1	Title: Early Antibody Responses Associated with Survival in COVID19 Patients
2	
3	Authors: Zhao-Hua Zhou, Ph.D. ^{1*} , Sai Dharmarajan, Ph.D. ² , Mari Lehtimaki, Ph.D. ¹ , Susan L.
4	Kirshner, Ph.D. ¹ , Steven Kozlowski, M.D. ^{1*}
5	
6	¹ Office of Biotechnology Products, Office of Pharmaceutical Quality, Center for Drug Evaluation
7	and Research, Food and Drug Administration; Silver Spring, MD, USA.
8	² Office of Biostatistics, Office of Translational Science, Center for Drug Evaluation and Research,
9	Food and Drug Administration; Silver Spring, MD, USA.
10	
11	*Address correspondence to Dr. Zhao-Hua Zhou and Dr. Steven Kozlowski, Office of
12	Biotechnology Products, OPQ, CDER, Food and Drug Administration, White Oak Building 71
13	Room 2230, 10903 New Hampshire Ave., Silver Spring, MD 20993
14	
15	Tel: 301-796-2046; Fax: 301-796-9743; E-mails <u>: Zhaohua.Zhou@fda.hhs.gov;</u>
16	<u>Steven.Kozlowski@fda.hhs.gov</u>
17	Running Title: COVID 19 Survival and Early Antibody Responses
18	Word Count: 3075; Abstract Word Count:150
19	

20

21 Abstract

23	Neutralizing antibodies to the SARS CoV-2 spike proteins have been issued Emergency Use
24	Authorizations and are a likely mechanism of vaccines to prevent COVID-19. However, benefit
25	of treatment with monoclonal antibodies has only been observed in clinical trials in outpatients
26	with mild to moderate COVID-19 but not in patients who are hospitalized and/or have
27	advanced disease. To address this observation, we evaluated the timing of anti SARS-CoV-2
28	antibody production in hospitalized patients with the use of a highly sensitive multiplexed
29	bead-based immunoassay allowing for early detection of antibodies to SARS-CoV-2. We found
30	that significantly lower levels of antibodies to the SARS-CoV-2 spike protein in the first week
31	after symptom onset were associated with patients who expired as compared to patients who
32	were discharged. We also developed a model, based on antibody level trajectory, to predict
33	COVID 19 outcome that is compatible with greater antibody benefit earlier in COVID 19 disease.
34	
35	Author Summary: We evaluated antibodies to SARS-CoV-2 over time in patients that were
36	hospitalized with COVID 19. Early detection of Anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibodies was associated with
37	survival in patients hospitalized with COVID 19. Early antibody levels predicted outcome in our
38	study. This result is consistent with the benefit of therapeutic antibodies early in the course of
39	COVID 19 disease. With additional study, early antibody levels may be helpful in deciding on
40	appropriate therapies.

Introduction 41

42	
43	SARS-COV-2 has led to more than 100 million cases of COVID-19 globally with high morbidity
44	and mortality. There were over 485,000 deaths in the United States as of February 2021 (1).
45	Neutralizing antibodies to the SARS COV-2 spike protein are candidates for therapeutics (2).
46	There have been three Emergency Use Authorizations issued for such antibodies and
47	combinations (3-5), with many others in the development pipeline. Induction of neutralizing
48	antibodies in immunized people is also likely to be a mechanism of vaccines to prevent COVID-
49	19 (6, 7).
50	COVID-19 has an inflammatory phase associated with Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome and
51	severe disease (8). This phase has macrophage and monocyte activation, cytokine release, may
52	involve viral transmission that is not dependent on the ACE2 viral receptor (9) and may be
53	enhanced by binding of SARS-CoV-2 specific antibodies to cells via Fc receptors (10). A host with
54	activated immune and endothelial cells may also be more sensitive to antibody-virus immune
55	complex- associated inflammation.
56	Some studies evaluating neutralizing antibody treatment in patients who are hospitalized
57	and/or have advanced disease have been stopped due to lack of benefit (11, 12). Current EUAs
58	for neutralizing antibody are limited to outpatients with mild to moderate disease who are at
59	high risk for progressing to severe disease (3-5). In contrast to findings of clinical benefit in
60	outpatients early in disease progression with mild to moderate COVID-19, some studies in
61	hospitalized patients have correlated high levels of neutralizing antibody and "early"

- 62 seroconversion (8-16 days after onset as defined by these studies) with severity of disease for
- 63 both SARS-Cov-1 (13) and SARS-CoV-2 (14).
- To address this apparent gap, we evaluated the timing of anti SARS-CoV-2 antibody generation
- in patients who survived and in patients who expired with the use of a highly sensitive
- 66 multiplexed bead-based immunoassay method (15) allowing for earlier detection (within days
- of symptom onset) of antibody to SARS-CoV-2. We also developed a model that was predictive
- of outcome based on the trajectory of antibody levels over time.
- 69 These results are compatible with a model of COVID-19 disease with an early viral replication
- phase, wherein antibody may be more beneficial, and a late inflammatory pathology phase,
- 71 where there is no current evidence of benefit from virus specific antibody. This disease model is
- supported by convalescent plasma therapy that suggests better outcomes with early treatment
- 73 (16, 17) and no benefit with late treatment (18).
- 74
- 75
- 76

77 Results

78

- 79 Demographics of the patients in the study are provided in subsets by outcome in Table 1. The
- 80 numbers are small but a notable difference in outcome by sex is observed. There were 4 to 16
- collections per patient over a range of 0 to 42 days post-symptom onset. Antibody levels were
- 82 plotted by time based on days post-symptom onset in the expired and discharged patients for
- the SARS-CoV-2 antigens in Figure 1. The trajectories of antibody levels appear to be different
- 84 between hospitalized patients who expired and those who were discharged. Specifically,
- patients in the expired group seem to have lower antibody levels in the first week to 12 days
- 86 after onset, after which values in the groups appear to converge.

Table 1. Demographics data by patient outcome.

	Discharged	Expired	Total
Patients	22	11	33
Age ¹			
30-51	5	2	7
52-73	12	6	18
74-95	5	3	8
Sex			
female	10	1	11
male	12	10	22
Days from onset to hospitali	zation ¹		
0-4	14	8	22
5-9	6	3	9
10-14	2	0	2
Treatments ²			
Ventilator/Intubation	12	8	20
Convalescent Sera/Plasma	1	3	4
Statin	2	2	4
Underlying conditions ³			
Diabetes	9	4	13
Hypertension	10	6	16
Kidney disease	3	4	7
Obese or morbidly obese	5	1	6
Antibody sampling			
Samples/patient (Median)	6	6	6
Samples/patient (Range)	4-16	4-13	4-16
Days post-onset (Range)	0-42	0-30	0-42

- Age and days from onset to hospitalization are divided in three even groups spanning
 the range of patient data.
- ² Treatments shown were chosen based on potential effect on antibody titer and
- 92 number of patients under treatment.
- ³ ³ Underlying conditions shown were chosen based on prevalence in the patients in the
- study with 5 or more patients with each condition.
- 95

97	Given the amount of missing data in daily antibody levels, we tested for differences across
98	expired and discharged groups using antibody levels at week one, week two and after week
99	two. For patients with more than one sample within a week, we used the median of the
100	available antibody levels. Figure 2 displays the distribution of antibody levels to different
101	antigen targets at week one along with results from a t-test comparing the means of the
102	distributions. Levels of antibodies that bind to all the spike protein antigens and the receptor
103	binding domain were significantly lower at week one for expired patients. The anti-NP antibody
104	levels were also lower at week one for expired patients. Using an alternative maximum signal
105	calculation (inverse dilution x MFI), led to the same findings (Supplementary Materials). No
106	significant differences were seen for antibody levels in week 2; However, after week
107	2 there was an increased anti-RBD level for expired patients in the primary analysis (Supplementary
108	Materials).
108 109	Materials). We also fit a linear mixed model (Model 1, Supplementary Materials), accounting for patient-
108 109 110	Materials). We also fit a linear mixed model (Model 1, Supplementary Materials), accounting for patient- level correlation, to the data to model the antibody response using time, expired / discharged
108 109 110 111	Materials). We also fit a linear mixed model (Model 1, Supplementary Materials), accounting for patient- level correlation, to the data to model the antibody response using time, expired / discharged status, and the interaction between time and expired / discharged status as predictors. This
108 109 110 111 112	Materials). We also fit a linear mixed model (Model 1, Supplementary Materials), accounting for patient- level correlation, to the data to model the antibody response using time, expired / discharged status, and the interaction between time and expired / discharged status as predictors. This model yielded similar results as the t-test in Figure 2. The mean antibody levels, at week one,
108 109 110 111 112 113	Materials). We also fit a linear mixed model (Model 1, Supplementary Materials), accounting for patient- level correlation, to the data to model the antibody response using time, expired / discharged status, and the interaction between time and expired / discharged status as predictors. This model yielded similar results as the t-test in Figure 2. The mean antibody levels, at week one, were estimated to be significantly lower in the expired group than in the discharged group
108 109 110 111 112 113 114	Materials). We also fit a linear mixed model (Model 1, Supplementary Materials), accounting for patient- level correlation, to the data to model the antibody response using time, expired / discharged status, and the interaction between time and expired / discharged status as predictors. This model yielded similar results as the t-test in Figure 2. The mean antibody levels, at week one, were estimated to be significantly lower in the expired group than in the discharged group (Table 2). The mean increase from week one was also found to be significantly higher in the
108 109 110 111 112 113 114 115	Materials). We also fit a linear mixed model (Model 1, Supplementary Materials), accounting for patient- level correlation, to the data to model the antibody response using time, expired / discharged status, and the interaction between time and expired / discharged status as predictors. This model yielded similar results as the t-test in Figure 2. The mean antibody levels, at week one, were estimated to be significantly lower in the expired group than in the discharged group (Table 2). The mean increase from week one was also found to be significantly higher in the expired group at week two for both S1 and S2 spike proteins and at after week 2 for S1 spike
108 109 110 111 112 113 114 115 116	Materials). We also fit a linear mixed model (Model 1, Supplementary Materials), accounting for patient- level correlation, to the data to model the antibody response using time, expired / discharged status, and the interaction between time and expired / discharged status as predictors. This model yielded similar results as the t-test in Figure 2. The mean antibody levels, at week one, were estimated to be significantly lower in the expired group than in the discharged group (Table 2). The mean increase from week one was also found to be significantly higher in the expired group at week two for both S1 and S2 spike proteins and at after week 2 for S1 spike protein (Table 2). These findings suggest that later increases in antibody response are unlikely

118 Table 2 Estimates from Linear Mixed Model (Model 1) of Anti-S1 and Anti-S2 IgG

119 Titer Values (log) by Time and Outcome

	Antigen Ta	argets				
	S1			S2		
	Expired	Discharged	Difference	Expired	Discharged	Difference
Wk1	6.65	13.5	6.86*	12.8	16.2	3.41*
Wk2	16.7	18.5	1.72	19.1	19.2	0.09
Beyond Wk2	17.9	20.6	2.66	18.5	20.4	1.91
Change from Wk1 to Wk2	10.1	4.95	-5.14*	6.32	2.99	3.33*
Change from Wk1 to beyond Wk2	11.2	7.04	-4.20*	5.73	4.23	1.50

*Statistically Significant Differences in IgG Titer Values between Expired and Discharged
 groups at α=0.05.

122

123 While the above approaches helped us demonstrate significant differences in the early antibody response between patients who expired and those who were discharged, it did not 124 tell us whether the antibody response trajectory itself can be predictive of the eventual 125 outcome. To answer this question, we used a joint model (Model 2, Supplementary Materials) 126 to relate the patient-specific antibody response to the eventual outcome. Specifically, we first 127 fit a linear mixed model to the data to model the antibody response using time as a predictor 128 129 and allowing for patient-specific deviations from the mean response at each time point. Then, we used the patient-specific predictions from this model as predictors in a probit regression 130 model (Supplementary Materials) to predict the eventual outcome of death. The predicted 131 132 patient-specific antibody levels were significant predictors of the outcome. The joint modeling approach produced models with AUC of 0.802 (95% CI: 0.647 -- 0.957) and 0.760 (95% CI: 0.578 133

-- 0.943) for spike protein domains S1 and S2 respectively (Figure 3), indicating that the patient specific trajectories are highly predictive of the eventual outcome.

Results for the linear mixed model and the joint model for other antibody isotypes, IgM and
IgA, are less striking as compared to IgG and are available in the Supplementary Materials.
There is also a sensitivity analysis excluding two patients in the Supplementary Materials.

139 Discussion

140

141 We observed that lower levels of early antibody responses to several spike protein antigens 142 correlated with poor outcomes. In addition, a joint model (Model 2) was developed, based on antibody trajectory, that was predictive of poor outcomes. This appears to differ with prior 143 studies of SARS-CoV-1 (13) and SARS-CoV-2 (14) that noted a negative correlation with early 144 145 antibody peak levels. These studies consider early seroconversion as <16 days or 8-14 days. 146 When the actual timing of the results is compared, these studies are not in conflict with our data regarding early seroconversion at < 7 days from symptom onset. Although early antibody 147 detection is seen in other studies (19) many assay formats have limited sensitivity (20) and may 148 not detect early antibody, at low levels. Bead-based immunoassays can be highly sensitive (15, 149 150 21) allowing for early antibody detection. In addition, the bead-based assay described here had 151 a similar binding pattern to other assays using ten panel samples in the First WHO SARS-COV-2 152 International Standard harmonization exercise (22).

153

154 This study has limitations, including the small number of patients and the evaluation of patients 155 relatively early in the pandemic, with a high mortality. 10 out of 11 mortality outcomes were

observed in males. Given our small sample size, we are not able to investigate if the 156 157 relationship between antibody response and outcome was moderated by sex; However, there was a similar relationship when only male samples were evaluated (Supplementary Materials). 158 Despite these limitations, a clear association between early antibody generation and survival is 159 160 noted. These findings are consistent with other studies when matched for timeframe. These findings are robust across multiple Spike protein antigens and sensitivity analyses. This pattern 161 was also observed with antibodies to RBD which are strongly correlated with neutralizing 162 163 activity (23). A cut-point based maximum signal method had even stronger associations with 164 early antibody levels (Supplementary Materials). Antibody data from past and future studies 165 can be evaluated to further refine and confirm these findings; There may be other qualitative 166 antibody characteristics associated with patient outcomes (24). Early antibody responses may relate to variability in time of infection to symptom onset and reflect other mechanisms related 167 168 to disease onset.

169

Although the mechanisms for these findings need further elucidation, these results align well 170 with clinical studies on the apeutic antibodies (2). These antibodies show benefit in outpatients 171 172 with mild to moderate COVID-19, before further disease progression (3-5, 25, 26) whereas 173 benefit of antibody treatment has not been observed in clinical trials in patients hospitalized 174 due to COVID-19, and may be associated with worse clinical outcomes when administered to hospitalized patients with COVID-19 requiring high flow oxygen or mechanical ventilation (11, 1)175 12, 27). The importance of antibody early in disease also fits with data on early treatment using 176 convalescent plasma (16, 17) but not later treatment (18) and also with the initial evaluations 177

178	of vaccines that g	generate neutralizing	g antibodies.	The exact stage of	of disease pro	gression that
-						0

- 179 may have clinical benefit from antibody therapy needs further study and may be dependent on
- 180 the nature of the antibodies, additional interventions and other factors.
- 181

182	In developing an early antibody response as a predictor of outcomes, it is important to have
183	sensitive method to reliably detect antibody early in the course of disease, such as the flow
184	cytometry bead-based method we describe. Such an assay with appropriate modeling could be
185	studied as an approach to predict the clinical course of patients and aid in selection of the
186	appropriate therapeutic interventions.

- 187 Materials and Methods
- 188
- 189 **Patient samples**
- 190

Deidentified samples were obtained from Shady Grove Washington Adventist Hospital. Patients 191 192 were hospitalized and diagnosed with COVID 19 by a PCR method. Onset of patient symptoms was in April through May 2020. Serial samples from 33 patients were evaluated; 11 of the 193 patients expired and 22 were discharged. There were 4 to 16 consecutive collections per 194 195 patient over a range of 0 to 42 days post-symptom onset. A variety of anti-coagulant tubes were used for blood collection including Heparin lithium, EDTA for plasma or serum. The 196 197 patient manifestations, demographics and outcomes were blinded before evaluating sample 198 antibody profiles detection and unblinded for correlation with outcomes after antibody levels were determined. Pre-COVID serum and plasma samples were retained from previous research 199 projects of the lab. These were deidentified samples without additional information. COVID-19 200

201	patient samples were heat-treated at 60°C for one hour to de-activate the virus before
202	performing the antibody assay.
203	This study was reviewed by the FDA Office of the Chief scientist and CBER Center Human
204	Subject Protections (HSP) Liaison who determined that the study does not require FDA IRB
205	review and approval because it is not research involving human subjects as defined in 45 CFR
206	part 46 and it is not an FDA-regulated clinical investigation, as defined in 21 CFR part 56.
207 208	Reagents
209	Functional CBA beads were purchased from BD Biosciences (San Jose, CA). Recombinant SARS
210	COV2 antigens were purchased from commercial vendors: RBD-His was purchased from
211	(Raybiotech, #230-30162) and (Sino Biological #40150-V08B2); S1 ECD-His (40591-V08H),
212	S1D614G (40591-V08H3), S2 ECD-His (40590-V08B), S1+S2 ECD (40589-V08B1) were purchased
213	from Sino Biological; Recombinant SARS-CoV-2 Nucleocapsid Protein (NP) was purchased from
214	(Raybiotech).
215	Streptavidin-PE, streptavidin-BV421, anti-human IgG-PE, anti-human IgM- V450, and
216	biotinylated anti-human IgA monoclonal antibodies were purchased from BD Biosciences (San
217	Jose, CA). The specificity of these reagents was confirmed by ELISA and/or flow cytometry.
218	Multiplexed SARS CoV2 Antigen Beads Array
219	Multiplexed SARS CoV2 recombinant antigen-coupled target beads and BSA control beads were
220	prepared using sulfo-SMCC chemistry with Functional Bead Conjugation Buffer Set (BD
221	Biosciences) according to manufacturer's instructions. Conjugation of antigens and antibody

222	binding were confirmed by flow cytometry using ELISA-confirmed rabbit anti-SARS CoV2
223	immune serum, SARS CoV1 immune rabbit serum, non-immunized control rabbit serum, as well
224	as convalescent human COVID19 serum and pre-COVID19 human serum samples. Binding
225	specificity was confirmed by free antigen inhibition of detection signal. In brief, serum samples
226	were serially diluted with PBS buffer (containing 1% BSA and 2mM EDTA) from 1:10 up to
227	1:100,000,000, mixed with SARS-CoV-2 bead arrays, with and without free SARS-CoV-2
228	antigens, incubated at 4°C with shaking overnight; washed with PBS buffer, developed with
229	anti-human Ig isotype antibodies, and detected by flow cytometry (BD LSRFortessa™). Flow
230	data files were analyzed using FlowJo software (FlowJo, LLC, Ashland, OR).
231	The multiplexed beads array method was demonstrated to sensitively and specifically detect
232	antibody signals in rabbit anti-SARS-CoV-2 immune serum, convalescent human COVID-19
233	serum, and serum samples from patients with PCR-confirmed COVID19.
234	The assay was also used to participate in the Establishment of the 1st WHO International
235	Standard and Reference Panel for anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibody (22). Using our flow-cytometry
236	based assays for the detection of IgA, IgG and IgM against SARS-CoV-2 antigens (E, M, N, RBD,
237	S1, S2 and S1+S2ECD) and expressing the IgG data as relative to the candidate International
238	Standard IgG with an assigned arbitrary unitage of 1000 IU/mL, the binding pattern obtained
239	with the ten panel samples, was similar to the pattern obtained with all of the 27 neutralization
240	assays that participated in the harmonization exercise (Figure 2 and Figure 6 in the WHO online
241	report).

242

Detection of anti-CoV2 antibody

243

244	Detection for anti-CoV2 antibodies in heat-inactivated serum or plasma samples was done
245	using 96 well U-shaped plates for high-throughput runs. Serum/plasma samples were serially
246	diluted 1:100, 1:1,000, 1;10,000 and 1:100,000 for detection of IgG and IgA, and 1:20, 1:80,
247	1:320, 1:1,280 for detection of IgM. For every 96-well plate, \sim 2.4 x 10 ⁶ beads containing targets
248	and control beads were added to 2 mL serum enhancement buffer (supplied in the BD human
249	CBA kits). Target beads and control beads were mixed in total of 9 mL buffer (2 mL serum
250	treatment buffer, 2 mL beads capture buffer, 5 mL sample diluent). Then 80 μ L beads and 80 μ L
251	of serum sample were added per well (96-U plate), leading to another 2-fold sample dilution,
252	incubated overnight at 4°C with shaking and washed twice. Ten μ L/well of anti-human IgGFc-
253	PE, 1 $\mu L/well$ of anti-human IgA-bio (and further developed by streptavidin-BV421) or 2 $\mu L/well$
254	anti-human-IgM-V450 were added and after 1 hour, the wells were washed twice by
255	centrifugation and analyzed by flow cytometry HTS run. Final sample dilutions were 1:200,
256	1:2,000, 1;20,000 and 1:200,000 for detection of IgG and IgA, and 1:40, 1:160, 1:640, 1:2,560
257	for detection of IgM. Fourteen pre-COVID serum samples were used as negative controls. Flow
258	cytometry data were analyzed with FlowJo software (FlowJo, LLC); More than 10,000 signal
259	events were collected per sample. Single bead populations were gated by FSC-SSC. Target
260	beads and control beads were separated by APC & ACP-Cy7 fluorescence intensity and properly
261	compensated for effective display. PE & V450 or BV421 fluorescence intensity of target beads
262	and control beads were exported to Excel files and further analyzed for antibody levels.
263	Antigen-specific antibody levels (i.e., extrapolated titer value) are the maximum inverse dilution
264	factor where the MFI of titration curves plateau. Due to limited titrations, antigen-specific
265	antibody levels (i.e., extrapolated titer values) were calculated based on multiplying the inverse

266	of each sample dilution by an additional inverse dilution factor and using the maximum value.
267	The additional inverse dilution factor was calculated based on a linear regression (Excel
268	Forecast function) between MFI and dilution. The regression used the linear segment of a
269	selected sample titration curve vs. MFI, on each plate, as a standard curve. An alternative set of
270	antigen-specific antibody levels were calculated based on the maximal signal of inverse dilution
271	factor x median fluorescent intensity (MFI) for each titration; in this calculation, MFI must meet
272	a threshold-criteria based on the average + 3SD of 14 pre-COVID 19 samples. All the calculated
273	antibody level values were log transformed for further analysis.
274 275	Antibody Level Analysis and Predictive Modeling for Outcome
276	Log2 transformed antibody levels over time, starting from the earliest sample collection date
277	after onset, in the expired and discharged patients were plotted. The trajectories of antibody
278	levels are displayed for hospitalized patients who expired and who were discharged alive.
279	For patients who expired, the earliest sample was at Day 0 and the latest sample was at Day 30,
280	with a median of 6 samples per patient. For patients who were discharged, the earliest sample
281	was at day 0 and the latest sample was at Day 42, with a median of 6 samples per patient.
282	As there were limited sequential sample days for any given patient, we tested for differences
283	across expired and discharged groups using antibody levels at week one, week two and after
284	week two. For patients with more than one sample within a week, we used the median of the
285	available antibody levels. Density and box plots were used to display the distribution of
286	antibody levels at week one, two and after week two, along with results from a t-test
287	comparing the means of the distributions for different proteins.

We also fit a linear mixed model (Model 1), accounting for patient-level correlation, to the data 288 289 to model the antibody response using time, expired / discharged status and the interaction between time and expired / discharged status as predictors. Specifically, the mean antibody 290 levels at week 1, week 2 and after week 2 were estimated for the expired group and the 291 292 discharged group. The estimated antibody titer value differences between expired group and the discharged group were calculated and underwent statistical test. The mean increase 293 294 antibody titer of week 2 and after week 2 from week one value was also calculated for each 295 patient group to compare antibody response.

296 To determine whether the antibody response trajectory itself can be predictive of the eventual 297 outcome, we used a joint model (Model 2) to relate the patient-specific antibody response to 298 the eventual outcome. Specifically, we first fit a linear mixed model to the data to model the 299 antibody levels using time as a predictor and allowing for patient-specific deviations from the 300 mean response at each time point. Then, we used the patient-specific predictions from this model as predictors in a probit regression model to predict the eventual outcome of Death (or 301 expired status). The predicted patient-specific antibody levels were used as predictors of the 302 303 outcome as in model 1 and the joint modeling approach Receiver Operating Characteristic (ROC) curves were plotted and under the curve (AUC) calculated within figure with 95% 304 confidence intervals. Details on the modeling are in the Supplementary Materials under 305 306 Statistical Modeling.

307

308

309 Acknowledgements

- 310
- 311 We would like to thank Daniela Verthelyi, Mohan Manangeeswaran, Amy Rosenberg, Adam
- Fisher, Adam Sherwat, John Farley and Sau Lee for critical review of the manuscript. We also
- thank Hana Golding, Emily Braunstein and Carolyn Wilson for coordinating of clinical samples.
- 314 We would like to thank Mat Soukup and Yong Ma for critical review of statistical analysis. We
- thank JuMe Park, Sujata Bupp and Hanxia Huang for lab and technical support.
- 316 For providing the patient samples we thank: James Rost, CMO, White Oak Medical Center, and
- 317 Norton Elson, AHC Medical Director Quality and Clinical Effectiveness of Washington Adventist
- 318 Medical HealthCare; Nicolas Cacciabeve, Laboratory Medical Director of Advanced Pathology
- 319 Associates; Rob San Luis, Hollie Genser, Demetra Collier, Meaza Belay, Genevieve Caoili,
- 320 Zanetta E. Morrow and Bryana Streets of Quest Diagnostics.
- 321 Steven Kozlowski and Zhao-Hua Zhou are members of the Office of Pharmaceutical Quality
- 322 Center of Excellence for Infectious Diseases and Inflammation at CDER, FDA.
- 323 This article reflects the views of the authors and should not be construed to represent FDA's
- 324 views or policies.
- 325 **Funding**: This study was funded with FDA MCM resources.
- 326 Author Contributions:
- 327 Conception of the work: ZZ, SK
- 328 Performing experiments: ZZ

- 329 Data analysis and interpretation: ZZ, SD, ML, SLK, SK
- 330 Statistical analysis: SD
- 331 Drafting and revision of the manuscript: ZZ, SD, ML, SLK, SK
- 332 **Competing interests:** The authors declare no conflicts of interest.
- **Data and materials availability:** Contact the corresponding authors for data and materials;
- 334 Materials are commercially available except for patient samples; Patient samples may have
- limited availability.

337 **References**

338

JHU. COVID 19 Dashboard by the Center for Systems Science and Engineering (CSSE) at 339 1. Johns Hopkins University (JHU) 2020 [Available from: 340 https://gisanddata.maps.arcgis.com/apps/opsdashboard/index.html#/bda7594740fd402994234 341 342 67b48e9ecf6. Collins FS, Woodcock J, Graham BS, Arvin A, Bieniasz P, Ho D, et al. Therapeutic 343 2. Neutralizing Monoclonal Antibodies: Report of a Summit sponsored by Operation Warp Speed 344 and the National Institutes of Health 2020 [Available from: 345 https://www.nih.gov/sites/default/files/research-training/initiatives/activ/20200909-mAb-346 347 summit-pub.pdf. 348 3. FDA. Bamlanivimab and etesevimab EUA Letter of Authorization 2021 [Available from: http://pi.lilly.com/eua/bam-and-ete-eua-fda-authorization-letter.pdf. 349 350 4. FDA. Bamlanivimab EUA Letter of Authorization 2020 [Available from: https://www.fda.gov/media/143602/download. 351 FDA. Casirivimab and imdevimab EUA Letter of Authorization 2020 [Available from: 352 5. https://www.fda.gov/media/143891/download. 353 Baden LR, El Sahly HM, Essink B, Kotloff K, Frey S, Novak R, et al. Efficacy and Safety of the 354 6. mRNA-1273 SARS-CoV-2 Vaccine. N Engl J Med. 2020. 355 356 Jackson LA, Anderson EJ, Rouphael NG, Roberts PC, Makhene M, Coler RN, et al. An 7. mRNA Vaccine against SARS-CoV-2 - Preliminary Report. N Engl J Med. 2020;383(20):1920-31. 357 358 8. Cardone M, Yano M, Rosenberg AS, Puig M. Lessons Learned to Date on COVID-19 Hyperinflammatory Syndrome: Considerations for Interventions to Mitigate SARS-CoV-2 Viral 359 Infection and Detrimental Hyperinflammation. Front Immunol. 2020;11:1131. 360 9. Pruimboom L. SARS-CoV 2; Possible alternative virus receptors and pathophysiological 361 determinants. Med Hypotheses. 2020:110368. 362 Eroshenko N, Gill T, Keaveney MK, Church GM, Trevejo JM, Rajaniemi H. Implications of 363 10. antibody-dependent enhancement of infection for SARS-CoV-2 countermeasures. Nat 364 Biotechnol. 2020;38(7):789-91. 365 Company ELa. Lilly Statement on the NIAID Decision to Pause Enrollment in ACTIV-3 366 11. Clinical Trial 2020 [Available from: https://www.lilly.com/news/stories/statement-activ3-clinical-367 368 trial-covid19-niaid-decision-pause-enrollment. 369 12. Regeneron. REGN-COV2 Independent Data Monitoring Committee Reccomends Holding Enrollment in Hospitalized Patients with High Oxygen Requirements and Continuing Enrollment 370 371 in Patients with Low or No Oxygen Requirements 2020 [Available from: https://investor.regeneron.com/news-releases/news-release-details/regn-cov2-independent-372 373 data-monitoring-committee-recommends. 374 13. Lee N, Chan PK, Ip M, Wong E, Ho J, Ho C, et al. Anti-SARS-CoV lgG response in relation to disease severity of severe acute respiratory syndrome. J Clin Virol. 2006;35(2):179-84. 375 Liu L, To KK, Chan KH, Wong YC, Zhou R, Kwan KY, et al. High neutralizing antibody titer in 376 14. 377 intensive care unit patients with COVID-19. Emerg Microbes Infect. 2020;9(1):1664-70. Zhou ZH, Stone CA, Jakubovic B, Phillips EJ, Sussman G, Park J, et al. Anti-PEG IgE In 378 15. 379 Anaphylaxis Associated with Polyethylene Glycol. J Allergy Clin Immunol Pract. 2020.

Libster R, Perez Marc G, Wappner D, Coviello S, Bianchi A, Braem V, et al. Early High-Titer 380 16. 381 Plasma Therapy to Prevent Severe Covid-19 in Older Adults. N Engl J Med. 2021. 382 17. Salazar E, Christensen PA, Graviss EA, Nguyen DT, Castillo B, Chen J, et al. Treatment of 383 Coronavirus Disease 2019 Patients with Convalescent Plasma Reveals a Signal of Significantly Decreased Mortality. Am J Pathol. 2020;190(11):2290-303. 384 Simonovich VA, Burgos Pratx LD, Scibona P, Beruto MV, Vallone MG, Vazquez C, et al. A 385 18. Randomized Trial of Convalescent Plasma in Covid-19 Severe Pneumonia. N Engl J Med. 2020. 386 Padoan A, Cosma C, Sciacovelli L, Faggian D, Plebani M. Analytical performances of a 387 19. 388 chemiluminescence immunoassay for SARS-CoV-2 IgM/IgG and antibody kinetics. Clin Chem Lab 389 Med. 2020;58(7):1081-8. Montesinos I, Gruson D, Kabamba B, Dahma H, Van den Wijngaert S, Reza S, et al. 390 20. Evaluation of two automated and three rapid lateral flow immunoassays for the detection of 391 392 anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibodies. J Clin Virol. 2020;128:104413. Norman M, Gilboa T, Ogata AF, Maley AM, Cohen L, Busch EL, et al. Ultrasensitive high-393 21. 394 resolution profiling of early seroconversion in patients with COVID-19. Nat Biomed Eng. 2020;4(12):1180-7. 395 Mattiuzzo G, Bentley EM, Hassall M, Routley S, Richardson S, Bernasconi V, et al. 396 22. WHO/BS.2020.2403 Establishment of the WHO International Standard and Reference Panel for 397 398 anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibody. WHO; 2020 12/10/2020. 399 Iver AS, Jones FK, Nodoushani A, Kelly M, Becker M, Slater D, et al. Persistence and decay 23. of human antibody responses to the receptor binding domain of SARS-CoV-2 spike protein in 400 COVID-19 patients. Sci Immunol. 2020;5(52). 401 402 Atyeo C, Fischinger S, Zohar T, Slein MD, Burke J, Loos C, et al. Distinct Early Serological 24. 403 Signatures Track with SARS-CoV-2 Survival. Immunity. 2020;53(3):524-32 e4.

404 25. Gottlieb RL, Nirula A, Chen P, Boscia J, Heller B, Morris J, et al. Effect of Bamlanivimab as
405 Monotherapy or in Combination With Etesevimab on Viral Load in Patients With Mild to
406 Moderate COVID-19: A Randomized Clinical Trial. JAMA. 2021;325(7):632-44.

- 407 26. Chen P, Nirula A, Heller B, Gottlieb RL, Boscia J, Morris J, et al. SARS-CoV-2 Neutralizing
 408 Antibody LY-CoV555 in Outpatients with Covid-19. N Engl J Med. 2020.
- 409 27. Company ELa. Lilly Statement Regarding NIH's ACTIV-3 Clinical Trial 2020 [Available from:
 410 https://www.lilly.com/news/stories/authors/eli-lilly-and-company.
- 411
- 412

413

414 Figure 1. Anti-SARS CoV2 IgG Antibody Kinetics After Symptom Onset

Antibody titers at different days after onset were measured by the multiplexed beads array 415 as described in Methods. Displayed are specific IgG antibody titer values (log 416 417 transformed) in expired (orange) and discharged (green) groups of patients targeting the nucleocapsid protein (NP) and five spike protein components, i.e., S1+S2 ECD, S2, S1 418 419 (D614G), S1 and RBD. Dots are titer values for each patient at the corresponding day 420 from onset; lines are smoothed regression fit to the observed data with 95% confidence 421 interval bands.



- 426
- 427

428

429 Figure 2

Comparison of Week1 (0 to 7 days) After Onset Anti-SARS COV2 IgG Antibody Titers Between Discharged and Expired Groups

Density and box plots show distribution of specific IgG titer values (log transformed) at
week 1 after onset targeting SARS CoV2 NP and five spike protein components, S1+S2
ECD, S2, S1 (D614G), S1 and RBD. The expired (orange) and discharged (green)
groups were shown with t-test comparison p-values.

436



440

439

Figure 3. ROC Curves for Joint Model (Model 2) to Predict Death Using IgG Titer Values

- Area under the curve (AUC) is presented within figure with 95% confidence intervals
- (shown in the blue regions) for specific IgG antibodies to S1 and S2, respectively.



447 Supplementary Materials

- 449 Statistical Modeling
- 450 Assay Characteristics Figure S1, S2, S3
- 451 IgG Levels at Week 2 and After Week 2 Post-onset Comparisons Figure S4, S5, Table S1
- 452 IgG Analysis Using IgG Cut-point MFI Method Figure S6
- 453 IgG Cut-point MFI Week 1 Post-onset Comparison Figure S7
- 454 IgG Cut-point MFI Modeling Table S2, Figure S8
- 455 IgM Analysis
- 456 Anti-SARS CoV2 IgM Antibody Kinetics Figure S9
- 457 IgM Week 1 Post-onset Comparison Figure S10
- 458 IgM Modeling Table S3, Figure S11
- 459 IgA Analysis
- 460 Anti-SARS CoV2 IgA Antibody Kinetics Figure S12
- 461 IgA Week 1 Post-onset Comparison Figure S13
- 462 IgA Modeling Table S4, Figure S14
- 463 IgG Sensitivity Analysis (exclude 1000 and 1007)
- 464 Anti-SARS CoV2 IgG Sensitivity Analysis Kinetics Figure S15
- 465 IgG Sensitivity Analysis MFI Week 1 Comparison Figure S16
- 466 IgG Sensitivity Analysis Modeling Table S5, Figure S17
- 467 IgG Sensitivity Analysis (Males)
- 468 Anti-SARS CoV2 IgG Sensitivity Analysis Kinetics Figure S18
- 469 IgG Sensitivity Analysis MFI Week 1 Comparison Figure S19
- 470 IgG Sensitivity Analysis Modeling Table S6, Figure S20