

1 **Homologous and heterologous antibodies to coronavirus 229E, NL63, OC43, HKU1,**
2 **SARS, MERS and SARS-CoV-2 antigens in an age stratified cross-sectional serosurvey in**
3 **a large tertiary hospital in The Netherlands**
4

5 Brenda M. Westerhuis^{1*}, Erwin de Bruin^{1*}, Felicity D. Chandler¹, Chris R. B. Ramakers¹,
6 Nisreen M.A. Okba¹, Wentao Li², Herman Goossens³, Menno D. de Jong⁴, Berend Jan Bosch²,
7 Bart L. Haagmans¹, Pieter L. A. Fraaij¹, Reina S. Sikkema¹, Marion P.G. Koopmans^{#1}
8

9 *Both authors contributed equally

10

- 11 1. Erasmus Medical Centre, Rotterdam
12 2. University of Utrecht, Utrecht
13 3. Antwerp University, Antwerp
14 4. Amsterdam Medical Centre, Amsterdam
15

16 # Corresponding author

17 Marion P.G. Koopmans

18 Wytemaweg 80

19 3015 CN Rotterdam

20 The Netherlands

21 m.koopmans@erasmusmc.nl
22

23

24 **Abstract**
25

26

27

28 Understanding the coronavirus (CoV) antibody landscape in relation to disease and
29 susceptibility is critical for modelling of steps in the next phase during the current covid-19
30 pandemic. In March 2020, during the first month of the epidemic in The Netherlands, we
31 performed cross sectional studies at two time points amongst patients of the Erasmus Medical
32 Centre in Rotterdam, to assess the presence of antibodies against seasonal human
33 coronaviruses (OC43, 229E, NL63, HKU1), emerging zoonotic coronaviruses (SARS, MERS)
34 and SARS-CoV-2 in nine different age groups. We observed minimal SARS-CoV-2 reactivity
35 early March (0.7% of sera), increasing to 3.0%, four weeks later, suggesting probably
36 undetected cases during this early phase of the epidemic. Antibody responses were mostly
37 coronavirus species specific at young age, but possible cross-reactivity between human
38 seasonal CoVs was observed with increasing age.

38

39 Dear editor,

40

41 Understanding the coronavirus (CoV) antibody landscape in relation to disease and
42 susceptibility is critical for modelling of steps in the next phase during the current covid-19
43 pandemic. In March 2020, during the first month of the epidemic in The Netherlands, we
44 performed cross sectional studies at two time points amongst patients of the Erasmus Medical
45 Centre in Rotterdam, to assess the presence of antibodies against seasonal human
46 coronaviruses (OC43, 229E, NL63, HKU1), emerging zoonotic coronaviruses (SARS, MERS)
47 and SARS-CoV-2 in nine different age groups. We observed minimal SARS-CoV-2 reactivity
48 early March (0.7% of sera), increasing to 3.0%, four weeks later, suggesting probably
49 undetected cases during this early phase of the epidemic. Antibody responses were mostly
50 coronavirus species specific at young age, but possible cross-reactivity between human
51 seasonal CoVs was observed with increasing age.

52

53 A total of 1608 left-over plasma samples from patients of nine age categories were tested in one
54 dilution, of which 879 were collected in early March 2020 (timepoint 1: T1), and 729 in early
55 April 2020 (timepoint 2: T2; table 1). All plasma samples were tested against 19 different
56 antigens from seven human coronaviruses (hCoVs) (OC43, 229E, NL63, HKU1, SARS, MERS
57 and SARS-CoV-2). Recombinant spike proteins of the S1 subunit (all coronavirus subtypes), S
58 ectodomain (all except 229E) and nucleocapsid proteins (OC43, 229E, NL63, HKU1, MERS and
59 SARS) were included. The SARS-1 nucleocapsid protein has been used in the SARS-CoV-2
60 specific analyses as described previously(1).

61

62 Positivity rates for each of the SARS-CoV-2 antigens were calculated according to the cut-offs
63 determined, based on 100% specificity (Table 1, Figure 1, Supplemental figure). SARS-CoV-2
64 specific antibodies (one dilution) were analyzed, for T1 and T2 separately. Despite the short

65 interval between both sampling moments, a clear rise in SARS-CoV-2 seropositivity was
66 observed. The prevalence of antibodies to any of the SARS-CoV-2 antigens increased from
67 0.7% (6/ 879) at T1 to 3.0% (22/729) at T2. When only taking into account plasma samples
68 testing positive for all three antigens, the prevalence was 0.1% (1/879) at T1 and 2.3% (17/729)
69 at T2. Most antibody positive sera were detected in age groups 40-60 and 60-80. None of the
70 children below five years of age were seropositive (Tabel 1).

71

72

73 In sera with SARS-CoV-2 responses, crossreactivity was shown against the SARS and MERS
74 antigens (Figure 2). The majority of antibodies binding to antigens from seasonal human
75 coronaviruses were present from an early age onwards in most plasma samples, although
76 differences in antibody responses were detected between coronaviruses and between antigens
77 from the same virus (Figure 2). The median fluorescence level of hCoV antibody reactivity was
78 lowest in 6-24 month old children and increased from age groups 2-5 years old to >20 years old,
79 depending on the antigen. For some antigens a slight decrease in binding antibodies was
80 observed in individuals above 80 years old.

81

82 To determine how reactivity of the different seasonal hCoV antibody titers correlate with
83 (multiple) infections during lifetime, endpoint titers were calculated for all hCoV antigens for age
84 groups 0-2y (n=36 samples), 2-10y (n=38), 10-40y (n=37), 40+ (n=58) and 60+ (n=39). When
85 looking at all data combined, highest correlations were observed between S1 and the S
86 ectodomain from the same virus, and within alpha and beta coronaviruses, respectively. When
87 breaking the groups down in age groups, mainly strain specific signals were observed in the
88 lowest age group, with broadening of the correlation of antibody titers within the alpha and the
89 betacoronaviruses between the ages of 2 and 40 years, and further broadening of responses
90 between alpha and betacoronaviruses in individuals of 60 years and older (Figure 3).

91
92 Serological assays have been shown to be of great value in population surveys of viral
93 infections additional to virus detection assays. In this study we used a multiplex serological
94 protein microarray to detect possible infections of SARS-CoV-2 early in the epidemic among the
95 general population, including children and adolescents, as well as age stratified serological
96 responses against a broad range of other CoV strains. The seropositivity at 4 weeks after
97 confirmation of the first cases of SARS-CoV-2 in our study population revealed early, probably
98 undetected, cases during this period, confirming the importance of adding serosurveys to
99 assess the extent of spread of COVID-19. The highest seroprevalence was detected in the
100 group 40 years and older.

101
102 Our data are in agreement with results of screening among human blood donors between 1-15
103 April, showing an average seroprevalence of 2.7% country wide, up to 9.5% in the hardest-hit
104 areas (2). Worldwide most early seroprevalence studies showed similar numbers ranging from
105 0.4 – 14% (3), although seroprevalence can be considerably higher among outbreak settings (4,
106 5). Results of serological testing in a low prevalence situation need to be interpreted with
107 caution, as low-level cross-reactivity has been observed for most currently available assays (6).
108 A good practice can be to use combined assay results, counting only samples that had antibody
109 reactivity to two or three of the SARS-CoV-2 antigens as positives(7). By using this criterion,
110 and the high stringency cut-off defined by ROC analysis including serum samples from persons
111 with recent seasonal coronavirus infections, we trust that our estimates are robust.

112
113 The use of leftover specimens across age ranges does provide a broader picture of community
114 circulation than can be obtained with blood donors. The lack of SARS-CoV-2 antibody positive
115 children below five years of age may be explained by lower infection rates or susceptibility in
116 younger age groups, a lower proportion of severe cases, or both (8-10). We therefore were

117 interested to assess whether the lack of SARS-CoV-2 infections was potentially related to
118 immunity from other coronavirus infections.

119
120 The four endemic hCoVs (229E, NL63, OC43, and HKU) account for about 10% of all upper
121 respiratory tract infections in adults (11, 12), but most CoV cases among healthcare seeking
122 individuals with respiratory symptoms are detected in children <5 years old and elderly >64. In a
123 limited number of clinical case series in Europe, OC43 and NL63 were most commonly
124 detected, while HKU1 and 229E appear more infrequently or even in a temporal pattern (11, 13,
125 14). In our study, the prevalence and the magnitude of antibody positive signals increased from
126 two years of age, although at a different rate for the different viruses. The antibodies were
127 mostly specific for the different human CoVs in the younger age group, with limited correlation
128 between signals for antigens from different human seasonal coronaviruses belonging to the
129 same genera. Therefore, we find no evidence for presence of cross-reactive antibodies as an
130 explanation for the seemingly lower rate of SARS-CoV-2 infections in children.

131
132 This pattern changed with increasing age, with increasing correlation between antibody signals
133 for viruses within the same hCoV in adults, and even across hCoVs in older individuals. Cross
134 reactivity of antibodies between seasonal coronaviruses and SARS have been described in the
135 past. During an OC43 outbreak in British Columbia in 2003, cross-reactive antibodies to the
136 SARS-CoV nucleocapsid protein have been shown (15) and a recent study showed very limited
137 cross-reactivity with the SARS-CoV-2 ectodomain and S2 antigens in a naïve population, but
138 not with the other SARS-CoV antigens (RBD, S1 and NP) (16). Our assay cut-off was set for
139 high specificity of the SARS-CoV-2 measurements and therefore low-level binding would not be
140 detected. However, we did observe cross-reactive antibodies to MERS-CoV S ectodomain and
141 nucleocapsid antigens, without detectable responses to SARS-CoV-2, especially with increasing
142 age. The possible broadening of anti S1 and S ectodomain antibodies with increasing age

143 raises questions about the functionality of cross-reactive antibodies, although cross reaction
144 with SARS-CoV-2 was not detected.

145
146 The methods we used have inherent disadvantages. In agreement with the general data
147 protection regulation samples were collected in an anonymous manner, and as a consequence
148 patients may have been included more than once. In addition, while the use of leftover serum
149 collections is a proven method for fast deployment of sero-surveys, the study was hampered by
150 the fact that during the first wave of the COVID-19 pandemic non-essential hospital visits were
151 downscaled and individuals with mild respiratory disease strongly discouraged to visit health
152 care providers. This especially affected hospital visits in the pediatric population as also
153 reflected in our study with low numbers of serum samples for the pediatric population obtained
154 on time point 2. It may therefore be that individuals with mild symptoms avoided the hospital and
155 thus our study may underestimate the true sero-incidence in catchment area.

156
157 Nonetheless, we present an overview of the coronavirus antibody landscape in persons across
158 all age groups, and show specific responses to SARS-CoV-2 in the same multiplex assay
159 format. The presence of possible cross-hCoV and cross-subgroup binding antibodies with
160 increasing age warrants further study in relation to disease outcomes.

161

162 **Material and Methods**

163

164 *Plasma sample collection*

165 This protocol was based on the principle employed during the influenza A/H1N1 2009 pandemic
166 by Public Health England as a pragmatic approach to gathering essential baseline data for
167 population exposure assessment during a rapidly evolving epidemic (17). Leftover lithium-
168 heparin plasma samples submitted for general 24/7 clinical chemistry analyses at the Erasmus

169 medical center were collected. Samples from patients in which a SARS-CoV-2 PCR was
170 performed were excluded regardless of the result. Collection of plasma samples was done over
171 a 5 days period at 2 time points, March 2nd and April 3rd. To allow for additional or repeat
172 testing of archived samples if required clinically, left-over samples were retrieved after 4 to 7
173 days of cold storage (4C). The majority of samples from the children's cohort (<18 years) were
174 collected through finger or heel stick (capillary blood). The vast majority of blood from the adult
175 age cohorts were collected via venepuncture (venous blood). Only information regarding the
176 age was collected from the sera, covering nine age groups (Table 1). The study was approved
177 by the institutions medical ethical board and informed consent was waived as data were
178 collected anonymized (MEC-2020-0158).

179
180 For assay validation, a panel of 60 serum samples from patients with confirmed seasonal
181 coronavirus infections (OC43, 229E, HKU1 or NL63), collected before the COVID-19 outbreak
182 were obtained from the MERMAIDS-ARI study. A panel of 56 sera from confirmed SARS-CoV-2
183 patients, collected at more than 10 days post onset of symptoms, were used as a positive
184 control group (by universitair ziekenhuis Antwerp) (11). Positive control serum was made from a
185 pool of confirmed positive COVID-19 patients.

186
187 *Laboratory procedures*

188 All sera were tested against 19 different antigens from 7 different coronaviruses known to have
189 infected humans in the past (OC43, 229E, NL63, HKU1, SARS, MERS and SARS-CoV-2).
190 Recombinant spike proteins of the S1 subunit (all coronavirus subtypes) or the S ectodomain
191 (all except 229E) were expressed in HEK293 cells as described before (1, 18). Nucleocapsid
192 proteins produced in Escherichia coli (for OC43, 229E, NL63 and HKU1; Medix Biochemica,
193 Finland) or produced in baculovirus and insect cells (MERS and SARS; Sino biological, China)
194 were commercially obtained.

195

196 Recombinant proteins were printed using a non-contact printer (sciFlexarrayer SX, Scienion,
197 Germany) on glass microscope slides coated with 64 pads of nitrocellulose creating 64 protein
198 arrays per slide which were used to measure binding antibodies present in serum, as described
199 before (19). Briefly, serum was diluted 1 in 20 in Blotto blocking buffer (Thermo Fisher Scientific
200 Inc., Rockford, USA) containing 0,1 percent Surfact Amps (Thermo Fisher Scientific Inc.) and
201 used in one dilution. In addition, 18-20 randomly selected serum samples per age group were
202 tested in six dilutions to obtain full antibody titers to allow correlation plots. For this, randomly
203 selected serum samples were titrated in 4-fold serum dilution steps? ranging from 1 in 20 to
204 20480. Titer values were calculated by curve fitting using variable slope, minimal fluorescence
205 of 1000 and maximum fluorescence of 65535, as done before using Graphpad Prism (9). After
206 serum incubation and washing, slides were incubated with goat anti human IgG (Fab-specific)
207 conjugated to Alexa Fluor 647 (Jackson ImmunoResearch Laboratories Inc., West Grove, USA)
208 1 in 1000 diluted in Blotto blocking buffer containing 0,1 percent Surfact Amps. Single spot
209 median fluorescent signals using per spot background correction were measured using a
210 Powerscanner (Tecan Group Ltd, Mannedorf, Switzerland).

211

212 **Analysis**

213

214 Fluorescent cut-offs to determine positivity at a 1 in 20 serum dilution were determined, using
215 the validation panels of seasonal CoV (negative group) and SARS-CoV-2 patients (positive
216 group), by ROC-curves at which 100 percent specificity was chosen for high predictive value of
217 positive signals, using Graphpad Prism (GraphPad software, version 5.01, San Diego, USA).
218 Figures were made using Graphpad Prism (version 5.01) Correlation plots were made based on
219 the fully titrated samples. Pearson correlation heatmaps were made using the pheatmap
220 package using R Studio.

221

222 **Author Contributions**

223 BW, EdB, RS and MK wrote the manuscript and executed the analyses, FC executed the
224 laboratory analyses, CR, PF, MdJ, and HG were involved in the sampling design and sample
225 collection, EdB, NO, BJB, WL, BH and MK were involved in assay design and validation, all
226 authors read and contributed to the final manuscript.

227

228 **Competing Interests statement**

229 The authors declare no competing interests

230

231 **References**

232

233 1. Okba NMA, Müller MA, Li W, Wang C, GeurtsvanKessel CH, Corman VM, et al. Severe
234 Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2-Specific Antibody Responses in Coronavirus
235 Disease 2019 Patients. *Emerg Infect Dis.* 2020;26(7).

236 2. Slot E, Hogema BM, Reusken CBEM, Reimerink JH, Molier M, Karregat JHM, et al.
237 Herd immunity is not a realistic exit strategy during a COVID-19 outbreak. 2020.

238 3. Bobrovitz N, Arora RK, Yan T, Rahim H, Duarte N, Boucher E, et al. Lessons from a
239 rapid systematic review of early SARS-CoV-2 serosurveys. medRxiv.

240 2020:2020.05.10.20097451.

241 4. Fontanet A, Tondeur L, Madec Y, Grant R, Besombes C, Jolly N, et al. Cluster of
242 COVID-19 in northern France: A retrospective closed cohort study. medRxiv.

243 2020:2020.04.18.20071134.

244 5. Houlihan C, Vora N, Byrne T, Lewer D, Heaney J, Moore DA, et al. SARS-CoV-2 virus
245 and antibodies in front-line Health Care Workers in an acute hospital in London: preliminary

246 results from a longitudinal study. medRxiv. 2020:2020.06.08.20120584.

- 247 6. GeurtsvanKessel CH, Okba NMA, Igloi Z, Bogers S, Embregts CWE, Laksono BM, et al.
248 An evaluation of COVID-19 serological assays informs future diagnostics and exposure
249 assessment. *Nature Communications*. 2020;11(1):3436.
- 250 7. den Hartog G, Schepp RM, Kuijper M, GeurtsvanKessel C, van Beek J, Rots N, et al.
251 SARS-CoV-2-specific antibody detection for sero-epidemiology: a multiplex analysis approach
252 accounting for accurate seroprevalence. *medRxiv*. 2020:2020.06.18.20133660.
- 253 8. Davies NG, Klepac P, Liu Y, Prem K, Jit M, Pearson CAB, et al. Age-dependent effects
254 in the transmission and control of COVID-19 epidemics. *Nature Medicine*. 2020.
- 255 9. Lu X, Zhang L, Du H, Zhang J, Li YY, Qu J, et al. SARS-CoV-2 Infection in Children. *N*
256 *Engl J Med*. 2020;382(17):1663-5.
- 257 10. Wu Z, McGoogan JM. Characteristics of and Important Lessons From the Coronavirus
258 Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Outbreak in China: Summary of a Report of 72 314 Cases From the
259 Chinese Center for Disease Control and Prevention. *Jama*. 2020.
- 260 11. Nickbakhsh S, Ho A, Marques DFP, McMenemy J, Gunson RN, Murcia PR.
261 Epidemiology of Seasonal Coronaviruses: Establishing the Context for the Emergence of
262 Coronavirus Disease 2019. *J Infect Dis*. 2020;222(1):17-25.
- 263 12. Paules CI, Marston HD, Fauci AS. Coronavirus Infections—More Than Just the
264 Common Cold. *Jama*. 2020;323(8):707-8.
- 265 13. Heimdal I, Moe N, Krokstad S, Christensen A, Skanke LH, Nordbø SA, et al. Human
266 Coronavirus in Hospitalized Children With Respiratory Tract Infections: A 9-Year Population-
267 Based Study From Norway. *J Infect Dis*. 2019;219(8):1198-206.
- 268 14. Dijkman R, Jebbink MF, Gaunt E, Rossen JWA, Templeton KE, Kuijpers TW, et al. The
269 dominance of human coronavirus OC43 and NL63 infections in infants. *Journal of Clinical*
270 *Virology*. 2012;53(2):135-9.

- 271 15. Patrick DM, Petric M, Skowronski DM, Guasparini R, Booth TF, Krajden M, et al. An
272 Outbreak of Human Coronavirus OC43 Infection and Serological Cross-reactivity with SARS
273 Coronavirus. *Can J Infect Dis Med Microbiol.* 2006;17(6):330-6.
- 274 16. de Assis RR, Jain A, Nakajima R, Jasinskas A, Felgner J, Obiero JM, et al. Analysis of
275 SARS-CoV-2 Antibodies in COVID-19 Convalescent Blood using a Coronavirus Antigen
276 Microarray. *bioRxiv.* 2020:2020.04.15.043364.
- 277 17. Miller E, Hoschler K, Hardelid P, Stanford E, Andrews N, Zambon M. Incidence of 2009
278 pandemic influenza A H1N1 infection in England: a cross-sectional serological study. *Lancet.*
279 2010;375(9720):1100-8.
- 280 18. Wang C, Li W, Drabek D, Okba NMA, van Haperen R, Osterhaus A, et al. A human
281 monoclonal antibody blocking SARS-CoV-2 infection. *Nat Commun.* 2020;11(1):2251.
- 282 19. Reusken CB, Haagmans BL, Muller MA, Gutierrez C, Godeke GJ, Meyer B, et al. Middle
283 East respiratory syndrome coronavirus neutralising serum antibodies in dromedary camels: a
284 comparative serological study. *Lancet Infect Dis.* 2013;13(10):859-66.
- 285
286
287
288
289
290




Figure 1; Overview of all fluorescent signals detected, depicting fluorescence on the Y-axis, and SARS-CoV-2 antigens on the X-axis grouped on positivity profile, where; negative for all antigens (A), only positive for S1 (B, n=1), only positive for S-ecto (C, n=2), only positive for NP (D, n=6), positive for S1 and NP (E, n=1) and positive for all 3 SARS-CoV-2 antigens (F, n=18). Antigen specific cut-offs are depicted for S1 (horizontal line), S ecto (broken line) and NP (dotted line). Median values and interquartile range are depicted per group




Figure 2; Fluorescence signals against CoV antigens. Sera with fluorescence signals above the cutoff against SARS-CoV-2 S1 and S-ecto and SARS-CoV NP are indicated in red.




Figure 3; Pearson correlation heatmaps of binding antibody titers to HKU1, OC43, NL63 and 229E S1 and ectodomains

S1	timepoint 1			timepoint 2		
	total	positive	percentage	total	positive	percentage
6-12 months	41	0	0,0	17	0	0,0
1-2 years	75	0	0,0	14	0	0,0
2-5 years	42	0	0,0	24	0	0,0
5-10 years	96	1	1,0	34	0	0,0
10-20 years	131	0	0,0	139	1	0,7
20-40 years	131	0	0,0	140	3	2,1
40-60 years	134	1	0,7	140	5	3,6
60-80 years	124	0	0,0	139	7	5,0
80+ years	105	0	0,0	82	2	2,4
total	879	2	0,2	729	18	2,5
S ecto	timepoint 1			timepoint 2		
	total	positive	percentage	total	positive	percentage
6-12 months	41	0	0,0	17	0	0,0
1-2 years	75	0	0,0	14	0	0,0
2-5 years	42	0	0,0	24	0	0,0
5-10 years	96	0	0,0	34	0	0,0
10-20 years	131	0	0,0	139	1	0,7
20-40 years	131	0	0,0	140	3	2,1
40-60 years	134	2	1,5	140	5	3,6
60-80 years	124	0	0,0	139	7	5,0
80+ years	105	0	0,0	82	2	2,4
total	879	2	0,2	729	18	2,5
NP	timepoint 1			timepoint 2		
	total	positive	percentage	total	positive	percentage
6-12 months	41	0	0,0	17	0	0,0
1-2 years	75	0	0,0	14	0	0,0
2-5 years	42	0	0,0	24	0	0,0
5-10 years	96	0	0,0	34	0	0,0
10-20 years	131	0	0,0	139	1	0,7
20-40 years	131	1	0,8	140	4	2,9
40-60 years	134	1	0,7	140	5	3,6
60-80 years	124	2	1,6	139	9	6,5
80+ years	105	0	0,0	82	2	2,4
total	879	4	0,5	729	21	2,9
S1, Secto, NP	timepoint 1			timepoint 2		
	total	positive	percentage	total	positive	percentage
6-12 months	41		0,0	17		0,0
1-2 years	75		0,0	14		0,0
2-5 years	42		0,0	24		0,0

5-10 years	96		0,0	34		0,0
10-20 years	131		0,0	139	1	0,7
20-40 years	131		0,0	140	2	1,4
40-60 years	134	1	0,7	140	5	3,6
60-80 years	124		0,0	139	7	5,0
80+ years	105		0,0	82	2	2,4
total	879	1	0,1	729	17	2,3

Table 1. Seropositivity against SARS-CoV-2 antigens