International Journal of Aquatic Science
ISSN: 2008-8019
Vol 13, Issue 01, 2022

Analysis of the Different Levels of Immunity Present Within the Human Body with Reference to Covid-19

Dr. Suman Khatry[1], Ashik Ansary[2]

[1]*Research Guide, Dept. of Zoology, Sri Satya Sai University of Technology and Medical Sciences, Sehore Bhopal-Indore Road, Madhya Pradesh, India*
[2]*MD Research Scholar, Dept. of Zoology, Sri Satya Sai University of Technology and Medical Sciences, Sehore Bhopal-Indore Road, Madhya Pradesh, India*

Abstract: The immune system is the body's first line of defence against foreign invaders because it generates antibodies that can destroy disease-causing microorganisms. This page gives an overview of the immune system's protection against COVID-19, covers the immune system's process, function, and way of fighting virus, and describes the most recent medicines for and experimental data on COVID-19. This page also summarises the function of the immune system in protecting against COVID-19. Furthermore, several different threats to the immune system are covered. In the final section of the paper, we provide a list of both recommended and discouraged foods and close with a call to action for regular exercise. This article represents the most recent data on combating the coronavirus, and it can be used in any part of the world.

Keywords: COVID-19, immunity present, human body.

1. INTRODUCTION

The severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2), which has been spreading over the world, has been responsible for a large number of cases of illness and deaths. It is likely that a lack of protection against the virus is to blame for the huge increase in the number of cases that have been documented. The vast majority of SARS-CoV-2 transmission models are based on the premise that infection confers immunity to the virus for a period of at least one year, and here is where the models fall short. This concept is relevant for public health professionals in a number of different areas, including nonpharmaceutical medicines, the therapeutic use of infected persons' sera, and the efficacy of serological tests for identifying immune individuals. The dynamics of immunity will have an effect on how accurately serological testing can determine the prevalence of infection in communities. However, the scientific foundation for long-term immunity, which is crucial for both public health and therapeutic initiatives, is not well defined, and our understanding of the dynamics and nature of the immune response to SARS-CoV-2 infection is still limited. Both of these factors limit our ability to effectively combat these threats. In light of the limited knowledge we now possess concerning that virus, this review delves into the wider coronavirus family in search of hints regarding SARS-CoV-2 immunity. Several authors have pointed out human experimental infection experiments (also known as human challenge studies), which have shown that immunity to coronaviruses may only last for a year or two after an infection has occurred. This information was gleaned from human experimental infection experiments. Human

coronaviruses, often known as HCoVs, have been used in human challenge studies ever since they were discovered. Research in which participants were knowingly subjected to HCoV infection has provided some of the best characterizations yet of human responses to coronaviruses as well as the potential for immune responses to constrain infection and morbidity. In multiple human challenge trials conducted before the coronavirus challenge, antibody immunity was examined, and responses were connected to either protection from infection, a positive serological response, or the absence of symptoms.Human challenge viruses (HCoV) were able to be utilised without risk because of the low virulence of these viruses. Some people have advocated for their usage in specific populations; however, due to the increased risk of severe sickness caused by SARS-CoV-2, it is typically not possible to conduct such tests. It is necessary to have information of the time course of protective immunity against SARS-CoV-2 in order to have an all-encompassing understanding of the pandemic and post-pandemic dynamics. The rapid global expansion of SARS-CoV-2, much like the transmission of other diseases that have only recently been discovered, poses a threat to the virus's long-term survival since it reduces the number of vulnerable hosts. Cross-protection or antibody-dependent strengthening of the immune system against endemic coronaviruses may have an impact on the short- and long-term dynamics of SARS-CoV-2, but the nature of these interactions and the effects they have are not yet known. Cross-protection or antibody-dependent strengthening of the immune system against SARS-CoV-2 Seroprevalence studies of endemic coronaviruses that take into account age groups may give light on the potential drop in incidence rates due to improved population immunity in the event that SARS-CoV-2 becomes an endemic disease. In this paper, we report the findings of a systematic review of the literature on antibody measures of immunity to coronaviruses, including endemic HCoV (primarily HCoV-229E, HCoV-HKU1, HCoV-OC43, and HCoV-NL63), SARS-CoV (severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus that emerged in 2002), MERS-CoV (Middle East respiratory syndrome coronavirus), and early work We conceive the stages of exposure and infection at which immunity may play a role in the dynamics of SARS-CoV-2, as well as how the literature documenting work on this and other coronaviruses can provide insights into these stages, as follows: at the stage of exposure, immunity may play a role in the dynamics of SARS-CoV-. When an individual is exposed to a virus, their immune system produces an antibody response, which might vary over time and between different people (antibody kinetics). Evidence for such correlates of protection after exposure after being exposed can be found in the literature through the use of challenge trials and longitudinal cohort studies. In the event of infection, a person's immunological status, which may be influenced by pre-existing antibodies to various coronaviruses (among other mechanisms), may cause damage through immunopathogenesis; however, the majority of the research that has been conducted on this subject has been conducted in vitro. Determining immunity correlates is made more difficult by the presence of numerous coronavirus genera. These coronavirus genera are antigenically diverse and have the potential to confer cross-protection. However, they also have the potential to produce false-positive assay results due to cross-reactivity (or risk through immunopathogenesis). At the end of the day, the seroprevalence of a population is determined by the interaction of the individual-level phenomena that were covered earlier. Evidence, although ecological evidence, for or against the theorised mechanisms of immunity at the individual level can be gained through research that examine these factors across different age groups.

Related work

A.S. Hancock, et al[1] The infection caused by the influenza virus is still a significant threat to public health. We utilised a recombinant influenza virus that expressed green fluorescent protein in order to compare the in vivo transcriptomes of directly infected and uninfected bystander cells from infected mouse lungs. As a result of this comparison, we found that each population had many pathways that were uniquely regulated. It was shown that directly infected cells had a lower level of activity in the Wnt signalling pathway, which was proven to decrease viral generation but not interferon production. Our research is the first to differentiate the in vivo transcriptome changes induced by direct viral infection as opposed to simple exposure to the lung inflammatory milieu and to highlight the downregulation of Wnt signalling. This distinction was made possible by the fact that our study was the first to compare the two scenarios. Because Wnt signalling is essential to the maintenance of lung epithelial stem cells and the development of lung epithelial cells, this downregulation has significant repercussions for our knowledge of the pathophysiology of the influenza virus. Our research has uncovered a potential mechanism by which influenza viruses may interfere with the repair process of a host's lungs, and it has also uncovered potential therapies that either prevent lung damage or speed up the recovery process.

D. Wang et al[3] In this case series that was carried out at a single location and covered 138 patients who were diagnosed with NCIP, 26% of patients ended up needing to be admitted to the intensive care unit, and 4.3% of patients ended up passing away. It was hypothesised that hospital-associated transmission was responsible for the transfer of the 2019-nCoV from one individual to another in 41% of the patients.

Chen et al[4] This retrospective, single-center analysis included all 2019-nCoV cases that were diagnosed at Wuhan Jinyintan Hospital between January 1, 2019, and January 20, 2020. The inclusion period was from January 1, 2019, to January 20, 2020. After cases were validated using real-time RT-PCR, a variety of data types were analysed, including epidemiological, demographic, clinical, radiological, and laboratory information. The results were tracked till the 25th of January in the year 2020.

C. Huang et al[5] Patients in Wuhan who might have been infected with 2019-nCoV have all been moved to a specialised facility. We were able to confirm the infection of 2019-nCoV in a cohort of patients who accepted to have their data acquired prospectively by making use of real-time reverse transcription polymerase chain reaction and next-generation sequencing. This allowed us to gather further information on the virus. Using standardised data collection forms developed by WHO and the International Severe Acute Respiratory and Emerging Infections Consortium, information was extracted from electronic medical records (EMRs). In addition to speaking with patients and their loved ones, the researchers conducted these interviews in order to gather information regarding the symptoms and prevalence of the condition. Patients who were admitted to the intensive care unit (ICU) were evaluated alongside patients who were not admitted to the ICU to determine who had better results.

2. METHODOLOGY

The COVID-19 virus is a member of the RNA virus family, and it looks like a crown. In terms of size, it can be anywhere from 60 to 140 nanometers long. One side has a ridge that is shaped like a bowl. In order to do this, it makes the binding interface bigger by making the connections

it already has with ACE2 stronger. It has a stronger attraction to ACE2 because it can make better contact with the N-terminal helix of the enzyme. This is one reason why it has this attraction. When you sneeze or cough, you send droplets into the air, which you can then breathe in. This makes it possible for the virus to get into the nose and grow there. Almost all of the time, the COVID-19 virus needs to bind to acetylcholinesterase 2 to finish its life cycle. The ACE2 receptor, which is inside the host cell, pinches the surface spike protein, also called the S protein, of COVID-19. In this case, unlike with SARS-CoV, the enzyme furin, which is made by the host cell, is an important part of how the virus gets into the cell. Even if the body's innate immune system has a mild reaction to the virus, which can be found with a nasal swab, the virus can still spread and cause an infection. When the virus gets into the respiratory system, it will be met by a much stronger response from the body's innate immune system. Now, a cytokine that the body makes as a natural response to the problem may be able to predict how the illness will progress, and a medical exam may be able to find the problem. Now, you can do both of these things. Epithelial cells that have been infected by a virus are a key way for beta and lambda viruses to spread. Over 80% of sick people would only have mild symptoms in their upper and middle airways. When a patient's symptoms are treated with conservative care, they can be watched and cared for in the comfort of their own homes. About 20% of people who are infected have lung infiltrates, and some of these people go on to get very sick because they were infected. A recently published epidemiological study by the China Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDCP) found that COVID-19 killed more people who were already very sick. The Lasso algorithm says that a patient's age is the most important thing to know when trying to figure out how likely it is that they will get a serious illness in the future. When a serious illness was found, patients who were at least 5 years older than other patients had percent higher chance of dying than other patients. The majority of people who got COVD-19 were older adults with multiple long-term health problems. People in the severe group had chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD), high blood pressure, cancer, heart disease, and kidney failure much more often than people in the less severe group. Over a third of the 145 people with severe cases did not make it through the ordeal. 90.2% of the people who did make it through were 65 years old or older (60 and up). Forty out of fifty-one (78.5%) of the people who died had the underlying condition. People over 60 who have other health problems, like high blood pressure, are more likely to get a serious illness or die if they get SARS-CoV-2.

In order to make the current attempts to safely scale back population-based measures, such as physical separation, it is necessary to have a knowledge of whether or not recovery from COVID-19 confers immunity to reinfection or a reduction in the severity of the infection. A greater knowledge of the potential for postinfection immunity has significant implications for epidemiological studies (such as population susceptibility and transmission modelling), serologic therapy (such as convalescent plasma), and vaccine development. In this Perspective, we present the information that is currently known about the immune response to COVID-19, indicate key gaps in our understanding, and suggest options for further research It has been determined that the SARS-coronavirus 2 is the agent that causes COVID-19 (SARS-CoV-2). Within a few days to a few weeks of contracting the infection, the majority of infected individuals will produce measurable amounts of IgM and IgG antibodies. 1-3 It is unknown why some people do not establish a humoral immune response, as seen by the generation of antibodies; this can be an indicator of an underlying autoimmune disorder. Adding to the mystique that already exists is the fact that there is a lack of understanding regarding the connection that exists between an increase in antibodies and a matching increase in clinical

improvement. According to the findings of a limited study that consisted of just nine COVID-19 patients, an increase in clinical severity was associated with a rise in antibody titers. 1 Higher titers and the detection of antibodies may not, however, always point to more favourable clinical outcomes in COVID-19. Despite the fact that declines in SARS-CoV-2 viral loads have been followed by substantial increases in IgM and IgG antibodies, mild COVID-19 symptoms have been seen to go away prior to seroconversion (as represented by detectable IgM and IgG antibodies). It is now more expected that the viral burden will reach its peak early on in the illness, and then begin to decline as antibodies begin to develop and antibody titers begin to rise during the next two to three weeks. After the first week of significant illness, it is known that the ability to culture virus from nasopharyngeal tissues rapidly decreases; however, the exact length of time that a patient can shed infectious virus is uncertain. 2 There is not enough evidence available at this time to draw the conclusion that the continuing detection of viral RNA many days to weeks after recovery from COVID-19 poses a major danger to clinical or public health, particularly in the absence of symptoms. It has not been determined how long SARS-CoV-2 neutralising antibodies (NAbs, primarily IgG) remain in the body after the onset of symptoms; nonetheless, their presence has been observed to persist for up to 40 days after the onset of symptoms. The length of time that antibody responses are maintained against various different human coronaviruses hints to the possibility of relevance. For instance, IgG concentrations remained high for around 4–5 months after infection with SARS-CoV-1 (the virus that caused SARS), before progressively declining over the course of the next 2–3 years. This occurred after the virus that caused SARS had already caused infection. In individuals who were cured of MERS-CoV infection (the virus that caused Middle East respiratory syndrome), there was evidence that 4 NAbs remained in the body for up to 34 months after the infection.

Even the discovery of IgG and NAbs does not guarantee that a person will be protected for the long term. A brief preprint paper that has not been peer-reviewed is the only source of information that can be found regarding the topic of postinfection immunity in primates after they have been exposed to COVID-19. 6 According to the findings of this study, four rhesus macaques that had previously been infected with SARS-CoV-2 were able to recover and resist reinfection when they were rechallenged with the same virus 28 days later. It is unknown whether or not reinfection can be caused by these viruses at this time due to the fact that SARS has not been seen since 2004 and MERS infections are still uncommon. At least three of the other four most common human coronaviruses have the ability to reinfect humans. These viruses include the far less dangerous 229E, NL63, and OC43. 7 Although the specific reasons for reinfection are still not fully understood, several hypothesised explanations for it include transient immunity and subsequent exposure to different strains of the same virus.

There have been no cases of SARS-CoV-2 reinfection in humans that have been confirmed to yet. Evidence of reinfection is typically required to be culture-based verification of a new infection following clearance of the previous infection or evidence of reinfection with a molecularly unique form of the same virus. Both of these types of evidence are usually necessary. SARS-CoV-2 RNA was found once more in the throat swabs of two people who were otherwise healthy up to ten days after they had recovered from COVID-19 and had two or more consecutively PCR-negative upper respiratory specimens at least 24 hours apart. Additionally, these people had recovered from COVID-19 within the previous ten days. The results of tests that were negative for SARS-CoV-2 were not the last word because RNA for the virus was identified in nasopharyngeal and throat swabs that were obtained more than 20

days later. 9 After the initial peak of their sickness, virus loads were much lower and continued to decline in 18 individuals, according to the findings of another study that used PCR cycle threshold. Ten of the patients who participated in these investigations and had postrecovery positive test findings were asymptomatic or showed a small improvement in their respiratory function on radiographic evaluation, indicating that their pneumonia had reached a stable state. 8, 10 There is also no evidence available at this time to suggest that those who have demonstrated clinical improvement after having SARS-CoV-2 were a source of infection for additional people. It is wise, however, not to rule out the possibility of transmission because some persons, such as those with compromised immune systems, may be more prone to protracted shedding of other diseases.

It is also possible that these cases represent a true reinfection with COVID-19, or that the underlying illness is persistent or recurring. Both of these possibilities are worth considering. However, these instances might potentially indicate protracted sporadic viral RNA shedding at or near the limit of assay detection, or a change in collection technique, specimen handling, or storage conditions that negatively impacts test performance. Alternatively, these instances might indicate that the limit of assay detection is near or at. Because there is not enough evidence to differentiate between these possibilities in an accurate manner, there is a great deal of uncertainty. The viral burden (as determined by the PCR test cycle threshold) and viral culture are two examples of the kind of information that are required to be routinely obtained from a larger sample of patients in accordance with traditional practises.

The rapid development of serological assays to detect SARS-CoV-2 antibodies is an important step in the process of determining the prevalence of infections, whether or not they are accompanied by symptoms. However, it is too soon to use these tests to determine whether or not a person is immune to getting reinfected with the virus. The number of serologic tests is increasing, however it is not known what degree of performance can be anticipated given the risk of cross-reactivity with other coronaviruses (resulting in false-positives). Testing on a large scale of people who have never been exposed to COVID-19 and who have a low frequency of SARS-CoV-2 in their population is likely to produce more false-positive results than actual ones. This tendency may make it more difficult to interpret findings in clinical and epidemiologic investigations, especially if serologic assays are not highly specific or if extra testing is not conducted. This difficulty may be compounded if additional testing is not undertaken. However, an even more fundamental question is whether or whether immunity is equal to a robust IgG response. Researchers need to carry out well-designed, long-term cohort studies of patients who have recovered from COVID-19. This will allow them to keep a watch out for relapses. Such longitudinal studies may record cases of potential reexposure if they were linked to clinical and laboratory investigations of other possible causes, serologic testing, attempts to isolate virus by culture, and viral genomic analyses of isolated viral specimens. In the meantime, however, it is possible to recognise probable recurrences of infection by monitoring surveillance data and by requesting that medical professionals and public health officials report and investigate cases of possible recurrence in order to determine whether or not recurrence can be confirmed.

Last but not least, one study using a small animal model and some preliminary data on antibody responses to SARS-CoV-2 and other coronaviruses in the same family suggest that recovery from COVID-19 might provide some protection against reinfection, at least temporarily. On the other hand, there is a paucity of conclusive data on postinfection immunity, as well as a

lack of comprehension regarding how the immune system reacts to COVID-19. In light of the numerous unanswered questions raised by this public health crisis, it is imperative that public health policy, planning, and practise be guided by science that is at once cautious and exacting.
Conclusion

When a patient is re-infected is an extremely important factor in many aspects of public health policy. As the COVID-19 pandemic continues to spread, it is anticipated that reinfection will become increasingly commonplace. Vaccination rates need to be rapidly increased all around the world, and public health measures need to be maintained, in order to limit the risk of COVID-19 transmission, particularly among persons who have been infected with the virus in the past, such as those who have SARS-CoV-2.

3. REFERENCE

[1] A.S. Hancock, C.J. Stairiker, A.C. Boesteanu, et al. Transcriptome analysis of infected and bystander type 2 alveolar epithelial cells during influenza A virus infection reveals in vivo Wnt pathway downregulation J Virol, 92 (2018) e01325-18
[2] Wu Z, McGoogan JM. Characteristics of and important lessons from the coro-navirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) outbreak in China: summary of a report of 72314 cases from the Chinese Center for Disease Control and Prevention. JAMA 2020.
[3] D. Wang, B. Hu, C. Hu, Hu Chang, F. Zhu, X. Liu, et al. Clinical characteristics of 138 hospitalized patients with 2019 novel coronavirus-infected pneumonia in Wuhan, China JAMA (2020)
[4] N. Chen, M. Zhou, X. Dong, J. Qu, F. Gong, Y. Han, et al. Epidemiological and clinical characteristics of 99 cases of 2019 novel coronavirus pneumonia in Wuhan, China: a descriptive study
[5] C. Huang, Y. Wang, X. Li, L. Ren, J. Zhao, Y. Hu, et al. Clinical features of patients infected with 2019 novel coronavirus in Wuhan, China Lancet, 395 (10223) (2020), p. 49
[6] Huang, A.T., Garcia-Carreras, B., Hitchings, M.D.T. et al. A systematic review of antibody mediated immunity to coronaviruses: kinetics, correlates of protection, and association with severity. Nat Commun 11, 4704 (2020). https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-020-18450-4.
[7] Lavinder, J.J., Ippolito, G.C. Boosted immunity to the common cold might protect children from COVID-19. Nat Immunol 23, 8–10 (2022). https://doi.org/10.1038/s41590-021-01094-x
[8] Yang, J., Ma, L., Guo, L. et al. Seroprevalence and dynamics of anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibodies: a longitudinal study based on patients with underlying diseases in Wuhan. Respir Res 23, 188 (2022). https://doi.org/10.1186/s12931-022-02096-5
[9] Weiss SH, Wormser, GP. COVID-19: Understanding the science of antibody testing and lessons from the HIV epidemic. Diagnostic Microbiology & Infectious Disease (2020), 98: 115078 https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0732889320304545
[10] Wu Z, McGoogan JM. Characteristics of and important lessons from the Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) outbreak in China: summary of a Report of 72 314 Cases From the Chinese Center for Disease Control and Prevention. JAMA. 2020;323:1239–42.
[11] Deravi N, Fathi M, Vakili K, Yaghoobpoor S, Pirzadeh M, Mokhtari M, et al. SARS-CoV-2 infection in patients with diabetes mellitus and hypertension: a systematic review. Rev Cardiovasc Med. 2020;21:385–97. https://doi.org/10.31083/j.rcm.2020.03.78.

[12] Sariol A, Perlman S. Lessons for COVID-19 immunity from other coronavirus infections. Immunity. 2020;53:248–63. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.immuni.2020.07.005.
[13] Mo H, Zeng G, Ren X, Li H, Ke C, Tan Y, et al. Longitudinal profile of antibodies against SARS-coronavirus in SARS patients and their clinical significance. Respirology. 2006;11:49–53.
[14] Stringhini S, Wisniak A, Piumatti G, Azman AS, Lauer SA, Baysson H, et al. Seroprevalence of anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgG antibodies in Geneva, Switzerland (SEROCoV-POP): a population-based study. Lancet. 2020;396:313–9. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(20)31304-0.
[15] He Z, Ren L, Yang J, Guo L, Feng L, Ma C, et al. Seroprevalence and humoral immune durability of anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibodies in Wuhan, China: a longitudinal, population-level, cross-sectional study. Lancet. 2021;397:1075–84. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(21)00238-5.