





NHS University Hospitals of Leicester NHS Trust



Can we make better tests to quantify host infectiousness?

Turner-Warwick Lecture

Dr Daniel Pan

NIHR Doctoral Research Fellow

Honorary Specialist Registrar in Infectious Diseases and General Internal Medicine University of Leicester and University Hospitals of Leicester NHS Trust

Conflicts of interest

None.

My research is funded by the NIHR, but the views expressed are my own and not necessarily that of the Department of Health

SARS-CoV-2 – do we still care about it?





UK government data Chart made by @chrischirp on X

Respiratory viruses and transmission



Rapid tests for infectiousness

A rapid test must be..

- Accurate in assessment of host infectiousness
- Cheap, easy to perform, acceptable
- Scalable

Implications:

- Clinical assessment
- Rapid de-escalation
- Workplace (healthcare/care homes/schools)
- Used in indoor assessment models
- Human challenge studies
- Recruitment into studies with more complex methods of measuring exhaled breath
- Infectiousness as an outcome in observational studies/clinical trials

Rapid tests for infectiousness

Viral culture is thought to be the gold standard for infectiousness, but it cannot be scaled as a public health test, however **excellent association** between **viral load** by PCR, **viral culture** and **lateral flow assays** in human challenge studies

There is **poor association** between **lateral flow tests** with **actual transmission** in real-world studies, especially in **asymptomatic cases**



Innova LFTs missed up to 90% of source of secondary cases!

Killingley et al, *Nature Medicine* 2022 Deeks et al, *BMJ* 2022

For SARS-CoV-2, serial interval<incubation period



Viral load on swab does not peak pre-symptoms



Time since symptom onset (days)



Are we actually sampling from the best compartment for infectiousness?

within the host



- 1. More abundant respiratory emissions relate to more frequent transmission
- 2. Sampling for infectiousness should reflect this

Facemask sampling captures exhaled virus

Facemask sampling (FMS)



Exposed sampling strips processed – positive for both **RNA** and **viral culture**

FMS RNA **poor association** with concomitant URTS VL

Positive for shorter periods, stable signal



Williams C, Pan D et al Journal of Infection 2021

Facemask sampling relates to household transmission

We have shown that FMS related to household transmission better than URTS





Consistently higher FMS VL in those who transmitted compared to those who did not

Age adjusted OR of household transmission per log increase in copies/strip: 4.97; 95% CI, 1.20–20.55; p = 0.02 but not observed with peak NPS RNA VL

Other advantages of FMS

....but shouting does!



5310 to 315,000,000 copies/strip

Reading has no effect on FMS VL

Effect of reading on exhaled SARS-CoV-2 viral load



Pre-boost antibody titres negatively associated with exhaled VL on FMS following breakthrough

Relationship between pre-boost SARS-CoV-2 anti-spike antibody levels to viral load from exhaled breath in subsequent breakthrough infection



Log¹⁰ anti-spike antibody titres (BAU/ml)

FMS relates to transmission even now

Even with more strict definitions of transmission (household emission + sequencing) The same pattern emerges



Negative results in mpox

Negative results for pathogens not spread by the airborne route (for example, mpox)



Pan et al Journal of Infection 2023

Positive results in measles

First ever empirical evidence for exhaled measles in the literature



Guerra et al Lancet infectious diseases 2018

Screening

FMS also needs to be accepted by those who use it

What proportion of SARS-CoV-2 transmission is asymptomatic?

April 2023 – 202 samples from 188 participants; 5% prevalence of flu/SARS-CoV-2. All 'asymptomatic'

October 2022 – mock examinations – 36 participants and 6 patients (highly vulnerable); 1 participant was positive for SARS-CoV-2

Most HCWs are amenable but would like URTS to confirm diagnosis

HCWs don't like wearing facemasks but will do it if it protects patients

Longitudinal sampling of 50 participants in 2024 underway



Summary

- 1. Not all sampling sites are equal
- 2. FMS is positive for SARS-CoV-2 RNA in early disease and asymptomatics, and may relate to transmission in household contacts better than swabs
- 3. FMS is acceptable within healthcare settings (don't want to, but will do it if necessary to protect patients)
- 4. Findings from FMS is consistent with work done on other pathogens (mpox/measles/TB) and relation to transmission; work on SARS-CoV-2 replicable by other independent groups
- 5. Potential for FMS to be used within future vaccine studies



Pan et al Journal of Infection 2023
Pan et al Clinical Microbiology and Infection 2022
Zhou et al The Lancet Microbe 2023
Gallichotte et al American Journal of Infection Control 2022
Williams et al The Lancet Infectious Diseases 2020
Williams et al Clinical Infectious Diseases 2023

Turner-Warwick. *Thorax* 1975

Thank you! Contact: dp440@leicester.ac.uk

Pareek research group (University of Leicester)

Prof Manish Pareek Christopher A Martin Joshua Nazareth Amani Al-Oraibi Mayuri Gogoi

Barer research group (University of Leicester) Prof Mike Barer

Caroline Williams Eve Fletcher Jonathan Decker

Department of Population Health Sciences (University of Leicester) Prof Laura Gray

Hollingsworth Research Group Li Ka Shing Centre for Health Information and Discovery, Oxford Big Data Institute (University of Oxford) Prof Déirdre Hollingsworth Infectious Diseases Unit and Department of Microbiology (Leicester Royal Infirmary) Iain Stephenson Julian Tang

University of Nottingham Prof Jonathan Van-Tam

University of Southampton Prof Tristan Clark

Hong Kong School of Public Health Prof Benjamin Cowling

Probation review panel Pranabashis Haldar Tim Lucas









National Institute for Health and Care Research