Clinical and experimental factors that affect the reported performance characteristics of rapid testing for SARS-CoV-2.

Valentin Parvu, PhD,¹ Devin S. Gary, PhD,¹ Joseph Mann, MSN,¹ Yu-Chih Lin, PhD,¹ Dorsey Mills, BA,¹ Lauren Cooper, PhD,¹ Jeffrey C. Andrews, MD,¹ Yukari C. Manabe, MD,^{2,3} Andrew Pekosz, PhD,^{2,4} Charles K. Cooper, MD¹

¹Becton, Dickinson and Company, BD Life Sciences – Integrated Diagnostic Solutions, 7 Loveton Circle, Sparks, MD, USA,

²W. Harry Feinstone Department of Molecular Microbiology and Immunology, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health,

³Department of Medicine, Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine, Baltimore, Maryland

⁴Department of Emergency Medicine, Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine, Baltimore, Maryland

#To whom correspondence should be addressed:

Charles K. Cooper, MD

Vice President of Medical Affairs

Becton, Dickinson and Company, BD Life Sciences – Integrated Diagnostic Solutions

7 Loveton Circle, Sparks MD 21152, USA

Phone: 410-316-4984

E-mail: Charles_K_Cooper@bd.com

WORD COUNT

4,730

RUNNING TITLE: SARS-CoV-2 Antigen test sensitivity

ABSTRACT (194 words)

Tests that detect the presence of SARS-CoV-2 antigen in clinical specimens from the upper respiratory tract can provide a rapid means of COVID-19 disease diagnosis and help identify individuals that may be infectious and should isolate to prevent SARS-CoV-2 transmission. This systematic review assesses the diagnostic accuracy of SARS-CoV-2 antigen detection in COVID-19 symptomatic and asymptomatic individuals compared to RT-qPCR, and summarizes antigen test sensitivity using meta-regression. In total, 83 studies were included that compared SARS-CoV-2 rapid antigen lateral flow testing (RALFT) to RT-qPCR for SARS-CoV-2. Generally, the quality of the evaluated studies was inconsistent, nevertheless, the overall sensitivity for RALFT was determined to be 75.0% (95% confidence interval [CI]: 71.0-78.0). Additionally, RALFT sensitivity was found to be higher for symptomatic versus asymptomatic individuals and was higher for a symptomatic population within 7 days from symptom onset (DSO) compared to a population with extended days of symptoms. Viral load was found to be the most important factor for determining SARS-CoV-2 antigen test sensitivity. Other design factors, such as specimen storage and anatomical collection type, also affect the performance of RAFLT. RALFT and RT-qPCR testing both achieve high sensitivity when compared to SARS-CoV-2 viral culture.

INTRODUCTION

Severe Acute Respiratory Coronavirus-2 (SARS-CoV-2) is the highly transmissible viral agent responsible for development of Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19). (Carlos et al., 2020; Chang et al., 2020; Li et al., 2020; Wang et al., 2020) Based on measurements from specimen swabs, the viral load in infected individuals peaks around the time of symptom onset (approximately 2-3 days following infection). (Walsh et al., 2020) This time point coincides with the highest rate of SARS-CoV-2 transmissibility. Transmissibility usually tapers off within 8 days following symptom onset. (He et al., 2020) Asymptomatic individuals account for 40-45% of all infections and can transmit the virus for up to 14 days following infection. (Oran and Topol, 2020) Therefore, rapid, accurate diagnostic testing has been a key component of the response to COVID-19, as identification of SARS-CoV-2-positive individuals facilitates both appropriate treatment and reduced communal spread of the virus. (La Marca et al., 2020)

Molecular testing using reverse transcription, quantitative polymerase chain reaction (RT-qPCR) platforms has become the primary diagnostic method for COVID-19 diagnosis. (Wang and Taubenberger, 2010; Tahamtan and Ardebili, 2020) The major advantage of RT-qPCR testing is its high analytical sensitivity (translating to few false negative results). (Giri et al., 2021) However, large-scale clinical laboratory testing requires a dedicated infrastructure, and specialized technician training. In addition, due to the specimen transport and processing time, results for standard RT-qPCR can take days to obtain, depending on the catchment area and the demand for testing. (Bustin and Nolan, 2020)

Antigen-based testing involves the application of specific, SARS-CoV-2 antibodies (Figure 1) in several formats, including lateral flow immunofluorescent sandwich assays, chromatogenic digital immunoassay, lateral flow immunoassay with visual read, and microfluidic immunofluorescence assays.(Rezaei et al., 2020) Antigen testing for SARS-CoV-2 can be utilized either in conjunction with RT-qPCR as a first-line screening test, or utilized in decentralized health care settings in which RT-qPCR testing may not be conducive for rapid result turn-around.(Rezaei et al., 2020) Rapid antigen-based lateral flow testing (RALFT) for SARS-CoV-2, as with influenza, has been implemented globally to achieve rapid, accurate results for COVID-19 diagnosis.(Peeling et al., 2021) Although the majority of antigen-based tests share a common mechanism for detection of SARS-CoV-2 protein, the reported sensitivities of both Food and Drug Administration (FDA) Emergency Use Authorization (EUA)-approved and non-EUA-approved antigen-based tests have varied greatly in the literature.(Brümmer et al., 2021) Multiple meta-analyses and systematic reviews have reported large inter-study heterogeneity related to SARS-CoV-2 antigen-based testing.(Dinnes et al., 2020;Brümmer et al., 2021) Although reliable antigen test performance coincides with high specimen viral load,(Brümmer et al., 2021) study heterogeneity could impact our conclusions about antigen test performance. Factors that could affect overall antigen test performance include: analytical sensitivity (i.e. antibody/antigen binding affinity) of the assay, which likely varies for tests across manufacturers,(Mina et al., 2020) biases occurring from the study design (e.g. blinding, test order, etc.), the study population (e.g. symptomatic versus asymptomatic, days from symptom

onset [DSO], etc.), the anatomical collection site (e.g. nasopharyngeal versus anterior nares), and specimen storage conditions.(Lijmer et al., 1999;Griffith et al., 2020;Accorsi et al., 2021)

As others have noted previously, a wide range of reported sensitivities has been reported for rapid antigen testing.(Dinnes et al., 2020;Brümmer et al., 2021) The main objective of this meta-analysis was to explore possible causes of the high degree of heterogeneity of assay sensitivity estimates across different studies. Data were summarized and analyzed from over 80 articles and manufacturer IFUs to provide results on sensitivity for SARS-CoV-2 antigen testing from more than 25 individual assays.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The methods for conducting research and reporting results for systematic reviews and meta-analyses, which are outlined by the Cochrane Collaboration Diagnostic Test Accuracy Working Group and by PRISMA guidelines, were employed for this study.(Gatsonis and Paliwal, 2006;Leeflang, 2014;Page et al., 2020) This study protocol was registered with the PROSPERO International Prospective Register of Systematic Reviews in 2021 (PROSPERO CRD42021240421).(Booth et al., 2011)

The PICO (Participants, Intervention, Comparator, and Outcomes) of this meta-analysis was as follows: Participants were individuals undergoing SARS-CoV-2 testing in a healthcare setting (at least 8 cases); Intervention (primary) was the index test consisting of a SARS-CoV-2 antigen detection platform utilizing immunobiological mechanisms, such as a sandwich ELISA, combined with spatial resolution (e.g. immunochromatographic assay); Intervention (secondary) was testing for SARS-CoV-2 using antigen and RT-qPCR testing (indices 1 and 2); Comparator (primary) was RT-qPCR as the reference test for detecting SARS-CoV-2 genomic RNA (any target gene); Comparator (secondary) was SARS-CoV-2 viral culture as the reference method for identifying specimens with infectious viral particles; Outcome was the determination of antigen test sensitivity across independent variables.

Search and selection criteria

115 Eligible studies/sources included diagnostic studies of any design type (i.e. retrospective,
116 prospective, randomized, blinded and non-blinded) that specifically involved the detection of
117 SARS-CoV-2. The primary outcome was sensitivity for detection of SARS-CoV-2 in a
118 healthcare setting by rapid antigen testing, as compared with RT-qPCR. Both MEDLINE and
119 MedRxiv electronic databases were searched across dates ranging from January 01, 2020 to
120 February 01, 2021 with the following search terms: (1) ((Antigen test and (sars-cov-2 OR
121 COVID-19)) OR ((antigen[title/abstract] AND test) OR (Antigen[title/abstract] and assay)) AND
122 (SARS-CoV-2[title/abstract] OR COVID-19[title/abstract])) and (2) “SARS-CoV-2 and antigen
123 test or COVID-19 and antigen test”; respectively. In addition, a search was performed on the
124 FDA database ([https://www.fda.gov/medical-devices/coronavirus-disease-2019-covid-19-](https://www.fda.gov/medical-devices/coronavirus-disease-2019-covid-19-emergency-use-authorizations-medical-devices/vitro-diagnostics-euas#individual-antigen)
125 [emergency-use-authorizations-medical-devices/vitro-diagnostics-euas#individual-antigen](https://www.fda.gov/medical-devices/coronavirus-disease-2019-covid-19-emergency-use-authorizations-medical-devices/vitro-diagnostics-euas#individual-antigen)) for all
126 EUA SARS-CoV-2 antigen tests. All retrieved sources were assessed for relevance using pre-
127 determined inclusion/exclusion criteria. The inclusion criteria consisted of: (1) SARS-CoV-2
128 diagnostic target; (2) Sensitivity as a performance outcome; (3) Compares antigen testing
129 performance with RT-qPCR as reference; (4) Population includes symptomatic and/or
130 asymptomatic participants; (5) Human study; (6) English language; (7) Any region, country, or
131 state. Secondary inclusion sub-criteria for analyses included: (S1) Index performance results that
132 were stratified by viral load or by RT-qPCR (reference) cycle threshold; (S2) Delineated
133 specimens for reference and index testing between symptomatic and asymptomatic participants;
134 (S3) Delineated the anatomical site for specimen collection prior to reference and index testing;
135 (S4) Delineated whether the specimen was frozen prior to reference and index testing; (S5)

Specified whether the specimen was frozen prior to reference and index testing; (S6) Analytical limit of detection information was available for the reference assay; (S7) The index test manufacturer information was available. The exclusion criteria included: (1) Article/source from a non-credible source; (2) Article/source contains an unclear or indistinct research question; (3) Does not contain performance data specific to SARS-CoV-2; (4) Does not identify or does not involve standard upper respiratory SARS-CoV-2 specimens (e.g. contains other specimen types such as serological or saliva); (5) Contains no RT-qPCR reference results for comparison; (6) Data were collected in an unethical manner; (7) The index test involves a mechanism other than SARS-CoV-2 antigen detection involving a lateral flow (or similar) design; (8) Data not conducive for extraction required for analysis; (9) No data regarding true positive and false negative rates for the index test relative to the reference test. Additional, secondary exclusion criteria included (S1) Article/source not in the English language; and (S2) Study did not involve humans.

Full text reviews of the articles that passed initial screening were performed to identify those that met inclusion/exclusion criteria involving study methodologies, specimen collection, SARS-CoV-2 test details, and data type (sensitivity, specificity values, etc.) and format (raw data, only point estimates and 95% confidence intervals [95% CI] included, etc.), were identified and entered into data extraction tables to document study characteristics and to record raw data with calculated point estimates and 95% CI. A modified Newcastle-Ottawa Scale was used to evaluate the risk of bias (individual study quality),(Wells et al., 2011) which included the following bias

domains: detection (measurement of test result), reporting (failure to adequately control confounding, failure to measure all known prognostic factors), and spectrum (eligibility criteria, forming the cohort, selection of participants). Risk of bias summary assessments for individual studies was categorized as “high”, “moderate”, or “low”. The overall quality of evidence for the risk estimate outcomes (all included studies) was obtained using a modified Grading of Recommendations, Assessment, Development and Evaluation (GRADE) (Schunemann et al., 2013) methodology for observational diagnostic studies.

The seven domains used to ascertain the overall study quality and strength across the six independent variables were (1) Confounder effect; (2) Consistency; (3) Directness; (4) Magnitude of effect; (5) Precision; (6) Publication bias; and (7) Risk of bias (ascertained from individual studies). Study sub-groups were considered high quality when ≥ 4 of seven domains received a green rating, with no red ratings and < 3 unclear ratings; otherwise, it was considered moderate quality. Study sub-groups were considered moderate quality when three domains were green with < 3 red domains; or when two domains were green and < 3 domains were red with < 4 domains unclear; or when 1 domain was green with < 2 red domains and < 3 domains were unclear; or when no domains were green, no domains were red and < 2 domains were unclear. Any other combination of ratings resulted in a classification of quality as low

Subgroup meta-analysis was performed for the following factors: (1) viral load with fixed cutoff values; (2) symptomatic versus asymptomatic; (3) ≤ 7 DSO versus any DSO; (4) Anatomical

collection type for specimens used for both index and reference testing (anterior nares/mid-turbinate versus nasopharyngeal/oropharyngeal); (5) Specimen storage conditions (fresh versus frozen); (6) Analytical sensitivity of the reference RT-qPCR test (detection cutoff <500 genomic copies/mL [cpm] versus ≥ 500 cpm); and (7) Assay manufacturer.

Data analysis

Data extraction was accomplished by two reviewers/authors with any discrepancies adjudicated by a third reviewer/author. An independent author performed all statistical methods. All analyses were performed using R software (version 4.0.2) along with the meta (Balduzzi et al., 2019) and metaphor (Viechtbauer, 2010) packages. For each study, the sensitivity of the index test along with 95% Clopper-Pearson confidence intervals were calculated. Logit transformed sensitivity values were combined to obtain random effect estimates of overall sensitivity. The same method was applied to subgroup meta-analyses; subgroups were defined by disease status, reference and test collection type, reference and test storage (fresh / frozen), study spectrum bias, reference analytical sensitivity (high and low), and manufacturer. *Q-tests* for heterogeneity based on random effect models with common within-group variability were used to evaluate statistical differences between subgroups (univariate analysis). Moderators with significant heterogeneity in the subgroup analysis were included in a meta-regression mixed effect model. Forest plots were generated for all sub-group analyses; a funnel plot of all logit-transformed sensitivities was generated without taking into account study characteristics, and another funnel plot of residual values was generated after fitting the meta-regression model. Separately, for articles where viral

199 load information was available, subgroup meta-analysis by viral load (either measured by RT-
 200 PCR Ct of 25 or 30, or a viral cpm of 1×10^5) and symptomatic status was performed. The
 201 minimum number of studies required for synthesis is $n=3$.

RESULTS

At the outset, 1,695 sources were identified during the database search (Figure 2). From that group of candidate sources, screening was performed by title and abstract, and the potential pool of articles was reduced, and 148 underwent full-text review for data extraction. Eighty-three (83) articles/sources of the 148 were chosen for meta-analysis (Table 1) based upon further exclusion criteria (see Materials and Methods). Note, a list of excluded sources with their specific exclusion criteria is available upon request from the authors. Of the 83 source studies, 76 (91.6%) involved a cross-sectional study design. Data from 12 of the sources (one of which is still pending authorization) were from validation studies as part of Emergency Use Authorization from the FDA and can be found in each, respective, manufacturer instructions for use. Twenty-two (22) of the studies were conducted in the USA, nine in Spain, seven each from Germany and Japan, six from Italy, four from China, three each from France, Switzerland, and the UK, two each from Belgium and Chile; the rest of the countries represented in this study had only one. One-hundred and thirty-five (135) individual data sets were utilized in total from the 83 articles/sources; 30 articles provided more than one data set. The overall, combined number of specimens from participants, from across all 83 studies, was 53,689; the overall total number of RT-qPCR reference positive results for estimating sensitivity from across all 135 data sets was 13,260.

A modified Newcastle-Ottawa Scale was used to rate biases of detection, performance, and participant selection (spectrum bias; Figure 3). The majority of studies were associated with low

or moderate bias of detection (91.4%; 74/83), bias of performance (87.7%; 71/83), and spectrum bias (90.1%; 73/83). All included articles/sources had acceptable reference standards (which was an inclusion criteria), appropriate delay between index and reference testing, and no incorporation bias between the index and reference tests. The two most common weaknesses associated with study design for the included articles/sources were improper blinding and spectrum bias associated with participant enrollment.(Lijmer et al., 1999) Across the six primary factors (viral load, symptomatic versus asymptomatic, DSO, anatomical collection site, storage condition, analytical sensitivity of the reference RT-qPCR assay) analyzed here, the quality of evidence was quality of evidence was largely a mixture of high and moderate (Table 2).

Eighty-three percent (83.0%; 112/135) and 16.3% (22/135) of the data sets provided data from COVID-19 symptomatic and asymptomatic individuals, respectively. The index test sensitivity point estimate (with 95% CI) for the symptomatic group (80.1% [95%CI: 76.0, 83.7]; reference positive n=9,351) was significantly greater (p-value < 0.001) than that for index test sensitivity for the asymptomatic group (54.8% [95%CI: 48.6, 60.8]; reference positive n=1,723). Of the 112 symptomatic data sets, 37.5% (42) included participants that were ≤ 7 DSO and 25.9% (29) included individuals that were a mix of ≤ 7 DSO and > 7 DSO; 36.6% (41) had a DSO status that was unknown. A significant difference (p-value = 0.001) was observed when studies reporting on symptomatic individuals were sub-grouped by DSO; a sensitivity point estimate of 86.2% [95% CI: 81.8, 89.7] for the ≤ 7 DSO sub-group (reference positive n=3,480), compared to 70.8%

[95% CI: 60.7, 79.2] for the group including both ≤ 7 DSO and > 7 DSO (reference positive n=2,649) (Figure 4 and Table 3).

Eighteen (18) data sets reported true positives and false negatives by viral load in the specimen; 37 and 16 data sets reported values by a Ct value of 30 and 25, respectively, for the RT-qPCR (reference) assay. When data were stratified by $\geq 1 \times 10^5$ cpm (n=1,278 reference positive results) versus $< 1 \times 10^5$ cpm (n=781 reference positive results), a significant difference was observed ($p < 0.001$) between the sensitivity point estimates (93.8% [95%CI: 87.1, 97.1] and 28.6% [95% CI: 16.2, 45.3], respectively). Similar findings were associated with studies that were stratified by a Ct value of ≤ 30 (n=2,536 reference positive results) and > 30 (n=679 reference positive results) (89.5% [95%CI: 85.3, 92.5] and 18.7% [95% CI: 12.9, 26.3], respectively) and those that were stratified by a Ct value of ≤ 25 (n=897 reference positive results) and > 25 (n=673 reference positive results) (96.4% [95%CI: 94.3, 97.7] and 44.9% [95% CI: 33.0, 57.4], respectively).

Within a given viral load category, there were no statistical differences between studies performed with symptomatic subjects versus studies performed with asymptomatic subjects; this was true regardless of the exact definition of viral load category: Ct of 25, Ct of 30, or genome copies per ml of 10^5 (Figure 5 and Table 3).

True positives and false negatives by anatomic collection site were obtained from 97 data sets that included reference nasopharyngeal specimens and from 25 data sets that included nasal reference specimen. Antigen testing was usually paired from the same specimen type, only six

datasets being non-paired (antigen nasal, reference nasopharyngeal) specimens. When analysis was performed on data stratified by anatomic collection site of the reference specimen, antigen test sensitivity was higher with a nasal specimen (82.7% [95%CI: 74.7, 88.5, $p=0.037$]; reference positive $n=1,654$) compared to a nasopharyngeal specimen (73.1% [95%CI: 68.5, 77.2]; reference positive $n=10,607$) (Table 3).

Storage condition of the collected specimens was also analyzed as one factor that could affect antigen test sensitivity. True positives and false negatives by test storage condition of the specimen that underwent antigen testing were obtained from 133 data sets. When analysis was focused on storage condition for index testing, antigen test sensitivity was 75.3% [95%CI: 70.8, 79.3] (reference positive $n=9,666$) for fresh specimens and 70.9% [95%CI: 61.0, 79.1] (reference positive $n=3,307$) for frozen specimens. This observed difference was not however statistically significant ($p = 0.375$) (Table 3).

Analytical sensitivity of the reference method (RT-qPCR) was determined using the manufacturer's IFU when it was identified in the source documents and used to stratify true positive and false negative results associated with SARS-CoV-2 antigen testing. The LOD threshold for low and high analytical sensitivity was 500 cpm, which was the median (mean=582) LOD value for the analytical sensitivity from all of the reference methods included in this sub-analysis. Sensitivity values for antigen testing when stratified by high (reference

positive n=4,468) and low (reference positive n=2,645) analytically sensitive reference method were similar: 74.2% [95%CI: 66.9, 80.4] and 76.8% [95%CI: 67.2, 84.2], respectively (Table 3).

Manufacturer (see Table S1) and study spectrum bias were also significant factors in subgroup meta-analyses; higher sensitivity was reported in studies with large/moderate spectrum bias (Table 3). A mixed-effects meta-regression model with moderators including symptom status, anatomical collection site, study selection/spectrum bias, and manufacturer was fit to the studies. All factors remained significant in the multivariate analysis, except study spectrum bias (multivariate $p = 0.757$). The moderators accounted for 72% of study heterogeneity (model $R^2 = 0.722$). Visual inspection of unadjusted and multivariate-adjusted funnel plots for effect estimates from individual sources against study's size was performed (Figure 3). The funnel plot asymmetry revealed possible reporting/publication bias reflecting fewer studies than expected that could be characterized by a small group number and a low sensitivity estimate for the index. Overall, study heterogeneity could largely be accounted for by the independent variables identified through sub-group analysis in this study.

Culture as the reference

Sensitivity for SARS-CoV-2 antigen and RT-qPCR assays was determined as compared with SARS-CoV-2 viral culture as the reference method. There were five data sets that contained RT-qPCR (reference positive n=154) and antigen test (reference positive n=167) results. The overall

sensitivity for RT-qPCR was 99.0% [95% CI: 96.0, 100] and for antigen testing was 90.0% [95% CI: 84.0, 94.0] (Figure 6).

Specificity

Raw data for false positive and true negative rates were extracted from 63 of 81 of the included studies; the overall specificity across the included studies was 99.4% [95%CI: 99.3, 99.4] for antigen testing compared to RT-qPCR as the reference.

DISCUSSION

The PPA (sensitivity) point estimate for antigen testing, spanning the entire 135 data sets included here, was 75.0% (95% CI: 71.0, 79.0). We found that factors including specimen viral load, symptom presence, days from symptom onset, anatomical collection site, and the storage conditions for specimen collection could all affect the measured performance of SARS-CoV-2 antigen tests (Figure S1). In addition, our meta-analysis revealed that antigen test sensitivity (96.0% [95% CI: 90.0, 99.0]) was highest in SARS-CoV-2-positive individuals with an increased likelihood of being infectious at the time of testing (e.g., culture positive).{Pekosz, 2021 #8840} Although specificity data were not extracted for every study included in this meta-analysis, SARS-CoV-2 antigen testing had high specificity as published previously.(Brümmer et al., 2021) Experimental factors such as anatomical collection site, specimen storage conditions, analytical sensitivity of reference, and composition of the study population with respect to symptomology, all varied across the field of studies included here.

This meta-analysis adds to the conclusions of others that viral load is clearly the most important factor that influences sensitivity for SARS-CoV-2 antigen testing. Two related meta-analyses have been published to date. The first by Dinnes et al. (2020),(Dinnes et al., 2020) had the following key differences: (1) Dinnes et al. utilized numerous categories of POC tests beyond antigen based testing; (2) Dinnes et al. included five articles for antigen testing in their work; (3) Dinnes et al. did not stratify the meta-analysis results for antigen testing by study design/viral load as is performed in this work. The second by Brummer et al. (2021),(Brümmer et al., 2021)

had the following key differences: (1) Brummer et al. focused on commercial rapid antigen tests; (2) Brummer et al. only included 48 articles for antigen testing in their work; (3) Brummer et al. did not stratify the meta-analysis results for antigen test performance by study design characteristics as is performed in this work.(Brümmer et al., 2021)

Test sensitivity was stratified by RT-qPCR Ct value (using both 25 cycles and 30 cycles as the cutoff), an inverse relationship was shown between Ct value and SARS-CoV-2 antigen test sensitivity. Both the ≤ 25 Ct group and the ≤ 30 Ct group had significantly higher sensitivities than their > 25 Ct and > 30 Ct counterparts, respectively, regardless of subjects' symptom status. These results are consistent with those from previous studies. (Dinnes et al., 2020;Brümmer et al., 2021) However, Ct value has been shown by different groups to have low correlation between different RT-qPCR assays and platforms.(Ransom et al., 2020;Rhoads et al., 2020) RT-qPCR assays have different analytical sensitivities; a universal Ct value reference has not been established that can be used to define the optimal sensitivity/specificity characteristics for antigen testing. In addition to stratification by Ct value, analysis was also performed for SARS-CoV-2 antigen testing sensitivity by absolute viral load (using 1×10^5 as the cutoff). When data were analyzed using this strategy, similar results were observed as for stratification by Ct value. The viral load threshold utilized here was determined by a consensus value that appeared with regular frequency from the source articles and represented a viral threshold that consistently delineated a zone, across which, the false positive rate increased for most antigen tests. It is generally accepted that viral loads of less than 1×10^5 cpm correlate with non-culture positive

levels. However, whether 1×10^5 cpm is the most accurate threshold by which to measure antigen test performance is still a topic for debate. Some studies suggest that viral loads closer to 1×10^6 cpm might be a more appropriate threshold, which would act to minimize false positive rates. (Berger et al., 2020; La Scola et al., 2020; Larremore et al., 2020; Quicke et al., 2020; van Kampen et al., 2020; Wolfel et al., 2020)

Several factors identified here that affect SARS-CoV-2 antigen test performance have been identified in previous studies to affect specimen viral load. For example, a significant difference in sensitivity for detection was noted here between symptomatic and asymptomatic individuals. However, stratification in both symptomatic and asymptomatic specimen groups by high viral load has a similar effect of increasing test sensitivity. Our data show that 82% of SARS-CoV-2-positive specimens from symptomatic individuals corresponded to a high viral load, whereas only 64% of SARS-CoV-2-positive specimens from asymptomatic individuals qualified as high viral load in this analysis. This bias may be due to the difficulty of estimating the timing of peak viral load in asymptomatic individuals when attempting to compare the natural history of viral load trajectory in symptomatic vs asymptomatic individuals. (Smith et al., 2021) Nevertheless, the presence of symptoms probably overlaps with higher specimen viral load, which subsequently affects the antigen test sensitivity. Anatomical collection type of the index and/or reference test method can affect the measured sensitivity estimates of antigen testing during a clinical trial; also, through a mechanism that involves increased/decreased viral load on the specimen swab. Evidence suggests that viral loads may be higher with nasopharyngeal than with

nasal collection.(Pinninti et al., 2020) This difference may explain why measured antigen assay performance appears to be higher in studies that use a nasal RT-qPCR reference method.

Another factor identified here as potentially influencing measured antigen assay sensitivity was specimen storage, particularly with regard to the use of fresh vs frozen (i.e. “banked”) specimens. It is likely that protein antigen may, as the result of freeze/thawing, experience some degree of structural damage potentially leading to loss of epitope availability or a reduction in the affinity of epitope/paratope binding. Ninety-six (96) data sets involved fresh specimens for antigen testing and 23 data sets included freeze/thawed specimens for antigen testing. Although no statistically significant difference was detected between sensitivities for antigen test conducted on fresh versus frozen specimens, possibly due to the low data set group number in the frozen antigen group, a trend toward lower sensitivity was observed for tests performed on frozen specimens (75.3% [95% CI: 70.8, 79.3] for fresh versus 70.9% [95% CI: 61.0, 79.1] for frozen). In contrast, no similar trend was observed for specimen storage condition related to RT-qPCR testing (75.4% [95% CI: 70.6, 79.6] for fresh versus 77.7% [95% CI: 69.3, 84.3] for frozen). Additional results from in-house (i.e., a BD-IDS laboratory) testing with two different EUA authorized antigen assays demonstrate reduced immunoassay band intensity following freeze-thaw cycles, thus further supporting the findings from the meta-analysis that a freeze-thaw cycle could reduce analytical sensitivity for SARS-CoV-2 antigen testing (Figure S2).

The analytical sensitivity associated with the reference RT-qPCR assay was also investigated here as a possible variable that could affect the false negative rate of SARS-CoV-2 antigen testing. We hypothesized that relatively high analytical sensitivity for the reference RT-qPCR assay would impose a detection bias and result in decreased clinical sensitivity due to increased false negatives occurring near the RT-qPCR limit of detection. However, stratification by reference analytical sensitivity resulted in no difference in SARS-CoV-2 antigen test clinical sensitivity. It is likely that the analytical sensitivity of RT-qPCR, regardless of the manufacturer, is high enough that even relatively low sensitivity-RT-PCR assays are still well below the corresponding limit of detection for antigen testing. On the other hand, some manufacturers assay antigen test performance in a manner that involves sensitivity above and below a set Ct value. It is possible that analysis involving stratification by RT-qPCR analytical sensitivity could reveal differences in antigen test performance if all antigen test performances were determined in a similar manner that involves predetermined high/low viral load categories.

Several population and study design-specific factors were identified to be associated with higher measured assay sensitivity, likely due to the association with higher viral loads. This meta-analysis demonstrates that these factors exist in various combinations across studies in an inconsistent way, thus making comparisons of assay performance across these studies impossible. The lack of consistency across study designs makes it very difficult to compare point estimates between antigen tests to judge their relative clinical efficacy. The introduction of different forms of bias into study design, and during study conduct, could explain why

discrepancies have been noted, for example, between sensitivity values listed in manufacturers' IFUs and those obtained during independent evaluation of the same antigen test. Ultimately, direct comparison between antigen tests should be the most reliable approach for obtaining relative performance characteristics with any certainty. Here, we stratified SARS-CoV-2 antigen test sensitivity by spectrum bias associated with each of the data sources. We found that those studies rated with higher spectrum bias also had higher antigen test sensitivities. In addition, the funnel plot analysis that was performed for this meta-analysis shows obvious publication bias, which implicated a lack of publication of studies with low study group number and low sensitivity.

Clinical trials and studies involving diagnostics are vulnerable to the introduction of bias, which can alter test performance results and obstruct an accurate interpretation of clinical efficacy or safety. For example, antigen testing appears to have a higher sensitivity when compared to SARS-CoV-2 viral culture as the reference than when compared to RT-PCR. However, these two reference methods measure different targets: RNA only, versus infectious virus. Therefore, their use as a reference method should be intended to answer difference scientific questions, rather than artificially inflating apparent sensitivity point estimates. If the intent of a diagnostic test is determining increased risk of infectiousness through the presence of infectious virus, the high analytical sensitivity of RT-qPCR, which cannot distinguish RNA fragments from infectious virus, renders this diagnostic approach vulnerable to the generation of false positive results, particularly at later time points following symptom onset. At time points beyond one

week from symptom onset, a positive RT-qPCR result more likely indicates that an individual has been infected, but is no longer contagious and cannot spread infectious virus. This is especially true for those with a SARS-CoV-2-negative cell culture result. Previous reports have shown that performance values for rapid antigen tests and SARS-CoV-2 viral culture exhibit better agreement than do results from RT-qPCR compared to viral culture.(Pekosz et al., 2021) This finding further supports the use of antigen testing for SARS-CoV-2 for the identification of individuals with infectious virus who are therefore at greater risk of virus transmission.

Limitations

This study has some limitations. First, it was difficult to obtain reliable information across the sources, in a consistent manner, about disease severity, in order to perform meta-analysis on this aspect of COVID-19 diagnostics. Additionally, the studies included in this meta-analysis did not contain sufficient information to explore the potential effect of factors previously demonstrated to be associated with higher viral loads such as disease severity and community prevalence.

Conclusion

In addition to viral load, several factors including symptom status, anatomical collection site, and spectrum bias all influenced the sensitivity for SARS-CoV-2 detection by antigen-based testing. This heterogeneity of factors found to influence measured assay sensitivity, across studies, precludes comparison of assay sensitivity from one study to another. Future consideration

456 regarding standardization of these factors for antigen assay performance studies is warranted in
457 order to aid in results interpretation and relative performance assessment.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank Karen Eckert (Becton, Dickinson and Company, BD Life Sciences – Diagnostic Systems) for her input on the content of this manuscript and editorial assistance. The individuals acknowledged here have no additional funding or additional compensation to disclose.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

All authors contributed to the interpretation of the data, critically revised the manuscript for important intellectual content, approved the final version to be published, and agree to be accountable for all aspects of the work.

FUNDING

This study was funded by Becton, Dickinson and Company; BD Life Sciences—Integrated Diagnostic Solutions. Non-BD employee authors received research funds to support their work for this study.

POTENTIAL CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

VP, DSG, YCL, DM, LC, JM, JCA, and CKC are employees of Becton, Dickinson and Company
 AP—None
 YM—None

REFERENCES

- LumiraDx™ SARS-CoV-2Ag Test [package insert, EUA]. LumiraDx UK Ltd, Alloa FK 10 2PB, UK (2020).
- BD Veritor™ System for Rapid Detection of SARS-CoV-2 [package insert, EUA]. Becton, Dickinson and Company, Sparks-Glencoe, MD; (2020).
- BD Veritor™ Triplex System for Rapid Detection of SARS-CoV-2 and Flu A/B [package insert, EUA]. Becton, Dickinson and Company, Sparks-Glencoe, MD; (2020).
- BinaxNOW™ COVID-19 Ag CARD [package insert, EUA]. Abbott Diagnostics Scarborough Inc, Scarborough, ME (2020).
- BinaxNOW™ COVID-19 Ag CARD HOME TEST[package insert, EUA]. Abbott Diagnostics Scarborough Inc, Scarborough, ME (2020).
- CareStart™ COVID-19 Atigen-Rapid Diagnostic Test for the Detection of SARS-CoV-2 Antigen [package insert, EUA]. Access Bio, Inc, Somerset, NJ (2020).
- Centers for Disease Control. Interim Guidance for Antigen Testing for SARS-CoV-2. December 2020. <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-nCoV/lab/guidelines-clinical-specimens.html>.
- Clip COVID-Rapid Antigen Test [package insert, EUA]. Luminostics, Inc, Milpitas, CA (2020).
- COVID-19 Scientific Advisory Group Rapid Evidence Report. November 06, 2020. <https://www.albertahealthservices.ca/assets/info/ppih/if-ppih-covid-19-sag-performance-and-feasibility-of-rapid-covid-19-tests-rapid-review.pdf>.
- Ellume COVID-19 Home Test [package insert, EUA]. Ellume Limited, East Brisbane, Qtd 4189, Australia (2020).
- Food and Drug Administration. Establishing the Performance Characteristics of In Vitro Diagnostic Devices for the Detection or Detection and Differentiation of Influenza

- Viruses - Guidance for Industry and FDA Staff. July 2011.
<https://www.fda.gov/regulatory-information/search-fda-guidance-documents/establishing-performance-characteristics-vitro-diagnostic-devices-detection-or-detection-and>.
- QuickVue® SARS Antigen Test [package insert, EUA]. Quidel Corporation, San Diego, CA (2020).
- R Core Team (2020). R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical computing, Vienna, Austria. URL <https://www.R-project.org/>.
- Sampinute™ COVID-19 Antigen MIA [package insert, EUA]. Celltrion USA, Jersey City, NJ (2020).
- Sofia®2 Flu+SARS Antigen FIA [package insert, EUA]. Quidel Corporation, San Diego, CA (2020).
- Sofia® SARS Antigen FIA [package insert, EUA]. Quidel Corporation, San Diego, CA (2020).
- Abdelrazik, A.M., Elshafie, S.M., and Abdelaziz, H.M. (2020). Potential Use of Antigen-Based Rapid Test for SARS-CoV-2 in Respiratory Specimens in Low-Resource Settings in Egypt for Symptomatic Patients and High-Risk Contacts. *Lab Med*.
- Abdulrahman, A., Mustafa, F., Alawadhi, A.I., Alansari, Q., Alalawi, B., and Alqahtani, M. (2020). Comparison of SARS-COV-2 nasal antigen test to nasopharyngeal RT-PCR in mildly symptomatic patients. *medRxiv*, 2020.2011.2010.20228973.
- Accorsi, E.K., Qiu, X., Rumpler, E., Kennedy-Shaffer, L., Kahn, R., Joshi, K., Goldstein, E., Stensrud, M.J., Niehus, R., Cevik, M., and Lipsitch, M. (2021). How to detect and reduce potential sources of biases in studies of SARS-CoV-2 and COVID-19. *European Journal of Epidemiology*.
- Albert, E., Torres, I., Bueno, F., Huntley, D., Molla, E., Fernández-Fuentes, M., Martínez, M., Poujois, S., Forqué, L., Valdivia, A., Solano De La Asunción, C., Ferrer, J., Colomina, J.,

and Navarro, D. (2020). Field evaluation of a rapid antigen test (Panbio™ COVID-19 Ag Rapid Test Device) for COVID-19 diagnosis in primary healthcare centres. *Clin Microbiol Infect.*

Alemany, A., Baró, B., Ouchi, D., Rodó, P., Ubals, M., Corbacho-Monné, M., Vergara-Alert, J., Rodon, J., Segalés, J., Esteban, C., Fernández, G., Ruiz, L., Bassat, Q., Clotet, B., Ara, J., Vall-Mayans, M., C, G.B., Blanco, I., and Mitjà, O. (2021). Analytical and clinical performance of the panbio COVID-19 antigen-detecting rapid diagnostic test. *J Infect.*

Aoki, K., Nagasawa, T., Ishii, Y., Yagi, S., Kashiwagi, K., Miyazaki, T., and Tateda, K. (2021). Evaluation of clinical utility of novel coronavirus antigen detection reagent, Espline® SARS-CoV-2. *J Infect Chemother* 27, 319-322.

Aoki, K., Nagasawa, T., Ishii, Y., Yagi, S., Okuma, S., Kashiwagi, K., Maeda, T., Miyazaki, T., Yoshizawa, S., and Tateda, K. (2020). Clinical validation of quantitative SARS-CoV-2 antigen assays to estimate SARS-CoV-2 viral loads in nasopharyngeal swabs. *J Infect Chemother.*

Balduzzi, S., Rücker, G., and Schwarzer, G. (2019). How to perform a meta-analysis with R: a practical tutorial. *Evid Based Ment Health* 22, 153-160.

Beck, E.T., Paar, W., Fojut, L., Serwe, J., and Jahnke, R.R. (2021). Comparison of the Quidel Sofia SARS FIA Test to the Hologic Aptima SARS-CoV-2 TMA Test for Diagnosis of COVID-19 in Symptomatic Outpatients. *J Clin Microbiol* 59.

Berger, A., Ngo Nsoga, M.T., Perez-Rodriguez, F.J., Aad, Y.A., Sattonnet-Roche, P., Gayet-Ageron, A., Jaksic, C., Torriani, G., Boehm, E., Kronig, I., Sacks, J.A., De Vos, M., Bausch, F.J., Chappuis, F., Kaiser, L., Schibler, M., and Eckerle, I. (2020). Diagnostic accuracy of two commercial SARS-CoV-2 Antigen-detecting rapid tests at the point of care in community-based testing centers. *medRxiv*, 2020.2011.2020.20235341.

Booth, A., Clarke, M., Ghera, D., Moher, D., Petticrew, M., and Stewart, L. (2011). An international registry of systematic-review protocols. *The Lancet* 377, 108-109.

553 Brümmer, L.E., Katzenschlager, S., Gaeddert, M., Erdmann, C., Schmitz, S., Bota, M., Grilli,
554 M., Larmann, J., Weigand, M.A., Pollock, N.R., Carmona, S., Ongarello, S., Sacks, J.,
555 and Denking, C.M. (2021).

556 Bulilete, O., Lorente, P., Leiva, A., Carandell, E., Oliver, A., Rojo, E., Pericas, P., and Llobera,
557 J. (2020). Evaluation of the Panbio™ rapid antigen test for SARS-CoV-2 in primary
558 health care centers and test sites. *medRxiv*, 2020.2011.2013.20231316.

559 Bustin, S.A., and Nolan, T. (2020). RT-qPCR Testing of SARS-CoV-2: A Primer. *International*
560 *journal of molecular sciences* 21, 3004.

561 Carlos, W.G., Dela Cruz, C.S., Cao, B., Pasnick, S., and Jamil, S. (2020). Novel Wuhan (2019-
562 nCoV) Coronavirus. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 201, P7-p8.

563 Cerutti, F., Burdino, E., Milia, M.G., Alice, T., Gregori, G., Bruzzone, B., and Ghisetti, V.
564 (2020). Urgent need of rapid tests for SARS CoV-2 antigen detection: Evaluation of the
565 SD-Biosensor antigen test for SARS-CoV-2. *J Clin Virol* 132, 104654.

566 Chaimayo, C., Kaewnaphan, B., Tanlieng, N., Athipanyasilp, N., Sirijatuphat, R.,
567 Chayakulkeeree, M., Angkasekwini, N., Sutthent, R., Puangpunngam, N.,
568 Tharmviboonsri, T., Pongraweevan, O., Chuthapisith, S., Sirivatanauksorn, Y.,
569 Kantakamalakul, W., and Horthongkham, N. (2020). Rapid SARS-CoV-2 antigen
570 detection assay in comparison with real-time RT-PCR assay for laboratory diagnosis of
571 COVID-19 in Thailand. *Virol J* 17, 177.

572 Chang, D., Lin, M., Wei, L., Xie, L., Zhu, G., Dela Cruz, C.S., and Sharma, L. (2020).
573 Epidemiologic and Clinical Characteristics of Novel Coronavirus Infections Involving 13
574 Patients Outside Wuhan, China. *JAMA* 323, 1092-1093.

575 Ciotti, M., Maurici, M., Pieri, M., Andreoni, M., and Bernardini, S. (2021). Performance of a
576 rapid antigen test in the diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2 infection. *J Med Virol*.

- Colavita, F., Vairo, F., Meschi, S., Valli, B., Lalle, E., Castilletti, C., Fusco, D., Spiga, G., Bartoletti, P., Ursino, S., Sanguinetti, M., Di Caro, A., Vaia, F., Ippolito, G., and Capobianchi, M.R. (2020). COVID-19 Antigen Rapid Test as Screening Strategy at the Points-of-Entry: Experience in Lazio Region, Central Italy, August-October 2020. *medRxiv*, 2020.2011.2026.20232728.
- Courtellemont, L., Guinard, J., Guillaume, C., Giaché, S., Rzepecki, V., Seve, A., Gubavu, C., Baud, K., Helloco, C.L., Cassuto, G.N., Pialoux, G., Hocqueloux, L., and Prazuck, T. (2021). High performance of a novel antigen detection test on nasopharyngeal specimens for SARS-CoV-2 infection diagnosis: a prospective study. *medRxiv*, 2020.2010.2028.20220657.
- Diao, B., Wen, K., Zhang, J., Chen, J., Han, C., Chen, Y., Wang, S., Deng, G., Zhou, H., and Wu, Y. (2020). Accuracy of a nucleocapsid protein antigen rapid test in the diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2 infection. *Clin Microbiol Infect*.
- Dinnes, J., Deeks, J.J., Adriano, A., Berhane, S., Davenport, C., Dittrich, S., Emperador, D., Takwoingi, Y., Cunningham, J., Beese, S., Dretzke, J., Ferrante Di Ruffano, L., Harris, I.M., Price, M.J., Taylor-Phillips, S., Hooft, L., Leeftang, M.M., Spijker, R., and Van Den Bruel, A. (2020). Rapid, point-of-care antigen and molecular-based tests for diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2 infection. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 8, Cd013705.
- Drain, P.K., Ampajwala, M., Chappel, C., Gvozden, A.B., Hoppers, M., Wang, M., Rosen, R., Young, S., Zissman, E., and Montano, M. (2020). A rapid, high-sensitivity SARS-CoV-2 nucleocapsid immunoassay to aid diagnosis of acute COVID-19 at the point of care. *medRxiv*, 2020.2012.2011.20238410.
- Drevinek, P., Hurych, J., Kepka, Z., Briksi, A., Kulich, M., Zajac, M., and Hubacek, P. (2020). The sensitivity of SARS-CoV-2 antigen tests in the view of large-scale testing. *medRxiv*, 2020.2011.2023.20237198.

Favresse, J., Gillot, C., Oliveira, M., Cadrobbi, J., Elsen, M., Eucher, C., Laffineur, K., Rosseels, C., Van Eeckhoudt, S., Nicolas, J.B., Morimont, L., Dogné, J.M., and Douxfils, J. (2021). Head-to-Head Comparison of Rapid and Automated Antigen Detection Tests for the Diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2 Infection. *J Clin Med* 10.

Fenollar, F., Bouam, A., Ballouche, M., Fuster, L., Prudent, E., Colson, P., Tissot-Dupont, H., Million, M., Drancourt, M., Raoult, D., and Fournier, P.E. (2021). Evaluation of the Panbio COVID-19 Rapid Antigen Detection Test Device for the Screening of Patients with COVID-19. *J Clin Microbiol* 59.

Gatsonis, C., and Paliwal, P. (2006). Meta-analysis of diagnostic and screening test accuracy evaluations: methodologic primer. *AJR Am J Roentgenol* 187, 271-281.

Giri, B., Pandey, S., Shrestha, R., Pokharel, K., Ligler, F.S., and Neupane, B.B. (2021). Review of analytical performance of COVID-19 detection methods. *Anal Bioanal Chem* 413, 35-48.

Gremmels, H., Winkel, B.M.F., Schuurman, R., Rosingh, A., Rigter, N.a.M., Rodriguez, O., Ubijaa, J., Wensing, A.M.J., Bonten, M.J.M., and Hofstra, L.M. (2021). Real-life validation of the Panbio™ COVID-19 antigen rapid test (Abbott) in community-dwelling subjects with symptoms of potential SARS-CoV-2 infection. *EClinicalMedicine* 31, 100677.

Griffith, G.J., Morris, T.T., Tudball, M.J., Herbert, A., Mancano, G., Pike, L., Sharp, G.C., Sterne, J., Palmer, T.M., Davey Smith, G., Tilling, K., Zuccolo, L., Davies, N.M., and Hemani, G. (2020). Collider bias undermines our understanding of COVID-19 disease risk and severity. *Nature Communications* 11, 5749.

He, X., Lau, E.H.Y., Wu, P., Deng, X., Wang, J., Hao, X., Lau, Y.C., Wong, J.Y., Guan, Y., Tan, X., Mo, X., Chen, Y., Liao, B., Chen, W., Hu, F., Zhang, Q., Zhong, M., Wu, Y., Zhao, L., Zhang, F., Cowling, B.J., Li, F., and Leung, G.M. (2020). Temporal dynamics in viral shedding and transmissibility of COVID-19. *Nat Med* 26, 672-675.

Hirotsu, Y., Maejima, M., Shibusawa, M., Amemiya, K., Nagakubo, Y., Hosaka, K., Sueki, H., Hayakawa, M., Mochizuki, H., Tsutsui, T., Kakizaki, Y., Miyashita, Y., and Omata, M. (2021). Analysis of a persistent viral shedding patient infected with SARS-CoV-2 by RT-qPCR, FilmArray Respiratory Panel v2.1, and antigen detection. *J Infect Chemother* 27, 406-409.

Hirotsu, Y., Maejima, M., Shibusawa, M., Nagakubo, Y., Hosaka, K., Amemiya, K., Sueki, H., Hayakawa, M., Mochizuki, H., Tsutsui, T., Kakizaki, Y., Miyashita, Y., Yagi, S., Kojima, S., and Omata, M. (2020). Comparison of automated SARS-CoV-2 antigen test for COVID-19 infection with quantitative RT-PCR using 313 nasopharyngeal swabs, including from seven serially followed patients. *Int J Infect Dis* 99, 397-402.

Hoehl, S., Schenk, B., Rudych, O., Göttig, S., Foppa, I., Kohmer, N., Karaca, O., Toptan, T., and Ciesek, S. (2020). At-home self-testing of teachers with a SARS-CoV-2 rapid antigen test to reduce potential transmissions in schools. *medRxiv*, 2020.2012.2004.20243410.

Houston, H., Gupta-Wright, A., Toke-Bjølgerud, E., Biggin-Lamming, J., and John, L. (2021). Diagnostic accuracy and utility of SARS-CoV-2 antigen lateral flow assays in medical admissions with possible COVID-19. *medRxiv*, 2021.2001.2027.21250428.

Jääskeläinen, A.E., Ahava, M.J., Jokela, P., Szilovics, L., Pohjala, S., Vapalahti, O., Lappalainen, M., Hepojoki, J., and Kurkela, S. (2021). Evaluation of three rapid lateral flow antigen detection tests for the diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2 infection. *medRxiv*, 2020.2012.2030.20249057.

Jakobsen, K.K., Jensen, J.S., Todsén, T., Lippert, F., Martel, C.J.-M., Klokke, M., and Von Buchwald, C. (2021). Detection of SARS-CoV-2 infection by rapid antigen test in comparison with RT-PCR in a public setting. *medRxiv*, 2021.2001.2022.21250042.

James, A.E., Gulley, T., Kothari, A., Holder, K., Garner, K., and Patil, N. (2021). Performance of the BinaxNOW COVID-19 Antigen Card test relative to the SARS-CoV-2 real-time

reverse transcriptase polymerase chain reaction assay among symptomatic and asymptomatic healthcare employees. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol*, 1-15.

Kashiwagi, K., Ishii, Y., Aoki, K., Yagi, S., Maeda, T., Miyazaki, T., Yoshizawa, S., Aoyagi, K., and Tateda, K. (2020). Immunochromatographic test for the detection of SARS-CoV-2 in saliva. *medRxiv*, 2020.2005.2020.20107631.

Kohmer, N., Toptan, T., Pallas, C., Karaca, O., Pfeiffer, A., Westhaus, S., Widera, M., Berger, A., Hoehl, S., Kammel, M., Ciesek, S., and Rabenau, H.F. (2021). The Comparative Clinical Performance of Four SARS-CoV-2 Rapid Antigen Tests and Their Correlation to Infectivity In Vitro. *J Clin Med* 10.

Krüger, L.J., Gaeddert, M., Köppel, L., Brümmer, L.E., Gottschalk, C., Miranda, I.B., Schnitzler, P., Kräusslich, H.G., Lindner, A.K., Nikolai, O., Mockenhaupt, F.P., Seybold, J., Corman, V.M., Drosten, C., Pollock, N.R., Cubas-Atienzar, A.I., Kontogianni, K., Collins, A., Wright, A.H., Knorr, B., Welker, A., De Vos, M., Sacks, J.A., Adams, E.R., and Denking, C.M. (2020). Evaluation of the accuracy, ease of use and limit of detection of novel, rapid, antigen-detecting point-of-care diagnostics for SARS-CoV-2. *medRxiv*, 2020.2010.2001.20203836.

Krüttgen, A., Cornelissen, C.G., Dreher, M., Hornef, M.W., Imöhl, M., and Kleines, M. (2021). Comparison of the SARS-CoV-2 Rapid antigen test to the real star Sars-CoV-2 RT PCR kit. *J Virol Methods* 288, 114024.

La Marca, A., Capuzzo, M., Paglia, T., Roli, L., Trenti, T., and Nelson, S.M. (2020). Testing for SARS-CoV-2 (COVID-19): a systematic review and clinical guide to molecular and serological in-vitro diagnostic assays. *Reproductive biomedicine online* 41, 483-499.

La Scola, B., Le Bideau, M., Andreani, J., Hoang, V.T., Grimaldier, C., Colson, P., Gautret, P., and Raoult, D. (2020). Viral RNA load as determined by cell culture as a management tool for discharge of SARS-CoV-2 patients from infectious disease wards. *European Journal of Clinical Microbiology & Infectious Diseases* 39, 1059-1061.

679 Lambert-Niclot, S., Cuffel, A., Le Pape, S., Vauloup-Fellous, C., Morand-Joubert, L., Roque-
680 Afonso, A.M., Le Goff, J., and Delaugerre, C. (2020). Evaluation of a Rapid Diagnostic
681 Assay for Detection of SARS-CoV-2 Antigen in Nasopharyngeal Swabs. *J Clin*
682 *Microbiol* 58.

683 Larremore, D.B., Wilder, B., Lester, E., Shehata, S., Burke, J.M., Hay, J.A., Tambe, M., Mina,
684 M.J., and Parker, R. (2020). Test sensitivity is secondary to frequency and turnaround
685 time for COVID-19 surveillance. *medRxiv*, 2020.2006.2022.20136309.

686 Leeflang, M.M.G. (2014). Systematic reviews and meta-analyses of diagnostic test accuracy.
687 *Clinical Microbiology and Infection* 20, 105-113.

688 Li, Q., Guan, X., Wu, P., Wang, X., Zhou, L., Tong, Y., Ren, R., Leung, K.S.M., Lau, E.H.Y.,
689 Wong, J.Y., Xing, X., Xiang, N., Wu, Y., Li, C., Chen, Q., Li, D., Liu, T., Zhao, J., Liu,
690 M., Tu, W., Chen, C., Jin, L., Yang, R., Wang, Q., Zhou, S., Wang, R., Liu, H., Luo, Y.,
691 Liu, Y., Shao, G., Li, H., Tao, Z., Yang, Y., Deng, Z., Liu, B., Ma, Z., Zhang, Y., Shi, G.,
692 Lam, T.T.Y., Wu, J.T., Gao, G.F., Cowling, B.J., Yang, B., Leung, G.M., and Feng, Z.
693 (2020). Early Transmission Dynamics in Wuhan, China, of Novel Coronavirus–Infected
694 Pneumonia. *New England Journal of Medicine* 382, 1199-1207.

695 Lijmer, J.G., Mol, B.W., Heisterkamp, S., Bossel, G.J., Prins, M.H., Van Der Meulen, J.H.P.,
696 and Bossuyt, P.M.M. (1999). Empirical Evidence of Design-Related Bias in Studies of
697 Diagnostic Tests. *JAMA* 282, 1061-1066.

698 Linares, M., Pérez-Tanoira, R., Carrero, A., Romanyk, J., Pérez-García, F., Gómez-Herruz, P.,
699 Arroyo, T., and Cuadros, J. (2020). Panbio antigen rapid test is reliable to diagnose
700 SARS-CoV-2 infection in the first 7 days after the onset of symptoms. *J Clin Virol* 133,
701 104659.

702 Lindner, A.K., Nikolai, O., Kausch, F., Wintel, M., Hommes, F., Gertler, M., Krüger, L.J.,
703 Gaeddert, M., Tobian, F., Lainati, F., Köppel, L., Seybold, J., Corman, V.M., Drosten, C.,
704 Hofmann, J., Sacks, J.A., Mockenhaupt, F.P., and Denking, C.M. (2020). Head-to-head

comparison of SARS-CoV-2 antigen-detecting rapid test with self-collected anterior nasal swab versus professional-collected nasopharyngeal swab. *Eur Respir J*.

Lindner, A.K., Nikolai, O., Rohardt, C., Kausch, F., Wintel, M., Gertler, M., Burock, S., Horig, M., Bernhard, J., Tobian, F., Gaeddert, M., Lainati, F., Corman, V.M., Jones, T.C., Sacks, J.A., Seybold, J., Denking, C.M., and Mockenhaupt, F.P. (2021). SARS-CoV-2 patient self-testing with an antigen-detecting rapid test: a head-to-head comparison with professional testing. *medRxiv*, 2021.2001.2006.20249009.

Liotti, F.M., Menchinelli, G., Lalle, E., Palucci, I., Marchetti, S., Colavita, F., La Sorda, M., Sberna, G., Bordin, L., Sanguinetti, M., Cattani, P., Capobianchi, M.R., and Posteraro, B. (2020). Performance of a novel diagnostic assay for rapid SARS-CoV-2 antigen detection in nasopharynx samples. *Clin Microbiol Infect*.

Liu, D., Wu, F., Cen, Y., Ye, L., Shi, X., Huang, Y., Fang, S., and Ma, L. (2021). Comparative research on nucleocapsid and spike glycoprotein as the rapid immunodetection targets of COVID-19 and establishment of immunoassay strips. *Mol Immunol* 131, 6-12.

Mak, G.C., Lau, S.S., Wong, K.K., Chow, N.L., Lau, C.S., Lam, E.T., Chan, R.C., and Tsang, D.N. (2020). Analytical sensitivity and clinical sensitivity of the three rapid antigen detection kits for detection of SARS-CoV-2 virus. *J Clin Virol* 133, 104684.

Mak, G.C.K., Lau, S.S.Y., Wong, K.K.Y., Chow, N.L.S., Lau, C.S., Lam, E.T.K., Chan, R.C.W., and Tsang, D.N.C. (2021). Evaluation of rapid antigen detection kit from the WHO Emergency Use List for detecting SARS-CoV-2. *J Clin Virol* 134, 104712.

Masiá, M., Fernández-González, M., Sánchez, M., Carvajal, M., García, J.A., Gonzalo, N., De La Tabla, V.O., Agulló, V., Candela, I., Guijarro, J., Gutiérrez, J.A., De Gregorio, C., and Gutiérrez, F. (2020). Nasopharyngeal Panbio COVID-19 antigen performed at point-of-care has a high sensitivity in symptomatic and asymptomatic patients with higher risk for transmission and older age. *medRxiv*, 2020.2011.2016.20230003.

- Menchinelli, G., Bordi, L., Liotti, F.M., Palucci, I., Capobianchi, M.R., Sberna, G., Lalle, E., Romano, L., Angelis, G.D., Marchetti, S., Sanguinetti, M., Cattani, P., and Posteraro, B. (2021). Lumipulse G SARS-CoV-2 Ag Assay Evaluation for SARS-CoV-2 Antigen Detection Using 594 Nasopharyngeal Swab Samples from Different Testing Groups. *medRxiv*, 2021.2001.2026.21250533.
- Merino-Amador, P., Guinea, J., Muñoz-Gallego, I., González-Donapetry, P., Galán, J.-C., Antona, N., Cilla, G., Hernández-Crespo, S., Díaz-De Tuesta, J.-L., Gual-De Torrella, A., González-Romo, F., Escribano, P., Sánchez-Castellano, M.Á., Sota-Busselo, M., Delgado-Iribarren, A., García, J., Cantón, R., Muñoz, P., Folguez, M.D., Cuenca-Estrella, M., and Oteo-Iglesias, J. (2020). Multicenter evaluation of the Panbio™ COVID-19 Rapid Antigen-Detection Test for the diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2 infection. *medRxiv*, 2020.2011.2018.20230375.
- Mina, M.J., Parker, R., and Larremore, D.B. (2020). Rethinking Covid-19 Test Sensitivity — A Strategy for Containment. *New England Journal of Medicine* 383, e120.
- Möckel, M., Corman, V.M., Stegemann, M.S., Hofmann, J., Stein, A., Jones, T.C., Gastmeier, P., Seybold, J., Offermann, R., Bachmann, U., Lindner, T., Bauer, W., Drosten, C., Rosen, A., and Somasundaram, R. (2021). SARS-CoV-2 Antigen Rapid Immunoassay for Diagnosis of COVID-19 in the Emergency Department. *Biomarkers*, 1-13.
- Nalumansi, A., Lutalo, T., Kayiwa, J., Watera, C., Balinandi, S., Kiconco, J., Nakasegu, J., Olara, D., Odwilo, E., Serwanga, J., Kikaire, B., Ssemwanga, D., Nabadda, S., Ssewanyana, I., Atwine, D., Mwebesa, H., Bosa, H.K., Nsereko, C., Cotten, M., Downing, R., Lutwama, J., and Kaleebu, P. (2020). Field evaluation of the performance of a SARS-CoV-2 antigen rapid diagnostic test in Uganda using nasopharyngeal samples. *Int J Infect Dis* 104, 282-286.
- Ngo Nsoga, M.-T., Kronig, I., Perez Rodriguez, F.J., Sattonnet-Roche, P., Da Silva, D., Helbling, J., Sacks, J.A., De Vos, M., Boehm, E., Gayet-Ageron, A., Berger, A.,

Jacquierioz-Bausch, F., Chappuis, F., Kaiser, L., Schibler, M., Renzoni, A., and Eckerle, I. (2021). Diagnostic accuracy of Panbio™ rapid antigen tests on oropharyngeal swabs for detection of SARS-CoV-2. *medRxiv*, 2021.2001.2030.21250314.

Okoye, N.C., Barker, A.P., Curtis, K., Orlandi, R.R., Snively, E.A., Wright, C., Hanson, K.E., and Pearson, L.N. (2021). Performance Characteristics of BinaxNOW COVID-19 Antigen Card for Screening Asymptomatic Individuals in a University Setting. *J Clin Microbiol*.

Oran, D.P., and Topol, E.J. (2020). Prevalence of Asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 Infection. *Annals of Internal Medicine* 173, 362-367.

Osterman, A., Baldauf, H.M., Eletreby, M., Wettengel, J.M., Afridi, S.Q., Fuchs, T., Holzmann, E., Maier, A., Döring, J., Grzimek-Koschewa, N., Muenchhoff, M., Protzer, U., Kaderali, L., and Keppler, O.T. (2021). Evaluation of two rapid antigen tests to detect SARS-CoV-2 in a hospital setting. *Med Microbiol Immunol*, 1-8.

Page, M.J., McKenzie, J.E., Bossuyt, P.M., Boutron, I., Hoffmann, T.C., Mulrow, C.D., Shamseer, L., Tetzlaff, J.M., Akl, E.A., Brennan, S.E., Chou, R., Glanville, J., Grimshaw, J.M., Hróbjartsson, A., Lalu, M.M., Li, T., Loder, E.W., Mayo-Wilson, E., McDonald, S., McGuinness, L.A., Stewart, L.A., Thomas, J., Tricco, A.C., Welch, V.A., Whiting, P., and Moher, D. (2020). The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *MetaArXiv*.

Peeling, R.W., Olliaro, P.L., Boeras, D.I., and Fongwen, N. (2021). Scaling up COVID-19 rapid antigen tests: promises and challenges. *The Lancet. Infectious diseases*, S1473-3099(1421)00048-00047.

Pekosz, A., Parvu, V., Li, M., Andrews, J.C., Manabe, Y.C., Kodosi, S., Gary, D.S., Roger-Dalbert, C., Leitch, J., and Cooper, C.K. (2021). Antigen-Based Testing but Not Real-Time Polymerase Chain Reaction Correlates With Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 Viral Culture. *Clin Infect Dis*.

- Peto, T. (2021). COVID-19: Rapid Antigen detection for SARS-CoV-2 by lateral flow assay: a national systematic evaluation for mass-testing. *medRxiv*, 2021.2001.2013.21249563.
- Pilarowski, G., Lebel, P., Sunshine, S., Liu, J., Crawford, E., Marquez, C., Rubio, L., Chamie, G., Martinez, J., Peng, J., Black, D., Wu, W., Pak, J., Laurie, M.T., Jones, D., Miller, S., Jacobo, J., Rojas, S., Rojas, S., Nakamura, R., Tulier-Laiwa, V., Petersen, M., Havlir, D.V., and Derisi, J. (2020a). Performance characteristics of a rapid SARS-CoV-2 antigen detection assay at a public plaza testing site in San Francisco. *medRxiv*.
- Pilarowski, G., Marquez, C., Rubio, L., Peng, J., Martinez, J., Black, D., Chamie, G., Jones, D., Jacobo, J., Tulier-Laiwa, V., Rojas, S., Rojas, S., Cox, C., Petersen, M., Derisi, J., and Havlir, D.V. (2020b). Field performance and public health response using the BinaxNOW TM Rapid SARS-CoV-2 antigen detection assay during community-based testing. *Clin Infect Dis*.
- Pinninti, S., Trieu, C., Pati, S.K., Latting, M., Cooper, J., Seleme, M.C., Boppana, S., Arora, N., Britt, W.J., and Boppana, S.B. (2020). Comparing Nasopharyngeal and Midturbinate Nasal Swab Testing for the Identification of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2. *Clinical Infectious Diseases*.
- Pollock, N.R., Jacobs, J.R., Tran, K., Cranston, A., Smith, S., O' Kane, C., Roady, T., Moran, A., Scarry, A., Carroll, M., Volinsky, L., Perez, G., Patel, P., Gabriel, S., Lennon, N.J., Madoff, L.C., Brown, C., and Smole, S.C. (2021a). Performance and Implementation Evaluation of the Abbott BinaxNOW Rapid Antigen Test in a High-throughput Drive-through Community Testing Site in Massachusetts. *medRxiv*, 2021.2001.2009.21249499.
- Pollock, N.R., Savage, T.J., Wardell, H., Lee, R.A., Mathew, A., Stengelin, M., and Sigal, G.B. (2021b). Correlation of SARS-CoV-2 nucleocapsid antigen and RNA concentrations in nasopharyngeal samples from children and adults using an ultrasensitive and quantitative antigen assay. *J Clin Microbiol*.

- Porte, L., Legarraga, P., Vollrath, V., Aguilera, X., Munita, J.M., Araos, R., Pizarro, G., Vial, P., Iruretagoyena, M., Dittrich, S., and Weitzel, T. (2020). Evaluation of a novel antigen-based rapid detection test for the diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2 in respiratory samples. *Int J Infect Dis* 99, 328-333.
- Pray, I.W., Ford, L., Cole, D., Lee, C., Bigouette, J.P., Abedi, G.R., Bushman, D., Delahoy, M.J., Currie, D., Cherney, B., Kirby, M., Fajardo, G., Caudill, M., Langolf, K., Kahrs, J., Kelly, P., Pitts, C., Lim, A., Aulik, N., Tamin, A., Harcourt, J.L., Queen, K., Zhang, J., Whitaker, B., Browne, H., Medrzycki, M., Shewmaker, P., Folster, J., Bankamp, B., Bowen, M.D., Thornburg, N.J., Goffard, K., Limbago, B., Bateman, A., Tate, J.E., Gieryn, D., Kirking, H.L., Westergaard, R., and Killerby, M. (2021). Performance of an Antigen-Based Test for Asymptomatic and Symptomatic SARS-CoV-2 Testing at Two University Campuses - Wisconsin, September-October 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep* 69, 1642-1647.
- Prince-Guerra, J.L., Almendares, O., Nolen, L.D., Gunn, J.K.L., Dale, A.P., Buono, S.A., Deutsch-Feldman, M., Suppiah, S., Hao, L., Zeng, Y., Stevens, V.A., Knipe, K., Pompey, J., Atherstone, C., Bui, D.P., Powell, T., Tamin, A., Harcourt, J.L., Shewmaker, P.L., Medrzycki, M., Wong, P., Jain, S., Tejada-Strop, A., Rogers, S., Emery, B., Wang, H., Petway, M., Bohannon, C., Folster, J.M., Macneil, A., Salerno, R., Kuhnert-Tallman, W., Tate, J.E., Thornburg, N.J., Kirking, H.L., Sheiban, K., Kudrna, J., Cullen, T., Komatsu, K.K., Villanueva, J.M., Rose, D.A., Neatherlin, J.C., Anderson, M., Rota, P.A., Honein, M.A., and Bower, W.A. (2021). Evaluation of Abbott BinaxNOW Rapid Antigen Test for SARS-CoV-2 Infection at Two Community-Based Testing Sites - Pima County, Arizona, November 3-17, 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep* 70, 100-105.
- Quicke, K., Gallichote, E., Sexton, N., Young, M., Janich, A., Gahm, G., Carlton, E.J., Ehrhart, N., and Ebel, G.D. (2020). Longitudinal Surveillance for SARS-CoV-2 RNA Among Asymptomatic Staff in Five Colorado Skilled Nursing Facilities: Epidemiologic, Virologic and Sequence Analysis. *medRxiv*.

Ransom, E.M., Potter, R.F., Wallace, M.A., Mitchell, K.F., Yarbrough, M.L., Burnham, C.A., Anderson, N.W., and Parikh, B.A. (2020). Comparison of Extraction Methods and Thermocyclers for SARS-CoV-2 Molecular Detection Using Clinical Specimens. *J Clin Microbiol* 58.

Rastawicki, W., Gierczyński, R., Juszczak, G., Mitura, K., and Henry, B.M. (2021). Evaluation of PCL rapid point of care antigen test for detection of SARS-CoV-2 in nasopharyngeal swabs. *J Med Virol*.

Rezaei, M., Razavi Bazaz, S., Zhand, S., Sayyadi, N., Jin, D., Stewart, M.P., and Ebrahimi Warkiani, M. (2020). Point of Care Diagnostics in the Age of COVID-19. *Diagnostics (Basel)* 11.

Rhoads, D., Peaper, D.R., She, R.C., Nolte, F.S., Wojewoda, C.M., Anderson, N.W., and Pritt, B.S. (2020). College of American Pathologists (CAP) Microbiology Committee Perspective: Caution must be used in interpreting the Cycle Threshold (Ct) value. *Clin Infect Dis*.

Schunemann, H., Brozek, J., Guyatt, G., and Oxman, A. (2013). *GRADE Handbook for Grading Quality of Evidence and Strength of Recommendations*. <https://gdt.gradeapro.org/app/handbook/handbook.html> [Online]. [Accessed].

Schwob, J.M., Miauton, A., Petrovic, D., Perdrix, J., Senn, N., Jatton, K., Onya, O., Maillard, A., Minghelli, G., Cornuz, J., Greub, G., Genton, B., and D'acremont, V. (2020). Antigen rapid tests, nasopharyngeal PCR and saliva PCR to detect SARS-CoV-2: a prospective comparative clinical trial. *medRxiv*, 2020.2011.2023.20237057.

Scohy, A., Anantharajah, A., Bodéus, M., Kabamba-Mukadi, B., Verroken, A., and Rodriguez-Villalobos, H. (2020). Low performance of rapid antigen detection test as frontline testing for COVID-19 diagnosis. *J Clin Virol* 129, 104455.

Smith, R.L., Gibson, L.L., Martinez, P.P., Ke, R., Mirza, A., Conte, M., Gallagher, N., Conte, A., Wang, L., Fredrickson, R., Edmonson, D.C., Baughman, M.E., Chiu, K.K., Choi, H.,

Jensen, T.W., Scardina, K.R., Bradley, S., Gloss, S.L., Reinhart, C., Yedetore, J., Owens, A.N., Broach, J., Barton, B., Lazar, P., Henness, D., Young, T., Dunnett, A., Robinson, M.L., Mostafa, H.H., Pekosz, A., Manabe, Y.C., Heetderks, W.J., Mcmanus, D.D., and Brooke, C.B. (2021). Longitudinal assessment of diagnostic test performance over the course of acute SARS-CoV-2 infection. *medRxiv*, 2021.2003.2019.21253964.

Stokes, W., Berenger, B.M., Portnoy, D., Scott, B., Szelewicki, J., Singh, T., Venner, A.A., Turnbull, L., Pabbaraju, K., Shokoples, S., Wong, A.A., Gill, K., Guttridge, T., Proctor, D., Hu, J., and Tipples, G. (2021).

Strömer, A., Rose, R., Schäfer, M., Schön, F., Vollersen, A., Lorentz, T., Fickenscher, H., and Krumbholz, A. (2020). Performance of a Point-of-Care Test for the Rapid Detection of SARS-CoV-2 Antigen. *Microorganisms* 9.

Tahamtan, A., and Ardebili, A. (2020). Real-time RT-PCR in COVID-19 detection: issues affecting the results. *Expert review of molecular diagnostics* 20, 453-454.

Takeuchi, Y., Akashi, Y., Kato, D., Kuwahara, M., Muramatsu, S., Ueda, A., Notake, S., Nakamura, K., Ishikawa, H., and Suzuki, H. (2021). The evaluation of a newly developed antigen test (QuickNavi™-COVID19 Ag) for SARS-CoV-2: A prospective observational study in Japan. *medRxiv*, 2020.2012.2027.20248876.

Toptan, T., Eckermann, L., Pfeiffer, A.E., Hoehl, S., Ciesek, S., Drosten, C., and Corman, V.M. (2020). Evaluation of a SARS-CoV-2 rapid antigen test: Potential to help reduce community spread? *J Clin Virol* 135, 104713.

Torres, I., Poujois, S., Albert, E., Colomina, J., and Navarro, D. (2021). Evaluation of a rapid antigen test (Panbio™ COVID-19 Ag rapid test device) for SARS-CoV-2 detection in asymptomatic close contacts of COVID-19 patients. *Clin Microbiol Infect*.

Turcato, G., Zaboli, A., Pfeifer, N., Ciccariello, L., Sibilio, S., Tezza, G., and Ausserhofer, D. (2020). Clinical application of a rapid antigen test for the detection of SARS-CoV-2

infection in symptomatic and asymptomatic patients evaluated in the emergency department: A preliminary report. *J Infect.*

Van Der Moeren, N., Zwart, V.F., Lodder, E.B., Van Den Bijllaardt, W., Van Esch, H.R.J.M., Stohr, J.J.J.M., Pot, J., Welschen, I., Van Mechelen, P.M.F., Pas, S.D., and Kluytmans, J.a.J.W. (2020). PERFORMANCE EVALUATION OF A SARS-COV-2 RAPID ANTIGENTEST: TEST PERFORMANCE IN THE COMMUNITY IN THE NETHERLANDS. *medRxiv*, 2020.2010.2019.20215202.

Van Kampen, J., Van Der Vijver, D., Fraaij, P., Haagmans, B., Lamers, M., Okba, N., Van Den Akker, J., Endeman, H., Gommers, D., Cornelissen, J., Hoek, R., Van Der Eerden, M., Hesselink, D., Metselaar, H., Verbon, A., De Steenwinkel, J., Aron, G., Van Gorp, E., Van Boheemen, S., Voermans, J., Boucher, C., Molenkamp, R., Koopmans, M., Geurtsvankessel, C., and Van Der Eijk, A. (2020). Shedding of infectious virus in hospitalized patients with coronavirus disease-2019 (COVID-19): duration and key determinants. *ResearchGate Preprint Repository*.

Viechtbauer, W. (2010). Conducting Meta-Analyses in R with the metafor Package. *2010* 36, 48.

Villaverde, S., Domínguez-Rodríguez, S., Sabrido, G., Pérez-Jorge, C., Plata, M., Romero, M.P., Grasa, C., Jiménez, A.B., Heras, E., Broncano, A., Núñez, M., Illán, M., Merino, P., Soto, B., Molina-Arana, D., Bermejo, A., Mendoza, P., Gijón, M., Pérez-Moneo, B., Moraleda, C., and Tagarro, A. (2021). Diagnostic Accuracy of the Panbio SARS-CoV-2 Antigen Rapid Test Compared with Rt-Pcr Testing of Nasopharyngeal Samples in the Pediatric Population. *J Pediatr.*

Walsh, K.A., Jordan, K., Clyne, B., Rohde, D., Drummond, L., Byrne, P., Ahern, S., Carty, P.G., O'brien, K.K., O'murchu, E., O'Neill, M., Smith, S.M., Ryan, M., and Harrington, P. (2020). SARS-CoV-2 detection, viral load and infectivity over the course of an infection. *The Journal of infection* 81, 357-371.

Wang, D., Hu, B., Hu, C., Zhu, F., Liu, X., Zhang, J., Wang, B., Xiang, H., Cheng, Z., Xiong, Y., Zhao, Y., Li, Y., Wang, X., and Peng, Z. (2020). Clinical Characteristics of 138 Hospitalized Patients With 2019 Novel Coronavirus–Infected Pneumonia in Wuhan, China. *JAMA* 323, 1061-1069.

Wang, R., and Taubenberger, J.K. (2010). Methods for molecular surveillance of influenza. *Expert review of anti-infective therapy* 8, 517-527.

Weitzel, T., Legarraga, P., Iruretagoyena, M., Pizarro, G., Vollrath, V., Araos, R., Munita, J.M., and Porte, L. (2020). Comparative evaluation of four rapid SARS-CoV-2 antigen detection tests using universal transport medium. *Travel Med Infect Dis* 39, 101942.

Wells, G.A., Shea, B., O'connell, D., Peterson, J., Welch, V., Losos, M., and Tugwell, P. (2011). *The Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (NOS) for Assessing the Quality of Nonrandomised Studies in Meta-Analysis*. http://www.ohri.ca/programs/clinical_epidemiology/oxford.asp [Online]. [Accessed].

Wolfel, R., Corman, V.M., Guggemos, W., Seilmaier, M., Zange, S., Muller, M.A., Niemeyer, D., Jones, T.C., Vollmar, P., Rothe, C., Hoelscher, M., Bleicker, T., Brunink, S., Schneider, J., Ehmman, R., Zwirgmaier, K., Drosten, C., and Wendtner, C. (2020). Virological assessment of hospitalized patients with COVID-2019. *Nature* 581, 465-469.

Yamamoto, K., Suzuki, M., Yamada, G., Sudo, T., Nomoto, H., Kinoshita, N., Nakamura, K., Tsujimoto, Y., Kusaba, Y., Morita, C., Moriya, A., Maeda, K., Yagi, S., Kimura, M., and Ohmagari, N. (2021). Utility of the antigen test for coronavirus disease 2019: Factors influencing the prediction of the possibility of disease transmission. *Int J Infect Dis* 104, 65-72.

Young, S., Taylor, S.N., Cammarata, C.L., Varnado, K.G., Roger-Dalbert, C., Montano, A., Griego-Fullbright, C., Burgard, C., Fernandez, C., Eckert, K., Andrews, J.C., Ren, H., Allen, J., Ackerman, R., and Cooper, C.K. (2020). Clinical evaluation of BD Veritor

935 SARS-CoV-2 point-of-care test performance compared to PCR-based testing and versus
936 the Sofia 2 SARS Antigen point-of-care test. *J Clin Microbiol*.

FIGURE LEGENDS

Figure 1. Mechanism of action for SARS-CoV-2 antigen detection through lateral flow assay design. **(1)** The specimen analyte, containing SARS-CoV-2 antigen suspended in assay buffer, is deposited in the sample well **(at 2)**. **(3)** The analyte (containing antigen; in green) is absorbed into the sample pad and begins to diffuse across the reaction chamber into the conjugate pad. **(4)** The analyte comes into proximity of a SARS-CoV-2-specific antigen antibody that is conjugated to a tag (usually consisting of gold, latex, or a fluorophore). **(5)** The antigen/antibody complex migrates via diffusion across the nitrocellulose membrane. **(6)** The SARS-CoV-2 antigen-antibody complex comes into proximity of a second SARS-CoV-2 antigen antibody (different epitope) that is covalently bound to the device pad and an antibody-antigen-antibody complex forms, resulting in the test line. Further diffusion of excess SARS-CoV-2 antibodies (unbound to antigen) results in association of a second, covalently-bound antibody that is specific for the first SARS-CoV-2 antibody. **(7)** An antibody-antibody complex forms resulting in the control line.

Figure 2. PRISMA flow diagram for reconciliation of articles/sources included in this study.

Figure 3. Determination of bias associated with the source articles/documents included in this meta-analysis. (a) Scoring as Low, Moderate, and High was performed for Detection bias, Performance bias, and Spectrum bias associated with each data source included. The frequency

of the scores is plotted along the Y-axis. (b) and (c) Funnel plots of logit-transformed sensitivity in a model without any moderators (b) and with moderators included (c).

Figure 4. Forest plots containing calculated sensitivity values for index (SARS-CoV-2 antigen test) testing compared to reference (SARS-CoV-2 RT-qPCR assay) test. Data are stratified by days from symptom onset.

Figure 5. Forest plots containing calculated sensitivity values for index (SARS-CoV-2 antigen test) testing compared to reference (SARS-CoV-2 RT-qPCR assay) test. Data are stratified by viral load (genomic copies per mL; cpm) and by symptomatic or asymptomatic status.

Figure 6. Forest plots containing calculated sensitivity values for index (SARS-CoV-2 antigen test and SARS-CoV-2 RT-qPCR assay) testing compared to reference (SARS-CoV-2 viral culture) test.

TABLES
TABLE 1a

Table 1. Information characterizing data sources involving SARS-CoV-2 antigen testing for analyses described in this report

	Source RFID	Country	Total N	Reference (+)	Index (Antigen) test	Index Manufacturer	Ref. (RT-PCR) test	Ref. Manufacturer
1	Abdelrazik 2020 (Abdelrazik et al., 2020)	Egypt	310	190	BIOCREDIT COVID-19 Antigen Test	RapiGen Inc., Republic of Korea	Not available	Not available
2	Abdulrahman 2020 (Abdulrahman et al., 2020)	Bahrain	4183	734	Abbott Diagnostic GmbH, Jena, Germany	Abbott Diagnostic GmbH, Germany	TaqPath™ COVID-19 Multiplex Kit	Thermo Fisher, USA
3	Albert 2020 (Albert et al., 2020)	Spain	412	56	Panbio™ COVID-19 Ag Rapid Test Device	Abbott Diagnostic GmbH, Jena, Germany	TaqPath™ COVID-19 Multiplex Kit	Thermo Fisher, USA
4 (sx/asx)	Alemaný 2021 (Alemany et al., 2021)	Spain	1406	954	Panbio™ COVID-19 Ag Rapid Test Device	Abbott Diagnostic GmbH, Jena, Germany	Not available	Not available
5	Aoki 2020 (Aoki et al., 2020)	Japan	510	26	Lumipulse® SARS-CoV-2 Ag kit	Fujirebio Inc., Tokyo, Japan	TaqMan® Fast Virus 1-Step	Thermo Fisher Scientific, USA
6	Aoki 2021 (Aoki et al., 2021)	Japan	129	66	Espline® SARS-CoV-2	Fujirebio Inc., Japan	TaqMan® Fast Virus 1-Step	Thermo Fisher Scientific, USA
7	Beck 2021 (Beck et al., 2021)	USA	346	63	Quidel Sofia® SARS FIA	Quidel, San Diego, CA	Cepheid Xpert® Xpress	Cepheid, USA
8a	Berger 2020 (Berger et al., 2020)	Switzerland	535	126	Panbio™ COVID-19 Ag Rapid Test Device	Abbott Diagnostic GmbH, Germany	Roche Cobas® SARS-CoV-2 Assay	Roche Diagnostics, Switzerland
8b			529	193	STANDARD Q™ COVID-19 Ag Test	SD Biosensor, Republic of Korea	Roche Cobas® SARS-CoV-2 Assay	Roche Diagnostics, Switzerland
9 (sx/asx)	Bullete 2020 (Bullete et al., 2020)	Spain	1369	155	Panbio™ COVID-19 Ag Rapid Test Device	Abbott Diagnostic GmbH, Germany	TaqPath COVID-19 Multiplex Kit	Thermo Fisher Scientific, USA
10	Cerutti 2020 (Cerutti et al., 2020)	Italy	330	107	STANDARD Q™ COVID-19 Ag Test	SD Biosensor, Republic of Korea	Seegene Allplex® 2019 n-CoV Assay	Seegene Inc., Republic of Korea
11	Chaimayo 2020 (Chaimayo et al., 2020)	Thailand	454	63	STANDARD Q™ COVID-19 Ag Test	SD Biosensor, Republic of Korea	Seegene Allplex® 2019 n-CoV Assay	Seegene Inc., Republic of Korea
12	Ciotti 2021 (Ciotti et al., 2021)	Italy	50	43	COVID-19 Ag Respi-Strip	Coris BioConcept, Belgium	Seegene Allplex® 2019 n-CoV Assay	Seegene Inc., Republic of Korea
13	Colavita 2020 (Colavita et al., 2020)	Italy	941	208	STANDARD F™ COVID-19 Ag FIA	SD Biosensor, Republic of Korea	Roche Cobas® SARS-CoV-2 Assay	Roche Diagnostics, Switzerland
14	Courtellemont 2020 (Courtellemont et al., 2021)	France	248	125	COVID-VIRO®	AAZ, France	TaqPath COVID-19 Multiplex Kit	Thermo Fisher Scientific, USA
15	Diao 2021 (Diao et al., 2020)	China	251	205	SARS-CoV-2 Antigen FIC Assay (in house)	n/a	TaqMan One-Step RT-PCR Kit	Da An Gene, China
16	Drain 2020 (Drain et al., 2020)	USA; UK	512	186	LumiraDx™ SARS-CoV-2 Ag Test	LumiraDx, United Kingdom	Roche Cobas® SARS-CoV-2 Assay	Roche Diagnostics, Switzerland
17a (sx/asx)	Drevinek 2020 (Drevinek et al., 2020)	Czech R.	591	596	Panbio™ COVID-19 Ag Rapid Test Device	Abbott Diagnostic GmbH, Jena, Germany	Seegene Allplex® 2019 n-CoV Assay	Seegene Inc., Republic of Korea
17b (sx/asx)					STANDARD F™ COVID-19 Ag FIA	SD Biosensor, Republic of Korea	Seegene Allplex® 2019 n-CoV Assay	Seegene Inc., Republic of Korea
18a (sx/asx)				101	Biotal SARS-CoV-2 Ag card	Biotal Health, SLU, Spain	LightMix®	Roche Diagnostics, Switzerland
18b (sx/asx)	Favresse 2021 (Favresse et al., 2021)	Belgium	188	101	Panbio™ COVID-19 Ag Rapid Test Device	Abbott Diagnostic GmbH, Germany	LightMix®	Roche Diagnostics, Switzerland
18c (sx/asx)				100	Coronavirus Ag Rapid Test Cassette	Healgen Scientific, LLC, USA	LightMix®	Roche Diagnostics, Switzerland
18d (sx/asx)				100	Roche SARS-CoV-2 Rapid Antigen Test	Roche Diagnostics, Switzerland	LightMix®	Roche Diagnostics, Switzerland
18e (sx/asx)				101	VITROS SARS-CoV-2 Antigen test	Ortho Clinical Diagnostics, USA	LightMix®	Roche Diagnostics, Switzerland
19 (sx/asx)	Fenollar 2021 (Fenollar et al., 2021)	France	341	208	Panbio™ COVID-19 Ag Rapid Test Device	Abbott Diagnostic GmbH, Germany	Vita PCR SARS-CoV-2 Assay	Credo Diagnostics, Singapore
20	Gremmels 2021 (Gremmels et al., 2021)	The Netherlands; Aruba	1,369	206	Panbio™ COVID-19 Ag Rapid Test Device	Abbott Diagnostic GmbH, Germany	Seegene Allplex® 2019 n-CoV Assay	Seegene Inc., Republic of Korea
21	Hirotsu 2020 (Hirotsu et al., 2020)	Japan	313	61	Lumipulse® SARS-CoV-2 Ag kit	Fujirebio Inc., Japan	TaqMan Fast Virus 1-Step Master Mix	Thermo Fisher Scientific, USA
22	Hirotsu 2021 (Hirotsu et al., 2021)	Japan	27	23	Lumipulse® SARS-CoV-2 Ag kit	Fujirebio Inc., Japan	Not available	Not available
23	Hoehl 2020 (Hoehl et al., 2020)	Germany	711	9	RIDA® QUICK SARS-CoV-2 Antigen test	R-Biopharm, Darmstadt, Germany	Roche Cobas® SARS-CoV-2 Assay	Roche Diagnostics, Switzerland
24	Houston 2021 (Houston et al., 2021)	UK	728	284	Innova SARS-CoV-2 Antigen Rapid Test	Lotus Global Company, United Kingdom	Not available	Not available
25a	Jaaskelainen 2021 (Jääskeläinen et al., 2021)	Finland	188	152	Quidel Sofia® SARS FIA	Quidel, San Diego, CA	Not available	Not available
25b			189	162	STANDARD Q™ COVID-19 Ag Test	SD Biosensor, Republic of Korea	Not available	Not available
25c			190	156	Panbio™ COVID-19 Ag Rapid Test Device	Abbott Diagnostic GmbH, Germany	Not available	Not available
26 (sx/asx)	Jakobsen 2021 (Jakobsen et al., 2021)	Denmark	196	148	STANDARD Q™ COVID-19 Ag Test	SD Biosensor, Republic of Korea	Luna One-step RT-qPCR kit	New England Biolabs, USA
27 (sx/asx)	James 2021 (James et al., 2021)	USA	2,339	156	BinaxNOW™ COVID-19 Ag Card test kit	Abbott Diagnostics Inc., USA	PerkinElmer SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR	PerkinElmer, Inc., USA
28	Kashiwagi 2021 (Kashiwagi et al., 2020)	Japan	16	26	ESPLINE® SARS-CoV-2 test	Fujirebio Inc., Japan	Not available	Not available
29a	Kohmer 2021 (Kohmer et al., 2021)	Germany	100	76	RIDA® QUICK SARS-CoV-2 Antigen test	R-Biopharm, Darmstadt, Germany	Roche Cobas® SARS-CoV-2 Assay	Roche Diagnostics, Switzerland
29b					Roche SARS-CoV-2 Rapid Antigen Test	Roche Diagnostics, Switzerland	Roche Cobas® SARS-CoV-2 Assay	Roche Diagnostics, Switzerland
29c					NADAL® COVID-19 Ag Test	Nal von Minden GmbH, Germany	Roche Cobas® SARS-CoV-2 Assay	Roche Diagnostics, Switzerland
29d					LumiraDx™ SARS-CoV-2 Ag Test	LumiraDx, United Kingdom	Roche Cobas® SARS-CoV-2 Assay	Roche Diagnostics, Switzerland
30a	Kruger 2020 (Krüger et al., 2020)	Germany; UK	417	11	COVID-19 Ag Respi-Strip	Coris BioConcept, Belgium	Roche Cobas® SARS-CoV-2 Assay	Roche Diagnostics, Switzerland
30b			727	18	BIOEASY™ 2019-nCoV Ag Rapid Test	BIOEASY Technology, China	Roche Cobas® SARS-CoV-2 Assay	Roche Diagnostics, Switzerland
30c			1,267	50	STANDARD Q™ COVID-19 Ag Test	SD Biosensor, Republic of Korea	Roche Cobas® SARS-CoV-2 Assay	Roche Diagnostics, Switzerland
31	Kruttgen 2021 (Krüttgen et al., 2021)	Germany	150	77	Roche SARS-CoV-2 Rapid Antigen Test	Roche Diagnostics, Switzerland	Real Star SARS-CoV-2 RT PCR Kit	Altona, Germany
32	Lamabert-Niclot 2020 (Lambert-Niclot et al., 2020)	France	138	96	COVID-19 Ag Respi-Strip	Coris BioConcept, Belgium	Multiple tests used	Multiple manufacturers used
33	Linares 2020 (Linares et al., 2020)	Spain	141	90	Abbott Diagnostic GmbH, Jena, Germany	Abbott Diagnostic GmbH, Germany	Seegene Allplex® 2019 n-CoV Assay	Seegene Inc., Republic of Korea
34	Lindner 2020 (Lindner et al., 2020)	Germany	287	41	STANDARD Q™ COVID-19 Ag Test	SD Biosensor, Republic of Korea	Roche Cobas® SARS-CoV-2 Assay	Roche Diagnostics, Switzerland

	2020)							
35	Lindner 2021(Lindner et al., 2021)	Germany	146	82	STANDARD Q™ COVID-19 Ag Test	SD Biosensor, Republic of Korea	Roche Cobas® SARS-CoV-2 Assay	Roche Diagnostics, Switzerland
36	Liotti 2020(Liotti et al., 2020)	Italy	359	107	STANDARD F™ COVID-19 Ag FIA	SD Biosensor, Republic of Korea	Multiple tests used	Multiple manufacturers used
37	Liu 2021(Liu et al., 2021)	China	99	17	In-house assay	Not applicable	Not available	Not available
38a					COVID-19 Ag Respi-Strip	Coris BioConcept, Belgium	Not available	Not available
38b	Mak 2020(Mak et al., 2020)	China	140	143	NADAL® COVID-19 Ag Test	Nal von Minden GmbH, Germany	Not available	Not available
38c					STANDARD Q™ COVID-19 Ag Test	SD Biosensor, Republic of Korea	Not available	Not available
39	Mak 2021(Mak et al., 2021)	China	105	108	Abbott Diagnostic GmbH, Jena, Germany	Abbott Diagnostic GmbH, Germany	Not available	Not available
40 (sx/asx)	Masia 2020(Masiá et al., 2020)	Spain	913	40	Abbott Diagnostic GmbH, Jena, Germany	Abbott Diagnostic GmbH, Germany	Roche Cobas® SARS-CoV-2 Assay	Roche Diagnostics, Switzerland
41	Menchinelli 2021(Menchinelli et al., 2021)	Italy	594	196	Lumipulse® SARSCoV-2 Ag kit	Fujirebio Inc., Japan	Seegene Allplex® 2019 n-CoV Assay	Seegene Inc., Republic of Korea
42	Merino-Amador 2020(Merino-Amador et al., 2020)	Spain	958	361	Abbott Diagnostic GmbH, Jena, Germany	Abbott Diagnostic GmbH, Germany	Not available	Not available

TABLE 1b

Table 1 (continued)								
RFID	Source RFID	Country	Total N	Reference (+)	Index (Antigen) test	Index Manufacturer	Ref. (RT-PCR) test	Ref. Manufacturer
43	Mockel 2021(Möckel et al., 2021)	Spain	473	115	Roche SARS-CoV-2 Rapid Antigen Test	Roche Diagnostics, Switzerland	Roche Cobas® SARS-CoV-2 Assay	Roche Diagnostics, Switzerland
44	Nalumansi 2020(Nalumansi et al., 2020)	Uganda	262	94	STANDARD Q™ COVID-19 Ag Test	SD Biosensor, Republic of Korea	Not available	Not available
45	Ngo Nsoga 2021(Ngo Nsoga et al., 2021)	Switzerland	402	169	Abbott Diagnostic GmbH, Jena, Germany	Abbott Diagnostic GmbH, Germany	Roche Cobas® SARS-CoV-2 Assay	Roche Diagnostics, Switzerland
46	Okoye 2021(Okoye et al., 2021)	USA	2,638	46	BinaxNOW™ COVID-19 Ag Card test kit	Abbott Diagnostics, Inc., USA	TaqPath COVID-19 Multiplex Kit	Thermo Fisher Scientific, USA
47a	Osteman 2021(Osteman et al., 2021)	Germany	445	192	STANDARD F™ COVID-19 Ag FIA	SD Biosensor, Republic of Korea	RealAccurate® Quadruplex SARS CoV-2 PCR Kit	PathoFinder®, The Netherlands
47b				259	Roche SARS-CoV-2 Rapid Antigen Test	Roche Diagnostics, Switzerland	RealAccurate® Quadruplex SARS CoV-2 PCR Kit	PathoFinder®, The Netherlands
48	Pekosz 2021 ^a (Pekosz et al., 2021)	USA	251	38	BD Veritor™ SARS-CoV-2 Rapid Antigen test	Becton, Dickinson and Company, USA	Lyra® RT-PCR Assay	Quidel Corporation, USA
49a	Peto 2021(Peto, 2021)	UK	940	198	Innova SARS-CoV-2 Antigen Rapid Test	Lotus Global Company, United Kingdom	Not available	Not available
49b				100	Abbott Diagnostic GmbH, Jena, Germany	Abbott Diagnostic GmbH, Germany	Not available	Not available
50 (sx/asx)	Pilarowski 2020a (MedRxiv)(Pilarowski et al., 2020a)	USA	878	131	BinaxNOW™ COVID-19 Ag Card test kit	Abbott Diagnostics Scarborough, Inc., USA	Not available	Not available
51 (sx/asx)	Pilarowski 2020b (CID)(Pilarowski et al., 2020b)	USA	3,302	134	BinaxNOW™ COVID-19 Ag Card test kit	Abbott Diagnostics Scarborough, Inc., USA	Renegade XP™	RenegadeBio, USA
52	Pollock 2021a (JCM)(Pollock et al., 2021b)	USA	226	139	S-PLEX® SARS-CoV-2 Assay	Meso Scale Discovery, USA	Not available	Not available
53 (sx/asx)	Pollock 2021b (MedRxiv)(Pollock et al., 2021a)	USA	2,308	295	BinaxNOW™ COVID-19 Ag Card test kit	Abbott Diagnostics Scarborough, Inc., USA	CRSP SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR	Harvard University, USA
54	Porte 2021(Porte et al., 2020)	Chile	127	83	BIOEASY™ 2019-nCoV Ag Rapid Test	BIOEASY Technology, China	Genesig® Real-Time PCR assay	Primerdesign Ltd., United Kingdom
55 (sx/asx)	Pray 2020(Pray et al., 2021)	USA	1,098	59	Quidel Sofia® SARS FIA	Quidel, San Diego, CA	Multiple tests used	Multiple manufacturers used
56 (sx/asx)	Prince-Guerra 2021(Prince-Guerra et al., 2021)	USA	3,419	226	BinaxNOW™ COVID-19 Ag Card test kit	Abbott Diagnostics, Inc., USA	Multiple tests used	Multiple manufacturers used
57	Rastawicki 2021(Rastawicki et al., 2021)	Poland	167	38	PCL COVID-19 Ag rapid immunoassay	PLC, Republic of Korea	Multiple tests used	Multiple manufacturers used
58a	Schwob 2020(Schwob et al., 2020)	Switzerland	928	113	STANDARD Q™ COVID-19 Ag Test	SD Biosensor, Republic of Korea	Not available	Not available
58b				123	Abbott Diagnostic GmbH, Jena, Germany	Abbott Diagnostic GmbH, Germany	Not available	Not available
58c				139	COVID-VIRO®	AAZ, France	Not available	Not available
59 (sx/asx)	Scohy 2020(Scohy et al., 2020)	Belgium	148	93	COVID-19 Ag Respi-Strip	Coris BioConcept, Belgium	Genesig® Real-Time PCR assay	Primerdesign Ltd., United Kingdom
60	Stokes 2021(Stokes et al., 2021)	Canada	145	140	Abbott Diagnostic GmbH, Jena, Germany	Abbott Diagnostic GmbH, Germany	Not available	Not available
61	Stromer 2021(Strömer et al., 2020)	Germany	134	126	NADAL® COVID-19 Ag Test	Nal von Minden GmbH, Germany	Not available	Not available
62 (sx/asx)	Takeuchi 2021(Takeuchi et al., 2021)	Japan	771	74	Quick Navi™-COVID 19 Ag Rapid Test	Otsuka Pharmaceutical Co., Ltd., Japan	Not available	Not available
63	Toptan 2020(Toptan et al., 2020)	Germany	67	61	RIDA® QUICK SARS-CoV-2 Antigen test	R-Biopharm, Darmstadt, Germany	Roche Cobas® SARS-CoV-2 Assay	Roche Diagnostics, Switzerland
64	Torres 2021(Torres et al., 2021)	Spain	634	80	Abbott Diagnostic GmbH, Jena, Germany	Abbott Diagnostic GmbH, Germany	TaqPath COVID-19 Multiplex Kit	Thermo Fisher Scientific, USA
65 (sx/asx)	Turcado 2020(Turcato et al., 2020)	Italy	3,410	227	STANDARD Q™ COVID-19 Ag Test	SD Biosensor, Republic of Korea	Not available	Not available
66	Van der Moeren 2020(Van der Moeren et al., 2020)	The Netherlands	352	125	BD Veritor™ SARS-CoV-2 Rapid Antigen test	Becton, Dickinson and Company, USA	Roche Cobas® SARS-CoV-2 Assay	Roche Diagnostics, Switzerland
67	Villaverde 2021(Villaverde et al., 2021)	Spain	1,620	79	Abbott Diagnostic GmbH, Jena, Germany	Abbott Diagnostic GmbH, Germany	Not available	Not available
68a	Weitzel 2020(Weitzel et al., 2020)	Chile	111	81	Biocredit COVID-19 Antigen Test	RapiGen Inc., Republic of Korea	Genesig® Real-Time PCR assay	Primerdesign Ltd., United Kingdom
68b				80	Huaketai New Coronavirus	Savant Biotechnology Co., Ltd., China	Genesig® Real-Time PCR assay	Primerdesign Ltd., United Kingdom
68c				82	BIOEASY™ 2019-nCoV Ag Rapid Test	BIOEASY Technology, China	Genesig® Real-Time PCR assay	Primerdesign Ltd., United Kingdom
69	Yamamoto 2021(Yamamoto et al., 2021)	Japan	608	130	In-house assay	Not applicable	Not available	Not available
70	Young 2020 ^a (Young et al., 2020)	USA	226	32	BD Veritor™ SARS-CoV-2 Rapid Antigen test	Becton, Dickinson and Company, USA	Lyra® RT-PCR Assay	Quidel Corporation, USA
71	Binax IFU 2020	USA	460	120	BinaxNOW™ COVID-19 Ag Card test kit	Abbott Diagnostics, Inc., USA	Roche Cobas® SARS-CoV-2 Assay	Roche Diagnostics, Switzerland
72	BinaxHome IFU 2020	USA	53	27	BinaxNOW™ COVID-19 Ag Card test kit	Abbott Diagnostics, Inc., USA	Roche Cobas® SARS-CoV-2 Assay	Roche Diagnostics, Switzerland
73	CareStart IFU 2020	USA	126	46	CareStart™ COVID-19 Rapid Test	Access Bio, Inc. USA	Not available	Not available
74	Ellume IFU 2020	USA	198	40	Ellume COVID-19 Home Test	Ellume Limited, USA	Not available	Not available
75	Luminostics IFU 2020	USA	166	35	Clip COVID-Rapid Antigen Test	Luminostics, Inc., USA	Not available	Not available
76	LumiraDx IFU 2020	UK	257	86	LumiraDx™ SARS-CoV-2 Ag Test	LumiraDx, United Kingdom	Roche Cobas® SARS-CoV-2 Assay	Roche Diagnostics, Switzerland
77	QuickVue IFU 2020	USA	156	61	QuickVue® SARS Antigen Test	Quidel Corporation, USA	Not available	Not available
78	Sampinute IFU 2020	USA	72	39	Sampinute™ COVID-19 Antigen MIA	Celltrion, USA	Not available	Not available
79	Sofia IFU 2020	USA	209	33	Quidel Sofia® SARS FIA	Quidel, USA	Lyra® RT-PCR Assay	Quidel Corporation, USA
80	Sofia 2 IFU 2020	USA	165	45	Quidel Sofia® SARS FIA	Quidel, USA	Lyra® RT-PCR Assay	Quidel Corporation, USA
81	Veritor EUA 2020	USA	226	32	BD Veritor™ SARS-CoV-2 Rapid Antigen test	Becton, Dickinson and Company, USA	Lyra® RT-PCR Assay	Quidel Corporation, USA

82	Veritor CE Mark 2020	EU	251	38	BD Veritor™ SARS-CoV-2 Rapid Antigen test	Becton, Dickinson and Company, USA	Lyra® RT-PCR Assay	Quidel Corporation, USA
83	Veritor triplex IFU 2020	USA	115	61	BD Veritor™ SARS-CoV-2 Rapid Antigen test	Becton, Dickinson and Company, USA	Lyra® RT-PCR Assay	Quidel Corporation, USA

Abbreviations:

^a Pekosz 2021 was only used as a data source for sensitivity analysis with Ct score stratification and for sensitivity analysis using cell culture as a reference

^b Young 2021 was only used as a data source for sensitivity analysis for Ct score stratification

TABLE 2

Table 2. Overall quality of evidence for outcomes (modified GRADE) (Schunemann et al., 2013)

Independent variables	No. Studies	No. Data sets	Risk of bias	Directness	Precision	Consistency	Publication bias	Magnitude of effect	Confounder Effect ^b	Overall
Viral load stratification	27	71	Low	Direct	Precise	High	Low	Large	Low	High
Sx versus Asx	62	116	Moderate	Direct	Precise	High	Moderate	Large	Moderate	High
≤7 DSO versus ≤7 and >7 DSO combined	46	71	Moderate	Direct	Precise	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate
Anatomical collection site	60	112	Low	Direct	Precise	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate
Storage conditions	59	110	Moderate	Direct	Precise	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate
Analytical sensitivity	41	73	Unclear	Direct	Precise	Precise	Unclear	Low	Low	Moderate

Abbreviations: GRADE, Grading of Recommendations, Assessment, Development and Evaluation

^bConfounder effect characterizes the degree to which all plausible confounders would tend to increase confidence in the estimated effect

TABLE 3

Table 3. Diagnostic performance (sensitivity) for antigen testing, with RT-qPCR as reference, stratified by different population and experimental factors

Variable category	Variable group	No. data sets	Total Reference (+)	Sensitivity (%)	95% CI	Univariate ^a	Multivariate
RT-qPCR Ct value	≥10 ⁵ cpm	18	1,278	93.8	[87.1, 97.1]	p<0.001	n/a
	<10 ⁵ cpm	18	781	28.6	[16.2, 45.3]		
	Ct value ≤25	16	897	96.4	[94.3, 97.7]	p<0.001	n/a
	Ct value >25	16	673	44.9	[33.0, 57.4]		
	Ct value ≤30	37	2,536	89.5	[85.3, 92.5]	p<0.001	n/a
	Ct value >30	37	679	18.7	[12.9, 26.3]		
Symptom status	Symptomatic	95	9,351	80.1	[76.0, 83.7]	p<0.001	p < 0.001
	Asymptomatic	23	1,723	54.8	[48.6, 60.8]		
	Missing Information	15	2,186	65.3	[56.4, 73.3]		
	≤7 DSO	42	3,480	86.2	[81.8, 89.7]		
	≤7 DSO + >7DSO	29	2,649	70.8	[60.7, 79.2]		
Anatomical site (ref.)	Nasal swab	25	1,654	82.7	[74.7, 88.5]	p= 0.037	p = 0.023
	NPS	97	10,607	73.1	[68.5, 77.2]		
	Missing	11	999	71.6	[55.7, 83.6]		
Specimens storage (index)	Fresh	101	9,666	75.3	[70.8, 79.3]	p = 0.375	
	Frozen	23	3,307	70.9	[61.0, 79.1]		
	Missing	9	287	81.5	[69.3, 89.5]		
Analytical sensitivity (Ref.)	High (≤500 cpm))	53	4,531	74.2	[66.9, 80.4]	p=0.650	
	Low (>500 cpm)	22	2,582	76.8	[67.2, 84.2]		
	Missing	58	6,147	75.0	[69.8, 79.5]		
Study spectrum bias	High/Moderate	52	5,524	81.4	[75.5, 86.1]	p = 0.004	p = 0.757
	Low	81	5,871	70.4	[65.4, 74.9]		
All sources combined	n/a	133	13,260	75.0	[71.0, 78.0]		

Abbreviations: CI, confidence interval; DSO, days from symptom onset; Ct, cycle threshold; cpm, genomic copies per mL; NPS, nasopharyngeal swab;

^aQ-test p-value for heterogeneity among subgroups calculated from random effects meta-analysis

FIGURES
FIGURE 1

FIGURE 2

FIGURE 3

Figure 3.

a

b

c

FIGURE 4

Figure 4. Sensitivity values for antigen testing by days from symptom onset

FIGURE 5

Figure 5. Sensitivity values for antigen testing by viral load

FIGURE 6

Figure 6. Sensitivity values for antigen testing and RT-qPCR with SARS-CoV-2 viral culture assay as reference

SUPPLEMENTAL TABLES
TABLE S1

Table S1. Antigen test sensitivity across brands (minimum number of studies = 3 to be included)

Antigen test name	No. data sets	Total Reference (+)	Sensitivity (%)	95% CI
Abbott Panbio	28	4,400	74	[68, 80]
BinaxNOW	14	1,113	75	[64, 84]
Lumipulse	4	295	70	[48, 86]
LumiraDx	6	331	97	[85, 99]
Respi-Strip	6	372	37	[30, 44]
RIDA Quick	4	172	57	[40, 73]
Roche RAT	6	614	65	[56, 73]
Sofia	5	296	79	[62, 90]
Standard F	5	1,091	56	[48, 65]
Standard Q	15	1,427	80	[72, 86]
Veritor	5	252	83	[75, 89]

Abbreviations: CI, confidence interval; DSO, days from symptom onset; Ct, cycle threshold; cpm, genomic copies per mL; NPS, nasopharyngeal swab

^aQ-test p-value for heterogeneity among subgroups calculated from random effects meta-analysis

Figure S1. The relationship of factors that influence antigen test sensitivity

FIGURE S2

Figure S1. BD Veritor™ Plus Analyzer for SARS-CoV-2 antigen test Readings on RT-qPCR-positive SARS-CoV-2 specimens. Nasal specimens were collected and tested as described in the Manufacturer's IFU for the BD Veritor™ Plus Analyzer for SARS-CoV-2 antigen test. One set of specimens was tested fresh and a parallel group was tested after one freeze/thaw cycle. All specimens were positive by the same RT-qPCR assay and there were no differences in the respective Ct values for the two antigen test groups.