ANTIBODY RESPONSE TO COVID-19 INFECTION- CLINICAL VARIABLES AT PLAY

Anuj Parkash¹, Parul Singla² Meenu Bhatia¹

1. Department of Biochemistry, Rajiv Gandhi Cancer Hospital and Research Centre, New Delhi, INDIA
2. Department of Biochemistry, Sir Ganga Ram Hospital, New Delhi, INDIA

Corresponding author:

Anuj Parkash,

Department of Biochemistry, Rajiv Gandhi Cancer Institute & Research Centre, New Delhi, INDIA

Email: dranujpa@gmail.com

30

31 **ABSTRACT:**

32 **Background:** The current COVID19 pandemic began in December 2019 and rapidly expanded to
 33 become a global pandemic. The COVID 19 presents multitude of clinical disorders, ranges from
 34 asymptomatic infection to severe disease, which can accompanied by multisystem failure leading to
 35 death. The immune response to SARS CoV 2 is understood to involve all the components of the
 36 system that together causes viral elimination and recovery from the infection. However, such immune
 37 responses implicated in the disease has varied presentation ranging from mild to a severe form, which
 38 appears to hinge on the loss of the immune regulation between protective and altered responses. In
 39 this study, we want to unravel this association of immune responses to various clinical variables,
 40 which might have a major role to play, while generating the immune response. The objective was to
 41 test this hypothesis in our settings and comparing the results of serologic tests from a group of
 42 COVID 19 patients and will analyzed the disease severity in comparison.

43

44 **Methods:** Testing for SARS COV2 IgG Antibody was done with chemiluminescent assay on the
 45 Ortho Clinical Diagnostic's (OCD) Vitros 5600 platform.

46

47 **Results:** A total of 106 COVID 19 patients were included in this study, of whom 61 were male and 45
 48 were female. Their mean age was 43.7 years (range 17–83) and the median interval between initial
 49 symptom onset and sample collection was 12.33 days. Eighty patients (82%) had mild or moderate
 50 symptoms and twenty-six patients (18%) had severe symptoms. The antibody titers were positive in
 51 99 patients (93%) and were found negative in 7 patients (7%). When comparing patients with
 52 mild/moderate symptoms and patients with severe/critical diseases, no statistically significant
 53 difference was observed between their gender ratios ($P = 0.373$) and age composition ($P = 0.224$).

54 **Conclusions:** The data presented in this research study did not find any statistical significance
 55 between SARS CoV 2 IgG antibody levels with COVID 19 disease severity, duration of symptoms,
 56 age, gender, and length of convalescence.

57 **Keywords:** COVID 19, SARS CoV 2, immune response, COVID Antibodies

58

59

60

61

62

63

64

65

66

67

68 INTRODUCTION

69 The ongoing pandemic of COVID 19 is causing big threat to communities around the world. It is
 70 caused by a virus called severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2). It is a
 71 highly contagious virus and spread by respiratory route. Patients most commonly presented with
 72 fever, cough and respiratory symptoms. Mortality and morbidity quite largely depends upon the host
 73 immune response and people with co-morbidities are at greater risk from COVID-19 infection.. As a
 74 general immune principle, body immune response to acute phase of infection starts with IgM
 75 antibody, whereas IgG and IgA antibodies appears 3 to 4 weeks to post-exposure^{1,2}. However, it has
 76 been observed that the immune response against this virus is highly variable in nature. It is a general
 77 assumption that the patients who have had more severe disease appear to have higher levels of
 78 important neutralizing antibodies³. Similarly, patients who had mild or asymptomatic COVID-19 have
 79 low levels of neutralizing antibodies. Many authors have reported diverse presentation of SARS-CoV-
 80 2 antibodies and varied presentation with different clinical features^{4,5,6,7}. The present study is
 81 undertaken to understand the status of antibody generation in confirmed COVID-19 patients and to
 82 analyze its correlation with disease severity, if any in our hospital settings.

83 Material and Method:

84 The present study is a single-center, open-label, cross-sectional, retrospective study. The Subjects
 85 were recruited into single-arm consulting COVID19 OPD of a tertiary care cancer hospital in North
 86 India. All the subjects presenting to our hospital from the start of the pandemic to 11 September 2020,
 87 with COVID-19 infection were eligible for enrolment into the study. In keeping with Indian Council
 88 of Medical Research (ICMR) protocols and international practice, patients were deemed to have
 89 COVID-19 if a Real-time Polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR) assay test and/or cartridge-based
 90 nucleic acid amplification test (CBNAAT) test from a combination of the naso-oropharyngeal swab
 91 was positive for SARS-CoV-2. Patients with a radiological or clinical suspicion of COVID-19, but a
 92 negative RT-PCR test were not included in this analysis. A total of 108 subjects were enrolled in the
 93 study who were tested positive either by RT PCR) or CBNAAT by GeneXpert. The testing data were
 94 extracted from hospital electronic medical records (EMR) and the clinical data was obtained
 95 telephonically for detailed medical history. The data set includes patient demographics, co-
 96 morbidities, and course of illness, various symptoms, type of symptoms, and the severity of symptoms
 97 specific to COVID-19.

98 **Method:** Testing for SARS COV2 IgG Antibody was done with chemiluminescent assay on the
 99 Ortho Clinical Diagnostic's (OCD) Vitros 5600 platform, US with the dedicated reagents. Antibody
 100 levels are presented as chemiluminescence values divided by cutoff (S/CO) levels. The cutoff level
 101 used in the study was 1.00, as per the kit insert from OCD. The RT PCR test was performed on Quant
 102 5 studio (Thermo-Fisher life science) employing an ICMR approved real-time test kit (TRUPCR®),
 103 whereas CBNAAT testing was done with Cepheid®USA (GeneXpert® assay).

104 **Statistical Analysis:** Continuous variables are presented as Mean±S.D, whereas for categorical
 105 variables, frequencies, and percentages were provided. Shapiro- Wilk test was used to test the
 106 normality of the data for the data which follows the normal distribution (P-value >0.05). An
 107 Independent t-test was used to compare the age and duration of symptoms between Mild/Moderate
 108 and Severe patients. A Chi-square test was used to compare categorical variables with the severity of
 109 symptoms. All data entries and statistical analyses have been performed by using SPSS® Version
 110 23.0 software. All the reported p-values were two-sided and p-values <0.05 were considered to
 111 indicate statistical significance.

Ethical approval

The study was approved by the Institution Review Board (IRB) (ref. no. 2020003). The written informed consent was waived by the IRB, since the study was retrospective in nature.

Results

A total of 106 COVID-19 patients were included in this study, of whom 61 were male and 45 were female. Their mean age was 43.7 years (range 17–83) and the median interval between initial symptom onset and sample collection was 12.33 days. Eighty patients (82%) had mild or moderate symptoms and twenty-six patients (18%) had severe symptoms. (Table 1). The antibody titers were positive in 99 patients (93%) and were found negative in 7 patients (7%). When comparing patients with mild/moderate symptoms and patients with severe/critical diseases, no statistically significant difference was observed between their gender ratios ($P = 0.373$) and age composition ($P = 0.224$). The average duration of the convalescence period was 12.14 days to 12.92 days in mild to moderate cases and severe cases respectively with no statistical significance. Also, while analyzing various symptoms of the patients, the majority of patients experienced fever (97%), myalgia (61%) cough (60%), and weakness (37%) (Table 2). However, few patients experienced other symptoms e.g. loss of taste, loss of smell, diarrhea, and gastritis with minor frequency. The antibodies were detectable in samples collected over 90 days after onset of disease with the earliest seroconversion of IgG antibody was observed 2 days after disease onset. The area under the curve (AUC) of receiver operating characteristic curve (ROC) to predict the best possible detection of antibodies in the serum post-infection was 0.704 with 95% CI (0.603-0.792) (Fig 1).

Table 1: Demographic information

Severity of Symptoms	Mild/Moderate	Severe	P-value
Total	80	26	N/A
Age	42.55±16.16	47.12±16.46	0.224
Duration of convalescence	12.14±1.78	12.92±2.88	0.100
Female	36	9	0.373
Male	44	17	
Negative	5	2	0.797
Positive	75	24	

Table 2: Type of symptoms and their distribution

Variables		Mean±S.D/Frequency(%)
Age		43.67±16.27
Duration of symptoms		12.33±2.11
Sex	Female	45(42.5)
	Male	61(57.5)
SARS COV 2 IgG Antibody	Negative	7(6.6)
	Positive	99(93.4)
Fever	Absent	3(2.8)
	Present	103(97.2)
Weakness	Absent	66(62.3)
	Present	40(37.7)
Cough	Absent	46(43.4)
	Present	60(56.6)
Headache	Absent	81(76.4)
	Present	25(23.6)
Dyspnoea	Absent	98(92.5)

	Present	8(7.5)
Pneumonia	Absent	105(99.1)
	Present	1(0.9)
Gastritis	Absent	93(87.7)
	Present	13(12.3)
Myalgia	Absent	41(38.7)
	Present	65(61.3)
Nasal Congestion	Absent	101(95.3)
	Present	5(4.7)
Loss of taste	Absent	103(97.2)
	Present	3(2.8)
Loss of smell	Absent	102(96.2)
	Present	4(3.8)
Diarrhoea	Absent	100(94.3)
	Present	6(5.7)
Vomiting	Absent	105(99.1)
	Present	1(0.9)

Figure 1: AUC of receiver operating characteristic curve (ROC) to predict the best possible detection of antibodies.

DISCUSSION

COVID-19 represents an array of various clinical forms ranging from asymptomatic to mild, moderate, and very severe cases. In the present study out of 106 patients, males are affected more than females. This varied presentation could be due to higher exposure risk to males. Around 82% patients present with mild to moderate symptoms and 18 % patients present with severe symptoms. Majority of subjects (97.2%) present with fever and 40-50% subjects complaint of associated symptoms of cough, myalgia and weakness. More than 95% cases did not give history of any loss of taste or smell or Nasal congestion. Sharma et al in the review article on global trends of clinical presentation also enumerated similar trends of clinical presentation.⁸ The immunology of all these cases is different and becomes more complex when the patients progresses to severe disease. The research studies done by Long et al, Thevarajan et al, have found an association between high SARS-CoV-2 antibody levels and COVID-19 severity^{3,9}. A plausible explanation for this observation may be that patients experiencing severe forms of the disease are exposed to higher viral load⁹. Alternatively, it may represent an overall exaggerated immune response driven either by "cytokine storms" or by "antibody-dependent enhancement" (ADE) which are two known immune responses causing severe

lung tissue damage. However, as a counter explanation, many authors have found no association of the antibody response against COVID-19 with the severity of the disease. A recent study by Phipps W et al¹⁰, has concluded that the measurement of IgG and IgM antibodies did not predict disease severity. The data studied herein also do not support the abovementioned association between high SARS-CoV-2 antibody levels and COVID-19 severity. In effect, we failed to find differences in SARS-CoV-2 IgGs levels between patients with mild, moderate, or severe symptoms, when they are matched for age, sex, and co-morbidities. The threshold duration of antibody detection was 7 days from the onset of disease with sensitivity and specificity of 71.11 and 57.14 respectively with area under the curve (AUC) of 0.704 with 95% CI (0.603-0.792). Similar findings regarding antibody detection after COVID-19 illness has been observed in other clinical studies by Rode et al¹¹. Antibody dynamics due to variable antigen presentation may contribute to false positive or negative results and inconsistencies in seroprevalence studies¹². In our opinion, a comparison between studies addressing the abovementioned issue is challenging, thanks to notable variations in clinical characteristics, categorization of severity, and ways SARS-CoV-2 antibodies are utilized for detection and quantification.

CONCLUSION

The data presented in this research study did not find any statistical significance between SARS-CoV-2 IgG antibody levels with COVID-19 disease severity, duration of symptoms, age, gender, and length of convalescence. We finally conclude that a better understanding of the pathogenesis and immunogenicity should be studied in greater detail to understand the ever changing immunogenicity profile of SARS-COV-2.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

We would like to acknowledge Dr Anurag Mehta for his guidance and our patients who helped us in conducting the study.

REFERENCES

1. Jacofsky David , Jacofsky Emilia, Jacofsky M Understanding Antibody Testing for COVID-19. J Arthroplasty. 2020 Jul; 35(7): S74–S81.
2. Lauer SA, Grantz KH, Bi Q, Jones FK, Zheng Q, Meredith HR, Azman AS, Reich NG, Lessler J. The incubation period of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) from publicly reported confirmed cases: estimation and application. Ann Intern Med. 2020;172:577–582.
3. Long QX, Liu BZ, Deng HJ, Wu GC, Deng K, Chen YK, Liao P, Qiu JF, Lin Y, Cai XF, et al. Antibody responses to SARS-CoV-2 in patients with COVID-19. Nat Med. 2020;26: 845–848.
4. Thevarajan I, Nguyen THO, Koutsakos M, Druce J, Caly L, van de Sandt CE, Jia X, Nicholson S, Catton M, Cowie B, et al. Breadth of concomitant immune responses prior to patient recovery: a case report of non-severe COVID-19. Nat Med. 2020;26:453–455.
5. To KK, Tsang OT, Leung WS, Tam AR, Wu TC, Lung DC, Yip CC, Cai JP, Chan JM, Chik TS, Lau DP, Choi CY, Chen LL, Chan WM, Chan KH, Ip JD, Ng AC, Poon RW, Luo CT, Cheng VC, Chan JF, Hung IF, Chen Z, Chen H, Yuen KY. Temporal profiles of viral load in posterior oropharyngeal saliva samples and serum antibody responses during infection by SARS-CoV-2: an observational cohort study. Lancet Infect Dis. 2020;20:565–574.

- 196 6. Xiang F, Wang X, He X, Peng Z, Yang B, Zhang J, Zhou Q, Ye H, Ma Y, Li H, Wei X, Cai P,
197 Ma WL (2020) Antibody detection and dynamic characteristics in patients with COVID-19. Clin
198 Infect Dis 2020:ciaa461
- 199 7. Zhao R, Li M, Song H, Chen J, Ren W, Feng Y, Song JW, Peng Y, Su B, Guo X, Wang Y, Chen
200 J, Li J, Sun H, Bai Z, Cao WJ, Zhu J, Zhang Q, Sun Y, Sun S, Mao X, Su J, Chen H, He A, Jin R,
201 Sun L (2020b) Serological diagnostic kit of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies using CHO-expressed full-
202 length SARS-CoV-2 S1 proteins. medRxiv 2020.03.26.20042184.
- 203 8. Sharma R, Daga MK, Mawari G, Karra VK, Kumar N, Jha MK, Kumar S. Global trends of
204 clinical presentation of COVID-19. Indian J Med Spec 2020;11:59-64
- 205 9. Wang Y., Zhang L., Sang L. Kinetics of viral load and antibody response in relation to COVID-
206 19 severity. J. Clin. Invest. 2020 Jul 7:138759.
- 207 10. Phipps W,Jeffrey A et al. SARS-CoV-2 Antibody Responses Do Not Predict COVID-19 Disease
208 Severity. Am J. Clin. Path. 2020 Oct :459-465.
- 209 11. Rode, O.Đ., Kurolt, I., Puljiz, I. et al. Antibody response and the clinical presentation of patients
210 with COVID-19 in Croatia: the importance of a two-step testing approach. Eur J Clin Microbiol
211 Infect Dis (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10096-020-04019-y>
- 212 12. Di Giambenedetto S, Ciccullo A, Posteraro B, Lombardi F, Borghetti A, Sanguinetti M. Still
213 much to learn about the diagnostic role of SARS-CoV-2 antibody detection [published online
214 ahead of print, 2020 May 2]. Clin Infect Dis. 2020;ciao532.
215 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciao532>.

1

2 **Figure 1: AUC of receiver operating characteristic curve (ROC) to predict the best possible detection**
 3 **of antibodies.**