

# Acceptable Performance of the Abbott ID NOW Among Symptomatic Individuals with Confirmed COVID-19

William Stokes<sup>1,2,3,#</sup>, MD, Byron M. Berenger<sup>1,4</sup>, MD, Takshveer Singh<sup>5</sup>, Ifueko Adeghe<sup>2</sup>, MD, Angela Schneider<sup>5</sup>, MD, Danielle Portnoy<sup>6</sup>, Teagan King<sup>5</sup>, MD, Brittney Scott<sup>6</sup>, PhD, Kanti Pabbaraju<sup>1</sup>, Sandy Shokoples<sup>1</sup>, Anita A. Wong<sup>1</sup>, Kara Gill<sup>1</sup>, LeeAnn Turnbull<sup>1</sup>, Jia Hu<sup>7,8</sup>, MD, Graham Tipples<sup>1,2,9</sup>, PhD

<sup>1</sup>Public Health Laboratory, Alberta Precision Laboratories, Alberta, Canada

<sup>2</sup>Department of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine, University of Alberta, Alberta, Canada

<sup>3</sup>Division of Infectious Diseases, Department of Medicine, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta

<sup>4</sup>Department of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine, University of Calgary, Calgary, Alberta, Canada.

<sup>5</sup>Cumming School of Medicine, University of Calgary, Calgary, Alberta

<sup>6</sup>Faculty of Medicine & Dentistry, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta

<sup>7</sup>Department of Community Health Sciences, University of Calgary, Calgary, Alberta, Canada

<sup>8</sup>Public Health, Alberta Health Services, Alberta, Canada

<sup>9</sup>Li Ka Shing Institute of Virology, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada.

Corresponding author: William Stokes, [William.Stokes@AlbertaPrecisionLabs.ca](mailto:William.Stokes@AlbertaPrecisionLabs.ca)

Key words: ID NOW, rapid SARS-CoV-2 test, COVID-19 diagnostics.

34 **INTRODUCTION**

35 Point of care diagnostic tests for SARS-CoV-2, such as the ID NOW, have great potential to help  
36 combat the COVID-19 pandemic. The ID NOW is approved by the United States Food and Drug  
37 Administration (FDA) for the detection of SARS-CoV-2 in symptomatic individuals within the  
38 first 7 days of symptom onset for COVID-19 if tested within 1 hour of specimen collection.

39 However, clinical data on the performance of the ID NOW is limited, with many studies  
40 deviating from the manufacturer's instructions and/or having small sample size.

41 **METHODS**

42 Adults with COVID-19 in the community or hospital were recruited into the study. Paired throat  
43 swabs were collected, with one throat swab transported immediately in an empty sterile tube to  
44 the laboratory for ID NOW testing, and the other transported in universal transport media and  
45 tested by an in-house SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR assay targeting the E-gene. Positive percent  
46 agreement (PPA) was calculated.

47 **RESULTS**

48 133 individuals were included in the study. 129 samples were positive on either the ID NOW  
49 and/or RT-PCR. Assuming any positive result on either assay represents a true positive, PPA of  
50 the ID NOW compared to RT-PCR with 95% confidence intervals was 89.1% [82.0% - 94.1%]  
51 and 91.6% [85.1% - 95.9%], respectively. When analyzing individuals with symptoms  $\leq$  7 days  
52 and who had the ID NOW performed within an hour, ID NOW PPA increased to 98.2%.

53 **DISCUSSION**

54 In this study, SARS-CoV-2 results from the ID NOW were reliable, especially when testing was  
55 adhered to manufacturer's recommendations.

56

57

58 Conflict of interest

59 The manufacturer had no role to play in the study. The authors have no conflict of interests to  
60 disclose pertaining to this study

61

62

63

64

65

66

67

68

69 **INTRODUCTION**

70 The ID NOW (Abbott, Illinois, United States) is approved by the United States Food and Drug  
71 Administration (FDA) for the detection of severe acute respiratory syndrome-coronavirus-2  
72 (SARS-CoV-2) in individuals who are within the first 7 days of symptom onset. The assay  
73 targets a region of the RNA-dependent RNA polymerase (RdRp) gene of SARS-CoV-2 for using  
74 isothermal amplification and subsequent detection of fluorescence, with results available in  
75 under 15 minutes. Clinical specimens approved for testing include nasal, throat, and  
76 nasopharyngeal swabs. These specimens must be tested on the Abbott ID NOW either  
77 immediately or within 1 hour of collection if stored in a clean, unused tube. Specimens placed in  
78 viral/universal transport media (UTM) are not valid for testing on the Abbott ID NOW.<sup>1</sup>

79  
80 Current limitations of the Abbott ID NOW include the lack of strong data to determine its  
81 effectiveness in detecting SARS-CoV-2 in clinical settings. To date, the studies used to obtain  
82 FDA approval have not used clinical specimens. These studies have demonstrated that the limit  
83 of detection of the Abbott ID NOW is similar to other nucleic acid amplification tests at  
84 approximately 125 genome equivalents/mL. Of the clinical studies reported in the literature, the  
85 Abbott ID NOW has been shown to have excellent specificity (~100%) but sensitivity varies  
86 widely between studies (48.0% - 94.1%).<sup>2-17</sup> In addition, many of these studies suffer from poor  
87 study design such as comparing nasopharyngeal to nasal specimens, deviating from the product  
88 insert or having major delays in testing specimens on the ID NOW. Only two studies adhered to  
89 the FDA's recommendations for ID NOW testing, and both studies had a small sample size (<20  
90 samples positive for SARS-CoV-2).<sup>16,17</sup>

91

92 We sought to assess the positive percent agreement (PPA) of the ID NOW by comparing its  
93 performance to an in-house validated real-time reverse transcriptase (RT-PCR) among  
94 individuals with recently confirmed COVID-19 while adhering as closely as possible to the  
95 manufacturers recommendations. We also tested the accuracy of the ID NOW with samples  
96 taken from asymptomatic individuals at low risk for COVID-19 (i.e. no exposures) and on  
97 retrospective clinical samples previously positive for common respiratory pathogens.

98

## 99 **METHODS**

### 100 Testing individuals with confirmed COVID-19

101 Community and hospitalized individuals within the Calgary and Edmonton Health Zones of  
102 Alberta, Canada, who recently tested positive for SARS-CoV-2 at Alberta Precision Laboratories  
103 (APL) and confirmed as cases by Alberta Health Services (AHS) Public Health were recruited.  
104 Diagnostic testing was performed by a Health Canada approved SARS-CoV-2 assay or a lab  
105 developed real time RT-PCR assay (see below for details). Participants were identified by an  
106 AHS Public Health confirmed case list. Oral consent by phone was obtained for collection of  
107 samples in the participant's home or in a hospital (if hospitalized). Individuals under the age of  
108 18 and individuals in supportive or congregate living facilities were excluded. Eligible patients  
109 who consented to the study were recruited to have two throat swabs collected by trained  
110 healthcare professionals within their homes or inpatient unit. The University of Calgary Research  
111 Ethics board approved this study (REB20-444).

112

113 Individuals were asked to confirm their symptoms and date of symptom onset at the time of  
114 study swab collection. Healthcare workers performing the collection were given instructions on

115 how to perform throat swabs using the ClassiqSwabs (COPAN Diagnostics, California, United  
116 States) and the throat swab provided in the ID NOW testing kits (Abbott, Illinois, United  
117 States).<sup>18</sup> Throat swabs were collected from both sides of the oropharynx and the posterior  
118 pharyngeal wall under the uvula. Throat swabs were collected approximately one minute apart  
119 and the order in which throat swabs were collected was recorded.

120

121 For each paired throat swab, one was placed into a dry 15mL conical centrifuge tube (Fisher  
122 Scientific, MA, United States) for ID NOW testing and the other into a tube containing UTM  
123 (COPAN) for RT-PCR testing. Samples were transported to the APL Public Health Laboratory  
124 as quickly as possible, at room temperature, and tested upon receipt. Testing on the ID NOW  
125 instrument was done immediately upon receipt as per manufacturer's instructions. Throat swabs  
126 in UTM collected for RT-PCR testing were stored at 4°C and tested within 72 hours. Two  
127 hundred microliters of UTM were extracted on the MagMAX Express-96 or Kingfisher Flex  
128 (ABI) using the MagMAX-96 Viral RNA Isolation Kit (ThermoFisher) or the PurePrep Pathogen  
129 Kit (MolGen) according to manufacturer's instructions, and eluted into a volume of 110ul. RT-  
130 PCR testing included an assay targeting the envelope (E)-gene of SARS-CoV-2 developed and  
131 validated at APL, and the Cobas® SARS-CoV-2 (Roche Diagnostics, Indianapolis, IN) test on  
132 the Cobas 6800 instrument.<sup>19</sup>

133

134 For our lab-developed test, the samples were considered positive for SARS-CoV-2 when the  
135 cycle threshold (Ct) value was <35. If the Ct was ≥35, amplification from the same eluate was  
136 repeated in duplicate and was considered positive if at least 2/3 results had a Ct <41. Testing for  
137 SARS-CoV-2 on the Cobas 6800 instrument was performed according to manufacturer's

138 instructions. For the Cobas SARS-CoV-2 test, a positive result was defined as 2/2 targets  
139 positive or 1 or more targets positive in duplicate. If 1/2 targets were positive and duplicate  
140 testing was negative, the result was considered indeterminate.

141  
142 For discrepant results, the specimens were retested in triplicate with our lab developed RT-PCR  
143 test and in triplicate with the N2 assay from the CDC 2019-Novel Coronavirus (2019-nCoV)  
144 Real-Time RT-PCR Diagnostic Panel using the UltraPlex 1-Step Toughmix (Quantabio, MA,  
145 USA).<sup>20</sup> If still negative, the test was run on the Cobas 6800. PPA was calculated with Clopper-  
146 Pearson 95% confidence intervals. Statistical analysis was performed using Pearson Chi-squared  
147 for categorical variables and t-test for continuous variables using STATA (version 14.1).

148  
149 Negative samples and retrospective samples containing other respiratory viruses

150 Two throat swabs were collected from asymptomatic individuals at low risk of having COVID-  
151 19 (no recent travel, no exposures). One throat swab was tested immediately (<2 minutes) on the  
152 ID NOW instrument. The other throat swab was tested by RT-PCR as explained above. To  
153 assess for cross-reactivity, retrospective samples containing high concentrations of various  
154 respiratory viruses, stored in UTM, were tested by aliquoting 400uL of sample into the ID NOW  
155 blue specimen receiver. These samples were previously tested by the NxTAG® Respiratory  
156 Pathogen Panel (Luminex, Tx, United States) or the CDC influenza SARS-CoV-2 multiplex  
157 assay . The ability of the ID NOW to process this volume of UTM was confirmed by testing four  
158 retrospective positive SARS-CoV-2 samples, in UTM, and showing that they could be detected  
159 (data not shown, Ct values ranging from 21 - 28).

160

161 **RESULTS**

162 One hundred and fifty-two patients were recruited for this study. Fourteen individuals were  
163 asymptomatic at the time of COVID-19 diagnosis and at time of study collection and were  
164 therefore excluded from analysis (sub-analysis provided in the supplementary material). The date  
165 of symptom onset for two individuals was not captured at time of consent and they could not be  
166 reached later for clarification, and therefore excluded. Three samples were excluded as samples  
167 were lost for RT-PCR testing (all were ID NOW positive). Symptom details were not recorded  
168 for two individuals but they were still included in the analysis as symptom onset was known and  
169 they were still symptomatic at the time of collection. This resulted in the inclusion of 133  
170 individuals in our analysis and their characteristics are provided in Table 1.

171  
172 All individuals had symptoms at the time of collection and the majority (91.0%) were from the  
173 community. For the 131 individuals with recorded symptoms, cough was the most frequent  
174 symptom (40.5%), followed by pharyngitis (31.3%), fevers/chills (30.5%), headache (24.4%),  
175 nasal congestion (23.7%), anosmia (22.9%), malaise (21.4%), myalgias (21.4%), ageusia  
176 (19.1%), shortness of breath (13.0%), rhinorrhea (11.5%), nausea/vomiting (3.8%) and other  
177 including chest pain, diarrhea, loss of appetite or arthralgias (7.6%).

178  
179 Mean duration of symptoms at the time of collection was 6.9 (median=7, range=1 – 17) days.  
180 Seventy-five percent (n=100) of individuals were within the 7-day symptom onset window,  
181 62.4% (n=83) of individuals had their samples tested on the ID NOW within 1 hour from  
182 collection, and 46.6% (N=62) met the regulatory agency approved criteria for testing on the ID  
183 NOW (symptom onset  $\leq$  7 days and ID NOW test conducted within an hour from collection).

184 The mean E-gene Ct value for positive results from the RT-PCR assay was 30.9 (median=31.0,  
185 range=16.4 – 37.9).

186

187 Of the 133 samples, 96 were positive on both the ID NOW and RT-PCR (Table 2). Assuming  
188 any positive result represents a true positive, the PPA of the ID NOW compared to RT-PCR with  
189 95% confidence intervals was found to be 89.1% [82.0% - 94.1%] and 91.6% [85.1% - 95.9%],  
190 respectively (Table 3). There were 13 false negatives on the ID NOW instrument, with 11/13  
191 (91.7%) having Ct value > 30 on RT-PCR (or indeterminate on the Cobas 6800) and 6/13  
192 (41.7%) with Ct values > 37 on RT-PCR (or indeterminate on the Cobas 6800) (Table 4). Eight  
193 of the 13 false negative samples (61.5%) were from individuals within 7 days symptoms onset,  
194 four (30.7%) were samples that were tested on the ID NOW within an hour from collection, and  
195 only one (7.7%) was from an individual with symptoms  $\leq 7$  days and had the ID NOW  
196 performed within an hour. Samples tested on the ID NOW instrument were more likely to be  
197 positive if the sample was tested within one hour from collection ( $p=0.031$ ) and from individuals  
198 who had lower Ct values on RT-PCR testing ( $p<0.001$ ) (Table 5). RT-PCR samples were more  
199 likely to be positive if the sample was tested on individuals with symptoms  $\leq 7$  days (Table S2).

200

201 When tested in triplicate using RT-PCR followed by triplicate testing by the CDC method and  
202 testing on the Cobas 6800, 5/10 (50.0%) RT-PCR negative samples, with paired positive ID  
203 NOW swabs, resolved as positive. One sample was unable to undergo additional testing.

204

205 PPA between the ID NOW and RT-PCR, stratified based on individual characteristics, is  
206 provided in Figure 1. The highest ID NOW PPA (98.2%) was in individuals with symptoms  $\leq 7$



207 days and who had the ID NOW performed within an hour, followed by individuals with  
208 symptoms  $\leq 7$  days (91.2%), and in samples with ID NOW performed within an hour (89.8%).  
209 Further details are provided within the supplementary material.

210

211 Twenty asymptomatic individuals at low risk of COVID-19 were tested, all of which were  
212 negative on the ID NOW and RT-PCR. All four retrospective samples positive for SARS-CoV-2  
213 were positive on the ID NOW. All 11 retrospective samples containing other respiratory viruses  
214 tested were negative. These samples were previously positive for one of either human  
215 metapneumovirus, adenovirus, parainfluenza virus, other coronavirus (NL63, HKU1, NL63),  
216 enterovirus, respiratory syncytial virus, influenza A H3N2, influenza A H1N1, or influenza B.

217

218

## 219 **DISCUSSION**

220 Our study compared the PPA of the ID NOW to RT-PCR among individuals confirmed to have  
221 SARS-CoV-2 infection. Overall, PPA of the ID NOW instrument was high at 89.9% and  
222 comparable to our laboratory's RT-PCR (91.6%) for this population. In the cohort of patients  
223 with symptom onset  $\leq 7$  days prior to collection, and whose samples could be tested within one  
224 hour from collection, the PPA increased to 98.2%. While there were instances in our study where  
225 the ID NOW was positive and the RT-PCR was negative, we believe these are true positives  
226 based on several reasons. Participants recruited in our study were all recently diagnosed with  
227 COVID-19; none of the samples from the asymptomatic individuals at low risk of COVID-19  
228 gave false positive results throughout the study; when retested in triplicate or on an alternative  
229 platform, 40% of these samples had detectable RNA present; and no issues with false positive

230 results have been identified by the ID NOW manufacturer or among previous publications within  
231 the literature.<sup>2-17</sup>

232

233 PPA of the ID NOW varies widely in the literature from 48.0% to 94.1%.<sup>2-17</sup> However, most of  
234 these studies suffered from poor study design or were conducted when the manufacturer still  
235 considered placing swabs in UTM as appropriate for sample collection (prior to April, 2020).

236 Several studies did not adhere to the recommended time limit of 1 hour for time of collection to  
237 result which, as confirmed in this study, is a statistically significant factor in ID NOW's

238 performance.<sup>2,11,15</sup> One of the major studies to discredit the performance of the ID NOW

239 compared dry nasal swabs (tested on the ID NOW) to nasopharyngeal swabs (tested on Cepheid  
240 Xpert Xpress), which is an inappropriate comparison given the superiority of positivity rate

241 among nasopharyngeal specimens to nasal specimens.<sup>19,21</sup> Furthermore, Basu *et al.* tested

242 patients with symptom onset up to 1 month from time of sample collection, and it is unclear how

243 many patients with confirmed COVID-19 had symptoms  $\leq 7$  days.<sup>3</sup> Among the studies that

244 adhered to current ID NOW manufacturer recommendations for testing, ID NOW PPA was

245 66.7% and 94.1%.<sup>16,17</sup> However, both studies had small sample sizes (<20 samples positive for

246 SARS-CoV-2).

247

248 Limitations of our study include the low number of hospitalized patients recruited such that we

249 cannot make strong conclusions about the ID NOW performance among this population. The

250 majority of throat swabs tested on the ID NOW were collected before the comparator swab

251 (78.0%). However, we did not observe any difference in ID NOW or RT-PCR positivity rate

252 when comparing patients who had ID NOW throat swab collected first vs second (Table 5 and

253 supplementary material). There were discrepancies between ID NOW positive, RT-PCR negative  
254 specimens, that could have resulted from multiple factors, such as intra-collector variability in  
255 the throat swab collections and degradation of virus during transportation/storage, as opposed to  
256 false positive ID NOW results.

257

258 The strengths of our study include the large number of COVID-19 positive individuals recruited,  
259 particularly those residing within the community. We adhered to the manufacturer's  
260 recommendations, as much as possible, to recruit COVID-19 positive individuals with symptoms  
261  $\leq 7$  days at time of collection and to test samples on the ID NOW within an hour from collection.  
262 Adhering to these requirements was difficult, as it often took several days from symptom onset  
263 for an individual in the community to get swabbed and test results reported. Consequently, the  
264 symptom onset was often near seven days. Meeting the one-hour criteria was challenging as we  
265 had to drive back and forth from participants' households to our laboratory, and many  
266 participants were located in distant parts of the city (e.g.  $>30$  min drive to the laboratory) and  
267 other obstacles (e.g. traffic) increased transit time. Another strength of our study was the  
268 concurrent testing of asymptomatic individuals at low risk of COVID-19, and retrospective  
269 samples positive for other respiratory viruses, throughout the study to ensure there were no  
270 issues with false positive results (e.g. caused by contamination or cross-reactivity).

271

## 272 **CONCLUSIONS**

273 In conclusion, the ID NOW was found to be a comparable method to our RT-PCR for the  
274 detection of SARS-CoV-2 among individuals with symptomatic COVID-19 infection. PPA was  
275 enhanced when tested on individuals with symptom onset  $\leq 7$  days and when time from

276 collection to testing was within one hour. These results reassure us that the ID NOW is a reliable  
277 test method in symptomatic individuals, especially when adhering to the FDA-approved  
278 indications and recommendations for testing. Given the speed and low-complexity of ID NOW  
279 testing, these instruments can truly be used as a point of care device. As such, they will play an  
280 impactful role in combating the COVID-19 pandemic by improving testing in settings where  
281 low-volume rapid (<1h) turnaround times are much needed, such as among difficult to reach  
282 populations (e.g. homeless), inpatients with suspected nosocomial infection, and in rural areas  
283 where access to a laboratory is limited because transportation delays are significant.

284

## 285 **Acknowledgments**

286 This work was funded using internal operating funds of Alberta Precision Laboratories and  
287 Alberta Health Services. Test kits and instruments were paid for by the Public Health Agency of  
288 Canada. We thank the AHS mobile integrated health team for collecting samples in the  
289 community and Alberta Precision Laboratory staff for assistance with testing of samples.

290

291

292

293

294

295

296

297

298

299

## 300 REFERENCES

- 301
- 302 1. United States Food and Drug Administration. ID NOW COVID-19 – instructions for use.
- 303 2020. [Accessed Nov 30, 2020]. Available from:
- 304 <https://www.fda.gov/media/136525/download>
- 305 2. Thwe PM, Ren P. How many are we missing with ID NOW COVID-19 assay using
- 306 direct nasopharyngeal swabs? Findings from a mid-sized academic hospital clinical
- 307 microbiology laboratory. *Diagn Microbiol Infect Dis.* 2020;98(2):115123.
- 308 3. Basu A, Zinger T, Inghima K, et al. Performance of Abbott ID NOW COVID-19 rapid
- 309 nucleic acid amplification test using nasopharyngeal swabs transported in viral transport
- 310 media and dry nasal swabs in a New York city academic institution. *J Clin Microbiol.*
- 311 2020;58(8):e01136-20.
- 312 4. Zhen W, Smith E, Manji R, Schron D, Berry G. Clinical evaluation of three sample-to-
- 313 answer platforms for the detection of SARS-CoV-2. *J Clin Microbiol.*
- 314 2020;58(8):e00783-20.
- 315 5. Rhoads DD, Cherian SS, Roman K, et al. Comparison of Abbott ID Now, DiaSorin
- 316 Simplexa, and CDC FDA emergency use authorization methods for the detection of
- 317 SARS-CoV-2 from nasopharyngeal and nasal swabs from individuals diagnosed with
- 318 COVID-19. *J Clin Microbiol.* 2020;58(8):e00760-20.
- 319 6. Harrington A, Cox B, Snowdon J, et al. Comparison of Abbott ID Now and Abbott m2000
- 320 methods for the detection of SARS-CoV-2 from nasopharyngeal and nasal swabs from
- 321 symptomatic patients. *J Clin Microbiol.* 2020;58(8):e00798-20.
- 322 7. Smithgall MC, Scherberkova I, Whittier S, Green DA. Comparison of Cepheid Xpert
- 323 Xpress and Abbott ID Now to Roche cobas for the Rapid Detection of SARS-CoV-2. *J*
- 324 *Clin Virol.* 2020;128:104428.
- 325 8. Fung B, Gopez A, Servellita V, Arevalo S, Ho C, Deucher A, Thornborrow E, Chiu C,
- 326 Miller S. Direct comparison of SARS-CoV-2 analytical limits of detection across seven
- 327 molecular assays. *J Clin Microbiol.* 2020 Aug 24;58(9):e01535-20.
- 328 9. Moore NM, Li H, Schejbal D, Lindsley J, Hayden MK. Comparison of two commercial
- 329 molecular tests and a laboratory-developed modification of the CDC 2019-nCoV Reverse
- 330 transcriptase PCR assay for the detection of SARS-CoV-2. *J Clin Microbiol.* 2020 Jul
- 331 23;58(8):e00938-20.
- 332 10. Mitchell SL, George KS. Evaluation of the COVID19 ID NOW EUA assay. *J Clin Virol.*
- 333 2020;128:104429.
- 334 11. Lephart PR, Bachman MA, LeBar W, et al. Comparative study of four SARS-CoV-2
- 335 Nucleic Acid Amplification Test (NAAT) platforms demonstrates that ID NOW
- 336 performance is impaired substantially by patient and specimen type. *Diagn Microbiol*
- 337 *Infect Dis.* 2020;99(1):115200.
- 338 12. Comer SW, Fusk D. An extended laboratory validation study and comparative performance
- 339 evaluation of the Abbott ID NOW COVID-19 assay in a coastal California tertiary care medical
- 340 center. 2020. *medRxiv.* [Accessed Nov 30, 2020]. Available from:
- 341 <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.06.14.20130518v1>
- 342 13. Cradic K, Lockhart M, Ozbolt P, et al. Clinical evaluation and utilization of multiple
- 343 molecular in vitro diagnostic assays for the detection of SARS-CoV-2. *Am J Clin Pathol.*
- 344 2020;154(2):201–207.

- 345 14. Procop GW, Brock JE, Reineks EZ, et al. A comparison of five SARS-CoV-2 molecular  
346 assays with clinical correlations. *Am J Clin Pathol*. 2020;aqaa181.
- 347 15. Serei VD, Cristelli R, Joho K, et al. Comparison of Abbott ID NOW COVID-19 rapid  
348 molecular assay to cepheid Xpert Xpress SARS-CoV-2 assay in dry nasal swabs.  
349 *Diagnostic Microbiol Infect Dis*. 2020;115208.
- 350 16. Jin R, Pettengill MA, Hartnett NL, et al. Commercial severe acute respiratory syndrome  
351 coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) molecular assays: Superior analytical sensitivity of cobas  
352 SARS-CoV-2 relative to NxTAG CoV extended panel and ID NOW COVID-19  
353 test. *Arch Pathol Lab Med*. 2020;144(11):1303–1310.
- 354 17. Ghofrani M, Casas MT, Pelz RK, Kroll C, Blum N, Foster SD. Performance  
355 characteristics of the ID NOW COVID-19 assay: a regional health care system  
356 experience. *MedRxiv*. 2020. [Accessed Nov 30, 2020]. Available from:  
357 <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.06.03.20116327v1.full.pdf>
- 358 18. AHS collection guide. Alberta Health Services. Collection of Nasopharyngeal and Throat  
359 Swab for Detection of Respiratory Infection. 2017 [Accessed Nov 26, 2020]. Available  
360 from: [https://www.albertahealthservices.ca/assets/wf/plab/wf-provlab-collection-of-](https://www.albertahealthservices.ca/assets/wf/plab/wf-provlab-collection-of-nasopharyngeal-and-throat-swab.pdf)  
361 [nasopharyngeal-and-throat-swab.pdf](https://www.albertahealthservices.ca/assets/wf/plab/wf-provlab-collection-of-nasopharyngeal-and-throat-swab.pdf)
- 362 19. Berenger B, Fonseca K, Schneider AR, Hu J, Zelyas N. Sensitivity of nasopharyngeal,  
363 nasal and throat swab for the detection of SARS-CoV-2. 2020. *MedRxiv*.  
364 Doi:<https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.05.20084889> .
- 365 20. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. CDC 2019-Novel Coronavirus (2019-nCoV)  
366 Real-Time RT-PCR Diagnostic Panel: For Emergency Use Only: Instructions for Use  
367 [Accessed Nov 30, 2020]. Available from: <https://www.fda.gov/media/134922/download>.
- 368 21. Pinninti S, Trieu C, Pati S, et al. Comparing Nasopharyngeal and Midturbinate Nasal  
369 Swab Testing for the Identification of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus  
370 2. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2020. DOI: 10.1093/cid/ciaa882

371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
390

391 Table 1: Patient characteristics (N=133).

<b>Characteristic</b>	
Male gender	36.8
Mean age in years (median, range)	42.9 (40.4, 19.0 – 92.7)
Inpatient/Hospitalized at time of collection	9.0%
ID NOW throat swab collected first	78.0%
Mean time from sample collection to ID NOW testing (median, range), N=133	54.8 min (54, 20 – 233)
Samples tested on ID NOW within 1 hour from collection	62.4%
Mean time from starting ID NOW test to confirming positive result (median, range), N=106	2.4 min (2, 1 – 8 min)
Mean duration of symptoms from collection date (median, range)	6.9 days (7, 1 – 17 days)
Individuals with symptom duration $\leq$ 7 days from collection date	75.2%
Individuals with symptoms $\leq$ 7 days and ID NOW test conducted within an hour from collection, (N=62)	45.1%

392  
393

394 Table 2: Results of ID NOW and RT-PCR in

395 symptomatic COVID-19 patients (N=133).

		<b>RT-PCR</b>	
		Positive	Negative
<b>ID NOW</b>	Positive	96	10
	Negative	13	14

396  
397

398 Table 3: Positive percent agreement (PPA) between ID NOW and RT-PCR in

399 symptomatic COVID-19 patients (N=133). PPA calculated assuming any positive is a

400 true positive.

	<b>PPA [95% CI]</b>
<b>ID NOW</b>	89.1% [82.0% – 94.1%]
<b>RT-PCR</b>	91.6% [85.1% - 95.9%]

401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410

411 Table 4: Details on the ID NOW negative, RT-PCR positive results (N=14).

<b>Sample Number</b>	<b>Ct value from RT-PCR</b>	<b>Days from symptom onset at time of collection</b>	<b>Symptoms</b>	<b>Time from sample collection to ID NOW testing (min)</b>
1	33.2	7	Pharyngitis, cough	28
2	37.2	5	Cough, malaise, myalgias, fever	63
3	35.0	5	Pharyngitis, anosmia	79
4	34.3	6	Pharyngitis, cough, malaise, fever	63
5	Indeterminate	6	Pharyngitis, malaise, cough, fever, myalgia, anosmia, ageusia	64
6	31.7	6	Rhinorrhea, fever	94
7	33.8	7	Pharyngitis, cough	66
8	37.0	7	Headache, decreased appetite, anosmia, ageusia	72
9	36.8	8	Malaise	37
10	29.8	9	Sore throat	68
11	37.8	10	Pharyngitis, myalgias	78
12	37.8	11	Shortness of breath	36
13	37.8	12	Cough, anosmia	39
MEAN (median)	35.2 (35.9)	7.6 (7)	N/A	60.5 (64)

412 Only one false negative sample (coloured in grey) was from an individual who had duration of  
 413 symptoms  $\leq$  7 days at time of collection and had their sample tested within 1 hour from  
 414 collection.

415  
 416  
 417  
 418  
 419  
 420  
 421  
 422  
 423  
 424  
 425  
 426



427 Table 5: Characteristics between ID NOW negative and ID NOW positive samples (N=152).

	<b>ID NOW negative (N=27)</b>	<b>ID NOW positive (N=106)</b>	<b>P-value</b>
<b>Sample tested within one hour from collection</b>	44.4%	67.0%	0.031
<b>Mean duration of symptoms</b>	7.4 days	6.8 days	0.280
<b>Symptoms <math>\leq</math> 7 days at collection</b>	63.0%	78.3%	0.099
<b>Mean age</b>	41.4	43.3	0.590
<b>Mean Ct value</b>	35.2	30.3	<0.001
<b>Throat swab tested on ID NOW collected first</b>	77.8%	78.1%	0.972
<b>Hospitalized</b>	11.1%	8.5%	0.671
<b>Male gender</b>	44.4%	34.9	0.359

428

429

430

431

432

433

434

435

436

437

438

439

440

441

442

443

444 Figure 1: Positive percent agreement of the ID NOW and RT-PCR from samples, stratified based  
445 on sample/individual characteristics, with 95% confidence intervals provided. Stratified samples  
446 include those among all individuals (N=133), individuals with symptoms > 7 days (N=33),  
447 individuals with symptoms  $\leq$  7 days (N=100), individuals who had the ID NOW performed  
448 within  $\leq$  1 hour from collection (N=83), and individuals with symptoms  $\leq$  7 days and ID NOW  
449 performed  $\leq$  1 hour from collection (N=62).

