

Accuracy of rapid antigen testing for COVID-19 in shelter settings

Yasmin Garad, MSc¹; Andreea A. Manea, BSc¹; Negin Pak, BSc¹, Bronwyn Barker, MPH¹,
Danielle Kasperavicius, MPH¹, Lames Danok, BSc¹, Stefan Baral, MD, FRCPC, CCFP^{1,2,3},
Aaron M. Orkin, MD, MSc, MPH, PhD⁴, Amna Siddiqui, BScN², Sharon E. Straus, MD, MSc
^{1,6,7}, Christine Fahim, PhD, MSc^{1,8}

Affiliations

¹ Knowledge Translation Program, St. Michael's Hospital, Unity Health Toronto, Toronto, ON, Canada

² Inner City Health Associates, Toronto, ON, Canada

³ Department of Epidemiology, Johns Hopkins School of Public Health, Baltimore, MD, United States

⁴ St. Joseph's Health Centre, Unity Health Toronto, Toronto, ON, Canada

⁵ Department of Family and Community Medicine and Dalla Lana School of Public Health, University of Toronto, Toronto, ON, Canada

⁶ Department of Medicine, University of Toronto, Toronto, ON, Canada

⁷ Division of Geriatrics, Department of Medicine, St. Michael's Hospital, Unity Health Toronto, Toronto, ON, Canada

⁸ Institute of Health Policy, Management and Evaluation, University of Toronto, 155 College St., Toronto, ON M5T 3M6

*Corresponding author:

Christine Fahim, PhD
Scientist, Knowledge Translation Program
St. Michael's Hospital, Unity Health Toronto
Christine.Fahim@unityhealth.to

29 **Abstract**

30 **Background**

31 The COVID-19 pandemic disproportionately affected congregate living settings, including
32 shelters. COVID-19 transmission can have more adverse outcomes in these settings due to the
33 vulnerability of residents. Point of care rapid antigen testing (RAT) represents a strategy with
34 potential benefits for COVID-19 detection in shelters, including rapid results, ease of use, cost-
35 effectiveness, and early detection.

36 **Objectives**

37 Our primary objective was to assess the real-world test accuracy of RAT for COVID-19 using the
38 Quidel Sofia 2 Flu + SARS Antigen fluorescent immunoassay (Sofia RAT) compared to
39 polymerase chain reaction (PCR) testing among shelter residents in Ontario, Canada.

40 **Study Design**

41 A consecutive sample of 102 residents across six shelters who were symptomatic for, or exposed
42 to COVID-19 were included. The RAT and PCR samples were taken on the same day for each
43 participant. Results from the Sofia RAT were compared to PCR test results to determine test
44 accuracy. Participant demographic data could not be collected due to workforce constraints.

45 **Results**

46 We reported our methods and findings using the QUality Assessment tool of Diagnostic
47 Accuracy Studies (QUADAS-2) guidelines. Sofia 2 RAT specificity was 97.9% (95% CI: 92.7%
48 to 99.7%) for COVID-19 compared to PCR. Due to a lack of true positive cases, sensitivity
49 could not accurately be calculated (0.00% (95% CI: 0.00% to 52.2%)).

50 **Conclusion**

51 These data suggest that the Sofia RAT is a highly specific test for COVID-19.

52 **Keywords**

53 Rapid antigen testing (RAT), Homeless shelter, Test accuracy, COVID-19 detection, SARS-
54 CoV-2

55 **Background**

56 COVID-19 disproportionately affected individuals in homeless shelter settings^{1,2}. Individuals in
57 these settings experience a greater risk of physical frailty, comorbidity, and being
58 immunocompromised than the general population²⁻⁵. These risk factors in combination with
59 crowded conditions likely contributed to higher rates of COVID-19 in these settings^{2,6}.

60 Point of care rapid antigen testing (RAT) provides multiple benefits for COVID-19
61 detection compared to laboratory-based testing such as polymerase chain reaction (PCR)⁷. It is a
62 streamlined alternative, which compared to laboratory-based testing typically has shorter
63 processing times, does not require specific expertise for sample collection and handling, and is
64 more cost-effective⁷⁻¹⁰.

65 During the COVID-19 pandemic, RAT was used as a low-barrier and cost-effective tool
66 for early detection^{11,12}. As the pandemic evolved, new multiplex RAT point of care testing
67 became available including the Sofia 2 Flu + SARS Antigen fluorescent immunoassay (FIA;
68 hereafter Sofia RAT) developed by Quidel Corporation¹³. Due to its ability to simultaneously
69 detect respiratory infections that share similar clinical presentations, such as COVID-19 and
70 influenza, multiplex RAT can help to facilitate a streamlined approach to surveillance and
71 diagnosis in shelter settings¹⁴. To our knowledge, there are limited data regarding the
72 performance of Sofia RAT compared to PCR testing for COVID-19 in shelter settings.

73 **Objectives**

74 Our main objective was to assess the real-world test accuracy of RAT for COVID-19 using the
75 Sofia RAT compared to PCR testing among individuals in homeless shelters.

76 **Study Design**

77 We reported our methods and findings in accordance with the QUality Assessment tool of
78 Diagnostic Accuracy Studies (QUADAS-2)¹⁵. The project was conducted through St. Michael's
79 Hospital (Toronto, Ontario) from October 2022 until March 2023. Ethical approval was obtained
80 from the Unity Health Toronto Research Ethics Board (REB# 21-319).

81 A consecutive sample of residents across six shelters in Toronto, Ontario who were
82 symptomatic or exposed to COVID-19 were included. Shelters offer temporary accommodation
83 and support services to people experiencing homelessness (PEH). Participants were recruited by
84 nursing staff who conducted routine rapid antigen testing across the six shelters. Residents who
85 expressed interest and provided verbal consent were included in the study and compensated with
86 a \$20 (CAD) gift card for their participation.

87 Multiplex RAT was implemented, which used immunofluorescence technology to
88 simultaneously detect nucleocapsid protein from influenza A, influenza B and SARS-CoV-2. The
89 Sofia RAT was used in combination with the benchtop Sofia 2 FIA analyzer^{13,16,17}. This analyzer
90 generated results in 15 minutes¹⁷.

91 Following informed verbal consent from participants, PCR samples were collected
92 through a nasal or nasopharyngeal swab by a registered nurse at the same encounter where the
93 Sofia RAT was conducted. The PCR sample was transported to St. Michael's Hospital for
94 analysis within 48 hours of sample collection. The results were then reported to the study team
95 by the St. Michael's Hospital microbiology lab by fax and were also publicly reported to Toronto

96 Public Health, in accordance with provincial reporting requirements¹⁸. Positive results were
97 reported to the participant within 72 hours post-collection.

98 Statistical analyses were conducted using Stata version 18¹⁹. All measures of diagnostic
99 accuracy were estimated using Stata's `diag` command.

100 Results

101 In total, 102 individuals participated in the study. Sofia 2 RAT specificity was found to be 97.9%
102 (95% CI: 92.7% to 99.7%) (see Table 1). The percent of negative test results that were correctly
103 identified (NPV) was 95.0% (88.7% to 98.4%) (see Table 1). Due to a lack of positive cases,
104 sensitivity and positive predictive value could not be accurately calculated.

Population (<i>n</i> = 102)	Positive Results PCR n(%)	Negative Results PCR n(%)
Positive Results Sofia RAT (n (%))	0(0%)	2(2%)
Negative Results Sofia RAT (n (%))	5(5%)	95(93%)
Sensitivity	0.0% (0.0% to 52.2%)	
Specificity	97.9% (92.7% to 99.7%)	
Positive Likelihood Ratio	0.00	
Negative Likelihood Ratio	1.02 (0.99 to 1.05)	
Positive Predictive Value*	0.00 (0.0% to 84.2%)	
Negative Predictive Value*	95.0% (88.7% to 98.4%)	

105 **Table 1.** Comparison of Sofia RAT performance with PCR

106 Discussion

107 We determined that among individuals who were exposed or symptomatic for COVID-19, real
108 world specificity for case detection using the Sofia RAT compared to PCR was high²⁰. These
109 results on specificity for the Sofia RAT meet the criteria set by the World Health Organization
110 (WHO) to be considered an acceptable substitute to PCR testing (i.e. sensitivity \geq 80% and
111 specificity \geq 97%)²¹ in real world settings. However, we were unable to determine reliable results
112 for sensitivity due to a lack of positive test results in our sample. Due to this, the conclusions that

113 can be drawn regarding the application of the Sofia RAT based on the findings of this study are
114 limited.

115 Our findings on specificity for the Sofia RAT are also aligned with those of a recent
116 Cochrane review which demonstrated that the Sofia RAT was one of only two RAT tests that met
117 the WHO standards for specificity regardless of whether participants were symptomatic (i.e.,
118 99.4% (98.7% to 99.8%)) or asymptomatic (i.e., 99.7% (99.3% to 99.8%))²²⁻²⁸. Several other
119 studies similar to ours have demonstrated high specificity over 95% for COVID-19 for RAT
120 using the Sofia 2 analyzer²²⁻²⁹. However, to our knowledge no previous studies have assessed the
121 accuracy of the Sofia RAT in shelter settings.

122 In the Cochrane review noted above, the Sofia RAT was also one of seven rapid antigen
123 tests that met acceptable performance standards for sensitivity for symptomatic participants (i.e.,
124 80.0% (71.5% to 86.4%)) but did not meet these standards for asymptomatic individuals (i.e.,
125 41.2% (18.4% to 67.1%)). Rates of sensitivity for COVID-19 using the Sofia-2 RAT vary widely
126 in the literature²²⁻²⁸. Given the lack of routine and rapid access to PCR testing in shelter settings
127 and the option to use the Sofia-2 Analyzer to test for multiple infectious diseases, this test may be
128 a useful option to support the early detection of infectious disease in these settings^{30,31}.

129 Given its high specificity, this diagnostic tool is unlikely to have many false positives
130 meaning that there is a low risk of diagnostic delay³². Furthermore, this decreased diagnostic
131 delay can improve outbreak response, including individual clinical response like linkage to
132 treatment, but also public health response including supportive isolation. Overall, despite the risk
133 of false negatives, the use of rapid testing as a first step may be effective in reducing costs,
134 laboratory staff burden, and the risk of transmission by detecting some cases quickly and
135 implementing infection prevention and control practices^{7,9,22}.

136 This study has some limitations. First, due to a lack of positive cases we were unable to
137 determine a reliable estimate of sensitivity. Second, due to a lack of feasibility we were not able
138 to distinguish between symptomatic and asymptomatic participants or measure the viral load for
139 each sample, which may have impacted test accuracy³³. Lastly, for similar reasons, we were not
140 able to collect demographic data. However, our findings reflect the real-world circumstances
141 under which diagnostic testing occurs. Despite these limitations, our findings still show high
142 levels of accuracy in shelter settings for detecting the absence of COVID-19 using the Sofia
143 RAT.

144 **Conclusion**

145 Findings from our study demonstrated high specificity for COVID-19 testing using the Sofia
146 RAT, however we were unable to reliably report sensitivity due to the lack of true positive cases.
147 Individuals in shelter settings may be at greater risk of infection due to age, comorbid conditions,
148 and/or precarious housing³. Multiplex testing using rapid tests such as the Sofia RAT in homeless
149 shelter settings can support the rapid differential diagnosis of infectious diseases with similar
150 symptoms, allowing for appropriate infection prevention and control measures to be taken more
151 quickly¹⁴.

152 **Declaration of Competing Interests**

153 The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

154 **Availability of data and materials**

155 The datasets generated for this study are not publicly available to protect the privacy of
156 participants and related REB confidentiality requirements. De-identified can be made upon
157 request.

158 **Funding**

159 This study was funded by Health Canada (Grant # 2122-HQ-000078).

160 **Acknowledgements**

161 The authors would like to express their gratitude to all subjects for their engagement in this
162 study. We would also to thank Elizabeth Birkurovitz, Tina Kaur, Princilla Agyemang, Grace
163 Richandi for their contributions to the data collection for this study and manuscript review. SES
164 was funded by a Tier 1 Canada Research Chair.

165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208

References

1. Richard L, Nisenbaum R, Brown M, et al. Incidence of SARS-CoV-2 Infection Among People Experiencing Homelessness in Toronto, Canada. *JAMA Netw Open* 2023; **6**(3): e232774.
2. Baral S, Bond, A., Boozary, A., Bruketa, E., Elmi, N, Freiheit, S. D., Ghosh, M., Goyer, M. E., Orkin, A. M., Patel, J., Richter, T., Robertson, A., Sutherland, C., Svoboda, T., Turnbull, J., Wong, A., and Zhu, A. . Seeking shelter: homelessness and COVID-19. *FACETS* 2021; **6**: 925-58.
3. Fazel S, Geddes JR, Kushel M. The health of homeless people in high-income countries: descriptive epidemiology, health consequences, and clinical and policy recommendations. *Lancet* 2014; **384**(9953): 1529-40.
4. Tsai J, Wilson M. COVID-19: a potential public health problem for homeless populations. *Lancet Public Health* 2020; **5**(4): e186-e7.
5. Leung CS, Ho MM, Kiss A, Gundlapalli AV, Hwang SW. Homelessness and the response to emerging infectious disease outbreaks: lessons from SARS. *J Urban Health* 2008; **85**(3): 402-10.
6. Baggett TP, Gaeta JM. COVID-19 and homelessness: when crises intersect. *Lancet Public Health* 2021; **6**(4): e193-e4.
7. Kalia R, Kaila R, Kahar P, Khanna D. Laboratory and Point-of-Care Testing for COVID-19: A Review of Recent Developments. *Cureus* 2022; **14**(8): e28530.
8. Stall NM, Jones A, Brown KA, Rochon PA, Costa AP. For-profit long-term care homes and the risk of COVID-19 outbreaks and resident deaths. *CMAJ* 2020; **192**(33): E946-E55.
9. Woodbridge Y, Goldberg Y, Amit S, Kopelman NM, Mandel M, Huppert A. Public health-focused use of COVID-19 rapid antigen and PCR tests. *Sci Rep* 2024; **14**(1): 1430.
10. Dinnes J, Deeks JJ, Berhane S, et al. Rapid, point-of-care antigen and molecular-based tests for diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2 infection. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2021; **3**(3): CD013705.
11. Cheng CC, Liu CC, Chiu TF, Shiou-Sheng Chen S. Evaluation of a Rapid Antigen Test for the Diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2 during the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Inquiry* 2022; **59**: 469580221105354.
12. Zirbes J, Sterr CM, Keller C, Engenhart-Cabillic R, Nonnenmacher-Winter C, Gunther F. Efficiency analysis of rapid antigen test based SARS-CoV-2 in hospital contact tracing and screening regime: test characteristics and cost effectiveness. *Diagn Microbiol Infect Dis* 2023; **106**(4): 115991.
13. Quidel. Sofia SARS Antigen FIA Package Insert, 2020.
14. Boukli N, Flamand C, Chea KL, et al. One Assay to Test Them All: Comparing Multiplex Assays for Expansion of Respiratory Virus Surveillance. *medRxiv* 2023.
15. Whiting PF, Rutjes AW, Westwood ME, et al. QUADAS-2: a revised tool for the quality assessment of diagnostic accuracy studies. *Ann Intern Med* 2011; **155**(8): 529-36.
16. Bornemann L, Kaup O, Kleideiter J, Panning M, Ruprecht B, Wehmeier M. Real-life evaluation of the Sofia SARS-CoV-2 antigen assay in a large tertiary care hospital. *J Clin Virol* 2021; **140**: 104854.
17. QuidelOrtho Corporation. Sofia® 2 Fluorescent Immunoassay Analyzer. 2023.
18. Ontario Ministry of Health. Infectious Diseases Protocol, 2023, 2023.
19. StataCorp. Stata Statistical Software: Release 18. College Station, TX: StataCorp LLC; 2023.
20. Simundic AM. Measures of Diagnostic Accuracy: Basic Definitions. *EJIFCC* 2009; **19**(4): 203-11.

- 209 21. World Health Organization. COVID-19 Target product profiles for priority diagnostics to
210 support response to the COVID-19 pandemic v.1.0. 2020.
211 [https://www.who.int/publications/m/item/covid-19-target-product-profiles-for-priority-
213 214 215 216 217 218 219 220 221 222 223 224 225 226 227 228 229 230 231 232 233 234 235 236 237 238 239 240 241 242 243 244 245](https://www.who.int/publications/m/item/covid-19-target-product-profiles-for-priority-
212 diagnostics-to-support-response-to-the-covid-19-pandemic-v.0.1)
21. Dinnes J, Sharma P, Berhane S, et al. Rapid, point-of-care antigen tests for diagnosis of
SARS-CoV-2 infection. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2022; **7**(7): CD013705.
22. Brihn A, Chang J, K OY, et al. Diagnostic Performance of an Antigen Test with RT-PCR for
the Detection of SARS-CoV-2 in a Hospital Setting - Los Angeles County, California, June-August
2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep* 2021; **70**(19): 702-6.
23. Smith RD, Johnson JK, Clay C, et al. Clinical evaluation of Sofia Rapid Antigen Assay for
detection of severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) among emergency
department to hospital admissions. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol* 2022; **43**(8): 968-73.
24. Cernila M, Logar M, Mozina H, Osredkar J. Comparison between the Sofia SARS Antigen
FIA Test and the PCR Test in Detection of SARS-CoV-2 Infection. *Lab Med* 2022.
25. Pray IW, Ford L, Cole D, et al. Performance of an Antigen-Based Test for Asymptomatic
and Symptomatic SARS-CoV-2 Testing at Two University Campuses - Wisconsin, September-
October 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep* 2021; **69**(5152): 1642-7.
26. Gomez Marti JL GJ, McCullough M, Mallon A, Acero J, Kinzler A, et al. Differences in
detected viral loads guide use of SARS-CoV-2 antigen-detection assays towards symptomatic
college students and children. *medRxiv* 2021.
27. Porte L, Legarraga P, Vollrath V, et al. Evaluation of a novel antigen-based rapid detection
test for the diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2 in respiratory samples. *Int J Infect Dis* 2020; **99**: 328-33.
28. Jaaskelainen AE, Ahava MJ, Jokela P, et al. Evaluation of three rapid lateral flow antigen
detection tests for the diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2 infection. *J Clin Virol* 2021; **137**: 104785.
29. Tong R. COVID-19 in Skilled Nursing Homes and Other Long-Term Care Facilities (LTCFs):
Could Stronger Public-Health Measures Have Made a Difference? *Ethical Public Health Policy
Within Pandemics*: Springer Cham; 2022.
30. Paat YF, Morales, J., Escajeda, A. I., & Tullius, R. Insights from the shelter: Homeless
shelter workers' perceptions of homelessness and working with the homeless. *Journal of
Progressive Human Services* 2021; **32**: 263–83.
31. Trevethan R. Sensitivity, Specificity, and Predictive Values: Foundations, Pliabilities, and
Pitfalls in Research and Practice. *Front Public Health* 2017; **5**: 307.
32. Pradas LV, N.; Hannen, J.; Schölz, C.; Schubert, A.; Knotte, R.; Wille, L.; Kleinow, P.; Heuer,
A.; Weckesser, V.; et al. Comparison of SARS-CoV-2 Antigen Tests in Asymptomatic Testing of
Passengers at German Airports under Time Constraints: Application of Three Different Antigen
Test Formats. *COVID* 2021; **1**(3): 546-54.