

1 **Title: Engineering luminescent biosensors for point-of-care SARS-CoV-2 antibody**
2 **detection**

3
4 **Authors:**

5 Susanna K. Elledge^{1#}, Xin X. Zhou^{1#}, James R. Byrnes¹, Alexander J. Martinko², Irene Lui¹,
6 Katarina Pance¹, Shion A. Lim¹, Jeff E. Glasgow¹, Anum A. Glasgow³, Keirstinne Turcios⁴,
7 Nikita Iyer⁴, Leonel Torres⁴, Michael J. Peluso⁴, Timothy J. Henrich⁴, Taia T. Wang^{5,6}, Cristina
8 M. Tato⁵, Kevin K. Leung¹, Bryan Greenhouse^{4,5}, and James A. Wells^{1,5,7*}

9
10 **Affiliations:**

11 ¹*Department of Pharmaceutical Chemistry, University of California San Francisco, San Francisco, California,*
12 *94158, USA.*

13 ²*Soteria Biotherapeutics, San Francisco, California, 94107, USA.*

14 ³*Department of Bioengineering and Therapeutic Sciences, University of California San Francisco, San*
15 *Francisco, CA, USA.*

16 ⁴*Department of Medicine, University of California San Francisco, San Francisco, California, 94158, USA.*

17 ⁵*Chan Zuckerberg Biohub, San Francisco, California, 94158, USA.*

18 ⁶*Departments of Medicine and of Microbiology and Immunology, Stanford University School of Medicine,*
19 *Stanford, California, 94305, USA.*

20 ⁷*Department of Cellular and Molecular Pharmacology, University of California, San Francisco, California,*
21 *94158, USA.*

22
23
24 #These authors contributed equally.

25 *Correspondence: Jim.Wells@ucsf.edu

26
27
28 **SUMMARY**

29 Current serology tests for SARS-CoV-2 antibodies mainly take the form of enzyme-linked
30 immunosorbent assays or lateral flow assays, with the former being laborious and the latter being
31 expensive and often lacking sufficient sensitivity and scalability. Here we present the development
32 and validation of a rapid, low-cost solution-based assay to detect antibodies in serum, plasma,
33 whole blood, and saliva, using rationally designed split luciferase antibody biosensors (spLUC).
34 This new assay, which generates quantitative results in as short as 5 minutes, substantially reduces
35 the complexity and improves the scalability of COVID-19 antibody tests for point-of-care and
36 broad population testing.

37
38

39 INTRODUCTION

40 As the COVID-19 pandemic continues worldwide, broad testing for SARS-CoV-2 infection still
41 faces severe limitations. While nucleic acid testing is critical to detecting the virus, serological
42 antibody tests are vital tools for monitoring the dynamic human humoral response to SARS-CoV-
43 2 viral infection and vaccines (Krammer and Simon, 2020). Antibody tests serve as a complement
44 or an alternative to nucleic acid diagnostics for patients with a low viral load or for low-resource
45 areas where expensive RT-PCR testing is difficult to access (Long et al., 2020; To et al., 2020;
46 Zhao et al., 2020). Serological tests also support therapeutic development either through
47 identification of individuals who could serve as donors for convalescent serum therapeutics
48 (Casadevall and Pirofski, 2020), or patients with potentially strong neutralizing antibodies that can
49 be produced *in vitro* as new antivirals and prophylactics (Robbiani et al., 2020; Rogers et al., 2020).
50 Importantly, as a vaccine is developed, population-scale, longitudinal evaluation of antibody
51 responses is needed to determine the response to vaccination and the strength and duration of
52 immunity. This would be greatly accelerated with an assay that is simple, rapid, and high-
53 throughput without sacrificing accuracy and sensitivity (Lynch et al., 2020; Okba et al., 2020;
54 Seow et al., 2020; Smith et al., 2020; Yu et al., 2020; van Doremalen et al., 2020).

55 Traditional serological assays are not optimal in the face of this broad pandemic. The most
56 widely used laboratory serological tests take the form of enzyme-linked immunosorbent assays
57 (ELISA) (Amanat et al., 2020; Okba et al., 2020; Tan et al., 2020b; Xiang et al., 2020), which
58 usually entail a >2-hour protocol involving several steps of protein incubation and washes, and is
59 not readily amenable to deployment outside of a laboratory. A faster but significantly more
60 expensive approach is a lateral flow assay (Li et al., 2020; Lassaunière et al., 2020). However,
61 lateral flow assays can produce less reliable results depending on the quality of the lateral flow
62 device and different evaluation criteria (Whitman et al., 2020; Lassaunière et al., 2020). In addition,
63 lateral flow tests poorly capture the magnitude of a patient's antibody response as the test is
64 qualitative and not quantitative. Here we provide a next-generation, simple, and low-cost assay to
65 meet the mounting needs for broad antibody testing in the face of the ongoing pandemic and
66 eventual vaccine deployment. The assay, which is compatible with serum, plasma, whole blood,
67 and saliva samples, utilizes a simple split luciferase (spLUC) antibody sensor to generate
68 quantitative serological data in as short as 5 minutes. Testing of over 150 patient serum/plasma
69 samples across three validation cohorts demonstrates that the spLUC assay has both sensitivity
70 and specificity of >98%.

71

72 RESULTS

73 Engineering split luminescent biosensors (spLUC) for SARS-CoV-2 antibody detection

74 When envisioning a next-generation serological assay, we hypothesized that sensitive
75 biosensors for anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibodies could be utilized to greatly enhance the speed and
76 simplicity of serological testing (Dixon et al., 2016). We constructed anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibody
77 biosensors by fusing split Nanoluciferase (NanoLuc) fragments SmBiT and LgBiT (Dixon et al.,
78 2016) to SARS-CoV-2 viral protein antigens (**Figure 1A**). Since an antibody has two Fragment
79 Antigen Binding (Fab) arms, incubating serum with 1:1 mixed SmBiT and LgBiT biosensors will
80 result in half of the anti-viral antibodies binding LgBiT with one Fab arm, and SmBiT with the
81 other Fab arm. This hetero-bivalent interaction localizes the LgBiT and SmBiT fragments in close

82 proximity, resulting in reconstitution of an intact, active NanoLuc enzyme for luminescence-based
83 detection of reactive antibodies.

84 We chose to develop S and N sensors for SARS-CoV-2 antibody tests because COVID-19
85 patient antibodies are predominantly directed against epitopes on the viral S protein, which
86 interacts with the host receptor angiotensin-converting enzyme 2 (ACE2) and mediates viral entry
87 (Letko et al., 2020), and the N protein, which packages the viral genome into a ribonucleocapsid
88 (Kang et al., 2020). These two viral proteins are the primary antigens used in the current COVID-
89 19 serological tests (Qu et al., 2020; Stadlbauer et al., 2020; Zhao et al., 2007; Byrnes et al., 2020;
90 Amanat et al., 2020; Okba et al., 2020).


91 The S sensors were constructed by fusing the NanoLuc fragments to the receptor binding
92 domain (S-RBD), which is the primary target of neutralizing antibodies (**Figure S1A, B**) (Amanat
93 et al., 2020; Byrnes et al., 2020; Okba et al., 2020; Rosado et al., 2020). We modeled S-RBD
94 binding to two antibodies, C105 (Robbiani et al., 2020; Barnes et al., 2020), an ACE2-competing
95 binder, and CR3022 (Yuan et al., 2020), an ACE2 non-competing binder, to determine linker
96 lengths (**Supplementary text, Figure S1C**). Based on the models, we constructed SmBiT fusions
97 to S-RBD C-terminus with 15 or 25 residue Glycine/Serine (GS) linkers (S15 and S25), and LgBiT
98 fusions to S-RBD C-terminus with 5, 15, or 25 residue GS linkers (L5, L15 and L25). These
99 variants varied in expression yields (**Figure S1E**). Using recombinantly expressed S-RBD
100 antibodies and ACE2 variants, we determined the optimal linker variant, enzyme concentration,
101 buffer conditions, and impact of antibody-antigen binding affinity to signal strength
102 (**Supplemental text and Figure S1-3**). The (L15+ S25) sensor pair at 1 nM enzyme concentration
103 was identified as the optimal conditions for all subsequent assays.

104 In further characterizing the relationship between assay signal strength and antibody
105 concentration/binding affinity, we performed ordinary differential equation modeling in R
106 (**Supplemental text and Figure S4**). The modeling predicted a linear relationship between
107 antibody concentration and luciferase signal (**Figure S4B**), consistent with our experimental data
108 (**Figure 1B**). In addition, the results highlighted that the sensors at 1 nM are more sensitive to an
109 antibody binder with a $K_D \leq 1$ nM (**Figure S4B, C**). Importantly, this threshold is equivalent to
110 the median affinity reported for polyclonal antibody repertoires (Poulsen et al., 2007; Reddy et al.,
111 2015).

112 To construct the N sensors, we used the N-terminal sequence because aa 44-257 are found to be
113 more immunogenic than the C-terminal dimerization domain (aa 258-419) (**Figure S5A**)
114 (Zamecnik et al., 2020). In addition, dimerization promoted by the C-terminal domain may lead to
115 high basal NanoLuc reconstitution levels. The atomic structures of N (aa 44-180) (Kang et al.,
116 2020) showed the N and C termini are not in close proximity and therefore fusion at the N or C
117 terminus may result in different sensor sensitivity (**Figure S5B**). Given this knowledge, three
118 fusion sensor pairs were designed: (a) **LN+SN**: L/S-N(aa 44-257), (b) **LC+SC**: N(aa 44-180)-L/S,
119 and (c) **LC2+SC2**: N(aa 44-257)-L/S, where L and S represent LgBiT/SmBiT, C represents C-
120 terminal fusion, and N represents N-terminal fusion (**Figure S5C**). Testing on commercial
121 polyclonal anti-N protein antibody revealed that the LC + SC and LC2 + SC2 sensors generated
122 stronger signals over LN + SN (**Figure S5D**). The LC + SC sensors generated linear, dose-
123 dependent signals with commercial anti-N protein antibody (**Figure 1C**).

124 We next designed a simple and rapid protocol to assay a pilot set of serum samples from
125 convalescent SARS-CoV-2 patients (**Figure 1D**). Two healthy control sera collected before the

126 emergence of SARS-CoV-2 virus were also tested. Serial dilutions (1:12.5, 1:25, and 1:50) of heat-
 127 inactivated sera were measured using S or N sensors. Robust, dose-dependent luminescence signal
 128 was observed across all serum concentrations tested, with the 12.5-fold dilution showing the
 129 highest signal (**Figure 1E, F**). The S (L15+S25) sensors generated signal for all five patients tested
 130 (**Figure 1E**). The N (LC+SC) sensors detected patient antibodies from all four patients tested
 131 (**Figure 1F**). However, the N (LN+SN) sensors only detected antibodies from two patient sera
 132 samples that had the strongest seropositivity (**Figure S5E**), which further confirmed a C-terminal
 133 fusion enhances NanoLuc reconstitution relative to the N-terminal fusion.



134
 135 **Figure 1 Engineering luminescent biosensors for rapid and quantitative detection of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies.**
 136 (A) Schematic of the solution-based serology assay. Patient antibodies are incubated with SARS-CoV-2 S or N
 137 proteins fused to LgBiT/SmBiT. For the population of antibodies with one arm bound to the LgBiT sensor and the
 138 other arm bound to the SmBiT sensor, the NanoBiT luciferase enzyme is reconstituted and thus can produce active
 139 luciferase signal. (B) Dose-dependent spLUC signals for the recombinant anti-S-RBD antibody C004 in PBST + 10%
 140 FBS. (C) Dose-dependent spLUC signals for an anti-N-RBD antibody (Sino Biological, Cat#40588-T62-50) in PBST
 141 + 8% FBS. (D) Comparison of assay procedure between the ELISA and the spLUC assay. While the ELISA assay
 142 takes > 2 hours and involves multiple wash and incubation steps, the spLUC solution-based assay is simply completed
 143 in ≤ 30 minutes without the need for wash steps. (E) The S (L15+S25) sensors are able to detect antibodies in 5/5
 144 COVID-19 recovered patients. At all dilutions tested, all 5 patients generated signal above the background signal of
 145 two control serum samples collected before the pandemic. (F) The N (LC+SC) sensors are able to detect antibodies
 146 in 4/4 COVID-19 recovered patients. At all dilutions of serum tested, all 4 patients generated signal above the
 147 background signal of two control serum samples collected before the pandemic. (G) Patient antibodies for SARS-
 148 CoV-2 have various epitopes on the S-RBD (red). C004 and C105 have ACE2-competitive epitopes, while C135 and
 149 CR3022 (blue) have non-ACE2 competitive epitopes. (H) S sensors can detect patient antibodies of various epitopes
 150 with similar sensitivity. C004, C105, C135, and CR3022 patient antibodies were incubated with the S sensors at 10-
 151 fold antibody dilutions from 10 nM to 0.001 nM. For (B, C, E, F, H), the data points represent the average of duplicates

152 from two separate experiments. The error bars represent the standard deviation. **(I)** Schematic of antibody epitope
153 competition assay with patient serum samples. Direct signal is compared to signal generated in the presence of the
154 pre-incubated 1 μ M Fab +1 nM sensor. **(J)** Competition assay performed with C135 Fab on twelve outpatient sera
155 samples and recombinant C135 IgG protein. Samples were incubated with either no Fab (blue) or C135 Fab (off-
156 white). Patient 72 (serum source of the C135 antibody) had a decrease in signal in the presence of the C135 Fab. In
157 addition to Patient 72, patient 7, 21, 42, 98, 202 also had a decrease in signal. Bars represent the average of two
158 replicates, error bars represent standard deviation.

159 **Competitive spLUC assay to profile epitope-classes of antibodies**

160 In addition to a test to determine total binding antibodies, an assay that allows profiling of
161 epitope classes of antibodies can be highly valuable. In this regard, competitive ELISA assays
162 developed by us and others have enabled characterization of percentage of ACE2-competitive
163 antibodies (Byrnes et al., 2020; Tan et al., 2020a). These assays can potentially serve as surrogate
164 viral neutralization tests. However, S-RBD is known to have multiple additional neutralization
165 epitopes outside of the ACE2-binding site. An assay that allows for rapid, unbiased profiling of
166 those alternative epitopes could unveil further details of a patient's humoral response to neutralize
167 SARS-CoV-2.

168 We first show that spLUC assay can detect antibodies binding to various epitopes on S-RBD
169 (**Figure 1G**). We expressed and tested four reported neutralizing antibodies which bind to three
170 distinct epitopes on S-RBD. This includes: C004 and C105 (Robbiani et al., 2020), which are
171 ACE2-competitive binders; CR3022 (Yuan et al., 2020), which binds at a cryptic site outside of
172 the ACE2-binding site; and C135 (Robbiani et al., 2020), which does not compete with C004,
173 C105, CR3022 or ACE2-Fc, representing a unique binding epitope on S-RBD (**Figure S6**). All
174 four IgG antibodies generated dose-dependent luminescence signals at ≥ 0.1 nM concentrations
175 (**Figure 1H**).

176 We then designed a competitive spLUC assay to determine presence of a specific epitope class
177 of antibodies (**Figure 1I**). Out of the four antibodies tested, C135 represents an unconventional
178 and less understood epitope class. It neutralizes very potently ($IC_{50} = 17$ ng/ml) and could be
179 potentially used as in combination with other ACE2-competitive binders as a cocktail therapy. We
180 converted C135 IgG to a single binding arm Fab binder, and pre-incubated 1 μ M of C135 Fab with
181 the S sensors to generate “blocked sensors”. By comparing signal between the original and the
182 “epitope masked” sensors, we can determine how much signal from a patient's sample
183 corresponding to antibodies with a similar epitope (**Figure 1I**). We assayed 12 patient serum
184 samples with representative high, medium, and low anti-S-RBD antibody levels at a 1:25 dilution
185 of serum. IgG C135 served as a control for competition with Fab C135. Indeed, the luminescence
186 signal of IgG C135 was reduced by $\sim 90\%$ with the blocked sensors, which provided a validation
187 of this method. Sera 7, 21, 42, 72, 98 and 202 showed a decrease in luminescence signal, indicating
188 they likely have C135-competitive antibodies (**Figure 1J**). Patient #72 was the source for
189 identifying C135 (Robbiani et al., 2020) and indeed showed reduction in the spLUC signal when
190 competed with Fab. These results suggested that antibodies recognizing this unconventional,
191 neutralizing S-RBD epitope are present in a significant proportion of patient samples. Performing
192 this competitive serology assay with different competitive Fab antibodies in an expanded patient
193 cohort could further our understanding of the distribution of epitopes on S-RBD as well as the
194 correlation between binding epitopes and clinical outcomes.

195

196 **Characterization of larger cohorts of serum/plasma samples using the spLUC assay**

197 We next applied this new assay in an expanded number of patients (**Figure 2**). First, to determine
198 assay cutoff values and specificity, which reflects how well an assay performs in a group of
199 disease-negative individuals, we performed the tests on three cohorts of negative control samples
200 (Total $n = 144$), which include mainly healthy individual samples, 12 seasonal coronavirus patient
201 samples, and 20 flu vaccine pre- and post-vaccination samples. All controls were collected before
202 the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic. These controls generated significantly lower luminescent signals than
203 the COVID-19 patient sera samples (**Figure 2A, B**). The range, median, mean and standard
204 deviation values were calculated, and stringent cutoff values were determined by calculating the
205 mean plus three standard deviations (**Table S1**). With these determined cutoffs, we calculated the
206 specificity of the S sensors (1:12.5 serum dilution) to be 100% (56/56), and the N sensors (1:12.5
207 serum dilution) to be 99.2% (119/120).


208 We then used the spLUC assay to study three additional cohorts of patient samples (**Figure 2A,**
209 **B**). Cohort 1 is an outpatient cohort recruited at the Rockefeller University Hospital (Robbiani et
210 al., 2020). The samples were collected from individuals free of COVID-19 symptoms for ≥ 14 days.
211 The S sensors showed 84.2% (48/57) sensitivity, and the N sensors showed 100% (56/56)
212 sensitivity. Cohort 2 samples are consisted of remnant sera from COVID-19 patients within Kaiser
213 Permanente Hospitals of Northern California. These samples were drawn in any phase of infection,
214 including the early acute phase. A subset of these patients, who may have not fully seroconverted
215 at the time of sampling, had lower S sensor or N sensor signals compared to others in the spLUC
216 assays. The sensitivities of the assays were 89% (49/55) for S sensors and 98% (46/47) for N
217 sensors. Cohort 3 patients were part of the LIINC (Long-term Impact of Infection with Novel
218 Coronavirus) study from San Francisco General Hospital and included plasma of a mixture of
219 outpatient and inpatient samples drawn in the convalescent phase of the disease. With the S sensors,
220 we detected antibodies in 94% (44/47) of outpatient samples and 100% (9/9) of inpatient samples.
221 With the N sensors, we detected antibodies in 96% (45/47) of outpatient samples and 100% (9/9)
222 of inpatient samples. For all cohorts, the S and N signals show a strong correlation (**Figure 2C,**
223 **Figure S8**). Consistent with previous findings, we observed varying degrees of anti-S and N
224 antibody seropositivity between patients (**Figure 2A, B**), which reflects a wide range of patient
225 humoral response to this virus (Long et al., 2020; Lynch et al., 2020).

226 Importantly, we observed strong correlation of spLUC assay results to anti-Fab and anti-IgG S-
227 RBD ELISA signals (**Figure S7A-C**, $R = 0.43-0.91$). A base-10 logarithmic scale conversion was
228 applied to the spLUC assay signals for the correlation analysis to ELISA signals. This non-linear
229 correlation between the spLUC and ELISA assays is likely due to signal compression in ELISAs
230 at high antibody concentrations (Abcam, ELISA guide). For all cohorts, the S sensor seronegative
231 samples also had very low signals in S-RBD ELISA assays (**Figure S7D-F**), which confirmed the
232 presence of low levels of anti-S-RBD antibodies in these sub-cohorts of patients. Interestingly, the
233 correlations to IgM signals were much weaker (**Figure S7A-C**). It is possible that IgM was not
234 sensitively detected by the spLUC assay due to the weaker affinities of the individual binding arms
235 in IgMs (Mäkelä et al., 1970), or that the IgG response dominated the signal in many of the tested
236 patients.

237 One of the key uses of a highly sensitive serology assay is to grade the quality of convalescent
238 sera to neutralize virus (Krammer and Simon, 2020). In cohort 1, our analysis showed the S sensor
239 signals correlated with the half-maximal neutralizing titers (NT50s) reported by Robbiani et al

240 (Figure 2D, left panel), which is consistent with previous studies on the relationship between anti-
 241 S antibody titers and neutralization potency (Seow et al., 2020; Wajnberg et al., 2020; Amanat et
 242 al., 2020; Robbiani et al., 2020). Interestingly, we found that the N sensor signals showed a similar
 243 correlation with NT50 (Figure 2D, right panel). Our results indicate determining either anti-S or
 244 anti-N seropositivity is a general means to assess the neutralization potential of sera samples.

245



246

247 **Figure 2 Characterization of outpatient and inpatient serum samples using the spLUC test.** Cohort 1: samples
 248 drawn during the convalescent phase of an outpatient group, Cohort 2: samples drawn during the acute phase or the
 249 convalescent phase of a hospitalized group, and Cohort 3: samples drawn during the convalescent phase of a mixed
 250 inpatient and outpatient group. A 10-base logarithmic scale conversion was applied to all the solution assay signals
 251 for the correlation analysis unless otherwise specified. **(A)** SpLUC assay tested on expanded COVID-19 patient
 252 cohorts with S sensors at 1:12.5 serum dilution. Dots represent the average between two technical duplicates. Lines
 253 represent median values. The inpatient samples showed significantly higher antibody titers than the outpatient cohorts.
 254 **(B)** SpLUC assay tested on expanded COVID-19 patient cohorts with N sensors at 1:12.5 serum dilution. The inpatient
 255 samples showed significantly higher antibody titers than the outpatient cohorts. **(C)** A positive correlation ($R = 0.78$)
 256 was observed between S sensor signal and N sensor signal in the three cohort samples. All cohorts individually
 257 presented a similar trend (Figure S8). Line represent linear regression. **(D)** Correlation of spLUC signals (cohort 1)
 258 to neutralization efficiency (Robbiani et al., 2020). S sensor signal (blue) and N sensor signal (purple) is plotted against

259 50% maximal neutralization titer (NT50). Both show positive correlation ($R = 0.76$ for S and NT50 and $R = 0.62$ for
260 N and NT50). **(E)** Inpatients show significantly higher signal over outpatients in all three cohorts ($p < 0.0001$). **(F)**
261 Patients from cohort 1 that reported higher disease severity (6-10 vs 1-5) had higher antibody titer for both S and N
262 sensors and the difference for N sensors is statistically significant ($p = 0.0049$). **(G)** Higher overall antibodies titers were
263 observed in patients that reported fever compared to no fever patients for cohort 3. Lines represent median values.
264 This difference was statistically significant for the S sensors ($p = 0.0011$) but not N sensors. **(H)** Slightly higher overall
265 antibodies titers were observed in females compared to males for cohort 3, although the differences were not
266 statistically significant. There is a similar trend for cohort 1 (**Figure S9A**). The difference was more obvious for S
267 sensors. Lines represent median values. **(I)** For cohort 3, there is a slightly higher level of antibodies in the 60-85 age
268 group compared to 19-39 and 40-59. There is a similar trend for cohort 1 (**Figure S9B**). The differences were not
269 statistically significant. Lines represent median values. For A, B and F-I, the Mann-Whitney test P values for each
270 comparison are labeled on top of the datasets. For c-d, the Spearman R values and P values are labeled in the graphs.
271 For all figures, dots represent the average of two technical replicates. Horizontal lines represent median values. For c-
272 d, lines represent linear regression.

273 To try and gain clinical insights from our results, we analyzed our spLUC data in the context
274 of clinical and demographic features. First, the degree of seropositivity for inpatient samples was
275 significantly higher than that of outpatient samples (**Figure 2A, B, E**). Disease severity scores and
276 fever were also associated with a stronger antibody response (**Figure 2F and G**). These results
277 indicated a direct correlation of disease severity and adaptive immune response consistent with
278 previous studies (Zhao et al., 2020; Robbiani et al., 2020; Cervia et al., 2020; Lynch et al., 2020;
279 Long et al., 2020; Seow et al., 2020; Klein et al., 2020). In addition, males had slightly higher
280 antibody titer than females in both cohort 1 and 3 especially for anti-S antibodies, although the
281 differences were not statistically significant (**Figure 2H, Figure S9A**). This finding was consistent
282 with studies by Klein et al (Klein et al., 2020) and Robbiani et al (Robbiani et al., 2020), but
283 different from Zeng et al (Zeng et al., 2020), which reported females with severe disease developed
284 more antibodies than men with severe disease. This difference might be due to differing selection
285 criteria of patient cohorts. Lastly, patients of age 60-85 showed a higher trend of antibody response
286 compared to those in the 19-39 and 40-59 age brackets, but the difference was not statistically
287 significant (**Figure 2I, Figure S9B**). Similar findings on the impact of age have been reported
288 previously (Whitman et al., 2020; Lassaunière et al., 2020). These results highlight that
289 demographic and clinical features affect the antibody response of COVID-19 patients. A longer-
290 term, systematic, and population-level serological analysis is needed to further illuminate the
291 variables that affect patient humoral response to SARS-CoV-2.

292 Collectively, our assay showed high sensitivity and specificity for all three representative
293 cohorts of serum/plasma samples (inpatient, outpatient, acute phase, convalescent phase), with an
294 overall specificity of 100% (S sensor) and 99% (N sensor), and sensitivity of 89% (S sensor) and
295 98% (N sensor). These values are comparable or superior to reported values for laboratory ELISA
296 and lateral flow tests (Whitman et al., 2020; Lassaunière et al., 2020).

297


298 **Adapting the assay for low-resource settings and expanded sample types**

299 Lastly, we adapted our assays to begin to meet the clinical needs in remote and low-resources
300 settings and for point-of-care or large-scale deployment. While the current properties of the assay
301 meet most of the requirements for deployment in these types of settings, we tested to see if the
302 reaction time (30 minutes), reagent format (frozen aliquots of sensors), and sample type
303 (serum/plasma) could be further optimized.

304 We first tested if our initial reaction times (20-minute sensor/antibody incubation and 10-minute
 305 incubation with substrate, **Figure 1D**) are necessary and optimal. CR3022 (10 nM) was incubated
 306 with 1 nM S sensors for 5, 10, 15, and 20 min, followed by luciferase substrate addition and
 307 incubation for 0, 2, 4, 6, 8, and 10 minutes (**Figure 3A**). All time points resulted in bright
 308 luminescence signal, suggesting that the assay could be completed in as short as 5 minutes.

309 We then tested if the sensors can be lyophilized for ambient temperature storage and
 310 transportation. Although a small quantity (0-30%) of S sensors and N sensors were lost due to the
 311 lyophilization process (**Figure S10A**), both the lyophilized S and the N sensors can still robustly
 312 detect recombinant IgG or patient antibodies in serum with similar sensitivities seen for the fresh
 313 sensors (**Figure S10B, C**).

314



315 **Figure 3 Adapting the assay for whole blood and saliva sample types.** (A) spLUC assays can be accomplished in
 316 as short as 5 minutes. CR3022 (10 nM) was incubated with S sensors for 5, 10, 15, or 20 min. Luciferase substrates
 317 were then added and incubated with the reaction mix for 0, 2, 4, 6, 8 or 10 min. All reactions showed bright
 318 luminescence signal. Error bars represent the standard deviation. (B) The spLUC assay is compatible with whole blood
 319 samples and show similar signal in the corresponding plasma samples with both fresh and lyophilized sensors (R =
 320 0.94 for S sensors, R = 1 and 0.98 for N sensor fresh and lyophilized sensors, respectively). (C) Anti-S antibodies
 321 were detected in saliva samples with moderate sensitivity (33/42, 79%). The signals from saliva samples positively
 322 correlated with corresponding serum samples (R = 0.66, p < 0.0001). For a-c, each dot represents the average of two
 323 technical replicates.

325

326 Finally, we sought to determine if the spLUC assay could be compatible with other sample types.
327 First, whole blood samples were collected from six convalescent COVID-19 patients and plasma
328 samples were prepared in parallel for comparison (**Figure 3B**). Remarkably, although the overall
329 signals were lower from whole blood samples, all six samples generated N sensor signals and four
330 had S sensor signals above control levels with the lyophilized sensors (**Figure 3A**). In comparison,
331 all six patients generated N sensor signals and five had S sensor signals above cutoff values from
332 the plasma samples. Strong correlations were observed between the whole blood signals and the
333 plasma signals ($R > 0.9$). Fresh and lyophilized sensors showed very little difference in
334 performance.

335 Next, we tested the potential of using saliva as an input. To determine conditions, we added
336 varying concentrations of the CR3022 antibody into saliva from a healthy individual (**Figure S11**).
337 We saw a significant reduction in sensitivity for undiluted saliva relative to buffer alone, but
338 remarkably no loss in sensitivity when the saliva was diluted 1:2 in PBS buffer. We then tested 42
339 saliva samples at 1:2 dilution with the S sensors. We increased the reaction volume from 20 to 100
340 μl and the luminescence signal integration time from 1000 ms to 5000 ms for better sensitivity, as
341 lower antibody concentrations are expected from saliva samples (Randad et al., 2020). Out of the
342 42 samples, 33 had signals above the two healthy saliva controls, indicating a 79% assay sensitivity
343 (**Figure 3C**). A moderate correlation of saliva signal with corresponding serum signals was
344 observed ($R = 0.66$), consistent with recent reports (Faustini et al., 2020). These results highlight
345 the potential of using lyophilized sensors and whole blood or saliva samples as a convenient
346 diagnostic workflow for rapid and quantitative point-of-care antibody testing amenable to broad
347 population deployment or applications in resource-limited areas.

348

349 DISCUSSION

350 As the SARS-CoV-2 virus continues to spread, the need will continue to grow for serology
351 assays to determine not only the scope of infection, but also vaccine efficacy during clinical trials
352 and after large-scale vaccine deployment. We present here spLUC, a simple (no wash, two-step of
353 reagent addition), sensitive ($\geq 98\%$), specific ($\geq 99\%$), fast (as short as 5 minutes), low-input sample
354 volume (1 μl per reaction), low-cost ($\sim 15\text{¢}$ per reaction), and quantitative solution-phase
355 serological assay to detect antibodies against S and N proteins. We were able to test 159 patient
356 samples across three different cohorts with varying clinical and demographic features. Our results
357 enabled association analysis between these features (e.g. hospitalization, disease severity, presence
358 of fever, gender, age), demonstrating the promise of this rapid assay to generate large datasets to
359 better understand factors that modulate the humoral response following SARS-CoV-2 infection.

360 The quantitative and solution-based nature of the spLUC assay allows convenient assay
361 variations. We presented a competitive spLUC assay using epitope masked S sensors and used it
362 to study the prevalence of an unconventional neutralization epitope in the S-RBD domain. This
363 competitive spLUC assay has the potential to serve as a surrogate virus neutralization assay and to
364 unveil details of the interaction of patient antibodies to viral antigens.

365 Robust ELISA-based assays such as the one developed by Krammer and co-workers have
366 enabled tremendous progress of COVID-19 serological studies (Amanat et al., 2020; Stadlbauer
367 et al., 2020), but these assays are still laborious with multiple wash steps, which limits their
368 feasibility for population-scale sero-surveillance, point-of-care diagnostics, and deployment in

369 countries or remote areas that have limited access to analytical equipment and reagents. The
370 spLUC assays have important features amenable to all these applications. We have shown that our
371 reagents are not only compatible with lyophilization for easy transport and storage, but can also
372 readily detect antibodies directly from whole blood samples and saliva samples. With simple
373 pipettes and a battery-supported portable luminometer (e.g. 32526-11 Junior LB9509, Berthold
374 Technologies), the spLUC assay could be readily established at care centers or in the field
375 worldwide, regardless of infrastructure. To this end, we are currently collaborating with
376 bioengineers to develop portable luminometers that can be manufactured at low cost but provide
377 equal or better detection sensitivity.

378 Another important strength of our approach is the modularity. We expect, with modifications to
379 the sensor designs, that our strategy can be readily adapted to develop rapid serological tests for
380 immunity against virtually any infectious disease that elicits an antibody response for which the
381 protein antigen is known. Future development of our spLUC assay includes exploring orthogonal
382 split enzyme systems to allow multiplexing of assays. For instance, split β -lactamase, used by
383 Huang and co-workers for detecting herpes simplex virus antibodies (Fry et al., 2008), can provide
384 an orthogonal readout to luminescence. We envision that such multiplexed assays could be used
385 to develop broad-spectrum serological assays to simultaneously detect immunity against multiple
386 infectious diseases.

387 In summary, we have taken a structure-based protein engineering approach to design novel split
388 enzyme-fused sensors. These biosensors enable spLUC, a next-generation SARS-CoV-2 antibody
389 test suited for population-scale sero-surveillance, epitope mapping of patient antibody responses,
390 and testing in resource-limited areas. Future efforts will focus on continued evaluation of
391 alternative sample sources and development of similar split enzyme-based serological approaches
392 for a range of infectious diseases.

393

394 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

395 We acknowledge the members of the Wells Lab, especially those involved in our COVID-19
396 research program. We also acknowledge Dr. Michel Nussenzweig, Dr. Marina Caskey, and Dr.
397 Christian Gaebler (Rockefeller University), as well as Dr. Colin Zamecnik and Dr. Joseph DeRisi
398 (University of California, San Francisco) for providing the first cohort of convalescent sera. We
399 thank Dr. Michel Nussenzweig and Dr. Davide Robbiani for providing plasmids for C004, C105,
400 and C135 IgGs. We additionally thank Dr. Peter Kim for providing the plasmid for CR3022. We
401 thank Patrick Wilson (U. Chicago) for the seasonal coronavirus control samples. We thank Dr.
402 Michael Lin (Stanford University) for helpful discussions regarding split enzyme systems. We also
403 thank Charles Chiu (UCSF) for helpful discussions. We thank all the patients for their participation
404 in this study.

405 J.A.W. is grateful for funding from the Harry and Dianna Hind Endowed Professorship in
406 Pharmaceutical Sciences and the Chan Zuckerberg Biohub that helped support this work. The
407 National Science Foundation Graduate Research Fellowship Program supported S.K.E (1650113)
408 and I.L (2017244707). Postdoctoral Fellowship support included a National Institutes of Health
409 National Cancer Institute F32 (5F32CA239417 to J.R.B.), a Merck Fellow of the Damon Runyon
410 Cancer Research Foundation (DRG-2297-17 to X.X.Z.), a Merck Postdoctoral Research Fellow
411 from the Helen Hay Whitney Foundation (S.A.L.), and a National Institutes of Health K99/R00

412 (1K99GM135529 to A.A.G.). The LIINC cohort study was funded by NIH/NIAID
413 3R01AI141003-03S1 (T.J.H.). T.T.W was supported in part by Fast Grants, CEND COVID
414 Catalyst Fund, the NIH/NIAID (U19AI111825 and R01AI139119) and by the Rockefeller
415 University Center for Clinical and Translational Science Grant # UL1 TR001866. We would like
416 to acknowledge funding from the Chan Zuckerberg Biohub, Rapid Response as well.

417

418 **AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS**

419 S.K.E and X.X.Z conceived the study and designed the experiments. S.K.E., X.X.Z., and J.R.B.
420 analyzed data and wrote the manuscript. S.K.E. performed the experiments unless otherwise stated.
421 X.X.Z. performed structure modeling. J.R.B. performed the anti-Fab ELISA experiments and
422 provided advice for the whole blood work. A.J.M. performed the in silico differential equation
423 modeling. I.L., K.P, and S.A.L. helped with expression, purification, and performed the ACE2
424 epitope binning experiment. J.E.G. and A.A.G. designed, expressed, and purified the higher
425 affinity ACE2 mutant. T.T.W. provided patient sera and control sera samples. T.J.H., M.J.P., B.G.,
426 N.I., L.T., and K.T. provided patient samples, oversaw LIINC samples collections, sample
427 processing, sample maintenance, and cohort design. B.G., C.M.T. and K.K.L. provided helpful
428 discussions. J.A.W. supervised the research. All authors provided edits and approval of the final
429 manuscript version.

430

431 **DECLARATION OF INTERESTS**

432 S.K.E, X.X.Z., and J.A.W. have filed a provisional patent on the described solution-based
433 antibody detection assay (spLUC). J.E.G., A.A.G., I.L. and X.X.Z. have filed a provisional patent
434 on the ACE2 variants.

435

436 **METHODS**

437 All data described in the manuscript is available upon request.

438 **Plasmid construction**

439 Plasmids were constructed by standard molecular biology methods. The DNA fragments of
440 Spike-RBD, N protein, ACE2, and LgBiT were synthesized by IDT Technologies. The SmBiT tag
441 was generated by overlap-extension PCR. The Spike-RBD-5/15/25aa-LgBiT-12xHisTag, Spike-
442 RBD-15/25aa-SmBiT-12xHisTag, N protein(44-180)-10aa-LgBiT-12xHisTag, N protein(44-
443 180)-10aa-SmBiT-12xHisTag, LgBiT-10aa-N protein(44-257)-12xHisTag, and SmBiT-10aa-N
444 protein(44-257)-12xHisTag were generated by subcloning into a pFUSE-12xHisTag vector
445 (adapted from the pFUSE-hIgG1-Fc vector from InvivoGen). The ACE2-Fc fusion plasmids were
446 generated by subcloning the gene fragments of ACE2 and mutant into the pFUSE-hIgG1-Fc vector.
447 The C004, C105, and C135 IgGs LC and HC plasmids were a generous gift from the Nussenzweig
448 lab (Rockefeller University). The CR3022 IgG plasmids were a generous gift from the Kim lab
449 (Stanford) and the Wilson lab (Scripps). The C135 Fab was cloned by removing the Fc domain
450 from the HC plasmid. Complete plasmid sequences are available upon request.

451 **Expression and protein purification**

452 All proteins were expressed and purified from Expi293 BirA cells according to established
453 protocol from the manufacturer (Thermo Fisher Scientific). Briefly, 30 µg of pFUSE (InvivoGen)
454 vector encoding the protein of interest was transiently transfected into 75 million Expi293 BirA
455 cells using the Expifectamine kit (Thermo Fischer Scientific). For the IgG and Fab proteins, 15 µg
456 of each chain was transfected. Enhancer was added 20 h after transfection. Cells were incubated
457 for a total of 3 d at 37 °C in an 8% CO₂ environment before the supernatants were harvested by
458 centrifugation. Fc-fusion proteins were purified by Protein A affinity chromatography and His-
459 tagged proteins were purified by Ni-NTA affinity chromatography. Purity and integrity were
460 assessed by SDS/PAGE. Purified protein was buffer exchanged into PBS and stored at -80 °C in
461 aliquots.

462 **Solution serology protocol for in vitro, serum, blood, and saliva samples**

463 LgBiT and SmBiT sensors for either the Spike or N protein were prepared at a final
464 concentration of each sensor at 2nM in PBS + 0.05% Tween-20 + 0.2% BSA (PBSTB). For in
465 vitro IgGs or ACE2-Fc, the samples were prepared at 1:10 dilutions in PBSTB unless otherwise
466 specified. Serum and blood samples were diluted to 1:12.5 for both the S and N sensor samples in
467 PBSTB unless otherwise specified. Healthy individual saliva was spiked in with CR3022 and used
468 undiluted or diluted 1:2 in PBSTB. 10 µL of the 2 nM sensor mix and 10 µL of the sample were
469 combined in a 384 Lumitrac white plate (Greiner), skipping every other well and row to avoid
470 potential bleedover in signal. The plate was mixed on a plate shaker for 20 minutes. NanoLuc
471 substrate was diluted according to protocol 1:50 in NanoLuc dilution buffer (Promega) and 15 µL
472 was added to each well, followed by a 10-minute incubation period for the signal to stabilize.
473 Luminescence was measured on a Tecan M200 infinite plate reader with an integration time of
474 1000 ms.

475 **Competition serology protocol for in vitro and serum samples**

476 The competition serology assay was performed similarly to the solution serology assay except
477 that the S sensors were individually preincubated at 4 nM with 4 µM of either C004 Fab, C105
478 Fab, or C135 Fab for the in vitro competition assay and C135 Fab only for the serum competition
479 assay. The two sensors + Fab were combined 1:1 to make a 2 nM mix, and 10 µL of this mix was
480 added to the assay as described above.

481 **Epitope binning experiment**

482 Biolayer interferometry data was measured using an Octet RED384 (ForteBio). Biotinylated
483 Spike RBD protein was immobilized on the streptavidin (SA) biosensor (ForteBio). After blocking
484 with biotin, the sensor was loaded with one IgG followed by another IgG or ACE2-Fc to determine
485 epitope binning. PBS with 0.05% Tween-20 and 0.2% BSA was used for all diluents and buffers.

486 **Spike protein ELISA assay**

487 The Spike ELISA assay was performed as previously described. Briefly, 384 Maxisorp plates
488 were coated with 100 µL of 0.5 µg/mL Neutravidin for 1 hr. The plate was washed 3 times with
489 PBS + 0.05% Tween-20 (PBST) followed by incubation with 20nM S-RBD for 30 minutes.
490 Following 3 washes, the plate was blocked with 3% non-fat milk in PBS for 1 hour. The plate was
491 washed 3 times before the addition of 1:50 dilutions of serum in 1% non-fat milk for 1 hour. After
492 3 washes, secondary anti-Fab, anti-IgG, or anti-IgM antibody was added and incubated for 30

493 minutes before the addition of TMB for 3 minutes. The reaction was quenched with 1 M
494 phosphoric acid and absorbance was read on a Tecan M200 infinite plate reader at 450 nm.

495 **Lyophilization of sensors**

496 The S and N protein sensors were flash frozen in liquid nitrogen at concentrations between 10-
497 60 μM in 10 μL . A small hole was poked into the caps of the samples and left on a Benchtop K
498 (VirTis) lyophilizer overnight. The next day the sensors were reconstituted in 10 μL of ddH₂O and
499 concentration was verified by nanodrop.

500 **Serum, plasma, whole blood, and saliva samples**

501 The initial small patient cohort was a generous gift from the Wilson lab (UCSF) and heat
502 inactivated at 56°C for 1 hour before storage at -80°C. The first (outpatient) sample serum set
503 (cohort 1) was a generous gift for the Wilson lab (UCSF) and Nussenzweig lab (Rockefeller).
504 These samples were heat inactivated at 56°C for 1 hour and stored at 4°C in a 1:1 dilution in 40%
505 glycerol, 40 mM HEPES (pH 7.3), 0.04% NaN₃, in PBS. The second (inpatient) sample serum set
506 (cohort 2) was a generous gift from the T. Wang lab (Stanford) and were stored at -80°C as pure
507 serum samples. The third plasma cohort (cohort 3) and blood samples were generous gifts from
508 the Greenhouse lab (UCSF) and Henrich Lab (UCSF) as part of the LIINC study. The plasma
509 samples were stored at 4°C in a 1:1 dilution in 40% glycerol, 40 mM HEPES (pH 7.3), 0.04%
510 NaN₃, in PBS. The whole blood was stored undiluted at 4°C. Healthy blood samples were
511 purchased from Vitalent and stored undiluted at 4°C. The saliva samples were obtained
512 unstimulated, unexpectorated saliva and were stored at -80°C. Before assayed, the samples were
513 thawed and centrifuged at 9,000g to remove any insoluble or coagulated matter. Control saliva
514 from Nov 2019 was purchased from Lee Biosciences, stored at -20°C, and processed similarly.

515 **Study Approval of Patient Samples**

516 All patient samples were obtained using protocols approved by the UCSF, Stanford University,
517 and Rockefeller University Institutional Review Boards and in accordance with the Declaration of
518 Helsinki. Samples were de-identified prior to delivery to the lab where all assays described here
519 were performed. Collection of remnant sera from Kaiser Permanente was approved by the
520 Institutional Review Board of Stanford University (protocol #55718). Influenza virus vaccination
521 samples were from a US cohort enrolled at the Rockefeller University Hospital in New York City
522 in 2012-2013 under a protocol approved by the Institutional Review Board of Rockefeller
523 University (protocol #TWA-0804). Samples from people with seasonal coronavirus infections
524 were collected at the University of Chicago. Samples were de-identified serums of healthcare
525 workers that had respiratory illnesses, were swabbed, and tested positive for common cold
526 coronavirus infections in 2019 (U. Chicago protocol # 09-043-A).

527 **Data and Statistical analysis**

528 All graphing and statistical analysis was performed in GraphPad Prism. The non-parametric
529 Spearman correlation analysis was used in Prism to determine the correlation R value between
530 datasets. An unpaired Mann-Whitney test was performed to determine the difference between
531 datasets. A two-tail P value was used to determine statistical significance for all analysis. $P < 0.05$
532 was considered statistically significant.

533

534 **SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION**

535 Supplemental text, Fig. S1-S11, Table S1 are attached to the end of the PDF.

536

537 **REFERENCES**

538 Amanat, F., Stadlbauer, D., Strohmeier, S., Nguyen, T. H. O., Chromikova, V., McMahon, M.,
539 Jiang, K., Arunkumar, G. A., Jurczynszak, D., Polanco, J., Bermudez-Gonzalez, M., Kleiner, G.,
540 Aydillo, T., Miorin, L., Fierer, D. S., Lugo, L. A., Kojic, E. M., Stoeber, J., Liu, S. T. H.,
541 Cunningham-Rundles, C., Felgner, P. L., Moran, T., García-Sastre, A., Caplivski, D., Cheng, A.
542 C., Kedzierska, K., Vapalahti, O., Hepojoki, J. M., Simon, V., and Krammer, F. (2020). A
543 serological assay to detect SARS-CoV-2 seroconversion in humans. *Nat Med*

544 Barnes, C. O., West, A. P., Huey-Tubman, K., Hoffmann, M. A. G., Sharaf, N. G., Hoffman, P.
545 R., Koranda, N., Gristick, H. B., Gaebler, C., and Muecksch, F. (2020). Structures of human
546 antibodies bound to SARS-CoV-2 spike reveal common epitopes and recurrent features of
547 antibodies. *bioRxiv*

548 Byrnes, J. R., Zhou, X. X., Lui, I., Elledge, S. K., Glasgow, J. E., Lim, S. A., Loudermilk, R., Chiu,
549 C. Y., Wilson, M. R., and Leung, K. K. (2020). A SARS-CoV-2 serological assay to determine
550 the presence of blocking antibodies that compete for human ACE2 binding. *medRxiv*

551 Casadevall, A., and Pirofski, L.-a. (2020). The convalescent sera option for containing COVID-
552 19. *The Journal of clinical investigation* *130*, 1545-1548.

553 Cervia, C., Nilsson, J., Zurbuchen, Y., Valaperti, A., Schreiner, J., Wolfensberger, A., Raeber, M.
554 E., Adamo, S., Emmenegger, M., and Hasler, S. (2020). Systemic and mucosal antibody secretion
555 specific to SARS-CoV-2 during mild versus severe COVID-19. *bioRxiv*

556 Dixon, A. S., Schwinn, M. K., Hall, M. P., Zimmerman, K., Otto, P., Lubben, T. H., Butler, B. L.,
557 Binkowski, B. F., Machleidt, T., Kirkland, T. A., Wood, M. G., Eggers, C. T., Encell, L. P., and
558 Wood, K. V. (2016). NanoLuc Complementation Reporter Optimized for Accurate Measurement
559 of Protein Interactions in Cells. *ACS Chem Biol* *11*, 400-408.

560 Faustini, S. E., Jossi, S. E., Perez-Toledo, M., Shields, A., Allen, J. D., Watanabe, Y., Newby, M.
561 L., Cook, A., Willcox, C. R., Salim, M., Goodall, M., Heaney, J. L., Marcial-Juarez, E., Morley,
562 G. L., Torlinska, B., Wraith, D. C., Veenith, T., Harding, S., Jolles, S., Mark, P. J., Plant, T.,
563 Huissoon, A., O'Shea, M. K., Willcox, B. E., Drayson, M. T., Crispin, M., Cunningham, A. F.,
564 and Richter, A. G. (2020). Detection of antibodies to the SARS-CoV-2 spike glycoprotein in both
565 serum and saliva enhances detection of infection. *medRxiv*

566 Fry, S. R., Li, J., de las Heras, R., McCourt, J. A., Arel, E., Kachab, E. H., Hazell, S. L., and Huang,
567 C. Y. (2008). Detection of HSV type-1 and type-2 IgG using an in vitro PCA based homogeneous
568 immunoassay. *Biochem Biophys Res Commun* *372*, 542-546.

569 Kang, S., Yang, M., Hong, Z., Zhang, L., Huang, Z., Chen, X., He, S., Zhou, Z., Zhou, Z., and
570 Chen, Q. (2020). Crystal structure of SARS-CoV-2 nucleocapsid protein RNA binding domain
571 reveals potential unique drug targeting sites. *Acta Pharmaceutica Sinica B*

- 572 Klein, S., Pekosz, A., Park, H.-S., Ursin, R., Shapiro, J., Benner, S., Littlefield, K., Kumar, S.,
573 Naik, H. M., and Betenbaugh, M. (2020). Sex, age, and hospitalization drive antibody responses
574 in a COVID-19 convalescent plasma donor population. *medRxiv*
- 575 Krammer, F., and Simon, V. (2020). Serology assays to manage COVID-19. *Science* 368, 1060-
576 1061.
- 577 Lassaunière, R., Frische, A., Harboe, Z. B., Nielsen, A. C. Y., Fomsgaard, A., Krogfelt, K. A., and
578 Jørgensen, C. S. (2020). Evaluation of nine commercial SARS-CoV-2 immunoassays. *Medrxiv*
- 579 Letko, M., Marzi, A., and Munster, V. (2020). Functional assessment of cell entry and receptor
580 usage for SARS-CoV-2 and other lineage B betacoronaviruses. *Nature microbiology* 5, 562-569.
- 581 Li, Z., Yi, Y., Luo, X., Xiong, N., Liu, Y., Li, S., Sun, R., Wang, Y., Hu, B., Chen, W., Zhang, Y.,
582 Wang, J., Huang, B., Lin, Y., Yang, J., Cai, W., Wang, X., Cheng, J., Chen, Z., Sun, K., Pan, W.,
583 Zhan, Z., Chen, L., and Ye, F. (2020). Development and clinical application of a rapid IgM-IgG
584 combined antibody test for SARS-CoV-2 infection diagnosis. *J Med Virol*
- 585 Long, Q.-X., Liu, B.-Z., Deng, H.-J., Wu, G.-C., Deng, K., Chen, Y.-K., Liao, P., Qiu, J.-F., Lin,
586 Y., and Cai, X.-F. (2020). Antibody responses to SARS-CoV-2 in patients with COVID-19. *Nature*
587 *medicine* 1-4.
- 588 Lynch, K. L., Whitman, J. D., Lacanienta, N. P., Beckerdite, E. W., Kastner, S. A., Shy, B. R.,
589 Goldgof, G. M., Levine, A. G., Bapat, S. P., Stramer, S. L., Esensten, J. H., Hightower, A. W.,
590 Bern, C., and Wu, A. H. B. (2020). Magnitude and kinetics of anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibody
591 responses and their relationship to disease severity. *Clin Infect Dis*
- 592 Mäkelä, O., Ruoslahti, E., and Seppälä, I. J. (1970). Affinity of IgM and IgG antibodies.
593 *Immunochemistry* 7, 917-932.
- 594 Okba, N. M. A., Müller, M. A., Li, W., Wang, C., GeurtsvanKessel, C. H., Corman, V. M., Lamers,
595 M. M., Sikkema, R. S., de Bruin, E., Chandler, F. D., Yazdanpanah, Y., Le Hingrat, Q., Descamps,
596 D., Houhou-Fidouh, N., Reusken, C. B. E. M., Bosch, B. J., Drosten, C., Koopmans, M. P. G., and
597 Haagmans, B. L. (2020). Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2-Specific Antibody
598 Responses in Coronavirus Disease Patients. *Emerg Infect Dis* 26, 1478-1488.
- 599 Poulsen, T. R., Meijer, P.-J., Jensen, A., Nielsen, L. S., and Andersen, P. S. (2007). Kinetic, affinity,
600 and diversity limits of human polyclonal antibody responses against tetanus toxoid. *The Journal*
601 *of Immunology* 179, 3841-3850.
- 602 Qu, J., Wu, C., Li, X., Zhang, G., Jiang, Z., Li, X., Zhu, Q., and Liu, L. (2020). Profile of IgG and
603 IgM antibodies against severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2). *Clin*
604 *Infect Dis*
- 605 Randad, P. R., Pisanic, N., Kruczynski, K., Manabe, Y. C., Thomas, D., Pekosz, A., Klein, S.,
606 Betenbaugh, M. J., Clarke, W. A., Laeyendecker, O., Caturegli, P. P., Larman, H. B., Detrick, B.,
607 Fairley, J. K., Sherman, A. C., Roupheal, N., Edupuganti, S., Granger, D. A., Granger, S. W.,
608 Collins, M., and Heaney, C. D. (2020). COVID-19 serology at population scale: SARS-CoV-2-
609 specific antibody responses in saliva. *medRxiv*
- 610 Reddy, S. B., Anders, R. F., Cross, N., Mueller, I., Senn, N., Stanisc, D. I., Siba, P. M., Wahlgren,
611 M., Kironde, F., and Beeson, J. G. (2015). Differences in affinity of monoclonal and naturally

- 612 acquired polyclonal antibodies against Plasmodium falciparum merozoite antigens. BMC
613 microbiology 15, 1-11.
- 614 Robbiani, D. F., Gaebler, C., Muecksch, F., Lorenzi, J. C. C., Wang, Z., Cho, A., Agudelo, M.,
615 Barnes, C. O., Gazumyan, A., Finkin, S., Hägglöf, T., Oliveira, T. Y., Viant, C., Hurley, A.,
616 Hoffmann, H. H., Millard, K. G., Kost, R. G., Cipolla, M., Gordon, K., Bianchini, F., Chen, S. T.,
617 Ramos, V., Patel, R., Dizon, J., Shimeliovich, I., Mendoza, P., Hartweiger, H., Nogueira, L., Pack,
618 M., Horowitz, J., Schmidt, F., Weisblum, Y., Michailidis, E., Ashbrook, A. W., Waltari, E., Pak,
619 J. E., Huey-Tubman, K. E., Koranda, N., Hoffman, P. R., West, A. P., Rice, C. M., Hatzioannou,
620 T., Bjorkman, P. J., Bieniasz, P. D., Caskey, M., and Nussenzweig, M. C. (2020). Convergent
621 antibody responses to SARS-CoV-2 in convalescent individuals. Nature
- 622 Rogers, T. F., Zhao, F., Huang, D., Beutler, N., Burns, A., He, W.-t., Limbo, O., Smith, C., Song,
623 G., and Woehl, J. (2020). Isolation of potent SARS-CoV-2 neutralizing antibodies and protection
624 from disease in a small animal model. Science
- 625 Rosado, J., Cockram, C., Merklung, S. H., Demeret, C., Meola, A., Kerneis, S., Terrier, B., Fafi-
626 Kremer, S., de Seze, J., and Backovic, M. (2020). Serological signatures of SARS-CoV-2 infection:
627 Implications for antibody-based diagnostics. medRxiv
- 628 Seow, J., Graham, C., Merrick, B., Acors, S., Steel, K. J. A., Hemmings, O., O'Bryne, A., Kouphou,
629 N., Pickering, S., and Galao, R. (2020). Longitudinal evaluation and decline of antibody responses
630 in SARS-CoV-2 infection. medRxiv
- 631 Smith, T. R. F., Patel, A., Ramos, S., Elwood, D., Zhu, X., Yan, J., Gary, E. N., Walker, S. N.,
632 Schultheis, K., Purwar, M., Xu, Z., Walters, J., Bhojnagarwala, P., Yang, M., Chokkalingam, N.,
633 Pezzoli, P., Parzych, E., Reuschel, E. L., Doan, A., Tursi, N., Vasquez, M., Choi, J., Tello-Ruiz,
634 E., Maricic, I., Bah, M. A., Wu, Y., Amante, D., Park, D. H., Dia, Y., Ali, A. R., Zaidi, F. I.,
635 Generotti, A., Kim, K. Y., Herring, T. A., Reeder, S., Andrade, V. M., Buttigieg, K., Zhao, G.,
636 Wu, J. M., Li, D., Bao, L., Liu, J., Deng, W., Qin, C., Brown, A. S., Khoshnejad, M., Wang, N.,
637 Chu, J., Wrapp, D., McLellan, J. S., Muthumani, K., Wang, B., Carroll, M. W., Kim, J. J., Boyer,
638 J., Kulp, D. W., Humeau, L. M. P. F., Weiner, D. B., and Broderick, K. E. (2020). Immunogenicity
639 of a DNA vaccine candidate for COVID-19. Nat Commun 11, 2601.
- 640 Stadlbauer, D., Amanat, F., Chromikova, V., Jiang, K., Strohmeier, S., Arunkumar, G. A., Tan, J.,
641 Bhavsar, D., Capuano, C., Kirkpatrick, E., Meade, P., Brito, R. N., Teo, C., McMahon, M., Simon,
642 V., and Krammer, F. (2020). SARS-CoV-2 Seroconversion in Humans: A Detailed Protocol for a
643 Serological Assay, Antigen Production, and Test Setup. Curr Protoc Microbiol 57, e100.
- 644 Tan, C. W., Chia, W. N., Qin, X., Liu, P., Chen, M. I., Tiu, C., Hu, Z., Chen, V. C., Young, B. E.,
645 Sia, W. R., Tan, Y. J., Foo, R., Yi, Y., Lye, D. C., Anderson, D. E., and Wang, L. F. (2020a). A
646 SARS-CoV-2 surrogate virus neutralization test based on antibody-mediated blockage of ACE2-
647 spike protein-protein interaction. Nat Biotechnol
- 648 Tan, W., Lu, Y., Zhang, J., Wang, J., Dan, Y., Tan, Z., He, X., Qian, C., Sun, Q., and Hu, Q.
649 (2020b). Viral kinetics and antibody responses in patients with COVID-19. MedRxiv
- 650 To, K. K.-W., Tsang, O. T.-Y., Leung, W.-S., Tam, A. R., Wu, T.-C., Lung, D. C., Yip, C. C.-Y.,
651 Cai, J.-P., Chan, J. M.-C., and Chik, T. S.-H. (2020). Temporal profiles of viral load in posterior
652 oropharyngeal saliva samples and serum antibody responses during infection by SARS-CoV-2: an
653 observational cohort study. The Lancet Infectious Diseases

- 654 van Doremalen, N., Lambe, T., Spencer, A., Belij-Rammerstorfer, S., Purushotham, J. N., Port, J.
655 R., Avanzato, V., Bushmaker, T., Flaxman, A., and Ulaszewska, M. (2020). ChAdOx1 nCoV-19
656 vaccination prevents SARS-CoV-2 pneumonia in rhesus macaques. *bioRxiv*
- 657 Wajnberg, A., Amanat, F., Firpo, A., Altman, D., Bailey, M., Mansour, M., McMahon, M., Meade,
658 P., Mendu, D. R., and Muellers, K. (2020). SARS-CoV-2 infection induces robust, neutralizing
659 antibody responses that are stable for at least three months. *medRxiv*
- 660 Whitman, J. D., Hiatt, J., Mowery, C. T., Shy, B. R., Yu, R., Yamamoto, T. N., Rathore, U.,
661 Goldgof, G. M., Whitty, C., and Woo, J. M. (2020). Test performance evaluation of SARS-CoV-
662 2 serological assays. *medRxiv*
- 663 Xiang, J., Yan, M., Li, H., Liu, T., Lin, C., Huang, S., and Shen, C. (2020). Evaluation of Enzyme-
664 Linked Immunoassay and Colloidal Gold-Immunochromatographic Assay Kit for Detection of
665 Novel Coronavirus (SARS-Cov-2) Causing an Outbreak of Pneumonia (COVID-19). *MedRxiv*
- 666 Yu, J., Tostanoski, L. H., Peter, L., Mercado, N. B., McMahan, K., Mahrokhian, S. H., Nkolola, J.
667 P., Liu, J., Li, Z., Chandrashekar, A., Martinez, D. R., Loos, C., Atyeo, C., Fischinger, S., Burke,
668 J. S., Slein, M. D., Chen, Y., Zuiani, A., N Lelis, F. J., Travers, M., Habibi, S., Pessaint, L., Van
669 Ry, A., Blade, K., Brown, R., Cook, A., Finneyfrock, B., Dodson, A., Teow, E., Velasco, J., Zahn,
670 R., Wegmann, F., Bondzie, E. A., Dagotto, G., Gebre, M. S., He, X., Jacob-Dolan, C., Kirilova,
671 M., Kordana, N., Lin, Z., Maxfield, L. F., Nampanya, F., Nityanandam, R., Ventura, J. D., Wan,
672 H., Cai, Y., Chen, B., Schmidt, A. G., Wesemann, D. R., Baric, R. S., Alter, G., Andersen, H.,
673 Lewis, M. G., and Barouch, D. H. (2020). DNA vaccine protection against SARS-CoV-2 in rhesus
674 macaques. *Science*
- 675 Yuan, M., Wu, N. C., Zhu, X., Lee, C.-C. D., So, R. T. Y., Lv, H., Mok, C. K. P., and Wilson, I.
676 A. (2020). A highly conserved cryptic epitope in the receptor binding domains of SARS-CoV-2
677 and SARS-CoV. *Science* 368, 630-633.
- 678 Zamecnik, C. R., Rajan, J. V., Yamauchi, K. A., Mann, S. A., Sowa, G. M., Zorn, K. C., Alvarenga,
679 B. D., Stone, M., Norris, P. J., and Gu, W. (2020). ReScan, a Multiplex Diagnostic Pipeline, Pans
680 Human Sera for SARS-CoV-2 Antigens. *medRxiv*
- 681 Zeng, F., Dai, C., Cai, P., Wang, J., Xu, L., Li, J., Hu, G., Wang, Z., Zheng, F., and Wang, L.
682 (2020). A comparison study of SARS-CoV-2 IgG antibody between male and female COVID-19
683 patients: a possible reason underlying different outcome between sex. *Journal of Medical Virology*
- 684 Zhao, J., Wang, W., Wang, W., Zhao, Z., Zhang, Y., Lv, P., Ren, F., and Gao, X. M. (2007).
685 Comparison of immunoglobulin G responses to the spike and nucleocapsid proteins of severe acute
686 respiratory syndrome (SARS) coronavirus in patients with SARS. *Clin Vaccine Immunol* 14, 839-
687 846.
- 688 Zhao, J., Yuan, Q., Wang, H., Liu, W., Liao, X., Su, Y., Wang, X., Yuan, J., Li, T., Li, J., Qian,
689 S., Hong, C., Wang, F., Liu, Y., Wang, Z., He, Q., Li, Z., He, B., Zhang, T., Fu, Y., Ge, S., Liu,
690 L., Zhang, J., Xia, N., and Zhang, Z. (2020). Antibody responses to SARS-CoV-2 in patients of
691 novel coronavirus disease 2019. *Clin Infect Dis*
- 692

693 SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS

694

695 S sensor engineering and characterization

696 Linker modeling

697 We modeled S-RBD binding to two antibodies to determine the optimal linker lengths between
698 the S-RBD domains and the SmBiT/LgBiT fusions. The antibody C105 is an ACE2-competitive
699 binder (**Figure S1C**) (Robbiani et al., 2020; Barnes et al., 2020), while the antibody CR3022 does
700 not compete with ACE2 (**Figure S1D**) (Yuan et al., 2020). Based on the assumption that the wing-
701 span of antigen binding sites between Fab arms on a flexible-hinge region of an Fc are roughly
702 ~117-134 Å apart (Sosnick et al., 1992), and residue-to-residue distance in a linker lies between
703 the length of tightly packed alpha-helix residues (1.5 Å) and extended beta-strand residues (3.5 Å),
704 we estimated the total number of linker residues should be ~30-80 amino acids. Antibodies binding
705 to the CR3022 epitope may require a shorter linker for NanoLuc reconstitution (**Figure S1D**) than
706 antibodies competitive with ACE2 (**Figure S1C**). Considering S-RBD has a C-terminal 15-residue
707 loop to function as part of the linker, we constructed SmBiT fusions to S-RBD C-terminus with
708 15 or 25 residue Glycine/Serine (GS) linkers (S15 and S25), and LgBiT fusions to S-RBD C-
709 terminus with 5, 15, or 25 residue GS linkers (L5, L15 and L25). These linker variants were
710 expressed in Expi293 cells and varied in expression yields (**Figure S1E**). The N-terminal fusions
711 to S-RBD were not designed because the N and C termini localize in close proximity and we
712 hypothesized this alternative fusion design would result in similar sensor performance as the C-
713 terminal fusions (**Figure S1B**).

714

715 Optimization of enzyme concentrations, linkers and buffer conditions

716 We then determine the optimal enzyme concentration. A three-fold dilution series from 27 to
717 0.11 nM of the L15 + S25 sensors were mixed with increasing 10-fold dilutions of recombinant
718 CR3022 (**Figure S1F**). After a 20-minute incubation, the NanoLuc substrate was added and
719 allowed to develop for 10 minutes before luminescence signal was read. High sensor
720 concentrations (27, 9, 3 nM) resulted in stronger background luminescence signal and therefore
721 lower detection sensitivity of CR3022, due to increased basal association of the two split sensors.
722 Meanwhile, low sensor concentrations (0.33 and 0.1 nM) generated overall less signal than 1 nM
723 sensors because fewer sensors are captured on each antibody. As a result, sensors at 1 nM were
724 used in all subsequent assays.

725 Next we queried if linker lengths affect detection sensitivity. Sensors with varied linker lengths
726 were mixed with 10-fold dilutions of CR3022 and all resulted in dose-dependent luminescence
727 signals (**Figure S1F**). Little difference in detection sensitivity was observed, except that the (L5 +
728 S15) and (L5 + S25) linker combinations resulted in slightly decreased sensitivity at low antibody

729 concentrations. This result indicated that we had selected a proper range of linker lengths. Based
730 on robust signal and expression yields (**Figure S1E**), we chose the L15 and S25 sensor pair for
731 subsequent assays.

732 Interestingly, we observed that the regular PBSTB assay buffer (PBS, 0.05% Tween-20, 0.2%
733 m/v BSA, PBSTB) produced a higher background signal (average relative luciferase units (RLU)
734 = 70-80) than in serum samples (RLU = 24.5). We tested if supplementing Fetal Bovine Serum
735 (FBS) can reduce background (**Figure S2**). PBS + 0.05% Tween-20 (PBST) with 4-10 % FBS was
736 found to reduce the signal (mean RLU = 21) to a level that is close to signal from 12.5% serum,
737 and therefore can serve as a proper negative control. Both the recombinant anti-S antibody C004
738 and the commercial anti-N antibody (Sino biological, Cat#40588-T62-50) produced linear dose-
739 dependent signal in this buffer (**Figure 1B and C**), which can be used to generate standard curves
740 and calibrate the instruments for the spLUC assay.

741

742 **Impact of binding affinities**

743 To determine whether the affinity of the target binding to S-RBD affects signal strength, we
744 turned to two dimeric ACE2 constructs: ACE2-Fc, which is the human ACE2 peptidase domain
745 fused to IgG1 Fc(Lui et al., 2020), and an engineered ACE2-Fc variant that binds ~10x tighter to
746 S-RBD (**Figure S3**). Overall, signal from wild-type ACE2-Fc ($K_D = 10$ nM) is weak, with signal
747 that is more than two standard deviations above background only detected at the highest tested
748 ACE2-Fc concentration (10 nM). Conversely, the enhanced-affinity ACE2-Fc variant ($K_D = 1$ nM)
749 generated a dose-dependent signal from 0.1-10 nM protein concentrations and exhibited 2.6-fold
750 higher signal observed at 10 nM relative to the wild-type ACE2-Fc. These findings indicated the
751 sensors report the presence of not only larger quantities of anti-S-RBD binders but also higher-
752 affinity binders. This property of the sensors suggested spLUC assay may be used to characterize
753 binding affinities of S-RBD antibodies or ACE2 variants for therapeutic applications.

754

755 **Thermodynamic sensor model**

756 In further characterizing the relationship between assay signal strength and antibody
757 concentration/binding affinity, we performed ordinary differential equation modeling in R. We
758 made assumptions such as a sensor can only be bound by one antibody, that antibody binding is
759 non-cooperative, and that there is no detectable basal affinity of LgBiT and SmBiT at the
760 concentrations tested (**Figure S4A**). The modeling predicted a linear relationship between
761 antibody concentration and luciferase signal (**Figure S4B**), consistent with our experimental data
762 (**Fig. 1B, C**).

763 The following set of ordinary differential equations (ODEs) was written to describe the system
764 depicted in **Figure S4A** and generated the curve graphs in **Figure S4B and C**:

$$\begin{aligned}765 & \\766 & \frac{d[A]}{dt} = -k_{1f}[C][A] - k_{1f}[D][A] - k_{1f}[E][A] + k_{1r}[D] + k_{1r}[G] + k_{1r}[H] \\767 & \\768 & \frac{d[B]}{dt} = -k_{1f}[C][B] - k_{1f}[E][B] - k_{1f}[D][B] + k_{1r}[E] + k_{1r}[I] + k_{1r}[H] \\769 & \\770 & \frac{d[C]}{dt} = -k_{1f}[C][A] - k_{1f}[C][B] + k_{1r}[D] + k_{1r}[E] \\771 & \\772 & \frac{d[D]}{dt} = -k_{1r}[D] - k_{1f}[D][A] - k_{1f}[D][B] + k_{1f}[C][A] + k_{1r}[G] + k_{1r}[H] \\773 & \\774 & \frac{d[E]}{dt} = -k_{1r}[E] - k_{1f}[E][A] - k_{1f}[DE][B] + k_{1f}[C][B] + k_{1r}[H] + k_{1r}[I] \\775 & \\776 & \frac{d[G]}{dt} = -k_{1r}[G] + k_{1f}[D][A] \\777 & \\778 & \frac{d[H]}{dt} = -k_{1r}[H] - k_{1r}[H] + k_{1f}[D][B] + k_{1f}[E][A] \\779 & \\780 & \frac{d[I]}{dt} = -k_{1r}[I] + k_{1f}[E][B]\end{aligned}$$

781 Where:

782 A = LgBiT sensor

783 B = SmBiT sensor

784 C = Antibody

785 D = Antibody/ LgBiT sensor heterodimer

786 E = Antibody/ SmBiT sensor heterodimer

787 G = Antibody/ LgBiT sensor/LgBiT sensor trimer

788 H = Antibody/Active Enzyme trimer (Active Enzyme)

789 I = Antibody/ SmBiT sensor/SmBiT sensor trimer


790 k_{1f} = on rate of Antibody binding to Spike

791 k_{1r} = off rate of Antibody binding to Spike

792


793 For simplification, we assumed the following: 1) LgBiT sensor and SmBiT sensor had no
794 measurable interaction, 2) Antibody binding to LgBiT sensor or SmBiT sensor was non-
795 cooperative, and 3) Antibody binding to LgBiT sensor was equivalent in rate to antibody binding
796 to SmBiT sensor. The equations above were solved in R using the deSolve package to find the
797 concentration of each species at equilibrium. In all cases the initial concentrations of D, E, G, H,
798 and I were set to 0.

799



800
801
802 **Figure S1 Design and characterization of S sensors.** (A) Annotated depiction of the SARS-
803 CoV-2 Spike protein. The S sensors were developed using only the S-RBD domain (aa 328 – 533,
804 PDB: 6W41) shown in pink. (B) Structure of the S-RBD domain shows the N and C termini locate
805 in close proximity. (C, D) Modeling of c, ACE2-competitive antibody C105 (PDB: 6XCN)
806 binding to S-RBD-SmBiT/LgBiT sensors, and d, CR3022 (PDB: 6W41) binding to S-RBD-
807 SmBiT/LgBiT sensors. Modeling and distance measurements were performed with PDB 6XCN,
808 6W41, 1N8Z, 5IBO and 5D6D in PyMOL. (E) Yield of the 5 Spike-NanoBiT sensor fusions. The
809 Spike LgBiT sensors were made with 5aa, 15aa, and 25aa GS linkers (L5, L15 and L25). The
810 Spike SmBiT sensors were made with 15aa, and 25aa GS linkers (S15 and S25). Because the N
811 and C termini of the S-RBD domain locate in close proximity, only fusions to the C termini of S-
812 RBD were constructed. (F) The S sensors are most sensitive at 1 nM for detecting CR3022 in
813 solution compared to higher or lower sensor concentrations. (G) S sensors with varied linker
814 lengths resulted in very similar signal strength in detecting CR3022.


815
816
817



818
819


820 **Figure S2 Supplementing FBS reduces background signal in spLUC assays. PBST with 4-10%**
821 **FBS can be used as a negative control for serum samples as it shows similar signal suppression.**

822
823



824
825
826
827
828
829

Figure S3 The biosensors are more sensitive to high-affinity binders. The ACE2-Fc variant which bind 10-fold tighter to S-RBD generated ~3-fold higher signal at 10 nM protein concentration comparing to WT ACE2-Fc.




830
831


832 **Figure S4 ODE models predict a linear, dose-dependent response and K_D dependence of the**
 833 **luminescence signal. (A)** Antibody (C) and sensor components (A and B) are in thermodynamic
 834 equilibrium with enzymatically inactive (D, E, G, and I) and active (H) sensor bound species. **(B)**
 835 At 1 nM starting concentration of sensor ([A] and [B]), spLUC assays are predicted to generate
 836 signals linearly correlated to a broad range of antibody concentrations ([Ab]). Signal is predicted
 837 to be insensitive to antibody concentrations for antibodies with high affinity for the sensor (≤ 1 nM),
 838 but weaker affinity antibodies ($K_D > 1$ nM) will result in significantly lower levels of reconstituted
 839 enzyme. **(C)** At K_D values equivalent or higher than the sensor concentrations, the spLUC signals
 840 are predicted to drop significantly.

841

A




B




C

#	Sensor	Yield (mg/L)
LC	N(aa 44-180)-10aa-LgBiT	6.4
SC	N(aa 44-180)-10aa-SmBiT	14.2
LC2	LgBiT-10aa-N(aa 44-257)	11.2
SC2	SmBiT-10aa-N(aa 44-257)	1.8
LN	LgBiT-10aa-N(aa 44-257)	1.6
SN	SmBiT-10aa-N(aa 44-257)	6.8

D




E



842
843

844 **Figure S5 Design and characterization of N sensors.** (A) Annotated depiction of the SARS-
845 CoV-2 Nucleocapsid protein (protein N). All N protein fusions designed included the RNA
846 binding domain (aa 44-180, N-RBD) and excluded the dimerization domain (aa 257-419). (B)
847 Structure of the N-RBD domain shows the N and C termini locate far from each other and fusion
848 of the split enzyme fragments to N or C termini may result in different detection sensitivity (PDB:
849 6YI3). (C) Yield of the six N protein-NanoBiT sensor fusions. (D) The N-terminal N sensor pair
850 (LN + SN, 44-257) was less sensitive than the LC + SC (44-180) and LC2 + SC2 (44-257) C
851 terminal N sensor pairs when the assay was performed on a rabbit polyclonal anti-N protein
852 antibody (Sino Biological, Cat#: 40588-T62-50). (E) Additionally, only patient 6 and 8 showed
853 signals above controls in the serological assay performed with LN + SN sensors, while all four
854 patients showed signals with the LC + SC sensors.
855




856

857

858 **Figure S6 Epitope characterizations of CR3022, C004, C105 and C135.** (A) Design of a
859 Biolayer interferometry (BLI) experiment to characterize competitive binding of the antibodies
860 with ACE2-Fc and other antibodies. (B) BLI experiments showed C004 and C105 both competed
861 with ACE2-Fc for binding while C135 does not. (C) BLI experiments showed C004 competed
862 with C105 for binding while the other antibodies do not compete.


863

864



865
866


867 **Figure S7 Comparison of the ELISA and the spLUC results.** (A) Signals from the S sensor
868 spLUC assay (cohort 1) correlate very well with S-RBD ELISA anti-Fab signals ($R = 0.91$),
869 moderately well with anti-IgG signals ($R = 0.43$), and poorly with anti-IgM signals for cohort 1
870 ($R = -0.066$). (B) Signals from the S sensor spLUC assay (cohort 2) correlate very well with S-
871 RBD ELISA anti-Fab signals ($R = 0.84$) and with anti-IgG signals ($R = 0.86$), but poorly with anti-
872 IgM signals for cohort 1 ($R = 0.29$). (C) Signals from the S sensor (cohort 3) correlate well with
873 S-RBD ELISA anti-IgG signals ($R = 0.88$). For A-C, the Spearman R values and P values are
874 labeled in each graph. (D-F) The seronegative samples in the anti-S spLUC assay also showed low
875 anti-Fab or anti-IgG signals in ELISA serology tests for cohort 1 (D), cohort 2 (E), and cohort 3
876 (F).



877
878

879 **Figure S8 Individual cohorts show good correlation between S and N sensors.** Each cohort
880 shows robust correlation with $R = 0.59, 0.87,$ and 0.73 for (A), cohort 1, (B), cohort 2, and (C),
881 cohort 3, respectively.

882




883


884

885 **Figure S9 Further correlation of spLUC signal and gender/age.** (A) For cohort 3, males show
886 a slightly higher spLUC assay signal compared to females, although this difference is not
887 statistically significant. (B) Cohort 1 spLUC signal shows no significant difference in signal
888 among age groups.

889



890
891 **Figure S10 The S and N sensors were functional after lyophilization.** (A) Both the S and the N
892 sensors can survive lyophilization. The majority of proteins (70-100%) can be reconstituted after
893 lyophilization. The lyophilized S sensors lost 50% of signal. The lyophilized N sensors remain
894 100% active. (B) The lyophilized S sensors detected CR3022 at ~50% signal strength compared
895 to fresh sensors. (C) The lyophilized N sensors detected antibodies from patient sera at similar
896 signal strength compared to fresh sensors.
897



898
899 **Figure S11 Saliva condition optimization.** spLUC reactions are compatible with saliva samples.
900 The CR3022 antibody was spiked into healthy individual saliva at 10-fold dilutions from 100 nM
901 to 0.01 nM. While undiluted saliva reduced signal 10-fold and reduced sensitivity, 1:2 dilution of
902 saliva only reduced signal by 3-fold and did not decrease the sensitivity. Each dot represents the
903 average of two technical replicates and error bars represent standard deviation.
904

905 **Table. S1** Determination of assay cutoff values

	S	N
SERUM DILUTIONS	1:12.5	1:12.5
# SAMPLES	56	120
MIN	12	2.5
MAX	44.5	84
MEDIAN	23.2	25
MEAN	24.5	29.5
STANDARD DEVIATION (SD)	7.1	17.8
DERIVED CUTOFF (MEAN+3XSD)	45.9	83.1

906

907

908 **References and Notes**

- 909 Barnes, C. O., West, A. P., Huey-Tubman, K., Hoffmann, M. A. G., Sharaf, N. G., Hoffman, P.
910 R., Koranda, N., Gristick, H. B., Gaebler, C., and Muecksch, F. (2020). Structures of human
911 antibodies bound to SARS-CoV-2 spike reveal common epitopes and recurrent features of
912 antibodies. *bioRxiv*
- 913 Lui, I., Zhou, X. X., Lim, S. A., Elledge, S., Solomon, P., Rettko, N. J., Zha, B. S., Kirkemo, L.
914 L., Gramespacher, J. A., and Liu, J. (2020). Trimeric SARS-CoV-2 Spike interacts with dimeric
915 ACE2 with limited intra-Spike avidity. *bioRxiv*
- 916 Robbiani, D. F., Gaebler, C., Muecksch, F., Lorenzi, J. C. C., Wang, Z., Cho, A., Agudelo, M.,
917 Barnes, C. O., Gazumyan, A., Finkin, S., Hägglöf, T., Oliveira, T. Y., Viant, C., Hurley, A.,
918 Hoffmann, H. H., Millard, K. G., Kost, R. G., Cipolla, M., Gordon, K., Bianchini, F., Chen, S. T.,
919 Ramos, V., Patel, R., Dizon, J., Shimeliovich, I., Mendoza, P., Hartweiger, H., Nogueira, L., Pack,
920 M., Horowitz, J., Schmidt, F., Weisblum, Y., Michailidis, E., Ashbrook, A. W., Waltari, E., Pak,
921 J. E., Huey-Tubman, K. E., Koranda, N., Hoffman, P. R., West, A. P., Rice, C. M., Hatzioannou,
922 T., Bjorkman, P. J., Bieniasz, P. D., Caskey, M., and Nussenzweig, M. C. (2020). Convergent
923 antibody responses to SARS-CoV-2 in convalescent individuals. *Nature*
- 924 Sosnick, T. R., Benjamin, D. C., Novotny, J., Seeger, P. A., and Trewthella, J. (1992). Distances
925 between the antigen-binding sites of three murine antibody subclasses measured using neutron and
926 X-ray scattering. *Biochemistry* *31*, 1779-1786.
- 927 Yuan, M., Wu, N. C., Zhu, X., Lee, C.-C. D., So, R. T. Y., Lv, H., Mok, C. K. P., and Wilson, I.
928 A. (2020). A highly conserved cryptic epitope in the receptor binding domains of SARS-CoV-2
929 and SARS-CoV. *Science* *368*, 630-633.

930
931
932