

1 **Evaluation of a novel, rapid antigen detection test for the diagnosis of**
2 **SARS-CoV-2**

3
4 Rainer Thell ^{1,2}, Verena Kallab ^{1,2}, Wolfgang Weinhappel³, Wolfgang
5 Mueckstein³, Lukas Heschl⁴, Martina Heschl⁴, Stefan Korsatko⁵, Franz Toedling⁶,
6 Amelie Blaschke^{1,2}, Theresa Herzog^{1,2}, Anna Klicpera^{1,2}, Clara Koeller^{7,8}, Moritz
7 Haugk^{1,7}, Anna Kreil^{1,9}, Alexander Spiel^{1,10}, Philipp Kreuzer¹¹, Robert Krause¹²,
8 Christian Sebesta^{1,2}, Stefan Winkler¹³, Brenda Laky^{14,15}, and Marton Szell^{1,2}

9

10 ¹ Wiener Gesundheitsverbund

11 ² Department of Internal Medicine 2, Emergency Department, Klinik Donaustadt, Vienna,
12 Austria

13 ³ Primary Health Care Centre Medizin Mariahilf, Vienna, Austria

14 ⁴ Primary Health Care Centre Landarztteam, Oed, Austria

15 ⁵ Primary Health Care Centre Medius, Graz, Austria

16 ⁶ Primary Health Care Centre Praxis Dr Toedling, Probstdorf, Austria

17 ⁷ Emergency Department, Klinik Hietzing, Vienna, Austria

18 ⁸ Semmelweis University Budapest, Hungary

19 ⁹ Emergency Department, Klinik Landstrasse, Vienna, Austria

20 ¹⁰ Emergency Department, Klinik Ottakring, Vienna, Austria

21 ¹¹ Univ. Clinic of Internal Medicine, Emergency Department, Medical University Graz, Austria

22 ¹² Univ. Clinic of Internal Medicine, Section of Infectiology and Tropical Medicine, Medical
23 University Graz, Austria

24 ¹³ University Clinic of Internal Medicine I, Department of Infectiology and Tropical Medicine,
25 Medical University Vienna, Austria

26 ¹⁴ MedSciCare, Vienna, Austria

27 ¹⁵ Competence Centre Clinical Research, University Clinic of Dentistry, Medical University of
28 Vienna, Austria

29

30 **Keywords.** COVID-19; SARS-CoV-2; rapid COVID-19 test; point-of-care test

31

32 **Running title.** Rapid Antigen Test for SARS-CoV-2

33

34 **Corresponding author:**

35 Rainer Thell, MD

36 Department of Internal Medicine 2, Emergency Department, Klinik Donaustadt, Vienna,

37 Austria

38 Address: 122 Langobardenstrasse, 1210-Vienna, Austria

39 E-mail: rainer.thell@meduniwien.ac.at

40 Mobile: + 43 676 8311 2550

41

42 **Alternate corresponding author:**

43 Marton Szell, MD

44 Department of Internal Medicine 2, Emergency Department, Klinik Donaustadt, Vienna,

45 Austria

46 Address: 122 Langobardenstrasse, 1210-Vienna, Austria

47 E-mail: marton.szell@gesundheitsverbund.at

48 Mobile: + 43 699 1952 2950

49

50 **SUMMARY**

51 The rapid SARS-Cov-2 antigen test (SARS-CoV-2 Rapid Antigen Test (Roche Diagnostics),
52 was compared in symptomatic patients with PCR testing both in emergency departments and
53 primary health care centres. It showed an overall sensitivity of 80.3% and specificity of 99.1%;
54 these were higher with lower PCR cycle threshold numbers and with a shorter onset of
55 symptoms.

56 **ABSTRACT**

57 **Background.** Severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) causing
58 coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) is currently finally determined in laboratory settings by
59 real-time reverse-transcription polymerase-chain-reaction (rt-PCR). However, simple testing
60 with immediately available results are crucial to gain control over COVID-19. The aim was to
61 evaluate such a point-of-care antigen rapid test (AG-rt) device in its performance compared to
62 laboratory-based rt-PCR testing in COVID-19 suspected, symptomatic patients.

63 **Methods.** For this prospective study, two specimens each of 541 symptomatic female (54.7%)
64 and male (45.3%) patients aged between 18 and 95 years tested at five emergency departments
65 (ED, n=296) and four primary healthcare centres (PHC, n=245), were compared, using AG-rt
66 (positive/negative/invalid) and rt-PCR (positive/negative and cycle threshold, Ct) to diagnose
67 SARS-CoV-2. Diagnostic accuracy, sensitivity, specificity, positive predictive values (PPV),
68 negative predictive value (NPV), and likelihood ratios (LR+/-) of the AG-rt were assessed.

69 **Results.** Differences between ED and PHC were detected regarding gender, age, symptoms,
70 disease prevalence, and diagnostic performance. Overall, 174 (32.2%) were tested positive on
71 AG-rt and 213 (39.4%) on rt-PCR. AG correctly classified 91.7% of all rt-PCR positive cases
72 with a sensitivity of 80.3%, specificity of 99.1%, PPV of 98.3, NPV of 88.6%, LR(+) of 87.8,
73 and LR(-) of 0.20. The highest sensitivities and specificities of AG-rt were detected in PHC
74 (sensitivity: 84.4%, specificity: 100.0%), when using Ct of 30 as cut-off (sensitivity: 92.5%,
75 specificity: 97.8%), and when symptom onset was within the first three days (sensitivity: 82.9%,
76 specificity: 99.6%).

77 **Conclusions.** The highest sensitivity was detected with a high viral load. Our findings suggest
78 that AG-rt are comparable to rt-PCR to diagnose SARS-CoV-2 in COVID-19 suspected
79 symptomatic patients presenting both at emergency departments and primary health care centres.

80

81 INTRODUCTION

82 Conventional diagnostic steps for infection with SARS-CoV-19 were epidemiological contact
83 history, clinical impression, chest radiography, standard blood laboratory, and antigen detection
84 by means of real-time polymerase chain reaction (rt-PCR). PCR remains the gold standard test
85 for detection of SARS-CoV-2 infection.[1]

86 As SARS-CoV-2 is being fought, testing not just of patients with suspected infection, but as well
87 healthy individuals, takes places with rapid antigen test lateral flow devices.[2, 3] The way of
88 handling is advantageous to PCR testing, as there is neither a need for laboratory staff nor for a
89 laboratory environment, and the lateral flow device is rapid in application and timely superior to
90 the PCR procedure.

91 It soon became apparent that in this pandemic the available capacities for PCR testing were by
92 far from sufficient, and a feverish search for alternative and simpler detection methods began.

93 Testing that takes a certain time can make up for significant additional efforts of organisation of
94 patients in hospitals; and far beyond health systems, delay of testing effects societies as a whole.
95 This regards nearly all spheres of life. Furthermore, the ideal test system is reliable, fast, easy to
96 use, and affordable.

97 Besides PCR-testing, detection of antibodies against SARS-CoV-2 can play a role as well.

98 Serology is generally available, however, serology seems only interpretable with the knowledge
99 of patient's history and clinical appearance. IgA and IgM seem to quickly fade within 10 to 15
100 days, fade and thus, are not always be detectable, as opposed to IgG.[4-6]

101 However, antigen tests tend to better detect SARS-CoV-2, the more virus load the
102 nasopharyngeal mucus contains.[7, 8] In a meta-analysis by Dinnes et al.,[9] five trials compared
103 rt-PCR with 943 antigen tests were pooled. The average sensitivity was 56.2% (95% CI 29.5% to
104 79.8%), and the average specificity was 99.5% (95% CI 98.1% to 99.9%). More promising
105 results were reported by Porte et al., who tested 82 rt-PCR-positive samples with another rapid
106 antigen test and found a sensitivity of 93.9%.[10]

107 The purpose of this study was to assess the performance of a novel CE-marked *in vitro*
108 diagnostics (IVD) assay, the SARS-CoV-2 Rapid Antigen Test (Roche Diagnostics), for the
109 detection of SARS-CoV-2 antigen. According to the manufacturer's manual [11], the antigen test
110 shows 96.5% (95% CI 91.3% to 99.0%) of sensitivity and 99.7% (95% CI 98.2 to 99.9%) of
111 specificity.

112

113 **MATERIAL AND METHODS**

114 **Patients**

115 Patients were recruited consecutively between October 30, 2020 and December 13, 2020 at five
116 emergency departments and four primary healthcare centres in Austria. The study was approved
117 by four provincial ethics commissions (EK20-249-1020, GS1-EK-3/182-2020, 33-064 ex 20/21,
118 ABT08GP-15681/2020-18). Signed informed consent was obtained from all participants.
119 591 symptomatic adults (≥ 18 years) were included, who were willing to undergo sampling twice.
120 Inclusion criteria were cough, fever, ageusia/anosmia, shortness of breath and sore throat. A total
121 of 49 (8.3%) patients were excluded for the following reasons: asymptomatic (n=12), children
122 (< 18 years, n=10), missing rt-PCR and/or AG-rt data (n=8), unknown symptoms (n=13), and
123 symptom onset more than two weeks prior to testing (n=6).

124

125 **Procedure**

126 Two swabs per patient were taken by experienced medical staff. The first probe was analysed
127 using the point-of-care device (SARS-CoV-2 Rapid Antigen Test (Roche Diagnostics). Outcome
128 was recorded 15 minutes after sampling as positive, negative, or invalid. Only one case
129 (1/542=0.2%), a 31 year old male patient with a sore throat two days prior testing and a negative
130 rt-PCR, showed an invalid AG-rt reading, which was not included in analysis. All rt-PCR
131 analyses using the second probe of each patient was conducted in hospital's laboratories or in

132 other special laboratories. Rt-PCR results were collected as quantitative (Ct) and qualitative
133 (positive or negative) parameters. Ct was reported in 202 of 213 cases.

134 **Statistical Analysis**

135 Descriptive statistics was used to describe the characteristics of patients. The distribution of the
136 data was approximated by visual inspection of the histograms and the Kolmogorov Smirnov
137 tests. Normally distributed data were calculated as mean value with standard deviation (SD),
138 otherwise as median and range.

139 Continuous variables were compared between two groups with independent t-tests (parametric)
140 or Mann-Whitney U-tests (non-parametric). Chi-square or Fisher's exact tests were applied to
141 describe the relationship between proportions of categorical variables. Correlations between the
142 continuous parameters were performed using Spearman's rho.

143 Percentage accuracy in classification, sensitivity, specificity, positive predictive value (PPV),
144 and negative predictive value (NPV) were calculated. Positive (+) and negative (-) likelihood
145 ratios (LR) were calculated using sensitivity and specificity. The larger LR(+), the greater the
146 likelihood to be SARS-CoV-2 positive; and similarly, the smaller the LR(-), the lesser the
147 likelihood to be SARS-CoV-2 positive. All values are presented with their 95% confidence
148 interval (95% CI).

149 Statistical significance was set at a p-value of <0.05 (two-sided). All data were analysed with
150 SPSS software (IMP Statistics Version 25; SPSS Inc, Chicago, IL) and MedCalc Statistical
151 Software version 19.6.4 (MedCalc Software bv, Ostend, Belgium; <https://www.medcalc.org>;
152 2020).

153

154 **RESULTS**

155 Included in this prospective diagnostic study were 541 symptomatic patients of five ED (n=296)
 156 and four PHC (n=245), who were tested for SARS-CoV-2 using AG-rt and rt-PCR. The average
 157 age of the consecutively tested patients including 54.7% females and 45.3% males was
 158 49.1±19.7years (range, 18-95years).

159 A comparison between demographic characteristics between patients tested at ED and PHC
 160 showed significant differences regarding gender, age, and some symptoms (Table 1). The main
 161 symptom for patients presenting in ED was fever, while more than 60% of patients at a PHC
 162 reported to have a sore throat as most common symptom.

163


164 **Table 1. Comparison of demographic characteristics between emergency departments**
 165 **(ED) and primary healthcare centres (PHC).**

Characteristic	ED (N=296)	PHC (N=245)	P Value
Male – n / total N (%)	151 (51.0)	88 (35.9)	<0.001*
Age - median years (min-max)	58 (19-95)	37 (18-77)	<0.001 [†]
age groups – n (%)			
18-29 years	37 (12.5)	66 (26.9)	
30-39 years	28 (9.5)	71 (29.0)	
40-49 years	36 (12.2)	53 (21.6)	
50-59 years	53 (17.9)	28 (11.4)	<0.001*
60-69 years	43 (14.5)	18 (7.3)	
70-79 years	58 (19.6)	9 (3.7)	
80-89 years	36 (12.2)	0	
≥90 years	5 (1.7)	0	
Symptoms – median n (min-max)	2 (1-5)	1 (1-4)	<0.001 [†]
fever – n (%)	198 (66.9)	65 (26.5)	<0.001*
cough – n (%)	156 (52.7)	108 (44.1)	0.046*
sore throat – n (%)	56 (18.9)	150 (61.2)	<0.001*
dysgeusia/anosmia – n (%)	42 (14.2)	28 (11.4)	0.341*
dyspnoea – n (%)	125 (42.2)	15 (6.1)	<0.001*
rhinitis – n (%)	1 (0.3)	0	-
diarrhoea – n (%)	2 (0.7)	0	-
others – n (%)	7 (2.4)	2 (0.8)	-

166 Abbreviation: n and N, number; others including nausea, vomiting, fatigue, myalgia, and cephalaea.

167 * Chi-square test; [†] Mann-Whitney U-test; [‡] Fischer's exact test

168 Overall, 174 (32.2%) were tested positive on AG-rt and 213 (39.4%) on rt-PCR (Figure 1). AG
169 correctly classified 91.7% [95%CI 89.0-93.9] of all rt-PCR positive cases with a sensitivity of
170 80.3% [95%CI 74.3-85.4], specificity of 99.1% [95%CI 97.4-99.8], PPV of 98.3 [95%CI 94.7-
171 99.4], NPV of 88.6% [95%CI 85.5-91.0], LR(+) of 87.8 [28.4-271.3], and LR(-) 0.20 [0.15-
172 0.26].
173



174

175 **Fig. 1** Overall testing outcome

176

177 There were only three of 541 patients (0.6%) including two female aged 87 and 57 years and one
178 59-year old male with false positive AG-rt results. All three patients presented within five days
179 of first symptoms' onset with fever and cough and one additionally with dyspnoea.

180 The false negative tested patients (7.8%; ED: 30 and PHC: 12) included 50% females with an
181 average age of 53.0±17.2 years, the following symptoms: fever (n=29); cough (n=27); sore throat
182 (n=12); dyspnoea (n=12); and dysgeusia/anosmia (n= 5) with a median symptom onset of 3
183 (range, 0-14 days), and an average Ct of 31.2±3.9.

184 Sensitivity and specificity were similar regarding gender (female: 81.1% and 99.0%; male:
185 79.4% and 99.3%) and symptoms (fever: 79.0% and 97.6%; cough: 78.2% and 97.9%; dyspnoea:
186 79.0% and 98.8%; sore throat: 80.0% and 100.0%). Prevalence of the disease (positive rt-PCR
187 test) was 36.8% in female and 42.7% in male patients; in patients aged 18 to 45 years, 46 to 65
188 years, and older than 65 years, the prevalence was 33.9%, 45.7%, and 42.1%, respectively
189 (Supplement Table S1).

190

191 Diagnostic performance of the AG-rt at ED and PHC are presented in Table 2. Interestingly,
 192 sensitivity was lower and there were more than twice false negatives in ED compared to PHC.

193

194 **Table 2 Diagnostic performance of the antigen rapid test (AG-rt) at emergency**
 195 **departments (ED) and primary healthcare centres (PHC).**

	ED (n=296)	PHC (n=245)
True positive n (%)	106 (35.8)	65 (26.5)
False positive n (%)	3 (1.0)	0
False negative n (%)	30 (10.1)	12 (4.9)
True negative n (%)	157 (53.1)	168 (68.6)
Disease prevalence (%)	46.0	31.4
[95% CI]	[40.2-51.8]	[25.7-37.7]
Accuracy (%)	88.9	95.1
[95% CI]	[84.7-92.2]	[91.6-97.4]
Sensitivity (%)	77.9	84.4
[95% CI]	[70.0-84.6]	[74.4-91.7]
Specificity (%)	98.1	100
[95% CI]	[94.6-99.6]	[97.8-100.0]
PPV (%)	97.3	100
[95% CI]	[92.0-99.1]	
NPV (%)	84.0	93.3
[95% CI]	[79.2-87.8]	[89.3-95.9]
LR(+)	41.6	-
[95% CI]	[13.5-128.0]	
LR(-)	0.22	0.16
[95% CI]	[0.16-0.31]	[0.09-0.26]


196 Abbreviation: CI, confidence interval; ED, emergency departments; LR, likelihood ratio; n,
 197 numbers; NPV, negative predictive value; PHC, primary health care centres; PPV, positive
 198 predictive value.

199

200

201 Sensitivities between ED and PHC regarding days of symptom onset are presented in Figure 2.

202



203

204 **Figure 2** Sensitivities (in % with 95% confidence interval in parenthesis) between ED and PHC

205 regarding days of symptom onset.

206 The majority of patients (72.6%) was tested within the first three days after symptom onset.
 207 Symptom onset within 3 days and between 4 and 7 days showed a sensitivity above 80%, while
 208 onset of symptoms between 8 and 14 days was associated with a far less sensitivity. However,
 209 days of onset did not correlate with Ct (Spearman’s rho=0.109; p=0.124). Details regarding
 210 diagnostic performance of the AG-rt according symptom onset are presented in Table 3.

211


212 **Table 3** Diagnostic performance of the antigen rapid test (AG-rt) according symptom(s) onset.

AG-rt (n=541)	Onset within 3 days (n=393)	Onset 4-7 days (n=98)	Onset 8-14 days (n=50)
True positive n (%)	116 (29.5)	40 (40.8)	15 (30.0)
False positive n (%)	1 (0.3)	2 (2.0)	0
False negative n (%)	24 (6.1)	9 (9.2)	9 (18.0)
True negative n (%)	252 (64.1)	47 (48.0)	26 (52.0)
Disease prevalence (%) [95% CI]	35.6 [30.9-40.6]	50.0 [39.7-60.3]	48.0 [33.7-62.6]
Accuracy (%) [95% CI]	93.6 [90.8-95.8]	88.8 [80.8-94.3]	82.0 [68.6-91.4]
Sensitivity (%) [95% CI]	82.9 [75.6-88.7]	81.6 [68.0-91.2]	62.5 [40.6-81.2]
Specificity (%) [95% CI]	99.6 [97.8-100.0]	95.9 [86.0-99.5]	100.0 [86.8-100.0]
PPV (%) [95% CI]	99.2 [94.3-99.9]	95.2 [83.6-98.7]	100
NPV (%) [95% CI]	91.3 [87.9-93.8]	83.9 [74.3-90.4]	74.3 [63.3-82.9]
LR(+) [95% CI]	209.6 [29.6-1484.6]	20.0 [5.1-78.2]	-
LR(-) [95% CI]	0.17 [0.12-0.25]	0.19 [0.11-0.35]	0.38 [0.22-0.63]

213 Abbreviation: AG-rt, antigen rapid test; CI, confidence interval; LR, likelihood ratio; n,
 214 numbers; NPV, negative predictive value; PPV, positive predictive value.

215

216 Sensitivities between ED and PHC regarding rt-PCR cut offs at 20, 25, 30, and 40 are presented
217 in Figure 3.
218



219

220 **Figure 3** Sensitivities (in % with 95% confidence interval in parenthesis) between ED and PHC
221 regarding rt-PCR cut offs.
222

223 Diagnostic performance of the AG-rt with rt-PCR cut-offs defined as positive (Ct = 1-39)
 224 and negative (Ct > 40), and at Ct values of 30, 25, and 20 are presented in Table 4. The
 225 highest sensitivity and specificity was detected when using Ct of 30 as cut-off.

226

227 **Table 4** Diagnostic performance of the antigen rapid test (AG-rt) according to various cut-offs.

AG-rt (n=532*)	rt-PCR	rt-PCR Ct30	rt-PCR Ct25	rt-PCR Ct20
Cut-off				
positive	Ct = 1-39	Ct ≤ 30	Ct ≤ 25	Ct ≤ 20
negative	Ct > 40	Ct > 30	Ct > 25	Ct > 20
True positive n (%)	165 (31.0)	160 (30.1)	123 (23.1)	51 (9.6)
False positive n (%)	3 (0.6)	8 (1.5)	45 (8.5)	117 (22.0)
False negative n (%)	37 (7.0)	13 (2.4)	2 (0.4)	0
True negative n (%)	327 (61.4)	351 (66.0)	362 (68.0)	364 (68.4)
Disease prevalence (%)	38.0	32.5	23.5	9.6
[95% CI]	[33.8-42.3]	[28.6-36.7]	[20.0-27.3]	[7.2-12.4]
Accuracy (%)	92.5	96.1	91.2	78.0
[95% CI]	[89.9-94.6]	[94.0-97.5]	[88.4-93.4]	[74.2-81.5]
Sensitivity (%)	81.7	92.5	98.4	100
[95% CI]	[75.7-86.8]	[87.5-95.9]	[94.3-99.8]	[93.0-100.0]
Specificity (%)	99.1	97.8	88.9	75.7
[95% CI]	[97.4-99.8]	[95.7-99.0]	[85.5-91.8]	[71.6-79.5]
PPV (%)	98.2	95.2	73.2	30.4
[95% CI]	[94.7-99.4]	[91.0-97.6]	[67.5-78.3]	[27.1-33.8]
NPV (%)	89.8	96.4	99.5	100
[95% CI]	[86.9-92.2]	[94.1-97.9]	[97.9-99.9]	
LR(+)	89.9	41.5	8.9	4.1
[95% CI]	[29.1-277.7]	[20.9-82.5]	[6.8-11.7]	[3.5-4.8]
LR(-)	0.18	0.08	0.02	0
[95% CI]	[0.14-0.25]	[0.05-0.13]	[0.00-0.07]	

228 Abbreviation: AG-rt, antigen rapid test; CI, confidence interval; Ct, cycle threshold; LR,
 229 likelihood ratio; n, numbers; NPV, negative predictive value; PPV, positive predictive value; rt-
 230 PCR, reverse transcription polymerase chain reaction.

231 * No Ct was available in 11 samples.


232

233

234 Furthermore, significant lower Ct values were detected between TP (n=165; 22.2±4.2) and FN

235 (n=37; 31.2±3.9; p<0.001; Figure 4).

236



237

238 **Figure 4** Boxplot showing cycle threshold (Ct) values of true positive (n=165) and false negative

239 (n=37).

240

241

242 **DISCUSSION**

243 Rt-PCR testing is the gold-standard procedure for SARS-CoV-2 infection. As its results are often
244 not rapidly or timely available for every patient, the use of rt-PCR all too often is not adequate
245 neither in emergency departments nor in general practitioner's settings. Patient's flows are
246 crucial in the management of the disease, and so is the diagnostic flow in medical institutions
247 such as emergency departments or primary health care centres.

248 We found the SARS-CoV-2 Rapid Antigen Test (Roche Diagnostics) to produce an overall
249 sensitivity of 80.3% and specificity of 99.1% compared with rt-PCR, both in emergency
250 departments and primary health care centres. From symptom onset days 0 to 7, the sensitivity
251 was much better with 82.2%, whereas it reached 62.5% with disease onset from days 8 to 14.
252 Sensitivities were higher with lower PCR cycle threshold numbers.

253 Our results differ from the numbers claimed by the manufacturer, who reported a sensitivity of
254 96.5% and a specificity of 99.7%, who might have used specimens displaying higher viral
255 loads.[11]

256 Sensitivities of antigen assays in previously published trials including a meta-analysis showed a
257 wide range from 45% to 86%. [9, 10, 12-14] Direct comparison exposes varieties in test systems,
258 onset of disease, performance of the procedure, presence of symptoms, testing institutions, and
259 others. Notably, in our trial results including sensitivities and specificities differed between ED
260 and PHC. We did not find a conclusive explanation for this fact; staffs and their respective
261 training did not differ in any of the centres substantially.

262 Only in few patients (0.6%) a false positive result was detected with the IVD compared to PCR
263 testing. The implication of this number however, is that those patients obviously apparently are
264 to be sequestered into quarantine jointly with patients with true positive results, as long as PCR
265 test results are pending. This requires a careful epidemiological reflection, when mass testing is
266 performed.

267 The rate of false negative patients remained under 10%. None of these patients (n=37) had a Ct
268 under 22; in 4 patients a Ct of 23 to 25, and in a further 8 patients a Ct of 27 to 30 was detected;
269 all other patients (n=25) had a Ct above 30. This underlines the correlation of a virus detection
270 by means of the device and the viral load.

271 One of the limitations is the sole inclusion of symptomatic cases and not asymptomatic persons.
272 Actually, the purpose of the device under investigation is indeed the testing of symptomatic
273 persons with a suspected SARS-CoV-2 infection, which corresponds to the approval of the
274 device. No severity of symptoms and progress was considered for our trial.
275 Additionally, despite being considered as the gold standard, PCR testing is not 100% accurate
276 and test quality crucially depends on the quality of manual sampling of specimen.[15]

277

278 **CONCLUSION**

279 This prospective study demonstrated a performance of the SARS-CoV-2 Rapid Antigen Test
280 (Roche Diagnostics) with an overall sensitivity of 80.3% compared to rt-PCR, which, in case of
281 a negative result, needs to be interpreted together with the duration of the disease at the time of
282 testing, the viral load, and likely the diligence of the generation of the specimen.

283

284 **FUNDING**

285 Roche diagnostics provided the SARS-CoV-2 Rapid Antigen Test (Roche Diagnostics).

286 All authors declare that they have no conflict of interest. Our group received funding for this

287 research project from Roche Diagnostics.

288

289 REFERENCES

- 290 1. Wang Y, Kang H, Liu X, Tong Z. Combination of RT-qPCR testing and clinical features
291 for diagnosis of COVID-19 facilitates management of SARS-CoV-2 outbreak. *J Med*
292 *Viro* **2020**; 92(6): 538-9.
- 293 2. CDC. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. ARS-CoV-2 Testing Strategy:
294 Considerations for Non-Healthcare Workplaces. 21 October 2020.
- 295 3. ECDC. European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control. COVID-19 testing
296 strategies and objectives. 15 September 2020.
- 297 4. Okba NMA, Muller MA, Li W, et al. Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus
298 2-Specific Antibody Responses in Coronavirus Disease Patients. *Emerg Infect Dis* **2020**;
299 26(7): 1478-88.
- 300 5. Tang YW, Schmitz JE, Persing DH, Stratton CW. Laboratory Diagnosis of COVID-19:
301 Current Issues and Challenges. *J Clin Microbiol* **2020**; 58(6).
- 302 6. Xu Y, Xiao M, Liu X, et al. Significance of serology testing to assist timely diagnosis of
303 SARS-CoV-2 infections: implication from a family cluster. *Emerg Microbes Infect* **2020**;
304 9(1): 924-7.
- 305 7. Hirotsu Y, Maejima M, Shibusawa M, et al. Comparison of automated SARS-CoV-2
306 antigen test for COVID-19 infection with quantitative RT-PCR using 313
307 nasopharyngeal swabs, including from seven serially followed patients. *Int J Infect Dis*
308 **2020**; 99: 397-402.
- 309 8. Lambert-Niclot S, Cuffel A, Le Pape S, et al. Evaluation of a Rapid Diagnostic Assay for
310 Detection of SARS-CoV-2 Antigen in Nasopharyngeal Swabs. *J Clin Microbiol* **2020**;
311 58(8).
- 312 9. Dinnes J, Deeks JJ, Adriano A, et al. Rapid, point-of-care antigen and molecular-based
313 tests for diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2 infection. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* **2020**; 8:
314 CD013705.

- 315 10. Porte L, Legarraga P, Vollrath V, et al. Evaluation of a novel antigen-based rapid
316 detection test for the diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2 in respiratory samples. *Int J Infect Dis*
317 **2020**; 99: 328-33.
- 318 11. Roche. [https://www.roche.de/res/content/11722/40338-2_onepager_sars-cov-](https://www.roche.de/res/content/11722/40338-2_onepager_sars-cov-2_a4_v2_low_ksc.pdf)
319 [2_a4_v2_low_ksc.pdf](https://www.roche.de/res/content/11722/40338-2_onepager_sars-cov-2_a4_v2_low_ksc.pdf).
- 320 12. Cerutti F, Burdino E, Milia MG, et al. Urgent need of rapid tests for SARS CoV-2
321 antigen detection: Evaluation of the SD-Biosensor antigen test for SARS-CoV-2. *J Clin*
322 *Viro* **2020**; 132: 104654.
- 323 13. Linares M, Perez-Tanoira R, Carrero A, et al. Panbio antigen rapid test is reliable to
324 diagnose SARS-CoV-2 infection in the first 7 days after the onset of symptoms. *J Clin*
325 *Viro* **2020**; 133: 104659.
- 326 14. Young S, Taylor SN, Cammarata CL, et al. Clinical Evaluation of BD Veritor SARS-
327 CoV-2 Point-of-Care Test Performance Compared to PCR-Based Testing and versus the
328 Sofia 2 SARS Antigen Point-of-Care Test. *J Clin Microbiol* **2020**; 59(1).
- 329 15. <https://www.idsociety.org/practice-guideline/covid-19-guideline-diagnostics/>. Accessed
330 02.02.2021.
- 331
- 332