

1 Performance and Operational Evaluation of the Access Bio CareStart Rapid Antigen Test in a  
2 High-throughput Drive-through Community Testing Site in Massachusetts  
3  
4  
5 Nira R. Pollock, MD, PhD<sup>1</sup>; Kristine Tran, MS<sup>2</sup>; Jessica R. Jacobs, PhD<sup>2,3</sup>; Amber E. Cranston<sup>2</sup>; Sita  
6 Smith<sup>2</sup>; Claire Y. O’Kane<sup>2</sup>; Tyler J. Roady<sup>2</sup>; Anne Moran, MD<sup>4</sup>; Alison Scarry<sup>4</sup>; Melissa Carroll<sup>4</sup>;  
7 Leila Volinsky<sup>4</sup>; Gloria Perez<sup>4</sup>; Pinal Patel<sup>2</sup>, Stacey Gabriel, PhD<sup>5</sup>; Niall J. Lennon, PhD<sup>5</sup>; Lawrence  
8 C. Madoff, MD<sup>2,6</sup>; Catherine Brown, DVM, MSc, MPH<sup>2</sup>; Sandra C. Smole, PhD<sup>2</sup>

9  
10 1) Department of Laboratory Medicine, Boston Children’s Hospital, Boston, MA, USA  
11 2) Massachusetts Department of Public Health, Jamaica Plain, MA, USA  
12 3) Laboratory Leadership Service, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Atlanta, GA, USA  
13 4) Lawrence General Hospital, Lawrence, MA, USA  
14 5) Broad Institute of MIT and Harvard, Cambridge, MA, USA  
15 6) Division of Infectious Disease and Immunology, Department of Medicine, University of  
16 Massachusetts Medical Center, Worcester, MA, USA

17  
18

19 Key words: COVID-19, SARS-CoV-2, diagnostic, antigen, point-of-care

20

21 Running title: CareStart performance and implementation

22

23

24 Corresponding authors:

25

26 Sandra Smole, PhD  
27 Director, MA State Public Health Laboratory  
28 Bureau of Infectious Disease and Laboratory Sciences  
29 Massachusetts Department of Public Health  
30 305 South Street  
31 Jamaica Plain, MA 02131  
32 Phone: 617-983-4362 Fax: 617-983-6211  
33 Email: [sandra.smole@mass.gov](mailto:sandra.smole@mass.gov)

34

35 Nira Pollock, M.D., Ph.D., D(ABMM)  
36 Associate Medical Director, Infectious Diseases Diagnostic Laboratory, Boston Children's Hospital  
37 Division of Infectious Diseases, Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center  
38 Associate Professor of Pathology and Medicine, Harvard Medical School  
39 Farley Building 8th floor, Room FA828  
40 300 Longwood Ave  
41 Boston, MA 02115  
42 Phone: 857-218-5113 Fax: 617-730-0383  
43 Email: [nira.pollock@childrens.harvard.edu](mailto:nira.pollock@childrens.harvard.edu)

44 **Abstract**

45  
46

47 **Background:** To facilitate deployment of point-of-care testing for SARS-CoV-2, we evaluated  
48 the Access Bio CareStart COVID-19 Antigen test in a high-throughput, drive-through, free  
49 community testing site using anterior nasal (AN) swab RT-PCR for clinical testing.

50

51 **Methods:** Consenting symptomatic and asymptomatic children ( $\leq 18$  years) and adults received  
52 dual AN swabs. CareStart testing was performed with temperature/humidity monitoring. All  
53 tests had two independent reads to assess inter-operator agreement. Patients with positive  
54 CareStart results were called and instructed to isolate pending RT-PCR results. The paired RT-  
55 PCR result was the reference for sensitivity and specificity calculations.

56

57 **Results:** Of 1603 participants, 1245 adults and 253 children had paired RT-PCR/CareStart  
58 results and complete symptom data. 83% of adults and 87% of children were asymptomatic.  
59 CareStart sensitivity/specificity were 84.8% (95% confidence interval [CI] 71.1-93.7)/97.2%  
60 (92.0-99.4) and 85.7% (42.1-99.6)/89.5% (66.9-98.7) in adults and children, respectively, within  
61 5 days of symptoms. Sensitivity/specificity were 50.0% (41.0-59.0)/99.1% (98.3-99.6) in  
62 asymptomatic adults and 51.4% (34.4-68.1)/97.8% (94.5-99.4) in asymptomatic children.  
63 Sensitivity in all 234 RT-PCR-positive people was 96.3% with cycle threshold (Ct)  $\leq 25$ , 79.6%  
64 with Ct  $\leq 30$ , and 61.4% with Ct  $\leq 35$ . All 21 false positive CareStart tests had faint but normal  
65 bands. Inter-operator agreement was 99.5%. Operational challenges included identification of  
66 faint test bands and inconsistent swab elution volumes.

67

68 **Conclusions:** CareStart had high sensitivity in people with Ct  $\leq 25$  and moderate sensitivity in  
69 symptomatic people overall. Specificity was unexpectedly lower in symptomatic versus

70 asymptomatic people. Excellent inter-operator agreement was observed, but operational  
71 challenges indicate that operator training is warranted.  
72

73

74 **Introduction**

75

76 Although nucleic acid amplification tests (NAATs) for SARS-CoV-2 can be highly sensitive and  
77 are being performed at high volumes in centralized laboratories worldwide [1, 2], global testing  
78 capacity and turnaround time remain insufficient. The benefits of decentralized and expedited  
79 testing have driven the development of rapid diagnostic tests (RDTs) for point-of-care (POC) use  
80 that detect SARS-CoV-2 nucleocapsid antigen (Ag) in as little as 10-15 minutes. As of February  
81 10, 2020, there are 11 Ag RDTs with FDA Emergency Use Authorization (EUA) [3] that can be  
82 performed by personnel without formal laboratory training in patient care settings that operate  
83 under a Clinical Laboratory Improvement Amendments (CLIA) Certificate of Waiver.

84

85 Several tests that are visually read have demonstrated consistently high specificity (>99%) in  
86 field testing and high sensitivity in individuals with high viral burden (typically defined by the  
87 surrogate measure of a low cycle threshold [Ct] value in a real-time reverse transcription  
88 polymerase chain reaction [RT-PCR] assay performed on a separate swab collected in parallel)  
89 [4-10]. However, variability in sensitivity estimates yielded from field studies of individual Ag  
90 RDTs (e.g., the Abbott BinaxNOW COVID-19 Ag Card, [6, 8, 10]) have reinforced the fact that  
91 the performance of an Ag RDT must be established in the settings, conditions, and populations  
92 of intended use. Although nasopharyngeal (NP) sampling remains the reference method, anterior  
93 nasal (AN) sampling substantially increases testing access and acceptability, and a recent  
94 comparison study showed that sensitivity with self-collected nasal mid-turbinate swabs versus  
95 professionally-collected NP swab samples was similar [11].

96

97 The Access Bio CareStart COVID-19 Antigen (Ag) test has FDA EUA for AN swab samples  
98 [12] and can provide visually-read results at POC in 10 minutes. The potential for use of this test  
99 at large scale, and the paucity of data for test performance in asymptomatic individuals and in  
100 children, motivated us to perform an implementation and performance evaluation in a high-  
101 volume, high-prevalence community testing site currently using AN swab RT-PCR for clinical  
102 testing.

103

## 104 **Methods:**

105

### 106 Study population

107 The study was performed from January 11-January 22, 2021, at the Lawrence General Hospital  
108 “Stop the Spread” drive-through testing site, which accommodates Massachusetts residents from  
109 the surrounding area. CareStart testing was performed under the site’s CLIA waiver. No study-  
110 specific effort was made to recruit individuals to present to the testing site. Two of seven drive-  
111 through lanes were utilized for the study. Verbal consent for dual AN swabbing was obtained  
112 from adults and guardians of minors (with verbal assent for ages 7-17). Participants were  
113 informed of the Ag RDT results reporting plan (below). Presence or absence of symptoms (sore  
114 throat, cough, chills, body aches, shortness of breath, fever, runny nose, congestion, nausea,  
115 vomiting, diarrhea, loss of taste or smell) was recorded for each participant, including the date of  
116 symptom onset. Participants whose symptoms started on the day of testing were classified as  
117 Day 0. The study was reviewed by the Massachusetts Department of Public Health IRB and  
118 deemed not human subjects research.

119

### 120 Swab collection procedure

121 Cars with consented patients were marked with a glass marker, notifying the specimen collector  
122 to collect two AN swabs rather than one. Swab collection details are in Supplementary Methods;

123 in brief, collection involved swabbing both nostrils with each swab and operators alternated  
124 which swab was collected first (for RT-PCR vs. CareStart). CareStart swabs were captured in an  
125 empty sterile tube and taken to the testing trailer by a designated “runner.” Time of sample  
126 collection was recorded, and CareStart tests were initiated within an hour of collection.

127

#### 128 Access Bio CareStart COVID-19 Antigen test performance

129 The test was performed by trained operators (Master’s or PhD level laboratorians) according to  
130 the manufacturer instructions for use (IFU) [12]; note that testing of individuals with symptoms  
131 >5 days or without symptoms is off-label. Details of kit storage, quality control, and testing and  
132 results reporting procedures are in Supplementary Methods.

133

#### 134 RT-PCR assay

135 Dry AN swabs were collected per site routine and transported at room temperature to the Broad  
136 Institute for testing using the CRSP SARS-CoV-2 Real-time Reverse Transcriptase (RT)-PCR  
137 Diagnostic Assay under EUA [13]. Details are in Supplementary Methods.

138

#### 139 Results reporting

140 All positive CareStart results were verbally reported by phone to individuals the same day by the  
141 Massachusetts Department of Public Health (DPH). Participants with positive CareStart results  
142 were informed that the Ag result was presumptive positive and that they should isolate until they  
143 received their confirmatory RT-PCR result in 1-2 days. If the RT-PCR result was negative, they  
144 could discontinue isolation. RT-PCR results were provided to the patient by the Lawrence  
145 General Hospital’s portal or by walk up to a designated location at the Lawrence General  
146 Hospital. RT-PCR results were reported to DPH through routine electronic laboratory reporting

147 mechanisms and individuals with positive results were referred to local boards of health or the  
148 Community Tracing Collaborative for instruction on isolation and case investigation for contact  
149 tracing.

150

### 151 Statistical analysis

152 Sensitivity, specificity, negative predictive value (NPV), and positive predictive value (PPV) for  
153 the CareStart test were calculated using the RT-PCR result as the reference. 95% CI were  
154 calculated using the Clopper-Pearson method. Analyses utilized Microsoft Excel and GraphPad  
155 Prism.

156

### 157 **Results:**

158

159 Two different lots of CareStart kits were used for the study. Each operator was able to set up and  
160 read 20 tests per hour, and two operators were able to manage testing of samples coming from  
161 two drive-through lanes. 1493/1498 (99.7%) tests were initiated within 1 hour of collection (a  
162 window approved by the test manufacturer prior to study start); the median interval between  
163 sample collection and test initiation was 31 minutes (range 12–103 min) and the 5 tests  
164 performed at  $\geq 1$  hour were all negative (both Ag and paired RT-PCR results). All tests were read  
165 within the requisite 5 minute window per the EUA IFU [12]. Temperature and humidity in the  
166 testing trailer (Supplementary Methods) from 7:30AM-6:00PM ranged from 70.5-74.3°F and  
167 11.7-40.9%, respectively. All testing and kit storage temperatures met manufacturer  
168 recommendations [12].

169

170 Of 1603 participants [excluding those with invalid or missing RT-PCR results (n=48) and those  
171 with missing clinical data (n=57)], 1498 had paired RT-PCR/CareStart results and complete

172 symptom data, including 221 asymptomatic children, 1036 asymptomatic adults, 32 symptomatic  
173 children, and 209 symptomatic adults. Symptomatic individuals were further classified by days  
174 (D) since symptom onset; both cutoffs of  $\leq 5D$  and  $\leq 7D$  of symptoms were evaluated given that  
175 the CareStart test EUA is for individuals within 5D of symptom onset [12], but 7D is a window  
176 used by several other commercial Ag RDTs [3]. Clinical data for the study population are  
177 presented in Table 1 (demographics) and Supplementary Tables 1 and 2 (symptoms).

178

#### 179 CareStart performance in adults and children ( $\leq 18$ years old)

180 Sensitivity, specificity, PPV and NPV calculations for CareStart results vs. RT-PCR results as  
181 the reference, for each clinical subgroup, are presented in Table 2. Tables with data for each  
182 subgroup are presented in Supplementary Table 3.

183 Sensitivity in adults with symptoms  $\leq 5D$  was 84.8%, similar to that in the CareStart IFU (87.2%)  
184 [12]. Sensitivity in children with symptoms  $\leq 5D$  was 85.7%. Specificity in these symptomatic  
185 adults and children were 97.2% and 89.5%, respectively. Relative to symptomatic individuals,  
186 sensitivity in asymptomatic adults and children was lower at 50.0% and 51.4%, respectively,  
187 while specificity was higher (99.1% and 97.8%, respectively).

188

#### 189 Discordant analysis and analysis of Ct values

190 There were 21 false positive CareStart results across all 1498 individuals tested, including 8  
191 asymptomatic adults, 4 asymptomatic children, 3 children with symptoms  $\leq 7D$ , 3 adults with  
192 symptoms  $\leq 7D$ , and 3 adults with symptoms  $> 7D$ . All 21 false positives were scored as faint  
193 bands by both independent readers, and there was nothing unusual noted about band  
194 morphology. One in 21 swabs and two in 21 swabs had minimal and moderate blood,  
195 respectively; no excess mucus was observed. Ninety-nine false negative CareStart results were



196 found in 1498 individuals; 5/99 swabs had been minimally bloody and 1/99 had excess mucous.  
197 No correlation was observed between false positive or false negative CareStart results and  
198 presence of symptoms of congestion/rhinorrhea, order of swabbing (Ag vs. RT-PCR), time  
199 between sample collection and test initiation, or test kit lot.

200  
201 Distributions of Ct values for RT-PCR positive symptomatic (by days post symptom onset) and  
202 asymptomatic children and adults are shown in Figure 1; false negative vs. true positive paired  
203 CareStart results are indicated for all individuals. As expected, false negative CareStart results  
204 were paired with RT-PCR tests with higher Ct values. Sensitivity was evaluated at three different  
205 Ct cutoffs:  $\leq 25$ ,  $\leq 30$ ,  $\leq 35$  (Supplementary Table 4). Sensitivity in all subgroups combined  
206 (n=234 RT-PCR-positive individuals) was 96.3% with Ct  $\leq 25$ , 79.6% with  $\leq 30$ , and 61.4% with  
207  $\leq 35$ . Band strength (1 = faint, n = 45; 2 = medium, n = 11; 3 = strong, n = 79) as interpreted by  
208 the primary reader for the 135 true positive CareStart tests correlated clearly with Ct value, with  
209 median Ct (IQR) of 24.7 (21.8-27.8), 22.8 (19.9-24.5), and 18.0 (15.7-20.4), respectively, as  
210 shown in Figure 2. Five of 99 false negative CareStart results had a paired RT-PCR Ct  $\leq 25$  (1  
211 child, 4 adults), and 43/99 had paired Ct  $\leq 30$ ; the median (IQR) Ct value for the 99 individuals  
212 with false negative CareStart results was 32.0 (28.7-34.5). Distribution of the 99 false negative  
213 results among clinical subgroups is shown in the 2x2 tables in Supplementary Table 3.

214

### 215 Operational findings

216 Inter-operator agreement was excellent, with the two readers agreeing on the positive versus  
217 negative result for 1490/1498 (99.5%) CareStart tests. The 8 discordant reads were all faint  
218 positive vs. negative. The two readers disagreed on the strength of the positive band (faint vs.  
219 medium vs. strong) in 7 cases. Overall, readers noted that detection of faint positive bands and

220 distinguishing them from negative results required very close observation and good lighting,  
221 particularly due to the blue color of a faint positive band potentially resembling a shadow. A  
222 subset of 10 extracted samples with positive CareStart results were retested four hours later (as  
223 per the IFU [12], samples can sit for up to 4 hours in extraction buffer before testing) and all 10  
224 repeat results were qualitatively the same as the original results.

225

226 Operators noted that the volume of extraction buffer absorbed by the swab head was  
227 inconsistent, and that it was sometimes difficult to elute sufficient volume from the head of the  
228 swab for testing (a process that requires squeezing the sides of the extraction vial [12]). This  
229 issue required careful observation and, ultimately, experience to overcome. Additionally,  
230 operators noted that the polyester swab head did not seem completely stable (occasional apparent  
231 unravelling of the head surface, at an anecdotal rate of up to 5/200 tests per day). Coincidentally,  
232 the same swab brand was already in use for RT-PCR testing at this site, making it possible to  
233 confirm that this “unravelling” at the time of patient swabbing had already been observed over  
234 an extended time period with this particular swab. The operators found that a good deal of force  
235 was required to fit the caps on the extraction vials, and that the cap did not “click” as per the  
236 IFU, leading to concerns about spillage; they also found that peeling the foil off of the extraction  
237 vial was difficult and sometimes led to dripping of buffer and slippery gloves. Each skilled  
238 laboratorian was able to perform and read ~20 tests per hour; operators felt that throughput was  
239 limited by the short read time window (5’). No invalid CareStart test results were observed.

240

#### 241 **Discussion:**

242

243 The development of Ag RDTs offers the opportunity to dramatically expand COVID-19 testing  
244 capacity and also raises critical questions about how these tests could and should be used. Field

245 evaluation of an Ag RDT at POC in the settings and populations of intended use can add  
246 tremendously to the performance data available in manufacturer package inserts and guide test  
247 deployment. Gaps in performance data, particularly test performance in asymptomatic adults  
248 and both symptomatic and asymptomatic children, must be filled in order to optimally deploy Ag  
249 RDTs.

250 Prior to this study, only minimal data for performance of the CareStart test in symptomatic  
251 individuals was available in the manufacturer's IFU [12]. In order to understand how well the  
252 CareStart RDT could perform in both symptomatic and asymptomatic adults and children in a  
253 real-world but also best-case testing scenario, we implemented the test at a high-volume  
254 community testing site already experienced in collecting AN samples for RT-PCR. The  
255 CareStart test was performed by trained laboratory personnel, with careful attention paid to  
256 sample collection, results documentation, and quality control.

257

258 We found that the CareStart test had high sensitivity in individuals with highest viral burden  
259 (96.3% sensitive with paired PCR Ct value  $\leq 25$ ) and moderate sensitivity (84.8/85.7%) in  
260 symptomatic adults/children ( $\leq 5D$  of symptoms), respectively (acceptable per the FDA's target  
261 of  $\geq 80\%$  [14, 15]). Sensitivity in symptomatic individuals with  $\leq 5D$  of symptoms (the time  
262 frame recommended in the EUA IFU; [12]) was comparable to sensitivity in those with  $\leq 7D$  of  
263 symptoms (the time frame recommended for some other Ag RDTs like BinaxNOW[16]).

264 Sensitivity in asymptomatic adults and children was substantially lower than that in symptomatic  
265 individuals, which may correspond with the broad viral load distribution observed in this  
266 population (likely capturing early and late infections given unknown disease onset). Thus, the  
267 test does not appear to be optimal for ruling out SARS-CoV-2 infection in asymptomatic adults  
268 or children; use in serial testing programs and for testing of contacts of known cases deserves

269 independent study. FDA does provide guidance for consideration of serial Ag testing if the  
270 sensitivity is lower, e.g., 70% [14, 15].

271

272 It should be noted that in all groups, CareStart sensitivity followed Ct value distribution, with  
273 96.3% sensitivity observed in all participants with  $Ct \leq 25$  and 79.6% in those with  $Ct \leq 30$ .

274 Although false negative CareStart results were largely confined to those perhaps least likely to  
275 transmit SARS-CoV-2, the sensitivity of the CareStart test by Ct threshold cutoff was lower than  
276 observed in our recent study of the Abbott BinaxNOW in the same testing site [6] (99.3% with  
277  $Ct \leq 25$ , 95.8% with  $\leq 30$ , and 81.2% with  $\leq 35$ ). For the RT-PCR assay used in this study, Ct  
278 values of 25, 30, and 35 correspond to approximately  $5.4 \times 10^5$ ,  $1.7 \times 10^4$ , and  $5.5 \times 10^2$  copies/mL,  
279 respectively (Niall Lennon, personal communication; Supplementary Methods). The sources of  
280 the lower CareStart sensitivity are unknown, but one clear possibility is the dilution of the swab  
281 in extraction buffer in the CareStart test format.

282

283 Unexpectedly, we found that specificity of the CareStart test was lower in symptomatic people  
284 than in asymptomatic people: specificity in adults/children within 5D of symptoms were  
285 97.2%/89.5% and in asymptomatic adults/children were 99.1%/97.8%, respectively. This pattern  
286 was not observed in our BinaxNOW study (100% specificity in people within 7D of symptoms,  
287 and 99.6%/99.0% specificity in asymptomatic adults/children, respectively [6]) nor in the Access  
288 Bio prospective AN swab study detailed in the CareStart EUA IFU (100% specificity in  
289 symptomatic individuals [12]). This specificity is also lower than that observed in a number of  
290 other field studies of visually-read Ag RDTs, including the BinaxNOW, SD Biosensor SD Q,  
291 and Abbott PanBio RDTs (>99% for all, [4-10]). This finding might suggest a pre-analytical  
292 issue unique to this test or to this study (e.g., mucus on the swab, or the swab itself), but we did

293 not see any obvious overrepresentation of either nasal congestion/rhinorrhea or visible  
294 blood/mucus on the swabs of those with false positive results. Cross-reactivity with another  
295 pathogen in symptomatic patients is another possible explanation. No unusual band  
296 morphologies were noted in the 21 false positive results, and all were faint positive bands. We  
297 noted occasional “unravelling” of the swab head which might have contributed; because this  
298 issue was infrequent, we did not document when it occurred and thus are unable to correlate this  
299 event with false positive results. The overall variability we observed in absorption of extraction  
300 buffer by the swab head and subsequent elution volume may or may not have contributed to  
301 lower specificity. We note that the swab used for this study [SteriPack Sterile Polyester Spun  
302 Swab, 3” (Lakeland, Florida)] is the same swab that was used in the CareStart EUA study and  
303 will be included in the AN kit going forward. This same swab has been consistently used for  
304 RT-PCR testing over the past year at this site, with the same occasional “unravelling” noted at  
305 the time of sample collection, indicating that this does not appear to be a lot issue. Logistics of  
306 sample collection and testing in high volume at the site did require a window of time between  
307 collection and testing (median 31 minutes), but it was not possible to put each swab  
308 “immediately” into extraction buffer as stated in the IFU [12], and our window of one hour  
309 between collection and testing was pre-approved by the test manufacturer. Test specificity will  
310 need further confirmation in future studies.

311  
312 Our study yielded some important operational findings relevant to test implementation.  
313 Inter-operator agreement on positive/negative results was near 100%, confirming that only one  
314 person is needed to read each test result. The main challenge to reading the test was  
315 distinguishing a faint positive band from a negative result; operators attributed this in part to the

316 blue color of the faint positive band resembling a shadow, and recommended use of a strong  
317 light source in close proximity to the test device during test reading.

318 The requirement for extraction of the swab in buffer introduced multiple operational challenges.  
319 The volume of extraction buffer absorbed by the swab head appeared to be inconsistent, and  
320 operators sometimes had difficulty eluting sufficient volume from the head of the swab for  
321 testing [by squeezing the sides of the extraction vial as per the IFU; [12]]. This issue required  
322 careful observation and over time became easier for the operators. The occasional unravelling of  
323 the swab head in buffer (anecdotally, up to 5/200 tests/day) is described above. Operators noted  
324 that it was difficult to peel the foil off the extraction vial while wearing gloves. Additionally, a  
325 residual, small drop of buffer on the inner lid of the foil sometimes made gloves slippery with  
326 buffer, and operators had difficulty fitting the caps securely on the extraction vials, both of which  
327 led to concern about dropping vials during the extraction step. Each skilled laboratorian in the  
328 study was able to perform and read ~20 tests per hour; although the test only takes 10' to  
329 perform, the short read time window (5') required frequent breaks in test setup and thus  
330 decreased throughput.

331 In sum, these operational challenges indicate that dedicated operator training, beyond simply  
332 reading the IFU, is warranted for performance of this test to highlight potential failure modes.  
333 This recommendation for additional training is consistent with studies that have suggested that  
334 specific training in reading positive Ag RDT results may be needed to achieve high specificity  
335 [7, 8], and others that have suggested that the level of training of the operator impacts Ag RDT  
336 clinical sensitivity [17].

337

338 Our study had some limitations. We recognize that the comparator in our study was RT-PCR  
339 performed on an AN swab, as opposed to an NP swab, which is still considered the reference

340 method by the FDA [18]. This dual AN swab study design was also used for our recent  
341 BinaxNOW study [6]. Although AN swabs have had lower sensitivity than NP swabs in some  
342 studies, the sensitivity is highly dependent on the sampling technique and assay used [19]. The  
343 dry AN swab sampling method used in this study has been shown to have similar sensitivity to  
344 paired NP swabs in transport media [13]. We also note that a recent comparison study  
345 demonstrated that Ag RDT performance with nasal mid-turbinate swabs was similar to Ag RDT  
346 performance with NP swabs [11]. The time interval between sample collection and test initiation  
347 in this study is discussed above. Finally, we recognize that our symptomatic pediatric cohort  
348 was relatively small and thus the confidence intervals on all performance estimates relatively  
349 wide.

350

351 In summary, the Access Bio CareStart Ag RDT had high sensitivity in individuals with high viral  
352 burden ( $Ct \leq 25$ ) and moderate sensitivity in symptomatic individuals overall. Observed  
353 specificity was lower than estimates in the manufacturer IFU, slightly lower than some other  
354 visually-read Ag RDT products on the market, and unexpectedly lower in symptomatic versus  
355 asymptomatic individuals, warranting additional study. Excellent inter-operator agreement was  
356 observed, but operational challenges indicate that operator training is warranted to highlight  
357 possible test failure modes. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention recommendations for use  
358 of Ag tests were recently updated and address use of Ag tests (with/without NAAT confirmation)  
359 in various testing scenarios based on data to date [20].

360

### 361 **Funding**

362 This work was funded by the MA Department of Public Health. The community testing site and  
363 the work of N.R.P. were funded by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention Building and  
364 Enhancing Epidemiology, Laboratory and Health Information Systems Capacity in

365 Massachusetts – Enhancing Detection COVID Supplement (Grant # 6 NU50CK000518-01-08).

366 CareStart kits were donated by the manufacturer.

367

368 **Conflict of Interest**

369 None of the authors have conflicts of interest to declare.

370

371 **Acknowledgments**

372 We thank Kerin Milesky (Office of Emergency Preparedness, Massachusetts Department of

373 Public Health); Samantha Phillips, Bruce Hugabone, James McGarry, Robert Martucelli, Robert

374 Zalewski (Massachusetts Emergency Management Agency), and Christina Dispena

375 (Massachusetts State Fire Services) for assistance with logistical and support assistance at the

376 Lawrence General Hospital Stop the Spread site.

377 This publication was supported by Cooperative Agreement Number 1U60OE000103, funded by

378 the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention through the Association of Public Health

379 Laboratories.

380 The findings and conclusions in this report are those of the authors and do not necessarily

381 represent the official position of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) nor the

382 official views of the Association of Public Health Laboratories (APHL). Use of trade names and

383 commercial sources is for identification only and does not imply endorsement by the U.S.

384 Department of Health and Human Services or CDC.

385



386 **References**

387

- 388 1. Johns Hopkins University. COVID-19 Dashboard by the Center for Systems Science and  
389 Engineering (CCSE) at Johns Hopkins University. <https://coronavirus.jhu.edu/map.html>  
390 (Accessed February 12, 2020).
- 391 2. Centers for Disease Control. CDC COVID Data Tracker. [https://covid.cdc.gov/covid-](https://covid.cdc.gov/covid-data-tracker/#testing_testsperformed)  
392 [data-tracker/#testing\\_testsperformed](https://covid.cdc.gov/covid-data-tracker/#testing_testsperformed) (Accessed February 12, 2020).
- 393 3. Food and Drug Administration. Individual EUAs for Antigen Diagnostic Tests for SARS-  
394 CoV-2. [https://www.fda.gov/medical-devices/coronavirus-disease-2019-covid-19-](https://www.fda.gov/medical-devices/coronavirus-disease-2019-covid-19-emergency-use-authorizations-medical-devices/vitro-diagnostics-euas#individual-antigen)  
395 [emergency-use-authorizations-medical-devices/vitro-diagnostics-euas#individual-](https://www.fda.gov/medical-devices/coronavirus-disease-2019-covid-19-emergency-use-authorizations-medical-devices/vitro-diagnostics-euas#individual-antigen)  
396 [antigen](https://www.fda.gov/medical-devices/coronavirus-disease-2019-covid-19-emergency-use-authorizations-medical-devices/vitro-diagnostics-euas#individual-antigen). (Accessed February 10, 2020).
- 397 4. Krüger LJ, Gaeddert M, Köppel L, et al. Evaluation of the accuracy, ease of use and limit  
398 of detection of novel, rapid, antigen-detecting point-of-care diagnostics for SARS-CoV-2.  
399 medRxiv **2020**: 2020.10.01.20203836.
- 400 5. Iglói Z, Velzing J, van Beek J, et al. Clinical evaluation of the Roche/SD Biosensor rapid  
401 antigen test with symptomatic, non-hospitalized patients in a municipal health service  
402 drive-through testing site. medRxiv **2020**: 2020.11.18.20234104.
- 403 6. Pollock NR, Jacobs JR, Tran K, et al. Performance and Implementation Evaluation of the  
404 Abbott BinaxNOW Rapid Antigen Test in a High-throughput Drive-through Community  
405 Testing Site in Massachusetts. J Clin Microbiol, in press.
- 406 7. Pilarowski G, Lebel P, Sunshine S, et al. Performance characteristics of a rapid SARS-  
407 CoV-2 antigen detection assay at a public plaza testing site in San Francisco. J Infect Dis  
408 **2021**.

- 409 8. Pilarowski G, Marquez C, Rubio L, et al. Field performance and public health response  
410 using the BinaxNOW™ Rapid SARS-CoV-2 antigen detection assay during  
411 community-based testing. *Clin Infect Dis* **2020**.
- 412 9. Albert E, Torres I, Bueno F, et al. Field evaluation of a rapid antigen test (Panbio  
413 COVID-19 Ag Rapid Test Device) for COVID-19 diagnosis in primary healthcare  
414 centres. *Clin Microbiol Infect* **2020**.
- 415 10. Prince-Guerra JL, Almendares O, Nolen LD, et al. Evaluation of Abbott BinaxNOW  
416 Rapid Antigen Test for SARS-CoV-2 Infection at Two Community-Based Testing Sites -  
417 Pima County, Arizona, November 3-17, 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep* **2021**;  
418 70(3): 100-5.
- 419 11. Lindner AK, Nikolai O, Kausch F, et al. Head-to-head comparison of SARS-CoV-2  
420 antigen-detecting rapid test with self-collected anterior nasal swab versus professional-  
421 collected nasopharyngeal swab. *Eur Respir Journal*, in press.
- 422 12. Access Bio. Package Insert for the Access Bio CareStart COVID-19 Antigen Test.  
423 <https://www.fda.gov/media/142919/download>.
- 424 13. Clinical Research Sequencing Platform (CRSP), LLC at the Broad Institute of MIT and  
425 Harvard. CRSP SARS-CoV-2 Real-time Reverse Transcriptase (RT)-PCR Diagnostic  
426 Assay. <https://www.fda.gov/media/139858/download>.
- 427 14. Food and Drug Administration. Policy for Coronavirus Disease-2019 Tests During the  
428 Public Health Emergency (Revised), May 11, **2020**.  
429 <https://www.fda.gov/media/135659/download>.
- 430 15. Food and Drug Administration. In Vitro Diagnostics EUAs, Antigen Template for Test  
431 Developers, October 26, **2020**. <https://www.fda.gov/medical-devices/coronavirus->

- 432 [disease-2019-covid-19-emergency-use-authorizations-medical-devices/vitro-diagnostics-](#)  
433 [euas.](#)
- 434 16. Abbott. Package Insert for the Abbott BinaxNOW COVID-19 Ag CARD. **2020**;  
435 <https://www.fda.gov/media/141570/download>.
- 436 17. Preliminary report from the Joint PHE Porton Down & University of Oxford SARS-CoV-  
437 2 test development and validation cell:  
438 Rapid evaluation of Lateral Flow Viral Antigen detection devices (LFDs) for mass  
439 community testing.  
440 [https://www.ox.ac.uk/sites/files/oxford/media\\_wysiwyg/UK%20evaluation\\_PHE%20Por](https://www.ox.ac.uk/sites/files/oxford/media_wysiwyg/UK%20evaluation_PHE%20Porton%20Down%20%20University%20of%20Oxford_final.pdf)  
441 [ton%20Down%20%20University%20of%20Oxford\\_final.pdf](https://www.ox.ac.uk/sites/files/oxford/media_wysiwyg/UK%20evaluation_PHE%20Porton%20Down%20%20University%20of%20Oxford_final.pdf).
- 442 18. Food and Drug Administration. FAQs on Testing for SARS-CoV-2.  
443 [https://www.fda.gov/medical-devices/coronavirus-covid-19-and-medical-devices/faqs-](https://www.fda.gov/medical-devices/coronavirus-covid-19-and-medical-devices/faqs-testing-sars-cov-2)  
444 [testing-sars-cov-2](https://www.fda.gov/medical-devices/coronavirus-covid-19-and-medical-devices/faqs-testing-sars-cov-2).
- 445 19. Lee RA, Herigon JC, Benedetti A, Pollock NR, Denkinger C. Performance of Saliva,  
446 Oropharyngeal Swabs, and Nasal Swabs for SARS-CoV-2 Molecular Detection: A  
447 Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *J Clin Microbiol* **2020**, in press.
- 448 20. Centers for Disease Control. Interim Guidance for Antigen Testing for SARS-CoV-2.  
449 December 5, 2020. [https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/lab/resources/antigen-](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/lab/resources/antigen-tests-guidelines.html)  
450 [tests-guidelines.html](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/lab/resources/antigen-tests-guidelines.html).

451

452

453

454 **Table 1**

455

456 **Clinical characteristics of adult and pediatric patients contributing paired samples**

457

	<b>Adults, symptomatic (n=209)</b>	<b>Adults, asymptomatic (n=1036)</b>	<b>Children, symptomatic (n=32)</b>	<b>Children, asymptomatic (n=221)</b>
<b>Age in years, n (%)</b>				
<7	n/a	n/a	13 (40.6)	60 (27.2)
7-13	n/a	n/a	12 (37.5)	73 (33.0)
14-18	n/a	n/a	7 (21.9)	88 (39.8)
19-29	58 (27.8)	313 (30.2)	n/a	n/a
30-49	102 (48.8)	381 (36.8)	n/a	n/a
50-69	42 (20.1)	290 (28.0)	n/a	n/a
70 and older	7 (3.3)	52 (5.0)	n/a	n/a
<b>Sex, % female</b>	57.4	53.0	56.3	53.4
<b>Days of symptoms prior to COVID-19 test, median (IQR)</b>	3 (2,6) <sup>a</sup>	n/a	3 (2,4) <sup>b</sup>	n/a

458 IQR, interquartile range; n/a, not applicable

459 <sup>a</sup>Range 0-44 days

460 <sup>b</sup>Range 1-20 days

461

462

463  
464  
465  
466  
467  
468

**Table 2**

**Performance of the Access Bio CareStart versus RT-PCR (reference method) for detection of SARS-CoV-2 in anterior nasal swab samples from adults and children (≤18)**

Age	Group	N	Prevalence	Sensitivity (95% CI)	Specificity (95% CI)	PPV (95% CI)	NPV (95% CI)
All	Sx + ASx	1498	15.6%	57.7% (51.1 – 64.1)	98.3% (97.5 – 99.0)	86.5% (80.6 – 90.9)	92.6% (91.5 – 93.6)
Pediatric	Sx + ASx	253	18.2%	56.5% (41.1 – 71.1)	96.6% (93.2 – 98.6)	78.8% (63.2 – 88.9)	90.9% (87.8 – 93.3)
Adult	Sx + ASx	1245	15.1%	58.0% (50.6 – 65.1)	98.7% (97.8 – 99.3)	88.6% (82.0 – 93.0)	93.0% (91.8 – 94.0)
Pediatric	ASx	221	16.7%	51.4% (34.4 – 68.1)	97.8% (94.5 – 99.4)	82.6% (63.2 – 92.9)	90.9% (87.8 – 93.3)
Adult	ASx	1036	12.4%	50.0% (41.0 – 59.0)	99.1% (98.3 – 99.6)	88.9% (79.8 – 94.2)	93.3% (92.2 – 94.3)
Pediatric	Sx ≤5D	26	26.9%	85.7% (42.1 – 99.6)	89.5% (66.9 – 98.7)	75.0% (43.8 – 92.0)	94.5% (73.4 – 99.1)
Adult	Sx ≤5D	152	30.3%	84.8% (71.1 – 93.7)	97.2% (92.0 – 99.4)	92.9% (80.9 – 97.6)	93.6% (88.1 – 96.7)
Pediatric	Sx ≤7D	27	25.9%	85.7% (42.1 – 99.6)	85.0% (62.1 – 96.8)	66.6% (40.3 – 85.6)	94.5% (73.4 – 99.1)
Adult	Sx ≤7D	169	30.2%	84.3% (71.4 – 93.0)	97.5% (92.8 – 99.5)	93.5% (82.4 – 97.8)	93.5% (88.4 – 96.5)
Pediatric	Sx >7D	5	40.0%	50.0% (1.3 – 98.7)	100.0% (29.2 – 100.0)	100.0%	75.0% (42.9 – 92.3)
Adult	Sx >7D	40	22.5%	22.2% (2.8 – 60.0)	90.3% (74.3 – 98.0)	40.0% (11.6 – 77.3)	80.0% (73.5 – 85.3)

469 CI, confidence interval; PPV, positive predictive value; NPV, negative predictive value; Sx,  
470 symptomatic; ASx, asymptomatic; D, days  
471  
472


473 **Figure 1**

474

475 **Distribution of Cycle Threshold (Ct) Values in RT-PCR-positive Children and Adults by**  
476 **Days Post Symptom Onset**

477

478



479

480 Ct values for each RT-PCR-positive individual are shown; red circles indicate false negative  
481 Access Bio CareStart results and black circles, true positive CareStart results. Participants  
482 whose symptoms started on the day of testing are indicated as Day 0. RT-PCR, real-time reverse  
483 transcription polymerase chain reaction; ASx, asymptomatic.

484

485


486 **Figure 2**

487

488 **Correlation of Cycle Threshold (Ct) value with CareStart band strength**

489

490



491

492

493 Correlation of Access Bio CareStart test band strength (1= faint, n = 45; 2 = medium, n = 11; 3 =  
494 strong, n = 79, as interpreted by the first reader) and RT-PCR Cycle Threshold (Ct) value from a  
495 swab collected in parallel are shown for the 135 individuals with true positive CareStart tests.

496 Median Ct values (IQR) were 24.7 (21.8-27.8), 22.8 (19.9-24.5), and 18.0 (15.7-20.4) for Groups  
497 1, 2, and 3, respectively.

498

499

500

501

502

503

504