

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

Antibodies to SARS/CoV-2 in arbitrarily-selected Atlanta residents

Jun Zou[#], Alexis Bretin[#], & Andrew T. Gewirtz

Center for Inflammation, Immunity and Infection, Institute for Biomedical Sciences, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA, USA

Key Words: ELISA, IgG, IgM, Spike protein

Corresponding Author:
Andrew Gewirtz, PhD
Institute for Biomedical Sciences
Georgia State University
Atlanta, GA 30303
E-mail: agewirtz@gsu.edu
Phone: 404-413-3589

[#] Equal Contribution

36

37 **Abstract**

38 We quantitated anti-SARS/CoV-2 IgG and IgM by ELISA in self-collected blood samples
39 (n=142) in arbitrarily-selected metro Atlanta residents, primarily acquaintances of the authors'
40 lab members from 4/17-4/27, 2020. Archived serum (n=34), serum from nucleic acid test (NAT)-
41 positive subjects (n=4), and samples collected from NAT-positive community members (n=4)
42 served to validate the assay. The range of anti-SARS/CoV-2 antibodies in archived and NAT-
43 positive sera indicated need to compromise sensitivity or specificity. Accordingly, we set a
44 cutoff of 4 SD above the mean for IgG and 3 SD above the mean for IgM to indicate that an
45 individual had been exposed, and developed some degree of immunity, to SARS/CoV-2. The
46 IgG cutoff clearly compromised sensitivity but offered high specificity, both of which were
47 harder to gauge for IgM. Based on these cutoffs, excluding subjects whose participation resulted
48 from self-suspected SARS/CoV-2 infection, we found 7.1% positivity for anti-SARS/CoV-2 IgG
49 (3 of 127 subjects) or IgM (6 of 127). While we do not claim this small immune survey is
50 broadly representative of metro Atlanta, and we have greater confidence in the IgG results,
51 which had only 2.4% positivity, it nonetheless demonstrates that persons with antibodies to
52 SARS/CoV-2, who've not suspected they'd been exposed to this virus, can readily be found in
53 various Atlanta area neighborhoods (9 positives were in 8 zip codes). Accordingly, these results
54 support the notion that dissemination of the virus is more widespread than testing would indicate
55 but also suggests that most persons in metro Atlanta remain vulnerable to this virus. More
56 generally, these results support the general utility of sero-surveillance to guide public policy but
57 also highlight the difficulty of discerning if individuals have immunity to SARS/CoV-2.

58

59 **Introduction**

60 There is now a wide interest in measuring SARS-CoV-2 antibodies both as a means of gauging
61 the true extent to which persons within a particular geographic region have been infected by this
62 virus and perhaps as a means of discerning whether individuals might now be immune from
63 SARS/CoV-2-induced disease. To address the former, some have begun conducting “sero-
64 surveys”. One recently publicly-posted study described use of a lateral flow test, which purports
65 to give a qualitative yes or no for presence of absence of such antibodies and observed that 4.3 %
66 of tested resident of Santa Clara CA had been exposed to the virus [1]. Press releases of other
67 studies that did not give details of their methodology observed presence of SARS-CoV-2
68 antibodies in 14.3% of resident in Heinsberg, Germany and 18% of residents in New York State.
69 Herein, we report results of our effort to measure SARS/CoV-2 antibodies in resident of
70 metropolitan Atlanta, GA. We analyzed self-collected blood samples from acquaintances of the
71 authors’ lab members by a quantitative lab-based ELISA method. We found that antibodies to
72 SARS/CoV-2 are not merely a yes or no but have a broad quantitative range, with some overlap
73 when comparing samples from confirmed infected subjects versus samples collected before the
74 advent of SARS-CoV-2. Nonetheless, our quantitative approaches enabled seemingly readily and
75 reliable discernment that about 3 and 6 of 127 arbitrarily subjected Atlanta area residents
76 displayed SARs/CoV-2-specific IgG and IgM, respectively, which likely reflects that they have
77 been exposed to this virus.

78

79

80 **Methods**

81 All procedures received required approvals by Georgia State University's Institutional Review
82 Board and/or Biosafety committee.

83

84 **Subject selection:** An advertisement was prepared that explained that the goal of the study was
85 to perform community by sero-surveillance, and specified that no results would be provided to
86 individual participants. The advertisement was circulated by the authors and their lab members in
87 their neighborhoods (see table 1 for subject zip codes), which resulted in enrollment of 142
88 individuals, 135 of whom had not been tested for SARS/CoV-2 and 2 individuals whom had
89 suspected they'd been infected but tested negative at an area hospital. While these subjects were
90 not asked any health-related questions, some volunteered that they suspected they might have
91 been previously infected, which we noted. Additionally, we enrolled 4 community members
92 whom had been referred to the study by word of mouth primarily because they had been deemed
93 positive for SARS/CoV-2 by a PCR-based test. One of these subjects recruited 5 household
94 members, one of whom exhibited symptoms. We also enrolled 4 subjects who had not been
95 tested for SARS/CoV-2 but yet were referred to the study because they had told associates of the
96 study team that they believed they had been infected by SARS/CoV-2. Additionally, 3 serum
97 samples from NAT-positive subjects were provided by Sean Stowell (Emory University) and one
98 was provided by Mount Sinai School of Medicine Department of Pathology.

99

100 **Blood collection and serum isolation:** Subjects were provided an autoclaved 1.5 ml Eppendorf
101 tube, 2 26-gauge safety lancets, and asked to watch a video demonstrating collection of 1-2

102 blood droplets <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=H9e-9xvhrms>. Subjects were advised to then
103 collect their blood and contact study team. This procedure generally resulted in blood being
104 centrifuged (5000 rpm, 10 minutes) and serum isolated in a biosafety cabinet at GSU within 24
105 hours of blood collection, although test comparisons of allowing storing blood for up to 3 days
106 did not seem to impact results. This procedure yielded over 5 and 10 microliters of serum,
107 respectively in over 97% and 93% of subjects respectively. Serum was then heated, in sealed
108 Eppendorf tubes, to 55°C for 15 minutes to reduce its infective potential. Archived control sera
109 consisted of samples collected from healthy control subjects in the Atlanta area from 2015-2019
110 that had been stored at -80°C. Such sera was heat-inactivated as above prior to use in this study.

111
112 **ELISA** (Based on protocols from Krammer and colleagues [2])
113 Recombinant his-tagged S1 SARS/CoV-2 S1 Spike protein, purchased from Sino Biologicals
114 (Wayne PA), was diluted to a concentration of 1 µg/ml in PBS and applied overnight, 100 µl per
115 well, to Ni-coated 96-well plates (Fisher/Thermo) at 4 °C. Plates were then blocked with PBS/
116 5% skim milk for 1h at room temperature, washed 3X with PBST (PBS 0.1% tween 20). Serum,
117 sequentially diluted 1:100 in PBS/1% BSA and 1: 10 in 3% skim milk respectively, was then
118 applied to wells for 1h at 37 °C. Plates were then washed 3X with PBST and then incubated with
119 antihuman IgG or IgM (KPL), which was diluted 1:5000 and 1:50,000 respectively. 45 min
120 later, plates were washed 3X with PBST and developed with TMB for 10 minutes at which time
121 reaction was stopped with stop reagent (KPL, TMB Stop solution) and OD450 nm measured by
122 a 96-well plate reader (subtracting readings at 540 nm). A positive control for the assay was used
123 to assess and correct for plate to plate variance of the assay. In the course, of setting and
124 validating this assay, many samples were assayed multiple times and gave similar relative

125 patterns of results although absolute OD varied between assays run on different days. Hence, all
126 data reported herein results from all samples being assayed together.

127

128

129

130 **Results**

131 Some of the archived serum samples, which were collected well before SARS/CoV-2 is
132 thought to have existed, displayed modest but measurable immune reactivity to recombinant
133 SARS/CoV-2 S1 spike protein (Figure 1), likely reflecting non-specific binding or cross-
134 reactivity to other Coronavirus spike proteins. In any case, we presumed that any newly collected
135 serum samples displaying immune reactivity to SARS/CoV-2 spike protein above the range of
136 the archived samples likely reflects that an individual has been exposed to SARS/CoV-2.
137 Conversely, test samples having values within the range of the archived samples reflects an
138 individual's lack of exposure to SARS/CoV-2 or that the antibody response an individual
139 generated at the time of blood collection was not sufficient to rise above the range of the
140 archived samples. Indeed, one study reported that 30% of hospitalized subjects don't make
141 antibodies to the virus [3]. For example, one of the 4 hospital-provided NAT+ serum samples
142 yielded an OD within the range of the control samples. Hence, we concluded that setting a
143 specific cut-off to declare samples SARS/CoV-2 positive or negative will require compromising
144 sensitivity or specificity. Accordingly, as all archived sample fell within 2.6 SD of the group
145 mean, we set a cut-off of 4 SD above that mean as a threshold to indicate that an individual had
146 likely been exposed to SARS/CoV-2. If values had a normal distribution, such a cut-off would
147 provide over 99% specificity. This cut-off result was met by 3 of 4 community-collected NAT+
148 samples. The IgM assay was harder to validate in that, as one might expect, the 4 hospital-
149 provided convalescent serum samples were all within the range of the archived samples. Hence,
150 based on overall analysis of our data and other studies, we set a cutoff of 3 SD to indicate likely
151 recent exposure to SARS/CoV-2. Based on this cutoff, 2 of our 4 community-acquired NAT+
152 samples, including the one that was negative for IgG, were positive for SARS/CoV-2 anti-IgM.

153 Thus, all 4 community-collected subjects whom reported NAT+ to us exhibited anti-SARS/CoV-
154 2 IgG or IgM.

155 Based on the above-defined cutoffs, 7 of all 142 community-collected samples we
156 collected in this study were positive for SARS/CoV-2 IgG. Yet, the level of SARS/CoV-2 IgG
157 in all of these samples was dramatically lower than the 2 high-titer hospital-provided positive
158 control samples. We speculate that severe SARS/CoV-2 infections may result in viremia that
159 drives very high antibody responses whereas cases not requiring hospitalization result in more
160 subtle and/or delayed antibody responses. Accordingly, none of the blood samples we tested
161 (n=20), including 2 IgG+ and 2 IgM+ subjects, showed detectable virus in blood by PCR. Of the
162 7 IgG+ samples we collected from the community, 3 were from NAT+ subjects and one was a
163 household member of one of those subject. This latter sample yielded more than double the OD
164 of the sample provided by the overtly ill NAT+ subject despite the household member lacking
165 severe symptoms. Several other subjects were included in the study purely due to having
166 contacted the study team after having heard of the study second hand. Excluding both groups,
167 results in 3 of 127 subjects that were selected based only on acquaintance to the study team as
168 being IgG+. These positives were from 3 different zip codes (Table 1) and had no apparent
169 connection to each other and never displayed symptoms, and hence can be viewed as unbiasedly
170 selected to have participated in the study. Analogously, for IgM, 8 of 142 were positive of which
171 2 were previously found to be NAT+. Of the 127 unbiasedly-selected participants, 6 were
172 positive, all from different zip codes. These studies support the notion that dissemination of
173 SARS/CoV-2 is greater than confirmed testing would indicate and highlight importance of broad
174 randomized testing for past and present indicators of the virus.

175

176 **Discussion**

177 Determining the extent to which SARS/CoV-2 has disseminated within a particular
178 geographic region is critical to understanding its virulence and the degree to which the
179 community has acquired some degree of immunity to it. While testing for SARS/CoV-2, which
180 has largely focused on those with symptoms and, as of April 27, 2020, confirmed the presence of
181 the virus in about 0.23% of the population, true incidence of exposure is presumed to be much
182 higher. In accord with this notion, we found that 7.1% of those we arbitrarily-selected, we submit
183 unbiasedly, displayed levels of anti-SARS/CoV-2 antibodies that indicated likely exposure to the
184 virus. It is difficult to determine the extent to which our survey is representative of metro
185 Atlanta in general or even those areas that are most represented. We certainly would not claim
186 that our selection of participants was random but yet we submit our arbitrary selection process
187 had minimal bias in terms of whether persons suspected they'd been infected and largely resulted
188 in inclusion of households that would not have likely had close contact in 2020. But on the other
189 hand, our survey participants were heavily weighted toward northeast Atlanta neighborhoods and
190 surely under-represents African Americans and Latinos, whom are thought to be most likely to
191 be exposed to the virus. Nonetheless, that our small survey identified SARS/CoV-2 antibody-
192 positive in subjects whom were Caucasian, African Americans, Latinos, and Asian Americans
193 suggesting the virus has broadly disseminated in the region. The modest numbers of African
194 Americans and Latinos included make it difficult to weight or extrapolate our results but yet
195 attempting to so would lead us to guess that applying our methodology broadly and randomly
196 across the region would yield higher rates of SARS/CoV-2 antibody positivity than observed in
197 our study.
198

199 The rate of SARS/CoV-2 antibody positivity we observed is greater than the 2.4%
200 observed in Santa Clara SC in early April and is considerably lower than that recently measured
201 in NY. Yet, aside from our study being smaller and not having attempted random sampling, our
202 quantitative methodology may have allowed us to detect weak but nonetheless real positives that
203 would seem to be extremely difficult to detect by lateral flow without also picking up many false
204 positives. Considering this presumed methodological differenced (to our knowledge methods
205 used by NY State have not been reported in detail) and that the per capita death rate in New York
206 State is over 10 times that of Georgia, we speculate that applying our methodology to NY would
207 reveal higher rates of exposure than they observed by their methodology. Yet, one can readily
208 imagine alternative explanations. For example, perhaps sequence variants of SARS/CoV-2
209 predominating Atlanta are less virulent than that those in NY. Perhaps the lower population
210 density and relatively low use of public transportation in Atlanta resulted in exposures to lower
211 doses of the virus.

212 During the course of our study, about 15 participants expressed the view that they
213 strongly suspected they had been exposed to SARS/CoV-2 based on symptom; about 10 of our
214 unbiasedly selected subjects and 5 others who contacted us based on their symptoms. Only one
215 of these subjects displayed SARS/CoV-2 antibodies (IgM) thus indicating the difficulty of
216 diagnosing by symptoms. Conversely, none of the 3 IgG+ positive subjects we unbiasedly
217 identified displayed any symptoms, cautioning against presuming healthy people are not
218 infected. Yet, that all 3 had household members lack SARS/CoV-2 antibodies fits with the notion
219 that such individual are not “super spreaders” of the virus. In conclusion, we readily
220 acknowledge our study faced a variety of limitations, as one might expect would be the case
221 when a small team of mouse-based researchers seek to originate a clinical study in the course of

222 a pandemic. Nonetheless, we believe our results can inform approaches to sero-surveil
223 communities to better manage the pandemic.

224

225 References

226

- 227 1. Bendavid, E., et al., *COVID-19 Antibody Seroprevalence in Santa Clara County, California*. MedRxiv, 2020. <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.14.20062463>.
- 228 2. Stadlbauer, D., et al., *SARS-CoV-2 Seroconversion in Humans: A Detailed Protocol for a Serological Assay, Antigen Production, and Test Setup*. Curr Protoc Microbiol, 2020.
229 57(1): p. e100.
- 230 3. Wu, F., et al., *Neutralizing antibody responses to SARS-CoV-2 in a COVID-19 reCoVered*
231 2 patient cohort and their implications. MedRxiv, 2020.
232 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.03.30.20047365>.

233

234

235

236

237




Figure 1. SARS/Cov-2 antibody levels by ELISA. Data generated as described in text. Horizontal line indicates the 4 and 3 SD above the mean cutoff used for IgG and IgM.

238 **Table 1. Zip codes of SARS/CoV-2 antibody testing.**

239 Zip code, number of subjects tested, IgG+, and IgM+. Highlighted values refer to the positive

240 tests from persons whose selection was not based on suspected positivity.

zip	tested	IgG	IgM
30030	10	0	0
30033	32	1	1
30038	8	2	0
30041	1	0	0
30075	13	0	1
30094	2	0	1
30096	1	0	0
30097	1	0	0
30135	4	1	0
30188	5	0	1
30189	3	0	0
30303	1	0	0
30305	3	1	1
30307	15	0	1
30308	6	1	0
30309	1	0	1
30312	3	0	0
30316	1	0	0
30317	6	1	1
30318	1	0	0
30319	3	0	0
30324	3	0	0
30327	4	0	0
30328	2	0	0
30329	4	0	0
30339	1	0	0
30340	1	0	0
30342	2	0	0
30344	1	0	0
30345	1	0	0
30606	2	0	0
31302	1	0	0

241