

1 **The sensitivity of SARS-CoV-2 antigen tests in the view of large-scale testing**

2 Pavel Drevinek<sup>1\*</sup>, Jakub Hurych<sup>1</sup>, Zdenek Kepka<sup>1</sup>, Ales Briksi<sup>1</sup>, Michal Kulich<sup>2</sup>, Miroslav

3 Zajac<sup>1</sup>, Petr Hubacek<sup>1</sup>

4 <sup>1</sup>Department of Medical Microbiology, 2nd Faculty of Medicine, Charles University and Motol

5 University Hospital, Prague, Czech Republic

6 <sup>2</sup>Department of Probability and Statistics, Faculty of Mathematics and Physics, Charles

7 University, Prague, Czech Republic

8

9

10 \* Corresponding author

11 Department of Medical Microbiology, 2nd Faculty of Medicine, Charles University and Motol

12 University Hospital; V Uvalu 84, 150 06 Prague, Czech Republic

13 pavel.drevinek@lfmotol.cuni.cz

14 tel. +420 22443 5350; fax +420 22443 5352

1 **Abstract**

2 **Objectives:** Antigen tests have recently emerged as an interesting alternative to SARS-CoV-  
3 2 diagnostic PCR, thought to be valuable especially for the screening of bigger communities.  
4 To check appropriateness of the antigen based testing, we determined sensitivity of two  
5 point-of-care antigen tests when applied to a cohort of COVID-19 symptomatic, COVID-19  
6 asymptomatic and healthy persons.

7 **Methods:** We examined nasopharyngeal swabs with antigen test 1 (Panbio Covid-19 Ag  
8 Rapid Test, Abbott) and antigen test 2 (Standard F Covid-19 Ag FIA, SD Biosensor). An  
9 additional nasopharyngeal and oropharyngeal swab of the same individual was checked with  
10 PCR (Allplex SARS-nCoV-2, Seegene). Within a 4-day period in October 2020, we collected  
11 specimens from 591 subjects. Of them, 290 had COVID-19 associated symptoms.

12 **Results:** While PCR positivity was detected in 223 cases, antigen test 1 and antigen test 2  
13 were found positive in 148 (sensitivity 0.664, 95% CI 0.599 - 0.722) and 141 (sensitivity  
14 0.623, 95% CI 0.558 - 0.684) patients, respectively. When only symptomatic patients were  
15 analysed, sensitivity increased to 0.738 (95% CI 0.667 - 0.799) for the antigen test 1 and to  
16 0.685 (95% CI 0.611 - 0.750) for the antigen test 2. The substantial drop in sensitivity to  
17 12.9% (95% CI 0.067 - 0.234) was observed for samples with the PCR threshold cycle above  
18 > 30.

19 **Conclusions:** Low sensitivity of antigen tests leads to the considerable risk of false  
20 negativity. It is advisable to implement repeated testing with high enough frequency if the  
21 antigen test is used as a frontline screening tool.

22

23

## 1 **Introduction**

2 Early detection of SARS-CoV-2 infected individuals is a key factor for making the  
3 containment measures effective. Since the beginning of the pandemic, a nucleic acid  
4 detection by PCR has become a gold standard of a novel coronavirus disease (COVID-19)  
5 diagnostics (1). However, not fast enough turnaround time, a need for laboratory equipment  
6 and the shortage of reagents and plastic consumables raised concerns over the time about  
7 the PCR as the only frontline tool for testing, especially in surveillance regimes where great  
8 numbers of people need to be tested in relatively short time frames (2).

9 To overcome technical barriers associated with the use of PCR, point of care tests have  
10 been considered to complement diagnostic PCR tests and to be used for fast and onsite  
11 examination in various settings with suspected outbreaks of COVID-19. These include not  
12 only institutions and semi-closed communities such as schools and care homes (WHO  
13 interim guidance (3)), but even whole districts and countries, screened in the way of  
14 population-wide testing (ECDC Report (4)).

15 An attractive candidate which meets the logistic criteria for mass testing is an antigen-based  
16 detection of SARS-CoV-2 on the principle of immunochromatography. The test is  
17 inexpensive, rapid, ready and easy to use. Nevertheless, rapid antigen tests have potential  
18 limits in terms of low sensitivity that had been repeatedly documented for other respiratory  
19 viruses (5). First reports on the performance of SARS-CoV-2 antigen detection indicated  
20 similar findings (6-8), although the manufacturers of commercially available SARS-CoV-2  
21 antigen tests commonly claim sensitivities over 90%. However, these values reflect results of  
22 studies done on individuals who meet the criteria for the intended use of the kits, i.e.  
23 diagnostics of COVID-19 in patients with clinical symptoms, not in a mixed population of  
24 symptomatic, asymptomatic and healthy persons.

1 In our pilot study, we aimed to evaluate the performance of two antigen tests in a scenario  
2 close to the population-wide testing. In this regard, we tested a group of nearly 600 people  
3 who had no common epidemiological link between each other.

4

## 5 **Methods**

6 **Subjects.** Within a 4-day period in October 2020, we tested 591 individuals of 10 years of  
7 age or older, who attended a single collection site, dedicated to the SARS-CoV-2 specimen  
8 collection at the Motol University Hospital, Prague, Czech Republic, and consented to the  
9 study. The main reasons for their SARS-CoV-2 collection site visit were either the suspicion  
10 of COVID-19 infection (273 patients) or contact tracing (290 cases). While 511 persons were  
11 referred by general practitioner or public health officer, 54 individuals were self-payers. The  
12 mean age of the cohort was 40 years (age range 12 to 78 years), 44.7% were males. Nearly  
13 one half of the population (290 subjects) self-reported presence of one or more of the  
14 following symptoms: cough, pain of muscles and/or joints, chills, diarrhoea and/or vomiting,  
15 elevated body temperature, loss of smell and/or taste. The study was approved by the  
16 hospital Ethics Committee (ref no EK-1286/20).

17 **Antigen tests and PCR.** Upon the subject's consent, we sampled three separate  
18 nasopharyngeal swabs and one additional swab from the oropharynx. Two nasopharyngeal  
19 samples were used onsite for two antigen detection assays according to the manufacturers'  
20 instructions: Panbio Covid-19 Ag Rapid Test (Abbott, Germany; hereafter referred to as "Ag  
21 test 1") and Standard F Covid-19 Ag FIA (SD Biosensor, Republic of Korea; hereafter  
22 referred to as "Ag test 2"). Briefly, the swab was first inserted into an extraction buffer  
23 provided with the kit, then the amount of 5 (Ag test 1) or 4 drops (Ag test 2) was loaded on  
24 the test device. The results were read after 15 minutes incubation at room temperature by a  
25 naked eye (Ag test 1) or after 30 minutes incubation at room temperature on the bench (Ag  
26 test 2) in the Standard F200 Analyser ('read-only' mode). In order not to unnecessarily lose

1 the sensitivity of the assays, we ran antigen tests immediately upon collecting the sample  
2 and without the optional step of inserting the swab into the viral transport medium that may  
3 lead in undesirable antigen dilution.

4 The remaining nasopharyngeal swab along with the oropharyngeal swab were sampled in  
5 accordance with the international specimen collection guidelines (CDC, (9)). They were both  
6 inserted into the viral transport medium (10) and transported to the hospital microbiology  
7 laboratory for the PCR analysis. RNA extraction was performed with Viral Nucleic Acid  
8 Extraction kit (Zybio, China) on the EXM3000 instrument (Zybio, China). The extracts were  
9 subjected to the reverse transcription PCR, targeting N, E and RdRP/S genes (Allplex SARS-  
10 nCoV-2; Seegene, Republic of Korea), run on the CFX96 PCR cycler (Bio-Rad, USA). The  
11 sample was deemed positive if at least one of the genes was detected with a threshold cycle  
12 (Ct) value  $\leq 40$ ; to define a single Ct for a respective sample, we used the lowest Ct out of  
13 the three detected targets.

1 **Results**

2 The PCR positivity was detected in 223 cases (37.7%). Out of them, 168 people had one or  
3 more COVID-19 related symptoms (57.9% of all individuals with symptoms and 75.3% of all  
4 PCR positive cases), while 55 PCR positive subjects reported no symptoms at the time of  
5 sampling. Ag test 1 and Ag test 2 were found positive in 148 and 141 cases, respectively  
6 (Table 1).

7 (a)

		PCR		Total
		positive	negative	
Ag test 1	positive	148	0	148
	negative	75	368	443
Total		223	368	591
		Sensitivity 0.664 (0.599 - 0.722)	Specificity 1.000 (0.990 - 1.000)	

8

9 (b)

		PCR		Total
		positive	negative	
Ag test 2	positive	139	2	141
	negative	84	366	450
Total		223	368	591
		Sensitivity 0.623 (0.558 - 0.684)	Specificity 0.995 (0.980 - 0.999)	

10

1 **Table 1.** Number of positive and negative results when Ag test 1 (Table 1a) and Ag test 2  
2 (Table 1b) are compared to PCR results. Sensitivity and specificity values are reported with  
3 95% CI (in brackets).

4 Test sensitivity increased to 0.738 (95% CI 0.667 - 0.799) for the Ag test 1 and to 0.685  
5 (95% CI 0.611 - 0.750) for the Ag test 2 if only a subgroup of symptomatic patients (290  
6 subjects) was analysed (data not shown). On the contrary, a low sensitivity value of 0.436  
7 (95% CI 0.314 - 0.567) for either of the Ag tests was found in asymptomatic persons (301  
8 subjects).

9 The likelihood of detecting the SARS-CoV-2 antigen in a PCR positive person increased with  
10 decreasing PCR threshold cycle (Ct) (Table 2). The majority of PCR positive findings (161 of  
11 223, i.e., 72%) had low Ct cycles < 30. In vast majority of cases, these PCR results belonged  
12 to patients with COVID-19 associated symptoms (130 of 161 patients). Nevertheless, PCR  
13 results with Ct > 30 also comprised mostly the symptomatic patients (38 of 62 cases).  
14 Sensitivity of Ag tests was found greater than 80% only for samples with Ct < 30; a  
15 substantial drop in sensitivity to mere 12.9% was observed for samples with Ct > 30.

16 (a)

PCR Ct	No pts	No symptomatic pts	No asymptomatic pts	Ag test 1 sensitivity	Ag test 2 sensitivity
< 20	51	43	8	0.922 (0.815-0.969)	0.922 (0.815-0.969)
< 25	121	99	22	0.926 (0.865-0.960)	0.901 (0.835-0.942)
< 30	161	130	31	0.870 (0.809-0.913)	0.814 (0.747-0.866)
< 35	190	154	36	0.779 (0.715-0.832)	0.726 (0.659-0.785)

≤ 40	223	168	55	see Table 1a	see Table 1b
------	-----	-----	----	--------------	--------------

1

2 (b)

PCR Ct	No pts	No symptomatic pts	No asymptomatic pts	Ag test 1 sensitivity	Ag test 2 sensitivity
> 20	172	125	47	0.587 (0.512-0.658)	0.535 (0.460-0.608)
> 25	102	69	33	0.353 (0.267-0.450)	0.294 (0.214-0.389)
> 30	62	38	24	0.129 (0.067-0.234)	0.129 (0.067-0.234)
> 35	33	14	19	0.0 (0.0-0.104)	0.03 (0.005-0.153)

3

4 **Table 2.** Sensitivity of Ag test 1 and Ag test 2 in relation to the Ct if samples with higher Ct  
5 are added to the samples with lower Ct (Table 2a), and if samples with lower Ct are taken  
6 away from the samples with higher Ct (Table 2b).

7

8



## 1 **Discussion**

2 With the surge of the SARS-CoV-2 epidemic wave in autumn 2020, novel testing strategies  
3 to tackle the community transmission are being sought, including the option of population-  
4 wide screening with the aid of antigen tests (4). In our study, we mimicked a situation of  
5 mass screening in that we tested each individual, attending the hospital COVID-19 collection  
6 site, regardless of the presence or absence of clinical symptoms. Within 4 days, we enrolled  
7 nearly 600 individuals out of 800 eligible people who were 10 years or older. Our PCR  
8 positivity rate was almost 38% which was well in accordance with over 30% observed on a  
9 national level at the time of the study performance (daily reports on (11)).

10 In our study, we worked with two different antigen tests out of which one enabled europium  
11 fluorescence-based detection (Ag test 2), the detection that was believed to improve  
12 sensitivity. However, this mode of result visualisation did not have any impact on the change  
13 of sensitivity. Overall mean sensitivity values were 66.7% for Ag test 1 and 62.6% for Ag test  
14 2. If the parameter of the presence of clinical symptoms is a criterion for performing the test,  
15 sensitivity increased only modestly to 73.8% for Ag test 1 and 68.5% for Ag test 2, while it  
16 dropped below 50% if asymptomatic, but PCR positive persons are tested.

17 Our findings fit well with the known sensitivity characteristics of antigen tests for other  
18 respiratory viruses like influenza or respiratory syncytial virus where rapid  
19 immunochromatography tests reach the sensitivity of 54.4% and 80%, respectively (12, 13).  
20 Such discrepancies between sensitivity values reported in research articles and  
21 manufacturers' leaflets come from differences in selection of tested samples. For instance, a  
22 clinical evaluation of the Ag test 2 with the claimed sensitivity of 100% was performed on a  
23 positive spiked material, not on real subjects. Interim data on Ag test 1 showed the sensitivity  
24 of 85.5% (95% CI 78.2, 90.6), based on testing of 535 patients with suspicion of COVID-19  
25 (14). Of them, 77% were checked by the antigen test within three days from the onset of the  
26 symptoms, and 75% had their Ct < 25.

1 Similarly to Scohy et al. (8), we found out that the main attribute affecting the antigen test  
2 sensitivity is a viral load as estimated by the Ct. Lower viral load, represented in our study by  
3 high Ct values above 30, became hardly detectable by any of the two antigen tests used.  
4 Thus, patients with samples of late Ct values would be largely left undiagnosed, although  
5 many of them also presented with clinical symptoms in our study. Regardless of their clinical  
6 state, it is important to point out that they all might be also infectious as documented in  
7 studies on asymptomatic and presymptomatic persons (15, 16).

8 Because of the recent findings on infectivity (17), we can speculate that patients with low Ct  
9 were actually at the end of their infection stage and no longer posed the risk to others.  
10 However, our patient records show that only 5 of 62 patients with Ct > 30 visited the  
11 collection site to monitor the course of their infection (3 of them had still clinical symptoms),  
12 so we can assume that most of them were near the onset of the disease and cannot rule out  
13 their infectivity. In reference to the aim of our study, i.e. to check the effectiveness of the  
14 mass testing with antigen tests, another limitation of the study is the bias in selection of the  
15 subjects who were in most cases indicated for the examination due to symptoms or contact  
16 tracing. One can expect that the population-wide screening would include higher rate of  
17 asymptomatic people with low viral loads as well as healthy persons which in turn would lead  
18 in even higher false negativity and false positivity rates (18).

19 To conclude, in our opinion, the risk and rate of false negativity of antigen tests may have a  
20 significant negative impact on the effectiveness of outbreaks containment as it is crucial to  
21 early identify any positive person, including the ones with initially low viral load. Not to miss  
22 them, a single round of testing, which is likely the case when a population-wide screening is  
23 ordered, seems insufficient and inadequate. Instead, the strategy based on repeated testing  
24 with high enough frequency (2) needs to be implemented if the antigen test is used as a  
25 frontline screening tool.

26

1 Transparency declaration:

2 Supported by the Ministry of Health of the Czech Republic - conceptual development of  
3 research organization Motol University Hospital, FNM. All authors report no conflicts of  
4 interest relevant to this article.

5 Acknowledgements:

6 The authors are grateful to I. Adam, M. Sadilkova, K. Smolkova, M. Kalantay, I. Prosova, S.  
7 Strba, D. Kovarikova, B. Dzerengova, A. Hutnan, A. Shaker, V. Casarova and other staff  
8 members of Motol collection site for excellent technical assistance.

9

10 1. Sethuraman N, Jeremiah SS, Ryo A. Interpreting Diagnostic Tests for SARS-CoV-2.  
11 JAMA. 2020;323:2249-51.

12 2. Mina MJ, Parker R, Larremore DB. Rethinking Covid-19 Test Sensitivity - A Strategy  
13 for Containment. N Engl J Med. 2020.

14 3. WHO. Antigen detection in the diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2 infection using rapid  
15 immunoassays 2020. Available from: [https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/antigen-](https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/antigen-detection-in-the-diagnosis-of-sars-cov-2infection-using-rapid-immunoassays)  
16 [detection-in-the-diagnosis-of-sars-cov-2infection-using-rapid-immunoassays.](https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/antigen-detection-in-the-diagnosis-of-sars-cov-2infection-using-rapid-immunoassays)

17 4. ECDC. Population-wide testing of SARS-CoV-2: country experiences and potential  
18 approaches in the EU/EEA and the United Kingdom 2020. Available from:  
19 [https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/sites/default/files/documents/covid-19-population-wide-testing-](https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/sites/default/files/documents/covid-19-population-wide-testing-country-experiences.pdf)  
20 [country-experiences.pdf.](https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/sites/default/files/documents/covid-19-population-wide-testing-country-experiences.pdf)

21 5. Azar MM, Landry ML. Detection of Influenza A and B Viruses and Respiratory  
22 Syncytial Virus by Use of Clinical Laboratory Improvement Amendments of 1988 (CLIA)-  
23 Waived Point-of-Care Assays: a Paradigm Shift to Molecular Tests. J Clin Microbiol.  
24 2018;56.

- 1 6. Lambert-Niclot S, Cuffel A, Le Pape S, Vauloup-Fellous C, Morand-Joubert L, Roque-  
2 Afonso AM, et al. Evaluation of a Rapid Diagnostic Assay for Detection of SARS-CoV-2  
3 Antigen in Nasopharyngeal Swabs. *J Clin Microbiol.* 2020;58.
- 4 7. Mak GC, Cheng PK, Lau SS, Wong KK, Lau CS, Lam ET, et al. Evaluation of rapid  
5 antigen test for detection of SARS-CoV-2 virus. *J Clin Virol.* 2020;129:104500.
- 6 8. Scohy A, Anantharajah A, Bodeus M, Kabamba-Mukadi B, Verroken A, Rodriguez-  
7 Villalobos H. Low performance of rapid antigen detection test as frontline testing for COVID-  
8 19 diagnosis. *J Clin Virol.* 2020;129:104455.
- 9 9. CDC. Interim Guidelines for Collecting, Handling, and Testing Clinical Specimens for  
10 COVID-19 2020. Available from: [https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-nCoV/lab/guidelines-](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-nCoV/lab/guidelines-clinical-specimens.html)  
11 [clinical-specimens.html](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-nCoV/lab/guidelines-clinical-specimens.html).
- 12 10. Kim C, Ahmed JA, Eidex RB, Nyoka R, Waiboci LW, Erdman D, et al. Comparison of  
13 nasopharyngeal and oropharyngeal swabs for the diagnosis of eight respiratory viruses by  
14 real-time reverse transcription-PCR assays. *PLoS One.* 2011;6:e21610.
- 15 11. Ministry of Health CR. COVID-19: The summary of current situation in Czech  
16 Republic. Available from: <https://onemocneni-aktualne.mzcr.cz/covid-19>.
- 17 12. Merckx J, Wali R, Schiller I, Caya C, Gore GC, Chartrand C, et al. Diagnostic  
18 Accuracy of Novel and Traditional Rapid Tests for Influenza Infection Compared With  
19 Reverse Transcriptase Polymerase Chain Reaction: A Systematic Review and Meta-  
20 analysis. *Ann Intern Med.* 2017;167:394-409.
- 21 13. Chartrand C, Tremblay N, Renaud C, Papenburg J. Diagnostic Accuracy of Rapid  
22 Antigen Detection Tests for Respiratory Syncytial Virus Infection: Systematic Review and  
23 Meta-analysis. *J Clin Microbiol.* 2015;53:3738-49.
- 24 14. FIND. FIND Evaluation of Abbott Panbio COVID-19 Ag Rapid Test Device External  
25 Report 2020 [Available from: [https://finddx.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/11/Panbio\\_Ag-](https://finddx.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/11/Panbio_Ag-Public-Report_v1_1.pdf)  
26 [Public-Report\\_v1\\_1.pdf](https://finddx.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/11/Panbio_Ag-Public-Report_v1_1.pdf)].
- 27 15. Kimball A, Hatfield KM, Arons M, James A, Taylor J, Spicer K, et al. Asymptomatic  
28 and Presymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 Infections in Residents of a Long-Term Care Skilled

- 1 Nursing Facility - King County, Washington, March 2020. MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep.
- 2 2020;69:377-81.
- 3 16. Arons MM, Hatfield KM, Reddy SC, Kimball A, James A, Jacobs JR, et al.
- 4 Presymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 Infections and Transmission in a Skilled Nursing Facility. N
- 5 Engl J Med. 2020;382:2081-90.
- 6 17. Rhee C, Kanjilal S, Baker M, Klompas M. Duration of Severe Acute Respiratory
- 7 Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) Infectivity: When Is It Safe to Discontinue Isolation?
- 8 Clin Infect Dis. 2020.In press.
- 9 18. Sudlow C, Diggle P, Warlow O, Seymour D, Gordon B, Walker R, et al. Testing for
- 10 coronavirus (SARS-CoV-2) infection in populations with low infection prevalence: the largely
- 11 ignored problem of false positives and the value of repeat testing. medRxiv. 2020.
- 12