

1

2 **Title**

3 Excellent negative predictive value (99.8%) of two rapid molecular COVID-19 tests compared to
4 conventional RT-PCR for SARS-CoV-2 (COVID-19) in 2,011 tests performed in a single centre.

5

6 **Authors**

7 KW Leong*, TL Law**, AS Saiful***, Kang****, Woo*****, Chow*****, ZL Yong*****

8 *MBBS, FRCP, DipRCPath, Consultant Haematologist and Laboratory Head #.

9 **B.Sc(Hons) Biochem and Microbio, Laboratory Manager #.

10 *** BAppSc Applied Bio, Executive MLT #.

11 **** B.Sc (Hons) Biotech, Executive MLT #.

12 ***** MBBS, MPath (Med Microbio), Consultant Microbiologist #.

13 ***** MD, MRCP, Fellow Infectious Diseases, Consultant in Infectious Diseases #.

14 ***** BBiomedSC, MPhil Mgt, Chief Operating Officer #.

15 # Gleneagles Hospital Penang, Georgetown, Penang, Malaysia.

16

17

18 **Abstract**

19 Conventional Reverse Transcription Polymerase Chain Reaction (RT-PCR) remains the gold standard for
20 testing SARS-CoV-2. Since their availability, two rapid molecular COVID-19 tests were performed in parallel
21 with RT-PCR in all urgent and emergency admissions, as the negative predictive value was not yet
22 ascertained. In this study, we present the data of 2,011 test results using either ID Now COVID-19 (Abbott)
23 (Abbott ID NOW) or Xpert Xpress SARS-CoV-2 (Cepheid) (GeneXpert) tests comparing to conventional RT-
24 PCR results. The negative predictive value is 99.8%(3 false negatives out of 1,964 tests) using a cut-off CT
25 value of 40. Using a cut-off of RT-PCR CT value of 30 (predicting infectivity), the negative predictive value is
26 reduced to 99.9% (1 out of 1,964 tests). With these results, we feel confident to recommend the immediate
27 use of the rapid PCR tests alone and to use conventional RT-PCR for confirmation testing after.

28

29 **Running Title**

30 Excellent NPV of rapid molecular Covid-19 testing

31

32 **Keywords**

33 COVID-19, SARS-CoV-2, rapid molecular test, RT-PCR, Abbott ID NOW, GeneXpert

34

35

36 **Introduction**

37 Conventional RT-PCR for SARS-CoV-2 remains the gold standard to diagnose COVID-19 using three genes.¹

38 In our centre, the test is not done in-house leading to delay of results of up to three days. For urgent and

39 emergency admissions, this is not ideal as patients remain in isolation until a negative result is obtained,

40 after which patients would be allowed into general wards. Previous studies of rapid COVID-19 tests

41 reported negative predictive values using rather small sample sizes of less than 500^{1,2,3,4,5}. With the

42 relatively small sample sizes, our doctors did not feel confident to proceed with high risk procedures, such

43 as surgeries and endoscopies, where exposure to oral and nasal secretions are high. Thus, rapid COVID-19

44 tests were conducted in parallel with RT-PCR.

45

46

47 **Methodology**

48 Nasopharyngeal samples were taken at the same time as three swabs for tests. Oropharyngeal swabs were
49 taken from patients with nasal bleed, very young children and patients with platelet counts below 20 (rare).

50 Two swabs were sent to an off-site laboratory for RT-PCR testing. TaqPath RT-PCR Assays from
51 ThermoFisher were performed according to the manufacturers guidelines⁶. This detects three gene targets:
52 ORF1ab, S gene and N gene. A CT cut-off value of 40 was used according to our national consensus for
53 positivity.

54 The third swab was used for rapid COVID-19 testing. The samples were processed within one hour. All
55 samples were kept fresh and not frozen. Initially, only the Abbott ID NOW kit was used. Later as GeneXpert
56 kits were made available, both tests were used interchangeably. The Abbott ID NOW assays were
57 performed according to the manufacturer's guidelines. This test targets a portion of the RdRp gene within
58 the SARS-CoV-2 genome⁷ and uses isothermal nucleic acid amplification of this target gene. The GeneXpert
59 assays were also performed according to the manufacturer's guidelines. This is a polymerase chain reaction
60 test that targets the SARS-CoV-2 E and N2 genes^{8,9}.

61

62

63 **Results**

64 A total of 2,011 tests were performed from 7th Jan - 5th May 2021. A total of 1,506 tests were performed
65 using Abbott ID now (7th Jan - 5th May 2021) and 505 tests using GeneXpert (from 29th Mar - 5th May 2021).

66 Using a CT value cut-off of 40 (conventional RT-PCR), positive and negative predictive values were
67 calculated (following Malaysian consensus for reporting positive results).

68 There were 3 false negative results giving a negative predictive value of 99.8% (3/1,967). [Abbott ID NOW
69 99.8% (3/1,477); GeneXpert 100% (0/490).]

70 With a CT value cut-off of 30 (indicating infectivity), only one test using the Abbott ID NOW was considered
71 a false negative (Fig. 2).

72 The positive predictive value is less robust at 72.7% with 12 false positives out of 44 positive tests. [Abbott
73 ID NOW 65.5% (10/29 tests); GeneXpert 86.7% (2/15)]

74 The two false positives using GeneXpert were borderline results (Fig. 2) and can be considered as true
75 positives with high CT values.

76

77

78 **Figure 1a: Comparison Data for Rapid Molecular Test (Abbott ID NOW) vs RT-PCR**

07/01/2021 - 05/05/2021 Total: 1506 Samples				
		Confirmed COVID-19 by RT-PCR		
		<i>Positive</i>	<i>Negative</i>	
Abbott ID NOW COVID-19 Rapid PCR	<i>Positive</i>	True Positive (TP) 19	False Positive (FP) 10	Positive Predictive Value = 65.5% = TP / (TP+FP) = 19 / (19+10)
	<i>Negative</i>	False Negative (FN) 3	True Negative (TN) 1474	Negative Predictive Value = 99.8% = TN / (FN+TN) = 1474 / (3+1474)
		Sensitivity / True Positive Rate = 86.4% = TP / (TP+FN) = 19 / (19+3)	Specificity / True Negative Rate = 99.3% = TN / (FP+TN) = 1474 / (1474+10)	
		False Negative Rate = 13.6% = FN / (TP+FN) = 3 / (19+3)	False Positive Rate = 0.67% = FP / (FP+TN) = 10 / (10+1474)	

79

80

81

82 **Figure 1b: Comparison Data for Rapid Molecular Test (GeneXpert) vs RT-PCR**

83

29/03/2021 - 05/05/2021 Total: 505 Samples				
		Confirmed COVID-19 by RT-PCR		
		Positive	Negative	
GeneXpert Xpress COVID-19 Rapid PCR	Positive	True Positive (TP) 13	False Positive (FP) 2	Positive Predictive Value = 86.7% = TP / (TP+FP) = 13 / (13+2)
	Negative	False Negative (FN) 0	True Negative (TN) 490	Negative Predictive Value = 100% = TN / (FN+TN) = 490 / (0+490)
		Sensitivity / True Positive Rate = 100% = TP / (TP+FN) = 13 / (13+0)	Specificity / True Negative Rate = 99.6% = TN / (FP+TN) = 490 / (2+490)	
		False Negative Rate = 0% = FN / (TP+FN) = 0 / (13+0)	False Positive Rate = 0.41% = FP / (FP+TN) = 2 / (2+490)	

84

85

86 **Figure 1c: Comparison Data for COVID-19 Antigen Test vs RT-PCR**

87

03/06/2020 - 21/01/2021		Total: 619 Samples		
		Confirmed COVID-19 by RT-PCR		
		<i>Positive</i>	<i>Negative</i>	
COVID-19 Antigen	<i>Positive</i>	True Positive (TP) 1	False Positive (FP) 0	Positive Predictive Value = 100% = TP / (TP+FP) = 1 / (1+0)
	<i>Negative</i>	False Negative (FN) 5	True Negative (TN) 613	Negative Predictive Value = 99.2% = TN / (FN+TN) = 613 / (5+613)
		Sensitivity / True Positive Rate = 16.7% = TP / (TP+FN) = 1 / (1+5)	Specificity / True Negative Rate = 100% = TN / (FP+TN) = 613 / (0+613)	
		False Negative Rate = 83.3% = FN / (TP+FN) = 5 / (1+5)	False Positive Rate = 0% = FP / (FP+TN) = 0 / (0+613)	

88

89

90

91

92 **Figure 2a: CT values for Abbott ID NOW false negatives using conventional RT-PCR.**

Abbott ID NOW	CT value on conventional RT PCR		
Patient	N gene	ORF1ab gene	S gene
1	30.14	33	34.02
2	27.55	30.32	32.26
3	22.98	23.82	23.55

93

94 **Figure 2b: CT values for GeneXpert false positives compared to conventional RT-PCR.**

Patient	CT value on GeneXpert		CT value on conventional RT PCR		
	E gene	N2 gene	N gene	OR1ab gene	S gene
1	0.0	41.8	>40	>40	>40
2	37.9	39.9	>40	>40	>40

95

96

97 **Discussion**

98 Our results (Fig 1a, b) show a strong and robust negative predictive value for both rapid tests at 99.8%. This
99 will allow the rapid test to replace conventional RT-PCR in almost all situations, with conventional RT-PCR
100 performed only as a confirmatory test. At the beginning of the pandemic, our turnaround time for
101 conventional RT-PCR results were up to three days from collection. This improved to same-day results as
102 more centres were able to perform RT-PCR and the pandemic temporarily slowed. However, as infection
103 rates climbed again, and thus increasing testing demand, the turnaround time has increased again up to 36
104 hours.

105 Prior to the availability of these rapid COVID-19 tests, rapid antigen tests (SD Biosensor standard Q)⁹ were
106 performed in parallel with conventional RT-PCR (3rd Jun 2020 - 21st Jan 2021) (Fig. 1c). The results were
107 acceptable with negative predictive value at 99.2% (5 false negatives in 618 samples). However, there were
108 only 6 positive cases in a total of 619 samples (0.96%) and one true positive (0.16%) corresponding to a
109 sensitivity of 16.7% (5 false negatives of 6 positives). With these low positive results, the negative
110 predictive value may be overestimated. This is below the sensitivity benchmark required in a hospital
111 setting in order to continue with high risk procedures. While not ideal within the confines of a hospital, the
112 short turnaround duration and the low expert and material requirements make the rapid antigen test a
113 good means of community screening to reduce community transmission. Additionally, the material limiting
114 factors (i.e., number of available tests) are not as limiting as for rapid molecular and RT-PCR tests.

115 Out of 2,011 tests, 32 positive tests were identified with RT-PCR (1.6% positive rate) during the period of
116 Jan - May 2021. By contrast, there was only one RT-PCR positive test out of 619 tests during the period of
117 Jun 2020 - Jan 2021 (0.16%). Unpublished data among the group of hospitals in May 2021 has reached 10%.
118 In our hospital this has reached 3% in May¹⁰. We are currently experiencing a surge of cases since April
119 2021 with national rate of 5 to 6% positive tests¹⁰.

120 Both rapid molecular test kits require simple sample processing while PCR and analysis is machine
121 automated. Turnaround time is less than one hour and the number of tests that can be performed each
122 round is limited to the number of PCR and analysis machines. In our hospital, that number is four for each

123 type of rapid molecular test. Consequently, as cases increase, the waiting time for a test result would
124 increase as the number of machines becomes the limiting factor. This may be a point of concern as we face
125 a resurgence of infections.

126 The positive predictive value of Abbott ID Now is 65.5% and of GeneXpert is 86.7%. Thus GeneXpert is
127 robust and ideal point of care test. This is comparable to published results.^{1,2,3,4,5}

128 The viral load of an infected person only increases from Day +3 of exposure and in most cases peaks on
129 Day +5 and +8. This implies a remarkably short viral doubling time, indicating that it can take as short as
130 two days for a person to go from non-infectious to infectious. Thus, a result may no longer be valid if the
131 turnaround time exceeds a day.^{11,12,13} Negative conventional RT-PCR results obtained with a long
132 turnaround time may result in false security. Thus, point-of-care testing with rapid PCR tests that take less
133 than 1 hour is crucial when aerosolised procedures and surgeries under general anaesthesia are required.
134 To this end, a reliable negative test for COVID-19 is essential to minimise or negate transmission of COVID-
135 19 during procedures.

136 Although the positive predictive value is 65.5% for Abbott ID Now, we are reasonably satisfied with its use
137 for primary screening. The Abbott ID Now test is likely set up to have a high negative predictive value and a
138 corresponding higher CT value as a cutoff in order avoid missing positive cases (CT value above 35). The test
139 utilises a single gene portion as compared to two for GeneXpert and three genes in conventional RT-PCR.

140 The GeneXpert returns a CT value and can measure a CT value up to 45. For comparative purposes, the CT
141 cut off in most Malaysian laboratories is set to 40 by consensus, similar to conventional RT-PCR. In this
142 regard, the two false positives in this report could have been true positives with low viral load as their CT
143 value was near 40. While the RT-PCR results from these samples returned negative, the fact that the assay
144 was carried out off site may have led to minor variations due to sample degradation over time.

145 Our results represent a large sample size from a single institution. Pre-analytical variables are reduced, such
146 as sample collection and delivery. As the test swabs for both rapid tests and RT-PCR were taken at the same

147 time, this important pre-analytical variable is further reduced. In many reported series, the rapid molecular
148 tests were not done in parallel.

149 It is tempting to utilise GeneXpert without RT-PCR confirmation as it returns a CT value. However, with the
150 rapidly changing situation and emergence of new variants, caution has to be considered in regards to how
151 this would affect test results. We will continue monitoring the tests.

152 We have recommended to discontinue the use of conventional RT-PCR for routine screening of patients
153 admitted to our hospital and reserve it as a confirmatory test. Both rapid tests are robust as screening
154 tests. GeneXpert would be preferable with its high positive predictive value prior to high risk procedures
155 such as intubation, upper endoscopies and aerosolised procedures. Being point-of-care tests, the tests can
156 easily be repeated should procedures be delayed. However, the number of tests performed per time would
157 be a limiting factor. The Abbott ID NOW is a robust test to complement GeneXpert.

158

159

160 **Reference**

- 161 1. Lieberman JA, Pepper G, Naccache SN, Huang ML, Jerome KR, Greninger AL. Comparison of
162 Commercially Available and Laboratory-Developed Assays for In Vitro Detection of SARS-CoV-2 in
163 Clinical Laboratories. *J Clin Microbiol.* 2020 Jul 23;58(8):e00821-20
- 164 2. Loeffelholz MJ, Alland D, Butler-Wu SM et al. Multicentre evaluation of the Cepheid Xpert Xpress SARS-
165 CoV-2 test. *J Clin Micro.* 2020;58:e00926-e01020
- 166 3. Basu A, Zinger T, Inglima K, Woo KM, Atie O, Yurasits L, See B, Agüero-Rosenfeld ME. Performance of
167 Abbott ID Now COVID-19 Rapid Nucleic Acid Amplification Test Using Nasopharyngeal Swabs
168 Transported in Viral Transport Media and Dry Nasal Swabs in a New York City Academic Institution. *J*
169 *Clin Microbiol.* 2020 Jul 23;58(8):e01136-20.
- 170 4. Procop GW, Brock JE, Reineks EZ, Shrestha NK, Demkowicz R, Cook E, Ababneh E, Harrington SM. 5
171 October 2020. A comparison of five SARS-CoV-2 molecular assays with clinical correlations. *Am J Clin*
172 *Pathol* doi:10.1093/ajcp/aqaa181.
- 173 5. Chaimayo C, Kaewnaphan B, Tanlieng N, Athipanyasilp N, Sirijatuphat R, Chayakulkeeree M, et al, Rapid
174 SARS-CoV-2 antigen detection assay in comparison with real-time RT-PCR assay for laboratory
175 diagnosis of COVID-19 in Thailand. *Virology*. 2020 Nov 13;17(1):177
- 176 6. Quick Reference: TaqCheck™ SARS-CoV-2 Fast PCR Assay. [https://assets.thermofisher.com/TFS-](https://assets.thermofisher.com/TFS-Assets/LSG/manuals/MAN0019744_TaqCheckSARS-CoV-2_FastPCRAssay_QR.pdf)
177 [Assets/LSG/manuals/MAN0019744_TaqCheckSARS-CoV-2_FastPCRAssay_QR.pdf](https://assets.thermofisher.com/TFS-Assets/LSG/manuals/MAN0019744_TaqCheckSARS-CoV-2_FastPCRAssay_QR.pdf)
- 178 7. Abbott ID NOW Covid-19 quick reference instructions. [https://dam.abbott.com/en-](https://dam.abbott.com/en-us/homepage/coronavirus/38993-ID-NOW-QRG-r4-HD.pdf)
179 [us/homepage/coronavirus/38993-ID-NOW-QRG-r4-HD.pdf](https://dam.abbott.com/en-us/homepage/coronavirus/38993-ID-NOW-QRG-r4-HD.pdf)
- 180 8. Cepheid. (2020a) Xpert Xpress SARS-CoV-2 Datasheet (US-IVD). Retrieved from:
181 <https://cepheid.widen.net/s/rkmhdbdm7o>
- 182 9. Cepheid. (2020) *Xpert Xpress SARS-CoV-2*. (Package insert.) US Food and Drug Administration, Silver
183 Spring, MD. <https://www.fda.gov/media/136314/download>

- 184 10. IHH group of Malaysian Hospitals data on Covid 19 tests. Unpublished.
- 185 11. Antonio La Marca, Martina Capuzzo, Tiziana Paglia, Laura Roli, Tommaso Trenti, Scott M. Nelson.
- 186 Testing for SARS-CoV-2 (COVID-19): a systematic review and clinical guide to molecular and serological in-
- 187 vitro diagnostic assays. *RBMO*. June 14, 2020.
- 188 12. Watson J, Whiting PF, Brush JE. Interpreting a Covid-19 test result. *BMJ*. 2020 May 12;369:m1808.
- 189 13. Mina MJ, Parker R, Larremore DB. Rethinking Covid-19 Test Sensitivity - A Strategy for Containment. *N*
- 190 *Engl J Med*. 2020 Nov 26;383(22):e120.