



# Malaria Rapid Diagnostic Test Performance

Results of WHO product testing of  
malaria RDTs: round 6 (2014–2015)



# Malaria Rapid Diagnostic Test Performance

Results of WHO product testing of  
malaria RDTs: round 6 (2014–2015)

WHO Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data:

Malaria rapid diagnostic test performance: results of WHO product testing of malaria RDTs: round 6 (2014-2015).

I.World Health Organization.

ISBN 978 92 4 151003 5

Subject headings are available from WHO institutional repository

© World Health Organization 2015

All rights reserved. Publications of the World Health Organization are available on the WHO website ([www.who.int](http://www.who.int)) 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: [bookorders@who.int](mailto:bookorders@who.int)).

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 ([www.who.int/about/licensing/copyright\\_form/en/index.html](http://www.who.int/about/licensing/copyright_form/en/index.html)).

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 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 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.

Printed in Italy

Layout: Bruno Duret - Editor: Elisabeth Heseltine

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 [http://www.who.int/diagnostics\\_laboratory/evaluations/PQ\\_list/en/](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. 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 [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)). 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 3-6 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.

# Contents

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	IX
ABBREVIATIONS	X
1. SUMMARY OF PERFORMANCE OF RAPID DIAGNOSTIC TESTS FOR MALARIA: WHO PRODUCT TESTING ROUNDS 1–6	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. Delisting of products in summary report	4
1.6. How can product testing results inform RDT procurement and use?	5
1.7. Product testing and WHO programme for prequalification of diagnostics and medical devices	5
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	31
5.8. Interpreting the results	31
5.9. Recording anomalies	32
6. DATA MANAGEMENT	32
7. QUALITY ASSURANCE	32
7.1. Quality of malaria RDTs and their use	32
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	33
9.1. Measures of parasite detection: panel detection score and positivity rates	33
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	34
9.5. Invalid tests	35
9.6. Heat (thermal) stability	35
9.7. Anomalies	35

10. RELATION BETWEEN PARASITE DENSITY AND ANTIGEN CONCENTRATION	36
11. LABORATORY VERSUS FIELD-BASED MALARIA EVALUATIONS OF RAPID DIAGNOSTIC TESTS	36
12. RESULTS	37
12.1. Summary	37
12.2. Phase 1: <i>P. falciparum</i> culture panel	42
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>	44
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 DESCRIPTION AND ANOMALIES	60
14.1. Ease of use	60
14.2. Anomalies	60
15. DISCUSSION OF KEY FINDINGS	65
15.1. Panel detection score and its relation to sensitivity	65
15.2. False-positive rate and specificity	66
15.3. Reactivity of combination HRP2 and pan-pLDH test lines against <i>P. falciparum</i> samples	66
15.4. Heat (thermal) stability	67
15.5. Ease-of-use description	67
15.6. RDT anomalies in production lots	68
15.7. Inter-lot variation	68
15.8. Target antigens and species	68
16. USING RESULTS TO ENSURE HIGH-QUALITY DIAGNOSIS IN THE FIELD	69
16.1. Beyond performance	69
16.2. Beyond procurement	69
16.3. Post-market surveillance: lot verification	70
17. CONCLUSIONS	70
18. REFERENCES	71
ANNEXES	73
Annex S1: Characteristics of evaluation panels used in rounds 1–6 of WHO malaria RDT product testing, 2008–2015	74
Annex S2: Malaria RDT field assessment and anomalies	77
Annex S3: Selection of an appropriate RDT	80
Annex 1: Characteristics of RDTs evaluated in round 6	81
Annex 2: Malaria RDTs: guide to interpretation of results	83
Annex 3: Phase-1 results	98
Annex 4: Phase-2 results	102
Annex 5: Introducing RDT-based malaria diagnosis into national programmes	135

# FIGURES

- Figure S1. Malaria RDT performance in phase 2 of rounds 3–6 against wild-type (clinical) samples containing *P. falciparum* at low (200) and high (2000 or 5000) parasite density (parasites/μL) and clean-negative samples
- Figure S2. Malaria RDT performance in phase 2 of rounds 3–6 against wild-type (clinical) samples containing *P. vivax* at low (200) and high (2000 or 5000) 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 3–6 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/ $\mu$ L). 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/ $\mu$ 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/ $\mu$ 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/ $\mu$ 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/ $\mu$ L). Positivity rate at baseline and after 60 days' incubation
- Figure 30. Percentage of RDTs with various anomalies observed in production lots
- 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 1–6
- Table S2. Malaria RDT phase-2 performance in rounds 3–6 against wild-type (clinical) samples containing *P. falciparum* and *P. vivax* at low (200) and high (2000 or 5000) parasite density (parasites/ $\mu$ L) and clean-negative samples

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\\_27331](https://www.yunbaogao.cn/report/index/report?reportId=5_27331)

