medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.02.20222778; this version posted May 2, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.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 Page

Title	SARS-CoV-2 responsive T cell numbers and anti-Spike IgG levels are both associated with protection from COVID-19: A prospective cohort study in keyworkers
Authors' names and affiliations	David Wyllie[1+], Hayley E Jones[2], Ranya Mulchandani[1], Adam Trickey[2], Sian Taylor-Phillips[3], Tim Brooks[1], Andre Charlett[1], AE Ades[2], EDSAB-HOME investigators, Andrew Makin[4], Isabel Oliver[1, 2] + correspondence: david.wyllie@phe.gov.uk 1 Public Health England 2 Population Health Sciences, University of Bristol 3 University of Warwick 4 Oxford Immunotec Ltd
Correspondence	David Wyllie, Public Health England, Forvie Site, Addenbrookes' Campus, Robinson Way, Cambridge, CB2 0SR.

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.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/10.1101/2020.11.02.20222778; this version posted May 2, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.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.

Authors' details

Listed authors

Name	Job Title	Affiliation	Email address	ORCID
David Wyllie[+]	Consultant Microbiologist	Public Health England	David.wyllie@phe.gov.uk	0000-0002-9155-6228
Hayley E Jones	Senior Lecturer	University of Bristol, UK	Hayley.jones@bristol.ac.uk	0000-0002-4265-2854
Ranya Mulchandani	Field Epidemiology Training Programme (UK-FETP) Fellow	Public Health England	Ranya.mulchandani@phe.gov.uk	0000-0002-5157-1060
Adam Trickey	Senior Research Associate	University of Bristol, UK	Adam.trickey@bristol.ac.uk	0000-0003-3462-2898
Sian Taylor-Phillips	Professor	University of Warwick, UK	s.taylor-phillips@warwick.ac.uk	0000-0002-1841-4346
Tim Brooks	Consultant Microbiologist	Public Health England	Tim.brooks@phe.gov.uk	

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.02.20222778; this version posted May 2, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.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.

Andre Charlett	Head of Statistics and Modelling	Public Health England	Andre.charlett@phe.gov.uk	
Anthony E Ades	Professor	University of Bristol, UK	t.ades@bristol.ac.uk	
EDSAB-HOME investigators[&]	See below			
Andrew Makin	Vice President, Medical Affairs	Oxford Immunotec Ltd	amakin@oxfordimmunotec.com	
Isabel Oliver	Director, National Infection Service	Public Health England	isabel.oliver@phe.gov.uk	

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.02.20222778; this version posted May 2, 2021. 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.

EDSAB-HOME investigators

Name	Job Title	Affiliation	Email address	ORCID
Philippa Moore	Consultant Microbiologist	[9]Gloucestershire Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, Gloucester, UK	philippa.moore1@nhs.net	
John Boyes	Consultant Microbiologist	[9]Gloucestershire Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, Gloucester, UK	johnboyes@nhs.net	
Anil Hormis	Consultant Anaesthetist	[10]The Rotherham NHS Foundation Trust, Rotherham, UK	Anilhormis@nhs.net	
Neil Todd	Consultant Microbiologist	York Teaching Hospital NHS Foundation Trust, York, UK	Neil.todd@york.nhs.uk	
Ian Reckless	Consultant Physician	Milton Keynes University Hospital NHS Foundation Trust, Milton Keynes, UK	Ian.reckless@mkuh.nhs.uk	

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.02.20222778; this version posted May 2, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Abstract

Immune correlates of protection from COVID-19 are incompletely understood. 2,826 keyworkers had T-SPOT® *Discovery* SARS-CoV-2 tests (measuring interferon-γ secreting, SARS-CoV-2 responsive T cells, Oxford Immunotec Ltd), and anti-Spike S1 domain IgG antibody levels (EuroImmun AG) performed on recruitment into a cohort study. 285/2,826 (10.1%) of participants had positive SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR tests, predominantly associated with symptomatic illness, during 200 days followup. T cell responses to Spike, Nucleoprotein and Matrix proteins (SNM responses) were detected in some participants at recruitment, as were anti-Spike S1 IgG antibodies; higher levels of both were associated with protection from subsequent SARS-CoV-2 test positivity. In volunteers with moderate antibody responses, who represented 39% (252/654) of those with detectable anti-Spike IgG, protection was partial, and higher with higher circulating T cell SNM responses. SARS-CoV-2 responsive T cell numbers predict protection in individuals with low anti-Spike IgG responses; serology alone underestimates the proportion of the population protected after infection.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.02.20222778; this version posted May 2, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Introduction

The SARS-CoV-2 virus has caused a global pandemic that has killed over a million individuals, disrupted economies, and continues to spread widely; as of March 25, 2021, 4.3 million people have tested positive in the UK alone (1). Disease manifestations vary from asymptomatic or minimally symptomatic infection through to fatal pneumonia (2-5).

Animal data and human epidemiological indicate that immune protection to SARS-CoV-2 diseases can be elicited after natural infection (6-14). However, the relative importance of immune responses elicited following natural infection are not yet clear. Antibodies to SARS-CoV-2 nucleoprotein and spike protein are generated in >90% of cases of symptomatic infection (Table S1) and are associated with clinical protection epidemiologically (6, 7). Potent neutralisation of viral infectivity, predominantly by antibodies directed at the receptor binding domain moiety of the Coronavirus Spike S1 domain, occurs post infection (15), and represent a potential causative explanation for observed associations between serological responses and protection (6, 7). Unfortunately, antibody resistant escape variants can be selected *in vitro* (16), and the recently emergent and highly successful viral variants B.1.1.7 and 501Y.V2 (17) may result from similar *in vivo* selection. In support of this idea, these viruses are less effectively neutralised by antisera from natural infection, or vaccination with Spike protein from, ancestor viruses (18-20). Therefore, an understanding of antibody independent defence mechanisms which might reduce the impact of viral evasion of pre-existing humoral protection is an important topic for investigation.

In asymptomatically infected individuals, generation of SARS-CoV-2 responsive T cells without persistent antibodies has been reported (21-23). Additionally, SARS-CoV-2 responsive T cells have been described in a proportion of the SARS-CoV-2 naive population, likely primed by infection with the endemic common cold *Coronaviridae* (CCCs) (24-27). It has been proposed that such T cells may provide some protection from SARS-CoV-2 infection (27-29).

Reproducible, standardised high throughput serological assays which have minimal cross reactivity with CCCs have been developed (30, 31) and deployed on a large scale, even before a complete picture of their clinical utility was available (32), allowing an understanding of the association between anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibody responses and protection from subsequent COVID-19 (6, 7). By contrast, T cell immune responses to SARS-CoV-2 have been studied in smaller populations using a

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.02.20222778; this version posted May 2, 2021. 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.

combination of ELISPOT, flow cytometric analysis of cell surface activation induced markers, as well as intracellular cytokine staining (21-27).

The objectives of this study were i) to describe T cell and antibody responses to the SARS-COV-2 virus in UK keyworkers recruited to the EDSAB-HOME (Evaluating Detection of SARS-CoV-2 AntiBodies at HOME) cohort study (33), and ii) to measure the association between these responses at recruitment and subsequent COVID-19 development.

Methods

Study participants

We studied participants in the EDSAB-HOME study (ISRCTN56609224) (33), which recruited and characterised three keyworker "streams" in England. Recruitment occurred from 1 to 26 June 2020 at the end of the UK's first wave of COVID-19 (Supplementary figure 1). Two streams (Streams A, B) recruited Fire & Rescue or Police service keyworkers, or Health care keyworkers (n=1,139, n=1,533, respectively), independent of any history of COVID-19 disease, asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infection, or RT-PCR test results; in Stream C, healthcare workers were purposefully recruited on the basis of a history of prior RT-PCR positive testing (n=154) (Table S2). All participants were administered an identical questionnaire, which asked about demographic details, personal and household illness since 1 Jan 2020, and whether the individual had had RT-PCR tests for SARS-CoV-2. Self-reported SARS-CoV-2 test results were cross-checked against national laboratory records. The cohorts did not include acutely infected individuals; among the 268 (9.4%) cases who had had a positive RT-PCR result prior to recruitment, the test had occurred a median of 63 days prior to recruitment. The cohort would be expected to include both symptomatic and asymptomatically infected individuals, some of whom would not have been identified by the testing then available. On attending a study clinic, participants provided 6ml blood anticoagulated using EDTA used for immunoassays, and 6ml or 10ml lithium heparin anticoagulated blood used for T-SPOT tests.

Study endpoints

In the period after recruitment, large scale SARS-CoV-2 testing capability was in place in England. For participants, symptom driven nasal/throat RT-PCR testing was available through state and employer routes for those with cough, fever, or disordered taste/smell; all such tests, irrespective of

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.02.20222778; this version posted May 2, 2021. 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.

result, are recorded in a national database. Asymptomatic testing was not routinely available, except as part of national surveillance schemes, and in workplace-based settings from 6 November 2020 onward. We followed up participants, defining an endpoint as the first positive SARS-CoV-2 positive RT-PCR test during follow-up, for 200 days to 24 Jan 2021. We obtained details about symptoms and circumstances associated with the positive test from (i) an optional weekly symptom questionnaire sent to volunteers and (ii) a symptom questionnaire sent retrospectively to all individuals with positive tests. We excluded one result obtained from an individual tested as part of national surveillance study of randomly selected asymptomatic individuals, since the positive predictive value of results is much lower in the absence of symptoms(35).

Disease rates

The daily counts and rates of individuals testing positive for SARS-CoV-2 was obtained from https://coronavirus.data.gov.uk on 26 Jan 2021.

T-SPOT® *Discovery* SARS-CoV-2 kits

To quantify T cell responses, we used T-SPOT® *Discovery* SARS-CoV-2 kits (T-SPOT hereafter), which use ELISpot technology to detect IFN-γ release from immune cells after exposure to SARS-CoV-2 peptides. This test is similar to the T-SPOT®.*TB* test which identifies patients infected with *M. tuberculosis* (34), and has been widely used clinically. Peripheral blood mononuclear cells (PBMCs) were isolated from a whole blood sample using the T-Cell *Select*™ reagent (Oxford Immunotec). After quantification and dilution of recovered cells, 250,000 PBMCs were plated into each well of a T-SPOT® *Discovery* SARS-CoV-2 (Oxford Immunotec) kit. The kit is designed to measure responses to six different but overlapping peptides pools to cover protein sequences of six different SARS-CoV-2 antigens and includes negative and positive controls (Table S3). Peptide sequences that showed high homology to endemic coronaviruses were removed from the sequences, but sequences that may have homology to SARS-CoV-1 were retained. Cells were incubated overnight and interferon-γ secreting T cells detected. To analyse the T-SPOT result of individuals, we computed the sum of T-SPOT responses to groups of panels, subtracting the background (peptides absent) counts (Table S3).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.02.20222778; this version posted May 2, 2021. 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.

Laboratory Immunoassays

Our primary serological assay was a commercial immunoassay (EUROIMMUN Ag) measuring IgG against the SARS-CoV-2 Spike protein S1 domain (33). We report results in four categories, referred to as seronegative, weak reactivity, low level, and high level seropositives, depending on the immunoassay signal obtained (see Table S4). We also measured total anti-Nucleoprotein antibody (Roche Elecsys), considering positive assays with index >1.0, which is the manufacturer's recommended cut-off, as a secondary assay. To assess background levels in these assays, we analysed pre-pandemic plasma from the COMPARE study (36) using the same assays.

Masking

None of the individuals who ran the laboratory immunoassays had access to any information about the samples. Participants were notified of their EUROIMMUN serological results approximately one month after their clinic visit, with a warning this was not indicative of protection from disease. Participants were not informed of their T-SPOT results.

Ethics

EDSAB-HOME study was approved by NHS Research Ethics Committee (Health Research Authority, IRAS 284980) on 02-Jun-2020 and PHE Research Ethics and Governance Group (REGG, NR0198) on 21-May-2020. All participants gave written informed consent.

Statistics

Objective 1: Describe baseline immunological responses to the SARS-CoV-2 virus

We displayed T-SPOT counts to six pools of peptides and immunoassay results) as heatmaps generated by hierarchical clustering. We used also depicted correlations between immunological metrics and clinical meta data using heatmaps. We compared T-SPOT responses in individuals at low versus high risk of past infection (see Figure S6 for definitions) using receiver-operator analysis.

Objective 2: Measure associations between baseline immunological responses and subsequent COVID-19

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.02.20222778; this version posted May 2, 2021. 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.

To determine whether immunological predictors were associated with protection from COVID-19, we started follow-up 12 days after the last recruitment (i.e. 8 July 2020), the delay being to avoid inclusion of individuals who may have been incubating infection at recruitment. We explored associations between baseline T-SPOT responses and occupational or other risk factors for COVID-19 exposure, and with self-reported COVID-19 associated symptoms. We also quantified associations between the two exposure variables (antibody index and T-SPOT response) and subsequent COVID-19 using Poisson regression, first with categorised exposure variables and, second, estimating continuous relationships following square root transformation of exposure variables. The process by which the transformation was selected is described in Supplementary materials; in sensitivity analyses, we also used logarithmic transformation. Both univariable and multivariable regressions were performed, where multivariable models were adjusted for age as a continuous variable, gender, high risk occupation (defined as being medical or nursing hospital staff), ethnicity (white vs. non-white) as well as the average weekly incidence (individuals testing positive in the last 7 days) rates in the NHS region of residence of the participant. For continuous exposures, we fitted models in sequence: (i) EuroImmun anti-Spike IgG assay result, (ii) T-SPOT response, (iii) both IgG result and T-SPOT response, (iv) both responses and an interaction between them. More detail is given in the Supplementary Methods.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.02.20222778; this version posted May 2, 2021. 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

Cohort studied

2,867 key workers participated in the study (Fig. S1). 2,826 (98.5%) participants had T-SPOT (interferon gamma release assay) and serological assays performed successfully (Fig. 1). Causes of failure of these assays were raised T-SPOT background in 14/2,867 (0.5%) of cases, with logistical and sample size issues responsible for the other 27 failures (Fig. 1).

Evidence of past infection

Characteristics of the cohort, who were working age volunteers from the Fire & Police services during the first wave of the pandemic in the UK from March to June 2020, are shown in Table S2.

Overall, 562/2,826 (15.6%) of participants were seropositive for anti-Spike S1 domain IgG assay using the manufacturer's cut-off of 1.1 (Fig. S2). An additional 92/2826 (3.3%) individuals had weakly reactive sera (index between 0.35 and 1.1, Fig. S2), of whom 44/92 (48%) also had elevated anti-Nucleoprotein total antibody reactivity. In contrast, among 229 prepandemic samples tested with the same assay, 4/229 (1.7%) had weakly reactive sera none had detectable anti-Nucleoprotein responses (Fig. S2B). This suggested that some study participants with weak reactivity may have been previously infected with SARS-CoV-2. In support of this, we observed a higher proportion of individuals with previous SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR test positivity among study participants with weak reactivity (17/92, 18.5%) vs. seronegative (6/2172, 0.3%) participants.

Concordant T cell responses against multiple SARS-CoV-2 peptide pools

A wide range of T cell responses to peptide pools from SARS-CoV-2 proteins (Table S3) were detected using the T-SPOT test (Figure 2). We noted strong positive correlations between T-SPOT responses to Spike S1, S2 domains, Membrane, Nucleoprotein (r ~= 0.6) (Figure S3) and, therefore, we analysed the background-subtracted sum of T-SPOT responses to Spike, Membrane and Nucleoprotein (T-SPOT SNM results, see Table S3 for details). We also separately analysed the background subtracted sum of T-SPOT Envelope and Structural protein responses (T-SPOT ES results, Figure 2). We observed that T-SPOT SNM responses were markedly stronger than ES responses (Figure 3; for a comparison with anti-Nucleoprotein total antibody see Figure S4).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.02.20222778; this version posted May 2, 2021. 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.

T-SPOT SNM responses and anti-Spike IgG following SARS-CoV-2 infection

Among the 268/2826 individuals with confirmed previous SARS-CoV-2 infection, evidenced by a historical positive RT-PCR test, median T-SPOT SNM responses were 40 (interquartile range [IQR]: 22-67; 5th, 95th centiles 8-167 cells per 250,000 PBMC) (Table S5). Comparing individuals with previous SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR positivity with a subset of the cohort stringently selected to have a low risk of past SARS-CoV-2 infection (Figure S6), T-SPOT SNM results differentiate these two populations with area under curves of 0.96 and an optimal differentiation point of 12 cells / 250,000 PBMC (Figure S7A; T-SPOT ES results do not have this property, Fig S7B). However, there is overlap in T-SPOT SNM responses in individuals with confirmed disease and individuals we selected to be at low risk of past infection (Fig. S6).

Associations between serostatus, T-SPOT SNM responses, and COVID-19 risk factors and symptoms

While T-SPOT SNM results were associated with multiple well-characterised COVID-19 features, including fever, muscle aching, fatigue, headache, with abnormal sense of taste and smell in both the individual and in their household, and with occupation in the cohort overall (Figure 4A, Table S6), none of these associations were observed among the subset of seronegative individuals (Table S6).

The only exception was age. In seronegative individuals, T-SPOT counts fell with age (e.g. median: 5; 5th, 95th centiles 0-28.5 cells/250,000 in 18-25 year olds vs. 3; 0-15 cells /250,000 in >60 year olds. By contrast, in seropositive individuals, counts rose with increasing age (median, 19.5; 95th centile 4.95, 100.5 in 18-25 year-olds vs. 45; 8.6, 141.6 in over 60s) (see also Table S6).

Thus, in seronegative individuals, T-SPOT counts decline with age and are not associated with past infection, with the converse true in seropositive individuals.

Positive SARS-CoV-2 tests and symptoms

Overall, 285/2826 (10.1%) of participants had positive SARS-CoV-2 tests during a 200 day follow up (Table 1). At least 75% (216/285) were symptomatic: in 191 cases, questionnaires reporting symptoms were returned, while 25 positive results occurred before any asymptomatic testing was available, although questionnaires were not returned. Only 15/216 (7%) of respondents reported

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.02.20222778; this version posted May 2, 2021. 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.

having no symptoms (as listed in Table S6) when they were tested. In 54 cases (18%), questionnaires were not returned, and so symptom status is unknown. Of 191 symptomatic respondents, symptoms reported included shortness of breath (23%), cough (33%), fever (33%), sore throat (33%), runny nose (31%), headache (53%), muscle aching (53%), abnormal taste / smell (36%), fatigue (77%), and diarrhoea (17%).

Associations between anti-Spike IgG index and T-SPOT SNM responses and subsequent disease

The risk of testing positive for SARS-CoV-2 fell as both anti-Spike IgG index and T-SPOT SNM responses increased (Figures 5, 6, Tables 2-5). These associations were robust to adjustment for age, gender, region of residence, high risk occupation, ethnicity, and background infection rates (Tables 3-5).

In strongly seropositive individuals (n=402), no events were observed at any level of SNM T cell responses (Table 2). By contrast, among 2,172 individuals who were seronegative, 12.9% (285) tested positive over the follow-up period. Among the 252 individuals with weak reactivity or low level seropositivity (antibody index 0.35 to 3), 5 individuals developed events (2.0%) (Table 4). In this group, protection was associated with T-SPOT SNM results: 5/79 of those with 0-12 SNM responsive cells had positive PCR tests on follow-up, vs. 0/173 with more than 12 SNM responsive cells (Table 2). A post hoc Wilcoxon test provided evidence that higher SNM T cell responses were associated with enhanced protection within the subgroup with antibody index between 0.35 and 3 ($p=3\times10^{-3}$). This association with SNM T cell responses was not observed in the seronegative subjects (p = 0.47, Wilcoxon test).

When modelling continuous relationships, we found support for an interaction between SNM T-SPOT responses and anti-Spike antibody levels in protection from SARS-CoV-2 infection in the cohort studied (Table 5). Sensitivity analyses modelling log, rather than square root, transformed exposure variables similarly found evidence of interaction (Table S7). Put alternatively, modelling approaches indicated that (as is suggested by inspection of the raw data, Figure 6, and stratified analyses, Tables 2-4), disease protection increases as both SNM T cell responses and antibody levels increase.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.02.20222778; this version posted May 2, 2021. 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

In a large, prospective cohort study of keyworkers recruited in June 2020, about 16% of participants had clear serological evidence of past SARS-CoV-2 infection. We measured two immune correlates of protection against COVID-19 using commercial immunoassays: anti-Spike IgG antibodies (measured using kits from EuroImmun AG) and SARS-CoV-2 responsive T cell numbers (T-SPOT Coronavirus Discovery Kits, from Oxford Immunotec Plc). Using the T-SPOT assay, which is designed to minimise cross-reactivity with other similar viruses, T-cells responsive to peptides from several SARS-CoV-2 antigens were detected; responses to Spike, Nucleoprotein and Membrane proteins (SNM responses) were co-correlated, and coexisted with anti-Spike and anti-Nucleoprotein antibodies individuals with a history of microbiologically confirmed infection. This result is compatible with smaller studies in healthcare workers studying T cell assays using intracellular cytokine staining (21-23). By contrast to responses to SNM proteins, T cell responses to envelope and various structural proteins were much weaker and were not increased in those with a history of SARS-CoV-2 infection vs. those who had not.

We observed that higher anti-Spike antibody levels and SARS-CoV-2 responsive T cell numbers are associated with protection from testing positive for SARS-CoV-2 ; our data suggest an interaction between antibody levels and circulating SARS-CoV-2 responsive T cell numbers, such that, among individuals with modest antibody levels (EuroImmun anti-Spike IgG assay index 0.35 to 3, levels seen in about 40% of individuals with detectable antibody in our study) subsequent COVID-19 rates were lowest in those with higher T cell counts. This suggests a role for T cells in SARS-CoV-2 control, which is biologically plausible via multiple mechanisms, including direct T cell mediated virus control, T cell help for subsequent B cell antibody production, and as a marker for a memory B cell population primed by natural infection (40).

Interestingly, although the highest SNM responses were seen in individuals who also had detectable anti-Spike IgG antibody, in some individuals SNM responses comparable with those observed in SARS-CoV-2 survivors were seen in the absence of anti-Spike IgG. This remained true even if a very stringent cut-off was used for seropositivity, such as EuroImmun assay index > 0.35, which is much lower than the manufacturer's cut-off of 1.1 for a confirmed positive. It is possible that this is the case because some individuals, after exposure to SARS-CoV-2, retain circulating T cell responses when

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.02.20222778; this version posted May 2, 2021. 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.

serological responses decline to undetectable levels, or never make antibody at all(21-23). However, our epidemiological data do not support this explanation: absent detectable anti-Spike IgG, T-SPOT SNM responses were not associated with either occupational risk of COVID-19 (e.g. occupation) nor with a history of canonical COVID-19 symptoms. Although we cannot exclude previous SARS-CoV-2 infection without persistent antibody in a proportion of cases, exposure to other viruses, perhaps Common Cold Coronaviruses (CCCs) (24-27) inducing T cells cross-reactive with SARS-CoV-2 in the absence of persistent serological cross-reactivity(21, 22) is another possibility. Independent of the mechanism involved, it is important to note that, absent antibody against SARS-CoV-2, such cells may offer little SARS-CoV-2 protection since among seronegative volunteers we did not detect significant disease protection associated with T-SPOT SNM responses.

The size of the study, its cohort design, the ascertainment of endpoints using a standardised, national infrastructure are strengths of the study, and the collection of anti-SARS-CoV-2 serological responses and T cell responses at recruitment allow us to go beyond previous cohort studies that have examined associations between antibody levels and subsequent disease only(6, 7). Limitations include our measurement of immune correlates of protection an average of two months after infection (among those with PCR confirmation); we also counted circulating SARS-CoV-2 responsive interferon-γ secreting cells, but did not phenotype them (24), and so may have missed prognostic immunophenotypes in circulating cells, or aspects of their kinetics. In our endpoints, we did not consider recurrences, nor did we measure disease severity: immunological correlates of protection from severe disease, and from recurrence, might differ from those ascertained here.

Given the observational nature of the study, confounders might have affected the associations we observed. Multivariable modelling has been used to address this, but some factors cannot be controlled readily. For example, participants knew their symptom history and antibody status, so seropositive or previously symptomatic participants may have been more likely to allow themselves to be exposed to SARS-CoV-2. Secondly, some individuals may have been infected without being tested (and acquired protection) subsequent to the clinic visits. Thirdly, individuals at the highest risk of occupational exposure on follow-up may have been at highest risk of having been infected prior to recruitment. However, all these potential biases would be expected to dilute any immunology - protection association.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.02.20222778; this version posted May 2, 2021. 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.

Overall, this study suggests that clinical serodiagnostics with performance similar to the assay used here may underestimate the population with SARS-CoV-2 immunity for two reasons. Firstly, protection is evident at low antibody concentrations below the manufacturer's assay cut-off – so, if a clinical laboratory was reporting using this cut-off, a proportion of individuals with negative results would have low levels of antibodies and some degree of protection. Secondly, Coronavirus Spike, Nucleoprotein and Membrane response T cell numbers potentiate the protection seen at a given antibody level. This may reflect antibody independent T-cell control of viral replication(40). Such mechanisms, if present, may mitigate the impact of viral mutants less effectively neutralised by antisera induced by vaccination or ancestral strains (17-20). The magnitude of any such effect is of obvious public health importance and deserves additional investigation. The conduct of, and comparisons between, such investigations may be assisted by the availability of standardised T-SPOT kits used in this study, which are of similar format to the widely used T-SPOT®.*TB* tests used for tuberculosis diagnosis(34).

(3,462 words)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.02.20222778; this version posted May 2, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Tables

Table 1 Risk factors for testing PCR Positive on follow-up

Variable	Category	Individuals without pos. tests and proportion of total without pos. tests		Individuals with pos. tests and proportion of total with pos. tests		Incidence risk ratio (95% CI)	*p*
Age	18-25	167	0.07	28	0.10	Reference	
	26-40	971	0.38	115	0.40	0.72 (0.48, 1.09)	0.124
	41-60	1291	0.51	133	0.47	0.63 (0.42, 0.95)	0.029
	>60	112	0.04	9	0.03	0.51 (0.24, 1.08)	0.078
Gender	Male	919	0.36	91	0.32	Reference	
	Female	1622	0.64	194	0.68	1.21 (0.94, 1.55)	0.141
Recruitment stream	B Health Care	1335	0.53	198	0.69	Reference	
	C Health Care, PCR positive	154	0.06	0	0.00	NA	NA
	A Fire and Police	1052	0.41	87	0.31	0.57 (0.44, 0.73)	<0.001
Previously tested positive PCR	No	2273	0.89	285	1.00	Reference	
	Yes	268	0.11	0	0.00	NA	0.978
Region of residence	East Midlands	219	0.09	32	0.11	Reference	
	East of England	216	0.09	33	0.12	1.03 (0.63, 1.68)	0.904
	London	10	0.00	1	0.00	0.71 (0.10, 5.19)	0.736
	North West	1045	0.41	87	0.31	0.58 (0.39, 0.87)	0.008
	South East	900	0.35	130	0.46	0.99 (0.67, 1.46)	0.957
	South West	14	0.01	0	0.00	NA	0.995
	West Midlands	3	0.00	2	0.01	3.16 (0.76, 13.20)	0.114
	Yorkshire and The Humber	134	0.05	0	0.00	0.03 (0.00, 0.42)	0.985
High risk occupation	No	1252	0.49	111	0.39	Reference	
	Yes	1289	0.51	174	0.61	1.52 (1.20, 1.93)	0.001
Ethnicity	Non-White	420	0.17	75	0.26	Reference	
	White	2121	0.83	210	0.74	0.58 (0.44, 0.75)	<0.001

PCR: Polymerase chain reaction

CI: Confidence interval

Table 2 Percentage of individuals testing positive for SARS-CoV-2, stratified by immunological markers

T-SPOT response to SNM pools (per 250,000 cells)	Anti-Spike immunoassay signal (EuroImmun index) *				Total
	Seronegative 0 to 0.35	**Weakly reactive 0.35 to 1.1****	**Low level seropositive 1.1 to 3**	**High level seropositive Index >3**	
0-4	13% (170/1303)	7% (2/26)	12% (1/8)	0% (0/5)	13% (173/1342)
5-12	13% (80/587)	3% (1/26)	5% (1/19)	0% (0/51)	11% (81/683)
13-25	11% (20/193)	0% (0/8)	0% (0/47)	0% (0/90)	6% (20/338)
26-50	11% (8/69)	0% (0/17)	0% (0/53)	0% (0/110)	3% (8/249)
>50	10% (2/20)	0% (0/15)	0% (0/33)	0% (0/146)	1% (2/214)
Total	12% (280/2172)	3% (3/92)	1% (2/160)	0% (0/402)	10% (285/2826)

* The manufacturer's cutoff is 1.1 for 'confirmed positive' cases. ** Antibody ranges are closed on the left, so an interval of 0 to 0.35 denotes [0,0.35) and would include 0 but not 0.35. See Table S4 for definitions.

Table 3 Rates and rate ratios (RR) of testing positive for SARS-CoV-2, stratified by T-SPOT SNM response

	T-SPOT SNM response categories				
	0-4	**5-12**	**13-25**	**26-50**	**>50**
Percentage of individuals testing positive for SARS-CoV-2	13% (173/1342)	11% (81/683)	6% (20/338)	3% (8/249)	1% (2/214)
Rate per 100,000 person days	60.8 (52.4, 70.5)	56.4 (45.3, 70.0)	27.7 (17.9, 42.9)	15.1 (7.5, 30.2)	4.4 (1.1, 17.6)
	Relative risk of testing positive (rate ratio with 95% confidence intervals)				
Unadjusted RR	Reference	0.93 (0.71-1.21)	0.46 (0.29-0.72)	0.25 (0.12-0.50)	0.07 (0.02-0.29)
Adjusted RR*	Reference	0.91 (0.70-1.18)	0.43 (0.27-0.68)	0.24 (0.12-0.50)	0.08 (0.02-0.32)
Additionally adjusted for background rates RR**	Reference	0.90 (0.69-1.18)	0.43 (0.27-0.68)	0.25 (0.13-0.52)	0.09 (0.02-0.36)

* Adjusted for sex, ethnicity, age (continuous), high-risk occupation, region.
** As above but additionally adjusted for time-updated regional SARS-CoV-2 infection rates

Table 4 Rates and rate ratios (RR) of testing positive for SARS-CoV-2, stratified by anti-Spike antibodies

	Anti-spike antibody categories			
	Seronegative 0 to 0.35	**Weakly reactive 0.35 to 1.1$**	**Low level seropositive 1.1 to 3**	**High level seropositive Index >3**
Percentage of individuals testing positive for SARS-CoV-2	13% (173/1342)	11% (81/683)	6% (20/338)	3% (8/249)
Rate per 100,000 person days (95% confidence intervals)	60.7 (54.0, 68.3)	15.1 (4.9, 46.9)	5.9 (1.5, 23.6)	0
	Relative risk of testing positive (rate ratio with 95% confidence intervals)			
Unadjusted RR	Reference	0.25 (0.08-0.78)	0.10 (0.02-0.39)	0
Adjusted RR*	Reference	0.24 (0.08-0.75)	0.08 (0.02-0.34)	0
Additionally adjusted for background rates RR***	Reference	0.24 (0.08-0.75)	0.09 (0.02-0.38)	0
Additionally adjusted for background rates and T-cell categories RR****	Reference	0.27 (0.08-0.85)	0.12 (0.03-0.49)	0

* The manufacturer's cut-off is 1.1 for 'confirmed positive' cases. See Table S4 for definitions.

$ Antibody ranges are closed on the left, so 0 to 0.35 denotes [0,0.35] i.e. would include 0 but not 0.35. See Table S4 for definitions

** Adjusted for sex, ethnicity, age (continuous), high-risk occupation, region.
*** As above but additionally adjusted for time-updated regional SARS-CoV-2 infection rates
**** As above but also adjusted for T-cell count categories

Table 5: Incidence rate ratios (95% confidence intervals) of testing positive for SARS-CoV-2, modelling immunological metrics as transformed continuous variables

	Model 1: antibodies only		**Model 2: T cells only**		**Model 3: antibodies and T cells**		**Model 4: antibodies, T cells, and interaction term**	
	Unadjusted	**Adjusted***	**Unadjusted**	**Adjusted***	**Unadjusted**	**Adjusted***	**Unadjusted**	**Adjusted***
	Incidence rate ratios (95% confidence intervals)							
Square-root transformation of Anti-Spike IgG antibody index	0.09 (0.03, 0.26)	0.08 (0.03, 0.23)	N/A	N/A	0.09 (0.03, 0.28)	0.08 (0.03, 0.25)	1.80 (0.28, 11.50)	1.94 (0.29, 12.74)
Square-root transformation of T-SPOT response to SNM pools	N/A	N/A	0.90 (0.87, 0.93)	0.89 (0.86, 0.92)	0.99 (0.95, 1.03)	0.99 (0.95, 1.03)	0.99 (0.96, 1.04)	1.00 (0.96, 1.04)
Interaction term between the two variables above	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0.60 (0.38, 0.96)	0.58 (0.36, 0.93)
p-value of model fit vs Model 1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0.4735	0.4995	0.0171	0.0127
p-value of model fit vs Model 3	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0.0058	0.0040

Adjusted for age, gender, high-risk occupation, and white ethnicity.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.02.20222778; this version posted May 2, 2021. 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 Legends

Figure 1

Flow chart illustrating participant flows in the EDSAB-HOME project.

Figure 2

Hierarchical clustering of responses to Spike S1 domain, Spike S2 domain, Nucleoprotein, Membrane protein, structural proteins and Envelope proteins, as well as anti-Nucleoprotein and S1 serological responses in 2,826 unselected keyworkers from streams A,B and C.

Footnote: Data were log-transformed prior to clustering; units are arbitrary. The previous PCR positivity status of the participants is shown in a guide bar on the left of the main heatmap.

Figure 3

SNM responsive T cells responses and their relationship to anti-S1 IgG serological responses in 2,826 individuals (A) distribution of anti-Spike S1 IgG antibody responses (EUROIMMUN), and its relationship to symptoms. The vertical line is at 0.8, a manufacturer specified cutoff. (B) bivariate plots of anti-S1 IgG responses (EUROIMMUN) and the sum of Spike, Nucleoprotein and Membrane protein responsive T cell numbers. The horizontal line corresponds to 12 spots / 250,000 cells. (C) distribution of the sum of Spike, Nucleoprotein and Membrane protein responsive T cell numbers. (D) As in B, but for Envelope and structural protein responsive T cell numbers; (E) Distribution of Envelope and structural protein responsive T cell numbers. In marginal histograms (A,C,E), the number of individuals reporting symptoms is depicted in red.

Figure 4

Correlation matrices showing the relationship between individual or household self-reported symptoms, T cell numbers and immunoassay results in (A) 2,672 individuals from Streams A,B (B) 2,197 seronegative individuals.

Footnote: Clustering was performed independently in the two datasets. The order of the columns minimises differences between individuals. Only strong correlations are shown. Colour scale reflects

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.02.20222778; this version posted May 2, 2021. 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.

Spearman's correlation coefficient, ρ. In (A), the box denotes a correlation between various immune parameters and symptoms. Comparable correlations are not seen if symptomatic individuals are excluded (B). Serological data is not included in (B) as in (B) all individuals are seronegative.

Figure 5

Kaplan-Meier survival curves in showing time to testing positive for SARS-CoV-2, A) stratified by IgG responses against Spike protein for all individuals, B) stratified by T-SPOT SNM responses for all individuals, and C) stratified by T-SPOT SNM responses for seronegative individuals*..

*Seronegative: EuroImmun anti-S IgG index < 0.35.

Figure 6

Anti-Spike immunoassay results and T-SPOT SNM responses, illustrating the immunological metrics of those with positive SARS-CoV-2 tests, and those without.

Footnote: Dotted vertical lines reflect the margins of the categorisation presented in Table 2.

Funding statement

The study was commissioned by the UK Government's Department of Health and Social Care. It was funded and implemented by Public Health England, supported by the NIHR Clinical Research Network (CRN) Portfolio. Oxford Immunotec Ltd did T-SPOT tests at their own cost as part of the study. The Department of Health and Social Care had no role in the study design, data collection, analysis, interpretation of results, writing of the manuscript, or the decision to publish. DW acknowledges support from the NIHR Health Protection Research Unit in Genomics and Data Enabling at the University of Warwick. HEJ, AEA, and IO acknowledge support from the NIHR Health Protection Research Unit in Behavioural Science and Evaluation at University of Bristol. STP is supported by an NIHR Career Development Fellowship (CDF-2016-09-018). The views expressed are those of the author(s) and not necessarily those of the NHS, NIHR or the Department of Health and Social Care.

Data availability

The data analysed is available from the corresponding author on request.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.02.20222778; this version posted May 2, 2021. 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.

Conflict of Interest

Oxford Immunotec Ltd have a filed a patent relevant to the T-SPOT technology described in this work and its applications. DW is named as an inventor in the patent. AM is an employee of Oxford Immunotec Ltd. Other authors declare no conflicts of interest.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.02.20222778; this version posted May 2, 2021. 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. GOV.UK Coronavirus (COVID-19) in the UK 2021 [Available from: https://coronavirus.data.gov.uk.
2. Guan WJ, Ni ZY, Hu Y, Liang WH, Ou CQ, He JX, et al. Clinical Characteristics of Coronavirus Disease 2019 in China. The New England journal of medicine. 2020;382(18):1708-20.
3. Wölfel R, Corman VM, Guggemos W, Seilmaier M, Zange S, Müller MA, et al. Virological assessment of hospitalized patients with COVID-2019. Nature. 2020;581(7809):465-9.
4. Wu Z, McGoogan JM. Characteristics of and Important Lessons From the Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Outbreak in China: Summary of a Report of 72 314 Cases From the Chinese Center for Disease Control and Prevention. Jama. 2020;323(13):1239-42.
5. Yang R, Gui X, Xiong Y. Comparison of Clinical Characteristics of Patients with Asymptomatic vs Symptomatic Coronavirus Disease 2019 in Wuhan, China. JAMA network open. 2020;3(5):e2010182.
6. Hanrath AT, Payne BAI, Duncan CJA. Prior SARS-CoV-2 infection is associated with protection against symptomatic reinfection. The Journal of infection. 2020.
7. Lumley SF, O'Donnell D, Stoesser NE, Matthews PC, Howarth A, Hatch SB, et al. Antibody Status and Incidence of SARS-CoV-2 Infection in Health Care Workers. The New England journal of medicine. 2020.
8. Addetia A, Crawford KH, Dingens A, Zhu H, Roychoudhury P, Huang M, et al. Neutralizing antibodies correlate with protection from SARS-CoV-2 in humans during a fishery vessel outbreak with high attack rate. 2020:2020.08.13.20173161.
9. Houlihan CF, Vora N, Byrne T, Lewer D, Kelly G, Heaney J, et al. Pandemic peak SARS-CoV-2 infection and seroconversion rates in London frontline health-care workers. Lancet (London, England). 2020;396(10246):e6-e7.
10. Hassan AO, Case JB, Winkler ES, Thackray LB, Kafai NM, Bailey AL, et al. A SARS-CoV-2 Infection Model in Mice Demonstrates Protection by Neutralizing Antibodies. Cell. 2020;182(3):744-53.e4.
11. Rogers TF, Zhao F, Huang D, Beutler N, Burns A, He WT, et al. Isolation of potent SARS-CoV-2 neutralizing antibodies and protection from disease in a small animal model. Science (New York, NY). 2020;369(6506):956-63.
12. Mercado NB, Zahn R, Wegmann F, Loos C, Chandrashekar A, Yu J, et al. Single-shot Ad26 vaccine protects against SARS-CoV-2 in rhesus macaques. Nature. 2020.
13. Zost SJ, Gilchuk P, Case JB, Binshtein E, Chen RE, Nkolola JP, et al. Potently neutralizing and protective human antibodies against SARS-CoV-2. Nature. 2020;584(7821):443-9.
14. Chandrashekar A, Liu J, Martinot AJ, McMahan K, Mercado NB, Peter L, et al. SARS-CoV-2 infection protects against rechallenge in rhesus macaques. Science (New York, NY). 2020;369(6505):812-7.
15. Greaney AJ, Loes AN, Crawford KHD, Starr TN, Malone KD, Chu HY, et al. Comprehensive mapping of mutations to the SARS-CoV-2 receptor-binding domain that affect recognition by polyclonal human serum antibodies. 2021:2020.12.31.425021.
16. Andreano E, Piccini G, Licastro D, Casalino L, Johnson NV, Paciello I, et al. SARS-CoV-2 escape in vitro from a highly neutralizing COVID-19 convalescent plasma. 2020:2020.12.28.424451.
17. Tegally H, Wilkinson E, Giovanetti M, Iranzadeh A, Fonseca V, Giandhari J, et al. Emergence and rapid spread of a new severe acute respiratory syndrome-related coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) lineage with multiple spike mutations in South Africa. 2020:2020.12.21.20248640.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.02.20222778; this version posted May 2, 2021. 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.

18. Cele S, Gazy I, Jackson L, Hwa S-H, Tegally H, Lustig G, et al. Escape of SARS-CoV-2 501Y.V2 variants from neutralization by convalescent plasma. 2021:2021.01.26.21250224.
19. Collier D, Meng B, Ferreira I, Datir R, Temperton N, Elmer A, et al. Impact of SARS-CoV-2 B.1.1.7 Spike variant on neutralisation potency of sera from individuals vaccinated with Pfizer vaccine BNT162b2. 2021:2021.01.19.21249840.
20. Wang Z, Schmidt F, Weisblum Y, Muecksch F, Barnes CO, Finkin S, et al. mRNA vaccine-elicited antibodies to SARS-CoV-2 and circulating variants. 2021:2021.01.15.426911.
21. Gallais F, Velay A, Wendling M-J, Nazon C, Partisani M, Sibilia J, et al. Intrafamilial Exposure to SARS-CoV-2 Induces Cellular Immune Response without Seroconversion. 2020:2020.06.21.20132449.
22. Sekine T, Perez-Potti A, Rivera-Ballesteros O, Strålin K, Gorin JB, Olsson A, et al. Robust T Cell Immunity in Convalescent Individuals with Asymptomatic or Mild COVID-19. Cell. 2020;183(1):158-68.e14.
23. Reynolds CJ, Swadling L, Gibbons JM, Pade C, Jensen MP, Diniz MO, et al. Discordant neutralizing antibody and T cell responses in asymptomatic and mild SARS-CoV-2 infection. 2020;5(54):eabf3698.
24. Grifoni A, Weiskopf D, Ramirez SI, Mateus J, Dan JM, Moderbacher CR, et al. Targets of T Cell Responses to SARS-CoV-2 Coronavirus in Humans with COVID-19 Disease and Unexposed Individuals. Cell. 2020;181(7):1489-501.e15.
25. Braun J, Loyal L, Frentsch M, Wendisch D, Georg P, Kurth F, et al. SARS-CoV-2-reactive T cells in healthy donors and patients with COVID-19. Nature. 2020.
26. Le Bert N, Tan AT, Kunasegaran K, Tham CYL, Hafezi M, Chia A, et al. SARS-CoV-2-specific T cell immunity in cases of COVID-19 and SARS, and uninfected controls. Nature. 2020;584(7821):457-62.
27. Mateus J, Grifoni A, Tarke A, Sidney J, Ramirez SI, Dan JM, et al. Selective and cross-reactive SARS-CoV-2 T cell epitopes in unexposed humans. Science (New York, NY). 2020;370(6512):89-94.
28. Woldemeskel BA, Kwaa AK, Garliss CC, Laeyendecker O, Ray SC, Blankson JN. Healthy donor T cell responses to common cold coronaviruses and SARS-CoV-2. The Journal of clinical investigation. 2020;130(12):6631-8.
29. Lipsitch M, Grad YH, Sette A, Crotty S. Cross-reactive memory T cells and herd immunity to SARS-CoV-2. Nature reviews Immunology. 2020:1-5.
30. Evaluation of sensitivity and specificity of four commercially available SARS-CoV-2 antibody immunassays. Public Health England; 2020.
31. Okba NMA, Müller MA, Li W, Wang C, GeurtsvanKessel CH, Corman VM, et al. Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2-Specific Antibody Responses in Coronavirus Disease Patients. Emerging infectious diseases. 2020;26(7):1478-88.
32. Andersson M, Low N, French N, Greenhalgh T, Jeffery K, Brent A, et al. Rapid roll out of SARS-CoV-2 antibody testing-a concern. BMJ (Clinical research ed). 2020;369:m2420.
33. Mulchandani R, Taylor-Phillips S, Jones H, Ades T, Borrow R, Linley E, et al. Self assessment overestimates historical COVID-19 disease relative to sensitive serological assays: cross sectional study in UK key workers. 2020:2020.08.19.20178186.
34. Abubakar I, Lalvani A, Southern J, Sitch A, Jackson C, Onyimadu O, et al. Two interferon gamma release assays for predicting active tuberculosis: the UK PREDICT TB prognostic test study. Health technology assessment (Winchester, England). 2018;22(56):1-96.
35. Watson J, Whiting PF, Brush JE. Interpreting a covid-19 test result. 2020;369:m1808.
36. Bell S, Sweeting M, Ramond A, Chung R, Kaptoge S, Walker M, et al. Comparison of four methods to measure haemoglobin concentrations in whole blood donors (COMPARE): a diagnostic accuracy study. 2020:2020.11.06.20226779.
37. Youden WJ. Index for rating diagnostic tests. Cancer. 1950;3(1):32-5.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.02.20222778; this version posted May 2, 2021. 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.

38. Lauer SA, Grantz KH, Bi Q, Jones FK, Zheng Q, Meredith HR, et al. The Incubation Period of Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) From Publicly Reported Confirmed Cases: Estimation and Application. Annals of internal medicine. 2020;172(9):577-82.
39. Mulchandani R, Jones HE, Taylor-Phillips S, Shute J, Perry K, Jamarani S, et al. Accuracy of UK Rapid Test Consortium (UK-RTC) “AbC-19 Rapid Test” for detection of previous SARS-CoV-2 infection in key workers: test accuracy study. The BMJ. 2020;371:m4262.
40. Channappanavar R, Zhao J, Perlman S. T cell-mediated immune response to respiratory coronaviruses. Immunologic research. 2014;59(1-3):118-28.

Figure 1

EDSAB-HOME KEYWORKER COHORT
Recruitment in June 2020



Figure 2

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.02.20222778; this version posted May 2, 2021. 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 3


A
Number of individuals
150
100
50
0
0.03
0.1
0.3
1.1
2
3
5
10
Anti−S immunoassay signal
Did not report COVID−19 like symptoms
Reported COVID−19 like symptoms
B
SNM T−SPOT result (count/250,000 cells)
500
300
200
150
100
75
50
30
20
15
10
7
5
4
3
2
1
0
n=353
(12.5%)
n=485
(17.2%)
n=1911
(67.6%)
n=77
(2.7%)
Anti−S immunoassay signal
C
0
200
400
600
Number of individuals
D
ES T−SPOT result (count/250,000 cells)
n=51
(1.8%)
n=20
(0.7%)
n=2213
(78.3%)
n=542
(19.2%)
Anti−S immunoassay signal
E
Number of individuals

Figure 4

A All cases



B Seronegative cases



Figure 5


A All individuals
B All individuals
C Seronegative individuals
Anti-Spike S1 domain IgG index (EuroImmun AG)
index < 0.35
0.35 <= index < 1.1
1.1 <= index < 3
index >= 3
T-SPOT SNM responses per 250,000 PBMC (Oxford Immunotec)
0 to 4
5 to 12
13 to 25
26 to 50
Over 50
T-SPOT SNM responses per 250,000 PBMC (Oxford Immunotec)
0 to 4
4 to 25
Over 25
Proportion without positive SARS−CoV−2 RT−PCR tests
1.00
0.95
0.90
0.85
p < 0.0001
p < 0.0001
p = 0.89
0
50
100
150
200
250
Days followup, starting 2 weeks post study visit
Number at risk
2172 2169 2163 2088 1947 337
92 92 92 91 91 16
160 160 160 160 158 12
402 402 402 402 402 36
1342 1340 1337 1292 1203 227
683 682 679 659 620 97
338 338 338 330 322 38
249 249 249 246 241 19
214 214 214 214 212 20
1303 1301 1298 1254 1166 215
780 779 776 748 702 114
89 89 89 86 79 8
Cumulative events
0 3 9 85 228 280
0 0 0 1 1 3
0 0 0 0 2 2
0 0 0 0 0 0
0 2 5 51 142 173
0 1 4 24 63 82
0 0 0 8 16 20
0 0 0 3 8 8
0 0 0 0 2 2
0 2 5 50 140 170
0 1 4 32 78 100
0 0 0 3 10 10


Figure 6
Positive SARS-CoV-2 test on followup
No positive SARS-CoV-2 test on followup
SNM−T−SPOT result (counts/250,000 cells)
400
200
100
50
25
12
8
4
2
1
0.02
0.05
0.1
0.2
0.35
0.7
1.1
2
3
6
10
Anti−S immunoassay signal