

24 **Abstract**

25 **Objectives:** Antigen-based rapid diagnostic tests (Ag-RDTs) have been widely used for the detection of
26 SARS-CoV-2 during the Covid-19 pandemic. In settings of low disease prevalence, such as asymptomatic
27 community testing, national guidelines recommend molecular confirmation of positive Ag-RDT results.
28 This often requires patients to be recalled for repeat specimen recollection and subsequent testing in
29 reference laboratories. This project assessed the use of a point-of-care molecular method for SARS-CoV-
30 2 detection on-site at a volunteer-led asymptomatic community testing site, using the residual test
31 buffer (RTB) from positive Ag-RDTs.

32 **Methods:** The Abbott COVID-19 ID NOW assay was performed on RTB from two Ag-RDTs: the Abbott
33 Panbio COVID-19 Ag Rapid Test Device and the BTNX Rapid Response COVID-19 Antigen Rapid Test
34 Device. All RTBs were tested using real-time RT-PCR at a reference laboratory using the ThermoFisher
35 TaqPath COVID-19 Combo kit which was used to assign positive Ag-RDTs results as true or false
36 positives. Analytical specificity of the ID NOW was assessed with a panel of various respiratory
37 organisms.

38 **Results:** Of 419 positive Ag-RDTs from 5148 tests performed, ID NOW testing of the RTB was positive in
39 100% of the samples characterized as true positives by RT-PCR. No SARS-CoV-2 detections by ID NOW
40 were observed from 10 specimens characterized as false positive Ag-RDTs, or from contrived specimens
41 with various respiratory organisms.

42 **Conclusions:** The use of on-site molecular testing on RTB provides a suitable option for rapid
43 confirmatory testing of positive Ag-RDTs, thereby obviating the need for specimen recollection for
44 molecular testing at local reference laboratories.

45

46

47 **Introduction**

48 With their simplicity, speed, and scalability, antigen-based rapid diagnostic tests (Ag-RDTs) have been
49 deployed worldwide to facilitate SARS-CoV-2 detection.¹⁻⁵ Ag-RDT positive results has been associated
50 with the ability to culture SARS-CoV-2 *in vitro* or viral loads consistent with transmissible virus;
51 therefore, Ag-RDTs has been used as a surrogate for SARS-CoV-2 communicability.⁶⁻¹⁰ Nova Scotia was
52 the first Canadian province to implement Ag-RDTs for self-perceived asymptomatic individuals in low-
53 barrier volunteer-led community testing centres, to identify individuals at high risk of transmitting SARS-
54 CoV-2 that might otherwise have gone unnoticed.^{11,12} Following national guidelines, individuals with
55 positive Ag-RDTs were asked to return to testing centres for specimen recollection, and confirmatory
56 testing using nucleic acid amplification tests (NAATs) performed at local reference laboratories. To
57 streamline confirmation of positive Ag-RDTs, direct NAAT testing on the Ag-RDT residual test buffer
58 (RTB) was evaluated.

59 Like others¹³, our previous study demonstrated high sensitivity for SARS-CoV-2 detection using RTB from
60 nasopharyngeal and nasal swab collections.¹¹ RTB obviated the need for specimen recollection for
61 NAAT-based confirmation of Ag-RDT results, but RTB processing remained at the reference laboratory.
62 To further optimize community testing strategies, this project evaluated a portable NAAT-based rapid
63 diagnostic test (NAAT-RDT) for on-site confirmation of Ag-RDTs-positive results at the community testing
64 centers. The COVID-19 assay on the Abbott ID NOW instrument is an NAAT-RDT that uses isothermal
65 technology that is amenable to point-of-care applications.⁴ This NAAT-RDT is simple and provides rapid
66 results with high sensitivity and specificity, but its single-specimen processing limits its scalability for
67 testing large populations.¹⁴⁻¹⁶ Instead, this NAAT-RDT was evaluated for rapid confirmation of SARS-CoV-
68 2 using RTB from positive Ag-RDTs, at the site of sample collection (Table 1).

69 The assessment was performed in two stages on asymptomatic individuals presenting to urban rapid
70 testing sites. The first overlapping with the ISNOT project (designed to compare SARS-CoV-2 Ag-RDT
71 results from self-administered nasal and throat collections)¹² (Table S1 and S2), and the second was an
72 extension of the project where additional positive Ag-RDT RTBs were tested over a subsequent two-
73 week period (Table S3). In both cases, Ag-RDT self-testing using the Panbio COVID-19 Ag Rapid Test
74 Device (Abbott Rapid Diagnostics, Jena, Germany) or the Rapid Response COVID-19 Antigen Rapid Test
75 Device (BTNX Inc., Markham, ON) was used. Ag-RDTs were interpreted according to manufacturer
76 instructions, and SARS-CoV-2 target bands were graded with scores of 0 (negative), +/- (barely visible),
77 or 1+, 2+ or 3+ relative to the intensity of the control band. RTB from either Ag-RDT were subjected to
78 two NAATs. The COVID-19 ID Now assay (Abbott Diagnostics, Scarborough, MA) was performed on-site
79 following manufacturer instructions, except two drops of RTB that were added to the sample chamber
80 prior to processing the original Ag-RDT collection swab. The remaining RTB and swab were transported
81 to a central laboratory in the Ag-RDT reaction tube, and 200 µl of viral transport medial (VTM)
82 (Rodoxica, Little Rock, AR) was added to the tube. Following vortexing for 10 seconds, 200 µl of
83 VTM/RTB fluid was subjected to a total nucleic acid extraction (TNA) on a MagNA Pure 96 or LC 2.0
84 instrument (Roche Diagnostics Ltd., Roltkreuz, Switzerland), and 5 µl of the 50 µl of eluted TNAs were
85 used as template for real-time RT-PCR using the TaqPath COVID-19 Combo Kit (Life Technologies Corp.,
86 Frederick, MD).

87 Of 1472 individuals who consented to the ISNOT project¹², 159 and 58 were positive using the Panbio
88 (Table 1) and BTNX (Table S1) Ag-RDTs, respectively. The ID NOW was positive for all Ag-RDT positive
89 RTB samples, regardless of anatomical site of collection, Ag-RDT method used, antigen score, or RT-PCR
90 threshold cycle (Ct) value (Tables S1 and S2). No false positives were identified, suggesting high
91 specificity. This data supports use of the NAAT-RDT to quickly rule-in SARS-CoV-2 using RTB from
92 positive Ag-RDTs, thereby ruling out false positive Ag-RDT reactions. However, further testing was

93 needed to verify if false positive Ag-RDTs would be negative with the ID NOW assay. First, highly
94 concentrated nucleic acids from various respiratory microorganisms were spiked into 300 μ l Panbio
95 buffer and tested with the ID NOW assay. The assay detected a variety of SARS-CoV-2 lineages, but no
96 cross-reactions were observed with other respiratory organisms (Table S4). Then, for two weeks
97 following the ISNOT project, RTB from positive Ag-RDT reactions were subjected to ID NOW and RT-PCR
98 testing (Table S3). Of 3676 individuals tested, 147 had positive Ag-RDTs, and 137 were positive for both
99 ID NOW and RT-PCR. There were 10 false positive Ag-RDTs compared to RT-PCR, and these were also
100 negative by ID NOW. Consistent with our previous study¹¹, false positive Ag-RDTs were described as
101 having barely visible target bands, with antigen scores +/- or 1+. The proportion of false positives
102 observed (10/3676 or 0.3%) is consistent with manufacturer and literature claims, where false positive
103 reactions are rare at approximately 0.4%^{18,19}.

104 Specificity was the focus for the intended use of the ID NOW in this investigation. Sensitivity analyses
105 would require IDNOW and RT-PCR testing on all Ag-RDT RTB negative specimens, which would not
106 typically be performed in community-based surveillance. Some sensitivity data was captured during the
107 ISNOT quality initiative¹², as the ID NOW was performed in parallel on Ag-RDT RTB from paired swabs
108 samples from positive individuals. As such, some specimens were negative by Ag-RDT for one swab type
109 of the paired collection, but positive results were obtained by ID NOW and/or RT-PCR. While Ag-RDTs
110 appear less sensitive than NAATs (as seen in Tables S1 and S2), it has been argued that the additional
111 detections by NAATs often represent remnant RNA from resolved infections, when the risk for
112 transmission is low.²⁰⁻²³ Alternatively, it may represent periods of early infection that are short-lived in
113 population-based testing and can be mitigated by frequent testing over time with Ag-RDTs.²⁰⁻²³
114 Importantly, ID NOW confirmed all true positive Ag-RDTs, as well as detected 88.2% (30/34) and 85.7%
115 (18/21) of negative Panbio and BTNX Ag-RDT RTBs that tested positive by RT-PCR, respectively (Tables
116 S1 and S2). Discrepant results between ID NOW and RT-PCR were in specimens with Ct values \geq 30,

117 suggesting low viral loads. Altogether, the ID NOW was found to be sufficiently sensitive to be used as a
118 confirmatory method for Ag-RDTs.

119 Overall, ID NOW confirmed 409 true positive Ag-RDT results, ruled out 10 false positives, and there was
120 no cross-reactivity with other respiratory organisms. The applications of rapid NAAT-RDT confirmation
121 of positive Ag-RDTs on-site using RTB obviates the need for individuals to return for repeat specimen
122 collection for NAAT testing at local reference laboratories, as well as the need for trained personnel for
123 shipping biological samples to reference laboratories. With recent surges of SARS-CoV-2 activity with the
124 highly transmissible Omicron variant, many clinical laboratories were overwhelmed with high testing
125 demands, hampering their ability to support confirmation for Ag-RDT-positive results. Given wide
126 community spread, and the low proportion of false positive results during this period of high disease
127 prevalence, NAAT-based confirmation of Ag-RDT results was not prioritized. However, in the wake of
128 pandemic waves as disease prevalence decreases, the possibility of false positive Ag-RDT increases and
129 confirmatory testing for Ag-RDT will again become important to consider.^{24,25} The use of RTB testing
130 with NAAT-RDTs provides a feasible and accurate option for rapid confirmatory testing of positive Ag-
131 RDTs at community testing sites.

132 **Acknowledgements**

133 The authors are indebted to the community participants for this evaluation, and to the many Test-to-
134 Protect volunteers and coaches who have worked countless hours throughout the pandemic to ensure
135 the safety of their community and community members. The authors would also like to thank the
136 clinical laboratories across Nova Scotia, who have supported confirmation of Ag-RDTs results throughout
137 the pandemic.

138 **Funding**

139 The authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest. This work received no private or public
140 funding, except for the Ag-RDT kits that were provided in-kind from the government of Canada. RT-PCR
141 testing was provided in-kind by the Division of Microbiology, Department of Pathology and Laboratory
142 Medicine, Nova Scotia Health.

143 **Ethics**

144 This project was deemed a quality initiative and was therefore exempt from review by the Nova Scotia
145 Health Research Ethics Board (submission number 1027644). Specimens tested were obtained from
146 consenting participants, and all data related were provided anonymized, de-identified, and were used
147 solely with the intent to evaluate the performance characteristics of the different swab types for rapid
148 antigen testing programs used in Nova Scotia.

149 **Author contributions**

150 All authors were involved in the design, data acquisition, and data interpretation. JL, GP, and TH drafted
151 the initial manuscript, with all authors contributing, and agree with the content of the final version.

152 **References**

- 153 1. Matsuda EM, de Campos IB, de Oliveira IP, Colpas DR, Carmo AMDS, Brígido LFM. Field evaluation of
154 COVID-19 antigen tests versus RNA based detection: Potential lower sensitivity compensated by
155 immediate results, technical simplicity, and low cost. *J Med Virol*. 2021;93(7):4405-4410. doi:
156 10.1002/jmv.26985. PMID: 33788270; PMCID: PMC8250877.
- 157 2. Schwartz KL, McGeer AJ, Bogoch II. Rapid antigen screening of asymptomatic people as a public
158 health tool to combat COVID-19. *CMAJ*. 2021;193(13):E449-E452. doi: 10.1503/cmaj.210100. PMID:
159 33658247; PMCID: PMC8099167.

- 160 3. Pavelka M, Van-Zandvoort K, Abbott S, Sherratt K, Majdan M; CMMID COVID-19 working group;
161 Inštitút Zdravotných Analýz, Jarčuška P, Krajčí M, Flasche S, Funk S. The impact of population-wide
162 rapid antigen testing on SARS-CoV-2 prevalence in Slovakia. *Science*. 2021;372(6542):635-641. doi:
163 10.1126/science.abf9648. PMID: 33758017; PMCID: PMC8139426.
- 164 4. Safiabadi Tali SH, LeBlanc JJ, Sadiq Z, Oyewunmi OD, Camargo C, Nikpour B, Armanfard N, Sagan SM,
165 Jahanshahi-Anbui S. Tools and techniques for severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2
166 (SARS-CoV-2)/COVID-19 detection. *Clin Microbiol Rev*. 2021;34(3):e00228-20. doi:
167 10.1128/CMR.00228-20. PMID: 33980687; PMCID: PMC8142517.
- 168 5. Martín-Sánchez V, Fernández-Villa T, Carvajal Urueña A, Rivero Rodríguez A, Reguero Celada S,
169 Sánchez Antolín G, Fernández-Vázquez JP. Role of rapid antigen testing in population-based SARS-
170 CoV-2 screening. *J Clin Med*. 2021;10(17):3854. doi: 10.3390/jcm10173854. PMID: 34501297;
171 PMCID: PMC8432187.
- 172 6. Bullard J, Dust K, Funk D, Strong JE, Alexander D, Garnett L, Boodman C, Bello A, Hedley A, Schiffman
173 Z, Doan K, Bastien N, Li Y, Van Caesele PG, Poliquin G. Predicting infectious severe acute respiratory
174 syndrome coronavirus 2 from diagnostic samples. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2020;71(10):2663-2666. doi:
175 10.1093/cid/ciaa638. PMID: 32442256; PMCID: PMC7314198.
- 176 7. Pekosz A, Parvu V, Li M, Andrews JC, Manabe YC, Kodsi S, Gary DS, Roger-Dalbert C, Leitch J, Cooper
177 CK. Antigen-based testing but not real-time polymerase chain reaction correlates with severe acute
178 respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 viral culture. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2021;73(9):e2861-e2866. doi:
179 10.1093/cid/ciaa1706. PMID: 33479756; PMCID: PMC7929138.
- 180 8. Pickering S, Batra R, Merrick B, Snell LB, Nebbia G, Douthwaite S, Reid F, Patel A, Kia Ik MT, Patel B,
181 Charalampous T, Alcolea-Medina A, Lista MJ, Cliff PR, Cunningham E, Mullen J, Doores KJ, Edgeworth
182 JD, Malim MH, Neil SJD, Galão RP. Comparative performance of SARS-CoV-2 lateral flow antigen
183 tests and association with detection of infectious virus in clinical specimens: a single-centre

- 184 laboratory evaluation study. *Lancet Microbe*. 2021;2(9):e461-e471. doi: 10.1016/S2666-
185 5247(21)00143-9.
- 186 9. Kohmer N, Toptan T, Pallas C, Karaca O, Pfeiffer A, Westhaus S, Widera M, Berger A, Hoehl S,
187 Kammel M, Ciesek S, Rabenau HF. The comparative clinical performance of four SARS-CoV-2 rapid
188 antigen tests and their correlation to infectivity in vitro. *J Clin Med*. 2021;10(2):328. doi:
189 10.3390/jcm10020328. PMID: 33477365; PMCID: PMC7830733.
- 190 10. Tariq M, Kim DM, Kim CM, Bang MS, Lee YM, Seo JW, Kim DY, Yun NR. Viable severe acute
191 respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 isolates exhibit higher correlation with rapid antigen assays than
192 subgenomic RNA or genomic RNA. *Front Microbiol*. 2021;12:718497. doi:
193 10.3389/fmicb.2021.718497. PMID: 34867844; PMCID: PMC8633410.
- 194 11. Patriquin G, LeBlanc JJ, Williams C, Hatchette TF, Ross J, Barrett L, Davidson R. Comparison between
195 nasal and nasopharyngeal swabs for SARS-CoV-2 rapid antigen detection in an asymptomatic
196 population, and direct confirmation by RT-PCR from the residual buffer. *Microbiol Spectr*. 2022 Feb
197 16:e0245521. doi: 10.1128/spectrum.02455-21. PMID: 35171010.
- 198 12. Goodall B, LeBlanc JJ, Hatchette TF, Barrett L, Patriquin G. Investigating sensitivity of nasal or throat
199 (ISNOT): A combination of both swabs increases sensitivity of SARS-CoV-2 rapid antigen tests.
200 medRxiv 2022.01.18.22269426; doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.18.22269426>. [submitted to
201 *Microbiology Spectrum*, Spectrum00217-22]
- 202 13. Castineiras TMPP, Nascimento ÉRDS, Faffe DS, Galliez RM, Mariani D, Leitão IC, de Melo MGM,
203 Ferreira OC, Tanuri A; UFRJ COVID-19 Working group. Performance of an alternative RT-PCR
204 procedure using residual sample from the Panbio Ag COVID-19 test. *Braz J Infect Dis*.
205 2021;25(5):101630. doi: 10.1016/j.bjid.2021.101630. PMID: 34648741; PMCID: PMC8506141.
- 206 14. Ramachandran A, Noble J, Deucher A, Miller S, Tang PW, Wang RC. Performance of Abbott ID-Now
207 rapid nucleic amplification test for laboratory identification of COVID-19 in asymptomatic

- 208 emergency department patients. *J Am Coll Emerg Physicians Open*. 2021;2(6):e12592. doi:
209 10.1002/emp2.12592. PMID: 35005704; PMCID: PMC8716572.
- 210 15. Stokes W, Berenger BM, Singh T, Adeghe I, Schneider A, Portnoy D, King T, Scott B, Pabbaraju K,
211 Shokoples S, Wong AA, Gill K, Turnbull L, Hu J, Tipples G. Acceptable performance of the Abbott ID
212 NOW among symptomatic individuals with confirmed COVID-19. *J Med Microbiol*.
213 2021;70(7):001372. doi: 10.1099/jmm.0.001372. PMID: 34309503; PMCID: PMC8493423.
- 214 16. Smithgall MC, Scherberkova I, Whittier S, Green DA. Comparison of Cepheid Xpert Xpress and
215 Abbott ID Now to Roche cobas for the Rapid Detection of SARS-CoV-2. *J Clin Virol*. 2020;128:104428.
216 doi: 10.1016/j.jcv.2020.104428. PMID: 32434706; PMCID: PMC7217789.
- 217 17. Graham M, Muhi S, Hoang T, Ballard SA, McAuley J, Kwong JC, Williamson DA, Howden BP; COVID-
218 19 Diagnostics Research Group. Multi-site point of care assessment of Abbott ID NOW rapid
219 molecular test for SARS-CoV-2 in a low-prevalence setting. *Pathology*. 2021;53(7):912-914. doi:
220 10.1016/j.pathol.2021.07.002. PMID: 34561096; PMCID: PMC8416649.
- 221 18. Patriquin G, Davidson RJ, Hatchette TF, Head BM, Mejia E, Becker MG, Meyers A, Sandstrom P,
222 Hatchette J, Block A, Smith N, Ross J, LeBlanc JJ. Generation of false-positive SARS-CoV-2 antigen
223 results with testing conditions outside manufacturer recommendations: A scientific approach to
224 pandemic misinformation. *Microbiol Spectr*. 2021;9(2):e0068321. doi: 10.1128/Spectrum.00683-21.
225 Epub 2021 Oct 20. PMID: 34668722; PMCID: PMC8528119.
- 226 19. Hledík M, Polechová J, Beiglböck M, Herdina AN, Strassl R, Posch M. Analysis of the specificity of a
227 COVID-19 antigen test in the Slovak mass testing program. *PLoS One*. 2021;16(7):e0255267. doi:
228 10.1371/journal.pone.0255267. PMID: 34324553; PMCID: PMC8320988.
- 229 20. Larremore DB, Wilder B, Lester E, Shehata S, Burke JM, Hay JA, Tambe M, Mina MJ, Parker R. Test
230 sensitivity is secondary to frequency and turnaround time for COVID-19 screening. *Sci Adv*.
231 2021;7(1):eabd5393. doi: 10.1126/sciadv.abd5393. PMID: 33219112; PMCID: PMC7775777.

- 232 21. Mina MJ, Parker R, Larremore DB. Rethinking Covid-19 test sensitivity - A strategy for containment.
233 N Engl J Med. 2020;383(22):e120. doi: 10.1056/NEJMp2025631. PMID: 32997903.
- 234 22. Chin ET, Huynh BQ, Chapman LAC, Murrill M, Basu S, Lo NC. Frequency of routine testing for
235 coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) in high-risk healthcare environments to reduce outbreaks. Clin
236 Infect Dis. 2021;73(9):e3127-e3129. doi: 10.1093/cid/ciaa1383. PMID: 33570097; PMCID:
237 PMC7797732.
- 238 23. Patriquin G, LeBlanc JJ. SARS-CoV-2 sensitivity limbo - How low can we go? Int J Infect Dis.
239 2021;103:23-24. doi: 10.1016/j.ijid.2020.11.138. PMID: 33212261; PMCID: PMC7669480.
- 240 24. Skittrall JP, Wilson M, Smielewska AA, Parmar S, Fortune MD, Sparkes D, Curran MD, Zhang H, Jalal
241 H. Specificity and positive predictive value of SARS-CoV-2 nucleic acid amplification testing in a low-
242 prevalence setting. Clin Microbiol Infect. 2021;27(3):469.e9-469.e15. doi:
243 10.1016/j.cmi.2020.10.003. PMID: 33068757; PMCID: PMC7554481.
- 244 25. Jüni P, Baert S, Corbeil A, Johnstone J, Patel SN, Bobos P, Upton A, Barrett KA, Barrett LL, Bodmer
245 NS, Born KB, Bourns L, Evans GA, Hopkins J, Manuel DG, Morris AM, Razak F, Sander B, Science M,
246 Steiner R, Tepper J, Thampi N, McGeer A, on behalf of the Ontario COVID-19 Science Advisory Table.
247 Use of rapid antigen tests during the omicron wave. Science Briefs of the Ontario COVID-19 Science
248 Advisory Table. 2022;3(56). <https://doi.org/10.47326/ocsat.2022.03.56.1.0> [last accessed Feb 17,
249 2022].

Table 1. Summary of ID NOW results from all study phases.

Category			ID NOW results*			
			Nasal (n=164)	Throat (n=93)	Combined nasal/throat (n=162)	Total (n=419)
Antigen status	Ag+/NAAT+		100.0% (132/132)	100.0% (66/66)	100% (156/156)	100.0% (354/354)
	Ag+/NAAT-		0.0% (0/4)	N/A	0.0% (0/6)	0.0% (0/10)
	Ag-/NAAT+		82.1% (23/28)	92.6% (25/27)	N/A	87.3% (48/55)
Antigen score	Ag+/NAAT+	3+	100.0% (32/32)	100.0% (13/13)	100.0% (41/41)	100.0% (86/86)
		2+	100% (43/43)	100.0% (22/22)	100.0% (52/52)	100.0% (117/117)
		1+	100.0% (36/36)	100.0% (19/19)	100.0% (33/33)	100.0% (88/88)
		+/-	100.0% (21/21)	100.0% (12/12)	100.0% (30/30)	100.0% (63/63)
	Ag+/NAAT-	1+	0.0% (0/1)	N/A	0.0% (0/2)	0.0% (0/3)
		+/-	0.0% (0/3)	N/A	0.0% (0/4)	0.0% (0/7)
Ct value**	Ag+/NAAT+	<25	100.0% (28/28)	100.0% (6/6)	100.0% (62/62)	100.0% (96/96)
		25 to <30	100.0% (58/58)	100.0% (30/30)	100.0% (68/68)	100.0% (156/156)
		≥30	100.0% (46/46)	100.0% (30/30)	100.0% (26/26)	100.0% (102/102)
	Ag-/NAAT+	25 to <30	N/A	100.0% (4/4)	N/A	100.0% (4/4)
		≥30	82.1% (23/28)	91.3% (21/23)	N/A	86.3% (44/51)

*ID Now for individual test and project phases are provided in Tables S1, S2, and S3. **Ct values were categorized based on the N gene of the TaqPath real-time RT-PCR. Abbreviations: antigen (Ag); antigen-based rapid diagnostic test (Ag-RDT); threshold cycle (Ct); nucleic acid amplification test (NAAT); residual test buffer (RTB).