Detection of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies using commercial assays and seroconversion patterns in hospitalized patients

Tuaillon E[1*], Bolloré K[2], Pisoni A[1], Debiesse S[2], Renault C[2], Marie S[3], Groc S[3], Niels C[3], Pansu N[3], Dupuy AM[3], Morquin D[3], Foulongne V[1], Bourdin A[3], Le Moing V[3], Van de Perre P[1]

1. Pathogenesis and Control of Chronic Infections, University of Montpellier, INSERM, EFS; CHU Montpellier, Montpellier, France.
2. Pathogenesis and Control of Chronic Infections, University of Montpellier, INSERM, EFS, Montpellier, France.
3. Montpellier University Hospital, Montpellier, France.

Corresponding author: e-tuaillon@chu-montpellier.fr

Keywords: COVID-19, SARS-CoV-2 antibodies, point of care tests, ELISA

Abstract:

SARS-CoV-2 antibody assays are needed for serological surveys and as a complement to molecular tests to confirm COVID-19. However, the kinetics of the humoral response against SARS-CoV-2 remains poorly described and relies on the performance of the different serological tests.

In this study, we evaluated the performance of six CE-marked point-of-care tests (POC) and three ELISA assays for the diagnosis of COVID-19 by exploring seroconversions in hospitalized patients who tested positive for SARS-CoV-2 RNA.

Both the ELISA and POC tests were able to detect SARS-CoV-2 antibodies in at least half of the samples collected seven days or more after the onset of symptoms. After 15 days, the rate of detection rose to over 80% but without reaching 100%, irrespective of the test used. More than 90% of the samples collected after 15 days tested positive using the iSIA and Accu-Tell® POC tests and the ID.Vet IgG ELISA assay. Seroconversion was observed 5 to 12 days after the onset of symptoms. Three assays suffer from a specificity below 90% (EUROIMMUN IgG and IgA, UNscience, Zhuhai Livzon).

The second week of COVID-19 seems to be the best period for assessing the sensitivity of commercial serological assays. To achieve an early diagnosis of COVID-19 based on antibody detection, a dual challenge must be met: the immunodiagnostic window period must be shortened and an optimal specificity must be conserved.

43 **I. Introduction**

44 Severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus type 2 (SARS-CoV-2) infection was considered
45 pandemic on 11 March 2020. Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) began affecting France in mid-
46 February 2020, spreading in particular from a large, four-day long evangelical meeting that began on
47 February 17 and gathered 2,500 people in the northeastern city of Mulhouse. The *in vitro* diagnosis
48 of COVID-19 is currently based on the detection of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in respiratory tract specimens
49 (1). Viral RNA can be detected in nasopharyngeal swabs, sputum and bronchoalveolar lavage.
50 However, studies suggest that false-negative test results are relatively frequent, occurring in up to
51 40% of swab and sputum specimens (2). Confirmation of clinical diagnosis based on molecular tests
52 also can be difficult in mild forms of COVID-19 and when samples are collected long after the onset
53 of the disease (3).

54 Serology may be a promising way to assess SARS-Cov-2 infection, complementing molecular
55 techniques. Immunological methods can be used to detect the presence of IgM, IgA and IgG directed
56 against SARS-CoV-2 antigenic sites, usually located in the SARS-CoV-2 protein S or protein N (4, 5).
57 Since the beginning of the epidemic, commercial assays - using either laboratory assays or rapid test
58 formats - have been developed rapidly. While serological tests might be a simple and effective
59 screening method, they have shown limitations in the diagnosis of acute infections due to the time
60 required for an adaptive immune response to be acquired. In the very early phase of acute infections,
61 the capacity of serological tests to confirm a diagnosis is hence limited. Subjects with suspected
62 COVID-19 may seek advice and care immediately or several days after the onset of their symptoms.
63 IgM antibodies are produced by short-lived plasma cells during the early phase of the B cell response,
64 providing a first line of adaptive defense against viral infections, whereas the long-term humoral
65 response is based on high affinity IgG. However, the kinetics of the humoral response against SARS-
66 CoV-2 remains incompletely described as it fully relies on the performance of the serological tests

67 used. Serological tests may be useful to confirm SARS-CoV-2 infection when the seroconversion is
68 evidenced, and obviously for epidemiological serological surveys.

69 Many COVID-19 serological assays are commercialized in Europe, and most are CE-IVD marked. With
70 the exception of high-risk products, whose performance is subject to an external control by a
71 European Notified Body, it is the manufacturers' own responsibility to ensure that products delivered
72 to European markets meet the essential requirements. The performance of CE-IVD marked assays
73 therefore must be assessed and compared. POC tests dedicated to detecting anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgM
74 and IgG antibodies may also allow access to *in vitro* diagnostic tests outside laboratory facilities.
75 Some authors reported encouraging results using rapid lateral flow assays testing anti-IgM and IgG
76 SARS-CoV-2 antibodies, whereas other studies have reported poor sensitivity in patients with proven
77 COVID-19 (6–8).
78 In this study, we assessed and compared the performance of six rapid tests and three ELISAs for the
79 diagnosis of COVID-19, and explored seroconversions in subjects with confirmed COVID-19
80 hospitalized at the Montpellier University Hospital.

81

82 **II. Material and Methods**

83 From 18 March 2020, plasma samples were collected from consecutive patients hospitalized in the
84 Montpellier University Hospital with PCR-proven or suspected COVID-19 and included in the
85 "COVIDotheque" cohort (ClinicalTrials.gov Identifier: NCT04347850). Negative PCR-tested patients
86 for SARS-CoV-2 RNA were excluded from the present evaluation of serological tests. The cohort
87 received an institutional ethics committee approval (CPP Ile de France III, n°2020-A00935-34). The
88 demographic and clinical characteristics of the patients are detailed in Table 1. Severity of the Covid-
89 19 infection was defined following current WHO guidelines (6). Controls consisted of samples
90 collected in 2017-2018 in patients care in the department of Infectious Diseases and stored at -80°C
91 until used (DC-2015-2473).

92 **Table 1: Patient's characteristics**

	1 - 6 days*	7-14 days*	≥ 15 days*	Controls**
Number of patients	9	14	15	20
Age (mean, SD)	72 (55-90)	65 (39-86)	66 (51-83)	41 (17-72)
Sex ratio M/F	7/2	8/6	7/8	10/10
Severe COVID-19	4	9	13	-

93 * Days between onset of symptoms and sample collection

94 ** Controls consisted of samples collected in the pre-COVID-19 period (2017-2018)

95 All serological assays were performed in strict accordance with the manufacturer's instructions.

96

97 **ELISAs**

98 The ID.Vet, ID screen® SARS-CoV-2-N IgG indirect (ID.Vet, Montpellier, France), is an assay based on
99 the detection of IgG antibodies directed against the nucleocapsid protein suitable for serum or
100 plasma. A 100 µl volume of 1/20 diluted plasma samples was added to microplate wells and
101 incubated for 45 minutes at 21°C. Wells were washed three times, then HRP-conjugated protein G
102 was added and the mixture was incubated for 30 minutes at 21 °C. Wells then were washed again
103 three times and a chromogen solution was added. Following 20 minutes of incubation at 21 °C, the
104 reaction was stopped and the resultant absorbance was read on a microplate reader at 450 nm. The
105 cut-off value for a positive result was calculated according to the manufacturer's instructions: a ratio
106 < 60% is considered negative, ≥ 60% and < 70% borderline, and ≥ 70% positive.

107 SARS-CoV-2 IgA and IgG (EUROIMMUN, Lubeck, Germany) are assays based on the detection of
108 either IgA or IgG on two separate microplates using a recombinant subunit protein 1 (S1) in serum or
109 plasma. A 100 µl volume of 1:101 diluted plasma samples was added to microplate wells and
110 incubated for 60 minutes at 37 °C. Wells were washed three times, then HRP-conjugated anti-human
111 IgA or IgG were added and the mixture was incubated for 30 minutes at 37 °C. Wells then were

112 washed again three times and a chromogen solution was added. Following 30 minutes of incubation
113 at room temperature, the reaction was stopped and the resultant absorbance was read on a
114 microplate reader at 450 nm with reference at 620 nm. The ratio between the extinction of the
115 sample and calibrator on each plate was calculated. According to the manufacturer's instructions, a
116 ratio <0.8 is considered negative, ≥0.8 and <1.1 borderline, and ≥1.1 positive. However, for sensitivity
117 and specificity, 1.1 was used as a more stringent cut-off value for positive results and all values.

118

119 **Point-of-care (POC) tests**

120 Six COVID-19 lateral flow assays were evaluated. Five of these detect IgM and IgG SARS-CoV-2
121 antibodies separately: AccuBioTech Co, Ltd. Accu-Tell® COVID-19 IgG/IgM Rapid Test; (Beijing, China),
122 Zhuhai Livzon Pharmaceutical Group Inc. 2019-nCoV IgM/IgG Antibody Test Kit, (Guangdong, China),
123 Chongqing iSIA BIO-Technology Co., Ltd. 2019-nCoV IgM/IgG Diagnostic Test Kit; (Chongqing, China);
124 UNscience Biotechnology Co., Ltd. COVID-19 IgG/IgM Rapid Test Kit, (Wuhan, China), Acro Biotech,
125 Inc., 2019-nCoV IgM/IgG Rapid Test; (Rancho Cucomonga CA, USA). One only detects IgM:
126 Guangdong Hecin Biotech Co., Ltd. 2019-nCoV IgM Antibody Test Kit, (Guangzhou, China). These POC
127 tests can be performed on whole blood, serum, or plasma, and require 10µl of samples collected by
128 venous puncture or capillary blood collection and a buffer. In the presence of a control signal, any
129 band, even weakly visible, located in the IgM and/or IgG position is considered positive.

130

131 **Statistical analyses.** Data were summarized by number and percentage for categorical variables, i.e.,
132 positive and negative results. Samples were stratified in three categories according to the delay
133 between the onset of symptoms and sample collection: 0-6 days, 7-14 days, ≥15 days or more. Assay
134 agreement was assessed by computing the percentage of concordant results between tests for each
135 category. Exact 95% confidence intervals were calculated by means of a binomial law
136 accommodating for the small sample size.

137

138 ## III. Results

139 Clinical samples collected before the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic were used to check the
140 specificity of the assays (Fig. 1 and Table 2). All results of POC tests were considered as interpretable,
141 although the signal was sometimes weak on the internal control band. IgM and IgG bands were
142 observed in several COVID-19 negative samples using the UNscience POC tests. One out of the 20
143 COVID-19 negative samples also tested positive using the Zhuhai Livzon POC test as a consequence of
144 a single IgM band. All of the COVID-19 negative samples tested negative using the other four POC
145 tests. False positive results were observed in both the EUROIMMUN IgA and IgG ELISAs. For both of
146 these ELISAs, the results were situated in the "gray zone" in three cases and over the cut-off value in
147 one case. All of the COVID-19 negative samples tested negative using the ID.Vet ELISA.

148 Samples collected during the first six days of COVID-19 symptoms were rarely reported as positive by
149 any assay, ranging from 0% to 10%, varying with the six assays which all had a 100% specificity. The
150 proportion of samples testing positive for anti-SARS-CoV-2 rose to 50-85% during the second week of
151 COVID-19-related symptoms. IgG bands were more frequently detected or in a similar proportion as
152 IgM bands in POC tests during the second week.

153 Using the EUROIMMUN assays, anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgA were more frequently detected than IgG during
154 the second week. After at least 15 days following the onset of symptoms, the proportion of anti-
155 SARS-CoV-2 samples exceeded 80% for all of the benchmarked tests. Among the assays that obtained
156 a 100% specificity, two POC tests (iSIA and Accu-Tell®) and one ELISA (ID.Vet) obtained a sensitivity
157 greater than 90%. Good overall agreement between assays was recorded during the first week of
158 the disease course as most samples tested negative regardless of the test used, and after the second
159 week of COVID-19 since most of the samples tested positive (Fig. 2).

160 Signal-to-cut-off (S/CO) results were analyzed to provide semi-quantitative results using ELISA assays
161 (Fig. 3). We observed a bimodal distribution of S/CO values for anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgG for both the

162 EUROIMMUN and ID.Vet assays. Hence, S/CO remained generally low in samples collected within five
163 days of symptom onset, contrasting most of the time with values from samples collected 10 days
164 after symptom onset that were clearly over the cut-off. Although less obvious, the same trend was
165 observed using the IgA assay. The development of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies was analyzed over time in
166 four hospitalized patients (Fig. 4). In three patients, IgA and IgG were detected by the end of the first
167 week after the onset of symptoms (days 5-7) using the IgG and IgA ELISAs. Development of SARS-
168 CoV-2 antibodies was delayed up to days 12 and 15 for the last patient. Using the Accu-Tell® POC
169 test, seroconversion detected by SARS-CoV-2 antibodies occurred around the same time as the
170 ELISAs. IgG were detectable after IgM for one patients (Fig. 5A), before IgM for one patient (Fig. 5C),
171 and along with IgM for one patients (Fig. 5B&D).

172

173 **IV. Discussion**

174 In this study we evaluated the performance of commercial COVID-19 serological assays in POC and
175 ELISA formats. The tests were able to detect anti-SARS-CoV-2 in the majority of samples collected
176 seven days or more after the onset of symptoms. Clinical samples tested during the second week of
177 the disease tested positive with at least two tests. After 15 days, the rate of detection was high (>
178 80%) but never optimal (<100%) irrespective of the test used. More than 90% of the samples
179 collected more than 15 days after symptom onset tested positive using the iSIA and Accu-Tell® POC
180 tests. Although based only on IgG detection, a similar level of sensitivity was obtained using the
181 ID.Vet ELISA assay. Three assays suffer from an insufficient specificity (EUROIMMUN IgG and IgA,
182 UNscience, Zhuhai Livzon). Repeated testing from the early phase of the symptoms allowed IgG
183 seroconversion to be observed during the second week of COVID-19. These results confirmed
184 previous studies performed in hospitalized patients that used other serological assays (7–10).

185 Three out of six POC tests had a sensitivity greater than 90% for samples collected at least 15 days
186 after the onset of symptoms. During the second week of COVID-19, IgM were not detected before

187 IgG by means of the POC tests used in this study, suggesting that the IgM bands were not very
188 sensitive. Furthermore, the Hecin Biotech POC test based on detection of IgM alone was not more
189 sensitive on samples collected during the second week of COVID-19 compared to the IgM/IgG POC
190 test. Samples generally tested negative during the first week, suggesting that either this is too early
191 for the anti-SARS-CoV-2 specific response, or the antibody concentration is too tenuous to be
192 detected using POC tests. Considering only the POC tests for which we observed a 100% specificity,
193 IgM bands alone were detected in the few samples that tested positive during the first week of
194 COVID-19. The capacity of POC tests to detect IgM before IgG was disappointing. This observation
195 contrasts with previous studies suggesting that anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgM can be detectable several days
196 before IgG, reducing the window period of serological tests (10, 11). The lateral flow assays tested in
197 this study lack the sensitivity to detect IgM bands, but this may mitigate the risk of non-specific IgM
198 antibody detection due to interference factors such as rheumatoid factor IgM (12). Four of the six
199 POC tests had a specificity of 100%, which will have to be confirmed on a larger number of samples.

200 We frequently observed a weak signal in the IgM/IgG ELISAs, making it difficult to read the COVID-19
201 POC tests. By comparison with the POC tests, ELISA offers the advantage of an objective reading. One
202 ELISA manufacturer has based its assays on the detection of antibodies directed against spike protein
203 1 (S1) antigen (EUROIMMUN), and the second manufacturer on the nucleoprotein (NP) (ID.Vet). The
204 follow up by ELISA of four hospitalized patients confirmed the development of SARS-CoV-2
205 antibodies at the end of the first week of COVID-19 in three patients, but only after a delay of 12 days
206 in one patient. After 15 days from the onset of symptoms, the three ELISA kits showed a good ability
207 (>90%) to detect SARS-CoV-2 antibodies. As previously reported, anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgA were detected
208 earlier compared to IgG, but the assay had the disadvantage of a poor specificity, which has been
209 reported previously (13). Overall, our results suggest that a second testing of IgA/IgG positive results
210 might be necessary to control the rise of the signal when a low or moderate positive S/CO ratio is
211 obtained when using the EUROIMMUN tests. The prevalence of anti-SARS-CoV-2 was estimated to be
212 as low as 3.1% in the Occitanie region in May 2020 (14). In this context, a very high specificity is

213 required to obtain a good positive predictive value and an accurate estimate of anti-SARS-CoV-2
214 antibody prevalence in surveys. To control the specificity of the ID.Vet assay, we tested 100
215 additional samples collected before the occurrence of the SARS-CoV-2 epidemic and obtained a
216 99.6% specificity (data not shown).

217 Our study is one of the very first to evaluate the performance of commercial SARS-CoV-2 serologic
218 assays. It suffers two main weaknesses. First, the evaluation is based on a relatively small number of
219 plasma samples. This is due to the fact that only a limited number of samples were available during
220 the early phases of the epidemic in France. As a result, the estimation of sensitivity and specificity
221 values are relatively imprecise. Our preliminary results should be completed by investigations on a
222 larger sample size. Second, we selected samples from hospitalized patients with moderate to severe
223 COVID-19. The intensity of the humoral response to SARS-CoV-2 N or S proteins may be lower in
224 asymptomatic or paucisymptomatic COVID-19 cases. Again, our evaluation should be extended to a
225 larger group of subjects with different clinical presentations including asymptomatic infections.

226 In conclusion, COVID-19 serological assays in both lateral flow and ELISA formats have a good
227 capacity to detect SARS-CoV-2 antibodies two weeks after the onset of symptoms. The rate of
228 detection is close to zero during the first week. The rate of detection is variable during the second
229 week of COVID-19. Using POC tests, IgM detection did not appear earlier than IgG detection. ELISAs
230 detecting IgG directed against spike protein 1 versus nucleoprotein achieved comparable
231 sensitivities, but with a better specificity for the N protein-based ID.Vet test. The second week of the
232 disease is probably the best period of time to evaluate the sensitivity of the serological assays. Since
233 the most severe symptoms are observed after seven days of evolution, serological assays may be
234 useful in the diagnosis of patients with acute respiratory distress syndrome and a negative PCR assay.
235 In our study, repeated testing confirms that seroconversions occur during the second week of the
236 disease. To achieve an early diagnosis of COVID-19 based on antibody detection, a dual challenge

must be met: the immunodiagnostic window period must be shortened and an optimal specificity must be conserved.

Notes

Acknowledgments. We are grateful to Thomas Landragin for his technical assistance. We thank Grace Delobel for english language editing and review services.

Funding. This work was supported by Grants from Montpellier University Hospital and Montpellier University (MUSE).

Conflict of Interest. The authors declare that there are no conflicts of interest.

250 **References**

251 1. Tang Y-W, Schmitz JE, Persing DH, Stratton CW. 2020. The Laboratory Diagnosis of COVID-19
252 Infection: Current Issues and Challenges. J Clin Microbiol.

253 2. Wang W, Xu Y, Gao R, Lu R, Han K, Wu G, Tan W. 2020. Detection of SARS-CoV-2 in Different
254 Types of Clinical Specimens. JAMA.

255 3. Pan Y, Zhang D, Yang P, Poon LLM, Wang Q. 2020. Viral load of SARS-CoV-2 in clinical samples.
256 Lancet Infect Dis 20:411–412.

257 4. Qu J, Wu C, Li X, Zhang G, Jiang Z, Li X, Zhu Q, Liu L. 2020. Profile of IgG and IgM antibodies
258 against severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2). Clin Infect Dis.

259 5. Perera RA, Mok CK, Tsang OT, Lv H, Ko RL, Wu NC, Yuan M, Leung WS, Chan JM, Chik TS, Choi
260 CY, Leung K, Chan KH, Chan KC, Li K-C, Wu JT, Wilson IA, Monto AS, Poon LL, Peiris M. 2020.
261 Serological assays for severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2), March
262 2020. Euro Surveill 25.

263 6. WHO. Clinical management of severe acute respiratory infection (SARI) when COVID-19 disease
264 is suspected. WHO/2019-nCoV/clinical/2020.4.

265 7. Wölfel R, Corman VM, Guggemos W, Seilmaier M, Zange S, Müller MA, Niemeyer D, Jones TC,
266 Vollmar P, Rothe C, Hoelscher M, Bleicker T, Brünink S, Schneider J, Ehmann R, Zwirglmaier K,
267 Drosten C, Wendtner C. 2020. Virological assessment of hospitalized patients with COVID-2019.
268 Nature.

269 8. To KK-W, Tsang OT-Y, Leung W-S, Tam AR, Wu T-C, Lung DC, Yip CC-Y, Cai J-P, Chan JM-C, Chik
270 TS-H, Lau DP-L, Choi CY-C, Chen L-L, Chan W-M, Chan K-H, Ip JD, Ng AC-K, Poon RW-S, Luo C-T,
271 Cheng VC-C, Chan JF-W, Hung IF-N, Chen Z, Chen H, Yuen K-Y. 2020. Temporal profiles of viral

272 load in posterior oropharyngeal saliva samples and serum antibody responses during infection
273 by SARS-CoV-2: an observational cohort study. Lancet Infect Dis.

274 9. Guo L, Ren L, Yang S, Xiao M, Chang D, Yang F, Dela Cruz CS, Wang Y, Wu C, Xiao Y, Zhang L, Han
275 L, Dang S, Xu Y, Yang Q, Xu S, Zhu H, Xu Y, Jin Q, Sharma L, Wang L, Wang J. 2020. Profiling Early
276 Humoral Response to Diagnose Novel Coronavirus Disease (COVID-19). Clin Infect Dis.

277 10. Zhao J, Yuan Q, Wang H, Liu W, Liao X, Su Y, Wang X, Yuan J, Li T, Li J, Qian S, Hong C, Wang F,
278 Liu Y, Wang Z, He Q, Li Z, He B, Zhang T, Fu Y, Ge S, Liu L, Zhang J, Xia N, Zhang Z. 2020. Antibody
279 responses to SARS-CoV-2 in patients of novel coronavirus disease 2019. Clin Infect Dis.

280 11. Xiang F, Wang X, He X, Peng Z, Yang B, Zhang J, Zhou Q, Ye H, Ma Y, Li H, Wei X, Cai P, Ma W-L.
281 2020. Antibody Detection and Dynamic Characteristics in Patients with COVID-19. Clin Infect
282 Dis.

283 12. Wang Q, Du Q, Guo B, Mu D, Lu X, Ma Q, Guo Y, Fang L, Zhang B, Zhang G, Guo X. 2020. A
284 method to prevent SARS-CoV-2 IgM false positives in gold immunochromatography and
285 enzyme-linked immunosorbent assays. J Clin Microbiol.

286 13. Okba NMA, Müller MA, Li W, Wang C, GeurtsvanKessel CH, Corman VM, Lamers MM, Sikkema
287 RS, de Bruin E, Chandler FD, Yazdanpanah Y, Le Hingrat Q, Descamps D, Houhou-Fidouh N,
288 Reusken CBEM, Bosch B-J, Drosten C, Koopmans MPG, Haagmans BL. 2020. Severe Acute
289 Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2-Specific Antibody Responses in Coronavirus Disease 2019
290 Patients. Emerging Infect Dis 26.

291 14. Henrik Salje, Cecile Tran Kiem, Noemie Lefrancq, Noemie Courtejoie, Paolo Bosetti, Juliette
292 Paireau, Alessio Andronico, Nathanael Hoze, Jehanne Richet, Claire-Lise Dubost, Yann Le Strat,
293 Justin Lessler, Daniel Levy Bruhl, Arnaud Fontanet, Lulla Opatowski, Pierre-Yves Boelle, Simon
294 Cauchemez. .. Estimating the burden of SARS-CoV-2 in France. medRxiv, 2020th ed.

295 **Figures and Tables**

296

297 **Table 2. Performance of the assays observed in the study and provided by the manufacturers**

298

		Sensitivity (%)*		Specificity (%)*	
		Observed in the study	Reported by the manufacturer	Observed in the study	Reported by the manufacturer
ELISA	EUROIMMUN (IgA)	93.3 (80.7-100)	100	80.0 (63.7 - 96.3)	92.5
	EUROIMMUN (IgG)	93.3 (80.7-100)	80.0	85.0 (70.4 - 99.6)	98.5
	ID.Vet (IgG)	93.3 (80.7-100)	93.3 (78.8-98.2)	100	99.8 (99.3 - 99.9)
Lateral flow assays	Zhuhai Livzon (IgM)	80.0 (59.8 -100)	NC	95.0 (85.4 -100)	NC
	Zhuhai Livzon (IgG)	86.7 (69.5 - 100)	NC	100	NC
	UNscience (IgM)	80.0 (59.8 - 100)	98.5 (96.8-99.5) [a]	65.0 (44.1 - 89.1)	88.2 (83.1 - 92.2) [a]
	UNscience (IgG)	86.7 (69.5 - 100)		95.0 (85.4 - 100)	
	iSIA (IgM)	93.3 (80.7 - 100)	NC	100	NC
	iSIA (IgG)	80.0 (59.8 - 100)	NC	100	NC
	Hecin Biotech (IgM)	86.7 (69.5 - 100)	91.3 (87.6-94.2)	100	98.3 (95.8 - 99.6)
	Accu-Tell® (IgM)	91.7 (76.0 - 100)	91.8 (83.8-96.6)	100	96.0 (97.7-99.8)
	Accu-Tell® (IgG)	84.6 (65.0 - 100)	100 (96.1-100)	100	99.5 (98.1-99.9)
	Acro Biotech (IgM)	76.9 (54.0 - 99.8)	85 (62.1-96.8)	100	96.0 (86.3 - 99.5)
	Acro Biotech (IgG)	84.6 (65.0 - 100)	100 (86.0-100)	100	98.0 (89.4 - 99.9)

299 *in samples collected ≥ 15 days following symptom onset

300

301



Figure 1. Proportion of samples testing positive for anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibodies. Samples were stratified based on the delay from onset of symptoms. Weak signals, i.e., trace in immunochromatographic test results close to the cut-off value in ELISA, were considered as positive. The proportion of positive tests for each category and for each test and antibody isotype is indicated. For tests combining the detection of two isotypes, the last column indicates positivity for at least one of the two isotypes.



Figure 2. Between-tests agreement rates. The percentage of agreement between the POC and ELISA tests is presented.



Figure 3. Signal-to-cut-off results according to the time delay from symptom onset. A) EUROIMMUN IgA test. B) EUROIMMUN IgG test. C) ID.Vet IgG test. Samples from patients with proven SARS-CoV-2 infection are indicated by an orange circle, negative controls by a purple circle. The positivity threshold is indicated by the dotted line. Results in the area of uncertainty (gray) were considered positive.

333



334

335 **Figure 4. Seroconversions for anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibodies.** The results of four patients are

336 presented; in orange patient # 1; in yellow patient # 2, in blue patient # 3, in gray patient # 4. A)

337 EUROIMMUN IgA test. B) EUROIMMUN IgG test. C) ID.Vet IgG test. The positivity threshold is

338 indicated by the dotted line. The area of uncertainty is indicated in gray.

339

340

341



Figure 5. Pattern of anti-SARS-CoV-2 seroconversion using a lateral flow assay (Accu-Tell®). The results of three patients are presented. A) Patient # 1 (orange curve in Figure 3). B) Patient # 2 (yellow curve in Figure 3). C) Patient # 3 (blue curve in Figure 3). D) Patient # 4 (gray curve in Figure 3).