1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

Limits and opportunities of SARS-CoV-2 antigen rapid tests – an experience based perspective

Verena Schildgen^{1#}, Sabrina Demuth¹, Jessica Lüsebrink¹, and Oliver Schildgen¹

1. All Authors' affiliation: Kliniken der Stadt Köln gGmbH, Institut für Pathologie, Klinikum der Privaten Universität Witten/Herdecke, Ostmerheimer Str. 200, 51109 Köln

Send correspondence to:
Priv.-Doz.in. Dr. rer. nat. Verena Schildgen
Kliniken der Stadt Köln gGmbH
Klinikum der Privaten Universität Witten/Herdecke
Institut für Pathologie
Ostmerheimer Str. 200
D-51109 Köln (Cologne)
Germany
Tel.: +49(0)221-890718887
Fax.: +40(0)221-89073542
E-Mail: schildgenv@kliniken-koeln.de
verena.schildgen@uni-wh.de

23 Abstract

24 **Background:** Due to the steadily rising case numbers of SARS-CoV-2 infections worldwide
 25 there is an increasing need for reliable rapid diagnostic devices in addition to existing gold
 26 standard PCR-methods. Actually, public attention is focused on antigen assays including
 27 lateral flow tests (LFTs) as diagnostic alternative. Therefore, different LFTs were analyzed
 28 regarding their performance in a clinical setting.

29 **Material and Methods:** A pilot sample panel of 13 BALFs and 60 throat washing samples
 30 (TWs) with confirmed PCR results as well as 8 throat washes invalid by PCR was tested with
 31 the BIOCREREDIT test (RapiGEN), the Panbio™ assay (Abbott), and the SARS-CoV-2 Rapid
 32 Antigen Test (Roche).

33 **Conclusion:** The analyzed antigen test showed an inter-assay correlation of 27.4% with
 34 overall specificities ranging from 19.4% to 87.1%, while sensitivities of the respective tests
 35 ranged between 33.3% and 88.1%. Although these assays did not entirely meet all high
 36 expectations their benefit has to be carefully evaluated for the respective test strategy and
 37 setting.

38

39

40 Introduction:

41 In December 2019 the public became aware of the new betacoronavirus SARS-CoV-2 due to
 42 an outbreak in Wuhan, China (1). Very soon it turned out that spreading of the virus cannot
 43 be prevented and Covid-19 was declared a pandemic in March 2020
 44 (<https://www.euro.who.int/en/health-topics/health-emergencies/coronavirus-covid-19/news/news/2020/3/who-announces-covid-19-outbreak-a-pandemic>). In order to minimize the
 46 risk of infection different undirected as well as targeted tracking strategies were developed,
 47 whose success is dependent on extensive testing of the largest possible number of people
 48 (2). For SARS-CoV-2 detection different PCRs are used in routine diagnostic. Although these
 49 PCRs actually represent the diagnostic gold standard (3), valuable time passes until the
 50 result is available (<https://www.nytimes.com/2020/08/04/us/virus-testing-delays.html>). Since it
 51 was shown that rapid antibody screenings are not suitable to evaluate chains of infection or
 52 their interruption, other kinds of rapid on-site tests are needed to perform the requested mass
 53 testing.

54 Among these are the BIOCREREDIT COVID-19 Ag test of RapiGEN (Korea), the Panbio™
 55 COVID-19 Ag of Abbott (Germany), and the SARS-CoV-2 Rapid Antigen Test of Roche
 56 (Germany). These lateral flow tests (LFTs) are based on immunochromatography and show
 57 SARS-CoV-2 antigen presence by a coloured test line. Sampling should be performed in the
 58 nasopharynx with a supplied swab, but except the Panbio™ assay UTM/VTM (universal/viral
 59 transport media) are also appropriate. Moreover it has been shown that specimen other than
 60 nasopharyngeal swaps are superior regarding diagnostic sensitivity (4, 5). For this reason we
 61 tested a pilot sample panel of 60 throat washes and 13 bronchoalveolar fluids (BALFs)
 62 regarding its test performance.

63 Material and Methods:

64 A pilot sample panel of 13 BALFs and 60 throat washing samples (TWs) with confirmed PCR
 65 results (RealStar® SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR Kit, Altona, Germany) as well as 8 throat washes
 66 invalid by PCR was tested with three SARS-CoV-2 antigen lateral flow tests (LFTs). We
 67 compared the BIOCREREDIT assay of RapiGEN, the Panbio™ assay of Abbott, and the SARS-
 68 CoV-2 Rapid Antigen Test of Roche. If supplied, controls were performed according to the
 69 manufacturer. For test procedure sample volumes of 55µl (Roche), 110 µl (Abbott), and 150
 70 µl (RapiGen) BALF/TW instead of extracted swap material were applied to the respective
 71 assays, but otherwise tests were performed according to the manufacturers'
 72 recommendations. Additional analysis with the above listed tests were performed with PCR
 73 invalid samples (n=8).

74 Results:

75 First, proper performance of the Panbio™ was confirmed with the supplied controls (fig. 1A).
 76 After pooling these controls were applied to the devices of Roche, which also detected the
 77 positive control, and of RapiGEN, which was negative for the Abbott controls (fig.1B). In
 78 order to figure out if SARS-CoV-2 antigen can be detected in specimens other than
 79 nasopharyngeal swabs we applied either diluted or original PCR positive specimen on the
 80 device and checked for the presence of the control line (C) and the test line (T). To increase
 81 the probability of antigen detection samples with Ct values <16 for E- and S-gene were used.
 82 Although there was not sufficient material of sample II, this pilot approach showed that the
 83 specimens used allow a proper test performance and that SARS-CoV-2 antigen can
 84 principally be detected in throat washes (I and II) and BALF (III) (fig. 2).

85 The analysis of the complete test cohort revealed overall sensitivities of 33.3% (RapiGEN),
 86 50% (Abbott), and 88.1% (Roche) with opposite overall specificities of 87.1% (RapiGEN),
 87 77.4% (Abbott), and 19.4% (Roche) (table 1). This means positive predictive values (PPVs)
 88 ranging from 59.7% (Roche) to 77.8% (RapiGEN) and negative predictive values (NPVs) of
 89 53.3% (Abbott), 54.6% (Roche) and 49.1% (RapiGEN).

90 The analysis of 50 samples confirmed symptomatic (46%) or asymptomatic (54%) with
 91 regard to the respective PCR result, led to sensitivity/specificity values in asymptomatic
 92 individuals of 30.8/92.9% (RapiGEN), 38.5/71.4% (Abbott), and 84.6/14.3% (Roche) and to
 93 sensitivity/specificity values in symptomatic individuals of 30.0/76.9% (RapiGEN),
 94 40.0/84.6% (Abbott), and 100/7.7% (Roche). Regarding the BALF specimens the assays of
 95 Abbott and Roche showed performance data of 72.7% or 81.8% sensitivity and 100%
 96 specificity, whereas RapiGEN also showed 100% specificity but 54.6% sensitivity (table 1).

97 When comparing the antigen tests with regard to their correlation it turned out that the
 98 RapiGEN-Roche coincidence was 35.6% (26 samples), the RapiGEN-Abbott coincidence
 99 64.4% (47 samples), and the Roche-Abbott coincidence 50.7% (37 samples). In total, the
 100 LFTs provided the same results in 20 out of 73 samples (27.4%). These results damped the
 101 expectation that PCR invalid samples could reliably be analyzed with any of these rapid
 102 antigen tests, especially as two of these samples (n=8) still remained invalid in one LFT,
 103 respectively, and only three samples coincide as negative in all LFTs.

104 When checking any correlation of viral RNA load and presence of SARS-CoV-2 antigen we
 105 were able to monitor two asymptomatic individuals, who were PCR positive for more than
 106 five weeks before recovering in week six. Ct values ranged from 27.9 to 34.3 in patient A

(data series dark grey) and from 23.8 to 35.2 in patient B (data series light grey). The BIOCREdit assay detected SARS-CoV-2 antigen only in three samples of patient A with Ct values >30 (figure 3). Sample four of patient B was only detected by the Panbio™ assay and sample 5 only by the SARS-CoV-2 Rapid Antigen Test of Roche. Sample 1 of patient A remained antigen negative in all tests, despite a positive PCR result, whereas none of the samples was identified as positive in all three assays.

Discussion:

Due to the pandemic spread of SARS-CoV-2 it would be desirable to possess reliable rapid tests for infection control by early notification of cases to enable an effective outbreak management. Therefore, R&D efforts are focused on rapid diagnostic tests including SARS-CoV-2 antigen tests.

Here we tested SARS-CoV-2 antigen assays by RapiGen, Abbott, and Roche. According to the manufacturers' instructions, sampling should be performed with supplied swaps, but this test procedure limits test comparability as every swap represents an individual sample even if taken from the same patient. For this reason, and because UTM/VTM is also appropriate except for the Panbio™ assay, we evaluated assay performance with BALF and throat washes as these were performed with a physiological solution of NaCl (0.9% w/v) and thus did not contain any additional interfering chemicals compared to the allowed transport media. Although the Panbio™ assay excludes specimens other than swaps, it is unlikely that the Panbio™ buffer components ProClin300 and sodium acid (preservatives) or Tricin (buffer substance capturing divalent metal ions) have direct influence on SARS-CoV-2 antigen binding capacity. Solely missing Tween20 might have influenced antigen binding in the PanBio™ assay, but although test control lines occurred properly in all PCR pre-tested samples the overall correlation between all LFTs was only 27.4%.

The fact that the positive control supplied by Abbott was detected by Roche, but not by RapiGen, suggests that the assays may detect different antigens, which additionally complicates the estimation of test comparability and usability in clinical routine settings. Especially, as it still remains unclear if further common phenomena such as defective interfering particles, antigen drift or antigen shift occur during the current pandemic influence assay performance of any SARS-CoV-2 antigen test.

As SARS-CoV-2 antigen is detected in samples of individuals ranging from asymptomatic + PCR negative, to symptomatic + PCR negative, to asymptomatic + PCR positive, to symptomatic + PCR positive, antigen tests are not suitable for routine diagnostics as long the

complex relationships between viral RNA load, SARS-CoV-2 antigen detection, and clinical symptoms remain unsolved. This conclusion is supported by the manufacturer's recommendations, who explicitly claim that their assays are not approved as stand-alone diagnostic and the limitations that the assay should be performed "in patients with clinical symptoms" (RapiGEN) or that the test "is not intended to detect from defective (non-infectious) virus during the later stages of viral shedding that might be detected by PCR molecular tests" (Abbott). This means that these assays are not appropriate for the screening of asymptomatic individuals and cannot be recommended to date to be broadly used in any setting in which reliable diagnostics are crucial to avoid spreading of the virus, such as hospitals and long-term care facilities for the elderly or other risk groups, especially, as limited information on host and viral factors influencing shedding of SARS-CoV-2 antigens and their correlation to infectious viruses impede any prognosis on infectivity.

Although it actually seems that exclusive antigen tests have research character rather than being true IVDs and unfortunately cannot replace PCR assays, they should additionally be used to gain deeper insights into infectivity and the course of infection to develop more advanced testing strategies.

157

158

159 **Figure 1: Controls of the Panbio™ COVID-19 Ag test (Abott).** A Supplied PCs (2, 4, 6, 8)
 160 and NCs (1, 3, 5, 7) of four kits were performed according to the manufacturer's protocol. B
 161 Controls of approach A were pooled and applied to the antigen tests of Roche (9, 10) and
 162 RapiGEN (11, 12). While the PC of Abbott also became positive with Roche (10), the
 163 BIOCREDIT test did not recognize the positive control (11). PC = positive control, NC =
 164 negative control

165

166

167

168 **Figure 2: SARS-CoV-2 antigen detection.** To evaluate the suitability of specimen others
169 than nasopharyngeal swabs two PCR positive throat washes (I: Ct_{E-Gen}=15,6, Ct_{S-Gen}=14,8; II:
170 Ct_{E-Gen}=14,7, Ct_{S-Gen}=14,9) and one BALF (III: Ct_{E-Gen}=13,1, Ct_{S-Gen}=12,6) were used for initial
171 evaluation of lateral flow test performance. SARS-CoV-2 antigen was detected with the
172 BIOCREREDIT test in all samples, but dilution in assay buffer (d: 1, 5, 7) decreases sensitivity
173 compared to original fluid (o: 2, 6, 8). Undiluted samples I and III were also used for an initial
174 analysis with the Panbio™ COVID-19 Ag test (Abott) (3, 9) and the SARS-CoV-2 Rapid
175 Antigen Test (Roche) (4, 10) also delivering positive results in both tests. As shown by the
176 control line the specimens allowed a proper test performance and did not contain any
177 inhibitory substances. d=1:2 diluted with supplied buffer, o= original

178

179

	RapiGEN		Abbott		Roche	
	Sensitivity	Specificity	Sensitivity	Specificity	Sensitivity	Specificity
BAL N=13	54.6	100	72.7	100	81.82	100
TW _{symptomatic} N=23	30.0	76.9	40.0	84.6	100	7.7
TW _{asymptomatic} N=27	30.8	92.9	38.5	71.4	84.6	14.3
Total N=73	33.3	87.1	50.0	77.4	88.1	19.4

180

181 **Table 1: Sensitivity* and specificity* of SARS-CoV-2 antigen detection in PCR tested**
182 **specimen.** Three LFTs were used for evaluation. Analysis of the complete test cohort (n=73)
183 reveals overall sensitivities of 33.3% (RapiGEN), 50.0% (Abbott), and 88.1% (Roche).
184 Overall specificities range from 19.4% (Roche) to 77.42% (Abbott) up to 87.1% (RapiGEN).
185 50 samples confirmed symptomatic or asymptomatic reveal highest sensitivities (84.6% and
186 100%), but poor specificities with Roche, whereas highest specificities (76.9% and 92.9%)
187 are reached by RapiGEN with sensitivities of 30% respectively. In total the three LFTs match
188 in 20 of 73 samples (27.4%). * in percent, BAL= bronchoalveolar lavage, TW= throat wash

189

190

191

192 **Figure 3: Correlation of SARS-CoV-2 antigen detection with RNA load.** This figure
193 shows longitudinal SARS-CoV-2 detection by PCR in two asymptomatic individuals (A: dark
194 grey; B: light grey). In both cases SARS-CoV-2 RNA could be detected for about five weeks
195 before recovering in week six. The BIOCRECREDIT assay (red) detected SARS-CoV-2 antigen
196 only in patient A in three samples with Ct >30. Although the assays of Abbott (green) and
197 Roche (yellow) identified 4 and 7 samples as positive, respectively, one sample remained
198 antigen negative (sample 1 of patient A). Except the negative sample there was no
199 coincidence between the LFTs at all. * only tested negative by BIOCRECREDIT due to insufficient
200 material

201

202

203 References:

- 204 1. Zhu N, Zhang D, Wang W, Li X, Yang B, Song J, et al. A Novel Coronavirus from Patients with
205 Pneumonia in China, 2019. The New England journal of medicine. 2020;382(8):727-33.
- 206 2. Fineberg HV. Ten Weeks to Crush the Curve. The New England journal of medicine.
207 2020;382(17):e37.
- 208 3. Smithgall MC, Dowlatshahi M, Spitalnik SL, Hod EA, Rai AJ. Types of Assays for SARS-CoV-2
209 Testing: A Review. Laboratory medicine. 2020;51(5):e59-e65.
- 210 4. Wyllie AL, Fournier J, Casanovas-Massana A, Campbell M, Tokuyama M, Vijayakumar P, et al.
211 Saliva or Nasopharyngeal Swab Specimens for Detection of SARS-CoV-2. The New England journal of
212 medicine. 2020.
- 213 5. Malecki M, Lusebrink J, Teves S, Wendel AF. Pharynx gargle samples are suitable for SARS-
214 CoV-2 diagnostic use and save personal protective equipment and swabs. Infection control and
215 hospital epidemiology. 2020:1-2.

216

217

218 Statements

219 The authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest

220 The study did not receive any external funding.

221 The study was performed in agreement with the approval 122/2016 of the Ethical Committee
222 of the Private University of Witten/Herdecke.