

# Occurrence and Timing of Subsequent SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR Positivity Among Initially Negative Patients

Authors: Dustin R. Long, MD<sup>1</sup>, Saurabh Gombar, MD, PhD<sup>2</sup>, Catherine A. Hogan MD, MSc<sup>2,3</sup>, Alexander L. Greninger, MD, PhD<sup>4,5</sup>, Vikas O'Reilly Shah, MD, PhD<sup>6</sup>, Chloe Bryson-Cahn, MD<sup>7</sup>, Bryan Stevens, MD<sup>2,3</sup>, Arjun Rustagi, MD, PhD<sup>8</sup>, Keith R. Jerome, MD, PhD<sup>4,5</sup>, Christina S. Kong, MD<sup>2</sup>, James Zehnder, MD<sup>2</sup>, Nigam H. Shah, MD, PhD<sup>9</sup>, Noel S. Weiss MD, DrPH<sup>10</sup>, Benjamin A. Pinsky, MD, PhD<sup>2,3,8\*</sup> and Jacob Sunshine, MD, MSc<sup>6\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>University of Washington School of Medicine, Department of Anesthesiology & Pain Medicine, Division of Critical Care Medicine, Seattle, WA, USA

<sup>2</sup>Department of Pathology, Stanford University School of Medicine, Stanford, CA, USA

<sup>3</sup>Clinical Virology Laboratory, Stanford Health Care, Stanford, CA, USA

<sup>4</sup>University of Washington School of Medicine, Department of Laboratory Medicine, Seattle, WA, USA

<sup>5</sup>Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center, Vaccine and Infectious Disease Division, Seattle, WA, USA

<sup>6</sup>University of Washington School of Medicine, Department of Anesthesiology & Pain Medicine, Seattle, WA, USA

<sup>7</sup>University of Washington School of Medicine, Division of Allergy and Infectious Diseases, Seattle, WA, USA

<sup>8</sup>Division of Infectious Diseases and Geographic Medicine, Department of Medicine, Stanford University School of Medicine, Stanford, CA, USA

<sup>9</sup>Center for Biomedical Informatics Research, Stanford University, Stanford, CA, USA

<sup>10</sup>University of Washington School of Public Health, Department of Epidemiology, Seattle, WA, USA

\*To whom correspondence should be addressed:

Jacob E. Sunshine, MD, MSc (jesun@uw.edu) | 1959 NE Pacific Street, Seattle, WA 98195

Phone: (206) 543-6814; Fax: (206) 543-2958

Benjamin A. Pinsky, MD, PhD (bpinsky@stanford.edu) | 3375 Hillview, Room 2913, Palo Alto, CA 94304

Phone: (650) 498-5575; Fax (650) 736-1964

# 1 Abstract

2 **Background:** SARS-CoV-2 reverse transcriptase polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR) testing  
3 remains the cornerstone of laboratory-based identification of patients with COVID-19. As the  
4 availability and speed of SARS-CoV-2 testing platforms improve, results are increasingly relied  
5 upon to inform critical decisions related to therapy, use of personal protective equipment, and  
6 workforce readiness. However, early reports of RT-PCR test performance have left clinicians  
7 and the public with concerns regarding the reliability of this predominant testing modality and  
8 the interpretation of negative results. In this work, two independent research teams report the  
9 frequency of discordant SARS-CoV-2 test results among initially negative, repeatedly tested  
10 patients in regions of the United States with early community transmission and access to testing.

11 **Methods:** All patients at the University of Washington (UW) and Stanford Health Care  
12 undergoing initial testing by nasopharyngeal (NP) swab between March 2nd and April 7th, 2020  
13 were included. SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR was performed targeting the *N*, *RdRp*, *S*, and *E* genes and  
14 ORF1ab, using a combination of Emergency Use Authorization laboratory-developed tests and  
15 commercial assays. Results through April 14th were extracted to allow for a complete 7-day  
16 observation period and an additional day for reporting.

17 **Results:** A total of 23,126 SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR tests (10,583 UW, 12,543 Stanford) were  
18 performed in 20,912 eligible patients (8,977 UW, 11,935 Stanford) undergoing initial testing by  
19 NP swab; 626 initially test-negative patients were re-tested within 7 days. Among this group,  
20 repeat testing within 7 days yielded a positive result in 3.5% (4.3% UW, 2.8% Stanford) of  
21 cases, suggesting an initial false negative RT-PCR result; the majority (96.5%) of patients with  
22 an initial negative result who warranted reevaluation for any reason remained negative on all  
23 subsequent tests performed within this window.

24 **Conclusions:** Two independent research teams report the similar finding that, among initially negative  
25 patients subjected to repeat SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR testing, the occurrence of a newly positive result  
26 within 7 days is uncommon. These observations suggest that false negative results at the time of initial  
27 presentation do occur, but potentially at a lower frequency than is currently believed. Although it is not  
28 possible to infer the clinical sensitivity of NP SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR testing using these data, they may  
29 be used in combination with other reports to guide the use and interpretation of this common testing  
30 modality.

## 31 Introduction

32 Severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus-2 (SARS-CoV-2) is the etiologic agent of coronavirus  
33 disease 2019 (COVID-19). Accurate detection of the virus is essential to strategies endorsed by the  
34 Centers for Disease Control and World Health Organization. As the availability and speed of SARS-CoV-  
35 2 testing platforms improve, results of these tests are increasingly relied upon to inform critical decisions  
36 related to therapeutic intervention, use of personal protective equipment, patient isolation, and workforce  
37 readiness. While the analytic performance of SARS-CoV-2 reverse transcriptase polymerase chain  
38 reaction (RT-PCR) tests are well described[1], clinical performance is impacted by several factors that are  
39 difficult to measure, such as low levels of shedding during incubation and early infection[2], variability in  
40 the site of specimen acquisition[3,4], and sufficiency of sample collected. In addition, early reports and  
41 characterizations in the press have left the medical community and general public with concerns about the  
42 reliability of SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR testing and the interpretation of negative results. Data characterizing  
43 the scope of false negative results observed in the context of current US testing practices are needed to  
44 guide clinical protocols and inform the public, but are lacking.

45  
46 The initial US introduction of COVID-19 through Washington State[5] followed closely by Northern  
47 California[6], combined with the early availability of SARS-CoV-2 testing in both regions[7,8], provides  
48 an opportunity to evaluate clinical test performance in a population of repeatedly tested patients. In this  
49 study, utilizing data from two independent healthcare systems and analyzed by separate research teams,  
50 we report the frequency of discordant SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR results among initially test-negative  
51 individuals who were subsequently retested within 7 days.

52

## 53 Methods

### 54 Common Study Methods

55 All patients at both sites undergoing initial testing for COVID-19 by SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR of a  
56 nasopharyngeal (NP) swab between March 2nd and April 7th, 2020 were included. Test results through  
57 April 14th were extracted to allow for a complete 7-day observation period and an additional day for  
58 result reporting. Data on cycle threshold (Ct) values were extracted for each test, and are interpreted as  
59 inversely proportional to the viral load level present in the sample. Inconclusive RT-PCR test results (i.e.,  
60 only 1 of 2 SARS-CoV-2 target genes amplified) were treated as positive in accordance with institutional  
61 clinical guidelines.

62

### 63 UW Methods

64 The UW Virology clinical laboratory serves as the primary testing center for a broad region in the US  
65 Pacific Northwest, processing over 60% of all SARS-CoV-2 tests for Washington State during the time  
66 period examined. In order to ensure consistency of clinical data and compliance with patient privacy  
67 policies, analysis was limited to adult patients having an established affiliation with UW Medicine.  
68 Encounters spanning multiple facilities (e.g. outpatient, hospital, and drive-through testing locations)  
69 were linked using an unambiguous identifier common to all sites. UW guidelines over the study period  
70 for testing included the following: all patients who exhibited one or more symptoms of COVID-19 at the  
71 time of initial testing per institutional protocol, which involved new symptoms of acute respiratory  
72 infection (e.g., fever, cough, shortness of breath, myalgias, rhinorrhea, sore throat, anosmia, ageusia),  
73 combined with pertinent risk factors (occupation, age, chronic disease status, immunosuppression, contact  
74 with confirmed COVID-19 cases, pregnancy, housing stability, exposure to high-risk facilities or  
75 inpatient admission) or based on clinical judgement; starting March 30th, 2020, universal pre-operative

76 screening for all asymptomatic surgical cases. Nasopharyngeal samples were collected according to  
77 standard UW protocol (**Supplement 1**). UW testing platforms included a laboratory-developed test (LDT)  
78 two-target/two-control assay modified from the CDC (target genes *NI*, *N2*) operating under a Washington  
79 State emergency use authorization[7]; Panther Fusion SARS-CoV-2 assay (Hologic, Marlborough, MA,  
80 target genes two conserved regions of ORF1ab); Roche RT-PCR (Basel, Switzerland, target *E* gene);  
81 DiaSorin (Saluggia, Italy, target ORF1ab and *S* genes). The University of Washington Institutional  
82 Review Board determined this study to be exempt (STUDY00009931).

### 83 **Stanford Methods**

84 The Stanford Health Care (SHC) Clinical Virology Laboratory is based in northern California and  
85 performed SARS-CoV-2 testing on both adult and pediatric populations. Approximately 2/3 of the  
86 samples were from Stanford Medicine facilities and 1/3 were from medical facilities in northern  
87 California with the greatest concentration coming from facilities in San Mateo and Santa Clara counties.  
88 Testing was performed using one of two assays: 1) SHC Emergency Use Authorization LDT<sup>6</sup> or 2)  
89 Panther Fusion SARS-CoV-2 assay. This study received approval by the Stanford Institutional Review  
90 Board (Protocol #48973) and individual consent was not required.

### 91 **Results**

92 A total of 23,126 SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR tests (10,583 UW, 12,543 Stanford) were performed in 20,912  
93 eligible patients (8,977 UW, 11,935 Stanford) undergoing initial testing by NP swab between March 2nd  
94 and April 7th, 2020. Initial results for 91% (90.7% UW, 91.2% Stanford) of patients were negative  
95 (**Figure 1A**). Characteristics of initially negative patients are shown in **Supplemental Table 1**. The  
96 majority of these patients (95.9% UW, 97.4% Stanford) did not undergo repeat testing within 7 days and  
97 did not require subsequent evaluation in the form of outpatient, emergency department, or inpatient  
98 encounters (**Supplemental Table 1**). Results of other viral respiratory tests were available for UW

99 patients and several negatively retested patients were ultimately diagnosed with other viral respiratory  
100 illnesses, most commonly influenza A, rhinovirus, and RSV (**Supplemental Table 1**). However, a small  
101 proportion (4.1% UW, 2.6% Stanford) underwent repeat testing within this window despite an initial  
102 negative result (**Figure 1A**). Among those requiring reevaluation, 96.5% (95.9% UW, 97.2% Stanford)  
103 remained negative on all repeat tests performed within 7 days.

104  
105 It was observed that 3.5% (4.1% UW, 2.8% Stanford) of patients subjected to retesting on clinical  
106 grounds within 7 days were subsequently found to be positive during this period, suggesting a false  
107 negative initial result. The timing of clinical retesting and conversion among these patients is shown by  
108 site in **Figure 1B and Figure 1C**, respectively. The clinical contexts and testing parameters of the 22  
109 patients with discordant results are summarized in **Supplemental Table 2**. In this group, the mean  
110 interval between initial negative test and first positive retest was 4.0 days (SD 2.0). RT-PCR cycle  
111 threshold values of newly positive results averaged 28.5 (SD 8.0), consistent with lower viral RNA loads.

112  
113 At UW, the use of standardized testing algorithms enabled subgroup analysis based on testing indication  
114 (**Figure 1A**). A total of 299 asymptomatic individuals who were tested as part of universal screening for  
115 preoperative clearance were excluded, leaving 7,846 symptomatic individuals who tested negative at the  
116 time of initial presentation for analysis. Of the 302 individuals in this group with persistent or worsening  
117 symptoms warranting additional testing within 7 days, 4.3% converted from negative to positive and  
118 95.7% remained negative on all subsequent SARS-CoV-2 tests performed within this window.

## 119 Discussion

120 In this report, two independent research teams describe that, among patients initially testing negative by  
121 SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR of a NP swab, repeat testing within 7 days yielded a positive result in 3.5% of

122 cases; the majority (96.5%) of those warranting additional testing for any reason remained negative on all  
123 subsequent tests within this window. Among the subgroup of UW patients confirmed to have symptoms  
124 prior to an initial negative result who were retested for persistent or worsening symptoms, a similar  
125 proportion (4.3%) were subsequently found to be positive within 7 days. These observations suggest that  
126 false negative NP SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR results do occur, but potentially at a lower frequency than is  
127 currently believed.

128  
129 Results from each research group have limitations. Neither team is able to calculate a true clinical  
130 sensitivity or false negative proportion due to the absence of retesting in all initially negative patients and  
131 the lack of a gold standard confirmatory mechanism. Additionally, it cannot be ruled out that some  
132 discordant test results in this cohort may be due to newly acquired infection. By limiting the scope of  
133 retesting considered to a 7-day period, the likelihood of this scenario is minimized, but not eliminated.  
134 Finally, we were unable to ascertain the disease status of the individuals who initially tested negative for  
135 COVID-19 but did not undergo repeat testing; in most cases this likely reflects the absence of an  
136 indication for retesting (e.g. alternative diagnosis or resolution of symptoms), but could also be the result  
137 of limited access to care.

138 The intention of this report is not to definitively quantify the clinical performance of NP SARS-CoV-2  
139 RT-PCR testing, which will likely require orthogonal approaches such as serology. Rather, by  
140 characterizing the experience of two large US health systems on the short-term occurrence of newly  
141 positive SARS-CoV-2 results among initially test-negative patients, we provide data on a topic of  
142 practical significance that should be used in combination with other reports to guide the use and  
143 interpretation of this common testing modality.



144 **Funding**

145 This work was supported by the National Institute of General Medical Sciences at the National  
146 Institutes of Health [grant number T32 GM086270-11 to D.R.L.].

## 147 Acknowledgments

148 We would like to thank Christine Fong and the Center for Perioperative & Pain initiatives in  
149 Quality Safety Outcome (PPiQSO) at the University of Washington, Seattle for assistance with  
150 the data extract analyzed in the present work.

## 151 References

- 152 1. Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) EUA Information: In Vitro Diagnostic Products. Available  
153 at: [https://www.fda.gov/emergency-preparedness-and-response/mcm-legal-regulatory-and-policy-](https://www.fda.gov/emergency-preparedness-and-response/mcm-legal-regulatory-and-policy-framework/emergency-use-authorization#2019-ncov)  
154 [framework/emergency-use-authorization#2019-ncov](https://www.fda.gov/emergency-preparedness-and-response/mcm-legal-regulatory-and-policy-framework/emergency-use-authorization#2019-ncov). Accessed 3 April 2020.
- 155 2. Wölfel R, Corman VM, Guggemos W, et al. Virological assessment of hospitalized patients with  
156 COVID-2019. *Nature* **2020**; Available at: <http://www.nature.com/articles/s41586-020-2196-x>.  
157 Accessed 3 April 2020.
- 158 3. Wang W, Xu Y, Gao R, et al. Detection of SARS-CoV-2 in Different Types of Clinical Specimens.  
159 *JAMA* **2020**; Available at: <https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jama/fullarticle/2762997>. Accessed 3  
160 April 2020.
- 161 4. Fang Y, Zhang H, Xie J, et al. Sensitivity of Chest CT for COVID-19: Comparison to RT-PCR.  
162 *Radiology* **2020**; :200432.
- 163 5. Holshue ML, DeBolt C, Lindquist S, et al. First Case of 2019 Novel Coronavirus in the United  
164 States. *New England Journal of Medicine* **2020**; 382:929–936.
- 165 6. Hogan CA, Sahoo MK, Pinsky BA. Sample Pooling as a Strategy to Detect Community Transmission  
166 of SARS-CoV-2. *JAMA* **2020**; Available at:  
167 <https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jama/fullarticle/2764364>. Accessed 2 May 2020.
- 168 7. Casto AM, Huang M-L, Nalla A, et al. Comparative Performance of SARS-CoV-2 Detection Assays  
169 using Seven Different Primer/Probe Sets and One Assay Kit. *Journal of Clinical Microbiology*, in  
170 press.

- 171 8. U.S. Food and Drug Administration. Stanford Health Care Clinical Virology Laboratory SARS-CoV-  
172 2 test EUA Summary. 2020. Available at: <https://www.fda.gov/media/136818/download>. Accessed  
173 10 April 2020.

## 174 Figure Legends

175 **Figure 1. Identification of patients initially testing negative for SARS-CoV-2 and outcomes of**  
176 **repeat testing.** A. The primary measure was the occurrence of a discordant (newly positive) result within  
177 7 days. <sup>a</sup>Subgroup analysis excluding asymptomatic patients screened for surgical clearance at the  
178 University of Washington yielded similar results. B. Among patients initially testing negative for SARS-  
179 CoV-2 by RT-PCR of a nasopharyngeal swab, over 95% of patients at both UW (blue) and Stanford  
180 (orange) subjected to retesting remained negative on subsequent tests performed within 7 days. C.  
181 Retesting of initially negative individuals occurred at varied intervals across the 7-day period of  
182 observation.

A

### University of Washington

2020 Mar 2 - 2020 Apr 7  
8977 Eligible patients undergoing SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR testing by NP swab

832 Positive initial test result: 9.3%

8145 Negative initial test result: 90.7%

7807 No clinical indication for retest: 95.9%

338 Retested within 7 days: 4.1%

324 All retests negative: 95.9%

14 Discordant (newly positive) result 4.1%

299 Asymptomatic patients screened for preoperative clearance

7846<sup>a</sup> Initially negative symptomatic patients

7544 No clinical indication for retest: 96.2%

302 Retested within 7 days for symptom persistence or ongoing clinical concern: 3.8%

289 All retests negative: 95.7%

13 Discordant (newly positive) result: 4.3%

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.03.20089151>; this version posted May 8, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

### Stanford University

2020 Mar 2 - 2020 Apr 7  
11935 Eligible patients undergoing SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR testing by NP swab

1045 Positive initial test result: 8.8%

10890 Negative initial test result: 91.2%

10602 No clinical indication for retest: 97.4%

288 Retested within 7 days: 2.6%

280 All retests negative: 97.2%

8 Discordant (newly positive) result: 2.8%

Overall occurrence of discordant positive result within 7 days among initially negative patients subject to repeat testing: 3.5%

B SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR Conversion Within 7 Days of Negative Initial Test

