medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.07.20169987; this version posted August 7, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Performance of an automated anti-SARS-CoV-2 immunoassay in prepandemic cohorts

Elena Riester (elena.riester@labkom.de)[1], Beda Krieter (b.krieter@bsdwest.de)[2], Peter Findeisen (peter.findeisen@labor-limbach.de)[3], Michael Laimighofer (michael.laimighofer@roche.com)[4], Kathrin Schoenfeld (kathrin.schoenfeld@roche.com)[4], Tina Laengin (tina.laengin@roche.com)[4], **Christoph Niederhauser** (christoph.niederhauser@itransfusion.ch)[5,6]

[1]Labor Augsburg MVZ GmbH, Augsburg, Germany

[2]Red Cross Blood Transfusion Service West GmbH, Central Laboratory Hagen, Hagen, Germany

[3]MVZ Labor Limbach, Heidelberg, Germany

[4]Roche Diagnostics GmbH, Penzberg, Germany

[5]Interregionale Blood Transfusion Swiss Red Cross, Bern, Switzerland

[6]Institute for Infectious Diseases (IFIK), University of Bern, Bern, Switzerland

Corresponding author: Christoph Niederhauser; Interregionale Blood Transfusion Swiss Red Cross, Murtenstrasse 133, 3008 Bern, Switzerland; christoph.niederhauser@itransfusion.ch

Target: medRxiv

Subject area: Infectious Diseases (except HIV/AIDS)

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.07.20169987; this version posted August 7, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Conflicts of interest:

- **Elena Riester:** received speaker's honorarium from Roche.
- **Beda Krieter:** no conflicts of interest to disclose.
- **Peter Findeisen:** no conflicts of interest to disclose.
- **Michael Laimighofer:** employee of Roche Diagnostics GmbH.
- **Kathrin Schoenfeld:** employee of Roche Diagnostics GmbH; owner of shares in Roche.
- **Tina Laengin:** employee of Roche Diagnostics GmbH.
- **Christoph Niederhauser:** no conflicts of interest to disclose.

Funding: This study was funded by Roche Diagnostics GmbH (Mannheim, Germany).

Required information for submission system:

Ethical guidelines

This study was conducted in accordance with the study protocol provided by Roche Diagnostics and in accordance with the principles of the Declaration of Helsinki. All human samples utilised were anonymised, frozen, residual samples for which no ethical approval was required. The study protocol was submitted to institutional review boards at study sites in Innsbruck (Austria) and Bern (Switzerland) prior to study initiation; ethical approval was granted for Innsbruck, and a waiver granted for Bern.

Research reporting guidelines

Please see separate STARD checklist.

Data availability statement

Qualified researchers may request access to individual patient level data through the clinical study data request platform (https://vivli.org/). Further details on Roche's criteria for eligible studies are

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.07.20169987; this version posted August 7, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

available here: https://vivli.org/members/ourmembers/ . For further details on Roche's Global Policy on the Sharing of Clinical Information and how to request access to related clinical study documents, see here:

https://www.roche.com/research_and_development/who_we_are_how_we_work/clinical_trials/our_commitment_to_data_sharing.htm

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.07.20169987; this version posted August 7, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Abstract

Background: The Elecsys® Anti-SARS-CoV-2 immunoassay (Roche Diagnostics) was developed to provide an accurate and reliable method for the detection of antibodies to severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2). We evaluated the specificity of the Elecsys Anti-SARS-CoV-2 immunoassay in prepandemic sample cohorts across five sites in Germany, Austria and Switzerland.

Methods: Specificity of the immunoassay was evaluated using anonymised, frozen, residual serum and/or plasma samples from blood donors or routine diagnostic testing. All samples were collected before September 2019 and therefore presumed negative for SARS-CoV-2-specific antibodies. Cohorts included samples from blood donors, pregnant women and paediatric patients. Point estimates and 95% confidence intervals (CIs) were calculated.

Results: Overall specificities for the Elecsys Anti-SARS-CoV-2 immunoassay in 9575 samples from blood donors (n = 6714) and diagnostic specimens (n = 2861) were 99.82% (95% CI 99.69–99.91) and 99.93% (95% CI 99.75–99.99), respectively. Among 2256 samples from pregnant women, specificity was 99.91% (95% CI 99.68–99.99). Among 205 paediatric samples, specificity was 100% (95% CI 98.22–100).

Conclusion: The Elecsys Anti-SARS-CoV-2 immunoassay demonstrated a very high specificity across blood donor samples and diagnostic specimens from Germany, Austria and Switzerland. Our findings support the use of the Elecsys Anti-SARS-CoV-2 immunoassay as a potential tool for determination of an immune response following previous exposure to SARS-CoV-2 in the general population, including in blood donors, pregnant women and paediatric populations.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.07.20169987; this version posted August 7, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Introduction

The novel coronavirus, severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2), is the causative agent in the Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) outbreak, now deemed a pandemic, that first came to the world's attention in December 2019.[1,2] SARS-CoV-2 is an enveloped, single-stranded RNA virus that, like other coronaviruses, has a genome encoding 16 non-structural proteins and four structural proteins: spike (S), envelope (E), membrane (M) and nucleocapsid (N).[3,4] It elicits an array of symptoms including fever, cough, breathing difficulties and fatigue. While most cases are non-severe, patients with severe disease may experience acute respiratory distress syndrome, and critically ill patients develop respiratory failure, septic shock and/or multiple organ dysfunction.[5]

Diagnosis of COVID-19 is usually based on direct detection of SARS-CoV-2 by nucleic acid amplification tests (NAATs) which indicate the presence of an acute infection.[6,7] Following cessation of viral shedding, individuals who initially test negative for SARS-CoV-2 using NAATs may still test positive for the virus using antibody tests. Antibody tests identify individuals who have been exposed to the virus and developed an immune response, an approach that also allows assessment of the extent of exposure of a population.[8] This information is of great interest for public health and is needed for decision-making regarding containment measures in given populations, as well as to support diagnosis, contact tracing and epidemiological studies.

Research into antibody responses against SARS-CoV-2 is rapidly developing and has begun to shed light on the timing of seroconversion, a critical consideration in serological testing. Evidence to date suggests that immunoglobulin M (IgM) antibodies are detectable within 5 days of symptom onset, immunoglobulin G (IgG) antibodies within 5–14 days,[9–11] and immunoglobulin A (IgA) antibodies after approximately 3–6 days.[10,12] The chronological order in which IgM and IgG antibodies develop appears to be highly variable, as are antibody levels.[11,13–15] Together this supports the need for accurate serological tests that can detect both antibodies simultaneously.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.07.20169987; this version posted August 7, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

The COVID-19 pandemic has prompted a rapid response including the launch of several different serological assays. Reliable information regarding the relative performance of these assays in a wide range of settings is urgently needed.

The Elecsys® Anti-SARS-CoV-2 serological assay (Roche Diagnostics International Ltd, Rotkreuz, Switzerland) is designed for in vitro qualitative detection of antibodies to SARS-CoV-2, including IgG, in human serum and plasma. Generally, the most abundant antibodies produced by the body are directed against the N protein.[16–19] As such, this immunoassay is based on a modified recombinant protein representing the N antigen of SARS-CoV-2.

The clinical performance of the newly launched Elecsys Anti-SARS-CoV-2 serological assay is undergoing evaluation; however, this assay has demonstrated high sensitivity and specificity and acceptable agreement with EDI™ SARS-CoV-2 IgM and IgG enzyme-linked immunosorbent assays (ELISA).[20,21,22] The aims of this study were to explore the performance characteristics of the Elecsys Anti-SARS-CoV-2 immunoassay and to provide detailed evidence with regard to its clinical performance, with a focus on specificity, among various prepandemic patient cohorts.

Materials and Methods

Study design

This retrospective, non-interventional study was conducted at five sites: one site (Innsbruck [Austria]) provided serum samples and four sites (Augsburg [Germany], Hagen [Germany], Heidelberg [Germany], and Bern [Switzerland]) provided serum and/or plasma samples and performed testing using the cobas e 801 analyser (Roche Diagnostics International Ltd, Rotkreuz, Switzerland). All samples were obtained before September 2019 and were presumed negative for SARS-CoV-2-specific antibodies. We evaluated the specificity of the Elecsys Anti-SARS-CoV-2 immunoassay in samples from blood donor screening and routine diagnostic testing, including

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.07.20169987; this version posted August 7, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

pregnancy screening and paediatric samples. Details of the cohorts enrolled and tested across the five sites can be found in **Table 1**.

This study was conducted in accordance with the study protocol provided by Roche Diagnostics and in accordance with the principles of the Declaration of Helsinki. All human samples utilised were anonymised, frozen, residual samples for which no ethical approval was required. The study protocol was submitted to institutional review boards at study sites in Innsbruck (Austria) and Bern (Switzerland) prior to study initiation; ethical approval was granted for Innsbruck, and a waiver granted for Bern.

Assay

The Elecsys Anti-SARS-CoV-2 immunoassay uses a double-antigen sandwich (DAGS) format, which requires binding of antibodies in the patient sample to two specific antigens, and as such favours the preferential detection of mature, high-affinity antibodies characteristic of the late stages of SARS-CoV-2 infection.[23,24] The Elecsys Anti-SARS-CoV-2 immunoassay detects antibodies independent of isotype, detecting predominantly mature, high-affinity IgG but also IgA and IgM antibodies.[22] Briefly, the immunoassay involves incubation of patient samples with biotinylated N antigen and ruthenylated N antigen, leading to the formation of DAGS complexes in samples containing the corresponding antibodies. After the addition of streptavidin-coated microparticles, solid-phase bound DAGS complexes are magnetically captured to the surface of an electrode in the detection instrument and visualised by voltage-induced chemiluminescent emission.

The test is CE mark approved and detects antibodies in serum or plasma, collected using standard sampling tubes. The duration of the analysis is approximately 18 minutes and the results are presented as a cut-off index (COI) as well as an indication as to whether a sample is 'reactive' or 'non-reactive'. Results were determined automatically by the software by comparing the electrochemiluminescence signal obtained from the reaction product of the sample with the signal of the cut-off value previously obtained by calibration.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.07.20169987; this version posted August 7, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Sample handling and data management

Anonymised (two side delinked), frozen, residual samples were thawed to room temperature and homogenised using a slow rotating system (approximately 33 rpm) or by inverting slowing five times prior to assaying to avoid the production of foam. Before testing, samples were visually inspected to check that they did not contain clots/precipitates, foam or droplets at the container walls. Assay results were obtained via instrument export files.

Statistical analysis

An appropriate sample size was calculated using a previously published formula, to ensure $\alpha = 5\%$ and power = 80%.[25] Acceptance criteria required that confidence intervals (CIs) for specificity overlapped with the confidence range stated in the Elecsys Anti-SARS-CoV-2 immunoassay package insert, namely 99.65–99.91%. Point estimates and 95% CIs (two sided) for specificity were calculated based on the exact method. For the purpose of analysis, samples were grouped into those obtained from archived blood donations (Group A) and those from archived routine diagnostic specimens (Group B).

Results

Analysis set

From across the five sites, 9575 samples presumed negative for SARS-CoV-2 antibodies were included in the analysis; 6714 samples from archived blood donations and 2861 samples from archived routine diagnostic specimens. The diagnostic specimens included 2256 samples from pregnant women and 205 samples from paediatric patients (**Table 1**).

Specificity

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.07.20169987; this version posted August 7, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Specificity of the Elecsys Anti-SARS-CoV-2 immunoassay for the overall sample cohort (n = 9575) and by analysis group are shown in **Table 2**. Using an assay COI of 1.0 resulted in an overall specificity of 99.85% (95% CI 99.75–99.92) in samples obtained across all five sites. Among 6714 serum and/or plasma samples from blood donors and 2861 serum and/or plasma samples from routine diagnostic samples, specificity was 99.82% (95% CI 99.69–99.91) and 99.93% (95% CI 99.75–99.99), respectively. Among 2256 samples from pregnant women, specificity was 99.91% (95% CI 99.68–99.99). Among 205 paediatric samples, specificity was 100% (95% CI 98.22–100).

Across Groups A (blood donors) and B (routine diagnostic specimens), a total of 14 reactive samples were detected (Group A, n = 12; Group B, n = 2).

COI distribution

The COI distribution across samples is shown in **Figure 1**. In total, 9561 of the presumed SARS-CoV-2 negative samples tested had a COI of <1.0; the vast majority of these had COIs <0.1 (n = 9064). Only 14 samples had a COI ≥1.0 (pre-specified cut-off for reactivity).

Discussion

Emergence of SARS-CoV-2 and the subsequent COVID-19 pandemic have resulted in an urgent, unmet need for highly specific serological tests to aid determination of past exposure to the virus, and inform seroprevalence in a given population.[26,27] This study demonstrates that the Elecsys Anti-SARS-CoV-2 immunoassay displays very high specificity across a large cohort of blood donor and routine diagnostic samples (99.85%), supporting its use in routine testing for past exposure to SARS-CoV-2.

The very high specificity reported here for the Elecsys Anti-SARS-CoV-2 immunoassay corresponds with that reported by the manufacturer (99.78% specificity for blood donor samples; 99.81% specificity for routine diagnostic samples; 99.80% specificity overall[23]) and previous studies in

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.07.20169987; this version posted August 7, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

samples drawn pre-COVID-19, wherein the calculated specificity for this immunoassay ranged from 98.00–99.80%.[20,21,28,29]

Importantly, the overall specificity of the Elecsys Anti-SARS-CoV-2 immunoassay determined in the present study (99.85%) is also comparable with that of other commercially available assays. These include the Wantai SARS-CoV-2 Total Antibody ELISA (100% specificity), Abbott SARS-CoV-2 IgG ELISA (99.7% specificity) and DiaSorin LIAISON® SARS-CoV-2 S1/S2 IgG ELISA (98.3% specificity).[28,30] Specificity of the Wantai SARS-CoV-2 Total Antibody ELISA assay was evaluated using a cohort of 30 polymerase chain reaction-confirmed positive serum samples and 82 control serum samples, whereas specificities of the Abbott SARS-CoV-2 IgG ELISA and DiaSorin LIAISON® SARS-CoV-2 S1/S2 IgG ELISA were determined using 1554 serum samples collected pre-COVID-19, and therefore presumed negative for SARS-CoV-2.[28,30] Higher specificity was observed for the Elecsys Anti-SARS-CoV-2 immunoassay compared with the EuroImmun Anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgA and IgG ELISAs, for which 93% and 96% specificity, respectively, were previously observed.[30] The relatively lower specificities measured for these two assays could be attributed to cross-reactivity with antibodies to adenoviruses and other human coronaviruses,[30] which may result in false positive/negative results. Encouragingly, Muench et al. recently demonstrated that among 80 samples tested for cross-reactivity with common cold or endemic coronavirus panels using the Elecsys Anti-SARS-CoV-2 immunoassay, none were reactive.[21] The present analyses demonstrate a marginal decrease in specificity for the Elecsys Anti-SARS-CoV-2 immunoassay in blood donor samples taken during flu season (Bern, 99.71% [95% CI 99.16–99.94]; Innsbruck, 99.52% [95% CI 98.89–99.84]) compared with samples drawn outside of flu season (Bern, 99.90% [95% CI 99.64–99.99]), which may be a result of exposure to other immune stimuli in the form of seasonal flu. This difference was not statistically significant, however, and the Elecsys Anti-SARS-CoV-2 immunoassay displayed very high specificity in both groups.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.07.20169987; this version posted August 7, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

The Elecsys Anti-SARS-CoV-2 immunoassay also demonstrated very high specificity in samples from pregnant women (99.91%). Accurate serological assays for SARS-CoV-2 are especially important for use in pregnant women, for whom altered immune status may increase susceptibility to respiratory virus infections, and may therefore have implications for clinical management in this setting.[31] At present, there are limited data available on the performance of other commercially available serological assays for SARS-CoV-2 in pregnant women. Rushworth et al. conducted a performance evaluation of the Mount Sinai SARS-CoV-2 IgG antibody ELISA, and observed no false positive results in a cohort of negative control samples (n = 50) drawn from presumed healthy pregnant women pre-COVID-19.[32] In the present study, two reactive results were observed in prepandemic samples taken from pregnant women using the Elecsys Anti-SARS-CoV-2 immunoassay, which could be the result of an unknown cross-reactant.

Excellent specificity was observed for this immunoassay in a paediatric cohort (100% specificity), indicating strong performance in this setting; however, it should be noted that the statistical significance of these results is not very powerful due to the relatively small cohort of samples used (n = 205). Further investigation into and validation of other commercially available assays within this setting is warranted.

A major strength of this study is the large cohort of presumed SARS-CoV-2-negative serum and plasma samples (n = 9575) used to evaluate specificity of the Elecsys Anti-SARS-CoV-2 immunoassay, across multiple sites in different countries, ensuring that our data are reliable and can be used to form robust comparisons with immunoassay performance data from other studies. To our knowledge, the present study includes the largest cohort of samples from pregnant women used to date to evaluate the performance of a serological assay for SARS-CoV-2 with regard to specificity. Existing literature on the performance of commercially available assays for detection of antibodies to SARS-CoV-2 is limited in pregnant women and paediatric populations; thus, additional research in these groups is warranted to further inform clinical decision-making.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.07.20169987; this version posted August 7, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Conclusion

The performance of SARS-CoV-2 antibody assays in general is of high importance for public health and may affect political decision-making in pandemic management. This study generated additional data on the performance of the Elecsys Anti-SARS-CoV-2 immunoassay and provided broader evidence on the very high specificity of the assay, including in cohorts of pregnant women and paediatric populations.

Acknowledgements

The authors thank: Annelies Mühlbacher (University Hospital LKH) for provision of pre-COVID-19 pandemic blood donation samples, which were tested in Augsburg; Peter Gowland and Caroline Tinguley (Interregionale Blood Transfusion Swiss Red Cross) for involvement in preparation of prepandemic samples and laboratory work; Florina Langen (Roche Diagnostics) for study conceptualisation and drafting of the protocol, study management, interpretation of analysis and further critical input; Christopher Rank (Roche Diagnostics) for database generation and data validation, authorship of the statistical analysis plan and involvement in the formal analysis; Sigrid Reichhuber, Janina Edion and Yvonne Knack (Roche Diagnostics) for management of investigation sites, data acquisition and study monitoring.

Third-party medical writing support, under the direction of the authors, was provided by Chloe Fletcher (Gardiner-Caldwell Communications, Macclesfield, UK) and was funded by Roche Diagnostics International Ltd, Rotkreuz, Switzerland.

COBAS, COBAS E and ELECSYS are trademarks of Roche.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.07.20169987; this version posted August 7, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

References

1. Fauci AS, Lane HC, Redfield RR. Covid-19 – navigating the uncharted. N Engl J Med 2020;382:1268–69.
2. World Health Organization. Pneumonia of unknown cause – China. Disease outbreak news, 5 January 2020. Available at: https://www.who.int/csr/don/05-january-2020-pneumonia-of-unkown-cause-china/en/. Last accessed 3rd August 2020.
3. Li G, Fan Y, Lai Y, et al. Coronavirus infections and immune responses. J Med Virol 2020;92:424–32.
4. Lu R, Zhao X, Li J, et al. Genomic characterisation and epidemiology of 2019 novel coronavirus: implications of virus origins and receptor binding. Lancet 2020;395:565–74.
5. Wu Z, McGoogan JM. Characteristics of and important lessons from the coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) outbreak in China: summary of a report of 72 314 cases from the Chinese Center for Disease Control and Prevention. JAMA 2020;323:1239–42.
6. World Health Organization. Laboratory testing for coronavirus disease (COVID-19) in suspected human cases, 2 March 2020. Available at: https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/331329/WHO-COVID-19-laboratory-2020.4-eng.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y. Last accessed 3rd August 2020.
7. European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control. An overview of the rapid test situation for COVID-19 diagnosis in the EU/EEA, 1 April 2020. Available at: https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/en/publications-data/overview-rapid-test-situation-covid-19-diagnosis-eueea. Last accessed 3rd August 2020.
8. Meyer B, Drosten C, Müller MA, et al. Serological assays for emerging coronaviruses: challenges and pitfalls. Virus Res 2014;194:175–83.
9. Liu W, Liu L, Kou G, et al. Evaluation of nucleocapsid and spike protein-based enzyme-linked immunosorbent assays for detecting antibodies against SARS-CoV-2. J Clin Microbiol 2020;58:e00461-20.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.07.20169987; this version posted August 7, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

10. Guo L, Ren L, Yang S, et al. Profiling early humoral response to diagnose novel coronavirus disease (COVID-19). Clin Infect Dis 2020;71:778–85.
11. To KK-W, Tsang OTY, Leung WS, et al. Temporal profiles of viral load in posterior oropharyngeal saliva samples and serum antibody responses during infection by SARS-CoV-2: an observational cohort study. Lancet Infect Dis 2020;20:565–74.
12. Amanat F, Stadlbauer D, Strohmeier S, et al. A serological assay to detect SARS-CoV-2 seroconversion in humans. Nat Med 2020;26:1033–6.
13. Long QX, Liu BZ, Deng HJ, et al. Antibody responses to SARS-CoV-2 in patients with COVID-19. Nat Med 2020;26:845–8.
14. Zhao J, Yuan Q, Wang H, et al. Antibody responses to SARS-CoV-2 in patients of novel coronavirus disease 2019. Clin Infect Dis 2020; doi: 10.1093/cid/ciaa344 [online ahead of print].
15. Okba NMA, Müller MA, Li W, et al. Severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2-specific antibody responses in coronavirus disease 2019 patients. Emerg Infect Dis 2020;26:1478–88.
16. Che XY, Qiu LW, Pan YX, et al. Sensitive and specific monoclonal antibody-based capture enzyme immunoassay for detection of nucleocapsid antigen in sera from patients with severe acute respiratory syndrome. J Clin Microbiol 2004;42:2629–35.
17. Kohmer N, Westhaus S, Rühl C, et al. Brief clinical evaluation of six high-throughput SARS-CoV-2 IgG antibody assays. J Clin Virol 2020;129:104480.
18. Wurm T, Chen H, Hodgson T, et al. Localization to the nucleolus is a common feature of coronavirus nucleoproteins, and the protein may disrupt host cell division. J Virol 2001;75:9345–56.
19. Wang J, Ji J, Ye J, et al. The structure analysis and antigenicity study of the N protein of the SARS-CoV. Genom Proteom and Bioinf 2003;1:145–54.
20. Muench P, Jochum S, Wenderoth V, et al. Development and validation of the Elecsys Anti-SARS-CoV-2 immunoassay as a highly specific tool for determining past exposure to SARS-

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.07.20169987; this version posted August 7, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

CoV-2. medRxiv 2020. https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.16.20132803 [*preprint*] Last accessed 3rd August 2020.

21. Muench P, Jochum S, Wenderoth V, et al. Development and validation of the Elecsys Anti-SARS-CoV-2 immunoassay as a highly specific tool for determining past exposure to SARS-CoV-2. J Clin Microbiol 2020 [*in press]*
22. Egger M, Bundschuh C, Wiesinger K, et al. Comparison of the Elecsys® Anti-SARS-CoV-2 immunoassay with the EDI™ enzyme linked immunosorbent assays for the detection of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies in human plasma. Clin Chim Acta 2020;509:18–21.
23. Roche Diagnostics GmbH. Elecsys® Anti-SARS-CoV-2 method sheet v3. 2020.
24. Roche Diagnostics GmbH. Elecsys® Anti-SARS-CoV-2: Immunoassay for the qualitative detection of antibodies (incl. IgG) against SARS-CoV-2. 2020. Available at: https://diagnostics.roche.com/global/en/products/params/elecsys-anti-sars-cov-2.html Last accessed 3rd August 2020.
25. Hajian-Tilaki K. Sample size estimation in diagnostic test studies of biomedical informatics. J Biomed Inform 2014;48:193–204.
26. Meyer B, Torriani G, Yerly S, et al. Validation of a commercially available SARS-CoV-2 serological immunoassay. medRxiv 2020. https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.02.20080879 [*preprint*] Last accessed 3rd August 2020.
27. Kontou PI, Braliou GG, Dimou NL, et al. Antibody tests in detecting SARS-CoV-2 infection: a meta-analysis. medRxiv 2020. https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.22.20074914 [*preprint*] Last accessed 3rd August 2020.
28. Perkmann T, Perkmann-Nagele N, Breyer MK, et al. Side by side comparison of three fully automated SARS-CoV-2 antibody assays with a focus on specificity. medRxiv 2020. https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.04.20117911 [*preprint*] Last accessed 3rd August 2020.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.07.20169987; this version posted August 7, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

29. Ekelund O, Ekblom K, Somajo S, et al. High-throughput immunoassays for SARS-CoV-2 – considerable differences in performance when comparing three methods. medRxiv 2020. https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.22.20106294 [*preprint*] Last accessed 3rd August 2020.

30. Lassaunière R, Frische A, Harboe ZB, et al. Evaluation of nine commercial SARS-CoV-2 immunoassays. medRxiv 2020. https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.09.20056325 [*preprint*] Last accessed 3rd August 2020.

31. Liu H, Wang LL, Zhao SJ, et al. Why are pregnant women susceptible to COVID-19? An immunological viewpoint. J Reprod Immunol 2020;139:103122.

32. Rushworth SA, Johnson BB, Ashurst K, et al. Performance and health economic evaluation of the Mount Sinai COVID-19 serological assay identifies modification of thresholding as necessary to maximise specificity of the assay. medRxiv 2020. https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.11.20128306 [*preprint*] Last accessed 3rd August 2020.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.07.20169987; this version posted August 7, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Tables and figures

Table 1. Cohort details for blood donor samples and routine diagnostic specimens preceding the outbreak of SARS-CoV-2

Group	Collection timepoint	Sample type	Site(s)	No. of samples
Group A and B	**Pre-September 2019**	**All sample types**	**All sites**	**9575**
Group A (blood donors)	March 2016 (flu season)	Blood donation samples (serum)	Austria (Innsbruck*)	1048
	2016 (no seasonal indication)	Blood donation samples (serum)	Germany (Hagen)	2625
	Combined 2018 (flu and no flu season)	Blood donation samples (serum and plasma)	Switzerland (Bern)	3041
	July/August 2018 (no flu season)	Blood donation samples (serum)	Switzerland (Bern)	2003
	February/March 2018 (flu season)	Blood donation samples (plasma)	Switzerland (Bern)	1038
	Pre-September 2019	**All blood donation samples**	**Austria (Innsbruck*), Germany (Hagen) and Switzerland (Bern)**	**6714**
Group B (routine diagnostic testing)	Pre-September 2019	Samples from unselected routine diagnostic testing (serum)	Germany (Augsburg)	400
	Pre-September 2019	Samples from pregnancy screening (serum and plasma)	Germany (Augsburg)	1498
	Pre-September 2019	Samples from pregnancy screening (serum)	Germany (Heidelberg)	758
	Pre-September 2019	Samples from pregnancy screening (serum and plasma)	Germany (Augsburg and Heidelberg)	2256
	Pre-September 2019	Paediatric samples (serum)	Germany (Heidelberg)	205
	Pre-September 2019	**All routine diagnostic testing samples (including pregnancy screening and paediatric samples)**	**Germany (Augsburg and Heidelberg)**	**2861**

*Samples from Innsbruck were analysed at Augsburg. SARS-CoV-2, severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.07.20169987; this version posted August 7, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Table 2. Summary of specificity results for the Elecsys Anti-SARS-CoV-2 immunoassay in blood donor samples and routine diagnostic specimens

Group	Sample cohort	No. samples tested	No. samples reactive	No. samples non-reactive	Specificity, % (95% CI)
Group A and B		9575	14	9561	99.85 (99.75–99.92)
Group A (blood donors)	Austria (Innsbruck), flu season*	1048	5	1043	99.52 (98.89–99.84)
	Germany (Hagen)	2625	2	2623	99.92 (99.73–99.99)
	Switzerland (Bern)	3041	5	3036	99.84 (99.62–99.95)
	Switzerland (Bern), no flu season	2003	2	2001	99.90 (99.64–99.99)
	Switzerland (Bern), flu season	1038	3	1035	99.71 (99.16–99.94)
	All	6714	12	6702	99.82 (99.69–99.91)
Group B (routine diagnostic testing)	Germany (Augsburg), diagnostic routine	400	0	400	100 (99.08–100)
	Germany (Augsburg), pregnancy	1498	2	1496	99.87 (99.52–99.98)
	Germany (Heidelberg), pregnancy	758	0	758	100 (99.51–100)
	Germany (Augsburg and Heidelberg), pregnancy	2256	2	2254	99.91 (99.68–99.99)
	Germany (Heidelberg), paediatrics	205	0	205	100 (98.22–100)
	All	2861	2	2859	99.93 (99.75–99.99)

*Samples from Innsbruck were analysed at Augsburg.

CI, confidence interval; SARS-CoV-2, severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.07.20169987; this version posted August 7, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Figure

Figure 1. Cut-off index (COI) distribution in patient samples (n=9575)



SARS-CoV-2, severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2.