

# 1 Seropositivity to Nucleoprotein to detect SARS-CoV-2 infections: a tool to 2 detect breakthrough infections after COVID-19 vaccination

3 Lotus L. van den Hoogen<sup>1\*</sup>, Gaby Smits<sup>1</sup>, Cheyenne C.E. van Hagen<sup>2</sup>, Denise Wong<sup>2</sup>, Eric R.A. Vos<sup>2</sup>,  
4 Michiel van Boven<sup>2</sup>, Hester E. de Melker<sup>2</sup>, Jeffrey van Vliet<sup>1</sup>, Marjan Kuijer<sup>1</sup>, Linde Woudstra<sup>1</sup>, Alienke  
5 J. Wijmenga-Monsuur<sup>1</sup>, Corine H. GeurtsvanKessel<sup>3</sup>, Susanne P. Stoof<sup>4</sup>, Daphne Reukers<sup>5</sup>, Lisa A.  
6 Wijsman<sup>5</sup>, Adam Meijer<sup>5</sup>, Chantal B.E.M. Reusken<sup>5</sup>, Nynke Y. Rots<sup>1</sup>, Fiona R.M. van der Klis<sup>1</sup>, Robert S.  
7 van Binnendijk<sup>1</sup>, Gerco den Hartog<sup>1</sup>

- 8 1. Centre for Immunology of Infectious Diseases and Vaccines, National Institute for Public  
9 Health and the Environment (RIVM), Bilthoven, The Netherlands
- 10 2. Centre for Infectious Diseases, Epidemiology and Surveillance, National Institute for Public  
11 Health and the Environment (RIVM), Bilthoven, The Netherlands
- 12 3. Department of Viroscience, Erasmus MC, Rotterdam, the Netherlands
- 13 4. Department of Medical Microbiology *Comicro*, Dijklander ziekenhuis, Hoorn, The  
14 Netherlands
- 15 5. Centre for Infectious Diseases Research, Diagnostics and Laboratory Surveillance, National  
16 Institute for Public Health and the Environment (RIVM), Bilthoven, The Netherlands

17

18 Word count: 2,997

19 Inserts: 2 Tables; 2 Figures

20

21 \* Corresponding author:

22 [lotus.van.den.hoogen@rivm.nl](mailto:lotus.van.den.hoogen@rivm.nl)

23 Centre for Immunology of Infectious Diseases and Vaccines (IIV)  
24 National Institute of Public Health and the Environment (RIVM)  
25 Antonie van Leeuwenhoeklaan 9,  
26 3721 MA Bilthoven,  
27 The Netherlands

## 28 **Abstract**

### 29 Background

30 With COVID-19 vaccine roll-out ongoing in many countries globally, monitoring of breakthrough  
31 infections is of great importance. Antibodies persist in the blood after a severe acute respiratory  
32 syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) infection. Since COVID-19 vaccines induce immune response  
33 to the Spike protein of the virus, which is the main serosurveillance target to date, alternative  
34 targets should be explored to distinguish infection from vaccination.

### 35 Methods

36 Multiplex immunoassay data from 1,513 SARS-CoV-2 RT-qPCR-tested individuals (352 positive and  
37 1,161 negative) with a primary infection and no vaccination history were used to determine the  
38 accuracy of Nucleoprotein-specific immunoglobulin G (IgG) in detecting past SARS-CoV-2 infection.  
39 We also described Spike S1 and Nucleoprotein-specific IgG responses in 230 COVID-19 vaccinated  
40 individuals (Pfizer/BioNTech).

### 41 Results

42 The sensitivity of Nucleoprotein seropositivity was 85% (95% confidence interval: 80-90%) for mild  
43 COVID-19 in the first two months following symptom onset. Sensitivity was lower in asymptomatic  
44 individuals (67%, 50-81%). Participants who had experienced a SARS-CoV-2 infection up to 11  
45 months preceding vaccination, as assessed by Spike S1 seropositivity or RT-qPCR, produced 2.7-fold  
46 higher median levels of IgG to Spike S1  $\geq 14$  days after the first dose as compared to those unexposed  
47 to SARS-CoV-2 at  $\geq 7$  days after the second dose ( $p=0.011$ ). Nucleoprotein-specific IgG concentrations  
48 were not affected by vaccination in naïve participants.

### 49 Conclusions

50 Serological responses to Nucleoprotein may prove helpful in identifying SARS-CoV-2 infections after  
51 vaccination. Furthermore, it can help interpret IgG to Spike S1 after COVID-19 vaccination as  
52 particularly high responses shortly after vaccination could be explained by prior exposure history.

53 **Keywords:** COVID-19; SARS-CoV-2; Nucleoprotein; serosurveillance; immunoglobulin G; multiplex  
54 immunoassay

## 55 **Introduction**

56 Since late 2020, multiple countries have initiated vaccine roll-out against COVID-19 which is caused  
57 by severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) [1]. Breakthrough infections have  
58 been reported shortly after completion of the vaccination regimen [2]. Although COVID-19 vaccines  
59 were developed to prevent severe disease and mortality and not to provide sterile protection, it will  
60 remain important to monitor the frequency of breakthrough infections as well as their transmission  
61 potential, specifically as new SARS-CoV-2 variants emerge [3]. During the acute phase of an  
62 infection, molecular (RT-qPCR) and antigen tests are used to confirm symptomatic and  
63 asymptomatic breakthrough infections, i.e. after contact tracing or travel to a high-risk area.  
64 However, asymptomatic persons who do not seek testing will likely be missed. To ensure a complete  
65 picture of the frequency of breakthrough infections for surveillance purposes, frequent RT-qPCR  
66 testing would be needed which is time- and labor intensive as well as burdensome to individuals.

67 Serological assays can identify specific antibodies which indicate previous infection with  
68 SARS-CoV-2. SARS-CoV-2 serostatus can be determined high-throughput with multiplex  
69 immunoassays (MIA [4]), irrespective of the presence of clinical symptoms. Immunoglobulin G (IgG)  
70 antibodies persist for months after infection which widens the window of detection as compared to  
71 RT-qPCR and antigen tests [5]. This should provide a more accurate estimate of ongoing transmission  
72 in the general population. However, since the main serological marker used to date for SARS-CoV-2  
73 is also the vaccine target, Spike S1 or RBD, alternative serological targets should be explored to  
74 distinguish past infection from vaccination. Nucleoprotein is one of the structural immunogenic  
75 SARS-CoV-2 proteins. Others have reported sensitivity estimates ranging from 70% to 96% with  
76 specificity at  $\geq 95\%$ , depending the assay and reference population used [6-9]. Reference populations  
77 consisted of healthcare workers or hospitalized patients, which are not representative for the  
78 general population. Moreover, patients with severe symptoms produce higher antibody levels than  
79 those with mild or no symptoms which leads to overestimation of sensitivity estimates [5, 10].  
80 Hence, the reliability of Nucleoprotein to detect mild or asymptomatic infections, which represent  
81 the majority of COVID-19 cases [11, 12], is still unknown.

82 We previously described a bead-based detection method for simultaneous IgG detection to  
83 Spike S1 and Nucleocapsid [4]. In this study we aimed to determine the accuracy of seropositivity to  
84 Nucleoprotein and Spike S1 by time since RT-qPCR-confirmed infection with mild or asymptomatic  
85 SARS-CoV-2 using a prospective household survey as well as a nationwide population survey.

86

## 87 **Methods**

### 88 *Study design and population*

89 *Household cohort of infected and noninfected participants*

90 A prospective cohort study was performed in households where one household member had tested  
91 positive for SARS-CoV-2 to determine within household transmission [13]. Patients with a RT-qPCR-  
92 confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection (=index case) in the Municipal Health Service (GGD) Utrecht region,  
93 central Netherlands, were invited to participate with their household if they had at least one child  
94 under the age of 18 living at home. Households from 54 index cases were enrolled from March 24<sup>th</sup>  
95 to May 24<sup>th</sup> 2020 (with a total of 242 participants). Households were excluded if one or more of the  
96 household contacts did not want to participate in the study upfront. Furthermore, infants under the  
97 age of 1 were excluded. Most families were those of healthcare workers, for whom RT-qPCR testing  
98 was available at enrolment during the first pandemic wave (March/April 2020). Study nurses visited  
99 the families at their household within 24 hours after inclusion (T1), 2-3 weeks after inclusion (T2)  
100 and 4-6 weeks after inclusion (T3) to collect a venous blood sample for serological testing as well as  
101 a naso- and oropharyngeal swab, oral fluid and they supplied a feces collection kit. At 9-11 months  
102 after T1 (T5), another venous blood sample was collected at which point some of the participants  
103 had been COVID-19 vaccinated. Participants filled out a questionnaire at each sampling timepoint  
104 including data on demographic factors, symptoms and symptom onset, and vaccination data where  
105 applicable (brand product, number of vaccinations and their dates). The study was ethically  
106 approved by the Medical-Ethical Review Committee of the University Medical Center Utrecht  
107 (NL13529.041.06). All participants above the age of 12 gave written informed consent. Both parents  
108 or guardians of participating children below the age of 16 also gave written informed consent for  
109 participation of the child.

110 *National cohort of noninfected, convalescent and vaccinated individuals*

111 Serum samples were collected in an ongoing, nationwide longitudinal serosurveillance study; the  
112 PIENTER Corona (PICO) cohort study described by Vos et al. [14, 15]. Briefly, the PICO study  
113 emanated from a large-scale nationwide cross-sectional study performed in 2016-17 (PIENTER-3  
114 [16]). Participants from the PIENTER-3 study who had consented to follow-up were invited to  
115 participate in the PICO study in April 2020 [14] and the cohort was extended with an additional  
116 nationwide random sample in June 2020 [15]. Two more rounds have been completed in October  
117 2020 and February 2021. Each round participants were requested to return a self-collected finger-  
118 prick blood sample in a microtainer by mail and complete a questionnaire. Questions covered  
119 sociodemographic factors, clinical data (type and date of onset of symptoms), virological findings if  
120 applicable (SARS-CoV-2 RT-qPCR testing, and date and result of testing; February 2021 round only)  
121 and data on COVID-19 vaccination if applicable (brand product, number of vaccinations and their

122 dates; February 2021 round only). The study was ethically approved by the Medical Research Ethics  
123 Committees United MEC-U and registered under trial number NL8473. All participants above the age  
124 of 12 gave written informed consent. Both parents or legal guardians of participating children below  
125 the age of 16 years also gave written informed consent for participation of the child.

## 126 ***Laboratory methods***

### 127 *SARS-CoV-2 RT-qPCR testing in the household cohort*

128 All available samples in the household cohort were tested for presence of SARS-CoV-2 as previously  
129 described [13, 17]. The results of the naso- and oropharyngeal swab, oral fluid and feces specimens  
130 at T1 or T2 were combined to one result: RT-qPCR negative (all negative) or RT-qPCR positive (any  
131 positive). Index cases were considered RT-qPCR positive even if they tested negative at T1 and T2 as  
132 they would have tested RT-qPCR positive with local health authorities prior to enrolment in the  
133 study.

### 134 *Multiplex immunoassay for Immunoglobulin G detection in the household and national cohorts*

135 Serum was separated from blood clot and stored at -20°C until analysis. Total IgG to Spike S1 and  
136 Nucleoprotein was measured with a MIA as previously described [4]. Median fluorescence intensity  
137 measurements were expressed as binding antibody units per milliliter (BAU/ml) using 5-parameter  
138 logistic interpolation of the International Standard for human anti-SARS-CoV-2 immunoglobulin  
139 (20/136 NIBSC standard) [18].

## 140 ***Statistical analyses***

141 All statistical analyses were performed in R version 4.0.2 [19]. Calculation of seropositivity thresholds  
142 and associated assay performance is detailed in the Supplementary Methods. Sensitivity of  
143 seropositivity to Nucleoprotein and Spike S1 in detecting a past RT-qPCR-confirmed SARS-CoV-2  
144 infection was determined in 1) hospitalized COVID-19 patients (Intensive Care Unit or ward), 2) mild  
145 COVID-19 patients (i.e., with COVID-19-related symptoms but not hospitalized), and 3) individuals  
146 with an asymptomatic infection. Specificity was determined in those who tested RT-qPCR negative.  
147 COVID-19-related symptoms were classified as fever, coughing, shortness of breath, loss of taste or  
148 smell, sore throat, headache, pain while breathing, runny nose, muscle ache, diarrhoea, (extreme)  
149 tiredness and/or nausea.

150 Data from the national and household cohort were analyzed jointly. We did not include  
151 repeated samples from the same individuals. Unvaccinated participants who underwent SARS-CoV-2  
152 confirmatory testing between two weeks and 6 months prior to serological sampling were included  
153 in the study. Exclusion criteria were incomplete symptom data, serological evidence of SARS-CoV-2

154 exposure prior to testing or other testing than RT-qPCR such as rapid antigen tests (Supplementary  
155 Figure 2). The time since onset of symptoms was used to determine sensitivity over time since  
156 infection. For asymptomatic participants in the national cohort, the time since RT-qPCR testing date  
157 was used. In the household cohort, the time since onset of symptoms or diagnosis date for the index  
158 case was used if the time since onset of symptoms was unknown or in asymptomatic participants.  
159 For reference, sera from 27 hospitalized COVID-19 cases between 14 days and 2 months after onset  
160 of symptoms were analysed: 7 patients in the household cohort (Supplementary Figure 2A), 10  
161 patients from the Erasmus Medical Centre in Rotterdam (Medical Ethical Committee number METC  
162 06/282) and 10 patients from the Dijklander hospital in Hoorn.

163 To describe IgG to Spike S1 and Nucleoprotein in a COVID-19 vaccinated study population,  
164 data from the two cohorts were also combined (Supplementary Figure 2). Participants who reported  
165 to have completed one or two doses of COVID-19 vaccination were included. As nearly all  
166 participants had received Pfizer/BioNTech, participants with other vaccine brands were excluded.  
167 Furthermore, participants with incomplete vaccination information, such as vaccination dates, were  
168 excluded. Past infection with SARS-CoV-2 was based on RT-qPCR confirmation in the household  
169 cohort and Spike S1 seroconversion in a previous study round or self-reported RT-qPCR testing  
170 where available in the national cohort.

171 Sensitivity and specificity estimates, and their 95% confidence intervals (CIs) were calculated  
172 applying Receiver Operating Characteristic (ROC) curves using the pROC package in R (version 1.16.2  
173 [20]). CIs were computed with 2,000 stratified bootstrap replicates. The Wilcoxon-Mann-Whitney  
174 test was used to compare IgG measurements between vaccinated participants who did vs. those  
175 who did not experience a prior SARS-CoV-2 infection.

176

## 177 **Results**

### 178 ***SARS-CoV-2 RT-qPCR-tested study population***

179 A total of 352 mild and asymptomatic participants had tested RT-qPCR positive for SARS-CoV-2 and  
180 1,161 negative (Table 1). The majority was female (61% of the RT-qPCR positives and 61% of the RT-  
181 qPCR negatives) and in the age category 22-65 years old (71% of the RT-qPCR positives and 68% of  
182 the RT-qPCR negatives). Most of the RT-qPCR positives experienced mild COVID-19-related  
183 symptoms (90%) compared to 56% of the RT-qPCR negatives, while 10% of the RT-qPCR positives  
184 and 44% of the RT-qPCR negatives were asymptomatic.

### 185 ***Nucleoprotein and Spike S1 seropositivity to detect past SARS-CoV-2 infection***

186 Nucleoprotein and Spike S1 IgG measurements by SARS-CoV-2 RT-qPCR status and symptom status  
187 are shown in Figure 1A. Sensitivity of Nucleoprotein was highest in hospitalized COVID-19 patients  
188 (100%) between two weeks and two months post onset of symptoms as compared to mild COVID-19  
189 (79%, 95% CI: 75-84%) or asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 (67%, 50-81%) between two weeks and six  
190 months following symptom onset/infection (Figure 1B). Seropositivity to Spike S1 showed higher  
191 sensitivity estimates (i.e., hospitalized: 100%, mild COVID-19: 89%, 85-92%, asymptomatic SARS-  
192 CoV-2: 72%, 56-86%). Sensitivity of Nucleoprotein for mild COVID-19 was highest shortly after  
193 infection: 85% (79-91%) at 2 weeks to 2 months following the onset of symptoms to 79% (70-86%) at  
194 3-4 months and 59% (44-72%) at 5-6 months. This decline was faster than that seen for Spike S1  
195 (from 90%, 85-94%, to 90%, 83-95% to 80%, 67-91%; Figure 1C).

196 Specificity in RT-qPCR negative tested persons was 97% (96-98%) for Nucleoprotein and 98%  
197 (97-99%) for Spike S1 (Figure 1B). For persons who seroconverted to either Nucleoprotein or Spike  
198 S1 within the RT-qPCR-negative selection (n=46), 19 had seroconverted to Nucleoprotein only (41%),  
199 9 to Spike S1 only (20%) and 18 to both Nucleoprotein and Spike S1 (39%).

#### 200 ***Spike S1 and Nucleoprotein IgG kinetics after COVID-19 vaccination with Pfizer/BioNTech***

201 Of the 230 Pfizer/BioNTech vaccinated participants, 118 had received two doses at the time of  
202 sampling (51%), 172 were female (75%) and 177 were 18-65 years old (77%) vs. 53 who were >65  
203 years old (23%) (Table 2). In previously naïve individuals (n=179), IgG to Spike S1 showed a  
204 homogenous response between individuals over time since vaccination (Figure 2A). After two weeks,  
205 96% of the previously naïve individuals had seroconverted to Spike S1 (126/131, Figure 2A). The  
206 majority was seronegative for Nucleoprotein (93%, 122/131; Figure 2B). Of the nine seropositive  
207 individuals, four were already seropositive for Nucleoprotein prior to vaccination but not for Spike  
208 S1. Participants who had experienced a SARS-CoV-2 infection preceding vaccination, produced 2.7-  
209 fold higher median levels of IgG to Spike S1  $\geq 14$  days after the first dose as compared to those  
210 unexposed to SARS-CoV-2 at  $\geq 7$  days after the second dose (6,480 vs. 2,438 BAU/ml, p=0.011, Figure  
211 2C).

212 Of the COVID-19 vaccinated participants with evidence for a previous SARS-CoV-2 infection,  
213 13 experienced symptom onset less than five months prior to sampling. Ten of these 13 had  
214 seroconverted to Nucleoprotein (77%, 54-100%), while nearly all were symptomatic during their  
215 infection (92%, 12/13). At 8-11 months post symptom onset, 45% (29-61%) were seropositive for  
216 Nucleoprotein while 82% (31/38) had been symptomatic during their infection.

217

#### 218 **Discussion**

219 As COVID-19 vaccines induce immune responses to the Spike protein, alternative serological targets  
220 need to be considered for serosurveillance of SARS-CoV-2 breakthrough infections. Here, we showed  
221 that seropositivity to Nucleoprotein can detect mild COVID-19 with a sensitivity of 85% between two  
222 weeks and two months following symptom onset compared to 90% for Spike S1. At 3-4 months post  
223 symptom onset, sensitivity declined to 79% for Nucleoprotein while it remained 90% for Spike S1.

224 Several publications have focused on the sensitivity of Nucleoprotein to detect past RT-  
225 qPCR-confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infections with estimates ranging from 70% to 96% [6-9]. The wide  
226 range in the observed sensitivity estimates is likely due to differences in the used reference  
227 population, often consisting of hospitalized patients or healthcare workers with COVID-19, and  
228 differences related to the applied antibody detection platforms. Few have stratified results by  
229 symptomatic status of the reference populations or time since onset of symptoms [7]. This while  
230 breakthrough infections are expected to be even more frequently mild or asymptomatic than  
231 primary infections. In mildly symptomatic persons (healthcare workers), Mariën et al. reported a  
232 sensitivity of 70% within six weeks and 85% more than five months after symptom onset [7]. We also  
233 reported a sensitivity of 85% in mildly symptomatic patients between two weeks and two months  
234 after symptom onset though we saw a decline to 59% at 5-6 months after symptom onset. In  
235 persons with an asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infection in our study, sensitivity of Nucleoprotein was  
236 67%; insufficient numbers were available to stratify this estimate further by time since infection. Our  
237 estimate for Spike S1 sensitivity in asymptomatic participants (72%; 26/36) was similar to that  
238 recently published by Vanshylla et al. combining IgG and IgA responses (77%; 34/44) [21]. Although  
239 Nucleoprotein sensitivity was lower in asymptomatic individuals, few to none of these individuals  
240 would have been identified by passive surveillance using RT-qPCR or antigen tests as the absence of  
241 symptoms would limit chances of seeking diagnosis.

242 Sensitivity decreased to 79% at 3-4 months following infection, a 8% seroreversion in 2  
243 months. Choudhry et al. reported 31% seroreversion for Nucleoprotein IgG after three months in  
244 seroconverted healthcare workers in the United Kingdom using rapid IgG/IgM tests [22]. Others  
245 have likewise shown that Nucleoprotein IgG antibodies decline on average 1.5-2 times faster than  
246 those to Spike S1 [10, 23]. The higher rate of seroreversion for Nucleoprotein compared to Spike S1,  
247 means that regular serological measurements is recommended to ensure detection of breakthrough  
248 infections (e.g. 2-3 monthly intervals). The serological response to Nucleoprotein may vary more  
249 following COVID-19 vaccination as partial immunity might limit viral replication and thus exposure of  
250 the immune system to the viral Nucleoprotein. Asymptomatic and mild cases that might be missed  
251 by RT-qPCR or serological testing are unlikely to pose a risk of development of disease requiring  
252 hospitalization. However, they might still contribute to transmission of the virus.



253 Previous specificity estimates for bead-based assays were  $\geq 97\%$  based on pre-pandemic  
254 controls [7-9]. Here we likewise showed that 97% of the RT-qPCR-negative population was  
255 seronegative for Nucleoprotein. However, presence of SARS-CoV-2 could have been missed in our  
256 study due to no detectable SARS-CoV-2 RNA at the time of sampling or incorrect sampling thus  
257 lowering specificity. 18 out of 37 Nucleoprotein seropositive persons also seroconverted to Spike S1  
258 which strengthens the hypothesis that these samples represent participants not being sampled  
259 optimally for RT-qPCR. The performance of an assay is a trade-off between sensitivity and specificity.  
260 As we expect the prevalence of breakthrough infections to be low, we focused on high specificity by  
261 setting a conservative seropositivity threshold.

262 Most of the COVID-19 vaccinated participants in the current study were healthcare workers  
263 who received Pfizer/BioNTech. IgG to Spike S1 after two doses showed comparable levels as those  
264 for healthcare workers from another study conducted in Rotterdam, the Netherlands [24], while a  
265 previously exposed population already produced robust IgG after one dose of Pfizer/BioNTech  
266 vaccine. Interestingly, the majority of the previously infected participants receiving one vaccination  
267 dose got infected approximately 11 months prior to vaccination (72%, 18/25). This suggests that  
268 infection up to a year prior to vaccination still enables robust boosting of IgG to Spike S1 as observed  
269 by others [25, 26], though numbers were small and nearly all were symptomatic. We confirmed that  
270 Nucleoprotein also detects past SARS-CoV-2 infection in the previous five months in this vaccinated  
271 population (77%), though the confidence interval was wide due to the low numbers available.

272 There are strengths and weaknesses in the cohorts we used in this study. Study team nurses  
273 collecting samples and questionnaire data at pre-set sampling timepoints is the strength of the  
274 household cohort, but its weakness includes that results are likely to correlate within families (i.e.,  
275 genetic relatedness and immune response). The national cohort is more representative of the  
276 general population, including more asymptomatic individuals, and the repeated cross-sectional  
277 design ensured that participants were included with different time frames since infection and/or  
278 vaccination. However, the weakness of this approach is that it relied on self-reported data. Several  
279 types of bias may arise from self-reported data including recall bias, e.g. those who tested SARS-CoV-  
280 2 positive might be more likely to remember the type of symptoms or test they received.

281 In conclusion, we showed that Nucleoprotein can detect prior SARS-CoV-2 infections with a  
282 sensitivity of 85% in a mildly symptomatic unvaccinated population between two weeks and two  
283 months after symptom onset. Serological responses to Nucleoprotein may thus prove helpful in  
284 identifying the frequency of SARS-CoV-2 infections in vaccinated persons, alongside molecular tests.  
285 Furthermore, it can help to interpret IgG to Spike S1 responses after COVID-19 vaccination as  
286 particularly high responses shortly after vaccination could be explained by prior exposure history.

287 **Funding**

288 This work was supported by the Dutch Ministry of Public Health, Welfare, and Sports (VWS).

289 **Acknowledgments**

290 We would like to thank all study participants and the team at the laboratory conducting all RT-qPCR  
291 assays, represented by Bas van der Veer, Sharon van den Brink and Anne-Marie van den Brandt.

292 **Conflict of interest**

293 The authors declare no competing interests.

## 294 References

- 295 1. Dong, E., H. Du, and L. Gardner, *An interactive web-based dashboard to track COVID-19 in*  
296 *real time*. *Lancet Infect Dis*, 2020. **20**(5): p. 533-534.
- 297 2. Polack, F.P., et al., *Safety and Efficacy of the BNT162b2 mRNA Covid-19 Vaccine*. *N Engl J*  
298 *Med*, 2020. **383**(27): p. 2603-2615.
- 299 3. Sheikh, A., et al., *SARS-CoV-2 Delta VOC in Scotland: demographics, risk of hospital*  
300 *admission, and vaccine effectiveness*. *Lancet*, 2021. **397**(10293): p. 2461-2462.
- 301 4. den Hartog, G., et al., *SARS-CoV-2-Specific Antibody Detection for Seroepidemiology: A*  
302 *Multiplex Analysis Approach Accounting for Accurate Seroprevalence*. *J Infect Dis*, 2020.  
303 **222**(9): p. 1452-1461.
- 304 5. den Hartog, G., et al., *Persistence of antibodies to SARS-CoV-2 in relation to symptoms in a*  
305 *nationwide prospective study*. *Clin Infect Dis*, 2021.
- 306 6. Fenwick, C., et al., *Changes in SARS-CoV-2 Spike versus Nucleoprotein Antibody Responses*  
307 *Impact the Estimates of Infections in Population-Based Seroprevalence Studies*. *J Virol*, 2021.  
308 **95**(3).
- 309 7. Marien, J., et al., *Evaluating SARS-CoV-2 spike and nucleocapsid proteins as targets for*  
310 *antibody detection in severe and mild COVID-19 cases using a Luminex bead-based assay*. *J*  
311 *Virol Methods*, 2021. **288**: p. 114025.
- 312 8. Rosado, J., et al., *Multiplex assays for the identification of serological signatures of SARS-*  
313 *CoV-2 infection: an antibody-based diagnostic and machine learning study*. *Lancet Microbe*,  
314 2021. **2**(2): p. e60-e69.
- 315 9. Fotis, C., et al., *Accurate SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence surveys require robust multi-antigen*  
316 *assays*. *Sci Rep*, 2021. **11**(1): p. 6614.
- 317 10. Dan, J.M., et al., *Immunological memory to SARS-CoV-2 assessed for up to 8 months after*  
318 *infection*. *Science*, 2021. **371**(6529).
- 319 11. Wu, Z. and J.M. McGoogan, *Characteristics of and Important Lessons From the Coronavirus*  
320 *Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Outbreak in China: Summary of a Report of 72314 Cases From the*  
321 *Chinese Center for Disease Control and Prevention*. *JAMA*, 2020. **323**(13): p. 1239-1242.
- 322 12. McDonald, S.A., et al., *Estimating the asymptomatic proportion of SARS-CoV-2 infection in*  
323 *the general population: Analysis of nationwide serosurvey data in the Netherlands*. *Eur J*  
324 *Epidemiol*, 2021.
- 325 13. Reukers, D.F.M., et al., *High infection secondary attack rates of SARS-CoV-2 in Dutch*  
326 *households revealed by dense sampling*. *Clin Infect Dis*, 2021.
- 327 14. Vos, E.R.A., et al., *Nationwide seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2 and identification of risk factors*  
328 *in the general population of the Netherlands during the first epidemic wave*. *J Epidemiol*  
329 *Community Health*, 2020.
- 330 15. Vos, E.R.A., et al., *Associations between measures of social distancing and SARS-CoV-2*  
331 *seropositivity: a nationwide population-based study in the Netherlands*. *Clin Infect Dis*, 2021.
- 332 16. Verberk, J.D.M., et al., *Third national biobank for population-based seroprevalence studies in*  
333 *the Netherlands, including the Caribbean Netherlands*. *BMC Infect Dis*, 2019. **19**(1): p. 470.
- 334 17. Corman, V.M., et al., *Detection of 2019 novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV) by real-time RT-PCR*.  
335 *Euro Surveill*, 2020. **25**(3).
- 336 18. World Health Organization. *First WHO International Standard for anti-SARS-CoV-2*  
337 *immunoglobulin (human)*. 2020 [cited 2021 7 June 2021]; Available from:  
338 <https://www.nibsc.org/documents/ifu/20-136.pdf>.
- 339 19. R Core Team, *R: A language and environment for statistical computing*. 2020, R Foundation  
340 for Statistical Computing: Vienna, Austria.
- 341 20. Robin, X., et al., *pROC: an open-source package for R and S+ to analyze and compare ROC*  
342 *curves*. *BMC Bioinformatics*, 2011. **12**: p. 77.

- 343 21. Vanshylla, K., et al., *Kinetics and correlates of the neutralizing antibody response to SARS-*  
344 *CoV-2 infection in humans*. Cell Host Microbe, 2021.
- 345 22. Choudhry, N., et al., *Disparities of SARS-CoV-2 Nucleoprotein-Specific IgG in Healthcare*  
346 *Workers in East London, UK*. Front Med (Lausanne), 2021. **8**: p. 642723.
- 347 23. Wheatley, A.K., et al., *Evolution of immune responses to SARS-CoV-2 in mild-moderate*  
348 *COVID-19*. Nat Commun, 2021. **12**(1): p. 1162.
- 349 24. Geers, D., et al., *SARS-CoV-2 variants of concern partially escape humoral but not T-cell*  
350 *responses in COVID-19 convalescent donors and vaccinees*. Sci Immunol, 2021. **6**(59).
- 351 25. Favresse, J., et al., *Early antibody response in health-care professionals after two doses of*  
352 *SARS-CoV-2 mRNA vaccine (BNT162b2)*. Clin Microbiol Infect, 2021.
- 353 26. Abu Jabal, K., et al., *Impact of age, ethnicity, sex and prior infection status on*  
354 *immunogenicity following a single dose of the BNT162b2 mRNA COVID-19 vaccine: real-*  
355 *world evidence from healthcare workers, Israel, December 2020 to January 2021*. Euro  
356 *Surveill*, 2021. **26**(6).
- 357

358 **Tables**

359 **Table 1: General description of the RT-qPCR-confirmed SARS-CoV-2 study population.**

% (n)	SARS-CoV-2 positive	SARS-CoV-2 negative
N*	352	1,161
Female	61.1% (215)	60.5% (702)
Age category (years)		
- 1-21	17.1% (60)	16.0% (186)
- 22-65	71.0% (250)	68.4% (794)
- 66-87	11.9% (42)	15.6% (181)
COVID-19 related symptoms**		
- No	10.2% (36)	43.6% (506)
- Yes	89.8% (316)	56.4% (655)

360 \*See Supplementary Figure 2A and 2B for more information on sample availability and exclusion  
361 criteria. \*\*Fever, coughing, shortness of breath, loss of taste or smell, sore throat, headache, pain  
362 while breathing, runny nose, muscle ache, diarrhoea, (extreme) tiredness and/or nausea.

363 **Table 2: General description of the COVID-19 vaccinated study population.**

	% (n) unless otherwise specified
N*	230
Female	75% (172)
Age category in years	
- 18-65	77 (177)
- 66-91	23% (53)
Healthcare worker	75% (172)
Vaccination	
- Two doses	51% (118)
- Median days since first vaccination, range (IQR)	24, 0-59 (14-32)
Past SARS-CoV-2 infection	
- No	78% (179)
- (Self-reported) RT-qPCR positive	14% (32)
- Seroconversion IgG to Spike S1 prior to vaccination	8% (19)

364 \*See Supplementary Figure 2A and 2B for more information on sample availability and exclusion  
365 criteria. \*\*Fever, coughing, shortness of breath, loss of taste or smell, sore throat, headache, pain  
366 while breathing, runny nose, muscle ache, diarrhoea, (extreme) tiredness and/or nausea.

367 IQR: interquartile range; IgG: immunoglobulin G.

368

369 **Figure legends**

370 **Figure 1: Nucleoprotein and Spike S1 IgG responses to detect SARS-CoV-2 infections.** In (A) IgG  
371 measurements to Nucleoprotein and Spike S1 are shown by SARS-CoV-2 PCR status and symptom  
372 status along with the threshold for seropositivity (dashed horizontal line). In (B) specificity and  
373 sensitivity estimates with 95% confidence intervals are shown for Nucleoprotein and Spike S1  
374 seropositivity. In (C) sensitivity estimates with 95% confidence intervals of Nucleoprotein and Spike  
375 S1 seropositivity over time (in months); this does not include repeated samples from the same  
376 individuals. S1: Spike S1, N: Nucleoprotein, IgG: immunoglobulin G, BAU/ml: binding antibody units.

377

378 **Figure 2: Nucleoprotein and Spike S1 IgG kinetics following COVID-19 vaccination.** IgG  
379 measurements to Spike S1 (A) and Nucleoprotein (B) in naïve individuals are shown over days since  
380 first vaccination. In (C) IgG measurements to Spike S1 are shown by prior exposure status and  
381 number of doses received, individuals were included if they were sampled  $\geq 14$  days after the first  
382 dose or  $\geq 7$  days after the second dose. In (A-C) the dashed horizontal line depicts the threshold for  
383 seropositivity. S1: Spike S1, N: Nucleoprotein, IgG: immunoglobulin G, BAU/ml: binding antibody  
384 units.





