



HAL
open science

Comparison of eight commercial, high-throughput, automated or ELISA assays detecting SARS-CoV-2 IgG or total antibody

Mary-Anne Trabaud, Vinca Icard, Marie-Paule Milon, Antonin Bal, Bruno Lina, Vanessa Escuret

► To cite this version:

Mary-Anne Trabaud, Vinca Icard, Marie-Paule Milon, Antonin Bal, Bruno Lina, et al.. Comparison of eight commercial, high-throughput, automated or ELISA assays detecting SARS-CoV-2 IgG or total antibody. *Journal of Clinical Virology*, 2020, 132, pp.104613 -. 10.1016/j.jcv.2020.104613 . hal-03491361

HAL Id: hal-03491361

<https://hal.science/hal-03491361v1>

Submitted on 21 Sep 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

Title: Comparison of eight commercial, high-throughput, automated or ELISA assays detecting SARS-CoV-2 IgG or total antibody

Authors: Mary-Anne Trabaud¹, Vinca Icard¹, Marie-Paule Milon¹, Antonin Bal^{1,2,3}, Bruno Lina^{1,2,3}, Vanessa Escuret^{1,2,3}

Affiliations

¹Laboratoire de Virologie, Institut des Agents Infectieux, Hôpital de la Croix-Rousse, Hospices Civils de Lyon, Lyon, France

²Centre National de Référence des Virus des infections respiratoires (dont la grippe), Hospices Civils de Lyon, Lyon, France

³Université Lyon 1, Faculté de Médecine Lyon Est, CIRI, Inserm U1111 CNRS UMR5308, Virpath, Lyon, France

Corresponding author: Mary-Anne Trabaud

¹Laboratoire de Virologie,
Institut des Agents Infectieux,
Hôpital de la Croix-Rousse,
103 grande rue de la Croix Rouse,
Lyon,
France

email: mary-anne.trabaud01@chu-lyon.fr

Keywords: SARS-CoV-2; COVID-19; IgG; total Ig; immunoassay; serology

Abbreviations :

HCW: Health Care Workers

SO: symptom onset

RBD: Receptor Binding Domain

CLIA: Chemiluminescent Immunoassay

ELFA: Enzyme Linked Fluorescent assay

CMIA: Chemiluminescent Microparticule Immunoassay

ECLIA: Electrochemiluminescent Immunoassay

ELISA: Enzyme Linked Immunoassay

Abstract word count: 178

Text word count: 1190

1 **ABSTRACT**

2 *Background:* Many commercial assays, of different designs, detecting SARS-CoV-2-specific
3 antibodies exist but with little experience with them.

4 *Objectives:* The aim of this study was to compare the performance of assays detecting IgG or
5 total antibodies to N or S antigens, validated for routine use in France, with samples from
6 subjects with more or less severe SARS-CoV-2 infection.

7 *Methods:* Eight assays were used: Abbott Architect, DiaSorin Liaison®, bioMérieux Vidas®,
8 Roche Elecsys Cobas®, Siemens Atellica®, BioRad Platelia ELISA, Epitope Diagnostics
9 ELISA, and Wantai ELISA. The tested population included 86 samples from 40 hospitalized
10 subjects and 28 outpatients at different time from symptom onset.

11 *Results:* The positivity rate varied depending on the assay but was greater for all assays in
12 hospitalized than non-hospitalized patients. Despite a good correlation between the assays,
13 discrepancies occurred, without a systematic origin, even for samples taken more than 20
14 days after symptom onset. These discrepancies were linked to low antibody levels in pauci-
15 symptomatic patients.

16 *Conclusion:* Whichever assay is chosen, a false negative result may need to be ruled out with
17 another test in a risk situation.

18

19

20 **1. Background**

21 The SARS-CoV-2 (Severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus-2) responsible for COVID-19
22 (Coronavirus infectious disease 2019) emerged in December 2019 in Wuhan, China. The members of
23 *Coronaviridae* family are enveloped positive RNA viruses; the 5' part of the genome is encoding for a
24 polyprotein cleaved in non-structural proteins forming the transcription and replication complex. The
25 3' part of the genome is encoding for the structural proteins, spike (S), envelope (E), membrane (M)
26 and the nucleoprotein (N). Serological assays target mainly the S and/or the N proteins which are
27 considered as the target of neutralizing antibodies and immunodominant protein, respectively.

28 While SARS-CoV-2 genome detection in respiratory specimens remain the only way to
29 confirm current infection, serology might be useful for epidemiological studies and past
30 SARS-CoV-2 infection determination in the absence of molecular diagnosis. Most of the
31 companies producing immunodiagnostic assays have rapidly produced tests detecting SARS-
32 CoV-2-specific IgG, IgM, IgA or total antibodies. Some of these assays have been evaluated
33 by independent groups [1-3] but their comparison on the same samples has rarely been
34 performed [4-15] or only for a small number of commercial assays, with the exception of
35 point-of-care systems.

36 **2. Objective**

37 The objective of this paper was to perform a performance comparison of eight commercial
38 assays of which five use automated instruments with CLIA or ELFA technology (Abbott
39 Architect, DiaSorin Liaison®, bioMérieux Vidas®, Roche Elecsys Cobas®, and Siemens
40 Atellica®), and three are microplate ELISA (BioRad Platelia, Epitepe Diagnostics EDI™,
41 Wantai).

42

43 **3. Materials and Methods**

44 The characteristics of each assay are presented in Table 1. For comparison, only the assays
45 detecting IgG or total antibodies are presented. Half of them are directed against the N protein
46 (Abbott Architect, Roche Elecsys Cobas®, Biorad Platelia, Epitope Diagnostics) and the
47 other half against parts of the S protein (S1+S2: Diasorin Liaison®, S1: biomérieux Vidas®
48 or the receptor binding domain (RBD): Siemens Atellica®, Wantai). All are CE marked and
49 their sensitivity and specificity were evaluated by the manufacturer (Table 1). Antibody
50 detection kits were used according to manufacturers' instructions.

51 In the present study 82 residual serum or plasma samples from a population of 68 SARS-
52 CoV-2 infected patients, confirmed by a positive RT-PCR (reverse transcriptase polymerase
53 chain reaction), were used.

54 **4. Results**

55 The patient population included 40 infected hospitalized patients (including 25 in intensive
56 care units) and 28 non hospitalized infected health care workers (HCW) (including
57 physicians, nurses, and lab staff). Age of the patients ranged from 7 to 81 years (median =
58 51). Median age of hospitalized patients was greater (64 years, range: 7-81) than that of HCW
59 (36 years, range: 25-59). In the HCW group, women proportion (22/28; 78.6%) was higher
60 than in the hospitalized group (11/40; 27.5%). Seven patients were tested at different time
61 points (ranging from 2 to 5). The delays between the dates of samples used for serology
62 testing, and the beginning of documented symptoms varied from 4 to 52 days ($37 \leq 20$ days,
63 $45 > 20$ days). The data were compared between 3 groups of delays from symptom onset (SO)
64 : ≤ 15 days (16 samples), 16-20 days (21 samples), > 20 days (45 samples). The results of the
65 eight assays, grouped according to the delay from SO and the patient population (hospitalized
66 patients versus HCW), are shown in Figure 1. The positivity rate is detailed in Table 2.

67 Regardless of the assay, antibody reactivity was higher in hospitalized patients compared to
68 non-hospitalized HCW. The positivity rate increased with time from SO but did not reach
69 100% in this population of HCW, probably because antibody titer declined relatively rapidly
70 in patients with mild disease and weak antibody response. Of the 45 samples taken in 40
71 patients more than 20 days after SO, 12 (26.7%) were negative for antibody detection in at
72 least one assay. Eleven of these 12 samples were from HCW. A low reactivity of positive
73 results was observed in most cases. Six were from two HCW with four and five follow-up
74 samples, respectively. In these two HCW, antibody kinetics either increased just above the
75 threshold, or increased then decreased, or never reached the threshold, depending on the
76 assay. In a single case of a hospitalized person with a sample taken more than 20 days after
77 SO, negative results were obtained with two assays (Abbott Architect and BioRad Platelia)
78 while all other assays gave positive results. Whatever the delay after SO, discrepancies
79 between assays occurred (29.3% of the samples) without being able to be systematically
80 attributed to the sensitivity, to the target antigen (N or S) or to the class of antibodies detected
81 (IgG or total). These discrepancies occurred mainly in samples from HCW (19/24, 79%).
82 Despite this, concordance between the tests was quite good and similar for all of them, with
83 no clear distinction depending on whether the tests being compared detected the same or
84 another viral target (Table 3). In addition, there was no better agreement between the tests
85 detecting total antibodies (Siemens Atellica®, Wantai, Roche Elecsys Cobas®) than between
86 these tests and those detecting only IgG.

87 **5. Discussion**

88 In the present study all assays showed similar overall performance although the most and
89 least sensitive tended to be the ELISA from Wantai and the Diasorin Liaison® assay,
90 respectively, as confirmed by previous reports with different patient populations [4, 6, 15].
91 For the other assays the differences were not sufficiently consistent to claim that one had a

92 better sensitivity than the others. Comparison of the same samples with these different
93 commercial antibody detection systems showed that samples from SARS-Cov-2 infected
94 patients could be negative for antibody detection by any of them. Antibodies undetectability
95 could be linked to patient characteristics such as variable kinetics of antibody production
96 against each viral target, strength of antibody response, antibody affinity, or assay
97 characteristics such as the antigen nature and preparation, or duration of antigen-antibody
98 incubation. Each of observed discrepancies could have had a different origin leading to no
99 obvious and consistent interpretation. Discrepant results occurred mainly in patients with mild
100 or asymptomatic infection, as antibody response might be weak and decreasing over time.
101 Such dissociated responses between assays have already been described by others [4, 8, 11].

102 Thus, in absence of molecular diagnosis, but with suggestive clinical features, a negative
103 antibody result may need to be evaluated with another assay to ensure that it was not a false
104 negative result.

105 One limitation of our study was the small size and heterogeneous sample population, limiting
106 determination of a true sensitivity for each assay. Specificity of these assays was not
107 addressed in this report but has been evaluated in other studies [4-6, 8, 9, 13]. Even if some
108 cross reactivity was observed, it was low, except with SARS-CoV virus, and often with
109 different samples with each test compared.

110 Despite good overall performance, commercial assays need to be further evaluated with
111 longitudinal samples from well characterized patients. In the first published studies, data came
112 from severe patients but serology would be more useful in individuals with mild illness.
113 Discrepancies between assays occurring mainly in this patient category, they should be the
114 target of future studies aimed at correlating the data with the kinetics of N and S-specific
115 antibodies, as well as their neutralizing capacity.

116 **Acknowledgments:**

117 We would like to thank all the technicians from the laboratory to make this evaluation
118 possible by performing all the antibody assays, and especially, Laure Zanghellini, Geraldine
119 Berthot, Catherine Girardi, Majdeline Lachgar, Christine Garrigou, and Marc Carteron. We
120 also thank Khadija Sfouli for her precious help at the working organization.

121

122 **Declaration of interest:** Antonin Bal has received research grant from bioMérieux for
123 research not related to this manuscript and has served as consultant for bioMérieux.

124 This work did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies, in the public, commercial
125 or not-for-profit sectors

126

127 **References :**

- 128 1. Bryan A, Pepper G, Wener MH, Fink SL, Morishima C, Chaudhary A, et al. Performance
129 Characteristics of the Abbott Architect SARS-CoV-2 IgG Assay and Seroprevalence in Boise,
130 Idaho. *J Clin Microbiol.* 2020 23, 58(8). doi:10.1128/JCM.00941-20
- 131 2. Tré-Hardy M, Wilmet A, Beukinga I, Dogné J-M, Douxfils J, Blairon L. Validation of a
132 chemiluminescent assay for specific SARS-CoV-2 antibody. *Clin Chem Lab Med.* 2020 Jul 28,
133 58(8):1357–64. doi:10.1515/cclm-2020-0594
- 134 3. Tang MS, Hock KG, Logsdon NM, Hayes JE, Gronowski AM, Anderson NW, et al. Clinical
135 Performance of the Roche SARS-CoV-2 Serologic Assay. *Clin Chem.* 2020 Aug 1,
136 66(8):1107–9. doi:10.1093/clinchem/hvaa132
- 137 4. Charlton CL, Kanji JN, Johal K, Bailey A, Plitt SS, MacDonald C, et al. Evaluation of six
138 commercial mid to high volume antibody and six point of care lateral flow assays for detection
139 of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies. *J Clin Microbiol.* 2020 Jul 14; doi:10.1128/JCM.01361-20

- 140 5. Egger M, Bundschuh C, Wiesinger K, Gabriel C, Clodi M, Mueller T, et al. Comparison of the
141 Elecsys® Anti-SARS-CoV-2 immunoassay with the EDITM enzyme linked immunosorbent
142 assays for the detection of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies in human plasma. *Clinica Chimica Acta*
143 2020, 509:18–21. doi:10.1016/j.cca.2020.05.049
- 144 6. GeurtsvanKessel CH, Okba NMA, Igloi Z, Bogers S, Embregts CWE, Laksono BM, et al. An
145 evaluation of COVID-19 serological assays informs future diagnostics and exposure
146 assessment. *Nat Commun* 2020, 11(1):3436. doi:10.1038/s41467-020-17317-y
- 147 7. Jääskeläinen AJ, Kuivanen S, Kekäläinen E, Ahava MJ, Loginov R, Kallio-Kokko H, et al.
148 Performance of six SARS-CoV-2 immunoassays in comparison with microneutralisation. *J*
149 *Clin Virol.* 2020 Jun 15, 129:104512. doi: 10.1016/j.jcv.2020.104512
- 150 8. Kohmer N, Westhaus S, Rühl C, Ciesek S, Rabenau HF. Brief clinical evaluation of six high-
151 throughput SARS-CoV-2 IgG antibody assays. *J Clin Virol.* 2020, 129:104480.
152 doi:10.1016/j.jcv.2020.104480
- 153 9. Lassaunière R, Frische A, Harboe ZB, Nielsen AC, Fomsgaard A, Krogfelt KA, et al.
154 Evaluation of nine commercial SARS-CoV-2 immunoassays. *Infectious Diseases (except*
155 *HIV/AIDS)*; 2020 Apr. <http://medrxiv.org/lookup/doi/10.1101/2020.04.09.20056325>
- 156 10. Nguyen NN, Mutnal MB, Gomez RR, Pham HN, Nguyen LT, Koss W, et al. Correlation of
157 ELISA based with random access serologic immunoassays for identifying adaptive immune
158 response to SARS-CoV-2. *Pathology*; 2020 Jul.
159 <http://medrxiv.org/lookup/doi/10.1101/2020.07.06.20145938>
- 160 11. Schnurra C, Reiners N, Biemann R, Kaiser T, Trawinski H, Jassoy C. Comparison of the
161 diagnostic sensitivity of SARS-CoV-2 nucleoprotein and glycoprotein-based antibody tests. *J*
162 *Clin Virol* 2020, 129:104544. doi:10.1016/j.jcv.2020.104544

- 163 12. Tang MS, Case JB, Franks CE, Chen RE, Anderson NW, Henderson JP, et al. Association
164 between SARS-CoV-2 neutralizing antibodies and commercial serological assays.
165 Immunology; 2020 Jul. <http://biorxiv.org/lookup/doi/10.1101/2020.07.01.182220>
- 166 13. Theel ES, Harring J, Hilgart H, Granger D. Performance Characteristics of Four High-
167 Throughput Immunoassays for Detection of IgG Antibodies against SARS-CoV-2. J Clin
168 Microbiol. 2020 Jun 8; doi: 10.1128/JCM.01243-20
- 169 14. Traugott M, Aberle SW, Aberle JH, Griebler H, Karolyi M, Pawelka E, et al. Performance of
170 Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 Antibody Assays in Different Stages of
171 Infection: Comparison of Commercial Enzyme-Linked Immunosorbent Assays and Rapid
172 Tests. J Infect Dis. 2020, 222(3):362–6. doi: 10.1093/infdis/jiaa305
- 173 15. Weidner L, Gänsdorfer S, Unterweger S, Weseslindtner L, Drexler C, Farcet M, et al.
174 Quantification of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies with eight commercially available immunoassays. J
175 Clin Virol. 2020, 129:104540. doi.org/10.1016/j.jcv.2020.104540
- 176

177 **Fig. 1. Distribution of antibody detection values for the different assays according to the**
178 **patient population and delay from symptom onset.**

179 Each dot represents the value obtained with each serological assay. The assays' results are
180 presented according to the targeted antigens : S1 or S1+peptide ((A) Diasorin Liaison®, (B)
181 bioMérieux Vidas®); Receptor Binding Domain ((C) Siemens Atellica®, (D) Wantai); or N
182 protein ((E) Abbott Architect, (F) Roche Elecsys Cobas®, (G) Biorad Platelia, (H) Epitope
183 Diagnostics EDI™). Results are expressed as a ratio of the sample signal to cut-off for all
184 tests except the EDI™ assay which is expressed in optical density and the Diasorin Liaison®
185 allowing the quantification of the antibodies in arbitrary units (AU/mL). Detection limit for
186 each test is shown with a discontinued line. Black or red dots are used for samples from
187 health care workers (HCW) or hospitalized (Hosp) patients respectively.

188

Table 1: Product description of the compared automated commercial antibody detection assays

Manufacturer assay name	DiaSorin Liaison®	bioMérieux Vidas®	Siemens Atellica®	Wantai	Abbott Architect	Roche Elecsys	BioRad Platelia	Epitope Diagnostics EDI™
Antibody detected	IgG	IgG	Total Ig	Total Ig	IgG	Total Ig	Total Ig	IgG
recombinant labeled protein	S1+S2	S1 + peptide	RBD	RBD	N	N	N	N
methodology	indirect CLIA (2 steps)	Sandwich ELFA (2 steps)	Sandwich CLIA (1 step)	Sandwich ELISA	indirect CMIA (2 steps)	Sandwich ECLIA (2 steps)	Sandwich ELISA (1 step)	Indirect ELISA (2 steps)
specimen type	serum/plasma	serum/plasma	serum/plasma	serum/plasma	serum/plasma	serum/plasma	serum/plasma	serum/plasma
sample volume	20 µL	100 µL	50 µL	100 µL	25 µL	20 µL	10 µL	1 µL
instrument used	Liaison® XL	Vidas®	Atellica®	manual or automated ELISA instrument	Architect	Cobas®	manual or automated ELISA instrument	manual or automated ELISA instrument
turnaround time	35 min	27 min	15 min	1.5 h	29 min	18 min	2 h	2 h
cutoff calculation basis	calibrator	standard	calibrator	negative control (min 0.19)	calibrator	calibrator	cut-off control (mean)	negative control (mean+0.18)
threshold	AU/mL; 12	ratio; 1	ratio; 1	ratio; 1.1	ratio; 1.4	ratio; 1	ratio; 1	≥ 1,1x (NC+0.18)
grey zone	>12 - <15	ND	ND	≥0.9 - ≤1.1	ND	ND	≥ 0.8 - < 1	≥ 0.9x (NC+0.18) < 1.1x (NC+0.18)
measuring interval	3.8 - 400		upper limit: 10				upper limit 3.5	
reported sensitivity: days from symptoms (number): %	≤ 5 (44): 25.0% 5-15 (52): 90.4% ≥16 (39): 97.4%	≤7 (117): 45.3% 8-15 (44): 88.6% ≥16 (29): 96,6%	<7 (89): 60.7% 7-13 (116): 97.5% ≥14 (42): 100%	94.5 %	<3 (5): 0% 3-7 (10): 50% 8-13 (34): 91.2% ≥14 (73): 100%	<7 (116): 65.5% 7-13 (59): 88.1% ≥14 (29): 100%	≤8 (8): 73% >8 (39): 97.4%	100 %
reported specificity	98.5 %	100 %	99.8 %	100 %	99.6 %	99.8 %	99.6 %	100 %

RBD: Receptor Binding Domain, CLIA: ChemiLuminescence ImmunoAssay, ELFA: Enzyme Linked Fluorescent Assay, CMIA: Chemiluminescence Microparticle ImmunoAssay, ECLIA: ElectroChemiLuminescence ImmunoAssay, ND: not determined

Characteristics of the commercial antibody detection assays classified according to the targeted antigen and the class of antibodies detected. The technical details of the assay as well of the sensitivity and specificity data reported by the manufacturer are listed.

Table 2: Positivity rate of each assay according to the delay from onset of symptoms

Days from symptom onset (N)	DiaSorin Liaison®	bioMérieux Vidas®	Siemens Atellica®	Wantai	Abbott Architect	Roche Elecsys	BioRad Platelia	Epitope Diagnostics EDI™
≤ 15 (16)	56.3%	81.3%	73.3%	100%	62.5%	68.8%	80%	81.3%
16 – 20 (21)	71.4%	90.5%	81%	95%	95.2%	85.7%	90.5%	100%
> 20 (45)	77.8%	90.7%	88.6%	97.6%	95.6%	88.9%	86.7%	95.3%

Percentage of antibody detection was expressed for each assay according to the delay expressed in days from symptom onset.

Table 3: Concordance between each assay

	DiaSorin Liaison®	bioMérieux Vidas®	Siemens Atellica®	Wantai	Abbott Architect	Roche Elecys	BioRad Platelia	Epitope Diagnostics EDI™
DiaSorin Liaison®	100%	80% (80)	82.5% (80)	72.7% (77)	78.05% (82)	80.5% (82)	81.5% (81)	74.7% (79)
bioMérieux Vidas®	80% (80)	100%	94.9% (78)	90.7% (75)	90% (80)	87.5% (80)	87.3% (79)	89.6% (77)
Siemens Atellica®	82.5% (80)	94.9% (78)	100%	85.3% (75)	86.1% (79)	87.3% (79)	82.5% (80)	84.2% (76)
Wantai	72.7% (77)	90.7% (75)	85.3% (75)	100%	90.9% (77)	87% (77)	89.5% (76)	93.5% (77)
Abbott Architect	78.05% (82)	90% (80)	86.1% (79)	90.9% (77)	100%	92.7% (82)	88.9% (81)	89.9% (79)
Roche Elecys	80.5% (82)	87.5% (80)	87.3% (79)	87% (77)	92.7% (82)	100%	90.1% (81)	84.8% (79)
BioRad Platelia	81.5% (81)	87.3% (79)	82.5% (80)	89.5% (76)	88.9% (81)	90.1% (81)	100%	87.2% (78)
Epitope Diagnostics EDI™	74.7% (79)	89.6% (77)	84.2% (76)	93.5% (77)	89.9% (79)	84.8% (79)	87.2% (78)	100%

We compared assays by pairs. Considering only the samples tested with both assays (N), we considered as concordant the samples for which antibodies were detected positive or detected negative by both assays; when one assay gave a positive value whereas the other gave a negative value, the sample result was considered as discordant between the assays.

Concordance was expressed as a percentage of samples detected positive or negative by the two considered assays.

Data are repeated for horizontal or vertical reading. Light grey boxes correspond to the comparison of tests detecting different viral proteins