

1 **Anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgM and IgG antibodies in health workers in Sergipe, Brazil**

2

3 Mônica Santos de Melo¹; Lysandro Pinto Borges²; Daniela Ragner Valadão de Souza¹; Aline
4 Fagundes Martins¹; José Melquiades de Rezende Neto³; Anderson Alves Ribeiro⁴; Aryanne
5 Araujo Santos², Grazielly Bispo da Invenção², Igor Leonardo Santos Matos², Kezia Alves dos
6 Santos², Nicolas Alessandro Alves Souza², Pâmela Chaves Borges²; Makson Gleydson Brito
7 de Oliveira^{5*}.

8

9 ¹Department of Education and Health, ³Department of Pharmacy, ⁵Department of Medicine.
10 Federal University of Sergipe, Lagarto, CEP 49400000, Sergipe, Brazil.

11 ²Department of Pharmacy. Federal University of Sergipe, São Cristóvão, CEP 49100000,
12 Sergipe, Brazil.

13 ⁴Federal University of the Southern Border, Erechim, Brazil.

14

15 *Corresponding author: Makson Gleydson Brito de Oliveira (PhD, Professor), Department of
16 Medicine, Federal University of Sergipe, Av. Governador Marcelo Déda, 13, CEP 49400-000
17 Lagarto, Sergipe, Brazil. Phone: 55 (79) 36322080. E-mail: makson_gbo@hotmail.com

18

19

Abstract

20 **Background:** The exponential growth of COVID-19 cases in Brazil is overloading health
21 systems with overcrowding of hospitals and overflowing intensive care units. Increasing
22 infection rates in health professionals can lead to the collapse of the health system and further
23 worsen the pandemic. The aim of this study was to evaluate the seroprevalence of IgM and
24 IgG for SARS-CoV-2 in health workers in Sergipe, Brazil.

25 **Methods:** The targeted tests involved health professionals working on the front line to combat
26 COVID-19. The samples were collected in the month of June, in six hospital units in the state
27 of Sergipe.

28 **Results:** 471 health professionals were tested. Of these, 28 workers (5.95%) tested positive
29 for IgM and 64 (13.59%) tested positive for IgG. 9 workers (1.91%) tested positive for IgM
30 and were also positive for IgG.

31 **Discussion:** Health workers must be monitored constantly, because if they are infected, they
32 can spread the virus to colleagues, hospitalized patients and even family members.

33 **Conclusion:** Knowing the prevalence of antibodies to the virus in health workers is an
34 important measure of viral spread control.

35 **Keywords:** SARS-CoV-2, COVID-19, Health workers, Immunofluorescence assays.

36

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

37

38 1. Introduction

39 The SARS-CoV-2 infection started in Wuhan, spread further in China and then spread
40 rapidly around the world, classified by the World Health Organization (WHO) on March 11
41 as a pandemic. This infection causes a severe acute respiratory syndrome, now called
42 COVID-19 (HUANG *et al.*, 2020; ZHU *et al.*, 2020; WHO, 2020).

43 In addition to respiratory symptoms, gastrointestinal symptoms, impairment of the
44 nervous system and a variety of clinical signs such as fever, cough, shortness of breath, sore
45 throat, malaise too can be seen (SINGHAL, 2020; BENVENUTO *et al.*, 2020). Other
46 symptoms include headache, dyspnoea, hemoptysis, diarrhea and lymphopenia (ROTHAN
47 and BYRAREDDY, 2020).

48 Infection with SARS-CoV-2 can be aggressive and generates a high rate of
49 hospitalization and, in some cases, hospitalization in Intensive Care Units (BAUD *et al.*,
50 2020). In Brazil, the exponential growth of COVID-19 cases is overloading health systems
51 with overcrowding of hospitals and overflowing intensive care units. The Unified Health
52 System (SUS) follows the guidelines recommended by the WHO to limit viral spread,
53 isolating people who contract the virus and oriented to compliance with quarantine for people
54 who are at greatest risk (OLIVEIRA *et al.*, 2020).

55 The orientation of social isolation is not suitable for health workers who work directly
56 to confront COVID-19. Increased infection rates among health workers can lead to the
57 collapse of the health system and further worsen the pandemic (BARRANCO and
58 VENTURA, 2020). In this context, the objective of this study was to evaluate the
59 seroprevalence of IgM and IgG for SARS-CoV-2 in health workers, from different
60 professions, in some health units in the state of Sergipe, Brazil.

61

62 2. Methods

63 The targeted tests involved health professionals working on the front line to combat
64 COVID-19. The samples were collected in the month of June, in six hospital units in the state
65 of Sergipe, in the municipalities of Aracaju, Nossa Senhora do Socorro, Nossa Senhora da
66 Glória and Estância. Personal data including age, gender, address, presence of any
67 comorbidities and symptoms compatible with COVID-19 were gathered through an online
68 questionnaire performed by a health care worker just before blood sample collection. Venous
69 blood samples were collected and centrifuged for serum separation. 471 people were enrolled
70 in this investigation.

71 The sample chosen for testing for IgG and IgM antibodies to SARS-CoV-2 was
72 human serum. For this purpose, approximately 3 mL of blood was collected from each
73 volunteer. Venous puncture was the chosen technique, with two possibilities for collection
74 sites: the antecubital fossa of the arm or the back of the hand, according to the volunteer's
75 preference. This sample was stored in a refrigerated environment to maintain viable biological
76 properties for analysis.

77 At the laboratory, the whole blood sample was centrifuged to separate the serum from
78 the other blood components. The centrifuge was programmed to perform 4000 rotations every
79 1 minute, for 10 minutes. The serum was packed in Eppendorf tubes and kept refrigerated at
80 -20°C until the moment of use. This biological material was analyzed using the ichroma™
81 COVID-19 Ab test (Boditech Med Inc. Chuncheon, Korea) following the manufacturer's
82 instructions for the detection IgG and IgM antibodies to SARS-CoV-2 by the fluorescence
83 method.

84 Immunofluorescence assays were performed at the Department of Pharmacy
85 Laboratory (Laboratory of Biochemistry and Clinical Immunology, LaBiC-Imm) at the
86 Federal University of Sergipe (UFS). Anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgM and IgG antibodies were

87 detected in sera using an in vitro diagnostic test system based on lateral flow sandwich
88 detection immunofluorescence technology (Ichroma2™ COVID-19 Ab in conjunction with
89 an Ichroma™ II Reader, Boditech Med Inc., South Korea) according to the manufacturer's
90 instructions. The immunofluorescence method applied showed a sensitivity of 95.8% and a
91 specificity of 97%. Another work by our group carried out the validation of the method using
92 120 serum samples collected from 60 real-time reverse transcription polymerase chain
93 reaction (rRT-PCR) confirmed COVID-19 cases, and 60 negative patients at different clinical
94 sites (BORGES *et al.*, 2020).

95 **3. Results**

96 A total of 471 health workers were tested. Of these, 134 were from the Sergipe
97 Emergency Hospital, 33 from the University Hospital and 88 from the Nossa Senhora de
98 Lourdes Maternity, all in the city of Aracaju; 76 of the Regional Hospital of Nossa Senhora
99 da Glória; 66 of the Municipal Hospital of the city of Nossa Senhora do Socorro; 74 of the
100 Regional Hospital of the city of Estância. Of these, 28 workers (5.95%) tested positive for
101 IgM and 64 (13.59%) tested positive for IgG. These results indicate an active or recent
102 infection for IgM reagents and a past infection for IgG reagents. 9 workers (1.91%)
103 serological profile indicating a recent infection that can still be contagious, tested positive for
104 IgM and were also positive for IgG. These data are plotted in Table 1. 370 workers tested
105 non-reactants for the presence of IgM and IgG antibodies to SARS-CoV-2.

106 INSERT TABLE 1

107 **4. Discussion**

108 The approach to screening health professionals who participated in the study in the
109 health environment depended on the institution's policies, including the number of samples
110 for each sector. In general, healthcare professionals should monitor themselves for fever and

111 symptoms of COVID-19 and stay home if they are ill. In a report of 48 health workers with
112 confirmed COVID-19 in King County, Washington, 65 percent reported working for an
113 average of two days while exhibiting symptoms of COVID-19 (CHOW *et al.*, 2020). In
114 addition, symptom screening alone did not identify all cases. The survey aims to contribute to
115 map the characteristics related to the work process of these professionals in the midst of the
116 COVID-19 pandemic, as well as the initiatives that are being carried out by managers in
117 health establishments in Brazil.

118 Based on these data, we can suggest the adoption of safety measures by health
119 professionals in their work processes, focusing mainly on the proper use of Personal
120 Protective Equipment (PPE); as well as Organization of the health establishment in relation to
121 the supply of equipment and supplies, cleaning and disinfection of the environments, in
122 addition to the training and monitoring indicators of its employees (LARSON and
123 LIVERMAN, 2011).

124 The rapid and accurate diagnosis of COVID-19 contributes to the management of the
125 disease (JIN *et al.*, 2020). The identification of antibodies, mainly IgM and IgG
126 immunoglobulins, produced shortly after infection, can contribute to ensure clinical diagnosis
127 and monitoring of the disease, allowing early intervention and playing a key role in fighting
128 outbreaks (BROADHURST *et al.*, 2016 ; KLUGE *et al.*, 2018). Among the serological tests
129 available are ELISA, CLIA, chemiluminescence, fluorescence, qualitative
130 immunochromatography (PADOAN *et al.*, 2020; LIPPI *et al.*, 2020; KIM *et al.*, 2020; DI
131 MAURO *et al.*, 2020; CARVALHO *et al.*, 2020). The immunofluorescence method was
132 chosen for serological tests performed in this study. Anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgM and IgG
133 antibodies were detected in the serum using an in vitro diagnostic test system based on lateral
134 flow sandwich detection immunofluorescence technology, which presented a sensitivity of
135 95.8% and specificity of 97%.

136 Our results show 5.95% IgM reagent antibody, so the choice of serum as a biological
137 sample for evaluation was due to the presence of antibodies. The production of antibodies,
138 mainly IgM, produced quickly after infection, can be a useful tool to assist in the detection of
139 contact with SARS-CoV-2. Thus, using laboratory techniques, the IgM - IgG antibody test
140 allows early intervention with infected people, playing a critical role in fighting outbreaks
141 (BROADHURST *et al.*, 2016; KLUGE *et al.*, 2018). Consistent with the recommendations of
142 the Infectious Diseases Society of America (IDSA), to maximize the predictive value of the
143 serological test, tests with high specificity (≥ 99.5 percent) should be used and the test should
144 be reserved for individuals with high probability pretest of previous infection (HANSEN *et*
145 *al.*, 2020). Our group recently published a cross-sectional study with stratified sampling on
146 the prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies in an asymptomatic population in the state of
147 Sergipe. Samples from 3.046 asymptomatic individuals showed a high prevalence of SARS-
148 CoV-2 antibodies (BORGES *et al.*, 2020).

149 In contrast to data in the literature, detectable antibodies generally take several days to
150 weeks to develop, and the time to detect antibodies varies according to the test (GUO *et al.*,
151 2020; ZHAO *et al.*, 2020; QU *et al.*, 2020; ZHANG *et al.*, 2020). For example, in a study that
152 considers 38 studies in a systematic review, IgM was detected in 23 percent in one week, 58
153 percent in two weeks and 75 percent in three weeks; the corresponding detection rates for IgG
154 were 30, 66 and 88 percent (DEEKS *et al.*, 2020). Other studies have suggested that the
155 positive IgG rate approaches 100 percent in 16 to 20 days (CATUREGLI *et al.*, 2020; LONG
156 *et al.*, 2020a; WANG *et al.*, 2020). According to our data, 13.59% of reagent IgG is observed.
157 However, the duration of the detectable antibodies is uncertain (LONG *et al.*, 2020b;
158 IBARRONDO *et al.*, 2020). In one study, it was observed that IgG levels decreased by an
159 average of approximately 75 percent from the acute to the early convalescent phase of the
160 disease and, eight weeks after infection, 40 percent of asymptomatic patients and 13 percent
161 of symptomatic patients had no detectable IgG (LONG *et al.*, 2020b).

162 Although people should stay at home to reduce the spread of COVID-19, health
163 professionals do the just the opposite. Your job and the longest job hours (due to the increase
164 in the number of infected people hospital) put them at risk of infection (THE LANCET,
165 2020). Health professionals must be monitored constantly, because if they are infected, they
166 can spread the virus to colleagues, hospitalized patients and even family members. Increased
167 infection rates in healthcare professionals can cause the pandemic to worsen, so an adequate
168 supply of effective PEPs, careful monitoring of all healthcare professionals is essential
169 (BARRANCO and VENTURA, 2020). This is due to the fact that health professionals are
170 currently the most important resource and, therefore, if health professionals are not cared for,
171 the health system is severely damaged.

172 **4. Conclusion**

173 The study showed the prevalence of COVID-19 in health professionals in the state of
174 Sergipe, Brazil. The immunofluorescence assay revealed the antibody rate for SARS-CoV-2
175 in the studied population. Knowing the prevalence of antibodies to the virus in health workers
176 is an important measure of viral spread control, since they do not comply with the
177 recommendations of social isolation, due to the need to act in the time of a pandemic, and,
178 therefore, are most susceptible to viral contamination and spread.

179

180 **Author Contributions:** All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the
181 manuscript.

182 **Funding:** This research was not funded. The authors themselves financed it.

183 **Acknowledgments:** The authors dedicate this article to all health professionals who are
184 facing COVID-19. We are eternally grateful to them, and hope that our article can contribute
185 to reducing the number of deaths.

186 **Conflicts of Interest:** The authors have declared that there is no conflict of interest.

187 **References**

- 188 Barranco R, Ventura F. Covid-19 and infection in health-care workers: An emerging problem.
189 Med Leg J. 2020;88(2):65-66. doi:10.1177/0025817220923694
- 190 Baud D, Qi X, Nielsen-Saines K, et al. Real estimates of mortality following Covid-19
191 infection. Lancet Infect Dis 2020; pii: S1473-3099(20)30195-X. doi: 10.1016/S1473-
192 3099(20)30195-X. [Epub ahead of print].
- 193 Benvenuto, D.; Giovanetti. M.; et al. The global spread of 2019-nCoV: a molecular
194 evolutionary analysis. Pathog Glob Health 2020, 1–4. doi: 10.1080/20477724.2020.1725339.
- 195 Borges LP, Martins AF, Melo MS, Oliveira MGB, Neto JMR, Dósea MB et al.
196 Seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2 IgM and IgG antibodies in an asymptomatic population in
197 Sergipe, Brazil. Rev Panam Salud Publica. 2020;44:e108.
198 <https://doi.org/10.26633/RPSP.2020.108>
- 199 Broadhurst MJ, Brooks TJG, Pollock NR. Diagnosis of Ebola Virus Disease: Past, Present,
200 and Future. Clin. Microbiol. Rev. 29 (4), 773–793, 2016.
- 201 Carvalho LFdCeS, Nogueira MS. Optical techniques for fastscreening – towards prevention
202 of the coronavirus COVID-19 outbreak. Photodiagnosis and Photodynamic Therapy, 2020.
- 203 Caturegli G, Materi J, Howard BM, Caturegli P. Clinical Validity of Serum Antibodies to
204 SARS-CoV-2: A Case-Control Study. Ann Intern Med 2020.
- 205 Chow EJ, Schwartz NG, Tobolowsky FA, Zacks RLT, Huntington-Frazier M, Reddy SC, Rao
206 AK. Symptom Screening at Illness Onset of Health Care Personnel With SARS-CoV-2
207 Infection in King County, Washington. JAMA. 2020 May 26;323(20):2087-2089. doi:
208 10.1001/jama.2020.6637 2020.

- 209 Deeks JJ, Dinnes J, Takwoingi Y, et al. Antibody tests for identification of current and past
210 infection with SARS-CoV-2. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2020; 6:CD013652.
- 211 Di Mauro G, Scavone C, Rafaniello C, Rossi F, Capuano A. SARS-Cov-2 infection:
212 Response of human immune system and possible implications for the rapid test and treatment.
213 *International Immunopharmacology*, 16 April 2020.
- 214 Guo L, Ren L, Yang S, et al. Profiling Early Humoral Response to Diagnose Novel
215 Coronavirus Disease (COVID-19). *Clin Infect Dis* 2020; 71:778.
- 216 Hansen KE, Caliendo AM, Arias CA, et al. Infectious Diseases Society of America
217 Guidelines on the Diagnosis of COVID-19: Serologic Testing. August 18, 2020
218 <https://www.idsociety.org/practice-guideline/covid-19-guideline-serology/> (Accessed on
219 August 19, 2020).
- 220 Huang, C.; Wang, Y.; et al. Clinical features of patients infected with 2019 novel coronavirus
221 in Wuhan, China. *Lancet*. 2020, 395, 497-506. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30183-5
- 222 Ibarondo FJ, Fulcher JA, Goodman-Meza D, et al. Rapid Decay of Anti-SARS-CoV-2
223 Antibodies in Persons with Mild Covid-19. *N Engl J Med* 2020.
- 224 Jin Y, Wang M, Zuo Z, Fan C, Ye F, Cai Z, Wang Y, Cui H, Pan K, Xu A. Diagnostic value
225 and dynamic variance of serum antibody in coronavirus disease 2019. *International Journal of*
226 *Infectious Diseases*, 94, 49-52, 01 may, 2020.
- 227 Kim YJ, Sung H, Ki CS, Hur M. COVID-19 Testing in South Korea: Current Status and the
228 Need for Faster Diagnostics. *Ann Lab Med*, 40(5): 349-350, 2020.
- 229 Kluge H, Martin-Moreno JM, Emiroglu N, Rodier G, Kelley E, Vujnovic M, Permanand G.
230 Strengthening global health security by embedding the International Health Regulations
231 requirements into national health systems. *BMJ Global Health* 3, 1–7, 2018.

- 232 Larson EL, Liverman CT. Preventing Transmission of Pandemic Influenza and Other Viral
233 Respiratory Diseases: Personal Protective Equipment for Healthcare Personnel: Update 2010.
234 Washington (DC): National Academies Press (US); 2011. Available from:
235 <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK209587/>
- 236 Lippi G, Salvagno G, Pegoraro M, Militello V, Caloi C, Peretti A, Gaino S, Bassi A, Bovo C
237 and Lo Cascio G. Assessment of immune response to SARS-CoV-2 with fully automated
238 MAGLUMI 2019-nCoV IgG and IgM chemiluminescence immunoassays. *Clinical Chemistry*
239 and *Laboratory Medicine* (published online ahead of print), 2020.
- 240 Long QX, Liu BZ, Deng HJ, et al. Antibody responses to SARS-CoV-2 in patients with
241 COVID-19. *Nat Med* 2020a; 26:845.
- 242 Long QX, Tang XJ, Shi QL, et al. Clinical and immunological assessment of asymptomatic
243 SARS-CoV-2 infections. *Nat Med* 2020b; 26:1200.
- 244 Oliveira WK, Duarte E, França GVA, Garcia LP. How Brazil can hold back COVID-19.
245 *Epidemiol. Serv. Saúde* [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2020 Sep 10] ; 29(2): e2020044.
246 Available from: [http://www.scielo.br/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S2237-](http://www.scielo.br/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S2237-96222020000200200&lng=en)
247 [96222020000200200&lng=en](http://www.scielo.br/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S2237-96222020000200200&lng=en). Epub Apr 27, 2020. [https://doi.org/10.5123/s1679-](https://doi.org/10.5123/s1679-49742020000200023)
248 [49742020000200023](https://doi.org/10.5123/s1679-49742020000200023).
- 249 Padoan A, Cosma C, Sciacovelli L, Faggian D and Plebani, M. Analytical performances of a
250 chemiluminescence immunoassay for SARS-CoV-2 IgM/IgG and antibody kinetics. *Clinical*
251 *Chemistry and Laboratory Medicine* (published online ahead of print), 2020.
- 252 Qu J, Wu C, Li X, et al. Profile of IgG and IgM antibodies against severe acute respiratory
253 syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2). *Clin Infect Dis* 2020.
- 254 Rothan HA and Byrareddy SN. The epidemiology and pathogenesis of coronavirus disease
255 (Covid-19) outbreak. *J Autoimmun* 2020; 109: 102433.

256 Singhal, T.A Review of Coronavirus Disease-2019 (COVID-19). Indian J Pediatr 2020, 87,
257 281-286. doi.org/10.1007/s12098-020-03263-6

258 The Lancet. Covid-19: protecting health-care workers. Lancet 2020; 395: 922.

259 Wang X, Guo X, Xin Q, et al. Neutralizing Antibodies Responses to SARS-CoV-2 in
260 COVID-19 Inpatients and Convalescent Patients. Clin Infect Dis 2020.

261 WHO. Pneumonia of unknown cause – China. 05 January 2020.
262 <https://www.who.int/csr/don/05-january-2020-pneumonia-of-unkown-cause-china/en/>

263 Zhang G, Nie S, Zhang Z, Zhang Z. Longitudinal Change of Severe Acute Respiratory
264 Syndrome Coronavirus 2 Antibodies in Patients with Coronavirus Disease 2019. J Infect Dis
265 2020; 222:183.

266 Zhao J, Yuan Q, Wang H, et al. Antibody responses to SARS-CoV-2 in patients of novel
267 coronavirus disease 2019. Clin Infect Dis 2020.

268 Zhu, H.; Wang, L.; et al. Clinical analysis of 10 neonates born to mothers with 2019-nCoV
269 pneumonia. Translational Pediatrics 2020, 9, 51-60. doi: 10.21037/tp.2020.02.06

270

271 **Table 1:** Seroprevalence of IgM and IgG for SARS-CoV-2 in health workers in six hospital units Sergipe, Brazil

| Site | Valid samples | IgM reagent | IgG reagent | IgM and IgG reagent | No reagent |
|------------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|---------------------|---------------|
| SEH | 134 | 1 | 13 | 1 | 119 |
| NSLM | 88 | 8 | 5 | 0 | 75 |
| RHNSG | 76 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 65 |
| MHNSS | 66 | 9 | 12 | 5 | 40 |
| UH | 33 | 2 | 7 | 0 | 24 |
| RHE | 74 | 4 | 23 | 0 | 47 |
| Total | 471 | 28 | 64 | 9 | 370 |
| Total (%) | 100% | 5,95% | 13.59% | 1,91% | 78,55% |

272 **SEH:** Sergipe Emergency Hospital; **NSLM:** Nossa Senhora de Lourdes Maternity; **RHNSG:** Regional Hospital
273 of Nossa Senhora da Glória; **MHNSS:** Municipal Hospital of Nossa Senhora do Socorro; **UH:** University
274 Hospital; **RHE:** Regional Hospital of Estância.