

Assessment of SARS-CoV-2 serological tests for the diagnosis of COVID-19 through the evaluation of three immunoassays: Two automated immunoassays (Euroimmun and Abbott) and one rapid lateral flow immunoassay (NG Biotech)

Thomas Nicol, Caroline Lefeuvre, Orianne Serri, Adeline Pivert, Françoise Joubaud, Vincent Dubée, Achille Kouatchet, Alexandra Ducancelle, Françoise Lunel-Fabiani, Hélène Le Guillou-Guillemette

▶ To cite this version:

Thomas Nicol, Caroline Lefeuvre, Orianne Serri, Adeline Pivert, Françoise Joubaud, et al.. Assessment of SARS-CoV-2 serological tests for the diagnosis of COVID-19 through the evaluation of three immunoassays: Two automated immunoassays (Euroimmun and Abbott) and one rapid lateral flow immunoassay (NG Biotech). Journal of Clinical Virology, 2020, 129, pp.104511. 10.1016/j.jcv.2020.104511. hal-03443223

HAL Id: hal-03443223 https://univ-angers.hal.science/hal-03443223

Submitted on 22 Aug 2022

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution - NonCommercial 4.0 International License

1 Title page

- 2 Title: Assessment of SARS-CoV-2 serological tests for the diagnosis of COVID-19 through
- 3 the evaluation of three immunoassays: two automated immunoassays (Euroimmun and
- 4 Abbott) and one rapid lateral flow immunoassay (NG Biotech)

5 Author names and affiliations:

- 6 Thomas Nicol^a, Caroline Lefeuvre^{ab}, Orianne Serri^a, Adeline Pivert^{ab}, Françoise Joubaud^c
- 7 Alexandra Ducancelle^{ab}, Françoise Lunel-Fabiani^{ab*}, and Hélène Le Guillou-Guillemette^{ab*}
- 8 ^aVirology Department, Angers University Hospital, Angers, France
- 9 ^bHIFIH Laboratory EA 3859, LUNAM, Angers, France
- 10 ^cDepartment of Biochemistry and Genetics, Angers University Hospital, Angers, France
- 11 **These two authors equally participated to the study*
- 12 Corresponding author: Hélène Le Guillou-Guillemette
- 13 PharmD, PhD
- 14 Postal address: Virology Department, Angers University Hospital, HIFIH Laboratory EA
- 15 3859, LUNAM, 4, rue Larrey 49000 Angers, France
- 16 Telephone number: (+33) 02 41 35 47 09
- 17 Word count of the abstract: 249/250
- 18 Word count of the text: 2493/2500
- **19 Declaration of interest:**
- 20 The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

21 Funding:

- 22 This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies. NG-Test® IgG-IgM
- 23 COVID-19 rapid test cassettes (NG Biotech Laboratoires) were kindly provided by the
- 24 manufacturer.

1 Abstract

Background: The emergence of new SARS-CoV-2 has promoted the development of new
serological tests that could be complementary to RT-PCR. Nevertheless, the assessment of
clinical performances of available tests is urgently required as their use has just been initiated
for diagnose.

Objectives: The aim of this study was to assess the performance of three immunoassays for
the detection of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies.

8 *Methods:* Two automated immunoassays (Abbott SARS-CoV-2 CLIA IgG and Euroimmun 9 Anti-SARS-CoV-2 ELISA IgG/IgA assays) and one lateral flow immunoassay (LFIA NG-10 Test® IgG-IgM COVID-19) were tested. 293 specimens were analyzed from patients with a 11 positive RT-PCR response, from patients with symptoms consistent with COVID-19 but 12 exhibiting a negative response to the RT-PCR detection test, and from control group 13 specimens. Days since symptoms onset were collected from clinical information sheet 14 associated with respiratory tract samples.

Results: Overall sensitivity for IgG was equivalent (around 80%) for CLIA, ELISA and LFIA.
Sensitivity for IgG detection, >14 days after onset of symptoms, was 100.0% for all assays.
Overall specificity for IgG was greater for CLIA and LFIA (more than 98%) compared to
ELISA (95.8%). Specificity was significantly different between IgA ELISA (78.9%) and IgM
LFIA (95.8%) (p<0.05). The best agreement was observed between CLIA and LFIA assays
(97%; k=0.936).

Conclusion: Excellent sensitivity for IgG detection was obtained >14 days after onset of
symptoms for all immunoassays. Specificity was also excellent for IgG CLIA and IgG LFIA.
Our study shows that NG-Test® is reliable and accurate for routine use in clinical
laboratories.

- 25 Keywords: SARS-CoV-2; COVID-19; performance; automated immunoassays; lateral flow
- 26 immunoassay

29 Background

30 A new acute respiratory syndrome named coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) has emerged from the region of Wuhan in China in December 2019. This infection, widespread all over the 31 world, is caused by a novel Sarbecovirus designated severe acute respiratory syndrome 32 coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2), associated with severe morbidity and mortality [1-3]. The 33 detection of viral RNA by real time reverse transcriptase-Polymerase chain reaction (RT-34 PCR) in respiratory tract samples is considered as the gold standard method for screening and 35 diagnosis in the early phase of infection. However, sensitivity is variable depending on 36 sample types, suitable sampling technique, the anatomic site, time of infection and viral load 37 [4–6]. Chest computed tomography (CT) may be helpful for the diagnosis, complementary to 38 RT-PCR, but it remains unspecific [7]. Development of new serological tests [8,9], readily 39 available and easier to perform compared to requirements of molecular assays in laboratories 40 [10], could be helpful as a complementary diagnostic tool and to increase the sensitivity of 41 tests especially in patients with late complications i.e. severe pneumonia. Different assays 42 have recently been commercialized: automated tests (enzyme-linked immunosorbent assays 43 [ELISA] or chemiluminescence enzyme immunoassays [CLIA]) or rapid detection test 44 (lateral flow immunoassays, LFIA). LFIA seems to be very attractive for large seroprevalence 45 studies because these tests can be used easily as point of care tests or in the laboratory, with a 46 result in less than 15 minutes. Serological tests can be used for symptomatic individuals for 47 which RT-PCR testing was either not performed at the time of acute illness or for which 48 nasopharyngeal swab result was found to be negative, and also for epidemiological studies 49 (close contacts screening, screening of health care workers ...) [11,12]. However, the 50 relevance of serological tests is highly related to their clinical performance, hence antibody 51 (Ab) assays with good sensitivity and specificity are needed. Despite a growing number of 52

available assays, related clinical performances are still scarce [13–17] or unknown and
individual studies are usually inconclusive. Moreover, the quality and diagnostic performance
of rapid tests have already been questioned in Spain and United Kingdom [18,19].

Objectives

The aim of the study was to assess the clinical performance of CE marked assays available in
Europe to detect SARS-CoV-2 antibodies: two automated immunoassays (Euroimmun and
Abbott assays) targeting two different proteins and also one lateral flow immunoassay (NG
Biotech).

63 Methods

64 Specimens

This retrospective study included 293 residual sera from patients with RT-PCR confirmed 65 SARS-CoV-2 infection, patients with symptoms consistent with COVID-19 but with a 66 negative RT-PCR result (clinical diagnosis of pneumonia of unknown etiology), and control 67 individuals (presumed negative). These samples were collected in the virology laboratory of 68 Angers University Hospital, France. Serum samples (n=141) obtained from 82 patients 69 (median age: 67 years) with confirmed COVID-19 by RT-PCR, performed in our laboratory 70 [20], were tested. 57 serum specimens obtained from 52 patients (median age: 64 years) with 71 symptoms consistent with COVID-19, but with negative RT-PCR results were analyzed. 72 Information about days since symptoms onset was determined by clinical information sheet 73 associated with respiratory tract samples. 50 residual serum samples presumed negative 74 collected before the emergence of SARS-CoV-2, in March 2019 and stored at -80°C were 75 used as control specimens. 76

Then, 25 serum samples with a potential cross-reaction to the SARS-CoV-2 immunoassays
were investigated (Table 1). Samples from 10 pregnant women and 10 sera from patients with
positive rheumatoid factor (RF) were also tested.

80 The study was approved by the Institutional Board of the Angers University Hospital.

Pathogen potentially cross-reactive	Number of specimens	
with SARS-CoV-2		
Seasonal coronaviruses (HKU1, NL63, 229E, OC43)	2	
Influenza A virus	3	
Respiratory Syncitial Virus	3	
Rhinovirus	3	
Parainfluenzae virus	1	
Acute EBV infection (positive for EBV VCA IgM and EBV VCA IgG)	7	
Acute CMV infection (positive for CMV IgM)	1	
M. pneumonia infection	2	
Acute Hepatitis A infection	1	
Acute hepatitis E infection	2	

Table 1. Selected specimens potentially containing cross-reacting antibodies with SARSCoV-2.

84

85 Serological assays

86 ELISA assay

The Euroimmun Anti-SARS-CoV-2 ELISA IgG and IgA assays (Euroimmun, Lüebeck, Germany) were performed according to the manufacturer's guidelines on the DS2® system, an automated microplate technology (Dynex Technologies GmbH, Denkendorf, Germany). The microplate wells are coated with recombinant S1 structural protein and the assay detects anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgG and IgA against the viral spike protein (Sp).

92

93 CLIA assay

94 The Abbott SARS-CoV-2 IgG (Abbott, Ireland) was performed according to the
95 manufacturer's instructions on the automated Abbott ARCHITECT *i*2000SR Instrument

96 The assay is a CLIA for qualitative detection of IgG antibodies against the SARS-CoV-2
97 nucleoprotein (Np) in serum or plasma.

98

99 Lateral flow test

100 NG-Test® IgG-IgM COVID-19 (NG Biotech Laboratoires, Guipry-Messac, France) is an 101 immune colloidal technique intended for the qualitative detection of IgG and IgM antibodies 102 against the SARS-CoV-2 nucleoprotein in serum or plasma. 10 μ L of specimen, were added 103 onto the sample loading area followed by 2 drops of sample dilution solution. The results 104 were read and interpreted 15 min after testing.

105

106 Statistical analysis

107 All statistical analyses were performed using IBM® SPSS® 15.0 Statistics software 108 (Statistical Package for Social Sciences, IBM Corp., Chicago, IL). To assess the sensitivity 109 and specificity, we choose the RT-PCR method as gold standard. Time from onset symptoms 110 was used to determine sensitivity and specificity. Grey zone was considered positive for the 111 statistical analyses. A *p* value <0.05 was considered statistically significant. The Cohen's 112 Kappa value was determined for agreement between assays.

114 **Results**

Sensitivities and specificities obtained with three immunoassays are summarized in Table 2. 115 The sensitivity of IgG ELISA at \leq 7 days of symptoms was 28.1%, at 8-14 days 72.4%, and 116 >14 days was 100.0%. The sensitivity of IgG CLIA at \leq 7 days of symptoms was 46.9%, at 8-117 14 days 69%, and was 100.0% >14 days. Sensitivity of IgG LFIA at \leq 7 days of symptoms 118 was 31.3%, at 8-14 days 69.0%, and was 100.0% >14 days. Overall sensitivity for IgG was 119 equivalent (around 80%) for CLIA, ELISA and LFIA. Overall specificity for IgG was greater 120 than 98% for CLIA and LFIA compared to ELISA (95.8%). Comparison of the sensitivity of 121 IgA ELISA (59.4%) and IgM LFIA (43.8%), during the first seven days after onset of 122 symptoms, was not significant (p>0.05). By contrast, specificity was significantly different 123 between IgA ELISA and IgM LFIA (p<0.05). 124

Among the control samples and the group of patients with negative RT-PCR, 26 false 125 positives were observed with IgA ELISA (17.3%): seven specimens from the cross-reactivity 126 127 study; seven from pre-epidemic specimens (March 2019); two from pregnant women; four from patients with RF; six from patients with negative SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR and symptoms 128 of pneumonia/dyspnea without a chest CT argument for COVID-19 or seroconversion 129 (median time between symptom onset and sera: 9.5 days). Fewer false positives were 130 observed with IgM LFIA: three specimens from the cross-reactivity study; one from pre-131 epidemic sera; three from patients with negative RT-PCR result and symptoms of 132 pneumonia/dyspnea without a chest CT argument (including two specimens from the same 133 patient). Five false positives were observed with IgG ELISA (Figure 1): two pre-pandemic 134 135 specimens, one sample from pregnant woman, one sample from a patient with RF and one with negative RT-PCR result (negative result with other assays). Only one false positive result 136 was observed with IgG CLIA and corresponded to a pre-pandemic specimen (Figure 1). 137

Using IgG LFIA, three false positives were observed; two were from a patient (negative RT-PCR) for whom the etiology of pneumonia was undetermined.

All patients with positive RT-PCR were positive for serological assays. Two discordant results between serologic assays and molecular method were reported: two patients clinically adjudicated as COVID-19 but with negative RT-PCR. These two samples were tested positive for all immunoassays (Figure 1). To determine the specificity for IgG of the three assays, we excluded two specimens positive for serological assays but negative for RT-PCR because the symptoms were strongly compatible with the COVID-19 and RT-PCR was performed 17-24 days after symptom onset.

Among patients with RT-PCR confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection, there were only two
individuals without COVID-19 symptoms, but with a notion of contact with infected patients.
Both SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR and serological assays were positives for these patients.

Table 2. Sensitivities of immunoassays for SARS-CoV-2 according to the onset of COVID-

	Overall	Time from the symptom onset		
	% (CI 95%)	0 to 7 days % (CI 95%)	8 to 14 days % (CI 95%)	15 or more days % (CI 95%)
ELISA assay				
IgG or IgA	Se: 87.4 (81.0-91.9%)	Se: 59.4	Se: 82.8	Se: 100.0
	Sp: 82.0 (75.1-87.3%)	(42.3-74.5%)	(65.5-92.4%)	(95.5-100.0%)
IgG	Se: 78.3 (70.9-84.3%)	Se: 28.1	Se: 72.4	Se:100.0
C	Sp: 96.7 (92.4-98.6%	(42.3-74.5%)	(54.3-85.3%)	(95.5-100.0%)
IgA	Se: 86.7 (80.2-91.3%)	Se: 59.4	Se: 79.3	Se: 100.0
C	Sp: 82.7 (75.8-87.9%)	(15.6-45.4%)	(61.6-90.2%)	(95.5-100.0%)
CLIA assay				
IgG	Se: 81.8 (74.7-87.3%)	Se: 46.9	Se: 69.0	Se: 100.0
	Sp: 99.3 (96.3-99.9%)	(30.9-63.6%)	(50.8-82.7%)	(95.5-100.0%)
Lateral flow				
immunoassay				
IgG or IgM	Se: 81.8 (74.7-87.3%)	Se: 43.8	Se: 72.4	Se: 100.0
	Sp: 95.3 (90.7-97.7%)	(28.2-60.7%)	(54.3-85.3%)	(95.5-100.0%)
IgG	Se: 78.3 (70.9-84.3%)	Se: 31.3	Se: 69.0	Se: 100.0
-	Sp: 98.0 (94.3-99.3%)	(18.0-48.6%)	(50.8-82.7%)	(95.5-100.0%)
IgM	Se: 81.8 (74.7-87.3%)	Se: 43.8	Se: 72.4	Se: 100.0
e	Sp: 95.3 (90.7-97.7%)	(28.2-60.7%)	(54.3-85.3%)	(95.5-100.0%)

152 19 symptoms and specificities data. CI: confidence interval.



Figure 1: Seropositivity of tested specimens with ELISA Euroimmun and CLIA Abbott 157 assays. Seropositivity analysis in 95 presumed negatives control samples (cross-reactivity 158 samples, march 2019 samples, pregnant women samples, patients with RF samples), 57 159 samples from 52 patients with RT-PCR negative relative to days from symptom onset (<7 160 days; 8-14 days; >14 days) and 141 samples from 82 patients with RT-PCR positive relative 161 to days from symptom onset. Blue circles correspond to sera from patients exhibiting a 162 positive RT-PCR result. Green circles correspond to sera from patients with negative RT-PCR 163 result. Ochre circles correspond to sera from individuals for whom RT-PCR detection has not 164 been performed. The black line represents the median of ratio. (+): number of seropositive 165 sera; (n): total number of specimens tested. A) Seropositivity with ELISA Euroimmun assay. 166 Dashed grey line represents cutoff for positivity (ratio ≥ 1.1). Dotted purple line corresponds 167 to cutoff for negativity (ratio <0.8). B) Seropositivity with CLIA Abbott assay. Dashed grey 168 169 line represents cutoff for positivity (ratio ≥ 1.4).

Table 3 summarized overall agreement and agreement relative to the time of symptoms onset between three immunoassays. Overall, excellent agreement was observed between the three assays. The best agreement was observed between CLIA and LFIA (97%; Cohen kappa index of 0.936). Even for the first week of symptoms onset, an excellent agreement was observed between ELISA and LFIA assays (95%; k=0.810). However, poor agreement was observed between ELISA and CLIA (89%; k=0.687). Overall agreement between IgG/IgA ELISA and IgG/IgM LFIA was excellent (96%; k=0.914).

Table 3. Agreement between IgG serological assays.

		Euroimmun	NG Biotech
		% (Kappa)	% (Kappa)
Overall	Abbott	96% (0.908)	97% (0.936)
	NG Biotech	96% (0.914)	
0 to 7 days	Abbott	89% (0.687)	91% (0.745)
	NG Biotech	95% (0.810)	
8 to 14 days	Abbott	95% (0.909)	98% (0.954)
-	NG Biotech	93% (0.864)	
15 or more days	Abbott	100% (1.000)	99% (0.962)
	NG Biotech	99% (0.962)	

¹⁷⁹

The IgA, IgM and IgG Ab kinetics were studied using specimens from seven patients (positive RT-PCR) with serial results and interesting kinetics (Figure 2). Then, five patients presented an earlier IgG seroconversion using CLIA compared to ELISA, the first week of symptom onset. Among these patients, we observed in three patients an IgM line with LFIA and IgA ELISA was positive for four patients.

Using LFIA, results were more easily interpretable for IgG line than for IgM line. IgM linewas difficult for reading, notably for seven sera.

187



190 Figure 2: Anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibodies seroconversion profiles for seven individuals. Xaxis: time from symptoms onset. Y-axis: interpretation ratio of two semi-quantitative 191 immunoassays. Dotted black line represents the day of positivity of LFIA NG-Test® IgG-IgM 192 COVID-19. The cutoff for positivity with ELISA Euroimmun assay is ≥ 1.1 (dotted blue line) 193 and the cutoff for positivity with CLIA Abbott assay is ≥ 1.4 (dotted red line). Patients 1, 2, 4 194 195 and 6 developed a prolonged immune response one month after symptoms onset and up 64 days for patient 4. Patients 1, 2 and 7 had early seroconversion in the second week after 196 symptoms onset and patient 5 had already seroconversion in the first week. Patient 3 had a 197

- seroconversion in the third week after symptoms onset. Patient 5 produced fewer antibodies
- 199 compared to other patients and notably IgA production is close to the threshold of positivity.

201 **Discussion**

A strong clinical performance of assays in diagnosis and management of COVID-19 is 202 essential to quickly contain the COVID outbreak worldwide. Therefore, the development of 203 serological assays, routinely used in clinical laboratories to determine recent infection or 204 previous contact with viruses, is a good option complementary to RT-PCR method [21]. On 205 May, 2020, the French Health Authority (Haute Autorité de Santé) and Infectious Diseases 206 Society of America recommended that patients with symptoms consistent with COVID-19 but 207 having a positive result for SARS-CoV-2 by RT-PCR may be diagnosed by serological tests 208 [22,23]. Various immunoassays are available on the European market [24,25] and subjected to 209 European regulations with the mandatory CE marked for sales. Nevertheless, the European 210 211 Commission, in its April 2020 recommendations, allowed exceptionally the marketing of tests that do not have the CE marked, in the interest of public health [22]. 212

Here, we evaluated three different CE marked commercial immunoassays for detection of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies in human serum and plasma. ELISA assay was performed on a semiautomated microplate technology requiring high handling and with a limited capacity of tests per day (90 tests per 4h). In contrast, CLIA assay is a fully automated random-access test and that can perform over 4,000 tests per 24h. These two assays are used in clinical laboratories, unlike LFIA, which can be used as a point of care test or in clinical laboratories and provides a result within 15 min.

Performance of Euroimmun assay has been evaluated in some studies [13,14,26–29], showing
sensitivity for IgG between 85% and 95% >14 days after symptoms onset and specificity
between 95 and 100%. Few studies reported clinical performance of Abbott assay
[14,16,26,28]. Sensitivity for IgG was between 94% and 100% more than 14 days post
symptom onset and specificity between 99 and 100%. In our study, we showed a sensitivity

for IgG of 100% for CLIA Abbott and ELISA Euroimmun assays >14 days after symptoms onset and an overall specificity for IgG of 78.3% and 81.8% with ELISA and CLIA respectively. We carried out a large cross-reactivity study and more false positives results were observed using ELISA than CLIA as previously described [14].

Recently, many CE marked LFIA became available. Two studies showed that sensitivity and 229 specificity were similar to those of Euroimmun assay [13,29]. However, to our knowledge, 230 only one study compared clinical performance between CLIA Abbott and LFIA [30] and no 231 study described diagnostic performance of NG-Test®. Here, we observed an excellent 232 agreement for IgG between CLIA and LFIA 15 days after onset symptoms (k=0.810), and an 233 234 excellent sensitivity and specificity for both assays. LFIA advantages are the ability to reach larger population groups, when used in point-of-care, and to evaluate the herd immunity 235 without saturating the capacity of laboratories. However, these devices must be used with 236 237 caution. Trained staff or automated reader devices are needed for good interpretation of result. Traceability of results may be at fault in case of use at the point-of-care and results may not 238 239 be reported to the health authorities for seroprevalence studies.

To evaluate sensitivity, some manufacturers or authors used the time from positive RT-PCR rather than the time from symptom onset. However, there is a risk of misestimating sensitivity as some patients presented late after the onset of symptoms with disease progression at time of the first PCR testing. Then, sensitivity and specificity must be interpreted with caution. The use of RT-PCR as gold standard may decrease the real number of patients infected by SARS-CoV-2 due to false negative results.

In our study, we observed false positive results with IgA ELISA and few with IgM LFIA. No false positive with IgM LFIA were observed with for RF specimens whereas interferences were described with some other immunoassays [31]. Elslande et al pointed out that the ELISA IgA should not be used for the screening of asymptomatic persons. It might be better not to measure IgM or IgA since it may result in a significant number of false-positive results
without improving diagnostic performance. [29]. It would appear here that IgM detection with
the LFIA provides a gain in diagnostic performance.

Developed immunoassays target either the Sp or the Np of SARS-CoV-2 [32], involving 253 different immune Ab responses. However, related studies are controversial. Some studies 254 255 described that early antibody response was targeted against Np and then Sp inducing an earlier positivity of the tests targeting Np [14,33]. By contrast, another study revealed that the 256 Sp-based ELISA was more sensitive than the Np-based one in the detection of IgM [34]. 257 Here, we did not observe any significant difference between sensitivity of IgA ELISA and 258 IgM LFIA which detect two different targets. Positive results with serological tests do not 259 260 indicate the presence of neutralizing antibodies, i.e. possible protective immunity to SARS-CoV-2 [35], but are only indicative of a contact with SARS-CoV-2 261

One of the strong points of our study is the use of large number of samples for cross reactivities study with other pathogens and other causes of false positive results ie. pregnancy and individuals with RF. Among symptomatic patients with positive RT-PCR, most of patients were elderly with a potential risk of low immune response.

Some limitations of the study are the subjectivity in the perception of symptoms by patients, in particular for elderly patient. Our study included few patients with asymptomatic infections and positive RT-PCR because specific indications of tests in France were, at the time of the study, mainly limited to patients who were symptomatic, due in particular to the shortage of tests.

In conclusion, our study showed equivalent clinical performance for IgG of three
immunoassays (ELISA, CLIA and LFIA) >14 days after symptoms onset. The three assays
had, as expected, a poor sensitivity during first days of symptom onset. Therefore, serological

tests can be useful to confirm past COVID-19, to do epidemiologic studies 15 days after 274 symptoms onset [36] or to identify people who could return to the workplace, even if its use is 275 still widely discussed [37]. For asymptomatic patients with RT-PCR negative, a higher 276 threshold must be used [16]. A lower threshold (8-14 days) should be used for symptomatic 277 patients >7 days with negative RT-PCR and clinical presentation consistent with COVID-19. 278 Currently, it is not clear whether IgG antibodies are protective against reinfection [38]. 279 Finally, even if the LFIA is reliable on serum or plasma, studies should be conducted to 280 281 evaluate the performance on fingerstick; a process commonly used for seroprevalence studies.

282 Acknowledgments

283 The authors thank the laboratory technicians who helped us.

284 The authors thank Thomas Le Guillou for proofreading the English manuscript.

285

286

287

289 **References**

- [1] World Health Organization, Coronavirus disease 2019, (2020).
 https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019 (accessed May 23, 2020).
- 293 [2] N. Zhu, D. Zhang, W. Wang, X. Li, B. Yang, J. Song, X. Zhao, B. Huang, W. Shi, R. Lu,
- P. Niu, F. Zhan, X. Ma, D. Wang, W. Xu, G. Wu, G.F. Gao, W. Tan, China Novel 294 Coronavirus Investigating and Research Team, A Novel Coronavirus from Patients with 295 Pneumonia in China, 2019, N Engl J Med. 382 (2020)727–733. 296 https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa2001017. 297
- [3] X. Yang, Y. Yu, J. Xu, H. Shu, J. Xia, H. Liu, Y. Wu, L. Zhang, Z. Yu, M. Fang, T. Yu,
 Y. Wang, S. Pan, X. Zou, S. Yuan, Y. Shang, Clinical course and outcomes of critically
 ill patients with SARS-CoV-2 pneumonia in Wuhan, China: a single-centered,
 retrospective, observational study, Lancet Respir Med. 8 (2020) 475–481.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/S2213-2600(20)30079-5.
- 303 [4] S.K. Vashist, In Vitro Diagnostic Assays for COVID-19: Recent Advances and Emerging
 304 Trends, Diagnostics. 10 (2020) 202. https://doi.org/10.3390/diagnostics10040202.
- 305 [5] M.J. Loeffelholz, Y.-W. Tang, Laboratory diagnosis of emerging human coronavirus
 306 infections the state of the art, Emerg Microbes Infect. 9 (2020) 747–756.
 307 https://doi.org/10.1080/22221751.2020.1745095.
- 308 [6] Y. Yang, M. Yang, C. Shen, F. Wang, J. Yuan, J. Li, M. Zhang, Z. Wang, L. Xing, J.
 309 Wei, L. Peng, G. Wong, H. Zheng, M. Liao, K. Feng, J. Li, Q. Yang, J. Zhao, Z. Zhang,
 310 L. Liu, Y. Liu, Evaluating the accuracy of different respiratory specimens in the
- laboratory diagnosis and monitoring the viral shedding of 2019-nCoV infections,
 medRxiv, 2020. https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.02.11.20021493.

- [7] X. Xie, Z. Zhong, W. Zhao, C. Zheng, F. Wang, J. Liu, Chest CT for Typical 2019-nCoV
 Pneumonia: Relationship to Negative RT-PCR Testing, Radiology. (2020) 200343.
 https://doi.org/10.1148/radiol.2020200343.
- 316 [8] A. Petherick, Developing antibody tests for SARS-CoV-2, Lancet. 395 (2020) 1101–
 317 1102. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30788-1.
- [9] N.M.A. Okba, M.A. Müller, W. Li, C. Wang, C.H. GeurtsvanKessel, V.M. Corman,
 M.M. Lamers, R.S. Sikkema, E. de Bruin, F.D. Chandler, Y. Yazdanpanah, Q. Le
- 320 Hingrat, D. Descamps, N. Houhou-Fidouh, C.B.E.M. Reusken, B.-J. Bosch, C. Drosten,
- 321 M.P.G. Koopmans, B.L. Haagmans, Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2-
- 322 Specific Antibody Responses in Coronavirus Disease 2019 Patients, Emerging Infect Dis.
- 323 26 (2020). https://doi.org/10.3201/eid2607.200841.
- 324[10]World Health Organization, Laboratory biosafety guidance related to the novel325coronavirus(2019-nCoV),(2020).https://www.who.int/docs/default-
- 326 source/coronaviruse/laboratory-biosafety-novel-coronavirus-version-1-
- 327 1.pdf?sfvrsn=912a9847_2 (accessed May 27, 2020).
- [11] Y. Xu, M. Xiao, X. Liu, S. Xu, T. Du, J. Xu, Q. Yang, Y. Xu, Y. Han, T. Li, H. Zhu,
 M. Wang, Significance of serology testing to assist timely diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2
 infections: implication from a family cluster, Emerg Microbes Infect. 9 (2020) 924–927.
 https://doi.org/10.1080/22221751.2020.1752610.
- Y.-W. Tang, J.E. Schmitz, D.H. Persing, C.W. Stratton, The Laboratory Diagnosis of
 COVID-19 Infection: Current Issues and Challenges, J Clin Microbiol. (2020).
 https://doi.org/10.1128/JCM.00512-20.
- I. Montesinos, D. Gruson, B. Kabamba, H. Dahma, S. Van den Wijngaert, S. Reza, V.
 Carbone, O. Vandenberg, B. Gulbis, F. Wolff, H. Rodriguez-Villalobos, Evaluation of
 two automated and three rapid lateral flow immunoassays for the detection of anti-SARS-

- 338 CoV-2 antibodies, J Clin Virol. 128 (2020) 104413.
 339 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcv.2020.104413.
- M.S. Tang, K.G. Hock, N.M. Logsdon, J.E. Hayes, A.M. Gronowski, N.W. Anderson,
 C.W. Farnsworth, Clinical Performance of Two SARS-CoV-2 Serologic Assays, Clin
 Chem. (2020). https://doi.org/10.1093/clinchem/hvaa120.
- Y. Pan, X. Li, G. Yang, J. Fan, Y. Tang, J. Zhao, X. Long, S. Guo, Z. Zhao, Y. Liu, H.
 Hu, H. Xue, Y. Li, Serological immunochromatographic approach in diagnosis with
 SARS-CoV-2 infected COVID-19 patients, J Infect. (2020).
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jinf.2020.03.051.
- [16] A. Bryan, G. Pepper, M.H. Wener, S.L. Fink, C. Morishima, A. Chaudhary, K.R.
 Jerome, P.C. Mathias, A.L. Greninger, Performance Characteristics of the Abbott
 Architect SARS-CoV-2 IgG Assay and Seroprevalence in Boise, Idaho, J Clin Microbiol.
 (2020). https://doi.org/10.1128/JCM.00941-20.
- [17] Z. Zainol Rashid, S.N. Othman, M.N. Abdul Samat, U.K. Ali, K.K. Wong, Diagnostic
 performance of COVID-19 serology assays, Malays J Pathol. 42 (2020) 13–21.
- E. Sevillano, Covid-19 in Spain: Unreliability of new tests delays effort to slow
 coronavirus spread in Spain | Society | EL PAÍS in English, (2020).
 https://english.elpais.com/society/2020-03-27/unreliability-of-new-tests-delays-effort-to-
- slow-coronavirus-spread-in-spain.html (accessed June 9, 2020).
- 357 [19] D. Brennan, U.K. says millions of coronavirus test kits bought from China are
 358 unreliable for most patients, Newsweek. (2020). https://www.newsweek.com/uk-says359 millions-coronavirus-test-kits-bought-china-unreliable-most-patients-1496506 (accessed
 360 June 9, 2020).
- 361 [20] F.-X. Lescure, L. Bouadma, D. Nguyen, M. Parisey, P.-H. Wicky, S. Behillil, A.
 362 Gaymard, M. Bouscambert-Duchamp, F. Donati, Q. Le Hingrat, V. Enouf, N. Houhou-

- Fidouh, M. Valette, A. Mailles, J.-C. Lucet, F. Mentre, X. Duval, D. Descamps, D.
 Malvy, J.-F. Timsit, B. Lina, S. van-der-Werf, Y. Yazdanpanah, Clinical and virological
 data of the first cases of COVID-19 in Europe: a case series, The Lancet Infectious
 Diseases. 20 (2020) 697–706. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30200-0.
- Z. Yongchen, H. Shen, X. Wang, X. Shi, Y. Li, J. Yan, Y. Chen, B. Gu, Different 367 [21] longitudinal patterns of nucleic acid and serology testing results based on disease severity 368 COVID-19 Infect. 369 of patients, Emerg Microbes 9 (2020)833-836. https://doi.org/10.1080/22221751.2020.1756699. 370
- 371 [22] Haute Autorité de Santé, Place des tests sérologiques dans la stratégie de prise en
 372 charge de la maladie COVID-19, (2020) 37.
- 373 [23] Infectious Diseases Society of America, IDSA COVID-19 antibody primer. May 4,
- 374 2020. https://www.idsociety.org/globalassets/idsa/public-health/covid-19/idsa-covid-19375 antibody-testing-primer.pdf (accessed June 10, 2020).
- 376 [24] Ministère des Solidarités et de la Santé, Plateforme COVID-19, (2020). https://covid377 19.sante.gouv.fr/tests (accessed May 25, 2020).
- 378 [25] SARS-CoV-2 diagnostic pipeline. (2020). https://www.finddx.org/testing-matters/
 379 (accessed June 9, 2020).
- [26] N. Kohmer, S. Westhaus, C. Rühl, S. Ciesek, H.F. Rabenau, Brief clinical evaluation
 of six high-throughput SARS-CoV-2 IgG antibody assays, J Clin Virol. 129 (2020)
 104480. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcv.2020.104480.
- 383 [27] N. Kohmer, S. Westhaus, C. Rühl, S. Ciesek, H.F. Rabenau, Clinical performance of
 384 different SARS-CoV-2 IgG antibody tests, J Med Virol. (2020).
 385 https://doi.org/10.1002/jmv.26145.

- E.S. Theel, J. Harring, H. Hilgart, D. Granger, Performance Characteristics of Four
 High-Throughput Immunoassays for Detection of IgG Antibodies against SARS-CoV-2, J
 Clin Microbiol. (2020). https://doi.org/10.1128/JCM.01243-20.
- 389 [29] J. Van Elslande, E. Houben, M. Depypere, A. Brackenier, S. Desmet, E. André, M.
- Van Ranst, K. Lagrou, P. Vermeersch, Diagnostic performance of 7 rapid IgG/IgM
 antibody tests and the Euroimmun IgA/IgG ELISA in COVID-19 patients, Clin Microbiol
 Infect. (2020). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cmi.2020.05.023.
- 393 [30] S. Dellière, M. Salmona, M. Minier, A. Gabassi, A. Alanio, J. Le Goff, C. Delaugerre,
- M.-L. Chaix, Evaluation of COVID-19 IgG/IgM Rapid Test from Orient Gene Biotech, J
 Clin Microbiol. (2020) JCM.01233-20. https://doi.org/10.1128/JCM.01233-20.
- 396 [31] Q. Wang, Q. Du, B. Guo, D. Mu, X. Lu, Q. Ma, Y. Guo, L. Fang, B. Zhang, G. Zhang,
- X. Guo, A Method To Prevent SARS-CoV-2 IgM False Positives in Gold
 Immunochromatography and Enzyme-Linked Immunosorbent Assays, J Clin Microbiol.
 58 (2020). https://doi.org/10.1128/JCM.00375-20.
- 400 [32] N. Sethuraman, S.S. Jeremiah, A. Ryo, Interpreting Diagnostic Tests for SARS-CoV401 2, JAMA. (2020). https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2020.8259.
- 402 [33] M.Z. Tay, C.M. Poh, L. Rénia, P.A. MacAry, L.F.P. Ng, The trinity of COVID-19:
 403 immunity, inflammation and intervention, Nat Rev Immunol. 20 (2020) 363–374.
 404 https://doi.org/10.1038/s41577-020-0311-8.
- 405 [34] W. Liu, L. Liu, G. Kou, Y. Zheng, Y. Ding, W. Ni, Q. Wang, L. Tan, W. Wu, S. Tang,
- 406 Z. Xiong, S. Zheng, Evaluation of Nucleocapsid and Spike Protein-Based Enzyme-Linked
- 407 Immunosorbent Assays for Detecting Antibodies against SARS-CoV-2, J Clin Microbiol.
- 408 58 (2020). https://doi.org/10.1128/JCM.00461-20.

- [35] N. Kohmer, S. Westhaus, C. Rühl, S. Ciesek, H.F. Rabenau, Clinical performance of
 SARS-CoV-2 IgG antibody tests and potential protective immunity, Microbiology, 2020.
 https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.08.085506.
- 412 [36] A.K. Winter, S.T. Hegde, The important role of serology for COVID-19 control,
 413 Lancet Infect Dis. (2020). https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30322-4.
- 414 [37] M.C. Weinstein, K.A. Freedberg, E.P. Hyle, A.D. Paltiel, Waiting for Certainty on
- 415 Covid-19 Antibody Tests At What Cost?, N Engl J Med. (2020)p2017739.
 416 https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMp2017739.
- 417 [38] J.G. Melgaço, T. Azamor, A.P.D. Ano Bom, Protective immunity after COVID-19 has
- 418 been questioned: What can we do without SARS-CoV-2-IgG detection?, Cell. Immunol.
- 419 353 (2020) 104114. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cellimm.2020.104114.