

1 COVID-19: Rapid Antigen detection for SARS-CoV-2 by lateral flow
2 assay: a national systematic evaluation for mass-testing

3
4 UK COVID-19 Lateral Flow Oversight Team

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Corresponding Author:

24 Prof Tim Peto

25 **Senior Author:** Professor Tim Peto, Nuffield Department of Medicine, University of Oxford

26 **Running Title:** Clinical utility of lateral flow SARS-CoV-2 antigen detection

27

28

29

30

Keywords: coronavirus, COVID-19, SARS-CoV-2, United Kingdom, Public Health, lateral flow, viral antigen detection, testing, national evaluation, LFD, lateral flow tests, lateral flow devices.

31 Abstract

32

33 *Background:* New lateral flow device (LFD) viral antigen immunoassays have been developed by commercial and
34 research organisations around the world as diagnostic tests for SARS-CoV-2 infection. To support decisions by
35 the UK Government on potential scale-up of mass population testing, we have at their request evaluated the
36 diagnostic performance of a significant number of point-of-care rapid SARS-CoV-2 LFDs.

37

38 *Methods:* 132 LFDs were initially reviewed by a Department of Health and Social Care team, part of the UK
39 government, from which 64 were selected for further evaluation. Standardised laboratory evaluations, and for
40 those that met the published criteria, field testing in the Falcon-C19 research study and UK pilots were performed
41 (UK COVID-19 testing centres, hospital, schools, armed forces).

42

43 *Results:* 4/64 LFDs so far have desirable performance characteristics from independent laboratory studies and
44 early preliminary field evaluations (Orient Gene, Deepblue and *Innova SARS-CoV-2 Antigen Rapid Qualitative*
45 *Test*), of which one underwent extended clinical assessment in field studies (*Innova*). 8951 *Innova* LFD tests
46 were performed with a kit failure rate of 5.6% (502/8951, 95% CI: 5.1-6.1), false positive rate of 0.32% (22/6954,
47 95% CI: 0.20-0.48) and a viral antigen detection/sensitivity (using RNA RT-PCR as a proxy for the presence of
48 antigen) of 78.8% when performed by laboratory scientists (156/198, 95% CI 72.4-84.3). Sensitivity was
49 significantly lower when testing was undertaken by non-experts with limited initial training

50

51 *Interpretation:* Several LFDs have promising performance characteristics for mass population testing and can be
52 used to identify infectious positive individuals. The *Innova* LFD shows good viral antigen detection/sensitivity with
53 excellent specificity, although kit failure rates and the impact of training are potential issues. These results
54 support the expanded evaluation of LFDs, and assessment of greater access to testing on COVID-19
55 transmission.

56

57

58 *Funding:* Department of Health and Social Care. University of Oxford. Public Health England Porton Down,
Manchester University NHS Foundation Trust, National Institute of Health Research.

59 **Introduction**

60

61 National governments and international organisations including the World Health Organisation (WHO) and
62 European Commission have highlighted the importance of individual testing, mass population testing and
63 subsequent contact tracing to halt the chain of transmission of SARS-CoV-2, the virus responsible for COVID-
64 19.^{1,2,3} The current diagnostic test involves reverse-transcription polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR) testing of
65 nose/throat swabs in specialised laboratories. Such capacity in the UK is currently estimated at ~500,000
66 tests/day⁴⁻⁷ and this is used with contact tracing procedures and mobile applications to identify close
67 symptomatic contacts of infected symptomatic individuals.⁸⁻¹⁰ However, there are significant challenges in
68 creating testing capacity to identify those with asymptomatic infections or to test contacts of individuals with
69 COVID-19. To date, turnaround time for RT-PCR has been typically slow (>24 hours).

70

71 To better understand and control SARS-CoV-2 transmission, there is an urgent need for large-scale, accurate,
72 affordable and rapid diagnostic testing assays, with the ability to detect infectious individuals. Lateral flow device
73 (LFD) immunoassays can be designed to test for different protein targets and are routinely used in healthcare
74 settings principally as a result of their affordability, ease of use, short turnaround time, and high-test accuracy. In
75 brief, a sample is placed on a conjugation pad where the analyte (or antigen) of interest is bound by conjugated
76 antibodies. The analyte-antibody mix subsequently migrates along a membrane by capillary flow across both
77 'test' and 'control' strips. These strips are coated with antibodies detecting the analyte of interest and a positive
78 test is confirmed by the appearance of coloured control and test lines.¹¹

79

80 Newly developed SARS-CoV-2 antigen LFDs identify the presence of specific viral proteins, using conjugated
81 antibodies to bind spike, envelope, membrane or nucleocapsid proteins. In contrast to the IgM/IgG "antibody
82 tests", these antigen tests directly identify viral proteins, and are not reliant on the host's immune response. In
83 contrast to RT-PCR, results for LFDs are observed in 10-30 minutes depending on the device, providing a
84 window for early interventions to halt the chain of transmission earlier in the disease course when individuals are
85 most infectious.¹²

86

87 To date, many manufacturers have developed first-generation rapid SARS-CoV-2 antigen-detecting LFDs.
88 However, many of these tests have not been independently validated. There is evidence of variable performance
89 when assessing test sensitivity and specificity, although several candidates looked promising on the basis of
90 early data.¹³⁻¹⁵ An independent national evaluation of these devices is important to facilitate population-level or
91 mass testing initiatives globally.

92

93 Here, we report the diagnostic performance of first-generation SARS-CoV-2 antigen-detecting LFD for rapid
94 point-of-care (POC) testing in work that was commissioned by the UK's Department of Health and Social Care
95 (DHSC) from PHE Porton Down and the University of Oxford.

96 **Methods**

97

98 A phased evaluation of available SARS-CoV-2 antigen LFDs was undertaken.

99

100 **Department of Health and Social Care evaluation (Phase 1 evaluation)**

101

102 The DHSC identified manufacturers supplying SARS-CoV-2 antigen LFDs that could enable mass testing at a
103 population level. A desktop review was performed to ensure there were appropriate instructions for use and to
104 assess manufacturers' claimed performance and manufacturing capabilities.¹⁶

105

106 **Pre-clinical evaluation (Phase 2 evaluation)**

107

108 Pre-clinical evaluation of candidate LFDs was performed by trained laboratory scientists at Public Health England
109 (PHE) Porton Down. LFDs were evaluated against SARS-CoV-2 spiked positive controls and known negative
110 controls, consisting of saliva collected from healthy adult staff volunteers.

111 Pre-defined and publically available "prioritisation" criteria to pass on to the next evaluation phase had to be met
112 for LFDs, consisting of (i) a kit failure rate of <10%; (ii) an analytical specificity of ≥97%, and (iii) an analytical
113 LOD of ≥9 of 15 (60%) at 10² pfu/mL, corresponding to a RT-PCR cycle threshold (Ct) of approximately 25
114 (~100,000 RNA copies/ml); and (iv) lack of cross-reactivity with seasonal coronaviruses to further test analytical
115 specificity.

116

117 **Retrospective secondary care evaluation (Phase 3a evaluation)**

118 Evaluation using patient samples retrospectively was started in August 2020 at PHE Porton Down. Samples were
119 obtained from a secondary healthcare setting (Oxford University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust).

- 120
- 121 • 1,000 SARS-CoV-2 negative samples: fresh samples held refrigerated were supplied the day after they
122 were tested negative by RT-PCR by the laboratory service at the John Radcliffe Hospital, Oxford, UK.
 - 123 • 200 SARS-CoV-2 positive samples: swabs collected in VTM from patients admitted to hospital during
124 the first wave of the UK pandemic (March-June 2020).¹⁷ These were diluted 1:4 SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR
125 negative saliva, aliquoted and frozen at -20°C for later use. For each positive sample, in addition to the
126 original diagnostic RT-PCR Ct value, a confirmatory RT-PCR was performed at PHE Porton Down on the
diluted sample to determine the new Ct value.

127 **Community research evaluation (Phase 3b evaluation)**

128 We undertook a field evaluation using samples from volunteers in the community in collaboration with the
129 National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) funded CONDOR Platform "COVID-19 National Diagnostic
130 Research and Evaluation Platform". This was performed within the FALCON-C19 study (Facilitating Accelerated
131 Clinical validation Of Novel diagnostics for COVID-19, 20/WA/0169, IRAS 284229), between 17th September and
132 23rd October 2020. This involved the recruitment and re-testing of consenting adults with a RT-PCR-confirmed
133 diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2 infection within 5 days of the original PCR result.

134

135 For the *Innova SARS-CoV-2 Antigen Rapid Qualitative Test*, testing was additionally performed for a subset of
136 samples on-site at four COVID-19 testing centres by trained research staff using the "dry swabs" to evaluate
137 "real-life"/diagnostic performance. Dry swabs are those that are not placed into viral transport medium prior to
138 performing the LFD test.

139

140 **Community field service evaluation (Phase 4 evaluation)**

141

142 Wider field service evaluations were performed within a number of UK institutions and settings. These
143 evaluations utilised the *Innova SARS-CoV-2 Antigen Rapid Qualitative Test*. These institutions included a
144 secondary healthcare setting (John Radcliffe Hospital, Oxford), PHE Porton Down, armed forces members
145 (following an outbreak) and in secondary schools (pupils aged 11-18). Evaluations were also undertaken at
146 regional COVID-19 testing centres as part of an NHS Test and Trace service evaluation involving the general
147 public. The John Radcliffe Hospital, Oxford performed an evaluation as part of their asymptomatic staff screening
148 service using the Respiratory Diagnostic Kit Evaluation ('Red Kite') study (Research Ethics Committee reference:
149 19/NW/0730; North West-Greater Manchester South Research Ethics Committee).

150

151 **Statistical analyses**

152 Fisher's exact and chi-squared tests were used to determine non-random associations between categorical
153 variables. Statistical analyses and data visualisation were performed using R version 4.0.3. Sensitivity and
154 specificity and 95% confidence intervals were calculated using the exact Clopper-Pearson method.

155 **Results**

156

157 *Phase 1*

158 A total of 132 suppliers of SARS-CoV-2 antigen detection LFDs were identified and referred to the DHSC for
 159 initial Phase 1 review. Among these, at the time of publication, 64 were selected by the DHSC for further
 160 evaluation by the UK lateral flow oversight group.

161

162 *Phase 2*

163 As part of Phase 2 evaluations, 9,692 LFD tests were performed at PHE Porton Down across the 64 candidate
 164 devices as of the 3rd December 2020. 5 LFDs had a kit failure rate above the pre-specified threshold for
 165 exclusion (>10%), 17 kits had a false-positive rate below the pre-defined specificity threshold (<97%) and 28 kits
 166 a false-negative rate below the LOD threshold (<60% at 10² pfu/m). In total, across all three criteria, nineteen kits
 167 performed at a level in accordance with the UK Lateral Flow Oversight Group's *a priori* "prioritisation criteria". All
 168 nineteen kits also passed cross-reactivity analyses against seasonal human coronaviruses.

169

170 *Phase 3*

171 To date, eight LFDs have passed Phase 3a evaluation, namely: *Innova SARS-CoV-2 Antigen Rapid Qualitative*
 172 *Test (Innova)*, *Zhejiang Orient Gene Biotech Co. Coronavirus Ag Rapid Test Cassette (Swab) (Orient Gene)*,
 173 *Anhui Deepblue Medical Technology COVID-19 (Sars-CoV-2) Antigen Test kit (Colloidal Gold) (Deepblue)*,
 174 *Fortress Diagnostics Coronavirus Ag Rapid Test (Fortress)*, *Roche SD Biosensor Standard Q COVID-19 Ag Test*
 175 *(SD Bio swab)*, *Surescreen Diagnostics SARS-CoV-2 Antigen Rapid Test Cassette (Nasopharyngeal swab*
 176 *(Surescreen) and LFD x (the manufacturer had not given consent to be named)*. (Supplementary Table 1). Three
 177 LFDs did not pass 3a evaluation and the remaining LFDs are currently undergoing evaluation. Four LFDs
 178 (Deepblue, Innova, Orientgene, LFD x) have passed Phase 3b evaluation (Table 1, Supp Figure 1), one LFD did
 179 not pass and the remainder have not been evaluated.

180

181

Viral Load	Average Ct	Innova Number tested/number positive (%)	LFD x Number tested/number positive (%)	Orient Gene Number tested/number positive (%)	Deepblue Number tested/number positive (%)
>10million	<18	5/5 (100)	1/1 (100)	-	3/3 (100)
1-10 million	18-21.5	23/23 (100)	12/13 (92)	17/17 (100)	19/19 (100)
0.1-1 million	21.5-25	52/54 (96)	19/21 (91)	18/18 (100)	43/44 (98)
10,000-100,000	25-28	37/42 (88)	13/13 (100)	18/19 (95)	38/38 (100)
1,000-10,000	28-31	25/33 (76)	17/19 (90)	14/18 (78)	18/29 (62)
100-1,000	31-34.5	11/33 (33)	10/26 (39)	11/19 (58)	8/36 (22)
<100	>34.5	2/7 (29)	1/6 (17)	0/4 (0)	0/8 (0)
Overall	na	155/197 (79)	73/99 (74)	78/95 (82)	129/177(73)

182

183

184

185

186

187

188

189

190

Table 1. Results of the Phase 3b evaluations showing viral antigen detection/sensitivity of four LFD tests using dry-swab samples from community sampling. Tests were performed by laboratory scientists. Ct – cycle threshold on RT-PCR.

185 *Extended Innova LFD evaluation (Phases 2-4)*

186 The limit of detection of the Innova LFD (Table 2) was determined as part of Phase 2 evaluations for the Innova
 187 test. This analysis consisted of saliva spiked with SARS-CoV-2 with stock of SARS-CoV-2 with a standardised
 188 PFU. Under these ideal concentrations, at an estimated PFU of 390/mL, which corresponds to a Ct of ~25, the
 189 LFD identified all samples.

PFU/ml	Ct equivalent	Positive LFD tests/total LFD tests	% positive
100000	16	20/20	100
10000	19	25/25	100
1000	23.7	65/65	100
390	25.2	5/5	100
100	25.5	63/65	96
40	28.5	3/5	60
20	29.3	0/5	0
10	30.2	0/5	0
5	31	0/5	0
2.5	31.7	0/5	0
1.2	32.5	0/5	0

191

192

Table 2. Limit of sensitivity for SARS-CoV-2 detection by the Innova LFD for antigen detection using saliva sample spiked with SARS-CoV-2. Ct - cycle threshold. PFU - plaque forming units.

193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200

Our phase 4 evaluation focused on field testing of the Innova LFD, for which we had a sufficient supply of kits available for wider testing at the time. Device specificity was determined through an analysis of 6954 tests from evaluation phases 2-4. The percentage of false-positives ranged from 0.00-0.49%, with an overall specificity of 99.68%. The false-positive rate was centre-dependent ($p=0.014$, Fisher's exact test). These evaluations noted that where there were challenges in interpreting the results when the test result was "weak" (i.e. the test line was very faint) (Table 3).

Evaluation Phase	False positives/total number	False positives and 95% confidence interval
Phase 2 evaluation	0/72	0.0% (0.0-5.0)
Phase 3a evaluation- negative samples	0/940	0.0% (0.0-0.4)
Phase 4 evaluation- hospital staff	1/329*	0.3% (0.01-1.7)
Phase 4 evaluation- armed forces	0/105	0.0% (0.0-3.5)
Phase 4 evaluation- PHE staff	0/209	0.0% (0.0-1.8)
Phase 4 evaluation- school 1	9/1855**	0.5% (0.2-0.9)
Phase 4 evaluation- school 2 + 3 + 4	7/2130**	0.3% (0.1-0.7)
Phase 4 evaluation- COVID-19 testing centre	5/1314***	0.4% (0.1-0.9)
TOTAL	22/6954	0.3% (0.2-0.5)

*This was 1 weak positive result that was also a weak positive on repeating; ** Weak positives result were negative on retesting with Innova; *** Not photographed or repeated. Taken in a setting of prevalence of 14% LFD positive results.

201
202
203
204

Table 3. Number of false positives in negative samples in each evaluation stage for the Innova LFD. 95% confidence intervals presented in each case.

205
206
207
208
209
210

Across Phase 2-4 evaluation stages, 8,951 Innova LFD tests were performed, including a diverse cohort of populations as part of Phase 3b and Phase 4 testing, namely out-patient SARS-CoV-2 cases, healthcare staff, armed forces personnel and secondary school children. The overall kit failure rate for the Innova LFD was 5.6% (502/8951, 95% CI: 5.1-6.1) (Table 4). The most common reason for kit failure was poor transfer of the liquid within the device from the reservoir onto the test strip.

Innova LFD evaluation phase	LFD failures (%)
Phase 2 negatives	0/72 (0.0%)
Phase 2 positive dilution series	0/60 (0.0%)
Phase 2 positive extended dilution series	0/155 (0.0%)
Phase 2 Swab comparison	0/187 (0.0%)
Phase 3a positives	13/191 (6.8%)
Phase 3a negatives	50/990 (5.1%)
Phase 3b FALCON (Dry swabs- field)	27/267 (10.1%)
Phase 3b FALCON (Dry swabs- lab)	9/212 (4.2%)
Phase 3b FALCON (VTM swabs)	9/157 (5.7%)
Phase 4 hospital staff	17/358 (4.7%)
Phase 4 armed forces	6/157 (3.8%)
Phase 4 PHE staff	19/212 (8.9%)
Phase 4 school 1	311/1855 (16.8%)
Phase 4 school 2 + 3 + 4	14/2132 (0.7%)
Phase 4 COVID-19 testing centre	27/1946 (1.4%)
	502/8951 (5.6%)

211
212


Table 4. Evaluations of the Innova LFD across Phases 2-4. The table demonstrates the kit failure rate.

213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227

Viral antigen detection/sensitivity in individuals with confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection using the Innova LFD was assessed in the Phase 3b evaluation as part of the FALCON-C19 research study. Optimal viral antigen detection/sensitivity when performed by laboratory scientists, was 78.8% (95% CI 72.4-84.3%; 156/198 cases where a paired PCR was performed; see below for differing performance by test operator category). Subgroup analyses showed there were no discernible differences in viral antigen detection/sensitivity in those without symptoms vs. symptomatic individuals (27/41 [65.9%] vs. 95/344 [72.4%], $p=0.38$). We did not find any evidence of associations between LFD positivity and symptoms or past medical history, with the exception of presence of headache (Supplementary Table 2).

The association between Innova LFD viral antigen detection/sensitivity and estimated viral load/Ct value was explored using the paired RT-PCR VTM swab sample taken at the same time as the swab used for LFD. There was a strong association between viral load detection (RNA copies/mL) determined through RT-PCR and viral antigen detection by LFD (Figure 1). Confirming earlier analyses, sensitivity of LFDs is highest in samples with higher viral loads.^{18,19}


228 Within the 3b FALCON-C19 study, LFDs were also assessed by sampling 150uL of viral transport medium (VTM)
 229 solution instead of using dry swabs; this was associated with poorer performance rate (Supp Figure 2). The use
 230 of dry swabs forms the basis of the manufacturer's instructions for use. This was likely due to a dilution factor
 231 involved in placing the swab first into VTM and then analysing the VTM sample, and highlights potential issues in
 232 generating direct comparisons between LFDs and VTM samples (Supp Figure 2).



233

234 *Figure 1. Association between viral antigen detection/sensitivity and viral load (RNA copies/mL and Ct) in Phase 3b Falcon-C19 study evaluation*
 235 *for dry swabs when performed by trained laboratory scientists and trained healthcare workers. Diamond shows point estimate, with 95%*
 236 *confidence intervals, pooling data from all other categories.*
 237

238 As part of Phase 3b-4 evaluations, work was performed to report on the effect of the operator on viral antigen
 239 detection/sensitivity in RT-PCR-positive cases using the Innova LFD. Tests were classified according to whether
 240 they were performed by a laboratory scientist, a fully trained research health care worker or by a self-trained lay
 241 individual working at a regional NHS Test and Trace centre. Performance was optimal when the LFD was used
 242 by laboratory scientists (156/198 LFDs positive [78.8%, 95% CI: 72.4-84.3%]) relative to trained healthcare-
 243 workers (156/223 LFDs positive [70.0%, 95% CI: 63.5-75.9%]) and self-trained members of the public given a
 244 protocol (214/372 LFDs positive [57.5%, 95% CI: 52.3-62.6%]; $p < 0.0001$).
 245



246
247

Figure 2. Effect of training and operator on the viral detection/sensitivity of the Innova LFD in COVID-19 PCR-positive patients.

Discussion

We report on our national evaluation of SARS-CoV-2 viral antigen-detecting LFDs, focussing on the *Innova SARS-CoV-2 Antigen Rapid Qualitative Test*, which has a viral antigen detection (sensitivity) of 78.8% when performed by laboratory scientists and a specificity of 99.7%, using RT-PCR as 'gold standard' for positive and negative status. In our evaluation, test performance was largely maintained across different settings and cohorts; however, performance was partly operator-dependent and kit failures are not infrequent.

Test performance to detect SARS-CoV-2-positive samples was improved at lower Ct values/higher viral loads, and were >90% at Ct values <25 equating to ~390 pfu/mL (Supplementary Table 3). There is an expanding body of evidence that suggests viral load/antigen is important as individuals with the highest viral loads are the most infectious,²⁰ and the presence/absence of viral antigens determined by LFDs is more strongly associated with a viral culture than RT-PCR positivity.²¹

Our experience is that many LFDs entering our national evaluation program do not perform at a level required for mass population deployment and this reflects the literature. To date, an increasing number of evaluations of SARS-CoV-2 antigen-detecting LFD have been published with variable results. A number of LFDs show good²⁴ or acceptable sensitivity and specificity^{28 29}, however, many studies have identified tests with poor sensitivities or specificities.^{30 15}

A challenge for most countries during the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic has been the expansion of capacity for diagnostic testing to support the identification of symptomatic and asymptomatic cases. This would aid in offering testing to "contacts" of COVID-19 and enable targeted testing to better safeguard vulnerable populations e.g. care home residents. Reliance on RT-PCR involves significant infrastructural and specialist human resources to implement at increasing scale. Both the World Health Organisation and European commission have issued guidance supporting wider implementation of antigen-targeting LFDs, and in November, Slovakia became the first country in the world to implement entire population testing using LFDs.^{1,3,31} The UK has similar aspirations to pursue a strategy of mass testing and has implemented a city wide mass testing in Liverpool using the Innova LFD in this study.³²

It is important to note that there are some potential issues with considering RT-PCR as the gold standard test for COVID-19. Many individuals have persisting viral RNA fragments that can linger for weeks-months without any evidence of active viral replication; in this instance a PCR-positive is likely to overcall the "infectious" status of an individual.³³ Indeed, when compared to the ability to perform viral culture, data suggest that RT-PCR tends to overestimate the presence of replicating or infectious virions.³⁴

In field testing, performance of the Innova LFD was dependent on the test operator. Individuals who had read a protocol immediately prior to self-sampling did not perform as well as individuals with hands-on training, or clinical laboratory personnel who had performed several hundred LFD tests. Like other operator-dependent procedures, further work is required to determine the duration and content of "training" to derive optimal test performance. We also assume that the use of LFDs to successfully identify individuals with higher viral loads and enabling an earlier diagnosis will be of benefit in interrupting transmission, however, this remains to be proven.

SARS-CoV-2 control will benefit from a variety of testing strategies. This might include those optimised for determining past infection/exposure (e.g. serology), those that are of benefit in determining current/recent infection (e.g. RT-PCR), or those identifying potential infectivity. A combination of approaches incorporating the strengths of each of these tests can be effectively used for individuals and for population-level management of the pandemic. Approaches to testing will remain relevant even when effective vaccines become available as it may take several months for an appreciable effect on transmission to be fully realised.³⁵

In conclusion, we completed late stage evaluations of seven LFDs. We report sensitivities of 70-80% and specificities $\geq 99.7\%$ for each LFD evaluated in phase 3b, which involved testing by laboratory personnel or trained healthcare professionals. To identify patients with higher viral loads (Ct<25), each LFD had >90% sensitivity. Sensitivity was lower in phase 4 evaluations, while specificity was maintained. The simplicity of LFDs, without a requirement for specialist training or equipment, mean that they are an attractive option for mass testing. Future research should focus on post-implementation evaluation of diagnostic accuracy, including the potential benefit of regular serial sampling to improve accuracy and reduce transmission.

305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346

Acknowledgements

The authors thank the participants and their families affected by COVID-19, NHS doctors and nurses and other medical staff, research scientists and support staff at Public Health England, Porton Down, NHS Test and Trace COVID-19 testing centres staff, the NIHR research network, the University of Birmingham medical school, the University of Oxford medical school, the University of Newcastle medical school, NHS Test and Trace and St John Ambulance.

We would like to thank all members of the UK Lateral flow oversight group in contributing data at a challenging time as listed in the web appendix (appendix page 1)

We would like to acknowledge the Department of Health and Social Care, NIHR, University of Manchester and University of Oxford Biomedical Research Council in funding this study.

Viral stocks were supplied by Dr Julian Druce, Doherty Institute, Queensland University, Australia.

The NHS and funders had no role in data collection, analysis or decision to publish.

Funding statement

DSL is supported by the NIHR Community Healthcare MedTech and In vitro Diagnostic Cooperative and the NIHR Applied Research Collaboration (ARC) West Midlands. LYWL, DWC, TEAP, AV, SJH, ASW and HLP are supported by the NIHR Oxford BRC. DWC and NS are supported by the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) Health Protection Research Unit in Healthcare Associated Infections at University of Oxford (NIHR200915) in partnership with Public Health England (PHE). KKC is Medical Research Foundation-funded. DWC, ASW and TEAP are NIHR Senior Investigators. PCM is funded by the Wellcome Trust (grant 110110/Z/15/Z). Falcon-C19 is a project funded by a National Institute for Health Research (NIHR). DWE is a Robertson Foundation Big Data Institute Fellow. SFL is funded by a Wellcome Trust Clinical Research Fellowship.

The report presents independent research funded by the National Institute for Health Research, Wellcome Trust and the Department of Health. The views expressed in this publication are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the NHS, Wellcome Trust, the National Institute for Health Research, the Department of Health or Public Health England.

Declaration of interest

DWE declares lecture fees from Gilead, outside the submitted work. LYWL has previously received speaker honorarium from the Merck group and Servier for unrelated work. The other authors have nothing to disclose.

347 **References**

- 348
- 349 1. Diagnostic testing for SARS-CoV-2. <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/diagnostic-testing-for-sars-cov-2>.
- 350 2. Raffle, A. E., Pollock, A. M. & Harding-Edgar, L. Covid-19 mass testing programmes. *The BMJ* vol. 370 (2020).
- 351 3. Commission steps up actions on testing. *European Commission - European Commission*
- 352 https://ec.europa.eu/commission/presscorner/detail/en/ip_20_2047.
- 353 4. How is the COVID-19 Virus Detected using Real Time RT-PCR? | IAEA. [https://www.iaea.org/newscenter/news/how-is-](https://www.iaea.org/newscenter/news/how-is-the-covid-19-virus-detected-using-real-time-rt-pcr)
- 354 [the-covid-19-virus-detected-using-real-time-rt-pcr](https://www.iaea.org/newscenter/news/how-is-the-covid-19-virus-detected-using-real-time-rt-pcr).
- 355 5. EMERGENCY USE AUTHORIZATION (EUA) SUMMARY COVID-19 RT-PCR TEST (LABORATORY CORPORATION
- 356 OF AMERICA). <https://www.fda.gov/media/136151/download>.
- 357 6. Ghoshal, U., Vasanth, S. & Tejan, N. A guide to laboratory diagnosis of Corona Virus Disease-19 for the
- 358 gastroenterologists. *Indian Journal of Gastroenterology* vol. 39 236–242 (2020).
- 359 7. Coronavirus (COVID-19) in the UK: Testing. <https://coronavirus.data.gov.uk/testing>.
- 360 8. NHS Test and Trace: how it works - GOV.UK. <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/nhs-test-and-trace-how-it-works>.
- 361 9. NHS COVID-19 - NHS. <https://www.nhs.uk/apps-library/nhs-covid-19/>.
- 362 10. Coronavirus (COVID-19): Contact tracing in Scotland | NHS inform. [https://www.nhsinform.scot/illnesses-and-](https://www.nhsinform.scot/illnesses-and-conditions/infections-and-poisoning/coronavirus-covid-19/test-and-protect/coronavirus-covid-19-contact-tracing)
- 363 [conditions/infections-and-poisoning/coronavirus-covid-19/test-and-protect/coronavirus-covid-19-contact-tracing](https://www.nhsinform.scot/illnesses-and-conditions/infections-and-poisoning/coronavirus-covid-19/test-and-protect/coronavirus-covid-19-contact-tracing).
- 364 11. O'Farrell, B. Evolution in Lateral Flow–Based Immunoassay Systems. in *Lateral Flow Immunoassay* 1–33 (Humana
- 365 Press, 2009). doi:10.1007/978-1-59745-240-3_1.
- 366 12. Guglielmi, G. Fast coronavirus tests: what they can and can't do. *Nature* **585**, 496–498 (2020).
- 367 13. Porte, L. *et al.* Evaluation of a novel antigen-based rapid detection test for the diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2 in respiratory
- 368 samples. *Int. J. Infect. Dis.* **99**, 328–333 (2020).
- 369 14. Mertens, P. *et al.* Development and Potential Usefulness of the COVID-19 Ag Respi-Strip Diagnostic Assay in a
- 370 Pandemic Context. *Front. Med.* **7**, 225 (2020).
- 371 15. Denkinger, C. Evaluation of the accuracy, ease of use and limit of detection of novel, rapid, antigen-detecting point-of-care
- 372 diagnostics for SARS-CoV-2. *medRxiv* 2020.10.01.20203836 (2020) doi:10.1101/2020.10.01.20203836.
- 373 16. Protocol for evaluation of rapid diagnostic assays for specific SARS-CoV-2 antigens (lateral flow devices). *GOV.UK*
- 374 [https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/assessment-and-procurement-of-coronavirus-covid-19-tests/protocol-for-](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/assessment-and-procurement-of-coronavirus-covid-19-tests/protocol-for-evaluation-of-rapid-diagnostic-assays-for-specific-sars-cov-2-antigens-lateral-flow-devices)
- 375 [evaluation-of-rapid-diagnostic-assays-for-specific-sars-cov-2-antigens-lateral-flow-devices](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/assessment-and-procurement-of-coronavirus-covid-19-tests/protocol-for-evaluation-of-rapid-diagnostic-assays-for-specific-sars-cov-2-antigens-lateral-flow-devices).
- 376 17. Eyre, D. W. *et al.* Differential occupational risks to healthcare workers from SARS-CoV-2 observed during a prospective
- 377 observational study. *eLife* **9**, e60675 (2020).
- 378 18. Gremmels, H. *et al.* Real-life validation of the Panbio™ COVID-19 antigen rapid test (Abbott) in community-dwelling
- 379 subjects with symptoms of potential SARS-CoV-2 infection. *EClinicalMedicine* **0**, (2020).
- 380 19. Merino-Amador, P. *et al.* Multicenter evaluation of the Panbio™ COVID-19 Rapid Antigen-Detection Test for the diagnosis
- 381 of SARS-CoV-2 infection. *medRxiv* 2020.11.18.20230375 (2020) doi:10.1101/2020.11.18.20230375.
- 382 20. Singanayagam, A. *et al.* Duration of infectiousness and correlation with RT-PCR cycle threshold values in cases of
- 383 COVID-19, England, January to May 2020. *Eurosurveillance* **25**, 2001483 (2020).
- 384 21. Antigen-based testing but not real-time PCR correlates with SARS-CoV-2 virus culture | medRxiv.
- 385 <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.10.02.20205708v1>.

- 386 22. Cevik, M. *et al.* SARS-CoV-2, SARS-CoV, and MERS-CoV viral load dynamics, duration of viral shedding, and
387 infectiousness: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Lancet Microbe* **0**, (2020).
- 388 23. Madewell, Z. J., Yang, Y., Longini, I. M., Halloran, M. E. & Dean, N. E. Household transmission of SARS-CoV-2: a
389 systematic review and meta-analysis of secondary attack rate. *MedRxiv Prepr. Serv. Health Sci.* (2020)
390 doi:10.1101/2020.07.29.20164590.
- 391 24. Nicol, T. *et al.* Assessment of SARS-CoV-2 serological tests for the diagnosis of COVID-19 through the evaluation of
392 three immunoassays: Two automated immunoassays (Euroimmun and Abbott) and one rapid lateral flow immunoassay
393 (NG Biotech). *J. Clin. Virol.* **129**, 104511 (2020).
- 394 25. Igl[□]i, Z. *et al.* Clinical evaluation of the Roche/SD Biosensor rapid antigen test with symptomatic, non-hospitalized
395 patients in a municipal health service drive-through testing site. *medRxiv* 2020.11.18.20234104 (2020)
396 doi:10.1101/2020.11.18.20234104.
- 397 26. Pilarowski, G. *et al.* Performance characteristics of a rapid SARS-CoV-2 antigen detection assay at a public plaza testing
398 site in San Francisco. *medRxiv* 2020.11.02.20223891 (2020) doi:10.1101/2020.11.02.20223891.
- 399 27. Schwob, J.-M. *et al.* Antigen rapid tests, nasopharyngeal PCR and saliva PCR to detect SARS-CoV-2: a prospective
400 comparative clinical trial. *medRxiv* 2020.11.23.20237057 (2020) doi:10.1101/2020.11.23.20237057.
- 401 28. Linares, M. *et al.* Panbio antigen rapid test is reliable to diagnose SARS-CoV-2 infection in the first 7 days after the onset
402 of symptoms. *J. Clin. Virol.* **133**, 104659 (2020).
- 403 29. Bulilete, O. *et al.* Evaluation of the PanbioTM rapid antigen test for SARS-CoV-2 in primary health care centers and test
404 sites. *medRxiv* 2020.11.13.20231316 (2020) doi:10.1101/2020.11.13.20231316.
- 405 30. Mak, G. C. *et al.* Evaluation of rapid antigen test for detection of SARS-CoV-2 virus. *J. Clin. Virol. Off. Publ. Pan Am. Soc.*
406 *Clin. Virol.* **129**, 104500 (2020).
- 407 31. The effectiveness of population-wide, rapid antigen test based screening in reducing SARS-CoV-2 infection prevalence in
408 Slovakia. *CMMID Repository* <https://cmmid.github.io/topics/covid19/Slovakia.html> (2020).
- 409 32. Boseley, S. & Elgot, J. Liverpool to pioneer UK's first attempt at mass Covid testing. *The Guardian* (2020).
- 410 33. Carmo, A. *et al.* Clearance and persistence of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in patients with COVID-19. *J. Med. Virol.* **92**, 2227–2231
411 (2020).
- 412 34. La Scola, B. *et al.* Viral RNA load as determined by cell culture as a management tool for discharge of SARS-CoV-2
413 patients from infectious disease wards. *Eur. J. Clin. Microbiol. Infect. Dis.* **39**, 1059–1061 (2020).
- 414 35. Mina, M. J., Parker, R. & Larremore, D. B. Rethinking Covid-19 Test Sensitivity — A Strategy for Containment. *N. Engl. J.*
415 *Med.* **0**, null (2020).
- 416 36. Larremore, D. B. *et al.* Test sensitivity is secondary to frequency and turnaround time for COVID-19 surveillance. *medRxiv*
417 (2020) doi:10.1101/2020.06.22.20136309.
- 418 37. Covid-19: Daily coronavirus test plan to cut contacts' 14-day self-isolation. *BBC News* (2020).
- 419 38. November 2020, J. S. NHS staff to get twice-weekly home covid tests with immediate effect. *Health Service Journal*
420 <https://www.hsj.co.uk/acute-care/nhs-staff-to-get-twice-weekly-home-covid-tests-with-immediate-effect/7028943.article>.
- 421

422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446

Research in Context

Evidence before the study:

Lateral flow devices are a new form of testing for SARS-CoV-2. They differ from RT-PCR tests in that they rely on the detection of viral antigens by immunoassays and their utility has not yet been fully defined. A literature review was performed in PubMed and bioRxiv/medRxiv for all studies using lateral flow devices for the detection of SARS-CoV-2 viral antigen. This used the search terms “COVID-19”, “SARS-CoV-2”, “viral antigen” and “lateral flow devices” and was not limited to English language publications. To date, the majority of studies have been largely single centre studies analysing a single test and there are contrasting results with some LFDs showing good sensitivity and specificity^{24 25 13 19 26 27 18}, and others demonstrating poorer performance.^{28 29}

Added value of the study

This UK COVID-19 Lateral Flow Oversight group study is the largest national evaluation undertaken of viral antigen LFDs for COVID-19. We have flagged four LFDs with the best performance characteristics from our assessments. The Innova LFD has been tested the most extensively and has high specificity with acceptable sensitivity. Our data has also highlighted the critical importance of training. We also note the need for further clinical studies to demonstrate that the identification of individuals with higher viral loads will be of benefit in interrupting transmission.

Implications of all the available evidence

Our data indicates that LFDs for COVID-19 have performance characteristics attractive for the UK mass testing program. Ongoing iterative evaluation of the population-level roll-out of LFDs in reducing transmission of COVID-19, and the contribution of such tests to reducing the risk of morbidity and mortality for clinically vulnerable individuals, is desirable. Further work is required to determine the amount and content of “training” to derive optimal test performance.

