



24 COVID-19 swab-negative vs swab-positive cohort UK

25 **Keywords**

26 Coronavirus infection, COVID-19, severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2, Retrospective  
27 Studies, Cohort Studies, Hospitalization

28 **Abstract**

29 Patients with strong clinical features of COVID-19 with negative real time polymerase chain reaction  
30 (RT-PCR) SARS-CoV-2 testing are not currently included in official statistics. The scale,  
31 characteristics and clinical relevance of this group are thus unknown. We performed a retrospective  
32 cohort study in two large London hospitals to characterize the demographic, clinical, and  
33 hospitalization outcome characteristics of swab-negative clinical COVID-19 patients. We found 1 in 5  
34 patients with a negative swab and clinical suspicion of COVID-19 received a clinical diagnosis of  
35 COVID-19 within clinical documentation, discharge summary or death certificate. We compared this  
36 group to a similar swab positive cohort and found similar demographic composition, symptomology  
37 and laboratory findings. Swab-negative clinical COVID-19 patients had better outcomes, with shorter  
38 length of hospital stay, reduced need for >60% supplementary oxygen and reduced  
39 mortality. Patients with strong clinical features of COVID-19 that are swab-negative are a common  
40 clinical challenge. Health systems must recognize and plan for the management of swab-negative  
41 patients in their COVID-19 clinical management, infection control policies and epidemiological  
42 assessments.

43 **Background**

44 As of 2<sup>nd</sup> August 2020, the World Health Organization (WHO) has reported 17.6 million confirmed  
45 cases of COVID-19 globally with 532,340 confirmed deaths.[1] WHO defines a confirmed case as a  
46 person with laboratory confirmation of COVID-19 infection.[2] Cases where laboratory confirmation  
47 is not done or inconclusive are recognized as probable cases however those with strong clinical  
48 features, but negative testing are not recognized.[2] Epidemiological evaluations in many countries,  
49 including the UK, focus on patients with positive real-time polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR)

50 testing.[3] This places a significant importance on the diagnostic accuracy of laboratory testing when  
51 it has been performed.

52

53 However, the diagnostic accuracy of RT-PCR upper respiratory tract swabs is increasingly being  
54 questioned. A study utilizing both chest computerized tomography imaging (CT) and RT-PCR testing  
55 in patients with suspected COVID-19 found 75% of cases with a negative RT-PCR test had CT  
56 findings suggestive of COVID-19.[4] Several case reports describe patients with clinical features of  
57 COVID-19 but negative upper respiratory tract swabs who later have positive confirmatory testing on  
58 induced sputum or bronchial lavage.[5–7] A recent analysis of published cohorts calculated the false-  
59 negative rate of RT-PCR testing amongst symptomatic COVID-19 patients who eventually test  
60 positive for COVID-19 is likely 20% and increases gradually with time since symptoms onset.[8]

61

62 Acknowledging this, some patients with strong features of COVID-19 receive a clinical diagnosis of  
63 COVID-19 despite a negative swab result. This clinical approach is being further recognized in the  
64 admission criteria of some clinical trials who permit recruitment of these patients.[9] For example in  
65 the recently reported RECOVERY trial 10% of those randomized to dexamethasone had a negative  
66 swab at the time of randomization.[10] However, little has been documented about the scale and  
67 clinical relevance of this subgroup of patients for whom there is no consensus on optimal  
68 management. Our study aims to assess the real-world prevalence and characteristics of clinically  
69 diagnosed swab-negative COVID-19, including factors associated with swab-negative disease, and  
70 whether their outcomes differ to swab-positive patients.

71

## 72 **Methods**

73 We retrospectively reviewed medical admissions from March 1 to April 12, 2020 at Imperial College  
74 Healthcare Trust (ICHNT) in London, UK from two admitting sites. We defined eligible cases as  
75 those who presented with clinical suspicion of COVID-19 or had symptoms compatible with COVID-  
76 19, were admitted to hospital and had a SARS-CoV-2 nasopharyngeal swab performed. We collected  
77 full demographic characteristics, time course of symptoms, time of presentation and testing,

78 presenting symptoms, final diagnosis and outcome as well as radiological and laboratory findings for  
79 all patients with a negative swab from admission until discharge. Cases were evaluated using the  
80 Public Health England (PHE) testing criteria for possible COVID cases.

81

82 We defined swab-negative clinical COVID-19 cases as follows: a) clinical COVID-19 or high level of  
83 suspicion as defined by the treating medical team (as recorded in the medical notes, discharge  
84 documents or death certificate); and b) RT-PCR swab-negative (on initial and any subsequent tests  
85 performed).

86

87 The swab-negative clinical COVID-19 group of patients was compared to a subgroup of a previously  
88 described swab-positive cohort who were similarly admitted via general medical admissions.<sup>11</sup> Chi-  
89 square, Fisher's and rank sum tests were used, as appropriate, to compare the cohorts' characteristics,  
90 and odds ratios (OR) calculated to assess differences in the outcomes of respiratory deterioration,  
91 defined as requiring greater than 60% oxygen, and death. Lastly, we assessed the cumulative risk of  
92 the competing outcomes of hospital discharge and death over time using the using the Nelson-Aalen  
93 estimator.

94

95 The study was approved by the ICHNT clinical governance team. As we report on routinely collected  
96 non-identifiable clinical audit data, no individual informed consent was required under the UK policy  
97 framework for health and social care. All methods were conducted in accordance with relevant  
98 guidelines and regulations.

99

## 100 **Results**

101 We identified 1,119 emergency medical admissions with initial clinical suspicion of COVID-19 who  
102 had a SARS-CoV-2 swab performed (Figure 1). Initial swab was negative in 456 (41%) and positive  
103 in 663 (59%) patients. 62% (281/456) of those who were swab-negative received an alternative  
104 diagnosis. 47 of the swab-negative cohort later tested positive for COVID-19 on repeat PCR testing.  
105 The most common alternative diagnoses included community acquired pneumonia, lower respiratory

106 tract infection and exacerbations of chronic lung disease such as chronic obstructive pulmonary  
107 disease.

108

109 Overall, 20% (94/456) of swab-negative cases were identified as swab-negative clinical COVID-19.  
110 98% (92/94) of these cases fulfilled PHE criteria for patients eligible to be swabbed for COVID-19  
111 compared to 84% of the entire swab-negative group. 41/94 had repeat swab testing performed and  
112 remained negative.

113

114 The demographic profile and symptomatology of the swab-positive and swab-negative cohorts were  
115 similar, with high rates of influenza-like symptoms, cough and fever in both groups (Table). Typical  
116 features such as shortness of breath was higher in the swab-negative clinical COVID-19 cohort (75/92  
117 (79.79%) vs 312/478 (66.67%)  $p=0.017$ ). The swab-negative cohort was more likely to have chest  
118 radiographs reporting typical COVID-19 appearances than the swab-positive cohort (53/77 (68.83%)  
119 vs 195/389 (50.13%);  $p=0.004$ ).

120

121 Overall haematological and biochemical findings that have been associated with COVID-19 including  
122 raised CRP, d-dimer and ferritin were similarly distributed between the two cohorts. A higher  
123 proportion of patients had moderate lymphopenia within the swab-negative group (65/94 (69.15%) vs  
124 258/460 (56.09%);  $p=0.026$ ).

125

126 Patients in the swab-negative group presented slightly later in their clinical course after symptom  
127 onset, at a median of 7 days (IQR 4.3-13) for the RT-PCR-negatives compared to 6 days (IQR 3-10)  
128 within the RT-PCR-positives cohort ( $p<0.001$ ). Interestingly, RT-PCR-negative patients had better  
129 hospitalisation outcomes than RT-PCR-positives. The former had a 57% lower probability of  
130 requiring  $\geq 60\%$  supplementary oxygen during hospitalisation (OR 0.43, 95%CI 0.26-0.70,  $p<0.001$ ),  
131 a shorter length of hospital stay (median 5 days vs 6 days,  $p<0.001$ ) and 60% lower probability of  
132 death (OR 0.40, 95%CI 0.22-0.72,  $p<0.001$ ). The cumulative risk of being discharged alive was  
133 significantly higher in the swab-negative group than the positive group ( $p < 0.001$ ). Furthermore, the

134 swab-negative cohort have a lower cumulative risk of in-hospital mortality than positives ( $p < 0.001$ )  
135 (Figure 2).

136

### 137 **Discussion**

138 We find one in five patients who had a negative COVID-19 swab received a clinical diagnosis of  
139 COVID-19 despite negative testing. This represents a 13% higher estimate of the number of  
140 hospitalized COVID-19 patients compared to considering swab-positive patients alone. Overall the  
141 clinical, biochemical and radiological features of the swab-negative clinical COVID-19 cohort did not  
142 differ significantly to the swab-positive cohort. Typical features of COVID-19 such as shortness of  
143 breath, typical chest x-ray findings and lymphopenia are more common in the swab-negative cohort as  
144 we would expect in a group defined by these parameters. Despite these similarities, swab-negative  
145 patients tended to have a longer delay between symptom onset and hospitalization, and had  
146 significantly better hospitalization outcomes, including mortality. Whether this potentially less  
147 aggressive phenotype is related to a lower viremia, variations in immune response or a different stage  
148 of illness presenting after period of peak viral replication is not yet known. Further research including  
149 immunological profiling would help further elucidate underlying disease mechanisms.

150

151 Our study is, to our knowledge, the first to detail a cohort of swab-negative clinical COVID-19. Our  
152 results provide evidence to validate swab-negative COVID-19 as a real clinical entity commonly  
153 encountered in hospital settings, findings which have important implications for current clinical  
154 practice and public health guidance.[12]

155

156 Firstly, it highlights that clinicians caring for COVID-19 patients should maintain a high clinical  
157 suspicion, even in the presence of a negative swab result. Our results suggest that a combination of  
158 clinical, radiological and biochemical features in keeping with COVID-19 disease, rather than swab  
159 results alone, should guide clinical management.

160

161 Secondly, managing swab-negative clinical COVID-19 within hospital poses disease control  
162 challenges. Cohorting this group with swab-positive patients presents potential risk of SARS-CoV-2  
163 infection, if the clinical diagnosis is incorrect.<sup>12</sup> Alternatively, isolating these patients from both swab-  
164 negative low-risk patients and swab-positive groups would place significant strain on hospital  
165 resources and may be unfeasible during an outbreak. Repeated testing may be beneficial in some  
166 cases however in our cohort 41/94 swab negative clinical COVID-19 cases had a repeat swab which  
167 remained negative. Testing on sputum or bronchial lavage may provide greater sensitivity.<sup>5-7</sup>  
168 However, their use is limited by feasibility and potential risk to healthcare workers. Serological  
169 testing to confirm exposure to SARS-CoV-2 is likely the optimal second-line test as it is not operator-  
170 dependent, is low-risk to healthcare workers, and can feasibly be performed on a large number of  
171 patients. Serological proof of exposure could reduce concern regarding cohorting with swab-positive  
172 patients. However, these tests are not yet in routine clinical practice and require further evaluation.

173

174 Lastly, but importantly, from a public health perspective, swab-negative clinically diagnosed COVID-  
175 19 patients may not be captured in surveillance statistics, thereby underestimating healthcare demand.  
176 As the pandemic evolves countries with reducing incidence should consider this clinical group and  
177 how they should be addressed when planning interventions to prevent second-wave outbreaks such as  
178 contact tracing.

179 Our study is limited by its retrospective nature and likely under-estimates the proportion of patients  
180 with swab-negative clinical COVID-19, as it requires a high degree of clinical confidence without  
181 alternative diagnosis. The lack of positive confirmatory test means we cannot be sure of the true  
182 diagnosis in the clinically diagnosed swab negative group. However, this does not detract from the  
183 clinical problems this group presents to hospital management and epidemiological assessment. In the  
184 absence of improved testing or routine second line testing for patients who have high clinical  
185 suspicion of COVID-19 but negative swab testing, this group is likely to continue to pose a clinical  
186 challenge. During the period of data collection changes in local policy regarding repeated testing  
187 prevented re-testing for COVID-19 even in cases with high clinical suspicion therefore not all patients  
188 had repeated testing performed.

189

190 Patients with strong clinical features of COVID-19 who have negative nasopharyngeal RT-PCR test  
191 results are a common but understudied clinical group. Patients with a clinical diagnosis of COVID-19  
192 do not differ significantly to similar swab-positive patients but seem to have better outcomes.  
193 Healthcare services should recognize and plan for the management of this group when making disease  
194 control interventions and epidemiological assessments.

195

196

## 197 **References**

- 198 1 World Health Organization. Coronavirus disease (COVID-2019) situation reports.  
199 2020.[https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019/situation-](https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019/situation-reports)  
200 reports (accessed 18 May 2020).
- 201 2 World Health Organization. Global surveillance for COVID-19 caused by human  
202 infection with COVID-19 virus: interim guidance.  
203 2020.[https://www.who.int/publications-detail/global-surveillance-for-covid-19-caused-](https://www.who.int/publications-detail/global-surveillance-for-covid-19-caused-by-human-infection-with-covid-19-virus-interim-guidance)  
204 by-human-infection-with-covid-19-virus-interim-guidance (accessed 18 May 2020).
- 205 3 UK Government. Number of coronavirus (COVID-19) cases and risk in the UK. Number  
206 of coronavirus (COVID-19) cases and risk in the UK.  
207 2020.<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/coronavirus-covid-19-information-for-the-public>  
208 (accessed 27 Apr 2020).
- 209 4 Ai T, Yang Z, Hou H, *et al*. Correlation of Chest CT and RT-PCR Testing in Coronavirus  
210 Disease 2019 (COVID-19) in China: A Report of 1014 Cases. *Radiology* 2020;:200642.  
211 doi:10.1148/radiol.2020200642
- 212 5 Hase R, Kurita T, Muranaka E, *et al*. A case of imported COVID-19 diagnosed by PCR-  
213 positive lower respiratory specimen but with PCR-negative throat swabs. *Infectious*  
214 *Diseases* 2020;**52**:423–6. doi:10.1080/23744235.2020.1744711



- 215 6 Winichakoon P, Chaiwarith R, Liwsrisakun C, *et al.* Negative Nasopharyngeal and  
216 Oropharyngeal Swabs Do Not Rule Out COVID-19. *J Clin Microbiol* 2020;**58**:e00297-  
217 20, /jcm/58/5/JCM.00297-20.atom. doi:10.1128/JCM.00297-20
- 218 7 Han H, Luo Q, Mo F, *et al.* SARS-CoV-2 RNA more readily detected in induced sputum  
219 than in throat swabs of convalescent COVID-19 patients. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases*  
220 2020;;S1473309920301742. doi:10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30174-2
- 221 8 Kucirka LM, Lauer SA, Laeyendecker O, *et al.* Variation in False-Negative Rate of  
222 Reverse Transcriptase Polymerase Chain Reaction–Based SARS-CoV-2 Tests by Time  
223 Since Exposure. *Annals of Internal Medicine* 2020;;M20-1495. doi:10.7326/M20-1495
- 224 9 Kulkarni S, Fisk M, Kostapanos M, *et al.* Repurposed immunomodulatory drugs for  
225 Covid-19 in pre-ICu patients - mulTi-Arm Therapeutic study in pre-ICu patients admitted  
226 with Covid-19 – Repurposed Drugs (TACTIC-R): A structured summary of a study  
227 protocol for a randomised controlled trial. *Trials* 2020;**21**:626. doi:10.1186/s13063-020-  
228 04535-4
- 229 10 Horby P, Lim WS, Emberson J, *et al.* Effect of Dexamethasone in Hospitalized Patients  
230 with COVID-19: Preliminary Report. *Infectious Diseases (except HIV/AIDS)* 2020.  
231 doi:10.1101/2020.06.22.20137273
- 232 11 Perez Guzman P, Daunt A, Mukherjee S, *et al.* Report 17: Clinical characteristics and  
233 predictors of outcomes of hospitalised patients with COVID-19 in a London NHS Trust:  
234 a retrospective cohort study. Imperial College London 2020. doi:10.25561/78613
- 235 12 Public Health England. COVID-19: investigation and initial clinical management of  
236 possible cases. 2020.[https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/wuhan-novel-](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/wuhan-novel-coronavirus-initial-investigation-of-possible-cases/investigation-and-initial-clinical-management-of-possible-cases-of-wuhan-novel-coronavirus-wn-cov-infection#criteria)  
237 [coronavirus-initial-investigation-of-possible-cases/investigation-and-initial-clinical-](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/wuhan-novel-coronavirus-initial-investigation-of-possible-cases/investigation-and-initial-clinical-management-of-possible-cases-of-wuhan-novel-coronavirus-wn-cov-infection#criteria)  
238 [management-of-possible-cases-of-wuhan-novel-coronavirus-wn-cov-infection#criteria](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/wuhan-novel-coronavirus-initial-investigation-of-possible-cases/investigation-and-initial-clinical-management-of-possible-cases-of-wuhan-novel-coronavirus-wn-cov-infection#criteria)  
239 (accessed 18 May 2020).

240

241

242

243

244 **Author Contributions:**

245 SN – Conceived study, data interpretation and provided clinical expertise and critical revision of the  
246 manuscript for intellectual and scientific content

247 PM – Conceived study, wrote the first manuscript and led on acquisition of data, interpreted data,  
248 provided clinical expertise and critical revision of the manuscript for intellectual and scientific content

249 PP – Conceived study, performed statistical analysis, interpreted data, provided clinical expertise and  
250 critical revision of the manuscript for intellectual and scientific content

251 AC – Supported data acquisition and curation and critical revision of the manuscript for intellectual  
252 and scientific content

253 NK - Supported data acquisition and curation and critical revision of the manuscript for intellectual  
254 and scientific content

255 AD - Supported data acquisition and curation and critical revision of the manuscript for intellectual  
256 and scientific content

257 SM - Supported data acquisition and curation and critical revision of the manuscript for intellectual  
258 and scientific content

259 MDK – Performed statistical analysis, data interpretation and critical revision of the manuscript for  
260 intellectual and scientific content

261 GC – Provided clinical expertise and critical revision of the manuscript for intellectual and scientific  
262 content

263 MRT – Provided clinical expertise and scientific expertise to lead the discussion of clinical and public  
264 health implications and critical revision of the manuscript for intellectual and scientific content

265 PJW - Provided clinical expertise and scientific expertise to lead the discussion of clinical and public  
266 health implications and critical revision of the manuscript for intellectual and scientific content

267 TBH - Provided clinical expertise and scientific expertise to lead the discussion of clinical and public  
268 health implications and critical revision of the manuscript for intellectual and scientific content

269 KH - Provided clinical expertise and scientific expertise to lead the discussion of clinical and public  
270 health implications and critical revision of the manuscript for intellectual and scientific content

271

### 272 **Funding Statement**

273 This work was supported by Medical Research Council Centre for Global Infectious Disease  
274 Analysis. Funders of the study had no role in study design, data collection, data analysis, data  
275 interpretation, or writing of the report.

### 276 **Competing Interests Statement**

277 Acknowledgements: SN, TBH, KH, PJW and PP are supported by the MRC Centre for Global  
278 Infectious Disease Analysis (MR/R015600/1); this award is jointly funded by the UK Medical  
279 Research Council (MRC) and the UK Department for International Development (DFID) under the  
280 MRC/DFID Concordat agreement and is also part of the EDCTP2 program supported by the  
281 European Union (EU). The authors would also like to acknowledge the support of the Imperial BRC  
282 Centre and J-IDEA. The authors would like to thank all patients and staff at Imperial College  
283 Healthcare NHS Trust.

284 Role of the Funder/Sponsor: The funding organizations had no role in the design and conduct of the  
285 study; collection, management, analysis, and interpretation of the data; preparation, review, or  
286 approval of the manuscript; and decision to submit the manuscript for publication.

287

### 288 **Figure 1. Case identification.**

289 \*98% (92/94) Clinical COVID-19 cases fulfilled PHE guidance on testing eligibility

290

### 291 **Figure 2. Cumulative risk of hospitalization outcomes by swab status.**

292

293 **Table.** Description of clinical characteristics and clinical course

294 *Abbreviations: CK, creatine kinase; CRP, C-reactive protein; EWS, early warning score;*

295 *FiO<sub>2</sub>, inspiratory fraction of oxygen; IQR, interquartile range; LDH, lactate dehydrogenase.*

296 \* Pearson's Chi-squared test with Yates' continuity correction

297 † Wilcoxon rank sum test with continuity correction

298 ‡ Fisher's exact test for count data

	RT-PCR-positive (n = 468)	RT-PCR-negative (n = 94)	p value
<b>Demography</b>			
Male, n (%)	288 (61.5%)	57 (60.6%)	0.962 *
Median age (IQR)	68 (54 - 79)	67 (54.25 - 78)	0.638 †
<b>Symptoms</b>			
Influenza-like syndrome, n (%)	341 (72.9%)	74 (78.7%)	0.293 *
Cough, n (%)	353 (75.4%)	71 (75.5%)	1.000 *
Fever, n (%)	389 (83.1%)	75 (79.8%)	0.530 *
Nasal discharge, n (%)	9 (1.9%)	3 (3.2%)	0.433 ‡
Shortness of breath, n (%)	312 (66.7%)	75 (79.8%)	<b>0.017</b> *
Wheezing, n (%)	1 (0.2%)	4 (4.3%)	<b>0.003</b> ‡
Anosmia, n (%)	12 (2.6%)	10 (10.6%)	<b>0.001</b> *
<b>Admission Oxygen Requirements (FiO<sub>2</sub>)</b>			
Room air, n (%)	254 (54.3%)	50 (53.2%)	0.937 *
24 to <40%	108 (23.1%)	31 (33.0%)	0.058 *
40 to <60%	8 (1.7%)	3 (3.2%)	0.405 ‡
>60%	98 (20.9%)	10 (10.6%)	<b>0.030</b> *
<b>Chest Radiograph</b>			
Normal CXR	65/389 (16.7%)	7/77 (9.1%)	0.129 *
Typical COVID-19 CXR	195/389 (50.2%)	53/77 (68.8%)	<b>0.004</b> *
Atypical COVID-19 CXR	106/389 (27.3%)	15/77 (19.5%)	0.201 *
Non-COVID abnormal CXR	23/389 (5.9%)	2/77 (2.6%)	0.403 ‡
<b>Laboratory Test</b>			
Lymphocytes ≥1.1	154/460 (33.5%)	25 (26.6%)	0.238 *
Lymphocytes 0.5-1.0	258/460 (56.1%)	65 (69.2%)	<b>0.026</b> *
Lymphocytes <0.5	43/460 (9.4%)	4 (4.3%)	0.152 ‡
CRP ≥100	230/448 (51.3%)	55/93 (59.1%)	0.209 *
CRP 10-99	186/448 (41.5%)	33/93 (35.5%)	0.336 *
CRP <10	32/448 (7.1%)	5/93 (5.4%)	0.698 *
D-dimer ≥3000	42/225 (18.7%)	16/66 (24.2%)	0.411 *
D-dimer 2000-2999	29/225 (12.9%)	9/66 (13.6%)	1.000 *

D-dimer 1000-1999	64/225 (28.4%)	19/66 (28.8%)	1.000 *
D-dimer 500-999	63/225 (28.0%)	18/66 (27.3%)	1.000 *
D-dimer <500	27/225 (12.0%)	4/66 (6.1%)	0.255 ‡
LDH ≥243	166/179 (92.7%)	48/51 (94.1%)	0.976 *
LDH <243	13/179 (7.3%)	3/51 (5.9%)	1.000 ‡
CK ≥320	63/210 (30.0%)	16/64 (25.0%)	0.538 *
CK <320	147/210 (70.0%)	48/64 (75.0%)	0.538 *
Ferritin ≥5000	13/259 (5.0%)	4/68 (5.9%)	0.761 ‡
Ferritin 1000-4999	94/259 (36.3%)	27/68 (39.7%)	0.706 *
Ferritin 500-999	73/259 (28.2%)	15/68 (22.1%)	0.390 *
Ferritin 300-499	38/259 (14.7%)	10/68 (14.7%)	1.000 *
Ferritin <300	41/259 (15.8%)	12/68 (17.7%)	0.860 *
<b>Clinical Course</b>			
Median (IQR) days prior to admission	6 (3 - 10)	7 (4.25 - 13)	<b>0.013</b> †
Median (IQR) length of stay	6 (4 - 10)	5 (2.25 - 6)	<b>&lt;0.001</b> †
Received ≥60% FIO2, n (%)	215 (45.9%)	25 (26.6%)	<b>0.001</b> *
Died, n (%)	151 (32.3%)	15 (16.0%)	<b>0.002</b> *

299

300

301



