

# Malaria Rapid Diagnostic Test Performance

Results of WHO product testing of malaria RDTs: Round 5 (2013)







## Malaria Rapid Diagnostic Test Performance

Results of WHO product testing of malaria RDTs: Round 5 (2013)







### WHO Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data:

Malaria rapid diagnostic test performance: results of WHO product testing of malaria RDTs: round 5 (2013).

1.Diagnostic Techniques and Procedures. 2.Malaria - diagnosis. 3.Diagnostic Tests, Routine - methods. I.World Health Organization.

ISBN 978 92 4 150755 4 (NLM classification: WC 750)

#### © World Health Organization 2014

All rights reserved. Publications of the World Health Organization are available on the WHO website (<a href="www.who.int">www.who.int</a>) or can be purchased from WHO Press, World Health Organization, 20 Avenue Appia, 1211 Geneva 27, Switzerland (tel.: +41 22 791 3264; fax: +41 22 791 4857; e-mail: <a href="mailtookorders@who.int">bookorders@who.int</a>).

Requests for permission to reproduce or translate WHO publications –whether for sale or for non-commercial distribution– should be addressed to WHO Press through the WHO website (<a href="https://www.who.int/about/licensing/copyright\_form/en/index.html">www.who.int/about/licensing/copyright\_form/en/index.html</a>).

The designations employed and the presentation of the material in this publication do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the World Health Organization concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries. Dotted lines on maps represent approximate border lines for which there may not yet be full agreement.

The mention of specific companies or of certain manufacturers' products does not imply that they are endorsed or recommended by the World Health Organization in preference to others of a similar nature that are not mentioned. Errors and omissions excepted, the names of proprietary products are distinguished by initial capital letters.

All reasonable precautions have been taken by the World Health Organization to verify the information contained in this publication. However, the published material is being distributed without warranty of any kind, either expressed or implied. The responsibility for the interpretation and use of the material lies with the reader. In no event shall the World Health Organization be liable for damages arising from its use.

Layout: Bruno Duret - Editor: Elisabeth Heseltine

Printed in Italy

Reference to any company or product in this report, particularly those listed in any of the figures and tables, does not constitute an endorsement, certification, or warranty of fitness by WHO of such company or product for any purpose, and does not imply any preference over companies or products of a similar nature that are not mentioned.

WHO does not furthermore warrant that: (1) the lists and figures are complete and/or error free; and/or that (2) any products included in the figures and tables are of acceptable quality, have obtained regulatory approval in any country, or that their use is otherwise in accordance with the national laws and regulations of any country, including but not limited to patent laws. Inclusion of any products in this report, particularly in any of the figures and tables listed on pages V-VII, does not furthermore imply any approval by WHO of these products (which is the sole prerogative of national authorities).

The WHO Programme of Prequalification of Diagnostics and Medical Devices uses the results of the WHO Malaria RDT Product Testing Programme as the laboratory evaluation component of the prequalification process for malaria RDTs. Although not currently a requirement for WHO procurement, manufacturers are encouraged to apply for WHO prequalification. A regularly updated list of WHO-prequalified diagnostics, including malaria RDTs, is available at <a href="http://www.who.int/diagnostics\_laboratory/evaluations/PQ\_list/en/">http://www.who.int/diagnostics\_laboratory/evaluations/PQ\_list/en/</a>.

WHO recommendations for procurement of malaria RDTs are currently based on the attainment of a set of minimum performance criteria in the WHO Malaria RDT Product Testing Programme. These recommendations were established by the WHO Malaria Policy Advisory Committee in 2012 , are outlined in this report and presented in full in a WHO information note (available at <a href="http://www.who.int/malaria/publications/atoz/rdt\_selection\_criteria\_en.pdf?ua=1">http://www.who.int/malaria/publications/atoz/rdt\_selection\_criteria\_en.pdf?ua=1</a>). Products that do not meet the full set of minimum performance criteria are not eligible for procurement by WHO.

The lists of RDTs included in this report are not exhaustive lists of malaria RDTs. These lists reflect those products which have been submitted for evaluation in Rounds 2-5 of the WHO Malaria RDT Product Testing Programme, and indicate to what extent these products, as manufactured by the listed companies, were -at the time of their evaluation- found to meet the above mentioned set of minimum performance criteria. The evaluation results indicated in the figures and tables apply only to the specific product as listed with its unique product code / catalogue number and as manufactured by the listed company.

The improper storage, transport and handling of malaria RDTs may affect their level of performance.

The fact that certain products are not included in the lists and figures in this report indicates that they have not or not yet been submitted for evaluation in the WHO Malaria RDT Product Testing Programme, or that their evaluation has not yet been completed and published in [a new edition of this report]. It does not however indicate anything in respect of such products' performance. The lists and figures are updated regularly, and malaria RDTs are added to the lists and figures as and when (following the voluntary participation in the WHO Malaria RDT Product Testing Programme) their evaluation against the above mentioned set of minimum performance criteria has been completed.

Although the malaria RDTs listed in the tables and figures are regularly re-evaluated, and updated evaluation results are published by WHO, WHO cannot represent that products included in the lists and figures will continue to meet the performance criteria in the same manner as indicated. WHO recommends therefore that before procurement of a malaria RDT, each lot of that product undergoes lot testing at one of the two following lot-testing laboratories: Institut Pasteur du Cambodge (IPC), Cambodia or Research Institute for Tropical Medicine (RITM), The Philippines.

WHO disclaims any and all liability and responsibility whatsoever for any injury, death, loss, damage, or other prejudice of any kind that may arise as a result of or in connection with the procurement, distribution and use of any product included in this report and the figures and tables listed on pages V-VII.

This report may not be used by manufacturers and suppliers for commercial or promotional purposes.

# 

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	VIII			
ABBREVIATIONS				
1. SUMMARY OF PERFORMANCE OF RAPID DIAGNOSTIC TESTS FOR MALARIA:				
WHO PRODUCT TESTING ROUNDS 1-5	1			
1.1. Introduction	1			
1.2. The WHO product testing programme	1			
1.3. Panel detection score and other results of the evaluation	2			
1.4. Summary of outcomes	4			
1.5. How can product testing results inform RDT procurement and use?	5			
1.6. Product testing and WHO programme for prequalification of diagnostics and medical devices	5			
2. WHO MALARIA RDT PRODUCT TESTING:	0.0			
ROUND 5: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	20			
<ul><li>2.1. Introduction</li><li>2.2. The WHO product testing programme</li></ul>	20			
2.3. Results of the evaluation	21			
2.4. Use of the results	22			
3. BACKGROUND	22			
4. OBJECTIVE	24			
5. MATERIALS AND METHODS	24			
5.1. Test selection	24			
5.2. The product testing protocol	26			
5.3. Evaluation panels	27			
5.4. RDT registration	29			
5.5. Specimen panel registration	29			
5.6. Test phases	29 29			
<ul><li>5.7. Performing rapid tests</li><li>5.8. Interpreting the results</li></ul>	30			
6. DATA MANAGEMENT	31			
7. QUALITY ASSURANCE	31			
8. ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS	32			
9. DATA ANALYSIS	32			
9.1. Measures of parasite detection: panel detection score and positivity rates	32			
9.2. False-positive results	32			
9.2.1 Incorrect species identification 9.2.2 False-positive results	32			
for <i>Plasmodium</i> -negative samples	33			
9.3. Band intensity 9.4. Lot agreement	33			
9.5. Invalid tests	33			
9.6. Heat (thermal) stability	33			

10. RELATION BETWEEN PARASITE DENSITY AND ANTIGEN CONCENTRATION	34
11. LABORATORY VERSUS FIELD-BASED	
MALARIA RDT EVALUATIONS	34
12. RESULTS	35
12.1. Summary	35
12.2. Phase 1: <i>P. falciparum</i> culture panel	40
12.3.1 <i>P. falciparum</i> detection	41
12.3.2 <i>P. vivax</i> detection 12.3.3 Combined detection of <i>P. falciparum</i> and <i>P. vivax</i>	42
12.3.4 <i>P. falciparum</i> and <i>P. vivax</i> positivity rate	43
12.3.5 Band intensity	43
12.3.6 False-positive rates	45
12.4. Performance of products under the compulsory resubmission requirement	48
13. HEAT STABILITY	50
14. EASE-OF-USE DESCRIPTION AND RDT	
ANOMALIES	57
15. DISCUSSION OF KEY FINDINGS	60
15.1. Panel detection score and its relation to sensitivity	60
15.2. False-positive rate and specificity	61
15.3. Reactivity of combination HRP2 and pan-pLDH	
test lines against <i>P. falciparum</i> samples	61
15.4. Heat (thermal) stability	62
15.5. Ease-of-use description and RDT anomalies in production lots	62
15.6. Inter-lot variation	63
15.7. Target antigens and species	63
16. USING RESULTS TO ENSURE HIGH-QUALITY DIAGNOSIS IN THE FIELD	64
16.1. Beyond procurement	64
16.2. Lot testing	64
17. CONCLUSIONS	65
18. REFERENCES	65
ANNEXES	67
Annex S1: Characteristics of evaluation panels used	
in rounds 1–5 of WHO malaria RDT product testing, 2008–2013	68
Annex S2: Malaria RDT field assessment and anomalies	71
Annex S3: Selection of an appropriate RDT	74
Annex 1: Characteristics of RDTs evaluated in round 5	75
Annex 2: Malaria RDTs: guide to interpretation of results	77
Annex 3: Phase-1 results	92
Annex 4: Phase-2 results	96
Annex 5: Introducing RDT-based malaria diagnosis	125

## **FIGURES**

Figure S1:	Malaria RDT performance in phase 2 of rounds 2–5 against wild-type (clinical) samples containing $P$ . folcoparum at low (200) and high (2000 or 5000) parasite density (parasites/ $\mu$ L) and clean-negative samples
Figure S2:	Malaria RDT performance in phase 2 of rounds 2–5 against wild-type (clinical) samples containing <i>P. vivas</i> at low (200) and high (2000 or 5000) parasite density (parasites/μL) and clean-negative samples
Figure S3:	Panel detection score of malaria combination and pan-only RDTs meeting WHO procurement criteria for false-positive and invalid rates, in phase 2 of rounds 2–5 against wild-type (clinical) samples containing Palciparum and P. vivax at low parasite density (200 parasites/µL)
Figure 1:	Mode of action of antigen-detecting malaria RDTs
Figure 2:	Network of specimen collection, characterization and testing sites
Figure 3:	Overview of malaria RDT product testing
Figure 4a:	Origin of phase-2 <i>P. falciparum</i> wild-type (clinical) samples
Figure 4b:	Origin of phase-2 <i>P. vivax</i> wild-type (clinical) samples
Figure 5:	Testing procedure and calculation of panel detection score and band intensity for product A against a sample density of 200 parasites/µL
Figure 6:	Testing procedure and calculation of panel detection score and band intensity for product A against a sample density of 2000 parasites/ $\mu L$
Figure 7:	Classification of incorrect species identification with combination malaria RDTs
Figure 8:	Explanation of lot agreement calculation
Figure 9:	Phase-1 <i>P. falciparum</i> panel detection score of malaria RDTs at low (200) and high (2000) parasite density (parasites/ $\mu$ L) according to target antigen type (HRP2 or pLDH)
Figure 10:	Phase-2 <i>P. falciparum</i> panel detection score of malaria RDTs at low (200) and high (2000) parasite density (parasites/ $\mu$ L) according to target antigen type (HRP2 or pLDH)
Figure 11:	Phase-2 <i>P. vivax</i> panel detection score of malaria RDTs at low (200) and high (2000) parasite density (parasites, $\mu$ L) according to target antigen type (aldolase, pLDH)
Figure 12:	Phase-2 P. falciparum panel detection score and positivity rate at 200 parasites/µL
Figure 13:	Phase-2 P. vivax panel detection score and positivity rate at 200 parasites/µL
Figure 14:	Phase-2 P. falciparum (P. falciparum test line) false-positive rate against clean-negative samples
Figure 15:	Phase-2 Plasmodium spp. (pan or P. vivax/Pvom test line) false-positive rate against clean-negative samples
Figure 16:	Phase-2 <i>P. falciparum</i> false-positive rate versus <i>P. falciparum</i> panel detection score at low parasite density (200 parasites/µL)
Figure 17:	Phase-2 <i>P. vivax</i> false-positive rate versus <i>P. vivax</i> panel detection score at low parasite density (200 parasites/µL)
Figure 18:	Phase-2 $P$ . $falciparum$ panel detection score at low parasite density (200 parasites/ $\mu$ L) during initial and subsequent testing of compulsorily and voluntarily resubmitted malaria RDTs
Figure 19:	Phase-2 <i>P. vivax</i> panel detection score at low parasite density (200 parasites/µL) during initial and subsequent testing of compulsorily and voluntarily resubmitted malaria RDTs
Figure 20:	Heat stability of <i>P. falciparum</i> -specific test line of <i>P. falciparum</i> -only tests against a low-density <i>P. falciparum</i> sample (200 parasites/µL). Positivity rate at baseline and after 60 days' incubation
Figure 21:	Heat stability of $P$ . falciparum-specific test line of $P$ . falciparum-only tests against a high-density $P$ . falciparum sample (2000 parasites/ $\mu$ L). Positivity rate at baseline and after 60 days' incubation
Figure 22:	Heat stability of <i>P. falciparum</i> -specific test line in combination tests against a low-density <i>P. falciparum</i> sample (200 parasites/µL). Positivity rate at baseline and after 60 days' incubation
Figure 23:	Heat stability of <i>P. falciparum</i> -specific test line in combination tests against a high-density <i>P. falciparum</i> sample (2000 parasites/ $\mu$ L). Positivity rate at baseline and after 60 days' incubation
Figure 24:	Heat stability of pan line of pan-specific tests against a low-density <i>P. falciparum</i> sample (200 parasites/µL). Positivity rate at baseline and after 60 days' incubation

- Figure 25: Heat stability of pan line of pan-specific tests against a high-density *P. falciparum* sample (2000 parasites/μL). Positivity rate at baseline and after 60 days' incubation
- Figure 26: Heat stability of pan line of combination tests against a low-density *P. falciparum* sample (200 parasites/μL). Positivity rate at baseline and after 60 days' incubation
- Figure 27: Heat stability of pan line of combination tests against a high-density *P. falciparum* sample (2000 parasites/μL). Positivity rate at baseline and after 60 days' incubation
- Figure AS1.1: Box-and-whisker plot of distribution of *P. falciparum* HRP2 concentration (ng/mL) in product testing phase 2 (wild-type) panels
- Figure AS1.2: Box-and-whisker plot of distribution of *P. falciparum* pLDH concentration (ng/mL) in product testing phase 2 (wild-type) panels
- Figure AS1.3: Box-and-whisker plot of distribution of *P. vivax* pLDH concentration (ng/mL) in product testing phase 2 (wild-type) panels
- Figure AS1.4: Box-and-whisker plot of distribution of *P. falciparum* aldolase concentration (ng/mL) in product testing phase 2 (wild-type) panels
- Figure AS1.5: Box-and-whisker plot of distribution of *P. vivax* aldolase concentration (ng/mL) in product testing phase 2 (wild-type) panels
- Figure AS2.1: Malaria RDT anomalies encountered in production lots
- Figure AS3.1: Selecting an appropriate RDT
- Figure A5.1: Example of malaria RDT implementation steps and timeline
  Figure A5.2: Components of the budget for a malaria diagnosis programme

### **TABLES**

- Table S1: Product resubmissions: WHO malaria RDT product testing rounds 1–5
- Table S2 Malaria RDT phase-2 performance in rounds 2–5 against wild-type (clinical) samples containing *P. falciparum* and *P. vivax* at low (200) and high (2000 or 5000) parasite density (parasites/µL) and clean-negative samples
- Table S3: Malaria RDT rounds 2–5 heat stability results on a cultured *P. falciparum* sample at low (200) and high (2000) parasite density (parasites/μL). Positivity rate at baseline and after 60 days' incubation at 35 °C and 45 °C
- Table 1a: Manufacturers and products accepted into round 5 of WHO malaria RDT product testing programme
- **Table 1b:** Products due for compulsory resubmission in round 5
- Table 2: Characteristics of Diagnodium can negative complete

### 预览已结束,完整报告链接和二维码如下:

https://www.yunbaogao.cn/report/index/report?reportId=5\_27798



