

1 **Head-to-head comparison of four antigen-based rapid detection tests for the diagnosis of**
2 **SARS-CoV-2 in respiratory samples**

3

4 Thomas Weitzel^{a,b}#, Paulette Legarraga^a, Mirentxu Iruretagoyena^a, Gabriel Pizarro^a, Valeska
5 Vollrath^a, Rafael Araos^{b,c,d}, José M. Munita^{b,c,d}, Lorena Porte^a#

6

7 ^aLaboratorio Clínico, Clínica Alemana, Universidad del Desarrollo, Santiago, Chile

8 ^bInstituto de Ciencias e Innovación en Medicina (ICIM), Facultad de Medicina Clínica Alemana,
9 Universidad del Desarrollo, Santiago, Chile

10 ^cServicio de Infectología, Clínica Alemana de Santiago, Facultad de Medicina Clínica Alemana,
11 Universidad del Desarrollo, Santiago, Chile

12 ^dMillennium Initiative for Collaborative Research On Bacterial Resistance (MICROB-R),
13 Santiago, Chile

14

15 Running head: Comparison of antigen tests for SARS-CoV-2

16

17 #Address correspondence to Lorena Porte, lporte@alemana.cl; or Thomas Weitzel,

18 thomas.weitzel@gmail.com

19

20 Paulette Legarraga and Mirentxu Iruretagoyena contributed equally to this work.

21 **Abstract**

22 In the context of the Covid-19 pandemic, the development and validation of rapid and easy-to-
23 perform diagnostic methods are of high priority. We compared the performance of four rapid
24 antigen detection tests for SARS-CoV-2 in respiratory samples. Immunochromatographic SARS-
25 CoV-2 assays from RapiGEN, Liming bio, Savant, and Bioeasy were evaluated using universal
26 transport medium containing naso-oropharyngeal swabs from suspected Covid-19 cases. The
27 diagnostic accuracy was determined in comparison to SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR. A total of 111
28 samples were included; 80 were RT-PCR positive. Median patients' age was 40 years, 55% were
29 female, and 88% presented within the first week after symptom onset. The evaluation of the
30 Liming bio assay was discontinued due to insufficient performance. The overall sensitivity
31 values of RapiGEN, Liming bio, and Bioeasy tests were 62.0% (CI95% 51.0–71.9), 16.7%
32 (CI95% 10.0–26.5), and 85.0% (CI95% 75.6–91.2), respectively, with specificities of 100%.
33 Sensitivity was significantly higher in samples with high viral loads (RapiGEN, 84.9%; Bioeasy,
34 100%). The study highlighted the significant heterogeneity of test performance among evaluated
35 assays, which might have been influenced by the use of a non-validated sample material. The
36 high sensitivity of some tests demonstrated that rapid antigen detection has the potential to serve
37 as an alternative diagnostic method, especially in patients presenting with high viral loads in
38 early phases of infection. This is particularly important in situations with limited access to RT-
39 PCR or prolonged turnaround time. Further comparative evaluations are necessary to select
40 products with high performance among the growing market of diagnostic tests for SARS-CoV-2.

41

42 **Key words:** Coronavirus; SARS-CoV-2; Covid-19; diagnosis; rapid diagnostic test; antigen
43 detection

44

45 **Introduction**

46 Since its emergence in 2019, the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic has caused tremendous public
47 health challenges worldwide (1). Early detection of cases is essential to help curtail this
48 unprecedented pandemic; thus, rapid and easy-to-perform diagnostic tools that can be used to test
49 large numbers of samples in a short period of time are crucial (2). To date, the recommended
50 diagnostic method for SARS-CoV-2 infection (known as Covid-19) is real-time reverse-
51 transcription polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR), which was introduced in January 2020 (3),
52 and is now performed using WHO or CDC protocols (4, 5), as well as various commercial assays
53 (6).

54 The gap between the number of samples and the capacity to perform RT-PCR in a timely
55 manner is considered a mayor limitation of public health containment strategies (7). Therefore,
56 there is a critical demand for alternative assays, especially rapid diagnostic tests (RDTs), which
57 are timely, easy to perform, and can serve for point-of-care testing (POCT) or community-based
58 testing (8). RDTs for antibody detection have been developed, but due to the delay in humoral
59 immune response, they have limited use for early diagnosis and low sensitivity for community-
60 based screening (9, 10). Antigen detection tests, on the other hand, have the advantage of
61 detecting the presence of the virus itself and might therefore be a better tool for early cases, but
62 require sufficient viral loads and high-quality sampling (11). Although SARS-CoV-2-specific
63 antigen testing has only recently been developed (12); the market pressure generated by this
64 unprecedented pandemic has resulted in many novel assays that are now commercially available
65 (13). Unfortunately, scientific literature supporting their accuracy is scarce and real-world
66 performance of these assays is uncertain; their validation and comparison are therefore of high

67 priority (12, 14). Here we present a head-to-head comparison and evaluation of four novel
68 antigen-based RDTs for the detection of SARS-CoV-2 in respiratory specimens from suspected
69 Covid-19 cases.

70

71 **Material and Methods**

72 We conducted a head-to-head study of the diagnostic accuracy of four rapid SARS-CoV-
73 2 antigen detection tests compared to RT-PCR. Samples derived from patients with respiratory
74 symptoms and/or fever, attending Clínica Alemana, a private medical center in Santiago, Chile,¹⁰
75 between March 16 and April 26, 2020. Specimens were obtained by trained personnel in a
76 specially dedicated “Respiratory Emergency Room” and consisted of naso-oropharyngeal (NOP)
77 swabs, which were placed in tubes with 3 mL universal transport medium (UTM-RT[®] System,
78 Copan Diagnostics, Murrieta, CA, USA). Samples were initially examined for SARS-CoV-2
79 RNA by COVID-19 Genesig[®] Real-Time PCR assay (Primerdesign Ltd., Chander’s Ford, UK)
80 after RNA extraction with the Magna Pure Compact system (Roche Molecular Systems Inc.,
81 Pleasanton, Ca, USA) or using a manual protocol with the High Pure Viral Nucleic Acid kit
82 (Roche Molecular Systems Inc., Mannheim, Germany). The Primerdesign RT-PCR received
83 FDA Emergency Use Authorization (EUA) and is within the WHO Emergency Use Listing
84 (EUL) tests eligible for procurement. The test kit includes a positive control template of the
85 target gene and a RNA internal extraction control. It targets the RNA-dependent RNA
86 polymerase (RdRp) with a detection limit of 0.58 copies/μL, according to the manufacturer.
87 Samples showing an exponential amplification curve and a cycle threshold (Ct) value ≤ 40 were
88 considered as positive.

89 PCR-characterized samples (UTM with swabs) were kept at -80° C and tested on April
90 28 and 29 by the following lateral flow antigen-detection kits: 1) “Biocredit COVID-19 Ag One
91 Step SARS-CoV-2 Antigen Test” (RapiGEN Inc., Anyang-si, Gyeonggi-do, Republic of Korea),
92 2) “COVID-19 Antigen Rapid Test Device StrongStep® COVID-19 Antigen Test” (Liming Bio-
93 Products Co., Jiangsu, China; 3) “Huaketai New Coronavirus (SARS-CoV-2) N Protein
94 Detection Kit (Fluorescence immunochromatography)” (Savant Biotechnology Co., Beijing,
95 China), and 4) “Diagnostic Kit for 2019-Novel Coronavirus (2019-nCoV) Ag Test (Fluorescence
96 Immunochromatographic Assay)” (Bioeasy Biotechnology Co., Shenzhen, China). All kits have
97 a cassette format and display test and control lines, permitting a rapid use without positive and
98 negative control specimens (Table 1). Tests must be read after a specific incubation period (5 to
99 15 minutes). The first two assays use colloid gold conjugated antibodies, resulting in visible
100 colored bands, whereas the latter two kits are based on fluorescein-marked antibodies. For the
101 Savant assay we used a UV flashlight provided by the manufacturer for visual readout, while the
102 Bioeasy kit was automatically read by the immunofluorescence analyzer EASY-11 (Bioeasy
103 Biotechnology Co.).
104 Importantly, our evaluation protocol included a deviation from the manufacturer’s instructions.
105 Instead of using the provided test solution, we used the equivalent volume of UTM, as described
106 in other studies (15-17). This method allowed us to compare all four assays using the same
107 specimens and to rapidly evaluate a large number of samples previously characterized by RT-
108 PCR.

109 Positive and negative samples were selected by convenience among the 5,276 respiratory
110 specimens processed for SARS-CoV-2 in the clinical laboratory during the study period. Due to
111 the shortage of available test kits, a 2:1 distribution of positive to negative samples was chosen.

112 Seventeen of the positive specimens had been used in a previous evaluation of the Bioeasy RDT
113 by our group (15). Assays were tested in parallel from the same sample and by the same trained
114 technician, who was blinded to the RT-PCR results. All test procedures, except the reading of the
115 cassette, were performed under a BSL2 cabinet. Assays with visual output were read by two
116 independent observers, who conferred with a third observer in case of disagreement. Results of
117 the RDTs were compared to those of RT-PCR as reference method; for samples with discordant
118 result, tests were repeated. Demographic and clinical data were obtained from the mandatory
119 Covid-19 notification forms and analyzed in an anonymized manner. Samples with high viral
120 loads (defined as Ct value <25) were compared to those with low viral load (Ct values >25) (16).
121 Statistical analyses were performed with OpenEpi (version 3.01) and GraphPad Prism (version
122 8.4.2).

123 All materials and personnel for this evaluation except the test from Savant Biotechnology
124 Co. were purchased using funds for routine diagnostics of the Clinical Laboratory of Clínica
125 Alemana; the Savant RDT was provided free-of-charge by the manufacturer. The study was
126 approved by the respective institutional review board (Comité Etico Científico, Facultad de
127 Medicina Clínica Alemana, Universidad del Desarrollo, Santiago, Chile) and need for informed
128 consent was waived.

129

130 **Results**

131 The study included a total of 111 samples from symptomatic patients; 55% were female,
132 with a median age of 40 years, which was similar to the population of all patients tested for
133 Covid-19 in our laboratory during the study period (57% female, median age 38 years). Eighty of
134 the tested specimens were RT-PCR positive for SARS-CoV-2, which represented 22% of all

135 positives during the study period, while 31 samples were RT-PCR negative. The median duration
136 from symptom onset to sampling was 2 days (IQR 1-5 days); 88% of specimens (96/109;
137 missing data, n=2) were taken during the first week of symptoms. Ct values ranged from 10.7 to
138 37.7 (mean, 22.5).

139 While all four tests were user-friendly, test performances showed significant differences
140 (Table 2). The evaluation of the Liming bio kit was stopped after 19 samples, due to its poor
141 results with a sensitivity of 0% (0/9), specificity of 90% (9/10), and a Kappa coefficient of -0.1.
142 Sensitivities of the other three assays ranged from 16.7% for the Savant test to 85% for Bioeasy
143 (Table 2). Similarly, Bioeasy had the highest accuracy (89.2%) and Kappa coefficient (0.8). All
144 three assays had a specificity of 100% and proved robust; invalid results occurred only with
145 RapiGen (n=2) and Savant (n=2) due to insufficient liquid migration.

146 In addition, we correlated the viral loads of samples with true positive and false negative
147 results. As shown in Figure 1, mean Ct values of false negative samples were significantly higher
148 than in true positives samples in all three tests. RapiGen and Bioeasy mainly missed to detect
149 samples with high viral load (Ct values >25); this threshold was less clear for the Savant assay.
150 Accordingly, sensitivity values of RapiGen and Bioeasy differed significantly among subgroups
151 with high viral loads and low viral loads (Ct >25) (Figure 2). Indeed, the two assays identified
152 84.9% and 100% of specimens with high viral load, but only 15.4% and 53.8% of those with low
153 viral load, respectively. In case of the Savant assay, although the difference in sensitivity among
154 samples with high and low viral loads remained, it was far less striking (21.2% vs. 7.7%,
155 respectively) (Figure 2). RapiGen and Bioeasy had a concordance of 82%, while agreement
156 between these two tests and Savant was 67% and 50%, respectively. As visualized in Figure 3,
157 all samples identified as positive by RapiGen or Savant were also detected by Bioeasy.

158 Moreover, the latter platform identified various additional positive samples, especially among
159 those with lower viral loads (Ct 22-30) and it was the only test to detect specimens with very low
160 viral loads (Ct >30).

161 All four tests were incubated on a flat surface at room temperature and delivered results
162 in short time (5 to 15 minutes). The visual readout of RapiGen was clear, regardless of the
163 intensity of the band, due to its dual colored format in which the control band was red and
164 positive results appeared as black lines. The visual interpretation of the fluorescence Savant
165 assay was difficult under daylight conditions. This test might perform differently with its reader,
166 which was not available in Chile. Bioeasy had a user-friendly readout performed by a desktop
167 instrument that interpreted the cassettes in <1 minute. The instrument included options for saving
168 patient results, QR coding, and printing, and is suitable to be connected to a laboratory
169 information system.

170

171 **Discussion**

172 The evaluated assays are among the 22 antigen detection tests for SARS-CoV-2 available
173 at the time of writing, of which 14 are commercialized with CE (Conformité Européene)
174 marking (13). However, it is important to note that the CE licencing process is based on self-
175 reporting of manufacturers, does not grant high performance, and can be misused (18, 19).
176 Indeed, the challenge and problems presented by this procedure has recently been addressed by
177 the European Commission in light of the evolving Covid-19 pandemic (12). The emerging
178 marketing and use of novel PCR-independent tests in the absence of robust performance data has
179 been criticized and it has the potential to cause more damage than benefit (20, 21). Independent
180 evaluations of such diagnostic assays are therefore urgently needed, with larger comparative

181 studies for antibody tests only recently available or under way (22, 23). Antigen-based testing is
182 still in its infancy and evaluations are scarce (12). Up to now, we only found four publications
183 available (three peer-reviewed), evaluating two assays (15-17, 24), while comparative studies are
184 lacking.

185 Sensitivity is the most important performance parameter of SARS-CoV-2 antigen
186 detection (12). However, it is also considered the main limiting factor due to experiences with
187 influenza and RSV lateral flow detection kits (6, 25). Newer biosensor-based methods to detect
188 SARS-CoV-2 antigen have shown promising results and could offer a highly sensitive alternative
189 for rapid diagnosis in the future (26, 27).

190 Our comparison detected significant performance heterogeneity among the evaluated kits.
191 The Bioeasy assay had the highest sensitivity, which was in accordance with our previous
192 evaluation (15). The here reported sensitivity (85%) was almost identical to the value reported by
193 the manufacturer (85.5%). A study from China (with participation of the manufacturer) found an
194 overall sensitivity of 68%; however, for samples with Ct values ≤ 30 , the sensitivity increased to
195 98% (24). This excellent identification rate in specimens with high viral loads (Ct <25) was
196 confirmed in this report and our recently published study (15). The RapiGen test also showed an
197 acceptable sensitivity (84.9%) with high viral load samples, but was much less sensitive (15.4%)
198 when the viral burden was low. This test had a visual readout, which might have contributed to
199 lower sensitivity. Another assay with visual bands (Respi-Strip CORIS) was recently evaluated
200 in two European studies. Overall sensitivity ranged from 50% to 57.6%; however, detection rates
201 improved for samples with high viral loads (Ct <25) reaching sensitivities of 73.9% to 82.2%
202 (16, 17). The other two assays evaluated by us showed an insufficient performance. Savant had
203 an overall sensitivity of 16.7%, which did not increase significantly in high viral load samples

204 (Figure 2), while the Liming bio assay did not detect any of 10 positives and was not further
205 evaluated.

206 All four tests had a cassette format; two had visual readout and two were based on
207 immunofluorescence, one of which required an automated reader. In our experience, all systems
208 were easy to use, robust, and gave a qualitative result in short time (10-20 minutes). The
209 fluorescence reader eased interpretation, but it required a higher standard including technical
210 support. The user-friendliness of all tests demonstrated their potential for decentralized
211 screening. However, the application as POCT is hampered by the inherent biological hazard of
212 respiratory specimens, which require processing in a biosafety cabinet (28). This problem could
213 be overcome if extraction buffers or solutions with virus inactivating properties are used.

214 The enormous performance gaps detected in our study highlight the urgent need of
215 comparative studies of commercialized antigen tests (12). A possible explanation of performance
216 variations might be related to differences in protein targets. However, details on the detection
217 system (target antigen and detecting antibody) are only reported by a minority of manufacturers
218 (29). The methodology of using specimens stored in UTM for evaluation purposes is another
219 critical point with advantages and disadvantages (15), which should be systematically validated,
220 e.g. with spiked samples.

221 Performance data are critical for local decision making and also for global agencies in the
222 procurement of simpler, scalable diagnostic tests. Although these tests are less sensitive than RT-
223 PCR, they might be useful during outbreak situations, when timely results are important, but
224 access to molecular testing is limited (14). As shown in this and other reports, antigen tests are
225 more reliable in samples with high viral loads, which usually occur during the first days of
226 clinical disease (30-32). In our population, for example, 96% of high viral load specimens

227 derived from patients in their first week of symptoms. Accordingly, the sensitivities for first
228 week samples reached 91%- 95% (Bioeasy) in this and previous studies (15). Interestingly, a
229 similar value (94%) was reported for SARS-CoV antigen detection during the first 5 days of
230 disease in a publication from 2004 (33).

231 The potential to detect early infections might be crucial for the design of new RDT-based
232 algorithms, which are particularly important in weaker health systems and low resource settings
233 such as Latin America and Africa. Possible frontline applications include community-based
234 testing, e.g. in drive-through test stations, and at-home self-testing (34). However, in light of the
235 imperfection of tests, large scale strategies need to be well designed to avoid negative effects
236 (35). Another application might be as an adjunct to RT-PCR to achieve rapid preliminary results,
237 e.g. for healthcare workers.

238 A limitation regarding the evaluation of specificity was the low number of negative
239 samples and that the study was performed during a season with reduced circulation of other
240 respiratory viruses.

241 In conclusion, our comparative study highlighted a significant heterogeneity of test
242 performance. The high sensitivity of some tests demonstrated that antigen detection has the
243 potential to serve as an alternative or adjunct diagnostic method to RT-PCR, especially in
244 patients presenting with high viral loads in early phases of infection. This might be of particular
245 importance in situations with limited access to RT-PCR or prolonged turnaround time. Further
246 comparative evaluations are necessary to select for tests with high performance among the
247 growing market of diagnostics for Covid-19.

248

249 **Acknowledgements**

250 We thank Savant Biotechnology Co. for providing the test kits free of charge for evaluation.

251

252 **Contributors**

253 LP and TW conceived the study. LP, PL, MG, and GP curated the data. LP, TW, PL, and MI

254 analysed the data. LP and GP performed the investigation. LP and TW administered the project.

255 LP, PL, and VV supervised the study. LP, TW, PL, MI, JMM, and RA validated the data. TW

256 wrote the first draft. All authors contributed in reviewing and editing later drafts, and approved

257 the final version.

258

259 **Declaration of interests**

260 All authors declare no competing interests.

261

262 **Funding**

263 This work did not receive funding.

264 **Table 1.** Main characteristics of four rapid SARS-CoV-2 antigen-detection tests (as recommended by manufacturer)

Characteristic	Test N°1	Test N°2	Test N°3	Test N°4
Manufacturer	RapiGen	Liming bio	Savant	Bioeasy
Commercial name	Biocredit One Step SARS-CoV-2 Antigen Test	StrongStep® COVID-19 Antigen Test	Huaketai New Coronavirus (SARS-CoV-2) N Protein Detection Kit (FIA)	Diagnostic Kit for 2019-Novel Coronavirus (2019-nCoV) Ag Test (FIA)
Catalogue N°	G61RHA20	500200	BCT-HKT-050	YRLF04401025
Lot N°	H073001SD	2003014	20031501	2002N408
Certification ²	CE-IVD	CE-IVD	CE-IVD	CE-IVD
Antigen detected	Not specified	Not specified	N protein	Not specified ¹
Specimen	NP/OP swab	NP/OP swab	Throat swab	NP/OP swab, sputum
Extraction/ Dilution	Swab immersed in assay diluent and strongly squeezed	Swab immersed in extraction buffer and strongly squeezed	Swab immersed in conservation solution immediately before testing	Swab immersed in extraction buffer and strongly squeezed
Volume applied into cassette	3-4 drops (~90-150 µL)	3 drops (~100 µL)	60 µL	2 drops (100 µL)
Study sample	150 µL of UTM	150 µL of UTM	60 µL of UTM	100 µL of UTM
Incubation (at room temperature)	5-8 minutes	15-20 minutes	15 minutes ±1 minute	10 minutes ±0 minutes
Readout	Visual: colored bands	Visual: colored bands	Visual: fluorescent bands (under UV light)	Automated: fluorescence reader

265 FIA, fluorescence immune assay; NP, nasopharyngeal; OP, oropharyngeal

266 ¹ N protein (24)

267 ² Information from (13)

268

269 **Table 2.** Performance of four antigen detection tests for SARS-CoV-2 compared to RT-PCR

Antigen detection test		RT-PCR		Sensitivity		Specificity		Accuracy	Kappa
Assay	Result	Positive	Negative	%	CI95%	%	CI95%	%	coefficient
RapiGen (n = 109) ¹	Positive	49	0	62.0	51.0-71.9	100	88.7-100	72.5	0.5
	Negative	30	30						
Liming bio (n = 19) ²	Positive	0	1	0	0.0-29.9	90.0	59.6-98.2	47.4	-0.1
	Negative	9	9						
Savant (n = 109) ¹	Positive	13	0	16.7	10.0-26.5	100	89.0-100	40.4	0.1
	Negative	65	31						
Bioeasy (n = 111)	Positive	68	0	85.0	75.6-91.2	100	89.0-100	89.2	0.8
	Negative	12	31						

270 ¹ Two invalid results were excluded

271 ² Testing was suspended after 19 samples due to poor test performance

272 **References**

- 273 1. WHO. A coordinated Global Research Roadmap. March 2020.
274 https://www.who.int/blueprint/priority-diseases/key-action/Coronavirus_Roadmap_V9.pdf?ua=1
275 (accessed 19 May 2020)
- 276 2. Nguyen T, Duong Bang D, Wolff A. 2020. 2019 novel coronavirus disease (COVID-19): Paving the
277 road for rapid detection and point-of-care diagnostics. *Micromachines (Basel)* 11:E306.
- 278 3. Corman VM, Landt O, Kaiser M Molenkamp R, Meijer A, Chu DKW, Bleicker T, Brünink S,
279 Schneider J, Schmidt ML, Mulders DG, Haagmans BL, van der Veer B, van den Brink S, Wijsman L,
280 Goderski G, Romette JL, Ellis J, Zambon M, Peiris M, Goossens H, Reusken C, Koopmans MP,
281 Drosten C . 2020. Detection of 2019 novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV) by real-time RT-PCR. *Euro*
282 *Surveill* doi:10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2020.25.3.2000045.
- 283 4. World Health Organization (WHO). 19 March 2020. Laboratory testing for 2019 novel coronavirus
284 (2019-nCoV) in suspected human cases. Interim guidance. [https://www.who.int/publications-](https://www.who.int/publications-detail/laboratory-testing-for-2019-novel-coronavirus-in-suspected-human-cases-20200117)
285 [detail/laboratory-testing-for-2019-novel-coronavirus-in-suspected-human-cases-20200117](https://www.who.int/publications-detail/laboratory-testing-for-2019-novel-coronavirus-in-suspected-human-cases-20200117) (accessed
286 19 May 2020)
- 287 5. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Respiratory Viruses Branch, Division of Viral Diseases.
288 04 Feb 2020. Real-Time RT-PCR Panel for Detection 2019-Novel Coronavirus. Instructions for Use.
289 [https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/lab/index.html?CDC_AA_refVal=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.cdc.gov%2Fcoronavirus%2F2019-ncov%2Ftab%2Frt-pcr-detection-instructions.html)
290 [ncov/lab/index.html?CDC_AA_refVal=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.cdc.gov%2Fcoronavirus%2F2019-](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/lab/index.html?CDC_AA_refVal=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.cdc.gov%2Fcoronavirus%2F2019-ncov%2Ftab%2Frt-pcr-detection-instructions.html)
291 [ncov%2Ftab%2Frt-pcr-detection-instructions.html](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/lab/index.html?CDC_AA_refVal=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.cdc.gov%2Fcoronavirus%2F2019-ncov%2Ftab%2Frt-pcr-detection-instructions.html) (accessed 19 May 2020)
- 292 6. Cheng MP, Papenburg J, Desjardins M, Kanjilal S, Quach C, Libman M, Dittrich S, Yansouni CP. .
293 13 April 2020. Diagnostic testing for severe acute respiratory syndrome-related coronavirus-2: A
294 narrative review. *Ann Intern Med* doi:10.7326/M20-1301
- 295 7. World Health Organization (WHO). 22 March 2020. Laboratory testing strategy recommendations for
296 COVID-19. Interim guidance. [https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/331509/WHO-](https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/331509/WHO-COVID-19-lab_testing-2020.1-eng.pdf)
297 [COVID-19-lab_testing-2020.1-eng.pdf](https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/331509/WHO-COVID-19-lab_testing-2020.1-eng.pdf) (accessed 19 May 2020)
- 298 8. Patel R, Babady E, Theel ES, Storch GA, Pinsky BA, St George K, Smith TC, Bertuzzi S.. 2020.
299 Report from the American Society for Microbiology COVID-19 International Summit, 23 March
300 2020: Value of diagnostic testing for SARS-CoV-2/COVID-19. *mBio* 11:e00722-20.
- 301 9. Tang YW, Schmitz JE, Persing DH, Stratton CW. 3 April 2020. The laboratory diagnosis of COVID-
302 19 infection: Current issues and challenges. *J Clin Microbiol* doi: 10.1128/JCM.00512-20.
- 303 10. Döhla M, Boesecke C, Schulte B, Diegmann C, Sib E, Richter E, Eschbach-Bludau M, Aldabbagh S,
304 Marx B, Eis-Hübinger AM, Schmithausen RM, Streeck H. 2020. Rapid point-of-care testing for

- 305 SARS-CoV-2 in a community screening setting shows low sensitivity. *Public Health* 182:170-172.
306 doi:10.1016/j.puhe.2020.04.009.
- 307 11. World Health Organization (WHO). 8 April 2020. Advice on the use of point-of-care
308 immunodiagnostic tests for COVID-19. Scientific Brief. [https://www.who.int/news-](https://www.who.int/news-room/commentaries/detail/advice-on-the-use-of-point-of-care-immunodiagnostic-tests-for-covid-19)
309 [room/commentaries/detail/advice-on-the-use-of-point-of-care-immunodiagnostic-tests-for-covid-19](https://www.who.int/news-room/commentaries/detail/advice-on-the-use-of-point-of-care-immunodiagnostic-tests-for-covid-19)
310 (accessed 19 May 2020).
- 311 12. European Commission. 15 April 2020. Communication from the Commission: Guidelines on
312 COVID-19 in vitro diagnostic tests and their performance (2020/C 122 I/01). Official Journal of the
313 European Union. [https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-](https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:52020XC0415(04)&from=EN)
314 [content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:52020XC0415\(04\)&from=EN](https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:52020XC0415(04)&from=EN) (accessed 19 May 2020).
- 315 13. Foundation for Innovative New Diagnostics (FIND). SARS-CoV-2 diagnostic pipeline.
316 <https://www.finddx.org/covid-19/pipeline> (accessed 19 May 2020)
- 317 14. European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control (ECDC). 23 April 2020. Coronavirus disease
318 2019 (COVID-19) in the EU/EEA and the UK – ninth update.
319 [https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/en/publications-data/rapid-risk-assessment-coronavirus-disease-2019-](https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/en/publications-data/rapid-risk-assessment-coronavirus-disease-2019-covid-19-pandemic-ninth-update)
320 [covid-19-pandemic-ninth-update](https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/en/publications-data/rapid-risk-assessment-coronavirus-disease-2019-covid-19-pandemic-ninth-update) (accessed 19 May 2020).
- 321 15. Porte L, Legarraga P, Vollrath V, Aguilera X, Munita JM, Araos R, Pizarro G, Vial P, Iruretagoyena
322 M, Dittrich S, Weitzel T. 2020. Evaluation of novel antigen-based rapid detection test for the
323 diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2 in respiratory samples. *Int J Infect Dis* (accepted for publication).
324 <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3569871> (preprint).
- 325 16. Mertens P, De Vos N, Martiny D, Jassoy C, Mirazimi A, Cuypers L, Van den Wijngaert S, Monteil
326 V, Melin P, Stoffels K, Yin N, Mileto D, Delaunoy S, Magein H, Lagrou K, Bouzet J, Serrano G,
327 Wautier M, Leclipteux T, Van Ranst M, Vandenberg O and LHUB-ULB SARS-CoV-2 working
328 diagnostic group. 2020. Development and potential usefulness of the COVID-19 Ag Respi-Strip
329 diagnostic assay in a pandemic context. *Front. Med* 7:225. doi: 10.3389/fmed.2020.00225.
- 330 17. Lambert-Niclot S, Cuffel A, Le Pape S, Vauloup-Fellous C, Morand-Joubert L, Roque-Afonso AM,
331 Le Goff J, Delaugerre C; AP-HP/Universities/Inserm COVID-19 research collaboration. 13 May
332 2020. Evaluation of a rapid diagnostic assay for detection of SARS CoV-2 antigen in nasopharyngeal
333 swab. *J Clin Microbiol* doi:10.1128/JCM.00977-20.
- 334 18. European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control (ECDC). 1 April 2020. An overview of the rapid
335 test situation for COVID-19 diagnosis in the EU/EEA. [https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/en/publications-](https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/en/publications-data/overview-rapid-test-situation-covid-19-diagnosiseueea#no-link)
336 [data/overview-rapid-test-situation-covid-19-diagnosiseueea#no-link](https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/en/publications-data/overview-rapid-test-situation-covid-19-diagnosiseueea#no-link) (accessed 19 May 2020).

- 337 19. World Health Organization (WHO). 5 April 2020. Medical Product Alert N°3/2020: Falsified medical
338 products, including in vitro diagnostics, that claim to prevent, detect, treat or cure COVID-19.
339 <https://www.who.int/news-room/detail/31-03-2020-medical-product-alert-n-3-2020>.
- 340 20. Theel ES, Slev P, Wheeler S, Couturier MR, Wong SJ, Kadkhoda K. 29 April 2020. The role of
341 antibody testing for SARS-CoV-2: Is there one? *J Clin Microbiol* doi:10.1128/JCM.00797-20.
- 342 21. Lee CY, Lin RTP, Renia L, Ng LFP. 2020. Serological approaches for COVID-19: Epidemiologic
343 perspective on surveillance and control. *Front Immunol* 11:879.
- 344 22. Whitman JD, Hiatt J, Mowery CT, Shy BR, Yu R, Yamamoto TN, Rathore U, Goldgof GM, Whitty
345 C, Jonathan M. Woo, Gallman AE, Miller TE, Levine AG, Nguyen DN, Bapat SP, Balcersek J,
346 Bylsma S, Lyons AM, Li S, Wong AW, Gillis-Buck EM, Steinhart ZB, Lee Y, Apathy R, Lipke MJ,
347 Smith JA, Zheng T, Boothby IC, Isaza E, Chan J, Acenas II DD, Lee J, Macrae TA, Kyaw TS, Wu D,
348 Ng DL, Gu W, York VA, Eskandarian HA, Callaway PC, Warriar L, Moreno ME, Levan J, Torres L,
349 Farrington L, Loudermilk R, Koshal K, Zorn KC, Garcia-Beltran WF, Yang D, Astudillo MG,
350 Bernstein BE, Gelfand JA, Ryan ET, Charles RC, Iafrate AJ, Lennerz JK, Miller S, Chiu CY, Stramer
351 SL, Wilson MR, Manglik A, Ye CJ, Krogan NJ, Anderson MS, Cyster JG, Ernst JD, Wu AHB,
352 Lynch KL, Bern C, Hsu PD, Marson A. 2020. Test performance evaluation of SARS-CoV-2
353 serological assays. <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.04.25.20074856v2> (preprint).
- 354 23. Deeks JJ, Dinnes J, Takwoingi Y, Davenport C, Leeftang MMG, Spijker R, Hooft L, Van den Bruel
355 A, Emperador D, Dittrich S. 2020. Diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2 infection and COVID-19: accuracy of
356 signs and symptoms; molecular, antigen, and antibody tests; and routine laboratory markers
357 (Protocol). *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* doi:10.1002/14651858.CD013596.
- 358 24. Diao B, Wen K, Chen J, Liu Y, Yuan Z, Han C, Chen J, Pan Y, Chen L, Dan Y, Wang J, Chen Y,
359 Deng G, Zhou H, Wu Y. Diagnosis of acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 infection by
360 detection of nucleocapsid protein.
361 <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.03.07.20032524v2> (preprint).
- 362 25. Venter M, Richter K. 13 May 2020. Towards effective diagnostic assays for COVID-19: a review. *J*
363 *Clin Pathol* doi:10.1136/jclinpath-2020-206685.
- 364 26. Seo G, Lee G, Kim MJ, Baek SH, Choi M, Ku KB, Lee CS, Jun S, Park D, Kim HG, Kim SJ, Lee JO,
365 Kim BT, Park EC, Kim SI. 2020. Rapid detection of COVID-19 causative virus (SARS-CoV-2) in
366 human nasopharyngeal swab specimens using field-effect transistor-based biosensor. *ACS Nano*
367 14:5135-5142.
- 368 27. Mahari S, Roberts A, Shahdeo D, Gandhi S. 2020. eCovSens-Ultrasensitive Novel In-House Built
369 Printed Circuit Board Based Electrochemical Device for rapid detection of nCovid-19 antigen, a spike

370 protein domain 1 of SARS-CoV-2. <https://www.biorxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.04.24.059204v3>
371 (preprint).

372 28. World Health Organization (WHO). 12 February 2020. Laboratory biosafety guidance related to the
373 novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV). Interim guidance. [https://www.who.int/docs/default-](https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/coronaviruse/laboratory-biosafety-novel-coronavirus-version-1-1.pdf?sfvrsn=912a9847_2)
374 [source/coronaviruse/laboratory-biosafety-novel-coronavirus-version-1-1.pdf?sfvrsn=912a9847_2](https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/coronaviruse/laboratory-biosafety-novel-coronavirus-version-1-1.pdf?sfvrsn=912a9847_2)
375 (accessed 19 May 2020).

376 29. González JM, Shelton WJ, Díaz-Vallejo M, Rodríguez-Castellanos VE, Zuluaga JDH, Chamorro DF ,
377 Arroyo-Ariza D. 2020. Immunological assays for SARS-CoV-2: an analysis of available commercial
378 tests to measure antigen and antibodies <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.10.20061150> (preprint).

379 30. Wölfel, R., Corman, V.M., Guggemos, W. Seilmaier M, Zange S, Mueller MA, Niemeyer D, Jones
380 TC, Vollmar P, Rothe C, Hoelscher M, Bleicker T, Brünink S, Schneider J, Ehmann R, Zwirgmaier
381 K, Drosten C, Wendtner C. 2020. Virological assessment of hospitalized patients with COVID-2019.
382 Nature <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-020-2196-x>.

383 31. Zou L, Ruan F, Huang M, Liang L, Huang H, Hong Z, Yu J, Kang M, Song Y, Xia J, Guo Q, Song T,
384 He J, Yen HL, Peiris M, Wu J. 2020. SARS-CoV-2 viral load in upper respiratory specimens of
385 infected patients. *N Engl J Med* 382: 1177-1179.


386 32. To KK, Tsang OT, Leung WS, Tam AR, Wu TC, Lung DC, Yip CC, Cai JP, Chan JM, Chik TS, Lau
387 DP, Choi CY, Chen LL, Chan WM, Chan KH, Ip JD, Ng AC, Poon RW, Luo CT, Cheng VC, Chan
388 JF, Hung IF, Chen Z, Chen H, Yuen KY. 2020. Temporal profiles of viral load in posterior
389 oropharyngeal saliva samples and serum antibody responses during infection by SARS-CoV-2: an
390 observational cohort study. *Lancet Infect Dis* 20:565-574. doi:10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30196-1.

391 33. Che XY, Hao W, Wang Y, Di B, Yin K, Xu YC, Feng CS, Wan ZY, Cheng VC, Yuen KY. 2004.
392 Nucleocapsid protein as early diagnostic marker for SARS. *Emerg Infect Dis* 10:1947-1949.

393 34. Gharizadeh B, Yue J, Yu M, Liu Y, Zhou M, Lu D, Zhang J. 29 April 2020. Navigating the pandemic
394 response life cycle: molecular diagnostics and immunoassays in the context of COVID-19
395 management *IEEE Rev Biomed Eng* doi:10.1109/RBME.2020.2991444.

396 35. Gray N, Calleja D, Wimbush A, Miralles-Dolz E, Gray A, De-Angelis M, Derrer-Merk E, Uchenna
397 Oparaji B, Stepanov V, Clearkin L, Ferson S. 2020. "No test is better than a bad test": Impact of
398 diagnostic uncertainty in mass testing on the spread of COVID-19.
399 <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.04.16.20067884v2> (preprint).


400 **Figure 1.** Comparison of viral loads (Ct values) among true positive and false negative results of
401 three rapid antigen assays. Red lines represent mean values; p values calculated by two-tailed t-
402 Test.



403


404 **Figure 2.** Sensitivity (%) of three rapid antigen tests in subgroups of samples with high viral
405 load ($Ct < 25$) and low viral load ($Ct > 25$). Sensitivity values are represented by dots and squares,
406 while bars demonstrate 95% confidence intervals.

407



408

409 **Figure 3.** Concordance of four rapid antigen tests among 80 RT-PCR positive samples. Each line
 410 represents an individual sample. Samples are listed from high Ct values (top) to low Ct values
 411 (bottom).



412