

# Strategies for infection control and prevalence of anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgG in 4,554 employees of a university hospital in Munich, Germany

Johanna Erber<sup>1,2</sup>, Verena Kappler<sup>3,4</sup>, Bernhard Haller<sup>5</sup>, Hrvoje Mijočević<sup>3</sup>, Ana Galhoz<sup>6,7</sup>, Clarissa Prazeres da Costa<sup>8,9</sup>, Friedemann Gebhardt<sup>8</sup>, Natalia Graf<sup>3</sup>, Dieter Hoffmann<sup>2,3</sup>, Markus Thaler<sup>10</sup>, Elke Lorenz<sup>4,11</sup>, Hedwig Roggendorf<sup>12</sup>, Florian Kohlmayer<sup>5</sup>, Andreas Henkel<sup>13</sup>, Michael P Menden<sup>6,7,14</sup>, Jürgen Ruland<sup>2,10</sup>, Christoph D Spinner<sup>1,2</sup>, Ulrike Protzer<sup>2,3†</sup>, Percy Knolle<sup>12†</sup>, Paul Lingor<sup>15†</sup> on behalf of the SeCoMRI Study Group<sup>^</sup>

**Short title:** Anti-SARS-CoV-2-IgG seroprevalence in 4,554 hospital employees

## Author affiliations:

<sup>1</sup>Technical University of Munich, School of Medicine, University Hospital rechts der Isar, Department of Internal Medicine II, Munich, Germany.

<sup>2</sup>German Centre for Infection Research (DZIF), Munich Partner Site, Munich, Germany.

<sup>3</sup>Technical University of Munich, School of Medicine, Institute of Virology, Munich, Germany.

<sup>4</sup>Technical University of Munich, School of Medicine, University Hospital rechts der Isar, Department for Sports Medicine, Munich, Germany.

<sup>5</sup>Technical University of Munich, School of Medicine, University Hospital rechts der Isar, Institute of Medical Informatics, Statistics and Epidemiology, Munich, Germany.

<sup>6</sup>Institute of Computational Biology, Helmholtz Zentrum München-German Research Centre for Environmental Health, Neuherberg, Germany.

<sup>7</sup>Department of Biology, Ludwig-Maximilians University Munich, Martinsried, Germany.

<sup>8</sup>Technical University of Munich, School of Medicine, Institute for Medical Microbiology, Munich, Germany.

<sup>9</sup>Technical University of Munich, School of Medicine, Centre for Global Health, Munich, Germany.

<sup>10</sup>Technical University of Munich, School of Medicine, Institute of Clinical Chemistry and Pathobiochemistry, Munich, Germany.

<sup>11</sup>Technical University of Munich, School of Medicine, Deutsches Herzzentrum Muenchen, Klinik für Herz- und Kreislauferkrankungen, Munich, Germany.

<sup>12</sup>Technical University of Munich, School of Medicine, University Hospital rechts der Isar, Institute of Molecular Immunology, Munich, Germany.

<sup>13</sup>Technical University of Munich, School of Medicine, University Hospital rechts der Isar, Information Technology Department, Munich, Germany.

<sup>14</sup>German Centre for Diabetes Research (DZD e.V.), Neuherberg, Germany.

<sup>15</sup>Technical University of Munich, School of Medicine, University Hospital rechts der Isar, Department of Neurology, Munich, Germany.

\* Corresponding authors: [paul.lingor@tum.de](mailto:paul.lingor@tum.de) (PL), [protzer@tum.de](mailto:protzer@tum.de) (UP)

† These authors contributed equally to this work.

46 ^ Members of the SeCOMRI study group are listed in the supporting information (S1  
47 Appendix).

48

49 **Abbreviations:** CI, confidence interval; CLIA, chemiluminescent immunoassay;  
50 ECLIA, electrochemiluminescent immunoassay; ELISA, enzyme-linked  
51 immunosorbent assay; HCW, health care workers; MRI, University Hospital Munich  
52 rechts der Isar; OR, odds ratio; PCR, polymerase chain reaction; PPE, personal  
53 protective equipment; SARS-CoV-2, severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus

54 2

55

56 **Abstract**

57 **Background**

58 Hospital staff are at high risk of infection during the coronavirus disease (COVID-19)  
59 pandemic. We analysed the exposure characteristics, efficacy of protective  
60 measures, and transmission dynamics in this hospital-wide prospective  
61 seroprevalence study.

62 **Methods and Findings**

63 Overall, 4554 individuals were tested for anti-severe acute respiratory syndrome  
64 coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) IgG antibodies using a chemiluminescent  
65 immunoassay. Individual risk factors, use of personal protective equipment (PPE),  
66 occupational exposure, previous SARS-CoV-2 infection, and symptoms were  
67 assessed using a questionnaire and correlated to anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgG antibody  
68 titres and PCR testing results. Odds ratios with corresponding exact 95% confidence  
69 intervals were used to evaluate associations between individual factors and  
70 seropositivity. Spatio-temporal trajectories of SARS-CoV-2-infected patients and staff  
71 mobility within the hospital were visualised to identify local hotspots of virus  
72 transmission.

73 The overall seroprevalence of anti-SARS-CoV-2-IgG antibody was 2.4% [95% CI  
74 1.9–2.9]. Patient-facing staff, including those working in COVID-19 areas, had a  
75 similar probability of being seropositive as non-patient-facing staff. Prior interaction  
76 with SARS-CoV-2-infected co-workers or private contacts and unprotected exposure  
77 to COVID-19 patients increased the probability of seropositivity. Loss of smell and  
78 taste had the highest positive predictive value for seropositivity. The rate of  
79 asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infections was 25.9%, and higher anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgG

80 antibody titres were observed in symptomatic individuals. Spatio-temporal hotspots of  
81 SARS-CoV-2-positive staff and patients only showed partial overlap.

82 **Conclusions**

83 Patient-facing work in a healthcare facility during the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic may be  
84 safe if adequate PPE and hygiene measures are applied. The high numbers of  
85 asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infections that escaped detection by symptomatic testing  
86 underline the value of cross-sectional seroprevalence studies. Unprotected contact is  
87 a major risk factor for infection and argues for the rigorous implementation of hygiene  
88 measures.

## 89 **Introduction**

90 The outbreak of severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2)  
91 was declared a pandemic and global health emergency by the World Health  
92 Organization in March 2020 and continues to pose significant challenges to  
93 healthcare systems [1]. Alarming infection rates, morbidity, and mortality have been  
94 reported among medical staff fighting the pandemic, threatening the functionality of  
95 healthcare facilities and emphasizing the need to implement effective infection  
96 control measures [2-4]. The reported prevalence of anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgG antibodies  
97 in health care workers (HCW) varies from 13.7% in the New York City area, 10.2% in  
98 a nationwide study in Spain, 7.5% in 580 HCW in a Spanish hospital, 6.4% in >3000  
99 HCW in a tertiary hospital in Belgium, 4.0% in >28790 HCW in Denmark, and 0.4% to  
100 3.8% in Chinese hospitals [5-10]. Importantly, working in coronavirus disease  
101 (COVID-19) designated areas is reported to carry an increased risk of infection  
102 [8,11].

103 The greater Munich area became the epicentre of the first German SARS-CoV-2  
104 outbreak after the first confirmed case on January 27, 2020. A rapid and massive rise  
105 in SARS-CoV-2 infections occurred in March 2020, when infected individuals  
106 returned from skiing resorts such as Ischgl, Austria, where the spread of infection  
107 was dramatic [12]. The University Hospital Munich rechts der Isar (MRI) faced the  
108 challenge of rapidly growing numbers of COVID-19 patients combined with an  
109 increasing number of staff in quarantine. To reduce the spread of infections,  
110 guidelines for the use of personal protective equipment (PPE) for staff and patients  
111 were introduced, including the obligation to wear face masks in all areas of the  
112 hospital (Fig 1A). Additionally, a telephone hotline was established to provide staff  
113 with guidance for polymerase chain reaction (PCR) testing and quarantine policies.

114 To better understand the epidemiology and immune response to SARS-CoV-2 and to  
115 identify best-practice approaches protecting staff and patients, a prospective,  
116 observational cohort study was initiated to assess the risk factors and evidence for  
117 infection, including clinical symptoms, and to determine the seroprevalence of SARS-  
118 CoV-2 antibodies.

## 119 **Methods and Materials**

### 120 **Study design and participants**

121 Between April 14, 2020 and May 29, 2020, all clinical and non-clinical MRI staff ( $\geq 18$   
122 years) ( $n = 6305$ ) and medical students of the Technical University of Munich (TUM)  
123 ( $n = 1699$ ) were invited to participate in this prospective, monocentric, observational  
124 study (S1 Fig). Upon obtaining written informed consent, including the use of  
125 personal information for research, demographic data; chronic medical conditions;  
126 occupation; work location; use of PPE; exposure to SARS-CoV-2-positive patients,  
127 co-workers, or private contacts; symptom history; previous PCR testing for SARS-  
128 CoV-2, and outcome were acquired by a standardised electronic questionnaire (S2  
129 Appendix). Serum samples were collected and subjected to anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgG  
130 and IgM testing (primary outcome). IgM was tested in all individuals until May 4, 2020  
131 ( $n = 1620$ ) and thereafter only if IgG was positive or typical symptoms of COVID-19  
132 were reported ( $n = 88$ ) (S3 Appendix, S2 Fig). Staff reporting symptoms or testing  
133 positive for IgM were recommended to undergo nasopharyngeal swab testing for  
134 SARS-CoV-2 by PCR. Personal data were stored in a pseudonymized manner using  
135 the open-source electronic case form system m4 DIS (BitCare GmbH, Munich,  
136 Germany) [13]. The study was approved by the Ethics Committee of the Technical  
137 University of Munich, School of Medicine (approval number: 216/20S).

138 Since March 2020, a continuous infection surveillance program for all staff has been  
139 implemented in MRI, including an employee testing centre and staff counselling  
140 ("Corona hotline"), which is available seven days per week. Individuals with  
141 symptoms compatible with COVID-19 or previous risk contacts are scheduled for  
142 testing for SARS-CoV-2 by PCR from combined nasopharyngeal swabs.  
143 Symptomatic staff or staff with high-risk contact without PPE were advised to stay  
144 home while awaiting their test results. Employees who tested negative were

145 permitted to return to work when they had been asymptomatic for at least 48 hours.  
146 In case of a positive test result, staff were quarantined for 14 days, then retested and  
147 only allowed to continue working if the PCR tests were negative on two consecutive  
148 days. The PCR-results of staff testing were included in the present analysis if the  
149 study participants consented.

150

### 151 **Laboratory analysis**

152 Primary detection of serum IgM and IgG antibodies against SARS-CoV-2 S1 or N  
153 protein was performed using a paramagnetic particle chemiluminescent  
154 immunoassay (CLIA) on an iFlash 1800 immunoassay analyser (Shenzhen Yhlo  
155 Biotech Co., Shenzhen, China). Values  $\geq 10$  AU/mL were considered positive. All  
156 sera tested positive for IgM or IgG, all sera with IgG 5–10 AU/mL, and all sera from  
157 SARS-CoV-2 PCR-positive individuals were subjected to confirmatory testing. For  
158 confirmation, total antibodies against SARS-CoV-2 N protein were determined using  
159 an electrochemiluminescent immunoassay (ECLIA) on a Cobas e411 analyser  
160 (Roche Diagnostics, Mannheim, Germany). In all samples with incongruent results,  
161 IgG antibodies against SARS-CoV-2 S1 protein were determined using an enzyme-  
162 linked immunosorbent assay (ELISA) (Euroimmun, Luebeck, Germany), and  
163 immunoblot was used to differentiate antibodies against N, S1 and the receptor  
164 binding domain of SARS-CoV-2 from those against seasonal coronaviruses  
165 (Mikrogen, Neuried, Germany) (S3 Appendix). Nucleic acids were extracted from  
166 nasopharyngeal swabs using the mSample Preparation System DNA kit following a  
167 standard protocol on an m2000sp device for RNA and DNA extraction (Abbott,  
168 Wiesbaden, Germany) and subjected to SARS-CoV-2 PCR using oligo-dT for  
169 reverse transcription and N1 and N3 primer and probe sets for detection according to  
170 the protocol of the Centre for Disease Control and Prevention, Atlanta, USA.



171

172 **Analysis of patient and staff trajectories**

173 Anonymised patient mobility trajectory data were extracted from our hospital  
174 information system. COVID-19 was diagnosed either when patients showed typical  
175 clinical symptoms or had COVID-19-typical findings in low-dose lung CT-scan and  
176 tested positive for SARS-CoV-2 by PCR or for anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgM or IgG [14]. For  
177 spatio-temporal analysis of patient data, we used all trajectories available  
178 from December 30, 2019 to May 29, 2020 for each admitted COVID-19 patient, as  
179 the exact interval of when the patients were contagious could not be determined.  
180 Trajectories of SARS-CoV-2 IgG seropositive staff were obtained from our  
181 questionnaire data if available (February 1, 2020 to May 29, 2020). Based on the  
182 spatio-temporal trajectories of patients and staff, two types of representations were  
183 created: (i) static representations over all timeframes and (ii) dynamically animated.  
184 The static representation is based on the relative frequency of patients or staff  
185 members at each hospital location normalised by all locations of the available  
186 trajectory time. For the dynamic representation, we illustrated two different relative  
187 frequencies normalised by all timeframes: the relative frequency of individual patients  
188 in each hospital location and the relative frequency of staff members mapped to their  
189 last locations for 14 days before they tested positive for SARS-CoV-2 IgG or were  
190 quarantined.

191 To analyse patient mobility within the hospital during the pandemic, we compared the  
192 spatial trajectories of COVID-19 patients to all patients diagnosed with any non-  
193 COVID-19 pneumonia (viral or bacterial) from December 1, 2019 to June 10, 2020  
194 (S3 Fig). All analyses were performed using R software version 3.6.0 (R Foundation  
195 for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria), and the source code is available at  
196 <https://github.com/AnaGalhoz37/SeCOMRI>.

197

198 **Statistical analysis**

199 Absolute and relative frequencies of positive tests for anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgG and IgM  
200 (CLIA, Yhlo) are given for all study participants and relevant subgroups. An exact  
201 95% confidence interval (CI) for the estimated seroprevalence is presented. To  
202 evaluate the association with potential risk factors, odds ratios (ORs) with  
203 corresponding exact 95% CIs (mid-p intervals) were estimated. The distributions of  
204 antibody titres are visualised by boxplots or dot plots and are described by medians  
205 and quartiles. Spearman's rank correlation coefficient was used to evaluate the  
206 association between the time of IgG testing and the IgG titre level. The confidence  
207 interval widths were not adjusted for multiplicity. Missing data were not imputed, and  
208 the number of missing values is presented for each variable. Statistical analyses  
209 were conducted using the statistical software R version 4.0.2 (R Foundation for  
210 Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria).

## 211 **Results**

### 212 **Anti-SARS-CoV-2-IgG seroprevalence in 4,554 hospital employees**

213 The study participation rate was 63.5% [4001/6305] for employees and 35.5%  
214 [603/1699] for medical students; the complete data from 4554 individuals were  
215 available for primary analysis (S1 Fig). The mean age of the study participants was  
216 38.5 years; 3207 (70.4%) were women and 1342 (29.5%) were men (S4 Fig).  
217 Positive anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgG antibodies were found in 108/4554 study participants.  
218 In 102 individuals, additional assays confirmed the anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgG screening  
219 result (S1 Table). Two additional individuals reporting a positive PCR test  
220 seroconverted during follow-up. Four individuals with IgG titres of 5–10 AU/mL in the  
221 screening assay, which is below the cut-off, were found to be positive in at least two  
222 other assays (S1 and S2 Tables). In five individuals, the screening result could not be  
223 confirmed by the other assays used; in one, there was insufficient material available  
224 to complete testing (S3 Table) (see S3 Appendix for details). Considering all 108  
225 study participants who tested positive for anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgG antibodies in at least  
226 two different assays, we determined a seroprevalence of 2.4% [95% CI, 1.9–2.9]  
227 (primary endpoint).

### 228 **Individual and occupational risk factors for SARS-CoV-2 infection**

229 The first patient with PCR-confirmed COVID-19 was admitted to our university  
230 hospital on March 6, 2020, and 163 COVID-19 patients were hospitalised between  
231 March 6, 2020 and May 29, 2020 (Fig 1A). Infection prevention measures were  
232 dynamically adjusted according to the prevalent pandemic situation (Fig 1A).  
233 Individual risk factors for infection were identified through correlation of self-reported  
234 survey data with seropositivity for anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgG antibodies. We found an  
235 association between seropositivity and male sex (OR 1.54 [95% CI, 1.03–2.27]) or

236 age, with the highest frequency observed for the age group of 51–60 years (OR 1.75  
237 [95% CI, 1.06–2.85] compared to those  $\leq 30$  years) (Table 1, 4, Fig 5). A higher  
238 relative frequency of seropositivity was found for individuals with diabetes mellitus  
239 (OR 2.96 [95% CI, 1.01–6.81], while no significant differences were observed in staff  
240 with pre-existing pulmonary or cardiovascular disease (Table 2, S5 Fig).  
241 Seropositivity was decreased in smokers (OR 0.52 [95% CI, 0.26–0.94]) (Table 2, S5  
242 Fig). No relevant difference in seropositivity was observed between HCW involved in  
243 direct patient care, including care of COVID-19 patients, and those working in  
244 intensive care units or the emergency department compared to staff members not  
245 working in these areas and not performing patient-associated tasks (Fig 1B, Table 2,  
246 S5 Fig). Conversely, seropositivity was particularly high in administrative staff without  
247 any direct patient contact (OR 2.36 [95% CI, 1.19–4.80]) (Fig 1C, Table 1, S5 Fig).  
248 Seropositivity was also markedly increased in staff who declared exposure to co-  
249 workers (OR 1.74 [95% CI, 1.11–2.65]) or private contacts with SARS-CoV-2  
250 infection (OR 5.56 [95% CI, 3.32–8.94]) (Fig 1B, Table 2, S5 Fig). Self-reported  
251 unprotected contact with COVID-19 patients (no medical mask,  $<1.5$  metre distance,  
252 or aerosol-generating medical procedure without filtering masks with either FFP2 or  
253 N95 standard and/or eye protection or face shields) was associated with higher  
254 seroprevalence (OR 4.77 [95% CI, 3.09–7.22]) (Table 2, S5 Fig). For staff reporting  
255 to perform aerosol-generating procedures we observed an even lower rate of  
256 seropositivity (OR 0.50 [95% CI 0.23-0.94]; Fig 1B, Table 2, S5 Fig).

### 257 **Symptoms and anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgG antibody titres in hospital staff**

258 In our cohort, 1272 individuals (27.9%) reported current or recent (within eight weeks  
259 before testing) presence of at least one symptom indicative of COVID-19 (Table 2,  
260 S5 Fig), 79 of which (6.2%) were seropositive for anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgG antibodies

261 (Table 2, S5 Fig). Loss of smell (36 seropositive of 144 individuals with reported loss  
262 of smell, 25.0%) and loss of taste (39 of 124, 31.5%) had the highest positive  
263 predictive value (Table 2, S5 Fig), and seropositivity was associated with a higher  
264 number of symptoms reported (Table 3, S5 Fig).

265 In seropositive individuals, we found no significant differences in anti-SARS-CoV-2  
266 IgG antibody titres for different age groups, sex, comorbidities, or exposure profiles  
267 (S6 Fig). However, anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgG levels were higher in staff who reported  
268 more COVID-19-related symptoms (S7 Fig). We observed the highest titres for those  
269 who reported diarrhoea, fever, elevated temperature, shivering, limb pain, and  
270 headache (S7 Fig).

### 271 **Value of symptom-based PCR testing**

272 Symptom-based PCR testing of material obtained from nasopharyngeal swabs was  
273 initiated early during the pandemic through a dedicated COVID-19 telephone hotline.  
274 The first hospital employee with SARS-CoV-2 infection was identified on March 9,  
275 2020, and 28 individuals with SARS-CoV-2 infection detected by PCR before  
276 participating in this study tested positive for anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgG (Fig 1A), (S8 Fig).  
277 Ten seropositive individuals reported positive PCR, one positive antibody testing at  
278 other facilities. However, 68 of 108 (63%) SARS-CoV-2 infections had not been  
279 diagnosed previously, data on prior testing was missing for one individual. Among  
280 these 68 seropositive individuals, 28 did not report any COVID-19-typical symptoms  
281 in the initial survey (25.9% of all seropositive staff), indicating that symptom-based  
282 testing can miss SARS-CoV-2 infection.

### 283 **Analysis of spatio-temporal trajectories**

284 To identify and localize potential hotspots of infection, we systematically analysed  
285 contact between staff and COVID-19 patients using the cumulative data on staff  
286 serology and the patient registry. Thus, we plotted available spatial and temporal  
287 information on the presence of COVID-19 patients and anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgG  
288 antibody-positive staff with daily resolution on a hospital map. Visualisation of these  
289 spatio-temporal mobility trajectories revealed only a slight overlap between the  
290 distinct spatial and temporal hotspots of COVID-19 patients and anti-SARS-CoV-2  
291 IgG antibody-positive staff (Fig 1D, Videos).

## 292 **Discussion**

293 Studies on the seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2 are essential to reliably analyse  
294 exposure characteristics among hospital staff and to evaluate the efficacy of  
295 protective measures. Despite the high overall burden of patients with COVID-19  
296 disease in our hospital, the seroprevalence of 2.4% for anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgG  
297 antibodies among university hospital staff after the first wave in Germany is lower  
298 than that reported in previous studies, which may be attributed to differences in the  
299 cohort composition, fast implementation of protective measures, or frequency of  
300 exposure [1,2].

301 Although hospital staff have an increased occupational risk of contact with SARS-  
302 CoV-2-infected patients, and a high burden of SARS-CoV-2 infection among HCW  
303 involved in the care of COVID-19 patients has been previously reported, we did not  
304 observe higher seroprevalences in staff who reported direct patient contact, including  
305 those working in COVID-19 designated areas [11,12,15]. Unexpectedly, we observed  
306 lower seroprevalence in staff who reported exposure to aerosol-generating high-risk  
307 procedures, possibly reflecting increased awareness and the implementation of  
308 particularly rigorous personal protection measures in this subgroup. Furthermore, the

309 type of protective equipment used was not associated with seroprevalence, but 98%  
310 of staff reported routinely using medical masks, which was required by internal  
311 hospital policy for patient-facing staff since March 16, 2020, and for all staff starting  
312 March 27, 2020. The almost parallel rise of SARS-CoV-2 infection cases in staff and  
313 patients is suggestive of extrinsic infection causes in both groups, such as the  
314 simultaneous return from high-risk holiday areas. Consistently, exposure to SARS-  
315 CoV-2-infected private contacts or co-workers was the most important risk factor for  
316 SARS-CoV-2 infection in our cohort. This underscores the need for adherence to  
317 protective measures during both private and professional personal contacts.

318 Male staff in our study cohort showed a higher seroprevalence. Based on a recent  
319 study reporting a significantly lower perceived infection risk in men than in women,  
320 adherence to hygiene guidelines and social distancing measures might have been  
321 lower in male staff [16,17]. Interestingly, smokers showed a significantly lower  
322 seroprevalence, which is in contrast to that reported in previous studies [6,7,9,10,16].  
323 Because smokers are more susceptible to respiratory tract infections and smoking  
324 involves hand-to-mouth contact and frequent social interactions, the lower  
325 seroprevalence is unexpected but in line with other reports [18,19,20-22]. Staff  
326 suffering from diabetes mellitus had a higher seroprevalence than non-diabetics.  
327 Previously, diabetes mellitus reportedly correlates with the severity of COVID-19 and  
328 associated mortality, but no increase in susceptibility to SARS-CoV-2 infection have  
329 been reported to date [23].

330 The serological assessment confirmed infection in most individuals who reported  
331 positive testing for SARS-CoV-2 by PCR. However, repeated testing over >4 weeks  
332 with at least two separate assays each did not detect antibodies in six individuals  
333 (two with positive in-house PCR results and four with reported positive external PCR

334 results) (S8 Fig, No. 14, 29). This may be explained by false-positive PCR results or  
335 by the failure to develop antibody responses after low-symptomatic infection, which  
336 may occur in up to 10% of convalescents following SARS-CoV-2 infection [24].

337 For 19 seropositive individuals, previous PCR testing yielded negative results.  
338 Because virus shedding is often limited to only a few days, PCR detection of SARS-  
339 CoV-2 RNA critically depends on timing and properly performed nasopharyngeal  
340 swabs. Thus, negative PCR test results are frequent and should be questioned,  
341 repeated, and complemented by antibody testing if clinical signs or history suggest  
342 an infection [25]. However, false-positive antibody test results also need to be  
343 considered, particularly in the light of an overall low prevalence and possible cross-  
344 reactivity with other coronaviruses. The IgG immunoassay used for screening proved  
345 to have a specificity of 99.89% in our study; it uses two SARS-CoV-2 antigens (N and  
346 S1) for detection and has an estimated sensitivity of 96.30%. We retested all IgM or  
347 IgG-positive sera and all sera with titres of 5–10 AU/mL, which is below the cut-off,  
348 by a second assay with particularly high specificity (99.90%) that uses recombinant  
349 N-protein as the antigen. If required, additional assays were performed: either an  
350 ELISA, using recombinant S1 protein as capture antigen, or an immunoblot, testing  
351 for antibodies against three different SARS-CoV-2 antigens. Serum was only  
352 considered positive if two or more antibody assays were positive (S3 Appendix).  
353 However, the requirement of such extensive confirmatory testing strengthens the  
354 notion that each test for SARS-CoV-2 antibodies requires critical evaluation.

355 Our study also revealed that approximately 2/3 of the seropositive staff had a hitherto  
356 undetected infection. These infections may have been oligo- or asymptomatic without  
357 even alarming medically trained personnel. Furthermore, 25 anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgG  
358 antibody-positive individuals had not been PCR-tested despite reporting at least one



359 COVID-19 compatible symptom. 1183 staff members tested seronegative despite  
360 reporting at least one symptom related to COVID-19. The focus on symptoms with  
361 the strongest association with seropositivity, such as loss of smell, loss of taste,  
362 fatigue, fever, and cough, may therefore be helpful in developing more accurate and  
363 economical screening algorithms. Our results highlight that symptom-based testing  
364 may miss staff infections. All 28 asymptomatic seropositive individuals remained  
365 undiagnosed before the study, emphasising the significance of rigorous  
366 implementation of systematic hygiene measures in pandemic situations.  
367 Transmission by asymptomatic infected staff may occur at any time and will not be  
368 prevented by random testing. All these results strongly support the continuous use of  
369 medical masks as a simple and efficient measure for employee and patient  
370 protection.

371 To identify infection hotspots and putative patient/staff overlaps, we visualised the  
372 temporo-spatial mobility trajectories of patients and staff to monitor the infection  
373 dynamics. Real-time use of such trajectory mapping at high resolution may yield  
374 additional information that allows the reaction to react more quickly and intuitively to  
375 infection foci. Continuous evaluation of mobility trajectory mappings may highlight  
376 areas of recurrent infections and thus identify previously unattended needs that  
377 should be addressed for future waves of the pandemic.

378 The current study has several limitations. First, because this was a voluntary  
379 assessment, participation was incomplete and may have biased the results. We  
380 cannot exclude the possibility that staff members with a higher perceived risk of  
381 infection were more likely to participate. Furthermore, as most students stayed at  
382 home during lock-down, their participation rate was low. Second, symptoms and  
383 exposures were retrospectively assessed and self-reported and thus subject to a

384 recall bias. Third, although we attempted a cross-sectional analysis, our data  
385 documents the average seroprevalence during the entire testing period; thus,  
386 seroconversions occurring during this period may have been missed. Finally, PCR  
387 testing results were only available from individuals who consented to their use  
388 (4373/4554), limiting the possibility of cross-validating PCR results with  
389 seroprevalence.

390 Altogether, our findings have several important implications. We did not observe a  
391 relevant increase in anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgG antibody seropositivity in HCW (including  
392 those working with COVID-19 patients) compared to staff who were not directly  
393 involved in patient care as long as PPE was used. Importantly, interaction with  
394 SARS-CoV-2 infected co-workers and/or private contacts was a major risk factor for  
395 infection. Among the symptoms reported, loss of smell and taste were strongly  
396 indicative of SARS-CoV-2 infection. However, almost two-thirds of seropositive  
397 individuals detected in this cross-sectional study had not been previously diagnosed  
398 with SARS-CoV-2 infection, while 25.9% reported asymptomatic infections. Thus,  
399 obligatory wearing of medical masks by all employees and, whenever tolerated, also  
400 by patients, may minimise virus transmission risks, although it was not possible to  
401 formally separate this effect from that of minimising personal contacts imposed by the  
402 general lock-down. To date, the value of anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibodies for protective  
403 immunity and their sustainability in infected individuals remains unclear. Longitudinal  
404 studies with combined testing for virus-specific antibodies and their infection-  
405 neutralizing ability, as well as virus-specific T-cell immunity are needed to estimate  
406 the longevity and protective value of the anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgG antibody responses in  
407 hospital staff.


408 **Acknowledgements**

409

410 A list of the SeCoMRI Study Group is available in S1 Appendix in the Supporting  
411 Information. We are indebted to all study participants who consented to having their  
412 data published. This study would not have been possible without the contribution of  
413 clinical and administrative staff involved in the enrolment and obtaining informed  
414 consent of study participants. In particular, we would like to thank all technical staff of  
415 the Institute of Virology and the Institute of Clinical Chemistry for performing the  
416 diagnostic tests. We are grateful to Yhlo, Shenzhen, China, and Mikrogen, Neuried,  
417 Germany, for providing part of the test kits for free. We are obliged to the hospital  
418 board of directors for their financial and organisational support.

419 **Figures and Tables**

**Figure 1**



421 **Fig 1: Prevalence and distribution of SARS-CoV-2 infections in patients and**  
422 **staff at a university hospital in Munich, Germany**

423 **(A)** Number of all COVID-19 patients admitted to the hospital. Suspected COVID-19  
424 cases are depicted in light orange, new confirmed COVID-19 cases are in dark red.  
425 Blue squares show positive PCR tests for SARS-CoV-2 RNA in university hospital  
426 staff. Lines indicate the densities of positive PCR tests in staff (blue) and new  
427 COVID-19 cases in patients (red). Carnival holidays: February 22, 2020 to March 1,  
428 2020. First COVID-19 patient admitted: March 6, 2020. Seroprevalence study: April  
429 14, 2020 to May 29, 2020. The implemented infection preventive measures are  
430 annotated below.

431 **(B)** Prevalence of anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgG antibodies correlated to occupational risk  
432 factors. Dashed line indicates the overall seroprevalence of 2.4%. **(C)** Numbers of  
433 subjects according to occupational groups (dark blue bars, proportion of seropositive  
434 staff highlighted in red) compared to all employed staff (light blue bars). **(D–F)**  
435 Cumulative representation of frequencies of seropositive staff **(D)**, COVID-19-  
436 patients **(E)**, and the differences in both between different hospital areas **(F)** are  
437 shown by dot plots and assigned to distinct hospital areas. For the purposes of  
438 discretion of data from study participants, the graphical representation of spatial  
439 information is partially distorted. The dashed lines indicate COVID-19 designated  
440 areas in the hospital. FFP: Filtering face piece, Lab: Laboratory, min: Minimum, max:  
441 Maximum, MRI: University Hospital Munich rechts der Isar, PCR: Polymerase chain  
442 reaction, SARS-CoV-2: Severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2.

443 **Table 1: Seroprevalence by general characteristics and occupation**

	<b>Anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibody</b>		<b>IgG</b>	<b>Odds ratio (95%CI)</b>
	<b>Negative</b>	<b>Positive</b>		
<b>Age groups</b>				
18–30 (n = 1622)	1585 (97.7%)	37 (2.3%)		1 (ref)
31–40 (n = 1134)	1115 (98.3%)	19 (1.7%)		0.73 (0.41–1.27)
41–50 (n = 758)	740 (97.6%)	18 (2.4%)		1.05 (0.58–1.83)
51–60 (n = 766)	736 (96.1%)	30 (3.9%)		1.75 (1.06–2.85)
>60 (n = 274)	270 (98.5%)	4 (1.5%)		0.66 (0.19–1.66)
<b>Sex</b>				
Female (n = 3207)	3141 (97.9%)	66 (2.1%)		1 (ref)
Male (n = 1342)	1300 (96.9%)	42 (3.1%)		1.54 (1.03–2.27)
Unreported (n = 5)	5 (100%)	0		
<b>Profession</b>				
Nurses (n = 958)	934 (97.5%)	24 (2.5%)		1.55 (0.80–3.10)
Physicians (n = 860)	846 (98.4%)	14 (1.6%)		1 (ref)
Clinical ancillary staff (n = 383)	374 (97.7%)	9 (2.3%)		1.46 (0.60–3.39)
Non-clinical ancillary staff (n = 120)	118 (98.3%)	2 (1.7%)		1.09 (0.16–4.02)
Scientists/laboratory workers (n = 635)	627 (98.7%)	8 (1.3%)		0.78 (0.31–1.84)
Administrative staff (n = 557)	536 (96.2%)	21 (3.8%)		2.36 (1.19–4.80)
Other (n = 424)	412 (97.2%)	12 (2.8%)		1.76 (0.79–3.88)
Students (n = 603)	586 (97.2%)	17 (2.8%)		1.75 (0.85–3.65)

444

445 SARS-CoV-2: Severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2

446

447

448 **Table 2: Seroprevalence by self-reported risk factors and symptoms**

	No. of anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgG antibody positives/total (%)		Odds ratio (95%CI)	No. of anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgG positives/missing data
	True	False		
<b>Individual risk factors</b>				
Pulmonary disease	8/317 (2.5)	99/4212 (2.4)	1.1 (0.48–2.14)	1/25
Cardiovascular disease	5/329 (1.5)	102/4200 (2.4)	0.64 (0.22–1.43)	1/25
Diabetes mellitus	5/79 (6.3)	102/4451 (2.3)	2.96 (1.01–6.81)	1/24
Immunodeficiency	0/92 (0.0)	107/4434 (2.4)		1/28
Immunosuppressive therapy	1/69 (1.4)	105/4461 (2.4)	0.7 (0.03–3.15)	2/24
Smoking	11/817 (1.3)	96/3718 (2.6)	0.52 (0.26–0.94)	1/19
<b>Exposure</b>				
Patient facing role	55/2559 (2.1)	50/1934 (2.6)	0.83 (0.56–1.22)	3/61
Aerosol generating procedures	9/712 (1.3)	96/3794 (2.5)	0.50 (0.23–0.94)	3/48
COVID-19 assigned area	21/712 (2.9)	85/3803 (2.2)	1.34 (0.80–2.13)	2/39
Emergency department	11/515 (2.1)	95/3999 (2.4)	0.91 (0.46–1.64)	2/40
Ward	43/1633 (2.6)	63/2882 (2.2)	1.21 (0.81–1.79)	2/39
Intensive care unit	16/690 (2.3)	89/3824 (2.3)	1.00 (0.56–1.67)	3/40
<b>Contact to SARS-CoV-2-positive</b>				
Patient	31/1028 (3.0)	74/3436 (2.2)	1.42 (0.91–2.15)	3/90
Co-worker	29/816 (3.6)	76/3644 (2.1)	1.74 (1.11–2.65)	3/94
Private contact	22/220 (10.0)	83/4218 (2.0)	5.56 (3.32–8.94)	3/116
Unprotected contact	34/435 (7.8)	70/3997 (1.8)	4.77 (3.09–7.22)	4/122
Protected contact	32/1230 (2.6)	73/3237 (2.3)	1.16 (0.75–1.75)	3/87

<b>Personal protective equipment</b>				
Use of PPE	104/4458 (2.3)	2/75 (2.7)	0.81 (0.25–5.35)	2/21
Medical mask	104/4437 (2.3)	2/95 (2.1)	1.04 (0.32–6.83)	2/22
FFP2/N95-mask	32/1497 (2.1)	74/3011 (2.5)	0.87 (0.56–1.31)	2/46
FFP3-mask	8/325 (2.5)	96/4163 (2.3)	1.09 (0.48–2.13)	4/66
Protective clothing	34/1677 (2.0)	72/2835 (2.5)	0.8 (0.52–1.19)	2/42
Eye protection or face shield	29/1580 (1.8)	77/2934 (2.6)	0.7 (0.45–1.06)	2/40
<b>Symptoms</b>				
Experienced symptoms	79/1272 (6.2)	28/3263 (0.9)	7.62 (4.98–12.00)	1/19
Exhaustion	54/771 (7.0)	53/3763 (1.4)	5.27 (3.57–7.78)	1/20
Fatigue	67/795 (8.4)	40/3738 (1.1)	8.49 (5.72–12.77)	1/21
Cough	50/668 (7.5)	57/3861 (1.5)	5.40 (3.65–7.97)	1/25
Shortness of breath	19/307 (6.2)	88/4222 (2.1)	3.12 (1.82–5.08)	1/25
Rhinitis	47/689 (6.8)	60/3843 (1.6)	4.62 (3.11–6.82)	1/22
Loss of smell	36/144 (25.0)	71/4384 (1.6)	20.23 (12.87–31.41)	1/26
Loss of taste	39/124 (31.5)	67/4402 (1.5)	29.62 (18.79–46.38)	2/28
Sore throat	30/740 (4.1)	77/3792 (2.0)	2.05 (1.31–3.11)	1/22
Headache	46/766 (6.0)	61/3766 (1.6)	3.88 (2.61–5.73)	1/22
Limb pain	36/403 (8.9)	71/4129 (1.7)	5.61 (3.67–8.45)	1/22
Shivering	36/442 (8.1)	71/4092 (1.7)	5.03 (3.29–7.56)	1/20
Diarrhea	20/316 (6.3)	87/4214 (2.1)	3.22 (1.90–5.21)	1/24
Elevated temperature	46/491 (9.4)	61/4032 (1.5)	6.73 (4.51–9.98)	1/31
Fever (> 38°C)	29/233 (12.4)	77/4288 (1.8)	7.79 (4.90–12.1)	2/33

450

451

PPE: Personal protective equipment, FFP: Filtering face piece

452



453 **Table 3: Seroprevalence by symptom onset and frequency**

	SARS-CoV-2 IgG		Odds ratio (95%CI)
	Negative	Positive	
<b>Symptom onset</b>			
Not applicable (n = 3373)	3336 (98.9%)	37 (1.1%)	1 (ref)
Past 14 days (n = 219)	209 (95.4%)	10 (4.6%)	4.36 (2.02–8.59)
Past 3 to 8 weeks (n = 943)	883 (93.6%)	60 (6.4%)	6.113 (4.05–9.35)
Unknown (n = 19)	18	1	
<b>Symptom frequency (p &lt; 0.001)</b>			
0 (n = 3273)	3245 (99.1%)	28 (0.9%)	1 (ref)
1–4 (n = 548)	529 (96.5%)	19 (3.5%)	4.17 (2.27–7.5)
5–8 (n = 491)	454 (92.5%)	37 (7.5%)	9.42 (5.72–15.7)
9–14 (n = 223)	200 (89.7%)	23 (10.3%)	13.32 (7.45–23.58)
Unknown (n = 19)	18	1	

454

## 455 References

- 456 1. Coronavirus disease (COVID-19) outbreak situation. Available from:  
457 <https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019>. Accessed August 10, 2020.
- 458 2. Wei XS, Wang XR, Zhang JC, Yang WB, Ma WL, Yang BH, et al. A cluster of health care workers  
459 with COVID-19 pneumonia caused by SARS-CoV-2. *J Microbiol Immunol Infect.* 2020.  
460 doi:10.1016/j.jmii.2020.04.013.
- 461 3. J Chu J, Yang N, Wei Y, Yue H, Zhang F, Zhao J, et al. Clinical characteristics of 54 medical staff  
462 with COVID-19: A retrospective study in a single center in Wuhan, China. *J Med Virol.* 2020;92(7):807-  
463 13.
- 464 4. Houlihan CF, Vora N, Byrne T, Lewer D, Kelly G, Heaney J, et al. Pandemic peak SARS-CoV-2  
465 infection and seroconversion rates in London frontline health-care workers. *Lancet (London, England).*  
466 2020;396(10246):e6-e7.
- 467 5. Moscola J, Sembajwe G, Jarrett M, Farber B, Chang T, McGinn T, et al. Prevalence of SARS-CoV-  
468 2 Antibodies in Health Care Personnel in the New York City Area. *Jama.* 2020;324(9):893-5.
- 469 6. Pollán M, Pérez-Gómez B, Pastor-Barriuso R, Oteo J, Hernán MA, Pérez-Ordóñez M, et al.  
470 Prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 in Spain (ENE-COVID): a nationwide, population-based  
471 seroepidemiological study. *Lancet (London, England).* 2020. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(20)31483-5.
- 472 7. Xu X, Sun J, Nie S, Li H, Kong Y, Liang M, et al. Seroprevalence of immunoglobulin M and G  
473 antibodies against SARS-CoV-2 in China. *Nature medicine.* 2020;26, 1193-1195.
- 474 8. Iversen K, Bundgaard H, Hasselbalch RB, Kristensen JH, Nielsen PB, Pries-Heje M, et al. Risk of  
475 COVID-19 in health-care workers in Denmark: an observational cohort study. *The Lancet Infectious*  
476 *Diseases.* 2020. doi:10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30589-2.
- 477 9. Steensels D, Oris E, Coninx L, Nuyens D, Delforge ML, Vermeersch P, et al. Hospital-Wide SARS-  
478 CoV-2 Antibody Screening in 3056 Staff in a Tertiary Center in Belgium. *Jama.* 2020;324(2):195-7.
- 479 10. Garcia-Basteiro AL, Moncunill G, Tortajada M, Vidal M, Guinovart C, Jiménez A, et al.  
480 Seroprevalence of antibodies against SARS-CoV-2 among health care workers in a large Spanish  
481 reference hospital. *Nat Commun.* 2020;11(1):3500
- 482 11. Poulidakos D, Sinha S, Kalra PA. SARS-CoV-2 antibody screening in healthcare workers in a  
483 tertiary centre in North West England. *Journal of clinical virology : the official publication of the Pan*  
484 *American Society for Clinical Virology.* 2020;129:104545.
- 485 12. Available from: <https://www.i-med.ac.at/mypoint/news/746359.html>]. Accessed August 10, 2020.
- 486 13. Prasser F, Kohlbacher O, Mansmann U, Bauer B, Kuhn KA. Data Integration for Future Medicine  
487 (DIFUTURE). *Methods Inf Med.* 2018;57(S 01):e57-e65.
- 488 14. Burian E, Jungmann F, Kaissis GA, Lohöfer FK, Spinner CD, Lahmer T, et al. Intensive Care Risk  
489 Estimation in COVID-19 Pneumonia Based on Clinical and Imaging Parameters: Experiences from the  
490 Munich Cohort. *J Clin Med.* 2020;9(5).
- 491 15. Chou R, Dana T, Buckley DI, Selph S, Fu R, Totten AM. Epidemiology of and Risk Factors for  
492 Coronavirus Infection in Health Care Workers. *Ann Intern Med.* 2020;173(2):W46-W47.
- 493 16. Stringhini S, Wisniak A, Piumatti G, Azman AS, Lauer SA, Baysson H, et al. Seroprevalence of  
494 anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgG antibodies in Geneva, Switzerland (SEROCoV-POP): a population-based study.  
495 *Lancet (London, England).* 2020;396(10247):313-9.
- 496 17. Behrens GMN, Cossmann A, Stankov MV, Witte T, Ernst D, Happel C, et al. Perceived versus  
497 proven SARS-CoV-2-specific immune responses in health-care professionals. *Infection.* 2020:1-4.
- 498 18. Grundy EJ, Suddek T, Filippidis FT, Majeed A, Coronini-Cronberg S. Smoking, SARS-CoV-2 and  
499 COVID-19: A review of reviews considering implications for public health policy and practice. *Tob*  
500 *Induc Dis.* 2020;18:58.
- 501 19. Millett ER, De Stavola BL, Quint JK, Smeeth L, Thomas SL. Risk factors for hospital admission in  
502 the 28 days following a community-acquired pneumonia diagnosis in older adults, and their  
503 contribution to increasing hospitalisation rates over time: a cohort study. *BMJ Open.*  
504 2015;5(12):e008737.
- 505 20. Almirall J, Serra-Prat M, Bolibar I, Balasso V. Risk Factors for Community-Acquired Pneumonia in  
506 Adults: A Systematic Review of Observational Studies. *Respiration.* 2017;94(3):299-311.
- 507 21. Israel A, Feldhamer I, Lahad A, Levin-Zamir D, Lavie G. Smoking and the risk of COVID-19 in a  
508 large observational population study. *medRxiv.* 2020:2020.06.01.20118877.
- 509 22. Farsalinos K, Niaura R, Le Houezec J, Barbouni A, Tsatsakis A, Kouretas D, et al. Editorial:  
510 Nicotine and SARS-CoV-2: COVID-19 may be a disease of the nicotinic cholinergic system. *Toxicol*  
511 *Rep.* 2020;7:658-63.
- 512 23. Mazucanti CH, Egan JM. SARS-CoV-2 disease severity and diabetes: why the connection and  
513 what is to be done? *Immun Ageing.* 2020;17:21.
- 514 24. Long QX, Tang XJ, Shi QL, Li Q, Deng HJ, Yuan J, et al. Clinical and immunological assessment  
515 of asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infections. *Nature medicine.* 2020;26(6):1200-1204.

516 25. Sethuraman N, Jeremiah SS, Ryo A. Interpreting Diagnostic Tests for SARS-CoV-2. *Jama*  
517 .2020:323(22):2249-2251.

## 518 **Supporting Information files**

519 **S1 Appendix: SeCoMRI Study Group**

520 **S2 Appendix: Questionnaire**

521 **S3 Appendix: Calculation of specificity and sensitivity of the SARS-CoV-2**  
522 **antibody tests**

523 **S1 Table: Samples with confirmed positive IgG against SARS-CoV-2**

524 **S2 Table: Summary of confirmatory assays**

525 **S3 Table: Samples with positive IgG against SARS-CoV-2 that could not be**  
526 **confirmed**

527 **S4 Table: Samples with positive IgM against SARS-CoV-2 that could not be**  
528 **confirmed**

529 **S5 Table: Calculation of specificity and sensitivity**

530 **S1 Figure: Study flow chart illustrating the testing algorithm and included**  
531 **results**

532 **S2 Figure: Anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgG and IgM levels**

533 **S3 Figure: Relative frequency of requested diagnostics, therapies, and spatial**  
534 **information between patients diagnosed with COVID-19 and non-COVID-19**  
535 **pneumonia**

536 **S4 Figure: Age and sex distribution of the study participants**

537 **S5 Figure: Graphic representation of all odds ratios for seropositivity to SARS-**  
538 **CoV-2 IgG represented in Table S1–3**

539 **S6 Figure: Distribution of anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgG levels stratified for**  
540 **personal/occupational risk factors**

541 **S7 Figure: Anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgG levels and symptoms**

542 **S8 Figure: Time course of anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibody and PCR test results in 33**  
543 **employees**

544 **S1 Video: Time lapse of the relative frequencies of all trajectories for COVID-19**  
545 **cases**

546 **S2 Video: Time lapse of the relative frequencies of trajectories available for**  
547 **SARS-CoV-2-positive staff working on campus**

548 **S3 Video: Time lapse of the relative frequencies for the difference in**  
549 **trajectories available for COVID-19 cases and for SARS-CoV-2-positive staff**