1	Title: Performance evaluation of the Roche Elecsys Anti-SARS-CoV-2 S immunoassay
2	
3	Authors: Elena Riester ¹ , Peter Findeisen ² , J. Kolja Hegel ³ , Michael Kabesch ⁴ , Andreas
4	Ambrosch ⁵ , Christopher M Rank ⁶ , Florina Langen ⁶ , Tina Laengin ⁶ , Christoph Niederhauser ^{7,8}
5	
6	Affiliations:
7	¹ Labor Augsburg MVZ GmbH, Augsburg, Germany; ² MVZ Labor Limbach, Heidelberg,
8	Germany; ³ Labor Berlin, Charité Vivantes Services GmbH, Berlin, Germany; ⁴ University
9	Children's Hospital Regensburg (KUNO) at the Hospital St. Hedwig of the Order of St. John
10	and the University Hospital, University of Regensburg, Germany; Institute for Laboratory
11	Medicine, Microbiology and Hygiene, Barmnerzige Bruder Hospital, Regensburg, Germany;
12	Roche Diagnostics GmbH, Penzberg, Germany; Interregionale Blood Transfusion Swiss Red
13	Cross, Bern, Switzerland; "Institute for Infectious Diseases (IFIK), University of Bern, Bern,
14	Switzerland
15	
16	
1/	Christoph Niederhauser, Interregionale Blood Transfusion Swiss Red Cross, Murtenstrasse
18	133, 3008 Bern, Switzerland, <u>Christoph.Niederhauser@itransfusion.ch</u>
19	Burning Titler Evaluation of the Electric Anti SARS CoV 2.5 accov
20	Kanning Title: Evaluation of the Elecsys Anti-SARS-Cov-2.5 assay
21	Key words: SARS-Cov-2, spike protein, nucleocapsid protein, immunoassay, antibodies
23	Abstract
24	Background: The Elecsys [®] Anti-SARS-CoV-2 S immunoassay (Roche Diagnostics
25	International Ltd, Rotkreuz, Switzerland) has been developed for the <i>in vitro</i> quantitative
26	detection of antibodies to the severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-
27	2) spike (S) protein. We evaluated the performance of this assay using samples from seven
28	sites in Germany, Austria, and Switzerland.
29	
30	Methods: Anonymized frozen, residual serum, or plasma samples from blood donation
31	centers or routine diagnostic testing were used for this study. For specificity and sensitivity
32	analyses, presumed negative samples collected before October 2019 and SARS-CoV-2 PCR-
33	confirmed single or sequential samples were tested, respectively. The performance of the
34	Elecsys Anti-SARS-CoV-2 S immunoassay was also compared with other commercial
35	immunoassays.

- 37 Results: The overall specificity (n=7880 pre-pandemic samples) and sensitivity (n=240 PCR-
- 38 positive samples [\geq 14 days post-PCR]) for the Elecsys Anti-SARS-CoV-2 S immunoassay
- 39 were 99.95% (95% confidence interval [CI]: 99.87–99.99) and 97.92% (95% CI: 95.21–
- 40 99.32), respectively. Compared with seven other immunoassays, the Elecsys Anti-SARS-CoV-
- 41 2 S assay had comparable or greater specificity and sensitivity. The Elecsys Anti-SARS-CoV-2
- 42 S immunoassay had significantly higher specificity compared with the LIAISON[®] SARS-CoV-2
- 43 S1/S2 IgG, ADVIA Centaur[®] SARS-CoV-2 Total, ARCHITECT SARS-CoV-2 IgG, iFlash-SARS-
- 44 CoV-2 IgM, and EUROIMMUN Anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgG and IgA assays, and significantly higher
- 45 sensitivity (≥14 days post-PCR) compared with the ARCHITECT SARS-CoV-2 IgG, iFlash-
- 46 SARS-CoV-2 IgG and IgM, and EUROIMMUN Anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgG assays.
- 47
- 48 Conclusion: The Elecsys Anti-SARS-CoV-2 S assay demonstrated a robust and favorable
- 49 performance across samples from multiple European sites, with a very high specificity and
- 50 sensitivity for the detection of anti-S antibodies.

51 Introduction

52 In December 2019 a novel coronavirus emerged (1), named severe acute respiratory 53 syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2), which is the causative agent of the disease, COVID-54 19 (2, 3). SARS-CoV-2 is an enveloped, single-stranded RNA virus of the family 55 Coronaviridae; its genome encodes 16 nonstructural proteins and four structural proteins: 56 spike (S), envelope (E), membrane (M), and nucleocapsid (N) (4). The most prominent 57 protein component on the viral surface is the S glycoprotein -a large transmembrane 58 protein that assembles into trimers to form the distinctive surface spikes of coronaviruses (5, 59 6). Each S monomer consists of two subunits, S1 and S2, which mediate receptor binding 60 (via the receptor-binding domain [RBD] located in S1) and membrane fusion, respectively, 61 leading to entry into host cells (6-8). 62 63 Following infection with SARS-CoV-2, the host mounts an immune response against the 64 virus, including production of specific antibodies against viral antigens (9). Understanding 65 the dynamics of the antibody response to the virus is critical in establishing a relevant time 66 window to use for serology testing (9). Studies into the kinetics of antibodies to SARS-CoV-2 67 are rapidly emerging and, based on current evidence, both immunoglobulin M (IgM) and G 68 (IgG) antibodies have been detected as early as day 0 to 5 after symptom onset (10, 11). 69 The chronological order of appearance and levels of IqM and IqG appears to be highly 70 variable and often simultaneous (12-14). Several studies have observed median 71 seroconversion at day 10–13 after symptom onset for IgM and day 12–15 for IgG, with

72 maximum seroconversion for IgM, IgG, and total antibodies occurring at week 2–3, week 2–

73 4, and around week 2, respectively (13-16).

74

75 Emergence of the COVID-19 pandemic has resulted in an urgent and unmet need to develop 76 reliable serological tests to determine past exposure to the virus and the seroprevalence in a 77 given population (17). This information is crucial to support diagnosis, contact tracing, 78 epidemiology studies, and vaccine development to enable characterization of pre-vaccination 79 immune status and vaccine-induced immune response (9, 18-20). There are currently 242 80 candidate SARS-CoV-2 vaccines in development (21) and, of these, 10 are currently in early, 81 limited, or fully approved use (status February 09, 2021) (22). The majority of the vaccines 82 in use are based on the S protein, with the goal of eliciting protective neutralizing 83 antibodies; the rest are based on whole inactivated SARS-CoV-2 (23, 24). Serology assays 84 are also needed for the identification of neutralizing antibodies from convalescent plasma 85 donors (25).

~ ~

86	
87	The Elecsys $^{ extsf{B}}$ Anti-SARS-CoV-2 S (Roche Diagnostics International Ltd, Rotkreuz,
88	Switzerland) is an electrochemiluminescence immunoassay (ECLIA), which has been
89	developed for the <i>in vitro</i> quantitative detection of antibodies, including IgG, against the
90	SARS-CoV-2 S protein RBD in human serum and plasma (26).
91	
92	The objective of this multicenter European study was to evaluate the specificity and
93	sensitivity of the Elecsys Anti-SARS-CoV-2 S immunoassay using pre-pandemic samples
94	(from routine diagnostics or blood donation) and PCR-positive samples, respectively, as well
95	as compare the performance of this quantitative test with other commercially available
96	immunoassays in terms of specificity and sensitivity.
97	
98	Materials and methods
99	Study design
100	The study was executed from August 17, 2020 to September 1, 2020 with samples tested at
101	four European sites: Labor Augsburg MVZ GmbH, Augsburg, Germany; MVZ Labor Dr.
102	Limbach & Kollegen GbR, Heidelberg, Germany; Interregionale Blutspende SRK AG (SRK
103	Bern), Bern, Switzerland; and Krankenhaus Barmherzige Brüder, Regensburg, Germany.
104	Samples were collected from those four sites, as well as from three additional sites: Labor
105	Berlin – Charité Vivantes GmbH, Berlin, Germany; Tirol Kliniken, Innsbruck, Austria; and
106	Deutsches Rotes Kreuz Blutspendedienst West, Hagen, Germany.
107	
108	Samples from Augsburg and Heidelberg included those referred to the respective study site
109	by physicians. Heidelberg also tested samples from employees and hospitalized patients,
110	including a subset from patients receiving dialysis. All samples provided by the study site in
111	Berlin were collected from hospitalized patients, including a subset from patients monitored
112	in the intensive care unit (ICU). Samples tested in Regensburg were taken from employees
113	and pediatric patients referred to the site by physicians.
114	
115	These samples were collected and tested in accordance with applicable regulations,
116	including relevant European Union directives and regulations, and the principles of the
117	Declaration of Helsinki. All samples from Augsburg, Heidelberg, Berlin, and Hagen were
118	anonymized. A statement was obtained from the Ethics Committee (EC) of the
119	Landesärztekammer Bayern confirming that there are no objections to the use of
120	anonymized leftover samples. From the internal EC at the study site in Bern (Switzerland) a

waiver was received and from the internal EC at the study site in Innsbruck (Austria) an

approval was received. For Regensburg (Germany), EC approvals were already in place,
amendments were submitted to notify the EC about Elecsys Anti-SARS-CoV-2 S testing. At
Augsburg, Heidelberg, and Bern the assays were performed on the cobas e 801 analyzer
(Roche Diagnostics International Ltd, Rotkreuz, Switzerland), whereas at Regensburg the
assays were performed on the cobas e 601 analyzer (Roche Diagnostics International Ltd,
Rotkreuz, Switzerland).

128

121

129 Serum and plasma samples

130 Anonymized frozen, residual samples from blood donation centers or routine laboratory

diagnostics, as well as banked samples, were used for this study. For specificity analysis of

132 the Elecsys Anti-SARS-CoV-2 S assay, 7880 presumed negative samples (5056 blood donor

and 2824 diagnostic routine samples) that were collected before October 2019 were tested.

134 The diagnostic routine cohort included samples from pregnancy screening and pediatrics.

135 For the sensitivity analysis of the Elecsys Anti-SARS-CoV-2 S assay, 827 PCR-confirmed

136 single or sequential samples from 272 different patients, with known time difference

137 between blood draw and positive PCR test, were tested. Of these presumed negative and

138 PCR-confirmed samples, 7903 were tested on the commercially available Elecsys[®] Anti-

139 SARS-CoV-2 assay (Roche Diagnostics International Ltd, Rotkreuz, Switzerland) (27).

140 Additionally, a number of these samples were tested on other commercially available assays:

141 LIAISON[®] SARS-CoV-2 S1/S2 IgG (DiaSorin) (28), 2052 samples; EUROIMMUN Anti-SARS-

142 CoV-2 IgG (29) and IgA assays (EUROIMMUN) (30), 1618 and 1624 samples, respectively;

143 ARCHITECT SARS-CoV-2 IgG (Abbott) (31), 3068 samples; ADVIA Centaur[®] SARS-CoV-2

144 Total (Siemens Healthineers) (32), 1064 samples; iFlash-SARS-CoV-2 IgG and IgM assays

145 (Shenzhen YHLO Biotech Co) (33), both 1062 samples.

146

147 Elecsys Anti-SARS-CoV-2 S assay

148 The Elecsys Anti-SARS-CoV-2 S immunoassay is a quantitative ECLIA that detects high-

affinity antibodies to the SARS-CoV-2 S protein RBD and has a low risk of detecting weakly

150 cross-reactive and unspecific antibodies. Results are automatically reported as the analyte

151 concentration of each sample in U/mL, with <0.80 U/mL interpreted as negative for anti-

152 SARS-CoV-2 S antibodies and \geq 0.80 U/mL interpreted as positive for anti-SARS-CoV-2 S

antibodies (Roche Diagnostics GmbH. Elecsys Anti-SARS-CoV-2 S assay method sheet. 2020;

154 version 01) (26).

156	Comparator assays
157	Specimens were analyzed using eight comparator immunoassays according to the
158	manufacturer's instructions. Interpretation of results was performed according to the
159	manufacturer's instructions.
160	
161	The Elecsys Anti-SARS-CoV-2 assay is an ECLIA for the <i>in vitro</i> qualitative detection of
162	antibodies, including IgG, against SARS-CoV-2, using a recombinant protein representing the
163	nucleocapsid (N) antigen (27). Results are automatically calculated in the form of a cutoff
164	index (COI), with COI values <1.0 interpreted as non-reactive (negative) for anti-SARS-CoV-
165	2 N antibodies and \geq 1.0 as reactive (positive) for anti-SARS-CoV-2 N antibodies (27).
166	
167	The LIAISON SARS-CoV-2 S1/S2 IgG assay is an indirect chemiluminescence immunoassay
168	(CLIA) for the quantitative detection of IgG anti-S1 and IgG anti-S2 antibodies to SARS-CoV-
169	2 (28). Results are automatically calculated, with antibody concentrations expressed as
170	arbitrary units (AU/mL). Concentrations of <12.0 AU/mL are interpreted as negative, \ge 12.0
171	to <15.0 AU/mL are interpreted as equivocal, and \geq 15.0 AU/mL are interpreted as positive
172	(28). Equivocal values are referred to as 'gray zone' results.
173	
174	The EUROIMMUN Anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgG and IgA assays are separate enzyme-linked
175	immunosorbent assay (ELISAs) that detect IgG or IgA anti-S1 antibodies to SARS-CoV-2 (29,
176	30). Results are evaluated semi-quantitatively by calculation of a ratio in which the
177	absorbance values of the controls or patient samples are related to the absorbance value of
178	the calibrator (29, 30). For both assays, ratio results <0.8 are interpreted as negative, \geq 0.8
179	to <1.1 are borderline, and \geq 1.1 are positive (29, 30). Borderline values are referred to as
180	'gray zone' results.

181

182The ARCHITECT SARS-CoV-2 IgG assay is a chemiluminescent microparticle immunoassay183(CMIA) used for the qualitative detection of IgG antibodies against the N antigen (31).184Results are expressed in signal-to-cutoff (S/CO) values, with <1.4 results interpreted as</td>185negative and \geq 1.4 results interpreted as positive (31).

186

187 The ADVIA Centaur SARS-CoV-2 Total assay is a CLIA intended for the qualitative detection

188 of antibodies against the RBD of the S1 protein (32). Results are reported in index values,

189 with <1.0 interpreted as non-reactive (negative) for anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibodies and \geq 1.0

190 interpreted as reactive (positive) for anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibodies (32).

191

192 The iFlash-SARS-CoV-2 IgM and IgG assays (33) are separate CLIAs used for the qualitative

- 193 detection of IgM or IgG against the S and N proteins. The iFlash system automatically
- 194 calculates the analytic concentration of each sample, with <10 AU/mL interpreted as non-
- 195 reactive and \geq 10 AU/mL interpreted as reactive for anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgM or IgG antibodies.
- 196

197 Statistical analysis

- 198 Sample size estimations for specificity and sensitivity analyses were based on formulae
- 199 proposed previously (34). Assuming specificities between 0.998 and 0.999 and a sensitivity
- of 0.999, samples sizes of 1698 to 20964 and 32 to 50 respectively, would be required to
- 201 obtain a significance level of 0.05 and a power of 0.8. For specificity and sensitivity
- 202 calculations, point estimates and two-sided 95% confidence intervals (CIs) using the exact
- 203 method were computed employing R version 3.4.0 (35). In the sensitivity evaluation, assay
- 204 results were assigned to the respective week after positive PCR result. In the comparison
- 205 with other commercially available assays, only samples with paired measurements were
- 206 included in the respective analyses. For the differences in estimated specificities and
- 207 sensitivities between Elecsys Anti-SARS-CoV-2 S assay and the comparator assays, two-
- sided 95% Wald CIs were calculated as previously recommended (36). If these CIs did not
- 209 include zero, differences were considered as statistically significant.
- 210

211 Data availability

- 212 Qualified researchers may request access to individual patient level data through the clinical
- 213 study data request platform (https://vivli.org/). Further details on Roche's criteria for eligible
- studies are available here: https://vivli.org/members/ourmembers/. For further details on
- 215 Roche's Global Policy on the Sharing of Clinical Information and how to request access to
- 216 related clinical study documents, see here:
- 217 https://www.roche.com/research_and_development/who_we_are_how_we_work/clinical_tri
- 218 als/our_commitment_to_data_sharing.htm.

219

220 **Results**

221 Overall performance of the Elecsys Anti-SARS-CoV-2 S assay

- 222 Specificity in different target cohorts
- 223 Specificity of the Elecsys Anti-SARS-CoV-2 S assay was evaluated at three European sites
- 224 (with samples from five European sites) using 7880 evaluable residual samples from blood
- 225 donors and routine diagnostic testing; all of which were collected before October 2019 and

226 presumed negative for SARS-CoV-2 antibodies. The overall specificity for all samples was 227 99.95% (95% CI: 99.87–99.99) (Table 1). There were four samples with reactive results of 228 1.790 U/mL, 0.900 U/mL, 0.870 U/mL, and 1.130 U/mL. Three of these reactive samples 229 were from blood donor samples, of which one was collected in March 2016 (influenza 230 season) at Innsbruck, Austria and two were collected in July/August 2018 (outside influenza 231 season) at Bern, Switzerland (Table 1). There was no statistically significant difference in 232 specificity between blood donor samples collected during or outside influenza season. The 233 other reactive sample was from the pregnancy screening cohort in Augsburg (Table 1).

234

235 Sensitivity in different target cohorts

In total, 827 evaluable single and sequential samples from 272 SARS-CoV-2 PCR-confirmed

237 patients were evaluated at three European sites (with samples from four European sites).

The time span of samples collected after positive PCR was between day 0 and day 120. For

subjects with sequential blood draws with more than one sample per time interval, only the

240 result of the last blood draw per given time interval was used for the respective sensitivity

241 calculation. The sensitivity of the Elecsys Anti-SARS-CoV-2 S assay ≥14 days post-PCR

242 (n=240) was 97.92% (95% CI: 95.21–99.32) (Table 2a). The resulting site-specific

243 sensitivities for Augsburg, Berlin, Heidelberg, and Regensburg samples collected \geq 14 days

244 post-PCR confirmation were 100.00% (95% CI: 95.89–100.00), 100.00% (95% CI: 91.40–

245 100.00), 98.72% (95% CI: 93.06–99.97%), and 87.88% (95% CI: 71.80–96.60),

246 respectively (Table 2b).

247

248 Visualization of seroconversions and/or titer visualization

249 For all subjects with at least two sequential blood draws, trajectories were plotted to

visualize antibody titer development from day 0 to 78 post-PCR-positive test (Figure 1). Most

trajectories show a rapid increase in antibody titer and no considerable decline of antibody

titer can be seen for the early and later blood draws. Once detected reactive, none of the

subsequent samples drawn per subject showed a decline of titer below the cutoff.

254

255 Comparison with Elecsys Anti-SARS-CoV-2 assay

A direct method comparison between the Elecsys Anti-SARS-CoV-2 S assay and the

257 commercially available Elecsys Anti-SARS-CoV-2 assay was performed. This included a total

- 258 of 7903 samples comprising both confirmed positive samples from sensitivity testing and
- 259 presumed positive samples with at least one positive antibody result (n=1011), as well as
- 260 presumed negative samples from specificity testing cohort samples (n= 6892: n=4068 blood

- 261 donors; n=2824 routine diagnostic). For all samples, the overall percent agreement (OPA)
- 262 between the Elecsys Anti-SARS-CoV-2 S assay and the Elecsys Anti-SARS-CoV-2 assay was
- 263 99.30% (95% CI: 99.10–99.48) (Table S1a). For presumed negative samples and confirmed
- 264 positive samples, the negative percent agreement (NPA) and positive percent agreement
- 265 (PPA), respectively, between the S- and N-assays were >99% (Table S1b-c).
- 266

267 *Comparison with other commercially available assays*

- 268 The performance of the Elecsys Anti-SARS-CoV-2 S immunoassay was compared with seven
- 269 other commercially available SARS-CoV-2 assays, and sensitivity and specificity results,
- along with percent agreement, were recorded.
- 271
- 272 The OPA between the Elecsys Anti-SARS-CoV-2 S assay and other comparator tests was
- 273 recorded (Table S2). The Elecsys Anti-SARS-CoV-2 S test had the highest OPA with the
- 274 ARCHITECT SARS-CoV-2 IgG (N-assay), at 99.19% (95% CI: 98.80–99.47), and the lowest
- 275 OPA with the ADVIA Centaur SARS-CoV-2 Total (S-assay), at 88.25% (95% CI: 86.16–
- 276 90.13) (Table S2).
- 277
- 278 Specificity
- 279 The specificity of the Elecsys Anti-SARS-CoV-2 S assay was comparable or higher than the
- 280 specificity of all tested comparator assays (Table 3). The specificity of the Elecsys Anti-
- 281 SARS-CoV-2 S test was significantly higher compared with the LIAISON SARS-CoV-2 S1/S2
- 282 IgG, ADVIA Centaur SARS-CoV-2 Total, ARCHITECT SARS-CoV-2 IgG, iFlash-SARS-CoV-2
- IgM, and EUROIMMUN Anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgG and IgA assays (Table S3a). No statistically
- 284 significant difference was observed between the specificity of the Elecsys Anti-SARS-CoV-2 S
- assay compared with the iFlash-SARS-CoV-2 IgG assay (Table S3a).
- 286

287 Sensitivity

- 288 The sensitivity of the Elecsys Anti-SARS-CoV-2 S assay for detecting seropositive results was
- 289 compared with six comparator assays; analysis compared with the LIAISON SARS-CoV-2
- 290 S1/S2 IgG test could not be performed due to a small sample size. Sensitivity was recorded
- for samples collected between 0–6, 7–13, and \geq 14 days post-PCR-positive test. The
- 292 sensitivity of the Elecsys Anti-SARS-CoV-2 S assay was equal to or higher than the sensitivity
- for all tested IgM, IgG, and total antibody assays at all time intervals (Table 4). The
- 294 EUROIMMUN Anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgA assay showed a higher sensitivity in the 0–6 and 7–13
- 295 days post-PCR time intervals and a lower sensitivity in the \geq 14 days post-PCR time interval

compared with the Elecsys Anti-SARS-CoV-2 S assay (Table 4). The sensitivity of the Elecsys

297 Anti-SARS-CoV-2 S assay at detecting antibodies \geq 14 days post-PCR was significantly higher

298 compared with the ARCHITECT SARS-CoV-2 IgG, iFlash-SARS-CoV-2 IgG and IgM, and

299 EUROIMMUN Anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgG assays (Table S3b).

300

301 Discussion

302 Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, there is a pressing need to develop highly specific and 303 sensitive serology tests to assist with the diagnosis of, and to reveal past exposure to, the 304 SARS-CoV-2 virus (17), as well as to support the development of vaccines through 305 distinguishing natural infection-induced immunity from vaccine-induced immunity (9, 18). 306 This was the first multicenter study to demonstrate the performance of the automated 307 Elecsys Anti-SARS-CoV-2 S immunoassay, which detects antibodies against the SARS-CoV-2 308 S protein RBD. Antibodies against the RBD have previously been shown to correlate strongly 309 with protective neutralizing antibodies (37).

310

311 The results from our study revealed that the Elecsys Anti-SARS-CoV-2 S immunoassay 312 displays a robust and favorable performance under routine conditions at multiple sites in 313 Europe, with a very high specificity (99.95%) and sensitivity (97.92%) for the detection of 314 anti-S antibodies. The point estimates for specificity and sensitivity are comparable to the 315 values reported in the package insert of the Elecsys Anti-SARS-CoV-2 S assay (99,98% and 316 98.8%, respectively) (26). In addition, the Elecsys Anti-SARS-CoV-2 S assay showed a 317 performance comparable with the commercially available Elecsys Anti-SARS-CoV-2 (N-318 assay), with 95% CIs that overlap (99.69–99.88% for specificity and 97.0–100% for 319 sensitivity); both assays had a very high overall percent agreement. The Elecsys Anti-SARS-320 CoV-2 assay has a previously reported specificity and sensitivity \geq 14 days post-confirmation 321 of 99.8% and 99.5%, respectively (38).

322

323 The overall specificity of >99.9% determined in this study demonstrated that the Elecsys 324 Anti-SARS-CoV-2 S is a highly specific assay for the detection of antibodies against SARS-325 CoV-2. Notably, this analysis included 2424 samples from pregnant women and pediatric 326 populations. The availability of an accurate SARS-CoV-2 serology assay is particularly 327 important for the pregnant population, considering the changes in the immune system that 328 occur during pregnancy, which may increase the woman's susceptibility to severe infection 329 (39). Additionally, an antibody assay with a high specificity is imperative to reduce the risk 330 of false-positive results, which may inaccurately indicate a past SARS-CoV-2 infection (40).

331

The Elecsys Anti-SARS-CoV-2 S immunoassay demonstrated good specificity and sensitivity
in direct comparison with other commercially available assays; both performance
measurements were equal to or greater than those for all other evaluated comparator
assays. These other assays have also been assessed in previous studies (17, 41-44).
However, it is important to note that, for a direct comparison of sensitivity, the available
assays differ with respect to assay designs (e.g. antibody classes used) as well as the
targets (anti-N and anti-S) that they detect.

339

340 A multicenter comparison of seven serology assays, including the Elecsys Anti-SARS-CoV-2 341 assay, revealed a subpopulation of PCR-confirmed SARS-CoV-2 individuals who were 342 persistently seronegative, which represents a proportion of patients that may be at risk for 343 re-infection (45). Within the group of PCR-confirmed samples in our study, for which there 344 was at least one S and one N antibody result from another comparator assay, there were 345 samples from five patients all of which had a reactive Elecsys Anti-SARS-CoV-2 S test result, 346 a reactive or 'gray zone' EUROIMMUN test result and a reactive ADVIA Centaur test result 347 (S-assays), and a non-reactive Elecsys Anti-SARS-CoV-2 and ARCHITECT SARS-CoV-2 IqG 348 test result (N-assays). There was only one sample that was commonly non-reactive in all S-349 based assays and reactive in all N-based assays. However, the blood draw was taken very 350 early, at the same day as the PCR was done, and the follow-up sample was reactive with the 351 Elecsys Anti-SARS-CoV-2 S assay. Data indicating differences in the kinetics of serology 352 assays are ambiguous and there is little difference in the timing of these responses (42, 46-353 49). However, differences between N- and S- antigen-based assays should be taken into 354 consideration when interpreting results.

355

A major strength of this study is the large cohort of presumed negative samples from multiple sites used to determine the specificity of the assay, as well as the multiple method comparison analyses performed and the various population cohorts used, with samples from pediatric and pregnant woman. Further studies should be performed to determine the sensitivity of the Elecsys Anti-SARS-CoV-2 S immunoassay on a larger sample group.

361

362 Conclusion

363 This study demonstrated the performance of the Elecsys Anti-SARS-CoV-2 S immunoassay,

with a very high specificity of 99.95% and sensitivity of 97.92% in samples ≥14 days post-

365 PCR confirmation, which was equal to or greater than the performance of seven other

- 366 commercially available immunoassays. Therefore, these data support the use of the Elecsys
- 367 Anti-SARS-CoV-2 S immunoassay for reliable identification of past exposure to SARS-CoV-2
- in various populations, and highlight the potential for the use of this assay in determining
- immune status during vaccine efficacy studies.
- 370

371 Funding

372 This study was funded by Roche Diagnostics GmbH (Mannheim, Germany).

373

374 Conflicts of interest

- 375 ER and AA report grants from Roche Diagnostics, during the conduct of the study and
- 376 personal fees from Roche Diagnostics (honoraria for lectures), outside the submitted work.
- 377 MK reports non-financial support from Roche Diagnostics, during the conduct of the study.
- 378 CN, PF and JKH have nothing to disclose. FL, CMR, and TL are employees of Roche
- 379 Diagnostics GmbH.
- 380

381 Acknowledgements

- 382 The authors would like to acknowledge: Kathrin Schoenfeld (Roche Diagnostics) for her role
- in study conceptualization, study management, interpretation of analysis, and further critical
- 384 input; Michael Laimighofer (Roche Diagnostics) for his role in database generation and data
- validation, statistical analysis plan, and formal analysis; and Sigrid Reichhuber and Janina
- 386 Edion (Roche Diagnostics) for their role in investigational site management, data acquisition,
- 387 and study monitoring. Medical writing support was provided by Katie Farrant, Elements
- 388 Communications Ltd, Westerham, UK and was funded by Roche Diagnostics International
- 389 Ltd, Rotkreuz, Switzerland. ELECSYS and COBAS E are trademarks of Roche Diagnostics. All
- 390 other product names and trademarks are the property of their respective owners.

391 References

392 393 394	1.	Chan JF, Yuan S, Kok KH, To KK, Chu H, Yang J, Xing F, Liu J, Yip CC, Poon RW, Tsoi HW, Lo SK, Chan KH, Poon VK, Chan WM, Ip JD, Cai JP, Cheng VC, Chen H, Hui CK, Yuen KY. 2020. A familial cluster of pneumonia associated with the 2019 novel
395		coronavirus indicating person-to-person transmission: a study of a family cluster.
396		lancet 395:514–523.
397	2.	Wu F, Zhao S, Yu B, Chen YM, Wang W, Song ZG, Hu Y, Tao ZW, Tian JH, Pei YY,
398		Yuan ML, Zhang YL, Dai FH, Liu Y, Wang QM, Zheng JJ, Xu L, Holmes EC, Zhang YZ.
399		2020. A new coronavirus associated with human respiratory disease in China. Nature
400		579:265–269.
401	3.	World Health Organization. 2020. WHO Director-General's remarks at the media
402		briefing on 2019-nCoV on 11 February 2020.
403		https://www.who.int/dg/speeches/detail/who-director-general-s-remarks-at-the-
404		media-briefing-on-2019-ncov-on-11-february-2020. Accessed February 26 2021.
405	4.	Naqvi AAT, Fatima K, Mohammad T, Fatima U, Singh IK, Singh A, Atif SM, Hariprasad
406		G, Hasan GM, Hassan MI. 2020. Insights into SARS-CoV-2 genome, structure,
407		evolution, pathogenesis and therapies: Structural genomics approach. Biochim
408		Biophys Acta Mol Basis Dis 1866:165878.
409	5.	Walls AC, Park YJ, Tortorici MA, Wall A, McGuire AT, Veesler D. 2020. Structure,
410		function, and antigenicity of the SARS-CoV-2 spike glycoprotein. Cell 181:281–292
411		e6.
412	6.	Tang T, Bidon M, Jaimes JA, Whittaker GR, Daniel S. 2020. Coronavirus membrane
413		fusion mechanism offers a potential target for antiviral development. Antiviral Res
414		178:104792.
415	7.	Wrapp D, Wang N, Corbett KS, Goldsmith JA, Hsieh CL, Abiona O, Graham BS,
416		McLellan JS. 2020. Cryo-EM structure of the 2019-nCoV spike in the prefusion
417		conformation. Science 367:1260–1263.
418	8.	Ou X, Liu Y, Lei X, Li P, Mi D, Ren L, Guo L, Guo R, Chen T, Hu J, Xiang Z, Mu Z,
419		Chen X, Chen J, Hu K, Jin Q, Wang J, Qian Z. 2020. Characterization of spike
420		glycoprotein of SARS-CoV-2 on virus entry and its immune cross-reactivity with
421		SARS-CoV. Nat Commun 11:1620.
422	9.	Galipeau Y, Greig M, Liu G, Driedger M, Langlois MA. 2020. Humoral responses and
423		serological assays in SARS-CoV-2 infections. Front Immunol 11:610688.
424	10.	Liu W, Liu L, Kou G, Zheng Y, Ding Y, Ni W, Wang Q, Tan L, Wu W, Tang S, Xiong Z,
425		Zheng S. 2020. Evaluation of nucleocapsid and spike protein-based enzyme-linked

426		immunosorbent assays for detecting antibodies against SARS-CoV-2. J Clin Microbiol
427		58.
428	11.	Guo L, Ren L, Yang S, Xiao M, Chang, Yang F, Dela Cruz CS, Wang Y, Wu C, Xiao Y,
429		Zhang L, Han L, Dang S, Xu Y, Yang QW, Xu SY, Zhu HD, Xu YC, Jin Q, Sharma L,
430		Wang L, Wang J. 2020. Profiling early humoral response to diagnose novel
431		coronavirus disease (COVID-19). Clin Infect Dis 71:778–785.
432	12.	To KK, Tsang OT, Leung WS, Tam AR, Wu TC, Lung DC, Yip CC, Cai JP, Chan JM,
433		Chik TS, Lau DP, Choi CY, Chen LL, Chan WM, Chan KH, Ip JD, Ng AC, Poon RW, Luo
434		CT, Cheng VC, Chan JF, Hung IF, Chen Z, Chen H, Yuen KY. 2020. Temporal profiles
435		of viral load in posterior oropharyngeal saliva samples and serum antibody responses
436		during infection by SARS-CoV-2: an observational cohort study. Lancet Infect Dis
437		20:565–574.
438	13.	Long QX, Liu BZ, Deng HJ, Wu GC, Deng K, Chen YK, Liao P, Qiu JF, Lin Y, Cai XF,
439		Wang DQ, Hu Y, Ren JH, Tang N, Xu YY, Yu LH, Mo Z, Gong F, Zhang XL, Tian WG,
440		Hu L, Zhang XX, Xiang JL, Du HX, Liu HW, Lang CH, Luo XH, Wu SB, Cui XP, Zhou Z,
441		Zhu MM, Wang J, Xue CJ, Li XF, Wang L, Li ZJ, Wang K, Niu CC, Yang QJ, Tang XJ,
442		Zhang Y, Liu XM, Li JJ, Zhang DC, Zhang F, Liu P, Yuan J, Li Q, Hu JL, Chen J, et al.
443		2020. Antibody responses to SARS-CoV-2 in patients with COVID-19. Nat Med
444		26:845–848.
445	14.	Zhao J, Yuan Q, Wang H, Liu W, Liao X, Su Y, Wang X, Yuan J, Li T, Li J, Qian S,
446		Hong C, Wang F, Liu Y, Wang Z, He Q, Li Z, He B, Zhang T, Fu Y, Ge S, Liu L, Zhang
447		J, Xia N, Zhang Z. 2020. Antibody responses to SARS-CoV-2 in patients with novel
448		coronavirus disease 2019. Clin Infect Dis 71:2027–2034.
449	15.	Lou B, Li TD, Zheng SF, Su YY, Li ZY, Liu W, Yu F, Ge SX, Zou QD, Yuan Q, Lin S,
450		Hong CM, Yao XY, Zhang XJ, Wu DH, Zhou GL, Hou WH, Li TT, Zhang YL, Zhang SY,
451		Fan J, Zhang J, Xia NS, Chen Y. 2020. Serology characteristics of SARS-CoV-2
452		infection after exposure and post-symptom onset. Eur Respir J 56.
453	16.	Young BE, Ong SWX, Ng LFP, Anderson DE, Chia WN, Chia PY, Ang LW, Mak TM,
454		Kalimuddin S, Chai LYA, Pada S, Tan SY, Sun L, Parthasarathy P, Fong SW, Chan YH,
455		Tan CW, Lee B, Rötzschke O, Ding Y, Tambyah P, Low JGH, Cui L, Barkham T, Lin
456		RTP, Leo YS, Renia L, Wang LF, Lye DC. 2020. Viral dynamics and immune correlates
457		of COVID-19 disease severity. Clin Infect Dis doi:10.1093/cid/ciaa1280.
458	17.	Kontou PI, Braliou GG, Dimou NL, Nikolopoulos G, Bagos PG. 2020. Antibody tests in
459		detecting SARS-CoV-2 infection: A meta-analysis. Diagnostics (Basel) 10:319.

460	18.	Ernst E, Wolfe P, Stahura C, Edwards KA. 2021. Technical considerations to
461		development of serological tests for SARS-CoV-2. Talanta 224:121883.
462	19.	Zhu FC, Guan XH, Li YH, Huang JY, Jiang T, Hou LH, Li JX, Yang BF, Wang L, Wang
463		WJ, Wu SP, Wang Z, Wu XH, Xu JJ, Zhang Z, Jia SY, Wang BS, Hu Y, Liu JJ, Zhang J,
464		Qian XA, Li Q, Pan HX, Jiang HD, Deng P, Gou JB, Wang XW, Wang XH, Chen W.
465		2020. Immunogenicity and safety of a recombinant adenovirus type-5-vectored
466		COVID-19 vaccine in healthy adults aged 18 years or older: a randomised, double-
467		blind, placebo-controlled, phase 2 trial. Lancet 396:479–488.
468	20.	Widge AT, Rouphael NG, Jackson LA, Anderson EJ, Roberts PC, Makhene M, Chappell
469		JD, Denison MR, Stevens LJ, Pruijssers AJ, McDermott AB, Flach B, Lin BC, Doria-
470		Rose NA, O'Dell S, Schmidt SD, Neuzil KM, Bennett H, Leav B, Makowski M, Albert J,
471		Cross K, Edara VV, Floyd K, Suthar MS, Buchanan W, Luke CJ, Ledgerwood JE,
472		Mascola JR, Graham BS, Beigel JH. 2021. Durability of Responses after SARS-CoV-2
473		mRNA-1273 Vaccination. N Engl J Med 384:80–82.
474	21.	World Health Organization. 2021. The COVID-19 candidate vaccine landscape.
475		https://www.who.int/publications/m/item/draft-landscape-of-covid-19-candidate-
476		vaccines Accessed February 09 2021
170		
477	22.	The New York Times. 2021. Coronavirus vaccine tracker.
477 477 478	22.	The New York Times. 2021. Coronavirus vaccine tracker. https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2020/science/coronavirus-vaccine-tracker.html.
477 478 479	22.	The New York Times. 2021. Coronavirus vaccine tracker. https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2020/science/coronavirus-vaccine-tracker.html. Accessed February 09 2021.
477 478 479 480	22. 23.	The New York Times. 2021. Coronavirus vaccine tracker. https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2020/science/coronavirus-vaccine-tracker.html. Accessed February 09 2021. Dai L, Gao GF. 2020. Viral targets for vaccines against COVID-19. Nat Rev Immunol
477 478 479 480 481	22. 23.	The New York Times. 2021. Coronavirus vaccine tracker. https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2020/science/coronavirus-vaccine-tracker.html. Accessed February 09 2021. Dai L, Gao GF. 2020. Viral targets for vaccines against COVID-19. Nat Rev Immunol doi:10.1038/s41577-020-00480-0.
477 478 479 480 481 482	22. 23. 24.	The New York Times. 2021. Coronavirus vaccine tracker. https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2020/science/coronavirus-vaccine-tracker.html. Accessed February 09 2021. Dai L, Gao GF. 2020. Viral targets for vaccines against COVID-19. Nat Rev Immunol doi:10.1038/s41577-020-00480-0. Forni G, Mantovani A. 2021. COVID-19 vaccines: where we stand and challenges
477 478 479 480 481 482 483	22. 23. 24.	The New York Times. 2021. Coronavirus vaccine tracker. https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2020/science/coronavirus-vaccine-tracker.html. Accessed February 09 2021. Dai L, Gao GF. 2020. Viral targets for vaccines against COVID-19. Nat Rev Immunol doi:10.1038/s41577-020-00480-0. Forni G, Mantovani A. 2021. COVID-19 vaccines: where we stand and challenges ahead. Cell Death Differ doi:10.1038/s41418-020-00720-9:1-14.
477 478 479 480 481 482 483 484	22. 23. 24. 25.	The New York Times. 2021. Coronavirus vaccine tracker. https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2020/science/coronavirus-vaccine-tracker.html. Accessed February 09 2021. Dai L, Gao GF. 2020. Viral targets for vaccines against COVID-19. Nat Rev Immunol doi:10.1038/s41577-020-00480-0. Forni G, Mantovani A. 2021. COVID-19 vaccines: where we stand and challenges ahead. Cell Death Differ doi:10.1038/s41418-020-00720-9:1-14. Ni L, Ye F, Cheng ML, Feng Y, Deng YQ, Zhao H, Wei P, Ge J, Gou M, Li X, Sun L,
477 478 479 480 481 482 483 483 484 485	22. 23. 24. 25.	The New York Times. 2021. Coronavirus vaccine tracker. https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2020/science/coronavirus-vaccine-tracker.html. Accessed February 09 2021. Dai L, Gao GF. 2020. Viral targets for vaccines against COVID-19. Nat Rev Immunol doi:10.1038/s41577-020-00480-0. Forni G, Mantovani A. 2021. COVID-19 vaccines: where we stand and challenges ahead. Cell Death Differ doi:10.1038/s41418-020-00720-9:1-14. Ni L, Ye F, Cheng ML, Feng Y, Deng YQ, Zhao H, Wei P, Ge J, Gou M, Li X, Sun L, Cao T, Wang P, Zhou C, Zhang R, Liang P, Guo H, Wang X, Qin CF, Chen F, Dong C.
477 478 479 480 481 482 483 484 485 486	22. 23. 24. 25.	 The New York Times. 2021. Coronavirus vaccine tracker. https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2020/science/coronavirus-vaccine-tracker.html. Accessed February 09 2021. Dai L, Gao GF. 2020. Viral targets for vaccines against COVID-19. Nat Rev Immunol doi:10.1038/s41577-020-00480-0. Forni G, Mantovani A. 2021. COVID-19 vaccines: where we stand and challenges ahead. Cell Death Differ doi:10.1038/s41418-020-00720-9:1-14. Ni L, Ye F, Cheng ML, Feng Y, Deng YQ, Zhao H, Wei P, Ge J, Gou M, Li X, Sun L, Cao T, Wang P, Zhou C, Zhang R, Liang P, Guo H, Wang X, Qin CF, Chen F, Dong C. 2020. Detection of SARS-CoV-2-specific humoral and cellular immunity in COVID-19
477 478 479 480 481 482 483 484 485 486 487	22. 23. 24. 25.	The New York Times. 2021. Coronavirus vaccine tracker. https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2020/science/coronavirus-vaccine-tracker.html. Accessed February 09 2021. Dai L, Gao GF. 2020. Viral targets for vaccines against COVID-19. Nat Rev Immunol doi:10.1038/s41577-020-00480-0. Forni G, Mantovani A. 2021. COVID-19 vaccines: where we stand and challenges ahead. Cell Death Differ doi:10.1038/s41418-020-00720-9:1-14. Ni L, Ye F, Cheng ML, Feng Y, Deng YQ, Zhao H, Wei P, Ge J, Gou M, Li X, Sun L, Cao T, Wang P, Zhou C, Zhang R, Liang P, Guo H, Wang X, Qin CF, Chen F, Dong C. 2020. Detection of SARS-CoV-2-specific humoral and cellular immunity in COVID-19 convalescent individuals. Immunity 52:971–977 e3.
477 478 479 480 481 482 483 484 485 486 487 488	22. 23. 24. 25. 26.	 The New York Times. 2021. Coronavirus vaccine tracker. https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2020/science/coronavirus-vaccine-tracker.html. Accessed February 09 2021. Dai L, Gao GF. 2020. Viral targets for vaccines against COVID-19. Nat Rev Immunol doi:10.1038/s41577-020-00480-0. Forni G, Mantovani A. 2021. COVID-19 vaccines: where we stand and challenges ahead. Cell Death Differ doi:10.1038/s41418-020-00720-9:1-14. Ni L, Ye F, Cheng ML, Feng Y, Deng YQ, Zhao H, Wei P, Ge J, Gou M, Li X, Sun L, Cao T, Wang P, Zhou C, Zhang R, Liang P, Guo H, Wang X, Qin CF, Chen F, Dong C. 2020. Detection of SARS-CoV-2-specific humoral and cellular immunity in COVID-19 convalescent individuals. Immunity 52:971–977 e3. Roche Diagnostics GmbH. 2020. Elecsys® Anti-SARS-CoV-2 S assay method sheet;
477 478 479 480 481 482 483 484 485 486 485 486 487 488 489	22. 23. 24. 25. 26.	 The New York Times. 2021. Coronavirus vaccine tracker. https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2020/science/coronavirus-vaccine-tracker.html. Accessed February 09 2021. Dai L, Gao GF. 2020. Viral targets for vaccines against COVID-19. Nat Rev Immunol doi:10.1038/s41577-020-00480-0. Forni G, Mantovani A. 2021. COVID-19 vaccines: where we stand and challenges ahead. Cell Death Differ doi:10.1038/s41418-020-00720-9:1-14. Ni L, Ye F, Cheng ML, Feng Y, Deng YQ, Zhao H, Wei P, Ge J, Gou M, Li X, Sun L, Cao T, Wang P, Zhou C, Zhang R, Liang P, Guo H, Wang X, Qin CF, Chen F, Dong C. 2020. Detection of SARS-CoV-2-specific humoral and cellular immunity in COVID-19 convalescent individuals. Immunity 52:971–977 e3. Roche Diagnostics GmbH. 2020. Elecsys® Anti-SARS-CoV-2 S assay method sheet; V1. https://diagnostics.roche.com/global/en/products/params/elecsys-anti-sars-cov-
477 478 479 480 481 482 483 484 485 486 485 486 487 488 489 490	22. 23. 24. 25. 26.	 The New York Times. 2021. Coronavirus vaccine tracker. https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2020/science/coronavirus-vaccine-tracker.html. Accessed February 09 2021. Dai L, Gao GF. 2020. Viral targets for vaccines against COVID-19. Nat Rev Immunol doi:10.1038/s41577-020-00480-0. Forni G, Mantovani A. 2021. COVID-19 vaccines: where we stand and challenges ahead. Cell Death Differ doi:10.1038/s41418-020-00720-9:1-14. Ni L, Ye F, Cheng ML, Feng Y, Deng YQ, Zhao H, Wei P, Ge J, Gou M, Li X, Sun L, Cao T, Wang P, Zhou C, Zhang R, Liang P, Guo H, Wang X, Qin CF, Chen F, Dong C. 2020. Detection of SARS-CoV-2-specific humoral and cellular immunity in COVID-19 convalescent individuals. Immunity 52:971–977 e3. Roche Diagnostics GmbH. 2020. Elecsys® Anti-SARS-CoV-2 S assay method sheet; V1. https://diagnostics.roche.com/global/en/products/params/elecsys-anti-sars-cov-2-s.html. Accessed February 26 2021.
477 478 479 480 481 482 483 484 485 486 487 488 489 490 491	 22. 23. 24. 25. 26. 27. 	 The New York Times. 2021. Coronavirus vaccine tracker. https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2020/science/coronavirus-vaccine-tracker.html. Accessed February 09 2021. Dai L, Gao GF. 2020. Viral targets for vaccines against COVID-19. Nat Rev Immunol doi:10.1038/s41577-020-00480-0. Forni G, Mantovani A. 2021. COVID-19 vaccines: where we stand and challenges ahead. Cell Death Differ doi:10.1038/s41418-020-00720-9:1-14. Ni L, Ye F, Cheng ML, Feng Y, Deng YQ, Zhao H, Wei P, Ge J, Gou M, Li X, Sun L, Cao T, Wang P, Zhou C, Zhang R, Liang P, Guo H, Wang X, Qin CF, Chen F, Dong C. 2020. Detection of SARS-CoV-2-specific humoral and cellular immunity in COVID-19 convalescent individuals. Immunity 52:971–977 e3. Roche Diagnostics GmbH. 2020. Elecsys® Anti-SARS-CoV-2 S assay method sheet; V1. https://diagnostics.roche.com/global/en/products/params/elecsys-anti-sars-cov-2-s.html. Accessed February 26 2021. Roche Diagnostics GmbH. 2020. Elecsys® Anti-SARS-CoV-2 assay method sheet;
477 478 479 480 481 482 483 484 485 486 485 486 487 488 489 490 491 492	 22. 23. 24. 25. 26. 27. 	The New York Times. 2021. Coronavirus vaccine tracker. https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2020/science/coronavirus-vaccine-tracker.html. Accessed February 09 2021. Dai L, Gao GF. 2020. Viral targets for vaccines against COVID-19. Nat Rev Immunol doi:10.1038/s41577-020-00480-0. Forni G, Mantovani A. 2021. COVID-19 vaccines: where we stand and challenges ahead. Cell Death Differ doi:10.1038/s41418-020-00720-9:1-14. Ni L, Ye F, Cheng ML, Feng Y, Deng YQ, Zhao H, Wei P, Ge J, Gou M, Li X, Sun L, Cao T, Wang P, Zhou C, Zhang R, Liang P, Guo H, Wang X, Qin CF, Chen F, Dong C. 2020. Detection of SARS-CoV-2-specific humoral and cellular immunity in COVID-19 convalescent individuals. Immunity 52:971–977 e3. Roche Diagnostics GmbH. 2020. Elecsys® Anti-SARS-CoV-2 S assay method sheet; V1. https://diagnostics.roche.com/global/en/products/params/elecsys-anti-sars-cov- 2-s.html. Accessed February 26 2021. Roche Diagnostics GmbH. 2020. Elecsys® Anti-SARS-CoV-2 assay method sheet; 09203095501 V6.0. https://www.fda.gov/media/137605/download. Accessed

494	28.	DiaSorin. 2020. LIAISON® SARS-CoV-2 S1/S2 IgG assay method sheet;
495		M0870004366/D 09/20.
496		https://www.diasorin.com/sites/default/files/allegati_prodotti/covid
497		<u>brochure igg unica m0870004366-d low.pdf</u> . Accessed February 26 2021.
498	29.	EUROIMMUN. 2020. Anti-SARS-CoV-2 ELISA (IgG) product data sheet;
499		EI_2606_D_UK_A06, 10/2020. https://www.coronavirus-
500		diagnostics.com/documents/Indications/Infections/Coronavirus/EI_2606_D_UK_A.pdf
501		. Accessed February 26 2021.
502	30.	EUROIMMUN. 2020. Anti-SARS-CoV-2 ELISA (IgA) product data sheet;
503		EI_2606_D_UK_B04, 10/2020. https://www.coronavirus-
504		diagnostics.com/documents/Indications/Infections/Coronavirus/EI_2606_D_UK_B.pdf
505		. Accessed February 26 2021.
506	31.	Abbott. 2020. ARCHITECT SARS-CoV-2 IgG assay method sheet.
507		https://www.fda.gov/media/137383/download. Accessed February 26 2021.
508	32.	Siemens. 2020. ADVIA Centaur® SARS-CoV-2 Total (COV2T) assay method sheet;
509		11206904_EN Rev. 01, 2020-05. https://www.fda.gov/media/138446/download .
510		Accessed February 26 2021.
511	33.	Shenzhen YHLO Biotech Co Ltd. 2020. iFlash-SARS-CoV-2 IgM/IgG antibody test
512		product overview. <u>http://en.szyhlo.com/cmscontent/iFlash-SARS-CoV-2-IgMIgG-</u>
513		Antibody-Test-439.html. Accessed February 26 2021.
514	34.	Hajian-Tilaki K. 2014. Sample size estimation in diagnostic test studies of biomedical
515		informatics. J Biomed Inform 48:193–204.
516	35.	R Core Team. 2017. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R
517		Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. <u>https://www.R-project.org/</u> .
518		Accessed February 26 2021.
519	36.	Wenzel D, Zapf A. 2013. Difference of two dependent sensitivities and specificities:
520		Comparison of various approaches. Biom J 55:705–718.
521	37.	Premkumar L, Segovia-Chumbez B, Jadi R, Martinez DR, Raut R, Markmann A,
522		Cornaby C, Bartelt L, Weiss S, Park Y, Edwards CE, Weimer E, Scherer EM, Rouphael
523		N, Edupuganti S, Weiskopf D, Tse LV, Hou YJ, Margolis D, Sette A, Collins MH,
524		Schmitz J, Baric RS, de Silva AM. 2020. The receptor binding domain of the viral
525		spike protein is an immunodominant and highly specific target of antibodies in SARS-
526		CoV-2 patients. Sci Immunol 5.
527	38.	Muench P, Jochum S, Wenderoth V, Ofenloch-Haehnle B, Hombach M, Strobl M,
528		Sadlowski H, Sachse C, Torriani G, Eckerle I, Riedel A. 2020. Development and

520		validation of the Electric Anti CARC CoV 2 immunoaccov as a highly energific tool for
529		Validation of the Elecsys Anti-SARS-Cov-2 infinutioassay as a highly specific tool for
530		determining past exposure to SARS-CoV-2. J Clin Microbiol 58.
531	39.	Dashraath P, Wong JLJ, Lim MXK, Lim LM, Li S, Biswas A, Choolani M, Mattar C, Su
532		LL. 2020. Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic and pregnancy. Am J
533		Obstet Gynecol 222:521–531.
534	40.	Farnsworth CW, Anderson NW. 2020. SARS-CoV-2 serology: much hype, little data.
535		Clin Chem 66:875–877.
536	41.	Meyer B, Torriani G, Yerly S, Mazza L, Calame A, Arm-Vernez I, Zimmer G, Agoritsas
537		T, Stirnemann J, Spechbach H, Guessous I, Stringhini S, Pugin J, Roux-Lombard P,
538		Fontao L, Siegrist CA, Eckerle I, Vuilleumier N, Kaiser L, Geneva Center for Emerging
539		Viral D. 2020. Validation of a commercially available SARS-CoV-2 serological
540		immunoassay. Clin Microbiol Infect 26:1386–1394.
541	42.	Kohmer N, Westhaus S, Ruhl C, Ciesek S, Rabenau HF. 2020. Brief clinical evaluation
542		of six high-throughput SARS-CoV-2 IgG antibody assays. J Clin Virol 129:104480.
543	43.	Okba NMA, Muller MA, Li W, Wang C, GeurtsvanKessel CH, Corman VM, Lamers MM,
544		Sikkema RS, de Bruin E, Chandler FD, Yazdanpanah Y, Le Hingrat Q, Descamps D,
545		Houhou-Fidouh N, Reusken C, Bosch BJ, Drosten C, Koopmans MPG, Haagmans BL.
546		2020. Severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2-specific antibody responses
547		in coronavirus disease patients. Emerg Infect Dis 26:1478–1488.
548	44.	Ocmant A, Roisin S, De Meuter R, Brauner J. 2021. Clinical performance of the Advia
549		Centaur anti-SARS-CoV-2 chemiluminescent immunoassay related to antibody
550		kinetics. J Med Virol doi:10.1002/jmv.26800.
551	45.	Oved K, Olmer L, Shemer-Avni Y, Wolf T, Supino-Rosin L, Prajgrod G, Shenhar Y,
552		Payorsky I, Cohen Y, Kohn Y, Indenbaum V, Lazar R, Geylis V, Oikawa MT, Shinar E,
553		Stoyanov E, Keinan-Boker L, Bassal R, Reicher S, Yishai R, Bar-Chaim A, Doolman R,
554		Reiter Y, Mendelson E, Livneh Z, Freedman LS, Lustig Y. 2020. Multi-center
555		nationwide comparison of seven serology assays reveals a SARS-CoV-2 non-
556		responding seronegative subpopulation. EClinicalMedicine 29:100651.
557	46.	Burbelo PD, Riedo FX, Morishima C, Rawlings S, Smith D, Das S, Strich JR, Chertow
558		DS, Davey RT, Jr., Cohen JI. 2020. Detection of nucleocapsid antibody to SARS-CoV-
559		2 is more sensitive than antibody to spike protein in COVID-19 patients. medRxiv
560		doi:10.1101/2020.04.20.20071423.
561	47.	Wang Y, Zhang L, Sang L, Ye F, Ruan S, Zhong B, Song T, Alshukairi AN, Chen R,
562		Zhang Z, Gan M, Zhu A, Huang Y, Luo L, Mok CKP, Al Gethamy MM, Tan H, Li Z,
563		Huang X, Li F, Sun J, Zhang Y, Wen L, Li Y, Chen Z, Zhuang Z, Zhuo J, Chen C,

564		Kuang L, Wang J, Lv H, Jiang Y, Li M, Lin Y, Deng Y, Tang L, Liang J, Huang J,
565		Perlman S, Zhong N, Zhao J, Malik Peiris JS, Li Y, Zhao J. 2020. Kinetics of viral load
566		and antibody response in relation to COVID-19 severity. J Clin Invest 130:5235–
567		5244.
568	48.	Van Elslande J, Decru B, Jonckheere S, Van Wijngaerden E, Houben E,
569		Vandecandelaere P, Indevuyst C, Depypere M, Desmet S, Andre E, Van Ranst M,
570		Lagrou K, Vermeersch P. 2020. Antibody response against SARS-CoV-2 spike protein
571		and nucleoprotein evaluated by four automated immunoassays and three ELISAs.
572		Clin Microbiol Infect 26:1557 e1–1557 e7.
573	49.	Johnson M, Wagstaffe HR, Gilmour KC, Mai AL, Lewis J, Hunt A, Sirr J, Bengt C,
574		Grandjean L, Goldblatt D. 2020. Evaluation of a novel multiplexed assay for
575		determining IgG levels and functional activity to SARS-CoV-2. J Clin Virol
576		130:104572.
577		

Sample cohort		Number of	Reactive	Specificity (95% confidence		
		samples	sa mples	intervals, 2-sided)		
Blood donors						
	Innsbruck / influenza season	1050	1	99.90% (99.47–100.00)		
Origin /	Hagen / no seasonal selection	955	0	100.00% (99.61–100.00)		
season	Bern / outside influenza season	2000	2	99.90% (99.64–99.99)		
	Bern / influenza season	1051	0	100.00% (99.65–100.00)		
Total blood do	onors	5056	3	99.94% (99.83–99.99)		
Diagnostic ro	utine					
	Augsburg / diagnostic routine	400	0	100.00% (99.08–100.00)		
O isin (aska t	Augsburg / pregnancy screening	1496	1	99.93% (99.63–100.00)		
Origin / conort	Heidelberg / pregnancy screening	737	0	100.00% (99.50–100.00)		
	Heidelberg / pediatric samples	191	0	100.00% (98.09–100.00)		
Total diagnostic routine		2824	1	99.96% (99.80–100.00)		
Overall (all sa	mples)	7880	4	99.95% (99.87–99.99)		

578 Table 1. Specificity results for the Elecsys Anti-SARS-CoV-2 S assay

Days post-PCR-positive test	Number of	Reactive	Non-reactive	Sensitivity (95% confidence		
	samples	samples	samples	intervals, 2-sided)		
0 to 6	44	25	19	56.82% (41.03–71.65)		
7 to 13	49	42	7	85.71% (72.76–94.06)		
14 to 20	47	46	1	97.87% (88.71–99.95)		
21 to 27	58	58	0	100.00% (93.84–100.00)		
28 to 34	43	43	0	100.00% (91.78–100.00)		
35 to 41	57	56	1	98.25% (90.61–99.96)		
42 to 48	47	47	0	100.00% (92.45–100.00)		
49 to 55	39	35	4	89.74% (75.78–97.13)		
56 to 62	33	33	0	100.00% (89.42–100.00)		
≥63 (up to 120)	21	21	0	100.00% (83.89–100.00)		
All samples \geq 14 (up to 120) ¹	240	235	5	97.92% (95.21–99.32)		

580 Table 2a. Overall sensitivity results for the Elecsys Anti-SARS-CoV-2 S assay

581 ¹ Only the last sample taken \geq 14 days post-PCR of each patient is included in the sensitivity calculation.

582 PCR, polymerase chain reaction

583

584 Table 2b. Sensitivity results for the Elecsys Anti-SARS-CoV-2 S assay per site

Days post-	Aug	jsburg	Berlin		Heidelberg		Regensburg	
PCR-positive	Ν	Sensitivity	N	Sensitivity	Ν	Sensitivity	N	Sensitivity
test		(95% CI)		(95% CI)		(95% CI)		(95% CI)
0 to 6	3	33.33%	23	60.87%	18	55.56%	0	N/A
		(0.84–90.57)		(38.54–80.29)		(30.76–78.47)		
7 to 13	4	100.00%	34	85.29%	11	81.82%	0	N/A
		(39.76–100.00)		(68.94–95.05)		(48.22–97.72)		
\geq 14 (up to 120) ¹	88	100.00%	41	100.00%	78	98.72%	33	87.88%
		(95.89–100.00)		(91.40–100.00)		(93.06–99.97)		(71.80–96.60)

585 ¹ Only the last sample taken \geq 14 days post-PCR of each patient is included in the sensitivity calculation.

586 CI, confidence interval; N, number of samples; N/A, not applicable; PCR, polymerase chain reaction

588	Table 3. Sp	ecificity c	of the Elecsy	/s Anti-SARS-	CoV-2 S assay	y and other com	parator assay	ys
-----	-------------	-------------	---------------	---------------	---------------	-----------------	---------------	----

Assay	Number of	Reactive	Non-reactive	Specificity (95% confidence	
	samples	samples	samples	intervals, 2-sided)	
LIAISON SARS-CoV-2 S1/S2 IgG (GZ excl.) ¹	2033	24	2009	98.82% (98.25–99.24)	
Elecsys Anti-SARS-CoV-2 S		1	2032	99.95% (99.73–100.00)	
LIAISON SARS-CoV-2 S1/S2 IgG (GZ+)	2040	31	2009	98.48% (97.85–98.97)	
Elecsys Anti-SARS-CoV-2 S		1	2039	99.95% (99.73–100.00)	
ADVIA Centaur SARS-CoV-2 Total	928	121	807	86.96% (84.62-89.06)	
Elecsys Anti-SARS-CoV-2 S		0	928	100.00% (99.60-100.00)	
ARCHITECT SARS-CoV-2 IgG	2932	9	2923	99.69% (99.42–99.86)	
Elecsys Anti-SARS-CoV-2 S		1	2931	99.97% (99.81–100.00)	
EUROIMMUN Anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgG (GZ excl.)	903	23	880	97.45% (96.20–98.38)	
Elecsys Anti-SARS-CoV-2 S		0	903	100.00% (99.59–100.00)	
EUROIMMUN Anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgG (GZ+)	074	44	880	95.24% (93.66–96.52)	
Elecsys Anti-SARS-CoV-2 S	927	0	924	100.00% (99.60–100.00)	
EUROIMMUN Anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgA (GZ excl.)	895	38	857	95.75% (94.22–96.98)	
Elecsys Anti-SARS-CoV-2 S		0	895	100.00% (99.59–100.00)	
EUROIMMUN Anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgA (GZ+)	028	71	857	92.35% (90.45–93.98)	
Elecsys Anti-SARS-CoV-2 S	920	0	928	100.00% (99.60-100.00)	
iFlash-SARS-CoV-2 IgG	928	0	928	100.00% (99.60-100.00)	
Elecsys Anti-SARS-CoV-2 S	920	0	928	100.00% (99.60–100.00)	
iFlash-SARS-CoV-2 IgM	928	4	924	99.57% (98.90–99.88)	
Elecsys Anti-SARS-CoV-2 S		0	928	100.00% (99.60–100.00)	

589 ¹For antibody assays with a gray zone, two calculations were performed. In the first calculation, all gray zone

results were excluded from the analysis (GZ excl.) and in the second calculation these results were interpreted as

591 reactive (GZ+).

592 GZ, gray zone

594 Table 4. Sensitivity of the Elecsys Anti-SARS-CoV-2 S assay and other comparator assays

Assay	Days post-PCR- Total		Non-reactive	Sensitivity (95% confidence	
	positive test	samples	samples	intervals, 2-sided)	
ADVIA Centaur SARS-CoV-2 Total	0.0	18	8	55.56% (30.76–78.47)	
	0-6		8	55.56% (30.76-78.47)	
Elecsys Anti-SARS-CoV-2 S	7–13	11	2	81.82% (48.22–97.72)	
			2	81.82% (48.22–97.72)	
			4	94.81% (87.23–98.57)	
	≥14	//	1	98.70% (92.98–99.97)	
ARCHITECT SARS-CoV-2 IgG	0–6	18	9	50.00% (26.02-73.98)	
			8	55.56% (30.76-78.47)	
Elecsys Anti-SARS-CoV-2 S	7–13		2	81.82% (48.22–97.72)	
		11	2	81.82% (48.22–97.72)	
	≥14		10	87.01% (77.41–93.59)	
		77	1	98.70% (92.98 - 99.97)	
EUROIMMUN Anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgG	0–6	43	21	51.16% (35.46-66.69)	
(GZ excl.) ¹			18	58.14% (42.13-72.99)	
	7–13		7	84.44% (70.54–93.51)	
Elecsys Anti-SARS-CoV-2 S		45	7	84.44% (70.54–93.51)	
			7	93.91% (87.86–97.52)	
	≥14	115	2	98.26% (93.86–99.79)	
EUROIMMUN Anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgG	0–6	44	21	52.27% (36.69–67.54)	
(GZ+)			19	56.82% (41.03-71.65)	
	7–13	49	7	85.71% (72.76–94.06)	
Elecsys Anti-SARS-CoV-2 S			7	85.71% (72.76–94.06)	
	≥14	119	6	94.96% (89.35–98.13)	
			1	99.16% (95.41-99.98)	
EUROIMMUN Anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgA			18	59.09% (43.25–73.66)	
(GZ excl.)	0–6	44	19	56.82% (41.03-71.65)	
			4	91.84% (80.40–97.73)	
Elecsys Anti-SARS-CoV-2 S	7–13	49	7	85.71% (72.76–94.06)	

	>14	110	3	97.46% (92.75–99.47)
	217	110	1	99.15% (95.37–99.98)
EUROIMMUN Anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgA	0.0	44	18	59.09% (43.25–73.66)
(GZ+)	0-0		19	56.82% (41.03-71.65)
	7 10	40	4	91.84% (80.40–97.73)
Elecsys Anti-SARS-CoV-2 S	/-13	79	7	85.71% (72.76–94.06)
	>14	101	3	97.52% (92.93–99.49)
	214	121	1	99.17% (95.48–99.98)
iFlash-SARS-CoV-2 IgG	0.0	17	8	52.94% (27.81–77.02)
	0-0	17	7	58.82% (32.92 - 81.56)
Elecsys Anti-SARS-CoV-2 S	7 12	11	2	81.82% (48.22–97.72)
	7-15		2	81.82% (48.22–97.72)
	>14	76	5	93.42% (85.31–97.83)
	<u> </u>		0	100.00% (95.26-100.00)
iFlash-SARS-CoV-2 IgM	0–6	17	11	35.29% (14.21-61.67)
			7	58.82% (32.92-81.56)
Elecsys Anti-SARS-CoV-2 S	7–13	11	9	18.18% (2.28–51.78)
			2	81.82% (48.22–97.72)
	≥14	76	49	35.53% (24.88–47.34)
			0	100.00% (95.26-100.00)

¹For antibody assays with a gray zone, two calculations were performed. In the first calculation, all gray zone

results were excluded from the analysis (GZ excl.) and in the second calculation these results were interpreted as

reactive (GZ+).

598 GZ, gray zone





Figure 1. Longitudinal antibody titers of all subjects. Concentration of anti-S SARS-CoV-2
antibodies, as measured by the Elecsys Anti-S SARS-CoV-2 S immunoassay, over time (days 0 to 78)
in sequential samples from all study sites. Each grey circle represents a different data point, with
darker circles representing overlapping data points. The solid blue line represents the combined curve
and the blue dashed lines represent the upper and lower confidence limits. The red dashed line
indicates the assay cutoff limit (0.80 U/mL).