

# Antibody seroprevalence and rate of asymptomatic infections with SARS-CoV-2 in Austrian hospital personnel.

Iris Leister<sup>1,2,§</sup>, Elisabeth Ponocny-Seliger<sup>3,§</sup>, Herwig Kollaritsch<sup>4,\*</sup>, Peter Dungal<sup>5,6</sup>, Barbara Holzer<sup>7</sup>, Johannes Grillari<sup>5,6,8</sup>, Heinz Redl<sup>5,6</sup>, Ivo Ponocny<sup>9</sup>, Claudia Wilfing<sup>5</sup>, Ludwig Aigner<sup>1,2</sup>, Markus Exner<sup>10</sup>, Michaela Stainer<sup>5,6</sup>, Matthias Hackl<sup>6,11</sup>, Thomas Hausner<sup>5,6,12</sup>, Rainer Mittermayr<sup>5,6,12</sup>, Wolfgang Schaden<sup>5,6,13</sup>

1 Institute of Molecular Regenerative Medicine, Paracelsus Medical University, Salzburg, Austria;

2 Spinal Cord Injury and Tissue Regeneration Center Salzburg (SCI-TReCS) and ParaMove, Paracelsus

Medical University, Salzburg, Austria;

3 Institute for Quantitative Methods, Sigmund Freud Private University, Vienna, Austria;

4 Institute of Specific Prophylaxis and Tropical Medicine, Medical University of Vienna, Vienna,

Austria;

5 Ludwig-Boltzmann Institute for Experimental and Clinical Traumatology, Vienna, Austria;

6 Austrian Cluster for Tissue Regeneration, Vienna, Austria

7 Austrian Agency for Health and Food Safety, Mödling, Austria

8 Institute of Molecular Biotechnology, Department of Biotechnology, BOKU – University of Natural

Resources and Life Sciences, Vienna, Austria;

9 Department for Applied Statistics and Economics, Modul University Vienna, Vienna, Austria;

10 Labors.at GmbH, Vienna, Austria

11 TAmiRNA GmbH, Vienna, Austria

12 AUVA Trauma Center Vienna, Vienna, Austria

13 AUVA Headquarter, Vienna, Austria

\* corresponding author

§ shared first authorship

Correspondence:

Univ.-Prof. Dr. Herwig Kollaritsch

e-mail: [dr.herwig.kollaritsch@gmail.com](mailto:dr.herwig.kollaritsch@gmail.com)

## 33 Abstract

34 **Context:** On March 11, the World Health Organization (WHO) announced the current  
35 corona virus disease 2019 (COVID-19) outbreak as a pandemic. The first laboratory-  
36 confirmed case of COVID-19 in Austria was announced on February 27, 2020. Since then, the  
37 incidence of infection followed an exponential increase until a complete lockdown in March  
38 2020. Thereafter easing of restrictions was gradually introduced and until mid-August daily  
39 infections remained mostly below 5 per 100.000 population.

40

41 **Objectives:** The aims of this study are to determine i) how many employees in Austrian  
42 trauma hospitals and rehabilitation facilities have virus specific IgG and IgM, and/or  
43 neutralizing antibodies against SARS-CoV-2, ii) how many are active virus carriers  
44 (symptomatic and asymptomatic) during the study, iii) the antibody decline in seropositive  
45 subjects over a period of around six months, and iv) the utility of rapid antibody tests for  
46 outpatient screening.

47

48 **Study Design:** Open uncontrolled observational cross-sectional study.

49

50 **Setting/Participants:** A total of 3301 employees in 11 Austrian trauma hospitals and  
51 rehabilitation facilities of the Austrian Social Insurance for Occupational Risks (AUVA)  
52 participated in the study.

53

54 **Study Interventions and Measures:** Rapid antibody tests for SARS-CoV-2 specific IgG and  
55 IgM antibodies, and RT-PCR tests based on oropharyngeal swab samples, as well as  
56 laboratory-based antibody tests using ELISA/PRNT were performed. The tests were  
57 conducted twice, with an interval of  $42.4 \pm 7.7$  (Min=30, Max=64) days. Additionally,  
58 participants filled out a questionnaire including questions related to personal health,  
59 traveling activities, living situation, as well as inquiries of symptoms and comorbidities.  
60 Antibody positive tested participants were re-tested with ELISA/PRNT tests at a third time  
61 point on average  $188.0 \pm 12.8$  days after their initial test.

62

63 **Results:** In our study cohort, only 27 out of 3301 participants (0.81%) had a positive  
64 antibody test at any time point during the study confirmed via neutralization test. Among  
65 participants who had positive test results in either of the antibody tests, 50.4% did not  
66 report any symptoms consistent with common manifestations of COVID-19 during the study  
67 period or within the preceding six weeks. In the group who tested positive during or prior to  
68 study inclusion the most common symptoms of an acute viral illness were rhinitis (21.9%),  
69 and loss of taste and olfactory sense (21.9%).

70 The rapid antibody test was generally more sensitive based on serum (sensitivity=86.6%) as  
71 compared to whole blood (sensitivity=65.4). Concerning both ELISA tests overall the Roche  
72 test detected 24 (sensitivity=88.9%) and the Diasorin test 22 positive participants  
73 (sensitivity=81.5%).

74 In participants with a positive PRNT, a significant decrease in PRNT concentration from  
75  $31.8 \pm 22.9$  (Md=32.0) at T1 to  $26.1 \pm 17.6$  (Md=21.3) at T2 to  $21.4 \pm 13.4$  (Md=16.0) at T3  
76 ( $\chi^2=23.848$ , df=2,  $p<0.001$ ) was observed ( $\chi^2=23.848$ , df=2,  $p<0.001$ ) – with an average time  
77 of  $42.4 \pm 7.7$  days between T1 and T2 and  $146.9 \pm 13.8$  days between T2 and T3.

78  
79 **Conclusions:** During the study period (May 11<sup>th</sup> – December 21<sup>th</sup>) only 0.81% were tested  
80 positive for antibodies in our study cohort. The antibody concentration decreases  
81 significantly over time with 14.8% (4 out of 27) losing detectable antibodies.

82  
83 **Keywords:** severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2; SARS-CoV-2; COVID-19  
84 diagnostic testing

85

86

## 87 Introduction

88 The novel severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) was first reported  
89 in December 2019 in Wuhan, China. On March 11, the World Health Organization (WHO)  
90 announced the current "corona virus disease 2019" (COVID-19) outbreak as a pandemic.

91 The first laboratory-confirmed case of COVID-19 in Austria was announced on February 27,  
92 2020. The incidence of infection follows an exponential growth, and the mean basic  
93 reproduction number was estimated to range from 2.24 to 3.58.<sup>1</sup> After a complete  
94 lockdown in March/April, the epidemiologic situation in Austria remained stable with daily  
95 infection numbers well below 5/100.000 population until mid of August. Recently the  
96 numbers of confirmed cases continue to increase daily indicating a second wave of  
97 infections.<sup>2</sup>

98

99 The incubation period, defined as the time from infection to symptom onset, falls within the  
100 range of 2–14 days with 95% confidence and has a mean of around 5 days.<sup>3</sup> Backer et al.  
101 found similar results and reported an estimated mean incubation period of 6.4 days (95%  
102 CI= 5.6–7.7), ranging from 2.1 to 11.1 days (2.5th to 97.5th percentile).<sup>4</sup>

103

104 It has been reported that some individuals, particularly persons of younger age, infected  
105 with SARS-CoV-2 remain asymptomatic while real-time reverse transcription polymerase  
106 chain reaction (RT-PCR) tests were positive.<sup>5,6</sup> Also, comparable levels of viral load in upper  
107 respiratory specimens were found in asymptomatic individuals and symptomatic patients.<sup>7</sup>  
108 Asymptomatic or pre-symptomatic SARS-CoV-2 virus carriers represent a considerable pool  
109 for transmission of infection considering the communicable period is reported to be up to  
110 three weeks.<sup>8–11</sup> However, the proportion of asymptomatic cases remains unclear,  
111 estimations from studies vary between 18% and 33.3%.<sup>12</sup> There is evidence that this group  
112 of persons may transmit the infection for a period of at least one week although remaining  
113 PCR-positive for several weeks.<sup>13</sup> This is particularly important in health care settings where  
114 patients and employees are at risk for exposure and infection.<sup>14</sup>

115

116 RT-PCR of the viral nucleic acid can also yield to false-negative results.<sup>5,15–17</sup> False negative  
117 rates of up to 20% have been reported leading to failure to quarantine infected

118 individuals.<sup>18–20</sup> Additional serological testing of virus specific IgG and IgM antibodies is  
119 recommended because antibodies represent longer lasting markers of infection with SARS-  
120 CoV-2 in contrast to methods of pathogen detection, with the latter being detectable only  
121 transiently at the time of pathogen presence at sites where diagnostic material is  
122 collected.<sup>5,21</sup>

123

124 It is assumed, that most individuals who are infected with SARS-CoV-2 develop antibodies  
125 within three weeks after onset of Covid-19 symptoms.<sup>14,22,23</sup> However, some studies  
126 reported a rapid waning of antibody titers indicating that humoral immunity against SARS-  
127 CoV-2 may be very short-lived, particularly in patients with asymptomatic infection.<sup>21,24</sup>  
128 Among routine antibody tests ELISA tests for antibodies directed against RBD (receptor  
129 binding domain) of SARS-CoV spike protein are considered to be a kind of „gold standard“ to  
130 detect protective antibodies whilst IgA and IgG ELISA tests against viral nucleoproteins have  
131 only diagnostic value.<sup>25</sup> In addition, tests for detection of neutralizing antibodies are  
132 considered to be reference for all kinds of routine tests.

133 Sensitivity rates as well as specificity rates of recently evolved and currently available rapid  
134 antibody tests are not yet reliable enough.<sup>16,26,27</sup> Additionally, many of those tests are not  
135 entirely specific for the SARS-CoV-2 virus, because of a cross-reactivity to other human SARS  
136 viruses like HCoV-OC43, HCoV-HKU1, HCoV-229E and HCoV-NL63.<sup>23</sup> Therefore, it is  
137 recommended to evaluate the antibody status via laboratory based enzyme linked  
138 immunosorbent assay (ELISA) and / or plaque reduction neutralization test (PRNT).<sup>25</sup>

139

140 The aims of this study were to determine i) how many employees in Austrian trauma  
141 hospitals and rehabilitation facilities have virus specific IgG and IgM, and/or neutralizing  
142 antibodies against SARS-CoV-2, indicating that they have recovered from infection with or  
143 without having shown symptoms at any time, ii) how many were actively infected during  
144 the study period and did not show COVID-19 associated symptoms while included in the  
145 study, iii) the antibody decline in seropositive subjects over a period of around six months,  
146 and iv) the utility of rapid antibody tests for outpatient screening.

147

## 148 Methods

149 This is an open, uncontrolled, three-time cross-sectional study.

150

### 151 Study population

152 All employees in Austrian trauma hospitals and rehabilitation facilities of the Austrian Social  
153 Insurance for Occupational Risks (AUVA) have been invited to participate in the study. In  
154 total, 3301 hospital employees were enrolled in eleven participating hospitals and  
155 rehabilitation facilities in Austria. The mean(SD) age in the cohort was 43.8 (11.9) years,  
156 2246 (68%) are female, 1049 (31.8%) are male, and 6 (0.2%) refused to disclose their  
157 gender. Written informed consent has been obtained from all study participants.

158

### 159 Study procedures

160 The study procedures are depicted in figure 1. A rapid antibody test (chip based) for SARS-  
161 CoV-2 specific IgG and IgM antibodies, and an RT-PCR test based on oropharyngeal swab  
162 samples, as well as the ELISA / PRNT tests (if indicated) were offered to all employees in  
163 Austrian trauma hospitals and rehabilitation facilities. The rapid antibody tests and PCR  
164 tests were conducted twice, with  $42.4 \pm 7.7$  (Min=30, Max=64) days in between testing. The  
165 lab-based ELISA and/or PRNT was conducted only if the rapid antibody test showed a  
166 positive or questionable result or if a prior positive PCR was known. Participants who had  
167 positive antibody tests in ELISA and/or PRNT, were invited for a third blood sample  
168 collection  $186.8 \pm 11.5$  days after their initial positive result to determine antibody kinetics.  
169 Individuals who agreed to participate in the study were asked to fill out an additional  
170 questionnaire to identify special risk factors which consisted of the following items:

171

- 172 ○ demographics (name, contact details, gender, age, height, bodyweight)
- 173 ○ code of the hospital or rehabilitation facility
- 174 ○ if the participant is a smoker including a quantification of smoking habit
- 175 ○ if the person had been tested for SARS-CoV-2 previously (with either an antibody  
176 test or a RT-PCR) including the test result
- 177 ○ survey flu like symptoms (at present or within the previous six weeks)
- 178 - fever

- 179 - cough
- 180 - dyspnea
- 181 - nasal congestion
- 182 - sore throat
- 183 - headaches
- 184 - myalgia
- 185 - impaired sense of smell or taste
- 186 - diarrhea
- 187 ○ questions related to the living situation
  - 188 - how many people live in the same household
  - 189 - how many adolescents below the age of 15 years live in the same household
  - 190 - inquiry of flu like symptoms within the family members / housemates
- 191 ○ questions related to commuting
  - 192 - use of public transportation
  - 193 - by car
  - 194 - by bike
  - 195 - walking
- 196 ○ survey on traveling activities within the previous six weeks
  - 197 - eastern Austria
  - 198 - western Austria
  - 199 - Italy
  - 200 - within Europe
  - 201 - outside of Europe
- 202 ○ attendance on large-scale events with more than 100 people within the last six
- 203 weeks
- 204 ○ job description (divided into 25 categories: medical doctors, nurses, administrative
- 205 staff, cleaning staff, medical-technical staff, laboratory staff, etc.)
- 206 ○ working hours within the last four weeks and periods of absence
- 207 ○ inquiry of comorbidities
  - 208 ○ hypertension
  - 209 ○ diabetes mellitus
  - 210 ○ coronary artery disease

- 211           ○ chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD)
- 212           ○ chronic kidney disease
- 213       ○ inquiry of immunosuppression and allergies
- 214       ○ test results of the IgG and IgM antibody test
- 215       ○ test result of the RT-PCR test based on oropharyngeal swab samples
- 216       ○ test result of the ELISA / PRNT
- 217

218 The period of sample collection was from May 11th until August 23<sup>rd</sup> 2020 for the PCR and  
219 LFA, and until December 4<sup>th</sup> 2020 for the additional blood sample collection in subjects with  
220 positive results prior.

221  
222

## 223 Real-time reverse transcription polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR) tests

### 224 RNA Isolation

225 Total RNA was isolated from 200µL of virus media using the commercially available Maxwell  
226 RSC Viral Total Nucleic Acid Purification Kit (Promega, AS1330) in combination with the  
227 Maxwell RSC48 system. Samples were mixed with 200µL lysis buffer, 20µL Proteinase K, and  
228 0.5µL internal positive control (IPC, Ingenetix Viroreal SARS & SARS-CoV-2, DHUV02313x5)  
229 followed by vigorous mixing for a minimum of 10 seconds and 10 minutes incubation at  
230 room temperature. Afterwards samples were applied to Promega Maxwell cartridges and  
231 subject to automated processing on the Maxwell RSC 48 system according to the  
232 manufacturer's instructions. Samples were purified with paramagnetic particles that serve  
233 as mobile solid phase. Total RNA was eluted in 50 µl nuclease-free water.

234

### 235 SARS-CoV-2 Screening Assay

236 The CE-IVD ViroReal SARS-CoV-2 & SARS Kit (Ingenetix, Austria, Cat: DHUV02313x5) was  
237 used for detection of SARS-CoV-2 nucleocapsid RNA in the clinical sample material. Probes  
238 were designed to detect the nucleocapsid protein gene (N gene) of SARS-CoV-2 as well as  
239 SARS-CoV and SARS-related coronavirus. Other beta coronaviruses are not detected with  
240 this kit. The primer and probe design chosen by this assay is not identical to the WHO  
241 design, as it intends to cover possible future changes in the virus sequence, therefore a

242 highly conserved region in all SARS coronavirus clusters of the N gene was chosen as target  
243 region. This allows universal detection of all so far known SARS-CoV strains including SARS-  
244 CoV-2 and SARS-like CoV without discriminating between strains.

245 The test uses a one-step reverse transcription real-time PCR (RT-PCR) reaction. A probe-  
246 specific amplification curve at 530 nm (FAM channel) indicates the amplification of virus-  
247 specific RNA. An internal RNA positive control (RNA IPC) is detected in Cy5 channel and was  
248 used as internal PCR control for both RNA extraction as well as RT-PCR efficiency. The target  
249 for the RNA IPC is extracted together with the sample. To set up the reaction 5µL isolated  
250 RNA were mixed with 2 µL nuclease free water (NFW), 2.5µL reaction mix and 0.5µL SARS-  
251 CoV-2 & SARS Assay Mix + RNA IPC Assay Mix. RT-qPCR was performed under following  
252 conditions: RT: 50°C for 15min, Activation: 95°C for 20sec, PCR 45 cycles: 95°C for 5 sec and  
253 60°C for 30 sec. Cycle of quantification (Cq) was calculated with the second derivative  
254 maximum method.

255

### 256 SARS-CoV-2 Confirmation Assay

257 Positive results from the screening assay SARS-CoV-2 were confirmed on the basis of an  
258 independent detection of the SARS-CoV-2 specific E-Gene. This protocol is based on a  
259 publication from Corman et al. "Detection of 2019 novel coronavirus (2019nCoV) by real  
260 time-RT-PCR"<sup>28</sup> using Superscript III RT-qPCR System (Thermo Fisher, Cat: 12574026). Per  
261 reaction, 3.44µL RNA were mixed with 5µL reaction mix, 0.4µL RT/Polymerase, 0.4µL 1µg/µL  
262 BSA, 0.16µL MgSO4 and 0.2µL of each E-Gene forward and reverse primer and probe. RT-  
263 qPCR is performed under following conditions: RT: 55°C for 10min, Activation: 95°C for  
264 3min, PCR 45 cycles: 95°C for 15 sec and 58°C for 30 sec. Cq-value was calculated with the  
265 second derivative maximum method. Sequences of the used primers and probes are shown  
266 below.

267

Gene & Reagent	Sequence	Conc. *
E-Gene FW Primer	ACAGGTACGTTAATAGTTAATAGCGT	400nM
E-Gene Rev Primer	ATATTGCAGCAGTACGCACACA	400nM
E-Gene Probe	/5Cy5/ACACTAGCCATCCTTACTGCGCTTCG/3BHQ_2/	200nM

268 \* concentration in nM/L based on the final reaction mix, e.g. 1.5µL of a 10µM primer working solution per 25  
269 µL total reaction yields a final concentration of 600nM as indicated in the table.

270

271

## 272 **Rapid antibody test: SARS-CoV-2 Antibody lateral flow assay (LFA)**

273 LFAs were performed according to the instructions-for-use (TAmiRNA GmbH, Austria). In  
274 brief, all test components were brought to room temperature. Sera or plasma aliquots were  
275 completely thawed before testing, or whole blood was freshly collected using safety lancets.  
276 The test cassette was removed from the sealed pouch and the required amount of sample  
277 (20 µl serum/plasma or 20 µl whole blood) was pipetted into the specimen well using clean  
278 disposable pipets. Immediately after the sample was applied to the sample inlet, three  
279 drops of sample buffer were applied to the buffer well. Results were read within the  
280 specified time window of 15 minutes.

281

## 282 **Laboratory-based ELISA (Roche and Diasorin)**

283 SARS-CoV-2 specific antibodies were measured from serum samples with two assays: (i) a qualitative  
284 eCLIA assay targeting pan-immunoglobulin (IgM, IgA, IgG) antibodies against the nucleoprotein (N-  
285 Ag) (Roche Elecsys Anti-SARS-CoV-2) on a cobas e601 analyzer. Samples with a cutoff index COI <1.0  
286 are classified as non-reactive. (ii) a quantitative CLIA assay targeting IgG antibodies against the S1/S2  
287 protein (Diasorin LIAISON SARS-CoV-2 S1/S2 IgG) on a LIAISON XL analyzer. Results are expressed in  
288 arbitrary units (AU/ml). Samples with <12,0 AU/ml are classified as negative; 12,0 ≤ x < 15,0 as  
289 borderline and ≥ 15,0 as positive.

290 According to the manufacturer, for the Roche Elecsys Anti-SARS-CoV-2 assay sensitivity rates range  
291 between 65.5% and 100% depending on the time between diagnosis and sample collection (65.5% 0-  
292 6 days, 88.1% 7-13 days, and 100% more than 14 days after diagnosis, respectively).

293 Sensitivity rates for the Diasorin LIAISON SARS-CoV-2 S1/S2 IgG range between 25% and 97.4% and  
294 are also dependent on the time since diagnosis via RT-PCR according to the manufacturer (25% less  
295 than 5 days, 90.4 % 5-15 days, and 97.4% more than 15 days after diagnosis).

296

## 297 **Neutralization test**

### 298 **Cell lines and viruses**

299 Vero 76 clone E6 cells (CCLV-RIE929, Friedrich-Loeffler-Institute, Riems, Germany) were  
300 cultured in minimum essential medium Eagle (E-MEM) with Hank's balanced salt solution

301 (HBSS) (BioWhittaker, Lonza, Szabo Scandic, Austria), supplemented with 10% fetal bovine  
302 serum (Corning, Szabo Scandic, Austria) (FBS) and were used to titrate virus preparations  
303 and for the neutralization assays. Vero E6 TMRSS-2 (provided by Stefan Pöhlmann;  
304 Deutsches Primatenzentrum, Göttingen, Germany) - initially described in Hoffmann et al. -  
305 were cultured in Dulbecco's modified Eagle's medium (DMEM) with 10% fetal bovine serum  
306 (FBS) and used for virus passaging and isolating infectious virus from clinical samples.<sup>29</sup> The  
307 virus used for the neutralization assay was originally isolated from a clinical specimen (NP  
308 swab), taken in mid-March 2020 from a 25-year old male patient in Lower Austria and  
309 further passaged twice on Vero E6 TMRSS-2 cells.

310

### 311 Neutralization assay

312 The neutralization assay was set up in flat-bottom 96-well tissue culture plates. Human sera  
313 were heat-treated for 30 min at 56°C and diluted 1 to 4 in triplicates in serum-free DMEM  
314 medium as starting point for the assay. Two-fold serially diluted sera were incubated with  
315 an equal volume of 50 µl SARS-CoV-2 at a minimum of 2,000 tissue culture infectious dose  
316 50% (TCID50)/ml) for 90 min at 37°C. Next, 25,000 Vero 76 clone E6 cells were added to the  
317 serum/virus mixture in each well in a volume of 100 µl in EMEM, supplemented with 10%  
318 FBS and incubated for 4 days at 37°C, 5% CO<sub>2</sub> in a humidified incubator. The CPE in every  
319 well was scored under an inverted optical microscope and the reciprocal of the highest  
320 serum dilution that protected more than 50% of cells from CPE was taken as the neutralizing  
321 titer.

322

323 PRNT was used as a reference in this study because neutralization assays are proposed to  
324 have the highest validity for CoV serology.<sup>23</sup>

325

### 326 Statistical analysis

327 Statistical analysis was performed using SPSS statistical software (version 26, SPSS Inc.,  
328 Chicago, Illinois, USA). Figures were compiled with Biorender.com, draw.io, and Microsoft  
329 Excel (Microsoft Corp., Redmond, WA, USA). Results of the PCR and rapid antibody test (IgG  
330 and IgM) were included in the eCRF at both time points together with all questionnaire

331 data. If an ELISA and / or PRNT was indicated, results of these tests have also been included  
332 in the eCRF.

333 The sensitivity of the rapid antibody and ELISA test was calculated with respect to the  
334 neutralization test for all three time points separately. As blood was only sampled in case of  
335 a positive prior PCR or a positive or questionable rapid antigen test, sensitivity estimations  
336 are biased in favor of these tests and specificity cannot be determined.

337 Data are analyzed exploratively; for comparison of groups concerning sociodemographic  
338 and medical variables chi-square-tests and t-tests depending on the scale are applied.

339 Reduction in antibody concentration between time points is tested via Friedman test and  
340 Spearman correlation is used to evaluate dependencies between reduction in antibody  
341 concentration, age of the participants, and days between T1/T2 and T2/T3, respectively.

342

## 343 Results

344 Details on demography and occupation of the study participants are summarized in table 1.

345 At first time point (T1), a total of  $n_1=3301$  hospital employees could be enrolled whereby  
346 sociodemographic variables (see Table 1) were comparable to the total AUVA population. At  
347 the second test time point (T2), which was on average  $40.1 \pm 9.8$  days later, a reduced  
348 number of  $n_2=2941$  could be re-tested by means of a PCR test.

349 Within the study cohort, 334 persons (10.1%) had comorbidities that are considered to be  
350 associated with a more severe course of disease in Covid-19 (see table 2). Among the

351 participants with comorbidities, 257 (7.8%) had hypertension, 41 (1.2%) had diabetes  
352 mellitus, 19 (0.6%) had coronary artery disease, 43 (1.3) had COPD, and 14 (0.4%) had  
353 chronic kidney disease. These 334 individuals, together with an additional 31 (0.9%)

354 immunocompromised persons are considered a risk group in the event of infection with  
355 SARS-CoV-2. Furthermore 1116 (33.8%) participants reported to have allergies. (table 2)

356 A total of 769 (23.3%) employees are smokers, whereby 513 (15.5%) smoke between six and  
357 15 cigarettes per day, 212 (6.4%) smoke more than 15 cigarettes per day, and 44 (1.3%)

358 stated to use other products containing nicotine. Chi-squared analysis revealed that in

359 individuals who smoke, the incidence of flu-like symptoms within six weeks before study

360 enrollment was significantly higher (11%) compared to non-smokers (9%,  $p < 0.001$ , Cramer

361  $V = 0.71$ ).

362

### 363 Active virus carriers during the study period

364 Only one person had a positive PCR test result at T1 on May 12<sup>th</sup>. This participant was a  
365 medical doctor, who already tested positive 60 days before study inclusion and is therefore  
366 allocated to group A in our analysis.

367

### 368 Participants with positive test results

369 A total of  $n_p=32$  participants were tested SARS-CoV-2 positive at any time point either prior  
370 to the study (i.e. prior positive PCR-Test = Group A) or were tested positively for antibodies  
371 during the study (positive or questionable/inconclusive rapid antibody test and/or positive  
372 ELISA (Roche and/or Diasorin) = Group B). (Sociodemographic and health characteristics of  
373 these groups can be found in Table 1 and Table 2, respectively.)

374 Nineteen (59.4%) out of 32 test-positive participants reported no symptoms of an acute  
375 viral illness within six weeks prior to study enrollment as well as during the study period.

376 PRNT was performed if any antibody test was positive. Due to limited serum sample  
377 availability in 4 out of 32 participants, PRNT was performed on 28 sera with 25 out of which  
378 neutralizing activity was observed (one test was questionable). One participant lost  
379 neutralizing antibodies between T1 and T2 and another three participants lost them  
380 between T2 and T3.

381 Concerning clinical signs, rhinitis (21.9%) and loss of taste and olfactory sense were the most  
382 prominent symptoms (21.9%; table 3) in the group who tested positive at any time during or  
383 prior to study inclusion.

384

### 385 Group A: Participants with a positive PCR test prior to study inclusion

386 Fifteen employees had positive PCR test results for acute SARS-CoV-2 infection prior to  
387 study inclusion, with an average of  $44.5 \pm 20.0$  days between a prior positive PCR and T1 in  
388 the present study. Out of these, eight persons suffered from symptoms in the preceding six  
389 weeks.

390 Thirteen of these employees showed a positive neutralization test, for one participant the  
391 neutralization test result was below the threshold of a 1:4 dilution, and for another  
392 participant no blood sample could be obtained. Based on the blood samples only for seven

393 of these participants the rapid antibody test was positive – including the person with the  
394 neutralization value below the threshold – so the sensitivity for the rapid antibody test in  
395 group A at T1 was only 46.2% (figure 3). Using the rapid antibody test with serum nine  
396 positive results (sensitivity= 69.2%) and the one participant with the neutralization value  
397 below the threshold could be detected correctly.

398 A total of thirteen participants had a positive ELISA- test from Roche again including the one  
399 person with the neutralization test below the threshold, resulting in a sensitivity of 92.3%  
400 when compared with the neutralization test. Based on the ELISA- test from Diasorin ten  
401 participants were positive, again including the NT negative participant (sensitivity=69.2%).  
402 At the second timepoint (T2), a neutralization test result could only be obtained for eleven  
403 participants (all of them have tested positive at T1). The rapid antibody test based on whole  
404 blood was only positive for four of them (sensitivity = 36.0%), while based on blood serum it  
405 was positive for seven (sensitivity=64%). Concerning both ELISA tests the Roche test  
406 detected all eleven positive participants (sensitivity=100%) and the Diasorin test only nine  
407 positive participants (sensitivity=82%).

408 For twelve participants a neutralization test result was obtained at (T3), showing that two  
409 persons lost their antibodies between T2 and T3 (marked with T3(-) in figure 3); both ELISA  
410 tests detected all nine positive participants (sensitivity=100%), the Roche test resulted in  
411 one false positive whereas the Diasorin test detected all three negative participants  
412 correctly.

413 Concerning those participants where a positive neutralization test was obtained, a  
414 significant decrease of the value from  $26.5 \pm 14.7$  (Md=32.0) at T1 to  $21.8 \pm 16.2$  (Md=16.0)  
415 at T2 and to  $17.8 \pm 9.8$  (Md=16.0) at T3 could be seen ( $\chi^2=10.4$ , df=2, p=0.006) – with an  
416 average time between T1 and T2 of  $40.3 \pm 6.1$  days and between T2 and T3 of  $151.6 \pm 8.1$   
417 days.

418

#### 419 **Group B: Participants with a positive antibody test during the study, either** 420 **rapid antibody and/or ELISA at T1 and/or T2**

421 Seventeen employees were tested positive for antibodies during the study, either with the  
422 rapid antibody test and/or one of the ELISA tests, whereby the latter were only performed  
423 in individuals with a prior positive or questionable rapid antibody test. For 14 of these

424 participants a neutralization test for validation could be performed. The majority was  
425 asymptomatic as only five participants reported symptoms in the preceding six weeks.  
426

427 At T1, 14 persons of group B had a positive rapid antibody test based on whole blood, which  
428 could be confirmed for ten persons via neutralization test (sensitivity = 83.3%; figure 4).

429 Using blood serum for the rapid antibody test, which was available only for 13 persons, all  
430 of them were positive – compared with the neutralization test but also one negative  
431 participant and one participant with a questionable result (sensitivity=100%).

432 The ELISA-Roche test was positive for nine persons (sensitivity=81.8%) and the ELISA-  
433 Diasorin test was positive for ten persons (sensitivity=90.9%) again compared to the  
434 neutralization test (figure 4). At T2 neutralization tests could be performed for fifteen  
435 persons; one additional person who had a negative PCR and negative rapid antibody test at  
436 T1 but reported on flu-like symptoms prior to T1 was tested positive at T2 (No 16, marked  
437 T2(+) in figure 4) and one person seemingly lost his/her antibodies in the 41 days after T1  
438 (No 21 ,marked T2(-) in figure 4). Based on whole blood, 12 persons were tested positive  
439 with the rapid antibody test, whereby ten cases (sensitivity=83.0%) which also showed  
440 neutralization activity. Although, based on blood serum, 14 persons had positive results in  
441 the LFA, 11 of which also showed neutralization activity (sensitivity= 92.0%). The ELISA-  
442 Roche showed a sensitivity of 92% and the ELISA-Diasorin one of 100% for T2 using PRNT as  
443 reference.

444 Thirteen participants could be re-tested at T3 with the neutralization test showing a positive  
445 result for eleven persons. One additional participant became positive (No 17, marked with  
446 T3(+) in figure 4) which had so far only been positive in the rapid antibody test at T1 and T2,  
447 but reported flu-like symptoms between T2 and T3. Another person lost detectable  
448 antibodies (No 23, marked with T3(-) in figure 4). The ELISA-Diasorin test correctly identified  
449 all positive (sensitivity=100%) and negative participants while the ELISA-Roche test resulted  
450 in one false negative result (sensitivity=91%).

451 Concerning those four participants (no 17, 18, 19, 20) who are marked with an asterisk in  
452 figure 4, only the rapid antibody test was positive either at T1 and/or T2 – so it may be  
453 hypothesized that they have always been false positive in the rapid antibody test and  
454 patient no 17, who showed antibodies at T3 most probably had corona between T2 and T3.

455 Also, in group B a significant decrease in the neutralization test value from  $37.5 \pm 29.0$   
456 (Md=32.0) at T1 to  $30.1 \pm 18.6$  (Md=26.7) at T2 to  $24.4 \pm 15.6$  (Md=28) at T3 could be seen  
457 ( $\chi^2=14.389$ , df=2, ,  $p=0.001$ ) – with an average time of  $43.7 \pm 8.5$  days, and  $143.6 \pm 16.2$  days  
458 between T1 / T2, and T2 / T3, respectively.

459 The rapid antibody test shows a low sensitivity of only 43.2% (T1)/36% (T2) based on blood  
460 and 69.2% (T1)/64% (T2) based on serum in a group of participants who had been PCR  
461 positive recently. But, if a positive or questionable rapid antibody test result was obtained,  
462 the result could be confirmed via PRNT at the same time of sample collection for 83.3%  
463 (T1)/83% (T2) based on blood and 100% (T1)/92% (T2) based on serum. Summarizing these  
464 findings, the ELISA-Roche shows higher sensitivity than ELISA-Diasorin in participants who  
465 have been positive a priori, but in validating the rapid antibody test results ELISA-Diasorin  
466 outperformed ELISA-Roche.

467

#### 468 Decline of antibody concentration

469 PRNT values showed a significant decrease from  $31.8 \pm 22.9$  (Md=32.0) at T1 to  $26.1 \pm 17.6$   
470 (Md=21.3) at T2 to  $21.4 \pm 13.4$  (Md=16.0) at T3 ( $\chi^2=23.848$ , df=2,  $p<0.001$ ) – with an average  
471 time of  $42.4 \pm 7.7$  days between T1 and T2 and  $146.9 \pm 13.8$  days between T2 and T3. Only  
472 two participants maintained their antibody titers at all three time points. Generally, the  
473 decrease in concentration is independent of the time period between T1/T2 and T2/T3,  
474 respectively ( $p_{T1/T2}=0.065$ ,  $p_{T1/T2}=0.775$ ;  $p_{T2/T3}=0.042$ ,  $p_{T1/T2}=0.861$ ).

475

#### 476 General antibody seroprevalence

477 No difference in terms of antibody seroprevalence was observed between male and female  
478 participants, smokers and non-smokers, the geographical area of the participating center, or  
479 the presence of comorbidities or allergies ( $p>0.05$ ). Only medical doctors were slightly  
480 overrepresented ( $p=0.097$ ) in the group of positive cases, and individuals who were tested  
481 positive showed somewhat more traveling activities, especially outside Europe in  
482 February/March ( $p=0.010$ ). The number of persons per household was even slightly smaller  
483 ( $2.34 \pm 1.5$  vs.  $2.73 \pm 1.32$ ;  $z=1.783$ ,  $p=.075$ ) in the group of persons with antibody  
484 seroprevalence with no differences according to the number of children below the age of 15  
485 years ( $p>0.05$ ). Only seven persons reported of cohabitants with flu-like symptoms at least

486 six weeks prior to the study whereby five had symptoms themselves (the neutralization test  
487 confirmed antibody seroprevalence for six persons and for one person the results were  
488 questionable). Also, asymptomatic persons do not differ from symptomatic ones in the  
489 neutralization test values ( $p>.0.05$ ). Finally, persons with positive seroprevalence do not  
490 differ according to how they reach their work place (public transport, car, bicycle or walk;  
491  $p>0.05$ ).  
492

## 493 Discussion

494 In our study cohort, only 32 out of 3301 participants (0.96%) had a positive antibody test at  
495 any time point during the study whereby results could be confirmed for 27 via neutralization  
496 test. This is remarkably lower compared to a large multicenter study in the USA, where 6%  
497 had detectable SARS-CoV-2 antibodies.<sup>14</sup> Also, a large study on 61 075 residents of Spain  
498 reported a seroprevalence between 4.6 and 5% (by point-of-care test and immunoassay,  
499 respectively) where sample collection took place between April 27 and May 11, 2020.<sup>30</sup>  
500 Another study by Korth et al. on 316 healthcare workers who had contact to COVID-19  
501 patients in a tertiary hospital in Essen, Germany found a SARS-CoV-2-IgG antibody  
502 seroprevalence of 1.6% between March 25th and April 21th, 2020.<sup>31</sup> This may be partly  
503 explained by the different epidemiological situation in the respective countries. Austria had  
504 a low incidence during sample collection of this study with a 14-day notification rate of  
505 reported cases per 100 000 population ranging between 0.0 and 88.2 during the study  
506 period (May 11<sup>th</sup> – August 23<sup>rd</sup>).<sup>32</sup> Additionally, the occupational risk was reduced in the  
507 participating trauma hospitals/rehabilitation centers because infected patients have been  
508 transferred to specifically implemented corona wards in other hospitals in Austria.  
509

## 510 Asymptomatic cases

511 Among participants who had positive test results in either of the antibody tests, 50.4% did  
512 not report any symptoms consistent with common manifestations of COVID-19 (fever,  
513 fatigue, dry cough, dyspnea, nasal congestion, headaches, myalgia, or diarrhea<sup>1,9,33–35</sup>) in  
514 the preceding weeks irrespective of their age. Previous literature reported that around 30%  
515 of seropositive participants were asymptomatic.<sup>21,30,36</sup> Antibody levels were lower in

516 smokers and in women who had a less severe course of disease of COVID-19, and were  
517 generally elevated in older adults.<sup>21</sup>

518

### 519 Sensitivity and specificity of antibody tests

520 Sensitivity and specificity rates of different SARS-CoV-2 antibody tests vary between 53%  
521 and 94%, and between 91% and 99.5%, respectively.<sup>37</sup> Due to the pandemic, an urgent need  
522 for outpatient and rapid field detection of antibodies against SARS-CoV-2 virus emerged.  
523 Therefore, a valid antibody test it is of utmost interest for society and previous literature  
524 has reported about validity of several rapid antibody tests:

525 Li et al. used the SARS-CoV-2 rapid IgG-IgM combined antibody test kit to detect IgM and  
526 IgG antibodies against SARS-CoV-2 virus in human blood. The study reported a sensitivity of  
527 88.66%, and a specificity of 90.63%, considering a positive test result if IgM, or IgG, or both  
528 are positive. In their study, 64.48% (256 out of 397) of positive patients had both IgM and  
529 IgG antibodies 8-33 days after infection symptoms appeared, and test results from venous  
530 blood and fingertip blood matched with 100% consistency.<sup>26</sup> Another study by Lee and  
531 colleagues used the ALLTEST 2019-nCoV IgG/ IgM Rapid Test Cassette and found a  
532 sensitivity of 100%, a specificity of 98.0%, and an accuracy rate of 98.6% for the anti-SARS-  
533 CoV-2 IgG antibody. IgG appeared at post-exposure 18-21 days or the illness day 11. The  
534 relative sensitivity for the IgM antibody was reported to be 85% (95% CI, 62.1% - 96.8%)<sup>27</sup>  
535 In contrast, sensitivity rates of the antibody lateral flow assay in our study showed a wide  
536 variation ranging between 36.0% and 69.2% depending on the type of sampling (whole  
537 blood or serum) and the time point of sample collection (T1 vs. T2) in the group who had  
538 tested positive via PCR prior to study inclusion. Surprisingly, sensitivity rates were higher in  
539 participants with a positive antibody test during the study and no positive PCR prior to the  
540 study, ranging between 83.0% and 100%. The rapid antibody test generally shows higher  
541 sensitivity when based on serum than on whole blood.

542 Summarizing these results, the rapid antibody test based on whole blood can - at best - be  
543 used for a pre-screening for suspected cases. Based on serum, the test showed better  
544 sensitivity which may be due to higher antibody concentration in serum versus whole  
545 blood..

546

547 In our study, the ELISA tests showed an overall sensitivity of 88.9% in the Roche test and  
548 81.5% in the Diasorin test using the neutralization test as a reference.

549

### 550 **Antibody production and waning**

551 Guo et al. conducted a longitudinal study on 82 confirmed and 58 probable cases using a  
552 nucleocapsid-based ELISA and found that the production of IgM, IgA and IgG antibodies  
553 against SARS-CoV-2 were positive as early as day one after symptom onset. The median  
554 duration of IgM and IgA antibody detection were 5 days (IQR 3-6), while IgG was detected  
555 14 days (IQR 10-18) after symptom onset. IgM antibody levels increased between days 8–  
556 14; but did not increase further between days 15–21, or after day 21. The IgG antibodies  
557 could be detected on days 0–7, and continued to increase on days 8–14, as well as days 15–  
558 21, and plateaued by day 21.<sup>16</sup>

559 Previous literature reported, that antibodies remained stable for four months after  
560 diagnosis<sup>21,36</sup> In our study, a significant decline in neutralizing antibody concentration was  
561 observed between time points of testing within a period of approximately six months, but  
562 PRNT tests remained well above threshold in most patients indicating persistence of  
563 neutralizing antibodies. This result supports national vaccination recommendations in post-  
564 COVID patients which recommend suspending vaccination in such individuals.<sup>38,39</sup> This is in  
565 contrast to US recommendations (no suspension of vaccination).<sup>40</sup>

566

### 567 **Limitations**

568 Antibody seroprevalence may be underestimated if participants had not yet produced a  
569 sufficient antibody response at the time of sample collection, or if antibody titers had  
570 already declined since the infection. We tried to reduce this bias by conducting the PCR and  
571 LFA tests twice with approximately six weeks in between testing (between T1 and T2) and  
572 an additional serum sample collection for ELISA / PRNT after another three months  
573 (between T2 and T3).

574

### 575 **Conclusion**

576 This study identified the following factors related to SARS-CoV-2 infection among health  
577 care workers in Austrian trauma centers and rehabilitation facilities: During the study period

578 (May 11<sup>th</sup> – December 21<sup>th</sup>) only 0.81% were tested positive for neutralizing antibodies,  
579 indicating that non-pharmaceutical interventions and other epidemiological interventions as  
580 recommended in Austria at the time of the study were widely effective in keeping infection  
581 rates low.

582 The antibody concentration in patients tested positive for COVID decreases significantly  
583 over a period of six months with 14.8% (4 out of 27) losing detectable antibodies.

584 Also, the results of rapid antibody tests are questionable due to a wide variability in their  
585 sensitivity rates.

586

### 587 **Funding**

588 The project was funded by the Austrian Social Insurance for Occupational Risks (AUVA) and  
589 the authors would like to express their sincere appreciation.

590

### 591 **Ethical Considerations and consent to participate**

592 All procedures performed in this study were in accordance with the ethical standards of the  
593 institutional and national research committee and with the 1964 Helsinki declaration and its  
594 later amendments or comparable ethical standards. All participants provided written,  
595 informed consent. The study was approved by the ethics committee of the Austrian social  
596 insurance for occupational risks (AUVA) (Vote No. 04/2020). The study was registered on  
597 the ClinicalTrials.gov database (unique identifier: NCT04354779).

598 All authors have read and approved the manuscript.

599

## 600 References

601

- 602 1. Lai C-C, Shih T-P, Ko W-C, Tang H-J, Hsueh P-R. Severe acute respiratory syndrome  
603 coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) and coronavirus disease-2019 (COVID-19): The epidemic  
604 and the challenges. *Int J Antimicrob Agents*. 2020;55(3):105924.  
605 doi:10.1016/j.ijantimicag.2020.105924
- 606 2. Amtliches Dashboard COVID19: öffentlich zugängliche Informationen.  
607 Bundesministerium für Soziales, Gesundheit, Pflege und Konsumentenschutz.  
608 <https://info.gesundheitsministerium.at/dashboard.html?l=de>. Published 2020.
- 609 3. Linton NM, Kobayashi T, Yang Y, et al. Incubation Period and Other Epidemiological  
610 Characteristics of 2019 Novel Coronavirus Infections with Right Truncation: A  
611 Statistical Analysis of Publicly Available Case Data. *J Clin Med*. 2020;9(2):538.  
612 doi:10.3390/jcm9020538
- 613 4. Backer JA, Klinkenberg D, Wallinga J. Incubation period of 2019 novel coronavirus  
614 (2019-nCoV) infections among travellers from Wuhan, China, 20–28 January 2020.  
615 *Eurosurveillance*. 2020;25(5). doi:10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2020.25.5.2000062
- 616 5. Dong X, Cao Y, Lu X, et al. Eleven Faces of Coronavirus Disease 2019. *Allergy*. March  
617 2020. doi:10.1111/all.14289
- 618 6. Lin C, Ding Y, Xie B, et al. Asymptomatic novel coronavirus pneumonia patient outside  
619 Wuhan: The value of CT images in the course of the disease. *Clin Imaging*. 2020;63:7-  
620 9. doi:10.1016/j.clinimag.2020.02.008
- 621 7. Zou L, Ruan F, Huang M, et al. SARS-CoV-2 Viral Load in Upper Respiratory Specimens  
622 of Infected Patients. *N Engl J Med*. 2020;382(12):1177-1179.  
623 doi:10.1056/NEJMc2001737
- 624 8. Chan JF-W, Yuan S, Kok K-H, et al. A familial cluster of pneumonia associated with the  
625 2019 novel coronavirus indicating person-to-person transmission: a study of a family  
626 cluster. *Lancet*. 2020;395(10223):514-523. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30154-9
- 627 9. Hu Z, Song C, Xu C, et al. Clinical characteristics of 24 asymptomatic infections with  
628 COVID-19 screened among close contacts in Nanjing, China. *Sci China Life Sci*. March  
629 2020. doi:10.1007/s11427-020-1661-4
- 630 10. Heymann DL, Shindo N, WHO Scientific and Technical Advisory Group for Infectious


- 631 Hazards. COVID-19: what is next for public health? *Lancet*. 2020;395(10224):542-545.  
632 doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30374-3
- 633 11. Bai Y, Yao L, Wei T, et al. Presumed Asymptomatic Carrier Transmission of COVID-19.  
634 *JAMA*. February 2020. doi:10.1001/jama.2020.2565
- 635 12. Mizumoto K, Kagaya K, Zarebski A, Chowell G. Estimating the asymptomatic  
636 proportion of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) cases on board the Diamond  
637 Princess cruise ship, Yokohama, Japan, 2020. *Euro Surveill*. 2020;25(10).  
638 doi:10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2020.25.10.2000180
- 639 13. *PCR Positives: What Do They Mean?*; 2020.
- 640 14. Self WH, Tenforde MW, Stubblefield WB, Feldstein LR, Steingrub JS. Seroprevalence  
641 of SARS-CoV-2 Among Frontline Health Care Personnel in a Multistate Hospital  
642 Network — 13 Academic Medical Centers , April – June 2020. *MMWR - Morb Mortal*  
643 *Wkly Rep*. 2020;69:1-7.
- 644 15. Xie X, Zhong Z, Zhao W, Zheng C, Wang F, Liu J. Chest CT for Typical 2019-nCoV  
645 Pneumonia: Relationship to Negative RT-PCR Testing. *Radiology*. February  
646 2020:200343. doi:10.1148/radiol.2020200343
- 647 16. Guo L, Ren L, Yang S, et al. Profiling Early Humoral Response to Diagnose Novel  
648 Coronavirus Disease (COVID-19). *Clin Infect Dis*. March 2020. doi:10.1093/cid/ciaa310
- 649 17. Kucirka LM, Lauer SA, Laeyendecker O, Boon D, Lessler J. Variation in False-Negative  
650 Rate of Reverse Transcriptase Polymerase Chain Reaction-Based SARS-CoV-2 Tests by  
651 Time Since Exposure. *Ann Intern Med*. 2020;173(4):262-267. doi:10.7326/M20-1495
- 652 18. Li Y, Yao L, Li J, et al. Stability issues of RT-PCR testing of SARS-CoV-2 for hospitalized  
653 patients clinically diagnosed with COVID-19. *J Med Virol*. 2020;92(7):903-908.  
654 doi:10.1002/jmv.25786
- 655 19. Li D, Wang D, Dong J, et al. False-negative results of real-time reverse-transcriptase  
656 polymerase chain reaction for severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2: Role  
657 of deep-learning-based ct diagnosis and insights from two cases. *Korean J Radiol*.  
658 2020;21(4):505-508. doi:10.3348/kjr.2020.0146
- 659 20. Ferrari D, Sabetta E, Ceriotti D, et al. Routine blood analysis greatly reduces the false-  
660 negative rate of RT-PCR testing for COVID-19. *Acta Biomed*. 2020;91(3):1-8.  
661 doi:10.23750/abm.v91i3.9843
- 662 21. Alter G, Seder R. The Power of Antibody-Based Surveillance. *N Engl J Med*. 2020:1-2.

- 663 doi:10.1056/NEJMSa1201918.6.
- 664 22. Xiang F, Wang X, He X, et al. Antibody Detection and Dynamic Characteristics in  
665 Patients with COVID-19. *Clin Infect Dis*. April 2020. doi:10.1093/cid/ciaa461
- 666 23. Okba N, Muller M, Li W, et al. SARS-CoV-2 specific antibody responses in COVID-19  
667 patients. *Emerg Infect Dis*. 2020;preprint:1-18. doi:10.1101/2020.03.18.20038059
- 668 24. Huang AT, Garcia-Carreras B, Hitchings MDT, et al. A systematic review of antibody  
669 mediated immunity to coronaviruses: kinetics, correlates of protection, and  
670 association with severity. *Nat Commun*. 2020;11(1):1-16. doi:10.1038/s41467-020-  
671 18450-4
- 672 25. To KK-WW, Tsang OT-YY, Leung W-SS, et al. Temporal profiles of viral load in  
673 posterior oropharyngeal saliva samples and serum antibody responses during  
674 infection by SARS-CoV-2: an observational cohort study. *Lancet Infect Dis*.  
675 2020;20(5):565-574. doi:10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30196-1
- 676 26. Li Z, Yi Y, Luo X, et al. Development and Clinical Application of A Rapid IgM-IgG  
677 Combined Antibody Test for SARS-CoV-2 Infection Diagnosis. *J Med Virol*. 2020:0-1.  
678 doi:10.1002/jmv.25727
- 679 27. Lee N-Y, Li C-W, Tsai H-P, et al. A case of COVID-19 and pneumonia returning from  
680 Macau in Taiwan: clinical course and anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgG dynamic. *J Microbiol*  
681 *Immunol Infect*. 2020. doi:10.1016/j.jmii.2020.03.003
- 682 28. Corman VM, Landt O, Kaiser M, et al. Detection of 2019 novel coronavirus (2019-  
683 nCoV) by real-time RT-PCR. *Eurosurveillance*. 2020;25(3). doi:10.2807/1560-  
684 7917.ES.2020.25.3.2000045
- 685 29. Hoffmann M, Kleine-Weber H, Schroeder S, et al. SARS-CoV-2 Cell Entry Depends on  
686 ACE2 and TMPRSS2 and Is Blocked by a Clinically Proven Protease Inhibitor. *Cell*.  
687 2020;181(2):271-280.e8. doi:10.1016/j.cell.2020.02.052
- 688 30. Pollán M, Pérez-Gómez B, Pastor-Barriuso R, et al. Prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 in Spain  
689 (ENE-COVID): a nationwide, population-based seroepidemiological study. *Lancet*.  
690 2020;396(10250):535-544. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(20)31483-5
- 691 31. Korth J, Wilde B, Dolff S, et al. SARS-CoV-2-specific antibody detection in healthcare  
692 workers in Germany with direct contact to COVID-19 patients. *J Clin Virol*. 2020;128.  
693 doi:10.1016/j.jcv.2020.104437
- 694 32. European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control - Data on the weekly subnational

- 695 14-day notification rate of new COVID-19 cases.  
696 <https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/en/publications-data/weekly-subnational-14-day->  
697 notification-rate-covid-19. Published 2020. Accessed December 11, 2020.
- 698 33. Zu ZY, Jiang M Di, Xu PP, et al. Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19): A Perspective  
699 from China. *Radiology*. February 2020:200490. doi:10.1148/radiol.2020200490
- 700 34. Wang D, Hu B, Hu C, et al. Clinical Characteristics of 138 Hospitalized Patients With  
701 2019 Novel Coronavirus-Infected Pneumonia in Wuhan, China. *JAMA*.  
702 2020;323(11):1061. doi:10.1001/jama.2020.1585
- 703 35. Xu Z, Shi L, Wang Y, et al. Pathological findings of COVID-19 associated with acute  
704 respiratory distress syndrome. *Lancet Respir Med*. February 2020.  
705 doi:10.1016/S2213-2600(20)30076-X
- 706 36. Gudbjartsson DF, Norddahl GL, Melsted P, et al. Humoral Immune Response to SARS-  
707 CoV-2 in Iceland. *N Engl J Med*. September 2020:1-11. doi:10.1056/nejmoa2026116
- 708 37. Horvath K, Semlitsch T, Jeitler K, Krause R, Siebenhofer A. Antibody tests for COVID-  
709 19: What the results tell us. *Z Evid Fortbild Qual Gesundheitswes*. 2020.  
710 doi:10.1016/j.zefq.2020.05.005
- 711 38. BMSGPK. COVID-19-Impfungen: Anwendungsempfehlungen Des Nationalen  
712 Impfgremiums.; 2021. [https://www.sozialministerium.at/dam/jcr:c8dcc8fe-4ec3-4eb7-b1fb-86cc75845f93/COVID-19-](https://www.sozialministerium.at/dam/jcr:c8dcc8fe-4ec3-4eb7-b1fb-86cc75845f93/COVID-19-4eb7-b1fb-86cc75845f93/COVID-19-Impfungen__Anwendungsempfehlung_des_Nationalen_Impfgremiums_Version_1.2_(Stand_25.01.2021).pdf)  
713 [Impfungen\\_\\_Anwendungsempfehlung\\_des\\_Nationalen\\_Impfgremiums\\_Version\\_1.2\\_](https://www.sozialministerium.at/dam/jcr:c8dcc8fe-4ec3-4eb7-b1fb-86cc75845f93/COVID-19-Impfungen__Anwendungsempfehlung_des_Nationalen_Impfgremiums_Version_1.2_(Stand_25.01.2021).pdf)  
714 [\(Stand\\_25.01.2021\).pdf](https://www.sozialministerium.at/dam/jcr:c8dcc8fe-4ec3-4eb7-b1fb-86cc75845f93/COVID-19-Impfungen__Anwendungsempfehlung_des_Nationalen_Impfgremiums_Version_1.2_(Stand_25.01.2021).pdf).
- 715  
716 39. Robert Koch Institut. Epidemiologisches Bulletin - Beschluss der STIKO zur 1.  
717 Aktualisierung der COVID-19-Impfempfehlung. 2021:1-74.  
718 [https://www.sozialministerium.at/dam/jcr:c8dcc8fe-4ec3-4eb7-b1fb-](https://www.sozialministerium.at/dam/jcr:c8dcc8fe-4ec3-4eb7-b1fb-86cc75845f93/COVID-19-Impfungen__Anwendungsempfehlung_des_Nationalen_Impfgremiums_Version_1.2_(Stand_25.01.2021).pdf)  
719 [86cc75845f93/COVID-19-](https://www.sozialministerium.at/dam/jcr:c8dcc8fe-4ec3-4eb7-b1fb-86cc75845f93/COVID-19-Impfungen__Anwendungsempfehlung_des_Nationalen_Impfgremiums_Version_1.2_(Stand_25.01.2021).pdf)  
720 [Impfungen\\_\\_Anwendungsempfehlung\\_des\\_Nationalen\\_Impfgremiums\\_Version\\_1.2\\_](https://www.sozialministerium.at/dam/jcr:c8dcc8fe-4ec3-4eb7-b1fb-86cc75845f93/COVID-19-Impfungen__Anwendungsempfehlung_des_Nationalen_Impfgremiums_Version_1.2_(Stand_25.01.2021).pdf)  
721 [\(Stand\\_25.01.2021\).pdf](https://www.sozialministerium.at/dam/jcr:c8dcc8fe-4ec3-4eb7-b1fb-86cc75845f93/COVID-19-Impfungen__Anwendungsempfehlung_des_Nationalen_Impfgremiums_Version_1.2_(Stand_25.01.2021).pdf).
- 722 40. CDC. Frequently Asked Questions about COVID-19 Vaccination.  
723 <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/vaccines/faq.html>. Published 2021.  
724 Accessed January 29, 2021.  
725  
726

727 Figure 1: Study procedures

728




729

730 Figure created with draw.io

731

732 Figure 2: time intervals of testing

733



\*) in case of a positive or inconclusive result in the rapid antibody test (LFA): blood sample collection for laboratory-based ELISA and PRNT

\*\*) in case of a positive or inconclusive result in the rapid antibody test (LFA) at T2 and/or T2: blood sample collection for laboratory-based ELISA and PRNT

\*\*\*) New infections, together with the reported number of infections which are inquired by the Austrian government, should 1) inform conclusions whether there is a specific risk for health care workers (HCW), and 2) detect recent asymptomatic infections thereby enabling the calculation of the actual rate of infections.

734

735 Figure created with Biorender.com

736

737 Table 1 Sociodemographic Variables – All Groups

Sociodemographic variables	Total group (n=3301)	Positive during study (n=32)	Prior positive PCR – Group A (n=15)	Positive LFA and/or ELISA – Group B (n=17)
Sex (f/m)	2246 (68%)/1049 (31.8%)*	21 (65.6%)/11 (34.4%)	9 (60.0%)/6 (40.0%)	12 (70.6%)/5 (29.4%)
Age	43.6±10.5 (Min=16, Max=66)	40.5±9.7 (Min=28, Max=55)	39.4±9.4 (Min=28, Max=55)	41.5±10.1 (Min=28, Max=54)
Function				
Nurses	1318 (39.9%)	13 (40.6%)	6 (40.0%)	7 (41.2%)
Medical doctors	397 (12.0%)	7 (21.9%)**	3 (20.0%)	4 (23.5%)
Physiotherapists or occupational therapists	270 (8.2%)	2 (6.3%)	1 (6.7%)	1 (5.9%)
Speech and language therapists	8 (0.2%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Radiographers	156 (4.7%)	1 (3.1%)	1 (6.7%)	0 (0%)
Laboratory staff	33 (1%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Dietologists	12 (0.4%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Cleaning staff	150 (4.5%)	1 (3.1%)	1 (6.7%)	0 (0%)
Typists	156 (4.7%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Janitorial service	101 (3.1%)	1 (3.1%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Reception	40 (1.2%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Administrative Staff	311 (9.4%)	2 (6.3%)	1 (6.7%)	1 (5.9%)
Other	305 (9.2%)	4 (12.5%)	2 (13.3%)	2 (11.8%)
No. of persons per household/ children<14yrs.	2.72±1.3/ 1064 (32.2%)	2.34±1.5/ 8 (25.0%)	2.40±1.4/ 4 (26.7%)	2.29±1.6 4 (23.5%)

738 \*...6 (0.2%) refused to disclose their gender; \*\*...overrepresented compared to total group

739

740 Table 2 Health Variables – All Groups


<b>Health Variables</b>	<b>Total group (n=3301)</b>	<b>Positive during study (n=32)</b>	<b>Prior positive PCR – Group A (n=15)</b>	<b>Positive LFA and/or ELISA – Group B (n=17)</b>
Hypertension	257 (7.8%)	3 (9.4%)	1 (6.7%)	2 (11.8%)
Diabetes Mellitus	41 (1.2%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Coronary Artery Disease	19 (0.6%)	1 (3.1%)	1 (6.7%)	0 (0%)
COPD	43 (1.3%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Chronic Kidney Disease	14 (0.4%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Immunocompromised	31 (0.9%)	1 (3.1%)	0 (0%)	1 (5.9%)
Allergies	1116 (33.8%)	14 (43.8%)	8 (53.3%)	6 (35.3%)
Smoker	769 (23.3%)	5 (15.6%)	3 (20.0%)	2 (11.8%)

741

742 Table 3: Symptoms – All Groups

<b>Symptoms</b>	<b>Positive during study (n=32)</b>	<b>Prior positive PCR – Group A (n=15)</b>	<b>Positive LFA and/or ELISA – Group B (n=17)</b>
At least one symptom	13	8	5
Fever	3 (9.4%)	2 (13.3%)	1 (5.9%)
Cough	4 (12.5)	3 (20.0%)	1 (5.9%)
Dyspnea	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Rhinitis	7 (21.9%)	4 (26.7%)	3 (17.6%)
Sore throat	5 (15.6%)	4 (26.7%)	1 (5.9%)
Headache	6 (18.8%)	3 (20.0%)	3 (17.6%)
Melalgia	5 (15.6%)	3 (20.0%)	2 (11.8%)
Loss of taste and olfaction	7 (21.9%)	6 (40.0%)	1 (5.9%)
Diarrhea	3 (9.4%)	2 (13.3%)	1 (5.9%)

Figure 3: Group A – PRNT, ELISA (Roche and Diasorin) and rapid antibody test (LFA) with either whole blood (LFA(B)) or blood serum (LFA(S)) at T1, T2 and T3



T3(-)  
T3(-)

