1	Evaluation of a Commercial Culture-free Neutralization Antibody Detection Kit for
2	Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome-Related Coronavirus-2 and Comparison with an
3	Anti-RBD ELISA Assay
4	Jesse Papenburg MD MSc ^{a,b,c,d†} , Matthew P. Cheng MDCM ^{b,c,e†} , Rachel Corsini MSc ^c ,
5	Chelsea Caya MScPH ^c , Emelissa Mendoza ^f , Kathy Manguiat ^f , L. Robbin Lindsay ^f ,
6	Heidi Wood ^f , Michael A. Drebot ^f , Antonia Dibernardo ^f , Gerasimos Zaharatos ^{b,c} , Reneée
7	Bazin PhD ^g , Romain Gasser PhD ^{h,i} , Mehdi Benlarbi ⁱ , Gabrielle Gendron-Lepage ⁱ ,
8	Guillaume Beaudoin-Bussières BSc ^{h,i} , Jérémie Prévost BSc ^{h,i} , Andrés Finzi PhD ^{h,i} ,
9	Momar Ndao DVM PhD ^{c,j,k} , Cedric P Yansouni MD ^{b,c,e,k#}
10	^a Division of Pediatric Infectious Diseases, Department of Pediatrics, Montreal Children's
11	Hospital, Montreal, Quebec, Canada
12	^b Division of Microbiology, Department of Clinical Laboratory Medicine, Optilab Montreal
13	- McGill University Health Centre, Montreal, Quebec, Canada
14	^c McGill Interdisciplinary Initiative in Infection and Immunity, Montreal, Quebec, Canada
15	^d Department of Epidemiology, Biostatistics, and Occupational Health, School of Population
16	and Global Health, McGill University, Montreal, Quebec, Canada
17	^e Division of Infectious Diseases, Department of Medicine, McGill University Health Centre,
18	Montreal, Quebec, Canada
19 20	^f Zoonotic Diseases and Special Pathogens, National Microbiology Laboratory, Public Health
20	Agency of Canada, winnipeg, Mantoba, Canada
21	^g Affaires Médicales et Innovation, Héma-Québec, Quebec, Quebec, Canada

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

- 22 ^hDépartement de Microbiologie, Infectiologie et Immunologie, Université de Montréal,
- 23 Montreal, Quebec, Canada
- 24 ⁱCentre de Recherche du CHUM, Montreal, Quebec, Canada
- 25 ^jNational Reference Centre for Parasitology, Montreal, Quebec, Canada
- ²⁶ ^kJ.D. MacLean Centre for Tropical Diseases, McGill University, Montreal, Quebec, Canada
- 27 [†] These authors contributed equally to this manuscript
- 28 Running Title: Evaluation of cPass SARS-CoV-2 assay
- Tables: 2
- 30 Figures: 4
- 31 Word count text: 3119
- 32 Word count abstract: 219

33 Funding

34	C.P.Y and J. Papenburg hold a "Chercheur-boursier clinicien" career award from the Fonds de
35	recherche du Québec - Santé (FRQS). This work was partially supported by le Ministère de
36	l'Économie et de l'Innovation du Québec (Program de soutien aux organismes de recherche et
37	d'innovation), by the Fondation du CHUM, and by the Canadian Institutes of Health Research
38	(via the COVID-19 Immunity Task Force) to A.F. A.F. is the recipient of a Canada Research
39	Chair on Retroviral Entry (RCHS0235 950-232424). G.B.B, and J. Prévost are supported by
40	CIHR fellowships. R.G. is supported by a MITACS Accélération postdoctoral fellowship.
41	cPass kits were provided in kind by Genscript.
42	The funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or
43	preparation of the manuscript.
44	
15	Potential conflicts of interest

45 *Potential conflicts of interest*

J. Papenburg reports grants from MedImmune, grants from Sanofi Pasteur, grants and personal fees
from Seegene, grants and personal fees from Janssen Pharmaceutical, grants and personal fees from
AbbVie, outside the submitted work. MPC reports personal fees from GEn1E Lifesciences (as a
member of the scientific advisory board) and personal fees from nplex biosciences (as a member of
the scientific advisory board), both outside the submitted work.

51

52 #Correspondence to:

53 Cédric Yansouni, MD, J.D. MacLean Centre for Tropical Diseases, Divisions of Infectious

54 Diseases and Medical Microbiology, McGill University Health Centre, 1001 Décarie Blvd.,

55 Room EM3.3242, Montreal, Qc., Canada H4A 3J1, Email: cedric.yansouni@mcgill.ca

56 ABSTRACT

57 Background: SARS-CoV-2 surrogate neutralization assays that obviate the need for viral 58 culture offer substantial advantages regarding throughput and cost. The cPass SARS-CoV-2 59 Neutralization Antibody Detection Kit (Genscript) is the first such commercially available assay, detecting antibodies that block RBD/ACE-2 interaction. We aimed to evaluate cPass to 60 61 inform its use and assess its added value compared to anti-RBD ELISA assays. Methods: Serum reference panels comprising 205 specimens were used to compare cPass to 62 63 plaque-reduction neutralization test (PRNT) and a pseudotyped lentiviral neutralization 64 (PLV) assay for detection of neutralizing antibodies. We assessed the correlation of cPass 65 with an ELISA detecting anti-RBD IgG, IgM, and IgA antibodies at a single timepoint and 66 across intervals from onset of symptoms of SARS-CoV-2 infection. Results: Compared to PRNT-50, cPass sensitivity ranged from 77% - 100% and specificity 67 68 was 95% - 100%. Sensitivity was also high compared to the pseudotyped lentiviral 69 neutralization assay (93% [95%CI 85-97]), but specificity was lower (58% [95%CI 48-67]). 70 Highest agreement between cPass and ELISA was for anti-RBD IgG (r=0.823). Against the 71 pseudotyped lentiviral neutralization assay, anti-RBD IgG sensitivity (99% [95%CI 94-100]) 72 was very similar to that of cPass, but overall specificity was lower (37% [95%CI 28-47]). 73 Against PRNT-50, results of cPass and anti-RBD IgG were nearly identical. 74 **Conclusions**: The added value of cPass compared to an IgG anti-RBD ELISA was modest. 75

- 76 Key Words: "SARS-CoV-2", "COVID-19", "Diagnosis", "Serology", "ELISA",
- 77 "Neutralization Test", "Neutralizing Antibodies", "Immunity"
- 78

79 INTRODUCTION

Use cases for serological testing for prior exposure to *Severe acute respiratory syndrome-related coronavirus-2* (SARS-CoV-2) have been reviewed in detail (1, 2). Despite a rapid increase in the number and availability of serological assays detecting SARS-CoV-2 antibodies, critical knowledge gaps remain regarding the magnitude and kinetics of the correlation between results of these assays and the presence of neutralizing antibodies.

85 Only a subset of antibodies against a specific antigen can neutralize viral replication. Assays that measure neutralizing antibody levels, such as plaque reduction neutralization 86 87 tests (PRNT) and microneutralization methods, provide essential data; these assays can help validate candidate diagnostic tests and define serological correlates of immunity. However, 88 89 functional cell-based assays of SARS-CoV-2 neutralization can only be performed in a Biosafety Level 3 (BSL-3) laboratory, which is labour-intensive, costly, and severely limits 90 91 testing throughput. Pseudotyped viruses have been developed that incorporate the Spike 92 protein of SARS-CoV-2 and can be cultivated in BSL-2 conditions (3). Assays incorporating 93 such pseudotyped viruses provide a functional assessment of the host neutralizing antibody 94 responses as an alternative to using the wild-type virus (4-7). By contrast, surrogates of 95 neutralization that bypass the need for viral culture would offer substantial advantages in 96 terms of throughput, cost, and scalability. At least one direct ELISA assay detecting 97 antibodies to the whole Spike protein has received regulatory approval in Europe for 98 assessment of neutralizing antibodies (8). Further, several groups have proposed blocking 99 assays, leveraging different signal detection methods to quantify the presence of host 100 antibodies that can block the interaction of the SARS-CoV-2 Spike protein with human ACE-101 2 receptor (9-12).

102	On 6 Nov 2020, the FDA issued an emergency use authorization (EUA) for the cPass
103	SARS-CoV-2 Neutralization Antibody Detection Kit (cPass; Genscript, Piscataway, NJ)(13),
104	which is the first such surrogate neutralization assay to be commercially available. The cPass
105	uses a blocking ELISA format with human ACE-2 receptor molecules coated on an ELISA
106	plate (9, 14). Human sera pre-incubated with labelled epitopes of the receptor binding
107	domain (RBD on S1 proteins) are then transferred to the plate. This blocking ELISA serves
108	as a surrogate assay to inform on the capacity of human sera to block the interaction between
109	the Spike fusion protein (through its RBD) and its cellular receptor ACE-2.
110	The objective of this study was to inform the use of the cPass and assess its added
111	value compared to laboratory-developed anti-RBD ELISA assays by performing an
112	evaluation using a variety of well characterised specimens. A number of reference panels
113	were utilized to better understand the ability of the cPass assay to detect significant titres of
114	neutralizing antibodies assessed by culture-based reference methods. We compared cPass to
115	PRNT and to a pseudotyped virus neutralization assay. We also sought to describe the
116	correlation of cPass with a laboratory-developed indirect ELISA detecting anti-RBD IgG,
117	IgM, and IgA antibodies at a single timepoint and across different timeframes among
118	specimens collected at a known interval from onset of symptoms of SARS-CoV-2 infection.

119 METHODS

120 Ethics

121 Research ethics board approval or exemption was obtained at all participating122 institutions.

123 Source of specimens tested

124 We assembled several well-characterised SARS-CoV-2 serological specimen panels to 125 assess the performance characteristics of the cPass culture-free neutralization antibody 126 detection kit (Table 1). These panels included: a first panel from the Public Health Agency of 127 Canada's National Microbiology Laboratory comprising serological samples from COVID-128 19 patients, healthy individuals, as well as patients non-SARS-CoV-2 infections (NML panel 129 1; Supplemental Table 1); NML Panel 2 (the National SARS-CoV2 Serological Panel 130 (NSSP)), comprising 60 serum or plasma specimens from persons with prior SARS-CoV-2 infection documented by nucleic acid amplification testing (NAAT) and 21 specimens from 131 132 healthy blood donors collected in Canada prior to July 2019; the World Health 133 Organization's "First WHO International Reference Panel for anti-SARS-CoV-2 134 immunoglobulin" (NIBSC code 20/268) (15); and two separate curated panels from Héma-135 Québec and CR-CHUM. The later panels comprised convalescent plasma donors (confirmed 136 SARS-CoV-2 infection and complete resolution of symptoms for at least 14 days) with either 137 single timepoint or longitudinal follow-up. In addition to panels using neutralization assays as 138 the reference standard, we assembled 136 specimens from healthy blood donors who tested 139 negative for the presence of anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibodies by both a lab-developed anti-RBD 140 IgG ELISA and a commercial assay detecting anti-nucleocapsid antibodies (Abbott Architect 141 SARS-CoV-2 IgG Assay). These specimens, collected between 25 May and 9 July 2020,

142 were acquired to help assess the ability of the cPass assay to detect specimens that test

143 negative by other serological methods.

144 Culture-free neutralization antibody detection assay (cPass)

All specimens and controls were processed according to the manufacturer's instructions (including a 10X dilution factor of the primary specimen) and were tested in triplicate. The percentage of inhibition calculation was based on the mean of OD for each triplicate. A cut-off of 30% inhibition of RBD-ACE2 binding was used to determine the presence of neutralizing antibodies, based on the manufacturer's instructions for use.

150 Detection of neutralizing antibodies by culture-based reference methods

Neutralizing antibodies were detected via either assessment of plaque reduction
neutralization titres using wild-type SARS-CoV-2, or by determining the neutralization halfmaximal inhibitory dilution (PLV ID50) or the neutralization 80% inhibitory dilution (PLV
ID80) of pseudotyped lentiviral vector (16).

155 Assessment of plaque-reduction neutralization using wild-type SARS-CoV-2 was performed at the Public Health Agency of Canada's National Reference Laboratory for 156 157 Microbiology. Briefly, serological specimens were diluted 2-fold from 1:20 to 1:640 in 158 DMEM supplemented with 2% FBS and challenged with 50 plaque forming units (PFU) of 159 SARS-CoV-2 (hCoV-19/Canada/ON ON-VIDO-01-2/2020, EPI -ISL 425177), which were 160 titrated by plaque assay (17). After 1 hour of incubation at 37°C and 5% CO2, the sera-virus 161 mixtures were added to 12-well plates containing Vero E6 cells at 90% to 100% confluence 162 and incubated at 37°C and 5% CO2 for 1 hour. After adsorption, a liquid overlay comprising 163 1.5% carboxymethylcellulose diluted in MEM supplemented with 4% FBS, L-glutamine, 164 non-essential amino acids, and sodium bicarbonate was added to each well and plates were

incubated at 37°C and 5% CO2 for 72 hours. The liquid overlay was removed, and cells were
fixed with 10% neutral-buffered formalin for 1 hour at room temperature. The monolayers
were stained with 0.5% crystal violet for 10 minutes and washed with 20% ethanol. Plaques
were enumerated and compared to controls. The highest serum dilution resulting in 50% and
90% reduction in plaques compared with controls were defined as the PRNT-50 and PRNT90 endpoint titres, respectively. PRNT-50 titres and PRNT-90 titres ≥1:20 were considered
positive for SARS-CoV-2 neutralizing antibodies.

172 Pseudoviral neutralization testing was performed as previously described (16). 173 Briefly, target cells were infected with single-round luciferase-expressing lentiviral particles. 174 HEK 293T cells were transfected by the calcium phosphate method with the lentiviral vector 175 pNL4.3 R-E- Luc (NIH AIDS Reagent Program) and a plasmid encoding for SARS- CoV-2 176 Spike at a ratio of 5:4. Two days post-transfection, cell supernatants were harvested and stored at -80° C until use. 293T-ACE2 target cells were seeded at a density of 1 x 10^{4} 177 178 cells/well in 96-well luminometer-compatible tissue culture plates (Perkin Elmer) 24h before 179 infection. Recombinant viruses in a final volume of 100 µL were incubated with the indicated 180 sera dilutions (1/50; 1/250; 1/1250; 1/6250; 1/31250) for 1h at 37°C and were then added to 181 the target cells followed by incubation for 48h at 37°C; cells were lysed by the addition of 30 uL of passive lysis buffer (Promega) followed by one freeze-thaw cycle. An LB942 TriStar 182 183 luminometer (Berthold Technologies) was used to measure the luciferase activity of each 184 well after the addition of 100 µL of luciferin buffer (15mM MgSO₄, 15mM KPO₄ [pH 7.8], 185 1mM ATP, and 1mM dithiothreitol) and 50 µL of 1mM d-luciferin potassium salt (ThermoFisher Scientific). The neutralization half-maximal inhibitory dilution (ID50) or the 186 187 neutralization 80% inhibitory dilution (ID80) represents the sera dilution to inhibit 50% or 188 80% of the infection of 293T-ACE2 cells by recombinant viruses bearing the indicated 189 surface glycoproteins.

190 Indirect anti-RBD ELISA assays

Specimens were analysed with a laboratory-developed indirect ELISA detecting anti-RBD IgG, IgM, and IgA as previously described (16, 18).

193 Statistical analysis

194 The diagnostic accuracy of the cPass surrogate viral neutralization assay was 195 estimated compared to different reference standards (WT PRNT-50; WT PRNT-90; PLV ID50; PLV ID80, Live Virus (CPE), and VSV-PV). Sensitivities and specificities are 196 197 presented with 95% confidence intervals (95% CI). The effect of varying the cut-off value 198 (i.e., % inhibition of RBD-ACE2 binding) for cPass positivity on the diagnostic accuracy of 199 the cPass against a PLV PRNT-50 reference standard was investigated using a receiver 200 operating characteristic (ROC) curve. The association between cPass % inhibition and results 201 obtained using laboratory-developed ELISA detecting anti-S-RBD IgG, IgM, and IgA are 202 presented in scatterplots with the strength of these associations informed by Pearson 203 correlation. Lastly, among specimens from individuals with a known interval from onset of 204 SARS-CoV-2 infection symptoms and repeated testing over time, spaghetti plots were 205 created to investigate any change in signal over time for the cPass and direct anti-S-RBD 206 ELISA with statistical significance assessed using the Wilcoxon matched-pairs signed-rank 207 test (p<0.05 denoted by *). Statistical analyses were performed using R version 3.5.2 (R Core 208 Team, Vienna, Austria).

209

210 **RESULTS**

Diagnostic accuracy for the detection of anti-SARS-CoV-2 neutralizing antibodies, and
 the impact of using different reference standards

Table 1 shows the estimated diagnostic accuracy of the GenScript cPass neutralization antibody detection assay among well characterised specimen panels, according to different reference standards. Among various reference standards, results from the same PLV ID50 assay were available for all panels except the WHO panel, and this was used to estimate aggregate diagnostic accuracy values across several panels.

- 218 Overall, cPass had sensitivity ranging 77% - 100% and specificity of 95% - 100% 219 compared to the reference standard of a 50% plaque reduction neutralization using SARS-CoV-2 viral culture (WT PRNT-50) (Table 1). Changing the WT PRNT-50 cut-off titre from 220 221 1:20 to 1:50 had minimal impact on specimen categorization. Sensitivity remained very high 222 compared to the reference standard of a neutralization half-maximal inhibitory dilution using 223 a validated pseudotyped lentiviral vector neutralization assay (PLV ID50) with a cut-off titre 224 of 1:50, but specificity was lower than that compared to WT PRNT-50, ranging from 17-70% 225 (Table 1).
- The effect of cut-off values on the diagnostic accuracy of the GenScript cPass assay is shown in Figure 1. A receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curve using the reference standard of PLV ID50 yielded an area under the ROC curve of 0.858.

229 Effect of serial dilution on the accuracy for detecting sera with positive PRNT-90 titres

Against the most stringent reference standard of 90% plaque reduction neutralization

using SARS-CoV-2 viral culture (WT PRNT-90), estimated specificity was reduced

compared to WT PRNT-50. Specificity remained similar whether a cut-off WT PRNT-90

titre for positivity of 1:20 or 1:50 was used [61% (95%CI 42-77) and 57% (95%CI 39-74),

respectively] (Table 1). We performed serial dilution of the 16 primary specimens from the

235 National Microbiology Laboratory Panel with WT PRNT-50 titres ≥1:20 to determine

236 whether we could establish a dilution that increased specificity for detecting those with WT

PRNT-90 titres ≥1:20 without sacrificing sensitivity (Figure 2). A 50-fold dilution of
specimens with positive WT PRNT-50 titres increased specificity for those with positive WT
PRNT-90 titres from 11% (95%CI 0-48) to 100% (95%CI 66-100), with one missed PRNT90 positive specimen.

Agreement of the GenScript cPass assay with laboratory-developed ELISA detecting anti-RBD IgG, IgM, and IgA.

243 Results obtained with cPass were compared to those obtained using laboratory-

244 developed ELISA detecting anti-RBD IgG, IgM, and IgA to assess whether the cPass yields

245 complementary information (Figure 3). Highest agreement between cPass percent inhibition

of RBD-ACE2 binding and ELISA readout was seen for anti-RBD IgG (Pearson correlation

247 coefficitient r=0.823), compared to that observed with anti-RBD IgM and IgA (r=0.505 and

248 0.489, respectively). The diagnostic accuracy of categorical anti-RBD IgG results for the

249 detection of SARS-CoV-2 neutralizing antibodies was very similar to that observed with the

250 cPass for most panels and reference standards (Tables 1 and 2). Compared to PLV ID50,

251 cPass overall sensitivity was 93% [95% CI 85-97] and specificity 58% [95% CI 48-67],

whereas anti-RBD IgG overall sensitivity was 99% [95% CI 94-100] and specificity 37%

253 [95% CI 28-47].

However, when NML panel 2 was considered in isolation, categorical results for the
detection of SARS-CoV-2 neutralizing antibodies differed substantially between cPass and
anti-RBD IgG in terms of sensitivity compared to WT PRNT-50 (cPass 77% [95% CI 64-87],
anti-RBD IgG 98% [95% CI 91-100]) and specificity compared to PLV ID50 (cPass 61%
[95% CI 47-74], anti-RBD IgG 39% [95% CI 26-53]). If a cut-off of 20% RBD-ACE2
binding inhibition were used instead of the 30% cut-off recommended by the manufacturer,

cPass sensitivity against WT PRNT-50 would rise to 92% [95% CI 82-97] with a lower
estimated specificity of 46% [95% CI 33-60].

- Among paired specimens from the same individual collected at a known interval from
- 263 SARS-CoV-2 diagnosis, aggregate results of both cPass and direct anti-RBD IgG ELISA did
- not change between 6 weeks and 10 weeks after diagnosis (p=1.00 and 0.104, respectively,
- by the Wilcoxon signed rank test) (Figure 4). In contrast, ELISA readouts decreased
- significantly over the same timeframe for direct anti-RBD IgM (p=0.0058) and IgA
- 267 (p=0.0012).

268 Negative agreement between cPass and other serological assays.

- Among 136 specimens from healthy blood donors who tested negative for the presence
- of anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibodies by both a lab-developed anti-RBD IgG ELISA and the
- 271 Abbott Architect SARS-CoV-2 IgG Assay (anti-N protein), cPass yielded negative results for
- 272 134 specimens (negative agreement 98.5% [95% CI 94.8 99.8]).

273 DISCUSSION

274	Rapid and high throughput surrogates for PRNT or pseudovirus neutralization assays
275	that bypass the need for cell culture are awaited with the belief that they will offer additional
276	information to that from standard direct immunoassays, such as a higher specificity for
277	neutralizing antibodies. The cPass SARS-CoV-2 Neutralization Antibody Detection Kit
278	(cPass) is the first such assay to be commercially available and to receive FDA EUA in the
279	U.S. An evaluation of a cPass prototype, using a cut-off value of 20% inhibition, found that it
280	could provide a high-throughput screening tool for confirmatory PRNT testing (19). The
281	results of the current evaluation support the ability for cPass to detect neutralizing antibodies
282	to SARS-CoV-2, although specificity varied considerably depending on the reference assay
283	used. Our data also extend these findings by showing that cPass performed similarly to a non-
284	blocking anti-RBD ELISA among varied well characterised specimen panels.

285 Among 205 specimens evaluated by a SARS-CoV-2 reference neutralization assay in 286 the current work - either WT PRNT-50 or PLV ID50 - the overall estimated sensitivity of 287 cPass for detection of anti-SARS-CoV-2 neutralizing antibodies was high, regardless of the 288 reference standard technique or reference standard cut-off titre for positivity. The lower 289 sensitivity of cPass compared to WT PRNT-50 observed for specimens in NML panel 2 290 (Table 1) appears related to the choice of 30% RBD-ACE2 binding inhibition cut-off 291 recommended by the manufacturer, which may result in false negative results for specimens 292 with low titres of neutralizing antibodies. Among all specimens evaluated, however, reducing 293 the inhibition cut-off to 20% would have a minimal impact on overall sensitivity and yield 294 substantial reduction in overall specificity compared to PLV-50 (Figure 1). Our results do not 295 suggest that the cPass assay, targeting only RBD-ACE2 blockade, would miss a substantial 296 proportion of patients with neutralizing antibodies that target non-RBD epitopes (20-22). This

297 may be because neutralizing antibodies to non-RBD epitopes usually occur concomitantly298 with anti-RDB neutralizing antibodies, instead of in isolation.

299 By contrast, estimates of the specificity of cPass for the detection of anti-SARS-CoV-300 2 neutralizing antibodies were contingent of the reference standard used (Table 1). There was 301 near-perfect negative agreement with WT PRNT-50 using a cut-off titre of either 1:20 or 302 1:50. However, negative agreement was much lower when cPass was compared to either 303 PLV ID50 or WT PRNT-90. Our data raise the unresolved questions of which reference 304 technique (i.e., wild-type or pseudotyped live viral culture), level of stringency (e.g., 50% 305 inhibition of infection vs 80%, 90%, etc), and cut-off titre (e.g., 1:20 vs 1:50) best represent 306 serocorrelates of protection to SARS-CoV-2, or other relevant applications. Moreover, 307 protocols can vary widely for the same technique across different laboratories, requiring 308 caution in the interpretation of these and other data (23). In the current manuscript, PLV ID50 309 with a cut-off titre of 1:50 was used as the overall comparator because it was the technique 310 applied to all available specimen panels except the 5-member panel from WHO. Our results 311 must be interpreted in context with this potential source of bias. However, we note that this 312 technique has been employed by other groups and thus offers a high degree of 313 generalizability with other results (24, 25).

The cPass assay detected all specimens with positive WT PRNT-90 titres, with a significant proportion of false positives (Figure 2). A 50-fold dilution of the 16 primary specimens with WT PRNT-50 titres \geq 1:20 increased specificity for detecting those with WT PRNT-90 titres \geq 1:20 from 11% (95% CI 0-48) to 100% (95% CI 66-100). This may represent a useful approach for using the cPass assay to identify blood specimens with positive WT PRNT-90 titres, which has been proposed as a desirable characteristic for sera used in convalescent plasma trials by some regulatory agencies.

321 Finally, results of the cPass assay are best correlated with those of a laboratory-322 developed indirect anti-RBD ELISA detecting IgG, both at a single timepoint (Table 2, 323 Figure 3) and across time among paired specimens form the same individual collected at a 324 known interval from symptoms onset (Figure 4). However, a slightly higher specificity for 325 the detection of anti-SARS-CoV-2 neutralizing antibodies was observed for cPass compared 326 to anti-RBD IgG ELISA across most panels (Tables 1 and 2). The fact that results of cPass 327 and anti-RBD IgG remained stable between 6 and 10 weeks post-symptom onset, while 328 ELISA readouts decreased significantly over the same timeframe for anti-RBD IgM and IgA 329 is potentially concerning given recent work suggesting a major role of IgM and IgA in the 330 neutralizing activity of convalescent plasma against SARS-CoV-2 (18, 26-28). The observed 331 trend toward lower specificity of cPass at later timepoints among convalescent plasma donors 332 with longitudinal follow-up (i.e. [60% (95% CI 15-95)] at 6 weeks vs [17% (95% CI 0-64)] at 333 10 weeks) may thus be related to loss of neutralizing IgM (Table 1). Taken together, these 334 results suggest that a positive cPass result in the context of a remote infection may not 335 accurately predict the presence of neutralizing antibodies. In addition, specificity of the cPass 336 may be affected by the possibility that part of the inhibition of binding in the cPass assay 337 could be due to steric hindrance by the abundant anti-Spike antibodies of the IgG isotype 338 rather than by true neutralization (as occurs in vivo).

339

340 CONCLUSIONS

The results of the current evaluation demonstrate the ability of cPass to detect blood
specimens with anti-SARS-CoV-2 neutralizing antibodies. However, the added value of
cPass compared to an IgG anti-RBD ELISA was modest.

344 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

- 345 We thank the convalescent plasma donors who participated in this study; the Héma-
- 346 Québec team involved in convalescent donor recruitment and plasma collection; the staff
- 347 members of the CRCHUM BSL3 Platform for technical assistance; Stefan Pöhlmann (Georg-
- 348 August University, Germany) for the plasmid coding for SARS-CoV-2 S.

349 **REFERENCES**

- 1. Cheng MP, Yansouni CP, Basta NE, Desjardins M, Kanjilal S, Paquette K, Caya C,
- 352 Semret M, Quach C, Libman M, Mazzola L, Sacks JA, Dittrich S, Papenburg J. 2020.
- 353 Serodiagnostics for Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome-Related Coronavirus 2 : A
- 354 Narrative Review. Ann Intern Med 173:450-460.
- 2. Van Caeseele P, Bailey D, Forgie SE, Dingle TC, Krajden M. 2020. SARS-CoV-2
- 356 (COVID-19) serology: implications for clinical practice, laboratory medicine and
- 357 public health. Cmaj 192:E973-e979.
- 358 3. Crawford KHD, Eguia R, Dingens AS, Loes AN, Malone KD, Wolf CR, Chu HY,
- 359 Tortorici MA, Veesler D, Murphy M, Pettie D, King NP, Balazs AB, Bloom JD.
- 3602020. Protocol and Reagents for Pseudotyping Lentiviral Particles with SARS-CoV-2
- 361 Spike Protein for Neutralization Assays. Viruses 12.
- 362 4. Nie J, Li Q, Wu J, Zhao C, Hao H, Liu H, Zhang L, Nie L, Qin H, Wang M, Lu Q, Li
- 363 X, Sun Q, Liu J, Fan C, Huang W, Xu M, Wang Y. 2020. Establishment and
- validation of a pseudovirus neutralization assay for SARS-CoV-2. Emerg Microbes
 Lufact 0x680 686
- **365** Infect 9:680-686.
- 366 5. Amanat F, Stadlbauer D, Strohmeier S, Nguyen THO, Chromikova V, McMahon M,
- 367 Jiang K, Arunkumar GA, Jurczyszak D, Polanco J, Bermudez-Gonzalez M, Kleiner
- 368 G, Aydillo T, Miorin L, Fierer DS, Lugo LA, Kojic EM, Stoever J, Liu STH,
- 369 Cunningham-Rundles C, Felgner PL, Moran T, García-Sastre A, Caplivski D, Cheng
- 370 AC, Kedzierska K, Vapalahti O, Hepojoki JM, Simon V, Krammer F. 2020. A
- 371 serological assay to detect SARS-CoV-2 seroconversion in humans. Nat Med
- **372 26**:1033-1036.

- 3736.Li Q, Liu Q, Huang W, Li X, Wang Y. 2018. Current status on the development of
- 374 pseudoviruses for enveloped viruses. Rev Med Virol 28.
- 375 7. Hyseni I, Molesti E, Benincasa L, Piu P, Casa E, Temperton NJ, Manenti A,
- 376 Montomoli E. 2020. Characterisation of SARS-CoV-2 Lentiviral Pseudotypes and
- 377 Correlation between Pseudotype-Based Neutralisation Assays and Live Virus-Based
- 378 Micro Neutralisation Assays. Viruses 12.
- BiaSorin S.p.A. 2020. Liaison(R) SARS-CoV-2 S1/S2 IgG Brochure -A quantitative
 assay with correlation to neutralizaing antibodies.6.
- 381 9. Tan CW, Chia WN, Qin X, Liu P, Chen MI, Tiu C, Hu Z, Chen VC, Young BE, Sia
- 382 WR, Tan YJ, Foo R, Yi Y, Lye DC, Anderson DE, Wang LF. 2020. A SARS-CoV-2
- 383 surrogate virus neutralization test based on antibody-mediated blockage of ACE2-

384 spike protein-protein interaction. Nat Biotechnol 38:1073-1078.

- 385 10. Muruato AE, Fontes-Garfias CR, Ren P, Garcia-Blanco MA, Menachery VD, Xie X,
- 386 Shi PY. 2020. A high-throughput neutralizing antibody assay for COVID-19

diagnosis and vaccine evaluation. Nat Commun 11:4059.

- 388 11. Danh K, Karp DG, Robinson PV, Seftel D, Stone M, Simmons G, Bagri A,
- 389 Schreibman M, Buser A, Holbro A, Battegay M, Corash LM, Hanson C, Tsai CT.
- 3902020. Detection of SARS-CoV-2 neutralizing antibodies with a cell-free PCR assay.
- 391 medRxiv doi:10.1101/2020.05.28.20105692.
- 392 12. Abe KT, Li Z, Samson R, Samavarchi-Tehrani P, Valcourt EJ, Wood H, Budylowski
- 393 P, Dupuis AP, 2nd, Girardin RC, Rathod B, Wang JH, Barrios-Rodiles M, Colwill K,
- 394 McGeer AJ, Mubareka S, Gommerman JL, Durocher Y, Ostrowski M, McDonough
- 395 KA, Drebot MA, Drews SJ, Rini JM, Gingras AC. 2020. A simple protein-based
- 396 surrogate neutralization assay for SARS-CoV-2. JCI Insight 5.

- 13. U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA). 2020. Coronavirus (COVID-19) Update:
- FDA Authorizes First Test that Detects Neutralizing Antibodies from Recent or Prior
 SARS-CoV-2 Infection.
- 400 14. GenScript USA Inc. 2020. cPass(TM) SARS-CoV-2 Neutralization Antibody
- 401 Detection Kit -Instructions for use.18.
- 40215.The National Institute for Biological Standards and Control (NIBSC). 2020. First
- 403 WHO International Reference Panel for anti-SARS-CoV-2 immunoglobulin (NIBSC
 404 code: 20/268).2.
- 405 16. Prévost J, Gasser R, Beaudoin-Bussières G, Richard J, Duerr R, Laumaea A, Anand
- 406 SP, Goyette G, Benlarbi M, Ding S, Medjahed H, Lewin A, Perreault J, Tremblay T,
- 407 Gendron-Lepage G, Gauthier N, Carrier M, Marcoux D, Piché A, Lavoie M, Benoit
- 408 A, Loungnarath V, Brochu G, Haddad E, Stacey HD, Miller MS, Desforges M, Talbot
- 409 PJ, Maule GTG, Côté M, Therrien C, Serhir B, Bazin R, Roger M, Finzi A. 2020.
- 410 Cross-Sectional Evaluation of Humoral Responses against SARS-CoV-2 Spike. Cell
 411 Rep Med 1:100126.
- 412 17. Mendoza EJ, Manguiat K, Wood H, Drebot M. 2020. Two Detailed Plaque Assay
- 413 Protocols for the Quantification of Infectious SARS-CoV-2. Curr Protoc Microbiol
 414 57:ecpmc105.
- 415 18. Beaudoin-Bussières G, Laumaea A, Anand SP, Prévost J, Gasser R, Goyette G,
- 416 Medjahed H, Perreault J, Tremblay T, Lewin A, Gokool L, Morrisseau C, Bégin P,
- 417 Tremblay C, Martel-Laferrière V, Kaufmann DE, Richard J, Bazin R, Finzi A. 2020.
- 418 Decline of Humoral Responses against SARS-CoV-2 Spike in Convalescent
- 419 Individuals. mBio 11:e02590-20.
- 420 19. Valcourt EJ, Manguiat K, Robinson A, Chen JC, Dimitrova K, Philipson C,
- 421 Lamoureux L, McLachlan E, Schiffman Z, Drebot MA, Wood H. 2020. Evaluation of

422		a commercially-available surrogate virus neutralization test for severe acute
423		respiratory syndrome coronavirus-2 (SARS-CoV-2). Diagn Microbiol Infect Dis
424		99:115294.
425	20.	Voss WN, Hou YJ, Johnson NV, Kim JE, Delidakis G, Horton AP, Bartzoka F, Paresi
426		CJ, Tanno Y, Abbasi SA, Pickens W, George K, Boutz DR, Towers DM, McDaniel
427		JR, Billick D, Goike J, Rowe L, Batra D, Pohl J, Lee J, Gangappa S, Sambhara S,
428		Gadush M, Wang N, Person MD, Iverson BL, Gollihar JD, Dye J, Herbert A, Baric
429		RS, McLellan JS, Georgiou G, Lavinder JJ, Ippolito GC. 2020. Prevalent, protective,
430		and convergent IgG recognition of SARS-CoV-2 non-RBD spike epitopes in COVID-
431		19 convalescent plasma. bioRxiv doi:10.1101/2020.12.20.423708.
432	21.	Wec AZ, Wrapp D, Herbert AS, Maurer DP, Haslwanter D, Sakharkar M, Jangra RK,
433		Dieterle ME, Lilov A, Huang D, Tse LV, Johnson NV, Hsieh C-L, Wang N, Nett JH,
434		Champney E, Burnina I, Brown M, Lin S, Sinclair M, Johnson C, Pudi S, Bortz R,
435		3rd, Wirchnianski AS, Laudermilch E, Florez C, Fels JM, O'Brien CM, Graham BS,
436		Nemazee D, Burton DR, Baric RS, Voss JE, Chandran K, Dye JM, McLellan JS,
437		Walker LM. 2020. Broad neutralization of SARS-related viruses by human
438		monoclonal antibodies. Science (New York, NY) 369:731-736.
439	22.	Liu L, Wang P, Nair MS, Yu J, Rapp M, Wang Q, Luo Y, Chan JF, Sahi V, Figueroa
440		A, Guo XV, Cerutti G, Bimela J, Gorman J, Zhou T, Chen Z, Yuen KY, Kwong PD,
441		Sodroski JG, Yin MT, Sheng Z, Huang Y, Shapiro L, Ho DD. 2020. Potent
442		neutralizing antibodies against multiple epitopes on SARS-CoV-2 spike. Nature
443		584:450-456.
444	23.	Ferrara F, Temperton N. 2018. Pseudotype Neutralization Assays: From Laboratory
445		Bench to Data Analysis. Methods Protoc 1.

446	24.	Muecksch F, Wise H, Batchelor B, Squires M, Semple E, Richardson C, McGuire J,
447		Clearly S, Furrie E, Greig N, Hay G, Templeton K, Lorenzi JCC, Hatziioannou T,
448		Jenks S, Bieniasz PD. 2020. Longitudinal Serological Analysis and Neutralizing
449		Antibody Levels in Coronavirus Disease 2019 Convalescent Patients. The Journal of
450		Infectious Diseases doi:10.1093/infdis/jiaa659.
451	25.	Gaebler C, Wang Z, Lorenzi JCC, Muecksch F, Finkin S, Tokuyama M, Ladinsky M,
452		Cho A, Jankovic M, Schaefer-Babajew D, Oliveira TY, Cipolla M, Viant C, Barnes
453		CO, Hurley A, Turroja M, Gordon K, Millard KG, Ramos V, Schmidt F, Weisblum
454		Y, Jha D, Tankelevich M, Yee J, Shimeliovich I, Robbiani DF, Zhao Z, Gazumyan A,
455		Hatziioannou T, Bjorkman PJ, Mehandru S, Bieniasz PD, Caskey M, Nussenzweig
456		MC. 2020. Evolution of Antibody Immunity to SARS-CoV-2. bioRxiv
457		doi:10.1101/2020.11.03.367391:2020.11.03.367391.
458	26.	Gasser R, Cloutier M, Prévost J, Corby F, Ducas E, Ding S, Dussault N, Landry P,
459		Tremblay T, Laforce-Lavoie A, Lewin A, Beaudoin-Bussières G, Laumaea A,
460		Medjahed H, Larochelle C, Richard J, Dekaban G, Dikeakos J, Bazin R, Finzi A.
461		2020. Major role of IgM in the neutralizing activity of convalescent plasma against
462		SARS-CoV-2. Cell Rep, in press doi:https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.09.333278.
463	27.	Klingler J, Weiss S, Itri V, Liu X, Oguntuyo KY, Stevens C, Ikegame S, Hung CT,
464		Enyindah-Asonye G, Amanat F, Baine I, Arinsburg S, Bandres JC, Kojic EM, Stoever
465		J, Jurczyszak D, Bermudez-Gonzalez M, Nádas A, Liu S, Lee B, Zolla-Pazner S, Hioe
466		CE. 2020. Role of IgM and IgA Antibodies in the Neutralization of SARS-CoV-2. J
467		Infect Dis doi:10.1093/infdis/jiaa784.
468	28.	Sterlin D, Mathian A, Miyara M, Mohr A, Anna F, Claër L, Quentric P, Fadlallah J,
469		Devilliers H, Ghillani P, Gunn C, Hockett R, Mudumba S, Guihot A, Luyt CE,
470		Mayaux J, Beurton A, Fourati S, Bruel T, Schwartz O, Lacorte JM, Yssel H, Parizot

- 471 C, Dorgham K, Charneau P, Amoura Z, Gorochov G. 2020. IgA dominates the early
- 472 neutralizing antibody response to SARS-CoV-2. Sci Transl Med
- doi:10.1126/scitranslmed.abd2223.

475 TABLE 1. Diagnostic accuracy of the GenScript cPass surrogate viral neutralization assay to

- detect neutralizing antibodies among well-characterised specimen panels, according to 476
- 477 reference standard used

SOURCE	Number	Reference standard	Cut-off for reference positivity ^a	<u>TP</u>	<u>FP</u>	<u>FN</u>	<u>TN</u>	<u>Sensitivity</u> <u>%</u> (95% Cl)	<u>Specificity</u> <u>%</u> (95% CI)
National Microbiology Laboratory panel #1 (Canada)	20 SARS-CoV-2 PCR positive 20 negative for SARS-CoV-2 and positive for related infections	WT PRNT- 50	1:20	19	1	0	20	100 (82- 100)	95 (76- 100)
			1:50	18	2	0	20	100 (81- 100)	91 (71-99)
		WT PRNT- 90	1:20	7	13	0	20	100 (59- 100)	61 (42-77)
			1:50	5	15	0	20	100 (48- 100)	57 (39-74)
		PLV ID50	1:50	12	8	1	19	92 (64- 100)	70 (50-86)
		PLV ID80	1:50	10	10	0	20	100 (69- 100)	67 (47-83)
National Microbiology Laboratory panel #2 (Canada)	60 SARS-CoV-2 PCR positive 21 negative for SARS-CoV-2 and positive for related infections	WT PRNT- 50	1:20	46	0	14	21	77 (64-87)	100 (84- 100)
			1:50	45	1	13	22	78 (65-87)	96 (78- 100)
		PLV ID50	1:50	24	22	1	34	96 (80- 100)	61 (47-74)
WHO panel (UK)	3 SARS-CoV-2 positive 2 SARS-CoV-2 negative	WT PRNT- 50	1:20	2	1	0	2	100 (16- 100)	67 (9-99)
		Live Virus (CPE)	1:20	3	0	1	1	75 (19-99)	100 (3- 100)
		VSV-PV	1:20	3	0	0	2	100 (29- 100)	100 (16- 100)

HQ Blood bank -convalescent plasma donors with	Specimens characterised by anti-S-RBD ELISA and PLV ID50	PLV ID50	1:50	10	2	0	3	100 (69- 100)	60 (15-95)
follow-up ^b	15 Patients, 6 weeks post-symptom onset								
	Specimens characterised by anti-S-RBD ELISA and PLV ID50	PLV ID50	1:50	8	5	0	1	100 (63- 100)	17 (0-64)
	14 Patients, 10 weeks post- symptom onset								
HQ Blood bank -convalescent plasma donors with single timepoint	Specimens characterised by anti-S-RBD ELISA and PLV ID50	PLV ID50	1:50	24	12	4	10	86 (67-96)	45 (24-68)
follow-up ^b	50 Patients, any time post-symptom onset								
	0-6 weeks post-symptom onset			11	6	1	0	92 (62- 100)	0 (0-46)
	>6 weeks post-symptom onset			13	6	3	10	81 (54-96)	62 (35-85)
Overall (vs PLV ID50)°		PLV ID50	1:50	78	49	6	67	93 (85-97)	58 (48-67)

480 infection or an epidemiological link to a known case of COVID-19 (SARS CoV-2 infection).

481 ° Results from the same PLV ID50 neutralization assay were available for all panels except the WHO panel; PLV

482 ID50 assay was used to calculate overall diagnostic accuracy values.

483

478

479

484 WT PRNT-50 or PRNT-90 denotes neutralization titres required for a 50% or 90% plaque reduction, respectively,

485 using SARS-CoV-2 viral culture; PLV ID50 or PLV ID80 denotes the serum dilution to inhibit 50% or 80% of the

486 infection of 293T-ACE2 cells by recombinant viruses bearing the indicated surface glycoproteins; TP true

487 positive; FP false positive; FN false negative; TN true negative; Anti-S-RBD antibodies against receptor binding

488 domain of SARS-CoV-2 Spike protein; HQ Héma-Québec; WHO World Health Organization; VSV PV Vesicular

489 stomatitis virus pseudovirus; CPE cytopathic effect; NAAT nucleic acid amplification test.

490 **TABLE 2.** Diagnostic accuracy of a laboratory-developed IgG anti-RBD ELISA to detect

491 neutralizing antibodies

SOURCE	Number	Reference standard	Cut-off for positivity ^a	<u>TP</u>	<u>FP</u>	<u>FN</u>	<u>TN</u>	<u>Sensitivity</u>	<u>Specificity</u>
National Microbiology Laboratory panel #1 (Canada)	20 SARS-CoV-2 positive 20 negative for SARS-CoV-2 and positive for related infections	WT PRNT-50	1:20	19	1	0	20	100 (82- 100)	95 (76- 100)
			1:50	18	2	0	20	100 (81- 100)	91 (71-99)
		WT PRNT-90	1:20	7	13	0	20	100 (59- 100)	61 (42-77)
			1:50	5	15	0	20	100 (48- 100)	57 (39-74)
		PLV PRNT-50	1:50	12	8	1	19	92 (64- 100)	70 (50-86)
		PLV ID80	1:50	10	10	0	20	100 (69- 100)	67 (47-83)
National Microbiology Laboratory panel #2 (Canada)	60 SARS-CoV-2 PCR positive 21 negative for SARS-CoV-2 and positive for related infections	WT PRNT-50	1:20	59	0	1	21	98 (91- 100)	100 (84- 100)
			1:50	57	2	1	21	98 (91- 100)	91 (72-99)
		PLV ID50	1:50	25	34	0	22	100 (86- 100)	39 (26-53)

HQ Blood bank - convalescent plasma donors with longitudinal follow-up ^b	Specimens characterised by anti- S-RBD ELISA and PLV ID50 15 Patients, 6 weeks post-symptom onset	PLV ID50	1:50	10	3	0	2	100 (69- 100)	40 (5-85)
	Specimens characterised by anti- S-RBD ELISA and PLV ID50	PLV ID50	1:50	8	6	0	0	100 (63- 100)	0 (0-46)
	14 Patients, 10 weeks post- symptom onset								
HQ Blood bank - convalescent plasma donors with	Specimens characterised by anti- S-RBD ELISA and PLV ID50	PLV ID50	1:50	28	22	0	0	100 (88- 100)	0 (0-15)
single timepoint follow-up ^b	50 Patients, any time post-symptom onset								
	0-6 weeks post-symptom onset			12	6	0	0	100 (74- 100)	0 (0-46)
	>6 weeks post-symptom onset			16	16	0	0	100 (79- 100)	0 (0-21)
Overall (vs PLV ID50)			1:50	83	73	1	43	99 (94- 100)	37 (28-47)

493 ^a Cut-off used to determine IgG anti-RBD ELISA positivity was ≥4.335.

494

495 WT PRNT-50 or PRNT-90 denotes neutralization titres required for a 50% or 90% plaque reduction, respectively,

496 using SARS-CoV-2 viral culture; TP true positive; FP false positive; FN false negative; TN true negative; Anti-S-

497 RBD antibodies against receptor binding domain of SARS-CoV-2 Spike protein; HQ Héma-Québec; VSV PV

498 Vesicular stomatitis virus pseudovirus; CPE cytopathic effect.

499 **FIGURE LEGENDS**

- 500 Figure 1. Effect of cut-off values on the diagnostic accuracy of the Genscript cPass SARS-
- 501 CoV-2 neutralization antibody detection kit.
- 502 Panel (A) shows the receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curve, with different cPass cut-
- offs. Panel (B) details results and estimates of sensitivity and specificity for different 503
- 504 %inhibition of RBD-ACE2 binding cut-offs for cPass positivity. The reference standard used
- 505 is PLV PRNT 50 at a titre of $\geq 1:50$. The specimens from the WHO panel (n=5) are not
- 506 included in the above figure as PLV PRNT 50 was not performed, thereby resulting in a total
- 507 N of 200. AUC denotes Area Under the ROC Curve; TP true positive; FP false positive; FN
- 508 false negative; TN true negative.

509

- 510 Figure 2. Effect of serial dilution on the accuracy for detecting sera with positive PRNT90 511 titres.
- 512 Serial dilution of the 16 primary specimens with WT PRNT 50 titres \geq 1:20 was performed to establish a dilution that increased specificity for detecting those with WT PRNT 90 titres
- 513
- \geq 1:20. Panel (A) shows individual data points according to dilution and WT PRNT 90 status 514
- 515 (positive >1:20). Box plots depict the median and interguartile range. Panel (B) details results
- 516 and estimates of sensitivity and specificity for serial dilution factor. All dilution factors are
- 517 additional to the 10X dilution required in the manufacturer's instructions. WT PRNT 90
- 518 denotes neutralization titres required for a 90% plaque reduction using SARS-CoV-2 viral
- 519 culture; TP true positive; FP false positive; FN false negative; TN true negative.

- 521 Figure 3. Correlation of the Genscript cPass assay with anti-S-RBD ELISA.
- 522 Correlation of the Genscript cPass assay with the anti-S-RBD ELISA normalized relative
- luciferase units (RLU) for each plasma tested at a dilution (1:500) is presented. Scatterplots 523

524	and Pearson correlation coefficient for results obtained with cPass compared to those
525	obtained using laboratory-developed ELISA detecting anti-RBD IgG, IgM, and IgA (Panels
526	A, B, C, respectively). The vertical dashed line depicts the manufacturer's recommended cut-
527	off for cPass positivity. Specimens from the NML panel 2 and Héma-Québec convalescent
528	plasma donors panel are included in the above figure. Specimens from the NML panel #1
529	were excluded as anti-S-RBD ELISA for IgM and IgA were not performed.
530	
531	Figure 4. Change of signal over time for Genscript cPass and anti-RBD ELISA.
532	Spaghetti plot of results obtained with cPass (panel A) and the plots shown in panels B, C, D
533	represent (B and C) the areas under the curve (AUC) calculated from relative luciferase units
534	(RLU) obtained with serial plasma dilutions or (D) the normalized RLU for one plasma
535	dilution (1:500) for laboratory-developed ELISA detecting anti-RBD IgG, IgM, and IgA
536	(panels B, C, D, respectively) among specimens collected at a known interval from SARS-
537	CoV-2 diagnosis. Horizontal lines indicate paired specimens form the same individual. P
538	values are calculated via the Wilcoxon signed rank test, and values <0.05 are designated with
539	an Asterix. In all panels, red dots denote specimens with positive cPass results, and blue dots
540	specimens with negative cPass results.



Threshold % inhibition for positivity	TP	FP	FN	TN	Sensitivity (95% CI)	Specificity (95% CI)
20%	80	64	4	52	95.2 (88.2-98.6)	44.8 (35.5-54.3)
30%	78	49	6	67	92.8 (85.0-97.3)	57.7 (48.2-66.8)
40%	72	36	12	80	85.7 (76.3-92.3)	68.9 (59.7-77.2)
50%	65	24	19	92	77.3 (66.9-85.7)	79.3 (70.7-86.2)
60%	54	15	30	101	64.2 (53.0-74.4)	87.0 (79.5-92.5)

В



Dilution Factor for Primary Specimens

Dilution Factor	ТР	FP	FN	ΤN	Sensitivity (95% CI)	Specificity (95% CI)
1X	7	8	0	1	100 (59-100)	11 (0-48)
10X	7	3	0	6	100 (59-100)	67 (30-93)
50X	6	0	1	9	86 (42-100)	100 (66-100)
100X	4	0	3	9	57 (18-90)	100 (66-100)



