

1 Performance and usability evaluation of three LDH-based malaria rapid diagnostic
2 tests in Kédougou, Senegal

3

4 Babacar Souleymane Sambe^{1#}, Stephanie Zobrist^{2*#}, William Sheahan², Divya Soni³, Aissatou Diagne¹,
5 Ibrahima Sarr¹, Arona Sabene Diatta¹, Serigne Ousmane Mbacke Diaw¹, Allison Golden², Hannah Slater²,
6 Ihn Kyung Jang², Nerie Roa², Sampa Pal², Fatoumata Diene Sarr¹, Joseph Faye¹, Inès Vigan-Womas¹,
7 Yakou Dieye⁴, Moustapha Cisse⁴, Gonzalo J Domingo^{2&}, Makhtar Niang^{1&}

8

9 1. Institut Pasteur de Dakar, Dakar, Senegal

10 2. PATH, Seattle, United States

11 3. PATH, New Delhi, India

12 4. PATH, Dakar, Senegal

13 * Corresponding author: Stephanie Zobrist, szobrist@path.org

14 # Denotes equal contribution

15 & Denotes equal contribution

16 **Main text word count:** 4,830

17 **Abstract**

18 **Background**

19 The emergence of *pflhrp2/3*-deleted parasites threatens histidine-rich protein 2 (HRP2)-based malaria
20 rapid diagnostic test (RDT) performance. RDTs targeting *Plasmodium falciparum* (*Pf*) lactate
21 dehydrogenase (LDH) may address current product limitations and improve case management.

22 **Objectives**

23 To evaluate the performance and usability of three LDH-based RDTs in febrile patients.

24 **Methods**

25 A cross-sectional diagnostic accuracy study was conducted in Kédougou, Senegal. Capillary blood was
26 tested using the SD Bioline Ag Pf (#05FK50) and three LDH-based RDTs: BIOCREREDIT Malaria Ag Pf
27 (pLDH), BIOCREREDIT Pf (pLDH/HRPII), and BIOCREREDIT Pf/Pv (pLDH/pLDH) (Rapigen Inc.,
28 Republic of Korea). Venous blood was collected to repeat the BIOCREREDIT RDTs and conduct
29 microscopy. Frozen venous specimens were tested using a reference PCR assay. A quantitative multiplex
30 malaria antigen assay measured antigen concentration. RDT performance was determined and analyzed as
31 a function of antigen concentration distribution. Usability of the *Pf*-only BIOCREREDIT tests was evaluated
32 using a questionnaire.

33 **Results**

34 154/220 participants (70%) were *Pf*-positive by PCR. The Pf (pLDH/HRPII) test demonstrated the
35 highest sensitivity at 78% (70.9%–84.5%); specificity was 89% (79.4%–95.6%). All RDTs performed
36 better than microscopy (53% sensitivity). RDTs performed better when compared to antigen
37 concentration over PCR results. Improved sensitivity of the Pf (pLDH/HRPII) test was driven by the
38 HRP2 line. Line intensity correlated with antigen concentration. Predicted sensitivity using the analytical

39 limit of detection (LOD) was comparable to observed sensitivity. RDTs demonstrated acceptable
40 usability.

41 **Conclusions**

42 Both HRP2 and LDH contributed to the sensitivity of the best-performing *Pf*-RDT. RDT analytical LODs
43 can be used to predict performance in populations with known antigen concentrations.

44 **Keywords**

45 Malaria, diagnosis, rapid diagnostic test, lactate dehydrogenase, histidine rich protein 2

46 **Introduction**

47 Accurate and timely diagnosis of malaria is essential to ensure effective treatment for patients and
48 accelerate control and elimination efforts. Lateral flow immunochromatographic rapid diagnostic tests
49 (RDTs) for malaria have been widely accepted in endemic settings due to their simplicity, low cost,
50 minimal infrastructure requirements, and rapid time to result.^{1,2}

51 Malaria RDTs function by detecting specific protein antigens expressed by the malaria parasite in the
52 blood of infected individuals.³ Histidine-rich protein 2 (HRP2) and lactate dehydrogenase (LDH) are two
53 common antigens targeted by malaria RDTs. The vast majority of RDTs used for the diagnosis of
54 *Plasmodium falciparum* (*Pf*) malaria target HRP2, as this antigen is specific to *Pf* and cannot be produced
55 by other malarial species.⁴ To date, HRP2 has been the preferred target for *Pf* RDTs due to its abundant
56 production by the parasite, as well as greater heat stability and clinical sensitivity as compared to PflDH-
57 based RDTs.⁵⁻¹¹ Senegal, along with many other African countries where *Pf* is the predominant
58 species,^{12,13} currently relies primarily on HRP2-based RDTs for malaria diagnosis.

59 There are significant limitations to the widespread use of HRP2-based *Pf* RDTs. The HRP2 antigen can
60 persist in the peripheral bloodstream for multiple weeks following parasite clearance and can, therefore,
61 result in false-positive results among individuals who have recently received treatment. Most importantly,
62 the performance of HRP2-based RDTs is threatened by increasing reports of parasites with deleted
63 *hrp2/hrp3* genes.^{14,15} In settings with a significant prevalence of *hrp2/hrp3* gene deletions in symptomatic
64 populations, the World Health Organization (WHO) advises switching to RDTs that do not rely
65 exclusively on HRP2 detection.¹⁶ Several studies have documented observations of *Pf hrp2/hrp3* gene
66 deletions in Senegal.^{17,18} Recent modeling suggests that deletions identified in Western Africa are
67 projected to increase,¹⁹ and, as such, further monitoring of deletion prevalence and impact on RDT
68 performance in this setting is warranted. A switch to PflDH-based tests must take into account the
69 significantly higher limits of detection (LOD) for LDH, and consequently the lower clinical sensitivity of

70 these tests.²⁰ For this reason, improvements in the performance of PfLDH-based tests are needed in order
71 to minimize tradeoffs in sensitivity.

72 RapiGen Inc. (Republic of Korea) has developed three novel, LDH-based malaria RDTs:

- 73 • The BIOCREDIT Malaria Ag Pf (pLDH/HRP2) RDT, with two test lines for HRP2 and PfLDH
- 74 • The BIOCREDIT Malaria Ag Pf/Pv (pLDH/pLDH) RDT, with two test lines for PfLDH and PvLDH
- 75 • The BIOCREDIT Malaria Ag Pf (pLDH) RDT, with one test line for PfLDH.

76 Analytical benchmarking and clinical sensitivity modeling for these tests indicate that they have improved
77 LODs for LDH that may result in higher clinical performance in terms of sensitivity toward *Pf* infections
78 with *hrp2/hrp3* gene deletions and for *Plasmodium vivax* (*Pv*) clinical infections.²⁰ Additionally, previous
79 evaluations of these tests in Ghana, Burundi, Uganda, Djibouti, and the Republic of Korea have also
80 demonstrated promising clinical performance.^{21–25}

81 This study aimed to evaluate the clinical performance of these three malaria RDTs among a febrile
82 population in Kédougou, Senegal, in comparison to a reference polymerase chain reaction (PCR) assay
83 and antigen concentration quantification. The performance of microscopy and a currently available
84 HRP2-based comparator RDT were also evaluated in the same population in order to enable informed
85 decision-making regarding the recommendation of new, highly sensitive point-of-care tools for malaria.

86 **Materials and methods**

87 **Ethical approval**

88 This study was reviewed and approved by the Comité National d'Ethique pour la Recherche en Santé
89 (CNER) [00000126/MSAS/CNER/SP], Sénégal, and WIRB-Copernicus Group (WCG) [1313427]
90 Institutional Review Boards (IRBs). Written informed consent was obtained for all study participants. For
91 minors, consent was provided by legal guardians, and children over the age of 7 also provided assent.

92 **Study design and population**

93 Between November 2021 and February 2022, a cross-sectional diagnostic accuracy study of patients
94 presenting with febrile symptoms was conducted in Kédougou, Senegal. The Kédougou region borders
95 Guinea and Mali and experiences a high burden of *Pf* malaria with moderate seasonality.^{26,27} Patients aged
96 6 months and older presenting with febrile symptoms were recruited from five health facilities: the
97 Kédougou Health Center, and the Tomboronkoto, Dalaba, Bandafassi, and Bantako health posts.
98 Individuals weighing less than 8 kg or those who had a serious illness, as determined by the health care
99 provider, were excluded from participation. Given the high malaria transmission and parasite prevalence
100 in the study location, it was expected that some participants would either become reinfected or continue to
101 exhibit malaria during the study period and return to the health center/post. In such cases, the individual's
102 status as a returning participant was recorded, but all testing was repeated, and they were treated in the
103 study analysis as a unique sample.

104 **Study procedures and RDT testing**

105 Following enrollment, participants completed a brief questionnaire to collect information on
106 demographics, current health status, and medical history. Next, trained study staff collected capillary
107 blood samples, performed the standard-of-care malaria RDT (the SD BIOLINE Malaria Ag P.f
108 [#05FK50]), and conducted the three investigational tests: the Rapigen BIOCREDIT Malaria Ag Pf
109 (pLDH/HRPII), BIOCREDIT Malaria Ag Pf (pLDH), and BIOCREDIT Malaria Ag Pf/Pv
110 (pLDH/pLDH). All tests were conducted according to the manufacturer's instructions and read within the
111 specified timeframes. Test and control line intensities of the Rapigen test results were assigned based on
112 comparison of test and control line observed intensities to 16-point (test) and 5-point (control) intensity
113 scales on a card provided by Rapigen. All invalid test results were recorded. Results from the standard-of-
114 care RDT were used to inform clinical care, and all patients found positive were treated according to
115 national guidelines.

116 Next, 4 mL of venous blood was collected into an EDTA tube and transported under cold chain to the
117 Institut Pasteur field station in Kédougou. At the field station, the venous blood was aliquoted and the
118 three BIOCREDIT RDTs were repeated. All test operators at the field station were blinded to the clinic
119 RDT results. One aliquot of venous blood was also used to prepare microscopy slides, and the remaining
120 aliquots were frozen at -20°C. Microscopy slides were read by a trained, blinded microscopist at the
121 Institut Pasteur de Dakar laboratory in Dakar, Senegal. Frozen venous blood specimens were shipped on
122 ice to PATH (Seattle, USA) for reference PCR testing and confirmatory antigen concentration
123 determination. Operators performing the reference and confirmatory assays were blinded to all RDT and
124 microscopy results and vice versa.

125 **Reference PCR testing**

126 Frozen whole blood in EDTA was analyzed for the detection of *Pf* nucleic acid using a real-time PCR
127 assay. A photoinduced electron transfer (PET) PCR assay for *Pf* was conducted at PATH. DNA was
128 extracted from 100 µL of frozen whole blood using QIAamp DNA Mini Kits (QUIAGEN, Valencia, CA,
129 cat #51106) and eluted into 100 µL of elution buffer and stored at -20°C. All samples were screened for *Pf*
130 using the forward (5'-ACC CCT CGC CTG GTG TTT TT-3') and reverse (HEX-5'-agg cgg ata ccg cct
131 ggT CGG GCC CCA AAA ATA GGA A-3') self-quenching primers, as established by the Centers for
132 Disease Control and Prevention.²⁸ The reaction was performed in a 20 µL reaction containing 2X TaqMan
133 Environmental buffer 2.0 (Applied Biosystems, Grand Island, NY, Cat # 4398044), 62.5 nM each of
134 forward and reverse primers and 5 µL of template DNA. Cycling parameters were 95°C for 10 minutes,
135 followed by 45 cycles of denaturation at 95°C for 10 seconds and annealing at 60°C for 40 seconds. Cycle
136 threshold (Ct) values, defined as the number of cycles required for the fluorescent signal to cross the
137 threshold (i.e., exceeds the background level), were recorded after the end of each annealing step.
138 Specimens with Ct values <40 were considered positive. *Pf* 3D7 with known parasitemia was used as a
139 positive control. All assays were performed using Agilent Mx3005pro thermocyclers (Agilent
140 Technologies, Santa Clara, CA).

141 **Antigen concentration determination**

142 Antigen concentration was determined with a quantitative antigen assay: Q-Plex™ Human Malaria Array
143 (5-Plex) (Quansys Biosciences, Logan UT, USA). This is a chemiluminescent ELISA that allows the
144 identification of malaria infection and the simultaneous detection of human C-reactive protein (CRP) in
145 human blood, serum, and plasma. This assay uses a quantitative sandwich enzyme immunoassay to
146 measure malaria HRP2, PfLDH, PvLDH, PanLDH antigens, and human CRP in less than 4 hours.^{29,30} The
147 cutoffs used for antigen positivity were as described previously.²⁹

148 **Usability study**

149 Two usability studies were conducted to evaluate the *Pf*-only BIOCREDIT RDTs: the BIOCREDIT
150 Malaria Ag Pf (pLDH) and the BIOCREDIT Malaria Ag Pf (pLDH/HRPII) RDTs. Participants included
151 health care workers, who are representative of intended end users of malaria RDTs in rural and urban
152 settings in Senegal. Each participant evaluated only one of the two RDTs and completed a questionnaire
153 assessing label and packaging comprehension as well as results interpretation of images of contrived
154 RDTs.³¹

155 **Data management and statistical analysis**

156 All study results were recorded on data collection forms and double-entered into REDCap® (Research
157 Electronic Data Capture, version 12.3.3), a web-based software platform with built-in validation rules to
158 minimize data entry errors.³²

159 For the estimation of sample size, a 95% confidence interval was assumed, with an absolute precision of
160 0.025. In the absence of preliminary data, a 50% prevalence of *Pf* infection was assumed, yielding a target
161 sample size of 241 participants.

162 Descriptive statistical analysis, including calculating point estimates, distributions, and frequencies of
163 responses, was conducted to summarize and characterize the study population. The number and

164 percentage of participants infected with malaria, as determined by all assays, were assessed. Diagnostic
165 accuracy was determined by calculating the sensitivity, specificity, positive predictive value (PPV), and
166 negative predictive value (NPV) of all RDTs and microscopy in comparison to (1) the reference PCR
167 assay and (2) the quantitative antigen assay. The diagnostic accuracy of the quantitative antigen assay
168 relative to the PCR reference method was also calculated. For comparisons using antigen concentrations
169 as the reference method, the cognate target (PfLDH, HRP2, or both) was used to determine true positivity
170 or negativity. All diagnostic performance results were reported with 95% confidence intervals (CIs)
171 calculated using the conservative exact binomial method.

172 RDT performance was analyzed as a function of antigen concentration distribution and parasite density.
173 This analysis was conducted only for the BIOCREREDIT Malaria Ag Pf (pLDH/HRP2) RDT as it was the
174 only test in this study with both PfLDH and HRP2 lines and had comparable PfLDH results to the other
175 two BIOCREREDIT products. Firstly, the relationships between HRP2 and PfLDH concentrations and
176 parasite density, stratified by RDT result, are described using boxplots with jittered datapoints overlaid.
177 Next, scatterplots of HRP2 versus PfLDH concentration stratified by RDT status and PCR status are used
178 to explore visually explore the data. A sigmoidal dose response statistical model was then fitted within a
179 Bayesian framework to estimate the relationship between antigen concentration and operator-assigned
180 RDT line intensity scores for each antigen. Finally, a logistic regression model was fitted within a
181 Bayesian framework to estimate the relationship between antigen concentration and the probability of
182 RDT positivity for each antigen.²⁰ In both models, antigen concentrations were log₁₀ transformed to
183 ensure appropriate scaling. Uninformative priors were used in the line intensity model. Both models were
184 run for 10,000 iterations and convergence was assessed via visual checks of the coefficient trace plots.

185 ²⁰The Rapigen BIOCREREDIT Pf (pLDH/HRP2) test has previously been evaluated for analytical
186 performance against antigen concentration using a standardized laboratory panel.²⁰ Golden *et al.* (2024)
187 determined the test's antigen LOD, defined as the concentration at which the test was expected to be
188 positive 90% of the time, to be 525 pg/mL for HRP2 and 1,318 pg/mL for LDH. Here, we applied these

189 cutoffs to predict the test result for each sample as detectable or not detectable by the RDT, depending on
190 whether the measured cognate antigen concentration was above or below the LOD. The predicted clinical
191 performance of the BIOCREREDIT Malaria Ag Pf (pLDH/HRPII) RDT against both the reference PCR and
192 antigen concentration results in this population was then calculated.

193 Statistical analysis was conducted using R version 4.2.1 (R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna,
194 Austria).

195 Usability assessment included both multiple-choice and open-ended questions, and responses were
196 analyzed using descriptive statistics.

197 **Results**

198 **Characteristics of the study population**

199 A total of 236 participants were included in the study. Of these, 220 had venous blood available for
200 reference assay analysis and were therefore included in the analytical sample. Of these 220 participants,
201 capillary results for the investigational tests were not available for two participants, and one result from
202 the BIOCREREDIT Malaria Ag Pf (pLDH) test was excluded from analysis due to a data recording error.
203 Microscopy results were available for 183 participants, and a subset of specimens from 200 participants
204 with sufficient specimen volume underwent antigen concentration testing.

205 Table 1 presents the demographic information of the study participants. The majority of participants
206 (60%) were over 16 years of age, and there was an even distribution of male (49%) and female (51%)
207 participants. The study population reported a diverse range of symptoms, and 41% were febrile at
208 enrollment, defined as having a body temperature of $\geq 37.5^{\circ}\text{C}$.

209 Seventy percent (154/220) of enrolled participants were *Pf*-positive by reference PCR. For these PCR-
210 confirmed *Pf*-positive cases, the mean parasite density was 729,386.5 parasites/ μL , the mean HRP2
211 concentration was 3,399.3 ng/mL, and the mean pLDH concentration was 556.6 ng/mL. No *Pv*-positive

212 specimens were observed on any of the assays. One suspected *hrp2/hrp3* deletion case was identified by
213 the criteria of HRP2-negative and PfLDH-positive antigen concentration results in this population. No
214 invalid results were obtained on any RDTs in this study.

215 **Diagnostic performance of investigational and comparator RDTs against reference PCR**

216 Table 2 presents a summary of the diagnostic performance of all investigational and comparator tests
217 compared to the PCR reference assay by specimen type. When using the PCR reference method,
218 microscopy showed the lowest overall performance with a sensitivity of 53% (95% CI: 44.5–62.2). The
219 BIOCREREDIT Malaria Ag Pf (pLDH/HRPII) test showed the highest sensitivity of all evaluated tests at
220 78% (95% CI: 70.9 – 84.5). The corresponding PPV and NPV were 94% (95% CI: 88.9–97.7) and 64%
221 (95% CI: 53.5–73.9), respectively. The two BIOCREREDIT PfLDH-only tests in this study showed the
222 lowest performance. Both of these tests, as well as the PfLDH line alone on the BIOCREREDIT Malaria Ag
223 Pf (pLDH/HRPII) test, had lower sensitivity than the comparator HRP2-based RDT (71%; 95% CI: 63.6–
224 78.4). The BIOCREREDIT Malaria Ag Pf (pLDH/HRPII) test also had the lowest specificity at 89% (95%
225 CI: 79.4–95.6), with the HRP2 line showing the lowest specificity.

226 **Diagnostic performance of investigational and comparator RDTs against antigen** 227 **concentration**

228 Sixty-six percent (131/200) of participants whose samples were tested with the quantitative antigen assay
229 were *Pf*-positive. Table 3 presents a summary of the diagnostic performance of all investigational and
230 comparator tests, compared to the quantitative antigen assay, by specimen type. When RDT performance
231 was compared against the quantitative antigen assay as the reference method, the sensitivity of all tests on
232 both capillary and venous specimens was significantly higher than when compared against the PCR
233 reference, with the largest improvements observed on the PfLDH test lines. The same trend is observed
234 for specificity, with the exception of the HRP2 line on the BIOCREREDIT Malaria Ag Pf (pLDH/HRPII)
235 test with capillary specimens, which showed 92% specificity (95% CI: 82.5 – 96.8), as compared to 92%

236 specificity (95% CI: 82.5–96.8), compared to 92% (95% CI: 83.2–97.5) when compared against PCR.
237 Overall, the PfLDH-only tests had the highest performance compared to the antigen assay, irrespective of
238 specimen type. This can be understood in the context of the performance of the quantitative antigen assay
239 relative to the reference PCR method, which also showed the lowest sensitivity (71%) for the detection of
240 PfLDH (Supplementary Table 1). All RDTs performed slightly better on venous blood specimens than on
241 capillary specimens using both reference methods, although differences were negligible and within the
242 95% CIs.

243 **Antigen concentration distribution and performance of the BIOCREDIT Malaria Ag** 244 **(pLDH/HRP2) RDT**

245 Figure 1 summarizes the relationship between (A) HRP2 concentration and parasite density and (B) LDH
246 concentration and parasite density, with color coding used to distinguish results for each line on the
247 BIOCREDIT Malaria Ag Pf (pLDH/HRP2). The HRP2 line detects specimens with lower target antigen
248 concentrations compared to the PfLDH line.

249 The BIOCREDIT Malaria Ag Pf (pLDH/HRP2) RDT has a 50% probability of detecting HRP2 at an
250 antigen concentration of 0.175 ng/mL, and a 90% probability at 2.84 ng/mL (Supplementary Figure 1).
251 The 50% and 90% probabilities of detection for PfLDH are 2.17 ng/mL and 12.24 ng/mL, respectively
252 (Supplementary Figure 1).

253 Figure 2 shows the contribution of each test line to the overall performance of the BIOCREDIT Malaria
254 Ag Pf (pLDH/HRP2), displaying the PfLDH and HRP2 concentrations for each clinical specimen. The
255 results for the HRP2 and PfLDH test lines on the RDT are shown for each clinical specimen in panels A
256 and B, respectively, and combined in panel C. More PCR-confirmed specimens had detectable HRP2
257 concentrations on the HRP2 line but not the LDH line, compared to specimens that were detectable on the
258 LDH line but not the HRP2 line (Figure 2, panel C).

259 RDT line intensity was also correlated with the antigen concentration for the BIOCREREDIT Pf
260 (pLDH/HRP2) test (Figure 3). The HRP2 line showed an antigen-dependent increase in visible intensity
261 between approximately 0.1 ng/mL and 100 ng/mL (100 –100,000 pg/mL). The PflDH line showed an
262 antigen-dependent increase in visible intensity between approximately 2 ng/mL and 100 ng/mL (2,000 –
263 100,000 pg/mL). For both lines, the test lines for specimens with HRP2 or PflDH concentrations above
264 100 ng/mL appeared to be saturated and did not significantly increase with higher antigen concentrations.

265 **Performance prediction based on analytical sensitivity**

266 Table 4 shows the predicted sensitivities based on the test’s analytical LOD as applied to this study
267 population against both the quantitative antigen and PCR reference methods and the observed sensitivities
268 (also shown in Tables 2 and 3) for each antigen on the RDT and the combined RDT test result. The
269 specificity against the quantitative antigen reference method is, by definition, 100% for all antigens;
270 therefore, only specificity against PCR is presented. Overall, the predicted and observed sensitivities were
271 comparable. When using the antigen concentration reference method, the predicted sensitivity of the RDT
272 was slightly lower than the observed sensitivity for the detection of HRP2 (84% versus 88%) but slightly
273 higher for the detection of PflDH (92% versus 91%). For the detection of either HRP2 and/or PflDH,
274 the predicted sensitivity was lower than the observed sensitivity (84% versus 89%). Against the PCR
275 reference method, the test’s predicted sensitivity was lower than the observed sensitivity for HRP2 (78%
276 versus 81%) and slightly higher for PflDH (67% versus 66%). For HRP2 and/or PflDH, the predicted
277 sensitivity was, again, lower (78% versus 82%).

278 For overall test performance against PCR, the HRP2 line was predicted to contribute the most to test
279 sensitivity, with a marginal increase when the LDH line was included. Indeed, this pattern of performance
280 was observed in the study. Additionally, the HRP2 line was predicted to contribute to a drop in the
281 specificity of the test compared to LDH line when using the PCR reference method, as was observed in
282 the study.

283 Usability results

284 In total, 10 healthcare workers evaluated the usability of the BIOCREREDIT Pf (pLDH) test, and 16
285 evaluated the BIOCREREDIT Pf (pLDH/HRPII) test. All participants successfully conducted the tests, and
286 no critical errors were observed during the use of either test. Responses to the multiple-choice label
287 comprehension questionnaires indicated that most participants understood the tests' intended uses, safety
288 information, and warnings (Supplementary Table 2). The greatest source of error in the test's workflow
289 was in identifying the correct number of assay buffer drops to add to the test devices and determining the
290 correct reading window for test result interpretation. Additionally, most contrived test result images were
291 correctly read and interpreted by participants, with an overall interpretation error rate of 4.0% for the
292 BIOCREREDIT Pf (pLDH) test and 4.8% for the BIOCREREDIT Pf (pLDH/HRPII) test (Supplementary Table
293 3). Ninety percent of participants evaluating the BIOCREREDIT Pf (pLDH) test reported that it was either
294 "easy" or "very easy" to use, compared to 70% of those evaluating the BIOCREREDIT Pf (pLDH/HRPII)
295 test.

296 Discussion

297 This study evaluated the performance of three novel LDH-based malaria RDTs in a febrile population in
298 Kédougou, Senegal, and assessed RDT performance as a function of antigen concentration distribution.
299 Improved sensitivity for PfLDH is critical for RDTs to detect emerging *hrp2/3* deletions. The WHO
300 recommends switching to LDH-based RDTs only when there is a confirmed significant prevalence (>5%)
301 of false-negative RDT results arising from *hrp2/hrp3* deletions due to the documented lower sensitivity of
302 LDH-based RDTs for *Pf*.¹⁶ This study population had only one specimen with a suspected deletion based
303 on the HRP2 and PfLDH results from the antigen quantification assay; however, this case could also be
304 attributed to a *Plasmodium malariae* or *ovale* infection, which have previously been found in this area of
305 Senegal.²⁷ Specimens in this study were not genotyped for *hrp2/3* deletions.

306 Among all RDTs included in this study, the BIOCREREDIT Malaria Ag Pf (pLDH/HRPII) test, which has
307 test lines for both HRP2 and PfLDH, showed the highest sensitivity for the detection of *Pf* at 78%. This
308 sensitivity is slightly higher than that of the SD Bioline HRP2-based RDT (71%), an established, WHO-
309 prequalified product currently in routine use in Senegal. Although the HRP2 line alone on the
310 BIOCREREDIT Malaria Ag Pf (pLDH/HRPII) was more sensitive than the comparator SD Bioline HRP2-
311 based test (78% versus 71% on capillary specimens), the sensitivities of the PfLDH lines alone on all
312 three BIOCREREDIT RDTs (61%–64% on capillary specimens) were lower than that of the comparator.
313 This suggests that in populations such as this, where *hrp2/3* deletions are uncommon, the PfLDH line
314 alone cannot compensate for the performance of the HRP2 line, even with the improved LOD for LDH on
315 the Rapigen tests.

316 On the BIOCREREDIT Malaria Ag Pf (pLDH/HRPII) RDT, a higher rate of false positives was observed on
317 both capillary and venous specimens when considering results based on either test line, leading to a
318 consequently lower specificity than other RDTs included in this evaluation. For most of these specimens
319 (5/7), the measured antigen concentrations were below the detection levels or lower than the LOD of the
320 RDT. Some drop in specificity may be attributed to the persistence of HRP2, as shown in the predicted
321 performance of the RDT compared to the PCR reference assay, in contrast to LDH, where the presence of
322 LDH closely corresponds to the presence of parasite DNA.

323 The results of this study are consistent with findings from other clinical evaluations of these tests. In
324 Burundi, Niyukuri *et al.* (2022) reported sensitivities of 79.9% and 72.3% for the BIOCREREDIT Malaria
325 Ag Pf (pLDH/HRPII) test in clinical and subclinical populations, respectively, in a sample with only two
326 *hrp3* deletions.²¹ The authors also similarly reported lower specificity for this test compared to the HRP2-
327 only comparator RDT in both clinical and subclinical cases (82.4% versus 96.2% for clinical cases;
328 84.4% versus 93.4% for subclinical cases). Another study conducted in Djibouti, where there are high
329 rates of *hrp2/3* deletions and *Pv* cases,^{33–35} found a sensitivity and specificity of 88.2% and 100%,
330 respectively, on the BIOCREREDIT Malaria Ag Pf/Pv (pLDH/pLDH) for the detection of *Pf*.²³

331 The inclusion of a quantitative assay to determine antigen concentration in this study allowed for
332 assessment of RDT performance relative to the cognate analytes detected by each RDT test line. The
333 performance of the RDT, evaluated against a reference assay for the same analyte (in contrast to
334 microscopy or PCR), demonstrated improved sensitivity and specificity for both antigens across all
335 RDTs. The relative sensitivities of the individual antigen test lines, when using the quantitative antigen
336 reference assay compared to PCR/DNA as a reference standard, are driven by the analytical sensitivity of
337 the reference assay for the analyte, the overall antigen concentration distribution in the specimens, and the
338 absolute LODs of the RDTs for the antigens. The quantitative antigen assay has a higher clinical LOD for
339 LDH compared to HRP2,²⁹ which results in missing clinical samples with low LDH concentrations.

340 Additionally, clinical specimens overall have lower LDH concentrations compared to HRP2, resulting in
341 fewer PCR samples with measurable LDH levels, as shown previously.^{29,30} Consequently, the sensitivity
342 of the antigen lines on the RDTs is highest for LDH when using the antigen reference method but lowest
343 when using the PCR method. Most essentially, the lower analytical sensitivity of the LDH lines combined
344 with the lower abundance of LDH in clinical specimens compared to HRP2 results in a lower sensitivity
345 of the LDH lines compared to the HRP2 lines in the RDTs evaluated in this study.

346 Although not an intended endpoint of the study, the training of test operators to record RDT line intensity
347 in this study enabled the demonstration that—even by eye—a reasonable relationship was present
348 between RDT line intensity and antigen concentration. Given that challenge and longitudinal studies
349 suggest that the ratio of HRP2 to LDH can be used to differentiate active from recently cleared
350 infections,³⁶ further investigation into the utility of HRP2/LDH line intensities from an RDT for this
351 purpose is warranted.

352 The analytical sensitivity (LOD) of the BIOCREREDIT Malaria Ag Pf (pLDH/HRPII) RDT was previously
353 determined through laboratory-based benchmarking studies.²⁰ In this study, the laboratory-derived LOD
354 of the BIOCREREDIT Malaria Ag Pf (pLDH/HRPII) test was combined with the distribution of antigen
355 concentrations and reference PCR results from the study population to estimate the predicted performance

356 of the RDT, which was then compared to the observed performance from this study. Overall, the
357 predicted performance of the test was comparable to the observed performance, demonstrating the value
358 of understanding the underlying antigen concentration in a population and validating the ability to predict
359 RDT performance based on analytical LODs. Notably, as we observed, the predictions confirmed HRP2
360 as the largest driver of clinical sensitivity for the test in this population, with LDH contributing to a
361 marginal improvement in clinical sensitivity for *Pf* infection. Additionally, as observed, there is a larger
362 drop in specificity due to the HRP2 line in contrast to the LDH line. This predicted drop in specificity
363 arises exclusively from specimens which have antigen but are PCR negative. The drops in specificity are
364 driven either by the emergence of antigen in advance of DNA, or more likely, by the accumulation and
365 persistence of antigen after DNA clearance. Other sources of cross-reactivity not accounted for in
366 analytical studies are likely to contribute to the actual observed clinical specificity.

367 Using analytical performance to predict the performance of new RDTs in different populations with
368 varying parasite density distributions is a valuable tool for assessing the impact of new tests in diverse
369 contexts of use. As previously shown for SARS-CoV-2 RDTs, where quantitative N-antigen data could
370 be used to predict clinical sensitivity across different specimen types,^{37,38} understanding the underlying
371 HRP2 and LDH concentration distributions across various use cases and epidemiological settings (e.g.,
372 case management, asymptomatic, pregnancy, low and high transmission) can improve predictions of test
373 performance in these contexts.

374 From a usability perspective, the study demonstrated that intended users in this setting were able to
375 accurately comprehend key elements of the product labels and correctly interpret images of results. This
376 aligns with a long history of prior research demonstrating the simplicity of these tests and their ability to
377 be conducted by end users.³⁹⁻⁴¹ The most common errors related to the correct identification of the
378 number of assay buffer drops to add to the test devices and determining the appropriate reading window
379 for interpreting test results. These aspects of malaria RDT workflows often vary between products,
380 highlighting the importance of context-specific training that emphasizes key aspects of the test

381 procedure.⁴² The results suggest a slight user preference for the *Pf* RDT with a single test line compared
382 to the product with two separate test lines for HRP2 and pLDH. However, both products were evaluated
383 by small samples and two different groups of users; therefore, comparisons should be interpreted with
384 caution.


385 Several other limitations of this study should also be noted. Microscopy and antigen quantification results
386 were only available for a subset of participants. Although *Pv* has been observed in Eastern
387 Senegal,^{13,27,43,44} no cases were identified in this population. Consequently, the performance of the
388 BIOCREDIT Malaria Ag Pf/Pv (pLDH/pLDH) test for the detection of *Pv* malaria was not assessed, and
389 test performance on specimens with mixed infections could not be evaluated. Lastly, this study assessed
390 test performance in a symptomatic, febrile population in an area of high endemicity. Analytical
391 benchmarking and prior evaluations suggest that relative performance improvements may be expected
392 with asymptomatic populations and subclinical cases.^{20,21,24} Future studies should further investigate test
393 performance in these contexts.

394 In summary, this study confirms that despite the higher analytical sensitivity of the BIOCREDIT tests'
395 LDH line compared to other currently WHO-prequalified RDTs, the HRP2 line primarily drives the
396 sensitivity of the RDT in this high-burden setting with negligible suspected *hrp2/hrp3* deletions. An RDT
397 that performs equally to support clinical diagnosis of *Pf* malaria, regardless of the underlying prevalence
398 of *hrp2/hrp3* deletions, should detect both HRP2 and LDH, possibly on the same line to simplify
399 interpretation.

400 **Figures**


401 **Figure 1. Box plots of (A) HRP2 and (B) pfLDH antigen concentration distributions as a**
402 **function of parasite density in PCR-confirmed cases. Results by line from the BIOCRDIT**
403 **Pf (pLDH/HRPII) test are indicated in color. Positive test lines are shown in red, and**
404 **negative test lines are shown in blue for the HRP2 line and pfLDH line in panels A and B,**
405 **respectively.**

406 **A**



407


408 **B**



409


410 **Figure 2. HRP2 concentration plotted against PfLDH for clinical specimens. PCR-**
411 **confirmed *P. falciparum* specimens are shown as filled triangles. PCR-negative specimens**

412 are represented as an open triangle. Test line results from the BIOCREREDIT Pf
413 (pLDH/HRPII) test are represented in color: red for HRP2-positive specimens, blue for
414 LDH-positive specimens, and purple for specimens positive on both lines (Panel C).




415
416 **Figure 3. Correlation between antigen concentration and line intensity (0 is a negative test**
417 **result, 1-15 are positive test results) on the BIOCREREDIT Pf (pLDH/HRPII) RDT. Panel A**
418 **shows the intensity of the HRP2 line on the RDT plotted against the HRP2 concentration.**
419 **Panel B shows the intensity of the LDH line on the RDT plotted against LDH**
420 **concentration. Dotted lines indicate the concentration at which line intensity is weakly**
421 **visible (score of 1).**

422 **A**



423

424 **B**



425

426 **Tables**

427 **Table 1. Demographic information of study participants**

	Value	N	Proportion
Age (years)			
Mean (SD)	20.42 (14.81)	220	-
Range	0 – 71	220	-
Age categories			
0-2 years	15	220	0.07
3-5 years	17	220	0.08
6-12 years	41	220	0.19
13-15 years	13	220	0.06
16-64 years	130	220	0.59
65+ years	4	220	0.02
Sex			
Male	107	220	0.49
Female	113	220	0.51
Pregnancy status			
Pregnant	9	113	0.08
Not pregnant	95	113	0.84
Rather not say	9	113	0.08
Any antimalarial drug received in the last four weeks			
Yes	55	219	0.25
No	164	219	0.75
Symptom status			
Abdominal pain	50	220	0.23
Chills	54	220	0.25
Conjunctival redness	2	220	0.01
Cough	43	220	0.20
Dizziness/vertigo	49	220	0.22
Dysuria	1	220	0.00
Fatigue	131	220	0.60
Fever (self-report)	173	220	0.79
Headache	151	220	0.69
Nausea	36	220	0.16
Stomachache	59	220	0.27
Sweats	13	220	0.06
Vomiting	72	220	0.33
Other	52	220	0.24
Febrile at enrollment (temperature $\geq 37.5^{\circ}\text{C}$)			
Yes	89	219	0.41
No	130	219	0.59

428 SD, standard deviation.

429
430

Table 2. Diagnostic performance of investigational and comparator tests against reference PCR for detection of *P. falciparum* by specimen type.

Test	Target	Capillary					Venous				
		N	Sensitivity (95% CI)	Specificity (95% CI)	PPV (95% CI)	NPV (95% CI)	N	Sensitivity (95% CI)	Specificity (95% CI)	PPV (95% CI)	NPV (95% CI)
SD BIOLINE Ag Pf (#05FK50)	PfHRP2	220	0.714 (0.636 – 0.784)	0.939 (0.852 – 0.983)	0.965 (0.913 – 0.990)	0.585 (0.485 – 0.680)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
BIOCREDIT Pf (pLDH/HRPII)	Pf (HRP2 and/or PfLDH positive)	218	0.783 (0.709 – 0.846)	0.894 (0.794 – 0.956)	0.944 (0.889 – 0.977)	0.641 (0.535 – 0.739)	220	0.818 (0.748 – 0.876)	0.894 (0.794 – 0.956)	0.947 (0.895 – 0.979)	0.678 (0.569 – 0.774)
	PfHRP2 Only	218	0.776 (0.702 – 0.840)	0.924 (0.832 – 0.975)	0.959 (0.908 – 0.987)	0.642 (0.537 – 0.738)	220	0.812 (0.741 – 0.870)	0.924 (0.832 – 0.975)	0.962 (0.913 – 0.987)	0.678 (0.571 – 0.772)
	PfLDH Only	218	0.618 (0.536 – 0.696)	0.955 (0.873 – 0.991)	0.969 (0.912 – 0.994)	0.521 (0.428 – 0.612)	220	0.662 (0.582 – 0.736)	0.970 (0.895 – 0.996)	0.981 (0.932 – 0.998)	0.552 (0.457 – 0.644)
BIOCREDIT Pf/Pv (pLDH/pLDH)	PfLDH	218	0.645 (0.563 – 0.721)	0.955 (0.873 – 0.991)	0.970 (0.916 – 0.994)	0.538 (0.444 – 0.631)	220	0.662 (0.582 – 0.736)	0.970 (0.895 – 0.996)	0.981 (0.932 – 0.998)	0.552 (0.457 – 0.644)
BIOCREDIT Pf (pLDH)	PfLDH	217	0.642 (0.560 – 0.719)	0.955 (0.873 – 0.991)	0.970 (0.915 – 0.994)	0.538 (0.444 – 0.631)	220	0.662 (0.582 – 0.736)	0.970 (0.895 – 0.996)	0.981 (0.932 – 0.998)	0.552 (0.457 – 0.644)
Microscopy	Parasites	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	183	0.534 (0.445 – 0.622)	0.981 (0.897 – 1.000)	0.986 (0.924 – 1.000)	0.455 (0.361 – 0.552)

431
432
433
434

Abbreviations: Ag, antigen; CI, confidence interval; HRPII/2, histidine-rich protein 2; *Pf*, *Plasmodium falciparum*; PfLDH, *Plasmodium falciparum*- specific lactate dehydrogenase; pLDH, *Plasmodium* lactate dehydrogenase; PPV, positive predictive value; *Pv*, *Plasmodium vivax*; NPV, negative predictive value; N/A, not applicable

435 **Table 3. Diagnostic performance of investigational and comparator tests against the reference quantitative antigen assay for**
 436 **detection of *P. falciparum* by specimen type.**

Test	Target	Capillary					Venous				
		N	Sensitivity (95% CI)	Specificity (95% CI)	PPV (95% CI)	NPV (95% CI)	N	Sensitivity (95% CI)	Specificity (95% CI)	PPV (95% CI)	NPV (95% CI)
SD BIOLINE Ag Pf (#05FK50)	PfHRP2	200	0.760 (0.677 – 0.831)	0.958 (0.881 – 0.991)	0.970 (0.916 – 0.994)	0.687 (0.586 – 0.776)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
BIOCREDIT Pf (pLDH/HRPII)	Pf (HRP2 and/or PfLDH positive)	198	0.837 (0.762 – 0.896)	0.928 (0.839 – 0.976)	0.956 (0.900 – 0.985)	0.753 (0.647 – 0.840)	200	0.893 (0.827 – 0.940)	0.971 (0.899 – 0.996)	0.983 (0.941 – 0.998)	0.827 (0.727 – 0.902)
	PfHRP2 Only	198	0.819 (0.741 – 0.882)	0.915 (0.825 – 0.968)	0.945 (0.885 – 0.980)	0.739 (0.634 – 0.827)	200	0.876 (0.806 – 0.927)	0.958 (0.881 – 0.991)	0.974 (0.926 – 0.995)	0.810 (0.709 – 0.887)
	PfLDH Only	198	0.869 (0.786 – 0.928)	0.990 (0.945 – 1.000)	0.989 (0.938 – 1.000)	0.883 (0.808 – 0.936)	200	0.911 (0.838 – 0.958)	0.990 (0.945 – 1.000)	0.989 (0.942 – 1.000)	0.916 (0.846 – 0.961)
BIOCREDIT Pf/Pv (pLDH/pLDH)	PfLDH	198	0.889 (0.810 – 0.943)	0.980 (0.929 – 0.998)	0.978 (0.922 – 0.997)	0.898 (0.825 – 0.948)	200	0.911 (0.838 – 0.958)	1.000 (0.963 – 1.000)	1.000 (0.961 – 1.000)	0.917 (0.848 – 0.961)
BIOCREDIT Pf (pLDH)	PfLDH	197	0.898 (0.820 – 0.950)	0.990 (0.945 – 1.000)	0.989 (0.939 – 1.000)	0.907 (0.836 – 0.955)	200	0.911 (0.838 – 0.958)	1.000 (0.963 – 1.000)	1.000 (0.961 – 1.000)	0.917 (0.848 – 0.961)

437 *Abbreviations:* Ag, antigen; CI, confidence interval; HRP2, histidine-rich protein 2; *Pf*, *Plasmodium falciparum*; PfLDH, *Plasmodium falciparum*- specific lactate
 438 dehydrogenase; pLDH, *Plasmodium* lactate dehydrogenase; PPV, positive predictive value; *Pv*, *Plasmodium vivax*; NPV, negative predictive value; N/A, not applicable

439 **Table 4. Performance of the Rapigen BIOCREREDIT Pf (pLDH/HRP2) RDT. Sensitivity is presented against confirmed positive**
 440 **cases separately by the quantitative antigen and PCR reference assays. Specificity is presented against confirmed negative**
 441 **cases by PCR. The table presents (i) the predicted results of the test based on its analytical limit of detection, and (ii) the**
 442 **observed results of the test against each reference method.**

Test Line	Quantitative antigen assay reference		PCR reference			
	Sensitivity (95% CI)		Sensitivity (95% CI)		Specificity (95% CI)	
	Predicted	Observed (Table 3)	Predicted	Observed (Table 2)	Predicted	Observed (Table 2)
HRP2 line	0.844 (0.769 – 0.902)	0.876 (0.806 – 0.927)	0.775 (0.697 – 0.842)	0.812 (0.741 – 0.870)	0.984 (0.912 – 1.000)	0.958 (0.881 – 0.991)
PfLDH line	0.920 (0.848 – 0.965)	0.911 (0.838 – 0.958)	0.667 (0.581 – 0.745)	0.662 (0.582 – 0.736)	1.000 (0.941 – 1.000)	0.990 (0.945 – 1.000)
HRP2 and/or PfLDH lines	0.838 (0.764 – 0.897)	0.893 (0.827 – 0.940)	0.783 (0.704 – 0.848)	0.818 (0.748 – 0.876)	0.984 (0.912 – 1.000)	0.971 (0.899 – 0.996)

443 *Abbreviations:* CI, confidence interval; HRP2, histidine-rich protein 2; PCR, polymerase chain reaction; *Pf*, *Plasmodium falciparum*; PfLDH, *Plasmodium falciparum*-specific
 444 lactate dehydrogenase; pLDH, *Plasmodium* lactate dehydrogenase; PPV, positive predictive value; NPV, negative predictive value; N/A, not applicable

445 **Supplementary material**

446 **Supplementary Tables**

447 **Supplementary Table 1.** Diagnostic performance of the quantitative antigen concentration assay against
 448 the reference PCR for the detection of *P. falciparum*.

Test	Target	Venous				
		N	Sensitivity (95% CI)	Specificity (95% CI)	PPV (95% CI)	NPV (95% CI)
Quantitative antigen assay	PfHRP2	199	0.855 (0.785 – 0.909)	0.836 (0.719 – 0.918)	0.922 (0.861 – 0.962)	0.718 (0.599 – 0.819)
	PfLDH	199	0.710 (0.627 – 0.784)	0.967 (0.887 – 0.996)	0.980 (0.930 – 0.998)	0.596 (0.493 – 0.693)
	Pf (HRP2 and/or PfLDH positive)	199	0.862 (0.793 – 0.915)	0.820 (0.700 – 0.906)	0.915 (0.854 – 0.957)	0.725 (0.604 – 0.825)

449 *Abbreviations:* CI, confidence interval; HRP2, histidine-rich protein 2; PCR, polymerase chain reaction; PfLDH, *Plasmodium*
 450 *falciparum*-specific lactate dehydrogenase; PPV, positive predictive value; NPV, negative predictive value
 451

452 **Supplementary Table 2.** Label comprehension questionnaire results for the Pf (pLDH) and Pf
 453 (pLDH/HRPII) tests.

Question	Correct responses n (%)	
	BIOCREDIT Pf (pLDH) Test	BIOCREDIT Pf (pLDH/HRPII) Test
True or false: the test can be used to detect infection with <i>Pf</i> parasite causing malaria in humans.	10 (100.0%)	16 (100.0%)
What does the test measure?	10 (100.0%)	13 (81.3%)
Which plasmodium antigen can be detected using the test?	9 (90.0%)	15 (93.8%)
The test can be used with which type(s) of samples?	7 (70.0%)	16 (100.0%)
At what temperature should the test kit be stored?	10 (100.0%)	15 (93.8%)
When should you apply the assay buffer to the test device?	10 (100.0%)	16 (100.0%)
How much blood is required to run the test?	7 (70.0%)	12 (75.0%)
How many drops of assay buffer should you add to the test device?	5 (50.0%)	10 (62.5%)
How many test lines can you see on the device (including control line)?	9 (90.0%)	16 (100.0%)
How long should you wait to interpret the test results?	10 (100.0%)	16 (100.0%)
True or false: You can read the test result after 35 minutes.	7 (70.0%)	8 (50.0%)
True or false: with the presence of any test line, no matter how faint, the result is considered positive	8 (80.0%)	15 (93.8%)
Can you re-use the test device?	10 (100.0%)	16 (100.0%)
Where should the blood sample be applied to the test device?	10 (100.0%)	16 (100.0%)
Where should the assay buffer be applied to the test device?	10 (100.0%)	16 (100.0%)

454

Key

>85%
70%-85%

<70%

455

456 **Supplementary Table 3.** Result interpretation questionnaire results for (a) the Pf (pLDH) test, and (b) the
457 Pf (pLDH/HRPII) test.

458 A) BIOCREREDIT Pf (pLDH) test

Image code	Control	Test Line	Interpretation	Correct responses n (%)	Incorrect responses selected (n)
A	Visible	Strong	Positive	10 (100.0%)	
B	None	Strong	Invalid	9 (90.0%)	Positive (1)
C	Visible	Weak	Positive	10 (10.0%)	
D	Visible	None	Negative	9 (90.0%)	Invalid (1)
E	None	None	Invalid	10 (100.0%)	

459 B) BIOCREREDIT Pf (pLDH/HRPII) test

Image code	Control	HRPII Line	pLDH Line	Interpretation	Correct responses n (%)	Incorrect responses selected (n)
A	None	None	None	Invalid	16 (100.0%)	
B	Visible	Weak	Strong	Positive	16 (100.0%)	
C	Visible	Strong	Strong	Positive	15 (93.8%)	Negative (1)
D	Visible	Weak	Weak	Positive	15 (93.8%)	Negative (1)
E	None	Strong	Weak	Invalid	15 (93.8%)	Negative (1)
F	Visible	Weak	None	Positive	13 (81.3%)	Negative (3)
G	Visible	None	Strong	Positive	15 (93.8%)	Negative (1)
H	Visible	None	Weak	Positive	16 (100.0%)	
I	Visible	None	None	Negative	16 (100.0%)	
J	Visible	Strong	None	Positive	15 (93.8%)	Negative (1)
K	None	Weak	None	Invalid	15 (93.8%)	Negative (1)
L	None	None	Weak	Invalid	15 (93.8%)	Negative (1)
M	Visible	Strong	Weak	Positive	16 (100.0%)	

460

Key

>85%

70%-85%

<70%


461

462

463 **Supplementary Figures**


464 **Supplementary Figure 1.** Probability of test line positivity on the BIOCREREDIT Pf (pLDH/HRP2) RDT
465 as a function of antigen concentration. In panel A, the probability of the HRP2 test line positivity is
466 plotted against HRP2 concentration. In panel B, the probability of the LDH test line positivity is plotted
467 against LDH concentration. The 50% and 90% probabilities of positivity are shown on both graphs.

468 **A**



469

470 **B**



471

472

473 **Acknowledgments**

474 The authors appreciate the support and contributions of the study participants. We also thank the research
475 staff and laboratory technicians at the study sites and the Institut Pasteur de Dakar for their valuable
476 support. We thank Mikka Nyarko for editorial support provided to this manuscript.

477 **Conflict of interest statement**

478 The authors have no competing interests to declare.

479 **Funding statement**

480 This work was supported by grants from the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation (INV-006979 and INV-
481 071824) to GD. RapiGen donated the BIOCREDIT RDTs used in this evaluation. The REDCap instance
482 used is supported by the Institute of Translational Health Sciences, which is funded by the National
483 Center for Advancing Translational Sciences of the National Institutes of Health under award number
484 UL1TR002319.

485 **Data availability statement**

486 The data underlying the results presented in this manuscript can be accessed at the following link:
487 <https://doi.org/10.7910/DVN/00MVWZ>

488 **References**

- 489 1. Aidoo M, Incardona S. Ten years of universal testing: how the rapid diagnostic test became a game
490 changer for malaria case management and improved disease reporting. *Am J Trop Med Hyg.*
491 2021;106(1):29–32. doi: 10.4269/ajtmh.21-0643.
- 492 2. Mouatcho JC, Goldring JPD. Malaria rapid diagnostic tests: challenges and prospects. *J Med*
493 *Microbiol.* 2013;62(Pt 10):1491–1505. doi: 10.1099/jmm.0.052506-0.
- 494 3. World Health Organization, Global Malaria Programme. How malaria RDTs work [Internet]; n.d.
495 [Cited 2024 Feb 19]. Available from: [https://www.who.int/teams/global-malaria-programme/case-](https://www.who.int/teams/global-malaria-programme/case-management/diagnosis/rapid-diagnostic-tests/how-malaria-rdts-work)
496 [management/diagnosis/rapid-diagnostic-tests/how-malaria-rdts-work](https://www.who.int/teams/global-malaria-programme/case-management/diagnosis/rapid-diagnostic-tests/how-malaria-rdts-work)
- 497 4. Jain P, Chakma B, Patra S, Goswami P. Potential biomarkers and their applications for rapid and
498 reliable detection of malaria. *Biomed Res Int.* 2014;2014:852645. doi: 10.1155/2014/852645.
- 499 5. Jimenez A, Rees-Channer RR, Perera R, et al. Analytical sensitivity of current best-in-class malaria
500 rapid diagnostic tests. *Malar J.* 2017;16(1):128. doi: 10.1186/s12936-017-1780-5.
- 501 6. Li B, Sun Z, Li X, et al. Performance of pfHRP2 versus pLDH antigen rapid diagnostic tests for the
502 detection of *Plasmodium falciparum*: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Arch Med Sci.*
503 2017;13(3):541–549. doi: 10.5114/aoms.2017.67279.
- 504 7. Abba K, Deeks JJ, Olliaro P, et al. Rapid diagnostic tests for diagnosing uncomplicated *P. falciparum*
505 malaria in endemic countries. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* 2011;2011(7):CD008122. doi:
506 10.1002/14651858.CD008122.pub2.
- 507 8. Ashley EA, Touabi M, Ahrer M, et al. Evaluation of three parasite lactate dehydrogenase-based rapid
508 diagnostic tests for the diagnosis of *falciparum* and *vivax* malaria. *Malar J.* 2009;8:241.
509 doi:10.1186/1475-2875-8-241.
- 510 9. Maltha J, Guiraud I, Lompo P, et al. Accuracy of PfHRP2 versus Pf-pLDH antigen detection by
511 malaria rapid diagnostic tests in hospitalized children in a seasonal hyperendemic malaria
512 transmission area in Burkina Faso. *Malar J.* 2014;13:20. doi: 10.1186/1475-2875-13-20.
- 513 10. Alemayehu GS, Lopez K, Dieng CC, et al. Evaluation of PfHRP2 and PfLDH malaria rapid
514 diagnostic test performance in Assosa Zone, Ethiopia. *Am J Trop Med Hyg.* 2020;103(5):1902–1909.
515 doi: 10.4269/ajtmh.20-0485.
- 516 11. Martiáñez-Vendrell X, Skjefte M, Sikka R, Gupta H. Factors affecting the performance of HRP2-
517 based malaria rapid diagnostic tests. *Trop Med Infect Dis.* 2022;7(10):265. doi:
518 10.3390/tropicalmed7100265.
- 519 12. World Health Organization. World malaria report 2023. Geneva: WHO; 2023. Available from:
520 <https://www.who.int/teams/global-malaria-programme/reports/world-malaria-report-2023>
- 521 13. Niang M, Thiam LG, Sow A, et al. A molecular survey of acute febrile illnesses reveals *Plasmodium*
522 *vivax* infections in Kedougou, southeastern Senegal. *Malar J.* 2015;14:281. doi: 10.1186/s12936-015-
523 0808-y.

- 524 14. Beshir KB, Parr JB, Cunningham J, et al. Screening strategies and laboratory assays to support
525 Plasmodium falciparum histidine-rich protein deletion surveillance: where we are and what is needed.
526 Malar J. 2022;21(1):201. doi: 10.1186/s12936-022-04226-2.
- 527 15. Gatton ML, Chaudhry A, Glenn J, et al. Impact of Plasmodium falciparum gene deletions on malaria
528 rapid diagnostic test performance. Malar J. 2020;19(1):392. doi: 10.1186/s12936-020-03460-w.
- 529 16. World Health Organization, Global Malaria Programme. False-negative RDT results and implications
530 of new reports of P. falciparum histidine-rich protein 2/3 gene deletions. Geneva: WHO; 2017.
531 Available from: [https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/documents/publications/gmp/false-](https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/documents/publications/gmp/false-negative-rdt-results.pdf?sfvrsn=ec917b72_2)
532 [negative-rdt-results.pdf?sfvrsn=ec917b72_2](https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/documents/publications/gmp/false-negative-rdt-results.pdf?sfvrsn=ec917b72_2)
- 533 17. Deme AB, Park DJ, Bei AK, et al. Analysis of pfhrp2 genetic diversity in Senegal and implications
534 for use of rapid diagnostic tests. Malar J. 2014;13:34. doi: 10.1186/1475-2875-13-34.
- 535 18. Wurtz N, Fall B, Bui K, et al. Pfhrp2 and pfhrp3 polymorphisms in Plasmodium falciparum isolates
536 from Dakar, Senegal: impact on rapid malaria diagnostic tests. Malaria J. 2013;12(1):34. doi:
537 10.1186/1475-2875-12-34.
- 538 19. Watson OJ, Tran TNA, Zupko RJ, et al. Global risk of selection and spread of Plasmodium
539 falciparum histidine-rich protein 2 and 3 gene deletions. medRxiv [Internet]; 2024 Jan 1. doi:
540 10.1101/2023.10.21.23297352.
- 541 20. Golden A, Slater HC, Jang IK, et al. Analytical sensitivity analysis and clinical impact modeling of
542 rapigen rapid diagnostic tests for malaria. Am J Trop Med Hyg. 2024;111(5):956–966. doi:
543 10.4269/ajtmh.24-0003.
- 544 21. Niyukuri D, Sinzinkayo D, Troth EV, et al. Performance of highly sensitive and conventional rapid
545 diagnostic tests for clinical and subclinical Plasmodium falciparum infections, and HRP2/3 deletion
546 status in Burundi. PLOS Glob Public Health. 2022;2(7):e0000828. doi:
547 10.1371/journal.pgph.0000828.
- 548 22. Park SH, Jegal S, Ahn SK, et al. Diagnostic performance of three rapid diagnostic test kits for malaria
549 parasite Plasmodium falciparum. Korean J Parasitol. 2020;58(2):147–152. doi:
550 10.3347/kjp.2020.58.2.147.
- 551 23. Abdi Moussa R, Papa Mze N, Yonis Arreh H, et al. Assessment of the performance of lactate
552 dehydrogenase-based rapid diagnostic test for malaria in Djibouti in 2022–2023. Diagnostics (Basel).
553 2024;14(3):262. doi: 10.3390/diagnostics14030262.
- 554 24. Kayode TA, Addo AK, Addison TK, et al. Comparison of three rapid diagnostic tests for
555 Plasmodium falciparum diagnosis in Ghana. Malar J. 2024;23(1):265. doi: 10.1186/s12936-024-
556 05073-z.
- 557 25. Bahk YY, Park SH, Lee W, et al. Comparative assessment of diagnostic performances of two
558 commercial rapid diagnostic test kits for detection of Plasmodium spp. in Ugandan patients with
559 malaria. Korean J Parasitol. 2018;56(5):447. doi: 10.3347/kjp.2018.56.5.447.
- 560 26. Linn AM, Ndiaye Y, Hennessee I, et al. Reduction in symptomatic malaria prevalence through
561 proactive community treatment in rural Senegal. Trop Med Int Health. 2015;20(11):1438–1446. doi:
562 10.1111/tmi.12564.

- 563 27. Daniels RF, Deme AB, Gomis JF, et al. Evidence of non-Plasmodium falciparum malaria infection in
564 Kédougou, Sénégal. *Malaria J.* 2017;16(1):9. doi: 10.1186/s12936-016-1661-3.
- 565 28. Lucchi NW, Narayanan J, Karell MA, et al. Molecular diagnosis of malaria by photo-induced
566 electron transfer fluorogenic primers: PET-PCR. *PLOS ONE.* 2013;8(2):e56677. doi:
567 10.1371/journal.pone.0056677.
- 568 29. Jang IK, Tyler A, Lyman C, et al. Multiplex human malaria array: quantifying antigens for malaria
569 rapid diagnostics. *Am J Trop Med Hyg.* 2020;102(6):1366–1369. doi: 10.4269/ajtmh.19-0763.
- 570 30. Jang IK, Tyler A, Lyman C, et al. Simultaneous quantification of Plasmodium antigens and host
571 factor C-reactive protein in asymptomatic individuals with confirmed malaria by use of a novel
572 multiplex immunoassay. *J Clin Microbiol.* 2019;57(1):e00948-18. doi: 10.1128/JCM.00948-18.
- 573 31. World Health Organization. Technical specifications series for submission to WHO prequalification
574 – diagnostic assessment. TSS-3 malaria rapid diagnostic tests. Geneva: WHO; 2017. Available from:
575 <https://iris.who.int/bitstream/handle/10665/255038/9789241512275-eng.pdf?sequence=1>
- 576 32. Harris PA, Taylor R, Thielke R, et al. Research electronic data capture (REDCap)—a metadata-
577 driven methodology and workflow process for providing translational research informatics support. *J*
578 *Biomed Inform.* 2009;42(2):377–381. doi: 10.1016/j.jbi.2008.08.010.
- 579 33. Iriart X, Menard S, Chauvin P, et al. Misdiagnosis of imported falciparum malaria from African areas
580 due to an increased prevalence of pfhrp2/pfhrp3 gene deletion: the Djibouti case. *Emerg Microbes*
581 *Infect.* 2020;9(1):1984–1987. doi: 10.1080/22221751.2020.1815590.
- 582 34. Moussa RA, Papa Mze N, Arreh HY, et al. Molecular investigation of malaria-infected patients in
583 Djibouti city (2018–2021). *Malar J.* 2023;22(1):147. doi: 10.1186/s12936-023-04546-x.
- 584 35. Rogier E, McCaffery JN, Mohamed MA, et al. Plasmodium falciparum pfhrp2 and pfhrp3 gene
585 deletions and relatedness to other global isolates, Djibouti, 2019–2020. *Emerg Infect Dis.*
586 2022;28(10):2043–2050. doi: 10.3201/eid2810.220695.
- 587 36. Reichert EN, Hume JCC, Sagara I, et al. Ultra-sensitive RDT performance and antigen dynamics in a
588 high-transmission Plasmodium falciparum setting in Mali. *Malaria J.* 2020;19(1):323. doi:
589 10.1186/s12936-020-03389-0.
- 590 37. Golden A, Oliveira-Silva M, Slater H, et al. Antigen concentration, viral load, and test performance
591 for SARS-CoV-2 in multiple specimen types. *PLOS ONE.* 2023;18(7):e0287814. doi:
592 10.1371/journal.pone.0287814.
- 593 38. Golden A, Cantera JL, Lillis L, et al. A reagent and virus benchmarking panel for a uniform
594 analytical performance assessment of N antigen-based diagnostic tests for COVID-19. *Microbiol*
595 *Spectr.* 2023;11(3):e0373122. doi: 10.1128/spectrum.03731-22.
- 596 39. Miller JS, Mbusa RK, Baguma S, et al. Assessing village health workers’ ability to perform and
597 interpret rapid diagnostic tests for malaria 4 years after initial training: a cross-sectional study. *Am J*
598 *Trop Med Hyg.* 2021;104(1):294–297. doi: 10.4269/ajtmh.20-0747.

- 599 40. Harvey SA, Jennings L, Chinyama M, et al. Improving community health worker use of malaria rapid
600 diagnostic tests in Zambia: package instructions, job aid and job aid-plus-training. *Malar J*.
601 2008;7:160. doi: 10.1186/1475-2875-7-160.
- 602 41. Counihan H, Harvey SA, Sekeseke-Chinyama M, et al. Community health workers use malaria rapid
603 diagnostic tests (RDTs) safely and accurately: results of a longitudinal study in Zambia. *Am J Trop*
604 *Med Hyg*. 2012;87(1):57. doi: 10.4269/ajtmh.2012.11-0800.
- 605 42. Foundation for Innovative New Diagnostics. Malaria rapid diagnostic tests: an implementation guide.
606 The essentials for RDT implementation. Geneva: FIND; 2013. Available from:
607 https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/57a08a42ed915d3cfd000686/malaria_rdt_implementation_guide2013.pdf
608
- 609 43. Niang M, Sane R, Sow A, et al. Asymptomatic *Plasmodium vivax* infections among Duffy-negative
610 population in Kedougou, Senegal. *Trop Med Health*. 2018;46:45. doi: 10.1186/s41182-018-0128-3.
- 611 44. Niang M, Diop F, Niang O, et al. Unexpected high circulation of *Plasmodium vivax* in asymptomatic
612 children from Kédougou, southeastern Senegal. *Malar J*. 2017;16(1):497. doi: 10.1186/s12936-017-
613 2146-8.
- 614