

Title:

Diagnostic accuracy and utility of SARS-CoV-2 antigen lateral flow assays in medical admissions with possible COVID-19

Authors:

Hamish Houston^a, Ankur Gupta-Wright^{b,c,d}, Edward Toke-Bjolgerud^a, James Biggin-Lamming^a, Laurence John^a.

Author affiliations:

- a) Northwick Park Hospital, London North West University Healthcare NHS Trust, Harrow, United Kingdom
- b) Institute for Global Health, University College London, London, United Kingdom
- c) Clinical Research Department, London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine, London, United Kingdom
- d) Ealing Hospital, London North West University Healthcare NHS Trust, London, United Kingdom

Corresponding Author:

Dr Ankur Gupta-Wright
Institute for Global Health
University College London
Mortimer Market, off Caper Street
London
WC1E 6JB
United Kingdom
07764607560
a.gupta-wright@ucl.ac.uk / ankurgw@outlook.com

Word Count: 797

Abstract:

We evaluated diagnostic accuracy of the Innova SARS-CoV-2 Antigen Rapid Qualitative Test compared to SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR from nasopharyngeal swabs in adult admissions who met the COVID-19 case definition at a busy acute hospital in the UK. We found the Innova SARS-CoV-2 Antigen Rapid Qualitative Test had a good specificity in patients with symptoms of COVID-19 presenting to hospital. The Innova LFA can be used to rapidly identify COVID-19 cases amongst hospital admissions meeting the COVID-19 case definition, allowing patients to be allocated to COVID-19 cohort areas.

Text:

The scale-up of SARS-CoV-2 antigen lateral flow assays (LFAs) has caused much controversy, with concerns about lower sensitivity in asymptomatic individuals and when assays are performed by operators without healthcare training.^{1,2} The proposed benefits of SARS-CoV-2 antigen LFAs are high specificity, fast turnaround times for results (under 30 minutes) and ease of scalability.³ These assays are of potential utility for rapidly identifying SARS-CoV-2 in patients who fit the COVID-19 case definition and require hospital admission as prompt isolation prevents nosocomial transmission. Isolation rooms are often limited and capacity easily overwhelmed, necessitating the cohorting of patients with proven COVID-19. Even using rapid platforms, SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR turnaround times are often too slow to inform patient placement from emergency departments (EDs).⁴ SARS-CoV-2 LFAs could help improve flow of patients from the ED into 'COVID-19 positive' cohorts and reduce pressure on limited hospital isolation rooms. However, little data exists on their diagnostic accuracy in this setting.

We therefore evaluated diagnostic accuracy of the Innova SARS-CoV-2 Antigen Rapid Qualitative Test (Lotus Global Company, London, UK) compared to SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR from nasopharyngeal swabs (NPS) in adult admissions who met the COVID-19 case definition at a busy acute hospital in the UK.⁵ The Innova LFA was performed as per the manufacturer's instructions by appropriately trained health-care assistants in the ED. A second NPS was simultaneously sent for SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR. Between the 17th November 2020 and 31st December 2020, 728 patients presenting to the ED met the COVID-19 case definition and had valid Innova LFA and RT-PCR results. Baseline characteristics are shown in Table 1A. 55.1% were male and median age was 67.5 years. 264 patients tested positive by Innova LFA. Those testing positive were younger (median age 65 vs 71, $p=0.038$), more unwell (NEWS of 5 vs 3, $p<0.001$) and more often febrile on arrival (Temperature $>38^{\circ}\text{C}$ in 41.9% vs 15.8%, $p<0.001$) than those with negative LFA results. Overall, admission SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR was positive in 38.5% (280/728).

Compared to SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR as the reference standard, the Innova LFA had sensitivity of 86.4% (242/280, 95% Confidence Interval [CI] 81.9-90.0) and specificity of 95.1% (426/448, 95%CI 92.6-96.7) (Table 1B). 22/448 (4.9%) patients with a negative SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR on admission had a positive LFA. 8 of these 22 patients reported a positive COVID-19 test result up to 14 days prior to admission and 5/22 subsequently had a positive PCR result within 5 days of admission. 13/22 had chest radiograph features consistent with 'classic/probable COVID-19' as reported by a radiologist. Only 5/22 patients had no PCR or radiological evidence of COVID-19. 1/5 patients reported a confirmed household contact and only 2/5 left hospital with a diagnosis other than COVID-19. This suggests the lower than expected specificity of Innova LFA is likely to be a result of an imperfect reference standard, and specificity would be higher if using a clinical and RT-PCR based composite reference standard.⁶

38 patients had negative Innova LFAs but positive PCR results. 20/38 had cycle threshold (Ct) values available, with median Ct values of 29 (IQR 27-35). Innova LFA results were available a median 3.2 hours after arrival (IQR 2.0-4.3, n=681) compared to 13.8 hours (IQR 9.9-18.2, n=679) for RT-PCR. 57.1% (n=35) had chest radiographs which were reported as typical for COVID-19. Of those with symptom duration recorded, 77.3% (17/22) were symptomatic for at least 7 days prior to attending the ED.

Accounting for the inadequacy of a single SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR as a reference standard, we found the Innova SARS-CoV-2 Antigen Rapid Qualitative Test had good specificity in patients with symptoms of COVID-19 presenting to hospital. Sensitivity in this setting was high (86.4%) when compared to pre-clinical evaluation studies.¹ Furthermore, results were mostly available within a few hours of presentation, allowing transfer of patients to COVID-19 cohort areas and reducing demand for isolation rooms whilst awaiting PCR results. Placing patients in the 'right bed' first-time is also likely

to reduce delays in care and increase efficiency, and allows isolation rooms to be prioritised for individuals requiring admission with suspected COVID-19 but negative LFA results. Of the 38 patients with COVID-19 (based on SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR) who were 'missed' by the Innova LFA, median Ct values were reasonably high, and correspond to viral loads associated with lower sensitivity in previous studies.¹ However, sensitivity of the Innova LFA appears lower than some other SARS-CoV-2 viral antigen LFAs.⁷ Importantly, individuals requiring admission with suspected COVID-19 should not be moved out of isolation on the basis of a negative SARS-CoV-2 viral antigen LFA results.

In summary, the Innova LFA can be used to rapidly identify COVID-19 cases amongst hospital admissions meeting the COVID-19 case definition with good diagnostic accuracy, and rapidly identify patients that can be allocated to COVID-19 cohort areas. Based on these data, this application of COVID-19 LFAs has now been recommended by NHS England.⁸

Declarations:

Funding: This study received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial or not-for-profit sector. The manufacturer (Lotus Global Company, London, UK) had no role in the study conception, design, data analysis or manuscript preparation.

Approval: The study was approved by the London North West University Hospitals Trust Research and Development Committee, and given the SARS-CoV-2 antigen lateral flow assay was implemented as part of routine clinical care and this was a retrospective review using routinely collected clinical data, they deemed formal ethical approval was not required.

Acknowledgements: We would like to acknowledge to all the clinical staff at Northwick Park Hospital who cared for the patients involved in this study, particularly the point-of-care team within the emergency department.

Conflicts of interest: The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

References

- 1 PHE Porton Down & University of Oxford SARS-CoV-2 LFD test development and validation cell. Preliminary report from the Joint PHE Porton Down & University of Oxford SARS-CoV-2 test development and validation cell: Rapid evaluation of Lateral Flow Viral Antigen detection devices (LFDs) for mass community testing. 2020 [https://www.ox.ac.uk/sites/files/oxford/media_wysiwyg/UK_evaluation_PHE Porton Down University of Oxford_final.pdf](https://www.ox.ac.uk/sites/files/oxford/media_wysiwyg/UK_evaluation_PHE%20Porton%20Down%20University%20of%20Oxford_final.pdf).
- 2 Deeks, JJ. Operation Moonshot proposals are scientifically unsound. *BMJ* 2020;370:m3699. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.m3699>
- 3 World Health Organization. SARS-CoV-2 antigen-detecting rapid diagnostic tests: an implementation guide. Geneva, 2020 <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789240017740>.
- 4 Brendish NJ, Poole S, Naidu V V., et al. Clinical impact of molecular point-of-care testing for suspected COVID-19 in hospital (COV-19POC): a prospective, interventional, non-randomised, controlled study. *Lancet Respir Med* 2020;8:1192–200. doi:10.1016/S2213-2600(20)30454-9
- 5 World Health Organization. WHO COVID-19 case definition. Geneva, 2020. <https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/333912>. License: CC BY-NC-SA 3.0 IGO
- 6 Woloshin S, Patel N, Kesselheim AS. False Negative Tests for SARS-CoV-2 Infection - Challenges and Implications. *N Engl J Med*. 2020 Aug 6;383(6):e38. doi: 10.1056/NEJMp2015897. Epub 2020 Jun 5. PMID: 32502334.
- 7 Pilarowski G, Marquez C, Rubio L, et al. Field performance and public health response using the BinaxNOW TM Rapid SARS-CoV-2 antigen detection assay during community-based testing. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2020 Dec 26:ciaa1890. doi: 10.1093/cid/ciaa1890. Epub ahead of print. PMID: 33367619.
- 8 NHS England. Novel coronavirus (COVID-19) standard operating procedure: lateral flow device testing for emergency department patient pathways. 2020 <https://www.england.nhs.uk/coronavirus/publication/standard-operating-procedure-lateral-flow-device-testing-for-emergency-department-patient-pathways/>.

Table 1: Baseline Characteristics and Diagnostic Performance

A – Baseline Characteristics	LFA Negative	LFA Positive	Total	p-value
N	464	264	728	
Age on arrival (years) median (IQR)	71 (53.5, 83) (n=464)	65 (49.5, 80) (n=264)	67.5 (52, 82) (n=728)	0.038
Age over 65 years, n (%; 95%CI)	260 (56.0%, 51.5 - 60.6)	125 (47.3%, 41.3 - 53.4)	385 (52.9%, 49.3 - 56.5)	0.024
Female Sex, n (%)	211 (45.5%, 40.9 - 50.0)	116 (43.9%, 38.0 - 49.9)	327 (44.9%, 41.3 - 48.5)	0.69
Male Sex, n (%)	253 (54.5%, 50.0 - 59.1)	148 (56.1%, 50.1 - 62.0)	401 (55.1%, 51.5 - 59.7)	
NEWS, median (IQR)	3 (1, 6) (n=422)	5 (3, 7) (n=230)	4 (2, 6) (n=652)	<0.001
Pulse, median (IQR)	94 (82, 111) (n=426)	96 (84, 108) (n=229)	95 (82, 110) (n=655)	0.66
Systolic BP, median (IQR)	136 (120, 151) (n=421)	135.5 (122.5, 149) (n=228)	136 (121, 151) (n=649)	0.93
Diastolic BP, median (IQR)	78 (68, 88) (n=421)	80 (71, 89) (n=228)	79 (70, 88) (n=649)	0.10
Respiratory rate, median (IQR)	20 (18, 27) (n=425)	24 (20, 32) (n=228)	22 (18, 28) (n=653)	<0.001
SpO2 <94%, n (%; 95%CI)	55 (12.9%, 9.8 - 16.1)	68 (29.7%, 23.8 - 35.6)	123 (18.8%, 15.8 - 21.8)	<0.001
Required Supplemental Oxygen, n (%; 95%CI)	72 (16.9%, 13.3 - 20.4)	69 (29.9%, 24.0 - 35.8)	141 (21.4%, 18.3 - 24.6)	<0.001
Temperature >38°C, n (%; 95%CI)	67 (15.8%, 12.3 - 19.2)	96 (41.9%, 35.5 - 48.3)	163 (24.9%, 21.6 - 28.2)	<0.001
B – Diagnostic Performance	LFA Negative	LFA Positive	Total	
N	464	264	728	
SARS-CoV2 RNA Detectable on RT-PCR, n (%)	38	242	280	Sensitivity = 86.4% (95%CI 81.9-90.0)
SARS-CoV2 RNA Undetectable on RT-PCR, n (%)	426	22	448	Specificity = 95.1% (95%CI 92.6-96.7)
	NPV = 91.8% (95%CI 87.7-94.5)	PPV = 91.8% (95%CI 87.7-94.5)		

Table 1 footnotes:

A - Baseline characteristics and SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR results for patients testing positive and negative by the Innova Lateral Flow Antigen (LFA) Assay. For observations on arrival, 9.6 to 10.9% of data were missing. Pair-wise comparisons were performed using chi-squared tests for proportions, t-tests for means and Wilcoxon rank sum for median. *P-values are shown for the comparison between the LFA positive and LFA negative groups. IQR=Inter-quartile range, CI=Confidence Interval, NEWS=National Early Warning Score, SpO2=Oxygen Saturations.

B - Diagnostic performance of the Innova Lateral Flow Antigen (LFA) Assay compared to a single SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR from nasopharyngeal swab on admission. PPV = Positive Predictive Value, NPV = Negative Predictive Value, CI = confidence interval.