

Rapid antigen tests and COVID-19: What they can and cannot do.

Jitka Polechová¹, Kory D. Johnson², Pavel Payne³, Alex Crozier⁴, Mathias Beiglböck¹, Pavel Plevka³, Eva Schernhammer⁵

¹Department of Mathematics, University of Vienna, Austria

²Institute for Statistics and Mathematics, Vienna University of Economics and Business, Austria

³CEITEC, Masaryk University, Brno, Czech Republic

⁴Division of Biosciences, University College London, London, UK

⁵Division of Epidemiology, Center for Public Health, Medical University of Vienna, Austria

Correspondence: Jitka Polechová, jitka@univie.ac.at

Contributions: JP and KJ contributed equally.

Abstract: Rapid antigen tests detect proteins at the surface of virus particles, identifying the disease during its infectious phase. In contrast, PCR tests detect RNA genomes and sometimes react to a COVID-19 infection before the infectious phase but also to remnants of the virus genome, even weeks after virus replication has ended. Furthermore, the logistics for administering the tests are different. In this article, we discuss relative advantages of the different testing procedures and summarise evidence that shows that using antigen tests 2-3 times per week could become a powerful tool to suppress the COVID-19 epidemic. We also discuss the results of recent large-scale rapid antigen testing in Austrian schools.

Abstract in German: Antigen-Schnelltests weisen Proteine an der Oberfläche von Viruspartikeln nach und identifizieren die Krankheit während ihrer infektiösen Phase. Im Gegensatz dazu weisen PCR-Tests RNA-Moleküle nach und entdecken damit eine COVID-19-Infektion manchmal schon vor der infektiösen Phase, reagieren aber selbst Wochen nach Ende der Virusreplikation noch auf Reste des Virusgenoms. Außerdem ist die Logistik für die Durchführung der Tests unterschiedlich. In diesem Artikel diskutieren wir die relativen Vorteile der verschiedenen Testverfahren und fassen Belege zusammen, die zeigen, dass die Verwendung von Antigentests 2-3 Mal pro Woche zu einem wirksamen Instrument zur Unterdrückung der COVID-19-Epidemie werden könnte. Wir setzen die Sensitivität der Antigentests in Beziehung zu den Ergebnissen der Massentests in österreichischen Schulen.

Rapid SARS-CoV-2 antigen tests are now widely available and have been provided free of charge for home-testing in Austria since March 1, 2021. We focus specifically on their comparison to PCR tests, which are the gold standard for diagnosing COVID-19. In contrast to PCR testing, the widespread and frequent use of rapid antigen tests holds the potential to identify COVID-19 cases when they are infectious. This may improve pandemic control by lowering the transmission rate and the effective reproduction number. This potential can only be fully realized if these tests are used effectively and if the public fully understands both their capabilities and their limitations. A particularly important factor is that even when used in a supervised manner, rapid antigen tests are less sensitive than PCR tests. The results and discussion presented below focus on the base SARS-CoV-2 strain, dominant in 2020. The main points are applicable to new variants as well, though some of their parameters differ (for example, preliminary evidence suggests that for the faster spreading variant B.1.1.7 [1], the infectious phase may be slightly longer and the viral load higher [2,3].)

In general, a virus can be detected by looking for its genetic material (DNA or RNA) or by detecting viral antigens which are present at the surface of the virus. As opposed to antibody tests, which detect antibodies from previous infection, antigen tests are used to detect people who are currently infected – and infectious. A few dozen to a hundred virus particles are sufficient for a rapid antigen test to detect SARS-CoV-2 [4]. Antigen tests are now readily available to the public and can provide results within 15 minutes. Therefore, they are a useful tool for rapidly identifying and isolating positive, infectious cases in order to reduce further transmissions. In contrast, a PCR test can detect the virus at even lower concentrations, as the PCR cyler multiplies the viral genetic material, but the execution of a PCR test, from sample collection to delivery of the results, is time consuming. The resulting delay in obtaining the result of a PCR-test may enable further transmissions.




Figure 1. Despite having lower diagnostic sensitivity, rapid antigen tests identify the vast majority of infectious cases. Frequent testing is essential to identify these cases early and to efficiently limit the spread of the virus in the population. Figure modified from [5] with permission; viral load is shown on a logarithmic scale.

Within the first two to three days after infection with SARS-CoV-2, neither PCR nor rapid antigen tests can detect the virus (Figure 1), as its concentration is too low [6]. During the subsequent steep rise in virus concentration, a PCR test may detect infection a little earlier than a rapid antigen test. This period, however, is short, lasting around a day or even less [7]. It is primarily within this 24-hour period that PCR tests provide additional benefit

compared to antigen tests for the purpose of reducing further transmissions. While detecting infections early is key, the benefit of a PCR-test to detect cases at a lower viral load (earlier in the infection) is negated by the significantly longer turnaround time of the PCR-test result. In specialized settings such as hospitals, it is possible for an urgent PCR test to be returned in a few hours, but in general practice, it takes about a day or even longer.

As the viral load increases and the person becomes infectious, the rapid antigen test will start detecting the virus. This “infectious period” is shown in orange in Figure 1 and usually lasts 5 to 8 days. Typically, SARS-CoV-2 concentration in the upper respiratory tract peaks within a week after infection [8,9], which is when the vast majority of new infections occur [10,11]. This short period of infectivity explains why a high frequency of testing is essential for suppressing the spread of COVID-19: testing less frequently than once per week has little effect on new infections as most cases will be detected too late. In the last phase of disease progression (day 10 through 25), the load of live virus gradually diminishes and the concentration of viral RNA declines. Without any live virus, a person is no longer infectious and the antigen test will be negative. In contrast, PCR tests may produce positive results even when infectious particles are no longer present, because viral RNA remains in the respiratory tract at detectable levels. This post-infectious phase is shown in purple in Figure 1; the duration of the post-infectious phase is longer among those with severe infections and somewhat shorter among asymptomatic individuals [9,12,13].

The sensitivity of a test is defined as its ability to detect infection by a virus, and PCR remains the gold standard for diagnosing a COVID-19 infection. To suppress an epidemic, however, the ability to detect and isolate an infectious person before they infect others is decisive: timing is paramount. Identifying a case in the post-infectious phase is important for diagnosis, but not from a public health perspective, i.e. for preventing secondary infections. Importantly, the infectious phase (orange in Figure 1) is considerably shorter than the overall time during which a PCR test can detect viral RNA in an infected person. Studying clusters of infections enables estimation of viral loads of individuals transmitting SARS-CoV-2, and indicates that self-administered rapid antigen tests can detect 84-91% of those cases which cause secondary infections [10,11]. By identifying cases early, rapid antigen tests can prevent the vast majority of subsequent infections.

In particular, it has been reported that over 80% of new infections are caused by fewer than 20% of cases [14–16]. Such so-called ‘superspreading’ is caused by ‘superspreaders’ who have both a large number of contacts and often a higher viral load. These cases are more easily identified using rapid antigen tests, and identifying them early would yield a large reduction in further transmissions. As such, there is additional benefit in testing people with many contacts even more frequently.

The mode of sampling may impact the sensitivity of both PCR and rapid antigen tests, e.g., nasopharyngeal sample collection versus gargle tests or anterior nasal swabs. Evidence suggests that the effect of sampling on the detection of infectious individuals is minimal. A German study found that out of 30 individuals with high viral loads (more than 10 million of viral RNA per swab; CT < 25) all were correctly identified through rapid antigen tests with professionally administered nasopharyngeal swab, and 29 were identified through rapid antigen tests with self-performed anterior nasal swab [17]. The authors also concluded that “supervised self-sampling from the anterior nose is a reliable alternative to professional nasopharyngeal sampling using a WHO-listed SARS-CoV-2 [rapid antigen test]”. Given the

ease-of-use of rapid antigen tests, self-sampling and self-testing at home or at work may be a helpful approach to better control the pandemic. Larremore et al. [7] indicate that if half of the population would self-test every 3 days with a rapid antigen test and isolate in the case of a positive result, we could achieve approximately a 40% reduction of the effective reproduction number R . For example, an R of 1.3 could be reduced to 0.8, and the epidemic would dissipate.

In order to interpret the outcome of wide scale antigen testing, it is helpful to have a rough estimate for how many positive cases one expects to find. We consider testing a randomly selected person from the general population whose infection status is unknown but who is currently not in quarantine, i.e., a person who does not suspect to be infected at the time of testing. What is the approximate probability that their rapid antigen test will be positive? Bearing in mind that we only aim to understand the order of magnitude of antigen-detectable cases, multiple lines of reasoning suggest that it is very low. First, a detailed epidemiological model fitted to Austrian data on February 15, 2021 estimates that 0.09% of the population is infected but not in quarantine [18]. Second, a back-of-the-envelope calculation arrives at a similar conclusion. Assume that there are around 1,500 new cases reported per day (as observed for much of February in Austria) and that there is a case detection rate of 50% [19]. In this scenario, 1,500 people become infectious every day and do not quarantine. Assuming that they are infectious for a week (in line with Figure 1), this results in around 10,000 undetected infectious individuals in Austria – i.e., cases which can be detected via an antigen test. Since the population of Austria is 8.9 million, the probability that a person in Austria tests positive via an antigen test is therefore approximately 0.1% under the given scenario.¹

Upon reopening schools in February 2021 after a prolonged lockdown, Austria started mass rapid antigen testing of all school children twice a week. Tests were conducted every Monday and Wednesday using the Lepu Medical antigen test, which uses an anterior nasal swab. The first week of school antigen testing resulted in 198 positives among 470,000 tests conducted in Vienna and Lower Austria (in the week February 8 to 12, 2021), yielding a positivity rate of 0.04% [20]. Among these, more than 75% were subsequently confirmed positive using a PCR-test (suggesting a rather high specificity of 99.99%). In the second week, the number of positive tests in Vienna and Lower Austria was substantially higher with 353 positives, yielding a positivity rate of 0.075%. The third and final week of available data resulted in 445 positives [21]. Austria's Minister of Education Heinz Faßmann offered as a possible explanation that the quality of swab taking had improved from the first to second round. It is also possible that COVID-19 incidence is lower in pupils than in the general population, especially after a lockdown. In young children between 5 to 10 years old, COVID-19 incidence is reported to be about half of that of the general population [22]. That being said, the incidence among 5-15 year olds in Austria has been steadily rising in recent weeks. Similarly, it is conceivable that school children stay infectious - and hence antigen-test positive - for a shorter period of time than adults. This would also lower the estimate of expected proportion of positive rapid antigen tests for this group compared to that given above.

¹ This calculation has been simplified by ignoring errors that are hard to quantify and have countervailing effects. For example, many people will be infectious for some days before they learn of their status, and others might never be detected but still quarantine themselves because they are a close contact of somebody who has been detected or because they have symptoms.

Additional PCR testing in Austrian schools should help to quantify the ability of self-administered antigen tests to identify infectious and pre-infectious cases. For example, the ‘Gurgelstudie’ [gargling trial] [23] is set to resume in March 2021. While self-administered antigen tests enable the prevention of the majority of future infections [10], there is a small fraction of infectious adults which are not detected using self administered tests [4,17,24], and this may occur more often for children. Using gargling PCR tests in all schools in Austria would likely detect some additional COVID-19 cases compared to antigen tests, a fraction of which would potentially be in the important pre-infectious phase. Unfortunately, the current capacity of PCR testing and sampling-to-result delay limits the applicability of wide-spread PCR testing for controlling the pandemic.

Michael Mina, a professor of epidemiology from Harvard School of Public Health, has been advocating the use of rapid antigen tests as a public-health tool since last summer [7,12,25,26]. On average, a recent antigen test (self-administered or not), is a better indicator of infectiousness than a test that is several days old, regardless of the type of test [17,24]. Inevitably, some people will swab incorrectly, leading to false negative results, and even professionally administered antigen tests can miss cases with low viral loads that are on the cusp of becoming infectious. As such, rapid antigen tests must not encourage reckless behavior, but rather enable people to lower their risk of infecting others by testing at least twice per week. Having longer gaps between tests decreases the potential benefit for reducing transmissions [7]. In conclusion, testing frequently, even with self-administered tests, can be a powerful tool to suppress the COVID-19 epidemic.

References:

1. Davies NG, Abbott S, Barnard RC, Jarvis CI, Kucharski AJ, Munday JD, et al. Estimated transmissibility and impact of SARS-CoV-2 lineage B.1.1.7 in England. *Science* [Internet]. American Association for the Advancement of Science; 2021 [cited 2021 Mar 4]; Available from: <https://science.sciencemag.org/content/early/2021/03/03/science.abg3055>
2. Kissler S, Fauver JR, Mack C, Tai CG, Breban MI, Watkins AE, et al. Densely sampled viral trajectories suggest longer duration of acute infection with B.1.1.7 variant relative to non-B.1.1.7 SARS-CoV-2. 2021 [cited 2021 Mar 4]; Available from: <https://nrs.harvard.edu/URN-3:HUL.INSTREPOS:37366884>
3. Kidd M, Richter A, Best A, Cumley N, Mirza J, Percival B, et al. S-variant SARS-CoV-2 lineage B1.1.7 is associated with significantly higher viral loads in samples tested by ThermoFisher TaqPath RT-qPCR. *J Infect Dis*. 2021;jiab082.
4. UK COVID-19 Lateral Flow Oversight Team. COVID-19: Rapid Antigen detection for SARS-CoV-2 by lateral flow assay: a national systematic evaluation for mass-testing [Internet]. *Infectious Diseases (except HIV/AIDS)*; 2021 Jan. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.13.21249563>
5. Crozier A, Rajan S, Buchan I, McKee M. Put to the test: use of rapid testing technologies for covid-19. *BMJ* [Internet]. BMJ Publishing Group Ltd; 2021;372. Available from: <https://www.bmj.com/content/372/bmj.n208>
6. Kucirka LM, Lauer SA, Laeyendecker O, Boon D, Lessler J. Variation in false-negative rate of reverse transcriptase polymerase chain reaction-based SARS-CoV-2 tests by time since exposure. *Ann Intern Med*. 2020;173:262–7.
7. Larremore DB, Wilder B, Lester E, Shehata S, Burke JM, Hay JA, et al. Test sensitivity is secondary to frequency and turnaround time for COVID-19 screening. *Sci Adv*. 2021;7:eabd5393.
8. Cevik M, Kuppalli K, Kindrachuk J, Peiris M. Virology, transmission, and pathogenesis of SARS-CoV-2. *BMJ*. 2020;m3862.

9. Cevik M, Tate M, Lloyd O, Maraolo AE, Schafers J, Ho A. SARS-CoV-2, SARS-CoV, and MERS-CoV viral load dynamics, duration of viral shedding, and infectiousness: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Lancet Microbe*. 2021;2:e13–22.
10. Lee LY, Rozmanowski S, Pang M, Charlett A, Anderson C, Hughes GJ, et al. An observational study of SARS-CoV-2 infectivity by viral load and demographic factors and the utility lateral flow devices to prevent transmission [Internet]. 2021 Jan. Available from: http://modmedmicro.nsms.ox.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/infectivity_manuscript_2021_0119_merged.pdf
11. Marks M, Millat-Martinez P, Ouchi D, Roberts C h, Alemany A, Corbacho-Monné M, et al. Transmission of COVID-19 in 282 clusters in Catalonia, Spain: a cohort study. *Lancet Infect Dis*. 2021;S1473309920309853.
12. Mina MJ, Peto TE, García-Fiñana M, Semple MG, Buchan IE. Clarifying the evidence on SARS-CoV-2 antigen rapid tests in public health responses to COVID-19. *The Lancet* [Internet]. 2021 [cited 2021 Feb 24]; Available from: <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0140673621004256>
13. Sun J, Xiao J, Sun R, Tang X, Liang C, Lin H, et al. Prolonged Persistence of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in Body Fluids. *Emerg Infect Dis* [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2021 Feb 26];26. Available from: https://wwwnc.cdc.gov/eid/article/26/8/20-1097_article
14. Liu Y, Eggo RM, Kucharski AJ. Secondary attack rate and superspreading events for SARS-CoV-2. *The Lancet*. 2020;395:e47.
15. Adam DC, Wu P, Wong JY, Lau EHY, Tsang TK, Cauchemez S, et al. Clustering and superspreading potential of SARS-CoV-2 infections in Hong Kong. *Nat Med*. Nature Publishing Group; 2020;26:1714–9.
16. Johnson KD, Beiglböck M, Eder M, Grass A, Hermisson J, Pammer G, et al. Disease Momentum: Estimating the Reproduction Number in the Presence of Superspreading. *ArXiv201208843 Phys Q-Bio Stat* [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2021 Mar 5]; Available from: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2012.08843>
17. Lindner AK, Nikolai O, Kausch F, Wintel M, Hommes F, Gertler M, et al. Head-to-head comparison of SARS-CoV-2 antigen-detecting rapid test with self-collected anterior nasal swab versus professional-collected nasopharyngeal swab [Internet]. *Infectious Diseases (except HIV/AIDS)*; 2020 Oct. Available from: <http://medrxiv.org/lookup/doi/10.1101/2020.10.26.20219600>
18. Epimath: SEIR team. SEIR Simulator [Internet]. [cited 2021 Feb 23]. Available from: <https://epimath.at/en/seir/>
19. ORF. Stichprobenstudie: CoV-Dunkelziffer deutlich gestiegen [Internet]. *news.ORF.at*. 2020 [cited 2021 Feb 26]. Available from: <https://orf.at/stories/3191333/>
20. der Standard, riss. Nasenbohrertest an Schulen: 470.000 Tests brachten 198 positive Fälle [Internet]. 2021 [cited 2021 Feb 28]. Available from: <https://www.derstandard.de/story/2000124065253/nasenbohrertest-an-schulen-fassmann-faenget-200-dicke-fische>
21. APA. Diese Woche rund 900 positive Selbsttests an Schulen [Internet]. 2021 [cited 2021 Mar 3]. Available from: <https://science.apa.at/power-search/8002604952673151401>
22. Pollán M, Pérez-Gómez B, Pastor-Barriuso R, Oteo J, Hernán MA, Pérez-Olmeda M, et al. Prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 in Spain (ENE-COVID): a nationwide, population-based seroepidemiological study. *The Lancet*. 2020;396:535–44.
23. Willeit P, Krause R, Lamprecht B, Berghold A, Hanson B, Stelzl E, et al. Prevalence of RT-PCR-detected SARS-CoV-2 infection at schools: First results from the Austrian School-SARS-CoV-2 Study. *medRxiv*. Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory Press; 2021;2021.01.05.20248952.
24. Mina M, Miller S, Quigley M, Prentiss T, McKinnon JE, Comer S. Analyzing conflicting results in rapid point-of-care COVID-19 testing. 2020 [cited 2021 Feb 26]; Available from: <https://nrs.harvard.edu/URN-3:HUL.INSTREPOS:37364504>
25. Mina MJ, Parker R, Larremore DB. Rethinking Covid-19 test sensitivity — A strategy for containment. *N Engl J Med*. 2020;383:e120.
26. Mina MJ, Andersen KG. COVID-19 testing: One size does not fit all. *Science*. 2021;371:126–7.