

1 **Diagnostic accuracy of RT-PCR for detection of SARS-CoV-2 compared to a**
2 **“composite reference standard” in hospitalized patients**

3
4 **Noah Reich¹, Christopher F. Lowe^{2,3}, David Puddicombe⁵, Nancy Matic^{2,3}, Jesse Greiner⁴,**
5 **Janet Simons³, Victor Leung^{2,3}, Terry Chu⁴, Hiten Naik⁴, Nick Myles³, Laura Burns⁴, Marc**
6 **G. Romney^{2,3}, Gordon Ritchie^{2,3}, Sylvie Champagne^{2,3}, Kent Dooley^{3,6}, Inna Sekirov^{3,7},**
7 **Aleksandra Stefanovic^{2,3}**

8 ¹Faculty of Medicine, University of British Columbia, Canada

9 ²Division of Medical Microbiology and Virology, Providence Health Care, St. Paul’s Hospital

10 ³Department of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine, University of British Columbia, Vancouver,
11 Canada

12 ⁴Department of Medicine, Division of General Internal Medicine, University of British
13 Columbia, Vancouver, Canada

14 ⁵Perinatal Services BC, Provincial Health Service Authority, Vancouver, BC

15 ⁶Life Labs, Vancouver, Canada

16 ⁷British Columbia Center for Disease Control, Vancouver, BC

17

18 Short title: Diagnostic accuracy of RT-PCR for SARS-CoV-2

19 Keywords: Coronavirus, COVID-19, SARS-CoV-2, diagnostic accuracy, sensitivity, serology

20

21 Corresponding Author

22 Aleksandra Stefanovic MD, FRCPC

23 St. Paul’s Hospital, Providence Health Care

24 Virology Laboratory

25 1081 Burrard St.

26 Vancouver, BC, Canada

27 V6Z 1Y6

28 Email: astefanovic@providencehealth.bc.ca

29 Tel: (604) 806-8371

30

31 **Abstract**

32 Background:

33 COVID-19 caused by the novel coronavirus SARS-CoV-2 has caused the greatest public health
34 emergency of our time. Accurate laboratory detection of the virus is critical in order to contain
35 the spread. Although real-time polymerase chain reaction (PCR) has been the cornerstone of
36 laboratory diagnosis, there have been conflicting reports on the diagnostic accuracy of this
37 method.

38 Methods:

39 A retrospective review was performed on all hospitalized patients tested for SARS-CoV-2 (at St.
40 Pauls Hospital in Vancouver, BC) from March 13 – April 12, 2020. Diagnostic accuracy of
41 initial PCR on nasopharyngeal (NP) swabs was determined against a composite reference
42 standard which included a clinical assessment of the likelihood of COVID-19 by medical
43 experts, initial and repeat PCR, and post-hoc serological testing.

44 Results:

45 A total of 323 patients were included in the study, 33 (10.2%) tested positive and 290 (89.8%)
46 tested negative by initial PCR. Patients testing positive were more likely to exhibit features of
47 cough (66.7% vs 39.3%), shortness of breath (63.6% vs 35.9%), fever (72.7% vs 27.6%),
48 radiographic findings (83.3% vs 39.6%) and severe outcomes including ICU admission (24.2%
49 vs 9.7%) and mortality (21.2% vs 6.2%) compared to patients testing negative. Serology was
50 performed on 90 patients and correlation between serology and PCR was 98.9%. There were 90
51 patients included in the composite reference standard. Compared to the composite reference
52 standard, initial PCR had sensitivity of 94.7% (95% CI 74.0 to 99.9%), specificity of 100% (95%
53 CI 94.9 to 100%), positive predictive value of 100% (95% CI 81.5 to 100%) and a negative
54 predictive value of 98.6% (95% CI 92.5 to 100%).

55 Discussion:

56 Our study showed high sensitivity of PCR on NP swab specimens when compared to composite
57 reference standard in hospitalized patients. High correlation of PCR with serological testing
58 further increased confidence in the diagnostic reliability of properly collected NP swabs.

59

60 **Introduction:**

61 COVID-19, a disease caused by the novel coronavirus virus SARS-CoV-2, has caused an
62 unprecedented global pandemic and rapidly developed into the greatest public health emergency
63 of our time [1] [2]. The number of COVID-19 cases has reached over 100,000,000 and resulted in
64 more than 2,000,000 deaths globally at the time of this manuscript [3]. Accurate laboratory
65 detection has been paramount to controlling SARS-CoV-2 spread through identification of
66 infected individuals and areas of outbreak in the community and healthcare facilities.
67 Furthermore, expeditious testing of infected individuals has been critical to the public health
68 response of rapid case identification, contact tracing and quarantine [4].

69 Clinical manifestations of COVID-19 range from asymptomatic or mild infections to severe
70 pneumonia, respiratory failure and death [5]. While most cases of COVID-19 are mild, up to
71 20% require hospitalization and 5% intensive care [6] [7]. Hospitalized patients most commonly
72 present with fever, cough, shortness of breath, myalgia, fatigue, lymphopenia and bilateral
73 ground glass opacities on chest imaging. [6] [7] [8]

74 Molecular methods such as PCR are the mainstay for the diagnosis of COVID-19 in hospitalized
75 patients. Significant differences in molecular assays exist with respect to extraction methods,
76 target detection, specimen validation, instrumentation, and analytical sensitivity. The SARS-
77 CoV-2 genome has been well characterized allowing for primer development targeting different
78 components of the viral genome [9]. Commonly used primer targets include RdRP gene (RNA-
79 dependent RNA polymerase), E gene (envelope glycoprotein), N gene (nucleocapsid
80 phosphoprotein), ORF 1a/b genes (open reading frame), and S gene (spike glycoprotein). As part
81 of the *in vitro* diagnostic validation and regulatory approval, molecular assays undergo
82 assessment of analytic sensitivity and specificity; however, clinical diagnostic performance is
83 less well described. Reports of initial false negative SARS-CoV-2 results by PCR, later
84 diagnosed with COVID-19 by chest CT and repeat PCR, have emerged [10] [11]. As SARS-
85 CoV-2 serological testing has become available, this has presented another testing modality to
86 retrospectively adjudicate suspected cases with negative PCR [12]. The sensitivity and
87 specificity of serology are estimated in the range of 90-100% and 95-100%, respectively [13].

88 As no single reference standard for diagnosing COVID-19 exists, we aim to determine the
89 clinical sensitivity, specificity, positive and negative predictive values of a SARS-CoV-2 PCR
90 assay in acutely ill patients admitted to hospital using a composite reference method including
91 clinical assessment, molecular testing and serology for SARS-CoV-2.

92 **Methods:**

93 Participant selection

94 All adult patients aged ≥ 18 years admitted to an acute care hospital for >24 hrs tested by PCR for
95 SARS-CoV-2 from March 13 to April 17, 2020 were included in the study. Patients were
96 excluded from the study if they had testing performed >40 days after symptom onset [14].

97 Data collection

98 Data were collected retrospectively from the hospital's electronic medical record system. Patient
99 information included age, gender, medical comorbidities, symptoms, vital signs, laboratory and
100 imaging findings at the time of presentation to hospital. Presence of keywords on imaging
101 reports typical of COVID-19 infection (i.e., ground-glass, patchy infiltrates, opacification,
102 airspace disease, consolidation, crazy paving sign) as reported in the literature, were used as a
103 dichotomous variable [11] [15]. Admission date, discharge date, ICU admission, and mortality
104 were also collected. This study was approved by the Research Ethics Board, University of British
105 Columbia.

106 Diagnostic testing

107 Specimens for testing included nasopharyngeal swab, sputum, tracheal aspirate, or
108 bronchoalveolar lavage. Testing for viral RNA consisted of one of two commercial methods:
109 LightMix® Real-Time PCR COVID-19 assay for the Envelope E-gene (TIB Molbiol, Germany)
110 with amplification on the Roche LightCycler® 480, or Roche cobas® SARS-CoV-2 Qualitative
111 Assay on the cobas® 6800 System for detection of ORF1/a and E-genes (Roche Molecular
112 Diagnostics, Laval, QC). Antibody testing was performed on patients with serum collected ≥ 2
113 weeks and <4 months after PCR testing or symptom onset. Elecsys® Anti-SARS-CoV-2 assay
114 (Roche) using recombinant protein representing the nucleocapsid (N) antigen for determination
115 of total antibodies was performed on the Roche cobas® e601. The test result is given as a cut-off
116 index (COI) with $\text{COI} \geq 1.0$ considered “reactive” and $\text{COI} < 1.0$ as “non-reactive” as per package
117 insert [16].

118 Assessment of clinical likelihood of COVID-19

119 Patients were classified as having low, moderate, or high likelihood of COVID-19 based on chart
120 review and clinical assessment [6] [7] [8]. The assessors were asked to review epidemiologic risk
121 factors, clinical signs and symptoms, imaging findings, and laboratory results (other than SARS-
122 CoV-2 PCR or serology results) to judge the probability of COVID-19 infection. Low
123 probability cases had a clear alternative diagnosis explaining the clinical presentation and/or
124 clinical features inconsistent with a COVID-19 infection; moderate probability cases had
125 compatible clinical features and/or radiology findings but a presumptive alternative diagnosis;
126 and high probability cases presented with compatible clinical features, radiological findings, no
127 alternative diagnosis and/or an epidemiologic link to a known COVID-19 case. Patients deemed
128 moderate to high risk for COVID-19 on initial assessment, underwent further review by an
129 “expert panel” consisting of two internal medicine specialists caring for patients on dedicated
130 COVID-19 hospital units. Any discordance in “expert” assessment was reviewed by an

131 infectious disease specialist. Reviewers were not blinded to the PCR test result as it was reported
132 in the electronic medical chart but were blinded to the serological result.

133 Composite reference standard

134 The composite reference standard included the clinical assessment, any PCR result and serology.
135 Positive reference standard was defined as testing positive on at least 2 out of 3 modalities
136 (moderate or high clinical likelihood, PCR and serology). Composite reference testing was only
137 performed on cases which had all 3 modalities, including serology, available. Cases with no
138 serology available but PCR conversion from negative to positive for the same clinical episode
139 within 4 weeks were deemed false negative on initial PCR and were included in the calculation
140 of diagnostic accuracy. PCR reversion from positive to negative in patients with resolved clinical
141 symptoms within the follow-up period was not considered false positive as such conversion was
142 considered as part of the natural history of the disease.

143 Statistical Analysis:

144 The analysis population included all eligible patients who were admitted to hospital during the
145 study period. Pearson's chi-squared test was used to measure the association between binary or
146 categorical variables and PCR result. T-tests were performed to compare the equality of means
147 between continuous variables. For the sensitivity, specificity, positive and negative predictive
148 values, exact binomial 95% confidence intervals were calculated. Stata version 14.1 was used for
149 all analyses [17].

150 **Results:**

151 Epidemiological data

152 There were 323 patients included in the study of which 33 (10.2%) tested positive and 290
153 (89.8%) tested negative on initial PCR. The mean age of the PCR positive and negative cases
154 was 70.4 and 58.3, respectively (Table 1). Males and females comprised 69.3% and 30.3% of
155 PCR negative cases and 66.7% and 33.3% of PCR positive cases, respectively. The average time
156 from symptom onset to hospital admission in PCR positive and negative cases was 4.8 and 4.2
157 days, respectively. Of the PCR positive cases, 30.3% reported having a high risk exposure to a
158 COVID-19 confirmed case and 12.1% reported a travel history, while only 1.7% of PCR
159 negative cases had a high risk exposure and 3.1% had a travel history.

160 With regards to clinical features at presentation, PCR positive cases were more likely to have
161 cough 66.7% vs 39.3%, shortness of breath 63.6% vs 35.9% and fever 72.7% vs 27.6%.
162 Leukocytosis was present in 6.3% of PCR positive and 47.2% of PCR negative patients
163 ($p < 0.001$). Lymphopenia ($\leq 1.1 \times 10^9/L$) was present in 66.7% of PCR positive and 49.7% of PCR
164 negative cases ($p = 0.064$).

165 Positive chest x-ray (CXR) findings were reported in 83.3% of the PCR positive cases versus
166 39.6% of PCR negative patients ($p < 0.001$). Positive Chest CT features were present in 100% of
167 PCR positive cases compared to 45.3% of PCR negative cases ($p=0.062$). Of the PCR positive
168 cases, 4 (12.9%) cases were mild, 14 (45.2%) were moderate, 5 (15.2%) were severe, and 8
169 (25.8%) were critical; 2 (6.1%) cases were unable to be classified.

170 There were 24.2% and 9.7% ICU admissions in the PCR positive and negative groups,
171 respectively ($p=0.012$). Mortality occurred within 30 days in 21.2% of PCR positive and 6.2% of
172 PCR negative cases ($p=0.002$) (Table 1).

173 All patients had an NP swab collected initially. Subsequent samples included repeat NP swabs
174 (102), sputum (6), saliva (3), tracheal aspirate (2), bronchoalveolar lavage (3) and rectal swab
175 (1). There were no cases that initially tested negative by NP that subsequently tested positive by
176 an alternative sampling method. In two cases, an initial negative PCR was followed by a positive
177 PCR test occurring during the same clinical episode (within the 30 days). These cases were
178 coded as false negatives by initial PCR.

179 Clinical assessment

180 On clinical assessment of PCR negative cases, 245, 37, and 8 were deemed low, moderate and
181 high probability for COVID-19, respectively. Of PCR positive cases, 1, 3 and 29 were assigned
182 low, moderate, and high probability, respectively. Inter-assessor reliability of cases with
183 moderate or high clinical suspicion was 68.4% ($k=0.68$) [18]. In cases where composite standard
184 was available, clinical assessment of high likelihood correctly identified 91.2% of true cases,
185 whereas of cases with moderate and low clinical likelihood, 11.5% and 0.4% were true cases,
186 respectively.

187 PCR comparison with Serology

188 Serology was available for 90 (27.9%) of included patients, of which 17 tested “reactive” and 73
189 tested “non-reactive”. Serology was done at a mean of 69 days (range 14 to 138 days) from
190 symptom onset. The agreement between PCR and Serology was 98.9%, with one PCR positive
191 case testing non-reactive on serology ($COI=0.73$) (Table 3).

192 PCR comparison with composite reference standard

193 There were 90 patients included in the composite reference standard: 19 (21.1%) positive, 71
194 (78.9%) negative. Compared to the composite reference standard initial PCR was found to have
195 no false positives and 2 false negative. Sensitivity was estimated as 94.7% (95% CI 74.0 to
196 99.9%), specificity was 100% (95% CI 94.9 to 100%), positive predictive value was 100% (95%
197 CI 81.5 to 100%) and a negative predictive value was 98.6% (95% CI 92.5 to 100%) (Table 2).

198 **Discussion:**

199 In our study population, older age and male gender were associated with PCR positivity in
200 keeping with previous reports of elderly and male patients having more severe disease requiring
201 hospitalization [19]. Rates of epidemiological links to a known COVID-19 exposure were
202 significantly higher in PCR positive cases at 31.4%. As previously reported, cough, fever,
203 shortness of breath and myalgia were more frequently seen in PCR positive cases admitted to
204 hospital [6]. Lymphopenia was present in 66.7% of PCR positive and 49.7% of PCR negative
205 cases although this difference was not statistically significant ($p=0.064$). Observed trend of
206 higher proportion of lymphopenia in PCR positive cases did not reach statistical significance
207 perhaps as a result of high overall prevalence of lymphopenia in our study population due to
208 other causes (HIV, solid organ transplantation, steroid therapy etc.) and small number of cases.
209 Leukocytosis however, was significantly more frequent among PCR negative cases suggesting
210 alternative diagnoses (i.e. bacterial causes of infection). Rates of severe outcomes including ICU
211 admission of 24% and mortality of 21% were higher in the PCR positive group and similar to
212 previous reports in hospitalized patients including early reports from Wuhan and more recent
213 data from the UK [6] [20].

214 Positive CXR findings were more likely to be present in PCR positive cases compared to PCR
215 negative cases ($p<0.001$); presence of positive CT chest finding did not reach statistical
216 significance ($p=0.095$) between the two groups, perhaps due to limited numbers. Studies
217 comparing the diagnostic accuracy of CT chest to PCR reported higher sensitivity but poor
218 specificity (~25%) of CT chest [21] [22] [10] [11] [23]. CT chest for primary screening or
219 diagnosis of COVID-19 is not helpful in low prevalence setting due to significant rate of false
220 positives [24]. Even though radiological findings may be helpful as an added diagnostic tool in
221 settings of high COVID-19 incidence, they not only lack specificity but can also be falsely
222 negative early after symptom onset [11] [15].

223 The estimated clinical sensitivity of NP swab PCR of 94.3% from this study echoes a study by
224 Miller et al. who similarly ascertained PCR sensitivity of 95% in the first 5 days post-symptom
225 onset in hospitalized patients [25]. Earlier studies have suggested clinical sensitivity of molecular
226 assays to be in the range of 70% [26] [27] [28]. One of the earlier studies was a letter by Wang et
227 al which included only 8 “nasal swabs” in their analysis [26]. While there is much
228 interchangeable use of “nasal” and “nasopharyngeal (NP) swabs” in the literature, these are
229 considerably different collection methods with “nasal swabs” being much less sensitive [29] [30]
230 [31] [32]. Our group has further demonstrated the importance of proper specimen collection
231 method with increased rate of false negative results in inadequately collected NP swabs [32].
232 Yang et al. (pending peer review) also reported low sensitivity of PCR, however they similarly
233 included nasal swabs and utilized molecular assay with lower analytical sensitivity [27] [33]
234 [34]. Although their study had limited data on patient characteristics and confirmation of
235 COVID-19 diagnosis, it did suggest improved accuracy of lower respiratory tract specimens in
236 diagnosis of more severe cases of COVID-19 [27]. Indeed pathogenesis of SARS-COV-2
237 demonstrates that the virus, once acquired, replicates in the upper respiratory tract and in a subset

238 of patients advances and propagates in the lower respiratory airways and alveoli causing a more
239 severe presentation [35]. However, there are practical challenges in obtaining lower respiratory
240 tract specimens due to difficulty with sputum production or concerns of aerosol generation with
241 bronchoscopy. In our study, only in a small proportion (3.4%) of patients had lower respiratory
242 swabs collected.

243 There were 2 false negative cases on initial PCR converting to positive on subsequent testing. In
244 the first case, the initial negative NP swab was taken 24 hrs after symptom onset and became
245 positive 8 days later. PCR testing earlier than 48 hours of symptom onset can lead to false
246 negative results as viral shedding can be below the level of detection [36]. The second false
247 negative occurred in an elderly patient with severe viral pneumonia and high clinical likelihood
248 of COVID-19. The patient's first three NP swabs were negative until the fourth one tested
249 positive 18 days after symptom onset. In severe infection viral load tends to be higher and peaks
250 later; in this patient, it is possible that a lower respiratory specimen would have yielded better
251 viral RNA recovery [37]. Clinical diagnostic accuracy of a SARS-CoV-2 PCR assay depends on
252 the timing of presentation, clinical syndrome, anatomical site of testing, and quality of specimen
253 collection, all of which are separate from the analytic performance of the assay itself [38] [32]
254 [36].

255 As no accepted true gold standard for diagnosis of COVID-19 is available, we have developed a
256 pragmatic composite reference model based on clinical assessment by medical experts, PCR and
257 serology. A number of clinical prediction models have been proposed, however they have
258 suffered from a high risk of bias and a lack of validation, therefore we opted against using them
259 in our study [39]. Our model, although practical, is affected by the subjective nature of clinical
260 likelihood assessment. Expert group inter-assessor reliability was 68.4% in assigning patients to
261 moderate or high clinical likelihood groups. The moderate agreement could be reflective of non-
262 specific nature of COVID-19 presentation as well as the risk attitudes of assessors [40]. In order
263 to mitigate some of this subjectivity, we assigned patients deemed moderate or high likelihood
264 category as positive on clinical assessment and cases in low likelihood category as negative.
265 PCR and serology are incorporated as objective parts of the model; however, the evaluators were
266 blinded to serology but not PCR results, which may have introduced bias in the clinical
267 assessment.

268 Serological immunoassays have more recently become an adjunct to testing for COVID-19 [12]
269 [41]. Similar to nucleic acid testing, serological diagnostic accuracy is determined by the target
270 antigen and timing of collection. For example, antibodies (Abs) targeting the SARS-CoV-2 N
271 protein are detectable earlier than antibodies against S protein, and Anti-N-protein IgG Abs tend
272 to decrease earlier in the disease course than Anti-S-protein IgG Abs [42]. Our study criteria of
273 serological inclusion is reflective of the fact that antibodies are more reliably detectable after two
274 weeks and begin to decrease at four months after symptom onset [42] [12] [43] [41]. The
275 correlation of PCR with serology was 98.9%, further increasing our confidence in the diagnostic
276 performance on properly collected NP swabs. There were 2 false negative serology results

277 compares to composite reference standard. While 99% of truly negative serological cases had
278 COI value <0.1 (data not shown), one of the false negative cases had COI value of 0.73 closer to
279 a cut-off for positivity. This case was a heart transplant recipient who was deemed a true case
280 based on high clinical likelihood and a positive PCR. Perhaps due to his immunosuppression,
281 this patient was unable to mount a strong immune response. Interestingly, another true COVID-
282 19 case with prior renal transplant had a serology level at the threshold of positivity (COI=0.99)
283 as well. The second false negative case was an elderly patient on rituximab for rheumatoid
284 arthritis (COI=0.099). Recent studies have observed blunted or absent serological response in
285 transplanted patients and persons taking immunosuppressive medication [44] [45]. Further work
286 is needed in characterizing patients with low levels of IgG/IgM due various immunodeficiencies
287 and interpretation of serological results in immunocompromised individuals should be done with
288 caution.

289 The limitations of our study are the retrospective design and selection bias due to a hospital
290 setting. Our data on clinical sensitivity applies to sicker, hospitalized patients who tend to have
291 greater viral shedding, possibly leading to improved rates of PCR detection [46] [37]. Clinical
292 assessment of COVID-19 likelihood was not blinded to PCR results as reviewers had access via
293 an electronic medical record. Additionally, we have included the initial PCR test under
294 evaluation as part of the composite reference standard. Even though we have expanded the
295 reference standard to include any subsequent PCR results, this could have artificially enhanced
296 the diagnostic performance of the index PCR and introduced a bias. The proposed reference
297 standard has not been yet fully validated but reflects a practical approach utilizing currently
298 available diagnostic modalities. The presence of a clear alternative diagnosis was used to assign
299 lower likelihood of COVID-19 infection and although unlikely, there may have been cases of
300 dual diagnoses. Furthermore, we were only able to obtain serology on a subset of patients as
301 many were discharged from hospital prior to the time required to develop antibodies and had no
302 subsequent bloodwork. Similar to PCR, false negative serology on patients could have
303 overestimated PCR sensitivity, but in our data set, this is a rare occurrence which primarily
304 applies to highly immunocompromised individuals.

305 **Conclusion:**

306 In summary, the risk of false-negative results with nucleic acid amplification tests is mostly
307 related to pre-analytical factors such as timing of collection, the quality of sampling method and
308 specimen type [36] [42]. Molecular testing on NP swabs has a high clinical sensitivity and
309 excellent correlation with serology. As recommended by IDSA guidelines, cases with high
310 clinical likelihood of COVID-19 and repeatedly negative NP swab PCR should undergo testing
311 with serology to further enhance diagnostic yield [47], and a single PCR result cannot be
312 interpreted in isolation without full clinical assessment of the case.

313

314 **Acknowledgements:**

315 The authors would like to thank Dr. Christopher Ryerson, Dr. Jane McKay and the Post-COVID-
316 19 Recovery Clinic for their support of this work. We would like to extend our appreciation to
317 Dr. Althea Hayden and Dr. Rohit Vijh for their guidance. We are also grateful to our medical
318 microbiology and biochemistry technologists and scientists for their commitment to providing
319 high quality of laboratory testing.

320

321

322

323 **References:**

324

- [1] Z. Wu and J. M. McGoogan, "Characteristics of and Important Lessons from the Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Outbreak in China: Summary of a Report of 72 314 Cases from the Chinese Center for Disease Control and PRevention.," *JAMA*, vol. 323(13), pp. 1239-1242, 2020.
- [2] WHO, "WHO Situation Report, #51".
- [3] "<https://coronavirus.jhu.edu/map.html>," [Online].
- [4] "<https://www.canada.ca/en/public-health/services/diseases/2019-novel-coronavirus-infection/guidance-documents/federal-provincial-territorial-public-health-response-plan-ongoing-management-covid-19.html>," [Online].
- [5] R. T. Gandhi, J. B. Lynch and C. Del Rio, "Mild or Moderate Covid-19," *N Engl J Med*, 2020.
- [6] W. J. Guan, Z. Y. Ni, Y. Hu, W. H. Liang, C. Q. Ou, J. X. He, L. Liu, H. Shan, C. L. Lei, D. Hui, B. Du and Et al., "China Medical Treatment Expert Group for Covid-19. Clinical Characteristics of Coronavirus Disease 2019 in China," *N Engl J Med*, vol. 382, no. 18, pp. 1708-1720, 2020.
- [7] D. Wang, B. Hu, C. Hu, F. Zhu, X. Liu, J. Zhang and et al., "Clinical Characteristics of 138 Hospitalized Patients with 2019 Novel Coronavirus-Infected Penumonia in Wuhan, China," *JAMA*, vol. 323, no. 11, pp. 1061-1069, 2020.
- [8] C. Huang, Y. Wang, X. Li, L. Ren and et al., "Clinical features of patients infected with 2019 nocel coronavirus in Wuhan, China," *Lancet*, vol. 395, pp. 497-506, 2020.

- [9] N. Zhu, D. Zhang, W. Wang, X. Li, B. Yang, J. Song, X. Zhao, B. Huang, W. Shi, R. Lu, P. Niu, F. Zhan, X. Ma, D. Wang, W. Xu, G. Wu, G. F. Gao and W. Tan, "China Novel Coronaviurs Investigating and Research Team: A Novel Coronavirus from Patients with Pnumonia in China," *New England Journal of Medicine*, vol. 382, no. 8, pp. 727-733, 2020.
- [1 X. Xie, Z. Zhong, W. Zhao, C. Zheng, F. Wang and J. Liu, "Chest CT for Typical 2019-nCoV Pneumonia: 0] Relationship to Negative RT-PCR Testing.," *Radiology*, vol. 12, 2020.
- [1 T. Ai, Z. Yang, H. Hou, C. Zhan, C. Chen, W. Lv, Q. Tao, Z. Sun and L. Xia, "Correlation of Chest CT and 1] RT-PCR Testing in Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) in China: A Report of 1014 Cases.," *Radiology*, vol. 10, 2020.
- [1 Q. X. Long, B. Z. Liu, H. J. Deng and et al., "Antibody responses to SARS-CoV-2 in patients with COVID- 2] 19," *Nat Med*, 2020.
- [1 "https://www.fda.gov/medical-devices/emergency-situations-medical-devices/emergency-use- 3] authorizations," 2020 April 2020. [Online].
- [1 F. Zhou, T. Yu, R. Du, G. Fan, Y. Lin and et al., "Clinical course and risk factors for mortality of adult 4] inpatients with COVID-19 in Wuhan, China: a retrospectice cohort study," *Lancet*, vol. 395, no. 10229, pp. 1054-1062, 2020.
- [1 A. Bernheim, X. Mei, M. Huang and et al., "Chest CT Findings in Coronavirus Disease-19 (COVID-19): 5] Relationship to Duration of Infection.," *Radiology*, vol. 295, no. 3, 2020.
- [1 Roche-Canada, "Elecsys Anti-SARS-CoV-2," [Online]. Available: 6] https://www.rochecanada.com/content/dam/rochexx/roche-ca/products/docs/package_inserts/Can%20Elecsys%20Anti-SARS-CoV-2-09203079190-V1-PI-En-E2G.pdf.
- [1 Stata-Corp, "Stata statistical software: release 14.," College Station, TX: StataCorp. 7]
- [1 P. Brennan and A. Silman, "Statistical methods for assessing observer variability in clinical 8] measures," *BMJ*, vol. 304, no. 6840, pp. 1491-1494, 1992.
- [1 J. M. Jin, P. Bai, W. He, F. Wu, X. Liu, D. M. Han, S. Liu and J. K. Yang, "Gender Differences in Patients 9] with COVID-19: Focus on Severity and Mortality," *Front Public Health*, vol. 8, no. 152, 2020.
- [2 N. Brendish, S. Pool, V. Naidu, C. Mansbridge, N. Norton and H. Wheeler, "Clinical impact of 0] molecular point-of-care testing for suspected COVID-19 in hospital (COV-19POC): a prospective, interventional, non-randomised, controlled study," *Lancet*, vol. 8, no. 12, 2020.

- [2 C. Carver and N. Jones, "Comparative accuracy of oropharyngeal and nasopharyngeal swabs for
1] diagnosis of COVID-19," *CEBM*, 2020.
- [2 L. Zou, F. Ruan, M. Huang and L. Liang, "SARS-CoV-2 Viral Load in Upper Respiratory Specimens of
2] Infected Patients," *N Engl J Med*, vol. 382, no. 12, pp. 1177-1179, 2020.
- [2 Y. Fang, H. Zhang, J. Xie and et al., "Sensitivity of Chest CT for COVID-19: Comparison to RT-PCR.,"
3] *Radiology*, vol. 296, no. 2, pp. E115-E117, 2020.
- [2 H. Kim, H. Hong and S. H. Yoon, "Diagnostic Performance of CT and Reverse Transcriptase
4] Polymerase Chain Reaction for Coronavirus Disease 2019: A Meta-Analysis.," *Radiology*, vol. 296, no.
3, pp. E145-E155, 2020.
- [2 T. E. Miller, W. F. Garcia, A. Z. Bard, T. Gogakos, M. N. Anahtar, M. G. Astudillo and et al., "Clinical
5] sensitivity and interpretation of PCR and serological COVID-19 diagnostics for patients presenting to
the hospital.," *FASEB J.*, 2020.
- [2 W. Wang, Y. Xu, R. Gao and et al., "Detection of SARS-CoV-2 in Different Types of Clinical
6] Specimens," *JAMA*, 2020.
- [2 Y. Yang, M. Yang, C. Shen and et al., "Evaluating the accuracy of different respiratory specimens in
7] the laboratory diagnosis and monitoring the viral shedding of 2019-nCoV infections.," *medRxiv*,
2020.
- [2 S. Woloshin, N. Patel and A. S. Kesselheim, "False Negative Tests for SARS-CoV-2 Infection -
8] Challenges and Implications.," *N Engl J Med*, vol. 383, no. 6, 2020.
- [2 WHO, "WHO guidelines for the collection of human specimens for laboratory diagnosis of avian
9] influenza infection," 2020.
- [3 H. Pere, I. Podglajen, M. Wack, E. Flamarion, T. Mirault, G. Goudot, C. Hauw-Berlemont, L. Le, E.
0] Caudron, S. Carrabin, J. Rodary, T. Ribeyre, L. Belec and D. Veyer, "Nasal swab sampling for SARS-
CoV-2: A convenient alternative in time of nasopharyngeal swab shortage.," *J Clin Microbiol.*, 2020.
- [3 "<https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/lab/guidelines-clinical-specimens.html>," [Online].
1]
- [3 N. N. Kinloch, G. Ritchie, C. J. Brumme and et al., "Suboptimal Biological Sampling as a Probable
2] Cause of False-Negative COVID-19 Diagnostic Test Results.," *J Infect Dis*, vol. 222, no. 6, pp. 899-902,
2020.
- [3 "https://www.who.int/diagnostics_laboratory/eual/200722_final_pqpr_eul_0513_200_00_sars_cov_2_nucleic_acid.pdf?ua=1," [Online].
3]

- [3 T. Pillonel, V. Scherz, K. Jaton, G. Greub and C. Bertelli, "Letter to the editor: SARS-CoV-2 detection
4] by real-time RT-PCR.," *Euro Surveill.*, vol. 25, no. 21, 2020.
- [3 R. J. Mason, "Pathogenesis of COVID-19 from a cell biology perspective.," *Eur Respir J.*, vol. 55, no. 4,
5] 2020.
- [3 L. M. Kucirkak, S. A. Lauer, O. Laeyvendecker, D. Boon and H. Lessler, "Variation in False-NEgative
6] Rate of Reverse Transcriptase Polymerase Chain Reaction-Based SARS-CoV-2 Tests by Time Since
Exposure.," *Ann Intern Med.*, vol. 173, no. 4, pp. 262-267, 2020.
- [3 S. Zheng, J. Fan, F. Yu, B. Feng and et al., "Viral load dynamics and disease severity in patients
7] infected with SARS-CoV-2 in Zhejiang province, China, January - March 2020: retrospective cohort
study," *Br Med J*, 2020.
- [3 X. He, E. Lau, P. Wu and et al., "Temporal dynamics in viral shedding and transmissibility of COVID-
8] 19.," *Nat Med*, vol. 26, pp. 672-675, 2020.
- [3 L. Wynants, B. Van Calster, G. S. Collins and et al., "Prediction models for diagnosis and prognosis of
9] covid-19 infection: systematic review and critical appraisal.," *BMJ*, vol. 369, 2020.
- [4 A. R. Beyer, B. Fasolo, P. A. de Graeff and H. Hillege, "Risk attitudes and personality traits predict
0] perceptions of benefits and risks for medicinal products: a field study of European medical
assessors," *Value Health*, vol. 18, no. 1, pp. 91-99, 2015.
- [4 S. K. Vashist, "In Vitro Diagnostic Assays for COVID-19: Recent Advances and Emerging Trends.,"
1] *Diagnostics (Basel)*, vol. 10, no. 4, p. 202, 2020.
- [4 G. Caruana, A. Croxatto, A. Coste and et al., "Diagnostic Strategies for SARS-CoV-2 infection and
2] interpretation of microbiological results," *Clin Microbiol Infect*, vol. 26, no. 9, pp. 178-182, 2020.
- [4 J. Zhao, Q. Yuan, H. Wang and et al., "Antibody responses to SARS-CoV-2 in patients of novel
3] coronavirus disease," *Clin Infect Dis.*, 2020.
- [4 P. D. Burbelo, F. X. Riedo, C. Morishima, S. Rawlings, D. Smith and e. al., "Sensitivity in Detection of
4] Antibodies to Nucleocapsid and Spike Prtoetins of Severe Acute Respiratroy Syndrome Coronavirus
2 in Patients with Coronavirus Disease 2019," *J Infect Dis.*, vol. 222, no. 2, pp. 206-213, 2020.
- [4 L. R. Peterson, S. Sami, N. Vuong, MAT, P. Pathela and e. al., "Lack of antibodies to SARS-CoV-2 in a
5] large cohort of previously infected persons," *Clinical Infectious Diseases*, 2020.
- [4 R. Wolfel, V. M. Corman, W. Guggemos and et al., "Virological assessment of hospitalized patients
6] with COVID-2019," *Nature*, vol. 581, pp. 465-469, 2020.

- [4 I. S. P. Guidelines. [Online]. Available: [https://www.idsociety.org/practice-guideline/covid-19-7\] guideline-serology/](https://www.idsociety.org/practice-guideline/covid-19-7] guideline-serology/).
- [4 V. M. Corman, M. Kaiser, R. Molenkamp, A. Meijer, D. Chu, Landt, O and et al., "DEtection of 2019 8] novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV) by realtime RT-PCR.," *Euro Surveill*, vol. 25, 2020.
- [4 C. f. D. C. a. Prevention, *CDC 2019 Novel Coronavirus (2019-nCoV) Real-Time RT-PCR Diagnostc 9] panel.*
- [5 R. Jin, M. A. Pettengill, N. L. Hartnett, H. E. Auerbach, S. C. Peiper and Z. Wang, "Commercial SARS- 0] CoV-2 Molecular Assays: Superior Analytical Sensitivity of cobas SARS-CoV-2 Relative to NxTAG Cov Extended Panel and ID NOW COVID-19 Test," *Arch Pathol Lab Med*, 2020.
- [5 J. K. Chen , C. Y. Yip, J. W. Chan and et al., "Clinical Performance of the Luminex NxTAG CoV Extended 1] Panel for SARS-CoV-2 Detection in Nasopharyngeal Specimens from COVID-19 Patients in Hong Kong," *Journal of clinical microbiology*, vol. 58, no. 8, 2020.
- [5 "https://www.fda.gov/medical-devices/coronavirus-disease-2019-covid-19-emergency-use- 2] authorizations-medical-devices/vitro-diagnostics-euas," [Online].
- [5 S. A. Irving, M. F. Vandermaus, D. K. Shay and E. A. Belongia, "Comparison of nasal and 3] nasopharyngeal swabs for influenza detection in adults," *Clin Med Res.*, vol. 10, no. 4, pp. 215-218, 2012.
- [5 R. T. Suhandynata, M. A. Hoffman, M. J. Kelner, R. W. McLawhon, S. L. Reed and R. L. Fitzgerald, 4] "Longitudinal Monitoring of SARS-CoV-2 IgM and IgG Seropositivity to Detect COVID-19," *J Appl Lab Med*, 2020.
- [5 R. Li, S. Pei, B. Chen, Y. Song, T. Zhang, W. Yang and J. Shaman, "Substantial undocumented infection 5] facilitates the rapid dissemination of novel coronavirus (SARS-CoV-2)," *Science*, vol. 368, no. 6490, pp. 489-493, 2020.
- [5 M. Artesi, S. Bontems, P. Gobbels, M. Franckh and et al., "A recurrent mutation at position 26,340 of 6] SARS-CoV-2 is associated with failure of the E-gene qRT-PCR utilized in a commercial dual-target diagnostic assay.," *J Clin Microbiol*, 2020.
- [5 U. F. a. D. Administration, "EUA authorized serology test performance," 2020. [Online]. Available: 7] <https://www.fda.gov/medical-devices/coronavirus-disease-2019-covid-19-emergency-use-authorizations-medical-devices/eua-authorized-serology-test-performance>.
- [5 I. Huang and R. Pranata, "Lymphopenia in severe coronavirus disease - 2019 (COVID-19): systematic 8] review and meta-analysis.," *J Intensive Care*, vol. 8, no. 36, 2020.

[5 WHO, "WHO Emergency Use Assessment Coronavirus disease (COVID-19) IVDs," [Online]. Available:
 9] https://www.who.int/diagnostics_laboratory/eual/200722_final_pqpr_eul_0513_200_00_sars_cov2_nucleic_acid.pdf?ua=1. [Accessed January 2021].

325

326

327

328

329

330

331 **Tables:**

332 **Table 1. Clinical Characteristics of the Study Patients According to PCR result**

Characteristic	PCR positive (N=33)	PCR negative (N=290)	p-value
Age Mean (SD)	70.4 (17.8)	58.3 (17.5)	<0.001
Gender Male – no. (%) Female – no. (%) Undifferentiated – no. (%)	22 (66.7) 11 (33.3) 0	201 (69.3%) 88 (30.3) 1 (0.3)	0.891
Exposure to known source of transmission within past 14 days – no. (%)	10 (30.3)	5 (1.7)	<0.001
Travel history outside of Canada	4 (12.1)	9 (3.1)	0.01
Days from symptom onset to admission to hospital Mean (SD)	4.8 (3.2)	4.2 (6.1)	0.31
Symptoms on admission – no. (%) Fever (>37.5°C) Cough Shortness of breath Sore throat Rhinorrhea Myalgias	24 (72.7) 22 (66.7) 21 (63.6) 3 (9.1) 3 (9.1) 11 (33.3)	80 (27.6) 114 (39.3) 104 (35.9) 16 (5.5) 26 (9.0) 29 (10)	<0.001 0.003 0.002 0.41 0.98 <0.001

Headache	7 (21.2)	30 (10.3)	0.06
Change in mental status	6 (18.2)	42 (14.5)	0.57
Laboratory findings			
Leukocytosis (>11) x10 ⁹ /L	2 (6.3)	137 (47.2)	<0.001
Lymphopenia (≤1.1) x10 ⁹ /L	22 (66.7)	143 (49.7)	0.064
CRP(>3.1) mg/L	22 (91.7)	177 (82.7)	0.26
Radiological findings			
Abnormalities on CXR – no./total	25 (83.3)	89 (39.6)	<0.001
Abnormalities on CT chest – no./total	3 (100)	39 (45.3)	0.06
Clinical outcomes at data cutoff – no./(%)			
ICU admission	8 (24.2)	28 (9.7)	0.01
Mortality at 30 days	7 (21.2)	18 (6.2)	≤0.01

333

334 **Table 2: Diagnostic accuracy of PCR compared to composite reference standard**

335

Feature	Result	Confidence interval
Clinical Sensitivity	94.7%	(95% CI 74.0% – 99.9%)
Clinical Specificity	100%	(95% CI 94.9%-100%)
NPV	98.6%	(95% CI 92.5% - 100%)
PPV	100%	(95% CI 81.5%-100%)
Prevalence	11.4%	(95% CI 8.1% - 15.6%)

336

337 **Table 3: Comparison of PCR to Serology for SARS-CoV-2 diagnosis**

338

PCR	Serology		
	Positive	Negative	Total
Positive	18	1*	19
Negative	0	71	71

339 *COI=0.73

340 Overall Percent Agreement= 98.9%, (95% CI 94.0%-99.9%)