

1 **Multicenter evaluation of a fully automated high-throughput SARS-CoV-2**  
2 **antigen immunoassay**

3

4 Dominik Nörz<sup>a\*</sup>, Flaminia Olearo<sup>a\*</sup>, Stojan Perisic<sup>b</sup>, Matthias F. Bauer<sup>c</sup>, Elena Riester<sup>d</sup>, Tanja  
5 Schneider<sup>e</sup>, Kathrin Schönfeld<sup>e</sup>, Tina Laengin<sup>e</sup>, and Marc Lütgehetmann<sup>a</sup>

6

7 <sup>a</sup>Center for Diagnostics, Institute of Medical Microbiology, Virology and Hygiene, University Medical  
8 Center Hamburg-Eppendorf (UKE), Hamburg, Germany

9 <sup>b</sup>Hospital of Stuttgart, Institute for Clinical Chemistry and Laboratory Medicine, Stuttgart, Germany

10 <sup>c</sup>Hospital of Ludwigshafen, Institute for Laboratory Medicine, Ludwigshafen, Germany

11 <sup>d</sup>Labor Augsburg MVZ GmbH, Augsburg, Germany

12 <sup>e</sup>Roche Diagnostics GmbH, Penzberg, Germany

13

14 \*Contributed equally to this work

15

16 **Corresponding author:**

17 Marc Lütgehetmann

18 Institute of Medical Microbiology, Virology and Hygiene

19 Martinstraße 52

20 D-20246 Hamburg

21 [mluetgeh@uke.de](mailto:mluetgeh@uke.de)

22

23 **Running title:** SARS-CoV-2 antigen immunoassay

## 24 **ABSTRACT**

25 **Introduction:** Molecular testing for SARS-CoV-2 continues to suffer from delays and  
26 shortages. Antigen tests have recently emerged as a viable alternative to detect patients  
27 with high viral loads, associated with elevated risk of transmission. While rapid lateral flow  
28 tests greatly improved accessibility of SARS-CoV-2 detection in critical areas, their manual  
29 nature limits scalability and suitability for large-scale testing schemes. The Elecsys® SARS-  
30 CoV-2 Antigen assay allows antigen immunoassays to be carried out on fully automated  
31 high-throughput serology platforms. **Methods:** A total of 3139 nasopharyngeal and  
32 oropharyngeal swabs were collected at 3 different testing sites in Germany. Swab samples  
33 were pre-characterized by RT-qPCR and consecutively subjected to the antigen  
34 immunoassay on either the cobas e 411 or cobas e 801 analyzers. **Results:** Of the tested  
35 respiratory samples, 392 were PCR positive for SARS-CoV-2 RNA. Median concentration was  
36  $2.95 \times 10^4$  (interquartile range [IQR]  $5.1 \times 10^2$ – $3.5 \times 10^6$ ) copies/mL. Overall sensitivity and  
37 specificity of the antigen immunoassay were 60.2% (95% confidence interval [CI] 55.2–65.1)  
38 and 99.9% (95% CI 99.6–100), respectively. A 93.7% (95% CI 89.7–96.5) sensitivity was  
39 achieved at a viral RNA concentration  $\geq 10^4$  copies/mL (~cycle threshold (Ct) value <29.9).  
40 **Conclusion:** The Elecsys SARS-CoV-2 Antigen assay reliably detected patient samples with  
41 viral loads of 10,000 copies/mL and higher. It thus represents a viable high-throughput  
42 alternative for screening of patients, or in situations where PCR testing is not readily  
43 available.

44 **Keywords:** Antigen immunoassay; High-throughput platform; SARS-CoV-2

45

46 **Key Summary Points:**

47 *Why carry out this study?*

- 48       • The SARS-CoV-2 pandemic has led to a surge in demand for reliable, mass diagnostic  
49       tests worldwide.
- 50       • A thorough clinical evaluation of a fully automated high-throughput Elecsys® SARS-  
51       CoV-2 Antigen assay on a total of 3139 clinical samples pre-characterized by  
52       quantitative RT-PCR was carried out.

53 *What was learned from the study?*

- 54       • The assay demonstrated excellent specificity (99.9%) and good relative sensitivity,  
55       with an overall sensitivity of 60.2% and a sensitivity of 93.7% for samples containing  
56        $\geq 10^4$  viral RNA copies/mL.
- 57       • The Elecsys SARS-CoV-2 Antigen assay is a viable high-throughput, automated  
58       alternative to manual lateral-flow antigen tests.

59

## 60 INTRODUCTION

61 RT-qPCR remains the gold standard for detection of SARS-CoV-2 in clinical specimens due to  
62 its unparalleled analytic accuracy [1, 2]. However, the sudden surge in demand for molecular  
63 testing continues to overstretch the capacity of both diagnostic laboratories and reagent  
64 suppliers, leading to reporting delays and sometimes inadequate availability of testing where  
65 it is urgently needed. SARS-CoV-2 antigen immunoassays have recently emerged as an  
66 alternative to nucleic acid amplification tests, most prolifically in the form of rapid, point-of-  
67 care, lateral flow tests (LFTs) [3-5]. Despite their inherent disadvantage in sensitivity  
68 compared with PCR, mathematical modeling suggests that tests could be effective for  
69 infection control if appropriate testing frequency were adopted [6]. Using currently available  
70 rapid antigen tests for mass testing does however bring about additional challenges, as this  
71 assay format is highly manual in nature and largely unsuitable for automation. Moving the  
72 SARS-CoV-2 antigen assay from LFT to a high-throughput immunoanalyzer using  
73 electrochemiluminescence detection technology could improve those issues, while further  
74 increasing overall testing capacity. The aim of this study was to evaluate the sensitivity and  
75 specificity of the new fully automated Elecsys® SARS-CoV-2 Antigen assay, using samples  
76 characterized by the gold standard: RT-qPCR.

77

## 78 METHODS

### 79 Samples

80 In this multicenter study, nasopharyngeal and oropharyngeal samples were tested following  
81 routine diagnostics at the University Medical Center Hamburg-Eppendorf, the Hospital of

82 Stuttgart, and Hospital Ludwigshafen (**Table S1**). Overall, the study comprised a total of 3139  
83 nasopharyngeal and oropharyngeal swab samples, including 1331 samples from the Hospital  
84 of Stuttgart, 1058 samples from University Medical Center Hamburg-Eppendorf, and 647  
85 samples from Hospital Ludwigshafen, as well as 103 banked nasopharyngeal samples in  
86 universal viral transport (UVT) system from a commercial vendor (Boca Biolistics, Pompano  
87 Beach, FL, USA). Specimens were collected in November 2020, in 3 mL of Copan Universal  
88 Transport Medium (UTM-RT, Copan, Brescia, Italy) or BD Universal Viral Transport (UVT,  
89 Becton, Dickinson, Sparks, MD, USA) using flocked swabs.

90 This study was conducted in accordance with applicable regulations, the study protocol  
91 provided by Roche Diagnostics, and the principles of the Declaration of Helsinki. The use of  
92 anonymized remnant samples material was approved by ethical review committees prior to  
93 study initiation (ethics committee names and approval numbers: Ethik-Kommission bei der  
94 Landesärztekammer Baden-Württemberg; F-2020-154 [Stuttgart]; Ethik-Kommission der  
95 Ärztekammer Hamburg; WF-184/20 [Hamburg]; Ethik-Kommission bei der  
96 Landesärztekammer Rheinland-Pfalz: 2020-15449[Ludwigshafen]).

97

## 98 **Antigen Assay and RT-qPCR**

99 Antigen detection was performed at two testing sites (University Medical Center Hamburg-  
100 Eppendorf (UKE) and testing site of Augsburg) using the Elecsys SARS-CoV-2 Antigen assay on  
101 the cobas e 411 and cobas e 801 immunoanalyzers. The Elecsys SARS-CoV-2 Antigen assay  
102 (Roche Diagnostics International Ltd, Rotkreuz, Switzerland) is an automated  
103 electrochemiluminescence immunoassay (ECLIA), developed for *in vitro* qualitative detection  
104 of SARS-CoV-2 antigen. It utilizes monoclonal antibodies directed against the SARS-CoV-2

105 nucleocapsid protein in an antibody sandwich assay format for the detection of SARS-CoV-2  
106 in upper respiratory tract specimens [7]. The time to result for the assay can be as little as 18  
107 minutes, and the analyzer automatically calculates a cut-off based on the measurement of  
108 two calibrators: one negative (COV2AG Cal1) and one positive (COV2AG Cal2). The results  
109 obtained are interpreted as recommended by the manufacturer as either 'reactive' or 'non-  
110 reactive' in the form of a cut-off index (COI), i.e. 'non-reactive' if COI <1.0 or 'reactive' if COI  
111 ≥1.0.

112 RT-qPCR testing was performed with the qualitative cobas® SARS-CoV-2 assay on the cobas®  
113 6800 system (Roche Molecular Systems, Inc., Branchburg, NJ, USA), according to  
114 manufacturer's instructions [8]. Quantification was performed using cycle threshold (Ct)  
115 values of Target-2 (envelope protein coding gene) [9] using reference material by Qnostics  
116 Ltd. (Glasgow, UK) as the quantification standard. The formula for conversion Ct value to  
117 log<sub>10</sub> copies/mL is (Ct × -0.30769) +13.2. The lower limit of quantification was set to Ct=33  
118 corresponding to 1000 copies SARS-CoV-2 RNA/mL, in accordance with previous studies [9].  
119 It has to be noted that the PCR test and quantification standard used for generating  
120 quantitative results were not recommended for this purpose by the respective  
121 manufacturers and reliability is expected to be lower than commercial quantitative solutions  
122 once they become available, which represents a limitation of this study.

123

## 124 **Statistical Analysis**

125 Sensitivity and specificity, including 95% confidence intervals (CIs), were assessed as per  
126 Altman [10]. Pearson correlation was used for linear regression. The significance threshold

127 was set at a two-sided alpha value of 0.05. Statistical analysis was performed with STATA  
128 (version 15) and GraphPad Prism (version 86 9.0.0).

129

### 130 **Data availability**

131 Qualified researchers may request access to individual patient level data through the clinical  
132 study data request platform (<https://vivli.org/>). Further details on Roche's criteria for eligible  
133 studies are available here: <https://vivli.org/members/ourmembers/>. For further details on  
134 Roche's Global Policy on the Sharing of Clinical Information and how to request access to  
135 related clinical study documents, see here:

136 [https://www.roche.com/research\\_and\\_development/who\\_we\\_are\\_how\\_we\\_work/clinical  
137 trials/our\\_commitment\\_to\\_data\\_sharing.htm](https://www.roche.com/research_and_development/who_we_are_how_we_work/clinical_trials/our_commitment_to_data_sharing.htm).

138

### 139 **RESULTS**

140 A total of 3139 respiratory samples were analyzed in this study (**Table S1**). Three hundred  
141 and ninety-two samples were SARS-CoV-2 RNA positive and 2747 samples were SARS-CoV-2  
142 RNA negative. For PCR-positive samples, 79/392 (20.2%) patients were asymptomatic and  
143 79.8% (313/392) were symptomatic, with 47.6% (149/313) of samples collected within the  
144 first 5 days of symptom onset. The median concentration of viral RNA was  $2.95 \times 10^4$  SARS-  
145 CoV-2 copies/mL (interquartile range [IQR]  $5.1 \times 10^2$ – $3.5 \times 10^6$  SARS-CoV-2 RNA copies/mL;  
146 **Fig. 1a**). In total, 236/392 samples were detected as reactive for SARS-CoV-2 antigen with  
147 the Elecsys assay, with a median COI value of 46.0 (IQR 6.0–701.3). Distribution of the results  
148 for the PCR-positive and PCR-negative groups is shown in **Fig. 1b**. The overall sensitivity and

149 specificity were 60.2% (95% CI 55.2–65.1, number of samples [N]=392) and 99.9% (95% CI  
150 99.6–100, N=2747), respectively (**Table 1**). The cumulative sensitivity was 93.7%, 100%, and  
151 100% for samples with >10,000 copies (~Ct <29.9), 100,000 copies (~Ct <26.6), and 1,000,000  
152 copies (~Ct <23.0) (**Table 1**), respectively.

153 For samples from symptomatic patients, the assay reached an overall relative sensitivity of  
154 68.4% (95% CI 62.9–73.5, N=313), increasing to 83.2% (95% CI 76.2–88.8, N=149) if  
155 symptoms had manifested within the last 5 days (**Table S2**). On the other hand, the overall  
156 sensitivity observed in asymptomatic patients was only 27.8% (95% CI 18.3–39.1, N=79).  
157 Relative sensitivities corresponded with high RNA levels and gradually decreased as RNA  
158 levels decreased. A considerable increase in sensitivity was observed when analysis was  
159 limited to samples containing >10,000 copies/mL, reaching 95.9% (95% CI 92.2–98.2, N=197)  
160 for symptomatic patients and 76.9% (95% CI 56.4–91.0, N=26) for asymptomatic patients  
161 (**Table S2**).

162 To analyze the overall assay performance, samples were sorted by SARS-CoV-2 RNA  
163 copies/mL and individual sensitivities calculated for sets of 20 samples (shown using a heat  
164 map in **Fig. 2A**). Of note, the sensitivity of the assay was 95% and 50% at concentrations of  
165 around  $2 \times 10^5$  and  $2 \times 10^4$ – $5 \times 10^3$  viral copies/mL, respectively, but <10% for samples with  $<10^3$   
166 copies/mL. When the analysis was focused on samples containing RNA levels beyond 95%  
167 sensitivity of the immunoassay (10,000 copies/mL; Ct <29.9), a significant linear correlation  
168 was observed between the Elecsys SARS-CoV-2 Antigen assay COI value and SARS-CoV-2 RNA  
169 copies/mL ( $p < 0.0001$ ;  $r^2 = 0.786$ ; **Fig. 2B**). Also, in this group, a sensitivity of 98.3% (95% CI  
170 94.0–99.8) was achieved in the sub-analysis of patients tested less than 5 days after  
171 symptom onset.



## 172 **DISCUSSION**

173 The introduction of rapid SARS-CoV-2 antigen testing into the market was met with a lot of  
174 initial enthusiasm due to the promise of broad availability and easy application. While there  
175 are many different methods for antigen detection in clinical practice, such as enzyme-linked  
176 immunosorbent assays and ECLIA, the first wave of commercial tests consisted  
177 predominantly of rapid, point-of-care LFTs with optical read-outs. Preliminary performance  
178 data demonstrated good sensitivity in high-viral-load samples, but low concentrations of  
179 virus are frequently missed, thus leading to the sobering conclusion that antigen tests  
180 cannot provide the same definitive results as RT-qPCR [5, 11-13]. Although PCR tests are  
181 analytically superior, their effectiveness for infection control has often been hampered by  
182 supply shortages and reporting delays.

183 Recent studies have shown a correlation between the probability of recovering infectious  
184 virus from clinical samples and the time of onset of symptoms, as well as RNA  
185 concentrations ( $>1 \times 10^6$  copies/mL) within the specimen [14, 15]. This suggests that the risk  
186 of transmission is highest during the early stages of disease, when viral titers are at their  
187 peak, which would also facilitate detection by antigen test. A recent study by McKay et al.  
188 [16] demonstrated good correlation between positive antigen-test and positive viral culture;  
189 however, negative viral culture should not be misinterpreted as a reliable indicator for ruling  
190 out transmission risk. It has further been suggested that a low sensitivity test can be just as  
191 effective at detecting infections as a highly sensitive one, if testing can be made possible at  
192 increased frequency [6]. Most currently available SARS-CoV-2 antigen tests utilize a rapid,  
193 point-of-care LFT format, thus relying on a high degree of human interaction. They are  
194 unsuitable for automation and additional human operators are required at the same

195 proportion as testing capacity is scaled up. While there are clear benefits of a point-of-care  
196 test that can be carried out with minimal training and requiring no specialized equipment  
197 [17], testing en masse (e.g. in healthcare facilities) is vastly more efficient when performed  
198 automatically using high-throughput immunoassay platforms.

199 In this study, we stratified samples to assess the relative sensitivity of the new Elecsys SARS-  
200 CoV-2 Antigen assay for the cobas immunoassay analyzer systems using the gold standard,  
201 RT-qPCR. Although the overall relative sensitivity for the entire sample set was 60.2%,  
202 among those patients that were tested in the first 5 days from the onset of symptoms, the  
203 sensitivity increased to 83.2%. Furthermore, the Elecsys SARS-CoV-2 Antigen assay was able  
204 to detect 93.7% of patients with elevated risk of transmission (Ct <30 and accordingly  
205 c(RNA) > 10,000 copies/mL). Overall relative specificity was determined as 99.9% in a total of  
206 2747 negative samples. These results are in line with existing preliminary data on the clinical  
207 performance of other available SARS-CoV-2 antigen tests [12, 18], including other high-  
208 throughput SARS-CoV-2 antigen tests like the Lumipulse [19], demonstrating a cumulative  
209 sensitivity of 55.2% compared with PCR.

210 The main limitation of the present study is that it is not a head-to-head comparison of the  
211 different systems on the market, and future investigation is needed to address this concern.  
212 However, the high-throughput Elecsys SARS-CoV-2 Antigen assay might be a valuable  
213 analytic option in the coming months in the struggle to control the pandemic.

214

## 215 **CONCLUSIONS**

216 The novel Elecsys SARS-CoV-2 Antigen immunoassay showed good performance in a broad  
217 set of clinical samples compared to RT-PCR. It demonstrated a high reliability in detecting

218 samples containing high concentrations of viral RNA, indicative of high transmission  
219 potential. Furthermore, a relative specificity of 99.9% ensures a minimal rate of false-  
220 positives, consequently saving resources on confirmation-testing and unnecessary  
221 quarantine. The ability to run the test on high-throughput immunoassay platforms, and a  
222 time-to-result of approximately 18 minutes, allow for en masse deployment of SARS-CoV-2  
223 antigen testing, for example in the context of centralized large-scale testing schemes.

224

## 225 **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

226 **Funding.** This study was funded by Roche Diagnostics GmbH (Mannheim, Germany).

227

228 **Authorship.** All named authors meet the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors  
229 (ICMJE) criteria for authorship for this article, take responsibility for the integrity of the work  
230 as a whole, and have given their approval for this version to be published.

231

232 **Authorship Contributions.** Tina Laengin, Tanja Schneider, and Kathrin Schönfeld developed  
233 the study conceptualization and design and study protocol, and managed the study conduct,  
234 database generation and data validation. Marc Lütgehetmann, Stojan Perisic, and Matthias  
235 F. Bauer provided sample material and Marc Lütgehetmann, Stojan Perisic, and Elena Riester  
236 generated data during study testing. Marc Lütgehetmann, Tanja Schneider, and Tina Laengin  
237 conceived the original idea of the manuscript. Dominik Nörz, Flaminia Olearo, Marc  
238 Lütgehetmann, and Tanja Schneider formally analyzed the data and its representations for  
239 the manuscript. Dominik Nörz, Marc Lütgehetmann, and Flaminia Olearo drafted the

240 manuscript and interpreted the data with critical input from Tanja Schneider and Tina  
241 Laengin. All authors reviewed and revised the manuscript and approved it for publication.

242

243 **Medical Writing, Editorial, and Other Assistance.** The authors thank: Serology team of the  
244 University Medical Center Hamburg-Eppendorf, Institute of Medical Microbiology, Virology  
245 and Hygiene; the laboratory team of the Institute of Laboratory Diagnostics, Hygiene and  
246 Transfusion Medicine at the Klinikum Ludwigshafen; the Corona specimen acquisition team  
247 and its Coordinator Mr. OA Christian Menzel (Clinic of Stuttgart), Corona testing facility team  
248 (Clinic of Stuttgart) as well as Ms. Pauline Weissleder and Ms. Sina Semenowitsch (Clinic of  
249 Stuttgart) for great help with specimen handling and data processing; Sigrid Reichhuber,  
250 Janina Edion, and Yvonne Knack (Roche Diagnostics) for management of investigation sites,  
251 data acquisition, and study monitoring. Medical writing support, under the direction of the  
252 authors, was provided by Tina Patrick (Elements Communications Ltd, Westerham, Kent, UK)  
253 and was funded by Roche Diagnostics International Ltd, Rotkreuz, Switzerland.

254 COBAS, COBAS E and ELECSYS are trademarks of Roche.

255

256 **Disclosures.** Tanja Schneider, Kathrin Schönfeld, and Tina Laengin are employees of Roche  
257 Diagnostics GmbH. Marc Lütgehetmann has received speaker's honoraria and related travel  
258 expenses from Roche Diagnostics. Elena Riestler has received speaker's honorarium from  
259 Roche. Stojan Perisic, Flaminia Olearo, Matthias F. Bauer and Dominik Nörz have no conflicts  
260 to report.

261

262 **Compliance with Ethics Guidelines.** This study was conducted in accordance with applicable  
263 regulations, the study protocol provided by Roche Diagnostics, and the principles of the  
264 Declaration of Helsinki of 1964, and its later amendments. The use of anonymized remnant  
265 samples material was approved by ethical review committees prior to study initiation (ethics  
266 committee names and approval numbers: Ethik-Kommission bei der Landesärztekammer  
267 Baden-Württemberg; F-2020-154 [Stuttgart]; Ethik-Kommission der Ärztekammer Hamburg:  
268 WF-184/20 [Hamburg]; Ethik-Kommission bei der Landesärztekammer Rheinland-Pfalz:  
269 2020-15449[Ludwigshafen]).

270

271 **Data Availability.** The datasets generated during and/or analyzed during the current study  
272 are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

273

274

275      **REFERENCES**

- 276      1.      World Health Organization. Laboratory testing for coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-  
277                    19) in suspected human cases. 2020. [https://www.who.int/publications-](https://www.who.int/publications-detail/laboratory-testing-for-2019-novel-coronavirus-in-suspected-human-cases-20200117)  
278                    [detail/laboratory-testing-for-2019-novel-coronavirus-in-suspected-human-cases-](https://www.who.int/publications-detail/laboratory-testing-for-2019-novel-coronavirus-in-suspected-human-cases-20200117)  
279                    [20200117](https://www.who.int/publications-detail/laboratory-testing-for-2019-novel-coronavirus-in-suspected-human-cases-20200117). Accessed June 04 2021.
- 280      2.      Corman VM, Landt O, Kaiser M, et al. Detection of 2019 novel coronavirus (2019-  
281                    nCoV) by real-time RT-PCR. Euro Surveill 2020;25:2000045.  
282                    <https://doi.org/10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2020.25.3.2000045>.
- 283      3.      Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Interim Guidance for Antigen Testing for  
284                    SARS-CoV-2. 2021. [https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/lab/resources/antigen-tests-guidelines.html)  
285                    [ncov/lab/resources/antigen-tests-guidelines.html](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/lab/resources/antigen-tests-guidelines.html). Accessed June 04 2021.
- 286      4.      Igl̃i Z, Velzing J, van Beek J, et al. Clinical evaluation of the Roche SD Biosensor rapid  
287                    antigen test for SARS-CoV-2 in Municipal Health Service Testing Site, the Netherlands.  
288                    Emerg Infect Dis 2021;27:1323–9. <https://doi.org/10.3201/eid2705.204688>.
- 289      5.      Olearo F, Nörz D, Heinrich F, et al. Handling and accuracy of four rapid antigen tests  
290                    for the diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2 compared to RT-qPCR. J Clin Virol 2021; 137:104782.  
291                    <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcv.2021.104782>.
- 292      6.      Mina MJ, Parker R, Larremore DB. Rethinking covid-19 test sensitivity — a strategy  
293                    for containment. N Engl J Med 2020; 383:e120.  
294                    <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMp2025631>.
- 295      7.      Roche Diagnostics GmbH. Elecsys® Anti-SARS-CoV-2 method sheet v1. 2021.  
296                    [https://diagnostics.roche.com/global/en/products/params/elecsys-anti-sars-cov-](https://diagnostics.roche.com/global/en/products/params/elecsys-anti-sars-cov-2.html)  
297                    [2.html](https://diagnostics.roche.com/global/en/products/params/elecsys-anti-sars-cov-2.html). Accessed June 04 2021.

- 298 8. Roche Molecular Systems Inc. cobas® SARS-CoV-2 Qualitative assay for use on the  
299 cobas® 6800/8800 Systems. 09179917001-05EN. Doc Rev. 5.0.  
300 <https://www.fda.gov/media/136049/download>. Accessed February 11 2021.
- 301 9. Nörz D, Frontzek A, Eigner U, et al. Pushing beyond specifications: Evaluation of  
302 linearity and clinical performance of a fully automated SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR assay for  
303 reliable quantification in blood and other materials outside recommendations. J Clin  
304 Virol 2020;132:104650. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcv.2020.104650>.
- 305 10. Altman DG, Bland JM. Diagnostic tests. 1: Sensitivity and specificity. BMJ 1994;  
306 308:1552. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.308.6943.1552>.
- 307 11. Scohy A, Anantharajah A, Bodéus M, et al. Low performance of rapid antigen  
308 detection test as frontline testing for COVID-19 diagnosis. J Clin Virol  
309 2020;129:104455. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcv.2020.104455>.
- 310 12. Corman VM, Haage VC, Bleicker T, et al. Comparison of seven commercial SARS-CoV-  
311 2 rapid Point-of-Care Antigen tests. Lancet Microbe 2021.  
312 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2666-5247\(21\)00056-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2666-5247(21)00056-2).
- 313 13. Krüger LJ, Gaeddert M, Tobian F, et al. Evaluation of the accuracy and ease-of-use of  
314 Abbott PanBio - A WHO emergency use listed, rapid, antigen-detecting point-of-care  
315 diagnostic test for SARS-CoV-2. PLoS One 2021;16:e0247918.  
316 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0247918>.
- 317 14. Jefferson T, Spencer EA, Brassey J, Heneghan C. Viral cultures for COVID-19 infectious  
318 potential assessment – a systematic review. Clin Infect Dis 2020; ciaa1764.  
319 <https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciaa1764>.

- 320 15. Woelfel R, Corman VM, Guggemos W, et al. Virological assessment of hospitalized  
321 patients with 2019. *Nature* 2020; 581:465–9. [https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-020-](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-020-2196-x)  
322 2196-x.
- 323 16. McKay SL, Tobolowsky FA, Moritz ED, et al. Performance evaluation of serial SARS-  
324 CoV-2 rapid antigen testing during a nursing home outbreak. *Ann Intern Med*  
325 2021;M21-0422. <https://doi.org/10.7326/M21-0422>.
- 326 17. Hoehl S, Schenk B, Rudych O, et al. At-home self-testing of teachers with a SARS-CoV-  
327 2 rapid antigen test to reduce potential transmissions in schools. *medRxiv* 2020.  
328 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.04.20243410>.
- 329 18. Weitzel T, Legarraga P, Iruretagoyena M, et al. Head-to-head comparison of four  
330 antigen-based rapid detection tests for the diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2 in respiratory  
331 samples. *bioRxiv* 2020: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.27.119255>.
- 332 19. Hirotsu Y, Maejima M, Shibusawa M, et al. Comparison of automated SARS-CoV-2  
333 antigen test for COVID-19 infection with quantitative RT-PCR using 313  
334 nasopharyngeal swabs, including from seven serially followed patients. *Int J Infect Dis*  
335 2020;99:397–402. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijid.2020.08.029>.
- 336



337 **Figures and Tables**

338

339 **Figure 1.**

340 **a)** Number of positive samples relative to cobas SARS-CoV-2 PCR titer [copies/mL]; **b)** COI values of  
341 Elecsys SARS-CoV-2 Antigen test from 2747 cobas SARS-CoV-2 PCR-negative and 392 cobas SARS-  
342 CoV-2 PCR-positive samples.

343

344 **Figure 2.**

345 **a)** Elecsys SARS-CoV-2 Antigen assay results in relation to cobas SARS-CoV-2 RNA copies/mL. Dark  
346 blue fields represent positive and light blue fields represent negative Elecsys SARS-CoV-2 Antigen test  
347 results. On left side, sensitivity was calculated every  $\approx 20$  samples included in the interval of the  
348 heatmap (copies/mL); **b)** Correlation between Elecsys SARS-CoV-2 Antigen assay ( $\log_{10}$  [COI], y-axis)  
349 and cobas SARS-CoV-2 PCR assay ( $\log_{10}$  [RNA copies/mL], x-axis). Closed blue circles: measurements  
350 within linear range considered for the trendline and correlation (SARS-CoV-2 RNA  $\geq 10^5$  copies/mL;  
351 COI  $\geq 1$ ). Open blue circles: measurements outside of the linear range of Elecsys SARS-CoV-2 or one  
352 cobas SARS-CoV-2 PCR Target negative, not considered for trendline and correlation.  $p < 0.0001$ ;  
353  $r^2 = 0.786$ .

354 Ag, antigen; COI, cut-off index; Ct, cycle threshold

355

356 **Table 1. Sensitivity and specificity results for the Elecsys SARS-CoV-2 Antigen assay**



357


	<b>cobas SARS-CoV-2 assay</b>	<b>N total</b>	<b>Elecsys SARS-CoV-2 Antigen negative</b>	<b>Elecsys SARS-CoV-2 Antigen positive</b>	<b>Relative sensitivity/specificity, % (95% CI two-sided)</b>
	<b>PCR positive</b>	<b>392</b>	<b>156</b>	<b>236</b>	<b>60.2 (55.2–65.1)</b>
<b>Relative sensitivity</b>	>10 <sup>4</sup> copies/mL (~Ct <29.9)	223	14	209	93.7 (89.7–96.5)
	>10 <sup>5</sup> copies/mL (~Ct <26.6)	171	0	171	100 (97.9–100)
	>10 <sup>6</sup> copies/mL (~Ct <23.0)	122	0	122	100 (97.0–100)
<b>Relative specificity</b>	<b>PCR negative</b>	<b>2747<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>2743</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>99.9 (99.6–100)</b>

358

359 <sup>a</sup>15 samples invalid with cobas SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR, but negative with another SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR test.

360 CI, confidence interval; Ct, cycle threshold; N, number of samples

**a****b**

**a**Relative sensitivity [interval of  $\approx 20$  samples]

Positive Ag test  
Negative Ag test

**b**