Evolution of human antibody responses up to one year after SARS-CoV-2 infection

Floriane Gallais,[1,2], Pierre Gantner,[1,2] Timothée Bruel[3,4,5], Aurelie Velay,[1,2] Delphine Planas[3,4,5], Marie-Josée Wendling, [1] Sophie Bayer[6], Morgane Solis,[1,2] Elodie Laugel,[1,2] Nathalie Reix[6], Anne Schneider[7], Ludovic Glady[6], Baptiste Panaget,[1,2] Nicolas Collongues[8], Marialuisa Partisani[9], Jean-Marc Lessinger[6], Arnaud Fontanet[10], David Rey[9], Yves Hansmann[11], Laurence Kling-Pillitteri [12], Olivier Schwartz[3,4,5], Jérome De Sèze[8], Nicolas Meyer[13], Maria Gonzalez[12], Catherine Schmidt-Mutter[8], Samira Fafi-Kremer[1,2]

[1] Virology Laboratory, Strasbourg University Hospital, Strasbourg, France;

[2] Strasbourg University, INSERM, IRM UMR-S 1109, F-67000 Strasbourg, France;

[3]Virus & Immunity Unit, Department of Virology, Institut Pasteur, Paris, France.

[4]CNRS UMR 3569, Paris, France.

[5]Vaccine Research Institute, Creteil, France.

[6]CHU de Strasbourg, Laboratoire de Biochimie Clinique et Biologie Moléculaire, F-67091 Strasbourg, France

[7]CHU de Strasbourg, Département de Génétique Moléculaire du cancer, F-67091 Strasbourg, France.

[8]Centre d'investigation Clinique INSERM 1434, CHU Strasbourg, France.

[9]CHU de Strasbourg, Trait d'Union, F-67091 Strasbourg, France.

[10] Emerging Diseases Epidemiology Unit, Department of Global Health, Institut Pasteur, Paris, France

[11]CHU de Strasbourg, Service des infectieuses et tropicales, F-67091 Strasbourg, France.

[12]CHU de Strasbourg, Service de Pathologies Professionnelles, F-67091 Strasbourg, France.

[13]CHU de Strasbourg, Service de santé Publique, GMRC, F-67091 Strasbourg, France.

Corresponding author. Prof Samira FAFI-KREMER, Virology Laboratory and INSERM UMR_S 1109, Strasbourg University Hospitals, 3 rue Koeberlé, F-67000 Strasbourg, France; phone: (33) 3 69 55 14 38; fax: (33) 3 68 85 37 50, e-mail: samira.fafi-kremer@unistra.fr

The authors have declared that no conflict of interest exists.

Abstract

Assessment of the kinetics of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies is essential to predict protection against reinfection and durability of vaccine protection. Here, we longitudinally measured Spike (S) and Nucleocapsid (N)-specific antibodies in 1,309 healthcare workers (HCW) including 393 convalescent COVID-19 and 916 COVID-19 negative HCW up to 405 days. From M1 to M7-9 after infection, SARS-CoV-2 antibodies decreased moderately in convalescent HCW in a biphasic model, with men showing a slower decay of anti-N (p=0.02), and a faster decay of anti-S (p=0.0008) than women. At M11-13, anti-N antibodies dramatically decreased (half-life: 210 days) while anti-S stabilized (half-life: 630 days) at a median of 2.41 log Arbitrary Units (AU)/mL (Interquartile Range (IQR): 2.11 -2.75). One case of reinfection was recorded in convalescent HCW (0.47 per 100 person-years) versus 50 in COVID-19 negative HCW (10.11 per 100 person-years). Correlation with live-virus neutralization assay revealed that variants D614G and B.1.1.7, but not B.1.351, were sensitive to anti-S antibodies at 2.3 log AU/mL, while IgG ≥ 3 log AU/mL neutralized all three variants. After SARS-CoV-2 vaccination, anti-S levels reached 4 logs regardless of pre-vaccination IgG levels, type of vaccine, and number of doses. Our study demonstrates a long-term persistence of anti-S IgG antibodies that may protect against reinfection. By significantly increasing cross-neutralizing antibody titers, a single-dose vaccination strengthens protection against escape mutants.

Introduction

Since the beginning of the pandemic, hypothesis of waning humoral immunity in COVID-19 convalescent patients has raised many concerns about reliability of population-based seroprevalence studies and more critically about long-term antibody protection against reinfection and by extension the durability of vaccine protection. COVID-19 leads to the development of protective neutralizing antibodies in the vast majority of cases [1-4]. Several reports suggested a rapid decline of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies as early as 3 months after infection[3,5], while others reported persistence of antibody responses up to five months[4,6]. A recent rigorous study investigating T and B cell responses in convalescent COVID-19 reported that substantial immune memory is generated after COVID-19, and 95% of subjects retained immune memory at ≈ 6 months after infection[7]. Furthermore, the presence of SARS-CoV-2 anti-spike (S) and anti-nucleocapsid (N) IgG antibodies were associated with a reduced risk of SARS-CoV-2 reinfection within 6 months after initial infection[8]. The recent emergence of SARS-CoV-2 variants with high transmissibility such as variant B.1.1.7 or decreased susceptibility to antibodies such as variant B.1.351 has raised the question of whether antibodies still protect against reinfection. Data on persistence and long-term efficacy of the immune response are therefore expected to understand the overall evolution of pandemic and post-pandemic dynamics, especially in the era of emerging variants[9-12].

Here, using validated serological assays [13-15] on a large cohort of healthcare workers (HCW) recovered from a mild COVID-19, we first described the dynamics of SARS-CoV-2 humoral response up to one year after COVID-19 and analyzed the incidence of reinfection within this period. Second, we used the S-Fuse live-virus neutralization assay[16], to assess the sensitivity of infectious SARS-CoV-2 variants to anti-S antibodies before and after vaccination several months after primary infection.

Results

Cohort characteristics.

The study involved 3,482 samples from 1,309 healthcare workers (HCW), including 393 convalescent COVID-19 (here called COVID-19 positive) and 916 COVID-19 negative HCW (Figure 1). The COVID-19 positive HCW included 345 with a history of positive SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR and 48 with positive serology only. Both COVID-19 positive and COVID-19 negative cohorts included various professional groups (nurses, doctors, caregivers and administrative staff) both with a median age of 39 (Interquartile Range (IQR) 30-51 and 30-50, respectively), and a predominance of females (76.8% and 78.5%). In COVID-19 positive HCW, a history of contact with a COVID-19 case was reported in 66% of participants, respectively. COVID-19 consistent symptoms were reported by 383 participants (97.5%), including 367 (93.4%) and 16 (4.1%) with mild or moderated disease, respectively (Table 1). No severe cases have been reported. All COVID-19 positive participants were sampled at M1 (median 31 days post symptom onset (DSO); IQR, 24-38), 383 at M3-6 (median, 107 DSO; IQR, 92-131), 346 at M7-9 (median, 215 DSO; IQR, 195-243) and lastly 141 at M11-13 (median, 350 DSO; IQR, 341-367), of which 43 were vaccinated against SARS-CoV-2 before M11-13 sampling. Only one asymptomatic reinfection was reported after nine months in this cohort. Conversely, among the 916 COVID-19 negative HCW, 50 (5.5%) reported a symptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infection (8 before M3-6, 29 before M7-9 and 13 before M11-13) confirmed by a positive RT-PCR test and by seroconversion in 56% and 100% of them, respectively.

Natural history of humoral response up to one year after COVID-19.

We first sought to analyze the dynamics of SARS-CoV-2 humoral responses and its determinants in the aftermath of COVID-19 (e.g. natural history after primary infection in the absence of vaccination). Seropositivity rates differ widely depending on: (1) isotypes (IgM or IgG), (2) antibody targets (N or S), (3) assays and (4) timepoints of serum collection (Figure2A). Anti-S IgM and IgG testing using lateral flow assay (LFA) were positive for 91.3% and 83.7% of COVID-19 positive HCW at M1, respectively. Approximately half of individuals (51.0% and 58.1%, respectively) had still detectable antibodies at

M11-13 showing a significant decrease in the rates of LFA-detected antibodies one-year after COVID-19 (both p<0.0001). Positivity rates of anti-N IgG response as measured by ELISA also significantly decreased from M1 (85.0%) to M11-13 (19.8%) (p<0.0001). Conversely, anti-S IgG response was maintained over time as shown by the persistence of seropositivity chemiluminescence microparticle immunoassay (CMIA)-based rates: 97.1% at M1 to 96.0% at M11-13 (p=0.51).

Next, we analyzed the dynamics of anti-S and anti-N IgG titers over time. Anti-S titers assessed by CMIA significantly decayed by 0.07, 0.04 and 0.02 log Arbitrary Units (AU/mL) per month from M1 to M3-6, M3-6 to M7-9 and M7-9 to M11-13, respectively (all p<0.01) (Figure2B and C), Thus, the estimated half-life ($t_{1/2}$) of each phase was of 210, 330 and 630 days, respectively. At M11-13, the median titer of anti-S IgG was 2.41 log AU/mL (IQR: 2.11-2.75), with 82% of participants showing IgG> 2.0 log AU/mL and 59% > 2.3 log AU/mL.

Next, we investigate the effect of age, gender, body mass index (BMI), blood group, rhesus status, DSO, and initial Ct values obtained by real-time reverse transcriptase PCR (RT-PCR) in nasal swabs on CMIA anti-S IgG titers at M7-9 and on decay speed between M3-6 and M7-9 by univariate (not shown) and multivariate analyses. No significant difference of anti-S IgG titers was found in univariate analysis according to gender. However, antibody titers declined faster in men in univariate analysis from M3-6 to M7-9. By multivariate analysis (Figure 2D), anti-S IgG titers also decayed faster in men than in women with an acceleration of antibody titers decrease of -0.033 log AU/mL per month (95% confidence interval (95%CI, -0.053 to -0.014; p=0.0008) in the first condition. Another factor significantly associated with faster decay was the rhesus-negative (Rh-) status, impacting the decay by a factor of -0.021 log AU/mL per month (95%CI, -0.002 to -0.040; p=0.0008). Notably, no significant effect of age, BMI, blood group, DSO or initial Ct values on anti-S titer slope was observed (Figure 2D).

Regarding ELISA anti-N IgG, a significant decay of ratios was observed between the four study visits (Figure 2E). Interestingly, a triphasic kinetic dynamics of anti-N IgG index over time was observed with a first steep decay between M1 and M3-6 (median, -0.26 optical density (OD) ratio Sample/Cut-Off

(S/CO) per month), then a slower decay up to M7-9 (-0.02) before a second drop to M11-13 (-0.07; all p<0.0001) (Figure 2F). Thus, the $t_{1/2}$ of each phase was of 60, 690 and 210 days, respectively. This pattern differed from those of anti-S IgG titers. Univariate and multivariate analyses were conducted for anti-N index similarly to anti-S titers in order to identify potential predictor factors of anti-N IgG index dynamics. Higher antibody index were found at M7-9 in men in univariate analysis compared to women. Moreover, a slower decay from M3-6 to M7-9 was revealed by multivariate analysis in men (0.046 OD ratio S/CO per month; 95%CI 0.007-0.087; p=0.02) and in older participants (0.017 per 10-year age; 95%CI 0.002-0.032; p=0.03) (Figure 2G). Thus, male participants displayed a faster decay of anti-S antibodies and conversely a slower decay of anti-N antibodies.

We then assessed the relative incidence of SARS-CoV-2 infections in convalescent COVID-19 and COVID-19 negative HCW during follow-up. Overall, 51 SARS-CoV-2 infections developed after enrollment: 1 in the COVID-19 positive group (incidence of 0.47 per 100 person-years) and 50 in the COVID-19 negative group (incidence of 10.11 per 100 person-years), indicating a relative reduction in the incidence of SARS-CoV-2 reinfection in the previously infected group of 95.4% (p<0.0001, Figure 3). The only case of reinfection occurred in a 23 years-old woman working as a medical student. She first developed a symptomatic mild COVID-19 in March 2020 with a high viral load found in nasopharyngeal swab (Ct=17) leading to an anti-S and anti-N IgG seroconversion (2.6 log AU/mL and 1.0 OD S/CO after 96 DSO, respectively). The second asymptomatic episode in January 2021 was revealed by a low viral load (Ct=34) detected six days after extra-professional COVID-19 exposure. The reinfection was associated with positive anti-S IgM and a rebound of both anti-S IgG titer and anti-N IgG index without vaccination (3.6 log AU/mL and 1.7 OD S/CO after 345 DSO, respectively, 22 days after 2nd positive RT-PCR). Altogether, our findings indicate that although anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibody titers are declining, the risk of reinfection within a year post-infection remains low.

Impact of SARS-CoV-2 vaccination on humoral response in COVID-19 positive HCW.

To investigate how SARS-CoV-2 antibodies evolve after COVID-19 vaccination in convalescent COVID-19 HCW, serological results of the 42 COVID-19 positive HCW who received at least one dose of vaccine between M7-9 and M11-13 visits were compared to those of the 98 unvaccinated participants with a M11-13 follow-up. Among vaccinated-participants, 23 received a single-dose from 1 to 47 days before M11-13 sampling, including 11 HCW vaccinated with ChAdOx1 nCoV-19 vaccine (AstraZeneca), 3 with mRNA-1273 vaccine (Moderna) and 9 with BNT162b2 vaccine (Pfizer-BioNTech). The 19 other participants received two doses of BNT162b2 vaccine (Pfizer-BioNTech) and their M11-13 sera were collected from 3 to 65 days after the second dose of vaccine.

The five participants sampled earlier than 6 days after a single dose vaccination still displayed anti-S antibody titers under 3 log AU/mL at M11-13 (Figure 4A). Conversely, a rebound of anti-S IgG titers was observed in all samples collected later than 6 days after vaccination with a median increase of 1.97 log AU/mL between M7-9 and M11-13 (IQR, 1.51 to 2.25; $p<0.0001$). Indeed, post-vaccination titers reached, at least, double the values measured at M1 post-infection. Antibody titers over 4 log AU/mL were found in all except one of these vaccinated HCW (Figure 4A, B). Interestingly, the only participant with a weaker anti-S response of 3.44 log AU/mL at M11-13 despite double dose vaccination displayed a history of positive SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR (Ct=26) and positive anti-S IgM during all the follow-up but without anti-S or anti-N IgG seroconversion before vaccination. Altogether, our findings suggest that a strong humoral response is rapidly re-mobilized after a single-dose vaccination among COVID-19 positive individuals.

Sensitivity of infectious SARS-CoV-2 variants to anti-S antibodies at M11-13.

To assess whether SARS-CoV-2 variants are sensitive to anti-S antibodies that persist at M11-13 with or without prior vaccination, sera collected at M11-13 from 28 convalescent COVID-19 (13 vaccinated and 15 unvaccinated) were analyzed with the S-Fuse live-virus neutralization assay[16] (Figure 5A). The 13 vaccinated HCW received a single dose, including 8 with ChAdOx1 nCoV-19 vaccine (AstraZeneca),

3 with BNT162b2 vaccine (Pfizer-BioNTech) and 2 with mRNA-1273 vaccine (Moderna). Sera collected from unvaccinated participants showed median neutralizing antibody titers of 2.31 log IC_{50} (IQR: 2.03-2.76), 2.10 log IC_{50} (IQR: 1.76-2.45) and 1.51 log IC_{50} (IQR: 1.48-1.87) against D614G, B.1.1.7 and B.1.351 live-strains, respectively. Sera from vaccinated participants showed a median neutralizing antibody titer of 4.01 log IC_{50} (IQR: 3.88-4.35), 4.03 log IC_{50} (IQR: 3.85-4.23) and 3.14 log IC_{50} (IQR: 2.99-3.58) against the same viral strains, respectively (Figure 5B). Strong correlation was observed at M11-13 between neutralizing antibody titers assessed by S-Fuse neutralization assay and anti-S IgG titers measured by CMIA with Spearman correlation coefficients of 0.934, 0.952 and 0.967 for D614G, B.1.1.7 and B.1.351, respectively (*p* values<0.0001) (Figure 5C). Anti-S titers around 2.3 log AU/mL neutralized D614G, B.1.1.7 but not B.1.351 variants at more than 2 log IC_{50}. Anti-S IgG titers > 3 log AU/mL neutralized D614G, B.1.1.7 at ≥ 3 log IC_{50} and B.1.351 at ≥ 2 log IC_{50}. These anti-S IgG titers were reached by all vaccinated HCW regardless of pre-vaccination anti-S IgG titers, type of vaccine or number of vaccine doses. Based on the strong correlation between CMIA and neutralization assay, neutralizing titers were extrapolated to the remaining 83 unvaccinated HCW and the 24 HCW vaccinated for more than 6 days to predict the strength of neutralization at M11-13 in all participants (Figure 5D). Altogether, our findings suggest that former COVID-19 positive individuals benefit from a single-dose vaccine and efficiently neutralize current SARS-CoV-2 variants.

Discussion

The duration and effectiveness of adaptive immunity directed against SARS-CoV-2 after primary infection are key questions to understand the coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic. The present study involving a large cohort of HCW followed prospectively over one year provides, for the first time, crucial information on persistence of circulating SARS-CoV-2 antibodies after mild COVID-19. We demonstrate that: i) anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibody titers evolve differently in men and women; ii) anti-S IgG stabilize at a median titer of 2.41 log AU/mL (IQR: 2.11 – 2.75) one year after symptom onset

and the risk of SARS-CoV-2 reinfection was significantly reduced in the ensuing 12 months; iii) CMIA anti-S IgG titers strongly correlate with neutralization titers, iv) Anti-S IgG titers at 2 log AU/mL efficiently neutralize D614G, B.1.1.7 but not B.1.351; v) SARS-CoV-2 vaccination significantly increase anti-S antibodies to levels that neutralize all three variants regardless of pre-vaccination IgG levels, type of vaccine, or number of doses.

Our longitudinal study covered a serological monitoring up to 405 days of convalescent COVID-19 and COVID-19 negative HCW and showed that almost all COVID-19 convalescent (96%) still have detectable anti-S IgG one year after infection. A previous longitudinal study investigating anti-S IgG found relatively stable antibody titers over eight months after COVID-19[7]. However, this study had data at only two time points and was not able to define a model for the kinetic of antibodies[7]. In our study, follow-up at M1, M3-M6, M7-M9 and M11-13 showed a tri-phasic decay of anti-S antibodies with slower half-life between day 210 and day 405. This segmented anti-S decay could reflect B cells turnover after infection[2]. Although antibody titers were variable between unvaccinated convalescents, 82% still have anti-S IgG titers up to 2 log AU/mL and 59% up to 2.3 log AU/mL at M11-13. According to correlation curve, these titers are supposed to neutralize D614G and B.1.1.7 variants but less B.1.351, suggesting that most COVID-19 convalescents may at least be protected from reinfection by the former variants one year after primary infection. It should be noted that our hospital faced three waves of COVID-19 from March-June 2020, September 2020 – January 2021 and from March 2021 to now, with the last one due to B1.1.7 variant. During the period April 2020 – April 2021, 50 new infections were reported in COVID-19-negative participants while only one case of asymptomatic reinfection was reported in the COVID-19-positive participants within the same period. Although antibodies represent only a part of the immune response, this strongly suggests that convalescent COVID-19 develop robust immune response that reduces the risk of reinfection with SARS-CoV-2 within at least one year.

Interestingly, all individuals who received SARS-COV-2 vaccine displayed high antibody titers able to neutralize all three variants tested regardless of pre-vaccine anti-S IgG levels, type of vaccine (mRNA or Adenovirus-vector vaccines) or number of vaccine doses. The antibody titers increase was observed as early as 7 days after vaccination. This suggests that a robust memory B cell response is established in COVID-19 convalescents including those with low antibody titers. This is in line with the study of Dan *et al*. who performed an extensive characterization of memory B cells and revealed that the slight antibody decline occurring in convalescents individuals doesn't reflect real waning of humoral immunity but rather a contraction of the immune response with antibody affinity maturation and anti-S memory B cells persistence[7]. These observations are very hopeful regarding durability of humoral responses developed after COVID-19 and suggest that this protection against SARS-CoV-2 infection may last for years as reported for common human coronaviruses[17].

Unlike anti-S antibody titers which stabilize over time, we observed a steep decay of anti-N IgG titers after seven to nine months post-infection, with only less than 20% seropositive after one year. Previous studies with a shorter monitoring period after infection found discrepant results regarding anti-N IgG persistence, depending on commercial assays used. One study described a sustained humoral response up to ten months after infection[18] whereas an other in reported a significant decrease early after infection in line with our findings[19]. These differences could be explained by increased avidity that compensates antibody loss or by changes in recognized epitopes over time[18]. Overall, our study show that serological assays targeting nucleocapsid should not be preferred for seroprevalence studies, even if they have the advantage to differentiate between natural infection and post-vaccine immunity.

We evaluated several host factors as potential predictors of antibody titers and of their kinetics up to seven to nine months after primary infection. While no differences in SARS-CoV-2 IgG titers were observed, their kinetic was influenced by gender and rhesus. Notably, men displayed a significantly faster decay of anti-S IgG and conversely a significantly slower decrease of anti-N IgG titers between

M3-6 and M7-9 after infection, independently of age and of titers measured at M3-6. Sex difference in SARS-CoV-2 immune response was previously described early after infection. Takahashi and colleagues reported that female patients had more robust T cell activation than male patients in the early phase of SARS-CoV-2 infection[20]. Other studies reported a higher peak of anti-S antibody titers in men early after infection followed by a steeper decay compared to females[7,21-23]. The early greater humoral response in convalescent men have been linked to the higher risk of severe disease in this population and to prolonged virus shedding[24,25]. However, this sex difference was also observed independently of age, severity of symptoms, or duration of symptoms [7,21]. We showed that differences in antibody kinetics depending on gender were still observed later than six months, independently of case severity since only mild and few moderate and asymptomatic cases were monitored in our study. The sex differences in immune responses may be multifactorial, notably based on sex steroids concentrations, on transcriptional factors and on incomplete inactivation of immunoregulatory genes on the second X chromosome in females [26,27]. Previous studies reported a relationship between the ABO and rhesus blood groups and the COVID-19 susceptibility, suggesting that type O blood and rhesus-negative status may protect against severe COVID-19[28,29]. In our study, Rh- status was associated with faster decay of anti-S IgG titers over time, while no association was observed with ABO blood groups.

Although our study provides crucial data on the natural history of mild COVID-19, it is important to note that there are some limitations. Neutralization experiments were performed on a small subset of the cohort due to insufficient volume of remaining sera. However, the strong correlation between CMIA IgG levels and neutralizing titers observed in this study and reported by the manufacturer and by other studies [13,30,31], allows an extrapolation of the results to the entire cohort. Assessment of reinfection was based on participant reports during visits, as no RT-PCR surveillance was planned in the study. Therefore, it cannot be excluded that the COVID-19 positive participants had unnoticed asymptomatic reinfection during follow-up. However, no COVID-19 positive HCW except the case of reinfection had a significant increase of both anti-S and anti-N levels during follow-up. Another

limitation is the unbalanced sex distribution with predominance of women. This sex ratio reflects the sex distribution of the healthcare workers in our hospital. Nevertheless, the sex difference in immune response was observed by using univariate and multivariate analysis. Furthermore, we were not able to investigate the kinetic of memory B cells because of the lack of adequate samples. Finally, our results were obtained in participants with a median age of 39 years (IQR 30-51), hence we cannot exclude that older individuals may experience different evolution of their humoral response overtime.

Altogether, our data demonstrate a long-term persistence of anti-S IgG titers that may protect convalescent COVID-19 against reinfection by variants D614G and B.1.1.7. By increasing the levels of cross-neutralizing antibodies, SARS-CoV-2 vaccine may strengthen their protection especially against variants harboring antibody escape mutations like B1.351. Future work will help determining whether vaccine-induced antibodies evolve in the same manner and whether their kinetic is different between men and women.

Methods

Study design and participants.

We characterized SARS-CoV-2 antibody persistence in COVID-19 healthcare workers (HCW) from Strasbourg University Hospitals, France up to 13 months after infection. Participants were recruited as follows (Figure 1): among 1,496 HCW initially screened by SARS-CoV-2 serology between 6th April and 7th May 2020 in our institution, all participants with a COVID-19 history proven either by serology at screening or by a previous RT-PCR were recruited and followed at M1, M3-6, M7-9 and M11-13. In parallel, participants displaying negative serology without a history of positive RT-PCR for SARS-CoV-2 were recruited to evaluate the incidence of infection. Participants completed a questionnaire at each visit in reference to sociodemographic characteristics, COVID-19 exposure, symptoms, virological findings and eventually vaccination.

RT-PCR assay

RT-PCR for SARS-CoV-2 RNA detection was previously performed on nasopharyngeal swab samples at the time of diagnosis. All except five RT-PCR positive samples were analyzed in our laboratory with SARS-CoV-2 specific primers and probes targeting two regions on the viral RNA-dependent RNA polymerase (*RdRp*) gene (Institut Pasteur, Paris, France; WHO technical guidance). Ct values obtained in each sample were considered for statistical analyses.

Serological assays

Screening assays. All sera were initially screened for SARS-CoV-2 antibodies using two commercial assays. The first one is the Biosynex® (COVID-19 BSS IgG/IgM) Lateral Flow Assay (LFA) detecting separately IgM and IgG directed against the Receptor Binding Domain (RBD) domain of the SARS-CoV-2 spike protein, with estimated overall sensitivity and specificity of 96% and 99% 22 days since symptoms onset (DSO), respectively [3]. The second assay used was the EDI™ Novel coronavirus COVID-19 IgG ELISA assay which displayed in our hands a sensitivity of 81% and a specificity of 96% to detect anti-nucleocapsid protein (N) IgG after 22 DSO [3].

Confirmation assay. All M1 sera associated with at least one positive result using the above-mentioned assays or with a history of positive SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR were retrospectively analyzed with the Abbott Architect SARS-CoV-2 IgG Quant II assay (Abbott, Sligo, Ireland) to confirm the serological positive status and to measure the anti-S IgG titer, if allowed by remaining serum volume. Sera collected during follow-up were also analyzed with this commercial assay for the entire selected cohort of COVID-19 HCW to define the serological status at each timepoint. This assay is an automated chemiluminescence microparticle immunoassay (CMIA) that quantify anti-RBD IgG with 50 AU/mL as a positive cut-off and a maximal threshold of quantification of 40,000.0 AU/mL (80,000 AU/mL with 1:2 dilution). According

to the manufacturer, this CMIA displays clinical sensitivity and specificity of 98.81% and 99.55% after 15 DSO, respectively. Antibody titers measured with this assay are announced by the manufacturer to correlate, with a high probability (>95%), to neutralizing antibody titers assessed by plaque reduction assay on SARS-CoV-2 reference strain. This correlation was confirmed by previous studies[13,30].

S-Fuse live-virus neutralization assay. A neutralizing assay was performed on M7-9 and M11-13 sera from a panel of 28 participants, including 15 non-vaccinated and 13 single-dose-vaccinated COVID-19 HCW between these two timepoints matched on the quantitative anti-RBD IgG value measured at M7-9. The live-virus neutralization assay used S-Fuse reporter cells as previously reported [4]. Briefly, S-Fuse reporter cells correspond to U2OS-ACE2 GFP1–10 and GFP 11 cells that produce GFP only upon fusion with neighboring cells occurring when they are productively infected with SARS-CoV-2. Neutralization of three live viral strains was assessed for each serum, including the D614G, B.1.1.7 and B.1.351 variants. Infection was quantified by measuring the number of GFP+ syncytia at 18 h.

Statistical analysis.

Chi-squared test, Kruskal-Wallis rank sum test and Fisher's exact test were conducted to identify any significant changes in categorical variables over time and between groups. Non parametric Wilcoxon paired tests and Mann-Whiney tests were conducted to compare quantitative data over time or between groups, respectively. All tests were two-sided with an α level of 0.05. To model anti-S (log-transformed) and anti-N IgG titers over time a triphasic decay was used, and the half-life ($t_{1/2}$) of each decay phase was calculated.

To assess characteristics of patients with a faster/slower decay in anti-S and anti-N IgG titers, non-parametric tests were used for univariate analyses (Wilcoxon and Fisher’s exact tests). Variables achieving a *p* value <0.17 in the univariate analysis were entered into a multivariate linear regression model (with a backward stepwise method based on the likelihood ratio test). Multivariate analyses were performed with R software version 4.0.3 (R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna,

Austria). Factors effects in multivariate linear regression are given with a 95%CI. All other data were analyzed and represented using Graphpad Prism version 9.0.0. We used the Kaplan–Meier method to estimate the cumulative probability of SARS-CoV-2 infection or re-infection per group (COVID-19 negative or previsouly COVID-19 positive, respectively) and used the log-rank test to perform between-group comparisons. Results were represented as median or mean values, with interquartile range (IQR) or minimum and maximum values, as indicated in the figure legends.

Study approval.

This analysis was conducted on data from an on-going prospective, interventional, monocentric, longitudinal, cohort study enrolling healthcare workers from the Strasbourg University Hospitals (ClinicalTrials.gov Identifier: NCT04441684). The protocol was approved by the institutional review board of CPP Sud Méditerranée III. All participants provided a written informed consent.

Acknowledgments

We are grateful to all the study participants who donated blood, The team of Cellule d'Appel , Pôle des Ressources Humaines who scheduled the planning of participants, the DRCI team including Eric Demonsant, Hélène Soavelo, Caroline Bouvrais and Evelyne Acacie who prepared the IRB protocol, the ECRF and the administrative part of the protocol, the CIC Inserm 1434 team, including Alexandre Bolle who coordinated recruitment of participants and Noelle Huber, Christine Toulouse, Sophie Wohlgemuth who collected samples, the team of Service de Medecine du Travail who managed the cohort, and the technical staff of Pôle de Biologie and Laboratoire de Virologie including Anne Moncolin, Veronique Sohn, Axelle Grub, Nathalie Durand, Nadège Frey and Elise Suhr for management and distribution of samples. This work was supported by Strasbourg University Hospitals (SeroCoV-HUS; PRI 7782), the Agence Nationale de la Recherche (ANR-18-CE17-0028), Laboratoire d'Excellence TRANSPLANTEX (ANR-11-LABX-0070_TRANSPLANTEX), and Institut National de la Santé et de la Recherche Médicale (UMR_S 1109).

Author contributions.

SFK, CSM, MG, YH and NM conceived and designed the study. CSM, JDS, NC, DR, MP AF, LKP and MG recruited participants. SB, NR, AS, LG, BP, and JML carried out LFA experiments. TB, DP and OS carried out S-Fuse neutralization experiments. FG, AV, MJW, MS and EL analyzed serological data. FG and PG performed statistical analyses. SFK, FG and PG wrote the manuscript with substantial input from all co-authors.

Table 1. Characteristics of the 393 COVID-19 positive healthcare workers.

	Total	Females	Males	P value
Number of COVID-19 positive HCW	393	302	91	NA
Age (years), median (IQR)	39.0 (29.6-50.5)	40.0 (30.1-51.1)	34.3 (28.6-44.6)	0.0965
BMI (kg/m²), median (IQR)	23.6 (21.3-26.9)	23.6 (21.0-27.8)	24.0 (21.9-25.6)	0.8157
		Blood group		
A, n (%)	162 (41.2)	125 (41.4)	37 (40.7)	0.2112
B, n (%)	33 (8.4)	23 (7.6)	10 (11.0)	
AB, n (%)	16 (4.1)	14 (4.6)	2 (2.2)	
O, n (%)	129 (32.8)	108 (35.8)	21 (23.1)	
Rhesus negative, n (%)	60 (15.3)	50 (16.6)	10 (11.0)	0.2448
Unknown, n (%)	53 (13.5)	32 (10.6)	21 (23.1)	0.0045
		COVID-19 history		
Contact with COVID-19 case, n (%)	259 (65.9)	200 (66.2)	59 (64.8)	0.8021
Previous positive SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR, n (%)	345 (87.8)	263 (87.1)	82 (90.1)	0.5837
COVID-19 symptoms, n (%)	383 (97.4)	294 (97.4)	89 (97.8)	1.0
Known date of symptoms onset, n (%)	378 (96.2)	289 (95.7)	89 (97.8)	0.5359
Hospitalization, n (%)	16 (4.1)	10 (3.3)	6 (6.6)	0.2211
		Serum collection		
HCW sampled at M1, n (%)	393 (100)	302 (100)	91 (100)	0.6925
HCW sampled at M3-6, n (%)	383 (97.5)	294 (97.4)	89 (97.8)	
HCW sampled at M7-9, n (%)	346 (88.0)	275 (91.1)	71 (78.0)	
HCW sampled at M11-13, n (%)	141 (35.9)	113 (37.4)	28 (30.8)	
		Time from symptom onset to serum collection at:		
M1 (days), median (IQR; range)	31 (24-38; 6-58)	32 (24-38; 6-53)	29 (24-37; 13-58)	0.2087
M3-6 (days), median (IQR; range)	107 (92-131; 78-172)	107.5 (92.3-131; 78-172)	105 (90-130; 78-164)	0.6583
M7-9 (days), median (IQR; range)	215 (195-243; 161-284)	217 (196-246; 161-284)	210 (194-237; 169-281)	0.3388
M11-13 (days), median (IQR; range)	350 (341-367; 321-405)	351 (340-365; 321-405)	349 (346-375; 332-394)	0.2978
		Vaccination		
Single-dose vaccination between M7-9 and M11-13, n (% of M11-13)	23 (16.3)	18 (15.9)	5 (17.9)	0.7796
Double dose vaccination between M7-9 and M11-13, n (% of M11-13)	19 (13.5)	14 (12.4)	5 (17.9)	0.5356

BMI: body mass index; HCW: Healthcare workers; IQR: Interquartile range; NA: not applicable; NS: not significative; RT-PCR: Real-time reverse transcriptase PCR. P values were calculated with Mann-Whitney, Chi-square and Fisher exact tests using the Graphpad Prism version 9.0.0 software.

References

1. Atyeo C, Fischinger S, Zohar T, et al. Distinct Early Serological Signatures Track with SARS-CoV-2 Survival. *Immunity.* Sep 15 2020;53(3):524-532 e524.
2. Gaebler C, Wang Z, Lorenzi JCC, et al. Evolution of antibody immunity to SARS-CoV-2. *Nature.* Mar 2021;591(7851):639-644.
3. Isho B, Abe KT, Zuo M, et al. Persistence of serum and saliva antibody responses to SARS-CoV-2 spike antigens in COVID-19 patients. *Science immunology.* Oct 8 2020;5(52).
4. Iyer AS, Jones FK, Nodoushani A, et al. Persistence and decay of human antibody responses to the receptor binding domain of SARS-CoV-2 spike protein in COVID-19 patients. *Science immunology.* Oct 8 2020;5(52).
5. Ibarrondo FJ, Fulcher JA, Goodman-Meza D, et al. Rapid Decay of Anti–SARS-CoV-2 Antibodies in Persons with Mild Covid-19. *New England Journal of Medicine.* 2020;383(11):1085-1087.
6. Wajnberg A, Amanat F, Firpo A, et al. Robust neutralizing antibodies to SARS-CoV-2 infection persist for months. *Science.* Dec 4 2020;370(6521):1227-1230.
7. Dan JM, Mateus J, Kato Y, et al. Immunological memory to SARS-CoV-2 assessed for up to 8 months after infection. *Science.* Feb 5 2021;371(6529).
8. Lumley SF, O'Donnell D, Stoesser NE, et al. Antibody Status and Incidence of SARS-CoV-2 Infection in Health Care Workers. *The New England journal of medicine.* Feb 11 2021;384(6):533-540.
9. Davies NG, Abbott S, Barnard RC, et al. Estimated transmissibility and impact of SARS-CoV-2 lineage B.1.1.7 in England. *Science.* Apr 9 2021;372(6538).
10. Hu J, Peng P, Wang K, et al. Emerging SARS-CoV-2 variants reduce neutralization sensitivity to convalescent sera and monoclonal antibodies. *Cellular & Molecular Immunology.* 2021/04/01 2021;18(4):1061-1063.
11. Sabino EC, Buss LF, Carvalho MPS, et al. Resurgence of COVID-19 in Manaus, Brazil, despite high seroprevalence. *Lancet.* Feb 6 2021;397(10273):452-455.
12. Tegally H, Wilkinson E, Giovanetti M, et al. Detection of a SARS-CoV-2 variant of concern in South Africa. *Nature.* Apr 2021;592(7854):438-443.
13. Prendecki M, Clarke C, Brown J, et al. Effect of previous SARS-CoV-2 infection on humoral and T-cell responses to single-dose BNT162b2 vaccine. *Lancet.* Feb 25 2021.
14. Velay A, Gallais F, Benotmane I, et al. Evaluation of the performance of SARS-CoV-2 serological tools and their positioning in COVID-19 diagnostic strategies. *Diagnostic microbiology and infectious disease.* 2020/08/21/ 2020:115181.
15. Fafi-Kremer S, Bruel T, Madec Y, et al. Serologic responses to SARS-CoV-2 infection among hospital staff with mild disease in eastern France. *EBioMedicine.* 2020;31(102915):102915.
16. Planas D, Bruel T, Grzelak L, et al. Sensitivity of infectious SARS-CoV-2 B.1.1.7 and B.1.351 variants to neutralizing antibodies. *Nature medicine.* Mar 26 2021.
17. Huang AT, Garcia-Carreras B, Hitchings MDT, et al. A systematic review of antibody mediated immunity to coronaviruses: kinetics, correlates of protection, and association with severity. *Nature communications.* Sep 17 2020;11(1):4704.
18. Favresse J, Eucher C, Elsen M, et al. Persistence of Anti-SARS-CoV-2 Antibodies Depends on the Analytical Kit: A Report for Up to 10 Months after Infection. *Microorganisms.* 2021;9(3):556.
19. Muecksch F, Wise H, Batchelor B, et al. Longitudinal Serological Analysis and Neutralizing Antibody Levels in Coronavirus Disease 2019 Convalescent Patients. *J Infect Dis.* Feb 13 2021;223(3):389-398.
20. Takahashi T, Ellingson MK, Wong P, et al. Sex differences in immune responses that underlie COVID-19 disease outcomes. *Nature.* Dec 2020;588(7837):315-320.
21. Grzelak L, Velay A, Madec Y, et al. Sex differences in the evolution of neutralizing antibodies to SARS-CoV-2. *J Infect Dis.* Mar 7 2021.

22. L'Huillier AG, Meyer B, Andrey DO, et al. Antibody persistence in the first 6 months following SARS-CoV-2 infection among hospital workers: a prospective longitudinal study. *Clinical microbiology and infection : the official publication of the European Society of Clinical Microbiology and Infectious Diseases.* Jan 20 2021.

23. Robbiani DF, Gaebler C, Muecksch F, et al. Convergent antibody responses to SARS-CoV-2 in convalescent individuals. *Nature.* Aug 2020;584(7821):437-442.

24. Choe PG, Kim KH, Kang CK, et al. Antibody Responses 8 Months after Asymptomatic or Mild SARS-CoV-2 Infection. *Emerg Infect Dis.* Mar 2021;27(3):928-931.

25. Klein SL, Pekosz A, Park HS, et al. Sex, age, and hospitalization drive antibody responses in a COVID-19 convalescent plasma donor population. *J Clin Invest.* Nov 2 2020;130(11):6141-6150.

26. Fischinger S, Boudreau CM, Butler AL, Streeck H, Alter G. Sex differences in vaccine-induced humoral immunity. *Seminars in immunopathology.* Mar 2019;41(2):239-249.

27. Scully EP, Haverfield J, Ursin RL, Tannenbaum C, Klein SL. Considering how biological sex impacts immune responses and COVID-19 outcomes. *Nature reviews. Immunology.* Jul 2020;20(7):442-447.

28. Ray JG, Schull MJ, Vermeulen MJ, Park AL. Association Between ABO and Rh Blood Groups and SARS-CoV-2 Infection or Severe COVID-19 Illness : A Population-Based Cohort Study. *Annals of internal medicine.* Mar 2021;174(3):308-315.

29. Zhang Y, Garner R, Salehi S, La Rocca M, Duncan D. Association between ABO blood types and coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19), genetic associations, and underlying molecular mechanisms: a literature review of 23 studies. *Annals of Hematology.* 2021/05/01 2021;100(5):1123-1132.

30. McKay PF, Hu K, Blakney AK, et al. Self-amplifying RNA SARS-CoV-2 lipid nanoparticle vaccine candidate induces high neutralizing antibody titers in mice. *Nature communications.* Jul 9 2020;11(1):3523.

31. Iyer AS, Jones FK, Nodoushani A, et al. Dynamics and significance of the antibody response to SARS-CoV-2 infection. *medRxiv.* Jul 20 2020.

Figure legends

Figure 1: Flow chart of survey recruitment and serum sampling among the healthcare workers (HCW) at the Strasbourg University Hospital. First line serological screening was performed using two commercial assays: the Biosynex® (COVID-19 BSS IgG/IgM) Lateral Flow Assay (LFA) detecting anti-Spike (S) antibodies and the EDI™ Novel coronavirus COVID-19 IgG ELISA assay detecting the anti-Nucleocapside protein (N) IgG. A third assay, namely the Abbott SARS-CoV-2 IgG II Quant assay measuring the anti-S IgG, was used to confirmed seropositive samples. Serological testing on the first serum sample of each participant between the 6th April and the 7th May 2020 (M1) and on further sera collected at M3-6, M7-9 and M11-13 led to the establishment of two separate cohorts of COVID-19 positive or negative HCW, both with serological follow-up.
Anti-S: anti-spike protein; Anti-N: anti-nucleocapsid protein; CMIA: Chemiluminescent microparticle immunoassay; ELISA: Enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay; HCW: Healthcare workers; LFA: Lateral flow assay; RT-PCR: Real-time reverse transcriptase PCR.

Figure 2: Dynamics and determinants of SARS-CoV-2 humoral responses after COVID-19. (**A**) SARS-CoV-2 seropositive rate over time among participants (M1 (n= 393), M3-6 (n=383), M7-9 (n=346), M11-13 (n=98)) according to serological assays. (**B**) Dynamics of anti-S IgG titers expressed in log AU/mL (Abbott SARS-CoV-2 IgG II Quant assay) over time among HCWs with known first date of symptoms (M1 (n=369), M3-6 (n= 369), M7-9 (n= 333), M11-13 (n=98). (**C**) Anti-S IgG titers variation per month expressed in log AU/mL between each timepoints (M1 to M3-6 (n=374), M3-6 to M7-9 (n=337), M7-9 to M11-13 (n=93)). (**D**) Associations between anti-S IgG titers decay between M3-6 to M7-9 and demographical, biological and virological data and time of sampling at M3-6 expressed in days post symptoms onset (DSO) (n=337). (**E**) Dynamics of anti-N IgG ratios expressed in ratio Optical density (OD) Sample/Cut Off (CO) (EDI™) over time among HCWs with known first date of symptoms (M1 (n=378), M3-6 (n= 369), M7-9 (n= 333), M11-13 (n=98)). (**F**) Anti-N IgG ratios variation per month expressed in ratio OD Sample/CO between each timepoints (M1 to M3-6 (n=383), M3-6 to M7-9 (n=337), M7-9 to M11-13 (n=93)). (**G**) Associations between anti-N IgG ratios decay between M3-6 to M7-9 and demographical, biological and virological data and time of serum sampling at M3-6. For panel **B, C, E and F**, red lines represent median values and yellow lines the interquartile range for each population. *p value < 0.05; **p value < 0.01; ***p value < 0.001, ****p value <0.0001; calculated with non-parametric Wilcoxon paired tests using the Graphpad Prism version 9.0.0 software. For panel **D and G**, data are depicted as factors effects in multivariate linear regression given with a 95% confidence interval (95%CI). Multivariate analyses were performed with R software version 4.0.3 (R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria).

Figure 3. Kaplan–Meier estimates of the probability of SARS-CoV-2 infection protection.

The cumulative probabilities of remaining free of SARS-CoV-2 infection among COVID-19 negative (COVID-19-) participants (red curve) and reinfection among former COVID-19 positive (COVID-19+) participants (blue curve) are shown on one year of follow-up (with 95% confidence interval, dotted lines). Exposition starts since the first negative serology for the COVID-19- group and two months after initial SARS-CoV-2 infection for the COVID-19+ group, as described previously[8]. SARS-CoV-2 infection/re-infection was assessed either by RT-qPCR or/and serology. Vaccinated individuals were censored at the time of the first vaccine dose. The number of exposed participants is defined under the x axis. Comparison of survival curves was performed using log-rank test. Comparison and p value were computed using the Graphpad Prism version 9.0.0 software.

Figure 4: Impact of SARS-CoV-2 vaccination on humoral response in COVID-19+ HCW (**A**) Timing of anti-S IgG titers rebound after vaccination among the 42 COVID-19 positive HCW who received at least one dose of vaccine against SARS-CoV-2 between M7-9 and M11-13 visits. The dotted vertical black line corresponds to the day of first injection (D0). Anti-S IgG titers among HCWs vaccinated with one dose of AstraZeneca vaccine are depicted in red circles, with one dose of Moderna vaccine in green squares, with one or two doses of Pfizer vaccine in light blue and dark blue triangles, respectively. (**B**) Comparison of anti-S IgG titers dynamics over time between 98 unvaccinated HCWs in orange dots and 38 HCWs vaccinated for more than six days in dark blue dots. (**B) and (C)** *p value < 0.05; **p value < 0.01; ***p value < 0.001, ****p value <0.0001; calculated with non-parametric Wilcoxon paired tests and Mann-Whiney tests using the Graphpad Prism version 9.0.0 software. The dotted horizontal black line corresponds to the anti-S IgG titer positivity threshold.

Figure 5: Neutralization efficiency after a single-dose vaccination among the COVID-19+ HCWs. Neutralizing antibody titers against live-strains of B.1.160, B.1.1.7 and B.1.351 variants of SARS-CoV-2 were measured in sera collected at M11-13 for 13 single-dose vaccinated HCW and 15 unvaccinated HCW. (**A**) Anti-S IgG (log AU/mL) kinetics between M7-9 and M11-13 according to vaccination status. (**B**) Neutralizing antibody titers (log IC50) against the B.1.160, the B.1.1.7 and the B.1.351 variants measured at M11-13. The dotted black line corresponds to positivity threshold of neutralization assay. Neutralizing antibody titers measured in HCWs vaccinated with one dose of AstraZeneca vaccine, Moderna vaccine and Pfizer-BioNtech vaccine are depicted in red circles, green squares, and light blue triangles, respectively. **(C)** Spearman correlation between anti-S IgG titers (log AU/mL) and neutralizing antibody titer (log IC50) against the B.1.160 (green circles), the B.1.1.7 (violet squares) and the B.1.351 (orange triangles) variants measured at M11-13 in vaccinated (n=13) and unvaccinated (n=15) HCW. The calculated correlation coefficients (r) and linear regression equations are depicted. (**D**) Pie charts depicting the frequency of logIC50 neutralization titer categories (extrapolated from CMIA anti-S titers) for all participants at M11-13 of according to the viral strain and the vaccination status. The number of participants is included at the center of the pie. *p value < 0.05; **p value < 0.01; ***p value < 0.001, ****p value <0.0001; calculated with non-parametric Wilcoxon paired tests or Spearman correlation. P values and correlation coefficients computed using the Graphpad Prism version 9.0.0 software.

Figure 1


1,496 HCW in Strasbourg University Hospitals screened by SARS-CoV-2 serology at M1 after symptom onset
187 HCW excluded: no further serum collected
1,309 HCW with at least one follow-up timepoint (M3-6 and/or M7-9 and/or M11-13)
964 HCW without history of positive SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR
Screening at M1: IgM/IgG anti-S LFA and anti-N IgG ELISA
846 HCW seronegative
118 HCW seropositive with at least one assay
Confirmation at M1 : anti-S IgG CMIA
70 HCW seronegative
345 HCW with history of positive SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR
48 HCW seropositive
COVID-19 positive HCW (n = 393)
COVID-19 negative HCW (n = 916)

Figure 2


A
LFA IgM anti-S
LFA IgG anti-S
ELISA IgG anti-N
CMIA IgG anti-S
% of participants
M1
M3-6
M7-9
M11-13
Positive
Negativ
B
Anti-S dynamics
Anti-S IgG titer (log AU/mL)
Positivity threshold
DSO (days)
E
Anti-N dynamics
Anti-N IgG index (OD ratio S/CO)
C
Anti-S slope
Anti-S IgG titer variation per month (log AU/mL)
M1 to M3-6
M3-6 to M7-9
M7-9 to M11-13
F
Anti-N slope
Anti-N IgG index variation per month (OD ratio S/CO)
D
Predictors of anti-S decay from M3-6 to M7-9
- Rhesus (versus +)
A blood type (versus O)
B blood type (versus O)
Anti-S titers at M3-6 (per 1 log10AU/mL increment)
DSO at M3-6 (per 10 days increment)
BMI (per 1 unit increment)
Age (per 10 years increment)
Men (versus Women)
Ct (per 10 cycles increment)
Factor effect (log AU/mL variation per month, 95% CI)
Faster decay
Slower decay
G
Predictors of anti-N decay from M3-6 to M7-9
Anti-N titers at M3-6 (per 1 OD increment)
Factor effect (OD ratio S/CO variation per month, 95% CI)

Figure 3



No. at risk				
COVID-19+	393	356	169	34
COVID-19-	916	834	408	126

Figure 4


A
Timing of anti-S IgG rebound after vaccination
Anti-S IgG titers (log AU/mL)
Time since first dose (days)
AstraZeneca (1 dose)
Moderna (1 dose)
Pfizer (1 dose)
Pfizer (2 doses)
B
Anti-S dynamics after vaccination
Anti-S IgG titer (log AU/mL)
****
M1
M3-6
M7-9
M11-13
No vaccine
n=98
Vaccine (>6 days)
n=38

Figure 5


A
Anti-S IgG kinetic according to vaccination status
Anti-S IgG titer (log AU/mL)
M7-9
M11-13
No vaccine
One dose vaccine
B
Neutralizing antibody titers
in HCW one year after COVID-19
Neutralization titer (log IC50)
D614G
B.1.1.7
B.1.351
Astrazeneca
Moderna
Pfizer-BioNTech
C
Correlation between anti-S IgG
and neutralizing antibody titer
Neutralization titer (log IC50)
Anti-S IgG titer (log AU/mL)
rs = 0.934 y=0.944x + 0.038
rs = 0.952 y=0.988x - 0.224
rs = 0.967 y=0.791x - 0.177
D614G
B.1.1.7
B.1.351
D
Extrapolated neutralizing antibody titer at M11-13
No vaccine
One dose vaccine
D614G n=98
B.1.1.7 n=98
B.1.351 n=98
D614G n=37
B.1.1.7 n=37
B.1.351 n=37
log10IC50:
<2
2-2.2
2.2-2.5
2.5-3
3-3.5
3.5-4
≥4