

1 **EVALUATION OF A NEW “ALL IN ONE” SARS-COV-2 ANTIGEN-DETECTING**
2 **RAPID DIAGNOSTIC TEST AND SELF-TEST: DIAGNOSTIC PERFORMANCE AND**
3 **USABILITY ON CHILD AND ADULT POPULATION**

4 Thierry Prazuck ¹, Anne Gravier ², Daniela Pires-Roteira ¹, Aurelie Theillay ¹, Sandra Pallay ¹,
5 Mathilda Colin ¹, Raphael Serreau ³, Laurent Hocqueloux ¹, Nino Guy Cassuto ⁴

6 ¹ Centre hospitalier régional d'Orléans, service des maladies infectieuses et tropicales,
7 Orléans

8 ² Centre gratuit d'information, de dépistage et de diagnostic (CeGIDD) Orléans, Centre
9 Hospitalier Régional d'Orléans, Orléans

10 ³ Service de médecine préventive, Orléans Métropole, Orléans

11 ⁴ Laboratoires Drouot, Paris

12 **Corresponding Author:**

13 Dr Thierry Prazuck

14 Centre Hospitalier Régional d'Orléans

15 Service des maladies infectieuses et tropicales

16 Orléans/France

17 E-mail : thierry.prazuck@chr-orleans.fr

18 Shortened Title: SARS-COV 2 ALL IN® nasal self-test performance and usability

19 **ABSTRACT**

20 The control of the COVID-19 epidemics has been one of top global health priorities for the
21 last eighteen months. To that end, more reliable and easy-to-use diagnostic tests are
22 necessary. Young children are still not eligible to vaccination and it is important to find a way
23 to easily test this key population regularly. With that in mind, we evaluated a new innovative
24 easy two-step self-test named COVID-VIRO ALL IN[®] developed by AAZ that uses a sampling
25 nasal sponge instead of a classic nasal swab. Mirroring the previous study conducted on the
26 first generation of COVID-VIRO[®] antigenic self-test, we first performed a multicentre,
27 prospective study on 124 adults and children, in a point-of-care setting. Sensitivity, specificity
28 and overall acceptance of the COVID-VIRO ALL IN[®] antigen self-test compared to RT-PCR
29 on nasopharyngeal samples were evaluated at 93.02%, 100% and 97,5%, respectively. We
30 then performed a multicentre, prospective, usability study to evaluate the ease of use of
31 COVID-VIRO ALL IN[®] in real life on 68 laypersons, all adults. Globally, 99% of them
32 considered the instructions material good, 98% executed the procedure well, and all of them
33 interpreted the results correctly. The usability was then specifically investigated on 40
34 children and teenagers participants, comparing both COVID-VIRO[®] first generation and the
35 new COVID-VIRO ALL IN[®]. All of them found COVID-VIRO ALL IN[®] much easier to use and
36 much more comfortable. For young children, the COVID-VIRO ALL IN[®] self-test appears to
37 be safer (less risk of trauma compare to nasal swabs and no liquid exposure) easier to use
38 than classic COVID self-tests and giving immediate result which is not the case for RT-PCR
39 done on saliva samples (currently done in routine for kids in French schools). It could be an
40 adapted tool for future mass screening campaigns in schools or at home under adult
41 supervision for kids from the age of 3.

42 **Keywords:** COVID-19; Diagnostic Testing; SARS-CoV-2; Antigen Testing, Self-test,
43 Usability, Nasal sampling; Children COVID testing

44 1 INTRODUCTION

45 COVID-19 is an infectious respiratory disease caused by the SARS-CoV-2 virus. As of now,
46 this disease which started in Wuhan, China in 2019, has spread worldwide and has been
47 acknowledged as a pandemic disease on 11 March 2020 by the World Health Organization
48 (WHO).¹ COVID-19 is characterised by pneumonia and upper/lower respiratory tract
49 infection. Symptoms appear after an average incubation period of 5.2 days, the most
50 common being fever, cough and fatigue, but also headache, sore throat and even acute
51 respiratory distress syndrome leading to respiratory failure.²

52 Numerous highly sensitive and specific tests have been developed in an intent to control the
53 spread of the epidemic. Nowadays, detection of SARS-CoV-2 infection is mainly executed
54 through the RT-PCR (Reverse transcription Polymerase chain reaction) method based on
55 the molecular detection of the virus genetic material from a nasopharyngeal sample. Highly
56 sensitive and reliable, this method still requires very specific and expensive material /
57 equipment, as well as trained staff to perform the test in a safe and reliable manner. Results
58 can also take several days before acquisition. Finally, although nasopharyngeal sampling is
59 generally safe, this procedure is not exempt of any physical nor psychological risk, especially
60 if performed in a repetitive and intensive manner.³ Cerebrospinal leak and meningitis have
61 indeed been observed in some cases.⁴⁻⁶

62 RT-PCR saliva sampling has recently come to light as a nasopharyngeal sampling
63 alternative especially for young children massive repeated screening campaigns in schools.
64 It is a simpler sampling method with an estimated sensitivity of (85 % IC 95 % [82 %-88 %].
65 ^{7,8}

66 Alternatively, lateral-flow immunoassays have been developed to detect the presence of the
67 virus antigens from nasopharyngeal samples. These SARS-CoV-2 specific antigen assays
68 (Rapid Antigen Diagnostic Test, RADT), available in pharmacy provide reliable results and
69 were adapted for the purpose of home usage, from simple and more comfortable sampling

70 methods (nasal sampling), enabling globally-scaled testing. Quick results from this method
71 allows early detection and isolation of Covid-19 cases.⁹

72 The FDA has already approved several antigen home tests and the French health authority
73 (Haute autorité de Santé, HAS) has defined the minimal performance requirements for these
74 tests with an emphasis on the necessity of conducting real life studies.¹⁰⁻¹²

75 In a previous study, we demonstrated that the COVID-VIRO[®] (AAZ-LMB, Boulogne-
76 Billancourt, France) antigen-based rapid detection self-test was an appropriate RADT thanks
77 to high performance and good usability assessments results, on an adult population. To
78 further improve the test usability and thus user's satisfaction while keeping the best
79 performance possible, AAZ developed a new, simpler COVID-VIRO ALL IN[®] nasal samples
80 test where all components of the previous COVID-VIRO[®] test are gathered in an "all in one"
81 device.

82 COVID VIRO ALL IN[®] uses a nasal sponge sampling method integrated at the end of the
83 device. The first objective of this study was to evaluate the diagnostic performance of
84 COVID-VIRO ALL IN[®] on children and adults compare to the reference method
85 (nasopharyngeal RT-PCR). The second objective was to evaluate usability of COVID-VIRO
86 ALL IN[®] for both children and adults, compared with the previous COVID-VIRO[®] test.

87

88 **2 MATERIALS AND METHODS**

89 The study was evaluated and approved by the French ethics committee (Comité de
90 Protection des Personnes Nord-Ouest IV) in October 2020 and was notified to the French
91 data protection authority. This study was conducted in accordance with the Declaration of
92 Helsinki. This implies that all participants provided written informed consent before
93 undergoing any study-specific procedure. Two different study settings were used, one for the
94 performance study on adults and children and one for the usability/practicability study on
95 adults. Usability/practicability was also assessed for children, while comparing COVID-VIRO

96 ALL IN[®] and COVID-VIRO[®]. Consent from parents or legal representative was collected for
97 all non-adult participants.

98 The performance study was set in the two COVID units of the Centre Hospitalier Régional
99 d'Orléans: La Madeleine Hospital and La Source Hospital. The inclusion criteria for the
100 performance study were the following: minors (ages from 5 to 17 years old) with the
101 agreement of the legal representative or adults volunteers (> 18 years old), harboring mild to
102 moderate symptoms (headache, fatigue, fever, sore throat, aches and pains, loss of smell
103 and taste etc.), for less than 7 days and not requiring immediate hospitalization. The non-
104 inclusion criteria were: hospitalised patients, symptomatic patients with symptoms duration >
105 7 days, asymptomatic patients or asymptomatic contact with a known case.

106 Regarding the usability study, the adult volunteers who participated were patients of a
107 medical analysis laboratory (Drouot laboratory, Paris) while children participants were
108 recruited from our infectious diseases department (Orléans Regional Hospital). No specific
109 inclusion/non-inclusion criteria were applied.

110 2.1 **In vitro diagnostic device under investigation**

111 COVID-VIRO ALL IN[®] (AAZ-LMB, Boulogne-Billancourt, France) is a vertical flow test that
112 uses highly sensitive monoclonal antibodies to detect SARS-CoV-2 core antigen in a nasal
113 sample. The test uses monoclonal antibodies to the SARS-CoV-2 core protein attached to
114 the test area (T) on a nitrocellulose strip. A monoclonal antibody to the SARS-CoV-2 core
115 protein labelled with colloidal gold is used as a freeze-dried conjugate.

116 In the test, SARS-CoV-2 antigens in the sample interact with monoclonal anti-SARS-CoV-2
117 antibodies to form a coloured antibody-antigen complex. This complex migrates by capillarity
118 across the membrane to the test line (Figure 1) where it is captured by the membrane bound
119 monoclonal anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibodies. A coloured test line appears in the results window
120 if SARS-CoV-2 antigens are present in the sample. The intensity of the coloured test line will
121 vary depending on the amount of SARS-CoV-2 antigen present in the sample. If no SARS-
122 CoV-2 antigen is present in the sample, no colour will appear on the test line. The control line

123 is used as a procedural control and should always appear in the control area if the test
124 procedure is performed correctly. The visual interpretation of the result can be performed
125 after 15 minutes.

126 2.2 **Comparator**

127 The RT-PCR test for SARS-CoV-2 was performed in the virology unit of the CHR Orléans,
128 France. Nucleic acid extraction was performed with an automated sample preparation
129 system MGISP-960 (MGI, China). Real-time PCR detection of SARS-CoV-2 RNA targeting
130 the ORF1ab, S and N genes was performed with the TaqPath V2 Covid-19 Multiplex RT-
131 PCR kit (Thermofisher, Illkirch, France). Amplification was performed on QuantStudio5
132 (Applied Biosystems). The results of the assay were performed according to the
133 manufacturer's instructions. The assay includes an internal RNA extraction control and an
134 amplification control. The samples were analysed taking into account the new positivity
135 criteria of the French Microbiology Society's expert committee (version 4 of 14 January
136 2021), in particular taking into account the specific characteristics of the Thermofisher kit
137 used for the RT-PCR measurement.

138 2.3 **Methodology**

139 2.3.1 Performance study

140 Upon arrival in the study centre, patients were registered for nasopharyngeal RT-PCR
141 testing. Eligible patients were informed about the study. After consent to participate, the
142 trained nurse performed the COVID-VIRO ALL IN[®] nasal test and recorded the test result on
143 the previously filled-in collection form without communicating it to the patient. Then, a
144 nasopharyngeal swab was taken by the nurse for the RT-PCR test by the hospital laboratory.
145 The RT-PCR test was performed using the TaqPath V2 Covid-19 Multiplex RT-PCR from
146 Thermofisher (Thermofisher, Illkirch, France) including a variant screening. The RT-PCR
147 result was then communicated to the patient within 24 hours and recorded in the patient's
148 file.

149 2.3.2 Usability study on adults (>18 years old)

150 2.3.2.1 *Comprehension of instructions and test execution*

151 Each participant was asked to consult the instructions for use (written, French language only,
152 available in Figure 1) in full before carrying out the self-test. Each person was then asked to
153 collect a nasal sample in both nostrils with the nasal sponge included in the device, dip the
154 device back into the diluent pad, pierce the buffer capsule by pushing the device in the
155 support, and wait for the valid result (Figure 1). Each participant was asked to comment on
156 the different steps of the self-test on a questionnaire (Table 1). The person performing the
157 test was supervised by an observer (laboratory staff, nurse or doctor) who gave an a
158 posteriori assessment of the performance of the various steps by filling in an evaluation form
159 for each participant (Table 1).

160 2.3.2.2 *Interpretation of test results*

161 The usability study also included a test result interpretation exercise during which the
162 observer instructed the participant to randomly select 1 of 4 contrived self-tests (1 negative, 2
163 positive and 1 invalid), read it and give his/her interpretation of the result. The participant
164 interpretation as well as his/her opinion on the ease of interpretation was collected on a
165 questionnaire (Table 2).

166 2.3.3 Usability study on children and teenagers (<15 years old)

167 In the same fashion as the adults, each participant was asked to comment on the different
168 steps of the COVID-VIRO ALL IN[®] and COVID-VIRO[®] self-tests on a questionnaire (Table 3).
169 For 12-15 years old participants, the test was supervised by an observer (laboratory staff,
170 nurse or doctor) who gave an a posteriori assessment of the performance of the various
171 steps by filling in an evaluation form for each participant (Table 3). The test was directly
172 performed by the parent/legal representative on 3-11 years old participants. The usability
173 study also included a test result interpretation exercise during which the observer instructed
174 the participant to randomly select 1 of 4 contrived self-tests (1 negative, 2 positive and 1
175 invalid, Figure 2), read it and give his/her interpretation of the result. The participant

176 interpretation as well as his/her opinion on the ease of interpretation was collected on a
177 questionnaire (Table 4). The participant was then asked his preferences concerning COVID-
178 VIRO ALL IN[®] or COVID-VIRO[®] (Table 5).

179 2.4 Data analysis

180 2.4.1 Performance study

181 Populations were described in terms of percentage, mean, standard deviation, range and
182 median values. The test data was analysed in the Department of Infectious. True positive
183 (TP) results were defined as positive individuals according to the reference method
184 considered positive by the COVID-VIRO ALL IN[®] test, FP (false positive) results were
185 negative individuals according to the reference method considered positive by COVID-VIRO
186 ALL IN[®] test, FN (false negative) were positive individuals according to the reference
187 method, considered negative by the COVID-VIRO ALL IN[®] test and VN (true negative) were
188 defined as negative individuals according to the reference method considered as negative by
189 the COVID-VIRO ALL IN[®] test. The specificity (Sp), sensitivity (Se), positive predictive value
190 (PPV; probability that subjects with a positive screening test truly have the disease), negative
191 predictive value (NPV, probability that subjects with a negative screening test truly don't have
192 the disease) and overall percent agreement (percentage of correctly classified instances) of
193 the COVID-VIRO[®] test compared to the reference test (RT-PCR) were calculated according
194 to the following formulas:

195 - **Sp (%)** = $100 \times [TN / (TN + FP)]$

196 - **Se (%)** = $100 \times [TP / (TP + FN)]$

197 - **PPV (%)** = $100 \times [TP / (TP + FP)]$

198 - **NPV (%)** = $100 \times [TN / (TN + FN)]$

199 - **OPA (%)** = $100 \times [(TN + TP) / (TN + FN + TP + FP)]$

200 Confidence intervals for sensitivity and specificity were obtained with the Wilson score
201 method.

202 2.4.2 Usability study

203 Populations were described in terms of absolute number and percentage.

204

205 **3 RESULTS**

206 3.1 **COVID-VIRO ALL IN[®] Performance study**

207 A total of 124 patients were recruited in the city of Orléans. Out of these 124 patients, only
208 one was excluded as his RT-PCR was considered inconclusive according to the
209 classification criteria of the French Microbiology Society¹³. Specifically, this patient was RT-
210 PCR positive for the N gene and ORF gene but with a Ct value of 33 and 37 respectively.
211 According to the French guideline¹³, this sample is positive from a laboratory stand point but
212 is excreting very low level of SARS-CoV-2 virus (Ct>32) Indicating a negligible level of
213 contagiousness. Therefore, according to the French guideline the lab can either consider
214 such samples weak positive or negative. As such, this participant was removed from the
215 analysis. From the remaining 123 patients left, 4 were identified as asymptomatic patients,
216 and thus were also excluded from this study. Consequently, the final study population
217 comprises 119 patients. The sex ratio of the study population was 0.78 (52 men and 67
218 women). The median age was 37 years (mean: 38 years, range: 80 years). Among this
219 population, the median duration of symptoms before the sampling date was 2 days (mean:
220 2.55, range: 7). Two groups were constituted according to the RT-PCR test results: 39
221 positive and 80 negative samples. The results are presented in Table 6.

222 In the overall population, the COVID-VIRO ALL IN[®] test performed as follows:

- 223 - Sensitivity: 93.02% (95 %CI: 81.4% - 97.6%)
- 224 - Specificity: 100% (95 %CI: 95.2% - 100%)
- 225 - Positive predictive value: 100%
- 226 - Negative predictive value: 96.2%
- 227 - Overall percent agreement: 97,5 %

228 Overall agreement of results between RT-PCR and COVID-VIRO ALL IN[®] were observed for
229 116 (97.5%) patients.

230 3.2 COVID-VIRO ALL IN[®] Usability study

231 3.2.1 Substudy 1 – COVID-VIRO ALL IN[®]: Adults comprehension of instructions, test
232 execution and interpretation of results

233 A total of 68 patients (41 women and 27 men), from 18 to 67 years old (mean: 34 years) and
234 from different occupational categories, participated in this study. None of them was excluded.

235 Regarding the quality of the COVID-VIRO ALL IN[®] self-test instructions, all participants but
236 one (98.5%) found the quality of the written instructions to be either good or very good. The
237 last participant chose to respond “bad” to that question. Regarding the ease of execution of
238 the COVID-VIRO[®] sample collection (nasal sampling), 100% of the participants found it easy
239 or very easy (16.2% and 83.8% respectively). Likewise, COVID-VIRO ALL IN[®] self-test
240 procedures were considered easy or very easy to perform by nearly all the participants
241 (25.0% easy and 73.5% very easy). Only one found them hard to execute. Interestingly, it
242 appeared that it was the same patient that was not satisfied with the written instructions.

243 During the execution of the test, every participant was supervised by a trained professional
244 (physician, nurse or laboratory personnel) and had the opportunity of requesting his/her
245 assistance. Then, the supervisor had to rate the execution quality of the test procedures by
246 the participant. Only 2/68 (2.9%) of the subjects were considered as having poorly executed
247 the test procedures whereas 66 (97.1%) were rated as good or very good (21/68 - 30.9%
248 and 45/68 - 66.2%, respectively). The most frequent observation was that some test users
249 were repositioning the protective cover on top of the test after sample collection, despite
250 instructions asking to throw it away, making it impossible to carry out the next steps properly.
251 As an interpretation exercise, the subjects were then randomly given one out of four
252 contrived tests and requested to read and interpret its result. Among all participants, 21
253 sorted a negative test, 4 an invalid test and 43 a positive test. Overall, none of the 68

254 patients misinterpreted the test. Only one patient found the reading and interpreting steps
255 difficult, the majority considering them to be either easy (14.7%) or very easy (83.8%).

256 3.2.2 Substudy 2 – COVID-VIRO ALL IN[®] and COVID-VIRO[®] comparison on Child and
257 Teenager populations

258 *3.2.2.1 Comprehension of instructions and test execution*

259 A total of 24 children (from 3 to 11 years old) and 16 teenagers (from 12 to 15 years old),
260 with parents from different occupational categories, participated in this comparison study
261 between COVID-VIRO ALL IN[®] and COVID-VIRO[®] usage and interpretation. None of them
262 was excluded. All were followed by a supervisor who had to rate the execution quality of the
263 test procedures, and none of them had any problem with the realisation of the test except
264 one 10 years old participant.

265 Regarding the quality of both self-test instructions, nearly all participants considered the
266 quality of the written instructions to be either good or very good. In the 3 to 11 years old
267 population, most children found the COVID-VIRO ALL IN[®] instructions to be very good
268 (20/24, 83.3%), a slightly lower result was observed for COVID-VIRO[®] instructions (17/24,
269 70.8%). In the teenager population COVID-VIRO ALL IN[®] instructions seem as easier to
270 understand (13/16 very good, 81.3%) compare to COVID-VIRO[®] instructions (11/16 very
271 good, 68.8%). One 14 years old participant considered the COVID-VIRO[®] instructions poorly
272 written, but not COVID-VIRO ALL IN[®] instructions.

273 Similarly, all participants but one found both the COVID-VIRO[®] and COVID-VIRO ALL IN[®]
274 sample collection rather easy or very easy. Following this, 7 out of 30 total participants
275 (23.3%) found that the COVID-VIRO[®] nasal swab sampling was uncomfortable, whereas
276 only 2/30 (6.7%) felt the same way for COVID-VIRO ALL IN[®] nasal sample collection.

277 Altogether, both populations found the procedures for both COVID-VIRO[®] and COVID-VIRO
278 ALL IN[®] easy or very easy to perform. Only 2 teenagers found the COVID-VIRO[®] self-test

279 difficult to execute, and another one felt the same way about the COVID-VIRO ALL IN[®] self-
280 test.

281 3.2.2.2 *Interpretation of results*

282 Just like the adult population, child and teenager populations were randomly given a
283 contrived test to interpret the results (both a COVID-VIRO[®] and a COVID-VIRO ALL IN[®] self-
284 test). Overall, there was only one child participant who misunderstood the results on one test.
285 Otherwise, no interpretation error was observed for all other participants

286 Lastly, children and teenagers were asked whether they preferred the COVID-VIRO[®] or
287 COVID-VIRO ALL IN[®] self-test. In the child group, 19 participants out of 24 preferred the
288 COVID-VIRO ALL IN[®] test (79.2%). Similarly, 14 out of 16 teenagers preferred the COVID-
289 VIRO ALL IN[®] test (87.5%). Overall, 33 participants out of the 40 preferred the COVID-VIRO
290 ALL IN[®] (82,5%)

291 Participants expressed that the COVID-VIRO ALL IN[®] system was:

- 292 - Easier to read
- 293 - Simpler to use
- 294 - More comfortable/less painful.

295

296 **4 DISCUSSION**

297 In our previous prospective study on COVID-VIRO[®] rapid antigenic test diagnostic
298 performance in real life conditions on nasopharyngeal samples¹⁴, the performance of the test
299 was very similar to the reference method since the specificity and sensitivity were 100% and
300 96.88% respectively which placed it above the requirements of the French National Authority
301 for Health (HAS) (sensitivity \geq 80%, specificity \geq 99%)¹² and the World Health Organization
302 (WHO).¹⁵ Our current study showed COVID-VIRO ALL IN[®] present almost same

303 performances with 93.02% sensitivity, 100% specificity and an overall agreement of 97,5%
304 with nasopharyngeal RT-PCR.

305 In addition to the performance assessment, we conducted a usability study following the FDA
306 recommendations.¹⁶ The participant was asked to read the test instructions and perform all
307 the procedures while being supervised, in order to assess whether the participant was able
308 to correctly perform the test on his/her own and interpret it accurately. This time, 68 adults of
309 different age, education level and socio-economic background, were included in the study
310 constituting a representative sampling of the French general population. According to them,
311 the quality of written instructions is good enough to be easily understood, proving that the
312 documents provided with the COVID-VIRO ALL IN[®] test are accessible for all laypersons.

313 Moreover, this study showed that the COVID-VIRO ALL IN[®] test is very practicable since all
314 participants were able to obtain a valid and interpretable result without requesting the
315 supervisor's assistance.

316 In terms of satisfaction about COVID-VIRO ALL IN[®] usage, all the participants declared that
317 the sample collection or the subsequent testing procedures were easy or very easy to
318 perform, except one. Similarly, only one participant found the reading and the interpretation
319 steps somewhat difficult. All together, these results demonstrate that the COVID-VIRO ALL
320 IN[®] test is highly adapted for use by an adult layperson.

321 Similar usability study was conducted on a population of 40 children (24 between 3 and 11
322 years old and 16 teenagers between 12 to 15 years old), while comparing directly COVID-
323 VIRO ALL IN[®] and COVID-VIRO[®] first generation usage satisfaction. When asked which test
324 they preferred, most of them (83%) answered COVID-VIRO ALL IN[®] because it is “easier”,
325 “simpler” or “more comfortable”. As such, the new COVID-VIRO ALL IN[®] self-test allows a
326 high accurate diagnostic as good as first generation COVID-VIRO[®], but with better usability
327 and participant satisfaction.

328 Following our previous study, it seems that the usability of a COVID self-test is improved with
329 COVID-VIRO ALL IN[®] for all types of population and especially for children, by combining all
330 components into one easy-to-use self-device, while maintaining high performance of the test.
331 As a RADT, it is a great alternative since it lowers the risks and adverse effects of nasal
332 classic swabs actually used with COVID self-tests. The sampling device seems indeed well
333 adapted for use by young children under adult supervision. The current French school
334 screening strategy for young children is based on the RT-PCR test done on saliva. This
335 matrix is known to be less sensitive than the nasopharyngeal sample that remains the
336 current gold standard.⁸ In our study, the performance of COVID-VIRO ALL IN[®] self-test were
337 as good as RT-PCR done on saliva samples. The ALL IN ONE self-test seems to be a
338 potential additional tool for large testing operations and especially for young children in
339 schools or at home under adult supervision. A recent study from Colosi et al., confirmed that
340 weekly screening would reduce the number of cases on average by 24% in elementary and
341 53% in middle school compared to symptom-based testing alone¹⁷. This result confirms the
342 great interest of a massive repeated screening campaigns in school based on self-testing.
343 COVID-VIRO ALL IN could replace or help to complement actual testing strategies (saliva
344 RT-PCR tests) and give both a reliable and quick answer to a key population (children under
345 12 years old) which are currently not eligible to vaccination.”

346 **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

347 The authors would like to thank the technical staff of the Department of Infectious diseases
348 for their excellent assistance. Furthermore, the authors thank Thibaut de Sablet and
349 Alexandre Bourgeois of Clinact, France for providing medical writing support/editorial support
350 in accordance with Good Publication Practice (GPP3) guidelines.

351 **CONFLICT OF INTEREST**

352 The authors report no conflicts of interest. The authors alone are responsible for the content
353 and the writing of the paper.

354 **AUTHORS CONTRIBUTIONS**

355 Experimental strategy design: T. Prazuck, R. Serreau, and N. G. Cassuto. Experiments: A.
356 Gravier, M. Colin, A. Thiellay, D. Pires-Roteira and S. Pallay. Data Curation, T. Prazuck.
357 Manuscript writing: T. Prazuck, L. Hocqueloux and R. Serreau. Manuscript editing, T.
358 Prazuck and N. G. Cassuto.

359 **DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT**

360 The data that support the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author
361 upon reasonable request.

362 **ORCID**

363 Thierry Prazuck: ORCID iD: 0000-0002-2212-6873

364 **REFERENCES**

- 365 1. World Health Organization. the media briefing on COVID-19 [Internet]. 2020; Available
366 from: [https://www.who.int/director-general/speeches/detail/who-director-general-s-](https://www.who.int/director-general/speeches/detail/who-director-general-s-opening-remarks-at-the-media-briefing-on-covid-19---11-march-2020)
367 [opening-remarks-at-the-media-briefing-on-covid-19---11-march-2020](https://www.who.int/director-general/speeches/detail/who-director-general-s-opening-remarks-at-the-media-briefing-on-covid-19---11-march-2020)
- 368 2. Rothan HA, Byrareddy SN. The epidemiology and pathogenesis of coronavirus disease
369 (COVID-19) outbreak. *Journal of Autoimmunity* 2020;109:102433.
- 370 3. French National Academy of Medicine. Covid-19: which samples for which tests?
371 [Internet]. 2021. Available from: [https://www.academie-medecine.fr/wp-](https://www.academie-medecine.fr/wp-content/uploads/2021/02/21.2.17-Covid19-which-samples-for-which-tests-ENG-1.pdf)
372 [content/uploads/2021/02/21.2.17-Covid19-which-samples-for-which-tests-ENG-1.pdf](https://www.academie-medecine.fr/wp-content/uploads/2021/02/21.2.17-Covid19-which-samples-for-which-tests-ENG-1.pdf)
- 373 4. Sullivan CB, Schwalje AT, Jensen M, et al. Cerebrospinal Fluid Leak After Nasal Swab
374 Testing for Coronavirus Disease 2019. *JAMA Otolaryngology–Head & Neck Surgery*
375 2020;146(12):1179–81.
- 376 5. Alberola-Amores FJ, Valdeolivas-Urbelz E, Torregrosa-Ortiz M, Álvarez-Sauco M,
377 Alom-Poveda J. Meningitis due to cerebrospinal fluid leak after nasal swab testing for
378 COVID-19. *Eur J Neurol* 2021;10.1111/ene.14736.
- 379 6. Föh B, Borsche M, Balck A, et al. Complications of nasal and pharyngeal swabs: a
380 relevant challenge of the COVID-19 pandemic? *Eur Respir J* 2021;57(4):2004004.
- 381 7. Sadikoglu IS, Caymaz MG. Saliva: Both a Threat and an Opportunity in Covid-19
382 Pandemic. *Pak J Med Sci* 2021;37(4):1215–20.
- 383 8. HAS. Méta-analyse de l'intérêt diagnostique des tests RT-PCR salivaires de détection
384 du SARS-CoV-2. 2021;54.
- 385 9. European Medicines Agency. Considerations on the use of self-tests for COVID-19 in
386 the EU/EEA [Internet]. Available from: [https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/en/publications-](https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/en/publications-data/considerations-use-self-tests-covid-19-eueea)
387 [data/considerations-use-self-tests-covid-19-eueea](https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/en/publications-data/considerations-use-self-tests-covid-19-eueea)
- 388 10. Food and Drug Administration. FDA Authorizes Antigen Test as First Over-the-Counter
389 Fully At-Home Diagnostic Test for COVID-19 [Internet]. 2020;Available from:

- 390 [https://www.fda.gov/news-events/press-announcements/coronavirus-covid-19-update-](https://www.fda.gov/news-events/press-announcements/coronavirus-covid-19-update-fda-authorizes-antigen-test-first-over-counter-fully-home-diagnostic)
391 [fda-authorizes-antigen-test-first-over-counter-fully-home-diagnostic](https://www.fda.gov/news-events/press-announcements/coronavirus-covid-19-update-fda-authorizes-antigen-test-first-over-counter-fully-home-diagnostic)
- 392 11. Food and Drug Administration. FDA Continues to Advance Over-the Counter and Other
393 Screening Test Development [Internet]. 2021; Available from: It has to be noted that the
394 valid test that was interpreted as an invalid test was a valid test with a strong test band
- 395 12. Haute Autorité de Santé. Covid-19: quelle place pour les tests antigéniques nasaux
396 dans la stratégie de dépistage? [Internet]. 2021; Available from: [https://www.has-](https://www.has-sante.fr/jcms/p_3243463/fr/covid-19-quelle-place-pour-les-tests-antigeniques-nasaux-dans-la-strategie-de-depistage)
397 [sante.fr/jcms/p_3243463/fr/covid-19-quelle-place-pour-les-tests-antigeniques-nasaux-](https://www.has-sante.fr/jcms/p_3243463/fr/covid-19-quelle-place-pour-les-tests-antigeniques-nasaux-dans-la-strategie-de-depistage)
398 [dans-la-strategie-de-depistage](https://www.has-sante.fr/jcms/p_3243463/fr/covid-19-quelle-place-pour-les-tests-antigeniques-nasaux-dans-la-strategie-de-depistage)
- 399 13. Société Française de Microbiologie. Avis SFM du 25/09/2020 relatif à l'interprétation de
400 la valeur de Ct (estimation de la charge virale) - Version 4 du 14/01/2021 Avis du 25
401 septembre 2020 de la Société Française de Microbiologie (SFM) relatif à l'interprétation
402 de la valeur de Ct obtenue en cas de RT-PCR SARS-CoV-2 positive sur les
403 prélèvements cliniques réalisés à des fins diagnostiques ou de dépistage. 2021;
- 404 14. Cassuto NG, Gravier A, Colin M, et al. Evaluation of a SARS-CoV-2 antigen-detecting
405 rapid diagnostic test as a self-test: Diagnostic performance and usability. Journal of
406 Medical Virology [Internet] 2021 [cited 2021 Sep 6];n/a(n/a). Available from:
407 <https://doi.org/10.1002/jmv.27249>
- 408 15. World Health Organization. SARS-CoV-2 antigen-detecting rapid diagnostic tests: An
409 implementation guide [Internet]. 2020; Available from:
410 <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789240017740>
- 411 16. Food and Drug Administration. Template for Manufacturers of Molecular and Antigen
412 Diagnostic COVID-19 Tests for Non-Laboratory Use [Internet]. 2020; Available from:
413 <https://www.fda.gov/media/140615/download>
- 414 17. Colosi E, Bassignana G, Contreras DA, et al. Self-testing and vaccination against
415 COVID-19 to minimize school closure [Internet]. Infectious Diseases (except HIV/AIDS);
416 2021 [cited 2021 Sep 14]. Available from:
417 <http://medrxiv.org/lookup/doi/10.1101/2021.08.15.21261243>

418

419

420 **Table 1.** COVID-VIRO ALL IN[®] usability and supervisor’s questionnaires for Adults

USABILITY QUESTIONNAIRE			
QUESTION			
1. What is your opinion regarding the written instructions for the COVID-VIRO ALL IN[®] test?	<input type="checkbox"/> Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Very good
2. What is your opinion regarding the execution of the nasal swab for the COVID-VIRO ALL IN[®] test?	<input type="checkbox"/> Difficult	<input type="checkbox"/> Easy	<input type="checkbox"/> Very easy
3. What is your opinion regarding the execution of the procedures COVID-VIRO ALL IN[®] test?	<input type="checkbox"/> Difficult	<input type="checkbox"/> Easy	<input type="checkbox"/> Very easy
SUPERVISOR QUESTIONNAIRE			
QUESTION			
1. What is your opinion on the participant's performance of this test?	<input type="checkbox"/> Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Very good

421

422

423 **Table 2.** Interpretation questionnaire for Adults

QUESTION			
1. What is the result of the test?	<input type="checkbox"/> No band	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 band	<input type="checkbox"/> 2 bands
2. How did you interpret this result?	<input type="checkbox"/> Negative	<input type="checkbox"/> Positive	<input type="checkbox"/> Inconclusive
3. How would you describe the reading and interpretation steps of the test?	<input type="checkbox"/> Difficult	<input type="checkbox"/> Easy	<input type="checkbox"/> Very easy
4. How would you describe the ease of interpretation of the COVID-VIRO ALL IN [®] nasal self-test?	<input type="checkbox"/> Difficult	<input type="checkbox"/> Easy	<input type="checkbox"/> Very easy

424

425

426 **Table 3.** COVID-VIRO ALL IN[®] and COVID-VIRO[®] usability and supervisor’s questionnaires
 427 for Children/Teenagers

USABILITY QUESTIONNAIRE			
QUESTION			
1. What is your opinion regarding the written instructions for the test?	<input type="checkbox"/> Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Very good
2. What is your opinion regarding the execution of the nasal swab for the test?	<input type="checkbox"/> Uncomfortable	<input type="checkbox"/> Comfortable	<input type="checkbox"/> Very Comfortable
3. What is your opinion regarding the execution of the procedures?	<input type="checkbox"/> Difficult	<input type="checkbox"/> Easy	<input type="checkbox"/> Very easy
SUPERVISOR QUESTIONNAIRE			
QUESTION			
1. What is your opinion on the participant's performance of this test?	<input type="checkbox"/> Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Very good

428

429

430 **Table 4.** COVID-VIRO ALL IN[®] and COVID-VIRO[®] interpretation questionnaire for Children
 431 and Teenagers

QUESTION			
1. What is the result of the test?	<input type="checkbox"/> No band	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 band	<input type="checkbox"/> 2 bands
2. How did you interpret this result?	<input type="checkbox"/> Negative	<input type="checkbox"/> Positive	<input type="checkbox"/> Inconclusive
3. How would you describe the reading and interpretation steps of the test?	<input type="checkbox"/> Difficult	<input type="checkbox"/> Easy	<input type="checkbox"/> Very easy
4. How would you describe the ease of interpretation of the nasal self-test?	<input type="checkbox"/> Difficult	<input type="checkbox"/> Easy	<input type="checkbox"/> Very easy

432

433 **Table 5.** COVID-VIRO ALL IN[®] and COVID-VIRO[®] comparison questionnaire for Children
 434 and Teenagers

QUESTION		
1. Which test did you prefer?	<input type="checkbox"/> COVID-VIRO ALL IN [®]	<input type="checkbox"/> COVID-VIRO [®]
2. Why?	Describe here	

435

436

437 **Table 6. Performance of the COVID-VIRO ALL IN[®] antigenic rapid test in the overall**

438 **Children and Adult population**

		Total
		N=119
True Positive	N	119
	VP	40/119 (33.6%)
Sensitivity: 93,02 %		
False Positive	N	119
	FP	0 (0.0%)
False Negative	N	119
	FN	3/119 (2.5%)
True Negative	N	119
	VN	75/119 (63.9%)
Specificity = 100 %		
Overall agreement	N	119
	TP + TN	116/119 (97,5%)
97,5 % concordance		

439

440

441 **Figure 1.** Visual appearance of the COVID-VIRO ALL IN[®] test device and representation of
442 the potential results



443