

1 **Title**

2 Field evaluation of specificity and sensitivity of a standard SARS-CoV-2 antigen rapid
3 diagnostic test: A prospective study at a teaching hospital in Northern Ghana

4

5 **Authors**

6 Alhassan Abdul-Mumin^{1,2}, Abdulai Abubakari³, Faith Agbozo⁴, Abass Abdul-Karim⁵,
7 Benjamin Demah Nuertey², Kareem Mumuni², Anna-Katharina Heuschen^{6§}, Lisa Hennig⁶,
8 Claudia M. Denking^{7*}, Olaf Müller^{6*}, Albrecht Jahn^{6*}

9 1. University for Development Studies, School of Medicine, Department of Paediatrics
10 and Child Health, Tamale, Ghana

11 2. Tamale Teaching Hospital, Tamale, Ghana

12 3. University for Development Studies, School of Public Health, Department of Global
13 Health, Tamale, Ghana

14 4. University of Health and Allied Sciences, School of Public Health, Department of
15 Family and Community Health, Hohoe, Ghana

16 5. Ghana Health Service, Zonal Public Health and Reference Laboratory, Tamale, Ghana

17 6. Institute for Global Health, University Hospital Heidelberg, Ruprecht-Karls-University
18 Heidelberg

19 7. Department of Infectious Diseases, Division of Tropical Medicine, University Hospital
20 Heidelberg, Ruprecht-Karls-University Heidelberg

21

22 *These authors contributed equally to the paper

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

23 [§]Corresponding author

24 **Abstract**

25 Background: The testing capacity for SARS-CoV-2 in Africa is rather limited. Antigen-
26 detection rapid diagnostic tests (Ag-RDTs) are a cheap and rapid alternative to reverse
27 transcriptase-polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR) tests, but there is little data about their
28 performance under real life conditions in tropical countries.

29 Objective: To evaluate the performance of a standard Ag-RDT in a population of a major
30 hospital in northern Ghana.

31 Methods: Prospective, cross-sectional, blinded verification of the performance of the SD
32 Biosensor Standard Q SARS-CoV-2 Ag-RDT under real life conditions in 135 symptomatic
33 patients and 58 contacts of RT-PCR positives at Tamale Teaching Hospital in February 2021.
34 Nasopharyngeal samples were taken under standard conditions and tested against RT-PCR in
35 the hospital laboratory.

36 Results: 193 participants (median age 35 years, 109 male) were included into the study for
37 which both RT-PCR test and Ag-RDT results were available. A total of 42 (22%) were RT-
38 PCR positive. Of the 42 RT-PCR positives, 27 were Ag-RDT positive, resulting in a sensitivity
39 of 64% (95% CI 49-79). Sensitivity among symptomatic patients was 58% (95% CI 38-78).
40 123 were identified Ag-RDT negatives of the 151 RT-PCR negatives, resulting in a specificity
41 of 81% (95% CI 75-87).

42 Conclusions: SARS-CoV-2 Ag-RDTs appear to have a rather low sensitivity and particularly
43 a low specificity under real life conditions in Africa. The role of existing Ag-RDTs in countries
44 with high-temperature climates and limited resources still needs more data and discussion.

45

46 **Background**

47 The emergence of COVID-19 in China by the end of 2019 has led to the largest pandemic in
48 recent human history (1, 2). It had initially been predicted, that Africa would become the worst
49 affected global region, due to its weak health systems, prevailing poverty, and the existing high
50 burden of infectious diseases (3, 4). However, by the end of 2020, only some 2% of the global
51 number of cases and deaths were reported from the WHO African Region, but there have
52 recently been signs for a resurgence of the number of cases (5).

53 There are various potential reasons for the low number of cases reported from sub-
54 Saharan Africa (SSA). The likely main reasons are a much lower testing capacity in most
55 countries of SSA and a much younger population associated with fewer symptomatic cases;
56 however, other factors such as climate, which may affect transmission dynamics, the effects of
57 early public health response measures, herd immunity due to cross reactions with other corona
58 viruses or prevailing parasitic infections may also play a role (4). Findings from SARS-CoV-2
59 seroprevalence surveys support the growing evidence of under-reporting and a high proportion
60 of asymptomatic and mild cases in SSA countries (6). In Zambia for example, a population-
61 based survey has shown that the number of laboratory-confirmed SARS-CoV-2 cases are
62 underestimating the real degree of community transmission at least 100-fold (7). However,
63 SARS-CoV-2 serology results in SSA resulting from commercial tests validated outside Africa
64 need to be interpreted with caution (8).

65 Testing is essential for the diagnosis of COVID-19 patients and to identify those persons
66 who are infectious. Molecular assays to diagnose SARS-CoV-2 are considered the gold
67 standard for detection of SARS-CoV-2 infection. They are typically based on RT-PCR to detect
68 viral RNA and are highly sensitive and specific (9). However, they require a good laboratory
69 infrastructure, trained staff, expensive equipment, and results are usually available only with

70 significant delay (10). Single use, lateral flow, antigen-detection rapid diagnostic tests (Ag-
71 RDTs) are a cheaper and easy to use alternative to RT-PCR tests. They are considered as a
72 useful supplement to RT-PCR testing, in particular as they mainly identify cases in the early
73 phase of disease and with high viral load and thus likely to be infective, and as they provide
74 results within 15 minutes (11, 12). An increasing number of Ag-RDTs has become authorized
75 by the US Food and Drug Administration (FDA) and other health authorities, which have been
76 shown to be highly specific, but not as sensitive as molecular tests (10). WHO recommends a
77 minimum sensitivity of 80% and a minimum specificity of 97% for SARS-CoV-2 Ag-RDTs
78 (10).

79 We here report the results of a field evaluation of a standard SARS-CoV-2 Ag-RDT
80 (SD Biosensor Standard Q) in Ghana which assesses whether the performance reported in
81 clinical studies in mostly high-resourced countries with moderate climates holds up in low-
82 resourced settings with high-temperature climates.

83

84 **Methods**

85 Study location and population

86 This study was conducted in the Tamale Teaching Hospital, situated in Tamale in the Northern
87 Region of Ghana. It serves as the only tertiary health care facility for the Northern Region
88 (where Tamale is located), Northeast, Savannah, Upper East and Upper West Regions as well
89 as parts of the Bono East and Oti Regions of Ghana. Together, the population of the catchment
90 area is about six million. The hospital also serves as the clinical training setting for students of
91 the *University for Development Studies*. Since the detection of the first case of COVID-19 in
92 Ghana in March 2020, the hospital has been at the forefront of the fight against the pandemic

93 in the northern sector of the country. It hosts the only treatment center for COVID-19 as well
94 as the zonal laboratory, where most samples taken from suspected COVID-19 cases are tested.

95

96 COVID-19 in Ghana

97 The first cases of COVID-19 in Ghana were recorded on March 12, 2020, while the first case
98 in Tamale has occurred about two weeks after this. By September 9, 2021, Ghana – with a
99 population of about 30 million - had a total of 123,874 reported SARS-CoV-2/COVID-19 cases
100 and 1098 reported deaths (13). The Northern Region has recorded 1,713 cases to date, with the
101 majority of these cases coming from the Tamale metropolis. A lockdown, mainly for Greater
102 Accra and some parts of the Ashanti Region, was imposed for two weeks in April 2020 to stem
103 the control of the virus spread. While the first epidemic wave lasted from March until
104 November 2020, a second wave is currently under way, driven mainly by new strains of the
105 virus with higher infectivity, and increasing rates of hospitalization due to severe symptoms
106 (13, 14). Ghana has a limited capacity to run RT-PCR tests, which has resulted in significant
107 delays in getting RT-PCR test results during the first and second waves of the pandemic.

108

109 Study design and participants

110 This study is a cross-sectional, blinded verification study of the performance of the Standard
111 Q SARS-CoV-2 Ag-RDT under real life conditions at the Tamale Teaching Hospital. From
112 February 15 to 20, 135 consecutive patients and 58 contacts were recruited. The patients were
113 eligible if they were referred by an attending physician because they exhibited signs suggestive
114 of COVID-19 (symptomatic), or if they were contacts of patients who tested positive for

115 COVID-19 by RT-PCR test. None of the asymptomatic participants reported back to hospital
116 with symptoms within 14 days after the sample collection.

117 The sample size of 200 was determined using the Cochrane (1977) formula for sample size
118 calculation.

119 Following verbal informed consent, clinical and demographic data were recorded from the
120 study participants on a standard questionnaire, including specific symptoms, age, and sex.

121 None of the participants declined for samples to be taken and to participate in the study.

122

123 Index test

124 The Ag-RDT evaluated was the STANDARD Q SARS-CoV-2 Ag Test (SD Biosensor, Inc.
125 Gyeonggi-do, Korea), which is distributed by Roche (15). The test was purchased in
126 Switzerland and transported to the Institute of Global Health in Heidelberg, Germany, using
127 standard procedures. From Heidelberg, the tests were sent to Tamale, Ghana, by air, again
128 using standard procedures for transport of laboratory materials. In Tamale, the test kits were
129 stored in a designated storage room at the Tamale Teaching Hospital at temperatures between
130 22°C and 27°C. Testing was done according to manufacturer's instructions for use. However,
131 both the COVID-19 isolation center and the general wards were not air-conditioned, and the
132 environmental temperature fluctuated between 24°C and 37°C. Most of the tests were done
133 during daytime when the temperature was highest.

134

135 Reference test

136 Reverse transcriptase-polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR) was used as the reference test. The
137 RT-PCR samples were collected by health-care workers using nasopharyngeal swabs. At the
138 study laboratory, the samples were initially lysed to inactivate any viral agent, followed by
139 extraction of the viral RNA in separate biosafety class 2 cabinets. The next step involved the
140 mastermix preparation and template addition in separate hoods. The final stage was
141 amplification using AriaMx real-time PCR thermocycler. The reagent used was LightMix®
142 SarbecoV E-gene (manufacturer TIB MOLBIOL) which is the standard assay used in the
143 *Public Health Reference Laboratory*. The assay targets only the E-gene of SARS-CoV-2.
144 Further details and test properties can be found in the instructions for use (16). A Ct value of
145 <40 is interpreted as a positive and Ct values ≥ 40 as a negative test result for SARS-CoV-2.

146

147 Sample collection and testing

148 Samples were collected by a clinical team at the study hospital, consisting of physicians, nurses,
149 and biomedical laboratory scientists. Two nasopharyngeal samples were taken from the same
150 nostril by trained staff from each participant. One sample was tested immediately at the hospital
151 using the Standard Q SARS-CoV-2 Ag-RDT, with the result being interpreted according to the
152 manufacture`s guidelines and recorded on a specific paper form. The second sample was
153 transported in a viral transport medium to the zonal public health laboratory located within the
154 premises of the Teaching Hospital for extraction and RT-PCR testing.

155

156 Statistical methods

157 To determine sensitivity and specificity of the Standard Q SARS-CoV-2 Ag-RDT (with 95%
158 CIs), results were compared to RT-PCR results from the same participant, as per Altman (17).
159 A predefined subgroup analysis by symptoms presence was performed.

160 We used “R” version 4.0.3. (R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria) to
161 generate all analyses and plots.

162

163 Ethical aspects

164 The evaluation protocol was approved by the Ethical Review Committee of the Tamale
165 Teaching Hospital. The data used for the evaluation were routine data from the hospital
166 services. Laboratory samples were anonymized and results could not be traced to individual
167 participants. All participants provided verbal informed consent and there were no refusals.

168

169 **Results**

170 A total of 198 participants were recruited for the study. For five participants, no RT-PCR results
171 were available. Thus, 193 participants were included into the study for which both RT-PCR
172 test and Ag-RDT results were available.

173

174 Demographic characteristics

175 The median age was 35 years (range: 5 months to 93 years). 109 participants were male, 84
176 were female.

177

178 Clinical characteristics

179 Table 1 shows the clinical characteristics of the study participants. 135 (70%) were
180 symptomatic; 58 (30%) were asymptomatic. Cough (60%), fever (34%), general weakness

181 (36%), rhinitis (36%) and headache (36%) were the main symptoms recorded. Ageusia and
 182 anosmia were recognized in only 16% and 19% of study participants respectively. Non-
 183 communicable diseases (NCDs) that are associated with severe COVID-19 were very rare (one
 184 case each of Diabetes mellitus, hypertension and cardiovascular disease), and none of the study
 185 participants was on medication for a chronic disease.

186 Table 1: Clinical characteristics of study participants in Tamale Teaching Hospital, Ghana

187	<u>Diagnosis</u>	<u>number</u>	<u>proportion</u>
188	Asymptomatic	58/193	30%
189	Symptomatic	135/193	70%
190	-----		
191	Cough	81/135	60%
192	Fever	46/135	34%
193	Weakness	49/135	36%
194	Rhinitis	48/135	36%
195	Headache	49/135	36%
196	Sore throat	24/135	18%
197	Dyspnea	22/135	16%
198	Diarrhea	11/135	8%
199	Nausea/vomiting	11/135	8%
200	Pain	38/135	28%
201	<i>joint pain</i>	7/135	5%
202	<i>muscle pain</i>	15/135	11%
203	<i>chest pain</i>	16/135	12%
204	<i>abdominal pain</i>	24/135	18%
205	Anosmia	25/135	19%
206	Ageusia	21/135	16%

207 NCDs 3/135 2%

208

209 Test results

210 Table 2 and 3 show the results. A total of 42 (22%) study participants were RT-PCR positive,
 211 and 151 (78%) were RT-PCR negative. Of the 42 RT-PCR positives, 27 were Ag-RDT
 212 positive, resulting in a sensitivity of 64% (95% CI 49-79). 123 were identified Ag-RDT
 213 negative of the 151 RT-PCR negatives, resulting in a specificity of 81% (95% CI 75-87). The
 214 positive predictive value of the Ag-RDT in this population was 49% (95% CI 36-62) and the
 215 negative predictive value 89% (95% CI 84-94). The positive predictive accuracy (PPA) of the
 216 test was 28% and negative predictive accuracy (NPA) was 95%. Among the asymptomatic
 217 participants, there were 18 RT-PCR positives (31%) and 13 (72%) (95% CI 51-93) were
 218 detected by Ag-RDT. Only considering the symptomatic participants (24 RT-PCR positives,
 219 18%), the sensitivity was 58% (95% CI 38-78). Regarding the cycle threshold (Ct) values of
 220 our participants who were PCR positive (40/42), none was <25; 8 (20%) had values between
 221 25 and <30; 29 (72.5%) were between 30 and <35; and 3 (7.5%) were between 35 and <40.

222

223 Table 2: SARS-CoV-2 Ag-RDT test results in comparison to RT-PCR results in Tamale
 224 Teaching Hospital, Ghana

225 <u>Ag-RDT result</u>	226 <u>RT-PCR result</u>		227 <u>Total</u>
	228 <u>Positive</u>	229 <u>Negative</u>	
230 Positive	27	28	55
Negative	15	123	138
Total	42	151	193

230

231 **Table 3:** Subgroup analysis results of true/false positives and negatives in Tamale Teaching
 232 Hospital, Ghana

	n	TP	FP	TN	FN	PPV	NPV	PPA	NPA	Sensitivity (95%CI)	Specificity (95%CI)
Overall	193	14%	15%	64%	8%	48%	89%	28%	95%	64% (95%CI 49-79)	81% (95%CI 75-87)
Symptomatic	135	10%	19%	64%	7%	34%	90%	22%	94%	58% (95%CI 38-78)	77% (95%CI 69-85)
Asymptomatic	58	22%	5%	64%	9%	81%	87%	54%	96%	72% (95%CI 51-93)	93% (95%CI 85-100)

233
 234 TP=true positives, FP=false positives, TN=true negatives, FN=false negatives, PPV=positive predictive value,
 235 NPV=negative predictive value, PPA=positive predictive accuracy, NPA=negative predictive accuracy

236

237 **Discussion**

238 Our study demonstrates a limited sensitivity (64%) and very low specificity (81%) for a WHO
 239 approved SARS-CoV-2 Ag-RDT, which is much below the performance demonstrated in
 240 systematic reviews (73,8% and 99,7% respectively)(12) and even more so with the
 241 manufacturers data (sensitivity 76,6% and specificity 97,6%)(18).

242 Much of the data generated by the Standard Q Ag-RDT stem from high resource
 243 settings with temperate climates. There are limited data on evaluations of SARS-CoV-2 Ag-
 244 RDT available until very recently from lower-resourced settings with hotter climates (19). A
 245 study in Cameroon compared results from the SD Biosensor Standard Q SARS-CoV-2 Ag-
 246 RDT with RT-PCR results in asymptomatic and symptomatic adult participants from eight
 247 hospitals and demonstrated an overall sensitivity of 59% (95% CI 53-65), with the sensitivity
 248 increasing to 69% (95% CI 62-75) when only symptomatic participants were considered (20).
 249 Another study in Uganda compared results from another SARS-CoV-2 Ag-RDT with RT-PCR
 250 results in adult hospital patients and controls and demonstrated a sensitivity of 70% (95% CI
 251 60-79) (21).

252 The sensitivity in our study (64% overall and 58% in symptomatic participants) is
253 comparable to this data from Uganda and Cameroon. Interestingly, the sensitivity in
254 asymptomatic participants in our study was higher than in symptomatic participants, but this
255 did not reach statistical significance. A potential explanation could be that more of the
256 asymptomatic patients were captured early in the disease when the viral load is high. The higher
257 sensitivity in asymptomatic patients speaks more for participants related aspects affecting the
258 sensitivity than operational or environmental factors, as those would be expected to affect
259 performance in symptomatic and asymptomatic participants equally (22).

260 Specificity in our study (81%) is lower than that demonstrated in both Uganda and
261 Cameroon (92%) (20, 21) and shows that under study conditions in SSA countries a much
262 lower specificity than the WHO requested minimum specificity of 97% has to be expected.
263 Possible explanations for the lower specificity in our study could be cross-reacting antibodies
264 from previous infections or the environmental temperatures (24°-37°C) during the study period
265 in the rooms (the general wards and the COVID-19 isolation center) where the tests were
266 carried out. The Ct values for our patients, who were tested RT-PCR positive, were generally
267 high. As reported in the results, none of the participants had Ct values < 25 and the majority of
268 the values were between 30 to <35 (72.5%). This could have affected the performance of the
269 RDTs as higher Ct values correspond with lower viral load and studies have shown that the
270 performance of RDTs fall with increasing Ct values (12, 23). In addition, most testing occurred
271 during the day when temperatures were high although direct sunlight was avoided. The
272 manufacturer recommends a temperature of maximum 30°C and others have demonstrated that
273 high temperatures above the manufacturer recommended targets negatively affect the test
274 performance (22). While the study by Haage et al. demonstrated an effect of high temperatures
275 primarily on sensitivity, others have shared the experience that it also substantially affects
276 specificity (Denkinger personal communication). One way to minimize the effects of high

277 temperatures on the test accuracy in these settings would be to conduct the tests in the mornings
278 and evenings when the environmental temperature will be relatively lower. However, care must
279 be taken not to negate the advantage of the RDT test, which is to provide rapid results to aid
280 clinical decision making. Another important factor could be the high prevalence of other
281 endemic infectious diseases, or others as yet unknown factors (4, 20).

282 Having Ag-RDTs with high specificity and sensitivity will be a key element for
283 controlling the pandemic in settings like northern Ghana in particular as well as Ghana and
284 SSA in general. This is due to the fact that the turnaround time for the gold standard test (PCR)
285 was very long in both the first and second wave of the pandemic due to limited testing capacity.
286 As a result, clinical decision making was delayed and increased the risk of further transmission.
287 RDTs with their quick turnaround time could facilitate clinical decision making and contact
288 screening of confirmed COVID-19 cases. The high negative predictive accuracy for the Ag-
289 RDTs used in this study makes it a valuable tool for these purposes but all positive tests will
290 require confirmation with RT-PCR test (24).

291 The limitations of this study are firstly that it was done in one center of one country
292 only, thus limiting generalizability. Secondly, the overall sample size was small and further
293 subgroup analyses to better understand the data were not possible. Thirdly, the temperature at
294 time of testing was not recorded thus limiting a differentiated understanding of the impact of
295 temperature. Another limitation is that the study did not include the duration between the onset
296 of symptoms and the timing of the testing for the symptomatic participants. And while it is a
297 limitation that the tests were not performed in manufacturer recommended temperature range,
298 the strength of this study is, that it has been done under real life conditions in a high-
299 temperature, limited resource country.

300

301 **Conclusion**

302 This field evaluation of a standard SARS-CoV-2 Ag-RDT shows a rather low sensitivity and
303 specificity. Given these findings, further studies are needed to assess the role of existing Ag-
304 RDTs in high-temperature climates in Africa and around the world, where easy-to-use tests are
305 urgently needed as RT-PCR testing is not widely available.

306

307 **Contributors**

308 CMD, AJ, and AAM designed the study, OM wrote the first paper draft, AAM coordinated the
309 field work, all authors contributed to the content of the paper.

310

311 **Declaration of interests**

312 We declare no conflict of interests.

313

314 **Funding**

315 The study has received funding from the *Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit*
316 (GIZ) in Germany.

317

318 **Acknowledgements**

319 We thank the Covid-19 team of the *Tamale Teaching Hospital* for assisting with the sample
320 collection, Dr. Kingsley Bimpong and Dr. Hadi Salawudini for assisting with data entry, and

321 the staff of the *Zonal Public Health and Reference Laboratory*, Tamale, for assisting with the
322 RT-PCR testing.

323

324 **References**

- 325 1. Müller O, Lu G, Jahn A, Razum O. COVID-19 Control: Can Germany Learn From
326 China? *Int J Health Policy Manag.* 2020;9(10):432-5.
- 327 2. Lu G, Razum O, Jahn A, Zhang Y, Sutton B, Sridhar D, et al. COVID-19 in Germany
328 and China: mitigation versus elimination strategy. *Glob Health Action.* 2021;14(1):1875601.
- 329 3. Massinga Loembé M, Tshangela A, Salyer SJ, Varma JK, Ouma AEO, Nkengasong
330 JN. COVID-19 in Africa: the spread and response. *Nat Med.* 2020;26(7):999-1003.
- 331 4. Maeda JM, Nkengasong JN. The puzzle of the COVID-19 pandemic in Africa.
332 *Science.* 2021;371(6524):27-8.
- 333 5. Impouma B, Wolfe CM, Mboussou F, Farham B, Saturday T, Pervilhac C, et al.
334 Monitoring and Evaluation of COVID-19 response in the WHO African Region: challenges
335 and lessons learned. *Epidemiol Infect.* 2021:1-14.
- 336 6. Usuf E, Roca A. Seroprevalence surveys in sub-Saharan Africa: what do they tell us?
337 *Lancet Glob Health.* 2021.
- 338 7. Mulenga LB, Hines JZ, Fwoloshi S, Chirwa L, Siwingwa M, Yingst S, et al.
339 Prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 in six districts in Zambia in July, 2020: a cross-sectional cluster
340 sample survey. *The Lancet Global Health.* 2021.
- 341 8. Nkuba Ndaye A, Hoxha A, Madinga J, Mariën J, Peeters M, Leendertz FH, et al.
342 Challenges in interpreting SARS-CoV-2 serological results in African countries. *The Lancet*
343 *Global Health.* 2021;9(5):e588-e9.

- 344 9. Tsang NNY, So HC, Ng KY, Cowling BJ, Leung GM, Ip DKM. Diagnostic
345 performance of different sampling approaches for SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR testing: a
346 systematic review and meta-analysis. *Lancet Infect Dis*. 2021.
- 347 10. Peeling RW, Olliaro PL, Boeras DI, Fongwen N. Scaling up COVID-19 rapid antigen
348 tests: promises and challenges. *Lancet Infect Dis*. 2021.
- 349 11. Dinnes J, Deeks JJ, Adriano A, Berhane S, Davenport C, Dittrich S, et al. Rapid,
350 point-of-care antigen and molecular-based tests for diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2 infection.
351 *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2020;8(8):Cd013705.
- 352 12. Brümmer LE, Katzenschlager S, Gaeddert M, Erdmann C, Schmitz S, Bota M, et al.
353 Accuracy of novel antigen rapid diagnostics for SARS-CoV-2: A living systematic review
354 and meta-analysis. *PLOS Medicine*. 2021;18(8):e1003735.
- 355 13. SITUATION UPDATE, COVID-19 OUTBREAK IN GHANA [Internet]. 2021 [cited
356 20/05/2021]. Available from: <https://www.ghanahealthservice.org/covid19/archive.php>.
- 357 14. WHO afro. New COVID-19 variants fuelling Africa's second wave2021. Available
358 from: <https://www.afro.who.int/news/new-covid-19-variants-fuelling-africas-second-wave>.
- 359 15. Roche Group. Roche SARS-CoV-2 Rapid Antigen Test receives special approval for
360 at-home patient self-testing using nasal swabs in Germany 2021 [Available from:
361 <https://www.roche.com/de/media/releases/med-cor-2021-02-26c.htm>.
- 362 16. MOLBIOL T. Instructions For Use: LightMix® SarbecoV E-gene plus EAV
363 control2020. Available from: [https://www.roche-as.es/lm_pdf/MDx_40-0776_96_Sarbeco-E-](https://www.roche-as.es/lm_pdf/MDx_40-0776_96_Sarbeco-E-gene_V200204_09164154001%20(1).pdf)
364 [gene_V200204_09164154001%20\(1\).pdf](https://www.roche-as.es/lm_pdf/MDx_40-0776_96_Sarbeco-E-gene_V200204_09164154001%20(1).pdf).
- 365 17. Altman DG, Bland JM. Diagnostic tests. 1: Sensitivity and specificity. *Bmj*.
366 1994;308(6943):1552.
- 367 18. WHO. Veri-Q PCR 316 Coronavirus disease 2019(COVID-19) Detection Kit nCoV-
368 QS2021. Available from:

- 369 https://extranet.who.int/pqweb/sites/default/files/documents/eul_0495_188_00_nCoV-
370 [QS_EN_IFU_v4.pdf](#).
- 371 19. Jacobs J, Kühne V, Lunguya O, Affolabi D, Hardy L, Vandenberg O. Implementing
372 COVID-19 (SARS-CoV-2) Rapid Diagnostic Tests in Sub-Saharan Africa: A Review. *Front*
373 *Med (Lausanne)*. 2020;7:557797.
- 374 20. Boum Y, Bebell LM, Bisseck A-CZ-K. Africa needs local solutions to face the
375 COVID-19 pandemic. *The Lancet*. 2021;397(10281):1238-40.
- 376 21. Nalumansi A, Lutalo T, Kayiwa J, Watera C, Balinandi S, Kiconco J, et al. Field
377 evaluation of the performance of a SARS-CoV-2 antigen rapid diagnostic test in Uganda
378 using nasopharyngeal samples. *Int J Infect Dis*. 2021;104:282-6.
- 379 22. Haage V, Ferreira de Oliveira-Filho E, Moreira-Soto A, Kühne A, Fischer C, Sacks
380 JA, et al. Impaired performance of SARS-CoV-2 antigen-detecting rapid diagnostic tests at
381 elevated and low temperatures. *Journal of Clinical Virology*. 2021;138:104796.
- 382 23. Peña M, Ampuero M, Garcés C, Gaggero A, García P, Velasquez MS, et al.
383 Performance of SARS-CoV-2 rapid antigen test compared with real-time RT-PCR in
384 asymptomatic individuals. *Int J Infect Dis*. 2021;107:201-4.
- 385 24. Prince JR LD. Sensitivity, Specificity, and Predictive Accuracy as Measures of
386 Efficacy of Diagnostic Tests. *Annals of Saudi Medicine*. 1981;1:13-8.

387

388