Seven-month kinetics of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies and protective role of pre-existing antibodies to seasonal human coronaviruses on COVID-19

Natalia Ortega[1a], Marta Ribes[1a], Marta Vidal[1], Rocío Rubio[1], Ruth Aguilar[1], Sarah Williams[1], Diana Barrios[1], Selena Alonso[1], Pablo Hernández-Luis[2,3], Robert A. Mitchell[1], Chenjerai Jairoce[1,4], Angeline Cruz[1], Alfons Jimenez[1,5], Rebeca Santano[1], Susana Méndez[1], Montserrat Lamoglia[1,6], Neus Rosell[1], Anna Llupià[1,7], Laura Puyol[1], Jordi Chi[1], Natalia Rodrigo Melero[8], Daniel Parras[2], Pau Serra[2], Edwards Pradenas[9], Benjamin Trinité[9], Julià Blanco[9,10], Alfredo Mayor[1,4,5], Sonia Barroso[11], Pilar Varela[11], Anna Vilella[1,5], Antoni Trilla[1,5,12], Pere Santamaria[7,13,14], Carlo Carolis[8], Marta Tortajada[11], Luis Izquierdo[1], Ana Angulo[2,3], Pablo Engel[2,3], Alberto L. García-Basteiro[1,4,15], Gemma Moncunill[1*], Carlota Dobaño[1,5*]

Affiliations

[1] ISGlobal, Hospital Clínic, Universitat de Barcelona, Barcelona, Catalonia, Spain

[2] Institut d'Investigacions Biomèdiques August Pi i Sunyer, Barcelona, Spain

[3] Immunology Unit, Department of Biomedical Sciences, Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences, University of Barcelona, Barcelona, Spain

[4] Centro de Investigação em Saúde de Manhiça, Maputo, Mozambique

[5] Spanish Consortium for Research in Epidemiology and Public Health, Madrid, Spain

[6] School of Health Sciences TecnoCampus Universitat Pompeu Fabra, Mataró, Spain

[7] Department of Preventive Medicine and Epidemiology, Hospital Clinic, Universitat de Barcelona, Barcelona, Spain

[8] Biomolecular screening and Protein Technologies Unit, Centre for Genomic Regulation (CRG), The Barcelona Institute of Science and Technology, Barcelona, Spain.

[9] IrsiCaixa AIDS Research Institute, Germans Trias i Pujol Research Institute (IGTP), Can Ruti Campus, UAB, 08916, Badalona, Catalonia, Spain

[10] University of Vic–Central University of Catalonia (UVic-UCC), 08500, Vic, Catalonia, Spain

[11] Occupational Health Department, Hospital Clínic, Universitat de Barcelona, Barcelona, Spain

[12] Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences, Universitat de Barcelona, Barcelona, Spain

[13] Julia McFarlane Diabetes Research Centre, Cumming School of Medicine, University of Calgary, Calgary, Alberta, Canada.

[14] Department of Microbiology, Immunology and Infectious Diseases, Snyder Institute for Chronic Diseases, Cumming School of Medicine, University of Calgary, Calgary, Alberta, Canada

[15] International Health Department, Hospital Clínic, Universitat de Barcelona, Barcelona, Spain

[a] Shared first authors

[*] Shared last authors and correspondence:

Carlota Dobaño, carlota.dobano@isglobal.org
Gemma Moncunill, gemma.moncunill@isglobal.org
ISGlobal. Carrer Roselló 132, 08036 Barcelona, Spain

Abstract

Unraveling the long-term kinetics of antibodies to SARS-CoV-2 and its determinants, including the impact of pre-existing antibodies to human coronaviruses causing common cold (HCoVs), is essential to understand protective immunity to COVID-19 and devise effective surveillance strategies. IgM, IgA and IgG levels against six SARS-CoV-2 antigens and the nucleocapsid antigen of the four HCoV (229E,NL63, OC43 and HKU1) were quantified by Luminex, and antibody neutralization capacity was assessed by flow cytometry, in a cohort of health care workers followed-up for 6 months (N = 578). Seroprevalence increased over time from 13.5% (month 0) and 15.6% (month 1) to 16.4% (month 6). Levels of antibodies, including those with neutralizing capacity, were stable over time, except IgG to nucleocapsid antigen and IgM levels that waned. After the peak response, anti-spike antibody levels increased from ~150 days post-symptom onset in all individuals (73% for IgG), in the absence of any evidence of re-exposure. Pre-existing antibodies to alpha-HCoV were lower in individuals who subsequently seroconverted for SARS-CoV-2. IgG and IgA to HCoV were significantly higher in asymptomatic than symptomatic seropositive individuals. Thus, pre-existing cross-reactive HCoVs antibodies could have a protective effect against SARS-CoV-2 infection and COVID-19 disease.

59 **Introduction**

60 Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19), caused by the Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome
61 Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2), has already caused a loss of 3.2 M lives globally[1]. Since its
62 emergence, a key priority has been the understanding of the kinetics and protective role of
63 the immune response in the population, to assess the degree of exposure in serosurveys
64 and to understand immunity to the virus. This knowledge guides vaccine development,
65 selection of donors for hyperimmune serum-transfusion therapies, and combining antigens
66 with the highest immunogenic and neutralizing capacity to improve surveillance interventions.
67 Longitudinal studies assessing SARS-CoV-2 antibody kinetics have found that IgA and IgM
68 peak between week 3 and 4 post symptoms onset (PSO) and wane thereafter, with IgA
69 persisting longer than IgM[2-7]. IgA and IgM seroreversion was estimated between days 71 and
70 49, respectively[8], but IgA has also been found to remain detectable 6 months post infection
71 and to be less affected by the decay than IgM[9,10]. Several studies have observed relatively
72 stable levels of IgG to the spike (S) protein after three[11,6], four[12,13] and six to eight
73 months[2,9,14-16]. However, others reported that IgG only lasted around 3-4 months PSO[17,18].
74 Many studies consistently observe that IgG to the nucleocapsid (N) protein, found inside the
75 virus or infected cells, decay faster than IgG to S, being a marker of a more recent infection
76 but less sensitive for assessing population seroprevalence[2,13-20]. While antibodies targeting N
77 protein are unlikely to directly neutralize SARS-CoV-2, those targeting S, responsible for the
78 interaction with the ACE2 receptor in the host cells, are considered the main neutralizers[21].
79 Studies up-to-date point that neutralizing antibodies (nAbs) strongly correlate with antibody
80 titers to S[16,19-22] and also positively correlate with increased disease severity[26].
81 Understanding the extent of antibody cross-reactivity with other human coronaviruses
82 (HCoV) is important to elucidate the impact of such pre-existing antibodies on COVID-19
83 immunity. Four low-pathogenic HCoV causing common cold have circulated among humans
84 for at least 100 years: the alphacoronaviruses 229E and NL63, and the betacoronaviruses
85 OC43 and HKU1. They account for about 10% of all acute respiratory tract infections, and
86 thus, a substantial proportion of the global population is expected to carry antibodies against

87 them[27,28], although their protective immunity might be short-lasting[29] Previous studies found
88 some cell-mediated[30,31] and antibody cross-reactivity of HCoV immune responses with
89 SARS-CoV-2[32-34]. Regions within N and S antigens with high amino acid homology between
90 SARS-CoV-2 and HCoV are potential targets of cross-reactive antibodies[33-36], and could
91 exert cross-protective effects against SARS-CoV-2 infection and/or disease. Prior studies
92 have not found protection against infection, as participants with recent documented infection
93 with an endemic HCoV had similar rates of SARS-CoV-2 acquisition than those without
94 recent HCoV infection[37-39]. Regarding anti-disease protection, COVID-19 patients with a
95 recent HCoV diagnosis had statistically significant lower odds for COVID-19 intensive care
96 unit admission and death[39], but other studies did not find any association between confirmed
97 prior history of seasonal HCoVs and COVID-19 severity[37,38]. Some recent studies have
98 suggested that this pre-existing immunity would not confer cross-protection but, rather, be
99 responsible for an immunological imprinting or 'original antigenic sin', a phenomenon well
100 studied for influenza virus infections. This suggests that the immune system privileges recall
101 of existing memory responses -in this case of HCoV-, in detriment of stimulating *de novo*
102 responses -here to SARS-CoV-2- leading to poor outcomes or severe disease[31,32]. The
103 possibility of antibodies to HCoVs acting as antibody-derived enhancement (ADE) has also
104 been reviewed and the most recent evidence shows no clinical, *in vitro* or animal
105 evidence[40,41]. Disentangling the role of pre-existing HCoVs antibodies on anti-SARS-CoV-2
106 responses may have implications in the deployment of potentially effective vaccines, as well
107 as for the interpretation of serological studies.
108 At the beginning of the pandemic, healthcare workers (HCW) were considered to be at a
109 higher risk of SARS-CoV-2 infection than the general population, although there is now
110 evidence that seroprevalence is similar when using adequate personal protective equipment.
111 We previously observed 9.3% (95% CI, 7.1-12.0) SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence in a random
112 cohort of 578 HCW from Hospital Clínic in Barcelona (HCB) between March-April 2020[42], and
113 of 14.9% after a month follow-up[4], based on the detection of antibodies to one antigen

114 (receptor binding domain, RBD). IgA, IgM and IgG levels declined after 3 months with
115 antibody decay rates of 0.12, 0.15 and 0.66 respectively[4].
116 In the present study, we aimed to characterize the antibody kinetics and neutralization
117 capacity between March and October 2020 at four cross-sectional surveys and estimate the
118 seroprevalence in the same cohort of HCW. For this analysis, we measured IgM, IgG and
119 IgA isotypes against an expanded panel of six SARS-CoV-2 antigens and tested cross-
120 reactivity with the N antigen of the four endemic HCoVs (HKU1, 229E, OC43 and NL63) to
121 assess its potential impact on COVID-19 protection.
122

123 ## Results

124 **Seroprevalence, seroconversions and seroreversions**

125 From the initial cohort, 507 individuals participated in a fourth visit (M6) six months after
126 baseline (12.3% lost to follow-up). Mean age was 42.7 (SD: 11.2) and 72% were female. Full
127 demographic characteristics at baseline (M0), one (M1) and three (M3) month follow up visits
128 were as described[4,42] **(Supplementary Table 1).**
129 Samples collected at M0, M1 and M3 were re-tested with a wider panel of antigens along
130 with M6 samples. The seroprevalence for either IgM and/or IgG and/or IgA was 13.5% at M0,
131 15.6% at M1 and 16.4% at M6 **(Supplementary Table 2**). Newly detected SARS-CoV-2
132 infections increased by 22, 9 by rRT-PCR and 13 by serology, at M6 compared to visit M1.
133 When considering rRT-PCR and serology data, 84 out of 578 participants (14.5%, 95% CI
134 11.8-17.7%) had evidence of infection at M0 by serology or rRT-PCR, 91/566 (16.1%, 95%
135 CI 13.1-19.4%) at M1 and 91/507 (17.9%, 95% CI 14.7-21.6%) at M6. The cumulative
136 prevalence of infection was 16.8% (95% CI 13.8-20.1%) and 19.6% (95% CI 16.4-23.0%) at
137 M1 and M6, respectively. Unlike seropositive proportions, we had a relatively stable number
138 of undetermined results over time, 48 (8.3%), 52 (9.1%) and 37 (7.3%) participants at
139 baseline, M1 and M6, respectively. Sixty-seven out of the 119 participants (56.3%) with any
140 evidence of infection had a positive rRT-PCR (**Supplementary Table 2**).

141 At visits M1 and M3, we mainly observed seroreversions of seropositive individuals at M0 for
142 IgA and IgM to all antigens (30% and 24.5%, respectively). Hardly any participant
143 seroreverted from M3 to M6 (**Supplementary Table 2**). Overall, there were 9 participants
144 who were seronegative and previously had a positive rRT-PCR, 32 to 197 days prior to
145 sample draw. Three of these HCWs were asymptomatic.
146 Having reported COVID-19-compatible symptoms at any visit was associated with
147 experiencing a SARS-CoV-2 infection with an OR of 463 (95% CI, 122 -3157) in the
148 univariable analysis. Physicians and psychologists had 50% lower odds of infection (OR
149 0.49, 95% CI 0.27-0.85) than nurses and other auxiliary health professionals
150 (**Supplementary Table 3**). Age, sex and other variables were not found to be associated
151 with SARS-CoV-2 infection. Sixty-nine percent of the infections were symptomatic and a
152 single participant required hospitalization in our cohort.
153
154 **Kinetics of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies up to 7.7 months PSO**
155 Levels of SARS-CoV-2 antigen specific isotypes (IgM, IgA, IgG) were plotted against time
156 with up to four observations with a maximum 7.7 months PSO, in a total of 235 samples from
157 76 symptomatic participants (**Figure 1**). Kinetic curves were very similar when plotted against
158 days since positive rRT-PCR in participants who were asymptomatic or symptomatic
159 (**Supplementary Figure 1**).
160 IgA or IgM peaked within the first month PSO, while IgG peaked around day 50 PSO. SARS-
161 CoV-2 IgG levels were generally steady for S antigens (S, S1, S2 and RBD) and for IgA up to
162 230 days PSO (71% and 69% of the participants remained seropositive six months PSO,
163 respectively), and waned at a clearly slower rate than IgM (34% of the participants remained
164 seropositive) and IgG to N-related antigens (26% of the participants remained seropositive).
165 Antibody levels were observed to increase from ~150 days PSO onwards (**Figure 1**). To
166 further explore this, we grouped participants based on their antibody levels at M6 compared
167 to the previous visit (M1 or M3). We only considered participants who had already shown a
168 decrease in antibodies after the peak response. We therefore calculated an “antibody

169 increase index" between both visits for each antigen-isotype combination and labelled the
170 individuals as "decayers" when the ratio of antibody levels between both visits was <1, and
171 as "sustainers/increasers" when the ratio was ≥ 1, in line with the methodology by Chen et
172 al.[17]. Increased levels were observed in all antigen-isotype combinations (**Figure 1**). Most
173 sustainers/increasers had a boost for more than one antigen-isotype pair, as assessed by a
174 Venn diagram (**Supplementary Figure 2**). Levels at seroconversion visit were higher in
175 decayers than sustainers/increasers, being statistically significant for N IgG, S2 IgG and S1
176 IgM (**Supplementary Figure 3a**). There was no association of the antibody increase index or
177 being a sustainer/increaser or a decayer with age. We observed a trend towards having a
178 higher antibody increase index, mainly for IgG, in participants who reported current or past
179 symptoms at M6 since last visit, several months after COVID-19 disease recovery
180 (**Supplementary Figure 3b**). Of note, none of these individuals reported new infections and
181 we did not find any association between having reported a contact with a COVID-19 case at
182 M6 and the antibody increase index (data not shown). We also identified a trend towards
183 higher antibody increase index in participants with shorter duration of symptoms (<10 days)
184 compared to those who had symptoms for >10 days (**Supplementary Figure 3c**). We
185 explored all the variables in univariable and multivariable logistic regression models and
186 none were robustly associated with being a sustainer/increaser or a decayer (data not
187 shown).
188
189 **Kinetics of neutralizing antibodies**
190 Plasma neutralizing capacity measured as RBD-ACE2-binding inhibition generally increased
191 between the day of onset of symptoms until day 80 and remained stable thereafter up to 250
192 days PSO (**Figure 2**). We correlated the antibody neutralizing capacity and levels at the
193 different study visits. At the first cross-sectional visit (M0, mean days PSO=20) levels of all
194 three Ig isotypes against RBD and S antigens positively correlated with neutralization
195 capacity (r_s=0.19-0.32, $p<0.05$), while the correlation between antibody levels against N and
196 RBD-ACE2 neutralization did not reach statistical significance (**Figure 3a**). At the fourth

197 cross-sectional visit (M6, mean days PSO=200), IgM levels to any antigen did not correlate
198 with neutralization percentage, whilst IgG and IgA levels against all six antigens showed
199 moderate to strong correlations (r_s=0.24-0.76, $p<0.05$), with higher correlations for S antigens
200 (**Figure 3b**). We performed a PCA for all antigen-isotype pairs (**Supplementary Figure 4**)
201 and the first 5 components, explaining 75.12% of the variance were included as predictors in
202 a model with neutralizing capacity as an outcome ($p<0.05$, adjusted R^2 0.575). Component 1
203 and 5 were significantly associated with neutralizing capacity (**Supplementary Table 4**). In
204 these components, S and S1 IgG, and S2 IgM, contributed to an increase in the
205 neutralization activity, whilst N C-terminal IgG negatively influenced it ($p<0.001$). We
206 observed that antibodies to S antigens were highly contributing to the prediction of the
207 neutralization percentage (component 1, longer vectors).
208 We did not find any significant difference in neutralizing capacity between
209 sustainers/increasers and decayers. The neutralizing capacity was also not associated with
210 the antibody increase index, except for IgM increase index that inversely correlated with the
211 neutralization percentage at M0 and after six months PSO (**Supplementary Figure 5**).
212
213 **Cross-reactivities of SARS-CoV-2 with endemic HCoV**
214 Pre-pandemic plasma samples had some antibody reactivity against SARS-CoV-2 antigens,
215 particularly against N protein, and levels of antibodies against N from SARS-CoV-2 positively
216 correlated with antibodies to HCoV N antigens (to a lesser extent for IgM), indicating cross-
217 reactivity between them (**Supplementary Figure 6**).The amino acid pairwise similarities and
218 identities of full-length SARS-CoV-2 N protein and seasonal HCoVs are 36% and 26.4% to
219 229E, 39.1% and 27% to NL63, 48.1% and 35.7% to OC43 and 47% and 35.2% to HKU1[36].
220 Therefore, we analyzed the antibody levels against HCoV N antigens prior and after SARS-
221 CoV-2 infection in the 33 participants who seroconverted during the study period. While
222 some participants showed stable anti-HCoV N antibody levels, a general upward trend was
223 observed. IgG to 229E significantly increased after SARS-CoV-2 seroconversion.

224 Considering that not all seroconverters had an increase in levels supports a back-boost of N
225 HCoV beyond cross-reactivity (**Supplementary Figure 7**).
226 We investigated whether having higher baseline anti-HCoV N antibody levels could be
227 protective against SARS-CoV-2 infection. Overall, we observed a consistent trend towards
228 higher baseline IgG levels to alpha-HCoV 229 ($p=0.06$) and NL63 ($p=0.15$) in participants
229 who did not seroconvert compared to seroconverters, although these differences did not
230 reach statistical significance (**Figure 4a**). We assessed whether having higher anti-HCoV N
231 antibody levels prior to infection could confer protection against COVID-19 symptoms in
232 participants who seroconverted during the study period. Although statistical significance was
233 only reached for IgA against OC43, we observed a common trend towards higher levels of
234 anti-HCoV N IgA and IgG in asymptomatic than symptomatic SARS-CoV-2 seropositive
235 participants (**Figure 4b**). Consistently, levels of all three isotypes against alpha HCoVs and
236 of IgA to OC43 experienced a higher fold-increase after SARS-CoV-2 infection in
237 asymptomatic than symptomatic seroconverters ($p<0.05$) (**Figure 4c**), suggesting that a back
238 boost -beyond cross-reactivity- in anti-HCoV antibody levels could confer disease-protective
239 immunity. In line with this finding, seropositive asymptomatic participants had significantly
240 higher IgG levels against all four HCoVs than symptomatic participants in the first visit after
241 SARS-CoV-2 positivity (**Figure 4d**). In contrast, anti-SARS-CoV-2 N antibody levels were
242 higher in symptomatic seropositive participants ($p<0.05$) (**Figure 4e**).
243 Finally, we tested whether baseline anti-HCoV antibody levels impacted *de novo* production
244 of antibodies to SARS-CoV-2. To test this hypothesis we correlated the increase in anti-N
245 SARS-CoV-2 antibody levels from baseline to seroconversion for the three isotypes against
246 the anti-N HCoVs antibody levels at baseline (adding up levels of isotypes). Overall, we
247 observed a statistically significant inverse relationship between anti-HCoV IgG and IgA
248 baseline levels and the increase of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies ($r_s=-0.35$, $p<0.05$; $r_s=-0.18$,
249 $p<0.05$; respectively). This suggests that pre-existing antibodies against the four HCoV N
250 induced a lighter *de novo* production of antibodies against SARS-CoV-2 N (**Supplementary**
251 **Figure 8**).

252 **Discussion**

253 To our knowledge, this is the first longitudinal study to assess the antibody response to such
254 a wide panel of antigens from SARS-CoV-2 and HCoV, up to 7.7 months after infection, and
255 the first to show evidence of COVID-19 protection by pre-existing HCoV antibodies. This is
256 important to track the evolution of the immunity in asymptomatic and mild/moderate cases,
257 particularly in an indispensable population like HCW, and to understand why some people
258 may be less affected by COVID-19. A strength of the present study is the availability of
259 sequential sampling within a random cohort including asymptomatic and symptomatic
260 subjects.

261 Importantly, we observed a trend towards higher levels of antibodies against HCoVs N
262 proteins at baseline in those participants who did not become infected with SARS-CoV-2,
263 suggesting some level of cross-protection against infection. Moreover, asymptomatic SARS-
264 CoV-2 seropositive participants tended to have higher anti-HCoV N IgA and IgG levels prior
265 to seroconversion than symptomatic participants, suggesting cross-protection against
266 disease. In addition, asymptomatic seropositive participants had significantly higher anti-
267 HCoV N IgG levels after infection than symptomatics, pointing towards a disease-protective
268 back-boost of anti-HCoV antibodies. Combined with the observation that higher baseline
269 anti-HCoV N antibody levels correlated with less *de novo* anti-SARS-CoV-2 N antibody
270 production, we propose a protective effect of previous exposure to HCoVs, which could be
271 the result of a diminished exposure (decreased viral load) due to the suggested protective
272 role of anti-HCoV antibodies. Other studies have reported a lack of anti-disease cross-
273 protection[37-39]; and some studies have associated severe COVID-19 with a back-boosting of
274 antibodies against S2 from betacoronaviruses[32], and N and S from OC43[31]. However, these
275 studies included only hospitalized patients, as opposed to our cohort that included mainly
276 asymptomatic and participants with mild/moderate symptoms. HCoV protective immunity
277 against reinfection has been observed to last around 12 months[29]. Knowing the duration of
278 HCoV protective immunity to reinfection and disease will be key to the understanding of
279 HCoV's role on COVID-19 epidemiology and pathology at population level. We show a

280 cumulative prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 infection of 19.6% (95% CI 16.4-23.0%) after six
281 months of follow-up (October 2020). The cumulative prevalence around May 2020,
282 corresponding to our second visit (M1), recalculated here with a wider antigen panel, was
283 16.8% (CI 95% 13.8-20.1%), similar to other studies in Spanish HCW that ranged between
284 10.5% and 19.9%[43-45]. Around 28% of the total infections detected throughout the follow up
285 were newly diagnosed after the first visit (M0), which would reveal that infections in the
286 hospital setting mostly happened within the first pandemic wave. No re-infections were
287 reported in our cohort and this could be related to the induction and maintenance of robust
288 neutralizing antibodies along the study period, in contrast with another study in a cohort of
289 173 primary HCW in which 4 reinfections were reported[46]. Surprisingly, only 56% of
290 participants with evidence of infection by serology had a positive rRT-PCR, highlighting that
291 almost half of the infections went under-detected, mainly during the baseline visit (only 49%
292 had a previous positive rRT-PCR) and going up to 73% of rRT-PCR detection rate in the
293 following visits. We observed a high seroreversion rate for IgA and IgM at visits M1 and M3,
294 decreasing at visit M6. This finding reinforces the rapid decay below the seropositivity
295 threshold of these two isotypes compared to IgG, for which only 9 participants seroreverted
296 between M1 and M6 visits. Although some reports have pointed to a higher antibody decay
297 in HCW with mild symptoms[47], our results show that IgG levels are maintained up to 7.7
298 months PSO, in line with other studies[2,9,14-16]. Interestingly, IgA levels were maintained in
299 those individuals who did not serorevert during the first 3 months PSO. Furthermore, IgG to
300 N C-terminal rapidly decreased below the positivity threshold, as seen in other studies[2,13-20].
301 However, the vast majority of participants with a previous infection remained seropositive for
302 S-related antigens. This finding is of special relevance because RBD and S IgG antibody
303 levels have been shown to correlate with neutralizing activity and S is the main target of
304 currently deployed COVID-19 vaccines and most products under development.
305 Remarkably, we noticed a pronounced increase in S-related IgG levels from day 150 PSO
306 onwards in 34/46 (73.9%) participants. Previous studies that reached 150 days of follow-up
307 have not highlighted this phenomenon [6,14,16], but it was observed in Figueiredo-Campos et

308 al.[9]. Chen et al. assessed a subset of individuals with stable or increasing antibody levels at
309 day ~100[17]. In our study, nearly all increasers showed the boost in levels for more than one
310 antigen-isotype pair, in line with the results observed by Chen et al.[17]. We also found a
311 consistent tendency pointing to shorter duration of symptoms in participants with higher
312 increase indices, labeled as quick healers, independently from their age. In contrast with their
313 work, we found statistically significant differences in SARS-CoV-2 antibody levels at
314 seroconversion, with decayers showing higher levels compared to sustainers-increasers for
315 N IgG, S2 IgG and S1 IgM. The increase in antibody levels in recovered participants could be
316 related to a natural boost after a re-exposure, although we do not have any evidence of
317 reinfection, and sustainers/increasers did not report more contacts with positive cases than
318 decayers. A similar late increase in antibody levels has been reported in a study describing
319 immunity to Ebola virus, showing a pattern of decay-stimulation of antibody production in
320 survivors who had been neither re-exposed nor vaccinated, and had been asymptomatic
321 since the infection[48]. The authors argued that the increase in antibodies could be the result of
322 *de novo* antigenic stimulation at immune-privileged sites, that is, the persistence of antigens
323 in specific organs would mimic a re-infection and boost immunity. Interestingly, Gaebler et
324 al. observed antigen persistence in the small intestine and related it with the memory B cell
325 response evolving during the first 6 months after infection, with accumulation of Ig somatic
326 mutations, and production of antibodies with increased neutralizing breadth and potency[10].
327 Strong correlations were found between antibody neutralization capacity and the days PSO,
328 as identified in previous literature[16,19,20,22], in accordance with the antibody affinity increase
329 after the maturation of the immune response. Anti-spike antigens contributed to an increase
330 in the antibody neutralization capacity, whilst anti-N C-terminal IgG negatively impacted it.
331 IgM may have a neutralization role early after infection but it may be lost after a few months,
332 consistent with the decay of IgM levels.
333 Antibodies from sustainers/increasers and decayers had equivalent neutralization capacities,
334 suggesting that the increasing antibody levels observed 150 days PSO are not associated
335 with the quality of the response. Unexpectedly, IgM increase index negatively correlated with

336 the antibody neutralization capacity at baseline and after six months visits. It would appear
337 that the virus could be more persistent in participants with lower neutralizing capacity and as
338 a result IgM response is successively increased.
339 The main limitations of this study are that our cohort had few participants with severe
340 disease, and that we only assessed the impact of anti-HCoV N antibodies on SARS-CoV-2
341 response, while anti-N antibodies are not expected to have neutralizing capacity. However, it
342 is likely that sera with high levels of N HCoV antibodies would also have high levels of
343 antibodies targeting S antigens and B and T cells specific to HCoV, which could explain the
344 potential association with a protective effect. Altogether, further studies will be needed to
345 elucidate the potential role of prior HCoV infections in the spectrum of COVID-19 severity, as
346 well as the temporal relevance of HCoV exposure and the possible impact on vaccine
347 responses.
348 In conclusion, antibody levels and neutralizing capacity are generally maintained up to 7.7
349 months, and in a substantial number of individuals antibody levels increase after some
350 months PSO. Further studies are needed to elucidate the mechanisms and nature of these
351 increases and their implications for virus shedding and disease progression. Importantly,
352 previous exposure to HCoVs could have a protective effect against SARS-CoV-2 infection
353 and symptoms development, and may explain in part the differential susceptibility to disease
354 in the population. Additional work focusing on prospective cohorts would allow the
355 assessment of mechanisms and confirm causality in anti-HCoV antibodies on SARS-CoV-2
356 acquisition, disease progression, immune response maintenance and correlates of
357 protection.
358

359 ## Methods

360 ### Study design, population and setting

361 We measured the levels of antibodies to SARS-CoV-2 antigens in blood samples of 578
362 randomly selected HCW from HCB followed up at four visits: baseline - hereby termed “M0”-
363 (month 0, March 28th to April 9th 2020, n = 578), “M1” (month 1, April 27th to May 6th 2020, n =

364 566), “M3” (month 3, July 28th to August 6th 2020) when only participants with previous
365 evidence of infection were invited (n=70), and “M6” (month 6, Sept 29th to Oct 20th 2020, n =
366 507) (12.3% lost to follow-up). We collected retrospective data on symptoms in order to set
367 the beginning of the disease, and the longest period since symptoms onset was 231 days
368 (7.7 months).
369 The study population included HCW who delivered care and services directly or indirectly to
370 patients, as described[4,42]. We collected nasopharyngeal swabs for SARS-CoV-2 rRT-PCR at
371 M0 and M1 and a blood sample for antibody and immunological assessments at all visits.
372 SARS-CoV-2 detection by rRT-PCR followed the CDC-006-00019 CDC/DDID/NCIRD/
373 Division of Viral Diseases protocol, as previously described[4,42]. Participants isolated at home
374 due to a COVID-19 diagnosis or on quarantine, were visited at their households for sample
375 and questionnaires collection.
376 Written informed consent was obtained from all study participants prior to study initiation. The
377 study was approved by the Ethics Committee at HCB (Ref number: HCB/2020/0336). Data
378 for each participant were collected in a standardized electronic questionnaire as described[42].
379
380 **Quantification of antibodies to SARS-CoV-2**
381 IgM, IgG and IgA antibodies to the full length SARS-CoV-2 S protein, its subregions S1 and
382 S2, RBD that lies within the S1 region, the N full length protein and its specific C-terminal
383 region, and the full length N protein of the HCoVs HKU1, 229E, OC43 and NL63, were
384 measured by Luminex (Supplementary Information) based on a previously described
385 protocol[51]. Sequential plasma samples from the same individual were tested together in the
386 same assay plate. Assay positivity cutoffs specific for each isotype and analyte were
387 calculated as 10 to the mean plus 3 standard deviations (SD) of $\log_{10}$-transformed mean
388 fluorescence intensity (MFI) of 129 pre-pandemic controls. Results were defined as
389 undetermined when the MFI levels for a given isotype-analyte were between the positivity
390 threshold and an upper limit at 10 to the mean plus 4.5 SD of the $\log_{10}$-transformed MFIs of
391 pre-pandemic samples, and no other isotype-antigen combination was above the positivity

392 cutoff and the participant did not have any previous evidence of seropositivity or rRT-PCR
393 positivity.
394
395 **Neutralizing antibodies**
396 Percentage of inhibition of RBD binding to ACE2 by plasma was analyzed through a flow
397 cytometric-based *in vitro* assay as detailed in the Supplementary Information. This technique
398 stands for its rapidity and efficiency and sets a potential alternative to the more demanding
399 plaque-reduction neutralization assays. Briefly, a murine stable cell line expressing the ACE2
400 receptor was incubated with RBD-mFc fusion protein, composed of RBD fused to the Fc
401 region of murine IgG1, previously exposed to the different plasma samples at a dilution 1/50.
402 Cells were stained with anti-mouse IgG-PE, washed, and analyzed by flow cytometry using
403 standard procedures. One hundred and one samples were tested alongside 20 positive and
404 20 negative pre-pandemic controls, in duplicates **(Supplementary Fig 9a)**. We cross-
405 validated the neutralization assay with a validated assay [52]. Fifty-five plasma samples were
406 analyzed for pseudovirus neutralization and half maximal dilutions concentrations (ID50)
407 were compared with the results obtained with the flow cytometry. There was a strong
408 correlation (rho = 0.9, $p<0.0001$) between both assays **(Supplementary Fig 9b)**.
409
410 **Statistical data analysis**
411 Prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies or SARS-CoV-2 infection confirmed by rRT-PCR, and
412 cumulative prevalence of past or current infection (positive SARS-CoV-2 rRT-PCR and/or
413 antibody seropositivity at any time point) were calculated as proportions with 95% CI.
414 We tested the association between variables with the Chi-square or Fisher's exact test for
415 categorical variables, and with the Wilcoxon Sum Rank test for continuous variables. Paired
416 Samples Wilcoxon Test was used for paired continuous data. We assessed the relationships
417 between continuous variables using linear regression models and Spearman's rank
418 correlation test. Locally estimated scatterplot smoothing (LOESS) was used to visualize
419 trends in antibody levels over days PSO or post rRT-PCR diagnosis.

420 A Venn diagram was created to illustrate the overlap between anti-N full-length protein, anti-
421 N C-term, anti-RBD, anti-S, anti-S1, anti-S2 in the Sustainer/Increaser groups[53].
422 Univariable and multivariable linear regression models were run to assess factors associated
423 with SARS-CoV-2 antibody levels and prevalence. The variables tested were the following:
424 sex and age, presence of COVID19 symptoms (individual symtoms also incuded - fatigue,
425 cough, disnea and other respiratory symptoms, anosmia or ageusia, sorethroat, fever,
426 rhinorrea, headache, chills and digestive symptoms-) , nº of people living in the household
427 and nº of children, worked in a COVID19 ward, type of job (doctor, nurse, administrative),
428 had daily contact with patients, smoking habits, chronic medication, presence of baseline
429 illness, previous contract with a positive COVID19 case.
430 We additionally explored the association between the SARS-CoV-2 antibody levels and the
431 percentage of neutralization of RBD at month 6 in a Principal Components Analysis (PCA)
432 that included all isotype/antigen pairs. Before the PCA, we confirmed the adequacy of the
433 analysis by testing the colinearity of the variables with the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin analysis (>0.5)
434 and the Bartlett's sphericity test ($p < 0.001$). The number of factors chosen was based on
435 eigenvalues >1 that explained >75% of the total variance. To investigate the relationships
436 between HCoV levels and a subset of variables with clinical outcomes and SARS-CoV-2
437 antibody levels, we built multivariable logistic and linear models, respectively, for those
438 participants for whom we had a sample prior to seroconversion.
439 A P-value of ≤ 0.05 was considered statistically significant and 95% and CIs were calculated
440 for all estimates. We performed the statistical analysis in R version 4.0.3 (packages tidyverse
441 and corrplot).
442

443 **Data availability**

444 Anonymized data used for this analysis is available and made public under the title of this
445 publication at http://diposit.ub.edu/dspace/handle/XXXXX.
446

447 **Code availability**

448 Code used in the analysis is available at http://diposit.ub.edu/dspace/handle/XXXX.

449

450 **References**

451 1. WHO Coronavirus Disease (COVID-19) Dashboard. World Health Organization.
452 Available at: https://covid19.who.int/ (2021).
453 2. Dan, J. M. et al. Immunological memory to SARS-CoV-2 assessed for up to 8 months
454 after infection. *Science* **371** (2021). doi:10.1126/science.abf4063
455 3. Graham, N. R. et al. Kinetics and Isotype Assessment of Antibodies Targeting the Spike
456 Protein Receptor Binding Domain of SARS-CoV-2 In COVID-19 Patients as a function of
457 Age and Biological Sex. Preprint at 10.1101/2020.07.15.20154443 (2020).
458 4. Moncunill, G. et al. SARS-CoV-2 Seroprevalence and Antibody Kinetics Among Health
459 Care Workers in a Spanish Hospital After 3 Months of Follow-up. *The Journal of*
460 *Infectious Diseases* **223** (2020).
461 5. Padoan, A. et al. IgA-Ab response to spike glycoprotein of SARS-CoV-2 in patients with
462 COVID-19: A longitudinal study. *Clinica Chimica Acta* **507** (2020).
463 6. Seow, J. et al. Longitudinal evaluation and decline of antibody responses in SARS-CoV-
464 2 infection. Preprint at: 10.1101/2020.07.09.20148429 (2020).
465 7. Tan, Y. et al. Durability of neutralizing antibodies and T-cell response post SARS-CoV-2
466 infection. *Frontiers of Medicine* **14** (2020).
467 8. Iyer, A. S. et al. Persistence and decay of human antibody responses to the receptor
468 binding domain of SARS-CoV-2 spike protein in COVID-19 patients. *Science*
469 *Immunology* **5** (2020).
470 9. Figueiredo-Campos, P. et al. Seroprevalence of anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibodies in COVID-
471 19 patients and healthy volunteers up to 6 months post disease onset. *European Journal*
472 *of Immunology* **50**, 2025–2040 (2020).
473 10. Gaebler, C. et al. Evolution of Antibody Immunity to SARS-CoV-2. *Nature* (2021).
474 doi:10.1101/2020.11.03.367391

475 11. Isho, B. et al. Persistence of serum and saliva antibody responses to SARS-CoV-2 spike
476 antigens in COVID-19 patients. *Science Immunology* **5**, 1-21 (2020). doi:
477 10.1126/sciimmunol.abe5511
478 12. Hartog, G. D. et al. SARS-CoV-2-specific antibody detection for sero-epidemiology: a
479 multiplex analysis approach accounting for accurate seroprevalence. *The Journal of*
480 *Infectious Diseases* **222**, 1452–1461 (2020). doi:10.1101/2020.06.18.20133660
481 13. Orth-Höller, et al. Kinetics of SARS-CoV-2 specific antibodies (IgM, IgA, IgG) in non-
482 hospitalized patients four months following infection. *Journal of Infection* (2020).
483 doi:10.1016/j.jinf.2020.09.015
484 14. Pradenas E. et al. Stable neutralizing antibody levels six months after mild and severe
485 COVID-19 episode. Med 3, 313-320 (2021)
486 15. Ripperger, T. J. et al. Orthogonal SARS-CoV-2 Serological Assays Enable Surveillance
487 of Low-Prevalence Communities and Reveal Durable Humoral Immunity. *Immunity* **53**
488 (2020).
489 16. Whitcombe, A. L. et al. Comprehensive analysis of SARS-CoV-2 antibody dynamics in
490 New Zealand. (2020). Preprint at 10.1101/2020.12.10.20246751
491 17. Chen, Y. et al. Quick COVID-19 Healers Sustain Anti-SARS-CoV-2 Antibody Production.
492 *Cell* **183**, (2020).
493 18. Havervall, S. et al. SARS-CoV-2 induces a durable and antigen specific humoral
494 immunity after asymptomatic to mild COVID-19 infection. (2021). Preprint at
495 10.1101/2021.01.03.21249162
496 19. Ibarrondo, F. J. et al. Rapid Decay of Anti–SARS-CoV-2 Antibodies in Persons with Mild
497 Covid-19. *New England Journal of Medicine* **383**, 1085–1087 (2020).
498 20. L'Huillier, A. G. et al. Antibody persistence in the first six months following SARS-CoV-2
499 infection among hospital workers: a prospective longitudinal study. *Clinical Microbiology*
500 *and Infection* (2021). doi:10.1016/j.cmi.2021.01.005
501 21. Wagner, A. et al. A longitudinal seroprevalence study in a large cohort of working adults
502 reveals that neutralising SARS-CoV-2 RBD-specific antibodies persist for at least six

503 months independent of the severity of symptoms. (2020). Preprint at
504 10.1101/2020.12.22.20248604
505 22. Premkumar, L. et al. The RBD Of The Spike Protein Of SARS-Group Coronaviruses Is A
506 Highly Specific Target Of SARS-CoV-2 Antibodies But Not Other Pathogenic Human and
507 Animal Coronavirus Antibodies. (2020). Preprint at 10.1101/2020.05.06.20093377
508 23. Wajnberg, A. et al. Robust neutralizing antibodies to SARS-CoV-2 infection persist for
509 months. *Science* **370**, 1227–1230 (2020).
510 24. Garcia-Beltran WF., et al. COVID-19-neutralizing antibodies predict disease severity and
511 survival. *Cell* **184**, 476-488 (2021). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2020.12.015
512 25. Guthmiller, JJ. et al. SARS-CoV-2 Infection Severity Is Linked to Superior Humoral
513 Immunity against the Spike. *MBio* **12** (2021). doi: 10.1128/mBio.02940-20
514 26. Legros V., et al. A longitudinal study of SARS-CoV-2-infected patients reveals a high
515 correlation between neutralizing antibodies and COVID-19 severity. *Cell Mol Immunol*
516 **18**, 318–27 (2021). https://doi.org/10.1038/s41423-020-00588-2
517 27. Takeshita, M. et al. Incomplete humoral response including neutralizing antibodies in
518 asymptomatic to mild COVID-19 patients in Japan. *Virology* **555**, 35–43 (2021).
519 28. Ma, Z., Li, P., Ji, Y., Ikram, A. & Pan, Q. Cross-reactivity towards SARS-CoV-2: the
520 potential role of low-pathogenic human coronaviruses. *The Lancet Microbe* **1**, (2020).
521 29. Arthur, W.E.E., et al. Seasonal coronaviruses protective immunity is short-lasting. Nature
522 Medicine 26, 1691-1693 (2020).
523 30. Grifoni A., et al. Targets of T Cell Responses to SARS-CoV-2 Coronavirus in Humans
524 with COVID-19 Disease and Unexposed Individuals. *Cell* **181**, 1489-1501 (2020). doi:
525 10.1016/j.cell.2020.05.015.
526 31. Westerhuis BM., et al. Homologous and heterologous antibodies to coronavirus 229E,
527 NL63, OC43, HKU1, SARS, MERS and SARS-CoV-2 antigens in an age stratified cross-
528 sectional serosurvey in a large tertiary hospital in The Netherlands (2020). Preprint at
529 10.1101/2020.08.21.20177857

530 32. Aydillo, T. et al. Antibody Immunological Imprinting on COVID-19 Patients. (2020).
531 Preprint at 10.1101/2020.10.14.20212662
532 33. Assis, R. et al. Analysis of Serologic Cross-Reactivity Between Common Human
533 Coronaviruses and SARS-CoV-2 Using Coronavirus Antigen Microarray. *Nature*
534 *Communications* **12**, (2020). doi:10.1101/2020.03.24.006544
535 34. Ng, K. W. et al. Pre-existing and de novo humoral immunity to SARS-CoV-2 in humans.
536 *Science* **370** (2020). doi:10.1101/2020.05.14.095414
537 35. Becker, M. et al. Exploring beyond clinical routine SARS-CoV-2 serology using MultiCov-
538 Ab to evaluate endemic coronavirus cross-reactivity. Nature Communications 12, 1152
539 (2021).
540 36. Dobaño, C. et al. Immunogenicity and crossreactivity of antibodies to SARS-CoV-2
541 nucleocapsid protein. *Translational Research* (2021). doi: 10.1016/j.trsl.2021.02.006
542 37. Anderson, E. M. et al. Seasonal human coronavirus antibodies are boosted upon SARS-
543 CoV-2 infection but not associated with protection. *Cell* (2020).
544 doi:10.1101/2020.11.06.20227215
545 38. Gombar, S. et al. SARS-CoV-2 infection and COVID-19 severity in individuals with prior
546 seasonal coronavirus infection. *Diagnostic Microbiology and Infectious Disease* (2020).
547 doi:10.1101/2020.12.04.20243741
548 39. Sagar, M. et al. Recent endemic coronavirus infection is associated with less-severe
549 COVID-19. *Journal of Clinical Investigation* **131**, (2021).
550 40. Arvin, A. M. et al. A perspective on potential antibody-dependent enhancement of SARS-
551 CoV-2. *Nature* **584**, 353–363 (2020).
552 41. Lee, W. S., Wheatley, A. K., Kent, S. J. & Dekosky, B. J. Antibody-dependent
553 enhancement and SARS-CoV-2 vaccines and therapies. *Nature Microbiology* **5**, 1185–
554 1191 (2020).
555 42. Garcia-Basteiro, A. L. et al. Seroprevalence of antibodies against SARS-CoV-2 among
556 health care workers in a large Spanish reference hospital. *Nature Communications* **11**,
557 (2020).

558 43. Barallat J., et al. Seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2 IgG specific antibodies among
559 healthcare workers in the Northern Metropolitan Area of Barcelona, Spain, after the first
560 pandemic wave. *PLoS One* **15**, (2020). Doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0244348
561 44. Fernandez, J. G. et al. Impact of SARS-CoV-2 pandemic among health care workers in a
562 secondary teaching hospital in Spain. *Plos One* **16**, (2021).
563 45. Varona JF., et al. Seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies in over 6000 healthcare
564 workers in Spain. *Int J Epidemiol* (2021). doi:10.1093/ije/dyaa277
565 46. Dobaño, C. et al. Persistence and baseline determinants of seropositivity in health care
566 workers up to nine months after COVID-19. Preprint at: 10.21203/rs.3.rs-142984/v1
567 47. Self WH., et al. Decline in SARS-CoV-2 Antibodies After Mild Infection Among Frontline
568 Health Care Personnel in a Multistate Hospital Network — 12 States, April–August 2020.
569 *MMWR* **69**, 1762–1766 (2020). doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.15585/mmwr.mm6947a2external
570 icon
571 48. Adaken C., et al. Ebola virus antibody decay–stimulation in a high proportion of
572 survivors. *Nature* (2021). doi: 10.1038/s41586-020-03146-y
573 49. Amanat F., et al. A serological assay to detect SARS-CoV-2 seroconversion in humans.
574 *Nat Med* **26**, 1033–1036 (2020). https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-020-0913-5
575 50. Meyer B, Chiaravalli J, Brownridge P, Bryne DP, Daly LA, Agou F, et al. Characterisation
576 of protease activity during SARS-CoV-2 infection identifies novel viral cleavage sites and
577 cellular targets for drug repurposing (2020). Preprint from:
578 https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.16.297945
579 51. Dobaño, C. et al. Highly sensitive and specific multiplex antibody assays to quantify
580 immunoglobulins M, A and G against SARS-CoV-2 antigens. (2020). Preprint at
581 10.1101/2020.06.11.147363
582 52. Trinité, B., et al. SARS-CoV-2 infection elicits a rapid neutralizing antibody response that
583 correlates with disease severity. *Sci Rep* 11, 2608 (2021).

53. Heberle, H., Meirelles, G. V., Silva, F. R. D., Telles, G. P. & Minghim, R. InteractiVenn: a web-based tool for the analysis of sets through Venn diagrams. *BMC Bioinformatics* **16**, (2015).

Author Contributions

A.A., A.L.G.B., P.E., G.M., A.M., C.D. designed the study. A.C., M.L., N.O., M.R., N.R., S.W. recruited participants, collected data and obtained samples at the clinic. A.J., M.V., R.A., R.R., D.B., R.A.M., L.P., S.A., C.J. processed the samples, developed and performed the serological assays and analysis. A.A., P.E., and P.H.L., performed the flow cytometry neutralization assay and E.P, B.T and J.B the pseudovirus-based neutralization assay. R.A, R.S., S.B., A.V., A.L., A.T., P.V., M.T. contributed to design and the critical interpretation of the results. J.C., L.I., N.R.M, C.C., P.Se., D.P., and P.Sa., produced the antigens. N.O., M.R., analyzed the data and R.S. gave support to data analysis. S.M. managed the clinical data. N.O., M.R., G.M., C.D. wrote the first draft of the paper. All authors approved the final version as submitted to the journal.

Acknowledgements

We thank the participation of health care workers who are committed with this study as well as with their professional activity that has a positive impact in the society, even more relevant during the pandemic. We are grateful to Eugénia Chóliz, Pau Cisteró, Antía Figueroa-Romero, Silvia Folchs, Jochen Hecht, Mikel J. Martínez, Núria Pey, Patricia Sotomayor and Sara Torres who participated in the field and/or laboratory work during previous visits. We also thank Cristina Castellana and the administrative department in ISGlobal, Sergi Sanz and Sergio Olmos for statistical advice, Jordi Rello for scientific advice, and the nurses from Occupational Health and Preventive Medicine departments (HCB).

Funding

This work was supported by Institut de Salut Global de Barcelona (ISGlobal) internal funds; in-kind contributions of Hospital Clínic de Barcelona, and European Institute of Innovation and Technology (EIT) Health (grant number 20877), supported by the European Institute of Innovation and Technology, a body of the European Union receiving support from the H2020 Research and Innovation Programme; by the Fundació Provada Daniel Bravo Andreu through the high-throughput equipment they provided; Ministerio de Ciencia e Innovación through the Centro de Excelencia Severo Ochoa 2019–2023 program (grant number CEX2018-000806-S); and the Catalan Government through the Centres de Recerca de Catalunya program (for P.S.: 2017-SGR-3380 and MINECO RTI2018-093964-B-I00). . G. M. was supported by the Departament de Salut, Generalitat de Catalunya (grant number SLT006/17/00109). L. I. work was supported by PID2019-110810RB-I00 grant from the Spanish Ministry of Science & Innovation.

Work at IrsiCaixa was partially funded by Grifols, the Departament de Salut of the Generalitat de Catalunya (grant SLD016 to JB), the Spanish Health Institute Carlos III (Grant PI17/01518. PI20/00093 to JB), CERCA Programme/Generalitat de Catalunya 2017 SGR 252, and the crowdfunding initiatives #joemcorono, BonPreu/Esclat and Correos. EP was supported by a doctoral grant from National Agency for Research and Development of Chile (ANID): 72180406.

The funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, the decision to publish, or the preparation of the manuscript.

Competing interests

The authors declare no competing interests.

Figures



Figure 1. Kinetics of SARS-CoV-2 antibody levels since onset of symptoms. Levels (median fluorescence intensity, MFI) of IgA, IgG and IgM against each antigen (Nucleocapsid full length protein (N), and its C-terminal domain, the Receptor Binding Domain (RBD), full S protein and its subregions S1 and S2) measured in 357 samples from 76 symptomatic participants collected in up to four time points per participant (paired samples joined by lines). The black solid line represents the fitted curve calculated using the LOESS (locally estimated scatterplot smoothing) method. Shaded areas represent 95% confidence intervals. Dashed line represents the positivity threshold. Participants were grouped based on their antibody levels at M6 compared to the previous visit, individuals were labelled for each isotype-antigen pair as “Decayers” (pink) when the ratio of antibody levels between both visits was <1 and as “Sustainers/Increasers” (light blue) when the ratio was ≥ 1 and grey when the classification was not applicable.



Figure 2. Longitudinal antibody neutralizing capacity. Antibody neutralizing capacity, as a percentage of ACE2 binding inhibition in plasma samples from 64 symptomatic participants collected in three serial visits (M0, M1 and M6) represented as days after symptom onset. Paired samples are joined by grey lines. The black solid line represents the fitted curve calculated using the LOESS (locally estimated scatterplot smoothing) method. Shaded areas represent 95% confidence intervals.



Figure 3. Correlations between antibody levels and RBD-ACE2 neutralization capacity. Spearman's rank correlation test between levels (median fluorescence intensity, MFI) of IgA, IgG and IgM against each antigen (Nucleocapsid full length protein (N), and its C-terminal domain, the Receptor Binding Domain (RBD), full S protein and its subregions S1 and S2) at **a)** baseline visit (M0) and **b)** M6 visit; and plasma neutralization capacity (as a percentage of RBD-ACE2 binding inhibition). P-values and r_s correlation coefficients are color-coded for each antigen/isotype pair. Colored lines represent the fitted curve calculated using the linear model method. Shaded areas represent 95% confidence intervals.



Figure 4. The influence of anti-HCoV antibody levels on the antibody response to SARS-CoV-2. a) Differences in baseline levels (median fluorescence intensity, MFI) of IgG against HCoV N protein between participants who were seronegative during the entire study (COVID-19 Ab-) and participants who seroconverted (COVID-19 Ab+). **b)** Differences in IgA, IgG and IgM levels prior to infection against N of the four HCoVs between symptomatic and asymptomatic participants who seroconverted during the study. **c)** Differences in fold-increase of IgG levels against N of the four HCoVs after SARS-CoV-2 seroconversion in symptomatic vs asymptomatic COVID-19 cases. **d)** Differences in anti-HCoV N IgG levels at seroconversion visit between symptomatic and asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 seropositive participants. **e)** Differences in anti-SARS-CoV-2 N IgG, IgA and IgM levels in asymptomatic versus symptomatic participants at seroconversion visit.

685 **Extended data figures**

686

687

688

		Total
Sex [a]	Male Female	161 (28%) 417 (72%)
Professional Category [a]	Nurse / Auxiliary / Stretcher-bearer Physician Lab technicians Admin officers Other6	288 (50%) 147 (25%) 45 (8%) 98 (17%)
Age[c]		42.1 (11.6)
Daily contact with patients [a]	No Yes	123 (21%) 455 (79%)
Working in a COVID19 unit [a]	No Yes	315 (54%) 263 (46%)
Close contact with COVID19 confirmed or suspected case [a]	No Yes	137 (24%) 441 (76%)
Previously diagnosed of COVID19 by RT-qPCR[a]	No Yes	539 (93%) 39 (7%)
Comorbiditiesa[b]	No Yes	517 (89%) 61 (11%)
Household size[c]		2.8 (1.2)
Received Flu vaccine (2019-2020 season) [a]	No Yes	339 (59%) 239 (41%)
Reporting COVID-19 compatible symptoms within previous month [a]	No Yes	368 (64%) 210 (36%)

a n (Column percentage)
b Includes, cleaning, kitchen and maintenance staff
c Arithmetic Mean (SD) [n]
d Comorbidities include: heart and liver disease, diabetes, chronic respiratory and renal disease, cancers and autoimmune and other immunological disorders.

689

690 **Supplementary Table 1.** Baseline characteristics of study participants.



Supplementary Figure 1. **Kinetics of SARS-CoV-2 antibody levels since day of first positive rRT-PCR test.** Levels (median fluorescence intensity, MFI) of IgA, IgG and IgM against each antigen (Nucleocapsid full length protein (N), and its C-terminal domain, the Receptor Binding Domain (RBD), full S protein and its subregions S1 and S2). Data are shown only for the 67 participants who had a positive rRT-PCR. Up to four time points are shown per participant (paired samples joined by lines). The black solid line represents the fitted curve calculated using the LOESS (locally estimated scatterplot smoothing) method. Shaded areas represent 95% confidence intervals.



Supplementary Figure 2. Venn Diagram illustrating the overlap between antigen-specific IgGs in the “Sustainers/Increasers" group. Participants were grouped based on their antibody levels at M6 compared to the previous visit, individuals were labelled for each isotype-antigen pair as “Decayers” when the ratio of antibody levels between both visits was <1 and as “Sustainers/Increasers” when the ratio was ≥ 1. Here, we only represent participants who classify as “Sustainers/Increasers" for IgG against each of the studied antigens (n=34). Between parentheses are the number of sustainers/Increasers seropositive for IgG against the indicated antigen.

713

	visit	All isotypes(%) [95% CI]	IgA (%) [95% CI]	IgG (%) [95% CI]	IgM (%) [95% CI]
Seroprevalence*	M0	78/578 (13.5%) [10.8- 16.6%]	60/578 (10.4%) [8.0-13.2%]	42/578 (7.6%) [5.3-9.7%]	53/578 (9.2%) [6.9-11.8%]
	M1	86/566 (15.6%) [12.3-18.4%]	61/566 (10.8%) [8.3-13.6%]	59/566 (10.8%) [8.0-13.2%]	54/566 (9.6%) [7.2-12.3%]
	M6	83/507 (16.4%) [13.3-19.9%]	58/507 (11.4%) [8.8-14.5%]	58/507 (11.4%) [8.8-14.5%]	35/507 (6.9%) [4.9-9.5%]
Seroconversion*	M1	23/500 (4.6%)	20/500 (4.0%)	21/500 (4.2%)	19/500 (3.8%)
	M6	13/478 (2.7%)	10/478 (2.1%)	12/478 (2.5%)	11/478 (2.3%)
Seroreversion	M1	7/78 (9.0%)	18/60 (30.0%)	2/44 (4.5%)	13/53 (24.5%)
	M3	6/88 (6.8%)	14/61 (23.0%)	6/61 (9.8%)	16/54 (29.6%)
	M6	0/49 (0.0%)	1/30 (3.3%)	1/44 (2.3%)	1/12 (8.3%)

714

715 **Supplementary Table 2**. Seroprevalence, seroconversion and seroreversion rates for each
716 visit.

717 *Only participants with previous evidence of SARS-CoV-2 infection were invited to visit M3,
718 thus, no seroprevalence or seroconversion data are presented for this visit.

719

720

	OR (95% CI)	
	Univariable Logistic Regression	p value
Age	1.00 (0.98-1.02)	0.9365
Sex		
Females	1.33 (0.83-2.20)	0.241
Males	1.0 (Ref)	
Job function		
Nurses and auxiliary health professionals [a]	1.0 (Ref)	
Laboratory and other technicians	0.92 (0.40-1.94)	0.8314
Physicians and psychologists	0.49 (0.27-0.85)	0.0138 *
Others [b]	0.88 (0.49-1.53)	0.6618
Involved in clinical care		
Yes	1.17 (0.70-2.01)	0.56
No	1.0 (Ref)	
Worked in a COVID ward		
Yes	0.90 (0.59-1.39)	0.634
No	1.0 (Ref)	
Baseline illness [c]		
Yes	0.79 (0.45-1.33)	0.385
No	1.0 (Ref)	
Chronic medication		
Yes	0.69 (0.39-1.18)	0.19
No	1.0 (Ref)	
Symptomatic		
Yes	153.2 (67.3-416.3)	<2e-16 ***
No	1.0 (Ref)	
Nº children co-living	1.02 (0.78-1.30)	0.901
Nº people household	1.04 (0.87-1.24)	0.679
Smoker		
Yes	0.78 (0.45-1.31)	0.373
No	1.0 (Ref)	

721 **Supplementary Table 3.** Univariable analysis of factors associated with having detectable
722 SARS-CoV-2 antibodies at M6 (IgM and/or IgG and/or IgA against each antigen
723 (Nucleocapsid (N), and its C-terminal domain, the Receptor Binding Domain (RBD), full S
724 protein and its subregions S1 and S2). All factors explored are included in the table.

725 * p-value <0.05
726 *** p-value < 0.001
727 [a] Includes stretcher-bearer.
728 [b] Includes, cleaning, kitchen and maintenance staff
729 [c] Comorbidities include heart and liver disease, diabetes, chronic respiratory and renal
730 disease, cancers and autoimmune, and other immunological disorders.

731

	Dependent variable:
	Beta (SE)
Component 1[a]	3.893*** (0.482)
Component 2	0.932 (0.649)
Component 3	-0.923 (0.811)
Component 4	-0.585 (0.918)
Component 5 [b]	3.579*** (1.108)
Constant	34.488*** (1.151)
Observations	56
R^2	0.614
Adjusted R^2	0.575
Residual Std. Error	8.615 (df = 50)
F Statistic	15.903*** (df = 5; 50)
Note:	*p<0.1; >**p<0.05; >***p<0.01>

[a] Mostly contributing to the Component 1: S1 IgG (0.374) / S IgG (0.381)
[b] Mostly contributing to the Component 5: N C terminal IgG (-0.656) / S2 IgM (0.355)

Supplementary Table 4. Principal Components Regression. SE: Standard Error.



Supplementary Figure 3. Comparisons of serological and clinical characteristics between sustainers/increasers and decayers. **a)** Differences in antibody levels at seroconversion between sustainers/increasers and decayers (median fluorescence intensity, MFI) of IgA, IgG and IgM against each antigen (Nucleocapsid (N), and its C-terminal domain, the Receptor Binding Domain (RBD), full S protein and its subregions S1 and S2)). **b)** Differences in antibody increase index (represented in log scale) between seropositive participants who reported symptoms and those who did not in month 6 (M6) after recovering from a previous SARS-CoV-2 infection. **c)** Differences in antibody increase index (represented in log scale) between seropositive symptomatic participants who reported less than 10 days of symptom duration and those who reported more than 10 days.



Supplementary Figure 4. Principal Components Analysis (PCA) Biplot. Vectors represent all antigen/isotype pairs and their contribution to the variance in the antibody neutralization percentage represented in the two main dimensions axis. Observations are plotted according to their neutralization percentage at fourth visit (M6).



Supplementary Figure 5. a) Sample collection timeline. **b)** Correlations between antibody increase index and neutralization capacity. Spearman's rank correlation test between antibody increase index (MFI increase between M6 and previous visit) of IgA, IgG and IgM against each study antigen (Nucleocapsid full length protein (N), and its C-terminal domain, the Receptor Binding Domain (RBD), full S protein and its subregions S1 and S2), and the plasma neutralization capacity at M0 (as a percentage of RBD-ACE2 binding inhibition). P-values and r_s correlation coefficients are color-coded for each antigen/isotype pair. Colored lines represent the fitted curve calculated using the linear model method. Shaded areas represent 95% confidence intervals.



Supplementary Figure 6. Correlation plot with hierarchical clustering showing the correlations between IgG, IgM and IgA levels against Nucleocapsid (N) protein from the four seasonal human coronaviruses (HCoV) and SARS-CoV-2 in 101 pre-pandemic samples. Significance level in the correlations is represented by * ($p < 0.05$), ** ($p < 0.01$), *** ($p < 0.001$). Bold letters highlight SARS-CoV-2 coronavirus for visualization purposes.



Supplementary Figure 7. Boxplots comparing the levels (median fluorescence intensity, MFI) of IgA, IgG and IgM against the Nucleocapsid (N) protein of the four seasonal human coronaviruses (HCoV) before and after SARS-CoV-2 seroconversion.



Supplementary Figure 8. Linear regression models showing the relation between antibody levels against the four HCoV N proteins (three isotypes added) and the anti-SARS-CoV-2 N antibody ratio of seroconversion (seroconversion levels/baseline levels) for all three isotypes. P-values and r_s correlation coefficients are given for each isotype. Black lines represent the fitted curve calculated using the linear model method. Shaded areas represent 95% confidence intervals.



Supplementary Figure 9. a) Antibody neutralization capacity is compared between negative controls, positive controls and participants. b) Correlation between neutralization values as per the flow cytometry assay used for this work and values from a cross-validated pseudovirus neutralization assay (ID50 - half maximal dilutions concentrations).

795 **Supplementary Information**
796
797 **Quantification of antibodies to SARS-CoV-2 by Luminex**
798
799 The levels of IgG, IgM and IgA were assessed in single replicates by high-throughput
800 multiplex quantitative suspension array technology (qSAT). The assay was performed in 6
801 plates of 384 wells with samples from the same individual in the same plate (samples from
802 visit M0 to M6).The SARS-CoV-2 antigens included were the spike full protein (S) (aa 1-1213
803 expressed in Expi293 and His tag-purified), the S1 (aa 1-681, expressed in Expi293 and His
804 tag-purified) and S2 (purchased from SinoBiologicals), the receptor binding domain (RBD)
805 (fused with C-terminal 6xHis and StrepTag purification sequences and purified from
806 supernatant of lentiviral-transduced CHO-S cells cultured under a fed-batch system), the
807 nucleocapsid full protein (N) and the specific N C-terminal region, and the four HCoV N full
808 length proteins (expressed in *E. coli* and His tag-purified). Assay performance was previously
809 established as 100% specificity and 95.78% sensitivity for seropositivity 14 days after
810 symptoms onset [1].
811
812 **Coupling of proteins to microspheres**
813
814 MagPlex® polystyrene 6.5 µm COOH-microspheres (Luminex Corp, Austin, TX, USA) were
815 washed, sonicated and activated with Sulfo-NHS (*N*-hydroxysulfosuccinimide) and EDC (1-
816 Ethyl-3-[3-dimethylaminopropyl]carbodiimide hydrochloride) (Thermo Fisher Scientific
817 Inc.,Waltham USA). Next, microspheres were washed and resuspended in 50 mM MES pH
818 5.0 (MilliporeSigma, St. Louis, USA). The recombinant proteins were then incubated with the
819 microspheres at the optimal concentrations (from 10 to 50 µg/mL) and left at 4°C on a shaker
820 overnight. Coupled microspheres were resuspended in PBS with 1% BSA to covalently block
821 the free carboxylic group (-COOH) absorbing most of the non-specific binding to secondary
822 or tertiary antibodies during assay steps [2] and heterophilic antibody binding seen in
823 previous systems [3]. Microspheres recovery were quantified on a Guava® easyCyte™ Flow
824 Cytometer (Luminex Corporation, Austin, USA). Equal amounts of each antigen-coupled
825 microspheres were multiplexed and stored at 2000 microspheres/µL at 4°C, protected from
826 light.
827
828 **qSAT assay**
829
830 Antigen-coupled microspheres were added to a 384-well µClear® flat bottom plate (Greiner
831 Bio-One, Frickenhausen, Germany) in multiplex (2000 microspheres per analyte per well) in
832 a volume of 90 µL of Luminex Buffer (1% BSA, 0.05% Tween 20, 0.05% sodium azide in
833 PBS) using 384 channels Integra Viaflo semi-automatic device (96/384, 384 channel pipette).
834 Two hyperimmune pools (one for IgG and IgA, and another one for IgM) were used as
835 positive controls in each plate assay for QA/QC purposes and were prepared at 2-fold, 8
836 serial dilutions from 1:12.5. Pre-pandemic samples were used as negative controls to
837 estimate the cut off of seropositivity. Ten µL of each dilution of the positive control, negative
838 controls and test samples (prediluted 1:50 in 96 round-bottom well plates), were added to a
839 384-well plate using Assist Plus Integra device with 12 channels Voyager pipette (final test
840 sample dilution of 1:500). To quantify IgM responses, test samples and controls were pre-
841 treated with anti-Human IgG (Gullsorb) at 1:10 dilution, to avoid IgG interferences. Technical
842 blanks consisting of Luminex Buffer and microspheres without samples were added in 4

843 wells to detect and adjust for non-specific microsphere signals. Plates were incubated for 1 h
844 at room temperature in agitation (Titramax 1000) at 900 rpm and protected from light. Then,
845 the plates were washed three times with 200 µL/well of PBS-T (0.05% Tween 20 in PBS),
846 using BioTek 405 TS (384-well format). Twenty five µL of goat anti-human IgG-phycoerythrin
847 (PE) (GTIG-001, Moss Bio) diluted 1:400, goat anti-human IgA-PE (GTIA-001, Moss Bio)
848 1:200, or goat anti-human IgM-PE (GTIM-001, Moss Bio) 1:200 in Luminex buffer were
849 added to each well and incubated for 30 min. Plates were washed and microspheres
850 resuspended with 80 µL of Luminex Buffer, covered with an adhesive film and sonicated 20
851 seconds on sonicator bath platform, before acquisition on the Flexmap 3D® reader. At least
852 50 microspheres per analyte per well were acquired, and median fluorescence intensity
853 (MFI) was reported for each analyte.
854
855 **Neutralizing antibodies**
856
857 The stable cell line 300.19-ACE2 was obtained by transfecting 300.19 cells with a plasmid
858 encoding human ACE2 cDNA (SinoBiological) with an Amaxa cell line Nucleofector kit V,
859 followed by hygromycin selection and subsequent subcloning. RBD-mFc fusion protein,
860 containing RBD fused to the Fc region of murine IgG1 was obtained by cloning RBD
861 amplified from the pcDNA3-SARS-CoV-2-S-RBD-Fc (Addgene) into the PFUSE-mIGg1-Fc1
862 (InvivoGen). HEK-293T cells were transiently transfected with the RBD-mFc plasmid using
863 polyethylenimine as previously described [4]. The supernatant containing the RBD-mFc
864 protein was collected 7 days after transfection, and concentrated 4-fold using an Amicon
865 Ultra-15 Centrifugal Filter Unit with an Ultracel-30 membrane (Millipore).
866 A total of 1.2 x10^3 300.19-ACE2 cells per well in a 96-well plate were incubated for 30 min at
867 4°C with 4 mg/mL of RBD-mFc fusion protein previously exposed to diluted plasma (1:50) for
868 30 min at 4°C. Samples were stained with anti-mouse IgG-PE (Jackson ImmunoResearch),
869 washed, and analyzed by Flow cytometry using standard procedures. Samples were
870 acquired with a FACSCanto II (BD Biosciences) and analyzed with FlowJo Xv10.0.7 (Tree
871 Star, Inc) software [4].
872 Pseudovirus-based neutralization assay using HIV-based pseudovirus and ACE2 expressing
873 293T cells is described in Pradenas et al. [5]. This assay has been validated by direct
874 comparison of IC50 neutralization values obtained using pseudoviruses infecting ACE2
875 expressing 293 cells and replicative viruses infecting Vero cells in Trinité et al. [6].
876
877
878 **Supplementary References**
879
880 [1] Dobaño, C. et al. Highly sensitive and specific multiplex antibody assays to quantify
881 immunoglobulins M, A and G against SARS-CoV-2 antigens. (2020). Preprint at
882 10.1101/2020.06.11.147363

883 [2] Waterboer T, Sehr P, Pawlita M. Suppression of non-specific binding in serological
884 Luminex assays. *J Immunol Methods* **309**, 200–4 (2006)

885 [3] Martins TB, Pasi BM, Litwin CM, Hill HR. Heterophile antibody interference in a
886 multiplexed fluorescent microsphere immunoassay for quantitation of cytokines in human
887 serum. *Clin Diagn Lab Immunol* **11**, 325-9 (2004)
888
889 [4] Martínez-Vicente P, Farre D, Sánchez C, Alcamí A, Engel P, Angulo A. Subversion of

890 natural killer cell responses by a cytomegalovirus-encoded soluble CD48 decoy receptor.
891 *PLoS Pathog* **15** (2019)
892 [5] Pradenas E. et al. Stable neutralizing antibody levels six months after mild and severe
893 COVID-19 episode. Med 3, 313-320 (2021)
894 [6] Trinité, B., et al. SARS-CoV-2 infection elicits a rapid neutralizing antibody response that
895 correlates with disease severity. Sci Rep 11, 2608 (2021).
896