medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.03.20243725; this version posted December 7, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Head-to-head comparison of SARS-CoV-2 antigen-detecting rapid test with professional-collected anterior nasal versus nasopharyngeal swab

Andreas K. Lindner[1*], Olga Nikolai[1*], Chiara Rohardt[1], Susen Burock[2], Claudia Hülso[1], Alisa Bölke[1], Maximilian Gertler[1], Lisa J. Krüger[3], Mary Gaeddert[3], Frank Tobian[3], Federica Lainati[3], Joachim Seybold[4], Terry C. Jones[5,6], Jörg Hofmann[7], Jilian A. Sacks[8], Frank P. Mockenhaupt[1§] and Claudia M. Denkinger[3,9 §]

[*,§]Authors contributed equally

[1] Charité – Universitätsmedizin Berlin, corporate member of Freie Universität Berlin, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, and Berlin Institute of Health; Institute of Tropical Medicine and International Health, Berlin, Germany.

[2] Charité – Universitätsmedizin Berlin, corporate member of Freie Universität Berlin, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, and Berlin Institute of Health; Charité Comprehensive Cancer Center

[3] Division of Clinical Tropical Medicine, Center of Infectious Diseases, Heidelberg University Hospital, Germany.

[4] Charité – Universitätsmedizin Berlin, corporate member of Freie Universität Berlin, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, and Berlin Institute of Health; Medical Directorate, Berlin, Germany.

[5] Charité – Universitätsmedizin Berlin, corporate member of Freie Universität Berlin, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, and Berlin Institute of Health; Institute of Virology, Berlin, Germany.

[6] German Centre for Infection Research (DZIF), partner site Charité, 10117 Berlin, Germany.

[7] Labor Berlin - Charité Vivantes GmbH, Berlin, Germany

[8] Foundation for Innovative New Diagnostics, Geneva, Switzerland

[9] German Centre for Infection Research (DZIF), partner site Heidelberg, 69120 Heidelberg, Germany.

Correspondence: Claudia M. Denkinger, Division of Clinical Tropical Medicine, Heidelberg University Hospital, Im Neuenheimer Feld 672, 69120 Heidelberg, Germany. E-mail: claudia.denkinger@uni-heidelberg.de

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.03.20243725; this version posted December 7, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Abstract

Background: Nasopharyngeal (NP) swab samples for antigen-detecting rapid diagnostic tests (Ag-RDTs) require qualified healthcare professionals and are frequently perceived as uncomfortable by patients.

Methods: We performed a manufacturer-independent, prospective diagnostic accuracy study, comparing professional-collected anterior nasal (AN) to nasopharyngeal swab, using the test kits of a WHO-listed SARS-CoV-2 Ag-RDT (STANDARD Q COVID-19 Ag Test, SD Biosensor), which is also being distributed by Roche. Individuals with high suspicion for COVID-19 infection were tested. The reference standard was RT-PCR using a combined oro-/nasopharyngeal swab sample. Percent positive and negative agreement, as well as sensitivity and specificity were calculated.

Results: Among the 179 participants, 41 (22.9%) tested positive for SARS-CoV-2 by RT-PCR. The positive percent agreement of the two different sampling techniques for the Ag-RDT was 93.5% (CI 79.3-98.2). The negative percent agreement was 95.9% (CI 91.4-98.1). The Ag-RDT with AN-sampling showed a sensitivity of 80.5% (33/41 PCR positives detected; CI 66.0-89.8) and specificity of 98.6% (CI 94.9-99.6) compared to RT-PCR. The sensitivity with NP-sampling was 73.2% (30/41 PCR positives detected; CI 58.1-84.3) and specificity was 99.3% (CI 96.0-100). In patients with high viral load (>7.0 $\log_{10}$ RNA SARS-CoV2/swab), the sensitivity of the Ag-RDT with AN-sampling was 100% and 94.7% with NP-sampling.

Conclusion: This study demonstrates that sensitivity of a WHO-listed SARS-CoV-2 Ag-RDT using a professional AN-sampling kit is at least equal to that of the NP-sampling kit, although confidence intervals overlap. Of note, differences in the IFUs of the test procedures could have contributed to different sensitivities. AN-sampling can be performed with less training, reduces patient discomfort, and it enables scaling of antigen testing strategies. Additional studies of patient self-sampling should be considered to further facilitate the scaling-up of Ag-RDT testing.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.03.20243725; this version posted December 7, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

To the Editor:

Antigen-detecting rapid diagnostic tests (Ag-RDTs) are likely to play a substantial role in innovative testing strategies for SARS-CoV-2 [1, 2]. Currently, most Ag-RDTs require nasopharyngeal (NP) swab samples. However, NP-sampling necessitates qualified healthcare professionals, thus limiting scale-up of testing.

We conducted a prospective diagnostic accuracy study with the objective to directly compare the performance of professional-collected anterior nasal (AN) versus NP swab, using a WHO-listed SARS-CoV-2 Ag-RDT. The reference standard was RT-PCR collected from a combined NP/oropharyngeal (OP) swab. The study was continued until 30 positive NP swab samples according to Ag-RDT were obtained, which is the minimum recommended by the WHO Emergency Use Listing Procedure to demonstrate sample type equivalency [3]. This manufacturer-independent study was conducted in partnership with the Foundation of Innovative New Diagnostics (FIND), the WHO collaborating centre for COVID-19 diagnostics.

Adults at high risk for SARS-CoV-2 infection according to clinical suspicion who attended the ambulatory SARS-CoV-2 testing facility of Charité University Hospital Berlin, Germany, were enrolled from 11-18 November 2020. Participants were excluded if either of the swabs for the Ag-RDT or the RT-PCR reference standard could not be collected.

Participants first underwent collection of the AN-sample, using the specific nasal swab provided in the test kit of the manufacturer, according to the instructions for use, which also correspond to the U.S. CDC instructions [4]. Briefly, while tilting the patient's head back 70 degrees, the swab was inserted about 2cm into each nostril, parallel to the palate until resistance was met at turbinates, then rotated 3-4 times against the nasal walls on each side. Subsequently, a separate NP-swab (provided in the manufacturer test kit) for the Ag-RDT and a combined OP/NP-swab (eSwab from Copan placed in 1ml Amies medium) as per institutional recommendations for RT-PCR were taken from different sides of the nose.

The Ag-RDT evaluated was the STANDARD Q COVID-19 Ag Test (SD Biosensor, Inc. Gyeonggi-do, Korea; henceforth called STANDARD Q) [5]. Study procedures followed the same process as described in the prior study by Lindner et al [6]. The IFUs for AN- and NP-sampling showed differences, with a more elaborate extraction process and a higher volume of extracted specimen used for testing of AN-samples.

Of 181 patients invited, 180 (99.4%) consented to participate. One patient was excluded as both swabs for the Ag-RDT could not be obtained. The average age of participants was 36.2 years (Standard Deviation [SD] 12.2) with 48.0% female and 14.5% having comorbidities. On the day of testing, 96.1%

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.03.20243725; this version posted December 7, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

of participants had one or more symptoms consistent with COVID-19. Duration of symptoms at the time of presentation on average was 4.2 days (SD 2.6). Among the 179 participants, 41 (22.9%) tested positive for SARS-CoV-2 by RT-PCR (Table 1).

No invalid Ag-RDT results were observed on either AN- or NP-samples. Four patients tested positive by AN- but not by NP-sampling. One patient was positive by NP-sampling only. The positive percent agreement was 93.5% (CI 79.3-98.2); including one false positive result with AN and one with NP. The negative percent agreement was 95.9% (CI 91.4-98.1). Inter-rater reliability was high (kappa 0.95 for AN; 0.98 for NP). In the semi-quantitative read-out of the test band intensity in double positive pairs, there was no remarkable difference (8 higher on AN, 9 higher on NP). A third reader was necessary for the agreement on the results of three tests for which the test band was very weak.

The STANDARD Q Ag-RDT with AN-sampling showed a sensitivity of 80.5% (33/41 PCR positives detected; CI 66.0-89.8) and specificity of 98.6% (CI 94.9-99.6) compared to RT-PCR. The sensitivity with NP-sampling was 73.2% (30/41 PCR positives detected; CI 58.1-84.3) and specificity was 99.3% (CI 96.0-100). In patients with high viral load (>7.0 $\log_{10}$ RNA SARS-CoV2/swab), the sensitivity of the Ag-RDT with AN-sampling was 100% (19/19 PCR positives detected; CI 83.9-100) and 94.7% (18/19 PCR positives detected; CI 76.4-99.7) with NP-sampling. In contrast, the Ag-RDT frequently did not detect patients with lower viral load or with symptoms >7 days (Table 1).

The strengths of the study are the standardized sampling methods, two independent blinded readers and an additional semi-quantitative assessment of Ag-RDT results. The cohort was representative, judging from the comparable sensitivity observed in the recent independent validation study of STANDARD Q (sensitivity 76.6%; CI 62.8-86.4) [7]. The study is limited as it was performed in a single centre.

In conclusion, this study demonstrates that sensitivity of a WHO-listed SARS-CoV-2 Ag-RDT using professional AN-sampling kit is at least equal to that of NP-sampling kit, although confidence intervals overlap. Of note, differences in the IFUs of the test procedures could have contributed to different sensitivities. AN-sampling can be performed with less training, reduces patient discomfort, and enables scaling of antigen testing strategies. Additional studies of patient self-sampling should be considered to further facilitate scale-up of Ag-RDT testing [6].

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.03.20243725; this version posted December 7, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

TABLE 1 Antigen-detecting RDT results with a professional-collected AN swab and NP swab in RT-PCR positive patients from combined OP/NP swab. CT-values and viral load (in descending order) of the paired RT-PCR samples are shown, as well as the duration of symptoms per patient. The positive percent agreement between nasal AN and NP samples on Ag-RDT, and the respective sensitivities compared to RT-PCR are shown.

No.	AN swab SD Q Ag-RDT	NP swab SD Q Ag-RDT	OP/NP swab RT-PCR		Symptom duration (days)
			CT value	Viral load[3]	
1	pos (+++)	pos (+++)	16.41[2]	9.11	-
2	pos (++)	pos (+++)	19.25[1,4]	-	7
3	pos (+++)	pos (+++)	19.82[1]	8.85	4
4	pos (++)	pos (+++)	17.68[2]	8.73	1
5	pos (+++)	pos (+++)	17.82[2]	8.69	3
6	pos (+++)	pos (+++)	18.57[2]	8.46	4
7	pos (+++)	pos (+++)	22.09[1]	8.17	4
8	pos (++)	pos (+++)	19.96[2]	8.05	8
9	pos (++)	pos (+++)	22.70[1]	7.99	5
10	pos (++)	pos (++)	20.74[2]	7.82	3
11	pos (+++)	pos (+++)	23.54[1]	7.75	3
12	pos (+++)	pos (+++)	24.09[1]	7.58	3
13	pos (+++)	pos (+++)	24.37[1]	7.50	2
14	pos (+++)	pos (++)	21.83[2]	7.50	5
15	pos (+)	pos (+++)	24.41[1]	7.49	2
16	pos (++)	pos (+++)	24.62[1]	7.43	6
17	pos (+)	neg	22.42[2]	7.32	10
18	pos (+++)	pos (+++)	25.38[1]	7.20	4
19	pos (+++)	pos (++)	22.85[2]	7.19	5
20	pos (++)	pos (+++)	23.05[2]	7.13	5
21	pos (++)	neg	26.48[1]	6.87	8
22	pos (+++)	pos (++)	24.13[2]	6.81	3
23	pos (+++)	pos (+++)	24.63[2]	6.66	2
24	pos (+++)	pos (++)	24.71[2]	6.64	3
25	pos (+++)	pos (++)	27.84[1]	6.47	2
26	neg	neg	25.55[2]	6.39	4
27	pos (++)	pos (+++)	28.82[1]	6.18	5
28	pos (+++)	pos (++)	26.64[2]	6.07	3
29	neg	neg	26.79[2]	6.02	3
30	pos (+++)	pos (++)	29.87[1]	5.87	4
31	neg	neg	30.91[1]	5.56	7
32	pos (+++)	pos (+++)	29.31[2]	5.27	5
33	neg	neg	29.84[2]	5.12	4
34	pos (+)	neg	33.05[1]	4.93	8
35	pos (++)	pos (+)	31.56[2]	4.61	5
36	neg	neg	34.24[1]	4.58	6
37	neg	neg	34.52[1]	4.50	9
38	pos (+)	pos (++)	34.69[1]	4.44	-
39	pos (+)	neg	35.16[1]	4.31	10
40	neg	neg	34.58[2]	3.71	7
41	neg	pos (+)	35.53[2]	3.43	8
	Sensitivity 33/41 (80.5%)	**Sensitivity** 30/41 (73.2%)			
	Positive percent agreement[5] 93.5% (CI 79.3-98.2)				

[1] Roche Cobas SARS-CoV-2 assay (E-gene, T2 target)
[2] TibMolbiol assay, E-gene target.
[3] $\log_{10}$ RNA SARS-CoV2/swab
[4] only T1 CT value, T2 invalid due to suspected mutation within oligonucleotide binding region, VL not specified
[5] including 1 false positive on AN and 1 on NP

Abbreviations: No., patient number; SD Q, STANDARD Q COVID-19 Ag Test (SD Biosensor); Ag-RDT, antigen-detecting rapid diagnostic test; AN, anterior nasal; NP, nasopharyngeal; OP, oropharyngeal; CT, cycle threshold; RT-PCR, reverse transcription-polymerase chain reaction; neg., negative; pos (+), weak positive; pos. (++), positive; pos. (+++), strong positive.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.03.20243725; this version posted December 7, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Acknowledgements: Heike Rössig, Mia Wintel, Franka Kausch, Elisabeth Linzbach, Katja von dem Busche, Stephanie Padberg, Melanie Bothmann, Zümrüt Tuncer, Stefanie Lunow, Beate Zimmer, Astrid Barrera Pesek, Sabrina Pein, Nicole Buchholz, Verena Haack, Oliver Deckwart.

Author contributions: AKL, LJK, FL and CMD designed the study and developed standard operating procedures. AKL and ON implemented the study design, enrolled patients, performed laboratory work and led the writing of the manuscript. FPM and JS coordinated and supervised the study site. CR, SB, CH, AB enrolled patients. MGe coordinated the testing facility. MGa and FT led the data analysis. TCJ and JH were responsible for PCR testing and contributed to the interpretation of the data. JAS supported the study design setup and the interpretation of the data. All authors have reviewed the manuscript.

Data availability: All raw data and analysis code are available upon a request to the corresponding author.

Conflict of interest: None declared.

Support statement: The study was supported by FIND, Heidelberg University Hospital and Charité University Hospital internal funds, as well as a grant of the Ministry of Science, Research and the Arts of Baden-Württemberg, Germany. FIND provided input on the study design, and data analysis in collaboration with the rest of the study team.

References

1. European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control. Options for the use of rapid antigen tests for COVID-19 in the EU/EEA and the UK. https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/en/publications-data/options-use-rapid-antigen-tests-covid-19-eueea-and-uk. Date last accessed: November 21 2020.
2. European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control. Surveillance of COVID-19 at long-term care facilities in the EU/EEA. https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/en/publications-data/surveillance-COVID-19-long-term-care-facilities-EU-EEA. Date last accessed: November 21 2020.
3. WHO. Instructions and requirements for Emergency Use Listing (EUL) submission: In vitro diagnostics detecting SARS-CoV-2 nucleic acid and rapid diagnostics tests detecting SARS-CoV-2 antigens. https://extranet.who.int/pqweb/sites/default/files/documents/PQDx_347_NAT-antigen_instructions.pdf. Version 4, June 2020. Date last accessed Novemeber 27 2020.
4. CDC. Interim Guidelines for Collecting, Handling, and Testing Clinical Specimens for COVID-19. https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/lab/guidelines-clinical-specimens.html. Date last accessed: November 21 2020.
5. SD Biosensor. COVID-19 Ag STANDARDTM Q COVID-19 Ag Test 2020. http://sdbiosensor.com/xe/product/7672. Date last accessed: October 15 2020.
6. Lindner AK, Nikolai O, Kausch F, Wintel M, Hommes F, Gertler M, et al. Head-to-head comparison of SARS-CoV-2 antigen-detecting rapid test with self-collected anterior nasal swab versus professional-collected nasopharyngeal swab. medRxiv. 2020:2020.10.26.20219600.
7. Krueger LJ, Gaeddert M, Koeppel L, Bruemmer L, Gottschalk C, Miranda IB, et al. Evaluation of the accuracy, ease of use and limit of detection of novel, rapid, antigen-detecting point-of-care diagnostics for SARS-CoV-2. medRxiv. 2020:2020.10.01.20203836.