

Antibody Response and Disease Severity in Healthcare Worker MERS Survivors

**Abeer N. Alshukairi, Imran Khalid,
Waleed A. Ahmed, Ashraf M. Dada,
Daniyah T. Bayumi, Laut S. Malic,
Sahar Althawadi, Kim Ignacio, Hanadi S. Alsalmi,
Hail M. Al-Abdely, Ghassan Y. Wali,
Ismael A. Qushmaq, Basem M. Alraddadi,
Stanley Perlman**

We studied antibody response in 9 healthcare workers in Jeddah, Saudi Arabia, who survived Middle East respiratory syndrome, by using serial ELISA and indirect immunofluorescence assay testing. Among patients who had experienced severe pneumonia, antibody was detected for ≥ 18 months after infection. Antibody longevity was more variable in patients who had experienced milder disease.

A study evaluating the immune response in patients infected with severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus (SARS-CoV) showed antiviral antibodies in survivors can be detected by ELISA and immunofluorescence assay (IFA) for up to 24 months after infection (1). Another study revealed that SARS-CoV antibodies were not detectable at 6 years after infection (2). Antibody response to Middle East respiratory syndrome coronavirus (MERS-CoV) typically is detected in the second and third week after the onset of the infection (3–5), but little is known about the longevity of the response or whether the decrease in antibody response over time correlates with the severity of the initial infection. We conducted a longitudinal study of antibody response among a cohort of MERS survivors who had been treated at King Faisal Specialist Hospital and Research Center in Jeddah, Saudi Arabia (KFSHRC-J).

The Study

Our research proposal was approved by the KFSHRC-J institutional review board. Written informed consent was obtained from all study participants. During the Jeddah MERS

outbreak in 2014, we tested specimens from 1,412 patients with suspected MERS-CoV infection by using a real-time reverse transcription PCR (rRT-PCR) assay. We identified 40 confirmed cases on the basis of rRT-PCR-positive specimens obtained by nasopharyngeal swab or bronchoalveolar lavage, as described previously (6; online Technical Appendix, <http://wwwnc.cdc.gov/EID/article/22/6/16-0010-Techapp1.pdf>). For each patient, ≥ 2 specimens were analyzed and rRT-PCR was conducted twice. Eighteen of 40 cases were in healthcare workers (HCWs); 12 of these 18 HCWs were symptomatic. The 6 asymptomatic HCWs were identified through contact tracing during active hospital surveillance for MERS cases. The patient cohort for this study consisted of 9 HCWs who were MERS-CoV-positive on the basis of rRT-PCR results and who agreed to provide blood samples for serial serologic testing for MERS-CoV by ELISA and IFA.

Patients' medical records were reviewed for information on demographic characteristics, comorbidities, clinical presentation, intensive care unit admission, and outcome. Patients were classified into 4 categories according to their clinical presentation: asymptomatic, upper respiratory tract infection, pneumonia, or severe pneumonia. Patients with severe pneumonia were those who required intubation and ventilatory support and were treated in an intensive care unit. Serial ELISA and IFA testing was performed at 3, 10 and 18 months after illness onset (online Technical Appendix). Specimens were considered to represent previous infection only when ELISA and IFA test results both were positive. Microneutralization testing was not available in the KFSHRC-J laboratory.

Disease onset corresponded to the date of the first MERS-CoV-positive rRT-PCR result. Data were available for analysis from 9 patients who were MERS-CoV-positive and had serial MERS-CoV serologic testing at 3 and 10 months after illness onset. Patients with severe pneumonia who were MERS-CoV-antibody-positive at 10 months had follow-up testing at 18 months. Serum samples could not be obtained from patient 3, who was also MERS-CoV-antibody-positive at 10 months. All patients were initially healthy without underlying conditions except patient 2 (Table), who had hypothyroidism. Four of the 9 patients were women; 2 of them, patients 2 and 8, were 32 weeks and 20 weeks' pregnant, respectively, when they had MERS-CoV infection. Average patient age was 38 years (range 27–54 years).

Of the 9 patients, 2 had severe pneumonia, 3 had mild pneumonia not requiring intensive care, 1 had upper respiratory tract disease, and 3 remained asymptomatic. All patients recovered without sequelae. The 2 patients with severe pneumonia had the highest antibody titers detected

Author affiliations: King Faisal Specialist Hospital and Research Center, Jeddah, Saudi Arabia (A.N. Alshukairi, I. Khalid, W.A. Ahmed, A.M. Dada, D.T. Bayumi, L.S. Malic, H.S. Alsalmi, G.Y. Wali, I.A. Qushmaq, B.M. Alraddadi); King Faisal Specialist Hospital and Research Center, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia (S. Althawadi, K. Ignacio); General Directorate of Infection Prevention and Control, Ministry of Health, Riyadh (H.M. Al-Abdely); University of Iowa Department of Microbiology, Iowa City, Iowa, USA (S. Perlman)

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.3201/eid2206.160010>

Table. Antibody response in 9 confirmed survivors of MERS-CoV infection, by selected demographic and clinical characteristics, King Faisal Specialist Hospital and Research Center, Jeddah, Saudi Arabia, 2014*

Patient no.	Age, y/sex	Clinical presentation	Test results							
			PCR, C _t		Serology at 3 mo		Serology at 10 mo		Serology at 18 mo	
			NPS	BAL	ELISA†	IFA‡	ELISA†	IFA‡	ELISA†	IFA‡
1	49/M	Severe pneumonia	28	26	+ (3.17)	+	+ (2.99)	+	+ (3.3)	+
2	33/F	Severe pneumonia	31	26	+ (2.7)	+	+ (2.09)	+	+ (2.9)	+
3	54/F	Pneumonia	34	ND	+ (2.91)	+	+ (1.9)	+	ND	ND
4	40/M	Pneumonia	32	ND	+ (1.29)	+	− (0.65)	−	ND	ND
5	37/M	Pneumonia	35	ND	+ (3.2)	+	+ (1.2)	−	ND	ND
6	36/M	URTI	32	ND	− (0.07)	−	− (0.07)	−	ND	ND
7	27/F	Asymptomatic	33	ND	− (0.046)	−	− (0.04)	−	ND	ND
8	28/F	Asymptomatic	32	ND	− (0.12)	−	− (0.06)	−	ND	ND
9	35/M	Asymptomatic	33	ND	− (0.07)	−	− (0.04)	−	ND	ND

*+, positive; −, negative; BAL, bronchoalveolar lavage; Ct, cycle threshold; IFA, indirect-immunofluorescence assay; MERS-CoV, Middle East respiratory syndrome coronavirus; ND, not done; NPS, nasopharyngeal swab; URTI, upper respiratory tract infection.

†ELISA for MERS-CoV S gene antibody; positive defined as a value >1.1, negative as <0.8, and borderline as between 0.8 and 1.1.

‡IFA for MERS-CoV IgG; endpoint titers not done.

among all patients and remained MERS-CoV-antibody-positive when tested at 18 months after illness onset. They also had prolonged viral shedding documented by persistent positive rRT-PCR results for 13 days (patient 1) and 12 days (patient 2); rRT-PCR analyses were negative after 2–5 days for patients 4–9. rRT-PCR was only repeated at day 13 for patient 3, and the result was negative. Three patients with pneumonia were MERS-CoV-antibody-positive at 3 months, but antibody was detected in only 1 of the 3 at 10 months (Table). All patients who had an upper respiratory tract infection or remained asymptomatic had no detectable antibody response on the basis of ELISA and IFA results.

Conclusions

Our results indicate that the longevity of the MERS-CoV antibody response correlated with disease severity. Accordingly, 2 patients with severe MERS-associated pneumonia had a persistent antibody response detected for ≥ 18 months after infection, whereas patients with disease confined to the upper respiratory tract or who had no clinical signs had no detectable MERS-CoV antibody response. Two previous studies have described longitudinal analyses of MERS-CoV surface glycoprotein-specific antibody responses in recovered patients. In the first study, which described a MERS outbreak in Jordan (7), MERS-CoV antibodies, including neutralizing antibodies, were still detectable in 7 patients with pneumonia 13 months after infection; most of these patients had severe pneumonia. In the second study, Drosten et al. (8) demonstrated that MERS-CoV neutralizing antibodies were produced at low levels after mild or subclinical infection and were potentially short-lived.

The results of our study have implications for understanding the pathogenesis and the treatment of MERS. First, patients with mild or subclinical infections who had no detectable antibody response might be at risk for recurrent infection and would also not be detected in population-based studies, resulting in falsely low prevalence rates. Previous studies suggest that neutralizing antibodies were not

sufficient to clear MERS-CoV, because neutralizing antibodies were detected in up to 50% of fatal MERS cases and antibody levels did not correlate well with virus load in the lungs (3). T-cell responses are critical for protection from subsequent challenge in animals experimentally infected with SARS-CoV (9). Although T cells have persisted up to 6 years in SARS survivors (2), whether these patients would have been protected if infected a second time with SARS-CoV is unknown. Additional studies will be required to assess the relative importance of T- and B-cell responses in MERS survivors. Second, we speculate that patients with low-level virus replication could provide a reservoir for infection of highly susceptible humans (i.e., those with underlying conditions). Such patients would be difficult to detect because they are only transiently positive for MERS-CoV antibody or might never mount an antibody response to MERS-CoV. Third, patients who recovered from severe pneumonia associated with MERS probably would be good candidates for providing MERS-CoV-specific convalescent-phase serum samples for use in treatment trials.

Our study is limited by the small number of patient numbers and the lack of neutralizing antibody testing. ELISA is highly sensitive but might cross-react with seasonal human coronavirus antibodies (10); it is useful as a screening test because it is 10-fold more sensitive than IFA. An IFA is required for confirmation (11), and use of a spike protein-specific IFA greatly diminishes the likelihood of cross-reactivity. Neutralization assays are considered definitive and must be performed whenever the results of ELISA and IFA are not conclusive (12). In the 9 patients reported here, ELISA and IFA results were consistent and conclusive. A limitation of this study is that serologic testing from single patients was not performed on the same day; therefore, only qualitative but not quantitative conclusions about changes with time after illness onset can be made.

In conclusion, our results indicate that MERS-CoV antibody persistence depends on disease severity. Further studies are required to determine the role of the

virus-specific T-cell response in MERS patients and determine whether patients with mild infections are at risk for reinfection and would therefore benefit from vaccination. Our data also show that potential donors of MERS-CoV convalescent-phase serum samples are limited to patients who recover from severe pneumonia.

Acknowledgments

We thank Mohamma Rasmi Gabajah for help in obtaining blood samples from HCWs.

This work was supported by the Pathology Department at KFSHRC-J. S.P. was supported by a grant from the US National Institutes of Health (grant no. PO1 AI060699).

Dr. Alshukairi is an infectious diseases consultant at KFSHRC-J. Her interests include tuberculosis and infections in immunocompromised hosts.

References

- Liu W, Fontanet A, Zhang PH, Zhan L, Xin ZT, Baril L, et al. Two-year prospective study of the humoral immune response of patients with severe acute respiratory syndrome. *J Infect Dis.* 2006;193:792–5. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1086/500469>
- Tang F, Quan Y, Xin ZT, Wrarmert J, Ma MJ, Lv H, et al. Lack of peripheral memory B cell responses in recovered patients with severe acute respiratory syndrome: a six-year follow-up study. *J Immunol.* 2011;186:7264–8. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4049/jimmunol.0903490>
- Corman VM, Albarrak AM, Omrani AS, Albarrak MM, Farah ME, Almasri M, et al. Viral shedding and antibody response in 37 patients with Middle East respiratory syndrome coronavirus infection. *Clin Infect Dis.* 2016;62:477–83.
- Park WB, Perera RA, Choe PG, Lau EH, Choi SJ, Chun JY, et al. Kinetics of serologic responses to MERS coronavirus infection in humans, South Korea. *Emerg Infect Dis.* 2015;21:2186–9. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3201/eid2112.151421>
- Buchholz U, Müller MA, Nitsche A, Sanewski A, Wevering N, Bauer-Balci T, et al. Contact investigation of a case of human novel coronavirus infection treated in a German hospital, October–November 2012. *Euro Surveill.* 2013;18:20406.
- Corman VM, Müller MA, Costabel U, Timm J, Binger T, Meyer B, et al. Assays for laboratory confirmation of novel human coronavirus (hCoV-EMC) infections. *Euro Surveill.* 2012;17:20334.
- Al-Abdallat MM, Payne DC, Alqasrawi S, Rha B, Tohme RA, Abedi GR, et al. Hospital-associated outbreak of Middle East respiratory syndrome coronavirus: a serologic, epidemiologic, and clinical description. *Clin Infect Dis.* 2014;59:1225–33. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciu359>
- Drosten C, Meyer B, Müller MA, Corman VM, Al-Masri M, Hossain R, et al. Transmission of MERS-coronavirus in household contacts. *N Engl J Med.* 2014;371:828–35. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa1405858>
- Channappanavar R, Fett C, Zhao J, Meyerholz DK, Perlman S. Virus-specific memory CD8 T cells provide substantial protection from lethal severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus infection. *J Virol.* 2014;88:11034–44. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1128/JVI.01505-14>
- Meyer B, Drosten C, Müller MA. Serological assays for emerging coronaviruses: challenges and pitfalls. *Virus Res.* 2014;194:175–83. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.virusres.2014.03.018>
- Müller MA, Meyer B, Corman VM, Al-Masri M, Turkestani A, Ritz D, et al. Presence of Middle East respiratory syndrome coronavirus antibodies in Saudi Arabia: a nationwide, cross-sectional, serological study. *Lancet Infect Dis.* 2015;15:559–64. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099\(15\)70090-3](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099(15)70090-3)
- Aburizaiza AS, Mattes FM, Azhar EI, Hassan AM, Memish ZA, Muth D, et al. Investigation of anti-middle East respiratory syndrome antibodies in blood donors and slaughterhouse workers in Jeddah and Makkah, Saudi Arabia, fall 2012. *J Infect Dis.* 2014;209:243–6. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/infdis/jit589>

Address for correspondence: Abeer N. Alshukairi, King Faisal Specialist Hospital and Research Center, Department of Medicine, PO Box 6653, Jeddah 21452, Saudi Arabia; email: abeer_sh@doctor.com

EID Podcast: 75 Years of Histoplasmosis Outbreaks in the United States

Histoplasmosis has been described as the most common endemic mycosis in the United States. A literature review was conducted to assess epidemiologic features of histoplasmosis outbreaks in the U.S. During 1938–2013, a total of 105 outbreaks involving 2,850 cases were reported in 26 states and the territory of Puerto Rico.



Visit our website to listen:
<http://go.usa.gov/cu3yW>

Antibody Responses and Disease Severity in Healthcare Worker MERS Survivors

Technical Appendix

Methods and Materials

Quantitative Real-Time Reverse Transcription PCR (rRT-PCR)

MERS-CoV rRT-PCR was performed as described previously (1) using RNA extracted from nasopharyngeal swabs and/or bronchoalveolar lavages obtained from patients in April 2014. Briefly, nasopharyngeal and BAL samples were immediately transported on ice to the lab. Nucleic acid extraction was performed using an EZ1 advance XL Extraction System and an EZ1 Virus mini kit v2.0 (Qiagen, Germany). The EZ1 kit provides a fully automated procedure for purification of viral nucleic acid. cDNA was prepared and analyzed by PCR using a Light Cycler (Roche, Switzerland), with a Realtime Ready RNA Virus Master (Roche) and primers complementary to the region upstream of the E-gene and to the Orf1a gene (TIB MOLBIOL, Germany). Negative and positive controls were included in each run. Positive controls produced exponential curves with well-defined logarithmic, linear and plateau phases, documenting the specific amplification of MERS-CoV RNA. Negative controls produced no PCR signal. The data were interpreted independently by two different technologists with final approval by an experienced molecular virologist. The C_t value cutoff was 35.

ELISA

ELISAs were performed as described previously (2,3). Briefly, a MERS-CoV-specific ELISA kit was purchased from EUROIMMUN, Germany. The assay uses microplates coated with purified recombinant MERS-CoV S1 spike protein. Use of the S1 fragment, the least conserved protein in the CoV genome, as antigen reduces the risk of cross reactivity with antibodies against other human coronaviruses. Positive and negative controls, included in the kit, were used according to the manufacturer's instructions. Samples with an optical density equal to or more than 1.1 were considered as positive and those with less than 0.8 as negative. Results

between 0.8 and 1.1 were considered borderline. Serial dilution and triplicate runs were not required according to the manufacturer's instructions. 1:101 dilutions were used.

Anti-MERS Coronavirus IIFT (IgG)

The Anti-MERS-CoV IIFT (IgG) kit is a validated indirect immunofluorescence assay (EUROIMMUN, Germany) that is used for qualitative detection of IgG antibody to MERS-CoV (4). The kit was used as per the manufacturer's instructions. Positive and negative controls were run with all samples. Staining with anti-MERS-CoV antibodies results in a distinctive pattern of fluorescence in the cytoplasm of infected cells, consisting of fine to coarse granular structures. Samples are reported as positive according to the degree of fluorescence observed when compared to positive and negative controls. Reactions are considered positive when fluorescence is observed in majority of the cells (50–100 cells per low power field). The antigen is coated on slides with 2 Biochips (one Biochip coated with MERS-CoV infected cells (species EU 14) and the other Biochip with noninfected cells (not specified in the instruction leaflet). MERS-CoV-specific antibody is detected using Fluorescein-conjugated goat anti-human IgG. The positive controls are anti-mitochondrial antibodies (AMA, IgG human). Negative controls antibody were provided by the manufacturer and consisted of human sera known to be negative for antibody reactive with MERS coronavirus and SARS coronavirus. The recommended sample dilution for qualitative evaluation was 1:100 in sample buffer. Only one dilution was used as per instructions. Stained slides were examined using a Zeiss Axioskop2 Plus fluorescent microscope with a wavelength filter of 490nm. The slides were examined using a low power objective (x20). Several fields were examined for each sample.

The following subjective scoring was applied:

1. Negative - No fluorescence or 1+ intensity (dim or dull apple-green fluorescence, lacking in sharpness, no focal labeling)
2. Weakly positive - 2+ intensity (clear distinguishable apple-green focal fluorescence)
3. Moderately positive - 3+ intensity (bright focal apple-green fluorescence)
4. Strongly positive - 4+ intensity (very bright focal apple-green fluorescence)

The positive control contained numerous cells that fluoresced strongly (4+). There were at least 50 –100 cells noted per low power field. The Biochip slides are also coated with numerous cells (50–100 per LPF). As noted, in the positive samples, numerous cells showed 3+ to 4+ fluorescence. There were at least 20–30 positive cells.

There are five wells per slide. In each well, there are two biochips, one biochip contains infected MERS-coronavirus Cells and the other biochip contains noninfected cells. The positive control is added to the first well and the negative control is added to the second well. Patient samples are added to the remaining three wells. If the sample is positive, a reaction will be observed in the biochip that contains the MERS-coronavirus infected cells, whereas the biochip with noninfected cells will show no fluorescence or very dim, nonfocal fluorescence.

References

1. Corman VM, Müller MA, Costabel U, Timm J, Binger T, Meyer B, et al. Assays for laboratory confirmation of novel human coronavirus (hCoV-EMC) infections. *Euro Surveill.* 2012;17:20334. [PubMed](#)
2. Drosten C, Meyer B, Müller MA, Corman VM, Al-Masri M, Hossain R, et al. Transmission of MERS-coronavirus in household contacts. *N Engl J Med.* 2014;371:828–35. [PubMed](#)
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa1405858>
3. Aburizaiza AS, Mattes FM, Azhar EI, Hassan AM, Memish ZA, Muth D, et al. Investigation of anti-middle East respiratory syndrome antibodies in blood donors and slaughterhouse workers in Jeddah and Makkah, Saudi Arabia, fall 2012. *J Infect Dis.* 2014;209:243–6. [PubMed](#)
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/infdis/jit589>
4. Buchholz U, Müller MA, Nitsche A, Sanewski A, Wevering N, Bauer-Balci T, et al. Contact investigation of a case of human novel coronavirus infection treated in a German hospital, October–November 2012. *Euro Surveill.* 2013;18:20406. [PubMed](#)