

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

Evaluating diagnostic accuracies of Panbio™ COVID-19 rapid antigen test and RT-PCR for the detection of SARS-CoV-2 in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia using Bayesian Latent-Class Models (BLCM)

Abay Sisay^{1, 2, ¶,*}, Sonja Hartnack^{3, ¶}, Abebaw Tiruneh^{1, 4}, Yasin Desalegn⁴, Abraham Tesfaye^{1,5}, Adey Feleke Desta²

¹Department of Medical Laboratory Sciences, College of Health Sciences, Addis Ababa University, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia
²Department of Microbial, Cellular and Molecular Biology, College of Natural and Computational Sciences, Addis Ababa University, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia
³Section of Epidemiology, Vetsuisse Faculty, University of Zurich, Zurich, Switzerland
⁴Addis Ababa Public Health Research and Emergency Management Laboratory, Addis Ababa Health Bureau, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia
⁵Diagnostic Unit, Center for Innovative Drug Development and Therapeutic Trials for Africa, CDT- Africa, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

*Corresponding author

¶ These authors contributed equally to this work

28 Abstract

29 **Background:** Rapid diagnostics are vital for curbing the transmission and control of COVID-19
30 pandemic. Although many commercially available antigen-based rapid diagnostic tests (Ag-
31 RDTs) for the detection of SARS-CoV-2 are recommended by the WHO, their diagnostic
32 performance has not yet been assessed in Ethiopia. So far, the vast majority of studies
33 assessing diagnostic accuracies of rapid antigen tests considered RT-PCR as a gold standard,
34 which inevitably leads to bias when RT-PCR is not 100% sensitive and specific. Thus, this study
35 aimed to evaluate the diagnostic performance of Panbio™ COVID-19 rapid antigen test jointly
36 together with the RT-PCR for the detection of SARS-CoV-2.

37 **Methods:** A prospective cross-sectional study was done from July to September 2021 in Addis
38 Ababa, Ethiopia, during the third wave of the pandemic involving two health centers and two
39 hospitals. Diagnostic sensitivity and specificity of Panbio™ rapid antigen test and RT-PCR were
40 obtained using Bayesian Latent-Class Models (BLCM).

41 **Results:** 438 COVID-19 presumptive clients were enrolled, 239 (54.6%) were females, of whom
42 196 (44.7%) had a positive RT-PCR and 158 (36.1%) were Ag-RDT positive. The Ag-RDT and RT-
43 PCR had a sensitivity (95% CrI) of 99.6 (98.4- 100), 89.3 (83.2- 97.6) and specificity (95% CrI) of
44 93.4 (82.3 - 100), 99.1 (97.5- 100) respectively. Most of the study participants, 318 (72.6)
45 exhibited COVID-19 symptoms and the most reported was cough 191 (43.6).

46 **Conclusion:** The diagnostic performance of Panbio™ COVID-19 Ag RDT is coherent with the
47 WHO established criteria of having a sensitivity $\geq 80\%$ for Ag-RDTs. Superior performance of
48 the Panbio™ RDT was documented in samples with the lowest cycle-threshold RT-PCR values
49 and clients with confirmed clinical symptoms. Thus, we recommend the use of the Panbio™
50 RDT for both symptomatic and asymptomatic individuals in clinical settings for screening
51 purposes.

52
53 **Key words:** *diagnostic sensitivity, diagnostic specificity, no gold standard, rapid diagnostic tests*

54
55

56 INTRODUCTION

57 The global public health and economic threats that resulted in countless disastrous effects
58 due to COVID-19 is being revealed in numerous ways and it's not yet over. More than
59 6,223,645 deaths from over 504,834,324 documented cases have been reported as of April 18,
60 2022, since its detection in December 2019 and its being declared as public health emergency
61 in March 2020 [1, 2,3].

62 In Africa, the current health systems and laboratory diagnostic capacities are at their
63 questionable with respect to managing outbreaks as early as possible. Accordingly, realizing
64 the 2030 SDG with lots of pitfalls in the diagnostic capacity and with so many people failing to
65 get diagnosed. Irrefutably, rapid diagnostic tests are fundamental components of a successful
66 outbreak containment strategy by prompt identification of cases that minimize response
67 costs and save lives due to outbreak of the current COVID -19 [4, 5].

68 Ethiopia, being one of the countries with limited trained human and material resources is no
69 exception, being the 6th in Africa with 468,895 COVID-19 cases. The country had experienced
70 its fourth wave with an overwhelmingly rapid community transmission compared with the
71 previous epidemic waves, having 35% of positivity rate and 56,706 new cases (Data of
72 December 2021) [3, 6]. Despite this, the country has been tackling the pandemic through
73 allocation of the limited resources for the transmission prevention and implementation of a
74 uniform evidence-based preventive protocol at all levels of the health care system under
75 central command, which is considered as a wise decision for optimal resource utilization [7,
76 8].

77 The current choice of established tests for the diagnosis of COVID-19 with a relatively better
78 diagnostic performance using respiratory swab sample is RT-PCR, but its affordability and
79 infrastructure demand for most laboratories in the low-income countries are atypical.
80 Alternative testing modalities have become convenient approaches to reach more clients and
81 a step forward to empower individuals by bringing healthcare services closer to them. In view

82 of this, rapid antigen tests have been in place as an option with their comparable diagnostic
83 performance [9-11].

84 The impact of rapid diagnostic testing (RDT) has been significant because results can be
85 delivered in short turnaround time of COVID-19 testing. RDT has become a game-changer for
86 triaging patients and crucial medical decisions [7,12]. Compared to RDT, the procedure of RT-
87 PCR is sophisticated, may lead to specimen contamination and technical personnel are prone
88 to acquiring the virus while demand samples from the presumptive cases [4]. On the other
89 hand, several RDTs have been and are currently being developed and commercialized [4, 7,13].
90 Despite the ease of application and low cost, RDTs are still in need of attention on their quality
91 diagnostic performance for the containment of the virus [14,15].

92 Since May 2021, Ethiopia has started using Panbio™ COVID-19 rapid antigen test for the
93 diagnosis of COVID-19 in line with RT-PCR [16,17]. Yet, there has been no documented evidence
94 on its diagnostic performance. Indeed, the pandemic urges to have an evidence-based
95 information on its diagnostic accuracy as critically and timely imperative for the program and
96 has its impact in the containment strategy and for continuous quality improvements on its
97 implementation as part of the pandemic control [11,18,19, 20]. Moreover, a lot of studies are
98 available elsewhere that evaluated Panbio™ COVID-19 Ag-RDTs against RT-PCR as the gold
99 standard [21-24], which inevitably leads to bias. Yet, no study has been conducted using BLCM.
100 Thus, this study aimed to assess the diagnostic performance of Panbio™ rapid antigen test for
101 the detection of SARS-CoV-2 in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia using BLCM to bridge the lack of
102 performance accuracy in clinical setting.

103 **Materials and methods**

104 **Study design, period and settings**

105 A health facility-based prospective cross-sectional diagnostic test evaluation study was
106 conducted from July to September 2021, during on the third wave of the epidemic, among
107 COVID-19 presumptive clients in public health facilities of Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. The study

108 site, Addis Ababa is described in Sisay A. and colleagues,2022 [17]. As part of the current
109 pandemic response, the Addis Ababa Health bureau selected 20 health centers: which is 2
110 health centers from the ten sub cities, it is based on the previous sub city classification and 6
111 hospitals for the pilot and start up implementation of this rapid antigen test, Panbio™
112 (Abbott) rapid antigen test kit for the detection of SARS-CoV-2 using nasopharyngeal swabs
113 against. From these sites, we have selected two government health centers (Kazanches,
114 Kotebe) and two hospitals (Zewuditu Memorial Hospital, Ras Desta Damitew Memorial
115 Hospital). These two public hospitals are amongst the largest and the referral health care
116 system promotes and provides preventive, curative and rehabilitative outpatient care
117 including basic laboratory services [25,26].

118 **Sampling method**

119 The study population were all presumptive COVID-19 clients among public health facilities of
120 Addis Ababa who were willing to take part in the study and were available during data
121 collection period. We employed a convenience sampling technique until it reached a
122 maximum saturation point (n=438). Stratification of the samples in the four selected sites
123 was done based on the health facilities' previous three months of SARS-CoV-2 testing
124 performance and availability of resources (see [annex 1](#)). The sampling also considered
125 contingency for non-response, invalid and contamination for assuring the best
126 representativeness of the specimens.

127

128 **Flow of study Participants**

129 In this study, eligible participants from community surveillance, contacts of confirmed cases,
130 and suspects who fulfill the WHO criteria and Ethiopian guideline for COVID-19 cases were
131 screened by trained professionals as quick triage system [27]. Of these, a total of 438
132 nasopharyngeal swabs was collected by trained health professionals.

133 We excluded the critically ill cases, confirmed COVID-19 positive patients and with age \leq 18
134 years old. Regarding test kit selection, Panbio™ COVID-19 Ag RDT was used for our study

135 mainly because Panbio™ RDT was the only locally available test kit listed by WHO and
136 authorized by the Ethiopian regulatory body for laboratory utilization [27, 28].

137 **Methods of Sample collection and data collection instruments**

138 We collected the nasopharyngeal respiratory specimens twice from each study participant
139 upon consent using viral transport medium: one for rapid antigen and the other for RT-PCR.
140 The rapid Ag tests were analyzed immediately according to the manufacturers' instruction by
141 the primary investigators and results were obtained by the visual interpretation of each
142 testers. The other collected specimen was placed in 3 mL of Viral Transport Medium (VTM)
143 and packed by triple packing system for maintaining the safety measures and shipped
144 immediately to Addis Ababa Public health research and emergency management center
145 laboratory (AAPHEML) for RT-PCR testing. The clinical specimens were collected with strict
146 bio safety measure and lab procedure of Panbio rapid Ag. The quantitative data were
147 collected using a structured data collection tool, prepared was developed in English language
148 after reviewing relevant literature .It included the socio-demographic characteristics and
149 client`s clinical information used for the analysis of the finding of the study [28,29].

150 **Laboratory Testing Procedures**

151 **RT- PCR SARS-CoV-2 testing**

152 2 mL VTM (China, Miraclean Technology Co., Ltd., www.mantacc.com) nasopharyngeal
153 specimens were collected and all the nasopharyngeal samples were extracted in BIOER auto
154 method extraction machine with MgaBio plus virus RNA purification kit II and analyzed by
155 using Sansure Biotech (MA-6000) SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR assay on the BGI Real-Time Fluorescent
156 RT-PCR Kit for Detecting SARS-CoV-2 in a real-time reverse transcription polymerase chain
157 reaction (RT-PCR) test. The assay developed for detecting specific single target gene, which
158 is found on the ORF1ab region of SARS-CoV-2 genome. Further, human housekeeping gene β -
159 Actin is the target gene for the internal control. The master mixing was done by mixing 20 μ l
160 master mix reagent and 10 μ l of the extracted sample RNA to the well pre filled with PCR-Mix
161 in the following order: no template (negative) control, patient specimen(s), and positive

162 control. The reference test with a cycle threshold (Ct) < 38 as the criteria for a positive result
163 if Ct value of internal reference not higher than 32 at VIC/HEX and specimen is negative
164 ORF1ab/FAM as 0 or no data available while Ct value at VIC/HEX not higher than 32 [30].

165 **Ag-RDT SARS-CoV-2 testing**

166 The collected nasopharyngeal swab was processed on site using the Panbio™ Ag-RDT (Abbott
167 Diagnostic GmbH, Germany). The samples from the swab are mixed with approximately 300
168 µl of buffer, and then add 5 drops are dispensed into the device. The results were interpreted
169 in 15 -20 minutes following in the manufacturer's instruction but the results do not read after
170 20 minutes. It detects the presence of the nucleocapsid (N) proteins of the virus on a
171 membrane based using an immune chromatography assay. For a positive result with the
172 Panbio (Abbot) test, a test line must form in the result window (T) and a control (C) line is
173 visible to indicate a test result is valid. In the Negative result is the presence of only the control
174 line(C) and no test line (T) within the result window seen. Invalid result was not occurred in
175 our study if the test line nor the control line was not visible in the result window prior to the
176 specimen dispensed on the device [29]. The test was performed as per Panbio™ COVID-19 Ag
177 Rapid Test Device (NASAL), in vitro diagnostic rapid test for qualitative detection of SARS-
178 CoV-2 antigen (Ag) in a strictly safety percolations [28].

179 **Data quality Assurance**

180 Data compilers and laboratory workers get its appropriate orientation on how to perform and
181 how to assure valid data using the tool and additional written guide have been provided to
182 them on interpreting each of the study variables. The principal investigators have closely
183 supervised the data collection process so as to ensure the completeness and consistency of
184 the data collection. The laboratory testing was done as per its approved documented
185 standard operating procedures and manufacturer recommendations. In all extraction
186 procedures, as part of assuring the quality management system, we always incorporate a
187 positive and negative quality controls. In addition, data were double entered to prevent error
188 during data entry via cross-checking and also finally checked and verified prior to analysis.

189 **Data analysis and Interpretation**

190 Descriptive data of the research was entered and analyzed using SPSS statistical software
191 version 23. The rapid antigen test results obtained by visual interpretation were interpreted
192 as positive and negative based on the inbuilt internal control. The RT-PCR laboratory results
193 were interpreted as positive and negative based on the cut-off Ct values of the manufacturer
194 recommendation. All laboratory test results were considered valid if and only if the internal
195 quality control were passed. The binomial 95 % confidence intervals which were obtained
196 following Jeffreys approach in the R package DescTools were used (R version 4.1.3)[and
197 Cohen’s kappa value to assess the agreement beyond chance were obtained with the R
198 package psych [31,34,35]. A value of 1 implies almost perfect agreement and values less than
199 1 implies less than perfect agreement, with a range of values between 0 and 1 [30,31].

200 **Bayesian latent class model (BLCM)**

201 With the aim to obtain diagnostic tests accuracies in the absence of a perfect gold standard,
202 Bayesian latent class models (BLCM) were fit to the data following the approach from Hui and
203 Walter for two tests and four populations with MCMC (Markov chain Monte Carlo) simulation
204 to construct posteriors in JAGS version 4.3.0 [32] using the runjags package [33]. The
205 frequencies of the four combinations of dichotomized Panbio and RT-PCR results (++; +;-;-
206) in the four populations, respectively, were modeled with a multinomial distribution. To allow
207 for potential conditional dependencies, pair wise covariance between sensitivities and
208 specificities of all RT-PCRs were included in separate models. Model selection, i.e., in- or
209 exclusion of conditional dependencies was based on the 95% credibility intervals (including 0
210 or not) and on Bayesian p-values. The model code (S1 File) was obtained with the function
211 “auto huiwalter” of the runjags package [34], with three chains of 50 000 iterations each, a
212 burn-in of 5000 iterations, and a thinning of 10 iterations. Minimally informative priors (beta
213 (1,1)) were used for the sensitivities of both tests, the specificity of Panbio and the four
214 prevalences. The shape parameters for the specificity of the RT-PCR were obtained with beta
215 buster assuming “to be 95% sure that the specificity is greater than 90% with a mode at 99%”
216 as prior information. Convergence was assessed by visual inspection of the trace plots and

217 the potential scale reduction factor (Gelman Rubin statistic) being below 1.1. A sensitivity
218 analysis was performed by using different combinations of minimally (dbeta(1,1)) or weakly
219 informative priors (dbeta(2,1))

220 **Ethical consideration**

221 Ethical approval was obtained from IRB of department of medical laboratory Sciences,
222 College of Health Sciences, Addis Ababa University (reference-MLS/174/21)), IRB office of
223 Health bureau, AAPHREML (Reference-AAHB/4039/227) and also from Addis Ababa
224 University, College of natural and computational science IRB (IRB-CNCSDO/604/13/2021).
225 Additionally, AAPHREML wrote support letter to the study health facilities. During data
226 collection process the data collectors informed each study health facility and study
227 participants about the purpose and anticipate benefits of the research and on their full right
228 to refuse, withdraw or completely reject part or all of their part in the study. Written informed
229 consent on the use of data with full anonymity was obtained from the voluntary participants.
230 This work has been done and performed as per Helsinki declaration.

231

232

233

234

235

236

237

238

239

240 **Results**

241 **Socio-demographic characteristics of the study variables of participants**

242 A total of 438 presumptive clients were identified and enrolled in this study and the majority
243 of them, 239 (54.6%) were females and the age of the participants were ranging from 18 to 84
244 years and the mean age was 36.38 ± 14.3 years. Three fourth of the study participants (n=318)
245 had symptoms of COVID-19 and the most reported clinical symptoms were cough (n=191),
246 followed by headache (n=39). For more than half (n=258) of the participants, the reason for
247 getting tested was due to observing the classic symptoms. The detail demographic data were
248 depicted in table 1.

249

250

251

252

253

254

255

256

257

258

259

260

261 Table 1. Demographic characteristics of study participants and cross-classified results of RT-
 262 PCR and Panbio, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, 2021 (n=438)

Variable		N (%)[95% CI]	RT-PCR positive test results N (%) [95% CI]	Panbio positive test results N (%) [95% CI]	
Gender	Male	199 (45.3)[40.8;50.1]	92 (46.2)[39.4;53.2]	78 (39.2)[32.6;46.1]	
	Female	239 (54.6)[49.9;59.2]	104 (43.5)[37.2;49.8]	80 (33.5)[27.7;39.6]	
Occupation	Health worker	17 (3.9)[0.0;8.9]	11 (64.7)[41.1;83.7]	10 (58.8)[35.6;79.3]	
	Government Employee	97 (22.1)[17.3;27.2]	48 (49.59)[39.7;59.3]	41 (42.3)[32.8;52.2]	
	Self employed	63 (14.4)[9.6;19.4]	29 (46.0) [34.1;58.3]	28 (44.4)[32.6;56.7]	
	Private employee	118 (26.9)[22.1;32.0]	48 (40.7) [32.1;49.7]	32 (27.1)[19.7;35.6]	
	NGO employee	9 (2.0) [0.0;7.1]	4 (44.4)[17.3;74.6]	4 (44.4)[17.3;74.6]	
	No response /Others	134 (30.6)[25.8;35.6]	56 (41.8)[33.7;50.2]	43 (32.1)[24.6;40.3]	
	COVID-19 symptoms	Yes	318 (72.6)[68.5;76.9]	164 (51.6)[46.1;57.0]	139 (43.7)[38.3;49.2]
		No	118 (26.9)[22.8;31.2]	32 (27.1)[19.7;35.6]	19 (16.1)[10.3;23.5]
Don't know		2 (0.4)[0;4.7]	0 (0)[0;6.7]	0 (0)[0;6.7]	
clinical symptoms	Cough	191 (43.6)[38.8;48.5]	107 (56.0)[48.9;62.9]	91 (47.6)[40.6;54.7]	
	Fever	33 (7.5)[2.7;12.4]	14 (42.2)[26.8;59.3]	11 (33.3)[19.2;50.3]	
	Shortness of breath	13 (3.0)[0;7.8]	6 (46.1)[22.1;71.7]	6 (46.1)[22.1;71.7]	
	Sore throat	21 (4.8)[0;9.6]	7 (33.3)[16.3;54.6]	6 (28.6)[12.9;49.7]	
	Headache	39 (8.9)[4.1;13.8]	15 (38.5)[24.5;54.1]	9 (23.1)[12.1;37.9]	
	Easy fatigue	6 (1.4)[0;6.2]	3 (50)[16.7;83.3]	3 (50)[16.7;83.3]	
	Loss of smell and /or taste	4 (0.9)[0;5.8]	2 (50)[12.3;87.7]	2 (50)[12.3;87.7]	
	Joint &/or muscle pain	13 (3.0)[0;7.8]	11 (84.6)[59.1;96.6]	11 (84.6)[59.1;96.6]	
	1 to 8(All symptoms)	2 (0.4)[0;5.3]	2 (100)[33.3;100]	2 (100)[33.3;100]	
	No response	116 (26.5)[21.7;31.3]	29 (25)[17.8;33.4]	17 (14.6)[9.1;21.9]	
Have comorbidity	yes	57 (13.0)[10.1;16.4]	26 (45.6)[33.2;58.5]	22 (38.6)[26.8;51.5]	
	No/no answer	381 (87.0)[83.6;89.9]	170 (44.6)[39.7;49.6]	136 (35.7)[31.0;40.6]	
Type of comorbidity	DM	26 (5.9)[3.2;9.1]	13 (50)[31.6;68.4]	12 (46.1)[28.2;64.9]	
	Hypertensive	25 (5.7)[3.0;8.9]	14 (56)[36.8;73.9]	10 (40)[22.7;59.4]	
	HIV/AIDS	2 (0.4)[0;3.6]	1 (50)[6.1;93.9]	1 (50)[6.1; 93.9]	
	Chronic respiratory D/s	3 (0.7)[0;3.8]	1 (33.3)[3.9;82.3]	1 (33.3)[3.8;82.3]	
	Chronic Cardiac D/S	2 (0.4)[0;3.6]	0 (0)[0;66.7]	0 (0)[0;66.7]	
	Malignancy	2 (0.4)[0;3.6]	1 (50)[6.1;93.9]	1 (50)[6.1;93.9]	
	Other and have no comorbidity	378 (86.3)[83.6;89.5]	166 (44.1)[39.2;49.2]	133 (35.2)[30.5;40.1]	

Table 1 cont.'

Contact with confirmed case	Yes		170 (38.8)[34.2;43.6]	50 (29.4)[22.9;36.6]	34 (20)[14.5;26.5]
	No		266 (60.7)[56.2;65.6]	146 (54.9)[48.9;60.8]	124 (46.6)[40.7;52.6]
	Others		2 (0.4)[0;5.3]	0 (0)[0;66.7]	0 (0)[0;66.7]
Assumed place of exposure	Home		83 (18.9)[14.1;23.9]	30 (36.1)[26.4;46.8]	20 (24.1)[15.9;34.1]
	Workplace		114 (26.0)[21.2;31.0]	40 (35.1)[26.8;44.1]	31 (27.2)[19.7;35.8]
	Health facility		1 (0.2)[0;5.2]	0 (0)[0;85.3]	0 (0)[0;85.3]
	Others		3 (0.7)[0;5.6]	0 (0)[0;53.5]	0 (0)[0;53.5]
	Not recognized		237 (54.1)[49.3;59.0]	126 (53.2)[46.8;59.4]	107 (45.1)[38.9;51.5]
Previously tested positive Covid-19 vaccination	Yes		60 (13.7)[10.7;17.1]	23 (38.3)[26.8;50.9]	14 (23.3)[14.0;35.1]
	No		378 (86.3)[82.8;89.3]	173 (45.8)[40.8;50.8]	144 (38.1)[33.3;43.1]
Wear face mask regularly	Yes		49 (11.2)[8.5;14.4]	17 (34.7)[22.5;48.6]	11 (22.4)[12.5;35.5]
	No		389 (88.8)[85.6;91.5]	179 (46.0)[41.1;51.0]	147 (37.8)[33.1;42.7]
	No response		6 (1.4)[0.2;2.9]	4 (66.7)[28.6;92.3]	4 (66.7)[28.6;92.3]
Reason for testing	Suspect		258 (58.9)[54.3;63.8]	140 (54.3)[48.2;60.3]	120 (46.5)[40.5;52.6]
	Contact of confirmed case		177 (40.4)[35.8;45.3]	56 (31.6)[25.1;38.7]	38 (21.5)[15.9;27.9]
	Community surveillance		3 (0.7)[0;5.6]	0 (0)[0;53.5]	0 (0)[0;53.5]
	Zewdito Memorial hospital(HF1)		46 (10.5)[5.7;15.3]	23 (50)[35.9;64.1]	20 (43.5)[29.9;57.8]
Health facility	Ras Desta Damtew Memorial Hospital(HF2)		230 (52.5)[47.7;57.3]	86 (37.4)[31.3;43.8]	63 (27.4)[21.9;33.4]
	Kazenchis Health Center(HF3)		116 (26.5)[21.7;31.3]	62 (53.4)[44.4;62.3]	57 (49.1)[40.1;58.2]
	Kotebe Health Center(HF4)		46 (10.5)[5.7;15.3]	25 (54.3)[40.0;68.1]	18 (39.1)[26.0;53.4]

263

264 **Test performance accuracy based on days since Clinical symptom onset**

265 The performance accuracy of the RDT were high as of the lowest number of ct values as
 266 depicted in table 2. As the ct values of the test Sensitivity Performance of the Rapid Antigen
 267 Test Kits with the Date of Clinical Onset of Symptoms of the Clients, and ct values 2022, Addis
 268 Ababa, Ethiopia

269

270

271 **Table 2- Test performance along date of clinical onset and its CT values, 2021, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.**

Date of clinical onset	RT PCR test result			RT PCR positive test result along with ct. values				Panbio Ag RDT result		Total
	Positive	Negative	Total	Ct ≤25	Ct>25 to ≤30	>30 to Ct ≤35	>35 to Ct <38	Positive	Negative	
0-3days	63	75	138	50	9	1	3	56	82	138
4-7days	100	55	155	66	27	4	3	82	73	155
8-10 days	16	9	25	8	6	2	0	11	14	25
11-15 days	6	6	12	1	3	0	2	3	9	12
>15 days	2	30	32	0	1	0	1	1	31	32
No response	9	67	76	2	3	2	2	5	71	76
Total	196	242	438	127	49	9	11	158	280	438

*** over all Kapa value 81% (95% CI: 75.82% to 87.45%)

272

273 **Diagnostic Performance of Panibo Ag test and RT-PCR using BLCM**

274 We have performed BLCMs to assess the diagnostic performance of the Panbio™ antigen test
 275 and RT-PCR in the absence of a gold standard using 4 population with 2 tests, with symptoms
 276 and without symptoms using BLCM. Accordingly, the Ag-RDT and RT-PCR had a sensitivity
 277 (95% CrI) of 99.6% (98.4%- 100%), 89.3% (83.2%- 97.6%) and specificity (95% CrI) of 93.4% (82.3%
 278 - 100%), 99.1% (97.5%- 100%) respectively, table 3a.

279 **Table 3 a- Performance of test kits using all model of BLCM, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, 2021**

Variable	Model with all patients	Model: Patients with symptoms	Model: Patients without symptoms
	Median [95% CrI]	Median [95% CrI]	Median [95% CrI]
Se_Panbio	99.6[98.4;100]	99.3[97.4;100]	99.2[96.6;100]
Se_PCR	89.3[83.2;97.6]	91.4[83.8;100]	89.4[81.3;98.0]
Sp_Panbio	93.4[82.3;100]	91.6[82.7;100]	83.6[58.6;100]
Sp_PCR	99.1[97.5;100]	99.0[97.2;100]	98.0[93.1;100]
Prev Hf1	54.0[39.3;68.4]	50.0[33.5;66.2]	64.4[36.3;89.1]
Prev Hf2	70.0[62.1;77.1]	58.9[49.6;68.0]	90.5[80.7;97.4]
Prev Hf3	49.1[39.4;58.5]	46.0[35.5;56.4]	57.8[37.7;76.5]
Prev Hf4	55.2[38.7;71.2]	43.3[25.3;62.3]	76.8[51.7;95.6]

280

281 The performance of Ag-RDT was also examined using different parameters or conditional
 282 dependency, as depicted in table 3b and S1-S6 ([supplementary files, S1-S6](#)).

283 Table 3 b: Performance of test kits on conditional dependency using BLCM, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, 2021

	Model covariance sensitivities	Model covariance specificities
	Median [95% CrI]	Median [95% CrI]
Se_Panbio	91.6[71.8;100]	99.5[98.3;100]
Se_PCR	81.7[61.2;95.2]	89.0[82.7;97.4]
Sp_Panbio	92.9[80.3;100]	91.9[80.5;100]
Sp_PCR	98.9[96.4;100]	98.1[92.1;100]
Prev HF1	60.7[40.4;86.5]	53.1[37.9;68.0]
Prev HF2	77.0[65.9;100]	69.6[61.4;76.8]
Prev HF3	54.8[40.7;75.7]	48.3[37.8;58.1]
PrevHF4	61.9[40.1;88.1]	54.7[37.0;70.6]
Cov_se ¹	0.064[-0.0005;0.1757]	-
Cov_sp ²	-	0.009[-0.0014;0.0066]

284 1: Bayesian p-value for covariance between sensitivity of Panbio and PCR 0.986

285 2: Bayesian p-value for covariance between specificity of Panbio and PCR 0.969

286

287 Discussion

288 Accurate reliable rapid diagnostic tests play a very crucial role in curbing COVID-19 infections.
 289 Accordingly, rapid Ag-based diagnostic tests that could pinpoint patients at early disease
 290 were commonly recommended. In this regard, the current status of our country's laboratory
 291 diagnosis system for COVID-19 is centralized with limited number of facilities resulted in longer
 292 turnaround of results, which goes against the escalation of the virus in a country having more
 293 than 100 million population and not more than 4,000 diagnostic medical laboratories [7, 16].

294 The diagnostic sensitivity and specificity of Panbio was comparable with reports by Nsoga *et.*
 295 *al.* with sensitivity and specificity ranges of 71.4%-91.7% and 94.9%-100%, respectively, while
 296 using RT-PCR as a gold standard. These study results also considered Ct values of <30 that
 297 yielded test sensitivities from 87.7% to 97.8% [36-38].

298 In terms of predictive values: when we use RT-PCR as gold standard, our finding had
299 comparable PPV and incomparable NPV when compared and contrasted with a study by
300 Bulilete et al., with the overall sensitivity of 71.4% (95% CI: 63.1%, 78.7%), the specificity of 99.8%
301 (95% CI: 99.4%, 99.9%), the positive predictive value of 98.0% (95% CI: 93.0%, 99.7%) and a
302 negative predictive value of 96.8% (95% CI: 95.7%, 97.7%) [39]. This indicates a clear difference
303 in the specificity of the test performance among the negative cases, which may be due to the
304 difference in study participant recruitments, which is we used more the asymptomatic and
305 having clients with chief complaint of COVID-19 while presenting in the health facilities [39].

306 Our study finding illustrates more inline finding with the WHO stated criteria for the emergency
307 use of clinical setting of such products as appropriate criteria, such as WHO's priority target
308 product profiles for COVID-19 diagnostics of acceptable 'sensitivity \geq 80% and specificity \geq
309 97%), can be considered as a replacement for laboratory-based RT-PCR when immediate
310 decisions about patient care. This is truer in symptomatic clients and we are not sure that this
311 performance be in asymptomatic cases. Indeed, Panbio™ COVID-19 Ag-RDTs has a similar
312 sensitivity performance in both symptomatic and asymptomatic, but its specificity is lower
313 among clients without symptoms. Whereas RT-PCR is slightly lower in clients among without
314 symptoms [40, 41].

315 As a general principle RDTs can be used outside laboratories, at/ or near the point of care.
316 They are easy to use, provide rapid results and do not require any expensive equipment. Ag-
317 RDTs can be considered as alternatives to expand NAAT here (NAAT) for direct detection of
318 SARS-CoV-2 virus for diagnosis of early COVID-19 and also its critical tool to scale-up testing
319 and diagnostic in the fight against COVID-19 for the control of the pandemic. Nevertheless,
320 we highly underline that these tests should be performed under strict follow-up of trained
321 professional starting from the very beginning of pre analytical to post analytical of result
322 dissemination [42].

323 A similar study conducted in Germany, Switzerland and Japan in comparing this RDT
324 diagnostic performance and using RT-PCR as a gold standard method of the classical method
325 model showed more comparable finding among symptomatic study participants and its

326 superior performance have been observed in case of samples having the lowest ct values and
327 high amount of viral concentration. We understand that, there might be a direct relationship
328 with the ct values and viral load of the study samples. However, because of resource
329 limitation, we did not monitor the viral concentration of the clients and readers should
330 consider it while inferring our finding with these studies [12, 15, 43, 44].

331 Our finding revealed the Panbio™ rapid antigen test have highest level of agreement of the
332 inter-test agreement beyond chance of the established assays (RT-PCR) with an average
333 Cohen's kappa value of 81% (95% CI: 75.82% to 87.45%) among our study subjects of 438 COVID-
334 19 suspected individuals, which was consistent with similar studies [36, 37] and lower finding
335 compared with Torres et. al., where the defined study population was different form the
336 present study [45].

337 The diagnostic performance Panbio™ Covid-19 Ag rapid test highly correlate with Ct values
338 and day of clinical onset. We found a superior performance in lowest ct values, which is most
339 probably during at this condition the viral concentration become high and as the clinical onset
340 of the day increase its performance among asymptomatic cases [37, 41].

341 Most of the false negative Ag-RDT results were among the population with contacts of SARS-
342 CoV-2 confirmed patient within a week range of contact of confirmed case and they have
343 reported no clinical symptoms and chief complaints when arriving at the testing health
344 facilities. Their age ranged from 18 to 68 years old and most of them were female. Also there
345 was a single false positive report from the total non-diseased of 242. The low frequency of
346 false positive report of the AG-RDT was in line with a study done by Bulilete and colleagues in
347 Spain and Akingba and colleagues, in south Africa, while we consider RT-PCR as gold standard
348 [38,39].

349 This study proved the presence of a clear difference in the performance of the test kits when
350 taking RT-PCR as a perfect gold standard, instead of using BLCM assuming no gold standard.

351

352 **Conclusion and recommendations**

353 The introduction of rapid antigen laboratory diagnostic methods in routine laboratory for
354 identification of SARS-COV-2 for a possibility of expanding to the general service, especially
355 near to the patients which could help medical practitioners for isolating the patients and
356 intervention of infections that can help to combat the devastating transmission. Based on our
357 study findings, the diagnostic performance of the Panbio™ Covid-19 RDT were 99.6 %
358 sensitivity and 93.4 % specificity among presumptive cases of Addis Ababa, by which it qualify
359 the WHO established criteria required to have for Ag-RDTs (sensitivity $\geq 80\%$ and specificity
360 $\geq 97\%$) . Thus, it's highly recommended to use it in areas of symptomatic individuals. This can
361 minimize reoccurrence and further spread of the pandemic and gripped the spread of the
362 virus by testing all the presumptive. We highly recommended further large-scale study
363 coupled with genomic approaches considering the presence of performance variation as the
364 variant of concern continues to emerge.

365 **Supporting information**

366 S1 –S6 are supplementary material used for this BLCM analysis, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, 2022.

367 **Authors' contributions**

368 **Conceptualization:** Abay Sisay, Adey Feleke Desta

369 **Data curation:** Abay Sisay, Abebaw Tiruneh, Yasin Desalegn, Abraham Tesfaye, Adey Feleke
370 Desta

371 **Formal analysis:** Abay Sisay, Sonja Hartnack ,

372 **Investigation:** Abay Sisay, Sonja Hartnack ,Abebaw Tiruneh, Yasin Desalegn, Abraham
373 Tesfaye, Adey Feleke Desta

374 **Methodology:** Abay Sisay, Sonja Hartnack ,Abebaw Tiruneh, Abraham Tesfaye, Adey Feleke
375 Desta

376 **Project administration:** Abay Sisay,

377 **Resources:** Abay Sisay,

378 **Software:** Abay Sisay, Sonja Hartnack , Adey Feleke Desta

379 **Supervision:** Abay Sisay, Sonja Hartnack ,Abebaw Tiruneh, Abraham Tesfaye, Adey Feleke
380 Desta

381 **Validation:** Abay Sisay, Sonja Hartnack, Abebaw Tiruneh, Abraham Tesfaye, Adey Feleke
382 Desta

383 **Visualization:** Abay Sisay, Sonja Hartnack, Adey Feleke Desta

384 **Writing original draft:** Abay Sisay, Sonja Hartnack

385 **Writing review & editing:** Abay Sisay, Sonja Hartnack, Abebaw Tiruneh, Yasin Desalegn,
386 Abraham Tesfaye, Adey Feleke Desta

387 **Conflicts of interest**

388 We, the authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal
389 relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper

390 **Data Availability Statement**

391 All data set used in this study are included in this manuscript.

392 **Funding**

393 This work was financed by Addis Ababa University through adaptive research and problem
394 solving project, with project title, Evaluation and Validation of the Diagnostic Performance of
395 SARS-CoV-2 rapid test for the detection of Novel Corona Virus, Ref #-PR/5.15/590/12/20 and no
396 external funding was received. The funders anywhere not involved in study design, data
397 collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript. The contents
398 are purely the responsibilities of the authors and did not represent and reflect the view of the
399 funder.

400 Acknowledgments

401 We are very grateful and acknowledge the Addis Ababa University and Addis Ababa Health
402 bureau, the Zewditu Memorial Hospital, the Ras Desta Damtew Memorial Hospital, the
403 Kotebe Health Center and the Kazanches Health Center for granting their institutional ethical
404 approval and their strong support and assistance in accessing diverse resources used in the
405 study.

406 We also acknowledge all the data collector and study participants.

407

408

409

410

411 References

- 412 1. World Health Organization Best Practices for the Naming of New Human Infectious
413 Diseases. https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/163636/WHO_HSE_FOS_15.1_eng.pdf. Access date 12 March 2022.
- 414
- 415 2. Zhu N, Zhang D, Wang W, et al. A Novel Coronavirus from Patients with Pneumonia in
416 China, 2019. *N Engl J Med*. 2020;382(8):727-733. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa2001017
- 417 3. University JH. Johns Hopkins University, J.H., worldometers COVID 19 Daily update.
418 worldometers. Available from: <https://coronavirus.jhu.edu/>. Accessed March 12, 2022.
- 419 4. Konrad R, Eberle U, Dangel A, et al. Rapid establishment of laboratory diagnostics for
420 the novel coronavirus SARS-CoV-2 in Bavaria, Germany, February 2020. *Euro Surveill*.
421 2020;25(9):2000173. doi:10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2020.25.9.2000173.
- 422 5. UN. Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable
423 Development.pdf <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/post2015/transformingourworld/publication>. Access date March 20, 2022.
- 424
- 425 6. Ethiopian Public Health Institutes. COVID-19 daily report.
426 <https://twitter.com/ephiethiopia>. Access date March 20, 2022

- 427 7. Sisay A, Tesfaye A, Desale A, et al. Diagnostic Performance of SARS-CoV-2 IgM/IgG
428 Rapid Test Kits for the Detection of the Novel Coronavirus in Ethiopia. *J Multidiscip*
429 *Healthc.* 2021; 14:171-180. Published 2021 Jan 27. doi:10.2147/JMDH.S290711
- 430 8. Abbot global Point of Care. PANBIO™ COVID-19 ANTIGEN SELF-TEST.
431 [https://www.globalpointofcare.abbott/en/product-details/panbio-covid-19-ag-](https://www.globalpointofcare.abbott/en/product-details/panbio-covid-19-ag-antigen-test.html)
432 [antigen-test.html](https://www.globalpointofcare.abbott/en/product-details/panbio-covid-19-ag-antigen-test.html). Accessed date March 12, 2022.
- 433 9. Munne K, Bhanothu V, Bhor V, Patel V, Mahale SD, Pande S. Detection of SARS-CoV-2
434 infection by RT-PCR test: factors influencing interpretation of results. *Virus disease.*
435 2021;32(2):187-189. doi:10.1007/s13337-021-00692-5
- 436 10. Sharma K, Aggarwala P, Gandhi D, Mathias A, Singh P, Sharma S, et al. (2021)
437 Comparative analysis of various clinical specimens in detection of SARS-CoV-2 using
438 rRT-PCR in new and follow up cases of COVID-19 infection: Quest for the best choice.
439 *PLoS ONE* 16(4): e0249408. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0249408>
- 440 11. Goudouris ES. Laboratory diagnosis of COVID-19. *J Pediatr (Rio J).* 2021;97(1):7-12.
441 doi:10.1016/j.jpmed.2020.08.001.
- 442 12. Eshghifar Nahal, BusheriAli, Shrestha Rojeet, Beqaj Safedin, Evaluation of Analytical
443 Performance of Seven Rapid Antigen Detection Kits for Detection of SARS-CoV-2 Virus.
444 *International Journal of General Medicine* 2021;14 435–440
- 445 13. Won J, Lee S, Park M, et al. Development of a Laboratory-safe and Low-cost Detection
446 Protocol for SARS-CoV-2 of the Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19). *Exp Neurobiol.*
447 2020;29(2):107-119. doi:10.5607/en20009
- 448 14. Yang T, Wang YC, Shen CF, Cheng CM. Point-of-Care RNA-Based Diagnostic Device for
449 COVID-19. *Diagnostics.* 2020 Mar 18;10(3). PubMed PMID: 32197339.
- 450 15. Khandker SS, Nik Hashim NHH, Deris ZZ, Shueb RH, Islam MA. Diagnostic Accuracy of
451 Rapid Antigen Test Kits for Detecting SARS-CoV-2: A Systematic Review and Meta-
452 Analysis of 17,171 Suspected COVID-19 Patients. *J. Clin. Med.* 2021; 10(16):3493.
453 <https://doi.org/10.3390/jcm10163493>
- 454 16. Ethiopian public health institute, EPHI. Interim Guide for SARS CoV- 2 Antigen Rapid
455 Diagnostic Testing in Ethiopia. EPHI, February 2022, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

- 456 17. Sisay A, Abera A, Dufera B, Endrias T, Tasew G, Tesfaye A, et al,. Diagnostic accuracy of
457 three commercially available one step RT-PCR assays for the detection of SARS-CoV-2
458 in resource limited settings. *PLoS One*. 2022 Jan 20;17(1):e0262178. doi:
459 10.1371/journal.pone.0262178. PMID: 35051204; PMCID: PMC8775315
- 460 18. Liu W, Tao ZW, Wang L, et al. Analysis of factors associated with disease outcomes in
461 hospitalized patients with 2019 novel coronavirus disease. *Chin Med J (Engl)*.
462 2020;133(9):1032-1038. doi:10.1097/CM9.0000000000000775.
- 463 19. Zhang W, Du RH, Li B, et al. Molecular and serological investigation of 2019-nCoV
464 infected patients: implication of multiple shedding routes. *Emerg Microbes Infect*.
465 2020;9(1):386-389. Published 2020 Feb 17. doi:10.1080/22221751.2020.1729071.
- 466 20. Wang L, Shi Y, Xiao T, et al. Chinese expert consensus on the perinatal and neonatal
467 management for the prevention and control of the 2019 novel coronavirus infection
468 (First edition). *Ann Transl Med*. 2020;8(3):47. doi:10.21037/atm.2020.02.20
- 469 21. Ngo Nsoga MT, Kronig I, Perez Rodriguez FJ, Sattounet-Roche P, Da Silva D, Helbling
470 J, et al. (2021) Diagnostic accuracy of Panbio rapid antigen tests on oropharyngeal
471 swabs for detection of SARS-CoV-2. *PLoS ONE* 16(6): e0253321.
472 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0253321>
- 473 22. Wagenhäuser I, Knies K, Rauschenberger V, et al. Clinical performance evaluation of
474 SARS-CoV-2 rapid antigen testing in point of care usage in comparison to RT-qPCR.
475 *EBioMedicine*. 2021; 69:103455. doi:10.1016/j.ebiom.2021.103455
- 476 23. Albert E, Torres I, Bueno F, et al. Field evaluation of a rapid antigen test (Panbio™
477 COVID-19 Ag Rapid Test Device) for COVID-19 diagnosis in primary healthcare centres.
478 *Clin Microbiol Infect*. 2021; 27(3):472.e7-472.e10. doi:10.1016/j.cmi.2020.11.004
- 479 24. Thirion-Romero I, Guerrero-Zúñiga DS, Arias-Mendoza DA, et al. Evaluation of Panbio
480 rapid antigen test for SARS-CoV-2 in symptomatic patients and their contacts: a
481 multicenter study. *Int J Infect Dis*. 2021; 113:218-224. doi:10.1016/j.ijid.2021.10.027
- 482 25. Central Statistics Agency. Summary and Statistical Report of the 2007 Population and
483 Housing Census Results. Central Statistical Agency, Addis Ababa Ethiopia. 2008.
484 accessed March 12, 2022.

- 485 26. World Health Organization (WHO). COVID-19 Preparedness Bulletin Ethiopia.
486 <https://extranet.who.int/sph/news/covid-19-preparedness-bulletin-ethiopia>. Accessed
487 date March 12, 2022.
- 488 27. WHO. Laboratory testing for coronavirus disease (COVID-19) in suspected human
489 cases: interim guidance; 2020. Available from:
490 [https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/331501?locale-attribute](https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/331501?locale-attribute=en&fbclid=IwAR1XbKVPhGao_oWRr7F8LArwK9YDngyK2fhCGILlI5xfVs9u89S30lue5gc)
491 [=en&fbclid=IwAR1XbKVPhGao_oWRr7F8LArwK9YDngyK2fhCGILlI5xfVs9u89S30lue5gc](https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/331501?locale-attribute=en&fbclid=IwAR1XbKVPhGao_oWRr7F8LArwK9YDngyK2fhCGILlI5xfVs9u89S30lue5gc). Accessed date March 12,
492 2022.
- 493 28. World Health Organization (WHO). COVID-19 Ag Rapid Test Device (Nasopharyngeal).
494 IFU for Panbio - EUL 0564-032-00.[https://www.who.int/publications/m/item/EUL-0564-](https://www.who.int/publications/m/item/EUL-0564-032-00)
495 [032-00](https://www.who.int/publications/m/item/EUL-0564-032-00). Accessed date March 12, 2022.
- 496 29. Manufacturer's Instructions for Use (IFU), [https://dam.abbott.com/en-](https://dam.abbott.com/en-gb/panbio/120007883-v1-Panbio-COVID-19-Ag-Nasal-AsymptomaticSe.pdf)
497 [gb/panbio/120007883-v1-Panbio-COVID-19-Ag-Nasal-AsymptomaticSe.pdf](https://dam.abbott.com/en-gb/panbio/120007883-v1-Panbio-COVID-19-Ag-Nasal-AsymptomaticSe.pdf). Accessed
498 date March 12, 2022.
- 499 30. Manufacturer's Instructions for Use (IFU), Real-time fluorescent RT-PCR kit for
500 detecting 2019-nCoV, MFG030010. BGI Biotechnology (Wuhan) Co., Ltd, Building B2,
501 Zone B/C/D, Wuhan National Bioindustry Base, NO.666 Gaoxin Avenue, East Lake High-
502 tech Development Zone, Wuhan
- 503 31. Cohen's kappa Kappa value interpretation (see Landis, JR & Koch, GG (1977). The
504 measurement of observer agreement for categorical data. *Biometrics*, 33, 159-174).
- 505 32. Just another Gibbs Sampler. <https://mcmc-jags.sourceforge.io/>.
- 506 33. Denwood Matthew J. (2016). runjags: An R Package Providing Interface Utilities,
507 Model Templates, Parallel Computing Methods and Additional Distributions for MCMC
508 Models in JAGS. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 71(9), 1–25. doi: 10.18637/jss.v071.i09).
- 509 34. R Core Team (2022). R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R
510 Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. URL [https://www.R-](https://www.R-project.org/)
511 [project.org/](https://www.R-project.org/).
- 512 35. Andri Signorell et mult. al. (2021). DescTools: Tools for descriptive statistics. R
513 package version 0.99.44.
- 514

- 515 36. Fenollar F, Bouam A, Ballouche M, Fuster L, Prudent E, Colson P, et al.. Evaluation of
516 the Panbio Covid-19 rapid antigen detection test device for the screening of patients
517 with Covid-19. *J Clin Microbiol.* 2020. Nov 2; JCM.02589-20. [PMC free
518 article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
- 519 37. Linares M, Pérez-Tanoira R, Carrero A, Romanyk J, Pérez-García F, Gómez-Herruz P, et
520 al.. Panbio antigen rapid test is reliable to diagnose SARS-CoV-2 infection in the first 7
521 days after the onset of symptoms. *Journal of Clinical Virology.* 2020. Oct 16; 104659. doi:
522 10.1016/j.jcv.2020.10465
- 523 38. Akingba OL, Sprong K, Marais G, Hardie DR. Field performance evaluation of the
524 PanBio rapid SARS-CoV-2 antigen assay in an epidemic driven by the B.1.351 variant in
525 the Eastern Cape, South Africa. *Journal of Clinical Virology Plus.* 2021;1(1):100013.
526 doi:10.1016/j.jcvp.2021.100013
- 527 39. Bulilete O, Lorente P, Leiva A, Carandell E, Oliver A, Rojo E, et al., Panbio™ rapid antigen
528 test for SARS-CoV-2 has acceptable accuracy in symptomatic patients in primary health
529 care. *J Infect.* 2021 Mar;82(3):391-398. doi: 10.1016/j.jinf.2021.02.014. Epub 2021 Feb 13.
530 PMID: 33592253; PMCID: PMC7881288.
- 531 40. World Health Organization. COVID-19 Strategy Update. 14 April 2020
532 (<https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/covid-19-strategy-update---14-april-2020>,
533 accessed March 12, 2022).
- 534 41. FIND. Rapid diagnostic tests for COVID-19 ([https://www.finddx.org/wpcontent/
535 uploads/2020/05/FIND_COVID-19_RDTs_18.05.2020.pdf](https://www.finddx.org/wpcontent/uploads/2020/05/FIND_COVID-19_RDTs_18.05.2020.pdf), accessed 12 March 2022).
- 536 42. Africa CDC. New guidance to expand rapid antigen testing for COVID-19 response in
537 Africa released. [https://africacdc.org/download/interim-guidance-on-the-use-of-rapid-
538 antigen-tests-for-covid-19-response/](https://africacdc.org/download/interim-guidance-on-the-use-of-rapid-antigen-tests-for-covid-19-response/). Accessed date March 12, 2022.
- 539 43. Krüger LJ, Gaeddert M, Tobian F, et al. The Abbott PanBio WHO emergency use listed,
540 rapid, antigen-detecting point-of-care diagnostic test for SARS-CoV-2-Evaluation of the
541 accuracy and ease-of-use. *PLoS One.* 2021;16(5):e0247918. Published 2021 May 27.
542 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0247918

- 543 44. Torres I, Poujois S, Albert E, Colomina J, Navarro D. Evaluation of a rapid antigen test
544 (Panbio™ COVID-19 Ag rapid test device) for SARS-CoV-2 detection in asymptomatic
545 close contacts of COVID-19 patients. *Clin Microbiol Infect.* 2021; 27(4):636.e1-636.e4.
546 doi:10.1016/j.cmi.2020.12.022
- 547 45. Altamimi, AM, Obeid, DA, Alaifan, TA, et al. Assessment of 12 qualitative RT-PCR
548 commercial kits for the detection of SARS-CoV-2. *J Med Virol.* 2021; 93: 3219-
549 3226. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jmv.26900>

550

551 **Supplementary materials, S1-S6** ([supplementary files, S1-S6](#)). .

552 S1: BLCM. Code. R

553 S2: performance analysis with weakly informative priors

554 S3: Graphical output from the final BLCM (trace plot, ECDF, density and autocorrelation plot)
555 for sensitivity of Panbio rapid antigen test

556 S4: Graphical output from the final BLCM (trace plot, ECDF, density and autocorrelation plot)
557 for sensitivity of RT-PCR

558 S5: Graphical output from the final BLCM (trace plot, ECDF, density and autocorrelation plot)
559 for specificity of Panbio rapid antigen test

560 S6: Graphical output from the final BLCM (trace plot, ECDF, density and autocorrelation plot)
561 for specificity of RT-PCR

562

563 Annex 1- Stratification of the samples in the four selected sites we allocate the total proposed
564 438 sample in to the four selected sites accordingly.

Health Facility name	Assigned code	Assigned sample size
Zewditu memorial Hospital	01	46
Ras Desta Damtew memorial Hospital	02	230
Kazanchis Health Ceneter	03	116
Kotebe Health Center	04	46

565