Evaluation of three rapid lateral flow antigen detection tests for the diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2 infection

Jääskeläinen AE¹, Ahava MJ¹, Jokela P¹, Szivovics L², Pohjala S³, Vapalahti O^{1, 2, 4}, Lappalainen M¹, Hepojoki J^{2, 5}, Kurkela S¹

¹HUS Diagnostic Center, HUSLAB, Clinical Microbiology, University of Helsinki and Helsinki University Hospital, Finland

²University of Helsinki, Faculty of Medicine, Medicum, Department of Virology, Finland

³Metropolia University of Applied Sciences, Helsinki, Finland

⁴University of Helsinki, Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, Department of Veterinary Biosciences, Helsinki, Finland

⁵University of Zürich, Vetsuisse Faculty, Institute of Veterinary Pathology, Zürich, Switzerland

Abstract

Introduction

The COVID-19 pandemic has led to high demand of diagnostic tools. Rapid antigen detection tests have been developed and many have received regulatory acceptance such as CE IVD or FDA markings. Their performance needs to be carefully assessed.

Materials and Methods

158 positive and 40 negative retrospective samples collected in saline and analyzed by a laboratory-developed RT-PCR test were used to evaluate Sofia (Quidel), Standard Q (SD Biosensor), and Panbio™ (Abbott) rapid antigen detection tests (RADTs). A subset of the specimens was subjected to virus culture.

Results

The specificity of all RADTs was 100% and the sensitivity and percent agreement was 80% and 85% for Sofia, 81% and 85% for Standard Q, and 83% and 86% for Panbio™, respectively. All three RADTs evaluated in this study reached a more than 90% sensitivity for samples with a high viral load as estimated from the low Ct values in the reference RT-PCR. Virus culture was successful in 80% of specimens with a Ct value <25.

Conclusions

As expected, the RADTs were less sensitive than RT-PCR. However, they benefit from the speed and ease of testing, and lower price as compared to RT-PCR. Repeated testing in appropriate settings may improve the overall performance.

39 Introduction

40

41 The superior analytical sensitivity and specificity makes RT-PCR the primary diagnostic tool for the
 42 detection of SARS-CoV-2 in respiratory samples [1-2]. Rapid antigen detection tests (RADTs) can be
 43 cheap and easy to use compared to RT-PCR. Contrary to PCR, antigen tests do not amplify the
 44 detected target, rendering them generally less sensitive [3]. The SARS-CoV-2 RADTs are relatively
 45 new in the market, without extensive evaluation. They appear to show very variable performance:
 46 according to a systematic review published in August 2020, RADT sensitivity values varied from 0%
 47 to 94% [4]. We evaluated three CE IVD marked SARS-CoV-2 RADTs: Sofia (Quidel), Standard Q COVID-
 48 19 Ag (SD Biosensor), and Panbio™ (Abbott). In each of these tests, the sample is suspended or
 49 diluted in a sample inactivation medium and transferred to a test device. If SARS-CoV-2 antigen is
 50 present above a threshold concentration, a line will appear in the test device within 15 minutes. For
 51 Panbio™ and Standard Q, the line is visible for a naked eye, and for Sofia, detection of the
 52 fluorescent signal is automated.

53

54 Materials and methods

55

56 The evaluation was performed at the HUS Diagnostic Center, the diagnostic laboratory of Helsinki
 57 University Hospital and Helsinki and Uusimaa Hospital District, Helsinki, Finland. Research permit
 58 HUS/157/2020 (Helsinki University Hospital, Finland) was obtained from the local review board.

59 Evaluated tests

60 We evaluated the performance of Quidel Sofia SARS FIA (Quidel, San Diego, CA), Standard Q COVID-
 61 19 Ag test (SD Biosensor, Republic of Korea), and Panbio™ (Abbott Diagnostic GmbH, Jena, Germany)
 62 according to each manufacturer's guidelines for samples in virus transport medium. All evaluated

63 tests are intended for fresh swab samples, so this is off-label use and leads to dilution of samples,
64 see Table 1.

65 **Reference test**

66 The samples were originally analyzed with a laboratory-developed RT-PCR test (LDT) based on the
67 method by Corman and others [5] and modified by us [6] to detect the N gene target of SARS-CoV-2.

68 **Patient samples**

69 A total of 198 nasopharyngeal swabs in 0.9% saline taken between April and November 2020 and
70 stored in -20°C were available for the study.

71 The analytical performance evaluation was conducted with 102 samples: 40 LDT negative and 62
72 positive samples, selected to cover a wide Ct value range. The Ct value of the positive control varied
73 between 26.35-32.66.

74 To investigate the test performance in an outpatient setting, another set of LDT positive samples
75 from adults from outpatient clinics and drive-through testing sites was included by selecting samples
76 systematically backwards from 18 November until 96 specimens were reached, i.e. November 1-18
77 2020. Samples from hospitals and occupational health services were excluded, as well as samples
78 that had less than the required 750 µl for three RADTs left. The positive control Ct values varied from
79 25.56 to 27.96. Eighty-seven samples were analyzed by Sofia, 90 by Panbio™ and 96 by Standard Q.

80 **Virus culture**

81 The PCR positive subset of samples used for analytical performance evaluation was subjected to
82 virus isolation experiments in Vero E6 TMRPSS2 cells as described in [7].

83 **Statistics**

84 Concordance of the results was examined in McNemars's test. Level of statistical significance was set
85 at $P < 0.05$. Cohen's kappa coefficient was computed to assess the agreement between the methods

by chance and Mann-Whitney U test was used to compare the Ct value medians. Statistical analysis was performed using SPSS/PASW statistical program package, version 25 (IBM SPSS Inc., Chicago, IL, USA).

Results

The performance of the Sofia, Standard Q and Panbio™ RADTs in comparison with the LDT RT-PCR was assessed by analysing 188, 198 and 190 specimens, respectively. The three RADTs provided valid results for all specimens. The specificity for all three tests was 100%: all RT-PCR negative samples tested negative. In all, the results of Sofia were 80.4% (119/148) consistent with the reference RT-PCR with a kappa value of 0.636 ($P < 0.001$). The Standard Q and Panbio™ tests achieved overall agreements of 84.85% and 86.32% as compared to the RT-PCR with kappa values of 0.633 ($P < 0.001$) and 0.660 ($P < 0.001$), respectively. For all of the RADTs, the observed difference to the reference PCR was statistically significant ($P < 0.001$). The median Ct values of the specimens positive with RADTs were significantly lower than those of the specimens with false negative results ($P < 0.001$ for all RADTs) (Table 2 and Figure 1).

Table 3 shows the results for the analytical evaluation of the tests, 62 positive and 40 negative samples in LDT RT-PCR with results of virus culture experiments. Of 18 culture positive specimens, 17 were positive in RADTs.

The Ct values in the 96 positive samples of the adult outpatients were 10.74-32.49. In all, 75 samples (78%) had a Ct value < 25 , sixteen (17%) had Ct values of 25-29.99 and five (5%) ≥ 30 . The sensitivity values of RADTs were 87% (Panbio™), 89% (Standard Q) and 92% (Sofia) but reached 92-96% for samples with Ct < 30 . (Table 4 and Figure 2).

Discussion

We evaluated three lateral-flow RADTs for the detection of SARS-CoV-2 infection in nasopharyngeal swab samples collected in 0.9% saline. Our results agree with previous observations that RADTs perform well in detecting culture positive samples and samples with high viral loads [8-11]. Compared to RT-PCR, the sensitivity of RADTs is low: in the present study the sensitivity was only 12-38% in samples with $Ct \geq 30$ (Table 2).

However, the distribution of Ct values of RT-PCR positive samples in settings where antigen detection tests could primarily be used is unknown. We wanted to approach the real-life setting by testing all positive outpatient adult samples tested by LDT in our laboratory during 2.5 weeks in November 2020. The testing strategy in Finland in November 2020 assumed patients to have at least mild symptoms of SARS-CoV-2 infection. Thus, this panel is unlikely to include asymptomatic or presymptomatic patients. During the time of evaluation, the sampling was available in average within 12 hours of seeking for testing. Although medical records of outpatients were not available, we assume the majority of this panel to consist of samples taken within a couple of days from symptom onset. 78% of samples had a Ct value < 25 , and 95% < 30 , of the N gene in our LDT. This may justify using antigen tests as a diagnostic tool even when their sensitivity compared to nucleic acid testing is poor for samples with high Ct values. Careful consideration between the advantages (ease, speed, costs) and disadvantages (lower sensitivity) needs to be conducted in the selection of appropriate testing strategies [11-12]. If RADTs are considered, laboratories need to perform independent clinical validations, as manufacturers' declaration of performance may not include satisfactory selection of clinical samples. WHO has stated SARS-CoV-2 a biohazard risk for laboratory personnel [13], which needs to be accounted for in RADT testing. In addition, RADTs are not easily scalable for mass testing.

The present study is limited by its retrospective nature. Ideally, samples for RADT evaluation should be collected according to manufacturer's instructions. Instead, we used frozen samples in saline. This may lead to underestimation of the sensitivity of the antigen detection tests.

All three RADTs, Sofia, Standard Q and Panbio™, were specific but less sensitive than RT-PCR. In appropriate settings, this disadvantage may be compensated by the ability to perform the test outside a central laboratory, the shorter turnaround time, and lower price. The sensitivity of the testing regimen as a whole can be increased by repeat testing [14]. Simple and cheap RADTs with a satisfactory performance, such as the three tests evaluated in this study, make repeated testing a realistic diagnostic approach in settings in which RT-PCR is not readily or quickly available.

Acknowledgements

We thank Marianne Ahola, Jenna Roivas and Laila Shakari for excellent technical assistance.

References

1. Matheeussen V, Corman VM, Donoso Mantke O, McCulloch E, Lammens C, Goossens H, Niemeyer D, Wallace PS, Klapper P, Niesters HGM, Drosten C, Ieven M, on behalf of the RECOVER project and collaborating networks. International external quality assessment for SARS-CoV-2 molecular detection and survey on clinical laboratory preparedness during the COVID-19 pandemic, April/May2020. [Euro Surveill.](https://doi.org/10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2020.25.27.2001223) 2020;25(27):pii=2001223. <https://doi.org/10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2020.25.27.2001223>
2. van Kasteren PB, van der Veer B, den Brink S, Wijsman L, Jonge J, van den Brandt A, Molenkamp R, Reusken CBEM, Meijer A. Comparison of seven commercial RT-PCR diagnostic kits for COVID-19. J Clin Virol 2020;128 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcv.2020.104412>
3. Merckx J, Wali R, Schiller I, Caya C, Gore GC, Chartrand C, Dendukuri N, Papenburg J. Diagnostic accuracy of novel and traditional rapid tests for influenza infection compared with reverse transcriptase polymerase chain reaction. A systematic review and meta-analysis. Annals of Internal Medicine 2017;6. Doi: 10.7326/M17-0848
4. Dinnes J, Deeks JJ, Adriano A, Berhane S, Davenport C, Dittrich S, Emperador D, Takwoingi Y, Cunningham J, Beese S, Dretzke J, Ferrante di Ruffano L, Harris IM; Price MJ, Taylor-Phillips S, Hooft L, Leeflang MM, Spijker R, Van den Bruel A, Cochrane COVID-19 Diagnostic Test Accuracy Group: Rapid, point-of-care antigen and molecular-based tests for diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2 infection. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews 2020;8. DOI: 10.1002/14651858.CD013705.
5. Corman VM, Landt O, Kaiser M, Molenkamp R, Meijer A, Chu DK, Bleicker T, Brünink S, Schneider J, Schmidt ML, Mulders DG, Haagmans BL, van der Veer B, van den Brink S, Wijsman L, Goderski G, Romette JL, Ellis J, Zambon M, Peiris M, Goossens H, Reusken C,

- 172 Koopmans MP, Drosten C. Detection of 2019 novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV) by real-time RT-
173 PCR. Euro Surveill. 2020 Jan;25(3):2000045. doi: 10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2020.25.3.2000045.
174 Erratum in: Euro Surveill. 2020 Apr;25(14): Erratum in: Euro Surveill. 2020 Jul;25(30): PMID:
175 31992387; PMCID: PMC6988269.
- 176 6. Mannonen L, Kallio-Kokko H, Loginov R, Jääskeläinen AE, Jokela P, Antikainen J, Väre P,
177 Kekäläinen E, Kurkela S, Jarva H, Lappalainen M. Comparison of two commercial platforms
178 and a laboratory developed test for detection of SARS-CoV-2 RNA. 2020 (Preprint.) doi:
179 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.03.20144758>
- 180 7. Rusanen J, Kareinen L, Szilovics L, Uğurlu H, Levanov L, Jääskeläinen AE, Ahava M, Kurkela
181 S, Saksela K, Hedman K, Vapalahti O, Hepojoki J. A generic, scalable, and rapid TR-FRET –
182 based assay for SARS-CoV-2 antigen detection. 2020 (Preprint.) doi:
183 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.07.20245167>
- 184 8. Corman VM, Haage VC, Bleicker T, Schmidt ML, Mühlemann B, Zuchowski M, Jö Lei WK,
185 Tscheak P, Möncke-Buchner E, Müller MA, Krumbholz A, Drexler JF, Drosten C: Comparison
186 of seven commercial SARS-CoV.2 rapid Point-of-Care Antigen tests. 2020. (Preprint.)
187 doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.12.20230292>
- 188 9. Merino-Amador P, Guinea J, Muñoz-Gallego I, González-Donapetry P, Galán J-C, Antona
189 N, Cilla G, Hernández-Crespo S, Díaz-de Tuesta J-L, Gual-de Torrella A, González-Romo F
190 Escribano P, Sánchez-Castellano MÁ, Sota-Busselo M, Delgado-Iribarren A, García J,
191 Cantón R, Muñoz P, Folgueira MD, Cuenca-Estrella M, Oteo-Iglesias J, Spanish Panbio™
192 COVID-19 validation group: Multicenter evaluation of the Panbio™ COVID-19 Rapid Antigen-
193 Detection Test for the diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2 infection. 2020 (Preprint.)
194 doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.18.20230375>

- 195 10. Toptan T, Eckermann L, Pfeiffer AE, Hoehl S, Ciesek S, Drosten C, Corman VM. Evaluation of a
196 SARS-CoV-2 rapid antigen test: potential to help reduce community spread? 2020 (Preprint.)
197 doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.04.20240283>
- 198 11. WHO: Antigen-detection in the diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2 infection using rapid immunoassays.
199 Interim guidance. Available at [https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/antigen-detection-](https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/antigen-detection-in-the-diagnosis-of-sars-cov-2infection-using-rapid-immunoassays)
200 [in-the-diagnosis-of-sars-cov-2infection-using-rapid-immunoassays](https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/antigen-detection-in-the-diagnosis-of-sars-cov-2infection-using-rapid-immunoassays). Updated September 11,
201 [2020](https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/antigen-detection-in-the-diagnosis-of-sars-cov-2infection-using-rapid-immunoassays). Accessed December 29, 2020.
- 202 12. ECDC: Options for the use of rapid antigen tests for COVID-19 in the EU/EEA and the UK.
203 Technical report. Available at
204 [https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/sites/default/files/documents/Options-use-of-rapid-antigen-](https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/sites/default/files/documents/Options-use-of-rapid-antigen-tests-for-COVID-19.pdf)
205 [tests-for-COVID-19.pdf](https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/sites/default/files/documents/Options-use-of-rapid-antigen-tests-for-COVID-19.pdf). Updated November 19, 2020. Accessed December 29, 2020.
- 206 13. WHO: Laboratory biosafety guidance related to coronavirus disease (COVID-19): interim
207 guidance. Available at <https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/332076>. Updated May 13,
208 2020. Accessed December 29, 2020.
- 209 14. Mina MJ, Parker R, Larremore DB. Rethinking Covid-19 test sensitivity – a strategy for
210 containment. N Engl J Med 2020; 383:e120 DOI: 10.1056/NEJMp2025631

	Quidel Sofia SARS Antigen FIA	SD Biosensor SARS-CoV-2 Rapid Antigen test	Abbott Panbio™ COVID-19 Ag Rapid TEST Device NP
Intended use	Nasopharyngeal and nasal swabs	Nasopharyngeal swabs	Nasopharyngeal swabs
Target	Nucleocapsid protein	Nucleocapsid protein	Nucleocapsid protein
Interpretation of results	Sofia or Sofia2 instrument	Visual	Visual
Procedural control/visible control line	Yes/No	Yes/Yes	Yes/Yes
External controls	Yes	Available, but not included in the kit	Yes
LoD, as reported by the manufacturer	1.13x10 ² TCID ₅₀ /mL	3.12x10 ^{2.2} TCID ₅₀ /mL	2.5x10 ^{1.8} TCID ₅₀ /mL
Sensitivity, as reported by the manufacturer	96.67%	96.52%	93.33%
Specificity, as reported by the manufacturer	100 %	99.68%	99.45%
Incubation time	15 minutes	15-30 minutes	15-20 minutes
Sample volume	120 µl	3 drops	5 drops
Sample volume when using a frozen VTM sample µl	250	350	150
Sample dilution when using a frozen saline sample in this study, approximately	1:6	1:4	1:10
Regulatory certification	CE-IVD, FDA EUA	CE-IVD	CE-IVD
Lots used in this evaluation	143489	QCO3020105	41ADF024A

Table 1. Main properties of the three RADTs evaluated in this study.

		SOFIA	STANDARD Q	PANBIO
		QUIDEL	SD BIOSENSOR	ABBOTT
All samples	Tested, n	188	198	190
	Same as ref	159	168	164
	Agreement	84.57%	84.85%	86.32%
	95% CI	78.72-89.04	79.19-89.18	80.70-90.49
All RT-PCR positive samples	Tested, n	148	158	152
	Tested pos, n	119	128	126
	Sensitivity	80%	81%	83%
	Agreement	80.41%	81.01%	82.89%
	95% CI	73.28-86.00	74.19-86.36	76.12-88.05
	Ct median (Ag ⁻ /Ag ⁺)	31.75/20.97	31.17/20.95	31.08/20.98
RT-PCR positives, Ct <25	Tested, n	89	97	92
	Tested pos, n	88	96	90
	Sensitivity	99%	99%	98%
RT-PCR positives, Ct 25-29.99	Tested, n	34	35	34
	Tested pos, n	28	24	26
	Sensitivity	82%	69%	76%
RT-PCR positives, Ct <30	Tested, n	123	132	126
	Tested pos, n	116	120	116
	Sensitivity	94%	91%	92%
RT-PCR positives, Ct ≥30	Tested, n	25	26	26
	Tested pos, n	3	8	10
	Sensitivity	12%	31%	38%

Table 2. The performance of RADTs, all samples, all RT-PCR positive samples, and samples grouped according to Ct values of the N gene target in the LDT RT-PCR. Tested, n, number of tested samples. Same as ref: number of samples tested the same as reference LDT RT-PCR test, positive or negative. Tested pos, n, number of samples that were positive in RADT. Ag⁻/Ag⁺: Ct median of samples that

		SOFIA QUIDEL	STANDARD Q SD BIOSENSOR	PANBIO ABBOTT	VIRUS CULTURE
Total RT-PCR positive samples	Tested, n	61	62	62	59
	Tested pos, n	39	43	48	18
	Sensitivity	64%	69%	77%	31%
RT-PCR positives, Ct <25	Tested, n	22	22	22	20
	Tested pos, n	22	22	22	16
	Sensitivity	100%	100%	100%	80%
RT-PCR positives, Ct 25-29.99	Tested, n	19	19	19	19
	Tested pos, n	15	14	16	2
	Sensitivity	79%	74%	84%	11%
RT-PCR positives, Ct <30	Tested, n	41	41	41	39
	Tested pos, n	37	36	38	18
	Sensitivity	90%	88%	93%	46%
RT-PCR positives, Ct ≥30	Tested, n	20	21	21	20
	Tested pos, n	2	7	10	0
	Sensitivity	10%	33%	48%	0%
RT-PCR negatives	Tested, n	40	40	38	ND
	Tested pos, n	0	0	0	

Table 3. The performance of the antigen tests and virus culture in a panel of selected 62 positive and 40 negative samples according to Ct values of the N gene target in the LDT RT-PCR. Tested, n, number of tested samples. Tested pos, n, number of samples that were positive in antigen test or virus culture. ND, not done.

		SOFIA QUIDEL	STANDARD Q SD BIOSENSOR	PANBIO ABBOTT
Total RT-PCR positive samples	Tested, n	87	96	90
	Tested pos, n	80	85	78
	Sensitivity	92%	89%	87%
RT-PCR positives, Ct <25	Tested, n	67	75	70
	Tested pos, n	66	74	68
	Sensitivity	99%	99%	97%
RT-PCR positives, Ct 25-29.99	Tested, n	15	16	15
	Tested pos, n	13	10	10
	Sensitivity	87%	63%	67%
RT-PCR positives, Ct <30	Tested, n	82	91	85
	Tested pos, n	79	84	78
	Sensitivity	96%	92%	92%
RT-PCR positives, Ct ≥30	Tested, n	5	5	5
	Tested pos, n	1	1	0
	Sensitivity	20%	20%	0%

Table 4. The performance of antigen tests in a panel of positive adult outpatient samples in November 1-18, 2020, grouped according to Ct values of the N gene target in the LDT RT-PCR.

Tested, n, number of tested samples. Tested pos, n, number of samples that were positive in antigen test.

Figure 1. Sensitivities of Sofia, Standard Q and Panbio rapid antigen detection tests for SARS-CoV-

2. Total number of RT-PCR positive samples tested for Sofia: 148, Standard Q: 158, Panbio: 152; number of RT-PCR positive samples, Ct<25, tested for Sofia: 89, Standard Q: 97, Panbio: 92. Number of RT-PCR positive samples, Ct 25-29.99, tested for Sofia: 34, Standard Q: 35, Panbio: 34. Number of R-PCR positive samples, Ct ≥30, tested for Sofia: 25, Standard Q: 26, Panbio: 26.

234
235

236 **Figure 2. Sensitivity of the RADTs in comparison to Ct values in RT-PCR.** Samples include all the LDT
237 RT-PCR positive nasopharyngeal samples from adult outpatients at HUSLAB in 1.-18. November 2020
238 that had enough sample volume left for three antigen tests. N= 96, however, in some cases, not all
239 three RADTs were performed to all samples. Each dot indicates one samples. Ct <25: 75 samples; Ct
240 25-29.99: 16 samples; Ct ≥30: 5 samples.