

## **Sustained seroprevalence of anti SARS-CoV-2 total immunoglobulins in asymptomatic blood donors**

M Carmen Martín <sup>1</sup>

M Isabel González <sup>1</sup>

Nuria Holgado <sup>1</sup>

Ana I Jimenez <sup>1</sup>

Nuria Ortega <sup>1</sup>

Isabel Page <sup>1</sup>

Alba Parrado<sup>1</sup>

María Pérez <sup>1</sup>

Lydia Blanco-Peris <sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Centro de Hemoterapia y Hemodonación de Castilla y León

**Running Title:** Seroprevalence of anti SARS-CoV-2 in asymptomatic blood donors

**Keywords:** total immunoglobulins, SARS-CoV-2, seroprevalence, blood donors

**Corresponding author:** M Carmen Martín; [cmartinalo@saludcastillayleon.es](mailto:cmartinalo@saludcastillayleon.es); Centro de Hemoterapia y Hemodonación de Castilla y León, Paseo de Filipinos, Valladolid, Spain

## Sustained seroprevalence of anti SARS-CoV-2 total immunoglobulins in asymptomatic blood donors

### 1 Abstract

2 **Background:** Seroprevalence analysis of SARS-CoV-2 is one of the keys to  
3 accurately monitor pandemics and help the authorities make health decisions and  
4 adjust the current social interventions. The aim of this study was to determine  
5 retrospective seroprevalence evolution among blood donors along prepandemic  
6 months, and the first wave in Spain. A secondary objective was to determine  
7 whether age, blood group or haematological parameters are related to recent  
8 past infection.

9 **Material and Methods:** A total of 12719 donations SARS-CoV-2 from July 2019  
10 to October 2020 were analysed. Donors were 60.9% males and their average  
11 age was 46+/-13. An automated chemiluminescence double-antigen sandwich  
12 immunoassay for the in vitro semi quantitative detection of total antibodies to  
13 SARS-CoV-2 in human serum and plasma was performed.

14 **Results:** Seropositivity donation rate grew up from week 11 to week 21, reaching  
15 plateau by near 8% donations, sustained until week 43 when 2nd wave arose in  
16 our country. 6.7% individuals were positive by the end of 1st wave. No  
17 differences by sex age or blood group were found regarding antibodies.  
18 Lymphocyte were significantly higher in positive woman as compared to negative  
19 ones and haemoglobin were lower in positive men as compared to negative  
20 ones.

21 **Discussion:** Seroprevalence due to asymptomatic cases would be equivalent to  
22 that of general population. Sex and age would not affect COVID-19 susceptibility  
23 but its severity. Gender differences are present even in asymptomatic individuals:  
24 females are possibly protected by their relative lymphocytosis and neutropenia  
25 whereas males are would be weaker as seropositive men show a decrease of  
26 haematocrit and haemoglobin. Further studies are needed to confirm these  
27 gender differences not only in severe but as well in asymptomatic cases as they  
28 can help better understand COVID19 pathogenesis and prognosis.

29

### 30 Introduction

31 SARS-CoV-2 infection curses asymptomatic or with just mild symptoms in a  
32 number of cases. This make it hard to calculate accurate infection or fatality rates  
33 and prevalence. These calculations are important for evaluating risks of COVID-  
34 19 disease, predicting the spread of the virus and managing health resources <sup>1</sup>.

35 Most cases develop an effective immune response during infection, leading to  
36 viral eradication and the production of specific T cell responses and antibodies  
37 against SARS-CoV-2 that are usually detectable 10–21 days after infection.

38 Antibody assays are quite different: they either detect antibodies against different  
39 viral proteins (S1, S1/S2, RBD or NC) or different immunoglobulin classes: IgG,  
40 IgM, IgA or their combinations. To make it even messier, many factors can  
41 influence test performance, including cross-reactivity with other coronaviruses or  
42 platform (laboratory-based vs point-of-care, lateral flow). Chemiluminescence  
43 assays have suitable performances regarding both sensibility and sensitivity,

44 even though those values have been estimated as testing populations with  
45 compatible symptoms and would be presumably lower when performing  
46 serosurveillance analysis on apparently healthy population. Chemiluminiscent  
47 immunoassays exhibit a significantly higher specificity score but a lower  
48 sensitivity, as compared to ELISA immunoassays. Moreover, immunoassays  
49 detecting IgG antibodies against SARS-CoV-2 N protein instead of S protein  
50 alone are more reliable, considering both specificity and sensitivity scores <sup>2</sup>.

51 SARS-CoV-2 disease burden is suspected to be much larger than reported  
52 COVID-19 cases due to low detection rates, especially at the beginning of  
53 pandemics. Seroprevalence surveys are needed to monitor the pandemic, both  
54 before and after vaccination strategies. <sup>3</sup> Reported COVID-19 cases do not  
55 represent the full SARS-CoV-2 disease burden. Case reports are dependent on  
56 patients seeking health care, massive local screenings or regional tracking  
57 activities. Analysis of data from seroprevalence and serosurveillance is a  
58 common strategy for estimating underreporting and real disease burden. There  
59 are several features that should be taken into account, including time between  
60 infection and antibody development or antibody waning, which must be  
61 considered to understand seroprevalence surveys avoiding biases as. Any  
62 seroprevalence survey should be evaluated for selection bias. Serological  
63 surveys with a random sampling design of the general population are difficult to  
64 perform in a pandemic, but a random sampling design of the general population  
65 yields a seroprevalence estimate least likely to be affected by selection bias.  
66 Blood donors are a quite representative subset of general population aged 18-65.

67 Blood donor-based serosurveillance is a powerful and cost-effective strategy to  
68 monitor infectious diseases. There are quite a lot of infections for which routine  
69 donor screening is well known to be useful, including human immunodeficiency  
70 virus (HIV), hepatitis C virus (HCV), hepatitis B virus (HBV), human T-  
71 lymphotropic virus (HTLV), and West Nile virus (WNV) <sup>1</sup>, babesiosis or Crimean-  
72 Congo fever. The use of blood donor samples means we're sampling mainly  
73 asymptomatic and recovered cases of COVID-19 (normal blood donation is  
74 allowed after 28 days following COVID-19 symptoms' resolution).

75 Heterogeneity of susceptibility and transmission is hard to evaluate but does  
76 exist<sup>4</sup>. A portion of the population is not susceptible to infection from the first  
77 pathogen contact. Some may have pre-existing immunity via cross-reactivity or  
78 particular host factors such as mucosal immunity or trained innate immunity  
79 protection (as it has been reported to be conferred by DTP or BCG vaccination <sup>5</sup>).  
80 There is as well a proportion of seronegative individuals that will develop  
81 immunity by T cell mediated responses but without exhibiting an antibody  
82 response <sup>6</sup>.

83 Castilla y Leon, with a population of 2.299.598 inhabitants, has accumulated  
84 221.816 confirmed cases (<https:// analisis.datosabiertos.jcyl.es/>), with an overall  
85 case-fatality rate of 4.85 to date.

86 Our institution, Centro de Hemoterapia de Castilla y León keeps within its  
87 Biobank serum samples from every single donor along the last ten years, that  
88 makes up around 1 million sera together with their demographical data such as  
89 sex or age and laboratory parameters (blood counts, blood group, haemoglobin,  
90 etc...) . The Biobank of the Centro de Hemoterapia de Castilla y León is included  
91 in the National Registry of Biobanks (RD17 / 16/2011) with the number

92 B.0000264 and holds an ISO 9001: 2015 certification endorsing our granting of  
93 safety and traceability of any human biological sample we distribute, always  
94 behaving Spanish and European rules on human samples and data protection  
95 management.

96 The starting hypothesis is the existence of a certain number of asymptomatic  
97 carriers of the SARS-CoV-2 virus that would develop antibodies against the new  
98 coronavirus <sup>6</sup> (and subsequently contribute to herd immunity). There are recently  
99 described early cases in France <sup>7</sup>, arising the question of whether the pathogen  
100 could have been circulating even before the official recording of the first cases in  
101 Spain by January 31<sup>st</sup>, 2020.

102 The main aim of this study is to detect serum antibodies to determine what  
103 percentage of the population has had contact with the virus at different times and  
104 has therefore developed antibodies against it. A secondary goal is to establish  
105 whether sex, age, blood group or haematological abnormalities are related to  
106 recent past infection. This epidemiological features would make it possible to  
107 optimize hospital management of COVID19 cases, make a good forecast of  
108 resources for possible future outbreaks, and would facilitate decisions in the  
109 social sphere by reliably knowing the percentage of immunized patients.

## 110 **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

### 111 *Aim, design and setting of the study*

112 The aim of this study was to obtain, a reliable knowledge of asymptomatic  
113 COVID-19 cases and their immunological and haematological characteristics,  
114 seroprevalence, rate of positive donations and its temporal evolution along the  
115 first wave. So, a retrospective observational analysis was performed.

### 116 *Participants*

117 The study population comprised randomised samples from blood, plasma  
118 (excluding convalescent) and platelet donations from July 2019 to October 2020.  
119 A total of 12718 samples of 11444 donors over 18 years old were included.

### 120 *Data collection*

121

122 All haematological and demographical data were extracted from electronic  
123 medical records. The collection form included age, sex, blood group, and  
124 laboratory data.

125

### 126 *Laboratory data an analyses*

127

128 Major laboratory markers were extracted from medical records. Routine blood  
129 examinations included leukocyte (WBC), neutrophil, lymphocyte, platelet,  
130 monocyte, eosinophil and basophil counts (cells\*10<sup>3</sup>/μL) and their percentages.  
131 Serum biochemical tests recorded were immunoglobulins IgG, IgA and IgM  
132 (mg/dL). Haemoglobin (Hb), haematocrit (HCT) and corpuscular mean volume  
133 were analysed as well. An automated chemiluminescence double-antigen  
134 sandwich immunoassay for the in vitro semi quantitative detection of total  
135 antibodies to SARS-CoV-2 in human serum and plasma was performed. Target  
136 antigen of the immunoassay is a recombinant nucleocapsid (N) protein. Elecsys®  
137 Anti-SARS-CoV-2 detects antibodies correlating with virus-neutralizing ones and  
138 is therefore useful to help characterize the immune reaction to SARS-CoV-2 <sup>9,10</sup>.  
139 Immunoassay was validated by testing of 6 pairs of samples (plasma EDTA and

140 serum) from diagnosed PCR-positive, symptomatic cases infected by mid-April,  
141 that were previously reported positive by the CMV, and checked to be as well  
142 positive for IgG (Chemiluminiscence, N protein, Abbott Alinity S) and IgA (ELISA,  
143 S protein, Euroimmun) antiSARS-CoV-2 and another set of ten prepandemic  
144 samples therefore supposed to be negative. A 100% concordance was yielded by  
145 these validation assays. The cut-off was that recommended by manufacturer  
146 (OD>1 to report reactivity).

147

#### 148 *Statistical analysis*

149

150 Demographic and clinical characteristics of patients were expressed as their  
151 mean/median and standard deviation (SD) for continuous variables and  
152 frequency distributions are reported for categorical variables. Age was analysed  
153 both as continuous and categorical variable; in the latter case was recoded into 4  
154 groups: <30, 30-45, 45-60, 60-75 years old.

155 Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was performed on each continuous variable to contrast  
156 normality and only IgG and IgM followed normal distributions, therefore non-  
157 parametric Kruskal-Wallis test was performed to compare laboratory values. To  
158 contrast the Ho of independence within categorical variables, Pearson's Chi-  
159 square and Fisher's exact test were carried out.

160

#### 161 *Ethics approval*

162

163 This study was conducted according with national regulations, institutional  
164 policies and in the tenets of the Helsinki Declaration. This study was approved,  
165 with the Valladolid Health Area Drug Research Ethics Committee acting as the  
166 main committee, in a meeting held on June 11, 2020 with the reference number  
167 "BIO-2020-93".

168

#### 169 *Availability of data and materials*

170

171 Data collected for the study, including fully anonymized participant data, are  
172 available to others. Data available include fully anonymized participant data and  
173 data dictionary. Related documents are available from the date of publications  
174 henceforth: study protocol, statistical analysis, and approval of Ethical Board.  
175 These documents are available from the date of publications henceforth at email  
176 address [cmartinalo@saludcastillayleon.es](mailto:cmartinalo@saludcastillayleon.es). Data would be shared after approval  
177 of proposals by the Valladolid Este Ethical Committee.

178

#### 179 *Abbreviations.*

180 Immunoglobulin G (IgG); immunoglobulin A (IgA); immunoglobulin M (IgM);  
181 polymerase chain reaction (PCR); standard deviation (SD); interquartile range  
182 (IQR); White blood cells (WBC), haemoglobin (Hb), haematocrit (HCT), mean  
183 corpuscular volume (MCV).

184

185

186

## 187 **Results**

188 A total of 12718 donations (either whole blood, plasmapheresis or platelet  
189 apheresis) were tested for total anti SARS-CoV2 antibodies. Donors made up  
190 11444, 60.91% males, aged 18-75, average 46+/-13, 45.8%A, 40.3% O,

191 10.56%B, 3.31%AB. 660 out of 9886 single donors were positive within weeks 11  
192 to 43, that makes a seroprevalence of 6.73% at the end of the first wave.

193 Donations collected since 19/07/2019 (week -24) to 19/10/2020 (week 43) were  
194 analysed

195 Seropositivity rate grew up from week 11 to week 21, reaching a 7.8% plateau,  
196 with just subtle changes until week 43 when 2<sup>nd</sup> wave arose in our country.  
197 Plateau was reached by the last week of May 2020, 11 weeks after close  
198 lockdown in Spain, that begun in March, 15<sup>th</sup> and 17 weeks after 31/01, the date  
199 of the first declared case. As can be seen in Figure 1, a pronounced slope can be  
200 appreciated from then to plateau at week 22.

201 Three donations yielded positive results along 2019 (July, September and  
202 October) but none of them were positive when testing separately IgG, IgA or IgM.  
203 Their OD were 1.05, 1.08 and 5.46 respectively. 1142 donations from year 2019  
204 were analysed.

205 No differences in anti SARS-CoV2 reactivity due to sex, age or blood group of  
206 donors were found (Table I)

207 Immunoglobulin levels didn't show any differences as comparing positive and  
208 negative donations but haemoglobin (14.9 vs 17.7 g/dL;  $p<0.05$ ) and haematocrit  
209 (45.2% vs 44.4%) were both significantly lower in positive donations  
210 (Supplementary Table I). WBC were slightly lower (7.5 vs 7.2 cells\*10<sup>3</sup>/μL;  
211  $p<0.02$ ).

212 As splitting data by sex, the fact arose that lower haemoglobin (46.8% vs 45.9%;  
213  $p<0.05$ ) and haematocrit (15.5 vs 15.3 g/dL;  $p<0.05$ ) were significantly different  
214 just in males and that positive females had significantly lower WBC (7.67 vs 7.25  
215 cells\*10<sup>3</sup>/μL) and neutrophil numbers (4.53 vs 4.27 cells\*10<sup>3</sup>/μL) and percent,  
216 and conversely, a higher lymphocyte percent as a trend (31.7% vs 33.10%;  
217  $p<0.2$ ) with significantly lower count (2.39 vs 2.35 cells\*10<sup>3</sup>/μL  $p<0.05$ ). A trend  
218 of lower platelet count in positive women was observed (261 vs 255  
219 cells\*10<sup>3</sup>/μL;  $p<0.02$ ) and monocyte (0.46 vs 0.44 cells\*10<sup>3</sup>/μL) and higher  
220 monocyte (0.4 vs 0.5 cells\*10<sup>3</sup>/μL). No other significant differences were found  
221 either in males, females or overall.

## 222 Discussion

223 A seroprevalence around 6.73% (7.8% of donations) was reached and sustained  
224 in our region regarding 18-75 years old population without COVID-19  
225 antecedents. This fact agrees with the seroprevalence study ENE-COVID19  
226 promoted by the *Instituto Nacional the Epidemiología*<sup>11</sup>, where is reported that a  
227 7.2% of the participants in our region would have anti SARS-CoV2 IgG antibodies  
228 by the end of June. It is to notice that almost ¼ people in our region (25.51%  
229 according to National Institute of Statistics, INE 2020 data) is older than 65 and  
230 are necessarily underrepresented in this study as it comprises blood donors. That  
231 happens as well with population under 18 (under 4.5%).

232 The first case in Spain was reported on 31/01/2020, but 3 positive donations  
233 were found as testing samples collected along 2019. That could be meaningful in  
234 two opposite ways: one possible explanation would be cross reactivity to  
235 seasonal cold coronaviruses and the other would be that SARS-COV-2 would  
236 have been circulating at least since 2019 summer.

237 Although the possibility of cross reactivity has been widely commented in mass  
238 media, little scientific literature can be found to date. It has been checked that  
239 long-term cross-reactive both T-cell and antibodies can be a correlate of  
240 protections against COVID-19<sup>8</sup>. It will be therefore important to determine the  
241 magnitude and prevalence of this correlates to accurately determine the  
242 immunization status of populations, the so named herd immunity.

243 There are as well reports about SARS-CoV-2 circulating in Europe along 2019.  
244 Italy's Ministry of Health reported high levels of "unusual" strains of flu and  
245 pneumonia concentrated in the area around Milan and appearing in 17 of Italy's  
246 20 regions<sup>12</sup>. Our three donors would be even earlier cases.

247 Conversely to clinical forms of COVID-19<sup>13</sup> neither age nor sex have an  
248 influence on the probability to develop an asymptomatic infection. Another  
249 seroprevalence reports from european countries support this feature<sup>14-18</sup>. It may  
250 be therefore ascertained that age and sex do not have a role in SARSCoV-2  
251 infection susceptibility, but only in their progression to severe forms.

252 Blood group has been reported elsewhere<sup>6, 19, 20</sup> to confere susceptibility or  
253 determine severity (most studies do not split these two concepts) to SARS-CoV2  
254 infection. Relationship with susceptibility is not supported by our data. We  
255 excluded convalescent plasma donors, opposite to other studies, that focused  
256 into these donors<sup>20</sup>. Perhaps blood group might be related only to clinical cases  
257 and therefore linked to severity but not related to asymptomatic infection. Another  
258 surface antigens such as HLA or KIR might be as well involved and should be  
259 studied.

260 Several blood count anomalies have been reported to be associated to SARS-  
261 CoV2 infection, notably lymphopenia and neutrophilia<sup>21</sup>. Conversely, our data  
262 reveal that asymptomatic positive women had a significant neutropenia and  
263 lymphocytosis as compared to negative ones. Perhaps this feature is a correlate  
264 of protection against clinical severity. Mortality in COVID-19 is associated to low  
265 haemoglobin<sup>22</sup>. In our series, haemoglobin and haematocrit were present just in  
266 positive males as compared to negative ones. A hampering in O2 transport due  
267 to hem- group<sup>23</sup> destruction has been reported to be responsible for that bad  
268 prognosis. It seems as if males were more labile to this damage after infection,  
269 being this effect visible even when no symptoms are present.

## 270 **Conclusions**

271 We can conclude that seroprevalence due to asymptomatic cases is equivalent to  
272 that of general population. Sex and age would not affect COVID-19 susceptibility  
273 but its severity. Gender differences are present even in asymptomatic individuals:  
274 females are possibly protected by relative lymphocytosis and neutropenia  
275 whereas males are would be weaker as seropositive men show a decrease of  
276 haematocrit and haemoglobin. Further studies are needed to confirm these  
277 gender differences not only in severe but as well in asymptomatic cases as they  
278 can help better understand COVID19 pathogenesis and prognosis.

279

## 280 **Acknowledgements**

281 The authors thank to all blood donors making this work possible by allowing  
282 research use of their samples by the Biobanco del Centro de Hemoterapia y

283 Hemodonación de Castilla y León. They also thank the staff in charge of blood  
284 donation, and lab technicians for their efforts and Roche for its support.

### 285 **Funding and resources**

286 This work has been carried out provided free equipment and test reagents from  
287 Roche Diagnostics International Ltd.

### 288 **Authors' contributions**

289 LB and MCM conceived the idea for this study, designed the protocol, analysed  
290 the data and drafted the manuscript. IP, AJ and MIGF were in charge of  
291 laboratory data. All authors provided critical revisions and approved the final  
292 version of the manuscript.

### 293 **Disclosure of conflicts of interest**

294 Authors stated no conflicts of interest although M Carmen Martin will speak about  
295 this issue in a sponsored symposium of Roche Diagnostics International Ltd.

296

297

298

### 299 **References**

300

- 301 1. Busch MP, Stone M. Serosurveillance for Severe Acute Respiratory  
302 Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) Incidence Using Global Blood  
303 Donor Populations. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2020;**72(2)**:254-256
- 304 2. Speletas M, Kyritsi MA, Vontas A, et al. Evaluation of Two  
305 Chemiluminescent and Three ELISA Immunoassays for the Detection of  
306 SARS-CoV-2 IgG Antibodies: Implications for Disease Diagnosis and  
307 Patients' Management. *Front Immunol*. 2020;**11**:609242
- 308 3. Angulo FJ, Finelli L, Swerdlow DL. Estimation of US SARS-CoV-2 Infections,  
309 Symptomatic Infections, Hospitalizations, and Deaths Using  
310 Seroprevalence Surveys. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2021;**4(1)**:e2033706
- 311 4. Friston K, Costello A, Pillay D. 'Dark matter', second waves and  
312 epidemiological modelling. *BMJ Glob Health*. 2020;**5(12)**:e003978
- 313 5. Netea MG, van der Meer JW, van Crevel R. BCG vaccination in health care  
314 providers and the protection against COVID-19. *J Clin Invest*.  
315 2021;**131(2)**:e145545
- 316 6. Gallais F, Velay A, Nazon C, Wendling MJ, Partisani M, Sibia J, Candon S,  
317 Fafi-Kremer S. Intrafamilial Exposure to SARS-CoV-2 Associated with  
318 Cellular Immune Response without Seroconversion, France. *Emerg Infect*  
319 *Dis*. 2021;**27(1)**:113–21

- 320 7. Gallian P, Pastorino B, Morel P, Chiaroni J, Ninove L, de Lamballerie X.  
321 Lower prevalence of antibodies neutralizing SARS-CoV-2 in group O  
322 French blood donors. *Antiviral Res.* 2020;181:104880
- 323 8. Poonia B, Kottlilil S. Immune Correlates of COVID-19 Control. *Front*  
324 *Immunol.* 2020;11:569611
- 325 9. Kohmer N, Westhaus S, Rühl C, Ciesek S, Rabenau HF. Brief clinical  
326 evaluation of six high-throughput SARS-CoV-2 IgG antibody assays. *J Clin*  
327 *Virol.* 2020;129:104480
- 328 10. Müller L, Ostermann PN, Walker A, et al. Sensitivity of anti-SARS-CoV-2  
329 serological assays in a high-prevalence setting [published online ahead of  
330 print, 2021 Feb 3]. *Eur J Clin Microbiol Infect Dis.* 2021;1-9
- 331 11. Pastor-Barriuso R, Pérez-Gómez B, Hernán MA, et al. Infection fatality risk  
332 for SARS-CoV-2 in community dwelling population of Spain: nationwide  
333 seroepidemiological study. *BMJ.* 2020;371:m4509.  
334
- 335 12. Murtas R, Decarli A, Russo AG. Trend of pneumonia diagnosis in  
336 emergency departments as a COVID-19 surveillance system: a time series  
337 study. *BMJ Open.* 2021;11(2):e044388.
- 338 13. Jurado A, Martín MC, Abad-Molina C, et al. COVID-19: age, Interleukin-6, C-  
339 reactive protein, and lymphocytes as key clues from a multicentre retrospective  
340 study. *Immun Ageing.* 2020;17:22  
341
- 342 14. Dickson E, Palmateer NE, Murray J, et al. Enhanced surveillance of COVID-  
343 19 in Scotland: population-based seroprevalence surveillance for SARS-  
344 CoV-2 during the first wave of the epidemic. *Public Health.* 2021;190:132-  
345 134
- 346 15. Hallal PC, Hartwig FP, Horta BL, et al. SARS-CoV-2 antibody prevalence in  
347 Brazil: results from two successive nationwide serological household  
348 surveys. *Lancet Glob Health.* 2020;8(11):e1390-e1398.
- 349 16. Bogogiannidou Z, Vontas A, Dadouli K, et al. Repeated leftover serosurvey  
350 of SARS-CoV-2 IgG antibodies, Greece, March and April 2020. *Euro*  
351 *Surveill.* 2020;25(31):2001369
- 352 17. Biggs HM, Harris JB, Breakwell L, et al. Estimated Community  
353 Seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2 Antibodies - Two Georgia Counties, April  
354 28-May 3, 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep.* 2020;69(29):965-970
- 355 18. Stringhini S, Wisniak A, Piumatti G, et al. Seroprevalence of anti-SARS-  
356 CoV-2 IgG antibodies in Geneva, Switzerland (SEROCoV-POP): a  
357 population-based study. *Lancet.* 2020;396(10247):313-319
- 358 19. Pendu JL, Breiman A, Rocher J, Dion M, Ruvoën-Clouet N. ABO Blood  
359 Types and COVID-19: Spurious, Anecdotal, or Truly Important  
360 Relationships? A Reasoned Review of Available Data. *Viruses.*  
361 2021;13(2):160

- 362 20. Muñiz-Diaz E, Llopis J, Parra R, et al. Relationship between the ABO blood  
363 group and COVID-19 susceptibility, severity and mortality in two cohorts  
364 of patients. *Blood Transfus.* 2021;**19**(1):54-63
- 365
- 366 21. Agbuduwe C, Basu S. Haematological manifestations of COVID-19: From  
367 cytopenia to coagulopathy. *Eur J Haematol.* 2020;**105**(5):540-546
- 368 22. Goud PT, Bai D, Abu-Soud HM. A Multiple-Hit Hypothesis Involving  
369 Reactive Oxygen Species and Myeloperoxidase Explains Clinical  
370 Deterioration and Fatality in COVID-19. *Int J Biol Sci.* 2021 Jan 1;**17**(1):62-  
371 72
- 372 23. Dattilo M. The role of host defences in Covid 19 and treatments  
373 thereof. *Mol Med.* 2020;**26**(1):90
- 374
- 375
- 376

377 **Tables**

378

	Negative		Positive	
	n	%	n	%
Female	4531	38,1%	164	40,3%
Male	7375	61,9%	243	59,7%
<30	3551	29,8%	104	25,6%
30 to 45	5036	42,3%	180	44,2%
45 to 60	1151	9,7%	42	10,3%
60 to 75	2168	18,2%	81	19,9%
A	5411	45,5%	198	48,6%
AB	423	3,6%	16	3,9%
B	919	7,7%	22	5,4%
O	5151	43,3%	171	42,0%

379 Table I. Sex, age range and blood group of positive/negative anti SARS-COV2 donations  
380 analysed

381

382

383

384

		n	mean	median	SD	IQR
Age	Negative	11906	44.0	45.8	12.8	34.2-54.2
	Positive	407	44.2	46.5	13.0	32.8-54.8
IgA	Negative	194	236.9	223.5	101.3	163-292
	Positive	5	224.4	274.0	92.3	134-282
IgG	Negative	194	1065.4	1037.5	217.4	910-1185
	Positive	5	1123.8	1095.0	249.9	924-1229
IgM	Negative	194	113.3	100.5	64.8	69-138
	Positive	5	103.0	89.0	41.7	78-97
WBC	Negative	11219	7.5	7.2	1.8	6.16-8.5
	Positive	386	7.2	7.1	1.6	6.15-8.22
Hb*	Negative	11218	14.9	14.9	1.3	14-15.8
	Positive	386	14.7	14.7	1.2	13.8-15.4
Hematocrite*	Negative	11218	45.1	45.2	3.5	42.7-47.6
	Positive	386	44.5	44.4	3.5	42.3-46.6
Platelets	Negative	11217	247.9	243.0	54.3	211-280
	Positive	386	247.3	242.5	55.7	206-276
Neutrophil count (t)	Negative	11217	4.4	4.3	1.4	3.44-5.19
	Positive	386	4.3	4.2	1.2	3.34-5.03
Neutrophil %	Negative	11217	58.8	58.9	7.5	53.8-63.9

Lymphocyte count	Positive	386	58.5	58.7	7.1	54.3-63.4
	Negative	11216	2.3	2.3	0.7	1.86-2.72
Lymphocyte %	Positive	386	2.3	2.2	0.6	1.89-2.64
	Negative	11216	31.7	31.5	6.9	27-36.2
Monocyte count	Positive	386	32.1	32.4	6.6	27.3-36.1
	Negative	11216	0.5	0.46	0.1	0.38-0.56
Monocyte %	Positive	386	0.5	0.46	0.1	0.37-0.54
	Negative	11216	6.5	6.4	1.5	5.5-7.4
Eosinophil count	Positive	386	6.5	6.4	1.4	5.5-7.3
	Negative	11217	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.09-0.23
Eosinophil %	Positive	386	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.09-0.22
	Negative	11217	2.5	2.1	1.8	1.3-3.2
Basophil count	Positive	386	2.4	2.0	1.7	1.3-3.1
	Negative	11217	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.02-0.04
Basophil %	Positive	386	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.02-0.04
	Negative	11217	0.5	0.5	0.2	0.3-0.6
	Positive	386	0.5	0.5	0.3	0.4-0.6

385 \*p<0.001

386 (t)p<0.2

387 Supplementary Table I. Descriptive analysis of age, immunoglobulins (mg/dL),

388 Hb(g/dL), MCV, hemogram counts (cells\*10<sup>3</sup>/μL) and percents, of reactive and non-

389 reactive donations

390

			n	mean	median	SD	IQR
Age	Female	Negative	4531	42.0	<b>43.50</b>	13.3	30.3-53.3
		Positive	164	42.1	<b>45.39</b>	13.6	28.6-53.1
	Male	Negative	7375	45.2	<b>46.81</b>	12.2	36.7-54.8
		Positive	243	45.7	<b>46.98</b>	12.5	35.5-55.9
IgA	Female	Negative	54	214.3	<b>200.00</b>	97.0	157-250
		Positive	3	235.3	<b>274.00</b>	105.5	116-316
	Male	Negative	140	245.6	<b>233.50</b>	101.9	176.5-302.5
		Positive	2	208.0	<b>208.00</b>	104.7	134-282
IgG	Female	Negative	54	1076.4	<b>1062.50</b>	191.3	964-1186
		Positive	3	1082.7	<b>1095.00</b>	152.9	924-1229
	Male	Negative	140	1061.2	<b>1029.00</b>	227.2	903-1181.5
		Positive	2	1185.5	<b>1185.50</b>	436.3	877-1494
IgM	Female	Negative	54	143.1	<b>129.50</b>	64.6	94-169
		Positive	3	114.3	<b>89.00</b>	53.7	78-176
	Male	Negative	140	101.8	<b>90.00</b>	61.3	64.5-121
		Positive	2	86.0	<b>86.00</b>	15.6	75-97
MCV	Female	Negative	3618	91.2	<b>91.50</b>	4.8	88.4-94.4
		Positive	142	91.2	<b>91.40</b>	4.1	88.9-93.5
	Male	Negative	6141	90.9	<b>91.00</b>	4.6	88.1-93.8

		Positive	204	90.6	<b>91.00</b>	4.8	88-94.1
WBC	Female*	Negative	4270	7.8	<b>7.67</b>	1.9	6.48-8.96
		Positive	157	7.5	<b>7.25</b>	1.5	6.28-8.57
	Male	Negative	6949	7.2	<b>7.02</b>	1.8	5.99-8.2
		Positive	229	7.1	<b>6.98</b>	1.6	6.01-8.03
Hb	Female	Negative	4269	13.8	<b>13.80</b>	0.9	13.2-14.4
		Positive	157	13.7	<b>13.80</b>	0.9	13.2-14.3
	Male*	Negative	6949	15.5	<b>15.50</b>	1.0	14.9-16.2
		Positive	229	15.3	<b>15.30</b>	1.0	14.7-15.8
HCT	Female	Negative	4269	42.4	<b>42.30</b>	2.7	40.6-44
		Positive	157	42.1	<b>42.00</b>	2.5	40.5-43.6
	Male*	Negative	6949	46.8	<b>46.80</b>	2.8	45-48.6
		Positive	229	46.2	<b>45.90</b>	3.0	44.3-47.7
PLT	Female	Negative	4268	265.9	<b>261.00</b>	56.6	228-300
		(t) Positive	157	261.0	<b>255.00</b>	60.5	219-296
	Male	Negative	6949	236.8	<b>233.00</b>	49.6	204-266
		Positive	229	237.9	<b>234.00</b>	50.2	203-266
Neutrophil count	Female*	Negative	4268	4.7	<b>4.53</b>	1.4	3.65-5.47
		Positive	157	4.4	<b>4.27</b>	1.2	3.56-5.08
	Male	Negative	6949	4.3	<b>4.10</b>	1.4	3.34-4.95
		Positive	229	4.2	<b>4.10</b>	1.2	3.24-4.97
Neutrophil %	Female	Negative	4268	59.2	<b>59.40</b>	7.4	54.2-64.3
		Positive	157	58.1	<b>58.10</b>	7.2	54-62.9
	Male	Negative	6949	58.6	<b>58.70</b>	7.5	53.6-63.6
		Positive	229	58.8	<b>58.70</b>	7.0	54.6-63.5
Lymphocyte count	Female*	Negative	4267	2.5	<b>2.39</b>	0.7	1.97-2.88
		Positive	157	2.4	<b>2.35</b>	0.6	2.02-2.81
	Male	Negative	6949	2.2	<b>2.18</b>	0.6	1.8-2.62
		Positive	229	2.2	<b>2.17</b>	0.6	1.8-2.51
Lymphocyte %	Female	Negative	4267	32.0	<b>31.70</b>	6.9	27.4-36.5
		(t) Positive	157	33.0	<b>33.10</b>	7.0	28.4-37
	Male	Negative	6949	31.5	<b>31.30</b>	6.9	26.8-36.1
		Positive	229	31.4	<b>31.70</b>	6.3	26.7-35.6
Monocyte count	Female	Negative	4267	0.5	<b>0.46</b>	0.1	0.37-0.55
		(t) Positive	157	0.5	<b>0.44</b>	0.1	0.36-0.52
	Male	Negative	6949	0.5	<b>0.46</b>	0.1	0.38-0.56
		Positive	229	0.5	<b>0.47</b>	0.1	0.38-0.55
Monocyte %	Female	Negative	4267	6.1	<b>6.00</b>	1.4	5.1-6.9
		Positive	157	6.1	<b>6.00</b>	1.4	5.2-6.9
	Male	Negative	6949	6.7	<b>6.60</b>	1.5	5.7-7.6
		Positive	229	6.7	<b>6.70</b>	1.4	5.8-7.6
Eosinophil	Female	Negative	4268	0.2	<b>0.14</b>	0.1	0.09-0.21

count		Positive	157	0.2	<b>0.13</b>	0.1	0.09-0.19
	Male	Negative	6949	0.2	<b>0.16</b>	0.1	0.1-0.24
		Positive	229	0.2	<b>0.15</b>	0.1	0.09-0.23
Eosinophil %	Female	Negative	4268	2.2	<b>1.80</b>	1.6	1.2-2.8
		Positive	157	2.3	<b>1.80</b>	1.7	1.1-2.8
	Male	Negative	6949	2.7	<b>2.20</b>	1.8	1.4-3.4
		Positive	229	2.5	<b>2.10</b>	1.7	1.4-3.2
Basophil count	Female	Negative	4268	0.0	<b>0.03</b>	0.0	0.02-0.05
		Positive	157	0.0	<b>0.04</b>	0.0	0.02-0.05
	Male	Negative	6949	0.0	<b>0.03</b>	0.0	0.02-0.04
		Positive	229	0.0	<b>0.03</b>	0.0	0.02-0.04
Basophil %	Female	Negative	4268	0.5	<b>0.40</b>	0.2	0.3-0.6
	(t)	Positive	157	0.5	<b>0.50</b>	0.3	0.3-0.6
	Male	Negative	6949	0.5	<b>0.50</b>	0.2	0.3-0.6
		Positive	229	0.5	<b>0.50</b>	0.2	0.4-0.6

391 \*p<0.001

392 (t)p<0.2

393 Supplementary Table II. Descriptive analysis of age, immunoglobulins (mg/dL),  
 394 Hb(g/dL), MCV, hemogram counts (cells\*10<sup>3</sup>/μL) and percents, of reactive and non-  
 395 reactive donations by sex

## 396 Figures

397 Figure 1. COVID-19 seropositive donation rate 2020 evolution by weeks. Temporal  
 398 series' model (mobile median t=6; exponential smoothing model R<sup>2</sup>=0.991;p<0.001)

399

