

1 Comparison of sixteen serological SARS-CoV-2 immunoassays in sixteen clinical  
2 laboratories

3 Brief title: Comparison of sixteen SARS-CoV-2 immunoassays

4 *Lene H. Harritshøj<sup>a,#</sup>, Mikkel Gybel-Brask<sup>a</sup>, Shoaib Afzal<sup>b,t</sup>, Pia R. Kamstrup<sup>b</sup>, Charlotte S.*  
5 *Jørgensen<sup>c</sup>, Marianne Kragh Thomsen<sup>d</sup>, Linda Hilsted<sup>e</sup>, Lennart Friis-Hansen<sup>f</sup>, Pal B. Szecsi<sup>g</sup>,*  
6 *Lise Pedersen<sup>g</sup>, Lene Nielsen<sup>h</sup>, Cecilie B. Hansen<sup>i</sup>, Peter Garred<sup>i,u</sup>, Trine-Line Korsholm<sup>j</sup>, Susan*  
7 *Mikkelsen<sup>j</sup>, Kirstine O. Nielsen<sup>j</sup>, Bjarne K. Møller<sup>j</sup>, Anne T. Hansen<sup>a</sup>, Kasper K. Iversen<sup>k,l</sup>,*  
8 *Pernille B. Nielsen<sup>k,l</sup>, Rasmus B. Hasselbalch<sup>k,l</sup>, Kamille Fogh<sup>k,l</sup>, Jakob B. Norsk<sup>k,l</sup>, Jonas Henrik*  
9 *Kristensen<sup>k,l</sup>, Kristian Schønning<sup>m</sup>, Nikolai S. Kirkby<sup>m</sup>, Alex C. Y. Nielsen<sup>m</sup>, Lone H. Landsy<sup>n</sup>,*  
10 *Mette Loftager<sup>n</sup>, Dorte K. Holm<sup>o</sup>, Anna C. Nilsson<sup>o</sup>, Susanne G. Sækmose<sup>p</sup>, Birgitte Grum-*  
11 *Schwensen<sup>p</sup>, Bitten Aagaard<sup>q</sup>, Thøger G. Jensen<sup>r</sup>, Dorte M. Nielsen<sup>s</sup>, Henrik Ullum<sup>a,u</sup>, and*  
12 *Ram B.C. Dessau<sup>s</sup>*

13

14 <sup>a</sup> Dept. of Clinical Immunology, Copenhagen University Hospital, Rigshospitalet, Copenhagen,  
15 Denmark

16 <sup>b</sup> Dept. of Clinical Biochemistry, Copenhagen University Hospital, Herlev and Gentofte Hospital,  
17 Herlev, Denmark

18 <sup>c</sup> Dept. of Virus & Microbiological Special Diagnostics, Statens Serum Institut, Copenhagen,  
19 Denmark

20 <sup>d</sup> Dept. of Clinical Microbiology, Aarhus University Hospital, Aarhus, Denmark

21 <sup>e</sup> Dept. of Clinical Biochemistry, Copenhagen University Hospital, Rigshospitalet, Denmark

22 <sup>f</sup> Dept. of Clinical Biochemistry, Copenhagen University Hospital, Bispebjerg and Frederiksberg  
23 Hospital, Copenhagen, Denmark

24 <sup>g</sup> Dept. of Clinical Biochemistry, Holbæk Hospital, Holbæk, Denmark

25 <sup>h</sup> Dept. of Clinical Microbiology, Copenhagen University Hospital, Herlev and Gentofte Hospital,  
26 Denmark

27 <sup>i</sup> Laboratory of Molecular Medicine, Dept. of Clinical Immunology, Copenhagen University Hospital,  
28 Rigshospitalet, Copenhagen, Denmark

29 <sup>j</sup> Dept. of Clinical Immunology, Aarhus University Hospital, Aarhus, Denmark

30 <sup>k</sup> Dept. of Cardiology, Herlev og Gentofte Hospital, University of Copenhagen, Herlev, Denmark.

31 <sup>l</sup> Dept. of Emergency Medicine, Herlev og Gentofte Hospital, University of Copenhagen, Herlev,  
32 Denmark

33 <sup>m</sup> Dept. of Clinical Microbiology, Copenhagen University Hospital, Rigshospitalet, Copenhagen,  
34 Denmark

35 <sup>n</sup> Dept. of Nonclinical and Clinical Assay Sciences in Global Discovery & Development Sciences,  
36 Novo Nordisk A/S, Måløv, Denmark

37 <sup>o</sup> Dept. of Clinical Immunology, Odense University Hospital, Odense, Denmark

38 <sup>p</sup> Dept. of Clinical Immunology, Zealand University Hospital, Næstved Hospital, Næstved, Denmark

39 <sup>q</sup> Dept. of Clinical Immunology, Aalborg University Hospital, Aalborg, Denmark

40 <sup>r</sup> Dept. of Clinical Microbiology, Odense University hospital, Odense, Denmark

41 <sup>s</sup> Dept. of Clinical Microbiology, Zealand University hospital, Slagelse Hospital, Slagelse, Denmark

42 <sup>t</sup> Faculty of Health and Medical Sciences, University of Copenhagen, Copenhagen, Denmark

43 <sup>u</sup> Dept. of Clinical Medicine, Faculty of Health Sciences, University of Copenhagen, Denmark

44

45 Key words: SARS-CoV-2 antibody test, evaluation, anti-SARS-CoV-2 serology assay

46 # Corresponding author: Lene Holm Harritshøj, email: [Lene.holm.harritshoej@regionh.dk](mailto:Lene.holm.harritshoej@regionh.dk)

47 **Abstract:**

48 Serological SARS-CoV-2 assays are needed to support clinical diagnosis and  
49 epidemiological investigations. Recently, assays for the large-volume detection of total  
50 antibodies (Ab) and immunoglobulin (Ig) G and M against SARS-CoV-2 antigens have  
51 been developed, but there are limited data on the diagnostic accuracy of these assays.  
52 This study was organized as a Danish national collaboration and included fifteen  
53 commercial and one in-house anti-SARS-CoV-2 assays in sixteen laboratories. Sensitivity  
54 was evaluated using 150 serum samples from individuals diagnosed with asymptomatic,  
55 mild or moderate nonhospitalized (n=129) or hospitalized (n=31) COVID-19, confirmed by  
56 nucleic acid amplification tests, collected 13-73 days from symptom onset. Specificity and  
57 cross-reactivity were evaluated in samples collected prior to the SARS-CoV-2 epidemic  
58 from > 586 blood donors and patients with autoimmune diseases or CMV or EBV  
59 infections. Predefined specificity criteria of  $\geq 99\%$  were met by all total-Ab and IgG assays  
60 except one (Diasorin/LiaisonXL-IgG 97.2%). The sensitivities in descending order were:  
61 Wantai/ELISA total-Ab (96.7%), CUH/NOVO in-house ELISA total-Ab (96.0%),  
62 Ortho/Vitros total-Ab (95.3%), YHLO/iFlash-IgG (94.0%), Ortho/Vitros-IgG (93.3%),  
63 Siemens/Atellica total-Ab (93.2%), Roche-Elecsys total-Ab (92.7%), Abbott-Architect-IgG  
64 (90.0%), Abbott/Alinity-IgG (median 88.0%), Diasorin/LiaisonXL-IgG (84.6%),  
65 Siemens/Vista total-Ab (81.0%), Euroimmun/ELISA-IgG (78.0%), and Snibe/Maglumi-IgG  
66 (median 78.0%). The IgM results were variable, but one assay (Wantai/ELISA-IgM) had  
67 both high sensitivity (82.7%) and specificity (99%). The rate of seropositivity increased with  
68 time from symptom onset and symptom severity. In conclusion, predefined sensitivity and  
69 specificity acceptance criteria of 90%/99%, respectively, for diagnostic use were met in  
70 five of six total-Ab and three of seven IgG assays.

71 **Introduction**

72 The World Health Organization (WHO) was notified in late December 2019 regarding a  
73 cluster of cases of pneumonia in Wuhan City, China. The virus responsible was isolated in  
74 the first week of January 2020, and its genome was shared a week later. Phylogenetic  
75 analysis showed that it was a novel coronavirus, designated initially as 2019 novel  
76 coronavirus (2019-nCoV) and later as severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2  
77 (SARS-CoV-2). SARS-CoV-2 quickly spread worldwide, and the WHO declared COVID-19  
78 a pandemic on March 11<sup>th</sup> (1).

79 In the following months, several hundred assays for detecting SARS-CoV-2 emerged.  
80 Different versions of nucleic acid amplification tests (NAATs) for naso-/oro-pharyngeal  
81 swabs or washes and lower respiratory tract specimens are the method of choice for  
82 detecting COVID-19 (2). However, assays for detecting antibodies that are produced as  
83 part of the humoral immune response to SARS-CoV-2 infection have emerged only  
84 recently (3). These assays mostly show that one week after the first symptoms, 30% of the  
85 patients with COVID-19 have seroconverted, increasing to 70% after the 2<sup>nd</sup> week and to  
86 above 90% by the 3<sup>rd</sup> week (4). Accordingly, serological assays measuring either total  
87 antibodies (total Ab), immunoglobulin G (IgG) or IgM against antigens of SARS-CoV-2  
88 have been used for supporting a diagnosis of COVID-19, for monitoring the epidemic, and  
89 for screening recovered COVID-19 patients to derive plasma for use in convalescent  
90 plasma therapy (5). Currently, the numerous serological assays have only been validated  
91 on very small numbers of samples and at best have been approved for emergency use  
92 with only a few days of evaluation. Several serological assays, especially the lateral flow  
93 point-of-care tests, have a suboptimal performance with a low sensitivity and are not  
94 recommended for diagnostic use or even for population monitoring (6-8). Recently, several

95 manufacturers of larger instruments have released serological assays useful for mass  
96 testing, but few studies have compared these assays directly (9). This comparison is  
97 needed for the commutability of the test results and the scientific data. Here, we present a  
98 national evaluation of sixteen serological SARS-CoV-2 immunoassays across 16 different  
99 laboratories in Denmark.

100

## 101 **Materials and Methods**

102 A case control design was chosen in order to include pre-pandemic samples.

103

### 104 *Case panel samples for determination of clinical sensitivity*

105 The case panel samples tested in all assays (N=150) were obtained from a variety of  
106 convalescent patients in the Capital Region of Denmark with a confirmed SARS-CoV-2  
107 NAAT result, that were identified in the Danish national microbiology database (MiBa) from  
108 February 2020 to April 2020(10). Individuals were contacted via public secure mail and a  
109 total of 639 persons responded. Serum samples of 3.5 ml and 4 ml EDTA samples were  
110 obtained from each person in 20 + 2 separate vials during May 3<sup>rd</sup> to May 11<sup>th</sup>, 2020. For  
111 this study serum samples from sample date May 3<sup>rd</sup> were chosen and send to all  
112 participating laboratories. Epidemiologic and clinical data were collected from an electronic  
113 self-reported questionnaire completed on the day of blood sampling.

114

115

116

117 *Archive samples for determination of clinical specificity*

118 Archived plasma samples from pre-COVID-19 blood donations drawn during the influenza  
119 seasons of 2017-2018 and 2018-2019 were tested with the SARS-CoV-2 total-antibody  
120 (Ab) assays and the IgG and the IgM assays. The number of tested samples (N) were  
121 >586 for the total-Ab and IgG assays but only >400 for the IgM assays. Different samples  
122 were used across regions, with minor overlap in some cases.

123

124

125 *Archive samples for determination of cross-reactivity*

126 For all assays, cross-reactivity (x-reactivity) was investigated by testing patients with  
127 unspecified autoimmune diseases (N=10-131). Due to challenges with available amounts  
128 of sample material, 10 samples were pooled and tested across all assays. The nonpooled  
129 samples were tested in selected assays. Additionally, for all assays, the archived samples  
130 from patients with acute infections of Cytomegalovirus (CMV) or Epstein Bar virus (EBV)  
131 or other acute viral diseases were tested (N=10-37), but different samples were used  
132 across the assays. All samples were obtained prior to January 2020, before the first  
133 COVID-19 case in Denmark.

134

135

136 *Immunoassay platforms*

137 The performance of diagnostic accuracy of commercial immunoassays for the detection of  
138 anti-SARS-CoV-2 total Ab, anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgG and anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgM were tested

139 on the appropriate platforms by experienced laboratory technicians following the  
140 manufacturers' protocols with the cut-off values suggested by the manufacturers (Table 1).

141 *Enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay (ELISA)*

142 The commercial ELISA assays for anti-SARS-CoV-2 total Ab, IgG and IgM detection were  
143 performed on open platform analyzers or manually by experienced laboratory technicians  
144 according to the manufacturers' instructions. The Euroimmun SARS-CoV-2 IgG assay was  
145 performed on an Analyzer I (Euroimmun AG, Lübeck, Germany), QUANTA Lyser 160  
146 (INOVA Diagnostics, San Diego, CA, USA) or EVOLIS (BioRad, Hercules, CA, USA). The  
147 Wantai SARS CoV-2 total-Ab and IgM assays were performed manually and measured  
148 using a Tecan Sunrise ELISA reader (Männedorf, Switzerland) at 450 nm with reference at  
149 620 nm.

150 One in-house ELISA detecting total Ab was tested in this evaluation. Briefly, the *CUH-*  
151 *NOVO SARS-CoV-2 total-Ab* ELISA (a noncommercial assay produced in-house in a  
152 collaboration between Copenhagen University Hospital and Novo Nordisk A/S, Denmark)  
153 is based on a recombinant receptor-binding domain (RBD) of the SARS-CoV-2 spike  
154 protein used both for coating and detection. The assay will be described in detail  
155 elsewhere. In this study, the samples were diluted 1:100 in PBS tween-20 in 96-well plates  
156 coated with RBD. Total-Ab was detected using HRP-conjugated streptavidin diluted in  
157 PBS-T mixed with biotin-labeled RBD. TMB ONE was used as a substrate. The reaction  
158 was stopped with 0.3 M H<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub>, and the optical density (OD) of the samples was measured  
159 at 450-620 nm. The CUH-NOVO SARS-CoV-2 total Ab ELISA used a semi-automated  
160 setup, and the results were based on signal-to-noise (S/N) ratios between the samples of  
161 interest and the negative quality control. The cut-off value was calculated based on

162 receiver operating characteristic (ROC) analysis by prioritizing the specificity. Sample  
163 results < 9.4 were interpreted as negative. The assay can also be performed in a 384-well  
164 format.

165 Some assays were evaluated in more than one laboratory.

## 166 **Table 1**

167

168

169

170

### 171 *Statistics*

172 Data handling, graphics and statistics were performed using the R statistical software  
173 (v.4.0.2; R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria (URL [https://www.R-](https://www.R-project.org/)  
174 [project.org/](https://www.R-project.org/))). The parameters of diagnostic accuracy and the plots were determined using  
175 the mada package (meta-analysis of diagnostic accuracy; Philipp Doebler (2019), R  
176 package version 0.5.9 (<https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=mada>)). For calculation of the  
177 95% confidence intervals for the sensitivity and specificity, the default “Wilson” option was  
178 chosen. For plotting of bivariate confidence regions in the ROC space, a continuity  
179 correction of 0.5 was applied.

180

181

182

183 *Performance criteria*

184 We defined acceptance criteria for the diagnostic accuracy of the assays depending on  
185 immunoglobulin type and intended use. In a low-seroprevalence setting, the specificity of  
186 the test is the most important concern and must be high. Irrespective of specific clinical  
187 indication for the use of the anti-SARS-CoV-2 total-Ab and anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgG assays,  
188 we defined the specificity acceptance criteria to be  $\geq 99\%$ . For the SARS-CoV-2 total-Ab  
189 assays, the defined acceptable sensitivity for diagnostic use was  $\geq 92\%$ , with an optimal  
190 sensitivity of  $\geq 95\%$ . For the anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgG assays, the defined acceptable  
191 sensitivity was  $\geq 90\%$ . For epidemiologic surveys, the acceptable sensitivity was  $\geq 80\%$  for  
192 both the anti-SARS-CoV-2 total-Ab and the anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgG assays. No acceptance  
193 criteria for the diagnostic accuracy of the anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgM assays were defined, as  
194 most of the samples in the case panel were collected  $> 3$  weeks after TSO.

195

196 **Results**

197 Of 150 patient samples, epidemiologic and clinical data were received from 149 patients;  
198 for the patient characteristics, refer to Table 2. Most of the patients were categorized with  
199 clinically mild to moderate symptoms (N=112), and only 31 cases had been admitted to  
200 hospital. Time from symptom onset (TSO) was  $> 14$  days in 133 case panel patients, while  
201 20 patients had a TSO  $\leq 3$  weeks and 120 samples were drawn  $> 3$  weeks from the TSO,  
202 of which 79 samples (53%) were collected  $> 6$  weeks after symptom onset. Among a total  
203 of 7 patients with a TSO  $\leq 14$  days, the TSO was 13 or 14 days.

204

205 **Table 2**



206

207 *Data on the detection of anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibodies according to the assay*

208 The results of the tests, i.e., true positives (TP), false negatives (FN), false positives (FP),  
209 and true negatives (TN), as well as the calculated sensitivity and specificity of each assay,  
210 are presented in Table 3 in descending order of sensitivity, accounting for specificity. The  
211 specificities are calculated by combining the data from all sites that validated the same  
212 assay. The key to each laboratory in Table 3 is presented in (Table S1). The commercial  
213 ELISAs and the Diasorin/LiaisonXL assay have defined gray zone results. In our results  
214 and calculations, we defined gray zone results as negative.

215 All total-Ab assays performed with high and acceptable specificities ( $\geq 99\%$ ). The two total-  
216 Ab ELISAs and the Ortho Vitros total-Ab assay performed with an optimal sensitivity  
217 ( $\geq 95\%$ ), while the Siemens Atellica and Roche Elecsys assays performed with acceptable  
218 sensitivity for diagnostic use ( $\geq 92\%$ ). One outlier - the Siemens Vista - performed with an  
219 acceptable sensitivity for epidemiologic surveys ( $\geq 80\%$ ) but not for diagnostic use ( $\geq 92\%$ ).  
220 Of the IgG assays, all but the Diasorin/LiaisonXL IgG assay resulted in acceptable  
221 specificities ( $\geq 99\%$ ). Three assays (the YHLO iFlash IgG, the Ortho CD Vitros IgG and the  
222 Abbott Architect IgG assays) resulted in acceptable sensitivities ( $\geq 90\%$ ). The sensitivity  
223 was improved in all total-Ab and IgG assays if the analyses were restricted to samples  
224 collected > 3 weeks after symptom onset (Table 3).

225 Regarding the IgM assays, the performance of the Wantai IgM ELISA demonstrated a  
226 much higher sensitivity than the other two IgM assays, with an acceptable specificity of  
227 99.0% and no detected x-reactivity (Fig. 1). The sensitivity of the YHLO/iFlash IgM assay  
228 was low, and x-reactivity was detected in 2 of 25 samples from pre-COVID-19 patients

229 with either acute CMV or EBV infections, whereas the Snibe/Maglumi IgM assay  
230 performed poorly in specificity and sensitivity (Fig. 1).

231

232 **Table 3**

233

234 **Figure 1**

235

236 *Data on the detection of anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibodies according to TSO and disease*  
237 *severity*

238 The largest variation in true positive samples between the assays for each Ig type  
239 category was shown among samples with a TSO  $\leq 21$  days (Fig. 2). In addition, increasing  
240 rates of seropositive results were found with the severity of symptoms in all assays (Fig.  
241 2). Generally, serological testing had a low sensitivity when tested less than three weeks  
242 from symptom onset and in patients who were asymptomatic or had mild disease at home  
243 but were not bedridden. If patients have been bedridden or hospitalized, the sensitivity in  
244 the convalescent cases by serological testing was  $>90\%$  for most of the total-Ab or IgG  
245 assays included in the study (Fig. 2). Except for one assay (Wantai IgM), the IgM assays  
246 showed a very low sensitivity, especially among the patients with mild symptoms. The  
247 large difference in sensitivity according to the disease severity was not explained by the  
248 difference in time of testing. The two large groups of the nonhospitalized symptomatic  
249 cases both had a similar median TSO near 40 days and a range of distribution from  
250 symptom onset to blood sampling (results not shown).

251 A total of 4 samples were not detected by any of the assays. Of these, 3 patients had mild  
252 clinical symptoms and one patient had moderate symptoms, with the TSO varying  
253 between 17-73 days.

254

255 **Figure 1**

256

257 **Discussion**

258 The results of this study demonstrated that diagnostic accuracy was highest in the group  
259 of the SARS-CoV-2 total-Ab assays compared to the group of the SARS-CoV-2 IgG  
260 assays. Except for one outlier - Siemens Vista - all total-Ab assays resulted in acceptable  
261 performances for diagnostic use regarding both specificity and sensitivity. The SARS-CoV-  
262 2 IgG assays demonstrated a larger variation in sensitivities, and only three assays  
263 demonstrated a predefined acceptable sensitivity for diagnostic use, whereas one assay  
264 did not meet the defined acceptance criteria for specificity. All total-Ab and IgG assays  
265 showed higher seropositive rates in samples from patients with a TSO > 3 weeks, and  
266 seropositive rates increased with symptom severity in all assays across all Ig types.

267 Nominally, the accuracy of the Wantai total-Ab, the in-house CUH/NOVO total-Ab ELISA,  
268 and the Ortho CD Vitros total-Ab assays were the best, with optimal sensitivity for  
269 diagnostic use according to our criteria. However, the Roche Elecsys total-Ab and the  
270 Siemens Atellica total-Ab assays also performed with acceptable sensitivity for diagnostic  
271 use, and the confidence intervals for sensitivity and specificity overlapped for the  
272 mentioned assays. The poor sensitivity of the Siemens Vista assay was seemingly due to  
273 the manufacturer's setting with a suboptimal assigned cut-off value. For example,  
274 adjusting the Siemens Vista assay cut-off from 1000 to 375 increased the sensitivity from

275 81.0 to 93.9% without changing the 100% specificity, exemplifying the risk of the forced  
276 releases of new assays. Adjustment in cut-offs could potentially also improve the  
277 performance of other investigated assays. However, for this study, we used assays as  
278 specified by the manufacturers of the assays.

279 Among the SARS-Cov-2 IgG assays, three assays - YHLO iFlash IgG, Ortho CD Vitros  
280 IgG, and Abbott Architect IgG - showed acceptable sensitivity performance for diagnostic  
281 use. When using a TSO limit of >21 days for the antibody assays, the Abbott Alinity IgG  
282 assay also reached an acceptable sensitivity. Regarding specificity, only the  
283 Diasorin/LiaisonXL IgG assay did not meet the defined criteria. More than half of the  
284 samples in the case panel had a TSO > 6 weeks and were not optimal for the evaluation of  
285 the sensitivity of the IgM assays. However, among the IgM assays, the Wantai IgM assay  
286 stood out with a relatively high sensitivity and specificity.

287 In three of the evaluated assays, a recombinant nucleocapsid antigen (rN) is used in the  
288 immunoassay, while in eight assays, a recombinant spike antigen (rS) of the RBD is used;  
289 two assays did not specify the protein(s) used as the capturing antigen in the assay, and  
290 two assays (the YHLO IgG and IgM) use both rN and rS. Our study does not seem to  
291 suggest that the chosen antigen (N vs S RBD) affects the assay performance in general.  
292 Instead, the differences in performance seem to be associated with overall assay design  
293 rather than the choice of antigen. This parallels the observations by Havari, who  
294 demonstrated the appearance of neutralizing antibodies against both N and S proteins  
295 simultaneously (11).

296 A potential limitation for the use of immunoassays can be interference due to x-reactivity in  
297 individuals with autoimmune disease or acute infections with EBV or CMV. We tested this

298 directly by using samples from patients with these diseases. This did not seem to be an  
299 issue in most assays, except for in the Diasorin/LiaisonXL IgG and YHLO/iFlash IgM  
300 assays, which showed interference in some samples.

301 In the US, the FDA (US Food and Drug Administration) requires a minimum sensitivity of  
302 90% and a specificity of 95% for emergency use authorization of serologic anti-SARS-  
303 CoV-2 assays (12). In the UK, the Medicines and Healthcare Products Regulatory Agency  
304 (MHRA) has defined a Target Product Profile for Enzyme Immunoassays detecting  
305 antibodies against SARS-CoV-2, with an acceptable sensitivity and specificity of  $\geq 98\%$  for  
306 anti-SARS-CoV-2-immunoassays among patients with a history of SARS-CoV-2  $\geq 20$  days  
307 after symptom onset (13). In our study, the sensitivities calculated from the case samples  
308 with a known TSO  $> 21$  days (N=123) did not reach 98% in any assay evaluated (Table 3a-  
309 c). However, we prioritized high diagnostic specificity ( $\geq 99\%$ ) as our main criterion, since  
310 Denmark has a low anti-SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence (1.7%) (14). For example, in a  
311 population with a low anti-SARS-CoV-2 prevalence, an assay specificity of 97.2%  
312 (Diasorin/LiaisonXL) would lead to low positive predictive values. Interestingly, many  
313 manufacturers use a TSO  $\geq 14$  days, in contrast to  $\geq 20$  or  $> 21$  days, as a cut-off for optimal  
314 sensitivity, so there is a need for international consensus on establishing a criterion for  
315 TSO to test for optimal sensitivity.

316 We found 4 cases with no anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibodies in any assay. This finding could be  
317 explained by several factors, including an early-stage infection, mild disease, a transient  
318 antibody response only, no antibodies produced or produced at nondetectable levels, or  
319 false positive NAAT tests. Early stage infection was not the case in these 4 patients, who  
320 had a TSO between 17-73 days, whereas the largest variation in sensitivity performance  
321 between the anti-SARS-CoV-2 assays was seen in the samples with a TSO  $\leq 21$  days.

322 The TSO among the COVID-19 case samples indeed determined the absolute sensitivity  
323 values obtained, as the median seroconversion time is reportedly 11 days (interquartile  
324 range of 7.3-14.0 days) after onset of symptoms (15-18). Though in this case, with a TSO  
325 of 17 to 73 days, this does not seem to be a plausible explanation for the lack of  
326 antibodies; instead, a combination of mild COVID-19 symptoms in the nonhospitalized  
327 group of case panel members and the collection of blood samples in the late convalescent  
328 stage might explain the nondetectable antibodies. As we showed, most anti-SARS-CoV-2  
329 total-Ab and IgG assays had a higher rate of seropositivity among the hospitalized patients  
330 compared to the nonhospitalized patients, and previous studies have also shown that anti-  
331 SARS-CoV-2 titers correlate with the severity of COVID-19 among hospitalized patients  
332 (19, 20) and that there is a time-dependent decline in antibody titers for anti-SARS-CoV-2  
333 Ab in general, including neutralizing antibodies (14, 20).

334 The data also provides some interesting preliminary observations regarding the antibody  
335 response in general. First, most individuals (approximately 97%) seem to develop some  
336 sort of antibody response. Second, this response seems to be at a peak in samples taken  
337 at approximately 3 weeks after TSO. Third, the response seems to be positively correlated  
338 with disease severity. However, while our study compares the ability of antibody assays to  
339 detect people who have had NAAT-confirmed COVID-19, it does not compare the ability to  
340 detect individuals who are protected against reinfection with SARS-CoV-2. Identification of  
341 those who are protected against reinfection, at least for a certain period, would be an  
342 important aspect of an assay, but it is too early in the epidemic to make this kind of  
343 comparison on a large scale. However, a recent study from GeurtsvanKessel et al.  
344 reported cut-off values in the Wantai total-Ab assay indicating detectable levels of

345 neutralizing antibodies. The authors suggest this as a tool for the detection of neutralizing  
346 antibodies, though the clinical utility of this remains unclear (21).

347 Our study has several strengths and limitations. A major strength is that the case panel  
348 used for sensitivity across all 16 assays included 150 samples from the same patients,  
349 which is one of the largest panels investigated to date. Additionally, and in contrast to most  
350 previous evaluations of serological SARS-CoV-2 assays, this case panel was obtained  
351 largely from patients who had milder symptoms of COVID-19, evaluating whether the  
352 assays could detect SARS-CoV-2 antibodies among the most common type of patient with  
353 SARS-CoV-2 infection. This is valuable knowledge in sero-epidemiological investigations.  
354 The specificity was evaluated with a significant number of pre-COVID-19 blood donor  
355 samples, making this study very solid in terms of clinical accuracy and agreement between  
356 the assays investigated. Furthermore, we investigated x-reactivity using samples from  
357 individuals and specificity using individuals with autoimmune disease or acute infections  
358 with EBV or CMV. For these tests of specificity, we could not use samples from the same  
359 individuals across all assays due to the small sample volumes. This could potentially  
360 introduce heterogeneity between assay in the specificity data. However, using  $\geq 586$   
361 samples from healthy donors for each assay makes this a very large sample and  
362 substantial differences in a small homogenous country with same standard operating  
363 procedures for the Danish blood banks is unlikely. Even though we tried to assess the risk  
364 of interference by examining serum from patients with viral diseases known to be  
365 associated with increased levels of assay-interfering antibodies, these could be present in  
366 patients with other diseases, e.g., cancers. Thus, we could have underestimated the  
367 potential for interference.

368 In conclusion, this comparative study of 15 commercial and 1 in-house laboratory  
369 serological SARS-CoV-2 assays pinpoints differences in accuracy; however, several total-  
370 Ab and IgG assays reached predefined criteria for acceptable performance, especially in  
371 samples from cases with a TSO over 3 weeks. Additionally, the antibody response  
372 seemed to be strongest among patients with more severe disease. Last, it appears as if  
373 the use of emergency authorizations has led to release of suboptimal assays in some  
374 cases, and simple measures such as optimization of cut-off values could lead to major  
375 improvements in performance. Thus, it is possible that optimized versions of some assays  
376 may be released in near future.

377

378

### 379 **Acknowledgements**

380 We wish to thank the laboratory technicians in all laboratories who performed the  
381 validation of assays in this evaluation for their thorough and effective laboratory  
382 performance. Additionally, we wish to thank the head of DEKS (Danish Institute for  
383 External Quality Assurance for Laboratories in the health sector), Gitte Henriksen, for  
384 distributing the samples from patients with autoimmune diseases.

385 We wish to thank Charlotte Helgstrand for providing the antigen used in the in-house CUH-  
386 NOVO total-Ab ELISA. The plasmid used for synthesizing the SARS CoV2 RBD  
387 polypeptide for that assay was made and kindly contributed by the International AIDS  
388 Vaccine Initiative ("IAVI") and provided by the responsible IAVI employee, Joseph Jardine,  
389 Scripps Institute, La Jolla, CA, USA.



390 The development of the CUH-NOVO SARS-CoV-2 Total Ab ELISA was financially  
391 supported by grants from the Carlsberg Foundation (CF20-0045) and the Novo Nordisk  
392 Foundation (205A0063505).

393 Some of the assays evaluated were purchased and some were provided for evaluation  
394 from the manufacturer without costs. We thank the manufacturers for technical advice and  
395 support.

396

397

#### 398 **Ethical approval**

399 The study of samples from patients with former SARS-CoV-2 infection for validation of  
400 serological SARS-CoV-2 assays was approved by the Regional Scientific Committee for  
401 the Capital Region of Denmark (H-20028627). All blood donors were asked for consent for  
402 using archive samples for their use in the validation of new methods and assay  
403 investigations as quality control projects.

404

405

406

#### 407 **Conflict of interest**

408 Dessau reports personal fees from Advisory board meeting 2018, Roche  
409 Diagnostics, outside the submitted work

410

411 All other authors declare no competing interests.

412

413

## 414 **References**

415

- 416 1. Ghebreyesus T. 2020. WHO Director-General's opening remarks at the media briefing on COVID-19  
417 - 11 March 2020.
- 418 2. Rabi FA, Al Zoubi MS, Kasasbeh GA, Salameh DM, Al-Nasser AD. 2020. SARS-CoV-2 and Coronavirus  
419 Disease 2019: What We Know So Far. *Pathogens* 9.
- 420 3. Prompetchara E, Ketloy C, Palaga T. 2020. Immune responses in COVID-19 and potential vaccines:  
421 Lessons learned from SARS and MERS epidemic. *Asian Pac J Allergy Immunol* 38:1-9.
- 422 4. Deeks JJ, Dinnes J, Takwoingi Y, Davenport C, Spijker R, Taylor-Phillips S, Adriano A, Beese S,  
423 Dretzke J, Ferrante di Ruffano L, Harris IM, Price MJ, Dittrich S, Emperador D, Hooft L, Leeflang MM,  
424 Van den Bruel A. 2020. Antibody tests for identification of current and past infection with SARS-  
425 CoV-2. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 6:Cd013652.
- 426 5. Theel ES, Slev P, Wheeler S, Couturier MR, Wong SJ, Kadkhoda K. 2020. The Role of Antibody  
427 Testing for SARS-CoV-2: Is There One? *JClinMicrobiol*.
- 428 6. Whitman JD, Hiatt J, Mowery CT, Shy BR, Yu R, Yamamoto TN, Rathore U, Goldgof GM, Whitty C,  
429 Woo JM, Gallman AE, Miller TE, Levine AG, Nguyen DN, Bapat SP, Balcerek J, Bylsma SA, Lyons AM,  
430 Li S, Wong AW, Gillis-Buck EM, Steinhart ZB, Lee Y, Apathy R, Lipke MJ, Smith JA, Zheng T, Boothby  
431 IC, Isaza E, Chan J, Acenas DD, Lee J, Macrae TA, Kyaw TS, Wu D, Ng DL, Gu W, York VA, Eskandarian  
432 HA, Callaway PC, Warriar L, Moreno ME, Levan J, Torres L, Farrington LA, Loudermilk R, Koshal K,  
433 Zorn KC, Garcia-Beltran WF, Yang D, et al. 2020. Test performance evaluation of SARS-CoV-2  
434 serological assays. *medRxiv*.
- 435 7. Bastos ML TG, Abidi SK, Campbell J R, Haraoui L, Johnston JC, Lan Z, Law S, MacLean E, Trajman A,  
436 Menzies D, Benedetti A, Khan FA. 2020. Diagnostic accuracy of serological tests for covid-19:  
437 systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMJ* 2020;370:m2516  
438 doi:<https://www.bmj.com/content/370/bmj.m2516>.

- 439 8. Ria Lassaunière AF, Zitta B, Harboe, Alex C.Y. Nielsen, Anders Fomsgaard, Karen A. Krogfelt,  
440 Charlotte S. Jørgensen. 2020. Evaluation of nine commercial SARS-CoV-2 immunoassays. medRxiv  
441 doi:<https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.04.09.20056325v1>.
- 442 9. Kohmer N, Westhaus S, Ruhl C, Ciesek S, Rabenau HF. 2020. Brief clinical evaluation of six high-  
443 throughput SARS-CoV-2 IgG antibody assays. J Clin Virol 129:104480.
- 444 10. Voldstedlund M, Haarh M, Molbak K, MiBa Board of R. 2014. The Danish Microbiology Database  
445 (MiBa) 2010 to 2013. Euro Surveill 19.
- 446 11. Haveri A, Smura T, Kuivanen S, Osterlund P, Hepojoki J, Ikonen N, Pitkapaasi M, Blomqvist S,  
447 Ronkko E, Kantele A, Strandin T, Kallio-Kokko H, Mannonen L, Lappalainen M, Broas M, Jiang M,  
448 Siira L, Salminen M, Puumalainen T, Sane J, Melin M, Vapalahti O, Savolainen-Kopra C. 2020.  
449 Serological and molecular findings during SARS-CoV-2 infection: the first case study in Finland,  
450 January to February 2020. Euro Surveill 25.
- 451 12. Duong YT WC, Justman J. 2020. Antibody testing for coronavirus disease 2019: not ready for prime  
452 time. BMJ 2020;370:m2655.
- 453 13. [https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/medicines-and-healthcare-products-regulatory-](https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/medicines-and-healthcare-products-regulatory-agency)  
454 [agency](https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/medicines-and-healthcare-products-regulatory-agency). 2020. Target Product Profile EIA antibody tests antibodies to SARS-CoV-2.  
455 [https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/how-tests-and-testing-kits-for-coronavirus-covid-](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/how-tests-and-testing-kits-for-coronavirus-covid-19-work/target-product-profile-enzyme-immunoassay-eia-antibody-tests-to-help-determine-if-people-have-antibodies-to-sars-cov-2)  
456 [19-work/target-product-profile-enzyme-immunoassay-eia-antibody-tests-to-help-determine-if-](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/how-tests-and-testing-kits-for-coronavirus-covid-19-work/target-product-profile-enzyme-immunoassay-eia-antibody-tests-to-help-determine-if-people-have-antibodies-to-sars-cov-2)  
457 [people-have-antibodies-to-sars-cov-2](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/how-tests-and-testing-kits-for-coronavirus-covid-19-work/target-product-profile-enzyme-immunoassay-eia-antibody-tests-to-help-determine-if-people-have-antibodies-to-sars-cov-2). Accessed
- 458 14. Erikstrup C, Hother CE, Pedersen OBV, Molbak K, Skov RL, Holm DK, Saekmose SG, Nilsson AC,  
459 Brooks PT, Boldsen JK, Mikkelsen C, Gybel-Brask M, Sorensen E, Dinh KM, Mikkelsen S, Moller BK,  
460 Haunstrup T, Harritshoj L, Jensen BA, Hjalgrim H, Lillevang ST, Ullum H. 2020. Estimation of SARS-  
461 CoV-2 infection fatality rate by real-time antibody screening of blood donors. Clin Infect Dis.
- 462 15. Long QX, Liu BZ, Deng HJ, Wu GC, Deng K, Chen YK, Liao P, Qiu JF, Lin Y, Cai XF, Wang DQ, Hu Y, Ren  
463 JH, Tang N, Xu YY, Yu LH, Mo Z, Gong F, Zhang XL, Tian WG, Hu L, Zhang XX, Xiang JL, Du HX, Liu HW,

- 464 Lang CH, Luo XH, Wu SB, Cui XP, Zhou Z, Zhu MM, Wang J, Xue CJ, Li XF, Wang L, Li ZJ, Wang K, Niu  
465 CC, Yang QJ, Tang XJ, Zhang Y, Liu XM, Li JJ, Zhang DC, Zhang F, Liu P, Yuan J, Li Q, Hu JL, Chen J, et  
466 al. 2020. Antibody responses to SARS-CoV-2 in patients with COVID-19. *Nat Med* 26:845-848.
- 467 16. 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, Liu Y,  
468 Wang Z, He Q, Li Z, He B, Zhang T, Fu Y, Ge S, Liu L, Zhang J, Xia N, Zhang Z. 2020. Antibody  
469 responses to SARS-CoV-2 in patients of novel coronavirus disease 2019. *Clin Infect Dis*.
- 470 17. Lou B, Li TD, Zheng SF, Su YY, Li ZY, Liu W, Yu F, Ge SX, Zou QD, Yuan Q, Lin S, Hong CM, Yao XY,  
471 Zhang XJ, Wu DH, Zhou GL, Hou WH, Li TT, Zhang YL, Zhang SY, Fan J, Zhang J, Xia NS, Chen Y. 2020.  
472 Serology characteristics of SARS-CoV-2 infection since exposure and post symptom onset. *Eur*  
473 *Respir J* doi:10.1183/13993003.00763-2020.
- 474 18. Huang AT, Garcia-Carreras B, Hitchings MDT, Yang B, Katzelnick LC, Rattigan SM, Borgert BA,  
475 Moreno CA, Solomon BD, Rodriguez-Barraquer I, Lessler J, Salje H, Burke D, Wesolowski A,  
476 Cummings DAT. 2020. A systematic review of antibody mediated immunity to coronaviruses:  
477 antibody kinetics, correlates of protection, and association of antibody responses with severity of  
478 disease. *medRxiv* doi:10.1101/2020.04.14.20065771.
- 479 19. Qu J, Wu C, Li X, Zhang G, Jiang Z, Li X, Zhu Q, Liu L. 2020. Profile of IgG and IgM antibodies against  
480 severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2). *Clin Infect Dis*  
481 doi:10.1093/cid/ciaa489.
- 482 20. Seow J GC, Merrick B, Acors S, Steel KJA, Hemmings O, O'Bryne A, Kouphou N, Pickering S, Galao R,  
483 Betancor G, Wilson HD, Signell AW, Winstone H, Kerridge C, Temperton N, Snell L, Bisnauthsing K,  
484 Moore A, Green A, Martinez L, Stokes B, Honey J, Izquierdo-Barras A, Arbane G, Patel A, O'Connell L,  
485 O'Hara G, MacMahon E, Douthwaite S, Nebbia S, Batra R, Martinez-Nunez R, Edgeworth JD, Neil  
486 SJD, Malim M, Doores K. 2020. Longitudinal evaluation and decline of antibody responses in SARS-  
487 CoV-2 infection. *medRxiv* doi:<https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.09.20148429>.

488 21. GeurtsvanKessel CH, Okba NMA, Igloi Z, Bogers S, Embregts CWE, Laksono BM, Leijten L, Rokx C,  
489 Rijnders B, Rahamat-Langendoen J, van den Akker JPC, van Kampen JJA, van der Eijk AA, van  
490 Binnendijk RS, Haagmans B, Koopmans M. 2020. An evaluation of COVID-19 serological assays  
491 informs future diagnostics and exposure assessment. NatCommun 11:3436.

492

493

494

## 495 **Legends**

496

497 Figure 2. Summary ROC plot of sensitivity and false positive rate with elliptic 95% bivariate  
498 confidence regions corresponding to the data in table 3 for assays with total Ig, IgG and  
499 IgM respectively. For the IgG assays where data was available from more than one  
500 laboratory the median result was chosen for the COVID-19 cases and for the pre-  
501 pandemic blood donors the total of all the samples was used, as these were from different  
502 persons. The vertical broken line at a false positive rate of 0.01 correspond to a 99%  
503 specificity. The y-axis for IgM has a different scale from 20% sensitivity instead of 70%.

504

505

506 Figure 2. Antibody development for total-Ab (IgT), IgG and IgM as a function of days from  
507 symptom onset in three-week periods and severity of symptoms grouped as "mild or  
508 none", "in bed" at home or "hospitalized". Assays are color coded. Several lines with the  
509 same color appear if the same assay was performed in different laboratories as indicated  
510 to show the (small) interlaboratory variation.

Table 1

Manufacturer	Laboratory No.	Analyzer	Cat No.	Lot No.	Manufacturers' cutoff	Antigen	Ab type	Method
Roche Diagnostics, Mannheim, Germany	5+6	Elecsys	09175431190	495040, 490258	Negative <1.0 COI Positive ≥1.0 COI	rN	TotalAb	Sandwich CLIA
Siemens Healthcare, Tarrytown, USA	4	Atellica IM	11206711	C2T01 C2T02	Negative <1.0 Positive ≥1.0	rS1 RBD	TotalAb	Sandwich FIA
Siemens Healthcare, Tarrytown, USA	7	Dimension Vista 500	K7414	20148BA	Negative <1000 Positive ≥1000	rS1 RBD	TotalAb	Sandwich CLIA
Abbott, Abbott Park, Illinois, USA	10+11+12	Alinity	06R90	17065FN00, 17069FN00	Negative <1.4 (S/C) Positive ≥1.4 (S/C)	rN	IgG	Sandwich CMIA
Abbott, Abbott Park, Illinois, USA	9	Architect	R686	16253FN00	Negative <1.4 (S/C) Positive ≥1.4 (S/C)	rN	IgG	Sandwich CMIA
Snibe, Shenzhen, China	4+13+14	Maglumi 4000+	130219015M	272200501	Negative < 1.0 Positive ≥ 1.0	r2019-nCoV nonspecified	IgG	Indirect CLIA
Snibe, Shenzhen, China	4+13+14	Maglumi 800	130219016M	271200401	Negative < 1.0 Positive ≥ 1.0	r2019-nCoV nonspecified	IgM	Capture CLIA
Ortho-Clinical Diagnostics, Pencoed Bridgend, UK	3	Vitros 3600	619 9922	0012, 0021, 0151	Negative <1.0 (S/CO) Positive ≥ 1.0 (S/CO)	rS1 RBD	TotalAb	Sandwich CLIA
Ortho-Clinical Diagnostics, Pencoed Bridgend, UK	3	Vitros 3600	619 9919	0100	Negative <1.0 (S/CO) Positive ≥ 1.0 (S/CO)	rS1 RBD	IgG	Sandwich CLIA
Wantai, Beijing, China	1	ELISA	WS-1096	NCOA20200301, NCOA20200401	Negative < 1.1 Positive ≥ 1.1	rS RBD	TotalAb	Double antigen sandwich ELISA
Wantai, Beijing, China	10	ELISA	WS-1196	NCOM20200301	Negative < 1.1 Positive ≥ 1.1	rS RBD	IgM	Two-step solid-phase antibody capture ELISA
Diasorin, Saluggia, Italy	13+14+15+16	LiaisonXL	311450	354009 354010	Negative < 12 AU/ml Equivocal 12-15 AU/ml Positive ≥ 15 AU/ml	rS1 rS2, RBD	IgG	Indirect CLIA
Euroimmun, Lübeck, Germany	9+10	ELISA	EI 2668-9601 G	E200408AO, E200420AW, E200423AF, E200317BP, E200416AE	Negative < 0. 8 Borderline ≥ 0.8 to <1.1 Positive ≥ 1.1	ss1, RBD	IgG	Solid phase, Enzyme immunoassay
Copenhagen University Hospital and Novo Nordisk A/S, Denmark	2	ELISA	In-house	-	Negative < 9.4 Positive ≥ 9.4	rS RBD	TotalAb	Double antigen sandwich ELISA
YHLO Biotechnology, Shenzhen, China	8	iFlash 1800		20200301, 20200212	Negative < 10 AU/ml Positive ≥ 10 AU/ml	rS	IgG	Indirect CLIA
YHLO Biotechnology, Shenzhen, China	8	iFlash 1800		20200301, 20200212	Negative < 8 AU/ml Positive ≥ 8 AU/ml	rS	IgM	Indirect CLIA

CLIA, Chemiluminescence immunoassay; FIA, Fluorescence immunoassay; CMIA, Chemiluminescence microparticle immunoassay; r, recombinant; S, spike antigen; RBD, receptor binding domain; N, nucleocapsid antigen; IgG, Immunoglobulin G; IgM, Immunoglobulin M; TotalAb, total antibodies

Table 2. Case panel patient characteristics

Characteristic	N (%)
Sex	
Male	52 (34.9)
Female	97 (65.1)
Age, median (IQR) years	54 (43-64)
Age, range, years	18-83
Time from symptom onset (TSO), days	
0-7	0 (0.0)
>7-14	7 (4.7)
>14-21	13 (8.7)
>21-42	49 (32.7)
>42	71 (47.3)
NA	9 (6.0)
Time from positive SARS-CoV-2 PCR, days	
0-7	1 (0.7)
>7-14	15 (10.0)
>14-21	22 (14.6)
>21-42	90 (60.0)
>42	21 (47.3)
Symptom degree	
No symptoms	6 (4.0)
Mild (at home, well)	37 (24.8)
Moderate (home, bedridden)	75 (50.3)
Severe (hospitalized)	2 (1.3)
Critical (assisted ventilation)	29 (19.5)
Total	149 (100)

N, number; IQR, Interquartile range; NA, not available.



TABLE 3. Anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibody assays with results

Manufacturer/Platform	Assay #	Laboratory #	TP	FN	FP	TN	X-reactive samples		Sensitivity % (95% CI)	Specificity % (95% CI)	Sensitivity % in 120 samples with TSO>21 days†§	
							Auto FP/N	EBV, CMV FP/N				
<b>Total-Ab assays</b>												
Wantai ELISA	1	1	145	5	3	656	0/65	0/37	96.7 (92.4-98.6)	99.5 (98.7-99.8)	97.6	
In-house CUH/NOVO ELISA	2	2	144	6	3	617	0/50	0/25	96.0 (91.5-98.2)	99.5 (98.6-99.8)	95.9	
Ortho CD Vitros	3	3	143	7	0	605	0/50	0/20	95.3 (90.7-97.7)	100.0 (99.4-100)	95.9	
Siemens Atellica	4	4	138	10	3	593	0/50	0/25	93.2 (87.9-96.7)	99.5 (98.5-99.8)	96.7	
Roche Elecsys	5	5	139	11	2	216	ND	ND	92.7 (87.3-95.9)	99.1 <sup>#</sup> (96.7-99.7)	95.9	
		6	138	12	0	610	0/60	0/25	92.0 (86.5-95.4)	100.0 (99.4-100)	95.9	
Siemens Vista	6	7	119	28	0	596	0/10	0/25	81.0 (73.7-87.0)	100.0 (99.4-100)	81	
<b>IgG assays</b>												
YHLO iFlash	7	8	141	9	4	582	ND	0/25	94.0 (89.0-96.8)	99.3 (98.3-99.7)	95.9	
Ortho CD Vitros	8	3	140	10	0	600	0/50	0/25	93.3 (88.2-96.3)	100.0 (99.4-100)	95.9	
Abbott Architect	9	9	135	15	3	600	0/25	1/32	90.0 (84.2-93.8)	99.5 (98.5-99.8)	93.5	
Abbott Alinity	10	10	134	16	4	596	0/50	0/25	89.3 (83.3-93.8)	99.3 (98.3-99.7)	93.5	
		11	132	18			0/50	ND	88.0 (81.8-92.3)			91.9
		12	132	18			0/53	ND	88.0 (81.8-92.3)			91.9
EuroImmune ELISA	11	9+10	117	33	5	594	0/50	0/35	78.0 (70.7-83.9)	99.2 (98.1-99.6)	82.9	
Snibe Maglumi	12	13	116	32	9	1164	0/50	0/10	78.4 (71.1-84.2)	99.2 (98.5-99.6)	82.8	
		14	117	33			0/50	ND	78.0 (70.5-84.4)			82.9
		4	113	37			ND	ND	75.3 (67.6-82.0)			81.0
Diasorin LiaisonXL	13	14	128	22	39	1349	1/60	0/25	85.3 (78.8-90.1)	97.2 (96.2-97.9)	89.4	
		15	127	23			1/60	0/25	84.7 (77.9-90.0)			88.6
		13	125	23			2/50	0/10	84.5 (77.6-89.9)			87.7
		16	123	27			1/50	2/25	82.0 (74.9-87.8)			87.0
<b>IgM assays</b>												
Wantai ELISA	14	10	124	26	4	396	0/53	0/25	82.7 (75.8-87.9)	99.0 (97.5-99.6)		
YHLO iFlash	15	8	63	87	2	583	ND	2/25	42.0 (34.4-50.0)	99.7 (98.8-99.9)		

Snibe Maglumi	16	14	63	87	44	1140	1/50	ND	42 (34.4-50.0)	96.3 (95.0-97.3)
		13	45	103			0/50	0/10	30.4 (23.1-38.5)	
		4	39	109			ND	ND	26.4 (19.5-34.2)	

# Patient samples from hospitalized patients from before January 2020.

†The mean size of the 95% confidence intervals for the sensitivities of the samples collected 21 days or later after symptom onset is 8% for Total-Ab assays.

§The mean size of the 95% confidence intervals for the sensitivities of the samples collected 21 days or later after symptom onset is 11% for IgG assays.

IgG, Immunoglobulin G; IgM, Immunoglobulin M; total-Ab, total antibodies;

TP, true positive; FN, false negative; FP, false positive; TN, true negative; N, number tested; Auto, preCOVID-19 samples from patients with autoimmune diseases; EBV, CMV, preCOVID-19 samples from patients with acute Epstein-Barr virus or Cytomegalo virus or other acute viral infections; ND, not done.



