

1

2 **Limits and opportunities of SARS-CoV-2 antigen rapid tests – an experience based**
3 **perspective**

4 Verena Schildgen^{1#}, Sabrina Demuth¹, Jessica Lüsebrink¹, and Oliver Schildgen¹

5

6 1. All Authors' affiliation: Kliniken der Stadt Köln gGmbH, Institut für Pathologie, Klinikum
7 der Privaten Universität Witten/Herdecke, Ostmerheimer Str. 200, 51109 Köln

8

9 # Send correspondence to:

10 Priv.-Doz.in. Dr. rer. nat. Verena Schildgen

11 Kliniken der Stadt Köln gGmbH

12 Klinikum der Privaten Universität Witten/Herdecke

13 Institut für Pathologie

14 Ostmerheimer Str. 200

15 D-51109 Köln (Cologne)

16 Germany

17 Tel.: +49(0)221-890718887

18 Fax.: +40(0)221-89073542

19 E-Mail: schildgenv@kliniken-koeln.de

20 verena.schildgen@uni-wh.de

21

22

23 **Abstract**

24 **Background:** Due to the steadily rising case numbers of SARS-CoV-2 infections worldwide
25 there is an increasing need for reliable rapid diagnostic devices in addition to existing gold
26 standard PCR-methods. Actually, public attention is focused on antigen assays including
27 lateral flow tests (LFTs) as diagnostic alternative. Therefore, different LFTs were analyzed
28 regarding their performance in a clinical setting.

29 **Material and Methods:** A pilot sample panel of 13 BALFs and 60 throat washing samples
30 (TWs) with confirmed PCR results as well as 8 throat washes invalid by PCR was tested with
31 the BIOCREDIT test (RapiGEN), the Panbio™ assay (Abbott), and the SARS-CoV-2 Rapid
32 Antigen Test (Roche).

33 **Conclusion:** The analyzed antigen test showed an inter-assay correlation of 27.4% with
34 overall specificities ranging from 19.4% to 87.1%, while sensitivities of the respective tests
35 ranged between 33.3% and 88.1%. Although these assays did not entirely meet all high
36 expectations their benefit has to be carefully evaluated for the respective test strategy and
37 setting.

38

39

40 **Introduction:**

41 In December 2019 the public became aware of the new betacoronavirus SARS-CoV-2 due to
42 an outbreak in Wuhan, China (1). Very soon it turned out that spreading of the virus cannot
43 be prevented and Covid-19 was declared a pandemic in March 2020
44 ([https://www.euro.who.int/en/health-topics/health-emergencies/coronavirus-covid-](https://www.euro.who.int/en/health-topics/health-emergencies/coronavirus-covid-19/news/news/2020/3/who-announces-covid-19-outbreak-a-pandemic)
45 [19/news/news/2020/3/who-announces-covid-19-outbreak-a-pandemic](https://www.euro.who.int/en/health-topics/health-emergencies/coronavirus-covid-19/news/news/2020/3/who-announces-covid-19-outbreak-a-pandemic)). In order to minimize the
46 risk of infection different undirected as well as targeted tracking strategies were developed,
47 whose success is dependent on extensive testing of the largest possible number of people
48 (2). For SARS-CoV-2 detection different PCRs are used in routine diagnostic. Although these
49 PCRs actually represent the diagnostic gold standard (3), valuable time passes until the
50 result is available (<https://www.nytimes.com/2020/08/04/us/virus-testing-delays.html>). Since it
51 was shown that rapid antibody screenings are not suitable to evaluate chains of infection or
52 their interruption, other kinds of rapid on-site tests are needed to perform the requested mass
53 testing.

54 Among these are the BIOCREREDIT COVID-19 Ag test of RapiGEN (Korea), the Panbio™
55 COVID-19 Ag of Abbott (Germany), and the SARS-CoV-2 Rapid Antigen Test of Roche
56 (Germany). These lateral flow tests (LFTs) are based on immunochromatography and show
57 SARS-CoV-2 antigen presence by a coloured test line. Sampling should be performed in the
58 nasopharynx with a supplied swab, but except the Panbio™ assay UTM/VTM (universal/viral
59 transport media) are also appropriate. Moreover it has been shown that specimen other than
60 nasopharyngeal swaps are superior regarding diagnostic sensitivity (4, 5). For this reason we
61 tested a pilot sample panel of 60 throat washes and 13 bronchoalveolar fluids (BALFs)
62 regarding its test performance.

63 **Material and Methods:**

64 A pilot sample panel of 13 BALFs and 60 throat washing samples (TWs) with confirmed PCR
65 results (RealStar® SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR Kit, Altona, Germany) as well as 8 throat washes
66 invalid by PCR was tested with three SARS-CoV-2 antigen lateral flow tests (LFTs). We
67 compared the BIOCREREDIT assay of RapiGEN, the Panbio™ assay of Abbott, and the SARS-
68 CoV-2 Rapid Antigen Test of Roche. If supplied, controls were performed according to the
69 manufacturer. For test procedure sample volumes of 55µl (Roche), 110 µl (Abbott), and 150
70 µl (RapiGen) BALF/TW instead of extracted swap material were applied to the respective
71 assays, but otherwise tests were performed according to the manufacturers'
72 recommendations. Additional analysis with the above listed tests were performed with PCR
73 invalid samples (n=8).

74 **Results:**

75 First, proper performance of the Panbio™ was confirmed with the supplied controls (fig. 1A).
76 After pooling these controls were applied to the devices of Roche, which also detected the
77 positive control, and of RapiGEN, which was negative for the Abbott controls (fig.1B). In
78 order to figure out if SARS-CoV-2 antigen can be detected in specimens other than
79 nasopharyngeal swabs we applied either diluted or original PCR positive specimen on the
80 device and checked for the presence of the control line (C) and the test line (T). To increase
81 the probability of antigen detection samples with Ct values <16 for E- and S-gene were used.
82 Although there was not sufficient material of sample II, this pilot approach showed that the
83 specimens used allow a proper test performance and that SARS-CoV-2 antigen can
84 principally be detected in throat washes (I and II) and BALF (III) (fig. 2).

85 The analysis of the complete test cohort revealed overall sensitivities of 33.3% (RapiGEN),
86 50% (Abbott), and 88.1% (Roche) with opposite overall specificities of 87.1% (RapiGEN),
87 77.4% (Abbott), and 19.4% (Roche) (table 1). This means positive predictive values (PPVs)
88 ranging from 59.7% (Roche) to 77.8% (RapiGEN) and negative predictive values (NPVs) of
89 53.3% (Abbott), 54.6% (Roche) and 49.1% (RapiGEN).

90 The analysis of 50 samples confirmed symptomatic (46%) or asymptomatic (54%) with
91 regard to the respective PCR result, led to sensitivity/specificity values in asymptomatic
92 individuals of 30.8/92.9% (RapiGEN), 38.5/71.4% (Abbott), and 84.6/14.3% (Roche) and to
93 sensitivity/specificity values in symptomatic individuals of 30.0/76.9% (RapiGEN),
94 40.0/84.6% (Abbott), and 100/7.7% (Roche). Regarding the BALF specimens the assays of
95 Abbott and Roche showed performance data of 72.7% or 81.8% sensitivity and 100%
96 specificity, whereas RapiGEN also showed 100% specificity but 54.6% sensitivity (table 1).

97 When comparing the antigen tests with regard to their correlation it turned out that the
98 RapiGEN-Roche coincidence was 35.6% (26 samples), the RapiGEN-Abbott coincidence
99 64.4% (47 samples), and the Roche-Abbott coincidence 50.7% (37 samples). In total, the
100 LFTs provided the same results in 20 out of 73 samples (27.4%). These results damped the
101 expectation that PCR invalid samples could reliably be analyzed with any of these rapid
102 antigen tests, especially as two of these samples (n=8) still remained invalid in one LFT,
103 respectively, and only three samples coincide as negative in all LFTs.

104 When checking any correlation of viral RNA load and presence of SARS-CoV-2 antigen we
105 were able to monitor two asymptomatic individuals, who were PCR positive for more than
106 five weeks before recovering in week six. Ct values ranged from 27.9 to 34.3 in patient A

107 (data series dark grey) and from 23.8 to 35.2 in patient B (data series light grey). The
108 BIOCREDIT assay detected SARS-CoV-2 antigen only in three samples of patient A with Ct
109 values >30 (figure 3). Sample four of patient B was only detected by the Panbio™ assay and
110 sample 5 only by the SARS-CoV-2 Rapid Antigen Test of Roche. Sample 1 of patient A
111 remained antigen negative in all tests, despite a positive PCR result, whereas none of the
112 samples was identified as positive in all three assays.

113 **Discussion:**

114 Due to the pandemic spread of SARS-CoV-2 it would be desirable to possess reliable rapid
115 tests for infection control by early notification of cases to enable an effective outbreak
116 management. Therefore, R&D efforts are focused on rapid diagnostic tests including SARS-
117 CoV-2 antigen tests.

118 Here we tested SARS-CoV-2 antigen assays by RapiGen, Abbott, and Roche. According to
119 the manufacturers' instructions, sampling should be performed with supplied swaps, but this
120 test procedure limits test comparability as every swap represents an individual sample even
121 if taken from the same patient. For this reason, and because UTM/VTM is also appropriate
122 except for the Panbio™ assay, we evaluated assay performance with BALF and throat
123 washes as these were performed with a physiological solution of NaCl (0.9% w/v) and thus
124 did not contain any additional interfering chemicals compared to the allowed transport media.
125 Although the Panbio™ assay excludes specimens other than swaps, it is unlikely that the
126 Panbio™ buffer components ProClin300 and sodium acid (preservatives) or Tricin (buffer
127 substance capturing divalent metal ions) have direct influence on SARS-CoV-2 antigen
128 binding capacity. Solely missing Tween20 might have influenced antigen binding in the
129 PanBio™ assay, but although test control lines occurred properly in all PCR pre-tested
130 samples the overall correlation between all LFTs was only 27.4%.

131 The fact that the positive control supplied by Abbott was detected by Roche, but not by
132 RapiGen, suggests that the assays may detect different antigens, which additionally
133 complicates the estimation of test comparability and usability in clinical routine settings.
134 Especially, as it still remains unclear if further common phenomena such as defective
135 interfering particles, antigen drift or antigen shift occur during the current pandemic influence
136 assay performance of any SARS-CoV-2 antigen test.


137 As SARS-CoV-2 antigen is detected in samples of individuals ranging from asymptomatic +
138 PCR negative, to symptomatic + PCR negative, to asymptomatic + PCR positive, to
139 symptomatic + PCR positive, antigen tests are not suitable for routine diagnostics as long the

140 complex relationships between viral RNA load, SARS-CoV-2 antigen detection, and clinical
141 symptoms remain unsolved. This conclusion is supported by the manufacturer's
142 recommendations, who explicitly claim that their assays are not approved as stand-alone
143 diagnostic and the limitations that the assay should be performed "in patients with clinical
144 symptoms" (RapiGEN) or that the test "is not intended to detect from defective (non-
145 infectious) virus during the later stages of viral shedding that might be detected by PCR
146 molecular tests" (Abbott). This means that these assays are not appropriate for the screening
147 of asymptomatic individuals and cannot be recommended to date to be broadly used in any
148 setting in which reliable diagnostics are crucial to avoid spreading of the virus, such as
149 hospitals and long-term care facilities for the elderly or other risk groups, especially, as
150 limited information on host and viral factors influencing shedding of SARS-CoV-2 antigens
151 and their correlation to infectious viruses impede any prognosis on infectivity.

152 Although it actually seems that exclusive antigen tests have research character rather than
153 being true IVDs and unfortunately cannot replace PCR assays, they should additionally be
154 used to gain deeper insights into infectivity and the course of infection to develop more
155 advanced testing strategies.

156

157




158

159 **Figure 1: Controls of the Panbio™ COVID-19 Ag test (Abott).** A Supplied PCs (2, 4, 6, 8)
160 and NCs (1, 3, 5, 7) of four kits were performed according to the manufacturer's protocol. B
161 Controls of approach A were pooled and applied to the antigen tests of Roche (9, 10) and
162 RapiGEN (11, 12). While the PC of Abbott also became positive with Roche (10), the
163 BIOCREDIT test did not recognize the positive control (11). PC = positive control, NC =
164 negative control

165

166



167

168 **Figure 2: SARS-CoV-2 antigen detection.** To evaluate the suitability of specimen others
 169 than nasopharyngeal swabs two PCR positive throat washes (I: $Ct_{E-Gen}=15,6$, $Ct_{S-Gen}=14,8$; II:
 170 $CT_{E-Gen}=14,7$, $Ct_{S-Gen}=14,9$) and one BALF (III: $Ct_{E-gen}=13,1$, $Ct_{S-Gen}=12,6$) were used for initial
 171 evaluation of lateral flow test performance. SARS-CoV-2 antigen was detected with the
 172 BIOCREEDIT test in all samples, but dilution in assay buffer (d: 1, 5, 7) decreases sensitivity
 173 compared to original fluid (o: 2, 6, 8). Undiluted samples I and III were also used for an initial
 174 analysis with the Panbio™ COVID-19 Ag test (Abott) (3, 9) and the SARS-CoV-2 Rapid
 175 Antigen Test (Roche) (4, 10) also delivering positive results in both tests. As shown by the
 176 control line the specimens allowed a proper test performance and did not contain any
 177 inhibitory substances. d=1:2 diluted with supplied buffer, o= original

178

179


	RapiGEN		Abbott		Roche	
	Sensitivity	Specificity	Sensitivity	Specificity	Sensitivity	Specificity
BAL N=13	54.6	100	72.7	100	81.82	100
TW _{symptomatic} N=23	30.0	76.9	40.0	84.6	100	7.7
TW _{asymptomatic} N=27	30.8	92.9	38.5	71.4	84.6	14.3
Total N=73	33.3	87.1	50.0	77.4	88.1	19.4

180

181 **Table 1: Sensitivity* and specificity* of SARS-CoV-2 antigen detection in PCR tested**
 182 **specimen.** Three LFTs were used for evaluation. Analysis of the complete test cohort (n=73)
 183 reveals overall sensitivities of 33.3% (RapiGEN), 50.0% (Abbott), and 88.1% (Roche).
 184 Overall specificities range from 19.4% (Roche) to 77.42% (Abbott) up to 87.1% (RapiGEN).
 185 50 samples confirmed symptomatic or asymptomatic reveal highest sensitivities (84.6% and
 186 100%), but poor specificities with Roche, whereas highest specificities (76.9% and 92.9%)
 187 are reached by RapiGEN with sensitivities of 30% respectively. In total the three LFTs match
 188 in 20 of 73 samples (27.4%). * in percent, BAL= bronchoalveolar lavage, TW= throat wash

189

190



191

192 **Figure 3: Correlation of SARS-CoV-2 antigen detection with RNA load.** This figure
193 shows longitudinal SARS-CoV-2 detection by PCR in two asymptomatic individuals (A: dark
194 grey; B: light grey). In both cases SARS-CoV-2 RNA could be detected for about five weeks
195 before recovering in week six. The BIOCREDIT assay (red) detected SARS-CoV-2 antigen
196 only in patient A in three samples with Ct >30. Although the assays of Abbott (green) and
197 Roche (yellow) identified 4 and 7 samples as positive, respectively, one sample remained
198 antigen negative (sample 1 of patient A). Except the negative sample there was no
199 coincidence between the LFTs at all. * only tested negative by BIOCREDIT due to insufficient
200 material

201

202

203 **References:**

- 204 1. Zhu N, Zhang D, Wang W, Li X, Yang B, Song J, et al. A Novel Coronavirus from Patients with
205 Pneumonia in China, 2019. *The New England journal of medicine*. 2020;382(8):727-33.
- 206 2. Fineberg HV. Ten Weeks to Crush the Curve. *The New England journal of medicine*.
207 2020;382(17):e37.
- 208 3. Smithgall MC, Dowlatshahi M, Spitalnik SL, Hod EA, Rai AJ. Types of Assays for SARS-CoV-2
209 Testing: A Review. *Laboratory medicine*. 2020;51(5):e59-e65.
- 210 4. Wyllie AL, Fournier J, Casanovas-Massana A, Campbell M, Tokuyama M, Vijayakumar P, et al.
211 Saliva or Nasopharyngeal Swab Specimens for Detection of SARS-CoV-2. *The New England journal of*
212 *medicine*. 2020.
- 213 5. Malecki M, Lusebrink J, Teves S, Wendel AF. Pharynx gargle samples are suitable for SARS-
214 CoV-2 diagnostic use and save personal protective equipment and swabs. *Infection control and*
215 *hospital epidemiology*. 2020:1-2.

216

217

218 **Statements**

219 The authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest

220 The study did not receive any external funding.

221 The study was performed in agreement with the approval 122/2016 of the Ethical Committee
222 of the Private University of Witten/Herdecke.