

1 **SARS-CoV-2 antigenemia/viremia masks seroconversion in a COVID-19**  
2 **patient**

3 Konstantinos Belogiannis, M.D.<sup>1\*</sup>, Venetia A. Florou, M.D.<sup>1\*</sup>, Paraskevi C. Fragkou, M.D.,  
4 M.Sc.<sup>2\*</sup>, Stefanos Ferous, M.D., M.Sc.<sup>3</sup>, Loukas Chatzis, M.D., M.Sc.<sup>4</sup>, Aikaterini Polyzou,  
5 Ph.D.<sup>1</sup>, Nefeli Lagopati, Ph.D.<sup>1</sup>, Aikaterini Touliatou, M.D., Ph.D.<sup>3</sup>, Demetrios Vassilakos,  
6 Ph.D.<sup>1</sup>, Christos Kittas, M.D., Ph.D.<sup>1</sup>, Athanasios G. Tzioufas, M.D., Ph.D.<sup>4</sup>, Sotiris Tsiodras,  
7 M.D., Ph.D.<sup>2</sup>, and Vassilis Gorgoulis, M.D., Ph.D.<sup>1,5,6,7</sup>

8 <sup>1.</sup> Molecular Carcinogenesis Group, Department of Histology and Embryology, Medical  
9 School, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, Athens, Greece

10 <sup>2.</sup> 4<sup>th</sup> Department of Internal Medicine, Attikon University Hospital, National and  
11 Kapodistrian University of Athens, Athens, 12462, Greece

12 <sup>3.</sup> 2<sup>nd</sup> Medical Department, General Hospital of Athens G. Gennimatas

13 <sup>4.</sup> Department of Pathophysiology, Athens School of Medicine, National and Kapodistrian  
14 University of Athens, 11527 Athens, Greece

15 <sup>5.</sup> Faculty Institute for Cancer Sciences, Manchester Academic Health Sciences Centre,  
16 University of Manchester, Manchester, UK

17 <sup>6.</sup> Biomedical Research Foundation, Academy of Athens, Athens, Greece

18 <sup>7.</sup> Center for New Biotechnologies and Precision Medicine, Medical School, National and  
19 Kapodistrian University of Athens, Athens, Greece

20

21 \*Equal contribution as first authors.

22

23 **Corresponding author:**

24 Prof. Sotirios Tsiodras, 4<sup>th</sup> Department of Internal Medicine, Attikon University Hospital,

25 Medical School, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens.

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

26 1Rimini Str, Chaidari, Attiki, 12462, Greece

27 Email: [tsiodras@med.uoa.gr](mailto:tsiodras@med.uoa.gr)

28 Tel: +302105831990, Fax: +30 2105326446

29

30

31

## 32 **Summary**

33

34 Immune responses against SARS-CoV-2 have been vigorously analyzed. It has been  
35 proposed that a subset of mild or asymptomatic cases with undetectable antibodies may clear  
36 the virus in a T-cell cytotoxic-dependent manner, albeit recent data revealed the importance  
37 of B-cells in that regard. We hypothesized that underdiagnosed antigenemia/viremia may  
38 conceal humoral response possibly through immunocomplex formation. We report the first  
39 case of late-onset seroconversion detected following decline in antigenemia/viremia levels.  
40 Consequently, classification of at least a subset of COVID-19 cases as non-responders might  
41 not represent a true immunobiological phenomenon, rather reflect antibody masking due to  
42 prolonged antigenemia/viremia.

43

44 **Keywords:** SARS-CoV-2; COVID-19; viremia; antigenemia; antibody; seroconversion;  
45 immunoprevalence; non-responders.

46

47

48

49

50

## 51 **Introduction**

52

53 Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2), the culprit of an  
54 ongoing pandemic, continues to engender detrimental effects on healthcare systems  
55 worldwide leading to serious socioeconomic consequences. Following an incubation period  
56 of 2-14 days infected individuals experience a heterogeneous clinical course of the so-called  
57 Coronavirus Disease-2019 (COVID-19), ranging from asymptomatic infection to critical  
58 illness<sup>1,2</sup>. Similarly, symptomatic infection comprises of a wide array of clinical  
59 manifestations from localized disease affecting preferentially the respiratory and occasionally  
60 the gastrointestinal tract, to multi-systemic organ involvement<sup>3,4</sup>.

61 The brisk induction of pro-inflammatory responses, the so-called cytokine storm  
62 syndrome, is currently regarded as the major contributor of COVID-19-related multi-organ  
63 dysfunction<sup>5</sup>. However, there is sparse evidence that contradicts this supposition, implying a  
64 possible underestimated degree of viral-induced organ cytotoxicity<sup>6</sup>. Although the route of  
65 viral dissemination to other organs is still a subject of debate, growing evidence suggests this  
66 occurs haematogenously<sup>4,5,7</sup>. Nonetheless, SARS-CoV-2 viremia and antigenemia have only  
67 been documented in disproportionately low rates than expected and the clinical significance of  
68 their presence remains undetermined<sup>8-11</sup>.

69 Besides the role of viremia in COVID-19 pathogenesis, another ambiguous aspect of  
70 the disease is the host's immune response against SARS-CoV-2, and more specifically, the  
71 diversity of the humoral response level among SARS-CoV-2-infected patients. Based on  
72 currently available serological assays, it is evident that the majority of COVID-19 patients  
73 seroconvert within 2 weeks post symptom onset (p.s.o), whereas delayed (beyond the 2<sup>nd</sup>  
74 week p.s.o) or even absent antibody responses (non-responders) have also been documented  
75 **(Figure 1A)**<sup>12</sup>. The latter is particularly true in asymptomatic or paucisymptomatic patients<sup>12</sup>.

76 This divergent pattern of humoral response has also been observed in the other two beta-  
77 coronaviruses (SARS-CoV and Middle East respiratory syndrome coronavirus, MERS-CoV)  
78 as well as other viral strains, such as human papillomavirus (HPV) and human rhinoviruses<sup>12-  
79 14</sup>. This phenomenon of undetectable antibody titers following convalescence constitutes a  
80 paradox which has neither been studied nor satisfactorily explained.

81 To explain this paradox in COVID-19, we sought to examine the hypothesis that the  
82 presence of the virus and/or viral fragments (viremia and/or antigenemia) in the serum may  
83 mask seroconversion. If this is true, then two conditions should be met: 1) viral RNA should  
84 be detected in the blood stream, and 2) if the absence of seroconversion is due to  
85 antigen/viral-mediated saturation of circulating antibodies (i.e immunocomplexes formation),  
86 then the progressive decrease of antigenemia/viremia should be followed by increasingly  
87 detectable antibody titers<sup>15</sup>. Herein, we report to the best of our knowledge, the first case as a  
88 proof-of-concept supporting the proposed scenario.

89

## 90 **Case presentation**

91 We report the case of a young male in his 20's who presented with a 24-hour history  
92 of fever up to 38.4°C, without any additional signs or symptoms (**Figure 2A**). Due to a recent  
93 history of close contact with a confirmed COVID-19 case, nasopharyngeal swab from the  
94 patient was obtained and tested for SARS-CoV-2 with reverse transcription polymerase chain  
95 reaction (RT-PCR) on day 2 p.s.o, confirming the diagnosis (Cycle threshold value (Ct)=15).  
96 Subsequently, the patient self-isolated at home for two weeks, as per national infection  
97 control protocols. His fever subsided within a few days. Besides antipyretics, the patient did  
98 not receive any other medications. However, upon completion of the two-weeks' isolation,  
99 low grade fever (up to 37.4°C) recurred. A repeat RT-PCR test on day 15 p.s.o. was positive  
100 (Ct=30) (**Figure 2A**). Fever finally resolved 25 days after symptom onset.

101 A series of serum samples for the detection of antibodies against SARS-CoV-2 were  
102 collected at regular intervals (every 4-5 days) starting on day 6 p.s.o up to day 27 p.s.o,  
103 followed by two additional samples on days 55 and 73 (**Figure 2A**), a timeframe that exceeds  
104 the expected seroconversion window (**Figure 1A**).

105

## 106 **Materials and Methods**

### 107 **Monoclonal antibody production**

108 The monoclonal antibodies 480-S2 and 479-G2 used in the present immunoassays  
109 have been generated by immunizing mice against the receptor binding domain (RBD) region  
110 of the spike (S) protein of SARS-CoV-2 via a modification of the method described by  
111 Koehler and Milstein<sup>16</sup>. Following vigorous immunosorbent assay selection cycles, clones  
112 exhibiting the required sensitivity, specificity and reproducibility were selected for  
113 downstream applications as detailed below. These have been extensively validated (**Figure**  
114 **1B**) and are under proprietary rights (patent application no.:22-0003846810).

115

### 116 **Double antigen ELISA for antibody detection**

117 High-binding plates precoated with 1.5µg/ml S-trimer (Trenzyme, GmbH, Germany)  
118 were blocked with 300µl of 4% Bovine Serum Albumin (BSA) following incubation for 1  
119 hour at Room Temperature (RT). Then, 50µl of serum samples were loaded in duplicates (1:1  
120 dilution) and incubated at 4°C overnight. Next, 50µL/well of S protein conjugated to  
121 Horseradish Peroxidase (S-HRP) (5:12000 dilution) were loaded and incubated for 45  
122 minutes at RT. After appropriate washing, 50µL/well of 3,3',5,5'-Tetramethylbenzidine  
123 (TMB) were added and let to incubate for 10 minutes at RT in the dark. Subsequently, 50µL  
124 of phosphoric acid were used for reaction termination and the absorption was quantified  
125 using a microplate reader at 450nm (cut-off value: 0.100). Washing was performed at

126 appropriate steps using Phosphate Buffer Saline/0.1% Tween (PBSTx5). Following testing  
127 on 150 negative pre-COVID-19 and 250 RT-PCR positive samples, validation data revealed  
128 90.5% sensitivity and 95% specificity (**Suppl. Figure 1i**).

129 Our 'in house' method was cross-referenced to an FDA-approved and independently  
130 validated enzyme linked immunosorbent assay (ELISA) (Euroimmun, Luebeck, GmBH,  
131 Germany), by testing a panel of 321 anonymised samples (Pearson's Chi-squared test with  
132 Yates' continuity correction; p-value=0.5288)<sup>17</sup>. With regards to the presented case, the only  
133 discrepancy between the two ELISA methods was day 27 (2 weeks beyond the expected  
134 seroconversion window) where Euroimmun was positive and ours was negative. Moreover,  
135 antibody detection was tested by a commercially available Rapid Antigen Detection test, as  
136 well (lateral flow technology by Prognosis, BIO-SHIELD 2019-NCOV IGG, Catalog  
137 number: C1148/C1196).

138

### 139 **Sandwich ELISA for SARS-CoV-2 antigen detection**

140 High-binding plates precoated with 2µg/ml of monoclonal antibody 480-S2 were  
141 blocked with 300µl of 4%BSA/0.05%Tween blocking buffer following incubation for 1 hour  
142 at 37°C. Subsequently, 50µl of serum samples (1:1 dilution) were loaded in duplicates and  
143 were allowed to incubate overnight at 4°C. Following adequate washes with PBST, 50µl of  
144 secondary antibody 479-G2 solution labelled with HRP (G2-HRP at a concentration of  
145 1:50000) were loaded into each well, and after a 30min incubation period at RT in the dark,  
146 development of the signal was performed using 50µl of TMB substrate. Following a 10min  
147 incubation time, equal volume of phosphoric acid was introduced to terminate the reaction  
148 and signal was quantified as above (cut-off value: 0.100). Performance characteristics of the  
149 test were calculated following testing on 100 samples (28 RT-PCR positive and 72 negative

150 pre-COVID-19 samples), revealing a sensitivity of 93% and specificity of 99% (**Suppl.**  
151 **Figure 1ii**).

152

### 153 **Immunohistochemistry**

154 Immunohistochemistry was performed using the anti-SARS-CoV-2 monoclonal  
155 antibody (479-G2). The Novolink Polymer Detection System (Leica Biosystems) was used  
156 for development of the signal and hematoxylin for counterstaining (**Figure 1B, Suppl.**  
157 **Figure 2B**). The specificity of the immunohistochemical signal was confirmed by 1) omitting  
158 the primary antibody and 2) performing competition with the corresponding spike antigen  
159 (**Figure 1B**).

160

### 161 **Molecular Detection of SARS-CoV-2 RNA**

162 RT-PCR was implemented via a validated protocol as previously reported<sup>18</sup>.

163

### 164 **Next Generation Sequencing**

165 Next Generation Sequencing (NGS) of the viral genome in the presented case was performed  
166 as detailed in Supplementary Materials and Methods and in **Suppl. Figure 3**.

167

### 168 **Data and Statistical Analysis**

169 Line graph representing the optical density (O.D) values of Viral/Antigen load and  
170 anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibody titers as a function of time, was constructed with GraphPad  
171 Prism version 7.00 ([www.graphpad.com](http://www.graphpad.com)). Statistically significant differences between the  
172 two methods 'in house' ELISA and Euroimmun were evaluated by Pearson's Chi-squared test  
173 with Yates' continuity correction as appropriate.  $P < 0.05$  was considered statistically  
174 significant. The samples were examined in duplicates.

175

## 176 **Ethical Statement**

177           Written informed consent was obtained by the patients for the collection and  
178 processing of the samples as well as for the publication of this case report. This case report  
179 was conducted within the frame of ‘Emblematic action to handle SARS-CoV-2 infection:  
180 Epidemiological study in Greece via extensive testing for viral and antibody detection,  
181 sequencing of the virome and genetic analysis of the carriers’, which has been approved by  
182 the Ethics Committee of Medical School of National Kapodistrian University of Athens  
183 (Approval No. 317/12-06-2020).

184

## 185 **Results**

186           Regarding the first assumption of our hypothesis, properly preserved serum from  
187 confirmed COVID-19 patients was examined for the presence of viral RNA via RT-PCR.  
188 Molecular analysis exhibited a positive result demonstrating that a patient was infected with a  
189 previously uncharacterized strain showing 99% similarity with Wuhan-Hu-1 variant (**Suppl.**  
190 **Figure 1A, Suppl. Figure 3A**), which is in line with evidence supporting its detection in the  
191 blood<sup>8-11</sup>. Bioinformatic analysis of this variant revealed the presence of a series of amino  
192 acid substitution including the D614G and A879S in the spike (S) protein (**Suppl. Figure**  
193 **3B**). Subsequently, to test the second part of our assumption, validation of the produced  
194 antibody was carried out in nasopharyngeal swabs, post-mortem material and serum from  
195 confirmed COVID-19 patients. The appropriate negative controls were included in all three  
196 settings. In swabs, the sensitivity and specificity of the assay reached the values of 96,5% and  
197 99%, respectively (patent application no.:22-0003846810) (**Suppl. Figure 1iii**). Applying the  
198 antibody in immunohistochemical assays, viral particles were detected in archival material  
199 from lung tissues of COVID-19 patients<sup>19</sup>. The specificity of the immunohistochemical signal



200 was confirmed by 1) omitting the primary antibody and 2) performing competition with the  
201 corresponding spike antigen (**Figure 1B**). Tissues from a large cohort of non-COVID-19  
202 patients served as negative control<sup>20</sup>. Finally, the ‘in house’ sandwich ELISA assay for  
203 antigen detection we developed (for sensitivity and specificity see **Suppl. Figure 1ii**),  
204 identified viral antigens and/or the virus in serum of RT-PCR confirmed COVID-19 patients  
205 (antigenemia/viremia), whereas healthy individuals were negative.

206 Notably, our ‘in house’ sandwich ELISA assay for antigen detection revealed the  
207 presence of the virus and/or its constituents in the serum of a patient with remarkably high  
208 clinical suspicion of COVID-19 based on his clinical and laboratory findings (**Figure 3A-E**,  
209 **Suppl. Figure 2A**). In this case, a definite clinical diagnosis was not made possible due to  
210 lack of molecular confirmation by RT-PCR in a series of nasopharyngeal (5X) and even a  
211 bronchoalveolar lavage (BAL) specimen (**Figure 3A**). However, post-mortem  
212 immunohistochemical analysis of the lung tissue confirmed the viral infection (**Figure 3F**,  
213 **Suppl. Figure 2B**). Overall, the above workflow demonstrated **a**) the robustness of the  
214 antibody produced and **b**) that antigenemia/viremia may take place in a subset of COVID-19  
215 patients.

216 Given that antigenemia/viremia may occur, we sought to examine whether our  
217 working hypothesis stands in the presented case. Monitoring of the kinetics of the two  
218 parameters under investigation showed a progressive decline of antigenemia/viremia that was  
219 accompanied by a gradual increase of antibody titers resulting in evident seroconversion  
220 beyond the expected seroconversion window. In the case of lateral flow testing,  
221 seroconversion failed to be detected (**Figure 2B**).

222

## 223 **Discussion**

224 Immune responses against SARS-CoV-2 have challenged the scientific community  
225 worldwide, mainly due to their high inter-individual variability<sup>2</sup>. Heightened immune  
226 responses have been associated with adverse clinical outcomes while non-detectable ones,  
227 characterize mainly asymptomatic and mild cases<sup>12,21</sup>. The absence of humoral immunity has  
228 been attributed to various factors including variability in disease severity and host-related  
229 characteristics<sup>22</sup>. With regards to the latter, augmented innate over adaptive immune  
230 responses and/or a robust T-cell-mediated viral clearance are proposed as possible  
231 explanations<sup>23</sup>. However, this notion was disputed by recent studies demonstrating presence  
232 of dominant B-cell over T-cell responses irrespective of disease severity along with  
233 longitudinal persistence in memory specific T- as well as B-cells in mild cases<sup>24,25</sup>. This  
234 emphasizes the importance of humoral immunity in viral clearance and points towards a  
235 different explanation, whilst raising an important question: does the phenomenon of non-  
236 responders reflect a true immunobiological event or a limitation of currently available  
237 diagnostic tools in precisely portraying the immune landscape?

238 According to a study comparing different antibody detecting assays, this observation  
239 was reproducible by all methods, implying that absence of seroconversion represents a  
240 biological rather than a technical issue<sup>22</sup>. To the contrary, serum of presumably non-  
241 responders inhibited cell line infection upon culture with viable SARS-CoV-2, as assessed by  
242 a neutralization assay, the gold standard for antibody efficiency<sup>12,23</sup>. The latter supports that a  
243 technical limitation of the currently available diagnostic tools might be at play<sup>12</sup>.

244 Our findings suggest that delayed and/or absent kinetics of the antibody reaction is  
245 most probably due to the prolonged and increased presence of the virus or its constituents  
246 (spike antigen in the present case) in the serum, saturating the antibody response, thus  
247 rendering antibody detection feasible only when antigenemia/viremia drops below a certain  
248 threshold (**Suppl. Figure 4**). Similarly to the prolonged shedding seen in nasopharyngeal and

249 gastrointestinal tract secretions, it is likely that such an event could take place in the blood  
250 stream, as well<sup>26</sup>. A probable source of antigenemia/viremia could be PANoptosis  
251 (Pyroptosis, Apoptosis, Necroptosis), whereby cellular contents are released out of the cell  
252 and into the circulation<sup>27</sup>. A similar explanation has been proposed for the presence of viral  
253 RNA in the blood, reflecting a wash-out phenomenon from primary sites of infection<sup>9,28</sup>.

254 The take home message from the current effort is that antigenemia/viremia may affect  
255 SARS-CoV-2 antibody tests of seemingly non-responders<sup>23</sup>. In this context, such a  
256 phenomenon may lead to delay in or absence of seroconversion (negative result) secondary to  
257 immune interference/competition due to immunocomplexes formation (**Suppl. Figure 4**)<sup>15</sup>. It  
258 is likely that the ratio between antigens and immunoglobulins -rather the absolute values  
259 there of- at a given timepoint during propagation of immune responses determines the result  
260 of the immunodiagnostic method. As a result, such a confounding factor should be taken into  
261 consideration when interpreting test results. Moreover, it could serve as a partial explanation  
262 in discrepancies observed between various diagnostic tools monitoring antibody kinetics, as  
263 demonstrated also in the presented case (**Figure 2B**)<sup>23,29</sup>. Therefore, immune response  
264 monitoring should be evaluated in longer intervals to better estimate population  
265 seroprevalence, thus designing tailored public health strategies (diagnostic algorithms). Such  
266 strategies, within the context of vaccine shortage, could potentially include vaccination  
267 prioritization of most vulnerable groups harboring little or no antibody protection against  
268 SARS-CoV-2 re-infection<sup>30</sup>.

269

## 270 **Disclosure/Conflict of Interest**

271 The authors wish to declare no conflict of interest.

272

## 273 **Acknowledgments**

274 We would like to thank Mr. Dimitris Veroutis for his valuable contribution in performing  
275 immunohistochemical analysis in lung tissue specimens, Dr. Panagiota Tsioli in performing  
276 RT-PCR in serum of COVID-19-confirmed cases, and Dr. Athanassios Kotsinas, Assistant  
277 Professor at the Faculty of Medicine, NKUA, for providing representative NGS results. This  
278 work was supported by the: National Public Investment Program of the Ministry of  
279 Development and Investment / General Secretariat for Research and Technology, in the  
280 framework of the Flagship Initiative to address SARS-CoV-2 (2020ΣΕ01300001); Horizon  
281 2020 Marie Sklodowska-Curie training program no. 722729 (SYNTRAIN); Welfare  
282 Foundation for Social & Cultural Sciences, Athens, Greece (KIKPE); H. Pappas donation;  
283 Hellenic Foundation for Research and Innovation (HFRI) grants no. 775 and 3782 and  
284 NKUA-SARG grant 70/3/8916.

285

## 286 **References:**

- 287 1. Symptoms of Coronavirus | CDC [cited 2021 Jan 12]; Available from:  
288 <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/symptoms-testing/symptoms.html>.
- 289 2. Perlman S. COVID-19 poses a riddle for the immune system. *Nature*.  
290 2020;584(7821):345-346. doi:10.1038/d41586-020-02379-1.
- 291 3. Russell MW, Moldoveanu Z, Ogra PL, Mestecky J. Mucosal Immunity in COVID-19:  
292 A Neglected but Critical Aspect of SARS-CoV-2 Infection. *Front Immunol*.  
293 2020;11:611337. Published 2020 Nov 30. doi:10.3389/fimmu.2020.611337.
- 294 4. Gupta A, Madhavan MV, Sehgal K, et al. Extrapulmonary manifestations of COVID-  
295 19. *Nat Med*. 2020;26(7):1017-1032. doi:10.1038/s41591-020-0968-3.
- 296 5. Schurink B, Roos E, Radonic T, et al. Viral presence and immunopathology in patients  
297 with lethal COVID-19: a prospective autopsy cohort study. *Lancet Microbe*.  
298 2020;1(7):e290-e299. doi:10.1016/S2666-5247(20)30144-0.

- 299 6. Leisman DE, Ronner L, Pinotti R, et al. Cytokine elevation in severe and critical  
300 COVID-19: a rapid systematic review, meta-analysis, and comparison with other  
301 inflammatory syndromes. *Lancet Respir Med.* 2020;8(12):1233-1244.  
302 doi:10.1016/S2213-2600(20)30404-5.
- 303 7. Di Cristanziano V, Meyer-Schwickerath C, Eberhardt KA, et al. Detection of SARS-  
304 CoV-2 viremia before onset of COVID-19 symptoms in an allo-transplanted patient  
305 with acute leukemia [published online ahead of print, 2020 Sep 18]. *Bone Marrow*  
306 *Transplant.* 2020;10.1038/s41409-020-01059-y. doi:10.1038/s41409-020-01059-y.
- 307 8. Wang W, Xu Y, Gao R, et al. Detection of SARS-CoV-2 in Different Types of  
308 Clinical Specimens. *JAMA.* 2020;323(18):1843-1844. doi:10.1001/jama.2020.3786.
- 309 9. Fajnzylber J, Regan J, Coxen K, et al. SARS-CoV-2 viral load is associated with  
310 increased disease severity and mortality. *Nat Commun.* 2020;11(1):5493. Published  
311 2020 Oct 30. doi:10.1038/s41467-020-19057-5.
- 312 10. Bermejo-Martin JF, González-Rivera M, Almansa R, et al. Viral RNA load in plasma  
313 is associated with critical illness and a dysregulated host response in COVID-19. *Crit*  
314 *Care.* 2020;24(1):691. Published 2020 Dec 14. doi:10.1186/s13054-020-03398-0.
- 315 11. Hingrat QL, Visseaux B, Laouenan C, et al. Detection of SARS-CoV-2 N-antigen in  
316 blood during acute COVID-19 provides a sensitive new marker and new testing  
317 alternatives [published online ahead of print, 2020 Dec 8]. *Clin Microbiol Infect.*  
318 2020;S1198-743X(20)30721-7.
- 319 12. Kellam P, Barclay W. The dynamics of humoral immune responses following SARS-  
320 CoV-2 infection and the potential for reinfection. *J Gen Virol.* 2020;101(8):791-797.  
321 doi:10.1099/jgv.0.001439.
- 322 13. Pierce Campbell CM, Viscidi RP, Torres BN, et al. Human Papillomavirus (HPV) L1  
323 Serum Antibodies and the Risk of Subsequent Oral HPV Acquisition in Men: The

- 324 HIM Study. *J Infect Dis.* 2016;214(1):45-48. doi:10.1093/infdis/jiw083.
- 325 14. Doyle WJ, Casselbrant ML, Li-Korotky HS, et al. The interleukin 6 -174 C/C  
326 genotype predicts greater rhinovirus illness. *J Infect Dis.* 2010;201(2):199-206.  
327 doi:10.1086/649559.
- 328 15. Felsenstein S, Herbert JA, McNamara PS, Hedrich CM. COVID-19: Immunology and  
329 treatment options. *Clin Immunol.* 2020; 215:108448. doi:10.1016/j.clim.2020.108448.
- 330 16. Köhler G, Milstein C. Continuous cultures of fused cells secreting antibody of  
331 predefined specificity. *Nature.* 1975;256(5517):495-497. doi:10.1038/256495a0
- 332 17. Vlachoyiannopoulos P, Alexopoulos H, Apostolidi I, et al. Anti-SARS-CoV-2  
333 antibody detection in healthcare workers of two tertiary hospitals in Athens,  
334 Greece. *Clin Immunol.* 2020;221:108619. doi:10.1016/j.clim.2020.108619.
- 335 18. Lagopati N, Tsioli P, Mourkioti I, et al. Sample pooling strategies for SARS-CoV-2  
336 detection [published online ahead of print, 2020 Dec 11]. *J Virol Methods.*  
337 2020;289:114044. doi:10.1016/j.jviromet.2020.114044.
- 338 19. Evangelou K, Veroutis D, Foukas PG, et al. Alveolar type II cells harbouring SARS-  
339 CoV-2 show senescence with a proinflammatory phenotype. bioRxiv 2021;  
340 2021.01.02.424917.
- 341 20. Gorgoulis VG, Vassiliou LV, Karakaidos P, et al. Activation of the DNA damage  
342 checkpoint and genomic instability in human precancerous lesions. *Nature.*  
343 2005;434(7035):907-913. doi:10.1038/nature03485.
- 344 21. Li K, Huang B, Wu M, et al. Dynamic changes in anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibodies during  
345 SARS-CoV-2 infection and recovery from COVID-19. *Nat Commun.*  
346 2020;11(1):6044. Published 2020 Nov 27. doi:10.1038/s41467-020-19943-y.
- 347 22. Baron RC, Risch L, Weber M, et al. Frequency of serological non-responders and  
348 false-negative RT-PCR results in SARS-CoV-2 testing: a population-based study. *Clin*

- 349 *Chem Lab Med.* 2020;58(12):2131-2140. Published 2020 Aug 31. doi:10.1515/cclm-  
350 2020-0978.
- 351 23. Marklund E, Leach S, Axelsson H, et al. Serum-IgG responses to SARS-CoV-2 after  
352 mild and severe COVID-19 infection and analysis of IgG non-responders. *PLoS One.*  
353 2020;15(10):e0241104. Published 2020 Oct 21. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0241104.
- 354 24. Linssen J, Ermens A, Berrevoets M, et al. A novel haemocytometric COVID-19  
355 prognostic score developed and validated in an observational multicentre European  
356 hospital-based study. *Elife.* 2020;9:e63195. Published 2020 Nov 26.  
357 doi:10.7554/eLife.63195.
- 358 25. Rodda LB, Netland J, Shehata L, et al. Functional SARS-CoV-2-specific immune  
359 memory persists after mild COVID-19. Preprint. *Res Sq.* 2020; rs.3.rs-57112.  
360 Published 2020 Aug 13. doi:10.21203/rs.3.rs-57112/v1.
- 361 26. Karia R, Nagraj S. A Review of Viral Shedding in Resolved and Convalescent  
362 COVID-19 Patients [published online ahead of print, 2020 Sep 3]. *SN Compr Clin*  
363 *Med.* 2020; 1-10. doi:10.1007/s42399-020-00499-3.
- 364 27. Lee S, Channappanavar R, Kanneganti TD. Coronaviruses: Innate Immunity,  
365 Inflammasome Activation, Inflammatory Cell Death, and Cytokines. *Trends Immunol.*  
366 2020;41(12):1083-1099. doi:10.1016/j.it.2020.10.005.
- 367 28. Jana L Jacobs, John W Mellors, Detection of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome  
368 Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) RNA in Blood of Patients With Coronavirus Disease  
369 2019 (COVID-19): What Does It Mean?, *Clinical Infectious Diseases,*  
370 ciaa1316, <https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciaa1316>
- 371 29. Jääskeläinen AJ, Kuivanen S, Kekäläinen E, et al. Performance of six SARS-CoV-2  
372 immunoassays in comparison with microneutralisation. *J Clin Virol.* 2020;  
373 129:104512. doi:10.1016/j.jcv.2020.104512.

374 30. Ejm M, Study Group S. Do antibody positive healthcare workers have lower SARS-  
375 CoV-2 infection rates than antibody negative healthcare workers? Large multi-centre  
376 prospective cohort study (the SIREN study), England: June to November 2020.  
377 medRxiv 2021;2021.01.13.21249642.

378

## 379 **Figure Legends**

380

381 **Figure 1: A.** Antibody responses and viral load temporal kinetics as they correlate with  
382 clinical symptoms are depicted. Estimated time intervals are based on data from several  
383 published studies. The graph in red illustrates the antibody response pattern of our patient -  
384 who is considered as late/non-responder - relatively to that mounted in most COVID-19  
385 individuals. **B.** Immunohistochemical images from lung tissues of a positive COVID-19  
386 patient (images i-vi) and a negative control (image vii). Cytoplasmic staining of Type II  
387 Pneumocytes is seen following incubation with secondary Anti-SARS-CoV-2 monoclonal  
388 antibody (479-G2) with (ii, iv, vi) and without (i, iii, v) competition with excess (one in ten  
389 dilution) viral Spike (S) protein. Upon competition, cytoplasmic signal is lost (ii, iv, vi).

390

391 **Figure 2: A.** Table summarizing patient's (presented case) clinical characteristics. **B.**  
392 Diagram depicting kinetics of antigen/viral load as relate to antibody generation detected by  
393 two separate immunodiagnostic assays (in house ELISA and Lateral Flow). Time-dependent  
394 decline in the antigen/viral load is associated with seroconversion 55-days post symptom  
395 onset in the case of our 'in house' ELISA, whilst it failed to occur according to Lateral Flow  
396 assay.

397



398 **Figure 3: A.** Table summarizing sampling dates and types of specimens obtained for  
399 diagnostic purposes in a separate patient with high clinical suspicion of COVID-19. **B, C, D:**  
400 X-RAYS obtained at different time points during patient’s clinical course (on admission, at  
401 clinical deterioration (Day 4) and post-intubation, respectively). Progressively worsening  
402 patchy infiltrations as well as air bronchogram can be visualized in affected lung fields. **E.**  
403 Computed Tomography (CT) of the lungs obtained at time of clinical deterioration (following  
404 Chest X-RAY; **Figure 2C**) demonstrating diffuse ground glass opacities in affected lung  
405 fields, typical for COVID-19. **F.** Immunohistochemical confirmation of SARS-CoV-2  
406 infection in cadaveric lung tissue material derived from the same patient.

407

408 **Supplementary Figure 1. A.** Positive RT-PCR values as detected in the serum of confirmed  
409 COVID-19 patients. Amplification of target genes (N1, N2), regions encoding for  
410 nucleocapsid protein of SARS-CoV-2, as well as a reporter gene (RNase P) are shown along  
411 usage of adequate controls. **B.** Performance characteristics (sensitivity and specificity  
412 expressed in percentages) of ‘In house’ assays: **i.** Double Antigen ELISA for antibody  
413 detection, **ii.** Sandwich ELISA for antigen detection in serum, and **iii.** Sandwich ELISA for  
414 antigen detection in nasopharyngeal swab specimens.

415

416 **Supplementary Figure 2. A.** Additional immunohistochemistry pictures depicting presence  
417 of SARS-CoV-2 in Type II pneumocytes in the lung of the diseased patient. Staining was  
418 performed using secondary antibody 479-G2. **B.** Diagram depicting trends in antigen/viral  
419 load and antibody kinetics as a function of time in the same patient. Interestingly, detection of  
420 antigen/viral load in the serum was possible via our in house developed ELISA, confirming  
421 COVID-19 diagnosis. This is in line with post-mortem immunohistochemical analysis

422 **(Figure 3F, Supplementary Figure 3B)** and in contrast to RT-PCR testing, which was  
423 repeatedly negative **(Figure 3A)**.


424

425 **Supplementary Figure 3. A.** RNA sequencing of SARS-CoV-2 strain isolated from present  
426 case. Upon comparison against Wuhan-Hu-1 complete genome, 99% coverage similarity was  
427 observed. **B.** Table listing mutations and their corresponding gene locus within SARS-CoV-2  
428 genome.

429


430 **Supplementary Figure 4.** A plausible explanation for interference may be that anti-SARS-  
431 CoV-2 antibodies present in the serum may directly cross react to viral antigens and/or virus  
432 also found in the serum. Subsequently, the association between anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibodies  
433 and viral antigens in the serum will inhibit the cross reaction of anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibodies  
434 with the immobilized SARS-CoV-2 antigen immobilized on ELISA microplates. We also  
435 suggest that when antigen/viral load decreases, this interference/competitive effect is  
436 alleviated, permitting serum anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibodies to cross react to immobilized  
437 antigen on the ELISA plate and hence being detected. Competitive ELISA is an established  
438 practice in immunoassays where the affinity between an antigen and antibody is tested. We  
439 propose that this effect may also occur during serological diagnostic tests for SARS-CoV-2,  
440 where antigenemia/viremia observed in COVID-19 will directly interfere with the  
441 immunoassay. Presumably, this may also extend to other infectious viral diseases where  
442 antigenemia/viremia has been observed.

**A**



**B**

**COVID - 19 Lung**




**A**

**Figure 2**

<i>Demographic information</i>	
Age	18-28
Sex	Male
<i>History of present illness / Diagnostic Workup</i>	
Onset of COVID-19 symptoms	Day 1 → day of symptom onset
Symptoms	Fever
Duration of symptoms	Day 1 - 3; Fever up to 38.4°C Day 14 - 18; Fever up to 37.4°C
Positive PCR tests	Day 2; Ct=15 Day 16; Ct=30
Days of blood sampling	Day 6 Day 11 Day 16 Day 20 Day 27 Day 55 Day 73

**B**








**A**

Demographic information	
Age	45 - 55
Sex	Male
History of present illness / Diagnostic Workup	
Onset of COVID-19 symptoms	Day 1 → day of admission
Symptoms	Confusion, Hypoxia (Day 1) Intubation and Mechanical Ventilation (Day 4)
PCR tests	Day 1; NP: Negative Day 2; NP: Negative Day 3; NP: Negative Day 4; BAL: Negative Day 6; NP: Negative
Days of blood sampling	Day 6 Day 7


**B**



**C**



**E**



**F**

