

1 **LETTER TO THE EDITOR**

2 **Point-of-care evaluation of a rapid antigen test (CLINITEST® Rapid COVID-19**  
3 **Antigen Test) for diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2 infection in symptomatic and**  
4 **asymptomatic individuals**

5 Ignacio Torres<sup>1</sup>, Sandrine Poujois<sup>1</sup>, Eliseo Albert<sup>1</sup>, Gabriela Álvarez<sup>1</sup>, Javier Colomina<sup>1</sup>,  
6 and David Navarro<sup>1,2\*</sup>

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

9 <sup>2</sup>*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 Rapid antigen assays (RAD) based on lateral flow immunochromatography (LFIC)  
25 technology have emerged as a valuable tool for the control of COVID-19 pandemic.  
26 Manufacturer-independent, real-world evaluation of these assays is crucial given the  
27 considerable heterogeneity reported in their clinical and analytical performances. Here,  
28 we report for the first time on the point-of-care performance of the CLINITEST® Rapid  
29 COVID-19 Antigen Test (Siemens, Healthineers, Erlangen, Germany) to detect SARS-  
30 CoV-2 infection in presumptive COVID-19 cases or asymptomatic close contacts of  
31 COVID-19 patients. When compared to RT-PCR, the overall sensitivity of the assay  
32 was 80.2 (95% CI, 70.9-87.1) for symptomatic patients sampled (nasopharyngeal  
33 specimens) within five days after the onset of symptoms and 60% (95% CI, 40.7-  
34 76.6%) for asymptomatic participants. The overall specificity was 100% in both  
35 population groups.

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46 Rapid and decentralized testing for SARS-CoV-2 infection is one of the cornerstones of  
47 controlling the COVID-19 pandemic [1]. Rapid antigen assays (RAD) based on lateral  
48 flow immunochromatography (LFIC) technology offer advantages over molecular  
49 assays for the purpose, as they are low-cost, easy-to-use and instrument-free devices.  
50 An increasing number of RAD LFIC assays are being marketed nowadays.  
51 Manufacturer-independent, real-world evaluation of these assays is crucial given the  
52 considerable heterogeneity reported in their clinical and analytical performances [2].  
53 Here, we report for the first time on the point-of-care (POC) performance of the  
54 CLINITEST® Rapid COVID-19 Antigen Test (Siemens, Healthineers, Erlangen,  
55 Germany) to detect SARS-CoV-2 infection in presumptive COVID-19 cases or  
56 asymptomatic close contacts of COVID-19 patients. The CLINITEST® RAD is a LFIC  
57 device licensed for detection of SARS-CoV-2 nucleocapsid protein in nasopharyngeal  
58 (NP) or nasal swabs to diagnose COVID-19 within the first week after symptoms onset.

59 A total of 270 subjects were enrolled in this prospective study from November 26 2020  
60 to January 21 2021. The study was approved by the Ethical Committee of Hospital  
61 Clínico Universitario INCLIVA, Valencia (October, 2021). Participants were either  
62 outpatients with suspected COVID-19 (n=178; median age, 41 years; range, 11-83  
63 years; females, 112 -62.9%-), reporting at 5 or days or less (median 3 days; range 1-5  
64 days) after onset of symptoms (one or more of the following: fever, dry cough,  
65 rhinorrhea, chest pain, dyspnea, myalgia, fatigue, anosmia, ageusia, odynophagia,  
66 diarrhea, conjunctivitis, and cephalgia), or asymptomatic close contacts of COVID-19  
67 patients (n=92; median age, 44 years; range, 11-87 years; females, 54 -58.7%-), as  
68 defined by the Spanish Ministry of Health [3]. Of the latter subset, 78 and 14 subjects  
69 were household or non-household contacts, respectively. These were sampled at a

70 median of 4 days (range, 0-7 days) in the former group and a median of 5 days (range,  
71 2-7 days) in the latter.

72 NP for RAD and RT-PCR testing were collected at POC by experienced nurses. For  
73 each patient, one swab was taken from the left nostril for RAD testing, and the other,  
74 obtained from the right nostril, was placed in 3 ml of Universal Transport Medium  
75 (UTM, Becton Dickinson, Sparks, MD, USA) and used for RT-PCR testing. RAD  
76 testing was carried out at POC immediately after sampling following the manufacturer's  
77 recommendations. RT-PCRs were conducted within 24 h. of specimen collection at the  
78 Microbiology Service of Hospital Clínico Universitario (Valencia, Spain) with the  
79 TaqPath COVID-19 Combo Kit (ThermoFisher Scientific, Massachusetts, USA).

80 Among symptomatic patients, 73 tested positive by RT-PCR and RAD, 18 by RT-PCR  
81 only, and the remaining patients tested negative by both assays, thus indicating good  
82 agreement between RT-PCR and RAD results (Kappa index, 0,80; 95% CI, 0.71-0.88).

83 Household contacts (n=78; median age, 42 years; range, 14-81 years; females, 45 -  
84 57.7% -) were tested at a median of 4 days (range, 0-7) after diagnosis of the index case.

85 Non-household contacts (n=14; median age, 52 years; range, 11-87 years; range, 11-87  
86 years; females, 9 -64.3%-) were sampled at a median of 5 days (range, 2-7) after self-  
87 reported exposure. Of the 15 subjects returning RT-PCR positive/RAD positive results,  
88 10 tested positive only by RT-PCR, and the remaining 67 tested negative by both  
89 assays. The concordance between results returned by both assays was moderate in this  
90 population group (Kappa index, 0.68; 95% CI, 0.50-0.87). Interestingly, of the 15  
91 asymptomatic participants testing positive by RT-PCR, five became symptomatic later  
92 on, all of whom had a positive RAD result.

93

94 As expected [2], SARS-CoV-2 RNA load was significantly higher ( $P<0.0001$ ) in RT-  
95 PCR positive/RAD positive specimens than in RT-PCR positive/RAD negative samples  
96 from both symptomatic and asymptomatic participants (Supplementary Table 1).

97 Of note, time to sampling from symptoms onset or after exposure to the index case was  
98 similar across RAD-positive and RAD-negative participants (not shown).

99 Therefore, the sensitivity of the RAD assay was notably higher in symptomatic than in  
100 asymptomatic subjects (Table 1), whereas specificity was similar (100%). Negative and  
101 positive predictive values, adjusted to the median prevalence of positive cases within  
102 the study period in our Health Department (22%) were 94.7 % (95% CI, 87.6-97.9%)  
103 and 100 % (95% CI, 82.1-100%), respectively for symptomatic patients and 89.9%  
104 (95% CI, 81.7-94.6%) and 100% (95% CI, 77.5-100%), respectively for asymptomatic  
105 close contacts.

106 According to our data, the CLINITEST® Rapid COVID-19 Antigen Test meets the  
107 criteria recommended in WHO interim guidance for RAD diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2  
108 infection (at least 80% sensitivity and 97% specificity), but as with other commercially-  
109 available RAD assays [1,5,6], this only applies in symptomatic patients with suspected  
110 COVID-19 who are tested shortly after symptoms onset (up to 5 days in the current  
111 study). In contrast, the POC performance of this and other RAD assays [1,6], is clearly  
112 suboptimal in asymptomatic close-contact individuals, either household or non-  
113 household. Two non-mutually exclusive factors may account for this observation: (i)  
114 SARS-CoV-2 RNA shedding in the upper respiratory tract (URT) could follow different  
115 kinetics in symptomatic and asymptomatic subjects, implying that the sampling time in  
116 the latter may have been inappropriate (too early or too late) to capture all infection  
117 cases; (ii) SARS-CoV-2 infected individuals not subsequently developing COVID-19  
118 display lower overall viral loads in URT than those who do. In support of this latter

119 viewpoint, all five participants eventually developing COVID-19 returned positive  
120 results by RAD at the sampling time. This was also observed in a previous study using  
121 the Panbio RAD assay from Abbott Laboratories [6].

## 122 **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

123 We are grateful to Siemens Healthineers for providing the Rapid Test Device kits. This  
124 company had no role in the study design, data collection, data analysis, data  
125 interpretation, or writing of the report. We thank all staff working at Clinic University  
126 Hospital and primary healthcare centers belonging to the Clínico Malvarrosa Health  
127 Department for their unwavering commitment in the fight against COVID-19. We  
128 would also like to thank María José Beltrán, Pilar Botija and Ana Sanmartín for  
129 assistance in organizing RAD testing in primary healthcare centers.

## 130 **FINANCIAL SUPPORT**

131 This work received no public or private funds.

## 132 **CONFLICTS OF INTEREST**

133 The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

## 134 **AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS**

135 IT, SP, EA and GA: Methodology and data validation. IT, EA, and JC: Formal analysis.  
136 DN: Conceptualization, supervision, writing the original draft. All authors reviewed the  
137 original draft.

## 138 **REFERENCES**

- 139 1. Mina MJ, Parker R, Larremore DB. Rethinking Covid-19 Test Sensitivity - A  
140 Strategy for Containment. *N Engl J Med* 2020;383(22):e120.

- 141 2. Hayer J, Kapasic D, Zemmrich C. Real-world clinical performance of  
142 commercial SARS-CoV-2 rapid antigen tests in suspected COVID-19: A  
143 systematic meta-analysis of available data as per November 20, 2020.  
144 MmedRxiv, 2020; doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.22.20248614>.
- 145 3. Estrategia de detección precoz, vigilancia y control de COVID-19.  
146 [https://www.mscbs.gob.es/profesionales/saludPublica/ccayes/alertasActual/nCov](https://www.mscbs.gob.es/profesionales/saludPublica/ccayes/alertasActual/nCov/documentos/COVID19_Estrategia_vigilancia_y_control_e_indicadores.pdf)  
147 [/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).  
148 [November 11 2020](https://www.mscbs.gob.es/profesionales/saludPublica/ccayes/alertasActual/nCov/documentos/COVID19_Estrategia_vigilancia_y_control_e_indicadores.pdf).
- 149 4. World Health Organisation. Advice on the use of point-of-care  
150 immunodiagnostic tests for COVID-19. 08.04.2020 2020  
151 [https://www.who.int/news-room/commentaries/detail/advice-on-the-use-of-](https://www.who.int/news-room/commentaries/detail/advice-on-the-use-of-point-of-care-immunodiagnostic-tests-for-covid-19)  
152 [point-of-care-immunodiagnostic-tests-for-covid-19](https://www.who.int/news-room/commentaries/detail/advice-on-the-use-of-point-of-care-immunodiagnostic-tests-for-covid-19) (accessed 20.01.2020).
- 153 5. Albert E, Torres I, Bueno F, Huntley D, Molla E, Fernández-Fuentes MÁ, et al.  
154 Field evaluation of a rapid antigen test (Panbio™ COVID-19 Ag Rapid Test  
155 Device) for COVID-19 diagnosis in primary healthcare centres. Clin Microbiol  
156 Infect 2020 Nov 13:S1198-743X(20)30697-2.
- 157 6. Torres I, Poujois S, Albert E, Colomina J, Navarro D. Evaluation of a rapid  
158 antigen test (Panbio™ COVID-19 Ag rapid test device) for SARS-CoV-2  
159 detection in asymptomatic close contacts of COVID-19 patients. Clin Microbiol  
160 Infect 2021; Jan 6:S1198-743X(20)30782-5.

161

**Table 1. Performance of the CLINITEST® Rapid COVID-19 Antigen Test at point of care for detection of SARS-CoV-2 infection**

Population group	RAD performance	
	Sensitivity (95% CI)	Specificity (95% CI)
Symptomatic patients with suspected COVID-19	80.2 (70.9-87.1)	100% (95.8-100)
Asymptomatic close contacts of COVID-19 patients	60.0 (40.7-76.6)	100% (94.6-100)
All participants $C_T \leq 20$ ( $\geq 7.1 \log_{10}$ copies/ml)	100 (94,9-100)	-
All participants $C_T \leq 25$ ( $\geq 6.2 \log_{10}$ copies/ml)	95.5 (89-98.2)	-
All participants $C_T \leq 30$ ( $\geq 5.2 \log_{10}$ copies/ml)	94.6 (87.9-97.7)	-
All participants $C_T < 33$ ( $\geq 3.4 \log_{10}$ copies/ml)	75.9 (67.3-82.7)	-
CI, confidence interval; CT, RT-PCR cycle threshold; RAD, rapid antigen assay.		