

1 **Title Page**

2 **Impact of COVID-19 pre-test probability on positive predictive value of high cycle threshold**

3 **SARS-CoV-2 real-time reverse transcription PCR test results**

4 Jonathan B. Gubbay,^{a,b,c#} Heather Rilkoff,^a Heather L. Kristjanson,^a Jessica D. Forbes,^a Michelle
5 Murti,^{a,e} AliReza Eshaghi,^a George Broukhanski,^{a,b} Antoine Corbeil,^{a,b} Nahuel Fittipaldi,^{a,b} Jessica
6 P. Hopkins,^{a,d,e} Erik Kristjanson,^a Julianne V. Kus,^{a,b} Liane Macdonald,^{a,e} Anna Majury,^{a,f} Gustavo
7 V Mallo,^a Tony Mazzulli,^{a,g} Roberto G. Melano,^{a,b} Romy Olsha,^a Stephen J. Perusini,^a Vanessa
8 Tran,^{a,b} Vanessa G Allen,^{a,b} Samir N Patel^{a,b}

9

10 ^aPublic Health Ontario, Toronto, Ontario, Canada

11 ^bDepartment of Laboratory Medicine and Pathobiology, University of Toronto, Toronto,
12 Ontario, Canada

13 ^cDivision of Infectious Diseases, Department of Paediatrics, The Hospital for Sick Children,
14 Toronto, Ontario, Canada.

15 ^dDepartment of Health Research Methods, Evidence, and Impact, McMaster University,
16 Hamilton, Ontario, Canada

17 ^eDalla Lana School of Public Health, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada

18 ^fDepartment of Pathology and Molecular Medicine, Queens University, Kingston, Ontario,
19 Canada

20 [§]Department of Microbiology, Sinai Health/University Health Network, Toronto, Ontario,
21 Canada

22

23 **Running Title:** positive predictive value of SARS-CoV-2 PCR tests

24 **Keywords** SARS-CoV-2 PCR, cycle threshold, false positive tests, test performance; positive
25 predictive value; asymptomatic PCR testing

26

27 # Address correspondence to Jonathan B. Gubbay, Jonathan.Gubbay@oahpp.ca

28 Public Health Ontario

29 661 University Avenue, Toronto, Ontario, Canada

30 M5G 1M1

31 Phone: +1 647-792-3170

32 Fax: +1 416-235-5800

33

34

35

36

37 **Impact of COVID-19 pre-test probability on positive predictive value of high cycle threshold**

38 **SARS-CoV-2 real-time reverse transcription PCR test results**

39 **ABSTRACT**

40 **Background**

41 Performance characteristics of SARS-CoV-2 nucleic acid detection assays are understudied
42 within contexts of low pre-test probability, including screening asymptomatic persons without
43 epidemiological links to confirmed cases, or asymptomatic surveillance testing. SARS-CoV-2
44 detection without symptoms may represent resolved infection with persistent RNA shedding,
45 presymptomatic or asymptomatic infection, or a false positive test. This study assessed clinical
46 specificity of SARS-CoV-2 real-time reverse transcription polymerase chain reaction (rRT-PCR)
47 assays by retesting positive specimens from five pre-test probability groups ranging from high
48 to low with an alternate assay.

49 **Materials and Methods**

50 A total of 122 rRT-PCR positive specimens collected from unique patients between March and
51 July 2020 were retested using a laboratory-developed nested RT-PCR assay targeting the RNA-
52 dependent RNA polymerase (RdRp) gene followed by Sanger sequencing.

53 **Results**

54 Significantly less positive results in the lowest pre-test probability group (facilities with
55 institution-wide screening having ≤ 3 positive asymptomatic cases) were reproduced with the
56 nested RdRp gene RT-PCR assay than in all other groups combined (5/32, 15.6% vs 61/90, 68%;

57 p <0.0001), and in each subgroup with higher pre-test probability (individual subgroup range
58 50.0% to 85.0%).

59 **Conclusions**

60 A higher proportion of false-positive test results are likely with lower pre-test probability.
61 Positive SARS-CoV-2 PCR results should be interpreted within the context of patient history,
62 clinical setting, known exposure, and estimated community disease prevalence. Large-scale
63 SARS-CoV-2 screening testing initiatives among low pre-test probability populations should be
64 evaluated thoroughly prior to implementation given the risk of false positives and consequent
65 potential for harm at the individual and population level.

66

67

68 INTRODUCTION

69 The COVID-19 pandemic has resulted in implementation of large-scale testing practices globally
70 with the aim of early case detection. Prompt testing facilitates timely public health and clinical
71 management, including case identification, contact tracing, and treatment. Widespread
72 laboratory testing has also significantly contributed to knowledge of the epidemiology of the
73 SARS-CoV-2 virus. One such observation is that of positive real-time reverse transcription PCR
74 (rRT-PCR) tests in persons without symptoms. This may be represent resolved infections with
75 persistent viral RNA shedding, active presymptomatic (patients who later develop symptoms)
76 or asymptomatic (patients who never develop symptoms prior to or following testing)
77 infections, or because of false positive laboratory tests.¹ The likelihood of a false positive rRT-
78 PCR result increases as pre-test probability of the condition it is designed to detect decreases.
79 Examples of low pre-test probability scenarios include asymptomatic groups with no known
80 exposure to COVID-19 cases, and communities with low prevalence of COVID-19. Further, a
81 positive rRT-PCR result close to the limit of detection (LOD) of an assay has a greater likelihood
82 of being false positive.²

83 False positive results can be attributable to pre-analytical errors (e.g. specimen contamination
84 or aliquoting errors), analytical errors (e.g. quality assurance failures, reagent contamination, or
85 non-specific assay signal detection), or post-analytical errors (e.g. improper interpretation or
86 transcription of results). As outlined by Cohen and Kessel, false positive results can have
87 unintended consequences on the public health response including outbreak identification and

88 modelling, case reporting, and resource allocation.³ Moreover, negative consequences are
89 greatest when disease prevalence is low. Therefore, pre-test probability is important to
90 consider when discriminating between true or false positive rRT-PCR results.

91 The cycle threshold (Ct) value, an indirect measure of viral load, and its application to test
92 interpretation has become an important tool for public health practitioners. Together with
93 available clinical and epidemiological factors, the Ct value can help determine appropriate
94 public health follow-up (e.g., contact tracing and/or outbreak declaration) for asymptomatic
95 patients.⁴ However, multiple studies have shown that Ct values overlap between symptomatic,
96 presymptomatic, and asymptomatic cases, and that time from initial infection to testing is the
97 most significant determinant of Ct value.⁵⁻⁷ Presymptomatic persons may have comparable viral
98 loads to symptomatic individuals and may be just as likely as symptomatic individuals to infect
99 others due to their unawareness of having the virus, hence their identification has far reaching
100 implications for public health management.^{8,9}

101 Ontario is the most populous province in Canada with approximately 14.7 million residents¹⁰.
102 The first case of COVID-19 in the province was identified in a patient who presented to hospital
103 on January 23, 2020.¹¹ The first pandemic wave peaked in April and was characterized by a
104 disproportionate impact on congregate settings including residents in long-term care and
105 retirement homes and for some workplaces.¹² During the first wave, policy changes expanded
106 testing to asymptomatic screening programs within long-term care, hospitals, and some
107 workplace settings, irrespective of risk factors or community prevalence. Such widespread
108 testing has brought into focus the interpretation and implications of positive SARS-CoV-2 rRT-

109 PCR results with high Ct values, since many of these settings have both low prevalence and low
110 pre-test probability of infection.

111 This study evaluates the relative burden of false positive testing outcomes when testing
112 persons in low pre-test probability settings, by exploring the likelihood of a reproducible
113 positive test result upon retesting specimens having high rRT-PCR Ct values, stratified by pre-
114 test probability. The findings have the potential to inform testing guidelines for persons with
115 low pre-test probability, such as within low prevalence communities.

116 **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

117 Public Health Ontario (PHO) Laboratory, the Ontario provincial public health and reference
118 laboratory, conducts approximately 25% of SARS-CoV-2 testing for the province. Specimens are
119 submitted from acute care (e.g., hospitals), community, institutional, and occupational settings,
120 as well as from outbreaks. Specimen data were obtained from the PHO laboratory information
121 system (LIS).

122 A total of 122 specimens from unique patients aged 10 to 99 years (median 53.5 years) who
123 underwent clinical testing between mid-March and July 2020 were included in the analysis. All
124 specimens included were initially positive by rRT-PCR with Ct value ≥ 35 using either (i) a
125 laboratory-developed test (LDT) targeting the envelope (E) gene, or (ii) a commercial assay
126 targeting the E and open reading frame 1ab (ORF1ab) genes (cobas[®] SARS-CoV-2, Roche
127 Diagnostics, Germany).¹³

128 Interpreting results for specimens tested using the LDT E gene rRT-PCR assay was based on
129 prior validation data, which determined a LOD of 192 copies/ml of primary sample (95% CI 16
130 to 2,392 copies/ml of specimen), corresponding to Ct values between 34.8 and 38.7. Based on

131 this data, LDT Ct results ≤ 38.0 are reported as detected and Ct values ≥ 40.0 are reported as not
132 detected. Ct values between 38.1 and 39.9 are reported as indeterminate.¹⁴ Indeterminate
133 results may be due to low viral target quantity in the clinical specimen approaching the assay
134 LOD, failed automated viral RNA extraction, or, in rare cases, nonspecific reactivity (false signal)
135 in the specimen. When clinically relevant or important to public health management, repeat
136 testing is recommended.

137 Specimens tested with the cobas[®] SARS-CoV-2 rRT-PCR assay were reported as detected or not
138 detected - the manufacturer does not include an indeterminate range. The maximum number
139 of cycles of PCR amplification used in the assay is proprietary and not provided in the kit insert
140 or other available documentation.

141 To be included in the study, specimens had to be collected from persons belonging to one of
142 five groups based on information provided on the PHO laboratory requisition. The groups had
143 differing pre-test probability of COVID-19 infection (based on presence of symptoms, prior
144 laboratory confirmation as a case, and epidemiological links to other positive cases) and a high
145 Ct value of ≥ 35 on either the LDT or cobas[®] rRT-PCR assay (E gene target). A Ct value of ≥ 35 was
146 chosen as a conservative estimate of lack of infectivity based on other studies using different
147 assays reporting that a Ct of >34 indicates an individual is not likely to be infectious at the time
148 of diagnostic testing.^{7,9,15} Table 1 contains a description of the five categories, ordered from
149 highest pre-test probability setting (Group 1) to lowest pre-test probability setting (Group 5).
150 Groups 1-4 were tested throughout the study period (March - June 2020), whereas Group 5 was
151 tested beyond the peak of the first pandemic wave (May - July 2020).

152 The study dataset was produced by manually reviewing a line list of positive specimens of
153 appropriate Ct values available at the PHO Laboratory, Toronto location, which met inclusion
154 criteria. Group 1, with highest pre-test probability, consisted of high Ct positive specimens from
155 persons with a previous positive result with a lower Ct value (Ct <30). Group 5, which consisted
156 of asymptomatic positives in facilities that underwent whole facility screening with three or
157 fewer positive cases identified, was considered the category with lowest pre-test probability of
158 infection (based on both asymptomatic status and being least likely to be exposed to a case).
159 None of the facilities in Group 5 were in outbreak at the time screening was commenced, which
160 was confirmed by review of the provincial public health information system for the reporting
161 and surveillance of diseases. Group 5 was thus chosen as the reference group when conducting
162 statistical analysis.

163 Specimens included in this study were retested with a LDT end-point nested RT-PCR assay
164 targeting the RNA dependent RNA polymerase (RdRp) gene, followed by Sanger sequencing of
165 amplicons with expected size of 192 base pairs. This assay was adapted from a previously
166 published Middle East Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus (MERS-CoV) nested PCR, altered such
167 that the relevant primer bases match SARS-CoV-2: an outer primer and newly designed inner
168 primers were used for both amplification and sequencing.¹⁶ Primers used are presented in
169 Table 2. The LOD determined during validation was similar to that of the E gene rRT-PCR, at 256
170 copies/ml of primary specimen (95% CI 37.92 to 1733 copies/ml).

171 The proportion of specimens detected by the RdRp gene nested PCR assay as well as the
172 median and range of Ct values were determined overall and for each of the five categories.

173 Statistical significance for median Ct value comparison was calculated using Wilcoxon rank-sum

174 test. Statistical significance for categorical results was calculated using Fisher's exact test with
175 Bonferroni correction to adjust for multiple comparisons. Results were considered significant
176 at a level of 0.05. All analyses were conducted using SAS Enterprise Guide 8.3.¹⁷
177 The PHO Ethics Review Board determined that this project is exempt from research ethics
178 committee review, as it describes analyses that were completed at PHO Laboratory as part of
179 routine clinical respiratory testing during the first wave of the COVID-19 pandemic in Ontario
180 and are therefore considered public health practice, not research.

181 **RESULTS**

182 Table 3 describes the results of the specimens overall and by group. After retesting using the
183 RdRp gene nested PCR assay with Sanger sequencing, results varied according to pre-test
184 probability. Overall, 66/122 (54.1%) specimens had RdRp gene detected. There was a significant
185 difference ($p < 0.01$) in the E gene Ct values among specimens that were reproducible in the
186 RdRp gene nested RT-PCR (median Ct 36.2, range 35.0 to 40.6) compared to those that could
187 not be confirmed (median Ct 37.5, range 35.2-39.8).

188 A similar high proportion of specimens from Groups 1 (18/23; 78.3%) and 2 (17/20; 85.0%),
189 both high pre-test probability groups, had reproducible positive results using the RdRp gene
190 nested PCR assay. However, a significantly lower proportion of positive results in the lowest
191 pre-test probability group (Group 5) were reproducible with RdRp gene nested PCR with Sanger
192 sequencing than in all other groups combined (5/32, 15.6% vs 61/90, 68%; $p < 0.0001$), and in
193 each subgroup.

194 **DISCUSSION**

195 This study was conducted to ascertain impact of different pre-test probability patient categories
196 on ability to reproduce positive rRT-PCR results of high Ct value ($Ct \geq 35$) with a laboratory
197 developed nested PCR assay targeting an independent gene target, RdRp, including Sanger
198 sequencing of the PCR amplicon. We documented a much lower rate of reproducible positive
199 tests among patients in the lowest pre-test probability category of asymptomatic persons
200 within an institution with three or fewer positive patients identified through screening testing
201 (Group 5). Among this group, only five (15.6%) of 32 patients tested positive with the RdRp
202 gene nested RT-PCR. This is in contrast to the other patient groups with higher pre-test
203 probability, where 50% to 85% of E gene rRT-PCR positive specimens were also RdRp gene PCR
204 positive.

205 Results of the group-specific analysis suggest that screening asymptomatic individuals in low
206 prevalence situations can generate results which are false positive due to low positive
207 predictive value. This is indicated by the higher percentage of reproducible positive results in
208 symptomatic cases (85.0% detected) compared to cases with no known evidence of disease and
209 likely no contact with positive cases (15.6% detected).

210 A significantly higher rate of RdRp gene nested RT-PCR positivity was also found among
211 asymptomatic patients exposed to a probable or confirmed case (Group 3, 66.7% detected),
212 and among asymptomatic persons who were tested in facilities with ≥ 10 positive cases (Group
213 4, 50% detected), both reflecting higher pre-test probability scenarios than Group 5.

214 It should be noted that lack of detection with the RdRp gene nested PCR assay is not necessarily
215 a false positive E gene rRT-PCR result, and should not be used to definitively infer false

216 positivity at the individual level. In general, specimens with Ct values well below the assay cut-
217 off for positivity (e.g. Ct values <35 with the positivity cut-off set at Ct 38.0) are less likely to be
218 false positive. However, if the initial positive result was of high Ct value, near the assay cut-off,
219 then repeat testing of the same specimen may yield a negative result, as assay performance
220 near the LOD is not consistent, with results varying on repeat testing. Furthermore, different
221 assays will perform differently on the same specimen having virus quantity near the LOD.
222 However, when applied at a group level, these results provide an indication of the potential
223 relative contribution of false positive test results that may occur in different settings which are
224 differentiated by pre-test probability.

225 In general, the PPV of COVID-19 PCR assays is excellent among patients with high pre-test
226 probability and approaches 100%.² This was previously determined at PHO using Sanger
227 sequencing of amplicons from RT-PCR positive specimens excluding those for which viral copy
228 number was near the LOD of the assay. However, when testing asymptomatic patients with
229 low pre-test probability in low prevalence settings, the PPV is likely to be different. For
230 example, if community prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 is 1% with a rRT-PCR test sensitivity of 80%
231 and specificity of 99%, the PPV of a positive test is only 44.7%. If prevalence were to increase to
232 5% or 10%, then the PPV increases significantly to 80.8% and 89.9%, respectively. Recent
233 serosurveys conducted by PHO using residual convenience specimens found a low adjusted
234 monthly seroprevalence of 1.1% among specimens received in June, July and again in August,
235 2020.¹⁸ This provides further evidence that Ontario overall was a low prevalence setting for
236 SARS-CoV-2 infection during the study period.

237 Analysis of results from over 100,000 SARS-CoV-2 tests conducted at PHO Laboratory for
238 asymptomatic screening programs (including long-term care homes, retirement homes,
239 childcare settings, hospitals, settings with migrant workers, and correctional institutions) during
240 the same period as this study identified a positivity rate of 0.2%, (unpublished data). Nearly
241 70% of positive tests had Ct values ≥ 35 , suggesting that true positivity is likely to be lower,
242 given the potential for false-positive high Ct results in these low-prevalence settings.

243 Limitations of this study include small sample size and use of a non-randomized sampling
244 method that may limit generalizability of findings. Additionally, all specimens from Groups 2 to
245 5 included in the study were indicated as the individual's first positive specimen tested by PHO.
246 However, because PHO Laboratory only conducts a subset of Ontario's testing (approximately
247 25%), it is possible that patients had additional positive tests processed at other laboratories,
248 which would increase the pre-test probability of the specimen regardless of the group to which
249 the individual's sample was assigned. For similar reasons, it is possible that not all positive
250 cases from individual institutions were captured in our study if some testing for additional cases
251 was done at other laboratories or individuals declined testing. To substantiate that the low-
252 prevalence institutional settings had no more than three cases, validation was conducted
253 against provincially reported outbreak-related cases associated with these settings within a
254 three week period. It was assumed that if the number of cases identified by the asymptomatic
255 screening program became greater than 3, an outbreak would be declared and any additional
256 cases would be captured as part of the outbreak.

257 A further limitation of this study involves changes to government testing guidelines as the
258 pandemic evolved: changes occurred in both the population incidence of COVID-19 as well as
259 guidelines indicating who should be tested during the period of this study, from March to July
260 2020. This may introduce a bias, since persons tested in periods with more cases, or with
261 stricter testing criteria as occurred earlier in the pandemic in Ontario, may have a greater
262 likelihood of infection.

263 Specimens included in this study were stored at -80C for weeks to months prior to conducting
264 the RdRp gene nested RT-PCR. RNA degradation during storage and freeze-thaw is possible, and
265 was more likely to affect specimens that were close to the LOD, resulting in a negative RdRp RT-
266 PCR in a specimen that was true rRT-PCR positive at the time of initial testing.

267 Specimen inclusion was based on E gene Ct value at the time of rRT-PCR. Determination of Ct
268 values for LDTs rely on interpretation by the reporting technologist, introducing variability in Ct
269 value assignment. This introduces a risk of reporter bias influencing the specimens included in
270 this study.

271 Despite these limitations, the results presented here are an important first step towards
272 quantifying the magnitude of false-positive test results in low-prevalence settings, which will
273 increasingly become the norm in many countries with increased use of widespread testing,
274 including broad testing in low pre-test probability populations. Globally, few studies have
275 investigated widespread testing results from low-prevalence areas. This may be attributed to
276 factors such as testing capacity, resources, and practicality. Instead, testing is often restricted to
277 travellers from high prevalence countries, or to those individuals who present with symptoms

278 or a history of exposure, which is linked to public health management.¹⁹ Currently, there exist a
279 few studies that have attempted to ascertain prevalence through probability-based population-
280 level surveillance studies, rather than initiating a study in an area known to have low
281 prevalence.^{20,21} Examples of targeted low-prevalence studies include examination of potential
282 SARS-CoV-2 detection in wastewater, as well as serosurveillance studies in low prevalence
283 areas.^{22,23}

284 The results of this study have implications for informing future testing approaches, including
285 the utility of conducting broad screening with PCR-based tests in settings with low pre-test
286 probability. For example, in Ontario, this work has been used to inform recent public health
287 approaches, resulting in discontinuation of unnecessary public health management such as case
288 isolation, contact tracing, and outbreak declaration for asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 rRT-PCR
289 positive persons with low pre-test probability who are negative on retesting.²

290 **CONCLUSIONS**

291 SARS-CoV-2 Ct values can be of use when interpreting positive laboratory results derived from
292 patients with low pre-test probability, in particular asymptomatic persons with no
293 epidemiological link to a confirmed COVID-19 case. Ontario has produced guidance documents
294 facilitating risk-based patient management and follow-up that do not rely on definitively
295 concluding if the specimen is true or false positive, which often cannot be achieved with high
296 Ct-positive specimens due to difficulty in reproducing results near the assay LOD on retesting.
297 Health care providers, public health professionals, policy-makers and the public will benefit
298 from ongoing education to understand that false positive tests will occur when testing

299 asymptomatic patients during periods of low community prevalence of SARS-CoV-2, even when
300 utilizing assays with excellent performance. These false positive tests and unnecessary case
301 isolation, contact tracing and outbreak declaration likely outweigh the benefits from the low
302 numbers of true cases detected among these populations.

303 **Notes.**

304 **Author contributions.** JBG, SNP, and HR conceived the study, with input from MM and JH. AE,
305 SP, GM, and GB conducted laboratory work required for this study. HR verified the underlying
306 data, conducted data collection and data analysis. JBG, HR and HK wrote the initial drafts of the
307 manuscript. All other authors reviewed and edited the manuscript equally.

308 **Financial Support.** This work was funded by Public Health Ontario.

309 **Acknowledgements.** We gratefully acknowledge the staff of Virus Detection and Molecular
310 Diagnostics, Public Health Ontario Laboratory, for diagnostic testing of SARS-CoV-2 specimens.

311 **Potential conflicts of interest.** All authors declare no competing interests.

312

313

314

315 **REFERENCES**

- 316 1. Management of Cases and Contacts of COVID-19 in Ontario; September 8 , 2020
317 (version 9.0). Ontario Ministry of Health. Toronto, ON: Queen’s Printer for Ontario; 2020
- 318 2. Ontario Agency for Health Protection and Promotion (Public Health Ontario). Real-Time
319 PCR Cycle Threshold (Ct) Values: An Overview of Cycle Threshold Values and their role in
320 SARS-Cov-2 Real-Time PCR Test Interpretation. Toronto, ON: Queen's Printer for
321 Ontario; 2020
- 322 3. Cohen AN, Kessel B. False positives in reverse transcription PCR testing for SARS-CoV-2.
323 *medRxiv*. 2020; (published online May 20.)
- 324 4. Liu Y, Yan LM, Wan L, et al. Viral dynamics in mild and severe cases of CoVID-19. *Lancet*
325 *Infect Dis*. 2020; **20**: 656–657
- 326 5. Arons MM, Hatfield KM, Reddy SC, et al. Presymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infections and
327 transmission in a skilled nursing facility. *N Engl J Med*. 2020; **382**: 2081–2090
- 328 6. Long QX, Tang XJ, Shi QL, et al. Clinical and immunological assessment of asymptomatic
329 SARS-CoV-2 infections. *Nat Med*. 2020; **26**: 1200–04
- 330 7. Singanayagam A, Patel M, Charlett A, et al. Duration of infectiousness and correlation
331 with RT-PCR cycle threshold values in cases of COVID-19, England, January to May 2020.
332 *Euro Surveill*. 2020; **25**2001483
- 333 8. Zhou R, Li F, Chen F, et al. Viral dynamics in asymptomatic patients with COVID-19. *Int J*
334 *Infect Dis*. 2020; **96**: 288–290
- 335 9. Tom MR, Mina MJ. To Interpret the SARS-CoV-2 Test, Consider the Cycle Threshold
336 Value. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2020; ciaa619.

- 337 10. Statistics Canada. Table 17-10-0005-01 Population estimates on July 1st, by age and sex.
338 <https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/t1/tbl1/en/tv.action?pid=1710000501>. Date Accessed:
339 November 9, 2020
- 340 11. Marchand-Sen  cal M, Kozak R, Mubareka S, Salt N, Gubbay JB, Eshaghi A, Allen VG, Li Y,
341 Bastien N, Gilmour M, Ozaldin O, Leis JA, Diagnosis and Management of First Case of
342 COVID-19 in Canada: Lessons Applied From SARS-CoV-1, *Clin Infect Dis*. 2020;ciaa227.
- 343 12. Ontario COVID-19 Data Tool. [https://www.publichealthontario.ca/en/data-and-](https://www.publichealthontario.ca/en/data-and-analysis/infectious-disease/covid-19-data-surveillance/covid-19-data-tool)
344 [analysis/infectious-disease/covid-19-data-surveillance/covid-19-data-tool](https://www.publichealthontario.ca/en/data-and-analysis/infectious-disease/covid-19-data-surveillance/covid-19-data-tool). Date
345 accessed: November 9, 2020.
- 346 13. Corman VM, Landt O, Kaiser M et al. Detection of 2019 novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV)
347 by real-time RT-PCR. *Euro Surveill*. 2020; **25**2000045
- 348 14. Case Definition – Coronavirus Disease (COVID-19). Ontario Ministry of Health. Toronto,
349 ON: Queen’s Printer for Ontario; 2020
- 350 15. Jaafar R, Aherfi S, Wurtz N, Grimaldier C, Hoang VT, Colson P, et al. Correlation between
351 3790 qPCR positives samples and positive cell cultures including 1941 SARS-CoV-2
352 isolates. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2020; (Published online Sept 28)
353 <https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciaa1491>
- 354 16. Corman VM, M  ller MA, Costabel U, et al. Assays for laboratory confirmation of novel
355 human coronavirus (hCoV-EMC) infections. *Euro Surveill*. 2012; **17**20334
- 356 17. SAS Institute Inc. SAS® Enterprise Guide 8.2: User’s Guide. Cary, NC: SAS Institute Inc.
357 2019.

- 358 18. <https://www.publichealthontario.ca/en/data-and-analysis/infectious-disease/covid-19->
359 [data-surveillance/covid-19-serosurveillance](https://www.publichealthontario.ca/en/data-and-analysis/infectious-disease/covid-19-data-surveillance/covid-19-serosurveillance). Date accessed: November 9, 2020.
- 360 19. García-Basteiro AL, Chaccour C, Guinovart C, Llupià A, Brew J, Trilla A, et al. Monitoring
361 the COVID-19 epidemic in the context of widespread local transmission. *Lancet Respir*
362 *Med.* 2020; **8**: 440–442
- 363 20. Gudbjartsson DF, Helgason A, Jonsson H, Magnusson OT, Melsted P, Norddahl GL, et al.
364 Spread of SARS-CoV-2 in the Icelandic population. *N Engl J Med.* 2020; **382**: 2302–15
- 365 21. Vodičar PM, Valenčak AO, Zupan B, Županc TA, Kurdija S, Korva M, et al. Low prevalence
366 of active COVID-19 in Slovenia: a nationwide population study on a probability-based
367 sample. *Microbiol Infect.* 2020; (Published online Jul 18)
- 368 22. Randazzo W, Truchado P, Cuevas-Ferrando E, Simón P, Allende A, Sánchez G. SARS-CoV-
369 2 RNA in wastewater anticipated COVID-19 occurrence in a low prevalence area. *Water*
370 *Res.* 2020; **181**: 115942
- 371 23. Bendavid E, Mulaney B, Sood N, Shah S, Ling E, Bromley-Dulfano R, et al. COVID-19
372 Antibody Seroprevalence in Santa Clara County, California. *MedRxiv.* 2020; (published
373 online April 30.)

374

Table 1: Study Patient Categories and Definitions			376	LES
Group^a	Category	Definition		
1 ^b	Confirmed cases with second positive specimen of high Ct value	Persons who initially tested positive with a low Ct value (<30) and had a subsequent test with a high Ct value (≥35)	377	
2	Symptomatic patient with high Ct positive specimen	Having a positive test with high Ct value (Ct ≥35) and at least one symptom as noted in the PHO LIS		
3 ^c	Asymptomatic - exposure to probable or confirmed case	Indicated as asymptomatic in the PHO LIS. Tested due to exposure to probable or confirmed case OR residing at same address as another positive case	378	a
4	Asymptomatic - facility with ≥10 positive cases	Indicated as asymptomatic in the PHO LIS and tested as part of an outbreak with at least 10 positive cases	379	G
5	Facility with institution-wide screening, with ≤3 positive cases, all asymptomatic	Tested as part of an outbreak or surveillance testing investigation having three or fewer asymptomatic positive tests and no symptomatic positive cases in the Public Health Ontario's laboratory information system	380 381	r o

382 up 1 represents patients with highest pre-test probability and Group 5 represents those with lowest pre-test probability.

383 ^b20 patients were symptomatic, two were asymptomatic at time of first test, and one did not have symptom information

384 available at time of first test

385 ^cGroup 3 contains specimens from institutional outbreaks (as well as non-outbreaks), and thus some specimens could also be

386 classified in the "facility 10+ positive category"

387

SARS-CoV-2 RdRp nested PCR primers	Sequence 5' to 3'	Primer position aligned with SARS-CoV-2 (NCBI Reference Sequence: NC_045512.2)
Nested PCR outer primers	TGCCATTAGTGCAAAGAATAGAGC	15078-15101bp
	GCATGGCTCTATCACATTTAGG	15319-15298bp
Nested PCR inner primers	GCACCGTAGCTGGTGTCTCT	15104-15123bp
	AATCCCAACCCATAAGGTGA	15295-15276bp

388

389 RdRp = RNA dependent RNA polymerase

390 *Protocol was adapted from Corman et al., 2012 (ref. 16)

391

392

Group ^a	N	PATIENTS		DETECTED BY RdRp PCR		NOT DETECTED BY RdRp PCR		P-value ^b
		Median Age (Range)	Median Ct (Range) on initial E gene PCR	N (%)	Median Ct (Range) on initial E gene PCR	N (%)	Median Ct (Range) on initial E gene PCR	
1	23	52 (14-99)	36.9 (35.0-38.4)	18 (78.3)	36.7 (35.0-38.3)	5 (21.7)	38.1 (35.9-38.4)	<0.0001
2	20	68.5 (26-94)	36.6 (35.0-38.3)	17 (85.0)	36.9 (35.03-38.3)	3 (15.0)	36.3 (35.6-37.4)	<0.0001
3	15	38 (10-93)	36.1 (35.4-38.0)	10 (66.7)	36.0 (35.4-37.2)	5 (33.3)	37.5 (36.0-38.0)	0.0078
4	32	57.5 (15-97)	37.5 (35.4-40.6)	16 (50.0)	36.6 (35.4-40.6)	16 (50.0)	37.7 (35.5-38.3)	0.035
5	32	46 (17-95)	36.9 (35.2-39.8)	5 (15.6)	36.2 (35.6-37.5)	27 (84.3)	37.0 (35.2-39.8)	(ref) ^c
Total	122	53.5 (10-99)	36.9 (35.0-40.6)	66 (54.1)	36.2 (35.0-40.6)	56 (45.9)	37.5 (35.2-39.8)	<0.0001^d

393

394 ^aRefer to Table 1 for Group definitions

395 ^bP-values compare proportion detected in each Group to Group 5, as the reference group.

396 ^cRepresents reference group to which other groups are compared

397 ^dP-value compares Groups 1 to 4 combined to Group 5, as the reference group

398 Ct = cycle threshold; E = envelope gene real-time Reverse-Transcription PCR; RdRp = RNA dependent RNA polymerase gene endpoint PCR

399 with Sanger sequencing confirmation.