

# 1 **Joint Detection of Serum IgM/IgG Antibody is An Important** 2 **Key to Clinical Diagnosis of SARS-COV-2 Infection**

3 Fang Hu<sup>1</sup>, Xiaoling Shang<sup>1</sup>, Meizhou Chen<sup>1\*</sup>, Changliang Zhang<sup>1</sup>

4 \* **Corresponding Author:** Meizhou Chen, cmz245380374@163.com

5 1Department of Clinical Laboratory, Huangshi Central Hospital, Edong Healthcare  
6 Group (Affiliated Hospital of Hubei Polytechnic University), No.141 Tianjin Road,  
7 Huangshi City, Hubei, 435000, China

## 8 **Abstract**

9 **Background:** This study was aimed to investigate the application of SARS- COV-2  
10 IgM and IgG antibodies in diagnosis of COVID-19 infection.

11 **Method:** This study enrolled a total of 178 patients at Huangshi Central Hospital from  
12 January to February, 2020. Among them, 68 patients were SARS-COV-2 infected  
13 confirmed with nucleic acid test (NAT) and CT imaging. 9 patients were in the  
14 suspected group (NAT negative) with fever and other respiratory symptoms. 101  
15 patients were in the control group with other diseases and negative to SARS-COV-2  
16 infection. After serum samples were collected, SARS-COV-2 IgG and IgM antibodies  
17 were tested by chemiluminescence immunoassay (CLIA) for all patients.

18 **Results:** The specificity of serum IgM and IgG antibodies to SARS-COV-2 were  
19 99.01% (100/101) and 96.04% (97/101) respectively, and the sensitivity were 88.24%  
20 (60/68) and 97.06% (66/68) respectively. The combined detection rate of  
21 SARS-COV-2 IgM and IgG antibodies were 98.53% (67/68).

22 **Conclusion:** Combined detection of serum SARS-COV-2 IgM and IgG antibodies  
23 had better sensitivity compared with single IgM or IgG test, which can be used as an  
24 important diagnostic tool for SARS-COV-2 infection and a screening tool of potential  
25 SARS-COV-2 carriers in clinics, hospitals and accredited scientific laboratory.

26 **Keywords:** SARS-COV-2 Virus Infection; Serological test; SARS-COV-2 IgM/IgG  
27 antibody; Chemiluminescence Immunoassay

## 28 **Introduction**

29 The novel coronavirus (SARS-CoV-2) is a new virus responsible for an outbreak of  
30 respiratory illness known as COVID-19, and now it is a global pandemic in more than  
31 215 countries [1]. The current standard diagnostic method for diagnosis of COVID-19  
32 is to detect the virus nucleic acid RT-PCR [2]. However, real-time PCR detection had  
33 some limitations, e.g. time-consuming, complicated operation with specialized  
34 equipment, need special detection sites, which limit its application during COVID-19  
35 outbreak [3]. Therefore, a simple, sensitive and accurate test was needed to identify  
36 SARS-COV-2 infected patients in a COVID-19 outbreak area urgently.

37 Based on the diagnosis experience of many clinical cases, the detection of novel  
38 coronavirus antibody can be used as an auxiliary diagnosis of novel coronavirus  
39 pneumonia [4,5]. After SARS-COV-2 infection, the body's immune system can create  
40 immune response to fight against the virus and produce specific antibodies. In general  
41 virology, the immunoglobulin M (IgM) antibody, produced in the early period after  
42 the infection, can indicate the current infection or the recent infection.

43 Immunoglobulin G (IgG) antibody is also an important antibody produced by the  
44 immune system, indicating that the disease is in the middle to late stage, or presence  
45 of past infection. Therefore, the combined detection of IgM and IgG can be used not  
46 only in the early diagnosis of infectious diseases, but also in the assessment of the  
47 stage of infection.

48 Chemiluminescence immunoassay (CLIA) has been developed as an effective  
49 combination of immunoassay and chemiluminescence system [6] and it has been used  
50 recently in SARS-COV-2 diagnosis. In this study, we used a CLIA test product, which  
51 can detect IgM and IgG in human serum within 30 minutes. Our aim is to investigate  
52 the clinical value of CLIA for the diagnosis of SARS-COV-2 infection. This CLIA  
53 method demonstrated good sensitivity and specificity in our study, which can be used  
54 not only in hospitals and accredited laboratories, but also can be used in airports,  
55 border ports, seaports, and train stations etc. This CLIA method has potential to be a  
56 powerful weapon against the COVID-19 pandemic.

## 57 **Materials and Methods**

### 58 **Patients**

59 This study enrolled a total of 178 patients who visited Huangshi Central Hospital in  
60 Hubei Province, China, between January and February 2020. The patients included 91  
61 males (51.1%) and 87 females (48.9%) with a mean age of 54.3 years (ranging from 2  
62 months to 94 years). Among them, SARS-COV-2 group had 68 patients, 36 males and  
63 32 females (ranging from 30 years to 90 years); suspected group had 9 patients, 7

64 males and 2 females (ranging from 2 months to 64 years); negative group had 101  
65 patients, 48 males and 53 females (ranging from 2 years to 94 years). This study is in  
66 compliance of ICC clinical trial specifications and the Helsinki Declaration.

### 67 **Serologic tests**

68 Serum was collected from all patients. Serum SARS-CoV-2 IgG and IgM were tested  
69 by CLIA kits and iFlash 3000 fully automated CLIA analyzer from Shenzhen YHLO  
70 Biotech Co., Ltd (China). Briefly, serum was separated by centrifugation at 2500g for  
71 5 min within 12 hours of collection. The magnetic beads of these CLIA assays are  
72 coated with two antigens of SARS-CoV-2 (Nucleocapsid protein and N protein, Spike  
73 protein and S protein). SARS-CoV-2 IgM/IgG titers (in arbitrary units, AU/ml) were  
74 calculated automatically by the CLIA analyzer based on relative light units (RLU),  
75 and the viral antibody titer is positively associated with RLU. The cut-off values for  
76 positive SARSCoV-2 IgM and IgG are both 10 AU/ml.

### 77 **SARS-COV-2 nucleic acid test**

78 RT-PCR was used to detect open reading frame 1ab (ORF1ab) and nucleocapsid  
79 protein (N) in the SARS-COV-2 genome. CT value interpretation of test results is  
80 based on instruction of use from manufacturer. Confirmation of positive COVID-19 is  
81 based on at least one target-specific RT-PCR positive result of ORF1ab and N genes  
82 of SARS-COV-2 in the same specimen.

### 83 **Data analysis**

84 The statistical analysis was performed using SPSS 19.0 statistical software (IBM

85 SPSS, Chicago, IL, USA). The kappa coefficient was calculated.  $\text{Kappa} \geq 0.75$   
86 indicates good consistency,  $0.75 \geq \text{kappa} > 0.4$  for medium consistency, and kappa  
87  $< 0.4$  for poor consistency.

88 The specificity and sensitivity of the CLIA test kits were calculated according to the  
89 following equations:

90 Sensitivity (%) =  $100 \times [\text{True Positive} / (\text{True Positive} + \text{False Negative})]$ ;

91 Specificity (%) =  $100 \times [\text{True negative} / (\text{True Negative} + \text{False Positive})]$ .

## 92 **Results**

### 93 **The specificity of SARS-CoV-2 IgG/IgM antibody test**

94 Samples from both NAT negative patients (suspect group, 9 subjects) and other  
95 diseases population (control group, 101 subjects) were used to assess the clinical  
96 specificity of the assay (Table 1). Among the 101 patients in the control group, 100  
97 patients were negative for SARS-COV-2 IgM antibody, with a clinical specificity of  
98 99.01% (100/101). 97 patients were negative for SARS-COV-2 IgG antibody, with a  
99 clinical specificity was 96.04% (97/101). In the suspect group, all 9 patients had  
100 negative antibody test results. The false positive results of SARS-COV-2 IgM and IgG  
101 antibodies may be caused by autoantibodies, heterophilic antibodies and other factors.

102 Table 1: Clinical specificity of SARS-CoV-2 IgM and SARS-CoV-2 IgG

103

---

Sample	SARS-COV-2 IgM	SARS-COV-2 IgG
--------	----------------	----------------

	Number			Clinical		Clinical	
		Negative	Positive	Specificity	Negative	Positive	Specificity
Suspect Group	9	9	0	100.00%	9	0	100.00%
Control Group	101	100	1	99.01%	97	4	96.04%

104

105 **The detection sensitivity of SARS-CoV-2 IgG/IgM antibody test**

106 Samples from 68 SARS-Cov-2 infected patients (confirmed with RT-PCR) were used  
 107 to evaluate the clinical sensitivity of the assays (Table 2). We analyzed the clinical  
 108 sensitivity on both SARS-CoV-2 IgM and IgG antibodies at three time periods, before  
 109 7 days, 7-14 days, and after 14 days since the onset of the symptoms. During these  
 110 time periods, SARS-CoV-2 IgM demonstrated clinical sensitivity of 75.00%, 88.00%,  
 111 and 93.55% respectively, and SARS-CoV-2 IgG demonstrated 83.33%, 100.00%, and  
 112 100.00% respectively. The total clinical sensitivity of SARS-COV-2 IgM and IgG to  
 113 SARS-COV-2 infection were 88.24% (60/68) and 97.06% (66/68), respectively.

114 Table 2: Clinical sensitivity of SARS-CoV-2 IgM and SARS-CoV-2 IgG

Days Since Onset of Symptoms	Sample Number	SRAS-COV-2 IgM			SRAS-COV-2 IgG		
		Negative	Positive	Clinical Sensitivity	Negative	Positive	Clinical Sensitivity

< 7 days	12	3	9	75.00%	2	10	83.33%
7-14 days	25	3	22	88.00%	0	25	100.00%
>14 days	31	2	29	93.55%	0	31	100.00%
Total	68	8	60	88.24%	2	66	97.06%

115

116 **Comparison of SARS-COV-2 antibody test and SARS-COV-2 nucleic acid test**  
 117 **(NAT)**

118 The comparison between SARS-COV-2 IgM / IgG antibody test and NAT of 178  
 119 patients is shown in Table 3. The positive predictive value of SARS-COV-2 IgM / IgG  
 120 antibody detection was 93.06% (67/72), the negative predictive value was 99.06%  
 121 (105/106). The positive predictive value of the NAT for SARS-COV-2 was 100%  
 122 (68/68) and the negative predictive value was 96.36% (106/110).

123 Table 3: Comparison of SARS-COV-2 IgM/IgG antibody detection and SARS-COV-2  
 124 nucleic acid detection

		IgM/IgG antibody				
		Positive	Negative	Total	Positive Predictive Value of NAT	Negative Predictive Value of NAT
	Positive	67	1	68	100.00%	
Nucleic acid	Negative	5	105	110		96.36%
	Total	72	106	178		

---

Positive Predictive Value of Antibody Test	93.06%
Negative predictive value of Antibody Test	99.06%

---

125 **Discussion**

126 Novel Coronavirus is caused by severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2  
127 (SARS-CoV-2) [7]. SARS-COV-2 belongs to the subfamily of *Coronavirinae* (named  
128 *Betacoronavirus*), and its genome is a single-stranded positive-sense RNA [8].  
129 Different from MERS-CoV and SARS-CoV, SARS-COV-2 is the seventh member of  
130 the family of coronaviruses that infect humans [9]. The disease (COVID-19) is  
131 spreading rapidly within five months, and now it has been found in more than 215  
132 countries. By June 19th, 2020, over 8, 300, 000 COVID-19 confirmed patients were  
133 reported, with > 450, 000 deaths. Currently, the SARS-COV-2 NAT is the routine  
134 confirmation test for the clinical diagnosis of COVID-19 [2]. However, not all clinical  
135 COVID-19 patients might have positive result from SARS-COV-2 NAT. The reasons  
136 of false negative NAT results in COVID-19 include collection and storage of the  
137 sample, the condition of NAT test laboratory and the quality of the test kit [10].  
138 Therefore, nucleic acid detection, CT imaging, blood routine examination and other  
139 methods can be used together for the comprehensive diagnosis of COVID-19.  
140 Since February 2020, several SARS-COV-2 IgM and IgG antibody immunoassay kits  
141 have been developed in China. Antibody detection is a new detection method for  
142 SARS-COV-2, so the clinical specificity and clinical sensitivity of such tests must be  
143 carefully validated [11]. Our study demonstrated that the SARS-COV-2 IgM and IgG



144 CLIA kits (YHLO Biotech, Shenzhen, China) had a high clinical specificity, reaching  
145 99.01% and 96.04% respectively. Therefore, SARS-COV-2 IgM and IgG antibody  
146 detection reagents have high clinical specificity and can meet the screening and  
147 diagnosis requirements of SARS-COV-2.

148 In COVID-19 cases, the clinical sensitivity of SARS-COV-2 IgM detection was  
149 88.23%, while the clinical sensitivity of SARS-COV-2 IgG detection was 97.06%.  
150 CLIA system can simultaneously detect 150-300 clinical samples, which is a good  
151 tool for screening and diagnosis of the Novel Coronavirus Pneumonia infected by  
152 SARS-COV-2. Our study results showed that the combined detection of  
153 SARS-COV-2 IgM and IgG antibodies is an effective tool to improve the diagnostic  
154 sensitivity and specificity and reduce the chance of false negative NAT results. We  
155 demonstrate that the antibody detection can be used as one of the effective methods of  
156 COVID-19 clinical detection.

157 In NAT confirmed group, serum from 68 COVID-19 cases were tested by  
158 SARS-CoV-2 IgM and IgG. SARS-CoV-2 IgM antibodies can be detected in 75.00%  
159 of patients before 7 days since onset of the symptoms, and the positive rate reached to  
160 the 88.00% on the period of 7-14 days, and then increased to 93.55% after 14 days.

161 The positive rate of SARS-CoV-2 IgG was 83.33% before 7 days since onset of  
162 symptoms, and reached to 100.00% on 7-14 days and remained 100% after 14 days.

163 In general, the immune response to infection by pathogenic microorganisms is first  
164 expressed as an increase in IgM antibody titer and then a rapid decrease until it  
165 disappears. While the IgG antibody titer normally increased in the middle and late

166 stages of the infection, and it can be positive for a long time even after recovery.

167 According to the results of this study, the positive rate of IgM in SARS-COV-2

168 infected patients is lower than IgG, because most of the infected patients were in the

169 middle stage of infection or in the recovery stage. Interestingly, we have observed a

170 phenomenon that SARS-CoV-2 IgM and IgG antibodies developed almost

171 simultaneously and this observation is consistent with some recent studies [12].

172 Further studies are needed to verify this phenomenon in the diagnosis and prognosis

173 of COVID-19.

174 We found false negative results for IgM / IgG in the NAT group. There might be three

175 reasons: First of all, false negative results may be due to low antibody titer. When IgM

176 and IgG titer is below the detection limit, the test result might be negative. Secondly,

177 the difference in individual immune response and antibody production could be

178 another reason for the false negative results in COVID-19 patients. The last reason

179 might be that IgM antibody might decrease or even, disappear after 15 days. In each

180 individual case, it is difficult to know exactly when or how long the patient has been

181 really infected, and someone might have IgM titer below detection limit and not

182 detectable. In the joint detection of SARS-COV-2 IgM and IgG, there was only one

183 negative patients (male, 77 years old) who had respiratory failure, chronic obstructive

184 pulmonary disease, coronary atherosclerosis, acute myocardial infarction, heart failure

185 with SARS-COV-2 infection. In the control group, 5 cases were positive for antibody

186 detection (1 case for IgM, 4 cases for IgG). The results suggested that the patients

187 who had some other diseases, including tumors, leukemia, diabetes, hypertension,

188 coronary atherosclerosis, bronchitis or lung infections might be more susceptible to  
189 infected by SARS-COV-2 and led to a positive antibody detection. Also, there might  
190 be false negative nucleic acids, or recovered/ mild / asymptomatic patients with  
191 SARS-COV-2. All of these cases will provide valuable reference for the follow-up  
192 study and clinical diagnosis of COVID-19.

193 Our study also has some limitations. For example, we didn't investigate the  
194 cross-reaction with other pathogens (e.g., hCoV-NL-63 or others), MERS-COV,  
195 SARS-COV and some auto-antibodies that could cause interference for immunoassay.  
196 We also didn't perform dynamic monitoring of the change of antibodies titer for  
197 in-depth study.

## 198 **Conclusions**

199 Overall, testing SARS-CoV-2 IgG and IgM by CLIA method is convenient for  
200 sampling, and it has high efficiency. The results of this study indicated that combined  
201 detection of serum IgM and IgG antibodies to SARS-COV-2 had better sensitivity and  
202 specificity compared with single IgM or IgG test. Therefore, the serological test  
203 results can be used as an effective diagnostic tool for SARS-COV-2 infection. It also  
204 can be used as an efficient supplement of RNA detection for confirmation of  
205 SARS-CoV-2 infection in clinics, hospitals and accredited scientific laboratory.

## 206 **Abbreviations**

207 SARS-CoV-2: severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2; NAT: nucleic acid

208 test; CLIA: chemiluminescence immunoassay; IgM: Immunoglobulin M; IgG:

209 Immunoglobulin G.

## 210 **Acknowledgements**

211 All the SARS-COV-2 IgG and IgM CLIA kits used in this study were kindly supplied

212 by the manufacturers, namely, YHLO Biotech (Shenzhen, China).

## 213 **Disclaimers**

214 The authors confirm that there are no conflicts of interest.

## 215 **Authors' contribution**

216 Fang Hu analyzed the data, drafted the article and contributed to study design.

217 Xiaoling Shang and Changliang Zhang contributed to data gathering. Meizhou Chen

218 contributed to study design, editing and revising the paper. All authors read and

219 approved the final manuscript.

## 220 **Funding**

221 The author(s) received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or

222 publication of this article.

## 223 **Availability of data and materials**

224 The datasets used and/or analyzed during the current study are available from the

225 corresponding author on reasonable request.

226 **Consent for publication**

227 Not applicable.

228 **Competing interests**

229 The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

230 **Reference**

231 [1] Hui DS, E IA, Madani TA, et al. The continuing 2019-nCoV epidemic threat of  
232 novel coronaviruses to global health - The latest 2019 novel coronavirus outbreak  
233 in Wuhan, China. *Int J Infect Dis.* 2020; 91:264-266.

234 [2] Corman VM, Landt O, Kaiser M, et al. Detection of 2019 novel coronavirus  
235 (2019-nCoV) by real-time RT-PCR. *Euro Surveill.* 2020;25(3):2000045.

236 [3] Jin L, Guangming Y, Liangjun C, Jiajun W, Yirong L. Analysis of false-negative  
237 results for 2019 novel coronavirus nucleic acid test and related countermeasures.  
238 *Chin J Lab Med.* 2020;43(00): E006-E006.

239 [4] Jin Y, Wang M, Zuo Z, et al. Diagnostic value and dynamic variance of serum  
240 antibody in coronavirus disease 2019. *Int J Infect Dis.* 2020; 94:49-52.

241 [5] Qu J, Wu C, Li X, et al. Profile of IgG and IgM antibodies against severe acute  
242 respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2). *Clin Infect Dis.* 2020.

243 [6] Chen D, Zhang Y, Xu Y, et al. Comparison of chemiluminescence immunoassay,

- 244 enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay and passive agglutination for diagnosis of  
245 *Mycoplasma pneumoniae* infection. *Ther Clin Risk Manag.* 2018; 14:1091-1097.
- 246 [7] Huang C, Wang Y, Li X, et al. Clinical features of patients infected with 2019  
247 novel coronavirus in Wuhan, China. *Lancet.* 2020;395(10223):497-506.
- 248 [8] Chen Y, Liu Q, Guo D. Emerging coronaviruses: Genome structure, replication,  
249 and pathogenesis. *J Med Virol.* 2020;92(4):418-423.
- 250 [9] Zhu N, Zhang D, Wang W, et al. A Novel Coronavirus from Patients with  
251 Pneumonia in China, 2019. *N Engl J Med.* 2020;382(8):727-733.
- 252 [10] Mo X, Qin W, Fu Q, Guan M. Understanding the Influence Factors in Viral  
253 Nucleic Acid Test of 2019 novel Coronavirus (2019-nCoV) *Chin J Lab Med.*  
254 2020;43(00): E002-E002.
- 255 [11] Zhao J, Yuan Q, Wang H, et al. Antibody responses to SARS-CoV-2 in patients of  
256 novel coronavirus disease 2019. *Clin Infect Dis.* 2020.
- 257 [12] Long QX, Liu BZ, Deng HJ, et al. Antibody responses to SARS-CoV-2 in  
258 patients with COVID-19. *Nat Med.* 2020.1-4.