

Analytical comparison of nine SARS-CoV-2 antigen-detecting rapid diagnostic tests for emerging SARS-CoV-2 variants

Meriem Bekliz¹, Kenneth Adea¹, Manel Essaidi-Laziosi¹, Jilian A Sacks², Camille Escadafal², Laurent Kaiser^{3,4,5}, Isabella Eckerle^{1,3,5*}

¹Department of Microbiology and Molecular Medicine, University of Geneva, Geneva, Switzerland.

²FIND, Geneva, Switzerland.

³Division of Infectious Diseases, Geneva University Hospitals, 1205 Geneva, Switzerland.

⁴Laboratory of Virology, Division of Infectious Diseases and Division of Laboratory Medicine, University Hospitals of Geneva & Faculty of Medicine, University of Geneva, 1205 Geneva, Switzerland.

⁵Geneva Centre for Emerging Viral Diseases, University Hospitals Geneva, and University of Geneva, Switzerland.

**Corresponding author:* Isabella Eckerle, Geneva Centre for Emerging Viral Diseases, Geneva University Hospitals, Geneva, Switzerland. Geneva University Hospitals, Rue Gabrielle-Perret-Gentil 4, 1205 Geneva, Switzerland.

Tel: +41223729820;

Email: isabella.eckerle@hcuge.ch

Keywords

SARS-CoV-2; COVID-19; coronavirus; rapid diagnostic test; variant of concern; variant of interest; sensitivity

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

Abstract

Several SARS-CoV-2 variants of concern/interest (VOC/VOI) emerged recently, with VOCs outcompeting earlier lineages on a global scale. To date, few data on routine diagnostic performance for VOC/VOIs are available. Here, we investigate the analytical performance of nine commercially available antigen-detecting rapid diagnostic tests (Ag-RDTs) for VOC B.1.1.7, B.1.351, P.1 and VOI P.2 with cultured SARS-CoV-2. Comparable or higher sensitivity was observed for VOC/VOI compared to a non-VOC/VOI early-pandemic virus for all Ag-RDTs.

The study

Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) antigen-detecting rapid diagnostic tests (Ag-RDTs) provide laboratory-independent results at the point of care and thus are powerful tools for public health interventions. Recently, clinical and analytical studies showed SARS-CoV-2 Ag-RDT detection thresholds correlate with the presence of infectious virus in symptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infections.^{1,2} However, the majority of Ag-RDT validation studies were done before SARS-CoV-2 variants of concern/interest (VOC/VOI) emerged, with the VOCs currently outcompeting earlier lineages.³ To date, data on routine diagnostic performance for VOC/VOIs is sparse.^{4,5} Furthermore, clinical validation studies comparing multiple VOCs in parallel are hardly feasible.

We investigated the analytical sensitivity of nine commercially available Ag-RDTs using cultured SARS-CoV-2, comparing lineage B.1.610 (first pandemic wave) with VOCs B.1.1.7, B.1.351, P.1 and VOI P.2.

Briefly, infectious titers and RNA copies of virus stocks grown in VeroE6 were quantified by plaque titration and RT-PCR (E gene), respectively. Isolates were tested in serial dilutions, starting with 5.44 Log₁₀ PFU/mL, except for P.1 which had a maximum titer of 4.24 Log₁₀ PFU/mL. An infectious titer of 5.44 Log₁₀ PFU/mL corresponded to 10.26, 12.11, 9.86 and 11.23 Log₁₀ RNA copies/mL for B.1.610, B.1.1.7, B.1.351 and P.2, respectively. For P.1, the infectious titer of 4.24 Log₁₀ PFU/mL corresponded to 11.81 Log₁₀ RNA copies/mL.

Ag-RDT assays were performed according to the manufacturers' instructions, with the exception that 5 µL of virus dilution was directly added to the proprietary buffer, and then applied to the Ag-RDT in duplicates under BSL3 conditions. Results were read independently by two individuals. Any visible test band in the presence of a visible control band was considered as positive. Ag-RDT buffer without virus was used as negative control.

When analyzing results normalized to PFU/mL, comparable or better performance to the early-pandemic lineage was observed for B.1.1.7, B.1.351, P.1 and P.2 for all assays (**Figure**). Overall sensitivity and specificity for individual isolates varied between Ag-RDTs, with the best-performing assay positive at dilutions as low as 2.43 Log₁₀ PFU/mL and the lower-sensitive assays positive at 4.54 Log₁₀ PFU/mL. Consistently, the highest sensitivity was seen for P.1 and P.2. Although testing for analytical sensitivity with cultured virus cannot fully replace clinical data, our data provide reassuring results for the use of Ag-RDTs to diagnose VOCs. Phenotypic properties, such as a remarkable difference in the RNA:infectious virus ratio, could hint at production of defective viral particles. Their impact on diagnostic test performance should be further investigated.

Funding


This work was supported by the Swiss National Science Foundation (Grant Nr. 196383), the Fondation Ancrage Bienfaisance du Groupe Pictet, and the Foundation for Innovative New Diagnostics (FIND). The Swiss National Science Foundation and the Fondation Ancrage Bienfaisance du Groupe Pictet had no role in data collection, analysis, or interpretation. Ag-RDTs were provided by FIND and FIND was involved in methodology, data analysis, interpretation and writing.

Acknowledgments

We thank Erik Boehm for language editing.

Conflict of Interest Statement.

The authors have no conflicts of interest to declare.



Figure

Heat map of analytical sensitivity of nine Ag-RDTs assays with SARS-CoV-2 variants of concern B.1.1.7., B.1.351, P.1 and variant of interest P.2 in comparison to an early-pandemic SARS-CoV-2 isolate (B.1.610), based on Log₁₀ PFU/mL. Ag-RDTs used were I) Genedia COVID-19 Ag (Green Cross Medical Science Corp); II) Sure Status (Premier Medical Corporation); III) Joysbio SARS-CoV-2 Antigen Rapid Test Kit (Joysbio); IV) Edinburgh Genetics (Edinburgh); V) 2019-nCoV Antigen test (Wondfo), VI); Standard Q COVID-19 Ag (SD Biosensor/Roche); VII) Panbio COVID-19 Ag Rapid test device (Abbott); VIII) NowCheck Covid-19 Ag test (Bionote) and IX) Ichroma Covid-19 Ag (Boditech). All Ag-RDTs are based on detection of the nucleocapsid protein of SARS-CoV-2.

References

1. Nordgren J, Sharma S, Olsson H, et al. SARS-CoV-2 rapid antigen test: High sensitivity to detect infectious virus. *J Clin Virol* 2021; **140**: 104846.
2. Corman VM, Haage VC, Bleicker T, et al. Comparison of seven commercial SARS-CoV-2 rapid point-of-care antigen tests: a single-centre laboratory evaluation study. *Lancet Microbe* 2021.
3. WHO. Weekly epidemiological update on COVID-19 - 11 May 2021. <https://www.who.int/publications/m/item/weekly-epidemiological-update-on-covid-19---11-may-2021> (accessed 17.05.2021).
4. Jungnick S, Hobmaier B, Mautner L, et al. Detection of the new SARS-CoV-2 variants of concern B.1.1.7 and B.1.351 in five SARS-CoV-2 rapid antigen tests (RATs), Germany, March 2021. *Euro Surveill* 2021; **26**(16).
5. (PHE) PHE. Guidance SARS-CoV-2 lateral flow antigen tests: evaluation of VUI-202012/01. <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/sars-cov-2-lateral-flow-antigen-tests-evaluation-of-vui-20201201/sars-cov-2-lateral-flow-antigen-tests-evaluation-of-vui-20201201>.