

1 **A dual antigen ELISA allows the assessment of SARS-CoV-2 antibody** 2 **seroprevalence in a low transmission setting**

3

4 Sarah M. Hicks,^{1*} Kai Pohl,^{2,3*} Teresa Neeman,⁴ Hayley A. McNamara,² Kate M. Parsons,⁵
5 Jin-shu He,⁵ Sidra A. Ali,¹ Samina Nazir,¹ Louise C. Rowntree,⁶ Thi H. O. Nguyen,⁶
6 Katherine Kedzierska,⁶ Denise L. Doolan,⁷ Carola G. Vinuesa,^{2,8,9} Matthew C. Cook,^{2,9}
7 Nicholas Coatsworth,^{10,11} Paul S. Myles,^{12,13} Florian Kurth,³ Leif E. Sander,³ Graham J.
8 Mann,¹ Russell L. Gruen,¹⁴ Ameer J. George,^{1,5} Elizabeth E. Gardiner,^{1†} Ian A. Cockburn.^{2†#}
9 and the SARS-CoV-2 Testing in Elective Surgery Collaborators¹⁵

10

11 1. ACRF Department of Cancer Biology and Therapeutics, John Curtin School of Medical
12 Research, The Australian National University, Canberra, Australia

13 2. Department of Immunology and Infectious Disease, John Curtin School of Medical
14 Research, The Australian National University, Canberra, Australia

15 3. Department of Infectious Diseases and Respiratory Medicine, Charité, Universitätsmedizin
16 Berlin, Berlin, Germany

17 4. Biological Data Science Institute, John Curtin School of Medical Research, The Australian
18 National University, Canberra, Australia

19 5. ANU Centre for Therapeutic Discovery, The Australian National University, Canberra,
20 Australia

21 6. Department of Microbiology and Immunology, Peter Doherty Institute, University of
22 Melbourne, Melbourne, Australia.

23 7. Centre for Molecular Therapeutics, Australian Institute of Tropical Health and Medicine,
24 James Cook University, Cairns, Australia.

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

- 25 8. China Australia Centre for Personalised Immunology, Shanghai Renji Hospital, Jiaotong
26 University, Shanghai, China.
- 27 9. Department of Immunology Canberra Hospital, Canberra, Australia.
- 28 10. ANU Medical School, Australian National University, Canberra, Australia
- 29 11. The Canberra Hospital, Infectious Diseases, Canberra, Australia
- 30 12. Department of Anaesthesiology and Perioperative Medicine, Alfred Hospital, Melbourne,
31 Australia.
- 32 13. Department of Anaesthesiology and Perioperative Medicine, Monash University,
33 Melbourne, Australia
- 34 14. College of Health and Medicine, Australian National University, Canberra, Australia
- 35 15. See Supplementary Text

36

37 † and * These authors contributed equally

38 #Corresponding Author

39

40 Running Title: Seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2 in Australia

41

42 Word count (abstract): 98

43 Word count (main text): 1969

44 **Notes**

45

46 **Conflict of Interest Statement:** NC is an employee of the Australian Government

47 Department of Health and Ageing contributed to study design, interpretation of results, and
48 approval of the manuscript. All other authors declare no competing interests.

49

50 **Funding:** The study was sponsored by the Australian Government Department of Health and
51 Ageing and Medibank Private.

52

53

54 **Corresponding Author Contact Details:** ian.cockburn@anu.edu.au +61 (0)2 6125 4619

55 Department of Immunology and Infectious Disease, John Curtin School of Medical Research,
56 The Australian National University, Canberra, Australia

57

58 **Abstract**

59

60 Estimates of seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies have been hampered by inadequate
61 assay sensitivity and specificity. Using an ELISA-based approach to that combines data
62 about IgG responses to both the Nucleocapsid and Spike-receptor binding domain antigens,
63 we show that near-optimal sensitivity and specificity can be achieved. We used this assay to
64 assess the frequency of virus-specific antibodies in a cohort of elective surgery patients in
65 Australia and estimated seroprevalence in Australia to be 0.28% (0 to 0.72%). These data
66 confirm the low level of transmission of SARS-CoV-2 in Australia before July 2020 and
67 validate the specificity of our assay.

68

69 **Key words:** SARS-CoV-2, COVID19, seroprevalence, ELISA, antibodies

70 **Introduction**

71

72 Reported cases of severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) are likely
73 to represent only a fraction of actual SARS-CoV-2 infections, as ~40% of cases are mild or
74 asymptomatic, or otherwise undiagnosed [1]. Detection of antibodies that recognize viral
75 antigens specific for SARS-CoV-2 has become an important molecular sentinel of current or
76 prior exposure to SARS-CoV-2 [2]. Measurement of antibody levels can provide information
77 regarding the status of infection in an individual, as well as indicate the rate and extent of
78 response to treatment and to recovery. Since a significant number of people either present
79 with mild symptoms of COVID19 infection or are asymptomatic, serological measurements
80 will have ongoing utility in gauging exposure and prevalence in the community [3]. Such
81 studies will provide valuable information on the time course and longevity of antibody
82 responses to SARS-CoV-2 [4]. Further, serological testing is likely to be valuable in the
83 assessment of vaccine efficacy. However, analyses of seroprevalence, especially in low
84 prevalence settings are hampered by assays with inadequate sensitivity and specificity [5].

85

86 Australia has reported low case numbers of COVID-19 per head of population compared to
87 other developed Westernized countries, especially before the July/August 2020 outbreak in
88 Melbourne, Victoria (Australian Department of Health). Efforts to control the spread of the
89 virus have likely been helped by relative geographical isolation and an advanced healthcare
90 system. However nucleic acid testing generally only reveals a fraction of the total numbers of
91 infections thus the overall numbers of previous infections is unknown [3, 6]. Nonetheless it is
92 likely that the total of previously infected individuals is low as a proportion of the population
93 (<1%) and thus assessment of seroprevalence requires the use of highly sensitive and specific
94 methodologies. In order to assess the seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2 in Australia we

- 95 therefore developed a dual-antigen ELISA assay which gave superior sensitivity and
- 96 specificity compared to assays that rely on single antigens.

97 **Materials and Methods**

98

99 *Samples and ethics statement*

100

101 Collection of blood from individuals pre-2020 was carried out after provision of informed
102 consent, using procedures approved by the Human Research Ethics Committees (HREC) of
103 the Australian National University (2016/317) and ACT Health (1.16.011 and 1.15.015).
104 Samples from SARS-CoV-2 positive individuals were collected after consent under the
105 following protocols: Alfred Hospital HREC (280/14); James Cook University HREC
106 (#H7886); ACT Health HREC (1.16.011); Charité Ethics Committee (EA2/066/20) [7].
107 Approval for the elective surgery study was given by Alfred Hospital Ethics Committee
108 (339/20) and the Australian National University (2020/379). Whole blood was collected by
109 venipuncture into an empty syringe (healthy donors) or a red capped serum vacutainer tube
110 (patients), rested for 1 h then centrifuged (1000g, 10 min, 4°C) and the upper serum phase
111 removed by aspiration to a new tube and immediately frozen. All samples were heated to
112 56°C for 1 h prior to analysis.

113

114 *ELISA protocol*

115

116 Our ELISA protocol was based on previously published methodologies with modifications
117 [8]. Briefly, white 96-well maxisorp microtitre plates (Nunc 436110) were coated overnight
118 at 4°C with 100 µL of 500 ng/mL Spike RBD (GenScript, Z03483) or Nucleocapsid
119 (GenScript, Z03480) protein in 1X Dulbecco's phosphate-buffered saline (PBS) pH 7.4
120 (Sigma D1408). Wells were washed three times with PBS containing 0.2% (v/v) Tween-20
121 (PBS-T), blocked with 100 µL 3% (w/v) BSA in PBS with 0.1% (v/v) Tween-20 for 1 h at

122 room temperature (RT), then washed once with PBS-T, before addition of 50 μ L serum
123 diluted to 1:100 in 1% (w/v) BSA in PBS with 0.1% (v/v) Tween-20. Plate washing was
124 performed by repeated plunging of plates into a bucket filled with PBS-T and flicking of well
125 contents into a sink. After 1 h incubation at RT, wells were washed five times with PBS-T
126 and incubated with 100 μ L of horseradish peroxidase (HRP)-conjugated anti-human IgG,
127 IgM or IgA antibodies diluted to the optimal concentration in 1% BSA (w/v) in PBS with
128 0.1% Tween-20 for 1 h at RT. Wells were washed five times with PBS-T then 100 μ L of
129 Super Signal ELISA Pico enhanced chemiluminescent (ECL) substrate (Pierce, Rockford, IL,
130 USA) was added and light emission (stable after 1 min) was measured using a Victor-Nivo
131 luminescence plate reader. For high throughput screening of samples, steps downstream of
132 sample addition were automated as outlined in the supplementary materials and methods.

133

134 *Statistical analysis*

135

136 ELISA data was expressed as the normalized Log_{10} emission at 700nm. ROC analysis and
137 cutoffs were determined using GraphPad Prism 8 software. Estimates of seroprevalence were
138 calculated using R with 95% confidence intervals were calculated by bootstrapping. Bayesian
139 analysis to determine the probability of positivity for each sample was determined using R
140 based on the distributions of the positive and negative values described as mixed
141 distributions. Full details of statistical analysis and R codes are given the Supplementary
142 Materials and Methods.

143 **Results**

144

145 *Optimization of manual and automated ELISA protocol conditions*

146

147 To optimize our assay we used a library of 184 serum samples collected pre-2020 as negative
148 controls, and a panel of 43 sera from individuals infected with SARS-CoV-2 as positive
149 controls. Initial optimization of assay conditions was carried out with defined pools of sera
150 from 5 positive donors and 5 negative donors. Noting that even small gains in specificity can
151 substantially reduce the number of false negatives in large sero-surveys, we optimized the
152 concentration and amount of antigen used for coating, blocking and washing conditions.
153 Overall, we found that the principal factors affecting assay performance were the coating
154 conditions and the necessity of stringent washing (Table S1 and Figure S1).

155

156 To handle large numbers of samples we optimized our ELISA assay for automation. We
157 investigated the use of an enhanced chemiluminescence (ECL) substrate as these substrates
158 have superior sensitivity compared to traditional colorimetric absorbance substrates such as
159 *O*-phenylenediamine dihydrochloride (OPD) [9] and do not require a stopping step
160 facilitating automation. Comparing different protocols to distinguish our responses to the N
161 antigen in positive and negative donors we determined that ECL was marginally superior to
162 OPD with a larger separation between positive and negative control values (Figure S2 A and
163 B). Importantly, conducting the analysis on a robotic platform did not compromise assay
164 sensitivity and specificity (Figure S2 C-D).

165

166 *Combining IgG responses to multiple antigens gives optimal sensitivity and specificity*

167

168 Having established optimal ELISA conditions, we wanted to determine the optimal antigen,
169 or combination of antigens for seroprevalence surveys. We therefore compared responses to
170 the full S1 domain of the Spike protein (S1), Nucleocapsid protein (N) and the receptor
171 binding domain (RBD) of the Spike protein. Overall, the sensitivity and specificity of
172 responses to the N and RBD were comparable, with the N protein being slightly superior
173 (Figure 1 A and B). Surprisingly, the S1 protein gave very poor sensitivity and specificity
174 with many negative samples giving high values (Figure S3). We next investigated the
175 possibility of combining data for both antigens. Plotting responses to the RBD and N
176 antigens revealed that even the less responsive positive control samples generally had at least
177 elevated responses to both antigens (Figure 1C). Thus, using the mean of the responses to the
178 RBD and N responses, we found that a cutoff of 1.302 gave 100% sensitivity and 98.91%
179 specificity (Figure 1D). Neither IgA nor IgM responses distinguished positive and negative
180 donors as well as IgG, and averaging IgA or IgM responses to both antigens did not
181 substantively improve the assay (Figure S4).

182

183 *The seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2 is low in Australia*

184

185 We next used our dual-antigen IgG ELISA to assess the seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2
186 infection among 2991 individuals, providing blood samples at 10 hospital sites across 4 states
187 in Australia in May and June 2020. These individuals were enrolled in a prospective cohort
188 study to determine the prevalence of asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infection in individuals
189 undergoing elective surgery in Australia; full demographic information is given in the full
190 manuscript describing this prospective cohort study separately (Coatsworth *et al.* Submitted).
191 In our initial screen 41/2991 were above our cutoff of 1.302 (Figure 2A), correcting for the
192 specificity of our assay we calculated the seroprevalence to be 0.28% (0 to 0.71%). To

193 confirm our positive results, we retested the top 2.7% of samples from each site in parallel
194 with our complete set of positive and negative control samples. In this analysis 15 individuals
195 remained above the 100% specificity cutoff (Figure 2B), however plotting the RBD and N
196 values showed that only 5 samples were strongly positive for both antigens, clustering with
197 our positive controls. In contrast the remaining 10 putative positives were close to the cutoff
198 and were in many cases strongly positive for only one or other antigen, thus we reasoned
199 these might be false positives. Of note, 1/5 (20%) of our high-confidence positive samples
200 was a contact of a known SARS-CoV-2+ individual, compared to 14/2986 (0.47%) in the
201 remainder of the cohort ($p=0.0248$ by two-tailed Fisher's exact test; odds ratio=53.1 (4.07-
202 357) giving us confidence that our assay was detecting true positive individuals.

203

204 To avoid biases associated with the use of cutoffs we also calculated the probability of each
205 of our 80 retested samples being positive based on the known distributions of the positive and
206 negative results (Figure 2C). This analysis determined that the top 6 samples each had a
207 >50% (58-99%) probability of being positive, while the remaining 9 potentially positive
208 samples had individual probabilities of being positive of 10-47%. By summing the
209 probabilities of positivity among these samples we can estimate that ~8 (0.27%) individuals
210 in our cohort would be positive which is similar to our original estimate of seroprevalence.

211 **Discussion**

212

213 Here we report results from the first large scale seroprevalence survey in Australia. We
214 estimate a seroprevalence of 0.28%, which - given a population estimate for Australia of
215 25.50 million individuals - equates to 71,400 infections (95% CI: 0 to 181,050). At start of
216 sample collection (2nd June) 7387 cases/102 deaths had been reported in Australia, rising to
217 11,190 cases/116 deaths by 17th July when sample collection finished suggesting that testing
218 was capturing 10-15% of cases and that there was a low case fatality rate, similar to other
219 jurisdictions with high testing rates [10]. Note that due to the small number of positive
220 samples we have not attempted to stratify our analysis based on the demographic
221 characteristics of our cohort. A key caveat of our study is that the positive controls used for
222 assay validation are skewed to hospitalized individuals and thus we do not know with
223 certainty the performance characteristics of the assays for asymptomatic cases who are
224 known to have lower antibody levels [4, 11]. Moreover, a recent study has suggested that
225 asymptomatic cases may not always seroconvert, though the assays used there had lower
226 sensitivity than we report for our assay [5, 11]. Overall however, these data suggest that the
227 low case number seen in Australia was reflective of low community transmission not
228 inadequate testing. This is supported by the fact that the subsequent outbreak in Melbourne in
229 July/August 2020 emerged from breaches of hotel quarantine of overseas travelers rather than
230 undetected community transmission.

231

232 A variety of assays of have been put forward for the assessment of seroprevalence of
233 antibodies to SARS-CoV-2. Lateral flow devices were used in early studies, but these devices
234 have insufficient sensitivity and specificity for use in low prevalence settings [12]. However,
235 more recent studies using ELISA based assays with greater statistical rigor have overcome

236 some of these issues and given reliable estimates of seroprevalence in higher-transmission
237 areas such as the United States [3, 13, 14]. More recently, commercial
238 electrochemiluminescence-based assays have been developed that offer high degrees of
239 sensitivity and specificity as well as standardization [6, 15]. However, these assays only
240 assess IgG responses to a single antigen and are relatively expensive. By combining results
241 from responses to antigens and using convergent statistical approaches we show how an
242 assay that can be established in ordinarily equipped laboratories can obtain credible estimates
243 of SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence, even in low transmission settings.

244

245 **Acknowledgements**

246

247 The authors acknowledge the contributions of all participants, study sites, local investigators,
248 surgical and anaesthetic teams, the study coordinators Sophie Wallace and Lucy Morris.

249

250

251 **References**

252

253 1. Oran DP, Topol EJ. Prevalence of Asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 Infection : A Narrative
254 Review. *Ann Intern Med* **2020**; 173:362-7.

255 2. Long QX, Liu BZ, Deng HJ, et al. Antibody responses to SARS-CoV-2 in patients with
256 COVID-19. *Nat Med* **2020**; 26:845-8.

257 3. Havers FP, Reed C, Lim T, et al. Seroprevalence of Antibodies to SARS-CoV-2 in 10
258 Sites in the United States, March 23-May 12, 2020. *JAMA Intern Med* **2020**.

259 4. Long QX, Tang XJ, Shi QL, et al. Clinical and immunological assessment of
260 asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infections. *Nat Med* **2020**; 26:1200-4.

261 5. GeurtsvanKessel CH, Okba NMA, Igloi Z, et al. An evaluation of COVID-19 serological
262 assays informs future diagnostics and exposure assessment. *Nat Commun* **2020**; 11:3436.

263 6. Pollan M, Perez-Gomez B, Pastor-Barriuso R, et al. Prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 in Spain
264 (ENE-COVID): a nationwide, population-based seroepidemiological study. *Lancet* **2020**;
265 396:535-44.

266 7. Kurth F, Roennefarth M, Thibeault C, et al. Studying the pathophysiology of coronavirus
267 disease 2019: a protocol for the Berlin prospective COVID-19 patient cohort (Pa-COVID-
268 19). *Infection* **2020**; 48:619-26.


269 8. Amanat F, Stadlbauer D, Strohmeier S, et al. A serological assay to detect SARS-CoV-2
270 seroconversion in humans. *Nat Med* **2020**; 26:1033-6.

271 9. Samineni S, Parvataneni S, Kelly C, Gangur V, Karmaus W, Brooks K. Optimization,
272 comparison, and application of colorimetric vs. chemiluminescence based indirect sandwich
273 ELISA for measurement of human IL-23. *J Immunoassay Immunochem* **2006**; 27:183-93.

274 10. Gudbjartsson DF, Norddahl GL, Melsted P, et al. Humoral Immune Response to SARS-
275 CoV-2 in Iceland. *N Engl J Med* **2020**.

- 276 11. Sekine T, Perez-Potti A, Rivera-Ballesteros O, et al. Robust T cell immunity in
277 convalescent individuals with asymptomatic or mild COVID-19. bioRxiv
278 **2020**:2020.06.29.174888.
- 279 12. Bond K, Nicholson S, Lim SM, et al. Evaluation of serological tests for SARS-CoV-2:
280 Implications for serology testing in a low-prevalence setting. *J Infect Dis* **2020**.
- 281 13. Flannery DD, Gouma S, Dhudasia MB, et al. SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence among
282 parturient women in Philadelphia. *Sci Immunol* **2020**; 5:eabd5709.
- 283 14. Mansour M, Leven E, Muellers K, Stone K, Mendu DR, Wajnberg A. Prevalence of
284 SARS-CoV-2 Antibodies Among Healthcare Workers at a Tertiary Academic Hospital in
285 New York City. *J Gen Intern Med* **2020**; 35:2485-6.
- 286 15. Bryan A, Pepper G, Wener MH, et al. Performance Characteristics of the Abbott
287 Architect SARS-CoV-2 IgG Assay and Seroprevalence in Boise, Idaho. *J Clin Microbiol*
288 **2020**; 58:e00941-20.
289

Figure 1




290

291 **Figure 1: Combining IgG responses to different antigens improves sensitivity and**
 292 **specificity.** IgG responses to the N antigen (a) and RBD antigen (b) among positive and
 293 negative control samples and corresponding ROC curve used to determine the 100%
 294 sensitivity and specificity cutoffs for ELISAs using that antigen (dashed black lines on
 295 graph); individual data and mean \pm SD shown. (c) Relationship between responses to the N
 296 and RBD antigens among positive and negative control samples, dashed lines represent the
 297 100% specificity and sensitivity cutoffs derived from the mean of the IgG responses to the N
 298 and RBD antigens. (d) Mean responses to the N and RBD antigens among positive and
 299 negative control samples and corresponding ROC curve.

300

Figure 2



301

302

303 **Figure 2 Estimation of seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2 in Australia** (a) Normalized
304 averaged responses to the RBD and N antigens for each of the 2991 individuals in the study
305 separated by study site and state. (b) Anti-N and anti-RBD responses for the top 2.7%
306 samples from each site (n=80) compared to the positive and negative controls; the circled
307 unknown sample was a contact of a SARS-CoV-2+ individual. (c) Frequency distribution of
308 the negative, positive and unknown samples (bars) plotted against the calculated probability
309 of positivity in a Bayesian model based on the distributions of the positives and negative
310 samples.

311