

1 ORIGINAL ARTICLE:

2 **Multi-centre post-implementation evaluation of SARS-CoV-2 antigen-based point of**
3 **care tests used for asymptomatic screening of continuing care healthcare workers**

4
5 Jamil N Kanji^{a-d,*}, Dustin T Proctor^{d,e}, William Stokes^{b,c,f}, Byron M Berenger^{b,d}, James
6 Silvius^g, Graham Tipples^{b,h,i}, A Mark Joffe^{f,j}, Allison A Venner^{d,e}

7
8 Affiliations:

- 9
10 a. Division of Infectious Diseases, Department of Medicine, University of Calgary
11 School of Medicine, 3030 Hospital Drive NW, Calgary, AB, Canada, T2N 4W4
12
13 b. Public Health Laboratory, Alberta Precision Laboratories, Alberta, Canada
14
15 c. Department of Laboratory Medicine and Pathology, Faculty of Medicine and
16 Dentistry, University of Alberta, 8440 – 112 Street NW, Edmonton, AB, Canada,
17 T6G 2B7
18
19 d. Department of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine, University of Calgary School of
20 Medicine, 3535 Research Road NW, Calgary, AB, Canada, T2L 2K8
21
22 e. Clinical Biochemistry, Alberta Precision Laboratories, Diagnostic and Scientific
23 Center, 3535 Research Road NW, Calgary, AB, T2L 2K8
24
25 f. Division of Infectious Diseases, Department of Medicine, University of Alberta, 8440
26 – 112 Street NW, Edmonton, AB, Canada, T6G 2B7
27
28
29 g. Division of Geriatric Medicine, Cumming School of Medicine, 3030 Hospital Drive
30 NW, Calgary, AB, Canada, T2N 4W4
31
32 h. Li Ka Shing Institute of Virology, 6-010 Katz Group Center for Pharmacy and Health
33 Research, University of Alberta, Edmonton, AB, Canada, T6G 2E1
34
35 i. Department of Medical Microbiology and Immunology, Faculty of Medicine and
36 Dentistry, University of Alberta, 8440 – 112 Street NW, Edmonton, AB, Canada,
37 T6G 2B7
38
39 j. Alberta Health Services, Seventh Street Plaza, 14th floor-North Tower, 10030 – 107
40 Street NW, Edmonton, AB, Canada, T5J 3E4
41

42 *Corresponding author:

43 Jamil N. Kanji, MD, DTM&H, FRCPC
44 Public Health Laboratory, Alberta Precision Laboratories
45 3030 Hospital Drive NW, Calgary, AB, Canada T2N 4W4
46 Phone: +1 403 944 1207; Fax: +1 403 283 0142
47 Email: jamil.kanji@albertahealthservices.ca
48

49 Word count (main manuscript): 2082

50

51 Abstract word count: 209

52

53 **Abstract**

54

55 **OBJECTIVES**

56 Frequent screening of SARS-CoV-2 among asymptomatic populations using antigen-based
57 point of care tests (APOCT) is occurring globally with limited clinical performance data.
58 The positive predictive value (PPV) of two APOCT used in the asymptomatic screening of
59 SARS-CoV-2 among healthcare workers (HCW) at continuing care (CC) sites across Alberta,
60 Canada was evaluated.

61 **METHODS**

62 Between February 22 and May 2, 2021, CC sites implemented SARS-CoV-2 voluntary
63 screening of their asymptomatic HCW. Onsite testing with Abbott Panbio or BD Veritor
64 occurred on a weekly or twice weekly basis. Positive APOCT were confirmed with a real-
65 time reverse-transcriptase polymerase chain reaction (rRT-PCR) reference method.

66 **RESULTS**

67 A total of 71,847 APOCT (17,689 Veritor and 54,158 Panbio) were performed among 369
68 CC sites. Eighty-seven (0.12%) APOCT were positive, of which 39 (0.05%) confirmed as
69 true positives using rRT-PCR. Use of the Veritor and Panbio resulted in a 76.6% and 30.0%
70 false positive detection, respectively ($p < 0.001$). This corresponded to a 23.4% and 70.0%
71 PPV for the Veritor and Panbio, respectively.

72 **CONCLUSIONS**

73 Frequent screening of SARS-CoV-2 among asymptomatic HCW in CC, using APOCT,
74 resulted in a very low detection rate and a high detection of false positives. Careful
75 assessment between the risks vs benefits of APOCT programs in this population needs to be
76 thoroughly considered before implementation.

77

78 Key words: point-of-care, SARS-CoV-2 antigen, positive predictive value, sensitivity

79 **Introduction**

80

81

82 Point of Care Testing (POCT), and specifically antigen-based point of care tests (APOCT),
83 represent an important public health measure in managing SARS-CoV-2 transmissions when
84 used appropriately and with acknowledgement of their shortcomings. APOCT is particularly
85 useful in identifying and isolating SARS-CoV-2 positive cases in symptomatic individuals in
86 high-risk settings, such as congregate housing and care facilities or in areas where longer
87 turn-around-times (TAT) of more sensitive nucleic acid testing may compromise containment
88 of transmission. Governments around the world have been quick to support the widescale
89 implementation of APOCT programs [1].

90

91 Rapid and wide-scale deployment of APOCT has been promoted despite limited data
92 regarding the analytical and clinical performance of these devices in the various settings in
93 which they have been used. POCT programs that include APOCT have been criticised for the
94 poor sensitivity of these tests compared to PCR tests, particularly in asymptomatic
95 individuals [2]. However, there has been intense interest in testing asymptomatic individuals
96 from a public health perspective, as some estimate that 30 to 40 percent of infectious
97 individuals are asymptomatic. Rapid identification and isolation of these individuals is
98 viewed as highly effective in breaking chains of transmission [1, 3-5]. However, there is
99 concern that APOCT may demonstrate poor specificity when used for the surveillance of
100 asymptomatic individuals, with reports citing up to 60% false positive rates [6, 7].

101

102 Routine serial testing of asymptomatic staff in continuing care facilities using APOCT has
103 been implemented as a purportedly important public health measure for early case
104 identification, and prevention of SARS-CoV-2 outbreaks among vulnerable residents [1, 3-5].

105 While APOCT may represent an important tool in limiting transmission in congregate
106 settings, the negative impacts of a false positive result for staff and the site needs to be
107 considered and further data on the clinical performance of APOCT in continuing care
108 facilities is required.

109

110 Our aim was to evaluate the positive predictive value (PPV) of two APOCT (Abbott
111 Panbio™ and BD Veritor™) in a largescale multicenter implementation of asymptomatic
112 SARS-CoV-2 testing of healthcare workers (HCWs) in continuing care facilities.

113

114 **Methods**

115

116 *Setting*

117 Asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 testing of HCWs in continuing care facilities province-wide
118 was implemented as POCT as part of the provincial pandemic response in the province of
119 Alberta, Canada (population 4.4 million) [8]. A retrospective review of test results was
120 completed for testing completed from February 22, 2021 – May 2, 2021 inclusive. Facilities
121 were assigned (based on availability, oversight, and preference) to use either the Panbio
122 COVID-19 Antigen Rapid Test (Abbott Laboratories, Chicago, USA) or the Veritor COVID-
123 19 Rapid Antigen Test (Becton, Dickson, and Company, Franklin Lakes, USA), herein
124 referred to as APOCT.

125

126 Early in the pandemic, the provincial health authority had instituted a continuous masking
127 policy for all continuing care facilities, where all staff were required to continuously wear a
128 medical mask while at work, to be changed should the mask become soiled or wet [9].

129 Adjunctive eye protection (face shield or goggles) was advised during all episodes of patient

130 care, or continuously if there was a SARS-CoV-2 outbreak declared at the site [10]. HCWs
131 at all facilities were required to complete a ‘fit for work’ symptom questionnaire twice per
132 shift, and immediately leave their shift after informing their manager and arrange COVID-19
133 testing should they develop symptoms or screen positive [11].

134

135 *Asymptomatic testing*

136 Each site received training for a limited number of on-site health care workers to conduct
137 voluntary asymptomatic staff testing of site staff on a weekly basis. Training, operating
138 procedures and medical/operational oversight were provided by Alberta Precision
139 Laboratories (APL) POCT (for sites run by Alberta Health Services [AHS]). Sites external to
140 AHS had vendor-driven training and medical/operational oversight was provided by the site.
141 Staff conducting testing wore personal protective equipment (PPE) consisting of eye
142 protection, surgical mask, gloves, and a splash-resistant gown. Sampling was done using the
143 nasal swab provided in each test kit with testing conducted as per manufacturer’s guidelines
144 [12, 13]. While awaiting results, staff were permitted to continue working. Staff who were
145 symptomatic were not permitted to receive POCT asymptomatic testing and were directed to
146 access COVID-19 testing through public health test centers. At the discretion of individual
147 facilities, staff testing could be increased to twice weekly for non-outbreak related staff at a
148 site where a COVID-19 outbreak had been declared (staff considered linked to the outbreak
149 were not eligible for asymptomatic testing).

150

151 Staff receiving positive APOCT results were required to immediately isolate and obtain a
152 confirmatory throat or nasopharyngeal swab test for SARS-CoV-2 with a real-time reverse-
153 transcriptase polymerase chain reaction (rRT-PCR) result at an approved public health test

154 center. rRT-PCR testing was carried out at the provincial Public Health Laboratory
155 (ProvLab) using a validated laboratory-developed assay [14] or a Health Canada approved
156 test at an accredited laboratory. Confirmatory rRT-PCR testing was not conducted on
157 negative SARS-CoV-2 APOCT results. Individuals with invalid APOCT results were
158 referred for rRT-PCR evaluation. APOCT test results were not recorded in the medical chart
159 of HCWs. Any positive APOCT results were considered presumptive positive and were not
160 included in total provincial COVID-19 case counts, using instead the confirmatory rRT-PCR
161 results. All HCWs with a positive APOCT result were able to obtain a follow-up rRT-PCR
162 test.

163

164 *Data extraction and analysis*

165 Data recording, organization, and provision of results were provided by Seniors Health and
166 Continuing Care (AHS). Confirmatory rRT-PCR testing results were extracted from the
167 ProvLab laboratory information system. Data were tabulated in Microsoft Excel.
168 Proportional comparisons were done using a two-sample proportions z-test. Continuous
169 variables were compared using Mann-Whitney tests while categorical variables were
170 compared using Chi-square or Fisher's exact tests. Significance was set at $p < 0.05$.
171 Confidence intervals were calculated using Wilson's method. Statistical analysis was
172 conducted using StatPlus (AnalystSoft Inc, Alexandria, USA).

173

174 **Results**

175

176 Over the 10-week period, 369/466 (79.18%) provincial continuing care sites participated in
177 the asymptomatic screening program (Table 1). During the study period, 71,847 APOCT

178 were conducted (mean 7,184.7 tests per week; range 615-11648; 17,689 on the Veritor and
179 54,158 on the Abbott Panbio) (Table 2). A total of 87 (0.12%) APOCT were positive, of
180 which 39 (44.83%) were confirmed to be true positives using rRT-PCR (time duration
181 between APOCT and rRT-PCR confirmation not available). The APOCT positivity rate did
182 not differ significantly across the ten-week period (Table 1; $p=0.35$).

183

184 Compared to the Panbio, the false detection rate was significantly higher using the Veritor
185 (76.6%, 95% confidence interval (CI) 62.8-86.4% vs 30.0%, 95%CI 18.1-45.4%; $p<0.0001$)
186 (Table 2). The PPV was significantly higher with the Panbio test (70%, 95%CI 54.6-81.9%
187 vs 23.4%, 95%CI 13.6-37.2%; $p<0.0001$).

188

189 During this time, a total of 66,338 cases of COVID-19 were diagnosed in Alberta (prevalence
190 of 1.5%) with an average rRT-PCR positivity rate (for all specimens tested) of 7.2% (median
191 6.3%; range 3.8-13.6%) [15]. During the study period, a total of 32 outbreaks were declared
192 in continuing care facilities across the province (one in March 2021, 29 in April 2021, and
193 two in May 2021). HCWs in continuing care facilities were offered mRNA COVID-19
194 vaccines starting December 16, 2020 alongside the residents in these facilities (dosing
195 between first doses being four and six weeks for residents and HCWs respectively). The
196 proportion of all HCWs working in Alberta continuing care facilities who had received one
197 dose of COVID-19 vaccine as of February 1 and May 2, 2021 was 1.1 and 69.9%
198 respectively. The proportion having received two doses of vaccine by these dates was 16.0
199 and 83.6% respectively. The demographics and proportions of vaccinated HCWs tested were
200 not available, as neither were the follow-up rRT-PCR testing results of 87 individuals with
201 invalid APOCT results.

202

203 **Discussion**

204 Despite great emphasis on the use of APOCT as a tool to combat the COVID-19 pandemic,
205 expansion of APOCT for asymptomatic testing has been met with hesitation due to their
206 limited PPV, especially in settings of low disease prevalence [16]. This study confirms and
207 quantitates these concerns, demonstrating in a large-scale implementation of asymptomatic
208 screening in continuing care HCWs, that APOCT have a low overall PPV (44.83%) and a
209 high proportion of false positives (55.17%).

210

211 Similar performance concerns related to APOCT have been raised by a number of studies. A
212 recent Cochrane Database systematic review reported the overall sensitivity (Sn) and
213 specificity (Sp) of APOCT in symptomatic disease to be 72.0 and 99.5% (twenty-seven
214 studies combined) and asymptomatic disease to be 58.1% and 98.9% respectively (twelve
215 studies combined) [2]. Applying this to the provincial prevalence of disease we observed
216 during the study period (1.5%), indicates our findings are consistent, with an expected PPV
217 for APOCT around 44.6%. Several studies have reported a PPV as low as 33.3% [17, 18].

218

219 Many reports of asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 testing campaigns using either APOCT or rRT-
220 PCR tests have demonstrated low test positivity rates, suggesting high volume testing of
221 asymptomatic individuals is of low yield [19-22]. Another Canadian study evaluating
222 universal APOCT screening of HCWs in continuing care also found a similar APOCT
223 positivity rate of 0.16% [23]. The prevalence of positive results in our cohort was similar at
224 0.12%, however the true prevalence of disease in our cohort is much less if true positives are
225 accounted for (0.05%). Therefore, when considering the true positivity rate, the yield of
226 asymptomatic screening programs is poor.

227

228 The Veritor displayed both a lower PPV and a higher proportion of false positive tests
229 compared to the Panbio. Both tests were initially authorised by the FDA and Health Canada
230 for the diagnosis of COVID-19 within the first five (Veritor) to seven (Panbio) days of
231 COVID-19 symptom onset [16]. Our findings are consistent with the literature,
232 demonstrating the PPVs for the Veritor in asymptomatic individuals ranging from 24.9-
233 50.1% (with disease prevalence of 0.5-1.5%) [24] and that of the Panbio to be 28.0-54.0%,
234 using prevalence estimates of 0.5-1.5% [24-26]. Thus, the Panbio would be preferred over
235 the Veritor for asymptomatic screening of COVID-19.

236

237 The impact of a false positive result can lead to considerable burden and distress on both
238 individuals and the health care system. False positive test results in HCWs and others can
239 lead to loss of income due to the need to isolate, collateral effects to close contacts, and also
240 psychological damage due to misdiagnosis, stigma and fear of infecting others (especially
241 loved ones who could have poor outcomes) [27]. In health care settings, the need for
242 isolation in response to a false positive result can lead to staff shortages, adding further stress
243 on other employees and patients. False positive APOCT results in acute care settings have
244 resulted in unnecessary cancellation or postponement of treatment/procedures, and also risks
245 that individual possibly being exposed to SARS-CoV-2 if moved into a COVID-19 treatment
246 unit based on the APOCT result [28]. Thus, we strongly recommend proper education about
247 the meaning of APOCT results, and ensuring processes are in place for timely confirmation
248 with rRT-PCR if APOCT is implemented.

249

250 The setup of asymptomatic testing programs using APOCT requires considerable input of
251 resources and logistical organization. To ensure the utmost quality of testing, APOCT should
252 undergo appropriate test verification, creation of standard operating procedures and training
253 programmes, and include appropriate medical and operational oversight through an
254 accredited laboratory when implementing the associated POCT program [29]. Information
255 technology specialists are generally required to establish reporting systems so that results can
256 be accurately captured to facilitate public health reporting, disease notification, and contact
257 tracing. Furthermore, ongoing oversight to address reporting errors, test distribution, and
258 ongoing test validation must be built into the APOCT infrastructure [30]. The impact of false
259 positive results, alongside these important operational considerations must be accounted for
260 when deciding on the benefit of an APOCT screening program.

261

262 The principal limitation of this study is that only positive APOCT tests were confirmed by
263 rRT-PCR, and thus no other test parameters other than a PPV could be calculated. The data
264 however, still confirms in a large asymptomatic HCW population, that APOCT has a low
265 PPV. The major strengths of this study lie in the large number of tests performed,
266 participating sites, and inclusion of two different APOCT platforms.

267

268 The utility of screening asymptomatic individuals with COVID-19 APOCT is best
269 determined by weighing the costs and benefits specific to each setting. With widespread
270 vaccination increasing and disease prevalence falling, fewer positive test results are likely to
271 be found among asymptomatic persons in the coming months (with a large proportion of
272 them being false-positives), leading such endeavors to be quite costly from a materials and
273 human resources perspectives for most health care systems. Therefore, it is important to

274 reconsider the value and effectiveness of asymptomatic APOCT COVID-19 programs over

275 the long term, especially in the context of increasing population immunity.

276

277 **Declarations**

278

279 *Ethics approval*

280 Presentation of the data contained in this report has been approved by the Human Research

281 Ethics Board at the University of Alberta (study identifier Pro00110831).

282

283 *Conflicts of interest*

284 None of the authors have any conflicts of interests with respect to this manuscript to declare.

285

286 *Funding*

287 This work did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial,

288 or not-for-profit sectors. Tests were purchased by the government of Canada and distributed

289 to provinces to aid in the COVID-19 response. All other resources used internal funds.

290

291 *Acknowledgements*

292 We would like to thank the Alberta Precision Laboratories POCT staff for their support to the

293 Panbio POCT program who developed and supported designated continuing care facilities.

294 We would also like to thank the staff within the Provincial Seniors Health program who

295 developed the program parameters and operationalised the program (Sandra Gugins and

296 Sharon Leontowicz), and participating Continuing Care sites, staff responsible for the

297 asymptomatic testing programs and those staff who participated in screening.

298

299 *CRedit Author Statement*

300 Jamil N Kanji – formal analysis, data curation, writing – original draft, writing – review and

301 editing, visualization

302 Dustin Proctor – validation, writing – original draft, writing – review and editing
303 William Stokes – conceptualization, methodology, validation, investigation, resources,
304 project administration, writing – original draft, writing – review and editing
305 Byron Berenger – conceptualization, validation, resources, writing – original draft, writing –
306 review and editing
307 James Silvius - conceptualization, validation, resources, project administration, writing –
308 review and editing
309 Graham Tipples - conceptualization, validation, resources, project administration, writing –
310 review and editing
311 Mark A Joffe - conceptualization, validation, resources, project administration, writing –
312 review and editing
313 Allison Venner – conceptualization, methodology, validation, investigation, resources,
314 project administration, writing – original draft, writing – review and editing, supervision
315
316 **Availability of data and materials**
317 The datasets used and/or analysed during the current study are available from the
318 corresponding author on reasonable request.
319
320
321

322 **References**

323

324 [1] Government of Canada, Priority strategies to optimize testing and screening for COVID-
325 19 in Canada: Report. <[https://www.canada.ca/en/health-canada/services/drugs-health-](https://www.canada.ca/en/health-canada/services/drugs-health-products/covid19-industry/medical-devices/testing-screening-advisory-panel/reports-summaries/priority-strategies.html)
326 [products/covid19-industry/medical-devices/testing-screening-advisory-panel/reports-](https://www.canada.ca/en/health-canada/services/drugs-health-products/covid19-industry/medical-devices/testing-screening-advisory-panel/reports-summaries/priority-strategies.html)
327 [summaries/priority-strategies.html](https://www.canada.ca/en/health-canada/services/drugs-health-products/covid19-industry/medical-devices/testing-screening-advisory-panel/reports-summaries/priority-strategies.html)>, (accessed May 17, 2021.).

328 [2] J. Dinnes, J.J. Deeks, S. Berhane, M. Taylor, A. Adriano, C. Davenport, S. Dittrich, D.
329 Emperador, Y. Takwoingi, J. Cunningham, S. Beese, J. Domen, J. Dretzke, L. Ferrante di
330 Ruffano, I.M. Harris, M.J. Price, S. Taylor-Phillips, L. Hooft, M.M. Leeflang, M.D. McInnes,
331 R. Spijker, A. Van den Bruel, C.-D.T.A.G. Cochrane, Rapid, point-of-care antigen and
332 molecular-based tests for diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2 infection, *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*
333 3(3) (2021) CD013705-CD013705.

334 [3] A. Crozier, S. Rajan, I. Buchan, M. McKee, Put to the test: use of rapid testing
335 technologies for covid-19, *BMJ* 372 (2021) n208.

336 [4] M. Liu, R.K. Arora, M. Krajden, Rapid antigen tests for SARS-CoV-2, *Canadian Medical*
337 *Association Journal* 193(13) (2021) E447-E447.

338 [5] Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), COVID-19 Pandemic Planning
339 Scenarios. <<https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/hcp/planning-scenarios.html>>,
340 (accessed May 17, 2021.).

341 [6] K. Wu, Nevada Halts Use of Rapid Coronavirus Tests in Nursing Homes, Citing
342 Inaccuracies, *New York Times*.

343 [7] S. Armstrong, Covid-19: Tests on students are highly inaccurate, early findings show,
344 *BMJ* 371 (2020) m4941.

345 [8] Government of Alberta, Population statistics. <[https://www.alberta.ca/population-](https://www.alberta.ca/population-statistics.aspx)
346 [statistics.aspx](https://www.alberta.ca/population-statistics.aspx)>, (accessed May 10, 2021.).

- 347 [9] Alberta Health Services, Directive: Use of masks during COVID-19.
348 <https://extranet.ahsnet.ca/teams/policydocuments/1/clp-ahs-use-of-masks-hcs-267.pdf>,
349 (accessed May 10, 2021.).
- 350 [10] Alberta Health Services, Continuing Care - Personal Protective Equipment (PPE) -
351 Frequently Asked Questions. [https://www.albertahealthservices.ca/assets/info/ppih/if-ppih-](https://www.albertahealthservices.ca/assets/info/ppih/if-ppih-covid-19-ppe-faq-continuing-care.pdf)
352 [covid-19-ppe-faq-continuing-care.pdf](https://www.albertahealthservices.ca/assets/info/ppih/if-ppih-covid-19-ppe-faq-continuing-care.pdf)>, (accessed May 10, 2021.).
- 353 [11] Alberta Health Services, Fit For Work: COVID-19.
354 <https://www.albertahealthservices.ca/topics/Page17076.aspx>>, (accessed May 15, 2021.).
- 355 [12] Abbott, Panbio COVID-19 Ag Rapid Test Device (Nasal). [https://dam.abbott.com/en-](https://dam.abbott.com/en-gb/panbio/120007883-v1-Panbio-COVID-19-Ag-Nasal-AsymptomaticSe.pdf)
356 [gb/panbio/120007883-v1-Panbio-COVID-19-Ag-Nasal-AsymptomaticSe.pdf](https://dam.abbott.com/en-gb/panbio/120007883-v1-Panbio-COVID-19-Ag-Nasal-AsymptomaticSe.pdf)>, (accessed
357 May 17, 2021.).
- 358 [13] D.a.C. Beckton, Veritor System for Rapid Detection of SARS-CoV-2.
359 <https://bdveritor.bd.com/content/dam/bdveritor/pdfs/BD-Veritor-IFU.pdf>>, (accessed May
360 17, 2021.).
- 361 [14] K. Pabbaraju, A.A. Wong, M. Douesnard, R. Ma, K. Gill, P. Dieu, K. Fonseca, N.
362 Zelyas, G.A. Tipples, Development and validation of RT-PCR assays for testing for SARS-
363 CoV-2, Official Journal of the Association of Medical Microbiology and Infectious Disease
364 Canada 6(1) (2021) 16-22.
- 365 [15] Government of Alberta, Cases in Alberta. [https://www.alberta.ca/covid-19-alberta-](https://www.alberta.ca/covid-19-alberta-data.aspx)
366 [data.aspx](https://www.alberta.ca/covid-19-alberta-data.aspx)>, May 17, 2021).
- 367 [16] R.W. Peeling, P.L. Olliaro, D.I. Boeras, N. Fongwen, Scaling up COVID-19 rapid
368 antigen tests: promises and challenges, The Lancet Infectious Diseases.
- 369 [17] I.W. Pray, L. Ford, D. Cole, C. Lee, J.P. Bigouette, G.R. Abedi, D. Bushman, M.J.
370 Delahoy, D. Currie, B. Cherney, M. Kirby, G. Fajardo, M. Caudill, K. Langolf, J. Kahrs, P.
371 Kelly, C. Pitts, A. Lim, N. Aulik, A. Tamin, J.L. Harcourt, K. Queen, J. Zhang, B. Whitaker,

- 372 H. Browne, M. Medrzycki, P. Shewmaker, J. Folster, B. Bankamp, M.D. Bowen, N.J.
373 Thornburg, K. Goffard, B. Limbago, A. Bateman, J.E. Tate, D. Gieryn, H.L. Kirking, R.
374 Westergaard, M. Killerby, Performance of an Antigen-Based Test for Asymptomatic and
375 Symptomatic SARS-CoV-2 Testing at Two University Campuses - Wisconsin, September-
376 October 2020, *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep* 69(5152) (2021) 1642-1647.
- 377 [18] M. Masiá, M. Fernández-González, M. Sánchez, M. Carvajal, J.A. García, N. Gonzalo-
378 Jiménez, V. Ortiz de la Tabla, V. Agulló, I. Candela, J. Guijarro, J.A. Gutiérrez, C. de
379 Gregorio, F. Gutiérrez, Nasopharyngeal Panbio COVID-19 Antigen Performed at Point-of-
380 Care Has a High Sensitivity in Symptomatic and Asymptomatic Patients With Higher Risk
381 for Transmission and Older Age, *Open Forum Infectious Diseases* 8(3) (2021).
- 382 [19] P. Ravani, L. Saxinger, U. Chandran, K. Fonseca, S. Murphy, E. Lang, L. McDougall, B.
383 Manns, COVID-19 screening of asymptomatic patients admitted through emergency
384 departments in Alberta: a prospective quality-improvement study, *CMAJ Open* 8(4) (2020)
385 E887-e894.
- 386 [20] J. Ferguson, S. Dunn, A. Best, J. Mirza, B. Percival, M. Mayhew, O. Megram, F.
387 Ashford, T. White, E. Moles-Garcia, L. Crawford, T. Plant, A. Bosworth, M. Kidd, A.
388 Richter, J. Deeks, A. McNally, Validation testing to determine the sensitivity of lateral flow
389 testing for asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 detection in low prevalence settings: Testing
390 frequency and public health messaging is key, *PLoS Biol* 19(4) (2021) e3001216.
- 391 [21] J. Olalla, A.M. Correa, Martín-Escalante, M D, M.L. Hortas, M.J. Martín-Sendarrubias,
392 V. Fuentes, Sena, G, J. García-Alegría, t.R. Group, Search for asymptomatic carriers of
393 SARS-CoV-2 in healthcare workers during the pandemic: a Spanish experience, *QJM: An*
394 *International Journal of Medicine* 113(11) (2020) 794-798.
- 395 [22] S. Cao, Y. Gan, C. Wang, M. Bachmann, S. Wei, J. Gong, Y. Huang, T. Wang, L. Li, K.
396 Lu, H. Jiang, Y. Gong, H. Xu, X. Shen, Q. Tian, C. Lv, F. Song, X. Yin, Z. Lu, Post-

- 397 lockdown SARS-CoV-2 nucleic acid screening in nearly ten million residents of Wuhan,
398 China, *Nature Communications* 11(1) (2020) 5917.
- 399 [23] S.N. Kain D, Allen V, Evans GA, Hopkins J, Kouyoumdjian FG, McGeer A, Mubareka
400 S, Patel SN, Rochon PA, Schwartz B, Juni P, Johnstone J, Routine Asymptomatic SARS-
401 CoV-2 Screen Testing of Ontario Long-Term Care Staff After COVID-19 Vaccination.
402 <<https://doi.org/10.47326/ocsat.2021.02.15.1.0>>, 2021 (accessed May 14, 2021.).
- 403 [24] G. Caruana, A. Croxatto, E. Kampouri, A. Kritikos, O. Opota, M. Foerster, R. Brouillet,
404 L. Senn, R. Lienhard, A. Egli, G. Pantaleo, P.N. Carron, G. Greub, Implementing SARS-
405 CoV-2 Rapid Antigen Testing in the Emergency Ward of a Swiss University Hospital: The
406 INCREASE Study, *Microorganisms* 9(4) (2021).
- 407 [25] I. Torres, S. Poujois, E. Albert, J. Colomina, D. Navarro, Evaluation of a rapid antigen
408 test (Panbio™ COVID-19 Ag rapid test device) for SARS-CoV-2 detection in asymptomatic
409 close contacts of COVID-19 patients, *Clin Microbiol Infect* 27(4) (2021) 636.e1-636.e4.
- 410 [26] B. Baro, P. Rodo, D. Ouchi, A.E. Bordoy, E.N. Saya Amaro, S.V. Salsench, S. Molinos,
411 A. Alemany, M. Ubals, M. Corbacho-Monné, P. Millat-Martinez, M. Marks, B. Clotet, N.
412 Prat, O. Estrada, M. Vilar, J. Ara, M. Vall-Mayans, G.B. C, Q. Bassat, I. Blanco, O. Mitjà,
413 Performance characteristics of five antigen-detecting rapid diagnostic test (Ag-RDT) for
414 SARS-CoV-2 asymptomatic infection: a head-to-head benchmark comparison, *J Infect* 82(6)
415 (2021) 269-275.
- 416 [27] E. Surkova, V. Nikolayevskyy, F. Drobniewski, False-positive COVID-19 results:
417 hidden problems and costs, *The Lancet Respiratory Medicine* 8(12) (2020) 1167-1168.
- 418 [28] B. Healy, A. Khan, H. Metezai, I. Blyth, H. Asad, The impact of false positive COVID-
419 19 results in an area of low prevalence, *Clin Med (Lond)* 21(1) (2021) e54-e56.

- 420 [29] P.M. Yip, A.A. Venner, J. Shea, A. Fuezery, Y. Huang, L. Massicotte, N. Tetreault, C.
421 Tomalty, J.L.V. Shaw, Point-of-care testing: A position statement from the Canadian Society
422 of Clinical Chemists, *Clin Biochem* 53 (2018) 156-159.
- 423 [30] E.H. Kaplan, H.P. Forman, Logistics of Aggressive Community Screening for
424 Coronavirus 2019, *JAMA Health Forum* 1(5) (2020) e200565-e200565.
- 425
- 426

427 **Table 1.** Weekly APOCT for asymptomatic staff at continuing care sites across Alberta,
 428 Canada.

Week	Number of reporting sites	Number of tests performed	Positive APOCTs (%) ^a	Invalid APOCTs (%)	Number confirmed by rRT-PCR (%)
Feb 22-28, 2021	11	615	1 (0.16)	4 (0.65)	0
Mar 1-7, 2021	115	2,446	0	4 (0.16)	0
Mar 8-14, 2021	188	4,374	3 (0.07)	16 (0.37)	0
Mar 15-21, 2021	309	8,680	8 (0.09)	29 (0.33)	1 (12.50)
Mar 22-28, 2021	293	7,603	6 (0.08)	4 (0.05)	1 (16.67)
Mar 29-Apr 4, 2021	311	8,029	9 (0.11)	13 (0.16)	5 (55.56)
Apr 5-11, 2021	317	9,599	12 (0.13)	3 (0.03)	8 (66.67)
Apr 12-18, 2021	325	9,312	15 (0.16)	4 (0.04)	6 (40.00)
Apr 19-25, 2021	321	9,541	17 (0.18)	6 (0.06)	10 (58.82)
Apr 26-May 2, 2021	369	11,648	16 (0.14)	4 (0.03)	8 (50.00)
Total	369	71,847	87 (0.12)	87 (0.12)	39 (44.83)

429 Abbreviations: Apr – April; Feb – February; Mar – March; rRT-PCR – real time reverse
 430 transcriptase polymerase chain reaction.

431 ^aChange in APOCT positivity across the ten weeks is not significant (Pearson’s Chi-square,
 432 p=0.35).

433

434 **Table 2.** APOCT and rRT-PCR confirmatory results for asymptomatic continuing care
435 health care workers in Alberta, Canada.

Item	BD Veritor	Panbio	Total (%)
Total APOCTs	17,689	54,158	71,847
Positive APOCTs (%)	47 (0.27)	40 (0.07)	87 (0.12)
Negative APOCTs (%)	n/a	n/a	71,673 (99.76)
Invalid APOCTs (%)	n/a	n/a	87 (0.12)
Positive APOCTs confirmed by rRT-PCR (%)	11 (0.06)	28 (0.05)	39 (0.05)
Number of false positives (%)	36/47 = 76.60% ^a	12/40 = 30.00% ^a	48/87 = 55.17%
Positive predictive value (%)	11/47 = 23.40% ^a	28/40 = 70.00% ^a	39/87 = 44.83%

436 Abbreviations: n/a – not available

437 ^aComparison between BD Veritor and Abbott Panbio: $p < 0.0001$.

438

439

440 **STROBE CHECKLIST**

441 **Source of STROBE checklist:** [https://www.strobe-](https://www.strobe-statement.org/fileadmin/Strobe/uploads/checklists/STROBE_checklist_v4_cohort.pdf)
 442 [statement.org/fileadmin/Strobe/uploads/checklists/STROBE_checklist_v4_cohort.pdf](https://www.strobe-statement.org/fileadmin/Strobe/uploads/checklists/STROBE_checklist_v4_cohort.pdf)

443

444 **Manuscript title:**

445 Multi-centre post-implementation evaluation of SARS-CoV-2 antigen-based point of care
 446 tests used for asymptomatic screening of continuing care healthcare workers

447

Section	Description	Location in Manuscript
Title and Abstract	(a) Indicate the study’s design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract (b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found	Title indicates study type Abstract provides details of outbreak and interventions.
Introduction		
Background and rationale	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported	Introduction – page 4-5
Objectives	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses	Last paragraph of introduction – page 5.
Methods		
Study design	Present key elements of study design early in the paper	Outlined in Methods – Page 6
Setting	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection	Methods – Page 5-7
Participants	Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants. Describe methods of follow-up	Methods – Page 5 (first paragraph)
Variables	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable	Methods – Pages 5-6

Data sources	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group	Methods – Pages 7
Bias	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias	Not applicable. There are limitations outlined in the discussion.
Study size	Explain how the study size was arrived at	As this was a retrospective review, not applicable. However, sample sizes and details of data extraction provided in Methods page 7 and Results 7-8.
Quantitative analysis	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why	Methods page 7.
Statistical methods	Describe all statistical methods	Methods pages 7.
Results		
Participants	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed (b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage (c) Consider use of a flow diagram	Results – Page 8
Descriptive data	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders (b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest (c) Summarise follow-up time (eg, average and total amount)	Results – Pages 7-8
Outcome data	Report numbers of outcome events or summary	Results pages 7-8, Table 1+2

	measures over time	
Main results	(a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included (b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized (c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period	Results pages 7-8, Table 1+2
Other analyses	Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses	Not applicable.
Discussion/Interpretation		
Key results	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives	First paragraph of Discussion.
Limitations	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias	Limitations section of Discussion (page 11).
Interpretation	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence	Pages 9-12.
Generalisability	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results	Pages 10-11.
Other		
Funding	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based	Outlined in declarations section.