

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

Characteristics of three different chemiluminescence assays for testing for SARS-CoV-2 antibodies

Myriam C. Weber ^{1 *}, Martin Risch ^{2 *}, Sarah L. Thiel ¹, Kirsten Grossmann ^{3,4}, Susanne Nigg ⁵, Nadia Wohlwend ³, Thomas Lung ³, Dorothea Hillmann ³, Michael Ritzler ³, Francesca Ferrara ³, Susanna Bigler ⁶, Konrad Egli ⁶, Thomas Bodmer ⁶, Mauro Imperiali ⁷, Yacir Salimi ⁸, Felix Fleisch ⁹, Alexia Cusini ⁹, Sonja Heer ¹⁰, Harald Renz ¹¹, Matthias Paprotny ¹, Philipp Kohler ⁵, Pietro Vernazza ⁵, Lorenz Risch ^{3,4,12}, Christian R. Kahlert ^{5,13}

Short title: Diagnostic characteristics of COVID-19 serology

* contributed equally

- ¹ Landesspital Liechtenstein, Heiligkreuz, 9490 Vaduz, Liechtenstein
- ² Central laboratory, Kantonsspital Graubünden, Loësstrasse 170, 7000 Chur, Switzerland
- ³ Labormedizinisches zentrum Dr Risch, Wuhrstrasse 14, 9490 Vaduz, Liechtenstein
- ⁴ Private Universität im Fürstentum Liechtenstein, Dorfstrasse, 9495 Triesen, Liechtenstein
- ⁵ Department of Infectious Diseases and Hospital Epidemiology, Cantonal Hospital St Gallen, Rohrschacherstrasse 95 9007 St Gallen, Switzerland
- ⁶ Labormedizinisches zentrum Dr Risch, Waldeggstrasse 37, 3097 Liebefeld, Switzerland
- ⁷ Centro medicina di laboratorio Dr Risch, Via Arbostra 2, 6963 Pregassona, Switzerland
- ⁸ Clm Dr Risch arc lémanique SA, Chemin de l'Esparcette 10, 1023 Crissier, Switzerland
- ⁹ Division of Infectious Diseases, Kantonsspital Graubünden, Loësstrasse 170, 7000 Chur, Switzerland
- ¹⁰ Blutspendedienst Graubünden, Loësstrasse 170, 7000 Chur, Switzerland
- ¹¹ Institute of Laboratory Medicine and Pathobiochemistry, Molecular Diagnostics, Philipps University Marburg, University Hospital Giessen and Marburg, Baldingerstraße, 35043 Marburg, Germany
- ¹² Center of Laboratory Medicine, University Institute of Clinical Chemistry, University of Bern, Inselspital, 3010 Bern, Switzerland
- ¹³ Children's Hospital of Eastern Switzerland, Department of Infectious Diseases and Hospital Epidemiology, Claudiusstrasse 6, 9006 St. Gallen, Switzerland

Word count Abstract: 300
Keywords: 11
Word count Manuscript: 4907
References: 51
Tables: 1
Figures: 3

Correspondence to:

Prof. Dr.med. Lorenz Risch, MPH MHA
Labormedizinisches zentrum Dr. Risch
Wuhrstrasse 14
9490 Vaduz
Email lorenz.risch@risch.ch
Phone +41 58 523 30 00

Abstract

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

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

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, quarantine or isolation ¹. 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 ²⁻⁸. The clinical presentation of COVID-19 has been shown to be heterogeneous in severity as
86 well as in clinical signs and symptoms ⁹. A substantial proportion of patients have only minimal
87 symptomatology or are even asymptomatic ¹⁰. Currently, there is no vaccination available, and causal
88 therapies are very limited ¹¹. 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
90 reinstitute possibly “normal” social and economic circumstances ^{12,13}. To guide these actions to reverse
91 socioeconomic lockdown, knowledge on the prevalence of COVID-19 is needed ¹⁴. 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
94 symptoms ¹⁵.

95 Serologic testing allows us to estimate the proportion of individuals already infected with COVID-
96 19, either in the total population, in healthcare workplace settings or in general workplace settings ^{16,17}. It
97 facilitates contact tracing as well as surveillance and assists in the identification of individuals susceptible
98 to COVID-19 infection ^{2,18,19}. Furthermore, individuals having had contact with confirmed COVID-19
99 patients might be interested in determining whether they developed SARS-CoV-2 specific antibodies, if
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 ^{20,21}. 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

104 virus ²²⁻²⁵. 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 ²⁶. However, some of these tests have been criticized for poor sensitivity and
108 specificity ²⁷. 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) ²⁸. Some of these cross-reacting antibodies, however, have actually shown neutralizing activity
111 against SARS-CoV-2 ²⁹. 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 ^{6,12}. 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 ³⁰.

117 Whereas ELISA tests were available relatively early during the pandemic, the supply of these
118 tests has been relatively scarce ^{31,32}. Only recently have assays using chemiluminescence (CLIA) become
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
121 different specific antigens, i.e., the internal nucleocapsid (N) antigen or the surface spike protein (S1 or
122 S1/S2) ²⁷. 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 ³⁵. Since the specificity of SARS-CoV2 antibody tests has been the
128 subject of debate, false positive results can occur in low-prevalence settings ³⁶. 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 ¹³.

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
146 Liechtenstein and Swiss patients having their laboratory evaluations sent to labormedizinisches zentrum
147 Dr. Risch in Vaduz (Liechtenstein) and Buchs (Switzerland) and consisted of COVID-19 patients (mainly
148 outpatients) whose serum was drawn after COVID-19 disease was confirmed by RT-PCR between March
149 2nd and April 23rd, 2020 (n=145). This group was used for determination of sensitivity. The method of RT-
150 PCR measurement has been conducted as reported elsewhere ³⁷. The patients from Liechtenstein were
151 prospectively and consecutively enrolled within a national COVID-19 cohort, whereas the Swiss patients
152 consisted from a retrospectively assembled convenience sample, both detailed in references ^{37,38}. 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 15th to May 4th, 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 3rd, 2020 (n=1002) as described elsewhere ³⁹. Hospital admissions in this region peaked in the
161 second week of April 2020. The blood donors and the healthcare workers were used to determine
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

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 ⁴⁰⁻⁴². 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) ³⁹, 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 2nd, 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 ⁴³.

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® 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
217 posttest probability ⁴⁴. Receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curves with the area under the curves
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 ⁴⁵. 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

224 correlation. P-values <0.05 were considered statistically significant. Medcalc version 18.11.3 (Mariakerke,
225 Belgium) and Microsoft Excel 2016 MSO (16.0.8431.2046) (Microsoft Inc, Seattle, USA) were used for
226 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
242 CMIA and ECLIA, and 0.94 between LIA and ECLIA. In the COVID-19 patients, there was a significant
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**

247 When looking at specificities of the different assays at the cut-offs provided by the manufacturers within
248 the group of blood donors and healthcare workers without COVID-19, the following characteristics were
249 observed: 99.5% specificity (95% CI [98.9,99.8], i.e., 1187/1193 individuals; 3 false positives from blood
250 donors, 3 false positives from healthcare workers) for the CMIA, 99.7% specificity (95% CI [99.3,99.9],
251 i.e., 1190/1193 individuals; 1 false positive from blood donors, 2 false positives from healthcare workers)
252 for the LIA, and 99.91% specificity (95% CI [99.5,99.98], i.e. 1192/1193 individuals; 1 false positive from
253 healthcare workers) for the ECLIA. There was no overlap between the participants with false positive

254 results across the three assays. The respective sensitivities were 93% (95% CI [88,96], i.e., 135/145) for
255 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
256 ECLIA. When performing ROC analysis on all COVID-19 cases and healthy controls, the AUCs of the
257 different assays in detecting COVID-19 disease were 0.984 (95% CI [0.976,0.99]) for CMIA and 0.982
258 (95% CI [0.974,0.989]) for both the LIA and the ECLIA (curves not shown). There were no significant
259 differences between the AUCs of the three assays.

260

261 **Multilevel likelihood ratios**

262 We then calculated multilevel likelihood ratios at the manufacturers' cut-off levels as well as at half and
263 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
264 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
265 positive (+LR) and negative likelihood ratios (-LR). Regarding diagnostic value of the LR, the investigated
266 serological tests can be considered to offer meaningful diagnostic characteristics. Of note, clinical
267 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%.

281 Regarding negative predictive values (NPVs), the ECLIA due to the highest sensitivity had a NPV
282 of 99% up to a pretest probability of 26% at the manufacturer's cut-off. At half of the manufacturer's cut-
283 off, 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
295 RCHKU1; SARS-CoV-2 ELISA IgG 0.1; IgA 0.3), 0.5 (infection with RCOC43; SARS-CoV-2 ELISA IgG
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 ^{46,47}. 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 ³⁰. 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 ⁴⁸. 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 ⁴⁹. 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 ³⁷: 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 ⁵⁰.

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

343 importance because they are not expected to change an individual's behavior in response to its potential
344 damage.

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 ^{40,51,52}. 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 ⁴⁰. 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 ¹³. 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 ⁴⁴. 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],
365 3/1193). For ruling out COVID-19, modified decision limits thus seem appropriate.

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

373 for chemiluminescence immunoassays when offering SARS-CoV-2 testing to clinicians and public health
374 professionals⁵³.

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 subunit²⁹. 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 sera²⁹. 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 methods⁴². 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 ⁵⁰.
406 The specificities identified in our study from contemporary samples are comparable to those obtained in
407 a similar study on pre-pandemic samples ⁵⁴. 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.

427 Funding

428 The research project was funded by a grant from the government of the Principality of Liechtenstein and
429 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 publish
434 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

457 **References**

- 458 1. Helmy YA, Fawzy M, Elasad 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.
- 461 2. Patel R, Babady E, Theel ES, et al. Report from the American Society for Microbiology COVID-
462 19 International Summit, 23 March 2020: Value of Diagnostic Testing for SARS-CoV-2/COVID-19. *mBio*
463 2020;11.
- 464 3. Drame M, Tabue Teguo M, Proye E, et al. Should RT-PCR be considered a gold standard in the
465 diagnosis of COVID-19? *J Med Virol* 2020.
- 466 4. Stowell S, Guarner J. Role of serology in the COVID-19 pandemic. *Clin Infect Dis* 2020.
- 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 6. Long QX, Liu BZ, Deng HJ, et al. Antibody responses to SARS-CoV-2 in patients with COVID-
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 9. Guan WJ, Ni ZY, Hu Y, et al. Clinical Characteristics of Coronavirus Disease 2019 in China. *N*
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.
- 482 12. Stedman M, Davies M, Lunt M, Verma A, Anderson SG, Heald AH. A phased approach to
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 15. Iacobucci G. Covid-19: Lack of capacity led to halting of community testing in March, admits
489 deputy chief medical officer. *BMJ* 2020;369:m1845.
- 490 16. Winter AK, Hegde ST. The important role of serology for COVID-19 control. *Lancet Infect Dis*
491 2020;20:758-9.
- 492 17. Bhagavathula AS, Aldhaleei WA, Rahmani J, Mahabadi MA, Bandari DK. Knowledge and
493 Perceptions of COVID-19 Among Health Care Workers: Cross-Sectional Study. *JMIR Public Health*
494 *Surveill* 2020;6:e19160.
- 495 18. Pung R, Chiew CJ, Young BE, et al. Investigation of three clusters of COVID-19 in Singapore:
496 implications for surveillance and response measures. *Lancet* 2020;395:1039-46.
- 497 19. Yong SEF, Anderson DE, Wei WE, et al. Connecting clusters of COVID-19: an epidemiological
498 and serological investigation. *Lancet Infect Dis* 2020;20:809-15.
- 499 20. Pan Y, Li X, Yang G, et al. Serological immunochromatographic approach in diagnosis with
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 22. Kim H, Hong H, Yoon SH. Diagnostic Performance of CT and Reverse Transcriptase-
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 24. Long C, Xu H, Shen Q, et al. Diagnosis of the Coronavirus disease (COVID-19): rRT-PCR or
508 CT? *Eur J Radiol* 2020;126:108961.
- 509 25. Lippi G, Simundic AM, Plebani M. Potential preanalytical and analytical vulnerabilities in the
510 laboratory diagnosis of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19). *Clin Chem Lab Med* 2020;58:1070-6.
- 511 26. Beeching NJ, Fletcher TE, Beadsworth MJB. Covid-19: testing times. *BMJ* 2020;369:m1403.
- 512 27. Mallapaty S. Will antibody tests for the coronavirus really change everything? *Nature*
513 2020;580:571-2.
- 514 28. Meyer B, Drosten C, Muller MA. Serological assays for emerging coronaviruses: challenges and
515 pitfalls. *Virus Res* 2014;194:175-83.

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

575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596

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

597 **Legends to Figures**

598 **Figure 1.** SARS-CoV-2 antibody titers of three different chemiluminescence assays in individuals with
599 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;

601

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

606

607 **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.

611

612

613

614

615

616

617

618

619

620

621

622

623

624


625

626

627 **Figures**


628 **Figure 1**

629 **a)**




630

631 **b)**



632


633 **c)**



634


635 **Figure 2**

636 **a)**




637

638 **b)**



639

640 **c)**




641

642

643


644 **Figure 3**

645 **a)**




646

647 **b)**



648

649 **c)**



650