

1 Differential Performance of CoronaCHEK SARS-CoV-2 Lateral Flow Antibody Assay by
2 Geographic Origin of Samples
3
4 Owen R. Baker¹, M. Kate Grabowski^{2,3}, Ronald M. Galiwango³, Aminah Nalumansi⁴, Jennifer
5 Serwanga^{4,6}, William Clarke², Yu-Hsiang Hsieh², Richard E. Rothman², Reinaldo E. Fernandez²,
6 David Serwadda^{3,5}, Joseph Kagaayi³, Tom Lutalo^{3,4}, Steven J. Reynolds^{1,2,3}, Pontiano Kaleebu^{4,6},
7 Thomas C. Quinn^{1,2}, Oliver Laeyendecker^{1,2*}

8
9
10 1) Division of Intramural Research, National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases,
11 National Institutes of Health, Baltimore, MD, USA

12 2) Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine, Baltimore, MD, USA

13 3) Rakai Health Sciences Program, Kalisizo, Uganda

14 4) Uganda Virus Research Institute, Entebbe, Uganda

15 5) Makerere University School of Public Health, Kampala, Uganda

16 6) Medical Research Council, Uganda Virus Research Institute and London School of
17 hygiene and Tropical Medicine Uganda Research Unit

18
19 *Corresponding Author

20 Oliver Laeyendecker, MS, MBA, PhD

21 Staff Scientist, IHSS/LIR/NIAID/NIH

22 Associate Professor, Infectious Diseases, SOM/JHU

23 Associate Professor, Epidemiology, JHSPH

24 855 North Wolfe Street

25 Rangos Building, Room 538A

26 Baltimore, MD 21205

27 Email: olaeyen1@jhmi.edu

28

29 Running Title: Variation in SARS-CoV-2 antibody test by country

30

31 Conflict of Interest: None to declare

32

33 Funding: Support was provided by the Division of Intramural Research, National Institute of

34 Allergy and Infectious Diseases (NIAID), National Institutes of Health (NIH), as well as by

35 extramural support from NIAID UM1-AI068613 for supporting R.E.F.; and NIH Center of

36 Excellence in Influenza Research and Surveillance HHSN272201400007C to R.E.R.

37

38 Acknowledgements: We acknowledge all of the participants who contributed specimens to this

39 study and the study staff without whom this study would not have been possible.

40 **Abstract:**

41 **Background:** We assessed the performance of CoronaCHEK lateral flow assay on samples from
42 Uganda and Baltimore to determine the impact of geographic origin on assay performance.

43 **Methods:** Serum samples from SARS-CoV-2 PCR+ individuals (Uganda: 78 samples from 78
44 individuals and Baltimore: 266 samples from 38 individuals) and from pre-pandemic individuals
45 (Uganda 1077 and Baltimore 532) were evaluated. Prevalence ratios (PR) were calculated to
46 identify factors associated with a false-positive test.

47 **Results:** After first positive PCR in Ugandan samples the sensitivity was: 45% (95% CI 24,68) at
48 0-7 days; 79% (95%CI 64,91) 8-14 days; and 76% (95%CI 50,93) >15 days. In samples from
49 Baltimore, sensitivity was: 39% (95% CI 30, 49) 0-7 days; 86% (95% CI 79,92) 8-14 days; and
50 100% (95% CI 89,100) 15 days post positive PCR. The specificity of 96.5% (95% CI 97.5,95.2) in
51 Ugandan samples was significantly lower than samples from Baltimore 99.3% (95% CI
52 98.1,99.8), $p < 0.01$. In Ugandan samples, individuals with a false positive result were more likely
53 to be male (PR 2.04, 95% CI 1.03,3.69) or individuals who had a fever more than a month prior
54 to sample acquisition (PR 2.87, 95% CI 1.12,7.35).

55 **Conclusions:** Sensitivity of the CoronaCHEK was similar in samples from Uganda and Baltimore.
56 The specificity was significantly lower in Ugandan samples than in Baltimore samples. False
57 positive results in Ugandan samples appear to correlate with a recent history of a febrile illness,
58 potentially indicative of a cross-reactive immune response in individuals from East Africa.

59 INTRODUCTION

60 Severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) infection causes
61 coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) (1), which has been detected on all continents and
62 continues to be a public health emergency globally (2). Critical to public health efforts to
63 combat the pandemic are accurate serologic assays to differentiate exposed from unexposed
64 individuals (3). Many studies investigate the performance of these assays on samples from Asia
65 (4), Western Europe (5), and the United States (6). However, little information is available on
66 the performance of these assays in an African setting, though initial studies provide evidence of
67 potential problems (7), particularly among febrile patients infected by other infectious
68 pathogens (8).

69 Serologic assays used for the detection of antibodies to different viral infections can
70 vary in performance based on the origin of the samples being tested, as has been seen in HIV
71 (9), HCV (10), and HSV-2 (11). It is thought that these differences in specificity result from host
72 genetics of the source population and the frequency and distribution of the infectious agents
73 exposed to the population (12). We sought to compare the performance of the CoronaCHEK
74 Lateral Flow Assay (LFA) on samples from Uganda and the United States to assess the impact of
75 geographic origin on the performance of this assay. Samples from known SARS-CoV-2 infected
76 individuals with known duration of infection and pre-pandemic samples were tested to
77 evaluate the sensitivity and specificity of the assay and to identify factors associated with a
78 false positive result.

79

80 METHODS

81 **Ethics statement:**

82 The use of samples from Baltimore was approved by The Johns Hopkins University
83 School of Medicine Institutional Review Board (IRB00247886, IRB00250798, and IRB00091667).
84 The use of samples from Uganda was approved by the Uganda Virus Research Institute's
85 Research Ethics Committee (GC/127/20/04/773, GC/127/13/01/16), Western Institutional
86 Review Board, protocol 200313317 and the Uganda National Council for Science and
87 Technology (HS637ES). The parent studies were conducted according to the ethical standards of
88 the Helsinki Declaration of the World Medical Association, where all subjects provided written
89 informed consent. All samples were de-identified prior to testing.

90

91 **Sample sets:**

92 To assess sensitivity, samples from subjects known to be SARS-CoV-2 PCR+ from Uganda
93 and the United States with known duration from first PCR+ date were evaluated. Samples from
94 78 PCR+ individuals at different time intervals were identified at the Uganda Virus Research
95 Institute in Entebbe, and Makerere University in Kampala, Uganda. None of the Ugandan
96 individuals were hospitalized and all had mild disease. Samples (n=266) from the United States
97 were from 38 hospitalized COVID-19 patients, attending the Johns Hopkins Hospital in
98 Baltimore, Maryland in the United States (13).

99 To assess the specificity of the assay, pre-pandemic samples were tested. This included
100 1077 stored samples from the Rakai Community Cohort Study, collected between 2011 and
101 2013 (14). The Ugandan samples included 543 individuals who reported having been febrile
102 within the month prior to sample acquisition and 534 individuals who did not report a febrile

103 illness, matched by age and gender. The 532 pre-pandemic samples from the US were remnant
104 CBC samples collected from Johns Hopkins Hospital Emergency Department (JHH ED) patients
105 collected between December 2015 and January 2016 (15).

106

107 **Laboratory Testing and Statistical Analysis:**

108 All samples were analyzed with the CoronaCHEK LFA (Hangzhou Biotest Biotech Co Ltd)
109 according to the manufacturer's protocol. Sensitivity by duration of infection and specificity
110 among pre-pandemic samples were assessed for the presence of either IgM or IgG bands for
111 any reactivity. Statistical analysis was performed with STATA 14.2 (Statacorp College Station,
112 Texas, USA), and 95% confidence intervals (95% CI) for sensitivity and specificity were
113 calculated with the Clopper-Pearson exact method. Bivariate Poisson regression models were
114 used to calculate prevalence ratios (PR) for factors associated with a false-positive test among
115 pre-pandemic samples.

116

117 **RESULTS**

118 There were significant differences in the performance for the CoronaCHEK LFA between
119 samples from Uganda and Baltimore (**Table 1**). When comparing any reactivity (IgM or IgG)
120 there was no significant difference in reactivity by duration of infection. Though 100% of
121 samples from Baltimore were seropositive by 14 days after their first time point, this was not
122 the case for the Ugandan samples. Specificity, when considering any reactive band as a false
123 positive result, was significantly lower in Ugandan samples at 96.9% (CI 95.2, 97.5) than in those
124 from Baltimore, 99.3% (CI 98.1, 99.8), $p < 0.01$. When limited to Ugandan samples collected

125 from individuals with no reported febrile illness in the month prior to sample collection
126 (n=500), the specificity was still significantly lower 96.8% (CI 95.0,98.1) than in those samples
127 from Baltimore, $p < 0.05$.

128 There were four and 38 false positive results in Baltimore pre-pandemic samples and
129 Ugandan samples, respectively. All four from Baltimore were all faint IgM bands while 82%
130 (31/38) of the false positive samples from Uganda had only reactive IgM bands. Of the seven
131 pre-pandemic Ugandan samples that were IgG reactive, two were also reactive for IgM.
132 Ugandan samples were significantly more likely to misclassify if they came from men (PR 2.04,
133 95% CI 1.03, 3.69, $p = 0.04$) or the individual had reported fever more than a month prior to
134 sample collection (PR 2.87, 95% CI 1.12, 7.35, $p = 0.028$). There was a trend to test positive if
135 they had reported pneumonia-like symptoms (PR 2.34, 95% CI 0.98, 5.59, $p = 0.056$). Other
136 factors not associated with a false positive result included age, community type, and HIV status
137 (**Table 2**). There were too few misclassified samples from Baltimore to assess factors
138 associated with misclassification within this population.

139

140 **DISCUSSION**

141 This study demonstrates differential performance of the CoronaCHEK LFA on samples
142 collected from Uganda compared to those collected from Baltimore. Though sensitivity for both
143 IgG and IgM in samples from Baltimore was 100% by 14 days after the subjects first PCR+ date,
144 unlike samples from Uganda, this difference was not significantly different. Specificity was
145 significantly lower in the Ugandan pre-pandemic samples compared to those from Baltimore,
146 though this difference was all associated with the IgM band. False positive results in Ugandan

147 samples were higher among men and those who had reported a febrile episode more than a
148 month prior to sample acquisition. Of the false positive results detected, the vast majority
149 were IgM reactivity.

150 These results demonstrate that the performance characteristics of serological assays for
151 SARS-CoV-2 antibody detection cannot be extrapolated to different populations without
152 adequate validation studies. This study supports the need for validation studies on SARS-CoV-2
153 serologic assays in Africa, an area where little data exists (16). Though a lower specificity was
154 found in Ugandan samples than those from Baltimore, the specificity of 96.5% was much
155 greater than the 85% found for the Euroimmun IgG S1 ELISA in pre-pandemic samples from
156 Benin (8). As shown in the study by Mboumba Bouassa (7), our study demonstrated that the
157 main cause for false positive results was a reactive IgM test. If one ignores the presence of an
158 IgM band, the specificity of the CoronaCHEK increased to 99.4% (95% CI 98.7, 99.7) for Ugandan
159 samples and 100% (95% CI 99.3, 100) in Baltimore samples, with no loss of sensitivity at 14 days
160 post first positive PCR for SARS-CoV-2.

161 There are a number of limitations of our study. First, the samples from Uganda of SARS-
162 CoV-2 infected patients were limited, with only six samples within the first week post first PCR
163 positive test and no serial samples for a given individual. Additionally, these samples from
164 known infected Ugandan individuals had limited symptoms, while the Baltimore samples from
165 known SARS-CoV-2 positive individuals were all hospitalized subjects. The pre-pandemic
166 samples from Baltimore were not matched to those from Uganda based on symptomology,
167 though historically, individuals attending the ED in the United States have a high prevalence of
168 fever and viral infections (17). Samples from the JHH ED do have a high burden of chronic viral

169 infections, as demonstrated by a seroprevalence of 6%, 12% and 50% for HIV, HCV and HSV-2
170 respectively (18).

171 In summary, the geographical origin of the samples appeared to impact the
172 performance of the CoronaCHEK LFA. IgM reactivity was the main cause for the false positive
173 results. Given that IgM responses generally appear a couple days before IgG, it may be useful
174 not to measure IgM at all in serological studies given the improvement in specificity. Further
175 evaluations of serologic assays are needed to find appropriate tools for sero-surveillance in an
176 African setting.

177

178 REFERENCES

- 179 1. Zhu N, Zhang D, Wang W, Li X, Yang B, Song J, Zhao X, Huang B, Shi W, Lu R, Niu P, Zhan F,
180 Ma X, Wang D, Xu W, Wu G, Gao GF, Tan W. 2020. A Novel Coronavirus from Patients
181 with Pneumonia in China, 2019. *N Engl J Med* 382:727–733.
- 182 2. Eurosurveillance Editorial Team. 2020. Note from the editors: World Health Organization
183 declares novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV) sixth public health emergency of international
184 concern. *Euro Surveill* 25.
- 185 3. Bermingham WH, Wilding T, Beck S, Huissoon A. 2020. SARS-CoV-2 serology: Test, test,
186 test, but interpret with caution! *Clin Med J R Coll Physicians London* 20:365–368.
- 187 4. Zhao J, Yuan Q, Wang H, Liu W, Liao X, Su Y, Wang X, Yuan J, Li T, Li J, Qian S, Hong C,
188 Wang F, Liu Y, Wang Z, He Q, Li Z, He B, Zhang T, Fu Y, Ge S, Liu L, Zhang J, Xia N, Zhang Z.
189 2020. Antibody Responses to SARS-CoV-2 in Patients with Novel Coronavirus Disease
190 2019. *Clin Infect Dis* 71:2027–2034.

- 191 5. Sacristan MS, Collazos-Blanco A, Cintas MIZ, García AS, de Villavicencio CY, Maestre MM.
192 2020. Comparison of various serological assays for novel SARS-COV-2. *Eur J Clin Microbiol*
193 *Infect Dis* 1–6.
- 194 6. Patel EU, Bloch EM, Clarke W, Hsieh YH, Boon D, Eby Y, Fernandez RE, Baker OR, Keruly
195 M, Kirby CS, Klock E, Littlefield K, Miller J, Schmidt HA, Sullivan P, Piwowar-Manning E,
196 Shrestha R, Redd AD, Rothman RE, Sullivan D, Shoham S, Casadevall A, Quinn TC, Pekosz
197 A, Tobian AAR, Laeyendecker O. 2021. Comparative performance of five commercially
198 available serologic assays to detect antibodies to SARS-CoV-2 and identify individuals
199 with high neutralizing titers. *J Clin Microbiol* 59.
- 200 7. Mboumba Bouassa RS, Péré H, Tonen-Wolyec S, Longo JDD, Moussa S, Mbopi-Keou FX,
201 Mossoro-Kpinde CD, Grésenguet G, Veyer D, Bélec L. 2020. Unexpected high frequency
202 of unspecific reactivities by testing pre-epidemic blood specimens from Europe and
203 Africa with SARS-CoV-2 IgG–IgM antibody rapid tests points to IgM as the Achilles heel. *J*
204 *Med Virol* 93.
- 205 8. Yadouleton A, Sander AL, Moreira-Soto A, Tchibozo C, Hounkanrin G, Badou Y, Fischer C,
206 Krause N, Akogbeto P, De Oliveira Filho EF, Dossou A, Brünink S, Aïssi MAJ, Djingarey MH,
207 Hounkpatin B, Nagel M, Drexler JF. 2021. Limited specificity of serologic tests for SARS-
208 CoV-2 antibody detection, Benin. *Emerg Infect Dis* 27:233–237.
- 209 9. Van Kerckhoven I, Vercauteren G, Piot P, Van Der Groen G. 1991. Comparative evaluation
210 of 36 commercial assays for detecting antibodies to HIV. *Bull World Health Organ*
211 69:753–760.
- 212 10. Mullis CE, Laeyendecker O, Reynolds SJ, Ocamá P, Quinn J, Boaz I, Gray RH, Kirk GD,

- 213 Thomas DL, Quinn TC, Stabinski L. High Frequency of False-Positive Hepatitis C Virus
214 Enzyme-Linked Immunosorbent Assay in Rakai, Uganda
215 <https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/cit602>.
- 216 11. Biraro S, Mayaud P, Morrow RA, Grosskurth H, Weiss HA. 2011. Performance of
217 commercial herpes simplex virus type-2 antibody tests using serum samples from Sub-
218 Saharan Africa: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Sex Transm Dis* 38:140–147.
- 219 12. Ng KW, Faulkner N, Cornish GH, Rosa A, Harvey R, Hussain S, Ulferts R, Earl C, Wrobel AG,
220 Benton DJ, Rouston C, Bolland W, Thompson R, Agua-Doce A, Hobson P, Heaney J,
221 Rickman H, Paraskevopoulou S, Houlihan CF, Thomson K, Sanchez E, Shin GY, Spyer MJ,
222 Joshi D, O'Reilly N, Walker PA, Kjaer S, Riddell A, Moore C, Jebson BR, Wilkinson M,
223 Marshall LR, Rosser EC, Radziszewska A, Peckham H, Ciurtin C, Wedderburn LR, Beale R,
224 Swanton C, Gandhi S, Stockinger B, McCauley J, Gamblin SJ, McCoy LE, Cherepanov P,
225 Nastouli E, Kassiotis G. 2020. Preexisting and de novo humoral immunity to SARS-CoV-2
226 in humans. *Science* (80-) 370:1339–1343.
- 227 13. Conklin SE, Martin K, Manabe YC, Schmidt HA, Miller J, Keruly M, Klock E, Kirby CS, Baker
228 OR, Fernandez RE, Eby YJ, Hardick J, Shaw-Saliba K, Rothman RE, Caturegli PP, Redd AD,
229 Tobian AAR, Bloch EM, Benjamin Larman H, Quinn TC, Clarke W, Laeyendecker O. 2021.
230 Evaluation of serological SARS-CoV-2 lateral flow assays for rapid point-of-care testing. *J*
231 *Clin Microbiol* 59.
- 232 14. Grabowski MK, Serwadda DM, Gray RH, Nakigozi G, Kigozi G, Kagaayi J, Ssekubugu R,
233 Nalugoda F, Lessler J, Lutalo T, Galiwango RM, Makumbi F, Kong X, Kabatesi D, Alamo ST,
234 Wiersma S, Sewankambo NK, Tobian AAR, Laeyendecker O, Quinn TC, Reynolds SJ,

- 235 Wawer MJ, Chang LW. 2017. HIV Prevention Efforts and Incidence of HIV in Uganda. N
236 Engl J Med 377:2154–2166.
- 237 15. Mohareb AM, Patel A V, Laeyendecker OB, Toerper MF, Signer D, Clarke WA, Kelen GD,
238 Quinn TC, Haukoos JS, Rothman RE, Hsieh Y-H. 2020. The HIV screening cascade: current
239 Emergency Department-based screening strategies leave many patients with HIV
240 undiagnosed. JAIDS J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr Publish Ah.
- 241 16. Jacobs J, Kühne V, Lunguya O, Affolabi D, Hardy L, Vandenberg O. 2020. Implementing
242 COVID-19 (SARS-CoV-2) Rapid Diagnostic Tests in Sub-Saharan Africa: A Review. Front
243 Med. Frontiers Media S.A.
- 244 17. Weiss AJ, Wier LM, Stocks C, Blanchard J. 2006. Overview of Emergency Department
245 Visits in the United States, 2011: Statistical Brief #174Healthcare Cost and Utilization
246 Project (HCUP) Statistical Briefs. Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (US).
- 247 18. Patel EU, Laeyendecker O, Hsieh YH, Rothman RE, Kelen GD, Quinn TC. 2016. Parallel
248 declines in HIV and hepatitis C virus prevalence, but not in herpes simplex virus type 2
249 infection: A 10-year, serial cross-sectional study in an inner-city emergency department. J
250 Clin Virol 80:93–97.
- 251

Table 1. Sensitivity and Specificity of CoronaCHEK Lateral Flow Point of Care Assay for the Detection of IgM and IgG Antibodies to SARS-CoV-2

Sensitivity	Performance		
	IgM % (95% CI)	IgG % (95% CI)	IgM or IgG % (95% CI)
Uganda			
≤ 7 days (n=22)	41% (21 - 64)	41% (21 - 64)	45% (24 - 68)
>7 to 14 days (n=39)	74% (58 - 87)	49% (32 - 87)	79% (64 - 91)
>14 – 28 days (n=17)	41% (18 - 67)	65% (38 - 86)	76% (50 - 93)
Baltimore			
≤ 7 days (n=102)	34% (25 – 44)	21% (13 – 30)	39% (30 – 49)
>7 to 14 days (n=132)	82% (74 – 88)	75% (67 – 82)	86% (79 – 92)
>14 – 28 days (n=32)	100% (89 – 100)	100% (89 – 100)	100% (89 – 100)
Specificity			
Uganda (n=1077)	96.9% (95.7 - 97.9)	99.4% (98.7 - 99.7)	96.5% (95.2 - 97.5)
Baltimore (n=532)	99.3% (98.1 – 99.8)	100% (99.3 - 100)	99.3% (98.1 - 99.8)

Table 2. Factors associated with a false positive SARS-CoV-2 antibody response in samples from Uganda.

Defining Category	Outcome: SAR-CoV-2 Antibody Positive	
	% (n/N)	PR (95% CI)
<i>Categorical variables</i>		
Sex		
<i>Female</i>	2.7% (20/737)	Ref.
<i>Male</i>	5.3% (18/340)	2.06 (1.03, 3.69)
Age		
<i>18-24</i>	3.1% (10/327)	Ref.
<i>25-34</i>	4.3% (19/439)	1.42 (0.66, 3.04)
<i>35-44</i>	2.7% (7/260)	0.88 (0.34, 2.31)
<i>45-54</i>	3.9% (2/61)	1.28 (0.28, 5.85)
Community Type		
<i>Agrarian</i>	3.2% (14/436)	Ref.
<i>Fishing</i>	5.1% (19/372)	1.59 (0.80, 3.17)
<i>Trading</i>	1.9% (5/269)	0.58 (0.21, 1.61)
Pregnancy (no males in analysis)		
<i>Not pregnant</i>	2.5% (8/318)	Ref.
<i>Pregnant</i>	2.9% (12/419)	1.14 (0.47, 2.78)
Fever < 1 mo		
<i>No</i>	3.2% (17/534)	Ref.
<i>Yes</i>	3.9% (21/543)	1.21 (0.64, 2.30)
Fever > 1 mo		
<i>No</i>	3.2% (33/1,023)	Ref.
<i>Yes</i>	9.3% (5/54)	2.87 (1.12, 7.35)
Cough		
<i>No</i>	3.3% (27/825)	Ref.
<i>Yes</i>	4.4% (11/252)	1.33 (0.66, 2.69)
Pneumonia		
<i>No</i>	3.2% (32/997)	Ref.
<i>Yes</i>	7.5% (6/80)	2.34 (0.98, 5.59)
HIV Status		
<i>Negative</i>	3.4% (21/618)	Ref.
<i>Positive</i>	3.7% (17/459)	1.09 (0.58, 2.07)