Specificity of SARS-CoV-2 antibody-detection assays against S and N protein among pre-COVID-19 sera from patients with protozoan and helminth parasitic infections

Cedric P Yansouni MD^{1,2,3,4,#}, Jesse Papenburg MD MSc^{3,4,5,6}, Matthew P. Cheng MDCM^{2,3,4}, Rachel Corsini MSc⁴, Chelsea Caya MScPH⁴, Fabio Vasquez Camargo⁷, Luke B Harrison MD PhD^{2,3}, Gerasimos Zaharatos MD³, Philippe Büscher PhD⁸, Babacar Faye MD⁹, Magatte Ndiaye PhD⁹, Greg Matlashewski PhD¹⁰, Momar Ndao DVM PhD^{2,4,7,10,#}

¹ J.D. MacLean Centre for Tropical Diseases, McGill University, Montreal, Quebec, Canada

² Division of Infectious Diseases, Department of Medicine, McGill University Health Centre, Montreal, Quebec, Canada

³ Division of Microbiology, Department of Clinical Laboratory Medicine, Optilab Montreal - McGill University Health Centre, Montreal, Quebec, Canada

⁴ McGill Interdisciplinary Initiative in Infection and Immunity, Montreal, Quebec, Canada

⁵ Division of Pediatric Infectious Diseases, Department of Pediatrics, Montreal Children's Hospital, Montreal, Quebec, Canada

⁶ Department of Epidemiology, Biostatistics, and Occupational Health, School of Population and Global Health, McGill University, Montreal, Quebec, Canada

⁷ National Reference Centre for Parasitology, Research Institute of the McGill University Health Centre, Montreal, Quebec, Canada

⁸ Department of Biomedical Sciences, Institute of Tropical Medicine, Antwerp, Belgium

⁹ Faculty of Medicine, Department of Parasitology, University of Cheikh Anta Diop, Dakar, Senegal

¹⁰ Department of Microbiology and Immunology, McGill University, Montreal, QC, Canada

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

Running Title: SARS-CoV-2 serology with parasitic infections

Tables: 3

Figures: 3

Word count text: 2747

Word count abstract: 237

Funding

This work was funded by a grant from the McGill Interdisciplinary Initiative in Infection and Immunity (MI4); <https://www.mcgill.ca/mi4/>. C.P.Y and J.P. hold a “Chercheur-boursier clinicien” career award from the Fonds de recherche du Québec – Santé (FRQS).

The funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript.

Potential conflicts of interest

JP reports grants from MedImmune, grants from Sanofi Pasteur, grants and personal fees from Seegene, grants and personal fees from AbbVie, outside the submitted work. MPC reports personal fees from GEN1E Lifesciences (as a member of the scientific advisory board), personal fees from nplex biosciences (as a member of the scientific advisory board), outside the submitted work. He is the co-founder of Kanvas Biosciences and owns equity in the company. In addition, MPC has a patent Methods for detecting tissue damage, graft versus host disease, and infections using cell-free DNA profiling pending, and a patent Methods for assessing the severity and progression of SARS-CoV-2 infections using cell-free DNA pending. CPY reports being on an Independent Data Monitoring Committee (IDMC) for Medicago Inc. All other authors report no conflicts of interest.

51 #Correspondence to:

52 Cédric P Yansouni, MD, J.D. MacLean Centre for Tropical Diseases, Divisions of Infectious
53 Diseases and Medical Microbiology, McGill University Health Centre, 1001 Décarie Blvd.,
54 Room EM3.3242, Montreal, Qc., Canada H4A 3J1, Email: cedric.yansouni@mcgill.ca

55

56 Momar Ndao, DVM, PhD. Research Institute of the McGill University Health Centre, 1001
57 Décarie Blvd., Room EM3.3244, Montreal, Qc., Canada H4A 3J1, Email:
58 momar.ndao@mcgill.ca

59

ABSTRACT

Background: We aimed to assess the specificity of SARS-CoV-2 antibody detection assays among people with known tissue-borne parasitic infections.

Methods: We tested three SARS-CoV-2 antibody-detection assays (cPass SARS-CoV-2 Neutralization Antibody Detection Kit, Abbott SARS-CoV-2 IgG assay, and STANDARD Q COVID-19 IgM/IgG Combo Rapid Test) among 559 pre-COVID-19 sera.

Results: The specificity of assays was 95-98% overall. However, lower specificity was observed among sera from patients with protozoan infections of the reticuloendothelial system, such as human African trypanosomiasis (Abbott Architect; 88% [95%CI 75-95]), visceral leishmaniasis (SD RDT IgG; 80% [95%CI 30-99]), and from patients with recent malaria from a holoendemic area of Senegal (ranging from 91% for Abbott Architect and SD RDT IgM to 98-99% for cPass and SD RDT IgG). For specimens from patients with evidence of past or present helminth infection overall, test specificity estimates were all $\geq 96\%$. Sera collected from patients clinically suspected of parasitic infections that tested negative for these infections yielded a specificity of 98-100%. The majority (>85%) of false-positive results were positive by only one assay.

Conclusions: The specificity of SARS-CoV-2 serological assays among sera from patients with tissue-borne parasitic infections was below the threshold required for decisions about individual patient care. Specificity is markedly increased by the use of confirmatory testing with a second assay. Finally, the SD RDT IgG proved similarly specific to laboratory-based assays and provides an option in low-resource settings when detection of anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgG is indicated.

Key Words: “SARS-CoV-2”, “COVID-19”, “Diagnostic accuracy”, “Antibody test”, “Serology”, “Parasitic infections”, “Malaria”, “Kinetoplastid infections”, “Protozoan

85 infections”, “Helminth infections”, “*Strongyloides*”, “*Schistosoma*”, “*Filaria*”, “*Trichinella*”,

86 “Neglected tropical diseases”

87

INTRODUCTION

Use cases for serological testing for *Severe acute respiratory syndrome-related coronavirus-2* (SARS-CoV-2) have been reviewed in detail (1, 2). Despite a rapid increase in the number and availability of serological assays detecting anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibodies, critical knowledge gaps remain regarding cross reactivity of assays with sera from patients with non-coronavirus infectious agents.

In tropical regions of the world, several infections that dominate the local epidemiology of acute fever syndromes may cause non-specific cross reactivity with a wide range of serological assays (3-7). The mechanisms underlying cross reactivity include infection of the reticuloendothelial system by several protozoans, with associated polyclonal B-lymphocyte proliferation (6, 7), and the broad diversity of antibodies elicited by various helminth infections (8). These infections include many Neglected Tropical Diseases (NTD) and Malaria, for which the combined global burden exceeds 1.6 billion cases annually, with 3.8 billion at risk (9, 10). Simultaneously, three of the four countries with the largest total number of deaths attributed to COVID-19 are currently Brazil, India, and Mexico (11), all of which suffer a high burden of NTDs or malaria. As a result of this overlapping incidence, the specificity of SARS-CoV-2 serological tests may be different in countries endemic for these infections compared to that in high-income countries.

We aimed to assess the specificity of SARS-CoV-2 antibody detection assays among people either with known tissue-borne parasitic infections or residing in areas where such infections are endemic. We tested three SARS-CoV-2 antibody-detection assays against either the S or the N protein, among a large collection of pre-COVID-19 sera from patients proven to have different tropical infectious diseases.

METHODS

Ethics

This work was approved by the Research Ethics Boards of the Research Institute of the McGill University Health Centre (RI-MUHC # 2021-7246).

Source of specimens tested

Specimens were well-characterised sera collected prior to July 2019 from patients with active or recent malaria imported to Canada, with active or recent malaria in a hyperendemic area (Senegal), from clinical suspects for human African trypanosomiasis and for visceral leishmaniasis, from seropositives for Chagas disease, for *Strongyloides* sp., for *Schistosoma* sp., for filaria species, and for *Trichinella* sp., and from negative controls for whom tissue-borne parasitic infection was suspected but antibody testing was negative. The source and types of specimens are detailed in Table 1.

SARS-CoV-2 antibody testing

Three different SARS-CoV-2 antibody-detection assays were selected to assess the specificity of assays that detect different analytes, including anti-SARS-CoV-2 N-protein IgM, anti-SARS-CoV-2 N-protein IgG, and anti-Receptor Binding Domain (RBD) blocking antibodies of all immunoglobulin subclasses. We included an immunochromatographic rapid diagnostic test (RDT) that can be performed in low resource settings and available from a quality-assured manufacturer with an international presence to enhance the relevance of this evaluation to the low resource settings where NTDs and malaria are common.

Culture-free neutralization antibody detection assay (cPass)

The cPass SARS-CoV-2 Neutralization Antibody Detection Kit (cPass; Genscript, Piscataway, NJ) uses a blocking ELISA format with human ACE-2 receptor molecules coated on an ELISA plate (12, 13). Human sera pre-incubated with labelled epitopes of the RBD on S1 proteins are then transferred to the plate. This blocking ELISA serves as a surrogate assay to determine the capacity of human sera to block the interaction between the Spike fusion protein (through its RBD) and its cellular receptor ACE-2. The analyte detected is anti-RBD blocking Ab of all subclasses. All the specimens, including positive and negative controls provided with the kit, were processed according to the manufacturer's instructions, and included a 10X dilution factor of the primary specimen. All specimens and controls were tested in duplicate and the percentage of inhibition calculation was based on the mean of OD for each duplicate. A cut-off of 30% inhibition for SARS-CoV-2 neutralizing antibody detection was used to determine the presence of neutralizing antibodies, based on the manufacturer's instructions for use.

Abbott SARS-CoV-2 IgG assay

The Abbott SARS-CoV-2 IgG assay (Abbott Laboratories, Abbott Park, Illinois, USA), which detects IgG against SARS-CoV-2 N-protein, was performed on the Architect i2000sr platform according to the manufacturer's instructions. Specimens were thawed on the day of testing and were centrifuged 10,000g for 10 min prior to each run. A sample to stored calibrator index (S/C) cut-off value of 1.4 was used for positive results, according to the manufacturer's recommendations.

STANDARD Q COVID-19 IgM/IgG Combo Rapid Test

The STANDARD Q COVID-19 IgM/IgG Combo Rapid Test (SD BioSensor, Gyeonggi-do, Republic of Korea) is a rapid immunochromatography test for the qualitative

detection of specific IgM and IgG against SARS-CoV-2 N-protein on two separate test lines. Serum specimens were processed according to the manufacturer's instructions. Briefly, 10µl of serum were applied to the specimen well of the test device. Three drops (90µl) of buffer were added immediately and vertically into the same specimen well. The test results were read visually at within 15 minutes. Any visible band was considered a positive result. To facilitate analysis of positive test results, the intensity of test bands was further classified as: no signal (0), barely visible but present (1), low intensity (faint but definitively positive) (2), and medium to high intensity (3) (Figure 1).

Statistical analysis

Because all specimens were collected in the pre-pandemic era, prior to July 2019, all positive results for SARS-CoV-2 antibodies were considered false positives. The primary outcome calculated was test specificity and its corresponding 95% confidence intervals (95% CI), estimated according to a binomial distribution using Wilson Score method with Yate's continuity correction as appropriate. The secondary outcome was relative risk (RR) for a false positive and the associated 95% CI. Both were estimated according to (i) positivity status for each parasite of interest, and (ii) SARS-CoV-2 target antigen tested. Statistical analyses were performed using R version 3.5.2 (R Core Team, Vienna, Austria). Area-proportional Venn diagrams were generated using eulerAPE version 3 (14).

RESULTS

Specificity of three commercial SARS-CoV-2 serological assays

The origin and characteristics of pre-COVID-19 specimens are reported in Table 1. Table 2 presents test specificity across the 559 samples tested. Overall, the point estimates of specificity of the cPass (10/559: 98%; 95% CI 97-99) and SD RDT IgG result (15/559: 97%;

95% CI 96-98) were similar to those for Abbott Architect (26/548: 95%; 95% CI 93-97) and SD RDT IgM result (30/559: 95%; 95% CI 92-96).

For specimens from patients with evidence of blood- or tissue-invasive protozoan infections overall, test specificity was as follows: cPass (4/339: 99%; 95% CI 97-99), SD RDT IgG results (10/339: 97%; 95% CI 95-98), Abbott Architect (19/328: 94%; 95% CI 91-96) and SD RDT IgM result (23/339: 93%; 95% CI 90-95). For specimens from Senegalese patients with malaria, specificity ranged from 91% (95% CI 84-95) for the Abbott Architect and SD RDT IgM result to 99% (95% CI 94-100) for the SD RDT IgG result. For specimens from travellers with imported malaria, test specificity ranged between 92% and 99%. Among sera positive for anti-*Leishmania* sp and anti-*Trypanosoma cruzi* antibodies, cPass, Abbott Architect and SD RDT IgM displayed 100% specificity. However, the SD RDT IgG result yielded specificities of 80% (95% CI 30-99) and 92% (95% CI 81-97) against visceral leishmaniasis and human American trypanosomiasis, respectively. The SD RDT IgG result did not generate any false positives when used against human African trypanosomiasis specimens, whereas specificity of 88% (95% CI 75-95) was observed for Abbott Architect.

For specimens from patients with evidence of past or present helminth infection overall, test specificity estimates were all $\geq 96\%$. When evaluated against specimens seropositive for *Strongyloides* sp. (n=50) and *Trichinella* sp. (n=30), specificities ranged from 96% to 98%. Test specificity assessed against specimens seropositive for filarial species (n=40) ranged from 92% to 95%, and from 92% to 97% against specimens seropositive for *Schistosoma* sp. (n=40).

Sera collected from patients clinically suspected of parasitic infections that tested negative were also assessed. cPass yielded a specificity of 98% (1 false positive out of 60), whereas Abbott Architect, SD RDT IgG and SD RDT IgM showed a specificity of 100%.

To allow statistical comparisons across the entire group, we computed the relative risk (RR) and 95% CI of a false positive result by assay and target analyte, according to specimen origin (Table 3). Compared to cPass, the risk of a false positive SARS-CoV-2 result was higher for the Architect and the SD RDT IgM result overall across all specimens (RR 2.65, 95% CI 1.29-5.45; and RR 3.00, 95% CI 1.48-6.08, respectively), for malaria specimens overall (RR 4.89, 95% CI 1.42-16.79; and RR 7.00, 95% CI 2.11-23.16), and for protozoan infections overall (RR 4.91, 95% CI 1.69-14.28; RR 5.75, 95% CI 2.01-16.45). No significant differences were seen across assays for helminthic infections. SD RDT IgG relative risk of false positive was not significantly different to that of cPass for any of the specimen origins.

Characterisation of false positive results in terms of categorical agreement and signal intensity across serological assays

Categorical agreement between commercial serological assays for the detection of SARS-CoV-2 is depicted in Figure 2. The majority (>85%) of false positive results were positive by only one of the assays tested. When comparing cPass, Abbott Architect and SD RDT IgG (Fig. 2 A), cPass, Abbott Architect and SD RDT IgM (Fig. 2 B) or cPass, Abbott Architect and SD RDT IgG or SD RDT IgM (Fig. 2 C), all three assays were in agreement for only 14% (5/36), 7.8% (4/51) or 8.3% (5/60) of the false positive results, respectively. When comparing SD RDT IgG and SD RDT IgM (Fig. 2 D), the two assays were in agreement for 15% (4/39) of the specimens with a false positive result.

Readout intensities of each serological test were assembled in a heatmap for specimens with false positive results from one or more tests (Figure 3). Overall, among specimens with false positive results, there was very little correlation between the signal intensity of a false positive test result and the probability of a false positive with another assay. Strong signal intensities were common among false positive results from laboratory-based assays. The cPass yielded positive results for 10/60 (16.7%) specimens with false positive results from one or more tests, with 5 of these having a binding inhibition of >50%. The Abbott Architect yielded positive results for 26/60 (43.3%) false-positive specimens, with 17 of these having sample-to-stored-calibrator index (S/C) of >1.68, which we considered as strong positives. By contrast, weak or very weak signal intensity was common for the false-positive results observed with the SD RDT. SD RDT IgG was positive among 16/60 (36.7%) false-positive specimens, with 5 of these having “barely visible but present” bands. By contrast, SD RDT IgM was positive for 30/60 (50%) false positive specimens, with 20 of these having “barely visible but present” bands. All but one of the other positive SD RDT IgM results were considered “weak”.

DISCUSSION

We sought to assess the specificity of three SARS-CoV-2 antibody detection assays among people either with known tissue-borne parasitic infections or residing in areas where such infections are highly endemic. We tested assays against either the S or the N protein, among a large collection of well characterised pre-COVID-19 sera from clinical suspects with relevant tropical infectious diseases which may lead to cross-reactions with SARS-CoV-2 serologic assays. Previous reports found increased frequency of non-specific binding leading to positive results in smaller cohorts of patients with and without recent malaria in Nigeria (15), Benin (16) and Tanzania and Zambia (17). We confirm these findings with

different serological assays and extend them to patients with imported malaria residing in a non-endemic area, as well as to patients with several key tropical infectious diseases for which there is a current void of available information on which to base interpretation of serological results for SARS-CoV-2.

The observed specificity of all assays ranged from 95-98% in the overall group of specimens. However, those for the Abbott Architect (95% [95%CI 93-97]) and the SD RDT IgM (95% [95%CI 93-96]) fell short of the WHO-recommended 97% benchmark for SARS-CoV-2 serological assays (18). Moreover, these values are well below estimates for the Abbott Architect from previous data among specimens from high-income countries, including 99.6% reported by the manufacturer using a panel of pre-COVID-19 specimens or from patients positive for alternative respiratory pathogens (n = 1070) (19) and 99.6% reported in an independent evaluation of 1099 pre-COVID-19 specimens (20). Similarly, the values for the SD RDT IgM are lower than the 100% specificity reported in the FDA serology test evaluation report for the STANDARD Q COVID-19 IgM/IgG Combo Rapid (21).

As expected, the lowest observed specificities were seen among sera from patients with protozoan infections of the reticuloendothelial system, such as human African trypanosomiasis (Abbott Architect; 88% [95%CI 75-95]), visceral leishmaniasis (SD RDT IgG; 80% [95%CI 30-99]), and from patients with recent malaria from a holoendemic area of Senegal (ranging from 91% for Abbott Architect and SD RDT IgM to 98-99% for cPass and SD RDT IgG). Non-specific cross-reaction among patients in malaria endemic areas may be potentiated by co-infections rather than from malaria infections alone. Alternatively, repeated infections with *Plasmodium* species rather than co-infections with other organisms may lead

to a greater cross-reactivity. This is consistent with the association between false positive SARS-CoV-2 results and the presence of anti-*Plasmodium* antibodies (15), as well as the relatively higher specificity observed in our cohort of patients with antibodies to tissue-invasive helminths. Taken as a whole, the observed specificities among the assays and specimens tested are likely sufficiently elevated to be useful for serosurveys and epidemiologic tracking, but below the threshold required for individual patient care decisions (1, 18).

In order to allow statistical comparisons between different SARS-CoV-2 diagnostic assays, we computed the relative risk of a false positive result by diagnostic assay and target analyte, according to specimen origin (Table 3). The cPass showed the least variation across specimen origins and consistently had the highest specificity across groups. This assay was designed as a surrogate viral neutralization assay and measures the strength of inhibition of RDB binding to ACE-2 by host antibodies of any subclass. Perhaps surprisingly for a lateral flow immunochromatographic SARS-CoV-2 assay, the SD RDT IgG also showed very high performance across groups. Using cPass as the reference value, SD RDT IgG had a lower relative risk (RR) of a false positive result than either SD RDT IgM or Abbott Architect. The latter two tests were statistically significantly more likely to yield false positive results than the cPass for specimens with evidence of protozoan infections overall but not for specimens with evidence of tissue-invasive helminth infections. We previously showed that cPass has marginal advantages over anti-RBD IgG ELISA (12). In this case, the SD RDT IgG detects anti-N IgG and performed comparably to a sophisticated surrogate viral neutralization assay. Moreover, it compared favourably to the laboratory-based Abbott Architect in this group of specimens of interest. This is relevant to low-resource tropical settings where central laboratory capacity frequently limits care of patients with fever syndromes (22).

The finding of very low categorical agreement between SARS-CoV-2 serological assays among specimens with a false positive result is consistent with non-specific binding between host antibodies and test antigens. This observation can be leveraged to design testing algorithms with increased specificity. In our specimen set, requiring a positive result from a second test among cPass, Abbott Architect, or SD RDT IgG would rule out the majority of false positive results obtained after a first positive result (Figure 2). Others have proposed an avidity assay using various concentrations of urea washes to prevent non-specific binding (15) but this approach may not be suitable in low-resource settings, even when centralized laboratories exist.

Limitations of our study include the fact that the available volume of stored pre-pandemic specimens precluded the possibility of performing specific avidity testing or assessing for the presence of antibodies to seasonal coronaviruses that may have cross-reacted with the SARS-CoV-2 serological assays. However, a report from the United States found no false positives for Abbott Architect or SD RDT IgM/IgG among 21 patients with recent seasonal coronavirus infections: NL63 (n = 11), HKU1 (n = 7) and 229E (n = 3) (23). Moreover, the fact that our data recapitulates findings from previous studies in malarial-endemic areas is reassuring regarding their robustness.

CONCLUSIONS

The specificity of SARS-CoV-2 serological assays was decreased among sera from patients with tissue-borne parasitic infections, below the threshold required for decisions about individual patient care. Specificity is markedly increased by the use of confirmatory testing with a second assay. Finally, the SD RDT IgG proved similarly specific to laboratory-

336 based assays and provides an option in low-resource settings when detection of anti-SARS-
337 CoV-2 IgG is indicated.

REFERENCES

1. Cheng MP, Yansouni CP, Basta NE, Desjardins M, Kanjilal S, Paquette K, Caya C, Semret M, Quach C, Libman M, Mazzola L, Sacks JA, Dittrich S, Papenburg J. 2020. Serodiagnostics for Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome-Related Coronavirus 2 : A Narrative Review. *Ann Intern Med* 173:450-460.
2. Van Caesele P, Bailey D, Forgie SE, Dingle TC, Krajden M. 2020. SARS-CoV-2 (COVID-19) serology: implications for clinical practice, laboratory medicine and public health. *CMAJ* 192:E973-e979.
3. Lejon V, Ngoyi DM, Ilunga M, Beelaert G, Maes I, Büscher P, Fransen K. 2010. Low specificities of HIV diagnostic tests caused by *Trypanosoma brucei gambiense* sleeping sickness. *J Clin Microbiol* 48:2836-9.
4. Gillet P, Mumba Ngoyi D, Lukuka A, Kande V, Atua B, van Griensven J, Muyembe JJ, Jacobs J, Lejon V. 2013. False positivity of non-targeted infections in malaria rapid diagnostic tests: the case of human african trypanosomiasis. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis* 7:e2180.
5. Shanks L, Ritmeijer K, Piriou E, Siddiqui MR, Kliescikova J, Pearce N, Ariti C, Muluneh L, Masiga J, Abebe A. 2015. Accounting for False Positive HIV Tests: Is Visceral Leishmaniasis Responsible? *PLoS One* 10:e0132422.
6. Ly A, Hansen DS. 2019. Development of B Cell Memory in Malaria. *Front Immunol* 10:559.
7. Silveira ELV, Dominguez MR, Soares IS. 2018. To B or Not to B: Understanding B Cell Responses in the Development of Malaria Infection. *Front Immunol* 9:2961.
8. Rahumatullah A, Balachandra D, Noordin R, Baharudeen Z, Lim YY, Choong YS, Lim TS. 2021. Broad specificity of immune helminth scFv library to identify monoclonal antibodies targeting *Strongyloides*. *Sci Rep* 11:2502.

9. World Health Organization. 2020. Ending the neglect to attain the Sustainable Development Goals: a road map for neglected tropical diseases 2021–2030. World Health Organization, Geneva.
10. World Health Organization. 2020. World malaria report 2020: 20 years of global progress and challenges. World Health Organization, Geneva.
11. Center for Systems Science and Engineering (CSSE). 2020. COVID-19 Dashboard, Johns Hopkins University. <https://coronavirus.jhu.edu/map.html>. Accessed June 17, 2021.
12. Papenburg J, Cheng MP, Corsini R, Caya C, Mendoza E, Manguiat K, Lindsay LR, Wood H, Drebot MA, Dibernardo A, Zaharatos G, Bazin R, Gasser R, Benlarbi M, Gendron-Lepage G, Beaudoin-Bussires G, Prvost J, Finzi A, Ndao M, Yansouni CP. 2021. Evaluation of a Commercial Culture-Free Neutralization Antibody Detection Kit for Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome-Related Coronavirus-2 and Comparison With an Antireceptor-Binding Domain Enzyme-Linked Immunosorbent Assay. Open Forum Infect Dis 8:ofab220.
13. Taylor SC, Hurst B, Charlton CL, Bailey A, Kanji JN, McCarthy MK, Morrison TE, Huey L, Annen K, DomBourian MG, Knight V. 2021. A New SARS-CoV-2 Dual-Purpose Serology Test: Highly Accurate Infection Tracing and Neutralizing Antibody Response Detection. J Clin Microbiol 59.
14. Micallef L, Rodgers P. 2014. eulerAPE: drawing area-proportional 3-Venn diagrams using ellipses. PLoS One 9:e101717.
15. Steinhardt LC, Ige F, Iriemenam NC, Greby SM, Hamada Y, Uwandu M, Aniedobe M, Stafford KA, Abimiku A, Mba N, Agala N, Okunoye O, Mpamugo A, Swaminathan M, Onokevbagbe E, Olaleye T, Odoh I, Marston BJ, Okoye M, Abubakar I, Rangaka MX, Rogier E, Audu R. 2021. Cross-Reactivity of Two SARS-

CoV-2 Serological Assays in a Setting Where Malaria Is Endemic. J Clin Microbiol
59:e0051421.

16. Yadouleton A, Sander AL, Moreira-Soto A, Tchibozo C, Hounkanrin G, Badou Y, Fischer C, Krause N, Akogbeto P, de Oliveira Filho EF, Dossou A, Brünink S, Aïssi MAJ, Djingarey MH, Hounkpatin B, Nagel M, Drexler JF. 2021. Limited Specificity of Serologic Tests for SARS-CoV-2 Antibody Detection, Benin. Emerg Infect Dis 27:233-7.
17. Tso FY, Lidenge SJ, Peña PB, Clegg AA, Ngowi JR, Mwaiselage J, Ngalamika O, Julius P, West JT, Wood C. 2021. High prevalence of pre-existing serological cross-reactivity against severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus-2 (SARS-CoV-2) in sub-Saharan Africa. Int J Infect Dis 102:577-583.
18. World Health Organization. 2020. Target product profiles for priority diagnostics to support response to the COVID-19 pandemic v.1.0. World Health Organization, Geneva.
19. Abbott Laboratories. 2020. SARS-CoV-2 IgG for use with ARCHITECT package insert. Abbott Laboratories, Chicago, IL.
20. Patel EU, Bloch EM, Clarke W, Hsieh YH, Boon D, Eby Y, Fernandez RE, Baker OR, Keruly M, Kirby CS, Klock E, Littlefield K, Miller J, Schmidt HA, Sullivan P, Piwowar-Manning E, Shrestha R, Redd AD, Rothman RE, Sullivan D, Shoham S, Casadevall A, Quinn TC, Pekosz A, Tobian AAR, Laeyendecker O. 2021. Comparative Performance of Five Commercially Available Serologic Assays To Detect Antibodies to SARS-CoV-2 and Identify Individuals with High Neutralizing Titers. J Clin Microbiol 59.

- 411 21. SD BioSensor Inc. 2020. Serology Test Evaluation Report for “STANDARD Q
412 COVID-19 IgM/IgG Duo, Updated June 21, 2020. SD BioSensor Inc, Gyeonggi-do,
413 Republic of Korea.
- 414 22. Semret M, Ndao M, Jacobs J, Yansouni CP. 2018. Point-of-care and point-of-'can':
415 leveraging reference-laboratory capacity for integrated diagnosis of fever syndromes
416 in the tropics. Clin Microbiol Infect 24:836-844.
- 417 23. Paiva KJ, Grisson RD, Chan PA, Huard RC, Caliendo AM, Lonks JR, King E, Tang
418 EW, Pytel-Parenteau DL, Nam GH, Yakirevich E, Lu S. 2021. Validation and
419 performance comparison of three SARS-CoV-2 antibody assays. J Med Virol 93:916-
420 923.
- 421

FIGURE LEGENDS

Figure 1 Categorization for SD RDT band intensity, based on a standard colour scale

provided by SD Biosensor. A score of 0 indicates no signal; 1 indicates barely visible but present (corresponding to R1-R6 on the standard scale); 2 indicates low intensity (i.e. faint but definitively positive, corresponding to R7-R12 on the standard scale); 3 indicates medium to high intensity (corresponding to R13-R21 on the standard scale). The upper row shows the standard color scale provided by the manufacturer. The lower row shows actual RDTs used in the present study, photographed on the same day under standardized lighting conditions. The illustrative test line is shown in the dashed rectangle.

Figure 2. Venn diagram comparing false positive results from cPass, Abbott Architect, SD RDT IgG and SD RDT IgM serology from patients with protozoan and helminth parasites infections. Panels A, B, and C represent the overlap of cPass and Abbott Architect with SD RDT IgG, SD RDT IgM, or any positive SD RDT result, respectively. Panel D depicts the overlap of SD RDT IgG and SD RDT IgM. RDT denotes rapid diagnostic test; numbers denote the number of false positive specimens in each category.

Figure 3. Heatmap of readout signal intensity of all false positive specimens identified using three commercial serological assays for the detection of SARS-CoV-2. RDT denotes rapid diagnostic test. Cut-off used to determine cPass positivity: Negative was <20% inhibition; Indeterminate was 20 to <30% inhibition; Positive was ≥30% inhibition. Cut-off used to determine Abbott Architect positivity: Negative was a signal-to-cut-off ratio <1.0; Weak positive was 1.0 to 1.2; Strong positive was >1.2

445 Categorization for SD RDT band intensity: a score of 0 indicates no signal; 1 indicates barely
446 visible but present; 2 indicates low intensity (i.e., faint but definitively positive); 3 indicates
447 medium to high intensity.

cPass	Negative: <20% inhibition	-	Indeterminate: 20 to <30% inhibition	Positive: ≥30% inhibition
Abbott Architect	Negative: signal-to-cut-off ratio <1.0	-	Weak positive: signal-to-cut-off ratio 1.0 to 1.2	Strong positive: signal-to-cut-off ratio >1.2
SD RDT band intensity	No signal: Indicated by 0	Barely visible but present: Indicated by 1	Low intensity (faint but definitively positive): Indicated by 2	Medium to high intensity: Indicated by 3

448

Table 1. Origin of Pre-COVID-19 specimens.

Parasitic diagnosis*	Origin	Testing details
Imported malaria*	Specimens from clinical suspects submitted to NRCP	Patients in whom a separate whole blood specimen submitted to NRCP was positive for malaria by PCR within 14 days
Malaria* in hyperendemic area	Specimens from clinical suspects submitted to the Department of Parasitology, University of Cheikh Anta Diop, Dakar, Senegal	Confirmed active or recent malaria by microscopy or RDT
Visceral leishmaniasis* (<i>Leishmania donovani</i> complex)	Specimens from clinical suspects submitted to NRCP	Direct agglutination test (DAT)
Human African trypanosomiasis* (<i>Trypanosoma brucei gambiense</i>)	Specimens from clinical suspects submitted to ITM or NRCP	Card agglutination test for trypanosomiasis (CATT)
<i>Trypanosoma cruzi</i> seropositivity	Specimens from clinical suspects submitted to NRCP	Crude <i>Trypanosoma cruzi</i> epimastigotes antigen enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay (ELISA)
<i>Strongyloides stercoralis</i> seropositivity	Specimens from clinical suspects submitted to NRCP	Recombinant Strongyloides antigen (NIE) ELISA
<i>Schistosoma</i> sp. seropositivity	Specimens from clinical suspects submitted to NRCP	Crude <i>Schistosoma mansoni</i> and <i>S. haematobium</i> antigens ELISA
<i>Filaria</i> sp. seropositivity	Specimens from clinical suspects submitted to NRCP	Crude <i>Brugia malayi</i> antigen ELISA
Trichinellosis* (<i>Trichinella</i> sp.)	Specimens from clinical	Crude <i>Trichinella spiralis</i> antigen ELISA

suspects submitted to		
NRCP		
Sera from parasite-suspects	Specimens from clinical	Sera from parasite-suspects negative for all
negative for all above pathogens	suspects submitted to	above pathogens
NRCP		
<p>* These specimens were drawn from patients clinically suspected of active disease for the purpose of diagnosis, as opposed to screening of asymptomatic individuals. ITM Institute of Tropical Medicine Antwerp; NRCP National Reference Centre for Parasitology; RDT rapid diagnostic test.</p>		

Table 2. Diagnostic specificity of three commercial serological assays for the detection of SARS-CoV-2.

PRE-COVID SPECIMEN ORIGIN	Number	Assay	Analyte detected	FP	TN	Specificity % (95% CI) ^a
Confirmed active or recent malaria by microscopy or RDT (Senegal -endemic area)*	100	cPass ^b	Anti-RBD blocking Ab, all subclasses	2	98	98 (93-99)
	90 ^c	Abbott Architect	Anti-N-IgG	8	82	91 (83-95)
	100	SD RDT IgM	Anti-N-IgM	9	91	91 (84-95)
	100	SD RDT IgG	Anti-N-IgG	1	99	99 (94-100)
Patients in whom a separate whole blood specimen was positive for malaria by PCR within the same 14 days (NRCP -non-endemic area)*	143	cPass	Anti-RBD blocking Ab, all subclasses	1	142	99 (96-100)
	142 ^d	Abbott Architect	Anti-N-IgG	6	136	96 (91-98)
	143	SD RDT IgM	Anti-N-IgM	12	131	92 (86-95)
	143	SD RDT IgG	Anti-N-IgG	4	139	97 (93-99)
Visceral leishmaniasis*	5	cPass	Anti-RBD blocking Ab, all subclasses	0	5	100 (46-100)
	5	Abbott Architect	Anti-N-IgG	0	5	100 (46-100)
	5	SD RDT IgM	Anti-N-IgM	0	5	100 (46-100)
	5	SD RDT IgG	Anti-N-IgG	1	4	80 (30-99)
Human African trypanosomiasis *	42	cPass	Anti-RBD blocking Ab, all	1	41	98 (88-99)

			subclasses			
	42	Abbott Architect	Anti-N-IgG	5	37	88 (75-95)
	42	SD RDT IgM	Anti-N-IgM	2	40	95 (84-99)
	42	SD RDT IgG	Anti-N-IgG	0	42	100 (89-100)
<i>Trypanosoma cruzi</i> seropositivity	49	cPass	Anti-RBD blocking Ab, all subclasses	0	49	100 (91-100)
	49	Abbott Architect	Anti-N-IgG	0	49	100 (93-100)
	49	SD RDT IgM	Anti-N-IgM	0	49	100 (93-100)
	49	SD RDT IgG	Anti-N-IgG	4	45	92 (81-97)
Overall protozoan parasitic infections (Malaria/leishmaniasis/trypanosomiasis)	339	cPass	Anti-RBD blocking Ab, all subclasses	4	335	99 (97-99)
	328	Abbott Architect	Anti-N-IgG	19	309	94 (91-96)
	339	SD RDT IgM	Anti-N-IgM	23	316	93 (90-95)
	339	SD RDT IgG	Anti-N-IgG	10	329	97 (95-98)
<i>Strongyloides stercoralis</i> seropositivity	50	cPass	Anti-RBD blocking Ab, all subclasses	2	48	96 (86-99)
	50	Abbott Architect	Anti-N-IgG	1	49	98 (89-100)
	50	SD RDT IgM	Anti-N-IgM	1	49	98 (89-100)
	50	SD RDT IgG	Anti-N-IgG	1	49	98 (89-100)
<i>Schistosoma</i> sp. seropositivity	40	cPass	Anti-RBD blocking Ab, all subclasses	1	39	97 (87-99)
	40	Abbott Architect	Anti-N-IgG	2	38	95 (83-99)

	40	SD RDT IgM	Anti-N-IgM	3	37	92 (80-97)
	40	SD RDT IgG	Anti-N-IgG	1	39	97 (87-99)
<i>Filaria</i> sp. seropositivity	40	cPass	Anti-RBD blocking Ab, all subclasses	2	38	95 (83-99)
	40	Abbott Architect	Anti-N-IgG	3	37	92 (80-97)
	40	SD RDT IgM	Anti-N-IgM	2	38	95 (83-99)
	40	SD RDT IgG	Anti-N-IgG	2	38	95 (83-99)
Trichinellosis* (<i>Trichinella</i> sp.)	30	cPass	Anti-RBD blocking Ab, all subclasses	0	30	100 (86-100)
	30	Abbott Architect	Anti-N-IgG	1	29	97 (83-99)
	30	SD RDT IgM	Anti-N-IgM	1	29	97 (83-99)
	30	SD RDT IgG	Anti-N-IgG	1	29	97 (83-99)
Overall helminth infections (Strongyloidiasis/Schistosomiasis/Filariasis/Trichinellosis)	160	cPass	Anti-RBD blocking Ab, all subclasses	5	155	97 (93-99)
	160	Abbott Architect	Anti-N-IgG	7	153	96 (91-98)
	160	SD RDT IgM	Anti-N-IgM	7	153	96 (91-98)
	160	SD RDT IgG	Anti-N-IgG	5	155	97 (93-99)
Sera from parasite-suspects negative for all above diseases	60	cPass	Anti-RBD blocking Ab, all subclasses	1	59	98 (91-100)
	60	Abbott Architect	Anti-N-IgG	0	60	100 (92-100)
	60	SD RDT IgM	Anti-N-IgM	0	60	100 (94-100)
	60	SD RDT IgG	Anti-N-IgG	0	60	100 (94-100)

Overall -all samples	559	cPass	Anti-RBD blocking Ab, all subclasses	10	549	98 (97-99)
	548	Abbott Architect	Anti-N-IgG	26	522	95 (93-97)
	559	SD RDT IgM	Anti-N-IgM	30	529	95 (92-96)
	559	SD RDT IgG	Anti-N-IgG	15	544	97 (96-98)

* These specimens were drawn from patients clinically suspected of active disease for the purpose of diagnosis, as opposed to screening of asymptomatic individuals.

^a Wilson score interval binomial 95% confidence intervals presented with Yate's continuity correction applied as appropriate

^b Cut-off used to determine cPass positivity was $\geq 30\%$ inhibition. The cut-off used to determine Abbott Architect positivity was a sample-to-stored-calibrator index (S/C) of ≥ 1.4 .

^c Results were unavailable for 10 of 100 specimens due to insufficient volume.

^d Results were unavailable for 1 of 143 specimens due to insufficient volume.

CI confidence interval; FP false positive; NRCP National Reference Centre for Parasitology; TN true negative.

Table 3. Relative risk of a false positive result by assay and target analyte, according to specimen origin.

PRE-COVID SPECIMEN ORIGIN	Number	Assay	Analyte detected	FP	TN	Risk ratio (95% CI)
Confirmed active or recent malaria by microscopy or RDT (Senegal -endemic area)*	90	Abbott Architect	Anti-N-IgG	8	82	4.44 (0.97-20.38)
	100	SD RDT IgM	Anti-N-IgM	9	91	4.50 (0.997-20.31)
	100	SD RDT IgG	Anti-N-IgG	1	99	0.50 (0.05-5.43)
	100	cPass ^a	Anti-RBD blocking Ab, all subclasses	2	98	Ref.
Patients in whom a separate whole blood specimen was positive for malaria by PCR within the same 14 days (NRCP -non-endemic area)*	142	Abbott Architect	Anti-N-IgG	6	136	6.04 (0.74-49.55)
	143	SD RDT IgM	Anti-N-IgM	12	131	12.00 (1.58-91.07)
	143	SD RDT IgG	Anti-N-IgG	4	139	4.00 (0.45-35.35)
	143	cPass	Anti-RBD blocking Ab, all subclasses	1	142	Ref.
Overall Malaria (Senegal and NRCP)	232	Abbott Architect	Anti-N-IgG	14	218	4.89 (1.42-16.79)
	243	SD RDT IgM	Anti-N-IgM	21	222	7.00 (2.11-23.16)
	243	SD RDT IgG	Anti-N-IgG	5	238	1.67 (0.40-6.90)
	243	cPass ^a	Anti-RBD blocking Ab, all subclasses	3	240	Ref.
Visceral leishmaniasis *	5	Abbott Architect	Anti-N-IgG	0	5	-
	5	SD RDT IgM	Anti-N-IgM	0	5	-
	5	SD RDT IgG	Anti-N-IgG	1	4	-

	5	cPass	Anti-RBD blocking Ab, all subclasses	0	5	Ref.
Human African trypanosomiasis*	42	Abbott Architect	Anti-N-IgG	5	37	5.00 (0.61-40.99)
	42	SD RDT IgM	Anti-N-IgM	2	40	2.00 (0.19-21.22)
	42	SD RDT IgG	Anti-N-IgG	0	42	0
	42	cPass	Anti-RBD blocking Ab, all subclasses	1	41	Ref.
<i>Trypanosoma cruzi</i> seropositivity	49	Abbott Architect	Anti-N-IgG	0	49	-
	49	SD RDT IgM	Anti-N-IgM	0	49	-
	49	SD RDT IgG	Anti-N-IgG	4	45	-
	49	cPass	Anti-RBD blocking Ab, all subclasses	0	49	Ref.
Overall protozoan parasitic infections	328	Abbott Architect	Anti-N-IgG	19	309	4.91 (1.69-14.28)
(Malaria/leishmaniasis/trypanosomiasis)	339	SD RDT IgM	Anti-N-IgM	23	316	5.75 (2.01-16.45)
	339	SD RDT IgG	Anti-N-IgG	10	329	2.50 (0.79-7.89)
	339	cPass	Anti-RBD blocking Ab, all subclasses	4	335	Ref.
<i>Strongyloides stercoralis</i> seropositivity	50	Abbott Architect	Anti-N-IgG	1	49	0.50 (0.05-5.34)
	50	SD RDT IgM	Anti-N-IgM	1	49	0.50 (0.05-5.34)
	50	SD RDT IgG	Anti-N-IgG	1	49	0.50 (0.05-5.34)
	50	cPass	Anti-RBD blocking Ab, all subclasses	2	48	Ref.

<i>Schistosoma</i> sp. seropositivity	40	Abbott Architect	Anti-N-IgG	2	38	2.00 (0.19-21.18)
	40	SD RDT IgM	Anti-N-IgM	3	37	3.00 (0.32-27.63)
	40	SD RDT IgG	Anti-N-IgG	1	39	1.00 (0.06-15.44)
	40	cPass	Anti-RBD blocking Ab, all subclasses	1	39	Ref.
<i>Filaria</i> sp. seropositivity	40	Abbott Architect	Anti-N-IgG	3	37	1.50 (0.26-8.50)
	40	SD RDT IgM	Anti-N-IgM	2	38	1.00 (0.15-6.75)
	40	SD RDT IgG	Anti-N-IgG	2	38	1.00 (0.15-6.75)
	40	cPass	Anti-RBD blocking Ab, all subclasses	2	38	Ref.
Trichinellosis* (<i>Trichinella</i> sp.)	30	Abbott Architect	Anti-N-IgG	1	29	-
	30	SD RDT IgM	Anti-N-IgM	1	29	-
	30	SD RDT IgG	Anti-N-IgG	1	29	-
	30	cPass	Anti-RBD blocking Ab, all subclasses	0	30	Ref.
Overall helminth infections (Strongyloides/Schistosomiasis/Filaria/Trichinella)	160	Abbott Architect	Anti-N-IgG	7	153	1.40 (0.45-4.32)
	160	SD RDT IgM	Anti-N-IgM	7	153	1.40 (0.45-4.32)
	160	SD RDT IgG	Anti-N-IgG	5	155	1.00 (0.29-3.39)
	160	cPass	Anti-RBD blocking Ab, all subclasses	5	155	Ref.
Sera from parasite-suspects negative for all above pathogens	60	Abbott Architect	Anti-N-IgG	0	60	-
	60	SD RDT IgM	Anti-N-IgM	0	60	-

	60	SD RDT IgG	Anti-N-IgG	0	60	-
	60	cPass	Anti-RBD blocking Ab, all subclasses	1	59	Ref.
Overall -all samples	548	Abbott Architect	Anti-N-IgG	26	522	2.65 (1.29-5.45)
	559	SD RDT IgM	Anti-N-IgM	30	529	3.00 (1.48-6.08)
	559	SD RDT IgG	Anti-N-IgG	15	544	1.50 (0.68-3.31)
	559	cPass	Anti-RBD blocking Ab, all subclasses	10	549	Ref.

* These specimens were drawn from patients clinically suspected of active disease for the purpose of diagnosis, as opposed to screening of asymptomatic individuals.

^a Cut-off used to determine cPass positivity was $\geq 30\%$ inhibition. The cut-off used to determine Abbott Architect positivity was a sample-to-stored-calibrator index (S/C) of ≥ 1.4 .

CI confidence interval; FP false positive; IgG Immunoglobulin G; IgM Immunoglobulin M; NRCP National Reference Centre for Parasitology; Ref. Reference; TN true negative.

COLOR SCALE

REF: REF-10

LOT: REF1020001

EXP1: Jul. 2023

Serial No:

EXP2:

SD BIOSENSOR

Pre-COVID specimen origin	Specimen number	cPass % inhibition	Abbott Signal-to-cutoff ratio	SD RDT IgG band intensity	SD RDT IgM band intensity
Confirmed active or recent malaria by microscopy or RDT (Senegal -endemic area)	#1	6.57	1.03	0	0
	#2	0.28	1.14	0	0
	#3	-0.89	1.26	0	0
	#4	11.09	0.31	0	2
	#5	7.85	0.26	0	1
	#6	5.26	2.95	0	0
	#7	5.81	0.07	0	1
	#8	4.26	0.51	0	1
	#9	-10.00	1.37	0	0
	#10	-7.20	0.13	0	1
	#11	4.30	0.21	0	1
	#12	9.04	1.42	0	0
	#13	-0.98	0.31	0	1
	#14	-9.19	0.26	0	1
	#15	31.52	0.66	0	2
	#16	55.52	3.29	3	0
	#17	28.46	1.52	0	0
Patients in whom a separate whole blood specimen was positive for malaria by PCR within the same 14 days (NRCP -non-endemic area)	#18	30.90	0.68	0	0
	#19	-14.18	1.05	0	0
	#20	7.97	1.08	0	0
	#21	10.59	1.02	0	0
	#22	29.07	0.12	1	0
	#23	11.38	1.31	0	2
	#24	18.13	0.45	0	2
	#25	3.91	0.26	0	1
	#26	-17.52	0.09	2	0
	#27	11.95	0.11	0	2
	#28	10.01	0.21	0	1
	#29	22.43	1.09	0	0
	#30	-8.15	0.07	0	1
	#31	-9.05	0.61	2	1
	#32	2.86	0.14	0	1
	#33	-9.47	0.14	0	1
	#34	28.77	1.26	3	1
	#35	-8.48	0.31	0	1
	#36	-7.49	0.11	0	1
Visceral leishmaniasis	#37	-2.35	0.11	3	0
Human African trypanosomiasis	#38	6.73	1.92	0	2
	#39	11.93	1.32	0	0
	#40	39.10	0.62	0	1
	#41	5.12	1.04	0	0
	#42	11.63	1.02	0	0
	#43	3.60	1.39	0	0
	#44	6.40	0.19	2	0
Human American trypanosomiasis	#45	10.30	0.21	2	0
	#46	-5.36	0.07	1	0
	#47	-10.72	0.06	1	0
	#48	33.42	0.10	0	0
Strongyloidiasis	#49	94.12	5.32	3	2
Schistosomiasis	#50	12.40	1.49	0	0
	#51	50.30	1.69	2	2
	#52	15.99	0.04	0	1
	#53	5.51	0.09	0	1
Filariasis	#54	21.89	1.13	0	0
	#55	50.40	1.84	3	2
	#56	67.92	2.96	1	3
Trichinellosis	#57	5.76	0.05	0	1
	#58	22.57	0.02	1	0
	#59	5.88	3.77	0	0
Sera from parasite-suspects negative for all above diseases	#60	31.61	0.04	0	0