

1 **Title:**

2 Laboratory verification of new commercial lateral flow assays for Cryptococcal antigen (CrAg)
3 detection against the predicate IMMY LFA in a reference laboratory in South Africa

4 **Short title:**

5 CrAg LFA assay verification in South Africa

6 **Keywords:** Cryptococcal antigen, lateral flow assay, verification, accuracy, sensitivity,
7 specificity

8 **Authors:**

9 Lindi-Marie Coetzee^{1,2}, Deborah Kim Glencross^{1,2}

10 Lindi-Marie Coetzee orcid: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8981-1744>

11 Deborah Kim Glencross orcid: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7106-769X>

12 **Affiliations:**

13 ¹National Health Laboratory Service (NHLS), National Priority Programs Unit, Johannesburg,
14 South Africa

15 ²Department of Molecular Medicine and Haematology, Faculty of Health Sciences, University
16 of Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South Africa

17 **Corresponding author:**

18 Dr. Lindi-Marie Coetzee

19 lindi.coetzee@nhls.ac.za

20 Author Contributions:

21 LC was responsible for the concept, data collection and analysis and writing of the paper. DK
22 was responsible for the review and editing of the paper.

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

23 **Abstract**

24 **Background** Reflex Cryptococcal antigen (CrAg) testing in HIV-positive patients is
25 done routinely at 47 laboratories in South Africa on samples with a confirmed CD4
26 count <100 cells/ μ l, using the IMMY Lateral Flow Assay (LFA) as the standardized
27 predicate method.

28 **Objective** This study aimed to verify the diagnostic performance of newer CrAg LFA
29 assays against the predicate method.

30 **Methods** Remnant CD4 samples collected between February and June 2019, with
31 confirmed predicate LFA CrAg results, were retested on settled plasma with the (i)
32 IMMY CrAg semi-quantitative (SQ) LFA; (ii) Bio-Rad RDT CryptoPS SQ; and (iii)
33 Dynamiker CrAg SQ assays, within 24 hours of predicate testing. Sensitivity/
34 specificity analyses were conducted comparing predicate versus the newer assays,
35 with McNemar's test's p-values reported for comparative results (p values <0.05
36 significant). Positivity grading was noted for the IMMY SQ and Bio-Rad assays.

37 **Results** Of the 254 samples tested, 228 had comparative CrAg results across all
38 assays. The predicate method reported 85 CrAg positive (37.2%), compared to
39 between 35.08 and 37.28% for the Bio-Rad, IMMY SQ and Dynamiker assays. The
40 IMMY CrAg SQ grading (+1 to +5) showed 67% of CrAg positive results had a grading
41 ≥ 3 , indicative of higher CrAg concentration (infection severity). False-negative results
42 across all assays were <2%, with sensitivity >95% for all. False-positive results were
43 highest for the Dynamiker LFA (14%) with a specificity of 77% (p=0.001). IMMY SQ
44 and Bio-Rad assays specificities exceeded 90% (p=0.6 and 0.12). Internal quality
45 control showed 100% accuracy for all assays.

46 **Conclusion** Performance verification of newer CrAg LFA assays under typical
47 laboratory conditions varied, with best results by IMMY SQ and Bio-Rad. The high
48 burden of HIV and cryptococcal disease in South Africa requires high specificity and -
49 sensitivity (>90%) to prevent unnecessary treatment/hospitalization. The added value
50 of positivity grading for patient management needs confirmation.

51 **WORDS: 298**

53 Introduction

54 Cryptococcal meningitis (CM) is a highly infectious disease caused by *Cryptococcus*
55 *neoformans*, with a high mortality rate, particularly among HIV-positive patients in
56 developing countries such as South Africa [1-3]. Following the inclusion of
57 cryptococcal antigen (CrAg) screening in the 2016 World Health Organization (WHO)
58 HIV guidelines [4], and subsequent inclusion in the South African HIV guidelines [5], a
59 CrAg reflex screening pilot program was launched at selected National Health
60 Laboratory Service (NHLS) CD4 laboratories in South Africa [6, 7]. This program was
61 subsequently extended nationally in June 2017 to 47 CD4 laboratories, where remnant
62 blood samples from HIV-positive patients with a confirmed CD4 count <100cells/ μ l
63 (severely immune-compromised) are identified by the laboratory information system
64 (LIS) for reflex CrAg testing [8-10]. The data collected for the program has been used
65 extensively to report on the prevalence of CrAg in South Africa [8, 9, 11], the cost-
66 effectiveness of the local program [12, 13] and the high burden of patients living with
67 HIV with a CD4 count <100 cells/ μ l (immune-compromised) [8, 9]. Approximately 10%
68 of all CD4 samples tested annually (~230 000/annum) receive a reflex CrAg test with
69 a national CrAg positivity rate of 6.2% [8, 9].

70 All reflexed CrAg testing is performed using the lateral flow assay (LFA) from IMMY
71 (Immuno-Mycologics, IMMY, Norman, OK, USA) [14]. The IMMY LFA was the only
72 commercially available assay at the time of the national roll-out and was
73 recommended in the WHO HIV guidelines from 2018 [15]. Several studies described
74 the performance of this assay against the ELISA and latex agglutination assays on
75 serum, plasma, cerebrospinal fluid and urine [14, 16-30]. Since 2018, additional CrAg
76 LFA products have been developed and introduced worldwide and became available
77 in South Africa [31-33].

78 This study set out to verify the diagnostic performance of the newer CrAg LFA assays
79 against the predicate method (IMMY LFA) for accuracy, sensitivity and specificity
80 under typical laboratory conditions. The high burden of HIV and cryptococcal disease
81 in South Africa requires an assay with high specificity and sensitivity (>90%) to prevent
82 unnecessary treatment/hospitalization. This will enable the accurate distinction of
83 positive and negative results to ensure appropriate early initiation of antifungal therapy
84 to reduce mortality.

85 **Materials and Methods**

86 **Ethics clearance**

87 Ethics clearance was obtained from the University of the Witwatersrand (M1706108,
88 approved for 5 years from 13/07/2017 to 07/2022). No patient consent was required
89 as random remnant blood samples were used as per ethics clearance after laboratory
90 predicate results were reported. The study results were for assay verification purposes
91 only. No patient information was available to either the testing staff or the authors of
92 this paper.

93 **CrAg Testing methods**

94 All reagents and test consumables were supplied by local diagnostic suppliers, with
95 training provided for each assay for two medical technologists. The assays verified in
96 this study are CE/IVD approved (Conforms to European Union Requirements/in vitro
97 diagnostics). The manufacturer instructions defined in the package insert were used
98 for reagents storage, quality control (positive and negative internal controls), testing
99 (sample volume, incubation time), interpretation of results, detection limitations and
100 result reporting. All safety precautions were adhered to as part of good laboratory

101 practice (GLP). Results were reported as positive, negative, or invalid (no control line
102 visible), with concentration ratings noted for specific assays as per their package
103 inserts (IMMY SQ and Bio-Rad). Samples with faint positive lines were verified by a
104 senior staff member or retested if the result was inconclusive. All CrAg testing and
105 retesting were done on settled plasma, with no titrations performed as this is not the
106 practice for CrAg reflex screening.

107 **Laboratory predicate method**

108 The predicate method is the LFA by IMMY (Immuno-Mycologics, Norman, Oklahoma,
109 United States) [34]. This assay is an immunochromatographic test for the qualitative
110 and semi-quantitative detection of the capsular polysaccharide antigen of
111 *Cryptococcus* species in plasma and serum, using specimen wicking and gold-
112 conjugated anti-CrAg antibodies. Currently, the predicate method is used only as a
113 qualitative assay for reflex testing. Samples were prepared according to the
114 manufacturer's instructions and the national internal standard operating procedure.

115 **Newer generation CrAg LFA methods**

116 This IMMY CrAg SQ dipstick sandwich immunochromatographic assay is a newer
117 commercial IMMY CrAg dipstick (Immuno-Mycologics, Norman, Oklahoma, United
118 States) [33]. The principle is similar to the original IMMY CrAg LFA assay, with the
119 exception that there is one control line and two test lines (T1 and T2) on a wicking strip
120 [33, 35]. Positive results will always have a control line, with either T1 and/or T2 lines
121 visible. The intensity (concentration) of CrAg binding is interpreted from a scoring
122 scale of 1+ to 5+ as per package insert.

123 The Bio-Rad RDT CryptoPS (Biosynex CryptoPS) assay is a single-use rapid semi-
124 quantitative CrAg strip test (BIOSYNEX S.A., Illkirch–Graffenstaden, France) [36].
125 Sample and diluent are dispensed into the well and test lines (T1 and T2) will form

126 depending on the concentration in the specimen [31, 36]. T1 represents
127 concentrations lower than 25ng/ml with T2 detecting concentrations up to 2.5µg/ml.
128 Dynamiker CrAg LFA (Dynamiker Technology, Tianjin Eco-City, Tianjin, China) [32] is
129 an immunochromatographic test using conjugated Cryptococcus antibodies to gold
130 particles. CrAg will form complexes that appear as a visible line, while the free
131 antibodies bind to form a control line [32].

132 **Patient samples and study settings**

133 Remnant samples collected in Ethylenediaminetetraacetic acid (EDTA) submitted for
134 CD4 testing at the Charlotte Maxeke Academic Hospital (CMJAH) and Tambo
135 Memorial laboratories between February and May 2019, with a confirmed count of
136 <100cells/µl, received onsite reflex CrAg testing using the IMMY CrAg LFA predicate
137 method. These laboratories are accredited by the South African National Accreditation
138 System (SANAS), adhere to good laboratory practice (GLP) and International
139 Organization for Standardization (ISO/ICE 15189:2014) guidelines [37]. In addition,
140 they are enrolled in the local external quality assessment (EQA) [38]. Patient
141 management was based on the predicate CrAg result reported.

142 Reagents for 300 tests were provided from local service providers for IMMY and
143 Dynamiker (only 280 tests available from Bio-Rad). Before comparative testing
144 commenced, four tests per assay were reserved for training and ten tests for possible
145 duplicate/repeat testing. Daily quality-control tests at two levels (negative and positive)
146 were done per assay/testing day (n=32 tests/assay in total) (Fig 1).

147 **Figure 1: Summary of verification samples tested:** Patient samples tested across three
148 new CrAg LFA assays, including quality control (QC), duplicate testing and rejections, using
149 the available tests provided by suppliers. (Authors own work).
150

151 Following predicate testing, samples were delivered to the CMJAH CD4 research unit
152 for re-testing within 24 hours. The project coordinator collated CrAg results in and
153 Excel spreadsheet and batched available samples for blind testing. The batch size
154 was restricted to a maximum of 25 samples (n=75 tests across 3 assays) per day (≤ 3
155 hours per testing day per trainer) and included all positive samples collected from the
156 testing laboratories on the testing day with random negative samples. Results for the
157 IMMY CrAg SQ LFA [33], Bio-Rad RDT CryptoPS Assay (Biosynex CryptoPS) [31,
158 36], and Dynamiker CrAg LFA assays [32] were recorded on printed worklists against
159 anonymized sample ID numbers and collated by the project coordinator into the project
160 Excel file.

161 The verification criteria for sensitivity and specificity levels were set at $>90\%$ to
162 correlate with the current IMMY CrAg LFA predicate method. The Standards for
163 Reporting of Diagnostic Accuracy Studies (STARD) statement checklist was used for
164 transparency of result reporting [39, 40].

165 **Statistical analysis**

166 Statistical analysis and the graphic display were done with GraphPad Prism Software
167 version 7 (GraphPad Software, San Diego, United States). Assay performance
168 statistics included: sensitivity, specificity, positive predictive value (PPV), negative
169 predictive value (NPV) and accuracy. These parameters were calculated using the
170 predicate IMMY CrAg LFA as the reference method. The MedCalc software and online
171 calculator were used for this purpose [41], with McNemar's test's for paired nominal
172 data used to assess significance between the predicate and each new CrAg assay,
173 with p-values calculated ($p < 0.05$ regarded as significant) [42].

174

175 **Results**

176 Assay-specific positive and negative controls were analyzed with every batch of
177 samples retested with 100% accuracy for all assays over the test period. Of the 10
178 tests per assay set aside for duplicate or re-testing, only 4 repeat tests were performed
179 with the Bio-Rad assay. Repeat test results were not reported as the outcome did not
180 change from the original result observed.

181 **Performance of reference and test methods**

182 **Reference methods results**

183 In total, 254 patient samples were tested using the IMMY LFA SQ and Dynamiker SQ
184 assays. Only 230 samples could, however, be retested using the Bio-Rad assay due
185 to import challenges and the available timeline of the project. With 2 samples excluded
186 due to receipt >72 hours after predicate testing, only 228 samples could be used for
187 comparison across the three new assays (Fig 1). Of these 228 results, the predicate
188 LFA CrAg reference method identified 143 CrAg negative (62.72%) and 85 CrAg
189 positive results (Table 1).

190 Of all samples tested, 183/228 (80.3%) showed equivalent results across all testing
191 assays versus predicate; 102 negative (71.3% of total negative samples) and 81
192 positive samples (95.3% of total positive samples). The remaining 45/184 samples
193 showed discrepant results for one or more assays against the reported predicate result
194 (41 and 4 reported a negative and positive result respectively) (Fig 2).

195 **Figure 2: CrAg test results compared to the predicate LFA method:** A summary of CrAg
196 test results by the predicate method, indicating the number of results that were equivalent
197 across the four LFA assays versus the numbers of discrepant results, where one or more
198 assays had opposite results to the predicate result reported. (Purple bars represent CrAg
199 negative results and blue bars CrAg positive results),

200

201 **Newer commercial CrAg LFA test assay results**

202 Excellent agreement was noted for the number/percentage positive samples identified
203 by the IMMY SQ, Bio-Rad and Dynamiker assays against the predicate method. The
204 agreement for negative CrAg results, however, showed greater variability with the Bio-
205 Rad and Dynamiker assays. False-positive results were observed with all assay
206 comparisons to the predicate reference method used and ranged from 3 to 32 (1.31
207 to 14.03%) of the 228 samples tested, while false-negative results (compared to the
208 reference method) of <2% were reported across the test assays (Table 1). The highest
209 number of discordant results was reported for the Dynamiker assay, against the
210 reference predicate method (p-value <0.001, McNemar's test's test). Of the 32
211 samples classified as false-positive, 11 had very faint positive bands, while 21 samples
212 had clear positive bands as reported by two independent observers. Further analysis
213 of Dynamiker assay performance excluding the 11 samples with faint positive results,
214 only managed to reduce the percentage of false-positive samples by 3%, i.e. false
215 positivity rates remained greater than 9% (data not shown).

216 IMMY SQ results showed an excellent correlation with the predicate method (Table 1;
217 McNemar's test's test p=0.62). Of the 87 reported positive CrAg results, 20 recorded
218 a 1+ reading (including the 3 false-positives compared to the predicate), with 20 a 2+,
219 28 a 3+. 18 a 4+ and only one a 5+ result, confirming that 67.85% of samples had a
220 score of 3+ or more, i.e. an elevated concentration of CrAg associated with a high
221 burden of disease. With Bio-Rad (McNemar's test's test p=0.12), of the reported 92
222 positive samples, 51 had a T1 result, of which 50 (98.03%) correlated with an IMMY
223 SQ of a1+ or 2+ result, while 41 Bio-Rad tests had a T2 result, of which 37 (90.24%)
224 correlated with an IMMY SQ results of $\geq 3+$.

225

226 **Table 1: Summary of all CrAg assay results.**

IMMY Predicate CrAg LFA as Reference	IMMY SQ	BioRad	Dynamiker
Positive number (% of total)	84 (36.84)	81 (35.52)	85 (37.28)
Negative number (% of total)	140 (61.40)	132 (57.89)	111 (48.68)
False-positive number (% of total)	3 (1.31)	11 (4.82)	32 (14.03)
False-negative number (% of total)	1 (0.43)	4 (1.75)	0 (0.0)
p-value (Mc Nemar test)	0.617	0.123	<0.001***
TOTAL	228	228	228

227

228 The total test number and number of positive and negative samples were recorded as well as the
 229 number of false-positive and false-negative samples for each CrAg assay compared to the predicate
 230 CrAg LFA assay as reference method (n=85 CrAg positive and 143 CrAg negative samples). Data is
 231 reported as test results recorded and the percentage of total tests (n=228), with a p-value of the
 232 McNemar's test's for paired nominal data comparison (<0.05 statistically significant).

233

234 Sensitivity and Specificity analysis

235 Sensitivity and specificity analyses were done, using the predicate IMMY CrAg LFA
 236 as the reference method on 228 samples (Table 2). Specificity was greater than 95%
 237 for IMMY SQ assay, while 92.36% and 77.62% were reported for the Bio-Rad and
 238 Dynamiker assays respectively. Sensitivity ranged from 95.24% to 100% for the Bio-
 239 Rad and Dynamiker assays. An accuracy of 85.95% was reported for Dynamiker,
 240 compared to >90% reported for IMMY SQ and Bio-Rad assays.

241

242 **Table 2: Summary of specificity and sensitivity analyses.**

	Sensitivity and Specificity parameters as percentage (95% CI)	IMMY CrAg SQ LFA	Bio-Rad CrAg LFA	Dynamiker CrAg LFA
PREDICATE IMMY CrAg LFA	Specificity	97.90 (93.99-99.57)	92.36 (86.74-96.13)	77.62 (69.90-84.16)
	Sensitivity	98.82 (93.32-99.97)	95.24 (88.25-96.65)	100 (95.75-100.00)
	Positive Predictive Value (PPV)	96.55 (90.13-98.85)	87.91 (80.44-92.78)	72.65 (66.19-78.28)
	Negative Predictive Value (NPV)	99.29 (95.23-99.9)	97.08 (92.73-98.86)	100
	Accuracy	98.25 (95.57-99.52)	93.42 (89.38-96.27)	85.96 (80.77-90.20)

243

244 Each of the newer CrAg assays was assessed against the predicate IMMY CrAg LFA. All results are
 245 reported as a percentage with the 95% confidence interval in brackets. Data were collected from
 246 February to June 2019 at two testing laboratories in South Africa.

247

248

249

250

251 **Discussion**

252

253 This study set out to verify the diagnostic performance of the newer CrAg LFA assays
254 against the predicate method (IMMY LFA) for accuracy, sensitivity and specificity
255 under typical laboratory conditions.

256 Of the newer commercial CrAg assays, IMMY SQ fared best, with sensitivity and
257 specificity exceeding 95%, while Bio-Rad results were also acceptable with sensitivity
258 and specificity greater than 90%. Similar acceptable outcomes have been reported
259 for the IMMY SQ assay by Tenforde et al. and Temfack et al [43, 44].

260 The lower sensitivity of between 78-88% and specificity of more than 90% [43-46] have
261 been reported for the Bio-Rad CryptoPS assay (also marketed as Biosynex CryptoPS)
262 as well as lower specificity in samples with a low fungal burden (missed positivity) in
263 these samples [43, 44] The verification results of this current South African
264 comparison, confirmed the slightly lower sensitivity and specificity of the Bio-Rad
265 CryptoPS assay, however still within local acceptable criteria of sensitivity and
266 specificity of >90%. A possible explanation previously reported mentioned the
267 differences described in the limit of detection between IMMY LFA (5ng/ml) vs. Bio-Rad
268 (25ng/ml) [46].

269 Our local study reported acceptable sensitivity of more than 98% for the Dynamiker
270 CrAg assay, but specificity rates of 77% (vs. predicate LFA). The Dynamiker assay
271 reported the highest number of false-positive results, mainly due to weak positive
272 bands reported by two independent observers. Even with these removed from all
273 calculations, the false positivity rate remained at ~10%. Similar high false-positive
274 results were reported by Kwizera et al, where they showed comparable sensitivity with
275 IMMY LFA, but poor specificity in serum and plasma samples [35]. This may in part

276 be due to the lower detection limit of Dynamiker (1.25ng/ml vs. 1.75 ng/ml for IMMY
277 LFA). A small study (n=25) published in 2018, reported that Dynamiker had a brighter
278 intensity of a positive result than comparative results with the IMMY LFA, and the
279 authors suggested that a faint positive result with Dynamiker should be reported as
280 CrAg negative with this assay [47]. This is, however, impractical in a typical laboratory
281 setting where only one assay kit is used and laboratory staff is trained to report all
282 positive results (faint or clear) as such. No verification testing is done routinely in the
283 NHLS CrAg reflex program and comparative testing may only be available in research
284 facilities for specific projects. The observed higher positivity could be attributed to the
285 differences in methods compared to IMMY and other LFA strips, in that there is no
286 diluent used. A comparative study on cryopreserved serum samples (n=162) reported
287 acceptable specificity of 89% of the Dynamiker assay versus IMMY LFA [48]. Their
288 study had only a small number of positive samples (n=14; 8.6% of total tests), but
289 reported an equivalent number of false-positive results (n=15; 9.3% of total tests),
290 which they contribute to the lower detection threshold of the Dynamiker assay.

291 All findings of our study were shared with the local service provider and subsequently,
292 a refined version of the assay was provided for testing. Unfortunately, the issue of faint
293 false-positive results persisted (data not shown)

294 Our study showed that the performance of the IMMY SQ and Bio-Rad assays were
295 comparable to IMMY LFA results with both sensitivity and specificity greater than 90%
296 These results confirm earlier reported verification results with this CrAg assay [43, 44,
297 46], where there was a good correlation with LFA titer results, where the grading from
298 1+ to 5+ showed correlation with titers [43, 44, 46]. This was further confirmed in a
299 study on cerebrospinal fluid (CSF), where increasing IMMY SQ grades were
300 associated with greater LFA titer and quantitative culture results/colony forming units

301 (CFU/ml) [49]. The risk stratification offered by the IMMY SQ and Bio-Rad assays may
302 be important from a clinical perspective to identify the severity of meningitis and the
303 infiltration of the central nervous system (CNS) associated with elevated CrAg
304 concentrations [43, 44, 46]. Patients with a grade of ≥ 3 may have a higher risk of poor
305 outcomes, as reported by Tadeo et al, 2021 [49].

306 **Limitations**

307 This verification study of the diagnostic performance of newer LFA CrAg test methods
308 was done on typical laboratory samples, tested by qualified technologists. In-house
309 unpublished reproducibility verifications performed on fresh EDTA samples over time
310 using the IMMY LFA method showed reproducible results up to 48 hours on samples
311 kept at room temperature. Assay recommendations indicate testing within 24 hours
312 with samples stored at room temperature or up to 48 hours if refrigerated [32-34, 36].
313 Manufacturers need to take into consideration the time delay from sample collection
314 to testing to ensure this does not affect the outcome of the test results, i.e. ensure the
315 robustness of their assay to produce a reliable result even on samples older than 24
316 hours. Although the LFA technology is ideal for point-of-care testing at a clinic level,
317 this would delay patient testing while waiting for a confirmation of a CD4 count, with
318 most patients typically only returning for test results within 7-14 days [15].

319 Operator feedback highlighted extra preparation steps needed with some assays and
320 expressed challenges with result interpretation where more than two bands were
321 present, i.e. particularly with assays like Bio-Rad and IMMY SQ with multiple lines to
322 read manually, even though all tests were read independently by two LFA trained
323 members of staff.

324 Typical laboratory challenges with CrAg LFA testing include mislabeling and
325 transcription errors to the worksheet and onto the LIS. Automated cassette readers
326 could be used to ensure direct transfer of the strip result to the LIS. Some strip readers
327 were tested locally, though the challenges were either it making use of an intermediary
328 program (like Excel) for result reporting (no direct interface with laboratory information
329 system), or single sample reading of results that may not necessarily reduce turn-
330 around-time of CrAg result reporting or hands-on time by operators.

331 The positivity percentages reported here do not represent the incidence of CrAg in
332 South Africa [50, 51] as samples were collected from two facilities for assay
333 performance specifically. Due to fairly low positivity rates at these facilities, all positive
334 samples available were retested. Care was taken to include as many positive samples
335 for statistical comparisons between assays, within the limitations of suitable samples,
336 available reagents and time of operators to conduct testing.

337 **Conclusion**

338 The local verification of performance of newer commercial CrAg assays is necessary
339 to confirm accurate result reporting as there is inevitable variability between assays.
340 Additional information provided by some assays like the Bio-Rad and IMMY SQ i.e.
341 the intensity of antigen detected should be further investigated to assess its value to
342 clinicians in deciding on whether a lumbar puncture is needed or a CNS infiltration is
343 suspected. The relevance of this added information may, however, depend on the
344 local treatment guidelines i.e. in South Africa all CrAg positive patients will get a lumbar
345 puncture currently [15, 52] and cost-effectiveness of graded assays, especially in large
346 national CrAg screening programs.

347

348 **Acknowledgements**

349 The authors would like to thank the trainers (Neo Mokone and Sithembile Mojalefa) of
350 the National Priority Program (NPP) for testing samples.

351

352 References

- 353 1. Pongsai P, Atamasirikul K, Sungkanuparph S. The role of serum cryptococcal antigen
354 screening for the early diagnosis of cryptococcosis in HIV-infected patients with different
355 ranges of CD4 cell counts. *J Infect.* 2010;60(6):474-7
356 <https://doi.org/http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jinf.2010.03.015>.
- 357 2. Jarvis JN, Boule A, Loyse A, Bicanic T, Rebe K, Williams A, et al. High ongoing burden
358 of cryptococcal disease in Africa despite antiretroviral rollout. *AIDS.* 2009;23(9):1
359 <https://doi.org/10.1097/QAD.0b013e32832bc0fc>
- 360 3. Parker BJ, Wannemuehler KA, Marston BJ, N.P. G, Pappas PG, Chiller TM. Estimation
361 of the current global burden of cryptococcal meningitis among persons living with HIV/AIDS.
362 *AIDS.* 2009;23(4):5 <https://doi.org/10.1097/QAD.0b013e328322ffac>
- 363 4. World Health Organization. Consolidated guidelines on the use of antiretroviral drugs
364 for treating and preventing HIV infection Recommendations for a public health approach
365 [Guideline]. Geneva, Switzerland 2016, Accessed: 15 November 2019. Available from:
366 <https://www.who.int/hiv/pub/arv/arv-2016/en/>.
- 367 5. Govender NP, Meintjes G, Mangena P, Nel J, Potgieter S, Reddy D, et al. Southern
368 African HIV Clinicians Society guideline for the prevention, diagnosis and management of
369 cryptococcal disease among HIV-infected persons: 2019 update. *South Afr J HIV Med.*
370 2019;20(1):1030 <https://doi.org/10.4102/sajhivmed.v20i1.1030>
- 371 6. Coetzee LM, Cassim N, Glencross DK, Rapid scale-up of reflexed Cryptococcal
372 antigen (CrAg) screening across a CD4 laboratory network in South Africa. *International Aids*
373 *Society (IAS);* 2017, 23-26 July; Paris,
374 France, https://www.iasociety.org/Web/WebContent/File/IAS2017_conference_report.pdf.
- 375 7. Mokone G, Mojalefa S, Coetzee L, Glencross DK, Implementation of a National
376 Cryptococcal antigen (CrAg) reflexed screening programme in South Africa. *Society of*
377 *Medical Laboratory Science of South Africa (SMLTSA);* 2017, 19-21 May 2017; Durban, South
378 Africa
- 379 8. Cassim N, Coetzee LM, Govender NP, Glencross DK. District and sub-district analysis
380 of cryptococcal antigenaemia prevalence and specimen positivity in KwaZulu-Natal, South
381 Africa. *Afr J Lab Med.* 2018;7(1):757 <https://doi.org/10.4102/ajlm.v7i1.757>
- 382 9. Coetzee LM, Cassim N, Sriruttan C, Mhlanga M, Govender NP, Glencross DK.
383 Cryptococcal antigen positivity combined with the percentage of HIV-seropositive samples
384 with CD4 counts <100 cells/ul identifies districts in South Africa with advanced burden of
385 disease. *PLoS One.* 2018;13(6):e0198993 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0198993>
- 386 10. Govender NP, Glencross DK. National coverage of reflex cryptococcal antigen
387 screening: A milestone achievement in the care of persons with advanced HIV disease. *S Afr*
388 *Med J.* 2018;108(7):534-5 <https://doi.org/10.7196/SAMJ.2018.v108i7.13094>
- 389 11. Greene G, Lawrence DS, Jordan A, Chiller T, Jarvis JN. Cryptococcal meningitis: a
390 review of cryptococcal antigen screening programs in Africa. *Expert Rev Anti Infect Ther.*
391 2020;1-12 <https://doi.org/10.1080/14787210.2020.1785871>
- 392 12. Cassim N, Coetzee LM, Schnippel K, Glencross DK. Estimating the cost-per-result of
393 a national reflexed Cryptococcal antigenaemia screening program: Forecasting the impact of
394 potential HIV guideline changes and treatment goals. *PLoS One.* 2017;12(8):e0182154
395 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0182154>
- 396 13. Cassim N, Schnippel K, Coetzee LM, Glencross DK. Establishing a cost-per-result of
397 laboratory-based, reflex Cryptococcal antigenaemia screening (CrAg) in HIV+ patients with
398 CD4 counts less than 100 cells/ul using a Lateral Flow Assay (LFA) at a typical busy CD4
399 laboratory in South Africa. *PLoS One.* 2017;12(2):e0171675
400 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0171675>
- 401 14. Kozel TR, Bauman SK. CrAg lateral flow assay for cryptococcosis. *Expert Opin Med*
402 *Diagn.* 2012;6(3):245-51 <https://doi.org/10.1517/17530059.2012.681300>
- 403 15. World Health Organization. Guidelines for the diagnosis, prevention and management
404 of cryptococcal disease in HIV-infected adults, adolescents and children [Guideline]. Geneva,

- 405 Switzerland2018, Accessed: 15 November 2019. Available from:
406 <https://www.who.int/hiv/pub/guidelines/cryptococcal-disease/en/>.
- 407 16. Jarvis JN, Percival A, Bauman S, Pelfrey J, Meintjes G, Williams GN, et al. Evaluation
408 of a novel point-of-care cryptococcal antigen test on serum, plasma, and urine from patients
409 with HIV-associated cryptococcal meningitis. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2011;53(10):1019-23
410 <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/cir613>
- 411 17. Lindsley MD, Mekha N, Baggett HC, Surinthonng Y, Autthateinchai R, Sawatwong P, et
412 al. Evaluation of a newly developed lateral flow immunoassay for the diagnosis of
413 cryptococcosis. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2011;53(4):321-5 <https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/cir379>
- 414 18. Binnicker MJ, Jespersen DJ, Bestrom JE, Rollins LO. Comparison of four assays for
415 the detection of cryptococcal antigen. *Clin Vaccine Immunol*. 2012;19(12):1988-90
416 <https://doi.org/10.1128/CVI.00446-12>
- 417 19. Gates-Hollingsworth MA, Kozel TR. Serotype sensitivity of a lateral flow immunoassay
418 for cryptococcal antigen. *Clin Vaccine Immunol*. 2013;20(4):634-5
419 <https://doi.org/10.1128/CVI.00732-12>
- 420 20. Hansen J, Slechta ES, Gates-Hollingsworth MA, Neary B, Barker AP, Bauman S, et
421 al. Large-scale evaluation of the immuno-mycologics lateral flow and enzyme-linked
422 immunoassays for detection of cryptococcal antigen in serum and cerebrospinal fluid. *Clin*
423 *Vaccine Immunol*. 2013;20(1):52-5 <https://doi.org/10.1128/CVI.00536-12>
- 424 21. Vijayan T, Chiller T, Klausner JD. Sensitivity and specificity of a new cryptococcal
425 antigen lateral flow assay in serum and cerebrospinal fluid. *MLO Med Lab Obs*. 2013;45(3):16,
426 8, 20
- 427 22. Kabanda T, Siedner MJ, Klausner JD, Muzoora C, Boulware DR. Point-of-care
428 diagnosis and prognostication of cryptococcal meningitis with the cryptococcal antigen lateral
429 flow assay on cerebrospinal fluid. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2014;58(1):113-6
430 <https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/cit641>
- 431 23. Lourens A, Jarvis JN, Meintjes G, Samuel CM. Rapid diagnosis of cryptococcal
432 meningitis by use of lateral flow assay on cerebrospinal fluid samples: influence of the high-
433 dose "hook" effect. *J Clin Microbiol*. 2014;52(12):4172-5 <https://doi.org/10.1128/JCM.01683-14>
- 434 14
- 435 24. Magambo KA, Kalluvya SE, Kapoor SW, Seni J, Chofle AA, Fitzgerald DW, et al. Utility
436 of urine and serum lateral flow assays to determine the prevalence and predictors of
437 cryptococcal antigenemia in HIV-positive outpatients beginning antiretroviral therapy in
438 Mwanza, Tanzania. *J Int AIDS Soc*. 2014;17:19040 <https://doi.org/10.7448/IAS.17.1.19040>
- 439 25. Huang HR, Fan LC, Rajbanshi B, Xu JF. Evaluation of a new cryptococcal antigen
440 lateral flow immunoassay in serum, cerebrospinal fluid and urine for the diagnosis of
441 cryptococcosis: a meta-analysis and systematic review. *PLoS One*. 2015;10(5):e0127117
442 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0127117>
- 443 26. Chen M, Zhou J, Li J, Li M, Sun J, Fang WJ, et al. Evaluation of five conventional and
444 molecular approaches for diagnosis of cryptococcal meningitis in non-HIV-infected patients.
445 *Mycoses*. 2016;59(8):494-502 <https://doi.org/10.1111/myc.12497>
- 446 27. Nalintya E, Kiggundu R, Meya D. Evolution of Cryptococcal Antigen Testing: What is
447 new? *Curr Fungal Infect Rep*. 2016;10(2):62-7 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12281-016-0256-3>
- 448 28. Tang MW, Clemons KV, Katzenstein DA, Stevens DA. The cryptococcal antigen lateral
449 flow assay: A point-of-care diagnostic at an opportune time. *Crit Rev Microbiol*.
450 2016;42(4):634-42 <https://doi.org/10.3109/1040841X.2014.982509>
- 451 29. Caceres DH, Zuluaga A, Tabares AM, Chiller T, Gonzalez A, Gomez BL. Evaluation
452 of a Cryptococcal antigen Lateral Flow Assay in serum and cerebrospinal fluid for rapid
453 diagnosis of cryptococcosis in Colombia. *Revista do Instituto de Medicina Tropical de Sao*
454 *Paulo*. 2017;59:e76 <https://doi.org/10.1590/s1678-9946201759076>
- 455 30. Moodley K, Coetzee L, Glencross DK. Testing platforms for early detection of
456 Cryptococcal Antigenemia in high volume CD4 testing laboratories in South Africa. 8th
457 INTEREST Workshop; 5-9 May; Lusaka, Zambia
458 2014.[https://www.researchgate.net/publication/273577376_Testing_Platforms_for_Early_De](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/273577376_Testing_Platforms_for_Early_Detection_of_Cryptococcal_Antigenaemia_in_High_Volume_CD4_Testing_Laboratories_in_South_Africa)
459 [tection_of_Cryptococcal_Antigenaemia_in_High_Volume_CD4_Testing_Laboratories_in So](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/273577376_Testing_Platforms_for_Early_Detection_of_Cryptococcal_Antigenaemia_in_High_Volume_CD4_Testing_Laboratories_in_South_Africa)
460 [uth_Africa](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/273577376_Testing_Platforms_for_Early_Detection_of_Cryptococcal_Antigenaemia_in_High_Volume_CD4_Testing_Laboratories_in_South_Africa)

- 461 31. BioRad. RDT Crypto PS Assay 2017, Accessed: 20 October 2020. Available from:
462 <http://www.diagnostics-bio-rad.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/RDT-CryptoPS-Assay.pdf>.
- 463 32. Biotechnology D. Dynamiker Cryptococcal Antigen Lateral Flow Assay (LFA)
464 [Catalogue No.: DNK-1411-1]. London, England: Wellkang Ltd; 2017, Accessed: 9 October
465 2020. Available from: [https://www.rafer.es/sites/default/files/pack_insert-dnk-](https://www.rafer.es/sites/default/files/pack_insert-dnk-cryptococcal_antigen_lfa.pdf)
466 [cryptococcal_antigen_lfa.pdf](https://www.rafer.es/sites/default/files/pack_insert-dnk-cryptococcal_antigen_lfa.pdf).
- 467 33. IMMY. CrAgSQ Lateral Flow Assay: For the Detection of Cryptococcal antigen.
468 Norman, OK, USA: IMMY; 2019.
- 469 34. IMMY. CrAg® LFA: CRYPTOCOCCAL ANTIGEN Norman, OK, USA: IMMY; 2019,
470 Accessed: 2 October 2020. Available from: <https://www.immy.com/crag>.
- 471 35. Kiiza TK, Nimwesiga A, Skipper CP, Kwizera R, Apeduno L, Okirwoth M, et al.,
472 Diagnostic performance of a semi-quantitative Point of Care assay for Cryptococcus. CROI
473 2020; 2020, 8-11 March; Boston, MA,
474 USA, [https://www.croiconference.org/abstract/diagnostic-performance-of-a-semiquantitative-](https://www.croiconference.org/abstract/diagnostic-performance-of-a-semiquantitative-point-of-care-assay-for-cryptococcosis/)
475 [point-of-care-assay-for-cryptococcosis/](https://www.croiconference.org/abstract/diagnostic-performance-of-a-semiquantitative-point-of-care-assay-for-cryptococcosis/).
- 476 36. Biosynex. BIOSYNEX® CryptoPS: For the semi-quantitative detection of
477 Cryptococcus sp. antigens in whole blood, serum, plasma and CSF [Package insert
478 112001]. ILLKIRCH-GRAFFENSTADEN - France: Biosynex SA; 2018, Accessed: 9 October
479 2020. Available from: <https://www.biosynex.com/flyers/pro/mycologie/en/cryptops.pdf>.
- 480 37. South African National Accreditation System (SANAS). International and Regional
481 Recognition [Regulatory guidelines]. Pretoria, South Africa: SANAS; 2020, Accessed: 12
482 October 2020. Available from:
483 <https://www.sanas.co.za/pages/index.aspx?page=international-regional-recognition>.
- 484 38. National Health Laboratory Service (NHLS). Proficiency testing Johannesburg, South
485 Africa 2021, Accessed: 29 April 2021. Available from: [https://www.nhls.ac.za/quality-](https://www.nhls.ac.za/quality-assurance/proficiency-testing/)
486 [assurance/proficiency-testing/](https://www.nhls.ac.za/quality-assurance/proficiency-testing/).
- 487 39. Cohen JF, Korevaar DA, Altman DG, Bruns DE, Gatsonis CA, Hooft L, et al. STARD
488 2015 guidelines for reporting diagnostic accuracy studies: explanation and elaboration. *BMJ*
489 *Open*. 2016;6(11):e012799 <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2016-012799>
- 490 40. Bossuyt PM, Reitsma JB, Bruns DE, Gatsonis CA, Glasziou PP, Irwig L, et al. STARD
491 2015: An Updated List of Essential Items for Reporting Diagnostic Accuracy Studies.
492 *Radiology*. 2015;277(3):826-32 <https://doi.org/10.1148/radiol.2015151516>
- 493 41. MedCalc Software. Diagnostic test evaluation calculator: MedCalc Software Ltd, ;
494 2015, Accessed: 8 November 2021. Available from:
495 https://www.medcalc.org/calculator/diagnostic_test.php.
- 496 42. Trajman A, Luiz RR. McNemar chi2 test revisited: comparing sensitivity and specificity
497 of diagnostic examinations. *Scand J Clin Lab Invest*. 2008;68(1):77-80
498 <https://doi.org/10.1080/00365510701666031>
- 499 43. Temfack E, Kouanfack C, Mossiang L, Loyse A, Fonkoua MC, Molloy SF, et al.
500 Cryptococcal Antigen Screening in Asymptomatic HIV-Infected Antiretroviral Naive Patients in
501 Cameroon and Evaluation of the New Semi-Quantitative Biosynex CryptoPS Test. *Front*
502 *Microbiol*. 2018;9:409 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fmicb.2018.00409>
- 503 44. Tenforde MW, Boyer-Chammard T, Muthoga C, Tawe L, Milton T, Rulaganyang I, et
504 al. Diagnostic accuracy of the Biosynex CryptoPS cryptococcal antigen semi-quantitative
505 lateral flow assay in patients with advanced HIV disease. *J Clin Microbiol*. 2020
506 <https://doi.org/10.1128/JCM.02307-20>
- 507 45. Rajasingham R, Wake RM, Beyene T, Katende A, Letang E, Boulware DR.
508 Cryptococcal Meningitis Diagnostics and Screening in the Era of Point-of-Care Laboratory
509 Testing. *J Clin Microbiol*. 2019;57(1) <https://doi.org/10.1128/JCM.01238-18>
- 510 46. Skipper C, Tadeo K, Martyn E, Nalintya E, Rajasingham R, Meya DB, et al. Evaluation
511 of Serum Cryptococcal Antigen Testing Using Two Novel Semiquantitative Lateral Flow
512 Assays in Persons with Cryptococcal Antigenemia. *J Clin Microbiol*. 2020;58(4)
513 <https://doi.org/10.1128/JCM.02046-19>
- 514 47. Bjornsdottir MK, Mahler SS, Raluca D, Arendrup MC, Evaluation of the new Dynamiker
515 cryptococcal antigen lateral flow assay (LFA) in comparison with IMMY LFA and Meridian latex
516 agglutination test. 28th European Congress of Clinical Microbiology and Infectious Diseases

- 517 (ECCMID) 2018, 21-24 April; Madrid,
518 Spain, file:///C:/Users/lindi.coetzee/Documents/My%20Documents/2021/Papers/LFA%20revi
519 ew%201/P1197_abstract.pdf.
- 520 48. Noguera MC, Escandon P, Rodriguez J, Parody A, Camargo L. Comparison of two
521 commercial tests (Immy vs. Dynamiker) for cryptococcal capsular antigen. *Rev Soc Bras Med*
522 *Trop.* 2021;54:e03072021 <https://doi.org/10.1590/0037-8682-0307-2021>
- 523 49. Tadeo KK, Nimwesiga A, Kwizera R, Apeduno L, Martyn E, Okirwoth M, et al.
524 Evaluation of the Diagnostic Performance of a Semiquantitative Cryptococcal Antigen Point-
525 of-Care Assay among HIV-Infected Persons with Cryptococcal Meningitis. *J Clin Microbiol.*
526 2021;59(8):e0086021 <https://doi.org/10.1128/JCM.00860-21>
- 527 50. Coetzee LM, Cassim N, Glencross DK. Analysis of HIV disease burden by calculating
528 the percentages of patients with CD4 counts <100 cells/microL across 52 districts reveals hot
529 spots for intensified commitment to programmatic support. *S Afr Med J.* 2017;107(6):507-13
530 <https://doi.org/10.7196/SAMJ.2017.v107i6.11311>
- 531 51. Coetzee LM, Cassim N, Srirottan C, Mhlanga M, Govender NP, Glencross DK.
532 Cryptococcal antigen positivity combined with the percentage of HIV-seropositive samples
533 with CD4 counts <100 cells/mul identifies districts in South Africa with advanced burden of
534 disease. *PLoS One.* 2018;13(6):e0198993 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0198993>
- 535 52. Loyse A, Burry J, Cohn J, Ford N, Chiller T, Ribeiro I, et al. Leave no one behind:
536 response to new evidence and guidelines for the management of cryptococcal meningitis in
537 low-income and middle-income countries. *Lancet Infect Dis.* 2019;19(4):e143-e7
538 [https://doi.org/10.1016/s1473-3099\(18\)30493-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/s1473-3099(18)30493-6)

539
540

541




Fig 1




Fig 2