

1 SARS Coronavirus-2 microneutralisation and commercial 2 serological assays correlated closely for some but not all enzyme 3 immunoassays

4 Gregory J Walker ^{1,2}, Zin Naing ³, Alberto Ospina Stella ⁴, Malinna Yeang ^{1,3}, Joanna
5 Caguicla ³, Vidiya Ramachandran ³, Sonia R Isaacs ¹, David Agapiou ⁴, Rowena A
6 Bull ⁴, Sacha Stelzer-Braid ^{1,2}, James Daly ⁵, Iain B Gosbell ^{5,6}, Veronica C Hoad ⁵,
7 David O Irving ^{5,7}, Joanne M Pink ⁵, Stuart Turville ⁴, Anthony D Kelleher ⁴, William D
8 Rawlinson ^{1,2,3,8}

9

10 Affiliations:

11 ¹ Virology Research Laboratory, Prince of Wales Hospital, Sydney, NSW 2031,
12 Australia

13 ² School of Medical Sciences, and School of Women's and Children's Health, Faculty
14 of Medicine, University of New South Wales, Sydney, NSW 2052, Australia

15 ³ Serology and Virology Division (SaViD), NSW Health Pathology, Prince of Wales
16 Hospital, Sydney, NSW 2031, Australia

17 ⁴ Kirby Institute, University of New South Wales, Sydney, NSW 2052, Australia

18 ⁵ Australian Red Cross Lifeblood, 417 St Kilda Rd, Melbourne, Victoria 3004,
19 Australia

20 ⁶ School of Medicine, Western Sydney University, Penrith, NSW, Australia

21 ⁷ Faculty of Health, University of Technology, Sydney

⁸ *School of Biotechnology and Biomolecular Sciences, Faculty of Science, University of New South Wales, Sydney, NSW 2052, Australia*

***Corresponding author:** Prof William Rawlinson, Virology Research Laboratory, Level 3 Clinical Sciences Building, Prince of Wales Hospital, Randwick 2031, Australia.

E-mail: w.rawlinson@unsw.edu.au **Ph:** +61 2 93829188

Alternate contact: Gregory Walker, Virology Research Laboratory, Level 3 Clinical Sciences Building, Prince of Wales Hospital, Randwick 2031, Australia.

Email: gregory.walker@unsw.edu.au **Ph:** +61 2 93829096

Running title: Detection of SARS-CoV-2 neutralising antibody

34 **Abstract**

35 *Background*

36 Serological testing for SARS-CoV-2 specific antibodies provides important research
37 and diagnostic information relating to COVID-19 prevalence, incidence, and host
38 immune response. A greater understanding of the relationship between functionally
39 neutralising antibodies detected using microneutralisation assays and binding
40 antibodies detected using scalable enzyme immunoassays (EIA) is needed in order
41 to address protective immunity post-infection or vaccination, and assess EIA
42 suitability as a surrogate test for screening of convalescent plasma donors. We
43 assessed whether neutralising antibody titres correlated with signal cut-off ratios in
44 five commercially available EIAs, and one in-house assay based on expressed spike
45 protein targets.

46 *Methods*

47 Sera from individuals recovered from patients or convalescent plasma donors who
48 reported laboratory-confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection (n=200), and negative control
49 sera collected prior to the COVID-19 pandemic (n=100) were assessed in parallel.
50 Performance was assessed by calculating EIA sensitivity and specificity with
51 reference to microneutralisation.

52 *Results*

53 Neutralising antibodies were detected in 166 (83%) samples. Compared with this,
54 the most sensitive EIAs were the Cobas Elecsys Anti-SARS-CoV-2 (98%) and Vitros
55 Immunodiagnostic Anti-SARS-CoV-2 (100%), which detect total antibody targeting
56 the N and S1 antigens, respectively. The assay with the best quantitative relationship
57 with microneutralisation was the Euroimmun IgG.

58 *Conclusions*

59 These results suggest the marker used (total Ab vs IgG vs IgA), and the target
60 antigen are important determinants of assay performance. The strong correlation
61 between microneutralisation and some commercially available assays demonstrate
62 their potential for clinical and research use in assessing protection following infection
63 or vaccination, and use as a surrogate test to assess donor suitability for
64 convalescent plasma donation.

65

66 **Keywords**

67 SARS-CoV-2, neutralising antibody, serology, COVID-19, convalescent plasma

68

69

70 **Introduction**

71 The easing of COVID-19 control measures requires extensive surveillance for the
 72 early detection of new clusters, as well as an understanding of the level and duration
 73 of protective immunity in the community. Serological testing for SARS-CoV-2 specific
 74 antibodies is an important tool that serves multiple diagnostic and research purposes
 75 including: i) confirmation of suspected infection, ii) informing public health policy by
 76 determining the true infection rate (symptomatic and asymptomatic cases) occurring
 77 within a population, iii) assessing seroconversion following infection or vaccination
 78 and iv) as a potential scalable screening test to determine suitability for convalescent
 79 plasma donation (1-4).

80 It is important to decipher the neutralising capability of developed SARS-CoV-2
 81 specific antibodies to understand whether the host response will provide sufficient
 82 protection from future reinfection. Neutralising antibodies can be detected using the
 83 microneutralisation assay and plaque reduction neutralisation test. These assess the
 84 ability of patient-derived serum samples containing SARS-CoV2 specific antibody to
 85 inhibit infection of cells cultured in vitro (5). These virus neutralisation tests require
 86 the handling of replication-competent SARS-CoV-2 in specialized containment
 87 laboratories (biosafety level 3, at minimum (6)), and for this reason are impractical to
 88 scale. Commercially available serology tests such as enzyme immunoassays (EIA)
 89 are faster and less laborious than traditional culture-based methods, which is
 90 advantageous in the diagnostic laboratory setting (7). However, these assays do not
 91 differentiate between binding antibodies and neutralising antibodies (8). The
 92 detection of binding antibodies does not necessarily confer virus-neutralisation or
 93 protection against virus replication in the infected host, and traditional virus
 94 neutralisation tests remain the reference standard (9). Correlation of binding

antibodies detected using EIA with neutralising antibody titres will be crucial for population-level screening of seroconversion and assessment of herd-immunity following vaccination and rapid assessment of the suitability of convalescent plasma donors (4, 10).

In response to demand for SARS-CoV-2 serological testing kits, numerous assays have been released under relaxed regulatory assessment criteria (1). Validation studies by end-users are important to assess the performance characteristics of these new commercial assays, and to determine the correlation between EIAs and neutralising antibody titres. To date, a small number of studies have validated a range of commercially available SARS-CoV-2 serological assays against a live-virus neutralisation test (11-15). Assays assessed in these publications incorporate automated platforms as well as serology-based point of care tests and have some, but limited crossover with the comparison of EIAs in the present study. Others tested too few samples to effectively correlate EIA results with neutralising antibody titres (16-20), lacked comparison of head-to-head EIAs (21, 22), or used live-virus neutralisation as a reference standard primarily to validate assays developed in-house (23-26). Here we report on the performance of a unique set of five commercially available SARS-CoV-2 serological assays and an in-house developed EIA, with reference to a reference-standard microneutralisation assay.

Methods

Sample collection and testing

All samples were received by the Serology and Virology Division at the Prince of Wales Hospital Randwick, Australia. Two hundred sera were collected from laboratory-confirmed COVID-19 patients (n=157) between March and June of 2020. The majority were recruited as convalescent plasma donors (self-reported laboratory confirmed infection) and tested as part of the release test to ensure donor suitability on behalf of Australian Red Cross Lifeblood (161 samples from 124 donors). Donor samples were collected 37 to 101 days post- test positivity date (mean=60.5). The donors ranged in age from 20 to 78 years old (mean =45.3 years) with 54.6% being males. A smaller proportion of serum (39/200), were obtained from COVID-19 patients 1 to 47 days post- laboratory-confirmed diagnosis. An additional 100 sera were obtained from patients prior to the COVID-19 pandemic between 2016 and 2018 (control cohort). This included 25/100 samples serologically positive for antibodies to common respiratory viruses (Supplementary Table 1). Antibodies to SARS-CoV-2 in samples were measured using a microneutralisation assay at two dilutions (1:40 and 1:80), and up to six other immunoassays including an in-house developed EIA. Commercially available assays were performed according to the manufacturer's instructions, using kits of the same lot number for all assays. Samples returning equivocal/borderline results (as per the manufacturer-specified range) were not included in sensitivity and specificity calculations.

Virus microneutralisation assay

Dilutions of test serum were prepared on a 96-well plate in duplicate in viral culture media (MEM + 2% fetal bovine serum + 1x penicillin-streptomycin-glutamine). The dilutions were incubated for one hour at 37°C with an equal volume of 200 TCID₅₀ SARS-CoV-2 isolate. A suspension of Vero E6 cells containing 2x10⁴ cells was added to each well, and plates were incubated at 37°C (5% CO₂) for three days. The plates were observed for cytopathic effect and the neutralisation titre determined as the dilution that conferred complete protection from infection in both replicates. Neutralising titres of 1:40 and above were considered positive.

Cobas Elecsys Anti-SARS-CoV-2

The Elecsys Anti-SARS-CoV-2 (Roche Diagnostics, Australia) is an electrochemiluminescence immunoassay (ECLIA) for the detection of total antibody against the N protein of SARS-CoV-2 in serum and plasma. The platform provided a readout indicating whether the sample measurement is above or below the signal cutoff, and was interpreted as positive (≥1.0) or negative (<1.0).

Vitros Immunodiagnostic Anti-SARS-CoV-2

The Vitros Immunodiagnostic Anti-SARS-CoV-2 (Ortho-Clinical Diagnostics, Australia) is a chemiluminescent immunoassay (CLIA) utilizing a recombinant SARS-CoV-2 S1 protein to measure total antibody present in serum and plasma. The platform provided a readout indicating whether the sample measurement was above or below the signal cutoff, and was interpreted as positive (≥1.0) or negative (<1.0).

Abbott Architect SARS-CoV-2 IgG

The Architect SARS-CoV-2 IgG (Abbott Diagnostics, Australia) is a chemiluminescent microparticle immunoassay (CMIA) for the detection of IgG antibodies to the nucleocapsid (N) protein of SARS-CoV-2 in serum and plasma. The platform calculated a result by dividing the chemiluminescent signal from each sample with a calibrated signal. The unit for the assay is Index (S/C) and the result was interpreted as positive (≥ 1.4) or negative (< 1.4).

Euroimmun Anti-SARS-CoV-2 ELISA

The Anti-SARS-CoV-2 (Euroimmun, Germany) is an enzyme linked immunosorbent assay (ELISA) based platform that utilizes recombinant S1 protein to bind anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibodies in serum or plasma. Separate kits for the detection of IgG and IgA were used. Photometric measurement of colour intensity was used to calculate a ratio of the sample over the calibrator. The ratio was interpreted as positive (≥ 1.1), borderline ($\geq 0.8 - < 1.1$), or negative (< 0.8).

In-house RBD assay

The in-house ELISA was performed by coating 96-well microtiter ELISA plates with biotinylated RBD antigen (Supplementary information), which bound SARS-CoV-2 specific antibodies. Diluted serum (1:101) or controls were added to respective wells for one hour. Wells were aspirated and washed three times with wash solution (PBS + 1% Tween 20). A secondary antibody (antihuman-IgG conjugated with the enzyme alkaline phosphatase, Virion/Serion) was then added to wells for 30 minutes to

detect and bind the immune complex. The wash step was then repeated, before the addition of substrate solution (p-nitrophenylphosphate, Virion/Serion) for 30 minutes. The stopping solution was then added (<0.1 N sodium hydroxide and 40 mM EDTA, Virion/Serion) and absorbance was read at 405/620 nm. The cutoff optical density (OD) was set at 0.2 above the negative control OD. Samples were considered positive if the absorbance value was equal to or higher than the cutoff value.

Statistical Analyses

The performance of the commercial assays were compared using results of the microneutralisation assay as the reference-standard. For sensitivity, only microneutralisation-positive samples were used in calculations. Assay specificity and cross-reactivity were assessed using samples from the negative-control cohort. Equivocal results were excluded from sensitivity and specificity calculations. Figures including optical density ratios and ROC curves were generated in GraphPad Prism 9. For the purpose of this analysis, serum collected ≥ 14 days post- laboratory confirmed COVID-19 diagnosis was considered convalescent.

Ethics approval to compare and validate antibody SARS-CoV-2 assays as part of a larger project to collect, manufacture and supply convalescent plasma to patients enrolled in clinical trials and for COVID-19 Immunoglobulin was approved by the Lifeblood Ethics Committee (approval number Hoad 30042020).

Results

Neutralising antibodies were detected in 166/200 (83%) COVID-19 confirmed sera (Table 1). There were 151/167 (90%) convalescent sera (≥ 14 days) positive for neutralising antibodies including 112 (67%) which were neutralising at the highest dilution tested (1:80). No samples in the control cohort were positive for neutralising antibodies.

Across all assays SARS-CoV-2 antibodies were detected in 182/200 (91%) samples tested, with individual EIA positivity ranging between 61-90% (Table 1). There were five convalescent sera from NAT-confirmed COVID-19 patients that returned negative results by microneutralisation and all EIAs tested (samples tested on ≥ 3 EIAs).

The sensitivity values of the commercially available assays against the microneutralisation reference-standard ranged from 69-100%, with assays measuring total antibody being most sensitive (Table 1). There was little difference in the sensitivity of assays in detecting neutralising antibody between acute and convalescent COVID-19 samples. Optical density ratios for each EIA, at varying neutralising antibody titres are shown in Figure 1. The Euroimmun IgG assay had the highest positive predictive value (94%) and displayed the best quantitative relationship with microneutralisation (Figure 2). All EIAs other than the Euroimmun IgA (94%) and in-house ELISA (96%) displayed 100% specificity in testing the negative control cohort.

Discussion

Serological assays need to have validated performance characteristics in assessing SARS CoV-2 infection for diagnosis, surveillance and correlation with other assays. Given neutralisation activity is important for immunity and for potential therapeutic options such as convalescent plasma and immunoglobulin production, the major strength of our study is that it is one of the few to validate serological assays for SARS-CoV-2 against a virus neutralisation test. On reference testing, neutralising antibodies were detected in 83% of samples, compared to EIA which detected SARS-CoV-2 antibodies in 91% of samples across all assays. This was unsurprising considering that not all patients with COVID-19 develop neutralising antibodies to infection (27). For this reason, all assays produced false positives in reference to microneutralisation, with Euroimmun IgG displaying the highest positive predictive value and best correlation with neutralising antibody titres. Clinically, EIAs that correlate strongly with microneutralisation are of importance considering that the detection of neutralising antibodies may be useful in informing return to work and the discontinuation of transmission-based precautions (1).

For the aim of detecting protective neutralising antibodies, the S1-based Vitros Immunodiagnostic and the N-based Cobas Elecsys assays were most sensitive. A previous study suggested that assays targeting RBD and N proteins were more sensitive and better correlated with neutralisation titres than those targeting the S1 protein (23). Our testing of 300 samples found assay sensitivity to be dependent on assay marker (total Ab vs IgG vs IgA), and quantitative relationship dependent on the target antigen used – with the three spike-based assays best correlating with neutralising antibody titre (Figure 2).

In line with other validation studies using composite reference standards (28-30), the Euroimmun anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgG ELISA was highly sensitive and specific. However, the reported performance of the Euroimmun anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgA ELISA is mixed, and here we found it to have low sensitivity. IgG response is longer lived (31) and these findings may be reflective of our cohort, which was primarily made up of convalescent serum collected more than 36 days following laboratory-confirmed infection. The performance of the Architect IgG assay in detecting neutralising antibody was moderate, and in convalescent samples positivity was well below the sensitivity values advertised by the manufacturer (74% vs 100%). This highlights the importance of independent validation studies comparing a range of assays against multiple reference standards. Interestingly, there were five convalescent sera from reported laboratory-confirmed COVID-19 patients that returned negative results by microneutralisation and all EIAs tested. This also occurred in a validation study and could be explained by a failure to develop a measureable systemic antibody response, clearance of infection via other immune mechanisms, or an initial false-positive RT-qPCR result (32). Whilst donors in our study were required to confirm they had laboratory confirmed infection to donate, proof in terms of visualisation of a hard copy of the donors' results did not occur. Therefore it is possible that donors were non-compliant, or that the five samples in our study that were negative on all assays had a biological absence of antibodies.

All assays other than Euroimmun IgA displayed excellent specificity in testing a control cohort of pre-COVID-19 sera. The control cohort also included a small panel of non-SARS-CoV-2 sera positive for other respiratory virus antibodies, and we found no cross-reactivity on any of the assays used. Others have suggested that S1 and N are highly specific targets for SARS-CoV-2 serological analyses (23), and

these antigens largely form the basis of current commercially available assays. A limitation of this work is that the timing of serum collection was not standardised, and that samples obtained were not tested equally across all assays due to limitations in sample volume and dead volume requirements of the automated EIAs. Nonetheless, the relatively large number of samples run remains a strength of this study, and allows for a head-to-head comparison of commercially available SARS-CoV-2 serological tests seen in few other studies.

We and others have shown that commercially available serological assays for SARS-CoV-2 have varying performance that is dependent on both the platform and marker used. The assay chosen by end-users should be tailored to specific applications - for example, assays measuring antibodies to the nucleocapsid antigen might be best suited to disease surveillance as spike-protein based vaccines become available. During the COVID-19 pandemic, serological assays will be crucial in answering questions of immune protection against reinfection. If convalescent plasma or COVID-19 immunoglobulin is found to be a potentially effective therapeutic intervention, high throughput serological assays that closely correlate with neutralisation antibody levels are vital for scalability. As further testing platforms become available, validation studies such as this are needed to identify assays that inform on antibody titre and functionality.

299 **Funding**

300 No specific funding was provided for this study.

301

302 **Acknowledgements**

303 The authors would like to thank the Clinical Chemistry Laboratory at the Prince of
 304 Wales Hospital Randwick, the Reproductive Endocrinology Laboratory at the Royal
 305 Hospital for Women Randwick, and University of New South Wales Stats Central for
 306 their generous technical support. Australian Governments fund Australian Red Cross
 307 Lifeblood for the provision of blood, blood products and services to the Australian
 308 community.

309

310

References

1. Petherick A. Developing antibody tests for SARS-CoV-2. *The Lancet*. 2020;395(10230):1101-2
2. Krammer F, Simon V. Serology assays to manage COVID-19. *Science*. 2020;368(6495):1060-1.
3. Peeling RW, Wedderburn CJ, Garcia PJ, et al. Serology testing in the COVID-19 pandemic response. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases*. 2020;20(9):e245-e9.
4. Maor Y, Cohen D, Paran N, et al. Compassionate use of convalescent plasma for treatment of moderate and severe pneumonia in COVID-19 patients and association with IgG antibody levels in donated plasma. *EClinicalMedicine*. 2020;26.
5. Henderson JR, Taylor RM. Arthropod-Borne Virus Plaques in Agar Overlaid Tube Cultures. *Proc Soc Exp Biol Med*. 1959;101(2):257-9.
6. Stelzer-Braid S, Walker GJ, Aggarwal A, et al. Virus isolation of severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) for diagnostic and research purposes. *Pathology (Phila)*. 2020.
7. D'Cruz RJ, Currier AW, Sampson VB. Laboratory Testing Methods for Novel Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome-Coronavirus-2 (SARS-CoV-2). *Frontiers in Cell and Developmental Biology*. 2020;8(468).
8. Tan CW, Chia WN, Qin X, et al. A SARS-CoV-2 surrogate virus neutralization test based on antibody-mediated blockage of ACE2–spike protein–protein interaction. *Nat Biotechnol*. 2020.
9. Klasse PJ. Neutralization of Virus Infectivity by Antibodies: Old Problems in New Perspectives. *Advances in Biology*. 2014;2014:157895.
10. Houlihan CF, Beale R. The complexities of SARS-CoV-2 serology. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases*. 2020.

- 336 11. GeurtsvanKessel CH, Okba NMA, Igloi Z, et al. An evaluation of COVID-19
337 serological assays informs future diagnostics and exposure assessment. *Nature*
338 *Communications*. 2020;11(1):3436.
- 339 12. Henss L, Scholz T, von Rhein C, et al. Analysis of humoral immune
340 responses in SARS-CoV-2 infected patients. *J Infect Dis*. 2020.
- 341 13. Luchsinger LL, Ransegnola B, Jin D, et al. Serological Assays Estimate
342 Highly Variable SARS-CoV-2 Neutralizing Antibody Activity in Recovered COVID19
343 Patients. *J Clin Microbiol*. 2020:JCM.02005-20.
- 344 14. Patel EU, Bloch EM, Clarke W, et al. Comparative performance of five
345 commercially available serologic assays to detect antibodies to SARS-CoV-2 and
346 identify individuals with high neutralizing titers. *J Clin Microbiol*. 2020:JCM.02257-20.
- 347 15. Weidner L, Gänsdorfer S, Unterweger S, et al. Quantification of SARS-CoV-2
348 antibodies with eight commercially available immunoassays. *J Clin Virol*.
349 2020;129:104540.
- 350 16. Jääskeläinen AJ, Kuivanen S, Kekäläinen E, et al. Performance of six SARS-
351 CoV-2 immunoassays in comparison with microneutralisation. *Journal of clinical*
352 *virology : the official publication of the Pan American Society for Clinical Virology*.
353 2020;129:104512-.
- 354 17. Brigger D, Horn MP, Pennington LF, et al. Accuracy of serological testing for
355 SARS-CoV-2 antibodies: first results of a large mixed-method evaluation study.
356 *Allergy*. 2020:10.1111/all.14608.
- 357 18. Kohmer N, Westhaus S, Rühl C, Ciesek S, Rabenau HF. Brief clinical
358 evaluation of six high-throughput SARS-CoV-2 IgG antibody assays. *Journal of*
359 *clinical virology : the official publication of the Pan American Society for Clinical*
360 *Virology*. 2020;129:104480-.

- 361 19. Kohmer N, Westhaus S, Rühl C, Ciesek S, Rabenau HF. Clinical performance
362 of different SARS-CoV-2 IgG antibody tests. J Med Virol. 2020;92(10):2243-7.
- 363 20. Marklund E, Leach S, Axelsson H, et al. Serum-IgG responses to SARS-CoV-
364 2 after mild and severe COVID-19 infection and analysis of IgG non-responders.
365 PloS one. 2020;15(10):e0241104-e.
- 366 21. Lumley SF, Eyre DW, McNaughton AL, et al. SARS-CoV-2 antibody
367 prevalence, titres and neutralising activity in an antenatal cohort, United Kingdom, 14
368 April to 15 June 2020. Eurosurveillance. 2020;25(42):2001721.
- 369 22. Meschi S, Colavita F, Bordi L, et al. Performance evaluation of Abbott
370 ARCHITECT SARS-CoV-2 IgG immunoassay in comparison with indirect
371 immunofluorescence and virus microneutralization test. Journal of clinical virology :
372 the official publication of the Pan American Society for Clinical Virology.
373 2020;129:104539-.
- 374 23. Okba NMA, Müller M, Li W, et al. Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome
375 Coronavirus 2–Specific Antibody Responses in Coronavirus Disease Patients.
376 Emerging Infectious Disease journal. 2020;26(7):1478.
- 377 24. Grzelak L, Temmam S, Planchais C, et al. A comparison of four serological
378 assays for detecting anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibodies in human serum samples from
379 different populations. Sci Transl Med. 2020;12(559).
- 380 25. Padoan A, Bonfante F, Sciacovelli L, Cosma C, Basso D, Plebani M.
381 Evaluation of an ELISA for SARS-CoV-2 antibody testing: clinical performances and
382 correlation with plaque reduction neutralization titer. Clinical Chemistry and
383 Laboratory Medicine (CCLM). 2020;58(11):e247.

26. Peterhoff D, Glück V, Vogel M, et al. A highly specific and sensitive serological assay detects SARS-CoV-2 antibody levels in COVID-19 patients that correlate with neutralization. *Infection*. 2020;1-8.
27. Robbiani DF, Gaebler C, Muecksch F, et al. Convergent antibody responses to SARS-CoV-2 in convalescent individuals. *Nature*. 2020;584(7821):437-42.
28. Beavis KG, Matushek SM, Abeleda APF, et al. Evaluation of the EUROIMMUN Anti-SARS-CoV-2 ELISA Assay for detection of IgA and IgG antibodies. *Journal of clinical virology : the official publication of the Pan American Society for Clinical Virology*. 2020;129:104468-.
29. Haselmann V, Kittel M, Gerhards C, et al. Comparison of test performance of commercial anti-SARS-CoV-2 immunoassays in serum and plasma samples. *Clin Chim Acta*. 2020;510:73-8.
30. Charlton CL, Kanji JN, Johal K, et al. Evaluation of six commercial mid to high volume antibody and six point of care lateral flow assays for detection of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies. *J Clin Microbiol*. 2020;JCM.01361-20.
31. Hsueh PR, Huang LM, Chen PJ, Kao CL, Yang PC. Chronological evolution of IgM, IgA, IgG and neutralisation antibodies after infection with SARS-associated coronavirus. *Clin Microbiol Infect*. 2004;10(12):1062-6.
32. Ainsworth M, Andersson M, Auckland K, et al. Performance characteristics of five immunoassays for SARS-CoV-2: a head-to-head benchmark comparison. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases*.

Table 1. Performance of commercially available SARS-CoV-2 serological assays


	Microneutralisation	Cobas total Ab	Vitros total Ab	Abbott IgG	In-house IgG	Euroimmun IgG	Euroimmun IgA
Platform	Cell culture	ECLIA	CLIA	CMIA	ELISA	ELISA	ELISA
Antigen	-	N	S1	N	RBD	S1	S1
All COVID-19 samples							
Total	200	197	98	199	94	132	96
Positive	166	175	88	139	79	106	51
Negative	34	22	10	60	11	24	32
Equivocal	-	-	-	-	4	2	13
Positivity (%)	83.0	88.8	89.8	69.8	87.8	81.5	61.4
Sensitivity ¹ (%)	-	98.2	100.0	78.8	96.1	94.3	69.4
Convalescent samples ²							
Total	167	167	73	167	74	109	73
Positive	151	160	72	123	65	93	40
Negative	16	70	1	43	6	66	24
Equivocal	-	-	-	-	3	2	9
Positivity (%)	90.4	95.8	98.6	73.7	91.5	86.9	62.5
Sensitivity ¹ (%)	-	98.7	100.0	76.8	95.3	93.6	65.0
Negative samples							
Total	100	100	99	100	100	100	100
Positive	0	0	0	0	4	0	6
Negative	100	100	99	100	96	100	92
Equivocal	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
Specificity ¹ (%)	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	96.0	100.0	93.9
PPV (%)	-	93.7	90.9	93.5	89.2	94.3	87.7
NPV (%)	-	97.5	100.0	78.1	97.2	95.1	77.3

¹ Sensitivity and specificity calculated against reference-standard virus neutralisation test

² Samples were considered convalescent if they were collected ≥ 14 days post-NAT detection

Equivocal results were excluded from sensitivity and specificity calculations

ECLIA, electrochemiluminescence immunoassay; CLIA, chemiluminescent immunoassay; CMIA, chemiluminescent microparticle immunoassay; ELISA, enzyme linked immunosorbent assay; N, nucleoprotein; S1, spike glycoprotein subunit 1; RBD, receptor binding domain; PPV, positive predictive value; NPV, negative predictive value




1

2 **Figure 1.** Optical density ratios of SARS-CoV-2 enzyme immunoassays (EIA) at
3 varying neutralising antibody titres. Serum from COVID-19 confirmed patients were
4 assayed using microneutralisation and (A) Cobas Elecsys Anti-SARS-CoV-2, (B)

5 Vitros Immunodiagnostic Anti-SARS-CoV-2, (C) Abbott Architect SARS-CoV-2 IgG,
6 (D) an In-house IgG ELISA, (E) Euroimmun Anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgG ELISA, and (F)
7 Euroimmun Anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgA ELISA. Dashed line indicates the positive cut-off
8 value of each assay determined by the manufacturer. The width of the scatter plot is
9 proportionate to the number of data points at a given value, and the median EIA
10 optical density shown. OD, optical density.

11

12



13

14 **Figure 2.** ROC curves for each enzyme immunoassay (A) Cobas Elecsys Anti-
15 SARS-CoV-2, (B) Vitros Immunodiagnostic Anti-SARS-CoV-2, (C) Abbott Architect
16 SARS-CoV-2 IgG, (D) an In-house IgG ELISA, (E) Euroimmun Anti-SARS-CoV-2
17 IgG ELISA, and (F) Euroimmun Anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgA ELISA. Note: Data are

18 presented for up to 200 COVID-19 confirmed sera using microneutralisation as the
19 reference-standard. Euroimmun IgG had the best correlation with the detection of
20 neutralising antibody (AUC= 0.9525). Dashed line represents assay performance at
21 the positive cut-off value specified by the manufacturer. ROC, receiver operating
22 characteristic; AUC, area under curve.

23