

1 **Detection of Nucleocapsid Antibody to SARS-CoV-2 is More Sensitive than Antibody to**
2 **Spike Protein in COVID-19 Patients**

3

4 Peter D. Burbelo,¹ Francis X. Riedo,² Chihiro Morishima,³ Stephen Rawlings,⁴ Davey
5 Smith,⁴ Sanchita Das,⁵ Jeffrey R. Strich,⁶ Daniel S. Chertow,⁶ Richard T. Davey, Jr.,⁷
6 and Jeffrey I. Cohen^{8*}

7

8 ¹National Institute of Dental and Craniofacial Research, National Institutes of Health,
9 Bethesda, Maryland

10 ²Medical Director Infection Control and Prevention, EvergreenHealth, Kirkland, Washington

11 ³Department of Laboratory Medicine, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington

12 ⁴Division of Infectious Diseases and Global Public Health, San Diego Center for AIDS Research
13 (CFAR), University of California San Diego, San Diego, California

14 ⁵ Department of Laboratory Medicine, Clinical Center, National Institutes of Health,
15 Bethesda, Maryland

16 ⁶Critical Care Medicine Department, Clinical Center, National Institutes of Health,
17 Bethesda, Maryland

18 ⁷Laboratory of Immunoregulation, National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases,
19 National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, Maryland

20 ⁸Laboratory of Infectious Diseases, National Institute of Allergy and Infectious
21 Diseases, National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, Maryland

22 **Running title: Analysis of SARS-CoV-2 N and S antibodies**

23

24 **Footnotes**

25 *Financial support.* This work was supported by the intramural research programs of the National
26 Institute of Dental and Craniofacial Research, the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious
27 Diseases, and the National Institute of Health Clinical Center.

28

29 Potential conflicts of interest. All authors: No reported conflicts of interest.

30

31 Correspondence to: Jeffrey I. Cohen, Bldg., 50, Room 6134, 50 South Drive, MSC8007,
32 National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, MD 20892-8007, Phone: 301-496-5265, e-mail:
33 jcohen@niaid.nih.gov, FAX : 301-480-3619

34

35 Word count text: 3,470

36

37 Abstract word count: 198

38

39 **ABSTRACT**

40 **Background:** SARS-CoV-2, the cause of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19), is associated
41 with respiratory-related morbidity and mortality. Assays to detect virus-specific antibodies are
42 important to understand the prevalence of infection and the course of the immune response.

43 **Methodology:** Quantitative measurements of plasma or serum antibodies by luciferase
44 immunoprecipitation assay systems (LIPS) to the nucleocapsid and spike proteins were analyzed
45 in 100 cross-sectional or longitudinal samples from SARS-CoV-2-infected patients. A subset of
46 samples was tested with and without heat inactivation.

47 **Results:** Fifteen or more days after symptom onset, antibodies against SARS-CoV-2
48 nucleocapsid protein showed 100% sensitivity and 100% specificity, while antibodies to spike
49 protein were detected with 91% sensitivity and 100% specificity. Neither antibody levels nor the
50 rate of seropositivity were significantly reduced by heat inactivation of samples. Analysis of
51 daily samples from six patients with COVID-19 showed anti-nucleocapsid and spike antibodies
52 appearing between day 8 to day 14 after initial symptoms. Immunocompromised patients
53 generally had a delayed antibody response to SARS-CoV-2 compared to immunocompetent
54 patients.

55 **Conclusions:** Antibody to the nucleocapsid protein of SARS-CoV-2 is more sensitive than
56 spike protein antibody for detecting early infection. Analyzing heat-inactivated samples by LIPS
57 is a safe and sensitive method for detecting SARS-CoV-2 antibodies.

58

59 Keywords: COVID-19; SARS-CoV-2; coronavirus; serology

60

61

62 Infections with severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) causing
63 coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19), were first reported in China [1-4]. The major clinical
64 feature of COVID-19 SARS-CoV-2 is virus-associated pneumonitis [5-7]. Unlike other highly
65 pathogenic coronaviruses such as SARS/SARS-CoV-1 and Middle East respiratory syndrome
66 coronavirus (MERS-CoV) [8], SARS-CoV-2 spreads more rapidly and reached six of the seven
67 continents, including North America [9], within three months of the initial outbreak. Nucleic
68 acid-based testing of oropharyngeal or nasopharyngeal swabs and saliva is useful for diagnosing
69 acute infection. SARS-CoV-2 virus RNA can often be detected in upper respiratory secretions at
70 the time of the first appearance of symptoms, peaks during the first week, and later declines with
71 time [10, 11]. RNA from SARS-CoV-2, like the related SARS-CoV-1 [12], can also be detected
72 in blood [11, 13], and high levels of circulating viral RNA are associated with more severe
73 disease [13].

74 Assessment of the antibody response to SARS-CoV-2 should complement the RNA-
75 based tests and improve our understanding of the disease course, contribute to epidemiological
76 studies and inform vaccine development. Antibodies to the nucleocapsid protein are the most
77 sensitive target for serologic diagnosis of infection with SARS-CoV-1 [14, 15]. Antibodies
78 against the spike protein of SARS-CoV-1, the target of neutralizing antibody and vaccine
79 development, emerge at a later time than those against the nucleocapsid protein. Recently,
80 several groups have reported serological diagnostic tests using the nucleocapsid and/or spike
81 protein from SARS-CoV-2 by ELISA [11, 16, 17], immunofluorescence [18] and even a lateral
82 flow test [19]. One study that used ELISA to measure only antibodies to the nucleocapsid
83 protein found that patients become seropositive 10-18 days after the onset of symptoms [16]. A
84 commercial ELISA using the spike protein demonstrated that IgG antibodies were detectable at a

85 median of 14 days after onset of symptoms [17]. To et al. examined antibodies against both the
86 spike and nucleocapsid by ELISA in a small number of samples and found that IgG antibodies
87 against the nucleocapsid protein were generally detectable at about the same time as antibodies
88 to the spike protein [11]. Despite these findings, further studies are needed to better understand
89 antibody dynamics in persons infected with SARS-CoV-2 to determine the most sensitive and
90 specific antibody assays, and to use these antibody-based tests to determine seroprevalence in
91 different populations. In addition, it is currently unknown whether the viral RNA that has been
92 detected in the blood [11, 13] indicates the presence of infectious virus, but this has the potential
93 to be a safety hazard for health care workers, clinical laboratory technicians and researchers
94 analyzing serology in persons infected with SARS-CoV-2. Thus, a sensitive and specific
95 antibody assay using heat treated plasma or serum may enhance safety when working with these
96 fluids.

97 We and others have employed a liquid phase immunoassay technology termed Luciferase
98 Immunoprecipitation Systems (LIPS) to measure antibodies against many different viruses, to
99 stratify infected patients based on the level of their antibodies, and for virus discovery [20].
100 LIPS has shown promise for detecting antibodies against coronaviruses including the
101 nucleocapsid of MERS-CoV [21] and the spike protein of swine acute diarrhea syndrome
102 coronavirus (SADS-CoV) [22]. Unlike ELISA, which is solid phase, LIPS is performed in
103 solution, thus maintaining the native antigen conformation. The antigen is produced in
104 mammalian cells and often retains post-translational modifications of the antigen, unlike
105 bacterial recombinant proteins or peptide based ELISAs. LIPS assays typically have a dynamic
106 range up to 6 log₁₀ for some antigens and require < 5 ul of plasma or sera for testing. Here
107 recombinant nucleocapsid and spike protein from SARS-CoV-2 as antigens in LIPS assays were

108 used to measure antibodies in patients with COVID-19 from four geographically disparate
109 locations across the United States. The LIPS assay showed high sensitivity and specificity for
110 detecting SARS-CoV-2 antibodies and demonstrated that nucleocapsid antibodies emerge before
111 spike antibodies. Moreover, as there are potential safety issues related to the presence of SARS-
112 CoV-2 RNA in blood, we show that heat inactivation of plasma at 56°C for 30 min does not
113 significantly reduce the sensitivity of the LIPS assay and thus allows testing to be performed
114 more safely.

115 **METHODS**

116 **Characteristics of the patients with COVID-19**

117 This retrospective study analyzed both cross-sectional and longitudinal blood samples collected
118 from patients with COVID-19 or controls from four clinical sites. Anonymized plasma or serum
119 from patients from University of California, San Diego (UCSD, n=3), University of Washington,
120 Seattle (UW, n=17), EvergreenHealth, Kirkland, Washington (EH, n=23) (**Table 1**) were
121 obtained under an IRB exemption. Plasma from patients at the NIH Clinical Center, NIH (n=6)
122 were obtained under a protocol approved by the IRB of the NIH Intramural Research Program;
123 all patients signed consent. Additional anonymized blood bank donor controls (n=32) collected
124 at the NIH Clinical Center prior to 2018 were used as uninfected controls for serological testing.
125 The time interval between the initial symptoms and obtaining plasma/serum samples from PCR+
126 confirmed cases was variable and ranged from 2 to 50 days. SARS-CoV2 infection was
127 confirmed in each case by reverse transcriptase PCR detection of viral RNA from nasal and/or
128 throat swabs performed at clinical laboratories associated with each location. Thirteen patients
129 from the UW, 13 of 23 subjects from the outbreak at EH (including the nursing home and family
130 members of health workers), 3 patients from the UCSD (two samples from each), and 6 patients

131 from the NIH Clinical Center, Bethesda, MD were confirmed positive for SARS-CoV-2 RNA. In
132 the case of the NIH samples, serial daily blood drawn samples (n=68) were available covering 0-
133 20 days from symptom onset.

134 **Storage and Heat Inactivation**

135 Plasma/serum samples were collected and stored frozen at -80° C, except for the heat-inactivated
136 samples from the NIH that were not previously frozen. In light of previous studies that showed a
137 marked loss in infectivity of SARS-CoV-1 [23] and MERS [24] coronaviruses with heating, we
138 adopted a precautionary safety protocol performed before analysis. An aliquot of plasma/serum
139 from each patient sample was first incubated at 56° C for 30 min and then used for testing as
140 described below.

141

142 **Luciferase Immunoprecipitation Systems (LIPS) for Measurement of SARS-CoV-2**

143 **Antibodies**

144 LIPS assays, in which viral proteins fused to light-emitting luciferase are immunoprecipitated,
145 were essentially performed as described [25]. A plasmid expressing the nucleocapsid of SARS-
146 CoV-2 (amino acids 1-417 of GenBank MN908947) was generated as a synthetic DNA (Twist
147 Biosciences) and cloned into the pREN2 eukaryotic expression vector as C-terminal *Renilla*
148 luciferase fusion protein. A plasmid expressing the spike protein of SARS-CoV-2 (amino acids
149 1-538 of GenBank MN908947) was generated by PCR from a plasmid containing a prefusion
150 form of the spike protein (2019-nCoV-2_S-2P [26]) and produced as a N-terminal fusion protein
151 in the pGAUS3 vector for expression as a *Gaussia* luciferase fusion protein. The resulting
152 plasmid was termed pGAUS3-Spike. A second spike construct, pGAUS3-Spike-Δ2 (amino
153 acids 1-513) was also constructed in the pGAUS3 vector in the same way. Preliminary tests

154 comparing antibody detection using pGAUS3-Spike- Δ 2 and pGAUS3-Spike showed similar
155 results and the former construct was not used further.

156 Nucleocapsid and spike protein-light emitting plasmid constructs were transfected into
157 Cos1 cells with Fugene-6 and lysates were harvested 48 hours later to obtain crude cell extracts.
158 For testing, heat-inactivated serum or plasma samples were diluted 1:10 in assay buffer A
159 (20 mM Tris, pH 7.5, 150 mM NaCl, 5 mM MgCl₂, 1% Triton X-100) and 10 μ l of the diluted
160 sample were then tested in a 96-well microtiter plate as described [25]. After incubation at room
161 temperature for one hour, the mixture was transferred to a microtiter filter plate containing
162 protein A/G beads and incubated for one hour. The antibody-antigen-bead complexes were then
163 washed eight times with buffer A and twice with PBS on a microtiter filter plate to remove
164 unbound antigens. After the final wash coelenterazine substrate (Promega) was added to detect
165 *Renilla* luciferase and *Gaussia* reporter activity and light units (LU) were measured in a Berthold
166 LB 960 Centro microplate luminometer (Berthold Technologies, Bad Wildbad).

167 Antibody levels were reported as the geometric mean level (GML) with 95% confidence
168 interval (CI). Cut-off limits for determining positive antibodies in the SARS-CoV-2-infected
169 samples were based on the mean plus three standard deviations of the serum values derived from
170 the 32 uninfected blood donor controls or by receiver operator characteristics (ROC) analysis.
171 For some of the data percentages for categorical variables, mean and range, geometric mean plus
172 95% CI were used to describe the data. Wilcoxon signed rank were used for statistical analysis.

173

174 **RESULTS**

175 **Characteristics of the patients with COVID-19**

176 Patients with COVID-19 were located in four geographically distinct locations across the United
177 States and included 35 SARS-CoV-2 cases confirmed by PCR, 10 subjects with COVID-19-like
178 symptoms or household contacts of persons with COVID-19 (not tested by PCR), and 32 blood
179 donors who donated samples before 2018 used as controls (Table 1). The majority of the SARS-
180 CoV-2 PCR-confirmed cases were male (87%) and the median age was 44 years (range, 32-50
181 years). A subset of the SARS-CoV-2 PCR-confirmed cases had one or more risk factors
182 including heart disease, lung disease, diabetes, and/or they were immunocompromised. Two
183 different plasma samples, drawn 2-3 days apart, were available for each of the three COVID-19
184 cases from the UCSD and multiple daily samples were available from the NIH patients with
185 COVID-19. Combining the cross-sectional and longitudinal studies resulted in 100 samples
186 from PCR+ patients.

187

188 **Detection of Antibodies to the Nucleocapsid Protein of SARS-CoV-2 is More Sensitive than** 189 **Antibodies to the Spike Protein in COVID-19 Patients**

190 LIPS assays for detecting antibodies were developed using SARS-CoV-2 nucleocapsid and spike
191 antigens produced in mammalian cells. Pilot experiments using nucleocapsid-*Renilla* luciferase
192 and spike protein-*Gaussia* luciferase fusion proteins were conducted with serum or plasma from
193 blood donor controls collected prior to 2018. Results showed a low background with little or no
194 antibody immunoreactivity against the spike protein, but there was a higher background
195 immunoreactivity against the nucleocapsid (**data not shown**). Based on the need to develop a
196 highly specific SARS-CoV-2 LIPS serological test without potential false positives, stringent
197 cut-off values from the blood donor controls were assigned based on statistical methods and/or
198 ROC. From this analysis, cut-off values for the nucleocapsid and spike proteins were derived

199 from the mean plus four standard deviations (125,000 LU) and the mean plus three standard
200 deviations (45,000 LU) of the blood donor controls, respectively.

201 Using these cut-off values, plasma or serum samples from the COVID-19 cohort were
202 evaluated by LIPS assay for antibodies against the nucleocapsid or spike protein. For safety
203 reasons, all samples used for this analysis were heated at 56°C for 30 min to reduce the
204 likelihood of having infectious virus in the samples. Coded plasma or serum samples from
205 suspected COVID-19 cases from EH were then tested as well as noncoded pre-2018 blood
206 donors, and SARS-CoV-2 PCR-positive cases from the UCSD, UW, EH, and the NIH Clinical
207 Center (NIH). A wide dynamic range of antibody levels against the nucleocapsid and spike
208 protein were observed differing by up to 100-fold between samples (**Figure 1**). In order to
209 compare the sensitivity of the nucleocapsid and spike LIPS assays, a minimum interval of >14
210 days between onset of symptoms and time of blood collection was used to determine the number
211 of seropositive serum or plasma samples in the SARS-CoV-2 PCR-positive group. Among the
212 PCR+ patient samples collected >14 days after onset of symptoms (**Figure 1, black dots**),
213 seropositive nucleocapsid antibodies were detected in 4/4 patients from UW, 7/7 from EH, and
214 32/32 serial samples from the six NIH patients, yielding both a sensitivity and specificity of
215 100%. A similar analysis of the spike antibody in samples collected >14 days after onset of
216 symptoms showed a slightly lower sensitivity of 91% (32/35) with 100% specificity, where 4/4
217 patients from UW, 6/7 from EH, and 22/24 from NIH were seropositive.

218 Evaluation of samples collected at ≤ 14 days after onset of symptoms showed reduced
219 sensitivity, but specificity was maintained. The sensitivity for antibody to the nucleocapsid
220 protein at this time point was 51% (33/65) with antibodies detected in 1/6 samples from UCSD,
221 5/9 from UW, 3/6 from EH and 24/44 from NIH (**Figure 1, orange dots**). Analysis of spike

222 antibodies of samples collected at ≤ 14 days after onset of symptoms showed a sensitivity of 43%
223 (28/65) with antibody detected in 0/6 samples from UCSD, 4/9 samples from UW, 2/6 from EH
224 and 22/44 from NIH. Taken together, our findings indicate that detection of antibodies against
225 the nucleocapsid protein is more sensitive than detection of antibodies against the spike protein,
226 and that nucleocapsid antibodies generally appear earlier than spike antibodies.

227 In addition to the SARS-CoV-2 PCR-confirmed patients, suspected cases of COVID-19
228 from EH were also analyzed for seropositivity. Nine of the ten suspected cases without viral PCR
229 confirmation, that showed symptoms compatible with COVID-19 collected between January and
230 February 2020, were seronegative for both nucleocapsid and spike antibodies (**Figure 1**).
231 Interestingly, one case from March 2020 from a person who was a household contact with a
232 SARS-CoV-2 PCR+ patient, was seropositive for both nucleocapsid and spike antibodies.

233 Since there is interest in using serological assays to assess current and historical
234 infections, we evaluated the robustness of the LIPS assay for detecting SARS-CoV-2 antibodies
235 by analyzing the level of antibodies in all PCR-confirmed samples collected more than 14 days
236 after symptom onset. The geometric mean level (GML) of nucleocapsid antibody levels in the 35
237 seropositive samples was 694,600 (95% CI, 570,000-844,600 LU), which was approximately 32
238 times higher than the GML of the blood donor controls of 21,356 LU (95% CI, 17,032-
239 26,752). Antibodies against spike protein showed a similar discriminatory potential for the
240 seropositive samples with GML of 346,800 LU (95% CI, 218,800-550,000 LU), which was
241 approximately 21 times higher than the blood donor controls with 16,843 LU (95% CI, 14,172-
242 20,007 LU). These findings indicate that the LIPS assays for antibodies to nucleocapsid and
243 spike protein are robust and should be useful to evaluate the prevalence of infection with
244 SARS-CoV-2.

245

246 **Time course of the appearance of serum antibodies against SARS-CoV-2 differs in**
247 **immunocompetent and immunocompromised patients**

248 To understand the timing and trajectory of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies against nucleocapsid and
249 spike proteins, serial daily blood samples from the six NIH patients with COVID-19 were
250 studied. In all six subjects, SARS-CoV-2 antibody levels rose with time in both the three
251 immunocompetent (**Figure 2A**, NIH patients 1-3) and three immunocompromised patients
252 (**Figure 2B**, NIH patients 4-6). These latter three patients had chronic lymphocytic leukemia,
253 metastatic chordoma, or had received a hematopoietic stem-cell transplant. All three
254 immunocompetent COVID-19 patients showed a rapid rise in antibody to nucleocapsid and
255 began within 10 days of symptom onset in 2 patients (no samples were available before day 11
256 for the third patient, **Figure 2A**). Antibodies against the spike protein in these three
257 immunocompetent patients generally tracked with the nucleocapsid antibodies, but in one case
258 seropositivity appeared 2 days later than nucleocapsid antibody. The third patient, NIH-3, with a
259 history of hypertension and heart disease died of cardiovascular shock and hypoxemia 13 days
260 after onset of symptoms.

261 Antibody profiles in the three immunocompromised NIH patients showed more blunted
262 responses against the SARS-CoV-2 antigens (**Figure 2B**). Patient NIH-4 became seropositive
263 for both nucleocapsid and spike antibodies on day 14 and these antibodies then plateaued at these
264 low levels for the next seven days. Similarly, patient NIH-5 did not become seropositive until
265 day 13 for spike antibody and day 14 for nucleocapsid antibody. Patient NIH-6 was both PCR+
266 for SARS-CoV-2 and seropositive on the day of symptoms, suggesting that he had an
267 asymptomatic infection for several days before diagnosis. Despite the blunted antibody

268 response, none of the immunocompromised patients died. Overall, the results with this small
269 group of patients suggests that immunocompromised patients generally have a more attenuated
270 and/or delayed antibody response to SARS-CoV-2 than immunocompetent patients.

271

272 **Heat inactivation of plasma minimally impacts detection of antibody to SARS-CoV-2 in the** 273 **LIPS assay**

274 While heating plasma to 56° C for 30 min has been shown to reduce the titer of human
275 coronaviruses, heating might reduce or eliminate IgM and IgG responses [27]. Therefore, we
276 performed LIPS assays on a subset of the patients with COVID-19 from the known or suspected
277 cases (N=38) with and without heat inactivation, to evaluate its impact on nucleocapsid antibody
278 levels and seropositivity status. Evaluation of antibody responses in heated versus unheated
279 plasma samples showed that antibody levels were mostly unchanged (**Figure 3**). In a single
280 sample from one patient with COVID-19, antibody to SARS-CoV-2 was not detected after heat-
281 inactivation. Of note, this sample came from an NIH patient with COVID-19 who was antibody
282 positive at day 7 using non-heated plasma and became seropositive using heat-inactivated plasma
283 from day 8. Statistical analysis showed no significant difference in antibody levels between
284 plasma that was heated or unheated (Wilcoxon Signed rank test) and the values were highly
285 correlative ($R_s=0.913$; $P<0.0001$). These findings indicate that the heat-inactivation process is
286 diagnostically suitable for testing of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies by LIPS.

287

288 **DISCUSSION**

289 We used a fluid-phase LIPS assay to investigate antibodies to the SARS-CoV-2
290 nucleocapsid and spike protein in COVID-19 patients after infection. The LIPS assay
291 demonstrated high sensitivity and a wider dynamic range for antibody detection compared to

292 other published assays [11, 16-19]. An analysis of longitudinal plasma samples showed that
293 antibodies against the nucleocapsid and spike proteins appeared about the same time between
294 day 8 and day14 after the onset of symptoms. Only one study to date has examined antibodies
295 separately against the nucleocapsid protein and spike protein [11] and our findings are in general
296 agreement. COVID-19 patient plasma samples obtained ≥ 14 days after symptom onset showed
297 that the LIPS assay for antibodies against the nucleocapsid and spike protein had 100% and 94%
298 sensitivity, respectively, with 100% specificity for both antibodies. Additional studies using this
299 high-throughput, highly quantitative LIPS assay may also help determine whether the relative
300 levels of antibodies observed in convalescent COVID-19 patients or uninfected vaccinated
301 persons correlate with prevention of reinfection or primary infection, respectively. Quantitative
302 antibody profiles will be useful in determining antibody decay over time. It is known that for
303 some viral infections there is long-lasting antibody responses and protection from infection, but
304 for others antibody levels wane at faster rates [28]. Following humoral response profiles of
305 natural infection from convalescent COVID-19 cases over time should provide important
306 insights into the half-life of these antibodies.

307 Using the quantitative LIPS assay, our studies with serial patient samples from the NIH
308 cohort showed the temporal relationship between antibody dynamics with onset of symptoms
309 and PCR positivity for SARS-CoV-2. Cut-off values for a positive result was based on pre-2018
310 blood donors and may underestimate the number of seropositive persons because some
311 individual patients showed low antibody values initially that gradually rose before exceeding the
312 cut-off value. Nevertheless, all three of the immunocompetent COVID-19 patients showed rapid
313 seroconversion within 10 days of onset of symptoms for antibody to the nucleocapsid protein and
314 robust, but slightly delayed for antibody to the spike proteins. In contrast, the

315 immunocompromised NIH patients exhibited a slower rise in antibody levels with a plateau at
316 lower levels compared to the immunocompetent patients, and two patients did not become
317 seropositive until 14 days after onset of symptoms. Nonetheless, the immunocompromised
318 patients had a favorable clinical outcome. The NIH patient who died (NIH-3) was not
319 immunocompromised and had a rapid rise in antibody production reaching levels comparable to
320 the other immunocompetent patients. In addition, one of the two EH patients who died showed
321 the highest antibody levels in that cohort of patients. While excessive proinflammatory responses
322 to the virus have been reported to contribute to poor outcomes [29-31], larger studies of COVID-
323 19 patients are required to determine whether antibody levels directly correlate with disease
324 severity.

325 Prior studies have shown high levels of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in blood from patients with
326 COVID-19 [1, 4]. At present, it is not certain whether infectious virus might be circulating in the
327 blood early during infection. Accordingly, we heated plasma or serum to 56°C for 30 min to
328 reduce the titer of SARS-CoV-2 before performing the LIPS assays, since prior studies have
329 shown a marked loss in infectivity of SARS-CoV-1 [23, 32] and MERS [24] coronaviruses with
330 heat treatment. While impaired detection of viral IgM and IgG antibody responses to viruses
331 after heating samples to 56°C has been reported [27], and several abstracts report similar findings
332 with SARS-CoV-2 samples, our direct comparison of untreated and treated samples found high
333 concordance of the antibody values revealing the suitability of heat inactivation. This
334 inactivation protocol may be useful to enhance safety when studying highly infectious saliva
335 from COVID-19 patients [11] for IgG and IgA antibodies. Further modification of LIPS assays
336 for detection of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies, including the use of different protein fragments, full-
337 length spike protein, and/or different luciferase reporters, may further improve assay

338 performance. Nonetheless, our current assay provides highly quantitative results with a high
339 degree of sensitivity and specificity and should be useful for larger seroepidemiologic studies.

340

341 *Acknowledgements.* We thank Kizzmekia S. Corbett, Barney Graham, and Jason S. McClellan
342 for the gift of plasmid 2019-nCoV-2_S-2P, Jocelyn Voell for assistance with sample collection,
343 Marie K. Hensley, Jemilin E. Mendoza and Kristine A. Vander Hart for clinical data
344 management, and Jason Van Winkle, MD and Diego Lopez de Castilla, MD for clinical support

345

346

347 **References**

- 348
- 349 1. Chan JF, Yuan S, Kok KH et al. A familial cluster of pneumonia associated with the 2019 novel
350 coronavirus indicating person-to-person transmission: a study of a family cluster. *Lancet* **2020**;
351 395:514-23.
- 352 2. Wu F, Zhao S, Yu B et al. A new coronavirus associated with human respiratory disease in China.
353 *Nature* **2020**; 579:265-69.
- 354 3. Zhou P, Yang XL, Wang XG et al. A pneumonia outbreak associated with a new coronavirus of
355 probable bat origin. *Nature* **2020**; 579:270-73.
- 356 4. Chen L, Liu W, Zhang Q et al. RNA based mNGS approach identifies a novel human coronavirus
357 from two individual pneumonia cases in 2019 Wuhan outbreak. *Emerg Microbes Infect* **2020**;
358 9:313-19.
- 359 5. Chen N, Zhou M, Dong X et al. Epidemiological and clinical characteristics of 99 cases of 2019
360 novel coronavirus pneumonia in Wuhan, China: a descriptive study. *Lancet* **2020**; 395:507-13.
- 361 6. Huang C, Wang Y, Li X et al. Clinical features of patients infected with 2019 novel coronavirus in
362 Wuhan, China. *Lancet* **2020**; 395:497-506.
- 363 7. Zhu N, Zhang D, Wang W et al. A Novel Coronavirus from Patients with Pneumonia in China,
364 2019. *N Engl J Med* **2020**; 382:727-33.
- 365 8. Cui J, Li F, Shi ZL. Origin and evolution of pathogenic coronaviruses. *Nat Rev Microbiol* **2019**;
366 17:181-92.
- 367 9. Holshue ML, DeBolt C, Lindquist S et al. First Case of 2019 Novel Coronavirus in the United
368 States. *N Engl J Med* **2020**; 382:929-36.
- 369 10. Zou L, Ruan F, Huang M et al. SARS-CoV-2 Viral Load in Upper Respiratory Specimens of Infected
370 Patients. *N Engl J Med* **2020**; 382:1177-79.
- 371 11. To KK, Tsang OT, Leung WS et al. Temporal profiles of viral load in posterior oropharyngeal saliva
372 samples and serum antibody responses during infection by SARS-CoV-2: an observational cohort
373 study. *Lancet Infect Dis* **2020**.
- 374 12. Chang L, Yan Y, Wang L. Coronavirus Disease 2019: Coronaviruses and Blood Safety. *Transfus*
375 *Med Rev* **2020**.
- 376 13. Chen W, Lan Y, Yuan X et al. Detectable 2019-nCoV viral RNA in blood is a strong indicator for
377 the further clinical severity. *Emerg Microbes Infect* **2020**; 9:469-73.
- 378 14. Leung DT, Tam FC, Ma CH et al. Antibody response of patients with severe acute respiratory
379 syndrome (SARS) targets the viral nucleocapsid. *J Infect Dis* **2004**; 190:379-86.
- 380 15. Zhu H, Hu S, Jona G et al. Severe acute respiratory syndrome diagnostics using a coronavirus
381 protein microarray. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **2006**; 103:4011-6.
- 382 16. Guo L, Ren L, Yang S et al. Profiling Early Humoral Response to Diagnose Novel Coronavirus
383 Disease (COVID-19). *Clin Infect Dis* **2020**.
- 384 17. Zhao J, Yuan Q, Wang H et al. Antibody responses to SARS-CoV-2 in patients of novel coronavirus
385 disease 2019. *Clin Infect Dis* **2020**.
- 386 18. Wolfel R, Corman VM, Guggemos W et al. Virological assessment of hospitalized patients with
387 COVID-2019. *Nature* **2020**.
- 388 19. Li Z, Yi Y, Luo X et al. Development and Clinical Application of A Rapid IgM-IgG Combined
389 Antibody Test for SARS-CoV-2 Infection Diagnosis. *J Med Virol* **2020**.
- 390 20. Burbelo PD, Lebovitz EE, Notkins AL. Luciferase immunoprecipitation systems for measuring
391 antibodies in autoimmune and infectious diseases. *Transl Res* **2015**; 165:325-35.

- 392 21. Alagaili AN, Briese T, Mishra N et al. Middle East respiratory syndrome coronavirus infection in
393 dromedary camels in Saudi Arabia. *mBio* **2014**; 5:e00884-14.
- 394 22. Zhou P, Fan H, Lan T et al. Fatal swine acute diarrhoea syndrome caused by an HKU2-related
395 coronavirus of bat origin. *Nature* **2018**; 556:255-58.
- 396 23. Yunoki M, Urayama T, Yamamoto I, Abe S, Ikuta K. Heat sensitivity of a SARS-associated
397 coronavirus introduced into plasma products. *Vox Sang* **2004**; 87:302-3.
- 398 24. Leclercq I, Batejat C, Burguiere AM, Manuguerra JC. Heat inactivation of the Middle East
399 respiratory syndrome coronavirus. *Influenza Other Respir Viruses* **2014**; 8:585-6.
- 400 25. Burbelo PD, Ching KH, Klimavicz CM, Iadarola MJ. Antibody profiling by Luciferase
401 Immunoprecipitation Systems (LIPS). *J Vis Exp* **2009**; Oct 7;(32).
- 402 26. Wrapp D, Wang N, Corbett KS et al. Cryo-EM structure of the 2019-nCoV spike in the prefusion
403 conformation. *Science* **2020**; 367:1260-63.
- 404 27. Al-Muzairi IA, Mansour M, Almajed L et al. Heat inactivation can differentiate between IgG and
405 IgM antibodies in the pretransplant cross match. *Transplant Proc* **2008**; 40:2198-9.
- 406 28. Amanna IJ, Carlson NE, Slifka MK. Duration of humoral immunity to common viral and vaccine
407 antigens. *N Engl J Med* **2007**; 357:1903-15.
- 408 29. Chen T, Wu D, Chen H et al. Clinical characteristics of 113 deceased patients with coronavirus
409 disease 2019: retrospective study. *BMJ* **2020**; 368:m1091.
- 410 30. Chen G, Wu D, Guo W et al. Clinical and immunologic features in severe and moderate
411 Coronavirus Disease 2019. *J Clin Invest* **2020**.
- 412 31. Guo T, Fan Y, Chen M et al. Cardiovascular Implications of Fatal Outcomes of Patients With
413 Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19). *JAMA Cardiol* **2020**.
- 414 32. Darnell ME, Taylor DR. Evaluation of inactivation methods for severe acute respiratory
415 syndrome coronavirus in noncellular blood products. *Transfusion* **2006**; 46:1770-7.
- 416

417

418 **Figure legends**

419 **Figure 1. Detection of antibodies against SARS-CoV-2 nucleocapsid and spike protein in**

420 **patients with COVID-19.** Antibody levels against SARS-CoV-2 nucleocapsid and spike

421 protein were determined in 32 pre-2018 blood donors, 10 suspected COVID-19 cases (not PCR

422 confirmed) from EvergreenHealth, Kirkland, WA (EH), three PCR+ COVID-19 patients from

423 UCSD, 13 PCR+ COVID-19 patients from the University of Washington (UW), 13 PCR+

424 COVID-19 patients from EH, and 6 COVID-19 patients from the NIH Clinical Center (NIH).

425 Each symbol represents a sample from an individual patient or different time points from an

426 individual patient. Antibody levels are plotted in light units (LU) on a log₁₀ scale. Black circles

427 represent plasma or serum samples obtained after 15 or more days after symptom onset and

428 orange circles are from plasma or serum samples obtained 14 or less days after symptom onset.

429 The dashed lines represent the cutoff level for determining positive antibody titers as described

430 in the Methods.

431

432 **Figure 2. Longitudinal profile of antibodies against nucleocapsid and spike protein in**

433 **immunocompetent and immunocompromised COVID-19 patients from NIH.** Antibody

434 levels were determined in daily blood draws from six COVID-19 patients. Three of the COVID-

435 19 patients were immunocompetent (**Panel A, NIH-1-3**) and three (**Panel B, NIH-4-6**) were

436 immunocompromised. The levels of antibody to the nucleocapsid (black line) and spike protein

437 (blue line) over time are shown and were plotted on the y-axis using a log₁₀ scale. Time zero

438 represents the first day symptoms appeared, and the vertical arrows are the time of diagnosis by

439 PCR. The cut-off values for determining seropositivity is shown by the dotted lines. The red X's

440 indicates the day after onset of symptoms that patient NIH-3 died.

441

442 **Figure 3. Heat inactivation of plasma or serum samples has no significant impact on**

443 **detection of nucleocapsid antibodies.** A subset (n=38) of plasma samples from patients with

444 COVID-19 including samples from PCR-positive patients from very early infection (less than 8

445 days) and at later times after initial infection were analyzed. Levels of antibody to the

446 nucleocapsid protein were determined by LIPS for aliquots of paired samples from unheated

447 plasma or serum and from heated plasma or serum. Antibody levels were plotted, and the

448 horizontal and vertical dotted lines represent the cutoff values for seropositivity. The diagonal

449 line is a theoretical value if the antibody levels were identical for heated and unheated samples.

450 The antibody values strongly correlated for heat treated and not heat-treated samples as shown

451 by the Spearman rank correlation (R_s) of 0.92 ($P < 0.0001$) and only one sample showed a

452 significant decrease with heating.

453

454

455

456

457

458

459

Table 1. Subject Characteristics of COVID-19 Cohort

| | N | Gender (M:F) | Age years | With one or More Risk Factors* | SARS-CoV-2 PCR Positive | Time from Symptoms to First Blood Draw | Ventilator | Mortality |
|------------------------------|----------|-------------------------|----------------------|---|------------------------------------|---|-------------------|------------------|
| | | ratio | (range) | no. (%) | no. (%) | Average (range) | no. (%) | no. (%) |
| Blood Donors | 32 | ND | ND | ND | ND | ND | ND | ND |
| Suspected Cases [#] | 10 | 4:6 | 32(7-49) | 0 (0) [‡] | 0 (0) [§] | 47.1 Days (26-79) [‡] | 0 (0) | 0 (0) |
| Univ. Calif., San Diego | 3 | 2:1 | 73 (59-84) | 2 (66) | 3 (100) | 7.8 Days (5-14) | 3 (100) | 1 (33) |
| Univ. of Washington | 13 | 10:3 | 66 (43-95) | 13 (100) | 13 (100) | 13.2 Days (4-24) | 4 (31) | 5 (38) |
| EvergreenHealth | 13 | 3:10 | 59 (19-88) | 6 (46) | 13 (100) | 18 Days (2-50) [‡] | 3 (23) | 3 (23) |
| NIH Clinical Center | 6 | 5:1 | 45 (22-67) | 5 (83) | 6 (100) | 5.5 Days (0-11) | 3 (50) | 1 (17) |

*Risk factors including heart disease, lung disease, diabetes, obesity, and/or immunocompromise

Abbreviation: ND, not determined

[#]EvergreenHealth

[§]2 PCR negative and 8 not determined

[‡]Unknown for 1 subject

Fig. 1





Fig. 2

A.



B.




Fig. 3

