Evaluation of three rapid lateral flow antigen detection tests for the diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2 infection

- 3
- 4 Jääskeläinen AE¹, Ahava MJ¹, Jokela P¹, Szirovicza L², Pohjala S³, Vapalahti O^{1, 2, 4}, Lappalainen M¹,
- 5 Hepojoki J^{2, 5}, Kurkela S¹
- 6
- ¹HUS Diagnostic Center, HUSLAB, Clinical Microbiology, University of Helsinki and Helsinki University
 Hospital, Finland
- 9 ²University of Helsinki, Faculty of Medicine, Medicum, Department of Virology, Finland
- 10 ³Metropolia University of Applied Sciences, Helsinki, Finland
- ⁴University of Helsinki, Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, Department of Veterinary Biosciences,
- 12 Helsinki, Finland
- 13 ⁵University of Zürich, Vetsuisse Faculty, Institute of Veterinary Pathology, Zürich, Switzerland
- 14

15 Abstract

16

17 Introduction

- 18 The COVID-19 pandemic has led to high demand of diagnostic tools. Rapid antigen detection tests
- 19 have been developed and many have received regulatory acceptance such as CE IVD or FDA
- 20 markings. Their performance needs to be carefully assessed.
- 21

22 Materials and Methods

23 158 positive and 40 negative retrospective samples collected in saline and analyzed by a laboratory-

24 developed RT-PCR test were used to evaluate Sofia (Quidel), Standard Q (SD Biosensor), and

- 25 Panbio[™] (Abbott) rapid antigen detection tests (RADTs). A subset of the specimens was subjected to
- 26 virus culture.
- 27

28 Results

29 The specificity of all RADTs was 100% and the sensitivity and percent agreement was 80% and 85%

- 30 for Sofia, 81% and 85% for Standard Q, and 83% and 86% for Panbio[™], respectively. All three RADTs
- evaluated in this study reached a more than 90% sensitivity for samples with a high viral load as

estimated from the low Ct values in the reference RT-PCR. Virus culture was successful in 80% of
 specimens with a Ct value <25.

34

35 Conclusions

- 36 As expected, the RADTs were less sensitive than RT-PCR. However, they benefit from the speed and
- are ease of testing, and lower price as compared to RT-PCR. Repeated testing in appropriate settings
- 38 may improve the overall performance.

39 Introduction

40

41	The superior analytical sensitivity and specificity makes RT-PCR the primary diagnostic tool for the
42	detection of SARS-CoV-2 in respiratory samples [1-2]. Rapid antigen detection tests (RADTs) can be
43	cheap and easy to use compared to RT-PCR. Contrary to PCR, antigen tests do not amplify the
44	detected target, rendering them generally less sensitive [3]. The SARS-CoV-2 RADTs are relatively
45	new in the market, without extensive evaluation. They appear to show very variable performance:
46	according to a systematic review published in August 2020, RADT sensitivity values varied from 0%
47	to 94% [4]. We evaluated three CE IVD marked SARS-CoV-2 RADTs: Sofia (Quidel), Standard Q COVID-
48	19 Ag (SD Biosensor), and Panbio $^{ m m}$ (Abbott). In each of these tests, the sample is suspended or
49	diluted in a sample inactivation medium and transferred to a test device. If SARS-CoV-2 antigen is
50	present above a threshold concentration, a line will appear in the test device within 15 minutes. For
51	Panbio™ and Standard Q, the line is visible for a naked eye, and for Sofia, detection of the
52	fluorescent signal is automated.
53	

54 Materials and methods

55

The evaluation was performed at the HUS Diagnostic Center, the diagnostic laboratory of Helsinki University Hospital and Helsinki and Uusimaa Hospital District, Helsinki, Finland. Research permit HUS/157/2020 (Helsinki University Hospital, Finland) was obtained from the local review board.

59 Evaluated tests

60 We evaluated the performance of Quidel Sofia SARS FIA (Quidel, San Diego, CA), Standard Q COVID-

61 19 Ag test (SD Biosensor, Republic of Korea), and Panbio[™] (Abbott Diagnostic GmbH, Jena, Germany)

62 according to each manufacturer's guidelines for samples in virus transport medium. All evaluated

- 63 tests are intended for fresh swab samples, so this is off-label use and leads to dilution of samples,
- 64 see Table 1.

65 Reference test

- 66 The samples were originally analyzed with a laboratory-developed RT-PCR test (LDT) based on the
- 67 method by Corman and others [5] and modified by us [6] to detect the N gene target of SARS-CoV-2.

68 Patient samples

- 69 A total of 198 nasopharyngeal swabs in 0.9% saline taken between April and November 2020 and
- 70 stored in -20°C were available for the study.
- 71 The analytical performance evaluation was conducted with 102 samples: 40 LDT negative and 62
- 72 positive samples, selected to cover a wide Ct value range. The Ct value of the positive control varied
- 73 between 26.35-32.66.
- 74 To investigate the test performance in an outpatient setting, another set of LDT positive samples
- 75 from adults from outpatient clinics and drive-through testing sites was included by selecting samples
- systematically backwards from 18 November until 96 specimens were reached, i.e. November 1-18
- 77 2020. Samples from hospitals and occupational health services were excluded, as well as samples
- 78 that had less than the required 750 μl for three RADTs left. The positive control Ct values varied from
- 79 25.56 to 27.96. Eighty-seven samples were analyzed by Sofia, 90 by Panbio[™] and 96 by Standard Q.

80 Virus culture

- 81 The PCR positive subset of samples used for analytical performance evaluation was subjected to
- 82 virus isolation experiments in Vero E6 TMRPSS2 cells as described in [7].

83 Statistics

84 Concordance of the results was examined in McNemars's test. Level of statistical significance was set

at P<0.05. Cohen's kappa coefficient was computed to assess the agreement between the methods

by chance and Mann-Whitney U test was used to compare the Ct value medians. Statistical analysis
was performed using SPSS/PASW statistical program package, version 25 (IBM SPSS Inc., Chicago, IL,

88 USA).

89

90 Results

91

The performance of the Sofia, Standard Q and Panbio[™] RADTs in comparison with the LDT RT-PCR 92 93 was assessed by analysing 188, 198 and 190 specimens, respectively. The three RADTs provided valid 94 results for all specimens. The specificity for all three tests was 100%: all RT-PCR negative samples 95 tested negative. In all, the results of Sofia were 80.4% (119/148) consistent with the reference RT-96 PCR with a kappa value of 0.636 (P<0.001). The Standard Q and Panbio[™] tests achieved overall 97 agreements of 84.85% and 86.32% as compared to the RT-PCR with kappa values of 0.633 (P<0.001) 98 and 0.660 (P<0.001), respectively. For all of the RADTs, the observed difference to the reference PCR 99 was statistically significant (P<0.001). The median Ct values of the specimens positive with RADTs 100 were significantly lower than those of the specimens with false negative results (P<0.001 for all 101 RADTs) (Table 2 and Figure 1). 102 Table 3 shows the results for the analytical evaluation of the tests, 62 positive and 40 negative 103 samples in LDT RT-PCR with results of virus culture experiments. Of 18 culture positive specimens, 17 104 were positive in RADTs. 105 The Ct values in the 96 positive samples of the adult outpatients were 10.74-32.49. In all, 75 samples 106 (78%) had a Ct value <25, sixteen (17%) had Ct values of 25-29.99 and five (5%) \geq 30. The sensitivity 107 values of RADTs were 87% (Panbio™), 89% (Standard Q) and 92% (Sofia) but reached 92-96% for 108 samples with Ct <30. (Table 4 and Figure 2).

109

110

111 Discussion

112

113	We evaluated three lateral-flow RADTs for the detection of SARS-CoV-2 infection in nasopharyngeal
114	swab samples collected in 0.9% saline. Our results agree with previous observations that RADTs
115	perform well in detecting culture positive samples and samples with high viral loads [8-11].
116	Compared to RT-PCR, the sensitivity of RADTs is low: in the present study the sensitivity was only 12-
117	38% in samples with Ct≥30 (Table 2).
118	However, the distribution of Ct values of RT-PCR positive samples in settings where antigen
119	detection tests could primarily be used is unknown. We wanted to approach the real-life setting by
120	testing all positive outpatient adult samples tested by LDT in our laboratory during 2.5 weeks in
121	November 2020. The testing strategy in Finland in November 2020 assumed patients to have at least
122	mild symptoms of SARS-CoV-2 infection. Thus, this panel is unlikely to include asymptomatic or
123	presymptomatic patients. During the time of evaluation, the sampling was available in average
124	within 12 hours of seeking for testing. Although medical records of outpatients were not available,
125	we assume the majority of this panel to consist of samples taken within a couple of days from
126	symptom onset. 78% of samples had a Ct value <25, and 95% <30, of the N gene in our LDT. This may
127	justify using antigen tests as a diagnostic tool even when their sensitivity compared to nucleic acid
128	testing is poor for samples with high Ct values. Careful consideration between the advantages (ease,
129	speed, costs) and disadvantages (lower sensitivity) needs to be conducted in the selection of
130	approriate testing strategies [11-12]. If RADTs are considered, laboratories need to perform
131	independent clinical validations, as manufacturers' declaration of performance may not include
132	satisfactory selection of clinical samples. WHO has stated SARS-CoV-2 a biohazard risk for laboratory
133	personnel [13], which needs to be accounted for in RADT testing. In addition, RATDs are not easily

134 scalable for mass testing.

- 135 The present study is limited by its retrospective nature. Ideally, samples for RADT evaluation should
- 136 be collected according to manufacturer's instructions. Instead, we used frozen samples in saline.
- 137 This may lead to underestimation of the sensitivity of the antigen detection tests.
- 138 All three RADTs, Sofia, Standard Q and Panbio[™], were specific but less sensitive than RT-PCR. In
- appropriate settings, this disadvantage may be compensated by the ability to perform the test
- 140 outside a central laboratory, the shorter turnaround time, and lower price. The sensitivity of the
- 141 testing regimen as a whole can be increased by repeat testing [14]. Simple and cheap RADTs with a
- satisfactory performance, such as the three tests evaluated in this study, make repeated testing a
- realistic diagnostic approach in settings in which RT-PCR is not readily or quickly available.

144

145 Acknowledgements

146

147 We thank Marianne Ahola, Jenna Roivas and Laila Shakari for excellent technical assistance.

148 References

149

150	1.	Matheeussen V, Corman VM, Donoso Mantke O, McCulloch E, Lammens C, Goossens H,
151		Niemeyer D, Wallace PS , Klapper P, Niesters HGM, Drosten C, Ieven M, on behalf of the
152		RECOVER project and collaborating networks. International external quality assessment for
153		SARS-CoV-2 molecular detection and survey on clinical laboratory preparedness during the
154		COVID-19 pandemic, April/May2020. <u>Euro Surveill.</u>
155		2020;25(27):pii=2001223. https://doi.org/10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2020.25.27.2001223
156	2.	van Kasteren PB, van der Veer B, den Brink S, Wijsman L, Jonge J, van den Brandt A,
157		Molenkamp R, Reusken CBEM, Meijer A. Comparison of seven commercial RT-PCR diagnostic
158		kits for COVID-19. J Clin Virol 2020:128 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcv.2020.104412
159	3.	Merckx J, Wali R, Schiller I, Caya C, Gore GC, Chartrand C, Dendukuri N, Papenburg J.
160		Diagnostic accuracy of novel and traditional rapid tests for influenza infection compared
161		with reverse transcriptase polymerase chain reaction. A systematic review and meta-
162		analysis. Annals of Internal Medicine 2017:6. Doi: 10.7326/M17-0848
163	4.	Dinnes J, Deeks JJ, Adriano A, Berhane S, Davenport C, Dittrich S, Emperador D, Takwoingi Y,
164		Cunningham J, Beese S, Dretzke J, Ferrante di Ruffano L, Harris IM; Price MJ, Taylor-Phillips S,
165		Hooft L, Leeflang MM, Spijker R, Van den Bruel A, Cochrane COVID-19 Diagnostic Test
166		Accuracy Group: Rapid, point-of-care antigen and molecular-based tests for diagnosis of
167		SARS-CoV-2 infection. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews 2020:8. DOI:
168		10.1002/14651858.CD013705.
169	5.	Corman VM, Landt O, Kaiser M, Molenkamp R, Meijer A, Chu DK, Bleicker T, Brünink S,
170		Schneider J, Schmidt ML, Mulders DG, Haagmans BL, van der Veer B, van den Brink S,
171		Wijsman L, Goderski G, Romette JL, Ellis J, Zambon M, Peiris M, Goossens H, Reusken C,

172		Koopmans MP, Drosten C. Detection of 2019 novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV) by real-time RT-
173		PCR. Euro Surveill. 2020 Jan;25(3):2000045. doi: 10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2020.25.3.2000045.
174		Erratum in: Euro Surveill. 2020 Apr;25(14): Erratum in: Euro Surveill. 2020 Jul;25(30): PMID:
175		31992387; PMCID: PMC6988269.
176	6.	Mannonen L, Kallio-Kokko H, Loginov R, Jääskeläinen AE, Jokela P, Antikainen J, Väre P,
177		Kekäläine n E, Kurkela S, Jarva H, Lappalainen M. Comparison of two commercial platforms
178		and a laboratory developed test for detection of SARS-CoV-2 RNA. 2020 (Preprint.) doi:
179		https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.03.20144758
180	7.	Rusanen J, Kareinen L, Szirovicza L, Uğurlu H, Levanov L, Jääskeläinen AE, Ahava M, Kurkela
181		S, Saksela K, Hedman K, Vapalahti O, Hepojoki J. A generic, scalable, and rapid TR-FRET –
182		based assay for SARS-CoV-2 antigen detection. 2020 (Preprint.) doi:
183		https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.07.20245167
184	8.	Corman VM, Haage VC, Bleicker T, Schmidt ML, Mühlemann B, Zuchowski M, Jó Lei WK,
185		Tscheak P, Möncke-Buchner E, Müller MA, Krumbholz A, Drexler JF, Drosten C: Comparison
186		of seven commercial SARS-CoV.2 rapid Pont-of-Care Antigen tests. 2020. (Preprint.)
187		doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.12.20230292
188	9.	Merino-Amador P, Guinea J, Muñoz-Gallego I, González-Donapetry P, Galán J-C, Antona
189		N, Cilla G, Hernáez-Crespo S, Díaz-de Tuesta J-L, Gual-de Torrella A, González-Romo F
190		Escribano P, Sánchez-Castellano MÁ, Sota-Busselo M, Delgado-Iribarren A, García J,
191		Cantón R, Muñoz P, Folgueira MD, Cuenca-Estrella M, Oteo-Iglesias J, Spanish Panbio™
192		COVID-19 validation group: Multicenter evaluation of the Panbio™ COVID-19 Rapid Antigen-
193		Detection Test for the diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2 infection. 2020 (Preprint.)
194		doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.18.20230375

195	10. Toptan T	F, Eckermann L	, Pfeiffer AE	, Hoehl S	, Ciesek S	, Drosten C	, Corman VM.	Evaluation of a
-----	--------------	----------------	---------------	-----------	------------	-------------	--------------	-----------------

- 196 SARS-CoV-2 rapid antigen test: potential to help reduce community spread? 2020 (Preprint.)
- 197 doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.04.20240283
- 198 11. WHO: Antigen-detection in the diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2 infection using rapid immunoassays.
- 199 Interim guidance. Available at <u>https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/antigen-detection-</u>
- 200 in-the-diagnosis-of-sars-cov-2infection-using-rapid-immunoassays. Updated September 11,
- 201 <u>2020. Accessed December 29, 2020.</u>
- 202 12. ECDC: Options for the use of rapid antigen tests for COVID-19 in the EU/EEA and the UK.
- 203 Technical report. Available at
- 204 https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/sites/default/files/documents/Options-use-of-rapid-antigen-
- 205 tests-for-COVID-19.pdf. Updated November 19, 2020. Accessed December 29, 2020.
- 206 13. WHO: Laboratory biosafety guidance related to coronavirus disease (COVID-19): interim
- 207 guidance. Available at <u>https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/332076</u>. Updated May 13,
- 208 2020. Accessed December 29, 2020.
- 209 14. Mina MJ, Parker R, Larremore DB. Rethinking Covid-19 test sensitivity a strategy for
- 210 containment. N Engl J Med 2020; 383:e120 DOI: 10.1056/NEJMp2025631

· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
	Quidel Sofia SARS	SD Biosensor SARS-	Abbott Panbio™
	Antigen FIA	CoV-2 Rapid Antigen	COVID-19 Ag Rapid
		test	TEST Device NP
	Nasopharyngeal and	Nasopharyngeal	Nasopharyngeal
Intended use	nasal swabs	swabs	swabs
Target	Nucleocapsid protein	Nucleocapsid protein	Nucleocapsid protein
	Sofia or Sofia2		
Interpretation of results	instrument	Visual	Visual
Procedural control/visible control line	Yes/No	Yes/Yes	Yes/Yes
		Available, but not	
External controls	Yes	included in the kit	Yes
LoD, as reported by the manufacturer	1.13x10 ² TCID ₅₀ /mL	3.12x10 ^{2.2} TCID ₅₀ /mL.	2.5x10 ^{1.8} TCID ₅₀ /mL
Sensitivity, as reported by the			
manufacturer	96.67%	96.52%	93.33%
Specificity, as reported by the			
manufacturer	100 %	99.68%	99.45%
Incubation time	15 minutes	15-30 minutes	15-20 minutes
Sample volume	120 µl	3 drops	5 drops
Sample volume when using a frozen			
VTM sample μl	250	350	150
Sample dilution when using a frozen			
saline sample in this study,			
approximately	1:6	1:4	1:10
Regulatory certification	CE-IVD, FDA EUA	CE-IVD	CE-IVD
Lots used in this evaluation	143489	QCO3020105	41ADF024A

211 Table 1. Main properties of the three RADTs evaluated in this study.

		SOFIA	STANDARD Q	PANBIO
		QUIDEL	SD BIOSENSOR	ABBOTT
All	Tested, n	188	198	190
samples	Same as ref	159	168	164
	Agreement	84.57%	84.85%	86.32%
	95% CI	78.72-89.04	79.19-89.18	80.70-90.49
All RT-PCR	Tested, n	148	158	152
positive	Tested pos, n	119	128	126
samples	Sensitivity	80%	81%	83%
	Agreement	80.41%	81.01%	82.89%
	95% CI	73.28-86.00	74.19-86.36	76.12-88.05
	Ct median (Ag⁻/Ag⁺)	31.75/20.97	31.17/20.95	31.08/20.98
RT-PCR	Tested, n	89	97	92
positives,	Tested pos, n	88	96	90
Ct <25	Sensitivity	99%	99%	98%
RT-PCR	Tested, n	34	35	34
positives,	Tested pos, n	28	24	26
Ct 25-29.99	Sensitivity	82%	69%	76%
RT-PCR	Tested, n	123	132	126
positives,	Tested pos, n	116	120	116
Ct <30	Sensitivity	94%	91%	92%
RT-PCR	Tested, n	25	26	26
positives,	Tested pos, n	3	8	10
Ct ≥30	Sensitivity	12%	31%	38%

212 Table 2. The performance of RADTs, all samples, all RT-PCR positive samples, and samples grouped

213 according to Ct values of the N gene target in the LDT RT-PCR. Tested, n, number of tested samples.

Same as ref: number of samples tested the same as reference LDT RT-PCR test, positive or negative.

215 Tested pos, n, number of samples that were positive in RADT. Ag⁻/Ag⁺: Ct median of samples that

		SOFIA	STANDARD Q	PANBIO	VIRUS
		QUIDEL	SD BIOSENSOR	ABBOTT	CULTURE
Total RT-PCR positive	Tested, n	61	62	62	59
samples	Tested pos, n	39	43	48	18
	Sensitivity	64%	69%	77%	31%
RT-PCR positives, Ct	Tested, n	22	22	22	20
<25	Tested pos, n	22	22	22	16
	Sensitivity	100%	100%	100%	80%
RT-PCR positives, Ct	Tested, n	19	19	19	19
25-29.99	Tested pos, n	15	14	16	2
	Sensitivity	79%	74%	84%	11%
RT-PCR positives, Ct	Tested, n	41	41	41	39
<30	Tested pos, n	37	36	38	18
	Sensitivity	90%	88%	93%	46%
RT-PCR positives, Ct	Tested, n	20	21	21	20
≥30	Tested pos, n	2	7	10	0
	Sensitivity	10%	33%	48%	0%
RT-PCR negatives	Tested, n	40	40	38	ND
	Tested pos, n	0	0	0	

Table 3. The performance of the antigen tests and virus culture in a panel of selected 62 positive

and 40 negative samples according to Ct values of the N gene target in the LDT RT-PCR. Tested, n,

219 number of tested samples. Tested pos, n, number of samples that were positive in antigen test or

220 virus culture. ND, not done.

		SOFIA	STANDARD Q	PANBIO
		QUIDEL	SD BIOSENSOR	ABBOTT
Total RT-PCR positive	Tested, n	87	96	90
samples	Tested pos, n	80	85	78
	Sensitivity	92%	89%	87%
RT-PCR positives, Ct <25	Tested, n	67	75	70
	Tested pos, n	66	74	68
	Sensitivity	99%	99%	97%
RT-PCR positives, Ct 25-	Tested, n	15	16	15
29.99	Tested pos, n	13	10	10
	Sensitivity	87%	63%	67%
RT-PCR positives, Ct <30	Tested, n	82	91	85
	Tested pos, n	79	84	78
	Sensitivity	96%	92%	92%
RT-PCR positives, Ct ≥30	Tested, n	5	5	5
	Tested pos, n	1	1	0
	Sensitivity	20%	20%	0%

Table 4. The performance of antigen tests in a panel of positive adult outpatient samples in

223 November 1-18, 2020, grouped according to Ct values of the N gene target in the LDT RT-PCR.

224 Tested, n, number of tested samples. Tested pos, n, number of samples that were positive in antigen

225 test.



228 Figure 1. Sensitivities of Sofia, Standard Q and Panbio rapid antigen detection tests for SARS-CoV-

229 **2.** Total number of RT-PCR positive samples tested for Sofia: 148, Standard Q: 158, Panbio: 152;

230 number of RT-PCR positive samples, Ct<25, tested for Sofia: 89, Standard Q: 97, Panbio: 92. Number

of RT-PCR positive samples, Ct 25-29.99, tested for Sofia: 34, Standard Q: 35, Panbio: 34. Number of

232 R-PCR positive samples, Ct ≥30, tested for Sofia: 25, Standard Q: 26, Panbio: 26.



234 235

236 Figure 2. Sensitivity of the RADTs in comparison to Ct values in RT-PCR. Samples include all the LDT

237 RT-PCR positive nasopharyngeal samples from adult outpatients at HUSLAB in 1.-18. November 2020

that had enough sample volume left for three antigen tests. N= 96, however, in some cases, not all

three RADTs were performed to all samples. Each dot indicates one samples. Ct <25: 75 samples; Ct

240 25-29.99: 16 samples; Ct ≥30: 5 samples.