

1 **Sex differences in the decline of neutralizing antibodies to SARS-CoV-2**

2

3 Ludivine Grzelak^{1,2,*}, Aurélie Velay^{3,4,*}, Yoann Madec^{5,*}, Floriane Gallais^{3,4}, Isabelle
4 Staropoli¹, Catherine Schmidt-Mutter⁶, Marie-Josée Wendling^{3,4}, Nicolas Meyer⁷, Cyril
5 Planchais⁸, David Rey⁹, Hugo Mouquet⁸, Ludovic Gladys¹⁰, Yves Hansmann¹¹, Timothée Bruel¹,
6 Jérôme De Sèze^{6,12}, Arnaud Fontanet⁵, Maria Gonzalez¹³, Olivier Schwartz^{1,14,&,#} and Samira
7 Fafi-Kremer^{3,4, &,#}

8

9 ¹ Virus & Immunity Unit, Department of Virology, Institut Pasteur, CNRS UMR3569, Paris,
10 France

11 ² Sorbonne Paris Cité, Université de Paris, Paris, France

12 ³ CHU de Strasbourg, Laboratoire de virologie, F-67091 Strasbourg, France

13 ⁴ Université de Strasbourg, INSERM, IRM UMR_S 1109, Strasbourg, France

14 ⁵ Emerging Diseases Epidemiology Unit, Department of Global Health, Institut Pasteur, Paris,
15 France

16 ⁶ Centre d'investigation Clinique INSERM 1434, CHU Strasbourg, France

17 ⁷ CHU de Strasbourg, Service de santé Publique, GMRC, F-67091 Strasbourg, France

18 ⁸ Laboratory of Humoral Immunology, Department of Immunology, Institut Pasteur, INSERM
19 U1222, Paris, France

20 ⁹ CHU de Strasbourg, Pôle SMO, le Trait d'Union, F-67091 Strasbourg, France

21 ¹⁰ CHU de Strasbourg, Laboratoire de Biochimie Clinique et Biologie Moléculaire, F-67091
22 Strasbourg, France.

23 ¹¹ CHU de Strasbourg, Service des infectieuses et tropicales, F-67091 Strasbourg, France

24 ¹² CHU de Strasbourg, Service de Neurologie, F-67091 Strasbourg, France

25 ¹³ CHU de Strasbourg, Service de Pathologies Professionnelles, F-67091 Strasbourg, France

26 ¹⁴ Vaccine Research Institute, Faculté de Médecine, INSERM U955, Université Paris-Est
27 Créteil, Créteil, France

28

29 *co-first authors

30 &co-last authors

31 #correspondence to olivier.schwartz@pasteur.fr & samira.fafi-kremer@chru-strasbourg.fr

32 **The evolution of SARS-CoV-2 humoral response in infected individuals remains**
33 **poorly characterized. Here, we performed a longitudinal study of sera from 308 RT-**
34 **qPCR+ individuals with mild disease, collected at two time-points, up to 6 months post-**
35 **onset of symptoms (POS). We performed two anti-S and one anti-N serology assays and**
36 **quantified neutralizing antibodies (NABs). At month 1 (M1), males, individuals > 50 years**
37 **of age or with a body mass index (BMI) > 25 exhibited higher levels of antibodies.**
38 **Antibody levels decreased over time. At M3-6, anti-S antibodies persisted in 99% of**
39 **individuals while anti-N IgG were measurable in only 59% of individuals. The decline in**
40 **anti-S and NABs was faster in males than in females, independently of age and BMI. Our**
41 **results show that some serology tests are less reliable overtime and suggest that the**
42 **duration of protection after SARS-CoV-2 infection or vaccination will be different in**
43 **women and men.**

44 The duration of humoral immune responses to SARS-CoV-2 is poorly characterized and
45 debated. The male sex, greater age and a higher body mass index (BMI) are risk factors for a
46 more severe disease. It is well established that severe COVID-19 patients produce higher
47 antibody titers than asymptomatic or mildly symptomatic individuals¹⁻⁴. However, some studies
48 reported stable antibody levels within the first three months of recovery, whereas others
49 showed a rapid decrease in convalescent patients regardless of disease severity^{1-3,5-8,9,10}.
50 Cross-sectional analyses of 10,000-30,000 individuals showed a relative stability of the
51 humoral response^{7,11}. Anti-Spike (S) antibody amounts correlate with virus neutralization
52 capacity, since S is the main, if not the unique, target for neutralizing antibodies. Neutralizing
53 antibody titers also vary depending on the time post-onset of symptoms (POS) and the severity
54 of disease^{1-4,12}. Very little is known about the influence of characteristics such as sex, age,
55 body mass index (BMI) on the longevity and efficiency of anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibodies,
56 particularly in mildly symptomatic individuals, who represent the majority of COVID-19 cases.

57 We analyzed the longitudinal antibody response in a monocentric cohort of 308 RT-
58 qPCR confirmed staff from Strasbourg University Hospitals. The inclusion criteria are indicated
59 in supplemental Fig. 1. The cohort included 75% females, with median age of 39 years (Table
60 1). The participants were nurses, doctors, caregivers and administrative staff. Contact with a
61 COVID-19 patient, within or outside of the hospital, was reported by 37% of individuals, and
62 290 participants (94%) had mild symptoms consistent with COVID-19 (dry cough, fever,
63 dyspnea, anosmia or ageusia...). Sixteen (5%) participants were hospitalized for moderate
64 disease. None progressed to severe or critical illness. The median (interquartile range (IQR))
65 time from onset of symptoms to PCR testing was 3 (1-5) days. All individuals were sampled
66 twice. The first blood sampling (M1) was performed at a median (IQR) of 31 (24-38) days POS
67 (range: 11-58) and the second one (M3-6) at a median (IQR) of 107 (92-130) days POS (range:
68 78-172).

69 Seropositivity rates in this cohort were estimated based on time-points of collection, with
70 four different assays (Fig. 1). We used the flow cytometry based S-Flow assay to measure
71 anti-Spike IgG, because it displays high sensitivity (>99 %) and specificity (100%), as
72 previously determined with pre-pandemic and SARS-CoV-2 positive samples^{13,14}. All
73 participants had anti-SARS-CoV-2-antibodies by S-Flow at M1 and only 3 participants became
74 negative at M3-6. The second assay was a lateral flow assay (LFA, Biosynex™), to detect anti-
75 Spike IgG and IgM. This test was slightly less sensitive than the S-Flow, but stable over-time,
76 with 85% individuals seropositive for IgG at the two time-points. IgM detection was higher at
77 M1 (93% of seroprevalence) and decreased to 79% at M3-6, likely reflecting the contraction of
78 the IgM response. Measurement of anti-N IgG antibodies with an ELISA (EDI™) gave similar

79 results than the LFA at M1, but only 59% of individuals remained positive at M3-6. This sharp
80 decrease may reflect a lower abundance of anti-N-specific antibodies in mild disease, a
81 different kinetic of the anti-N response, or a lower sensitivity of the test ¹⁵. It has recently been
82 reported that differences in the sensitivity of ELISA tests, including those detecting anti-N
83 antibodies, may be dependent on the days POS ^{12, 16}.

84 We then quantified the neutralizing activity of the sera, to assess the potential protection
85 of the humoral immune response. While different tests are currently available, we selected a
86 neutralization assay based on lentiviral particles pseudotyped with the Spike protein. We and
87 others previously demonstrated a strong correlation of neutralization titers obtained with single-
88 cycle pseudovirus and infectious SARS-CoV-2 ^{14,16,17}. We tested a single dilution of the sera
89 (1:100) to calculate the neutralization activity. We previously reported a correlation between
90 the percentage of neutralization of the lentiviral pseudotypes measured at this non saturating
91 1:100 dilution, and the titers obtained by performing serial dilutions of the sera ¹⁴. We defined
92 a threshold of a positive neutralization at 20% (ID20 neutralization), based on background
93 signal obtained with pre-pandemic sera (specificity of the test: 97.9%, not shown). With this
94 threshold, 95% and 84% of the sera were positive at M1 and M3-6, respectively (Fig. 1).
95 Applying more stringent thresholds (50% or 80% neutralization) confirmed a decline of the
96 neutralization activity over time (Extended data Fig. 1).

97 We next assessed the dynamics of the immune response by comparing antibody levels
98 at different time points POS (Fig. 2). To provide a quantitative measurement of anti-S IgG with
99 the S-Flow, we defined a Binding Unit (BU), which corresponds to the fluorescent signal
100 standardized by establishing a dose-response curve with a reference anti-Spike human
101 monoclonal antibody. A longitudinal analysis demonstrated a slight but significant decrease of
102 anti-S IgG amounts between M1 and M3-6 (Fig. 2A). This decline was also visible with
103 neutralization activity and anti-N IgG levels of sera (Fig. 2A). We did not use the LFA in this
104 analysis, since it does not provide quantitative results. As expected^{14,16}, we observed a
105 correlation between neutralization activity and anti-S or anti-N IgG in the sera (not shown).
106 Plotting the median values of anti-S, neutralizing and anti-N antibodies at different time
107 intervals confirmed this slow decline and further showed large inter-individual variations (Fig.
108 2B).

109 We then sought to determine whether variations of the antibody response may be
110 attributed to the biological or clinical characteristics of the participants. We analyzed the
111 associations between antibody levels (anti-S IgG, neutralizing activity or anti-N IgG) and the
112 sex, age, BMI and type of symptoms. This analysis was performed at M1 and M3-6. We also
113 calculated the slope of the curves between the two time-points, to assess the impact of the
114 participants' characteristics on the evolution of the immune response. Levels of anti-S and
115 neutralizing antibodies were higher in males than in females at M1 (Fig. 2), in line with previous
116 reports of a more robust induction of the immune response (cytokines and antibodies) in male
117 patients ^{18,19}. This difference was no longer visible at M3-6. Accordingly, the slope of antibody
118 decline was significantly steeper in males (Fig. 2). A multivariate analysis showed that anti-S
119 and neutralizing antibodies were higher at the first time-point (Extended data Table 1) and
120 declined more rapidly in males (Table 2), independently of other parameters. There was no
121 significant difference between males and females regarding the levels and decline of anti-N
122 IgG.

123 The majority of individuals showed a decline whereas other displayed stable antibody
124 amounts. We categorized the subjects, based on the stability of the humoral response, into

125 “sustainer” and “decayer” groups²⁰ (Extended data Fig. 2). The proportion of decayers varied
126 between 71 and 83% for the three serological assays. Among decayers, the median half-life
127 of antibody levels was 41.0 weeks (IQR: 24.3-71.8) for Anti-S IgG, 19.9 weeks (IQR: 14.4-36)
128 for neutralizing antibodies, and 18.4 weeks (IQR: 15.2-25.7) for anti-N IgG (Extended data Fig.
129 2B). We also noted that female subjects were in higher proportion sustainers than decayers
130 compared to males (Extended data Fig. 2C), in line with our observation that antibodies persist
131 for longer periods of time in women (Fig. 2B).

132 Categorization of the participants by age (≤ 30 , 30-50 and >50 years old) and by BMI (17-
133 25, ≥ 25) further showed that older participants and those with a high BMI had higher antibody
134 titers at M1, as seen with anti-S, neutralization and anti-N antibodies (extended data Fig. 3).
135 However, the decline of antibody levels occurred at the same rate, regardless of age or BMI
136 (Table 2 and extended data Fig. 3).

137 There was no association of reported clinical signs, except anosmia/ageusia, to the
138 amount of antibodies at M1 nor with their evolution overtime (extended data Table 1 and Table
139 2). This likely reflects the homogeneity of symptom severity in this cohort, as all participant
140 suffered from a mild-to-moderate disease. A minor fraction of patients were temporarily
141 hospitalized (n=16). As previously reported^{14,21}, the antibody levels at M1 were higher in
142 hospitalized individuals but they decreased at the same rate than non-hospitalized patients
143 (extended data Table 1 and extended data Fig. 4). Multivariate analyses indicated that high
144 antibody levels at M1 were associated with a more rapid decline, independently of any other
145 parameters (Table 2). This is in line with a recently reported link between antibody persistence
146 and disease severity²⁰.

147 In conclusion, we performed here a longitudinal analysis of the humoral immune
148 response in a cohort of 308 RT-PCR confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infected patients with mild
149 disease. We report that antibody levels and neutralizing activity decline over the 172 days of
150 analysis. Neutralizing antibody titers decreased twice as fast as anti-S IgG, with half-lives of
151 19.9 and 41 weeks, respectively. Assessing the humoral response on the long-term is critical
152 to evaluate immune protection at the population level. Commercially available assays have
153 been validated with sera collected from acutely or recently infected individuals. We show here
154 that some of these assays are not sensitive enough and not suited for long-term analyses. This
155 may explain some discrepant results in the literature regarding the stability or waning of
156 antibody titers in convalescent patients. We further report sex differences in the longevity of
157 the immune response, with males displaying higher antibody levels shortly after infection, but
158 a steeper decrease. Multiple studies have demonstrated that women develop more robust
159 responses to infections and vaccination and are more sensitive to auto-immune diseases than
160 men^{22,23}. This may be linked to sex hormones, X chromosomal and environmental factors.
161 SARS-CoV-2-infected women mount significantly more robust T cell activation than male
162 patients¹⁸, which will also impact the duration of the response. Future work will help
163 determining whether the sex differences reported here are amplified over longer periods of
164 time, and may be linked to differences in antigen persistence¹². It will also be of interest
165 extending our analysis on antibody longevity to other categories of persons, including
166 asymptomatic individuals who represent the majority of SARS-CoV-2 cases, patients who
167 recovered from more severe forms of COVID-19, and volunteers engaged in vaccine trials.
168 Whether future vaccines might provide a longer protection in women than in men remains an
169 outstanding question.

170

171 **Methods**

172 **Study design.** The objective of this longitudinal study was to assess the onset and the
173 persistence of anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibodies in sera from mild COVID-19 healthcare workers
174 from Strasbourg University Hospital. Among the 507 individuals of the cohort who donated
175 samples, 308 individuals with RT-qPCR-confirmed COVID-19 diagnostic were enrolled in the
176 study, with samples collected at two timepoints: Month 1 (M1) (median 31 days, range 11-58
177 days) and M3-6 (median 107 days, range 78-172 days) POS. Primary data are provided in the
178 figures or the Supplementary Materials.

179 **Participants.** Since April 2020, a prospective, interventional, monocentric, longitudinal, cohort
180 clinical study enrolling hospital staff from the Strasbourg University Hospitals is on-going
181 (ClinicalTrials.gov Identifier: NCT04441684). At enrolment (From April 15 to 29 2020) written
182 informed consent was collected and participants completed a questionnaire which covered
183 sociodemographic characteristics, virological findings (SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR results including
184 date of testing) and clinical data (date of symptom onset, type of symptoms, hospitalization).
185 The symptoms included in the survey were: myalgia, shortness of breath or difficulty breathing,
186 fever, asthenia, rhinitis/pharyngitis, cough, headache, anosmia/dysgeusia, diarrhea, other.
187 Laboratory identification of SARS-CoV-2 was performed at least 10 days before inclusion by
188 RT-PCR testing on nasopharyngeal swab specimens according to current guidelines (Institut
189 Pasteur, Paris, France; WHO technical guidance). The assay targets two regions of the viral
190 RNA-dependent RNA polymerase (RdRp) gene with a threshold of detection of 10 copies per
191 reaction.

192 **Cells.** 293T cells (ATCC® CRL-3216™) were grown in complete DMEM medium (10% Fetal
193 Calf Serum, 1% Penicillin/ streptomycin). 293T cells were transduced to express SARS-CoV-
194 2 spike protein (GenBank: QHD43416.1) or were transduced with an empty lentivector to
195 assess background staining. The transduced cells were selected with 2.5 ug/mL of puromycin.
196 293T cells stably expressing ACE2 and inducible TMPRSS2 (293T-ACE2-iTMPRSS2) were
197 made by lentiviral transduction and selection with puromycin (1 ug/mL) and blasticidin (10
198 ug/mL). Cells were tested for absence of mycoplasma contamination using Mycoalert™
199 Mycoplasma Detection Kit (Lonza).

200 **Serological assays**

201 Commercial serological assays. All serum samples were first tested at Strasbourg University
202 Hospital using two commercial assays:

203 1) a CE-Marked LFA for detection of IgM and IgG against the SARS-CoV-2 RBD of the S
204 protein developed by Biosynex® (COVID-19 BSS IgG/IgM). The test has a specificity of 99%
205 and a sensitivity of 96% for samples >22 days POS²⁴. Sera were tested according to
206 manufacturer's instructions. Results were scored according to the sample lines intensity
207 compared to those of the control line. The absence of the sample line was scored as negative,
208 whereas a visible sample line was classified as positive. Interpretation was done by two
209 independent readers.

210 2) a CE-Marked ELISA assay for detection of IgG against the full-length recombinant N protein
211 from Epitope Diagnostics (EDI™ Novel coronavirus COVID-19 IgG). The test has a specificity
212 of 96% and a sensitivity of 81% after 28 days POS in our hands²⁴. Cutoffs for IgG detection
213 were calculated according to the manufacturer's instructions.

214 **S-Flow assay.** A first version of the S-Flow assay was previously described¹⁴ and was adapted
215 by using 293T cells stably expressing the codon-optimised SARS-CoV-2 spike protein (293T
216 Spike cells). Stainings were also performed on control (293T Empty) cells. The specificity and
217 sensitivity of this assay were assessed using 253 pre-pandemic samples and 377 RT-PCR
218 confirmed SARS-CoV-2 cases. The sensitivity is 99.2% with a 95% confidence interval of
219 97.69%-99.78% and the specificity is 100% (98.5-100). As previously described, 5×10^4 cells
220 were plated in a 96-well round bottom plate and 50 μ L of a 1:300 dilution of the serum in MACS
221 Buffer was added. The mix was incubated for 30 minutes at 4°C. The cells were then washed
222 with PBS and stained with anti-IgG Alexa Fluor 647 secondary antibody (dilution 1:600;
223 Thermo Fisher Scientific) for 30 min at 4°C. Cells were fixed for 10 min with 4%
224 paraformaldehyde and data was acquired on an Attune NxT instrument (Life Technologies).
225 Results were analysed with FlowJo 10.7.1 (Becto Dickinson & Company). After testing 253
226 pre-pandemic samples, the positivity of a sample was defined as a specific binding above 40%.
227 The specific binding was calculated as follow: $100 \times (\% \text{ binding } 293\text{T Spike} - \% \text{ binding } 293\text{T}$
228 $\text{Empty}) / (100 - \% \text{ binding } 293\text{T Empty})$.

229 Binding units (BU) were calculated to standardize the results. A standard curve established
230 with serial dilutions of a human anti-S monoclonal antibody (mAb 48) was acquired on the
231 same day as the S-Flow assay. The decimal logarithm of the median of fluorescence of the
232 sample was reported on the standard curve to obtain an equivalent value (in ng/mL) of the
233 monoclonal antibody concentration in decimal logarithm.

234 **Neutralization of pseudotyped lentiviral particles.** The neutralization assay was performed
235 as described¹⁴. 2×10^4 293T-ACE2-TMPRSS2 were plated in 96-well plates. Sera were diluted
236 at 1: 100 and incubated with Spike-pseudotyped lentiviral particles (a kind gift from Pierre
237 Charneau, Theravectys-Pasteur laboratory) for 15 minutes at room temperature before
238 addition to the cells. After 48h, the luciferase signal was measured with EnSpire® Multimode
239 Plate Reader (PerkinElmer). The percentage of neutralization was calculated as follow: $100 \times$
240 $(1 - \text{mean}(\text{luciferase signal in sample duplicate}) / \text{mean}(\text{luciferase signal in virus alone}))$. A
241 titration with a human anti-S monoclonal antibody (mAb 48) was added to each plate to verify
242 the reproducibility of the assay.

243 **Statistical analysis.** Baseline characteristics between men and women were compared using
244 a chi-square test for categorical variable and student's t-test for continuous variables.
245 Correlations between antibody measures at M1 were estimated. Factors associated with BU
246 and neutralization levels at M1 were investigated using linear regression models, while factors
247 associated with IgM and IgG positivity at M1 were investigated using logistic regression
248 models. The difference in BU and neutralization levels between M1 and M3-6 was then
249 estimated and standardized by the time interval between the two timepoints. Factors
250 associated with these standardized differences were investigated using linear regression
251 models. For these analyses, factors that were associated with the outcome with a p-value
252 < 0.15 in univariate analysis were introduced in the multivariate model. A p-value < 0.05 was
253 considered statistically significant. Subjects were divided into "sustainer" or "decayer"
254 categories, for anti-S IgG, anti-N IgG and neutralizing antibody responses. To determine
255 appurtenance at one the two categories, we calculated the fraction: antibody value at M3-6
256 divided by value at M1. If the fraction was ≥ 1 , the donor was considered as "sustainer" for this
257 antibody while it was considered as "decayer" if the fraction was < 1 . The half-life of decayers
258 was then extrapolated from the equation of the segment formed by the two timepoints. It
259 corresponds to the week for which the level of antibody reaches half of the M1 level.

260 All analyses were performed using Stata (Stat Corp., College Station, TX, USA), Excel 365
261 (Microsoft), RStudio Desktop 1.3.1093 (R Studio, PBC) or Prism 8 (Graphpad Software).

262 **Acknowledgments.** We thank the patients for participation to the study, Maaran Michael
263 Rajah for critical reading of the manuscript, the DRCI, the CIC and Médecine du travail teams
264 for the management of the cohort, Sophie Bayer from the UCBECC team, Anne Moncolin,
265 Veronique Sohn and Axelle Grub from the Virology laboratory for management and distribution
266 of the samples, Pierre Charneau for the kind gift of pseudoviruses.

267 **Funding Sources.** SFK lab is funded by Strasbourg University Hospitals (SeroCoV-HUS; PRI
268 7782), the Agence Nationale de la Recherche (ANR-18-CE17-0028), Laboratoire d'Excellence
269 TRANSPLANTEX (ANR-11-LABX-0070_TRANSPLANTEX), and Institut National de la Santé
270 et de la Recherche Médicale (UMR_S 1109). O.S. is funded by Institut Pasteur, Urgence
271 COVID-19 Fundraising Campaign of Institut Pasteur, ANRS, Sidaction, the Vaccine Research
272 Institute (ANR-10-LABX-77), Labex IBEID (ANR-10-LABX-62-IBEID), "TIMTAMDEN" ANR-14-
273 CE14-0029, "CHIKV-Viro-Immuno" ANR-14-CE14-0015-01, and the Gilead HIV cure program.
274 ANR/Fondation Pour la Recherche Médicale Flash COVID. LG is supported by the French
275 Ministry of Higher Education, Research and Innovation. The funders had no role in study
276 design, data collection, interpretation, or the decision to submit the work for publication.

277 **Declaration of interests.** SFK, YM, RG, LT, FA, PS, CSM, NC, AB, AV, NL, MM, NM, DR,
278 BH, JDS and AF have no competing interest to declare. LG, IS, TB, and OS are holder of a
279 provisional patent on the S-Flow assay.

280 **Authors contribution.**

281 Conceptualization and Methodology: AF, OS, SFK
282 Cohort management and sample collection: AV, FG, CSM, MJW, CSM, DR, NM, YH, JDS, AF,
283 MG, SFK
284 LFA and EDI tests: AV, FG, MJW, LGI
285 S-Flow and seroneutralization assays: TB, LG, IS, FA, PS, PC, OS
286 Data assembly and manuscript writing: LG, TB, YM, RG, LT, AF, SFK, OS,
287 Funding acquisition: AF, OS, SFK
288 Supervision: OS, SFK
289


290 References.

- 291 1. Long, Q.X., *et al.* Clinical and immunological assessment of asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2
292 infections. *Nat Med* (2020).
- 293 2. Iyer, A.S., *et al.* Persistence and decay of human antibody responses to the receptor binding
294 domain of SARS-CoV-2 spike protein in COVID-19 patients. *Sci Immunol* **5**(2020).
- 295 3. Ibarondo, F.J., *et al.* Rapid Decay of Anti-SARS-CoV-2 Antibodies in Persons with Mild Covid-
296 19. *N Engl J Med* **383**, 1085-1087 (2020).
- 297 4. Zohar, T. & Alter, G. Dissecting antibody-mediated protection against SARS-CoV-2. *Nature*
298 *Reviews Immunology* **20**, 392-394 (2020).
- 299 5. Bölke, E., Matuschek, C. & Fischer, J. Loss of Anti-SARS-CoV-2 Antibodies in Mild Covid-19.
300 *New England Journal of Medicine* **383**, 1694-1698 (2020).
- 301 6. Seow, J., *et al.* Longitudinal observation and decline of neutralizing antibody responses in the
302 three months following SARS-CoV-2 infection in humans. *Nature Microbiology* (2020).
- 303 7. Wajnberg, A., *et al.* Robust neutralizing antibodies to SARS-CoV-2 infection persist for months.
304 *Science*, eabd7728 (2020).
- 305 8. Prévost, J., *et al.* Cross-Sectional Evaluation of Humoral Responses against SARS-CoV-2 Spike.
306 *Cell Reports Medicine* **1**, 100126 (2020).
- 307 9. Isho, B., *et al.* Persistence of serum and saliva antibody responses to SARS-CoV-2 spike antigens
308 in COVID-19 patients. *Science Immunology* **5**, eabe5511 (2020).
- 309 10. Chen, Y., *et al.* A comprehensive, longitudinal analysis of humoral responses specific to four
310 recombinant antigens of SARS-CoV-2 in severe and non-severe COVID-19 patients. *PLOS*
311 *Pathogens* **16**, e1008796 (2020).
- 312 11. Stadlbauer, D., *et al.* Repeated cross-sectional sero-monitoring of SARS-CoV-2 in New York
313 City. *Nature* (2020).
- 314 12. Gaebler, C., *et al.* Evolution of Antibody Immunity to SARS-CoV-2. *Biorxiv*,
315 2020.2011.2003.367391 (2020).
- 316 13. Fafi-Kremer, S., *et al.* Serologic responses to SARS-CoV-2 infection among hospital staff with
317 mild disease in eastern France. *EBioMedicine*, 102915 (2020).
- 318 14. Grzelak, L., *et al.* A comparison of four serological assays for detecting anti-SARS-CoV-2
319 antibodies in human serum samples from different populations. *Sci Transl Med* (2020).
- 320 15. Weisberg, S.P., *et al.* Distinct antibody responses to SARS-CoV-2 in children and adults across
321 the COVID-19 clinical spectrum. *Nature Immunology* (2020).
- 322 16. Muecksch, F., *et al.* Longitudinal analysis of serology and neutralizing antibody levels in
323 COVID19 convalescents. *The Journal of infectious diseases* (2020).
- 324 17. Luchsinger, L.L., *et al.* Serological Assays Estimate Highly Variable SARS-CoV-2 Neutralizing
325 Antibody Activity in Recovered COVID19 Patients. *Journal of Clinical Microbiology*, JCM.02005-
326 02020 (2020).
- 327 18. Takahashi, T., *et al.* Sex differences in immune responses that underlie COVID-19 disease
328 outcomes. *Nature* (2020).
- 329 19. Robbiani, D.F., *et al.* Convergent antibody responses to SARS-CoV-2 in convalescent
330 individuals. *Nature* **584**, 437-442 (2020).
- 331 20. Chen, Y., *et al.* Quick COVID-19 Healers Sustain Anti-SARS-CoV-2 Antibody Production. *Cell*
332 (2020).
- 333 21. Wölfel, R., *et al.* Virological assessment of hospitalized patients with COVID-2019. *Nature*
334 (2020).
- 335 22. Markle, J.G. & Fish, E.N. SexX matters in immunity. *Trends Immunol* **35**, 97-104 (2014).
- 336 23. Bunders, M.J. & Altfeld, M. Implications of Sex Differences in Immunity for SARS-CoV-2
337 Pathogenesis and Design of Therapeutic Interventions. *Immunity* **53**, 487-495 (2020).
- 338 24. Velay, A., *et al.* Evaluation of the performance of SARS-CoV-2 serological tools and their
339 positioning in COVID-19 diagnostic strategies. *Diagnostic Microbiology and Infectious Disease*
340 **98**, 115181 (2020).


Characteristics	Total N (%)	Females N (%)	Males N (%)
Nb individuals	308	232 (75.3)	76 (24.7)
Age (years), median (IQR)	39 (30.0-50.7)	40.1 (30.0-54.1)	34.4 (29.6-43.7)
Age group (years)			
≤ 30	77 (25.0)	57 (24.6)	20 (26.3)
31-50	151 (49.0)	109 (47.0)	42 (55.3)
> 50	80 (26.0)	66 (28.4)	14 (18.4)
BMI (kg/m ²), median (IQR)	23.9 (21.3-27.0)	23.9 (21.1-28.1)	23.9 (21.6- 25.8)
BMI group (kg/m²)			
< 25	195 (63.3)	143 (61.6)	52 (68.4)
≥ 25	113 (36.7)	89 (38.4)	24 (31.6)
Contact with COVID-19 case			
No	149 (48.4)	113 (48.7)	36 (47.4)
Yes	115 (37.3)	85 (36.6)	30 (39.5)
Missing	44 (14.3)	34 (14.7)	10 (13.1)
Reported symptoms			
Aguesia and/or anosmia	226 (73.4)	176 (75.9)	50 (65.8)
Cough	202 (65.6)	150 (64.7)	52 (68.4)
Diarrhea	110 (35.7)	94 (40.5)	16 (21.1)
Dyspnoea	148 (48.1)	117 (50.4)	31 (40.8)
Fatigue	266 (86.3)	198 (85.3)	68 (89.5)
Fever or feeling of fever	234 (76.0)	169 (72.8)	65 (85.5)
Headache	237 (76.9)	185 (80.0)	52 (68.4)
Myalgia	221 (71.8)	160 (69.0)	61 (80.3)
Pharyngitis or rhinitis	171 (55.5)	129 (55.6)	42 (55.3)
Hospitalized	16 (5.2)	10 (4.3)	6 (7.9)
Time between onset of symptoms and positive RT-qPCR test result (days), median (IQR; range)	3 (1-5; 0-14)	3 (2-5; 0-14)	2 (1-4; 0-14)
Time from onset of symptoms to 1 st blood sample collection (days), median (IQR; range)	31 (24-38 ; 11-58)	32 (24.8-38; 11-53)	27.5 (24-35; 13-58)
Time from onset of symptoms to 2 nd blood sample collection (days), median (IQR; range)	107 (92-130.2 ; 78-172)	109.5 (93-131; 79-172)	102 (90-126.2; 78-164)

Table 1. Characteristics of the 308 SARS-CoV-2-infected individuals. The biological (age, sex, BMI) and clinical (contact with COVID-19 cases, reported symptoms, and time POS) characteristics of the 308 RT-PCR+ individuals are indicated. The median values are indicated, as well as the interquartile range (IQR) and total range when stated.

A



B



C





Figure 1. Temporal evolution of anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibodies

Fig. 1. Temporal evolution of anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibodies. **A.** The number of individuals displaying anti-S (S-Flow or Biosynex™ tests), anti-N (ELISA N EDI™) or neutralizing antibodies were plotted at Month 1 (M1) and M3-6 post onset of symptoms (POS). The percentages of positive cases are indicated in the bars. Neutralization positivity was defined as a neutralizing activity against lentiviral pseudotypes higher than 20%, at a serum dilution of 1:100 (defined as Inhibitory dose (ID20)). Differences between time-points were analyzed with a Chi-square test, **** $p < 0.0001$. **B.** The level of antibodies defined as Binding Units for anti-S IgG (S-Flow assay), percentage of neutralization, and Optical Density (OD) for anti-N IgG (ELISA) were plotted against the number of days POS. Pink and purple points stand for M1 and M3-6 time-points, respectively. Each grey line connects the two time-points from a same donor. The black line represents the median of all samples for each time-point. Paired Wilcoxon test was performed between M0 and M3-6, **** $p < 0.001$. **C.** Donors were grouped by days POS in 14- or 29-day categories. BU, neutralization percentage and OD are shown. Results are medians with interquartile range.

A



B




Fig. 2. Sex differences in anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibody levels at the two samplings and their temporal evolution. **A.** Anti-S IgG (in BU), percentages of neutralization and anti-N IgG (in OD) were compared between males (green dots) and females (orange dots) at M1 or at M3-6 POS. The black line represents the median of all samples for each time-point. Samples from females and males were compared at each time-point with a Mann-Whitney test, * $p < 0.05$, ns: not significant. p-value or non-significance (ns) are indicated on the segments. **B.** Weekly evolution of antibody levels between M1 and M3-6 was calculated as $(\text{level at M3-6} - \text{levels at M1}) / (\# \text{ weeks POS M3-6} - \# \text{ weeks POS M1})$. Color coding and graphical parameters are as in A. The dotted line represents a stable antibody level (evolution of 0). Statistical analysis Mann-Whitney test, ** $p < 0.01$.

	Anti-S IgG (S-Flow)		Neutralizing Abs (PNT)		Anti-N IgG (ELISA-N)	
	Factor effect (95% CI)	p-value	Factor effect (95% CI)	p-value	Factor effect (95% CI)	p-value
Gender		0.005		0.039		ns
Female	1		1			
Male	-0.047 (-0.080 – -0.014)		-2.26 (-4.41 – -0.11)			
Age (years)						0.0003
≤30	ns		ns		+0.11 (0.05 – 0.17)	
31-50					1	
>50					-0.01 (-0.07 – 0.04)	
BMI ≥25						0.13
No	ns		ns		1	
Yes					-0.04 (-0.09 – 0.01)	
Hospitalisation		0.37				0.45
No	1		ns		1	
Yes	-0.030 (-0.095 – 0.036)				-0.04 (-0.15 – 0.06)	
Fever						ns
No	ns		ns			
Yes						
Cough						0.73
No	ns		ns		1	
Yes					-0.01 (-0.06 – 0.04)	
Dyspnea						0.19
No	ns		ns		1	
Yes					-0.03 (-0.08 – 0.02)	
Anosmia/ agueusia				0.84		ns
No	ns		1			
Yes			-0.22 (-2.39 – 1.94)			
Levels at M1		<0.0001		<0.0001		<0.0001
≤median	1		1		1	
>median	-0.094 (-0.123 – -0.065)		-4.20 (-6.06 – -2.34)		-0.26 (-0.33 – -0.20)	

Table 2. Multivariate analysis of antibody evolution. A univariate analysis of the temporal evolution of antibody levels was first performed for each of the indicated category. When the p value was < 0.15, a multivariate analysis by linear regression was performed for the indicated categories. For each type of antibodies (anti-S, anti-N, neutralizing), the factor effect with its 95% confidence interval (95% CI) and the associated p-value are indicated. Non-significant (ns) corresponds to an analysis with a univariate p-value higher than 0.15.