medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.09.21250610; this version posted February 12, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Title: Pooling of samples for SARS-CoV-2 detection using rapid antigen tests

Authors: Nol Salcedo[1], Alexander Harmon[1], Bobby Brooke Herrera[1,2‡]

Affiliations:

[1]E25Bio, Inc., Cambridge, MA, USA

[2]Department of Immunology and Infectious Diseases, Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health, Boston, MA, USA

[‡]Corresponding Author: BBH, bbherrera@e25bio.com

Key Words: SARS-CoV-2, COVID-19, rapid antigen test, pooled testing

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.09.21250610; this version posted February 12, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Abstract

While molecular assays, such as reverse-transcription polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR), have been widely used throughout the coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic, the technique is resource intensive and costly. As a means to reduce costs and expand diagnostic efficiency, pooled testing using RT-PCR has been implemented. However, pooled testing using rapid antigen tests has not been evaluated. Here, we propose a pooling strategy for rapid antigen testing that would significantly expand COVID-19 surveillance, especially for low-to-middle income countries, and schools and workplaces. Our data demonstrate that combining of up to 20 samples per pool can expand surveillance with rapid antigen tests, even if a pool contains only one positive sample.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.09.21250610; this version posted February 12, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Background

With ongoing worldwide transmission of severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2), laboratory testing has played an important role in detecting the virus in symptomatic and asymptomatic individuals. Molecular assays, such as reverse-transcription polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR), are accurate but costly, challenging large scale surveillance efforts, especially for low-to-middle income countries.

Pooling subsamples and processing them in groups by RT-PCR has been proposed as a testing strategy to reduce costs (1). A recent study demonstrated that a range of positive pools could be identified, even if the Ct value of a single sample was up to 34 (2). Public health surveillance tools, such as rapid antigen tests, have also been advocated for since early in the pandemic to help control SARS-CoV-2 spread. Rapid antigen tests are optimized to identify infectious individuals, and can be self-administered or performed at the point-of-care, leading to faster sample to result time and more frequent testing (3). However, pooled testing using rapid antigen tests, has not been evaluated.

Results

We propose a pooling strategy for antigen testing that is easy to implement and can further expand COVID-19 surveillance. To analyze the effect of sample pooling on the analytical sensitivity of a rapid antigen test, we compared antigen detectability of single nasal swab specimens with varying Ct values versus when pooled into 19 negative nasal swab specimens. Antigen detectability was determined by applying 100 µl of the single specimen or pooled sample to the rapid antigen test (E25Bio, Inc.). Ct values and viral load (VL) for each positive nasal swab specimen was determined by extracting RNA via the QIAamp Viral RNA Kit (Qiagen) and measured using the CDC's 2019-nCoV Real-Time RT-PCR N1 assay on the

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.09.21250610; this version posted February 12, 2021. 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. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

QuantStudio 5 Real-Time PCR System (Applied Biosystems). The primary studies under which the samples and data were collected received ethical clearance from the non-profit PATH (www.path.org) Institutional Review Board (IRB) (approval number 00004244.) All excess samples and corresponding data were banked and de-identified prior to analysis. This study received an exemption determination from the PATH IRB.

Our results show that the rapid antigen test detected positive pools between Ct values 18.3 (VL: 7.6E7) and 28.5 (VL: 6.7E4), compared to 18.3 and 29.1 (VL: 4.8E4) for single nasal swab specimens (Figure). These data suggest that combining of up to 20 samples per pool can expand surveillance with rapid antigen tests, even if a pool contains only one positive sample. Only in the case of a positive pool test result is additional rapid antigen testing and/or RT-PCR of individual samples required. Notably, specimens collected and screened beyond the acute infection phase (7 days post-infection) will likely escape detection by a rapid antigen test, regardless if the specimen is pooled or non-pooled (data not shown).

Conclusion

Pooled testing using rapid antigen tests can be a cost-effective and efficient public health approach to expand COVID-19 surveillance, especially for low-to-middle income countries and schools or workplaces.

Competing Interests

NS, AH, and BBH are employed by E25Bio, Inc., a biotechnology company that develops diagnostic assays for fever-causing infectious diseases.

References

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.09.21250610; this version posted February 12, 2021. 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. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

1. Tromberg BJ, Schwetz TA, Perez-Stable EJ, Hodes RJ, Woychik RP, Bright RA, et al. Rapid Scaling Up of Covid-19 Diagnostic Testing in the United States - The NIH RADx Initiative. N Engl J Med. 2020;383(11):1071-7.

2. Lohse S, Pfuhl T, Berko-Gottel B, Rissland J, Geissler T, Gartner B, et al. Pooling of samples for testing for SARS-CoV-2 in asymptomatic people. Lancet Infect Dis. 2020;20(11):1231-2.

3. Larremore DB, Wilder B, Lester E, Shehata S, Burke JM, Hay JA, et al. Test sensitivity is secondary to frequency and turnaround time for COVID-19 screening. Sci Adv. 2020.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.09.21250610; this version posted February 12, 2021. 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. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Figure



Figure Legend

Figure: Analytical sensitivity of a rapid antigen test using single nasal swab specimens versus pooled samples

Nasal swabs were collected into 300 µl saline buffer. 100 µl of the positive nasal swab specimens with Ct values ranging between 18.3 and 29.9 were spiked into 100 µl of 19 negative nasal swab specimens. 100 µl of the pooled samples or 100 µl of the single positive nasal swab specimens were applied to the antigen test and allowed to run for 15 minutes before visual test results were image captured. To determine relative nucleocapsid antigen levels detected by the antigen test, images were analyzed using image processing software. Briefly, a R (version 4.0.3) script running on a desktop computer was activated upon DropBox sync and called ImageJ (NIH) to perform the image analysis on the uploaded file. ImageJ quantified the pixel intensities at the antigen test background and test areas, and generated a normalized intensity,

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.09.21250610; this version posted February 12, 2021. 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. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

calculated by dividing the cumulative intensity of the test area by the cumulative intensity of the background area. Ct, cycle threshold. Horizontal dashed line, limit of detection for the antigen test.