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\textbf{ABSTRACT}

\textbf{Purpose:} The accuracy of level of anti-severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) antibodies is a great concern. We aimed to compare the efficacy of anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibody detection kits from two manufacturers in evaluating the efficacy of SARS-CoV-2 vaccines.

\textbf{Methods:} The immune responses and consistency of four anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibodies were evaluated using two manufacturers’ antibody kits (A and B) in 61 subjects within 160 days after vaccination with the CoronaVac vaccine.

\textbf{Results:} The total seropositivity rates of neutralizing antibodies and IgM antibodies detected by kit A were higher than those detected by kit B ($P = 0.003$ and $P < 0.001$, respectively). Conversely, the total seropositivity rates of total antibodies and IgG antibodies were higher in kit B than kit A ($P < 0.001$ and $P < 0.001$, respectively). The consistency rates showed less than 90% agreement between the kits for the detection of the four antibodies, and the $\kappa$ score showed moderate or substantial consistency. The half-lives of neutralizing antibodies, total antibodies, and IgG antibodies within 160 days after vaccination, detected by kit A were 63.88 days, 80.50 days, and 63.70 days, respectively and by kit B were 97.06 days, 65.41 days, and 77.99 days, respectively.

\textbf{Conclusion:} The efficacy of antibody detection differed between the two commercial anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibody kits, although there was moderate consistency, which may affect the clinical application and formulation of the vaccine strategy.

1. Introduction

Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19), caused by the severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2), is spreading worldwide, leading to extremely high morbidity and mortality [1,2]. Vaccination is one of the most effective interventions to substantially reduce severe disease and death due to SARS-CoV-2 infection [3]. A large-scale vaccine inoculation program against SARS-CoV-2 was implemented globally [4]. The level of anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibodies is a critical parameter for evaluating the effects of vaccination and SARS-CoV-2 infection. Careful screening of antibodies is of great significance for the development of COVID-19 therapies and guidance of vaccine strategies [5,6]. Several anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibody test kits have been approved for emergency use to provide tools for large-scale clinical and epidemiological screenings. Recently, a large number of serological assays were validated in a restricted number of samples [7], and several serological tests were not recommended for COVID-19 population surveillance due to poor performance and low sensitivity [8,9]. The accuracy of these methods is an ongoing concern. Here, we compared anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibody detection kits from two manufacturers that use the receptor-binding domain (RBD) and spike epitopes as target antigens to evaluate the efficacy of SARS-CoV-2 vaccines. The immune responses, seropositivity rates, and attenuation half-lives of four anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibodies (a neutralizing antibody, a total antibody, an IgG antibody,
and an IgM antibody) were evaluated using antibody test kits from two manufacturers in 61 CoronaVac vaccine recipients within 160 days after vaccination, and the consistency of the test results of both kits was analyzed. By comparing the kits, we aimed to provide a basis for the clinical and epidemiological application of anti-SARS-COV-2-specific antibody kits, which will contribute to the authorities’ quality monitoring and quality control protocols.

2. Methods

2.1. Study design and participants

The vaccination cohort was designed as described in our previous report [10]. The participants received the first standard dose (0.5 mL/dose) of inactivated SARS-CoV-2 vaccine (Sinovac Biotech Ltd., Beijing, China) on January 24, 2021, and the second dose 28 days later. Serum samples were then collected by centrifugation from the 61 participants at 11 time points over 160 days, and the tests on the serum were completed within six hours. This study was approved by the Institutional Ethics Committee of Zhongshan Hospital of Xiamen University, School of Medicine, Xiamen University and was in compliance with national legislation and the Declaration of Helsinki guidelines. All the participants provided written informed consent.

2.2. Detection of anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibodies

For both kit A (Anto Biological Pharmacy Enterprise Co., Ltd., Zhengzhou, China) and kit B (Xiamen Innovax Biotech Co., Ltd., Xiamen, China), anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibody tests were performed using a chemiluminescent microparticle immunoassay on a compatible instrument according to the manufacturers’ instructions. Antigen epitope and antibody detection methodologies differed between the two manufacturers’ kits (Table 1). The neutralizing antibody assay for kit A was based on the competition method. When SARS-CoV-2-neutralizing antibodies were present in the sample, they bound to the horseradish peroxidase (HRP)-labeled RBD antigen and blocked (neutralized) the binding of angiotensin-converting enzyme 2 (ACE2) (coated on microparticles) to the RBD antigen. The HRP-labeled RBD antigen that was not neutralized by SARS-CoV-2-neutralizing antibodies formed a complex with ACE2 on the microparticles. Thus, the relative light units (RLUs) were inversely proportional to the amount of SARS-CoV-2-specific neutralizing antibodies in the sample. The neutralizing antibody assay for kit B was also based on a competition assay, in which neutralizing antibodies in the sample competed with biotinylated anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibodies for binding to the acridine ester-labeled spike protein to form “biotinylated SARS-CoV-2 antibody–acridine ester spike protein” complexes. The concentration of competing neutralizing antibodies in the sample was inversely proportional to the RLU detected. The neutralizing antibody titer was calibrated to the First WHO International Standard for anti-SARS-CoV-2 immunoglobulin and was recorded in IU/mL [11]. A neutralizing antibody concentration ≥ 54 IU/mL was defined as positive [12].

For the total antibody, both kits A and B used the same RBD of the spike protein as the coating antigen. Kit A detected the total antibody using a double-antigen sandwich method: the microparticle coated with the RBD of the SARS-CoV-2 spike protein was combined with the sample and detected by an anti-human immunoglobulin antibody labeled with an enzyme, and a total antibody concentration ≥ 8 AU/mL was defined as positive. Kit B measured the total antibody using a double-antigen sandwich method, and the total antibody was recorded as signal/cut-off (S/CO) (RLU of samples to be tested/cut off). S/CO ≥ 1.00 was defined as positive. Both kits A and B used an indirect method to detect the level of IgG antibodies, but kit A used the SARS-CoV-2 spike protein for coating and kit B used the RBD. IgM antibody levels were detected using a capture method. The enzyme conjugate was HRP-labeled spike protein in kit A, and acridine ester-labeled RBD was used as the antigen in kit B. Both IgG and IgM antibody titers were recorded as S/CO. S/CO < 1.00 was considered negative and S/CO ≥ 1.00 was considered positive (Table 1).

2.3. Statistical analysis

Data were analyzed using IBM SPSS Statistics version 26 (SPSS, Inc., Chicago, IL, USA). A McNemar’s test was used to compare test rates. The agreement rate and Cohen’s kappa coefficient (κ) were used to analyze the consistency. The consistency analysis of the two manufacturers’ kits was classified as nearly perfect (0.81–1.00), substantial (0.61–0.80), moderate (0.41–0.60), fair (0.21–0.40), mild (0.02) or poor (<0) according to the consistency of the κ value [13,14]. Power law models were used to analyze antibody waning [15]. A summary independent-samples t-test was used to analyze the differences in half-life between the two kits. Statistical significance was set at P < 0.05.

3. Results

3.1. Seropositive rates of four anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibodies determined by kits from two manufacturers

The results of the dynamic evaluation of the seropositivity rates of each antibody detected by the kits from the two manufacturers at each time point are shown in Table 2. The seropositivity rate of neutralizing antibodies increased slowly from day 0 to day 28 after vaccination. On day 28, the seropositivity rate of neutralizing antibodies detected by kit A was 4.92%, and that detected by kit B was 8.20%. The seropositivity rate of neutralizing antibodies detected by the kits from the two manufacturers began to increase rapidly after the second dose, and the seropositivity rates were 52.46% and 68.65%, respectively. There were significant differences between the seropositive rates detected by the kits from the two manufacturers from the 42nd day to the 56th day, and the seropositivity rates of neutralizing antibodies detected by kit A were higher than those detected by kit B (P < 0.001). On days 130 and 160, the seropositivity rate of neutralizing antibodies decreased significantly. On day 160, the seropositivity rates determined by the kits from the two manufacturers were 19.67% and 18.03%, respectively, and there was no significant difference between the two kits (P > 0.05). The total seropositivity rate of neutralizing antibodies detected using kit A was higher

| Table 1 | The coated antigen types and detection methods of the kits from the two manufacturers. |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
|                  | Methodology     | Antigen epitope | Cut-off value   | Quantitative/ Qualitative |
|                  | Kit A          | Kit B          | Kit A          | Kit B          | Kit A          | Kit B          | Kit A          | Kit B          |
| Neutralizing antibody | Competitive method | Competitive method | RBD | Spike protein | ≥54 IU/mL | ≥54 IU/mL | Quantitative | Quantitative |
| Total antibody    | Double-antigen sandwich method | Double-antigen sandwich method | RBD | RBD | ≥8AU/mL | S/CO ≥ 1.00 | Quantitative | Qualitative |
| IgG antibody      | Indirect method | Indirect method | Spike protein  | RBD | S/CO ≥ 1.00 | S/CO ≥ 1.00 | Qualitative | Qualitative |
| IgM antibody      | Capture method | Capture method | Spike protein  | S/CO ≥ 1.00 | S/CO ≥ 1.00 | Qualitative | Qualitative |

RBD: receptor-binding domain of the spike protein; S/CO: RLU of samples to be tested/cut off.
The consistency rates of neutralizing, total, IgG, and IgM antibodies detected by the kits from the two manufacturers were 79.73%, 83.75%, 97.06%, and 90.20%, respectively, and the consistency analysis of the seropositivity rates of the four anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibodies detected by the kits from the two manufacturers. P<0.001. Owing to the small amount of data, the fitting curves and decay half-lives of IgM antibodies failed to fit the model, and the decay half-lives could not be estimated. These results showed that the estimated half-lives of the four antibodies differed between the two commercial kits.

### 4. Discussion

Extensive and reliable antibody tests have contributed to the serological diagnosis of COVID-19 and to vaccine serological studies. Increased accuracy and consistency of antibody test kits provides a reliable guarantee for evaluating the effects of vaccination and SARS-CoV-2 infection. In our study, the same vaccinated population showed different antibody responses. The conclusion was supported by the finding that the total seropositivity rates of the four anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibodies (neutralizing, total, IgG, and IgM antibodies) detected by the two commercial kits were different at 11 serum time points after vaccination. Consistency analysis also demonstrated that the four antibodies showed only moderate or substantial consistency. The half-lives of neutralizing antibodies, total antibodies, and IgG antibodies were 63.88 (95% CI, 57.20–72.79) days, 80.50 (95% CI, 68.79–96.89) days, and 63.70 (95% CI, 56.36–73.21) days, respectively, within 160 days after vaccination. For kit B, the half-lives of neutralizing antibodies, total antibodies, and IgG antibodies were 97.06 (95% CI, 77.38–129.64) days, 84.61 (95% CI, 72.32–84.61) days, respectively (Fig. 1A–C). Summary independent-samples t-test results showed that the half-lives of neutralizing antibodies, total antibodies and IgG antibodies were 79.73% (95% CI, 72.30–79.19) days, and 77.99 (95% CI, 73.82–84.61) days, respectively, comparing to the positivity rate of the two kits at each time point.

### Table 2

| Antibody type          | Kit D0 | D7 | D14 | D21 | D28 | D35 | D42 | D49 | D56 | D130 | D160 | P<0.05 |
|------------------------|--------|----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|------|--------|
| Neutralizing antibody  | Kit A  | 0  | 0.539 | 0.661 | 0.656 | 0.454 | 0.539 | 0.661 | 0.656 | 0.454 |       |<0.003 |
| Kits                  |        |    |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |        |
| Total antibody        | Kit A  | 0  | 3.28 | 6.56 | 8.20 | 5.74 | 2.35 | 0.74 | 0.26 | 0.50 | 0.80 | 0.001 |
| Kits                  |        |    |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |        |
| IgG antibody          | Kit A  | 0  | 9.80 | 21.31 | 77.05 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 78.69 | 0.001 |
| Kits                  |        |    |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |        |
| IgM antibody          | Kit A  | 0  | 4.92 | 9.84 | 23.1 | 77.05 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 91.80 | 73.77 |        |
| Kits                  |        |    |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |        |

### Table 3

| Antibody type          | Kit B   | Consistency rate | Kappa |
|------------------------|---------|------------------|-------|
| Neutralizing antibody  | +       | 300              | 79.73% | 0.539 |
| Total antibody         | +       | 726              | 83.75% | 0.661 |
| IgG antibody           | +       | 650              | 82.71% | 0.656 |
| IgM antibody           | +       | 82               | 88.38% | 0.454 |

"+": positive; "-": negative. The agreement rate and Cohen’s kappa coefficient (κ) were used to analyze the consistency.
Establishing immune memory is essential for the defense against SARS-CoV-2 infection. The serological positivity rate and half-life of antibodies, especially neutralizing antibodies and IgG antibodies, are important indicators for evaluating vaccine efficacy. Neutralizing antibodies block the ability of SARS-CoV-2 to infect host cells by inhibiting the binding of the SARS-CoV-2 spike protein to host cell ACE2 and are an important predictor of vaccine efficacy. Our previous study showed that neutralizing antibody and anti-RBD IgG antibody levels were strongly correlated. Thus, anti-RBD IgG antibody levels can be used for the assessment of immunity following SARS-CoV-2 infection or vaccination. The results of this study confirmed that the vaccinated population had a high positive rate of neutralizing and IgG antibodies after the second dose of the vaccine, which could have a protective effect against SARS-CoV-2 infection. However, the total positivity rates of neutralizing and IgG antibodies were different when using kits from different manufacturers (P < 0.001). Similarly, the positivity rates of total antibodies and IgM antibodies determined by the kits from the two manufacturers were also shown to be different in the vaccinated population. Furthermore, our results showed that the half-lives of the four antibodies estimated using the power law model were different between the two commercial kits. Notably, the serological positivity rate and half-life of antibodies might not be sufficient to reflect a robust immune response. One opinion is that SARS-CoV-2-specific memory T and B cells are important for long-term protection. Due to the lack of data on long-term protection among the vaccinated population, we found only different serological positive rates and half-lives of antibodies and could not determine which reagent was more suitable for antibody surveillance in the vaccinated population.

An understanding of the degree of immune protection conferred by a vaccine is urgently required to assist in the future deployment of vaccines. The selection of a high-performance antibody detection kit to assess the degree of immune response to a vaccine is a common concern in developing vaccine strategies. In this study, four antibody responses to vaccine administration were detected using kits from two manufacturers in parallel. Two interrater reliability measures, the percentage of agreement and the κ score, were used to compare the consistency of antibody measurements using kits from two manufacturers. The overall results showed less than 90% agreement in the detection of the four antibodies between the kits from the two manufacturers, and the κ score showed moderate or substantial consistency. Neutralizing antibodies and IgG antibodies showed moderate agreement, which may be caused by the different target sites of neutralizing antibodies and the different antibody detection methods. Although the same target antigen was used for total antibody detection in kits from the different companies, the κ score showed only substantial and imperfect consistency, which may be due to the nonconformity of the recombinant antigen from different companies. Therefore, to improve the consistency of antibody testing, it is important to standardize the process, and the quality control system should carry out external quality control led by health authorities to improve the consistency of different products. A clinical evaluation should be performed before selecting a certain reagent, and a traceability system should be established.

To the best of our knowledge, this is the first prospective cohort study of four anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibodies to compare serum antibody detection kits for evaluating the efficacy of SARS-CoV-2 vaccines after vaccination. However, this study had several limitations that need to be addressed. First, only dynamic changes in antibody levels were detected in vaccinees, and the role of anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibodies was not evaluated in COVID-19 patients. Second, the results of neutralizing antibody tests were not verified by the gold standard neutralization test. Only the consistency of the kits from the two manufacturers was compared, so no diagnostic performance evaluation was performed to judge the strengths or weaknesses of the kits from the two manufacturers.

In conclusion, the immune responses, seropositivity rates, and attenuation half-lives of the four anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibodies were different between the two manufacturer’s commercial anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibody test kits, and the consistency between the kits was moderate, which may affect clinical application and the decision-making process for subsequent disease prevention and control and formulation of vaccine strategies.
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