

Evaluation of automated antigen detection test for detection of SARS-CoV-2

Gannon CK Mak , Stephen SY Lau , Kitty KY Wong ,
Nancy LS Chow , CS Lau , Ken HL Ng , Edman TK Lam ,
Rickjason CW Chan , Dominic NC Tsang

PII: S0732-8893(21)00183-8
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.diagmicrobio.2021.115490>
Reference: DMB 115490



To appear in: *Diagnostic Microbiology & Infectious Disease*

Received date: 30 April 2021
Revised date: 7 July 2021
Accepted date: 10 July 2021

Please cite this article as: Gannon CK Mak , Stephen SY Lau , Kitty KY Wong , Nancy LS Chow , CS Lau , Ken HL Ng , Edman TK Lam , Rickjason CW Chan , Dominic NC Tsang , Evaluation of automated antigen detection test for detection of SARS-CoV-2, *Diagnostic Microbiology & Infectious Disease* (2021), doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.diagmicrobio.2021.115490>

This is a PDF file of an article that has undergone enhancements after acceptance, such as the addition of a cover page and metadata, and formatting for readability, but it is not yet the definitive version of record. This version will undergo additional copyediting, typesetting and review before it is published in its final form, but we are providing this version to give early visibility of the article. Please note that, during the production process, errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

Evaluation of automated antigen detection test for detection of SARS-CoV-2

Gannon CK Mak*, so_phls10@dh.gov.hk, Stephen SY Lau, Kitty KY Wong, Nancy LS
Chow, CS Lau, Ken HL Ng, Edman TK Lam, Rickjason CW Chan, Dominic NC Tsang

All from Microbiology Division, Public Health Laboratory Services Branch, Centre for
Health Protection, Department of Health, Hong Kong Special Administrative Region

*Correspondence to: 9/F, Public Health Laboratory Centre, 382 Nam Cheong Street, Shek Kip
Mei, Kowloon, Hong Kong Special Administrative Region

Abstract

Background and objective: RT-PCR is the gold standard to detect SARS-CoV-2, however, its
capacity is limited. We evaluated an automated antigen detection (AAD) test, Elecsys
SARS-CoV-2 Antigen (Roche, Germany), for detecting SARS-CoV-2.

Results: We compared the limit of detection (LOD) between AAD, rapid antigen detection
(RAD) test, SARS-CoV-2 Rapid Antigen Test (SD Biosensor, Korea), and in-house RT-PCR
test. LOD results showed that the AAD test was 100 fold more sensitive than the RAD test,
while the sensitivity of the AAD test was comparable to the RT-PCR test. The AAD test
detected between 85.7% and 88.6% of RT-PCR-positive specimens collected from
COVID-19 patients, false negative results were observed for specimens with Ct values >30.

Conclusions: Although clinical sensitivity for the AAD test was not superior or comparable to the RT-PCR test in the present study, the AAD test may be an alternative to RT-PCR in terms of turn-around time and throughput.

Keywords

SARS-CoV-2, COVID-19, Automated Antigen Detection, Rapid Antigen Detection, RT-PCR

1. Introduction

Successful COVID-19 control could only be achieved by widespread testing, contacts tracing and cases isolation. RT-PCR is the gold standard and the most widely used method to detect SARS-CoV-2 [1,2]. For rapid diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2 infection, rapid antigen detection (RAD) assays for qualitative determination of SARS-CoV-2 antigen are available. RAD assays are fast and can be performed by healthcare professional without intensive training and specialized instrument. However, application of these assays are limited to the high viral load samples [3-5]. With the limited capacity of RT-PCR tests, it is not known whether the sudden increased of COVID-19 cases will lead to the increased demand for SARS-CoV-2 diagnosis.

Alternatives have to be sought for other assays which shared similar turn-around time, throughput and even clinical performance with RT-PCR.

The purpose of this evaluation was to evaluate an automated antigen detection (AAD) test in detecting SARS-CoV-2. The first part of the study was to assess the limit of detection (LOD) between AAD, RAD and RT-PCR tests. The second part was to evaluate the performance of AAD in detecting SARS-CoV-2 in different types of respiratory specimens.

2. Methods

2.1 Respiratory isolates

SARS-CoV-2

The dilution set of the SARS-CoV-2 culture isolate (strain hCoV-19/Hong Kong/VM20001097/2020, the first SARS-CoV-2 case detected in Hong Kong) was used to determine LOD between different assays [3]. The sensitivity of different assays can be obtained by measuring the lowest concentration of the culture isolate. RT-PCR was the gold

standard among different assays, the viral load of different dilution points were estimated by the cycle threshold (Ct) values.

To prepare the dilution set, 1:100 dilution was performed for the stock of the culture supernatant. Then, serial tenfold dilution was performed to obtain a dilution set from 10^{-2} to 10^{-8} . Each dilution point was aliquoted and stored at -70°C until further testing.

Non-SARS-CoV-2 respiratory virus isolates

To evaluate the cross-reactivity of the AAD test, 13 non-SARS-CoV-2 respiratory virus isolates were tested. They were influenza A(H1), influenza A(H3), influenza B, adenovirus, coronavirus type OC43, coronavirus type 229E, parainfluenza virus type 1, parainfluenza virus type 2, parainfluenza virus type 3, parainfluenza virus type 4, respiratory syncytial virus, rhinovirus and enterovirus. Except OC43 and 229E, all of the isolates were obtained from our routine culture of respiratory specimens received from other hospitals and clinics. OC43 and 229E were kindly provided by the Department of Microbiology, University of Hong Kong.

2.2 Respiratory specimens

From January 6, 2021 to March 12, 2021, respiratory specimens from COVID-19 patients collected by the Public Health Laboratory Services Branch in Hong Kong were retrieved for this evaluation. All of the specimens were confirmed with SARS-CoV-2 infection by RT-PCR as described [3].

The Ct values used to classify specimens as ‘high viral load’, ‘medium viral load’ and ‘low viral load’ were identical to previous studies, they were <18.57, 18.57-28.67 and >28.67 respectively [4,5].

The types of specimens selected were nasopharyngeal swab (NPS) and combined nasopharyngeal swab and throat swab (NPS & TS). A total of 35 specimens each for NPS and NPS & TS were selected. Since we were out of specimens, there were some minor deviation for the ratio of viral load distribution, 1:2:1, for ‘high viral load’, ‘medium load’ and ‘low viral load’ specimens as described [4].

An additional of 20 NPS specimens collected between September and October 2009, prior to the introduction of SARS-CoV-2, were also included to evaluate the cross-reactivity of the AAD test. These specimens were previously tested positive for influenza viruses.

2.3 Antigen detection kits used

RAD kit

The Roche ‘SARS-CoV-2 Rapid Antigen Test’ (SD Biosensor, Korea) kit was selected in the present study to compare LOD between different assays. This kit was under the ‘WHO Emergency Use Listing for In vitro diagnostics (IVDs) Detecting SARS-CoV-2’ [6]. Another name of this kit was Standard Q COVID-19 Ag. The procedures were carried out according to manufacturer’s instructions.

AAD kit

The 'Elecsys SARS-CoV-2 Antigen' (Roche, Germany) kit was chosen in the present study. The intended use for this kit was for NPS and oropharyngeal swab specimens, 30uL of sample volume was required to transfer to the reaction container. The principles was based on electrochemiluminescence and an analyzer was required. The cobas e 801 analyzer was used in the present study, it has been installed in our setting for performing routine serology tests. There were no hands on procedures except transferring samples to the reaction containers (including the dead volume of the reaction container) and loading them to the analyzer. After starting the test, the results were available in 18 minutes. This instrument allows for continuous loading of samples and a maximum of 300 samples can be loaded. Positive and negative results were automatically outputted from the analyzer and were shown as 'Reactive' or 'Non-reactive'. All of the calculation steps were done by the instrument, the results were calculated by using Cutoff Index (COI). $\text{COI} \geq 1.0$ and < 1.0 were for 'Reactive' and 'Non-reactive' results respectively.

2.4 Sample preparation

All samples tested for the AAD test were inactivated by using 'SARS-CoV-2 Extraction Solution C' (Roche, Germany). To inactivate SARS-CoV-2 samples, the SARS-CoV-2

Extraction Solution C was mixed with samples in 1:10 ratio. Due to the limited quantity for each specimen, 150uL of each sample was used. It means that 15uL SARS-CoV-2 Extraction Solution C was mixed with 150uL samples in the present study. After standing at room temperature for 2 mins, the inactivated samples were transferred to reaction containers and proceeded for the AAD test.

In order to see if there were any effects of 'SARS-CoV-2 Extraction Solution C' on RAD and RT-PCR tests, LOD was determined using inactivated samples and untreated samples.

2.5 RT-PCR

The in-house developed RT-PCR test was used to detect the presence of SARS-CoV-2 nucleic acid in all samples as described previously [3]. It targets the large polyprotein ORF1ab of SARS-CoV-2. Viral RNA amount in respiratory specimens were estimated from cycle threshold (Ct) value.

3. Results

142

143 The LOD of the RAD test was 100 fold less sensitive than SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR test which
 144 was concordant to our previous study. We previously compared the SARS-CoV-2 Rapid
 145 Antigen Test (SD Biosensor, Korea) kit with the in-house RT-PCR test, the SARS-CoV-2
 146 Rapid Antigen Test was 100 fold less sensitive than the in-house RT-PCR test [4]. The LOD
 147 of the AAD test was 10^{-6} which was comparable to RT-PCR test. When comparing the
 148 inactivated samples and un-treated samples, the LOD for RAD and RT-PCR tests remained
 149 the same for these two group of samples (Table 1).

150

151 We also evaluated variability between runs for the AAD test. LOD was performed in two
 152 different days, and the results were the same. The COI values were shown in Table S1.

153

154 Table 1. Comparison of RT-PCR, rapid antigen detection (RAD) and automated antigen
 155 detection (AAD) tests for the limit of detection of SARS-CoV-2.

Dilution ^b	Test results ^a				
	Inactivated samples			Un-treated samples	
	RT-PCR ^c	RAD	AAD	RT-PCR ^c	RAD
10^{-2}	18.78	POS	POS	19.61	POS
10^{-3}	22.86	POS	POS	24.19	POS

10^{-4}	27.47	POS	POS	27.96	POS
10^{-5}	29.74	NEG	POS	31.60	NEG
10^{-6}	36.07	NEG	POS	34.90	NEG
10^{-7}	NEG	ND	NEG	NEG	ND
10^{-8}	NEG	ND	NEG	NEG	ND

^a ND, not done; POS, positive; NEG, negative.

^b Serial tenfold dilution of the SARS-CoV-2 culture isolate, hCoV-19/Hong Kong/VM20001097/2020 (case 1 of the Hong Kong patient).

^c RT-PCR were tested twice in the same run with identical results. The Ct values shown were the mean of both runs.

In the cross-reactivity test using virus isolates and NPS collected prior to the introduction of SARS-CoV-2, all were tested negative by the AAD test.

Of the 70 specimens tested, the AAD test can detect all high viral load and medium viral load specimens (100%, N=57) but low sensitivity for low viral load specimens (28.6–33.3 %) (Table 2). Review of the COI values showed that some values were varied from the viral load of the specimens estimated by Ct values, however, COI values were correlated with Ct values in general (Table S2).

Table 2. Performance characteristics of the automated antigen detection (AAD) test for the presence of SARS-CoV-2 in 70 respiratory specimens.

Specimen type ^a	Specimens used for the AAD test and the results				
	Ct value		No. of specimens		sensitivity
	Mean	Range	tested	positive	
NPS					
High	16.56	13.65-18.44	13	13	100
Medium	22.85	18.60-27.62	15	15	100
Low	32.84	28.81-34.96	7	2	28.6
All	22.51	13.65-34.96	35	30	85.7
NPS & TS					
High	16.73	14.90-18.36	12	12	100
Medium	21.57	18.58-24.67	17	17	100
Low	32.30	29.46-35.40	6	2	33.3
All	21.75	14.90-35.40	35	31	88.6

^a 'High', means specimens with Ct values <18.57 of SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR; 'Medium', Ct values between 18.57 and 28.67; 'Low', Ct values >28.67.

174

4. Discussion

176

In this study, we determined the performance characteristics of the Elecsys SARS-CoV-2 Antigen kit for detecting SARS-CoV-2 respiratory specimens and compared the results with RAD test and RT-PCR test as the gold standard. To the best of our knowledge, there is no peer-reviewed study of evaluating this kit.

The methodology used in the present study was same as before for evaluating RAD kits [3-5]. Confounding factors such as types of specimens processed and method to quantify the viral load were limited. Our data indicated that the AAD and RT-PCR tests shared similar LOD results. In terms of clinical sensitivity, the AAD test is better than the RAD test (Table S3). The AAD test showed 100% sensitivity for detected specimens with Ct values <30. For low viral load specimens, although declined sensitivity was found, the AAD test can detect specimens up to 31.69.

The AAD test evaluated in the present study was a high throughput test. All of the hands on procedures were mainly the sample preparation steps and the samples loading steps to the analyzer. To handle around 100 specimens by two laboratory technologists, we estimated that around 1.5 hours were required from samples preparation to results interpretation. For RT-PCR, it normally requires 3 hours to process 100 specimens from RNA extraction, PCR

reagent dispensing to thermal cycling. We have to say that the AAD test is not suitable for low-complexity laboratories. An analyzer is required to install in the laboratory and intensive training is needed. AAD is not different to the RAD test while RAD is a point of care test. On the other hand, the cobas e 801 analyzer is mainly for testing serum specimens in our setting. There are rigid sample requirements for this analyzer and is not suitable for viscous specimens such as throat saliva and sputum. Swab samples were less affected as they were immersed in the viral transport media and were homogenized. In addition, bubbles generated especially during the sample inactivating steps will be rejected by the analyzer. Extra procedures were required to ensure the reaction containers were free of bubbles. For example, a disposable dropper was required to aspirate the bubbles on the top.

The limitations of this study include the fact that we employed a small sample size to evaluate the AAD test. In addition, it remains unclear whether the AAD test is applicable to laboratories like us for receiving throat saliva as majority specimen type for confirmation. However, our results were in-line with other AAD systems to detect SARS-CoV-2. These studies showed that other AAD systems were capable of detecting low viral load SARS-CoV-2 specimens or having higher sensitivity than the RAD tests [7-9]. The VITROS test (Ortho Clinical Diagnostics, USA) showed a sensitivity of 100% when clinical samples of Ct values ≤ 33 were tested. On the contrary RAD tests were mostly effective to identify

RT-PCR positive samples with Ct values ≤ 25 [7]. The S-PLEX test (MesoScale Diagnostics, USA) was capable of detecting 95.4% of clinical samples after excluding samples with Ct values > 35 [8]. The Lumipulse G test (Fujirebio, Japan) also shared similar performance when samples were tested with Ct cutoff of 35 [9].

In summary, the gold standard to detect SARS-CoV-2 remains RT-PCR assay in terms of sensitivity and specificity. The AAD test is a method of choice and serves as adjunct to RT-PCR test when there is an upsurge of specimens or when large number high risk group of individuals are required for testing.

Author contributions statement

- Gannon CK Mak: Conceptualization, Methodology, Validation, Investigation, Writing - original draft, Writing - review & editing
- Stephen SY Lau: Validation, Investigation
- Kitty KY Wong: Validation, Investigation
- Nancy LS Chow: Validation, Investigation
- CS Lau: Resources, Supervision
- Ken HL Ng: Supervision

232 - Edman TK Lam: Supervision

233 - Rickjason CW Chan: Supervision, Writing - original draft, Writing - review & editing

234 - Dominic NC Tsang: Supervision, Writing - original draft, Writing - review & editing

235

236 Declaration of competing interest

237 The authors declare that they have not received any funding for this study and no
238 known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to
239 influence the work reported in this paper.

240

241 Acknowledgement

242 We thank our colleagues Ester Wong, Vincent Pun and John Tam for coordinating and
243 technical assistance of the cobas e 801 analyzer.

244

245 References

246

- 247 1. Vandenberg O, Martiny D, Rochas O, van Belkum A, Kozlakidis Z. Considerations for
248 diagnostic COVID-19 tests. Nat Rev Microbiol. 2021 Mar;19(3):171-183. doi:
249 10.1038/s41579-020-00461-z. Epub 2020 Oct 14. PMID: 33057203; PMCID:
250 PMC7556561.

- 251 2. Carter LJ, Garner LV, Smoot JW, Li Y, Zhou Q, Saveson CJ, Sasso JM, Gregg AC,
252 Soares DJ, Beskid TR, Jervey SR, Liu C. Assay Techniques and Test Development for
253 COVID-19 Diagnosis. ACS Cent Sci. 2020 May 27;6(5):591-605. doi:
254 10.1021/acscentsci.0c00501. Epub 2020 Apr 30. PMID: 32382657; PMCID:
255 PMC7197457.
- 256 3. Mak GC, Cheng PK, Lau SS, Wong KK, Lau CS, Lam ET, Chan RC, Tsang DN.
257 Evaluation of rapid antigen test for detection of SARS-CoV-2 virus. J Clin Virol. 2020
258 Aug;129:104500. doi: 10.1016/j.jcv.2020.104500. Epub 2020 Jun 8. PMID: 32585619;
259 PMCID: PMC7278630.
- 260 4. Mak GC, Lau SS, Wong KK, Chow NL, Lau CS, Lam ET, Chan RC, Tsang DN.
261 Analytical sensitivity and clinical sensitivity of the three rapid antigen detection kits for
262 detection of SARS-CoV-2 virus. J Clin Virol. 2020 Dec;133:104684. doi:
263 10.1016/j.jcv.2020.104684. Epub 2020 Oct 29. PMID: 33176236; PMCID:
264 PMC7598567.
- 265 5. Mak GCK, Lau SSY, Wong KKY, Chow NLS, Lau CS, Lam ETK, Chan RCW, Tsang
266 DNC. Evaluation of rapid antigen detection kit from the WHO Emergency Use List for
267 detecting SARS-CoV-2. J Clin Virol. 2020 Dec 4;134:104712. doi:
268 10.1016/j.jcv.2020.104712. Epub ahead of print. PMID: 33338894; PMCID:
269 PMC7716730.

- 270 6. WHO. WHO Emergency Use Listing for In vitro diagnostics (IVDs) Detecting
271 SARS-CoV-2 (last updated: 2 October 2020). Available at:
272 [https://www.who.int/diagnostics_laboratory/201002_eul_sars_cov2_product_list.pdf?ua](https://www.who.int/diagnostics_laboratory/201002_eul_sars_cov2_product_list.pdf?ua=1)
273 [=1](#) (Accessed 29 April 2021)
- 274 7. Favresse J, Gillot C, Oliveira M, Cadrobbi J, Elsen M, Eucher C, Laffineur K, Rosseels
275 C, Van Eeckhoudt S, Nicolas JB, Morimont L, Dogné JM, Douxflis J. Head-to-Head
276 Comparison of Rapid and Automated Antigen Detection Tests for the Diagnosis of
277 SARS-CoV-2 Infection. *J Clin Med*. 2021 Jan 13;10(2):265. doi: 10.3390/jcm10020265.
278 PMID: 33450853; PMCID: PMC7828347.
- 279 8. Wang H, Hogan CA, Verghese M, Solis D, Sibai M, Huang C, Zehnder J, Sahoo MK,
280 Pinsky BA. Ultra-sensitive Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2
281 (SARS-CoV-2) Antigen Detection for the Diagnosis of Coronavirus Disease 2019
282 (COVID-19) in Upper Respiratory Samples. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2021 Apr 8;ciab063. doi:
283 10.1093/cid/ciab063. Epub ahead of print. PMID: 33830203.
- 284 9. Gili A, Paggi R, Russo C, Cenci E, Pietrella D, Graziani A, Stracci F, Mencacci A.
285 Evaluation of Lumipulse® G SARS-CoV-2 antigen assay automated test for detecting
286 SARS-CoV-2 nucleocapsid protein (NP) in nasopharyngeal swabs for community and
287 population screening. *Int J Infect Dis*. 2021 Feb 26;105:391-396. doi:

288 10.1016/j.ijid.2021.02.098. Epub ahead of print. PMID: 33647511; PMCID:

289 PMC7908845

290

291

292 Table S1. The Cutoff Index (COI) values generated by the automated antigen detection test in
293 two different runs

Dilution	COI values run 1	COI values run 2
10^{-2}	4378	4326
10^{-3}	241	287
10^{-4}	23.5	24.2
10^{-5}	2.99	3.03
10^{-6}	1.13	1.25
10^{-7}	0.959	0.984
10^{-8}	0.946	0.960

294 The two runs were performed in two different days.

295 Table S2. The cycle threshold (Ct) and Cutoff Index (COI) values generated by the RT-PCR
 296 and the automated antigen detection (AAD) tests respectively for the 70 respiratory
 297 specimens [nasopharyngeal swab (NPS) =35, combined nasopharyngeal swab and throat swab
 298 (NPS & TS) = 35] collected from COVID-19 positive patients.

NPS			NPS & TS		
Ct	AAD result	COI ^a	Ct	AAD result	COI ^a
13.65	Reactive	20111	14.90	Reactive	13.3
14.85	Reactive	24586	15.44	Reactive	14193
16.43	Reactive	8585	15.73	Reactive	2560
16.44	Reactive	9266	16.62	Reactive	6449
16.50	Reactive	8515	16.70	Reactive	14398
16.54	Reactive	5092	16.76	Reactive	9943
16.78	Reactive	6280	16.85	Reactive	4950
16.80	Reactive	5342	16.91	Reactive	10274
16.92	Reactive	10128	17.32	Reactive	1058
16.93	Reactive	1120	17.37	Reactive	4838
17.10	Reactive	5319	17.80	Reactive	2658
17.90	Reactive	4905	18.36	Reactive	189
18.44	Reactive	1887	18.58	Reactive	1399
18.60	Reactive	256	18.76	Reactive	5064
18.68	Reactive	3648	19.34	Reactive	3294
19.63	Reactive	209	19.52	Reactive	17154
19.91	Reactive	2572	19.68	Reactive	311
20.39	Reactive	57.5	20.16	Reactive	402
22.33	Reactive	58.8	20.51	Reactive	190
22.69	Reactive	32.4	20.76	Reactive	205

22.86	Reactive	38.1	22.33	Reactive	33.4
23.12	Reactive	117	22.45	Reactive	60.6
23.77	Reactive	5.13	22.58	Reactive	61.4
24.75	Reactive	31.6	22.74	Reactive	79.4
25.57	Reactive	7.26	22.75	Reactive	35.8
26.00	Reactive	3.47	23.54	Reactive	2.17
26.83	Reactive	2.14	23.66	Reactive	19.2
27.62	Reactive	1.15	24.61	Reactive	129
28.81	Reactive	1.03	24.67	Reactive	1.05
31.69	Reactive	3.06	29.46	Reactive	12.4
32.95	Non-reactive	0.466	30.34	Reactive	6.01
33.13	Non-reactive	0.739	32.35	Non-reactive	0.469
33.45	Non-reactive	0.560	32.66	Non-reactive	0.577
34.90	Non-reactive	0.438	33.61	Non-reactive	0.691
34.96	Non-reactive	0.419	35.40	Non-reactive	0.866

299 ^a COI ≥ 1.0 and < 1.0 were for 'Reactive' and 'Non-reactive' results respectively.

Table S3. Performance characteristics of the automated antigen detection (AAD) and the rapid antigen detection (RAD) tests for detecting SARS-CoV-2 in respiratory specimens.

Specimen type ^a	AAD					RAD ^b				
	Ct value		No. of specimens		sensitivity	Ct value		No. of specimens		sensitivity
	mean	range	tested	positive		mean	range	tested	positive	
NPS										
High	16.56	13.65-18.44	13	13	100	16.38	14.56–18.07	9	9	100 %
Medium	22.85	18.60-27.62	15	15	100	23.44	18.98–27.51	16	13	81.3 %
Low	32.84	28.81-34.96	7	2	28.6	31.73	28.91–34.47	10	1	10 %
All	22.51	13.65-34.96	35	30	85.7	23.99	14.56–34.47	35	23	65.7 %
NPS & TS										
High	16.73	14.90–18.36	12	12	100	15.96	12.94–18.43	9	9	100 %

Medium	21.57	18.58-24.67	17	17	100	23.72	19.75-28.59	16	15	93.8 %
Low	32.30	29.46-35.40	6	2	33.3	32.04	29.00-34.24	10	1	10 %
All	21.75	14.90-35.40	35	31	88.6	24.10	12.94-34.24	35	25	71.4 %

^a 'High', means specimens with Ct values <18.57 of SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR; 'Medium', Ct values between 18.57 and 28.67; 'Low', Ct values >28.67.

^b Data compiled from Mak et al., Analytical sensitivity and clinical sensitivity of the three rapid antigen detection kits for detection of SARS-CoV-2, J. Clin. Virol. 133 (2020), 104684, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcv.2020.104684>