

1 **The dark side of SARS-CoV-2 rapid antigen testing: screening asymptomatic**
2 **patients.**

3 Giorgia Caruana, MD¹, Laure-Line Lebrun, MD², Oriane Aebischer, MD², Onya
4 Opota, PhD¹, Luis Urbano, MD², Mikael de Rham, MD³, Oscar Marchetti, MD^{2,§} and
5 Gilbert Greub, PhD, MD^{1,4,§}

6 ¹ Institute of Microbiology, Lausanne University Hospital and University of Lausanne,
7 Switzerland;

8 ² Patients Safety Program, Ensemble Hospitalier de la Côte (EHC), Morges,
9 Switzerland;

10 ³ CoVID-19 Task Force Direction, Ensemble Hospitalier de la Côte (EHC), Morges,
11 Switzerland;

12 ⁴ Department of Medicine, Infectious Diseases Division, Lausanne University
13 Hospital, Lausanne, Switzerland;

14 [§] G.G. and O.M. contributed equally

15 Corresponding author:

16 Prof. Gilbert Greub

17 Institute of Microbiology, Lausanne University Hospital and University of Lausanne,
18 Switzerland; Correspondence: gilbert.greub@chuv.ch; Tel.: +41 (0)21 314 49 79

19 Alternate corresponding author:

20 Dr. Giorgia Caruana

21 Institute of Microbiology, Lausanne University Hospital and University of Lausanne,
22 Switzerland; Correspondence: giorgia.caruana@chuv.ch; Tel.: +41 (0)79 556 97 85

23

24 Running title: Antigen tests for COVID-19 asymptomatics

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

25 **Words count: 1050**

26 **Key words: SARS-CoV-2, COVID-19 Diagnostic Testing, Rapid Antigen Test,**

27 **Health Plan Implementation, Emergency Ward.**

28 **Abstract**

29 Most of the reports describing SARS-CoV-2 rapid antigen tests (RATs) performances
30 derive from COVID-19 symptomatic subjects in outpatient settings during periods of
31 highest incidence of infections and high rates of hospital admissions. Here we
32 investigated the role of RATs in an Emergency Department, as a screening tool before
33 admission for COVID-19 asymptomatic patients. Each patient was screened with two
34 simultaneous nasopharyngeal swabs: one immediately analyzed at the bedside using
35 RAT and the other sent to the laboratory for RT-PCR analysis. A total of 116 patients
36 were screened at hospital admission in a 250-bed community hospital in Morges
37 (EHC), Switzerland. With a disease prevalence of 6% based on RT-PCR results, RAT
38 detected only two out of seven RT-PCR positive patients (sensitivity 28.6%) and
39 delivered two false positive results (specificity 98.2%), thus resulting not fiable enough
40 to be used as a screening method in this clinical scenario.

41

42

43

44 **1. Introduction**

45 The world has been dealing with SARS-CoV-2 pandemic since the first cases of
46 pneumonia of unknown origin described in December 2019 in Wuhan, China ¹. One
47 year later, huge steps have been made in clinical knowledge on this new infectious
48 disease and different types of diagnostic tests have been developed ². Reverse
49 transcriptase polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR), which detects the viral RNA, is
50 now largely considered as the diagnostic gold standard. However, questions remain
51 regarding the optimal clinical use and the indications of antigen tests.

52 In Switzerland, the first epidemic wave (March-April 2020) forced laboratories to
53 use the maximum of their test capacities. Because of the high flow of patients
54 consulting hospitals' Emergency Departments, faster diagnostic results were needed
55 for triage, aimed at minimizing nosocomial transmissions. Rapid molecular systems
56 detecting viral RNA, such as GeneXpert SARS-CoV-2 PCR test (Cepheid, USA),
57 combined with classic RT-PCR systems, adequately responded to this clinical need,
58 nevertheless with difficulties in reagents supplies.

59 In October 2020 Switzerland faced a massive second wave, with up to 1800
60 infections in 14 days/100.000 inhabitants ³, representing one of the world's highest rate
61 at that period. To meet the urgent need for rapid diagnosis immediately followed by
62 quarantine and contact tracing, a key tool for optimal management of epidemics, the
63 Swiss Federal Office of Public Health (FOPH) authorized the use of rapid antigen tests
64 (RATs) in addition to gold-standard RT-PCR ⁴.

65 Several reports describe RAT performances, most of them derived from COVID-
66 19 symptomatic subjects in outpatient settings during periods of highest incidence of
67 infections and high rates of hospital admissions ^{5,6}. To date, more data are needed to
68 clarify the role of RAT as a screening tool among patients admitted to hospital

69 Emergency Departments, with or without symptoms of COVID-19, during different
70 phases of the epidemic curve. An extensive evaluation was performed in an Emergency
71 Department of an Italian hospital with Standard Q[®] COVID-19 Rapid Antigen Test
72 (SD Biosensor, Roche) screening on nasopharyngeal samples from symptomatic and
73 asymptomatic patients ⁷. Among patients without COVID-19 symptoms, a sensitivity
74 of 50% and a specificity of 99.6% was reported, with a SARS-CoV-2 prevalence of
75 6.5%. Another study performed in Germany investigated the use of RAT as a screening
76 tool among symptomatic patients with COVID-19 admitted to the Emergency
77 Department ⁸. In this study, performed with Standard Q[®] COVID-19 Rapid Antigen
78 Test (SD Biosensor/Roche) on nasopharyngeal samples, sensitivity was 75.3% and
79 specificity 100%, with a COVID-19 prevalence of 32.8%. After the implementation of
80 RAT at the Emergency Department of the Lausanne University Hospital (CHUV) for
81 quick triaging of patients with or without COVID-19 symptoms ⁹, we applied a
82 combined RAT and RT-PCR nasopharyngeal screening to asymptomatic patients
83 admitted in the Emergency Department of a 250-bed community hospital (EHC) in
84 Morges, Switzerland.

85 **2. Methods**

86 Two simultaneous nasopharyngeal swabs were collected to screen asymptomatic
87 adults hospitalized in medical and surgical wards according to a standard procedure of
88 the Emergency Department of EHC. The first swab was analyzed at the bedside using
89 Standard Q[®] COVID-19 Rapid Antigen Test (SD Biosensor-Republic of Korea/Roche-
90 Switzerland). Patients with a positive RAT were isolated in single rooms waiting for
91 the molecular confirmation, performed on one of the following platforms at the
92 Institute of Microbiology of the Lausanne University Hospital (CHUV): i) Test Cobas
93 6800[®] SARS-CoV-2 (Roche, Basel, Switzerland) or ii) automated high-throughput

94 molecular diagnostic platform, using Magnapure RNA-extraction coupled to applied
95 Biosystems 7900 amplification device (Quant Studio 7) and three Hamilton robots
96 (with primers targeting the E- and RdRp- encoding)¹⁰. RAT and RT-PCR results were
97 compared in the frame of the EHC Patients Safety Program. This analysis in the frame
98 of the CHUV Microbiology Laboratory Quality Control Program was approved by the
99 institutional Ethical Review Board.

100 *Ethical declaration*

101 This article was prepared according to STANDARD guidelines for diagnostic
102 accuracy studies reporting. The data on the fiability of the different antigen assays were
103 obtained during a quality enhancement project at our institution (CHUV, Lausanne).
104 According to national law (Swiss Federal Act on Human Research), the performance
105 and publishing the results of such a project can be done without asking the permission
106 of the competent research ethics committee

107 *Role of the funding source*

108 The authors did not receive any financial support for this work. All authors had
109 full access to all the data in the study and they accept responsibility to submit for
110 publication.

111

112

113 **3. Results**

114 From 04/12/2020 to 04/01/2021, we consecutively screened 116 asymptomatic
115 patients. 63 (54.3%) females and 53 (45.7%) males were tested, with a median age of
116 46.7 years [IQR 35.3-69.6] (population characteristics are described in Table 1).

117 As compared to RT-PCR, RAT detected two out of seven SARS-CoV-2 positive
118 patients and delivered two false-positive results, exhibiting a sensitivity of 28.6% and

119 a specificity of 98.2%. The prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 carriage of 6% according to
120 RT-PCR results was significantly underestimated by RAT to 1.7%.

121 **4. Discussion**

122 RATs are an attractive option for COVID-19 diagnostics due to low costs, rapidity
123 and point-of-care solutions. However, they show a gap in analytical sensitivity as
124 compared to the gold-standard RT-PCR, the detection of the viral load being reduced
125 by a factor 1.000 to 10.000.

126 In Switzerland, RATs are authorized for immediate COVID-19 diagnosis in
127 outpatients with symptoms lasting less than 4 days and early cohorting in-patients due
128 to high numbers of hospitalizations, when pre-test probability is above 20% ⁴. This
129 second condition was recommended because in settings with disease prevalence above
130 20%, the diagnostic performance gap might be partially compensated by the diagnostic
131 speed, allowing prompt isolation of highly contagious patients, thus reducing the risk
132 of nosocomial transmission.

133 Turcato and colleagues interestingly investigated the global clinical benefit
134 derived from RAT screening against symptom-based screening in the Emergency
135 Department with a decision curve analysis (DCA), reporting a considerable net benefit
136 even in settings with SARS-CoV-2 prevalence lower than 15% ⁷. DCA is a useful, fast
137 and easy alternative to a full decision analysis for giving a global overlook of benefits.
138 Nevertheless, being only based on the reasonable range of threshold probabilities,
139 DCA might have simplified some assumptions (e.g.: symptoms evaluation performed
140 with the support of imaging/inflammatory parameters/clinical scores versus simple
141 symptoms evaluation for initial triaging purposes) and more complex decision analyses
142 might be needed before ultimately applying changes to screening strategy
143 recommendations.

144 On the other hand, the data gathered so far showed a clinically relevant difference
145 between RAT diagnostic performances in symptomatic and asymptomatic patients,
146 with significantly lower sensitivity in the absence of symptoms. Hence, adopting a
147 RAT-based screening strategy in patients without symptoms of COVID-19 might miss
148 a significant number of asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 carriers. This increases the risk of
149 nosocomial transmission from patients with false-negative RAT results. Moreover,
150 false-positive RAT results likely raise the hazard of hospital-acquired COVID-19, if
151 the patient is cohorted with SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR-positive patients.

152 These RATs limitations represent key issues for patients' safety in the hospital
153 arguing against the use of RAT screening among asymptomatic patients admitted via
154 the Emergency Department.

155 **Data availability**

156 Study data are not publically available but they will be shared upon request for the peer-
157 review process.

158 **Funding** 159

160 This research received no external funding.

161

162 **Conflicts of Interest**

163 Dr. Caruana, Dr. Lebrun, Dr. Aebischer, Dr. Opota, Dr. Urbano, and Prof. Marchetti
164 have nothing to disclose. Prof. Greub reports grants from Resistell, from Nittobo,
165 outside the submitted work and he is the co-director of "JeuPro", a start-up distributing
166 the game Krobs, a card game about microbes' transmission.

167

168 **Patient Consent Statement**

169 This article was prepared according to STANDARD guidelines for diagnostic ac-
170 curacy studies reporting. The data on the viability of the different antigen assays were
171 obtained during a quality enhancement project at our institution (CHUV, Lausanne,
172 Switzerland). According to national law (Swiss Federal Act on Human Research), the
173 performance and publishing of the results of such a project can be done without asking
174 the permission of the competent research ethics committee and patients data were
175 gathered as part of routine care.

176

177 **Tables**

178 Table 1. Characteristics of hospitalized patients without CoVID-19 symptoms
 179 admitted to the EHC Emergency Department between 4/12/2020 and 04/01/2021.

	Patients without CoVID-19 symptoms (n=116)	
	SARS-CoV-2 positive RAT (n=4)	SARS-CoV-2 negative RAT (n=112)
Gender		
Female	2 (50%)	61 (54.5%)
Male	2 (50%)	51 (45.5%)
Age		
Median [IQR], years	41.9 [30.7-61.2]	46.7 [35.3-69.6]
SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR result		
Negative	2 (50%) ^a	107 (95.5%)
Positive	2 (50%)	5 (4.5%)
Viral load		
Median [IQR], cp/ml	1.8e+08 [1.8e+08 - 1.8e+08] ^b	1.9e+04 [6.2e+03 - 8e+05]

180
 181 RAT: rapid diagnostic testing. RT-PCR: reverse transcriptase polymerase chain
 182 reaction. IQR: interquartile range. Cp/ml: viral copies per milliliter. ^a Among 4 positive
 183 RAT results, 2 were false positive results, not confirmed by RT-PCR. In this setting,
 184 RAT detected less than one third (2/7, 28.6%) of asymptomatic hospitalized patients,
 185 who resulted positive by RT-PCR. ^b One out of 7 RT-PCR positive patients (also tested
 186 positive with RAT) had a viral load at the limit of detection, that was not-quantifiable.

187

188

189 **References**

190

- 191 1. WHO. Rolling updates on coronavirus disease (COVID-19). *WHO characterizes*
192 *COVID-19 as a pandemic* 2020; Available at:
193 [https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019/events-as-they-](https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019/events-as-they-happen)
194 [happen](https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019/events-as-they-happen). Accessed January 25, 2021.
- 195 2. FIND. SARS-COV-2 DIAGNOSTIC PIPELINE. 2021; [https://www.finddx.org/covid-](https://www.finddx.org/covid-19/pipeline/?avance=all&type=Rapid+diagnostic+tests&test_target=Antigen&status=all§ion=show-all&action=default)
196 [19/pipeline/?avance=all&type=Rapid+diagnostic+tests&test_target=Antigen&status=](https://www.finddx.org/covid-19/pipeline/?avance=all&type=Rapid+diagnostic+tests&test_target=Antigen&status=all§ion=show-all&action=default)
197 [all§ion=show-all&action=default](https://www.finddx.org/covid-19/pipeline/?avance=all&type=Rapid+diagnostic+tests&test_target=Antigen&status=all§ion=show-all&action=default). Accessed January 25, 2021.
- 198 3. ECDC. COVID-19 situation update worldwide, as of week 2 2021. *Evolution of trends*
199 *in 14-day COVID-10 cases and death notification rates by country and continent or*
200 *region* <https://covid19-country-overviews.ecdc.europa.eu/>. Accessed January 25, 2021.
- 201 4. FOPH. Coronavirus : Tests. *Testing strategy and coverage of the costs of tests*
202 [https://www.bag.admin.ch/bag/en/home/krankheiten/ausbrueche-epidemien-](https://www.bag.admin.ch/bag/en/home/krankheiten/ausbrueche-epidemien-pandemien/aktuelle-ausbrueche-epidemien/novel-cov/testen.html)
203 [pandemien/aktuelle-ausbrueche-epidemien/novel-cov/testen.html](https://www.bag.admin.ch/bag/en/home/krankheiten/ausbrueche-epidemien-pandemien/aktuelle-ausbrueche-epidemien/novel-cov/testen.html). Accessed January
204 25, 2021.
- 205 5. Schwob J-M, Miauton A, Petrovic D, et al. Title: Antigen rapid tests, nasopharyngeal
206 PCR and saliva PCR to detect SARS-CoV-2: a prospective comparative clinical trial.
207 *medXriv*. 2020.
- 208 6. Fenollar F, Bouam A, Ballouche M, et al. Evaluation of the Panbio Covid-19 rapid
209 antigen detection test device for the screening of patients with Covid-19. *J Clin*
210 *Microbiol*. Nov 2 2020.
- 211 7. Turcato G, Zaboli A, Pfeifer N, et al. Clinical application of a rapid antigen test for the
212 detection of SARS-CoV-2 infection in symptomatic and asymptomatic patients
213 evaluated in the emergency department: A preliminary report. *J Infect*. Dec 19 2020.

- 214 8. Möckel M, Corman VM, Stegemann MS, et al. SARS-CoV-2 Antigen Rapid
215 Immunoassay for Diagnosis of COVID-19 in the Emergency Department. *Biomarkers :*
216 *biochemical indicators of exposure, response, and susceptibility to chemicals.* Jan 16
217 2021:1-13.
- 218 9. Caruana G, Croxatto A, Kampouri E, et al. ImplemeNting SARS-CoV-2 Rapid antigen
219 testing in the Emergency wArd of a Swiss univErsity hospital: the INCREASE study.
220 *medRxiv.* 2021:2021.2002.2010.21250915.
- 221 10. Opota O, Brouillet R, Greub G, Jaton K. Comparison of SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR on a
222 high-throughput molecular diagnostic platform and the cobas SARS-CoV-2 test for the
223 diagnostic of COVID-19 on various clinical samples. *Pathog Dis.* Nov 11 2020;78(8).
224
225