

# Real-World Clinical Performance of the Abbott Panbio with Nasopharyngeal, Throat and Saliva Swabs Among Symptomatic Individuals with COVID-19

William Stokes<sup>1,2,3</sup>, MD, Byron M. Berenger<sup>1,4</sup>, MD, Danielle Portnoy<sup>6</sup>, Brittney Scott<sup>6</sup>, PhD, Jonas Szelewicki<sup>6</sup>, Takshveer Singh<sup>5</sup>, Allison A. Venner<sup>1,4</sup>, PhD, LeeAnn Turnbull<sup>1</sup>, Kanti Pabbaraju<sup>1</sup>, Sandy Shokoples<sup>1</sup>, Anita A. Wong<sup>1</sup>, Kara Gill<sup>1</sup>, Tracy Guttridge<sup>1</sup>, Dustin Proctor<sup>1,4</sup>, PhD, Jia Hu<sup>7,8</sup>, MD, Graham Tipples<sup>1,2,9</sup>, PhD

<sup>1</sup>Alberta Precision Laboratories, Alberta, Canada

<sup>2</sup>Department of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine, University of Alberta, Alberta, Canada

<sup>3</sup>Division of Infectious Diseases, Department of Medicine, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta

<sup>4</sup>Department of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine, University of Calgary, Calgary, Alberta, Canada

<sup>5</sup>Cumming School of Medicine, University of Calgary, Calgary, Alberta

<sup>6</sup>Faculty of Medicine & Dentistry, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta

<sup>7</sup>Department of Community Health Sciences, University of Calgary, Calgary, Alberta, Canada

<sup>8</sup>Public Health, Alberta Health Services, Alberta, Canada

<sup>9</sup>Li Ka Shing Institute of Virology, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada.

Corresponding author: William Stokes, [William.Stokes@AlbertaPrecisionLabs.ca](mailto:William.Stokes@AlbertaPrecisionLabs.ca)

Keywords: Panbio, COVID-19, SARS-CoV-2, POCT, rapid diagnostics, antigen

## Conflict of interest

The manufacturer had no role to play in the study. The authors have no conflict of interests to disclose pertaining to this study.

36 ABSTRACT

37 **BACKGROUND**

38 Point of Care Testing (POCT) SARS-CoV-2 antigen tests, such as the Abbott Panbio, have great  
39 potential to help combat the COVID-19 pandemic. The Panbio is Health Canada approved for  
40 the detection of SARS-CoV-2 in symptomatic individuals within the first 7 days of COVID-19  
41 symptom onset(s).

42 **METHODS**

43 Symptomatic adults recently diagnosed with COVID-19 in the community were recruited into  
44 the study. Paired nasopharyngeal (NP), throat, and saliva swabs were collected, with one paired  
45 swab tested immediately with the Panbio, and the other transported in universal transport media  
46 and tested using reverse-transcriptase polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR). Positive percent  
47 agreement (PPA) was calculated. Subsequently, individuals within 7 days of symptom onset who  
48 presented to community assessment centres for SARS-CoV-2 testing had Panbio testing  
49 completed and paired with RT-PCR results from parallel NP or throat swabs.

50 **RESULTS**

51 145 individuals were included in the study. Collection of throat and saliva was stopped early due  
52 to poor performance (throat PPA 57.7%, n=61, and saliva PPA 2.6%, n=41). NP swab PPA was  
53 87.7% [n=145, 95% confidence interval 81.0% - 92.7%]. There were 1,641 symptomatic  
54 individuals tested by Panbio in community assessment centres, with 268/1641 (16.3%) positive  
55 for SARS-CoV-2. There were 37 false negatives, corresponding to a PPA of 86.2% [81.5% -  
56 90.1%].

57 **CONCLUSIONS**

58 The Panbio test reliably detects most cases of SARS-CoV-2 from adults in the POCT community  
59 setting presenting within 7 days of symptom onset using nasopharyngeal swabs. Throat and  
60 saliva swabs are not reliable specimens for the Panbio.

61  
62

63

64

65

66

67

68

69

70

71

72 **INTRODUCTION**

73 The Panbio (Abbott, Ill, United States) is approved by Health Canada for the detection of SARS-  
74 CoV-2 antigen in individuals who are within the first 7 days of symptom(s) onset. The  
75 immunochromatographic assay detects SARS-CoV-2 nucleocapsid protein and is indicated only  
76 for nasopharyngeal (NP) swabs. The test should be conducted either immediately after  
77 collection, or up to 2 hours if the NP swab is placed in the Panbio extraction tube filled with  
78 extraction buffer at room temperature.<sup>1</sup>

79  
80 Based on a study by Abbott that was conducted on 585 NP specimens collected from individuals  
81 exposed to SARS-CoV-2 or having COVID-19 symptoms within 7 days, sensitivity of the  
82 Panbio was found to be 91.4% and specificity 99.8% when compared to a reverse transcriptase  
83 real-time polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR) reference method. Sensitivity increased to over  
84 94% when samples with cycle threshold (Ct) >33 were excluded.<sup>1</sup> There is currently a paucity of  
85 data available from external third parties on the Panbio's performance. The few published studies  
86 have demonstrated Panbio sensitivity ranges from 72.6% - 86.5% among symptomatic  
87 individuals or exposed asymptomatic individuals.<sup>2-4</sup>

88  
89 We sought to assess the positive percent agreement (PPA) of the Panbio by comparing its  
90 performance to RT-PCR testing among individuals in the community using two separate  
91 evaluations. The first by testing individuals with recently confirmed COVID-19 while adhering  
92 as closely as possible to manufacturer recommendations (testing of symptomatic individuals  
93 within 7 days of symptom(s) onset). The second setting was a prospective evaluation using the  
94 Panbio to diagnose COVID-19 in SARS-CoV-2 assessment/screening centres. We also tested the

95 accuracy of the Panbio with samples taken from asymptomatic individuals at low risk for  
96 COVID-19 (i.e. no exposures), and on retrospective clinical samples previously positive for  
97 common respiratory pathogens.

98

## 99 **METHODS**

### 100 Testing individuals with known COVID-19

101 Individuals residing within the Calgary and Edmonton Health Zones of Alberta, Canada, who  
102 recently tested positive for SARS-CoV-2 at Alberta Precision Laboratories (APL; AB, Canada)  
103 and confirmed as cases by Alberta Health Services (AHS; AB, Canada) Public Health were  
104 recruited. Diagnostic testing was performed by a Health Canada approved SARS-CoV-2 assay or  
105 a lab developed RT-PCR assay (see below for details). Participants were identified by an AHS  
106 Public Health confirmed case list. Oral consent by phone was obtained to collect samples in the  
107 participant's home. At the time of consent the symptoms of the individual were recorded (usually  
108 within 24h of collecting study swabs). Individuals under the age of 18, or in supportive or  
109 congregate living facilities were excluded. Eligible individuals who consented to the study were  
110 recruited to have two NP swab, two throat swabs, and a saliva sample collected by trained  
111 healthcare professionals. The University of Calgary Research Ethics board approved this study  
112 (REB20-444).

113

114 Healthcare workers previously trained in NP and throat swab collection performing the  
115 collection were given instructions on how to collect swabs from recruited COVID-19 infected  
116 individuals. For reference testing, the YOCON NP swab and universal transport media (UTM)  
117 (Yocon, Beijing, China) and ClassiqSwabs for throat in COPAN UTM-RT (COPAN

118 Diagnostics, California, United States) were used.<sup>5</sup> Saliva samples tested on the Panbio were  
119 compared to throat swabs sent for RT-PCR testing. For Panbio testing, the NP swab provided in  
120 the Panbio testing kits,(Abbott) was used, and the ClassiqSwab was used for throat. NP swabs  
121 were collected from separate nares. Throat swabs were collected from both sides of the  
122 oropharynx and the posterior pharyngeal wall under the uvula. Throat swabs were collected  
123 approximately one minute apart and collectors were asked to alternate the order in which throat  
124 swabs were collected. Saliva was collected by having the individual hold a ClassiqSwab  
125 (COPAN) in their mouth for approximately 30 seconds.

126  
127 For each paired NP and throat swab, one was tested immediately on the Panbio cartridge for  
128 testing and the other was placed into UTM for RT-PCR testing. Throat and NP swabs in UTM  
129 collected for RT-PCR testing were stored at 4°C upon arrival at the laboratory and tested within  
130 72 hours of collection. RT-PCR testing included an assay targeting the E-gene of SARS-CoV-2  
131 developed within our laboratory (Public Health Laboratory, APL), and the Cobas® SARS-CoV-  
132 2 test on the Cobas 6800 instrument run according to the manufacturer’s instructions.<sup>6</sup> For the E  
133 gene RT-PCR, 200ul of UTM were extracted on the MagMAX Express-96 or Kingfisher Flex  
134 (ABI) using the MagMAX-96 Viral RNA Isolation Kit (ThermoFisher) or the PurePrep Pathogen  
135 Kit (MolGen) according to manufacturer’s instructions, and eluted into a volume of 110ul.

136  
137 For our lab-developed test, the samples were considered positive for SARS-CoV-2 when E-gene  
138 cycle threshold (Ct) value was <35. If the Ct was ≥35, amplification from the same eluate was  
139 repeated in duplicate and was considered positive if at least 2/3 results had a Ct <41. For the  
140 Cobas SARS-CoV-2 test, as per the manufacturer, a positive result was defined as 2/2 targets

141 positive, or 1 or more targets were positive in duplicate. If 1/2 targets were positive and duplicate  
142 testing was negative, the result was considered indeterminate.

143

144 For discrepant results (Panbio positive, RT-PCR negative), the swabs in UTM were reextracted  
145 and retested in triplicate with the N2 assay from the US CDC 2019-Novel Coronavirus (2019-  
146 nCoV) Real-Time RT-PCR Diagnostic Panel using the UltraPlex 1-Step Toughmix (Quantabio,  
147 MA, USA) and on the Cobas 6800.<sup>7</sup> PPA was calculated with Clopper-Pearson 95% confidence  
148 intervals. Statistical analysis was performed using Pearson Chi-squared for categorical variables  
149 and t-test for continuous variables using STATA (version 14.1).

150

#### 151 Negative samples and exclusivity panel

152 Two NP swabs were collected from asymptomatic individuals at low risk of having COVID-19  
153 (no recent travel, no exposures). One swab was tested immediately on the Panbio testing  
154 cartridge. The other swab was tested by RT-PCR, as explained above. To assess for cross-  
155 reactivity, retrospective samples containing various respiratory viruses, stored in UTM at -80°C,  
156 were tested by aliquoting 3 drops of sample into the Panbio testing cartridge. These samples  
157 were previously detected by the NxTAG® Respiratory Pathogen Panel (Luminex, Tx, United  
158 States) or the CDC influenza A/B multiplex assay.<sup>8</sup> The ability of the Panbio to process this  
159 volume of UTM was confirmed by testing retrospective positive SARS-CoV-2 samples, in UTM,  
160 and showing that they could be detected (data not shown; only samples with Ct <25 were  
161 detectable on the Panbio).

162

163

164 Prospective testing of individuals with suspected COVID-19

165 After the first clinical evaluation, a pilot implementation was conducted where individuals that  
166 presented to AHS assessment centres in Edmonton and Calgary, who had symptoms at time of  
167 testing and were within the first 7 days of symptom onset, were eligible for Point of Care Testing  
168 (POCT) using the Abbott Panbio test. Individuals were asked by AHS staff if they would like to  
169 receive Panbio testing or routine testing alone. Those receiving routine testing alone were not  
170 included in the analysis. For each individual who agreed to POCT Panbio testing, one NP swab  
171 was collected for Panbio testing and one NP swab in UTM from a different nare for RT-PCR. A  
172 minority of individuals had throat swabs sent for RT-PCR due to individual refusal of a second  
173 NP swab. If an individual had a negative Panbio test, the swab sent for confirmatory testing to an  
174 APL laboratory for RT-PCR testing. Positive Panbio results were considered true positives and  
175 reported to the individual (a second swab was still sent to the lab for storage). The RT-PCR  
176 testing was performed on the APL E-gene PCR or on a Health Canada/FDA approved  
177 commercial assay. Commercial assays were site specific, and included the Allplex (Seegene,  
178 Seoul, South Korea), BDMax (Becton Dickinson, NJ, United States), Panther Fusion (Hologic,  
179 MA, United States), GeneXpert (Cepheid, CA, United States), and Simplexa (DiaSorin,  
180 Saluggia, Italy).

181

182

183 **RESULTS**

184 One hundred and sixty-three individuals were recruited for the first clinical evaluation. Eighteen  
185 individuals were excluded: Three were asymptomatic at the time of COVID-19 diagnosis and at  
186 time of study recruitment, nine were symptomatic at the time of COVID-19 diagnosis but

187 asymptomatic at time of study recruitment, four had Panbio results that were not recorded, one  
188 had the Panbio reported as negative before 15 minutes, and another was unable to be processed  
189 by RT-PCR. Individual characteristics of the remaining 145 individuals is provided in Table 1.

190  
191 Cough was the most frequent symptom at enrollment (42.8%), followed by headache (42.1%),  
192 myalgias (41.4%), sinus congestion (36.6%), malaise (31.0%), pharyngitis (29.0%), fevers/chills  
193 (28.3%), anosmia (24.1%), ageusia (24.1%), rhinorrhea (20.0%), shortness of breath (5.5%),  
194 nausea/vomiting (3.4%), and other (17.9%), including chest pain, diarrhea, eye soreness,  
195 lymphadenopathy, loss of appetite, arthralgia, dizziness, and/or conjunctivitis. Mean duration of  
196 symptoms at the time of collection was 6.1 days (median 6, range 3 - 10 days). Ninety-one  
197 percent of individuals were within the 7-day symptom onset window. The mean E-gene Ct value  
198 for positive results from RT-PCR was 24.7 (median 24.8, range 15.9 – 37.9).

199  
200 Throat and saliva sample collection was terminated early due to very poor performance,  
201 therefore only 61 and 41 individuals had a throat and saliva sample taken, respectively. There  
202 were 70.0% of throat swabs tested on the Panbio that were collected before the reference throat  
203 swab. In addition, 14.6% of swabs used for saliva testing on the Panbio were collected before  
204 both throat swabs, and the rest of the saliva swabs were tested after the two throat swabs. The  
205 PPA of throat and saliva swabs (95% confidence intervals (CI)) was 57.7% (95% CI 43.2% -  
206 71.3%) and 2.6% (95% CI 0.06% - 13.5%), respectively (see supplementary material).

207  
208 Of the 145 that underwent a NP swab, 121 were positive on both the Panbio and RT-PCR (Table  
209 2). The PPA of the Panbio compared to RT-PCR was 87.7% (95% CI 81.0% - 92.7%) (Table 3).



210 There were 17 false negatives on the Panbio, with 14/17 (82.4%) having a Ct > 25 by RT-PCR  
211 and 9/17 (52.9%) with Ct > 30 on RT-PCR (Supplementary material). Two samples were from  
212 individuals outside the 7-day symptom onset window. Restricting the analysis to individuals with  
213 symptom onset ≤ 7 days did not significantly change the PPA of the Panbio, which was 88.1%  
214 (95% CI 81.1% - 93.2%) for this group. Panbio positive samples had lower Ct values on RT-  
215 PCR testing than Panbio negative samples (p<0.001; Table 4). All samples (n=7) with a Ct value  
216 ≥ 33 were negative on the Panbio.

217  
218 When tested in triplicate using RT-PCR followed by triplicate testing by the CDC method and  
219 testing on the Cobas 6800, neither of the two RT-PCR negative samples, with paired positive  
220 Panbio samples, resolved as positive.

221  
222 There were 1,641 symptomatic individuals who were tested by POCT on the Panbio in  
223 community assessment centres from December 7 – 21, 2020, with 268/1641 (16.3%) positive for  
224 SARS-CoV-2. Individual participant characteristics are provided in Table 5. There were 37 false  
225 negatives, corresponding to a PPA of 86.2% [95% CI 81.5% - 90.1%]. Of the 37 false negative  
226 samples, 23 were positive on the Allplex, 6 on the Panther, and 8 on the Cobas. Of the 23  
227 samples positive on the Allplex, 7 had E-gene Ct<20, 4 had Ct 20-25, 3 had Ct 25-30, 5 had Ct  
228 >30, and 4 required repeat testing as only 1 of the 3 targets were initially positive (N-gene or  
229 RdRp, all with Ct > 35).

230  
231 Twenty asymptomatic individuals at low risk of COVID-19 were tested by POCT, all of which  
232 were negative on the Panbio and RT-PCR. All 11 retrospective samples containing other

233 respiratory viruses tested were negative. These samples were previously positive for one of either  
234 human metapneumovirus, adenovirus, parainfluenza virus type 4, other coronavirus (NL63,  
235 HKU1, NL63), enterovirus/rhinovirus, respiratory syncytial virus, influenza A H3N2, influenza  
236 A H1N1, or influenza B.

237

238

## 239 **DISCUSSION**

240 The initial community clinical study and the evaluation post-implementation by POCT at  
241 community assessment centres demonstrated similar PPA. Overall, the PPA of the Panbio was  
242 moderate at 86.2-87.7% compared to various RT-PCR platforms for this population. This study  
243 demonstrates that, in real world settings, acceptable sensitivity is achieved for clinical use with  
244 the Panbio, but confirmatory testing of negatives is likely necessary for most populations.

245

246 While there were two instances in the initial clinical evaluation of known COVID-19 individuals  
247 where the Panbio was positive and the RT-PCR was negative, we believe these are true positives  
248 based on several reasons. Participants recruited in our study were all recently diagnosed with  
249 COVID-19; none of the samples from the asymptomatic individuals at low risk of COVID-19  
250 gave false positive results throughout the study; and no issues with false positive results have  
251 been identified by the Panbio manufacturer or among previous Panbio publications within the  
252 literature.<sup>2-4</sup>

253

254 The PPA of the Panbio varies in the literature from 72.6% to 86.5% among individuals with  
255 symptoms  $\leq 7$  days.<sup>2-4</sup> These studies varied in terms of their study design and reference standards  
256 used. All studies examined paired NP swabs tested with the Panbio and a PCR-based platform,

257 with two of the three studies using the Allplex (Seegene, South Korea).<sup>3,4</sup> One study<sup>2</sup> used the  
258 VitaPCR SARS-CoV-2 (Credo diagnostics, Singapore) that has limited data available on its  
259 performance, which may potentially explain why 7 samples were Panbio positive but VitaPCR  
260 SARS-CoV-2 negative.<sup>9</sup> Gremmels *et al.* performed testing on the Panbio up to 2 hours from  
261 collection, which may account for the lower sensitivity detected (72.6%).<sup>3</sup> Of the studies that  
262 examined positivity rate based on symptom duration, one study found no difference in positivity  
263 rate with duration of symptom onset<sup>3</sup>, whereas another found higher sensitivity in individuals  
264 with symptom onset < 7 days (sensitivity 86.5%) compared to individuals with symptom onset ≥  
265 7 days (sensitivity 53.8%).<sup>4</sup> We found no difference in Panbio sensitivity among individuals with  
266 symptoms > 7 days, but this was limited to a very small pool of samples (N=15). All studies,  
267 including ours, found decreases in Panbio sensitivity among SARS-CoV-2 samples with higher  
268 Ct values, with sensitivity dropping when Ct values are approximately > 26.

269  
270 Our study contributes to the literature on the Panbio's performance by using alternative  
271 collection methods, such as throat and saliva swabs. Unfortunately, these specimens were proven  
272 to be inferior to NP swabs and should not be used on the Panbio. Further studies are required to  
273 determine if an alternative way to test saliva on the Panbio could prove effective (e.g. direct  
274 inoculation of saliva onto the Panbio test cartridge or saliva collected in a media). We did not  
275 evaluate nasal swabs on the Panbio because the results could have been altered by collecting NP  
276 swabs also. However, previous work done by our laboratory has shown nasal swabs to be  
277 inferior to throat swabs for the detection of SARS-CoV-2, so it would be surprising if nasal  
278 swabs proved to be as effective a specimen as NP swabs for testing on the Panbio.<sup>6</sup>

279

280 Our study was predominately restricted to individuals within the community who had symptoms  
281  $\leq 7$  days. As such, our study was unable to provide any conclusions about the Panbio  
282 performance among individuals admitted to hospital, in congregate living facilities, who are  
283 asymptomatic, and individuals with symptoms  $> 7$  days. Our study did not evaluate the negative  
284 percent agreement of the Panbio when applied in real-world settings. The strengths of our study  
285 include the large number of COVID-19 positive individuals recruited. In addition, we included  
286 prospective data taken from real-world settings (symptomatic individuals presenting to COVID  
287 assessment centres) and found similar results, which further reinforces our study findings. We  
288 also tested asymptomatic individuals at low risk of COVID-19 (no travel, no exposure), and  
289 tested retrospective samples positive for other respiratory viruses.

290

## 291 **CONCLUSIONS**

292 In conclusion, the Panbio was able to detect most SARS-CoV-2 positive samples among  
293 individuals with symptomatic COVID-19 infection. However, its performance will miss at least  
294 10% of people with confirmed COVID-19 infection, and therefore negative results on the Panbio  
295 obtained from individuals at high risk for COVID-19 infection should be considered presumptive  
296 until confirmed with a PCR test. Individuals who had a negative Panbio test result but have  
297 ongoing suspicion for COVID-19, could consider an alternative testing solution by retesting  
298 them using the Panbio at frequent intervals. Further studies are required to determine if repeat  
299 interval testing can increase sensitivity of the Panbio in detecting SARS-CoV-2 in real world  
300 settings. Given the speed, low-complexity and acceptable performance, the Panbio test is suitable  
301 for use in the POCT setting, especially when rapid identification of positive patients is critical.  
302 As such, they will play an impactful role in combating the COVID-19 pandemic by improving

303 testing in settings where rapid turnaround times are much needed, such as among difficult to  
304 reach populations (e.g. homeless), inpatients with suspected nosocomial infection, in high  
305 throughput COVID-19 assessment centres, and in rural areas where access to a laboratory is  
306 limited because transportation delays are significant.

307

### 308 **Acknowledgments**

309 This work was funded using internal operating funds of Alberta Precision Laboratories and  
310 Alberta Health Services. Test kits and instruments were paid for by the Public Health Agency of  
311 Canada. We thank the AHS mobile integrated health team for collecting samples in the  
312 community and Alberta Precision Laboratory staff for assistance with testing of samples and in  
313 the development and support of the POCT program.

314

315

316

317

318

319

320

321

322

323

324

325

326

327

328

329

330

331

332

333

334

335

336

337

338 **REFERENCES**

- 339 1. Abbott. Panbio: COVID-19 Ag Rapid Test Device. 2020. [Accessed Dec 25, 2020].  
340 Available at:  
341 [https://www.who.int/diagnostics\\_laboratory/eual/eul\\_0564\\_032\\_00\\_panbi\\_covid19\\_ag\\_r](https://www.who.int/diagnostics_laboratory/eual/eul_0564_032_00_panbi_covid19_ag_rapid_test_device.pdf)  
342 [apid\\_test\\_device.pdf](https://www.who.int/diagnostics_laboratory/eual/eul_0564_032_00_panbi_covid19_ag_rapid_test_device.pdf).
- 343 2. Fenollar F, Bouam A, Ballouche M, et al. Evaluation of the Panbio Covid-19 rapid  
344 antigen detection test device for the screening of patients with Covid-19. *J Clin*  
345 *Microbiol.* 2020;JCM.02589-20.
- 346 3. Gremmels, et al. Real-life validation of the Panbio COVID-19 antigen rapid test (Abbott)  
347 in community-dwelling subjects with symptoms of potential SARS-CoV-2 infection.  
348 *MedRxiv.* 2020. [Accessed Dec 25, 2020]. Available from:  
349 <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.10.16.20214189v1>.
- 350 4. Linares M, Pérez-Tanoira R, Carrero A, et al. Panbio antigen rapid test is reliable to  
351 diagnose SARS-CoV-2 infection in the first 7 days after the onset of symptoms. *J Clin*  
352 *Virol.* 2020;133:104659.
- 353 5. Berenger BM, Conly JM, Fonseca K, et al. Saliva collected in universal transport media  
354 is an effective, simple and high-volume amenable method to detect SARS-CoV-2. *Clin*  
355 *Microbiol Infect.* 2020;S1198-743X(20)30689-3.
- 356 6. Berenger B, Fonseca K, Schneider AR, Hu J, Zelyas N. Sensitivity of nasopharyngeal,  
357 nasal and throat swab for the detection of SARS-CoV-2. 2020. *MedRxiv.*  
358 Doi:<https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.05.20084889> .
- 359 7. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. CDC 2019-Novel Coronavirus (2019-nCoV)  
360 Real-Time RT-PCR Diagnostic Panel: For Emergency Use Only: Instructions for Use  
361 [Accessed Nov 30, 2020]. Available from: <https://www.fda.gov/media/134922/download>.
- 362 8. Selvaraju S, Selvarangan R. Evaluation of three influenza A and B real-time reverse  
363 transcription-PCR assays and a new 2009 H1N1 assay for detection of influenza viruses.  
364 *J Clin Microbiol.* 2010;48(11):3870-5
- 365 9. Fournier PE, Zandotti C, Ninove L, et al. Contribution of VitaPCR SARS-CoV-2 to the  
366 emergency diagnosis of COVID-19. *J Clin Virol.* 2020;133:104682.

367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383

384 Table 1: Individual characteristics of known COVID-19 in tested with the Panbio (N=145).

| Characteristic   |                           |
|--|---------------------------|
| Male gender  | 42.8%                     |
| Mean age in years (median, range)  | 39.4 (36.0, 18.5 – 86.6)  |
| Mean time from starting Panbio test to confirming positive result (median, range), N=119 (4 did not record time to positivity) | 3.8min (3, 0.5 – 15min)   |
| Mean Ct value for RT-PCR positive results (median, range), N=138   | 24.7 (24.8, 15.9 – 37.9)  |
| Mean duration of symptoms from collection date (median, range)   | 6.1 days (6, 3 – 10 days) |
| Individuals with symptom duration $\leq 7$ days from collection date   | 91.0%                     |

385  
386  
387  
388  
389

Table 2: Results of Panbio and RT-PCR in symptomatic known COVID-19 infected individuals (N=145).

|        |          | RT-PCR   |          |
|--------|----------|----------|----------|
|        |          | Positive | Negative |
| Panbio | Positive | 121      | 2        |
|        | Negative | 17       | 5        |

390  
391  
392  
393  
394

Table 3: Positive percent agreement (PPA) and negative percent agreement (NPA) between Panbio and RT-PCR in symptomatic known COVID-19 infected individuals (N=145).

|               | PPA [95% CI]          | NPA [95% CI]          |
|---------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| <b>Panbio</b> | 87.7% [81.0% - 92.7%] | 71.4% [29.0% - 96.3%] |

395 CI: confidence interval

396  
397  
398  
399  
400

Table 4: Characteristics between Panbio negative and Panbio positive samples in known COVID-19 infected individuals (N=145).

|  | Panbio negative (N=22) | Panbio positive (N=123) | P-value |
|--|------------------------|-------------------------|---------|
| <b>Mean duration of symptoms at collection (days)</b>  | 6.2                    | 6.1                     | 0.636   |
| <b>Symptoms <math>\leq 7</math> days at collection</b> | 86.4%                  | 91.9%                   | 0.405   |
| <b>Mean age</b>  | 37.1                   | 39.8                    | 0.394   |
| <b>Mean Ct value</b>                                   | 30.6                   | 23.8                    | <0.001  |
| <b>Male gender</b>                                     | 45.8%                  | 42.3%                   | 0.748   |

401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406

407 Table 5: Characteristics from individuals with unknown COVID-19 status tested prospectively in  
408 POCT setting at assessment centres (N=1,641).

| <b>Characteristic</b>  |   |
|--|---|
| Male gender  | 40.0%   |
| Mean age in years (median, range)                                      | 40.8 (39, 5 – 90)   |
| Location of assessment centre  | Calgary (65.8%)<br>Edmonton (34.2%)                             |
| Specimen used for confirmatory RT-PCR                                  | NP swab (94.5%)<br>Throat swab (5.5%)                           |
| Instrument used for RT-PCR   | Seegene (71.1%)<br>Cobas (20.9%)<br>LDT (6.5%)<br>Other (1.5%)* |
| Mean E-gene Ct value for RT-PCR positive results (median, range), N=72 | 22.7 (22.1, 13.2 – 33.9)  |

409 NP: Nasopharyngeal swab

410 LDT: Lab developed test (see “methods”)

411 \*GeneXpert, Simplexa, BDMax

412