamics of
496 the neutralizing antibody response to SARS-CoV-2 infection. *Clin Infect Dis.* 2020.
497 17. Ibarrondo FJ, Fulcher JA, Goodman-Meza D, Elliott J, Hofmann C, Hausner MA, et al.
498 Rapid Decay of Anti-SARS-CoV-2 Antibodies in Persons with Mild Covid-19. *N Engl J*
499 *Med.* 2020.
500 18. Rodda LB, Netland J, Shehata L, Pruner KB, Morawski PM, Thouvenel C, et al. Functional
501 SARS-CoV-2-specific immune memory persists after mild COVID-19. *medRxiv.*
502 2020:2020.08.11.20171843.

503 19. Kreer C, Zehner M, Weber T, Ercanoglu MS, Gieselmann L, Rohde C, et al. Longitudinal
504 Isolation of Potent Near-Germline SARS-CoV-2-Neutralizing Antibodies from COVID-
505 19 Patients. *Cell.* 2020;182(4):843-54.e12.
506 20. Kaneko N, Kuo HH, Boucau J, Farmer JR, Allard-Chamard H, Mahajan VS, et al. Loss of
507 Bcl-6-Expressing T Follicular Helper Cells and Germinal Centers in COVID-19. *Cell.*
508 2020.
509 21. To KK, Hung IF, Ip JD, Chu AW, Chan WM, Tam AR, et al. COVID-19 re-infection by a
510 phylogenetically distinct SARS-coronavirus-2 strain confirmed by whole genome
511 sequencing. *Clin Infect Dis.* 2020.
512 22. Addetia A, Crawford KHD, Dingens A, Zhu H, Roychoudhury P, Huang ML, et al.
513 Neutralizing antibodies correlate with protection from SARS-CoV-2 in humans during a
514 fishery vessel outbreak with high attack rate. *J Clin Microbiol.* 2020.
515 23. McAndrews KM, Dowlatshahi DP, Dai J, Becker LM, Hensel J, Snowden LM, et al.
516 Heterogeneous antibodies against SARS-CoV-2 spike receptor binding domain and
517 nucleocapsid with implications on COVID-19 immunity. *JCI Insight.* 2020.
518 24. Das MK, Chaudhary A, Bryan A, Wener MH, Fink SL, and Morishima C. Rapid Screening
519 Evaluation of SARS-CoV-2 IgG Assays Using Z-Scores to Standardize Results. *Emerg*
520 *Infect Dis.* 2020;26(10).
521 25. Kroemer M, Spehner L, Vettoretti L, Bouard A, Eberst G, Floury SP, et al. COVID-19
522 patients display distinct SARS-CoV-2 specific T-cell responses according to disease
523 severity. *J Infect.* 2020.
524 26. US Food and Drug Administration. Investigational COVID-19 Convalescent Plasma
525 (FDA-2020-D-1137). *Center for Biologics Evaluation and Research.* May

526 2020:https://www.fda.gov/regulatory-information/search-fda-guidance-
527 documents/investigational-covid-19-convalescent-plasma.
528 27. Wrapp D, Wang N, Corbett KS, Goldsmith JA, Hsieh CL, Abiona O, et al. Cryo-EM
529 structure of the 2019-nCoV spike in the prefusion conformation. *Science.*
530 2020;367(6483):1260-3.
531 28. Ott M, Jing L, Lorenzo L, Casanova JL, Zhang SY, and Koelle DM. T-Cell Responses to
532 HSV-1 in Persons Who Have Survived Childhood Herpes Simplex Encephalitis. *Pediatr*
533 *Infect Dis J.* 2017.
534 29. Bates DM, Machler M, Bolker BM, and Walker SC. lme4: Linear Mixed-Effects Models
535 Using Eigen and S4. R Package Version 1.1-7. *Journal of Statistical Software.*
536 2015;67(1):1-48.
537

538 **FIGURES**



539

540 **Figure 1.** Distribution of neutralization antibody titers in convalescent subjects (N=250). Values

541 on the x-axis represent the dilution factor of serum that yielded a 50% reduction in SARS-CoV-2

542 infection of Vero E6 cells.



Figure 2. Relationship between serum measurements of anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibodies. Levels of anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgG antibodies specific for S1(Euroimmun, EU) (A) or of anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgG antibodies specific for NP (Abbott) expressed as z-scores (B) are shown relative to neutralizing antibody titers obtained from the same samples. Each symbol represents the initial specimen from one person. (C) Anti-SARS-CoV-2 S1 IgG levels (EU) relative to anti-SARS-CoV-2 nucleocapsid (N) protein IgG levels (Abbott). The dotted lines indicate the positivity threshold (z-score of 3) for both EU and Abbott assay results. Colored circles indicate discordant results between the Euroimmun and Abbott assays. Blue circles represent samples with negative z-score results (z-score <3.0) by Euroimmun and positive (z-score ≥3.0) by Abbott. Conversely, red circles represent samples with positive (z-score ≥3.0) results by Euroimmun and negative (z-score <3.0) by Abbott.



556
557
558 **Figure 3.** Individual antibody levels obtained at various timepoints after symptom resolution
559 from 41 persons recovered from PCR-positive SARS-CoV-2 infection and an initial nAb titer of
560 1:40 or greater. The same 41 persons are represented in each graph. (A) Neutralization assay, (B)
561 Euroimmun (anti-S1) IgG assay, (C) Abbott (anti-NP) IgG assay results as a function of time
562 since resolution of symptoms. Each line connects two results from a single participant.

563 **TABLES**

564

565 **Table 1. Demographic and clinical characteristics of study subjects.**

566

Category	**Value (N=250)**
Age (range)	51 (19-91)
Men	119 (47.6%)
Hispanic ethnicity	11 (4.4%)
Race	
White	214 (85.6)
Asian	22 (8.8%)
Black	4 (1.6%)
Pacific Islander	1 (0.4%)
Native American	1 (0.4%)
Other	4 (1.6%)
More than one race	4 (1.6%)
Median (range) days between symptom resolution and antibody test[A]	50 (21-110)
Median (range) days between positive PCR and antibody test	61 (14-112)
Severity	
Outpatient[B]	223 (89.2%)
Hospitalized but not in ICU	18 (7.2%)
ICU	9 (3.6%)

567 [A]Excluding one asymptomatic person

568 [B]Includes one asymptomatic participant who was a household contact of a person with

569 symptomatic COVID-19

570 **Table 2. Clinical correlates of high (≥1:80) circulating SARS-CoV-2 neutralizing antibody**
571 **titers.**
572

Co-variates	Univariable		Multivariable	
	Odds Ratio (OR)	**95% Confidence Interval (CI)**	**Adjusted Odds Ratio (AOR)**	**95% Confidence Interval (CI)**
Age, per year	**1.04**	1.02-1.06	**1.03**	1.00-1.06
Men vs women	**2.27**	1.35-3.82	**2.08**	1.13-3.82
Race, white vs non-white	0.52	0.24-1.13		
Symptoms				
Fever	**3.12**	1.73-5.61	**2.73**	1.25-5.97
Cough	**1.52**	0.87-2.67	0.94	0.45-1.97
Runny nose	0.97	0.57-1.65		
Difficulty breathing	**2.12**	1.26-3.54	1.65	0.84-3.25
Wheezing	1.34	0.71-2.55		
Sore throat	**0.63**	0.37-1.07	0.80	0.41-1.58
Diarrhea	0.83	0.49-1.40		
Fatigue	0.86	0.41-1.80		
Muscle aches	1.23	0.69-2.17		
Anosmia/ageusia	0.77	0.45-1.30		
Headache	0.99	0.59-1.67		
Number of symptoms	1.07	0.95-1.21	1.08	0.86-1.34

Days between positive PCR and antibody test	**0.98**	0.97-0.99	**0.97**	0.96-0.99
Duration of symptoms (days)[A]	1.00	0.98-1.03		
Hospitalization	**9.98**	2.31-43.16	**6.59**	1.32-32.96
Comorbidities				
Cancer	**2.23**	0.96-5.19	2.27	0.81-6.38
Heart disease	1.49	0.69-3.22		
Kidney disease	0.78	0.25-2.39		
Hypertension	1.34	0.62-2.92		
Hyperlipidemia	1.73	0.69-4.34		
Lung disease	0.72	0.36-1.47		
Diabetes	**5.36**	1.55-18.48	2.75	0.69-10.95

573 [A]excluding one asymptomatic subject

574 **Bolded** odds ratios indicate $P<0.2$ in the univariable analysis or $P<0.05$ in the multivariable

575 analysis.

576 **Table 3. Sensitivity and specificity of circulating IgG anti-S1 and anti-NP immunoassays**

577 **for predicting neutralizing antibody titers.**

	nAb ≥ 1:80				nAb ≥ 1:160			
Criteria	Z-score	ODR	Sensitivity	Specificity	Z-score	ODR	Sensitivity	Specificity
Manufacturer's cut-off[A]								
Anti-S1 IgG	4.2	0.8	0.99	0.24	4.6	0.8	1.00	0.14
Anti-NP IgG	9.4	1.4	0.99	0.21	8.4	1.4	1.00	0.12
Z-score cut-off of 3.0								
Anti-S1 IgG	3.0	0.7	0.99	0.17	3.0	0.6	1.00	0.11
Anti-NP IgG	3.0	0.5	1.00	0.11	3.0	0.5	1.00	0.06
Optimized Z-score[B]								
Anti-S1 IgG	32.6	4.5	0.77	0.81	42.4	5.8	0.87	0.74
Anti-NP IgG	34.2	4.9	0.78	0.72	40.0	5.7	0.86	0.72

578 [A]Z-scores calculated for manufacturer-determined optical density ratio (ODR) positivity thresholds of 0.8 for anti-S1

579 IgG and 1.4 for anti-NP IgG immunoassays.

580 [B]Optimal Z-score based on the maximum value of Youden's index.

581 **Table 4. Clinical and laboratory characteristics of seronegative individuals.**

582

Subject	Age at draw[A]	Sex	Severity	Comorbidities	Days sx onset to 1st draw	Days (+) PCR to 1st draw	Days symptom resolved to 1st draw	Days between 1st and 2nd draws
1	40s	M	Outpt	None	41	38	30	54
2	40s	M	Outpt	None	43	39	28	55
3	60s	F	Outpt	None	47	41	37	46
4	40s	F	Outpt	None	42	42	22	41
5	40s[B]	F	Outpt	Asthma	52	50	40	na
6	40s	F	Inpt	Lung carcinoid; Asthma; Vasculitis	95	87	70	20
7	50s	F	Outpt	None	78	76	64	21

583 Abbreviations: Outpt for outpatient; Inpt for inpatient; Asx for asymptomatic; sx for symptoms;

584 na for non-applicable

585 [A]Ages are given as decade of life

586 [B]Subject did not return for a second blood draw