

1 **Performance Comparison of a Flow Cytometry-based and Two Commercial**
2 **Chemiluminescent Immunoassays for Detection and Quantification of Antibodies**
3 **Binding to SARS-CoV-2 Spike Protein**

4 Arantxa Valdivia,^{1†} Fabián Tarín,^{2†} María Jesús Alcaraz,¹ Paula Piñero,² Ignacio
5 Torres,¹ Francisco Marco,³ Eliseo Albert,¹ David Navarro^{1,4*}

6 ¹*Microbiology Service, Clinic University Hospital, INCLIVA Health Research Institute,*
7 *Valencia, Spain;*²*Hematology Department, Hospital General Universitario Alicante,*
8 *Spain;*³*Immunology Department, Hospital General Universitario Alicante, Spain;*
9 ⁴*Department of Microbiology, School of Medicine, University of Valencia, Valencia,*
10 *Spain.*

11 [†]Both authors contributed equally to the present work.

12 ***Correspondence:** *David Navarro, Microbiology Service, Hospital Clínico*
13 *Universitario, and Department of Microbiology, School of Medicine, Av. Blasco Ibáñez*
14 *17, 46010 Valencia, Spain. Phone: +34 963864657; Fax: +3963864173; E-mail:*
15 *david.navarro@uv.es.*

16 **Running Title:** Flow cytometry-based and CLIA assays to detect antibodies against
17 SARS-CoV-2 S protein.

18

19

20

21

22

23 **ABSTRACT**

24 The performance of a laboratory-developed quantitative IgG/IgA flow cytometry-based
25 immunoassay (FCI) using Jurkat T cells stably expressing full-length native S protein
26 was compared against Elecsys® electrochemiluminiscent (ECLIA) Anti-SARS-CoV-2
27 S (Roche Diagnostics, Pleasanton, CA, USA), and LIAISON® SARS-CoV-2 TrimericS
28 IgG chemiluminiscent assay (CLIA) (Diasorin S.p.a, Saluggia, IT) for detection and
29 quantitation of SARS-CoV-2-specific antibodies. A total of 225 serum/plasma
30 specimens from 120 acute or convalescent COVID-19 individuals were included.
31 Overall, IgG/IgA-FCI yielded the highest number of positives (n=179), followed by
32 IgA-FCI (n=177), Roche ECLIA (n=175), IgG-FCI (n=172) and Diasorin CLIA
33 (n=154). Positive percent agreement between FCI and compared immunoassays was
34 highest for Roche ECLIA, ranging from 96.1% (IgG/IgA-FCI) to 97.7% (IgG-FCI),
35 whereas negative percent agreement was higher between FCI and Diasorin CLIA,
36 regardless of antibody isotype. A strong correlation (Rho:0.6-0.8) was found between
37 IgG-FCI or IgA-FCI levels and antibodies quantified by Roche ECLIA and Diasorin
38 CLIA. The trajectory of antibody levels delineated by the different immunoassays in 22
39 of patients with sequential specimens (≥ 3) was frequently discordant, with the exception
40 of IgG and IgA determined by FCI assay and to a lesser extent antibodies quantified by
41 Roche ECLIA and Diasorin CLIA. The data suggest that FCI may outperform Roche
42 ECLIA and Diasorin CLIA in terms of clinical sensitivity for serological diagnosis of
43 SARS-CoV-2 infection.

44 **KEY WORDS:** SARS-CoV-2 antibodies, COVID-19, flow cytometry-based
45 immunoassay, chemiluminescent immunoassay, SARS-CoV-2 S protein.

46 **INTRODUCTION**

47 SARS-CoV-2 serological assays enable us to identify individuals infected either
48 recently or in the past, assess humoral immune responses elicited by SARS-CoV-2
49 vaccines and infer level of susceptibility to reinfection or primary infection in vaccinees
50 (1,2). Among SARS-CoV-2 structural components, Spike protein (S) elicits the most
51 potent neutralizing antibodies, which are crucially involved in protecting against SARS-
52 CoV-2 infection (3,4). The S protein, which is assembled into trimers in the viral
53 membrane, interacts with angiotensin converting enzyme type 2 receptor (ACE2)
54 through the receptor-binding domain (RBD) (5). Binding of RBD to ACE2 promotes
55 cleavage of S into S1 and S2, and exposure of the fusion peptide located within S2,
56 which eventually leads to cellular and viral membrane fusion (5). A large number of
57 immunoassays using recombinant RBD, S1 or S2 subunits or full-length monomeric S
58 protein as the binding antigen and returning either qualitative or semiquantitative results
59 have been developed, evaluated in different studies and found to exhibit variable
60 sensitivity and specificity (see 1,2,6,7 for review). A new generation of recently
61 launched commercially-available SARS-CoV-2 immunoassays detect antibodies
62 binding to the SARS-CoV-2 S protein in its native (trimeric) conformation or RBD and
63 offer quantitative estimates of antibody levels (8-11), and preliminary results show
64 increased sensitivity for detection of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies, as well as reliable
65 estimates of serum neutralizing activity against SARS-CoV-2. In this context, a
66 quantitative flow cytometry-based immunoassay (FCI) has been developed employing
67 Jurkat T cells stably expressing the full-length native S protein, which is reported to be
68 highly specific and display greater sensitivity than various comparative immunoassays
69 targeting recombinant RBD or S subunit proteins (12). Here, we evaluated the
70 performance of this FCI against two new-generation immunoassays: Elecsys® Anti-

71 SARS-CoV-2 S (Roche Diagnostics, Pleasanton, CA, USA), and LIAISON[®] SARS-
72 CoV-2 TrimericS IgG assay (Diasorin S.p.a, Saluggia, IT), using sera from in- or
73 outpatients with SARS-CoV-2 infection documented by RT-PCR.

74 **PATIENTS AND METHODS**

75 **Patients and specimens.** The current retrospective study was carried out using
76 cryopreserved (-20°C) serum or plasma samples collected from the following four
77 groups: (I) Convalescent COVID-19 patients, as clinically (13) and microbiologically
78 documented by RT-PCR (14), who had been admitted to different hospital wards and
79 eventually released. A total of 60 specimens from 35 patients, drawn at a median of 60
80 days (range, 8–141 days) since symptoms onset were included; (II) Acute COVID-19
81 patients admitted to the intensive care unit (ICU). A total of 115 specimens from 40
82 patients, collected at a median of 16 days (range, 2–43 days) after onset of symptoms
83 were included; (III) Acute or convalescent COVID-19 subjects (n=45) who tested
84 negative by rapid lateral flow immunoassay–LFIC– (INNOVITA 2019-nCoV Ab Test;
85 Beijing Innovita Biological Technology, China), or CLIA (LIAISON[®] SARS-CoV-2
86 S1/S2 IgG CLIA; DiaSorin, Saluggia, Italy, the MAGLUMI 2019-nCoV IgG SNIBE –
87 Shenzhen New Industries Biomedical Engineering Co., Ltd, Shenzhen, China, or both)
88 in use in our laboratory at the time of sample collection and routine testing. A total 50
89 specimens from this group, collected at a median of 44 days after onset of symptoms
90 (range, 11–91) were included, of which 13 specimens tested negative by LFIC, 34
91 returned negative results by LIAISON assay and 7 by MAGLUMI assay; and (IV) Pre-
92 pandemic sera obtained from unique blood donors (n=100). Specimens belonging to
93 different groups of SARS-CoV-2-infected individuals were combined or treated

94 individually, as appropriate for study purposes. The study was approved by the Ethics
95 Committee of Hospital Clínico Universitario INCLIVA.

96 **Flow cytometry native SARS-CoV-2 S assay.** FCI was carried out at the Hematology
97 Department of Hospital General Universitario, Alicante, Spain, as previously described
98 in detail (12). Briefly, transfected human Jurkat T-cell line (clone E6-1) stably
99 expressing both the full-length native SARS-CoV-2 S protein and a truncated version of
100 the human Epidermal growth factor receptor (huEGFRt) were used as the binding
101 antigens (S-Jurkat). Non-transfected Jurkat cells (0-Jurkat) were used as controls. For
102 each individual assay, a mixture of 50,000 0-Jurkat and 150,000 S-Jurkat cells was
103 made in a single tube. Sera were diluted 1:50 in phosphate-buffered saline (PBS)
104 containing 1% bovine serum albumin (BSA) and 0.02% sodium azide and incubated
105 with the cell mixture for 30 min on ice. The cells were then spun down, washed with
106 PBS-BSA and stained with mouse anti-human IgG-PerCP Jackson ImmunoResearch,
107 Cambridgeshire, UK), anti-human IgA-Alexa Fluor 647 (Jackson ImmunoResearch)
108 and anti-human EGFR (BV421) (Biolegend, San Diego, CA, USA). Samples were then
109 washed and acquired on an Omnicyt flow cytometer (Cytognos S.L, Salamanca, Spain).
110 A minimum of 50,000 viable events, discarding doublets and debris, were considered
111 for the analyses. IgG or IgA antibodies bound to S proteins were identified by
112 comparing the median fluorescence intensity (MFI) of the S-Jurkat and the 0-Jurkat
113 cells in each sample. We established the difference between S-Jurkat and 0-Jurkat cells
114 using the normalized MFI-ratio between EGFR and both antibody isotypes (IgG MFI-
115 ratio and IgA MFI-ratio respectively). Data were analyzed using Infinicyt 2.0 software
116 (Cytognos S.L.). Samples were considered positive for IgG or IgA when the normalized
117 difference was ≥ 1 .

118 **Commercially-available chemiluminescent SARS-CoV-2 S assays.** Roche Elecsys®
119 Anti-SARS-CoV-2 S (Roche Diagnostics, Pleasanton, CA, USA), an
120 electrochemiluminescence sandwich immunoassay (ECLIA) that quantifies total (IgG
121 and IgM) antibodies directed against RBD, was run on cobas® e601 modular analyzer
122 (Roche Diagnostics, Rotkreuz, Switzerland). The assay is calibrated with the first WHO
123 International Standard and Reference Panel for anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibody (15). The
124 limit of detection of the assay is 0.4 U/ml and its quantification range is between 0.8
125 and 250.0 U/mL. Specimens yielding values >250 U/ml were diluted 1/10 and re-
126 assayed. LIAISON® SARS-CoV-2 TrimericS IgG assay (Diasorin S.p.a, Saluggia,
127 Italy), run on a DiaSorin LIAISON platform (DiaSorin, Stillwater, USA), measured IgG
128 antibodies against a trimeric S-protein antigen. Samples yielding <13 AU/ml were
129 considered negative. According to the manufacturer, the upper quantification limit of
130 the assay is 800 AU/mL. Both assays were performed at the Microbiology Service at the
131 Hospital Clínico Universitario, Valencia, Spain, following the instructions of the
132 respective manufacturers.

133 **Statistical methods.** Positive and negative percent agreement (PPA and NPA,
134 respectively) between immunoassays were calculated using a diagnostic 2x2 test.
135 Cohen's Kappa statistics was used to assess the degree of concordance between
136 qualitative results provided by the immunoassays and interpreted as previously
137 recommended (16). The Spearman's rank test was used to assess the correlation
138 between continuous variables using the entire dataset (i.e. individuals with single and
139 repeated measurements). Two-sided exact *P* values were reported. A *P* value <0.05 was
140 considered statistically significant. The analyses were performed using SPSS version
141 20.0 (SPSS, Chicago, IL, USA).

142 **RESULTS**

143 **Specificity of the Flow cytometry-based SARS-CoV-2 S immunoassay.** In the
144 current study, FCI was multiplexed for quantitative detection of SARS-CoV-2 IgG and
145 IgA isotypes. Previously published data (12) found detection and quantitation of SARS-
146 CoV-2-S-binding IgM to be less consistent and reliable. To evaluate the specificity of
147 FCI, a total of 100 pre-pandemic sera collected from blood donors were assayed. None
148 of these sera gave a positive signal on the FCI assay.

149 **Overall agreement between qualitative results provided by the immunoassays.**

150 When combining specimens from all three groups of SARS-CoV-2-infected patients,
151 we found that IgG/IgA-FCI yielded the highest number of positives (n=179), closely
152 followed by IgA-FCI (n=177), Roche ECLIA (n=175), and IgG-FCI (n=172) (Table 1).
153 Diasorin CLIA returned a substantially lower number of positive results (n=154) than
154 the former platforms. A subanalysis was next conducted including only sera (n=50) that
155 scored negative by LFIC or CLIA assays routinely used at our laboratory at the time of
156 testing request. As shown in Table 2, FCI (either IgG, IgA or IgG/IgA) yielded a greater
157 number of positive results than Roche ECLIA or Diasorin CLIA.

158 Overall, PPA between FCI and the immunoassay compared was highest for Roche
159 ECLIA, ranging from 96.1% (IgG/IgA-FCI) to 97.7% (IgG-FCI) (Table 3), whereas
160 NPA was overall greater between FCI and Diasosin CLIA, regardless of the antibody
161 isotype detected (91.4% to 97.2%). Inter-rater agreement between FCI (either IgG, IgA
162 or IgG/IgA) and Roche ECLIA was strong ($k \geq 0.8$), while it was only moderate with
163 Diasorin CLIA ($k \geq 0.6 < 0.8$). Inter-rater agreement between results returned by Roche
164 ECLIA and Diasorin CLIA was also moderate ($k = 0.76$).

165 **Correlation between antibody levels measured by the immunoassays under**
166 **comparison.** A strong correlation (Rho ranging between 0.6 and 0.8) was found
167 between IgG-FCI, IgA-FCI levels and total antibodies quantified by Roche ECLIA
168 (Figure 1A and 1B, respectively) and IgG measured by Diasorin CLIA (Figure 1C and
169 1D, respectively).

170 **Kinetics of antibody levels measured by different immunoassays.** A total of 22
171 patients belonging to groups I and II had three or more sequential sera available for
172 kinetic analyses. Trajectories of antibody levels delineated by the different
173 immunoassays were categorized as either ascending, descending, ascending to a peak
174 then descending, or fluctuating. As displayed in Table 4, congruent trajectories were
175 seen more frequently for IgG-FCI and IgA-FCI, followed by IgG-FCI or IgA-FCI and
176 IgG measured by Diasorin CLIA. Concordant trajectories were observed commonly for
177 antibodies quantified by Roche ECLIA and Diasorin CLIA; surprisingly, congruent
178 trajectories were seldom seen for IgG or IgA-FCI and total antibodies measured by
179 Roche ECLIA. Fig. 2 exemplifies concordant (2A-D) or divergent (2E-H) antibody
180 trajectories as delineated by the different immunoassays.

181 **DISCUSSION**

182 In this study we compared the performance of an in-house-developed quantitative FCI
183 (12) with the SARS-CoV-2 trimericS-IgG CLIA from Diasorin and Roche RBD-
184 specific IgG/IgM antibody ECLIA for serological diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2 infection
185 in patients with either acute or convalescent COVID-19. All three assays have been
186 reported to measure serum/plasma antibody levels that correlate with those quantified
187 by virus neutralization assays, using either wild type SARS-CoV-2 or lentiviral-S-
188 pseudotyped virions (8-12). Of note, only Roche ECLIA is calibrated to the first WHO

189 International Standard and Reference Panel for anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibody (15). By
190 using a large number of pre-pandemic sera we found the specificity of FCI to be 100%,
191 in agreement with a previous estimate (12). Nevertheless, it must be stressed that we are
192 not certain that sera from individuals with past seasonal coronavirus infection were
193 represented in the panel. The pre-pandemic sera was not run with Roche ECLIA and
194 Diasorin CLIA, and 100% specificity was assumed for both Roche ECLIA as stated by
195 the manufacturer, and Diasorin CLIA as recently reported (9). The main findings of the
196 current study can be summarized as follows. First, direct comparison between IgG-FCI
197 and Diasorin CLIA is biologically straightforward since both assays employ native
198 SARS-CoV-2 S protein as the binding antigen and target the same antibody isotype.
199 Notwithstanding this, both PPA and NPA were below 92% and inter-rater agreement
200 between immunoassays was only moderate ($k=0.69$). Moreover, correlation between
201 SARS-CoV-2 S IgG levels quantified by both immunoassays was strong ($Rho=0.69$),
202 but certainly not as strong as anticipated. The lack of full concordance between the
203 results provided by the two assays may relate to subtle differences in the conformation
204 of the binding S protein: whereas in Diasorin CLIA the S protein bound to solid phase
205 exhibits a stable native trimeric conformation, both trimeric and monomeric versions of
206 the S protein were found to be displayed on the surface of transfected Jurkat T cells
207 (12). Furthermore, since SARS-CoV-2-S IgA responses can be documented in the
208 absence of detectable SARS-CoV-2-S IgGs (17), it was not unexpected to observe that
209 PPA decreased whereas NPA increased when IgA FCI results were considered for the
210 analyses, either individually or in combination with IgG ones. Second, despite the fact
211 that Roche ECLIA measures total antibodies (IgG and IgM) binding to the RBD domain
212 of S1 subunit protein instead of the native full-length S protein, we found excellent PPA
213 between the results returned by this assay and by FCI (IgG, IgA or IgG/IgA), ranging

214 between 96.1% to 97.7%, and strong inter-rater agreement (k value >0.8), reinforcing
215 the idea that humoral immune response against SARS-CoV-2 following natural
216 infection is mainly directed towards RBD (3-5). In turn, the lower NPA between FCI
217 and Roche ECLIA than between FCI and Diasorin CLIA can be explained by the fact
218 that highly immunogenic B-specific epitopes lie outside the RBD (3). Along with
219 isotype-related differences in the humoral response against SARS-CoV-2, this may also
220 partly account for the suboptimal correlation (Rho , 0.69 for IgG-FCI and Rho , 0.67 for
221 IgA-FCI) between antibody levels quantified by the two immunoassays. Third, both IgA
222 and IgG/IgA-FCI returned more positive results overall than Roche ECLIA and
223 Diasorin CLIA. Interestingly, all three assays, most notably FCI, returned a number of
224 positive results in sera that had scored negative by CLIA assays targeting recombinant
225 S1/S2 subunit proteins or RBD, which were in use for routine diagnosis of SARS-CoV-
226 2 infection at the time of testing request (18). Assuming a specificity of 100% for all
227 assays, these data suggest that the immunoassays evaluated herein, most strikingly FCI,
228 may increase clinical sensitivity of previously marketed assays such as LIAISON[®]
229 SARS-CoV-2 S1/S2 IgG CLIA and MAGLUMI 2019-nCoV IgG. Fourth, analyzing the
230 kinetics of serum antibody levels in a number of patients with sequential specimens
231 brought the conclusion that the antibody trajectories quantified by the different
232 immunoassays were seldom congruent, with the exception of IgG and IgA determined
233 by FCI assay and to a lesser extent total antibodies quantified by Roche ECLIA and IgG
234 measured by Diasorin CLIA. This observation raises doubts as to the comparability of
235 studies addressing the impact on clinical outcomes of antibody kinetics (i.e. peak levels
236 or the area under a curve), if they employ different immunoassays.

237 In our view, the main limitations of the current study are the relative small number of
238 specimens included in the evaluation panel and that discrepancies across results
239 returned by the evaluated immunoassays were not resolved by performing antibody
240 neutralization assays, the gold standard for serological diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2
241 infection (6).

242 In summary, herein we have shown that a FCI using Jurkat T cells expressing the
243 SARS-CoV-2 native S protein for detection of IgG and IgA-specific antibodies is highly
244 specific and seemingly provides increased clinical sensitivity for diagnosis of SARS-
245 CoV-2 infection when compared to two new-generation immunoassays targeting either
246 the S protein in its trimeric conformation (Diasorin CLIA) or RBD (Roche ECLIA).
247 The assay is easy to perform and standardize; the need for a flow cytometer should not
248 be viewed as a disadvantage compared to high-throughput CLIA assays, as this platform
249 is widely available at immunology and hematology departments in hospitals of all sizes.
250 Further studies evaluating the performance of FCI for documenting seroconversion in
251 vaccinated people are underway.

252 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

253 We thank Vitro S.A (Seville, Spain) for providing reagents, flow cytometer equipment
254 and software for the FCI. El Centro Superior de Investigaciones Científicas (CSIC),
255 Spain holds a patent for the method in which the FCI used herein was based upon. FCI
256 [12]. Eliseo Albert holds a Juan Rodés Contract (JR20/00011) from Instituto de Salud
257 Carlos III (Madrid, Spain). Ignacio Torres holds a Río Hortega Contract (CM20/00090)
258 from Instituto de Salud Carlos III (Madrid, Spain).

259

260

261 **REFERENCES**

- 262 **1. Galipeau Y, Greig M, Liu G, Driedger M, Langlois MA.** Humoral Responses
263 and Serological Assays in SARS-CoV-2 Infections. *Front Immunol* **2020**;
264 11:610688.
- 265 **2. Lisboa Bastos M, Tavaziva G, Abidi SK, Campbell JR, Haraoui LP,**
266 **Johnston JC, et al.** Diagnostic accuracy of serological tests for covid-19:
267 systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMJ* **2020**;370:m2516.
- 268 **3. Zohar T, Alter G.** Dissecting antibody-mediated protection against SARS-CoV-
269 2. *Nat Rev Immunol* **2020**; 20:392-394.
- 270 **4. Zost SJ, Gilchuk P, Case JB, Binshtein E, Chen RE, Nkolola JP, et al.**
271 Potently neutralizing and protective human antibodies against SARS-CoV-2.
272 *Nature* **2020**; 584:443-449.
- 273 **5. Wang MY, Zhao R, Gao LJ, Gao XF, Wang DP, Cao JM.** SARS-CoV-2:
274 Structure, Biology, and Structure-Based Therapeutics Development. *Front Cell*
275 *Infect Microbiol* **2020**;10:587269.
- 276 **6. Deeks JJ, Dinnes J, Takwoingi Y, Davenport C, Spijker R, Taylor-Phillips**
277 **S, et al.** Antibody tests for identification of current and past infection with
278 SARS-CoV-2. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* **2020**;6:CD013652.
- 279 **7. Li D, Li J.** Immunologic testing for SARS-CoV-2 infection from the antigen
280 perspective. *J Clin Microbiol* **2020**:JCM.02160-20.
- 281 **8. Perkmann T, Perkmann-Nagele N, Koller T, Mucher P, Radakovics A,**
282 **Marculescu R, et al.** Anti-Spike protein assays to determine post-vaccination

- 283 antibody levels: a head-to-head comparison of five quantitative assays. medRxiv
284 **2021**; doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.05.21252977>.
- 285 **9. Higgins V, Fabros A, Kulasingam V.** Quantitative measurement of anti-SARS-
286 CoV-2 antibodies: Analytical and clinical evaluation. *J Clin Microbiol* **2021**;
287 JCM.03149-20.
- 288 **10. Poljak M, Oštrbenk Valenčak A, Štamol T, Seme K.** Head-to-head
289 comparison of two rapid high-throughput automated electrochemiluminescence
290 immunoassays targeting total antibodies to the SARS-CoV-2 nucleoprotein and
291 spike protein receptor binding domain. *J Clin Virol* **2021**;137:104784.
- 292 **11. Bonelli F, Blocki FA, Bunnell T, Chu E, De La O A, Grenache DG, et al.**
293 Evaluation of the automated LIAISON() SARS-CoV-2 TrimericS IgG assay for
294 the detection of circulating antibodies. *Clin Chem Lab Med* **2021**; Mar 12. doi:
295 10.1515/cclm-2021-0023
- 296 **12. Horndler L, Delgado P, Abia D, Balabanov I, Martínez-Fleta P, Cornish G,**
297 **et al.** Flow cytometry multiplexed method for the detection of neutralizing
298 human antibodies to the native SARS-CoV-2 spike protein. *EMBO Mol Med*
299 **2021**;13:e13549.
- 300 **13. Guan W-j, Ni Z-y, Hu Y, Liang WH, Ou CQ, He JX, et al.** Clinical
301 characteristics of coronavirus disease 2019 in China. *New Engl J Med* **2020**;
302 382:1708-1720.
- 303 **14. Gozalbo-Rovira R, Gimenez E, Latorre V, Francés-Gómez C, Albert E,**
304 **Buesa J, et al.** SARS-CoV-2 antibodies, serum inflammatory biomarkers and

305 clinical severity of hospitalized COVID-19 patients. *J Clin Virol*
306 **2020**;131:104611

307 **15. Mattiuzzo G, Bentley EM, Hassall M, Routley S, Richardson S, Bernasconi**
308 **V, et al.** Establishment of the WHO International Standard and Reference Panel
309 for anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibody. WHO/BS/2020.2403, December 10, 2020.

310 **16. McHugh M.** “Interrater Reliability: The Kappa Statistic.” *Biochemia Medica*
311 *HDMB* 2012; 276–82.

312 **17. Fu Y, Pan Y, Li Z, Li Y.** The Utility of Specific Antibodies Against SARS-
313 CoV-2 in Laboratory Diagnosis. *Front Microbiol* **2021**;11:603058.

314 **17. Valdivia A, Torres I, Latorre V, Francés-Gómez C, Albert E, Gozalbo-**
315 **Rovira R, et al.** Inference of SARS-CoV-2 spike-binding neutralizing antibody
316 titers in sera from hospitalized COVID-19 patients by using commercial enzyme
317 and chemiluminescent immunoassays. *Eur J Clin Microbiol Infect Dis*
318 **2021**;40:485-494.

319


320 **FIGURE LEGENDS**

321 **Figure 1.** Correlation between serum antibody levels measured by IgG (panels A and
322 C) and IgA (panels B and D) flow cytometry-based immunoassay (FCI) and
323 Elecsys SARS-CoV-2 total antibody electrochemiluminescent assay (Roche
324 diagnostics) and LIAISON® SARS-CoV-2 TrimericS IgG chemiluminescent
325 assay (Diasorin S.p.a). MFI indicates median fluorescence intensity.


326 **Figure 2.** Trajectory of serum/plasma antibody levels as delineated by the
327 immunoassays evaluated in the study, namely IgG or IgA flow cytometry-based

328 immunoassay (FCI), Elecsys SARS-CoV-2 total antibody
329 electrochemiluminescent assay (Roche diagnostics) and LIAISON® SARS-
330 CoV-2 TrimericS IgG chemiluminescent assay (Diasorin S.p.a). A representative
331 example of concordant (A-D) and discordant (E-H) antibody trajectories are
332 shown. MFI indicates median fluorescence intensity.


A



B



C



D

