

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

**Laboratory Comparison of Rapid Antigen Diagnostic Tests for Lymphatic
Filariasis: STANDARD™ Q Filariasis Antigen Test (QFAT) and Bioline Filariasis
Test Strip (FTS)**

Short title: Comparison of rapid antigen tests for lymphatic filariasis

Authors:

Patricia M Graves¹, Jessica L Scott¹, Alvaro Berg Soto^{1,2}, Antin YN Widi^{1,3}, Maxine Whittaker¹, Derek Lee⁴, Colleen L Lau^{5,6}, Kimberly Y Won⁷.

Addresses/Affiliations:

(1) College of Public Health, Medical and Veterinary Sciences, WHO Collaborating Centre for Vector-Borne and Neglected Tropical Diseases, and Australian Institute of Tropical Health and Medicine, James Cook University, Cairns and Townsville, QLD, Australia

(2) Andes Analytics, Santiago, Chile.

(3) Faculty of Medicine and Veterinary Medicine, Nusa Cendana University, Kupang, East Nusa Tenggara, Indonesia

(4) SD Biosensor, Suwon, Republic of Korea

(5) School of Public Health, Faculty of Medicine, The University of Queensland, Brisbane, QLD, Australia

(6) Centre for Clinical Research, Faculty of Medicine, The University of Queensland, Brisbane, QLD, Australia

(7) Division of Parasitic Diseases and Malaria, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Atlanta GA, USA

Correspondence

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

24 Patricia.graves@jcu.edu.au

25 James Cook University, McGregor Rd, Smithfield, Cairns 4870, Australia

26 **Abstract**

27 Background: Accurate and user-friendly rapid diagnostic tests (RDT) are needed to assess prevalence
28 of *Wuchereria bancrofti* antigen in the Global Programme to Eliminate Lymphatic Filariasis (GPELF).
29 We evaluated performance under laboratory conditions of the new Q Filariasis Antigen Test (QFAT)
30 against the Filariasis Test Strip (FTS) for detecting antigen of *Wuchereria bancrofti*, a causative agent
31 of lymphatic filariasis (LF).

32 Methodology/Principal Findings: We compared test performance using available panels of serum
33 (n=195) and plasma (n=189) from LF endemic areas in the Asia-Pacific region (Samoa, American
34 Samoa and Myanmar) together with Australian negative controls (n=46). Prior antigen and antibody
35 positivity status of endemic samples had been determined by rapid test or ELISA. The proportion of
36 all samples testing positive at 10 minutes was higher with QFAT (44.8%) than FTS (41.3%).

37 Concordance between tests was 93.5% (kappa 0.87, N=417) at 10 minutes, and increased over time
38 to 98.8% (kappa 0.98) at 24 hours. Sensitivity of QFAT and FTS at 10 minutes compared to prior
39 antigen results were 92% (95% CI 88.0-96.0) and 86% (95% CI 80.0-90.0), respectively. Specificity was
40 98% for QFAT and 99% for FTS at 10 minutes. Sensitivity increased over time for both tests, rising to
41 99% for QFAT and 97% for FTS at 24 hours. QFAT positively identified all microfilaria (Mf)-positive
42 samples, whereas FTS was negative for 3 of 66 Mf-positives. For both QFAT and FTS, there was
43 evidence of cross-reaction with *Dirofilaria repens* and *Onchocerca lupi* but not with
44 *Acanthochilonema reconditum*, *Cercopithifilaria bainaie* or *Strongyloides*. Disadvantages noted for
45 QFAT were inconvenient packaging and an additional buffer step. Advantages of QFAT include ease-
46 of-use, smaller sample (10-20 µL vs 75 µL for FTS), clearer control line, and higher sensitivity for Mf-
47 positive samples.

48 Conclusions/Significance. Under lab conditions, QFAT is a suitable rapid Ag test for use in filariasis
49 elimination programmes and has advantages over FTS.

50 **Author summary**

51 Lymphatic filariasis (LF) is a debilitating and stigmatizing disease that affects populations in tropical
52 areas usually in developing social environments. It is caused by a parasite worm transmitted by
53 mosquitoes. The WHO programme to eliminate LF aims to improve the lives of their residents
54 through a global mass drug administration campaign, and provide the tools to monitor prevalence
55 within the countries' public health contexts. It is imperative to utilize the most effective and practical
56 diagnostic tests to monitor progress to elimination of this disease, while ensuring a cost-effective
57 and rapid implementation under potentially vulnerable settings. In this study we investigated the
58 performance of a new rapid antigen diagnostic test for LF compared to the existing recommended
59 test, in samples of known infection status from the Asia-Pacific region. The results showed the new
60 test to be a suitable rapid antigen test, with advantages over the current test, for use in filariasis
61 elimination programmes in the region.

62 **Keywords**

63 Filariasis, diagnostics, antigen, microfilaria, surveillance, *Wuchereria bancrofti*, elimination

64 **Abbreviations**

65 Antigen: Ag

66 Antibody: Ab

67 Lymphatic filariasis: LF

68 Q filariasis antigen test: QFAT

69 Filariasis test strip: FTS

70 Microfilariae: Mf

71 World Health Organization: WHO

72 Global Programme to Eliminate Lymphatic Filariasis: GPELF

73 Mass drug administration: MDA
74 Immunochromatographic test: ICT
75 Confidence interval: CI
76 Cohen's Kappa: K
77

78 **Introduction**

79 Lymphatic filariasis (LF) is a mosquito-transmitted neglected tropical disease caused by infection
80 with filarial parasites (*Wuchereria bancrofti*, *Brugia malayi*, or *B. timori*). Over time, infection can
81 lead to damage of the lymphatic vessels, causing hydrocele and lymphoedema. People who live with
82 these chronic and disabling manifestations of LF can experience reduced economic productivity and
83 social stigma. The Global Programme to Eliminate Lymphatic Filariasis (GPELF), established by the
84 World Health Organization (WHO), aims to eliminate LF as a public health problem with a two-armed
85 approach: interrupting transmission through mass drug administration (MDA) of anti-filarial
86 medicines and alleviating suffering among patients through morbidity management and disability
87 prevention.

88

89 Currently, 44 of 72 LF endemic countries still need MDA, with the majority implementing it with
90 support from GPELF [1]. There has been a 74% reduction in global LF infections from 1997 to 2018
91 [2] but many countries are still conducting MDA or surveillance to validate elimination.

92

93 Accurate and sensitive diagnostic tests for measuring infection prevalence are essential components
94 of the GPELF [3, 4]. National programs use diagnostic tests to establish baseline endemicity, monitor
95 the impact of MDA campaigns, inform decisions to stop MDA in transmission assessment surveys
96 (TAS), and detect potential recrudescence post-cessation of MDA. Historically, the gold
97 standard test for diagnosing LF was identifying microfilariae (Mf) on stained blood slides, but this
98 requires time and skill, and (outside the Pacific areas of subperiodic diurnal transmission) blood

99 samples for slides must be collected at night. In the 1980s, two enzyme-linked immunosorbent
100 assays (ELISA) were developed to detect *W. bancrofti* using monoclonal antibodies to detect the
101 same circulating filarial antigen (Ag) from adult worms [5-7]. Both tests produce quantitative
102 readouts and can be performed using samples derived from either dried blood spots, anticoagulated
103 whole blood, serum or plasma, with attention to dilution factors [8]. However, these tests require a
104 suitably equipped laboratory.

105

106 One of the Ag ELISA tests, Og4C3, is commercially available (Cellabs, Sydney). The other ELISA test
107 [7] was subsequently converted to a rapid test format, the immunochromatographic test (ICT)
108 (initially Binax Now, then Alere, now Abbott) [9]. The ICT was widely utilised since the start of the
109 GPELF in national surveys for prevalence mapping and surveillance. Subsequently, to reduce the cost
110 and amount of blood needed for ICT, and improve the shelf life and storage requirements, the Alere
111 filariasis test strip (FTS) was developed using the same critical reagents in a new test format [10].
112 Despite some discrepancies in concordance between the ICT and FTS tests in field evaluations [11],
113 with FTS showing increased sensitivity, the WHO Neglected Tropical Diseases Strategic and Technical
114 Advisory Group was satisfied with the diagnostic characteristics of FTS compared with ICT [12]. Thus,
115 guidance on implementing TAS and critical cut-off numbers for passing were not changed and a
116 study in American Samoa supported the approval of the FTS test for use in programme monitoring
117 [11]. Since 2015, where *W. bancrofti* is the causative agent of LF, the Bionline Filariasis Test Strip (FTS,
118 Abbott) has been the main Ag rapid diagnostic test recommended for programme use.

119

120 While the FTS has been used widely since 2015, limitations have been identified. The assay cross-
121 reacts with *Loa loa* infections [13, 14] although this is not a concern in the Asia-Pacific region. The
122 test requires a relatively large volume of blood (75 µL), routinely collected by finger prick. The time
123 needed to collect 75 µL increases the risk of clotting and could prevent proper flow of blood through
124 the test strip. Logistical challenges have been experienced in field settings because the FTS consists

125 of a single lightweight strip devoid of any protective housing. Users are required to secure the test
126 strips onto a plastic tray with labels or tape to minimize movement. Issues with flow of whole blood
127 through the strip has caused some users to delay the start of the 10-minute timing for reading the
128 test result. Therefore, improved and more user-friendly rapid antigen tests are urgently needed.
129 Availability of alternative tests would also ease supply problems with FTS such as those experienced
130 during the COVID-19 pandemic when all rapid test manufacturers were focused on producing rapid
131 antigen tests for SARS-CoV-2. In addition, FTS is thought to be less accurate when used with EDTA
132 than heparinized blood samples.

133

134 Although LF rapid Ag tests and similar rapid antibody (Ab) tests are designed primarily to give a
135 binary (positive/negative) result, they can also give a semi-quantitative readout by comparing the
136 density of the test line to the control line. Intensity is usually scored on a scale of 1 to 3, where 1
137 (low) represents a test line less dense than control, 2 (medium) when the two lines are of similar
138 density, and 3 (high) when the test line is denser than the control line. Changes in Ag or Ab intensity
139 score over time have been used to assess impact of control measures and progress to elimination for
140 LF [15] and onchocerciasis [16]. Chesnais et al., 2016 reported a strong correlation ($\rho = 0.91$; $P <$
141 0.001) between the FTS intensity score and plasma Ag levels measured by Og4C3 ELISA in a study in
142 Democratic Republic of the Congo in 2014, supporting the use of test line density as a proxy for
143 blood Ag level. Higher test density scores were also associated with Mf slide positivity [15]. Semi-
144 quantitative intensity scoring is frequently done in LF surveys, but its usefulness in cross-sectional
145 studies is not yet clear.

146

147 The primary aim of this study was to evaluate the diagnostic performance of QFAT compared to the
148 currently recommended FTS through a head-to-head comparison of samples with known prior Ag
149 results. The WHO Collaborating Centre for Vector-borne and Neglected Tropical Diseases at James
150 Cook University (JCU) served as an independent assessor for this study. We used samples collected

151 from the Asia-Pacific region that were already available in JCU collections. Results will inform the
152 decision about whether the new Standard Q Filariasis Antigen Test (QFAT) can serve as a suitable
153 alternative to the FTS in GPELF activities. Secondary objectives were to investigate cross-reactivity
154 with other helminths, discordance in results between independent test readers, and performance of
155 the tests with different sample types (serum, heparin plasma, EDTA plasma). In addition, we studied
156 whether test line density was informative, and whether there were changes in test results
157 (concordance, sensitivity and specificity) over time. The requirement to read all tests at 10 minutes
158 can be challenging if many samples are tested concurrently during large surveys. Extending the
159 reading time without compromising specificity would help to better distribute the workload,
160 especially for duplicate readers, and allow later checking by supervisors.

161

162 **Materials and Methods**

163 **QFAT and FTS Kits**

164 The WHO provided 510 FTS tests (17 boxes of 30 tests) and SD Biosensor provided 500 QFAT tests
165 (20 boxes of 25 tests). Tests were sent to JCU Cairns and kept at room temperature (~25°C) for up to
166 3 months before use. The batch numbers were FTS lot number 181193; FTS pouch number 178066;
167 QFAT lot number SIJ35HIAC and QFAT buffer number 5IJ34D1S5. Expiry dates were 28 Dec 2022 for
168 FTS and 16 Jan 2024 for QFAT. The study was performed in August and September 2022. Initially one
169 of each test type was checked with positive control obtained in 2014 from the Filariasis Research
170 Reagent Resource Center (FR3) <http://www.filariasiscenter.org/>; both tests gave a weak positive
171 result (as expected). This was repeated with one of each test type at the end of the study, with
172 similar results.

173 Both FTS and QFAT are designed to be used with whole blood direct from a participant's finger. For
174 FTS, it is generally accepted that if anticoagulated blood is used, heparin should be the choice of

175 anticoagulant. QFAT also gives instructions for use of the test with serum or plasma, with a reduced
176 sample volume compared to whole blood.

177

178 **Blood sample description and selection**

179 A total of 456 serum and plasma samples were assembled from collections archived at JCU and
180 affiliated research groups. Samples included those previously tested for LF antigen by ICT, FTS or
181 Og4C3 ELISA (and in some cases, also for Mf and antibodies) in previous studies in American Samoa,
182 Samoa and Myanmar [17-19, 11]. These samples were collected either from LF endemic areas
183 (n=384) or from non-LF endemic countries (n=72) for control purposes. The 384 endemic samples
184 were collected from American Samoa (total n=257: 133 collected in 2014 and 124 in 2016), Samoa
185 (n=35 in 2019) and Myanmar (n=92 in 2014). Samples of EDTA plasma were included to investigate
186 whether QFAT would be a more versatile test than FTS for different sample types. The 72 non-
187 endemic samples were mainly from Australia (46 human negative controls and 19 human samples
188 positive for *Strongyloides* antibody diagnosed at NSW Pathology by ELISA against *S.ratti* antigen)
189 together with seven dog samples from Italy used in a previous study of Og4C3 ELISA [20]. Of the 384
190 endemic area samples, LF antibody results were available for only 349 (Supplementary Table 1).
191 Slide Mf results were only available from American Samoa and Samoa for 165 (78.2%) of the Ag-
192 positive participants, of whom 69 were Mf-positive.

193 It should be noted that American Samoa 2016 samples of serum (collected in SST vacutainers) and
194 plasma (collected in heparin tubes) were from the same individuals (N=62). In Samoa 2019, there
195 were 12 individuals who had plasma collected in both heparin and EDTA tubes. Details of sample
196 collections are available in previous publications [17-19, 21].

197 Two of the 456 samples (one heparin and one EDTA plasma) had no serum or plasma in selected vial
198 (missing) and were removed from study entirely. Two additional samples were unable to be tested
199 using FTS due to insufficient volume (one heparin and one EDTA plasma). Additionally, 18 out of 19

200 of the human *Strongyloides* positive samples and one of the Australian negative controls only had
201 enough sample for testing by QFAT, not FTS. Samples selected and tested are shown in Figure 1.
202 Samples were selected with the aim of having approximately equal proportions of Ag-positive and
203 Ag-negative samples for optimal estimation of sensitivity and specificity. The final selection resulted
204 in 54.9% Ag-positives and 45.1% Ag-negatives among the samples from endemic areas
205 (Supplementary Table 1).

206 **Ethical approval**

207 Participants gave express written consent for their samples to be stored and used for additional
208 studies, with the exception of Myanmar where waiver of consent for re-use of deidentified samples
209 was applied for. Samples were collected under the following ethical approvals:

- 210 ▪ American Samoa 2014: Institutional Review Board of American Samoa, James Cook
211 University Human Research Ethics Committee and The University of Queensland (approval
212 number 2014000409).
- 213 ▪ American Samoa 2016: Australian National University (protocol number 2016/482)
- 214 ▪ Samoa 2019: Samoan Ministry of Health and The Australian National University Human
215 Research Ethics Committee (protocol number 2018/341).
- 216 ▪ Myanmar 2014: James Cook University Human Research Ethics Committee approval number
217 H5261 approved by the Ministry of Health and Sports, Myanmar. Since consent in the initial
218 study for future sample use was not fully explicit and participants could not be recontacted,
219 waiver of consent was granted by James Cook University Human Research Ethics Committee
220 (approval number H8341) in consultation with Myanmar collaborators.

221 **Sample preparation and test procedures**

222 The samples used for testing had been shipped frozen from the country of origin to Australia and
223 stored at minus 70°C for three to six years depending on the source. Human control samples had

224 been stored for varying periods from six to over 10 years. Most samples had undergone one
225 previous freeze-thaw cycle. They were thawed from minus 70°C, aliquoted and kept at 4°C until
226 testing the same day. QFAT and FTS tests were performed as per the manufacturers' instructions,
227 but instead of using the pipettes supplied by the kits, calibrated micropipettes were used to transfer
228 the appropriate sample volumes to the test sample pads.

229

230 The results of QFAT and FTS were read at the recommended time of 10 minutes by two independent
231 blinded observers who were unaware of the sample type or prior result. Each observer used the
232 manufacturers' criteria for test interpretation and classified the tests as positive, negative or invalid.
233 Tests were deemed invalid if no control line was present in the test window. A 10-minute timer was
234 started from the time that the sample migrated to the test line (FTS) or time of adding buffer (QFAT).

235

236 For FTS and QFAT tests that were Ag-positive, the intensity of the test line relative to the control line
237 was scored as low (test line intensity lighter than the control line), medium (test line intensity same
238 as control line) or high (test line intensity darker than the control line). At 1 hour and 24-hour time
239 points after initial testing, QFAT and FTS tests were re-read by the same two observers. Flashlights
240 were used for illumination to assess test lines if needed.

241

242 Recommended volume for whole blood for the FTS test is 75 µL. Current instructions do not specify
243 a volume for serum or plasma. Recommended volume for whole blood for the QFAT test is 20 µL,
244 with 10 µL recommended for serum. Initial testing of eight samples of Ag-positive serum and heparin
245 plasma from American Samoa (4 each of Mf positive and negative) was conducted to establish
246 sample volume for FTS for this study and the integrity of the tests. Ideally, we would have compared
247 the same volume on both tests (for example 20 µL). However, with FTS, none of eight serum
248 samples flowed with 20 µL, giving invalid results, while the QFAT test functioned well with 10 or 20

249 μL . Based on these preliminary evaluations, we used 75 μL for FTS and 10 μL for QFAT
250 (manufacturers' recommendations) for the rest of the samples.

251 **Data analysis**

252 Results were recorded on paper, transcribed into Excel and imported into R studio (v. 2023.06.0
253 Build 421) for recoding and analysis. Records with missing or inconsistent information were
254 identified and rechecked against paper records. Selected samples were classified as missing (no
255 serum or plasma in selected vial), or insufficient if they had not enough volume for testing.

256

257 Test validity: The proportion of invalid tests was based on the initial 10-minute reading to
258 approximate the real-world situation. However, tests deemed invalid at the first 10-minute reading
259 were repeated if there was sufficient sample remaining, to maximise the sample size for
260 concordance and performance analysis.

261

262 Discordance between observers: The proportion of tests with discordance between the two
263 observers was determined. Results were stratified by whether the samples originated from an
264 endemic or non-endemic region and then by sample type (i.e., endemic serum, endemic heparin
265 plasma, endemic EDTA plasma, non-endemic human serum, and non-endemic dog serum).

266 McNemar's Chi-squared test was performed to assess the difference between FTS and QFAT for
267 discordant results for each sample type. Only samples with valid test results for both FTS and QFAT
268 were included in this analysis.

269

270 Antigen prevalence: For valid tests, the following rules were used to assign a final result to each
271 sample (positive, negative, or indeterminate) at each time point:

- 272 a. If both observers agreed on positive or negative, the result was assigned as positive or
273 negative, respectively.

- 274 b. If the observers disagreed and a third assessment was made on a repeat test with one
275 observer to break the tie, the dominant result was assigned (e.g., a positive result if 2 out of
276 3 assessments were positive).
- 277 c. If the observers disagreed and a third assessment (repeat test) was not able to be
278 conducted, the result was classified as indeterminant.

279

280 For assessment of concordance and performance, *Strongyloides*-positive human samples and dog
281 serum samples were excluded, leaving a sample size of 430 comprising endemic samples and
282 Australian negative controls. Missing, insufficient and indeterminant results were also excluded for
283 analysis at each of the three reading times.

284

285 Concordance between test types: To determine concordance between FTS and QFAT results, we
286 calculated the percentage of agreement between positive and negative results and the Cohen's
287 Kappa (K) agreement statistic with 95% CI for each of the three reading times . Classification of K was
288 as follows: poor (K <0.2), fair (K 0.21-0.40), moderate (K 0.41-0.60), good (K 0.61-0.80) and excellent
289 (K 0.81-1.00). Kappa values were obtained using the VCD package for R, version 1.4-11. Only records
290 with valid results for both FTS and QFAT were included.

291

292 Test performance: We compared the final result for each sample in each test to their results
293 obtained in previous studies (Supplementary Table 1). LF Ag and Ab testing was not previously
294 performed on all the Australian negative samples included in this analysis, although some had been
295 used in previous ELISA studies as negative controls. Considering that LF has not been endemic in
296 Australia for almost seven decades, we assumed that these samples were negative for LF Ag and Ab.
297 We compared results in this study with two reference standards from previous testing: 1) the prior
298 Ag test result, and 2) the prior combined 'Ag or any Ab' result. We calculated the sensitivity,
299 specificity, positive and negative predictive value of FTS and QFAT against each of these reference

300 standards using epiR package v 2.0.62. This analysis was performed at all three time points to assess
301 whether test performance metrics changed over time.

302

303 Results for FTS and QFAT were also compared to Mf-positivity results from previous studies. In
304 these studies, slides were made from Ag-positive persons only.

305

306 Intensity score comparison, by observer: We used the entire dataset (n = 452 samples for FTS and
307 454 samples for QFAT) to classify samples by their intensity score value (either low, medium or high)
308 at each time point (i.e., 10 mins, 1 hour and 24 hours), stratified by observer and test type. Samples
309 missing values for at least one time reading were also removed.

310 Test usability. At the end of the study, the two test observers independently provided written
311 feedback on each test, prompted by the following categories: Instructions for use, test packaging,
312 test set-up, sample volume, control line, test readability, and other comments.

313

314 **Results**

315 A total of 456 samples were selected for testing, of which 384 were from endemic areas; two
316 endemic samples were missing for both tests (no serum or plasma in selected vial).

317 **Test validity**

318 At the first 10-minute reading, one of the FTS tests (0.2%, N=433) and two of the QFAT tests (0.4%,
319 N=454) gave invalid results. All three samples were repeated, providing valid results for 380 FTS
320 samples and 382 QFAT samples from endemic areas. None of the non-endemic samples tested (N=
321 53 FTS and 72 QFAT) had invalid results.

322 **Discordance between observers**

323 Discordance between the two observers at 10 minutes with endemic samples was greater for FTS
324 than QFAT readings (3.7% versus 1.8% respectively, $p=0.096$). Discordance in endemic samples was
325 greatest for EDTA plasma samples using FTS (6.8%) and lowest for serum samples using QFAT (1.0%).
326 These differences were not statistically significant at the $p<0.05$ level (Supplementary Table 2). There
327 were no discordant observations in non-endemic samples for either FTS or QFAT. Discordant results
328 at any time point that could not be repeated were classed as indeterminate, with details given in
329 Supplementary Fig 1.

330 **Overall positivity, by test type**

331 Counts of positive, negative, and indeterminate endemic samples by sample type and test type at
332 the 10-minute reading are shown in Table 1A. In general, QFAT provided more positive results than
333 FTS for every sample type, as well as producing fewer indeterminate results.

334 Of note, Table 1A shows a higher number of indeterminate results for FTS with EDTA plasma while
335 there were no indeterminate results for QFAT with this sample type. Tables 1B and 1C show the
336 equivalent numbers for the 1-hour and 24-hour readings, respectively.

337 **Concordance between tests**

338 There was a high level of concordance between tests, as shown in Table 2. Concordance increased
339 over time, with the lowest level of concordance occurring at 10 mins (93.5%) and the highest
340 recorded at 24 hours (98.8%). Kappa values followed the same pattern, with Kappa (K) = 0.88 (95%
341 CI 0.83 to 0.92) at 10 minutes, and a K value of 0.98 (95% CI 0.95 to 1) occurring at 24 hours (Table
342 2). Overall, the Kappa agreement statistic suggested "excellent" agreement between the two tests.

343 **Test performance compared with prior antigen or antigen/antibody results**

344 At 10 minutes, when comparing predetermined Ag results, the sensitivity and negative predictive
345 value of the FTS was lower than for QFAT. The specificity and positive predictive value at this
346 timepoint for FTS and QFAT were comparable (Table 3). When comparing results of previously

347 determined 'Ag or any Ab' results, the sensitivity and negative predictive values were again lower for
348 both FTS and QFAT. However, sensitivity and negative predictive values were higher for QFAT than
349 FTS.

350 **Concordance and performance of tests with EDTA plasma samples only**

351 Since questions have been raised by users about the suitability of FTS for EDTA plasma, we
352 investigated the performance of the tests specifically for those samples. Concordance and
353 sensitivity/specificity are shown in Supplementary Table 3. Most of the discordant samples between
354 tests were of EDTA plasma sample type, for which QFAT appears more accurate than FTS.

355 **Change in test performance over time**

356 Some test results changed between readings over time, mainly from negative to positive
357 (Supplementary Table 4). For FTS, four negatives at 10 minutes became positive at 1 hour, while a
358 further 18 became positive at 24 hours (Supplementary Table 4a). Positives at 10 minutes generally
359 remained stable; only one became indeterminant at 1 hour but reverted to positive at 24 hours. For
360 QFAT, 10 negatives at 10 minutes became positive at 1 hour. Of these, one positive reverted to
361 negative at 24 hours and one became indeterminant. A further two samples changed from negative
362 to positive at 24 hours (Supplementary Table 4b).

363 Test performance increased over time. Figure 2a shows that FTS sensitivity increased from 86% at
364 the 10-minute reading to 89% after an hour, reaching a final value of 97% after 24 hours. Similarly,
365 QFAT sensitivity was at its lowest at the 10-minute reading (89%) and increased to its highest values
366 at the 1 hour and 24 hours readings. Thus, the difference in sensitivity and specificity between FTS
367 and QFAT decreased over time. Corresponding results for positive and negative predictive values
368 are given in Figure 2b.

369 **Performance in Mf-positive samples**

370 A total of 69 samples were previously positive for Mf. After removal of one missing QFAT test, the
371 remaining 68 samples all had positive QFAT results at 10 minutes. For FTS, after removal of one
372 missing sample and two indeterminant results, FTS missed three of 66 (4.6%) Mf-positive samples at
373 the 10-minute reading. Of note, two of the three false negative samples were from the same person
374 (serum and heparin plasma samples).

375 **Cross-reactions with other helminth infections**

376 Of the 20 *Strongyloides*-positive samples from humans, 19 tested with QFAT and one tested with FTS
377 were all Ag-negative. Samples from four dogs infected with *Acanthocheilonema reconditum* (1),
378 *Cercopithifilaria bairnei* (2), and *Dirofilaria repens* (1) were negative by both tests, while samples
379 from one dog with *D. repens* and one with *Onchocerca lupi* were positive by both tests.

380 **Intensity score over time, by test type and observer**

381 The proportion of intensity score values assigned by observers was different between FTS and QFAT.
382 Supplementary Figure 2 shows that both observers reported a larger number of high intensity scores
383 (test line denser than control line) using FTS than with QFAT. For the number of samples with results
384 at time points included in each comparison, see Supplementary Fig 1.

385 In general, the line intensity score was less useful for QFAT than FTS because the stronger control
386 line with QFAT means that almost all readings were classified as low or moderate intensity.

387 **Test acceptability**

388 Two observers independently provided feedback on the tests. Both preferred QFAT over FTS for all
389 aspects except the packaging, which was harder to open quickly for QFAT. Both mentioned that
390 QFAT requires much less sample (10 or 20 uL vs 75 uL for FTS) and that QFAT was easier to use. QFAT
391 requires an additional buffer step, which was mentioned as a disadvantage, but was clearer to read.

392

393 Discussion

394 Our laboratory-based study found very high concordance between the FTS and QFAT results when
395 read at 10 minutes. This study also found that QFAT had equivalent performance to FTS for detecting
396 *W. bancrofti* Ag based on prior known results of LF antigen for samples from the Asia Pacific. Like
397 FTS [22, 23, 11] (Dickson et al., 2018; Lau et al., 2020; Sheel et al., 2021), QFAT performed very well
398 for detecting *W. bancrofti* circulating Ag in persons from endemic areas in Samoa, American Samoa,
399 and Myanmar. No false positives were observed with non-exposed human sera.

400 Regarding test concordance in different sample types, we noted a higher number of positives with
401 FTS than QFAT using EDTA plasma. False positives with FTS are a known reported issue with EDTA
402 plasma among test users.

403 Compared with the main reference standard of previous Ag results, QFAT performed better than FTS
404 in terms of sensitivity (92% for QFAT and 86% for FTS) at the 10-minute reading. Both tests were
405 highly specific ($\geq 98\%$). When compared to previous 'Ag or any Ab' results, sensitivity was lower for
406 both tests (70% QFAT and 64% FTS) but specificity remained unchanged. This suggests that people
407 who were Ab-positive but not Ag-positive do not constitute a pool of Ag positives in the population,
408 undetected by either test.

409 The concordance between tests increased at 1 hour and 24 hours. Sensitivity of each test compared
410 to prior results also increased over time, which suggests that the increase in concordance was real
411 (i.e., tests were not accumulating false positives over time). These findings suggest that both tests
412 were robust, and accuracy was not compromised even when reading time was unexpectedly delayed
413 beyond the recommended time interval.

414 QFAT and FTS showed cross-reactivity with some dog samples positive for *O.lupi* and *D.repens*, but
415 not *C. bairnae* and *A. reconditum*. No cross-reactivity was seen for QFAT with *Strongyloides*-positive
416 human samples. Further testing with other human and animal worm parasites is recommended.

417 This study benefited from a controlled lab environment and a panel of previously well characterised
418 samples. A limitation of this study was that the samples had been stored for long periods of time
419 (several years at -70°C). Also, tests were done with the available samples of serum or plasma,
420 including heparinized or EDTA anticoagulated plasma. The FTS test instructions are not explicit, but
421 it is generally accepted that heparin rather than EDTA is the recommended anticoagulant for the
422 test. Our results suggest that QFAT does not have this limitation and performs better than FTS for
423 EDTA samples. In addition, selection of samples to include appropriate numbers of both serum and
424 plasma meant that 74 individuals contributed two sample types. Previous Ag and Ab results on the
425 samples had been determined by a variety of different methods (Og4C3 ELISA, ICT, FTS, Bm14 ELISA
426 and Wb123 ELISA). Finally, the need for an additional buffer step for QFAT could be seen as a
427 disadvantage, but opinions differ and some users regard lack of chase buffer for FTS as a
428 disadvantage.

429 This laboratory evaluation shows that QFAT is a suitable rapid antigen test for use in GPELF and has
430 advantages over FTS.

431

432 **Acknowledgements**

433 We are grateful to the following collaborators who provided blood samples and/or did previous
434 testing: Jan Douglass, Khin Saw Aye, Ben Dickson, Sarah Sheridan, Meru Sheel, Take Naseri, Robert
435 Thomsen, Saipale Fuimaono, Jesse Masson, Therese Kearns, Rogan Lee, and Alessio Giannelli.
436 Jonathan King was the liaison between WHO NTD, PQ and Procurement departments and the
437 manufacturer, without which the study would not have been possible. We thank Patrick Lammie
438 (Task Force for Global Health) for supporting the study, FR3 for providing the positive control, WHO
439 for providing FTS, and SD Biosensor for providing QFAT, and Julia S An for conducting training for
440 QFAT over Zoom.

441 **Funding**

442 This work was supported by a grant from the United States Agency for International Development
443 (USAID) through NTD SC, a program of the Task Force for Global Health, Inc. Its contents are solely
444 the responsibility of the authors and do not necessarily represent the views of the supporting
445 institutions. WHO supplied and shipped the FTS kits. SD Biosensor donated and shipped the QFAT
446 kits. CLL was supported by an Australian National Health and Medical Research Council Fellowship
447 (APP 1193826).

448 The findings and conclusions in this report are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent
449 the official position of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

450 **References**

- 451 [1] World Health Organization. Global programme to eliminate lymphatic filariasis: progress
452 report, 2023. *Weekly Epidemiological Record* 2023;98:489-502.
- 453 [2] Local Burden of Disease Neglected Tropical Diseases C. The global distribution of lymphatic
454 filariasis, 2000-18: a geospatial analysis. *Lancet Glob Health* 2020;8(9):e1186-e94.
455 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2214-109X\(20\)30286-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2214-109X(20)30286-2).
- 456 [3] Gass K, de Rochars MVB, Boakye D, Bradley M, Fischer PU, Gyapong J, et al. A multicenter
457 evaluation of diagnostic tools to define endpoints for programs to eliminate bancroftian filariasis.
458 *PLoS neglected tropical diseases* 2012;6(1):e1479.
- 459 [4] World Health Organization. Diagnostic test for surveillance of lymphatic filariasis. 2021. p.
460 16.
- 461 [5] Hertz MI, Rush A, Nutman TB, Weil GJ, Bennuru S, Budge PJ. Characterization of glycan
462 determinants that mediate recognition of the *Wuchereria bancrofti* circulating antigen by diagnostic
463 antibodies. *Molecular and Biochemical Parasitology* 2020;240.
- 464 [6] More SJ, Copeman DB. A highly specific and sensitive monoclonal antibody-based ELISA for
465 the detection of circulating antigen in bancroftian filariasis. *Tropical Medicine and Parasitology*
466 1990;41:403-6.
- 467 [7] Weil GJ, Jain DC, Santhanam S, Malhotra A, Kumar H, Sethumadhavan KV, et al. A
468 monoclonal antibody-based enzyme immunoassay for detecting parasite antigenemia in bancroftian
469 filariasis. *Journal of infectious diseases* 1987;156:350-5.
- 470 [8] Masson J, Douglass J, Roineau M, Aye K, Htwe K, Warner J, et al. Relative Performance and
471 Predictive Values of Plasma and Dried Blood Spots with Filter Paper Sampling Techniques and
472 Dilutions of the Lymphatic Filariasis Og4C3 Antigen ELISA for Samples from Myanmar. *Tropical*
473 *Medicine and Infectious Disease* 2017;2(2). <https://doi.org/10.3390/tropicalmed2020007>.
- 474 [9] Weil GJ, Lammie PJ, Weiss N. The ICT Filariasis Test: A rapid-format antigen test for diagnosis
475 of bancroftian filariasis. *Parasitology Today* 1997;13(10):401-4.
- 476 [10] Weil GJ, Curtis KC, Fakoli L, Fischer K, Gankpala L, Lammie PJ, et al. Laboratory and field
477 evaluation of a new rapid test for detecting *Wuchereria bancrofti* antigen in human blood. *The*
478 *American journal of tropical medicine and hygiene* 2013;89(1):11-5.
- 479 [11] Sheel M, Lau CL, Sheridan S, Fuimaono S, Graves PM. Comparison of
480 Immunochromatographic Test (ICT) and Filariasis Test Strip (FTS) for Detecting Lymphatic Filariasis
481 Antigen in American Samoa, 2016. *Tropical Medicine and Infectious Disease* 2021;6(3).
482 <https://doi.org/10.3390/tropicalmed6030132>.
- 483 [12] World Health Organization. Strengthening the Assessment of Lymphatic Filariasis
484 Transmission and Documenting the Achievement of Elimination. In: World Health Organization,
485 editor. Meeting of the Neglected Tropical Diseases Strategic and Technical Advisory Group's
486 Monitoring and Evaluation Subgroup on Disease-specific Indicators. Geneva, Switzerland: World
487 Health Organization Press; 2014. p. 51.
- 488 [13] Hertz MI, Nana-Djeunga H, Kamgno J, Jelil Njouendou A, Chawa Chunda V, Wanji S, et al.
489 Identification and characterization of *Loa loa* antigens responsible for cross-reactivity with rapid
490 diagnostic tests for lymphatic filariasis. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis* 2018;12(11):e0006963.
491 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pntd.0006963>.
- 492 [14] Pion SD, Montavon C, Chesnais CB, Kamgno J, Wanji S, Klion AD, et al. Positivity of Antigen
493 Tests Used for Diagnosis of Lymphatic Filariasis in Individuals Without *Wuchereria bancrofti* Infection
494 But with High *Loa loa* Microfilaremia. *Am J Trop Med Hyg* 2016;95(6):1417-23.
495 <https://doi.org/10.4269/ajtmh.16-0547>.
- 496 [15] Chesnais CB, Missamou F, Pion SDS, Bopda J, Louya F, Majewski AC, et al. Semi-Quantitative
497 Scoring of an Immunochromatographic Test for Circulating Filarial Antigen. *The American journal of*
498 *tropical medicine and hygiene* 2013;89(5):916-8. <https://doi.org/doi.org/10.4269/ajtmh.13-0245>.

- 499 [16] Nana-Djeunga HC, Sicard CM, Mogoung-Wafo AE, Chesnais CB, Deleglise H, Touka-Nounkeu
500 R, et al. Changes in Onchocerciasis Ov16 IgG4 Rapid Diagnostic Test Results Over One-Month Follow-
501 up: Lessons for Reading Timeframe and Decision-Making. *Am J Trop Med Hyg* 2022;107(3):658-61.
502 <https://doi.org/10.4269/ajtmh.21-1201>.
- 503 [17] Douglass J, Dykes L, Kelly-Hope L, Gordon S, Leggat P, Aye NN, et al. Preventive
504 chemotherapy reverses covert, lymphatic-associated tissue change in young people with lymphatic
505 filariasis in Myanmar. *Trop Med Int Health* 2019;24(4):463-76. <https://doi.org/10.1111/tmi.13212>.
- 506 [18] Graves PM, Sheridan S, Scott J, Amosa-Lei Sam F, Naseri T, Thomsen R, et al. Triple-Drug
507 Treatment Is Effective for Lymphatic Filariasis Microfilaria Clearance in Samoa. *Trop Med Infect Dis*
508 2021;6(2). <https://doi.org/10.3390/tropicalmed6020044>.
- 509 [19] Lau CL, Sheridan S, Ryan S, Roineau M, Andreosso A, Fuimaono S, et al. Detecting and
510 confirming residual hotspots of lymphatic filariasis transmission in American Samoa 8 years after
511 stopping mass drug administration. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis* 2017;11(9):e0005914.
512 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pntd.0005914>.
- 513 [20] Giannelli A, Cantacessi C, Graves P, Becker L, Campbell BE, Dantas-Torres F, et al. A
514 preliminary investigation of serological tools for the detection of *Onchocerca lupi* infection in dogs.
515 *Parasitology Research* 2014;113(5):1989-91. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00436-014-3844-6>.
- 516 [21] Sheel M, Sheridan S, Gass K, Won K, Fuimaono S, Kirk M, et al. Identifying residual
517 transmission of lymphatic filariasis after mass drug administration: Comparing school-based versus
518 community-based surveillance - American Samoa, 2016. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis* 2018;12(7):e0006583.
519 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pntd.0006583>.
- 520 [22] Dickson BFR, Graves PM, Aye NN, Nwe TW, Wai T, Win SS, et al. The prevalence of lymphatic
521 filariasis infection and disease following six rounds of mass drug administration in Mandalay Region,
522 Myanmar. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis* 2018;12(11):e0006944.
523 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pntd.0006944>.
- 524 [23] Lau CL, Meder K, Mayfield HJ, Kearns T, McPherson B, Naseri T, et al. Lymphatic filariasis
525 epidemiology in Samoa in 2018: Geographic clustering and higher antigen prevalence in older age
526 groups. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis* 2020;14(12):e0008927. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pntd.0008927>.

527

528

529 Table 1:

530 A: Overall antigen (Ag) positivity as determined by FTS and QFAT in this study in samples from LF

531 endemic areas at the 10-minute reading.

Sample type	Serum		Heparin Plasma		EDTA plasma		Total	
	FTS	QFAT	FTS	QFAT	FTS	QFAT	FTS	QFAT
Ag-positive	54 (27.7 %)	62 (31.8 %)	77 (92.8 %)	79 (94 %)	42 (41.2 %)	56 (54.4 %)	173 (45.5 %)	197 (51.6 %)
Ag-negative	140 (71.8 %)	132 (67.7 %)	6 (7.2 %)	5 (6.0 %)	53 (52 %)	47 (45.6 %)	199 (52.4 %)	184 (48.2 %)
Indeterminant	1 (0.5 %)	1 (0.5 %)	0 (0 %)	0 (0 %)	7 (6.9 %)	0 (0 %)	8 (2.1 %)	1 (0.3 %)
Total	195	195	83	84	102	103	380	382

532 FTS: filariasis test strip; QFAT: Q Filariasis Antigen Test; EDTA: ethylenediaminetetraacetic acid

533 B: Overall antigen (Ag) positivity as determined by FTS and QFAT in this study in samples from LF

534 endemic areas at the one-hour reading.

Sample type	Serum		Heparin Plasma		EDTA plasma		Total	
	FTS	QFAT	FTS	QFAT	FTS	QFAT	FTS	QFAT
Ag-positive	54 (27.7 %)	70 (35.9 %)	77 (92.8 %)	83 (98.8 %)	50 (49 %)	56 (54.4 %)	181 (47.6 %)	209 (54.7 %)
Ag-negative	133 (68.2 %)	120 (61.5 %)	5 (6 %)	0 (0 %)	49 (48 %)	45 (43.7 %)	187 (49.2 %)	165 (43.2 %)
Indeterminant	8 (4.1 %)	5 (2.6 %)	1 (1.2 %)	1 (1.2 %)	3 (2.9 %)	2 (1.9 %)	12 (3.2 %)	8 (2.1 %)
Total	195	195	83	84	102	103	380	382

535 FTS: filariasis test strip; QFAT: Q Filariasis Antigen Test; EDTA: ethylenediaminetetraacetic acid

536 C: Overall antigen (Ag) positivity as determined by FTS and QFAT in this study in samples from LF

537 endemic areas at the 24-hours reading.

Sample type	Serum		Heparin Plasma		EDTA plasma		Total	
	FTS	QFAT	FTS	QFAT	FTS	QFAT	FTS	QFAT
Ag-positive	67 (34.4 %)	69 (35.4 %)	81 (97.6 %)	84 (100 %)	51 (50 %)	56 (54.4 %)	199 (52.4 %)	209 (54.7 %)

Ag-negative	125 (64.1 %)	122 (62.6 %)	0 (0 %)	0 (0 %)	46 (45.1 %)	46 (44.7 %)	171 (45 %)	168 (44 %)
Indeterminant	3 (1.5 %)	4 (2.1 %)	2 (2.4 %)	0 (0 %)	5 (4.9 %)	1 (1 %)	10 (2.6 %)	5 (1.3 %)
Total	195	195	83	84	102	103	380	382

538 FTS: filariasis test strip; QFAT: Q Filariasis Antigen Test; EDTA: ethylenediaminetetraacetic acid

539

540

541 Table 2. Concordance between tests, excluding indeterminant results, for all timepoints

Time-points	FTS	QFAT		N	Concordance (%)	Kappa (95% CI)
		Positive	Negative			
10 minutes	Positive	167	6	417	93.5	0.87 (0.82-0.92)
	Negative	21	223			
1 hour	Positive	180	1	407	94.8	0.90 (0.85-0.94)
	Negative	20	206			
24 hours	Positive	196	1	412	98.8	0.98 (0.95-1.0)
	Negative	4	211			

542 CI: Confidence interval; FTS: Filariasis Test Strip; QFAT: Q Filariasis Antigen Test

543

544 Table 3. Sensitivity, specificity, positive predictive value and negative predictive value of FTS and
 545 QFAT at the 10-minute reading, compared to prior antigen and 'antigen or any antibody' test result.

Test	Positive for antigen only		Positive for antigen or any antibody	
	FTS (n=417)	QFAT (n=427)	FTS (n=417)	QFAT (n=427)
Sensitivity	86%	92%	64%	70%
% (95% CI)	(80-90%)	(88-96%)	(58-70%)	(65-76%)
Specificity	99%	98%	99%	99%
% (95% CI)	(97-100%)	(95-99%)	(96-100%)	(95-100%)
PPV (95% CI)	0.99 (0.96-1.00)	0.98 (0.95-0.99)	0.99 (0.97-1.00)	0.99 (0.96-1.00)
NPV (95% CI)	0.88 (0.83-0.92)	0.93 (0.89-0.96)	0.61 (0.54-0.67)	0.64 (0.58-0.71)

546 Positive predictive values (PPV); Negative predictive values (NPV); CI: confidence interval; FTS: Filariasis Test

547 Strip; QFAT: Q Filariasis Antigen Test

548

549 **Figure legends**

550

551 Fig 1. Flowchart of samples selected, tested and indeterminate at the 10 minute reading, by sample
552 category and type.

553 Fig 2.

554 a. Sensitivity and specificity of FTS and QFAT, compared to prior Ag results, at three time points.


555 b. Positive and negative predictive values of FTS and QFAT, compared to prior Ag results, at three
556 time points.

557

558

559


560 Fig 1. Sample selection and testing



561


562 Fig 2.

563 A:



564

565 B:



566

568

569 Supplementary Table 1: Profile and number of samples selected for the laboratory comparison of
570 FTS and QFAT for LF antigen detection. The selected samples were collected from LF endemic areas,
571 with known LF antigen and antibody status (using ICT, FTS or Og4C3 ELISA) determined prior to the
572 current study.

Country	American Samoa			Samoa		Myanmar	Total (% positive)
	2014	2016	2016	2019	2019	2014	
Year of sample collection	2014	2016	2016	2019	2019	2014	
Sample type	SST Serum	SST Serum	Heparin Plasma	Heparin Plasma	EDTA Plasma	EDTA Plasma	All
Antigen							
N with prior antigen results	133	62	62	23	12	92	384
Antigen-positive	8	62	62	23	12	44	211 (54.9%)
Antigen-negative	125	NA	NA	NA	NA	48	173 (45.1%)
Antibodies							
Bm14 Ab-positive	47	53	53	NA	NA	39	192 (55.0%)
Bm14 Ab-negative	86	9	9	NA	NA	53	157 (45.0%)
Wb123 Ab-positive	48	55	55	NA	NA	32	190 (54.4%)
Wb123 Ab-negative	85	7	7	NA	NA	60	159 (45.6%)
Any antibody positive	68	59	59	NA	NA	41	227 (65.0%)
Any antibody negative	65	3	3	NA	NA	51	122 (35.1%)
Antigen and/or antibody							
Antigen or any antibody positive	69	62	62	23	12	51	279 (73.4%)
Antigen or any antibody negative	64	0	0	NA	NA	41	101 (26.6%)

573 EDTA: ethylenediaminetetraacetic acid; NA: not available

574

575

576 Supplementary Table 2. Number and percentage of results with each test that showed discordance

577 between observers at 10 minutes.

	FTS		QFAT		
Sample type	Total tested	Discordant results (%)	Total tested	Discordant results (%)	Chi-square (p-value)
Endemic samples					
Total	380	14 (3.7 %)	382	7 (1.8 %)	2.8 (0.096)
Serum	195	6 (3.1 %)	195	2 (1.0 %)	1.5 (0.221)
Heparin Plasma	83	1 (1.2 %)	84	1 (1.2 %)	0 (1.0)
EDTA Plasma	102	7 (6.8 %)	103	4 (3.9 %)	0.8 (0.371)
Non-endemic samples					
Total	53	0	72	0	
Australian negative controls	45	0	46	0	
Australian <i>Strongyloides</i> -positive	1	0	19	0	
Dog serum	7	0	7	0	

578 FTS: filariasis test strip; QFAT: Q Filariasis Antigen Test; EDTA: ethylenediaminetetraacetic acid; p-value:
 579 probability under the assumption of no difference between tests (null hypothesis), of obtaining a result equal
 580 to or more extreme than what was actually observed.

581

582 Supplementary Table 3.

583 A: Concordance for 10 min reading with EDTA plasma samples only.

Reading time		QFAT-Positive	QFAT-Negative	Total	Concordance (%)	Kappa (95% CI)
10 mins	FTS-Positive	41	1	42		
	FTS-Negative	7	46	53		
	Total	48	47	95	91.6	0.83 (0.72-0.94)

584

585 B: Sensitivity and specificity for 10 min reading with EDTA plasma samples only

Reading time	Test	Sensitivity	Specificity	N
10 min	FTS	85% (72% to 94%)	96% (86% to 99%)	95
	QFAT	96% (87% to 100%)	94% (83% to 99%)	103

586

587

588 Supplementary Table 4. Samples with changes over time in reactivity for a) FTS and b) QFAT at 10 mins, 1 hour and 24 hours.

**Supp Table 4a:
FTS**

ID	Country	Sample type	FTS result at 10 minutes	FTS result at 1 hour	FTS result at 24 hours
296	Myanmar	EDTA Plasma	Indeterminate	Indeterminate	Positive
370	Myanmar	EDTA Plasma	Indeterminate	Positive	Indeterminate
271	Samoa	EDTA Plasma	Indeterminate	Positive	Positive
305	Myanmar	EDTA Plasma	Indeterminate	Positive	Positive
327	Myanmar	EDTA Plasma	Indeterminate	Positive	Positive
341	Myanmar	EDTA Plasma	Indeterminate	Positive	Positive
351	Myanmar	EDTA Plasma	Indeterminate	Positive	Positive
328	Myanmar	EDTA Plasma	Negative	Indeterminate	Negative
335	Myanmar	EDTA Plasma	Negative	Indeterminate	Negative
302	Myanmar	EDTA Plasma	Negative	Negative	Indeterminate
356	Myanmar	EDTA Plasma	Negative	Negative	Indeterminate
361	Myanmar	EDTA Plasma	Negative	Negative	Indeterminate
309	Myanmar	EDTA Plasma	Negative	Negative	Positive
354	Myanmar	EDTA Plasma	Negative	Negative	Positive
364	Myanmar	EDTA Plasma	Negative	Positive	Indeterminate
331	Myanmar	EDTA Plasma	Negative	Positive	Positive
86	Am Samoa	HEP Plasma	Negative	Negative	Indeterminate
103	Am Samoa	HEP Plasma	Negative	Negative	Indeterminate
70	Am Samoa	HEP Plasma	Negative	Negative	Positive
88	Am Samoa	HEP Plasma	Negative	Negative	Positive
90	Am Samoa	HEP Plasma	Negative	Negative	Positive
268	Samoa	HEP Plasma	Negative	Positive	Positive
133	Am Samoa	Serum	Negative	Indeterminate	Negative

147	Am Samoa	Serum	Negative	Indeterminate	Negative
151	Am Samoa	Serum	Negative	Indeterminate	Negative
12	Am Samoa	Serum	Negative	Indeterminate	Positive
62	Am Samoa	Serum	Negative	Indeterminate	Positive
128	Am Samoa	Serum	Negative	Indeterminate	Positive
24	Am Samoa	Serum	Negative	Negative	Indeterminate
170	Am Samoa	Serum	Negative	Negative	Indeterminate
7	Am Samoa	Serum	Negative	Negative	Positive
26	Am Samoa	Serum	Negative	Negative	Positive
28	Am Samoa	Serum	Negative	Negative	Positive
43	Am Samoa	Serum	Negative	Negative	Positive
57	Am Samoa	Serum	Negative	Negative	Positive
59	Am Samoa	Serum	Negative	Negative	Positive
129	Am Samoa	Serum	Negative	Negative	Positive
157	Am Samoa	Serum	Negative	Negative	Positive
169	Am Samoa	Serum	Negative	Negative	Positive
130	Am Samoa	Serum	Negative	Positive	Positive
31	Am Samoa	Serum	Positive	Indeterminate	Positive

589


**Supp Table 4b:
QFAT**

rowid	country	sampletype	QFAT result at 10 minutes	QFAT result at 1 hour	QFAT result at 24 hours
334	Myanmar	EDTA Plasma	Negative	Indeterminate	Indeterminate
371	Myanmar	EDTA Plasma	Negative	Indeterminate	Negative
103	Am Samoa	HEP Plasma	Negative	Indeterminate	Positive
72	Am Samoa	HEP Plasma	Negative	Positive	Positive
74	Am Samoa	HEP Plasma	Negative	Positive	Positive
90	Am Samoa	HEP Plasma	Negative	Positive	Positive
169	Am Samoa	Serum	Negative	Indeterminate	Indeterminate
134	Am Samoa	Serum	Negative	Indeterminate	Negative
145	Am Samoa	Serum	Negative	Indeterminate	Negative
28	Am Samoa	Serum	Negative	Indeterminate	Positive
170	Am Samoa	Serum	Negative	Negative	Indeterminate
141	Am Samoa	Serum	Negative	Positive	Negative
41	Am Samoa	Serum	Negative	Positive	Positive
61	Am Samoa	Serum	Negative	Positive	Positive
62	Am Samoa	Serum	Negative	Positive	Positive
128	Am Samoa	Serum	Negative	Positive	Positive
130	Am Samoa	Serum	Negative	Positive	Positive
133	Am Samoa	Serum	Negative	Positive	Positive
157	Am Samoa	Serum	Positive	Positive	Indeterminate



590

591

592



595 Supplementary Fig 2. Test score by observer and
 596 time period, by test type.



598

|

602