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**Supplemental Figure S1**



**Figure S1. Immunoglobulin constant regions targeted by proteotypic peptides and used for quantification of immunoglobulin isotypes and subclasses.**

**Supplemental Figure S2**



**Figure S2.** **Development of indirect ELISA for quantification of IgG and IgGAM antibodies in serum samples.** Ten serum samples (3 positive and 7 negative) were tested for COVID-19 specific antibodies. Each serum sample was tested against four different antigens (S1+S2 ECD, RBD, S1, and Nucleoprotein). As a control, serum samples were measured in wells incubated with PBS buffer instead of antigens.

**Supplemental Information.** The list of Standards for Reporting of Diagnostic Accuracy Studies (STARD2015) recommendations followed in the present work.
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