

1 **Adaptable Automated Interpretation of Rapid Diagnostic Tests Using Few-Shot Learning**

2
3 Siddarth Arumugam^{1†}; Jiawei Ma^{2†}; Uzay Macar²; Guangxing Han³; Kathrine McAulay⁴; Darrell
4 Ingram⁵; Alex Ying¹; David A. M. Colburn¹; Robert Stanciu¹; Thomas Gryś⁴; Shih-Fu Chang^{2,3*};
5 Samuel K. Sia^{1*}

6
7 ¹ Department of Biomedical Engineering, Columbia University, New York, NY 10027, USA

8 ² Department of Computer Science, Columbia University, New York, NY 10027, USA

9 ³ Department of Electrical Engineering, Columbia University, New York, NY 10027, USA

10 ⁴ Department of Laboratory Medicine and Pathology, Mayo Clinic, Phoenix, AZ 85054, USA

11 ⁵ Safe Health Systems, Inc., Los Angeles, CA 90036, USA

12
13 † These authors contributed equally to this article.

14 * Co-corresponding authors.

15
16 **Key words:** Few-shot adaptation, rapid diagnostic tests, self-supervision, COVID-19, pandemic

17 **Abstract**

18
19
20 Point-of-care lateral-flow assays (LFAs) are becoming increasingly prevalent for
21 diagnosing individual patient disease status and surveying population disease prevalence in a
22 timely, scalable, and cost-effective manner, but a central challenge is to assure correct assay
23 operation and results interpretation as the assays are manually performed in decentralized
24 settings. A smartphone-based software can automate interpretation of an LFA kit, but such

25 algorithms typically require a very large number of images of assays tested with validated
26 specimens, which is challenging to collect for different assay kits, especially for those released
27 during a pandemic. Here, we present an approach – AutoAdapt LFA – that uses few-shot
28 learning, an approach used in other applications such as computer vision and robotics, for
29 accurate and automated interpretation of LFA kits that requires a small number of validated
30 images for training. The approach consists of three components: extraction of membrane and
31 zone areas from an image of the LFA kit, a self-supervised encoder that employs a feature
32 extractor trained with edge-filtered patterns, and few-shot adaptation that enables generalization
33 to new kits using limited validated images. From a base model pre-trained on a commercial LFA
34 kit, we demonstrated the ability of adapted models to interpret results from five new COVID-19
35 LFA kits (three detecting antigens for diagnosing active infection, and two detecting antibodies
36 for diagnosing past infection). Specifically, using just 10 to 20 images of each new kit, we
37 achieved accuracies of 99% to 100% for each kit. The server-hosted algorithm has an execution
38 time of approximately 4 seconds, which can potentially enable quality assurance and linkage to
39 care for users operating new LFAs in decentralized settings.
40

41 **Main text**

42

43 **Introduction**

44

45 Lateral-flow assays (LFAs) present an increasing opportunity for increasing accessibility
46 to diagnostic assays, but errors in assay operation and results interpretation hinder their
47 deployment in decentralized settings, such as primary care clinics and homes¹⁻⁵. For example,
48 improper assay operation could produce absent control bands; alternatively, failure to identify
49 the presence of faint bands or confusing the zone type (e.g., control vs. test bands) could lead to
50 an incorrect interpretation of overall assay result⁶. For example, in the COVID-19 pandemic, a
51 number of SARS-CoV-2 antigen tests are now approved for home use⁷ to support decentralized
52 testing; consequently, user errors from incorrect operation and results interpretation are also
53 likely to become more prominent in the coming months to years.

54

55 Image-processing algorithms to automate the interpretation of LFAs and rapid diagnostic
56 tests can potentially provide quality assurance to users in decentralized settings and reduce
57 incidence of these errors, but existing algorithms have shortcomings such as the need to use
58 images collected by smartphones with physical attachments^{5,8-14}, are designed to work
59 retrospectively with a library of pre-collected images^{15,16}, or require a large number of labelled
60 training images ranging in the hundreds^{17,18} for each assay kit. By comparison, an ideal
61 algorithm would be scalable in deployment (for example, working in real time with images
62 collected by a smartphone camera without an extra adapter) and would not require experimental
63 collection of a large number of expert-labelled images with validated clinical specimens across a

64 large and ever-changing roster of new LFAs, which is especially challenging to achieve during
65 public health emergencies.

66

67 In this study, we have developed 1) an end-to-end modular workflow to work with assay
68 kit images taken with a smartphone with no external adapters and 2) a trained algorithm that can
69 be adapted to a new assay kit with just 10 to 20 images of the new kit in order to accurately
70 interpret the result (**Fig. 1a**). The ideal algorithm should generalize to different LFA kits with
71 variations in color and size of bands^{1,19-22}: the color and intensity of bands depend on sizes and
72 shapes of gold nanoparticles^{20,23}, material properties of the membrane, and membrane
73 pretreatment steps^{20,21}; the sizes of bands depend on liquid-dispensing conditions and capillary
74 flow time^{20,21}. Here, we propose a few-shot adaptation strategy – which has been employed in
75 applications ranging from computer vision to robotics²⁴⁻²⁶ to learn a strong classifier for new
76 domains²⁷⁻³¹ – to mitigate the performance drop caused by domain shift stemming from image-
77 pattern variance, using only a few labeled images. In our few-shot model adaptation strategy,
78 zone areas from many images of a “base” kit are cropped and used to pre-train a feature-
79 extraction network that employs self-supervised learning with edge-filtered images. To adapt to
80 a new assay kit, zone areas from 10 to 20 images are cropped, and the pre-trained model from the
81 base model (shown as “B” in **Fig. 1a**) adjusts its weights to a model adapted to a new assay
82 (shown as “N” in **Fig. 1a**) using supervised contrastive learning. Thus, for the end user
83 operating a new assay kit, zone areas from an image of the kit are cropped, and the adapted
84 network automatically and accurately interprets the bands at each zone and overall assay result.

85

86 In this study, we pre-trained a base model using expert-labelled images from the
87 AssureTech EcoTest COVID-19 IgG/IgM Antibody Test, an assay authorized by FDA, and
88 adapted the model to interpret LFAs from five other commercial COVID-19 LFAs (**Fig. 1b**).
89 The five LFAs include three antigen tests (ACON Flowflex SARS-CoV-2 Antigen Rapid Test,
90 Anhui DeepBlue SARS-CoV-2 Antigen Test, and Jinwofu SARS-CoV-2 Antigen Rapid Test),
91 one antibody test (ACON SARS-CoV-2 IgG/IgM Antibody Test), and an AssureTech EcoTest
92 COVID-19 IgG/IgM Antibody Test kit that uses a different housing (denoted in the paper as
93 ‘EcoTest (housing 2)’) but retains use of the same LFA membrane (**Fig. 1b**). Like almost all
94 commercial LFAs, these kits share rectangular control and test bands, but differ in kit housing
95 dimensions and membrane dimensions, as well as number, spacing and color of bands (kit-
96 specific dimensions shown in **Supplementary Table 1**). To illustrate the challenge for
97 interpreting new assay kits, without few-shot adaptation, this pre-trained algorithm produced
98 incorrect predictions (both false positives and false negatives) due to variations in color and
99 intensities of bands and membranes across new LFA kits (**Fig. 1c**).

100

101 **Overview of pipeline**

102

103 In the AutoAdapt LFA algorithm (**Fig. 1d**), a user takes an image of an LFA kit, which
104 enters a cloud-hosted pipeline with an instance-segmentation model that corrects the orientation
105 and perspective of the raw image, segments the assay kit from background and the membrane
106 from assay kit, and crops individual zones (i.e., regions in the membrane corresponding to bands
107 and a portion of surrounding area) from the membrane. Next, images of zones enter a feature-
108 extraction network, which is learned in order to generate robust feature representation as unique

109 signatures to discriminate positive cases from negative cases under diverse conditions (e.g.,
110 color, intensity, and width of bands); the feature-extraction network also adapts to new LFA kits
111 with a small number of images. From latent feature vectors for each zone, a binary classifier
112 recognizes colored rectangular bands, the form factor seen in the vast majority of LFAs^{32,33}, and
113 determines whether a band is present or absent in each zone. Finally, an assessment of the LFA
114 kit result is obtained by comparing the output of the binary classifier with a lookup table
115 containing all combinations of possible zone-level classification results; this kit-level
116 classification is sent to the user's smartphone as an interpreted LFA result. The server- hosted
117 algorithm has a mean execution time of 3.55 ± 2.28 seconds. Overall, this rapid automated
118 interpretation pipeline could fit within a larger digital platform³⁴⁻³⁷ that collects demographic
119 data for epidemiology and provides instructions to carry out the test as well as follow-up linkage
120 to care; **Supplementary Fig. 1**.

121
122 To develop this pipeline, we framed the objective as learning the optimal parameters of
123 the feature-extraction network and the classifier module by minimizing the loss functions given a
124 set of training images for an assay kit. Unlike methods that require *de novo* training on a new
125 LFA kit, we developed two novel methods to achieve adaptation requiring only a small number
126 of images of new kits. First, to ensure the underlying feature representation is robust against
127 variations in the LFA images, we developed a feature extractor that learns to extract robust latent
128 representation of zone images for classification; these latent representations are also used to
129 reconstruct (decode) the edges associated with the images. This auxiliary edge reconstruction
130 task is in addition to the standard fully-supervised classification task and helps learn feature
131 representation for effective adaptation, which is based on the observation that edges in an image
132 tend to remain invariant in diverse LFA images. As shown in **Fig. 2a**, edge-preservation can be

133 learned in a self-supervised manner (not requiring manually-assigned labels), by using the output
134 of an automatic edge detection algorithm (Sobel filter³⁸) as the ground truth for decoding.

135 Second, as shown in **Fig. 2b**, our system performs supervised contrastive learning using a dataset
136 combining images from the new LFA kit and the base LFA kit and learns a new classifier for the
137 new kit. Here, the neural network model pre-trained on a set of labeled LFA images from the
138 base kit is adapted to a new target LFA, using 10 to 20 labelled training images of a new kit.

139

140 **Image pre-processing**

141

142 For model training as well as during inference, the first module corrected for skew and
143 extracted the zones from the images of LFA kit. This module first detected the orientation of the
144 kit and carried out perspective correction using the predicted segmentation mask of the LFA kit
145 (**Supplementary Fig. 2**). This mask was generated by using Mask R-CNN³⁹, an instance
146 segmentation model (more details in Methods). The kit membrane from the perspective corrected
147 image was then localized and individual test zones were cropped out using the kit-specific
148 dimensions listed in a JSON file. For this study, the test-specific dimensions, such as kit height,
149 kit width, membrane width, membrane height, and zone dimensions, were measured from images
150 of LFA kits using Adobe Photoshop v21.0.2 and saved as a JSON file. These dimensions could
151 be directly provided by the kit manufacturers in the future. To measure the accuracy of the
152 automatic membrane segmentation step, we measure the intersection over union (IoU) scores
153 between the segmented membrane and the manually annotated ground-truth membrane region.
154 IoU scores greater than 90% for all the assay kits (**Table 1**) confirm the robustness of this first
155 step.

156

157 **Pre-training of feature extractor with edge detection and self-supervised learning**

158

159 The cropped test zones were fed into a feature extractor and the extracted features were
160 passed into a binary classifier and a decoder (**Fig. 2a**). The binary classifier (a fully connected
161 layer) outputs ‘0’ or ‘1’ to denote the absence or presence of the band in the cropped zone,
162 respectively. The images from the base LFA kit were manually annotated with the binary labels,
163 and the classifier was trained to learn specific prototypes associated with the positive and
164 negative classes using cross-entropy (CE) loss.

165

166 Images of kits with faint bands can lead to false negatives while stained membranes and
167 lighting artifacts can lead to false positives (**Fig. 1c**). Even though such failure cases can be
168 reduced by training on a large number of relevant examples, acquiring sufficient images on a
169 new LFA kit present a logistical challenge. Directly applying the model conventionally trained
170 on the base LFA kit (i.e., by minimizing only the CE loss) to new LFA kits, resulted in low
171 classification accuracy on the new kits. Hence, we designed a self-supervised, edge-enhanced
172 image reconstruction task to improve the generalizability of the feature extractor (**Fig. 2a**). The
173 network was trained to detect the edges of the image pattern (pixels at the junction between the
174 membrane background and the band in the zone) and reconstruct the corresponding edge-
175 enhanced image. This task is self-supervised: starting with RGB images of zones from a base
176 LFA kit, the model converted the image into grayscale and applied a Sobel filter³⁸ to generate the
177 ground truth image set (Sobel filter is a basic image processing algorithm that generates an
178 image emphasizing edges). In parallel, the model fed the extracted features into the decoder to

179 reconstruct the edge-enhanced image. This model was then trained to minimize the mean
180 squared error (MSE) between the reconstructed edge image from the decoder and the ground
181 truth edge image. By combining the fully-supervised image classification with the self-
182 supervised edge-enhanced image reconstruction, the feature extractor, classifier, and decoder
183 were trained jointly to optimize the zone classification accuracy as well as to learn a good feature
184 representation that is sensitive to edge information.

185

186 **Learning a new classifier for a new LFA using few-shot adaptation**

187

188 The pre-trained model from a base LFA kit was adapted to a new LFA kit with minimal
189 retraining via few-shot adaptation (**Fig. 2b**). We mixed the labeled data of the base LFA kit and
190 the new LFA kit and used this as the training set. We specifically used this mixture of data from
191 new kit and base kit to avoid overfitting to the small number of images of the new kit. In
192 addition to the CE loss used to train the binary classifier for the new LFA kit, we also used
193 supervised contrastive learning, between the cropped zone images of both the new kit and the
194 base kit, to refine the feature extractor.

195

196 We gathered the cropped zone images of both the base kit and the new kit, resampled the
197 data, and calculated the supervised contrastive (SupCT) loss⁴⁰. First, we extracted features of the
198 base kit cropped zone images for both positive and negative classes and considered them as
199 anchors. Next, we extracted features from the cropped zone images of the new kit and compared
200 them with all of the anchors using cosine similarity. The feature extractor was then trained to
201 maximize the cosine similarity between features of the same class. For the implementation, we

202 resampled the cropped zone images from the mixed dataset to build episodes and then computed
203 SupCT loss within each episode (more details in Methods). As a comparison to the adaptation
204 strategy, we also performed fine-tuning which only calculated the CE loss among samples within
205 the episodes for network updating.

206

207 **Results**

208

209 **Description of datasets**

210

211 While gathering the image dataset, we varied imaging conditions by using different
212 phones and imaging the assay kits under varied lighting conditions (more details in Methods).
213 For pre-training of the model, the training dataset from the base kit (AssureTech EcoTest
214 COVID-19 IgG/IgM Antibody Test) consisted of 383 membrane images (674 positive zones and
215 475 negative zones). An additional 254 membrane images (441 positive zones and 254 negative
216 zones) were used as the validation set for model selection under the fully-supervised
217 classification task.

218

219 In addition, we used a variational autoencoder⁴¹ to generate a synthetic dataset composed
220 of 600 zones each of faint positive and negative zones⁴². The synthetic data was mixed with the
221 training dataset for the self-supervised edge-reconstruction task.

222

223 The performance of base model is reported on an evaluation set consisting of 102
224 membrane images (168 positive zones and 138 negative zones) of the base kit. The results
225 (**Table 2**) demonstrate that our model works well for both zone-level classification and overall

226 kit-level classification on the base kit. A “zone-level” classification accuracy is the model’s
227 performance on all the zones for the entire evaluation data set, and “kit-level” classification
228 accuracy is the model’s performance in classifying all constituent zones of a single kit (e.g., a
229 kit-level result would be incorrect if any zone in that kit was classified incorrectly). Details
230 regarding the dataset for the five new kits are provided in **Supplementary Table 2**.

231

232 **Performance on 5 new COVID-19 tests**

233

234 We employed the pre-trained feature extractor using the few-shot adaptation strategy on
235 five COVID-19 LFA kits, and assessed the effects of our adaptation strategy and self-supervised
236 edge-detection task separately. The performance of the base model on the new kits are shown
237 when applied directly and with the proposed adaptation method using 10-shots (20 zone images)
238 highlighting the significant performance improvement seen using our few-shot adaptation
239 strategy (**Table 2**). On top of the pretrained base model, adaptation can consistently improve the
240 performance by including only a few training images of the new LFA kits. The EcoTest housing
241 2 kit was identical in all aspects to the base kit except for the housing, so the direct application of
242 the base model without any adaptation was able to achieve 100% zone-level and kit-level
243 accuracies.

244

245 In **Fig. 3**, we plot the classification accuracy, at zone level and kit level, against the
246 number of zone images used during the adaptation process, ranging from 0 (direct testing) to
247 using the entire training dataset. These figures also serve as the ablation study evaluating the
248 separate contributions made by self-supervision in pretraining the feature extractor as well as the
249 supervised contrastive learning during adaptation. We compare our adaptation approach with

250 three alternative approaches: 1) the proposed approach without the self-supervision component
251 in the pre-training stage, 2) the proposed approach without supervised contrastive loss during
252 adaptation, and 3) training the network for a new kit from scratch without the two components.
253 The second approach can be considered as a finetuning process that uses the pre-trained base
254 model and finetunes it with the standard CE loss. For all approaches, the base kit and new kit
255 images were mixed for network training, and the same data sampling strategy was used to ensure
256 a fair comparison.

257
258 For each kit, a random set of images of each class were selected from the training dataset
259 for model adaptation and performance of the trained model was validated against a separate
260 evaluation dataset. The plots for the different approaches are compared against the performance
261 upper bound achieved when using all the new images available for training mixed with the base
262 training images for the classification and edge reconstruction tasks. We showed that for each of
263 the kits, Flowflex, DeepBlue, Jinwofu, and ACON IgG/IgM we achieved maximum
264 classification accuracy using just 16, 14, 10, and 18 zone images respectively for the adaptation.
265 For example, we were able to adapt the base model to the Flowflex kit (**Fig. 3a**) using only eight
266 zone images per class (16 zone images) and reach the same performance (99.8% and 99.6% for
267 the zone and kit levels respectively) as a model trained from scratch using all available training
268 data (200 zone images). The results confirm that both self-supervised pretraining and supervised
269 contrastive loss help, and the combination of these two key ideas helps reach the highest
270 attainable performance. Between these two novel ideas, supervised contrastive learning is more
271 effective: it requires fewer training images during adaptation in order to reach the performance
272 upper bound that is achieved by using the entire training dataset.

273

274 In addition, as the feature extractor is pretrained under self-supervision, the extracted
275 features are sensitive to the edges and can work well even when zones with faint bands are
276 encountered. Even though the ACON IgG/IgM kit had the highest frequency of faint bands in
277 our dataset, our approach was able to reach the same performance as using entire training dataset
278 (**Fig. 3d**) using only nine images of each class (18 zone images). Adaptation without supervised
279 contrastive learning can also reach the same performance using 40-shot adaptation. For the
280 model trained without self-supervised pretraining 70 images (with SupCT loss) and 100 images
281 (without SupCT loss) of each class were required to reach the best performance. In addition,
282 direct testing performance (0-shot adaptation) of the model pretrained on the base kit was higher
283 when trained using self-supervision than when trained using only the CE loss.

284

285 **Table 3** shows the confusion matrices of the performance of the optimum shot adaptation
286 when evaluated on the evaluation dataset. By starting with a base model pretrained on an
287 existing LFA kit (AssureTech EcoTest COVID-19 IgG/IgM antibody assay kit), we have shown
288 that it is possible to adapt the existing model to different assay kits, which have different
289 numbers of test lines and form factors, using a small fraction of the images needed to train the
290 base model with no loss in accuracy. In addition to evaluating the confusion matrix among on
291 samples in the evaluation set, we devised an ambiguity region to evaluate the distribution of
292 detection scores (probability of positive class). The ambiguity region is bounded by the detection
293 score thresholds such that an image will be correctly classified only if the probability of the
294 ground truth class is high. The thresholds can be either manually set or statistically estimated
295 with 95% area under the curve (more details in Methods). We checked the detection scores of all
296 the images in the evaluation dataset against the ambiguity regions and those images with scores
297 falling in ambiguity region were not classified. We computed the percentage of images that were

298 categorized as ambiguous as well as the accuracy over the images that were classified. Since the
299 detection score for the false predictions were close to 0.5, they fell into the ambiguity region.
300 Therefore, by using this concept of the ambiguity region we were able to treat most of the failure
301 cases as ambiguous while keeping the number of true predictions that fell into the ambiguity
302 region to a minimum. This further increased the classification accuracy among the classified
303 samples consistently over four new target kits (**Table 3**).

304

305 **Conclusions and future work**

306

307 We have described the development of AutoAdapt LFA, an approach for the adaptation
308 of a LFA kit interpretation model trained on one kit to new kits, each with a different form
309 factor. We showed that this adaptation can be carried out using a much smaller subset of images
310 than what was used for training the base model. Compared to *de novo* training on every new
311 assay kit, this reduction in the number of images was achieved by adopting a modular approach
312 to the machine-learning pipeline: starting from an image of the kit, the perspective-corrected
313 membrane and individual zones were extracted followed by the extraction of the features
314 preserving edge information, and finally a binary output which indicated whether a band was
315 present in the cropped zone. A robust feature extractor is important for handling challenging
316 images in LFA kits like those with faint or partially formed lines. Our approach of using self-
317 supervision to extract features preserving edge information addressed this issue, and it is
318 believed that this use of self-supervised learning to reconstruct edge-enhanced images has not
319 been previously demonstrated. To our knowledge, the application few-shot learning, including
320 this adaptation framework, has not been demonstrated for interpretation of LFA kit images.

321 Thus, we have shown that using this novel approach, we can train accurate classification models
322 using a fraction of kit images that would be required in *de novo* training.

323
324 In terms of impact for medicine, this reduction in new training images to achieve assured
325 user interpretation of rapid test images is significant with the rise of use of rapid diagnostic tests.
326 Most immediately, the COVID-19 pandemic has thrust front and forward the need for rapid
327 testing and population surveillance to track and control the spread of the disease in a scalable and
328 timely manner. If effectively implemented, point-of-care testing can contribute significantly to a
329 rapid and effective public health response – as well as patients’ individual safety, privacy,
330 physical health and mental well-being – by enabling widespread timely testing in a manner that
331 does not overwhelm the limited capacity of testing facilities or provoke social crowding at
332 selected testing sites. By expediting the process of training a model to newly available rapid
333 diagnostic tests, the AutoAdapt LFA approach could facilitate reliable decentralized testing and
334 real-time monitoring of disease prevalence. In the longer term, the need to achieve assured user
335 interpretation will rise as patients and consumers will more frequently monitor their health via
336 self-testing for both infectious diseases and chronic conditions, in an age of precision health.
337 Future work includes validation on a wider variety of rapid tests, and generalization to LFA kits
338 beyond rectangular bands (for example, as in some vertical flow assays) and bands of single
339 colors (for example, some urinalysis kits with color-based readouts).

340 **Methods**

341

342 **Dataset Collection**

343 Base kit (AssureTech EcoTest COVID-19 IgG/IgM Antibody Test): train and validation
344 datasets were gathered using iPhone X at the Mayo Clinic Hospital, Phoenix, AZ. The evaluation
345 dataset images were gathered using three phones by two users: iPhone X, iPhone 7, Samsung
346 Galaxy J3 (SM-J337V). Care was taken to ensure that the kits were imaged under three different
347 ambient lighting conditions (warm white, cool white, and daylight).

348

349 Novel kits (ACON Flowflex SARS-CoV-2 Antigen Rapid Test, Anhui DeepBlue SARS-CoV-2
350 Antigen Test, Jinwofu SARS-CoV-2 Antigen Rapid Test, and ACON SARS-CoV-2 IgG/IgM
351 Antibody Test): training and evaluation sets were gathered using iPhone X at the Mayo Clinic
352 Hospital, Phoenix, AZ. Serum samples for the antibody tests were collected under Mayo Clinic
353 IRB 20-004544 or shared by the Department of Laboratory Medicine at the University of
354 Washington School of Medicine (Seattle, WA)⁴³. The use of excess clinical specimens was
355 reviewed by the Mayo Clinic Biospecimens Committee and an appropriate Material Transfer
356 Agreement was drawn up to allow access to de-identified specimens from the University of
357 Washington School of Medicine. The University of Washington IRB approved this work with a
358 consent waiver. Nasopharyngeal swabs from Mayo Clinic Hospital patients were heat fixed and
359 run for the antigen tests under Mayo Clinic IRB 20-010688. All necessary patient/participant
360 consent has been obtained and the appropriate institutional forms have been archived.

361 All assay kits were imaged within 10 minutes of running the test.

362

363 **Image acquisition and pre-processing based on Mask R-CNN**

364 The image processing workflow starts with an image of the assay kit being taken by the
365 user through the SMARTtest application¹⁸ in a fixed portrait orientation. This image is saved in
366 an AWS S3 bucket as a JPEG image from the frontend, and the corresponding URL is sent to
367 the AWS Lambda Function. The function reads the image data, stores the original resolution
368 image in a copy, and resizes the image while preserving the aspect ratio by capping the height of
369 the image to a maximum of 800 pixels. The membrane is localized in the resized image using the
370 instance segmentation model Mask RCNN (**Supplementary Fig. 2**), and the predicted bounding
371 box coordinates in the resized image are then transformed to the corresponding coordinates in the
372 image of the original resolution to get the highest possible resolution of the membrane which is
373 then sent to the classifier.

374
375 Mask R-CNN³⁹ builds on top of the preceding Faster R-CNN⁴⁴ and Fast R-CNN⁴⁵ models
376 and combines them with a fully-convolutional network (FCN) and introduces object mask
377 prediction (i.e., segmentation⁴⁶) in parallel to bounding box regression. Given an input image, the
378 model extracts feature maps via a pretrained deep neural network (e.g., VGG16), and
379 subsequently passes these in parallel through a ROI-specialized pooling layer followed by
380 several fully-connected layers and an FCN. The instance segmentation model has been trained
381 for two object classes: the kit and the membrane. The model outputs i) detection scores, ii)
382 bounding boxes, and iii) segmentation masks of a maximum of 100 objects. The bounding box
383 defines a rectangular area that contains the assay kit or the membrane. The segmentation mask
384 includes all the pixels that correspond to the actual area of the assay kit or the membrane and do
385 not necessarily have to be rectangular in shape. From all the detected objects we retain

386 information for a kit and membrane object with the highest detection score greater than 0.9.

387 **Supplementary Fig. 3** illustrates different IoU scores and the corresponding membrane
388 segmentation masks for the EcoTest (base kit).

389

390 The bounding boxes and segmentation masks of the kit and membrane with the highest
391 detection score are retrieved and a binary segmentation mask is generated for both kit and
392 membrane. Next, the rotation angle is estimated by performing contour detection on the
393 segmentation mask of the kit and membrane, and approximating a minimum-area quadrilateral
394 mask whose corner coordinates can be used to construct a right-angle triangle. The membrane is
395 cropped from the input image with the binary segmentation mask, and is subsequently rotated by
396 the estimated angle. The rotated membrane will have black regions if the estimated angle is
397 greater than zero, and the largest rectangle that doesn't include any black pixels is estimated and
398 extracted as the final membrane to be sent to the classifier. Additionally, we have the capability
399 to compute the homography matrix⁴⁷ between the predicted segmentation mask and bounding
400 box of the kit, and use it to transform the kit of the image to correct for distortion along the pitch
401 axis.

402

403 **Pre-training with self-supervised learning**

404

405 The model uses the Mean Squared Error (MSE) between the decoder output (the
406 reconstructed image) and the ground truth edge-enhanced image as the loss. For the base kit, the
407 number of labeled images were sufficient so that both the classification and the edge-enhanced
408 image reconstruction tasks were carried out to learn a good feature extractor. Thus, as shown in

409 **Fig. 2a** output features of each cropped zone are sent to both the classifier and the decoder. The
410 model uses the cross-entropy (CE) loss for the classification task and uses the MSE between the
411 reconstruction and the automatically reconstructed edge filtered image to learn the optimal
412 convolution kernel in the decoder for the self-supervised edge reconstruction task. By using the
413 edge-enhanced features, the feature extractor was able to generalize well on new assay kit
414 images even if the zones were faint.

415

416 To generate the ground-truth of the self-supervision task, the model first converted the
417 RGB image into a grayscale image, and then performed edge filtering using Sobel filtering to
418 highlight the pixels in the edge region (if an edge exists). The edge filtered images are then
419 normalized between 0 and 1 and set as labels for the self-supervision task.

420

421 With the annotated classification label and the self-generated edge detection label, the
422 equally weighted CE loss and MSE were summed up and used as the objective. In this manner,
423 the extracted features were made sensitive to the edge region and the encoded edge information
424 was used for the classification of cropped zone images including those with faint bands.

425

426 **Hyperparameter Selection**

427

428 *Instance segmentation model structure:*

429 We used the ResNet50 CNN as the backbone of the Mask R-CNN and pretrained it on
430 the ImageNet1K dataset for model initialization. The backbone has been trained on ImageNet1K

431 as a fully-supervised image classification task among 1,000 classes. We used a hidden layer size
432 of 256 for the mask predictor.

433

434 *Instance segmentation training:*

435 We used 50 epochs and Adam optimizer for all of the training processes. We pretrained
436 the model on a training subset of 50 images of the base kit with a learning rate of 5E-5 and
437 achieved an IOU score of 0.93 on an evaluation set of ten images. We then finetuned the model
438 on the new assay kits with a learning rate of 5E-6 using 10 training images and evaluated the
439 performance on 10 evaluation images. We used the following train-time augmentations: (i)
440 horizontal flip, (ii) scaling, (iii) aspect-ratio modification, (iv) brightness adjustment, (v) contrast
441 adjustment, (vi) hue adjustment, (vii) saturation adjustment, (viii) color distortion, (ix) jitter
442 addition, (x) cropping, (xi) padding, and (xii) Gaussian noise addition. **Supplementary Table 3**
443 shows the results from the test of robustness of the instance segmentation model using
444 bootstrapping.

445

446 *Classification model structure:*

447 We used the ResNet18 CNN as the feature extractor and pretrained the model on the
448 ImageNet1K dataset for model initialization⁴⁸. The feature extractor has been trained on
449 ImageNet1K as a fully-supervised image classification task among 1,000 classes. As shown in
450 **Fig. 2a**, during the pretraining on base kit images, classifier is configured as a fully connected
451 layer (top output) and the decoder is configured as a stack of three deconvolution layers (bottom
452 output).

453

454 *Classification model pre-training:*

455 Given a training set, all the images were fed into the model in sequence and the loss was
456 calculated for both gradient backpropagation and for updating the model. A single epoch is
457 completed when the model has seen all the images once. 90 epochs were run in our training
458 process. The performance of the model on the validation dataset was determined after each
459 epoch and the model achieving the highest accuracy was selected.

460

461 *Classification model adaptation & finetuning:*

462 The network was trained for 100 epochs for each of the new kits with a learning rate of
463 0.001. Within each epoch, we sample 30 episodes and set Q (number of samples per class) as 32
464 for each episode. The feature extractor was tuned with a learning rate of 0.0001. Adam optimizer
465 was used for the network parameter update of both the feature extractor and the classifier. The
466 inbuilt PyTorch image transformation functions were used, namely: 1) horizontal flip, 2)
467 Random Rotation, 3) Color Jitter (including grayscale). **Supplementary Table 4** shows the
468 results from the test of robustness of the adapted model on the 4 new test kits using
469 bootstrapping.

470

471 *Classification model training from scratch:*

472 Similar to the initialization step before self-supervision, a ResNet18 CNN is used as the
473 feature extractor which has been trained with the ImageNet1K dataset as a fully-supervised
474 image classification task. The network is then trained on the training images of the new assay kit
475 with Adam optimizer and a learning rate of 0.001. The same transformation functions used for
476 the adaptation were used here.

477

478 **Threshold Determination and Ambiguity Region**

479

480 In general, the thresholds (δ_{neg} , δ_{pos}) for negative class and positive class were determined
481 individually by feeding the detection score (probability of positive, P_{pos}) of all images of each
482 class into the statistical model and fitting separately. Using the threshold determination of
483 positive class as an example, the steps are explained below:

484 1) Select the Inverse Gaussian Distribution as the model template to be fitted^{49,50}. The
485 reasons why we select this one-side distribution model are,

486 a. The inverse gaussian distribution is used to model variables of non-negative
487 values.

488 b. Since the probability output from the model is between 0 and 1, the inverse
489 gaussian distribution is selected as it is tighter within the range [0,1] (i.e., the area
490 under its probability density function (PDF) curve within [0,1] is closer to one),
491 compared to other distribution models such as Gamma distribution which may
492 have an observable tail in [1, infinity) interval.

493 2) Feed the P_{pos} of all labelled positive zone images into the statistical model and use the
494 fitted parameters to draw the PDF curve.

495 3) We set the area under the probability distribution curve (between the threshold and the
496 extreme value, i.e., 1 for positive and 0 for negative) as 95% and use Divide and Conquer
497 to find the corresponding threshold value δ , which is threshold for positive class δ_{pos} .

498

499 For a negative class, P_{pos} is still used as input to find the classification score threshold δ_{neg} .
500 For the convenience of presentation, $[\delta_{neg}, \delta_{pos}]$ is used to denote the ambiguity region where
501 images with $\delta_{neg} \leq P_{pos} \leq \delta_{pos}$ will not be classified since they fall within the region, and the
502 images with $P_{pos} \leq \delta_{neg}$ or $P_{pos} \geq \delta_{pos}$ are classified as negative or positive respectively. The
503 ratio of the unclassified images with respect to the entire evaluation set is reported as the
504 percentage of ambiguous cases (as shown in **Table 3**).

505
506 **References**

- 507
508 1 Posthuma-Trumpie, G. A., Korf, J., van Amerongen, A. J. A. & chemistry, b. Lateral
509 flow (immuno) assay: its strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats. A literature
510 survey. **393**, 569-582 (2009).
- 511 2 Andryukov, B. G. J. A. M. Six decades of lateral flow immunoassay: from determining
512 metabolic markers to diagnosing COVID-19. **6**, 280-304 (2020).
- 513 3 Ibitoye, M., Frasca, T., Giguere, R., Carballo-Diéguez, A. J. A. & Behavior. Home
514 testing past, present and future: lessons learned and implications for HIV home tests. **18**,
515 933-949 (2014).
- 516 4 Koczula, K. M. & Gallotta, A. Lateral flow assays. *Essays in biochemistry* **60**, 111-120
517 (2016).
- 518 5 Carrio, A., Sampedro, C., Sanchez-Lopez, J. L., Pimienta, M. & Campoy, P. Automated
519 low-cost smartphone-based lateral flow saliva test reader for drugs-of-abuse detection.
520 *Sensors-Basel* **15**, 29569-29593 (2015).

- 521 6 Ghani, A. C., Burgess, D. H., Reynolds, A. & Rousseau, C. Expanding the role of
522 diagnostic and prognostic tools for infectious diseases in resource-poor settings. *Nature*
523 **528**, S50-52, doi:10.1038/nature16038 (2015).
- 524 7 FDA. *In Vitro Diagnostics EUAs - Antigen Diagnostic Tests for SARS-CoV-2*,
525 <[https://www.fda.gov/medical-devices/coronavirus-disease-2019-covid-19-emergency-](https://www.fda.gov/medical-devices/coronavirus-disease-2019-covid-19-emergency-use-authorizations-medical-devices/in-vitro-diagnostics-euas-antigen-diagnostic-tests-sars-cov-2)
526 [use-authorizations-medical-devices/in-vitro-diagnostics-euas-antigen-diagnostic-tests-](https://www.fda.gov/medical-devices/in-vitro-diagnostics-euas-antigen-diagnostic-tests-sars-cov-2)
527 [sars-cov-2](https://www.fda.gov/medical-devices/in-vitro-diagnostics-euas-antigen-diagnostic-tests-sars-cov-2)> (2021).
- 528 8 Ballard, Z. S. *et al.* Deep learning-enabled point-of-care sensing using multiplexed paper-
529 based sensors. **3**, 1-8 (2020).
- 530 9 Joung, H.-A. *et al.* Point-of-care serodiagnostic test for early-stage lyme disease using a
531 multiplexed paper-based immunoassay and machine learning. **14**, 229-240 (2019).
- 532 10 Contreras-Naranjo, J. C., Wei, Q. & Ozcan, A. J. I. J. o. S. T. i. Q. E. Mobile phone-
533 based microscopy, sensing, and diagnostics. **22**, 1-14 (2015).
- 534 11 Kong, J. E. *et al.* Highly Stable and Sensitive Nucleic Acid Amplification and Cell-
535 Phone-Based Readout. *Acs Nano* **11**, 2934-2943, doi:10.1021/acsnano.6b08274 (2017).
- 536 12 Potluri, V. *et al.* An inexpensive smartphone-based device for point-of-care ovulation
537 testing. **19**, 59-67 (2019).
- 538 13 Shah, K. G., Singh, V., Kauffman, P. C., Abe, K. & Yager, P. J. A. c. Mobile phone
539 ratiometric imaging enables highly sensitive fluorescence lateral flow immunoassays
540 without external optical filters. **90**, 6967-6974 (2018).
- 541 14 Dell, N. & Borriello, G. in *Proceedings of the 3rd ACM Symposium on Computing for*
542 *Development*. 1-10.

- 543 15 Ruppert, C., Phogat, N., Laufer, S., Kohl, M. & Deigner, H.-P. J. M. A. A smartphone
544 readout system for gold nanoparticle-based lateral flow assays: application to monitoring
545 of digoxigenin. **186**, 119 (2019).
- 546 16 Dell, N. L., Venkatachalam, S., Stevens, D., Yager, P. & Borriello, G. in *Proceedings of*
547 *the 5th ACM workshop on Networked systems for developing regions*. 3-8.
- 548 17 Draz, M. S. *et al.* Virus detection using nanoparticles and deep neural network-enabled
549 smartphone system. *Sci Adv* **6**, doi:10.1126/sciadv.abd5354 (2020).
- 550 18 Balán, I. C. *et al.* SMARTtest: A Smartphone App to Facilitate HIV and Syphilis Self-
551 and Partner-Testing, Interpretation of Results, and Linkage to Care. *AIDS and Behavior*,
552 1-14 (2019).
- 553 19 Aveyard, J., Mehrabi, M., Cossins, A., Braven, H. & Wilson, R. J. C. c. One step visual
554 detection of PCR products with gold nanoparticles and a nucleic acid lateral flow
555 (NALF) device. 4251-4253 (2007).
- 556 20 Parolo, C. *et al.* Tutorial: design and fabrication of nanoparticle-based lateral-flow
557 immunoassays. **15**, 3788-3816 (2020).
- 558 21 Millipore, E. J. E. M. C. B., MA, USA. Rapid lateral flow test strips: Considerations for
559 product development. **29**, 702-707 (2013).
- 560 22 Yetisen, A. K., Akram, M. S. & Lowe, C. R. Paper-based microfluidic point-of-care
561 diagnostic devices. *Lab Chip* **13**, 2210-2251, doi:10.1039/c3lc50169h (2013).
- 562 23 Huang, X. & El-Sayed, M. A. J. J. o. a. r. Gold nanoparticles: Optical properties and
563 implementations in cancer diagnosis and photothermal therapy. **1**, 13-28 (2010).
- 564 24 Lake, B. M., Salakhutdinov, R. & Tenenbaum, J. B. J. S. Human-level concept learning
565 through probabilistic program induction. **350**, 1332-1338 (2015).

- 566 25 Wang, Y., Yao, Q., Kwok, J. T. & Ni, L. M. J. A. C. S. Generalizing from a few
567 examples: A survey on few-shot learning. **53**, 1-34 (2020).
- 568 26 Wu, Y. & Demiris, Y. in *2010 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and*
569 *Automation*. 2889-2894 (IEEE).
- 570 27 Snell, J., Swersky, K. & Zemel, R. in *Advances in neural information processing systems*.
571 4077-4087.
- 572 28 Kang, B. *et al.* in *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision*.
573 8420-8429.
- 574 29 Wang, Y.-X., Ramanan, D. & Hebert, M. in *Proceedings of the IEEE International*
575 *Conference on Computer Vision*. 9925-9934.
- 576 30 Sun, Q., Liu, Y., Chua, T.-S. & Schiele, B. in *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on*
577 *computer vision and pattern recognition*. 403-412.
- 578 31 Wang, Y.-X. & Hebert, M. in *European Conference on Computer Vision*. 616-634
579 (Springer).
- 580 32 Sajid, M., Kawde, A.-N. & Daud, M. J. J. o. S. C. S. Designs, formats and applications of
581 lateral flow assay: A literature review. **19**, 689-705 (2015).
- 582 33 Bahadır, E. B. & Sezgintürk, M. K. J. T. T. i. A. C. Lateral flow assays: Principles,
583 designs and labels. **82**, 286-306 (2016).
- 584 34 Budd, J. *et al.* Digital technologies in the public-health response to COVID-19. *Nat Med*
585 **26**, 1183-1192, doi:10.1038/s41591-020-1011-4 (2020).
- 586 35 Wood, C. S. *et al.* Taking connected mobile-health diagnostics of infectious diseases to
587 the field. *Nature* **566**, 467-474, doi:10.1038/s41586-019-0956-2 (2019).

- 588 36 Whitelaw, S., Mamas, M. A., Topol, E. & Van Spall, H. G. J. T. L. D. H. Applications of
589 digital technology in COVID-19 pandemic planning and response. (2020).
- 590 37 Murray, C. J., Alamro, N. M. S., Hwang, H. & Lee, U. J. T. L. P. H. Digital public health
591 and COVID-19. **5**, e469-e470 (2020).
- 592 38 Kittler, J. J. I. & Computing, V. On the accuracy of the Sobel edge detector. **1**, 37-42
593 (1983).
- 594 39 He, K., Gkioxari, G., Dollar, P. & Girshick, R. Mask R-CNN. *IEEE Trans Pattern Anal
595 Mach Intell* **42**, 386-397, doi:10.1109/TPAMI.2018.2844175 (2020).
- 596 40 Khosla, P. *et al.* Supervised contrastive learning. (2020).
- 597 41 Kingma, D. P. & Welling, M. J. a. p. a. Auto-encoding variational bayes. (2013).
- 598 42 Wan, Z., Zhang, Y. & He, H. in *2017 IEEE symposium series on computational
599 intelligence (SSCI)*. 1-7 (IEEE).
- 600 43 McAulay, K. *et al.* Retrospective clinical evaluation of 4 lateral flow assays for the
601 detection of SARS-CoV-2 IgG. **98**, 115161 (2020).
- 602 44 Ren, S., He, K., Girshick, R. & Sun, J. Faster R-CNN: Towards Real-Time Object
603 Detection with Region Proposal Networks. *IEEE Trans Pattern Anal Mach Intell* **39**,
604 1137-1149, doi:10.1109/TPAMI.2016.2577031 (2017).
- 605 45 Girshick, R. in *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision*.
606 1440-1448.
- 607 46 Minaee, S. *et al.* Image segmentation using deep learning: A survey. (2021).
- 608 47 Geetha Kiran, A. & Murali, S. J. J. C. S. A. Automatic rectification of perspective
609 distortion from a single image using plane homography. **3**, 47-58 (2013).

610 48 Deng, J. *et al.* in *2009 IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*.
611 248-255 (Ieee).
612 49 Folks, J. L. & Chhikara, R. S. J. J. o. t. R. S. S. S. B. The inverse Gaussian distribution
613 and its statistical application—a review. **40**, 263-275 (1978).
614 50 Chhikara, R. *The inverse Gaussian distribution: theory: methodology, and applications*.
615 Vol. 95 (CRC Press, 1988).

616

617 **Acknowledgements**

618
619 We thank Ken Mayer for his involvement in the coordination of the study. Assay kits
620 were kindly provided to Mayo Clinic for evaluations from Acon, Paramount (DeepBlue and
621 Jinwofu), EcoTest (EcoTest Housing 2), and BTNX (EcoTest Housing 1). The work was
622 supported by Herbert Irving Comprehensive Cancer Center in partnership with the Irving
623 Institute for Clinical and Translational Research via a SARS-CoV-2 Research Pilot Grant,
624 Columbia University School of Engineering and Applied Science via a Technology Innovations
625 for Urban Living in the Face of COVID-19 Pilot Grant, and a gift from Bing Zhao.

626

627

628

629 **Author contributions**

630

631

632 S.A., U.M., and S.K.S., conceptualized the initial project. S.A., J.M, S.C., and S.K.S.
633 supervised the project. U.M. developed the object detection module. J.M., G.H., and S.C.
634 developed the feature extractor and few-shot adaptation modules. D.I. and U.M. worked on
635 cloud architecture and model hosting. A.Y. developed an image-labelling dashboard. D.C.

636 developed the workflow to record kit parameters. S.A., J.M., U.M., S.C., and S.K.S. analyzed the
637 data. K.M. and T.G. tested the assay kits with clinical samples and acquired smartphone images.
638 R.S. helped label images for object detection. S.A., J.M., U.M., S.C., and S.K.S. wrote the
639 manuscript.

640
641

642 **Competing interests**

643

644 A version of this algorithm has been licensed by Columbia University to Safe Health
645 Systems, Inc.

646

647 **Author Declarations**

648 I confirm all relevant ethical guidelines have been followed, and any necessary IRB and/or ethics
649 committee approvals have been obtained.

650 Yes

651 The details of the IRB/oversight body that provided approval or exemption for the research
652 described are given below:

653 Serum samples for the antibody tests were collected under Mayo Clinic IRB 20-004544 or
654 shared by the Department of Laboratory Medicine at the University of Washington School of
655 Medicine (Seattle, WA). The use of excess clinical specimens was reviewed by the Mayo Clinic
656 Biospecimens Committee and an appropriate Material Transfer Agreement was drawn up to
657 allow access to de-identified specimens from the University of Washington School of Medicine.

658 The University of Washington IRB approved this work with a consent waiver. Nasopharyngeal
659 swabs from Mayo Clinic Hospital patients were heat fixed and run for the antigen tests under
660 Mayo Clinic IRB 20-010688.

661

662 All necessary patient/participant consent has been obtained and the appropriate institutional
663 forms have been archived.

664 Yes

665 I understand that all clinical trials and any other prospective interventional studies must be
666 registered with an ICMJE-approved registry, such as ClinicalTrials.gov. I confirm that any such
667 study reported in the manuscript has been registered and the trial registration ID is provided
668 (note: if posting a prospective study registered retrospectively, please provide a statement in the
669 trial ID field explaining why the study was not registered in advance).

670 n/a

671 I have followed all appropriate research reporting guidelines and uploaded the relevant
672 EQUATOR Network research reporting checklist(s) and other pertinent material as
673 supplementary files, if applicable.

674 Yes

675 **Tables**

676

Kit name	IOU score
Flowflex	0.92
DeepBlue	0.89
Jinwofu	0.90
ACON IgG/IgM	0.93
EcoTest housing 2	0.93

677

678 **Table 1. Intersection over Union scores for membrane segmentation.** The IOU scores for
679 each of the new kit images was obtained by selecting ten images at random from a labelled pool
680 of 30 images for training and evaluating the performance on a fixed evaluation set of ten images.

681

682

683

684

685

686

687

688

689

690

691

Kit name	Without adaptation		With adaptation	
	Zone accuracy (%)	Kit accuracy (%)	Zone accuracy (%)	Kit accuracy (%)
EcoTest (base)	98.8	96.5	-	-
Flowflex	93.1	86.1	99.8	99.6
DeepBlue	93.2	86.4	99.5	98.9
Jinwofu	94.7	89.4	100	100
ACON IgG/IgM	91.0	73.6	98.8	96.4
EcoTest housing 2	100	100	-	-

692

693 **Table 2. Zone-level and kit-level classification accuracy without adaptation (direct testing)**

694 **and with adaptation.** For the direct testing case, the model pretrained on the base kit was

695 directly applied on each of the new kit's evaluation dataset. For the adaptation approach, the

696 pretrained model was adapted to each of the new kits, except for EcoTest housing 2 kit, using

697 10-shot adaptation (20 zone images) and the performance on their respective evaluation datasets

698 is listed here.

699

700

701

702

703

704

705

706

707 **a) EcoTest (base kit)**

Prediction \ Label	Positive	Negative
Positive	(TP) 165	(FP) 1
Negative	(FN) 3	(TN) 137

708

709 **b) Flowflex (2-zone kit; 224 zone images)**

Prediction \ Label	Positive	Negative	Ambiguity Region	[0.50, 0.50]	[0.08, 0.98]	[0.20, 0.80]
Positive	(TP) 303	(FP) 0	Accuracy	99.8%	100%	100%
Negative	(FN) 1	(TN) 142	Percentage ambiguous kits	-	5.2%	1.3%

710

711 **c) DeepBlue (2-zone kits; 184 zone images)**

Prediction \ Label	Positive	Negative	Ambiguity Region	[0.50, 0.50]	[0.21, 0.95]	[0.20, 0.80]
Positive	(TP) 242	(FP) 0	Accuracy	99.5%	100%	100%
Negative	(FN) 2	(TN) 124	Percentage ambiguous kits	-	4.9%	4.1%

712

713 **d) Jinwofu (2-zone kits; 104 zone image)**

Prediction \ Label	Positive	Negative	Ambiguity Region	[0.50, 0.50]	[0.05, 0.99]	[0.20, 0.80]
Positive	(TP) 164	(FP) 0	Accuracy	100%	100%	100%
Negative	(FN) 0	(TN) 44	Percentage ambiguous kits	-	1.4%	0

714

715 **e) ACON IgG/IgM (3-zone kits; 193 zone images)**

Label Prediction	Positive	Negative	Ambiguity Region	[0.50, 0.50]	[0.11, 0.88]	[0.20, 0.80]
Positive	(TP) 386	(FP) 1	Accuracy	98.8%	99.5%	99.3%
Negative	(FN) 6	(TN) 192	Percentage ambiguous kits	-	3.5%	2.8%

716

717 **f)** EcoTest housing 2 (3-zone kits; 24 zone image).

Label Prediction	Positive	Negative
Positive	(TP) 66	(FP) 0
Negative	(FN) 0	(TN) 6

718

719 **Table 3. Confusion matrices of the best models applied on the evaluation dataset (left)**

720 **Accuracy and the percentage of ambiguous kits across varying ambiguity regions (right)**

721 **(a)** is the confusion matrix for the base model on base kit evaluation set. The performance of the
 722 best performing adapted model on the evaluation dataset for each of the new kits **(b – e)** without
 723 the enforcement of an ambiguity region is shown in the tables to the left. **(f)** shows the confusion
 724 matrix for the EcoTest housing 2 kit. The tables on the right show the accuracy for the
 725 corresponding assay kit and percentage of kits classified as ambiguous values for the different
 726 kits when varying the ambiguity region.


727

728

729

730

731 **Figures**




732

733 **Figure 1. Overview of use case, challenge, and pipeline for image processing and machine**


734 **learning.** (a) Envisioned testing process for end user. The user takes an image of the assay kit

735 using a smartphone displaying an on-screen image guide. The zones containing the bands are
736 automatically identified, and a model that was pre-trained on a base kit (shown as “B” in the
737 network) and previously rapidly adapted to a new kit (using few-shot learning, shown as “N” in
738 the network) processes the images of zones. The model classifies each zone as positive or
739 negative, and provides an overall assay result on the screen of the smartphone. The cloud-hosted
740 model processes the image and generates the results in ~4 seconds. **(b)** Images of a base LFA kit
741 (EcoTest) for pre-training the model, and five new COVID-19 LFA kits (including both antigen
742 and antibody tests) to be interpreted. **(c)** Images illustrating the challenge for few-shot learning.
743 A pre-trained model on the base kit, without adaptation, produces failed predictions on the new
744 kits. Shown are both false positives and false negatives (likely due to variations in colors and
745 intensities of membrane background and bands). **(d)** Overview of AutoAdapt LFA pipeline.
746 From a raw input image of an assay kit, a correction of orientation and perspective is applied to
747 segment an image of an assay kit. From the assay kit image, a segmentation model based on
748 Mask R-CNN is used to extract the membrane region of interest (RoI). Based on measured kit-
749 specific parameters, individual zones are cropped, and passed through a software pipeline
750 consisting of a feature extractor followed by a binary classifier. Classification of each zone
751 allows, via a kit-specific lookup table, for a final classification of assay result (“kit-level”
752 classification or result) as positive, negative, or invalid.



753
 754 **Figure 2. Self-supervision and few-shot adaptation for LFA kits.** (a) The feature extractor is
 755 pretrained on the base kit using self-supervised learning task over edge-filtered patterns and
 756 fully-supervised binary classification task. For each zone, fully-supervised binary classification
 757 is carried out with cross-entropy loss with the annotated binary labels. Sobel filter is used to
 758 highlight the edge pixels between the band and the background of the membrane. The edge
 759 image after normalization is used as ground truth and the learning process is used to reconstruct
 760 an image that resembles the ground truth edge image, with the quality measured in MSE (Mean
 761 Square Error). The solid and dashed arrows indicate forward processing and gradient
 762 backpropagation respectively during the learning process. (b) Model adaptation is carried out by

763 supervised contrastive learning to regularize the feature extractor and fully-supervised learning
764 to learn an adapted classifier for the new kit. A sampling strategy to build an episode with Q
765 (e.g., 32) images per class is used: for each class (positive or negative), given K (e.g., 10) images
766 available, P (e.g., 4) images are subsampled from the new kit and mixed with Q-P images of the
767 base kit.



769 **Figure 3. Zone-level and kit-level classification accuracies for four new COVID-19 LFA**
770 **kits shown with ablated models and number of new kit training images.** Ablation studies
771 were carried out to analyze the relative contributions of self-supervised learning for feature
772 extraction and supervised contrastive learning for adaptation. Each model was evaluated by
773 varying the number of images used in the adaptation. Zone-level accuracy scores (left) and kit-
774 level accuracy scores (right) reported for four new assay kits, **(a)** Flowflex, **(b)** DeepBlue, **(c)**
775 Jinwofu and **(d)** ACON IgG/IgM. (The EcoTest housing 2 kit was identical in all aspects to the
776 base kit expect for the housing, so the direct application of the base model without any
777 adaptation was able to achieve 100% zone-level and kit-level accuracies.) The maximum
778 accuracy indicates the upper bound attained by training a model from scratch using all training
779 images for each kit.