medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.05.20225003; this version posted November 6, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in

perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

1

### Characteristics of three different chemiluminescence assays for testing for 2

#### SARS-CoV-2 antibodies 3

- 4
- 5 Myriam C. Weber 1\*, Martin Risch 2\*, Sarah L. Thiel 1, Kirsten Grossmann 3.4, Susanne Nigg 5, Nadia Wohlwend 3, Thomas Lung
- 6 <sup>3</sup>, Dorothea Hillmann <sup>3</sup>, Michael Ritzler <sup>3</sup>, Francesca Ferrara <sup>3</sup>, Susanna Bigler <sup>6</sup>, Konrad Egli <sup>6</sup>, Thomas Bodmer <sup>6</sup>, Mauro Imperiali
- 7 7, Yacir Salimi<sup>8</sup>, Felix Fleisch<sup>9</sup>, Alexia Cusini<sup>9</sup>, Sonja Heer<sup>10</sup>, Harald Renz<sup>11</sup>, Matthias Paprotny<sup>1</sup>, Philipp Kohler<sup>5</sup>, Pietro
- 8 Vernazza <sup>5</sup>, Lorenz Risch <sup>3,4,12</sup>, Christian R. Kahlert <sup>5,13</sup>
- 9
- 10 Short title: Diagnostic characteristics of COVID-19 serology
- 11 \* contributed equally
- 12 <sup>1</sup> Landesspital Liechtenstein, Heiligkreuz, 9490 Vaduz, Liechtenstein
- 13 <sup>2</sup> Central laboratory, Kantonsspital Graubünden, Loësstrasse 170, 7000 Chur, Switzerland
- 14 <sup>3</sup>Labormedizinisches zentrum Dr Risch, Wuhrstrasse 14, 9490 Vaduz, Liechtenstein
- 15 <sup>4</sup> Private Universität im Fürstentum Liechtenstein, Dorfstrasse, 9495 Triesen, Liechtenstein
- <sup>5</sup> Department of Infectious Diseases and Hospital Epidemiology, Cantonal Hospital St Gallen, 16
- Rohrschacherstrasse 95 9007 St Gallen, Switzerland 17
- 18 <sup>6</sup> Labormedizinisches zentrum Dr Risch, Waldeggstrasse 37, 3097 Liebefeld, Switzerland
- 19 <sup>7</sup> Centro medicina di laboratorio Dr Risch, Via Arbostra 2, 6963 Pregassona, Switzerland
- <sup>8</sup> Clm Dr Risch arc lémanique SA, Chemin de l'Esparcette 10, 1023 Crissier, Switzerland 20
- 21 <sup>9</sup> Division of Infectious Diseases, Kantonsspital Graubünden, Loësstrasse 170, 7000 Chur, Switzerland 22 <sup>10</sup> Blutspendedienst Graubünden, Loësstrasse 170, 7000 Chur, Switzerland
- 23 <sup>11</sup> Institute of Laboratory Medicine and Pathobiochemistry, Molecular Diagnostics, Philipps University
- 24 Marburg, University Hospital Giessen and Marburg, Baldingerstraße, 35043 Marburg, Germany <sup>12</sup> Center of Laboratory Medicine, University Institute of Clinical Chemistry, University of Bern, Inselspital, 25
- 3010 Bern, Switzerland 26
- <sup>13</sup> Children's Hospital of Eastern Switzerland, Department of Infectious Diseases and Hospital 27
- 28 Epidemiology, Claudiusstrasse 6, 9006 St. Gallen, Switzerland
- 29
- 30 Word count Abstract: 300
- 31 Keywords. 11
- 32 Word count Manuscript: 4907
- 33 References: 51
- 34 Tables: 1
- 35 Figures: 3
- 36
- 37 Correspondence to:
- 38
- 39 Prof. Dr.med. Lorenz Risch, MPH MHA
- 40 Labormedizinisches zentrum Dr. Risch
- 41 Wuhrstrasse 14
- 42 9490 Vaduz
- 43 Email lorenz.risch@risch.ch
- 44 Phone +41 58 523 30 00
- 45
- 46

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

#### 47 Abstract

2

48 Several tests based on chemiluminescence immunoassay techniques have become available to test for 49 SARS-CoV-2 antibodies. There is currently insufficient data on serology assay performance beyond 35 50 days after symptoms onset. We aimed to evaluate SARS-CoV-2 antibody tests on three widely used 51 platforms. A chemiluminescent microparticle immunoassay (CMIA; Abbott Diagnostics, USA), a 52 luminescence immunoassay (LIA; Diasorin, Italy), and an electrochemiluminescence immunoassay 53 (ECLIA; Roche Diagnostics, Switzerland) were investigated. In a multi-group study, sensitivity was 54 assessed in a group of participants with confirmed SARS-CoV-2 (n=145), whereas specificity was 55 determined in two groups of participants without evidence of COVID-19 (i.e. healthy blood donors, n=191, 56 and healthcare workers, n=1002). Receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curves, multilevel likelihood 57 ratios (LR), and positive (PPV) and negative (NPV) predictive values were characterized. Finally, 58 analytical specificity was characterized in samples with evidence of Epstein-Barr virus (EBV) (n=9), 59 cytomegalovirus (CMV) (n=7) and endemic common cold coronavirus infections (n=12) taken prior to the 60 current SARS-CoV-2 pandemic. The diagnostic accuracy was comparable in all three assays (AUC 0.98). Using the manufacturers' cut-offs, the sensitivities were 90%, 95% confidence interval, [84,94] (LIA), 93% 61 62 [88,96] (CMIA), and 96% [91,98] (ECLIA). The specificities were 99.5% [98.9,99.8]( CMIA) 99.7% 63 [99.3,99,9] (LIA) and 99.9% [99.5,99.98] (ECLIA). The LR at half of the manufacturers' cut-offs were 60 (CMIA), 82 (LIA), and 575 (ECLIA) for positive and 0.043 (CMIA) and 0.035 (LIA, ECLIA) for negative 64 results. ECLIA had higher PPV at low pretest probabilities than CMIA and LIA. No interference with EBV 65 66 or CMV infection was observed, whereas endemic coronavirus in some cases provided signals in LIA 67 and/or CMIA. Although the diagnostic accuracy of the three investigated assays is comparable, their 68 performance in low-prevalence settings is different. Introducing gray zones at half of the manufacturers' 69 cut-offs is suggested, especially for orthogonal testing approaches that use a second assay for 70 confirmation.

- 72 Keywords: Antibody, coronavirus, COVID-19, diagnostic accuracy, immunoassay, likelihood ratios, 73 predictive values, SARS-CoV-2, sensitivity, serology, specificity
- 74
- 75
- 76

### 77 Introduction

78 COVID-19 is a recently emerging pandemic disease caused by infection with SARS-CoV-2 virus. Although 79 there are considerable differences regarding its incidence, hospitalization rate, morbidity rate, and case 80 fatality rate between different countries, disease control at the moment is uniformly achieved by strict 81 prevention measures such as social distancing, wearing of face masks, hand-washing, contact tracing 82 and testing, guarantine or isolation <sup>1</sup>. Whereas the diagnosis of acute disease in the medical laboratory 83 most importantly relies on RT-PCR testing, serological testing for antibodies specifically directed against 84 viral proteins of SARS-CoV2 has increasingly come into the focus of public health authorities and medical 85 institutions <sup>2-8</sup>. The clinical presentation of COVID-19 has been shown to be heterogeneous in severity as 86 well as in clinical signs and symptoms <sup>9</sup>. A substantial proportion of patients have only minimal 87 symptomatology or are even asymptomatic <sup>10</sup>. Currently, there is no vaccination available, and causal 88 therapies are very limited <sup>11</sup>. After several countries showed success in confining the progression of the 89 COVID-19 pandemic with drastic measures, there is a need to gradually cancel these measures to reinstitute possibly "normal" social and economic circumstances <sup>12,13</sup>. To guide these actions to reverse 90 91 socioeconomic lockdown, knowledge on the prevalence of COVID-19 is needed <sup>14</sup>. Since a large 92 proportion of patients with suspected COVID-19 infection could not be tested by RT-PCR in the acute 93 phase, serological testing may gain increasing importance for retrospective clarification of clinical symptoms <sup>15</sup>. 94

95 Serologic testing allows us to estimate the proportion of individuals already infected with COVID-19, either in the total population, in healthcare workplace settings or in general workplace settings <sup>16,17</sup>. It 96 97 facilitates contact tracing as well as surveillance and assists in the identification of individuals susceptible to COVID-19 infection <sup>2,18,19</sup>. Furthermore, individuals having had contact with confirmed COVID-19 98 patients might be interested in determining whether they developed SARS-CoV-2 specific antibodies, if 99 100 they did not yet have access to testing. Moreover, serological testing allows us to clarify clinical cases in 101 which RT-PCR testing has been negative despite a high pretest probability for the presence of COVID-19 102 <sup>20,21</sup>. Such cases of false negative RT-PCR have been reported, possibly because of improper collection 103 techniques, viral loads below the detectable limit of the assay, or diminished upper airway shedding of the

4

104 virus <sup>22-25</sup>. Finally, the role of specific antibodies in terms of protection against reinfection and persistence 105 over time is currently not adequately defined.

106 In the beginning of the pandemic, lateral flow tests were primarily employed to perform serological 107 SARS-CoV2 testing <sup>26</sup>. However, some of these tests have been criticized for poor sensitivity and 108 specificity <sup>27</sup>. Poor specificity has been suspected to occur due to cross-reactivity with the antibody 109 response to endemic coronaviruses causing the common cold (i.e., HCoV-229E, -NL63, -OC43 and -110 HKU1) <sup>28</sup>. Some of these cross-reacting antibodies, however, have actually shown neutralizing activity 111 against SARS-CoV-2 <sup>29</sup>. Since the antibody response in SARS-CoV-2 infection needs 2 to 4 weeks to 112 develop, false negative antibody tests can occur due to insufficient duration between the onset of clinical 113 symptoms and the time of blood sampling or insensitive measurement techniques that require large 114 quantities of antibodies for a positive result <sup>6,12</sup>. At the moment, it is not known how long the antibody titers 115 persist. A recent Cochrane review stated that there are currently not enough studies available for antibody 116 tests done after 35 days of symptom onset <sup>30</sup>.

117 Whereas ELISA tests were available relatively early during the pandemic, the supply of these tests has been relatively scarce <sup>31,32</sup>. Only recently have assays using chemiluminescence (CLIA) become 118 119 available, with only a few validation data published so far 33,34. These assays are available in large 120 quantities and can be analyzed in high-throughput settings. The different assays are directed against different specific antigens, i.e., the internal nucleocapsid (N) antigen or the surface spike protein (S1 or 121 122 S1/S2) <sup>27</sup>. Not all SARS-CoV2 antibodies exhibit neutralizing properties. However, it has been shown that 123 antibodies against nucleocapsid antigen and the receptor-binding domain (RBD) of the spike protein have 124 a high correlation to virus neutralization titer 7.

125 The predictive values of negative and positive results depend on the pretest probability of the 126 presence of COVID-19 disease. In low-prevalence settings (<5% seropositivity), positive predictive values 127 are critically dependent on specificity <sup>35</sup>. Since the specificity of SARS-CoV2 antibody tests has been the 128 subject of debate, false positive results can occur in low-prevalence settings <sup>36</sup>. False positive assay 129 results are particularly problematic in low prevalence settings, as these could lead concerned individuals 130 into a false sense of security and increase their risk of contracting COVID-19 disease through unsafe 131 behavior <sup>13</sup>.

132 We aimed to investigate the diagnostic specificity and sensitivity of newly released 133 chemiluminescence immunoassays (CLIAs). We investigated these assay formats in a cohort of confirmed

134 COVID-19 patients to assess diagnostic sensitivity. Subsequently, we assessed the diagnostic specificity 135 of these tests in a cohort of healthcare workers and a cohort of healthy blood donors. Finally, we assessed 136 the analytical specificity of the different assays in samples collected prior to the COVID-19 pandemic, 137 which may potentially contain cross-reacting antibodies. In a model, we finally related the identified 138 diagnostic characteristics to negative and positive predictive values depending on the pretest probability 139 of having had COVID-19 in the personal history.

140

### 141 Methods

### 142 Study setting and study population

143 This is a study on diagnostic tests used for detection of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies in individuals originating 144 from Switzerland and Liechtenstein. Anonymized samples originating from four different types of patients 145 were investigated with three CLIAs. The first group of patients was retrospectively assembled from Liechtenstein and Swiss patients having their laboratory evaluations sent to labormedizinisches zentrum 146 147 Dr. Risch in Vaduz (Liechtenstein) and Buchs (Switzerland) and consisted of COVID-19 patients (mainly outpatients) whose serum was drawn after COVID-19 disease was confirmed by RT-PCR between March 148 149 2<sup>nd</sup> and April 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2020 (n=145). This group was used for determination of sensitivity. The method of RT-150 PCR measurement has been conducted as reported elsewhere <sup>37</sup>. The patients from Liechtenstein were prospectively and consecutively enrolled within a national COVID-19 cohort, whereas the Swiss patients 151 152 consisted from a retrospectively assembled convenience sample, both detailed in references <sup>37,38</sup>, The 153 second group of individuals was prospectively assembled and consisted of consecutive healthy blood 154 donors from the Blutspendedienst Graubünden without clinical suspicion of COVID-19 providing blood for 155 testing SARS-CoV2 antibodies from April 15<sup>th</sup> to May 4<sup>th</sup>, 2020 (n=191). In addition to fulfilling the normal 156 criteria of blood donation, these blood donors specifically responded they had had no had flu-like 157 symptoms or contact with a known COVID-19 patient during the past 14 days. The third cohort was 158 prospectively assembled within a study setting from the Kantonsspital St. Gallen and consisted of 159 healthcare workers providing a blood sample for detecting SARS-CoV2 antibodies between March 19th 160 and April 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2020 (n=1002) as described elsewhere <sup>39</sup>. Hospital admissions in this region peaked in the second week of April 2020. The blood donors and the healthcare workers were used to determine 161 162 specificity. Since these 2 groups did not have RT-PCR testing available, samples with at least two of the 163 three chemiluminescence assays positive were excluded from this analysis, assuming that these

6

164 individuals had occult SARS-CoV-2 infection. Such an orthogonal testing approach for SARS-CoV-2 165 antibodies has been reported to have a very high positive predictive value for COVID-19 and therefore is 166 suited to reliably exclude individuals with recent COVID-19 infection <sup>40-42</sup>. Characteristics of the excluded 167 10 seropositive individuals among the healthcare workers are detailed elsewhere (i.e. 6 individuals had 168 all three assays positive, 3 had CMIA and ECLIA positive, one had CMIA and LIA positive) <sup>39</sup>, whereas 4 169 individuals were excluded among the blood donors (one individual with positive SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR 170 result 24 days before sampling, three asymptomatic individuals). In the excluded blood donors, all three 171 chemiluminescence assays were positive. The fourth group of samples consisted of historical samples 172 sent to the labormedizinisches zentrum Dr. Risch in Buchs (Switzerland) that were known to have an 173 active or reactivated specific viral disease (Epstein-Barr virus, EBV, n=9; cytomegalovirus, CMV, m=7; 174 other common-cold coronaviruses: HKU1, NL63, OC43, 229E, n=12) to explore any cross-reactivity 175 causing false positive results in SARS-CoV2 serology. Endemic coronavirus disease was diagnosed 176 during 2019 in 10 cases, in January 2020 in 1 case, and in mid-February 2020 1 case, 8 days before the 177 first case of COVID-19 was reported in Switzerland. The last serum sample of patients with endemic 178 coronavirus disease was collected on March 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2020, which was 7 days after the first case in Switzerland 179 was identified. Samples from patients with active EBV (VCA IgM positive, EBNA IgG negative) as well as 180 active or reactivated CMV infection (IgG positive, IgM positive) were all drawn in 2019, i.e., before COVID-181 19 was first diagnosed in Switzerland and Liechtenstein. The study protocol was verified by the cantonal 182 ethics boards of Zurich (BASEC Req-20-00587) and Eastern Switzerland (EKOS; BASEC Nr. Req's 2020-183 00502 and 2020-00586). Whereas the cohort with healthcare workers provided written informed consent, 184 informed consent for performing laboratory analysis on anonymized samples in the other three groups 185 was waived. The study was taking into account the STARD guidelines <sup>43</sup>.

186

#### 187 Data collection and measurements

188 For each serum sample, the age and sex of the individual, the type of clinical setting, and the number of 189 days after first positive RT-PCR it was drawn (if applicable) were available. The sera employed for testing 190 were either fresh or stored at -25°C for less than 18 months. The antibodies were tested on the following 191 diagnostic platforms: COBAS 6000 (Roche Diagnostics, Rotkreuz, Switzerland), Abbott Architect i2000 192 (Abbott Diagnostics Baar, Switzerland), and Liaison XL (Diasorin, Luzern, Switzerland). The Roche 193 Diagnostics assay (Elecsys<sup>®</sup> Anti-SARS-CoV-2; ECLIA) employs a recombinantly engineered

194 nucleocapsid antigen for detection of total immunoglobulin. The molecular target from the Abbott 195 Diagnostics assay (SARS-CoV-2 IgG; CMIA) is also the nucleocapsid antigen, and it measures specific 196 IgG levels. The Diasorin assay (LIAISON® SARS-CoV-2 S1/S2 IgG; LIA) measures specific IgG directed 197 against S1/S2 antigens. To further elucidate the effects of any cross-reacting antibodies in the 3 198 chemiluminescence assays in the samples with EBV, CMV, or following endemic coronavirus, we also 199 employed the Euroimmun SARS-CoV-2 ELISA (Euroimmun, Luzern, Switzerland) to measure specific IgG 200 and IgA on a DSX instrument (Dynex Technologies, Denkendorf, Germany). The coefficients of variation 201 (CV's) of the employed methods in our hands were 2.7% for ECLIA, 3.6% for CMIA, 5.4% for LIA, 4.6% 202 for IgG ELISA, and 3.6% for IgA ELISA.

203

### 204 Statistical methods

205 Specificity was determined in the samples originating from blood donors and healthcare workers. The 206 sensitivity of the different assays was assessed in the group of patients with RT-PCR confirmed COVID-207 19 disease. The following cut-offs provided by the manufacturers were employed: a COI (COI= cutoff 208 index) >0.9 for ECLIA, a S/C value (S/C=extinction of the patient sample divided by the extinction of the 209 calibrator) >12 for LIA, a S/C value >1.4 for CMIA, and a S/C value of >1.1 in the ELISA. We also applied 210 alternative cut-offs (half and double of the manufacturers' cut-offs), in order to better understand the 211 relationship between signal strength and associated diagnostic characteristics. Positive and negative 212 likelihood ratios (LR) were calculated for the different cut-off levels 44. Regarding interpretation of LR, it is 213 generally acknowledged that a +LR >10 as well as a -LR <0.1 generate large and often conclusive 214 changes from the pretest to the posttest probability. A +LR between 5 and 10 as well as a -LR between 215 0.1 and 0.2 generate moderate shifts from the pretest to the posttest probability, whereas a +LR between 216 2 to 5 and a -LR from 0.2 to 0.5 generate small but sometimes important changes from the pretest to the posttest probability <sup>44</sup>. Receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curves with the area under the curves 217 218 (AUCs) calculated as an indicator of diagnostic accuracy. The AUCs for the different parameters were 219 compared by the method of Hanley and McNeil. Positive and negative predictive values for each of the 220 employed assays were then plotted as a function of pretest probability, as described earlier <sup>45</sup>. Continuous 221 variables are given as medians and interquartile ranges [IQRs], whereas proportions are given as 222 percentages together with 95% confidence intervals (CIs). Agreement between the two methods was 223 assessed by Cohen's kappa. The associations between variables were calculated with Spearman rank

8

correlation. P-values <0.05 were considered statistically significant. Medcalc version 18.11.3 (Mariakerke,</li>
 Belgium) and Microsoft Excel 2016 MSO (16.0.8431.2046) (Microsoft Inc, Seattle, USA) were used for
 statistical and graphical computations.

227

228 Results

### 229 Baseline characteristics

230 The group of RT-PCR confirmed COVID-19 patients consisted of 145 individuals with a median age of 46 231 years (IQR [30,58] years), and 79 of the patients, i.e., 48% (95% CI [40,56]), were female. The sera were 232 taken after a median of 47 IQR [40,54; minimum 21, maximum 66] days after first presentation with 233 suspected COVID-19. The blood donors had a median age of 44 years IQR [28,53], and 90 of the 191 234 donors, i.e., 47% (95% CI [40,54]) were female. In the cohort of healthcare workers, the median age was 235 38 years (IQR [30,49]), and 753 (75.1%, 95% CI [72.4,77.7]) were female. The cohort with prior EBV, 236 CMV or endemic coronavirus had a median age of 31 years (IQR [16,60]), and 17/30 (57%, 95% CI 237 [39,73]) were women. Serum samples of patients with common cold caused by endemic coronavirus had 238 their samples taken a median of 94 (IQR [30,235]) days after diagnosis. As shown in Figure 1 a-c, antibody 239 titers were different between COVID-19 patients and individuals without COVID-19. The correlation 240 between the 3 different assays was highly significant (p<0.0001). The agreement of the methods when 241 we used the manufacturers' cut-offs showed a kappa value of 0.92 between CMIA and LIA, 0.96 between CMIA and ECLIA, and 0.94 between LIA and ECLIA. In the COVID-19 patients, there was a significant 242 243 inverse association between days after RT-PCR and S/C in CMIA (r=-0.25, p=0.003), but not in LIA or 244 ECLIA.

245

### 246 Diagnostic specificity and sensitivity at the manufacturers' cut-offs

When looking at specificities of the different assays at the cut-offs provided by the manufacturers within the group of blood donors and healthcare workers without COVID-19, the following characteristics were observed: 99.5% specificity (95% CI [98.9,99.8], i.e., 1187/1193 individuals; 3 false positives from blood donors, 3 false positives from healthcare workers) for the CMIA, 99.7% specificity (95% CI [99.3,99,9], i.e., 1190/1193 individuals; 1 false positive from blood donors, 2 false positives from healthcare workers) for the LIA, and 99,91% specificity (95% CI [99.5,99.98], i.e. 1192/1193 individuals; 1 false positive from healthcare workers) for the ECLIA. There was no overlap between the participants with false positive

9

results across the three assays. The respective sensitivities were 93% (95% CI [88,96], i.e., 135/145) for the CMIA, 90% (95% CI [84,94], i.e., 130/145) for the LIA, and 96% (95% CI [91,98], i.e., 139/145) for the ECLIA. When performing ROC analysis on all COVID-19 cases and healthy controls, the AUCs of the different assays in detecting COVID-19 disease were 0.984 (95% CI [0.976,0.99]) for CMIA and 0.982 (95% CI [0.974,0.989]) for both the LIA and the ECLIA (curves not shown). There were no significant differences between the AUCs of the three assays.

260

### 261 Multilevel likelihood ratios

We then calculated multilevel likelihood ratios at the manufacturers' cut-off levels as well as at half and double the manufacturers' cut-off levels, i.e., a S/C of 0.7, 1.4 and 2.8 for the CMIA, respectively, a S/C of 6, 12, and 24 for the LIA, and a COI of 0.5, 1, and 2 for the ECLIA. Table 1 illustrates the different positive (+LR) and negative likelihood ratios (-LR). Regarding diagnostic value of the LR, the investigated serological tests can be considered to offer meaningful diagnostic characteristics. Of note, clinical characteristics are already meaningful at lower cut-off levels than recommended by the manufacturer.

268

### 269 Operational test characteristics

270 The positive predictive values (PPVs) for three different cut-offs (manufacturers' cut-offs and half as well 271 as double the manufacturers' cut-off values are shown in Figures 2a (CMIA), 2b (LIA), and 2c (ECLIA)). It 272 can be seen that ECLIA, especially in low pretest probability settings, due to the high specificity has 273 somewhat higher PPVs than the other assays: at the manufacturer's cut-off, the PPV was 97% at a pretest 274 probability of 3 percent, whereas at half of the manufacturer's cut-off, the PPV at a pretest probability of 275 3% was 95%. For the LIA, the PPV at a pretest probability of 5% was 95%, whereas the same PPV at half 276 of the manufacturer's cut-off was achieved with a pretest probability of 18%. At double the manufacturer's 277 cut-off, a PPV of 95% in the LIA was achieved with a pretest probability of 2%. Finally, with the CMIA, at 278 the manufacturer's cut-off, a PPV of 95% was achieved at a pretest probability of 5%, whereas at half of 279 the manufacturer's cut-off, the same PPV was seen at a pretest probability of 23%. At double the 280 manufacturer's cut-off, the CMIA had a PPV of 95% at a pretest probability of 4%.

Regarding negative predictive values (NPVs), the ECLIA due to the highest sensitivity had a NPV of 99% up to a pretest probability of 26% at the manufacturer's cut-off. At half of the manufacturer's cutoff, a NPV of 99% was seen up to a pretest probability of 30%. With the LIA, the NPV at the manufacturers'

284 cut-off was at 99% up to a pretest probability of 11%, whereas at half of the manufacturer's cut-off, the 285 NPV was at 99% up to a pretest probability of 30%. In the CMIA, the NPV at the manufacturer's cut-off 286 was 99% up to a pretest probability of 21%, whereas at half of the cut-off, the NPV was 99% up to a 287 pretest probability of 26%.

288

#### 289 Analytical specificity

290 None of the assays showed positive antibodies in sera from patients with active EBV or CMV disease. Of 291 the sera taken after endemic coronavirus infection, 4 were infected with RC229E, 3 were infected with 292 RCNL63, 2 were infected with RCHKU1, 2 had an infection with RCOC43, and one patient had both 293 RC229E and RCNL63. None of the patients showed antibody positivity in the ECLIA. In three patients 294 following infection with different coronaviruses, the CMIA showed an S/C result of 0.4 (infection with RCHKU1; SARS-CoV-2 ELISA IgG 0.1; IgA 0.3), 0.5 (infection with RCOC43; SARS-CoV-2 ELISA IgG 295 296 0.1; IgA 0.1), and 0.1 (infection with RC229E; SARS-CoV-2 ELISA IgG 0.7; IgA 4.1), whereas the other 297 samples did not reveal a detectable signal. The sample of a patient with RCOC43 infection with a 298 detectable CMIA signal also had a detectable LIA signal of 6.1, whereas all other samples had 299 unmeasurable signals. All together, even if SARS-CoV-2 antibody titers following endemic coronavirus 300 infections were below the manufacturers' cut-offs for positivity, 3 samples exhibited detectable antibodies 301 in the CMIA assay, one of which was also in the LIA assay.

302

303

#### 304 Discussion

305 The present study investigated the analytical (analytical specificity), diagnostic (diagnostic sensitivity and 306 specificity), and operational characteristics (likelihood ratios, predictive values) of three highly automated 307 assays for the detection of antibodies against SARS-CoV-2. These characteristics were investigated after 308 a median of 47 days after PCR-positivity. Although the three test formats showed comparable diagnostic 309 accuracy, test performance varied regarding positive predictive values in the low-prevalence setting. 310 Finally, the investigated tests did not show interference with two commonly encountered infections, i.e., 311 EBV and CMV. There was, however, cross-reactivity in some patients with proven previous infection by 312 endemic coronaviruses for two of the three analyzed tests.

313 The timing of antibody development in COVID-19 disease is crucial. Long and colleagues 314 demonstrated that IgG or IgM can be detectable in approximately 60% of patients at days 5-7 after 315 symptom onset, in 95% of patients after 12-14 days and in 100% of patients after 17 to 19 days 6. Tang 316 and colleagues demonstrated a seroconversion rate of 93.8% for CMIA and 89.4% for ECLIA 14 days 317 after symptom onset and later <sup>46,47</sup>. A systematic review performed by the Cochrane collaboration 318 regarding the usefulness of antibody tests to diagnose current or past infection with SARS-CoV-2 stated 319 that there are too few studies available to estimate test sensitivity beyond 35 days after symptom onset 320 <sup>30</sup>. The present study, with a median of 47 days after presentation for symptomatic COVID-19 disease, 321 therefore fills an important gap.

322 Laboratory results are interpreted by combining pretest probabilities with diagnostic 323 characteristics to obtain negative and positive predictive values according to Bayes' theorem <sup>48</sup>. To the 324 best of our knowledge, there is no clinical score available to predict the pretest probability of COVID-19 325 based only on clinical symptoms and history without any laboratory or imaging results <sup>49</sup>. Such a score 326 based on clinical history taking would improve the interpretation of COVID-19 serology results, not least 327 in a retrospective setting, where accurate laboratory results are not available because no blood has been 328 drawn. However, there are several other proxies to assess pretest probabilities. In the Swiss and 329 Liechtenstein setting, several situations can be described, in which the risk for patients to contract COVID-330 19 can be quantified <sup>37</sup>: 32% for household contacts, 13% of close working contacts, and 12-25% of 331 patients with fever >38°C and respiratory symptoms. Knowing the temporal and regional seroprevalence 332 of the region also allows for an approximation of pretest probability even without knowing the clinical 333 symptoms of a specific patient <sup>50</sup>.

334 The predictive values depend not only on the pretest probability but also on the sensitivity and 335 specificity of a test at a given cut-off. Negative results using the manufacturers' cut-offs had an NPV of 336 99% up to a pretest probability of 11% to 26%. At half of the manufacturer's cut-off, past COVID-19 could 337 be ruled out with a probability of 99% up to a pretest probability of 26% (CMIA) to 30% (LIA, ECLIA). 338 These pretest probabilities are in the range of those observed in symptomatic individuals. Thus, serology 339 done in patients with clinical symptoms three or more weeks before drawing blood together with 340 manufacturers' and modified manufacturers' cut-offs can be considered safe to exclude COVID-19 341 disease. Nevertheless, serological non-responders can occur with a frequency of approximately 3% and 342 may go overlooked. False negative results, if they occur at a low frequency, can be considered of minor

All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

importance because they are not expected to change an individual's behavior in response to its potentialdamage.

345 Regarding PPV, which is the probability that a positive result indicates a past infection with SARS-346 CoV-2, the ECLIA with the manufacturer cut-off provided the best operational characteristics at low pretest 347 probabilities  $\leq$  5%. In this assay, the PPV at 3% pretest probability was 97%, which raises the question 348 whether positive ECLIA results should be confirmed by an orthogonal testing approach <sup>40,51,52</sup>. When 349 taking the lower limit of the 95% CI of the specificity, i.e. 99.5%, the PPV at 1% pretest probability is 66%, 350 and 91% at 5% pretest probability. We therefore recommend continuing with the confirmation of positive 351 ECLIA results with a second assay <sup>40</sup>. Our data also show that at the manufacturer cut-offs, the CMIA and 352 LIA need confirmatory testing in low pretest probability (<5%) settings. Otherwise, the risk of false positive 353 results is larger than 5%. The problem of false positive results is that they can change the behavior of 354 individuals in that they will not adhere to hygienic and distancing measures after the (false) positive result 355 has been disclosed. This puts individuals at increased risk for contracting COVID-19, with its potentially 356 devastating consequences <sup>13</sup>. The medical laboratory thus has a great responsibility to deliver meaningful 357 results to the patients and their physicians.

358 Common recommendations on likelihood ratios state that +LR>10 and -LR<0.1 generate 359 meaningful changes from pretest to posttest probability <sup>44</sup>. Our findings suggest that all three assays 360 provide meaningful information, even at half of the manufacturers' cut-off values. The figures of pretest 361 probabilities against NPV illustrate that taking half of the manufacturer cut-off as a decision limit will still 362 safely rule out COVID-19: a cut-off as low as half of the manufacturer cut-off will correctly detect 98.9% 363 (95% CI [98.1,99.4]) (13/1193) of the COVID-19-negative cases in the CMIA. The respective proportions 364 are similar for the LIA (98.8%, 95% CI [98,99.3], (14/1193) and ECLIA (99.7%, 95% CI [99.3,99.9], 3/1193). For ruling out COVID-19, modified decision limits thus seem appropriate. 365

Looking at the relationship between pretest probability and PPV at a cut-off half of the manufacturer's cut-off illustrates that such a cut-off does not reliably diagnose past COVID-19 in low test probability settings. However, using an orthogonal testing approach recommended by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration <sup>41</sup>, i.e., an ECLIA result of 0.6 together with an LIA result of 6.1, would lead to a PPV of 99.1% at a pretest probability of 1%. A similar result would be achieved with a CMIA result of 0.7 together with an LIA result of 6.1, which at a pretest probability of 2% results in a PPV of 99%. This example illustrates that the introduction of gray zones should be considered not only for ELISA but also

All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

for chemiluminescence immunoassays when offering SARS-CoV-2 testing to clinicians and public health
 professionals <sup>53</sup>.

375 The fact that we found some cross-reactivity in patients with prior endemic coronaviruses raises 376 the question whether this finding represents analytical cross-reactivity or reflects cross-reactive immunity 377 conferred by recent endemic coronavirus disease. We did not conduct neutralization assays to clarify this 378 issue. However, Ng and colleagues reported that patient sera from human coronaviruses variably reacted 379 with SARS-CoV-2 S-antigen and nucleocapsid antigen, but not with the S1 subunit <sup>29</sup>. These patient sera 380 exhibited neutralizing activity against SARS-CoV-2 S pseudotypes according to the levels of SARS-CoV-381 2 S-binding IgG and with efficiencies comparable to those of COVID-19 patient sera <sup>29</sup>. In our study, we 382 had one case with a LIA signal (targeting S1-S2 antigen) and a CMIA signal (targeting nucleocapsid 383 antigen) without a signal in the IgG ELISA (which is targeted against S1). This patient had his serum 384 taken in September 2019 after infection with RCOC43 was diagnosed in January 2019. We are convinced 385 that identifying patients with endemic coronaviruses with potential neutralizing cross-reactivity will be of 386 increasing importance in the future. Whereas CMIA and LIA could play a role in identifying such 387 individuals, ECLIA is not expected to help further in this aspect, as none of the patients with endemic 388 coronavirus had a measurable antibody response. The measurements in the healthcare workers as well 389 as in the blood donors suggest that such constellations do not occur often: 1147/1193 (i.e., 96.1 (95% CI 390 [94.9,97.1])) have unmeasurable antibody titers in the LIA, whereas this frequency amounts to 921/1193 391 (i.e., 77.2% (95% CI [74.7,79.5])) in the CMIA.

392 Our study has strengths and limitations. A strength is that specificity has been assessed in a large 393 group of 1193 individuals without evidence of COVID-19. Such an approach offers the possibility to 394 describe the specificity with relatively narrow confidence intervals. A further strength is that we investigate 395 several potential cut-offs for clinical decision making. A limitation of the study is that samples employed 396 for evaluation of specificity were selected from contemporary and not pre-pandemic participants. Two 397 positive serology results in an orthogonal testing approach cannot provide 100% certainty that any 398 remaining false positives are truly false positive. Nevertheless, we demonstrate that combination of two 399 positive results with chemiluminescence assays has a very high positive predictive value even at low 400 pretest probabilities, comparable to that known from molecular methods <sup>42</sup>. Further, inclusion of the index 401 serology tests as part of the reference standard definition of absence of disease carries a risk of bias in 402 results. At low pretest probabilities, such a bias might have a considerable impact on positive predictive

403 values. There are several factors mitigating such a misinterpretation: a.) utilizing an orthogonal testing 404 approach in initially positive results, b.) the fact that even in the first wave of COVID-19, COVID-19 405 prevalence in some regions of Europe was already more than 10%, which cannot be considered low <sup>50</sup>. 406 The specificities identified in our study from contemporary samples are comparable to those obtained in 407 a similar study on pre-pandemic samples <sup>54</sup>. The study is finally limited by the fact that we did not have a 408 full clinical description of the COVID-19 patients included in this study, and patients hospitalized due to 409 COVID-19 represented a minority of the COVID-19 patients. However, since the majority of patients 410 subjected to serology will originate from the outpatient setting, we believe that this fact actually strengthens 411 our findings. In sum, we think that the limitations do not invalidate our findings.

412 In conclusion, we evaluated the serology in patients at a median of 47 days following the first 413 presentation of suspected COVID-19 infection and selected individuals without COVID-19 during the 414 pandemic. We found that the diagnostic accuracy of the three investigated assays was comparable. Assay 415 cut-offs have not been designed for orthogonal testing. Introducing gray zones at half of the 416 manufacturers' cut-offs is suggested. These differentiated cut-offs would allow for safer ruling out or ruling 417 in of past COVID-19 infections. Such an approach would allow us to more appropriately select samples 418 for further testing in an independent assay in an orthogonal testing algorithm. We propose that our findings 419 be replicated in other populations.

420

#### 421 Acknowledgments

422 The help of Toni Schönenberger and Walter Frehner in identifying samples is acknowledged.

423

#### 424 **Data Availability**

425 The data used to support the findings in this study will be available from the corresponding author upon 426 request.

15

## 427 Funding

- The research project was funded by a grant from the government of the Principality of Liechtenstein and
  the Swiss National Science Foundation (Project ID 196544).
- 430

### 431 Conflicts of Interest

432 The authors declare no conflict of interest. The funders had no role in the design of the study; in the

433 collection, analysis, or interpretation of data; in the writing of the manuscript, or in the decision to publish434 the results.

435

# 436 CRediT author statement

437 Myriam Weber: Conceptualization, Methodology, Formal analysis, Writing - Original Draft; Martin

- 438 Risch: Conceptualization, Methodology, Formal analysis, Writing Original Draft; Sarah Thiel: Data
- 439 curation, Validation, Resources; Kirsten Grossmann: Resources; Susanne Nigg: Resources; Kirsten
- 440 **Nadja Wohlwend**: Investigation, Validation, Resources; **Thomas Lung:** Validation, Resources;
- 441 **Dorothea Hillmann:** Investigation, Validation, Project administration, Resources; **Michael Ritzler:**
- 442 Resources; Francesca Ferrara: Resources; Susanna Bigler: Validation, Resources; Konrad Egli:
- 443 Validation, Resources; Thomas Bodmer: Validation, Resources; Mauro Imperiali: Validation,
- 444 Resources; **Yacir Salimi:** Validation, Resources; **Felix Fleisch:** Resources; **Alexia Cusini:** Resources;
- 445 Sonja Heer: Resources; Harald Renz: Conceptualization; Matthias Paprotny: Supervision, Resources,
- 446 Writing Original Draft; **Philipp Kohler:** Validation, Writing Original Draft; **Pietro Vernazza:**
- 447 Conceptualization, Funding acquisition, Writing Original Draft; Lorenz Risch: Conceptualization,
- 448 Methodology, Funding acquisition, Supervision, Resources, Writing Original Draft; Christian R.
- 449 Kahlert: Conceptualization, Methodology Supervision, Resources, Writing Original Draft; All authors:
- 450 Writing- Reviewing and Editing
- 451
- 452
- 453
- 454
- 455
- 456

All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

### 457 References

458 1. Helmy YA, Fawzy M, Elaswad A, Sobieh A, Kenney SP, Shehata AA. The COVID-19 Pandemic: 459 A Comprehensive Review of Taxonomy, Genetics, Epidemiology, Diagnosis, Treatment, and Control. J 460 Clin Med 2020;9. Patel R, Babady E, Theel ES, et al. Report from the American Society for Microbiology COVID-461 2. 462 19 International Summit, 23 March 2020: Value of Diagnostic Testing for SARS-CoV-2/COVID-19. mBio 463 2020:11. 464 Drame M, Tabue Teguo M, Proye E, et al. Should RT-PCR be considered a gold standard in the 3. 465 diagnosis of COVID-19? J Med Virol 2020. 466 Stowell S, Guarner J. Role of serology in the COVID-19 pandemic. Clin Infect Dis 2020. 4. 467 5. Zhao R, Li M, Song H, et al. Early detection of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies in COVID-19 patients as 468 a serologic marker of infection. Clin Infect Dis 2020. 469 Long QX, Liu BZ, Deng HJ, et al. Antibody responses to SARS-CoV-2 in patients with COVID-6. 470 19. Nat Med 2020;26:845-8. 471 7. To KK, Tsang OT, Leung WS, et al. Temporal profiles of viral load in posterior oropharyngeal 472 saliva samples and serum antibody responses during infection by SARS-CoV-2: an observational cohort 473 study. Lancet Infect Dis 2020;20:565-74. 474 8. Theel ES, Slev P, Wheeler S, Couturier MR, Wong SJ, Kadkhoda K. The Role of Antibody 475 Testing for SARS-CoV-2: Is There One? J Clin Microbiol 2020;58. 476 Guan WJ, Ni ZY, Hu Y, et al. Clinical Characteristics of Coronavirus Disease 2019 in China. N 9. 477 Engl J Med 2020;382:1708-20. 478 10. Wang Y, Kang H, Liu X, Tong Z. Asymptomatic cases with SARS-CoV-2 infection. J Med Virol 479 2020. 480 11. Yousefifard M, Zali A, Mohamed Ali K, et al. Antiviral therapy in management of COVID-19: a 481 systematic review on current evidence. Arch Acad Emerg Med 2020;8:e45. Stedman M, Davies M, Lunt M, Verma A, Anderson SG, Heald AH. A phased approach to 482 12. 483 unlocking during the COVID-19 pandemic-Lessons from trend analysis. Int J Clin Pract 2020:e13528. 484 13. Weinstein MC, Freedberg KA, Hyle EP, Paltiel AD. Waiting for Certainty on Covid-19 Antibody 485 Tests - At What Cost? N Engl J Med 2020. 486 14. Rubin EJ, Baden LR, Morrissey S. Audio Interview: The Challenges of Safe Reopening. N Engl 487 J Med 2020;382:e113. 488 lacobucci G. Covid-19: Lack of capacity led to halting of community testing in March, admits 15. 489 deputy chief medical officer. BMJ 2020;369:m1845. 490 Winter AK, Hegde ST. The important role of serology for COVID-19 control. Lancet Infect Dis 16. 491 2020;20:758-9. 492 Bhagavathula AS, Aldhaleei WA, Rahmani J, Mahabadi MA, Bandari DK. Knowledge and 17. 493 Perceptions of COVID-19 Among Health Care Workers: Cross-Sectional Study. JMIR Public Health 494 Surveill 2020;6:e19160. 495 Pung R, Chiew CJ, Young BE, et al. Investigation of three clusters of COVID-19 in Singapore: 18. 496 implications for surveillance and response measures. Lancet 2020;395:1039-46. 497 Yong SEF, Anderson DE, Wei WE, et al. Connecting clusters of COVID-19: an epidemiological 19. 498 and serological investigation. Lancet Infect Dis 2020;20:809-15. 499 Pan Y, Li X, Yang G, et al. Serological immunochromatographic approach in diagnosis with 20. 500 SARS-CoV-2 infected COVID-19 patients. J Infect 2020;81:e28-e32. 501 21. Guo L, Ren L, Yang S, et al. Profiling Early Humoral Response to Diagnose Novel Coronavirus 502 Disease (COVID-19). Clin Infect Dis 2020;71:778-85. 503 Kim H, Hong H, Yoon SH. Diagnostic Performance of CT and Reverse Transcriptase-22. 504 Polymerase Chain Reaction for Coronavirus Disease 2019: A Meta-Analysis. Radiology 2020:201343. 505 23. Bullis SSM, Crothers JW, Wayne S, Hale AJ. A Cautionary Tale of False-Negative 506 Nasopharyngeal COVID-19 Testing. IDCases 2020:e00791. 507 Long C, Xu H, Shen Q, et al. Diagnosis of the Coronavirus disease (COVID-19): rRT-PCR or 24. 508 CT? Eur J Radiol 2020;126:108961. 509 Lippi G, Simundic AM, Plebani M. Potential preanalytical and analytical vulnerabilities in the 25. 510 laboratory diagnosis of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19). Clin Chem Lab Med 2020;58:1070-6. 511 26. Beeching NJ, Fletcher TE, Beadsworth MBJ. Covid-19: testing times. BMJ 2020;369:m1403. 512 27. Mallapaty S. Will antibody tests for the coronavirus really change everything? Nature 2020;580:571-2. 513 514 28. Meyer B, Drosten C, Muller MA. Serological assays for emerging coronaviruses: challenges and 515 pitfalls. Virus Res 2014;194:175-83.

All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

17 Ng KW, Faulkner N, Cornish GH, et al. Pre-existing and <em>de novo</em> humoral immunity 516 29. 517 to SARS-CoV-2 in humans. bioRxiv 2020:2020.05.14.095414. 518 30. Deeks JJ, Dinnes J, Takwoingi Y, et al. Antibody tests for identification of current and past 519 infection with SARS-CoV-2. Cochrane Database Syst Rev 2020;6:CD013652. 520 Okba NMA, Muller MA, Li W, et al. Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2-Specific 31. 521 Antibody Responses in Coronavirus Disease Patients. Emerg Infect Dis 2020;26:1478-88. 522 Vashist SK. In Vitro Diagnostic Assays for COVID-19: Recent Advances and Emerging Trends. 32. 523 Diagnostics (Basel) 2020;10. 524 Padoan A, Cosma C, Sciacovelli L, Faggian D, Plebani M. Analytical performances of a 33. 525 chemiluminescence immunoassay for SARS-CoV-2 IgM/IgG and antibody kinetics. Clin Chem Lab Med 526 2020:58:1081-8. 527 34. Bryan A, Pepper G, Wener MH, et al. Performance Characteristics of the Abbott Architect 528 SARS-CoV-2 IgG Assay and Seroprevalence in Boise, Idaho. J Clin Microbiol 2020;58. 529 Xiang F, Wang X, He X, et al. Antibody Detection and Dynamic Characteristics in Patients with 35. COVID-19. Clin Infect Dis 2020. 530 531 36. Diamandis P, Prassas I, Diamandis EP. Antibody tests for COVID-19: drawing attention to the 532 importance of analytical specificity. Clin Chem Lab Med 2020;58:1144-5. 533 37. Thiel S, Weber MC, Risch L, et al. Flattening the curve in 52 days: characterization of the 534 COVID-19 pandemic in the Principality of Liechtenstein Swiss Med Wkly 2020:In press. 535 38. Baron RC, Risch L, Weber M, et al. Frequency of serological non-responders and false-negative 536 RT-PCR results in SARS-CoV-2 testing: a population-based study. Clin Chem Lab Med 2020. 537 Kohler P, Kahlert CR, Sumer J, et al. Prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 Antibodies among Swiss 39. 538 Hospital Workers - Results of a Prospective Cohort Study. Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol 2020:1-15. 539 Centers for Disease Prevention and Control. Interim Guidelines for COVID-19 Antibody Testing., 40. 540 2020. (Accessed 19.6.2020, 2020, at https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-541 ncov/lab/resources/antibody-tests-guidelines.html.) 542 U.S. Food and Drug Administration. EUA authorized serology test performance. 2020. 41. 543 (Accessed 11.7.2020, 2020, at https://www.fda.gov/medical-devices/emergency-situations-medical-544 devices/eua-authorized-serology-test-performance.) 545 42. Risch M, Weber M, Thiel S, et al. Temporal course of SARS-CoV-2 antibody positivity in 546 patients with COVID-19 following the first clinical presentation. Biomed Res Int 2020:In press. 547 43. Bossuyt PM, Reitsma JB, Bruns DE, et al. STARD 2015: an updated list of essential items for 548 reporting diagnostic accuracy studies. BMJ 2015;351:h5527. 549 Jaeschke R, Guyatt GH, Sackett DL. Users' guides to the medical literature. III. How to use an 44. 550 article about a diagnostic test. B. What are the results and will they help me in caring for my patients? 551 The Evidence-Based Medicine Working Group. JAMA 1994;271:703-7. 552 Risch L, Monn A, Luthy R, Honegger H, Huber AR. The predictive characteristics of D-dimer 45. 553 testing in outpatients with suspected venous thromboembolism: a Bayesian approach. Clin Chim Acta 554 2004;345:79-87. 555 46. Tang MS, Hock KG, Logsdon NM, et al. Clinical Performance of Two SARS-CoV-2 Serologic 556 Assays. Clin Chem 2020;66:1055-62. 557 Tang MS, Hock KG, Logsdon NM, et al. Clinical Performance of the Roche SARS-CoV-2 47. 558 Serologic Assay. Clin Chem 2020;66:1107-9. 559 48. Schulzer M. Diagnostic tests: a statistical review. Muscle Nerve 1994;17:815-9. 560 Huang D, Wang T, Chen Z, Yang H, Yao R, Liang Z. A novel risk score to predict diagnosis with 49. 561 coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) in suspected patients: A retrospective, multicenter, and 562 observational study. J Med Virol 2020. 563 Stringhini S, Wisniak A, Piumatti G, et al. Seroprevalence of anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgG antibodies in 50. 564 Geneva, Switzerland (SEROCoV-POP): a population-based study. Lancet 2020;396:313-9. 565 51. Allam M, Cai S, Ganesh S, et al. COVID-19 Diagnostics, Tools, and Prevention. Diagnostics 566 (Basel) 2020;10. 567 Kubina R, Dziedzic A. Molecular and Serological Tests for COVID-19 a Comparative Review of 52. 568 SARS-CoV-2 Coronavirus Laboratory and Point-of-Care Diagnostics. Diagnostics (Basel) 2020;10. 569 Meyer B, Torriani G, Yerly S, et al. Validation of a commercially available SARS-CoV-2 53. serological immunoassay. Clin Microbiol Infect 2020:2020.05.02.20080879. 570 571 54. Perkmann T, Perkmann-Nagele N, Breyer MK, et al. Side by side comparison of three fully 572 automated SARS-CoV-2 antibody assays with a focus on specificity. Clin Chem 2020. 573 574

#### Tables

- Table 1. Multilevel likelihood ratios as well as sensitivity and specificity are given for the different tests at
- different cut-off levels (manufacturers' cut-offs, half and double the manufacturers' cut-offs) for ruling in
- or ruling out a COVID-19 diagnosis. +LR= positive likelihood ratio; -LR= negative likelihood ratio. CMIA=
- chemiluminescence microparticle immunoassay; LIA= luminescence immunoassay;
- ECLIA=electrochemiluminescence immunoassay; Sens= sensitivity; Spec= specificity, CI= confidence
- interval.

	+LR at	-LR at	+LR at	-LR at	+LR at	-LR at
	cut-off/2	cut-off/2	cut-off	cut-off	2x cut-off	2x cut-off
	(Spec, [95% Cl])	(Sens, [95% Cl])	(Spec, [95% CI])	(Sens, [95% CI])	(Spec, 95% CI)	(Sens, 95% Cl)
CMIA	60	0.043	374	0.056	485	0.18
	(98.4 [97.5,99.0])	(95.8 [91.0-98.4])	(99.8 [99.3,99.9])	(94.4 [89.2,97.5])	(99.8 [99.4, 100])	(81.7 [74.3,87.7])
LIA	82	0.035	351	0.12	1027	0.14
	(98.8 [98.0,99.4])	(96.5 [92.1,98.9])	(99.8 [99.3 - 99.9])	(88,2 [81.8,93.0])	(100 [99.7,100])	(86.1 [79.4 - 91.3])
ECLIA	575	0.035	958	0.042	>958	0.042
	(99.8 [99.4,100])	(96.5 [92.1,98.9])	(99.9 [99.5,100])	(95.8 [91.2,98.5])	(100 [99.7,100])	(95.8 [91.2,98.5])



## 597 Legends to Figures

- **Figure 1.** SARS-CoV-2 antibody titers of three different chemiluminescence assays in individuals with
- and without COVID-19: a) CMIA, b) LIA, c) ECLIA. COVID-19=0: individuals without evidence of COVID-

600 19; COVID-19=1: patients with RT-PCR confirmed COVID-19;

- 602 Figure 2. Positive predictive values (PPVs) of SARS-CoV-2 antibody titers at three different cut-offs
- 603 (manufacturers' cut-offs, half and double the manufacturers' cut-offs) over the whole range of possible
- 604 pretest probabilities. Three different chemiluminescence assays were assessed: a) CMIA, b) LIA, c)
- 605 ECLIA
- **Figure 3.** Negative predictive values (NPVs) of SARS-CoV-2 antibody titers at three different cut-offs

608 (manufacturers' cut-offs, half and double the manufacturers' cut-offs) over the whole range of possible

609 pretest probabilities. Three different chemiluminescence assays were assessed: a) CMIA, b) LIA, c)

- 610 ECLIA.

- 627 Figures
- 628 Figure 1
- 629 a)











633

c)







#### Figure 3 644

a)

# 645

