

1 **Diagnostic accuracy of two commercial SARS-CoV-2 Antigen-detecting rapid tests at the**  
2 **point of care in community-based testing centers**

3  
4 Alice Berger<sup>1\*</sup>, Marie Therese Ngo Nsoga<sup>1\*</sup>, Francisco Javier Perez-Rodriguez<sup>2\*</sup>, Yasmine Abi  
5 Aad<sup>1</sup>, Pascale Sattonnet-Roche<sup>2</sup>, Angèle Gayet-Ageron<sup>3</sup>, Cyril Jaksic<sup>3</sup>, Giulia Torriani<sup>4</sup>, Erik  
6 Boehm<sup>1</sup>, Ilona Kronig<sup>1</sup>, Jilian A. Sacks<sup>5</sup>, Margaretha de Vos<sup>5</sup>, Frédérique Jacqueroz Bausch<sup>6</sup>,  
7 François Chappuis<sup>6</sup>, Laurent Kaiser<sup>1,2,7</sup>, Manuel Schibler<sup>1,2,7</sup>, Isabella Eckerle<sup>1,2,7</sup> for the Geneva  
8 Centre for Emerging Viral Diseases

9  
10 <sup>1</sup> Division of Infectious Disease, Geneva University Hospitals, Geneva, Switzerland.

11 <sup>2</sup> Geneva Centre for Emerging Viral Diseases, Geneva University Hospitals, Geneva,  
12 Switzerland.

13 <sup>3</sup> CRC & Division of Clinical-Epidemiology, Department of Health and Community Medicine,  
14 University of Geneva & University Hospitals of Geneva

15 <sup>4</sup> Department of Microbiology and Molecular Medicine, University of Geneva, Geneva,  
16 Switzerland

17 <sup>5</sup> Foundation for Innovative New Diagnostics, Geneva, Switzerland

18 <sup>6</sup> Department of Primary Care, Geneva University Hospitals, Geneva, Switzerland.

19 <sup>7</sup> Laboratory of Virology, Division of Laboratory Medicine, Geneva University Hospitals,  
20 Geneva, Switzerland

21  
22 \*contributed equally

23  
24 **NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.**

- 25 Corresponding author:
- 26 Isabella Eckerle
- 27 University Hospital of Geneva
- 28 Rue Gabrielle-Perret-Gentil 4
- 29 CH-1205 Geneva
- 30 Phone: +41 22 37 29820 / +41 79 55 33 895
- 31 Fax: +41 22 37 24097

32 **Abstract**

33 **Background.** Antigen-detecting rapid diagnostic tests for SARS-CoV-2 offer new opportunities  
34 for the quick and laboratory-independent identification of infected individuals for control of  
35 the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic.

36 **Methods.** We performed a prospective, single-center, point of care validation of two antigen-  
37 detecting rapid diagnostic tests (Ag-RDT) in comparison to RT-PCR on nasopharyngeal swabs.

38 **Findings.** Between October 9<sup>th</sup> and 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2020, 1064 participants were enrolled. The Panbio™  
39 Covid-19 Ag Rapid Test device (Abbott) was validated in 535 participants, with 106 positive  
40 Ag-RDT results out of 124 positive RT-PCR individuals, yielding a sensitivity of 85.5% (95% CI:  
41 78.0–91.2). Specificity was 100.0% (95% CI: 99.1–100) in 411 RT-PCR negative individuals. The  
42 Standard Q Ag-RDT (SD Biosensor, Roche) was validated in 529 participants, with 170 positive  
43 Ag-RDT results out of 191 positive RT-PCR individuals, yielding a sensitivity of 89.0% (95%CI:  
44 83.7–93.1). One false positive result was obtained in 338 RT-PCR negative individuals, yielding  
45 a specificity of 99.7% (95%CI: 98.4–100). For individuals presenting with fever 1-5 days post  
46 symptom onset, combined Ag-RDT sensitivity was above 95%.

47 **Interpretation.** We provide an independent validation of two widely available commercial Ag-  
48 RDTs, both meeting WHO criteria of  $\geq 80\%$  sensitivity and  $\geq 97\%$  specificity. Although less  
49 sensitive than RT-PCR, these assays could be beneficial due to their rapid results, ease of use,  
50 and independence from existing laboratory structures. Testing criteria focusing on patients  
51 with typical symptoms in their early symptomatic period onset could further increase  
52 diagnostic value.

53 **Funding.** Foundation of Innovative Diagnostics (FIND), Fondation privée des HUG, Pictet  
54 Charitable Foundation.

## 55 Introduction

56 The 2019 novel coronavirus (SARS-CoV-2) which causes Coronavirus Disease 19 (COVID-19),  
57 has led to an unprecedented pandemic and a global public health crisis. Developing diagnostic  
58 strategies that are easily accessible, provide rapid results and are of low cost to allow use in  
59 resource limited settings is critical in order to control the pandemic. While RT-PCR based  
60 detection remains the standard for the detection of emerging respiratory viruses (1,2), the  
61 global need for virus detection methods has fueled research and development of diagnostic  
62 tests, including as Antigen-detecting rapid diagnostic tests (Ag-RDT), that can be performed at  
63 the point of care (POC) (3).

64 Such laboratory-independent tests could be key to detecting acutely infected and especially  
65 contagious individuals, allowing for control of the pandemic by quickly isolating individuals  
66 during their contagious period to prevent further transmission. These tests can also help  
67 overcome bottlenecks such as overwhelmed diagnostic laboratories and global shortages of  
68 PCR reagents, while being affordable (4). Ag-RDTs could enable mass screenings, which allow  
69 estimation of active infection prevalence, and confirming a COVID-19 diagnosis especially in  
70 settings where results are not available in a timely manner (5). Given that viral load, as  
71 measured by RNA levels, peaks near symptom onset (6–8) and contagiousness can begin days  
72 before symptom onset (9,10), it is expected that RDTs would have the highest sensitivity (SN)  
73 in those infected individuals that are most contagious. However, reported SNs of Ag-RDTs vary  
74 widely, and manufacturer reported SNs are often substantially higher than the SNs reported  
75 by independent assessments (11). The World Health Organisation (WHO) has published an Ag-  
76 RDT target product profile, aiming at SN  $\geq 80\%$  and a specificity (SP) of  $\geq 97\%$  (5,12). Thus, we  
77 sought to evaluate the performance of two commercially available Ag-RDTs through a

78 prospective, single-center POC validation in comparison to RT-PCR for detecting SARS-CoV-2  
79 using nasopharyngeal swabs (NPS) under real-life conditions.

80

## 81 **Methods**

### 82 *Ethics*

83 The study was approved by the Cantonal ethics committee (Nr. 2020-02323). All study  
84 participants and/or their legal guardians provided written informed consent.

85

### 86 *Setting*

87 The study was performed in two geographically different testing centres in Geneva, run by our  
88 institution, the Geneva University Hospitals: one adjacent to the University hospital (“Sector  
89 E”) and the other located in another part of the city (“Sector G”) between October 9<sup>th</sup> and  
90 October 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2020. Both centres are supervised by the same team, and did not differ in their  
91 infrastructure, so we analyzed them as a single centre study.

92

### 93 *Study design and participants*

94 The primary objective of this prospective study was to assess the diagnostic accuracy (SN and  
95 SP) of the Ag-RDTs compared to the reference RT-PCR. All individuals presenting to the testing  
96 centres were informed about the study and enrolled if they consented. Participants were  $\geq 16$   
97 years of age, with suspected SARS-CoV-2 infection according to the local governmental testing  
98 criteria. This included suggestive symptoms for COVID-19 and/or recent exposure to a SARS-  
99 CoV-2 positive person. Asymptomatic individuals were included if they were notified by the  
100 Swiss COVID-19 app about a contact offering the option to get tested on day 5 after contact,

101 or if they received a notification from local health authorities (screening of people with high  
102 risk exposure in a cluster).

103

#### 104 *Study procedures*

105 For each participant, two NPS were collected. The first was a standard flocked swab placed in  
106 viral transport media (VTM), used routinely for viral genome detection by RT-PCR. The second  
107 NPS, provided in the Ag-RDT kit, was obtained from the contralateral nostril and was  
108 performed as recommended by the manufacturer. Both swabs were taken by the same  
109 trained nurse. All Ag-RDTs were performed immediately at the sample collection site.  
110 Adequate personal protective equipment was used while collecting the NPSs and performing  
111 the RDTs.

112

#### 113 *Data collection*

114 Clinical data were collected for each patient upon presentation with a questionnaire including  
115 the number of days post symptom onset (DPOS), known contact to a previous SARS-CoV-2  
116 infected person, comorbidities and type of symptoms. The following symptoms were  
117 recorded: rhinorrhea (runny nose),odynophagia, myalgia, chills, dry cough, productive cough,  
118 red expectoration, fever (anamnestic), anosmia/ageusia (loss of smell or taste),  
119 gastrointestinal symptoms, asthenia, dyspnea, thoracic pain and headache.

120 Comorbidities included in the questionnaire were hypertension, cardiovascular disease,  
121 chronic pulmonary disease, diabetes, chronic renal failure, active cancer including  
122 lymphoproliferative disease, severe immunosuppression, immunosuppressive therapy,  
123 pregnancy, and obesity (BMI >40 kg/m<sup>2</sup>).

124

125 *Ag-RDT testing*

126 The two validated Ag-RDTs were Panbio Covid-19 Ag Rapid Test device (Abbott Rapid  
127 Diagnostics) and Standard Q (SD Biosensor, Roche). Both Ag-RDTs were used as recommended  
128 by the manufacturers, using only materials provided by the manufacturers in the kits. Both  
129 assays were manually read, with two individuals reading the results separately after the  
130 indicated time. In case of discordant results, the two validators sought a consensus. All visible  
131 bands were considered a positive result. All Ag-RDT results were photographically  
132 documented.

133

134 *RT-PCR testing*

135 All participants were tested by a dual target RT-PCR assay for SARS-CoV-2 (Cobas, Roche) using  
136 NPS in 3mL VTM. For further analysis, only cycle threshold (Ct) values for the E-gene were  
137 used. For calculation of viral loads (VL) as SARS-CoV-2 genome copy numbers per mL, a  
138 standard curve was obtained by using a quantified supernatant from a cell culture isolate of  
139 SARS-CoV-2. All VLs were calculated from the Ct-values, according to  $\log_{10}$  SARS-CoV-2 RNA  
140 copies/ml = (Ct-44.5)/-3.3372 for Cobas (13,14).

141

142 *Statistics*

143 We enrolled all patients who met the SARS-CoV-2 testing criteria, over a 2-week period. During  
144 the first and second week, 529 and 535 patients were enrolled respectively. The target sample  
145 size was 530, as it would have sufficient power to generate a 95% confidence interval (CI) with  
146 a lower bound above the WHO target of 80%, if the prevalence was 25% and the measured SP  
147 was  $\geq 87.5\%$ .

148 All continuous variables were presented by their mean  $\pm$ standard deviation (SD) and median  
149 (interquartile range, IQR), categorical variables were presented by their frequencies and  
150 relative proportions. For comparisons of continuous variables, we used a nonparametric  
151 Mann-Whitney test due to small sizes; for comparisons of categorical variables, we either  
152 performed Chi<sup>2</sup> or Fischer's exact tests, depending on applicability.  
153 To enable Ag-RDT result combination, we performed a Bayesian t-test on their sensitivities  
154 and specificities. To be able to conduct the t-test, the confidence intervals of both sensitivities  
155 and specificities were converted into standard deviation to allow for the t-test to be  
156 conducted. The test computes a Bayesian Factor (BF) that allows comparison of the probability  
157 of observing our data under H<sub>0</sub> (both tests are equal in term of SN and SP) and H<sub>1</sub> (both tests  
158 are different). All analyses were performed using STATA version intercooled 16 (Stata Corp.,  
159 College Station, TX, USA). Statistical significance was defined as p<0.05 (two-sided).

160

## 161 **Results**

162 Between October 9<sup>th</sup> and October 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2020, 1064 participants were enrolled and included in  
163 the analysis. 535 participants were tested with the Panbio Ag-RDT from October 09<sup>th</sup> to 16<sup>th</sup>  
164 and 529 participants were tested with the Standard Q Ag-RDT from October 19<sup>th</sup> to 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2020.  
165 The demographic and clinical characteristics of the study population are shown in **Table 1**. The  
166 mean age of the study participants was 34.9 years (SD  $\pm$ 10.9) with 53.8% being female. The  
167 mean DPOS to testing was 2.7 (SD  $\pm$ 1day). Overall, 29.6% of participants were positive by RT-  
168 PCR with a mean Ct-value of 22.5 (SD  $\pm$ 5.1), corresponding to a VL of 1.8E7 SARS-CoV-2  
169 copies/mL. Most patients (97.8%) were symptomatic upon presentation at the testing centre,  
170 with only 3 reporting no symptoms. Symptoms information was missing for 4 patients. The  
171 study population tested with the Standard Q vs. was younger than that tested with the Panbio

172 assay (34.9 ±10.9 vs 38.5 ±13.6 years, respectively,  $p < 0.001$ ) and DPOS differed slightly  
173 (2.9±1.5 vs. 2.6±2.0 days, respectively,  $p = 0.0125$ ). Ct-values did not differ significantly  
174 between the two groups ( $p = 0.450$ ): 22.6 (SD ±4.9) in the Standard Q group vs. 22.4 (SD ±5.4)  
175 in the Panbio group, corresponding to 1.7E7 and 1.9E7 SARS-CoV-2 RNA copies/mL,  
176 respectively. The RT-PCR positivity rate was 23.2% and 36.1% for the population tested with  
177 the Panbio and the Standard Q, respectively, corresponding to an increase in the overall PCR  
178 positivity rate and reflecting the rapidly increasing local incidence during the time of this  
179 study.

180 The overall test performance for the Standard Q was 89.0% SN (95%CI: 83.7-93.1) and 99.7%  
181 SP (95%CI: 98.4-100%). The overall test performance for the Panbio assay was 85.5% SN  
182 (95%CI: 78.0-91.2) and 100% SP (95%CI: 99.1-100) (**Table 2**).

183 Ct-values of samples with positive Ag-RDT results ranged from 14.2-34.0 and 14.4-34.2 for  
184 Panbio and Standard Q ( $p = 0.1766$ ), respectively, while Ct-values of samples of samples tha  
185 tested falsely negative by Ag-RDT ranged from 16.0-39.7 and 19.8-37.4 ( $p = 0.7998$ ),  
186 respectively. Median Ct-values of Ag-RDT positive samples (Panbio: 20.4, IQR: 18.1-23.8;  
187 Standard Q: 21.2, IQR 18.6-24) were lower than those of Ag-RDT negative samples (Panbio:  
188 30.5, IQR: 27-35.9; Standard Q: 30.4, IQR: 25.7-33.9) (**Figure 1**). Furthermore, we evaluated  
189 overall Ag-RDT results in relation to Ct-values/viral load as well DPOS (**Figure 2**). False-negative  
190 results occurred in both assay across all DPOS.

191 We compared SN and SP between the two Ag-RDTs and concluded that we could accept, with  
192 high probabilities, (respectively likelihood ratio of  $BF_{01} = 10.2$  and 11.9) the hypothesis of  
193 equivalent SN and SP. Based on this, a combined SN of 87.6% (95%CI: 83.5-91.0) and a  
194 combined SP of 99.9% (95%CI: 99.3-100) for both Ag-RDTs were calculated with a positive  
195 predictive value of 99.6% (95%CI: 98.0-100) and a negative predictive value of 95.0% (95%CI:

196 93.3-96.5). In order to identify subpopulations in which maximal SN could be reached with  
197 these tests, we analyzed SN by DPOS, Ct-values as determined by RT-PCR, type of symptoms,  
198 comorbidities, and previous contact with a confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection.

199 Combined SN varied according to Ct-values: it was highest in samples with low Ct-values, with  
200 a SN of 98.4% (95% CI: 94.2-99.8) for  $Ct \leq 20$  ( $\leq 1.0E8$  SARS-CoV-2 copies/mL), decreased slightly  
201 to 95.5% (95%CI: 89.9-98.5) for  $20 < Ct \leq 25$  ( $< 1.0E8$  SARS-CoV-2 copies/mL  $\leq 3.2E6$ ), dropped  
202 further to 89.9% (95%CI: 86.0-93.0) for  $Ct \leq 35$  ( $\leq 3.2 E3$  SARS-CoV-2 copies/mL) and was lowest  
203 (only 40.9% (95%CI: 20.7-63.6)) for  $30 < Ct \leq 35$  ( $< 1.0E5$  SARS-CoV-2 copies/mL  $\leq 3E3$ ) (**Figure**  
204 **3**). The SN for all samples with a Ct value  $\leq 26.7$  ( $\leq 1E6$  SARS-CoV-2 copies/mL), an assumed cut-  
205 off for presence of infectious virus, was 95.7% (95%CI: 92.4-97.8).

206 SN increased with DPOS, from 88.2% at 0 DPOS (95%CI: 63.6-98.5) to 94.3% (95%CI: 84.3-98.8,  
207  $p=0.030$ ) at 1 DPOS, and remained high until 5 DPOS. The highest SN was seen between 1  
208 DPOS and 4-5 DPOS, ranging from 94.3% (95%CI: 84.3-98.8) to 94.8% (95%CI: 85.6-98.9), with  
209 a decline after 5 DPOS (**Figure 4A**).

210 Additionally, we analyzed SN according to specific symptoms, differentiating between typical  
211 COVID-19 symptoms (fever/chills, cough and anosmia/ageusia) and more non-specific  
212 symptoms of respiratory infection (all other symptoms reported). The highest SN of 93.8%  
213 (87.0-97.7) was observed for patients presenting with fever/chills and cough at the time of  
214 testing, followed by patients presenting with anosmia/ageusia or cough and fever/chills with  
215 a SN of 93.7% (95%CI: 87.4-97.4), but only 73.8% (95%CI: 58.0-86.1) in patients presenting  
216 with non-specific signs (**Figure 4B**). No difference in SN was seen between patients with  
217 (89.3%, 95%CI: 71.8-97.7,  $n=28$ ) or without (87.5%, 95%CI: 83.1-91.1,  $n=287$ ) comorbidities  
218 ( $p=0.999$ ). Typical symptoms were more frequent in patients with comorbidities (100%, 15/15  
219 patients) than in patients without comorbidities (86.5%, 96/138 patients) ( $p=0.012$ ), however

220 sample size was small. No difference was seen in patients with or without contact with a  
221 recently positive case ( $p=0.065$ ). We further analysed by DPOS, and found that the highest SN  
222 was seen in patients with fever/chills and presenting between 1 and 5 DPOS, at 95.7% SN  
223 (95%CI: 91.0-98.4).

## 224 Discussion

225 This study provides an independent, POC validation of two commercial Ag-RDTs in comparison  
226 to SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR and according to demographic and clinical information. This combined  
227 validation of two similar assays provides performance data in a real-life high incidence test  
228 setting with an approach aimed at an immediate implementation solution.

229 Both RDTs performed well with an overall SN of 87.6% (95%CI: 83.5-91) and a very high SP of  
230 99.9% (95%CI: 99.3-100) in our test setting during a time of very high SARS-CoV-2 weekly  
231 incidence (375/100,000 to 824/100,000 inhabitants) and a SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR positivity rate  
232 >20%. SN was higher in sub-populations with earlier DPOS numbers and characteristic COVID-  
233 19 symptoms. Importantly we highlight that on day 0 of symptoms, the SN may be lower than  
234 during the subsequent days, and as expected, the sensitivity drops rapidly when the Ct-values  
235 increase above a threshold of 30, mostly after 6-7 days. These results suggest that with  
236 increasing availability, Ag-RDTs can enable rapid and reliable identification of SARS-CoV-2  
237 cases and hold a promise for more efficient control of the current pandemic, independent of  
238 existing diagnostic structures.

239 The highest VL and thus the highest SARS-CoV-2 transmission probability occurs within the  
240 first week of symptom onset, with VLs peaking shortly before or at the time of symptom onset  
241 (6). Culturable virus has been predominantly found in the first week after symptom onset, up  
242 to a VL in the range of 1E6 copies/ml (14–17). This cut-off was also chosen by WHO in their  
243 Ag-RDT target product profile guide for SARS-CoV-2 diagnostics (12). The SN of the Ag-RDTs  
244 validated here, for patients presenting with a VL compatible with contagiousness, was 95.7%.  
245 Correspondingly, the highest Ag-RDT SN was also observed at early DPOS numbers and in  
246 patients with low Ct-values, again suggesting reliable identification of contagious individuals.

247 Our findings at the POC are in line with other validations performed across countries and at  
248 different SARS-CoV-2 prevalence, although study designs and specimens used varied  
249 considerably between studies. Standard Q was reported to have SNs between 70.6-88.7%,  
250 while SP remained high throughout these studies between 97.6-100% (18–24). A clinical study  
251 performed similarly to ours in a much lower-incidence setting (<1% RT-PCR positivity rate),  
252 found a SN/SP of 76.6%/100%, using a mixture of NPS and combined oro- and naso-pharyngeal  
253 swabs from a total of 2417 participants with 47 RT-PCR positive samples yielding 36 Ag-RDT  
254 (18).

255 For Panbio, other studies have reported SNs ranging from 73.3-91.7% with SP in the range of  
256 94.9-100% (25–28). Notably, the highest reported SN of 91.7%/98.9% comes from a study  
257 using 1,406 frozen archived NPS specimens of which 951 were positive by RT-PCR. However  
258 here tests were not done at the POC, and although the use of frozen samples is possible for  
259 RDTs (depending on manufacturers recommendation and on viral transport medium used), it  
260 is not their intended use (19,25). It is also unknown if a freeze-thaw cycle can affect the  
261 accessibility of viral antigens for Ag-RDT purposes.

262 While significant variation in overall SN is observed for the validated Ag-RDTs across studies,  
263 there is remarkable similarity when comparing samples with Ct-values in the same range –  
264 although caution must be exercised equating Ct-values to VLs across different studies. When  
265 considering Ct-values of <25, the Standard Q test was reported to have a SN of 100% (18),  
266 while the Panbio was reported to have a SN of 97.1% (27) or 98.2% (25), which is in agreement  
267 with our results of 97%. In contrast to most other validations, we did observe some cases of  
268 false-negative Ag-RDT results in patients with low Ct-values/high VLs across a range of DPOS.  
269 It is likely that these patients are contagious and could transmit SARS-CoV-2, with VLs that are  
270 compatible with culturable virus.

271 We did not find any validation of Ag-RDTs that has analyzed SN based on type of symptoms,  
272 which could be an additional factor for testing algorithms. Our data suggests that the best SN  
273 is found in symptomatic individuals with symptoms suggestive of COVID-19, early in the  
274 disease between day 1 and 5. The presence of only non-specific symptoms of respiratory  
275 illness corresponded to lower SN, however, few study participants had no COVID-19 specific  
276 symptoms at all.

277 Our study has several strengths. The Ag-RDTs were performed at the POC in parallel to RT-  
278 PCR, and is one of the largest in terms of RT-PCR positive individuals. The test population was  
279 mainly young adults without comorbidities, who mostly had typical COVID-19 symptoms that  
280 were still mild enough not to require hospitalization. This represents a population screened  
281 for public health intervention, and not for diagnostic purposes in a hospital setting; and the  
282 majority of SARS-CoV-2 infected individuals at the current phase of the epidemic in the  
283 community, which is an important group for early identification to limit viral transmission.  
284 Thus, the results of our study support implementing the Ag-RDTs in a decentralized manner  
285 for community testing, which could significantly alleviate the burden on diagnostic  
286 laboratories and hospital staff.

287 Although Ag-RDTs are less sensitive than RT-PCR and, in our study, false-negative Ag-RDT  
288 results were also seen in patients with high VL, the public health benefit of quickly identifying  
289 a large proportion of SARS-CoV-2 positive individuals in the community would still outweigh  
290 the disadvantages of occasional missed diagnoses (29). Repeatedly testing and following  
291 general recommendations like self-isolation for symptomatic individuals, even after a negative  
292 Ag-RDT would probably largely prevent further spread from individuals who had false-  
293 negative results. In a high prevalence situation like ours, positive Ag-RDTs have a high positive-  
294 predictive value, while negative results are less reliable, and thus negative-results should not

295 be used for rule-out purposes or for any kind of reduced infection prevention measures. The  
296 lower SN found at 0 DPOS was probably due to a still increasing VL. Re-testing with an Ag-RDT  
297 or RT-PCR, in case of persisting symptoms, could overcome this limitation.

298 Furthermore, our validation showed very high SP, with only one false-positive Ag-RDT result  
299 in an overall sample of 315 RT-PCR positive patients. Interestingly, the patient with this  
300 putative false-positive result returned 3 days later because of persisting respiratory  
301 symptoms, and then tested positive for SARS-CoV-2 by RT-PCR.

302 During the time this study was conducted, the Canton of Geneva was experiencing a severe  
303 second wave of SARS-CoV-2 infections, with a very high incidence as well as high RT-PCR  
304 positivity rates, thus extrapolating the findings of our study to low prevalence settings must  
305 be done with caution. Furthermore, our study population consisted mainly of young  
306 symptomatic individuals in an outpatient setting, thus diagnostic performance in other groups  
307 needs further validation. All diagnostic testing was performed on NPS collected by trained  
308 nurses, thus the use of the test with other materials (e.g. anterior nares swabs) or in other  
309 settings (e.g. self-testing) needs to be further validated, however a first study on anterior nasal  
310 samples showed promising results (30). Due to logistical and ethical reasons, we were not able  
311 to perform paired comparisons of both Ag-RDTs at the same time by taking three separate  
312 NPS, which would have helped to control for prevalence variation and inter-cohort variability.  
313 Nonetheless, we used robust methods to confirm that the SN and SP of both Ag-RDTs was  
314 equivalent, and further combined results of both Ag-RDTs.

315 In conclusion, we show good diagnostic accuracy of both Ag-RDTs, especially for rule-in  
316 purposes of infected individuals and in testing patients with defined clinical criteria. The SN  
317 for identification of SARS-CoV-2 infected individuals during the period of highest  
318 infectiousness, the rapidity of results as well as the independence from existing laboratory

319 structures make these Ag-RDTs promising tools for SARS-CoV-2 infection control in the  
320 community.

321

### 322 **Acknowledgements**

323 We thank all nurses and staff at the testing Centre Sectors of our institution as well as the  
324 patients for their willingness to participate in the study. We thank Catia Machado-Delgado for  
325 excellent technical assistance and Stéphanie Baggio for help with data analysis.

326

### 327 **Funding**

328 The study was supported by the Foundation for Innovative New Diagnostics, the Fondation  
329 privée des HUG and Pictet Charitable Foundation. M.T. Ngo Nsoga is a beneficiary of the  
330 excellence grant from the Swiss confederation and the grant from the humanitarian  
331 commission of the university hospitals of Geneva.

## 332 References

- 333 1. Corman VM, Eckerle I, Bleicker T, Zaki A, Landt O, Eschbach-Bludau M, et al. Detection of a novel human  
334 coronavirus by real-time reverse-transcription polymerase chain reaction. *Eurosurveillance*. 2012 Sep  
335 27;17(39):20285.
- 336 2. Drosten C, Günther S, Preiser W, van der Werf S, Brodt H-R, Becker S, et al. Identification of a Novel  
337 Coronavirus in Patients with Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome. *New England Journal of Medicine*.  
338 2003 May 15;348(20):1967–76.
- 339 3. Guglielmi G. The explosion of new coronavirus tests that could help to end the pandemic. *Nature*. 2020  
340 Jul;583(7817):506–9.
- 341 4. Mina MJ, Parker R, Larremore DB. Rethinking Covid-19 Test Sensitivity — A Strategy for Containment. *N*  
342 *Engl J Med*. 2020 Sep 30;Epub ahead of print.
- 343 5. Antigen-detection in the diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2 infection using rapid immunoassays [Internet]. [cited  
344 2020 Oct 8]. Available from: [https://www.who.int/publications-detail-redirect/antigen-detection-in-the-](https://www.who.int/publications-detail-redirect/antigen-detection-in-the-diagnosis-of-sars-cov-2infection-using-rapid-immunoassays)  
345 [diagnosis-of-sars-cov-2infection-using-rapid-immunoassays](https://www.who.int/publications-detail-redirect/antigen-detection-in-the-diagnosis-of-sars-cov-2infection-using-rapid-immunoassays)
- 346 6. He X, Lau EHY, Wu P, Deng X, Wang J, Hao X, et al. Temporal dynamics in viral shedding and  
347 transmissibility of COVID-19. *Nature Medicine*. 2020 May;26(5):672–5.
- 348 7. Zou L, Ruan F, Huang M, Liang L, Huang H, Hong Z, et al. SARS-CoV-2 Viral Load in Upper Respiratory  
349 Specimens of Infected Patients. *New England Journal of Medicine*. 2020 Mar 19;382(12):1177–9.
- 350 8. Walsh KA, Jordan K, Clyne B, Rohde D, Drummond L, Byrne P, et al. SARS-CoV-2 detection, viral load and  
351 infectivity over the course of an infection. *J Infect*. 2020 Jun 29;81(3):357–71.
- 352 9. Lauer SA, Grantz KH, Bi Q, Jones FK, Zheng Q, Meredith HR, et al. The Incubation Period of Coronavirus  
353 Disease 2019 (COVID-19) From Publicly Reported Confirmed Cases: Estimation and Application. *Ann*  
354 *Intern Med*. 2020 Mar 10;172(9):577–82.
- 355 10. Byrne AW, McEvoy D, Collins AB, Hunt K, Casey M, Barber A, et al. Inferred duration of infectious period  
356 of SARS-CoV-2: rapid scoping review and analysis of available evidence for asymptomatic and  
357 symptomatic COVID-19 cases. *BMJ Open*. 2020 Aug 5;10(8):e039856.
- 358 11. Walle IV, Leitmeyer K, Broberg EK, Group TEC-19 microbiological laboratories. Meta-analysis of the  
359 clinical performance of commercial SARS-CoV-2 nucleic acid, antigen and antibody tests up to 22 August  
360 2020. medRxiv. 2020 Sep 18;2020.09.16.20195917.
- 361 12. COVID-19 Target product profiles for priority diagnostics to support response to the COVID-19 pandemic  
362 v.1.0 [Internet]. [cited 2020 Oct 8]. Available from: [https://www.who.int/publications/m/item/covid-19-](https://www.who.int/publications/m/item/covid-19-target-product-profiles-for-priority-diagnostics-to-support-response-to-the-covid-19-pandemic-v.0.1)  
363 [target-product-profiles-for-priority-diagnostics-to-support-response-to-the-covid-19-pandemic-v.0.1](https://www.who.int/publications/m/item/covid-19-target-product-profiles-for-priority-diagnostics-to-support-response-to-the-covid-19-pandemic-v.0.1)
- 364 13. Baggio S, L’Huillier AG, Yerly S, Bellon M, Wagner N, Rohr M, et al. SARS-CoV-2 viral load in the upper  
365 respiratory tract of children and adults with early acute COVID-19. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2020 Aug 6
- 366 14. L’Huillier AG, Torriani G, Pigny F, Kaiser L, Eckerle I. Culture-Competent SARS-CoV-2 in Nasopharynx of  
367 Symptomatic Neonates, Children, and Adolescents. *Emerg Infect Dis*. 2020 Oct;26(10):2494–7.
- 368 15. Wölfel R, Corman VM, Guggemos W, Seilmaier M, Zange S, Müller MA, et al. Virological assessment of  
369 hospitalized patients with COVID-2019. *Nature*. 2020 May;581(7809):465–9.
- 370 16. Kampen JJA van, Vijver DAMC van de, Fraaij PLA, Haagmans BL, Lamers MM, Okba N, et al. Shedding of  
371 infectious virus in hospitalized patients with coronavirus disease-2019 (COVID-19): duration and key  
372 determinants. medRxiv. 2020 Jun 9;2020.06.08.20125310.

- 373 17. Vetter P, Eberhardt CS, Meyer B, Martinez Murillo PA, Torriani G, Pigny F, et al. Daily Viral Kinetics and  
374 Innate and Adaptive Immune Response Assessment in COVID-19: a Case Series. Spiropoulou CF, editor.  
375 mSphere. 2020 Dec 23;5(6):e00827-20.
- 376 18. Krueger LJ, Gaeddert M, Koeppl L, Bruemmer L, Gottschalk C, Miranda IB, et al. Evaluation of the  
377 accuracy, ease of use and limit of detection of novel, rapid, antigen-detecting point-of-care diagnostics  
378 for SARS-CoV-2. medRxiv. 2020 Oct 4;2020.10.01.20203836.
- 379 19. Cerutti F, Burdino E, Milia MG, Alice T, Gregori G, Bruzzone B, et al. Urgent need of rapid tests for SARS  
380 CoV-2 antigen detection: Evaluation of the SD-Biosensor antigen test for SARS-CoV-2. J Clin Virol. 2020  
381 Nov;132:104654.
- 382 20. Gupta A, Khurana S, Das R, Srigyan D, Singh A, Mittal A, et al. Rapid chromatographic immunoassay-  
383 based evaluation of COVID-19: A cross-sectional, diagnostic test accuracy study & its implications for  
384 COVID-19 management in India. The Indian journal of medical research. 2020 Oct 31;Online ahead of  
385 print.
- 386 21. FIND. FIND Evaluation of SD Biosensor, Inc. STANDARD TM Q COVID-19 Ag FIA External Report. 2020.  
387 FIND; 2020.
- 388 22. Chaimayo C, Kaewnaphan B, Tanlieng N, Athipanyasilp N, Sirijatuphat R, Chayakulkeeree M, et al. Rapid  
389 SARS-CoV-2 antigen detection assay in comparison with real-time RT-PCR assay for laboratory diagnosis  
390 of COVID-19 in Thailand. Virology Journal. 2020 Nov 13;17(1):177.
- 391 23. Nalumansi A, Lutalo T, Kayiwa J, Watera C, Balinandi S, Kiconco J, et al. Field Evaluation of the  
392 Performance of a SARS-CoV-2 Antigen Rapid Diagnostic Test in Uganda using Nasopharyngeal Samples.  
393 International Journal of Infectious Diseases. 2020 Oct 30;Epub ahead of print.
- 394 24. Gremmels H, Winkel BMF, Schuurman R, Rosingh A, Rigter NAM, Rodriguez O, et al. Real-life validation of  
395 the Panbio COVID-19 Antigen Rapid Test (Abbott) in community-dwelling subjects with symptoms of  
396 potential SARS-CoV-2 infection. medRxiv. 2020 Jan 1;2020.10.16.20214189.
- 397 25. Alemany A, Baro B, Ouchi D, Ubals M, Corbacho-Monné M, Vergara-Alert J, et al. Analytical and Clinical  
398 Performance of the Panbio COVID-19 Antigen-Detecting Rapid Diagnostic Test. medRxiv. 2020 Nov  
399 3;2020.10.30.20223198.
- 400 26. Albert E, Torres I, Bueno F, Huntley D, Molla E, Fernández-Fuentes MÁ, et al. Field evaluation of a rapid  
401 antigen test (Panbio™ COVID-19 Ag Rapid Test Device) for the diagnosis of COVID-19 in primary  
402 healthcare centers. medRxiv. 2020 Oct 20;2020.10.16.20213850.
- 403 27. Linares M, Pérez-Tanoira R, Carrero A, Romanyk J, Pérez-García F, Gómez-Herruz P, et al. Panbio antigen  
404 rapid test is reliable to diagnose SARS-CoV-2 infection in the first 7 days after the onset of symptoms.  
405 Journal of Clinical Virology. 2020 Oct 16;104659.
- 406 28. Fenollar F, Bouam A, Ballouche M, Fuster L, Prudent E, Colson P, et al. Evaluation of the Panbio Covid-19  
407 rapid antigen detection test device for the screening of patients with Covid-19. J Clin Microbiol. 2020 Nov  
408 2;JCM.02589-20.
- 409 29. Larremore DB, Wilder B, Lester E, Shehata S, Burke JM, Hay JA, et al. Test sensitivity is secondary to  
410 frequency and turnaround time for COVID-19 surveillance. medRxiv [Internet]. 2020 Sep 8 [cited 2020  
411 Nov 18]; Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7325181/>
- 412 30. Lindner AK, Nikolai O, Kausch F, Wintel M, Hommes F, Gertler M, et al. Head-to-head comparison of  
413 SARS-CoV-2 antigen-detecting rapid test with self-collected anterior nasal swab versus professional-  
414 collected nasopharyngeal swab. medRxiv. 2020 Oct 27;2020.10.26.20219600.

415

416 **Tables**

417 **Table 1.**

<b>Characteristics</b>	<b>Standard Q (n=529)</b>	<b>Panbio (n=535)</b>	<b>Combined (n=1064)</b>	<b>p-value</b>
Mean age ( $\pm$ SD, median)	34.9 ( $\pm$ 10.9, 33)	38.5 ( $\pm$ 13.6, 36)	36.7 ( $\pm$ 12.5, 34)	<0.001
Sex distribution, n (%)				0.966
Women	285 (53.9)	287 (53.6)	572 (53.8)	
Men	244 (46.1)	248 (46.4)	492 (46.2)	
Mean DPOS to RT-PCR ( $\pm$ SD, median)	2.9 ( $\pm$ 1.5, 3)	2.6 ( $\pm$ 2.0, 2)	2.7 ( $\pm$ 1.9, 2)	0.0125
Result of RT-PCR, n (%)				<0.001
Negative	338 (63.9)	411 (76.8)	749 (70.4)	
Positive	191 (36.1)	124 (23.2)	315 (29.6)	
Mean Ct ( $\pm$ SD, median) (n=315)	22.6 ( $\pm$ 4.9, 21.8)	22.4 ( $\pm$ 5.4, 21.0)	22.5 ( $\pm$ 5.1, 21.5)	0.450


418 Table 1. Characteristics of the study population. SD, standard deviation; RT-PCR, reverse transcription  
419 polymerase chain reaction; DPOS, days post symptom onset; Ct, cycle threshold  
420

421 **Table 2.**

<b>Characteristics</b>	<b>Standard Q</b>	<b>Panbio</b>	<b>Combined</b>
SN, % (95%CI)	89.0 (83.7-93.1)	85.5 (78.0-91.2)	87.6 (83.5-91.0)
SP, % (95%CI)	99.7 (98.4-100)	100 (99.1-100)	99.9 (99.3-100)
Positive predictive value, % (95%CI)	99.4 (96.8-100)	100 (96.6-100)	99.6 (98.0-100)
Negative predictive value, % (95%CI)	94.1 (91.2-96.3)	95.8 (93.4-97.5)	95 (93.3-96.5)


422 Table 2. Overall SN, SP, positive and negative predictive value of Standard Q and Panbio SARS-CoV-2 Ag-RDT.  
423 Positivity rate at the time of study for Standard Q was 36.1% and at the time of study for Panbio was 23.2%.

424 **Figures**




425  
426 **Figure 1.** Ct values, viral load and Ag-RDT results for RT-PCR-positive individuals tested with Standard Q (n= 191)  
427 and Panbio (n=124). Horizontal bars represent median and standard deviation. Dotted line: Ct value of 26.7 or  
428 1E6 SARS-CoV-2 RNA copy numbers/mL.


429



430 **A** **B**  
431 **Figure 2.** Ct values, viral load, days post symptom onset and Ag-RDT results for 190 patients tested with Standard  
432 Q (**A**) and 116 patients tested with Panbio (**B**) for which information on day of symptom onset was available.  
433 Dotted line: Ct value of 26.7 or 1E6 SARS-CoV-2 RNA copy numbers/mL.



434 A B  
 435 **Figure 3. A.** Combined SN of the two Ag-RDTs according to Ct-values of the RT-PCR. **B.** Combined SN of the two  
 436 Ag-RDTs according to subgroups of Ct-values of the RT-PCR. Ct values correspond to the following SARS-CoV-2  
 437 RNA copy numbers/mL: Ct 20: 1.0E8; Ct 25: 3.2E6; Ct 26.7: 1E6; Ct 30: 1.0E5, Ct 35: 3.2E3.  
 438



439 A B Days post symptom onset Symptoms  
 440 **Figure 4. A.** Combined SN of the two Ag-RDTs according to days post symptom onset. Number of patients per  
 441 category: Day 0, n= 17; day 1, n=53, day 2-3, n=135; day 4-5, n=58; day 6-7, n=14; > 7 days, n= 9). **B.** Combined  
 442 SN of the two Ag-RDTs according to symptoms F, fever/chills; C, cough, A, anosmia/ageusia (loss of smell or  
 443 taste), Us, unspecific symptoms (all other symptoms excluding fever/chills, cough and anosmia/angeusia).  
 444 Number of patients per category: F, n= 172; F and C, n= 97; F and A or C, n=111; A or C, n= 202; A, n= 79; Us,  
 445 n=42.