

1 **COVID-19 diagnosis and study of serum SARS-CoV-2 specific IgA, IgM and IgG**  
2 **by a quantitative and sensitive immunoassay**

3  
4 Huan Ma<sup>1,2#</sup>, Weihong Zeng<sup>1,2#</sup>, Hongliang He<sup>3#</sup>, Dan Zhao<sup>2</sup>, Yunru Yang<sup>2</sup>, Dehua Jiang<sup>4</sup>, Peigen Zhou<sup>5</sup>,  
5 Yingjie Qi<sup>3</sup>, Weihuang He<sup>4</sup>, Changcheng Zhao<sup>3</sup>, Ruting Yi<sup>4</sup>, Xiaofang Wang<sup>6</sup>, Bo Wang<sup>7</sup>, Yuanhong Xu<sup>7</sup>,  
6 Yun Yang<sup>3</sup>, Arnaud John Kombe Kombe<sup>2</sup>, Chengchao Ding<sup>6</sup>, Jiajia Xie<sup>8</sup>, Yong Gao<sup>3</sup>, Linzhao Cheng<sup>10</sup>,  
7 Yajuan Li<sup>7\*</sup>, Xiaoling Ma<sup>11\*</sup>, Tengchuan Jin<sup>1,2,12\*</sup>

8  
9 <sup>1</sup>Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, The First Affiliated Hospital of USTC, Division of Life  
10 Sciences and Medicine, University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei, Anhui 230001, China

11 <sup>2</sup>Hefei National Laboratory for Physical Sciences at Microscale, Laboratory of Structural Immunology,  
12 CAS Key Laboratory of Innate Immunity and Chronic Disease, Division of Life Sciences and Medicine,  
13 University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei, Anhui 230027, China

14 <sup>3</sup>Department of Infectious Diseases, The First Affiliated Hospital of USTC, Division of Life Sciences  
15 and Medicine, University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei, Anhui 230001, China

16 <sup>4</sup>Kangrun Biotech LTD, Guangzhou, Guangdong 511400, China

17 <sup>5</sup>Department of Statistics, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Madison, WI 53706, USA

18 <sup>6</sup>The First Affiliated Hospital of USTC, Division of Life Sciences and Medicine, University of Science  
19 and Technology of China, Hefei, Anhui 230001, China

20 <sup>7</sup>Department of Clinical Laboratory, The First Affiliated Hospital of Anhui Medical University, Hefei  
21 230032, China

22 <sup>8</sup>Department of Dermatology, The First Affiliated Hospital of USTC, Division of Life Sciences and  
23 Medicine, University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei, Anhui 230001, China

24 <sup>9</sup>Institute of Public Health, Division of Life Sciences and Medicine, University of Science and  
25 Technology of China, Hefei Anhui 230026, China

26 <sup>10</sup>Division of Life Sciences and Medicine, University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei Anhui  
27 230026, China, and Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine, Columbia, MD USA

28 <sup>11</sup>Department of Laboratory Medicine, The First Affiliated Hospital of USTC, Division of Life Sciences  
29 and Medicine, University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei, Anhui 230001, China

30 <sup>12</sup>CAS Center for Excellence in Molecular Cell Science, Chinese Academy of Science, Shanghai 200031,  
31 China

32  
33 **\*To whom correspondence should be addressed:**

34 Dr. Tengchuan Jin: Division of Life Sciences and Medicine, University of Science and Technology of  
35 China, Hefei, 230027, China; Email: jint@ustc.edu.cn; Tel: +86-551-63600720;

36 Dr. Xiaoling Ma: Department of Laboratory Medicine, The First Affiliated Hospital of USTC, Division  
37 of Life Sciences and Medicine, University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei, Anhui 230001,  
38 China; Email: maxiaoling@ustc.edu.cn; Tel: +86-551- 63600720.

39 Dr. Yajuan Li: Department of Clinical Laboratory, The First Affiliated Hospital of Anhui Medical  
40 University, Hefei 230032, China; Email: lyj106@ustc.edu.cn; Tel: +86-551- 62923175;

41 **NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.**  
#These authors contributed equally to this work.

## 42 Highlights

- 43 ● Developed a highly quantitative and sensitive serologic immunoassay for SARS-CoV-2-specific
- 44 IgA, IgM and IgG in COVID-19 patients.
- 45 ● Showed the inclusion of IgA to the conventional IgM + IgG in a serological test improves the
- 46 performance.
- 47 ● Revealed the kinetics of three antibody isotypes in COVID-19 patients.
- 48 ● Observed that serum IgA level positively correlated with COVID-19 disease severity.

49

## 50 Abstract

### 51 Background

52 The current pandemic of the Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) has  
53 caused a great loss in lives and economy. Detecting viral RNAs on nasopharyngeal and throat swabs is  
54 the standard approach for SARS-CoV-2 diagnosis with variable success. Currently, there are only a few  
55 studies describing the serological diagnostic methods that involve the detection of SARS-CoV-2-specific  
56 IgM and IgG. Here, we aimed to develop a more quantitative and sensitive serological test for COVID-  
57 19 diagnosis, monitoring and clinical investigation, based on the detection of antigen-specific IgA as  
58 well as IgM and IgG in blood in response to SARS-CoV-2 infection.

59

### 60 Methods

61 In this investigation, we report the development of a set of validated diagnostic kits for detecting serum  
62 IgA, IgM, and IgG specific to SARS-CoV-2 nucleocapsid protein (NP) and receptor-binding domain  
63 (RBD) of the spike protein by chemi-luminescence immuno-analysis. The kits were tested with a cohort  
64 of 216 sera from 87 laboratory-confirmed COVID-19 patients, and 483 sera from SARS-CoV-2 negative  
65 or healthy individuals as negative controls. A standard receiver operating characteristic (ROC) analysis  
66 was conducted to evaluate the diagnostic accuracy. Using the kits, serum levels of IgA, IgM, and IgG  
67 were analyzed, in response to SARS-CoV-2 infection and COVID-19 pathogenesis.

68

### 69 Findings

70 The diagnostic kits based on the RBD antigen outperformed those based on the NP. RBD-specific IgA,  
71 IgM, and IgG detection kits showed sensitivities of 98.6%, 96.8%, and 96.8%, and specificities of 98.1%,  
72 92.3%, and 99.8%, respectively. In addition, using purified RBD-specific immunoglobulins from a  
73 serum pool of COVID-19 patients as standards, the serum concentrations of RBD-specific IgA, IgM, and  
74 IgG proteins were determined. The concentrations varied widely among different patients. Median  
75 concentration of IgA and IgM reached peaks at 16-20 days after illness onset at 8.84 µg/mL and 7.25  
76 µg/mL, respectively, while median concentration of IgG peaked during 21-25 days after illness onset at  
77 16.47 µg/mL. Furthermore, the serum IgA level positively correlates with COVID-19 severity.

78

### 79 Interpretation

80 Our immunoassay of measuring SARS-CoV-2 specific antibodies IgA, IgM, and IgG in serum provides  
81 a better serological testing with improved sensitivity and specificity. Data of IgA, IgM, and IgG responses  
82 in blood of COVID-19 patients may provide novel insight for the monitoring and treatments of COVID-  
83 19. The kits are also suitable for epidemiological studies and vaccine validations.

84

## 85 **Funding**

86 Tengchuan Jin received funding from the Strategic Priority Research Program of the Chinese Academy  
87 of Sciences (XDB29030104), a COVID-19 special task grant by Chinese Academy of Science Clinical  
88 Research Hospital (Hefei) with Grant No. YD2070002017. Huan Ma received a “new medical science”  
89 fund of USTC (WK2070000130).

90

## 91 **Research in context**

### 92 **Evidence before this study**

93 On April 13th, 2020, we searched PubMed and preprint depositories with the key words COVID-19,  
94 SARS-CoV-2, antibody, IgM, IgG, or IgA. Ten studies described serum antibody responses in COVID-  
95 19 patients; most of them only measured IgM and IgG. Only three of them tested IgA levels. Relationship  
96 of serum IgA and disease severity has not been reported. *The Lancet* published an article on April 4th  
97 2020, calling for “developing antibody tests for SARS-CoV-2”.

98

### 99 **Added value of this study**

100 We present serum profiles of IgA, IgM and IgG responses in a cohort of 87 COVID-19 patients. We  
101 found the RBD of the SARA-CoV-2 spike protein to be a better viral antigen than the nucleocapsid  
102 protein for diagnostic kits. IgA detection provides additional values for diagnosing and monitoring  
103 COVID-19. The combination of IgA/IgG or IgA/IgM/IgG provides improved diagnostic reliability as  
104 compared to conventional IgM/IgG combinations. In addition, we observed that IgA levels in serum  
105 correlate positively with COVID-19 severity.

106

### 107 **Implications of all the available evidence**

108 Highly sensitive and quantitative immunoassays to measure serum antibodies will improve clinical  
109 diagnosis and epidemiology study of COVID-19. It is of great interest that the serum IgA levels positively  
110 correlate with illness severity. Further studies on the role of IgA in disease progress are warranted.

111

## 112 **Introduction**

113 At the end of 2019, a novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV or SARS-CoV-2) emerged in Wuhan, Hubei  
114 Province in China, causing a new type of coronavirus disease now named as COVID-19.<sup>1</sup> The virus  
115 spread globally and became a public health emergency and pandemic declared by the World Health  
116 Organization.<sup>2</sup> The quickly determined genetic sequence and virologic studies indicate that it is an  
117 enveloped RNA virus belonging to the corona virus superfamily.<sup>3</sup> Among the seven coronaviruses known  
118 to cause human diseases, the severe acute respiratory syndrome (SARS) virus broke out in 2003<sup>4</sup> and  
119 Middle East Respiratory Syndrome (MERS) virus broke out in 2012<sup>5</sup>. COVID-19 which is pathologically  
120 related to but different from SARS is expected to cause great impact on human society since World War  
121 II.<sup>6</sup> Reliable and effective diagnostics of SARS-CoV-2 and treatment of COVID-19 are urgently needed.

122 Detections of SARS-CoV-2 viral RNA by methods such as RT-qPCR supplemented by CT imaging  
123 are the primary methods for clinical diagnosis of COVID-19.<sup>7, 8</sup> However, this method has inherent  
124 limitations. The difficulty to obtain high-quality and consistent throat swab samples, as well as the low  
125 viral load at the late stage of infection, are limiting factors in clinical practice. Both challenges result in

126 a sensitivity below 70%.<sup>9-13</sup> Therefore, there is an urgent need for more reliable and rapid diagnostic  
127 methods to screen SARS-CoV-2 infected people including those who do not have overt symptoms. A  
128 serological test of virus-induced antibody production has unique advantages in clinical diagnostics,  
129 especially for identifying people who acquired immunity against pathogens without noticeable  
130 symptoms.<sup>14</sup> When the virus invades host, the body produces large amounts of immunoglobulin (Ig) by  
131 the immune system and released into blood, among them, IgG, IgM, and IgA isotypes.<sup>15</sup> It has been  
132 widely believed that IgM is the first antibody to be transiently synthesized in response to the virus  
133 invasion.<sup>15</sup> IgG is a major class of immunoglobulins found in the blood, comprising 75% of total serum  
134 immunoglobulins and has long-term immunity and immunological memory.<sup>15, 16</sup> Therefore, a  
135 combination of IgM and IgG has been used in various serological tests for detecting infection of SARS-  
136 CoV-2 as previously used for SARS and other coronaviruses.<sup>10, 11, 14, 17-21</sup> In contrast, IgA, which is mainly  
137 produced in mucosal tissues to hinder virus invasion and replication but also detected in blood (~15% of  
138 total immunoglobulins in blood),<sup>22</sup> has not been widely used in serological tests for detecting coronavirus  
139 infection. IgA's production kinetics and roles in anti-viral immunity of IgA are even less known.  
140 Currently, only a few published studies reported diagnosis of COVID-19 by using ELISA or "flow  
141 immunoassay" for detection of serum IgM and IgG with limited accuracy,<sup>10, 11, 17-20</sup> although SARS-CoV-  
142 2 specific IgA in serum was also detected in recent papers or a preprint.<sup>12, 23, 24</sup> The kinetics of antibody  
143 responses in COVID-19 remains undefined, specifically for IgA production.

144 In this study, we designed and evaluated a set of sensitive and quantitative kits to measure serum IgA,  
145 IgM, and IgG for detection of SARS-CoV-2 infection. Comprehensive data of RBD specific IgA, IgG,  
146 and IgM antibody levels in 216 serum samples of 87 COVID-19 patients and 483 negative controls are  
147 presented.

148

## 149 **Methods**

### 150 **Patients and clinical samples**

151 This study was reviewed and approved by the Medical Ethical Committee of the First Affiliated  
152 Hospital of USTC (approval number: 2020-XG(H)-014) and the First Affiliated Hospital of Anhui  
153 Medical University (approval number: Quick-PJ 2020-04-16). Patient information is listed in  
154 **supplementary table 1.**

155 Confirmed COVID-19 cases and clinical classifications were defined according to the New  
156 Coronavirus Pneumonia Prevention and Control Program (7th edition) published by the National Health  
157 Commission of China. This study enrolls a total of 87 cases of confirmed COVID-19 patients, who were  
158 admitted to the First Affiliated Hospital of USTC Hospital or the First Affiliated Hospital of Anhui  
159 Medical University between Jan 26 and Mar 5, 2020. Their blood samples were collected during routine  
160 clinical testing. All enrolled cases were confirmed to be infected with SARS-CoV-2 by use of a standard  
161 RT-qPCR assay on throat swab samples from the respiratory tract. For all of the enrolled patients, the  
162 date of illness onset, clinical classifications of severity, RNA testing results during the hospitalization  
163 period, and the personal demographic information, were obtained from the clinical records.

164 Among them, five patients were admitted to the ICU, one was died of cerebral hemorrhage after stroke.  
165 Twenty-two patients had severe COVID-19, and all of whom required oxygen supplementation. Fifty-  
166 six patients had moderate and nine patients had mild COVID-19. The median age of patients was 48  
167 years (range 21–91), and the average age of patients was 47.4 years. Thirty seven (42.5%) patients had

168 underline illnesses; the most common one was hypertension in eighteen patients (20.7%). A total 216  
169 serum samples were taken from the 87 COVID-19 patients.

170 Negative controls and potentially interfering non-COVID-19 patient serum samples were collected in  
171 order to evaluate the reliability of the kits. This cohort contains 330 sera from obviously healthy people,  
172 fifteen sera from once suspected cases (RT-qPCR negative but had typical manifestation of pneumonia)  
173 and 138 sera from other patients with different underlying diseases. All sera were stored at -20 °C.

174

#### 175 **Molecular cloning, protein expression and purification**

176 The viral nucleocapsid protein (NP) was expressed and purified from *E. coli*. Briefly, special treatment  
177 during the addition of high salt in lysis buffer and a hydrophobic interaction column was used to  
178 completely remove non-specific nucleic acid contamination. Our final protein was homogeneous and  
179 free of nucleic acid contamination as revealed by gel filtration and UV-Vis spectrum.

180 To make recombinant SARS-CoV-2 RBD in mammalian cells, an IFNA1 signal peptide DNA  
181 sequence, and DNA sequences encoding receptor binding region of spike protein and a human IgG1 Fc  
182 were fused together and cloned into pTT5 vector. The constructed expression vector was used to  
183 transiently transfect human HEK293F cells by polyethylenimine. After three days of expression, fusion  
184 protein was purified from cell supernatant using a Protein A column.

185

#### 186 **Diagnostic kit preparation and testing**

187 Briefly, the purified NP or RBD viral antigens were coated to magnetic particles to catch SARS-CoV-  
188 2 specific IgA, IgM, and IgG in patient sera. Then a second antibody that recognizes IgA, IgM, or IgG is  
189 conjugated with acridinium (which can react with substrates to generate a strong chemiluminescence)  
190 was added for detection of IgA, IgM, and IgG, respectively. The detected chemiluminescent signal over  
191 background signal was calculated as relative light units (RLU). Serum samples were collected by  
192 centrifugation of whole blood in test tubes at room temperature for 15 min. Prior to testing, a denaturant  
193 solution was added to each serum to a final concentration of 1% TNBP, 1% Triton X-100. After adequate  
194 mixing by inverting, the samples were incubated at 30 °C for 4 hours to completely denature any potential  
195 viruses. Such solvent/detergent (1% TNBP + 1% Triton X-100) treatment is recommended by WHO  
196 guidelines on viral inactivation and removal procedures intended to assure the viral safety of human  
197 blood plasma products ([https://www.who.int/bloodproducts/publications/WHO\\_TRS\\_924\\_A4.pdf](https://www.who.int/bloodproducts/publications/WHO_TRS_924_A4.pdf))<sup>25</sup>.  
198 Virus deactivated serum samples were then diluted 40 times with dilution buffer and subjected to testing  
199 at room temperature. Then RLU was measured using a fully automatic chemical luminescent  
200 immunoanalyzer, Kaeser 1000 (Kangrun Biotech, Guangzhou, China).

201 SARS-CoV-2 RBD-specific IgA, IgM, and IgG antibodies were purified from a serum pool of  
202 recovering patients (a manuscript in preparation) to be used as standards. The concentrations were  
203 determined using Bradford method (using bovine serum albumin protein as a standard). These antibodies  
204 were used to make a standard curve for each antibody detection kits to quantify the absolute antibody  
205 amounts in serum.

206

#### 207 **Statistical analysis**

208 Based on the clinical RT-qPCR diagnosis results of SARS-CoV-2 infection, receiver operating  
209 characteristic (ROC) analysis was conducted using MedCalc software to determine the optimal cut-off  
210 value (criterion) and evaluate the diagnostic value of NP- or RBD-specific IgA, IgM, and IgG kits.

211 The specificity and sensitivity of the antibody kits were calculated according to the following formulas:

212 Specificity (%) =  $100 \times [\text{True negative} / (\text{True Negative} + \text{False Positive})]$ ;

213 Sensitivity (%) =  $100 \times [\text{True Positive} / (\text{True Positive} + \text{False Negative})]$ ;

214 Overall agreement (%) =  $(\text{True negative} + \text{True Positive}) / \text{Total tests}$ .

215 In order to analyze the correlation of serum antibody levels and age with disease severity, we first used  
216 the Kruskal Wallis test<sup>26</sup> to test if there is any significant difference of IgA among the three groups (Mild,  
217 Moderate, Severe). Then Dunn's test<sup>27</sup> was used to perform a pair-wise test between each group, and  
218 Benjamini-Hochberg procedure<sup>28</sup> was used to adjust p-values. All the above analyses use R software  
219 version 3.6.1<sup>29</sup>. A p value less than 0.05 was judged statistically significant.

220

## 221 Results

222 Highly purified SARS-CoV-2 NP and RBD proteins (supplementary figure 1) were employed to  
223 develop a series of serological test kits, to detect the presence of NP- and RBD-specific IgA, IgM, and  
224 IgG, respectively (hereinafter referred to as "NP kit" and "RBD kit"). A cohort of 216 sera from 87  
225 SARS-CoV-2 infected patients was tested with both NP and RBD kits, together with 20 sera from 20  
226 non-SARS-CoV-2 infected patients as negative controls initially. The NP kits for IgA, IgM, and IgG  
227 showed diagnostic sensitivities of 89.8%, 78.2%, and 95.8%, and specificities of 85.0%, 95.0%, and  
228 100% respectively (supplementary figure 2A-C). However, the RBD kits for detecting IgA, IgM, and  
229 IgG showed higher diagnostic sensitivities of 97.2%, 93.1%, and 96.8%, and specificities of 100%,  
230 90.0%, and 100%, respectively (supplementary figure 2D-F). We conclude that the RBD based kits  
231 provide a better diagnostic accuracy than those based on NP, and thereafter used RBD kits in further  
232 studies.

233 To further evaluate the diagnostic accuracy of the RBD-based antibody detection kits, 330 sera from  
234 healthy people, 138 interfering sera from non-SARS-CoV-2 infected patients with different underlying  
235 diseases, and 15 sera from once suspected cases (RT-qPCR negative but had typical pneumonia  
236 symptoms) were included as negative controls. All samples were measured using RBD-based IgA, IgM,  
237 and IgG kit, respectively. The testing results were shown in figure 1A-C. With few exceptions in patients  
238 with other diseases (see supplementary table 2 for details), our detection of antibodies binding to SARS-  
239 CoV-2 RBD viral antigen is highly specific as well as sensitive. Overall, RBD-based IgA, IgM, and IgG  
240 kits show sensitivities of 98.6%, 96.8%, and 96.8%, and specificities of 98.1%, 92.3%, and 99.8%,  
241 respectively (figure 1D-F). The sensitivities, specificities and overall agreements of the RBD based IgA,  
242 IgM, or IgG kit, and their combinations are also summarized in table 1. When combining the IgA and  
243 IgG kits, the sensitivity, specificity and overall agreement elevate to 99.1%, 100%, and 99.7%,  
244 respectively. This is much better than when IgM and IgG were combined. When IgA, IgM, or IgG  
245 individual kit was used, we observed a total of 9 (0.61% to 6.67%), 37 (5.54% to 40.0%), and 1 (0 to  
246 0.73%) false positive cases in the three types of "negative controls", respectively, as shown in  
247 supplementary table 2. IgA is second after IgG in yielding few false positive, but much better than IgM.  
248 Few false-positive IgA results were mainly found in non-COVID-19 patients who had pneumonia or  
249 other underlying diseases. Very few cases of RBD IgA and IgG positive results in 330 healthy individuals

250 and 153 non-COVID-19 patients also indicate that our RBD-based detection kits did not cross-interact  
251 with antibodies raised against other human coronaviruses presenting in ~15% of common cold cases and  
252 also causing pneumonia. Taken together, our detection systems are highly specific to SARS-CoV-2  
253 RBD.

254 We attempted to analyze the kinetics of all the three isotypes of antibodies when multiple serum  
255 samples were collected from individual patients. Data from nine patients were showed in supplementary  
256 figure 3. To better understand the trends of antibody levels detected in all the 87 COVID-19 patients  
257 (some of them contributed multiple samples), data of 216 sera samples were divided into 6 groups  
258 according to the time windows of collection after illness onset. As shown in table 2, at 4-10 days after  
259 symptom onset, the RBD IgA kit showed the highest positive diagnostic rate as 88.2% (15/17), which is  
260 76.4% (13/17) and 64.7% (11/17) for IgM and IgG kit, respectively. The 2 sera diagnosed as negative at  
261 the 4-10 days group by the IgA kit were collected at the 4th day after illness onset, which could be too  
262 soon for detecting viral-specific antibodies of any types. In the group of 11-41 days after symptom onset,  
263 both IgA and IgG kit showed the same positive diagnostic rate as 99.5% (198/199). In contrast, IgM kit  
264 somehow showed a relatively lower positive diagnostic rate as 98.5% (196/199). These results suggest  
265 that including IgA in a test kit would provide better diagnostic outcome. We also plotted the quantitative  
266 data of all the three antibody levels as a function of the time windows when sera were collected after  
267 illness onset (figure 2A).

268 Because the detection sensitivity would vary among IgA, IgM, and IgG due to different secondary  
269 antibodies used, we used highly purified RBD-specific IgA, IgM, and IgG proteins from pooled sera of  
270 COVID-19 patients as standards (standard curves were shown in supplementary figure 4). In this way,  
271 we can convert RLU measured for clinical samples into absolute antibody concentrations (amounts per  
272 mL). To simplify a plot from large numbers of samples, we only plotted median and interquartile range  
273 values of antibody concentrations as a function of time windows. As shown in figure 2B, the median  
274 concentration of IgA reached the highest (8.8 µg/mL) during 16 to 20 days after illness onset, and then  
275 began to decline but remained at about 3.6 µg/mL until 41 days. The median concentration of IgG was  
276 the lowest in early stages but raised at 15 days post illness onset. IgG concentration reached peak during  
277 21-25 days after illness onset as 16.5 µg/mL, and stayed at a relatively high concentration (11.4 µg/mL)  
278 until 41 days, suggesting that IgG is more suitable for later stage of COVID-19 diagnosis. Although IgM  
279 reached its peak at early stages, its detecting sensitivity is lower than that of IgA and IgG. Our data  
280 suggest that IgM has the lowest diagnostic power among the three types of antibodies for diagnosing  
281 SARS-CoV-2. Adding IgA into a diagnostic kit that contains IgG and IgM improves the serologic testing  
282 power at both early and late stages.

283 To explore if a simple laboratory test such as measuring antibody levels in serum could serve as a  
284 quantifiable indicator for COVID-19 severity, we divided the 87 patients into three severity groups based  
285 on established clinical classifications. Consistent with previous studies<sup>30</sup>, we found that disease severity  
286 is correlated positively with age in our cohort (supplementary figure 5). Patients with severe symptoms  
287 were significantly older (median age of 62.5) than those patients with moderate (median age of 46) and  
288 mild symptoms (median age of 30). Remarkably, we found that IgA concentrations in severe cases were  
289 significantly higher than mild or moderate cases (figure 3A). IgG levels in moderate and severe COVID-  
290 19 patients were also higher than mild cases ( $p < 0.0001$ ) (figure 3C). The observation that serum IgG  
291 levels were higher in severe and moderate than mild COVID-19 patients have been previously reported

292 <sup>10, 21</sup>. We also provided here a novel observation that serum IgA levels correlate with COVID-19 severity  
293 (figure 3A), how the levels and roles of different types of antibodies as related to COVID-19 severity  
294 remain to be determined.

295

## 296 **Discussion**

297 Compared to sampling of nasopharyngeal or throat swabs, blood extraction is more convenient and  
298 reliable. Furthermore, serum antibody test is more convenient, fast and accurate, and with other  
299 advantages over the detection of viral RNA.<sup>9, 17</sup> We report here an improved serological kit that can  
300 sensitively and quantitatively detect serum levels of IgA as well as IgM and IgG. Together with recent  
301 reports by others<sup>9-12, 17-20, 23, 24</sup>, the serological data that we obtained from 216 serum samples of 87  
302 COVID-19 patients and 483 negative controls provide valuable information for all of us to use in the  
303 coming months, for diagnostics, treatment, epidemiological studies and vaccine validations of COVID-  
304 19.

305

### 306 **RBD-based serologic kits is better than NP-based kits for detecting IgA as well as IgM and IgG**

307 The nucleocapsid protein (NP) is the most abundant protein in coronaviruses, which was reported to  
308 be highly immunogenic and often used as a diagnostic marker for coronaviruses such as SARS-CoV<sup>31</sup>.  
309 The RBD of the spike protein on viral surface is the ligand binding to the major host receptor ACE2;  
310 therefore RBD could be a main target for neutralization antibodies.<sup>32, 33</sup> In this study, we explored the  
311 possibility of using either NP or RBD as an immobilized antigen in for developing a clinical COVID-19  
312 diagnostic kit. Our data (supplementary figure 2) showed RBD-based diagnostic kits were better  
313 performed than that of NP in detecting all the three types of antibodies. A few previous studies reported  
314 that RBD-based IgM and IgG detection is better than NP once a comparison was made<sup>19, 23</sup>, and the  
315 measurement is agreeable with the titers measured by virus neutralization assays<sup>23, 24</sup>. We provided here  
316 the evidence that RBD as an immobilized antigen is also better than NP in detection serum IgA from  
317 COVID-19 patients. The exact mechanisms of difference between the use of two types of viral antigens  
318 remain to be resolved. It could be that the NP as a highly basic protein interacts with acidic residues in  
319 complementarity determining region in antibodies is less specific. It could also be due to the fact that the  
320 NP antigen is expressed in bacteria as most investigators do, and the RBD protein we used is expressed  
321 in a human cell line enabling critical glycosylation and high-affinity binding to antibodies raised in  
322 COVID-19 patients. Nonetheless, we showed that our serological kits based on SARS-CoV-2 spike  
323 protein RBD as an immobilized antigen provide a high sensitivity and specificity for detecting IgA, IgM,  
324 and IgG in a quantitative manner.

325

### 326 **Our serological kits have overall good performance**

327 Our kits have much higher accuracy than RT-qPCR (sensitivity less than 70%) for detecting viral  
328 RNA<sup>9-13</sup>, and published immune-assays such as “flow immunoassay” and ELISA in earlier studies<sup>10-12,  
329 17-21, 23, 24</sup>. When we combined RBD-specific IgA and IgG kits together, the sensitivity, specificity and  
330 overall agreement elevate to 99.1%, 100%, and 99.7%, respectively (table 1). In addition, this RBD-  
331 based detection kit may also help to screen and detect neutralization antibodies targeting SARS-CoV-2  
332 RBD, because this peptide domain is exposed on viral surface and functions as a ligand binding to the  
333 host cell surface receptor ACE2.



334

### 335 **Detection of three isotypes of SARS-CoV-2 induced antibodies**

336 Although one serum collected at the 4th day after illness onset was diagnosed as positive by our IgM  
337 kit (not IgA or IgG kits in this study), the IgM kit overall showed a lower diagnostic specificity of 92.3%  
338 compared to that of IgG and IgA (figure 1). IgM is known to have relatively lower affinity toward  
339 antigens compared with that of IgG or IgA. In addition, IgM often causes false positive signals as we  
340 also observed (supplemental table 2), due to its pentameric structure<sup>34</sup>. To the contrary, IgA or IgG  
341 antibody does not have this problem. Our RBD-specific IgG kit showed high specificity of 99.8% (figure  
342 1) but relatively low sensitivity of 96.8%. This is expected, because that most (6/7) false negative cases  
343 were samples collected at 4-10 days after illness onset when IgG production is likely very low.

344 Our RBD-based IgA kit showed high sensitivity and specificity of 98.6% and 98.1%, except two sera  
345 collected at the 4th day after illness onset. All other sera (2 at the 6th day, 3 at the 7th day, 1 at the 8th  
346 day, 6 at the 9th day, and 3 at 10th day after illness onset) were diagnosed as positive. Based on our  
347 results, IgA and IgM are produced nearly simultaneously in early stage of infection, while IgA test has  
348 less false positives. As a result, IgA should be included in a serological test, which may provide higher  
349 diagnostic accuracy for COVID-19. Therefore, we highly recommend the use of RBD-specific IgA/IgG  
350 or IgA/IgM/IgG combinational serological test supplementing nucleic acid detection to provide a more  
351 accurate diagnosis of COVID-19.

352

### 353 **Kinetics of antibody production during COVID-19**

354 We also provide a data set of absolute antibody levels and their production kinetics for all three  
355 isotypes of antibodies in serum. Our results revealed that both IgM and IgA have early responses (peaked  
356 around 20th day after illness onset), while IgG showed up later (peaked around 25th day after the onset).  
357 Rapid increase of the three isotypes of serum RBD-specific antibodies started at about 10 days after  
358 illness onset (supplementary figure 4A-C), which is consistent with other reports describing the trends  
359 of IgM and IgG levels in serum<sup>14-19</sup>. The early appearance of IgA in COVID-19 patients' sera is probably  
360 due to the initial infection of this virus at the respiratory system, which is rich of mucosal immune cells.  
361 Due to the low basal level of IgA in serum, it makes SARS-CoV-2 specific IgA detection highly sensitive  
362 at early stage of infection. When we analyzed IgA, IgM, or IgG concentrations in the patients' serum  
363 with different COVID-19 severity, we observed that disease severity is positively correlated with IgA  
364 antibody concentrations (figure 3A). The underlying mechanisms of this novel observation need to be  
365 further investigated in the future.

366

### 367 **Clinical implications of high-levels of virus-induced IgA in COVID-19**

368 We observed the presence of high-level of RBD-specific IgA in COVID-19 patients' sera. It is widely  
369 believed that mucosal plasma cells are a major production source of IgA, which is rapidly transported  
370 across adjacent epithelial barriers into external secretions. In normal situations, very little IgA enters the  
371 blood<sup>35</sup>. During infection, high-level of pathogen specific IgA has been reported in mucosal for EV-71<sup>2</sup>,  
372 influenza<sup>36</sup>, and SARS<sup>37</sup>, suggesting the importance of IgA in immune responses to viral infection. It has  
373 also been reported that IgA is present in serum of COVID-19 patients, although a small number of  
374 patients was involved and study on IgA detection was so far limited<sup>12, 23, 24</sup>.

375 IgA is traditionally recognized to play an anti-inflammatory role and prevent tissue damage at mucosal  
376 sites. However, recent reports also demonstrated that serum IgA is involved in the formation of immune  
377 complexes to amplify inflammatory responses.<sup>38</sup> Serum IgA induced proinflammatory cytokine  
378 production by macrophages, monocytes and Kupffer cells in non-mucosal tissues including liver, skin  
379 and peripheral blood.<sup>39</sup> In this study, we observed that IgA was present in COVID-19 patients' serum,  
380 and its levels positively correlated with COVID-19 severity (figure 3A). In our cohort, we also observed  
381 that IgG levels were associated with worse clinical outcomes (figure 3C), as previously described<sup>10, 21</sup>.  
382 The latter phenomena has been suggestive of possible antibody-dependent enhancement (ADE) of  
383 infection. The immunopathological effects of ADE have been observed in various viral infections,  
384 characterized as antibody-mediated enhancement of viral entry and induction of a severe inflammatory  
385 response.<sup>40</sup> It is unclear currently if IgA as well as IgG contributed directly (e.g. via ADE) or indirectly  
386 (e.g. leading to a pathogenic inflammatory storm<sup>41</sup>) to the worse clinical outcome in severe COVID-19  
387 patients. If a high-level of IgA indeed contributes to aggravations in COVID-19 severe patients, blocking  
388 of IgA-Fc alpha Receptor I (FcαRI, CD89, an IgA receptor) interaction could mitigate ADE or  
389 inflammatory storms, thus providing a novel treatment strategy.

390 While the exact origin of serum IgA after SARS-CoV-2 infection remains to be determined, we suspect  
391 that lung and gut are probable places of producing large-quantity of IgA by abundant mucosal immune  
392 cells at these sites. Interestingly, several reports are available on the detection of viral RNA in stool or  
393 anal swabs<sup>42, 43</sup>. In fact, abdomen abnormality/diarrhea is often complained from COVID-19 patients.<sup>43</sup>  
394 These observations suggest that gut may be an important place for anti-viral response to coronaviruses,  
395 and large amounts of secretory IgA could be detected in these mucosal tissues in addition to that in blood.

396

#### 397 **Weakness of this study**

398 The current study at the present form has several limitations. We used 216 serum samples from 87  
399 confirmed COVID-19 patients in this study, and serum samples were not available every day for each  
400 patient. The earliest collected serum is at the 4th day after self-reported illness onset, and the last one  
401 was collected at the 41th day after illness onset. There are only 17 cases of serum samples collected  
402 within the first 10 days after illness onset; consequently the accuracy of early diagnosis requires further  
403 verification using larger and controlled samples. Similarly, there were only 23 cases of serum samples  
404 taken after 30 days post illness onset, hampering an analysis of long-term antibody levels in recovered  
405 patients. Most patients enrolled in this study were with clinically moderate symptoms (56/87, 64.4%).  
406 There were 17 severe and five critical cases, respectively, accounting for 19.5% and 5.75% respectively.  
407 There were also few cases of COVID-19 patients whose symptoms remained mild and serum samples  
408 were collected during hospitalization. Therefore, this study of the correlation between antibody levels  
409 and disease severity needs further verification.

410 In summary, this study reports a novel sensitive and quantitative serological testing kit of detecting  
411 IgA as well as IgM and IgG, for the diagnostics of COVID-19. Due to its high specificity and sensitivity,  
412 this kit could sensitively and quantitatively measure levels of IgA in blood and other tissues. The  
413 serological study also provides valuable information for monitoring and understanding of COVID-19.

414

#### 415 **Acknowledgements**

416 We would like to thank the staff and patients at Department of Infectious Diseases, The First Affiliated  
417 Hospital of USTC for their support in providing samples and clinical data collection. We would also like  
418 to thank Profs. Jianping Weng and Tian Xue and other colleagues in Division of Life Sciences and  
419 Medicine for their generous and professional support. We would like to thank Prof. Yan Xiang at  
420 University of Texas Health Science Center at San Antonio for critical reading and comments on this  
421 manuscript. We would specially thank Prof. Peihui Wang at Shandong University for a plasmid  
422 expressing the SARS-CoV-2 spike protein.

423

#### 424 **Conflict of interest**

425 Dehua Jiang and Weihuang He are employees of Kangrun Biotech LTD (Guangzhou, China).  
426 Tengchuan Jin, Huan Ma, Weihong Zeng in USTC and Dehua Jiang have applied a joining patent related  
427 to the antibody detecting kits. Other authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest.

428

#### 429 **Author Contributions**

430 Tengchuan Jin, Yajuan Li and Xiaoling Ma provide funding, designed the study, participated in data  
431 analysis, and wrote the manuscript. Huan Ma, Weihong Zeng and Hongliang He designed the study,  
432 performed the majority of experiments, analyzed the data and drafted the manuscript. Other authors  
433 participated in the experiments and/or writing of the manuscript.

434

#### 435 **References**

- 436 1. WHO. Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) Situation Report – 47. 07 March 2020.  
437 <https://www.who.int/docs/default>.
- 438 2. Zhu N, Zhang D, Wang W, et al. A Novel Coronavirus from Patients with Pneumonia in China,  
439 2019. *N Engl J Med* 2020; **382**(8): 727-33.
- 440 3. Zheng YY, Ma YT, Zhang JY, Xie X. COVID-19 and the cardiovascular system. *Nat Rev Cardiol*  
441 2020. Published online Mar 5. doi: 10.1038/s41569-020-0360-5.
- 442 4. Ksiazek TG, Erdman D, Goldsmith CS, et al. A novel coronavirus associated with severe acute  
443 respiratory syndrome. *N Engl J Med* 2003; **348**(20): 1953-66.
- 444 5. Zaki AM, van Boheemen S, Bestebroer TM, Osterhaus AD, Fouchier RA. Isolation of a novel  
445 coronavirus from a man with pneumonia in Saudi Arabia. *N Engl J Med* 2012; **367**(19): 1814-20.
- 446 6. Bloomgarden ZT. Diabetes and COVID-19. *J Diabetes* 2020; **12**(4): 347-8.
- 447 7. Corman VM, Landt O, Kaiser M, et al. Detection of 2019 novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV) by real-  
448 time RT-PCR. *Euro Surveill* 2020; **25**(3), 2000045.
- 449 8. Huang C, Wang Y, Li X, et al. Clinical features of patients infected with 2019 novel coronavirus in  
450 Wuhan, China. *Lancet* 2020; **395**(10223): 497-506.
- 451 9. Tang Y-W, Schmitz JE, Persing DH, Stratton CW. The Laboratory Diagnosis of COVID-19  
452 Infection: Current Issues and Challenges. *Journal of Clinical Microbiology* 2020. Published online Apr  
453 3. doi: 10.1128/JCM.00512-20.
- 454 10. Zhao J, Yuan Q, Wang H, et al. Antibody responses to SARS-CoV-2 in patients of novel  
455 coronavirus disease 2019. *Clinical Infectious Diseases* 2020. Published online Mar 28. doi:  
456 10.1093/cid/ciaa344.

- 457 11. Liu L, Liu W, Wang S, Zheng S. A preliminary study on serological assay for severe acute  
458 respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) in 238 admitted hospital patients. *medRxiv preprint*  
459 *doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.03.06.20031856*.
- 460 12. Guo L, Ren L, Yang S, et al. Profiling early humoral response to diagnose novel coronavirus disease  
461 (COVID-19). *Clinical Infectious Diseases* 2020. Published online 2020 Mar 21. doi: 10.1093/cid/ciaa310.
- 462 13. Lin C, Xiang J, Yan M, Li H, Huang S, Shen C. Comparison of throat swabs and sputum specimens  
463 for viral nucleic acid detection in 52 cases of novel coronavirus (SARS-Cov-2) infected pneumonia  
464 (COVID-19). *medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.02.21.20026187*.
- 465 14. Woo PC, Lau SK, Wong BH, et al. Detection of specific antibodies to severe acute respiratory  
466 syndrome (SARS) coronavirus nucleocapsid protein for serodiagnosis of SARS coronavirus pneumonia.  
467 *Journal of clinical microbiology* 2004; **42**(5): 2306-9.
- 468 15. Schroeder Jr HW, Cavacini L. Structure and function of immunoglobulins. *Journal of Allergy and*  
469 *Clinical Immunology* 2010; **125**(2): S41-S52.
- 470 16. Boes M. Role of natural and immune IgM antibodies in immune responses. *Molecular immunology*  
471 2000; **37**(18): 1141-9.
- 472 17. Li Z, Yi Y, Luo X, et al. Development and Clinical Application of A Rapid IgM - IgG Combined  
473 Antibody Test for SARS-CoV-2 Infection Diagnosis. *Journal of medical virology* 2020. Published  
474 online Feb 27. doi: 10.1002/jmv.25727.
- 475 18. Zhang W, Du R-H, Li B, et al. Molecular and serological investigation of 2019-nCoV infected  
476 patients: implication of multiple shedding routes. *Emerging microbes & infections* 2020; **9**(1): 386-9.
- 477 19. To KK-W, Tsang OT-Y, Leung W-S, et al. Temporal profiles of viral load in posterior  
478 oropharyngeal saliva samples and serum antibody responses during infection by SARS-CoV-2: an  
479 observational cohort study. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases* 2020. Mar 23. pii: S1473-3099(20)30196-1.  
480 doi: 10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30196-1.
- 481 20. Long Q-x, Deng H-j, Chen J, et al. Antibody responses to SARS-CoV-2 in COVID-19 patients: the  
482 perspective application of serological tests in clinical practice. *medRxiv preprint doi:*  
483 *https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.03.18.20038018*.
- 484 21. Zhang B, Zhou X, Zhu C, et al. Immune phenotyping based on neutrophil-to-lymphocyte ratio and  
485 IgG predicts disease severity and outcome for patients with COVID-19. *medRxiv preprint doi:*  
486 *https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.03.12.20035048*.
- 487 22. Lamm ME. Interaction of antigens and antibodies at mucosal surfaces. *Annual review of*  
488 *microbiology* 1997; **51**(1): 311-40.
- 489 23. Okba NM, Muller MA, Li W, et al. SARS-CoV-2 specific antibody responses in COVID-19 patients.  
490 *medRxiv* 2020. *medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.03.18.20038059*.
- 491 24. Amanat F, Nguyen T, Chromikova V, et al. A serological assay to detect SARS-CoV-2  
492 seroconversion in humans. *medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.03.17.20037713*.
- 493 25. Hellstern P, Solheim BG. The Use of Solvent/Detergent Treatment in Pathogen Reduction of  
494 Plasma. *Transfus Med Hemother* 2011; **38**(1): 65-70.
- 495 26. Kruskal WH, Wallis WA. Use of ranks in one-criterion variance analysis. *Journal of the American*  
496 *statistical Association* 1952; **47**(260): 583-621.
- 497 27. Dunn OJ. Multiple Comparisons Using Rank Sums. *Technometrics* 1964; **6**(3): 241-252.

- 498 28. Hochberg Y, Benjamini Y. More Powerful Procedures for Multiple Significance Testing. *Stat Med*  
499 1990; **9**(7): 811-8.
- 500 29. Team RC. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical  
501 Computing, Vienna, Austria. 2019. <https://www.R-project.org/>.
- 502 30. Wolfel R, Corman VM, Guggemos W, et al. Virological assessment of hospitalized patients with  
503 COVID-2019. *Nature* 2020. Published online Apr 1. doi: 10.1038/s41586-020-2196-x.
- 504 31. Li Y-H, Li J, Liu X-E, et al. Detection of the nucleocapsid protein of severe acute respiratory  
505 syndrome coronavirus in serum: comparison with results of other viral markers. 2005; **130**(1-2): 45-50.
- 506 32. Yan R, Zhang Y, Li Y, Xia L, Guo Y, Zhou Q. Structural basis for the recognition of SARS-CoV-  
507 2 by full-length human ACE2. *Science* 2020; **367**(6485): 1444-8.
- 508 33. Lan J, Ge J, Yu J, et al. Structure of the SARS-CoV-2 spike receptor-binding domain bound to the  
509 ACE2 receptor. *Nature* 2020. Published online Mar 30. doi: 10.1038/s41586-020-2180-5.
- 510 34. Arnold JN, Wormald MR, Sim RB, Rudd PM, Dwek RA. The impact of glycosylation on the  
511 biological function and structure of human immunoglobulins. *Annual Review of Immunology*; 2007:  
512 21-50.
- 513 35. Delacroix DL, Dive C, Rambaud JC, Vaerman JP. IgA subclasses in various secretions and in serum.  
514 *Immunology* 1982; **47**(2): 383-5.
- 515 36. Grund S, Michel S, Barthuber C, Adams O. Serum and mucosal antibodies fail as prognostic  
516 markers during critical influenza A infection. *J Clin Virol* 2016; **74**: 32-6.
- 517 37. Wu LP, Wang NC, Chang YH, et al. Duration of antibody responses after severe acute respiratory  
518 syndrome. *Emerg Infect Dis* 2007; **13**(10): 1562-4.
- 519 38. Hansen IS, Baeten DLP, den Dunnen J. The inflammatory function of human IgA. *Cellular and*  
520 *molecular life sciences : CMLS* 2019; **76**(6): 1041-55.
- 521 39. Hansen IS, Hoepel W, Zaat SAJ, Baeten DLP, den Dunnen J. Serum IgA Immune Complexes  
522 Promote Proinflammatory Cytokine Production by Human Macrophages, Monocytes, and Kupffer Cells  
523 through Fc $\alpha$ RI-TLR Cross-Talk. *Journal of immunology* 2017; **199**(12): 4124-31.
- 524 40. Cao X. COVID-19: immunopathology and its implications for therapy. *Nature Reviews*  
525 *Immunology* 2020: 1-2.
- 526 41. Li G, Fan Y, Lai Y, et al. Coronavirus infections and immune responses. *Journal of medical*  
527 *virology* 2020; **92**(4): 424-32.
- 528 42. Holshue ML, DeBolt C, Lindquist S, et al. First Case of 2019 Novel Coronavirus in the United  
529 States. *New England Journal of Medicine* 2020; **382**(10): 929-36.
- 530 43. Guan WJ, Ni ZY, Hu Y, et al. Clinical Characteristics of Coronavirus Disease 2019 in China. *N*  
531 *Engl J Med* 2020. Apr 10. pii: S0163-4453(20)30170-5. doi: 10.1016/j.jinf.2020.03.041.
- 532
- 533
- 534

535 **Tables**

536 **Table 1.** Comparisons of sensitivity, specificity and overall agreements of RBD-based IgA, IgM, and  
537 IgG detection kits and their combinations for diagnosing SARS-CoV-2.

538

Antibody type	Sensitivity		Specificity		Overall agreement	
	%	n/total	%	n/total	%	n/total
IgA	98.6	213/216	98.1	474/483	98.3	687/699
IgM	96.8	209/216	92.3	446/483	93.7	655/699
IgG	96.8	209/216	99.8	482/483	98.9	691/699
IgA and IgM	95.8	207/216	90.7	438/483	92.3	645/699
IgA and IgG	96.3	208/216	97.9	473/483	97.4	681/699
IgM and IgG	94.9	205/216	92.1	445/483	93.0	650/699
IgA and IgM and IgG	94.4	204/216	90.5	437/483	91.7	641/699
IgA or IgM	99.5	215/216	99.8	482/483	99.7	697/699
IgA or IgG	99.1	214/216	100	483/483	99.7	697/699
IgM or IgG	98.6	213/216	100	483/483	99.6	696/699
IgA or IgM or IgG	99.5	215/216	100	483/483	99.9	698/699

539

540

541

542 **Table 2.** Sensitivity of RBD-based IgA, IgM, and IgG detection kits in serum samples obtained at  
543 different periods after illness onset.

Days after illness onset	Positive serum samples diagnosed by RBD-based kits					
	IgA		IgM		IgG	
	%	n	%	n	%	n
4-10	88.24	15/17	76.47	13/17	64.71	11/17
11-15	100	30/30	100	30/30	96.67	29/30
16-20	100	55/55	100	55/55	100	55/55
21-25	98.21	55/56	100	56/56	100	56/56
26-30	100	35/35	100	35/35	100	35/35
31-41	100	23/23	86.96	20/23	100	23/23

544

545 **Figure legends**







546 **Figure 1.** Detection results and analyses of RBD-specific IgA, IgM, and IgG kits. Testing results of  
547 RBD-specific IgA (A), IgM (B), and IgG (C) kits using 330 sera from healthy people, 138 interfering  
548 sera from other patients with different diseases, 15 sera of once-suspected pneumonia patients that were  
549 tested negative for SRAS-CoV-2, and 216 sera of 87 qPCR-confirmed COVID-19 patients. RLU: relative  
550 light units. Black bar indicates median values. D-F: The receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curve  
551 analysis for SARS-CoV-2 diagnosis by RBD-specific IgA, IgM or IgG kit (D, E and F, respectively)  
552 using 483 sera of SARS-CoV-2 negative individuals and 216 sera of SARS-CoV-2 infected patients.  
553 AUC, area under the curve of ROC.

554



555 **Figure 2.** The kinetics of anti-RBD IgA, IgM, and IgG levels in sera of COVID-19 patients at different  
556 time windows. The median values of RLU (A) or calculated antibody mass concentrations (B) were  
557 plotted for each isotypes of three antibodies, IgA (red), IgM (green), and IgG (blue). Bars indicate  
558 interquartile ranges.



559

560 **Figure 3.** Serum antibody levels in three distinct severity groups of COVID-19 patients; mild: 25 sera  
561 from 9 patients; moderate: 135 sera from 56 patients; and severe: 56 sera from 22 patients (see methods  
562 for clinical classifications and supplemental Figure 5 for age distributions). Antibody levels in serum  
563 samples were collected from confirmed patients at 4 - 41 days post illness onset and presented as scatter  
564 plots. For IgA (A), levels in mild, moderate and severe patients were sequentially increased (p values  
565 indicated). Results for IgM are shown in B. For IgG (C), levels in moderate and severe patients were  
566 significantly higher than mild patients.





**A****B**

**A****B****C**