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Background. Despite the increased use and worldwide distribution of malaria rapid diagnostic tests (RDTs) that distinguish between *Plasmodium falciparum* and *non-falciparum* species, little is known about their performance detecting *Plasmodium knowlesi* (Pk), *Plasmodium malariae* (Pm), and *Plasmodium ovale* (Po). This review seeks to analyze the results of published studies evaluating the diagnostic accuracy of malaria RDTs in detecting Pk, Pm, and Po monoinfections.

Methods. MEDLINE, EMBASE, Web of Science, and CENTRAL databases were systematically searched to identify studies that reported the performance of RDTs in detecting Pk, Pm, and Po monoinfections.

Results. Among 40 studies included in the review, 3 reported on Pk, 8 on Pm, 5 on Po, 1 on Pk and Pm, and 23 on Pm and Po infections. In the meta-analysis, estimates of sensitivities of RDTs in detecting Pk infections ranged 2%-48%. Test performances for Pm and Po infections were less accurate and highly heterogeneous, mainly because of the small number of samples tested.

Conclusions. Limited data available suggest that malaria RDTs show suboptimal performance for detecting Pk, Pm, and Po infections. New improved RDTs and appropriately designed cross-sectional studies to demonstrate the usefulness of RDTs in the detection of neglected *Plasmodium* species are urgently needed.
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Despite its preventable and curable nature, malaria continues to be a life-threatening disease, with ongoing transmission in >90 countries [1]. Parasites belonging to the genus *Plasmodium* are responsible for malaria infections. *Plasmodium falciparum* (Pf), *Plasmodium vivax* (Pv), *Plasmodium knowlesi* (Pk), *Plasmodium malariae* (Pm), and *Plasmodium ovale* (Po) target humans as natural hosts [2]. Two forms of Po, which have been recently confirmed to be two distinct species, *Plasmodium ovale curtisi* (Poc) and *Plasmodium ovale wallikeri* (Pow), exist [3, 4]. In addition, *Plasmodium cynomolgi* has been reported to cause human infections [5]. Most of the epidemiological studies and operational interventions primarily focus on the two most common species, *Pf* and *Pv*, due to their global burden and mortality rates. Similar efforts on severe infections with these species have started to accumulate [6]. *Plasmodium ovale* malaria cases with severe conditions and even death have been reported [7, 8], and severe acute renal failure and severe anaemia have been shown to be associated with Pm infection [9–11]. Recently, Pk was reported to be the most common cause of malaria in Malaysia [12]. These observations reinforce the idea that all *Plasmodium* species infecting humans should be of concern if the global targets set by the World Health Organization (WHO) to eliminate malaria due to any species are to be achieved [13].

Microscopy and rapid diagnostic tests (RDTs) are the WHO-recommended tools to confirm the diagnosis of all suspected malaria cases [13]. Histidine-rich protein-2 (HRP2), lactate dehydrogenase (LDH), and aldolase are the targeted malaria antigens used in malaria RDTs [14]. Histidine-rich protein-2 is a *Pf*-specific antigen, whereas aldolase is common to all *Plasmodium* species (pan-specific). *Plasmodium falciparum*-specific, pan-specific, and *Pv*-specific LDH antibodies are also available to be used in commercially available malaria RDTs. Antibodies against these three antigens are often combined in RDTs to distinguish *Pf* and *Pv* from other species or to detect all species at once [14, 15]. Rapid diagnostic tests play a nonnegligible role in the control of malaria by promoting access to rapid diagnosis and appropriate treatment. Especially in settings where the conditions are not favorable for the use of microscopy, RDTs serve as an easy-to-use, cost-effective, and field-ready alternative.
However, the widespread use of *falciparum*-specific RDTs causes the missed detection of non-*falciparum* species, including *Pk*, *Pm*, and *Po* [16], especially because, in regions where malaria is endemic, individuals are often infected with more than one single *Plasmodium* species (mixed-species infections) [17–19]. This situation undermines the efforts to understand the epidemiological distribution and impact of circulating species. Even though malaria RDTs that also target non-*falciparum* species are available, their performance for the detection of *Pk*, *Pm*, and *Po* is less well studied than that of *Pf* and *Pv*. Thereby, there is a knowledge gap regarding the usefulness of currently available malaria RDTs for detection of *Pk*, *Pm*, and *Po* infections.

The objective of this systematic review is to summarize and analyze published information about the performance of malaria RDTs in detecting human monoinfections with the three *Plasmodium* species, *Pk*, *Pm*, and *Po*, in endemic and nonendemic settings. This review aims to highlight the big knowledge gap on the performance of malaria RDTs in detecting these *Plasmodium* species and to help make informed decisions on the use of diagnostic tools to support the elimination of malaria caused by any species.

**METHODS**

**Searched Databases**

A systematic approach was used to search the following databases for articles of possible relevance: Medline (PubMed), Web of Science, EMBASE, and the Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL). The search terms and strategy as adapted from an earlier report [15] are outlined in Supplementary Table 1. Searches were carried out in August 2017. Reference lists of all eligible studies were searched for additional relevant articles.

**Selection Criteria**

The data search was limited to studies with a cross-sectional or a case–control design with any sampling method. Case reports, reviews, editorials, country reports, guidelines, and conference abstracts were not eligible. To impose a focus on currently available malaria RDTs, only studies published during the last 20 years (from 1997 to 2017) were included.

Studies reporting on *Pk*, *Pm*, and/or *Po* human monoinfections were eligible. Studies reporting exclusively on *Pf* or *Pv* infections or mixed infections with *Pk*, *Pm*, and/or *Po* were excluded from further analysis. Reports on a single patient with *Pk*, *Pm*, or *Po* monoinfection were excluded from the review to enable meaningful evaluation of test performances. Studies reporting on participants living in endemic areas, as well as international travelers and migrants who had recently been to endemic areas, were included in the review. Studies detecting different *Plasmodium* species with conventional microscopy and/or polymerase chain reaction (PCR) as reference standard were considered eligible. All inclusion and exclusion criteria are summarized in Supplementary Table 2.

![Figure 1. Antigens targeted by rapid diagnostic test (RDT) types included in the review. Only type 2, 3, 4, and 6 RDTs are able to distinguish between *Plasmodium falciparum* (*Pf*) and non-*falciparum* infections. Type 2 tests detect *Pf*-specific histidine-rich protein-2 (HRP2) antigen and panmalarial aldolase, which is expressed by all species. Type 3 tests detect a pan-specific LDH in addition to *Pf*-specific HRP2 antigen. Type 4 RDTs target *Pf*-specific and pan-specific lactate dehydrogenase (LDH) antigens as two separate lines, allowing distinction between *Pf* and non-*falciparum* infections. Type 6 RDTs are 4-band tests that target *Pf*-specific HRP2, *Pv*-specific LDH, and pan-specific LDH [7, 8]. Abbreviations: HRP2, Histidine-rich protein-2; *Pf*, *Plasmodium falciparum*; pLDH, *Plasmodium* lactate dehydrogenase; *Pv*, *Plasmodium vivax*; RDT, rapid diagnostic test.](image-url)

Studies evaluating any immunochromatography-based RDTs designed for the detection of non-*falciparum* malaria were eligible. Bell and colleagues classified malaria RDTs according to antibody combinations and parasite species detected [14] (Figure 1; Supplementary Table 3). According to this classification, type 2, 3, 4, and 6 tests are able to detect non-*falciparum* infections and to distinguish them from *Pf* (and *Pv* in the case of type 6 RDTs) concurrent infections (Figure 1). Therefore, studies evaluating these four types of RDTs were included in the review. Interpretation of RDT results that were considered eligible for the review is summarized in Table 1. Reports that considered tests positive for *Pk/Pm/Po* infections when both *Pf-* or *Pv*-specific lines and pan-only lines were visible were excluded from the analysis or re-evaluated to avoid any spurious effect due to cross-reaction between *Pf* (and *Pv* in the case of type 6 tests) infections and pan-specific reagents.

**Data Extraction**

All titles and abstracts acquired through search were stored in Mendeley reference manager software (version 1.17.10; Mendeley Ltd). As a first step, duplicates were removed from the list; titles and abstracts were then screened, and those that were clearly not suitable for inclusion were excluded. Subsequently, articles were full-text screened, and those that did not comply with eligibility criteria were excluded. All excluded titles were stored, with tags indicating the reason for exclusion, in a separate folder.

Data were extracted by a review author (S. Y.) using a Google Form based on the predefined variables (Supplementary Table 4).
Tests were considered to be positive for *Plasmodium knowlesi*, *P. vivax*, *P. malariae* (Table 1. Interpretation of rapid diagnostic test results for Type 2/3/4 RDTs). The Cochrane Collaboration based on true positives (TPs), true negatives (TNs), false negatives (FNs), false positives (FPs), and total case numbers reported in studies. Corrections were made where necessary.

The Quality Assessment of Diagnostic Accuracy Score 2 framework was implemented to assess the methodological quality of individual studies included in the review [20]. Each question was answered with a “yes,” “no,” or “unclear” response based on the availability of relevant information in a given study and preset criteria (Supplementary Table 5).

Statistical Analysis and Data Synthesis

Studies were grouped according to the detected *Plasmodium* species and different RDT types for comparative analysis. The estimates of the observed sensitivity and specificity per study in each analysis group were visually summarized in a forest plot for easy-to-read visualization of the variabilities in test accuracy among studies and in a scatter plot of sensitivity versus specificity in cases where both sensitivity and specificity values were reported. Plots were drawn using the plot function and the forestplot package in R. A similar analysis was not undertaken for *P. malariae* and *P. ovale* studies because of the substantial heterogeneity observed (mostly linked to large confidence intervals owing to small sample sizes). In the absence of statistical pooling, the findings were presented in a narrative form, including tables and figures to aid in data visualization where appropriate.

The use of Cochrane’s Q test or Higgins’s I² statistics is not recommended for the assessment of heterogeneity across diagnostic accuracy studies because they do not take the threshold effect into consideration [21]. Therefore, heterogeneity was assessed by visual inspection of the forest plots. Subgroup analyses based on age, geographical areas, parasite densities, or any other criteria was not possible due to lack of complete data.

RESULTS

Results of the Search

The initial search allowed the identification of 1080 publications. After removing duplicates, 661 titles were left for screening. Title and abstract screening resulted in the exclusion of 474 titles. The full text of 187 titles was assessed for their eligibility, and 155 of these were excluded. An additional 16 titles, for which the full text was not available, were also excluded. The most common reason for exclusion was the unavailability of data for analysis. Other reasons for exclusion are shown in Figure 2. As a result, 32 articles were included in the review [22–53]. As an additional source of data, articles listed in the references of selected publications were also screened, which resulted in the inclusion of 8 further articles [54–61]. Thus, a total of 40 articles were selected for full data extraction.

Among the 40 articles included in the review, 3 reported on *P. knowlesi* (22, 29, 43), 8 on *P. malariae* (13, 19, 21, 23, 27, 32, 38, 39), 5 on *P. vivax* (23, 25, 30, 31, 54), 1 on *P. malariae* and *P. ovale* (32), and 23 on *P. malariae* and *P. ovale* (24, 26–28, 33, 35–39, 41, 45–47, 49–52, 55–58, 61). The majority of studies (n = 23) were done in nonendemic settings using samples obtained from imported cases (international travellers.)

### Table 1. Interpretation of rapid diagnostic test results for *Plasmodium knowlesi*, *Plasmodium malariae*, and *Plasmodium ovale* monoinfections

| Type 2/3/4 RDTs | TP | TN | FP | FN |
|----------------|----|----|----|----|
| **Microscopy/PCR** | **Only Pk/Pm/Po** | **Neg or non-Pk/Pm/Po** | **Neg or non-Pk/Pm/Po** | **Only Pk/Pm/Po** |
| **RDT** | **Only pan line visible** | **No lines visible or Pf line visible with or without pan line** | **Only pan line visible** | **No lines visible or Pf line visible with or without pan line** |

| Type 6 RDTs | TP | TN | FP | FN |
|----------------|----|----|----|----|
| **Microscopy/PCR** | **Only Pk/Pm/Po** | **Neg or non-Pk/Pm/Po** | **Neg or non-Pk/Pm/Po** | **Only Pk/Pm/Po** |
| **RDT** | **Only pan line visible** | **No lines visible or Pf and/or Pv line(s) visible with or without pan line** | **Only pan line visible** | **No lines visible or Pf and/or Pv line(s) visible with or without pan line** |

Abbreviations: FN, false positive; FP, false positive; Neg, negative; Pan, all *Plasmodium* species; PCR, polymerase chain reaction; Pf, *Plasmodium falciparum*; Pk, *Plasmodium knowlesi*; Pm, *Plasmodium malariae*; Po, *Plasmodium ovale*; Pv, *Plasmodium vivax*; RDT, rapid diagnostic test; TN, true negative; TP, true positive.
or migrants) [23, 24, 26, 28, 30, 33, 35–39, 45, 47, 49–52, 54–58, 61]. Sixteen studies were conducted in endemic settings [22, 25, 29, 31, 32, 34, 40–44, 46, 48, 53, 59, 60]. One study conducted two independent evaluations; one in a nonendemic area and the other in an endemic area [27].

All studies on Pk, with the exception of 1, reported on the parasite density estimated in patients, which ranged from 10 parasites per microliter of blood (p/μL) to 911,616 p/μL. The upper range of parasitemia estimated in Pm- and Po-infected patients did not exceed 9900 p/μL and 16,930 p/μL, respectively.

Methodological Quality of Included Studies

Methodological quality of selected studies varied highly (Figure 3; Supplementary Figure 1). A total number of 25 studies had a cross-sectional design, and 14 used a case-control design. One study did not describe the study design [42]. Three studies tested both archived and fresh samples [29, 35, 38]. In another three studies, the storage conditions of samples prior to testing remained unclear [33, 42, 54]. Among 34 studies that used freshly obtained samples, 14 used consecutive or random enrollment of patients. The rest either failed to

Figure 2. Flow chart of the selection procedure. Forty articles were included in the review. Abbreviations: Pf, Plasmodium falciparum; Pv, Plasmodium vivax; RDT, rapid diagnostic test.
Performance of Rapid Diagnostic Tests with *Plasmodium knowlesi* Mono-infections

All four studies reporting on the performance of RDTs in detecting *Pk* were explicitly designed for this purpose [22, 29, 32, 43]. All studies were undertaken in Malaysia and had a case-control design. One study evaluated both fresh and archived samples [29], whereas the other three relied only on fresh samples. In total, six different test brands were evaluated with different RDT types: two type 2, two type 3, one type 4, and one type 6 RDT. Sensitivities of the tests ranged 0%–74% (Figure 4A). Among all studies, only one study, which assessed two different RDT types, reported on both sensitivity and specificity estimates (Figure 4B) [32].

Sensitivities of type 2 RDTs used for *Pk* detection ranged 23%–29%. Based on analysis of 165 *Pk* cases in three independent evaluations, the summary estimate of sensitivity was 24% (95% confidence interval [CI], 18%–30%) [22, 29]. All fresh samples that tested positive for *Pk* with a type 2 RDT had parasite counts >4412 p/μL of blood [22, 29]. On the other hand, archived samples that were positive for *Pk* had a wide range of *Pk* parasitemia (one RDT positive sample with a parasite density <500 p/μL, four between 500 and 5000 p/μL, and five samples >5000 p/μL) [29].

Sensitivities of type 3 RDTs in *Pk* detection ranged 28%–74%. The meta-analyzed summary estimate of sensitivity was 48% (95% CI, 22%–75%). The summary estimate of sensitivity for type 4 RDTs was 12% (95% CI, 0%–25%), whereas for type 6 RDTs it was 2% (95% CI, 0%–5%).

Performance of Rapid Diagnostic Tests with *Plasmodium ovale* Mono-infections

Twenty-eight studies evaluated RDTs with *Po* infections mostly acquired in Africa (Ethiopia, Mali, Gabon) and Asia (India, Thailand) (Figure 6A). Thirteen studies reported on both sensitivity and specificity estimates (Figure 6B).

Seventeen studies evaluated type 2 RDTs for their performance in detecting *Po* infections [23–25, 27, 28, 30, 33, 36, 45, 47, 49, 54–56, 58, 61]. The RDTs used in 5 studies failed to detect any of the *Po* infections in a total of 23 fresh samples positive for *Po* [45, 49, 55, 58, 61]. The rest of the evaluations showed a wide range of sensitivities (range, 20%–100%). Among 10 studies that evaluated type 3 RDTs, three tested three different brands with a relatively large number of cases (n = 73–80) [37, 50, 52]. Sensitivities in two of these studies were low (18% and 19%) [37, 52], whereas the third study reported a comparatively higher sensitivity (76%) [50]. By contrast, the type 3 tests used in three other studies failed to detect any of the *Po* infections [31, 35, 46]. One study compared the
performances of five different brands using the same set of samples, and, in this case, the sensitivities ranged 7%–100% [39].

Type 4 RDTs were evaluated with Po in 12 studies [26, 33, 35, 36, 38, 39, 41, 49, 55–58]. Two studies, which tested 30 and 69 Po-positive archived samples, respectively, using two different brands, showed sensitivities of 80% (95% CI, 61%–92%) and 32% (95% CI, 21%–44%), respectively [35, 38]. The number of cases used in the rest of the evaluations did not exceed 18, and sensitivities ranged 0%–77%. Two different brands of type 6 RDTs were, on the other hand, evaluated in two independent studies [36, 51]. One study used archived samples [51], whereas the other used fresh samples [36]. Sensitivity was 5% (95% CI, 2%–13%) when archived samples were tested and 44% (95% CI, 22%–69%) when fresh samples were tested.

**DISCUSSION**

To our knowledge, this review is the first attempt to summarize the available data on the performance of RDTs for the detection of monoinfections due to neglected *Plasmodium* species *Pk*, *Pm*, and *Po* in endemic and nonendemic settings. Summary estimates of sensitivities of type 2, 3, 4, and 6 tests in detecting *Pk* infections were 24%, 48%, 12%, and 2%, respectively. Sensitivities of any RDT types included in the review range from no detection to 100% for *Pm* and *Po* monoinfections. Evidence overall is weak, mainly because of few studies available for *Pk* and highly heterogeneous results obtained from a small number of cases for *Pm* and *Po*. Nonetheless, the current data are still suggestive of low performance of currently available RDTs to detect *Pk*, *Pm*, and *Po* infections.

Similar variable performance of RDTs has previously been demonstrated in the frame of the FIND-WHO global RDT evaluation program [62], although evaluations in this program have been done so far with *Pf* and *Pv* clinical samples only. Annual reports from this program are currently guiding WHO and Global Fund recommendations for procurement of RDTs in endemic settings and are part of the prequalification process.
A

**Plasmodium malariae only, all studies**

| Study | No. of Cases | Sample Source Site | APD (per µl of blood) | RDT | Sensitivity (95% CI) | Specificity (95% CI) |
|-------|--------------|-------------------|-----------------------|-----|----------------------|----------------------|
| Raux et al., 2017[47]* | 7 | Africa | NR | Type 2 | 0.57 (0.33–0.90) | 0.22 (0.13–0.37) |
| Bourgeois et al., 2009[28] | 2 | Africa | NR | Type 2 | 0.5 (0.03–0.97) | NA |
| Eibach et al., 2013[27] | 2 | Africa | NR | Type 2 | 0.5 (0.01–0.99) | 0.99 (0.98–0.99) |
| Proux et al., 2001[50] | 4 | Asia | 824 (range, 80–2186) | Type 2 | 0 (0.00–0.60) | NA |
| Hausmair et al., 2016[54] | 9 | Asia | NR | Type 2 | 0 (0.00–0.37) | NA |
| Tamizaki et al., 2014[49]* | 2 | NR | Type 2 | 0.5 (0.01–0.99) | NA |
| Farcas et al., 2003[29]* | 3 | NR | Type 2 | 0.67 (0.09–0.99) | 0.99 (0.97–1.00) |
| Richter et al., 2004[45] | 2 | NR | Type 2 | 0 (0.00–0.94) | 0.87 (0.84–0.90) |
| De Mounibion et al., 2004[56] | 4 | NR | Type 2 | 0.75 (0.22–0.99) | NA |
| Wiese et al., 2006[61] | 3 | NR | Type 2 | 0.33 (0.01–0.91) | 0.99 (0.97–0.99) |
| Playford et al., 2001[52] | 2 | NR | 555 (range, 340–770) | Type 2 | 0 (0.00–0.84) | 0.8 (0.79–0.91) |
| Iqbal et al., 2002[53] | 2 | NR | NR | Type 2 | 0 (0.00–0.84) | NA |
| Houzé et al., 2013[36] | 9 | NR | NR | Type 2 | 0.56 (0.21–0.86) | NA |
| Wongsrichanalai et al., 2003[53] | 5 | NR | Type 2 | 0.8 (0.29–0.99) | 0.77 (0.71–0.82) |
| Grobusch et al., 2002[53] | 8 | NR | NR | Type 2 | 0 (0.00–0.37) | NA |
| Vander Palen et al., 2009[50]* | 51 | Africa | NR | Type 3 | 0.45 (0.27–0.64) | NA |
| Maltha et al., 2010[57] | 23 | Africa | NR | Type 3 | 0.3 (0.13–0.53) | NA |
| Maltha et al., 2013[39]* | 5 | Africa | 382 (range, 26–1920) | Type 3 | 0.6 (0.15–0.95) | NA |
| Maltha et al., 2013[39]* | 5 | Africa | 382 (range, 26–1920) | Type 3 | 1 (0.48–1.00) | NA |
| Maltha et al., 2013[39]* | 5 | Africa | 382 (range, 26–1920) | Type 3 | 0.4 (0.05–0.85) | NA |
| Maltha et al., 2013[39]* | 5 | Africa | 382 (range, 26–1920) | Type 3 | 0.6 (0.17–0.93) | NA |
| Maltha et al., 2013[39]* | 5 | Africa | 382 (range, 26–1920) | Type 3 | 0.8 (0.29–0.99) | NA |
| Tahar et al., 2013[48] | 4 | Africa | NR (range, 1130–7656) | Type 3 | 1 (0.40–1.00) | NA |
| Eibach et al., 2013[27] | 2 | Africa | NR | Type 3 | 0.5 (0.01–0.99) | 0.99 (0.98–1.00) |
| Kib et al., 2017[46] | 7 | Africa | NR | Type 3 | 0.14 (0.00–0.50) | 1 (0.99–1.00) |
| Grigg et al., 2014[52]* | 3 | Asia | NR | Type 3 | 0.67 (0.09–0.99) | 0.65 (0.59–0.71) |
| van Dijk et al., 2010[52]* | 25 | NR | NR | Type 3 | 0.56 (0.35–0.76) | 0.84 (0.61–0.97) |
| Coope et al., 2011[56] | 10 | NR | NR | Type 3 | 0.6 (0.27–0.86) | NA |
| Maltha et al., 2013[39]* | 5 | Africa | 382 (range, 26–1920) | Type 4 | 0.6 (0.15–0.95) | NA |
| Ratisimba et al., 2007[60] | 6 | Africa | NR | Type 4 | 0.67 (0.22–0.96) | NA |
| Ratisimaha et al., 2007[60] | 6 | Africa | NR | Type 4 | 0.85 (0.56–1.00) | NA |
| Ratisimba et al., 2007[60] | 6 | Africa | NR | Type 4 | 0.5 (0.12–0.89) | NA |
| Randriansolo et al., 2007[44] | 3 | Africa | NR | Type 4 | 1.29 (0.00–0.99) | 0.91 (0.86–0.96) |
| Grigg et al., 2014[52]* | 3 | Asia | NR | Type 4 | 0.67 (0.09–0.99) | 0.91 (0.87–0.96) |
| Pattanasai, 2003[41] | 5 | Asia | NR | Type 4 | 0.8 (0.28–0.99) | NA |
| Tamizaki et al., 2014[49]* | 2 | NR | NR | Type 4 | 0.5 (0.01–0.99) | NA |
| Maltha et al., 2011[50]* | 14 | NR | 643 (range, 0.1–9900) | Type 4 | 0.5 (0.01–0.99) | NA |
| Heurnane et al., 2012[35]** | 16 | NR | 473 (range, 0.1–6096) | Type 4 | 0.21 (0.05–0.51) | NA |
| De Mounibion et al., 2004[56] | 4 | NR | NR | Type 4 | 0.25 (0.07–0.53) | NA |
| Moody et al., 2000[57] | 17 | NR | NR | Type 4 | 0.5 (0.22–0.99) | NA |
| Playford et al., 2002[52] | 2 | NR | 555 (range, 340–770) | Type 4 | 0.47 (0.23–0.72) | 0.72 (0.63–0.81) |
| Iqbal et al., 2002[53] | 2 | NR | NR | Type 4 | 0 (0.00–0.84) | NA |
| Coope et al., 2011[56] | 10 | NR | NR | Type 4 | 0 (0.00–0.84) | NA |
| Houze et al., 2013[36] | 9 | NR | NR | Type 4 | 0 (0.00–0.84) | NA |
| Prabhahel et al., 2006[42]** | 2 | NR | NR | Type 4 | 0.6 (0.27–0.86) | NA |
| Metzger et al., 2008[46] | 15 | South America | 87 (range, 3–927) | Type 5 | 0 (0.00–0.84) | NA |
| van Dijk et al., 2009[51]* | 25 | NR | NR | Type 6 | 0.13 (0.02–0.40) | 0.99 (0.98–1.00) |
| Houze et al., 2013[36] | 9 | NR | NR | Type 6 | 0.56 (0.21–0.86) | NA |
| Houze et al., 2013[36] | 9 | NR | NR | Type 6 | 0.67 (0.30–0.93) | NA |

---

**Performance of malaria rapid diagnostic tests (RDTs) for the detection of Plasmodium malariae mono-infections in human blood. A, Forest plot of sensitivity and specificity of RDT types for detection of Plasmodium malariae (PM) infections. Studies are ordered by RDT type, sample source site, study design, and study ID. Studies listed have cross-sectional design unless marked with * for case-control design or with ** for unclear design. B, Plot of sensitivity versus specificity as estimated in studies that report on both. Size of symbols corresponds to the number of cases evaluated in each study. Abbreviations: APD, average parasite density of Pk cases (in median parasite density); CI, confidence interval; NA, not available; NR, not reported; RDT, rapid diagnostic test.**
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Plasmodium ovale, all studies

| Study | No. of Cases | Sample Source Site | APD (per μL of blood) | RDT | Sensitivity (95% CI) | Specificity (95% CI) |
|-------|--------------|--------------------|-----------------------|-----|----------------------|---------------------|
| Rass et al., 2017* | 6 | Africa | NR | Type 2 | 0.5 (0.38–0.8) | 0.38 (0.14–0.68) |
| Tanaka et al., 2011* | 10 | Africa | 1550 | Type 2 | 0.6 (0.46–0.81) | NA |
| Beauvois et al., 2013 | 5 | Africa | 924 (range, 507–1475) | Type 2 | 0.8 (0.8–0.99) | 0.66 (0.62–0.70) |
| Bourgeois et al., 2009 | 7 | Africa | NR | Type 2 | 0.71 (0.70–0.95) | NA |
| Ebach et al., 2013b | 3 | Africa | 1 (range, 1.29–1.00) | Type 2 | 1.0 (1.0–1.0) | 0.99 (0.97–1.00) |
| Farcas et al., 2003* | 9 | NR | NR | Type 2 | 0.63 (0.64–0.71) | 0.99 (0.96–1.00) |
| Rachter et al., 2004 | 5 | NR | NR | Type 2 | 0.99 (0.98–1.00) | 0.87 (0.84–0.90) |
| De Memon et al., 2004 | 6 | NR | NR | Type 2 | 0.83 (0.74–0.93) | NA |
| Weire et al., 2006 | 2 | NR | NR | Type 2 | 0.99 (0.98–1.00) | NA |
| Playford et al., 2002 | 4 | NR (range, 25–35) | NR | Type 2 | 0.99 (0.98–1.00) | NA |
| Iqbal et al., 2002 | 4 | NR (range, 25–35) | NR | Type 2 | 0.99 (0.98–1.00) | NA |
| Biggallion et al., 2005 | 12 | NR (range, 25–35) | NR | Type 2 | 0.99 (0.98–1.00) | NA |
| Gutt et al., 2006 | 5 | NR | NR | Type 2 | 0.99 (0.98–1.00) | NA |
| Ebach et al., 2013a | 9 | NR | NR | Type 2 | 0.99 (0.98–1.00) | NA |
| Houzet et al., 2013 | 18 | NR | NR | Type 2 | 0.99 (0.98–1.00) | NA |
| Grobush et al., 2002 | 25 | NR | NR | Type 2 | 0.99 (0.98–1.00) | NA |
| Durand et al., 2003 | 14 | NR | NR | Type 2 | 0.99 (0.98–1.00) | NA |
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Plasmodium ovale

Figure 6. Performance of malaria rapid diagnostic tests (RDTs) for the detection of Plasmodium ovale mono-infections in human blood. A, Forest plot of sensitivity and specificity of RDT types for detection of Plasmodium ovale (Po) infections. Studies are ordered by sample source site, study design, and study ID. Studies listed have cross-sectional design unless marked with * for case–control design or with ** for unclear design. Ebach et al. [27] has been designated as 2013a and 2013b to distinguish between the first part of the study (2013a), which was conducted in a nonendemic setting, and the second part of the study (2013b), which was conducted in an endemic setting. B, Plot of sensitivity versus specificity as estimated in studies that report on both. Size of symbols corresponds to the number of cases evaluated in each study. Abbreviations: APD, average parasite density of Po cases (° median parasite density); CI, confidence interval; NA, not available; NR, not reported; RDT, rapid diagnostic test.
at WHO. Expanding the evaluation to \textit{Pk}, \textit{Pm}, and \textit{Po} clinical samples would not only provide additional RDT performance data but would also guide countries in the selection of the most appropriate RDTs for their epidemiological context.

There is evidence demonstrating that \textit{Pm} and \textit{Po} infections commonly occur as coinfections with \textit{Pf} [4, 63], which would facilitate indirect treatment of malaria due to these species. In fact, if a patient is diagnosed as having malaria due to \textit{Pf}, treatment with artemisinin-based combination therapies (ACTs) could eventually eliminate any coinfection even if it is not specifically detected by microscopy or RDT [64]. However, this would not be the case for \textit{Pv} and \textit{Po} coinfections, for which primaquine would be needed to eliminate hypnozoites. There are currently no RDTs specific to \textit{Pk}, \textit{Pm}, or \textit{Po} infections. Rapid diagnostic tests that are capable of identifying these infections rely on the detection of antigens that are common to all \textit{Plasmodium} species. It has also been shown that \textit{Pk} cross-reacts with \textit{Pf}- and \textit{Pv}-specific pLDH [32, 65]. Thereby, the nonspecific nature of these tests precludes the differentiation of non-\textit{falciparum} species as well as the confirmation of mixed infections. Given the presumed low prevalence and/or limited geographical spread of these species, there is not much effort on the part of RDT manufacturers to develop species-specific tests. However, species-specific RDTs would likely play a pivotal role for case management and epidemiological purposes in the detection of \textit{Pk}, \textit{Pm}, and \textit{Po} infections in resource-limited settings.

Microscopy continues to be the gold standard for malaria diagnosis. However, it is imperfect, especially when it comes to species differentiation [22, 66, 67]. In this review, more than half of the studies (\(n = 21\)) relied solely on microscopy for \textit{Plasmodium} detection and species differentiation. Therefore, there is a risk that some of the discordant results in the included studies were misqualified due to the imperfect nature of the reference standard. \textit{Po} and \textit{Pm} infections usually occur at very low parasitemia, which hinders, even more, its detection by microscopy and current RDTs. Similarly, \textit{Pk} infections can occur at low parasitemia as well. Therefore, improved analytical sensitivity should be one of the first requirements when considering the development of new RDTs able to detect clinically significant infections due to \textit{Pk}, \textit{Pm}, and \textit{Po}.

A thorough and comprehensive literature search allowed the identification of 32 studies, and an additional 8 studies were identified by screening the references of included studies, which suggests that some potentially eligible studies could be missed through our search strategy. Potential reasons for this could be the poor indexing of diagnostic accuracy studies and the fact that our search was designed to identify neglected \textit{Plasmodium} infections, which were often not the primary target of studies and therefore were not explicitly mentioned in titles and abstracts. Nevertheless, studies evaluating the performance of diagnostic tests for the detection of these \textit{Plasmodium} species are scarce and, when performed, suboptimal. Appropriately designed studies with an explicit focus on the diagnosis of these three neglected non-\textit{falciparum} species are urgently needed. Such efforts would not only contribute to a better understanding of the performance of current tests but also guide the development of improved diagnostic tools for malaria while shedding light on the actual geographical distribution and epidemiological situation of malaria caused by these \textit{Plasmodium} species.
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