Declining SARS-CoV-2 PCR sensitivity with time and dependence on clinical features: consequences for control

Authors: B.J.M. Bergmans¹, C.B.E.M. Reusken², A.J.G. van Oudheusden¹, G.J. Godeke², A.A. Bonačić

Marinović², E. de Vries^{1,3}, Y.C.M. Kluiters-de Hingh¹, R. Vingerhoets¹, M.A.H. Berrevoets¹, J.J. Verweij¹, A.E.

Nieman¹, J. Reimerink², J.L. Murk¹, A.N. Swart2^{*}

Affiliations:

1

2

3

1 Laboratory of Medical Microbiology and Immunology, Elisabeth-TweeSteden Hospital, Tilburg, The Netherlands.

2 Centre for Infectious Disease Control, National Institute for Public Health and the Environment (RIVM),

Bilthoven, The Netherlands

3 Tranzo, Tilburg School of Social and Behavioral Sciences, Tilburg University, Tilburg, The Netherlands.

* Correspondence to: A.N. Swart, arno.swart@rivm.nl

4 Abstract

5	Real-time reverse transcription-polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR) on upper respiratory tract
6	(URT) samples is the primary method to diagnose SARS-CoV-2 infections and guide public
7	health measures, with a supportive role for serology. However, the clinical sensitivity of RT-PCR
8	remains uncertain. In the present study, Bayesian statistical modeling was used to
9	retrospectively determine the sensitivity of RT-PCR using SARS-CoV-2 serology in 644 COVID-19-
10	suspected patients with varying degrees of disease severity and duration. The sensitivity of RT-
11	PCR ranged between 79-95%; while increasing with disease severity, it decreased rapidly over
12	time in mild COVID-19 cases. Negative URT RT-PCR results should therefore be interpreted in
13	the context of clinical characteristics, especially with regard to containment of viral
14	transmission based on the 'test, trace and isolate' principle.

15 Introduction

16

17	COVID-19 is diagnosed primarily by testing upper respiratory tract (URT) samples with
18	real-time reverse transcription-polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR)(1). Experience with nucleic
19	acid amplification tests for other respiratory viruses, such as influenza virus, granted a high level
20	of confidence in the clinical sensitivity of these types of assays(2). Early in the SARS-CoV-2
21	pandemic, however, Chinese clinicians already reported substantial numbers of negative tests of
22	URT samples from patients with a high level of clinical suspicion for COVID-19(3 , 4). Frequent
23	false-negatives were later also reported by other physicians worldwide $(5, 6)$ and were indicated
24	to significantly complicate healthcare organization, hospital admission and isolation capacity
25	(7, 8).
26	
27	In several systematic reviews, the false-negative rate of RT-PCR was calculated to range
28	between 22-66%, depending on symptom duration(9 , 10). It is not known whether false-
29	negatives were due to methodological problems, such as sampling error, suboptimal
30	handling of samples or suboptimal assay design, or if they reflect a biological feature of
31	SARS-CoV-2 infections. Clinical samples of lower respiratory tract material such as sputum or
32	broncho-alveolar lavage fluid (BALF) appeared to yield significantly lower false negative rates
33	than URT samples in patients with COVID-19 pneumonia (3, 11, 12). However, only 13-30% of
34	patients produce sputum(7) and obtaining BALF is often impossible due to severe respiratory
35	distress, or not indicated due to mild disease. URT samples are therefore the preferred and most
36	feasible sample type. Estimates of sensitivity are further complicated by the lack of a reliable

37	gold standard. Although imaging techniques may aid in the diagnosis of COVID-19(13, 14),
38	their sensitivity and specificity are insufficient to be used as such.

40	Although complex, it is crucial to reliably assess the sensitivity of RT-PCR in different
41	clinical cohorts as RT-PCR is the foundation for test, trace and isolation policies that are the
42	cornerstone of worldwide pandemic control efforts. Highly sensitive and specific antibody
43	assays are important tools to support patient diagnostics at a later stage of the disease. We
44	postulate these can also be used to investigate the clinical sensitivity of RT-PCR. In the
45	present study, Bayesian statistical modeling was used to retrospectively determine the
46	clinical sensitivity of RT-PCR in URT-samples from a large cohort of COVID-19-suspected
47	patients with varying degrees of disease severity and symptom duration using serology assays.

48 Results

49	In the study period, 644 patients (>18 years of age) that presented at our hospital with clinically
50	suspected COVID-19 were tested for SARS-CoV-2 by RT-PCR on URT samples. URT material was
51	obtained by combined swabbing of subsequentially oropharynx (OP) and nasopharynx (NP),
52	using the same swab, to increase sensitivity and reduce the logistic and resource burden(15). In
53	addition, serum samples were taken after a minimum of 12 days post disease onset whenever
54	possible, to determine if specific antibodies to SARS-CoV-2 had developed. Samples were
55	obtained either through collection of left-over serum, taken for other purposes (N=109) or by
56	asking patients to have a blood sample taken for the purpose of this study (N= 141). In total,
57	sera from 250 patients were obtained and analyzed for the presence of SARS-CoV-2 specific
58	antibodies (Table 1, Fig. 1). To this goal, two independent tests were used; an in-house
59	developed protein micro-array based on SARS-CoV-2 S1 and N proteins (PMA (16, 17)) and the
60	Wantai total antibody ELISA based on the RBD-domain of S1 (Beijing Wantai Biological
61	Pharmacy Enterprise, Beijing, China; Cat # WS1096). The manufacturers of the Wantai assay
62	recommend index values of 1.1 and higher as evidence for the presence of specific antibodies.
63	However, we observed that at this cut-off value, several RT-PCR confirmed patients scored
64	negative and a cut-off of 0.25 was calculated to be more appropriate in our cohort (Fig. 2,
65	Supplementary Text). The rightmost panel of this figure gives quantitative evidence. The
66	histogram is scaled to 100% height per bar, and colored according to percentage of PCR positive
67	(purple) and negative (yellow) status of the patients. Clearly, using the manufacturer's cut-off,
68	many positives would be to the left of the cut-off and would score false-negative in the Wantai
69	test.

	Serum collected	No serum	р	Total
		collected		
	(N=250)	(N=394)		(N=644)
Age, mean (SD), years	64.5 (14.38)	67.9 (16.33)	0.007	66.6 (15.7)
Female, N (%)	116 (46.4%)	148 (37.6%)	0.026	264 (41%)
Immunocompromised, N (%)	37 (14.8%)	36 (9.12%)	0.027	73 (11.3%)
Interval symptom onset and URT-	8.25 (6.68)	7.49 (7.54)	0.192	7,78 (7.2)
swab collection, mean (SD), days				
Disease severity categories				
1, outpatients, N (%)	58 (23.2%)	67 (17.0%)	0.148	125 (19.4%)
2, hospitalized, non-ICU, N (%)	162 (64.8%)	273 (69.3%)		435 (67.5%)
3, ICU, N (%)	30 (12.0%)	54 (13.7%)		84 (13%)
Deceased, N (%)	16 (6.4%)	120 (30.5%)	<0.001	136 (21.1%)
First URT-swab positive (N/N	109 (43.6%)	195 (49.5%)	0.144	304 (47.2%)
total)				
Ct-value (first URT-swab)	28.7 (6.59)	28.5 (5.63)	0.795	28.5 (5.99)
RT-PCR positive (any sample,	123 (49.2%)	216 (54.8%)	0.164	339 (52.6%)
total), N (%)				
Additional samples in first URT-swab negative patients				
Second URT-swab positive (N/N	1/38 (2.6%)	9/51 (17.6%)		10/89 (11.2%)
total)				
Sputum positive (N/N total)	2/9 (22.2%)	4/19 (21.1%)		6/28 (21.4%)
Feces positive (N/N total)	11/29 (37.8%)	12/29 (41.4%)		23/58 (39.6%)
Interval symptom onset and	26.7 (10.1)	NA		26.7 (10.1)

serum collection, mean (SD), days			
Wantai ab index value (out of	10.38 (10.1)	NA	10.38 (10.1)
N=250)			
Wantai ab positive (out of N=250)	155 (62.0%)	NA	155 (62.0%)
Ct-value, cycle threshold value; ICU, intensive care unit; SD, standard deviation; URT, upper respiratory			
tract; RT-PCR, reverse-transcriptase polymerase chain reaction			

Table 1. Cohort baseline characteristics



72 Figure 1 Patient cohort flow-diagram



Figure 2. a) Histogram of Wantai total antibody index values on a logarithmic scale. The red vertical line indicates the
 manufacturer's cut-off value, the green vertical line our adapted cut-off value. b) Percentage of PCR-positivity within Wantai
 total antibody index values. The red vertical line indicates the manufacturer's cut-off value, the green vertical line our adapted
 cut-off value.



- 85 (coughing, sneezing, dyspnea, rhinitis, fever or diarrhea, see Materials and Methods). URT-
- 86 RT-PCR sensitivity varied according to disease severity: for outpatients, 79% (57%-99%
- 87 Bayesian credible interval (CI)), for patients admitted to a non-ICU hospital ward 86% (77-
- 95 CI), and for patients admitted to ICU 95% (83-1.00 CI) (Fig. 3, Table S1). URT-RT-
- 89 PCR sensitivity was higher in males than in females (91% vs 80%), higher in deceased than
- 90 in non-deceased patients (95% vs 83%) and higher in immunocompromised than in
- 91 immunocompetent patients (93% vs 85%) (Fig. S1, Table S1).





For each disease severity category, URT RT-PCR cycle threshold (Ct)-values displayed an
increasing trend by number of days since symptom onset, reflecting a decreasing viral load
in time, albeit with considerable inter-individual variation (Fig. 4, Table S2). Ct-values of
outpatients were generally higher, even close to symptom onset, and increased rapidly
compared to Ct-values of hospitalized patients. Ct-values were not significantly different

102	between males and females, between immunocompromised and immunocompetent patients,
103	or between deceased and non-deceased patients (Fig. S2, Table S2). In patients admitted to a
104	regular ward, URT RT-PCR retained its sensitivity up to at least three weeks post symptom
105	onset (Fig. 5). Clearly, RT-PCR on IC and in-hospital patients retains its initial sensitivity
106	for a prolonged period of time (approximately 15 and 20 days respectively). However, the
107	point of decline is highly uncertain, due to the absence of patient material longer after onset
108	of symptoms. Therefore, conclusions on the time of decline of sensitivity should not be
109	drawn for IC and in-hospital patients. In contrast, outpatients do show a marked decrease of
110	sensitivity over time, with lower uncertainty: sensitivity could be halved already within
111	three weeks. Sensitivities according to sex, mortality and immunosuppression remained
112	stable during at least three weeks post symptom onset (Fig. S3).



113

114 Figure 4. Linear increase of Ct-value in relation to days since onset of symptoms across different disease severity categories. The 115 shaded band indicates 95% Bayesian credible interval. The dots are the original data. Dots positioned at a Ct of 50 were right-116 censored in the inflated model (i.e. count as either above 50 or a negative individual). Abbreviations: ICU, Intensive Care Unit;

117 OUTP, outpatients; WARD, non-ICU hospitalized patients; ct, Ct-value



119Figure 5. Modeled sensitivities as a function of days since onset of symptoms. Panels and shading indicate disease severity. The120bands indicate 95% Bayesian credible interval, and black dots an estimate of sensitivity directly from the original data, by121assuming Wantai serology as the gold standard. Abbreviations: ICU, Intensive Care Unit; OUTP, outpatients; WARD, non-ICU122hospitalized patients.

COVID-19-suspected patients with a negative URT RT-PCR and without alternative
 diagnosis were frequently retested for SARS-CoV-2 after resampling. This increased the
 total number of RT-PCR-confirmed patients with 35 (Table 1). Repeated URT-swab was

- most commonly used, but had the least added value (10/89, 11.2%) positive). Feces
- generated the most additional positive results (23/58, 39.6%), followed by sputum (6/28,
- 128 21.4%). Note that these tests were not included in the Bayesian sensitivity analysis, due to
- their dependence on the outcome of the initial URT RT-PCR (see Supplementary Text).

130

131	Serum samples were analyzed for SARS-CoV-2 antibodies by ELISA and PMA. $Bayesian$
132	modelling revealed an overall sensitivity of >94% for both ELISA and PMA, which did not
133	change significantly according to disease severity category, sex or mortality (Fig. 2, Table
134	S1). The sensitivity of antibody assays was lower in immunocompromised patients (82-92%,
135	Table S1) and this was the only group in which antibody assays had a lower sensitivity
136	compared to UTR RT-PCR. The ELISA and PMA results were discrepant in only four of 250
137	sera (Table S3). All four patients tested RT-PCR positive in URT-swab, and three out of four
138	were immunocompromised.
139	Discussion
140	An accurate assessment of the clinical sensitivity of diagnostic tools, in particular of RT-PCR on
141	URT samples on which global test, trace and isolate strategies are based(18), is an absolute
142	requisite for good patient care and adequate infection risk management. We observed a
143	decrease in sensitivity with decreasing disease severity, an increase in sensitivity in
144	immunocompromised patients and a rapid decline of sensitivity in time post onset of
145	symptoms, but only in outpatients. In our study, 5-14% of hospitalized COVID-19 cases and 21%
146	of outpatients tested negative in URT-PCR. This finding is in contrast with local practice and
147	guidelines, which are often based on the assumption of near-perfect sensitivity(19).
148	

Frequent false-negatives have been consistently reported in several different countries since the onset of the pandemic. The analytical sensitivity of PCRs generally approaches 100%, which means tests are able to detect a single viral genome copy in the reaction volume(*20–23*), the

152	clinical sensitivity may be substantially lower, due to low quality of samples, presence of
153	inhibiting factors, suboptimal pre-analytic processing or specific biologic features of the viral
154	infection. If one assumes infection of the URT always occurs in SARS-CoV-2 infected persons, a
155	negative URT RT-PCR could be the result of localized early clearance of the virus or low levels of
156	local viral replication. The localized clearance would then have different kinetics than the rate
157	of viral load decline we measured in this study. Alternatively, the possibility should be
158	considered that the URT of these patients was not infected and infection can remain more
159	localized (e.g. to the trachea / lower respiratory tract)(24) . As can be expected, RT-PCR
160	sensitivity of URT correlates with the SARS-CoV-2 RNA load in these samples. The increase of
161	mean Ct-value over time was significantly slower in hospitalized patients compared to
162	outpatients, which explains why the sensitivity of RT-PCR on URT samples decreased more
163	rapidly in cases with mild infections than in hospitalized patients and suggests hospitalized
164	patients have difficulties clearing the virus. In our cohort, immunocompromised patients were
165	the only category in which the sensitivity of serology was lower (PMA), or comparable (Wantai)
166	to URT-RT-PCR. According to the definition we used, 73 of 644 patients were
167	immunocompromised (Table S4). Most patients suffered from conditions severely affecting
168	humoral immunity or were treated by systemic immunosuppressants that inhibit antibody
169	production. This relative lack of antibody response may explain the lower sensitivity of serology
170	in this patient group, and it may clarify why relatively many immunocompromised patients'
171	Wantai results fell below the manufacturer's cut-off value. Although antibody assays were
172	shown to have high sensitivity in the rest of our cohort, their use in tracing and isolating
173	strategies is nonexistent, due to the fact that antibodies take a while to be produced and may

174	be detectable for several months after initial infection. Therefore, in order to timely diagnose
175	and quarantine COVID-19 patients, URT-PCR will continue to be used as the assay on which
176	initial decisions are based.

177

178	Our estimated URT-PCR sensitivity has important consequences for screening, treatment and
179	isolation measures in hospitals. Though a positive PCR does not necessarily signify the presence
180	of viable virus(25), sensitivities of 86-94% are not sufficient to lift isolation measures in the
181	event of a negative initial URT-PCR. In the early stages of hospital admission, clinical suspicion
182	and local COVID-19 prevalence should guide isolation and treatment decisions. Additionally,
183	timely sputum or feces sampling should take place in an effort to confirm COVID-19 diagnosis.
184	Several studies found that 30-50% of COVID-19 patients have detectable SARS-CoV-2 RNA in
185	feces (26, 27). In our study, feces yielded 3.5 times more RT-PCR-confirmed positives than
186	repeated URT-swab: 40% of additionally sampled feces tested positive, as opposed to only 11%
187	of repeated URT-swabs (Table 1).

188

Our findings also have ramifications for broad molecular testing in the general population, as currently established across the world, based on URT-swabbing in high-throughput testing lanes(28). The evidently often absent thorough epidemiological and clinical interpretation of negative results in these settings, in combination with the observed low clinical sensitivity of RT-PCR in the population with mild complaints that typically visit those testing sites, will lead to missed cases. For example, if one assumes a sensitivity of 80% of RT-PCR for people with mild

195	symptoms in high-throughput testing lanes and where 200 of 10,000 persons with mild
196	complaints test positive, the apparent prevalence would be 2%. Using the Rogan-Gladen
197	estimator(29), the true prevalence would be Apparent Prevalence/Sensitivity=2%/80%=2.5%.
198	Hence, out of the 9800 persons tested negative, 50 are expected to be false negatives, which
199	the system will fail to isolate.
200	
201	In conclusion, our results show that for an accurate diagnosis based on RT-PCR test results and
202	subsequent appropriate clinical management and infection control measures, both in hospitals
203	and in public health, a thorough understanding of the clinical sensitivity of RT-PCR in URT
204	samples in clinically heterogeneous patient cohorts is necessary. The apparent lack of a high
205	clinical sensitivity of this standard diagnostic method in specific situations warrants vigilance for
206	missed cases especially in settings of high-throughput testing lanes where epidemiological and
207	clinical context are often disconnected from negative test results for final interpretation.

208 **References**

209	1.	A. Bhimraj, R. L. Morgan, A. H. Shumaker, V. Lavergne, L. Baden, V. C. C. Cheng, K. M.
210		Edwards, R. Gandhi, W. J. Muller, J. C. O'Horo, S. Shoham, M. H. Murad, R. A. Mustafa, S.
211		Sultan, Y. Falck-Ytter, Infectious Diseases Society of America Guidelines on the Treatment
212		and Management of Patients with COVID-19. Clin. Infect. Dis. (2020),
213		doi:10.1093/cid/ciaa478.
214	2.	U. Eigner, S. Reucher, N. Hefner, S. Staffa-Peichl, M. Kolb, U. Betz, M. Holfelder, G. Spier,
215		S. Pfefferle, M. Lütgehetmann, Clinical evaluation of multiplex RT-PCR assays for the
216		detection of influenza A/B and respiratory syncytial virus using a high throughput system.
217		J. Virol. Methods. 269 , 49–54 (2019).
218	3.	Y. Yang, M. Yang, C. Shen, F. Wang, J. Yuan, J. Li, M. Zhang, Z. Wang, L. Xing, J. Wei, L.
219		Peng, G. Wong, H. Zheng, M. Liao, K. Feng, J. Li, Q. Yang, J. Zhao, Z. Zhang, L. Liu, Y. Liu,
220		Evaluating the accuracy of different respiratory specimens in the laboratory diagnosis
221		and monitoring the viral shedding of 2019-nCoV infections, medRxiv, in press,
222		doi:10.1101/2020.02.11.20021493.
223	4.	Z. Yongchen, H. Shen, X. Wang, X. Shi, Y. Li, J. Yan, Y. Chen, B. Gu, Different longitudinal
224		patterns of nucleic acid and serology testing results based on disease severity of COVID-
225		19 patients. <i>Emerg. Microbes Infect.</i> 9 , 833–836 (2020).
226	5.	H. Krumholz, If you have coronavirus symptoms, assume you have the illness, even if you

test negative. *New York Times* (2020), pp. 3–4.

228	6.	S. Woloshin, N. Patel, A. S. Kesselheim, False Negative Tests for SARS-CoV-2 Infection —
229		Challenges and Implications. N. Engl. J. Med. (2020), doi:10.1056/nejmp2015897.
230	7.	J. L. Murk, R. van de Biggelaar, J. Stohr, J. Verweij, A. Buiting, S. Wittens, M. van Hooft, B.
231		Diederen, Y. Kluiters-de Hingh, E. Ranschaer, A. Brouwer, J. Retera, M. Verheijen, D.
232		Ramnarain, I. van Ek, J. van Oers, De eerste honderd opgenomen COVID-19-patiënten in
233		het Elisabeth-Tweesteden Ziekenhuis. <i>Ned. Tijdschr. Geneeskd.</i> 164 , 1–7 (2020).
234	8.	C. B. Reusken, A. Buiting, C. Bleeker-Rovers, B. Diederen, M. Hooiveld, I. Friesema, M.
235		Koopmans, T. Kortbeek, S. P. M. Lutgens, A. Meijer, J. L. Murk, I. Overdevest, T.
236		Trienekens, A. Timen, W. Van Den Bijllaardt, J. Van Dissel, A. Van Gageldonk-Lafeber, D.
237		Van Der Vegt, P. C. Wever, W. Van Der Hoek, J. Kluytmans, Rapid assessment of regional
238		SARS-CoV-2 community transmission through a convenience sample of healthcare
239		workers, the Netherlands, March 2020. Eurosurveillance. 25, 6–9 (2020).
240	9.	L. M. Kucirka, S. A. Lauer, O. Laeyendecker, D. Boon, J. Lessler, Variation in False-Negative
241		Rate of Reverse Transcriptase Polymerase Chain Reaction–Based SARS-CoV-2 Tests by
242		Time Since Exposure. Ann. Intern. Med., M20-1495 (2020).
243	10.	I. Arevalo-Rodriguez, D. Buitrago-Garcia, D. Simancas-Racines, P. Zambrano-Achig, R. del
244		Campo, A. Ciapponi, O. Sued, L. Martinez-Garcia, A. Rutjes, N. Low, J. A. Perez-Molina, J.
245		Zamora, <i>medRxiv</i> , in press, doi:10.1101/2020.04.16.20066787.
246	11.	R. Liu, H. Han, F. Liu, Z. Lv, K. Wu, Y. Liu, Y. Feng, C. Zhu, Positive rate of RT-PCR detection

of SARS-CoV-2 infection in 4880 cases from one hospital in Wuhan, China, from Jan to

248 Feb 2020. *Clin. Chim. Acta*. **505**, 172–175 (2020).

- W. Wang, Y. Xu, R. Gao, R. Lu, K. Han, G. Wu, W. Tan, Detection of SARS-CoV-2 in
 Different Types of Clinical Specimens. *JAMA J. Am. Med. Assoc.* 323, 1843–1844 (2020).
- T. Ai, Z. Yang, H. Hou, C. Zhan, C. Chen, W. Lv, Q. Tao, Z. Sun, L. Xia, Correlation of Chest
 CT and RT-PCR Testing in Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) in China: A Report of
 1014 Cases. *Radiology*, 200642 (2020).
- F. Pan, T. Ye, P. Sun, S. Gui, B. Liang, L. Li, D. Zheng, J. Wang, R. L. Hesketh, L. Yang, C.
 Zheng, Time course of lung changes at chest CT during recovery from Coronavirus
 disease 2019 (COVID-19). *Radiology*. 295, 715–721 (2020).
- A. L. M. Vlek, T. S. Wesselius, R. Achterberg, S. F. T. Thijsen, Combined throat/nasal swab
 sampling for SARS-CoV-2 is equivalent to nasopharyngeal sampling. *Eur. J. Clin. Microbiol. Infect. Dis.* (2020), doi:10.1007/s10096-020-03972-y.
- 260 16. C. Reusken, H. Mou, G. J. Godeke, L. van der Hoek, B. Meyer, M. A. Müller, B. Haagmans,
- 261 R. de Sousa, N. Schuurman, U. Dittmer, P. Rottier, A. Osterhaus, C. Drosten, B. J. Bosch,
- 262 M. Koopmans, Specific serology for emerging human coronaviruses by protein
- 263 microarray. *Eurosurveillance*. **18**, 2–7 (2013).

267

M. Koopmans, E. de Bruin, G. J. Godeke, I. Friesema, R. van Gageldonk, M. Schipper, A.
Meijer, R. van Binnendijk, G. F. Rimmelzwaan, M. D. de Jong, A. Buisman, J. van Beek, D.
van de Vijver, J. Reimerink, Profiling of humoral immune responses to influenza viruses

by using protein microarray. Clin. Microbiol. Infect. 18, 797–807 (2012).

268	18.	WHO, Critical preparedness, readiness and response actions for COVID-19: WHO/2019-
269		nCoV/Community_Actions/2020.3, 1–3 (2020).
270	19.	N. C. Grassly, M. Pons-salort, E. P. K. Parker, P. J. White, K. Ainslie, M. Baguelin, Report
271		16: Role of testing in COVID-19 control. Imp. Coll. London COVID-19 response team, 1–13
272		(2020).
273	20.	V. M. Corman, O. Landt, M. Kaiser, R. Molenkamp, A. Meijer, D. K. W. Chu, T. Bleicker, S.
274		Brünink, J. Schneider, M. L. Schmidt, D. G. J. C. Mulders, B. L. Haagmans, B. Van Der Veer,
275		S. Van Den Brink, L. Wijsman, G. Goderski, J. L. Romette, J. Ellis, M. Zambon, M. Peiris, H.
276		Goossens, C. Reusken, M. P. G. Koopmans, C. Drosten, Detection of 2019 novel
277		coronavirus (2019-nCoV) by real-time RT-PCR. <i>Eurosurveillance</i> . 25 , 1–8 (2020).
278	21.	D. K. W. Chu, Y. Pan, S. M. S. Cheng, K. P. Y. Hui, P. Krishnan, Y. Liu, D. Y. M. Ng, C. K. C.
279		Wan, P. Yang, Q. Wang, M. Peiris, L. L. M. Poon, Molecular Diagnosis of a Novel
280		Coronavirus (2019-nCoV) Causing an Outbreak of Pneumonia. Clin. Chem. 66, 549–555
281		(2020).
282	22.	P. B. van Kasteren, B. van der Veer, S. van den Brink, L. Wijsman, J. de Jonge, A. van den
283		Brandt, R. Molenkamp, C. B. E. M. Reusken, A. Meijer, Comparison of seven commercial
284		RT-PCR diagnostic kits for COVID-19. J. Clin. Virol. 128, 104412 (2020).
285	23.	A. K. Nalla, A. M. Casto, A. M. Casto, M. L. W. Huang, G. A. Perchetti, R. Sampoleo, L.
286		Shrestha, Y. Wei, H. Zhu, K. R. Jerome, K. R. Jerome, A. L. Greninger, Comparative
287		performance of SARS-CoV-2 detection assays using seven different primer-probe sets and

288	one assay ki	t. J. Clin.	Microbiol.	58,	e00557-20	(2020)).

	289	24.	Y. J. Hou	, K. Okuda	, C. E	. Edwards	, D. R.	. Martinez,	, T. Asakura	, K. H	l. Dinnon	, T.	Kato,	R.	Ε.
--	-----	-----	-----------	------------	--------	-----------	---------	-------------	--------------	--------	-----------	------	-------	----	----

- Lee, B. L. Yount, T. M. Mascenik, G. Chen, K. N. Olivier, A. Ghio, L. V. Tse, S. R. Leist, L. E.
- 291 Gralinski, A. Schäfer, H. Dang, R. Gilmore, S. Nakano, L. Sun, M. L. Fulcher, A. Livraghi-
- 292 Butrico, N. I. Nicely, M. Cameron, C. Cameron, D. J. Kelvin, A. de Silva, D. M. Margolis, A.
- 293 Markmann, L. Bartelt, R. Zumwalt, F. J. Martinez, S. P. Salvatore, A. Borczuk, P. R. Tata, V.
- 294 Sontake, A. Kimple, I. Jaspers, W. K. O'Neal, S. H. Randell, R. C. Boucher, R. S. Baric, SARS-
- 295 CoV-2 Reverse Genetics Reveals a Variable Infection Gradient in the Respiratory Tract.
- 296 *Cell*, S0092-8674(20)30675–9 (2020).
- 297 25. R. Wölfel, V. M. Corman, W. Guggemos, M. Seilmaier, S. Zange, M. A. Müller, D.

298 Niemeyer, T. C. Jones, P. Vollmar, C. Rothe, M. Hoelscher, T. Bleicker, S. Brünink, J.

- Schneider, R. Ehmann, K. Zwirglmaier, C. Drosten, C. Wendtner, Virological assessment of
 hospitalized patients with COVID-2019. *Nature*. 581, 465–469 (2020).
- 26. D. Wang, B. Hu, C. Hu, F. Zhu, X. Liu, J. Zhang, B. Wang, H. Xiang, Z. Cheng, Y. Xiong, Y.
- 302 Zhao, Y. Li, X. Wang, Z. Peng, Clinical Characteristics of 138 Hospitalized Patients with

303 2019 Novel Coronavirus-Infected Pneumonia in Wuhan, China. *JAMA - J. Am. Med. Assoc.* 304 **323**, 1061–1069 (2020).

Y. Chen, L. Chen, Q. Deng, G. Zhang, K. Wu, L. Ni, Y. Yang, B. Liu, W. Wang, C. Wei, J. Yang,
G. Ye, Z. Cheng, The presence of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in the feces of COVID-19 patients. *J. Med. Virol.* 92, 833–840 (2020).

308	28.	Government of the Netherlands, Testing for coronavirus, (available at
309		https://www.government.nl/topics/coronavirus-covid-19/coronavirus-test).
310	29.	W. J. Rogan, B. Gladen, Estimating prevalence from the results of a screening test. Am. J.
311		Epidemiol. 107 , 71–76 (1978).
312	30.	E. Van Der Vries, J. Anber, A. Van Der Linden, Y. Wu, J. Maaskant, R. Stadhouders, R. Van
313		Beek, G. Rimmelzwaan, A. Osterhaus, C. Boucher, M. Schutten, Molecular assays for
314		quantitative and qualitative detection of influenza virus and oseltamivir resistance
315		mutations. J. Mol. Diagnostics. 15, 347–354 (2013).
316	31.	R. Lassaunière, A. Frische, Z. B. Harboe, A. C. Y. Nielsen, A. Fomsgaard, K. A. Krogfelt, C. S.
317		Jørgensen, medRxiv, in press, doi:10.1101/2020.04.09.20056325.
318	32.	A. Lex, N. Gehlenborg, H. Strobelt, R. Vuillemot, H. Pfister, UpSet: Visualization of
319		Intersecting Sets. IEEE Trans. Vis. Comput. Graph. 20, 1983–1992 (2014).
320	33.	Z. Gu, R. Eils, M. Schlesner, Complex heatmaps reveal patterns and correlations in
321		multidimensional genomic data. Bioinformatics. 32, 2847–2849 (2016).
322	34.	R Core Team, R: A language and environment for statistical computing (R Foundation for
323		Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria, 2019; https://www.R-project.org/).
324		
325		

- 327 **Acknowledgments:** We thank BJ Bosch for providing the S1 antigen for the protein microarray
- 328 and H van Zundert for providing additional data on immunocompromise
- 329 **Funding:** This study has not received funding of any kind.
- 330 Author contribution:
- 331 JLM, BJMB, AEN and CBEMR conceived the project; BJMB arranged medical ethical approval,
- 332 BJMB, AJGvO and AEN provided recruitment of study participants, obtained metadata from
- 333 COVID-19 patients and obtained clinical samples; YCMK and MB provided additional clinical
- samples; BJMB and AJGvO coordinated clinical sample processing; GJG and JR processed patient
- samples; ANS, ABM and BJMB analyzed and interpreted data; BJMB, ANS, JLM, EdV, AEN,
- 336 CBEMR and JJV wrote and edited the manuscript with input from all listed authors.
- 337 **Competing interests:** Authors declare no competing interests.
- 338 **Data and materials availability:** The R script and data are available upon request from the 339 corresponding author.
- 340 **Ethical approval**
- 341 The study protocol was approved by both the institutional Science Review Board and the
- regional Medical Ethics Committee METC Brabant (reference number NW2020-31), with a
- 343 waiver of informed consent for using left-over serum, drawn for other purposes than this study.
- 344 Informed consent was obtained from patients who were contacted to have a blood sample
- drawn for the purpose of this study. The study was performed in accordance with the principles
- of the Declaration of Helsinki and was not supported by grants of any kind.

- 348 Supplementary Materials:
- 349 Materials and Methods
- 350 Figures S1-S5
- 351 Tables S1-S9
- 352 References (*30-34*)