

# 1           **Multicenter evaluation of the Panbio™ COVID-19 Rapid** 2           **Antigen-Detection Test for the diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2 infection**

3   Paloma Merino-Amador<sup>1</sup>, Jesús Guinea<sup>2</sup>, Irene Muñoz-Gallego<sup>3</sup>, Patricia González-  
4   Donapetry<sup>4</sup>, Juan-Carlos Galán<sup>5,6</sup>, Nerea Antona<sup>7</sup>, Gustavo Cilla<sup>8</sup>, Silvia Hernández-  
5   Crespo<sup>9</sup>, José-Luis Díaz-de Tuesta<sup>10</sup>, Ana Gual-de Torrella<sup>11</sup>, Fernando González-  
6   Romo<sup>1</sup>, Pilar Escribano<sup>2</sup>, Miguel Ángel Sánchez-Castellano<sup>4</sup>, Mercedes Sota-Busselo<sup>12</sup>,  
7   Alberto Delgado-Iribarren<sup>1</sup>, Julio García<sup>4</sup>, Rafael Cantón<sup>5,13</sup>, Patricia Muñoz<sup>2</sup>, M  
8   Dolores Folgueira<sup>3,14,15</sup>, Manuel Cuenca-Estrella<sup>16\*</sup>, Jesús Oteo-Iglesias<sup>13,17\*#</sup>, and  
9   Spanish Panbio™ COVID-19 validation group‡

10

11   <sup>1</sup>Microbiology Department, Hospital Universitario Clínico San Carlos, Madrid, Spain

12   <sup>2</sup>Microbiology Department, Hospital Universitario Gregorio Marañón, Madrid, Spain.

13   <sup>3</sup>Clinical Microbiology Department, Hospital Universitario Doce de Octubre, Madrid,  
14   Spain.

15   <sup>4</sup>Microbiology Department, Hospital Universitario La Paz, Madrid, Spain.

16   <sup>5</sup>Microbiology Department, Hospital Universitario Ramón y Cajal e Instituto Ramón y  
17   Cajal de Investigación Sanitaria (IRYCIS), Madrid, Spain.

18   <sup>6</sup>CIBER de Investigación en Salud Pública (CIBERESP). Madrid. Spain

19   <sup>7</sup> Osakidetza Basque Health Service, Hospital Universitario Cruces, Microbiology  
20   Department, Barakaldo, Spain.

21   <sup>8</sup>Health Research Institute, Biodonostia, San Sebastián, Spain; Osakidetza Basque  
22   Health Service, Hospital Universitario Donostia, Microbiology Department, San  
23   Sebastián, Spain.

24   <sup>9</sup>Osakidetza Basque Health Service, Hospital Universitario Araba, Microbiology

25   Department, Vitoria, Spain.

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

26 <sup>10</sup>Osakidetza Basque Health Service, Hospital Universitario Basurto, Microbiology  
27 Department, Bilbao, Spain.

28 <sup>11</sup>Osakidetza Basque Health Service, Hospital Universitario Galdakao-Usansolo,  
29 Microbiology Department, Galdakao, Spain.

30 <sup>12</sup>Osakidetza Basque Health Service, Hospital Universitario Donostia, Clinical  
31 Management Unit of Gipuzkoa Laboratories, San Sebastián, Spain

32 <sup>13</sup>Spanish Network for Research in Infectious Diseases (REIPI)

33 <sup>14</sup>Instituto de Investigación Hospital 12 de Octubre, imas12, Madrid, Spain.

34 <sup>15</sup>Department of Medicine, Universidad Complutense School of Medicine, Madrid,  
35 Spain.

36 <sup>16</sup> Instituto de Salud Carlos III, Majadahonda, Madrid, Spain.

37 <sup>17</sup>National Centre for Microbiology, Instituto de Salud Carlos III, Majadahonda,  
38 Madrid, Spain.

39

40 \*Manuel Cuenca-Estrella and Jesús Oteo-Iglesias contributed equally to this work.

41 ‡ Members of the Group are listed in Acknowledgements

42

43 **Running title:** Evaluation of the Panbio™ COVID-19 Ag Rapid Test

44 **Keywords:** COVID-19; rapid antigen-detection test; SARS-CoV-2

45

46 **# Corresponding autor:**

47 Jesús Oteo-Iglesias, National Centre for Microbiology, Instituto de Salud Carlos III,  
48 Carretera Pozuelo a Majadahonda, 28220 Majadahonda, Madrid, Spain.

49 Phone: ++34 918 22 3650. Fax: ++34 915097966.

50 Email: [jesus.oteo@isciii-es](mailto:jesus.oteo@isciii-es)

51 **Abstract**

52 The standard RT-PCR assay for COVID-19 is laborious and time-consuming, limiting  
53 the availability of testing. Rapid antigen-detection tests are faster and less expensive;  
54 however, the reliability of these tests must be validated before they can be used widely.  
55 The objective of this study was to determine the reliability of the Panbio™ COVID-19  
56 Ag Rapid Test Device (PanbioRT) (Abbott) for SARS-CoV-2 in nasopharyngeal swab  
57 specimens. This was a prospective multicenter study in ten Spanish university hospitals  
58 of patients from hospital units with clinical symptoms or epidemiological criteria for  
59 COVID-19. Patients whose onset of symptoms or exposure was more than 7 days earlier  
60 were excluded. Two nasopharyngeal exudate samples were taken to perform the  
61 PanbioRT and a diagnostic RT-PCR test. Among the 958 patients studied, 359 (37.5%)  
62 were positive by RT-PCR and 325 (33.9%) were also positive by the PanbioRT.  
63 Agreement was 95.7% (kappa score: 0.90). All 34 false-negative PanbioRT results were  
64 in symptomatic patients, with 23.5% of them at 6–7 days since the onset of symptoms  
65 and 58.8% presenting  $C_T > 30$  values for RT-PCR, indicating a low viral load. Overall  
66 sensitivity and specificity for the PanbioRT were 90.5% and 98.8%, respectively. The  
67 PanbioRT provides good clinical performance as a point-of-care test, with even more  
68 reliable results for patients with a shorter clinical course of the disease or a higher viral  
69 load. While this study has had a direct impact on the national diagnostic strategy for  
70 COVID-19 in Spain, the results must be interpreted based on the local epidemiological  
71 context.

72

73

74

## 75 **Introduction**

76 The novel coronavirus SARS-CoV-2, which causes severe acute respiratory syndrome,  
77 emerged in Wuhan (China) in December 2019. The virus has spread rapidly, causing a  
78 global pandemic that was defined by The World Health Organization (WHO) as  
79 Coronavirus disease-19 (COVID-19) (1). Reliable and early diagnosis of the responsible  
80 agent, not only in symptomatic patients but also in close contacts of confirmed cases, is  
81 critical to controlling the spread of the disease (2,3). Clinical diagnosis of COVID-19  
82 has relied on nucleic acid amplification tests, such as real-time reverse transcription  
83 polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR) assays to detect SARS-CoV-2 (3,4). RT-PCR, the  
84 current standard for COVID-19 diagnosis, is also the standard test in clinical  
85 microbiology laboratories for the diagnosis of many infections because the test is  
86 sensitive and pathogen-specific. However, the method is laborious, requiring  
87 inactivation of the virus and RNA extraction before the RT-PCR assay. The test (under  
88 optimal conditions) takes approximately 4-5 h, and the response time is typically 12 to  
89 24 h. This test also requires a continuous supply of PCR kits as well as swabs and  
90 transport media for samples, inactivation solutions, extraction reagents, and disposable  
91 plasticware. The WHO recommended at least 200 PCR tests per 100,000 population to  
92 ensure adequate control of the pandemic; however, in Spain more than 1,500 PCR tests  
93 per 100,000 population were performed in September and October 2020 (5). This high  
94 level of testing will be difficult to maintain in winter because of testing for other  
95 respiratory infections, such as influenza. Therefore, we risk saturating the PCR-testing  
96 capacity of microbiology laboratories, but also of sampling capacities in primary care  
97 centers.

98 There are ongoing efforts to develop fast, reliable, and inexpensive diagnostic tests  
99 specific for detection of SARS-CoV-2 antigens. Rapid antigen-detection tests (RADT)

100 for both laboratory and near-patient use detect SARS-CoV-2 proteins produced by  
101 replicating viruses in respiratory secretions (6). The Panbio™ COVID-19 Ag Rapid  
102 Test Device (PanbioRT) (Abbott Diagnostic GmbH, Jena, German) is a rapid in vitro  
103 test for the qualitative detection of the viral nucleocapsid protein in nasopharyngeal  
104 swab specimens from individuals who meet clinical and/or epidemiological criteria of  
105 COVID-19 infection. This is a novel, lateral-flow-format test that uses  
106 immunochromatography with colloidal gold in a point-of-care format, with results in  
107 15-20 min. The objective of this study is to determine the reliability of the PanbioRT  
108 with CE marking.

109

## 110 **Materials and Methods**

111 This was a prospective multicenter diagnostic evaluation study across ten independent  
112 university hospitals in two Spanish autonomous communities (Madrid and Basque  
113 Country) using consecutive enrollment. The hospitals participating in the study from  
114 Madrid were Hospital Clínico Universitario San Carlos, Hospital Universitario Ramón y  
115 Cajal, Hospital Universitario La Paz, Hospital Universitario Doce de Octubre, and  
116 Hospital Universitario Gregorio Marañón. Hospitals from Basque Country were  
117 Hospital Universitario Araba, Hospital Universitario Cruces, Hospital Universitario  
118 Basurto, Hospital Universitario Donostia, and Hospital Universitario Galdakao-  
119 Usansolo. Patients with clinical symptoms or epidemiological criteria (asymptomatic  
120 close contacts) for COVID-19 from hospital emergency rooms or other hospital units  
121 who were to receive a diagnostic RT-PCR test were included in the study. All  
122 participants were reported as part of the study and verbal informed consent was  
123 obtained prior to their inclusion. The result of the PanbioRT did not influence the  
124 clinical management of the patients, which was decided based on the RT-PCR result.

125 Patient data were coded and no samples were stored after the PanbioRT was performed.  
126 Patients whose onset of symptoms or exposure was more than 7 days earlier were  
127 excluded.  
128 Two nasopharyngeal exudate samples were taken per patient: one was used immediately  
129 by trained personnel to perform the PanbioRT according to the manufacturer's  
130 instructions, and the second was used for a molecular diagnostic (RT-PCR) by each  
131 hospital according to its standard procedures for COVID-19 diagnosis.  
132 The symptoms, number of days since the onset of symptoms or exposure, threshold  
133 cycle ( $C_T$ ) values for PCR, and demographic data were collected for all participants.  
134 Specificity and sensitivity with 95% confidence intervals (CI) were calculated using the  
135 RT-PCR results as the standard. Sensitivity was calculated for all patients and for  
136 specific groups of patients according to the time of onset of symptoms or exposure, RT-  
137 PCR  $C_T$  values, symptoms, and age. The level of agreement between the tests was  
138 evaluated using Cohen's kappa score (7).

139

## 140 **Results**

141 Between September and October 2020, 958 individuals who had at least one symptom  
142 compatible with COVID-19 (n=830) or had been in close contact with a diagnosed  
143 COVID-19 patient (n=128) were included in this study. There were between 8 and 245  
144 individuals from each participating hospital with a mean age of 42.4 years (range, 1-  
145 100); 61.3% were women (Table 1) and 58 cases were in pediatric patients ( $\leq 14$  years  
146 old).  
147 Among these 958 patients, 359 (37.5%) were positive by RT-PCR and 325 (33.9%)  
148 were also positive by the PanbioRT (Table 2). A total of 599 (62.5%) were negative by  
149 PCR and 592 (61.8%) were also negative by the PanbioRT (Table 2). The agreement

150 between both methods was 95.7% (kappa score: 0.90; CI 95%: 0.88–0.93). In 41  
151 patients the results differed between the two tests and most of the differences were in  
152 individuals who tested positive with the RT-PCR test but negative with the PanbioRT  
153 (n=34; 3.5%) (Table 2, Table 3). All 34 of these cases were in symptomatic patients,  
154 with 8 (23.5%) of them at 6–7 days since the onset symptoms, and 20 (58.8%) had  
155  $C_T > 30$  values for RT-PCR.

156 Based on these data, the overall sensitivity and specificity of the PanbioRT were 90.5%  
157 (CI 95%: 87.5–93.6) and 98.8% (CI 95%: 98–99.7), respectively (Table 3). Sensitivity  
158 was slightly higher in patients with  $\leq 5$  days of the clinical course of the disease (91.8%;  
159 CI 95%: 88.8–94.8) or in those who had a  $C_T < 30$  for the RT-PCR test (94.5%; CI 95%:  
160 91.7–97.3) (Table 4).

161 Among the 128 asymptomatic participants who had close contact with a COVID-19  
162 patient, there was full concordance in the 31 (24.2%) who were positive by RT-PCR  
163 and in the 97 that were negative. Six (10.3%) of the 58 pediatric patients included in the  
164 study were positive by RT-PCR and also by the PanbioRT.

165 The negative predictive value (NPV) and positive predictive value (PPV) in the study  
166 cohort, with a high prevalence (37.5%), were 94.6% and 97.8%, respectively (Table 4).  
167 PPV and NPV were also calculated for lower prevalence of 5% and 10%; the results  
168 obtained were 79.8% and 89.3%, respectively, for PPV; and 99.5 and 98.9%,  
169 respectively, for NPV.

170

## 171 **Discussion**

172 As the COVID-19 pandemic continues unabated, the gap between the number of tests  
173 that are needed and the testing capacity of laboratories or in primary care settings  
174 increases (3). RADT tests are simple to perform and interpret without the need for

175 equipment at the point-of-care, they are inexpensive, and they provide quick results.  
176 Early rapid antigen-detection test for COVID-19 diagnosis had poor reliability that  
177 precluded their general use (8-11); however, the new generation of RADT appear to  
178 have substantially improved reliability (12-15). Although these rapid tests show promise  
179 for use as part of a larger strategy for COVID-19 diagnosis and control (6), there are  
180 insufficient validation studies to support their use in varied patient environments. In this  
181 study the PanbioRT gave very good clinical performance values, with 90.5% sensitivity  
182 and 98.8% specificity; moreover, sensitivity was even improved in patients with five or  
183 fewer days of clinical progression of the disease. The strengths of this study include the  
184 large study size, the high percentage of positive cases, the inclusion of multiple centers,  
185 the prospective nature of the study, and the inclusion of point-of-care patients. This  
186 study has had an immediate clinical impact, having been used to modify the Spanish  
187 Strategy for Early Detection, Surveillance, and Control, of COVID-19 (Update  
188 September 25, 2020) (16).

189 In two recent pre-published Spanish studies with 412 patients (54 positive by RT-PCR)  
190 (13) and 255 patients (60 positive by RT-PCR) (12), the overall sensitivities were  
191 79.3% and 76.3%, respectively; however, in the second study sensitivity was 86.5% in  
192 symptomatic patients with seven or fewer days since the onset of symptoms (12). WHO  
193 guidelines require that SARS-CoV-2 RADT demonstrate  $\geq 80\%$  sensitivity and  $\geq 97\%$   
194 specificity compared to the RT-PCR reference assay (6). Thus, our data support the  
195 clinical use of the PanbioRT instead of the RT-PCR test in patients with symptoms of  
196 COVID-19 with a short clinical course ( $\leq 5-7$  days) of the disease. Although the results  
197 obtained in asymptomatic patients and children under 14 years of age were good, the  
198 number of cases included for these subpopulations was small (128 and 58, respectively),  
199 making it inadvisable to conclude general results about that. In a pre-published study



200 with frozen samples (17), sensitivity was significantly higher among samples collected  
201 in the setting of case identification (92.6%) and contact tracing (94.2%) than in  
202 asymptomatic screening (79.5%). This is consistent with the advice from the WHO  
203 against using RADT for screening asymptomatic individuals in populations with low  
204 COVID-19 prevalence (6) due to the potential increase of higher incidence of false  
205 positives. In this study, we estimated that the PPV decreased to 79.8% when the  
206 prevalence was 5%.

207 The performance of an RADT may depend on the epidemiological situation of the  
208 population being tested; therefore, how the test is used and how the results are  
209 interpreted will depend on local epidemiological factors (6). In populations with a high  
210 prevalence and a high frequency of symptomatic patients, a positive rapid test would be  
211 considered confirmatory for infection. However, a negative result would lead to further  
212 testing for respiratory pathogens, including an RT-PCR test for COVID-19 if the  
213 symptoms were consistent with this disease. In populations with a low prevalence of  
214 COVID-19 and more asymptomatic patients, a negative test would be accepted, but a  
215 positive test, which is more likely to be false, could require a confirmatory RT-PCR  
216 test.

217 The use of RADT as a diagnostic tool can greatly reduce the testing burden on  
218 microbiology laboratories. However, in the primary care setting, which has also reached  
219 saturation in the testing and diagnosis of COVID-19, changes would be required to  
220 allow them to perform the rapid test on-site. The ability to perform this test in patient  
221 care centers would simplify the process of testing, provide rapid results to the doctor  
222 and the patient, thus improving the decision-making process and reducing pressure on  
223 the health care providers.

224 In conclusion, this study showed that the PanbioRT provides very good clinical  
225 performance as a point-of-care test, with even better results for patients with a shorter  
226 clinical course of the disease or higher viral load. While this study has had a direct  
227 impact on the national diagnostic strategy for COVID-19 in Spain, the results must be  
228 interpreted based on the local epidemiological context. The ease and speed of RADT  
229 with good clinical performance could help to prevent an overload on health care services  
230 as laboratories will have to cope with an increase in respiratory infections during winter.

231

## 232 **Acknowledgments**

233 We thank Abbott Diagnostics for providing Panbio™ COVID-19 AG Rapid Test  
234 Device kit and all the professionals involved in the diagnosis of COVID-19 in the  
235 participating hospitals.

236 Members of the Spanish Panbio™ COVID-19 validation group are:

237 Sara Medrano and Alba Pérez (H. Universitario Clínico San Carlos), Oscar Martínez-  
238 Expósito (H. Universitario Cruces), Izaskun Alejo-Cancho (H. Universitario Galdakao),  
239 M. Carmen Martín-Higuera and Marta Rolo (H. Universitario Doce de Octubre), M<sup>a</sup>  
240 Jesús Estévez and Tania Bravo (H. Universitario Ramón y Cajal), Diego Vicente and  
241 Mila Montes (H. Universitario Galdakao-Usansolo).

242

## 243 **References.**

- 244 1. WHO, Coronavirus Disease (COVID-2019) Situation Report–51, 11 March 2020.  
245 Available from: [https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/coronaviruse/situation-](https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/coronaviruse/situation-reports/20200311-sitrep-51-covid-19.pdf?sfvrsn=1ba62e57_10)  
246 [reports/20200311-sitrep-51-covid-19.pdf?sfvrsn=1ba62e57\\_10](https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/coronaviruse/situation-reports/20200311-sitrep-51-covid-19.pdf?sfvrsn=1ba62e57_10)
- 247 2. Nguyen T, Duong Bang D, Wolff A. 2020. 2019 Novel coronavirus disease (COVID-  
248 19): Paving the road for rapid detection and point-of-care diagnostics. *Micromachines*  
249 (Basel) 11: 306. <https://doi.org/10.3390/mi11030306>. PMID: 32183357; PMCID:  
250 PMC7142866.
- 251 3. WHO, Laboratory Testing Strategy Recommendations for COVID-19. Interim  
252 Guidance, 21 March 2020. Available from:  
253 <https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/331509>.
- 254 4. Corman VM, Landt O, Kaiser M, Molenkamp R, Meijer A, Chu DK, Bleicker T,  
255 Brünink S, Schneider J, Schmidt ML, Mulders DG, Haagmans BL, van der Veer B, van  
256 den Brink S, Wijsman L, Goderski G, Romette JL, Ellis J, Zambon M, Peiris M,  
257 Goossens H, Reusken C, Koopmans MP, Drosten C. 2020. Detection of 2019 novel  
258 coronavirus (2019-nCoV) by real-time RT-PCR. *Euro Surveill* 25(3): 2000045.  
259 <https://doi.org/10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2020.25.3.2000045>
- 260 5. Spanish Ministry of Health. Enfermedad por el nuevo coronavirus COVID-19.  
261 Situación actual. Available from:  
262 [https://www.mscbs.gob.es/profesionales/saludPublica/ccayes/alertasActual/nCov/home.](https://www.mscbs.gob.es/profesionales/saludPublica/ccayes/alertasActual/nCov/home.htm)  
263 [htm](https://www.mscbs.gob.es/profesionales/saludPublica/ccayes/alertasActual/nCov/home.htm)
- 264 6. WHO, Antigen-detection in the diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2 infection using rapid  
265 immunoassays. Interim guidance, 11 September 2020. Available from:  
266 [https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/antigen-detection-in-the-diagnosis-of-sars-cov-](https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/antigen-detection-in-the-diagnosis-of-sars-cov-2infection-using-rapid-immunoassays)  
267 [2infection-using-rapid-immunoassays](https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/antigen-detection-in-the-diagnosis-of-sars-cov-2infection-using-rapid-immunoassays).
- 268 7. McHugh ML. 2012. Interrater reliability: the kappa statistic. *Biochem Med (Zagreb)*  
269 22: 276-82.
- 270 8. Lambert-Niclot S, Cuffel A, Le Pape S, Vauloup-Fellous C, Morand-Joubert L,  
271 Roque-Afonso AM, Le Goff J, Delaugerre C. 2020. Evaluation of a rapid diagnostic  
272 assay for detection of SARS-CoV-2 antigen in nasopharyngeal swabs. *J Clin Microbiol*  
273 58: e00977-20. <https://doi.org/10.1128/JCM.00977-20>

- 274 9. Blairon L, Wilmet A, Beukinga I, Tré-Hardy M. 2020. Implementation of rapid  
275 SARS-CoV-2 antigenic testing in a laboratory without access to molecular methods:  
276 Experiences of a general hospital. *J Clin Virol* 129: 104472.  
277 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcv.2020.104472>
- 278 10. Scohy A, Anantharajah A, Bodéus M, Kabamba-Mukadi B, Verroken A, Rodriguez-  
279 Villalobos H. 2020. Low performance of rapid antigen detection test as frontline testing  
280 for COVID-19 diagnosis. *J Clin Virol* 129:104455. [https://doi.org/](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcv.2020.104455)  
281 [10.1016/j.jcv.2020.104455](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcv.2020.104455)
- 282 11. Mak GC, Cheng PK, Lau SS, Wong KK, Lau CS, Lam ET, Chan RC, Tsang DN.  
283 Evaluation of rapid antigen test for detection of SARS-CoV-2 virus. 2020. *J Clin Virol*  
284 129:104500. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcv.2020.104500>.
- 285 12. Linares M, Pérez-Tanoira R, Romanyk J, Pérez-García F, Gómez-Herruz P, Arroyo  
286 T, Cuadros J. 2020. Panbio antigen rapid test is reliable to diagnose SARS-CoV-2  
287 infection in the first 7 days after the onset of symptoms. medRxiv preprint  
288 2020.09.20.20198192. <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.20.20198192>.
- 289 13. Albert E, Torres I, Bueno F, Huntley D, Molla E, Fernández-Fuentes MA, Martínez  
290 M, Poujois S, Forqué L, Valdivia A, Solano de la Asunción C, Ferrer J, Colomina J,  
291 Navarro D. Field evaluation of a rapid antigen test (Panbio™ COVID-19 Ag Rapid Test  
292 Device) for the diagnosis of COVID-19 in primary healthcare centers. medRxiv preprint  
293 2020.10.16.20213850. <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.16.20213850>.
- 294 14. Porte L, Legarraga P, Vollrath V, Aguilera X, Munita JM, Araos R, Pizarro G, Vial  
295 P, Iruretagoyena M, Dittrich S, Weitzel T. 2020. Evaluation of a novel antigen-based  
296 rapid detection test for the diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2 in respiratory samples. *Int J Infect*  
297 *Dis* 99: 328-333. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijid.2020.05.098>.
- 298 15. Young S, Taylor SN, Cammarata CL, Varnado KG, Roger-Dalbert C, Montano A,  
299 Griego-Fullbright C, Burgard C, Fernandez C, Eckert K, Andrews JC, Ren H, Allen J,  
300 Ackerman R, Cooper CK. 2020. Clinical evaluation of BD Veritor SARS-CoV-2 point-  
301 of-care test performance compared to PCR-based testing and versus the Sofia 2 SARS  
302 Antigen point-of-care test. *J Clin Microbiol.* <https://doi.org/10.1128/JCM.02338-20>
- 303 16. Spanish Ministry of Health. Estrategia de detección temprana, vigilancia y control  
304 de COVID-19 (Update September 25, 2020). Available from:

305 [https://www.mscbs.gob.es/profesionales/saludPublica/ccayes/alertasActual/nCov/docu](https://www.mscbs.gob.es/profesionales/saludPublica/ccayes/alertasActual/nCov/documentos/COVID19_Estrategia_vigilancia_y_control_e_indicadores.pdf)  
306 [mentos/COVID19\\_Estrategia\\_vigilancia\\_y\\_control\\_e\\_indicadores.pdf](https://www.mscbs.gob.es/profesionales/saludPublica/ccayes/alertasActual/nCov/documentos/COVID19_Estrategia_vigilancia_y_control_e_indicadores.pdf)

307 17. Alemany A, Baro B, Ouchi D, Ubals M, Corbacho-Monné M, Vergara-Alert J,  
308 Rodon J, Segalés J, Esteban C, Fernandez G, Ruiz L, Bassat Q, Clotet B, Ara J, Vall-  
309 Mayans M, G-Beiras C, Blanco I, Mitjà O. Analytical and clinical performance of the  
310 Panbio COVID-19 Antigen-Detecting Rapid Diagnostic Test. medRxiv preprint doi:  
311 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.30.20223198>

312

313

314

315 **Table 1.** Study cohort included in the validation study of Panbio™ COVID-19 Ag  
 316 Rapid Test Device.  
 317

Total N (valid PCR results)	<b>958</b>
Positive PCR [% (n)]	<b>37.5% (359)</b>
Age [mean (min–max)]	<b>42.4 (1–100)</b>
Gender [% F, (n/N)]	<b>61.3% (587/958)</b>
Symptoms present [% Yes, (n/N)]	<b>86.6% (830/958)</b>
Days from symptom onset or from exposure [mean (N)]	<b>2.8 (958)</b>
Days ≤5 [n/N (%)]	<b>854/958 (89.1%)</b>
Days 6–7 [(n/N (%)]	<b>104/958 (10.9%)</b>
PCR $C_T$ (n)	<b>295</b>
$C_T \geq 30$ [n/N, (%)]	<b>41 (13.9%)</b>
$C_T < 30$ [n/N, (%)]	<b>254 (86.1%)</b>

318  
 319

320

321 **Table 2.** Summary of the results of the Panbio™ COVID-19 Ag Rapid Test Device  
322 compared to RT-PCR.

323

<b>Panbio™ COVID-19 Ag Rapid Test Device</b>			
<b>RT-PCR</b>	Positive	Negative	TOTAL
Positive	325	34	359
Negative	7	592	599
TOTAL	332	626	958

324

325

**Table 3.** Cases with discordant results between the RT-PCR method and the PanbioRT.

Sex	Compatible symptoms	Days since symptoms onset	Panbio result	RT-PCR result	C <sub>T</sub> RT-PCR
Male	Yes	1	Negative	Positive	27
Female	Yes	1	Negative	Positive	34
Male	Yes	5	Negative	Positive	25
Male	Yes	6	Negative	Positive	29
Female	Yes	6	Negative	Positive	31
Male	Yes	5	Negative	Positive	26
Female	Yes	1	Negative	Positive	32
Female	Yes	2	Negative	Positive	37
Female	Yes	1	Negative	Positive	28
Male	Yes	3	Negative	Positive	32
Male	Yes	1	Negative	Positive	32
Female	Yes	7	Negative	Positive	30



Male	Yes	6	Negative	Positive	31
Female	Yes	2	Negative	Positive	26
Female	Yes	2	Negative	Positive	36
Female	Yes	1	Negative	Positive	30
Female	Yes	3	Negative	Positive	37
Female	Yes	5	Negative	Positive	35
Female	Yes	3	Negative	Positive	29
Female	Yes	3	Negative	Positive	26
Female	Yes	7	Negative	Positive	25
Female	Yes	2	Negative	Positive	26
Female	Yes	4	Negative	Positive	31
Female	Yes	3	Negative	Positive	34
Male	Yes	1	Negative	Positive	34
Female	Yes	7	Negative	Positive	38
Male	Yes	3	Negative	Positive	34

Female	Yes	4	Negative	Positive	34
Female	Yes	7	Negative	Positive	38
Male	Yes	3	Negative	Positive	34
Male	Yes	1	Negative	Positive	32
Female	Yes	3	Negative	Positive	37
Female	Yes	5	Negative	Positive	28
Male	Yes	7	Negative	Positive	30
Female	Yes	6	Positive	Negative	
Male	Yes	7	Positive	Negative	
Female	Yes	1	Positive	Negative	
Female	Yes	1	Positive	Negative	
Male	Yes	1	Positive	Negative	
Female	Yes	3	Positive	Negative	
Female	Yes	5	Positive	Negative	

328 **Table 4.** Estimation of clinical performance of the Panbio™ COVID-19 Ag Rapid Test Device compared to RT-PCR.

329

Relative Sensitivity (CI 95%)	90.5% (87.5–93.6)
Sensitivity days $\leq 5$ (CI 95%)	91.8% (88.8–94.8)
Sensitivity $C_T < 30$ (CI 95%)	94.5% (91.7–97.3)
Relative Specificity (CI 95%)	98.8% (98–99.7)
Agreement (kappa index; CI 95%)	95.7% (0.9; 0.88–0.93)
Positive predictive value (CI 95%)	97.8% (96.3–99.4)
Negative predictive value (CI 95%)	94.6% (92.8–96.3)

330

331

332