SARS-CoV-2 RNA and antibody dynamics in a Dutch household study with dense sampling frame

Wanda G.H. Han[1]*
Arno Swart[1]*
Axel Bonacic Marinovic[1]
Dirk Eggink[1]
Johan Reimerink[1]
Lisa A. Wijsman[1]
Bas van der Veer[1]
Sharon van den Brink[1]
Anne-Marie van den Brandt[1]
Fion Brouwer[1]
Marieke Hoogerwerf[1]
On behalf of the Dutch FFX-COVID-19 research group
Daphne F.M. Reukers[1]
Nynke Rots[1]
Chantal Reusken[1]
Adam Meijer[1]

[1]Centre for Infectious Disease Control, National Institute for Public Health and the Environment, Bilthoven, the Netherlands
*Equal contribution
Membership of the Dutch FFX-COVID-19 research group is provided in the Acknowledgments

Corresponding author contact information:
Adam Meijer
Centre for Infectious Diseases Research, Diagnostics and Laboratory Surveilance, Centre for Infectious Disease Control (CIb), National Institute for Public Health and the Environment (RIVM)
PO Box 1, 3720 BA Bilthoven, the Netherlands
Tel.: +31 302743595
E-mail: Adam.Meijer@rivm.nl

Running title: SARS-CoV-2 diagnostics and symptom onset

Abstract

This study investigated the dynamics of SARS-CoV-2 infection and diagnostics in household members of different ages and with different symptom severity after SARS-CoV-2 exposure during the early phase of the pandemic. Households with a SARS-CoV-2 confirmed positive case and at least one child in the Netherlands were followed for 6 weeks. Naso (NP)- and oropharyngeal (OP) swabs, oral fluid and feces specimens were analyzed for SARS-CoV-2 RNA and serum for SARS-CoV-2-specific antibodies. The dynamics of the presence of viral RNA and the serological response was modeled to determine the sampling time-frame and sample type with the highest sensitivity to confirm or reject a SARS-CoV-2 diagnosis. Transmission of SARS-CoV-2 between adults and children within a household was correlated with symptom severity of index cases. In children higher viral loads compared to adults were detected at symptom onset. Early in infection, higher viral loads were detected in NP and OP specimens, while RNA in especially feces were longer detectable. SARS-CoV-2-specific antibodies have a 90% probability of detection from 7 days (total Ig) and 18 days (IgG) since symptom onset. In conclusion this study has shown that on average, children carry higher loads of virus as compared to adults early after infection. For highest probability of detection in SARS-CoV-2 diagnostics early in infection, RT-PCR on NP and OP specimens are more sensitive than on oral fluid and feces. For SARS-CoV-2 diagnostics late after infection, RT-PCR on feces specimens and serology are more valuable.

Keywords: SARS-CoV-2, Household study, molecular diagnostics, serological diagnostics, infection dynamics

Introduction

Severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) has spread rapidly across the world since January 2020 [1]. In the Netherlands, the first COVID-19 (the syndrome caused by SARS-CoV-2) case was detected on 27 February 2020. From March until May 2020, the Dutch government mandated a partial lockdown. This included social distancing, self-quarantine and self-isolation orders, closing of schools, bars and restaurants, and urging people to work from home [2]. Yet, households are close-contact settings with high probability of (pre/a-symptomatic) transmission of SARS-CoV-2 after introduction of the virus. In this period, a prospective cohort study was performed including 55 complete households with a RT-PCR-confirmed SARS-CoV-2 positive case (index case) and at least one child below 18 years of age. All household contacts were tested as soon as possible after a SARS-CoV-2 infection in the household was identified. At multiple timepoints, various clinical samples were collected for molecular and serological diagnostics. Using a dense sampling strategy, SARS-CoV-2 transmission and kinetics of diagnostic parameters could be closely monitored within the households. Earlier we described that the estimated Secondary Attack Rate (SAR) in this cohort that was high (35% in children, 51% in adults), with reduced susceptibility of children compared to adolescents and adults (0.67; 95%CI: 0.40-1.1) [3]. Here we looked further into the kinetics of infection.

In the present study, we use the results of the dense sampling and various molecular and serological assays to identify participants with an acute or recent SARS-CoV-2 infection to analyse household transmission patterns in relation to disease severity. Secondly, we describe the dynamics of the infection per individual based on viral RNA and antibody presence. Lastly, we compared the dynamics of the different diagnostic methods (test and sample type), by modeling the outcomes per assay in relation to the days post symptom onset (dps), disease severity and age.

Methods

Study protocol

A prospective cohort study was performed following households where one symptomatic household member was tested RT-PCR positive for SARS-CoV-2 in the period 24 March – 6 April 2020 [3]. In brief, persons 18 years and older testing positive for SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR (i.e. the index case) who had at least one child in their household below the age of 18 could be included in this study (METC nr: NL13529.041.06). Table 1 describes the sampling scheme (See Reukers et al [3] for more details). We defined adults as individuals of 18 years of age or older and individuals as SARS-CoV-2 infection positive when they tested positive in at least one RT-PCR or serological assay.

COVID-19 severity

The day of onset of possible COVID-19 associated symptoms, i.e. respiratory symptoms (including sore throat, cough, dyspnea or other respiratory difficulties, rhinorrhoea), fever, chills, headache, anosmia or ageusia, muscle pain, joint ache, diarrhoea, nausea, vomiting, loss of appetite or fatigue, as reported by the participant was defined 1 dps. Laboratory confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infected cases with any clinical symptoms other than pneumonia and/or requiring medical consultation were defined as mild cases. Moderate cases showed clinical signs of pneumonia, including dyspnea. Severe cases reported dyspnea and consulted a health care professional for their symptoms, or reported having been admitted to the hospital for COVID-19 [3, 4].

Transmission categories

We categorized the household transmission patterns in three groups. In the 'no transmission' category, SARS-CoV-2 infection was only detected in the index case. In the 'adult transmission' category, SARS-CoV-2 infection was detected in adults other than the index case only. In the 'family transmission' category, SARS-CoV-2 infection was detected in children and possibly also adults other than the index case. In order to assess the significance of differences in severities over transmission

105 categories a generalized linear model (GLM) for count data with Poisson family and exponential link
106 was set up with interactions between the transmission category and severity classes.
107
108 *Molecular diagnostics*
109 Nasopharyngeal swabs (NP) and oropharyngeal swabs (OP) were collected in gelatin-lactalbumin-
110 yeast (GLY) viral transport medium (Mediaproducts BV, Groningen, The Netherlands), transported to
111 the laboratory in a cooling box and stored at maximum a few days at 4° C until being processed for
112 RT-PCR. Feces specimens were self-collected by the patient and send to the laboratory by regular mail,
113 stored frozen at -20° C until being processed for RT-PCR. Oral fluid specimens were collected with a
114 Oracol sponge (Malvern Medical Developments Ltd, U.K.), transported to the laboratory in a cooling
115 box, processed for storage according to the manufacturer's instructions, and aliquots stored frozen at
116 -80° C until being used for RT-PCR. Total nucleic acid was extracted from NP-, OP swab, oral fluid or
117 feces using MagNApure 96 (MP96) with total nucleic acid kit small volume (Roche). Of the feces
118 specimens a 5% suspension was made in MEM with Hanks' salts and penicillin and streptomycin,
119 vortex for 15 seconds and 1 minute centrifuged at 16,000 Relative Centrifugal Force. Two-hundred µl
120 supernatant was mixed with 275 µl MP96 lysis buffer including equine arteritis virus (EAV) internal
121 control and yeast tRNA stabilizer. Total nucleic acid was eluted in 50 µl Tris EDTA buffer. RT-qPCR was
122 performed on 5 µl total nucleic acid using TaqMan® Fast Virus 1-Step Master Mix (Thermo Fisher) on
123 Roche LC480 II thermal cycler with SARS-like beta coronavirus (Sarbeco) specific E-gene primers and
124 probe and EAV as described previously [5, 6]. As no other Sarbeco viruses are currently detected in
125 humans, a positive Sarbeco E-gene RT-qPCR is validly taken as positive for SARS-CoV-2. For modeling
126 purposes no detection of SARS-CoV-2 RNA was given an artificial cycle threshold (Ct) value of 40.
127
128 *Serological diagnostics*
129 The Wantai SARS-CoV-2 total antibody ELISA (Beijing Wantai Biological Pharmacy Enterprise, Beijing,
130 China; catalogue number WS1096) was performed according to the manufacturer's instructions [7].

This assay is a double-antigen sandwich ELISA using the recombinant receptor-binding domain of SARS-CoV-2 as antigen. Optical density (OD) is measured at 450 nm and the antibody OD ratio for each sample is calculated as the ratio of the OD of that sample to the reading of a calibrator (included in the kit).

Sera were tested for the presence of IgG antibodies reactive with the SARS-CoV-2 S1 and SARS-CoV-2 N antigens in a protein microarray, in duplicate 2-fold serial dilutions starting at 1:20, essentially as described previously [8]. For each antigen, a 4-parameter loglogistic calibration curve was generated. Antibody titers (EC50 value) were defined as the interpolated serum dilution that gave a fluorescence intensity of 50% of the corresponding calibration curve. Raw data were processed with the R 4.04 statistical software as described previously [9].

Modeling RT-PCR

All available RT-PCR outcomes (Table 1) were modelled by a Bayesian hierarchical model of the form

$$Ct_i \sim N(\mu_i, \sigma)$$

$$\mu_i = \alpha_{\text{test}[i]} + \alpha_{\text{test[i], id}[i]} + \alpha_{\text{test[i],agecat}[i]} + \alpha_{\text{test[i],severity}[i]} + +\left(\beta_{\text{test}[i]} + \beta_{\text{test}[i],\text{id}[i]} + \beta_{\text{test}[i],\text{agecat}[i]} + \beta_{\text{test}[i],\text{severity}[i]} +\right)d_i$$

Here, Ct_i is the measured Ct value for sample i, and σ the overall variation. There is a part dependent on the days since onset of symptoms (d_i) with coefficients β, and a constant part with coefficients α. Both the α and β parameters include several contributions stratified by categorical variables: id$[i]$ is the person specific identifier for sample i enabling longitudinal modelling, agecat$[i]$ is either 'child' or 'adult', severity$[i]$ is either 'asymptomatic', 'mild', 'moderate' or 'severe', and test$[i]$ is either 'pcr NP, 'pcr OP, 'pcr oral fluid', 'pcr feces', 'wantai', 'microarray S1' or 'microarray N'.

For the id's a hierarchical model is built (i.e. a random effect),

$$\alpha_{\text{test[i], id}[i]} \sim N(0, \sigma_{\text{test}[i]}), \quad \beta_{\text{test[i], id}[i]} \sim N(0, \tau_{\text{test}[i]}).$$

Whenever a Ct-value of 40 is encountered, we apply censoring in the model by changing the probability density function $f(x; \mu_i, \sigma)$ into its cumulative counterpart $1 - F(40;\ \mu_i, \sigma)$, thereby encoding that we have an unknown Ct value which would either indicate the absence of amplifiable

RNA or presence of RNA but well below the detection limit of the used RT-PCR. All parameters are given weakly informative priors, and the posterior distributions are obtained using the JAGS software [10], interfaced from R [11]. Bayesian credible intervals were obtained from the samples of the posterior as calculated by JAGS. Prediction intervals were calculated by drawing randomly from $N(\hat{\mu}_j, \hat{\sigma}_j)$, where the indicated means and standard deviations are samples from the posterior distributions. The posterior probability of being positive is modelled by $F(40; \hat{\mu}_j, \hat{\sigma}_j)$. The modeling did not include the Ct values of the inclusion RT-PCR NP+OP which was performed in index cases just before start of the study, since these values are not known to us.

Modeling serology

The dynamics of serology cannot be assumed to be linear as is the case for Ct-values. Rather, seronegative individuals have a titer (OD ratio for Wantai or EC50 for protein microarray) varying around a low value, and seropositive individuals have a titer varying around a high value. In the case of the ELISA-test and microarray-based assays used in the current study, we find that a cut-off value to distinguish seropositives and seronegatives works well, since the two components are well separated (Figure S1). Using the cut-off values 1 for Wantai (according to manufacturer's instructions) and 10 for microarray [8], we classify each measurement X_i as either positive or negative. Using a Bernouilli distribution and logit link for the probability we model the outcomes as

$$X_i \sim \text{Bernoulli}(p_i)$$

$$\begin{aligned}\text{logit}(p_i) = {} & \alpha_{\text{test}[i]} + \alpha_{\text{test[i],id}[i]} + \alpha_{\text{test[i],agecat}[i]} + \alpha_{\text{test[i],severity}[i]} \\ & + \left(\beta_{\text{test}[i]} + \beta_{\text{test[i],id}[i]} + \beta_{\text{test[i],agecat}[i]} + \beta_{\text{test[i],severity}[i]}\right) d_i\end{aligned}$$

Parameter estimation proceeds analogous to the RT-PCR model.

Assessing differences between factors

We assessed the difference between posterior estimates of parameters using the Region of Practical Equivalence (ROPE) [12-14]. The ROPE is an interval chosen based on domain knowledge that indicates values that are practically indistinguishable. For Ct-values our ROPE interval is [-1,1], which means that

185 we consider differences between Ct-values of less than one as not meaningful. For changes in Ct-value
186 per day (the slope) we choose [-1/7, 1/7], which means that we consider differences between Ct-
187 values of less than one per week as not meaningful. For serology detection probability (dps) our ROPE
188 interval is [-2,2], which means that we consider differences between days of less than 2 as not
189 meaningful. The ROPE is compared to the 89% highest posterior density interval (HDI). When the ROPE
190 contains the HDI, no meaningful difference exists, when the ROPE is completely outside of the HDI,
191 there is a difference, when the ROPE and HDI overlap we withhold a decision because of too high
192 uncertainty.
193
194 **Results**
195 *Household transmission SARS-CoV-2*
196 A total of 242 participants from 55 complete households were included in this study. The number of
197 analyses performed per assay and specimen type at the various timepoints with the day of the first
198 home visit (so the start of the study within the particular household) defined as day 1 are described in
199 Table 1 and Table S1. To identify different transmission patterns, we visualized SARS-CoV-2 infection
200 detection by the different assays and specimen types per participant and household in heatmaps. We
201 identified the transmission pattern 'no transmission' in 16 households (Figure 1A), 'adult transmission'
202 in 11 households (Figure 1B) and 'family transmission' in 28 households (Figure 1C). Eight of the 28
203 households in the 'family transmission' category did not show transmission to adults.
204 Symptom severity of COVID-19 index cases correlated with transmission of SARS-CoV-2
205 between adults and children within a household as reflected by the overrepresentation of index cases
206 with severe symptoms in the family transmission group (p=0.03, 54% of indexes with severe COVID-
207 19) compared to the other groups (Figure 2). In the no transmission category, more than half (56.3%)
208 of the index cases had mild symptoms, whilst only 19% had severe symptoms. In the adult
209 transmission category, there were 4 severe index cases out of 10 (36%).
210

211 *SARS-CoV-2 infection dynamics*

212 We investigated the SARS-CoV-2 infection dynamics in the participants of the study. Using an 'upset
213 plot' [15], Figure 3 shows patterns of positive and negative results in the various molecular and
214 serological assays. Of the 242 participants, 136 individuals were positive for SARS-CoV-2 infection by
215 either molecular and/or serological diagnostics. Of these 136 SARS-CoV-2 infection positive
216 individuals, 125 (91.9%) were symptomatic and severe symptomatic individuals were mainly (29 out
217 of 32) RT-PCR- and serology-positive (Figure 3B). Most individuals were found SARS-CoV-2 positive by
218 multiple diagnostic assays and/or materials, but 19 individuals tested positive with only one assay type
219 and/or material (only Wantai n=5, RT-PCR NP n=3, RT-PCR oral fluid n=3, RT-PCR OP n=2, RT-PCR feces
220 n=2, Inclusion PCR NP+OP n=2, MA-S n=1, MA-N n=1) during the study period (Figure 3A). In most of
221 the infected cases (81.6%, 111 of the 136) both SARS-CoV-2 RNA and SARS-CoV-2-specific antibodies
222 were detected (Figure 3B). For 12 individuals only at one timepoint during the study one positive test
223 was found (Figure 1, red rectangles).

224 Next, for the individuals with at least one RT-PCR and one serological result at visit 1, 2 and 3
225 (n=198), we could analyze rough dynamics of the infection process (Figure 4). The median dps relative
226 to visit 1 is indicated in Figure 4. Six common patterns in 173 individuals, ranked A – F based on
227 frequency, could be identified. Within laboratory confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infected individuals, the
228 common patterns B (n=28) and C (n=27) included individuals with a positive PCR and serological assay
229 at visit 1. As can be expected, SARS-CoV-2 viral RNA was not detected anymore in these cases at the
230 end of the study (4-6 weeks after inclusion), while SARS-CoV-2 antibodies remained present.
231 Individuals with pattern E (n=12) did not have detectable SARS-CoV-2 RNA at any visit, but did have
232 detectable SARS-CoV-2 antibodies at visit 1, 2 and 3. This pattern is in line with an earlier onset of
233 symptoms compared to the individuals with pattern B and C, thus these individuals were included in
234 the study later in their infection process resulting in already diminished viral RNA and present
235 antibodies at visit 1. Pattern D (n=18) and F (n=9) included individuals with a positive RT-PCR at visit 1
236 and developed antibodies after visit 1. Compared to pattern B and C, these individuals reported their

237 onset of symptoms 2-4 days later, thus at study inclusion (visit 1) they were earlier in their infection
238 process. Pattern A included individuals with negative RT-PCR and serology results at all visits. These
239 rough patterns underline that there are optimal time windows in which detection of SARS-CoV-2 viral
240 RNA or SARS-CoV-2-specific antibodies are most appropriate in diagnostics. To further investigate this
241 we used a modelling approach.
242
243 *Dynamics SARS-CoV-2 diagnostics*
244 Bayesian modeling on all available RT-PCR data demonstrated a difference in Ct-values at symptoms
245 onset between adults and children (Figure 5A, B and S2-G1) and in Ct-values at symptom onset and in
246 Ct-value increase per day between different specimen types (Figure 5C and S2-A to F). The predicted
247 Ct value (inversely correlated with viral load), was on average 2.6 Ct lower in children (Ct 27.5; all
248 specimens) compared to adults (Ct 30.1; all specimens) at the day of symptom onset (intercept)
249 (Figure 5A, B and S2-G1). The decay in time in viral load (slope) was comparable between adults and
250 children (Figure 5B and S2-G2). In line with this, there is a longer probability of SARS-CoV-2 RNA
251 detection with increasing dps in children (99% detection until 13 dps), compared to adults (99%
252 detection until 7.6 dps) (Figure S3A). When analyzing all ages, the predicted viral load seems slightly
253 higher in NP and OP swabs (Ct 28.8 and 28.7) compared to feces (Ct 30.1) and oral fluid (Ct 30.7) at
254 the day of symptom onset (intercept) (Figure 5C) indicating higher sensitivity of SARS-CoV-2 RNA
255 detection in NP and OP specimens compared to oral fluid (Figure S2-B1 and D1) and possibly feces
256 (Figure S2-C1 and E1). In contrast, there seems te be a slower decay (slope) in viral load in oral fluid
257 and feces specimens (0.25 and 0.22 Ct per day) compared to NP and OP specimens (0.35 and 0.36 Ct
258 per day) (Figure 5C). The relevance of these findings is uncertain as there is partial overlap between
259 the ROPE and HDI (Figure S2-B1 to E1 and B2 to E2). Overall, as a most likely estimate, the estimated
260 viral load is higher in NP and OP swabs compared to oral fuid until 21.1 dps and 19.0 dps, respectively
261 (Figure S4-B and D), and compared to feces until 10.2 dps and 9.7 dps, respectively (Figure S4-C and
262 E). Furthermore, there is a longer probability of SARS-CoV-2 RNA detection with increasing dps in feces

263 (90% detection until 27 dps), compared to NP, OP and oral fluid specimens (90% detection until 19.4,
264 20.3 and 22.7 dps, respectively) (Figure 5D and Figure S5-C, E and F). Similar trends are shown for 50%
265 and 10% detection probability (Figure S5 and S6). We could not find a clear correlation in severity of
266 symptoms and the dynamics of the SARS-CoV-2 RNA detection (data not shown).

267 Furthermore, we investigated the dynamics of SARS-CoV-2 antibody detection (Figure 6). The
268 Wantai assay (total Ig) demonstrated a higher sensitivity for detection of anti-S1 antibodies than the
269 micro-array (IgG) as the probability for detection was earlier using Wantai upon onset of illness (Figure
270 6A and S7-A). The dps at which 90% detection probability was reached for Wantai was 7.1 compared
271 to 16.9 and 18 for Nucleoprotein (N)- and S1-protein microarray respectively (Figure 6B). The protein
272 microarray for S1 and N had comparable sensitivity, in line with a previous study [8]. The probability
273 of detecting N-specific IgG antibodies in children was delayed by 3.0 days (at 90% probability
274 detection) versus adults (Figure 6C and D), while this was not the case for detection of S1-specific
275 antibodies (Figure 6C). The relevance of this finding is uncertain as there is much overlap between the
276 distributions in children and adults (Figure S8). The N-specific IgG antibody titers (at visit 3;
277 convalescent phase) were not significantly lower in children compared to adults (Figure S9).
278 Furthermore, we could not find a correlation in severity of symptoms and the dynamics of the SARS-
279 CoV-2 infection detection by the serological assays (data not shown).

280

281 **Discussion**

282 We studied SARS-CoV-2 RNA and antibody kinetics in a household cohort during the early phase of
283 the pandemic using an unusual dense sampling schedule allowing for high resolution analysis. For
284 highest probability of detection of SARS-CoV-2 RNA by RT-PCR early in infection NP and OP are more
285 suitable than oral fluid and feces. SARS-CoV-2-specific antibodies have a 90% probability of detection
286 from 7 dps with the Wantai assay and 18 dps with the microarray S1 and N assay. This study has been
287 performed in a naïve population during the early phase of the pandemic. Although SARS-CoV-2
288 vaccination, previous infection and the circulation of other SARS-CoV-2 variants may influence the

289 dynamics of SARS-CoV-2 infection and thereby diagnostics, our study provides valuable reference
290 insights into this subject.

291 Households present close-contact settings with high risk of SARS-CoV-2 transmission after
292 introduction of SARS-CoV-2 in the household [3, 16]. We observed a positive correlation between
293 transmission of SARS-CoV-2 between adults and children and the severity of disease in the household
294 indexes. This is in line with studies that report that the severity of SARS-CoV-2 infection of the index
295 case was associated with higher infectiousness [16, 17]. It should be noted that at the time of the
296 study, SARS-CoV-2 testing in the Netherlands was limited to symptomatic healthcare workers and
297 symptomatic vulnerable individuals. The index cases were thus mainly symptomatic healthcare
298 workers [3]. As schools and daycare centres were closed during the study period, transmission outside
299 the households among children was minimalized. Due to limited sample size, we could only
300 categorized children as those of 17 years of age or younger for the Bayesian hierarchical modelling. It
301 would be of interest to stratify the children in more groups, e.g. primary school age and adolescent
302 age.

303 Seroconversion rates in mild to severe symptomatic SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR positive cases have
304 been reported in the range of 93-100% after 3-4 week [18-20]. During the course of this study, a vast
305 majority of RT-PCR confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infected participants (91.0%, 111/122) developed SARS-
306 CoV-2 specific antibodies (Figure 3B). In 6 RT-PCR positive cases, serology data was missing. In 11 of
307 122 (9.0%) RT-PCR confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infected individuals there was no seroconversion (Figure
308 3B). These individuals may have experienced a relative mild infection, or in the cases with only one
309 positive RT-PCR test (including the available results of the extra sampling between visit 1 and 2, n=8)
310 and no evidence of antibody response, the SARS-CoV-2 diagnosis of these individuals is disputable.
311 Four of the 8 RT-PCR-negative cases that did have SARS-CoV-2-specific antibodies during the study
312 period, showed only one positive serological test, suggesting also a disputable SARS-CoV-2 diagnosis.
313 In the other 4 individuals, SARS-CoV-2-specific antibodies were detected at multiple visits including at
314 visit 1, therefore likely having experienced infection before inclusion. Nevertheless, technically there

315 was no evidence of false positivity as all negative controls had correct results. Therefore, the
316 disputable results remain unexplained. Transient exposure without established infection and rapid
317 waning of immune response might be one explanantion.The individuals with negative RT-PCR and
318 serology results at all visits were probably not infected with SARS-CoV-2 (Figure 3B and Figure 4,
319 pattern A). Those reporting symptoms were not tested for alternative diagnoses (i.e. other respiratory
320 viruses). From national surveillance reports we known that also other viruses causing COVID-19-like
321 acute respiratory infection symptoms circulated (https://www.rivm.nl/virologische-weekstaten).
322 Especially in March 2020, the first study month, before the COVID-19 measures were put in place.
323 Later on rhinoviruses continued circulating during the measures.

324 In the current study we used Bayesian hierarchical models to determine the sampling time-
325 frame and sample type with the highest sensitivity to confirm or reject a SARS-CoV-2 diagnosis. Due
326 to the close-contact settings with high probability of (pre/a-symptomatic) transmission of SARS-CoV-
327 2 after introduction of the virus in households and the longitudinal dense sampling performed in this
328 study, the analysis yielded results with relatively narrow credibility intervals which support our
329 findings. For highest probability of a SARS-CoV-2 diagnosis (lower Ct), RT-PCR on NP and OP specimens
330 were more suitable than feces and oral fluid until 10 dps and 20 dps, respectively (Figure S4C, E and
331 B, D). Our study confirms that NP and OP (or combined NP+OP) were the preferred sample type for
332 RT-PCR-based SARS-CoV-2 diagnostics within 1 week upon onset of symptoms [21-23]. A systematic
333 review concluded that of the alternative specimens to NP and OP swabs, oral fluid (saliva) has an
334 estimated sensitivity of 83.9% (95% CI: 77.4-88.8) and specificity of 96.4% (95% CI: 89.5-98.8)
335 compared to reference NP and OP swabs in nucleic acid assays [23]. The sensitivity and specificity of
336 feces specimens seems much lower, although limited data is available [23]. For SARS-CoV-2
337 diagnostics late in infection or in past infections, RT-PCR on feces and oral fluid specimens are more
338 valuable than NP and OP specimens, since the presence of viral RNA in especially feces remain present
339 over a longer time compared to NP and OP swab specimens. This is in line with findings of other studies
340 that indicate that SARS-CoV-2 RNA can be detected up to 126 days in feces compared to 83 days in

341 respiratory specimens and that beyond 10 dps, feces sampling may be preferred [22, 24, 25]. Although
342 SARS-CoV-2 RNA can remain present in respiratory and feces specimens for a long time, the duration
343 of presence of viable virus is relatively short-lived [26, 27]. Alternatively, from a week after symptom
344 onset testing for the presence of SARS-CoV-2 Spike-specific total Ig using Wantai ELISA can confirm a
345 recent or past SARS-CoV-2 infection. SARS-CoV-2 diagnostics using protein microarray detecting SARS-
346 CoV-2 Spike- and Nucleoprotein-specific IgG antibodies, is useful 2 weeks after infection or symptom
347 onset.

348 The infection dynamics of SARS-CoV-2 may be influenced by characteristics of the tested
349 population, such as age and the severity of COVID-19. We, however, could not find a clear correlation
350 in severity of symptoms or age and the RNA and SARS-CoV-2-specific antibody kinetics, although our
351 study may be underpowered to detect these differences (data not shown). Children in general report
352 milder symptoms compared to adults (Table S1) [3]. It is known that with age, the expression of ACE-
353 2 increases in nasal epithelium [28]. Since SARS-CoV-2 uses the ACE-2 receptor for host entry, a lower
354 expression of *ACE-2* in children relative to adults might explain the lower susceptibility and milder
355 infection course in children. However, our findings and other studies show that viral loads in children
356 are similar or higher than viral loads in adults [29, 30]. In our study children displayed lower Ct values
357 (higher viral loads) at the day of symptom onset compared to adults, while the decay in viral load was
358 comparable (Figure 5) . This suggests that if children become infected with SARS-CoV-2, they can carry
359 high loads of virus for a longer time compared to adults. Therefore, children are potentially longer
360 infectious than adults after symptom onset. Whether this observation holds for new Variants of
361 concern (VOC) e.a. delta, warrants further investigation. No clear differences between adults and
362 children were found in the dynamics of SARS-CoV-2 serology, yet the detection of N-specific antibodies
363 seems slightly delayed in children compared to adults (Figure 6C, D and S8). A study showed a reduced
364 breadth of anti-SARS-CoV-2-specific antibodies, predominantly generating IgG antibodies specific for
365 the S protein but not the N protein in children compared to adults [31]. Whether this has
366 consequences for the development of immunity to SARS-CoV-2 is not yet clear.

367 In summary, our study allowed for a high resolution analysis of the sensitivity of molecular
368 and serology-based detection of recent SARS-CoV-2 infections due to the unusual dense sampling
369 strategy in a confined setting. For highest probability of SARS-CoV-2 diagnostics early in infection, PCR
370 on NP and OP specimens are in favor over oral fluid and feces. For SARS-CoV-2 diagnostics late in
371 infection or in past infection, RT-PCR on feces specimens and serology are more valuable. Children
372 seem to carry higher loads of virus for a prolonged time in comparison to adults. The data presented
373 here strengthen the evidence-basis for SARS-CoV-2 testing strategies.
374

375 **Acknowledgements**

376 We thank the Public Health Service Utrecht for assistance in the recruitment of households. We thank
377 Alper Çevirgel, Anneke Westerhof, Anoek Backx, Elma Smeets-Roelofs, Elsa Porter, Elske Bijvank,
378 Francoise van Heiningen, Gabriel Goderski, Gert-Jan Godeke, Harry van Dijken, Helma Lith, Hinke ten
379 Hulscher, Ilse Akkerman, Ilse Schinkel, Jeroen Hoeboer, Jolanda Kool, Josine van Beek, Joyce Greeber,
380 Kim Freriks, Lidian Izeboud, Lisa Beckers, Liza Tymchenko, Maarten Emmelot, Maarten Vos, Margriet
381 Bisschoff, Marit de Lange, Marit Middeldorp, Marjan Bogaard, Marjan Kuijer, Martien Poelen, Nening
382 Nanlohy, Olga de Bruin, Rogier Bodewes, Ruben Wiegmans, Sakinie Misiedjan, Saskia de Goede,
383 Sophie van Tol, Titia Kortbeek, and Yolanda van Weert for assistance in logistics and laboratory
384 analyses. We thank Bettie Voordouw for critical review of manuscript. The Dutch FFX-COVID-19
385 research group of the Centre for Infectious Disease Control, National Institute for Public Health and
386 the Environment, the Netherlands, includes the following members: Arianne B. van Gageldonk-
387 Lafeber, Wim van der Hoek, Susan van den Hof, Adam Meijer, Daphne F.M. Reukers, Chantal Reusken,
388 Inge Roof and Nynke Rots.

389 This study was funded by the Dutch Ministry of Health, Welfare, and Sport (VWS).

390 None of the authors has any potential conflicts of interest to disclose.

391

References

[1] World Health Organization (WHO). Timeline of WHO's response to COVID-19. https://www.who.int/news/item/29-06-2020-covidtimeline.

[2] Minister Bruno Bruins MIvE, Minister Arie Slob, Minister Tamara van Ark. Kamerbrief met nieuwe aanvullende maatregelen om de COVID 19 uitbraak te bestrijden. Medische Zorg en Sport OCeW, Basis- en Voortgezet Onderwijs en Media, Sociale Zaken en Werkgelegenheid. Den Haag, 15 March 2020.

[3] Reukers DFM, van Boven M, Meijer A, Rots N, Reusken C, Roof I, et al. High infection secondary attack rates of SARS-CoV-2 in Dutch households revealed by dense sampling. Clin Infect Dis. 2021.

[4] (WHO) WHO. Clinical Management of COVID-19, 2020.

[5] Corman VM, Landt O, Kaiser M, Molenkamp R, Meijer A, Chu DK, et al. Detection of 2019 novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV) by real-time RT-PCR. Euro Surveill. 2020;25.

[6] Scheltinga SA, Templeton KE, Beersma MF, Claas EC. Diagnosis of human metapneumovirus and rhinovirus in patients with respiratory tract infections by an internally controlled multiplex real-time RNA PCR. J Clin Virol. 2005;33:306-11.

[7] Lassaunière R FA, Harboe ZB, Nielsen AC, Fomsgaard A, Krogfelt KA, Jørgensen CS. Evaluation of nine commercial SARS-CoV-2 immunoassays. medRxiv 2020040920056325. 2020.

[8] van Tol S, Mogling R, Li W, Godeke GJ, Swart A, Bergmans B, et al. Accurate serology for SARS-CoV-2 and common human coronaviruses using a multiplex approach. Emerg Microbes Infect. 2020;9:1965-73.

[9] Koopmans M, de Bruin E, Godeke GJ, Friesema I, van Gageldonk R, Schipper M, et al. Profiling of humoral immune responses to influenza viruses by using protein microarray. Clin Microbiol Infect. 2012;18:797-807.

[10] Martyn Plummer (2003). JAGS: A Program for Analysis of Bayesian Graphical Models Using Gibbs Sampling, Proceedings of the 3rd International Workshop on Distributed Statistical Computing (DSC 2003), March 20–22, Vienna, Austria. ISSN 1609-395X.

[11] R Core Team (2021). R: A language and environment for statistical computing. Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. URL https://www.R-project.org/.

[12] Kruschke JK, Liddell TM. The Bayesian New Statistics: Hypothesis testing, estimation, meta-analysis, and power analysis from a Bayesian perspective. Psychon Bull Rev. 2018;25:178-206.

[13] R M. Statistical rethinking: A bayesian course with examples in r and stan2018.

[14] Piironen J VA. Comparison of bayesian predictive methods for model selection. Statistics and Computing. 2017;27:711–35.

[15] Lex A, Gehlenborg N, Strobelt H, Vuillemot R, Pfister H. UpSet: Visualization of Intersecting Sets. IEEE Trans Vis Comput Graph. 2014;20:1983-92.

[16] Madewell ZJ, Yang Y, Longini IM, Jr., Halloran ME, Dean NE. Household Transmission of SARS-CoV-2: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. JAMA Netw Open. 2020;3:e2031756.

[17] Fung HF, Martinez L, Alarid-Escudero F, Salomon JA, Studdert DM, Andrews JR, et al. The household secondary attack rate of SARS-CoV-2: A rapid review. Clin Infect Dis. 2020.

[18] Fu Y, Li Y, Guo E, He L, Liu J, Yang B, et al. Dynamics and Correlation Among Viral Positivity, Seroconversion, and Disease Severity in COVID-19 : A Retrospective Study. Ann Intern Med. 2021;174:453-61.

[19] Long QX, Liu BZ, Deng HJ, Wu GC, Deng K, Chen YK, et al. Antibody responses to SARS-CoV-2 in patients with COVID-19. Nat Med. 2020;26:845-8.

[20] Wajnberg A, Mansour M, Leven E, Bouvier NM, Patel G, Firpo-Betancourt A, et al. Humoral response and PCR positivity in patients with COVID-19 in the New York City region, USA: an observational study. Lancet Microbe. 2020;1:e283-e9.

[21] Moreira VM, Mascarenhas P, Machado V, Botelho J, Mendes JJ, Taveira N, et al. Diagnosis of SARS-Cov-2 Infection by RT-PCR Using Specimens Other Than Naso- and Oropharyngeal Swabs: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. Diagnostics (Basel). 2021;11.

[22] Stanoeva KR, van der Eijk AA, Meijer A, Kortbeek LM, Koopmans MPG, Reusken C. Towards a sensitive and accurate interpretation of molecular testing for SARS-CoV-2: a rapid review of 264 studies. Euro Surveill. 2021;26.
[23] Lee RA, Herigon JC, Benedetti A, Pollock NR, Denkinger CM. Performance of Saliva, Oropharyngeal Swabs, and Nasal Swabs for SARS-CoV-2 Molecular Detection: a Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. J Clin Microbiol. 2021;59.
[24] Mallett S, Allen AJ, Graziadio S, Taylor SA, Sakai NS, Green K, et al. At what times during infection is SARS-CoV-2 detectable and no longer detectable using RT-PCR-based tests? A systematic review of individual participant data. BMC Med. 2020;18:346.
[25] Cevik M, Tate M, Lloyd O, Maraolo AE, Schafers J, Ho A. SARS-CoV-2, SARS-CoV, and MERS-CoV viral load dynamics, duration of viral shedding, and infectiousness: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Lancet Microbe. 2021;2:e13-e22.
[26] van Kampen JJA, van de Vijver D, Fraaij PLA, Haagmans BL, Lamers MM, Okba N, et al. Duration and key determinants of infectious virus shedding in hospitalized patients with coronavirus disease-2019 (COVID-19). Nat Commun. 2021;12:267.
[27] Wolfel R, Corman VM, Guggemos W, Seilmaier M, Zange S, Muller MA, et al. Virological assessment of hospitalized patients with COVID-2019. Nature. 2020;581:465-9.
[28] Bunyavanich S, Do A, Vicencio A. Nasal Gene Expression of Angiotensin-Converting Enzyme 2 in Children and Adults. JAMA. 2020;323:2427-9.
[29] Heald-Sargent T, Muller WJ, Zheng X, Rippe J, Patel AB, Kociolek LK. Age-Related Differences in Nasopharyngeal Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) Levels in Patients With Mild to Moderate Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19). JAMA Pediatr. 2020;174:902-3.
[30] L'Huillier AG, Torriani G, Pigny F, Kaiser L, Eckerle I. Culture-Competent SARS-CoV-2 in Nasopharynx of Symptomatic Neonates, Children, and Adolescents. Emerg Infect Dis. 2020;26:2494-7.
[31] Weisberg SP, Connors TJ, Zhu Y, Baldwin MR, Lin WH, Wontakal S, et al. Distinct antibody responses to SARS-CoV-2 in children and adults across the COVID-19 clinical spectrum. Nat Immunol. 2021;22:25-31.

471 **Legends**

472

473 **Figure 1.** Various transmission patterns of SARS-CoV-2 infection based on different assays and
474 specimen types collected at visits 1, 2 and 3 in households visualized in heatmaps. (A) households with
475 no transmission. (B) household with only transmission in adults. (C) heatmaps of household with
476 transmission in children and possibly also adults. Symptoms can be unrelated to a SARS-CoV-2
477 infection. On the left side, age category (A = adult and C = Child) of the participant is indicated. * Index
478 case. Blanks = not available/tested. Red rectangle: individual with only one test positive on one
479 timepoint. On the right side the Household ID (number) is indicated.

480

481 **Figure 2.** Symptom severity of COVID-19 index cases in the households. The GLM (generalized linear
482 model) revealed that there were less individuals in the "Severe" category than in the "Mild" category
483 (p=0.1), and that households in "Family transmission" category was overrepresented in the "Severe"
484 category (p=0.03). Maximum severity score of index is used.

485

486 **Figure 3.** (A) Overview of the (combination of) various positive SARS-CoV-2 infection diagnosis in the
487 242 participants of the study cohort for all various diagnostic assays or specimens. All available RT-
488 PCR and serology outcomes (Table 1) were incuded in these analyses.The black dots indicate a
489 positive test at any (or multiple) moment(s) during the study, except for 'Inclusion PCR NP+OP'
490 which was performed in index cases just before start of the study. The number of individuals with a
491 particular combination of positive tests are indicated in the top of the figure. The numbers at the
492 right after each test indicates the overall number of positive tests. (B) The number of individuals
493 with a positive or negative tests or missing data for serological and molecular (PCR) diagnostics
494 combined. In brackets the number of symptomatic or severe symptomatic individuals, respectively,
495 are indicated. Color intensity is related to the frequency.

496

497 **Figure 4.** Common SARS-CoV-2 infection dynamics patterns, based on the presence or absence of a
498 positive or negative RT-PCR or serological assay at visit 1, 2 and 3. Common patterns were named A
499 – F based on frequency, with the number of individuals (n) displaying the pattern indicated. The
500 median timing of onset of symptoms relative to visit 1 is indicated on the left. The black line
501 indicates whether on average symptoms were reported at visit 1, 2 or 3.
502
503 **Figure 5.** Dynamics SARS-CoV-2 infection diagnosis by RT-PCR in various specimens since symptoms
504 onset (dps). All available RT-PCR outcomes (Table 1) were incuded in these analyses. A) Predicted viral
505 load (Ct values RT-PCR) in relation to dps and specimen type. The shadow indicates the 95% Bayesian
506 confidence interval and the dotted lines indicate the prediction interval (variation over individuals). B
507 and C) Ct-value distribution at day symptom onset (intercept) and increase of Ct-value per day (slope)
508 in relation to age category (B) and different specimens (C). D) Average dps until when different
509 specimens have at least 90% detection probability.
510
511 **Figure 6.** Dynamics SARS-CoV-2 infection diagnosis by different serological assays. All available
512 serology outcomes (Table 1) were incuded in these analyses. Probability SARS-CoV-2-specific antibody
513 detection (A) and average dps from when the Wantai (Spike-specific IgM and IgG), microarray S1
514 (Spike-specific IgG) and microarray N (Nucleoprotein-specific IgG) assays have at least 90% detection
515 probability (B) for all ages. C) Probability SARS-CoV-2-specific antibody detection by Wantai,
516 microarray S1 and microarray N in adults and children D) Average dps from when microarray N has at
517 least 90% detection probability for adults and children. The shadows in (C) and (D) indicate the 95%
518 Bayesian confidence interval.
519

Table 1

	Visit 1														Visit 2	Visit 3
Day	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15 (range 14-21)	35 (range 28-42)
Start questionnaire	x															
Symptoms diary		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		
Final questionnaire																x
Blood (serum) - Wantai	222														210	149
Blood (serum) - Microarray S1 and N	230														221	208
Nasopharyngeal swab	183 [1]		53			46			51			55			221	
Oropharyngeal swab	187 [1]		53			47			51			54			230	
Oral fluid	219														206	189
Feces	222														226	195

Table 1. Schedule of administering questionnaires, symptom diaries and home visits for sampling. The numbers in the table indicate the amount of analyzed specimens in 242 participants. [1] A naso- and oropharyngeal swab was not collected for the index case at the first home visit, as these persons were already swabbed a few days before and tested SARS-CoV-2 positive.

Figure 1


A. No transmission
PCR NP
PCR OP
PCR feces
PCR oral fluid
Microarray S1
Microarray N
Wantai
Severity
Family members
Visit
Legend
pcr 1 Ct < 20
pcr 2 Ct 20 - 25
pcr 3 Ct 25 - 30
pcr 4 Ct 30 - 35
pcr 5 Ct 35 - 40
micr 1 EC50 < 10
micr 2 EC50 10 - 100
micr 3 EC50 100 - 1000
micr 4 EC50 > 1000
wantai 1 OD450nm < 1.0
wantai 2 OD450nm 1.0 - 10
wantai 3 OD450nm > 10
Asymptomatic
Mild
Moderate
Severe
B. Adults transmission
PCR NP
PCR OP
PCR feces
PCR oral fluid
Microarray S1
Microarray N
Wantai
Severity
Family members
Visit

Figure 1 continued

C. Family transmission



Figure 2


Count
9
4
3
4
2
4
8
5
15
No Transmission
Adults Transmission
Family Transmission
Transmission Category
Legend
Asymptomatic
Mild
Moderate
Severe

Figure 3


A
Intersection size
Wantai
Microarray S1
Microarray N
PCR NP
PCR Feces
PCR OP
PCR oral fluid
Incusion NP+OP PCR
117
97
94
80
77
70
60
55
Set size
B
Serology
Pos
Neg
Missing
111
(105, 29)
8
(7, 1)
11
(8, 1)
103
(58, 1)
6
(5, 0)
3
(1, 0)
PCR

Figure 4


E, n= 12
B, n= 28
C, n= 27
F, n= 9
D, n= 18
A, n= 79
pos
neg
-11.3days
-9.5days
-9.7days
-7.9days
-6.4days
-7.7days
value
0
1
2
3
visit
test
pcr
serо

Figure 5


A
Predicted CT values
PCR NP
PCR OP
PCR oral fluid
PCR Feces
Ct value
dps [day]
B
Intercept
Slope
Density
27.5
30.1
0.2
0.3
Intercept, Ct value at dps 0
age_cat
Adult
Child
C
Intercept
Slope
30.06
28.82
28.74
30.74
0.22
0.25
0.35
0.36
Intercept, Ct at dps 0
D
dps of 90% detection probability
Probability density
19.4
20.3
22.7
27
dps
test
PCR Feces
PCR NP
PCR OP
PCR oral fluid

Figure 6


A
Probability positive test
probability
dps [day]
B
Dps of 90% detection probability
Probability density
dps
7.1
16.9
18
test
Microarray N
Microarray S1
Wantai
C
Probability of positive test
Microarray N
Microarray S1
Wantai
probability
dps [day]
D
Microarray N
dps of 90% detection
Probability density
dps
15.3
18.2
age_cat
Adult
Child