Field performance evaluation of the PanBio rapid SARS-CoV-2 antigen assay in an epidemic driven by 501Y.v2 (lineage B.1.351) in the Eastern Cape, South Africa

Oluwakemi Laguda Akingba^{a,b}, Kaitlin Sprong^{a,b} and Diana Ruth Hardie^{a,c}

^aNational Health Laboratory Service, South Africa

^bDepartment of Laboratory Medicine and Pathology, Faculty of Health Sciences, Walter Sisulu University, Mthatha, South Africa

^cDivision of Medical Virology, Department of Pathology, University of Cape Town, Cape Town, South Africa

word count: 1256

Corresponding author: Diana Hardie, C18 Laboratory, Groote Schuur Hospital, Anzio Rd Observatory, 7925, Cape Town, South Africa

E mail: diana.hardie@uct.ac.za

Oluwakemi Laguda Akingba

e mail: Oluwakemi.LA@nhls.ac.za

Kaitlin Sprong

e mail: Kaitlin.sprong@nhls.ac.za

22

23 **Abstract:**

24 Background: South Africa was the African country most severely affected by the SARS-CoV-
25 2 pandemic during 2020, experiencing 2 waves of infection. During the first wave,
26 diagnostics were largely based on reverse transcription-linked PCR (RT-PCR). The Abbott
27 PanBio antigen test was deployed during the 2nd wave which was driven by emergence of
28 the 501Y.v2 variant. At the time of evaluation in mid-November 2020, 501Y.v2 was the
29 dominant circulating virus in Nelson Mandela Bay, in the Eastern Cape Province.

30 Methods: A prospective diagnostic evaluation study was undertaken, during a period of
31 high community transmission, to evaluate the field performance of the PanBio antigen RTD.
32 Testing was conducted at mobile community testing centres on 677 ambulant patients
33 seeking SARS-CoV-2 testing. RT-PCR was performed on the original naso-pharyngeal antigen
34 swabs to evaluate test performance.

35 Results: Of 146 RT-PCR positive individuals, 101 were RTD positive in the clinic. The antigen
36 RTD had an overall sensitivity of 69.2% (95%CI 61.4, 75.8) and specificity of 99.0% (95%CI
37 98.8, 99.3) in this clinical context. Sensitivity was strongly dependent on the amount of
38 virus in clinical samples, as reflected by the PCR cycle threshold (CT) value, with 100%
39 detection in samples where the CT was <20, 96% with CT between 20-25, 89% with CT
40 between 26-30 and 64% when CT was 31-35.

41 Conclusions: The assay reliably detected 501Y.v2 infections in ambulatory ill patients. Assay
42 sensitivity was >90% in patients with high viral loads who are expected to be most
43 infectious. Negative and positive predictive values were also >90%.

44 **Keywords:**

45 SARS-CoV-2

46 501Y.v2

47 B.1.351

48 Rapid antigen test

49 Point of care

50 COVID-19

51 **Abbreviations:**

52 COVID-19. Coronavirus disease 2019; CT, cycle threshold; SARS-CoV-2, severe acute
53 respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2; RTD, rapid test device; PCR, polymerase chain reaction;
54 RT-PCR, reverse transcription polymerase chain reaction; WHO, world health organisation;
55 501Y.v2, 501Y variant 2; IQR, interquartile range; NP, nasopharyngeal; GISAID, global
56 initiative for sharing all influenza data;

57

58

59 **Background:**

60 During 2020 South Africa was the African country most severely affected by the SARS-CoV-2
 61 pandemic with more than 1 380 000 laboratory confirmed cases and 83 918 excess
 62 deaths[1]. During this period, the country experienced 2 waves of infection[2]. Provision of
 63 an effective diagnostic service proved to be challenging. RT-PCR is the gold standard assay
 64 for SARS-CoV-2 diagnosis, however, in the context of high disease prevalence, laboratory
 65 systems may easily become overwhelmed. Rapid diagnostics such as antigen tests that can
 66 be performed at point of care provide a welcome solution. Their main drawback is lower
 67 sensitivity[3]. The WHO advises that assays that meet minimum performance requirements
 68 (>80% sensitivity, >97% specificity in the first 7 days of symptoms) can be used in contexts
 69 where nucleic acid-based testing is unavailable, or where turn-around times are
 70 prolonged[4]. The Abbott PanBio rapid SARS-CoV-2 antigen assay has fulfilled these criteria
 71 in evaluations in several studies [5][6]

72 This assay was deployed during the 2nd wave in South Africa which first became apparent in
 73 the Eastern Cape Province in October/November 2020. Increased disease activity was
 74 associated with emergence of a new variant, namely 501Y.v2[7]. This variant, now referred
 75 to as lineage B.1.351, first detected in October 2020 rapidly became the predominant virus,
 76 across the country, due to its higher transmissibility[8]. At the time of evaluation in mid-
 77 November 2020, it was the dominant circulating virus, responsible for around 84% of
 78 infections in Nelson Mandela Bay, estimate based on genomes submitted to global initiative
 79 for sharing all influenza data (GISAID) over this time period [9]. This prospective diagnostic
 80 evaluation study was designed to evaluate the field performance of the PanBio assay, but
 81 also provides evidence on its performance in individuals infected with 501Y.v2. Another
 82 novel aspect to this study is that RT PCR was performed on the same swab used for antigen
 83 testing, which obviated the need to collect further samples from patients and provided a
 84 more direct comparison with the antigen result.

85 **Methods and results:**

Prospective diagnostic evaluation study in Nelson Mandela Bay municipality, Eastern Cape South Africa during a period of high disease prevalence, using nasopharyngeal swabs to determine the accuracy of Abbott PanBio COVID-19 antigen RTD.

Verifying that used antigen swabs were suitable for PCR:

44 paired swabs were collected from symptomatic patients, one nylon tip, standard issue swab for PCR and the flocked antigen swab from the PanBio test kit. SARS-CoV-2 PCR was done on used antigen and matched nylon swabs.

The used antigen swab was prepared for PCR as follows: 1 mL saline was added to the swab container using a filter tip. The sample was vortexed and allowed to stand 2 minutes. The bottom cap was opened and fluid bled into a sterile vial. The matching PCR swab was snipped into a vial containing 1.5 ml normal saline and vortexed.

Paired samples were extracted on the EasyMag (bioMerieux) platform. RT-PCR was done using the Seegene nCoV assay with amplification on BioRad CFX realTime PCR machine. For PCR positive swabs, mean CT values of the 3 assay targets were compared.

Of the 44 paired samples, 13 were antigen positive. 26 were concordantly PCR negative, one sample was PCR positive on the antigen swab, but negative on the regular swab and 17 samples were concordantly PCR positive. When comparing mean CT values of the paired swabs, the antigen swab had values of 2 CTs lower than the swab collected for PCR. Wilcoxon signed-rank test p0.0073. (figure 1)

Figure 1: Average CT values of PCR positive paired antigen vs regular swabs are compared: The range of CT values from PCR of the antigen swab were on average 2 CTs lower than for those from the standard swabs. Wilcoxon signed-rank test p0.0073.

Study protocol:

Between 17 and 20 November 2020 mobile clinics ran community testing campaigns at 6 sites in Nelson Mandela Bay. Symptomatic patients were invited to undergo antigen testing. Nasopharyngeal (NP) swabs were tested using the PanBio SARS-CoV-2 RTD. Results were communicated to patients immediately. The used swabs were sent for PCR. RT-PCR: Seegene nCoV assay (BioRad CFX platform) was performed on the same swab used for antigen testing. (as described)

A total of 677 patients from 6 mobile clinics were tested by both antigen and PCR. Patients were ambulant and seeking COVID testing. They ranged in age range from 3-85 years; 59% were female.

Of these, 101 (14.9%) were antigen positive in the clinic. With PCR, 146 samples (21.4%) were reported as positive, 19 (2.8%) as inconclusive (single target positive, CT>38) and 509 (75.2%) were negative for both tests. Inconclusive samples were excluded from analysis as their significance was unresolved.

Antigen test performance:

Using PCR as the reference standard, the antigen test had an overall sensitivity (positive percent agreement) of 69.17% (95%CI 61.44, 75.80) and specificity (negative percent agreement) of 99.02% (95%CI 98.78, 99.26) in this clinical context.

Sensitivity was strongly dependent on the quantity of virus in clinical samples, as reflected by the CT value, with 100% detection by the antigen test in samples where the CT was <20, 95.5% with CT between 20-25, 89.3% with CT between 26-30 and 64,3% when CT was 31-35. The CT values of antigen positive and negative samples are shown (Figures 2 a, b)

The antigen assay was positive in 3 PCR negative patients. Given the prevalence of infection of 21% (as determined by PCR) the predictive value of a negative test was 91.9% and that of a positive test was 97.12%.

Figure 2 (a) Compares the number of antigen positive and negative samples according to CT category values obtained in PCR, (b) Compares the percentage of antigen positive samples according to virus levels, as reflected by the mean CT value.

Characteristics of PCR positive samples:

In the 146 PCR positive patients, CT values ranged from 17.4 to 41.3, median 30.1. As expected, the median CT and interquartile range (IQR) was lower in antigen positive samples at 28.7 (IQR 25.3-31.3). In comparison, the median and IQR of CT of antigen negatives was 35.8 (IQR 32.7-37.1). (figure 3)

Figure 3: Compares the range of CT values obtained on antigen positive and negative samples by reference PCR. Median and IQR values are given.

Discussion:

This study took place during a period of high community transmission associated with emergence of the 501Y.v2 variant in the Eastern Cape. PCR was performed directly on the antigen swab after testing which enabled a direct comparison to be made between antigen reactivity and PCR on the same sample. Overall, the PanBio antigen test had a sensitivity of 69.17% and specificity of 99.0%. The sensitivity is below the 80% WHO benchmark[4]. However, context is key. Testing was performed on unselected symptomatic individuals who requested testing, irrespective of symptom duration. This probably accounts for the fact that 50% of PCR positive patients had CT values > 30, indicating that on average sampling may have occurred later during infection than recommended for maximum performance. Nonetheless performance was good in patients with CTs <30. In this range, sensitivity was 91.3%. This concordance (using distinctly different technologies) suggests that the 501Y.v2 was reliably detected by the RTD and at an expected level of frequency when compared with PCR.

Assay specificity was similarly good at 99% and the predictive value of a positive test was 95%. This fulfils the WHO benchmark specificity requirements for deployment of this assay[4].

2 factors could compromise detection of the 501Y.v2 variant; namely amino acid changes in the region of the nucleocapsid protein targeted by kit antibodies, or reduced virus shedding in respiratory tract samples. The higher infectivity of the variant makes the latter explanation unlikely and preliminary evidence does not support it. 501Y.v2 has a single amino acid change in the linker region of the nucleocapsid protein, namely N205I [9]. As this amino acid is located in an unstructured region[10], it should not affect binding of kit antibodies.

The main limitation was that it was not feasible to confirm 501Y.v2 infection in positive cases. This was inferred from the fact that resurgence in this district was overwhelmingly due to 501Y.v2, based on contemporaneous genomes submitted to GISAID [9].

Conclusion:

The assay reliably detected 501Y.v2 virus infection in ambulatory ill patients in this high prevalence community setting. Sensitivity was >90% in patients with high viral loads who are expected to be most infectious. To optimise the use of antigen RDTs in different and changing circumstances, clinical predictors and the epidemiological context should be considered when deciding how to deploy these assays.

Ethics:

Ethical approval was obtained from the University of Cape Town Human Research Ethics Committee (UCT HREC 862.2020).

Informed consent:

Patients were willing participants and gave verbal consent to diagnostic testing. Data was anonymised and delinked.

Author contributions:

Study concept and design: DH, OL

193 Conduct of study, sample testing: OL, KS

194 Manuscript write up: DH, OL, KS

195 All authors approved the final manuscript

196 **Declaration of competing interest:**

197 The authors report no competing interests.

198 **Funding:**

199 No funding was given for this study.

200 **References:**

201 [1] SAMRC, Report on Weekly Deaths in South Africa, South Africa
202 Med. Res. Counc. 2021 (2020) 1.
203 <https://www.samrc.ac.za/reports/report-weekly-deaths-south-africa>.

204 [2] L.B. Waasila Jassat¹, Cheryl Cohen², Caroline Mudara¹, THE
205 FIRST AND SECOND WAVE OF COVID-19 IN THREE DISTRICTS OF
206 SOUTH AFRICA, COVID-19 Spec. PUBLIC Heal. Surveill. Bull.
207 COVID-19 Spec. PUBLIC Heal. Surveill. Bull. 18 (2021) 1–24.

208 [3] J. Cunningham, S. Beese, J. Dretzke, H. Im, P. Mj, H. Im, P. Mj, L.
209 Hoo, L. Mmg, R. Spijker, V.D.B. A, diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2
210 infection (Review), (2020).
211 <https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.CD013705>.www.cochranelibrary.com.
212

213 [4] WHO, Antigen-detection in the diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2 infection
214 using rapid immunoassays Interim guidance, 11 September
215 2020., World Heal. Organ. (2020).

- 216 <https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/334253>.
- 217 [5] M. Linares, R. Pérez-Tanoira, A. Carrero, J. Romanyk, F. Pérez-
 218 García, P. Gómez-Herruz, T. Arroyo, J. Cuadros, Panbio antigen
 219 rapid test is reliable to diagnose SARS-CoV-2 infection in the first
 220 7 days after the onset of symptoms, J. Clin. Virol. 133 (2020) 3–6.
 221 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcv.2020.104659>.
- 222 [6] B. Mühlemann, M. Zuchowski, W. Karen, J. Lei, Comparison of
 223 seven commercial SARS-CoV-2 rapid point of care antigen assays,
 224 MedRxiv. (2020).
 225 <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.12.20230292>.
- 226 [7] H. Tegally, E. Wilkinson, M. Giovanetti, A. Iranzadeh, V. Fonseca,
 227 J. Giandhari, D. Doolabh, S. Pillay, E.J. San, K. Wibmer, B.T.
 228 Sewell, J. Lourenço, L. Carlos, J. Alcantara, S.L. Kosakovsky, S.
 229 Weaver, D. Martin, R.J. Lessells, J.N. Bhiman, C. Williamson, T. De
 230 Oliveira, Emergence and rapid spread of a new severe acute
 231 respiratory syndrome-related coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) lineage
 232 with multiple spike mutations in South Africa, Arghavan
 233 Alisoltani-Dehkordi. 10 (2020) 2020.12.21.20248640.
 234 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.21.20248640>.
- 235 [8] C.K. Wibmer, F. Ayres, T. Hermanus, M. Madzivhandila, SARS-
 236 CoV-2 501Y . V2 escapes neutralization by South African COVID-
 237 19 donor plasma, BioRxiv Prepr. (2021).

<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.18.427166doi>:

[9] <https://corona-maps.live/gisaid/>

[10] W. Zeng, G. Liu, H. Ma, D. Zhao, Y. Yang, M. Liu, Biochemica
characterisation of SARS-VoV-2 nucleocapsid protein, Biochem.
Biophys. Research Commun. 527 (2020) 618–623.
<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bbrc.2020.04.136>.

Highlights:

- PanBio SARS-CoV-2 RTD performs well in a field evaluation with high disease prevalence
- Good concordance between RT-PCR and RTD in patients with 501Y.v2 variant infection.
- RT-PCR on the antigen swab enables a more direct comparison of methods.