

1 **Field comparison of STANDARD™ Q Filariasis Antigen Test**
2 **(QFAT) with Bioline Filariasis Test Strip (FTS) for the detection of**
3 **Lymphatic Filariasis in Samoa, 2023**

4 **Short title:** Field comparison of two rapid antigen tests for lymphatic filariasis detection in
5 Samoa

6 **Authors**

7 Jessica L Scott^{1*}, Helen J Mayfield^{2,3}, Jane Sinclair⁴, Beatris Mario Martin^{2,3}, Maddison Howlett²,
8 Ramona Muttucumaru^{2,5}, Kimberly Y Won⁶, Robert Thomsen⁷, Satupaitea Viali⁸, Rossana
9 Tofaeono-Pifeleti⁸, Patricia M Graves¹, Colleen L Lau^{2,3*}

10 **Affiliations**

11 (1) College of Public Health, Medical and Veterinary Sciences, James Cook University,
12 Queensland, Australia

13 (2) School of Public Health, Faculty of Medicine, The University of Queensland, Brisbane,
14 Queensland, Australia

15 (3) Centre for Clinical Research, Faculty of Medicine, The University of Queensland, Brisbane,
16 Queensland, Australia

17 (4) School of Chemistry and Molecular Biosciences, The University of Queensland, Brisbane,
18 Queensland, Australia

19 (5) National Centre for Epidemiology and Population Health, Australian National University,
20 Canberra, Australian Capital Territory, Australia

21 (6) Division of Parasitic Diseases and Malaria, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention,
22 Atlanta, Georgia, USA

23 (7) Samoa Ministry of Health, Apia, Samoa

24 (8) School of Medicine, National University of Samoa, Apia, Samoa

25 ***Corresponding author**

26 Jessica.scott2@my.jcu.edu.au (JLS)

27 Colleen.lau@uq.edu.au (CLL)

28 **Abstract**

29 **Background:** To monitor the progress of lymphatic filariasis (LF) elimination programmes, field
30 surveys to assess filarial antigen (Ag) prevalence require access to reliable, user-friendly rapid
31 diagnostic tests. We aimed to evaluate the performance of the new Q Filariasis Antigen Test
32 (QFAT) with the currently recommended Filariasis Test Strip (FTS) for detecting the Ag of
33 *Wuchereria bancrofti*, the causative agent of LF, under field conditions.

34 **Methodology/Principal Findings:** During an LF survey in Samoa, 344 finger-prick blood
35 samples were tested using FTS and QFAT. Microfilariae (Mf) status was determined from blood
36 slides prepared from Ag-positive samples. Each test was re-read at 1 hour and the next day to
37 determine the stability of results over time. Overall Ag-positivity by FTS was 29% and 30% by
38 QFAT. Concordance between the two tests was 94% (Kappa=0.85). Of the 105 Mf slides
39 available, 38.1% were Mf-positive, and all were Ag-positive by both tests. Darker test line
40 intensities from Ag-positive FTS were found to predict Mf-positivity (compared to same/lighter
41 line intensities). QFAT had significantly higher reported test result changes than FTS, mostly
42 reported the next day. The field laboratory team preferred QFAT over FTS due to the smaller
43 blood volume required, better usability, and easier readability.

44 **Conclusion/Significance:** QFAT could be a suitable and user-friendly diagnostic alternative for
45 use in the monitoring and surveillance of LF in field surveys based on its similar performance to
46 FTS under field conditions.

47

48 **Author Summary**

49
50 Lymphatic filariasis (LF) is a debilitating tropical disease caused by an infection with parasitic
51 filarial worms that are transmitted by mosquitoes. Long-term infection can lead to stigmatising
52 chronic conditions like lymphoedema and elephantiasis. The World Health Organization initiated
53 the global programme to eliminate lymphatic filariasis (GPELF) in 2000, which focuses on the
54 mass administration of anti-LF drugs to stop transmission in endemic countries. However, to
55 monitor the success of this programme and to make informed decisions to stop costly mass
56 drug administrations, it is crucial to have access to accurate and reliable rapid diagnostics.
57 Here, we evaluated the performance of a new rapid antigen test called the Q Filariasis antigen
58 test and compared it to the currently recommended filariasis test strip under field conditions in
59 Samoa. This study showed that the new rapid test could be a suitable alternative to the currently
60 recommended test for use in GPELF-related activities with more user-friendly features.

61 **Keywords**

62 Lymphatic filariasis; Elimination; Surveillance; Rapid Antigen Tests; Filariasis test strip; Q
63 filariasis antigen test; diagnostics; *Wuchereria bancrofti*

64

65 **Abbreviations**

66 Antigen: Ag

67 Lymphatic filariasis: LF

68 Q filariasis antigen test: QFAT

69 Filariasis test strip: FTS

70 Microfilariae: Mf

71 World Health Organization: WHO

72 Global Programme to Eliminate Lymphatic Filariasis: GPELF

73 Mass drug administration: MDA

74 Pacific Programme to Eliminate Lymphatic Filariasis: PacELF

75 Immunochromatographic test: ICT

76 Confidence interval: CI

77 Cohen's Kappa: K

78 **Introduction**

79 Lymphatic filariasis (LF) is a mosquito-borne neglected tropical disease caused by infection with
80 a parasitic worm. Consequences of long-term infection include chronic disabling and disfiguring
81 manifestations such as lymphoedema, including scrotal hydrocele, and elephantiasis. These
82 morbidities could lead to social stigmatisation and loss of work (1). The main pathogen causing
83 LF is the filarial worm *Wuchereria bancrofti* and, to a lesser extent, *Brugia malayi* and *B. timori*
84 (2).

85 To eliminate LF as a public health problem, the World Health Organization (WHO) established
86 the Global Programme to Eliminate Lymphatic Filariasis (GPELF) in 2000. One arm of the
87 program is focused on interrupting the transmission of LF through repeated rounds of mass
88 drug administration (MDA) of anti-filarial drugs in endemic regions (3). In conjunction with the
89 GPELF, the Pacific Programme to Eliminate LF (PacELF) was launched to support the 16
90 endemic Pacific Island Countries and Territories committed to combating this disease (4). Since
91 1999, the elimination of LF as a public health problem has been validated in eight countries in
92 the PacELF region, while the other eight, including Samoa, remain committed to eliminating the
93 disease. Accessibility to robust and reliable diagnostic tools remains essential for monitoring the
94 progress of GPELF activities and for post-validation surveillance (5).

95 In regions where *W. bancrofti* is the leading causative agent of LF, WHO recommends the
96 qualitative Alere Bioline Filariasis Test Strip (FTS; Alere Abbott), a rapid diagnostic test for
97 detecting circulating filarial antigen in human blood samples. Since 2015, FTS has been
98 successfully used in national programs, replacing the former immunochromatographic test (ICT,
99 BinaxNOW). Previous studies reported that FTS was preferred over ICT, as it was more stable
100 in the field, cheaper, and able to detect lower concentrations of circulating filarial antigen than
101 ICT (6), but its useability and user-friendliness under field conditions were considered a
102 drawback as it is susceptible to user-error (6, 7). Later, concerns were raised regarding potential

103 cross-reactivity with other filarial species, such as *Loa loa* (8), although this parasite is not
104 endemic in the Asia-Pacific. Further, since the COVID-19 pandemic, relying on a single
105 manufacturer has introduced procurement challenges for rapid diagnostic tests, which has been
106 a barrier for LF programmatic surveys.

107 A new rapid antigen test, the Q Filariasis Antigen test (QFAT) (SD Biosensor, Suwon, South
108 Korea), has been proposed as an alternative to the FTS for GPELF-related LF surveys. This
109 new test also detects filarial antigens from capillary blood, like FTS and requires less sample
110 volume, but its utility under field conditions has not been evaluated. This study aimed to
111 evaluate the performance of the new QFAT and FTS when deployed in an endemic region under
112 field conditions. The specific objectives were to compare the concordance between the two
113 tests for detecting the circulating antigen of *W. bancrofti*, to assess whether the intensity of the
114 test line of QFAT could indicate microfilariae positivity and determine test stability over time by
115 re-reading the tests at one hour and the next day. The findings from this study will support
116 recommendations regarding the suitability of QFAT as an alternative field diagnostic for GPELF-
117 related activities.

118 **Materials and methods**

119 **Study setting and participants**

120 Field and laboratory work for this study was undertaken in Samoa, on the main island of Upolu,
121 in 2023. Samples used in this study were sourced from three study components associated with
122 a monitoring and surveillance field project for LF. The first study component included follow-up
123 of participants (and their household members) from surveys conducted in Samoa in 2018 and
124 2019 (9, 10), who tested antigen (Ag) positive and had detectable microfilaria (Mf) in blood, as
125 identified by microscopy. The second component was a community-based survey of eight
126 sentinel villages, which were selected based on Ag prevalence in 2019 (two villages, each with
127 zero, low (3-4%), medium (6-7%) and high (13-16%) prevalence). The final component involved
128 targeted testing of households neighbouring those Ag-positive participants identified in the 2019
129 survey.

130 **Blood sample collection and processing**

131 Heparinised microvettes were used to collect 300 μ L of capillary (finger-prick) blood samples
132 from participants. Immediately after collection, blood samples were stored in a cold storage
133 container until the samples were delivered to the field laboratory, where the samples were
134 stored in the fridge at 4°C. Typically, samples were processed and tested the next morning.
135 Before testing, samples were acclimated to room temperature and tested in a field laboratory.
136 The rapid tests were performed per the manufacturer's instructions using 75 μ L of blood for FTS
137 and 20 μ L for QFAT. The precise volumes were transferred to the respective tests using a
138 calibrated micropipette.

139 **Reading and interpretation of rapid antigen test results**

140 Results of FTS and QFAT were read at the manufactures recommended time of 10 minutes by
141 up to three independent readers. Occasionally, a high laboratory workload meant that it was not
142 possible for all tests to be read by three readers. Tests were read by the naked eye and

143 illuminated with a torch if needed. Results were classified by each reader as positive, negative,
144 or invalid (no sample flow or absence of control line). Samples with invalid results were
145 repeated if there was sufficient blood. If the second test produced a valid result, this was
146 recorded as the final result. If the second test produced another invalid result, it was recorded
147 as invalid.

148 At the 10-minute readings, tests with a positive result had the test line semi-quantified based on
149 the intensity of the test line compared to the control line. These tests were scored by up to three
150 readers, accordingly: (1) test lines were lighter than the control line; (2) test lines were the same
151 intensity as the control line; or (3) test lines were darker than the control line. Each test was then
152 re-read at 1 hour and the next day (e.g. 12-18 hours) by one reader to determine whether the
153 tests remained stable over time. Re-reading the Ag tests after 10 minutes is not recommended
154 by the manufacturers.

155 **Selection of blood samples for QFAT comparison**

156 To select the samples for the QFAT trial, all samples from the wider survey were tested with FTS
157 in batches of five. Any batch of five samples that included at least one FTS-positive sample was
158 also tested using QFAT (Figure 1). This strategy ensured sufficient numbers of Ag-positive
159 samples for comparisons between FTS and QFAT. Therefore, it is important to note that the Ag
160 positivity rate presented in this study does not represent the prevalence in any of the three study
161 components mentioned previously. In addition to the above selection strategy, 14 samples that
162 were inadvertently frozen and invalid by FTS were purposefully included in the QFAT trial for
163 comparison.

164




Figure 1: Strategy used to select samples for Q Filariasis antigen test (QFAT) evaluation. Batches of Filariasis test strip with at least one antigen-positive test were selected for testing using QFAT. '+' indicates antigen (Ag)-positive tests and '-' indicates Ag-negative tests. Image created with BioRender.com.

165 **Determination of Mf status from thick smear blood films**

166 Blood samples testing positive for LF Ag by FTS and/or QFAT, up to three thick smear slides
167 were prepared (depending on the blood volume available). Each slide included three 20 µL
168 stripes of blood. Slides were dried, dehaemoglobinised in water and stained with Giemsa

169 following standard procedures (11). Two independent blinded readers examined at least two
170 slides per participant. If at least one slide reader detected any Mf, it was classified as Mf-
171 positive. If neither slide reader detected Mf, it was classified as Mf-negative. Slides with
172 discordant Mf results between the two slide readers were resolved by jointly re-examining the
173 slides and making a final judgment.

174 **Data analysis**

175 Data was analysed using GraphPad Prism 9 (Prism for Windows, version 9.2.0.332). FTS and
176 QFAT summaries were described as frequencies and percentages and reported with a 95%
177 confidence interval (CI). Final interpretations of the test results for FTS and QFAT were
178 determined by the consensus between the readers and were done accordingly; tests with
179 discordant readings between readers, the dominant reading was used as the result. If the
180 readings were discordant for tests with only two readers, it was classified as indeterminant. In
181 cases where a single reader provided the interpretation, this reading was considered final.
182 Discordance between the readers interpretations was determined when test interpretations
183 made by the readers differed from one another and the analysis excluded samples with invalid
184 interpretations.

185 Concordance between the results of the two rapid Ag tests (agreement or disagreement
186 between positive and negative results) was determined and reported as a percentage. Cohen's
187 Kappa (K) agreement statistics were performed to determine the probability that agreement
188 between the tests was not due to chance and reported with a 95% CI. Line intensity scores from
189 Ag-positive tests to use for the analysis were selected based on the consensus of test line
190 intensity scores by the independent readers. If no consensus was reached by the readers for a
191 particular test result, the result was excluded. These line intensity scores for FTS and QFAT
192 were then compared for those samples where Mf-status was determined. A univariable logistics
193 regression analysis was conducted to assess whether the darker test lines of Ag-positive tests

194 (compared to those with equal or lesser intensity than the control line) were predictive of Mf-
195 positivity. The relationship was presented as an odds ratio (OR) and reported with a 95% CI.
196 FTS and QFAT tests were re-read at 1 hour and next day time points to determine whether the
197 test results changed over time (from Ag-negative to Ag-positive, or vice versa). Tests with valid
198 positive or negative results at all three time points were compared. The McNemar test was used
199 to determine the difference between the proportion of tests that changed results from 10
200 minutes to 1 hour, and from 1 hour to the next day. Fisher's exact test was used to determine
201 the difference between the proportion of tests that changed results for FTS and QFAT at 1 hour
202 and next day readings. All statistical inferences were based on a p-value of <0.05.

203 **QFAT usability under field conditions**

204 Four field laboratory workers, trained before sample testing, provided independent verbal
205 feedback on FTS and QFAT at the conclusion of the field comparison. Two of the four laboratory
206 workers have had previous experience using FTS and/or QFAT. Laboratory workers were asked
207 for feedback on test set-up, sample application and volume, test readability and other relevant
208 aspects of the test's characteristics and procedure.

209 **Results**

210 A total of 344 whole blood samples were tested using both FTS and QFAT and were used to
211 evaluate test concordance at the initial reading (10 minutes after application of the sample). At
212 the 10-minute reading, no indeterminate results were reported for QFAT, but three (1.0%) were
213 reported for FTS. Of the 14 (4.1%) samples that were invalid by FTS, none were reported as
214 invalid by QFAT. For the invalid FTS readings, no control lines were reported for the tests, even
215 after repeating the samples on a newer batch of test strips. All 14 samples invalid by FTS
216 produced a valid result by QFAT (one positive and thirteen negatives). Thick blood smears were
217 prepared for 105 Ag-positive participants, and 40 (38.1%, 95% CI 29.4-47.6%) of these were
218 classified as Mf-positive. After the initial reading, 309 (89.8%) of the FTS and 341 (99.1%) of
219 QFAT were read again at 1 hour and the next day and were used for further analysis.

220 **Number of readers and discordance between readers at initial reading**

221 The number of readers for FTS and QFAT at the initial reading (10 minutes) and discordance
222 between the readers is summarised in Table 1. Among the 344 samples evaluated and removal
223 of the 14 invalid FTS interpretations, 70.3% of FTS and 84.6% of QFAT were read by three
224 independent blinded readers. The total proportion of interpretation discordance between readers
225 was highest for QFAT (4.4%) than FTS (2.1%). Specifically, for tests with only two readers, there
226 was higher discordance for FTS (1.0%) than QFAT (0%), but for tests with three readers,
227 discordance for QFAT (4.4%) was higher than FTS (1.2%).

228

229

230 Table 1: Number of readers for Filariasis Test Strip and Q Filariasis Antigen Test at initial
 231 reading (at 10 minutes) and discordant results between readers, excluding invalid test
 232 interpretations, Samoa 2023.

Number of readers	FTS		QFAT	
	Number of samples (%)	Discordant interpretations between readers (%)	Number of samples (%)	Discordant interpretations between readers (%)
3	232 (70.3%)	4 (1.2%)	291 (84.6%)	15 (4.4%)
2	80 (24.2%)	3 (1.0%)	48 (13.9%)	0 (0%)
1	18 (5.5%)	-	5 (1.5%)	-
Overall	330 (100%)	7 (2.1%)	344 (100%)	15 (4.4%)

233 FTS: Filariasis Test Strip; QFAT: Q Filariasis Antigen Test

234

235 **LF antigen positivity by FTS and QFAT**

236 Overall, 100 samples tested positive with FTS (29.0%, 95% CI 24.5-34.1%) and 104 samples
 237 with QFAT (30.2%, 95% CI 25.6-35.3%). If indeterminant and invalid FTS results were excluded
 238 from the analysis, Ag positivity was 30.6% (95% CI 25.8-35.8%) by FTS and 30.2% (95% CI
 239 25.6-35.3%) by QFAT.

240 **FTS and QFAT concordance at initial reading (at 10 minutes)**

241 The overall concordance between FTS and QFAT, including indeterminant and invalid readings
 242 (n=344), was 93.6%. The Kappa agreement statistic indicated excellent agreement between the
 243 two tests (K=0.85; 95% CI 0.80-0.91). Table 2 demonstrates that of the valid but discordant test
 244 results, one was positive by FTS and negative by QFAT, and four were positive by QFAT and
 245 negative by FTS.

246 Table 2: Concordance between Filariasis Test Strip and Q Filariasis Antigen Test results,
 247 including indeterminant and invalid tests, Samoa 2023.

		FTS					Concordance (%)	Kappa (95% CI)
		Positive	Negative	Indeterminant	Invalid	Total		
QFAT	Positive	99	4	0	1	104	93.6	0.85 (0.80-0.91)
	Negative	1	223	3	13	240		
	Indeterminant	0	0	0	0	0		
	Invalid	0	0	0	0	0		
	Total	100	227	3	14	344		

248 CI: Confidence interval; FTS: Filariasis Test Strip; QFAT: Q Filariasis Antigen Test

249

250 If indeterminant and invalid readings were excluded from the analysis, the concordance
 251 between FTS and QFAT (n=327) improved to 98.5% (Table 3). The Kappa agreement similarly
 252 indicated excellent agreement between the two tests (K=0.96; 95% CI 0.96- 1.0).

253 All 40 Mf-positive samples were Ag-positive by both FTS and QFAT. Of the 65 Mf-negative
 254 samples, 56 (86.1%) were Ag-positive by both QFAT and FTS, with 93.9% concordance and
 255 good agreement (K=0.68; 95% CI 0.39-0.97) between the two tests (Table 3).

256

257 Table 3: Concordance between Filariasis Test Strip and Q Filariasis Antigen Test for all samples
 258 and stratified by microfilaria positive or negative, excluding indeterminant and invalid results,
 259 Samoa 2023.

Samples with valid results for FTS and QFAT	N	QFAT	FTS		Concordance (%)	Kappa (95% CI)
			Positive	Negative		
All samples	327	Positive	99	4	98.5	0.96 (0.96-1.0)
		Negative	1	223		
Mf-positive	40	Positive	40	0	100.0	1.0 (1.0-1.0)
		Negative	0	0		
Mf-negative	65	Positive	56	3	93.9	0.68 (0.39-0.97)
		Negative	1	5		

260 Mf: Microfilaria; CI: Confidence interval; FTS: Filariasis Test Strip; QFAT: Q Filariasis Antigen
 261 Test

262

263 **Antigen-positive FTS and QFAT test line intensity scores**

264 The distribution of the FTS and QFAT test line intensity scores among the Mf-positive and Mf-
 265 negative participants are presented in Figure 2. Blood samples that were Ag-positive by FTS
 266 and Mf-positive produced predominantly strong (3) test lines (86.5%), compared to FTS Ag-
 267 positive/Mf-negative samples. In contrast, blood samples testing Ag-positive by QFAT and Mf-
 268 positive had mostly light (1) intensity test lines (92.4%), similar to test line intensities reported for
 269 QFAT Ag-positive and Mf-negative blood samples. For samples that tested positive for Ag by
 270 FTS, those with test lines darker than the control had 13.6 times higher odds of being Mf-
 271 positive (95% CI 4.8-45.4), compared to those with test lines that were the same or lighter
 272 intensity than the control (p-value <0.0001). However, a logistics regression could not be
 273 applied for QFAT because there were no samples with test lines that were darker than the
 274 control line.

275

276

277

278

279

280


281

282

283

284

285



286 Figure 1: Summary of test line gradings (darker, same or lighter than control line) determined for
287 participants with Antigen (Ag)-positive (A) filariasis test strip and (B) Q Filariasis antigen tests,
288 against microfilariae (Mf) status.

289 Changes in FTS and QFAT test results at 1 hour and next day timepoints

290 We assessed the difference between FTS and QFAT test results at three time points (10-
291 minutes, 1 hour and next day) to determine whether test results remained stable over time. Only
292 data sets with complete and valid readings across all three time points were included in the
293 analysis. Ag positivity at 10 minutes was 30.1% by FTS and 29.9% by QFAT (Supplementary 1,
294 Table 4). At 1 hour, Ag positivity was 30.2% by FTS and 29.6% by QFAT. The next day, the Ag
295 positivity remained at 30.2% for FTS but increased to 39.6% for QFAT.

296 A total of 46 (13.5%) QFAT tests were observed to have results change between 10 minutes
297 and 1 hour and/or the next day, while five (1.6%) changed for FTS. The proportion of QFAT tests
298 that had a reported change of results between the 1 hour and next day readings was statistically
299 significant (McNemar test p-value = 0.003). Additionally, there was a statistically significant
300 difference between the proportion of tests changing for FTS and QFAT at the next-day readings
301 (Fisher's exact test p-value = 0.006). These results indicate minor changes in test result
302 readings for FTS and QFAT between 10 minutes and 1 hour, whereas, at the next-day readings,
303 the number of test results reported to have changed was significantly greater for QFAT than for
304 FTS. The distinct proportion of tests reported to have changed at these times points for FTS and
305 QFAT have been broken down in supplementary file 2.

306 **QFAT usability under field conditions**

307 The field laboratory team reported that QFAT was preferred over FTS for multiple reasons.
308 QFAT required smaller sample volumes than FTS. Further, the smaller sample volume required
309 for QFAT made it easier to apply the blood sample, as blood spillage off the application pad was
310 occasionally noted with FTS but not QFAT. The QFAT cassette was easier to handle than the
311 loose strip and tray used for the FTS, and QFAT occupied less space in the field laboratory.
312 Furthermore, the control line for QFAT was consistently clearer and easier to identify than for
313 FTS. Although the test line on QFAT sometimes appeared lighter than the control, it was still
314 identifiable even without a torch, unlike FTS, which could be challenging to see at times. It was
315 also noted that in times of high laboratory demand the additional buffer step required for QFAT
316 could be missed, which could potentially lead to invalid test results.

317 **Discussion**

318 Our study found excellent concordance in LF Ag results between FTS and QFAT. Ag positivity
319 based on initial 10-minute readings was similar for both tests, with a slightly higher reported
320 positivity rate for QFAT. Additionally, it was encouraging to find that all Mf-positive samples were
321 Ag-positive by both QFAT and FTS as these samples tend to have higher levels of detectable
322 circulating Ag (12). Discordance between the independent readers was highest for QFAT
323 compared to FTS. However, all tests were resolvable due to the consensus among readers,
324 except for 1.0% of FTS test results that were classified as indeterminate.

325 It has been previously suggested that semi-quantification of the test line as compared to the
326 control line could indicate Mf-positivity from blood samples (13), which could have potential
327 utility in field studies to indirectly infer the level of Mf rates in a population over time (14). In this
328 current study we found that darker test line intensities, compared to the control line, produced
329 by Ag-positive FTS was a predictor of Mf-positivity. However, this was not the case for QFAT, as
330 no samples produced a test line that was darker than the control line. Indicating that the semi-
331 quantification of the test line for Ag-positive QFAT tests may have limited utility for indicating Mf-
332 positivity. However, this finding could be influenced by the smaller sample volume required for
333 QFAT than for FTS, as the greater intensity of the FTS test line noted in this study could
334 potentially be influenced by the tests greater sample volume requirement. It should also be
335 noted that QFAT consistently had stronger control lines as compared to FTS, whereby the
336 control line of FTS was often very faint. The darker control lines are more reliable as they are
337 less prone to misinterpretations and being discarded as invalid.

338 A significantly greater proportion of tests were reported to have changed for QFAT than FTS at
339 the next day readings. The propensity of the reported change was negative to positive. A
340 previous study comparing and assessing the stability of the former ICT with FTS over time
341 revealed that participants from a non-endemic country had Ag-negative FTS tests at 10 minutes,

342 but after 24 hours, some of the tests turned positive (6), indicating some level of unreliability of
343 FTS if test results are read after the recommended time. The findings from this study suggest
344 that test results from QFAT could produce false-positives overtime, indicating that results should
345 not be interpreted beyond the manufacturer's recommended timeframe.

346 In general, the field laboratory team preferred QFAT over FTS predominantly due to its smaller
347 sample volume requirements, which would be beneficial to field workers as it allows sufficient
348 volumes to be used for other purposes (e.g., Mf slides and/or dried blood spots) or for repeating
349 FTS or QFAT if needed, but also for its user-friendliness. However, the evaluation of user-
350 friendliness may be limited as micropipettes were used to apply precise volumes to the test
351 sample pad, deviating from the capillary tubes provided by the test kits.

352 The strengths of this study include the ability to simulate the performance of QFAT under field
353 conditions, given its integration within an LF community survey. However, in LF programmes
354 QFAT is intended for point-of-care application, specifically using blood directly from a finger-
355 prick. This approach was not evaluated in this current study. While QFAT has demonstrated
356 promising performance under field conditions in Samoa, additional field evaluations are
357 recommended for other settings and should consider evaluating the point-of-care aspect.

358 Additionally, having multiple readings of the test results at the initial 10 minutes was an
359 advantage to this study. Multiple readers enabled the resolution of discordant results, enhancing
360 the reliability of the conclusions drawn from this study. Cross-reactivity was not explored in this
361 current study and while concerns of cross-reactivity of FTS with *L. loa* (8) and potentially
362 strongyloidiasis (6) have been raised, it is unknown whether this is an issue for QFAT. Other
363 remaining knowledge gaps include whether QFAT will have comparable results to FTS after
364 repeated rounds of MDA and/or where Ag prevalence low. Additionally, a cost-benefit analysis
365 would also be of interest to determine whether QFAT's accuracy and user-friendliness
366 demonstrated in this study leads to cost savings compared to using FTS.

367 In summary, QFAT demonstrated promising performance under field conditions in Samoa. Our
368 study found that QFAT and FTS Ag-positivity rates were comparable, with excellent
369 concordance between the two tests. The field laboratory team preferred QFAT over FTS due to
370 smaller sample volume requirements, ease of use, and clearer readability, offering reliable and
371 user-friendly Ag detection test for LF surveillance and control programs.

372 **Acknowledgements**

373 We are grateful to the all the participants who took part in this survey. We are also deeply
374 appreciative of the Samoa Red Cross team and Stephanie Curtis for their assistance in the
375 conducting the field work, which formed an integral part of this study. We would like to thank the
376 SD biosensor for providing the QFATs and extend our gratitude to Jonathan King, who was the
377 liaison between NTD-WHO, PQ, the procurement departments and the manufacturers.

378 **Conflicts of Interest**

379 Nothing to declare.

380 **Funding**

381 This work received financial support from the Coalition for Operational Research on Neglected
382 Tropical Diseases (COR-NTD), which is funded at The Task Force for Global Health primarily by
383 the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation (OPP1190754), by UK aid from the British government, and
384 by the United States Agency for International Development through its Neglected Tropical
385 Diseases Program. Under the grant conditions of the Foundation, a Creative Commons
386 Attribution 4.0 Generic License has already been assigned to the Author Accepted Manuscript
387 version that might arise from this submission. CLL was supported by an Australian National
388 Health and Medical Research Council Fellowship (APP 1193826).

389 **Ethical Approval Statement**

390 Ethics approvals were obtained from the Samoa Ministry of Health and the Human Research
391 Ethics Committee (HREC) of The University of Queensland (protocol 2021/HE000895), and the
392 Australian National University HREC provided recognition of approval by another HREC.

393 **Disclaimer**

394 The findings and conclusions in this report are those of the authors and do not necessarily
395 represent the official position of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

396 **Declaration of Generative AI and AI-assisted technologies in the writing process**

397 During the preparation of this work the first author used Grammarly® for Microsoft Office
398 (v.6.8.263) to check grammar and spelling. After using this tool, the author reviewed and edited
399 the content as needed and takes full responsibility for the content of the publication.

400 **References**

- 401 1. Taylor MJ, Hoerauf A, Bockarie M. Lymphatic filariasis and onchocerciasis. *The Lancet*.
402 2010;376(9747):1175-85.
- 403 2. WHO. Lymphatic filariasis: World Health Organization (WHO); 2023 [Available from:
404 <https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/lymphatic-filariasis>.
- 405 3. WHO. Ending the neglect to attain the sustainable development goals: a road map for
406 neglected tropical diseases 2021–2030. World Health Organization (WHO); 2020. Report No.:
407 9240018794.
- 408 4. Ichimori K, Graves PM. Overview of PacELF—the Pacific Programme for the Elimination
409 of Lymphatic Filariasis. *Trop Med Health*. 2017;45(1):34.
- 410 5. Rebollo MP, Bockarie MJ. Shrinking the lymphatic filariasis map: update on diagnostic
411 tools for mapping and transmission monitoring. *Parasitology*. 2014;141(14):1912-7.
- 412 6. Weil GJ, Curtis KC, Fakoli L, Fischer K, Gankpala L, Lammie PJ, et al. Laboratory and
413 field evaluation of a new rapid test for detecting *Wuchereria bancrofti* antigen in human blood.
414 *Am J Trop Med Hyg*. 2013;89(1):11-5.
- 415 7. Pantelias A, King JD, Lammie P, Weil GJ. Development and Introduction of the Filariasis
416 Test Strip: A New Diagnostic Test for the Global Program to Eliminate Lymphatic Filariasis. *Am J*
417 *Trop Med Hyg*. 2022;106(5_Suppl):56-60.
- 418 8. Hertz MI, Nana-Djeunga H, Kamgno J, Jelil Njouendou A, Chawa Chunda V, Wanji S, et
419 al. Identification and characterization of *Loa loa* antigens responsible for cross-reactivity with
420 rapid diagnostic tests for lymphatic filariasis. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis*. 2018;12(11):e0006963.
- 421 9. Lau CL, Meder K, Mayfield HJ, Kearns T, McPherson B, Naseri T, et al. Lymphatic
422 filariasis epidemiology in Samoa in 2018: Geographic clustering and higher antigen prevalence
423 in older age groups. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis*. 2020;14(12):e0008927.
- 424 10. Graves PM, Sheridan S, Scott J, Amosa-Lei Sam F, Naseri T, Thomsen R, et al. Triple-
425 Drug Treatment Is Effective for Lymphatic Filariasis *Microfilaria* Clearance in Samoa. *Trop Med*
426 *Infect Dis*. 2021;6(2):44.
- 427 11. WHO. Lymphatic filariasis: monitoring and epidemiological assessment of mass drug
428 administration: a manual for national elimination programmes. Geneva, Switzerland: WHO:
429 World Health Organization (WHO); 2011.
- 430 12. Chesnais CB, Vlamincck J, Kunyu-Shako B, Pion SD, Awaca-Uvon NP, Weil GJ, et al.
431 Measurement of Circulating Filarial Antigen Levels in Human Blood with a Point-of-Care Test
432 Strip and a Portable Spectrodensitometer. *Am J Trop Med Hyg*. 2016;94(6):1324-9.
- 433 13. Chesnais CB, Missamou F, Pion SDS, Bopda J, Louya F, Majewski AC, et al. Semi-
434 Quantitative Scoring of an Immunochromatographic Test for Circulating Filarial Antigen. *Am J*
435 *Trop Med Hyg*. 2013;89(5):916-8.
- 436 14. Nana-Djeunga HC, Sicard CM, Mogoung-Wafo AE, Chesnais CB, Deléglise H, Touka-
437 Nounkeu R, et al. Changes in Onchocerciasis Ov16 IgG4 Rapid Diagnostic Test Results Over
438 One-Month Follow-up: Lessons for Reading Timeframe and Decision-Making. *Am J Trop Med*
439 *Hyg*. 2022;107(3):658-61.