

1 **Accuracy of rapid point-of-care antigen-based diagnostics for SARS-CoV-2: an updated sys-**
2 **tematic review and meta-analysis with meta regression analyzing influencing factors**

3
4 Lukas E. Brümmer¹⁺, Stephan Katzenschlager²⁺, Sean McGrath³, Stephani Schmitz⁴, Mary Gaeddert¹,
5 Christian Erdmann⁵, Marc Bota⁶, Maurizio Grilli⁷, Jan Larmann², Markus A. Weigand², Nira R. Pollock⁸,
6 Aurélien Macé⁹, Berra Erkosar⁹, Sergio Carmona⁹, Jilian A. Sacks⁹, Stefano Ongarello⁹, Claudia M. Den-
7 kinger^{1, 10}

8
9 + These authors contributed equally

10 * Corresponding author (Claudia.Denkinger@uni-heidelberg.de)

11
12 1) Division of Infectious Disease and Tropical Medicine, Center for Infectious Diseases, Heidelberg Uni-
13 versity Hospital, Heidelberg, Germany

14 2) Department of Anesthesiology, Heidelberg University Hospital, Heidelberg, Germany

15 3) Department of Biostatistics, Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health, Boston, Massachusetts,
16 United States of America

17 4) Department of Developmental Biology, Erasmus Medical Center, Rotterdam, Netherlands

18 5) FH Muenster University of Applied Sciences, Muenster, Germany

19 6) Agaplesion Bethesda Hospital, Hamburg, Germany

20 7) Library, University Medical Center Mannheim, Mannheim, Germany

21 8) Department of Laboratory Medicine, Boston Children's Hospital, Boston, Massachusetts, United
22 States of America

23 9) FIND, Geneva, Switzerland

24 10) German Center for Infection Research (DZIF), partner site Heidelberg University Hospital, Heidel-
25 berg, Germany

26

27

28

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

30 Running Title: Accuracy of point-of-care Ag-RDTs for SARS-CoV-2

31 **ABSTRACT**

32 **Background**

33 Comprehensive information about the accuracy of antigen rapid diagnostic tests (Ag-RDTs) for
34 SARS-CoV-2 is essential to guide public health decision makers in choosing the best tests and testing
35 policies. In August 2021, we published a systematic review and meta-analysis about the accuracy of
36 Ag-RDTs. We now update this work and analyze the factors influencing test sensitivity in further detail.

37 **Methods and findings**

38 We registered the review on PROSPERO (registration number: CRD42020225140). We systemat-
39 ically searched multiple databases (PubMed, Web of Science Core Collection, medRxiv, bioRxiv, and
40 FIND) for publications evaluating the accuracy of Ag-RDTs for SARS-CoV-2 until August 31, 2021. De-
41 scriptive analyses of all studies were performed, and when more than 4 studies were available, a ran-
42 dom-effects meta-analysis was used to estimate pooled sensitivity and specificity with reverse tran-
43 scription polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR) testing as a reference. To evaluate factors influencing
44 test sensitivity, we performed 3 different analyses using multivariate mixed-effects meta-regression
45 models. We included 194 studies with 221,878 Ag-RDTs performed. Overall, the pooled estimates of
46 Ag-RDT sensitivity and specificity were 72.0% (95% confidence interval [CI] 69.8 to 74.2) and 98.9%
47 (95% CI 98.6 to 99.1), respectively. When manufacturer instructions were followed, sensitivity in-
48 creased to 76.4% (95%CI 73.8 to 78.8). Sensitivity was markedly better on samples with lower RT-PCR
49 cycle threshold (Ct) values (sensitivity of 97.9% [95% CI 96.9 to 98.9] and 90.6% [95% CI 88.3 to 93.0]
50 for Ct-values <20 and <25, compared to 54.4% [95% CI 47.3 to 61.5] and 18.7% [95% CI 13.9 to 23.4]
51 for Ct-values ≥25 and ≥30) and was estimated to increase by 2.9 percentage points (95% CI 1.7 to 4.0)
52 for every unit decrease in mean Ct-value when adjusting for testing procedure and patients' symptom
53 status. Concordantly, we found the mean Ct-value to be lower for true positive (22.2 [95% CI 21.5 to
54 22.8]) compared to false negative (30.4 [95% CI 29.7 to 31.1]) results. Testing in the first week from
55 symptom onset resulted in substantially higher sensitivity (81.9% [95% CI 77.7 to 85.5]) compared to
56 testing after 1 week (51.8%, 95% CI 41.5 to 61.9). Similarly, sensitivity was higher in symptomatic

57 (76.2% [95% CI 73.3 to 78.9]) compared to asymptomatic (56.8% [95% CI 50.9 to 62.4]) persons. How-
58 ever, both effects were mainly driven by the Ct-value of the sample. With regards to sample type,
59 highest sensitivity was found for nasopharyngeal (NP) and combined NP/oropharyngeal samples
60 (70.8% [95% CI 68.3 to 73.2]), as well as in anterior nasal/mid-turbinate samples (77.3% [95% CI 73.0
61 to 81.0]).

62 **Conclusion**

63 Ag-RDTs detect most of the individuals infected with SARS-CoV-2, and almost all when high viral
64 loads are present (>90%). With viral load, as estimated by Ct-value, being the most influential factor
65 on their sensitivity, they are especially useful to detect persons with high viral load who are most likely
66 to transmit the virus. To further quantify the effects of other factors influencing test sensitivity, stand-
67 ardization of clinical accuracy studies and access to patient level Ct-values and duration of symptoms
68 are needed.

69 **INTRODUCTION**

70 Antigen rapid diagnostic tests (Ag-RDTs) for SARS-CoV-2 have proven to be a cornerstone in
71 fighting the COVID-19 pandemic, as they provide results quickly and are easy to use [1]. Nevertheless,
72 the Ag-RDTs' performance differs widely between manufacturers, the way they are performed, and
73 the patients in which they are used [2, 3]. Thus, a comprehensive synthesis of evidence on commer-
74 cially available Ag-RDTs and the factors influencing their accuracy is vital to guide public health decision
75 makers in choosing the right test for their needs [4].

76 We previously conducted a living systematic review (available online at [www.diagnosticsglob-](http://www.diagnosticsglobalhealth.org)
77 [alhealth.org](http://www.diagnosticsglobalhealth.org) and updated weekly until August 31, 2021), summarizing the accuracy of commercially
78 available Ag-RDTs reported in scientific literature. In an earlier analysis, including studies up until April
79 30, 2021, the pooled estimates of Ag-RDT sensitivity and specificity were 71.2% (95% confidence inter-
80 val (CI) 68.2% to 74.0%) and 98.9% (95% CI 98.6% to 99.1%), respectively, with the SARS-CoV-2 Antigen
81 Test (LumiraDx, UK; henceforth called LumiraDx) being the most sensitive [4]. Since then, many addi-
82 tional studies have been published with a substantial increase in studies assessing asymptomatic par-
83 ticipants, allowing for further sub-analysis of findings [3]. In prior studies, we and others found Ag-RDT
84 sensitivity to decrease significantly in persons with lower viral load, as estimated by Ct-value, as well
85 as asymptomatic persons or persons with more than 7 days since symptom onset (DOS > 7) [4]. How-
86 ever, studies including symptomatic patients enroll persons typically within days since onset of symp-
87 toms [5], when viral load is highest [6, 7]. On the contrary, studies including only asymptomatic persons
88 have a higher chance of including persons at a later stage in the disease and thus with lower viral load.
89 Therefore, the decrease in Ag-RDT sensitivity might only be driven by viral load, irrespective of persons'
90 symptom status.

91 With the present work, we aim not only to give an updated overview on the accuracy of commer-
92 cially available Ag-RDTs, but also to further explore the impact of viral load, the presence of symptoms
93 and testing procedure on the accuracy of Ag-RDTs.

94 **METHODS**

95 We developed a study protocol following standard guidelines for systematic reviews [8, 9], which
96 is available in the supplements (S1 Text). We also completed the PRISMA checklist (S1 PRISMA Check-
97 list), and registered the review on PROSPERO (registration number: CRD42020225140).

98

99 Search strategy

100 We performed a search of the databases PubMed, Web of Science, medRxiv, and bioRxiv. The
101 search terms were developed with an experienced medical librarian (M. Grilli), using combinations of
102 subject headings (when applicable) and text-words for the concepts of the search question. The main
103 search terms were “Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Corona-virus 2”, “COVID-19”, “Betacorona-
104 virus”, “Coronavirus”, and “Point of Care Testing” with no language restrictions. The full list of search
105 terms is available in S2 Text. We also manually searched the website of FIND, the global alliance for
106 diagnostics (<https://www.finddx.org/sarscov2-eval-antigen/>), for additional relevant studies. We per-
107 formed the search bi-weekly through August 31, 2021. The last manual search of the FIND website was
108 performed on September 10, 2021. In addition to conducting the present review, we updated our
109 website www.diagnosticsglobalhealth.org weekly with the latest search results based on the methods
110 outlined below.

111

112 Inclusion criteria

113 We included studies evaluating the accuracy of commercially available Ag-RDTs to establish a di-
114 agnosis of SARS-CoV-2 infection at the point-of-care (POC), against reverse transcription polymerase
115 chain reaction (RT-PCR) or cell culture as reference standard. We included all study populations irre-
116 spective of age, presence of symptoms or study location. We considered cohort studies, nested cohort
117 studies, case–control or cross-sectional studies, and randomized studies. We included both peer-re-
118 viewed publications and preprints.

119 We excluded studies, in which patients were tested for the purpose of monitoring or ending quar-
120 antine. Also, publications with a population size smaller than 10 were excluded (although the size
121 threshold of 10 is arbitrary, such small studies are more likely to give unreliable estimates of sensitivity
122 and specificity). Analytical accuracy studies, where tests are performed on spiked samples with a
123 known quantity of virus, were also excluded.

124

125 Index tests

126 Ag-RDTs for SARS-CoV-2 aim to detect infection by recognizing viral proteins (typically the SARS-
127 CoV-2 nucleoprotein). Most Ag-RDTs dedicated for point-of-care deployment use specific labeled an-
128 tibodies attached to a nitrocellulose matrix strip (lateral flow assay), to capture and detect the viral
129 antigen. Successful binding of the antibodies to the antigen either is detected visually by the appear-
130 ance of a line on the matrix strip or through a specific reader instrument for fluorescence detection.
131 Other point-of-care instrument-based tests use chips or cartridges that enable an automated immu-
132 noassay testing procedure. Ag-RDTs typically provide results within 10 to 30 minutes [10].

133

134 Reference standard

135 Viral culture detects viable virus that is relevant for transmission but is only available in research
136 settings. Since RT-PCR tests are more widely available and SARS-CoV-2 RNA (as reflected by RT-PCR
137 cycle threshold [Ct] value) highly correlates with SARS-CoV-2 antigen quantities [11], we considered
138 RT-PCR an acceptable reference standard for the purposes of this systematic review. Where an inter-
139 national standard for the correlation of the viral load to the Ct-values was used, we also report the
140 viral load [12].

141

142 The study selection, data extraction, assessment of the quality of studies and their independence
143 from manufacturers were performed as per prior description [4]. The data items extracted can be
144 found in the Supplement (S1 Table).

145

146 Statistical analysis and data synthesis

147 We extracted raw data from the studies and recalculated performance estimates where possible
148 based on the extracted data. Also, some primary studies reported the median Ct-value along with the
149 first and third interquartile range (IQR) and/or minimum and maximum values rather than the sample
150 mean and standard deviation. To incorporate these studies in our analyses, we applied the Quantile
151 Estimation approach [13] to estimate the mean and standard deviation of the Ct-values. In an effort to
152 use as much of the heterogeneous data as possible, the cutoffs for the Ct value groups were relaxed
153 by 2–3 points within each range. The <20 group included values reported up to ≤ 20 , the <25 group
154 included values reported as ≤ 24 or <25 or 20–25, and the <30 group included values from ≤ 29 to ≤ 33
155 and 25–30. The ≥ 25 group included values reported as ≥ 25 or 25 to 30, and the ≥ 30 group included
156 values from ≥ 30 to ≥ 35 . For the same reason, when categorizing by age, the age group <18 years (chil-
157 dren) included samples from persons whose age was reported as <16 or <18 years, whereas the age
158 group ≥ 18 years (adults) included samples from persons whose age was reported as ≥ 16 or ≥ 18 years.
159 Also, for the symptom duration groups, the ≤ 7 days group included ≤ 4 , ≤ 5 , ≤ 6 , 6 to 7, ≤ 7 and ≤ 9 days,
160 and the >7 days group >5, 6 to 10, 6-21, >7 and 8 to 14 days. The raw data can be found in the supple-
161 ments (S2 Table) and with more details online (<https://doi.org/10.11588/data/T3MIB0>). We prepared
162 forest plots for the sensitivity and specificity of each test and visually evaluated the heterogeneity
163 between studies.

164 If 4 or more datasets were available with at least 20 RT-PCR-positive samples per dataset for a
165 predefined analysis, a meta-analysis was performed. We report pooled estimates of sensitivity and
166 specificity for SARS-CoV-2 detection along with 95% confidence intervals (CIs) using a bivariate model
167 (implemented with the “reitsma” command from the R package “mada,” version 0.5.10). In subgroup
168 analyses (below), where papers presented data only on sensitivity, a univariate random effects inverse
169 variance meta-analysis was performed (using the “metagen” command from the R package “meta”,
170 version 5.1-1, and the “rma” command from the R package “metafor”, version 3.0-2). When there were

171 fewer than 4 studies for an index test, only a descriptive analysis was performed, and accuracy ranges
172 are reported.

173 We predefined subgroups for meta-analysis based on the following characteristics: Ct value
174 range, testing procedure in accordance with manufacturer's instructions as detailed in the instructions
175 for use (IFU) (henceforth called IFU-conforming) versus not IFU-conforming, age (<18 versus ≥18
176 years), sample type, presence or absence of symptoms, symptom duration (<7 days versus ≥7 days),
177 viral load, and type of RT-PCR assay used. We also provide mean Ct-value across true positive and false
178 negative test results. For categorization by sample type, we assessed (1) nasopharyngeal (NP) alone or
179 combined with other (e.g., oropharyngeal [OP]), (2) OP alone, (3) anterior nasal (AN) or mid-turbinate
180 (MT), (4) a combination of bronchoalveolar lavage and throat wash (BAL/TW), or (5) saliva.

181 We applied multivariate linear mixed-effect meta-regression models to explore factors that affect
182 diagnostic test sensitivity. Based on our previous analysis [4], we a priori defined an individual's time
183 since infection and sample type and condition as underlying factors, influencing test sensitivity through
184 an individual's symptom status (symptomatic vs. asymptomatic), the samples' viral load (estimated by
185 the mean Ct-value as presented in the study for the sub cohort of interest) and the testing procedure
186 (IFU- vs. not IFU-conforming). We performed 3 different analyses, each of which obtained unadjusted
187 and adjusted estimates (i.e., an estimate of the association between a factor and test sensitivity, hold-
188 ing the other covariates in the model constant) of the effect of factors on test sensitivity.

189 In the first analysis, we estimated the direct effect of symptom status, viral load and testing pro-
190 cedure on test sensitivity. For the second and third analysis, we restricted the meta-regression models
191 to data sets of symptomatic persons due to a lack of data. Specifically, the second analysis assessed
192 the effect of time since infection (estimated as the sample mean of symptom duration), viral load, and
193 testing procedure on test sensitivity. The third analysis also assessed the effect of time since infection,
194 viral load, and testing procedure on test sensitivity, but depicted the time since infection as a binary
195 covariate of the symptom duration subgroup (≤7 vs >7 days). Further details on the implementation of
196 the meta-regression models and the underlying casual diagrams are available in the Supplement (S3

197 Text, S3a to S3c). Data sets with less than 5 RT-PCR positives were excluded. We considered an effect
198 to be statistically significant when the regression coefficient's 95% confidence interval did not include
199 0. The analyses were performed using the "metafor" R package, version 3.0-2 [14].

200 As recommended to investigate publication bias for diagnostic test accuracy meta-analyses, we
201 performed the Deeks test for funnel-plot asymmetry [15] (using the "midas" command in Stata, ver-
202 sion 15); a p-value < 0.10 for the slope coefficient indicates significant asymmetry.

203

204 Sensitivity analysis

205 3 sensitivity analyses were performed: estimation of sensitivity and specificity excluding case-
206 control studies, estimation of sensitivity and specificity excluding not peer-reviewed studies, and esti-
207 mation of sensitivity and specificity excluding studies that were potentially influenced through test
208 manufacturers. We compared the results of each sensitivity analysis against the overall results to as-
209 sess the potential bias introduced by case-control, not peer-reviewed, and manufacturer-influenced
210 studies.


211

212 **RESULTS**

213 SUMMARY OF STUDIES

214 The systematic search resulted in 31,254 articles. After removing duplicates, 11,462 articles were
215 screened and 433 papers were considered eligible for full-text review. Of these, 259 were excluded
216 because they did not present primary data or the Ag-RDT was not commercially available, leaving 174
217 studies to be included in the systematic review [16-189]. A list of the studies excluded and their reason
218 for exclusion can be found in the Supplement (S4 Text). Further 20 studies were included from the
219 FIND website [190-209] (Fig 1).

220



221

222 **Fig 1: PRISMA flow diagram**

223 Based on Page, M.J., et al. [210]. Abbreviations: Ag-RDT = antigen rapid diagnostic tests; IFU =
224 instructions for use.

225

226 At the end of the data extraction process, 21 studies were still in preprint form [16, 17, 21, 47, 50,
227 55, 58, 65, 69, 74, 84, 100, 116, 121, 129, 160, 167, 168, 173, 174, 186]. All studies were written in
228 English, except for 3 in Spanish [53, 62, 134], 1 in Turkish [95], and 1 in French [153]. Out of the 196
229 studies, 26 conducted a case-control study [21, 32, 34, 66, 67, 72, 81, 84, 88-90, 93, 94, 96, 103, 108,
230 135, 140, 144, 145, 151, 156, 166, 168, 182, 184], while the remaining 168 were cross-sectional or
231 cohort studies. The reference method was RT-PCR in all except 1 study, which used viral culture [135].

232 The 194 studies were divided into 333 data sets. Across these, 76 different Ag-RDTs were evalu-
233 ated (75 lateral flow assays, of which 63 are interpreted visually and 12 required an automated, pro-
234 prietary reader; 1 assay is an automated immunoassay). The most common reasons for testing were

235 the occurrence of symptoms (98 data sets; 29.4% of data sets) and screening of asymptomatic persons
236 with (3; 0.9%) or without (22; 6.6%) close contact to a SARS-CoV-2 confirmed case. In 142 (42.6%) of
237 the data sets, individuals were tested due to more than 1 of the reasons mentioned and for 68 (20.4%)
238 the reason for testing was unclear.

239 In total, 221,878 Ag-RDTs were performed, with a mean number of samples per study of 666
240 (Range 15 to 22,994). The age of the individuals tested was specified for only 90,986 samples, of which
241 84,124 (92.5%) were from adults (age group ≥ 18) and 6,862 (7.5%) from children (age group < 18).
242 Symptomatic persons comprised 74,118 (33.4%) samples, while 97,982 (44.2%) samples originated
243 from asymptomatic persons, and for 49,778 (22.4%) samples the participant's symptom status was not
244 stated by the authors. The most common sample type evaluated was NP and mixed NP/OP (117,187
245 samples, 52.8%), followed by AN/MT (86,354 samples, 38.9%). There was substantially less testing
246 done on the other sample types, with 3,586 (1.6%) tests done from OP samples, 1,256 (0.6%) from
247 saliva, 219 (0.1%) from BAL/TW and for 13,276 (6.0%) tests the type of sample was not specified in the
248 respective studies.


249 A summary of the tests evaluated in clinical accuracy studies, including study author, sample size,
250 sample type, sample condition, IFU conformity, and symptom status can be found in Supplement (S2
251 Table). The Standard Q test (SD Biosensor, South Korea; distributed in Europe by Roche, Germany;
252 henceforth called Standard Q) was the most frequently used with 57 (17.1%) data sets and 36,246
253 (16.3%) tests, while the Panbio test (Abbott Rapid Diagnostics, Germany; henceforth called Panbio)
254 was assessed in 55 (16.5%) data sets with 38,620 (17.4%) tests performed. Detailed results for each
255 clinical accuracy study are available in the Supplement (S1 Fig).

256

257 METHODOLOGICAL QUALITY OF STUDIES

258 The findings on study quality using the QUADAS 2 tool are presented in Fig 2a and b. In 294
259 (88.3%) data sets a relevant study population was assessed. However, for only 68 (20.4%) of the data
260 sets the selection of study participants was considered representative of the setting and population

261 chosen (i.e., they avoided inappropriate exclusions or a case-control design and enrollment occurred
 262 consecutive or randomly).
 263



264
 265 **Fig 2a&b: (a)Methodological quality of the clinical accuracy studies (risk of bias) (b) Methodo-**
 266 **logical quality of the clinical accuracy studies (applicability)**

267
 268 The conduct and interpretation of the index tests was considered to have low risk of bias in 176
 269 (52.9%) data sets (e.g., through appropriate blinding of persons interpreting the visual read-out). How-
 270 ever, for 155 (46.5%) data sets sufficient information to clearly judge the risk of bias was not provided.
 271 In only 151 (45.3%) data sets the Ag-RDTs were performed according to IFU, while 138 (41.4%) were
 272 not IFU-conforming, potentially impacting the diagnostic accuracy; for 44 (13.2%) data sets the IFU
 273 status was unclear. The most common deviations from the IFU were (1) use of samples that were pre-
 274 diluted in transport media not recommended by the manufacturer (113 data sets; 12 unclear), (2) use
 275 of banked samples (103 data sets; 12 unclear), and (3) a sample type that was not recommended for
 276 Ag-RDTs (8 data sets; 11 unclear).

277 In 126 (37.8%) data sets the reference standard was performed before the Ag-RDT, or the opera-
 278 tor conducting the reference standard was blinded to the Ag-RDT results, resulting in a low risk of bias.

279 In almost all other data sets (206; 61.9%) this risk could not be assessed, due to missing information
280 and for 1 data set (0.3%) intermediate concern was raised. The applicability of the reference test was
281 judged to be of low concern for all data sets, as viral culture or RT-PCR are considered to adequately
282 define the target condition for the purpose of this study.

283 In 327 (98.2%) data sets, the sample for the index test and reference test were obtained at the
284 same time, while this was unclear in 6 (1.8%). In 226 (67.9%) data sets, the same RT-PCR assay was
285 used as the reference of all included samples, while in 85 (25.5%) data sets multiple RT-PCR assays
286 were used as the reference. For 22 (6.6%) data sets, the RT-PCR used as reference standard was un-
287 clear. Furthermore, for 19 (5.7%) data sets, there was a concern that not all selected study participants
288 were included in the analysis.

289 Finally, 45 (23.3%) of the studies received financial support from the Ag-RDT manufacturer. In 13
290 of these as well as in 2 others (in total 7.7% of all studies), employment of the authors by the manu-
291 facturer of the Ag-RDT studied was indicated. The respective studies are listed in the Supplement (S5
292 Text). Overall, a competing interest was found in 47 (24.2%) of the studies. Detailed assessment of
293 each QUADAS domain can be found in the Supplement (S2 Fig).

294

295 DETECTION OF SARS-COV-2 INFECTION

296 Overall, 38 data sets were excluded from the meta-analysis, as they included fewer than 20 RT-
297 PCR positive samples. An additional 28 data sets were missing either sensitivity or specificity and were
298 only considered for univariate analyses. The remaining 267 data sets, evaluating 198,584 tests, pro-
299 vided sufficient data for bivariate analysis. The results are presented in Fig 3a-e. Detailed results for
300 the subgroup analysis are available in the Supplement (S3 Fig, S4 Fig, S5 Fig, S6 Fig and S7 Fig).

301 Including any test and type of sample, the pooled estimates of sensitivity and specificity were
302 72.0% (95%CI 69.8 to 74.2) and 98.9% (95%CI 98.6 to 99.1), respectively. If testing was performed
303 according to IFU, sensitivity increased to 76.4% (95%CI 73.8 to 78.8) compared to not IFU-conforming

304 testing with a sensitivity of 66.7% (95%CI 62.6 to 70.6). Pooled specificity was similar in both groups:
305 99.1% (95% CI 98.8-99.3) and 98.4% (95% CI 97.8 to 98.8), respectively (Fig 3a).

306

307 **Subgroup analysis by Ct-value**

308 In samples with Ct-values <20 a very high estimate of sensitivity was found (97.9% [95% CI 96.9
309 to 98.9]). The pooled sensitivity for Ct-values <25 was markedly better at 90.6% (95% CI 88.3 to 93.0)
310 compared to the group with Ct \geq 25 at 54.4% (95% CI 47.3 to 61.5). A similar pattern was observed
311 when the Ct-values were analyzed using cut-offs <30 or \geq 30, resulting in an estimated sensitivity of
312 76.8% (95% CI 73.1 to 80.4) and 18.7% (95% CI 13.9 to 23.4), respectively (Fig 3b).

313 When pooling Ct-value estimates for true positive (TP) Ag-RDT results (TP; 5,083 samples; 69 data
314 sets) and false negative (FN) (2,408 samples; 78 data sets) Ag-RDT results, the mean Ct-values were
315 22.2 (95% CI 21.5 to 22.8) and 30.4 (95% CI 29.7 to 31.1), respectively (S8 Fig). Across both TP and FN
316 samples, mean Ct-value was 26.3 (95% CI 25.5 to 27.1). This demonstrates that RT-PCR positive sam-
317 ples missed by Ag-RDT have a substantially lower viral load (higher Ct-value) compared to those that
318 were detected. Individual forest plots for each data set with mean Ct-values are presented in the Sup-
319 plement (S9 Fig).

320

321 **Subgroup analysis by sample type**

322 Most data sets evaluated NP or combined NP/OP swabs (197 data sets and 104,341 samples) as
323 the sample type for the Ag-RDT. NP or combined NP/OP swabs achieved a pooled sensitivity of 70.8%
324 (95% CI 68.3 to 73.2) and specificity of 98.8% (95% CI 98.6 to 99.1). Data sets that used AN/MT swabs
325 for Ag-RDTs (52 data sets and 84,020 samples) showed a summary estimate for sensitivity of 77.3%
326 (95% CI 73.0 to 81.0) and specificity of 99.1% (95% CI 98.6 to 99.4). However, 2 studies that reported
327 direct head-to-head comparison of NP and AN/MT samples from the same participants using the same
328 Ag-RDT (Standard Q) reported equivalent performance [112, 113]. In contrast, saliva swabs (4 data
329 sets, 1,216 samples) showed the lowest pooled sensitivity with only 50.1% (95% CI 7.7 to 92.3) (Fig 3c).

330 In 3 of the data sets utilizing a saliva sample, saliva was collected as whole mouth fluid [20, 88, 150].
331 The fourth used a cheek swab for sample collection [51].

332 Due to only 3 data sets with 3586 samples, we were not able to estimate pooled sensitivity and
333 specificity for OP samples. Median sensitivity and specificity were 59.4% (range 50.0% to 81.0%) and
334 99.1% (range 99.0% to 100.0%), respectively. We were also not able to perform a subgroup meta-
335 analysis for BAL/TW due to insufficient data, with only 1 study with 73 samples evaluating the Biocredit
336 Covid-19 Antigen rapid test kit (RapiGEN, South Korea; henceforth called Rapigen), Panbio and Stand-
337 ard Q available and sensitivity ranging between 33.3% and 88.1% [151]. However, the use of BAL/TW
338 sampling would be considered not IFU-conforming.

339

340 **Subgroup analysis in symptomatic and asymptomatic participants**

341 Within the data sets possible to meta-analyze, 55,186 (43.2%) samples were from symptomatic
342 and 72,457 (56.8%) from asymptomatic persons. The pooled sensitivity for symptomatic persons was
343 markedly higher compared to asymptomatic persons with 76.2% (95% CI 73.3 to 78.9) vs. 56.8% (95%
344 CI 50.9 to 62.4). Specificity was above 98.6% for both groups (Fig 3d).

345

346 **Subgroup analysis comparing symptom duration**


347 Data were analyzed for 9,470 persons from 26 data sets with symptoms less than 7 days, while
348 for persons with symptoms ≥ 7 days fewer data were available (620 persons, 13 data sets). The pooled
349 sensitivity estimate for individuals with symptoms <7 days was 81.9% (95% CI 77.7 to 85.5), which is
350 markedly higher than the 51.8% (95% CI 41.5 to 61.9) sensitivity for individuals tested ≥ 7 days from
351 onset of symptoms (Fig 3d).

352

353 **Subgroup analysis by age**

354 For adults (age group ≥ 18), it was possible to pool estimates across 62,433 samples, whereas the
355 pediatric group (age group <18) included 5,137 samples. There was only a small difference with

356 overlapping confidence intervals in sensitivity with 74.8% (95% CI 71.5 to 77.8) and 69.8% (95% CI 61.0
 357 to 77.3) for the adult and pediatric group, respectively. For those data sets that reported a median Ct-
 358 value per age group, the Ct-value was slightly lower in the adult (median 22.6; Q1 = 20.5; Q3 = 24.6;
 359 48 data sets) compared to the pediatric group (median 23.2; Q1 = 20.3; Q3 = 25.2; 3 data sets). Speci-
 360 ficity was similar in both groups with over 99% (Fig 3e).
 361



362

363 **Fig 3a-e: Pooled sensitivity and specificity by IFU conformity, Ct-value*, sample type, symptom**
364 **status, duration of symptoms and age**

365 *Low Ct-values are the RT-PCR semi-quantitative correlate for a high virus concentration. Abbre-
366 viations: N = number of, CI = confidence interval, IFU = instructions for use, NP = nasopharyngeal, AN
367 = anterior nasal, MT = mid turbinate, *only sensitivity calculated


368

369 META REGRESSION

370 The first analysis, assessing all variables that could influence sensitivity (symptom status, testing
371 procedure [IFU-conforming vs. not IFU-conforming], and mean Ct-value), included 65 data sets of
372 symptomatic and 18 of asymptomatic persons. The second and third analysis assessed only sympto-
373 matic persons with 28 and 50 data sets, respectively. The full list of data sets for each analysis and
374 detailed results are available in the Supplement (S3 Text).

375 In the first analysis, we found viral load (as estimated by Ct-value) to be the driving factor of
376 sensitivity. Sensitivity was estimated to increase by 2.9 percentage points (95% CI 1.7 to 4.0) for every
377 unit the mean Ct-value decreased (Fig 4, Supplement Text S3d), after adjusting for symptom status and
378 testing procedure. In addition, sensitivity was estimated to be 20.0 percentage points (95% CI 13.7 to
379 26.3) higher for samples from symptomatic compared to asymptomatic participants. However, when
380 controlling for testing procedure and mean Ct-value, this difference declined to only 11.1 percentage
381 points (95% CI 4.8 to 17.4). The difference between IFU-conforming vs. not IFU-conforming testing
382 procedure was not significant (5.2 percentage points [95% CI -2.6 to 13.0] higher for IFU-conforming)
383 after controlling for symptom status and mean Ct-value.

384



385

386 **Fig 4: Pooled estimate of sensitivity across mean Ct-values holding symptom status and IFU-**
387 **status constant at their respective means**

388 Dotted lines are the corresponding 95% confidence intervals. The size of each point is a function
389 of the weight of the data set in the model, where larger data sets have larger points. Abbreviations: Ct
390 = cycle threshold

391

392 When assessing only symptomatic participants, test sensitivity was estimated to decrease by 3.2
393 percentage points (95% CI -1.5 to 7.9) for every 1 day increase in average duration of symptoms (mean
394 duration of symptoms ranged from 2.75 to 6.47 days). However, with the confidence interval including
395 the value zero, this effect was not statistically significant. When controlling for mean Ct-value and test-
396 ing procedure, the estimated effect of the average duration of symptoms was close to 0 (0.7 percent-
397 age points [95% CI -5.0 to 6.4], Supplement Text S3e).

398 Concordantly, for samples collected after 7 days of symptom onset sensitivity was estimated to
399 be 22.9 percentage points [95%CI 10.3 to 35.4] lower compared to those collected within 7 days. When
400 controlling for mean Ct-value and testing procedure, the model still showed a decrease in sensitivity


401 for samples collected after 7 days of symptom onset, but again closer to zero and no longer statistically
402 significant (-13.8 percentage points [95% CI -27.7 to 0.1], Supplement Text S3f).

403

404 ANALYSIS OF INDIVIDUAL TESTS

405 Based on 179 data sets with 143,803 tests performed, we were able to perform bivariate meta-
406 analysis of the sensitivity and specificity for 12 different Ag-RDTs (Fig 5). Across these, pooled estimates
407 of sensitivity and specificity on all samples were 71.6% (95%CI 69.0 to 74.1) and 99.0% (95% CI 98.8 to
408 99.2), which were very similar to the overall pooled estimate across all meta-analyzed data sets (72.0%
409 and 98.9%, above).

410



411

412 **Fig 5: Bivariate analysis of 12 Ag-RDTs**

413 Pooled sensitivity and specificity were calculated based on reported sample size, true positives,
414 true negatives, false positives, and false negatives. Abbreviations: N = number of, CI = confidence interval
415

416

417 The highest pooled sensitivity was found for the SARS-CoV-2 Antigen Test (LumiraDx, United King-
418 dom; henceforth called LumiraDx) and the Standard Q nasal test (SD Biosensor, South Korea;

419 distributed in Europe by Roche, Germany; henceforth called Standard Q nasal) with 82.7% (95% CI 73.2
420 to 89.4) and 81.4% (95% CI 73.8 to 87.2), respectively. However, all tests except the COVID-19 Ag Respi-
421 Strip (Coris BioConcept, Belgium; henceforth called Coris; sensitivity 48.4% (95% CI 36.1 to 61.0) had
422 confidence intervals that were overlapping. The pooled specificity was above 98% for all of the tests,
423 except for the Standard F test (SD Biosensor, South Korea; henceforth called Standard F) and LumiraDx
424 with specificities of 97.9% (95% CI 96.9 to 98.5) and 96.9% (95% CI 94.4 to 98.3), respectively. Hierar-
425 chical summary receiver-operating characteristic for LumiraDx and Standard Q nasal are available in
426 the Supplement (S10 Fig).

427 For 2 Ag-RDTs, we were only able to perform a univariate analysis, due to insufficient data. Sen-
428 sitivities for the COVID-19 Rapid Antigen Test Cassette (SureScreen, United Kingdom; henceforth called
429 SureScreen V) and the Nadal COVID-19 Ag Test (Nal von Minden, Germany; henceforth called Nadal)
430 were similar with 57.7% (95% CI 40.9 to 74.4) and 56.6% (95% CI 26.9 to 86.3), respectively (Fig S11).
431 Specificity was only possible to calculate for the Nadal, which was lowest throughout the per test anal-
432 ysis with 91.1% (95% CI 80.2 to 100). For the remaining 62 Ag-RDTs, there were insufficient numbers
433 of data sets for a uni-or bivariate meta-analysis, but performance estimates for each of these tests are
434 descriptively compared in the Supplement (S3 Table).

435 For Panbio and Standard Q, it was also possible to pool sensitivity per Ct-value subgroup for each
436 individual test. Panbio and Standard Q reached sensitivities of 97.2% (95% CI 95.3 to 99.2) and 98.1%
437 (95% CI 96.3 to 99.9) for Ct-value <20, 89.8% (95% CI 85.4 to 94.3) and 92.6% (95% CI 88.5 to 96.7) for
438 Ct-value <25 and 73.7% (95% CI 66.0 to 81.3) and 75.7% (95% CI 67.9 to 83.4) for Ct-value <30, respec-
439 tively. For Ct-value \geq 20 sensitivities for Panbio and Standard Q were 89.2% (95% CI 82.1 to 96.3) and
440 89.0% (95% CI 81.0 to 96.9), 51.3% (95% CI 32.9 to 69.7) and 57.0% (95% CI 36.9 to 77.0) for Ct-value
441 \geq 25, and 22.8% (95% CI 11.3 to 34.3) and 23.7% (95% CI 13.6 to 33.8) for Ct-value \geq 30, respectively (S4
442 Fig A-F). For BinaxNow (Abbott Rapid Diagnostics, Germany), LumiraDx, SD Biosensor, Standard F, Coris
443 and INNOVA SARS-CoV-2 Antigen Rapid Qualitative Test (Innova Medical Group, USA; henceforth
444 called Innova) sufficient data to pool sensitivity was only available for certain Ct-values, which are

445 available in the Supplement (S4 Fig A-F) as well. In addition, for 8 tests it was possible to calculate
446 pooled sensitivity and specificity estimates only including data sets that conformed to the IFU. These
447 are also listed in the Supplement (S4 Table).

448 In total, 31 studies accounting for 106 data sets conducted head-to-head clinical accuracy evalu-
449 ations of different tests using the same sample(s) from the same participant. These data sets are out-
450 lined in the Supplement (S2 Table). 9 studies performed their head-to-head evaluation as per IFU and
451 on symptomatic individuals. Across 4 studies, the Standard Q nasal (sensitivity 80.5% to 91.2%) and
452 the Standard Q (sensitivity 73.2% to 91.2%) showed a similar range of sensitivity [112, 126, 211]. 1
453 study reported a sensitivity of 60.4% (95% CI 54.9 to 65.6) for the Standard Q and 56.8% (95% CI 51.3
454 to 62.2) for the Panbio in a mixed study population of symptomatic, asymptomatic and high-risk con-
455 tact persons [186]. Another study described a sensitivity of 56.4% (95% CI 44.7 to 67.6) for the Rapigen
456 and 52.6% (95% CI 40.9 to 64) for the SGTi-flex COVID-19 Ag (Sugentech, South Korea) [160]. 1 study
457 included only very few samples and using a not IFU-conforming sample type (BAL), limiting the ability
458 to draw conclusions from the results [151].

459

460 SENSITIVITY ANALYSIS

461 We performed 3 sensitivity analyses including 213 data sets for non-case-control studies, 216
462 data sets including only peer reviewed studies and 190 data sets including only data sets without any
463 manufacturer influence. When excluding case-control studies, the sensitivity and specificity remained
464 at 71.9% (95% CI 69.4 to 74.2) and 99.0% (95% CI 98.8 to 99.2), respectively. Similar, when assessing
465 only peer reviewed studies sensitivity and specificity did not change significantly with 71.1% (95% CI
466 68.5 to 73.6) and 98.9% (95% CI 98.6 to 99.1), respectively. If studies that could have potentially been
467 influenced by test manufacturers were excluded, sensitivity decreased marginally, but with overlap-
468 ping confidence intervals (sensitivity of 70.3% [95% CI 67.6 to 72.9] and specificity of 99.0% [95% CI
469 98.7 to 99.2]).

470

471 **DISCUSSION**

472 After reviewing 194 clinical accuracy studies, we found Ag-RDTs to be 76.4% (95%CI 73.8 to 78.8)
473 sensitive and 99.1% (95% CI 98.8 to 99.3) specific in detecting SARS-CoV-2 compared to RT-PCR when
474 performed according to manufacturers' instructions. Viral load as estimated by Ct-value was the de-
475 ciding factor for sensitivity, confirming prior work [11]. There was a significant correlation between
476 test sensitivity and Ct-value, with sensitivity increasing by 2.9 percentage points for every unit decrease
477 in mean Ct-value when controlling for symptom status and testing procedure. The pooled Ct-value for
478 TP was on average over 8 points lower than for FN results (Ct-value of 22.2 for TP compared to 30.4
479 for FN results). A decrease in performance when not following manufacturer's instructions was sug-
480 gested but was not significant (-5.2 percentage points [95% CI -13.0 to 2.6]).

481 Furthermore, sensitivity was found to be higher when samples were from symptomatic (76.2%
482 sensitivity) compared to asymptomatic participants (56.8% sensitivity). This was confirmed in the re-
483 gression model, estimating sensitivity to be 20.0 percentage points higher in samples that originated
484 from symptomatic participants. In our previous analysis, we assumed that the increase in sensitivity is
485 not due to the symptom status as such, but results from the fact that in symptomatic study populations
486 chances are higher to include participants at the beginning of the disease with high viral load [4]. In
487 the present analysis, this assumption shows to be largely true. Controlling for Ct-value, the RT-PCR
488 correlate for viral load, the effect of symptomatic vs. asymptomatic participants on test sensitivity
489 strongly decreased to 11.1 percentage points. As others found symptomatic and asymptomatic indi-
490 viduals to have the same viral load when at the same stage of the disease [6], we would have expected
491 the regression coefficient to have decreased even further to 0. This non-zero difference in sensitivity
492 between symptomatic and asymptomatic participants may be due to the lack of access to individual
493 participant Ct-values, which required our analyses to control for the mean Ct-value over all participants
494 in a data set rather than the individual Ct-values. Furthermore, some variability is likely introduced by
495 the testing for the Ag-RDT and the RT-PCR not to occur from the sample. Therefore, some degree of
496 residual confounding is likely present.

497 We also found sensitivity to be higher when participants were tested within 7 days of symptom
498 onset (81.9% sensitivity) compared to > 7 days (51.8% sensitivity). Concordantly, our regression model
499 estimated that sensitivity decreases by 3.2 percentage points for every 1 day increase in mean symp-
500 tom duration. Again, this decrease in sensitivity is driven by viral load as was seen when controlling for
501 Ct-value. Importantly, it is not yet clear how the emergence of new SARS-CoV-2 variants of concern
502 and the growing vaccination coverage will affect Ag-RDTs sensitivity in the early days after symptom
503 onset. Most of the studies included in this analysis were performed at the time the wildtype and Alpha
504 variant were circulating. While data confirmed similar Ag-RDT sensitivity in the Delta variant compared
505 to wildtype, for the Omicron SARS-CoV-2 variant the first data in analytical studies suggests similar and
506 possibly lower performance [212, 213]. Vaccination did not affect viral kinetics in the first week [214]
507 and is unlikely to do so for the Omicron variant [215]. To further inform public health decision makers
508 on the best strategy to apply Ag-RDTs, clinical accuracy studies in settings with high prevalence of the
509 Omicron variant are urgently needed.

510 Looking at specific tests, LumiraDx and Standard Q nasal showed the highest sensitivity, perform-
511 ing above the 80% sensitivity target defined by the World Health Organization. However, while the
512 Standard Q nasal was 99.1% (95% CI 98.4 to 99.5) specific, the LumiraDx only had a specificity of 96.9%
513 (95% CI 94.4-98.3), which is just below the WHO target of 97%. The reason for the lower specificity is
514 unclear, particularly as independent analytical studies also confirmed the test had no cross-reactivity
515 [102]. Sample to sample variability must be considered, particularly as the sensitivity of the index tests
516 approaches that of the reference test. The 2 most often evaluated tests, namely Panbio (32,370 sam-
517 ples; sensitivity of 71.9%) and Standard Q (35,664 samples; sensitivity of 70.9%), performed slightly
518 below the overall average. Similarly, Panbio and Standard Q were also the most extensively evaluated
519 Ag-RDTs in the prior analysis, and with a sensitivity slightly above average [4]. Nonetheless, this up-
520 dated analysis indicates that there is limited added value is to be expected from any further analysis
521 of Ag-RDTs' overall sensitivity or the sensitivity of the most widely-evaluated tests. However, it will be
522 important to continue to reassess tests' analytical sensitivity for detection of new specific variants

523 (e.g., Omicron). Also, it would be of interest to evaluate the characteristics of specific formats of Ag-
524 RDTs, such as Ag-RDTs that are self-performed or those that are instrument-based.

525 Furthermore, sensitivity strongly differed between studies that conducted the Ag-RDTs as per
526 manufacturer's instructions and those that did not (sensitivity of 66.7% for not IFU-conforming vs.
527 76.4% for IFU-conforming). With regards to sample types, saliva showed a markedly lower sensitivity
528 of 50.1%, compared to NP or AN/MT samples, confirming what we found in our previous analysis [4].
529 Especially in light of the current debate on whether saliva or throat swabs might be a more sensitive
530 sample to detect the SARS-CoV-2 Omicron variant than NP or AN/MT samples [216-218], further re-
531 search is urgently needed to quantify the difference in viral load resulting from different sample types
532 and thus the effect of sample type on test sensitivity.

533 In concordance with the above, many studies reporting an unusually low sensitivity performed
534 the Ag-RDT not as per IFU [26, 28, 40, 66, 97, 108, 133, 184] or used saliva samples [20, 150, 155, 219].
535 However, 2 studies with IFU-conforming testing procedure on NP or AN/MT sample, still showed a low
536 sensitivity. This quite likely results from the on average low viral load in 1 study [49], and the asymp-
537 tomatic study population in the other [175]. On the contrary, compared to the other studies unusual
538 high sensitivity was found in studies where average viral load was high [45, 84, 144, 145] or participants
539 were mainly within the first week of symptom onset [42, 54, 135].

540 The main strength of our study lies in its living approach. The ability to update our methodology
541 as the body of evidence grows has enabled more improved analysis. For example, while data were too
542 heterogenous for a meta-regression during the prior analysis, with additional datasets we are now able
543 to analyze the relationship between an Ag-RDT's sensitivity, the samples' Ct-value, and the partici-
544 pants' symptom status in depth. Similarly, we decided to focus on clinical accuracy studies for POC Ag-
545 RDTs in this current review as analytical accuracy studies require a dedicated approach to be compa-
546 rable. Furthermore, the main results of our latest extractions are publicly available on our website.
547 This has not only equipped public health professionals with an up-to-date overview on the current

548 research landscape [220, 221], but also led other researchers and the test manufacturers to check our
549 data, improving the quality of our report through continuous peer-review.

550 Nonetheless, our study is limited in that we use RT-PCR as a reference standard to assess the
551 accuracy of Ag-RDTs, which might be a less appropriate reference standard than viral culture [135,
552 222]. However, viral culture is available in research settings only and its validity as a true proxy of actual
553 transmissibility is not proven, therefore we find RT-PCR a suitable reference standard for the clinical
554 accuracy studies included in this review. Furthermore, we fully acknowledge that Ct-value is not equiv-
555 alent to viral load, and that the correlation between Ct-value and viral load varies between RT-PCR
556 assays; nonetheless, we believe that the analysis of pooled Ct-value data across a very large data set
557 is a useful strategy to understand the overall contribution of viral load to Ag-RDT performance. Finally,
558 we are aware that the test specific sensitivities and specificities can be influenced by differences in
559 study design. However, we aimed to counterbalance this effect by assessing relevant aspects in study
560 design for each study and analyzing outliers. To enhance comparability in between clinical accuracy
561 studies, future studies should include individuals at a similar stage in the disease, use the same sample
562 types and adhere to the WHO standard for measuring SARS-CoV-2 viral load [12].

563

564 **CONCLUSION**

565 In summary, Ag-RDTs detect most of the persons infected with SARS-CoV-2 when performed ac-
566 cording to the manufacturers' instructions. While this confirms the results of our previous analysis, the
567 present analysis highlights that the sample's viral load is the most influential factor underlying test
568 sensitivity. Thus, Ag-RDTs can play a vital role in detecting persons with high viral load and therefore
569 likely to be at highest risk of transmitting the virus. This holds true even in the absence of patient
570 symptoms or differences in the duration of symptoms. To foster further research analyzing specific Ag-
571 RDTs and the factors influencing their sensitivity in more detail, standardization of clinical accuracy
572 studies and access to patient level Ct-value and duration of symptoms are essential.

573 **REFERENCES**

- 574 1. World Health Organization, *Recommendations for national SARS-CoV-2 testing strategies and*
575 *diagnostic capacities*. No. WHO/publications/i/item/WHO-2019-nCoV-lab-testing-2021.1-
576 eng, 2021.
- 577 2. Dinnes, J., et al., *Rapid, point-of-care antigen and molecular-based tests for diagnosis of*
578 *SARS-CoV-2 infection*. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews, 2021. **3**: p. CD013705.
- 579 3. World Health Organization, *Antigen-detection in the diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2 infection*. WHO
580 Reference Number: WHO/2019-nCoV/Antigen_Detection/2021.1, 2021.
- 581 4. Brümmer, L.E., et al., *Accuracy of novel antigen rapid diagnostics for SARS-CoV-2: A living*
582 *systematic review and meta-analysis*. PLoS Medicine, 2021. **18**(8): p. e1003735.
- 583 5. Nehme, M., et al., *COVID-19 Symptoms: Longitudinal Evolution and Persistence in Outpatient*
584 *Settings*. Ann Intern Med, 2021. **174**(5): p. 723-725.
- 585 6. Kissler, S.M., et al., *Viral dynamics of acute SARS-CoV-2 infection and applications to*
586 *diagnostic and public health strategies*. PLoS Biol, 2021. **19**(7): p. e3001333.
- 587 7. Wang, Y., et al., *Kinetics of viral load and antibody response in relation to COVID-19 severity*. J
588 Clin Invest, 2020. **130**(10): p. 5235-5244.
- 589 8. Leeflang, M.M., et al., *Systematic reviews of diagnostic test accuracy*. Annals of Internal
590 Medicine, 2008. **149**(12): p. 889-97.
- 591 9. Moher, D., et al., *Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the*
592 *PRISMA statement*. Annals of Internal Medicine, 2009. **151**(4): p. 264-9, W64.
- 593 10. World Health Organization, *Antigen-detection in the diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2 infection:*
594 *interim guidance, 6 October 2021*. WHO/2019-nCoV/Antigen_Detection/2021.1, 2021.
- 595 11. Pollock, N., et al., *Correlation of SARS-CoV-2 Nucleocapsid Antigen and RNA Concentrations in*
596 *Nasopharyngeal Samples from Children and Adults Using an Ultrasensitive and Quantitative*
597 *Antigen Assay*. Journal of Clinical Microbiology, 2020. **59**: p. e03077-20.
- 598 12. World Health Organization, *First WHO International Standard for SARS-CoV-2 RNA*. Version
599 3.0, Dated 11/02/2021, 2021.
- 600 13. McGrath, S., et al., *Estimating the sample mean and standard deviation from commonly*
601 *reported quantiles in meta-analysis*. Stat Methods Med Res, 2020: p. 962280219889080.
- 602 14. Viechtbauer, W., *Conducting Meta-Analyses in R with the metafor Package*. Journal of
603 Statistical Software, 2010. **36**(3): p. 1–48.
- 604 15. van Enst, W.A., et al., *Investigation of publication bias in meta-analyses of diagnostic test*
605 *accuracy: a meta-epidemiological study*. BMC Med Research Methodology, 2014. **14**: p. 70.
- 606 16. Abdul-Mumin, A., et al., *Field evaluation of specificity and sensitivity of a standard SARS-CoV-*
607 *2 antigen rapid diagnostic test: A prospective study at a teaching hospital in Northern Ghana*.
608 medRxiv [Preprint]; published September 17, 2021.
- 609 17. Abdulrahman, A., et al., *Comparison of SARS-COV-2 nasal antigen test to nasopharyngeal RT-*
610 *PCR in mildly symptomatic patients*. medRxiv [Preprint]; published December 08, 2020.
- 611 18. Abusrewil, Z., et al., *Time scale performance of rapid antigen testing for SARS-COV-2:*
612 *evaluation of ten rapid antigen assays*. Journal of Medical Virology, 2021: p. 1-7.
- 613 19. Agarwal, J., et al., *"David vs. Goliath": A simple antigen detection test with potential to*
614 *change diagnostic strategy for SARS-CoV-2*. Journal of Infection in Developing Countries,
615 2021. **15**(7): p. 904-909.
- 616 20. Agulló, V., et al., *Evaluation of the rapid antigen test Panbio COVID-19 in saliva and nasal*
617 *swabs: A population-based point-of-care study*. Journal of Infection, 2020. **82**(5): p. 186-230.
- 618 21. Akashi, Y., et al., *Evaluation and clinical implications of the time to a positive results of*
619 *antigen testing for SARS-CoV-2*. medRxiv [Preprint]; published June 13, 2021.
- 620 22. Akingba, O.L., K. Sprong, and D.R. Hardie, *Field performance evaluation of the PanBio rapid*
621 *SARS-CoV-2 antigen assay in an epidemic driven by 501Y.v2 (lineage B.1.351) in the Eastern*
622 *Cape, South Africa*. Journal of Clinical Virology Plus, 2021. **1**(1-2): p. 100013.

- 623 23. Albert, E., et al., *Field evaluation of a rapid antigen test (Panbio™ COVID-19 Ag Rapid Test*
624 *Device) for COVID-19 diagnosis in primary healthcare centres*. *Clinical Microbiology and*
625 *Infection*, 2020. **27**(3): p. 472.e7–472.e10.
- 626 24. Alemany, A., et al., *Analytical and Clinical Performance of the Panbio COVID-19 Antigen-*
627 *Detecting Rapid Diagnostic Test*. *Journal of Infection*, 2020. **82**(5): p. 186-230.
- 628 25. Allan-Blitz, L.T. and J.D. Klausner, *A Real-World Comparison of SARS-CoV-2 Rapid Antigen vs.*
629 *Polymerase Chain Reaction Testing in Florida*. *Journal of Clinical Microbiology*, 2021. **59**(10):
630 p. e0110721.
- 631 26. Baccani, I., et al., *Evaluation of Three Immunoassays for the Rapid Detection of SARS-CoV-2*
632 *Antigens*. *Diagnostic Microbiology and Infectious Disease*, 2021. **101**(2): p. 115434.
- 633 27. Bachman, C.M., et al., *Clinical validation of an open-access SARS-COV-2 antigen detection*
634 *lateral flow assay, compared to commercially available assays*. *PLoS One*, 2021. **16**(8): p.
635 e0256352.
- 636 28. Baro, B., et al., *Performance characteristics of five antigen-detecting rapid diagnostic test*
637 *(Ag-RDT) for SARS-CoV-2 asymptomatic infection: a head-to-head benchmark comparison*.
638 *Journal of Infection*, 2021. **82**(6): p. 269-275.
- 639 29. Beck, E.T., et al., *Comparison of Quidel Sofia SARS FIA Test to Hologic Aptima SARS-CoV-2*
640 *TMA Test for Diagnosis of COVID-19 in Symptomatic Outpatients*. *Journal of Clinical*
641 *Microbiology*, 2020. **59**(2): p. e02727-20.
- 642 30. Berger, A., et al., *Diagnostic accuracy of two commercial SARS-CoV-2 Antigen-detecting rapid*
643 *tests at the point of care in community-based testing centers*. *PLoS ONE*, 2020. **16**(3): p.
644 e0248921.
- 645 31. Bianco, G., et al., *Evaluation of an antigen-based test for hospital point-of-care diagnosis of*
646 *SARS-CoV-2 infection*. *Journal of Clinical Virology*, 2021. **139**: p. 104838.
- 647 32. Blairon, L., et al., *Efficacy comparison of three rapid antigen tests for SARS-CoV-2 and how*
648 *viral load impact their performance*. *Journal of Medical Virology*, 2021. **93**: p. 5783-5788.
- 649 33. Bornemann, L., et al., *Real-life evaluation of the Sofia SARS-CoV-2 antigen assay in a large*
650 *tertiary care hospital*. *Journal of Clinical Virology*, 2021. **140**: p. 104854.
- 651 34. Bouassa, M.R.S., et al., *Analytical performances of the point-of-care SIENNA™ COVID-19*
652 *Antigen Rapid Test for the detection of SARS-CoV-2 nucleocapsid protein in nasopharyngeal*
653 *swabs: A prospective evaluation during the COVID-19 second wave in France*. *International*
654 *Journal of Infectious Diseases*, 2021. **106**: p. 8-12.
- 655 35. Brihn, A., et al., *Diagnostic Performance of an Antigen Test with RT-PCR for the Detection of*
656 *SARS-CoV-2 in a Hospital Setting - Los Angeles County, California, June-August 2020*.
657 *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report*, 2021. **70**(19): p. 702-706.
- 658 36. Bruzzone, B., et al., *Comparative diagnostic performance of different rapid antigen detection*
659 *tests for COVID-19 in the real-world hospital setting*. *International Journal of Infectious*
660 *Diseases*, 2021. **107**: p. 215-218.
- 661 37. Bulilete, O., et al., *Panbio™ rapid antigen test for SARS-CoV-2 has acceptable accuracy in*
662 *symptomatic patients in primary health care*. *Journal of Infection*, 2021. **82**: p. 391-398.
- 663 38. Caramello, V., et al., *Are antigenic tests useful for detecting SARS-CoV-2 infections in patients*
664 *accessing to emergency departments? Results from a North-West Italy Hospital*. *Journal of*
665 *Infection*, 2021. **83**: p. 237-279.
- 666 39. Carbonell-Sahuquillo, S., et al., *Evaluation of a rapid antigen detection test (Panbio™ COVID-*
667 *19 Ag Rapid Test Device) as a point-of-care diagnostic tool for COVID-19 in a Pediatric*
668 *Emergency Department*. *Journal of Medical Virology*, 2021: p. 1-5.
- 669 40. Caruana, G., et al., *ImplemeNting SARS-CoV-2 Rapid antigen testing in the Emergency wArd*
670 *of a Swiss univErsity hospital: the INCREASE study*. *microorganisms*, 2021. **9**(4): p. 798.
- 671 41. Caruana, G., et al., *The dark side of SARS-CoV-2 rapid antigen testing: screening*
672 *asymptomatic patients*. *New Microbes and New Infections*, 2021. **42**: p. 100899.
- 673 42. Cassuto, N.G., et al., *Evaluation of a SARS-CoV-2 antigen-detecting rapid diagnostic test as a*
674 *self-test: diagnostic performance and usability*. *Journal of Medical Virology*, 2021: p. 1-7.

- 675 43. Cento, V., et al., *Frontline Screening for SARS-CoV-2 Infection at Emergency Department*
676 *Admission by Third Generation Rapid Antigen Test: Can We Spare RT-qPCR?* *Viruses-Basel*,
677 2021. **13**(5): p. 818.
- 678 44. Cerutti, F., et al., *Urgent need of rapid tests for SARS CoV-2 antigen detection: Evaluation of*
679 *the SD-Biosensor antigen test for SARS-CoV-2*. *Journal of Clinical Virology*, 2020. **132**: p.
680 104654.
- 681 45. Chaimayo, C., et al., *Rapid SARS-CoV-2 antigen detection assay in comparison with real-time*
682 *RT-PCR assay for laboratory diagnosis of COVID-19 in Thailand*. *Virology Journal*, 2020. **17**(1):
683 p. 177.
- 684 46. Chiu, R., et al., *Evaluation of the INDICAID COVID-19 Rapid Antigen Test in symptomatic*
685 *populations and asymptomatic community testing*. *Microbiology Spectrum*, 2021. **9**(1): p.
686 e0034221.
- 687 47. Christensen, K., et al., *Clinical evaluation of BD Veritor™ SARS-CoV-2 and Flu A+B Assay for*
688 *point-of-care (POC) System*. medRxiv [Preprint]; published May 05, 2021.
- 689 48. Ciotti, M., et al., *Performance of a rapid antigen test in the diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2 infection*.
690 *Journal of Medical Virology*, 2021. **93**: p. 2988–2991.
- 691 49. Dankova, Z., et al., *Comparison of SARS-CoV-2 Detection by Rapid Antigen and by Three*
692 *Commercial RT-qPCR Tests: A Study from Martin University Hospital in Slovakia*. *International*
693 *Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 2021. **18**(13).
- 694 50. Del Vecchio, C., et al., *Emergence of N antigen SARS-CoV-2 genetic variants escaping*
695 *detection of antigenic tests*. medRxiv [Preprint]; published March 26, 2021.
- 696 51. Di Domenico, M., et al., *Diagnostic Accuracy of a New Antigen Test for SARS-CoV-2 Detection*.
697 *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 2021. **18**(12): p. 6310.
- 698 52. Dierks, S., et al., *Diagnosing SARS-CoV-2 with Antigen Testing, Transcription-Mediated*
699 *Amplification and Real-Time PCR*. *Journal of Clinical Medicine*, 2021. **10**(11): p. 2404.
- 700 53. Domínguez Fernández, M., et al., *Experience with Panbio rapid antigens test device for the*
701 *detection of SARS-CoV-2 in nursing homes*. *Enfermedades Infecciosas y Microbiología Clínica*,
702 2021. **S0213-005X**.
- 703 54. Drain, P.K., et al., *A Rapid, High-Sensitivity SARS-CoV-2 Nucleocapsid Immunoassay to Aid*
704 *Diagnosis of Acute COVID-19 at the Point of Care: A Clinical Performance Study*. *Infectious*
705 *Diseases and Therapy*, 2021. **10**(2): p. 753–761.
- 706 55. Drevinek, P., et al., *The sensitivity of SARS-CoV-2 antigen tests in the view of large-scale*
707 *testing*. medRxiv [Preprint]; published November 24, 2020.
- 708 56. Eleftheriou, I., et al., *Real-life evaluation of a COVID-19 rapid antigen detection test in*
709 *hospitalized children*. *Journal of Medical Virology*, 2021.
- 710 57. Escrivá, B.F., et al., *The effectiveness of rapid antigen test-based for SARS-CoV-2 detection in*
711 *nursing homes in Valencia, Spain*. *Journal of Clinical Virology*, 2021. **143**: p. 104941.
- 712 58. Faico-Filho, K.S., et al., *Evaluation of the Panbio™ COVID-19 Ag Rapid Test at an Emergency*
713 *Room in a Hospital in São Paulo, Brazil*. medRxiv [Preprint]; published March 24, 2021.
- 714 59. Favresse, J., et al., *Head-to-Head Comparison of Rapid and Automated Antigen Detection*
715 *Tests for the Diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2 Infection*. *Journal of Clinical Medicine*, 2021. **10**(2): p.
716 265.
- 717 60. Fenollar, F., et al., *Evaluation of the Panbio Covid-19 rapid antigen detection test device for*
718 *the screening of patients with Covid-19*. *Journal of Clinical Microbiology*, 2020. **59**: p. e02589-
719 20.
- 720 61. Ferguson, J., et al., *Validation testing to determine the sensitivity of lateral flow testing for*
721 *asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 detection in low prevalence settings: Testing frequency and public*
722 *health messaging is key*. *PLoS Biol*, 2021. **19**(4): p. e3001216.
- 723 62. Fernández, M.D., et al., *Usefulness of the LumiraDx SARS-COV-2 antigen test in nursing home*.
724 *Enfermedades Infecciosas y Microbiología Clínica*, 2021.

- 725 63. Fernandez-Montero, A., et al., *Validation of a rapid antigen test as a screening tool for SARS-*
726 *CoV-2 infection in asymptomatic populations. Sensitivity, specificity and predictive values.*
727 *EClinicalMedicine*, 2021. **37**: p. 100954.
- 728 64. Ferté, T., et al., *Accuracy of COVID-19 rapid antigenic tests compared to RT-PCR in a student*
729 *population: The StudyCov study.* *Journal of Clinical Virology*, 2021. **141**: p. 104878.
- 730 65. Filgueiras, P., et al., *COVID-19 Rapid Antigen Test at hospital admission associated to the*
731 *knowledge of individual risk factors allow overcoming the difficulty of managing suspected*
732 *patients in hospitals COVID-19 Rapid Antigen Test facilitates the management of suspected*
733 *patients on hospital admission.* medRxiv [Preprint]; published January 08, 2021.
- 734 66. Fourati, S., et al., *Performance of six rapid diagnostic tests for SARS-CoV-2 antigen detection*
735 *and implications for practical use.* *Journal of Clinical Virology*, 2021. **142**: p. 104930.
- 736 67. Frediani, J.K., et al., *Multidisciplinary assessment of the Abbott BinaxNOW SARS-CoV-2 point-*
737 *of-care antigen test in the context of emerging viral variants and self-administration.* *Sci Rep*,
738 2021. **11**(1): p. 14604.
- 739 68. García-Fiñana, M., et al., *Performance of the Innova SARS-CoV-2 antigen rapid lateral flow*
740 *test in the Liverpool asymptomatic testing pilot: population based cohort study.* *British*
741 *Medical Journal*, 2021. **374**: p. n1637.
- 742 69. Gomez Marti, J.L., et al., *Differences in detected viral loads guide use of SARS-CoV-2 antigen-*
743 *detection assays towards symptomatic college students and children.* medRxiv [Preprint];
744 published February 01, 2021.
- 745 70. Gremmels, H., et al., *Real-life validation of the Panbio COVID-19 Antigen Rapid Test (Abbott)*
746 *in community-dwelling subjects with symptoms of potential SARS-CoV-2 infection.*
747 *EClinicalMedicine*, 2020. **31**: p. 100677.
- 748 71. Gupta, A., et al., *Rapid chromatographic immunoassay-based evaluation of COVID-19: A*
749 *cross-sectional, diagnostic test accuracy study & its implications for COVID-19 management*
750 *in India.* *Indian Journal of Medical Research*, 2020. **153**(1): p. 126.
- 751 72. Halfon, P., et al., *An optimized stepwise algorithm combining rapid antigen and RT-qPCR for*
752 *screening of COVID-19 patients.* *PLoS ONE*, 2021. **16**(9): p. e0257817.
- 753 73. Harris, D.T., et al., *SARS-CoV-2 Rapid Antigen Testing of Symptomatic and Asymptomatic*
754 *Individuals on the University of Arizona Campus.* *Biomedicines*, 2021. **9**(5): p. 539.
- 755 74. Herrera, V., et al., *Testing of Healthcare Workers Exposed to COVID19 with Rapid Antigen*
756 *Detection.* medRxiv [Preprint]; published August 18, 2020.
- 757 75. Holzner, C., et al., *SARS-CoV-2 rapid antigen test: Fast-safe or dangerous? An analysis in the*
758 *emergency department of an university hospital.* *Journal of Medical Virology*, 2021. **93**: p.
759 5323–5327.
- 760 76. Homza, M., et al., *Five Antigen Tests for SARS-CoV-2: Virus Viability Matters.* *Viruses*, 2021.
761 **13**(4).
- 762 77. Homza, M., et al., *Covid-19 antigen testing: better than we know? A test accuracy study.*
763 *Infectious Diseases*, 2021. **53**(9): p. 661-668.
- 764 78. Houston, H., et al., *Diagnostic accuracy and utility of SARS-CoV-2 antigen lateral flow assays*
765 *in medical admissions with possible COVID-19.* *Journal of Hospital Infection*, 2021. **110**: p.
766 203-205.
- 767 79. Ifko, M. and M. Skvarc, *Use of Immunochromatographic SARS-CoV-2 Antigen Testing in Eight*
768 *Long-Term Care Facilities for the Elderly.* *Healthcare*, 2021. **9**(7): p. 868.
- 769 80. Iglói, Z., et al., *Clinical evaluation of the Roche/SD Biosensor rapid antigen test with*
770 *symptomatic, non-hospitalized patients in a municipal health service drive-through testing*
771 *site.* *Emerging Infectious Diseases*, 2020. **27**(5): p. 1323-1329.
- 772 81. Jääskeläinen, A.E., et al., *Evaluation of three rapid lateral flow antigen detection tests for the*
773 *diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2 infection.* *Journal of Clinical Virology*, 2021. **137**: p. 104785.
- 774 82. James, A.E., et al., *Performance of the BinaxNOW COVID-19 Antigen Card test relative to the*
775 *SARS-CoV-2 real-time reverse transcriptase polymerase chain reaction assay among*

- 776 *symptomatic and asymptomatic healthcare employees*. Infection Control and Hospital
777 Epidemiology, 2021: p. 1-3.
- 778 83. Jegerlehner, S., et al., *Diagnostic accuracy of a SARS-CoV-2 rapid antigen test in real-life*
779 *clinical settings*. International Journal of Infectious Diseases, 2021. **109**: p. 118-122.
- 780 84. Johnson, C., et al., *Evaluation of the Panbio SARS-CoV-2 rapid antigen detection test in the*
781 *Bahamas*. medRxiv [Preprint]; published July 15, 2021.
- 782 85. Jung, C., et al., *Diagnostic Accuracy of SARS-CoV-2 Antigen Detection Test in Children: A Real-*
783 *Life Study*. Frontiers in Pediatrics, 2021. **9**: p. 647274.
- 784 86. Kahn, M., et al., *Performance of antigen testing for diagnosis of COVID-19: a direct*
785 *comparison of a lateral flow device to nucleic acid amplification based tests*. BMC Infect Dis,
786 2021. **21**(1): p. 798.
- 787 87. Kanaujia, R., et al., *Rapid antigen detection kit for the diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2 - are we*
788 *missing asymptomatic patients?* Indian Journal of Medical Microbiology, 2021.
- 789 88. Kannian, P., et al., *SARS-CoV2 antigen in whole mouth fluid may be a reliable rapid detection*
790 *tool*. Oral Diseases, 2021. **00**: p. 1-2.
- 791 89. Karon, B.S., et al., *Analytical sensitivity and specificity of four point of care rapid antigen*
792 *diagnostic tests for SARS-CoV-2 using real-time quantitative PCR, quantitative droplet digital*
793 *PCR, and a mass spectrometric antigen assay as comparator methods*. Clinical Chemistry,
794 2021. **hvb138**.
- 795 90. Kenyeres, B., et al., *Comparison of four PCR and two point of care assays used in the*
796 *laboratory detection of SARS-CoV-2*. Journal of Virological Methods, 2021. **293**: p. 114165.
- 797 91. Kernéis, S., et al., *Accuracy of saliva and nasopharyngeal sampling for detection of SARS-CoV-*
798 *2 in community screening: a multicentric cohort study*. European Journal of Clinical
799 Microbiology & Infectious Diseases, 2021: p. 1-10.
- 800 92. Kilic, A., B. Hiestand, and E. Palavecino, *Evaluation of Performance of the BD Veritor SARS-*
801 *CoV-2 Chromatographic Immunoassay Test in Patients with Symptoms of COVID-19*. Journal
802 of Clinical Microbiology, 2021. **59**(5).
- 803 93. Kim, D., et al., *Development and Clinical Evaluation of an Immunochromatography-Based*
804 *Rapid Antigen Test (GenBody (TM) COVAG025) for COVID-19 Diagnosis*. Viruses-Basel, 2021.
805 **13**(5).
- 806 94. Kim, H.W., M. Park, and J.H. Lee, *Clinical Evaluation of the Rapid STANDARD Q COVID-19 Ag*
807 *Test for the Screening of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2*. Annals of
808 Laboratory Medicine, 2022. **42**(1): p. 100-104.
- 809 95. Kipritci, Z., et al., *Evaluation of a Visually-Read Rapid Antigen Test Kit (SGA V-Chek) for*
810 *Detection of SARS-CoV-2 Virus*. Mikrobiyoloji Bulteni, 2021. **55**(3): p. 461-464.
- 811 96. Koeleman, J.G.M., et al., *Clinical evaluation of rapid point-of-care antigen tests for diagnosis*
812 *of SARS-CoV-2 infection*. European Journal of Clinical Microbiology & Infectious Diseases,
813 2021: p. 1-7.
- 814 97. Kohmer, N., et al., *The Comparative Clinical Performance of Four SARS-CoV-2 Rapid Antigen*
815 *Tests and Their Correlation to Infectivity In Vitro*. Journal of Clinical Medicine, 2021. **10**(2).
- 816 98. Kolwijck, E., et al., *Validation and implementation of the Panbio COVID-19 Ag rapid test for*
817 *the diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2 infection in symptomatic hospital healthcare workers*. Infection
818 Prevention in Practice, 2021. **3**(2): p. 100142.
- 819 99. Korenkov, M., et al., *Evaluation of a rapid antigen test to detect SARS-CoV-2 infection and*
820 *identify potentially infectious individuals*. Journal of Clinical Microbiology, 2021. **59**(9): p.
821 e0089621.
- 822 100. Krüger, L.J., et al., *Evaluation of the accuracy, ease of use and limit of detection of novel,*
823 *rapid, antigen-detecting point-of-care diagnostics for SARS-CoV-2*. medRxiv [Preprint];
824 published October 04, 2020.
- 825 101. Krüger, L.J., et al., *The Abbott PanBio WHO emergency use listed, rapid, antigen-detecting*
826 *point-of-care diagnostic test for SARS-CoV-2-Evaluation of the accuracy and ease-of-use*. PLoS
827 ONE, 2021. **16**(5): p. e0247918.

- 828 102. Krüger, L.J., et al., *Evaluation of accuracy, exclusivity, limit-of-detection and ease-of-use of*
829 *LumiraDx: An antigen-detecting point-of-care device for SARS-CoV-2*. *Infection*, 2021: p. 1-12.
- 830 103. Krüttgen, A., et al., *Comparison of the SARS-CoV-2 Rapid antigen test to the real star Sars-*
831 *CoV-2 RT PCR kit*. *Journal of Virological Methods*, 2020. **288**: p. 114024.
- 832 104. Kumar, K.K., et al., *Pre-Operative SARS CoV-2 Rapid Antigen Test and Reverse Transcription*
833 *Polymerase Chain Reaction: A conundrum in surgical decision making*. *Indian Journal of*
834 *Ophthalmology*, 2021. **69**(6): p. 1560-1562.
- 835 105. Kurihara, Y., et al., *The evaluation of a novel digital immunochromatographic assay with*
836 *silver amplification to detect SARS-CoV-2*. *Journal of Infection and Chemotherapy*, 2021.
837 **27**(10): p. 1493-1497.
- 838 106. L'Huillier, A., et al., *Diagnostic accuracy of SARS-CoV-2 rapid antigen detection testing in*
839 *symptomatic and asymptomatic children in the clinical setting*. *Journal of Clinical*
840 *Microbiology*, 2021. **59**(9): p. e00991-21.
- 841 107. Lambert-Niclot, S., et al., *Evaluation of a Rapid Diagnostic Assay for Detection of SARS-CoV-2*
842 *Antigen in Nasopharyngeal Swabs*. *Journal of Clinical Microbiology*, 2020. **58**(8): p. e00977-
843 20.
- 844 108. Lee, J., et al., *Clinical Performance of the Standard Q COVID-19 Rapid Antigen Test and*
845 *Simulation of its Real-World Application in Korea*. *Annals of Laboratory Medicine*, 2021.
846 **41**(6): p. 588-592.
- 847 109. Leixner, G., et al., *Evaluation of the AMP SARS-CoV-2 rapid antigen test in a hospital setting*.
848 *International Journal of Infectious Diseases*, 2021. **108**: p. 353-356.
- 849 110. Leli, C., et al., *Performance of a SARS CoV-2 antigen rapid immunoassay in patients admitted*
850 *to the Emergency Department*. *International Journal of Infectious Diseases*, 2021. **110**: p.
851 135–140.
- 852 111. Linares, M., et al., *Panbio antigen rapid test is reliable to diagnose SARS-CoV-2 infection in*
853 *the first 7 days after the onset of symptoms*. *Journal of Clinical Virology*, 2020. **133**: p.
854 104659.
- 855 112. Lindner, A., et al., *Head-to-head comparison of SARS-CoV-2 antigen-detecting rapid test with*
856 *professional-collected nasal versus nasopharyngeal swab*. *European Respiratory Journal*,
857 2020. **57**(5): p. 2004430.
- 858 113. Lindner, A.K., et al., *Head-to-head comparison of SARS-CoV-2 antigen-detecting rapid test*
859 *with self-collected nasal swab versus professional-collected nasopharyngeal swab*. *European*
860 *Respiratory Journal*, 2021. **57**(4).
- 861 114. Lindner, A.K., et al., *Diagnostic accuracy and feasibility of patient self-testing with a SARS-*
862 *CoV-2 antigen-detecting rapid test*. *Journal of Clinical Virology*, 2021. **141**: p. 104874.
- 863 115. Liotti, F.M., et al., *Performance of a novel diagnostic assay for rapid SARS-CoV-2 antigen*
864 *detection in nasopharynx samples*. *Clinical Microbiology and Infection*, 2020. **27**: p. 487–488.
- 865 116. Lunca, C., et al., *Performance of antigenic detection of SARS-CoV-2 in nasopharyngeal*
866 *samples*. medRxiv [Preprint]; published July 16, 2021.
- 867 117. Menchinelli, G., et al., *SARS-CoV-2 Antigen Detection to Expand Testing Capacity for COVID-*
868 *19: Results from a Hospital Emergency Department Testing Site*. *Diagnostics*, 2021. **11**(7).
- 869 118. Merino-Amador, P., et al., *Clinitest rapid COVID-19 antigen test for the diagnosis of SARS-*
870 *CoV-2 infection: A multicenter evaluation study*. *Journal of Clinical Virology*, 2021. **143**: p.
871 104961.
- 872 119. Merino-Amador, P., et al., *Multicenter evaluation of the Panbio™ COVID-19 Rapid Antigen-*
873 *Detection Test for the diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2 infection*. *Clinical Microbiology and Infection*,
874 2020. **27**(5): p. 758-761.
- 875 120. Mertens, P., et al., *Development and Potential Usefulness of the COVID-19 Ag Respi-Strip*
876 *Diagnostic Assay in a Pandemic Context*. *Frontiers in Medicine*, 2020. **7**: p. 225.
- 877 121. Micocci, M., et al., *Point of Care Testing using rapid automated Antigen Testing for SARS-*
878 *COV-2 in Care Homes – an exploratory safety, usability and diagnostic agreement evaluation*.
879 medRxiv [Preprint]; published April 26, 2021.

- 880 122. Möckel, M., et al., *SARS-CoV-2 Antigen Rapid Immunoassay for Diagnosis of COVID-19 in the*
881 *Emergency Department*. *Biomarkers*, 2021. **26**(3): p. 213-220.
- 882 123. Muhi, S., et al., *Multi-site assessment of rapid, point-of-care antigen testing for the diagnosis*
883 *of SARS-CoV-2 infection in a low-prevalence setting: A validation and implementation study*.
884 *Lancet Regional Health Western Pacific*, 2021. **9**: p. 100115.
- 885 124. Nalumansi, A., et al., *Field Evaluation of the Performance of a SARS-CoV-2 Antigen Rapid*
886 *Diagnostic Test in Uganda using Nasopharyngeal Samples*. *International Journal of Infectious*
887 *Diseases*, 2020. **104**: p. 282-286.
- 888 125. Ngo Nsoga, M.T., et al., *Diagnostic accuracy of Panbio rapid antigen tests on oropharyngeal*
889 *swabs for detection of SARS-CoV-2*. *PLoS ONE*, 2021. **16**(6): p. e0253321.
- 890 126. Nikolai, O., et al., *Anterior nasal versus nasal mid-turbinate sampling for a SARS-CoV-2*
891 *antigen-detecting rapid test: does localisation or professional collection matter?* *Infectious*
892 *Diseases*, 2021: p. 1-6.
- 893 127. Nordgren, J., et al., *SARS-CoV-2 rapid antigen test: High sensitivity to detect infectious virus*.
894 *Journal of Clinical Virology*, 2021. **140**: p. 104846.
- 895 128. Okoye, N.C., et al., *Performance Characteristics of BinaxNOW COVID-19 Antigen Card for*
896 *Screening Asymptomatic Individuals in a University Setting*. *Journal of Clinical Microbiology*,
897 2021. **59**(4): p. e03282-20.
- 898 129. Onsongo, S.N., et al., *Field performance of NowCheck rapid antigen test for SARS-CoV-2 in*
899 *Kisumu County, western Kenya*. medRxiv [Preprint]; published August 13, 2021.
- 900 130. Orsi, A., et al., *On-field evaluation of a ultra-rapid fluorescence immunoassay as a frontline*
901 *test for SARS-COV-2 diagnostic*. *Journal of Virological Methods*, 2021. **295**: p. 114201.
- 902 131. Osmanodja, B., et al., *Accuracy of a Novel SARS-CoV-2 Antigen-Detecting Rapid Diagnostic*
903 *Test from Standardized Self-Collected Anterior Nasal Swabs*. *Journal of Clinical Medicine*,
904 2021. **10**(10).
- 905 132. Osterman, A., et al., *Evaluation of two rapid antigen tests to detect SARS-CoV-2 in a hospital*
906 *setting*. *Medical Microbiology and Immunology*, 2021. **210**(1): p. 65-72.
- 907 133. Osterman, A., et al., *Comparison of four commercial, automated antigen tests to detect SARS-*
908 *CoV-2 variants of concern*. *Medical Microbiology and Immunology*, 2021: p. 1-13.
- 909 134. Parada-Ricart, E., et al., *Usefulness of the antigen for diagnosing SARS-CoV-2 infection in*
910 *patients with and without symptoms*. *Enfermedades Infecciosas y Microbiología Clínica*,
911 2020. **39**: p. 357-358.
- 912 135. Pekosz, A., et al., *Antigen-based testing but not real-time PCR correlates with SARS-CoV-2*
913 *virus culture*. *Clinical Infectious Diseases*, 2020. **ciaa1706**.
- 914 136. Pena, M., et al., *Performance of SARS-CoV-2 rapid antigen test compared with real-time RT-*
915 *PCR in asymptomatic individuals*. *International Journal of Infectious Diseases*, 2021. **107**: p.
916 201-204.
- 917 137. Pérez-García, F., et al., *Diagnostic performance of CerTest and Panbio antigen rapid*
918 *diagnostic tests to diagnose SARS-CoV-2 infection*. *Journal of Clinical Virology*, 2021. **137**: p.
919 104781.
- 920 138. Perez-Garcia, F., et al., *Comparative evaluation of Panbio and SD Biosensor antigen rapid*
921 *diagnostic tests for COVID-19 diagnosis*. *Journal of Medical Virology*, 2021. **93**(9): p. 5650-
922 5654.
- 923 139. Peto, T., *COVID-19: Rapid antigen detection for SARS-CoV-2 by lateral flow assay: A national*
924 *systematic evaluation of sensitivity and specificity for mass-testing*. *EClinicalMedicine*, 2021.
925 **36**: p. 100924.
- 926 140. Pickering, S., et al., *Comparative performance of SARS-CoV-2 lateral flow antigen tests and*
927 *association with detection of infectious virus in clinical specimens: a single-centre laboratory*
928 *evaluation study*. *Lancet Microbe*, 2021. **2**(9): p. E461-E471.
- 929 141. Pilarowski, G., et al., *Performance characteristics of a rapid SARS-CoV-2 antigen detection*
930 *assay at a public plaza testing site in San Francisco*. *The Journal of Infectious Diseases*, 2020.
931 **223**(7): p. 1139-1144.

- 932 142. Pollock, N., et al., *Performance and Implementation Evaluation of the Abbott BinaxNOW*
933 *Rapid Antigen Test in a High-throughput Drive-through Community Testing Site in*
934 *Massachusetts*. Journal of Clinical Microbiology, 2021. **59**(5): p. e00083-21.
- 935 143. Pollock, N.R., et al., *Performance and Operational Evaluation of the Access Bio CareStart*
936 *Rapid Antigen Test in a High-Throughput Drive-Through Community Testing Site in*
937 *Massachusetts*. Open Forum Infectious Diseases, 2021. **8**(7): p. ofab243.
- 938 144. Porte, L., et al., *Evaluation of two fluorescence immunoassays for the rapid detection of SARS-*
939 *CoV-2 antigen - new tool to detect infective COVID-19 patients*. PeerJ, 2020. **9**: p. e10801.
- 940 145. Porte, L., et al., *Evaluation of a novel antigen-based rapid detection test for the diagnosis of*
941 *SARS-CoV-2 in respiratory samples*. International Journal of Infectious Diseases, 2020. **99**: p.
942 328-333.
- 943 146. Qahtani, M.A., et al., *SARS-CoV-2 rapid antigen testing for departing passengers at*
944 *Vancouver international airport*. Journal of Travel Medicine, 2021. **taab085**.
- 945 147. Ristić, M., et al., *Validation of the STANDARD Q COVID-19 antigen test in Vojvodina, Serbia*.
946 PLoS ONE, 2021. **16**(2): p. e0247606.
- 947 148. Rottenstreich, A., et al., *Rapid antigen detection testing for universal screening for severe*
948 *acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 in women admitted for delivery*. American Journal
949 of Obstetrics and Gynecology, 2021. **224**(5): p. 539-540.
- 950 149. Salvagno, G.L., et al., *Clinical assessment of the Roche SARS-CoV-2 rapid antigen test*.
951 Diagnosis, 2021. **8**(3): p. 322-326.
- 952 150. Sberna, G., et al., *Letter of concern re: "Immunochromatographic test for the detection of*
953 *SARS-CoV-2 in saliva*. J Infect Chemother. 2021 Feb;27(2):384-386. doi:
954 10.1016/j.jiac.2020.11.016.". Journal of Infection and Chemotherapy, 2021. **27**: p. 1129-
955 1130.
- 956 151. Schildgen, V., et al., *Limits and opportunities of SARS-CoV-2 antigen rapid tests – an*
957 *experience based perspective*. Pathogens, 2020. **10**(1): p. 38.
- 958 152. Schuit, E., et al., *Diagnostic accuracy of rapid antigen tests in asymptomatic and*
959 *presymptomatic close contacts of individuals with confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection: cross*
960 *sectional study*. British Medical Journal, 2021. **374**: p. n1676.
- 961 153. Schwob, J.-M., et al., *Diagnostic du Covid-19 en milieu ambulatoire*. Revue médicale suisse,
962 2020. **17**(737): p. 862-865.
- 963 154. Scohy, A., et al., *Low performance of rapid antigen detection test as frontline testing for*
964 *COVID-19 diagnosis*. Journal of Clinical Virology, 2020. **129**: p. 104455.
- 965 155. Seitz, T., et al., *Evaluation of rapid antigen tests based on saliva for the detection of SARS-*
966 *CoV-2*. Journal of Medical Virology, 2021. **93**: p. 4161-4162.
- 967 156. Seynaeve, Y., et al., *Evaluation of Two Rapid Antigenic Tests for the Detection of SARS-CoV-2*
968 *in Nasopharyngeal Swabs*. Journal of Clinical Medicine, 2021. **10**(13): p. 2774.
- 969 157. Shah, M., et al., *Performance of Repeat BinaxNOW SARS-CoV-2 Antigen Testing in a*
970 *Community Setting, Wisconsin, November-December 2020*. Clinical Infectious Diseases, 2021.
971 **73**: p. S54–S57.
- 972 158. Shaikh, N., et al., *Performance of a Rapid SARS-CoV-2 Antigen Detection Assay in*
973 *Symptomatic Children*. Pediatrics, 2021. **148**(3): p. e2021050832.
- 974 159. Shaw, J.L.V., et al., *Evaluation of the Abbott Panbio COVID-19 Ag rapid antigen test for the*
975 *detection of SARS-CoV-2 in asymptomatic Canadians*. Diagnostic Microbiology and Infectious
976 Disease, 2021. **101**(4): p. 115514.
- 977 160. Shidlovskaya, E., et al., *The Value of Rapid Antigen Tests to Identify Carriers of Viable SARS-*
978 *CoV-2*. medRxiv [Preprint]; published March 12, 2021.
- 979 161. Shrestha, B., et al., *Sensitivity and specificity of lateral flow antigen test kits for covid-19 in*
980 *asymptomatic population of quarantine centre of province 3*. Kathmandu University Medical
981 Journal, 2020. **18**(2): p. 36-39.

- 982 162. Smith, R.D., et al., *Clinical Evaluation of Sofia Rapid Antigen Assay for Detection of Severe*
983 *Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 among Emergency Department to Hospital*
984 *Admissions*. Infection Control and Hospital Epidemiology, 2021: p. 1-6.
- 985 163. Šterbenc, A., et al., *Usefulness of rapid antigen testing for SARS-CoV-2 screening of*
986 *healthcare workers: a pilot study*. Clinical and Experimental Medicine, 2021: p. 1-4.
- 987 164. Stohr, J., et al., *Self-testing for the detection of SARS-CoV-2 infection with rapid antigen tests*
988 *for people with suspected COVID-19 in the community*. Clinical Microbiology and Infection,
989 2021.
- 990 165. Stokes, W., et al., *Clinical performance of the Abbott Panbio with nasopharyngeal, throat,*
991 *and saliva swabs among symptomatic individuals with COVID-19*. European Journal of Clinical
992 Microbiology & Infectious Diseases, 2021. **40**(8): p. 1721-1726.
- 993 166. Strömer, A., et al., *Performance of a Point-of-Care Test for the Rapid Detection of SARS-CoV-2*
994 *Antigen*. Microorganisms, 2020. **9**(1).
- 995 167. Suzuki, H., et al., *Diagnostic performance of a novel digital immunoassay (RapidTesta SARS-*
996 *CoV-2): a prospective observational study with 1,127 nasopharyngeal samples*. medRxiv
997 [Preprint]; published August 04, 2021.
- 998 168. Takeda, Y., M. Mori, and K. Omi, *SARS-CoV-2 qRT-PCR Ct value distribution in Japan and*
999 *possible utility of rapid antigen testing kit*. medRxiv [Preprint]; published June 19, 2020.
- 1000 169. Takeuchi, Y., et al., *The evaluation of a newly developed antigen test (QuickNavi™-COVID19*
1001 *Ag) for SARS-CoV-2: A prospective observational study in Japan*. Journal of Infection and
1002 Chemotherapy, 2021. **27**(6): p. 890-894.
- 1003 170. Takeuchi, Y., et al., *Diagnostic performance and characteristics of anterior nasal collection for*
1004 *the SARS-CoV-2 antigen test: a prospective study*. Scientific Reports, 2021. **11**(1): p. 10519.
- 1005 171. Terpos, E., I. Ntanasis-Stathopoulos, and M. Skvarc, *Clinical Application of a New SARS-CoV-2*
1006 *Antigen Detection Kit (Colloidal Gold) in the Detection of COVID-19*. Diagnostics, 2021. **11**(6):
1007 p. 995.
- 1008 172. Thakur, P., et al., *Utility of Antigen-Based Rapid Diagnostic Test for Detection of SARS-CoV-2*
1009 *Virus in Routine Hospital Settings*. Laboratory Medicine, 2021. **Online ahead of print**.
- 1010 173. Thell, R., et al., *Evaluation of a novel, rapid antigen detection test for the diagnosis of SARS-*
1011 *CoV-2*. medRxiv [Preprint]; published April 22, 2021.
- 1012 174. Thirion-Romero, I., et al., *Evaluation of a rapid antigen test for SARS-CoV-2 in symptomatic*
1013 *patients and their contacts: a multicenter study*. medRxiv [Preprint]; published May 24, 2021.
- 1014 175. Tinker, S.C., et al., *Point-of-Care Antigen Test for SARS-CoV-2 in Asymptomatic College*
1015 *Students*. Emerging Infectious Diseases, 2021. **27**(10).
- 1016 176. Toptan, T., et al., *Evaluation of a SARS-CoV-2 rapid antigen test: potential to help reduce*
1017 *community spread?* Journal of Clinical Virology, 2020. **135**: p. 104713.
- 1018 177. Torres, I., et al., *Point-of-care evaluation of a rapid antigen test (CLINITEST) Rapid COVID-19*
1019 *Antigen Test) for diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2 infection in symptomatic and asymptomatic*
1020 *individuals*. Journal of Infection, 2021. **82**(5): p. e11–e12.
- 1021 178. Torres, I., et al., *Real-life evaluation of a rapid antigen test (Panbio COVID-19 Ag Rapid Test*
1022 *Device) for SARS-CoV-2 detection in asymptomatic close contacts of COVID-19 patients*.
1023 Clinical Microbiology and Infection, 2020. **27**(4): p. 636.E1-636.E4.
- 1024 179. Tsai, S.C., et al., *Real world clinical performance of SARS-CoV-2 rapid antigen tests in*
1025 *suspected COVID-19 cases in Taiwan*. Journal of the Formosan Medical Association, 2021.
1026 **120**(10): p. 2042-2043.
- 1027 180. Turcato, G., et al., *Clinical application of a rapid antigen test for the detection of SARS-CoV-2*
1028 *infection in symptomatic and asymptomatic patients evaluated in the emergency*
1029 *department: a preliminary report*. Journal of Infection, 2020. **82**: p. E14-E16.
- 1030 181. Van der Moeren, N., et al., *Evaluation of the test accuracy of a SARS-CoV-2 rapid antigen test*
1031 *in symptomatic community dwelling individuals in the Netherlands*. PLoS One, 2021. **16**(5): p.
1032 e0250886.

- 1033 182. Van Honacker, E., et al., *Comparison of five SARS-CoV-2 rapid antigen detection tests in a*
1034 *hospital setting and performance of one antigen assay in routine practice: a useful tool to*
1035 *guide isolation precautions?* Journal of Hospital Infection, 2021. **114**: p. 144-152.
- 1036 183. Villaverde, S., et al., *Diagnostic Accuracy of the Panbio SARS-CoV-2 Antigen Rapid Test*
1037 *Compared with Rt-Pcr Testing of Nasopharyngeal Samples in the Pediatric Population.* The
1038 Journal of Pediatrics, 2021. **232**: p. P287-289.E4.
- 1039 184. Weitzel, T., et al., *Comparative evaluation of four rapid SARS-CoV-2 antigen detection tests*
1040 *using universal transport medium.* Travel Medicine and Infectious Disease, 2020. **39**: p.
1041 101942.
- 1042 185. Weitzel, T., et al., *SARS-CoV-2 rapid antigen detection tests.* Lancet Infectious Diseases, 2021.
1043 **21**(8): p. 1067-1068.
- 1044 186. Wertenaue, C., et al., *Diagnostic Efficacy of Rapid Antigen Testing for SARS-CoV-2: The*
1045 *COVid-19 AntiGen (COVAG) study.* medRxiv [Preprint]; published August 07, 2021.
- 1046 187. Yin, N., et al., *SARS-CoV-2 Diagnostic Tests: Algorithm and Field Evaluation From the Near*
1047 *Patient Testing to the Automated Diagnostic Platform.* Frontiers in Medicine, 2021. **8**: p. 380.
- 1048 188. Young, B.C., D.W. Eyre, and K. Jeffery, *Use of lateral flow devices allows rapid triage of*
1049 *patients with SARS-CoV-2 on admission to hospital.* Journal of Infection, 2021. **82**: p. 276-316.
- 1050 189. Young, S., et al., *Clinical evaluation of BD Veritor SARS-CoV-2 point-of-care test performance*
1051 *compared to PCR-based testing and versus the Sofia 2 SARS Antigen point-of-care test.*
1052 Journal of Clinical Microbiology, 2020. **59**(1).
- 1053 190. Foundation for Innovative New Diagnostics, *FIND Evaluation of Bionote, Inc. NowCheck*
1054 *COVID-19 Ag Test.* External Report Version 1.5, 20 April 2021, 2020.
- 1055 191. Foundation for Innovative New Diagnostics, *FIND Evaluation of RapiGEN Inc. BIOCREDIT*
1056 *COVID-19 Ag.* External Report Version 2.1, 10 December, 2020.
- 1057 192. Foundation for Innovative New Diagnostics, *FIND Evaluation of SD Biosensor, Inc.*
1058 *STANDARD™ F COVID-19 Ag FIA.* External Report Version 2.1, 10 December, 2020.
- 1059 193. Foundation for Innovative New Diagnostics, *FIND Evaluation of SD Biosensor, Inc. STANDARD*
1060 *Q COVID-19 Ag Test.* External Report Version 2.1, 10 December, 2020.
- 1061 194. Foundation for Innovative New Diagnostics, *FIND Evaluation of Boditech Medical, Inc.*
1062 *iChroma COVID-19 Ag Test.* External Report Version 1.0, 23 February 2021, 2021.
- 1063 195. Foundation for Innovative New Diagnostics, *FIND Evaluation of Joysbio (Tianjin)*
1064 *Biotechnology Co., Ltd. SARS-CoV-2 Antigen Rapid Test Kit (Colloidal Gold).* External Report
1065 Version 1.0, 11 February 2021, 2021.
- 1066 196. Foundation for Innovative New Diagnostics, *FIND Evaluation of Guangzhou Wondfo Biotech*
1067 *Co., Ltd Wondfo 2019-nCoV Antigen Test (Lateral Flow Method).* Public Report Version 1.0, 25
1068 February 2021, 2021.
- 1069 197. Foundation for Innovative New Diagnostics, *FIND Evaluation of Abbott Panbio COVID-19 Ag*
1070 *Rapid Test Device (NASAL).* External Report Version 1.0, 11 February 2021, 2021.
- 1071 198. Foundation for Innovative New Diagnostics, *FIND Evaluation of Bionote, Inc. NowCheck*
1072 *COVID-19 Ag Test, nasal swab.* External Report Version 1.0, 30 March 2021, 2021.
- 1073 199. Foundation for Innovative New Diagnostics, *FIND Evaluation of Fujirebio Inc. Espline SARS-*
1074 *CoV-2.* External Report Version 1.0, 29 March 2021, 2021.
- 1075 200. Foundation for Innovative New Diagnostics, *FIND Evaluation of Mologic Ltd, COVID 19 RAPID*
1076 *ANTIGEN TEST.* External Report Version 1.0, 23 April 2021, 2021.
- 1077 201. Foundation for Innovative New Diagnostics, *FIND Evaluation of NADAL COVID-19 Ag Rapid*
1078 *Test.* External Report Version 1.0, 26 April 2021, 2021.
- 1079 202. Foundation for Innovative New Diagnostics, *FIND Evaluation of Acon Biotech (Hangzhou) Co.*
1080 *Ltd; Flowflex SARS-CoV-2 Antigen Rapid Test.* External Report Version 1.0, 9 June 2021, 2021.
- 1081 203. Foundation for Innovative New Diagnostics, *FIND Evaluation of Edinburgh Genetics;*
1082 *ActivXpress+ COVID-19 Antigen Complete Testing Kit.* External Report Version 1.0, 26 April
1083 2021, 2021.

- 1084 204. Foundation for Innovative New Diagnostics, *FIND Evaluation of Green Cross Medical Sciences Corp.; Genedia W COVID-19 Ag*. External Report Version 1.0, 25 April 2021, 2021.
- 1085
- 1086 205. Foundation for Innovative New Diagnostics, *FIND Evaluation of Hotgen; Novel Coronavirus 2019-nCoV Antigen Test (Colloidal Gold)*. External Report Version 2.0, [15 September 2021], 2021.
- 1087
- 1088
- 1089 206. Foundation for Innovative New Diagnostics, *FIND Evaluation of Abbott; Panbio COVID-19 Ag Rapid Test Device*. Country Specific External Report Version 1.0, 28 April 2021, 2021.
- 1090
- 1091 207. Foundation for Innovative New Diagnostics, *FIND Evaluation of Premier Medical Corporation Pvt. Ltd; Sure Status COVID-19 Antigen Card Test*. External Report Version 1.1, 18 August 2021, 2021.
- 1092
- 1093
- 1094 208. Foundation for Innovative New Diagnostics, *FIND Evaluation of SD Biosensor, Inc.; STANDARD Q COVID-19 Ag Test*. External Report (Continue from V2.1) Version 1, 22 April 2021, 2021.
- 1095
- 1096
- 1097 209. Foundation for Innovative New Diagnostics, *FIND Evaluation of SD Biosensor, Inc.; STANDARD Q COVID-19 Ag Test, nasal swab*. External Report Version 2.0, 12 April 2021, 2021.
- 1098
- 1099 210. Page, M.J., et al., *The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews*. British Medical Journal, 2021. **372**: p. n71.
- 1100
- 1101 211. Lindner, A., et al., *SARS-CoV-2 patient self-testing with an antigen-detecting rapid test: a head-to-head comparison with professional testing*. medRxiv [Preprint]; published January 08, 2021.
- 1102
- 1103
- 1104 212. Deerain, J., et al., *Assessment of the analytical sensitivity of ten lateral flow devices against the SARS-CoV-2 omicron variant*. J Clin Microbiol, 2021: p. jcm0247921.
- 1105
- 1106 213. Bekliz, M., et al., *Analytical sensitivity of seven SARS-CoV-2 antigen-detecting rapid tests for Omicron variant*. medRxiv [Preprint]; published December 22, 2021.
- 1107
- 1108 214. Kissler, S.M., et al., *Viral Dynamics of SARS-CoV-2 Variants in Vaccinated and Unvaccinated Persons*. N Engl J Med, 2021. **385**(26): p. 2489-2491.
- 1109
- 1110 215. Hay, J.A., et al., *Viral dynamics and duration of PCR positivity of the SARS-CoV-2 Omicron variant*. medRxiv [Preprint]; published January 14, 2022.
- 1111
- 1112 216. Adamson, B., et al., *Discordant SARS-CoV-2 PCR and Rapid Antigen Test Results When Infectious: A December 2021 Occupational Case Series*. medRxiv [Preprint]; published January 05, 2022.
- 1113
- 1114
- 1115 217. Marais, G., et al., *Saliva swabs are the preferred sample for Omicron detection*. medRxiv [Preprint]; published December 24, 2021.
- 1116
- 1117 218. Schrom, J., et al., *Direct Comparison of SARS CoV-2 Nasal RT- PCR and Rapid Antigen Test (BinaxNOW(TM)) at a Community Testing Site During an Omicron Surge*. medRxiv [Preprint]; published January 12, 2022.
- 1118
- 1119
- 1120 219. Audigé, A., et al., *Reduced Relative Sensitivity of the Elecsys SARS-CoV-2 Antigen Assay in Saliva Compared to Nasopharyngeal Swabs*. Microorganisms, 2021. **9**(8): p. 1700.
- 1121
- 1122 220. Dye, C., et al., *Data sharing in public health emergencies: a call to researchers*. Bull World Health Organ, 2016. **94**(3): p. 158.
- 1123
- 1124 221. Modjarrad, K., et al., *Developing Global Norms for Sharing Data and Results during Public Health Emergencies*. PLoS Med, 2016. **13**(1): p. e1001935.
- 1125
- 1126 222. Mina, M.J., R. Parker, and D.B. Larremore, *Rethinking Covid-19 Test Sensitivity - A Strategy for Containment*. New England Journal of Medicine, 2020. **383**(22).
- 1127
- 1128