1 SARS-CoV-2-reactive interferon- γ -producing CD8⁺ T cells in patients hospitalized 2 with Coronavirus viral disease-2019

3 Estela Giménez¹, Eliseo Albert¹, Ignacio Torres¹, María José Remigia², María Jesús
4 Alcaraz¹, María José Galindo³, María Luisa Blasco⁴, Carlos Solano^{2,5}, María José
5 Forner^{3,5}, Josep Redón^{3,5}, Jaime Signes-Costa⁶, and David Navarro^{1,7*}

6 ¹*Microbiology Service, Clinic University Hospital, INCLIVA Health Research Institute,*
7 *Valencia, Spain.*

8 ²*Hematology Service, Clinic University Hospital, INCLIVA Health Research Institute,*
9 *Valencia, Spain.*

10 ³*Internal Medicine Department, Clinic University Hospital, INCLIVA Health Research*
11 *Institute, Valencia, Spain.*

12 ⁴*Medical Intensive Care Unit, Clinic University Hospital, INCLIVA Health Research*
13 *Institute, Valencia, Spain.*

14 ⁵*Department of Medicine, School of Medicine, University of Valencia, Valencia, Spain.*

15 ⁶*Pneumology Service, Clinic University Hospital, INCLIVA Health Research Institute,*
16 *Valencia, Spain*

17 ⁷*Department of Microbiology, School of Medicine, University of Valencia, Valencia,*
18 *Spain.*

19

20 ***Correspondence:** David Navarro, Microbiology Service, Hospital Clínico
21 Universitario, Instituto de Investigación INCLIVA, Valencia, and Department of
22 Microbiology, University of Valencia, Valencia, Spain. Av. Blasco Ibáñez 17, 46010
23 Valencia, Spain. Phone: 34(96)1973500; Fax: 34(96)3864173; E-mail:
24 david.navarro@uv.es.

25 EG and EA contributed equally to the present work.

26 ABSTRACT

27 There is limited information on SARS-CoV-2 T-cell immune responses in patients with
 28 Covid-19. Both CD4⁺ and CD8⁺ T cells may be instrumental in the resolution of and
 29 protection from SARS-CoV-2 infection. Here, we tested 25 hospitalized patients with
 30 either microbiologically documented Covid-19 (n=19) or highly suspected of having the
 31 disease (n=6) for the presence of SARS-CoV-2-reactive- CD69⁺-expressing interferon-
 32 γ -producing-(IFN- γ) CD8⁺ T cells by a flow-cytometry for intracellular cytokine staining
 33 assay. Two sets of overlapping peptides encompassing the SARS-CoV-2 Spike
 34 glycoprotein N-terminal 1-643 amino acid sequence and the entire sequence of SARS-
 35 CoV-2 M protein were used simultaneously as antigenic stimulus. Ten patients (40%)
 36 had detectable responses, displaying frequencies ranging from 0.15 to 2.7% (median of
 37 0.57 cells/ μ L; range, 0.43-9.98 cells/ μ L). The detection rate of SARS-CoV-2-reactive
 38 IFN- γ CD8⁺ T cells in patients admitted to intensive care was comparable ($P=0.28$) to
 39 that in patients hospitalized in other medical wards. No correlation was found between
 40 SARS-CoV-2-reactive IFN- γ CD8⁺ T-cell counts and SARS-CoV-2 S-specific antibody
 41 levels. Likewise, no correlation was observed between either SARS-CoV-2-reactive
 42 IFN- γ CD8⁺ T cells or S-specific IgG-antibody titers and blood cell count or levels of
 43 inflammatory biomarkers. In summary, in this descriptive, preliminary study we showed
 44 that SARS-CoV-2-reactive IFN- γ CD8⁺ T cells can be detected in a non-negligible
 45 percentage of patients with moderate to severe forms of Covid-19. Further studies are
 46 warranted to determine whether quantitation of these T-cell subsets may provide
 47 prognostic information on the clinical course of Covid-19.

48 **KEY WORDS:** SARS-CoV-2, Covid-19, CD8⁺ T cells, T-cell immunity.

49

50 INTRODUCTION

51 On March 11, 2020 the World Health Organization (WHO) declared Covid-19 a
 52 pandemic¹. As of May 12th more than 4,200,000 cases of Covid-19 have been reported
 53 worldwide, causing over 290,000 deaths.² Covid-19 commonly results in pneumonia,
 54 which could evolve to acute respiratory distress syndrome, leading to respiratory or
 55 multiorgan failure^{3,4}. Elucidation of immune responses conferring protection against
 56 SARS-CoV-2 is crucial to develop an effective vaccine prototype, which is urgently
 57 needed to blunt pandemic progression. A number of studies have focused on the
 58 characterization of SARS-CoV-2-specific antibody kinetics profiles⁵⁻¹⁰. Nevertheless,
 59 there is scant information on T-cell responses against SARS-CoV-2 in Covid-19
 60 patients. CD4⁺ and CD8⁺ T cells targeting structural viral proteins appear to
 61 confer broad and long-lasting protection against SARS-CoV¹¹. Several clusters of
 62 cytotoxic T lymphocyte (CTL) epitopes restricted by HLA-class I specificities
 63 commonly found in caucasians (i.e. HLA-A02) have been mapped within the spike (S)
 64 and the membrane (M) SARS-CoV proteins.¹¹ Since SARS-CoV shares high sequence
 65 identity with SARS-CoV-2,¹² it is reasonable to expect an analogous scenario in the
 66 SARS-CoV-2 infection. Braun and colleagues demonstrated the presence of SARS-
 67 CoV-2-S-reactive, activated (expressing CD38⁺ and HLA-DR) CD4⁺ T cells in 83% of
 68 Covid-19 patients.¹³ No data on the potential functionality of these cells was provided.¹³
 69 Ni et al. detected T-cell responses against several SARS-CoV-2 structural proteins, as
 70 measured by interferon- γ ELISPOT, in up to 50% of Covid-19 convalescent patients.¹⁴
 71 Here, we developed a flow-cytometry for intracellular cytokine staining (ICS) assay to
 72 enumerate peripheral blood SARS-CoV-2-reactive-IFN- γ -producing CD8⁺ T cells,
 73 which was used to assess the presence of virus-elicited T-cell immunity in patients with
 74 moderate to severe Covid-19.

75 PATIENTS AND METHODS

76 Patients

77 Twenty-five non-consecutive patients (14 males and 11 females; median age, 69 years;
78 range, 62 to 87 years) admitted to our center from March 17th to April 24th with
79 clinically suspected Covid-19 were included in the current study. The only inclusion
80 criterion was the availability of blood specimens for T-cell immunity analyses. Medical
81 history and laboratory data were retrospectively reviewed. The current study was
82 approved by the Ethics Committee of Hospital Clínico Universitario INCLIVA.

83 Detection of SARS-CoV-2 by RT-PCR

84 Nasopharyngeal or oropharyngeal specimens were obtained with flocked swabs in
85 universal transport medium (Beckton Dickinson, Sparks, MD, USA, or Copan
86 Diagnostics, Murrieta, CA, USA) and conserved at 4 °C until processed (within 6
87 hours). Tracheal aspirates from mechanically ventilated patients were also processed,
88 when available. These latter specimens were collected undiluted. Nucleic acid
89 extraction was performed using the Qiagen EZ-1 Viral extraction kit or the DSP virus
90 Pathogen Minikit on the EZ1 or QiaSymphony Robot instruments (Qiagen, Valencia,
91 CA, USA), respectively. Commercially-available RT-PCR assays used for SARS-CoV-
92 2 testing were one or more of the following: E-gene/LightMix® Modular SARS-CoV-2
93 (COVID-19) RdRP gene from TIB MOLBIOL GmHD, distributed by Roche
94 Diagnostics (Pleasanton, CA, USA) on the Light Cycler 2.0 instrument, the SARS-
95 COV-2 REALTIME PCR KIT from Vircell Diagnostics (Granada, Spain), the
96 REALQUALITY RQ-2019-nCoV from AB ANALITICA (Padua, Italy), both on the
97 Applied Biosystems 7500 instrument, the SARS-CoV-2 (S gene) – BD MAX™ System
98 (VIASURE Real Time PCR Detection Kits; CerTest, Zaragoza, Spain) and the Abbott

99 RealTime SARS-CoV-2 Assay (Abbott Molecular Diagnostics, Chicago, USA). A
100 number of these specimens were screened for the presence of other respiratory
101 pathogens by the the NxTAG® Respiratory Pathogen Panel (Luminex Corp, Austin, Tx,
102 USA).

103 **Antibody detection methods**

104 Initial screening for SARS-CoV-2-specific antibodies was carried out by using the
105 2019-nCoV IgG/IgM Rapid Test (Hangzhou AllTest Biotech Co., Ltd. China), a rapid
106 lateral flow chromatographic immunoassay (LFIC) designed for the qualitative
107 detection of IgG and IgM antibodies in human whole blood or serum. Sera obtained at
108 the time of blood collection for SARS-CoV-2 CD8⁺ T cell immunity analyses were
109 analyzed by the LIAISON® SARS-CoV-2 IgG (DiaSorin, Saluggia, Italy), a fully
110 automated quantitative chemiluminescent assay (CLIA) detecting IgG antibodies against
111 SARS-CoV-2 S protein (S1 and S2 subunits). Immunoassays were performed and
112 interpreted according the instructions of the respective manufacturer.

113 **SARS-CoV-2-reactive IFN- γ CD8⁺ T cells.**

114 Enumeration of SARS-CoV-2-reactive CD69⁺-expressing-IFN γ -producing-CD8⁺ T
115 cells was carried out by flow cytometry for ICS (BD Fastimmune, BD-Beckton
116 Dickinson and Company-Biosciences, San Jose, CA, USA), following an adapted
117 protocol developed by our group for quantitation of Cytomegalovirus-specific T
118 cells.^{15,16} Briefly, heparinized whole blood (0.5 ml) was simultaneously stimulated for 6
119 h with two sets of 15-mer overlapping peptides (11 mer overlap) encompassing the
120 SARS-CoV-2 Spike glycoprotein N-terminal 1-643 amino acid sequence (158 peptided)
121 and the entire sequence of SARS-CoV-2 M protein (53 peptides), at a concentration of
122 1 μ g/ml per peptide, in the presence of 1 μ g/ml of costimulatory mAbs to CD28 and

CD49d. Peptide mixes were obtained from JPT peptide Technologies GmbH (Berlin, Germany). Samples mock stimulated with PBS/DMSO and costimulatory antibodies were run in parallel. Brefeldin A (10 μ g/ml) was added for the last 4 h of incubation. Blood was then lysed (BD FACS lysing solution) and frozen at -80°C until tested. On the day of testing, stimulated blood was thawed at 37°C , washed, permeabilized (BD permeabilizing solution), and stained with a combination of labeled moAbs (anti-IFN γ -FITC, anti-CD69-PE, anti-CD8-PerCP-Cy5.5, and anti-CD3-APC) for 1 h at room temperature. Appropriate positive (phytohemagglutinin) and isotype controls were used. Cells were then washed, resuspended in 200 μ l of 1% paraformaldehyde in PBS, and analyzed within 2 h on an FACScanto flow cytometer using DIVA v8 software (BD Biosciences Immunocytometry Systems, San Jose, CA, USA). CD3 $^{+}$ /CD8 $^{+}$ events were gated and then analyzed for the CD69 $^{+}$ activation marker and IFN γ production (Figure 1A). The total number of SARS-CoV-2-reactive CD8 $^{+}$ T cells was calculated by multiplying the percentages of CD8 $^{+}$ T cells producing IFN γ on stimulation (after background subtraction) by the absolute CD8 $^{+}$ T cell count. Responses $\geq 0.1\%$ were considered specific.

Laboratory measurements

Clinical laboratory investigation included a complete blood count and serum levels of ferritin, Dimer-D, and C reactive protein (CRP). Data on serum IL-6 levels were not available.

Statistical methods

Frequency comparisons for categorical variables were carried out using the Fisher exact test. Differences between medians were compared using the Mann–Whitney U-test. The Spearman’s rank test was used for analysis of correlation between continuous variables.

Two-sided exact *P*-values were reported. A *P*-value <0.05 was considered statistically significant. The analyses were performed using SPSS version 20.0 (SPSS, Chicago, IL, USA).

RESULTS

Patient clinical features

Patients in this cohort were admitted to our center at a median of 7 days (range, 0-28 days) since the onset of symptoms. Twenty-two patients presented with pneumonia and imaging findings on chest-x ray or CT-scans compatible with Covid-19. The remaining three patients, clinically suspected of Covid-19 with no evidence of pneumonia, were admitted either due to aggravation of baseline chronic conditions (n=2) or venous thrombosis. Median hospitalization time of patients was 18 days (range, 4-52 days). Seven patients needed intensive care (ICU), of whom 2 died.

As shown in Table 1, diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2 was achieved in 17 patients by RT-PCR in upper or lower respiratory tract specimens, either at initial screening (n=10) or after repeat testing (n=7). Of these, 14 also had serological evidence of SARS-CoV-2 infection. Two patients tested repeatedly negative by RT-PCR, but exhibited IgG seroconversion. Finally, microbiological evidence of SARS-CoV-2 infection could not be obtained in 6 patients. These latter patients tested negative by a multiplexed RT-PCR assay targeting prevalent respiratory viruses and bacteria in upper or lower respiratory tract specimens.

Detection of SARS-CoV-2-reactive IFN- γ CD8⁺ T cells in Covid-19 patients

Enumeration of peripheral blood SARS-CoV-2-S1/M-reactive CD69⁺-IFN- γ CD8⁺ T cells was carried out at a median of 27 days from the onset of symptoms (range, 2-47 days). Eight patients were re-screened within the next 5 days. Ten patients (40%) had

171 detectable responses (Table 1 and Figure 1B), displaying frequencies ranging from 0.15
172 to 2.7% (median of 0.57 cells/ μ L; range, 0.43-9.98 cells/ μ L). Nine of these patients had
173 previously tested positive by RT-PCR, and 8 had specific antibodies detected by LFIC,
174 CLIA, or both. Among the latter patients, 3 had IgM antibodies. A single patient
175 (number 13 in Table 1) displayed detectable SARS-CoV-2-reactive IFN- γ CD8⁺ T cells
176 despite a lack of microbiological confirmation of Covid-19 by either RT-PCR or
177 serological methods. Fifteen patients had no detectable SARS-CoV-2 IFN- γ CD8⁺ T-
178 cell responses (representative examples shown in Figure 1C).

179 The detection rate of SARS-CoV-2-reactive IFN- γ CD8⁺T cells in patients admitted to
180 ICU (57%) was not significantly different ($P=0.28$) from that in patients hospitalized in
181 other medical wards (33%).

182 No correlation was found between levels of SARS-CoV-2-reactive IFN- γ CD8⁺ T cells
183 and those of SARS-CoV-2 S-specific antibodies quantitated by CLIA (Figure 2) in
184 paired whole blood and serum specimens.

185 **Adaptive immune responses to SARS-CoV-2 and laboratory markers of Covid-19** 186 **severity.**

187 We next investigated whether there was a relationship between SARS-CoV-2-reactive
188 IFN- γ CD8⁺ T-cell counts, S-specific IgG-antibody titers and blood levels of a number
189 of prognostic laboratory parameters of Covid-19 progression, including total leukocyte,
190 lymphocyte and neutrophil counts and markers of inflammation (or coagulation), such
191 as ferritin, CRP and Dimer-D. A pro-inflammatory state was noticed in most patients in
192 this series, while cytopenias were less frequently observed (Table 2). Patients with or
193 without detectable SARS-CoV-2-reactive IFN- γ CD8⁺ T cells were comparable
194 regarding these parameters (Table 2). In addition, no correlation was found between

195 either SARS-CoV-2-reactive IFN- γ CD8⁺ T cells or S-specific IgG-antibody titers and
196 blood cell count or levels of any of these biomarkers (Rho <0.2 and P >0.5 in all
197 correlation analyses).

198 **DISCUSSION**

199 There is a knowledge gap regarding the immune mechanisms that confer protection
200 against SARS-CoV-2. On the basis of experimental evidence gathered on SARS-CoV,
201 and MERS-CoV infections,^{17,18} it is assumed that both CD4⁺ and CD8⁺ T cells play a
202 major role in virus clearance and long-term protection against SARS-CoV-2 infection.
203 Although plausible, data supporting this assumption is lacking. In this context, to the
204 best of our knowledge, only two studies have assessed the frequency of SARS-CoV-2-
205 reactive CD4⁺ T (by flow cytometry) or T-cells (by IFN γ -ELISPOT) in peripheral blood
206 from patients with Covid-19 or convalescent individuals, respectively.^{13,14}

207 Here, we optimized a flow cytometry ICS method for quantitation of SARS-CoV-2-
208 reactive-activated (CD69⁺ expressing)-CD8⁺ T cells producing IFN- γ upon antigenic
209 stimulation. This assay uses whole blood as a matrix, thus circumventing the need of
210 PBMC separation, and a combination of two peptide mixes composed of overlapping
211 peptides spanning the S1 region of the S glycoprotein and the entire amino acid
212 sequence of the M protein. We chose SARS-CoV-2 S1 and M proteins as antigenic
213 stimuli because they are expected to contain highly immunogenic CTL epitopes
214 restricted by HLA-class I specificities commonly found in caucasian individuals (all
215 patients in this series), based on sequence alignment with SARS-CoV homologous
216 proteins.^{19,20} Moreover, amino acid sequences of these CTL epitopes are reasonably
217 distinct from aligned sequences present in seasonal coronaviruses, thereby predictably
218 minimizing the likelihood of detecting cross-reactive CD8⁺ T cells.¹¹ In turn, by

219 combining S1 and M peptide libraries, we aimed at maximizing our chances of
220 capturing as many SARS-CoV-2 TCR specificities as possible, thus potentially
221 increasing the sensitivity of the assay.

222 Several findings arose from our study. First, SARS-CoV-2 IFN- γ CD8⁺ T cells targeting
223 S1 and M proteins were detected in 40% of patients at a relatively late time after onset
224 of symptoms (median, 27 days). It is likely that these T-cell subsets could have been
225 circulating long before; our study, however, was not designed to characterize their
226 kinetics. It is relevant to note that the median age of our patients was high (62 years);
227 although speculative, it can be argued that the rate of detection could have been higher
228 in younger people (no immuosenescence).

229 Braun and colleagues detected S1 and S2-reactive CD4⁺ T cells expressing cell-surface
230 activation markers in 12 and 15 out of 18 patients (median age, 52 years old),
231 respectively, presenting with mild to severe forms of Covid-19.¹³ The potential antiviral
232 functionality of these T-cell subsets was not explored, though. Ni et al. reported the
233 presence of SARS-CoV-2-specific IFN γ T cells (measured by ELISPOT) targeting the
234 nucleocapsid protein, the M protein or the S1 receptor binding domain (RBD) in up to 7
235 out of 14 individuals who had recovered from Covid-19.¹⁴

236 Second, the frequency of SARS-CoV-2-reactive IFN- γ CD8⁺ T cells varied widely
237 across patients in this series, and was unexpectedly high in some of them (e.g. patient 7
238 in Table 1:2.75%).

239 Third, SARS-CoV-2-reactive IFN- γ -CD8⁺ T cells appeared to develop at comparable
240 rates and frequencies irrespective of Covid-19 severity. However, the two patients
241 deceased in this series had no detectable responses. This latter observation is
242 reminiscent of findings reported by Braun et al. who showed that patients with critical

243 disease states lacked S1-reactive CD4⁺ T cells.¹³ In line with this assumption, data
244 published in the SARS-CoV infection setting pointed to an impaired development of
245 adaptive immune responses in patients with severe forms of the disease.²¹

246 Fourth, interestingly enough, SARS-CoV-2-reactive IFN- γ CD8⁺ T cells were detected
247 in one patient with high clinical suspicion of Covid-19 without microbiological
248 documentation of SARS-CoV-2 infection and testing negative for respiratory viruses
249 and bacteria commonly causing community-acquired respiratory tract infections, thus
250 suggesting that T-cell immunity assays may be an ancillary tool for the diagnosis of
251 Covid-19 in patients with repeat RT-PCR negative testing and delayed antibody
252 conversion.

253 Fifth, we found no correlation between SARS-CoV-2-reactive IFN- γ CD8⁺ T cells and
254 S-specific antibody levels, which in turn appear to strongly correlate with SARS-CoV-2
255 neutralizing activity of sera²², suggesting that SARS-CoV-2 targeted B and T-cell
256 responses may follow divergent dynamics, as noticed in SARS CoV infection.¹⁹ Our
257 data is nevertheless in contrast with that reported by Ni et al.¹⁴ In that study, a strong
258 correlation was found between SARS-CoV-reactive IFN γ T cells and S1-RBD-specific
259 neutralizing antibodies in convalescent individuals (in our current study patients with
260 active disease were included).

261 Sixth, lung inflammation is the main cause of life-threatening respiratory disorders at
262 the severe stage of Covid-19. It is plausible that SARS-CoV-2-reactive T cells and
263 certain specificities of SARS CoV-2-specific antibodies (i.e. those mediating antibody-
264 dependent enhancement-ADE-) may be mechanistically involved in promoting such a
265 pro-inflammatory state.^{23,24} In this context, we found no correlation between SARS-
266 CoV-2-reactive IFN- γ CD8⁺ T cells, antibodies targeting the S protein (which contain

both neutralizing and ADE epitopes) and serum levels of ferritin, CRP and Dimer-D; these findings should not be overinterpreted and by no means rule out the involvement of virus-driven immunopathogenetic mechanisms in progression to acute respiratory distress syndrome. Further prospective studies assessing how dynamics of these parameters relate in sequential specimens are needed to shed some light on this issue.

In addition to the scarce number of patients in our series, the current study has a major limitation: the specificity of SARS-CoV-2-reactive IFN γ -CD8⁺ T cells was not proven. Based on sequence analyses, SARS-CoV-2 and seasonal alpha and beta coronaviruses may share HLA-class I-restricted immunogenic epitopes mapping within S1 and M potentially eliciting cross-reactive T cells.¹⁹ In support of this assumption, S-reactive CD4⁺ T cells could be detected in 34% of healthy control individuals who had seemingly not been infected by SARS-CoV-2, albeit at lower frequencies compared to patients with Covid-19, and displaying a differential pattern of cell-surface activation markers.¹³ We also tested 4 healthy asymptomatic individuals with no evidence of active or past Covid-19 and found one of them to be reactive, albeit displaying a low frequency of SARS-CoV-2 reactive IFN γ -CD8⁺ T cells (0.12%) (data not shown). In an epidemiological framework of heavy SARS CoV-2 community transmission, such as the one being currently faced in Spain, recruiting asymptomatic individuals, even if testing negative by RT-PCR or having no evidence of seroconversion, as negative controls, may not be entirely appropriate, as some of these could have been exposed and developed measurable T-cell responses. Unfortunately, we had not cryopreserved blood specimens from healthy individuals with or without documented infection caused by seasonal coronaviruses collected prior to the penetration of SARS-CoV-2 into our health department. Studies aimed at assessing the specificity of IFN γ CD8⁺ T cells

291 detected by our assay have been designed and planned to be initiated as soon as control
292 of our local epidemic outbreak is achieved.

293 In summary, in this descriptive, preliminary study we showed that SARS-CoV-2-
294 reactive IFN- γ CD8⁺ T cells can be detected in a non-negligible percentage of patients
295 with moderate to severe forms of Covid-19. As suggested by Braun and colleagues,¹³
296 either cross-reactive or not, quantitation of these T-cell subsets may provide prognostic
297 information on the clinical course of Covid-19. Studies designed to address this issue
298 are currently underway.

299 **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

300 No public or private funds were used for the current study. We are grateful to all
301 personnel who work at Clinic University Hospital, in particular to those at Microbiology
302 laboratory for their commitment in the fight against Covid-19.

303 **CONFLICT OF INTERESTS**

304 The authors declare no conflicts of interests.

305 **AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS**

306 EG, EA, IT, MJR and CS, performed T cell and antibody assays, and collected the data.
307 MJG, MLB, MJF, JR and JS-C attended the patients. DN and EG analyzed and
308 interpreted the data and wrote the manuscript.

309 **REFERENCES**

- 310 1. <https://www.who.int/dg/speeches/detail/who-director-general-s-opening>.
- 311 2. coronavirus-covid-19-global-cases-by-johns-Hopkins University
312 (<http://coronavirus.jhu.edu>)

- 313 3. Zhou F, Yu T, Du R, et al. Clinical course and risk factors for mortality of adult
314 inpatients with COVID-19 in Wuhan, China: a retrospective cohort study. *Lancet*. 2020;
315 Mar 28;395(10229):1054-1062. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30566-3. Epub 2020 Mar
316 11.
- 317 4. Guan WJ, Ni ZY, Hu Y, et al. Clinical Characteristics of Coronavirus Disease 2019
318 in China. *N Engl J Med*. 2020; Feb 28. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa2002032. [Epub ahead of
319 print].
- 320 5. Jiang S, Hillyer C, Du L. Neutralizing Antibodies against SARS-CoV-2 and Other
321 Human Coronaviruses. *Trends Immunol*. 2020 Apr 2. doi: 10.1016/j.it.2020.03.007.
- 322 6. Long QX, Liu BZ, Deng HJ, et al. Antibody responses to SARS-CoV-2 in patients
323 with COVID-19. *Nat Med*. 2020 Apr 29. doi: 10.1038/s41591-020-0897-1.
- 324 7. Wang C, Li W, Drabek D, et al. A human monoclonal antibody blocking SARS-
325 CoV-2 infection. *Nat Commun*. 2020 May 4;11(1):2251. doi: 10.1038/s41467-020-
326 16256-y.
- 327 8. Zhao J, Yuan Q, Wang H, et al. Antibody responses to SARS-CoV-2 in patients of
328 novel coronavirus disease 2019. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2020 Mar 28. pii: ciaa344. doi:
329 10.1093/cid/ciaa344.
- 330 9. To KK, Tsang OT, Leung WS, et al. Temporal profiles of viral load in posterior
331 oropharyngeal saliva samples and serum antibody responses during infection by SARS-
332 CoV-2: an observational cohort study. *Lancet Infect Dis*. 2020 May;20(5):565-574.
- 333 10. Wölfel R, Corman VM, Guggemos W, et al. Virological assessment of hospitalized
334 patients with COVID-2019. *Nature*. 2020 Apr 1. doi: 10.1038/s41586-020-2196-x.

- 335 11. Liu WJ, Zhao M, Liu K, et al. T-cell immunity of SARS-CoV: Implications for
336 vaccine development against MERS-CoV. Antiviral Res. 2017 Jan;137:82-92. doi:
337 10.1016/j.antiviral.2016.11.006. Epub 2016 Nov 11.
- 338 12. Lu R, Zhao X, Li J, Niu P, Yang B, Wu H. et al. Genomic characterisation and
339 epidemiology of 2019 novel coronavirus: implications for virus origins and receptor
340 binding. Lancet. 2020;395:565–74.
- 341 13. Braun J, Loyal L, Frentsch F, et al. Presence of SARS-CoV-2 reactive T cells in
342 COVID-19 patients and healthy donors. MedRxiv preprint. doi:
343 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.17.20061440>.
- 344 14. Ni L, Ye F, Cheng ML, Feng Y, Deng YQ, Zhao H, Wei P, Ge J, Gou M, Li X, Sun
345 L, Cao T, Wang P, Zhou C, Zhang R, Liang P, Guo H, Wang X, Qin CF, Chen F, Dong
346 C. Detection of SARS-CoV-2-Specific Humoral and Cellular Immunity in COVID-19
347 Convalescent Individuals. Immunity. 2020 May 3. pii: S1074-7613(20)30181-3
- 348 15. Solano C, Benet I, Clari MA, et al. Enumeration of cytomegalovirus-specific
349 interferongamma CD8+ and CD4+ T cells early after allogeneic stem cell
350 transplantation may identify patients at risk of active cytomegalovirus infection.
351 Haematologica. 2008 Sep;93(9):1434-6.
- 352 16. Tormo N, Solano C, Benet I, et al. Lack of prompt expansion of cytomegalovirus
353 pp65 and IE-1-specific IFNgamma CD8+ and CD4+ T cells is associated with rising
354 levels of pp65 antigenemia and DNAemia during pre-emptive therapy in allogeneic
355 hematopoietic stem cell transplant recipients. Bone Marrow Transplant. 2010
356 Mar;45(3):543-9.

- 357 17. Channappanavar R, Fett C, Zhao J, Meyerholz DK, Perlman S. Virus-specific
358 memory CD8+ T cells provide substantial protection from lethal severe acute
359 respiratory syndrome coronavirus infection. J Virol. 2014 Oct;88(19):11034-44.
- 360 18. Chen H, Hou J, Jiang X, Ma S, Meng M, Wang B, Zhang M, Zhang M, Tang X,
361 Zhang F, Wan T, Li N, Yu Y, Hu H, Yang R, He W, Wang X, Cao X. Response of
362 memory CD8+ T cells to severe acute respiratory syndrome (SARS) coronavirus in
363 recovered SARS patients and healthy individuals. J Immunol. 2005 Jul 1;175(1):591-8.
- 364 19. Channappanavar R, Zhao J, Perlman S. T cell-mediated immune response to
365 respiratory coronaviruses. Immunol Res. 2014 Aug;59(1-3):118-28.
- 366 20. Liu WJ, Zhao M, Liu K, Xu K, Wong G, Tan W, Gao GF. T-cell immunity of
367 SARS-CoV: Implications for vaccine development against MERS-CoV. Antiviral Res.
368 2017 Jan;137:82-92.
- 369 21. Cameron MJ, Bermejo-Martin JF, Danesh A, Muller MP, Kelvin DJ. Human
370 immunopathogenesis of severe acute respiratory syndrome (SARS). Virus Res. 2008
371 Apr;133(1):13-9.
- 372 22. Wu F, Wang A, Liu M, Wang Q, Chen J, Ling Y, Zhang Y, et al. Neutralizing
373 antibody responses to SARS-CoV-2 in a COVID-19 recovered patient cohort and their
374 implications. MedRxiv preprint. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.03.30.20047365>.
- 375 23. Lin L, Lu L, Cao W, Li T. Hypothesis for potential pathogenesis of SARS-CoV-2
376 infection-a review of immune changes in patients with viral pneumonia. Emerg
377 Microbes Infect. 2020 Dec;9(1):727-732.

24. Negro F. Is antibody-dependent enhancement playing a role in COVID-19 pathogenesis? Swiss Med Wkly. 2020 Apr 16;150:w20249. doi: 10.4414/smw.2020.20249. eCollection 2020 Apr 6.

FIGURE LEGENDS

1. Figure 1. Enumeration of SARS-CoV-2-S1/M-reactive CD69⁺-expressing IFN- γ -producing CD8⁺ T cells by flow cytometry for intracellular staining in Covid-19 patients. Panel A depicts the gating strategy. Panel B includes plots from patients with detectable responses, while in panel C plots from 10 patients testing negative are shown. Dot-plot figures were built with FlowJo software (BD Biosciences).

2. Figure 2. Correlation between SARS-CoV-2-S1/M-reactive CD69⁺-expressing IFN- γ -producing CD8⁺ T cells and serum levels of anti-S-IgG antibodies measured by CLIA. Rho and *P* values are shown.

Table 1. Microbiological and laboratory data on patients with Covid-19 included in the study.

Code	RT-PCR result	SARS- CoV-2 IgG and IgM results LFIC	SARS- CoV-2 IgG result (CLIA) ^a AU/ml	SARS- CoV-2- reactive CD8 ⁺ T- cells in cells/ μ L (Sample 1/Sample 2)	Days from onset of symptoms to immune determination (Sample 1 / Sample 2)	D-dimer in ng/ml (Sample 1/sample 2)	C- reactive protein in mg/dL Sample 1 / Sample 2)	Ferritin in ng/ml (Sample 1 / Sample 2)	Total leukocyte count in $\ast 10^9/L$ (Sample 1 / Sample 2)	Total lymphocyte count in $\ast 10^6/L$ (Sample 1 / Sample 2)	Total neutrophil count in $\ast 10^9/L$ (Sample 1 / Sample 2)
1	+	IgM-/ IgG+	134	0 / 0.72	37/42	1438 / 976	30/ 11	562	13/ 6	840 / 1560	10.3/2.9
2	+	IgM+/ IgG+	47	0 / 0.83	25/30	3510 /1613	8/ 101	312	9.5/11.8	1330 / 590	6.8/10.7
3	+	IgM-/ IgG-	-	0	15	547	20	83	19.8	350	19
4	+	IgM+/ IgG+	59.4	0.43 / 0	27/35	521 /709	124/ 11	904	7.8 / 6.1	1320 / 1560	5 /4

		IgG+									
5	+	IgM+/ IgG+	20.8	0 / 0	39/44	848 /634	20 /56	422 /534	11.2/ 8.3	200/550	10.8 /6.9
6	+	IgM+/ IgG+	59.9	0 / 0	35 / 40	1401 / 1503	0.7 / 30.6	887/ 990	14 /10.5	1320 / 820	12.1 / 7.4
7	+	NA	32.9	9.98	11	1259	98	221	13.6	1980	10.6
8	+	IgM-/ IgG+	150	0	47	510	10	151	8.4	2250	5.1
9	+	IgM+/ IgG+	25.3	0	45	390	2.4	274	6.8	2118	3.9
10	-	IgM-/ IgG-	-	0	5	418	8	1362	5	1960	2.7
11	+	IgM-/ IgG+	136	0	44	645	19	416	11	1420	8.7
12	-	IgM-/ IgG-	-	0	8	362	64	205	13	1300	10.6

		IgG-									
13	-	IgM-/ IgG-	-	2.78	27	91	2.3	181	11.7	840	10.3
14	+	IgM-/ IgG+	87.9	0.57	34	436	4.1	516	8	1690	5.2
15	+	IgM-/ IgG+	120	0.53	42	389	0.2	1079	7	1000	5.6
16	+	IgM-/ IgG+	79.3	0	42	241	3.1	147	12.7	2090	9.7
17	+	IgM-/ IgG+	29.4	6.42	43	326	11.7	428	6.1	2070	3.5
18	-	IgM+/ IgG-	-	0	2	345	69	252	4.9	1940	2.3
19	+	IgM+/ IgG+	-	1.20	-	545	0.8	61	7	2910	3.3

20	-	IgM-/ IgG-	15	0	26	-	23.5	-	8.8	1940	6.1
21	+	IgM-/ IgG-	NA	0	-	689	144	287	9.6	2950	5.2
22	+	IgM-/ IgG-	-	0 / 0.48	11/ 15	1707 /1103	32/ 29	790 /685	5	1570/ 1470	3.1/3.7
23	-	IgM-/ IgG-	-	0 / 0	9 / 13	314/ 85	4.1/1.3	401 / 225	6.6/ 67.5	780/ 690	5.2/5.2
24	-	IgM-/ IgG-	-	0 / 0	7 / 11	4339	10/ 15	617	7.5/ 7.1	950/1360	5.9/5
25	+	IgM-/ IgG-	101	0	14	186	13	272	9.4	2170	5.6
Abbreviations: CRP, C-Reactive Protein; CLIA, chemiluminiscent assay; LFIC, lateral flow immunochromatography; NA, not available; +, positive; -, negative.											

Table 2. Laboratory data of patients with and without detectable SARS-CoV-2-reactive IFN-γ-producing CD8⁺ T-cells			
Parameter	Detection of SARS-CoV-2-reactive specific IFN-γ-producing CD8⁺ T-cells		<i>P</i> value
	Yes	No	
Days since the onset of symptoms (median, range)	32 (11-43)	26 (2-45)	0.31
Total leukocyte count (x10⁹/L) , (median, range)	7.41 (5.63-13.58)	8.76 (4.93-19.80)	0.53
Total lymphocyte count (x10⁶/L) , (median, range)	1,515 (590-2,910)	1,360 (200-2,950)	0.65
Total neutrophil count (x10⁹/L) , (median, range)	5.12 (2.88-10.66)	5.90 (2.33-19.12)	0.41
Ferritin in ng/ml (median, range)	428 (61-1079)	409 (83-1362)	0.89
Dimer-D in ng/ml , (median, range)	533 (91-1613)	634 (85-4339)	0.83
C-reactive protein in mg/L , (median, range)	11 (0.2-124)	15 (0.7-144)	0.80
Normal values: 12-300 ng/ml for ferritin, <100 ng/ml for Dimer-D, and <10 mg/L for C-reactive protein.			

400

401

402

403

404

A

B

C