

1 **BRIEF REPORT**

2 **Field evaluation of a rapid antigen test (Panbio™ COVID-19 Ag Rapid Test**  
3 **Device) for the diagnosis of COVID-19 in primary healthcare centers**

4 Eliseo Albert,<sup>1</sup> Ignacio Torres,<sup>1</sup> Felipe Bueno,<sup>1</sup> Dixie Huntley,<sup>1</sup> Estefanía Molla,<sup>2</sup>  
5 Miguel Ángel Fernández-Fuentes,<sup>2</sup> Mireia Martínez,<sup>1</sup> Sandrine Poujois,<sup>1</sup> Lorena  
6 Forqué,<sup>1</sup> Arantxa Valdivia,<sup>1</sup> Carlos Solano de la Asunción,<sup>1</sup> Josep Ferrer,<sup>1</sup> Javier  
7 Colomina<sup>2</sup> and David Navarro<sup>1,3\*</sup>

8 <sup>1</sup>*Microbiology Service, Hospital Clínico Universitario, INCLIVA Research Institute,*  
9 *Valencia, Spain.*

10 <sup>2</sup>*Instituto Valenciano de Microbiología, Bétera, Valencia, Spain.*

11 <sup>3</sup>*Department of Microbiology, School of Medicine, University of Valencia, Valencia,*  
12 *Spain.*

13 **Keywords:** SARS-CoV-2, COVID-19, rapid antigen test (RAD), primary healthcare  
14 center.

15 **Running title:** Rapid antigen detection assay for diagnosis of COVID-19.

16

17 **\*Correspondence:** David Navarro, Microbiology Service, Hospital Clínico  
18 Universitario, Instituto de Investigación INCLIVA, Valencia, and Department of  
19 Microbiology, University of Valencia, Valencia, Spain. Av. Blasco Ibáñez 17, 46010  
20 Valencia, Spain. Phone: 34(96)1973500; Fax: 34(96)3864173; E-mail:  
21 david.navarro@uv.es.

22

23

## 24 **Abstract**

25 We evaluated the Panbio™ COVID-19 AG Rapid Test Device (RAD) for the diagnosis  
26 of COVID-19 in symptomatic patients attended in primary healthcare centers (n=412).  
27 Overall specificity and sensitivity of RAD was 100% and 79.6%, respectively, taking  
28 RT-PCR as the reference. SARS-CoV-2 could not be cultured from specimens yielding  
29 RT-PCR+/RAD- results.

## 30 **Introduction**

31 Rapid detection, effective isolation of symptomatic cases and systematic tracing of close  
32 contacts are paramount to blunt community spread of SARS-CoV-2 infection.  
33 Nowadays, reverse transcriptase polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR) is the  
34 diagnostic “gold standard” for COVID-19 [1]; nevertheless, specialized instrument and  
35 expertise are required to conduct RT-PCR assays. In addition, supply shortages of RT-  
36 PCR reagents have been encountered by many countries. Rapid antigen detection  
37 (RAD) immunoassays are particularly suited for point of care testing (POC), as they can  
38 be easily performed and interpreted without equipment, are low cost, and improve the  
39 turn-around time for results. Moreover, results obtained by a recently launched antigen  
40 assay appeared to correlate better with patient infectiousness than those returned by RT-  
41 PCR [2]. In this field study, we evaluated the Panbio™ COVID-19 AG Rapid Test  
42 Device (Abbott Diagnostic GmbH, Jena, Germany), a lateral flow  
43 immunochromatographic assay targeting SARS-CoV-2 nucleoprotein in  
44 nasopharyngeal (NP) specimens for diagnosis of COVID-19 in symptomatic patients  
45 attended in primary healthcare centers.

## 46 **Material and methods**

### 47 **Patients**

48 This prospective study included 412 patients (median age, 31 years; range, 1-91; 58%  
49 females), of whom 327 were adults (median, 36 years; range, 17-91) and 85 pediatrics  
50 ( $\leq 16$  years old; median, 11 years; range, 1-16), with clinical suspicion of COVID-19  
51 attended in primary care centers (n=8) of the Health Department Clínico-Malvarrosa in  
52 Valencia. Only patients with compatible signs or symptoms appearing within the prior  
53 week (0-7 days) were recruited. The study was conducted between September 2<sup>nd</sup> and  
54 October 7<sup>th</sup> 2020. The study was approved by the Hospital Clínico Universitario (HCU)  
55 INCLIVA Ethics Committee.

#### 56 **SARS-CoV-2 testing**

57 Trained nurses at each participating center collected two NP per patient using flocked  
58 swabs following appropriate safety precautions, one of which (provided by the  
59 manufacturer) was used for RAD and the other was placed in 3 mL of universal  
60 transport medium-UTM-(Becton Dickinson, Sparks, MD) and delivered to the  
61 Microbiology Service of HCU for RT-PCR testing. RAD was performed immediately  
62 after sampling following the instructions of the manufacturer (reading at 15 min.). RT-  
63 PCRs were carried out within 24 h. of specimen collection with the TaqPath COVID-19  
64 Combo Kit (Thermo Fisher Scientific, Massachusetts, USA), which targets SARS-CoV-  
65 2 ORF1ab, N and S genes. RNA was extracted using the Applied Biosystems™  
66 MagMAX™ Viral/Pathogen II Nucleic Acid Isolation Kits coupled with Thermo  
67 Scientific™ KingFisher Flex automated instrument (Thermo Fisher Scientific). The  
68 AMPLIRUN® TOTAL SARS-COV-2 Control (Viracell S.A., Granada, Spain-) was  
69 used as the reference material for SARS-CoV-2 RNA load quantitation (in copies/ml,  
70 considering RT-PCR  $C_{Ts}$  for the N gene: the linear regression equation was:  $Y = -$   
71  $0.31 * X + 13.77$ ;  $R^2 = 9.89$ ).

#### 72 **SARS-CoV-2 cell culture**

73 Samples collected in UTM were stored at  $-80^{\circ}\text{C}$  for up to 2 weeks before being  
74 processed for culture. Vero E6 cells, maintained in Modified Eagles Medium (MEM)  
75 supplemented with 5% Fetal Bovine Serum (FBS), 1% penicillin/ streptomycin, 0.5  
76  $\mu\text{g}/\text{mL}$  Amphotericin B and 1% L-glutamine, were seeded into 96 well plates (Thermo  
77 Fisher Scientific) at  $10^5$  cells/ml and inoculated in triplicate with patient samples (100  
78  $\mu\text{l}$  of a 1:1 dilution in MEM 2% FBS supplemented with antibiotics). Cultures were  
79 incubated at  $37^{\circ}\text{C}$  with 5%  $\text{CO}_2$  for 4 days. Blind subcultures were performed at 48 h  
80 and incubated for another 4 days. Cytopathic effect (CPE) was evaluated daily and  
81 recorded. The presence of SARS-CoV-2 was confirmed by RT-PCR (performed at time  
82 0, and days 2 and 4).

### 83 **Statistical analyses**

84 RAD was evaluated for its sensitivity and specificity with the associated 95%  
85 confidence intervals (CI) using RT-PCR as the reference. Negative predictive value  
86 (NPV) and positive predictive value (PPV) were calculated for prevalences of SARS-  
87 CoV-2 infection of 5% and 10%, according to that in our Health Department within the  
88 study period. Agreement between RAD and RT-PCR was assessed using Cohen's  
89 Kappa ( $\kappa$ ) statistics. Differences between medians were compared using the Mann-  
90 Whitney U-test. Receiver operating characteristic curves were built to determine SARS-  
91 CoV-2 RT-PCR cycle threshold ( $C_T$ ) and RNA loads best discriminating between RT-  
92 PCR+/RAD+ or RAD- specimens. Two-sided  $P$ -values  $<0.05$  were considered  
93 significant. Statistical analyses were performed using SPSS version 25.0 (SPSS,  
94 Chicago, IL, USA).

### 95 **Results**

96 Out of 412 patients, 43 tested positive by RT-PCR and RAD (10.4%) and 358 (86.9%)  
97 negative by both methods. Discordant results (RT-PCR+/RAD-) were noticed in 11  
98 patients (2.7%). Characteristics of these patients are shown in Supplementary Table 1.  
99 There were no RT-PCR-/RAD+ specimens. Concordance between both methods was  
100 good ( $\kappa$ , 0.87; 95% CI, 0.79-0.94). Accordingly, overall specificity and sensitivity of  
101 RAD was 100% (95% CI, 98.7-100%), and 79.6% (95% CI, 67.-88.8%), respectively.  
102 Sensitivity slightly increased (80.4%; 95% CI, 66.8-89.3%) in patients with clinical  
103 courses shorter than 5 days (Figure 1A).

104 The sensitivity was higher in adults (82.6%; 95% CI, 69.3-90.9%) than in pediatric  
105 patients (62.5%; 95% CI, 30.6-86.3%). The data are shown in Supplementary Table 2.

106 Overall RAD negative predictive value for an estimated prevalence of 5% and 10% was  
107 99% (95% CI, 97.4-99.6%) and 97.9 (95% CI, 95.9-98.9), respectively.

108 RT-PCR  $C_T$  values and SARS-COV-2 RNA loads were significantly higher or lower ( $P$   
109  $<0.001$ ), respectively, in RT-PCR+/RAD- than in RT-PCR+/RAD+ specimens (Figure  
110 1B and 1C).

111 ROC curve analyses indicated that RT-PCR  $C_T <25$  and SARS-CoV-2 RNA loads  $> 5.9$   
112  $\log_{10}$  copies/ml thresholds best discriminated between RT-PCR+/RAD+ and RT-  
113 PCR+/RAD-/ specimens, with a sensitivity and specificity of 100%

114 The time to sampling since the onset of symptoms did not differ ( $P=0.86$ ) between RT-  
115 PCR+/RAD+ (median, 3 days; range 1-7 days) and RT-PCR+/RAD- (median 2 days;  
116 range, 1-6 days) patients.

117 Patients with fever, either with or without other accompanying symptoms, tested more  
118 frequently RT-PCR+/ RAD+ ( $P=0.02$ ) than afebrile patients (Supplementary Table 3).

119 All 11 specimens yielding discordant RT-PCR/RAD results tested negative by culture,  
120 whereas SARS-CoV-2 could be recovered from 3 out of 3 specimens returning RT-  
121 PCR+/RAD+ results ( $C_T$ : 4, 14 and 16).

## 122 **Discussion**

123 Previous studies evaluating SARS-CoV-2 RAD tests either used retrieved specimens,  
124 which had been cryopreserved for a wide range of times, were conducted at central  
125 laboratories or both [3-7]. To our knowledge this is the first report on the performance  
126 of a RAD assay conducted at POC. As such, it may provide a realistic view of how  
127 implementation of RAD tests in clinical practice can contribute to the management and  
128 control of the COVID-19 pandemics. When compared to RT-PCR, the Panbio™  
129 COVID-19 AG Rapid Test Device assay yielded an excellent specificity and a fairly  
130 good overall sensitivity (79.6%); the latter slightly improved when the time to testing  
131 was less than 5 days since the onset of symptoms (80.6%). This figure is less impressive  
132 than that claimed by the manufacturer (93%); however it is close (86.5%) to that  
133 reported by Linares and colleagues [3] in a mixed cohort including patients attended at  
134 the Emergency Department or primary healthcare centers and centralized testing at the  
135 hospital laboratory. Sensitivity of SARS-CoV-2 RAD assays has been reported to vary  
136 between 45%-97% [3-7]; yet, direct comparison between studies is hampered by  
137 relevant dissimilarities regarding clinical characteristics and age of patients, site of  
138 testing, type of specimen processed, and time to testing, among others.

139 Interestingly, the sensitivity was higher in adults (82.6%) than in pediatric patients  
140 (62.5%). Previous studies found no age-related differences in SARS-CoV-2 RNA load  
141 in the upper respiratory tract [8]. Although speculative, dating the accurate onset of  
142 symptoms could have been less reliable in children than in adults.

143 In a setting with an incidence of COVID-19 ranging between 5% and 10% such as ours  
144 at the time of the study, the RAD NPV was very good (99% and 97.9%, respectively).

145 There were 11 out of 54 RT-PCR positive specimens that tested negative by RAD. In  
146 line with previous reports [2-4], SARS-CoV-2 RNA load in RT-PCR+/ RAD+  
147 specimens was significantly higher than that in RT-PCR+/ RAD- samples. In our  
148 setting, specimens with RT-PCR  $C_T > 25$  (equivalent to SARS-CoV-2 RNA loads  $< 5.9$   
149  $\log_{10}$  copies/ml) returned discordant RAD/RT-PCR results.

150 We did not observe a major impact of the time to testing on the likelihood of having a  
151 positive RAD result. On the other hand, fever was the only clinical feature reported  
152 more frequently in patients testing RT-PCR+/RAD+ than in those RT-PCR+/RAD-.

153 A relevant observation of our study was that SARS-CoV-2 could not be cultured from  
154 RT-PCR+/RAD- specimens. In line with that, Pekosz and colleagues [2], by using a  
155 highly sensitive cell culture system (VeroE6 TMPRSS2), found 1 out of 27 RAD-  
156 /culture + specimens. SARS-CoV-2 RNA load threshold associated with culture  
157 positivity herein ( $> 5.9 \log_{10}$  copies/ml) was remarkably close to others previously  
158 published-around  $10^6$  copies/ml-[2,9-11].

159 The main limitation of the current study is the relatively low number of cases in the  
160 series (13%); this, however, can be viewed as a strength, as this figure likely represents  
161 that found in many community settings worldwide where RAD testing is being  
162 increasingly used.

163 In summary, we found the Panbio™ COVID-19 AG Rapid Test Device to perform well  
164 as a POC for early diagnosis of COVID-19 in primary healthcare centers. More  
165 importantly, our data suggested that patients with RT-PCR-proven COVID-19 testing  
166 negative by RAD are unlikely to be infectious. Further studies are warranted to confirm

167 this assumption. The inconsequentiality of false negative RAD results, from a public  
168 health perspective [12], would support the implementation of a laboratory diagnostic  
169 approach which excluded confirmatory RT-PCR testing for negative RAD tests in non-  
170 hospitalized patients, even when the pretest probability is high. This would certainly  
171 alleviate laboratory workloads while dealing with RT-PCR supply shortages.

## 172 **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

173 We are grateful to Abbott Diagnostics for providing Panbio™ COVID-19 AG Rapid  
174 Test Device kits. We thank all personnel working at Microbiology Service of Clinic  
175 University Hospital for their unwavering commitment in the fight against COVID-19.  
176 We also thank María José Beltrán, Pilar Botija and Ana Sanmartín for assistance in the  
177 organization of RAD testing in primary healthcare centers.

## 178 **FINANCIAL SUPPORT**

179 This work received no public or private funds.

## 180 **CONFLICTS OF INTEREST**

181 The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

## 182 **AUTHOR'S CONTRIBUTIONS**

183 EA, IT, FB, DH, MM, SP, LF, AV, CSdA, JP and JC: Methodology (RT-PCR and  
184 RAD) and validation of data; EM and MA F-F: Methodology (cell culture) and  
185 validation of data. EA, IT: formal analysis. DN: Conceptualization, supervision, writing  
186 the original draft. All authors reviewed the original draft.

187

188

189

190 **REFERENCES**

- 191 1. Overview of Testing for SARS-CoV-2 (COVID-19)  
192 <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/hcp/testing-overview.html>.  
193 Updated September 18.
- 194 2. Pekosz A, Cooper C, Parvu V, Li M, Andrews J, Manabe YC, Kodsí S, Leitch F,  
195 Gary D, Roger-Dalbert C. Antigen-based testing but not real-time PCR  
196 correlates with SARS-CoV-2 virus culture. medRxiv 2020.10.02.20205708; doi:  
197 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.02.20205708>.
- 198 3. Linares M, Pérez-Tanoira R, Romanyk J, et al. Panbio antigen rapid test is  
199 reliable to diagnose SARS-CoV-2 infection in the first 7 days after the onset of  
200 symptoms. medRxiv **2020.09.20.20198192**; doi:  
201 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.20.20198192>.
- 202 4. Young S, Taylor SN, Cammarata CL, et al. Clinical evaluation of BD Veritor  
203 SARS-CoV-2 point-of-care test performance compared to PCR-based testing  
204 and versus the Sofia 2 SARS Antigen point-of-care test. J Clin Microbiol. **2020**  
205 Oct 6;JCM.02338-20.
- 206 5. Scohy A, Anantharajah A, Bodéus M, Kabamba-Mukadi B, Verroken A,  
207 Rodriguez-Villalobos H. Low performance of rapid antigen detection test as  
208 frontline testing for COVID-19 diagnosis. J Clin Virol. **2020** Aug;129:104455.  
209 doi: 10.1016/j.jcv.2020.104455.

- 210 6. Lambert-Niclot S, Cuffel A, Le Pape S, et al. Evaluation of a Rapid Diagnostic  
211 Assay for Detection of SARS-CoV-2 Antigen in Nasopharyngeal Swabs. *J Clin*  
212 *Microbiol.* **2020** Jul 23;58(8):e00977-20.
- 213 7. Mak GC, Cheng PK, Lau SS, et al. Evaluation of rapid antigen test for detection  
214 of SARS-CoV-2 virus. *J Clin Virol.* **2020** Aug;129:104500. doi:  
215 10.1016/j.jcv.2020.104500.
- 216 8. Baggio S, L'Huillier AG, Yerly S, et al. SARS-CoV-2 viral load in the upper  
217 respiratory tract of children and adults with early acute COVID-19. *Clin Infect*  
218 *Dis.* **2020** Aug 6:ciaa1157.
- 219 9. Wölfel R, Corman VM, Guggemos W, et al. Virological assessment of  
220 hospitalized patients with COVID-2019. *Nature.* **2020**;581:465-469.
- 221 10. Huang CG, Lee KM, Hsiao MJ, et al. Culture-Based Virus Isolation To Evaluate  
222 Potential Infectivity of Clinical Specimens Tested for COVID-19. *J Clin*  
223 *Microbiol.* **2020**;58:e01068-20
- 224 11. Bullard J, Dust K, Funk D, et al. Predicting Infectious Severe Acute Respiratory  
225 Syndrome Coronavirus 2 From Diagnostic Samples. *Clin Infect Dis.* **2020**  
226 :ciaa638.
- 227 12. Mina MJ, Parker R, Larremore DB. Rethinking Covid-19 Test Sensitivity - A  
228 Strategy for Containment. *N Engl J Med.* **2020** Sep 30. doi:  
229 10.1056/NEJMp2025631

230

231 **Figure Legend**

232 **Figure 1. (A)** Field performance of the Panbio™ COVID-19 AG Rapid Test Device  
233 (RAD) according to the time of testing since the onset of symptoms (< or ≥5 days) in a  
234 cohort of symptomatic patients with clinical suspicion of COVID-19 attended at  
235 primary healthcare centers. (B) RT-PCR C<sub>T</sub> values in specimens testing either RAD +  
236 or RAD -. (C) SARS-CoV-2 RNA loads in specimens testing either RAD + or RAD-.  
237 Median and *P* values are shown.

238

