# 1 The Value of Rapid Antigen Tests to Identify Carriers of Viable SARS-CoV-2

- 2 **Short title:** Antigenic tests to identify patients with viable SARS-CoV-2
- 3 Elena V. Shidlovskaya<sup>1</sup>, Nadezhda A. Kuznetsova<sup>1</sup>, Elizaveta V. Divisenko<sup>1</sup>, Maria
- 4 A. Nikiforova<sup>1</sup>, Andrei E. Siniavin<sup>1,2</sup>, Daria A. Ogarkova<sup>1</sup>, Aleksandr V. Shagaev<sup>4</sup>,

5 Maria A. Semashko<sup>1</sup>, Artem P. Tkachuk<sup>1</sup>, Olga A. Burgasova<sup>1,3</sup>, Vladimir A.

6 **Gushchin**<sup>1,5,\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup> N.F. Gamaleya National Research Center for Epidemiology and Microbiology,
 Ivanovsky Institute of Virology, Ministry of Health of the Russian Federation, 123098,

- 9 Moscow, Russia
- <sup>2</sup> Department of Molecular Neuroimmune Signalling, Shemyakin-Ovchinnikov Institute of
- 11 Bioorganic Chemistry, Russian Academy of Sciences, 117997, Moscow, Russia
- <sup>12</sup> <sup>3</sup>Peoples Friendship University of Russia (RUDN) University, 117198, Moscow, Russia
- 13 <sup>4</sup> Moscow Healthcare Department, 127006 Moscow, Russia
- <sup>5</sup> Department of virology, Lomonosov Moscow State University, 119991, Moscow,
   Russia
- 16 \* Address for correspondence: Vladimir A. Gushchin wowaniada@gmail.com
- 17

# 18 Abstract

19 The search for effective methods to detect patients who excrete a viable virus is 20 one of the urgent tasks of modern biomedicine. In the present study, we examined the diagnostic value of two antigen tests BIOCREDIT COVID-19 Ag (RapiGEN Inc., Korea) 21 22 and SGTI-flex COVID-19 Ag (Sugentech Inc., Korea) for their diagnostic value in 23 identifying patients who excrete viable SARS-CoV-2. As part of the study, we examined 24 samples from 106 patients who had just been admitted to the hospital, who had undergone quantitative RT-PCR and assessment of viability of SARS-CoV-2 using cell 25 culture. Sensitivity was 0.786 (0.492-0.953) for SGTI-flex COVID-19 Ag and 1 (0.768-26 27 1) for Biocredit COVID-19 Ag. Specificity of rapid tests was significantly higher than that of RT-PCR and was 0.663 (0.557-0.758) and 0.674 (0.568-0.768) for SGTI-flex 28 COVID-19 Ag and Biocredit COVID-19 Ag versus 0.304 (0.213-0.409) obtained for 29 PCR. Thus, for tasks of identifying viable SARS-CoV-2 during screening of conditionally 30 31 healthy people, as well as monitoring those quarantined, rapid tests show significantly 32 better results.

33

34

#### 35 Introduction

The SARS-CoV-2 virus pandemic has been a major global problem for over a 36 37 year. The lack of effective and widely available means of prevention and etiotropic treatment has led to a situation where wearing a mask and social distancing [1] remain 38 39 the primary ways to lift pressure off the healthcare system, allowing the most severe 40 COVID-19 patients to receive timely and necessary care in medical institutions, while patients with mild to moderate course are forced to remain on lockdown. At the same 41 42 time, massive restrictions significantly reduce economic activity and, as a result, 43 increase the risks of slowing down economic growth [2].

The main problem of monitoring and surveillance of SARS-CoV-2 is the ability of the virus to spread from asymptomatic patients several days before any symptoms occur [3], [4]. Moreover, contribution to the transmission of the virus from asymptomatic patients and from patients before the onset of symptoms is a significant problem both for the spread of the virus and for accounting for COVID-19 cases [5].

49 The recent successful launch of SARS-CoV-2 vaccines gives hope for an early reduction of the pandemic and a return to pre-quarantine living conditions [6], [7], [8], 50 51 [9]. All major vaccines ensure a convincing level of protection (over 90%) in the short 52 term and reliable protection against the severe course of COVID-19. At the same time, 53 the results of the study do not guarantee protection of those vaccinated from 54 subsequent infection with SARS-CoV-2, an asymptomatic course of the disease, which means that further participation of those vaccinated in the spread of the virus has yet to 55 56 be investigated. The emergence of new strains capable of partial or complete escape from the neutralizing effect of antibodies poses the most danger during prolonged mass 57 58 vaccination [10], [11], [12].

59 Detection of viral RNA does not always mean that a person is an infection carrier 60 and spreader. However, in the light of objective epidemic control, it is important to 61 specifically identify carriers of SARS-CoV-2. Timely and prompt identification of the 62 spreaders of infection and their isolation can improve the effectiveness of anti-epidemic 63 measures. Virus viability, as evaluated using cell culture, for samples with a viral load of 64 30 cycles (about 10<sup>5</sup>–10<sup>6</sup> GE/mL and below), in RT-PCR tests, is only 3% [13]. It is 65 obvious that the use of methods to assess virus viability using cell culture is unsuitable

for mass use due to the complexity of the procedure and the high cost. This requires thesearch for new simpler methods to identify the spread of the infection.

Rapid antigen tests, which have recently become widespread for the diagnosis of 68 COVID-19, in contrast to PCR, detect SARS-CoV-2 antigens, which, like RNA, comprise 69 viral particles and are produced in infected cells during the life cycle of the virus. The 70 71 disadvantage of antigen tests is their lower sensitivity compared to RT-PCR. According 72 to the results of Cochrane meta-analysis, sensitivity varies greatly: average sensitivity is 73 56.2% (95% CI, from 29.5 to 79.8%), average specificity is 99.5% (95% CI, from 98.1% to 99.9%; based on 8 experiments in 5 studies on 943 samples) [14]. At the same time, 74 the definitive advantage of rapid antigen tests is the significantly less laborious process 75 76 and the ease of learning the procedure, allowing to use the test at home as Point of 77 Care (POC) testing. The time it takes to obtain the result is also crucial, which can be as low as 5 minutes. Moreover, rapid antigen tests are not susceptible to contamination 78 79 with amplification products, characteristic of nucleic acid analysis methods, which reduces the likelihood of a false positive result. 80

81 To date, there are no data on the effectiveness of rapid antigen tests for identification of patients excreting viable SARS-CoV-2. In this paper, we describe 82 83 results of the pilot study of two rapid antigen tests BIOCREDIT COVID-19 Ag (RapiGEN Inc., Korea) and SGTI-flex COVID-19 Ag (Sugentech Inc., Korea) for their value in 84 85 identifying patients excreting viable SARS-CoV-2. As part of the study, we examined samples from 106 patients who had just been admitted to the hospital, who had 86 87 undergone two rapid tests: quantitative RT-PCR and viability assessment of SARS-CoV-2 using susceptible cell culture 293T/ACE2. Samples were collected from January 88 89 25, 2021 to February 8, 2021 at an infectious diseases hospital in Moscow.

#### 90 Results

#### 91 Study design

To investigate the ability of rapid antigen tests to identify patients who excrete viable SARS-CoV-2, it was planned to include primarily patients with suspected COVID-19 newly admitted to the hospital. Participants were admitted to the hospital on 2 to 10 days from the onset of symptoms. The main symptoms were fever, dry cough, chest

pain and discomfort, shortness of breath, loss of smell and taste. All included patients
had CT signs of lung damage. The study included 106 patients aged 28 to 95 years
(mean age 67.67), including 53 women (mean age 68.45) and 53 men (mean age
66.89) (Appendix Table 1).

100

# 101 Analytical characteristics of antigen tests compared to RT-PCR

102 Result of PCR tests of smears from 106 patients was positive in 73.58% patients (78 people). The viral load was determined for all positive samples (Appendix Tables 1, 103 2 and 3), which ranged from 88 to 3.5×10<sup>8</sup> GE/mL (median 4.6×10<sup>4</sup>). The SGTI-flex 104 COVID-19 Ag rapid test identified 41 of 78 positive samples. Sensitivity of SGTI-flex 105 106 COVID-19 Ag was 0.526 (95% confidence interval 0.409-0.6399), specificity was 0.964 107 (0.817–0.999) (Table 1). In turn, the Biocredit COVID-19 Ag rapid test identified 44 of 78 positive samples. For the Biocredit COVID-19 Ag test, sensitivity was 0.564 (0.447-108 0.676) and 1.000 (0.877-1.000), respectively. There was no significant differences 109 110 between the analytical characteristics of the tests (p = 0.8026, McNemar's test with 111 Edwards continuity correction).

# Table 1 – Assessment of sensitivity and specificity of rapid tests compared to RT PCR

SGTI-flex COVID-19 Ag			Biocredit COVID-19 Ag		
PCR result	negative	positive PCR r		negative	positive
negative	27	1	negative	28	0
positive	37	41	positive	34	44
Sensitivity	52.56%		Sensitivity	56.41%	
Specificity	96%		Specificity	100%	

114

For samples with a higher viral load, the sensitivity of tests was higher (Appendix Table 2) and starting from a viral load of 1.02E+05 (log10 = 5.0086) for SGTI-flex COVID-19 Ag and 4.74E+04 (log10 = 4.6758) for RapiGen Biocredit COVID-19 Ag, did not differ statistically from the results of PCR tests at a significance level of 0.01 (p =

0.01333, McNemar's test with Edwards continuity correction). P-value only increasedwith further increase in viral load.

121 To determine the analytical threshold of sensitivity with respect to the antigen in 122 virions of the culture fluid, we conducted a model experiment, when the culture fluid with 123 a known virus titer was used to assess the analytical sensitivity of rapid tests in the range from 10<sup>2</sup> to 10<sup>8</sup> GE/mL, using an interval of one order of magnitude. Both tests 124 125 showed the detection limit at a virus titer of 10<sup>6</sup> GE/mL (10<sup>5</sup> GE/test), which corresponded to 4×10<sup>5</sup> TCID50/mL or 4×10<sup>4</sup> TCID50/test. There was no statistically 126 127 significant difference in analytical characteristics depending on the day from the onset of 128 the disease (p-value = 0.2356 for SGTI-flex COVID-19 Ag, p-value = 0.8581 for 129 RapiGen Biocredit COVID-19 Ag with Fisher's exact test), which is not surprising given 130 that there were high-load patients on each day (Appendix Table 3).

### 131 Analytical characteristics of antigen tests for viability

All samples were evaluated for viability of SARS-CoV-2 virus using a sensitive cell culture. Viability was assessed using the 293T/ACE2 cell line with stable expression of the human ACE2 receptor. For samples with a cytopathogenic effect (CPE), RT-PCR was performed to confirm that the CPE was caused by SARS-CoV-2 and not by other infectious agents. Comparison of groups of samples with viable and non-viable viral load measured by quantitative PCR showed a significant difference (p<0.0001, p-value calculated using the Mann–Whitney test) (Fig. 1).



139

Figure 1. SARS-CoV-2 viral load in viable versus non-viable samples. Results are
 represented by a box plot: horizontal lines – medians; boxes – interquartile range;
 whiskers – min-max (p-value calculated using Mann–Whitney test)

Viability was shown only by samples with a viral load of  $7.3 \times 10^4$  (GE/mL) and higher (Fig. 1 and Table 2). However, not all samples with such a load remained viable. Rapid tests were able to give a positive result on samples with median values of  $5.72 \times 10^4$  and  $3.78 \times 10^4$  (GE/mL) for Biocredit COVID-19 Ag and SGTI-flex COVID-19 Ag, respectively. However, a positive result was also obtained for a number of samples with a load below  $10^4$  (GE/mL). It is not clear whether this is related to how the material

- 149 was collected for three different tests or the presence in some biological samples of a
- 150 disproportionate amount of antigen in relation to viral RNA.

Viral load (GE/mL)							
quantitative real-time RT-PCR							
value	Number of positive tests	Viral load (mean)	range	median			
Successful isolation	14	4.71×10 <sup>7</sup>	7.30×10⁴ – 3.50×10 <sup>8</sup>	1.03×10 <sup>6</sup>			
Unsuccessful isolation	الا 64 8.93×10⁵		89.00–2.56×10 <sup>7</sup>	2.26×10 <sup>4</sup>			
BIOCREDIT COVID-19 Ag							
Successful isolation	14 4.71×10 <sup>7</sup>		7.30×10⁴ – 3.50×10 <sup>8</sup>	1.03×10 <sup>6</sup>			
Unsuccessful isolation	30	1.87×10 <sup>6</sup>	89.00–2.56×10 <sup>7</sup>	5.72×10⁴			
RT-PCR "+", antigen test "- "	34	2.87×10 <sup>4</sup>	1.77×10² – 1.46×10⁵	9.85×10 <sup>3</sup>			
SGTI-flex COVID-19 Ag							
Successful isolation	11 5.97×10 <sup>7</sup>		7.30×10 <sup>4</sup> – 3.50×10 <sup>8</sup>	1.09×10 <sup>6</sup>			
Unsuccessful isolation	Insuccessful 30 1.40×10 <sup>6</sup> solation 37 4.87×10 <sup>5</sup> AT-PCR "+", 37 4.87×10 <sup>5</sup>		89.00–2.56×10 <sup>7</sup>	3.78×10 <sup>4</sup>			
RT-PCR "+", antigen test "- "			1.77×10 <sup>2</sup> – 1.31×10 <sup>7</sup>	1.87×10⁴			

# 151 Table 2 – Viral load (GE/mL) depending on viability and rapid test result

153 Overall, out of 106 samples, viable virus was detected in 14 patients, 154 representing 13.2% of all participants. Using these samples, SGTI-flex COVID-19 Ag 155 gave 11 (78.6%) positive results, while Biocredit COVID-19 Ag gave 14 (100%) positive 156 results (Table 3). As a result, the sensitivity of antigen tests was 0.786 (0.492–0.953) for 157 SGTI-flex COVID-19 Ag and 1 (0.768-1) for Biocredit COVID-19 Ag. Specificity was 0.663 (0.557-0.758) and 0.674 (0.568-0.768) for SGTI-flex COVID-19 Ag and Biocredit 158 159 COVID-19 Ag, respectively. For RT-PCR, the sensitivity was 1 (0.768-1), while the 160 specificity was 0.304 (0.213-0.409).

		SGTI-flex COVID-19 Ag		Biocredit COVID-19 Ag		quantitative real-time RT-PCR	
		Positive	Negative	Positive	Negative	Positive	Negative
-	Viable virus	11	3	14	0	14	0
	No viable virus	31	61	30	62	64	28
		Sensitivity 0.786 (0.492– 0.953)	Specificit y 0.663 (0.557– 0.758)	Sensitivity 1 (0.768– 1)	Specificit y 0.674 (0.568– 0.768)	Sensitivity 1 (0.768– 1)	Specificit y 0.304 (0.213– 0.409)

161 Table 3 – Assessment of sensitivity and specificity of rapid tests for viability

162

163 Comparing analytical characteristics of the tests for viability of the virus, it can be 164 observed that the rapid tests are indistinguishable from each other (p-value = 0.4533, 165 McNemar's test with Edwards continuity correction), but they differ significantly from RT-166 PCR (p-value = 2.546e-06 for SGTI-flex COVID-19 Ag, p-value = 1.519e-08 for 167 Biocredit COVID-19 Ag, McNemar test with Edwards continuity correction).

As the viral load increased, the sensitivity of the tests for viral viability increased and, starting from a viral load of 6.27E+04 (log10 = 4.7973) for SGTI-flex COVID-19 Ag and 5.11E+05 (log10 = 5.7084) for RapiGen Biocredit COVID-19 Ag, did not statistically significantly differ from the possibility of successful isolation of a viable virus at a significance level of 0.01 (p = 0.01529 and p = 0.01333, respectively).

There were no statistical differences in the analytical characteristics of rapid tests depending on the day of the disease (p-value = 0.5292 for SGTI-flex COVID-19 Ag, 0.4108 for RapiGen Biocredit COVID-19 Ag using Fisher's exact test). At the same time, the number of cases of successful isolation of a viable virus also did not statistically differ at different time intervals of the disease, which is probably due to the limited follow-up period and the use of only one sample from each patient.

#### 179 Discussion

Prompt identification of carriers of the viable SARS-CoV-2 virus and their timely isolation from the society is the most important step in containing a pandemic. Mass screening, in turn, is limited by access of the population to laboratory testing, which in the case of PCR is limited by the capabilities of laboratories. In this regard, many states are adopting new approaches, whereby samples are pooled to increase the amount of PCR tests [15], [16], [17], [18].

186 An alternative to using PCR laboratories is to use rapid antigen tests, including 187 for home use. In December 2020, the FDA for the first time authorized home use of an 188 antigen test to detect the virus [19]. There is no doubt that moving in this direction can 189 significantly improve access to testing. Evaluation of cost-effectiveness of mass 190 screening shows that in the case of, for example, the USA, the most optimal strategy is 191 weekly testing and two-week isolation of the infected person or monthly testing with 192 weekly isolation for scenarios of rapid (Re = 2.2) and slow (Re = 1.2) epidemic, 193 respectively [20]. The important point is that the use of antigen tests can significantly 194 increase the effectiveness of regular mass testing.

195 Recommendations regarding self-isolation and lockdown deserve special 196 attention. The existing WHO recommendations prescribe to revoke termination of 197 isolation for patients with manifest forms 13 days after the onset of symptoms, provided 198 that in the last 3 days the person did not experience any characteristic symptoms of the 199 disease, as well as 10 days after a positive PCR result for asymptomatic cases [21]. 200 Those who have come into contact with a person with a confirmed diagnosis of COVID-

201 19 are also prescribed a 14-day guarantine, however testing during the guarantine or 202 upon its termination is not mandatory. Currently such a strategy is subject to serious 203 scientific criticism [22], [23]. Re-testing at the beginning of quarantine and upon its 204 termination, but with a shorter time spent in isolation, as well as daily testing instead of 205 quarantine, according to the results of a mathematical model, can be more effective in 206 protecting against the spread of the infection after the guarantine is over. An additional 207 benefit of a shorter quarantine is that the person returns to work faster, which reduces 208 the economic damage of the pandemic lock down. It is worth noting that for the 209 purposes of mathematical modeling, a patient with a positive test result is considered 210 potentially infectious to others. In this connection, using tests that improve the accuracy 211 of the evaluation of the number of persons excreting the virus will allow to further 212 improve the effectiveness of monitoring.

213 WHO notes that studies to evaluate the viability of the virus in patient samples 214 are currently very limited. Viable virus was excreting in persons without symptoms, in 215 patients with mild to moderate course of COVID-19 for 8-9 days after the onset of 216 symptoms, and for a longer time period in critical patients [21]. However, a meta-217 analysis of the results of isolation of RNA and the viable virus extraction shows that 218 although SARS-CoV-2 RNA is excreted for several weeks, viable virus is not detected 219 already after 9 days [24]. Thus, given the significant difference in the dynamics of 220 isolation of RNA and the viable virus, there is now the need to look for tests that allow to 221 identify persons who excrete viable virus while minimizing the likelihood of a false-222 positive result in patients who no longer excrete viable virus. This will minimize the 223 amount of persons guarantined, reducing the negative economic damage of the 224 pandemic. It also allows epidemiological services to focus on patients who are the real 225 sources of infection spread. In this study, we investigated the value of antigen tests for 226 identifying carriers of a viable virus.

We examined samples from 106 patients admitted to a hospital in Moscow. The study included only those patients who had experienced first symptoms no earlier than 10 days before. All samples, in addition to being used for the two tests, were also used for quantitative PCR and assessment of viral viability using cell culture. Of 106 samples, 78 (73.58%) were PCR-positive. This is significantly higher than previously published

data with similar clinical setting [25]. This is probably due to a difference in design, as
for the purposes of this study, we searched for patients who had just been admitted to
the hospital, while the other studies did not make such a distinction [26], [27], [28].

235 Data of quantitative PCR are of particular interest. The viral load was determined 236 for all PCR-positive samples and it was found that it varied greatly, from 88 to 3.5×10<sup>8</sup> 237 GE/mL (median 4.6×10<sup>4</sup>). In terms of viral load, samples that showed viability were 238 significantly different from the rest (p<0.0001, the p-value was calculated using the 239 Mann–Whitney test). For all 14 samples that showed viability, the viral load was at least 7.3×10<sup>4</sup> (GE/mL). And although not all samples with a similar load or higher showed 240 241 viability, it is important that a cut-off quantitative threshold, after which the probability of the virus remaining viable is greatly reduced, can be established experimentally. 242

243 Standard evaluation of analytical characteristics of rapid tests showed that, relative to RT-PCR, their diagnostic characteristics were close to the mean values 244 245 published for the Cochrane meta-analysis [14]. For the SGTI-flex COVID-19 Ag test, 246 sensitivity was 0.526 (95% confidence interval 0.409-0.6399), specificity was 0.964 247 (0.817–0.999). For the Biocredit COVID-19 Ag test, sensitivity and specificity were 0.564 (0.447–0.676) and 1.000 (0.877–1.000), respectively. No significant differences 248 249 were found between tests (p = 0.8026). Analysis of the value of tests to detect samples containing viable virus showed that both tests are highly sensitive. Sensitivity was 0.786 250 251 (0.512–0.942) and 1 (0.755-1) for SGTI-flex COVID-19 Ag and Biocredit COVID-19 Ag. 252 The control method (RT-PCR) had sensitivity of 1 (0.886–1). In turn, specificity of rapid 253 tests was significantly higher than that of RT-PCR and was 0.663 (0.557-0.758) and 254 0.674 (0.568–0.768) for SGTI-flex COVID-19 Ag and Biocredit COVID-19 Ag versus 255 0.304 (0.213-0.409) obtained for PCR. Statistically, the results of the antigen tests used 256 in the study are indistinguishable from each other (p-value = 0.4533), but differ 257 significantly from RT-PCR (p-value = 2.546e-06 for SGTI-flex COVID-19 Ag, p-value = 1.519e-08 for Biocredit COVID-19 Ag). This means that rapid tests have significantly 258 259 better results for the task of identifying viable SARS-CoV-2.

We are not aware of any other studies that analyze the value of antigen tests to identify patients who excrete viable virus. Results obtained in this study require confirmation using more samples from patients who excrete viable virus. In this study,

there were 14 samples that showed viability. It appears important to investigate to what extent the results of this study will correlate with data obtained on samples from asymptomatic patients. It is known that such patients contribute significantly to the transmission of the virus, which in the context of our study means a higher viral load and, consequently, virus viability of these patients. Further investigation will clarify this issue and help to understand the value of antigen tests for the widespread detection of infectious agents in the context of the COVDI-19 pandemic.

#### 270 Conclusion

This article presents the results of a study on the value of rapid antigen tests to identify patients who excrete viable SARS-CoV-2. With a comparable effectiveness of detection of patients excreting a viable virus, antigen tests, relative to RT-PCR, showed significantly fewer false-positive results on patient samples that no longer excrete a viable virus, and therefore are safe for others. This suggests that practical use of antigen tests can lead to shorter isolation time and quarantine of people who are safe for general public.

278 Undoubtedly, a direct comparison of the analytical characteristics of RT-PCR 279 with antigen tests is not entirely correct, since the sensitivity of RT-PCR significantly 280 exceeds the sensitivity of antigen tests, however, to identify patients excreting a viable virus, the value of antigen tests, according to the result we obtained, is higher. It is 281 282 important to note that antigen testing does not require sophisticated equipment, trained personnel and complex quality control systems, which means that the widespread use 283 284 of antigen tests for mass screening and detection of persons excreting the virus among 285 conditionally healthy people is potentially of great value.

#### 286 Materials and methods

#### 287 Patients

The study included patients with suspected COVID-19 admitted to the hospital on day 289 2–10 from the onset of symptoms (fever, dry cough, chest pain and discomfort, 290 shortness of breath, loss of smell and taste) and with CT signs of lung damage. Study 291 was approved by the Local ethic committee of the Moscow First Infectious Diseases

Hospital (the Protocol #2 dated 2021-01-22). All participants signed the written informed consent to allow usage of nasal swab samples for research purposes.

The study included a total of 106 patients aged 28 to 95 years (mean age 67.67) including 53 women (mean age 68.45) and 53 men (mean age 66.89).

## 296 Sample collection and transportation

Using sterile swabs and observing the necessary safety precautions, nurses of the hospital collected three nasopharyngeal samples from each patient, two of which were used for antigen testing. The third sample was transferred to tubes with 1 mL of phosphate buffered saline (PBS). All collected materials were transferred to the reference center for coronavirus infection of the Gamaleya Research Institute of Epidemiology and Microbiology of the Ministry of Health of Russia cooled down to +4 degrees Celsius within 2 hours after collection.

## 304 Antigen testing

Antigen testing was done immediately after sample collection in accordance with the manufacturer's instructions directly at the patient's bedside. Testing was done using two commercially available rapid tests for the detection of SARS-CoV-2 antigen – BIOCREDIT COVID-19 Ag (RapiGEN Inc., Korea) and SGTI-flex COVID-19 Ag (Sugentech Inc., Korea).

## 310 SARS-CoV-2 testing

311 All collected samples were tested immediately after transportation. PCR amplification 312 was carried out using a one-step "SARS-CoV-2 FRT" commercial kit with catalog 313 number EA-128 (bought from N.F. Gamaleya NRCEM, Moscow, Russia). According to 314 manufacturer's information "SARS-CoV-2 FRT" kit allows to amplify a fragment from the 315 5' end region encoding the NSP1 gene (aprox. 450 to 650 nt bases upstream the 5' end 316 of SARS-CoV-2 viral genome). The protocol for gPCR-RT used in this study had been 317 described previously [29]. Briefly the conditions of the one-step RT-qPCR reaction were 318 as follows: 50°C for 15 min, 95°C for 5 min, followed by 45 cycles of 95°C for 10 s and 319 55°C for 1 min. The number of copies of viral RNA was calculated using a standard 320 curve generated by amplification of plasmid cloned DNA template fragment encoding 450 to 650 nt bases upstream the 5' end of SARS-CoV-2 viral genome. 321

## 322 Virus isolation

Isolation of the SARS-CoV-2 virus was performed using 293T/ACE2 cell line (with
stable expression of the human ACE2 receptor). Cells were cultured in DMEM medium
(PanEco, Russia) containing 10% FBS (HyClone, USA), 1% L-glutamine, and 1%

penicillin/streptomycin. 96-well plate was used for the experiment. For this, nasopharyngeal secretion (100  $\mu$ L) from COVID-19 patients was added to tablets. Plates were incubated for 5 days. Virus-induced cytopathic effect (CPE) was then assessed. Also, for samples with CPE, real-time PCR was performed to confirm that CPE was caused by SARS-CoV-2 and not by other infectious agents that can cause CPE.

# 332 Statistical treatment of results

All data were statistically treated using the methods available in different R packages. McNemar's test with Edwards continual correction was used to compare the two different tests. Fisher's exact test was used to analyze unrelated qualitative data. Quantitative indicators were checked for normal distribution using the Shapiro–Wilk test. Quantitative comparison of groups was done using the Mann–Whitney test. Confidence intervals for specificity and sensitivity, as well as confidence intervals for proportions, were calculated using binomial distribution with the help of Clopper–Pearson method.

## 340 Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare no conflicts of interest. The authors: E.V.S., N.A.K., E.V.D., M.A.N., A.E.S., D.A.O., M.A.S., A.P.T., O.A.B., V.A.G. had been supported by the Ministry of Health of the Russian Federation, Government assignment number AAAA-A20-120113090054-6.

345

# 346 **Reference**

- Chu DK, Akl EA, Duda S, Solo K, Yaacoub S, Schünemann HJ, et al. Physical distancing, face masks, and eye protection to prevent person-to-person transmission of SARS-CoV-2 and COVID-19: a systematic review and metaanalysis. Lancet. 2020;395: 1973–1987.
- BBC News. Coronavirus "could cost global economy \$8.8tn" says ADB. In: BBC
   News [Internet]. 15 May 2020 [cited 24 Feb 2021]. Available:
   https://www.bbc.com/news/business-52671992
- Imam N, Zaidi S, Chakraborty AR. Transmission, Prevention, and Risk Factors of COVID-19 - in BREAKING DOWN COVID-19. A Living Textbook. Publication of First Medicine and Global Clinical Carey Kriz, Naiyer Imam, Sarah Zaidi (Eds.)
   Partners.2020; p.25-36.
- 4. He X, Lau EHY, Wu P, Deng X, Wang J, Hao X, et al. Temporal dynamics in viral shedding and transmissibility of COVID-19. Nat Med. 2020;26: 672–675.

- Li R, Pei S, Chen B, Song Y, Zhang T, Yang W, et al. Substantial undocumented
  infection facilitates the rapid dissemination of novel coronavirus (SARS-CoV-2).
  Science. 2020. pp. 489–493. doi:10.1126/science.abb3221
- Baden LR, El Sahly HM, Essink B, Kotloff K, Frey S, Novak R, et al. Efficacy and
   Safety of the mRNA-1273 SARS-CoV-2 Vaccine. N Engl J Med. 2021;384: 403–
   416.
- Polack FP, Thomas SJ, Kitchin N, Absalon J, Gurtman A, Lockhart S, et al. Safety
   and Efficacy of the BNT162b2 mRNA Covid-19 Vaccine. N Engl J Med. 2020;383:
   2603–2615.
- Voysey M, Clemens SAC, Madhi SA, Weckx LY, Folegatti PM, Aley PK, et al.
   Safety and efficacy of the ChAdOx1 nCoV-19 vaccine (AZD1222) against SARS CoV-2: an interim analysis of four randomised controlled trials in Brazil, South
   Africa, and the UK. Lancet. 2021;397: 99–111.
- Logunov DY, Dolzhikova IV, Shcheblyakov DV, Tukhvatulin AI, et al. Safety and efficacy of an rAd26 and rAd5 vector-based heterologous prime-boost COVID-19 vaccine: an interim analysis of a randomised controlled phase 3 trial in Russia.
   Lancet. 2021;397: 671–681.
- Xie X, Liu Y, Liu J, Zhang X, Zou J, Fontes-Garfias CR, et al. Neutralization of
   SARS-CoV-2 spike 69/70 deletion, E484K, and N501Y variants by BNT162b2
   vaccine-elicited sera. doi:10.1101/2021.01.27.427998
- Muik A, Wallisch A-K, Sänger B, Swanson KA, Mühl J, Chen W, et al.
  Neutralization of SARS-CoV-2 lineage B.1.1.7 pseudovirus by BNT162b2 vaccineelicited human sera. Science. 2021. doi:10.1126/science.abg6105
- Hoffmann M, Arora P, Groß R, Seidel A, Hörnich B, Hahn A, et al. SARS-CoV-2
  variants B.1.351 and B.1.1.248: Escape from therapeutic antibodies and antibodies
  induced by infection and vaccination. doi:10.1101/2021.02.11.430787
- Jefferson T, Spencer EA, Brassey J, Heneghan C. Viral cultures for COVID-19
   infectivity assessment a systematic review (Update 4).
   doi:10.1101/2020.08.04.20167932
- 14. Dinnes J, Deeks JJ, Adriano A, Berhane S, Davenport C, Dittrich S, et al. Rapid,
   point-of-care antigen and molecular-based tests for diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2
   infection. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2020;8: CD013705.
- 15. Christoff AP, Cruz GNF, Sereia AFR, Boberg DR, de Bastiani DC, Yamanaka LE,
  et al. Swab pooling: A new method for large-scale RT-qPCR screening of SARSCoV-2 avoiding sample dilution. PLoS One. 2021;16: e0246544.
- 16. Lohse S, Pfuhl T, Berkó-Göttel B, Rissland J, Geißler T, Gärtner B, et al. Pooling of
   samples for testing for SARS-CoV-2 in asymptomatic people. Lancet Infect Dis.

- 397 2020;20: 1231–1232.
- 17. Deka S, Kalita D, Mangla A, Shankar R. Analysis of Multi-Sample Pools in the
   Detection of SARS-CoV-2 RNA for Mass Screening: An Indian Perspective. Indian
   J Med Microbiol. 2020;38: 451–456.
- 401 18. Barak N, Ben-Ami R, Sido T, Perri A, Shtoyer A, Rivkin M, et al. Lessons from
  402 applied large-scale pooling of 133,816 SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR tests. Science
  403 Translational Medicine. 2021. p. eabf2823. doi:10.1126/scitranslmed.abf2823
- 404 19. Website. [cited 24 Feb 2021]. Available: [https://www.npr.org/sections/health 405 shots/2020/12/15/946692950/fda-authorizes-first-home-coronavirus-test-that 406 doesnt-require-a-prescription
- 20. Du Z, Pandey A, Bai Y, Fitzpatrick MC, Chinazzi M, Pastore Y Piontti A, et al.
  Comparative cost-effectiveness of SARS-CoV-2 testing strategies in the USA: a
  modelling study. Lancet Public Health. 2021. doi:10.1016/S2468-2667(21)00002-5
- 410 21. Criteria for releasing COVID-19 patients from isolation. [cited 24 Feb 2021].
   411 Available: https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/criteria-for-releasing-covid-19 412 patients-from-isolation
- 413 22. Wells CR, Townsend JP, Pandey A, Moghadas SM, Krieger G, Singer B, et al.
  414 Optimal COVID-19 quarantine and testing strategies.
  415 doi:10.1101/2020.10.27.20211631
- 416 23. Quilty BJ, Clifford S, Flasche S, Kucharski AJ, John Edmunds W, CMMID COVID417 19 Working Group. Quarantine and testing strategies in contact tracing for SARS418 CoV-2. doi:10.1101/2020.08.21.20177808
- 24. Cevik M, Tate M, Lloyd O, Maraolo AE, Schafers J, Ho A. SARS-CoV-2, SARS-CoV, and MERS-CoV viral load dynamics, duration of viral shedding, and
  infectiousness: a systematic review and meta-analysis. The Lancet Microbe. 2021.
  pp. e13–e22. doi:10.1016/s2666-5247(20)30172-5
- 423 25. Munblit D, Nekliudov NA, Bugaeva P, Blyuss O, Kislova M, Listovskaya E, et al.
  424 StopCOVID cohort: An observational study of 3,480 patients admitted to the
  425 Sechenov University hospital network in Moscow city for suspected COVID-19
  426 infection. Clin Infect Dis. 2020. doi:10.1093/cid/ciaa1535
- 427 26. Kucirka LM, Lauer SA, Laeyendecker O, Boon D, Lessler J. Variation in False428 Negative Rate of Reverse Transcriptase Polymerase Chain Reaction-Based SARS429 CoV-2 Tests by Time Since Exposure. Ann Intern Med 2020
- 430 27. Tahamtan A, Ardebili A. Real-time RT-PCR in COVID-19 detection: issues affecting
  431 the results. Expert Rev Mol Diagn 2020; 20(5): 453-4.
- 432 28. Woloshin S, Patel N, Kesselheim AS. False Negative Tests for SARS-CoV-2

- 433 Infection Challenges and Implications. N Engl J Med 2020.
- 434 29. Pochtovyi, A.A., Bacalin, V.V., Kuznetsova, N.A., Nikiforova, M.A., Shidlovskaya,
  435 E.V., Verdiev, B.I., Milashenko, E.N., Shchetinin, A.M., Burgasova, O.A.,
- 436 Kolobukhina, L.V., Smetanina, S.V., Tkachuk, A.P., Gushchin, V.A., Gintsburg, A.L.
- 437 (2021). SARS-CoV-2 Aerosol and Surface Contamination in Health Care Settings:
- 438 The Moscow Pilot Study. Aerosol Air Qual. Res. 21, 200604.
- 439 https://doi.org/10.4209/aagr.200604

