1	Nucleocapsid antigenemia is a marker of acute SARS-CoV-2 infection				
2	Hans P. Verkerke <sup>*1,2</sup> , Gregory L. Damhorst <sup>*3,4</sup> , Daniel S. Graciaa <sup>3</sup> , Kaleb McLendon <sup>1</sup> , William O'Sick <sup>1</sup>				
3	Chad Robichaux <sup>5</sup> , Narayanaiah Cheedarla <sup>1</sup> , Sindhu Potlapalli <sup>1</sup> , Shang-Chuen Wu <sup>2</sup> , Kristin R.V				
4	Harrington <sup>5</sup> , Andrew Webster <sup>3</sup> , Colleen Kraft <sup>3</sup> , Christina A. Rostad <sup>6</sup> , Jesse J. Waggoner <sup>3,4,5,7</sup> , Neel R				
5	Gandhi <sup>3,5</sup> , Jeannette Guarner <sup>1</sup> , Sara C. Auld <sup>5,8</sup> , Andrew Neish <sup>1</sup> , John D. Roback <sup>1</sup> , Wilbur A. Lam <sup>4,7,9,10</sup> , N				
6	Sarita Shah <sup>†3,5</sup> , Sean R. Stowell <sup>†2</sup>				
7	*, <sup>†</sup> Equal contribution				
8	Affiliations:				
9	1. Department of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine, Emory University School of Medicine,				
10	Atlanta, GA, USA				
11	2. Department of Pathology, Brigham and Women's Hospital, Harvard Medical School, Boston,				
12	MA, USA				
13	3. Division of Infectious Diseases, Department of Medicine, Emory University School of Medicine,				
14	Atlanta, GA, USA				
15	4. The Atlanta Center for Microsystems-Engineered Point-of-Care Technologies, Atlanta, GA, USA				
16	5. Emory Healthcare, Atlanta, GA, USA				
17	6. Department of Epidemiology, Emory University Rollins School of Public Health, Atlanta, GA,				
18	USA				
19	7. Department of Pediatrics and Center for Childhood Infections and Vaccines, Emory University				
20	School of Medicine and Children's Healthcare of Atlanta, Atlanta, GA, USA				
21	8. The Atlanta Center for Microsystems-Engineered Point-of-Care Technologies, Atlanta, GA, USA				
22	9. Division of Pulmonary, Allergy, Critical Care and Sleep Medicine, Emory University School of				
23	Medicine, Atlanta, GA, USA				
24	10. Aflac Cancer & Blood Disorders Center at Children's Healthcare of Atlanta, Atlanta, GA, USA				
25	11. Wallace H. Coulter Department of Biomedical Engineering, Georgia Institute of Technology,				
26	Atlanta, GA, USA				

- 27
- 28 Running title: Nucleocapsid antigenemia in acute SARS-CoV-2
- 29
- 30 Keywords: nucleocapsid, antigenemia, COVID-19, SARS-CoV-2
- 31

32 Corresponding authors:

- 33 Sean Stowell, MD, PhD, Brigham and Women's Hospital, Harvard Medical School,
- 34 srstowell@bwh.harvard.edu, (617) 291-5755
- 35 Sarita Shah, MD, MPH, Emory University Rollins School of Public Health, sarita.shah@emory.edu, 404
- 36 727-7326

#### 37 Abstract

**Background.** Reliable detection of SARS-CoV-2 infection is essential for diagnosis and treatment of disease as well as infection control and prevention during the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic. Existing nucleic acid tests do not reliably distinguish acute from resolved infection, as residual RNA is frequently detected in the absence of replication-competent virus. We hypothesized that viral nucleocapsid in serum or plasma may be a specific biomarker of acute infection that could enhance isolation and treatment strategies at an individualized level.

44 **Methods.** Samples were obtained from a retrospective serological survey using a convenience sampling 45 method from adult inpatient and outpatient encounters from January through March 2021. Samples were 46 categorized along a timeline of infection (e.g. acute, late presenting, convalescent) based on timing of 47 available SARS-CoV-2 testing and symptomatology. Nucleocapsid was quantified by digital 48 immunoassay on the Quanterix HD-X platform.

49 **Results.** In a large sample of 1860 specimens from 1607 patients, the highest level and frequency of 50 antigenemia were observed in samples obtained during acute SARS-CoV-2 infection. Levels of 51 antigenemia were highest in samples from seronegative individuals and in those with more severe disease. 52 Using ROC analysis, we found that antigenemia exhibited up to 85.8% sensitivity and 98.6% specificity 53 as a biomarker for acute COVID-19.

54 **Conclusions.** Nucleocapsid antigenemia is a sensitive and specific biomarker for acute SARS-CoV-2 55 infection and may aid in individualized assessment of SARS-CoV-2 infection resolution or persistence,

although interpretation is limited by absence of a diagnostic gold standard for active infection.

# 57 Introduction

58 Although the standard of care for SARS-CoV-2, reverse transcription polymerase chain reaction 59 (RT-PCR) remains an imperfect diagnostic marker for coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) because 60 SARS-CoV-2 RNA commonly persists beyond the period of acute infection [1-3]. Accordingly, Centers 61 for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) guidelines do not recommend re-testing most individuals by 62 RT-PCR within 90 days following diagnosis. Instead, isolation guidelines are based on time from 63 symptom onset [4, 5]. This creates a dilemma when screening tests detect SARS-CoV-2 RNA in a patient 64 without well-defined onset or resolution of COVID-like illness. Alternative molecular markers for acute 65 infection are not widely available [6] and low sensitivity respiratory antigen testing may be effectively 66 applied at a population level [7, 8], but there remains a need for more sensitive and specific diagnostics to 67 provide individualized guidance.

68 The presence of viral nucleocapsid protein in peripheral blood (antigenemia) has been 69 demonstrated in SARS-CoV-1 and SARS-CoV-2 infection [9-21]. A blood-based antigen biomarker may 70 have inherent advantages over upper respiratory tract antigen testing, or biomarkers such as RT-PCR 71 cycle threshold (Ct) value and sub-genomic RNA (sgRNA), because specimen quality and quantity can be 72 standardized. Reports of antigenemia test performance as a diagnostic biomarker are inconsistent, likely due to varying assay composition and inconsistent reference standards as many studies compare against 73 74 respiratory RT-PCR as a gold standard and fail to account for the persistence of RNA beyond acute 75 infection.

In this study, we present evidence from a large serosurvey of adults in inpatient and outpatient settings to explore the hypothesis that nucleocapsid antigenemia is a sensitive and specific marker of acute infection as defined by a clinical timeline. Specifically, each blood sample was categorized through rigorous review of clinical history and respiratory SARS-CoV-2 testing in a schema that assumes a typical course of COVID-19 for all subjects. We find a strong association between acute infection and nucleocapsid antigenemia, which also correlates with serostatus and disease severity. Together our

findings suggest antigenemia may clarify disease timing and provide needed insight in many clinical
 settings.

- 84
- 85 Methods
- 86 *Clinical specimens*

87 We collected a convenience sample of residual plasma, serum, and whole blood specimens from 88 the clinical chemistry laboratory of Emory Medical Laboratories one day per week between January 11, 89 2021 and March 12, 2021. These specimens were originally collected for routine clinical testing from 90 inpatient (medical/surgical wards, intensive care, obstetrics) and outpatient settings (clinics, emergency 91 department, infusion centers, ambulatory surgery). Samples were transferred to a -80C repository after 92 clinical testing was completed, but prior to being discarded. More than one blood sample from the same 93 patient was permitted with a minimum time of five days between samples. This study was approved and 94 granted complete HIPAA and consent waiver by the Emory University Institutional Review Board 95 (STUDY00000510).

96

97 Nucleocapsid assay

Nucleocapsid antigenemia was quantified on the Quanterix HD-X platform. Residual serum and plasma samples were thawed once after storage at -80°C and diluted 1 to 3 in assay sample diluent. Diluted samples were then run using the ultrasensitive SIMOA SARS-CoV-2 N Protein Antigen assay on the automated Quanterix HD-X platform (Quanterix, Billerica, MA, USA) which has a validated limit of detection of 0.099 pg/mL in respiratory and saliva samples. Samples with antigen levels too high for the linear range of the assay were further diluted 1 to 20 and re-tested. Final antigen concentrations were determined by interpolation after sigmoidal fitting of duplicate calibration curves run on each test plate.

105

106 Serological Testing

In-house developed single-dilution serological screening assays for SARS-CoV-2 receptor
binding domain (RBD) and nucleocapsid antibodies were used to establish serological status at the time
of antigenemia testing. Antibody class-specific RBD serologies were performed as previously described
[22]. Nucleocapsid antibody testing was performed using an in-house developed ELISA (supplementary
information).

112

#### 113 Medical record review

Patient medical record number was recorded at the time of specimen collection. The Emory Healthcare Clinical Data Warehouse (CDW) was queried for SARS-CoV-2 nucleic acid amplification tests (NAAT), clinical notes, ICD-10 codes, laboratory values, mechanical ventilation, and date of death. All Ct values were obtained directly from reports produced by the manufacturer's software (supplementary information).

A COVID-19 status label (positive or negative) and a category (convalescent, late-presenting, acute, pre-COVID, and same-day negative) were assigned to each blood sample based on that patient's (1) SARS-CoV-2 respiratory testing (including NAAT or antigen), (2) date of earliest positive test, and (3) date of symptom onset (**Figure 1**).

123 Chart review began with automated review of NAAT results available in the medical record. 124 Blood samples from a patient with a positive NAAT more than fourteen days prior to sample collection 125 were labeled *convalescent* and no further review of the medical record for categorization purposes was 126 performed. History and physical clinical notes dated within fourteen days before or after the date of the 127 blood sample were then reviewed, if available, for all patients not labeled *convalescent*. Date of COVID-128 like symptom onset (including fever, fatigue, malaise, myalgia, headache, dyspnea, cough, wheezing, 129 anosmia, ageusia, congestion, rhinorrhea, or diarrhea) and earliest positive SARS-CoV-2 testing (NAAT 130 or antigen) was recorded if these had been described in the history narrative or clinician's assessment and 131 plan.

132	The original medical records were then reviewed for all patients (other than those labeled
133	convalescent) with a positive SARS-CoV-2 test who did not yet have date of symptom onset recorded in
134	our data set. The entire medical record was available during this stage, but the reviewer was blinded to
135	antigenemia status which was not considered in labeling of COVID-19 status or category assignment.
136	Given that re-infection with SARS-CoV-2 was rare at the time of this study [23], our approach
137	assumed that no re-infection events were captured in our sample set, which spanned 3 months. Patients
138	without any record of SARS-CoV-2 testing were excluded from analysis. Further detail is provided in
139	Supplementary Information.
140	
141	Data analysis
142	Data obtained during specimen collection were stored in Microsoft Excel. CDW reports were
143	provided in .csv format. All data were then imported into MATLAB (The MathWorks, Inc.) for analysis.
144	Wilcoxon rank-sum test was used for comparisons.
145	
146	Results
147	Specimens & COVID-19 status assignments
148	2,498 serum and plasma samples were targeted for evaluation during the study period (Figure
149	1B). Eleven samples were not evaluated for antigenemia due to pre-analytical factors such as insufficient
150	sample volume. 2,487 samples were available for quantification of antigenemia, of which 255 (10.2%)
151	exhibited detectable nucleocapsid. 115 of 2,487 were excluded due to lack of patient identifiers and five
152	additional samples were excluded as they had been collected on the same day as another blood sample
153	from a single patient. Clinical data were examined for the remaining 2,367 samples from 2,101 unique
154	patients (Table 1). 507 of 2,367 samples were excluded because of no record of SARS-CoV-2 testing,
155	and 11 of these 507 (2.1%) had detectable antigenemia.

156 The remaining 1,860 samples from 1,607 patients had SARS-CoV-2 testing records to guide 157 categorization and were classified as described in **Figure 1B** and **Table 2**.

158

#### 159 Diagnostic performance of antigenemia for acute COVID-19

160 Nucleocapsid antigenemia was present at higher frequency and with a higher median 161 concentration in acute COVID samples compared to samples categorized as late-presenting, convalescent, 162 pre-COVID, or same-day negative (p < 0.001 for all comparisons; Figure 2A). ROC analysis 163 demonstrated area under the curve (AUC) of 0.902 in distinguishing samples from patients experiencing 164 acute infection from all non-acute categories, and sensitivity and specificity were 85.2% and 89.9%, 165 respectively (Figure 2B). Test characteristics with censoring of the potentially ambiguous late-presenting 166 group showed AUC 0.914, sensitivity 85.8%, and specificity 93.7% while the most stringent comparison 167 (censoring of the convalescent and late-presenting groups) demonstrated AUC 0.972, sensitivity 85.8%, 168 and specificity 98.6%. Sensitivity improved to 93.9% when the comparison was only made among 169 seronegative individuals (Supplementary Figure 1).

Test characteristics were also examined when adjusting the reference standard by varying parameters of the acuity window. Sensitivity decreased as the window start period increased beyond -11days (**Figure 2C**). Meanwhile, specificity consistently increased as the period of the acuity window was lengthened. Maximum AUC was observed with a window period opening at -12 days (AUC = 0.912 with window close at +3 days) with minimal effect of varying the post-sampling period from 0 to +3 days (**Figure 2D**).

176 Ct values from positive nasopharyngeal RT-PCR were available from the same day as a blood 177 sample for 49 specimens. Only 6 of 17 samples with corresponding to Ct values greater than 33 had 178 antigenemia and four of six of these were from the GeneXpert assay (**Figure 2E**). All except for two 179 samples with corresponding Ct values less than 30 exhibited antigenemia.

180

### 181 *Temporal trends in antigenemia*

182 We analyzed the dynamics of antigen level over time in samples from the acute, late-presenting183 and convalescent groups. The frequency of detectable nucleocapsid and antigen concentration decreased

184 over time following diagnosis and reported symptom onset (Figures 3A-B). 18 samples were identified 185 from patients who were asymptomatic at the time of COVID-19 diagnosis, 5 (27.7%) of which had 186 detectable nucleocapsid antigenemia. Nucleocapsid antigen was detected more frequently (50.0%) in the 187 subset of samples available from asymptomatic patients within 3 days of their diagnosis (Figure 3C). 188 Among 55 samples from individuals with positive respiratory RT-PCR testing on the same day, seven 189 convalescent samples did not exhibit antigenemia (Figure 3D, Supplementary Table 1) and acute 190 infections primarily exhibited high antigenemia. Among this subset of patients, no antigenemia was 191 observed more than fourteen days after the earliest known positive test (Figure 3D).

192

#### 193 Examination of outliers

194 We reviewed medical records for individuals with unexpected presence or absence of 195 antigenemia. Twenty-one samples in the convalescent group had antigenemia (Supplementary Table 2, 196 **Supplementary Figure 2**). Among these, two individuals had clinical history consistent with re-infection 197 by SARS-CoV-2, two were highly immunocompromised, and eleven samples (median time from diagnosis 20 days, IQR 16.5-28.5 days) had severe COVID-19 marked by need for high-flow oxygen, 198 199 intubation or death. End-stage renal disease or dialysis was more common among samples in the 200 convalescent group with antigenemia compared to those without antigenemia (fraction [95% confidence 201 interval] = 0.41 [0.20-0.61] vs 0.13 [0.07-0.18]) whereas other co-morbidities were not significantly 202 different (Supplementary Figure 3). Three individuals had negative respiratory SARS-CoV-2 testing 203 and antigenemia on the same day, none of which had evidence of COVID-related symptoms 204 (Supplementary Table 3). Eighteen samples had antigenemia after more than fourteen days of 205 symptoms, of which fourteen were seropositive for both N IgG and RBG IgG, two seropositive for RBD 206 IgG only, and two were seronegative for both. Thirteen had nucleocapsid level less than 46 pg/mL while 207 the other five exceeded 700 pg/mL including both N and RBD seronegative patients and N-/RBD+ 208 sample (Supplementary Table 4, Supplementary Figures 4 & 5). Twenty individuals with samples

209 categorized in the acute COVID group did not have antigenemia – ten of these were collected ten or more

210 days after symptom onset (**Supplementary Table 5, Supplementary Figure 6**).

211

## 212 Antigenemia trends by antibody serostatus

Distribution of nucleocapsid levels in the acute COVID group were significantly different with higher median values in seronegative samples compared to seropositive samples for nucleocapsid IgG, RBD IgG, RBD IgA, and RBD IgM (p < 0.001 for each comparison, **Figure 4**). Seropositive samples were also more likely to have undetectable antigenemia. Similar trends were seen in the late-presenting group except for the comparison based on IgM which was not significant (**Supplementary Figure 7**).

218

# 219 Association of Antigenemia with COVID-19 severity

In the acute COVID group, distribution of nucleocapsid antigen was significantly different and median value was higher in samples from patients who died or required intubation within 30 days of sampling compared to those who survived or did not require intubation (**Figure 5A-C**). This observation held true for comparison based on the composite of intubation or mortality. Levels of nucleocapsid antigenemia were not significantly associated with elevated D-dimer (cutoff 500 ng/mL) but were associated with elevated CRP (p = 0.002 in comparison based on 40 mg/L cutoff; **Figure 5D-E**).

226

### 227 Discussion

This analysis of blood samples from routine clinical specimens collected during the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic demonstrates the following: First, antigenemia is a sensitive and specific marker for acute SARS-CoV-2 infection. Second, nucleocapsid is elevated in samples without evidence of antinucleocapsid (IgG) and anti-spike (IgG, IgM, and IgA) seroconversion. Third, antigenemia is associated with disease severity.

Evolving CDC isolation guidance during the COVID-19 pandemic reflects the difficulty of objectively defining resolution of SARS-CoV-2 infection. Underlying this is the persistence of RNA

235 targets beyond a period during which the immunocompetent individual is reasonably believed to harbor 236 replication-competent virus [1-3]. Meanwhile, persistence of replication-competent virus for months has 237 been demonstrated by viral culture in immunocompromised hosts [24-28]. This creates a diagnostic 238 dilemma when RT-PCR is persistently positive for weeks after diagnosis, when re-infection with SARS-239 CoV-2 is a consideration, or when encountering positive SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR test results in an 240 asymptomatic individual without history of prior objective diagnosis or prior COVID-like illness. Our 241 data suggest assessment of nucleocapsid antigenemia may assist providers in making judgments in these 242 scenarios.

243 Further, our data compels interest in whether antigenemia may provide direct evidence of active 244 viral replication, which aid in evaluation of infectiousness or guide therapeutics at an individualized level. 245 For example, antiviral agents are not likely to benefit a patient without active SARS-CoV-2 replication. 246 Clinical trial data therefore may be confounded by failure to stratify patients according to such a marker, 247 as late presenters after cessation of viral replication would likely fail to show benefit or may even suffer 248 harm from investigatory antiviral agents. In fact, recent evidence emphasizes benefit of antivirals early in 249 infection [29]. In showing its association with acute SARS-CoV-2 infection and characterizing outliers, 250 our data suggest that nucleocapsid should be further investigated as a marker of viral activity, 251 infectiousness, and a predictor of therapeutic response.

252 Strengths of our study include a diverse cohort that is among the largest in which nucleocapsid 253 antigenemia has been quantified to date and rigorous assignment of COVID-19 status through medical 254 record review. Prior studies restricting the definition of a positive case to no more than two weeks after 255 symptom onset report sensitivities between 90.9% and 97.5% and specificities between 94.2% and 100% 256 [15-20] (see **Supplementary Table 6**), and our data are consistent with these findings. Of further interest, 257 our data revealed detectable antigen in 11 (2.1%) of the blood samples obtained in the primary serosurvey 258 even though these patients were never screened with nasopharyngeal RT-PCR testing in our healthcare 259 system. These represent likely infectious patients who may have had a missed SARS-CoV-2 diagnosis

and suggest a potential role for antigenemia screening in a population for whom blood is already beingsampled to complement existing infection control measures.

We also detected antigenemia in a small number of patients with subclinical SARS-CoV-2 262 263 infection. Individuals who test positive for SARS-CoV-2 without antecedent or subsequent COVID-like 264 symptoms either represent shedding of replication-competent virus *during* subclinical disease or 265 persistent RNA shedding *following* subclinical disease. While we corroborate previous findings that 266 levels of antigenemia are associated with disease severity [19, 20], the presence of antigenemia in five 267 asymptomatic individuals with SARS-CoV-2 demonstrates that antigenemia can also be present in 268 subclinical infection. Despite the difficulty associated with identifying these cases, further investigation of 269 the prevalence of antigenemia in acute asymptomatic infection is needed to clarify its role in screening 270 broad populations.

271 This study is limited by use of a convenience sampling approach and retrospective data 272 collection. Symptom onset as recorded in the medical record can be subjective and influenced by recall 273 bias. Because of the ubiquity of community-based testing, SARS-CoV-2 diagnosis was documented prior 274 to evaluation in our healthcare system for a subset of these patients and was only known to us when 275 documented in the clinical narrative in addition to being subject to biases and imprecision. In addition, 276 nucleocapsid-specific immunoglobulin may interfere with quantitation of antigenemia in individuals who 277 have seroconverted although it is currently unknown whether total (Ig-bound and unbound) antigen or 278 free (unbound only) antigen is a more meaningful clinical indicator. The primary analysis relies on the 279 assumption that each subject is immunocompetent, that immunocompetent hosts have similar duration of 280 acute COVID-19, and that there are no other confounding factors which may result in prolonged 281 antigenemia. Recognizing these limitations, we performed a post-hoc investigation of outlier cases, which 282 facilitated hypothesis generation regarding reasons for prolonged antigenemia such as reduced renal 283 function, prolonged critical illness, and immune compromise (Supplementary Tables 1-5 & 7). Several 284 studies have demonstrated high specificity of antigenemia by evaluation of pre-pandemic samples [15, 17, 285 20], suggesting many false positives in our study are likely to have active infection beyond the parameters

286	for acute infection defined in our reference standard schema. This will be further clarified as more robust
287	comparisons to viral culture, sgRNA, RT-PCR Ct value, and respiratory antigen testing can be achieved.
288	Together our data demonstrate that nucleocapsid antigenemia is a sensitive and specific
289	biomarker of acute COVID-19 wherein COVID-19 status is defined by time since earliest positive testing
290	and symptom onset. We conclude that nucleocapsid antigenemia is a promising candidate biomarker for
291	active viral replication - the definition of which is the presence of replication-competent virus in a host -
292	recognizing that the available evidence points to this being an individualized process that cannot be
293	broadly defined based on a timeline. Further prospective studies with rigorous documentation of clinical
294	course and correlation with viral culture and other potential biomarkers of viral replication are needed.

#### 295 Acknowledgments

- 296 The authors thank Lisa Cole, Cecillitha J Williams, and Mark Meyers for assistance with specimen
- 297 collection and Heather Jones for assistance with obtaining Ct values.
- 298
- 299 Funding
- 300 This work was supported by funds from the Woodruff Health Sciences Center COVID-19 Center for
- 301 Urgent Research Engagement (CURE), NIH 1 U54 CA260563-01: Immune regulation of COVID-19
- 302 infection in cancer and autoimmunity to JDR, NIH R01 HL138656 COVID-19 supplement to SRS, NIH
- R01 AI138646 supplement to NSS, NIH K24 AI114444 to NRG, and NIH Grants U54 EB027690 03 and
- 304 UL1TR002378.
- 305

#### 306 **Conflicts of Interest**

- 307 C.A.R.'s institution has received funds to conduct clinical research unrelated to this manuscript from
  308 BioFire Inc, GSK, MedImmune, Micron, Janssen, Merck, Moderna, Novavax, PaxVax, Pfizer,
  309 Regeneron, Sanofi-Pasteur. She is co-inventor of patented RSV vaccine technology unrelated to this
  310 manuscript, which has been licensed to Meissa Vaccines, Inc.
- 311 All other authors report no conflicts of interest.

312

# 313 Human Subjects Research

- 314 This study was approved by the Institutional Review Board of Emory University for the use of residual
- 315 clinical specimens. Written informed consent by the patients was not required.

#### 316 **References**

- 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; 2(1): e13-e22.
- Yan D, Zhang X, Chen C, et al. Characteristics of Viral Shedding Time in SARS-CoV-2
   Infections: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. Front Public Health **2021**; 9: 652842.
- 322 3. Drain PK. Rapid Diagnostic Testing for SARS-CoV-2. New England Journal of Medicine **2022**.
- 3234.PreventionCfDCa.COVID-19QuarantineandIsolation.Availableat:324<a href="https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/your-health/quarantine-isolation.html">https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/your-health/quarantine-isolation.html</a>.Accessed32511/29/2021.
- 5. Prevention CfDCa. CDC Updates and Shortens Recommended Isolation and Quarantine Period
   for General Population. CDC Newsroom Releases 2021; 2021(December 29, 2021).
- Binnicker MJ. Can Testing Predict SARS-CoV-2 Infectivity? The Potential for Certain Methods
  to be a Surrogate for Replication-Competent Virus. J Clin Microbiol 2021: JCM0046921.
- 330 7. Mina MJ, Parker R, Larremore DB. Rethinking Covid-19 Test Sensitivity A Strategy for
  331 Containment. New England Journal of Medicine 2020; 383(22): e120.
- Chin ET, Huynh BQ, Chapman LAC, Murrill M, Basu S, Lo NC. Frequency of Routine Testing
   for Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) in High-risk Healthcare Environments to Reduce
   Outbreaks. Clinical Infectious Diseases 2020.
- 335 9. Che X-Y, Hao W, Wang Y, et al. Nucleocapsid Protein as Early Diagnostic Marker for SARS.
  336 Emerging Infectious Diseases 2004; 10(11): 1947-9.
- Li Y-H, Li J, Liu X-E, et al. Detection of the nucleocapsid protein of severe acute respiratory
   syndrome coronavirus in serum: Comparison with results of other viral markers. Journal of
   Virological Methods 2005; 130(1-2): 45-50.
- Li T, Wang L, Wang H, et al. Serum SARS-COV-2 Nucleocapsid Protein: A Sensitivity and
   Specificity Early Diagnostic Marker for SARS-COV-2 Infection. Front Cell Infect Microbiol
   2020; 10: 470.
- Lebedin YS, Lyang OV, Galstyan AG, Panteleeva AV, Belousov VV, Rebrikov DV. Serum
   SARS-CoV-2 nucleocapsid antigen detection is essential for primary diagnostics of SARS-CoV 2-associated pneumonia. medRxiv: Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory, 2020.
- Su B, Yin J, Lin X, et al. Quantification of SARS-CoV-2 antigen levels in the blood of patients
  with COVID-19. Sci China Life Sci 2021; 64(7): 1193-6.
- Ogata AF, Maley AM, Wu C, et al. Ultra-sensitive Serial Profiling of SARS-CoV-2 Antigens and
   Antibodies in Plasma to Understand Disease Progression in COVID-19 Patients with Severe
   Disease. Clin Chem 2020.
- Hingrat QL, Visseaux B, Laouenan C, et al. Detection of SARS-CoV-2 N-antigen in blood during
   acute COVID-19 provides a sensitive new marker and new testing alternatives. Clin Microbiol
   Infect 2020.
- Ahava M, Kurkela S, Kuivanen S, Lappalainen M, Jarva H, Jääskeläinen A. Detection of SARS CoV-2 nucleocapsid antigen from serum can aid in timing of COVID-19 infection. medRxiv.
   medRxiv: Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory, 2021.
- Shan D, Johnson JM, Fernandes SC, et al. N-protein presents early in blood, dried blood and
   saliva during asymptomatic and symptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infection. Nat Commun 2021; 12(1):
   1931.
- 360 18. Zhang Y, Ong CM, Yun C, et al. Diagnostic Value of Nucleocapsid Protein in Blood for SARS 361 CoV-2 Infection. Clinical Chemistry 2021.
- Wang H, Hogan CA, Verghese M, et al. SARS-CoV-2 Nucleocapsid Plasma Antigen for
   Diagnosis and Monitoring of COVID-19. Clin Chem 2021.
- Favresse J, Bayart J-L, David C, et al. Serum SARS-CoV-2 Antigens for the Determination of
   COVID-19 Severity. medRxiv: Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory, 2021.

- Thudium RF, Stoico MP, Hogdall E, et al. Early Laboratory Diagnosis of COVID-19 by Antigen
   Detection in Blood Samples of the SARS-CoV-2 Nucleocapsid Protein. J Clin Microbiol 2021;
   59(10): e0100121.
- 369 22. Verkerke H, Horwath M, Saeedi B, et al. Comparison of Antibody Class-Specific SARS-CoV-2
  370 Serologies for the Diagnosis of Acute COVID-19. J Clin Microbiol 2021; 59(4).
- 371 23. **!!! INVALID CITATION !!! [22]**.
- 24. Choi B, Choudhary MC, Regan J, et al. Persistence and Evolution of SARS-CoV-2 in an Immunocompromised Host. N Engl J Med 2020; 383(23): 2291-3.
- Avanzato VA, Matson MJ, Seifert SN, et al. Case Study: Prolonged Infectious SARS-CoV-2
  Shedding from an Asymptomatic Immunocompromised Individual with Cancer. Cell 2020;
  183(7): 1901-12 e9.
- Hensley MK, Bain WG, Jacobs J, et al. Intractable COVID-19 and Prolonged SARS-CoV-2
  Replication in a CAR-T-cell Therapy Recipient: A Case Study. Clin Infect Dis 2021.
- 379 27. Aydillo T, Gonzalez-Reiche AS, Aslam S, et al. Shedding of Viable SARS-CoV-2 after
  380 Immunosuppressive Therapy for Cancer. N Engl J Med 2020; 383(26): 2586-8.
- 381 28. McCarthy KR, Rennick LJ, Nambulli S, et al. Recurrent deletions in the SARS-CoV-2 spike
  382 glycoprotein drive antibody escape. Science 2021; 371(6534): 1139-42.
- 383 29. Gottlieb RL, Vaca CE, Paredes R, et al. Early Remdesivir to Prevent Progression to Severe
  384 Covid-19 in Outpatients. New England Journal of Medicine 2021.
- 385

	Positive	Negative	Undefined
Ν	130	385	1622
Age mean (IQR)	60.6 (52.2–73.0)	54.2 (39.2–69.6)	55.0 (39.8–70.2)
Female %	47.7	57.1	55.5
Vaccinated %	1.5	4.7	9.9
Race %			
African American or Black	78.5	72.0	60.7
American Indian or Alaskan Native	0.0	0.0	0.2
Asian	0.8	1.0	1.6
Caucasian or White	13.1	20.0	29.0
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0.0	0.3	0.2
Multiple	0.0	0.5	0.4
Unknown, Unavailable or Unreported	7.7	6.2	7.9
Ethnicity			
Non-Hispanic or Latino	83.9	86.0	84.4
Unreported, Unknown, Unavailable	13.9	7.8	11.9
Hispanic or Latino	0.8	5.5	3.0
Not Recorded	1.5	0.8	0.7
Antigenemia* %	85.8	10.1	3.9
Setting*			
Inpatient	70.9	42.9	39.3
ER or CDU	29.1	27.2	14.1
Outpatient	0.0	26.7	45.3
Peripartum	0.0	3.3	1.1

Table 1. Summary of patient characteristics by COVID status.

\*Reflects all included samples (including multiple samples for a unique patient). CDU = clinical decision unit

	Samples	Unique patients
Never SARS-CoV-2 positive	1416	1249
Same-day negative NAAT	194	194
Ever SARS-CoV-2 positive*	444	360
Convalescent	182	153
Late-presenting	30	30
Acute	141	130
Sampled three or more days prior to diagnosis	42	34
Negative interim testing	21	16

Table 2. Categories determined by chart review for samples and patients included in the analysis.

NAAT = Nucleic acid amplification testing; \*Includes in-hospital NAAT as well as community NAAT or antigen testing if reported in the clinical narrative

# **Figure captions**

**Figure 1.** (A) Schematic of process for COVID status assignment. Samples from patients with no record of positive SARS-CoV-2 respiratory testing were only considered negative if corresponding negative respiratory testing occurred on the same day. Due to the lack of a gold standard for active SARS-CoV-2 infection, samples from individuals with history of positive SARS-CoV-2 testing are labeled based on earliest known positive SARS-CoV-2 respiratory test and time since symptom onset. (B) Flow chart of categorization and labeling process indicating number of samples assigned to each group.

**Figure 2.** (A) Prevalence of antigenemia and serum or plasma nucleocapsid levels for blood samples by category. Unexpected results (presence of nucleocapsid in the convalescent and same-day negative groups, absence of nucleocapsid in the acute group) are examined in Supplementary Information Tables 2-5. (B) ROC curve for diagnostic performance of detectable antigenemia with reference to a -14/+3 day window for acute infection. The additional curves progressively exclude ambiguous categories. (C) Impact on sensitivity and specificity of varying the window period, which defines the reference standard for acute COVID. (D) AUC for the same varied window periods. (E) Antigenemia compared to RT-PCR Ct value for those specimens with a Ct value available from the clinical laboratory on the same day. Symbols correspond to assay and gene target with horizontal line linking Ct values for different targets detected in the same sample. This includes data from four assays on three thermocycler platforms described in further detail in Supplementary Information.

**Figure 3.** (A) Serum or plasma nucleocapsid plotted against time since diagnosis (top) and symptom onset (bottom, shown with an inverted y axis). Samples without antigen detected are shown stacked on the common horizontal axis. Four samples with antigenemia beyond 41 days are listed in the box and 93 samples without antigenemia between 41 and 351 days after earliest diagnosis are not shown. (B) Serum or plasma nucleocapsid in patients whose COVID-19 course was described as asymptomatic in clinical records. The x axis reflects time in between first known positive respiratory test and the day the blood sample used in our analysis was collected. (C) Serum or plasma nucleocapsid for individuals with positive nasopharyngeal RT-PCR on the same day as blood sample collection.

**Figure 4.** Comparison of serum or plasma nucleocapsid levels in individuals with and without SARS-CoV-2-specific antibodies. Samples were tested by in-house developed serological tests for nucleocapsid and receptor binding domain specific IgG as well as receptor binding domain specific IgA and IgM. Levels of nucleocapsid are plotted and compared in samples stratified by seropositivity for each antibody type.

**Figure 5.** Comparison of serum or plasma nucleocapsid levels by (A-C) severity and (D-E) inflammatory biomarkers. Intubation in figures B and C includes intubation within 30 days before or after the blood sample was collected. Individuals with severe COVID as defined by the composite of 30-day intubation or mortality are highlighted in D and E.











