

1 Analytical and Clinical Performance of the Panbio COVID-19 2 Antigen-Detecting Rapid Diagnostic Test

3
4 Andrea Alemany^{1,2*}, Bàrbara Baro^{3*}, Dan Ouchi¹, Maria Ubals^{1,2}, Marc Corbacho-Monné¹, Júlia
5 Vergara-Alert⁴, Jordi Rodon⁴, Joaquim Segalés^{5,6}, Cristina Esteban², Gema Fernandez², Lidia Ruiz⁷,
6 Quique Bassat^{3,8,9,10,11}, Bonaventura Clotet^{1,2,12}, Jordi Ara^{2,13}, Martí Vall-Mayans^{1,2}, Camila G-Beiras¹,
7 Ignacio Blanco^{2,13}, Oriol Mitjà^{1,2,12,14}

8 *Both authors contributed equally

9 ¹Fight AIDS and Infectious Diseases Foundation, Badalona, Spain

10 ²Hospital Universitari Germans Trias i Pujol, Badalona, Spain

11 ³ISGlobal, Hospital Clínic, Universitat de Barcelona, Barcelona, Spain

12 ⁴IRTA, Centre de Recerca en Sanitat Animal (CRESA, IRTA-UAB), Campus de la UAB, 08193
13 Bellaterra (Cerdanyola del Vallès), Spain

14 ⁵UAB, CRESA (IRTA-UAB), Campus de la UAB, 08193 Bellaterra (Cerdanyola del Vallès), Spain

15 ⁶Departament de Sanitat i Anatomia Animals, Facultat de Veterinària, UAB, 08193 Bellaterra
16 (Cerdanyola del Vallès), Spain

17 ¹³IrsiCaixa AIDS Research Institute, Germans Trias i Pujol Research Institute (IGTP), Badalona, Spain

18 ⁸Centro de Investigação em Saúde de Manhiça (CISM), Maputo, Mozambique

19 ⁹ICREA, Pg. Lluís Companys 23, 08010 Barcelona, Spain

20 ¹⁰Pediatric Infectious Diseases Unit, Pediatrics Department, Hospital Sant Joan de Déu (University of
21 Barcelona), Barcelona, Spain

22 ¹¹Consorcio de Investigación Biomédica en Red de Epidemiología y Salud Pública (CIBERESP), Madrid,
23 Spain

24 ¹²Universitat de Vic-Universitat Central de Catalunya (UVIC-UCC), Vic, Spain

25 ¹³Gerència Territorial Metropolitana Nord, Institut Català de la Salut, Barcelona, Spain

26 ¹⁴Lihir Medical Centre - InternationalSOS, Lihir Island, Papua New Guinea

27
28 Corresponding author: omitja@flsida.org

29 Oriol Mitjà, Fight Aids and Infectious Diseases Foundation, Hospital Germans Trias I Pujol, Carretera de
30 Canyet s/n 08916 Badalona, Spain

31 **Abstract**

32 *Background*

33 The current standard for COVID-19 diagnosis, RT-qPCR, has important drawbacks for its use as a tool
34 for epidemiological control, including the need of laboratory-processing, high cost, and long turnaround
35 from sampling to results release. Antigen-based rapid diagnostic tests (Ag-RDT) provide a promising
36 alternative for this purpose.

37 *Methods*

38 We assessed the analytical and clinical performance of the Ag-RDT Panbio COVID-19 Ag Test (Abbott),
39 using RT-qPCR as a reference test. The clinical performance was assessed using nasopharyngeal swabs,
40 collected in routine practice for case confirmation and contact tracing, and nasal mid-turbinate swabs,
41 collected in preventive screenings of asymptomatic individuals. Fresh samples were analysed by RT-q-
42 PCR, stored at -80 °C, and analysed using the Ag-RDT according to the manufacturer instructions.

43 *Findings*

44 The Ag-RDT had a limit of detection of 6.5×10^5 copies/reaction. The clinical performance was assessed
45 on 1,406 frozen swabs with a PCR result available: 951 (67.7%) positive and 455 (32.4%) negative. The
46 Ag-RDT identified the presence of SARS-CoV-2 in 872 of 951 PCR-positive samples (91.7%; 95% CI
47 89.8-93.4 and ruled out its presence in 450 of 455 PCR-negative samples (specificity 98.9%; 95% CI 97.5
48 – 99.6). Sensitivity increased in samples with lower Ct values (Ct <25, 98.2%; Ct<30, 94.9%) and was
49 higher among symptomatic cases (92.6%) and their contacts (94.2%) than among asymptomatic
50 individuals (79.5%). In the setting of asymptomatic screening, sensitivity also increased with lower Ct
51 values (Ct <25, 100%; Ct<30, 98.6%). Assuming a pre-test probability of 5%, the negative and positive
52 predictive values were 99.6% (99.5 – 99.6) and 81.5% (65.0 – 93.2), respectively.

53 *Interpretation*

54 The Panbio COVID-19 Ag-RDT has high sensitivity for detecting the presence of SARS-CoV-2 in nasal
55 or nasopharyngeal swabs of both, symptomatic and asymptomatic individuals. The diagnostic
56 performance of the test is particularly good in samples with viral loads associated with high risk of viral
57 transmission (Ct <25), which show high positive and negative predictive values even when assuming a
58 prevalence as low as 5%.

59 *Funding* Blueberry diagnostics, Fundació Institut d'Investigació en Ciències de la Salut Germans Trias
60 i Pujol, and #YoMeCorono.org crowdfunding campaign.

61

62 **Research in context**

63 *Evidence before this study*

64 On October 6, 2020, we searched PubMed for articles containing “Antigen”, “test”, “SARS-CoV-2”,
65 “COVID-19” and “performance” in either the title or the abstract. We found five studies that showed the
66 accuracy of point-of-care tests in identifying SARS-CoV-2 antigens for confirmation of clinically
67 suspected COVID-19. We found high variability in the diagnostic accuracy of Ag-RDT. Most tests
68 showed high specificity (i.e., 99% or higher), whereas sensitivity ranged from 11% to 92%; only one test
69 reported sensitivity higher than 60%. We found no studies investigating the diagnostic accuracy of the
70 *Panbio COVID-19 Ag Test*. We found no studies that assessed the performance of Ag-RDT for
71 population-level screening of asymptomatic individuals.

72 *Added value of this study*

73 Our analysis provides information regarding the diagnostic accuracy of the *Panbio COVID-19 Ag Test*
74 when tested on 1,406 frozen samples of nasopharyngeal and nasal swabs collected in routine practice for
75 diagnostic confirmation of symptomatic individuals with suspected COVID-19 or contacts exposed to a
76 positive case, and preventive screenings of unexposed asymptomatic individuals. Compared with RT-
77 qPCR as reference test, the Ag-RDT showed a sensitivity and specificity of 91.7% and 98.9%. Test
78 sensitivity increased in samples with viral load associated with high risk of transmission (Ct <25),
79 reaching more than 98%, regardless of the presence of symptoms.

80 *Implications of all the available evidence*

81 Available evidence show variability in the diagnostic performance of marketed Ag-RDT. Our results
82 provide substantial evidence that the point-of-care *Panbio COVID-19 Ag Test* can accurately identify
83 SARS-CoV-2 antigens in people with suspected clinical COVID-19 as well as in asymptomatic people
84 with high viral load and therefore, associated with higher risk of transmission. This finding represents a
85 potentially useful advance for mass screening of asymptomatic people at the point-of-care.

86

87

88 **Introduction**

89 Strategies for early identification of severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2)
90 cases and their contacts are a mainstay for containing the viral spread. Reverse transcription-polymerase
91 chain reaction (RT-qPCR) analysis of nasopharyngeal swabs remains the gold standard for identifying the
92 presence of the SARS-CoV-2 genome. However, the need for laboratory-processing, high cost, and long
93 turnaround from sampling to results release limits the feasibility of this technique for community-based
94 testing strategies. The growing body of evidence on the lack of infectivity of cases with low viral load^{1,2}
95 suggests that frequent testing with rapid diagnostic tests Antigen-detecting RDTs (Ag-RDT)—even those
96 with low sensitivity—may be more adequate than RT-qPCR for epidemiological control of the SARS-
97 CoV-2.³ Furthermore, preliminary data on the performance of Ag-RDTs suggest that their sensitivity
98 increases with the viral load, reaching 99% when testing specimens with high viral loads.^{4,5}

99 Ag-RDTs, commonly used in the diagnosis of infectious respiratory diseases, have recently become
100 available for the identification of SARS-CoV-2.⁶ Tests designed for clinical diagnosis of symptomatic
101 people require high analytic sensitivity. In contrast, test requirements⁷ for a containment strategy of
102 COVID-19 are rapid turnaround time (i.e., less than 20 minutes), low cost, and ease-of-use to allow
103 frequent testing at the point-of-care.⁸⁻¹²

104 Currently, the WHO recommends using Ag-RDTs to support diagnosis of cases and contacts during
105 outbreak investigations and monitor trends in disease incidence, particularly in remote settings or closed
106 groups (e.g., schools, care homes, or prisons), but not to screen asymptomatic populations.⁶ In this study,
107 we investigated the performance of a SARS-CoV-2 Ag-RDT for confirmation of clinically suspected
108 COVID-19 and their contacts using nasopharyngeal specimens, and for community screening of
109 asymptomatic people using nasal mid-turbinate specimens.

110

111 **Methods**

112 *Test selection*

113 After a literature review and web search¹³ for SARS-CoV-2 rapid antigen-based tests, we selected four
114 candidates deemed potentially suitable for diagnosis and screening strategies: COVID-19 Ag Respi-Strip
115 (Coris BioConcept, Gembloux, Belgium), Standard Q COVID-19 Ag Test (SD Biosensor, Suwon, South
116 Korea), Standard F COVID-19 Ag FIA (SD Biosensor, Suwon, South Korea), and Panbio™ COVID-19
117 Ag Test (Abbott Laboratories, Illinois, USA). The selected tests were pre-screened by triplicate on 40
118 frozen samples of nasopharyngeal swabs with known PCR result ([Table S1, Supplementary Material](#)).

119 Based on the pre-screening results, the Panbio COVID-19 Ag Test was selected for the assessment of
120 analytical and clinical performance.

121 The Panbio™ COVID-19 Ag Rapid Test Device is a chromatographic, immunoassay-based platform. For
122 a positive result, a gold conjugate human IgG specific to SARS-CoV-2 Ag and anti-SARS-CoV-2
123 antibody form a test line in the result window.

124

125 *Analytical performance of antigen rapid tests*

126 The analytical performance of the Ag-RDT test was assessed using a SARS-CoV-2 isolate (ID
127 EPI_ISL_510689) propagated in Vero E6 cells (ATCC CRL-1586). The median tissue culture infective
128 dose (TCID₅₀), defined as the dilution that caused cytopathic effect in 50% of the inoculated cell cultures,
129 was calculated by titrating a passage 3 SARS-CoV-2 stock into Vero E6 cells and culturing them at 37 °C
130 in a 5% CO₂ incubator for six days. Cells were cultured in Dulbecco's modified Eagle medium (DMEM;
131 Lonza) supplemented with 5% foetal calf serum (FCS; EuroClone), 100 U/mL penicillin, 100 µg/mL
132 streptomycin, and 2 mM glutamine (all ThermoFisher Scientific).

133 The analytical sensitivity was estimated by testing in triplicate eight ten-fold serial dilutions of the SARS-
134 CoV-2 suspension in PBS (Lonza). All samples were cross-validated by RT-qPCR and virus isolation in
135 Vero E6 cells. RT-qPCR for genomic detection (UpE assay; Corman et al., 2020) was conducted from
136 viral RNA extracted using the Indimag Pathogen kit (Indical Biosciences) from all serial dilutions on a
137 Biosprint 96 workstation (Qiagen). A plasmid containing the complete envelope gene (GenBank
138 NC_045512.2; IDT, Inc.) was used to quantify the amount of SARS-CoV-2 genome copies of each
139 sample. Virus isolation was performed in 16 replicates by inoculating 50 µL of each replicate per well
140 (containing 15,000 Vero E6 cells, seeded in 96-well plates), and incubating for 1 h at 37°C in a 5% CO₂
141 atmosphere. Then, 100 µL of supplemented DMEM were added to each well and the plates were
142 maintained at 37°C and 5% CO₂. Plates were daily monitored under the light microscope and wells were
143 evaluated for the presence of cytopathic effect for 6 days.

144

145 *Clinical performance*

146 The clinical performance of the Ag-RDT was assessed using RT-qPCR as a reference test with a cycle
147 threshold (Ct) < 40 as the criteria for a positive result. Samples consisted of nasopharyngeal swabs
148 collected in routine practice for diagnostic confirmation of symptomatic individuals with suspected
149 COVID-19 or contacts exposed to a positive case, and nasal mid-turbinate swabs collected in preventive

150 screenings of unexposed asymptomatic individuals in the general population. Swab specimens were
151 placed into sterile tubes containing viral transport media (DeltaSwab Virus, Deltalab, Ref 304301). RT-
152 qPCR tests were performed on fresh samples stored at 2 – 8 °C for up to 72 hours; samples were then
153 stored at –80 °C until their use for Ag-RDT.

154 Samples were classified according to the disease status of the participant (i.e., suspected symptomatic
155 case, exposed asymptomatic contact, and unexposed asymptomatic individual) based on the national
156 guideline definitions. Individuals' data were collected anonymously and handled according to the General
157 Data Protection Regulation 2016/679 on data protection and privacy for all individuals within the
158 European Union and the local regulatory framework regarding data protection.

159 RNA for RT-qPCR tests were extracted from fresh samples using the viral RNA/Pathogen Nucleic Acid
160 Isolation kit, optimized for a KingFisher instrument according to the manufacturer's instructions. PCR
161 amplification was conducted according to the recommendations of the 2019-nCoV RT-qPCR Diagnostic
162 Panel of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC).¹⁴ Briefly, a 20 µL PCR reaction mix was
163 prepared that contained 5 µL of RNA, 1.5 µL of N3 primers and probe (2019-nCov CDC EUA Kit,
164 catalog no. 10006770, Integrated DNA Technologies), and 5 µL of TaqPath 1-StepRT-qPCR Master Mix
165 (Thermo Fischer). Thermal cycling was performed on either Applied Biosystems 7500 or QuantStudio5
166 Real-Time PCR instruments (Thermo Fischer) at the following conditions: 15 min at 50 °C for reverse
167 transcription, followed by 2 min at 95°C, and then 45 cycles of 3 sec at 95°C and 30 sec at 55°C.

168 Rapid antigen tests were performed according to the manufacturer's IFU (Abbott, Illinois, USA) except
169 for the use of a viral transport media (DeltaSwab Virus) and swab storage as a frozen specimen. Internal
170 validation showed no significant change in the test performance using Abbot test Kit buffer or a mix of
171 the Kit buffer and transport media at 1:3 dilution; likewise, the use of frozen specimens showed no
172 significant differences compared with fresh ones. All Ag-RDT determinations were performed by two
173 blinded technicians, who used 100 µL of 1:3 mix of the Kit buffer and the sample previously thawed and
174 homogenized. Samples were applied directly to the test cassette and incubated for 15 minutes at room
175 temperature before reading results at naked eye, according to the manufacturer instructions (i.e., the
176 presence of any test line (T), no matter how faint, indicates a positive result).

177

178 *Statistical Analysis*

179 We determined the sample size needed to estimate sensitivity with 80% power and precision 2-25% was
180 944 if the actual sensitivity of the index test was 93.5% (reported by the manufacturer) and specificity

181 with 80% power and 2.25% precision was 450 if the actual specificity was 99.6% (reported by the
182 manufacturer).

183 Sensitivity and specificity were estimated as defined by Altman et al.¹⁵, and reported as a percentage and
184 the exact binomial 95% confidence interval (CI). The negative-predictive value (NPV) and positive-
185 predictive value (PPV) were estimated by considering the prevalence as pre-test probability;¹⁶ the two
186 values were modelled for pre-test probabilities ranging between 0.05 and 0.9 and plotted with the exact
187 binomial 95% CI.¹⁷ The significance threshold was set at a two-sided alpha value of 0.05. All analyses
188 and plots were performed using R version 3.6¹⁸.

189 *Role of the funding source*

190 The test Kits were purchased to Abbott Rapid Diagnostics Healthcare SL (Spain). The funders of the
191 study had no role in the study conception, design, conduct, data analysis, or writing of the report. All
192 authors had full access to all the data in the study and had final responsibility for the decision to submit
193 for publication.

194 **Results**

195 The initial viral stock of SARS-CoV-2 used for analytical performance was titrated on Vero E6 cells,
196 obtaining a $10^{6.4}$ TCID₅₀/mL. This value corresponded to an average viral load of 6.8×10^8 genome
197 copies/reaction measured by RT-qPCR. The Ag-RDT yielded positive results in viral stock dilutions of
198 1:10³ and higher, corresponding to a limit of detection (LoD) of 6.5×10^5 genome copies/reaction as
199 assessed by RT-qPCR (Table 1).

200 The clinical performance was analysed on 1,406 frozen swabs with a RT-qPCR result available: 951
201 (67.6%) positive and 455 (32.4%) negative. The mean age of the sampled individuals was 40.4 years, and
202 936 (66.6%) were female (Table 2). The Ct value was <20 in 258 (18.3%) samples, 20-to-24 in 305
203 (21.7%), 25-to-29 in 285 (20.3%), and >30 in 103 (7.3%). Nasopharyngeal swabs had been collected in
204 the setting of diagnosis confirmation in symptomatic cases (446/1406, 31.7%) and contact tracing
205 (473/1406, 33.6%), and mid-turbinate nasal swabs were collected in mass screening campaigns
206 (487/1406, 34.6%).

207 Overall, the Ag-RDT identified the presence of SARS-CoV-2 in 872 of 951 PCR-positive samples
208 (sensitivity 91.7%; 95% CI 89.8 – 93.4 and ruled out its presence in 450 of 455 PCR-negative samples
209 (specificity 98.9%; 95% CI 97.5 – 99.6) (Table 3). Samples with lower Ct values (i.e., a cut-off Ct <25 is
210 associated with an increased risk of infectiousness¹⁹⁻²¹) showed higher sensitivity than the overall sample
211 (Ct <25, 98.2%; Ct<30, 94.9%). Sensitivity was significantly higher among samples collected in the

212 setting of case identification (92.6%) and contact tracing (94.2%) than asymptomatic screening
213 (79.5%)(Table 3).

214 However, we did not observe significant differences regarding the sensitivity estimates according to Ct
215 value category between disease status groups (Figure 1A). In the setting of asymptomatic screening,
216 sensitivity of samples with Ct <25 and <30 were 100% and 98.6%, respectively. All samples (except one)
217 that tested negative for Ag-RDT in this setting had Ct values greater than 30 (Figure 1B).

218 Figure 2 shows the results of the modelling of the PPV and NPV based on the diagnostic performance
219 parameters found in the overall sample. At a pre-test probability of 5%, generally assumed for
220 asymptomatic screening in high-risk settings,²² the NPV was 99.6% (99.5 – 99.7) (Table 4) and increased
221 as the pre-test probability dropped. Correspondingly, the PPV at 5% pre-test probability was 81.5% (65.0
222 – 93.2), and decreased as pre-test probability decreased. At this pre-test probability, the estimated number
223 of false-negative and false-positive values per thousand tests were 4 (3 – 5) and 12 (4 – 27), respectively
224 (Figure S1, TableS2).

225

226 Discussion

227 We showed that the point-of-care diagnostic Panbio COVID-19 Ag Test had 91.7% sensitivity and 98.9%
228 specificity compared to standard laboratory-based RT-qPCR. Sensitivity was 99.0% for samples with Ct
229 <25 corresponding to people at the peak of their infection, when the viral load is highest and most
230 contagious. In nasal swab specimens from asymptomatic individuals tested in the setting of preventive
231 screenings of the general population, sensitivity was 74.5%, although it increased to 98.9% among
232 samples with a Ct value of <25 in this setting.

233 The high sensitivity of this Ag-RDT observed at higher viral loads is extremely relevant for the use of this
234 test as a tool for epidemiological control of the SARS-CoV-2 spread because of the accumulating
235 evidence on the high infectiousness of respiratory specimens with viral loads above 10^6 genome copies
236 /mL (which usually correspond to a Ct of approximately <25).^{1,2,23} Various studies have identified the Ct
237 value of 25 as a threshold below which only a small proportion of viruses can be cultured (25% for
238 Ct>30, 8% for Ct>35).¹⁹ Also, when looking at contact tracing, the secondary attack rate increases
239 significantly for values of Ct<25,²⁰ indicating notably higher infectiousness among individuals with viral
240 loads below this threshold.

241 Although the Panbio COVID-19 Ag device might overlook SARS-CoV-2 infection in individuals with
242 very low viral load (i.e., below the LoD of 6.8×10^5 SARS-CoV-2 genomic copies per reaction), it may

243 be suitable for identifying people with high potential for infectivity. The level of viral RNA copies rises
244 from undetectable to millions of RNA copy numbers/mL (equivalent to Ct > 40 to Ct < 25) in the order of
245 a day and then decreases to below an infectious level by day 10 in most patients with mild infection. For
246 some individuals, low levels of viral RNA can remain detectable by RT-qPCR for months.^{24,25} Many
247 people whose infection are detected during community screening using high-analytic-sensitivity RT-
248 qPCR are no longer infectious at the time of detection. The Ag-RDT reliably identifies people with high
249 viral loads and therefore it could be useful for screening strategies to identify and isolate asymptomatic
250 COVID-19 people while they are still infectious. Such a test could be used in focal screening to create
251 safe environments in social activities with high-risk of transmission (e.g., visiting relatives at nursing
252 homes, playing sports, going to a crowded place like movie theatres, music concerts, airports). It could
253 also be used for mass screening in communities with high transmission or even for at-home frequent use.

254 Our study is strengthened by the large sample size and the blinding of the technicians who processed and
255 read the results of the Ag-RDT. On the other hand, it has the limitation of not using the test under the
256 conditions specified by the manufacturer. Our results indicate that the test can be used on frozen samples
257 stored in transport media, thus allowing parallel sampling for Ag-RDT and PCR. However, caution
258 should be taken when using coloured media that may affect the background of the test thin layer. In our
259 experience, a 1:3 dilution with the Kit buffer prevented unspecific signal of yellow-coloured transport
260 media and provided adequate results; nevertheless, we encourage validating this type of approaches
261 before using the test. Likewise, our study was performed on stored samples rather than in a real-life
262 setting. Owing to this last limitation, common in other assessments of the clinical performance of RDT in
263 general,²⁶ we simulated the PPV and NPV assuming a prevalence of disease based on surveillance
264 estimates. According to our simulation, in a low prevalence setting (i.e., 5% prevalence or below), the
265 NPV would be very high (99.6%), and screening will result in 4 (95% CI 3 – 5) false-negative results per
266 thousand tests; the corresponding PPV would be relatively low (81.5%), stressing the need for
267 confirmatory testing with nucleic acid amplification techniques. Irrespective of the predictive values, one
268 must not lose sight of the relationship between the viral load and test sensitivity, a double-edged sword
269 that better suits this test for ensuring lack of infectivity of a subject along a limited time period following
270 test conduct.

271 A widely available, quick, unexpensive and accurate test could be game-changing and dramatically
272 reduce community transmission of the virus. Newly infected people could isolate at home, severing
273 transmission chains, and stopping the spread of the virus. We provide evidence on the high performance
274 of the Panbio COVID-19 Ag-RDT to screen people with symptomatic and asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2
275 infection at high risk of virus transmission.

276

277

278 **Contributors**

279 OM, AA, BB, CGB, IB, JV designed the study. AA, BB, MU, MCM, JR, LR performed the laboratory
280 procedures, and organized the data. DO did statistical analysis. OM wrote the first draft with revisions
281 and input from JR, JS, CE, GF, QB, BC, JA, MVM, CGB. All authors approved the final version.

282 **Conflicts of interest**

283 We declare no conflicts of interest

284 **Acknowledgements**

285 The authors would like to thank Gerard Carot-Sans (PhD) for providing professional medical writing
286 support during the preparation of the manuscript. We thank Andrea Tiburcio Lara and Elisabeth
287 Bascuñana Prieto for technical support

288 Bárbara Baró is a Beatriu de Pinós postdoctoral fellow granted by the Government of Catalonia's
289 Secretariat for Universities and Research, and by Marie Skłodowska-Curie Actions COFUND Programme
290 (BP3, 801370)

291

292 References

293

- 294 1 Wölfel R, Corman VM, Guggemos W, *et al.* Virological assessment of hospitalized patients with
295 COVID-2019. *Nature* 2020; **581**: 465–9.
- 296 2 La Scola B, Le Bideau M, Andreani J, *et al.* Viral RNA load as determined by cell culture as a
297 management tool for discharge of SARS-CoV-2 patients from infectious disease wards. *Eur J Clin*
298 *Microbiol Infect Dis* 2020; **39**: 1059–61.
- 299 3 Larremore DB, Wilder B, Lester E, *et al.* Test sensitivity is secondary to frequency and turnaround
300 time for COVID-19 surveillance. *medRxiv* 2020; : 2020.06.22.20136309.
- 301 4 Lambert-Niclot S, Cuffel A, Le Pape S, *et al.* Evaluation of a rapid diagnostic assay for detection
302 of sars-cov-2 antigen in nasopharyngeal swabs. *J Clin Microbiol* 2020; **58**: 0–3.
- 303 5 Porte L, Legarraga P, Vollrath V, *et al.* Evaluation of novel antigen-based rapid detection test for
304 the diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2 in respiratory samples. *Int J Infect Dis* 2020.
305 DOI:10.1016/j.ijid.2020.05.098.
- 306 6 World Health Organization (WHO). Antigen-detection in the diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2 infection
307 using rapid immunoassays. 2020. [https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/antigen-detection-in-](https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/antigen-detection-in-the-diagnosis-of-sars-cov-2infection-using-rapid-immunoassays)
308 [the-diagnosis-of-sars-cov-2infection-using-rapid-immunoassays](https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/antigen-detection-in-the-diagnosis-of-sars-cov-2infection-using-rapid-immunoassays) (accessed Sept 29, 2020).
- 309 7 Mina MJ, Parker R, Larremore DB. Rethinking COVID-19 test sensitivity—A strategy for
310 containment. *N Engl J Med* 2020.
- 311 8 Mak GC, Cheng PK, Lau SS, *et al.* Evaluation of rapid antigen test for detection of SARS-CoV-2
312 virus. *J Clin Virol* 2020; **129**. DOI:10.1016/j.jcv.2020.104500.
- 313 9 Mertens P, De Vos N, Martiny D, *et al.* Development and Potential Usefulness of the COVID-19
314 Ag Respi-Strip Diagnostic Assay in a Pandemic Context. *Front Med* 2020; **7**.
315 DOI:10.3389/fmed.2020.00225.
- 316 10 Young S, Taylor SN, Cammarata CL, *et al.* Clinical evaluation of BD Veritor SARS-CoV-2 point-
317 of-care test performance compared to PCR-based testing and versus the Sofia 2 SARS Antigen
318 point-of-care test. *J Clin Microbiol* 2020.
- 319 11 Nagura-Ikeda M, Imai K, Tabata S, *et al.* Clinical evaluation of self-collected saliva by
320 quantitative reverse transcription-PCR (RT-qPCR), Direct RT-qPCR, reverse transcription-loop-
321 mediated isothermal amplification, and a rapid antigen test to diagnose COVID-19. *J Clin*
322 *Microbiol* 2020; **58**. DOI:10.1128/JCM.01438-20.
- 323 12 Blairon L, Wilmet A, Beukinga I, Tré-Hardy M. Implementation of rapid SARS-CoV-2 antigenic
324 testing in a laboratory without access to molecular methods: Experiences of a general hospital. *J*
325 *Clin Virol* 2020; **129**: 104472.
- 326 13 Foundation for Innovative New Diagnostics. FIND EVALUATION OF SARS-COV-2 ANTIGEN
327 (AG) DETECTING TESTS. <https://www.finddx.org/COVID-19/sarscov2-eval-antigen/> (accessed
328 Aug 20, 2020).
- 329 14 Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). CDC 2019–Novel Coronavirus (2019-nCoV)
330 Real-Time RT-QPCR Diagnostic Panel. Cat. # 2019-nCoV EUA-01. 2020.
331 <https://www.fda.gov/media/134922/download> (accessed May 21, 2020).

- 332 15 Altman DG, Bland JM. Statistics Notes: Diagnostic tests 1: Sensitivity and specificity. *BMJ* 1994;
333 **308**: 1552.
- 334 16 Altman DG, Bland j. M. Statistics Notes: Diagnostic tests 2: Predictive values. *BMJ* 1994; **309**:
335 102.
- 336 17 Collett D. *Modelling Binary Data*, Second. 2002.
- 337 18 R Core Team. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Found. Stat. Comput.
338 Vienna, Austria. 2017. <https://www.r-project.org> (accessed May 25, 2020).
- 339 19 Singanayagam A, Patel M, Charlett A, *et al.* Duration of infectiousness and correlation with RT-
340 QPCR cycle threshold values in cases of COVID-19, England, January to May 2020.
341 *Eurosurveillance* 2020; **25**: 2001483.
- 342 20 Marc M, Millat P, Ouchi D, National Institute on Deafness and Other Communication Disorders.
343 Transmission of COVID-19 in 282 clusters in Catalonia, Spain: a cohort study. *medRxiv* 2020.
344 2020.10.27.20220277; doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.27.20220277>
- 345 21 He D, Zhao S, Lin Q, *et al.* The relative transmissibility of asymptomatic COVID-19 infections
346 among close contacts. *Int. J. Infect. Dis.* 2020; **94**: 145–7.
- 347 22 Oran DP, Topol EJ. Prevalence of Asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 Infection: A Narrative Review.
348 *Ann Intern Med* 2020.
- 349 23 Quicke K, Gallichote E, Sexton N, *et al.* Longitudinal Surveillance for SARS-CoV-2 RNA Among
350 Asymptomatic Staff in Five Colorado Skilled Nursing Facilities: Epidemiologic, Virologic and
351 Sequence Analysis. *medRxiv Prepr Serv Heal Sci* 2020; : 2020.06.08.20125989.
- 352 24 Richard M, Kok A, de Meulder D, *et al.* SARS-CoV-2 is transmitted via contact and via the air
353 between ferrets. *Nat Commun* 2020; **11**: 1–6.
- 354 25 Smith AM, Perelson AS. Influenza A virus infection kinetics: Quantitative data and models. *Wiley*
355 *Interdiscip Rev Syst Biol Med* 2011; **3**: 429–45.
- 356 26 Deeks JJ, Dinnes J, Takwoingi Y, *et al.* Antibody tests for identification of current and past
357 infection with SARS-CoV-2. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2020.
- 358
- 359
- 360

361 **Tables**

362

363 **Table 1.** Results of the analytical performance assessment

Sample dilution	Sample Id	Abbott test		RT-qPCR (no. genomic copies)	Isolation) (no. of wells with cytopathic effect / no. of total wells tested
		Result*	Time		
Non diluted (10 ^{6.4} TCID ₅₀ /mL)	0-1	++	<40sec	7.32E+08	16/16
	0-2	++	<40sec	6.25E+08	16/16
	0-3	++	<40sec	6.94E+08	16/16
1:10	1-1	++	<40sec	7.11E+07	16/16
	1-2	++	<40sec	7.35E+07	16/16
	1-3	++	<40sec	3.98E+07	16/16
1:10 ²	2-1	++	1.5 min	8.45E+06	16/16
	2-2	++	1.5 min	4.36E+06	16/16
	2-3	++	1.5 min	6.20E+06	16/16
1:10 ³	3-1	+	15min	6.19E+05	16/16
	3-2	+	15min	7.12E+05	16/16
	3-3	+	15min	6.16E+05	16/16
1:10 ⁴	4-1	-	>15 min	7.39E+04	15/16
	4-2	-	>15 min	6.94E+04	16/16
	4-3	-	>15 min	4.93E+04	15/16
1:10 ⁵	5-1	-	>15 min	5.10E+03	10/16
	5-2	-	>15 min	4.35E+03	6/16
	5-3	-	>15 min	6.32E+03	5/16
1:10 ⁶	6-1	-	>15 min	6.13E+02	3/16
	6-2	-	>15 min	7.68E+02	2/16
	6-3	-	>15 min	5.83E+02	1/8
1:10 ⁷	7-1	-	>15 min	< 10 ²	0/16
	7-2	-	>15 min	< 10 ²	0/16
	7-3	-	>15 min	< 10 ²	0/16
1:10 ⁸	8-1	-	>15 min	< 10 ²	0/16
	8-2	-	>15 min	< 10 ²	0/16
	8-3	-	>15 min	< 10 ²	0/16

364

365 *Abbot results are interpreted by naked eye as (++) high colour intensity observed in the chromatography

366 band, (+) faint colour intensity.

367

368 **Table 2.** Baseline characteristics of sampled individuals.

	All samples	PCR+	PCR-
N	1406	951	455
Age (years), <i>mean (SD)</i>	40.40 (24.50)	43.05 (24.88)	34.90 (22.75)
Gender , <i>n (%)</i> (n=1,389)			
<i>Male</i>	453 (32.2)	261 (27.9)	192 (42.4)
<i>Female</i>	936 (66.6)	675 (72.1)	261 (57.6)
Ct value , <i>median (IQR)</i> (n=951)	23.63 [19.72, 27.31]	23.63 [19.72, 27.31]	..
Ct stratification , <i>n (%)</i> (n=951)			
<20	258 (18.3)	258 (27.1)	..
20-24	305 (21.7)	305 (32.1)	..
25-29	285 (20.3)	285 (30.0)	..
>30	103 (7.3)	103 (10.8)	..
Disease status , <i>n (%)</i>			
<i>Case</i>	446 (31.7)	419 (44.1)	27 (5.9)
<i>Contact</i>	473 (33.6)	415 (43.6)	58 (12.7)
<i>Asymptomatic Screening</i>	487 (34.6)	117 (12.3)	370 (81.3)
Hospitalization , <i>n (%)</i>	15 (1.1)	15 (1.6)	0 (0.0)

369

370

371

372 **Table 3.** Clinical performance of the Ag-RDT Panbio COVID-19 Ag Test in the overall study sample and
 373 according to RT-qPCR Ct value and disease status.

	SENSITIVITY				SPECIFICITY			
	Ag-RDT				Ag-RDT			
	Detected	Not detected	PCR-positive	Sensitivity (95% CI)	Detected	Not detected	PCR-negative	Specificity (95% CI)
Overall	872	79	951	91.69% (89.75-93.37)	5	450	455	98.90% (97.45-99.64)
Ct stratification								
<20	254	4	258	98.45% (96.08-99.58)
20-24	303	2	305	99.34% (97.65-99.92)
25-29	256	29	285	89.82% (85.71-93.08)
>30	59	44	103	57.28% (47.15-66.98)
Disease status								
<i>Case</i>	388	31	419	92.6% (89.66-94.92)	0	27	27	100% (87.23-100)
<20	140	4	144	97.22% (93.04-99.24)
20-24	129	1	130	99.23% (95.79-99.98)
25-29	104	15	119	87.39% (80.06-92.77)
>30	15	11	26	57.69% (36.92-76.65)
<i>Contact</i>	391	24	415	94.22% (91.52-96.26)	0	58	58	100% (93.84-100)
<20	95	0	95	100% (96.19-100)
20-24	146	1	147	99.32% (96.27-99.98)
25-29	128	13	141	90.78% (84.75-95.00)
>30	22	10	32	68.75% (49.99-83.88)
<i>Asymptomatic screening</i>	93	24	117	79.49% (71.03-86.39)	5	365	370	98.65% (96.87-99.56)
<20	19	0	19	100% (82.35-100)
20-24	28	0	28	100% (87.66-100)
25-29	24	1	25	96.00% (79.65-99.90)
>30	22	23	45	48.89% (33.7-64.23)

374

375 **Ag-RDT:** Ag-detecting rapid diagnostic test. **CI:** confidence interval. **Ct:** cycle threshold for RT-qPCR

376

377

378 **Figure legends**

379

380 **Figure 1.** SARS-CoV-2 detection using the Ag-RDT Panbio COVID-19 Ag-Test on PCR-positive
381 samples according to rt-qPCR Ct value.

382 (A) Sensitivity (95CI) of the Ag-RDT according to the disease status and RT-qPCR Ct value. (B) Dot plot
383 (individual participants) by RT-qPCR Ct value and Ag-RDT result.

384

385

386 **Figure 2.** Modelling of positive predictive value (PPV) and negative predictive value (NPV) assuming
387 different pre-test probabilities. Dots represent the PPV and NPV at sequential increment of 0.01; lines are
388 the 95% confidence interval.

389

390





