

Longitudinal assessment of diagnostic test performance over the course of acute SARS-CoV-2 infection

Rebecca L. Smith, DVM, PhD^{1,2,3}, Laura L. Gibson, MD⁴, Pamela P. Martinez, PhD^{1,5,6}, Ruian Ke, PhD⁷, Agha Mirza, MS⁸, Madison Conte⁸, Nicholas Gallagher⁹, Abigail Conte¹⁰, Leyi Wang, PhD¹¹, Richard Fredrickson, DVM¹¹, Darci C. Edmonson¹, Melinda E. Baughman, MS¹, Karen K. Chiu¹, Hannah Choi, MS¹, Tor W. Jensen, PhD^{1,12}, Kevin R. Scardina¹, Shannon Bradley, MBA¹, Stacy L. Gloss, MS¹, Crystal Reinhart, PhD¹, Jagadeesh Yedetore, MS¹, Alyssa N. Owens, PhD¹³, John Broach, MD^{14,15}, Bruce Barton, PhD^{16,17}, Peter Lazar¹⁶, Darcy Hennessy¹⁸, Todd Young¹⁸, Alastair Dunnett¹⁸, Matthew L. Robinson, MD⁸, Heba H. Mostafa, PhD⁹, Andrew Pekosz, PhD¹⁰, Yukari C. Manabe, MD⁸, William J. Heetderks, MD, PhD¹⁹, David D. McManus, MD²⁰, Christopher B. Brooke, PhD^{1,5*}

¹ Carl R. Woese Institute for Genomic Biology, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Urbana, IL 61801, USA

² Department of Pathobiology, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Urbana, IL 61802, USA

³ Carle Illinois College of Medicine, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Urbana, IL 61801, USA

⁴ Division of Infectious Diseases and Immunology, Departments of Medicine and Pediatrics, University of Massachusetts Medical School, Worcester, MA 01655, USA

⁵ Department of Microbiology, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Urbana, IL 61801, USA

⁶ Department of Statistics, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Urbana, IL 61801, USA

⁷ T-6, Theoretical Biology and Biophysics, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, NM 87545, USA

⁸ Division of Infectious Diseases, Department of Medicine, Johns Hopkins School of Medicine, Baltimore, MD 21287, USA

⁹ Division of Medical Microbiology, Department of Pathology, Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine, Baltimore, MD 21287, USA

¹⁰ W. Harry Feinstone Department of Molecular Microbiology and Immunology, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, Baltimore, MD 21205, USA

¹¹ Veterinary Diagnostic Laboratory, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Urbana, IL 61802, USA

¹² Cancer Center at Illinois, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Urbana, IL 61801, USA

¹³ Center for Clinical and Translational Research, University of Massachusetts Medical School, Worcester, MA 01655, USA

¹⁴ UMass Memorial Medical Center, Worcester, MA 01655, USA

¹⁵ Department of Emergency Medicine, University of Massachusetts Medical School, Worcester, MA 01655, USA

¹⁶ Division of Biostatistics and Health Services Research, University of Massachusetts Medical School, Worcester, MA 01655, USA

¹⁷ Department of Population and Quantitative Health Sciences, University of Massachusetts Medical School, Worcester, MA 01655, USA

¹⁸ Carle Foundation Hospital, Urbana, IL 61801, USA

¹⁹ National Institute for Biomedical Imaging and Bioengineering, Bethesda, MD 20892, USA

²⁰ Division of Cardiology, University of Massachusetts Medical School, Worcester, MA 01655, USA

* Corresponding author (cbrooke@illinois.edu)

Summary: Adults newly infected with SARS-CoV-2 were sampled daily for saliva and nasal swab RTqPCR, Quidel SARS Sofia antigen FIA, and viral culture. We compare test sensitivities at different stages of acute infection and as a function of testing frequency.

Accepted Manuscript

Footnotes page

Conflict of Interest Statement: C.B.B. and L.W. are listed as inventors on a pending patent application for the saliva RTqPCR test used in this study.

Funding statement: This work was supported by the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute at the National Institutes of Health [3U54HL143541-02S2] through the RADx-Tech program.

This work has not been presented at a meeting.

Corresponding author:

Christopher Brooke

390 Burrill Hall

Urbana, IL 61801, USA

217-265-0991

cbrooke@illinois.edu

Background

Serial screening is critical for restricting spread of SARS-CoV-2 by facilitating the timely identification of infected individuals to interrupt transmission chains. The variation in sensitivity of different diagnostic tests at different stages of infection has not been well documented.

Methods

This is a longitudinal study of 43 adults newly infected with SARS-CoV-2. All participants provided daily samples for saliva and nasal swab RTqPCR, Quidel SARS Sofia antigen FIA, and live virus culture.

Results

We show that both RTqPCR and the Quidel SARS Sofia antigen FIA peak in sensitivity during the period in which live virus is detected in nasal swabs, but the sensitivity of RTqPCR tests rises more rapidly prior to this period. We also estimate the sensitivities of RTqPCR and antigen tests as a function of testing frequency.

Conclusions

RTqPCR tests are more effective than antigen tests at identifying infected individuals prior to or early during the infectious period and thus for minimizing forward transmission (given timely results reporting). All tests showed >98% sensitivity for identifying infected individuals if used at least every three days. Daily screening using antigen tests can achieve ~90% sensitivity for identifying infected individuals while they are viral culture positive.

KEYWORDS: SARS-CoV-2, Diagnostic testing, antigen testing, RTqPCR testing, test sensitivity

Accepted Manuscript

INTRODUCTION:

Frequent rapid diagnostic testing is critical for restricting community spread of SARS-CoV-2 by allowing the timely identification and isolation of infected individuals to interrupt the chain of transmission. Quantitative reverse transcription polymerase chain reaction (RTqPCR)-based detection of viral RNA within nasal swab or saliva samples represents the gold standard for sensitivity in detecting the presence of SARS-CoV-2. Unfortunately, it has been difficult to achieve high testing frequency and volume with the rapid reporting of results needed to mitigate transmission effectively due to supply shortages, cost, and infrastructure limitations.

There is considerable interest in the potential of rapid, lateral flow antigen tests to expand diagnostic testing capacity due to their ease of use, availability, relatively low cost, and rapid time-to-results [1]. However, data for their use in screening asymptomatic individuals is sparse [2]. Enthusiasm for their widespread deployment has been further tempered by well-publicized examples of false positive results in people with low pre-test probability of infection, and by reports suggesting they lack sensitivity compared with RTqPCR, potentially making them less effective at mitigating community spread [3–5].

To maximize the effectiveness of available testing resources, there is an urgent need to quantify the sensitivities of different testing platforms at different stages of infection and define how sensitivity can be enhanced through serial testing. To address this, we compared the sensitivities of nasal and saliva RTqPCR tests with the Quidel Sofia SARS Antigen Fluorescent Immunoassay (FIA) over the course of mild or asymptomatic acute SARS-CoV-2 infection through daily sampling of individuals enrolled early during infection. We also estimated the effects of varying serial testing frequency on the sensitivities of both RTqPCR and antigen tests.

METHODS:

This study was approved by the Western Institutional Review Board, and all participants provided informed consent.

Participants

All on-campus students and employees of the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign are required to submit saliva for RTqPCR testing every 2-4 days as part of the SHIELD campus surveillance testing program. Those testing positive are instructed to isolate, and were eligible to enroll in this study for a period of 24 hours following receipt of their positive test result. Close contacts of individuals who test positive (particularly those co-housed with them) are instructed to quarantine and were eligible to enroll for up to 5 days after their last known exposure to an infected individual. All participants were also required to have a documented negative saliva RTqPCR result 7 days prior to enrollment in the study.

Individuals were recruited via either a link shared in an automated text message providing isolation information sent within 30 minutes of a positive test result, a call from a study recruiter, or a link shared by an enrolled study participant or included in information provided to all quarantining close contacts. In addition, signs were used at each testing location and a website was available to inform the community about the study.

Participants were required to be at least 18 years of age, have a valid university ID, speak English, have internet access, and live within 8 miles of the university campus. After enrollment and consent, participants completed an initial survey to collect information on

demographics and health history, including suspected date of SARS-CoV-2 exposure. They were then provided with sample collection supplies.

Participants who tested positive prior to enrollment or during quarantine were followed for up to 14 days. Quarantining participants who continued to test negative by saliva RTqPCR were followed for up to 7 days after their last exposure. All participants' data and survey responses were collected in the Eureka digital study platform.

Sample collection

Each day, participants were remotely observed by study staff collecting:

1. 2 mL of saliva into a 50mL conical tube.
2. 1 nasal swab from a single nostril using a foam-tipped swab that was placed within a dry collection tube.
3. 1 nasal swab from the other nostril using a flocked swab that was subsequently placed in a collection vial containing viral transport media (VTM).

The order of nostrils (left vs. right) used for the two different swabs was randomized. For nasal swabs, participants were instructed to insert the soft tip of the swab at least 1 cm into the indicated nostril until they encountered mild resistance, rotate the swab around the nostril 5 times, leaving it in place for 10-15 seconds. After daily sample collection, participants completed a symptom survey. A courier collected all participant samples within 1 hour of collection using a no-contact pickup protocol designed to minimize courier exposure to infected participants. All study protocols were consistent throughout the duration of the study.

Saliva RTqPCR

After collection, saliva samples were stored at room temperature and RTqPCR was run within 12 hours of initial collection. The protocol for direct saliva-to-RTqPCR assay used has been detailed previously[6]. In brief, saliva samples were heated at 95°C for 30 minutes, followed by the addition of 2X Tris/Borate/EDTA buffer (TBE) at a 1:1 ratio (final concentration 1X TBE) and Tween-20 to a final concentration of 0.5%. Samples were assayed using the Thermo Taqpath COVID-19 assay.

Quidel assay

Foam-tipped nasal swabs were placed in collection tubes, transported with cold packs, and stored at 4°C overnight based on guidance from the manufacturer. The morning after collection, swabs were run through the Sofia SARS antigen FIA on Sofia 2 devices according to the manufacturer's protocol.

Nasal swab RTqPCR

Collection tubes containing VTM and flocked nasal swabs were stored at -80°C after collection and were subsequently shipped to Johns Hopkins University for RTqPCR and viral culture. After thawing, VTM was aliquoted for RTqPCR and infectivity assays. One ml of VTM from the nasal swab was assayed on the Abbott Alinity per manufacturer's instructions in a College of American Pathologist and CLIA-certified laboratory.

Nasal virus culture

VeroTMPRSS2 cells were grown in complete medium (CM) consisting of DMEM with 10% fetal bovine serum (Gibco), 1 mM glutamine (Invitrogen), 1 mM sodium pyruvate (Invitrogen), 100 U/ml of penicillin (Invitrogen), and 100 µg/ml of streptomycin (Invitrogen)[7]. Viral infectivity was assessed on VeroTMPRSS2 cells as previously described using infection media (IM; identical to CM except the FBS is reduced to 2.5%)[8]. When a cytopathic effect was visible in >50% of cells in a given well, the supernatant was harvested. The presence of SARS-CoV-2 was confirmed through RTqPCR as described previously by extracting RNA from the cell culture supernatant using the Qiagen viral RNA isolation kit and performing RTqPCR using the N1 and N2 SARS-CoV-2-specific primers and probes in addition to primers and probes for human RNaseP gene using synthetic RNA target sequences to establish a standard curve[9].

Data Analysis

At the time of analysis, nasal samples from 51 participants had been analyzed by virus culture and RTqPCR. Eight individuals were removed from the analysis because their nasal virus culture was never positive, leaving 43 remaining participants. All confidence intervals around sensitivity were calculated using binconf from the Hmisc package in R version 3.6.2.

The sensitivity of each of the tests was analyzed in three ways:

First, we calculated the “daily sensitivity” of each test across the course of the infection. Daily sensitivity was defined as the ability of each test (antigen, saliva RTqPCR, or nasal RTqPCR) to detect an infected person on a particular day, with day 0 defined as the day of first positive viral culture. Daily sensitivity was not calculated for timepoints with fewer than 5 observed person-days.

Second, we calculated the ability of each test to detect an infected person according to their viral culture status (“status sensitivity”). Viral culture status was defined as “pre-positive” on days prior to the first positive viral culture result, “positive” on days for which viral culture results were positive, and “post-positive” on days with negative viral culture results that occur after the first positive culture result. Status sensitivity was defined as the proportion of person-days with a positive result.

Finally, we calculated the ability of repeated testing over a 14-day period to detect an infected person (“protocol sensitivity”) using a value-of-information approach. Seven different testing frequencies were considered: daily, every other day, every third day, and so on, up to weekly sampling. For each individual, the result of testing on a given schedule was calculated for each potential starting date, with test results interpreted in parallel (all tests must be negative to be considered negative). For instance, each person contributed two observations to the “every other day” schedule, one starting on the first day of the study and comprising samples from days 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, and 13, and the other starting on the second day of the study and comprising samples from days 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, and 14. As each testing schedule was evaluated at each potential starting day, the number of potential schedules increased as testing frequency decreased. Protocol sensitivity was defined for individual testing schedules, where the numerator is the number of testing schedules resulting in at least one positive test and the denominator is the number of testing schedules examined, where a testing schedule is defined as a set of samples from one participant taken at a given frequency. The proportion of “observations” (or sets of samples) with a positive result (at least one positive test in the sampling timeframe) was considered to be the sensitivity of that testing protocol (test and frequency combination).

Sensitivities were considered significantly different at $p < 0.05$. All statistics were calculated using `binom.test` or `glm` in R. All code used in analyses can be found here:

<https://github.com/rlsdvm/CovidDetectAnalysis>

Results

Table 1 shows demographic information for study participants reported here. The majority of participants (30/43, 69.8%) were non-Hispanic white and the average age was 32.3 years (SD 12.8, range: 19, 73). Of the 43 participants, 23 provided 14 days of observations, 10 provided 13 days of observation, and only 3 provided fewer than 10 days of observation.

The estimated daily sensitivities of nasal and saliva RTqPCR and antigen tests relative to the day of first nasal swab viral culture positivity, which was used as a surrogate marker of infectious virus shedding, are shown in **Figure 1** and **Table S1**. For all three tests, daily and status sensitivity peaked during days in which infectious virus shedding was detectable, as would be expected. Antigen test daily sensitivity declined precipitously after infectious virus could no longer be detected in nasal swabs, dropping to 0.238 (95% CI: 0.135, 0.385) within a week after the onset of culture positivity, which was significantly lower ($p < 0.001$) than both nasal and saliva RTqPCR platforms. Nasal and saliva RTqPCR only showed minor decreases in sensitivity during this period, remaining at 0.857 (95% CI: 0.722, 0.933) and 0.690 (95% CI: 0.540, 0.809) after a week, respectively, and were not significantly different from each other ($p = 0.07$).

We also used the viral culture data to measure the status sensitivities of each test before, during, and after viral shedding (**Figure 2**). Prior to the first day of detectable shedding of infectious virus, nasal RTqPCR tests had significantly higher ($p < 0.05$) sensitivity, 0.650 (95%

CI: 0.483, 0.794), than the antigen test (0.375, 95% CI: 0.227, 0.542). The sensitivity of saliva RTqPCR, 0.750 (95% CI: 0.588, 0.873), was not significantly different from that of nasal RTqPCR ($p=0.14$) or antigen ($p=0.07$) prior to the first positive viral culture. On days when the viral culture was positive, there were no significant differences in sensitivity among the three testing modalities ($p>0.2$). After viral culture was no longer positive, the sensitivity of the antigen test (0.454, 95% CI: 0.376, 0.534) was significantly lower ($p<0.001$) than the sensitivity of the saliva (0.847, 95% CI: 0.782, 0.898) or nasal (0.945, 95% CI: 0.898, 0.974) RTqPCR tests.

We next estimated the protocol sensitivities, or how the ability of each of test platform to detect infected individuals was affected by differences in testing frequencies (**Table 2, Figure 3**). In the top panel of **Figure 3**, we show sensitivity to detect infected individuals at any stage of infection. For all three test platforms examined, protocol sensitivity remained >0.98 with testing at least every third day. When applied weekly, protocol sensitivity remained very high for nasal RTqPCR at 0.987 (95% CI: 0.966, 0.996) and for saliva RTqPCR 0.963 (95% CI: 0.936, 0.982), but dropped to only 0.797 (95% CI: 0.747, 0.841) for the antigen test, which was significantly lower than either PCR test ($p<0.001$).

When we compared the abilities of different testing frequencies to identify individuals before or during the period when infectious virus was detectable in nasal samples (**Figure 3, bottom panel**), we observed a clear reduction in protocol sensitivity for all testing modalities when testing frequencies decreased below daily, although the linear trend was not statistically significant ($p>0.05$). The reduction in protocol sensitivity was most pronounced for the antigen test, which dropped to 0.739 (95% CI: 0.634, 0.827) with testing every fourth day. However, both RTqPCR tests were only slightly better with both showing a sensitivity of 0.784 (95% CI: 0.684, 0.865) for nasal and of 0.761 (95% CI: 0.659, 0.846) for saliva.

Discussion

This is the first study to compare the longitudinal performance of rapid antigen and RTqPCR tests with infectious virus shedding through daily testing early during SARS-CoV-2 infection. Our data clearly define how the sensitivities of RTqPCR and antigen tests vary over the course of SARS-CoV-2 infection. Prior to the presumed infectious period (here defined as the period during which infectious virus could be detected in nasal swab samples), the daily sensitivities of nasal and saliva RTqPCR tests were substantially higher than that of the Quidel Sofia SARS Antigen FIA, suggesting that RTqPCR tests will be more effective than antigen tests at identifying infected individuals before they can transmit to others, provided that results reporting is rapid enough.

Both RTqPCR and antigen tests peak in daily and status sensitivities when infectious virus is detectable in nasal swab samples, suggesting that all three modalities can be effective at identifying individuals during the presumed infectious period. After this period, the daily sensitivity of RTqPCR tests decreased gradually, consistent with the dynamics described previously for RTqPCR [10,11]. In contrast, the daily sensitivity of the antigen test declined very quickly, suggesting that this test will be less effective at identifying individuals during later stages of infection. The short duration of antigen positivity may limit diagnosis and contact-tracing efforts in test-limited environments.

Previous studies have suggested that frequent testing would maximize the ability of a given test modality to detect infected individuals at any stage of infection [12–14]. We found that all testing modalities showed >98% protocol sensitivity to detect infection if used at least every three days, which supports that conjecture. However, the results presented here are based

on empirical data, rather than the modeling approaches previously used, and therefore give stronger confidence to these estimates.

Altogether, these data demonstrate the importance of frequent testing regardless of test modality for identifying individuals while they are contagious. It should be noted that while virus culture on nasal swabs represents the best proxy available for infectivity, it is likely imperfect. It is also possible that some samples taken from infectious individuals may have given negative results in the virus culture assay because they were below the limit of detection, especially given that the viral culture samples were subjected to a single freeze/thaw cycle prior to being assayed.

The sensitivities of particular testing protocols presented here assume that individuals will strictly adhere to these testing frequencies over time. This may be more feasible in more closed populations, such as schools or businesses, than in general public health settings where the population is more fluid. However, the results could also be applied at a personal level to assist concerned individuals in determining the best frequency at which to seek out testing. These results should not be applied to interpret the results of a single test outside the context of regular screening.

It should also be noted that participation in this study was limited to faculty, students, and staff of the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, and that the participant population included here was primarily young, non-Hispanic white, and skewed slightly towards males. All infections were either mild or asymptomatic, and no participants were hospitalized for COVID-19. The limited demographic and clinical profiles of our study population must be considered when extending these results to groups with different risk profiles.

Altogether, our results indicate that frequent serial RTqPCR testing with rapid results reporting is the optimal screening strategy for identifying asymptomatic or pre-symptomatic individuals before they can transmit the virus, thus mitigating community spread of SARS-CoV-2. In communities where serial RTqPCR testing with rapid results reporting is not possible, then frequent serial antigen testing (at least every three days or twice weekly) represents the best alternative.

Table Legends:

Table 1: Demographic information on participants enrolled in the COVID detect study

Table 2: Protocol sensitivity of each test platform to detect an infected person during a 14-day testing period, relative to the frequency of testing.

Table S1: Daily sensitivity of each test platform by day relative to the day of first nasal swab viral culture positivity.

Figure legends:

Figure 1: Daily sensitivity of each test platform by day relative to the day of first positive viral culture result. Shaded areas represent the 95% confidence interval around the observed proportion.

Figure 2: Status sensitivity of each test platform relative to viral culture positivity.

Bars indicate the 95% confidence interval around the observed proportion. Pre-positive ($n=31$) refers to samples taken on days before the first viral culture-positive sample collected from each individual. Positive ($n=153$) refers to samples taken on days for which viral culture results were positive. Post-positive ($n=126$) refers to samples taken on days with negative viral culture results that occur after the first positive culture result.

Figure 3: Protocol sensitivity of each test platform to detect an infected person (top) before or during days where nasal samples were viral culture positive or **(bottom)** at any time, over a 14-day testing period, relative to frequency of testing. Lines indicate 95% confidence interval around the observed proportion.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute at the National Institutes of Health [3U54HL143541-02S2] through the RADx-Tech program. The views expressed in this manuscript are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the views of the National Institute of Biomedical Imaging and Bioengineering; the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute; the National Institutes of Health, or the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. Sofia 2 devices and associated supplies were provided to Carle Foundation Hospital by Quidel, however Quidel played no role in the design of the study or the interpretation or presentation of the data. C.B.B. and L.W. are listed as inventors on a pending patent application for the saliva RTqPCR test used in this study. We wish to thank Shumon Ahmed, Carly Bell, Nate Bouton, Callie Brennen, Justin Brown, Coleco Buie, Emmaline Cler, Gary Cole, Trey Coleman, Lauren Engels, Savannah Feher, Kelsey Fox,

Lexi Freeman, Yesenia Gonzalez, Montez Harris, Dan Hiser, Ayesha Hussain, Daryl Jackson, Junko Jarrett, Michael Jenkins, Kalombo Kalonji, Syntyche Kanku, Steven Krauklis, Mary Krouse, Elmore Leshoure, Joe Lewis, Maggie Li, Angel Lopez, Guadalupe Lopez, Emily Luna, Chun Huai Luo, Colby Mackey, Skyler McLain, Yared Berhanu Melesse, Madison O'Donnell, Savanna Pflugmacher, Denver Piatt, Skyler Pierce, Jessica Quicksall, Gina Quitanilla, Ameera Samad, MacKenzie Scroggins, Monique Settles, Macie Sinn, Pete Varney, Evette Vlach, and Raeshun Williams-Chatman for their efforts supporting recruitment, enrollment, logistics, and sample collection. We also thank Jeffrey Olgin, Noah Peyser, and Xochitl Butcher for assistance with the Eureka platform, Michelle Lore for assistance with REDcap, Melanie Loots for assistance with administration, Gillian Snyder for assistance in development of study protocols and logistics, and Erin Iturriaga and Jue Chen for study protocol development.

References

1. Krüger LJ, Gaeddert M, Köppel L, et al. Evaluation of the accuracy, ease of use and limit of detection of novel, rapid, antigen-detecting point-of-care diagnostics for SARS-CoV-2 [Internet]. Infectious Diseases (except HIV/AIDS); 2020 Oct. Available from: <http://medrxiv.org/lookup/doi/10.1101/2020.10.01.20203836>
2. Pavelka M, Van-Zandvoort K, Abbott S, et al. The impact of population-wide rapid antigen testing on SARS-CoV-2 prevalence in Slovakia. *Science*. **2021**; :eabf9648.
3. Jääskeläinen A, Ahava M, Jokela P, et al. Evaluation of three rapid lateral flow antigen detection tests for the diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2 infection [Internet]. Infectious Diseases (except HIV/AIDS); 2021 Jan. Available from: <http://medrxiv.org/lookup/doi/10.1101/2020.12.30.20249057>
4. Moreno GK, Braun KM, Pray IW, et al. SARS-CoV-2 transmission in intercollegiate athletics not fully mitigated with daily antigen testing [Internet]. Infectious Diseases (except HIV/AIDS); 2021 Mar. Available from: <http://medrxiv.org/lookup/doi/10.1101/2021.03.03.21252838>
5. Pray IW, Ford L, Cole D, et al. Performance of an Antigen-Based Test for Asymptomatic and Symptomatic SARS-CoV-2 Testing at Two University Campuses — Wisconsin, September–October 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*. **2021**; 69(5152):1642–1647.

6. Ranoa DRE, Holland RL, Alnaji FG, et al. Saliva-Based Molecular Testing for SARS-CoV-2 that Bypasses RNA Extraction [Internet]. *Microbiology*; 2020 Jun. Available from: <http://biorxiv.org/lookup/doi/10.1101/2020.06.18.159434>
7. Matsuyama S, Nao N, Shirato K, et al. Enhanced isolation of SARS-CoV-2 by TMPRSS2-expressing cells. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. **2020**; 117(13):7001–7003.
8. Pekosz A, Parvu V, Li M, et al. Antigen-Based Testing but Not Real-Time Polymerase Chain Reaction Correlates With Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 Viral Culture. *Clin Infect Dis*. **2021**; .
9. Waggoner JJ, Stittleburg V, Pond R, et al. Triplex Real-Time RT-PCR for Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2. *Emerg Infect Dis*. **2020**; 26(7):1633–1635.
10. Kissler SM, Fauver JR, Mack C, et al. SARS-CoV-2 viral dynamics in acute infections [Internet]. *Epidemiology*; 2020 Oct. Available from: <http://medrxiv.org/lookup/doi/10.1101/2020.10.21.20217042>
11. Byrne AW, McEvoy D, Collins AB, et al. Inferred duration of infectious period of SARS-CoV-2: rapid scoping review and analysis of available evidence for asymptomatic and symptomatic COVID-19 cases. *BMJ Open*. **2020**; 10(8):e039856.
12. Paltiel AD, Zheng A, Walensky RP. Assessment of SARS-CoV-2 Screening Strategies to Permit the Safe Reopening of College Campuses in the United States. *JAMA Netw Open*. **2020**; 3(7):e2016818.
13. Larremore DB, Wilder B, Lester E, et al. Test sensitivity is secondary to frequency and turnaround time for COVID-19 screening. *Sci Adv*. **2021**; 7(1):eabd5393.
14. Kucirka LM, Lauer SA, Laeyendecker O, Boon D, Lessler J. Variation in False-Negative Rate of Reverse Transcriptase Polymerase Chain Reaction–Based SARS-CoV-2 Tests by Time Since Exposure. *Annals of Internal Medicine*. **2020**; 173(4):262–267.

Table 1: Demographic information for participants enrolled in the COVID detect study

Variable		Data
		n=43
Age in years (mean (SD))		33.1 (12.8)
Race (%)	Native American	0 (0.0)
	Asian	1 (2.3)
	Black	4 (9.3)
	Other	4 (9.3)
	Pacific Islander	0 (0.0)
	White	34 (79.1)
Gender (%)	Female	20 (46.5)
	Male	23 (53.5)
Ethnicity (%)	Hispanic	8 (18.6)
	Non-Hispanic	35 (81.4)

Table 2: Protocol sensitivity of each testing platform to detect an infected person during a 14-day testing period relative to the frequency of testing.


Testing Frequency	N	N (Before or While VC+ ^a)	Nasal Antigen				Saliva RTqPCR				Nasal RTqPCR			
			Probability of Detection		Number Positive		Probability of Detection		Number Positive		Probability of Detection		Number Positive	
			Any time ^b	Before Or While VC+	Any time	Before Or While VC+	Any time	Before Or While VC+	Any time	Before Or While VC+	Any time	Before Or While VC+	Any time	Before Or While VC+
Daily	43	22	1	0.909	43	20	1	0.955	43	21	1	1	43	22
Every Other Day	86	44	1	0.841	86	37	0.988	0.909	85	40	1	0.909	86	40
Every Third Day	129	66	1	0.803	129	53	0.984	0.833	127	55	1	0.848	129	56
Every Fourth Day	172	88	0.959	0.739	165	65	0.983	0.761	169	67	1	0.784	172	69
Every Fifth Day	215	110	0.921	0.682	198	75	0.981	0.709	211	78	0.995	0.727	214	80
Every Sixth Day	258	132	0.864	0.621	223	82	0.965	0.644	249	85	0.992	0.667	256	88
Weekly	301	154	0.797	0.558	240	86	0.963	0.597	290	92	0.987	0.597	297	92

^a “Before or While VC+” refers to detection of the individual before or during the time in which their viral culture was positive.

^b “Any time” refers to detection of the individual at any point in the 14-day testing period.


Antigen

1.0
0.8
0.6
0.4
0.2
0.0




Nasal RT-qPCR

1.0
0.8
0.6
0.4
0.2
0.0




Saliva RT-qPCR

1.0
0.8
0.6
0.4
0.2
0.0



Days Since First Viral Culture

Status Sensitivity



Antigen



Nasal
RTqPCR



Saliva
RTqPCR

Detection of infection

Detection before or while viral culture positive

