

Antigen-based testing but not real-time PCR correlates with SARS-CoV-2 virus culture

Andrew Pekosz, PhD,^{1,2} Charles K. Cooper, MD,³ Valentin Parvu, PhD,³ Maggie Li, MS,¹ Jeffrey C. Andrews, MD,³ Yukari C. Manabe, MD,^{1,4} Salma Kodsi, MS,³ Jeffrey Leitch, PhD,³ Devin S. Gary, PhD,³ Celine Roger-Dalbert, MS³

¹W. Harry Feinstone Department of Molecular Microbiology and Immunology, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, ²Department of Emergency Medicine

³Becton, Dickinson and Company, BD Life Sciences – Integrated Diagnostic Solutions, 7 Loveton Circle, Sparks, MD, USA,

⁴Department of Medicine, Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine, Baltimore, Maryland

#To whom correspondence should be addressed:

Andrew Pekosz, PhD

615 N. Wolfe Street

Room W2116

Baltimore, Maryland 21205

Phone: 410-502-9306

Email: apekosz1@jhu.edu

Charles K. Cooper, MD

Vice President of Medical Affairs

Becton, Dickinson and Company, BD Life Sciences – Integrated Diagnostic Solutions

7 Loveton Circle, Sparks MD 21152, USA

Phone: 410-316-4984

E-mail: Charles_K_Cooper@bd.com

WORD COUNT

1,668 (Introduction, Results, and Discussion); 942 (Methods)

KEY WORDS: SARS-CoV-2; Antigen testing; SARS-CoV-2 contagious; viral load; live culture; RT-PCR testing

RUNNING TITLE: SARS-CoV-2 antigen testing and infectiousness

1 **SUMMARY**

2 Individuals can test positive for SARS-CoV-2 by real-time polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR)
3 after no longer being infectious.¹⁻⁸ Positive SARS-CoV-2 antigen-based testing exhibits a
4 temporal pattern that corresponds with active, replicating virus and could therefore be a more
5 accurate predictor of an individual's potential to transmit SARS-CoV-2.^{2,3,9} Using the BD
6 Veritor System for Rapid Detection of SARS-CoV-2 later flow antigen detection test, we
7 demonstrate a higher concordance of antigen-positive test results with the presence of cultured,
8 infectious virus when compared to RT-PCR. When compared to infectious virus isolation, the
9 sensitivity of antigen-based testing is similar to RT-PCR. The correlation between SARS-CoV-2
10 antigen and SARS-CoV-2 culture represents a significant advancement in determining the risk
11 for potential transmissibility beyond that which can be achieved by detection of SARS-CoV-2
12 genomic RNA. Coupled with a rapid time-to-result, low cost, and scalability, antigen-based
13 testing should facilitate effective implementation of testing and public health interventions that
14 will better contain COVID-19.

15 INTRODUCTION

16 The SARS-CoV-2 causes COVID-19 and is spread from human-to-human primarily through
17 airborne transmission.¹⁰ The mean incubation time, or presymptomatic period, for SARS-CoV-2
18 is approximately 5.8 days (95% CI 5.0-6.7),^{11,12} and the period of transmission (the total time
19 during which a patient is contagious) begins around one to three days prior to symptom onset,
20 with a subsequent reduction in contagiousness occurring 7-10 days following symptom
21 onset.^{8,13,14} Recent work in a golden hamster SARS-CoV-2 model demonstrated that although the
22 presence of genomic RNA in nasal washes extends to 14 days post-inoculation, the detection of
23 infectious virus and the communicable period both end well before 14 days.¹⁵ In addition, four
24 previous studies, utilizing culture-based virus detection from human specimens, demonstrated an
25 absence of infectious isolates from most specimens taken eight days after symptom onset, despite
26 measurable viral RNA loads using RT-PCR.^{1,3,5,7}

27
28 Several SARS-CoV-2 antigen-based tests, which work via a lateral flow immunoassay
29 mechanism, have recently received Emergency Use Authorization (EUA) from the Food and
30 Drug Administration.¹⁶⁻¹⁹ Several lines of indirect evidence suggest that antigen-based testing
31 may align better with culture-based test results compared to RT-PCR. For example, higher RT-
32 PCR Ct values from specimens are observed when individuals are negative by antigen testing or
33 culture-based testing compared to those from individual that are antigen test⁹ or culture-based
34 test positive.⁶ In addition, current EUA SARS-CoV-2 antigen tests have optimal performance
35 profiles¹⁶⁻¹⁹ at time points that overlap with the temporal expression profile of SARS-CoV-2 sub-
36 genomic RNA (a marker for active, replicating virus).³ Despite the recognition that point-of-care
37 or other testing modalities might be more effective at discerning contagious from non-contagious

38 individuals,² no study has directly compared antigen-based testing with RT-PCR in the same
39 study using a reference method for infectiousness.

40

41 The objective of this study was to determine whether SARS-CoV-2 antigen testing differentiates
42 SARS-CoV-2-contagious individuals (e.g., those still shedding infectious virus) from non-
43 contagious individuals compared to RT-PCR methodology. To address this, we utilized Quidel
44 Lyra[®] SARS-CoV-2 Assay (“RT-PCR assay”) positive and negative specimens obtained from a
45 diverse set of collection sites across the USA. The RT-PCR assay and the BD Veritor™ System
46 for Rapid Detection of SARS-CoV-2 (“antigen test”) were compared to SARS-CoV-2
47 TMRSS2 culture (a sensitive virus culture test utilizing the VeroE6TMRSS2 cell line), which
48 served as the reference method for determining infectiousness.

49 **RESULTS**

50 The 38 RT-PCR positive specimens were tested for the presence of SARS-CoV-2 using infection
51 of VeroE6TMPRSS2 cell cultures (SARS-CoV-2 TMPRSS2 culture). Overall, 28 RT-PCR-
52 positive specimens were also positive by SARS-CoV-2 TMPRSS2 culture and 10 of 38 RT-
53 PCR-positive specimens were negative by SARS-CoV-2 TMPRSS2 culture (Figure 1A). SARS-
54 CoV-2 TMPRSS2 culture-positive specimens had a mean log₁₀ viral RNA copy number of 7.16
55 compared to 4.01 from specimens that were SARS-CoV-2 TMPRSS2 culture-negative (p-value
56 <0.001; two-sample t-test, 2-tailed analysis). Further stratification by results from the antigen test
57 showed that 27 of 28 RT-PCR-positive/SARS-CoV-2 TMPRSS2 culture-positive specimens
58 were also positive in the antigen test; only two of the ten RT-PCR-positive/ SARS-CoV-2
59 TMPRSS2 culture-negative specimens were positive by the antigen test.

60
61 Of the 38 RT-PCR-positive results utilized for these analyses, nine were antigen test negative.
62 These nine negative results showed a trend towards longer time from symptom onset compared
63 to the 29 RT-PCR assay-positive/antigen test-positive specimens (4.4 days on average versus
64 2.9, p-value = 0.108).⁹ Of the nine samples that were RT-PCR-positive/antigen test-negative, the
65 viral RNA copy number was significantly lower than that observed for the 29 RT-PCR-
66 positive/antigen test-positive specimens (mean 4.3 log₁₀ cp/mL versus 7.0 log₁₀ cp/mL, p-
67 value<0.001, Figure S1). Symptom day was not a significant factor in multivariate models, while
68 viral RNA load continued to be significant (p-value = 0.002).

69
70 Probit models for percent positivity by viral RNA load corresponding to the RT-PCR assay,
71 antigen test, SARS-CoV-2 TMPRSS2 culture, and SARS-CoV-2 culture with VeroE6 cells

72 (“SARS-CoV-2 VeroE6 culture;” data integrated into the probit model using previous data; see
73 Methods)⁶ are provided in Figure 1B. The SARS-CoV-2 VeroE6 culture yielded a positive result
74 at a rate of 5% for a viral load of 5.75 log₁₀ cp/ml, whereas the SARS-CoV-2 TMPRSS2 culture
75 corresponded to a positive result with a rate of 5% at a viral load of 4.5 log₁₀ cp/mL. At a viral
76 load of 2.6 log₁₀ cp/mL, the antigen test yielded a positive result at a rate of 5%. In a
77 multivariate generalized linear model with viral RNA load and test type, the SARS-CoV-2
78 TMPRSS2 culture was not significantly different from the antigen test (p-value = 0.953). Both
79 the SARS-CoV-2 TMPRSS2 culture and antigen test were significantly more likely to yield
80 positive results than SARS-CoV-2 VeroE6 culture (p-value<0.001 for both). Unlike the antigen
81 test, the RT-PCR assay showed very little overlap with SARS-CoV-2 TMPRSS2 culture,
82 yielding positive results at much lower viral loads.

83
84 As shown in Table 1, the antigen test demonstrated a sensitivity and specificity of 96.4% (95%
85 CI: 82.3, 99.4) and 98.7% (96.1, 99.7), respectively. The RT-PCR assay demonstrated a
86 sensitivity and specificity of 100% (87.7, 100) and 95.5% (91.1, 97.8), respectively. Based on the
87 study prevalence of 11.2%, as determined by SARS-CoV-2 TMPRSS2 culture positivity and a
88 total specimen number of 251 (based on the total, evaluable specimen set utilized for the Veritor
89 EUA study), the positive predictive value (PPV) for the antigen test was 90.0% (76.3, 97.6),
90 while the PPV for the RT-PCR assay was only 73.7% (60.8, 85.3).

91 **DISCUSSION**

92 The results here show similar sensitivity between the SARS-CoV-2 antigen test and the SARS-
93 CoV-2 RT-PCR assay (96.4% and 100%, respectively) over a time range of <8 days post
94 symptom onset. However, the SARS-CoV-2 antigen test had a PPV of 90.0%, whereas the RT-
95 PCR assay showed a PPV of only 73.7%. In addition, the probit model for percent positivity
96 employed in this study showed considerable overlap between the antigen test and the SARS-
97 CoV-2 Tmprss2 culture, with little overlap between the SARS-CoV-2 Tmprss2 culture and
98 RT-PCR.

99
100 Ct values are inversely correlated with the viral load thresholds corresponding to infectious virus
101 isolation. Because limits of detection vary between RT-PCR assays, however, Ct values reported
102 by specific RT-PCR assays correspond to different viral RNA loads.^{6,7,20-25} Here we utilized the
103 Lyra assay to establish a probit model of percent positivity by viral load, which facilitates a
104 better comparison of these results with previous work. Recent studies involving upper respiratory
105 swab specimens reported no cases of COVID-19 with SARS-CoV-2 viral RNA loads below 4
106 log₁₀ cp/mL.^{1,3,5,6,8,13,26,27} Other work has shown that specimens with viral RNA loads ≤ 6 log₁₀
107 cp/ml have minimal or no culturable SARS-CoV-2 virus.^{3,5,28-30} Here, a low percent positivity (5-
108 10%) was observed for the SARS-CoV-2 VeroE6- culture test below 6 Log₁₀ cp/mL. The
109 SARS-CoV-2 Tmprss2 culture test, however, showed 90% positivity at 5.6 log₁₀ cp/mL.
110 Although antigen test had a larger distribution of positivity, it overlapped considerably with the
111 SARS-CoV-2 Tmprss2 culture test and approached 90% positivity at a viral RNA load of
112 6.4Log₁₀. This is consistent with the WHO target product profile for priority diagnostics, which

113 supports viral RNA load based methodologies and includes an acceptable limit of detection for
114 point-of-care tests of 6Log10 cp/mL.³¹

115

116 As with other viruses, RT-PCR-based methodologies may be detecting SARS-CoV-2 RNA even
117 after infectious virus is no longer present,³²⁻³⁷ especially at time periods beyond 7 days from
118 symptom onset.^{1,3} For most patients with COVID-19, efforts to isolate live virus from upper
119 respiratory tract specimens have been unsuccessful ≥ 10 days from symptom onset; it is unlikely
120 that these individuals pose a transmission risk to others.²⁵ In addition, there is no evidence to date
121 that persistent or recurrent detection of viral RNA, following recovery from COVID-19, poses a
122 risk of SARS-CoV-2 transmission.²⁵

123

124 This work highlights a key potential value of decentralized POC antigen-based testing and
125 furthers our understanding of the interpretation of antigen test results. Antigen testing facilitates
126 accurate and rapid detection of infectious individuals who may not require direct medical
127 management (due to mild/non-severe disease), but for whom infection control measures have the
128 potential to interrupt community transmission. While RT-PCR is highly sensitive when
129 compared to SARS-CoV-2 TMRSS2culture, antigen testing also showed excellent sensitivity
130 (96.4%) coupled with better PPV relative to RT-PCR (90.0 versus 73.7) and rapid time to results.

131

132 This study had limitations. It only included specimens from patients within seven days of
133 symptom onset. Several studies have demonstrated an inability to culture SARS-CoV-2 beyond
134 day eight, despite ongoing RT-PCR positivity.^{1,3,5} Serial sampling of COVID-19 patients is
135 needed to determine if there is a propensity to have viral antigen test positive results after a

136 negative result, as can sometimes be seen with RT-PCR tests. Results from this study likely
137 underestimate the difference in specificity between RT-PCR and antigen testing that would be
138 expected in a set that included specimens collected at later times post symptom onset. In this
139 study, while three subjects were antigen test false positives versus SARS-CoV-2 TMPRSS2
140 culture, as many as ten subjects were RT-PCR false positives versus culture (viral RNA loads
141 ranging from 2.6 to 5.4 log₁₀ copies/mL). Although the sample size was adequate in this study,
142 the confidence intervals in the probit model were too wide to establish a definitive viral load cut-
143 off. To improve the precision associated with the point estimates, either a larger study or a meta-
144 analysis, involving multiple studies, would be required. Also, there are limitations associated
145 with the use of culture positivity or viral RNA load as a surrogate for infectiousness or
146 transmissibility that require further investigation. Finally, it is unclear how well the results here
147 will extrapolate to the other antigen tests due to variability in limit of detection or other test
148 characteristics.

149

150 *Conclusion*

151 Point-of-care SARS-CoV-2 antigen tests have the potential to significantly change the public
152 health interventions needed to minimize the spread of COVID-19 by providing a better test to
153 identify individuals that are likely to be shedding infectious virus and therefore transmit SARS-
154 CoV-2. This will allow for rapid identification of asymptomatic COVID-19 cases and inform
155 shorter periods of self-isolation for COVID-19 infected individuals. In addition, the low cost and
156 scalability in low and middle-income countries associated with antigen-based testing will be an
157 important tool in the diagnostic armamentarium to contain and suppress COVID-19 community
158 transmission.

159 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

160 We thank the National Institute of Infectious Diseases, Japan, for providing VeroE6TMPRSS2
161 cells. We also thank Karen Eckert (Becton, Dickinson and Company, BD Life Sciences –
162 Diagnostic Systems) for her input on the content of this manuscript and editorial assistance and
163 Stanley Chao (Becton, Dickinson and Company, BD Life Sciences – Diagnostic Systems) for
164 statistical support. The individuals acknowledged here have no additional funding or additional
165 compensation to disclose. We are grateful to the study participants who allowed this work to be
166 performed.

167

168 **AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS**

169 All authors contributed to the interpretation of the data, critically revised the manuscript for
170 important intellectual content, approved the final version to be published, and agree to be
171 accountable for all aspects of the work.

172

173 **FUNDING**

174 This study was funded by Becton, Dickinson and Company; BD Life Sciences—Integrated
175 Diagnostics Solutions. Non-BD employee authors received research funds to support their work
176 for this study.

177

178 **POTENTIAL CONFLICTS OF INTEREST**

179 CKC, VP, JCA, SK, JL, DSG, and CR-D are employees of Becton, Dickinson and Company

180 AP—None

181 ML—None

182 YM—None

183 **REFERENCES**

- 184 1 Bullard, J. *et al.* Predicting infectious SARS-CoV-2 from diagnostic samples. *Clinical*
185 *infectious diseases : an official publication of the Infectious Diseases Society of America*,
186 doi:10.1093/cid/ciaa638 (2020).
- 187 2 Mina, M. J., Parker, R. & Larremore, D. B. Rethinking Covid-19 Test Sensitivity — A
188 Strategy for Containment. *New England Journal of Medicine*,
189 doi:10.1056/NEJMp2025631 (2020).
- 190 3 Wolfel, R. *et al.* Virological assessment of hospitalized patients with COVID-2019.
191 *Nature* **581**, 465-469, doi:10.1038/s41586-020-2196-x (2020).
- 192 4 Widders, A., Broom, A. & Broom, J. SARS-CoV-2: The viral shedding vs infectivity
193 dilemma. *Infect Dis Health* **25**, 210-215, doi:10.1016/j.idh.2020.05.002 (2020).
- 194 5 La Scola, B. *et al.* Viral RNA load as determined by cell culture as a management tool for
195 discharge of SARS-CoV-2 patients from infectious disease wards. *Eur J Clin Microbiol*
196 *Infect Dis* **39**, 1059-1061, doi:10.1007/s10096-020-03913-9 (2020).
- 197 6 Huang, C. G. *et al.* Culture-Based Virus Isolation To Evaluate Potential Infectivity of
198 Clinical Specimens Tested for COVID-19. *J Clin Microbiol* **58**, doi:10.1128/JCM.01068-
199 20 (2020).
- 200 7 Gniazdowski, V. *et al.* Repeat COVID-19 Molecular Testing: Correlation with Recovery
201 of Infectious Virus, Molecular Assay Cycle Thresholds, and Analytical Sensitivity.
202 *medRxiv*, 2020.2008.2005.20168963, doi:10.1101/2020.08.05.20168963 (2020).
- 203 8 Arons, M. M. *et al.* Presymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 Infections and Transmission in a
204 Skilled Nursing Facility. *N Engl J Med* **382**, 2081-2090, doi:10.1056/NEJMoa2008457
205 (2020).
- 206 9 Young, S. *et al.* Clinical evaluation of BD Veritor SARS-CoV-2 point-of-care test
207 performance compared to PCR-based testing and versus the Sofia 2 SARS Antigen point-
208 of-care test. *Journal of Clinical Microbiology (In press)* (2020).
- 209 10 Morawska, L. & Cao, J. Airborne transmission of SARS-CoV-2: The world should face
210 the reality. *Environ Int* **139**, 105730, doi:10.1016/j.envint.2020.105730 (2020).

- 211 11 McAloon, C. *et al.* Incubation period of COVID-19: a rapid systematic review and meta-
212 analysis of observational research. *BMJ Open* **10**, e039652, doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2020-
213 039652 (2020).
- 214 12 Griffin, J. M. *et al.* A rapid review of available evidence on the serial interval and
215 generation time of COVID-19. *medRxiv*, 2020.2005.2008.20095075,
216 doi:10.1101/2020.05.08.20095075 (2020).
- 217 13 He, X. *et al.* Temporal dynamics in viral shedding and transmissibility of COVID-19. *Nat*
218 *Med* **26**, 672-675, doi:10.1038/s41591-020-0869-5 (2020).
- 219 14 Byrne, A. W. *et al.* Inferred duration of infectious period of SARS-CoV-2: rapid scoping
220 review and analysis of available evidence for asymptomatic and symptomatic COVID-19
221 cases. *BMJ Open* **10**, e039856, doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2020-039856 (2020).
- 222 15 Sia, S. F. *et al.* Pathogenesis and transmission of SARS-CoV-2 in golden hamsters.
223 *Nature* **583**, 834-838, doi:10.1038/s41586-020-2342-5 (2020).
- 224 16 BinaxNOW™ COVID-19 Ag CARD [package insert, EUA]. Abbott Diagnostics
225 Scarborough, Inc., Scarborough, MA; (2020).
- 226 17 LumiraDx™ SARS-CoV-2 Ag Test [package insert, EUA]. LumiraDx Group Limited,
227 Dumyat Business Park Alloa FK10 2PB, UK (2020).
- 228 18 BD Veritor™ System for Rapid Detection of SARS-CoV-2 [package insert, EUA].
229 Becton, Dickinson and Company, Sparks-Glencoe, MD; (2020).
- 230 19 Sofia® SARS Antigen FIA [package insert, EUA]. Quidel Corporation. San Diego, CA;
231 (2020).
- 232 20 Jacot, D., Greub, G., Jaton, K. & Opota, O. Viral load of SARS-CoV-2 across patients
233 and compared to other respiratory viruses. *Microbes Infect*, 2020.2007.2015.20154518,
234 doi:10.1016/j.micinf.2020.08.004 (2020).
- 235 21 La Marca, A. *et al.* Testing for SARS-CoV-2 (COVID-19): a systematic review and
236 clinical guide to molecular and serological in-vitro diagnostic assays. *Reprod Biomed*
237 *Online* **41**, 483-499, doi:10.1016/j.rbmo.2020.06.001 (2020).

- 238 22 van Kasteren, P. B. *et al.* Comparison of seven commercial RT-PCR diagnostic kits for
239 COVID-19. *J Clin Virol* **128**, 104412, doi:10.1016/j.jcv.2020.104412 (2020).
- 240 23 Vogels, C. B. F. *et al.* Analytical sensitivity and efficiency comparisons of SARS-CoV-2
241 RT-qPCR primer-probe sets. *Nat Microbiol* **5**, 1299-1305, doi:10.1038/s41564-020-
242 0761-6 (2020).
- 243 24 Dinnes, J. *et al.* Rapid, point-of-care antigen and molecular-based tests for diagnosis of
244 SARS-CoV-2 infection. *The Cochrane database of systematic reviews* **8**, CD013705,
245 doi:10.1002/14651858.CD013705 (2020).
- 246 25 CDC. Duration of Isolation and Precautions for Adults with COVID-19. Figure 5.
247 Updated September 10, 2020. [https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/hcp/duration-](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/hcp/duration-isolation.html)
248 [isolation.html](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/hcp/duration-isolation.html) (Last accessed 9/11/2020).
- 249 26 Cevik, M., Bamford, C. G. G. & Ho, A. COVID-19 pandemic-a focused review for
250 clinicians. *Clin Microbiol Infect* **26**, 842-847, doi:10.1016/j.cmi.2020.04.023 (2020).
- 251 27 Savvides, C. & Siegel, R. Asymptomatic and presymptomatic transmission of SARS-
252 CoV-2: A systematic review. *medRxiv*, doi:10.1101/2020.06.11.20129072 (2020).
- 253 28 Larremore, D. B. *et al.* Test sensitivity is secondary to frequency and turnaround time for
254 COVID-19 surveillance. *medRxiv*, doi:10.1101/2020.06.22.20136309 (2020).
- 255 29 Quicke, K. *et al.* Longitudinal Surveillance for SARS-CoV-2 RNA Among
256 Asymptomatic Staff in Five Colorado Skilled Nursing Facilities: Epidemiologic,
257 Virologic and Sequence Analysis. *medRxiv*, doi:10.1101/2020.06.08.20125989 (2020).
- 258 30 van Kampen, J. J. A. *et al.* Shedding of infectious virus in hospitalized patients with
259 coronavirus disease-2019 (COVID-19): duration and key determinants. *medRxiv*,
260 2020.2006.2008.20125310, doi:10.1101/2020.06.08.20125310 (2020).
- 261 31 WHO. COVID-19 Target product profiles for priority diagnostics to support response to
262 the COVID-19 pandemic v.0.1 Released July 31,
263 <https://www.who.int/publications/m/item/covid-19-target-product-profiles-for-priority->
264 [diagnostics-to-support-response-to-the-covid-19-pandemic-v.0.1](https://www.who.int/publications/m/item/covid-19-target-product-profiles-for-priority-) (2020).

- 265 32 Peiris, J. S. *et al.* Clinical progression and viral load in a community outbreak of
266 coronavirus-associated SARS pneumonia: a prospective study. *Lancet* **361**, 1767-1772,
267 doi:10.1016/s0140-6736(03)13412-5 (2003).
- 268 33 Chan, K. H. *et al.* Detection of SARS coronavirus in patients with suspected SARS.
269 *Emerging infectious diseases* **10**, 294-299, doi:10.3201/eid1002.030610 (2004).
- 270 34 Oh, M. D. *et al.* Viral Load Kinetics of MERS Coronavirus Infection. *N Engl J Med* **375**,
271 1303-1305, doi:10.1056/NEJMc1511695 (2016).
- 272 35 Wang, Y. *et al.* Factors Associated With Prolonged Viral Shedding in Patients With
273 Avian Influenza A(H7N9) Virus Infection. *J Infect Dis* **217**, 1708-1717,
274 doi:10.1093/infdis/jiy115 (2018).
- 275 36 Sissoko, D. *et al.* Persistence and clearance of Ebola virus RNA from seminal fluid of
276 Ebola virus disease survivors: a longitudinal analysis and modelling study. *The Lancet.*
277 *Global health* **5**, e80-e88, doi:10.1016/S2214-109X(16)30243-1 (2017).
- 278 37 Paz-Bailey, G. *et al.* Persistence of Zika Virus in Body Fluids - Final Report. *N Engl J*
279 *Med* **379**, 1234-1243, doi:10.1056/NEJMoa1613108 (2018).
- 280 38 Meng, X., Deng, Y., Dai, Z. & Meng, Z. COVID-19 and anosmia: A review based on up-
281 to-date knowledge. *American journal of otolaryngology* **41**, 102581,
282 doi:10.1016/j.amjoto.2020.102581 (2020).
- 283 39 Fu, L. *et al.* Clinical characteristics of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) in China: A
284 systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Infect* **80**, 656-665, doi:10.1016/j.jinf.2020.03.041
285 (2020).
- 286 40 Bossuyt, P. M. *et al.* STARD 2015: An Updated List of Essential Items for Reporting
287 Diagnostic Accuracy Studies. *Radiology* **277**, 826-832, doi:10.1148/radiol.2015151516
288 (2015).
- 289 41 Lyra® SARS-CoV-2 Assay [package insert, EUA]. Quidel Corporation. Athens, OH;
290 (2020).
- 291 42 Matsuyama, S. *et al.* Enhanced isolation of SARS-CoV-2 by TMPRSS2-expressing cells.
292 *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **117**, 7001-7003, doi:10.1073/pnas.2002589117 (2020).

- 293 43 Waggoner, J. J. *et al.* Triplex Real-Time RT-PCR for Severe Acute Respiratory
294 Syndrome Coronavirus 2. *Emerging infectious diseases* **26**, 1633-1635,
295 doi:10.3201/eid2607.201285 (2020).
- 296 44 Wickham, H. *ggplot2: Elegant Graphics for Data Analysis*. Springer-Verlag New York,
297 (2016).
- 298 45 R Core Team . *R: A language and environment for statistical computing*. R Foundation
299 for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. <https://www.R-project.org/> (2020).

300 **METHODS**

301 *Study design and specimen collection*

302 Prospective specimen collection, specimen use, and participant demographics for the parent
303 study were described previously.⁹ This study involved the use of residual respiratory swab
304 specimens from the previous antigen test Food and Drug Administration-Emergency Use
305 Authorization (EUA) study, which occurred across 21 geographically diverse study sites, from
306 June 5-11, 2020. Briefly, eligible participants were ≥ 18 years of age and had one or more self-
307 reported COVID-19 symptoms between 0-7 days from symptom onset.^{38,39} Nasal swab
308 specimens for use with antigen testing were collected only after the standard of care (SOC) swab.
309 Nasopharyngeal (NP) swab specimens were collected after the nasal swab specimen for use with
310 the RT-PCR assay (the laboratory reference standard in the EUA study); if an NP was collected
311 as part of the SOC procedure at a collection site, the participant was given the choice of having
312 an oropharyngeal (OP) swab specimen collected in lieu of a second NP swab for use with the
313 RT-PCR assay. Overall, 76 specimen sets (consisting of one nasal and either one NP or one OP
314 swab) were utilized from the original 251 evaluable specimen sets in the EUA study. The 76
315 specimens consisted of all 38 RT-PCR assay positive specimens, and 38, randomly selected RT-
316 PCR assay negative specimens from the parent study. Specimens for the RT-PCR assay
317 consisted of 71 NP swabs (37 and 34 positive and negative, respectively) and five OP swabs (1
318 and 4 positive and negative swabs, respectively). For the EUA study, reference testing was
319 performed at TriCore Reference Laboratories while the antigen testing was performed internally
320 at BD (San Diego, CA, USA). No study-related procedures were performed without an informed
321 consent process or signature of a consent form. This research was performed in alignment with

322 principles set forth by Good Clinical Practice guidelines and the Declaration of Helsinki. This
323 article was prepared according to STARD guidelines for diagnostic accuracy studies reporting.⁴⁰

324

325 *Test/assay procedures*

326 Antigen test and RT-PCR assay

327 The antigen test (Becton, Dickinson and Company, BD Life Sciences—Integrated Diagnostic
328 Solutions, San Diego, CA) and RT-PCR assay (Quidel Corporation, Athens, OH) were
329 performed according to the manufacturers' IFU.^{19,41} The only exception was that nasal swabs
330 were shipped on dry ice (-70°) to the testing site prior to preparation for the antigen test. The RT-
331 PCR assay reports cycle number in a manner that omits the first 10 cycles; here cycle numbers
332 for the RT-PCR assay are reported with the addition of first 10 cycles.

333

334 SARS-CoV-2 virus culture

335 VeroE6TMPRSS2 was adapted from the VeroE6 cell line (ATCC CRL-1586) to express the
336 TMPRSS2 protease at levels approximately 10-fold higher than that found in the human lung.⁴²
337 The cells were cultured in complete medium (CM) consisting of Dulbecco's modified Eagle
338 Medium, supplemented with 10% fetal bovine serum (Thermo Fisher Scientific-Gibco,
339 Waltham, MA), 1mM glutamine (Thermo Fisher Scientific-Invitrogen, Waltham, MA), 1mM
340 sodium pyruvate (Thermo Fisher Scientific-Invitrogen, Waltham, MA), 100µg/mL penicillin
341 (Thermo Fisher Scientific-Invitrogen, Waltham, MA) and 100 µg/mL streptomycin (Thermo
342 Fisher Scientific-Invitrogen, Waltham, MA), at 37°C in a humidified chamber with 5% carbon
343 dioxide. Cells were grown to 75% confluence in a 24 well plate format and the CM was removed
344 and replaced with 150 µL of infection media (IM) which is identical to CM but with the fetal

345 bovine serum reduced to 2.5%. One hundred microliters (100 μ L) of the clinical specimen was
346 added to each assay well and the cells were incubated at 37°C for two hours. The inoculum was
347 then aspirated and replaced with 0.5 ml IM; the cells were then maintained at 37°C for four days.
348 When a cytopathic effect was visible in most of the cells in a given well, the IM was harvested
349 and stored at -70°C. The presence of SARS-CoV-2 was confirmed through quantitative RT-PCR
350 as described previously,^{7,43} by extracting RNA from the cell culture supernatant using the Qiagen
351 viral RNA isolation kit and performing RT-PCR using the N1 and N2 SARS-CoV-2 specific
352 primers and probes in addition to primers and probes for human RNaseP gene using synthetic
353 RNA target sequences to establish a standard curve.

354

355 *Probit models for probability of positive SARS-CoV-2 result*

356 The RT-PCR assay was performed on serially diluted samples containing SARS-CoV-2 related
357 genomic RNA prepared in universal transport media (containing human lung epithelial cells at
358 130,000 cells per mL) at concentrations ranging from 1.27 log₁₀ copies/mL (cp/ml) to 4.27
359 log₁₀ cp/ml (Table S1). The RT-PCR assay probability of positive result was fit using a probit
360 model linking the Lyra results to viral RNA load. Linear regression was performed linking log₁₀
361 cp/ml viral RNA load to Lyra Ct score using all samples with at least 3 log₁₀ cp/ml (for which
362 observed Lyra positivity was 100%).

363

364 Antigen test positivity and SARS-CoV-2 Tmprss2 culture positivity (a surrogate for
365 contagiousness), with RT-PCR confirmation, were fit with a probit model as a function of viral
366 load, using results from the Veritor EUA study;⁹ RT-PCR assay Ct scores were used to estimate
367 viral RNA loads, as described above. SARS-CoV-2 VeroE6 culture positivity linkage to viral

368 load was inserted into the probit model for probability of a positive result using data from Huang
369 et al (2020).⁶ Virus isolation in Huang et al was attempted for a total of 60 specimens, positive
370 by RT-PCR for SARS-CoV-2. Of those, 23 were positive by culture. Ct scores of the SARS-
371 CoV-2 envelope, nucleocapsid, and non-structural protein-12 RT-PCR targets were linked to the
372 viral load (log₁₀ cp/ml) through quadratic regressions. The empirical equation for envelope
373 target Ct score was then used to calculate viral load for the 23 culture positive and 37 culture
374 negative specimens (Figure S2). All analyses were performed using the R software system and
375 the ggplot2 R package.^{44,45}

376

TABLES
377
TABLE 1
378

379

380

381

382

383

384

385

386

387

388

389

390

391

392

393

394

395

396

397

398

399

400

401

402

403

404

405

406

Table 1. Performance of the antigen test and the RT-PCR assay for detection of SARS-CoV-2 infectivity based on virus culture positive results within 0-7 days from symptom onset

Performance values	Antigen test performance	RT-PCR assay performance
Prevalence: 11.2%		
Sensitivity	96.4 [82.3, 99.4]	100 [87.7, 100]
Specificity	98.7 [96.1, 99.7]	95.5 [91.1, 97.8]
PPV	90.0 [76.3, 97.6]	73.7 [60.8, 85.3]
NPV	99.5 [97.7, 100]	100 [98.4, 100]
Accuracy	98.4 [96.0, 99.4]	96.0 [92.8, 97.8]
TP	27	28
FP	3	10
FN	1	0
TN^a	220	213

Abbreviations: RT-PCR, real-time polymerase chain reaction; PPV, positive predictive value; NPV, negative predictive value; TP, true positive; FP, false positive; FN, false negative; TN, true negative


^aincludes 176 specimen sets that were RT-PCR and antigen negative, with unavailable culture results.

407
408
409

FIGURES
FIGURE 1


410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427

Figure 1A.



428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445

Figure 1B.



446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457


Figure 1. (A) The 38 RT-PCR assay positive specimens are plotted by Log₁₀ copies/mL (y-axis) and are stratified by the SARS-CoV-2 live culture results (negative, n=10; positive, n=28). The median and inter-quartile range values, respectively, for the RT-PCR-positive/SARS-CoV-2 TMPRSS2 culture-negative were 4.21 and 1.37; the median and inter-quartile range values, respectively, for the RT-PCR-positive/SARS-CoV-2 TMPRSS2 culture-negative were 7.39 and 1.66. The mean values for the SARS-CoV-2 TMPRSS2 culture-negative and SARS-CoV-2 TMPRSS2 assay-positive specimen groups were significantly different (4.01 versus 7.16, respectively; p-value <0.001 based on two-sample t-test [2-tailed]). Antigen test positive results are indicated as red data points (n=29) and the antigen test negative results (n=9) are indicated by the green data points. (B) Probit models linking viral load to the probability of positive result of RT-PCR (Lyra), antigen test (Veritor), SARS-CoV-2 TMPRSS2 culture and SARS-CoV-2 Ver0E6 culture (refer to Huang et al 2020). Viral load levels at which there is a 5% chance of positive result: 1.6, 2.6, 4.5, and 5.75 log₁₀ cp/ml for RT-PCR, antigen, SARS-CoV-2 TMPRSS2 culture, and SARS-CoV-2 Ver0E6 culture, respectively.

458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476

SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIAL
TABLE S1


Table S1. Corresponding values for Ct score and viral RNA load during limit of detection analysis involving Lyra SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR assay-positive specimens

Viral Load (copies/mL)	Log10 Viral Load	#Positive/ #Tested	PCR assay Ct score; Mean (SD)
0	-	0/5	- (-)
19	1.27	0/9	- (-)
40	1.60	1/10	38.03 (-)
86	1.94	1/9	38.83 (-)
186	2.27	4/10	37.33 (1.20)
400	2.60	8/10	35.89 (1.69)
862	2.94	8/10	34.51 (1.62)
1857	3.27	10/10	32.66 (1.07)
4000	3.60	10/10	31.08 (0.75)
8618	3.94	9/9	30.09 (1.15)
18566	4.27	9/9	29.51 (1.45)



477 **FIGURE S1**

478 **Figure S1.** Box plots showing the median values for SARS-CoV-2 viral RNA loads from
479 antigen-positive and -negative results within the 38 RT-PCR-positive results from the
480 Veritor test EUA study. A two-sample t-test (2-tailed) analysis indicated a significantly
481 higher mean (7.0 log₁₀ cp/ml) for RT-PCR-positive/antigen-positive results compared to
482 that (4.3 log₁₀ cp/mL) for RT-PCR-positive/antigen negative results (p-value<0.001).



483 **FIGURE S2**

484
485 **Figure S2.** Relation of the RT-PCR Ct scores for the BD MAX assay, the RT-PCR
486 assay, and the RT-PCR method used in Huang et al (2020)⁶ to viral load. Empirical
487 equation for the RT-PCR assay $Ct = 42.69 - 3.14 \text{ Log}_{10} \text{ copies/mL}$. Empirical equation
488 for the E target in Huang et al: $\text{Log}_{10} \text{ copies/mL} = 12.377 - 0.052 \text{ Ct} - 0.005 \text{ Ct}^2$

489
490