

1 **TITLE**

2 Impact of Nasopharyngeal Specimen Quality on SARS-CoV-2 Test Sensitivity

3 **ABBREVIATED TITLE**

4 Specimen Quality and SARS-CoV-2 Ct

5 **AUTHORS**

6 Melissa Richard-Greenblatt, PhD (1); Matthew J. Ziegler, MD, MS (2,3); Valerie Bromberg (2);

7 Elizabeth Huang (2); Hatem Abdallah (2); Pam Tolomeo, MS (2); Ebbing Lautenbach, MD,

8 MPH, MS (2,3); Laurel Glaser, MD, PhD (1); Brendan J. Kelly, MD, MS (2,3)

9 **AFFILIATIONS**

10 1 - Department of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine;

11 2 - Division of Infectious Diseases, Department of Medicine;

12 3 - Department of Biostatistics, Epidemiology, and Informatics, Perelman School of Medicine,

13 University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA

14 **CORRESPONDING AUTHOR CONTACT**

15 Brendan J. Kelly, MD, MS - brendank@pennmedicine.upenn.edu

16 **AUTHORS' CONTRIBUTIONS**

17 MRG - study design, data collection, manuscript;

18 MJZ - study design, data analysis, manuscript;

19 VB - data collection, manuscript;

20 EH - data collection, manuscript;

21 HA - data collection, manuscript;

22 PT - data collection, manuscript;

23 EL - data analysis; manuscript;

24 LG - study design, manuscript;

25 BJK - study design, data analysis, manuscript

26 **DISCLOSURES**

27 The authors report no relevant disclosures.

28 **DATA AVAILABILITY**

29 Data, analysis scripts, and model code are available at github.com/bjklab.

30 **KEYWORDS**

31 SARS-CoV-2, cycle of threshold, test sensitivity

32 **Acknowledgements:**

33 BJK, MJZ, and EL are supported in part by a CDC Cooperative Agreement FOA#CK16-004

34 “Epicenters for the Prevention of Healthcare Associated Infections”. BJK is supported by the

35 National Institute for Allergy and Infectious Diseases (K23 AI121485 and L30 AI120149). MJZ is

36 supported by the National Institute for Allergy and Infectious Diseases (K23 AI143925).

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48 **Abstract**

49 **Background:** The SARS-CoV-2 reverse-transcription polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR)
50 cycle of threshold (Ct) has been used to estimate quantitative viral load, with the goal of
51 targeting isolation precautions for individuals with COVID-19 and guiding public health
52 interventions. However, variability in specimen quality can alter the Ct values obtained from
53 SARS-CoV-2 clinical assays. We sought to define how variable nasopharyngeal (NP) swab
54 quality impacts clinical SARS-CoV-2 test sensitivity.

55 **Methods:** We performed amplification of a human gene target (β -actin) in parallel with a clinical
56 RT-PCR targeting the SARS-CoV-2 *ORF1ab* gene for 1311 NP specimens collected from
57 patients with clinical concern for COVID-19. We evaluated the relationship between NP
58 specimen quality, characterized by high Ct values for the human gene target β -actin Ct, and the
59 probability of SARS-CoV-2 detection via logistic regression, as well as the linear relationship
60 between SARS-CoV-2 and β -actin Ct.

61 **Results:** Low quality NP swabs are less likely to detect SARS-CoV-2 (odds ratio 0.654, 95%CI
62 0.523 to 0.802). We observed a positive linear relationship between SARS-CoV-2 and β -actin Ct
63 values (slope 0.169, 95%CI 0.092 to 0.247). COVID-19 disease severity was not associated
64 with β -actin Ct values.

65 **Conclusions:** Variability in NP specimen quality accounts for significant differences in the
66 sensitivity of clinical SARS-CoV-2 assays. If unrecognized, low quality NP specimens, which are
67 characterized by a low level of amplifiable human DNA target, may limit the application of
68 SARS-CoV-2 Ct values to direct infection control and public health interventions.

69

70

71 **Introduction:**

72 As the COVID-19 pandemic continues to drive morbidity and mortality around the world, interest
73 has grown in using SARS-CoV-2 reverse-transcription polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR)
74 cycle of threshold (Ct) values as a means of quantifying viral load (1, 2). It has been proposed
75 that SARS-CoV-2 Ct values may correspond with viral burden and infectivity, and that SARS-
76 CoV-2 values may be used to predict disease severity and guide isolation precautions for
77 individuals with COVID-19 (3–7). SARS-CoV-2 Ct values have been shown to correspond with
78 community COVID-19 burden, and it has also been proposed that community Ct values may
79 help to guide non-pharmaceutical interventions to control COVID-19 (8).

80 We sought to understand the impact of nasopharyngeal (NP) specimen swab quality on the
81 measurement of SARS-CoV-2 Ct and the sensitivity of virus detection. To collect an NP swab
82 for SARS-CoV-2 testing, healthcare workers are instructed to advance a synthetic fiber swab
83 with plastic or wire shaft through the nostril until contacting the posterior nasopharynx at a depth
84 equal to the distance from the nostril to the opening of the ear, then to rub and roll the swab,
85 leaving the swab in place for several seconds to collect secretions, before rotating the swab
86 further as it is removed from the nostril (9). Variability in practice and patient tolerance of the
87 procedure has been observed, and may impact the sensitivity of SARS-CoV-2 detection, as well
88 as the cycle threshold (Ct) value observed when SARS-CoV-2 is detected (10–12).

89 To measure variability in the quality of NP swab collection, we performed amplification of a
90 human gene target (β -actin) in parallel with RT-PCR targeting the SARS-CoV-2 *ORF1ab* gene.
91 High β -actin Ct values have been previously validated as a marker of poor NP swab quality (2,
92 13). Below we report the relationship between quality of NP swab collection, sensitivity of
93 SARS-CoV-2 detection, and the range of impact we expect sub-standard NP swab collection
94 may exert on SARS-CoV-2 Ct values. We also examine the possibility of confounding by
95 COVID-19 disease severity.

96

97 **Materials and Methods:**

98 **Study Design, Setting, and Population:** We performed a retrospective cohort study, capturing
99 consecutive SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR tests performed at the Clinical Microbiology Laboratory of
100 the Hospital of the University of Pennsylvania between March 26 and July 4, 2020. We included
101 all SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR results performed on NP specimens via the BD Max SARS-CoV-2
102 assay (Becton Dickinson) for which a positive PCR control analyte (MS2 phage DNA) was
103 detected. A total of 1311 NP specimens were included. All specimens were assayed for β -actin
104 and MS2 phage DNA in parallel with SARS-CoV-2. A waiver of informed consent was granted
105 by the University of Pennsylvania Institutional Review Board (IRB protocols #843085 &
106 #843274).

107 **Causal Models:** We hypothesized that β -actin and SARS-CoV-2 Ct values are related because
108 poor NP specimen collection technique results in reduced capture of NP epithelial cells and
109 SARS-CoV-2 alike. β -actin is a commonly used endogenous reference gene, used as an
110 internal control for PCR reactions involving human specimens. This gene has been previously
111 validated as a marker for the presence of nasal epithelial cells, and prior research has
112 supported its use to assess the quality of self-collected midturbinate swabs (2, 13). We
113 additionally considered the possibility of confounding by COVID-19 severity of illness. It is
114 possible that those with more severe infection may have greater NP epithelial cell damage,
115 resulting in greater detection of both PCR targets, irrespective of sampling technique.

116 **Clinical Data Collection:** To evaluate the possibility of confounding by disease severity, we
117 measured two independent markers of respiratory illness: (1) the minimum room-air oxygen
118 saturation recorded within 2 days of SARS-CoV-2 testing, and (2) whether infiltrates were
119 observed chest computerized tomography (CT) imaging performed within 7 days of SARS-CoV-

120 2 testing. Per Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) guidelines(14), we considered
121 room-air oxygen saturation < 94% indicative of severe respiratory illness. Radiology reports for
122 CT imaging that described parenchymal lung disease, including “infiltrates”, “pneumonia”,
123 “groundglass”, or other “opacities”, were considered indicative of severe respiratory illness. The
124 presence of lung nodules, lung masses, chronic airway disease including bronchiectasis,
125 emphysematous changes, or pleural effusions in the absence of parenchymal disease as
126 described above, were not considered indicative of severe acute respiratory illness.

127 **Specimen Collection, Processing, and RT-PCR Assay:** Specimens were collected during
128 routine clinical practice using a nylon flocked mini-tip swab collected in VTM or saline.
129 Healthcare providers obtained samples using CDC guidelines for NP samples collection.
130 Samples were transported to the laboratory at ambient temperature and stored at 4°C if not run
131 immediately. Exk TNA2 extraction reagent kits (Becton Dickinson) for the BD MAX open system
132 reagent suite were used for the lab-developed SARS-CoV-2 assay based on a previously
133 described assay (15, 16). The BD MAX system was set to run type 1 workflow. PCR conditions
134 consisted of a reverse transcriptase step (600s at 58°C, 1 cycle), denaturation step (60s at
135 98°C, 1 cycle) and extension steps (10s at 98°C followed by 40s at 63°C, 40 cycles). Two
136 different sets of primer/probe master mix were prepared and 12.5 µl was aliquoted into BD MAX
137 0.3 mL snap-in conical tubes for storage at -70°C prior to use. The LUNA Universal Probe One-
138 Step RT-qPCR kit (New England Biolabs) was used to prepare the master mix according to
139 manufacturer guidelines with modified primer and probe concentrations. Master mix 1 was
140 composed of the SARS-CoV-2 orf1ab target (0.6 µM primers and 0.2 µM probe, sequences:
141 unpublished data), and the internal processing control MS2 bacteriophage (0.1 µM primers and
142 probe, sequences) (17). Master mix 2 contained the β-actin primers (0.6 µM) and probe (0.2
143 µM) (18). Samples were prepared by adding 200µl of NP specimen and 20 µl of specimen
144 processing control (5x10⁶ pfu/mL MS2 Phage; Zeptomatrix) to an Exk TNA2 sample buffer

145 tube. Sample buffer tubes containing patient specimens were loaded onto the BD MAX System
146 racks along with the Exk TNA2 test strips. Master mix 1, neutralization buffer (25 μ l NucliSENS
147 easyMAG Extraction Buffer 3, Biomerieux) and master mix 2 were snapped in to open positions
148 2 to 4, respectively, on the test strip prior to loading the rack onto the BD MAX system. All NP
149 samples for which the specimen processing control target (MS2) was detected were included in
150 the study (n=1311). Ct values for all three targets (β -actin, MS2 and SARS-CoV-2) were
151 recorded.

152 **Definition of Exposures and Outcomes:** The primary exposure of interest was the β -actin Ct
153 value, a surrogate for the quality of NP swab collection. The primary outcome of interest was
154 SARS-CoV-2 Ct value.

155 **Statistical Methods:** Data were organized using R statistical software version 3.6.1 (19), and
156 plots generated using the “ggplot2” package (20). Where β -actin and SARS-CoV-2 were not
157 detected, Ct values were imputed as 40 cycles. We examined (1) the linear relationship
158 between β -actin and SARS-CoV-2 Ct values, as well as (2) the impact of β -actin Ct on SARS-
159 CoV-2 detection using Bayesian linear and generalized-linear mixed effects models, which were
160 fit using Stan Hamiltonian Monte Carlo (HMC) version 2.21, via the “brms” package with default
161 weakly-informative priors (21, 22). Prior predictive modeling was performed, and models were fit
162 with 4 chains of 1000 iterations, confirmed with HMC diagnostics (no divergent iterations, Rhat
163 statistic < 1.1 for all parameters, and E-BFMI > 0.2) (23–25). We examined parameter
164 distributions at 50%, 80%, and 95% posterior credible intervals to understand the relationship
165 between exposure and outcome variables.

166 **Power and Sample Size:** We estimated the necessary cohort size based on the anticipated
167 effect of poor NP swab quantity (26). We anticipated that approximately 800 subjects would
168 detect a 10% reduction in sensitivity of SARS-CoV-2 detection related to a β -actin Ct increase of
169 10, with credible intervals precision ensuring type S error < 5% (27, 28). We targeted enrollment

170 of 10% more subjects to allow for a margin of error in that estimate, and we exceeded our
171 enrollment target.

172 **Availability of Data:** Data, analysis scripts, and model code are available at github.com/bjklab.

173

174 **Results:**

175 **SARS-CoV-2 Detection and Cycle of Threshold Range:** Of 1311 tested specimens, 138 were
176 found to have detectable SARS-CoV-2 within 40 cycles of PCR. Among these specimens,
177 median SARS-CoV-2 Ct was 28.15 (IQR 20.5 to 32.98). No secular trend was observed
178 between calendar time from local onset of COVID-19 cases and SARS-CoV-2 Ct values during
179 the study period (Pearson correlation 0.18). **Figure 1** depicts the distribution of SARS-CoV-2 Ct
180 values.

181 **Relationship between β -Actin and SARS-CoV-2 Cycle of Threshold:** We evaluated the
182 relationship between NP specimen quality, measured by β -actin Ct value, and SARS-CoV-2 test
183 sensitivity with logistic regression, and we found that increasing β -actin is significantly
184 associated with reduced detection of SARS-CoV-2 (odds ratio 0.654, 95%CI 0.523 to 0.802).
185 **Figure 2** depicts the relationship between β -actin and SARS-CoV-2 detection probability. We
186 further evaluated the linear relationship between β -actin and SARS-CoV-2 Ct values with linear
187 regression, and we found that SARS-CoV-2 Ct increases significantly with β -actin Ct (slope
188 0.169, 95%CI 0.092 to 0.247). A linear model restricted to include only the 134 specimens
189 within which both SARS-CoV-2 and β -actin were detectable (i.e., Ct < 40) also found that
190 SARS-CoV-2 Ct increased with β -actin, but this relationship did not have high posterior certainty
191 (slope 0.254, 95%CI -0.23 to 0.73), and linear model fit was poor.

192 **Impact of Poor NP Specimen Quality on SARS-CoV-2 Detection Sensitivity:** To understand
193 the potential impact of poor NP specimen quality, we evaluated the change in probability of

194 SARS-CoV-2 detection as β -actin Ct increases. We found that a 4-Ct increase in β -actin, from
195 Ct of 28 to Ct of 32 (roughly from the first quartile of observed β -actin Ct values to the third
196 quartile) results in a 5.4% (95%CI 2.7% to 8.2%) decreased probability of SARS-CoV-2
197 detection.

198 **Impact of Disease Severity on Relationship Between β -Actin and SARS-CoV-2 Cycle of**
199 **Threshold:** Considering the possibility that the observed association between SARS-CoV-2 and
200 β -actin Ct values is confounded by respiratory illness severity, we evaluated the relationship
201 between β -actin Ct and independent markers of respiratory illness. Oxygen saturation data were
202 available for 428 (32.6%) subjects; chest CT imaging was available for 111 (8.5%) subjects.
203 Linear regression relating β -actin Ct values to oxygen saturation revealed no significant
204 association, and the point estimate of association ran counter to concern for confounding by
205 disease severity. Lower oxygen saturation was in fact associated with higher β -actin Ct values
206 (less β -actin amplicon), with linear regression slope -0.04 (95%CI -0.273 to 0.182). Similarly, we
207 found that the presence of parenchymal lung disease on chest CT radiography reports had no
208 significant association with β -actin Ct values, and that the point estimate of association actually
209 suggests lung parenchymal infiltrates are associated with higher β -actin Ct values (less β -actin
210 Ct amplicon) with linear regression slope 0.428 (95%CI -0.655 to 1.61). These analyses of
211 independent markers of severe respiratory disease suggest that it is NP specimen quality, not
212 disease severity, that drives the association between SARS-CoV-2 and β -actin Ct values.

213

214 **Discussion:**

215 In this study, we found that higher β -actin Ct values, which have been previously validated as a
216 marker of low NP swab quality (2, 13), were associated with reduced probability of SARS-CoV-2
217 detection (odds ratio 0.654, 95%CI 0.523 to 0.802) and with higher SARS-CoV-2 Ct values

218 (linear regression slope 0.169, 95%CI 0.092 to 0.247). In our cohort, we observed 10.5% of
219 tested NP specimens had detectable SARS-CoV-2. Based on the observed impact of NP
220 specimen quality, we estimate that the reduction of quality NP specimen collection that results in
221 β -actin Ct increasing from 28 to 32 (roughly 25% to 75% percentile) decreases the absolute
222 probability of SARS-CoV-2 detection by 5.4% (95%CI 2.7% to 8.2%). This finding has several
223 important implications. First, the correlation between β -actin Ct and SARS-CoV-2 suggests that
224 quantitative interpretation of SARS-CoV-2 human specimens may be enhanced by adjusting for
225 the β -actin Ct. Second, the data support the concern that poor specimen collection may
226 contribute to false-negative results. The concern of false-negative NP SARS-CoV-2 testing has
227 led to the recommendation to retest patients with moderate to high clinical suspicion of COVID-
228 19 (29, 30). Reporting the β -actin Ct, or a β -actin-adjusted SARS-CoV-2 Ct may allow clinicians
229 to better interpret specimen quality when considering retesting.

230 We considered the possibility that the observed relationship between SARS-CoV-2 and β -actin
231 Ct values might be confounded by respiratory disease severity, but we found no significant
232 association between independent markers of severe respiratory disease and lower β -actin Ct
233 values. However, several limitations of our analysis must be acknowledged. Oxygen saturation
234 data and chest CT radiography reports were only available for a small percentage (32.6% and
235 8.5%, respectively) of our subjects. Subject demographics and medical comorbidities could not
236 be ascertained for subjects, so unmeasured confounders may contribute to the observed
237 association.

238 Nevertheless, we believe that the observed association between NP specimen quality and
239 SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR sensitivity is an important finding. From 1311 NP specimens submitted
240 for SARS-CoV-2 testing, we have quantified the variation in specimen quality measured by β -
241 actin Ct value, and we have defined the impact of the observed variation on test sensitivity and
242 SARS-CoV-2 Ct values.

243 SARS-CoV-2 Ct values have shown promise as a means to roughly quantify viral burden and so
244 to guide infection control and public health interventions (1, 2, 4–8). However, variability in NP
245 specimen collection may exert large effects on observed SARS-CoV-2 Ct values, limiting these
246 useful applications. As testing efforts expand, infrastructure to ensure quality sample collection
247 must expand as well (9). Concurrent measurement of a β -actin human gene target may provide
248 a means to recognize and adjust for variability in NP specimen quality.

249

250

251

252

253

254

255

256 **Figures:**

257 **Figure 1: Distribution and relationships of Ct values for SARS-CoV-2, β -actin, and MS2**
258 **DNA positive control.** A matrix plot depicting the observed cycle of threshold values for SARS-
259 CoV-2 RT-PCR, with MS2 DNA positive control and β -actin specimen quality control over 1311
260 consecutive clinical assays run between March 26 and July 4, 2020. Panels on the diagonal
261 present the distribution of each target's Ct values. Panels off the diagonal present the
262 relationship between Ct values for each pair of targets. Ct for specimens without detectable
263 SARS-CoV-2 or β -actin were imputed at 40 cycles.

264

265 **Figure 2: Relationship between β -actin and SARS-CoV-2 detection probability.** Binomial

266 logistic regression relating SARS-CoV-2 detection to β -actin Ct value reveals a negative

267 association, with high β -actin Ct (i.e., low quality) NP specimens less likely to detect SARS-

268 CoV-2. The absolute probability of SARS-CoV-2 detection is presented in relation to the

269 observed range of β -actin Ct values.

270

271

272

273

274

275

276 **REFERENCES**

277 1. He X, Lau EHY, Wu P, Deng X, Wang J, Hao X, Lau YC, Wong JY, Guan Y, Tan X, Mo X,

278 Chen Y, Liao B, Chen W, Hu F, Zhang Q, Zhong M, Wu Y, Zhao L, Zhang F, Cowling BJ, Li F,

279 Leung GM. 2020. Temporal dynamics in viral shedding and transmissibility of COVID-19. *Nature*

280 *medicine* 26:672–675.

281 2. Singanayagam A, Patel M, Charlett A, Lopez Bernal J, Saliba V, Ellis J, Ladhani S, Zambon

282 M, Gopal R. 2020. Duration of infectiousness and correlation with RT-PCR cycle threshold

283 values in cases of COVID-19, england, january to may 2020. *Euro surveillance: bulletin*

284 *Europeen sur les maladies transmissibles = European communicable disease bulletin* 25.


- 285 3. Westblade LF, Brar G, Pinheiro LC, Paidoussis D, Rajan M, Martin P, Goyal P, Sepulveda JL,
286 Zhang L, George G, Liu D, Whittier S, Plate M, Small CB, Rand JH, Cushing MM, Walsh TJ,
287 Cooke J, Safford MM, Loda M, Satlin MJ. 2020. SARS-CoV-2 viral load predicts mortality in
288 patients with and without cancer who are hospitalized with COVID-19. *Cancer cell* 38:661–
289 671.e2.
- 290 4. Rhee C, Kanjilal S, Baker M, Klompas M. 2020. Duration of severe acute respiratory
291 syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) infectivity: When is it safe to discontinue isolation?
292 *Clinical infectious diseases: an official publication of the Infectious Diseases Society of America*
293 <https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciaa1249>.
- 294 5. Tom MR, Mina MJ. 2020. To interpret the SARS-CoV-2 test, consider the cycle threshold
295 value. *Clinical infectious diseases: an official publication of the Infectious Diseases Society of*
296 *America* 71:2252–2254.
- 297 6. Alteri C, Cento V, Vecchi M, Colagrossi L, Fanti D, Vismara C, Puoti M, Perno CF, SCOVA
298 Study Group. 2020. Nasopharyngeal SARS-CoV-2 load at hospital admission as predictor of
299 mortality. *Clinical infectious diseases: an official publication of the Infectious Diseases Society of*
300 *America* <https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciaa956>.
- 301 7. Binnicker MJ. 2020. Challenges and controversies to testing for COVID-19. *Journal of clinical*
302 *microbiology* 58.
- 303 8. Hay JA, Kennedy-Shaffer L, Kanjilal S, Lipsitch M, Mina MJ. 2020. Estimating epidemiologic
304 dynamics from single cross-sectional viral load distributions. medrxiv;2020.10.08.20204222v1.
305 *Epidemiology*. medRxiv.
- 306 9. Procop GW, Shrestha NK, Vogel S, Van Sickle K, Harrington S, Rhoads DD, Rubin BP,
307 Terpeluk P. 2020. A direct comparison of enhanced saliva to nasopharyngeal swab for the
308 detection of SARS-CoV-2 in symptomatic patients. *Journal of clinical microbiology* 58.

- 309 10. Sethuraman N, Jeremiah SS, Ryo A. 2020. Interpreting diagnostic tests for SARS-CoV-2.
310 JAMA: the journal of the American Medical Association 323:2249–2251.
- 311 11. Fang Y, Zhang H, Xie J, Lin M, Ying L, Pang P, Ji W. 2020. Sensitivity of chest CT for
312 COVID-19: Comparison to RT-PCR. Radiology 296:E115–E117.
- 313 12. Higgins TS, Wu AW, Ting JY. 2020. SARS-CoV-2 nasopharyngeal swab Testing-False-
314 Negative results from a pervasive anatomical misconception. JAMA otolaryngology– head &
315 neck surgery <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamaoto.2020.2946>.
- 316 13. Smieja M, Castriciano S, Carruthers S, So G, Chong S, Luinstra K, Mahony JB, Petrich A,
317 Chernesky M, Savarese M, Triva D. 2010. Development and evaluation of a flocked nasal
318 midturbinate swab for self-collection in respiratory virus infection diagnostic testing. Journal of
319 clinical microbiology 48:3340–3342.
- 320 14. CDC. 2020. Discontinuation of Transmission-Based precautions and disposition of patients
321 with COVID-19 in healthcare settings (interim guidance). <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/hcp/disposition-hospitalized-patients.html>.
- 322
- 323 15. LeBlanc JJ, Gubbay JB, Li Y, Needle R, Arneson SR, Marcino D, Charest H, Desnoyers G,
324 Dust K, Fattouh R, Garceau R, German G, Hatchette TF, Kozak RA, Krajden M, Kuschak T,
325 Lang ALS, Levett P, Mazzulli T, McDonald R, Mubareka S, Prystajecky N, Rutherford C, Smieja
326 M, Yu Y, Zahariadis G, Zelyas N, Bastien N, COVID-19 Pandemic Diagnostics Investigation
327 Team of the Canadian Public Health Laboratory Network (CPHLN) Respiratory Virus Working
328 Group. 2020. Real-time PCR-based SARS-CoV-2 detection in canadian laboratories. Journal of
329 clinical virology: the official publication of the Pan American Society for Clinical Virology
330 128:104433.


- 331 16. Vermeiren C, Marchand-Senécal X, Sheldrake E, Bulir D, Smieja M, Chong S, Forbes JD,
332 Katz K. 2020. Comparison of copan ESwab and FLOQSwab for COVID-19 diagnosis: Working
333 around a supply shortage. *Journal of clinical microbiology* 58.
- 334 17. Rolfe KJ, Parmar S, Mururi D, Wreghitt TG, Jalal H, Zhang H, Curran MD. 2007. An
335 internally controlled, one-step, real-time RT-PCR assay for norovirus detection and
336 genogrouping. *Journal of clinical virology: the official publication of the Pan American Society for*
337 *Clinical Virology* 39:318–321.
- 338 18. Bas A, Forsberg G, Hammarström S, Hammarström M-L. 2004. Utility of the housekeeping
339 genes 18S rRNA, beta-actin and glyceraldehyde-3-phosphate-dehydrogenase for normalization
340 in real-time quantitative reverse transcriptase-polymerase chain reaction analysis of gene
341 expression in human T lymphocytes. *Scandinavian journal of immunology* 59:566–573.
- 342 19. R Core Team. 2018. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation
343 for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria.
- 344 20. Wickham H. 2016. Ggplot2: Elegant graphics for data analysis 1st ed. 2009. Corr. 3rd
345 printing 2010 edition. Springer International Publishing.
- 346 21. Carpenter B, Gelman A, Hoffman M, Lee D, Goodrich B, Betancourt M, Brubaker M, Guo J,
347 Li P, Riddell A. 2017. Stan: A probabilistic programming language. *Journal of statistical software*
348 76:1–32.
- 349 22. Bürkner P-C. 2017. Brms: An R package for bayesian multilevel models using stan. *Journal*
350 *of Statistical Software, Articles* 80:1–28.
- 351 23. McElreath R. 2016. Statistical rethinking: A bayesian course with examples in R and stan1
352 edition. CRC Press/Taylor & Francis Group.

- 353 24. Gabry J, Simpson D, Vehtari A, Betancourt M, Gelman A. 2019. Visualization in bayesian
354 workflow. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series A*, 182:389–402.
- 355 25. Gelman A, Vehtari A, Simpson D, Margossian CC, Carpenter B, Yao Y, Kennedy L, Gabry
356 J, Bürkner P-C, Modrák M. 2020. Bayesian workflow.
- 357 26. Rothman KJ, Greenland S. 2018. Planning study size based on precision rather than power.
358 *Epidemiology* 29:599–603.
- 359 27. Gelman A, Tuerlinckx F. 2000. Type S error rates for classical and bayesian single and
360 multiple comparison procedures. *Computational statistics* 15:373–390.
- 361 28. Gelman A, Carlin J. 2014. Beyond power calculations: Assessing type S (sign) and type M
362 (magnitude) errors. *Perspectives on psychological science: a journal of the Association for*
363 *Psychological Science* 9:641–651.
- 364 29. Gniazdowski V, Morris CP, Wohl S, Mehoke T, Ramakrishnan S, Thielen P, Powell H, Smith
365 B, Armstrong DT, Herrera M, Reifsnnyder C, Sevdali M, Carroll KC, Pekosz A, Mostafa HH.
366 2020. Repeat COVID-19 molecular testing: Correlation of SARS-CoV-2 culture with molecular
367 assays and cycle thresholds. *Clinical infectious diseases: an official publication of the Infectious*
368 *Diseases Society of America* <https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciaa1616>.
- 369 30. Hanson KE, Caliendo AM, Arias CA, Englund JA, Lee MJ, Loeb M, Patel R, El Alayli A,
370 Kalot' MA, Falck-Ytter Y, Lavergne V, Morgan RL, Hassan Murad M, Sultan S, Bhimraj A,
371 Mustafa RA. 2020. Infectious diseases society of america guidelines on the diagnosis of
372 COVID-19.
- 373
- 374


MS2 Ct






β-actin Ct






SARS-CoV-2 Ct



MS2 Ct



β-actin Ct



SARS-CoV-2 Ct

