

1 Performance Characteristics of the Abbott Architect SARS-CoV-2 IgG Assay and Seroprevalence

2 Testing in Idaho

3

4 Andrew Bryan^{1*}, Gregory Pepper^{1*}, Mark H. Wener^{1,2}, Susan L. Fink¹, Chihiro Morishima¹, Anu

5 Chaudhary¹, Keith R. Jerome^{1,3}, Patrick C. Mathias^{1,4}, Alexander L. Greninger^{1,3,#}

6

7 ¹ Department of Laboratory Medicine, University of Washington School of Medicine, Seattle,

8 WA

9 ² Department of Medicine, University of Washington School of Medicine, Seattle, WA

10 ³ Vaccine and Infectious Disease Division, Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center, Seattle, WA

11 ⁴ Department of Biomedical Informatics and Medical Education, University of Washington

12 School of Medicine, Seattle, WA

13

14

15 * These authors contributed equally

16 # Corresponding author, agrening@uw.edu

17

18

19 Running title: Abbott SARS-CoV-2 IgG test

20

21 **Background:** Coronavirus disease-19 (COVID19), the novel respiratory illness caused by severe
22 acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2), is associated with severe morbidity
23 and mortality. The rollout of diagnostic testing in the United States was slow, leading to
24 numerous cases that were not tested for SARS-CoV-2 in February and March 2020,
25 necessitating the use of serological testing to determine past infections.

26 **Methods:** We evaluated the Abbott SARS-CoV-2 IgG test for detection of anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgG
27 antibodies by testing 3 distinct patient populations.

28 **Results:** We tested 1,020 serum specimens collected prior to SARS-CoV-2 circulation in the
29 United States and found one false positive, indicating a specificity of 99.90%. We tested 125
30 patients who tested RT-PCR positive for SARS-CoV-2 for which 689 excess serum specimens
31 were available and found sensitivity reached 100% at day 17 after symptom onset and day 13
32 after PCR positivity. Alternative index value thresholds for positivity resulted in 100% sensitivity
33 and 100% specificity in this cohort. We tested 4,856 individuals from Boise, Idaho collected over
34 one week in April 2020 as part of the Crush the Curve initiative and detected 87 positives for a
35 positivity rate of 1.79%.

36 **Conclusions:** These data demonstrate excellent analytical performance of the Abbott SARS-
37 CoV-2 IgG test as well as the limited circulation of the virus in the western United States. We
38 expect the availability of high-quality serological testing will be a key tool in the fight against
39 SARS-CoV-2.

40

41

42 Introduction

43 Coronavirus disease-19 (COVID19) is a novel respiratory illness caused by Severe acute
44 respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2), a novel *Sarbecovirus* that recently emerged
45 from Wuhan, China in late 2019 (1). COVID-19 often progresses to lower respiratory tract
46 illness and can be associated with severe morbidity and mortality (2).

47 Serological testing can detect past cases of SARS-CoV-2 for which RT-PCR testing was
48 either not performed or for which nasopharyngeal swab sampling resulted in false negatives.
49 Serological tests require exceptional sensitivity and specificity, especially when seroprevalence
50 is low, in order to have adequate positive predictive value (3). To date, most SARS-CoV-2
51 serological tests on the market have inadequate performance characteristics to perform
52 widespread population or clinical testing (4). Here, we evaluated the Abbott SARS-CoV-2 IgG
53 test for use on the Abbott Architect platform. This assay detects IgG antibodies against the
54 SARS-CoV-2 nucleocapsid protein.

55

56 Methods

57 *Patient Cohorts*

58 Specificity samples were derived from de-identified excess serum specimens sent to our clinical
59 virology laboratory in 2018 and 2019. Sensitivity specimens were derived from excess serum
60 specimens sent for clinical testing from persons who tested RT-PCR positive for SARS-CoV-2
61 during March and April 2020. With the exception of the studies of biologic precision, for
62 patients with an IgG result on more than 1 aliquot on a specific date following onset of
63 symptoms or PCR positivity, only the mean index value for that patient-day was included in the

64 data set to minimize the bias from individual patient seroconversion and variable numbers of
65 samples per patient. For the calculations of sensitivity and specificity at the patient level using
66 the manufacturer's recommended index value cutoff of 1.40 (Figure 1), patients were assumed
67 to be seronegative for each day preceding the most recent negative IgG result and to be
68 seropositive for each day following an initial positive result. Serum specimens sent from the
69 Boise, Idaho metropolitan area were collected over a one-week period in late April 2020 as part
70 of the Crush the Curve initiative. This work was approved under a consent waiver by the
71 University of Washington IRB.

72

73 *IgG Testing*

74 Serum samples were run on the Abbott Architect instrument using the Abbott SARS-CoV-2 IgG
75 assay after FDA notification following manufacturer's instructions. The assay is a
76 chemiluminescent microparticle immunoassay for qualitative detection of IgG in human serum
77 or plasma against the SARS-CoV-2 nucleoprotein. The Architect requires a minimum of 100 μ L of
78 serum or plasma. Qualitative results and index values reported by the instrument were used in
79 analysis.

80

81 *Data analysis and visualization*

82 Patient demographic information (sex and age) was extracted alongside laboratory order and
83 result data (including index value) from the laboratory information system (Sunquest
84 Laboratory, Tuscon, AZ). Partial AUC analysis and data visualization were performed using the R
85 packages pROC, ggplot2, and cowplot (5, 6).

86

87 **Results**

88 *Sensitivity and Specificity of the Abbott SARS-CoV-2 IgG Assay*

89 To determine assay specificity, we used 1,020 deidentified serum specimens from 1,010
90 different individuals sent to our laboratory for HSV Western blot serology in 2018 and 2019,
91 before SARS-CoV-2 was thought to be circulating in Washington State and the United States (7).
92 One serum specimen from this set tested positive with an initial index value of 1.41 and
93 repeated at 1.49, above the Abbott-determined positivity cutoff of 1.40 (Figure 1A). All other
94 specimens tested negative, leading to an assay specificity of 99.90% in pre-COVID-19 serum.

95 To determine assay sensitivity, we used a series of 125 patients who tested RT-PCR
96 positive for SARS-CoV-2 for which 689 excess serum specimens comprising 415 unique patient
97 follow-up days were available. The vast majority of these patients were hospitalized at the
98 University of Washington Medical Center-Northwest Campus in Seattle, WA between March
99 and April 2020. Fifty-eight percent of patients were male and 42% female. The age distribution
100 by decade of life was: 20-29: 2.4%, 30-39: 4.8%, 40-49: 9.6%, 50-59: 17.6%, 60-69: 17.6%, 70-
101 79: 24.0%, 80-89: 16.0%, >= 90: 8.0%.

102 The sensitivity of the assay from the estimated day of symptom onset for the 125
103 patients included in our chart-review study was 53.1% (95%CI 39.4%-66.3%) at 7 days, 82.4%
104 (51.0-76.4%) at 10 days, 96.9% (89.5-99.5%) at 14 days, and 100% (95.1%-100%) at day 17 using
105 the manufacturer's recommended cutoff of 1.4. The sensitivity from the date of PCR positivity
106 was: 88.7% (78.5-94.4%) at 7 days, 97.2% (90.4-99.5%) at 10 days, 100.0% at 14 days (95.4-
107 100.0%), and 100.0% (95.5-100.0%) at 17 days using the manufacturer's recommended cutoff

108 of 1.4. Intriguingly, 22 of 88 individuals (25%) for which serum was available on the first day of
109 PCR positivity had simultaneous detection of serum anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgG and nasopharyngeal
110 SARS-CoV-2 RNA (Figure 1B).

111 We next used our SARS-CoV-2 IgG index values over 415 unique patient-days to assess
112 the change in index value over time, from the date of symptom onset (Figure 1C) and first
113 positive PCR result (Figure 1D). For these patients early in the course of their infections, index
114 values consistently increased over time, both on the review of individual patients with multiple
115 IgG results over time and aggregate summary data.

116 Based on our data suggesting consistent seroconversion and the low false positive rate
117 in our specificity study, we next asked what optimal index value cutoffs were for different days
118 after onset of symptoms or PCR positivity. Partial AUC analysis was performed setting the
119 minimum specificity between 99.0% and 99.9% (Tables 1-2), to minimize false positives given
120 the low seroprevalence to SARS-CoV-2 expected in our population and to identify the optimal
121 index thresholds for different potential uses of the test. These analyses indicated that optimal
122 thresholds for the serologic diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2 was 1.42-1.49 at ≥ 17 days from symptom
123 onset (sensitivity and specificity 100%); 0.7 at ≥ 14 days from onset (Sens 97.9%, Spec 99.6%);
124 0.7 at ≥ 10 days from onset (Sens 94.4%, Spec 99.6%); and 0.7 at ≥ 7 days from onset (Sens
125 88.0%, Spec 99.6%) (Figure 2).

126 Given our large unique data set, we next assessed the biologic variation of the antibody
127 results in PCR positive patients by examining all test results where at least 3 remnant serum or
128 plasma samples were available from the same day for the same patient. The coefficient of
129 variation was calculated for each of 75 available patient-days and plotted against the index

130 value (Figure 3A). The reproducibility of the measurable anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgG response was
131 robust across the index value range except for 2 situations: 1) higher CV's associated with very
132 low index values <0.1 related to analytical 'noise'; and 2) higher CVs related to the rapid change
133 in antibody levels associated with active seroconversion. The CV was < 10% for all included
134 patient-days above an index value of 0.4 except for 4 data points representing 3 different
135 patients in the process of seroconversion. For 3 of these 4 patient-days with CVs >10%, samples
136 had been drawn several hours apart. To further examine the process of seroconversion in
137 individual patients, we identified 7 patients that had IgG results available on at least 5 different
138 patient-days and in whom we captured the process of seroconversion, plus 1 patient that
139 appeared to be in the process of seroconverting, but did not cross positivity threshold (Figure
140 3B). In addition to assessment of the biologic variation, traditional analytic precision was
141 determined: the same remnant sample was analyzed 5-10 times on each of 3 Abbott Architect
142 instruments, yielding individuals CVs of between 1.4% and 2.5% and a cumulative CV of 2.6%
143 (cumulative mean 2.26).

144

145

146 *SARS-CoV-2 Seroprevalence Survey in Boise, Idaho*

147 We tested 4,856 individuals from Boise, Idaho sampled over one week in late April 2020
148 as part of the Crush the Curve initiative to determine anti-SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence in this
149 community. The age distribution of this cohort was: 0-19: 4.9%, 20-29: 6.2%, 30-39: 17.1%, 40-
150 49: 22.7%, 50-59: 23.5%, 60-69: 18.3%, 70-79: 6.7%, 80+: 0.5% (Table 3). The cohort had a
151 greater representation from female individuals with 54.2% female, 41.9% male with 3.9%

152 unknown. We detected 87 positive specimens in this cohort corresponding to a seroprevalence
153 of 1.79%, using the manufacturer's index value threshold of 1.40. Seroprevalence was higher
154 among males at 2.1% than it was among females at 1.6%. Those without a reported gender had
155 a seropositivity of 2.6%. Seroprevalence was highest among those over 80 years (4%), 60-69
156 year-olds (2.5%), and 20-29 year-olds (2.3%), and was lowest among those under 19 years of
157 age (0.4%).

158

159 **Discussion**

160 Here we report the performance characteristics of the recently available Abbott SARS-
161 CoV-2 IgG assay. Using the manufacturer's recommended index value cutoff of 1.40 for
162 determining positivity, we report an assay specificity of 99.9% from 1,020 pre-COVID-19 serum
163 specimens and sensitivity of 100% at 17 days after symptom onset and 13 days after PCR
164 positivity. Our results mirror that of the assay package insert, which details a 99.6% specificity
165 from 1,000 SARS-CoV-2 specimens and 100% sensitivity by day 14 after specimens.

166 In our own cohort, we found increasing the threshold would have resulted in a 100%
167 specificity and 100% sensitivity at 17 days post-symptom onset. However, the optimal
168 threshold may depend on the intended clinical use of the test and the characteristics of the
169 target population. Given limitations of clinical sensitivity of SARS-CoV-2 PCR testing for various
170 sample types, IgG serology with an applied low threshold may be a useful adjunctive diagnostic
171 for patients with negative PCR results who have been symptomatic for ≥ 7 days with a clinical
172 presentation consistent with COVID-19 disease. In contrast, a higher threshold might be
173 considered for PCR-negative asymptomatic patients for assessing previous undiagnosed

174 infection. For laboratories reporting a single diagnostic result for both populations, it may be
175 useful to report an inconclusive range corresponding to an OD ratio of roughly 0.8-1.5 with a
176 recommendation for repeat testing to minimize false negative results associated with
177 seroconversion. At this time, repeat serology may be preferable to a diagnostic algorithm using
178 a secondary assay, as no specific confirmatory assay with sufficient sensitivity and specificity
179 exists at this time.

180 Our serological validation was chiefly limited by use of excess serum specimens from a
181 mostly hospitalized population known to be very recently infected with SARS-CoV-2. This
182 convenience sample meant that PCR and serology data were not available for each day since
183 symptom onset, requiring us to censor follow-up days accordingly (e.g. days before if the first
184 longitudinal serological result was positive or days afterward if the last serological result was
185 negative). The majority of patients in this study were elderly individuals – 65.6% were older
186 than 60 years of age – many of whom also had altered mental status at time of presentation,
187 complicating our ability to accurately ascertain symptom onset. The elderly, hospitalized
188 population used in our sensitivity cohort could account for the delayed time to positivity seen in
189 our cohort versus the Abbott package insert (17 vs 14 days post-symptom onset), as declining
190 immune responses are associated with advanced age (8). It is unclear what the prevalence of
191 antibody is in individuals with subclinical or asymptomatic infections. We were also restricted
192 to limited descriptive epidemiological information on the serological survey conducted within
193 the Boise, Idaho metropolitan area. The Abbott SARS-CoV-2 IgG test is also limited in that it only
194 detects IgG antibodies directed against nucleocapsid and cannot be used for recombinant spike
195 protein vaccine studies.

196 Overall, our data demonstrate excellent performance of the Abbott Architect SARS-CoV-
197 2 IgG Assay and a high level of consistency with the package insert. Our data reinforce the
198 limited circulation of SARS-CoV-2 in the Pacific Northwest during early 2020. We expect high-
199 quality serological testing will be an important component of the diagnostic approach to SARS-
200 CoV-2.

201

202 *Acknowledgements*

203 The authors would like to thank the team behind Crush the Curve Idaho for facilitating sample
204 collection and delivery for SARS-CoV-2 IgG testing. We would also like to thank the University of
205 Washington Medical Center Northwest Campus clinical laboratory staff for reserving remnant
206 serum and plasma samples from COVID-19 PCR positive patients, particularly Leanne Gilly and
207 Michelle Manis. This work was supported by the Department of Laboratory Medicine at the
208 University of Washington Medical Center. ALG reports personal fees from Abbott Molecular,
209 outside of the submitted work.

210

211 **References**

- 212 1. Zhu N, Zhang D, Wang W, Li X, Yang B, Song J, Zhao X, Huang B, Shi W, Lu R, Niu P, Zhan F,
213 Ma X, Wang D, Xu W, Wu G, Gao GF, Tan W. 2020. A Novel Coronavirus from Patients with
214 Pneumonia in China, 2019. *New England Journal of Medicine* 382:727–733.
- 215 2. Yang X, Yu Y, Xu J, Shu H, Xia J, Liu H, Wu Y, Zhang L, Yu Z, Fang M, Yu T, Wang Y, Pan S, Zou
216 X, Yuan S, Shang Y. 2020. Clinical course and outcomes of critically ill patients with SARS-

- 217 CoV-2 pneumonia in Wuhan, China: a single-centered, retrospective, observational study.
218 The Lancet Respiratory Medicine.
- 219 3. Meyer B, Drosten C, Müller MA. 2014. Serological assays for emerging coronaviruses:
220 challenges and pitfalls. *Virus Res* 194:175–183.
- 221 4. Torres R, Rinder HM. 2020. Double-Edged Spike: Are SARS-CoV-2 Serologic Tests Safe Right
222 Now? *Am J Clin Pathol*.
- 223 5. Robin X, Turck N, Hainard A, Tiberti N, Lisacek F, Sanchez J-C, Müller M. 2011. pROC: an
224 open-source package for R and S+ to analyze and compare ROC curves. *BMC Bioinformatics*
225 12:77.
- 226 6. Wickham H. 2016. *ggplot2: Elegant Graphics for Data Analysis*. Springer-Verlag New York.
- 227 7. Bedford T, Greninger AL, Roychoudhury P, Starita LM, Famulare M, Huang M-L, Nalla A,
228 Pepper G, Reinhardt A, Xie H, Shrestha L, Nguyen TN, Adler A, Brandstetter E, Cho S, Giroux
229 D, Han PD, Fay K, Frazar CD, Ilcisin M, Lacombe K, Lee J, Kiavand A, Richardson M, Sibley TR,
230 Truong M, Wolf CR, Nickerson DA, Rieder MJ, Englund JA, the Seattle Flu Study
231 Investigators, Hadfield J, Hodcroft EB, Huddleston J, Moncla LH, Müller NF, Neher RA, Deng
232 X, Gu W, Federman S, Chiu C, Duchin J, Gautom R, Melly G, Hiatt B, Dykema P, Lindquist S,
233 Queen K, Tao Y, Uehara A, Tong S, MacCannell D, Armstrong GL, Baird GS, Chu HY,
234 Shendure J, Jerome KR. 2020. Cryptic transmission of SARS-CoV-2 in Washington State.
235 preprint, *Epidemiology*.

236 8. Montecino-Rodriguez E, Berent-Maoz B, Dorshkind K. 2013. Causes, consequences, and
237 reversal of immune system aging. *J Clin Invest* 123:958–965.

238

239

240 Table 1. ROC analysis to determine optimal index value thresholds from day of onset.

Minimum Specificity	Days From Onset	Threshold	Sensitivity	Specificity	pAUC
99.9%	≥ 17	1.5	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	≥ 14	1.5	97.2%	100.0%	98.6%
	≥ 10	1.5	92.1%	100.0%	96.1%
	≥ 7	1.4	84.2%	100.0%	92.1%
99.8%	≥ 17	1.5	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	≥ 14	1.5	97.2%	100.0%	98.6%
	≥ 10	1.5	92.1%	100.0%	96.1%
	≥ 7	1.3	94.9%	99.9%	92.2%
99.5%	≥ 17	1.5	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	≥ 14	0.8	97.9%	99.6%	98.6%
	≥ 10	0.7	94.4%	99.6%	96.4%
	≥ 7	0.7	88.0%	99.6%	92.8%
99.0%	≥ 17	1.5	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	≥ 14	0.8	97.9%	99.6%	98.8%
	≥ 10	0.6	94.9%	99.3%	96.9%
	≥ 7	0.6	88.4%	99.3%	93.4%

241

242 Table 2. ROC analysis to determine optimal index value thresholds from day of first positive

243 PCR result.

Minimum Specificity	Days From PCR	Threshold	Sensitivity	Specificity	pAUC
99.9%	≥ 17	1.6	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	≥ 14	1.6	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	≥ 10	1.6	96.4%	100.0%	98.2%
	≥ 7	1.6	90.7%	100.0%	95.3%
99.8%	≥ 17	1.6	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	≥ 14	1.6	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	≥ 10	1.6	96.4%	100.0%	98.2%
	≥ 7	1.3	91.9%	99.9%	95.6%
99.5%	≥ 17	1.5	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	≥ 14	0.8	97.9%	99.6%	98.6%
	≥ 10	0.7	94.4%	99.6%	96.4%
	≥ 7	0.7	88.0%	99.6%	92.8%
99.0%	≥ 17	1.6	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

	≥ 14	1.6	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	≥ 10	0.7	98.2%	99.6%	98.8%
	≥ 7	0.7	93.6%	99.6%	96.4%

244

245

246 Table 3 – Descriptive Epidemiology of Crush the Curve Seroprevalence Survey in Boise, Idaho

	Total (%)	Positive (%)
Total	4856 (100%)	87 (1.8%)
Reported Gender		
Female	2631 (54.2%)	42 (1.6%)
Male	2035 (41.9%)	40 (2.1%)
Unknown	190 (3.9%)	5 (2.6%)
Age (years)		
0-19	240 (4.9%)	1 (0.4%)
20-29	301 (6.2%)	7 (2.3%)
30-39	831 (17.1%)	13 (1.6%)
40-49	1102 (22.7%)	18 (1.6%)
50-59	1142 (23.5%)	22 (1.9%)
60-69	888 (18.3%)	22 (2.5%)
70-79	327 (6.7%)	3 (0.9%)
80+	25 (0.5%)	1 (4%)

247

248





249 **Figure Legends**

250 **Figure 1** – Performance characteristics of the Abbott SARS-CoV-2 IgG test. A) Specificity was
251 determined using 1,020 serum specimens taken before circulation of SARS-CoV-2 in the United
252 States. Index values by sample are shown in rank order, and sample with index values greater
253 than 0.7 are labeled. B) Sensitivity by day since symptom onset and PCR positivity is depicted
254 for 689 excess serum specimens comprising 415 unique patient follow-up days from 125 unique
255 patients, using the manufacturer’s recommended positivity index value cutoff of 1.40. Index
256 values are depicted by day since symptom onset (C) or PCR positivity (D). Index values were
257 averaged for patients with multiple specimens from the same day. The index value threshold of
258 1.40 for positivity is depicted in the red horizontal dashed line.


259
260 **Figure 2** – Receiver operating characteristic curves for the Abbott SARS-CoV-2 IgG test based on
261 ≥ 17 days (A), ≥ 14 days (B), ≥ 10 days (C), ≥ 7 days (D) after symptom onset or PCR positivity.
262 Minimum specificity was set to 99.5%.

263
264 **Figure 3** – Variation among biological replicates is explained by seroconversion. A) Coefficient of
265 variation versus index value is depicted for biological serum replicates from individuals who had
266 more than 3 serum or plasma draws from the same calendar day. Specimens taken from
267 individuals who were seroconverting during the repeat sampling period are shown in red. B)
268 Index value over time since symptom onset is shown for seven individuals who seroconverted
269 and one who failed to meet the positivity threshold during the sampling period. Each individual


270 is depicted by a different color. The index value threshold of 1.40 for positivity is depicted in
271 the red horizontal dashed line.




A.



B.



C.



D.

