

1

2 **Persisting Salivary IgG against SARS-CoV-2 at 9 Months After Mild COVID-19:**  
3 **A Complementary Approach to Population Surveys**

4

5 Hassan Alkharaan<sup>1#</sup>, Shaghayegh Bayati<sup>5#</sup>, Cecilia Hellström<sup>5</sup>, Annika Olsson<sup>2</sup>, Karin  
6 Lindahl<sup>2,4</sup>, Gordana Bogdanovic<sup>3</sup>, Soo Aleman<sup>2,4</sup>, Georgios Tsilingaridis<sup>1</sup>, Patricia De  
7 Palma<sup>1</sup>, Sophia Hober<sup>6</sup>, Anna Månberg<sup>5</sup>, Peter Nilsson<sup>5</sup>, Elisa Pin<sup>5#</sup>, Margaret  
8 Sällberg Chen<sup>1#</sup>

9

10 <sup>1</sup>Karolinska Institutet, Department of Dental Medicine, 14152, Stockholm, Sweden

11 <sup>2</sup>Karolinska University Hospital, Department of Infectious Diseases, 14186,  
12 Stockholm, Sweden

13 <sup>3</sup>Karolinska University Hospital, Department of Clinical Microbiology, 14186,  
14 Stockholm, Sweden

15 <sup>4</sup>Karolinska Institutet, Department of Medicine, 14186, Stockholm, Sweden

16 <sup>5</sup>Division of Affinity Proteomics, Department of Protein Science, School of  
17 Engineering Sciences in Chemistry, Biotechnology and Health (CBH), KTH Royal  
18 Institute of Technology, SciLifeLab, Stockholm, Sweden

19 <sup>6</sup>Division of Protein Technology, Department of Protein Science, KTH Royal Institute  
20 of Technology, Stockholm, Sweden

21

22 #These authors contributed equally

23

24 **Running title:** Salivary IgG to SARS-CoV-2 After Mild COVID-19

25 **Corresponding author:** Professor Margaret Sällberg Chen

26 **Word count:** 198 (abstract) 3487 (total)

27 **Figure and table count:** 3 figures, 3 tables, 3 supplementary figures.

28 *Footnote page*

29

30 **Conflict of interest statement:** NO

31 **Financial support statement:** This study was supported by grants from Region  
32 Stockholm, Knut and Alice Wallenberg foundation, Science for Life Laboratory  
33 (SciLifeLab), Erling-Persson family foundation (to SH).

34 **This study has not been presented any conference or meeting**

35 **Corresponding author contact information** Professor Margaret Sällberg Chen,  
36 Karolinska Institutet, Sweden. Email: [Margaret.Chen@ki.se](mailto:Margaret.Chen@ki.se)

37

38

39 **Abstract**

40 **Background:** Declining humoral immunity in COVID-19 patients and possibility of  
41 reinfections has raised concern. Mucosal immunity particularly salivary antibodies  
42 could be short-lived. However, long-term studies are sparse.

43 **Methods:** Using a multiplex bead-based array platform, we investigated antibodies  
44 specific to severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) proteins  
45 in 256 saliva samples from convalescent patients 1-9 months after symptomatic  
46 COVID-19 (n=74, Cohort 1), undiagnosed individuals with self-reported  
47 questionnaires (n=147, Cohort 2), and individuals sampled pre-pandemic time (n=  
48 35, Cohort 3).

49 **Results:** Salivary IgG antibody responses in Cohort 1 (mainly mild COVID-19) were  
50 detectable up to 9 month recovery, with high correlations between spike and  
51 nucleocapsid specificity. At 9 months, IgG remained in saliva in majority as seen in  
52 blood serology. Salivary IgA was rarely detected at this timepoint. In Cohort 2,  
53 salivary IgG and IgA responses were significantly associated with recent history of  
54 COVID-19 like symptoms. Salivary IgG also tolerated temperature and detergent pre-  
55 treatments.

56 **Conclusions:** Unlike SARS-CoV-2 salivary IgA that appeared short-lived, the  
57 specific IgG in saliva appears stable even after mild COVID-19 as noted for blood  
58 serology. The non-invasive saliva-based SARS-Cov-2 antibody testing with self-  
59 collection at homes may thus serve as a complementary alternative to conventional  
60 blood serology.

61

62 **Keywords:** COVID-19, saliva, antibody, serology, convalescence, immunoassay

## 63 **Introduction**

64 The novel severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) outbreake  
65 in an abrupt fashion since it was reported in Wuhan, China, in late December 2019  
66 (1), and obligated the World Health Organization to declare a global health  
67 emergency which escalated the concern to a pandemic situation on March 2020. As  
68 of Mars 2021, SARS-CoV-2 had infected over 114 million cases and caused up to  
69 2.5 million global deaths (2). The human adaptive immune system plays a key role to  
70 eliminate and memorize infectious microbes by launching a cascade of physiological  
71 activities that brings to the activation of B and T lymphocytes. B lymphocytes are  
72 responsible for producing antibodies that recognize and neutralize SARS-CoV-2  
73 antigens in order to eradicate the infection and have shown to play a vital role in  
74 protecting against re-infections in animal and humans (3–5). IgG, IgA, and IgM  
75 antibodies, all principal contributors of humoral immunity, are activated against  
76 SARS-CoV-2 and detected in the circulating blood of more than 90% of infected  
77 individuals from the 11-13 day post-symptom onset (PSO) (6–8). Currently, the  
78 SARS-CoV-2 immunity is under extensive examinations; a recent study showed that  
79 circulating antibodies post-SARS-CoV-2 infection can persist up to 8 months (9), and  
80 other previous studies show this immunological memory persists for a certain period  
81 followed by a slight decay, especially in asymptomatic infected individuals (10–14).

82 Oral and nasal cavities are considered the main gate for SARS-CoV-2 virus entry,  
83 and saliva secretory antibodies may be the first immunity arm that combat the  
84 infection by recognizing the virus. Salivary antibodies to SARS-CoV-2 can be  
85 detected early after symptom onset and may persist for up to at least three months  
86 post infection (8,10,12). Hence, saliva sampling could be a sensible and non-invasive  
87 way to indicate SARS-CoV-2 exposure. Similar to the previous SARS-CoV and

88 MERS-CoV, the spike protein (S) of SARS-CoV-2 recognizes the angiotensin-  
89 converting enzyme 2 (ACE2) receptor and uses it as a key entry to attack the host  
90 cells (15–17). Antibodies play an important role in resolving acute SARS-CoV-2  
91 infection (11,18) but differential features of anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibodies negatively  
92 impacting COVID-19 severity in hospitalized patients is also described, especially  
93 related to complement deposition and systemic inflammation (19). Understanding the  
94 dynamics and durability of antibody memory to SARS-CoV-2 is an instrumental step  
95 to manage the pandemic, and even useful in deploying vaccination strategies.  
96 However, as the mucosal immunity is known to be short-lived, the durability of SARS-  
97 CoV-2 specific antibodies in saliva could be limited, and whether they permit  
98 detection 3-4 month after infection (8,10) is of great interest.

99 In this study, we exploited a highly sensitive and specific multiplex SARS-CoV-2  
100 serology platform previously validated for seroprevalence studies (20) to investigate  
101 SARS-CoV-2 antibodies in the saliva. Samples from patients with diagnosis of mild  
102 coronavirus disease (COVID-19) in the convalescence phase, at 1- 9 months after  
103 diagnosis of COVID-19; and from undiagnosed individuals with or without history of  
104 COVID-19 symptoms, were analysed and compared to pre-pandemic samples. Our  
105 data indicate that spike-specific IgG reactivity is detectable in saliva in vast majority  
106 of patients 1 - 9 months post infection. This result was similar to that detected by  
107 blood serology performed in the clinical diagnostic laboratory. The IgA reactivity on  
108 the other hand was short-lived in saliva, detectable only the first 3 months. Moreover,  
109 IgG and IgA reactivity to both spike and nucleocapsid antigens significantly  
110 correlated with a history of COVID-19 like symptoms in undiagnosed individuals.

111

## 112 **Materials and methods**

### 113 **Experimental Design**

114 We applied a bead-based serology assay to detect IgG and IgA to SARS-CoV-2  
115 proteins in saliva samples to evaluate its performance. The assay method is  
116 originally developed for detection of SARS-CoV-2 specific IgG in serum and plasma  
117 (20). Salivary IgG and IgA responses to five different SARS-CoV-2 antigens (three  
118 spike proteins and two nucleocapsid proteins) were first tested. The antigens'  
119 performance in classifying positive and negative samples was evaluated for the  
120 single antigens as well as for antigens combined in panels. Best performing  
121 representations of spike and nucleocapsid were chosen in subsequent assessments.

122

### 123 **Cohort Design**

124 The study was approved by the human ethical authority (dnr 2020-01702, 2020-  
125 06381) and complied with the declaration of Helsinki. All participants were recruited  
126 after signing informed consent forms for this observational study. Saliva samples  
127 (total n=256) were collected and arranged in following groups. Cohort 1:  
128 convalescence COVID-19 samples (n=74) of 72 patients (2 participants donated  
129 twice at 6 months apart) diagnosed with COVID-19 during March-April 2020, were  
130 collected from June to December 2020; Cohort 2: samples from undiagnosed  
131 individuals donated during May-Nov 2020 (n=147); Cohort 3: anonymous saliva  
132 samples were from 2018 before the COVID-19 outbreak (pre-pandemic, n=35).

133 All convalescent patients (Cohort 1) had COVID-19 diagnosis confirmed by SARS-  
134 CoV-2 RT-PCR, except one patient who had positive SARS-CoV-2 antibodies at four  
135 time points in the convalescence phase. Seroconversion was tested by clinical  
136 SARS-CoV-2 blood serology assays (described below). The patients were recruited

137 from the department of Infectious Diseases, Karolinska University Hospital (n=65),  
138 and University Dental Clinic of Karolinska Institutet (n=7). Clinical demographic data  
139 of convalescent patients was compiled from medical journal records or questionnaire,  
140 and used in subgroup analysis. Among 72 patients, 95.8% had mild COVID-19,  
141 without hospitalization due to COVID-19 symptoms. Three were admitted to hospital  
142 for purpose of only isolation, and three were admitted due to COVID-19 symptoms. In  
143 the latter group, two were hospitalized without any required oxygen treatment and  
144 one received maximum 1.5 litre oxygen treatment during the hospitalization,  
145 indicating no severe disease outcome. The time-points of serum and saliva samples  
146 collection were grouped according to time post symptom onset (PSO), i.e. (i) PSO  
147 less than 3 months. (ii) PSO of 3-8 months. (iii) PSO of 9 months. Cohort 2  
148 constitutes of anonymous participants visiting the premises of University Dental Clinic  
149 of Karolinska Institutet or Eastman Institute Stockholm during the study time, such as  
150 patients, staff, or relatives to them. A questionnaire was used to collect COVID-19  
151 related symptom information for sub-group analysis of undiagnosed samples into (i)  
152 Symptomatic (ii) Non-symptomatic, based on their past 3 months health condition  
153 before sampling.

154

### 155 **Saliva samples collection**

156 Expecterated unstimulated whole saliva samples were used throughout this study. All  
157 samples were self-collected using standardized instructions and sample tubes  
158 provided by this study, processed and stored at -80 within 24 hr. Salivary stability  
159 tests were performed on samples subgroups to evaluate the antibody reactivity using  
160 samples treated with 1% Triton X-100 for 1 hour at room temperature or heat-treated  
161 at 56 C for 30 min in water bath to allow viral inactivation (19). Eighteen antibody-

162 positive from Cohort 1 and 10 antibody-negative samples from Cohort 2 were  
163 included in the comparison. Incubation at room temperature for one to three days  
164 was also tested in five samples to simulate the standard circumstances of mailed-in  
165 saliva self-collection procedure. Saliva samples from convalescent patients (Cohort  
166 1) were collected on the same day as venous blood during a COVID-19 follow-up  
167 examination at the department of Infectious Diseases, Karolinska University Hospital.

168

### 169 **Clinical serology tests**

170 Paired serum samples of all convalescent patients were tested by Dept. of Karolinska  
171 University Hospital Clinical Microbiology Laboratory. Three automated and one in-  
172 house diagnostic methods were used under the study period of included  
173 convalescence blood samples - SARS-CoV2-IgG test iFlash 1800 YHLO (CLIA),  
174 LIAISON® SARS-CoV-2 S1/S2 IgG test DiaSorin (CLIA), and SARS CoV-2 IgG in-  
175 house ELISA for samples taken prior to June 2020 mainly early convalescence  
176 samples (<9month). The Elecsys® Anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibody test Roche (ECLIA)  
177 was used for all late convalescence samples (9-month). YHLO determines the  
178 antibodies against SARS-CoV-2 nucleocapsid and spike protein, DiaSorin against  
179 spike protein, whilst Elecsys®, and in-house ELISA to the recombinant nucleocapsid  
180 protein. The tests use different techniques such as chemiluminescence  
181 immunoassay (CLIA), electrochemiluminescence immunoassay (ECLIA), and  
182 enzyme-linked immunoassay (ELISA).

183

### 184 **Antigen Production**

185 The proteins were produced as following: 1) Spike-f as spike trimers comprises the  
186 prefusion-stabilized spike glycoprotein ectodomain is expressed in HEK cells and



187 purified using a C-terminal Strep II tag, 2) Spike S1 domain was expressed in CHO  
188 cells and purified using C-terminal HPC4-tag, 3) Spike RBD domain was expressed  
189 in HEK cells and purified using the mFc C tag; 4) nucleocapsid, one full-length  
190 version and 5) one nucleocapsid C-terminal chain were each expressed in *E.coli* and  
191 purified using a C-terminal His-tag (21,22).

192

### 193 **SARS-CoV-2 antibody detection by a bead-based assay**

194 The analysis of salivary antibodies was performed as previously described (20) with  
195 a few modifications. Briefly, each antigen was diluted to a final concentration of 80  
196 µg/ml (100mM) with 2-(N-morpholino) ethanesulfonic acid buffer, pH 4.5  
197 (SigmaAldrich) and immobilized on uniquely color-coded bead type (bead ID)  
198 (MagPlex-C, Luminex corp.). The antigen-immobilized beads were then pooled to  
199 form the bead array. Besides the viral antigens, anti-human IgG (309-005-082,  
200 Jackson ImmunoResearch), anti-human IgA (800-338-9579, Bethyl), and the EBV  
201 EBNA1 protein (ab138345, Abcam) were also included as sample loading controls.

202 Saliva samples were diluted 1/5 in assay buffer composed of 3% bovine serum  
203 albumin (w/v), 5% non-fat milk (w/v) in 1×PBS supplemented with 0.05 % (v/v)  
204 Tween20 (VWR, 437082Q) and incubated with the bead array for 1 hour at room  
205 temperature and 650 RPM rotation. Afterwards, the antigen-antibody complexes  
206 were cross-linked by adding 0.2% paraformaldehyde (AlfaAesar, 30525-89-4) in PBS  
207 0.05% Tween 20 (PBS-T) for 10 min at room temperature. Detection was performed  
208 by applying R-phycoerythryne-conjugated anti-human IgG (H10104, Invitrogen)  
209 diluted 0.4 µg/mL, or R-phycoerythryne-conjugated anti-human IgA (800-338-9579,  
210 Bethyl) diluted 0.2 µg/mL in PBS-T for 30 minutes at room temperature. Finally, the

211 read-out was performed by using a FlexMap3D system and the xPONENT software  
212 (Luminex Corp.).

### 213 **Statistical analysis.**

214 Statistics and visualizations of the multiplex bead array generated data were  
215 performed using R (version 3.6.1) with RStudio (version 1.2.1335) and the additional  
216 packages heatmap (1.0.10), reshape2 (1.4.3). In-house developed functions were  
217 used for instrument file import and quality control. The bead array results were  
218 acquired as Median Fluorescent Intensity (MFI) per sample and bead identity. A  
219 cutoff for seropositivity was calculated per antigen as the mean + 7x SD of 12  
220 negative pre-pandemic reference samples carefully selected based on their signal  
221 intensity distribution. GraphPad Prism Version 9.0.0 (86) was used for the  
222 nonparametric comparisons Mann-Whitney test and Spearman correlation analysis.  
223 Datasets also initially underwent normality distribution testing. N1 Chi-squared test  
224 was used for comparisons of binomial datasets in MedCal software calculator. Two-  
225 sided p-values <0.05 were considered significant. Descriptive analyses were made  
226 on clinical characteristics and the number of observations, presented as numbers  
227 and percentages.

### 228 **Results**

#### 229 *Salivary antibody reactivity to SARS-CoV-2 proteins*

230 The assay performance was validated by comparing the capability of each of the five  
231 antigens included in the array to classify convalescent samples <3 mo–9 mo (Cohort  
232 1, n=74) and pre-pandemic samples (Cohort 3, n=35), of which 12 samples from  
233 Cohort 3 were used to set the assay cut-offs. Among the five antigens included in the  
234 assay, spike foldon (Spike-f) and C-terminal fragment (NC-C) showed the best

235 performance (88% and 61% sensitivity respectively, and 100% specificity) in  
236 classifying SARS-CoV-2 saliva samples of the convalescence cohort from the pre-  
237 pandemic cohort (**Table 1**). We also evaluated the antigen panel in all possible  
238 combinations of 2 and 3 proteins, considering as *positive* a sample that showed  
239 reactivity to both antigens in a panel-of-two antigens, and at least to two out of three  
240 antigens in a panel-of-three antigens (**Table S1 and 2**). There, the best performance  
241 among the panels was reached by the Spike-f, S1, RBD triple combination, showing  
242 70.3% sensitivity and 100% specificity. Hence, the absolute best performance was  
243 shown to be reached by Spike-f as single antigen (88% sensitivity, 100% specificity)  
244 in this COVID-19 convalescent and pre-pandemic saliva collection. IgA reactivities to  
245 the included proteins were identified only in a minority of cases, with higher  
246 prevalence of reactivity to Spike-f (12%) (**Table S3**).

247

#### 248 *Serum and salivary antibody reactivity overtime post Covid-19*

249 As shown in **Table 2**, Cohort 1 were mainly patients who have had mild COVID-19  
250 and were grouped according to duration past their diagnosis. Some were hospitalized  
251 for isolation mainly, but none received oxygen treatment or required ventilation  
252 related treatment. All individuals were free from respiratory symptoms at the 9-month  
253 follow-up but in a minority across all three groups various general residual symptoms  
254 were still noted (data not shown). As shown in **Table 3**, the vast majority of serum  
255 samples up to 9 months convalescence were still tested positive in clinical SARS-  
256 CoV-2 serology, with high seroprevalence across the whole time span of collection.  
257 Interestingly, paired saliva samples from Cohort 1 patients tested with the multiplex  
258 bead-array showed that the positivity rate of anti- Spike-f IgG in saliva remained  
259 remarkably high and in similar range (100%-87.5%) as noted for serum antibodies

260 (88.9%-96.9) throughout from early (<3 months) to late convalescence group (9  
261 months) (**Table 3, Figure 1a**). However, the NC-C specific IgG in saliva dropped  
262 significantly after 3 months (from 88.9% to 60.6-50.0%). As stated earlier, specific  
263 IgA responses to these antigens were detected only in a minority of the saliva  
264 samples, and was enriched in early convalescence (<3months, 44.4% for Spike-f and  
265 11% for NC-C), while dropping to less than 10% in later convalescent samples  
266 ( $p<0.01$ ).

267 Moreover, salivary IgG to Spike-f and NC-C showed to be highly correlated in this  
268 cohort ( $r=0.88$ ,  $p<0.0001$ , Spearman correlation test), with concordant serostatus in  
269 the majority of samples (**Figure 1b**). Significant albeit moderate correlations were  
270 also seen between IgA to Spike-f and NC-C ( $r=0.62$ ,  $p<0.001$ ), and between Spike-f  
271 specific IgA and IgG ( $r=0.45$ ,  $p<0.001$ ) (Figure 1b).

272

273 *Salivary antibody reactivity to SARS-CoV-2 in healthy donors is associated with the*  
274 *recent history of COVID-19 like symptoms.*

275 Next, we applied this assay platform to evaluate a second independent cohort -  
276 Cohort 2. Participants here were self-reporting symptom-free individuals visiting the  
277 University Dental Clinic's premises of Karolinska Institutet and the Eastman Institute  
278 in Stockholm. A total of 147 individuals from May to November 2020 participated in  
279 and donated saliva samples. Samples were collected and tested using the same  
280 standard operating protocol as for Cohort 1. Shown in **Figure 2a**, and based on  
281 antigen-specific cutoffs calculated on 20 negative controls, antibody reactivities to  
282 Spike-f and NC-C in this cohort were as following: IgG were detected in 14% to either  
283 Spike-f or NC-C, while 11% had detectable IgG to both antigens; for IgA, 10% and  
284 6% of the samples showed reactivity to Spike-f and NC-C respectively, while only 5%

285 showed reactivity to both. Salivary positivity was particularly enriched among  
286 participants with self-reported recent history of COVID-19-like symptoms (14 days to  
287 3 months prior to sampling time). Significant reactivities of IgG ( $p=0.004$ , and  $p=0.01$ )  
288 and IgA ( $p<0.0001$ , and  $p=0.044$ ) to either Spike-f or NC-C was found to associate  
289 with recent history of symptoms compared to pre-pandemic controls (**Figure 2a**).

290 A correlation analysis (**Figure 2b**) gave similar result as for Cohort 1, with highest  
291 reported correlation between salivary IgG to Spike-f and NC-C ( $r=0.81$ ,  $p<0.0001$ ,  
292 Spearman correlation test). Significant albeit moderate correlations were also seen  
293 between IgA to Spike-f and NC-C ( $r=0.73$ ,  $p<0.001$ ), and IgG and IgA to Spike-f  
294 ( $r=0.49$ ,  $p<0.001$ ), and Spike-f IgA to NC-C IgG ( $r=0.53$ ,  $p<0.001$ ).

295

296 *Saliva antibody stability – the influence of inactivation pre-treatment and room*  
297 *temperature*

298 Next the effects of inactivation treatment with 1% Triton X-100 or heat-treatment at  
299 56 C, as well as room temperature storage (identical aliquots left out for indicated  
300 time) on the antibody results were determined (**Figure 3**). Both 1% Triton X-100 and  
301 heat treatment showed slight or no change in the cutoff calculated based on the ten  
302 included negative controls. A good correlation between treated and non-treated  
303 samples was noted (**Figure 3 and S1**), with a few exceptions of single samples that  
304 show a drop in IgG reactivity. Simulation with room temperature storage (22°C)  
305 showed a slow decay in IgG signal intensity in positive samples (blue) over time, with  
306 the signals of negative samples remain low and stable (grey). Based on these data,  
307 inactivation by Triton X-100 or heat treatment treatments seems to have little effect  
308 on saliva samples. However, antibody decay variations showed slight IgG signal  
309 reduction by each day of room temperature storage.

## 310 **Discussion**

311 Comprehensive antibody testing and the subsequent interventions they generate are  
312 essential to monitoring and control SARS-CoV-2 transmission. The present study  
313 demonstrates that SARS-CoV-2 specific IgG in saliva after mild COVID-19 can serve  
314 as a complementary measure of exposure or immunity to SARS-CoV-2, particularly  
315 due to their frequent concurrence with serum IgG responses. Key findings include 1)  
316 SARS-CoV-2-specific mucosal salivary antibodies co-exist with the circulating blood  
317 antibodies up to 9 months post-natural infection in the majority of participants (88% in  
318 saliva vs. 97% in blood); 2) natural infection induces salivary antibodies to recognize  
319 both viral spike and nucleocapsid proteins; 3) the response correlates significantly to  
320 recent Covid-19-like symptom history in undiagnosed individuals; 4) saliva IgG is  
321 relatively stable tolerating both biosafety required temperature and detergent pre-  
322 treatment. All together representing a non-invasive approach suitable for population-  
323 based immunity surveys. Ideally, if the latter is sampled at home and mailed to the  
324 lab, it can help protect vulnerable persons at risk for severe COVID-19 by sparing the  
325 need to visit the laboratory units for blood draws. This is an appealing way to test  
326 persons, in pandemic situation, and definitely a complementary test for conventional  
327 blood IgG assay. Our data also showed that sample inactivation with either heat  
328 treatment or Triton X-100 might be both safe options for testing saliva sample in the  
329 lab, causing very little to no variation on the assay performance.

330

331 Severe COVID-19 symptoms have been shown to cause strong antibody responses  
332 in 99% of convalescence individuals, but published data show also that the antibody  
333 responses tend to disappear faster in cases with mild symptoms (6, 9, 16, 19).  
334 Possible reason for this is that tests developed earlier during the pandemic were

335 based on detection in samples from severe COVID-19 cases rather than individuals  
336 with mild symptoms, hence sensitivity was not optimal (23). Further, many of the  
337 early developed tests are using the nucleocapsid as antigen and antibodies targeting  
338 this part of the virus has been shown to decline faster (24) as also was detected  
339 here. In this study, we deliberately recruited convalescence samples from mild  
340 COVID-19 patients, showing that the multiplex antibody platform used here was  
341 capable of detecting specific SARS-CoV-2 antibodies in saliva up to 9 months post  
342 infection. In the present study, the clinical blood test results that were compared with  
343 the saliva reactivities are from certified patient diagnostics (including anti-N pan-Ig  
344 ECLIA), showed high performance in detecting late convalescence blood samples. In  
345 fact, our result is in line with a recent South Korean group reporting this diagnostic  
346 antibody assay is, among several others, effective in detecting SARS-CoV-2  
347 antibodies in blood (90%) of individuals up to 8 months after either asymptomatic  
348 infection or reporting mild-symptoms (25). The persistence of salivary IgG to  
349 structural viral proteins in the saliva samples after 9 months recovery from mild  
350 COVID-19 is intriguing, and possibly explained by a secondary exposure or spill-over  
351 from the blood. More studies are therefore warranted to clarify this. In relation to it,  
352 the mucosal antibody response is triggered slightly earlier upon infection (10).  
353 Information is still limited about the duration and kinetics of mucosal antibodies  
354 secreted into the mouth and nose, particularly in this patient group. A sensitive  
355 salivary antibody detection assay with the capability to identify infections with various  
356 severities would contribute to improving the current understanding of mucosal  
357 antibodies to SARS-CoV-2. For instance, such studies may compare low versus high  
358 avidity antibodies and their relation to neutralization or disease enhancement  
359 (10,26,27).

360

361 The notion that antibodies to previously known coronaviruses may block SARS-CoV-  
362 2 has raised a concern about whether these antibodies are functional. However, such  
363 antibodies are also known to be protective only for about 6 months after the infection,  
364 therefore would have disappeared in most cases of SARS-CoV-2 (28,29), Comparing  
365 saliva samples using pseudo-neutralizing assay in ACE-2 cross-blocking  
366 experiments will therefore be interesting. Other applications for quantitative and  
367 qualitative saliva antibody assays include immunity studies to elucidate vaccine-  
368 induced mucosal immunity, including the response to antigens representing new  
369 virus mutants and vaccine-induced escape mutants. Since mouth and nose are the  
370 first port of entry for SARS-CoV-2, sensitive and accurate methods for quantitative  
371 measurements of such local mucosal immunity will lead to better means to combat  
372 this virus.

373

374 One limitation of our study was the relatively small sample size and the  
375 predominantly male population. Another weakness is blood samples were not  
376 analyzed same way as saliva, and as several diagnostic assays were used only  
377 binary data is given. Also, because of the cross-sectional design, we could not obtain  
378 baseline or longitudinal saliva samples. Moreover, we could not assess individual  
379 possibilities of re-exposure or re-infection. However, it is unlikely that humoral  
380 immunity was boosted because in Stockholm, where the study takes place, the  
381 period June-Nov 2020 (second-wave) showed an increase in the daily incidence rate  
382 of COVID-19 from 30 to 400 cases/100,000 population (30). In conclusion, despite  
383 waning immunity concerns, the present study shows how our multiplex bead-based



384 immunoassays can detect antibodies against SARS-CoV-2 in saliva collected at 9  
385 months after infection in the majority of mildly symptomatic persons.

386

387 **Authors contributions:** E.P., A.M., P.N., M.S.C. conception and design of the study.  
388 H.A., S.B., A.M., A.O., collected the material and performed the experiments. H.A.,  
389 S.B., C.H. A.M., E.P., M.S.C. analyzed the data. E.P., AM, P.N., and M.S.C.  
390 supervised the work. K.L., S.A. G.B. S.H. contributed with material and data  
391 interpretations, H.A., S.B., E.P., and M.S.C. wrote the manuscript. All authors  
392 reviewed and revised the manuscript critically.

393

#### 394 **Acknowledgments**

395 All study participants who took interest in this study.

396 **References:**

- 397 1. Zhu N, Zhang D, Wang W, Li X, Yang B, Song J, et al. A Novel Coronavirus  
398 from Patients with Pneumonia in China, 2019. *N Engl J Med*. 2020;382(8):727–  
399 33.
- 400 2. University of Johns Hopkins. Coronavirus Resource Center [Internet]. Available  
401 from: <https://coronavirus.jhu.edu/map.html>
- 402 3. Krammer F. SARS-CoV-2 vaccines in development. *Nature* [Internet]. 2020 Oct  
403 22;586(7830):516–27. Available from: [http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/s41586-020-](http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/s41586-020-2798-3)  
404 2798-3
- 405 4. Wang H, Zhang Y, Huang B, Deng W, Quan Y, Wang W, et al. Development of  
406 an Inactivated Vaccine Candidate, BBIBP-CorV, with Potent Protection against  
407 SARS-CoV-2. *Cell*. 2020;182(3):713–721.e9.
- 408 5. Lumley SF, O'Donnell D, Stoesser NE, Matthews PC, Howarth A, Hatch SB, et  
409 al. Antibody Status and Incidence of SARS-CoV-2 Infection in Health Care  
410 Workers. *N Engl J Med* [Internet]. 2021 Feb 11;384(6):533–40. Available from:  
411 <http://www.nejm.org/doi/10.1056/NEJMoa2034545>
- 412 6. Amanat F, Stadlbauer D, Strohmeier S, Nguyen THO, Chromikova V,  
413 McMahon M, et al. A serological assay to detect SARS-CoV-2 seroconversion  
414 in humans. *Nat Med* [Internet]. 2020;26(7):1033–6. Available from:  
415 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/s41591-020-0913-5>
- 416 7. Premkumar L, Segovia-Chumbez B, Jadi R, Martinez DR, Raut R, Markmann  
417 AJ, et al. The receptor-binding domain of the viral spike protein is an  
418 immunodominant and highly specific target of antibodies in SARS-CoV-2  
419 patients. *Sci Immunol*. 2020;5(48):1–10.
- 420 8. Long QX, Liu BZ, Deng HJ, Wu GC, Deng K, Chen YK, et al. Antibody

- 421 responses to SARS-CoV-2 in patients with COVID-19. *Nat Med*.  
422 2020;26(6):845–8.
- 423 9. Dan JM, Mateus J, Kato Y, Hastie KM, Yu ED, Faliti CE, et al. Immunological  
424 memory to SARS-CoV-2 assessed for up to 8 months after infection. *Science*  
425 (80- ) [Internet]. 2021 Feb 5;371(6529):eabf4063. Available from:  
426 <https://www.sciencemag.org/lookup/doi/10.1126/science.abf4063>
- 427 10. Isho B, Abe KT, Zuo M, Jamal AJ, Rathod B, Wang JH, et al. Persistence of  
428 serum and saliva antibody responses to SARS-CoV-2 spike antigens in  
429 COVID-19 patients. *Sci Immunol*. 2020;5(52):1–21.
- 430 11. Baumgarth N, Nikolich-Žugich J, Lee FE-H, Bhattacharya D. Antibody  
431 Responses to SARS-CoV-2: Let’s Stick to Known Knowns. *J Immunol*  
432 [Internet]. 2020 Nov 1;205(9):2342–50. Available from:  
433 <http://www.jimmunol.org/lookup/doi/10.4049/jimmunol.2000839>
- 434 12. Pisanic N, Randad PR, Kruczynski K, Manabe YC, Thomas DL, Pekosz A, et  
435 al. COVID-19 Serology at Population Scale: SARS-CoV-2-Specific Antibody  
436 Responses in Saliva. Loeffelholz MJ, editor. *J Clin Microbiol* [Internet]. 2020  
437 Dec 17;59(1):1–13. Available from: <https://jcm.asm.org/content/59/1/e02204-20>
- 438 13. Ripperger TJ, Uhrlaub JL, Watanabe M, Wong R, Castaneda Y, Pizzato HA, et  
439 al. Orthogonal SARS-CoV-2 Serological Assays Enable Surveillance of Low-  
440 Prevalence Communities and Reveal Durable Humoral Immunity. *Immunity*  
441 [Internet]. 2020 Nov;53(5):925–933.e4. Available from:  
442 <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S1074761320304453>
- 443 14. Long Q-X, Tang X-J, Shi Q-L, Li Q, Deng H-J, Yuan J, et al. Clinical and  
444 immunological assessment of asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infections. *Nat Med*  
445 [Internet]. 2020 Aug 18;26(8):1200–4. Available from:

- 446 <http://www.nature.com/articles/s41591-020-0965-6>
- 447 15. Gui M, Song W, Zhou H, Xu J, Chen S, Xiang Y, et al. Cryo-electron  
448 microscopy structures of the SARS-CoV spike glycoprotein reveal a  
449 prerequisite conformational state for receptor binding. *Cell Res* [Internet]. 2017  
450 Jan 23;27(1):119–29. Available from: <http://www.nature.com/articles/cr2016152>
- 451 16. Hoffmann M, Kleine-Weber H, Schroeder S, Krüger N, Herrler T, Erichsen S, et  
452 al. SARS-CoV-2 Cell Entry Depends on ACE2 and TMPRSS2 and Is Blocked  
453 by a Clinically Proven Protease Inhibitor. *Cell* [Internet]. 2020 Apr;181(2):271–  
454 280.e8. Available from:  
455 <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0092867420302294>
- 456 17. Li W, Moore MJ, Vasilieva N, Sui J, Wong SK, Berne MA, et al. Angiotensin-  
457 converting enzyme 2 is a functional receptor for the SARS coronavirus. *Nature*  
458 [Internet]. 2003 Nov;426(6965):450–4. Available from:  
459 <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature02145>
- 460 18. Rydyznski Moderbacher C, Ramirez SI, Dan JM, Grifoni A, Hastie KM,  
461 Weiskopf D, et al. Antigen-Specific Adaptive Immunity to SARS-CoV-2 in Acute  
462 COVID-19 and Associations with Age and Disease Severity. *Cell* [Internet].  
463 2020;183(4):996–1012.e19. Available from:  
464 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2020.09.038>
- 465 19. Opeyemi S. Adeniji<sup>1</sup>, Leila B. Giron<sup>1</sup>, Netanel F Zilberstein,<sup>2</sup> Maliha  
466 W.Shaikh<sup>2</sup>, Robert A Balk<sup>2</sup>, James N Moy<sup>2</sup>, Christopher B. Forsyth<sup>2</sup>, Ali  
467 Keshavarzian<sup>2</sup>, Alan 10 Landay<sup>2</sup> MA-M. COVID-19 Severity Is Associated with  
468 Differential Antibody Fc-mediated Innate Immune Functions. *bioRxiv Prepr*  
469 [Internet]. 2021; Available from:  
470 <https://www.biorxiv.org/content/10.1101/2021.01.11.426209v1?s=09>

- 471 20. Rudberg A-S, Havervall S, Månberg A, Jernbom Falk A, Aguilera K, Ng H, et  
472 al. SARS-CoV-2 exposure, symptoms and seroprevalence in healthcare  
473 workers in Sweden. *Nat Commun* [Internet]. 2020 Dec 8;11(1):5064. Available  
474 from: <http://www.nature.com/articles/s41467-020-18848-0>
- 475 21. Tegel H, Steen J, Konrad A, Nikdin H, Pettersson K, Stenvall M, et al. High-  
476 throughput protein production - Lessons from scaling up from 10 to 288  
477 recombinant proteins per week. *Biotechnol J* [Internet]. 2009 Jan;4(1):51–7.  
478 Available from: <http://doi.wiley.com/10.1002/biot.200800183>
- 479 22. Kanje S, Enstedt H, Dannemeyer M, Uhlén M, Hober S, Tegel H.  
480 Improvements of a high-throughput protein purification process using a  
481 calcium-dependent setup. *Protein Expr Purif* [Internet]. 2020  
482 Nov;175(June):105698. Available from:  
483 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pep.2020.105698>
- 484 23. Takahashi S, Greenhouse B, Rodríguez-Barraquer I. Are Seroprevalence  
485 Estimates for Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 Biased? *J*  
486 *Infect Dis* [Internet]. 2020 Nov 9;222(11):1772–5. Available from:  
487 <https://academic.oup.com/jid/article/222/11/1772/5898481>
- 488 24. Havervall S, Jernbom Falk A, Klingström J, Ng H, Greilert-Norin N, Gabrielsson  
489 L, et al. SARS-CoV-2 induces a durable and antigen specific humoral immunity  
490 after asymptomatic to mild COVID-19 infection. *medRxiv* [Internet].  
491 2021;2021.01.03.21249162. Available from:  
492 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.03.21249162>
- 493 25. Choe PG, Kim K-H, Kang CK, Suh HJ, Kang E, Lee SY, et al. Antibody  
494 Responses 8 Months after Asymptomatic or Mild SARS-CoV-2 Infection.  
495 *Emerg Infect Dis* [Internet]. 2021 Mar;27(3):928–31. Available from:

- 496 [https://wwwnc.cdc.gov/eid/article/27/3/20-4543\\_article.htm](https://wwwnc.cdc.gov/eid/article/27/3/20-4543_article.htm)
- 497 26. Wen J, Cheng Y, Ling R, Dai Y, Huang B, Huang W, et al. Antibody-dependent  
498 enhancement of coronavirus. *Int J Infect Dis* [Internet]. 2020 Nov;100:483–9.  
499 Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijid.2020.09.015>
- 500 27. Lee WS, Wheatley AK, Kent SJ, DeKosky BJ. Antibody-dependent  
501 enhancement and SARS-CoV-2 vaccines and therapies. *Nat Microbiol*  
502 [Internet]. 2020 Oct 9;5(10):1185–91. Available from:  
503 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/s41564-020-00789-5>
- 504 28. Pinto D, Park YJ, Beltramello M, Walls AC, Tortorici MA, Bianchi S, et al.  
505 Cross-neutralization of SARS-CoV-2 by a human monoclonal SARS-CoV  
506 antibody. *Nature* [Internet]. 2020;583(7815):290–5. Available from:  
507 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/s41586-020-2349-y>
- 508 29. Edridge AWD, Kaczorowska J, Hoste ACR, Bakker M, Klein M, Loens K, et al.  
509 Seasonal coronavirus protective immunity is short-lasting. *Nat Med* [Internet].  
510 2020;26(11):1691–3. Available from: [http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/s41591-020-](http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/s41591-020-1083-1)  
511 [1083-1](http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/s41591-020-1083-1)
- 512 30. Folkhälsomyndighetens. Folkhälsomyndighetens veckorapporter om covid-19.  
513 [Internet]. 2020. p. June-November. Available from:  
514 <https://www.folkhalsomyndigheten.se/folkhalsorappo>

515

## 516 **Figure legends**

517 **Figure 1.** Measurement of IgG and IgA to Spike-f (soluble trimeric form of the spike  
518 glycoprotein stabilized in the pre-fusion conformation) and NC-C (nucleocapsid C-  
519 terminal fragment) of SARS-CoV2 in saliva of convalescence patients (Cohort 1). (A)  
520 Multiplex assay measured signal scores on indicated immunoglobulins to Spike-f and

521 NC-C in cohorts of pre-COVID samples (n=35), and convalescent patient samples at  
522 indicated month post infection (n=74). The data is expressed in median fluorescence  
523 index (MFI) and plotted using dot plots where each dot is one individual sample.  
524 Horizontal bars denote the mean and vertical line represents standard errors. Mann-  
525 Whitney U test for significance was performed (B) Spearman correlation analysis with  
526 coefficient indicated for respective antibody specificity pairs. n.s = not significant.

527

528 **Figure 2.** SARS-CoV2 specific IgG and IgA in saliva of undiagnosed study  
529 participants (Cohort 2) measured by same method as in Figure 1. Samples were sub-  
530 grouped by participant reported COVID-like symptoms the past 14 days - 3 months  
531 prior to sampling (Cohort 2). (A) Multiplex assay measured signal scores on indicated  
532 immunoglobulins to Spike-f and NC-C in cohorts of pre-COVID samples (n=35), and  
533 convalescent patient samples at indicated month post infection (n=146). The data is  
534 expressed in median fluorescence index (MFI) and plotted using dot plots where  
535 each dot is one individual sample. Horizontal bars denote the mean and vertical line  
536 represents standard errors. Mann-Whitney U test for significance was performed (B)  
537 Spearman correlation analysis with coefficient indicated for respective antibody  
538 specificity pairs. n.s = not significant.

539

540 **Figure 3.** Stability tests of saliva samples subjected to heat (HT), 1% Triton-X-100  
541 (Triton), or left for indicated time in room temperature. (A) SARS-CoV2 specific IgG  
542 and IgA reactivities in convalescence saliva samples (Pos) or Pre-pandemic saliva  
543 samples (Neg) were tested either untreated (Untreated) or after heat inactivation at  
544 56°C for 30 min (HT), or after Triton-X-100 inactivation (final 1% volume/volume) for  
545 60 min (Triton). Reactivities to Spike-f respective NC-C antigens are shown as box

546 plots with each dot representing one single sample. (B) Convalescence saliva  
547 samples (blue) or pre-pandemic saliva samples (grey) were aliquoted and placed in  
548 room temperature (22°C) at indicated time points, thereafter snap frozen and tested  
549 in same assay run for measurement of SARS-CoV2 specific IgG to spike or  
550 nucleocapsid.

551

## 552 **Supplementary materials**

553 **Figure S1.** Correlation analysis comparing inactivation by heat, Triton-X-100, and  
554 untreated conditions as shown in Figure 3A.



**Table 1. Single antigen specificity and sensitivity in detecting SARS-CoV-2 IgG in convalescent saliva (1-9 month PSO) and pre-pandemic saliva samples.**

		Convalescent (N=74)			Pre-pandemic (N=23) <sup>#</sup>		
Antigen	Host	Sensitivity [%]	Pos	Neg	Specificity [%]	Pos	Neg
Spike-f	HEK	88	65	9	100	0	23
S1	CHO	61	45	29	100	0	23
RBD	HEK	69	51	23	96	1	22
NC	<i>E. coli</i>	49	36	38	100	0	23
NC-C	<i>E. coli</i>	61	45	29	100	0	23

<sup>#</sup>Another 12 independent pre-pandemic saliva samples were used to establish assay cut-offs.

**Table 2. Demographic characteristics of convalescence samples of Cohort 1, grouped by the time-points of post symptom onset (PSO) at which the samples were taken.**

Parameters	Convalescent saliva samples (n=74)		
	< 3 months (n=9)	3-8 months (n=33)	9 months (n=32)
Gender (F:M)	8:1	23:10	6:26
Age (years) median (range)	59 (48-67)	49 (20-63)	57 (45-78)
Hospitalization status (%)			
○ Never hospitalized			
○ Hospitalized for only isolation purpose	66.7 11	94 3	97 3
○ Hospitalized due to COVID-19 symptoms	22	3	0
Days PSO (Mean   SD)	55   20	120   41	273   11


**Table 3. Cohort 1: Salivary antibodies to Spike or NC-C over time compared with serum positivity in clinically validated SARS-Cov-2 antibody diagnostics**

Convalescence (mo)	Serum Ab SARS CoV-2	Saliva IgG		Saliva IgA	
		Spike-f	NC-C	Spike-f	NC-C
<3	88.9%	100.0%	88.9%	44.4%	11.1%
3-8	90.9%	84.8%	60.6%**	6.3%***	3.1%**
9	96.9%	87.5%	50.0%***	9.7%***	6.5%***

Note: \*\* and \*\*\* indicate  $p < 0.01$  and  $p < 0.0001$  respective compared to clinical SARS-Cov-2 serum antibody diagnosis, determined by N-1 Chi-squared test (Campbell I, Statistics in medicine, 2007, Richardson JTE, Statistics in medicine, 2011). Ab (antibody). Spike-f (spike foldon), NC-C (nucleocapsid c-terminal chain).

Fig 1.

A.



B.




Fig 2.






Fig. 3

A.



B.



**Supplementary Table 1. Combinations of 2 antigens. Specificity and sensitivity in detecting SARS-CoV-2 IgG in Cohort 1 samples (1-9 months convalescence).**

		Positive controls (N=74)			Negative controls (N=23*)		
Antigen	Host	Sensitivity [%]	Negative result	Positive result	Specificity [%]	Negative result	Positive result
Spike-f S1	HEK CHO	60.8	29	45	100	23	0
Spike-f RBD	HEK HEK	68.9	23	51	100	22	0
Spike-f NC	HEK <i>E.Coli</i>	48.6	38	36	100	23	0
Spike-f NC-C	HEK <i>E.Coli</i>	60.8	29	45	100	23	0
S1 RBD	CHO HEK	68.9	23	51	100	23	0
S1 NC	CHO <i>E.Coli</i>	60.8	29	45	100	23	0
S1 NC-C	CHO <i>E.Coli</i>	60.8	29	45	100	23	0
RBD NC	HEK <i>E.Coli</i>	48.6	38	36	100	23	0
RBD NC-C	HEK <i>E.Coli</i>	60.8	29	45	100	23	0
NC NC-C	<i>E.Coli</i> <i>E.Coli</i>	48.6	38	36	100	23	0

Note. A sample is considered positive when classified positive for both antigens included in the panel.

\* The negative samples included here are Cohort 3 excluded the 12 negative used for cutoff calculation

**Supplementary Table 2. Combinations of 3 antigens. Specificity and sensitivity in detecting SARS-CoV-2 IgG in Cohort 1 samples (1-9 months convalescence).**

		Positive controls (N=74)			Negative controls (N=23*)		
Antigen	Host	Sensitivity [%]	Negative result	Positive result	Specificity [%]	Negative result	Positive result
Spike-f	HEK	70.3	22	52	100	23	0
S1	CHO						
RBD	HEK						
Spike-f	HEK	62.2	28	46	100	23	0
S1	CHO						
NC	<i>E.Coli</i>						
Spike-f	HEK	64.9	26	48	100	23	0
S1	CHO						
NC-C	<i>E.Coli</i>						
S1	CHO	62.2	28	46	100	23	0
RBD	HEK						
NC	<i>E.Coli</i>						
RBD	HEK	58.1	31	43	100	23	0
NC	<i>E.Coli</i>						
NC-C	<i>E.Coli</i>						
S1	CHO	58.1	31	43	100	23	0
NC	<i>E.Coli</i>						
NC-C	<i>E.Coli</i>						
Spike-f	HEK	60.8	29	45	100	23	0
NC	<i>E.Coli</i>						
NC-C	<i>E.Coli</i>						
Spike-f	HEK	70.3	22	52	95.7	22	1
RBD	HEK						
NC-C	<i>E.Coli</i>						
S1	CHO	59.5	30	44	100	23	0
RBD	HEK						
NC-C	<i>E.Coli</i>						
Spike-f	HEK	67.6	24	50	95.7	22	1
RBD	HEK						
NC	<i>E.Coli</i>						

Note. A sample is considered positive when classified positive for two out of three antigens included in the panel.

\* The negative samples included here are Cohort 3 excluded the 12 negative used for cutoff calculation

**Supplementary Table 3. Single antigen specificity and sensitivity in detecting SARS-CoV-2 IgA in Cohort 1 samples (1-9 months convalescence).**



		Positive controls (N=74)			Negative controls (N=23*)		
Antigen	Host	Sensitivity [%]	Negative result	Positive result	Specificity [%]	Negative result	Positive result
Spike-f*	HEK	16.2	62	12	95.7	22	1
S1	CHO	5.4	70	4	91.3	21	2
RBD	HEK	6.8	69	5	91.3	21	2
NC	<i>E. coli</i>	6.8	69	5	87.0	20	3
NC-C*	<i>E. coli</i>	5.4	70	4	91.3	21	2

\* The negative samples included here are Cohort 3 excluded the 12 negative used for cutoff calculation



Fig. S1

IgG:



IgA:

