

1 Research Article

2 **Lumipulse G SARS-CoV-2 Ag Assay Evaluation for SARS-CoV-2 Antigen Detection Using**
3 **594 Nasopharyngeal Swab Samples from Different Testing Groups**

4 Giulia Menchinelli^{a,b,§}, Licia Bordi^{c,§}, Flora Marzia Liotti^{a,b,§}, Ivana Palucci^{a,b}, Maria Rosaria
5 Capobianchi^c, Giuseppe Sberna^c, Eleonora Lalle^c, Lucio Romano^b, Giulia De Angelis^{a,b}, Simona
6 Marchetti^b, Maurizio Sanguinetti^{a,b,*}, Paola Cattani^{a,b,#}, and Brunella Posteraro^{a,d,#}

7

8 ^aDipartimento di Scienze Biotecnologiche di Base, Cliniche Intensivologiche e Perioperatorie,
9 Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore, Roma, Italy; ^bDipartimento di Scienze di Laboratorio e
10 Infettivologiche, Fondazione Policlinico Universitario A. Gemelli IRCCS, Roma, Italy; ^cIstituto
11 Nazionale per le Malattie Infettive (INMI) Lazzaro Spallanzani IRCCS, Rome, Italy; ^dDipartimento
12 di Scienze Mediche e Chirurgiche, Fondazione Policlinico Universitario A. Gemelli IRCCS, Roma,
13 Italy

14

15 [§]The first three authors contributed equally to this work. Author order was determined randomly.

16 [#]The last two authors contributed equally to this work. Author order was decided alphabetically.

17 ^{*}Corresponding author. E-mail: maurizio.sanguinetti@unicatt.it

18 **Running title:** SARS-CoV-2 Antigen Detection in Testing Groups

19

20 **ABSTRACT**

21 Compared to RT-PCR, lower performance of antigen detection assays, including the Lumipulse G
22 SARS-CoV-2 Ag assay, may depend on specific testing scenarios. We tested 594 nasopharyngeal
23 swab samples from individuals with COVID-19 (RT-PCR cycle threshold [Ct] values ≤ 40) or non-
24 COVID-19 (Ct values ≤ 40) diagnoses. RT-PCR positive samples were assigned to diagnostic,
25 screening, or monitoring groups of testing. With a limit of detection of 1.2×10^4 SARS-CoV-2
26 RNA copies/ml, Lumipulse showed positive percent agreement (PPA) of 79.9% (155/194) and
27 negative percent agreement of 99.3% (397/400), whereas PPAs were 100% for samples with Ct
28 values of <18 or $18-25$ and 92.5% for samples with Ct values of $25-30$. By three groups,
29 Lumipulse showed PPA of 87.0% (60/69), 81.1% (43/53), or 72.2% (52/72), respectively, whereas
30 PPA was 100% for samples with Ct values of <18 or $18-25$, and was 94.4%, 80.0%, or 100% for
31 samples with Ct values of $25-30$, respectively. RT-PCR positive samples were also tested for
32 SARS-CoV-2 subgenomic RNA and, by three groups, testing showed that PPA was 63.8% (44/69),
33 62.3% (33/53), or 33.3% (24/72), respectively. PPAs dropped to 55.6%, 20.0%, or 41.7% for
34 samples with Ct values of $25-30$, respectively. All 101 samples with a subgenomic RNA positive
35 result had a Lumipulse assay's antigen positive result, whereas only 54 (58.1%) of remaining 93
36 samples had a Lumipulse assay's antigen positive result. In conclusion, Lumipulse assay was highly
37 sensitive in samples with low RT-PCR Ct values, implying repeated testing to reduce consequences
38 of false-negative results.

39 **KEYWORDS** antigen detection, Lumipulse assay, nasopharyngeal swab, SARS-CoV-2, testing
40 group

41

42 INTRODUCTION

43 Antigen testing has recently been added to the landscape of clinical laboratory methods to detect
44 and combat the severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2), which is the
45 notorious cause of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) (https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/lab/resources/antigen-tests-guidelines.html#anchor_1597523027400). Like the molecular—
46 relying on real-time reverse-transcription polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR) and, to date, the
47 standard method for the etiological COVID-19 diagnosis—antigen testing detects the presence of
48 SARS-CoV-2 in the acute infection phase only (1). Unlike the molecular or antigen, antibody
49 testing is relevant in the convalescent or recovered infection phases only (1).

51 Theoretically, antigen-based assays are advantageous in terms of fast turnaround times and
52 reduced costs but are less sensitive than RT-PCR-based assays (2). Additionally, the former have
53 the disadvantage to provide false-positive results, which leads false-positive patients to be managed
54 as patients with true SARS-CoV-2 infection (3, 4). However, the false-positive result likelihood
55 seems to depend on specific testing scenarios (e.g., those to identify infected persons who are
56 asymptomatic and without known or suspected exposure to SARS-CoV-2)
57 ([https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/lab/resources/antigen-tests-](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/lab/resources/antigen-tests-guidelines.html#anchor_1597523027400)
58 [guidelines.html#anchor_1597523027400](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/lab/resources/antigen-tests-guidelines.html#anchor_1597523027400)). To mitigate this issue, the European Centre for Disease
59 Prevention and Control (ECDC) recommends antigen-based assays to be not only carefully selected
60 but also validated before their implementation in clinical practice (5). Since June 2020, the
61 Lumipulse G SARS-CoV-2 Ag (Fujirebio, Tokyo, Japan), detecting SARS-CoV-2 nucleocapsid (N)
62 protein, is being used in Japan where, according to the Japanese Ministry of Health, Labour and
63 Welfare policy (4), a positive antigen test result is enough to definitively diagnose COVID-19
64 without PCR—which is instead mandatory in European countries to confirm positive antigen results
65 (5). Two independent studies by Hirotsu et al. (6, 7) reported on the performance of the Lumipulse
66 G SARS-CoV-2 Ag assay (hereafter referred as the Lumipulse assay) using nasopharyngeal swab

67 samples. Serial or individual samples from 11 RT-PCR positive (SARS-CoV-2 infected) patients
68 and 215 RT-PCR negative (SARS-CoV-2 uninfected) patients (6) or 27 serial samples from one
69 patient with persistent SARS-CoV-2 RNA shedding during hospitalization (7) were used. In both
70 studies, samples with high viral load (corresponding to low values of RT-PCR cycle threshold
71 [Ct]—an accredited measure of virus [5]) or samples collected in the early infection phase showed
72 complete concordance between Lumipulse and RT-PCR results.

73 With the aim to fully understanding its usefulness, we evaluated the Lumipulse assay with 594
74 individuals' nasopharyngeal swab samples assigned to different testing groups (i.e., including early
75 or late infection patients). To this end, we compared Lumipulse assay antigen results with those of
76 RT-PCR assay targeting SARS-CoV-2 genomic RNA (usually used as an indicator of viral
77 presence). In parallel, RT-PCR positive samples were analyzed for the presence of subgenomic
78 RNA (recently proposed as an indicator of active viral replication) to support Lumipulse assay'
79 results.

80

81 MATERIALS AND METHODS

82 **Study design and clinical samples.** This study was conducted at the Fondazione Policlinico
83 Universitario A. Gemelli IRCCS (FPG) and was approved by the FPG Ethics Committee (reference
84 number 49978/20). Informed consent was obtained from all participants before including their
85 samples in the study. We included nasopharyngeal swab samples from patients/individuals (≥ 18 -
86 year aged) presenting at and/or admitted to our institution during a 2-week period in December
87 2020. Samples were from laboratory-confirmed COVID-19 ($n = 194$) or non-COVID-19 ($n = 400$)
88 diagnoses, which relied, respectively, on positive (Ct values of ≤ 40) or negative (Ct values of > 40)
89 results obtained using the Seegene Allplex 2019-nCoV, the DiaSorin Simplexa COVID-19 Direct,
90 or the Roche Diagnostics Cobas SARS-CoV-2 Test RT-PCR assays (8–10). For example, the
91 Seegene Allplex 2019-nCoV assay is a single-tube assay targeting the envelope (E), RdRP (RNA-
92 dependent RNA polymerase), and N SARS-CoV-2 genes and running on a Bio-Rad CFX96 Real-
93 time Detection system. Based on Ct values—i.e., numbers of cycles the fluorescent signal crosses
94 the threshold for positive detections—the Seegene software automatically analyzes RT-PCR results.
95 By this assay, a Ct value ≤ 40 for at least one of two viral genes (i.e., RdRP and N) or for the E gene
96 alone indicates, respectively, the certain or presumptive presence of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in the
97 sample. No positive samples only for E gene were included in the study. In view of relatively lower
98 performance of the DiaSorin Simplexa COVID-19 Direct assay (8, 11), samples ($n = 39$) initially
99 tested with this assay were retested with the Seegene Allplex 2019-nCoV assay to confirm
100 (positive) results. Likewise, samples with discordant results between the RT-PCR and the
101 Lumipulse assays (see below) were confirmed as positive ($n = 39$) or negative ($n = 3$) by retesting
102 as previously described (12).

103 For stratification purposes (5), we selected positive samples based on their Ct values (i.e., 11.2–
104 39.9) to include samples with different viral load levels. These samples were characterized for the
105 inclusion in three testing groups, namely diagnostic, screening, and monitoring groups, which were

106 in substantial accordance with the definitions reported in the interim technical guidance by the
107 Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) for rapid SARS-CoV-2 antigen testing
108 ([https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/lab/resources/antigen-tests-](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/lab/resources/antigen-tests-guidelines.html#anchor_1597523027400)
109 [guidelines.html#anchor_1597523027400](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/lab/resources/antigen-tests-guidelines.html#anchor_1597523027400)). Accordingly, diagnostic or monitoring groups included
110 persons who had signs or symptoms (i.e., clinical illness) consistent with COVID-19, who had no
111 clinical illness but a recent known or suspected exposure to SARS-CoV-2, or who had a previous
112 laboratory-confirmed COVID-19 diagnosis, whereas the screening group included persons who
113 were asymptomatic and without known or suspected exposure to SARS-CoV-2. All positive
114 samples were further stratified in five groups based on RT-PCR Ct values (<18, 18–<25, 25–<30,
115 30–<35, and 35–40).

116 All samples originally collected into universal transport medium (UTM; Copan, Brescia, Italy)
117 were portioned in aliquots that were kept at 4°C until testing with the Lumipulse assay (see below),
118 which was always performed within 2–4 hours from the time samples were subjected to RT-PCR
119 for detecting SARS-CoV-2 genomic RNA as above described. In parallel, additional aliquots from
120 the same samples were frozen at –80°C until testing for SARS-CoV-2 subgenomic RNA (see
121 below). Furthermore, we used archived frozen samples (RT-PCR negative) as a matrix to generate
122 contrived samples for the Lumipulse assay’s analytical sensitivity determination (see below).

123 **Lumipulse assay for SARS-CoV-2 antigen detection.** The Lumipulse assay quantitatively detects
124 SARS-CoV-2 N protein in clinical samples (e.g., nasopharyngeal swab) by a specific two-reaction
125 chemiluminescence-based immunoassay method on the Lumipulse G1200 automated immunoassay
126 analyzer (Fujirebio). In the first reaction, the sample (or the SARS-CoV-2 Ag calibrator) and the
127 sample treatment solution are added to an anti-SARS-CoV-2 monoclonal antibody-coated magnetic
128 particle solution, and then incubated for 10 min at 37°C to allow formation of specific antigen-
129 antibody immunocomplexes. In the second reaction (accessed after washing), an alkaline
130 phosphatase-labelled anti-SARS-CoV-2 monoclonal antibody solution is added and incubated for

131 10 min at 37°C to allow specific binding to the antigen of aforementioned immunocomplexes, and
132 then to form additional immunocomplexes. Finally (after washing), a substrate solution is added
133 and incubated for 5 min at 37°C, and the resulting chemiluminescence signals are automatically
134 read by the analyzer and used to calculate the SARS-CoV-2 antigen's amount in the sample through
135 the interpolation with a SARS-CoV-2 Ag calibrator curve.

136 We determined the limit of detection (LOD) of the Lumipulse assay according to a previously
137 described protocol (9). Briefly, aforementioned contrived samples were spiked with a dilution series
138 of Vero E6 cell-cultured SARS-CoV-2 (INMI-1 strain) at a concentration range of 1.0×10^5 50%
139 tissue culture infective dose (TCID₅₀)/ml (4.0×10^8 RNA copies/ml) to 1.0 TCID₅₀/ml (4.0×10^3
140 RNA copies/ml), and then tested in replicates (Fig. S1). For each sample, SARS-CoV-2 RNA was
141 amplified by RT-PCR in Rotor-GeneQ Real-Time cycler (Qiagen, Hilden, Germany), using the
142 RealStar SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR kit 1.0 (Altona Diagnostic GmbH, Hamburg, Germany). RNA
143 copies/ml were calculated through a standard curve prepared with serially diluted EURM-019
144 single-strand SARS-CoV-2 RNA fragments (<https://crm.jrc.ec.europa.eu/p/EURM-019>). Thus, we
145 plotted the probability (y-axis) against the SARS-CoV-2 concentration's logarithm (x-axis), and we
146 calculated the 95% LOD value, which was the lowest concentration at which the replicates yielded
147 positive detection 95% of the time (Fig. S1).

148 Before testing with the Lumipulse assay, samples were centrifuged at $3000 \times g$ for 15 min to allow
149 separation of the supernatant from the remaining viscous UTM material, and 100 µl were analyzed
150 for the antigen quantification as above described. Samples with an antigen level exceeding the
151 detection limit (i.e., 5000 pg/ml) were diluted, and dilutions were used to quantify the original
152 samples' antigen levels based on the dilution factor. Results were interpreted using a cutoff of 1.34
153 pg/ml as established by the Lumipulse assay's manufacturer, and were expressed as negative (<1.34
154 pg/ml), gray-zone positive (1.34–10 pg/ml), or positive (>10–>5000) results, respectively. For
155 convenience reasons, antigen concentrations >5000 pg/ml were rounded to 5000 pg/ml.

156 **RT-PCR assay for SARS-CoV-2 subgenomic RNA detection.** To determine the presence of
157 SARS-CoV-2 subgenomic RNA (i.e., E gene subgenomic RNA), samples were subjected to a
158 previously developed in-house RT-PCR assay (13). This is an adaptation from the method described
159 by Wölfel et al. (14) that looks specifically at the E gene subgenomic RNA to indicate active virus
160 infection/transcription (15). Briefly, SARS-CoV-2 RNA (also including genomic RNA) was
161 extracted from samples using the Seegene Nimbus automated system and then used for the RT-PCR
162 assay. This was performed with the Qiagen OneStep RT-PCR kit (Qiagen, Valencia, CA) and a 25-
163 μ l reaction volume containing 600 nM concentration each of primers (sgE_SARS-CoV2_F 5'-
164 CGATCTCTTG TAGATCTGTTCTC-3'; sgE_SARS-CoV2_R 5'-
165 ATATTGCAGCAGTACGCACACA-3') and 200 nM concentration of probe (sgE_SARS-CoV2_P
166 5'-FAM-ACACTAGCCATCCTTACTGCGCTTCG-BBQ-3'). Thermal cycling consisted of 30
167 min at 50°C for reverse transcription, followed by 15 min at 95°C and subsequent 45 cycles each of
168 10 s at 95°C, 15 s at 55°C, and 30 s at 72°C.

169 **Data collection and analysis.** Data were presented as numbers with percentages or as means \pm
170 standard deviation (SD), as appropriate. To determine Lumipulse assay's LOD, the MedCalc
171 statistical software (MedCalc Software Ltd, Ostend, Belgium) was used to convert RT-PCR
172 positive detection proportion into a "probability unit" (or "probit"). Lumipulse assay's results were
173 categorized as positive, gray-zone positive, or negative and, then, compared using a one-way
174 analysis of variance (ANOVA) with the Tukey's multiple-comparison test. For Lumipulse assay's
175 or subgenomic RNA assay's results, differences between *a priori* established groups were assessed
176 using the chi-square test or the Student's *t*-test, as appropriate. Percent agreement values, with their
177 respective confidence intervals (CIs), were calculated comparing Lumipulse assay's or subgenomic
178 RNA assay's results with those obtained by the reference method (i.e., genomic RNA RT-PCR
179 assay). Correlation between antigen levels (as determined by the Lumipulse assay) and Ct values
180 (as determined by the reference method) was assessed using the Spearman's correlation coefficient.

181 Statistical analysis was conducted using Stata 15 (StataCorp, College Station, TX) or GraphPad
182 Prism 7 (GraphPad Software, San Diego, CA) software. $P < 0.05$ was considered statistically
183 significant.

184

185 **RESULTS**

186 **SARS-CoV-2 antigen (Lumipulse assay) versus genomic or subgenomic RNA (RT-PCR assay)**

187 **testing.** First, we determined the analytical capability of the Lumipulse assay, a recently marketed
188 assay for SARS-CoV-2 N protein detection in European countries. As shown in Fig. S1, the LOD
189 was 2.95 TCID₅₀/ml, corresponding to 1.2×10^4 SARS-CoV-2 RNA copies/ml, at 95% detection
190 probability. Then, 594 nasopharyngeal swab samples, including RT-PCR positive ($n = 194$) or
191 negative ($n = 400$) samples, were tested with the Lumipulse assay.

192 **i) Overall performance.** Using SARS-CoV-2 RNA genomic RT-PCR assay as the reference
193 method (Table 1), the Lumipulse assay detected 155 of 194 samples as positive (antigen
194 concentration, ≥ 1.34 pg/ml) and 397 of 400 samples as negative (antigen concentration, < 1.34
195 pg/ml). This resulted in a positive percent (PPA) of 79.9% (95% confidence interval (CI), 73.6–
196 85.3) and a negative percent agreement (NPA) of 99.3% (95% CI, 97.8–99.8), respectively. Of 155
197 samples, 29 (18.7%) were positive within the gray-zone (antigen concentration, 1.34–10 pg/ml),
198 which defines an antigen positivity extent necessitating to be confirmed by RT-PCR. As depicted in
199 Fig. 1 and detailed in Table 1, we stratified Lumipulse assay's results according to RT-PCR Ct
200 values. Thus, we found significant differences in the mean Ct value \pm SD for 126 samples with
201 antigen-positive results (21.95 ± 6.03) as compared to 29 samples with antigen (gray-zone)-positive
202 results (30.85 ± 3.19) and to 39 samples with antigen-negative results (33.79 ± 2.39), respectively
203 (ANOVA with Tukey's multiple-comparison test; $P < 0.0001$ for both comparisons) (Fig. 1).
204 Interestingly, PPAs between Lumipulse assay's and RT-PCR assay's results were 100% for samples
205 with Ct values of < 18 ($n = 38$) or $18 < 25$ ($n = 49$) and 92.5% for samples with Ct values of $25 < 30$
206 ($n = 37$). For 31 of 155 samples with Ct values of $30 < 35$ ($n = 23$) or $35 < 40$ ($n = 8$), PPAs dropped
207 to 47.9% and 42.1%, respectively. More interestingly, 24 (82.8%) of 29 antigen (gray zone)-
208 positive results regarded samples with Ct values ranging from 25 to 35, whereas three (100%) of

209 three antigen (gray zone)-positive results regarded (antigen false-positive) samples with Ct values
210 >40.

211 **ii) Performance by different testing groups.** Table 2 shows the results of 194 antigen-positive
212 samples—overall described in Table 1—stratified by the diagnostic ($n = 69$), screening ($n = 53$), or
213 monitoring ($n = 72$) groups of testing for 194 patients with laboratory-confirmed COVID-19
214 diagnosis. Only for the monitoring group, samples used in the study were not the same as those at
215 the COVID-19 diagnosis time; thus, this group included COVID-19 patients who were tested
216 during the course of disease. Conversely, 122 patients in the two remaining groups were tested at
217 early disease phases. Table 2 also shows the results from SARS-CoV-2 subgenomic RNA detection
218 that was performed in parallel on the 194 samples.

219 Regarding antigen detection results, PPA with the reference method (i.e., SARS-CoV-2 RNA
220 genomic RT-PCR assay) was 87.0% (95% CI, 76.7–93.9; 60/69 results), 81.1% (95% CI, 68.0–
221 90.6; 43/53 results), or 72.2% (95% CI, 60.4–82.1; 52/72 results) in diagnostic, screening, and
222 monitoring groups, respectively. Consistent with that shown in Table 1, PPA was 100% for samples
223 with Ct values of <18 or 18–<25 in all three testing groups, and was 94.4%, 80.0%, or 100% for
224 samples with Ct values of 25–<30 in diagnostic, screening, and monitoring groups, respectively.
225 Regarding subgenomic RNA detection results, PPA with the reference method was 63.8% (95% CI,
226 51.3–75.0; 44/69 results), 62.3% (95% CI, 47.9–75.2; 33/53 results), or 33.3% (95% CI, 22.7–45.4;
227 24/72 results) in diagnostic, screening, and monitoring groups, respectively. Unlike antigen
228 detection results, PPAs for samples with Ct values of <18 or 18–<25 were, respectively, 86.7% and
229 100% in the diagnostic group, 100% and 94.1% in the screening group, and 100% and 83.3% in the
230 monitoring group. Interestingly, in all three groups, PPAs dropped to 55.6%, 20.0%, or 41.7% for
231 samples with Ct values of 25–<30, and reached 0% for almost all samples with Ct values of 30–<35
232 or 35–40, respectively. A chi-square test analysis was conducted to compare PPAs between antigen
233 and subgenomic-RNA detections among the three testing groups, and this analysis revealed

234 significant differences for the samples overall ($P = 0.002$, $P = 0.03$, and $P < 0.001$, respectively) or
235 the samples with Ct values ranging from 25–<30 or 35–40 ($P < 0.05$ for all comparisons).

236 **iii) Correlation between antigen levels and RT-PCR Ct values.** To corroborate these findings,
237 we assessed antigen levels in relation with the SARS-CoV-2 viral load expressed as RT-PCR Ct
238 values. A Spearman’s correlation analysis was conducted for all 194 samples that tested positive
239 with the RT-PCR assay, which were analyzed according to aforementioned testing groups (i.e.,
240 diagnostic, screening, and monitoring). As shown in Fig. 2, we found a significant (negative)
241 association between antigen levels and Ct values in either diagnostic (Spearman’s $\rho = -0.82$; P
242 < 0.0001), monitoring (Spearman’s $\rho = -0.76$; $P < 0.0001$), or screening (Spearman’s $\rho = -0.72$; P
243 < 0.0001) groups. As it can see, association was relatively stronger in the diagnostic group and less
244 strong in the screening group.

245 **Relationship between SARS-CoV-2 antigen and subgenomic RNA.** To investigate this issue, we
246 analyzed the characteristics of 194 antigen-positive or -negative samples according to the presence
247 ($n = 101$) or absence ($n = 93$) of subgenomic RNA. As shown in Table 3, all 101 samples with a
248 subgenomic RNA positive result had a Lumipulse assay’s antigen positive result, whereas only 54
249 (58.1%) of remaining 93 samples had a Lumipulse assay’s antigen positive result. Samples in the
250 subgenomic RNA-positive group had a mean Ct value \pm SD—at the RT-PCR assay for genomic
251 RNA—that did not significantly differ from that of samples in the subgenomic RNA-negative group
252 (20.3 ± 4.8 versus 29.9 ± 4.8 ; Student’s t -test; $P = 0.43$). Conversely, the time from COVID-19
253 diagnosis to testing (mean days \pm SD) for samples in the subgenomic RNA-positive group
254 significantly differed from the time for samples in the subgenomic RNA-negative group (1.6 ± 3.3
255 versus 6.1 ± 7.0 ; Student’s t -test; $P < 0.001$).

256

257 **DISCUSSION**

258 Taking advantage of antigen tests used to detect infection with viruses other than SARS-CoV-2
259 (16), diagnostics of COVID-19 quickly moved to use non-molecular (i.e., non-RT-PCR) laboratory
260 tests, including the Lumipulse assay (5). Unlike point-of-care antigen test formats (17), Lumipulse
261 assay employs a chemiluminescence-based SARS-CoV-2 antigen quantification (6), which should
262 enhance the test sensitivity to diagnose SARS-CoV-2 infection. To evaluate the Lumipulse assay,
263 we used RT-PCR as the best available comparator method (1), and we showed that the Lumipulse
264 assay had PPA (sensitivity) and NPA (specificity) of ~80% and 99%, respectively. Consequently,
265 the number of false-positive and-negative results driven by these metrics was 39 (among 194 RT-
266 PCR positive results) and 3 (among 400 RT-PCR negative results), respectively (Table 1). As the
267 Lumipulse assay returns positive results as positive (>10 to 5000 pg/ml) or gray-zone positive
268 (≥ 1.34 to 10 pg/ml), it is worthy to note that all the three false-positive results fell within the gray-
269 zone range. These results would have been confirmed by RT-PCR if antigen testing had been
270 performed as a frontline diagnostic method at the study time.

271 In our hands, Lumipulse assay met the minimum performance requirements of $\geq 80\%$ sensitivity
272 and $\geq 97\%$ specificity for rapid antigen tests as established by the World Health Organization
273 ([https://www.who.int/publications/m/item/covid-19-target-product-profiles-for-priority-diagnostics-](https://www.who.int/publications/m/item/covid-19-target-product-profiles-for-priority-diagnostics-to-support-response-to-the-covid-19-pandemic-v.0.1)
274 [to-support-response-to-the-covid-19-pandemic-v.0.1](https://www.who.int/publications/m/item/covid-19-target-product-profiles-for-priority-diagnostics-to-support-response-to-the-covid-19-pandemic-v.0.1)) and, later, agreed by the ECDC (5).
275 Additionally, we showed that the Lumipulse assay's sensitivity increased from ~93% to 100% with
276 samples that displayed RT-PCR Ct values below 25–30. As a reflection of high viral load, these
277 values are likely associated with an infectious SARS-CoV-2, contrasting higher Ct values (>30 to
278 40) that, instead, are likely associated with a non-infectious SARS-CoV-2 (14). A manner for
279 appraising the apparently low performance of the Lumipulse assay as compared to RT-PCR (i.e.,
280 $\geq 90\%$ sensitivity [[https://www.who.int/publications/m/item/covid-19-target-product-profiles-for-](https://www.who.int/publications/m/item/covid-19-target-product-profiles-for-priority-diagnostics-to-support-response-to-the-covid-19-pandemic-v.0.1)
281 [priority-diagnostics-to-support-response-to-the-covid-19-pandemic-v.0.1](https://www.who.int/publications/m/item/covid-19-target-product-profiles-for-priority-diagnostics-to-support-response-to-the-covid-19-pandemic-v.0.1)]), it was to assess the

282 Lumipulse assay's results with respect to the results of SARS-CoV-2 subgenomic RNA assay (14),
283 which was performed on the samples concomitantly tested for SARS-CoV-2 antigen. Thus, among
284 194 (SARS-CoV-2 genomic RNA) RT-PCR positive samples, 101 (52.1%) samples had positive
285 results for subgenomic RNA (and antigen), with 82 (94.3%) of 87 antigen-positive samples having
286 RT-PCR Ct values below 18–25 (Tables 2 and 3). Importantly, 54 of 93 samples negative at the
287 subgenomic RNA assay but positive at the Lumipulse antigen assay included samples from patients
288 who were tested 6.1 ± 7.0 days after COVID-19 diagnosis (Table 3), suggesting that SARS-CoV-2
289 antigen may be longer detected than SARS-CoV-2 subgenomic RNA. Consistent with these
290 findings, 101 aforementioned samples were from patients who were tested 1.6 ± 3.3 days after
291 COVID-19 diagnosis (Table 3), suggesting that SARS-CoV-2 antigen may indicate active infection.
292 It should be recalled that SARS-CoV-2 virions do not contain subgenomic RNA—i.e., RNA
293 replicative forms thought to encode the structural spike (S), E, membrane (M), or N virus
294 proteins—whereas subgenomic RNA is part of cellular membrane vesicles and thereby relatively
295 stable (15). Thus, antigen and subgenomic RNA represent two virus biology entities worthy of
296 investigation in clinical samples (7, 18, 19), especially in situations of prolonged (genomic RNA)
297 RT-PCR positivity implying infectious virus shedding (15).

298 In an attempt to appraise fully Lumipulse assay's performance, we analyzed 194 RT-PCR positive
299 samples stratified by groups of testing (Table 2). This stratification allowed us to assess the
300 accuracy of the Lumipulse assay to determine if a person presenting in the (primary or secondary
301 care) hospital or the community has SARS-CoV-2 infection. Therefore, we included 194 adults
302 suspected of ($n = 69$) or screened for ($n = 53$) SARS-CoV-2 infection or monitored for confirmed
303 COVID-19 ($n = 72$) in diagnostic, screening, or monitoring groups, respectively. We found that the
304 Lumipulse assay worked well, and almost equally, in all three testing groups, with 60 (diagnostic
305 group), 43 (screening group), or 52 (monitoring group) samples being positive. Expectedly, the
306 subgenomic RNA assay yielded positive results in 44 (diagnostic group), 33 (screening group), or

307 24 (monitoring group) samples. Of note, lowest sample positivity rates were seen in the monitoring
308 group with both Lumipulse (52/72 samples, 72.2%) and subgenomic RNA (24/72 samples, 33.3%)
309 assays. These findings concur with the idea that SARS-CoV-2 antigen or, particularly, subgenomic
310 RNA results are likely to be less positive in monitoring scenarios where positive results for genomic
311 RNA are, instead, indicative of prolonged SARS-CoV-2 shedding (15). Accordingly, in our
312 monitoring group, the time from COVID-19 diagnosis to testing was longer (up to 32 days) than in
313 diagnostic or screening groups (0 days).

314 To the best of our knowledge, this is to date the largest clinical study evaluating the Lumipulse
315 assay. Compared to previous studies (6, 7), our set of tested nasopharyngeal swab samples is not
316 only wider but also uncharted—we included 594 individuals' samples from testing scenarios with
317 different pretest probability that, in turn, reflected different clinical situations. Nonetheless, our
318 findings agreed with those by Hirotsu et al. (6) showing that the SARS-CoV-2 antigen levels
319 declined in consecutively collected samples of seven patients from the time of their hospital
320 admission to discharge. Therefore, the finding that antigen positivity rates varied according to
321 whether samples were in a diagnostic/screening rather than in a monitoring scenario reinforces the
322 hypothesis raised by Hirotsu et al. that antigen testing could be also useful to identify patients in the
323 early or late phase of SARS-CoV-2 infection (6). In an evaluations' review of five antigen tests
324 (four commercial and one in-house) by Dinnes et al. (17), average sensitivity was 56.2% (95% CI,
325 29.5 to 79.8%) and average specificity was 99.5% (95% CI 98.1 to 99.9%) based on five studies
326 with 943 samples (596 were confirmed SARS-CoV-2 samples). However, the sensitivity varied
327 considerably across studies (from 0% to 94%), causing uncertainty about how useful antigen tests
328 are in clinical practice (17). To enhance the applicability of our Lumipulse assay's results, we
329 determined the assay's analytical sensitivity (Fig. S1) before sample testing to ensure that the
330 assay's LOD was equivalent to 10^4 viral genomic copies/ml, which is the desirable limit
331 acknowledged to date (<https://www.who.int/publications/m/item/covid-19-target-product-profiles->

332 for-priority-diagnostics-to-support-response-to-the-covid-19-pandemic-v.0.1). Furthermore, we
333 limited oversampling of samples with laboratory-confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection, which
334 accounted for the high risk of bias affecting patient selection in many published studies (17).
335 Stratifying our study participants by days from the symptom onset (5) was impracticable for us.
336 However, we compensated for this limitation by including testing groups that were comparable for
337 size (~60 RT-PCR positive samples per group), and we assumed that RT-PCR negative samples
338 were almost equally distributed across testing groups.

339 To summarize, our results show that Lumipulse assay's performance was satisfactory, confirming
340 the current view about antigen-based laboratory testing for SARS-CoV-2 detection. In particular,
341 the Lumipulse assay was highly sensitive to detect SARS-CoV-2 antigen in samples with low RT-
342 PCR Ct values (<25) by overall or different testing scenarios. While Ct values >25 might not
343 correspond to situations with active SARS-CoV-2 infection and/or infectivity, a strategy of repeated
344 testing can maximize the Lumipulse assay's performance and thereby reduce consequences of false-
345 negative results.

346 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

347 The authors are grateful to the Reale Group and the Fondazione Valentino Garavani & Giancarlo
348 Giammetti for providing financial support to the COVID-19 Research at the FPG (Fondazione
349 Policlinico Universitario A. Gemelli IRCCS) of Rome (Italy), or with the Italian Health Ministry
350 for providing funds to the INMI (Istituto Nazionale per le Malattie Infettive Lazzaro Spallanzani
351 IRCCS) of Rome (Italy).

352 We thank Franziska Lohmeyer for English revision of the manuscript.

353

354 **REFERENCES**

- 355 1. Brooks ZC, Das S. 2020. COVID-19 testing. *Am J Clin Pathol* 154:575–584.
356 <https://doi.org/10.1093/ajcp/aqaa141>.
- 357 2. Cheng MP, Papenburg J, Desjardins M, Kanjilal S, Quach C, Libman M, Dittrich S,
358 Yansouni CP. 2020. Diagnostic testing for severe acute respiratory syndrome–related
359 coronavirus-2: a narrative review. *Ann Intern Med* M20-1301. [https://doi.org/10.7326/M20-](https://doi.org/10.7326/M20-1301)
360 1301.
- 361 3. Mak GC, Lau SS, Wong KK, Chow NL, Lau CS, Lam ET, Chan RC, Tsang DN. 2020.
362 Analytical sensitivity and clinical sensitivity of the three rapid antigen detection kits for
363 detection of SARS-CoV-2 virus. *J Clin Virol* 133:104684.
364 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcv.2020.104684>.
- 365 4. Ogawa T, Fukumori T, Nishihara Y, Sekine T, Okuda N, Nishimura T, Fujikura H, Hirai N,
366 Imakita N, Kasahara K. 2020. Another false-positive problem for a SARS-CoV-2 antigen
367 test in Japan. *J Clin Virol* 131:104612. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcv.2020.104612>.
- 368 5. European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control (ECDC). Options for the use of rapid
369 antigen tests for COVID-19 in the EU/EEA and the UK. 19 November 2020. ECDC:
370 Stockholm; 2020.
- 371 6. Hirotsu Y, Maejima M, Shibusawa M, Nagakubo Y, Hosaka K, Amemiya K, Sueki H,
372 Hayakawa M, Mochizuki H, Tsutsui T, Kakizaki Y, Miyashita Y, Yagi S, Kojima S, Omata
373 M. 2020. Comparison of automated SARS-CoV-2 antigen test for COVID-19 infection with
374 quantitative RT-PCR using 313 nasopharyngeal swabs, including from seven serially
375 followed patients. *Int J Infect Dis* 99:397–402. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijid.2020.08.029>.
- 376 7. Hirotsu Y, Maejima M, Shibusawa M, Amemiya K, Nagakubo Y, Hosaka K, Sueki H,
377 Hayakawa M, Mochizuki H, Tsutsui T, Kakizaki Y, Miyashita Y, Omata M. 2020. Analysis
378 of a persistent viral shedding patient infected with SARS-CoV-2 by RT-qPCR, FilmArray

- 379 Respiratory Panel v2.1, and antigen detection. *J Infect Chemother* Oct 29:S1341-
380 321X(20)30396-2. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jiac.2020.10.026>. Epub ahead of print.
- 381 8. Liotti FM, Menchinelli G, Marchetti S, Morandotti GA, Sanguinetti M, Posteraro B, Cattani
382 P. 2020. Evaluation of three commercial assays for SARS-CoV-2 molecular detection in
383 upper respiratory tract samples. *Eur J Clin Microbiol Infect Dis* Sep 4:1–9.
384 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10096-020-04025-0>. Epub ahead of print.
- 385 9. Liotti FM, Menchinelli G, Lalle E, Palucci I, Marchetti S, Colavita F, La Sorda M, Sberna
386 G, Bordi L, Sanguinetti M, Cattani P, Capobianchi MR, Posteraro B. 2020. Performance of
387 a novel diagnostic assay for rapid SARS-CoV-2 antigen detection in nasopharynx samples.
388 *Clin Microbiol Infect* Sep 23:S1198-743X(20)30583-8.
389 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cmi.2020.09.030>. Epub ahead of print.
- 390 10. Poljak M, Korva M, Knap Gašper N, Fujs Komloš K, Sagadin M, Uršič T, Avšič Županc T,
391 Petrovec M. 2020. Clinical evaluation of the Cobas SARS-CoV-2 test and a diagnostic
392 platform switch during 48 hours in the midst of the COVID-19 pandemic. *J Clin Microbiol*
393 58:e00599-20. <https://doi.org/10.1128/JCM.00599-20>.
- 394 11. Procop GW, Brock JE, Reineks EZ, Shrestha NK, Demkowicz R, Cook E, Ababneh E,
395 Harrington SM. A 2021. Comparison of five SARS-CoV-2 molecular assays with clinical
396 correlations. *Am J Clin Pathol* 155:69–78. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ajcp/aqaa181>.
- 397 12. Liotti FM, Menchinelli G, Marchetti S, Morandotti GA, Sanguinetti M, Posteraro B, Cattani
398 P. 2020. Evaluating the newly developed BioFire COVID-19 test for SARS-CoV-2
399 molecular detection. *Clin Microbiol Infect* 26:1699–1700.
400 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cmi.2020.07.026>.
- 401 13. Liotti FM, Menchinelli G, Marchetti S, Posteraro B, Landi F, Sanguinetti M, Cattani P.
402 2020. Assessment of SARS-CoV-2 RNA test results among patients who recovered from

- 403 COVID-19 with prior negative results. *JAMA Intern Med* Nov 12:e207570.
404 <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamainternmed.2020.7570>. Epub ahead of print.
- 405 14. Wölfel R, Corman VM, Guggemos W, Seilmaier M, Zange S, Müller MA, Niemeyer D,
406 Jones TC, Vollmar P, Rothe C, Hoelscher M, Bleicker T, Brünink S, Schneider J, Ehmann
407 R, Zwirgmaier K, Drosten C, Wendtner C. 2020. Virological assessment of hospitalized
408 patients with COVID-2019. *Nature* 581:465–469. [https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-020-2196-](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-020-2196-x)
409 [x](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-020-2196-x).
- 410 15. Alexandersen S, Chamings A, Bhatta TR. 2020. SARS-CoV-2 genomic and subgenomic
411 RNAs in diagnostic samples are not an indicator of active replication. *Nat Commun* 2020
412 11:6059. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-020-19883-7>.
- 413 16. Clerc O, Greub G. 2010. Routine use of point-of-care tests: usefulness and application in
414 clinical microbiology. *Clin Microbiol Infect* 2010 16:1054–1061.
415 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-0691.2010.03281.x>.
- 416 17. Dinnes J, Deeks JJ, Adriano A, Berhane S, Davenport C, Dittrich S, Emperador D,
417 Takwoingi Y, Cunningham J, Beese S, Dretzke J, Ferrante di Ruffano L, Harris IM, Price
418 MJ, Taylor-Phillips S, Hooft L, Leeflang MM, Spijker R, Van den Bruel A; Cochrane
419 COVID-19 Diagnostic Test Accuracy Group. 2020. Rapid, point-of-care antigen and
420 molecular-based tests for diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2 infection. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*
421 8:CD013705. <https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.CD013705>.
- 422 18. Rodríguez-Grande C, Adán-Jiménez J, Catalán P, Alcalá L, Estévez A, Muñoz P, Pérez-
423 Lago L, de Viedma DG; Gregorio Marañón Microbiology-ID COVID 19 Study Group.
424 2020. Inference of active viral replication in cases with sustained positive RT-PCRs for
425 SARS-CoV-2. *J Clin Microbiol* Nov 25:JCM.02277-20.
426 <https://doi.org/10.1128/JCM.02277-20>. Epub ahead of print.

427 19. Avanzato VA, Matson MJ, Seifert SN, Pryce R, Williamson BN, Anzick SL, Barbian K,
428 Judson SD, Fischer ER, Martens C, Bowden TA, de Wit E, Riedo FX, Munster VJ. 2020.
429 Case Study: Prolonged Infectious SARS-CoV-2 Shedding from an Asymptomatic
430 Immunocompromised Individual with Cancer. Cell 183:1901-1912.e9. doi:
431 10.1016/j.cell.2020.10.049.
432

433 **FIGURE LEGENDS**

434 **FIG 1** Distribution of Lumipulse assay's results according to RT-PCR assay's Ct values in 194
435 nasopharyngeal samples. Results are presented as positive (>10 –5000), gray-zone positive (1.34–10
436 pg/ml), or negative (<1.34 pg/ml), respectively. In each violin plot, solid line indicates the mean Ct
437 value (21.95, 30.85, and 33.79, respectively) and the area between dotted lines indicates the
438 standard deviation value (6.03, 3.19, and 2.39, respectively). Asterisks indicate statistically
439 significance ($P < 0.0001$) between result groups, as established using a one-way analysis of variance
440 (ANOVA) with the Tukey's multiple-comparison test.

441 **FIG 2** Correlation between the SARS-CoV-2 antigen levels quantified by the Lumipulse assay and
442 the SARS-CoV-2 genomic RNA Ct values obtained with the RT-PCR assay. Analysis was
443 separately conducted for (a) diagnostic, (b) screening, and (c) monitoring testing groups. Antigen
444 concentration is expressed as \log_{10} pg/ml. Concentrations of <1.34 pg/ml, 1.34 to 10 pg/ml, and >10
445 pg/ml were used to interpret Lumipulse assay's antigen results as negative, gray-zone positive, or
446 positive, respectively.

447 **FIG S1** Probit analysis to calculate the limit of detection (LOD) of the Lumipulse G SARS-CoV-2
448 Ag assay. In this analysis, input was the numbers of samples with positive detection, which were
449 obtained with Vero E6 cell-cultured SARS-CoV-2 (INMI-1 strain) tested in replicates at a
450 concentration range of 1.0×10^5 50% tissue culture infective dose (TCID₅₀)/ml (4.0×10^8 RNA
451 copies/ml) to 1.0 TCID₅₀/ml (4.0×10^3 RNA copies/ml). The output was the Lumipulse assay's
452 LOD, which was equivalent to a value of 0.47 \log_{10} TCID₅₀/ml (otherwise expressed as 2.95
453 TCID₅₀/ml) corresponding to 4.07 \log_{10} RNA copies/ml (otherwise expressed as 1.2×10^4
454 copies/ml).

TABLE 1. Comparison of Lumipulse assay results with the RT-PCR assay results stratified by Ct values for SARS-CoV-2 detection

RT-PCR assay ^a	Lumipulse assay ^b	
Ct values (no. of results)	No. of positive (including gray-zone positive) results	Percent agreement (95% confidence interval)
≤40 (194)	155 (29)	79.9 (73.6–85.3)
<18 (38)	38 (0)	100.0 (90.7–100.0)
18–<25 (49)	49 (1)	100.0 (92.7–100.0)
25–<30 (40)	37 (10)	92.5 (79.6–98.4)
30–<35 (48)	23 (14)	47.9 (33.3–62.8)
35–40 (19)	8 (4)	42.1 (20.3–66.5)
>40 (400)	3 (3)	99.3 (97.8–99.8)

Abbreviations: RT-PCR, real-time reverse-transcription polymerase chain reaction; SARS-CoV-2, severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2; Ct, cycle threshold.

^a SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR testing was performed on 594 individuals' nasopharyngeal swab samples. A positive result (i.e., a Ct ≤40) for at least one of two viral targets with the Seegene Allplex 2019-nCoV (nucleocapsid [N] and RdRP [RNA-dependent RNA polymerase]), the DiaSorin Simplexa COVID-19 Direct (S [spike] and ORF1ab [open reading frame 1ab]), or the Roche Diagnostics Cobas SARS-CoV-2 Test (E [envelope] and ORF1a) assays indicated the presence of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in individual's nasopharyngeal swab samples (*n* = 194). Samples with a Ct >40 for the mentioned genes were considered negative (*n* = 400).

^b SARS-CoV-2 antigen testing was performed on 594 individuals' nasopharyngeal swab samples with the Lumipulse G SARS-CoV-2 Ag assay. Using the manufacturer's cutoff of 1.34 pg/ml, results were interpreted as gray-zone positive or positive when antigen concentrations were 1.34–10 and >10–5000 pg/ml, respectively.

TABLE 2. Positive detections of Lumipulse antigen and subgenomic RNA compared with those of RT-PCR for SARS-CoV-2 in different testing groups^a

Results according to indicated RT-PCR Ct values for:					
Ct values (no. of results)	Lumipulse antigen detection ^b		Subgenomic RNA detection ^c		P value ^d
	No. of results (including gray-zone results)	Percent agreement (95% confidence interval)	No. of results	Percent agreement (95% confidence interval)	
Diagnostic group					
<18 (15)	15 (0)	100.0 (78.2–100.0)	13	86.7 (59.5–98.3)	0.14
18–<25 (20)	20 (0)	100.0 (83.2–100.0)	20	100.0 (83.2–100.0)	NA
25–<30 (18)	17 (1)	94.4 (72.7–99.9)	10	55.6 (30.8–78.5)	0.009
30–<35 (10)	6 (5)	60.0 (26.2–87.8)	0	0.0 (0.0–30.8)	0.003
35–40 (6)	2 (0)	33.3 (4.3–77.7)	1	16.7 (0.4–64.1)	0.52
All (69)	60 (6)	87.0 (76.7–93.9)	44	63.8 (51.3–75.0)	0.002
Screening group					
<18 (15)	15	100.0 (78.2–100.0)	15	100.0 (78.2–100.0)	NA
18–<25 (17)	17	100.0 (80.5–100.0)	16	94.1 (71.3–99.9)	0.30
25–<30 (10)	8 (5)	80.0 (44.4–97.5)	2	20.0 (2.5–55.6)	0.007
30–<35 (8)	3 (2)	38.0 (8.5–75.5)	0	0.0 (0.0–36.9)	0.05
35–40 (3)	0	0.0 (0.0–70.6)	0	0.0 (0.0–70.6)	NA
All (53)	43 (7)	81.1 (68.0–90.6)	33	62.3 (47.9–75.2)	0.03
Monitoring group					
<18 (8)	8	100.0 (63.1–100.0)	8	100.0 (63.1–100.0)	NA
18–<25 (12)	12 (1)	100.0 (73.5–100.0)	10	83.3 (51.6–97.9)	0.13
25–<30 (12)	12 (4)	100.0 (73.5–100.0)	5	41.7 (15.2–72.3)	0.002
30–<35 (30)	14 (7)	46.7 (28.3–65.7)	1	3.3 (0.1–17.2)	<0.001
35–40 (10)	6 (4)	60.0 (26.2–87.8)	0	0.0 (0.0–30.8)	0.003
All (72)	52 (16)	72.2 (60.4–82.1)	24	33.3 (22.7–45.4)	<0.001

Abbreviations: RT-PCR, real-time reverse-transcription polymerase chain reaction; SARS-CoV-2, severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2; Ct, cycle threshold; NA, not applicable.

^a Groups were established according to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) definitions for testing settings (https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/lab/resources/antigen-tests-guidelines.html#anchor_1597523027400), and were further stratified by viral load (i.e., Ct values) as indicated.

^b SARS-CoV-2 antigen was detected in nasopharyngeal swab samples of groups' individuals by the Lumipulse G SARS-CoV-2 Ag assay, which provides a 0.01–5000 pg/ml measurement range. Using the manufacturer's cutoff of 1.34 pg/ml, results were expressed as negative, gray-zone positive, or positive when antigen concentrations in the samples were <1.34, 1.34–10, or >10–5000 pg/ml, respectively. Samples with antigen concentrations above 5000 pg/ml were rounded to 5000 pg/ml for convenience reasons.

^c SARS-CoV-2 subgenomic RNA was detected in nasopharyngeal swab samples of groups' individuals by in-house RT-PCR assay for the presence of replicative (E gene) RNA (Liotti, 2020c).

^d For comparisons between percent agreement rates.

TABLE 3. Characteristics of 194 RT-PCR positive samples that tested positive or negative for the presence of SARS-CoV-2 subgenomic RNA^a

Characteristic ^b	Samples with a subgenomic RNA positive result (<i>n</i> = 101) grouped as		Samples with a subgenomic RNA negative result (<i>n</i> = 93) grouped as		<i>P</i> value ^c
	RT-PCR positive/Antigen positive (<i>n</i> = 101)	RT-PCR positive/Antigen negative (<i>n</i> = 0)	RT-PCR positive/Antigen positive (<i>n</i> = 54)	RT-PCR positive/Antigen negative (<i>n</i> = 39)	
RT-PCR Ct, mean value ± SD	20.3 ± 4.8	NA ^d	29.9 ± 4.8	33.8 ± 2.4	0.43
Testing from COVID-19 diagnosis, mean days ± SD	1.6 ± 3.3	NA ^d	6.1 ± 7.0	7.7 ± 8.6	<0.001

^a All samples were from diagnostic (*n* = 59), screening (*n* = 63), or monitoring (*n* = 72) testing groups (see Table 2). Testing for SARS-CoV-2 subgenomic RNA was performed using an in-house RT-PCR assay to assess the presence of replicative (E gene) RNA, as previously described (Liotti, 2020c).

^b The time period between SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR (to which Ct values refer) used to diagnose COVID-19 and testing for SARS-CoV-2 subgenomic RNA (and antigen) ranged from 0 days in the diagnostic or screening groups to 32 days in the monitoring group. Only in the last group, consequently, two temporally different samples were tested.

^c For comparisons between the RT-PCR positive/Antigen positive groups herein listed.

^d NA, not applicable.



