

Severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) seroprevalence: Navigating the absence of a gold standard

Running Title: SARS-CoV-2 Seroprevalence in Canada

Sahar Saeed¹, Sheila F. O'Brien^{1,2}, Kento Abe^{3,4}, QiLong Yi^{1,2}, Bhavisha Rathod³, Jenny Wang³, Mahya Fazel-Zarandi³, Ashleigh Tuite⁵, David Fisman⁵, Heidi Wood⁶, Karen Colwill³, Anne-Claude Gingras^{3,4}, Steven Drews^{7,8}

¹Epidemiology and Surveillance, Canadian Blood Services, Ottawa, Canada

² School of Epidemiology and Public Health, University of Ottawa, Ottawa, Canada

³ Lunenfeld-Tanenbaum Research Institute at Mt. Sinai Hospital, Sinai Health System, Toronto, Canada

⁴ Department of Molecular Genetics, University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada

⁵ Dalla Lana School of Public Health, University of Toronto, Canada

⁶ National Microbiology Laboratory, Public Health Agency of Canada, Winnipeg, Canada

⁷ Microbiology Department, Canadian Blood Services, Ottawa, Canada

⁸ Department of Laboratory Medicine & Pathology, Division of Diagnostic and Applied Microbiology, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Canada

Keywords: SARS-CoV-2, seroprevalence, immunoassays, Bayesian Latent Class Analysis

Summary: Multiple anti-SARS-CoV-2 immunoassays are available, but no gold standard exists. We used four unique assays to estimate very low SARS-COV-2 seroprevalence during the first COVID-19 wave in Canada. Caution should be exercised when interpreting seroprevalence estimates from single assays.

Corresponding Author:

Sahar Saeed, MSc., PhD

Canadian Blood Services
1800 Alta Vista Dr.
Ottawa, ON, Canada K1G 4J5

sahar.saeed@blood.ca

514-945-0224

Fax: 613-731-1411

Alternative corresponding author:

Steven Drews, PhD FCCM D(ABMM)

Steven.drews@blood.ca

587-710-6166

ABSTRACT:

Background: Multiple anti-SARS-CoV-2 immunoassays are available, but no gold standard exists. We assessed four assays using various methodological approaches to estimate SARS-COV-2 seroprevalence during the first COVID-19 wave in Canada.

Methods: This serial cross-sectional study was conducted using plasma samples from healthy blood donors between April-September 2020. Qualitative assessment of SARS-CoV-2 IgG antibodies was based on four assays: Abbott Architect SARS-Cov-2 IgG assay (target nucleocapsid) (Abbott-NP) and three in-house IgG ELISA assays (target spike glycoprotein (Spike), spike receptor binding domain (RBD), and nucleocapsid (NP)). Seroprevalence was estimated using multiple composite reference standards (CRS) and by a series of Bayesian Latent Class Models (BLCM) (using uninformative, weakly, and informative priors).

Results: 8999 blood samples were tested. The Abbott-NP assay consistently estimated seroprevalence to be lower than the ELISA-based assays. Discordance between assays was common, 13 unique diagnostic phenotypes were observed. Only 32 samples (0.4%) were positive by all four assays. BLCM using uninformative priors predicted seroprevalence increased from 0.7% (95% credible interval (CrI); 0.4, 1.0%) in April/May to 0.8% (95% CrI 0.5, 1.2%) in June/July to 1.1% (95% CrI 0.7, 1.6) in August/September. Results from CRS were very similar to the BLCM. Assay characteristics varied considerably over time. Overall spike had the highest sensitivity (89.1% (95% CrI 79.2, 96.9%)), while the sensitivity of the Abbott-NP assay waned from 65.3% (95% CrI 43.6, 85.0%) in April/May to 45.9% (95% CrI 27.8, 65.6) by August/September.

Discussion: We found low SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence rates at the end of the first wave and estimates derived from single assays may be biased.

INTRODUCTION:

Worldwide, more than 155 million people have been diagnosed with coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19), as of May 7, 2021 [1]. Yet, this is likely an underestimation of the true burden of severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) given testing is primarily used to confirm suspected infection as opposed to broad surveillance. For example, in Canada, testing was only accessible early in the pandemic to people who had symptoms, were known contacts of a case or had a relevant travel history [2]. This meant community transmission by asymptomatic or mildly symptomatic individuals was likely underestimated. Determining the proportion of individuals with evidence of an immune response to SARS-CoV-2 can provide a more comprehensive assessment of prevalence to assist public health officials in making policy decisions. This prompted an urgent need for seroprevalence studies and accurate anti-SARS-CoV-2 immunoassays to detect the true burden of disease.

While multiple commercial and in-house immunoassays to detect anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibodies are available, to date no gold standard exists [3]. Furthermore, laboratorians have described multiple examples of discordance between assays [4]. Some of this variability is in part due to the assays which vary significantly by the isotype (i.e. IgA, IgM, IgG), viral antigens (i.e. spike or nucleocapsid protein and whether full-length or partial), and test performance (i.e. sensitivity/specificity). It is also known that anti-SARS-COV-2 antibodies wane over time which can further affect the sensitivity and specificity of the assays [5-7]. Additionally, biological differences between individuals can lead to different antibody profiles. Given these overlapping challenges of estimating seroprevalence, relying on a single assay (regardless which assay this may be) may bias results.

In the absence of a gold standard, using results from multiple assays may improve accuracy. However, which methods are appropriate for estimating SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence has not been defined. One method is to use a composite reference standard (CRS); a traditional approach used in clinical settings based on prespecified rules from orthogonal testing [8]. More recently, Bayesian Latent Class Analysis

(BLCA) has become more mainstream in diagnostic studies [9]. In contrast to CRS which classifies individuals as either positive or negative, BLCA uses a likelihood-based approach from multiple imperfect assays to estimate test characteristics and prevalence. Given the uncertainty of the assay performance, we evaluated multiple methodological approaches to estimate SARS-COV-2 seroprevalence during the first COVID-19 wave in Canada using four unique assays.

METHODS:

Study Design and Population Sampling– We conducted a serial cross-sectional study among blood donors in Canada between April and September 2020 (Prior to COVID-19 vaccine availability). Canadian Blood Services collects approximately 850,000 blood donations per year from a combination of fixed and mobile sites in all larger cities and most urban areas from all provinces in Canada except Quebec [10]. Blood donors (>17 years old) must meet numerous selection criteria to ensure that they are in good health and at low risk of infectious disease. Beginning in March 2020, donors were deferred for two weeks if they were diagnosed with SARS-CoV-2 infection or if they were in contact with a known case. Each month 1500 deidentified samples were randomly selected by collection site. Data on the collection site, birth year, sex and Forward Sortation Area (FSA) of the residential postal code for each donor were extracted. The Research Ethics Board of the Canadian Blood Services and Lunenfeld-Tanenbaum Research Institute (LTRI) (REB study #20-0194-E) approved this study and exempted study-specific consent.

SARS-CoV-2 antibody testing– Retention EDTA plasma samples were aliquoted and frozen at -20°C at the CBS laboratory in Ottawa. Each sample was tested for SARS-CoV-2 IgG antibodies using four assays. The Abbott Architect SARS-Cov-2 IgG assay which targets the nucleocapsid antigen (Abbott-NP), (Abbott, Chicago IL) and three in-house IgG ELISA chemiluminescent assays recognizing distinct recombinant viral antigens: full length spike glycoprotein (Spike), spike glycoprotein receptor binding domain (RBD), and nucleocapsid (NP), were tested at the CBS laboratory in Ottawa and the Gingras

laboratory [11,12] at the LTRI in Toronto, respectively. Table 1 summarizes each antibody assay by: platform, antigen targets and how reactivity was determined.

Analysis—We evaluated the correlation between the individual assays by kappa statistics. In the absence of a gold standard, we examined multiple approaches to estimate seroprevalence. First, seroprevalence was estimated by individual assays based on pre-defined thresholds (Table 1). Then we used a series of composite reference standards to identify a “true” positive if a sample was reactive by a combination of two or more assays. Finally, we evaluated seroprevalence a Bayesian latent class analysis.

Bayesian Latent Class Analysis (BLCA)- In this study the “latent” unobservable target was evidence of SARS-CoV-2 infection (based on IgG positivity). Instead of relying on one imperfect assay, this iterative model leverages the data from multiple imperfect assays to estimate the “true” prevalence and test characteristics [13,14]. Given any one of four assays could assign an individual to be positive or negative, there was a maximum of 16 (2^4), possible diagnostic phenotypes. For this model, we assumed each assay was independent of the others, conditional on the individual's unknown antibody status. This means that the probability of obtaining a given diagnostic phenotype depended on the probability that an individual had been truly infected with SARS-CoV-2 and on the outcome of each assay given the underlying exposure status. Briefly, we estimated parameters in a Bayesian framework using a Gibbs sampler to produce Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) simulations. We ran 50,000 iterations, with the first 5000 steps discarded as burn-in. Given the uncertainty of assay performance in a “healthy” population, we used uninformative priors (uniform distributions). As a sensitivity analysis, we did evaluate “informative priors” based on +/-5% assumed sensitivity and +/-1% assumed specificity [12]. We also evaluate the model using “weakly informative priors” (sensitivity (range of 60%-100%) and specificity (range of 90%-100%)), for each assay. We verified convergence of all MCMC chains. We reported posterior means and 95% credible intervals (CrI) for all estimated parameters overall and by two-month intervals using SAS (version 9.1, SAS Institute, Cary, NC).

RESULTS:

Between April and September 2020, a total of 8999 healthy blood samples were assessed for SARS-CoV-2 antibodies by four distinct assays. Most donors (96%) were between 20-69 years old, there were slightly more male donors (52%) compared to female donors (48%) and there was representation from all provinces across Canada except Quebec. Donor characteristics remained consistent over the study period (**Supplemental Table 1**).

Individual Assays- We evaluated seroprevalence rates over time by the individual assays (**Figure 1**). The Abbott-NP assay consistently remained lower than the ELISA-based assays. Seroprevalence based on the spike assay was 3.1% in May, dropped to 1.2% in July and then plateaued around 3%. Rates were lower and more stable by RBD that started at 0.8% and increased to 1.6% by September. In contrast the NP assay increased significantly from May (1.2%) until June (3.7%). The signal to cut off ratios remained relatively stable over time for all assays (**Supplemental Figure 1**). Overall, the kappa score was low (0.28 $p < 0.0001$) and the percent agreement was highest between Abbott-NP and RBD (99% agreement; kappa 0.43).

Orthogonal Approach- Given screening occurred in a low prevalence setting, to minimize false positive results, we assumed a true positive was more likely when two or more assays were positive. *A priori*, choosing two pre-specified assays resulted in a range of seroprevalence estimates that ranged from 0.2% to 0.5% in April to 0.4% to 1.4% in September (**Figure 2**). Any two assays (from four) resulted in a seroprevalence that increased significantly over time from 0.5% (95% CI 0.3%, 1.1%) in April to 1.3% (95% CI 0.8, 2.0) in September ($p=0.02$) (**Figure 2**).

Bayesian Latent Class Model- From 16 possible diagnostic phenotypes, 13 were observed among the 8999 sampled (Eight phenotypes had at least 10 observations). The most frequent profile was “all

negative” (95.0% (95% CI 94.6, 95.5) followed by only positive by the individual ELISA-based assays (Spike only (1.8%, 95%CI 1.5, 2.0) and NP only (1.7, 95%CI 1.5, 2.1). Only 32 samples were positive for all four assays (0.4, 95%CI 0.3, 0.5) (**Table 2**). Overall seroprevalence was estimated to be 0.8% (95% CrI 0.6, 1.0%); 0.8% (95% CrI 0.6, 1.0%); 0.8% (95% CrI 0.7, 0.9%) using informative, weakly informative and non-informative priors, respectively. **Figure 3** illustrates temporal trends in seroprevalence by BLCA comparing the different priors. The model with the non-informative prior consistently was higher than the other two models, but the difference was not statistically significant. Given the uncertainty of test characteristics, we compared the observed vs predicted values of the three BLCM and found the uninformative model identified the all negative phenotype most accurately.

The test characteristics (sensitivity and specificity) varied significantly by the different assays (**Table 3**). Overall, the ELISA based assays had higher sensitivity than the Abbott-NP. RBD had the highest specificity (99.5% (95% CrI 99.4, 99.7%)) and NP had the lowest specificity (98.2% (95% CrI 97.9, 98.4%)). Abbott-NP had a sensitivity of 51.6% (95% CrI 39.4, 64.2%) and a specificity of 99.8% (95% CrI 99.7, 99.9%). Negative predictive values of all assays were very high (ranging from 99.6% to 99.9%). The Abbott-NP had the highest positive predictive value at 67.9% (95% CrI 64.8, 70.4%) while the ELISA based assays that ranged from 24.2 to 60%. Test characteristics varied considerably over time as the first wave of the pandemic progressed (**Table 3**). Sensitivity Abbott-NP assay waned the most from 65.3% (95%CrI 43.6, 85.0) in April/May to 45.9% (95% CrI 27.8, 65.6). Similar trends were observed using informative and non-informative priors (**Supplemental Table 2 and 3**).

Figure 4 compares seroprevalence rates based on the three methods (>2 reactive assays, BLCA-non-informative priors) and compares to the Abbott-NP (a common commercial assay). The latent class model and orthogonal approach yielded almost identical results and there was no evidence of waning seroprevalence rates over time.

DISCUSSION:

In the absence of a gold standard, we evaluated multiple assays and methodological approaches to estimate SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence in healthy Canadian blood donors. Results from orthogonal approaches varied by how many assays were chosen a priori. Using either a latent class analysis or a composite reference standard of at least two positive assays (out of four) generated similar results. Regardless of the analytical method, SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence was very low (~1%) at the end of the first COVID-19 wave among a healthy population of blood donors. This may be due in part to early travel and social contact restrictions that were widely implemented in multiple Canadian jurisdictions.

Gaps in laboratory testing during the first wave, the significant proportion of asymptomatic or paucisymptomatic infections, as well as a continuing pandemic have prompted public health authorities in Canada to continue to invest in serological surveys to evaluate the true burden of SARS-CoV-2. Yet unique biological and epidemiological challenges exist when estimating seroprevalence, particularly in low prevalence settings. We recently conducted a scoping review and identified 33 seroprevalence studies among blood donors worldwide. From the 33 studies, 27 unique assay combinations were identified, more than half of studies used a single assay to determine prevalence and less than a third accounted for imperfect test performance [15]. Results from this study suggest relying on a single assay to determine prevalence in a low prevalence setting may significantly bias results.

The variability in the number of diagnostic phenotypes may be associated with the interindividual variability of the immune response. SARS-CoV-2 infects cells using a spike glycoprotein to bind to human angiotensin-converting enzyme 2 (ACE2) [16-18]. The receptor binding domain attached to spike mediates both viral binding and fusion events and all proteins are targets for neutralizing monoclonal antibodies [19,20]. Biologically, it is not clear why a person may differentially express antibodies against SARS-CoV-2, but among our sample, we found 13 distinct diagnostic phenotypes. The discordance between assays may also be a product of imperfect test characteristics. In this study, we used one

commercial assay for which the manufacture originally reported a sensitivity of 95.9% and specificity of 99.6%. Later real-world reports suggested the sensitivity was as low as 92.7% [21-26]. Results from this study suggest significantly lower sensitivity. While it is customary to assume that assay performance remains static, amid this dynamic pandemic, waning antibody signals may compromise correct classification of prior SARS-CoV-2 exposure. We have previously shown in a longitudinal study that the NP signal in the ELISA-based assay wanes faster than spike or RBD [12]. Consistent with previous reports, we found the nucleocapsid signal from the Abbott assay also wanes faster than spike or RBD [27,28]. This suggests that NP-based assays may be identifying more recent exposures.

It should be noted that waning antibody signals do not necessarily mean waning cellular mediated immunity. Indeed, recent studies suggest in the absence of detectable antibody signals there is evidence of neutralization associated with longer lasting immunity [29,30]. Therefore, without adjusting for waning antibody signals we may be underestimating SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence. At this point in time, it remains unknown what the true measures or correlates of immunity are in the Canadian population. The data presented here does not address whether some blood donors may have mounted a cellular immune response with an antibody response that waned by the time of serologic testing. We also note that the presence of antibodies does not imply that those antibodies are neutralizing; although we have assessed for spike and RBD antibodies, we have not attempted to understand the neutralizing capacity of these donor specimens against wild type strains of SARS-CoV-2 or emerging variants in Canada. In the next steps of our analysis we will be undertaking studies to understand the neutralizing capacity of these donor specimens to SARS-CoV-2.

Our study has several strengths. First this study is nested within a large national seroprevalence survey which to date has tested >179,000 samples using the Abbott-NP assay since the beginning of the pandemic in Canada. While we tested only a fraction of the samples, seroprevalence rates (based on Abbott-NP) were very similar, illustrating the generalizability of our results nationally [31]. Given the

uncertainty around the assay characteristics specifically among an asymptomatic population, we used multiple methodological approaches to estimate seroprevalence and report all findings. One of the strengths of the BLCA is the ability to estimate assay performance. Given limited resources, it may not be feasible to evaluate seroprevalence using four unique assays. However, smaller nested studies with more comprehensive antibody data within larger surveys can be used to correct for measurement errors. For example, we used the sensitivity and specificity of the BCLA from this study to adjust for national seroprevalence estimates recently published between May-July 2020 [31]. We reported seroprevalence was 0.74% (95%CI 0.68, 0.80), but after reanalyzing the data with updated sensitivity/specificity, based on the BLCM with non-informative priors, we found that the corrected seroprevalence was 47% higher at 1.03% (95% CI 0.91, 1.14%). As the pandemic continues, the proportion of recent and older infections will continue to vary over time and having an ability to correct these time varying assay characteristics will become even more important.

Our study also has weaknesses. This study was conducted among blood donors, based on selection criteria to be allowed to donate blood donors may be healthy than the general population [32]. However, a recent study compared seroprevalence estimates from European blood donors to household surveys targeting the general population and found seroprevalence rates to be very similar [33]. Both CRS and LCA assume each of the assays is conditionally independent. It is possible this assumption may not hold, potentially biasing results. Assay performance is based on predefined thresholds. For the Abbott assay we used the manufacturer's ≥ 1.4 cut off, but recent reports do suggest reducing the threshold to >0.8 to increase sensitivity and to account for waning antibody signals. However, the sensitivity and specificity was not available by the manufacture for us to evaluate this alternative threshold. All four assays only probed for IgG meaning that we did not measure IgM and IgA, which may provide some neutralizing capacity in some individuals as anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgG titers begin to rise. In other donors, different profiles of anti-SARS-COV-2 IgM, IgA and IgG may also provide different profiles of humoral

protection. Finally, we did not assess for the SARS-CoV-2 neutralizing capacity of donor specimens nor the avidity of the IgG antibody responses in those donors.

In conclusion, regardless of the analytical method we found at the end of the first COVID-19 wave, SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence among a healthy population of Canadian blood donors was low (~1%) and the sensitivity of all the assays waned. This is supported by low rates of SARS-CoV-2 case detections reported nationally within this time-period [34]. These findings suggest significant limitations to using a single assay to estimate SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence in a low prevalence setting, such as healthy Canadian blood donors during the first wave of the COVID-19 pandemic. We recommend seroprevalence studies to use multiple assays on either their entire sample or at least a subset to estimate seroprevalence more accurately in the future.

Acknowledgements: We would like to thank Craig Jenkins, Valerie Conrod and Canadian Blood Services operations staff for their assistance with this project.

Source of funding: Canadian Institutes of Health Research and Alberta Innovates (VR2 172723), Krembil Foundation to the Sinai Health System Foundation. The robotics equipment used for the ELISA assays is housed in the Network Biology Collaborative Centre at the Lunenfeld-Tanenbaum Research Institute, a facility supported by Canada Foundation for Innovation funding, by the Ontarian Government and by Genome Canada and Ontario Genomics (OGI-139). Commercial Abbott Architect SARS-Cov-2 IgG assay kit costs were partially supported by Abbott Laboratories, Abbott Park, Illinois. Abbott analyzers used at Canadian Blood Services were provided by the COVID-19 Immunity task Force (CITF).

Conflict of Interest Statement: SJD has acted as a content expert for respiratory viruses for Johnson & Johnson (Janssen). The remaining authors have no conflicts of interest to disclose.

REFERENCES:

1. WHO Coronavirus (COVID-19) Dashboard | WHO Coronavirus (COVID-19) Dashboard with Vaccination Data. Available at: <https://covid19.who.int>. Accessed 7 May 2021.
2. Detsky AS, Bogoch II. COVID-19 in Canada: Experience and Response. *JAMA*, **2020**; 324(8):743-744.
3. Lisboa Bastos M, Tavaziva G, Abidi SK, *et al.* Diagnostic accuracy of serological tests for covid-19: systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMJ*, **2020**; Jul 1;370:m2516.
4. Ward M, Mullins KE, Pickett E, *et al.*, Performance of four automated SARS-CoV-2 serology assay platforms in a large cohort including susceptible COVID-19 negative and COVID-19 positive patients, *JALM*, **2021**, jfab014
5. Shioda K, Lau MSY, Kraay, ANM, *et al.*, Estimating the cumulative incidence of SARS-CoV-2 infection and the infection fatality ratio in light of waning antibodies, *Epidemiology*: April 2, **2021** [Epub]
6. Favresse J, Eucher C, Elsen M, *et al.* Persistence of Anti-SARS-CoV-2 Antibodies Depends on the Analytical Kit: A Report for Up to 10 Months after Infection. *Microorganisms*. **2021** Mar;9(3).
7. Chia WN, Zhu F, Ong SWX *et al.* Dynamics of SARS-CoV-2 neutralising antibody responses and duration of immunity: a longitudinal study. *Lancet Microbe*. March 23, **2021** [epub]
8. Pepe M: Incomplete data and imperfect reference tests. *The Statistical Evaluation of Medical Tests for Classification and Prediction*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press; **2003**:168-213.
9. van Smeden M, Naaktgeboren CA, Reitsma JB, Moons KJM, de Groot JAH. Latent Class Models in Diagnostic Studies When There is No Reference Standard--A Systematic Review. *Am J Epidemiol*, **2014**; Feb 15;179(4):423-31.
10. Canadian Blood Services. Available at: <https://www.blood.ca/en>. Accessed 7 May 2021.
11. Abe KT, Li Z, Samson R, *et al.* A simple protein-based surrogate neutralization assay for SARS-CoV-2. *JCI Insight*, **2020**; Oct 2;5(19):e142362.
12. Isho B, Abe KT, Zuo M, *et al.* Persistence of serum and saliva antibody responses to SARS-CoV-2 spike antigens in COVID-19 patients. *Sci Immunol*, **2020**; Oct 8;5(52):eabe5511.
13. Lewis FI, Torgerson PR. A tutorial in estimating the prevalence of disease in humans and animals in the absence of a gold standard diagnostic. *Emerg Themes Epidemiol*, **2012**; Dec 28;9(1):9.
14. Fisman DN, Greer AL, Brouhanski G, Drews SJ. Of gastro and the gold standard: evaluation and policy implications of norovirus test performance for outbreak detection. *J Transl Med*, **2009**; Mar 26;7:23.
15. Saeed S, Uzicanin S, Lewin A *et al.* Current Challenges of SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence studies among blood donors: A scoping review. *International Society of Blood Transfusion Conference*. 2021. Virtual Conference June 2-4, 2021.
16. Ou X, Liu Y, Lei X, *et al.* Characterization of spike glycoprotein of SARS-CoV-2 on virus entry and its immune cross-reactivity with SARS-CoV. *Nat Commun*, **2020**; 11:1620.
17. Yan R, Zhang Y, Li Y, Xia L, Guo Y, Zhou Q. Structural basis for the recognition of SARSCoV-2 by full-length human ACE2. *Science*, **2020**; 367:1444-1448.

18. Hoffmann M, Kleine-Weber H, Schroeder S, *et al.* SARS-CoV-2 Cell Entry Depends on ACE2 and TMPRSS2 and Is Blocked by a Clinically Proven Protease Inhibitor. *Cell*, **2020**; 181:271-280.
19. Coughlin M, Lou G, Martinez O, *et al.* Generation and characterization of human monoclonal neutralizing antibodies with distinct binding and sequence features against SARS coronavirus using Xenomouse. *Virology*, **2007**; 361:93-102.
20. Coughlin MM, Babcook J, Prabhakar BS. Human monoclonal antibodies to SARS coronavirus inhibit infection by different mechanisms. *Virology*, **2009**; 394:39-46.
21. Di GS, Ciccullo A, Posteraro B, Lombardi F, Borghetti A, Sanguinetti M. Still much to learn about the diagnostic role of SARS-CoV-2 antibody detection. *Clin Infect Dis*, **2020**; Nov 19;71(16):2299-2300.
22. Bryan A, Pepper G, Wenner MH, *et al.* Performance Characteristics of the Abbott Architect SARS-CoV-2 IgG Assay and Seroprevalence Testing in Idaho. *J Clin Microbiol*, **2020**; Jul 23;58(8):e00941-20.
23. Hachim A, Kavian N, Cohen CA, *et al.* ORF8 and ORF3b antibodies are accurate serological markers for early and late SARS-CoV-2 infection. *Nat Immunol*, **2020**; Oct;21(10):1293-1301.
24. SARS-COV-2 Immunoassays. Available at: <https://www.corelaboratory.abbott/us/en/offerings/segments/infectious-disease/sars-cov-2>. Accessed on 7 May 2021.
25. National SARS-CoV-2 Serology Assay Evaluation Group. Performance characteristics of five immunoassays for SARS-CoV-2: a head-to-head benchmark comparison. *Lancet Infect Dis*, **2020**; 20(12):1390–4000.
26. Tan SS, Saw S, Chew KL, *et al.* Head-to-head evaluation on diagnostic accuracies of six SARS-CoV-2 serological assays. *Pathology*, **2020**; Dec;52(7):770-777.
27. Bolotin S, Tran V, Osman S, *et al.*, SARS-CoV-2 Seroprevalence Survey Estimates Are Affected by Anti-Nucleocapsid Antibody Decline. *J Infect Dis*. **2021** Apr 23;223(8):1334-1338.
28. Buss LF, Prete CA, Abraham CMM, *et al.* Three-quarters attack rate of SARS-CoV-2 in the Brazilian Amazon during a largely unmitigated epidemic. *Science*, **2021**; Jan 15; 371(6526): 288-292
29. Cox RJ, Brokstad KA. Not just antibodies: B cells and T cells mediate immunity to COVID-19, *Nat Rev Immunol* **2020**; Aug 24; 20, 581-582.
30. Cohen KW, Linderman SL, Moodie Z, *et al.*, Longitudinal analysis shows durable and broad immune memory after SARS-CoV-2 infection with persisting antibody responses and memory B and T cells. medRxiv [Preprint]. 2021 Apr 27;2021.04.19.21255739.
31. Saeed S, Drews SJ, Pambrun C, *et al.* SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence among blood donors after the first COVID-19 wave in Canada. *Transfusion*, **2021**; Mar;61(3):862-872.
32. Atsma F, de Vegt F. The healthy donor effect: a matter of selection bias and confounding. *Transfusion*, **2011**; Sep;51(9):1883-5.

33. Grant R, Dub T, Andrianou X, Nohynek H, *et al.* SARS-CoV-2 population-based seroprevalence studies in Europe: a scoping review. *BMJ Open*. **2021** Apr 1;11(4):e045425.
34. Government of Canada COVID-19 daily epidemiology update. Available at: [COVID-19 daily epidemiology update - Canada.ca](#) Accessed 7 May 2021.

Table 1. Assay Characteristics

Assay	Assay platform	Capture Antigen (IgG)	Manufacture	Cut-offs (positive)	Cut-off reference*
Abbott-NP	Chemiluminescent microparticle immunoassay	Nucleocapsid	Abbott	≥ 1.40	Manufacture
Spike	Chemiluminescent ELISA	spike	Gingras Lab	≥ 0.190	3 SD + negative mean
RBD	Chemiluminescent ELISA	RBD	Gingras Lab	≥ 0.186	3 SD + negative mean
NP	Chemiluminescent ELISA	Nucleocapsid	Gingras Lab	≥ 0.396	3 SD + negative mean

*3 Standard deviations (SD) + negative mean is a standard approach to choosing cut-off thresholds for ELISA based assays. Briefly, the relative ratio values of the negative controls from 20-22 different tests were used. Ratios are transformed on the log₁₀-scale and then mean 3 SD determines the cutoff. Values are then exponentiated to identify cut off listed in the table.

Table 2. Diagnostic Phenotypes of anti-SARS-CoV-2 immunoassay results from 8999 samples tested

	In house ELISA				Observed	
	Abbott N=54	Spike N=228	RBD N=104	NP N=214	#	% (95% CI)
NONE	-	-	-	-	8557	95.0 (94.6, 95.5)
ALL	+	+	+	+	32	0.4 (0.3, 0.5)
All – Abbott	-	+	+	+	9	0.1 (0.1, 0.2)
NP Only	-	-	+	-	156	1.7 (1.5, 2.1)
RBD Only	-	-	-	+	39	0.4 (0.3, 0.6)
Spike Only	-	+	-	-	158	1.8 (1.5, 2.0)
Spike+RBD	-	+	+	-	15	0.2 (0.1, 0.3)
RBD+NP	-	-	+	+	7	0.1 (0.0, 0.3)
Abbott Only	+	-	-	-	17	0.2 (0.1, 0.3)
Spike+Abbott	+	+	-	-	2	0.0 (0.0, 0.1)
Spike+NP	-	+	-	+	9	0.1 (0.1, 0.2)
All –NP	+	+	+	-	2	0.0 (0.0, 0.1)
All-RBD	+	+	-	+	1	0.0 (0.0, 0.1)

Abbott- Architect SARS-Cov-2 IgG assay which targets the nucleocapsid antigen and three in-house IgG ELISA chemiluminescent assays recognizing distinct recombinant viral antigens: full length spike glycoprotein (Spike), spike glycoprotein receptor binding domain (RBD), and nucleocapsid (NP).

Table 3. Assay Characteristics overall and over time; based on the BLCM Posterior Means (95% Creditable Interval) (non-informative priors)

	Overall Prevalence: 0.80% (95%CrI 0.73, 0.87)				April/May 0.68% (0.57, 0.78)		June/July 0.82% (0.69, 0.93)		August/September 1.08% (0.91, 1.21)	
	Sensitivity	PPV	Specificity	NPV	Sensitivity	Specificity	Sensitivity	Specificity	Sensitivity	Specificity
Spike	89.1% (79.2, 96.9)	28.3% (25.9, 31.1)	98.2% (97.9, 98.4)	99.9% (99.9, 100.0)	92.2% (77.2, 99.4)	97.9% (97.4, 98.4)	82.5% (63.6, 96.3)	98.8% (98.4, 99.2)	81.9% (63.4, 96.2)	97.6% (97.0, 98.2)
RBD	86.3% (75.0, 95.3)	60.0% (54.8, 64.4)	99.5% (99.4, 99.7)	99.9% (99.8, 100.0)	84.2% (65.4, 96.7)	99.5% (99.2, 99.7)	82.7% (62.6, 97.3)	99.6% (99.3, 99.8)	78.5% (59.0, 93.9)	99.4% (99.0, 99.7)
NP	71.8% (60.1, 82.5)	24.2% (22.0, 26.6)	98.2% (97.9, 98.4)	99.8% (99.7, 99.8)	72.6% (51.3, 90.4)	99.5% (99.2, 99.7)	81.0% (62.3, 94.7)	97.3% (96.7, 97.9)	58.1% (39.3, 76.2)	97.6% (97.0, 98.2)
Abbott-NP	51.6% (39.4, 64.2)	67.9% (64.8, 70.4)	99.8% (99.7, 99.9)	99.6% (99.5, 99.7)	65.3% (43.6, 85.0)	99.7% (99.5, 99.9)	43.8% (24.8, 64.6)	99.7% (99.5, 99.9)	45.9% (27.8, 65.6)	99.9% (99.7, 100.0)

Abbott- Architect SARS-Cov-2 IgG assay which targets the nucleocapsid antigen and three in-house IgG ELISA chemiluminescent assays recognizing distinct recombinant viral antigens: full length spike glycoprotein (Spike), spike glycoprotein receptor binding domain (RBD), and nucleocapsid (NP)

Figure Legends:

Figure 1. Seroprevalence of the single assay by month over the first COVID-19 wave in Canada

Each line represents seroprevalence rates (summarized in table below) monthly between April and September 2020 (during the first COVID-19 Wave) based thresholds for each assay. Abbott Architect SARS-Cov-2 IgG assay (Abbott-NP) and three in-house IgG ELISA assays recognizing distinct recombinant viral antigens: full length spike glycoprotein (Spike), spike glycoprotein receptor binding domain (RBD), and nucleocapsid (NP).

Figure 2. Orthogonal analysis of multiple anti-SARS-CoV-2 immunoassays

Each line represents seroprevalence rates (summarized in table below) monthly between April and September 2020 (during the first COVID-19 Wave) based on predefined definitions. Since we are not comparing CRS, we did not include 95% CI for each data point (all overlapping). CRS based on a combination of reactive samples using: Abbott Architect SARS-Cov-2 IgG assay (Abbott-NP) and three in-house IgG ELISA assays recognizing distinct recombinant viral antigens: full length spike glycoprotein (Spike), spike glycoprotein receptor binding domain (RBD), and nucleocapsid (NP). Positivity based on “any two or more” was determined by a reactive sample from two or more assays)

Figure 3. Seroprevalence estimates by different BLCM (Informative, Weakly informative and Non-informative priors)

Each line represents seroprevalence rates (summarized in table below) derived from posterior means of three BLCMs (comparing informative, weakly informative and non-informative priors) bi-monthly between April and September 2020 (during the first COVID-19 Wave). Error bars represent 95% Credible Intervals.

Figure 4. Summary comparison of seroprevalence rates by analytical methods.

Each line represents seroprevalence rates (summarized in table below) derived from four analytical methods bi-monthly between April and September 2020 (during the first COVID-19 Wave). >2 proteins (positivity was determined by a reactive sample from two or more assays), BLCA-Bayesian latent class analysis with non-informative priors, results are posterior means and error bars are 95% CrI and Abbott-NP is a single commercial assay.

Figure 1. Seroprevalence of the single assay by month over the first COVID-19 wave in Canada




Figure 2. Orthogonal analysis of multiple anti-SARS-CoV-2 immunoassays




Figure 3. Seroprevalence estimates by different BLCM (Informative, Weakly informative and Non-informative priors)




Figure 4. Summary comparison of seroprevalence rates by analytical methods.

