

1 Evaluation of SARS-CoV2 antibody Rapid Diagnostic Test kits (RDTs) and Real Time-  
2 Polymerase Chain Reaction (Rt-PCR) for COVID-19 Diagnosis in Kaduna, Nigeria

3 Oluwafemi Ige<sup>1</sup>, Ayuba Sunday Buru<sup>2</sup>, Tanko Zainab Lamido <sup>1</sup>, Tahir Mohammed<sup>3</sup>,  
4 Livingstone Dogara<sup>4</sup>, Ijei Ifeoma Patience<sup>4</sup>, Bello-Manga Halima<sup>4</sup>, Audu Reward<sup>6</sup>, Ige  
5 Samuel<sup>5</sup> Nmadu Grace<sup>7</sup>

6 <sup>1</sup>Department of Medical Microbiology and Parasitology, Faculty of Basic Clinical Sciences,  
7 College of Medicine, Kaduna State University, Kaduna, Nigeria.

8 <sup>2</sup>Genomic Research Lab, Department of Medical Microbiology and Parasitology, Faculty  
9 of Basic Clinical Sciences, College of Medicine, Kaduna State University, Kaduna, Nigeria.

10 <sup>3</sup>Department of Medical Laboratory Science, Faculty of Health Sciences, College of  
11 Medicine, Ahmadu Bello University Zaria, Nigeria

12 <sup>4</sup>Department of Haematology and Blood Transfusion, Faculty of Basic Clinical Sciences,  
13 College of Medicine, Kaduna State University, Kaduna, Nigeria

14 <sup>5</sup>Department of Paediatrics, Yusuf Danstoho Memorial Hospital, Tudun Wada, Kaduna.

15 <sup>6</sup>Department of Medical Microbiology and Parasitology, BDTH, Kaduna State

16 <sup>7</sup>Department of Community Medicine, Faculty of Clinical Sciences, College of Medicine,  
17 Kaduna State University.

18 **Abstract:**

19 The emergence of the RNA virus SARS-CoV2, the causative agent of COVID-19 and its  
20 declaration by the World Health Organization (WHO) as a pandemic has disrupted the

21 delicate balance in health indices globally. Its attendant immune dysregulation and  
22 pathobiology is still evolving. Currently, real time PCR is the gold standard diagnostic  
23 test, however there are several invalidated antibody-based tests available for possible  
24 community screening. With ongoing community transmission in Nigeria, neither the true  
25 burden of COVID-19 nor the performance of these kits is presently known. This study  
26 therefore, compared the performance of the SARS CoV2 antibody test and the real time  
27 Polymerase Chain Reaction (Rt-PCR) in the diagnosis of COVID-19. For the purpose of  
28 this evaluation, we used the diagnostic test kit by Innovita® Biological Technology CO.,  
29 LTD China, a total of 521 venous blood samples were collected from consenting patients  
30 for the SARS COVID-19 rapid diagnostic kit and Oral and Nasopharyngeal swabs were  
31 collected and analyzed using the real time Polymerase chain reaction technique for  
32 nucleic acid detection and quantification.

33 **Key words:** SARS-CoV2, Rapid Diagnostic Test kits (RDTs), Real Time-Polymerase Chain  
34 Reaction (Rt-PCR), Liferiver®, Genefnder®, Innovita®, Kaduna State.

### 35 **Introduction:**

36 The outbreak of the new coronavirus (SARS-CoV-2/COVID-19) infection has spread to  
37 every continent of the globe, thus, forcing us to adapt to living with it. Since the  
38 emergence of this virus, there has been a lot of challenges in trying to curtail it, leading  
39 to a halt in all economic and social activities both locally and internationally. (Nicola *et al*,  
40 2020).

41 The SARS-CoV-2 virus is highly contagious and spreads easily within populations. Factors  
42 that aids the spread of the virus include; population density, environment social culture  
43 (Kaushik *et al*, 2020). The Clinical presentations of COVID-19 range from  
44 asymptomatic/mild symptoms to severe illness leading to multiple organ failure and  
45 death. Mortality from the disease is associated with advanced age, immune-  
46 compromised states, and those with comorbidities. (Guan *et al*, 2020).

47 Currently, there are over 5million cases worldwide with~340,000 deaths. In Nigeria, initial  
48 cases of COVID-19 were imported from other countries, however, with the advent of  
49 community transmission, there are 61,194 confirmed COVID-19 cases, 52,303 discharged  
50 and 1119 deaths as at 17/10/2020 (NCDC 2020). At the moment, there are no effective  
51 therapeutic strategies to treat COVID-19. Several drug therapies and vaccines are in  
52 different stages of clinical trials, however, none of these trials have given conclusive  
53 results yet. (Darrel, 2020; Ryan, 2020) Prevention and control strategies employed  
54 include; physical distancing, heightened personal and respiratory hygiene as well as  
55 prompt notification of the presence of ant case defining symptoms.

56 Since onset of this pandemic, schools and a lot of other social activities have come to a  
57 standstill. The big question is how long will this remain? Strategies towards gradual  
58 reopening of the society have to be developed. Testing for antibodies to the SARS-CoV-  
59 2 virus and determining the level of herd immunity is a viable strategy that will aid policy  
60 makers on deciding when to re-open societies. Despite the medical, social and economic

61 ramification of this pandemic Nigeria in general and Kaduna State in particular relies on  
62 tests kits, reagents and other accessories produced in other countries. Best practices  
63 require that any new test kit be validated before use. This will ensure that the  
64 performance of these kits is assessed and informed-decisions are taken by policy and  
65 regulatory bodies. The COVID-19 is also associated with socioeconomic problems. There  
66 is fear of contagion of the infection among the populace; the concept of social  
67 distancing is not compatible with the Nigerian and African communal structure. The  
68 lockdown policy embarked on in many states of the Nigeria Federation is not without  
69 hardship on the populace despite economic palliative measures of the government. At  
70 some point, a decision has to be made on when to re-open the economy and allow  
71 normal activities to resume, however, there is no locally relevant data on community  
72 exposure to and recovery from SARS-CoV2 in Kaduna State. This gap that will limit policy  
73 decisions such as when to ease restrictions and allow for normal activities including  
74 social, economic and educational to recommence; as well as vaccination targets for  
75 vulnerable versus general population

76 In response to the rising COVID-19 pandemic, several diagnostic test manufacturers have  
77 developed rapid and easy to use test kits to facilitate testing both within and outside the  
78 laboratory. Among which are test kits for the detection of antibodies in blood samples.  
79 However, the WHO recommends the validation of these test kits in appropriate

80 populations and settings. (WHO, 2020) This is to prevent false positive or negative  
81 categorization of people which may hinder disease control efforts.

82 The availability of a locally validated and adapted antibody test kit will improve the ease  
83 and access to a screening tool for point of care testing in primary, secondary and tertiary  
84 health care centres thereby, strengthening the local testing capacity for COVID-19. This  
85 will generally improve the ease of diagnosis/screening of COVID-19 in resource  
86 constrained settings. The detection of asymptomatic infections using a locally validated  
87 serological test kit will also improve community surveillance capacity, which will aid in  
88 decision making on measures to control the viral spread such as when to enforce  
89 quarantine or isolation.

90 The ability to detect the immune response using a rapid and reliable serology test has a  
91 huge advantage in the assessment of the viral spread in the population and the level of  
92 herd immunity. This study will shed more light in understanding the immune response to  
93 the virus in both immune-competent and immune-compromised individuals. The  
94 comparative advantage of utilization of the validated test kits for COVID-19 screening in  
95 the general community cannot be overemphasized. This will help policy makers and  
96 clinicians to pick up previously undiagnosed asymptomatic infected persons who might  
97 have recovered and developed antibodies and may serve as a reservoir for  
98 convalescence plasma to be utilized for those with severe infection as a form of passive  
99 immunity, in the absence of specific drug therapies or vaccines. The screening can also

100 help measure and determine how the society gradually ease back to normalcy and the  
101 number of patients coming for voluntary testing as well as reduction in stigma, which are  
102 in accordance with the targets of Goal 3 of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG).  
103 This pilot study therefore, seek to assessed and compare the performance of the SARS  
104 CoV2 antibody test and Real Time Polymerase Chain Reaction (Rt-PCR) in the diagnosis  
105 of COVID-19. (Elitza *et al.*, 2020)

## 106 **Materials and Methods:**

### 107 **Study Design:**

108 The study was conducted at 3 sites using both experimental and cross-sectional study  
109 designs. We employed an experimental study design as described by Momeni *et al*  
110 (2018) to assess the accuracy and precision of a Candidate SARS-CoV-2 test kit, an  
111 antibody-based rapid diagnostic kit for COVID 19.

### 112 **Study Setting:**

113 Infectious diseases control center (IDCC) and Hamdala Motel COVID 19 treatment center,  
114 and in the Community, Kaduna State.

115 For the purpose of this evaluation, the diagnostic test kit by Innovita® Biological  
116 Technology CO., LTD China, will be used on Venous whole blood samples (4.0mls)  
117 dispensed into Ethylene diamine tetra-acetic acid (EDTA) anticoagulated bottles.

118 Oral and Nasopharyngeal swabs will be analyzed using the real time Polymerase chain  
119 reaction technique for nucleic acid detection and quantification, following RNA extraction  
120 (with Liferiver extraction kits, Shanghai, China) using primers obtained from Genefinders  
121 Company LTD, South Korea.

122 **Eligibility:** Patients who present for community testing and those confirmed positive for  
123 SARS-CoV2 virus by RT PCR at the Isolation centers who give consent

124 Assuming a confidence (accuracy) of 0.95%, reliability (precision) of 0.90% and a sample  
125 size of 521, True positive value, true negative value and positive and negative predictive  
126 value of the antibody was assessed using the formula:

127 Accuracy =  $\frac{TP+TN}{TP+TN+FP+FN}$

128 Acceptability criterion = accuracy of  $\geq 95\%$

129 Sensitivity =  $\frac{TP}{TP+FN} \times 100$

130 Specificity =  $\frac{TN}{TN+FP} \times 100$

131 Positive Predictive Value =  $\frac{TP}{TP+FP} \times 100$

132 Negative Predictive Value =  $\frac{TN}{TN+FN} \times 100$

133 **Data Analysis:**

134 Data was analyzed using SPSS data analysis package ver. 23. Data for validation studies is  
135 presented as percentages. Qualitative data is summarized as percentages using charts  
136 and tables. Non skewed quantitative data will be summarized as means and standard  
137 deviations (SD) while skewed data will be summarized as medians and interquartile  
138 ranges (IQR). Proportions will be compared using Z-tests for proportions. Level of  
139 statistical significance will be set at  $p \leq 0.05$ .

140

141

142 **Ethical consideration:**

143 Ethical approval from Kaduna State Ministry of Health was obtained. Privacy of  
144 participants and confidentiality of all data was ensured during the study. The study was at  
145 no cost to the participants and they were free to withdraw at any point without loss of  
146 rights or privileges.

147 **Data Management:**

148 All data was safely secured using alphanumeric pass-worded computers with up-to date  
149 commercial antivirus software. Each entry was backed immediately using a secure  
150 external hard drive. Hard copies were kept in a separate, safe office under lock. Only  
151 authorized individuals had access to the data.

152 **Results:**

153 **Table 1: Sociodemographic characteristics of participants N=521**



Characteristics	Cases Frequency (%)	Healthy Frequency (%)	n
<b>Age</b>			
<30	71 (42.5)	138 (39.0)	156
30-49	66 (39.5)	135 (38.1)	
>49	30 (18.0)	81 (22.9)	158
Total	167 (100)	354(100)	
<b>Sex</b>			
Male	101 (60.5)	193 (54.5)	
Female	66 (39.5)	161 (45.5)	
Total	167(100)	354(100)	

159

160 Serum samples were tested from 521 persons 167 of whom were COVID-19 cases and  
 161 354 were healthy individuals. The mean age of the participants was 35.2± 15 years.  
 162 Majority of the cases (42.5%) and healthy (39.0%) participants were less than 30 years of  
 163 age. There were more male cases (60.5%) and male healthy participants (60.5%) than  
 164 females.

165 **IgM and IgG reactivities in negative control samples**

166 25 of sera from healthy blood donors tested IgM positive in the assay (25/354, 7.1%),  
 167 while five tested IgG positive (5/354, 1.4%) (Tables 2 and 3).

168 **IgM and IgG reactivities in PCR-confirmed COVID-19 patients**

169 Altogether 24 of 166 (14.5%) samples from PCR confirmed COVID-19 patients tested IgM  
170 positive and 26 tested (15.7%) IgG positive (Tables 2 and 3).

### 171 Assay sensitivity, specificity and accuracy

172 Based on the results described above and summarized in Tables 2 and 3, the assay  
173 showed a sensitivity of 14.4% (24/167) and 15.6% (26/167) for IgM and IgG, respectively.  
174 The assay showed an overall specificity of 92.9% (329/354, 25 false positive) and 98.6%  
175 (349/354, 5 false positive) for IgM and IgG, respectively. Using PCR-positive cases as true  
176 positives, the accuracy of the test was 67.8% (353/521) and 72.0% (375/521) for IgM and  
177 IgG, respectively. The positive and negative predictive values (the likelihood of being a  
178 case given a positive test result, and the likelihood of being healthy given a negative test  
179 result) for IgM were 48.9% (24/49) and 69.7% (329/472), respectively. For IgG, the  
180 corresponding values were 83.9% (26/ 31) and 71.2% (349/490).

181

182 Table 2. Comparisons of IgM results for 167 PCR-positive COVID-19 cases and 354  
183 healthy individuals

	Cases	Healthy	Total
IgM positive	24	25	49
IgM negative	143	329	472
<b>Total</b>	<b>167</b>	<b>354</b>	<b>521</b>

184

185

186

187

188

189

190

191 Table 3. Comparisons of IgG results for 167 PCR-positive COVID-19 cases and 354  
192 healthy individuals.

	Cases	Healthy	Total
IgG positive	26	5	31
IgG negative	141	349	490
Total	167	354	521

193

194

195 Table 4. Association between sociodemographic characteristics and IgM status

Characteristics	IgM Status		P value
	Positive (%)	Negative (%)	
Age			0.957
<30	20 (40.8)	138 (40.0)	
30-49	18 (36.7)	135 (38.8)	
>49	11 (22.4)	81 (21.2%)	

Total	49 (100)	472(100)	
<b>Sex</b>			0.001*
Male	39(79.6)	255 (54.0)	
Female	10(20.4)	217 (46.0)	
<b>Total</b>	<b>49(100)</b>	<b>472(100)</b>	

196 \*Statistical Significance

197 There was a statistically significant difference found between sociodemographic  
 198 characteristics sex (P=0.001) and IgM status of cases.

199

200

201

202 Table 5. Association between sociodemographic characteristics and IgG status

Characteristics	IgG Status		P value
	Positive (%)	Negative (%)	
<b>Age</b>			0.138
<30	17 (54.8)	192 (39.2)	
30-49	11 (35.5)	190 (38.8)	
>49	11 (9.7)	108 (22.0%)	
Total	31 (100)	472(100)	
<b>Sex</b>			0.015*

Male	24(77.4)	270 (55.1)
Female	7(22.6)	220 (44.9)
<b>Total</b>	<b>31(100)</b>	<b>490(100)</b>

203

204 There was a statistically significant difference found between sociodemographic  
205 characteristics sex (P=0.015) and IgG status of cases.

206

207

208

209

210

211

212

213

214

215

216 Table 6. Association between sociodemographic characteristics and PCR positivity

Characteristic	PCR Positivity		P value
	Positive	Negative	
Age			0.200

<30	71 (42.5)	138 (39.0)	
30-49	66 (39.5)	135 (38.1)	
>49	30 (18.0)	81 (22.9)	
Total	167 (100)	354(100)	
<b>Sex</b>			0.428
Male	101 (60.5)	193 (54.5)	
Female	66 (39.5)	161 (45.5)	
<b>Total</b>	<b>167(100)</b>	<b>354(100)</b>	

217

218 There were no statistically significant differences found between sociodemographic  
219 characteristics (Age, P=0.002; Sex. P=0.428) of PCR positivity status of cases.

220

## 221 **Discussions:**

222 The present study evaluated a commercial rapid test for detection of SARS-CoV-2-  
223 specific IgM and IgG. For the evaluation, samples from COVID-19 cases were obtained  
224 during disease condition and previously confirmed by PCR, were used as the true  
225 positives. According to the manufacturer of the PCR test, the specificity had been  
226 evaluated and was found to be 100% (95% CI:94.20% to 100%) for both IgM and IgG,  
227 while the sensitivity evaluated on COVID-19 cases was 87.3% (95% CI: 80.40% to 92.0%)  
228 for both IgM and IgG. Our results showed an overall very low sensitivity of IgM (14.4%)

229 and IgG (15.6%). A study carried out by Li et al. in China in contrast to our study findings  
230 reported an overall high testing sensitivity of 88.7% and 90.6% specificity. The specificity  
231 results for our study for IgM (92.9%) and IgG (98.6%) were higher than what was  
232 reported in Li *et al*/study.

233 There were 25 false IgM positive samples and 5 false positive IgG results observed from  
234 the healthy participants. This indicates that a cross-reaction to another coronavirus might  
235 have taken place. Previous literature has documented the occurrence of serological  
236 cross-reactions between SARS-CoV and SARS-CoV-2 (Wan WY 2020). Globally there are  
237 some other types of coronaviruses that affect humans that are endemic or even occur as  
238 epidemics. These include the 229E, HKU1, NL63 and OC43 strains. The picture of  
239 significant false positivises observed in this study may possibly be due the cross reaction  
240 from a previous infection with one of the strains of those other viruses mentioned above.  
241 It cannot be said for certain the commonality of the corona viruses as the agents  
242 responsible for the flu, but it has been estimated that about 20% of cases of the flu could  
243 be as a result of the coronaviruses (Bende M, 1989). The specificity for IgG detection of  
244 the rapid test evaluated in this study was similar to what was reported in another study of  
245 an enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay (ELISA), which had a specificity 97.5% (Zhao R  
246 2020). However, the sensitivity of our study was very low as compared with that of the  
247 ELISA which was also 97.5%. This study generally showed a poor sensitivity performance  
248 of antibody tests for both IgM and IgG. The negative predictive values for the rapid tests

249 in this study were not very high, indicating that this rapid test would not be useful for  
250 detecting past infections and possible immunity. It is not known when infection occurred  
251 for individuals in this study. The timing of the development of SARS-CoV-2-specific  
252 antibodies is variable. The humoral response kinetics to SARS-CoV-2 infection have not  
253 been fully understood, however it has been shown that reactive IgA, IgM, and IgG  
254 antibodies have been detected as soon as 1 day after symptom onset (Guo, 2020). In  
255 other previous studies, the antibodies were detected 10 to 15 days after symptom onset.  
256 The median time to the development of total antibody, IgM, and IgG has been estimated  
257 as 11, 12, and 14 days, respectively (Zhao,2020; Wu F,2020). We also investigated the  
258 possible associations between IgM, IgG and PCR positivity and sociodemographic  
259 characteristics. The associations found were those between IgM and IgG status and  
260 gender. According to the previous studies, gender has not been shown to have  
261 significant association with antibodies to SARSCoV-2. A study conducted in Spain did not  
262 show any statistically significant association with presence of IgM and IgG antibodies to  
263 SARS-CoV-2 and gender (Garcia-Basteiro 2020). Another study conducted in the United  
264 States of America similarly did not find any association between the presence of IgM and  
265 IgG antibodies to SARS-CoV-2 and gender (Havers FP, 2020). In another study  
266 conducted by Zeng *et al.* among 331 patients confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection, it was  
267 found that level of IgG antibody in mild, general and recovering patients did not show  
268 any difference between males and females. However, the average IgG antibody level in



269 female patients tended to be higher than that of in male patients in severe infections. It  
270 was observed that in comparison to male patients, most of the female patients  
271 generated a relatively high level of SARS-CoV-2 IgG antibody in severe infection. It was  
272 also reported that, the generation of IgG antibody in the females tended to be stronger  
273 than the male patients in the early phase of the disease. There are inconsistent findings  
274 from various studies on the associations between gender and SARS-CoV-2 antibody  
275 positivity. It is necessary for additional studies to be carried out to explore further and  
276 validate the relationship between gender and SARS-CoV-2 antibody positivity.

277 **Recommendation and Conclusion:** Although rapid antibody test kit has been found to be  
278 simple, inexpensive and faster in assessing COVID-19 infection in Humans, the specificity  
279 and sensitivity of the Innovita test kit for detecting SARS-CoV2 antibody as claimed by  
280 the manufacturer need to be reevaluated. The Rt-PCR still remain the gold standard as  
281 recommended by WHO for the diagnosis of SARS CoV2 infection until a more specific,  
282 sensitive and reliable rapid test kit has been developed and recommended by WHO for  
283 use at point of entry, point of care and for general community mass screening program  
284 for COVID-19 antibody.

285 **Conflict of Interest:** The authors declare that they have no conflicting interest.

286 **Acknowledgement:** The authors acknowledge the Ministry of Health (MOH) Kaduna State  
287 for the approval of this pilot study, Barau Dikko Teaching Hospital (BDTH) and the

288 Laboratory Pillar Kaduna State COVID-19 Rapid Response Team for their assistance and  
289 expertise

290

291

292

293 **References:**

294 Nicola, M., Alsafi, Z., Sohrabi, C., Kerwan, A., Al-Jabir, A., Iosifidis, C., Agha, M., & Agha, R.  
295 (2020). The Socio-Economic Implications of the Coronavirus and COVID-19 Pandemic: A  
296 Review. *International journal of surgery (London, England)*, S1743-9191(20)30316-2.  
297 Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijssu.2020.04.018>

298 Kaushik, S., Kaushik, S., Sharma, Y. *et al.* The Indian perspective of COVID-19 outbreak.  
299 *VirusDis.* (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13337-020-00587-x>

300 Guan, W. J., Liang, W. H., Zhao, Y., Liang, H. R., Chen, Z. S., Li, Y. M., Liu, X. Q., Chen, R. C.,  
301 Tang, C. L., Wang, T., Ou, C. Q., Li, L., Chen, P. Y., Sang, L., Wang, W., Li, J. F., Li, C. C., Ou,  
302 L. M., Cheng, B., Xiong, S., ... China Medical Treatment Expert Group for COVID-19 (2020).  
303 Comorbidity and its impact on 1590 patients with COVID-19 in China: a nationwide  
304 analysis. *The European respiratory journal*, 55(5), 2000547.  
305 <https://doi.org/10.1183/13993003.00547-2020>

306 Nigerian Center for Diseases Control, 2020. COVID-19 Cases Update, 16<sup>th</sup> October, 2020

307 Darrell Etherington. Pfizer and BioNTech announce joint development of a potential COVID-19 vaccine.  
308 [https://techcrunch.com/2020/03/17/pfizer-and-biontech-announce-joint-development-](https://techcrunch.com/2020/03/17/pfizer-and-biontech-announce-joint-development-of-a-potential-covid-19-vaccine/)  
309 [of-a-potential-covid-19-vaccine/](https://techcrunch.com/2020/03/17/pfizer-and-biontech-announce-joint-development-of-a-potential-covid-19-vaccine/). March 17, 2020

310 Jackson Ryan . Coronavirus vaccines: Drug trials, chloroquine and treatments for COVID-  
311 19. [https://www.cnet.com/how-to/coronavirus-vaccines-drug-trials-chloroquine-and-](https://www.cnet.com/how-to/coronavirus-vaccines-drug-trials-chloroquine-and-treatments-for-covid-19/)  
312 [treatments-for-covid-19/](https://www.cnet.com/how-to/coronavirus-vaccines-drug-trials-chloroquine-and-treatments-for-covid-19/). April 1, 2020.

313 World Health Organization. (2020) . Advice on the use of point-of-care  
314 immunodiagnostic tests for COVID-19: scientific brief, 8 April 2020. World Health  
315 Organization. <https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/331713>. License: CC BY-NC-SA 3.0  
316 IGO

317 Elitza S. Theel, Patricia Slev, Sarah Wheeler, Marc Roger Couturier, Susan J. Wong,  
318 Kamran Kadkhoda. The Role of Antibody Testing for SARS-CoV-2: Is There One? *J. Clin.*  
319 *Microbiol.* doi:10.1128/JCM.00797-20

320 Momeni A, Pincus M, Libien J. Validation of New Tests. In: *Introduction to Statistical*  
321 *Methods in Pathology*. First edn. Springer International Publishing AG Cham Switzerland  
322 2018:219-242

323 Li Z, Yi Y, Luo X, et al. Development and clinical application of a rapid IgM-IgG combined  
324 antibody test for SARS-CoV-2 infection diagnosis. *J Med Virol* [Internet]. 2020 Feb 27.  
325 cited 2020 Apr 4; jmv:25727. Available from: [https://onlinelibrary.](https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/jmv.25727)  
326 [wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/jmv.25727](https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/jmv.25727)

327 Wan WY, Lim SH, Seng EH. Cross-reaction of sera from COVID-19 patients with SARS-  
328 CoV assays. medRxiv [Internet]. 2020 Mar 23. cited 2020 Apr 1;20034454. Available from:  
329 <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.03.17.20034454v1>

330 Bende M, Barrow I, Heptonstall J, et al. Changes in human nasal mucosa during  
331 experimental coronavirus common colds. *Acta Otolaryngol.* 1989;107(3–4):262–269

332 Zhao R, Li M, Song H, et al. Serological diagnostic kit of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies using  
333 CHO-expressed full-length SARS-CoV-2 S1 proteins. medRxiv. 2020; 27:20042184.

334 Guo L, Ren L, Yang S, et al. Profiling early humoral response to diagnose novel  
335 coronavirus disease (COVID-19). *Clin Infect Dis.* Published online March 21, 2020.  
336 doi:10.1093/cid/ciaa310

337 Zhao J, Yuan Q, Wang H, et al. Antibody responses to SARS-CoV-2 in patients of novel  
338 coronavirus disease 2019. *Clin Infect Dis.* Published online March 28, 2020.  
339 doi:10.1093/cid/ciaa344

340 Wu F, Wang A, Liu M, et al. Neutralizing antibody responses to SARS-CoV-2 in a COVID-  
341 19 recovered patient cohort and their implications. medRxiv. Preprint posted online April  
342 20, 2020. doi:10.1101/2020.03.30.20047365

343 Garcia-Basteiro AL, Moncunill G, Tortajada M, Vidal M, Guinovart C, Jimenez A, Santano  
344 R, Sanz S, Mendez S, Llupia A, Aguilar R. Seroprevalence of antibodies against SARS-  
345 CoV-2 among health care workers in a large Spanish reference hospital. medRxiv. 2020  
346 Jan 1.

347 Havers FP, Reed C, Lim T, et al. Seroprevalence of Antibodies to SARS-CoV-2 in 10 Sites  
348 in the United States, March 23-May 12, 2020. JAMA Intern Med. Published online July 21,  
349 2020. doi:10.1001/jamainternmed.2020.4130

350 Furong Zeng, Xiang Chen and Guangtong Deng. Convalescent plasma for patients with  
351 COVID-19. PNAS June 9, 2020 11723 12528

352

353

354

355 APPENDIX I

356 PARTICIPATION INFORMATION LEAFLET

357 Serial no.....

358 Investigators:

359 Study Title: Validation of SARS-CoV2 Antibody Tests

360 Introduction:

361 The emergence of the Corona virus disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic has had  
362 significant impact on global health indices. Understanding the underlying mechanism(s)  
363 of the disease and the full clinical picture are still ongoing.

364 The gold standard for diagnosis of COVID-19 is Real Time Polymerase Chain Reaction  
365 (RT-PCR) which identifies the virus. There are new test kits that are commercially available  
366 that attempt to identify if one has been previously infected by identifying special proteins

367 called antibodies formed by the body in response to infection. The ability of these tests  
368 to accurately identify persons infected with COVID-19 is still being evaluated.  
369 This study seeks to compare the accuracy of a test kit (INNOVITA) against the gold  
370 standard for screening and diagnosis  
371 The findings from this study will hopefully make COVID-19 testing cheaper and less  
372 associated with stigma  
373 Your participation includes sample collection (4ml of venous blood). Needle pricks are  
374 associated with temporary pain and every effort will be made to minimize this. Tests  
375 performed will be at no cost to you. Your participation is entirely voluntary and you may  
376 withdraw from the study at any time without bearing consequences. The ethical  
377 committee of Kaduna State Ministry of Health has given approval for this study to be  
378 carried out. If you are willing to participate in this study, please complete the consent  
379 form attached.

380

381

382

383

## APPENDIX II

384

### CONSENT FORM FOR RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS

385

I.....of..... (address) agree to participate in

386

the study on validation of SARS-CoV2 Antibody Tests.

387 The full procedure for the tests has been explained to me and I understand that my  
388 blood sample and oral/nasal swab will be taken.

389 I make this consent without being subjected to any pressure.

390 Participant's name & signature.....Date.....

391 Witness' name & signature.....Date.....

392 Principal Investigator's name & signature.....Date.....

393 Contact Phone no:

394

395

396

397

398

399

400

401

402

403

404

APPENDIX III

405

- 406 RT-PCR test result .....
- 407 Date of test (DD/MM/YYYY) .....
- 408 Interval from onset of symptoms (fever, cough, shortness of breath etc) (in days) .....
- 409
- 410 Antibody test result
- 411 SARS-CoV2 Antibody Result: IgG [ ]
- 412 IgM [ ]
- 413
- 414
- 415
- 416