medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.26.21252546; this version posted March 1, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.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-ND 4.0 International license .

The accuracy of novel antigen rapid diagnostics for SARS-CoV-2: a living systematic review and meta-analysis.

Lukas E. Brümmer[1]*, Stephan Katzenschlager[2]*, Mary Gaeddert[1], Christian Erdmann[3], Stephani Schmitz[1], Marc Bota[4], Maurizio Grilli[5], Jan Larmann[2], Markus A. Weigand[2], Nira R. Pollock[6], Sergio Carmona[7], Stefano Ongarello[7], Jilian Sacks[7], Claudia M. Denkinger[1]

* These authors contributed equally

1) Division of Tropical Medicine, Center for Infectious Diseases, Heidelberg University Hospital, Heidelberg, Germany
2) Department of Anesthesiology, Heidelberg University Hospital, Heidelberg, Germany
3) FH Muenster University of Applied Sciences, Muenster, Germany
4) Agaplesion Bethesda Hospital, Hamburg, Germany
5) Library of the Medical Faculty Mannheim, Heidelberg University, Mannheim, Germany
6) Department of Laboratory Medicine, Boston Children's Hospital, Boston, MA USA
7) Foundation of Innovative New Diagnostics, FINDdx, Geneva, Switzerland

Keywords: SARS-CoV-2; Antigen Test; PCR; meta-analysis;

Running Title: Meta-Analysis: Rapid antigen tests for SARS-CoV-2

Corresponding author:
Claudia M. Denkinger
Division of Tropical Medicine, Center for Infectious Diseases, Heidelberg University Hospital, Heidelberg, Germany
Claudia.Denkinger@uni-heidelberg.de
+49 6221 56 36637

Summary: In this living systematic review we analyzed 98 data sets for performance of SARS-CoV-2 Ag-RDTs compared to RT-PCR. Best-performing tests achieved a sensitivity of 81.7%. Highest sensitivity was found in patients within seven days of symptom onset when NP swabs were utilized.

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.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/10.1101/2021.02.26.21252546; this version posted March 1, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.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-ND 4.0 International license .

ABSTRACT

Background: SARS-CoV-2 antigen rapid diagnostic tests (Ag-RDTs) are increasingly being integrated in testing strategies around the world. Studies of the Ag-RDTs have shown variable performance. In this systematic review and meta-analysis, we assessed the clinical accuracy (sensitivity and specificity) of commercially available Ag-RDTs.

Methods: We registered the review on PROSPERO (Registration number: CRD42020225140). We systematically searched multiple databases (PubMed, Web of Science Core Collection, medRvix and bioRvix, FINDdx) for publications up until December 11th, 2020. Descriptive analyses of all studies were performed and when more than four studies were available, a random-effects meta-analysis was used to estimate pooled sensitivity and specificity in comparison to reverse transcriptase polymerase chain reaction testing. We assessed heterogeneity by subgroup analyses ((1) performed conform with manufacturer's instructions for use (IFU) or not, (2) symptomatic vs. asymptomatic, (3) duration of symptoms less than seven days vs. more than seven days, (4) Ct-value <25 vs. <30 vs. ≥30, (5) by sample type)) and with meta-regression. We assessed study quality and risk of bias using the QUADAS 2 assessment tool.

Results: From a total of 11,715 articles, we extracted 98 analytical and clinical data sets. 74 clinical accuracy data sets were evaluated that included 31,202 samples. Across all meta-analyzed samples, the pooled Ag-RDT sensitivity was 73.8% (CI 68.6 to 78.5). If analysis was restricted to studies that followed the Ag-RDT manufacturers' instructions using fresh upper respiratory swab samples, the sensitivity increased to 79.1% (95%CI 75.0 to 82.8). The SD Biosensor Standard Q and Abbott Panbio showed the highest sensitivity with 81.7% and 72.7%, respectively. The best Ag-RDT performance was found with nasopharyngeal sampling (77.3%, CI 72.0 to 81.9) in comparison to other sample types (e.g., anterior nasal or mid turbinate 63.5%, CI 49.5 to 75.5). Testing in the first week from symptom onset resulted in higher sensitivity (87.5%, CI 86.0 to 89.1) compared to testing after one week (64.1%, CI 54.4 to 73.8). The tests performed markedly better on samples with lower Ct-values, i.e., <30 (87.9%, CI 86.7 to 88.8), in comparison to those with Ct ≥ 30 (47.8%, CI 41.1 to 54.5). Bias concerns were raised across all data sets, and financial support from the manufacturer was reported in 28.2% of data sets.

Conclusion: As Ag-RDTs detect most cases within the first week of symptom onset and those with high viral load, they can have high utility for screening purposes in the early phase of disease, and thus can be a valuable tool to fight the spread of SARS-CoV-2. Standardization of conduct and reporting of clinical accuracy studies would improve comparability and use of data.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.26.21252546; this version posted March 1, 2021. 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-ND 4.0 International license .

ABBREVIATIONS

Ag-RDT	= antigen rapid diagnostic test
AN/MT	= anterior nasal or midturbinate
AR	= Aruba
BAL/TW	= bronchoalveolar lavage or throat wash
CI	= confidence interval
Ct-value	= cycle threshold value
ER	= Emergency Room
FINDdx	= Foundation for Innovative New Diagnostics
FP	= false positive
FN	= false negative
IFU	= instructions for use
LRT	= lower respiratory tract
N	= sample size
NP	= nasopharyngeal
OP	= oropharyngeal
POC	= point of care
PC	= professional-collected
RT-PCR	= reverse transcriptase polymerase chain reaction
SC	= self-collected
TP	= true positive
TR	= travelers
TN	= true negative
UT	= Utrecht
VTM/UTM	= viral or universal transport medium

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.26.21252546; this version posted March 1, 2021. 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-ND 4.0 International license .

INTRODUCTION

As the COVID-19 pandemic continues around the globe, antigen rapid diagnostic tests (Ag-RDTs) for SARS-CoV-2 are seen as a complimentary to fight the virus' spread (1). The number of Ag-RDTs on the market is increasing constantly (2). Initial data from independent evaluations suggests that the performance of SARS-CoV-2 Ag-RDTs may be lower than what is reported by the manufacturers. In addition, Ag-RDT accuracy seems to vary substantially between tests (3-5).

With the increased availability of Ag-RDTs, an increasing number of independent validations have been published. Such evaluations differ widely in their quality, methods and results, making it difficult to assess the true performance of the respective tests (6). To inform decision makers on the best choice of individual tests, an aggregated, widely available and frequently updated assessment of the quality, performance and independence of the data is urgently necessary. While other systematic reviews have been published, they only include data up until May 2020 (7-9), exclude preprints (10), or were industry sponsored (11). In addition, only one assessed the quality of studies in detail, with data up until May, 2020 (6).

With our systematic review and meta-analysis, we aim to close this gap in the literature and link to a website (www.diagnosticsglobalhealth.org) that is continuously updated.

METHODS

We developed a study protocol following standard guidelines for systematic reviews (12, 13), which is available upon request. The PRISMA checklist and the study protocol are provided in the Supplements (S1, S14). We also registered the review on PROSPERO (Registration number: CRD42020225140).

SEARCH STRATEGY

We performed a search of the databases PubMed, Web of Science, medRxiv and bioRxiv using search terms that were developed with an experienced medical librarian (MG) using combinations of

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.26.21252546; this version posted March 1, 2021. 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-ND 4.0 International license .

subject headings (when applicable) and text-words for the concepts of the search question. The main search terms were "Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Corona-virus 2", "COVID-19", "Betacoronavirus", "Coronavirus" and "Point of Care Testing". The full list of search terms is available in the Supplement (S2). We also searched the FINDdx website (https://www.finddx.org/sarscov2-eval-antigen/) for relevant studies manually. We performed the search up until December 11th, 2020. No language restrictions were applied. Weekly searches are continued thereafter to update the website (www.diagnosticsglobalhealth.org).

INCLUSION CRITERIA

We included studies evaluating the accuracy of commercially available Ag-RDTs to establish a diagnosis of a SARS-CoV-2 infection against reverse transcriptase chain reaction (RT-PCR) or cell culture as reference standard. We included all study populations irrespective of age, presence of symptoms, or the study location. We considered cohort studies, nested cohort studies, case-control or cross-sectional studies and randomized studies. We included both peer reviewed publications and preprints.

We excluded studies in which patients were tested for the purpose of monitoring or ending quarantine. Also, publications with a population size smaller than 10 were excluded (although the size threshold of 10 is arbitrary, such small studies are more likely to give unreliable estimates of sensitivity or specificity).

INDEX TESTS

Point of Care (POC) Ag-RDTs for SARS-CoV-2 aim to detect infection by recognizing viral proteins. Most POC Ag-RDTs use specific labeled antibodies attached to a nitrocellulose matrix strip, to capture the virus antigen. Successful binding of the antibodies to the antigen is either detected visually (through the appearance of a line on the matrix strip (lateral flow assay)) or requires a specific

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.26.21252546; this version posted March 1, 2021. 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-ND 4.0 International license .

reader for fluorescence detection. POC microfluidic enzyme-linked immunosorbent assays have also been developed. Ag-RDTs typically provide results within 10 to 30min (5).

REFERENCE STANDARD

Viral culture detects viable virus that is relevant for transmission but is available in research settings only. Since RT-PCR tests are more widely available and SARS-CoV-2 RNA (as reflected by RT-PCR cycle threshold (Ct) value) highly correlates with SARS-CoV-2 antigen quantities, we considered it an acceptable reference standard for the purposes of this systematic review (14).

STUDY SELECTION AND DATA EXTRACTION

Two reviewers (LEB and CE, LEB and SS or LEB and MB) reviewed the titles and abstracts of all publications identified by the search algorithm independently, followed by a full-text review for those eligible, to select the articles for inclusion in the systematic review. Any disputes were solved by discussion or by a third reviewer (CMD).

A full list of the parameters extracted is included in the Supplement (S13) and the data extraction file is available upon request. Studies that assessed multiple Ag-RDTs or presented results based on differing parameters (e.g., various sample types) were considered as individual data sets.

At first, four authors (SK, CE, SS, MB) extracted five randomly selected papers in parallel to align on the extraction of data. Afterwards, data extraction as well as the assessment of methodological quality and independency from test manufacturers (see below) was performed by one author per paper (SK, CE, SS, MB) and controlled by a second (LEB, SK, SS, MB). Any differences were resolved by discussion or by consulting a third author (CMD).

STUDY TYPES

We differentiated between clinical accuracy studies (performed on clinical samples) or analytical accuracy studies (performed on contrived samples with known viral load). Analytical accuracy studies

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.26.21252546; this version posted March 1, 2021. 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-ND 4.0 International license .

can differ widely in methodology, impeding an aggregation of their results. Thus, while we extracted the data for both kinds of studies, we only considered data from clinical accuracy studies as eligible for the meta-analysis. Separately, we summarized the results of analytical studies and compared them with the results of the meta-analysis for individual tests.

ASSESSMENT OF METHODOLOGICAL QUALITY

The quality of the clinical accuracy studies was assessed by applying the QUADAS-2 tool (15). The tool evaluates four domains: patient selection, index test, reference standard, and flow and timing. For each domain, the risk of bias is analyzed using different signaling questions. Beyond the risk of bias, the tool also evaluates the applicability of the study of each included study to the research question for every domain. The QUADAS 2 tool was adjusted to the needs of this review and can be found in the Supplement (S3).

ASSESSMENT OF INDEPENDENCY FROM MANUFACTURERS

We examined whether a study received financial support from a test manufacturer (including the free provision of Ag-RDTs), whether any study author was affiliated with a test manufacturer, or a respective conflict of interest was declared. Studies were judged not to be independent from the test manufacturers if at least one of these aspects were found present, otherwise they were considered to be independent.

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS AND DATA SYNTHESIS

We prepared forest plots for the sensitivity and specificity of each test and visually evaluated the heterogeneity between studies. If four or more data sets were available with more than 20 positive RT-PCR samples per data set for a predefined analysis, a meta-analysis was performed. We report point estimates of sensitivity and specificity for SARS-CoV-2 detection compared to the reference standard along with 95% confidence intervals (CI) using a bivariate random effect hierarchical

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.26.21252546; this version posted March 1, 2021. 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-ND 4.0 International license .

model (implemented with the 'metandi' command in Stata). When there were less than four studies for an index test, only a descriptive analysis only was performed and accuracy ranges were reported. In sub-group analyses where papers presented data only on sensitivity, a univariate random effects logistic regression model was done (using the 'metan' command in Stata). We predefined the following subgroups for meta-analysis: by sampling and testing procedure in accordance with manufacturer's instructions as detailed in the instructions for use (henceforth called IFU-conform) vs. non-IFU conform, age (<18; ≥18), sample type, by presence or absence of symptoms, symptom duration (<7 days versus ≥7 days), type of RT-PCR used, and by Ct-value range. For categorization by sample type, we assessed (1) nasopharyngeal (NP) alone or combined with other (e.g., oropharyngeal (OP)), (2) OP alone, (3) anterior nasal or mid-turbinate (AN/MT), (4) a combination of bronchial alveolar lavage and throat wash (BAL/TW) or (5) saliva.

We aimed to do meta-regression with the 'mvmeta' command in Stata to examine the impact of covariates including symptom duration and Ct-value range. We also performed the Deeks' test for funnel-plot asymmetry as recommended to investigate publication bias for diagnostic test accuracy meta-analyses ((16), using the 'midas' command in Stata); a p-value<0.10 for the slope coefficient indicates significant asymmetry. Analyses were performed using Stata 15 (Stata Corporation, College Station, TX, USA), and forest plots were generated using Review Manager 5.3 (Nordic Cochrane Centre, Copenhagen, Denmark).

SENSITIVITY ANALYSIS

Two types of sensitivity analyses were planned: First, estimation of sensitivity and specificity excluding case-control studies. Secondly, estimation of sensitivity and specificity excluding non-peer-reviewed studies. We compared the results of each sensitivity analysis against overall results to assess the potential bias introduced by considering case-control studies and non-peer reviewed studies.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.26.21252546; this version posted March 1, 2021. 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-ND 4.0 International license .

DIAGNOSTICSGLOBALHEALTH.ORG

A summary of the data included in this paper is available on the website "www.diagnosticsglobalhealth.org". At least once per week we update this website by continuing the literature search and process described above. We plan to update the meta-analysis every month and post on the website.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.26.21252546; this version posted March 1, 2021. 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-ND 4.0 International license .

RESULTS

SUMMARY OF STUDIES

The systematic search resulted in 11,715 articles. After removing duplicates, 5,435 articles were screened, and 93 papers were considered eligible for data extraction. Of these, 41 were excluded because they did not present primary data (14, 17-56), leaving 52 studies to be included in the systematic review (Figure 1) (3, 57-107).

At the end of the data extraction process, 23 studies were still in preprint form (3, 57, 60, 62, 63, 66, 67, 75-77, 81, 86, 89, 91, 93, 94, 96, 97, 100, 102-104, 106). All studies were written in English, except for one in Spanish. Out of the 52 studies, 48 reported on clinical accuracy (3, 57-65, 67-83, 86-91, 93-107) and four on analytical accuracy (66, 84, 85, 92).

The 48 clinical accuracy studies were divided up in 74 data sets, while the four analytical accuracy studies accounted for 24 data sets. A total of 20 different Ag-RDTs were evaluated (15 lateral flow with visual readout, five requiring an automated reader), with 18 being assessed in a clinical accuracy study. Only 11 studies reported data for more than one test, and only four of these conducted a head-to-head assessment, i.e., testing at least two Ag-RDTs on the same sample or participant. The reference method was RT-PCR in all except one study, which used viral culture.

The most common reason for testing was the occurrence of symptoms (30.6% of data sets), while in another 15.3% of data sets persons were screened independent of symptoms. Close contact to a SARS-CoV-2 confirmed case was the reason for testing in further 5.1% of the data sets. In 8.2% of the data sets, persons were tested due to more than one of the reasons mentioned before and for 40.8% the reason for testing was unclear.

In total, 32,468 Ag-RDTs were done, 31,202 in clinical accuracy studies and 1,266 in analytical accuracy studies. In the clinical accuracy studies, the mean number of samples per clinical study was 422 (Range 17 to 4183). Only 274 tests were performed on pediatric samples and 10,154 on samples from adults. For the remaining 22,040 samples, age was not specified. 18,464 samples originated from symptomatic patients and 5,071 samples from asymptomatic patients. For 8,933 samples the

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.26.21252546; this version posted March 1, 2021. 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-ND 4.0 International license .

patient's symptom status could not be identified. The most common sample type evaluated was NP and mixed NP/OP (22,293 samples). There were substantially fewer data points for the other sample types: OP 796 samples and AN/MT 6,496 samples.

Of the data sets assessing clinical accuracy, 39.2% performed testing according to the manufacturers' recommendations (i.e., IFU-conform), while 58.1% were not IFU-conforming. The most common deviations from the IFU were (1) a sample type that was not recommended for Ag-RDTs (28 (37.8%) data sets; 2 (2.7%) not known), (2) use of samples that were prediluted in transport media not recommended by the manufacturer (26 (35,1%) data sets; 9 (12,2%) not known) and (3) use of banked samples (21 (28.4%) data sets; 12 (16.2%) not known).

A summary of the clinical accuracy data by study, including the test(s) evaluated, sample size, sample type, sample condition and IFU conformity, can be found in Table 1. Most data sets were available for the Panbio test by Abbott Rapid Diagnostics (Germany; henceforth called Panbio): 21 data sets and 15,809 tests; while Standard Q test by SD Biosensor (South Korea; distributed in Europe by Roche, Germany; henceforth called Standard Q) was assessed in 16 data sets with 6036 tests performed. Detailed results for each clinical accuracy study are available in the Supplement (S 4).

METHOLOGICAL QUALITY OF STUDIES

The findings on study quality using the QUADAS 2 tool are presented in Figure 2. Most studies assessed a relevant patient population (73.0%). However, for only 31.1% of the studies the patient selection was considered representative of the setting and population chosen (i.e., they avoided inappropriate exclusions, a case-control design and enrollment occurred consecutive or randomly).

The conduct and interpretation of the index tests was considered to have low risk for introduction of bias in 45.9% of studies (through e.g., appropriate blinding of persons interpreting the visual read-out). However, 51.4% of studies did not provide sufficient information to clearly judge the risk of bias. Only a subset of studies performed the Ag-RDTs according to IFU (39.2% of studies), while

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.26.21252546; this version posted March 1, 2021. 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-ND 4.0 International license .

58.1% were non-IFU conforming, which potentially affected the accuracy negatively (for 2.7% of studies it was unclear).

For half of the data sets (51.4%) the reference standard was performed ahead of the Ag-RDT or the operator conducting the Ag-RDT was blinded to its results, which resulted in a low risk of bias. However, almost half (47.3%) did not report sufficient information to judge the risk and one study specifically stated to have performed the reference standard not blinded to the Ag-RDT results. Nonetheless, the applicability of the reference test was judged to be of low concern for all studies, as cell culture or RT-PCR are expected to adequately define the target condition.

Most studies (67.6%) obtained the sample for the index test and reference test at the same time and applied the same reference standard across the samples. However, for 8.1% of data sets, we were concerned that not all selected patients were included in the analysis.

Financial support from the Ag-RDT manufacturer was found in 28.2% of the data sets. Five per-cent of the authors reported a conflict of interest and another five percent indicated employment by the manufacturer of the Ag-RDT studied.

DETECTION OF SARS-COV-2 INFECTION

Out of 74 clinical data sets (from 48 studies), ten were excluded from the meta-analysis, as they included less than 20 RT-PCR positive samples. Across the remaining 64 data sets, including any test and type of sample, the meta-analyzed sensitivity and specificity were 73.8% (95%CI 68.6 to 78.5) and 99.7% (95%CI 99.3 to 99.9). If testing was performed IFU-conform, sensitivity increased to 79.1% (95%CI 75.0 to 82.8) compared to non-IFU conform testing with a respective sensitivity of 68.5% (95%CI 58.4 to 77.2). Pooled specificity was the same in both groups (99.7% vs. 99.6%).

ANALYSIS OF SPECIFIC TESTS

Based on 47 out of the 64 clinical data sets with 24,543 tests performed, we were able to meta-analyze the sensitivity and specificity of five different Ag-RDTs: Standard Q, Panbio, the Standard F by

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.26.21252546; this version posted March 1, 2021. 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-ND 4.0 International license .

Biosensor (South Korea; henceforth called Standard F), the COVID-19 Ag Respi-Strip by Coris BioConcept (Belgium, henceforth called Coris) and the Biocredit Covid-19 Antigen rapid test kit by RapiGEN (South Korea; henceforth called Rapigen). Across these, pooled estimates of sensitivity and specificity on all samples were 73.1% (95%CI 67.1 to 78.3) and 99.7% (95% CI 99.2 to 99.9), which were very similar to the overall pooled estimate across all meta-analyzed data sets (73.8% and 99.7%, above).

Standard Q had the highest pooled estimate of sensitivity with 81.7% (95% CI 74.8 to 87.0). The pooled sensitivity for Standard F and Panbio were 70.9% (95% CI 52.0 to 84.6) and 72.7% (95%CI 63.7 to 80.2), respectively. Coris and Rapigen only reached a pooled sensitivity of 41.9% (95%CI 29.9 to 54.8) and 65.8% (95%CI 44.4 to 82.3), respectively. It is of note that one of the studies on Coris found sensitivity to be 87% in samples with Ct-values <25, but 0% for Ct-values ≥25 (104). The pooled specificity was above 99% for Coris, Panbio and Standard Q and above 98% for Rapigen and Standard F. All results are presented in Figure 3. Hierarchical summary receiver-operating characteristic for Standard Q and Panbio are available in the Supplement (S6).

The remaining thirteen Ag-RDTs did not have sufficient data to allow for a test-specific meta-analysis. For the ESPLINE SARS-CoV-2 by Fujirebio (Japan; henceforth called Espline) sensitivity ranged widely from 23.5% to 80.7%, while both the 2019-nCov Antigen Rapid Test Kit by Shenzhen Bioeasy Biotechnology (China; henceforth called Bioeasy) and BD Veritor by Becton, Dickinson and Company (US, New Jersey; henceforth called BD Veritor) showed smaller variability with sensitivities within 66.7% to 93.9% and 76.3% to 96.4%, respectively. For the Sofia SARS Antigen FIA by Quidel (US, California; henceforth called Sofia), a sensitivity between 76.8% and 93.8% was reported (Table 1). Forest plots for the data sets for each Ag-RDT are provided in the Supplement (S5).

Specificity was above 98% for BD Veritor and Espline for studies on NP or NP/OP samples and for Sofia it was 96.9%. For Bioeasy, specificity was as low as 85.6% in one study, even though the test was performed as recommended by the manufacturer. The results for all Ag-RDTs that have been evaluated in more than one data set but did not qualify for a test specific meta-analysis are summa-

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.26.21252546; this version posted March 1, 2021. 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-ND 4.0 International license .

rized in Table 2. The residual Ag-RDTs that were evaluated in one data set only are included in Table 1 and Supplement (S5).

Four studies accounting for 15 data sets conducted head-to-head clinical accuracy evaluations of tests using the same sample or samples from the same participant. These data sets are underlined in Table 1. Two such studies included more than 100 samples, whereas the other two included too small sample sizes to draw clear conclusions (96, 106). All tests were performed non-IFU conform as banked specimens were tested, the type of sample (OP, BAL/TW) was not recommended or viral/universal transport medium (VTM/UTM) was used resulting in pre-dilution. Not surprisingly, one head-to-head study found overall low sensitivity, with Standard Q (sensitivity 49.4%) being slightly more sensitive than Panbio (sensitivity 44.6%), but less sensitive than the CLINITEST® Rapid COVID-19 Antigen Test by Siemens Healthineers (Germany; sensitivity 54.9%) (89). Another study found Bioeasy (sensitivity 85.0%) to have higher sensitivity than Rapigen (sensitivity 62.0%) (105). In both studies, specificity was above 97.0% for all Ag-RDTs, except for SARS-CoV-2 Ag-RDT by Liming Bio (China; specificity 90.0%) (Supplement S5).

SUBGROUP ANALYSIS

The results are presented in Figure 4. Detailed results for the subgroup analysis are available in the Supplement (S7 to 11).

Subgroup analysis by IFU conformity

The summary results are presented in Figure 4B. When assessing only studies with an IFU-conforming sampling, a subgroup analysis by test type was possible for studies using Panbio (58, 59, 62, 63, 67, 68, 73, 77, 86, 97, 102) and Standard Q (62, 72, 74, 76, 81, 82, 88, 97) with 20 data sets performing 11,658 tests in total (Standard Q accounted for eight (40%) data sets and 3,293 (28.2%) tests). For Standard Q, we found a pooled sensitivity and specificity of 84.4% (95% CI 79.1 to 88.6) and 99.3% (95% CI 97.9 to 99.8) and for Panbio, we found a pooled sensitivity and specificity of

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.26.21252546; this version posted March 1, 2021. 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-ND 4.0 International license .

76.9% (95% CI 69.4 to 83.0) and 99.9% (95% CI 99.5 to 100.0), respectively. These results are largely similar to the subgroup analysis of the two tests when using NP samples.

Subgroup analysis by sample type

Most data sets evaluated NP or combined NP/OP swabs (49 data sets and 20,115 samples) as the sample type for the Ag-RDT. NP or combined NP/OP swabs achieved a pooled sensitivity of 77.3% (95% CI 72.0 to 81.9). Data sets that used AN/MT swabs for Ag-RDTs (five data sets and 6496 samples) showed a summary estimate for sensitivity of 63.5% (95% CI 49.5 to 75.5). Out of these five AN/MT data sets, three data sets used NP samples for the RT-PCR comparison (sensitivity 44.7% to 82.1%, specificity 99.1% to 100%) (57, 58, 82), while only two data sets used AN/MT for both Ag-RDT and RT-PCR testing (sensitivity 57,7% to 79,5%, specificity 98,7% to 100%; Figure 4A) (60, 93).

When evaluating results from two studies that reported direct head-to-head comparison of NP and MT samples from the same participants using the same Ag-RDT (Standard Q), the two sample types showed equivalent performance (81, 82).

Analysis of performance with an OP swab (722 samples), showed pooled sensitivity of only 48.2% (95%CI 42.7 to 53.8). However, all data were from one single head-to-head study that applied the same sample to four different tests after dilution with UTM (89). Specificity was above 99% for all three of the subgroups analyzed.

We were not able to perform a subgroup meta-analysis for BAL/TW due to insufficient data as there was only one study with 73 samples evaluating the Rapigen, Panbio and Standard Q (96). However, BAL/TW would in any case be off label use and is not considered a POC sample.

Another off-label sample used in one study (58) was saliva. In this data set with 610 samples, overall sensitivity was 23.1% (95% CI 16.2 to 31.9), while even sensitivity in samples from symptomatic patients with a Ct-value ≤25 was of only 41% (95% CI 28 to 56). Specificity was reported to be 100% (95% CI 99 to 100) (58).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.26.21252546; this version posted March 1, 2021. 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-ND 4.0 International license .

Three tests had sufficient data sets available to meta-analyze performance with NP swabs by test type. Standard Q with 83.3% (95%CI 77.3 to 87.9) sensitivity and 99.1% (95%CI 98.2 to 99.6) specificity and Panbio with 78.7% (95%CI 71.4 to 84.5) sensitivity and 99.9% (95%CI 99.5 to 100) specificity were the best performing tests. Coris had a sensitivity of only 41.9% (95%CI 29.9 to 54.8).

Subgroup analysis in symptomatic and asymptomatic patients

Within the data sets possible to meta-analyze, 12,625 samples (77.2%) were from symptomatic and 3,737 (22.8%) from asymptomatic patients. The pooled sensitivity for symptomatic patients was markedly different compared to asymptomatic patients with 78.1% (95%CI 69.6 to 84.8) versus 62.5% (95%CI 39.7 to 80.8), but confidence intervals were overlapping. Specificity was 99.7% (95%CI 99.4 to 99.9) for symptomatic and 99.9% (95%CI 97.6 to 100) for asymptomatic patients, respectively (Figure 4C).

Subgroup analysis comparing symptom duration

Limited data were available for this sub-analysis: data was analyzed for 2,875 patients with symptoms less than 7 days and 249 patients with symptoms ≥ 7 days. It was only possible to perform a univariate analysis of sensitivity. The pooled sensitivity for patients with onset of symptoms <7 days was 87.5% (95%CI 86.0 to 89.1) which is markedly higher than the 64.1% (95%CI 54.4 to 73.8) sensitivity found for individuals tested ≥ 7 days from onset of symptoms (Figure 4C).

Subgroup analysis by Ct-values

There were also limited data available for comparison of Ct-values in similar ranges. In an effort to use as much of the heterogeneous data as possible, the cut-offs for the Ct-value groups were relaxed by 2-3 points within each range. The <25 group included values reported as ≤24 to <25, the <30 group included values from ≤29 to ≤33. This resulted in some overlap for the <30 and ≥30 groups. The pooled sensitivity for Ct-values <25 was markedly better with 94.2% (95%CI 93.2 to 95.2) com-

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.26.21252546; this version posted March 1, 2021. 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-ND 4.0 International license .

pared to ≥ 25 32.5% (95%CI 28.0 to 37.1; Figure 4D). A similar pattern was observed when the Ct-values were analyzed using cut-offs <30 or ≥30, resulting in a sensitivity of 87.9% (95%CI 86.7 to 89.2) and 47.8% (95%CI 41.1 to 54.5), respectively (Figure 4D). Sensitivity in samples with a low viral load (<5 log 10 copies/ml) ranged between 46.9% (lowest estimate in single study) to 48.1% (highest estimate in a single study). In contrast, higher viral load samples (>6 log 10 copies/ml) showed higher sensitivity, ranging from 71.4% to 100%.

Subgroup analysis by age, type of RT-PCR and viral load

We were not able to perform a meta-analysis for the subgroups by age, type of RT-PCR or viral load (viral copies/mL) due to insufficient data.

Sensitivity by age ranged from 72.7% to 100% in patients under 18 years. A similar picture was found in adults ≥18 years, with sensitivity ranging between 76.3% to 93.6%. Specificity was above 99% in both groups.

In 52 (70.3%) of the data sets only one type of RT-PCR was used, whereas 15 (20.3%) tested samples in the same study using different RT-PCRs. For seven (9.4%) of the data sets we could not tell the type of RT-PCR. The Cobas® SARS-CoV-2 Test from Roche (Germany) was used most frequently in 24 (32.4%) of the data sets, followed by the Allplex® 2019 n-CoV Assay from Seegene in 16 (21.6%) and the SARS CoV-2 assay from Corman/TibMolBio in 14 (18.9%) of the data sets.

Meta regression

We were not able to perform a meta-regression due to the considerable heterogeneity in reporting sub-groups, which resulted in too few studies with sufficient data for comparison.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.26.21252546; this version posted March 1, 2021. 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-ND 4.0 International license .

Publication Bias

The result of the Deeks' test indicate significant asymmetry in the funnel plot for all 64 datasets with complete results (p=0.01) and for Standard Q publications (p=0.03), but not Panbio publications (p=0.95). All funnel plots are listed in the Supplement (S12).

COMPARISON WITH ANALYTICAL STUDIES

The four included analytical studies provided 24 data sets in total, evaluating eight different Ag-RDTs. 45.8% of the samples originated from NP swabs, whereas throat saliva, a combination of naso-pharyngeal aspirate and throat swab, as well as a combination of NP and throat swab accounted for 16.6% each. One data set included sputum.

Overall, the reported analytical sensitivity (limit of detection) in the studies correlated with the results of the meta-analysis presented above. For example, one study on NP swabs found Rapigen (limit of detection (LOD) in log10 copies per swab (108): 10.2) and Coris (LOD 7.46) to perform worse than Panbio (LOD 6.55) and Standard Q (LOD 6.78)(66). Similar results were found in another study, where the Standard Q showed the lowest LOD (detecting virus up to what is an equivalent Ct-value of 28.67), when compared to that of Rapigen and Coris (detecting virus up to what is an equivalent Ct-value of only 18.44 for both)(84).

SENSITIVITY ANALYSIS

When case control studies (13/64) were excluded, the pooled sensitivity stayed the same with 73.8% (95%CI 68.7 to 78.4) compared to 73.8% (95%CI 68.6 to 78.5) in the overall analysis with no change in pooled specificity. When excluding pre-prints (35/64), sensitivity decreased slightly to 69.2% (95% CI 60.7-76.6) compared to the overall analysis.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.26.21252546; this version posted March 1, 2021. 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-ND 4.0 International license .

DISCUSSION

In this comprehensive systematic review and meta-analysis, we have summarized the data of 52 studies evaluating the accuracy of 20 different Ag-RDTs. Across all meta-analyzed samples, our results show a sensitivity and specificity of 73.8% (95%CI 68.6 to 78.5) and 99.7% (95% CI 99.3 to 99.9). Over half of the studies did not perform the Ag-RDT in accordance with the test manufacturers' recommendation, which affected sensitivity negatively. When considering only IFU-conform studies the sensitivity increased to 79.1% (95%CI 75.0 to 82.8). While we found the sensitivity to vary across specific tests, the specificity was more consistently high.

The two Ag-RDTs that have been approved through the WHO emergency use listing procedure, Abbott Panbio and SD Biosensor Standard Q (distributed by Roche in Europe), have not only drawn the largest research interest, but also continue to be the best performing tests when comparing their meta-analyzed accuracy to that of other Ag-RDTs (Standard F, Coris and Rapigen). Two other Ag-RDTs with more data available (however insufficient data to meta-analyze) also show higher performance (BD Veritor and Sophia). However, both require an instrument for operation.

Not surprisingly, lower Ct-values, the RT-PCR semi-quantitative correlate for a high virus concentration, resulted in a significantly higher Ag-RDT sensitivity when compared to a high Ct-value (pooled sensitivity 94.2% vs. 32.5%). This confirms prior data that suggested that antigen concentrations and Ct-values were tightly correlated in NP samples (14). Ag-RDTs also showed higher sensitivity in patients within 7 days after symptom onset than in patients later in the course of the disease (pooled sensitivity 87.5% vs. 64.1%), which is to be expected given that samples from patients within the first week after symptom onset have been shown to contain the highest virus concentrations (109). In line with this, studies presenting an unexpectedly low overall sensitivity either shared a small population size with an on average high Ct-value (83, 98) or performed the Ag-RDT not as per

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.26.21252546; this version posted March 1, 2021. 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-ND 4.0 International license .

IFU, e.g., using saliva samples (58, 89). In contrast, studies with an unusually high Ag-RDT sensitivity were based on study populations with a high median Ct-value, between 18 and 22 (65, 94).

Our analysis also found that the accuracy of Ag-RDTs is substantially higher in symptomatic patients than in asymptomatic (pooled sensitivity 78.1% vs. 62.5%). Given that prior studies found largely no difference in the trajectory of viral load of patients with and without symptoms over the course of disease (109), this is likely explained by the varied stage in the course of disease at which testing is performed in asymptomatic patients presenting for one-time screening testing. While we were not able to perform a meta-regression assessing performance by duration of infection, studies that enrolled asymptomatic contacts of infected patients (3, 77, 99) were more likely to show higher Ag-RDT sensitivity than studies that performed random screening of asymptomatic persons (64, 93). This is explained by the fact, that asymptomatic persons who were tested after a contact with an infected person are more likely to be captured in the early phase of disease and have higher viral loads at the time of testing (110). However, with random screening, detection is possible at any point of disease (i.e., including late in disease, when PCR is still positive, but viable virus is rapidly decreasing (111)).

With regards to the sampling and testing procedure, we found Ag-RDTs to perform similarly across upper-respiratory swab samples (e.g., NP and AN/MT), particularly when considering the most reliable comparisons from head-to-head studies.

Similar to previous assessment (6), the methodological quality of the included studies revealed a very heterogenous picture. In the future, aligning the design of clinical accuracy studies to common agreed upon minimal specifications (e.g., by WHO or European Center of Disease Control) and reporting the results in a standardized way (112) would improve data quality and comparability.

The main strengths of our study lie in its comprehensive approach and continuous updates. By linking this review to our website www.diagnosticsglobalhealth.org, we strive to equip decision makers with the latest research findings on Ag-RDTs for SARS-CoV-2 and, to the best of our knowledge,

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.26.21252546; this version posted March 1, 2021. 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-ND 4.0 International license .

are the first in doing so. Furthermore, our study shows rigorous methods as both the study selection and data extraction were performed by one author and independently controlled by a second, we conducted blinded test extractions ahead of the actual data extraction, and we prepared a detailed interpretation guide for the QUADAS-2 tool.

However, our study is limited in that the inclusion of both preprints and peer-reviewed literature could affect the quality of our report. Nonetheless, we aimed to counterbalance this effect by applying a thorough assessment of all clinical studies included, utilizing the QUADAS-2 tool. Furthermore, a sensitivity analysis excluding preprints was performed. In addition, we restricted our report to data found in common research databases and the FINDdx website. Even though we are aware that further data for example from governmental research institutes exists (113), such data could not be included as sufficient detail describing the methods and results are not publicly available. Finally, the strong heterogeneity in data reporting, as discussed above, limited the meta-analysis.

CONCLUSION

In summary, it can be concluded that there are Ag-RDTs available that have high sensitivity, particularly when performed in the first week of illness when viral load is high, and high specificity. However, our analysis also highlights the variability in results between tests (which is not reflected in the manufacturer reported data), indicating the need for independent validations. Furthermore, the analysis highlights the importance of tests to be done in accordance with the manufacturers' recommended procedures and in alignment with standard diagnostic study and reporting guidelines. The accuracy achievable by the best-performing Ag-RDTs, combined with the rapid results turnaround time and ease of use, suggests that these tests could have a significant impact on the pandemic if applied in thoughtful testing and screening strategies.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.26.21252546; this version posted March 1, 2021. 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-ND 4.0 International license .

SOURCES

1. World Health Organization. Antigen-detection in the diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2 infection using rapid immunoassays: interim guid-ance, 11 September 2020. No WHO/2019-nCoV/Antigen_Detection/20201. 2020b.
2. Federal Institute for Drugs and Medical Devices (Bundesinstitut für Arzneimittel und Medizinprodukte). Liste der Antigen-Tests zum direkten Erregernachweis des Coronavirus SARS-CoV-2 2021 [Available from: https://antigentest.bfarm.de/ords/antigen/r/antigentests-auf-sars-cov-2/liste-der-antigentests?session=11206134045553&tz=1:00.
3. Krüger LJ, Gaeddert M, Köppel L, Brümmer LE, 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 [Preprint]; published October 04,. 2020a.
4. Denkinger CM, Grenier J, Minion J, Pai M. Promise versus reality: optimism bias in package inserts for tuberculosis diagnostics. Journal of Clinical Microbiology. 2012;50(7):2455-61.
5. World Health Organization. Advice on the use of point-of-care immunodiagnostic tests for COVID-19: scientific brief, 8 April 2020. No WHO/2019-nCoV/Sci_Brief/POC_immunodiagnostics/20201. 2020a.
6. Dinnes J, Deeks JJ, Adriano A, Berhane S, Davenport C, Dittrich S, et al. Rapid, point-of-care antigen and molecular-based tests for diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2 infection (Review). Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews. 2020(8).
7. Olalekan A, Iwalokun B, Akinloye OM, Popoola O, Samuel TA, Akinloye O. COVID-19 rapid diagnostic test could contain transmission in low- And middle-income countries. Afr J Lab Med. 2020;9(1).
8. Castro R, Luz PM, Wakimoto MD, Veloso VG, Grinsztejn B, Perazzo H. COVID-19: a meta-analysis of diagnostic test accuracy of commercial assays registered in Brazil. Brazilian Journal of Infectious Diseases. 2020;24(2):180-7.
9. La Marca A, Capuzzo M, Paglia T, Roli L, Trenti T, Nelson SM. Testing for SARS-CoV-2 (COVID-19): a systematic review and clinical guide to molecular and serological in-vitro diagnostic assays. Reproductive Biomedicine Online. 2020;41(3):483-99.
10. Van Walle I, Leitmeyer K, Broberg E. Meta-analysis of the clinical performance of commercial SARS-CoV-2 nucleic acid, antigen and antibody tests up to 22 August 2020. medRxiv [Preprint]; published September 18, 2020. 2020.
11. Hayer J, Kasapic D, Zemmrich C. Real-world clinical performance of commercial SARS-CoV-2 rapid antigen tests in suspected COVID-19: A systematic meta-analysis of available data as per November 20, 2020. medRxiv [Preprint]; published December 24,. 2020.
12. Leeflang MM, Deeks JJ, Gatsonis C, Bossuyt PM, Cochrane Diagnostic Test Accuracy Working G. Systematic reviews of diagnostic test accuracy. Annals of Internal Medicine. 2008;149(12):889-97.
13. Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, Group P. Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. Annals of Internal Medicine. 2009;151(4):264-9, W64.
14. Pollock N, Savage T, Wardell H, Lee R, Mathew A, Stengelin M, et al. Correlation of SARS-CoV-2 nucleocapsid antigen and RNA concentrations in nasopharyngeal samples from children and adults using an ultrasensitive and quantitative antigen assay. medRxiv [Preprint]; published November 13,. 2020.
15. Whiting PF, Rutjes AW, Westwood ME, Mallett S, Deeks JJ, Reitsma JB, et al. QUADAS-2: a revised tool for the quality assessment of diagnostic accuracy studies. Annals of Internal Medicine. 2011;155(8):529-36.
16. van Enst WA, Ochodo E, Scholten RJ, Hooft L, Leeflang MM. Investigation of publication bias in meta-analyses of diagnostic test accuracy: a meta-epidemiological study. BMC Med Res Methodol. 2014;14:70.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.26.21252546; this version posted March 1, 2021. 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-ND 4.0 International license .

17. Abdelrazik AM, Elshafie SM, Abdelaziz HM. Potential Use of Antigen-Based Rapid Test for SARS-CoV-2 in Respiratory Specimens in Low-Resource Settings in Egypt for Symptomatic Patients and High-Risk Contacts. Laboratory Medicine. 2020.

18. Azzi L, Baj A, Alberio T, Lualdi M, Veronesi G, Carcano G, et al. Rapid Salivary Test suitable for a mass screening program to detect SARS-CoV-2: A diagnostic accuracy study. Journal of Infection. 2020;81(3):E75-E8.

19. Blairon L, Wilmet A, Beukinga I, Tre-Hardy M. Implementation of rapid SARS-CoV-2 antigenic testing in a laboratory without access to molecular methods: Experiences of a general hospital. Journal of Clinical Virology. 2020;129.

20. Cardozo KHM, Lebkuchen A, Okai GG, Schuch RA, Viana LG, Olive AN, et al. Establishing a mass spectrometry-based system for rapid detection of SARS-CoV-2 in large clinical sample cohorts. Nature Communications. 2020;11(1):6201.

21. Cazares LH, Chaerkady R, Samuel Weng SH, Boo CC, Cimbro R, Hsu HE, et al. Development of a Parallel Reaction Monitoring Mass Spectrometry Assay for the Detection of SARS-CoV-2 Spike Glycoprotein and Nucleoprotein. Analytical Chemistry. 2020;92(20):13813-21.

22. Colavita F, Vairo F, Meschi S, Valli B, Lalle E, Castilletti C, et al. COVID-19 Antigen Rapid Test as Screening Strategy at the Points-of-Entry: Experience in Lazio Region, Central Italy, August-October 2020. medRxiv [Preprint]; published November 30,. 2020.

23. Conzelmann C, Gilg A, Groß R, Schütz D, Preising N, Ständker L, et al. An enzyme-based immunodetection assay to quantify SARS-CoV-2 infection. Antiviral Research. 2020;181:104882.

24. Courtellemont L, Guinard J, Guillaume C, Giaché S, Rzepecki V, Seve A, et al. Real-life performance of a novel antigen detection test on nasopharyngeal specimens for SARS-CoV-2 infection diagnosis: a prospective study. medRxiv [Preprint]; published November 3,. 2020.

25. Cui Z, Chang H, Wang H, Lim B, Hsu CC, Yu Y, et al. Development of a rapid test kit for SARS-CoV-2: an example of product design. Bio-Design and Manufacturing. 2020:1-4.

26. Diao B, Wen K, Chen J, Liu Y, Yuan Z, Han C, et al. Diagnosis of Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 Infection by Detection of Nucleocapsid Protein. medRxiv [Preprint]; published March 13,. 2020.

27. Diao B, Wen K, Zhang J, Chen J, Han C, Chen Y, et al. Accuracy of a nucleocapsid protein antigen rapid test in the diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2 infection. Clinical Microbiology and Infection. 2020.

28. Foundation for Innovative New Diagnostics. FIND Evaluation of Abbott Panbio COVID-19 Ag Rapid Test Device. External Report Version 21, 10 December. 2020.

29. Foundation for Innovative New Diagnostics. FIND Evaluation of Coris BioConcept COVID-19 Ag Respi-Strip. External Report Version 12, 10 December. 2020.

30. Grant BD, Anderson CE, Williford JR, Alonzo LF, Glukhova VA, Boyle DS, et al. SARS-CoV-2 Coronavirus Nucleocapsid Antigen-Detecting Half-Strip Lateral Flow Assay Toward the Development of Point of Care Tests Using Commercially Available Reagents. Analytical Chemistry. 2020;92(16):11305-9.

31. Hingrat QL, Visseaux B, Laouenan C, Tubiana S, Bouadma L, Yazdanpanah Y, et al. Detection of SARS-CoV-2 N-antigen in blood during acute COVID-19 provides a sensitive new marker and new testing alternatives. Clinical Microbiology and Infection. 2020.

32. Hirotsu Y, Maejima M, Shibusawa M, Nagakubo Y, Hosaka K, Amemiya K, et al. Comparison of automated SARS-CoV-2 antigen test for COVID-19 infection with quantitative RT-PCR using 313 nasopharyngeal swabs, including from seven serially followed patients. International Journal of Infectious Diseases. 2020;99:397-402.

33. Hoehl S, Schenk B, Rudych O, Göttig S, Foppa I, Kohmer N, et al. At-home self-testing of teachers with a SARS-CoV-2 rapid antigen test to reduce potential transmissions in schools. medRxiv [Preprint]; published December 07,. 2020.

34. Huang L, Ding L, Zhou J, Chen S, Chen F, Zhao C, et al. One-step rapid quantification of SARS-CoV-2 virus particles via low-cost nanoplasmonic sensors in generic microplate reader and point-of-care device. Biosensors and Bioelectronics. 2021;171:112685.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.26.21252546; this version posted March 1, 2021. 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-ND 4.0 International license .

35. Ikeda M, Imai K, Tabata S, Miyoshi K, Mizuno T, Murahara N, et al. Clinical evaluation of self-collected saliva by RT-qPCR, direct RT-qPCR, RT-LAMP, and a rapid antigen test to diagnose COVID-19. medRxiv [Preprint]; published June 08,. 2020.
36. Kashiwagi K, Ishii Y, Aoki K, Yagi S, Maeda T, Miyazaki T, et al. Immunochromatographic test for the detection of SARS-CoV-2 in saliva. medRxiv [Preprint]; published May 25,. 2020.
37. Kyosei Y, Namba M, Yamura S, Takeuchi R, Aoki N, Nakaishi K, et al. Proposal of De Novo Antigen Test for COVID-19: Ultrasensitive Detection of Spike Proteins of SARS-CoV-2. Diagnostics. 2020;10(8).
38. Lanser L, Bellmann-Weiler R, Öttl KW, Huber L, Griesmacher A, Theurl I, et al. Evaluating the clinical utility and sensitivity of SARS-CoV-2 antigen testing in relation to RT-PCR Ct values. Infection. 2020:1-3.
39. Lee JH, Choi M, Jung Y, Lee SK, Lee CS, Kim J, et al. A novel rapid detection for SARS-CoV-2 spike 1 antigens using human angiotensin converting enzyme 2 (ACE2). Biosensors and Bioelectronics. 2021;171:112715.
40. Liu D, Ju C, Han C, Shi R, Chen X, Duan D, et al. Ultra-sensitive nanozyme-based chemiluminescence paper test for rapid diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2 infection. bioRxiv [Preprint]; published June 05,. 2020.
41. Mahari S, Roberts A, Shahdeo D, Gandhi S. eCovSens-Ultrasensitive Novel In-House Built Printed Circuit Board Based Electrochemical Device for Rapid Detection of nCovid-19. bioRxiv [Preprint]; published May 11,. 2020.
42. Masiá M, Fernández-González M, Sánchez M, Carvajal M, García JA, Gonzalo N, et al. Nasopharyngeal Panbio COVID-19 antigen performed at point-of-care has a high sensitivity in symptomatic and asymptomatic patients with higher risk for transmission and older age. medRxiv [Preprint]; published November 17,. 2020.
43. Nagura-Ikeda M, Imai K, Tabata S, Miyoshi K, Murahara N, Mizuno T, et al. Clinical Evaluation of Self-Collected Saliva by Quantitative Reverse Transcription-PCR (RT-qPCR), Direct RT-qPCR, Reverse Transcription-Loop-Mediated Isothermal Amplification, and a Rapid Antigen Test To Diagnose COVID-19. Journal of Clinical Microbiology. 2020;58(9).
44. Nash B, Badea A, Reddy A, Bosch M, Salcedo N, Gomez AR, et al. The impact of high frequency rapid viral antigen screening on COVID-19 spread and outcomes: a validation and modeling study. medRxiv [Preprint]; published November 04,. 2020.
45. Ndwandwe D, Mathebula L, Kamadjeu R, Wiysonge CS. Cochrane corner: rapid point-of-care antigen and molecular-based tests for the diagnosis of COVID-19 infection. The Pan African Medical Journal. 2020;37(Suppl 1):10.
46. Pavelka M, Van-Zandvoort K, Abbott S, Sherratt K, Majdan M, Jarčuška P, et al. The effectiveness of population-wide, rapid antigen test based screening in reducing SARS-CoV-2 infection prevalence in Slovakia. medRxiv [Preprint]; published December 04,. 2020.
47. Renuse S, Vanderboom P, Maus A, Kemp J, Gurtner K, Madugundu A, et al. Development of mass spectrometry-based targeted assay for direct detection of novel SARS-CoV-2 coronavirus from clinical specimens. medRxiv [Preprint]; published August 06,. 2020.
48. Seo G, Lee G, Kim MJ, Baek SH, Choi M, Ku KB, et al. Rapid Detection of COVID-19 Causative Virus (SARS-CoV-2) in Human Nasopharyngeal Swab Specimens Using Field-Effect Transistor-Based Biosensor. American Chemical Society. 2020;14(4):5135-42.
49. Singh N, Ray P, Carlin A, Magallanes C, Morgan S, Laurent L, et al. Hitting the diagnostic sweet spot: Point-of-care SARS-CoV-2 salivary antigen testing with an off-the-shelf glucometer. medRxiv [Preprint]; published October 02,. 2020.
50. Singh P, Chakraborty R, Marwal R, Radhakrishan VS, Bhaskar AK, Vashisht H, et al. A rapid and sensitive method to detect SARS-CoV-2 virus using targeted-mass spectrometry. Journal of Proteins and Proteomics. 2020:1-7.
51. Torrente-Rodríguez RM, Lukas H, Tu J, Min J, Yang Y, Xu C, et al. SARS-CoV-2 RapidPlex: A Graphene-based Multiplexed Telemedicine Platform for Rapid and Low-Cost COVID-19 Diagnosis and Monitoring. Matter. 2020.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.26.21252546; this version posted March 1, 2021. 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-ND 4.0 International license .

52. Vadlamani BS, Uppal T, Verma S, Misra M. Functionalized TiO2 nanotube-based Electrochemical Biosensor for Rapid Detection of SARS-CoV-2. Sensors. 2020;20(20).

53. van Beek J, Igloi Z, Boelsums T, Fanoy E, Gotz H, Molenkamp R, et al. From more testing to smart testing: data-guided SARS-CoV-2 testing choices. medRxiv [Preprint]; published October 14,. 2020.

54. Weitzel T, Legarraga P, Iruretagoyena M, Pizarro G, Vollrath V, Araos R, et al. Head-to-head comparison of four antigen-based rapid detection tests for the diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2 in respiratory samples. bioRxiv [Preprint]; published May 30,. 2020.

55. Winkel BMF, Schram E, Gremmels H, Debast S, Schuurman R, Wensing AMJ, et al. Screening for SARS-CoV-2 infection in asymptomatic individuals using the Panbio™ COVID-19 Antigen Rapid Test (Abbott) compared to RT-qPCR. medRxiv [Preprint]; published December 04,. 2020.

56. Zakashansky J, Imamura A, Salgado D, Romero Mercieca H, Aguas RFL, Lao A, et al. Detection of the SARS-CoV-2 spike protein in saliva with Shrinky-Dink© electrodes. medRxiv [Preprint]; published November 18,. 2020.

57. Abdulrahman A, Mustafa F, AlAwadhi AI, Alansari Q, AlAlawi B, AlQahtani M. Comparison of SARS-COV-2 nasal antigen test to nasopharyngeal RT-PCR in mildly symptomatic patients. medRxiv [Preprint]; published December 08,. 2020.

58. Agulló V, Fernández-González M, Ortiz de la Tabla V, Gonzalo-Jiménez N, García JA, Masiá M, et al. Evaluation of the rapid antigen test Panbio COVID-19 in saliva and nasal swabs: A population-based point-of-care study. Journal of Infection. 2020;published online ahead of issue.

59. Albert E, Torres I, Bueno F, Huntley D, Molla E, Fernandez-Fuentes MA, et al. Field evaluation of a rapid antigen test (Panbio™ COVID-19 Ag Rapid Test Device) for COVID-19 diagnosis in primary healthcare centres. Clinical Microbiology and Infection. 2020.

60. Alemany A, Baro B, Ouchi D, Ubals M, Corbacho-Monné M, Vergara-Alert J, et al. Analytical and Clinical Performance of the Panbio COVID-19 Antigen-Detecting Rapid Diagnostic Test. medRxiv [Preprint]; published November 3,. 2020.

61. Beck ET, Paar W, Fojut L, Serwe J, Jahnke RR. Comparison of Quidel Sofia SARS FIA Test to Hologic Aptima SARS-CoV-2 TMA Test for Diagnosis of COVID-19 in Symptomatic Outpatients. Journal of Clinical Microbiology. 2020.

62. Berger A, Ngo Nsoga M-T, Perez Rodriguez FJ, Abi Aad Y, Sattonnet P, Gayet-Ageron A, et al. Diagnostic accuracy of two commercial SARS-CoV-2 Antigen-detecting rapid tests at the point of care in community-based testing centers. medRxiv [Preprint]; published November 23,. 2020.

63. Bulilete O, Lorente P, Leiva A, Carandell E, Oliver A, Rojo E, et al. Evaluation of the Panbio™ rapid antigen test for SARS-CoV-2 in primary health care centers and test sites. medRxiv [Preprint]; published November 16,. 2020.

64. Cerutti F, Burdino E, Milia MG, Allice T, Gregori G, Bruzzone B, et al. Urgent need of rapid tests for SARS CoV-2 antigen detection: Evaluation of the SD-Biosensor antigen test for SARS-CoV-2. Journal of Clinical Virology. 2020;132:104654.

65. Chaimayo C, Kaewnaphan B, Tanlieng N, Athipanyasilp N, Sirijatuphat R, Chayakulkeeree M, et al. Rapid SARS-CoV-2 antigen detection assay in comparison with real-time RT-PCR assay for laboratory diagnosis of COVID-19 in Thailand. Virology Journal. 2020;17(1):177.

66. Corman V, Haage V, Bleicker T, Schmidt ML, Muehlemann B, Zuchowski M, et al. Comparison of seven commercial SARS-CoV-2 rapid Point-of-Care Antigen tests. medRxiv [Preprint]; published November 13,. 2020.

67. Drevinek P, Hurych J, Kepka Z, Briksi A, Kulich M, Zajac M, et al. The sensitivity of SARS-CoV-2 antigen tests in the view of large-scale testing. medRxiv [Preprint]; published November 24,. 2020.

68. Fenollar F, Bouam A, Ballouche M, Fuster L, Prudent E, Colson P, et al. Evaluation of the Panbio Covid-19 rapid antigen detection test device for the screening of patients with Covid-19. Journal of Clinical Microbiology. 2020.

69. Foundation for Innovative New Diagnostics. FIND Evaluation of Bionote, Inc. NowCheck COVID-19 Ag Test. External Report Version 14, 10 December. 2020.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.26.21252546; this version posted March 1, 2021. 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-ND 4.0 International license .

70. Foundation for Innovative New Diagnostics. FIND Evaluation of RapiGEN Inc. BIOCREDIT COVID-19 Ag. External Report Version 21, 10 December. 2020.
71. Foundation for Innovative New Diagnostics. FIND Evaluation of SD Biosensor, Inc. STANDARD™ F COVID-19 Ag FIA. External Report Version 21, 10 December. 2020.
72. Foundation for Innovative New Diagnostics. FIND Evaluation of SD Biosensor, Inc. STANDARD Q COVID-19 Ag Test. External Report Version 21, 10 December. 2020.
73. Gremmels H, Winkela BMF, Schuurmana R, Rosinghb A, Rigterc NAM, Rodriguezd O, et al. Real-life validation of the Panbio COVID-19 Antigen Rapid Test (Abbott) in community-dwelling subjects with symptoms of potential SARS-CoV-2 infection. EClinicalMedicine. 2020;published online ahead of issue.
74. Gupta A, Khurana S, Das R, Srigyan D, Singh A, Mittal A, et al. Rapid chromatographic immunoassay-based evaluation of COVID-19: A cross-sectional, diagnostic test accuracy study & its implications for COVID-19 management in India. Indian Journal of Medical Research. 2020;published online ahead of issue.
75. Herrera V, Hsu V, Adewale A, Hendrix T, Johnson L, Kuhlman J, et al. Testing of Healthcare Workers Exposed to COVID19 with Rapid Antigen Detection. medRxiv [Preprint]; published August 18,. 2020.
76. Igl?i Z, Velzing J, van Beek J, van de Vijver D, Aron G, Ensing R, et al. Clinical evaluation of the Roche/SD Biosensor rapid antigen test with symptomatic, non-hospitalized patients in a municipal health service drive-through testing site. medRxiv [Preprint]; published November 20,. 2020.
77. Krüger LJ, Gaeddert M, Tobian F, Lainati F, Gottschalk C, Klein JAF, et al. Evaluation of the accuracy and ease-of-use of Abbott PanBio - A WHO emergency use listed, rapid, antigen-detecting point-of-care diagnostic test for SARS-CoV-2. medRxiv [Preprint]; published December 07,. 2020b.
78. Krüttgen A, Cornelissen CG, Dreher M, Hornef MW, Imöhl M, Kleinesa M. Comparison of the SARS-CoV-2 Rapid antigen test to the real star Sars-CoV-2 RT PCR kit. Journal of Virological Methods. 2020;288:114024.
79. Lambert-Niclot S, Cuffel A, Le Pape S, Vauloup-Fellous C, Morand-Joubert L, Roque-Afonso AM, et al. Evaluation of a Rapid Diagnostic Assay for Detection of SARS-CoV-2 Antigen in Nasopharyngeal Swabs. Journal of Clinical Microbiology. 2020;58(8).
80. Linares M, Pérez-Tanoira R, Carrero A, Romanyk J, Pérez-García F, Gómez-Herruz P, et al. Panbio antigen rapid test is reliable to diagnose SARS-CoV-2 infection in the first 7 days after the onset of symptoms. Journal of Clinical Virology. 2020;133:104659.
81. Lindner A, Nikolai O, Rohardt C, Burock S, Hülso C, Bölke A, et al. Head-to-head comparison of SARS-CoV-2 antigen-detecting rapid test with professional-collected anterior nasal versus nasopharyngeal swab. medRxiv [Preprint]; published December 07,. 2020.
82. 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. European Respiratory Journal. 2020.
83. Liotti FM, Menchinelli G, Lalle E, Palucci I, Marchetti S, Colavita F, et al. Performance of a novel diagnostic assay for rapid SARS-CoV-2 antigen detection in nasopharynx samples. Clinical Microbiology and Infection. 2020;article in press.
84. Mak GC, Lau SS, Wong KK, Chow NL, Lau CS, Lam ET, et al. Analytical sensitivity and clinical sensitivity of the three rapid antigen detection kits for detection of SARS-CoV-2 virus. Journal of Clinical Virology. 2020;133:104684.
85. Mak GCK, Cheng PKC, Lau SSY, Wong KKY, Lau CS, Lam ETK, et al. Evaluation of rapid antigen test for detection of SARS-CoV-2 virus. Journal of Clinical Virology. 2020;129.
86. Merino-Amador P, Guinea J, Muñoz-Gallego I, González-Donapetry P, Galán J-C, Antona N, et al. Multicenter evaluation of the Panbio™ COVID-19 Rapid Antigen-Detection Test for the diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2 infection. medRxiv [Preprint]; published November 20,. 2020.
87. Mertens P, De Vos N, Martiny D, Jassoy C, Mirazimi A, Cuypers L, et al. Development and Potential Usefulness of the COVID-19 Ag Respi-Strip Diagnostic Assay in a Pandemic Context. Frontiers in Medicine. 2020;7.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.26.21252546; this version posted March 1, 2021. 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-ND 4.0 International license .

88. Nalumansi A, Lutalo T, Kayiwa J, Watera C, Balinandi S, Kiconco J, et al. Field Evaluation of the Performance of a SARS-CoV-2 Antigen Rapid Diagnostic Test in Uganda using Nasopharyngeal Samples. International Journal of Infectious Diseases. 2020;article in press.

89. Olearo F, Nörz D, Heinrich F, Sutter JP, Rödel K, Schultze A, et al. Handling and accuracy of four rapid antigen tests for the diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2 compared to RT-qPCR. medRxiv [Preprint]; published December 07,. 2020.

90. Parada-Ricart E, Gomez-Bertomeu F, Picó-Plana E, Olona-Cabases M. Usefulness of the antigen for diagnosing SARS-CoV-2 infection in patients with and without symptoms. Enferm Infecciosias y Microbioligia Clinica. 2020.

91. Pekosz A, Cooper C, Parvu V, Li M, Andrews J, Manabe YCC, et al. Antigen-based testing but not real-time PCR correlates with SARS-CoV-2 virus culture. medRxiv [Preprint]; published October 05,. 2020.

92. Perchetti GA, Huang ML, Mills MG, Jerome KR, Greninger AL. Analytical Sensitivity of the Abbott BinaxNOW COVID-19 Ag CARD. Journal of Clinical Microbiology. 2020;accepted manuscript posted online.

93. Pilarowski G, Lebel P, Sunshine S, Liu J, Crawford E, Marquez C, et al. Performance characteristics of a rapid SARS-CoV-2 antigen detection assay at a public plaza testing site in San Francisco. medRxiv [Preprint]; published November 12,. 2020.

94. Porte L, Legarraga P, Iruretagoyena M, Vollrath V, Pizarro G, Munita J, et al. Rapid SARS-CoV-2 antigen detection by immunofluorescence – a new tool to detect infectivity. medRxiv [Preprint]; published October 06,. 2020.

95. Porte L, Legarraga P, Vollrath V, Aguilera X, Munita JM, Araos R, et al. Evaluation of a novel antigen-based rapid detection test for the diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2 in respiratory samples. International Journal of Infectious Diseases. 2020;99:328-33.

96. Schildgen V, Demuth S, Lüsebrink J, Schildgen O. Limits and opportunities of SARS-CoV-2 antigen rapid tests – an experience based perspective. medRxiv [Preprint]; published October 30,. 2020.

97. Schwob J-M, Miauton A, Petrovic D, Perdrix J, Senn N, Jaton K, et al. Antigen rapid tests, nasopharyngeal PCR and saliva PCR to detect SARS-CoV-2: a prospective comparative clinical trial. medRxiv [Preprint]; published November 24,. 2020.

98. Scohy A, Anantharajah A, Bodeus M, Kabamba-Mukadi B, Verroken A, Rodriguez-Villalobos H. Low performance of rapid antigen detection test as frontline testing for COVID-19 diagnosis. Journal of Clinical Virology. 2020;129.

99. Shrestha B, Neupane A, Pant S, Shrestha A, Bastola A, Rajbhandari B, et al. Sensitivity and specificity of lateral flow antigen test kits for covid-19 in asymptomatic population of quarantine centre of province 3. Kathmandu University Medical Journal. 2020;18(2 70COVID-19 Special Issue):34-7.

100. Takeda Y, Mori M, Omi K. SARS-CoV-2 qRT-PCR Ct value distribution in Japan and possible utility of rapid antigen testing kit. medRxiv [Preprint]; published June 19,. 2020.

101. Toptan T, Eckermann L, Pfeiffer A, Hoehl S, Ciesek S, Drosten C, et al. Evaluation of a SARS-CoV-2 rapid antigen test: potential to help reduce community spread? Journal of Clinical Virology. 2020;published online ahead of issue.

102. Torres I, Poujois S, Albert E, Colomina J, Navarro D. Real-life evaluation of a rapid antigen test (Panbio COVID-19 Ag Rapid Test Device) for SARS-CoV-2 detection in asymptomatic close contacts of COVID-19 patients. medRxiv [Preprint]; published December 02,. 2020.

103. Van der Moeren N, Zwart V, Lodder E, Van den Bijllaardt W, Van Esch H, Stohr J, et al. Performance evaluation of a SARS-CoV-2 rapid antigentest: test performance in the community in the Netherlands. medRxiv [Preprint]; published October 21,. 2020.

104. Veyrenche N, Bollore K, Pisoni A, Bedin AS, Mondain AM, Ducos J, et al. Diagnosis value of SARS-CoV-2 antigen/antibody combined testing using rapid diagnostic tests at hospital admission. medRxiv [Preprint]; published September 28,. 2020.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.26.21252546; this version posted March 1, 2021. 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-ND 4.0 International license .

105. Weitzel T, Legarraga P, Iruretagoyena M, Pizarro G, Vollrath V, Araos R, et al. Comparative evaluation of four rapid SARS-CoV-2 antigen detection tests using universal transport medium. Travel Medicine and Infectious Disease. 2020;39:101942.

106. Yokota I, Sakurazawa T, Sugita J, Iwasaki S, Yasuda K, Yamashita N, et al. Performance of qualitative and quantitative antigen tests for SARS-CoV-2 in early symptomatic patients using saliva. medRxiv [Preprint]; published November 10,. 2020.

107. Young S, Taylor SN, Cammarata CL, Varnado KG, Roger-Dalbert C, Montano A, et al. Clinical evaluation of BD Veritor SARS-CoV-2 point-of-care test performance compared to PCR-based testing and versus the Sofia 2 SARS Antigen point-of-care test. Journal of Clinical Microbiology. 2020;59(1).

108. Corman VM, Landt O, Kaiser M, Molenkamp R, Meijer A, Chu DK, et al. Detection of 2019 novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV) by real-time RT-PCR. Euro Surveill. 2020;25(3).

109. Kissler SM, Fauver JR, Mack C, Olesen SW, Tai C, Shiue KY, et al. SARS-CoV-2 viral dynamics in acute infections. medRxiv [Preprint]; published December 02,. 2020.

110. Kociolek LK, Muller WJ, Yee R, Dien Bard J, Brown CA, Revell PA, et al. Comparison of Upper Respiratory Viral Load Distributions in Asymptomatic and Symptomatic Children Diagnosed with SARS-CoV-2 Infection in Pediatric Hospital Testing Programs. Journal of Clinical Microbiology. 2020;59(1).

111. Turner F, Vandenberg A, Slepnev VI, Car S, Starritt RE, Seger MV, et al. Post-Disease Divergence in SARS-CoV-2 RNA Detection between Nasopharyngeal, Anterior Nares and Saliva/Oral Fluid Specimens - Significant Implications for Policy & Public Health. medRxiv [Preprint]; published January 26, . 2021.

112. Bossuyt PM, Reitsma JB, Bruns DE, Gatsonis CA, Glasziou PP, Irwig L, et al. STARD 2015: an updated list of essential items for reporting diagnostic accuracy studies. British Medical Journal. 2015;351:h5527.

113. Paul-Ehrlich-Institute. Comparative evaluation of the sensitivities of SARSCoV-2 antigen rapid tests Langen: Federal Institute for Vaccines and Biomedicines; 2020.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.26.21252546; this version posted March 1, 2021. 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-ND 4.0 International license .

Table 1: Clinical accuracy data for Ag-RDTs against SARS-CoV-2

Author	Study location	Sample type	Sample condition	IFU conform	Sample size	Sensitivity	Specificity
AAZ, COVID-VIRO® (LFA)							
[97] Schwob, NP	Switzerland	NP	fresh	yes	324	84.1% (95% CI 76.9-89.7)	100% (95% CI 98.0*-100*)
Abbott, BinaxNOW™ (LFA)							
[93] Pilarowski, AN	USA	AN/MT	fresh	yes	878	57.7% (95% CI 36.9*-76.7*)	100%* (95% CI 99.6*-100*)
Abbott, Panbio™ (LFA)							
[60] Alemany, NP	Spain	NP	banked	no	919	93.4% (95% CI 91.5-95.0)	100% (95% CI 95.8-100)
[86] Merino-Amador, NP	Spain	NP	fresh	yes	958	90.5% (95% CI 87.5-93.6)	98.8% (95% CI 98.0-99.7)
[77] Krüger, NP	Germany	NP	fresh	yes	1034	87.5% (95% CI 79.8-92.5)	99.9% (95% CI 99.4-100)
[97] Schwob, NP	Switzerland	NP	fresh	yes	271	86.1% (95% CI 78.6-91.7)	100% (95% CI 97.6*-100*)
[62] Berger, NP	Switzerland	NP	fresh	yes	535	85.5% (95% CI 78.0-91.2)	100% (95% CI 99.1-100)
[57] Abdulrahman, AN	Bahrain	AN/MT	fresh	no	4183	82.1% (95% CI 79.2-84.8)	99.1% (95% CI 98.8-99.4)
[73] Gremmels, NP, Ar	Netherlands	NP	fresh	yes	208	81.0% (95% CI 69.0-89.9)	100% (95% CI 97.5-100)
[59] Albert, NP	Spain	NP	fresh	yes	412	79.6% (95% CI 67.0-88.8)	100% (95% CI 98.7-100)
[60] Alemany, MT	Spain	AN/MT	banked	no	487	79.5% (95% CI 71.0-86.4)	98.7% (95% CI 96.9-99.6)
[68] Fenollar, NP	France	NP	fresh	yes	341	75.5% (95% CI 69.5-81.5)	94.9% (95% CI 91.2-98.6)
[80] Linares, NP	Spain	NP	fresh	unclear	255	73.3% (95% CI 62.2-83.8)	100% (95% CI 98.1*-100*)
[73] Gremmels, NP, Ut	Netherlands	NP	fresh	yes	1367	72.6% (95% CI 64.5-79.9)	100% (95% CI 99.7-100)
[63] Bulilete, NP	Spain	NP	fresh	yes	1362*	71.4% (95% CI 63.2*-78.7)	99.8% (95% CI 99.4-99.9)
[67] Drevinek, NP	Czech Republic	NP	fresh	yes	591	66.4% (95% CI 59.9-72.2)	100% (95% CI 99.0-100)
[58] Agullo, NP	Spain	NP	fresh	yes	652*	57.3% (95% CI 48.3-65.8)	99.8% (95% CI 98.8-100)
[77] Krüger, OP	Germany	OP	fresh	no	74	50.0% (95% CI 1.3-98.7)	100% (95% CI 94.9-100)
[96] Schildgen, LRT	Germany	BAL/TW	unclear	no	73	50.0% (95% CI 34.2*-65.8*)	77.4% (95% CI 58.9*-90.4*)
[102] Torres, NP	Spain	NP	fresh	yes	634	48.1% (95% CI 37.4-58.9)	100% (95% CI 99.3-100)
[58] Agullo, AN	Spain	AN/MT	fresh	no	659	44.7% (95% CI 36.1-53.6)	100% (95% CI 99.1-100)
[89] Olearo, OP	Germany	OP	unclear	no	184	44.6% (95% CI 34.3-55.3)	100% (95% CI 96.3-100)
[58] Agullo, saliva	Spain	saliva	fresh	no	610	23.1% (95% CI 16.2-31.9)	100% (95% CI 99.0-100)
Becton, Dickinson and Company, BD Veritor™ (requires reader)							
[91] Pekosz, NP	USA	NP	fresh	no	251	96.4% (95% CI 82.3-99.4)	98.7% (95% CI 96.1-99.7)
[103] Van der Moeren, MT/OP, scn	Netherlands	MT/OP	banked	no	351*	94.1% (95% CI 71.1-100)	100% (95% CI 98.9-100)
[107] Young, NP	USA	NP	banked	no	251	76.3%* (95% CI 60.8*-87.0*)	99.5%* (95% CI 97.4*-99.9*)
Beijing Savant Biotechnology, SARS-CoV-2 detection kit (LFA)							
[105] Weitzel, NP/OP	Chile	NP/OP	banked	no	109	16.7% (95% CI 10.0-26.5*)	100% (95% CI 89.0-100)
Bionote, NowCheck® (LFA)							
[69] FIND, NP	Brazil	NP	fresh	yes	400	89.2% (95% CI 81.7-93.9)	97.3% (95% CI 94.8-98.6)
Coris BioConcept, COVID-19 Ag Respi-Strip (LFA)							
[87] Mertens, NP	Belgium	NP	banked	no	328	57.6% (95% CI 48.7*-66.1*)	99.5% (95% CI 97.2*-100*)
[79] Lambert-Niclot, NP	France	NP	fresh	no	138	50.0% (95% CI 39.5-60.5)	100% (95% CI 91.8-100)
[3] Krüger, NP/OP	Germany/England	NP/OP	unclear	no	417	50.0% (95% CI 21.5-78.5)	95.8% (95% CI 93.4-97.4)
[98] Scohy, NP	Belgium	NP	fresh	no	148	30.2% (95% CI 21.7-39.9)	100% (95% CI 91.6*-100*)
[104] Veyrenche, NP	France	NP	fresh	no	65	29.0% (95% CI 15.7-42.3)	100% (95% CI 83.2*-100*)
Fujirebio, ESPLINE® SARS-CoV-2 (LFA)							
[100] Takeda, NP	Japan	NP	unclear	no	162	80.7%* (95% CI 68.6*-89.6*)	100%* (95% CI 96.4*-100*)
[106] Yokota, NP	Japan	NP	banked	no	17	58.8%* (95% CI 32.9*-81.6*)	not provided
[106] Yokota, saliva	Japan	saliva	banked	no	17	23.5%* (95% CI 6.8*-49.9*)	not provided
Fujirebio, Lumipulse® G SARS-CoV-2 Ag (requires reader)							
[106] Yokota, NP	Japan	NP	banked	no	17	100% (95% CI 80.5*-100)	not provided
[106] Yokota, saliva	Japan	saliva	banked	no	17	82.4%* (95% CI 56.6*-96.2*)	not provided

Caption: * Values differ from those provided in the respective manuscript due to missing or contradictory data. Data sets from an underlined author have not undergone peer-review yet (time of data extraction, 28.12.2020).
In data sets with underlined sample sizes the samples were used in head-to-head studies, performing different Ag-RDTs on the same patient.
Naming convention column "author": number in brackets relates to the list of sources. Letters behind the author's last name differentiates the data set from other data sets by the same author.
IFU = instructions for use; NP = nasopharyngeal; OP = oropharyngeal; AN = anterior nasal; MT = mid turbine; LRT = lower respiratory tract; BAL/TW = bronchoalveolar lavage and throat wash; CI = confidence interval; Ar = Aruba; Ut = Utrecht.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.26.21252546; this version posted March 1, 2021. 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-ND 4.0 International license .

Table 1 (continued): Clinical accuracy data for Ag-RDTs against SARS-CoV-2

Author	Study location	Sample type	Sample condition	IFU conform	Sample size	Sensitivity	Specificity
Liming Bio, SARS-CoV-2 Ag-RDT (LFA)							
[105] Weitzel, NP/OP	Chile	NP/OP	banked	no	19	0.0% (95% CI 0.0-29.9)	90.0% (95% CI 59.6-98.2)
MEDsan®, SARS-CoV-2 Antigen Rapid Test (LFA)							
[89] Olearo, OP	Germany	OP	unclear	no	184	45.8% (35.5%-56.5%)	97.0% (91.5%-98.9%)
QUIDEL, Sofia SARS Antigen FIA (requires reader)							
[94] Porte, NP/OP	Chile	NP/OP	banked	no	64	93.8% (95% CI 79.9-98.3)	96.9% (95% CI 84.3-99.4)
[61] Beck, NP	USA	NP	fresh	yes	346	77.0% (95% CI 64.5*-86.9*)	99.6% (95% CI 98.1*-100*)
[75] Herrera, unknown	USA	unclear	unclear	unclear	1172	76.8% (95% CI 72.6-80.5)	99.2% (95% CI 98.2-99.7)
RapiGEN, Biocredit Covid-19 Antigen Detection Kit (LFA)							
[99] Shrestha, NP	Nepal	NP	fresh	yes	113	85.0% (95% CI 71.7*-93.8*)	100% (95% CI 94.6*-100*)
[70] FIND, NP	Brazil	NP	fresh	yes	476	74.4% (95% CI 65.8-81.4)	99.0% (95% CI 97.2-99.6)
[104]Weitzel, NP/OP	Chile	NP/OP	banked	no	109	62.0% (95% CI 51.0-71.9)	100% (95% CI 88.7-100)
[96] Schildgen, LRT	Germany	BAL/TW	unclear	no	73	33.3% (95% CI 19.6*-49.6*)	87.1% (95% CI 70.2*-94.6*)
R-Biopharm, RIDA®QUICK SARS-CoV-2 Antigen (LFA)							
[101] Toptan, NP/OP	Germany	NP/OP	banked	no	67	77.6% (95% CI 64.7*-87.5*)	100% (95% CI 66.4*-100*)
[101] Toptan, unknown	Germany	unclear	banked	no	70	50.0% (95% CI 31.9*-68.1*)	100% (95% CI 90.8*-100*)
SD Biosensor, Standard F (requires reader)							
[94] Porte, NP/OP	Chile	NP/OP	banked	no	64	90.6% (95% CI 75.8-96.8)	96.9% (95% CI 84.3-99.4)
[71] FIND, NP	Brazil	NP	fresh	yes	453	77.5% (95% CI 69.2-84.1)	97.9% (95% CI 95.7-99.0)
[67] Drevinek, NP	Czech Republic	NP	fresh	yes	591	62.3% (95% CI 55.8-68.4)	99.5% (95% CI 98.0-99.9)
[83] Liotti, NP	Italy	NP	banked	no	359	47.1% (95% CI 37.1-57.1)	98.4% (95% CI 96.0-99.6)
SD Biosensor / Roche, Standard Q (LFA)							
[65] Chaimayo, NP/OP	Thailand	NP/OP	banked	no	454	98.3% (95% CI 91.1-100)	98.7% (95% CI 97.1-99.6)
[97] Schwob, NP	Switzerland	NP	fresh	yes	333	92.9% (95% CI 86.4-96.9)	100% (95% CI 98.3*-100*)
[62] Berger, NP	Switzerland	NP	fresh	yes	529	89.0% (95% CI 83.7-93.1)	99.7% (95% CI 98.4-100)
[72] FIND, NP	Brazil	NP	fresh	yes	400	88.7% (95% CI 81.3-93.4)	97.6% (95% CI 95.2-98.8)
[96] Schildgen, LRT	Germany	BAL/TW	unclear	no	73	88.1% (95% CI 74.4*-96.0*)	19.4% (95% CI 7.5*-37.5*)
[76] Iglói, NP	Netherlands	NP	fresh	yes	970	84.9% (95% CI 79.1-89.4)	99.5% (95% CI 98.7-99.8)
[74] Gupta, NP	India	NP	fresh	yes	330	81.8% (95% CI 71.3-89.6)	99.6% (95% CI 97.8-99.9)
[82] Lindner, NP, sc	Germany	NP	fresh	yes	289	79.5% (95% CI 64.5-89.2)	99.6% (95% CI 97.8-100)
[3] Krüger, NP/OP	Germany/England	NP/OP	unclear	no	1263	76.6% (95% CI 62.8-86.4)	99.3% (95% CI 98.6-99.6)
[82] Lindner, AN	Germany	AN/MT	fresh	no	289	74.4% (95% CI 58.9-85.4)	99.2% (95% CI 97.1-99.8)
[81] Lindner, NP, pc	Germany	NP	fresh	yes	180	73.0% (95% CI 58.1-84.3)	99.3% (95% CI 96.0-100)
[64] Cerutti, NP, ER	Italy	NP	unclear	no	185	72.1% (95% CI 62.5*-80.5*)	100% (95% CI 95.6*-100*)
[78] Krüttgen, NP	Germany	NP	banked	no	150	70.7% (95% CI 59.0*-80.6*)	96.0% (95% CI 88.9*-99.2*)
[88] Nalumansi, NP	Uganda	NP	fresh	yes	262	70.0% (95% CI 60.0-79.0)	92.0% (95% CI 87.0-96.0)
[89] Olearo, OP	Germany	OP	unclear	no	184	49.4% (95% CI 38.9-59.9)	100% (95% CI 96.3-100)
[64] Cerutti, NP, tr	Italy	NP	fresh	no	145	40.0% (95% CI 5.3*-85.3*)	100% (95% CI 97.4*-100*)
Shenzen Bioeasy Biotechnology, 2019-nCov Antigen Rapid Test Kit (requires reader)							
[95] Porte, NP/OP	Chile	NP/OP	banked	no	127	93.9% (95% CI 86.5-97.4)	100% (95% CI 92.1*-100*)
[104] Weitzel, NP/OP	Chile	NP/OP	banked	no	111	85.0% (95% CI 75.6-91.2)	100% (95% CI 89.0-100)
[90] Parada-Ricart, NP	Spain	NP	fresh	yes	172	73.1%* (95% CI 52.2*-88.4*)	85.6%* (95% CI 78.9*-90.9*)
[3] Krüger, NP/OP	Germany	NP/OP	fresh	no	727	66.7% (95% CI 41.7-84.8)	93.1% (95% CI 91-94.8)
Siemens Healthineers, CLINITEST® Rapid COVID-19 Antigen Test (LFA)							
[89] Olearo, OP	Germany	OP	unclear	no	170	54.9% (95% CI 43.4-65.9)	100% (95% CI 96.3-100)

Caption: * Values differ from those provided in the respective manuscript due to missing or contradictory data. A list including the original data can be found in the Supplement (S4).
Data sets from an underlined author have not undergone peer-review yet (time of data extraction, 28.12.2020).
In data sets with underlined sample sizes the samples were used in head-to-head studies, performing different Ag-RDTs on the same patient.
Naming convention column "author": number in brackets relates to the list of sources. Letters behind the author's last name differentiates the data set from other data sets by the same author.
IFU = instructions for use; NP = nasopharyngeal; OP = oropharyngeal; AN = anterior nasal; MT = mid turbine; LRT = lower respiratory tract; BAL/TW = bronchoalveolar lavage and throat wash; CI = confidence interval; sc = self-collected; pc = professional-collected; ER = emergency room; tr = travelers.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.26.21252546; this version posted March 1, 2021. 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-ND 4.0 International license .

Table 2: Summary clinical accuracy data for major Ag-RDTs not included in the meta-analysis

Manufacturer, Ag-RDT	Number of data sets	Sensitivity range	Specifcity range	Comments
Becton, Dickinson and Company, BD Veritor™ (requires reader)	3	76.3% to 96.4%	98.7% to 100%	- For the data set reporting 96.4% sensitivity, samples originated from symptomatic patients only and cell culture was used as reference standard
Fujirebio, ESPLINE® SARS-CoV-2 (lateral flow assay)	3	23.5% to 80.7%	100%*	- The data set reporting 23.5% sensitivity used saliva samples (not IFU-conform)
Fujirebio, Lumipulse® G SARS-CoV-2 Ag (requires reader)	2	82.4% to 100%	not provided	- Both data sets originate from the same study - One data set used saliva (sensitivity 82.4%), the other NP samples (sensitivity 100%). For this Ag-RDT, both sample types are IFU conform.
QUIDEL, Sofia SARS Antigen FIA (requires reader)	3	76.8% to 93.8%	100%	- For the data set reporting 76.8% sensitivity, it is not clear whether it was conducted IFU-conform
R-Biopharm, RIDA®QUICK SARS-CoV-2 Antigen (lateral flow assay)	2	50.0% to 77.6%	100%	- Both data sets originate from the same study and were conducted not IFU-conform - For the data set reporting 50.0% sensitivity, the used sample type is not clear. The other used NP/OP samples
Shenzen Bioeasy Biotechnology, 2019-nCov Antigen Rapid Test Kit (requires reader)	4	66.7% to 93.9%	85.6% to 100%	- The data set reporting 85.6% specificity was conducted IFU conform - The data sets reporting highest sensitivity were drawn from just symptomatic patients, for the others symptomatic patients made up more than two thirds of the study population

Caption: * only one data set for specificity was provided
IFU = instructions for use; Ag-RDT = antigen rapid diagnostic test; NP = nasopharyngeal; OP = oropharyngeal; AN = anterior nasal.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.26.21252546; this version posted March 1, 2021. 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-ND 4.0 International license .

Figures

Figure 1 PRISMA flow diagram

Figure 2 Methodological quality of the clinical accuracy studies

Figure 3 Summary forest plot for five meta-analyzed Ag-RDT

Figure 4 Summary forest plot for subgroup analysis.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.26.21252546; this version posted March 1, 2021. 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-ND 4.0 International license .

Figure 1 - PRISMA flow diagram



Caption: * some data sets split up data by multiple Ct-values, therefore the subgroup analysis by Ct-values includes more individual records than the overall amount of meta-analyzed data sets.
Abbreviations: Ag-RDT = antigen rapid diagnostic tests; IFU = instructions for use.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.26.21252546; this version posted March 1, 2021. 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-ND 4.0 International license .

Figure 2 - Methodological quality of the clinical accuracy studies



medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.26.21252546; this version posted March 1, 2021. 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-ND 4.0 International license .

Figure 3 - Summary forest plot for five meta-analyzed Ag-RDT



Caption: N=sample size; TP = true positive; FP = false positive; FN = false negative; TN = true negative; CI = confidence interval

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.26.21252546; this version posted March 1, 2021. 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-ND 4.0 International license .

Figure 4 - Summary forest plot for subgroup analysis



Caption: Panel A: Nasopharyngeal incudes mixed naso-/oropharyngeal; Nasal includes anterior nasal and mid-turbinate; Panel B: IFU = instructions for use; Panel C: <7d = below seven days of onset of symptoms; ≥7d = equal and greater than seven days of symptoms; N= sample size; CI = confidence interval
The samples size (N) and cell counts (True positive, etc.) were included in forest plots where data was available. However, these numbers were not reported consistently for many sub-groups.