medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.29.20140749; this version posted September 28, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Limited specificity of serologic tests for SARS-CoV-2 antibody detection, Benin, Western Africa.

Authors

Anges Yadouleton, PhD[1,2*], Anna-Lena Sander, MSc[3*], Andres Moreira-Soto, PhD[3*], Carine Tchibozo, MSc[1], Gildas Hounkanrin, MSc[1], Yvette Badou, MSc[1], Carlo Fischer, MSc[3], Nina Krause, MSc[3], Petas Akogbeto, PhD[4], Edmilson F. de Oliveira Filho, PhD[3], Anges Dossou, PhD[4], Sebastian Brünink[3], Melchior A. Joël Aïssi, PhD[5], Mamoudou Harouna Djingarey, PhD[6], Benjamin Hounkpatin, PhD[4], Michael Nagel, PhD[7$] and Jan Felix Drexler, MD[3,8#$]

Affiliations

[1]Laboratoire des Fièvres Hémorragiques Virales du Benin, Cotonou, Benin

[2]Ecole Normale Supérieure de Natitingou; Université Nationale des Sciences, Technologies, Ingénierie et Mathématiques (UNSTIM), Cotonou, Benin

[3]Charité-Universitätsmedizin Berlin, corporate member of Freie Universität Berlin, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, and Berlin Institute of Health, Berlin, Germany

[4]Ministry of Health, Cotonou, Benin

[5]Conseil National de Lutte contre le VIH-Sida, la Tuberculose, le Paludisme, les IST et les Epidémies, Cotonou, Benin

[6]World Health Organization, Regional Office for Africa, Health Emergencies programme, Brazzaville, Congo

[7]Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH, Bonn, Germany

[8]German Centre for Infection Research (DZIF), associated partner Charité-Universitätsmedizin Berlin, Germany

*These first authors contributed equally; $These senior authors contributed equally

#corresponding author

Corresponding Author

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.29.20140749; this version posted September 28, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Professor Dr. Jan Felix Drexler, Helmut-Ruska-Haus, Institute of Virology, Campus Charité Mitte, Charitéplatz 1, 10117 Berlin, Germany, Tel.: +49 30 450 625461/Fax: +49 30 450 7525907, felix.drexler@charite.de

Running title: Serological diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2, Benin

Keywords: Coronavirus, SARS-CoV-2, COVID-19, Benin, West-Africa

Abstract word count: 49 words

Text word count: 1161 words

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.29.20140749; this version posted September 28, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Abstract

Testing 68 RT-PCR-confirmed COVID-19 cases and controls from Benin, Western Africa with commercially available SARS-CoV-2 antibody ELISAs revealed up to 25% false-positive results, likely due to unspecific antibody responses elicited by acute malaria. Serologic tests must be carefully evaluated to robustly assess SARS-CoV-2 spread and immunity in tropical regions.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.29.20140749; this version posted September 28, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Introduction

Since its emergence in China late 2019, Coronavirus disease-19 (COVID-19) has afforded over 25 million cases and over 850,000 deaths globally by September 2020. Diagnosis of the causative pathogen severe acute respiratory syndrome-coronavirus-2 (SARS-CoV-2) is commonly based on reverse-transcription polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR) detecting viral nucleic acid or serologic assays based on antigen detection in early stages of disease (1, 2). In later stages of disease, antibody-based serologic testing can complement diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2 infection. In addition, antibody-based serologic testing is a valuable epidemiological tool to assess spread and potential immunity to SARS-CoV-2. Serologic studies in European and Asian countries indicate high sensitivity and specificity of widely used SARS-CoV-2 antibody ELISAs (3, 4). However, many serological tests have not been validated in resource-limited settings (5). For this purpose, we conducted a SARS-CoV-2 serologic assessment using SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR-confirmed patients and controls in Benin, Western Africa.

The study

We obtained convalescent sera from eight RT-PCR-confirmed patients sampled during March-April 2020 immediately after the identification of the first COVID-19 cases in Benin (average sampling was 8 days post SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR confirmation; range: 1-10 days; **Table 1**) and 60 sera from patients with acute febrile illness sampled for hemorrhagic fever surveillance during October-November 2019 (**Table 2**; sampling approved by the ethics committee of the Benin Ministry of Health: Arrêté 2020 No. 030/MS/DC/SGM/DNSP/CJ/SA/027SGG2020).

Sera were tested using commercially available ELISAs relying on different antigens and antibody classes, namely SARS-CoV-2 nucleocapsid (N) antigen (IgG), spike S1 subunit (both IgG and IgA), Middle East respiratory syndrome coronavirus (MERS)-CoV S1 (IgG; all from Euroimmun, Germany), and the FDA-approved SCoV-2 detect SARS-CoV-2 ELISA

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.29.20140749; this version posted September 28, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

(IgG only; spyke antigen; InBios, USA). Additionally, sera were tested using commercially available ELISA kits (Euroimmun, Germany) against the Zika virus (ZIKV) NS1 antigen (IgG), the Epstein-Barr virus (EBV) EBNA1 antigen (IgG), the EBV VCA antigen (both IgM and IgG) and using real time-PCR for Plasmodia (all human pathogenic species), EBV and cytomegalovirus (CMV) (all PCR tests from TIB Molbiol, Germany). Plaque reduction neutralization tests (PRNT) were performed using similar methods for SARS-CoV-2 and for ZIKV as previously described (4, 7). Testing for common cold betacoronaviruses HCoV-OC43- and HCoV-HKU1-specific antibodies relied on recombinant spike protein-based immunofluorescence assays as previously described (8).

In the eight RT-PCR-confirmed patients, SARS-CoV-2 seroconversion ranged from 62.5 to 100% (8/8; 95% CI: 30.8-100.0%), depending on the ELISA that was used (**Figure 1A**). This observation suggested differential sensitivity of ELISAs based on the immunoglobulin detected and on the commercial kit used. Indeed, IgA-based had a higher sensitivity compared to most of IgG-based SARS-CoV-2 ELISAs early after infection and only the InBios IgG-based kit detected all RT-PCR confirmed patients as positive (**Figure 1A**) (4). As shown in **Figure 1B**, 87.5% (7/8) of those ELISA results were confirmed by a highly specific SARS-CoV-2 PRNT. In 60 samples taken during October-November 2019 from febrile patients, 25.0% positive or borderline ELISA results that potentially represent true positives were observed when summarizing all antibody classes, antigens and kits (15/60; 95% CI, 15.7-37.3) (9). Different from RT-PCR-confirmed cases, ELISA reactivity in those samples contrasted with the complete lack of SARS-CoV-2-specific neutralizing antibodies (**Figure 1A** and **1B**). Likely unspecific SARS-CoV-2 ELISA reactivity may be consistent with three scenarios. First, antibodies elicited by common infections with endemic human coronaviruses may cross-react with SARS-CoV-2 antigens in patients (1). However, sera that yielded positive SARS-CoV-2 ELISA results did not differ significantly from sera that yielded

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.29.20140749; this version posted September 28, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

negative SARS-CoV-2 ELISA results in their reactivity with common cold coronaviruses (45.7-63.6% versus 70.4-74.0%; p=0.1 and p=0.7, Fisher´s exact test) (**Figure 1C**). Similarly, the magnitude of antibody titers against common cold coronaviruses did not differ significantly between those groups (p=0.09 and p=0.8, t-test) (**Figure 1D**). Notably, no serum reacted with MERS-CoV antigens, suggesting that unspecific reactivity may not automatically apply to all coronavirus antigens and tests (**Figure 1E**). Second, polyclonal B-cell activation can occur in infections with or reactivations of herpesviruses such as CMV and EBV and elicit false-positive results in serologic tests (10). However, only two patients were positive in a CMV PCR and only one patient was positive in an EBV PCR (**Figure 2A**). Additionally, SARS-CoV-2 ELISA-positive versus ELISA-negative individuals did not differ in their past exposure to EBV according to detailed serologic analyses (**Figure 2A** and **2B)**. Lastly, polyclonal B-cell activation can also be caused by acute malaria, which is widespread in Africa (11). As shown in **Figure 2C**, a higher proportion of those individuals that yielded positive SARS-CoV-2 ELISA results than those that yielded negative ELISA results were positive for Plasmodia in a highly sensitive PCR test (71.4% versus 54.3%), albeit this difference was not statistically significant (p=0.35, Fisher´s exact test). Similarly, significantly higher parasite loads occurred within SARS-CoV-2 ELISA-positive compared to ELISA-negative individuals (**Figure 2C**) (p=0.035; t-test). Higher parasite loads that decrease overtime have been observed in acute malaria, suggesting a higher proportion of acute malaria in SARS-CoV-2 ELISA-positive patients compared to sub-acute or chronic malaria in SARS-CoV-2 ELISA-negative patients (12). To assess the breadth of potentially unspecific reactivity, we tested the sera from febrile patients using a ZIKV IgG-ELISA for which unspecific reactivity in cases of acute malaria has been reported previously (11). As shown in **Figure 2D**, sera that elicited potentially unspecific SARS-CoV-2 ELISA results also elicited significantly more frequently positive ZIKV ELISA results (57.1 versus 23.9%; p=0.019, Fisher´s exact test). None of the sera yielding positive ZIKV ELISA results showed ZIKV-

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.29.20140749; this version posted September 28, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

specific neutralizing antibodies, suggesting unspecific reactivity of those sera in the ZIKV ELISA (**Figure 2A; Figure 2E**). Additionally, sera that yielded potentially false-positive results in the SARS-CoV-2 ELISA were also significantly more likely to show potentially false-positive results in the ZIKV ELISA (p=0.04; Chi-Square test) (**Figure 2D** and **2F**).

Conclusion

We provide an assessment of SARS-CoV-2 antibody-based serologic diagnostics from Benin that reveals unspecific reactivity in up to 25% of febrile patients, possibly due to acute malaria. Limitations of our study include the small number of patients as well as limited patient metadata. Testing of sera for CMV and EBV by PCR may not have been sensitive due to lack of cell-associated viral nucleic acid, so that a potential impact of herpesvirus reactivation on serologic testing cannot be excluded. Additionally, we cannot exclude that dengue virus antibodies cross-reacted in the ZIKV ELISA in SARS-CoV-2 ELISA-positive patients (6). Nevertheless, our exhaustive analyses point at acute malaria as the most likely cause of the unspecific serologic reactivity observed, albeit other co-existing conditions also affecting testing cannot be excluded (6).

Unspecific reactivity in serologic tests might affect public health interventions in tropical regions, leading to an overestimate of SARS-CoV-2 circulation in regions where malaria is endemic and to misidentifications of SARS-CoV-2 hotspots. Additionally, target populations for vaccine campaigns once those become available might be missed, and coexistent diseases such as malaria might be overlooked based on false-positive SARS-CoV-2 results, leading to higher mortality from those endemic diseases (13, 14). The robustness of current and future SARS-CoV-2 serologic tests should be further assessed by multi-centric sero-epidemiologic studies from different tropical regions (15).

Acknowledgments

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.29.20140749; this version posted September 28, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

We thank Arne Kühne, Wendy Jo-lei and Patricia Tscheak from the Institute of Virology, Charité, Berlin, Germany and Olfert Landt from Euroimmun GmbH, Germany.

This work was supported by the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH.

Author Bio

Dr. Yadouleton is a medical entomologist in the Centre de Recherche Entomologique de Cotonou, Benin, head of the Laboratoire des Fièvres Hémorragiques in Cotonou, and a teacher at the University of Natitingou, Benin. His research interests include mosquito control and the diagnosis of viral hemorrhagic fevers.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.29.20140749; this version posted September 28, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

References

1. Meyer B, Drosten C, Müller MA. Serological assays for emerging coronaviruses: challenges and pitfalls. Virus Res. 2014;194:175-83.
2. He X, Lau EHY, Wu P, Deng X, Wang J, Hao X, et al. Temporal dynamics in viral shedding and transmissibility of COVID-19. Nature Medicine. 2020 2020/05/01;26(5):672-5.
3. Zhao R, Li M, Song H, Chen J, Ren W, Feng Y, et al. Early detection of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies in COVID-19 patients as a serologic marker of infection. Clin Infect Dis. 2020 May 1.
4. Okba NMA, Muller MA, Li W, Wang C, GeurtsvanKessel CH, Corman VM, et al. Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2-Specific Antibody Responses in Coronavirus Disease 2019 Patients. Emerg Infect Dis. 2020 Apr 8;26(7).
5. Fischer C, Drosten C, Drexler JF. The difficulties in obtaining reliable Zika virus diagnostics. Lancet Infect Dis. 2019 Mar;19(3):240-1.
6. Lustig Y, Keler S, Kolodny R, Ben-Tal N, Atias-Varon D, Shlush E, et al. Potential antigenic cross-reactivity between SARS-CoV-2 and Dengue viruses. Clinical Infectious Diseases. 2020(ciaa1207).
7. Netto EM, Moreira-Soto A, Pedroso C, Hoser C, Funk S, Kucharski AJ, et al. High Zika Virus Seroprevalence in Salvador, Northeastern Brazil Limits the Potential for Further Outbreaks. MBio. 2017 Nov 14;8(6).
8. Corman VM, Muller MA, Costabel U, Timm J, Binger T, Meyer B, et al. Assays for laboratory confirmation of novel human coronavirus (hCoV-EMC) infections. Euro surveillance : bulletin Europeen sur les maladies transmissibles = European communicable disease bulletin. 2012 Dec 6;17(49).
9. Harvey R, Mattiuzzo G, Hassall M, Sieberg A, Muller MA, Drosten C, et al. Comparison of Serologic Assays for Middle East Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus. Emerg Infect Dis. 2019 Oct;25(10):1878-83.
10. Sangster MY, Topham DJ, D'Costa S, Cardin RD, Marion TN, Myers LK, et al. Analysis of the virus-specific and nonspecific B cell response to a persistent B-lymphotropic gammaherpesvirus. Journal of immunology. 2000 Feb 15;164(4):1820-8.
11. Van Esbroeck M, Meersman K, Michiels J, Arien KK, Van den Bossche D. Letter to the editor: Specificity of Zika virus ELISA: interference with malaria. Euro Surveill. 2016 May 26;21(21).
12. Dormond L, Jaton-Ogay K, de Valliere S, Genton B, Bille J, Greub G. Multiplex real-time PCR for the diagnosis of malaria: correlation with microscopy. Clin Microbiol Infect. 2011 Mar;17(3):469-75.
13. Fischer C, de Oliveira-Filho EF, Drexler JF. Viral emergence and immune interplay in flavivirus vaccines. Lancet Infect Dis. 2020 Jan;20(1):15-7.
14. Plucinski MM, Guilavogui T, Sidikiba S, Diakite N, Diakite S, Dioubate M, et al. Effect of the Ebola-virus-disease epidemic on malaria case management in Guinea, 2014: a cross-sectional survey of health facilities. Lancet Infect Dis. 2015 Sep;15(9):1017-23.
15. Elm J, Desowitz R, Diwan A. Serological cross-reactivities between the retroviruses HIV and HTLV-1 and the malaria parasite Plasmodium falciparum. Papua and New Guinea medical journal. 1998 Mar;41(1):15-22.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.29.20140749; this version posted September 28, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Tables

Table 1: Characteristics of confirmed SARS-CoV-2 positive patients for which serum samples were available taken from March-April 2020

Sample- ID	Sampling date	Location	Travel history	Symptoms	Day serum sample taken after PCR confirmation
1	March 2020	Cotonou	France	Fever	8
2	March 2020	Cotonou	Niger	Fever	1
3	March 2020	Cotonou	France	Fever	8
4	March 2020	Cotonou	France	Fever	10
5	April 2020	Cotonou	Germany	Fever	10
6	April 2020	Cotonou	France	Fever	9
7	April 2020	Cotonou	France	Fever	8
8	April 2020	Cotonou	Germany	Fever	8

Table 2: Characteristics of patients with febrile illnesses of unknown origin taken from October-November 2019

Sample- ID	Health Center*	Sampling date	Symptoms
215	CNHU	October 2019	Fever
311	CB	October 2019	Fever
312	CB	October 2019	Fever
313	CB	October 2019	Fever
314	CB	October 2019	Fever
315	CB	October 2019	Fever
316	CB	October 2019	Fever
317	CB	October 2019	Fever
318	CB	October 2019	Fever
319	CB	October 2019	Fever
320	CB	October 2019	Fever
321	CB	October 2019	Fever
322	CB	October 2019	Fever
323	CB	October 2019	Fever
324	CB	October 2019	Fever
325	CB	October 2019	Fever
326	CB	October 2019	Fever
327	CB	October 2019	Fever
328	CB	October 2019	Fever
329	CB	October 2019	Fever
330	CB	October 2019	Fever
331	CB	October 2019	Fever
332	CB	October 2019	Fever
333	CB	October 2019	Fever

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.29.20140749; this version posted September 28, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

334	CB	October 2019	Fever
335	CB	October 2019	Fever
336	CB	October 2019	Fever
337	CB	October 2019	Fever
338	CB	October 2019	Fever
339	CB	October 2019	Fever
201	CB	November 2019	Fever
202	CB	November 2019	Fever
203	CB	November 2019	Fever
204	CB	November 2019	Fever
205	AHC	November 2019	Fever
206	AHC	November 2019	Fever
207	AHC	November 2019	Fever
208	AHC	November 2019	Fever
209	AHC	November 2019	Fever
210	AHC	November 2019	Fever
211	AHC	November 2019	Fever
212	AHC	November 2019	Fever
213	AHC	November 2019	Fever
214	AHC	November 2019	Fever
216	CNHU	November 2019	Fever
217	CNHU	November 2019	Fever
218	CNHU	November 2019	Fever
219	CNHU	November 2019	Fever
220	CNHU	November 2019	Fever
221	CNHU	November 2019	Fever
222	CNHU	November 2019	Fever
223	CNHU	November 2019	Fever
224	CNHU	November 2019	Fever
225	CNHU	November 2019	Fever
226	CNHU	November 2019	Fever
227	CNHU	November 2019	Fever
228	CNHU	November 2019	Fever
229	CNHU	November 2019	Fever
230	CNHU	November 2019	Fever
291	AHC	November 2019	Fever

* Samples originated from three major health centers: Akkasato Health Center (AHC), Centre National Hospitalier Universitaire Hubert Koutoukou MAGA (CNHU) and the Clinique Boni (CB).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.29.20140749; this version posted September 28, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Figures



Figure 1. Serologic diagnostics of betacoronaviruses in Benin. A) SARS-CoV-2 ELISA reactivity using different commercially available assays in febrile patients from 2019 and SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR-confirmed patients from 2020. Dashed lines denote the ratio positivity threshold of >1,1 and borderline results between >0.9 to <1.1 defined by the manufacturer. Continuous line denotes the mean ELISA reactivity. **B**) SARS-CoV-2 plaque reduction neutralization test ($PRNT_{50}$) in febrile patients from 2019 and SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR-confirmed patients from 2020, shown in Log_{10} scale for clarity of presentation. Continuous line denotes the mean PRNT Log_{10} titer. **C**) Common cold betacoronaviruses HKU1 and OC43 seropositivity between 2019 febrile patients that were SARS-CoV-2 ELISA positive versus SARS-CoV-2 ELISA negative. **D**) Common cold betacoronaviruses IFA titer in febrile patients from 2019 and SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR-confirmed patients from 2020. Samples that were negative are not shown for graphical

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.29.20140749; this version posted September 28, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

reasons. N.s. not significant. **E**) MERS-CoV ELISA ratio in febrile patients from 2019 and SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR confirmed patients from 2020. Dashed line denotes the ratio positivity threshold of >1.1 ratio defined by the manufacturer.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.29.20140749; this version posted September 28, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.



medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.29.20140749; this version posted September 28, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Figure 2. Molecular and serologic test results for endemic pathogens in Benin. A) Individual reactivity of different commercially available SARS-CoV-2 ELISAs, SARS-CoV-2 plaque reduction neutralization test (PRNT) and Immunofluorescence (IFA) reactivity to common cold betacoronaviruses **(**ß-CoVs) OC43 and HKU1 in febrile patients from 2019 and SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR confirmed patients from 2020. Individual results of Epstein-Barr-Virus (EBV)-PCR, Cytomegalovirus (CMV)-PCR and three EBV ELISA: EBV-IgM, EBV-IgG and EBNA-IgG from the same patients. Individual results of Zika virus (ZIKV)-IgG ELISA, ZIKV-PRNT and malaria-PCR from the same patients. Gray square denotes a positive result, black square denotes an inconclusive result and white squares a negative result. Samples in which the assay was not performed due to low sample volumes are marked with a hyphen (–). d.p.d. denotes days the serum sample was taken post positive RT-PCR SARS-CoV-2 diagnosis. **B)** Epstein-Barr virus **(**EBV)-IgM, EBV-IgG and EBV-EBNA-IgG ELISA ratio between 2019 febrile patients that were SARS-CoV-2 ELISA positive versus SARS-CoV-2 ELISA negative. Dashed lines denote the ratio positivity threshold defined by the manufacturer. Continuous line denotes the mean ELISA reactivity. N.s. not significant. **C**) Percent parasitemic febrile patients that were SARS-CoV-2 ELISA-positive versus SARS-CoV-2 ELISA-negative. N.s. not significant. Right: Log_{10} plasmodium copies per ml. Continuous line denotes the mean copies/ml. Asterisk denotes $p<0.05$. **D**) Zika virus (ZIKV) seropositivity between febrile patients that were SARS-CoV-2 ELISA-positive versus SARS-CoV-2 ELISA-negative patients. Asterisk denotes $p<0.05$. Right: ZIKV IgG ELISA reactivity within both groups. Continuous line denotes the mean ELISA reactivity. N.s. not significant. **E**) ZIKV $PRNT_{50}$ log_{10} results between 2019 febrile patients that were SARS-CoV-2 ELISA positive versus SARS-CoV-2 ELISA negative. Continuous line denotes the mean $PRNT_{50}$ log_{10} reactivity **F**) ELISA ratio comparison between SARS-CoV-2 S1-IgA, S1-IgG, N-IgG ELISA and InBios SCoV-IgG ELISA positive or borderline patients with

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.29.20140749; this version posted September 28, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

ZIKV-IgG ELISA. Dashed lines denote the ratio positivity threshold of >1.1 and borderline results between >0.9 to <1.1 defined by the manufacturer.