

1 **Prevalence Threshold and Temporal Interpretation of Screening Tests:**
2 **The Example of the SARS-CoV-2 (COVID-19) Pandemic**

3

4 Jacques Balayla MD, MPH¹

5 Ariane Lasry B.Sc¹

6 Yaron Gil MD¹

7 Alexander Volodarsky-Perel MD¹

8

9 ¹ Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, McGill University, Montreal, Quebec,
10 Canada

11

12

13 No funding was received for this study.

14

15 The authors have no conflicts of interest to report.

16

17

18 **Word Count: 1,651**

19

20

21

22

23

24

25 **Corresponding Author**

26

27 Dr. Jacques Balayla MD, MPH, CIP, FRCSC

28 Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology

29 Jewish General Hospital

30 McGill University

31 Montreal, Canada

32 Jacques.balayla@mail.mcgill.ca

33 **Abstract**

34 The curvilinear relationship between a screening test's positive predictive value
35 (PPV) and its target disease prevalence is proportional. In consequence, there is an
36 inflection point of maximum curvature in the screening curve defined as a function of the
37 sensitivity (a) and specificity (b) beyond which the rate of change of a test's PPV declines
38 sharply relative to disease prevalence (ϕ). Herein, we demonstrate a mathematical model
39 exploring this phenomenon and define the prevalence threshold point (ϕ_e) where this
40 change occurs as:

$$\phi_e = \frac{\sqrt{a(-b+1)} + b - 1}{(a+b-1)}$$

41
42 Understanding where this prevalence point lies in the curve has important
43 implications for the interpretation of test results, the administration of healthcare systems,
44 the implementation of public health measures, and in cases of pandemics like SARS-
45 CoV-2, the functioning of society at large. To illustrate the methods herein described, we
46 provide the example of the screening strategies used in the SARS-CoV-2 (COVID-19)
47 pandemic, and calculate the prevalence threshold statistic of different tests available
48 today. This concept can help contextualize the validity of a screening test in real time,
49 thereby enhancing our understanding of the dynamics of the current pandemic.

50

51 **Keywords:** screening curve, positive predictive value, prevalence threshold, COVID-19,

52

Bayes' Theorem

53 **Introduction**

54 The novel SARS-CoV-2 (COVID-19) has reached over 4 million confirmed cases
55 worldwide; in the United States alone, the death toll totals close to 90,000 to date [1].
56 Despite efforts to contain its spread, the number of confirmed cases has continued to rise.
57 These estimations have been largely based on polymerase chain reaction (PCR) detection
58 of actively replicating viral material, found only among individuals who are actively
59 infected at the time of testing. Those who recover from the virus without having been
60 tested during the window of viral shedding are not included in prevalence estimates;
61 neither are asymptomatic individuals, roughly approximated as 18 to 30% of those
62 infected [2, 3]. Current estimates thus understate the true prevalence of COVID-19 by
63 failing to include the aforementioned groups. Whereas accurate prevalence estimates are
64 needed to inform public health measures, screening methods that depend on actively
65 replicating viral organisms will become less reliable as recovery proceeds and the
66 resulting prevalence of active infection among the population tapers. Bayes theorem thus
67 demonstrates the point beyond which the positive predictive value (PPV) of currently
68 employed PCR screening will decline as the curve ‘flattens’ over time. In contrast,
69 serologic testing for COVID-19 antibodies persist in plasma well beyond the period of
70 active infection; as recovery from active infection increases, so too will the cumulative
71 prevalence of seropositivity among the population over time. Herein, we use differential
72 equations to assess the geometry of screening curves and aim to describe the prevalence
73 threshold point beyond which the PPV of various COVID-19 screening tests declines
74 most acutely. Though this example is specific to the COVID-19 pandemic, the methods

75 herein described apply to all screening tests whose sensitivity and specificity parameters
76 are known.

77 **Validity of Screening Tests**

78 The validity of a screening test is defined as the ability to correctly delineate
79 individuals who have a given disease or condition from those who do not. The following
80 four parameters are used to assess the validity of screening tests: sensitivity a , specificity
81 b , positive predictive value ϕ , and negative predictive value σ . Sensitivity refers to the
82 proportion of people with a given disease who test positive for said disease, also termed
83 the true positive rate. Specificity, also termed true negative rate, refers to the proportion
84 of people without said disease who indeed test negative. Sensitivity and specificity are
85 properties inherent to the screening test itself and are unaffected by the prevalence of
86 disease in a given population. On the other hand, the positive predictive value is defined
87 as the percentage of patients with a positive test that do in fact have the disease, and
88 conversely, the negative predictive value refers to the percentage of patients with a
89 negative test that do not have the disease. These two parameters are dependent upon the
90 prevalence of disease being studied. Using Bayes' theorem, we can derive the following
91 equation expressing positive predictive value $p(\phi)$ as a function of disease prevalence ϕ .

92 **Equation 1. The Screening Curve Equation**

$$\rho(\phi) = \frac{a\phi}{a\phi + (1 - b)(1 - \phi)} = \frac{a\phi}{a\phi + b\phi - b - \phi + 1}$$

93

94

where:

95 ϕ = prevalence, $p(\phi)$ = positive predictive value, a = sensitivity and b = specificity

96 **Prevalence Threshold of a Screening Test**

97 Bayes' theorem describes the probability of an event, based on prior knowledge of
98 conditions that might be related to the event. The relationship between a screening test's
99 positive predictive value, $p(\phi)$, and its target disease prevalence ϕ is proportional - though
100 not linear in all but one case where the sum of sensitivity and specificity equals one.
101 From this curvilinear relationship, as stipulated in Figure 1, we can derive the prevalence
102 threshold ϕ_e at which the sharp inflection point in the screening curve occurs, as depicted
103 by the following equation (derivation available as a supplement).

104 **Equation 2. The Prevalence Threshold Equation**

$$\phi_e = \frac{\sqrt{a(-b+1)} + b - 1}{(a + b - 1)}$$

105

106

where:

107

ϕ_e = prevalence threshold, a = sensitivity and b = specificity

108

109 **Nasopharyngeal Swab RT-PCR Screening Test for COVID-19**


110 The Food and Drug Administration (FDA) published the analytical sensitivity and
111 specificity of the currently employed COVID-19 reverse transcription polymerase chain
112 reaction (RT-PCR) test [4]. The limit of detection (LoD) for the minimum detectable
113 concentration of SARS-CoV-2 genome (ie. sensitivity) in-vitro was set at 95%.
114 Additionally, the COVID-19 RT-PCR was tested against 30 respiratory microorganisms,
115 which yielded a specificity nearing 100%. While the above are *analytical* properties of
116 the COVID-19 RT-PCR test, estimates of its *clinical* properties vary significantly

117 between studies – particularly since some margin of error may result from improper
118 sampling by health care workers (wrong angle, too fast to withdraw and swab, etc.),
119 varying viral load and the subclinical stage when screening is carried out (colonization,
120 incubation, prodrome or acute infection). We will therefore use the FDA’s published
121 estimates for simplicity, where ϕ_e = prevalence threshold for detection of COVID-19, a =
122 sensitivity = 0.95, b = specificity = 0.99 and $a + b = 1.94$. Thus, as per equation 2, the
123 prevalence threshold for RT-PCR detection of COVID-19 is calculated as follows:

124 **Equation 3. Prevalence threshold for the COVID-19 RT-PCR screening test**

$$\frac{\sqrt{.95(-.99 + 1)} + .99 - 1}{(1.94 - 1)} = .093$$

126 In graphic form, the screening curve depicts the PPV as a function of prevalence as such:



127

128 The vertical line in red represents the prevalence threshold ϕ_e at 0.093 (9.3%).

129 In clinical practice, the sensitivity and specificity of the COVID-19 RT-PCR test
130 are likely lower than those estimated analytically by the FDA; the prevalence threshold
131 for detection that we have estimated above is thus likely conservative. Nonetheless, the
132 implication is such that below a prevalence of 9.3% actively replicating cases of COVID-
133 19 in the population, the PPV of RT-PCR testing declines almost exponentially. In other
134 words, we would expect a sharp increase in the number of false positive screening tests,
135 in turn falsely increasing the estimated prevalence of disease. Even with a conservative
136 estimation of the prevalence threshold, there are potentially significant health, social, and
137 economic implications of false positive screening tests.

138 **Serology Testing as a Public Health Tool**

139 Serology testing for SARS-CoV-2 involves blood-based testing for antibodies to
140 COVID-19. This screening method identifies all groups of individuals sub-acutely
141 infected or recovered from COVID-19, including those who may be asymptomatic at the
142 time of testing. Use of this tool can thus provide public health officials with a more
143 reliable estimation of the spread of COVID-19 and its cumulative prevalence among
144 different populations over time. Furthermore, this information can bring forth attempts at
145 a better understanding of disease transmission and immunity, which regarding COVID-
146 19, is largely uncertain up until this point.

147 The Johns Hopkins Center for Health Security recently released a report outlining
148 the sensitivity and specificity of various serology tests approved for diagnostic use in the
149 United States [5]. These are summarized in Table 1, with prevalence thresholds estimated
150 for each test. In contrast to RT-PCR screening, COVID-19 testing with serology can
151 delineate immune individuals at a prevalence threshold as low as 4.3%. As the

152 seropositive rates continue to increase, we deduce that above a prevalence of 4.3%, a
153 positive COVID-19 IgG screen can be reliably accepted as a true positive. In contrast, the
154 nasal RT-PCR test is most reliable when over 9.3% of the population has actively
155 replicating virus at any given time – a value thankfully thus far not reached, even after
156 accounting for an excess positive cases that are not tested.

157 Several countries have already started employing serology-based testing, either
158 for research purposes or to grant ‘immunity certificates’ to those in whom antibodies to
159 COVID-19 are found [6]. However, we must bear in mind that just as with RT-PCR
160 testing, serologic testing has inherent limitations related to the lag between acute
161 infection and the development of IgM and IgG antibodies as well. In the United States,
162 the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) recently released a COVID-19
163 Serology Surveillance Strategy [7]. This strategy aims to employ serology testing, termed
164 ‘seroprevalence,’ at the large-scale (ie. highly impacted areas such as New York and
165 Washington), the community-scale (with systematic selection of participants) and the
166 small-scale (specific subgroups, eg. healthcare workers). From the reasoning above, we
167 conclude that the best screening method to assess for acute infectivity, the need for
168 isolation, and the ensuing social and economic repercussions, is nasal swab RT-PCR for
169 actively replicating virus. In contrast, the most reliable screening method to assess for
170 disease prevalence and burden of disease is antibody testing via serology – assuming
171 enough time has lapsed since the acute infectious episode.

172 **Note on Rapid Diagnostic Testing**

173 In an effort to expedite testing speed and availability, rapid diagnostic tests (RDT)
174 have been developed for point-of-care use [8-17]. These tests rely on serological markers

175 against SARS-CoV-2, either IgM or IgG, for diagnosis of acute COVID-19 infection.
176 While the FDA has approved various RDTs for use under Emergency Use Authorization,
177 the WHO currently does not recommend their use outside of research purposes due to
178 their inconsistent sensitivities [18]. Indeed, concerns over reports of false negative results
179 prompted an FDA news release cautioning the public about the potential inaccuracy of
180 Abbott's ID NOW point-of-care RDT [13-17, 19]. Further studies with larger sample
181 sizes and clear manufacturer instructions for correct sampling are needed in order to
182 determine whether RDTs are reliable for clinical use.

183 **Conclusion**

184 The aforementioned values for sensitivity and specificity are likely to change as
185 more samples are obtained. However, their values as stipulated here are used not to
186 endorse a particular test, but to illustrate the concept of prevalence thresholds in the
187 context of the current pandemic. To illustrate the methods herein described, we provide
188 the example of the screening strategies used in the SARS-CoV-2 (COVID-19) pandemic,
189 and calculate the prevalence threshold statistics of different tests available today. This
190 concept can help contextualize the validity of a screening test in real time, thereby
191 enhancing our understanding of the dynamics of the current pandemic. [Identifying where
192 this prevalence point lies in the curve has important implications for the interpretation of
193 test results, the administration of healthcare systems, the implementation of public health
194 measures, and in cases of pandemics like SARS-CoV-2, the functioning of society at
195 large.

196

Table 1. Prevalence thresholds (ϕ_e) for different serologic tests available				
Test name	Test type	Sensitivity (%)	Specificity (%)	* ϕ_e
Cellex	RDT	93.8	95.6	16.1
Autobio	RDT	95.7, 99.0	99.0	9.1
DiaSorin	ELISA	90.0-97.0	98.0	15.1
Bio-Rad	Modified ELISA	98.0	99.0	9.2
Roche	ECLIA	65.5-100.0	99.8	4.3
Euroimmun	ELISA	13.9-100.0	100.0	n/a
ChemBio	RDT	Not available	Not available	n/a
Ortho-Clinical	ELISA	Not available	Not available	n/a
Mount Sinai	ELISA	Not available	Not available	n/a
Wadsworth	Microsphere	Not available	93-100	n/a
Abbott	CMIA	Not available	Not available	n/a
*The highest sensitivity was used for calculation of prevalence thresholds for tests with a range of sensitivities. <i>CMIA</i> (chemiluminescent immunoassay); <i>ECLIA</i> (electro-chemiluminescence immunoassay); <i>ELISA</i> (enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay); <i>RDT</i> (rapid diagnostic test).				

197

198

199

200 **References**

- 201 1. *WHO Coronavirus Disease (COVID-19) Dashboard*. May 17, 2020]; Available
202 from: <https://covid19.who.int>.
- 203 2. Mizumoto, K., et al., *Estimating the asymptomatic proportion of coronavirus*
204 *disease 2019 (COVID-19) cases on board the Diamond Princess cruise ship,*
205 *Yokohama, Japan, 2020*. Euro Surveill, 2020. **25**(10).
- 206 3. Nishiura, H., et al., *Estimation of the asymptomatic ratio of novel coronavirus*
207 *infections (COVID-19)*. Int J Infect Dis, 2020. **94**: p. 154-155.
- 208 4. *ACCELERATED EMERGENCY USE AUTHORIZATION (EUA) SUMMARY*
209 *COVID-19 RT-PCR TEST (LABORATORY CORPORATION OF AMERICA)*.
210 U.S. Food and Drug Administration. p. 1-12.
- 211 5. *Serology-based tests for COVID-19*. May 17, 2020]; Available from:
212 [https://www.centerforhealthsecurity.org/resources/COVID-19/serology/Serology-](https://www.centerforhealthsecurity.org/resources/COVID-19/serology/Serology-based-tests-for-COVID-19.html)
213 [based-tests-for-COVID-19.html](https://www.centerforhealthsecurity.org/resources/COVID-19/serology/Serology-based-tests-for-COVID-19.html).
- 214 6. Gigi Gronvall, N.C., Amanda Kobokovich, Rachel West, Kelsey Lane Warmbrod,
215 Matthew P Shearer, Lucia Mullen, Tom Inglesby, *Developing a National Strategy*
216 *for Serology (Antibody Testing) in the United States*. The Johns Hopkins Center
217 for Health Security. p. 1-38.
- 218 7. *COVID-19 Serology Surveillance Strategy*. May 17, 2020]; Available from:
219 [https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/covid-data/serology-](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/covid-data/serology-surveillance/index.html)
220 [surveillance/index.html](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/covid-data/serology-surveillance/index.html).
- 221 8. *DPP COVID-19 IgM/IgG System*. 2020, ChemBio Diagnostic Systems. p. 1-31.
- 222 9. *Cellex qSARS-CoV-2 IgG/IgM Rapid Test*. 2020. p. 1-5.

- 223 10. Pan, Y., et al., *Serological immunochromatographic approach in diagnosis with*
224 *SARS-CoV-2 infected COVID-19 patients.* J Infect, 2020.
- 225 11. Li, Z., et al., *Development and clinical application of a rapid IgM-IgG combined*
226 *antibody test for SARS-CoV-2 infection diagnosis.* J Med Virol, 2020.
- 227 12. Cassaniti, I., et al., *Performance of VivaDiag COVID-19 IgM/IgG Rapid Test is*
228 *inadequate for diagnosis of COVID-19 in acute patients referring to emergency*
229 *room department.* J Med Virol, 2020.
- 230 13. Zhen, W., et al., *Clinical Evaluation of Three Sample-To-Answer Platforms for*
231 *the Detection of SARS-CoV-2.* J Clin Microbiol, 2020.
- 232 14. Smithgall, M.C., et al., *Comparison of Cepheid Xpert Xpress and Abbott ID Now*
233 *to Roche cobas for the Rapid Detection of SARS-CoV-2.* J Clin Virol, 2020: p.
234 104428.
- 235 15. Rhoads, D.D., et al., *Comparison of Abbott ID Now, Diasorin Simplexa, and CDC*
236 *FDA EUA methods for the detection of SARS-CoV-2 from nasopharyngeal and*
237 *nasal swabs from individuals diagnosed with COVID-19.* J Clin Microbiol, 2020.
- 238 16. Harrington, A., et al., *Comparison of Abbott ID Now and Abbott m2000 methods*
239 *for the detection of SARS-CoV-2 from nasopharyngeal and nasal swabs from*
240 *symptomatic patients.* J Clin Microbiol, 2020.
- 241 17. Basu, A., et al., *Performance of the rapid Nucleic Acid Amplification by Abbott*
242 *ID NOW COVID-19 in nasopharyngeal swabs transported in viral media and dry*
243 *nasal swabs, in a New York City academic institution.* bioRxiv, 2020: p. 1-19.
- 244 18. *Advice on the use of point-of-care immunodiagnostic tests for COVID-19:*
245 *Scientific brief.* World Health Organization. p. 1-2.

- 246 19. *Coronavirus (COVID-19) Update: FDA Informs Public About Possible Accuracy*
247 *Concerns with Abbott ID NOW Point-of-Care Test*. 2020, U.S. Food and Drug
248 Administration.
249