# 1 Title: Decline of SARS-CoV-2 specific IgG, IgM and IgA in convalescent COVID-19 patients

#### 2 within 100 days after hospital discharge

- 3 Huan Ma<sup>1,2#</sup>, Dan Zhao<sup>2#</sup>, Weihong Zeng<sup>1,2#</sup>, Yunru Yang<sup>2</sup>, Xiaowen Hu<sup>3</sup>, Peigen Zhou<sup>4</sup>, Jianping Weng<sup>1,5,6</sup>,
- 4 Linzhao Cheng<sup>7</sup>, Xueying Zheng<sup>1,5,6\*</sup>, Tengchuan Jin<sup>1,2,8\*</sup>
- 5 <sup>1</sup>the First Affiliated Hospital of USTC, Division of Life Sciences and Medicine, University of Science and
- 6 Technology of China, Hefei, Anhui 230001, China
- 7 <sup>2</sup>Hefei National Laboratory for Physical Sciences at Microscale, Laboratory of Structural Immunology, CAS Key
- 8 Laboratory of Innate Immunity and Chronic Disease, Division of Life Sciences and Medicine, University of
- 9 Science and Technology of China, Hefei, Anhui 230027, China
- <sup>10</sup> <sup>3</sup>Department of Pulmonary and Critical Care Medicine, the First Affiliated Hospital of USTC, Division of Life
- 11 Sciences and Medicine, University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei, Anhui 230001, China
- 12 <sup>4</sup>Department of Statistics, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Madison, WI 53706, USA
- <sup>13</sup> <sup>5</sup>Joint Laboratory of Public Health, University of Science and Technology of China and Health Commission
- 14 of Anhui Province, Hefei Anhui 230026, China
- <sup>15</sup> <sup>6</sup>Clinical Research Hospital (Hefei) of Chinese Academy of Science, Hefei Anhui 230001, China
- <sup>7</sup>Division of Life Sciences and Medicine, University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei Anhui 230026,
- 17 China, and Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine, Baltimore, MD USA
- 18 <sup>8</sup>CAS Center for Excellence in Molecular Cell Science, Chinese Academy of Science, Shanghai 200031, China
- 19

#### 20 **\*To whom correspondence should be addressed:**

- Prof. Tengchuan Jin (primary contact): Division of Life Sciences and Medicine, University of Science and
   Technology of China, Hefei, 230027, China; Email: jint@ustc.edu.cn; Tel: +86-551-63600720;
- Prof. Xueying Zheng: the First Affiliated Hospital of USTC, Division of Life Sciences and Medicine, University of
   Science and Technology of China, Hefei, Anhui 230001, China; Email: lxyzheng@ustc.edu.cn; Tel:
   +86-551-62264206
- 26
- 27 *"These authors contributed equally to this work."*
- 28

#### 29 Abstract

Monitoring the levels of SARS-CoV-2 specific antibodies such as IgG, M and A in COVID-19 patient is 30 an alternative method for diagnosing SARS-CoV-2 infection and an simple way to monitor immune 31 32 responses in convalescent patients and after vaccination. Here, we assessed the levels of SARS-CoV-2 RBD specific antibodies in twenty-seven COVID-19 convalescent patients over 28-99 33 days after hospital discharge. Almost all patient who had severe or moderate COVID-19 symptoms and 34 35 a high-level of IgG during the hospitalization showed a significant reduction at revisit. The remaining patients who had a low-level IgG during hospitalization stayed low at revisit. As expected, IgM levels in 36 almost all convalescent patients reduced significantly or stayed low at revisit. The RBD-specific IgA 37 levels were also reduced significantly at revisit. We also attempted to estimate decline rates of 38 39 virus-specific antibodies using a previously established exponential decay model of antibody kinetics 40 after infection. The predicted days when convalescent patients' RBD-specific IgG reaches to an undetectable level are approximately 273 days after hospital discharge, while the predicted decay 41 times are 150 days and 108 days for IgM and IgA, respectively. This investigation and report will aid 42 current and future studies to develope SARS-CoV-2 vaccines that are potent and long-lasting. 43

44

#### 45 Introduction

The 2019 novel coronavirus (later renamed as SARS-CoV-2 in February 2020) infected over 12 million 46 47 people globally by early July and caused mild to severe COVID-19 patients in millions. Monitoring the levels of antibodies such as immunoglobin (Ig) G, M and A that are specific to SARS-CoV-2 and 48 present in blood provides not only an alternative method for diagnosing SARS-CoV-2 infection 49 (including asymptomatic carriers), but also an simple way to monitor immune responses in 50 51 convalescent patients or after vaccination. A high and persistent level of SARS-CoV-2 specific antibodies, especially those that can bind to and neutralize the virus, would be a strong indication that 52 an immunized host could resist to SRAS-CoV-2 infection. Currently, there are no effective drugs to 53 specifically prevent or cure SARS-CoV-2 infection; therefore, host immune responses and 54 55 antibody-based therapeutics will continue playing important roles in combating and later preventing 56 COVID-19.

57

We previously established a set of diagnostic kits that quantitatively and sensitively measure the levels 58 of serum IgG, IgM and IgA specific to the SARS-CoV-2 spike protein receptor binding domain (RBD), 59 based on a cohort of 87 hospitalized COVID-19 patients and 483 negative controls (Ma et al., 2020). 60 These antibodies specifically bind to the RBD may block its interaction with a cell-surface protein ACE2 61 that serves as a main viral receptor. Previous studies demonstrated that the serum level of IgG that 62 specifically binds to the RBD highly correlates with that of neutralizing antibody activity in blocking 63 64 infection of SARS-CoV-2 or a pseudo-virus (Ni et al., 2020; Robbiani et al., 2020; Wu et al., 2020). Our RBD-specific, chemiluminescence-based kits are highly guantitative and sensitive for detecting 65 SARS-CoV-2 elicited IgA, IgG and IgM in blood (Ma et al., 2020). During the optimal detection 66 window of 16-25 days post illness onset, levels of RBD-specific IgA and IgG, but not IgM, were 67 68 significantly higher in severe and moderate than mild COVID-19 patients (Ma et al., 2020).

69

#### 70 Results and Discussions

To assess the levels of SARS-CoV-2 specific antibodies in COVID-19 convalescent patients over time 71 after hospital discharge, we used the same kits for detecting RBD-specific IgG, IgM and IgA levels in 72 73 blood of patients in this cohort as we did for them during the hospitalization (Ma et al., 2020). 74 Thirty-three convalescent patients living in Anhui Province of China voluntarily came back to our clinic for revisit, 28-99 days after hospital discharge. Six of them were detected positive for SARS-CoV-2 75 nucleic acids and excluded in the current serology study. The information of 27 qualified 76 77 convalescent patients is listed in **Supplemental table 1** in the order of COVID-19 severity during hospitalization. The table includes clinical information, discharge and revisit dates, and interval (28-99 78 days with a median 91 days) for each patient. The levels of the RBD-specific serum IgG, IgM and IgA 79 (measured as relative light unit or RLU after 40-times dilution) shortly before discharge and at revisit 80 81 are tabulated at **Supplemental Table 2**. In Figure 1 (A-C), we plotted antibody levels soon before 82 discharge and at revisit as Cutoff Index (COI), which is the ratio of RLU Signal / Cutoff value determined previously for serum IgG, IgM and IgA, respectively(Ma et al., 2020). Among the 27 83 convalescent patients, all (except #10) who had severe or moderate COVID-19 symptoms and a 84 high-level of IgG during the hospitalization showed a significant reduction at revisit (A). 85 The remaining patients who had a low-level IgG during hospitalization stayed low at revisit. As expected, 86 IgM levels in these convalescent patients reduced significantly or stayed low at revisit, except #14 (B). 87 The RBD-specific IgA levels were also reduced significantly at revisit (C), except patient #10 who also 88 89 had an increased IgG, but not IgM. Few exceptional cases will need further studies.

90

We also attempted to estimate decline rates of virus-specific antibodies using a previously established exponential decay model of antibody kinetics after infection(Teunis et al., 2016). Based on the combined data of COI ratios before and after discharge for each of the 27 patients, we plotted decay curves for RBD-specific IgG, IgM and IgA over time (**Figure 1D-F**). The predicted days when convalescent patients' RBD-specific IgG reaches to an undetectable level are approximately 273 days (ranging from 134-304 days or 4.5-10 months) after hospital discharge (**D**), while the predicted decay times are 150 days and 108 days for IgM and IgA, respectively.

98

In summary, the initial data of this longitudinal study showed that the levels of SARS-CoV-2 99 100 RBD-specific antibodies in most COVID-19 convalescent patients reduced significantly or remained 101 low within the first 100 days after discharge. A mathematical modeling and extrapolation predicts that the virus-specific IgG in this group of convalescent patients will disappear in 273 days (~ 9 months). 102 103 Our data and analyses provide timely and critical information on how long acquired humoral immune 104 responses to this new human coronavirus could persist. In literature, there are so far few papers on the persistence of the SARS-CoV-2 elicited antibodies after recovery beyond two weeks(Long et al., 105 2020; Ni et al., 2020; Robbiani et al., 2020; Wu et al., 2020). In one study, blood samples (both cells 106 and plasma) of six convalescent patients were collected two weeks after discharge and used to 107 108 examine humoral and cellular immune responses(Ni et al., 2020). In another study (Wu et al., 2020), 109 the serum IgG specific to the SARS-CoV-2 RBD and virus-neutralizing antibodies remained similarly low in 47 recovered patients two weeks after discharge. However, a recent study reported drastic 110 declines of RBD-specific IgG and virus-neutralizing activities in 148 convalescent patients after an 111 average of 39 days (Robbiani et al, 2020). The most recent study reported that 12.9% of the 112 symptomatic group and 40% of the asymptomatic group became negative for IgG after 8 weeks, 113 consistent with our findings of up to 99 days or 14 weeks. 114

115

116 Our current and other related studies point out a conclusion that SARS-CoV-2 infection did not elicit a 117 long-last humoral immune memory. Similar to what reported with the SARS-CoV-1 infection (Cao et al., 2007). Our observation and decline kinetics modeling provide a guideline for SARS-CoV-2 vaccine 118 designing as how to achieve long-last humoral immune response and memory. One way is to seek 119 120 immunogens and adjuvants that show very strong immune responses such as virus-specific IgG 121 induction that can be easily monitored. For example, a recent clinical trial showed that an 122 experimental vaccine using inactivated SARS-CoV-2 viruses with alum as the adjuvant only elicited comparable to, but not much higher virus-specific IgG production than what we and others observed in 123 hospitalized COVID-19 patients (Xia et al., 2020). Using more potent immunogens and adjuvants to 124

enhance immune responses for stronger SARS-CoV-2 IgG production will be an important early indication for effective development of SARS-CoV-2 vaccines that are highly potent and long-lasting.

127 Although long-term data beyond 99 days after discharge are still in progress and needed to confirm our modeling, our current report provides timely information and fills the gap of knowledge to assess the 128 persistence of antibody levels in response to this novel human coronavirus. A rapid reduction of 129 antibodies (IgG, IgM and IgA) specific to SARS-CoV-2 we observed in convalescent patients examined 130 131 4-14 weeks after discharge warrants timely and close attention; however, one shall interpret our current data cautiously. First, we had data so far from a relatively small group of COVID-19 132 convalescent patients, who were first chosen because we can compare changes of the virus-specific 133 antibodies after discharge. Second, we measured only the antibodies specific to SARS-CoV-2 RBD 134 135 in the study subjects. Third, we have not examined cellular immune responses in this cohort of 136 patients as did by others (Grifoni et al., 2020; Ni et al., 2020). Overall, our data are similar to what reported with SARS-CoV-1 infection: patients recovered from SARS had a rapid IgG decline and 137 became undetectable after 3 years (Cao et al., 2007). However, a study reported the presence of 138 long-lasting memory T cells reactive to the SARS-CoV-1 N protein in SARS patients recovered from 17 139 years ago (Le Bert et al., 2020). Nonetheless, our observational and longitudinal serology study 140 provides timely and valuable information to aid current and future studies, to address important issues 141 such as how to use convalescent plasma or hyper-immunoglobins to treat COVID-19 patients and how 142 143 to develop SARS-CoV-2 vaccines that are highly potent and long-lasting.

144

## 145 Funding

T.J. is supported by the Strategic Priority Research Program of the Chinese Academy of Sciences
(XDB29030104), National Natural Science Fund (Grant No.: 31870731 and U1732109), the
Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities (WK2070000108). TJ is supported by a
COVID-19 special task grant supported by Chinese Academy of Science Clinical Research Hospital
(Hefei) with Grant No. YD2070002017. M.H. is supported by the new medical science fund of USTC

151	(WK2070000130). JW and XY are supported by the Fundamental Research Funds for the Central
152	Universities with Grant No. YD9110004001 and YD9110002002, respectively.

153

## 154 Acknowledgements

- 155 We thank the staff and patients in The First Affiliated Hospital of USTC for their support in providing
- 156 samples and clinical data collection. We would also like to thank Profs. Tian Xue and other colleagues
- in Division of Life Sciences and Medicine for their generous and professional support.
- 158

### 159 **Conflict of Interest Disclosures**

- 160 Authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest.
- 161
- 162
- 163

### 164 **References**

Cao, W.C., Liu, W., Zhang, P.H., Zhang, F., and Richardus, J.H. (2007). Disappearance of antibodies to
 SARS-associated coronavirus after recovery. N Engl J Med. 2007;357(11):1162-1163.
 doi:10.1056/NEJMc070348.

- Grifoni, A., Weiskopf, D., Ramirez, S.I., Mateus, J., Dan, J.M., Moderbacher, C.R., Rawlings, S.A.,
  Sutherland, A., Premkumar, L., Jadi, R.S., *et al.* (2020). Targets of T Cell Responses to SARS-CoV-2
  Coronavirus in Humans with COVID-19 Disease and Unexposed Individuals. Cell.
  2020;181(7):1489-1501.e15. doi:10.1016/j.cell.2020.05.015.
- Le Bert, N., Tan, A.T., Kunasegaran, K., Tham, C.Y.L., Hafezi, M., Chia, A., Chng, M.H.Y., Lin, M., Tan, N., Linster, M., *et al.* (2020). SARS-CoV-2-specific T cell immunity in cases of COVID-19 and SARS, and uninfected controls. Nature. 2020;10.1038/s41586-020-2550-z. doi:10.1038/s41586-020-2550-z.
- Long, Q.X., Tang, X.J., Shi, Q.L., Li, Q., Deng, H.J., Yuan, J., Hu, J.L., Xu, W., Zhang, Y., Lv, F.J., *et al.* (2020). Clinical and immunological assessment of asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infections. Nature
- medicine. 2020;26(8):1200-1204. doi:10.1038/s41591-020-0965-6.
- Ma, H., Zeng, W., He, H., Zhao, D., Jiang, D., Zhou, P., Cheng, L., Li, Y., Ma, X., and Jin, T. (2020).
  Serum IgA, IgM, and IgG responses in COVID-19. Cell Mol Immunol. 2020;17(7):773-775.
  doi:10.1038/s41423-020-0474-z.
- Ni, L., Ye, F., Cheng, M.L., Feng, Y., Deng, Y.Q., Zhao, H., Wei, P., Ge, J., Gou, M., Li, X., *et al.* (2020).
  Detection of SARS-CoV-2-Specific Humoral and Cellular Immunity in COVID-19 Convalescent
  Individuals.Immunity. 2020;52(6):971-977.e3. doi:10.1016/j.immuni.2020.04.023.
- Robbiani, D.F., Gaebler, C., Muecksch, F., Lorenzi, J.C.C., Wang, Z., Cho, A., Agudelo, M., Barnes,
  C.O., Gazumyan, A., Finkin, S., *et al.* (2020). Convergent antibody responses to SARS-CoV-2 in
  convalescent individuals. Nature. 2020;10.1038/s41586-020-2456-9. doi:10.1038/s41586-020-2456-9.
- Teunis, P.F., van Eijkeren, J.C., de Graaf, W.F., Marinović, A.B., and Kretzschmar, M.E. (2016). Linking
   the seroresponse to infection to within-host heterogeneity in antibody production. Epidemics.
   2016;16:33-39. doi:10.1016/j.epidem.2016.04.001.
- Wu, F., Wang, A., Liu, M., Wang, Q., Chen, J., Xia, S., Ling, Y., Zhang, Y., Xun, J., Lu, L., *et al.* (2020).
  Neutralizing antibody responses to SARS-CoV-2 in a COVID-19 recovered patient cohort and their
  implications. medRxiv, 2020.03.30.20047365; doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.03.30.20047365.
- Xia, S., Duan, K., Zhang, Y., Zhao, D., Zhang, H., Xie, Z., Li, X., Peng, C., Zhang, Y., Zhang, W., *et al.*(2020). Effect of an Inactivated Vaccine Against SARS-CoV-2 on Safety and Immunogenicity
  Outcomes: Interim Analysis of 2 Randomized Clinical Trials. JAMA. 2020;10.1001/jama.2020.15543.
  doi:10.1001/jama.2020.15543.
- 197
- 198

199

## 200 Figure legend

Figure 1 Changes of SARS-CoV-2 RBD-specific serum IgG, IgM and IgA levels in 27 convalescent 201 patients near hospital discharge and at revisit 28-99 days after discharge. (A-C) The antibody levels 202 203 are presented as Cut-Off Index (COI) which is calculated as RLU signal divided by the Cut-Off value previously set for each of IgG, IgM and IgA, respectively. The p values for the difference between 204 discharge and revisit are < 0.0001, 0.0023 and 0.0020 for IgG, IgM and IgA, respectively. (D-F) Decline 205 curves for RBD-specific IgG (D), IgM (E) and IgA (F) over time, based on a mathematical model of 206 exponential decay after its peak at recovery (soon before or at discharge). The ratios of COI at 207 revisit versus discharge (day 0) is plotted by  $\log_{10}$  scale for each patient's IgG, IgM and IgA separately, 208 209 as a function of time (days after discharge). See more details in supplemental Methods. The decay curve is marked as a blue line, and 95% confidence interval is marked as a grey zone for each type of 210 SARS-CoV-2 specific antibodies. 211

212



Figure 1