



Malaria Rapid Diagnostic Test Performance

Results of WHO product testing of
malaria RDTs: round 7 (2015–2016)



Malaria Rapid Diagnostic Test Performance

Results of WHO product testing of
malaria RDTs: round 7 (2015–2016)

Some rights reserved. This work is available under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 3.0 IGO licence (CC BY-NC-SA 3.0 IGO; <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/3.0/igo>).

Under the terms of this licence, you may copy, redistribute and adapt the work for non-commercial purposes, provided the work is appropriately cited, as indicated below. In any use of this work, there should be no suggestion that WHO endorses any specific organization, products or services. The use of the WHO logo is not permitted. If you adapt the work, then you must license your work under the same or equivalent Creative Commons licence. If you create a translation of this work, you should add the following disclaimer along with the suggested citation: "This translation was not created by the World Health Organization (WHO). WHO is not responsible for the content or accuracy of this translation. The original English edition shall be the binding and authentic edition".

Any mediation relating to disputes arising under the licence shall be conducted in accordance with the mediation rules of the World Intellectual Property Organization.

Suggested citation. Malaria rapid diagnostic test performance: results of WHO product testing of malaria RDTs: round 7 (2015–2016). Geneva: World Health Organization; 2017. Licence: CC BY-NC-SA 3.0 IGO.

Cataloguing-in-Publication (CIP) data. CIP data are available at <http://apps.who.int/iris>.

Sales, rights and licensing. To purchase WHO publications, see <http://apps.who.int/bookorders>. To submit requests for commercial use and queries on rights and licensing, see <http://www.who.int/about/licensing>.

Third-party materials. If you wish to reuse material from this work that is attributed to a third party, such as tables, figures or images, it is your responsibility to determine whether permission is needed for that reuse and to obtain permission from the copyright holder. The risk of claims resulting from infringement of any third-party-owned component in the work rests solely with the user.

General disclaimers. 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 WHO 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 and dashed 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 WHO 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 WHO 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 WHO be liable for damages arising from its use.

Layout: Bruno Duret

Editor: Elisabeth Heseltine

WHO does not warrant that: (1) the lists and figures are complete and/or error free and/or that (2) any products mentioned 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 patent laws. Mention of any product in this report, particularly in any of the figures and tables on pp. 8 and 9, does not imply their approval by WHO (as this 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 WHO prequalification is not currently a requirement for WHO procurement, manufacturers are encouraged to apply for it. A regularly updated list of WHO-prequalified diagnostics, including malaria RDTs, is available at http://www.who.int/diagnostics_laboratory/evaluations/PQ_list/en/.

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. The recommendations were established by the WHO Malaria Policy Advisory Committee in 2012, are outlined in this report and are presented in full in a WHO information note (available at <http://www.who.int/malaria/publications/atoz/rdt-selection-criteria.pdf>). Products that do not meet the full set of minimum performance criteria are not eligible for procurement by WHO. As of 1 January 2018, WHO prequalification will become a requirement for procurement recommendation (<http://www.who.int/malaria/news/2016/rdt-procurement-criteria/en/>).

The lists of RDTs included in this report are not exhaustive but reflect those products that were submitted for evaluation in rounds 4–7 of the WHO Malaria RDT Product Testing Programme. Their mention indicates the extent to which 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 evaluations indicated in the figures and tables apply only to the specific product listed with its unique product code or catalogue number and as manufactured by the listed company.

Improper storage, transport or handling of malaria RDTs may affect their performance.

The fact that certain products are not included in any of the lists and figures in this report indicates that they have not or not yet been submitted for evaluation to the WHO Malaria RDT Product Testing Programme or that their evaluation has not yet been completed and published or that they have been removed from summary reports due to noncompliance with compulsory resubmission requirements. It does not 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 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 evaluations are published by WHO, WHO cannot ensure that products on the lists and in figures will continue to meet the performance criteria in the same manner as indicated. WHO recommends therefore that, before procuring a malaria RDT, each lot of that product be tested at one of the two following lot-testing laboratories: the Institut Pasteur du Cambodge, Cambodia, or the Research Institute for Tropical Medicine, 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–VIII.

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

Contents

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	IX
ABBREVIATIONS	X
1. SUMMARY OF PERFORMANCE OF RAPID DIAGNOSTIC TESTS FOR MALARIA: WHO PRODUCT TESTING ROUNDS 1–7	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. De-listing of products in summary report	5
1.6. How product testing results can inform RDT procurement and use	5
1.7. Product testing and WHO programme for prequalification of diagnostics and medical devices	6
2. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	21
2.1. Introduction	21
2.2. The WHO product testing programme	21
2.3. Results of the evaluation	22
2.4. Use of the results	23
3. BACKGROUND	24
4. OBJECTIVE	24
5. MATERIALS AND METHODS	26
5.1. Test selection	26
5.2. The product testing protocol	28
5.3. Evaluation panels	28
5.4. Product registration	30
5.5. Specimen panel registration	30
5.6. Test phases	30
5.7. Performing rapid tests	32
5.8. Interpreting the results	32
5.9. Recording anomalies	32
6. DATA MANAGEMENT	32
7. QUALITY ASSURANCE	33
7.1. Quality of malaria RDTs and their use	33
7.2. Quality and objectivity of RDT readings	33
7.3. Quality of WHO specimen bank samples	33
7.4. Quality of the product testing site	33
8. ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS	33
9. DATA ANALYSIS	34
9.1. Measures of parasite detection: panel detection score and positivity rates	34
9.2. False-positive results	34
9.2.1 Incorrect species identification	34
9.2.2 False-positive results for <i>Plasmodium</i> -negative samples	34
9.3. Band intensity	34
9.4. Lot agreement	35
9.5. Invalid tests	35
9.6. Heat (thermal) stability	35
9.7. Anomalies	35
9.8. Labelling and instructions for use	35

10. ASSOCIATION BETWEEN PARASITE DENSITY AND ANTIGEN CONCENTRATION	36
11. EVALUATION OF MALARIA RAPID DIAGNOSTIC TESTS IN THE LABORATORY AND IN THE FIELD	36
12. RESULTS	37
12.1. Summary	37
12.2. Phase 1: <i>P. falciparum</i> culture panel	43
12.3. Phase 2: wild -type <i>P. falciparum</i> and <i>P. vivax</i> - and <i>Plasmodium</i> spp.-negative samples.	43
12.3.1 <i>P. falciparum</i> detection	43
12.3.2 <i>P. vivax</i> detection	44
12.3.3 Combined detection of <i>P. falciparum</i> and <i>P. vivax</i>	45
12.3.4 <i>P. falciparum</i> and <i>P. vivax</i> positivity rate	45
12.3.5 Band intensity	45
12.3.6 False-positive rates	47
12.4. Performance of resubmitted products	50
13. HEAT STABILITY	52
13.1. Summary	52
13.2. <i>Plasmodium falciparum</i>	52
13.3. <i>Plasmodium vivax</i>	52
14. EASE OF USE, ANOMALIES, LABELLING AND INSTRUCTIONS FOR USE	60
14.1. Ease of use	60
14.2. Anomalies	60
14.3. Labelling and instructions for use	60
15. DISCUSSION OF KEY FINDINGS	73
15.1. Panel detection score and its relation to sensitivity	73
15.2. False-positive rate and specificity	74
15.3. Reactivity of combination HRP2 and pan-pLDH test lines against <i>P. falciparum</i> samples	74
15.4. Heat (thermal) stability	75
15.5. Ease-of-use description	75
15.6. Labelling and instructions for use	75
15.7. Anomalies in RDT production lots	76
15.8. Inter-lot variation	76
15.9. Selecting RDTs: target antigens, species and sensitivity	76
16. USING RESULTS TO ENSURE HIGH-QUALITY DIAGNOSIS IN THE FIELD	78
16.1. WHO prequalification	78
16.2. Beyond procurement	78
16.3. Post-market surveillance: lot verification	79
17. CONCLUSIONS	79
18. REFERENCES	80
ANNEXES	83
Annex S1: Characteristics of evaluation panels used in rounds 1–7 of WHO malaria RDT product testing, 2008–2016	84
Annex S2: Malaria RDT field assessment and anomalies	87
Annex S3: Selection of an appropriate RDT	90
Annex 1: Characteristics of RDTs evaluated in round 7	91
Annex 2: Malaria RDTs: guide to interpretation of results	93
Annex 3: Phase-1 results	108
Annex 4: Phase-2 results	112
Annex 5: Introducing RDT-based malaria diagnosis into national programmes	145

FIGURES

- Figure S1. Malaria RDT performance in phase 2 of rounds 4–7 against wild-type (clinical) samples containing *P. falciparum* at low (200) and high (2000) parasite density (parasites/μL) and clean-negative samples
- Figure S2. Malaria RDT performance in phase 2 of rounds 4–7 against wild-type (clinical) samples containing *P. vivax* at low (200) and high (2000) parasite density (parasites/μL) and clean-negative samples
- Figure S3. Panel detection score of malaria combination RDTs meeting WHO procurement criteria for false-positive and invalid rates, in phase 2 of rounds 4–7 against wild-type (clinical) samples containing *P. falciparum* 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 *P. falciparum* wild-type (clinical) samples
- Figure 4b. Origin of phase-2 *P. vivax* 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/μL
- Figure 7. Classification of incorrect species identification with combination malaria RDTs
- Figure 8. Explanation of lot agreement calculation
- Figure 9. Phase-1 *P. falciparum* panel detection score of malaria RDTs at low (200) and high (2000) parasite density (parasites/μL)
- Figure 10. Phase-2 *P. falciparum* panel detection score of malaria RDTs at low (200) and high (2000) parasite density (parasites/μL)
- Figure 11. Phase-2 *P. vivax* panel detection score of malaria RDTs at low (200) and high (2000) parasite density (parasites/μL)
- 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* test line) false-positive rate against clean-negative samples
- Figure 16. Phase-2 *P. falciparum* false-positive rate versus *P. falciparum* panel detection score at low parasite density (200 parasites/μL)
- Figure 17. Phase-2 *P. vivax* false-positive rate versus *P. vivax* 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/μL) during initial and subsequent testing of compulsorily and voluntarily resubmitted malaria RDTs
- Figure 19. Phase-2 *P. vivax* 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 *P. falciparum*-specific test line of *P. falciparum*-only tests against a low-density *P. falciparum* 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/μL). Positivity rate at baseline and after 60 days' incubation
- Figure 22. Heat stability of *P. falciparum*-specific test line in combination tests against a low-density *P. falciparum* sample (200 parasites/μL). Positivity rate at baseline and after 60 days' incubation
- Figure 23. Heat stability of *P. falciparum*-specific test line in combination tests against a high-density *P. falciparum* sample (2000 parasites/μL). Positivity rate at baseline and after 60 days' incubation
- Figure 24. 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 25. 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 26. Heat stability of pan line of combination tests against a low-density *P. vivax* sample (200 parasites/ μ L). Positivity rate at baseline and after 60 days' incubation
- Figure 27. Heat stability of pan line of combination tests against a high-density *P. vivax* sample (2000 parasites/ μ L). Positivity rate at baseline and after 60 days' incubation
- Figure 28. Heat stability of *P. vivax*-specific test line in combination tests against a low-density *P. vivax* sample (200 parasites/ μ L). Positivity rate at baseline and after 60 days' incubation
- Figure 29. Heat stability of *P. vivax*-specific test line in combination tests against a high-density *P. vivax* sample (2000 parasites/ μ L). Positivity rate at baseline and after 60 days' incubation
- Figure 30. Percentage of RDTs with various anomalies observed in production lots
- Figure 31. Adherence to box labelling recommendations
- Figure 32. Adherence to cassette labelling recommendations
- Figure 33. Adherence to buffer bottle labelling recommendations
- Figure 34. Accessory labelling – use of internationally recognized symbols
- Figure 35. Completeness of information on accessory packaging – transfer device and lancet
- Figure 36. Completeness of information on accessory packaging – dessicant and alcohol swab
- Figure 37. Completeness of information included in the instructions for use: product information and intended use, precautions and limitations
- Figure 38. Completeness of information included in the instructions for use: procedure and performance specifications
- 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

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_26318

