medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.21.20159053; this version posted July 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 The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.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.

Title:

Prospective Observational Study of Screening Asymptomatic Healthcare Workers for SARS-CoV-2 at a Canadian Tertiary Care Center

Authors:

Deepali Kumar MD[1], Victor H. Ferreira PhD[1], Andrzej Chruscinski MD[1], Vathany Kulasingam PhD[1], Trevor J. Pugh PhD[1,3,4], Tamara Dus RN MN[1], Brad Wouters, PhD[1], Amit Oza, MD[1], Matthew Ierullo MSc[1], Terrance Ku MSc[1], Beata Majchrzak-Kita PhD[1], Sonika T. Humar, Ilona Bahinskaya MSc[1], Natalia Pinzon MSc[1], Jianhua Zhang PhD[1], Lawrence E. Heisler[3], Paul M. Krzyzanowski[3], Bernard Lam[3], Ilinca M. Lungu[3], Dorin Manase[5], Krista M. Pace[5], Pouria Mashouri[5], Michael Brudno[5], Michael Garrels RN[1], Tony Mazzulli MD[2], Myron Cybulsky MD[1], Atul Humar, MD[1]

Affiliation:

[1]University Health Network, Toronto, Ontario, Canada

[2]Sinai Health System, Toronto, Ontario, Canada

[3]Ontario Institute for Cancer Research, Toronto, Ontario, Canada

[4]University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada

[5]University Health Network Digital, Toronto, Ontario, Canada

Word Count: 1554

Corresponding Author:

Deepali Kumar MD MSc FRCPC

PMB 11-174

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.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/10.1101/2020.07.21.20159053; this version posted July 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 The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.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.

585 University Avenue

Toronto, Ontario, Canada M5G 2N2

(416) 340-4241

(416) 340-4043

Deepali.kumar@uhn.ca

ABSTRACT:

We screened three separate cohorts of healthcare workers for SARS-CoV-2 via nasopharyngeal swab PCR. A seroprevalence analysis using multiple assays was performed in a subgroup. The asymptomatic health care worker cohorts had a combined swab positivity rate of 29/5776 (0.50%, 95%CI 0.32-0.75) compared to the symptomatic cohort rate of 54/1597 (3.4%) (ratio of symptomatic to asymptomatic 6.8:1). Sequencing demonstrated several variants. The seroprevalence (n=996) was 1.4-3.4% depending on assay. Protein microarray analysis showed differing SARS-CoV-2 protein reactivities and helped define likely true positives vs. suspected false positives. Routine screening of asymptomatic health care workers helps identify a significant proportion of infections.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.21.20159053; this version posted July 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.

BACKGROUND:

SARS-CoV-2 is a novel respiratory coronavirus that has evolved into a widespread global pandemic. The transmission of COVID-19 to healthcare workers (HCWs) from patients, colleagues, or the community is a serious concern as it places potentially highly vulnerable patient populations at risk. Symptom screening for HCWs is standard infection control practice to help mitigate spread and protect both patients and other HCWs. However, studies have shown that a significant proportion of individuals have asymptomatic or pre-symptomatic infection but may still transmit virus [1-5]. We sought to understand the prevalence of asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infection in HCWs in a large Canadian tertiary care center (including a referral center for severe COVID-19) to determine the potential benefits of asymptomatic HCW screening. We also determined the seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies in HCW using commercial and in-house assays.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.21.20159053; this version posted July 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.

METHODS:

The setting for the study was the University Health Network, a large tertiary care center in Toronto, Canada with multiple sites and approximately 1300 total inpatient beds. The center includes both acute and long-term facilities and a provincial referral unit for advanced lung support for COVID-19 patients, as well as several dedicated COVID units. Over a 6 week period, HCWs were prospectively enrolled and underwent between 1-6 serial nasopharyngeal swabs for SARS-CoV-2 polymerase chain reaction (PCR) testing with communication and action in response to results in real-time. HCW were required to be asymptomatic and not have a previous diagnosis of COVID. Any symptomatic health care worker was referred to hospital occupational health and safety. The study was approved by the institutional research ethics board. Additional HCWs (asymptomatic or symptomatic) self-identified for voluntary screening through occupational health and safety. During the study period, the hospital cared for 975 COVID-19 patients of which approximately one-third were inpatients. Universal masking was in effect in the hospital and HCW with direct patient contact were required to wear a face shield. N95 masks were reserved for aerosol generating procedures.

SARS-CoV-2 PCR

Nasopharyngeal swabs were collected and underwent PCR testing by the clinical microbiology laboratory using either the Seegene Allplex PCR assay (Korea) or Altona PCR assay (Altona Diagnostics, Germany) using manufacturer's instructions.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.21.20159053; this version posted July 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.

Serology testing

Serologic testing for anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgG antibody was performed on a subset of consenting individuals. Serology was performed using two commercially available IgG assays, one that tests anti-nucleoprotein (NP) antibodies by CMIA (Abbott Diagnostics, Health Canada approved assay) and the other for anti-spike (S) antibodies (EuroImmun, Germany) followed by a further assessment using a custom in-house protein microarray platform. Commercial assays were carried out using manufacturer's instructions. To confirm antibody specificities a custom microarray was performed using 45 commercially available coronavirus recombinant proteins corresponding to SARS-CoV-2, SARS-CoV, MERS-CoV and community coronaviruses (CoV-NL63, -HKU1, -229E and -OC43) (Sino Biological and ProSci) [6,7]. [See Supplementary methods and Supplementary Table 1].

Viral genome sequencing

Targeted sequencing of the SARS-CoV-2 genome was performed for nasopharyngeal swab samples that were positive by PCR (See Supplementary methods). Briefly, RNA was isolated from nasopharyngeal swab fluid, followed by RT-PCR and PCR amplification of the complete viral genome using the ARTIC network version 3 primer set [8]. PCR products were sequenced on the Illumina MiSeq system using V2 sequencing chemistry and 250 bp paired end reads. Reads were aligned to the SARS-CoV-2 reference genome (GenBank: MN908947.3) using a Nextflow workflow [9] to form consensus sequences using the ARTIC network nCoV-2019 novel coronavirus

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.21.20159053; this version posted July 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.

bioinformatics protocol [10]. Only samples having >75% of the SARS-CoV-2 genome with consensus calls were used.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.21.20159053; this version posted July 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.

RESULTS:

Three separate cohorts were analyzed (Figure 1). The primary study cohort was a total of 1669 HCWs that were enrolled over a 6-week period (April 17 – May 29, 2020) with a total of 3173 nasopharyngeal swabs performed. HCWs included primarily nurses (n=655), physicians (n=152), allied health (n=446) and other (Supplementary Table 2). Absence of symptoms was confirmed for all participants at the time of testing. 472/1555 (29.1%) were actively involved in the care of COVID patients in the immediate two weeks prior to at least one of their swabs. The second cohort consisted of an additional 4107 asymptomatic HCWs who were tested through voluntary testing in the occupational health and safety department. The third cohort was symptomatic and consisted of an additional 1597 HCWs who self-identified as having at least one symptom compatible with COVID-19 and were tested by nasopharyngeal swab for SARS-CoV-2.

SARS-CoV-2 PCR

The prevalence of a positive nasopharyngeal swab at any time point in the primary study asymptomatic cohort was 9/1669 (0.54%, 95% CI 0.28-1.02). Of the 9 positive HCWs, 4 subsequently developed symptoms while the rest remained asymptomatic/pauci-symptomatic (Supplementary Table 3). Follow-up investigations in the patient wards of positive HCWs helped identify and subsequently contain two separate outbreaks in which previously unidentified patients were also found to be positive (data not shown). In the secondary volunteer cohort of 4107 asymptomatic HCWs, 20 were positive (0.49%, 95%CI 0.32-0.75) for a combined swab positive

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.21.20159053; this version posted July 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.

prevalence of 29/5776 (0.50%, 95%CI 0.35-0.72) in the two cohorts. In the self-identified HCW cohort with symptoms during the same 6-week period, 54/1597 (3.4%) were found to be PCR positive. Based on this, the ratio of symptomatic to asymptomatic positive HCWs was approximately 6.8 to 1.

Sequencing

Sequencing was successful in 6/9 positive HCWs in cohort 1. Based on sequence analysis, three predominant viral strains were identified (Supplementary Figure 1). In conjunction with an analysis of ward locations for positive HCWs, this suggests that at least some of the positive cases may have been due to HCW to HCW transmission or possibly from a common patient source.

Serology testing

A subset of 996 HCWs also underwent serology testing (Supplementary Table 2). By the anti-NP CMIA serology assay, a total of 14/996 (1.4%) were IgG positive (Supplementary Table 4). By the anti-Spike assay, a total of 22/996 HCWs were IgG positive (2.2%) and an additional 12/996 (1.2%) had borderline positive results. However, only two HCWs were IgG positive in both assays. We then analyzed all 34 seropositives via protein microarray to confirm antibodies against specific SARS CoV-2 proteins (Figure 2A-B). In the 14 HCWs positive by anti-NP, 13/14 had evidence of IgG antibodies against SARS CoV-2 nucleoprotein and 5 had evidence of antibodies against other viral proteins including spike protein and its receptor binding domain. Of the 22 positive by anti-Spike ELISA, 5 had evidence of antibodies against at least one SARS-

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.21.20159053; this version posted July 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.

CoV-2 spike protein and only the two that were positive by both assays had evidence of antibodies against nucleoprotein.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.21.20159053; this version posted July 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.

DISCUSSION:

This study demonstrates that routine SARS-CoV-2 PCR screening of asymptomatic HCWs in a large tertiary care hospital was valuable to identify and act upon unrecognized SARS-CoV-2 infection. Some of the positive HCWs were pre-symptomatic while others remained asymptomatic throughout their clinical course. We also found that in the hospital setting, there were significant numbers of asymptomatic infections with the ratio of symptomatic to asymptomatic HCWs being approximately 6.8:1. Serology demonstrated a higher rate of positivity suggesting that additional sequential PCR screening over time would likely be useful.

Previous studies of HCWs have shown mixed results with regards to symptomatic and asymptomatic infections. In Seattle, Washington, 185/3477 (5.3%) of symptomatic HCWs were found to have nucleic acid positivity for SARS-CoV-2 [11] . Hunter et al. screened 1654 HCWs in England and found a 14% rate of positivity with similar rates in non-clinical staff vs. clinical staff [12]. However, no data on symptoms was available in this study. In terms of asymptomatic infection, Lai et al. tested 335 asymptomatic HCWs in Wuhan, China and found 3 positives (0.9%) [5]. No serologic testing was performed in either study. Our study showed that although our overall active infections were low, a significant proportion were asymptomatic/pre-symptomatic.

In our study, depending on the commercial assay 1.4%-3.4% of HCW had evidence of past SARS-CoV-2 infection. This is similar to a German cohort where the seroprevalence among 406 clinic staff was found to be 2.7% [13], but lower than a

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.21.20159053; this version posted July 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.

Spanish cohort of HCWs where 9.3% were seropositive [14]. A novel aspect of our study was confirmatory assessment using a microarray-based assay to determine protein specific SARS-CoV-2 IgG antibodies which showed varying protein reactivity in HCWs who were seropositive based on commercially available assays. These data coupled with lack of agreement between commercial assays highlight the pitfalls and variability of results when performing large scale serosurveys in lower prevalence asymptomatic populations. In addition, the antibody profile post-infection may differ in individuals depending on clinical course and assays to look at multiple antigens simultaneously provide more robust information. While single-target assays may perform relatively well in patients with known COVID, when applied to large seroprevalence studies, performance characteristics appear poorer with significant disagreement between tests. Assays vary in their protein targets and since antibodies may wane over time, distinguishing true from false positives may be difficult. We suspect several of the results on a single assay were likely false positives.

In summary we show that a significant proportion of HCW during the pandemic may be asymptomatic/pre-symptomatic and propose that if symptomatic HCW in an institution are being diagnosed with COVID, then asymptomatic HCW testing should also be offered. Data on serosurveys in the asymptomatic HCW population need to be carefully interpreted as performance characteristics of assays may vary. However, the generally higher rate of past infections compared to current infections suggests there is utility in sequential screening of asymptomatic HCW by nasopharyngeal swabs.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.21.20159053; this version posted July 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.

FUNDING:

The study was funded by a peer-reviewed grant from the Mount Sinai Hospital and University Health Network Academic Medical Organization and the Toronto General and Western Hospital Foundation. This study was conducted with the support of the Genomics (genomics.oicr.on.ca) and Diagnostic Development programs of the Ontario Institute for Cancer Research through funding provided by the Government of Ontario.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS:

D.K., A.H., B.W., A.O. developed the study concept and protocol. D.K., V.H.F., A.C., V.K., T.J.P., L.E.H., P.M.K., B.L., I.M.L., T.D., M.I., T.K, B.M-K., J.Z., I.B, N.P, M.G., T.M., M.C., D.M., K.M.P., P.M., M.B. performed the research, analyzed, and collected data. All authors contributed to the writing of the manuscript.

COMPETING INTERESTS:

None for all authors.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.21.20159053; this version posted July 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.

SUPPLEMENTARY LABORATORY METHODS:

Viral genome sequencing:

Targeted sequencing of the SARS-CoV-2 genome was performed for nasopharyngeal swab samples that were positive by PCR. Briefly, RNA was isolated from nasopharyngeal swab fluid using Mag−Bind Viral DNA/RNA 96 Kit, and RT-PCR was performed using SuperScript IV First Strand Synthesis System (Thermo Fisher) and Q5 Hot Start High-Fidelity DNA Polymerase (NEB). The complete viral genome was amplified using a set of overlapping PCR primers, version 3 developed by the ARTIC network [8]. PCR products were sequenced on an Illumina MiSeq system using 250 bp paired end reads. Read were aligned to the SARS-CoV-2 reference genome (GenBank: MN908947.3) using a Nextflow workflow [9] that generates a consensus sequence from Illumina reads using the ARTIC network nCoV-2019 novel coronavirus bioinformatics protocol [10]. Consensus calls required a minimum coverage depth of 10, with a frequency threshold of 0.75 to call a variant. Only samples with >75% of the SARS-CoV-2 genome having consensus calls were used.

Antibody Testing:

10mL of peripheral blood was collected in red-top tubes (BD Vacutainer, Fisher Scientific, Mississauga, ON, Canada), incubated for at least 30 minutes to allow for clotting, and subsequently centrifuged at 2000 RCF for 10 minutes. Serum was collected in cryovials and frozen at -80 for batch processing. The EUROIMMUN anti-SARS-CoV-2 ELISA (IgG) kit [15] (EUROIMMUN AG, Luebeck, Germany) was performed manually. Briefly, serum was thawed and diluted 1:101 and added to wells pre-coated

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.21.20159053; this version posted July 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.

with antigens corresponding to the S1 region of the spike protein. To detect the bound antibodies, a second incubation is carried out using an enzyme-labelled anti-human IgG and substrate catalyzing a colorimetric reaction. Results are evaluated semi-quantitatively by calculation of a ratio of the extinction of the control or patient sample over the extinction of the calibrator. This ratio is interpreted as follows: < 0.8 negative, ≥ 0.8 to <1.0 borderline, and ≥ 1.1 IgG positive. The Abbott SARS-CoV-2 IgG [16] assay is a chemiluminescent microparticle immunoassay (CMIA) run on the fully automated ARCHITECT instrument (Abbott Laboratories, Chicago, IL, USA). Briefly, 75uL of undiluted serum per sample was loaded onto SARS-CoV-2 nucleoprotein coated paramagnetic microparticles, and assay diluent are combined and incubated. After washing, an anti-human IgG acridinium-labeled conjugate is added and the resulting chemiluminescent reaction is measured in relative light units (RLUs). The presence or absence of IgG antibodies to SARS-CoV-2 in the sample was determined by comparing the chemiluminescent RLU in the reaction to the calibrator RLU. An index measurement ≥1.4 was considered positive for anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgG antibodies. Both antibody tests received Emergency Use Authorization from the US Food and Drug Administration (FDA); the Abbott test has also received Health Canada authorization.

Antigen Microarray:

The Coronavirus antigen microarray was generated using previously published protocols for generation of antigen microarrays to screen for autoantibodies in heart failure and transplantation [6,7]. Human IgA, IgM, IgG and viral antigens were spotted in triplicate onto two-pad FAST nitrocellulose-coated slides (GVS North America, Sanford,

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.21.20159053; this version posted July 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.

ME, USA) using a Chipwriter Pro microarrayer (Virtek, Waterloo, ON., Canada) with solid pins (Arrayit, Sunnyvale, CA, USA). Dried slides were placed in FAST frames (GVS North America, Sanford, ME, USA) and blocked overnight at 4°C (blocking buffer: PBS, 5% FBS, 0.1% Tween). The next day, arrays were incubated with patient serum (diluted 1:100 in blocking buffer) for one hour at 4°C. After washing, the slides were incubated for 45 minutes at 4°C with a pair of secondary antibodies consisting of Cy3-labeled goat anti-human IgG (Jackson ImmunoResearch, West Grove, PA, USA) and Alexa Fluor 647-labeled goat anti-human IgM (Jackson ImmunoResearch, West Grove, PA, USA). After drying, fluorescent intensities of features were quantified using an Axon 4200A microarray scanner (Molecular Devices, Sunnyvale, CA., USA) with Genepix 6.1 software (Molecular Devices). Median fluorescent intensity minus local background (MFI-B) was determined at 532nm for Cy3, and 635nm for Alexa Fluor 647. The single averaged MFI-B for each antigen was calculated from the features arrayed in triplicate. A diverse collection of Coronavirus antigens (n=45), targeting SARS-CoV-2, along with MERS-CoV, SARS-CoV and community coronaviruses were used. The antigen library consisted of 30 SARS-CoV-2 antigens, 5 MERS-CoV antigens, 4 SARS-CoV antigens and 6 community coronavirus antigens (Supplementary Table 1). Antigens were diluted to 0.25 mg/ml in PBS and stored in aliquots at -80°C until the day of microarray printing.

In order to validate the results, convalescent sera from known COVID+ persons (n=7) obtained 6 weeks after infection and banked sera from healthy controls obtained prior to COVID-19 (n=18) were tested on the microarray platform. Significance of microarrays (SAM) demonstrated 39 reactivities that were higher in the COVID+ sera compared with pre-COVID samples (Supplementary Figure 3, Supplementary Table 5).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.21.20159053; this version posted July 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.

The eight highest ranked IgG reactivities by SAM (with mean MFI-B > 1,000 in COVID+ samples) were used for analysis of study samples that were positive by the two commercial kits (anti-NP CMIA and anti-S ELISA). Images of arrays probed with secondary antibodies only, pre-COVID serum, and COVID+ serum are shown in Supplementary Figure 2A. The linearity of the array assay for antibody detection was demonstrated by probing arrays with serial dilutions of serum from a COVID+ person (Supplementary Figure 2B-C).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.21.20159053; this version posted July 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 1A: Study Flow and Outcomes. HCW healthcare workers, NP nucleoprotein, S spike.



medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.21.20159053; this version posted July 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. Heatmap and graph of SARS-CoV-2 reactivity in study samples on antigen microarrays. A) Heatmap of eight SARS-CoV-2 IgG reactivities in individual anti-NP CMIA+ and anti-S ELISA+ samples. These antigen reactivities represent the eight highest ranked IgG reactivities that are upregulated in COVID+ samples (with mean MFI-B > 1000) as determined by significance analysis of microarrays. Anti-NP and anti-spike reactivity in individual samples on the arrays is indicated above the sample numbers. Positivity on the arrays was determined as described below. The mean reactivity of pre-COVID and COVID+ samples is shown as a comparison. The sample numbers in red indicate dual positive (anti-NP CMIA+ and anti-S ELISA+) samples. Yellow indicates high reactivity, whereas blue indicates low reactivity on the heatmap. B) Graphs of individual antigen IgG reactivity (MFI-B) in pre-COVID, COVID+, anti-NP CMIA+ and anti-S ELISA+ groups. Graphs show mean ± SD for samples in each of the groups. Samples in the anti-NP CMIA+ and anti-S ELISA+ groups were considered positive if the MFI-B was higher than the mean + 3 SD of the pre-COVID samples (dotted line). MFI-B, median fluorescent intensity minus background; NP, nucleocapsid protein; S, spike; SD, standard deviation.

A



medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.21.20159053; this version posted July 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.

B





medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.21.20159053; this version posted July 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.

Supplementary Table 1: Viral Antigens included in Protein Microarray.

Antigen #	Antigen	Virus	Source	Catalog #	Expression System
A1	Human coronavirus (HCoV-229E) Spike Protein (S1 Subunit, His Tag)	Community Coronavirus	Sino Biological	40601-V08H	HEK293
A2	SARS-CoV-2 (2019-nCoV) Spike Protein (RBD, His Tag)	SARS-CoV-2	Sino Biological	40592-V08H	HEK293
A3	2019-nCoV Spike Protein (S1+S2 ECD, His tag)	SARS-CoV-2	Sino Biological	40589-V08B1	Baculovirus-Insect Cells
A4	2019-nCoV Nucleocapsid Protein (His tag)	SARS-CoV-2	Sino Biological	40588-V08B	Baculovirus-Insect Cells
A5	2019-nCoV Spike Protein (S2 ECD, His tag)	SARS-CoV-2	Sino Biological	40590-V08B	Baculovirus-Insect Cells
A6	2019-nCoV Spike Protein (S1 Subunit, His Tag)	SARS-CoV-2	Sino Biological	40591-V08H	HEK293
A7	SARS-CoV-2/2019-nCoV Plpro / papainlike protease (aa 1564-1880, His Tag)	SARS-CoV-2	Sino Biological	40593-V07E	E. Coli
A8	2019-nCoV Spike Protein (S1 Subunit, His tag)	SARS-CoV-2	Sino Biological	40591-V08B1	Baculovirus-Insect Cells
A9	SARS-CoV-2 (2019-nCoV) Methyltransferase / ME-his Recombinant Protein	SARS-CoV-2	Sino Biological	40598-V07E	E. Coli
A10	Human SARS Coronavirus Nucleoprotein / NP Protein (His Tag)	SARS-CoV	Sino Biological	40143-V08B	Baculovirus-Insect Cells
A11	Human SARS Coronavirus Spike Protein (S1 Subunit, His Tag)	SARS-CoV	Sino Biological	40150-V08B1	Baculovirus-Insect Cells
A12	Human SARS Coronavirus Spike Protein (RBD, His Tag)	SARS-CoV	Sino Biological	40150-V08B2	Baculovirus-Insect Cells
A13	SARS-CoV (strain WH20) Plpro / papain-like protease (His Tag)	SARS-CoV	Sino Biological	40524-V08E	E. Coli
A14	MERS-CoV (NCoV / Novel coronavirus) Nucleoprotein / NP protein (His Tag)	MERS-CoV	Sino Biological	40068-V08B	Baculovirus-Insect Cells

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.21.20159053; this version posted July 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.

A15	MERS-CoV (NCoV / Novel coronavirus) Spike Protein (S1 Subunit, aa 1-725, His Tag)	MERS-CoV	Sino Biological	40069-V08H	HEK293
A16	MERS-CoV (NCoV / Novel coronavirus) Spike Protein (S2 Subunit, aa 726-1296, His Tag)	MERS-CoV	Sino Biological	40070-V08B	Baculovirus-Insect Cells
A17	MERS-CoV (NCoV / Novel coronavirus) Spike Protein fragment (RBD, aa 367-606, His Tag)	MERS-CoV	Sino Biological	40071-V08B1	Baculovirus-Insect Cells
A18	MERS-CoV (NCoV / Novel coronavirus) Spike Protein (S1 Subunit, aa 1-725, His Tag)	MERS-CoV	Sino Biological	40069-V08B1	Baculovirus-Insect Cells
A19	Human coronavirus spike glycoprotein Protein (isolate HKU1) (S1 Subunit, aa 1-760, His Tag)	Community Coronavirus	Sino Biological	40021-V08H	HEK293
A20	Human coronavirus HKU1 (isolate N5) (HCoV-HKU1) Spike/S1 Protein (S1 Subunit, His Tag)	Community Coronavirus	Sino Biological	40602-V08H	HEK293
A21	Human coronavirus (HCoV-229E) Spike Protein (S1+S2 ECD, His Tag)	Community Coronavirus	Sino Biological	40605-V08B	Baculovirus-Insect Cells
A22	Human coronavirus (HCoV-NL63) Spike/S1 Protein (S1 Subunit, His Tag)	Community Coronavirus	Sino Biological	40600-V08H	HEK293
A23	Human coronavirus (HCoV-OC43) Hemagglutinin esterase Protein (His Tag)	Community Coronavirus	Sino Biological	40603-V08H	HEK293
A24	MERS-CoV (NCoV / Novel coronavirus) Spike Protein (ECD, aa 1-1297, His Tag)	MERS-CoV	Sino Biological	40069-V08B	Baculovirus-Insect Cells
A25	SARS Coronavirus 2019 Spike Recombinant protein (800-1000 aa)	SARS-CoV-2	ProSci Inc	39-125	E. Coli
A26	SARS Coronavirus 2019 Spike Recombinant protein (1000-1200 aa)	SARS-CoV-2	ProSci Inc	39-126	E. Coli
A27	SARS Coronavirus 2019 Nucleocapsid Recombinant protein	SARS-CoV-2	ProSci Inc	39-113	E. Coli
A28	SARS Coronavirus 2019 Nucleocapsid Mosaic Recombinant protein	SARS-CoV-2	ProSci Inc	39-115	E. Coli

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.21.20159053; this version posted July 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.

A29	SARS Coronavirus 2019 Spike E Mosaic Recombinant protein	SARS-CoV-2	ProSci Inc	39-114	E. Coli
A30	SARS-CoV-2 (COVID-19, 2019-nCoV) Spike RBD Recombinant Protein	SARS-CoV-2	ProSci Inc	10-100	Human cells
A31	SARS-CoV-2 (COVID-19, 2019-nCoV) S1+S2 ECD (S-ECD) Recombinant Protein	SARS-CoV-2	ProSci Inc	10-108	Human cells
A32	SARS-CoV-2 (COVID-19, 2019-nCoV) ORF8 Recombinant Protein	SARS-CoV-2	ProSci Inc	10-002	E. Coli
A33	SARS-CoV-2 (COVID-19, 2019-nCoV) ORF3a Recombinant Protein	SARS-CoV-2	ProSci Inc	10-005	E. Coli
A34	SARS-CoV-2 (COVID-19, 2019-nCoV) Spike Recombinant Protein	SARS-CoV-2	ProSci Inc	10-006	E. Coli
A35	SARS-CoV-2 (COVID-19, 2019-nCoV) Nucleocapsid Recombinant Protein	SARS-CoV-2	ProSci Inc	10-007	E. Coli
A36	SARS-CoV-2 (COVID-19, 2019-nCoV) Spike-RBD Recombinant Protein	SARS-CoV-2	ProSci Inc	10-008	Sf21 cells
A37	SARS-CoV-2 (COVID-19, 2019-nCoV) Spike-ECD Recombinant Protein	SARS-CoV-2	ProSci Inc	10-011	Sf21 cells
A38	SARS-CoV-2 (COVID-19, 2019-nCoV) Spike-RBD Recombinant Protein	SARS-CoV-2	ProSci Inc	10-015	Human cells
A39	COVID 19 M Coronavirus Recombinant Protein	SARS-CoV-2	mybiosource.com	MBS8574735	E. Coli
A40	SARS-CoV-2 (COVID-19) 3C-like Proteinase	SARS-CoV-2	ProSci Inc	10-116	E. Coli
A41	SARS-CoV-2 (COVID-19) Papain-like Protease	SARS-CoV-2	ProSci Inc	10-119	E. Coli
A42	2019-nCoV Nucleocapsid Recombinant Protein	SARS-CoV-2	ProSci Inc	97-085	HEK293
A43	SARS-CoV-2 (COVID-19) S1 Recombinant Protein	SARS-CoV-2	ProSci Inc	97-087	HEK293
A44	2019-nCoV Nucleocapsid Recombinant Protein	SARS-CoV-2	ProSci Inc	97-077	E. Coli
A45	2019-nCoV Envelope Recombinant Protein	SARS-CoV-2	ProSci Inc	97-082	E. Coli

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.21.20159053; this version posted July 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.

Supplementary Table 2: Characteristics of health care workers undergoing nasopharyngeal swab (in Cohort 1) and serology testing.

Variable	**Nasopharyngeal SARS-CoV-2 PCR N=1669**	**Serology N=996**
Age (years); mean ± s.d.	40.3 ± 11.3	40.8 ± 11.1
Sex (M/F/Other)	356/1312/1	215/781
Occupation		
Nurse	655 (39.2%)	361(36.2%)
Physician	152 (9.1%)	101 (10.1%)
Allied Health	446 (26.7%)	261 (26.2%)
Other	396 (23.7%)	272 (27.3%)
Not specified	20 (1.2%)	1 (0.1%)
Lives with children <12 years of age	452/1555 (29.1%)	266/927 (28.7%)
Directly looked after COVID patient in the last 2 weeks	472/1555 (30.4%)	255/927 (27.5%)
Travel in the last 2 weeks	2/1555 (0.13%)	2/927 (0.22%)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.21.20159053; this version posted July 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.

Supplementary Table 3: Asymptomatic Healthcare workers that had positive SARS-CoV-2 PCR (n=9) in Cohort 1.

Study Code	Age/Sex	Occupation	Direct Care of COVID patient	Development of Symptoms in the 2 weeks following testing	Convalescent serology * (anti-NP index) Days post-PCR+
1	27/F	Nurse	No	No	Not done
2	44/F	Nurse	Yes	Yes	1.4 (Positive)
3	52/M	Nurse	Yes	Yes	Not done
4	26/F	Nurse	No	Yes	7.6 (Positive)
5	26/F	Nurse	No	Yes	5.8 (Positive)
6	37/F	Nurse	No	No	6.7 (Positive)
7	32/F	Allied Health	No	No	0.03 (Negative)
8	40/F	Nurse	No	No	Not done
9	33/F	Nurse	Yes	No	0.1 (Negative)

*serum taken 2-8 weeks after positive nasopharyngeal swab

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.21.20159053; this version posted July 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.

Supplementary Table 4: Healthcare Workers that were SARS-CoV-2 anti-nucleoprotein (NP) IgG positive (n=14).

Study Number	Age/Sex	Occupation	Direct Care of COVID patient	History of Recent Compatible Symptoms	SARS-CoV-2 PCR done on same day
1*	27/F	Nurse	-	-	-
2*	45/F	Allied Health	+	-	-
3	71/M	Physician	-	+	ND
4	38/M	Nurse	-	-	-
5	44/M	Nurse	-	+	-
6	55/F	Nurse	-	-	-
7	40/F	Allied Health	-	-	-
8	61/F	Nurse	-	-	-
9	46/F	Nurse	-	-	-
10	39/F	Nurse	-	+	-
11	36/F	Allied Health	-	-	-
12	46/F	Allied Health	-	-	-
13	58/F	Administrator	-	-	-
14	36/M	Allied Health	-	+	-

ND, not done

*also anti-Spike IgG positive

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.21.20159053; this version posted July 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.

Supplementary Table 5: List of antigen reactivities upregulated in COVID+ patients as determined by significance analysis of microarrays (fold change > 2, false discovery rate < 1%).

Antigen	Score	Fold Change	q-value (%)
IgG_A43, SARS-CoV-2 (COVID-19) S1 Recombinant Protein	7.75	71.38	0
IgG_A31, SARS-CoV-2 (COVID-19, 2019-nCoV) S1+S2 ECD (S-ECD) Recombinant Protein	7.36	36.60	0
IgG_A2, SARS-CoV-2 (2019-nCoV) Spike Protein (RBD, His Tag)	6.92	44.40	0
IgG_A30, SARS-CoV-2 (COVID-19, 2019-nCoV) Spike RBD Recombinant Protein	6.91	113.45	0
IgG_A6, 2019-nCoV Spike Protein (S1 Subunit, His Tag)	6.66	26.43	0
IgG_A44, 2019-nCoV Nucleocapsid Recombinant Protein	6.50	29.81	0
IgG_A38, SARS-CoV-2 (COVID-19, 2019-nCoV) Spike-RBD Recombinant Protein	6.12	79.78	0
IgG_A42, 2019-nCoV Nucleocapsid Recombinant Protein	5.94	43.87	0
IgM_A30, SARS-CoV-2 (COVID-19, 2019-nCoV) Spike RBD Recombinant Protein	5.18	12.15	0
IgG_A26, SARS Coronavirus 2019 Spike Recombinant protein (1000-1200 aa)	5.05	17.16	0
IgG_A5, 2019-nCoV Spike Protein (S2 ECD, His tag)	4.97	9.98	0
IgG_A10, Human SARS Coronavirus Nucleoprotein / NP Protein (His Tag)	4.53	17.43	0
IgG_A29, SARS Coronavirus 2019 Spike E Mosaic Recombinant protein	4.47	8.03	0
IgG_A4, 2019-nCoV Nucleocapsid Protein (His tag)	4.31	13.08	0
IgM_A2, SARS-CoV-2 (2019-nCoV) Spike Protein (RBD, His Tag)	4.29	6.03	0
IgM_A43, SARS-CoV-2 (COVID-19) S1 Recombinant Protein	4.25	8.07	0
IgM_A6, 2019-nCoV Spike Protein (S1 Subunit, His Tag)	3.99	7.44	0
IgG_A16, MERS-CoV (NCoV / Novel coronavirus) Spike Protein (S2 Subunit, aa 726-1296, His Tag)	3.81	5.54	0
IgG_A37, SARS-CoV-2 (COVID-19, 2019-nCoV) Spike-ECD Recombinant Protein	3.51	4.36	0
IgG_A39, COVID 19 M Coronavirus Recombinant Protein	3.27	2.62	0
IgG_A3, 2019-nCoV Spike Protein (S1+S2 ECD, His tag)	3.25	3.89	0
IgG_A36, SARS-CoV-2 (COVID-19, 2019-nCoV) Spike-RBD Recombinant Protein	2.99	6.01	0

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.21.20159053; this version posted July 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.

IgM_A31, SARS-CoV-2 (COVID-19, 2019-nCoV) S1+S2 ECD (S-ECD) Recombinant Protein	2.92	2.82	0
IgG_A24, MERS-CoV (NCoV / Novel coronavirus) Spike Protein (ECD, aa 1-1297, His Tag)	2.90	3.24	0
IgG_A35, SARS-CoV-2 (COVID-19, 2019-nCoV) Nucleocapsid Recombinant Protein	2.57	2.78	0
IgM_A42, 2019-nCoV Nucleocapsid Recombinant Protein	2.16	2.41	0
IgM_A23, Human coronavirus (HCoV-OC43) Hemagglutinin esterase Protein (His Tag)	2.15	4.07	0
IgM_A38, SARS-CoV-2 (COVID-19, 2019-nCoV) Spike-RBD Recombinant Protein	2.14	3.78	0
IgM_A25, SARS Coronavirus 2019 Spike Recombinant protein (800-1000 aa)	2.12	2.98	0
IgM_A15, MERS-CoV (NCoV / Novel coronavirus) Spike Protein (S1 Subunit, aa 1-725, His Tag)	1.99	2.67	0
IgM_A44, 2019-nCoV Nucleocapsid Recombinant Protein	1.99	2.11	0
IgM_A26, SARS Coronavirus 2019 Spike Recombinant protein (1000-1200 aa)	1.75	2.43	0
IgM_A22, Human coronavirus (HCoV-NL63) Spike/S1 Protein (S1 Subunit, His Tag)	1.75	2.64	0
IgM_A7, SARS-CoV-2/2019-nCoV Plpro / papainlike protease (aa 1564-1880, His Tag)	1.71	2.34	0
IgM_A5, 2019-nCoV Spike Protein (S2 ECD, His tag)	1.61	2.34	0
IgG_A11, Human SARS Coronavirus Spike Protein (S1 Subunit, His Tag)	1.58	2.47	0
IgM_A19, Human coronavirus spike glycoprotein Protein (isolate HKU1) (S1 Subunit, aa 1-760, His Tag)	1.48	2.41	0
IgM_A3, 2019-nCoV Spike Protein (S1+S2 ECD, His tag)	1.47	2.12	0
IgM_A41, SARS-CoV-2 (COVID-19) Papain-like Protease	1.46	2.20	0

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.21.20159053; this version posted July 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.

SUPPLEMENTARY FIGURE 1: Sequencing of SARS-CoV-2 from 6/9 healthcare workers with active infection (numbers on y-axis correspond to those in Supplementary Table 3). A multiple sequence alignment of all consensus reads and the MN908947.3 reference was generated, then used to build a phylogenetic tree using augur (https://github.com/nextstrain/augur). Variants were called using scripts developed as part of the nCoV-tools package (https://github.com/jts/ncov-tools). Sites with single base substitutions are shown, with N indicating no coverage at the site. For genome completeness, a cut-off of 75% was used to sequence samples. Three of the nine samples did not meet this cut-off. Genome completeness ranged between 83.7-97.1%. Results demonstrate 3 variants.



medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.21.20159053; this version posted July 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.

SUPPLEMENTARY FIGURE 2: Images of antigen microarrays and determination of linearity of the array assay. A) Images of 2-color arrays probed with secondary antibodies only, pre-COVID serum (negative control) and COVID+ serum (positive control). Antigens were spotted in triplicate; green indicates IgG reactivity, whereas red indicates IgM reactivity. On the array probed only with secondary antibodies, only human IgG and human IgM are detected. On the array probed with pre-COVID serum, reactivity against common community coronavirus antigens is detected. On the array probed with COVID+ serum, there are additional SARS-CoV-2 reactivities detected (boxes). Array features are approximately 500 μm in diameter. B) and C) Linearity studies using serial dilutions of COVID+ serum. Graph B shows MFI-B plotted against serum dilutions, whereas Graph C shows $\log_2$ transformed MFI-B. Linear responses are observed over a wide range of serum dilutions using $\log_2$ transformed MFI-B. Antibody responses become non-linear as MFI-B approaches saturation levels (MFI-B > 60,000). MFI-B, median fluorescent intensity minus background.

A



medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.21.20159053; this version posted July 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.

B



C



medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.21.20159053; this version posted July 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.

SUPPLEMENTARY FIGURE 3: Heatmap of the 39 antigen reactivities upregulated in COVID+ patients as determined by significance analysis of microarrays. The COVID+ samples (n=7) form a separate cluster from the pre-COVID samples (n=18) using a hierarchical clustering algorithm. Yellow indicates high reactivity, whereas blue indicates low reactivity.



medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.21.20159053; this version posted July 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. Bai, Y., *et al.* Presumed Asymptomatic Carrier Transmission of COVID-19. *JAMA* (2020).
2. Li, R., *et al.* Substantial undocumented infection facilitates the rapid dissemination of novel coronavirus (SARS-CoV-2). *Science* **368**, 489-493 (2020).
3. Black, J.R.M., Bailey, C., Przewrocka, J., Dijkstra, K.K. & Swanton, C. COVID-19: the case for health-care worker screening to prevent hospital transmission. *Lancet* **395**, 1418-1420 (2020).
4. Rivett, L., *et al.* Screening of healthcare workers for SARS-CoV-2 highlights the role of asymptomatic carriage in COVID-19 transmission. *Elife* **9**(2020).
5. Lai, X., *et al.* Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-2019) Infection Among Health Care Workers and Implications for Prevention Measures in a Tertiary Hospital in Wuhan, China. *JAMA Netw Open* **3**, e209666 (2020).
6. Chruscinski, A., *et al.* Generation of Two-color Antigen Microarrays for the Simultaneous Detection of IgG and IgM Autoantibodies. *J Vis Exp* (2016).
7. Chruscinski, A., *et al.* Generation of Antigen Microarrays to Screen for Autoantibodies in Heart Failure and Heart Transplantation. *PLoS One* **11**, e0151224 (2016).
8. Artic Network. hCoV-2019/nCoV-2019 Version 3 Amplicon Set. (2020). https://artic.network/resources/ncov/ncov-amplicon-v3.pdf.
9. Connor Lab. ncov2019-artic-nf - A Nextflow pipeline for running the ARTIC network's fieldbioinformatics tools. (2020). https://github.com/connor-lab/ncov2019-artic-nf/tree/9a91994b25adcb6b1ac6b5af48321fad37dcce2a.
10. Artic Network. nCoV-2019 novel coronavirus bioinformatics protocol. (2020). https://artic.network/ncov-2019/ncov2019-bioinformatics-sop.html.
11. Mani, N.S., *et al.* Prevalence of COVID-19 Infection and Outcomes Among Symptomatic Healthcare Workers in Seattle, Washington. *Clin Infect Dis* (2020).
12. Hunter, E., *et al.* First experience of COVID-19 screening of health-care workers in England. *Lancet* **395**, e77-e78 (2020).
13. Schmidt, S.B., Gruter, L., Boltzmann, M. & Rollnik, J.D. Prevalence of serum IgG antibodies against SARS-CoV-2 among clinic staff. *PLoS One* **15**, e0235417 (2020).
14. Garcia-Basteiro, A.L., *et al.* Seroprevalence of antibodies against SARS-CoV-2 among health care workers in a large Spanish reference hospital. *Nat Commun* **11**, 3500 (2020).
15. Beavis, K.G., *et al.* Evaluation of the EUROIMMUN Anti-SARS-CoV-2 ELISA Assay for detection of IgA and IgG antibodies. *J Clin Virol* **129**, 104468 (2020).
16. Bryan, A., *et al.* Performance Characteristics of the Abbott Architect SARS-CoV-2 IgG Assay and Seroprevalence in Boise, Idaho. *J Clin Microbiol* (2020).