

1 **RESEARCH NOTE**

2 **Real-life evaluation of a rapid antigen test (Panbio™ COVID-19 Ag Rapid Test**
3 **Device) for SARS-CoV-2 detection in asymptomatic close contacts of COVID-19**
4 **patients**

5 Ignacio Torres¹, Sandrine Poujois¹, Eliseo Albert¹, Javier Colomina¹, and David
6 Navarro^{1,2*}

7 ¹*Microbiology Service, Hospital Clínico Universitario, INCLIVA Research Institute,*
8 *Valencia, Spain.*

9 ²*Department of Microbiology, School of Medicine, University of Valencia, Valencia,*
10 *Spain.*

11

12 ***Correspondence:** David Navarro, Microbiology Service, Hospital Clínico
13 Universitario, Instituto de Investigación INCLIVA, Valencia, and Department of
14 Microbiology, University of Valencia, Valencia, Spain. Av. Blasco Ibáñez 17, 46010
15 Valencia, Spain. Phone: 34(96)1973500; Fax: 34(96)3864173; E-mail:
16 david.navarro@uv.es.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23 **ABSTRACT**

24 **Objectives:** There is limited information on the performance of rapid antigen detection
25 (RAD) tests to identify SARS-CoV-2-infected asymptomatic individuals. In this field
26 study, we evaluated the Panbio™ COVID-19 Ag Rapid Test Device (Abbott
27 Diagnostics, Jena, Germany) for the purpose.

28 **Methods:** A total of 634 individuals (355 female; median age, 37 years; range, 9-87)
29 were enrolled. Household (n=338) contacts were tested at a median of 2 days (range, 1-
30 7) after diagnosis of the index case and non-household contacts (n=296) at a median of
31 6 days (range, 1-7) after exposure. RAD testing was carried out at the point of care. The
32 RT-PCR test used was the TaqPath COVID-19 Combo Kit (Thermo Fisher Scientific,
33 Massachusetts, USA).

34 **Results:** In total, 79 individuals (12.4%) tested positive by RT-PCR, of whom 38
35 (48.1%) yielded positive RAD results. The overall sensitivity and specificity of the
36 RAD test was 48.1% (95% CI: 37.4-58.9) and 100% (95% CI: 99.3-100), respectively.
37 Sensitivity was higher in household (50.8%; 95% CI: 38.9-62.5) than in non-household
38 (35.7%; 95% CI:16.3-61.2%) contacts. Individuals testing positive by RAD test were
39 more likely ($P<0.001$) to become symptomatic than their negative counterparts.

40 **Conclusion:** The Panbio test displays low sensitivity in asymptomatic close contacts of
41 COVID-19 patients, particularly in non-household contacts. Nonetheless, establishing
42 the optimal timing for upper respiratory tract collection in this group seems imperative
43 to pinpoint test sensitivity.

44

45 **KEYWORDS:** SARS-CoV-2, COVID-19, rapid antigen detection test (RAD),
46 asymptomatic, close contacts.

47 **INTRODUCTION**

48 Rapid antigen detection (RAD) immunoassays have emerged as a valuable alternative to
49 RT-PCR for diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2 infection in patients presenting with clinically
50 compatible COVID-19 [1]. RAD tests are simple to carry out and return results within a
51 short time, thus being well-suited for point-of-care testing (POCT). Moreover, RAD
52 tests can be used as a proxy for SARS-CoV-2 cultured from respiratory tract specimens,
53 thus allowing reasonably accurate prediction of contagiousness [2,3]. The possibility of
54 using RAD tests to identify SARS-CoV-2-infected asymptomatic contacts of COVID-
55 19 patients is appealing, as it could effectively contribute to minimize community
56 SARS-CoV-2 spread through early detection of highly infectious individuals [1], yet
57 little is known about how RAD tests perform in this population group [4-6]. Here, we
58 report on the performance of the Panbio™ COVID-19 Ag Rapid Test Device (Abbott
59 Diagnostic GmbH, Jena, Germany) conducted at POC in this setting.

60 **Material and methods**

61 **Patients**

62 A total of 634 consecutive asymptomatic individuals (female, n=355; median age, 37
63 years; range, 9-87 years) attended at the Clínico-Malvarrosa Health Department
64 (Valencia, Spain) were enrolled between October 16 and November 20, 2020.
65 Participants were either household (n=338) or non-household (n=296) close contacts of
66 COVID-19 patients, as defined by the Spanish Ministry of Health [7]. Timing of sample
67 collection was prescribed at the discretion of either the physician in charge of the index
68 case or local health authorities. The study was approved by the Hospital Clínico de
69 Valencia (HCU) INCLIVA Research Ethics Committee.

70 **SARS-CoV-2 testing**

71 Nasopharyngeal swabs (NP) for RAD and RT-PCR testing were collected by
72 experienced nurses at the POC site located at Hospital Malvarrosa, as previously
73 detailed [3]. RAD testing was carried out at POC immediately after sampling. RT-PCRs
74 were conducted within 24 h. of specimen collection at the Microbiology Service of
75 Hospital Clínico Universitario (Valencia, Spain) with the TaqPath COVID-19 Combo
76 Kit (Thermo Fisher Scientific, Massachusetts, USA). RT-PCR Ct values were
77 normalized to copies/ml as previously described [3].

78 **Statistical analyses**

79 Agreement between RAD and RT-PCR tests was assessed using Cohen's Kappa (κ)
80 statistics. Differences between medians were compared using the Mann-Whitney U-test.
81 The Chi-squared test was used for frequency comparisons. Two-sided *P*-values <0.05
82 were considered statistically significant. Statistical analyses were performed using SPSS
83 version 25.0 (SPSS, Chicago, IL, USA).

84 **Results**

85 **Overall performance of the RAD test in asymptomatic close contacts**

86 A total of 79 out of 634 individuals (12.4%) tested positive by RT-PCR, of whom 38
87 (48.1%) returned positive RAD test results. There were no RT-PCR positive/RAD
88 negative cases. Accordingly, concordance between RT-PCR and RAD results was
89 moderate (κ index, 0.61; 95% CI, 0.5-0.73). As shown in Figure 1, SARS-CoV-2 RNA
90 load in NP was significantly higher ($P<0.001$) in RAD-positive (median, 8.7 log₁₀
91 copies/ml) than in RAD-negative individuals (4.9 log₁₀ copies/ml).

92 Overall sensitivity and specificity of RAD was 48.1% and 100% (Table 1). For the
93 above-mentioned prevalence (12.4%), the negative predictive value (NPV) of the RAD
94 test was 94.5%. As expected, RAD sensitivity was directly related to SARS-CoV-2 load

95 in NP specimens (Supplementary Table 1), reaching 96.8% when specimens with viral
96 load $\geq 7.4 \log_{10}$ copies/ml ($Ct \leq 20$) were analyzed separately.

97 **Performance of RAD test in household and non-household asymptomatic close**
98 **contacts**

99 Household contacts (n=338; median age, 36.5; range, 10-86 years; 175 female) were
100 tested at a median of 2 days (range, 1-7) after diagnosis of the presumed index case.
101 Sixty-five (19.2%) tested positive by RT-PCR, of whom 33 (50.7%) were positive by
102 RAD test. The likelihood of obtaining either a positive or a negative RAD result was
103 unrelated to the time elapsed since diagnosis of the index case ($P=0.33$).

104 Non-household contacts (n=296; median age, 38.5 years; range, 9-87 years; 180 female)
105 were tested at a median of 6 days (range, 1-7) after self-reported exposure. Five
106 individuals yielded RT-PCR-positive/RAD-positive results (1.6%) and 9 had RT-PCR-
107 positive/RAD-negative results (3.0%). Overall, median time from exposure to testing
108 was similar among individuals displaying either positive or negative RAD results
109 ($P=0.89$).

110 The agreement level between RT-PCR and RAD results was significantly higher
111 ($P<0.001$) for household (κ , 0.61; 95% CI, 0.50-0.75) than for non-household (κ , 0.51;
112 95% CI, 0.20-0.83) contacts. RAD sensitivity was significantly higher ($P < 0.001$) in
113 household contacts, while the opposite was true for NPV (Table 1).

114 SARS-CoV-2 RNA load was comparable ($P=0.21$) across household (median, 6.8 \log_{10}
115 copies/ml; range, 3.4-10.9) and non-household (median, 5.9 \log_{10} copies/ml; range, 3.5-
116 10.6) contacts, and was significantly higher ($P<0.001$) in RAD-positive than in RAD-
117 negative individuals, irrespective of the subcohort considered.

118 **Clinical outcomes**

119 Thirty-nine out of the 79 individuals testing positive by RT-PCR eventually became
120 mildly symptomatic (49.3%), without requiring hospitalization. Individuals testing
121 positive by RAD were more likely ($P<0.001$) to develop COVID-19 (30 out of 38) than
122 those who did not (9 out of 41).

123 **Discussion**

124 In this field study, overall sensitivity of the Panbio™ COVID-19 Ag Rapid Test Device
125 for identification of SARS-CoV-2-infected individuals among asymptomatic close
126 contacts of confirmed COVID-19 cases was 48.1%, close to the figures reported by
127 Linares et al. (54.5%) [4], Fenollar et al. (45.4%) [5] and Bulilete et al. (59.0%) [6], in
128 apparently comparable cohorts. However, in two of these studies [4,5], the RAD test
129 was carried out at a central laboratory, and timing of sample collection was not
130 disclosed [4,5]. In the study by Bulilete et al. [5] most participants (70.6%) were tested
131 within 5 days of exposure. Sensitivity of the Panbio™ test was lower than was
132 previously found [3-6] in symptomatic patients (around 80%), yet as reported for the
133 latter patients, RAD sensitivity was directly related to the magnitude of SARS-CoV-2
134 RNA load in NP specimens. Such a striking difference might reflect dissimilarities
135 across symptomatic and asymptomatic individuals in the kinetics of SARS-CoV-2 load
136 in the upper respiratory tract [8,9]. While it is well known that SARS-CoV-2 load peaks
137 around the time of symptoms onset in the former group [10,11], the timing is uncertain
138 in asymptomatic cases.

139 Interestingly, individuals testing positive by RAD were more likely to become (mildly)
140 symptomatic than their negative counterparts, pointing to a pathogenetic link between
141 SARS-CoV-2 RNA load and development of overt COVID-19.

142 The strength of the current study is that it reflects the real-life performance of the RAD
143 test at POC. Among its limitations are the relative low number of cases, and the
144 possibility that samples were collected too early after exposure, particularly in non-
145 household contacts, in whom RAD sensitivity was strikingly low. In this sense, Linares
146 et al. [4] reported the sensitivity of the Panbio™ test as very low in close contacts at
147 less than 7 days from exposure.

148 In summary, we found the Panbio™ test to display low sensitivity in asymptomatic
149 contacts of COVID-19 patients. Nevertheless, establishing the optimal timeframe for
150 NP collection in household and non-household contacts seems crucial to accurately
151 determine the sensitivity of the test.

152 **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

153 We are grateful to Abbott Diagnostics for providing the Panbio™ COVID-19 Ag Rapid
154 Test Device kits. We thank all personnel working at Clinic University Hospital and
155 primary healthcare centers belonging to the Clínico Malvarrosa Health Department for
156 their unwavering commitment in the fight against COVID-19. We would also like to
157 thank María José Beltrán, Pilar Botija and Ana Sanmartín for assistance in organizing
158 RAD testing in primary healthcare centers and Salvador Peiró for critical revision of the
159 manuscript.

160 **FINANCIAL SUPPORT**

161 This work received no public or private funds.

162 **CONFLICTS OF INTEREST**

163 The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

164 **AUTHOR'S CONTRIBUTIONS**

165 IT, SP and EA: Methodology and data validation. EA, IT and JC: Formal analysis. DN:
166 Conceptualization, supervision, writing the original draft. All authors reviewed the
167 original draft.

168 REFERENCES

- 169 1. Options for the use of rapid antigen tests for COVID-19 in the EU/EEA and the
170 UK. [https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/en/publications-data/options-use-rapid-antigen-](https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/en/publications-data/options-use-rapid-antigen-tests-covid-19-eueea-and-uk)
171 [tests-covid-19-eueea-and-uk](https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/en/publications-data/options-use-rapid-antigen-tests-covid-19-eueea-and-uk). November 19.
- 172 2. Pekosz A, Cooper C, Parvu V, Li M, Andrews J, Manabe YC, Kodsi S, et al.
173 Antigen-based testing but not real-time PCR correlates with SARS-CoV-2 virus
174 culture. medRxiv 2020.10.02.20205708; doi:
175 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.02.20205708>.
- 176 3. Albert E, Torres I, Bueno F, Huntley D, Molla E, Fernández-Fuentes MÁ, et al.
177 Field evaluation of a rapid antigen test (Panbio™ COVID-19 Ag Rapid Test
178 Device) for COVID-19 diagnosis in primary healthcare centers. Clin Microbiol
179 Infect. 2020 Nov 12:S1198-743X(20)30697-2.
- 180 4. Linares M, Pérez-Tanoira R, Romanyk J, Pérez-García F, Gómez-Herruz P,
181 Arroyo T, et al. Panbio antigen rapid test is reliable to diagnose SARS-CoV-2
182 infection in the first 7 days after the onset of symptoms. J Clin Virol
183 2020;133:104659.
- 184 5. Fenollar F, Bouam A, Ballouche M, Fuster L, Prudent E, Colson P, et al.
185 Evaluation of the Panbio Covid-19 rapid antigen detection test device for the
186 screening of patients with Covid-19. J Clin Microbiol 2020;JCM.02589-20.

- 187 6. Bulilete O, Lorente P, Leiva A, Carandell E, Oliver A, Rojo E, et al. Evaluation
188 of the Panbio™ rapid antigen test for SARS-CoV-2 in primary health care
189 centers and test sites. medRxiv 2020; doi:
190 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.13.20231316>.
- 191 7. Estrategia de detección precoz, vigilancia y control de COVID-19.
192 <https://www.mscbs.gob.es/profesionales/saludPublica/ccayes/alertasActual/nCov>
193 [/documentos/COVID19 Estrategia vigilancia y control e indicadores.pdf](https://www.mscbs.gob.es/profesionales/saludPublica/ccayes/alertasActual/nCov/documentos/COVID19_Estrategia_vigilancia_y_control_e_indicadores.pdf).
194 [November 11 2020](https://www.mscbs.gob.es/profesionales/saludPublica/ccayes/alertasActual/nCov/documentos/COVID19_Estrategia_vigilancia_y_control_e_indicadores.pdf).
- 195 8. Zhang Z, Xiao T, Wang Y, Yuan J, Ye H, Wei L, et al. Early viral clearance and
196 antibody kinetics of COVID-19 among asymptomatic carriers. medRxiv
197 2020.04.28.20083139.
- 198 9. Chau NVV, Thanh Lam V, Thanh Dung N, Yen LM, Minh NNQ, Hung LM , et
199 al. The natural history and transmission potential of asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2
200 infection. Clin Infect Dis 2020 Jun 4:ciaa711.
- 201 10. Baggio S, L'Huillier AG, Yerly S, Bellon M, Wagner N, Rohr M, et al. SARS-
202 CoV-2 viral load in the upper respiratory tract of children and adults with early
203 acute COVID-19. Clin Infect Dis 2020 Aug 6:ciaa1157.
- 204 11. Wölfel R, Corman VM, Guggemos W, Seilmaier M, Zange S, Müller MA, et al.
205 Virological assessment of hospitalized patients with COVID-2019. Nature
206 2020;581:465-9

207

208 **FIGURE LEGEND**


209 **Figure 1.** RT-PCR cycle thresholds (Ct) (A) and SARS-CoV-2 RNA load (B) in
210 asymptomatic close contacts of COVID-19 patients testing either positive or negative
211 by Panbio™ COVID-19 Ag Rapid Test Device (RAD). The AMPLIRUN® TOTAL
212 SARS-CoV-2 Control (Vircell S.A.; Granada, Spain) was used as the reference material
213 for SARS-CoV-2 RNA load quantitation (in copies/ml, considering RT-PCR Cts for the
214 N gene [3]). *P* values for comparisons are shown.

215

TABLE 1. Performance of the Panbio™ COVID-19 Ag Rapid Test Device for SARS-CoV-2 detection in asymptomatic household and non-household close contacts

Parameter	Population group		
	All individuals	Household contacts	Non-household contacts
Sensitivity % (95% CI)	48.1 (37.4-58.9)	50.8 (38.9-62.5)	35.7 (16.3-61.2)
Specificity% (95% CI)	100 (99.3-100)	100 (98.6-100)	100 (98.7-100)
Negative predictive value	93.1 (90.8-94.9)	89.5 (85.9-92.5)	96.9 (94.2-98.4)
Positive predictive value	100 (90.8-100)	100 (89.6-100)	100 (56.6-100)

^aAdjusted to actual prevalence in the respective population group.

A**B**