

1 **Diagnostic accuracy of rapid antigen tests in pre-/asymptomatic close contacts of**
2 **individuals with a confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection**

3

4 E Schuit PhD^{1,2*\$} and IK Veldhuijzen PhD^{3*}, RP Venekamp PhD¹, W van den Bijllaardt MD⁴,
5 SD Pas PhD^{4,5}, EB Lodder MD⁶, R Molenkamp PhD⁷, CH GeurtsvanKessel PhD⁷, J.Velzing
6 MSc⁷, RC Huisman BSc⁷, L Brouwer PhD⁸, T Boelsums MD⁸, GJ Sips PhD^{3,8}, KSM
7 Benschop PhD³, L Hooft PhD^{1,2}, JHHM van de Wijgert PhD^{1,9}, S van den Hof PhD^{3#} and
8 KGM Moons PhD^{1,2#}

9

10 * Dual first authorship

11 # Dual senior authorship

12

13 ¹ Julius Center for Health Sciences and Primary Care, University Medical Center Utrecht,
14 Utrecht University, Utrecht, The Netherlands

15 ² Cochrane Netherlands, University Medical Center Utrecht, Utrecht University, Utrecht, The
16 Netherlands

17 ³ Centre for Infectious Disease Control, National Institute for Public Health and the
18 Environment (RIVM), Bilthoven, The Netherlands

19 ⁴ Microvida Laboratory for Medical Microbiology, Amphia Hospital, Breda, The Netherlands

20 ⁵ Microvida Laboratory for Medical Microbiology. Bravis Hospital, Roosendaal, The
21 Netherlands

22 ⁶ Public Health Service West-Brabant, Breda

23 ⁷ Department of Viroscience, Erasmus MC, Rotterdam, The Netherlands

24 ⁸ Public Health Service Rotterdam-Rijnmond, Rotterdam

25 ⁹ Institute of Infection, Veterinary and Ecological Sciences, University of Liverpool,

26 Liverpool, UK

27

28 ^{\$} Corresponding author. Karel GM Moons, Julius Center for Health Sciences and Primary

29 Care, University Medical Center Utrecht, Utrecht University, Universiteitsweg 100, 3584 CG

30 Utrecht, The Netherlands. E-mail: k.g.m.moons@umcutrecht.nl.

31 Abstract

32 **Background** Pre-/asymptomatic close contacts of SARS-CoV-2 infected individuals were
33 tested at day 5 after contact by real-time reverse transcriptase polymerase chain reaction (RT-
34 PCR). Diagnostic accuracy of antigen-detecting rapid diagnostic tests (Ag-RDT) in pre-
35 /asymptomatic close contacts was up till now unknown.

36 **Methods** We performed a prospective cross-sectional diagnostic test accuracy study. Close
37 contacts (e.g. selected via the test-and-trace program or contact tracing app) aged ≥ 16 years
38 and asymptomatic when requesting a test, were included consecutively and tested at day 5 at
39 four Dutch public health service test sites. We evaluated two Ag-RDTs (BD VeritorTM System
40 Ag-RDT (BD), and Roche/SD Biosensor Ag-RDT (SD-B)) with RT-PCR as the reference
41 standard. Virus culture was performed in RT-PCR positive individuals to determine the viral
42 load cut-off above which 95% was culture positive, as a proxy of infectiousness.

43 **Results** Of 2,678 BD-tested individuals, 233 (8.7%) were RT-PCR positive and BD detected
44 149 (sensitivity 63.9%; 95% confidence interval 57.4%-70.1%). Out of 1,596 SD-B-tested
45 individuals, 132 (8.3%) were RT-PCR positive and SD-B detected 83 (sensitivity 62.9%;
46 54.0%-71.1%). When applying an infectiousness viral load cut-off ≥ 5.2 log₁₀ gene
47 copies/mL, the sensitivity was 90.1% (84.2%-94.4%) for BD, 86.8% (78.1% to 93.0%) for
48 SD-B overall, and 88.1% (80.5%-93.5%) for BD, 85.1% (74.3%-92.6%) for SD-B for those
49 still asymptomatic at the actual time of sampling. Specificity was >99% for both Ag-RDTs in
50 all analyses.

51 **Conclusions** The sensitivity for detecting SARS-CoV-2 of both Ag-RDTs in pre-
52 /asymptomatic close contacts is over 60%, increasing to over 85% after applying an
53 infectiousness viral load cut-off.

54 **Trial registration number** Not applicable. A study protocol is available upon request.

55 **Introduction**

56 The cornerstone of COVID-19 epidemic control has been the implementation of generic
57 infection control measures (hand hygiene, physical distancing, and staying at home when
58 symptomatic) combined with test-and-trace programs. Mathematical modelling studies have
59 shown that test-and-trace programs, in combination with generic infection control measures,
60 can successfully control SARS-CoV-2 epidemics, even when assuming that up to 40% of
61 transmissions may occur by pre-/asymptomatic individuals^{1,2}. However, they can only reduce
62 the reproductive number below 1.0 when test-and-trace delays are minimized^{3,4}. In test-and-
63 trace programs, contacts of infected individuals are actively traced and offered testing,
64 initially only when symptomatic, but increasingly also when pre-/asymptomatic⁵.

65 In the first phase of the epidemic, testing was performed by reverse transcriptase polymerase
66 chain reaction (RT-PCR) of combined oral-nasal/nasopharyngeal swabs. The sensitivities of
67 these tests increase as the upper respiratory tract viral load increases, and reaches a high
68 plateau on day 5 after infection^{6,7}. While RT-PCR is considered the reference test for SARS-
69 CoV-2, it also has disadvantages. RT-PCR testing platforms are typically only available in
70 centralized laboratories and require sample batching, thereby introducing testing delays.
71 Point-of-care SARS-CoV-2 tests became available during the global pandemic, and of these,
72 lateral flow antigen-detecting rapid diagnostic tests (Ag-RDT) are promising. They require no
73 or minimal equipment, provide a result within minutes, and can be performed in a range of
74 settings with relatively little training.

75 At the end of 2020, Ag-RDT had been evaluated and considered sufficient to replace RT-
76 PCRs, notably if not only in symptomatic individuals. Diagnostic accuracies may, however,
77 be lower in asymptomatic individuals and in samples containing lower SARS-CoV-2 viral
78 loads⁸. The latter is not necessarily problematic if lower viral load translates into lower
79 subsequent expected infectiousness⁹. The very few Ag-RDT evaluations performed in

80 asymptomatic individuals thus far had small sample sizes¹⁰, did not take into account whether
81 the tested individual had been exposed to an index case¹¹, nor was virus culture performed¹².
82 Therefore, we conducted this first large scale prospective diagnostic test accuracy study in
83 pre-/asymptomatic close contacts of index cases to quantify the accuracy of two Ag-RDTs for
84 detecting SARS-CoV-2 infection with RT-PCR as the reference standard.

85

86

87 **Methods**

88 *Ethical review*

89 The Medical Ethics Review Committee (METC) Utrecht concluded that ethics approval was
90 not required because the study is outside the scope of the Dutch Medical Research Involving
91 Human Subjects Act (protocol number: 20/750). All participants signed an informed consent
92 form prior to any study procedure.

93

94 *Study design and population*

95 This prospective cross-sectional diagnostic test accuracy study was embedded within the
96 Dutch routine testing infrastructure. As of 1 December 2020, Dutch policy encourages close
97 contacts who are still pre-/asymptomatic to schedule a test on the fifth day since last exposure
98 to an index case (referred to as a ‘fifth day test’). In the Netherlands, individuals are notified
99 as a close contact by the Dutch public health service test-and-trace program, and/or the Dutch
100 contact tracing mobile phone application (the ‘CoronaMelder’ app) and/or an individual with
101 a confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection (index case). Participants were recruited consecutively at
102 four Dutch public health service test sites, located in the West-Brabant region
103 (Raamsdonksveer and Roosendaal) and in the city of Rotterdam (Rotterdam Ahoy and
104 Rotterdam The Hague Airport [travellers were not considered]). Close contacts presenting at

105 these test sites were considered eligible if they were aged 16 years or older, scheduled for a
106 fifth day test, asymptomatic at the time of the test request, and willing and able to sign an
107 informed consent in Dutch language.

108

109 *Inclusion procedure*

110 Participants arrived at the test sites by car (West-Brabant) or by foot (Rotterdam). Test site
111 personnel approached them and verbally verified study eligibility. Eligible individuals
112 received a study flyer and a participant information letter. After signing the informed consent
113 form, a short questionnaire on presence, type and onset of symptoms (Supplementary Material
114 1) was completed by participants themselves (West-Brabant) or by test site personnel
115 (Rotterdam), while participants waited for sampling. Questionnaire data were extracted in
116 duplicate by two independent persons.

117

118 *Specimen collection, testing procedures and virus culture procedures*

119 A detailed description of collecting, testing, including culturing, of specimens can be found in
120 the Supplementary Material 2. Trained personnel took two combined oropharyngeal-nasal
121 (West-Brabant) or oro-nasopharyngeal (Rotterdam) swabs from each study participant: the
122 first for an RT-PCR test and the second for an Ag-RDT. Swabs were transported to relevant
123 offsite and onsite laboratories, respectively.

124 During the study period, all study sites were using Roche COBAS6800/8800 platforms for
125 RT-PCR testing (Supplementary Material 2), the sites in West-Brabant were using the BD
126 Veritor™ System for Rapid Detection of SARS-CoV-2 Ag-RDT ('BD'; Becton, Dickinson
127 and Company, Franklin Lakes, NJ, USA), and the Rotterdam sites the Roche/SD Biosensor
128 SARS-CoV-2 Rapid Antigen Test ('SD-B'; Roche Diagnostics, Basel, Switzerland). Both
129 Ag-RDT were applied according to manufacturer instructions with one exception: BD results

130 were determined visually instead of using a BD Veritor Plus Analyzer. Interpretation of Ag-
131 RDTs was always done prior to (thus blinded for) RT-PCR. Similarly, Ag-RDT results were
132 not available to those assessing RT-PCR results. Participants received the RT-PCR result, but
133 not the Ag-RDT result, to direct further management (such as quarantine advice).

134

135 At the Erasmus MC Viroscience diagnostic laboratory, samples of participants with a positive
136 RT-PCR test result were cultured for seven days, and, once cytopathic effects (CPE) were
137 visible, the presence of SARS-CoV-2 was confirmed with immunofluorescent detection of
138 SARS-CoV-2 nucleocapsid protein (Rabbit polyclonal antibody, Sino Biological inc.),
139 Eschborn, Germany) (Supplementary Material 2).

140

141 *Outcomes and statistical analyses*

142 The primary outcome was the diagnostic accuracy (in terms of sensitivity, specificity, positive
143 and negative predictive values with their 95% confidence intervals) of each Ag-RDT, with
144 RT-PCR as reference standard. Since the number of individuals without RT-PCR or Ag-RDT
145 result was very low (n=21 (0.5%); Figure 1), a complete case analysis was performed.

146 Secondary outcomes included the diagnostic Ag-RDT accuracies stratified for a) the
147 occurrence of COVID-19-like symptoms between test request and time of sampling (yes vs.
148 no), b) the number of days between last contact and date of sampling (<5 vs. 5 vs. >5 days), c)
149 different viral load cut-offs and the viral load cut-off above which 95% of RT-PCR positives
150 had a positive culture as a proxy of infectiousness. To the latter aim, Ct values were first
151 converted into viral loads (virus gene copies/ml) using a standard curve (Supplementary
152 Material 2). The infectiousness cut-off was defined as the viral load above which 95% of RT-
153 PCR positives showed *in vitro* infectivity in cell culture.

154 Finally, we used routine national testing data to determine whether any RT-PCR-negative
155 participants at day 5, afterwards tested positive by RT-PCR or Ag-RDT within 10 days after
156 the initial RT-PCR test, to determine whether testing pre-/asymptomatic individuals at day 5
157 since last contact with the index case, may be too early.

158

159 *Sample size considerations*

160 Previous Ag-RDT performance studies in symptomatic individuals found sensitivities of
161 around 85%^{9,13-15}. We based our sample size calculation on an expected sensitivity of 80%,
162 with a margin of error of 7%, type I error of 5% and power of 90%. Hence, we aimed for 140
163 positive RT-PCR tests for each Ag-RDT vs. RT-PCR test comparison. We anticipated a
164 SARS-CoV-2 prevalence (based on RT-PCR) in our target population of 10%, and closely
165 monitored RT-PCR test positivity proportion over time to prolong recruitment if needed.

166

167 **Results**

168 Between 14 December 2020 and 6 February 2021, 5,191 individuals were considered eligible
169 for participation of whom 4,296 participated (Figure 1). Both RT-PCR and Ag-RDT results
170 were available for 2,678 (99.5%) and 1,596 (99.5%) participants in the BD and SD-B group,
171 respectively. The BD and SD-B groups were similar: respectively the mean ages (standard
172 deviation (SD); in years) were 45.9 (SD 17.6) and 40.7 (SD 16.4), 51.3% and 47.3% were
173 female, and 8.6% and 10.1% had developed symptoms at the time of sampling (Table 1).

174

175 In the BD group, 233 (8.7%) had an RT-PCR-confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection; 149 were
176 detected by the BD Ag-RDT resulting in an overall sensitivity of 63.9% (95% CI 57.4% to
177 70.1%) (Table 1). In the SD-B group, 132 (8.3%) had an RT-PCR-confirmed SARS-CoV-2

178 infection; 83 were detected by the SD-B Ag-RDT resulting in an overall sensitivity of 62.9%
179 (95% CI 54.0% to 71.1%).

180 In individuals who had developed symptoms between the test request and the time of
181 sampling, the sensitivity was 84.2% (95% CI 68.7% to 94.0%) for BD (N=219) and 73.3%
182 (95% CI 54.1% to 87.7%) for SD-B (N=158). Additional stratified diagnostic accuracy
183 parameters are shown in Table 1. Two by two tables of all primary and secondary analyses are
184 presented in Tables S2 and S3.

185

186 Figure 2 shows the distribution of viral loads in individuals with a positive RT-PCR test
187 result, stratified by a combination of the SD-B Ag-RDT result and the ability to culture virus.
188 Above a viral load of 5.2 log₁₀ E-gene copies/mL, 95% of RT-PCR positive individuals
189 showed a positive virus culture. Using that viral load as a cut-off for infectiousness, the
190 sensitivity was 90.1% (95% CI 84.2% to 94.4%) for BD and 86.8% (95% CI 78.1 % to 93.0
191 %) for SD-B, respectively. Figure 3 shows diagnostic accuracy parameters stratified by
192 different viral load cut-offs. The sensitivity of both Ag-RDTs at the infectious viral load cut-
193 off in persons without symptoms at the time of sampling was 88.1% (95% CI 80.5% to
194 93.5%) for BD and 85.1% (74.3% to 92.6%). Other diagnostic accuracy parameters for this
195 group are presented in more detail in Table S4, and at varying viral load cut-offs in
196 Supplementary Figure 2.

197

198 Finally, routine national testing follow-up information was available for 89% of all included
199 study participants. A total of 31 (1.5%) and 26 (2.0%) individuals had a positive RT-PCR test
200 result within 10 days after an initial negative RT-PCR test result in the BD and SD-B group,
201 respectively.

202

203 **Discussion**

204 To our knowledge, this is the largest study thus far to specifically assess the diagnostic test
205 accuracy of Ag-RDTs in pre-/asymptomatic close contacts. Our study shows that two Ag-
206 RDTs, that are routinely used for symptomatic individuals, have around 63% sensitivity for
207 detecting SARS-CoV-2 in pre-/asymptomatic close contacts. However, both Ag-RDTs
208 particularly appeared to show a negative result – while the corresponding RT-PCR test was
209 positive – in those with a lower viral load ranges. At viral loads above 5.2 log₁₀ E gene
210 copies/mL (the assumed viral load cut-off for infectiousness based on viral culture results),
211 both Ag-RDTs showed sensitivities over 85%, i.e. above the WHO sensitivity criteria defined
212 for Ag-RDTs in symptomatic individuals. Specificity was >99% for both Ag-RDTs in all
213 analyses. About 2% of close contacts who initially tested RT-PCR negative at day 5,
214 developed symptoms and subsequently tested positive after day 5. This rather low percentage
215 indicates that testing close contacts that are still asymptomatic at day 5, is not too early.

216 The prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 infections among all adults, both symptomatic and pre-
217 /asymptomatic, tested as part of contact tracing in all the public health service testing sites in
218 the study period, was 18%¹⁶. This percentage is comparable to the prevalence among
219 symptomatic close contacts in our study population. Although the prevalence in pre-
220 /asymptomatic close contacts is expectedly lower, it is considerably higher than the
221 prevalence of 0.8%-1% (at the time of the study period) as estimated in the general population
222 of the Netherlands¹⁶, and in other countries^{17,18}.

223 Only about 2% of close contacts who initially tested RT-PCR negative at day 5 after the close
224 contact developed symptoms and subsequently tested positive, i.e. infections missed by RT-
225 PCR on day 5 after exposure to an index case. These proportions of ‘missed’ infections are
226 expected to increase when using an Ag-RDT instead of RT-PCR. This underlines the

227 importance of immediate self-isolation and repeat testing when symptoms develop after a
228 negative day 5 Ag-RDT.

229 The extent to which the lower sensitivity of Ag-RDTs compared to RT-PCR outweighs the
230 positive effects of simplified logistics, reduced delays, and the potential for self-testing, is
231 currently unknown. We will monitor this utilizing national test-and-trace information.
232 Modeling studies will also help to further address this question in the future.

233 We were also able to minimize missing values and measurement bias by taking samples for
234 the Ag-RDT and RT-PCR from each participant at the same time, using the same Ag-RDT
235 and RT-PCR reference test for all participants, and having all (index and reference) tests
236 performed by trained personnel who were blinded to the result of the other test.

237 Our study also has some potential limitations. First, although we aimed to sample pre-
238 /asymptomatic individuals at five days after exposure to an index case, 12% was sampled
239 before the fifth day since last contact. It is known that the accuracy of the RT-PCR reference
240 test is not yet optimal before the fifth day after contact with an index case ⁶. Interestingly
241 though, our stratified analysis indicated that the RT-PCR positivity fraction was actually
242 higher in close contacts who were sampled before the fifth day since last contact. We
243 hypothesize that some of these individuals have had prolonged contact with the index case,
244 for example because they live in the same household. Close contacts living in the same
245 household on average test more often positive compared to non-household close contacts
246 (20% vs. 10%) ¹⁶. This would also explain why these close contacts reported to have contact
247 with the index case less than 5 days ago, as the last contact with an infected household
248 member could be the same day of testing. A second limitation is that virus culture was only
249 available in one of the two central laboratories. Hence, the assumed infectiousness viral load
250 cut-off was extrapolated to the second laboratory. Reassuringly, the RT-PCR calibration
251 curves of both laboratories indicated that Ct values corresponded to similar viral loads in both

252 laboratories. A correlation between infectivity in culture and viral load of the specimen as
253 well as negative associations between lower viral loads and secondary attack rates have been
254 established¹⁹⁻²². Some uncertainty remains as the exact upper respiratory tract viral load cut-
255 off below which transmissions no longer take place is yet unknown, and due to high
256 variability in methodologies and results between laboratories and studies^{21,22}.

257 The Dutch Outbreak Management Team (OMT) that provides guidance to the Ministry of
258 Health, Welfare and Sport on policy regarding COVID-19, advised, based on the results of
259 this study, that pre-/asymptomatic close contacts of individuals with a confirmed SARS-CoV-
260 2 infection can be tested for SARS-CoV-2 using an Ag-RDT. As a result the Dutch policy
261 now allows testing of close contacts using Ag-RDTs from day 5 onwards, even when they
262 have not (yet) developed symptoms. Accordingly, positive test results are known and
263 communicated earlier such that the use of Ag-RDTs in pre-/asymptomatic close contacts has
264 the potential to help prevent onward SARS-CoV-2 transmission.

265

266 **References**

267

- 268 1. Ferrari A, Santus E, Cirillo D, et al. Simulating SARS-CoV-2 epidemics by region-
269 specific variables and modeling contact tracing app containment. *NPJ Digit Med* 2021;4:9.
- 270 2. Kucharski AJ, Klepac P, Conlan AJK, et al. Effectiveness of isolation, testing, contact
271 tracing, and physical distancing on reducing transmission of SARS-CoV-2 in different
272 settings: a mathematical modelling study. *Lancet Infect Dis* 2020;20:1151-60.
- 273 3. Ferretti L, Wymant C, Kendall M, et al. Quantifying SARS-CoV-2 transmission
274 suggests epidemic control with digital contact tracing. *Science* 2020;368.
- 275 4. Kretzschmar MER, G.; Bootsma, M.; van Boven, M.; van de Wijgert, J.; Bonten, M.
276 Time is of the essence: impact of delays on effectiveness of contact tracing for COVID-19, a
277 modelling study. medRxiv 2020.
- 278 5. COVID-19 Test-and-tracing protocol. 2021. at <https://lci.rivm.nl/COVID-19-bco>.)
- 279 6. Kucirka LM, Lauer SA, Laeyendecker O, Boon D, Lessler J. Variation in False-
280 Negative Rate of Reverse Transcriptase Polymerase Chain Reaction-Based SARS-CoV-2
281 Tests by Time Since Exposure. *Ann Intern Med* 2020;173:262-7.
- 282 7. Mallett S, Allen AJ, Graziadio S, et al. At what times during infection is SARS-CoV-2
283 detectable and no longer detectable using RT-PCR-based tests? A systematic review of
284 individual participant data. *BMC Med* 2020;18:346.
- 285 8. Boehme C, Hannay E, Sampath R. SARS-CoV-2 testing for public health use: core
286 principles and considerations for defined use settings. *Lancet Glob Health* 2021;9:e247-e9.
- 287 9. van Beek JI, Z.; Boelsums, T.; Fanoy, E.; Gotz, H.; Molenkamp, R.; van Kampen, J.;
288 GeurtsvanKessel, C.; van der Eijk, A.; van de Vijver, D.; Koopmans, M. From more testing to
289 smart testing: data-guided SARS-CoV-2 testing choices medRxiv 2020.

- 290 10. Pray IW, Ford L, Cole D, et al. Performance of an Antigen-Based Test for
291 Asymptomatic and Symptomatic SARS-CoV-2 Testing at Two University Campuses -
292 Wisconsin, September-October 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep* 2021;69:1642-7.
- 293 11. Winkel BMFS, E.; Gremmels, H.; Debast, S.B.; Schuurman, R.; Wensing, A.M.J.;
294 Bonten, M.J.M.; Goedhart, E.; Hofstra, M.; Antigen Rapid Test Validation Group. Screening
295 for SARS-CoV-2 infection in asymptomatic individuals using the Panbio™ COVID-19
296 Antigen Rapid Test (Abbott) compared to RT-qPCR. medRxiv 2020.
- 297 12. Stohr JJMZ, V.F.; Goderski, G.; Meijer, A.; Nagel-Imming, C.R.S.; Kluytmans-van
298 den Bergh, M.F.Q.; Pas, S.D.; van den Oetelaar, F.; Hellwich, M.; Gan, K.H.; Rietveld, A.;
299 Verweij, J.J.; Murk, J.L.; van den Bijllaardt, W.; Kluytmans, J.A.J.W. Self-testing for the
300 detection of SARS-CoV-2 infection with rapid antigen tests. medRxiv 2021.
- 301 13. RIVM Centrum Infectieziektebestrijding. Status validatie SARS-CoV-2 antigeen
302 sneltesten, 10 Mar 20212021.
- 303 14. Van der Moeren NZ, V.F.; Lodder, E.B.; van den Bijllaardt, W.; van Esch, H.R.J.M.;
304 Stohr, J.J.J.M.; Pot, J.; Welschen, I.; van Mechelen, P.M.F.; Pas, S.D.; Kluytmans, J.A.J.W.;
305 Performance evaluation of a SARS-CoV-2 Rapid antigen test: test performance in the
306 community in The Netherlands. medRxiv 2020.
- 307 15. Igloi ZV, J.; van Beek, J.; van de Vijver, D.; Aron, G.; Ensing, R.; Benschop, K.; Han,
308 W.; Boelsums, T.; Koopmans, M.; Geurtsvankessel, C.; Molenkamp, R. Clinical evaluation of
309 the Roche/SD Biosensor rapid antigen test with symptomatic, nonhospitalized patients in a
310 municipal health service drive-through testing site. medRxiv 2020.
- 311 16. weekly COVID-19 epidemiological situation reports. 2021. at
312 [https://www.rivm.nl/coronavirus-covid-19/actueel/wekelijkse-update-epidemiologische-](https://www.rivm.nl/coronavirus-covid-19/actueel/wekelijkse-update-epidemiologische-situatie-covid-19-in-nederland)
313 [situatie-covid-19-in-nederland.](https://www.rivm.nl/coronavirus-covid-19/actueel/wekelijkse-update-epidemiologische-situatie-covid-19-in-nederland))

- 314 17. Gudbjartsson DF, Helgason A, Jonsson H, et al. Spread of SARS-CoV-2 in the
315 Icelandic Population. *N Engl J Med* 2020;382:2302-15.
- 316 18. Sutton D, Fuchs K, D'Alton M, Goffman D. Universal Screening for SARS-CoV-2 in
317 Women Admitted for Delivery. *N Engl J Med* 2020;382:2163-4.
- 318 19. Deeks JJ, Raffle AE. Lateral flow tests cannot rule out SARS-CoV-2 infection. *BMJ*
319 2020;371:m4787.
- 320 20. Jefferson T, Spencer EA, Brassey J, Heneghan C. Viral cultures for COVID-19
321 infectious potential assessment - a systematic review. *Clin Infect Dis* 2020.
- 322 21. Lee LYWR, S.; Pang, M.; Charlett, A.; Anderson, C.; Hughes, G.J.; Barnard, M.;
323 Peto, L.; Vipond, R.; Sienkiewicz, A.; Hopkins, S.; Bell, J.; Crook, D.W.; Gent, N.; Walker,
324 A.S.; Eyre, D.W.; Peto, T.E.A. An observational study of SARS-CoV-2 infectivity by viral
325 load and demographic factors and the utility lateral flow devices to prevent transmission.
326 2021.
- 327 22. Marks M, Millat-Martinez P, Ouchi D, et al. Transmission of COVID-19 in 282
328 clusters in Catalonia, Spain: a cohort study. *Lancet Infect Dis* 2021.
- 329

330 **Tables**

331

332 *Table 1 Diagnostic accuracy parameters of both Ag-RDTs*

Analysis		#	Prevalence*	Sensitivity [%] (95% CI)	Specificity [%] (95% CI)	Positive Predictive Value [%] (95% CI)	Negative Predictive Value [%] (95% CI)
<i>BD Veritor™ System for Rapid Detection of SARS-CoV-2 Ag-RDT ('BD')</i>							
<u>Primary analysis</u>		2678	8.7%	63.9 (57.4 to 70.1)	99.6 (99.3 to 99.8)	94.3 (89.5 to 97.4)	96.7 (95.9 to 97.3)
<u>Secondary (stratified) analysis</u>							
Infectiousness viral load cut-off [†]		2677 [§]	5.7%	90.1 (84.2 to 94.4)	99.2 (98.8 to 99.5)	87.3 (81.0 to 92.0)	99.4 (99.0 to 99.7)
Symptoms at sampling [#]	Yes	219	17.4%	84.2 (68.7 to 94.0)	99.4 (97.0 to 100)	97.0 (84.2 to 99.9)	96.8 (93.1 to 98.8)
	No	2317	7.7%	58.7 (51.1 to 66.0)	99.6 (99.3 to 99.8)	92.9 (86.5 to 96.9)	96.6 (95.8 to 97.4)
Interval between sampling and last contact with index case [days] [@]	< 5	379	14.8%	69.6 (55.9 to 81.2)	99.7 (98.3 to 100)	97.5 (86.8 to 99.9)	95.0 (92.1 to 97.1)
	5	1303	6.5%	62.4 (51.2 to 72.6)	99.9 (99.5 to 100)	98.1 (90.1 to 100)	97.4 (96.4 to 98.2)
	> 5	511	9.0%	56.5 (41.1 to 71.1)	99.1 (97.8 to 99.8)	86.7 (69.3 to 96.2)	95.8 (93.7 to 97.4)
<i>Roche/SD Biosensor SARS-CoV-2 Rapid Antigen Test ('SD-B')</i>							
<u>Primary analysis</u>		1596	8.3%	62.9 (54.0 to 71.1)	99.5 (98.9 to 99.8)	91.2 (83.4 to 96.1)	96.7 (95.7 to 97.6)
<u>Secondary (stratified) analysis</u>							
Infectiousness viral load cut-off		1596	5.7%	86.8 (78.1 to 93.0)	99.2 (98.6 to 99.6)	86.8 (78.1 to 93.0)	99.2 (98.6 to 99.6)

Symptoms at sampling [#]	Yes	158	19.0%	73.3 (54.1 to 87.7)	98.4 (94.5 to 99.8)	91.7 (73.0 to 99.0)	94.0 (88.6 to 97.4)
	No	1414	7.1%	59.4 (49.2 to 69.1)	99.5 (99.0 to 99.8)	90.9 (81.3 to 96.6)	97.0 (95.9 to 97.8)
Interval between sampling and last contact with index case [days] [@]	< 5	153	13.1%	75.0 (50.9 to 91.3)	99.2 (95.9 to 100)	93.8 (69.8 to 99.8)	96.4 (91.7 to 98.8)
	5	1095	7.8%	61.2 (50.0 to 71.6)	99.5 (98.9 to 99.8)	91.2 (80.7 to 97.1)	96.8 (95.6 to 97.8)
	> 5	205	6.3%	69.2 (38.6 to 90.9)	99.5 (97.1 to 100)	90.0 (55.5 to 99.7)	97.9 (94.8 to 99.4)

333 CI = confidence interval; N/A = not applicable.

334 * SARS-CoV-2 infection based on RT-PCR test result

335 [#] Symptoms were not available from 142 individuals in the BD group and 24 in the SD-B group

336 [!] The viral load cut-off for infectiousness, defined as the viral load above which 95% of RT-PCR positives had a
337 positive viral culture, was 5.2 log₁₀ E gene copies/mL.

338 [§] Viral load was unavailable for one BD-tested individual with a positive RT-PCR test result

339 [@] The interval between the moment of sampling and the last contact with an infected individual was not available
340 for 488 individuals in the BD group and 143 individuals in the SD-B group, mainly because this question was
341 added to the questionnaire later in study. Initially, a 3-item questionnaire was used. Questions 1 and 2 in the 5-
342 item questionnaire (see Supplementary Material 1) were added after the first week of the study. In addition, do
343 note that the time interval between the last contact and the time of sampling is not the same as the time between
344 the test request and the time of sampling.

345

346 **Figure legends**

347 **Figure 1** Flow of study participants. BD = BD Veritor™ System for Rapid Detection of
348 SARS-CoV-2 Ag-RDT ('BD'), SD-B = Roche/SD Biosensor SARS-CoV-2 Rapid Antigen
349 Test.

350 **Figure 2** Distribution of viral loads of individuals with a positive RT-PCR test result,
351 stratified by a combination of the Roche/SD Biosensor SARS-CoV-2 Rapid Antigen Test
352 result (Ag-RDT+/-) and the ability to culture (culture +/-), with Ag-RDT+ and Ag-RDT-
353 corresponding to a positive and negative Ag-RDT result, and culture+ and culture- indicating
354 whether it was possible to culture virus or not.

355 **Figure 3** Diagnostic accuracy parameters of both Ag-RDTs for different definitions of RT-
356 PCR test positivity based on viral load cut-offs, where a positive RT-PCR test with a viral
357 load below the viral load cut-off threshold is considered a negative RT-PCR test result. Points
358 highlighted in red indicate a viral load cut-off of 5.2 log₁₀ E gene copies/mL, which was
359 considered the viral load cut-off for infectiousness as determined by viral culture. BD = BD
360 Veritor™ System for Rapid Detection of SARS-CoV-2 Ag-RDT; SD-B = Roche/SD
361 Biosensor SARS-CoV-2 Rapid Antigen Test; PPV = positive predictive value; NPV =
362 negative predictive value.

363 **Acknowledgements**

364 We would like to acknowledge all participants, study personnel at the local public health
365 service test sites, personnel at the participating labs, and study personnel at the RIVM that
366 helped process the questionnaires, design and distribute the study forms. A special thanks
367 goes to Esther Stiefelhagen, Roel Ensing, and Wendy Mouthaan for their efforts in the
368 logistics towards and at the local test sites. Written permission was obtained from all three to
369 include their names in this Acknowledgment section. ES, RE, and WH did not receive any
370 compensation for their contributions.

371

372 **Author contributions**

373 KGMM and JHHMvdW initiated the study. ES, IKV, RPV, WvdB, EL, RM, GJS, KB, LH,
374 JHHMvdW, SvdH, and KGMM designed the study. IKV coordinated the study. WvdB, SDP,
375 RM, JV, and RCH were responsible for lab analyses and data processing. CHGvK performed
376 virus culture. ES performed the statistical analysis in close collaboration with IKV and
377 KGMM. ES, IKV, RPV, SvdH, and KGMM drafted the first version of the manuscript. All
378 authors critically read the manuscript and provided feedback. All authors approved the
379 submission of the current version of the manuscript.

380

381 **Competing interest declaration**

382 None to be disclosed.

383

384 **Funding**


385 The study was funded by the Dutch Ministry of Health, Welfare and Sport. The funder had no
386 role in the design, conduct, data-analysis or report of the study.

387


388 **Additional information** (containing supplementary information line (if any) and
389 corresponding author line).


390 The study protocol is available upon request by contacting Karel Moons at
391 k.g.m.moons@umcutrecht.nl.

BD







SD-B





BD



SD-B

