

1 **Severe COVID-19 patients display a back boost of seasonal** 2 **coronavirus-specific antibodies**

3 Brenda M. Westerhuis PhD¹, Muriel Aguilar-Bretones MSc¹, Matthijs P. Raadsen MD¹, Erwin
4 de Bruin BSc¹, Nisreen M.A. Okba PhD¹, Bart L. Haagmans PhD¹, Thomas Langerak MD¹, Henrik
5 Endeman MD PhD², Johannes P.C. van den Akker MD², Diederik A.M.P.J. Gommers MD PhD²,
6 Eric C.M. van Gorp MD PhD¹, Barry H.G. Rockx PhD¹, Marion P.G. Koopmans DVM PhD¹,
7 Gijsbert P. van Nierop PhD^{1,*}

8

9 ¹Department of Viroscience and ²Intensive care unit of the Erasmus Medical Centre,
10 Wytemaweg 80, 3015 CE, Rotterdam, the Netherlands

11 *Correspondence: g.p.vannierop@erasmusmc.nl

12

13 Keywords: SARS-CoV-2, hCoV-OC43, seasonal coronavirus, cross-reactivity, original antigenic
14 sin

15

16 Word count: 4550 (4100 excluding methods)

17 Inserts: 1 table, 5 figures

18 Supplemental information: 6 figures

19 **Abstract (135 words)**

20 Severe acquired respiratory syndrome coronavirus-2 (SARS-CoV-2) is the cause of
21 coronavirus disease (COVID-19). In severe COVID-19 cases, higher antibody titers against
22 seasonal coronaviruses have been observed than in mild cases. To investigate antibody
23 cross-reactivity as potential explanation for severe disease, we determined the kinetics,
24 breadth, magnitude and level of cross-reactivity of IgG against SARS-CoV-2 and seasonal CoV
25 nucleocapsid and spike from 17 severe COVID-19 cases at the clonal level. Although patients
26 mounted a mostly type-specific SARS-CoV-2 response, B-cell clones directed against
27 seasonal CoV dominated and strongly increased over time. Seasonal CoV IgG responses that
28 did not neutralize SARS-CoV-2 were boosted well beyond detectable cross-reactivity,
29 particularly for HCoV-OC43 spike. These findings support a back-boost of poorly protective
30 coronavirus-specific antibodies in severe COVID-19 patients that may negatively impact *de*
31 *novo* SARS-CoV-2 immunity, reminiscent of original antigenic sin.

32 **Introduction (892 words)**

33 The introduction of the zoonotic severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-
34 2) has led to a pandemic of acute respiratory tract disease termed COVID-19¹. The majority
35 of COVID-19 patients experience mild symptoms including fever, sore throat, cough, dyspnea,
36 anosmia, ageusia and myalgia, none of which can be considered specific to this infection². In
37 some patients, SARS-CoV-2 infection leads to acute respiratory distress syndrome (ARDS) with
38 prolonged disease course requiring treatment at an intensive care unit (ICU) and resulting in
39 a high mortality rate²⁻⁴.

40 Risks for developing ARDS and poor disease outcome are older age and factors
41 consistent with immune activation⁵. Correlates of protection for severe COVID-19 are not
42 defined in humans but antibodies likely are important. However, there is concern that
43 suboptimal antibody responses may also be detrimental for COVID-19 outcome⁶. The
44 possibility of immune-mediated disease has been raised as a major concern for SARS-CoV-2
45 infection and an important consideration is the infection history and resulting immunological
46 background against seasonal coronaviruses (CoV)^{6,7}. A lack of knowledge on specific features
47 of the induced host response to SARS-CoV-2 in ARDS patients hampers the development of
48 targeted treatment to prevent or overcome severe disease⁵. Therefore, there is an urgent
49 need for detailed insight in the SARS-CoV-2 immune response in the context of a CoV-
50 experienced immune system.

51 For other viruses, several mechanisms have been described on how pre-existing
52 immunity to antigenically related viruses affect the outcome of infection. First, for influenza
53 and dengue viruses the immunological imprint of the initial infection dominates the host
54 response towards subsequent related infections for life^{8,9}. This mechanism, termed “original
55 antigenic sin” (OAS), relates to the propensity of adaptive immunity to preferentially fight

56 pathogens based on memory recall. Consequently, clones primed to target a specific epitope
57 may dominate the response to target a new slightly different cross-reactive epitope and have
58 reduced affinity and functionality, e.g. a poor neutralization potential for the new infection⁸⁻
59 ¹⁰. Moreover, OAS has also been linked to a delayed or weakened initiation of a new type-
60 specific response¹⁰.

61 Second, for influenza virus increased antibody titers targeting viruses far beyond the
62 response against the first encountered antigen alone were observed^{11,12}. The observed boost
63 in neutralization titers was stratified on antigenic seniority, with highest titer increase
64 towards more senior antigens¹². Also, a broad “back boost”, extending beyond cross-
65 reactivity, after infection or vaccination has been shown^{11,13}. This phenomenon has not yet
66 been described for any other viral infection but may have strong implications for vaccine
67 design and the response to infection. Although a back-boost by vaccination may be useful to
68 maintain broad immunity to preceding strains, it may negatively affect the development of a
69 newly induced immune response, similar to OAS⁹⁻¹¹.

70 Structural homology between the ectodomain of SARS-CoV-2 Spike (S, SARS2-S_{ECTO}) or
71 nucleocapsid protein (N, SARS2-N) with those of other endemic human seasonal CoV such as
72 hCoV-229E, -NL63, -HKU1 and -OC43 or recent epidemic strains such as SARS-CoV and Middle-
73 East respiratory syndrome coronavirus (MERS-CoV) suggests that memory B-cells capable of
74 expressing cross-reactive antibodies may pre-exist in patients^{14,15}. This is exemplified by the
75 cross-reactive antibody response towards SARS-CoV-2 in SARS-CoV infected individuals due
76 to high sequence homology (88.6% shared amino acids in N and 69.2% in S)^{14,16}. Structural
77 homology between SARS-CoV-2 and seasonal CoV is lower¹⁷, yet these viruses are highly
78 prevalent¹⁶. Repeated exposure to seasonal CoV may therefore also substantially contribute
79 to developing a SARS-CoV-2 response¹⁸.

80 A strong SARS2-N and SARS2-S IgM and IgG response is mounted in the vast majority
81 of infected individuals targeting the receptor binding domain (S_{RBD}), the outer- (S_1) and inner
82 domains (S_2) to various extent¹⁹. In severe COVID-19 cases this response is dominated by IgG
83 targeting the S_2 domain^{16,19}. There was no evidence of substantial IgG cross-reactivity towards
84 SARS-CoV-2 in healthy controls^{16,19}. In contrast, COVID-19 patients displayed elevated serum
85 IgG titers against the majority of seasonal CoV N and S antigens which suggests that the IgG
86 responses against these viruses are correlated by undefined mechanisms. Strikingly, high
87 serum OC43- S_{ECTO} IgG titers are associated with COVID-19 disease severity, which might be
88 related to stretches of amino acid sequence homology in S_2 ^{16,17}. Together, these studies
89 suggest that high antibody titers to seasonal CoV may associate with poor disease outcome
90 in COVID-19 patients and support the hypothesis that the immunological background is key.
91 A limitation of serological studies is that monoclonal IgG cross-reactivity patterns cannot be
92 defined and the functional contribution of seasonal CoV-specific IgG clones to immune
93 protection or immunopathogenesis remains largely unknown.

94 At the clonal level, it was shown that pre-existing SARS-CoV-2 cross-reactive IgG
95 memory B-cells predominantly target the SARS-CoV-2 S_2 with limited virus neutralization (VN)
96 potential²⁰. Besides a shared epitope that has been described in S_2 of SARS-CoV-2 and OC43²¹,
97 little is known on seasonal CoV IgG cross-reactivity patterns with SARS-CoV-2 and their
98 functional contribution. Pre-existing CoV-specific B-cells may provide protection from SARS-
99 CoV-2 infection by rapid production of cross-reactive antibodies that aid in viral clearance,
100 e.g. by a faster rise of cross-neutralizing antibodies from memory recall compared to initiating
101 a primary humoral response^{22,23}. However, based on observations in other viral infections,
102 pre-existing immunity may also promote pathology⁷.

103 Here, we longitudinally enumerated and categorized type-specific and cross-reactive
104 circulating B-cell clones targeting an array of N and S antigens from a broad selection of
105 human CoV in order to gain insight in immune kinetics, magnitude, breadth and function
106 towards SARS-CoV-2 in COVID-19 patients admitted to the intensive care unit (ICU).

107

108 **Methods (485 words)**

109 *Patient characteristics and clinical specimen*

110 PCR-confirmed COVID-19 patients²⁴ admitted to the ICU at the Erasmus Medical Center with
111 acute respiratory distress syndrome (ARDS) were included in a biorepository study (MEC-
112 2017-417) and samples were analyzed according to the SARS-CoV-2 protocol (MEC-2020-
113 0222) with approval from the medical ethical committee of the Erasmus MC. Personal or
114 deferred informed written consent was obtained after recovery or from a legal
115 representative, partner or family member of the participant respectively, all in compliance
116 with the Declaration of Helsinki. Plasma and peripheral blood mononuclear cells (PBMC) were
117 isolated from EDTA vacutainer blood collection tubes (BD biosciences) aliquoted and
118 cryopreserved as described elsewhere²⁵. Weekly serum and EDTA blood samples for PBMC
119 isolation were collected where the initial sample was collected within 2 days after admittance
120 to the ICU until patients were released from the ICU. From patients 1–6, samples from the
121 first three weeks were included in this study for longitudinal analysis. Additional serum
122 samples from later time points were included in the study if available. Additionally, 11 cross-
123 sectionally sampled COVID-19 patients were selected based on differential clinical outcome
124 of infection. Six succumbed to, and five recovered from SARS-CoV-2 infection (Table 1).

125

126 *B-cell profiling*

127 B-cells were isolated from cryopreserved PBMC using the EasySep human CD19 positive
128 selection kit (Stem Cell technologies) according to manufacturer's instructions. Oligoclonal
129 cultures of 100-300 CD19+ B-cells per well were seeded in 96 wells U-bottom plates in AIM-V
130 AlbuMAX medium supplemented with 10% fetal bovine serum, penicillin-streptomycin (all
131 Invitrogen) and β -mercaptoethanol (Sigma) (B-cell medium). Oligoclonal B-cell cultures were
132 stimulated using 1000 L-CD40L cells that were growth arrested by 40Gray γ -irradiation, 50
133 U/ml IL-2 (Novartis), 10 ng/ml IL-10 (Peprotech), 25 ng/ml IL-21 (Peprotech) and 1 μ g/ml R848
134 (Invivogen) for 48 hours and subsequently cultured for 12 days in B-cell medium
135 supplemented with 25ng/ml IL-21. Culture supernatants were harvested and reactivity of
136 secreted IgG was determined using protein microarray analysis.

137

138 *Protein micro-array analysis*

139 Reactivity of secreted IgG in oligoclonal culture supernatants towards an array of CoV N and
140 S proteins was analyzed using protein microarray analysis (PMA) as described elsewhere²⁶.
141 Paired sera of the respective PBMC samples were included in the analysis. Microarray slides
142 were scanned using a Powerscanner (Tecan, Switzerland). Background was determined for
143 each spot and mean fluorescence intensity signal (MFI, range 1 – 65,000) of two spots was
144 calculated for each serum or culture supernatant. For B-cell culture supernatants a cut-off
145 was set at 1,000 MFI for all antigens based on the highest signal of non-reactive cultures.
146 Serum IgG titers were calculated using 4-parameter logistic regression with inflection point
147 as titer²⁷.

148

149 *Virus neutralization assays*

150 Virus neutralization was determined by plaque reduction neutralization titers as previously
151 described¹⁷.

152

153 *Statistical analysis*

154 Serum IgG and virus neutralization titers and mean fluorescent intensity values of protein
155 microarray analysis were ²Log transformed for regression analysis. P-values below 0.05 were
156 considered statistically significant. All analyses were performed using 'R' and Graphpad Prism
157 7 as previously described^{18,27}.

158

159 **Results (1896 words)**

160 *Clinical characteristics of study participants*

161 Seventeen severe COVID-19 patients with moderate to severe ARDS were included in this
162 study, shortly after being admitted to the ICU or the Erasmus MC, Rotterdam (Table 1). From
163 six patients we included three or more longitudinal samples. All patients were tested RT-PCR
164 positive for SARS-CoV-2 and required mechanical ventilation during their stay at ICU. Five
165 females (mean age = 67.2y, range = 54-75y), and 12 males were included in the study (mean
166 age = 59.9y, range = 29-77y). Five patients died, nine recovered and three were transferred
167 to different hospitals for further treatment. Thirteen out of seventeen patients suffered from
168 one or more comorbidities, of which hypertension (n=6), and type 2 diabetes mellitus (n=5),
169 were the most common. Nine patients experienced thrombotic complication during their stay
170 at the ICU (Table 1).

171

172 *Serum IgG titers towards a broad range of coronavirus N and S antigens increased after SARS-*
173 *CoV-2 infection in severe COVID-19 patients*

174 All patients mounted a strong SARS-CoV-2 immune response shown by rising IgG titers against
175 SARS2-S_{ECTO}, SARS2-S₁ and SARS2-S_{RBBD} which peaked around 4 weeks post onset of clinical
176 symptoms (Figure 1A and Supplementary figure 1A for individual patients). These patients
177 were assumed never exposed to SARS-CoV and MERS-CoV. Nevertheless, there was a strong
178 IgG response towards all SARS-CoV antigens. Given the high structural similarities between N
179 and S of SARS-CoV and SARS-CoV-2^{16,28}, likely a cross-reactive response was mounted. The
180 increase in MERS-S_{ECTO} IgG, but not MERS-N and MERS-S₁ IgG and highest amino acid
181 homology within S₂ with SARS-CoV-2 suggested this cross-reactive response targeted MERS-
182 S₂¹⁷.

183 Besides the SARS-CoV-2 IgG response, serum IgG reactivity towards various, but not
184 all seasonal CoV antigens, increased in longitudinally analyzed COVID-19 patients (Figure 1A
185 and Supplementary figure 1A). All patients showed IgG reactivity towards at least one of the
186 229E, NL63, HKU1 or OC43 antigens (Supplementary figure 1A). Potential IgG cross-reactivity
187 in serum responses refutes any firm conclusions on previous exposure against these CoV. For
188 S, OC43-S_{ECTO} IgG titers were immunodominant at inclusion in all six patients and titers
189 increased in five out of six patients during follow-up.

190

191 *Severe COVID-19 patients showed outgrowth of circulating B-cells targeting a broad range of*
192 *coronaviruses*

193 To analyze the kinetics of the IgG response we longitudinally enumerated circulating B-cell
194 clones targeting CoV proteins using B-cell profiling on six severe COVID-19 patients
195 (Supplementary figure 1B). Paired CD19+ B-cells isolated from PBMC of COVID-19 patients

216 were stimulated oligoclonally *in vitro* at a limiting density that was empirically tested to give
217 a clonal B-cell response. Supernatants were individually screened for IgG reactivity towards
218 all available CoV antigens using PMA. The number of reactive B-cells was normalized for the
219 number of screened B-cells in order to compare frequencies between different samples
220 (Figure 1B). Overall, the frequency and total reactivity of *in vitro* stimulated peripheral blood-
221 derived B-cells was representative for the total serum IgG reactivity (Figure 1B and
222 supplementary figure 1B). Similar to serum IgG reactivity, all patients showed a strong
223 increase in SARS-CoV-2 reactive B-cells and the number of B-cell clones reactive towards
224 various seasonal CoV antigens increased after SARS-CoV-2 infection. However, the frequency
225 of HKU1-N reactive B-cells was higher than expected based on the low serum reactivity.
226 Potentially, this difference reflects a different level of B-cell activation *in vitro* and *in vivo*. The
227 linear outgrowth of B-cells reactive towards OC43-S_{ECTO}, SARS-S_{ECTO}, SARS2-S_{ECTO}, SARS2-S₁
228 and SARS2-S_{RBD} displayed strikingly similar kinetics in their response (Figure 1C).

209

210 *Coronavirus type-specific and cross-reactive IgG clones increased during SARS-CoV-2 infection*

211 The outgrowth of B-cells that do not target SARS-CoV-2 antigens is potentially related to
212 cross-reactivity. Therefore, we analyzed the multiplex PMA profiles of *in vitro* stimulated B-
213 cell cultures to address the level of cross-reactivity of monoclonal IgG. Profiles of CoV antigen-
214 reactive cultures are shown for a representative patient (patient 4, Figure 2). N-reactive
215 clones from this donor showed substantial cross-reactivity between 229E-N, NL63-N and
216 HKU1-N at all time points (Figure 2A). Although individual clones with aberrant cross-
217 reactivity can be identified in these patients, we hypothesize these contribute little to the
218 overall IgG response. A Pearson correlation test was used to calculate the strength and
219 robustness of cross-reactivity between each pair of antigens to identify cross-reactivity

220 patterns that significantly contribute to the induced immune response (Figure 2B). The level
221 of cross-reactivity as calculated by Pearson correlation test varied slightly over time due to
222 the limited number of clones per sample. Overall, the cross-reactivity patterns between 229E-
223 N, NL63-N and HKU1-N became more apparent and statistically more significant when all
224 clones from three time points (n=125) are combined for analysis (Figure 2B). OC43-N and
225 MERS-N clones displayed no cross-reactivity and cross-reactivity between SARS-N and
226 seasonal CoV was considered non-substantial (Figure 2A/B).

227 S-reactive IgG clones showed an increasing mostly SARS-CoV-2 type-specific response
228 with increasing numbers of detected SARS2-S_{ECTO} and SARS2-S₁ B-cell clones. Strong SARS2-
229 S_{ECTO} and SARS2-S₁ cross-reactivity indicated that mostly shared epitopes within S₁ were
230 targeted in this patient (Figure 2C and D). The frequency and number of detected SARS2-S_{RBD}
231 clones remained more or less stable, yet cross-reactivity towards SARS2-S_{ECTO} and SARS2-S₁
232 increased over time suggesting maturation of the SARS-CoV-2 specific response. The initial
233 lack of cross-reactivity of SARS2-S_{RBD} towards SARS2-S_{ECTO} and SARS2-S₁ suggested that the
234 epitope(s) targeted by the SARS2-S_{RBD} clones at day 9 were sterically hindered or displayed in
235 an alternative conformation in the larger SARS-CoV-2 S proteins on PMA (Figure 2C). The
236 increasing cross-reactivity suggests clones that target epitopes displayed on the outer surface
237 of S are naturally selected.

238 Strikingly, there was a dominant OC43-S_{ECTO}-specific response that increased over
239 time. This response significantly cross-reacted with HKU1-S_{ECTO} and SARS-S_{ECTO}, but not
240 SARS2-S_{ECTO} (Figure 2D). This suggests the outgrowth of OC43-S_{ECTO} clones is not driven by
241 SARS-CoV-2 cross-reactivity. The limited cross-reactivity between OC43-S_{ECTO} and OC43-S₁
242 suggested these clones predominantly target S₂. The correlated response between the paired

243 S₁ and S_{ECTO} antigens of NL63-, HKU1-, MERS-, SARS- and SARS-CoV-2 validated availability of
244 shared epitopes in both antigens.

245 The total number of detected S_{ECTO}-reactive clones (n=363) outnumbered S₁-reactive
246 clones (n=85) and showed greater cross-reactivity between different CoV compared to the S₁.
247 These data suggested clones targeting S₂ are immunodominant and more cross-reactive in
248 this donor.

249 For the other five longitudinally analyzed donors, similar patterns were observed with
250 *i)* high levels of cross-reactivity between 229E-N, NL63-N and HKU1-N but not SARS-N and
251 MERS-N *ii)* a mostly SARS-CoV-2 type-specific response that strongly increased over time, *iii)*
252 an OC43-S₂-specific response that increased over time with limited cross-reactivity towards
253 SARS-CoV-2. Notably, the N-reactivity of 1/6 patients showed increased cross-reactivity
254 between OC43-N and other seasonal strains (Supplementary figure 6). OC43-S_{ECTO}-specific B-
255 cells were immunodominant in 3/6 patients (Supplementary figure 1B) and the S₂ response
256 was immunodominant in 2/6 patients (Supplementary figures 2–6).

257

258 *N-IgG selectively cross-reacted between seasonal coronaviruses while S-IgG showed complex*
259 *cross-reactivity patterns involving all strains*

260 In order to determine the overall pattern of IgG cross-reactivity between N and S of different
261 CoV in severe COVID-19 patients we pooled all available N (n=2039, Figure 3A) and S-reactive
262 IgG clones (n=2699, Figure 3B) from all 17 included donors. For N, Pearson correlation analysis
263 validated that 229E-N, NL63-N and HKU1-N IgG clones most substantially cross-reacted (range
264 R=0.52 – 0.72, all p<0.0001, Figure 3C). Additionally, weak yet highly significant correlations
265 between OC43-N and other seasonal CoV strains were observed (range R=0.066 – 0.14, all
266 p<0.003). Conversely, no significant cross-reactivity was detected between seasonal and

267 emerging CoV indicating different epitopes to be involved for these recent zoonotic strains
268 (Figure 3C).

269 The combined analysis of all S-IgG clones showed complex cross-reactivity patterns,
270 including endemic seasonal and epidemic zoonotic strains (Figure 3D). All SARS-CoV and SARS-
271 CoV-2 S antigens positively correlated (range $R=0.14 - 0.80$, all $p<0.0001$). Additionally, all
272 corresponding S_1 and S_{ECTO} antigens positively correlated (range $R=0.35 - 0.80$, all $p<0.0001$)
273 validating availability of shared epitopes in paired antigens for all CoV strains.

274 Our cohort showed there was broad cross-reactivity within S_1 between 229E-, NL63-,
275 HKU1- and OC43-CoV but not MERS-CoV. For MERS-CoV significant cross-reactivity was
276 restricted to S_{ECTO} , suggesting cross-reactive epitopes are mostly located in S_2 (Figure 3D).

277

278 *Correlated clonal IgG reactivity patterns showed in vivo expansion of OC43- S_{ECTO} specific B-*
279 *cells beyond detectable cross-reactivity*

280 Given the synergistic outgrowth of OC43- S_{ECTO} and SARS-CoV and SARS-CoV-2 S-reactive B-
281 cells in severe COVID-19 patients (Figure 1C) one would presume that SARS-CoV-2 cross-
282 reactivity drives *in vivo* expansion of OC43- S_{ECTO} -specific B-cells. However, cross-reactivity
283 between OC43- S_{ECTO} and SARS-CoV-2 S antigens showed significant weak negative
284 correlations (range $R=-0.038 - -0.088$, range $p=4,7 \times 10^{-6} - 0.014$) suggesting that OC43- S_{ECTO}
285 specific clones are unlikely to cross-react with SARS-CoV-2 S in severe COVID-19 patients
286 (Figure 3B). Indeed, the majority of OC43- S_{ECTO} clones (752 out of 920 clones, 82%) did not
287 cross-react with SARS-CoV-2 indicating these were initiated prior to SARS-CoV-2 infection.
288 Due to lack of a pre-sample we cannot draw firm conclusions on pre-existence of SARS-CoV-
289 2 cross-reactive clones in this cohort.

290 Longitudinal analysis of OC43-S_{ECTO} clones in all 17 patients, grouped per week number
291 post onset of symptom showed the average relative number of clones that cross-reacted with
292 SARS-CoV-2 S antigens showed a moderate increase over 4 weeks (13 – 21%). The OC43-S_{ECTO}-
293 reactive clones that cross-reacted increasingly recognized epitopes in SARS2-S₁ and SARS2-
294 S_{RBD} indicating there was natural selection of SARS-CoV-2 cross-reactive clones specific for the
295 outer S domains (Figure 4).

296

297 *No evidence for functional contribution of OC43-S_{ECTO}-specific IgG in virus neutralization*

298 To determine what CoV-specific IgG functionally contribute to clearing SARS-CoV-2 infection
299 via virus neutralization (VN) we correlated serum S reactive IgG to serum SARS-CoV-2 VN
300 titers. All SARS-CoV and SARS-CoV-2 S antigens selectively positively correlated with serum
301 SARS-CoV-2 VN titers but none of the other CoV S antigens. This is congruent with SARS-
302 CoV/SARS-CoV-2 cross-reactivity patterns and other studies showing that S is the dominant
303 antigenic target of neutralizing clones^{29,30}. Notably, no correlation was detected between VN
304 and serum OC43-S_{ECTO} and OC43-S₁ IgG titers (Figure 5A).

305 To determine what circulating S-specific B-cells contribute to VN, the normalized S-
306 reactive B-cell counts were correlated with paired serum SARS-CoV-2 VN titers. Similar to
307 serum IgG titers, SARS2-S_{ECTO}, SARS-S₁ and SARS2-S₁ correlated with serum VN titers.
308 Contrasting to serum titers, OC43-S₁ B-cell numbers showed a positive correlation with VN.
309 Notably, the relatively low frequency of OC43-S₁-reactive B-cells (<0.01% of screened B-cells)
310 suggested the potential functional contribution of these clones to VN *in vivo* was limited.
311 Contrasting to serum IgG, SARS2-S_{RBD} B-cell counts did not reach significance in correlation
312 with VN titers (p=0.13), which may be related to the limited number of samples analyzed
313 (n=22). Notably, neither OC43-S_{ECTO}-specific serum IgG nor circulating specific B-cells

314 correlated with serum SARS-CoV-2 VN, which suggests that the strong OC43-S_{ECTO} response
315 had no substantial contribution to SARS-CoV-2 neutralization (Figure 5B).

316

317 **Discussion (1276 words)**

318 Multiplex IgG analysis of culture supernatants of *in vitro* activated B-cell cultures at limiting
319 dilutions allowed us to *i)* categorize strain-specific from cross-reactive monoclonal IgG, *ii)*
320 distinguish pre-existing clones targeting seasonal CoV from newly induced SARS-CoV-2-type
321 specific and cross-reactive clones, *iii)* perform in-depth analysis of humoral immune kinetics
322 in severe COVID-19 patients. Together with paired serological analysis these data gave
323 detailed insight in the magnitude, breadth and cross-reactivity patterns of the SARS-CoV-2
324 induced immune response in severe COVID-19 patients.

325 Severe COVID-19 patients displayed an evolving SARS-CoV-2 specific IgG response that
326 correlated with the increasing SARS-CoV-2 neutralization potential of serum during disease
327 progression. Additionally, these patients displayed a strong rise of pre-existing seasonal CoV-
328 specific clones that did not correlate with SARS-CoV-2 neutralizing titers, which is suggestive
329 of OAS. Based on this mechanism, one would expect that cross-reactivity to SARS-CoV-2
330 would drive outgrowth of pre-existing seasonal CoV-specific B-cells. However, here we
331 observed a strong outgrowth of clones that selectively targeting seasonal CoV. Using Pearson
332 regression analysis, we were able to distinguish rare from substantial cross-reactivity
333 patterns. Although clones were identified that showed SARS-CoV-2 cross-reactivity, these had
334 a minor contribution to the overall SARS-CoV-2 response.

335 For N, very limited cross-reactivity was observed between seasonal and emerging CoV
336 strains. Even though we could not confirm this for SARS-CoV-2, the high level of SARS2-N and
337 SARS-N sequence homology (88.6%) and reported strong correlation between serum SARS2-

338 N and SARS-N IgG titers¹⁶ suggests SARS-N may be used as a proxy of SARS2-N. This suggests
339 the outgrowth of 229E-N, NL63-N and HKU1-N reactive IgG clones was not selectively driven
340 by cross-reactivity.

341 The outgrowth of seasonal CoV-reactive B-cell clones was most striking for OC43-S_{ECTO}.
342 OC-43-S_{ECTO}-reactive clones outnumbered others in the majority of patients and showed a
343 synergistic outgrowth with the SARS-CoV-2-reactive B-cells. Of OC43-S_{ECTO} reactive clones
344 only a minor fraction cross-reacted with OC43-S₁ (66 out of 920 clones, 7%). This suggests the
345 majority of OC43-S_{ECTO} clones target S₂, which corresponds with previous studies^{16,21}. The
346 fraction of OC43-S_{ECTO} clones that cross-reacted with SARS-CoV-2 was limited (168 out of 920
347 clones, 18%) but for the clones that did, reactivity was increasingly directed towards SARS2-
348 S₁ and SARS2-S_{RBBD} and not S₂. As IgG targeting S₁ and S_{RBBD} confer the strongest VN potential,
349 these OC43-S_{ECTO} clones contribute to evolving SARS-CoV-2-specific IgG response^{23,31}.

350 OC43-S₂ clones potentially have low-affinity reactivity towards SARS-CoV-2, that is
351 below the detection limit of protein microarray, which drives expansion of OC43-S_{ECTO} clones.
352 This is of interest because low affinity antibodies, with consequentially a poor neutralizing
353 potential, can mediate engagement of Fc receptors (FcRs) on innate immune cells and
354 promote viral entry through a mechanism termed antibody-dependent enhancement (ADE).
355 This may either result in productive infection and increased viral spread – this was shown for
356 flaviviruses³² – or promote inflammation and tissue damage, as was described for SARS-
357 CoV^{33–35}. However, the level of OC43-S_{ECTO} clones that cross-react with SARS2-S₂ remained
358 stable over time, as determined by the OC43-S_{ECTO} clones that selectively cross-react with
359 SARS2-S_{ECTO} (Week 1, 7%; week 2, 4 %; week 3, 4% and week >4, 5%). If OC43-S_{ECTO} clones
360 were selectively expanding due to undetected low affinity cross-reactivity, one would expect
361 that clones that have detectable cross-reactivity to have a growth advantage. The reason for

362 this is that the clonal selection of B-cells is driven by the affinity of the B-cell antigen receptor
363 and SARS-S_{ECTO}-specific T_H-cell-mediated linked recognition of antigens, the presence of which
364 has been confirmed in an largely overlapping patient cohort²⁵.

365 We find no evidence of a functional contribution of OC43-S_{ECTO} reactive IgG to SARS-
366 CoV-2 VN. OC43-S₁ specific clones did correlate with SARS-CoV-2 VN titers although these
367 clones represent only a minor fraction of OC43-CoV specific clones. While it is possible that
368 OC43-S_{ECTO} specific IgG restrict viral replication by indirect mechanisms, they may also play
369 no role, or even have a detrimental effect by delaying the development of a type-specific
370 response or by enhancing immune pathology³⁶. The previously reported selective association
371 of increased OC43-S_{ECTO} IgG reactivity in severe versus mild COVID-19 patients supports a
372 potential role in immunopathology¹⁶. Unfortunately, the limited volume of B-cell culture
373 supernatants was insufficient to perform in-depth analysis of their affinity or function at the
374 clonal level and deserves follow-up studies.

375 Alternatively, the outgrowth of clones with reactivity towards the highly seroprevalent
376 seasonal strains may relate to a general immune activation induced by a hyper-inflammatory
377 state of the immune system³⁷. However, for individual patients, not all CoV-reactive B-cells
378 show similar outgrowth after SARS-CoV-2 infection. Furthermore, the low serum IgG
379 reactivity towards HKU1-N and relatively high frequency of HKU1-N-reactive clones suggests
380 these B-cell are not activated *in vivo*. Together, these data do not support this hypothesis.

381 Overall, our data suggest that cross-reactivity towards SARS-CoV-2 has a minor
382 contribution to the outgrowth of clones targeting seasonal CoV and *vice versa*. The boosted
383 response involves a broad range of seasonal CoV strains. For influenza virus, the gradual
384 antigenic evolution allows preceding exposures to different virus strains to be chronologically
385 ordered to determine antigen seniority¹². For seasonal CoV, the order and time window at

386 which individuals were infected or reinfected cannot be deferred. Potentially, the strong and
387 dominant OC43-S_{ECTO} response observed in severe COVID-19 patients relates to antigenic
388 seniority, but this cannot be confirmed. Regardless of the unknown timeline of preceding
389 infections, the outgrowth of seasonal CoV-specific clones is similar to the back-boost that was
390 initially described for influenza¹¹. Here, using antibody landscapes of hemagglutination
391 inhibition titers it was shown that infection or vaccination induced a broad increase in titers
392 towards preceding viruses^{11,13}. Based on the antigenic distance it was calculated that the back
393 boost extended beyond cross-reactivity^{11,13}. However, this mechanism was never validated
394 by antigen binding at a clonal level or shown for any other infectious agents. To our
395 knowledge, we present the first data on a back boost of IgG clones towards a different virus
396 family and substantiate this mechanism with clonal reactivity.

397 For influenza, back-boost is considered to have a positive contribution to vaccine
398 response by helping maintain immunity towards a broad range of influenza viruses and
399 allowing improved coverage by preemptive vaccination updates¹¹. Contrastingly, in OAS,
400 clones initiated by prior infections are shown to negatively impact *de novo* type-specific
401 response and worsen clinical outcome^{8-10,13,38}. Whether the SARS-CoV-2-specific response is
402 hampered by back-boost of seasonal clones, similar to what has been described for OAS, is of
403 interest. Immune dominance of IgG reactivity towards seasonal CoV and the late peak SARS-
404 CoV-2 response in these severe COVID-19 patients, 4 weeks after onset of clinical symptoms,
405 suggests the initiation of the SARS-CoV-2 response may be hampered by proliferation of
406 seasonal CoV-specific clones.

407 In summary, the detailed insights in kinetics and cross-reactivity patterns of N and S-
408 reactive IgG presented in this study will aid in the interpretation of serological assays and
409 expands our understanding of how the humoral immune system responds towards a novel

410 CoV. Also, it shows that studies on in-depth functional characterization of the boosted or
411 newly induced antibody clones after SARS-CoV-2 infection, e.g. VN and ADE assays, are
412 warranted. These data are critical to identify correlates of protection and drivers of
413 immunopathology for COVID-19 and may provide key insights for efficacy and safety testing
414 of future vaccines. Furthermore, the back boost of seasonal CoV IgG shows the immunological
415 background of individuals needs to be considered as an important factor in assessing the
416 quality and quantity of a newly initiated response towards SARS-CoV-2, either by infection or
417 vaccination.

418

419 **Acknowledgements**

420 This work has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and
421 innovation program under grant agreements No. 874735 (VEO) and No. 101003589
422 (RECoVER) and the Netherlands Organisation for Health Research and Development
423 (ZONMW) grant agreement 10150062010008. We kindly acknowledge Felicity Chandler BSc
424 for technical assistance, Ron A.M. Fouchier PhD and Georges M.G.M. Verjans PhD for
425 scientific discussions (all Erasmus MC, Rotterdam, the Netherlands) and Berend-Jan Bosch
426 PhD for supplying SARS-CoV-2 and OC43-SECTO antigens (University of Utrecht, the
427 Netherlands).

428

429 **Competing interest statement**

430 The authors have no competing interests

431 References

- 432 1. Zhu, N. *et al.* A novel coronavirus from patients with pneumonia in China, 2019. *N.*
433 *Engl. J. Med.* **382**, 727–733 (2020).
- 434 2. Huang, C. *et al.* Clinical features of patients infected with 2019 novel coronavirus in
435 Wuhan, China. *Lancet* **395**, 497–506 (2020).
- 436 3. Wang, D. *et al.* Clinical characteristics of 138 hospitalized patients with 2019 novel
437 coronavirus-infected pneumonia in Wuhan, China. *JAMA - J. Am. Med. Assoc.* **323**,
438 1061–1069 (2020).
- 439 4. Chen, N. *et al.* Epidemiological and clinical characteristics of 99 cases of 2019 novel
440 coronavirus pneumonia in Wuhan, China: a descriptive study. *Lancet* **395**, 507–513
441 (2020).
- 442 5. Wu, C. *et al.* Risk factors associated with acute respiratory distress syndrome and
443 death in patients with coronavirus disease 2019 pneumonia in Wuhan, China. *JAMA*
444 *Intern. Med.* **180**, 934–943 (2020).
- 445 6. Iwasaki, A. & Yang, Y. The potential danger of suboptimal antibody responses in
446 COVID-19. *Nature Reviews Immunology* **20**, 339–341 (2020).
- 447 7. Lee, W. S., Wheatley, A. K., Kent, S. J. & DeKosky, B. J. Antibody-dependent
448 enhancement and SARS-CoV-2 vaccines and therapies. *Nat. Microbiol.* **5**, 1–7 (2020).
- 449 8. Halstead, S. B., Rohanasuphot, S. & Sangkawibha, N. Original antigenic sin in dengue.
450 *Am. J. Trop. Med. Hyg.* **32**, 154–156 (1983).
- 451 9. Rey, F. A., Stiasny, K., Vaney, M.-C., Dellarole, M. & Heinz, F. X. The bright and the
452 dark side of human antibody responses to flaviviruses: lessons for vaccine design.
453 *EMBO Rep.* **19**, 206–224 (2018).
- 454 10. Kim, J. H., Skountzou, I., Compans, R. & Jacob, J. Original antigenic sin responses to

- 455 influenza viruses. *J. Immunol.* **183**, 3294–3301 (2009).
- 456 11. Fonville, J. M. *et al.* Antibody landscapes after influenza virus infection or vaccination.
457 *Science (80-.)*. **346**, 996–1000 (2014).
- 458 12. Lessler, J. *et al.* Evidence for antigenic seniority in influenza A (H3N2) antibody
459 responses in southern China. *PLoS Pathog.* **8**, 26 (2012).
- 460 13. Meade, P. *et al.* Influenza virus infection induces a narrow antibody response in
461 children but a broad recall response in adults. *MBio* **11**, 1–15 (2020).
- 462 14. Loganathan, S. K. *et al.* Rare driver mutations in head and neck squamous cell
463 carcinomas converge on NOTCH signaling. *Science* **367**, 1264–1269 (2020).
- 464 15. Lv, H. *et al.* Cross-reactive antibody response between SARS-CoV-2 and SARS-CoV
465 infections. *Cell Rep.* **31**, 1–20 (2020).
- 466 16. Wang, Y. *et al.* Kinetics of viral load and antibody response in relation to COVID-19
467 severity. *J. Clin. Invest.* **130**, (2020).
- 468 17. Okba, N. M. A. *et al.* Severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2-specific
469 antibody responses in coronavirus disease patients. *Emerg. Infect. Dis.* **26**, 1478–1488
470 (2020).
- 471 18. Westerhuis, B. M. *et al.* Homologous and heterologous antibodies to coronavirus
472 229E NL63 OC43 HKU1 SARS MERS and SARS-CoV-2 antigens in an age stratified
473 cross-sectional serosurvey in a large tertiary hospital in The Netherlands. *medRxiv*
474 (2020).
- 475 19. Long, Q. X. *et al.* Antibody responses to SARS-CoV-2 in patients with COVID-19. *Nat.*
476 *Med.* **26**, 845–848 (2020).
- 477 20. Ng, K. *et al.* Pre-existing and de novo humoral immunity to SARS-CoV-2 in humans.
478 *bioRxiv* 2020.05.14.095414 (2020). doi:10.1101/2020.05.14.095414

- 479 21. Ladner, J. T. *et al.* Epitope-resolved profiling of the SARS-CoV-2 antibody response
480 identifies cross-reactivity with an endemic human CoV. *bioRxiv Prepr. Serv. Biol.*
481 2020.07.27.222943 (2020). doi:10.1101/2020.07.27.222943
- 482 22. Shrock, E. *et al.* Viral epitope profiling of COVID-19 patients reveals cross-reactivity
483 and correlates of severity. *Science* (2020). doi:10.1126/science.abd4250
- 484 23. Wec, A. Z. *et al.* Broad neutralization of SARS-related viruses by human monoclonal
485 antibodies. *Science (80-.)*. **369**, 731–736 (2020).
- 486 24. Corman, V. M. *et al.* Detection of 2019 novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV) by real-time
487 RT-PCR. *Eurosurveillance* **25**, 1–8 (2020).
- 488 25. Weiskopf, D. *et al.* Phenotype and kinetics of SARS-CoV-2-specific T cells in COVID-19
489 patients with acute respiratory distress syndrome. *Sci. Immunol.* **5**, 1–14 (2020).
- 490 26. Koopmans, M. *et al.* Profiling of humoral immune responses to influenza viruses by
491 using protein microarray. *Clin. Microbiol. Infect.* **18**, 797–807 (2012).
- 492 27. Westerhuis, B. *et al.* Specific memory B cell response in humans upon infection with
493 highly pathogenic H7N7 avian influenza virus. *Sci. Rep.* **10**, 3152 (2020).
- 494 28. Wu, A. *et al.* Genome composition and divergence of the novel coronavirus (2019-
495 nCoV) originating in China. *Cell Host Microbe* **27**, 325–328 (2020).
- 496 29. He, Y. *et al.* Identification of immunodominant sites on the spike protein of severe
497 acute respiratory syndrome (SARS) coronavirus: Implication for developing SARS
498 diagnostics and vaccines. *J. Immunol.* **173**, 4050–4057 (2004).
- 499 30. Meyer, B., Drosten, C. & Müller, M. A. Serological assays for emerging coronaviruses:
500 Challenges and pitfalls. *Virus Res.* **194**, 175–183 (2014).
- 501 31. Barnes, C. O. *et al.* Structures of human antibodies bound to SARS-CoV-2 spike reveal
502 common epitopes and recurrent features of antibodies. *Cell* **182**, 828-842.e16 (2020).

- 503 32. Katzelnick, L. C. *et al.* Antibody-dependent enhancement of severe dengue disease in
504 humans. *Science (80-.)*. **358**, 929–932 (2017).
- 505 33. Wang, S. F. *et al.* Antibody-dependent SARS coronavirus infection is mediated by
506 antibodies against spike proteins. *Biochem. Biophys. Res. Commun.* **451**, 208–214
507 (2014).
- 508 34. Yip, M. S. *et al.* Antibody-dependent enhancement of SARS coronavirus infection and
509 its role in the pathogenesis of SARS. *Hong Kong Med. J.* **22**, 25–31 (2016).
- 510 35. Jaume, M. *et al.* Anti-severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus spike antibodies
511 trigger infection of human immune cells via a pH- and cysteine protease-independent
512 Fc R pathway. *J. Virol.* **85**, 10582–10597 (2011).
- 513 36. Monsalvo, A. C. *et al.* Severe pandemic 2009 H1N1 influenza disease due to
514 pathogenic immune complexes. *Nat. Med.* **17**, 195–199 (2011).
- 515 37. Bernasconi, N. L., Traggiai, E. & Lanzavecchia, A. Maintenance of serological memory
516 by polyclonal activation of human memory B cells. *Science (80-.)*. **298**, 2199–2202
517 (2002).
- 518 38. Fierz, W. & Walz, B. Antibody dependent enhancement due to original antigenic sin
519 and the development of SARS. *Front. Immunol.* **11**, 1–5 (2020).
- 520

521 **Figure legends**

522

523 **Figure 1. Severe COVID-19 patients generate a strong SARS-CoV-2-specific IgG response and**

524 **display an increasing IgG response towards other coronaviruses. A)** Longitudinal serum IgG

525 responses of six severe COVID-19 patients sampled three times with weekly intervals,

526 grouped per week number after onset of symptoms, towards a panel of nucleocapsid proteins

527 (N), the ecto- (S_{ECTO}) and head-domains (S_1) of spike or the SARS-CoV-2 (SARS2) receptor

528 binding domains (S_{RBD}). A SARS-CoV-2 response is mounted in all patients, together with a

529 boost of seasonal human 229E, NL63, HKU1, OC43 and emerging MERS, SARS and SARS2

530 coronavirus antigens. Dotted line shows the assay background. **B)** Enumeration of paired *in*

531 *vitro* stimulated peripheral blood-derived B-cells at limiting density with IgG reactivity

532 towards coronavirus antigens, normalized for the number of analyzed B-cells. Box represents

533 median, upper and lower quartile. Whiskers show range. **C)** OC43- S_{ECTO} , SARS- S_{ECTO} SARS2-

534 S_{ECTO}/S_1 and spike receptor binding domain (S_{RBD}) specific B-cell clones show a synergistic

535 linear outgrowth in the first four weeks after SARS-CoV-2 infection. Pearson correlation test,

536 solid line shows regression, dotted line shows the 95% confidence interval of the best-fit line.

537

538 **Figure 2. Supernatants of *in vitro* stimulated B-cells of a representative donor shows clonal**

539 **IgG cross-reactivity patterns towards different coronavirus strains.** B-cells were isolated

540 from peripheral blood samples of patient 4 and stimulated *in vitro* in oligoclonal cultures at

541 limiting dilution to analyze IgG reactivity at the clonal level. This representative patient was

542 analyzed at three consecutive weekly intervals starting at 9 days post onset of symptoms. **A)**

543 Heatmaps of the mean fluorescent intensity (MFI) of clonal IgG reactivity towards N of a panel

544 of coronaviruses. The number of single- and cross-reactive N-specific B-cells increased over

545 time after SARS-CoV-2 infection. **B)** Heatmaps of the Pearson regression coefficient (R, top
546 panels) and significance (bottom panels) between N-reactivity of specific B-cell clones shows
547 the level of cross-reactivity at weekly intervals and the clones of all time points combined. **C)**
548 Heatmaps and **D)** regression analysis of S_{ECTO} , S_1 and S_{RBD} reactive IgG clones from the same
549 patient is shown. Positive correlations (green shades) show clones likely cross-react, negative
550 correlations (orange shades) show clones are likely to not cross-react. Significant associations
551 are shown in red shades ($p < 0.05$).

552

553 **Figure 3. Combined analysis of reactive clones from all donors shows cross-reactivity**
554 **patterns between human seasonal and emerging coronaviruses.** Reactivity of N (n=2039)
555 and S-reactive IgG clones (n=2699) identified in 17 severe COVID-19 patients was analyzed.
556 **A)** Heatmaps show the relative amount (top panel, grey shades) and number of IgG clones
557 reactive towards at least one (top left to bottom right diagonal) or two N antigens and the
558 relative frequency of cross-reactivity towards these antigens (bottom panel, purple shades,
559 numerator is shown in clone count heatmap, denominator is indicated on x-axis). **B)** Relative
560 amount and number (left panel) and frequency (right panel) of S-cross-reactive IgG clones. **C)**
561 Pearson regression analysis of 2039 N reactive clones shows significant cross-reactivity
562 between all human seasonal coronaviruses. **D)** Regression analysis of 2699 S_{ECTO} , S_1 and S_{RBD}
563 reactive IgG clones shows broad cross-reactivity between human seasonal and emerging
564 coronavirus strains.

565

566 **Figure 4. OC43- S_{ECTO} -reactive clones show minor yet antigenically evolving cross-reactivity**
567 **towards SARS-CoV-2.** All OC43- S_{ECTO} -reactive clones (n=920) from 17 patients were stratified
568 by week number post onset of clinical symptoms. The proportion of single OC43- S_{ECTO} (blue)

569 and SARS-CoV-2 cross-reactive clones (grey) is shown (left pie). The cross-reactivity towards
570 a single (green colors), dual (yellow and orange colors) and three SARS-CoV-2 antigens (red
571 color) is depicted (right pie). The number of patients analyzed is indicated on the left. The
572 frequency and number of contributing clones for each cluster is shown inside and adjacent to
573 each part, respectively.

574

575 **Figure 5. Serum IgG titers or normalized B-cell counts reactive towards OC43-S₁, SARS-**
576 **S_{ECTO}/S₁ and SARS2-S_{ECTO}/S₁ correlate with serum SARS-CoV-2 virus neutralization titers, but**
577 **not OC43-S_{ECTO}. A)** Linear correlation between ²Log transformed serum IgG and SARS-CoV-2
578 virus neutralization (VN) titers shows that only SARS-CoV and SARS-CoV-2 spike-reactive IgG
579 associate with VN. Horizontal dotted line shows the background of the assay. **B)** Normalized
580 counts of B-cells specific for SARS-S_{ECTO}, OC43-S₁, SARS-S₁ and SARS2-S₁ selectively correlate
581 with VN. 22 Serum samples and corresponding B-cell cultures of 17 patients were included in
582 these analyses. Solid line depicts the best-fit regression coefficient. Dashed line shows the
583 95% confidence of the best-fit line.

Table 1. Patient characteristics

Patient ID	Gender	Age group	Days post onset symptoms at inclusion	Duration stay ICU (days)	Survival ¹	Thrombotic complication	Comorbidities
1	M	70-80	10	50	Y	Y	None
2	F	50-60	4	26	Y	Y	Hypertension
3	M	50-60	5	17	Y	N	Lung disease, Malignancy
4	F	60-70	9	21	Y	N	None
5	M	60-70	5	31	Y	N	Cardiac disease, Hypertension
6	M	50-60	12	45	Y	Y	Cardiac disease, Hypertension, Vascular disease, Type 2 diabetes, Lung disease
7	M	70-80	15	15	Y	N	Vascular disease, Type 2 diabetes
8	M	60-70	14	8	Y	N	Malignancy
9	M	50-60	15	10	Y	Y	Type 2 diabetes
10	F	70-80	20	13	Y	N	Hypertension
11	F	70-80	18	10	N	Y	Type 2 diabetes
12	M	20-30	9	10	N	N	None
13	F	70-80	16	8	N	Y	Cardiac disease, Vascular disease
14	M	60-70	33	26	N	Y	Hypertension
15	M	50-60	8	4	N	Y	Hypertension
16	M	70-80	29	11	Y	Y	None
17	M	60-70	13	5	Y	N	Cardiac disease, Type 2 diabetes

¹Patients were followed up for at least 60 days.




Figure 1. Severe COVID-19 patients generate a strong SARS-CoV-2-specific IgG response and display an increasing IgG response towards other coronaviruses.




Figure 2. Supernatants of in vitro stimulated B-cells of a representative donor shows clonal IgG cross-reactivity patterns towards different coronavirus strains.




Figure 3. Combined analysis of reactive clones from all donors shows cross-reactivity patterns between human seasonal and emerging coronaviruses.

It is made available under a [CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/) .




Figure 4. OC43-S_{ECTO}-reactive clones show minor yet antigenically evolving cross-reactivity towards SARS-CoV-2.




Figure 5. Serum IgG titers or normalized B-cell counts reactive towards OC43-S₁, SARS-S_{ECTO}/S₁ and SARS2-S_{ECTO}/S₁ correlate with serum SARS-CoV-2 virus neutralization titers, but not OC43-S_{ECTO}.