medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.08.26.21262426; this version posted September 5, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.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.




NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

# The comparability of Anti-Spike SARS-CoV-2 antibody tests is time-dependent: a prospective observational study

## Running title: Time-dependent agreement of antibody assays

Thomas Perkmann MD[a]*, Patrick Mucher MSc[a]*, Nicole Perkmann-Nagele MD[a], Astrid Radakovics MSc[a], Manuela Repl[a], Thomas Koller MD[a], Klaus G Schmetterer MD PhD[a], Johannes W Bigenzahn MD PhD[a], Florentina Leitner[a], Galateja Jordakieva MD PhD[b], Oswald F Wagner MD[a], Christoph J Binder MD PhD[a] and Helmuth Haslacher MD PhD[a]

*both authors contributed equally to the present manuscript

[a] Department of Laboratory Medicine, Medical University of Vienna, Austria

[b] Department of Physical Medicine, Rehabilitation and Occupational Medicine, Medical University of Vienna, Austria

Correspondence to:

Helmuth Haslacher MD PhD MSc BSc BA, Medical University of Vienna, Department of Laboratory Medicine, Waehringer Guertel 18-20, A-1090 Vienna, Austria, +43 1 40400 53190, helmuth.haslacher@meduniwien.ac.at

# Abstract

## Objectives

Various commercial anti-Spike SARS-CoV-2 antibody tests are used for studies and in clinical settings after vaccination. An international standard for SARS-CoV-2 antibodies has been established to achieve comparability of such tests, allowing conversions to BAU/ml. This study aimed to investigate the comparability of antibody tests regarding the timing of blood collection after vaccination.

## Methods

For this prospective observational study, antibody levels of 50 participants with homologous AZD1222 vaccination were evaluated at 3 and 11 weeks after the first dose and 3 weeks after the second dose using two commercial anti-Spike binding antibody assays (Roche and Abbott) and a surrogate neutralization assay.

## Results

The correlation between Roche and Abbott changed significantly depending on the time point studied. Although 3 weeks after the first dose, Abbott provided values three times higher than Roche, 11 weeks after the first dose, the values for Roche were twice as high as for Abbott, and 3 weeks after the second dose even 5-6 times higher.

## Conclusions

The comparability of quantitative anti-Spike SARS-CoV-2 antibody tests is highly dependent on the timing of blood collection after vaccination. Therefore, standardization of the timing of blood collection might be necessary for the comparability of different quantitative SARS-COV-2 antibody assays.



# Keywords

SARS-CoV-2; serology; vaccination; agreement; time-dependency

38 ## Introduction

39 Infectious diseases continue to pose a significant challenge for humanity, as the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic
40 has again demonstrated[1]. Nevertheless, in contrast to the past, diagnostic, therapeutic, and preventive
41 strategies are now being developed at an unprecedented rate to address these pandemic challenges.
42 Among all these strategies, however, one stands out: vaccination against SARS-CoV-2. Using new
43 technologies and extensive knowledge on active immunization against numerous pathogens, highly
44 efficient vaccines have been developed and applied within a few months[2].

45 The vaccination aims to induce a SARS-CoV-2 specific immune response in analogy to a passed infection,
46 which should protect against disease or even better against infection. The methodically simplest way to
47 objectify a particular immune reaction is to measure infection- or vaccine-induced specific antibodies[3,4].
48 Thus, antibody tests have been used for SARS-CoV-2 to confirm prior infection or detect unreported
49 infections as part of seroprevalence surveys[5–7]. Various antigens have been applied in this regard, which
50 fall into two classes: SARS-CoV-2 nucleocapsid-specific antibodies and antibodies directed against the
51 spike protein[8]. The latter antibodies, which are formed against components of the virus surface spike
52 protein, are induced by all COVID vaccines currently in use, making them an ideal surrogate for the
53 immune response after vaccination[9].

54 The need to establish quantitative assays to detect vaccine-induced antibodies was pointed out early
55 on[10]. Furthermore, an international standard for SARS-CoV-2 antibodies (NIBSC 20/136) was issued by
56 the WHO to improve the comparability of such assays[11]. Although there is currently no general
57 recommendation to determine antibody levels in all individuals after SARS-CoV-2 vaccination, this is
58 reasonable from a scientific perspective in the search for a correlate of protection and has been done in
59 numerous studies[12–19]. Moreover, it is now known that suboptimal or even lack of response to
60 vaccination can occur in specific groups like immunocompromised patients[20–26]. These potential non-
61 responders might be identified in a first step by determining the antibody levels after vaccination.

62 Unfortunately, there is little scientific evidence on the real-life comparability of different commercially
63 available quantitative test systems[27–29].

64 We could previously show that referencing the WHO SARS-CoV-2 antibody standard by reporting
65 standardized binding antibody units (BAU/mL) is insufficient for different test systems to provide
66 numerically comparable results[27]. We demonstrated this in a strictly standardized study setting
67 concerning the time of blood collection and the vaccine used: three weeks after the first dose of
68 BNT162b2. It was expected and has already been shown that antibody responses are dependent on the
69 type of vaccine used[30,31]. Moreover, time kinetics of post-vaccination antibody levels have been
70 described for different vaccines and various antibody assays[17,32–37]. However, whether and how these
71 influencing factors affect the comparability of different quantitative SARS-CoV-2 antibody tests has not
72 been systematically investigated. But answering these questions is fundamental to finding pragmatic
73 ways to compare results from various SARS-CoV-2 antibody tests.

74 In the present work, we aimed to expand knowledge on the comparability of quantitative anti-spike
75 SARS-CoV-2 assays using another commonly administered vaccine, AZD1222, combined with antibody
76 measurements at multiple time points: three weeks after the first vaccine dose, 11 weeks after the first
77 dose (immediately before the second dose), and finally three weeks after the second dose. Moreover,
78 pre- and post-booster levels were compared to SARS-CoV-2 specific T-cellular interferon γ responses.
79 This design allowed us, utilizing two of the most commonly used commercially available assays applied in
80 post-COVID vaccination antibody studies, the Roche Elecsys SARS-CoV-2 S-ECLIA[38–41]and the Abbott Anti-
81 SARS-CoV-2 IgG II[22,42,43], to examine in detail the comparability of the assays concerning the timing of
82 blood collection after vaccination.

# Methods

## Study design and participants

We included sera of 50 participants in this prospective observational performance evaluation study. Inclusion criteria were an age ≥18 years and willingness to donate blood in the course of the MedUni Wien Biobank's healthy blood donor collection (Medical University of Vienna ethics committee vote No. 404/2012). Incomplete follow-up samples and seropositivity for anti-nucleocapsid antibodies due to infection with SARS-CoV-2 lead to exclusion. The study protocol was reviewed and approved by the Medical University of Vienna ethics committee (1066/2021) and conforms with the Declaration of Helsinki.

## Laboratory methods

Blood samples were taken 3 weeks and 11 weeks ("pre-booster") after the first dose of AZD1222, as well as 3 weeks after dose 2. At pre- and post-booster time points, an additional amount of 4mL blood was drawn to estimate T-cellular immunity (see Fig. 1). Blood samples were processed and stored according to standard operating procedures by the MedUni Wien Biobank in an ISO 9001:2015 certified environment [44].

Previous SARS-CoV-2 infection was assessed by the Roche Elecsys SARS-CoV-2 nucleocapsid ECLIA (Roche, Rotkreuz, Switzerland) on cobas e801 modular analyzers (Roche)[45]. This assay detects total antibodies against the viral nucleocapsid, which are induced after infection, but not after vaccination with AZD1222.

Vaccine-induced antibodies against the viral spike protein were quantified using the Roche Elecsys SARS-CoV-2 S-ECLIA[46] and the Abbott Anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgG II[47,48]. This Roche test is a quantitative (range: 0.4 – 2,500 BAU/mL) total antibody sandwich assay recognizing antibodies directed against the receptor-binding domain (RBD) of the SARS-CoV-2 spike (S) protein and was performed on cobas e801 modular

106 analyzers (Roche), samples >0.8 BAU/mL are considered diagnostically positive. As a deviation from the
107 product manual, samples exceeding the quantification range were manually pre-diluted at a dilution
108 factor of 1:10. The Abbott assay also quantifies anti-RBD specific IgG-antibodies (range: 1.0-11,360.0
109 BAU/mL) and was applied on an Abbott Architect i2000r (Abbott, USA). The assay's threshold for
110 positivity is 7,1 BAU/mL.

111 Binding reactivities (Roche, Abbott) were compared to a well-described CE-IVD marked surrogate virus
112 neutralization test (GenScript cPass sVNT)[49–53]. This sVNT quantifies the serum's ability to inhibit
113 spike/ACE-2 interaction; results with an inhibition >30% are considered positive.

114 The T-cellular activity was estimated in pre- and post-booster whole blood samples using the
115 Quantiferon SARS-CoV-2 assay (Qiagen, Hilden, Germany [54–56]). In brief, we quantified the interferon
116 (IFN)γ-release after 21-hour incubation of 1 mL heparinized whole blood portions with two different
117 SARS-CoV-2 antigen mixtures (Ag1, Ag2), and with a negative ("Nil") and a mitogen control, using an
118 ELISA (Qiagen). For each patient and time point, IFNγ-values of the Nil control were subtracted from the
119 SARS-CoV-2 specific antigen mixes results of the samples and presented as Ag1-Nil and Ag2-Nil,
120 respectively.

## 121 Statistical analysis

122 Continuous data are presented as median (interquartile range), and categorical data as counts
123 (percentages). Paired data are compared by Wilcoxon- and Friedman-Tests. Correlations are calculated
124 according to Spearman. Serological assays are compared by Passing-Bablok regressions, which assess
125 differences between two test systems by estimating the slope (systematic proportional differences) and
126 the intercept (systematic constant differences) of a linear regression line. There are no preconditions
127 regarding the distribution of the measured values and the measurement errors to be met. P-values <0.05
128 were considered statistically significant. All calculations have been performed using MedCalc 19.7

129 (MedCalc bvba, Ostend, Belgium) and SPSS 26 (IBM, Armonk, USA). Graphs were drawn with Prism 9
130 (GraphPad, La Jolla, USA).

# 131 Results

## 132 Agreement between Roche and Abbott assays depends on the timing of blood collection

133 Blood samples of 50 individuals were collected 3 weeks and 11 weeks after the first dose of AZD1222 (11
134 weeks = ”pre-booster”) and 3 weeks after the second dose (“post-booster”). Participant characteristics
135 and binding assay levels at all assessed time points are presented in Tbl. 1 and Fig. 2.

136 In brief, Roche S antibody levels significantly increased from 13.55 BAU/mL (5.21-29.88) at 3 weeks after
137 the first dose to 60.20 (36.38-112.80) directly before the booster (all P<0.0001). 3 weeks after the
138 booster, the median levels were 895.50 (611.80-1681.00). With Abbott, results remained stable between
139 3 and 11 weeks after the first dose: 42.23 BAU/mL (26.00-78.99) and 32.88 (20.78-53.69), P=0.178, and
140 rose to 171.20 (123.40-278.70) 3 weeks after the booster (P<0.0001). Similar to the Abbott test, the
141 sVNT did not show significant changes between week 3 and 11 after the first dose but significantly
142 increased 3 weeks after the second dose: 47.1 % inhibition (35.5-60.6), 49.0 (35.2-62.4), 95.2 (92.1-97.9),
143 $P_{3w\ post\text{-}booster\ vs.\ pre\text{-}booster\ or\ 3w\ after\ dose\ 1}$<0.0001. In terms of relative changes in antibody levels for individual
144 participants when comparing 3 and 11 weeks after the first dose versus 3 weeks after the second dose,
145 we observed a 14.2 (8.4-30.8) and 80.8 [27.4-191.0] fold change in titers for Roche, and a 4.9 (3.0-10.1)
146 and 4.5 [2.2-9.9] fold change for Abbott. Thus, the Roche test discriminated increases in antibody levels
147 between weeks 3 and 11 after the first dose: 4.7 (2.2-9.5), whereas Abbott did not: 0.8 (0.5-1.4).

148 3 weeks after the first dose, results from Roche and Abbott binding assays showed a moderate
149 correlation (ρ=0.755, P<0.0001). Passing-Bablok regression analysis revealed the following equation:
150 Abbott = 7.4 + 2.99*Roche, whereby only the slope of the equation was statistically significant (2.06 –
151 17); intercept: -4.0 – 13.9). The agreement between both tests improved markedly 11 weeks after the

152 first dose, with the correlation coefficient rising to ρ=0.902, P<0.0001. Passing-Bablok regression
153 revealed that BAU/mL derived from Abbott were approximately half those measured by Roche: Abbott =
154 1.1 + 0.50 * Roche (intercept: -2.4 – 5.5, slope: 0.43 – 0.56). 3 weeks after dose 2, the correlation
155 between Roche and Abbott results remained excellent (ρ=0.950, P<0.0001); however, the conversion
156 between the values changed again, with Roche values approximately 5-6 times higher than Abbott
157 results: Abbott = 13.3 + 0.178 * Roche (intercept: -4.5 – 29.5; slope: 0.16 – 0.20). (Figure 3)

## 158 Correlation between binding assay and sVNT results

159 Next, we aimed to determine which of the two binding assays correlated better with neutralizing
160 antibodies, particularly 3 weeks after the first dose, where the agreement between Roche and Abbott
161 results was poorest. Neutralizing antibodies were estimated using the CE-IVD labeled cPass sVNT, with
162 30% inhibition as the threshold for positivity. 3w after the first dose, 6/50 (12%) participants yielded
163 results below this threshold, with a median inhibition of 47.1 % (35.5-60.6). At week 11, directly before
164 the booster, 4 of them rose above 30% inhibition, but two with initially positive results decreased below
165 the threshold, resulting in a total of 4 individuals (8%) below 30% inhibition. The median neutralizing
166 capacity remained nearly unchanged at an inhibition of 49.0 % (35.2-62.4). 3w after the booster dose, all
167 but one participant presented with at least medium neutralizing capacity (>60%, see Fig. 2). The median
168 increased to 95.2 % inhibition (92.1-97.9) at week 3 post booster; see Tbl. 1 and Fig. 2b.

169 As shown in Fig. 4, sVNT percent inhibition at 3 weeks after the first dose correlated with the Abbott
170 assay at ρ=0.887, P<0.0001; in contrast, the correlation with the Roche test was slightly lower at ρ=0.666
171 (P<0.0001). At 11 weeks after the first dose, sVNT results correlated very well with both assays (Abbott:
172 ρ=0.930, Roche: ρ=0.894, both P<0.0001). Similar results were observed at 3 weeks after the booster
173 (Abbott: ρ=0.877, Roche: ρ=0.837, both P<0.0001).

174 These data suggest that qualitative differences between early and late SARS-CoV-2 antibodies may affect
175 the comparability of serological tests.

## Relative changes of T-cellular responses, but not absolute IFNγ-levels, correlate with antibody levels

Finally, we examined the interactions between T-cellular and antibody responses (quantified with the Abbott and the Roche test). For this purpose, we compared the changes between the time before the booster (=11 after the first dose) and the time after the booster (3 weeks after the second dose). IFNγ-response to both used antigen mixtures (Ag1 and Ag2) increased after the booster shot: Ag1-Nil 0.10 IU/mL (0.05 – 0.16) to 0.15 IU/mL (0.09 – 0.32), P<0.0001; Ag2-Nil 0.16 IU/mL (0.09 – 0.31) to 0.31 IU/mL (0.16 – 0.98), see Fig. 3 and Tbl. 1. Levels from both antigen mixtures correlated well with each other (pre-booster ρ=0.725, P<0.0001; post-booster ρ=0.775, P<0.0001), see Fig. 5. Moreover, pre-booster levels were in good agreement with post-booster levels (Ag1-Nil ρ=0.786, P<0.0001; Ag2-Nil ρ=0.832, P<0.0001).

Pre-booster interferon γ (IFNγ)-levels only weakly correlated with antibody levels. In fact, most correlations lacked statistical significance, and no relevant correlation was found 3 weeks after the booster. In contrast, the relative changes of cellular and binding assay antibody responses, calculated as 100*(post-booster – pre-booster)/pre-booster, correlated significantly after incubation with Ag2; however, for Ag1 statistical significance could not be reached (see Tbl. 2). Interestingly, no such correlation was observed for the sVNT.

# Discussion

SARS-CoV-2 specific anti-spike protein assays have been and are still widely used for serological studies[57]. In contrast to seroprevalence studies, where discriminating between positive and negative is usually sufficient, quantitative results are needed to adequately describe the response to SARS-CoV-2 vaccines and, ideally, to find a protective correlate[19,58]. However, there is a major obstacle on the way to such a protection correlate: the need for comparability of quantitative measurement results of different SARS-

199 CoV-2 antibody tests[10,11]. In the present work, we compared two commercially available and broadly
200 used CE-IVD marked SARS-CoV-2 antibody assays (Roche and Abbott). Both assays quantitate antibodies
201 directed against the RBD domain of the SARS-CoV-2 spike protein and were referenced against the first
202 WHO standard for SARS-CoV-2 antibodies, thus providing results in BAU/mL. We demonstrated in a
203 previous study after vaccination with BNT162b that despite the standardization of SARS-CoV-2 antibody
204 assays according to the first WHO standard for SARS-CoV-2 antibodies, the numerical values of different
205 test systems are not interchangeable[27]. In the present work, we show for the first time that the problem
206 of comparability is even more profound because the conversion of results may change dramatically with
207 the time interval from vaccination.

208 Using samples from 50 individuals vaccinated with AZD1222, we could show that both assays detected
209 SARS-CoV-2 specific antibodies in all but two participants 3 weeks after the first dose. Both non-
210 responders were taking immunosuppressive drugs, which numerous studies have shown can lead to a
211 decreased to absent response to the vaccine[59–61]. However, after the booster dose, the antibody levels
212 markedly increased and reached detectable levels in all participants (Table 1 and Figure 2A). So, in
213 contrast to people with previous COVID[62–65], the second dose was required in our SARS-CoV-2 naïve
214 population (negative for anti-nucleocapsid antibodies at all timepoints) to induce high antibody levels.
215 The median relative change of individual antibody levels 3 weeks after the first versus 3 weeks after the
216 second dose was nearly 20-times higher for Roche than for Abbott (80.8 vs. 4.5-fold change); see also
217 Figure 2B. Despite targeting the same antigen (RBD) and converting to the same units (BAU/mL) using
218 the first WHO standard for SARS-CoV-2 antibodies, not even the relative increases in antibody levels
219 turned out to be comparable. The limited comparability of serological assays after vaccination is not
220 specific for the AstraZeneca vaccine, as it was also observed after immunization with Pfizer/BioNTech
221 BNT162b2[27].

222 Furthermore, when looking at the difference between 3 and 11 weeks after the first vaccination dose, it
223 was found that both the Abbott test and the cPass sVNT did not detect an increase in antibodies (Figure
224 2). In contrast, antibody levels measured by the Roche test increased >4-fold during this period. This
225 discrepancy could be either explained by the inability of the Abbott and sVNT assays to distinguish such
226 small changes in antibody concentration or the possibility that the Roche assay detects not only
227 quantitative but also qualitative changes of the antibodies formed. Because previous studies failed to
228 demonstrate a continuous increase in antibody levels for AZD1222 later than three weeks after
229 vaccination, the Roche total antibody sandwich assay may also be sensitive to qualitative changes in
230 nascent antibodies, in contrast to the Abbott IgG-specific assay[16,66]. This hypothesis is also supported by
231 the observation that in direct comparison with the sVNT, the Roche assay underestimated inhibitory
232 capacities at week 3 (Figure 4), which is discussed in detail below. Thus, overall, the assays studied show
233 significant differences in the kinetics of antibody levels, which has been reported previously but was only
234 rarely demonstrated from the same sample with different assays[28,67]. Although the correlation between
235 Roche and Abbott improved over time, their relationship changed significantly depending on the time of
236 blood sampling (Figure 3). At the first time point, Roche measured three times lower values in BAU/mL
237 than the Abbott assay, 11 weeks after the first dose, Roche measured twice as high as Abbott, and
238 finally, after the booster, Roche was median 5-6 times higher than Abbott.

239 As shown in numerous studies before, detection of SARS-CoV-2 anti-spike binding antibodies correlates
240 well with the presence of functional neutralizing antibodies, so we wanted to examine differences
241 between Roche and Abbott assays in this regard [68–73]. The agreement between the results of the binding
242 antibody assays and the neutralization test surrogate was generally good (Figure 4). In particular, at 11
243 weeks after the first vaccination, the correlation was excellent; after the booster, the correlation was
244 technically limited due to many participants reaching the plateau of the sVNT. However, the worst
245 correlation was found for the first antibody response 3 weeks after the first dose, and here Roche

246 performed significantly worse than Abbott. This finding may be important because the improvement in
247 Roche/sVNT correlation from ρ=0.666 to ρ=0.894 between 3 and 11 weeks after the first dose may
248 indicate reduced sensitivity of the Roche assay for early antibodies. In other words, the discrepancy
249 mentioned above that only Roche showed increasing antibody levels between 3 and 11 weeks after the
250 first dose, while the other two tests showed identical or even slightly decreasing levels (Figure 2), could
251 mean that the Roche test requires more matured antibodies to allow binding. It seems understandable
252 that the binding of antibodies to two antigens, as necessary in the Roche sandwich test, places higher
253 demands on the binding ability of antibodies than is the case in a typical anti-IgG-based detection
254 method.

255 In line with previous studies, the second dose of AZD1222 substantially enhanced the initial antibody
256 response in our cohort [31,66,74]. Therefore, we wanted to investigate the relationship between the
257 antibody levels and the cellular responses elicited by the booster. For this purpose, we used a SARS-COV-
258 2 Quantiferon IFN-γ release assay similar to those known from tuberculosis diagnostics and compared
259 the pre-booster and post-booster timepoints. As previously shown[75], the second vaccination dose
260 induced an increase in cellular reactivity (Figure 5). However, we found only weak, mostly statistically
261 non-significant correlations between antibody levels and IFN- γ levels before the booster and no
262 correlation at all after the booster (Table 2).

263 In contrast, the percent cellular response (fold change) to the booster correlated significantly with the
264 percent antibody response (ρ=0.33 for both binding assays), see Table 2. This finding suggests that the
265 increase of antibodies after a booster shot, which is detected by both binding assays, can be
266 substantiated by an accompanying cellular reaction. In contrast, we found no correlation between the
267 relative changes in cellular and sVNT response, which might be partly explained by the limited
268 measurement range of the sVNT. However, since not all antibodies formed are functionally active
269 neutralizing antibodies (NAbs), even not all of those specifically directed against the RBD domain of the

270 spike protein, the binding antibodies may be superior to the measurement of NAbs here as a correlate
271 for cellular activation.

272 This study has several strengths and limitations: although 50 participants might be considered a
273 relatively small cohort, we have shown in previous work that this number is sufficient for such
274 comparative approaches and that our data could be replicated in much larger cohorts[27,76]. One strength
275 of our study is that we followed exact time points for blood sampling in the context of a prospective
276 observational study. Furthermore, our cohort using AZD1222 (inducing significantly lower median
277 antibody levels than, e.g., BNT162b2) has the advantage of a broader distribution of values across the
278 measurable spectrum with a very low proportion of results above 1,000 BAU/mL. As this value
279 represents the upper limit of referencing with the WHO SARS-CoV-2 antibody standard, a linear
280 relationship is no longer guaranteed for values above this, leading to unwanted biases in comparing
281 different antibody tests.

282 In summary, with the present work, we show for the first time that the comparability of quantitative
283 anti-spike SARS-CoV-2 antibody tests is highly dependent on the timing of blood collection. Therefore, it
284 does not seem feasible to compare different quantitative SARS-COV-2 antibody results without
285 standardization of the time of collection.

## 286 Acknowledgments

287 We thank all sample donors for their valuable contributions. We further thank Martina Trella, Susanne
288 Keim, Borka Radovanovic-Petrova, Monika Martiny, Jadwiga Konarski, Bernhard Haunold, Maedeh
289 Iravany, and Shohreh Lashgari for perfect technical and administrative assistance. The MedUni Wien
290 Biobank is part of the Austrian biobanking consortium BBMRI.at.

The Department of Laboratory Medicine received compensation for advertisement on scientific symposia from Roche and Abbott and holds a grant for evaluating an in vitro diagnostic device from Roche.

There was no specific funding received for the present work.

## References

1 Cloeckaert Axel, Kuchler Karl. Grand Challenges in Infectious Diseases: Are We Prepared for Worst-Case Scenarios? *Front Microbiol* 2020;11:613383. Doi: 10.3389/fmicb.2020.613383.

2 Krammer F. SARS-CoV-2 vaccines in development. *Nature* 2020;586(7830):516–27. Doi: 10.1038/s41586-020-2798-3.

3 Jackson L. A., Anderson E. J., Rouphael N. G., Roberts P. C., Makhene M., Coler R. N., et al. An mRNA Vaccine against SARS-CoV-2 - Preliminary Report. *New Engl J Med* 2020;383(20):1920–31. Doi: 10.1056/nejmoa2022483.

4 Walsh Edward E., Jr. Robert W. Frenck, Falsey Ann R., Kitchin Nicholas, Absalon Judith, Gurtman Alejandra, et al. Safety and Immunogenicity of Two RNA-Based Covid-19 Vaccine Candidates. *New Engl J Med* 2020;383(25):2439–50. Doi: 10.1056/nejmoa2027906.

5 Stringhini S., Wisniak A., Piumatti G., Azman A. S., Lauer S. A., Baysson H., et al. Seroprevalence of anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgG antibodies in Geneva, Switzerland (SEROCoV-POP): a population-based study. *Lancet* 2020;396(10247):313–9. Doi: 10.1016/s0140-6736(20)31304-0.

6 Buss L. F., A. Jr. Prete C., Abrahim C. M. M., A. Jr. Mendrone, Salomon T., Almeida-Neto C. de, et al. Three-quarters attack rate of SARS-CoV-2 in the Brazilian Amazon during a largely unmitigated epidemic. *Science* 2021;371(6526):288–92. Doi: 10.1126/science.abe9728.

312 7 Pollan M., Perez-Gomez B., Pastor-Barriuso R., Oteo J., Hernan M. A., Perez-Olmeda M., et al.
313 Prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 in Spain (ENE-COVID): a nationwide, population-based seroepidemiological
314 study. *Lancet* 2020;396(10250):535–44. Doi: 10.1016/s0140-6736(20)31483-5.

315 8 Wang H., Ai J., Loeffelholz M. J., Tang Y. W., Zhang W. Meta-analysis of diagnostic performance of
316 serology tests for COVID-19: impact of assay design and post-symptom-onset intervals. *Emerg Microbes*
317 *Infec* 2020;9(1):2200–11. Doi: 10.1080/22221751.2020.1826362.

318 9 Vabret Nicolas, Britton Graham J., Gruber Conor, Hegde Samarth, Kim Joel, Kuksin Maria, et al.
319 Immunology of COVID-19: Current State of the Science. *Immunity* 2020;52(6):910–41. Doi:
320 10.1016/j.immuni.2020.05.002.

321 10 Gundlapalli A. V., Salerno R. M., Brooks J. T., Averhoff F., Petersen L. R., McDonald L. C., et al. SARS-
322 CoV-2 Serologic Assay Needs for the Next Phase of the US COVID-19 Pandemic Response. *Open Forum*
323 *Infect Dis* 2021;8(1):ofaa555. Doi: 10.1093/ofid/ofaa555.

324 11 Kristiansen Paul A, Page Mark, Bernasconi Valentina, Mattiuzzo Giada, Dull Peter, Makar Karen, et al.
325 WHO International Standard for anti-SARS-CoV-2 immunoglobulin. *Lancet* 2021. Doi: 10.1016/s0140-
326 6736(21)00527-4.

327 12 Collier Ai-ris Y., McMahan Katherine, Yu Jingyou, Tostanoski Lisa H., Aguayo Ricardo, Ansel Jessica, et
328 al. Immunogenicity of COVID-19 mRNA Vaccines in Pregnant and Lactating Women. *Jama* 2021;325(23).
329 Doi: 10.1001/jama.2021.7563.

330 13 Collier Dami A., Ferreira Isabella A. T. M., Kotagiri Prasanti, Datir Rawlings, Lim Eleanor, Touizer
331 Emma, et al. Age-related immune response heterogeneity to SARS-CoV-2 vaccine BNT162b2. *Nature*
332 2021:1–9. Doi: 10.1038/s41586-021-03739-1.

333 14 Jeewandara Chandima, Kamaladasa Achala, Pushpakumara Pradeep Darshana, Jayathilaka Deshni,
334 Aberathna Inoka Sepali, Danasekara Danasekara Rallage Saubhagya Rasikangani, et al. Immune
335 responses to a single dose of the AZD1222/Covishield vaccine in health care workers. *Nat Commun*
336 2021;12(1):4617. Doi: 10.1038/s41467-021-24579-7.

337 15 Schmidt Tina, Klemis Verena, Schub David, Mihm Janine, Hielscher Franziska, Marx Stefanie, et al.
338 Immunogenicity and reactogenicity of heterologous ChAdOx1 nCoV-19/mRNA vaccination. *Nat Med*
339 2021:1–6. Doi: 10.1038/s41591-021-01464-w.

340 16 Wei Jia, Stoesser Nicole, Matthews Philippa C., Ayoubkhani Daniel, Studley Ruth, Bell Iain, et al.
341 Antibody responses to SARS-CoV-2 vaccines in 45,965 adults from the general population of the United
342 Kingdom. *Nat Microbiol* 2021:1–10. Doi: 10.1038/s41564-021-00947-3.

343 17 Pegu Amarendra, O'Connell Sarah, Schmidt Stephen D., O'Dell Sijy, Talana Chloe A., Lai Lilin, et al.
344 Durability of mRNA-1273 vaccine–induced antibodies against SARS-CoV-2 variants. *Science*
345 2021:eabj4176. Doi: 10.1126/science.abj4176.

346 18 Krammer Florian. A correlate of protection for SARS-CoV-2 vaccines is urgently needed. *Nat Med*
347 2021;27(7):1147–8. Doi: 10.1038/s41591-021-01432-4.

348 19 Corbett Kizzmekia S., Nason Martha C., Flach Britta, Gagne Matthew, O'Connell Sarah, Johnston
349 Timothy S., et al. Immune correlates of protection by mRNA-1273 vaccine against SARS-CoV-2 in
350 nonhuman primates. *Science* 2021:eabj0299. Doi: 10.1126/science.abj0299.

351 20 Blain Hubert, Tuaillon Edouard, Gamon Lucie, Pisoni Amandine, Miot Stéphanie, Rolland Yves, et al.
352 Antibody response after one and two jabs of the BNT162b2 vaccine in nursing home residents: The
353 CONsort-19 study. *Allergy* 2021. Doi: 10.1111/all.15007.

354 21 Tzarfati Katrin Herzog, Gutwein Odit, Apel Arie, Rahimi-Levene Naomi, Sadovnik Maya, Harel Lotem,
355 et al. BNT162b2 COVID-19 Vaccine is significantly less effective in patients with hematologic
356 malignancies. *Am J Hematol* 2021. Doi: 10.1002/ajh.26284.

357 22 Prendecki Maria, Clarke Candice, Edwards Helena, McIntyre Stacey, Mortimer Paige, Gleeson Sarah,
358 et al. Humoral and T-cell responses to SARS-CoV-2 vaccination in patients receiving immunosuppression.
359 *Ann Rheum Dis* 2021:annrheumdis-2021-220626. Doi: 10.1136/annrheumdis-2021-220626.

360 23 Mrak Daniel, Tobudic Selma, Koblischke Maximilian, Graninger Marianne, Radner Helga, Sieghart
361 Daniela, et al. SARS-CoV-2 vaccination in rituximab-treated patients: B cells promote humoral immune
362 responses in the presence of T-cell-mediated immunity. *Ann Rheum Dis* 2021:annrheumdis-2021-
363 220781. Doi: 10.1136/annrheumdis-2021-220781.

364 24 S Guerrieri, S Lazzarin, C Zanetta, A Nozzolillo, M Filippi, L Moiola. Serological response to SARS-CoV-2
365 vaccination in multiple sclerosis patients treated with fingolimod or ocrelizumab: an initial real-life
366 experience. *J Neurol* 2021:1–5. Doi: 10.1007/s00415-021-10663-x.

367 25 Lacson Eduardo, Argyropoulos Christos, Manley Harold, Aweh Gideon, Chin Andrew, Salman Loay, et
368 al. Immunogenicity of SARS-CoV-2 Vaccine in Dialysis. *J Am Soc Nephrol* 2021:ASN.2021040432. Doi:
369 10.1681/asn.2021040432.

370 26 Stampfer Samuel D., Goldwater Marissa-Skye, Jew Scott, Bujarski Sean, Regidor Bernard, Daniely
371 David, et al. Response to mRNA vaccination for COVID-19 among patients with multiple myeloma.
372 *Leukemia* 2021:1–8. Doi: 10.1038/s41375-021-01354-7.

373 27 Perkmann Thomas, Perkmann-Nagele Nicole, Koller Thomas, Mucher Patrick, Radakovics Astrid,
374 Marculescu Rodrig, et al. Anti-Spike Protein Assays to Determine SARS-CoV-2 Antibody Levels: a Head-to-

375 Head Comparison of Five Quantitative Assays. *Microbiol Spectr* 2021;9(1):e00247-21. Doi:
376 10.1128/spectrum.00247-21.

377 28 Lukaszuk Krzysztof, Kiewisz Jolanta, Rozanska Karolina, Dabrowska Malgorzata, Podolak Amira, Jakiel
378 Grzegorz, et al. Usefulness of IVD Kits for the Assessment of SARS-CoV-2 Antibodies to Evaluate the
379 Humoral Response to Vaccination. *Nato Adv Sci Inst Se* 2021;9(8):840. Doi: 10.3390/vaccines9080840.

380 29 Meo Ashley Di, Miller Jessica J, Fabros Ansel, Brinc Davor, Hall Victor, Pinzon Natalia, et al. Evaluation
381 of Three anti-SARS-CoV-2 Serologic Immunoassays for Post-Vaccine Response. *J Appl Laboratory*
382 *Medicine* 2021:jfab087. Doi: 10.1093/jalm/jfab087.

383 30 Eyre David W., Lumley Sheila F., Wei Jia, Cox Stuart, James Tim, Justice Anita, et al. Quantitative SARS-
384 CoV-2 anti-spike responses to Pfizer-BioNTech and Oxford-AstraZeneca vaccines by previous infection
385 status. *Clin Microbiol Infec* 2021. Doi: 10.1016/j.cmi.2021.05.041.

386 31 Perkmann Thomas, Perkmann-Nagele Nicole, Mucher Patrick, Radakovics Astrid, Repl Manuela, Koller
387 Thomas, et al. Initial SARS-CoV-2 vaccination response can predict booster response for BNT162b2 but
388 not for AZD1222. *Int J Infect Dis* 2021. Doi: 10.1016/j.ijid.2021.07.063.

389 32 Fraley Elizabeth, LeMaster Cas, Geanes Eric, Banerjee Dithi, Khanal Santosh, Grundberg Elin, et al.
390 Humoral immune responses during SARS-CoV-2 mRNA vaccine administration in seropositive and
391 seronegative individuals. *Bmc Med* 2021;19(1):169. Doi: 10.1186/s12916-021-02055-9.

392 33 Buonfrate Dora, Piubelli Chiara, Gobbi Federico, Martini Davide, Bertoli Giulia, Ursini Tamara, et al.
393 Antibody response induced by the BNT162b2 mRNA COVID-19 vaccine in a cohort of health-care
394 workers, with or without prior SARS-CoV-2 infection: a prospective study. *Clin Microbiol Infec* 2021. Doi:
395 10.1016/j.cmi.2021.07.024.

396 34 Salvagno Gian Luca, Henry Brandon M., Pighi Laura, Nitto Simone De, Gianfilippi Gian Luca, Lippi
397 Giuseppe. Three-month analysis of total humoral response to Pfizer BNT162b2 mRNA COVID-19
398 vaccination in healthcare workers. *J Infection* 2021;83(2):e4–5. Doi: 10.1016/j.jinf.2021.06.024.

399 35 Kaneko Shun, Kurosaki Masayuki, Sugiyama Toru, Takahashi Yuka, Yamaguchi Yoshimi, Nagasawa
400 Masayuki, et al. The dynamics of quantitative SARS-CoV-2 anti-spike IgG response to BNT162b2
401 vaccination. *J Med Virol* 2021. Doi: 10.1002/jmv.27231.

402 36 Wheeler Sarah E., Shurin Galina V., Yost Mary, Anderson Adam, Pinto Lisa, Wells Alan, et al.
403 Differential Antibody Response to mRNA COVID-19 Vaccines in Healthy Subjects. *Microbiol Spectr*
404 2021;9(1):e00341-21. Doi: 10.1128/spectrum.00341-21.

405 37 Tré-Hardy Marie, Cupaiolo Roberto, Wilmet Alain, Beukinga Ingrid, Blairon Laurent. Waning
406 antibodies in SARS-CoV-2 naïve vaccinees: results of a three-month interim analysis of ongoing
407 immunogenicity and efficacy surveillance of the mRNA-1273 vaccine in healthcare workers. *J Infection*
408 2021. Doi: 10.1016/j.jinf.2021.06.017.

409 38 Borobia Alberto M, Carcas Antonio J, Pérez-Olmeda Mayte, Castaño Luis, Bertran María Jesús, García-
410 Pérez Javier, et al. Immunogenicity and reactogenicity of BNT162b2 booster in ChAdOx1-S-primed
411 participants (CombiVacS): a multicentre, open-label, randomised, controlled, phase 2 trial. *Lancet* 2021.
412 Doi: 10.1016/s0140-6736(21)01420-3.

413 39 Callegaro Annapaola, Borleri Daniela, Farina Claudio, Napolitano Gavino, Valenti Daniela, Rizzi Marco,
414 et al. Antibody response to SARS-CoV-2 vaccination is extremely vivacious in subjects with previous
415 SARS-CoV-2 infection. *J Med Virol* 2021. Doi: 10.1002/jmv.26982.

416 40 Michos Athanasios, Tatsi Elizabeth-Barbara, Filippatos Fillipos, Dellis Charilaos, Koukou Dimitra,
417 Efthymiou Vasiliki, et al. Association of total and neutralizing SARS-CoV-2 spike -Receptor Binding

418 Domain antibodies with epidemiological and clinical characteristics after immunization with the 1st and
419 2nd doses of the BNT162b2 vaccine. *Vaccine* 2021. Doi: 10.1016/j.vaccine.2021.07.067.

420 41 Douxfils Jonathan, Gillot Constant, Mullier François, Favresse Julien. Post-SARS-CoV-2 vaccination
421 specific antibody decrease — Thresholds for determining seroprevalence and seroneutralization differ. *J*
422 *Infection* 2021. Doi: 10.1016/j.jinf.2021.08.023.

423 42 Ebinger Joseph E., Fert-Bober Justyna, Printsev Ignat, Wu Min, Sun Nancy, Prostko John C., et al.
424 Antibody responses to the BNT162b2 mRNA vaccine in individuals previously infected with SARS-CoV-2.
425 *Nat Med* 2021:1–4. Doi: 10.1038/s41591-021-01325-6.

426 43 Konstantinidis Theocharis G, Zisaki Stavroula, Mitroulis Ioannis, Konstantinidou Eleni, Kontekaki
427 Eftychia G, Romanidou Gioulia, et al. Levels of Produced Antibodies after Vaccination with mRNA
428 Vaccine; Effect of Previous Infection with SARS-CoV-2. *J Clin Medicine* 2021;10(13):2842. Doi:
429 10.3390/jcm10132842.

430 44 Haslacher H., Gerner M., Hofer P., Jurkowitsch A., Hainfellner J., Kain R., et al. Usage Data and
431 Scientific Impact of the Prospectively Established Fluid Bioresources at the Hospital-Based MedUni Wien
432 Biobank. *Biopreserv Biobank* 2018;16(6):477–82. Doi: 10.1089/bio.2018.0032.

433 45 Perkmann Thomas, Perkmann-Nagele Nicole, Breyer Marie-Kathrin, Breyer-Kohansal Robab,
434 Burghuber Otto C, Hartl Sylvia, et al. Side by side comparison of three fully automated SARS-CoV-2
435 antibody assays with a focus on specificity. *Clin Chem* 2020;66(11):hvaa198-. Doi:
436 10.1093/clinchem/hvaa198.

437 46 Higgins V., Fabros A., Kulasingam V. Quantitative measurement of anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibodies:
438 Analytical and clinical evaluation. *J Clin Microbiol* 2021;59(4). Doi: 10.1128/jcm.03149-20.

439 47 Narasimhan Madhusudhanan, Mahimainathan Lenin, Araj Ellen, Clark Andrew E, Markantonis John,
440 Green Allen, et al. Clinical evaluation of the Abbott Alinity SARS-CoV-2 spike-specific quantitative IgG and
441 IgM assays among infected, recovered, and vaccinated groups. *J Clin Microbiol* 2021. Doi:
442 10.1128/jcm.00388-21.

443 48 English Emma, Cook Laura E, Piec Isabelle, Dervisevic Samir, Fraser William D, John W Garry.
444 Performance of the Abbott SARS-CoV-2 IgG II Quantitative antibody assay including the new Variants of
445 Concern (VOC 202012/V1 (UK) and VOC 202012/V2 (South Africa)): And first steps towards global
446 harmonization of COVID-19 antibody methods. *J Clin Microbiol* 2021:JCM0028821. Doi:
447 10.1128/jcm.00288-21.

448 49 Nandakumar Vijayalakshmi, Profaizer Tracie, Lozier Bucky K, Elgort Marc G, Larragoite Erin T, Williams
449 Elizabeth S C P, et al. Evaluation of a Surrogate ELISA- Based Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome
450 Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) cPass Neutralization Antibody Detection Assay and Correlation with IgG
451 Commercial Serology Assays. *Arch Pathol Lab Med* 2021. Doi: 10.5858/arpa.2021-0213-sa.

452 50 Papenburg Jesse, Cheng Matthew P, Corsini Rachel, Caya Chelsea, Mendoza Emelissa, Manguiat
453 Kathy, et al. Evaluation of a Commercial Culture-free Neutralization Antibody Detection Kit for Severe
454 Acute Respiratory Syndrome-Related Coronavirus-2 and Comparison with an Anti-RBD ELISA Assay. *Open*
455 *Forum Infect Dis* 2021. Doi: 10.1093/ofid/ofab220.

456 51 Murray Matthew J, McIntosh Megan, Atkinson Claire, Mahungu Tabitha, Wright Edward, Chatterton
457 Wendy, et al. Validation of a commercially available indirect assay for SARS-CoV-2 neutralising antibodies
458 using a pseudotyped virus assay. *J Infection* 2021. Doi: 10.1016/j.jinf.2021.03.010.

459 52 Taylor Sean C, Hurst Beth, Charlton Carmen L, Bailey Ashley, Kanji Jamil N, McCarthy Mary K, et al. A
460 New SARS-CoV-2 Dual-Purpose Serology Test: Highly Accurate Infection Tracing and Neutralizing
461 Antibody Response Detection. *J Clin Microbiol* 2021;59(4). Doi: 10.1128/jcm.02438-20.

462 53 Tan Chee Wah, Chia Wan Ni, Qin Xijian, Liu Pei, Chen Mark I.-C., Tiu Charles, et al. A SARS-CoV-2
463 surrogate virus neutralization test based on antibody-mediated blockage of ACE2–spike protein–protein
464 interaction. *Nat Biotechnol* 2020;38(9):1073–8. Doi: 10.1038/s41587-020-0631-z.

465 54 Schramm René, Costard-Jäckle Angelika, Rivinius Rasmus, Fischer Bastian, Müller Benjamin, Boeken
466 Udo, et al. Poor humoral and T-cell response to two-dose SARS-CoV-2 messenger RNA vaccine BNT162b2
467 in cardiothoracic transplant recipients. *Clin Res Cardiol* 2021:1–8. Doi: 10.1007/s00392-021-01880-5.

468 55 Re Daniel, Seitz-Polski Barbara, Carles Michel, Brglez Vesna, Graça Daisy, Benzaken Sylvia, et al.
469 Humoral and cellular responses after a third dose of BNT162b2 vaccine in patients treated for lymphoid
470 malignancies. *Medrxiv* 2021:2021.07.18.21260669. Doi: 10.1101/2021.07.18.21260669.

471 56 Jaganathan Soumya, Stieber Francis, Rao Sonia N, Nikolayevskyy Vladyslav, Manissero Davide, Allen
472 Nadia, et al. Preliminary Evaluation of QuantiFERON SARS-CoV-2 and QIAreach Anti-SARS-CoV-2 Total
473 Test in Recently Vaccinated Individuals 2021. Doi: 10.21203/rs.3.rs-623620/v1.

474 57 Arora R. K., Joseph A., Wyk J. Van, Rocco S., Atmaja A., May E., et al. SeroTracker: a global SARS-CoV-2
475 seroprevalence dashboard. *Lancet Infect Dis* 2021;21(4):e75–6. Doi: 10.1016/s1473-3099(20)30631-9.

476 58 Bergwerk Moriah, Gonen Tal, Lustig Yaniv, Amit Sharon, Lipsitch Marc, Cohen Carmit, et al. Covid-19
477 Breakthrough Infections in Vaccinated Health Care Workers. *New Engl J Med* 2021. Doi:
478 10.1056/nejmoa2109072.

479 59 Benotmane Ilies, Gautier Gabriela, Perrin Peggy, Olagne Jérôme, Cognard Noëlle, Fafi-Kremer Samira,
480 et al. Antibody Response After a Third Dose of the mRNA-1273 SARS-CoV-2 Vaccine in Kidney Transplant
481 Recipients With Minimal Serologic Response to 2 Doses. *Jama* 2021;326(11). Doi:
482 10.1001/jama.2021.12339.

483 60 Louapre Céline, Ibrahim Michella, Maillart Elisabeth, Abdi Basma, Papeix Caroline, Stankoff Bruno, et
484 al. Anti-CD20 therapies decrease humoral immune response to SARS-CoV-2 in patients with multiple
485 sclerosis or neuromyelitis optica spectrum disorders. *J Neurology Neurosurg Psychiatry* 2021:jnnp-2021-
486 326904. Doi: 10.1136/jnnp-2021-326904.

487 61 Boekel Laura, Steenhuis Maurice, Hooijberg Femke, Besten Yaëlle R, Kempen Zoé L E van, Kummer
488 Laura Y, et al. Antibody development after COVID-19 vaccination in patients with autoimmune diseases
489 in the Netherlands: a substudy of data from two prospective cohort studies. *Lancet Rheumatology* 2021.
490 Doi: 10.1016/s2665-9913(21)00222-8.

491 62 Perkmann Thomas, Perkmann-Nagele Nicole, Koller Thomas, Mucher Patrick, Radakovics Astrid, Wolzt
492 Michael, et al. Serum antibody response to BNT162b2 after natural SARS-CoV-2 infection. *Eur J Clin*
493 *Invest* 2021. Doi: 10.1111/eci.13632.

494 63 Prendecki Maria, Clarke Candice, Brown Jonathan, Cox Alison, Gleeson Sarah, Guckian Mary, et al.
495 Effect of previous SARS-CoV-2 infection on humoral and T-cell responses to single-dose BNT162b2
496 vaccine. *Lancet* 2021;397(10280):1178—1181. Doi: 10.1016/s0140-6736(21)00502-x.

497 64 Krammer Florian, Srivastava Komal, Alshammary Hala, Amoako Angela A., Awawda Mahmoud H.,
498 Beach Katherine F., et al. Antibody Responses in Seropositive Persons after a Single Dose of SARS-CoV-2
499 mRNA Vaccine. *New Engl J Med* 2021. Doi: 10.1056/nejmc2101667.

500 65 Bradley Todd, Grundberg Elin, Selvarangan Rangaraj, LeMaster Cas, Fraley Elizabeth, Banerjee Dithi,
501 et al. Antibody Responses after a Single Dose of SARS-CoV-2 mRNA Vaccine. *New Engl J Med* 2021. Doi:
502 10.1056/nejmc2102051.

503 66 Barrett Jordan R., Belij-Rammerstorfer Sandra, Dold Christina, Ewer Katie J., Folegatti Pedro M.,
504 Gilbride Ciaran, et al. Phase 1/2 trial of SARS-CoV-2 vaccine ChAdOx1 nCoV-19 with a booster dose
505 induces multifunctional antibody responses. *Nat Med* 2021;27(2):279–88. Doi: 10.1038/s41591-020-
506 01179-4.

507 67 Danese Elisa, Montagnana Martina, Salvagno Gian Luca, Gelati Matteo, Peserico Denise, Pighi Laura,
508 et al. Comparison of five commercial anti-SARS-CoV-2 total antibodies and IgG immunoassays after
509 vaccination with BNT162b2 mRNA. *J Med Biochem* 2021. Doi: 10.5937/jomb0-31475.

510 68 Irsara Christian, Egger Alexander E, Prokop Wolfgang, Nairz Manfred, Loacker Lorin, Sahanic Sabina, et
511 al. Clinical validation of the Siemens quantitative SARS-CoV-2 spike IgG assay (sCOVG) reveals improved
512 sensitivity and a good correlation with virus neutralization titers. *Clin Chem Laboratory Medicine Cclm*
513 2021;0(0):000010151520210214. Doi: 10.1515/cclm-2021-0214.

514 69 Boonyaratanakornkit J., Morishima C., Selke S., Zamora D., McGuffin S., Shapiro A. E., et al. Clinical,
515 laboratory, and temporal predictors of neutralizing antibodies against SARS-CoV-2 among COVID-19
516 convalescent plasma donor candidates. *J Clin Invest* 2021;131(3). Doi: 10.1172/jci144930.

517 70 Muecksch F., Wise H., Batchelor B., Squires M., Semple E., Richardson C., et al. Longitudinal
518 Serological Analysis and Neutralizing Antibody Levels in Coronavirus Disease 2019 Convalescent Patients.
519 *J Infect Dis* 2021;223(3):389–98. Doi: 10.1093/infdis/jiaa659.

520 71 Luchsinger Larry L, Ransegnola Brett P, Jin Daniel K, Muecksch Frauke, Weisblum Yiska, Bao Weili, et
521 al. Serological Assays Estimate Highly Variable SARS-CoV-2 Neutralizing Antibody Activity in Recovered
522 COVID-19 Patients. *J Clin Microbiol* 2020;58(12). Doi: 10.1128/jcm.02005-20.

523 72 Seow J., Graham C., Merrick B., Acors S., Pickering S., Steel K. J. A., et al. Longitudinal observation and
524 decline of neutralizing antibody responses in the three months following SARS-CoV-2 infection in
525 humans. *Nat Microbiol* 2020;5(12):1598–607. Doi: 10.1038/s41564-020-00813-8.

526 73 Szabó Zsófia, Szabó Tamás, Bodó Kornélia, Kemenesi Gábor, Földes Fanni, Kristóf Katalin, et al.
527 Comparison of virus neutralization activity and results of 10 different anti-SARS-CoV-2 serological tests in
528 COVID-19 recovered plasma donors. *Pract Laboratory Medicine* 2021;25:e00222. Doi:
529 10.1016/j.plabm.2021.e00222.

530 74 Barros-Martins Joana, Hammerschmidt Swantje I., Cossmann Anne, Odak Ivan, Stankov Metodi V.,
531 Ramos Gema Morillas, et al. Immune responses against SARS-CoV-2 variants after heterologous and
532 homologous ChAdOx1 nCoV-19/BNT162b2 vaccination. *Nat Med* 2021:1–5. Doi: 10.1038/s41591-021-
533 01449-9.

534 75 Ramasamy Maheshi N, Minassian Angela M, Ewer Katie J, Flaxman Amy L, Folegatti Pedro M, Owens
535 Daniel R, et al. Safety and immunogenicity of ChAdOx1 nCoV-19 vaccine administered in a prime-boost
536 regimen in young and old adults (COV002): a single-blind, randomised, controlled, phase 2/3 trial. *Lancet*
537 2021;396(10267):1979–93. Doi: 10.1016/s0140-6736(20)32466-1.

538 76 Jabal K. Abu, Ben-Amram H., Beiruti K., Batheesh Y., Sussan C., Zarka S., et al. Impact of age, ethnicity,
539 sex and prior infection status on immunogenicity following a single dose of the BNT162b2 mRNA COVID-
540 19 vaccine: real-world evidence from healthcare workers, Israel, December 2020 to January 2021.
541 *Eurosurveillance* 2021;26(6):2100096. Doi: 10.2807/1560-7917.es.2021.26.6.2100096.

542 ## Legends to Figures and Tables

543 ***Fig. 1:*** *Study flow chart. Anti-Spike(S)-antibody (Ab) assays: Roche S, Abbott S. Infection with SARS-CoV-2*
544 *was ruled out by detection of antibodies against the SARS-CoV-2 nucleocapsid (N) using the Roche N*
545 *ECLIA. W… weeks; sVNT… surrogate virus neutralization test.*

546 ***Fig. 2: A*** *Antibody levels (Roche, Abbott) and percent inhibition in a surrogate virus neutralization test*
547 *(sVNT) 3w (weeks) after the first dose of AZD1222, pre-booster (11w after the first dose), and 3w post-*
548 *booster. Dotted Lines indicate the test systems' thresholds for positivity (Roche: 0.8 BAU/mL, Abbott 7.1*
549 *BAU/mL, sVNT 30%) and, in the case of Roche, the upper level of quantification (2,500 BAU/mL). Green*
550 *lines represent the group median. ****… P<0.0001 in Wilcoxon tests.* ***B*** *Longitudinal changes of individual*
551 *Roche, Abbott, and cPass surrogate virus neutralization test (sVNT) results: 3w (3 weeks) after the first*
552 *dose, before the booster dose, and 3w after the booster dose. According to the manufacturers, Roche*
553 *results ≥15 BAU/mL correlate with a positive neutralization test, Abbott results ≥149,1 BAU/mL*
554 *correspond to a neutralization titer of at least 1:80; 30% inhibition is considered the sVNTs threshold for*
555 *positivity. Results are, according to the manufacturer, categorized into low (30-60%), medium (60-90%),*
556 *and high (>90%) neutralizing capacity (all levels indicated by dotted lines).*

557 ***Fig. 3: A*** *Passing-Bablok regression for Roche and Abbott results; readings were converted to BAU/mL.*
558 *The dotted lines are the 95% confidence intervals (CI) for the regression lines. The dashed lines represent*
559 *lines of equality.* ***B*** *Linear regression (±95% CI) of logarithmic results from Roche and Abbott.*
560 *3w… 3 weeks; BAU/mL… binding antibody units per milliliter*

561 ***Fig. 4:*** *Linear regression lines (±95% confidence intervals) for c-pass surrogate virus neutralization test*
562 *(sVNT) results and logarithmic binding assay results (top panel: Abbott, bottom panel: Roche). The dotted*
563 *vertical line represents the sVNT's threshold for positivity (30% inhibition). According to the*
564 *manufacturers, Roche results ≥15 BAU/mL correlate with a positive neutralization test, Abbott results*

565 *≥149,1 BAU/mL correspond to a neutralization titer of at least 1:80 as indicated by horizontal dotted*

566 *lines. 3w… 3 weeks; BAU/mL… binding antibody units per milliliter*

567 ***Fig. 5: A** Logarithmic IFNγ levels after stimulation of 1mL heparinized whole blood with Quantiferon*

568 *SARS-CoV-2 antigen mixture 1 (Ag1), antigen mixture 2 (Ag2), Nil (negative control) and mitogen control,*

569 *as well as Nil-corrected levels (Ag1-Nil, Ag2-Nil). Green lines indicate medians. **B** Pairwise comparisons of*

570 *Ag1-Nil and Ag2-Nil in response to the booster shot. **** <0.0001. Green lines indicate medians. **C** Linear*

571 *regression curves (±95% confidence intervals) of Ag1-Nil and Ag2-Nil before and after the booster shot.*

572 *3w… 3 weeks*

573 ***Tbl. 1: Participant characteristics and surrogates of humoral (Roche, Abbott, sVNT) and cellular (IFNγ)***

574 ***immunity.** P-values were derived from Friedman-tests.*

575 *3w… 3 weeks; BAU/mL… binding antibody units per milliliter; immunosuppr… immunosuppressive; sVNT…*

576 *surrogate virus neutralization test; IFNγ… interferon γ*

577 ***Tbl. 2: Correlation Table.** Spearman's ρ of rank correlations between Nil-corrected interferon γ (IFNγ)-*

578 *levels after incubation with Quantiferon SARS-CoV-2 antigen mixtures 1 (Ag1-Nil) or 2 (Ag2-Nil) and*

579 *antibody levels. sVNT… surrogate virus neutralization test. % response… 100*(post-booster – pre-*

580 *booster)/pre-booster*

| | Median (interquartile range) or counts (%) | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Female sex | 43 (86%) | | | |
| Age [years] | 35.5 (29-49) | | | |
| Immunosuppr. drugs | 2 (4%) | | | |
| | 3w post dose 1 | pre-booster | 3w post-booster | P-value |
| Roche [BAU/mL] | 13.6 (5.2-29.9) | 60.2 (36.4-112.8) | 895.5 (611.8-1681.0) | <0.0001 |
| Abbott [BAU/mL] | 42.2 (26.0-79.0) | 32.9 (20.8-53.7) | 171.2 (123.4-278.7) | <0.0001 |
| sVNT [% inhibition] | 47.1 (35.5-60.6) | 49.0 (35.3-62.4) | 95.2 (92.1-97.9) | <0.0001 |
| IFNγ Ag1-Nil [IU/mL] | | 0.10 (0.05-0.16) | 0.15 (0.09-0.32) | <0.0001 |
| IFNγ Ag2-Nil [IU/mL] | | 0.16 (0.09-0.31) | 0.31 (0.16-0.98) | <0.0001 |

***Tbl. 1: Participant characteristics and surrogates of humoral (Roche, Abbott, sVNT) and cellular (IFNγ) immunity.*** *P-values were derived from Friedman-tests.*
*3w… 3 weeks; BAU/mL… binding antibody units per milliliter; immunosuppr… immunosuppressive; sVNT… surrogate virus neutralization test; IFNγ… interferon γ*

| **Pre-booster** | Abbott | Roche | sVNT |
|---|---|---|---|
| Ag1-Nil | *0.236 (P=0.100)* | *0.258 (P=0.071)* | *0.217 (P=0.130)* |
| Ag2-Nil | ***0.287 (P=0.044)*** | *0.243 (P=0.089)* | *0.252 (P=0.077)* |
| **Post-booster** | Abbott | Roche | sVNT |
| Ag1-Nil | *0.037 (P=0.796)* | *0.101 (P=0.485)* | *-0.001 (P=0.995)* |
| Ag2-Nil | *0.067 (P=0.642)* | *0.095 (P=0.510)* | *0.024 (P=0.868)* |
| **% response** | Abbott | Roche | sVNT |
| Ag1-Nil | *0.251 (P=0.082)* | *0.247 (P=0.087)* | *0.196 (P=0.178)* |
| Ag2-Nil | ***0.333 (P=0.018)*** | ***0.325 (P=0.021)*** | *0.164 (P=0.255)* |

***Tbl. 2: Correlation table.*** *Spearman's ρ of rank correlations between Nil-corrected interferon γ (IFNγ)-levels after incubation with Quantiferon SARS-CoV-2 antigen mixtures 1 (Ag1-Nil) or 2 (Ag2-Nil) and antibody levels. sVNT… surrogate virus neutralization test. % response… 100*(post-booster – pre-booster)/pre-booster*


1st dose AZD1222
2nd dose AZD1222
Prospective inclusion of participants
(n=50)
3w after first dose AZD1222
• Roche S Ab
• Abbott S Ab
• sVNT
• Roche N Ab neg
11w after first dose AZD1222
• Roche S Ab
• Abbott S Ab
• sVNT
• SARS-CoV-2 Quantiferon
• Roche N Ab neg
3w after second dose AZD1222
• Roche S Ab
• Abbott S Ab
• sVNT
• SARS-CoV-2 Quantiferon
• Roche N Ab neg


A
Roche
Abbott
sVNT
Log [BAU/mL]
[% inhibition]
****
3w post dose 1
pre-booster
3w post-booster
B
log BAU/mL
% Inhibition
ULOQ
corr. with + NT
threshold for +
1/80 NT
high
medium
low
negative


A
3w after dose 1
pre-booster
3w post-booster
Abbott [BAU/mL]
Roche [BAU/mL]
B
3w after dose 1
pre-booster
3w post-booster
Abbott log [BAU/mL]
Roche log [BAU/mL]


3w after dose 1
pre-booster
3w post-booster
Abbott log [BAU/mL]
Roche log [BAU/mL]
sVNT [%]


A
Quantiferon
IFNγ log [IU/mL]
1
0
-1
-2
-3
Ag1
Ag2
Nil
Ag1-Nil
Ag2-Nil
Mitogen
Ag1
Ag2
Nil
Ag1-Nil
Ag2-Nil
Mitogen
pre-booster
post-booster


B
Ag1-Nil
****
Infγ [IU/mL]
1.5
1.0
0.5
0.0
pre-booster
3w post-booster
Ag2-Nil
****
Infγ [IU/mL]
2.5
2.0
1.5
1.0
0.5
0.0
pre-booster
3w post-booster


C
Ag1-Nil
3w post-booster
1.5
1.0
0.5
0.0
0.0
0.2
0.4
0.6
0.8
pre-booster
Ag2-Nil
3w post-booster
1.5
1.0
0.5
0.0
0.0
0.2
0.4
0.6
0.8
pre-booster