

1 **High Sensitivity and NPV for BinaxNOW Rapid Antigen Test in Children at a Mass**
2 **Testing Site During Prevalent Delta Variant**
3

4 Kristie J. Sun BA^{*a}, Mary Jane E. Vaeth BS^{*b}, Matthew Robinson MD^c, Maryam Elhabashy BA^d, Ishaan
5 Gupta MD^c, Sophia Purekal MD^b, E. Adrienne Hammershaimb MD MS^e, Ria Peralta BS^{b,f}, Asia
6 Mitchell^b, Maisha Foyez^b, J. Kristie Johnson PhD^g, James R Ficke MD^h, Yukari C. Manabe MD^c, James
7 D. Campbell MD MS^e, Charles W. Callahan DO^g, Charles F. Locke MD^c, Melinda Kantsiper MDⁱ,
8 CONQUER COVID Consortium, Zishan K. Siddiqui MD^c

9
10 *These authors contributed equally as co-first authors

11
12 **Affiliations:** ^aCase Western Reserve University School of Medicine, Cleveland, OH, USA; ^bBaltimore
13 Convention Center Field Hospital, Baltimore, MD, USA; ^cDepartment of Medicine, The Johns Hopkins
14 University School of Medicine, Baltimore, MD, USA; ^dUniversity of Maryland Baltimore County,
15 Baltimore, MD, USA; ^eCenter for Vaccine Development and Global Health, Department of Pediatrics,
16 University of Maryland School of Medicine, Baltimore, MD, USA; ^fNova Southeastern University
17 College Of Osteopathic Medicine, Fort Lauderdale, FL, USA; ^gDepartment of Pathology, University of
18 Maryland School of Medicine, Baltimore, MD, USA; ^hDepartment of Orthopedic Surgery, The Johns
19 Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD, USA; ⁱDivision of Hospital Medicine, The Johns Hopkins Bayview
20 Medical Center, Baltimore, MD, USA

21
22 **Keywords:** COVID-19, pediatric rapid antigen testing

23
24 **Address all correspondence and reprint requests to:** Zishan K. Siddiqui, MD, Department of
25 Medicine, The Johns Hopkins University, Meyer 8134K, 1800 Orleans St, Baltimore, MD, 21287
26 (Telephone: 443 287 3631; Fax: 410 502 0923; E-mail: zsiddiq1@jhu.edu).

27 ABSTRACT

28 SARS-CoV-2 continues to develop new, increasingly infectious variants, such as delta and
29 omicron. Here, we evaluate the efficacy of the Abbott BinaxNOW Rapid Antigen Test against
30 the gold standard of Reverse Transcription Polymerase Chain Reaction (“RT-PCR”) in 1054
31 pediatric participants presenting to a state-owned high-volume Coronavirus Disease 2019
32 (COVID-19) testing site. During the testing period, the delta variant was predominant. Prior to
33 sample collection, symptomatic and exposure status was collected for all participants based on
34 Centers for Disease Control (CDC) criteria. RT-PCR results demonstrated an overall prevalence
35 rate of 5.2%. For all participants, the sensitivity of the rapid antigen tests was 92.7% (95% CI
36 82.4% - 98.0%) and specificity was 98.0% (95% CI 97.0%-98.8%). For symptomatic
37 participants, the sensitivity was 92.3% (95% CI 74.9% - 99.1%), specificity was 96.6% (95% CI
38 93.6%- 98.4%), positive predictive value (PPV) was 72.7% (95% CI 54.5% - 86.7%) and
39 negative predictive value (NPV) was 99.2% (95% CI 98.2% - 100%). Among asymptomatic
40 participants, the sensitivity was 92.6% (95% CI 75.7% - 99.1%), specificity was 98.6% (95% CI
41 97.5% - 99.3%) the PPV was 71.4% (95% CI 53.7% - 85.4%) and the NPV was 99.7% (95% CI
42 99.0% - 100%). Our reported sensitivity and NPV are higher than other pediatric studies, but
43 specificity and PPV are lower.

44 **Importance** Children are especially impacted by the disease and its ability to disrupt educational
45 opportunities. Although vaccinations have been approved for children 5 years and older, many
46 children remain unvaccinated. Widespread testing may improve the ability for children to remain
47 in in-person activities, minimizing absences from school and extracurriculars. Highly accurate
48 rapid antigen tests may be vital to containing future COVID-19 waves while mitigating
49 detrimental effects.

50 INTRODUCTION

51 Many U.S. children remain susceptible to SARS-CoV-2 infection. 20 million children under 5
52 have no option for vaccination.¹ Among the 28 million eligible children aged 5-11, 18% have
53 received at least one dose of the Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) vaccine as of December
54 8, 2021.² Similarly, only 51% of 25 million eligible children aged 12-17 years have received two
55 doses of the vaccine.² Quick, accurate, and accessible diagnostic testing for SARS-CoV-2 in
56 pediatric populations is critical to keeping children in classrooms, especially given the
57 transmissibility of newer variants (e.g. delta, omicron) among vaccinated individuals.^{3,4} The
58 impact of disrupted in-person learning has been substantial. Students are more behind in
59 foundational coursework, with the effect compounded for students with historical racial or
60 socioeconomic disadvantages.⁵

61
62 One strategy to keep children safely in school is with routine testing. Challenges around testing
63 include delayed result reporting, high cost for reverse transcription polymerase chain reaction
64 (“RT-PCR”) tests, and access disparities among marginalized populations.⁶ Rapid antigen tests
65 offer an attractive alternative with results often returned in 15 minutes, lower cost, and ability to
66 predict patients harboring culturable, infectious virus.⁷ Studies of the accuracy of these tests in
67 children are conflicting. Most were conducted before the more aggressive variants like delta
68 became prevalent.^{8,9} We evaluated the real-world characteristics of the Abbott BinaxNOW rapid
69 antigen test (Abbott Laboratories, Abbott Park, IL) in children presenting to a high-throughput
70 setting. Our study took place in the context of a high prevalence of the delta variant, between
71 May 7, 2021 and December 6, 2021. The prevalence of the delta variant rapidly increased from

72 less than 2.5% of COVID-19 cases to more than 99% in Maryland and surrounding states during
73 the first month of the study period.¹⁰

74

75 METHODS

76 **Study design.** This single-center prospective study compared the performance, quantified as
77 sensitivity and specificity, of the BinaxNOW rapid antigen test against the current gold standard
78 of RT-PCR. BinaxNOW is a lateral flow assay that targets the SARS-CoV-2 viral nucleocapsid
79 (N) protein. The RT-PCR assay includes a panel of primer/probe sets targeting the viral N gene.
80 This study was approved by the Johns Hopkins institutional review board.

81

82 **Participants and study site.** All individuals under 18 years old were offered enrollment from
83 5/7/2021 – 12/6/2021. Potential enrollees and guardians were given written and verbal
84 information about the study and given the opportunity to opt out of the additional anterior nares
85 swabs for the rapid antigen test. The study site was a high-volume walk-up community collection
86 site linked to the Baltimore Convention Center Field Hospital.

87

88 **Data collection.** Before sample collection, data for demographics, symptoms, and any self-
89 perceived exposure status was collected for each participant. Presence of active COVID-19
90 symptoms was assessed based on the standard Centers for Disease Control and Prevention
91 (CDC) symptom checklist.¹¹ Participants who reported at least one symptom were considered
92 “symptomatic,” while those who reported no symptoms were considered “asymptomatic.”
93 Participant exposure status was obtained according to CDC risk stratification. Participants were
94 asked about living with someone with confirmed or suspected COVID-19; if they had been

95 within 6 feet of someone with confirmed or suspected COVID-19 for more than 15 minutes; and
96 if they had any other exposure to anyone with confirmed or suspected COVID-19. Participants
97 were considered to have had high risk exposures if they lived with or were within 6 feet for more
98 than 15 minutes of someone with confirmed or suspected COVID-19. Date of symptom onset
99 and exposure were recorded. Test implementation, education, and training processes have been
100 previously described.¹²

101
102 **Sample collection.** The rapid antigen and RT-PCR samples were collected sequentially for each
103 participant in the study by medical staff who were trained to perform rapid antigen tests.
104 Manufacturer's guidelines were followed in obtaining and processing rapid antigen samples.¹³
105 Staff collected bilateral anterior nares swabs first for direct inoculation onto rapid antigen tests
106 followed by additional bilateral anterior nares sample for RT-PCR. A designated, trained reader
107 interpreted and recorded the result on-site for each rapid antigen test 15 minutes after the test was
108 administered per the instructions for use. All samples for RT-PCR were sent to the University of
109 Maryland Pathology Associates-Maryland Genomics reference laboratory (University of
110 Maryland School of Medicine, Baltimore, MD) and processed using a modification of the CDC
111 2019 Novel Coronavirus Real-Time RT-PCR Diagnostic Panel. Individuals for whom the RT-
112 PCR or rapid antigen test was deemed indeterminate (control line not interpretable) were
113 excluded from analysis.

114
115 **Statistical analysis.** Accuracy results (sensitivity, specificity, and positive and negative
116 predictive values [PPV, NPV respectively]) and 95% confidence intervals (CIs) were calculated
117 using the binomial exact method for the rapid antigen test for both symptomatic and

118 asymptomatic populations compared with the RT-PCR gold standard. Accuracy results for
119 symptomatic and asymptomatic group were compared. Two tailed P values were calculated
120 using Fisher's exact test. Similar test accuracy was calculated for exposure groups and age
121 groups. Cycle threshold (C_T) values for PCR-positive tests were summarized and compared for
122 symptomatic and asymptomatic groups. A plot showing the distribution of RT-PCR C_T values
123 was generated for symptomatic and asymptomatic individuals (Figure 1). All statistical analyses
124 were performed using JMP Pro, version 14.0.0, software (SAS Institute, Cary, NC).

125

126 RESULTS

127 During the testing period, 1054 of 2811 children who were seen for diagnostic testing
128 participated in the study. Among participants, 508 (48.3%) were female, 438 (41.6%) were
129 White, 373 (35.4%) were African American, 105 (9.9%) were Hispanic, and the mean age was
130 8.9 years. Non-participants were similar for gender (female 49.1%, $P = 0.6$), were older (mean
131 9.4 years, $P = 0.001$), and were more often African American (55%, $P < 0.0001$) or Hispanic
132 (15.1%, $P < 0.0001$). Symptomatic status was obtained for 1046 (99.2%) participants, of which
133 756 (72.4%) were asymptomatic. Symptomatic participants were younger (7.8 vs 9.3 years, $P <$
134 0.0001). High risk exposure was reported by 152 (20.1%) asymptomatic and 50 (17.2%)
135 symptomatic participants. The COVID-19 prevalence rate, based on RT-PCR results, was 5.2%
136 (55/1054) overall, 9.0% (26/290) for symptomatic individuals, and 3.6% (27/756) for
137 asymptomatic individuals. For symptomatic participants, 96.2% (275/286) tested within 7 days
138 after symptom onset. The prevalence rate was 20% for symptomatic participants with high-risk
139 exposure and 7.2% for asymptomatic with high-risk exposure (Table 1).

140

141 **Test accuracy.** The sensitivity of the rapid antigen tests for all participants was 92.7% (95% CI
142 82.4% - 98.0%) and specificity was 98.0% (95% CI 97.0%-98.8%). Sensitivity was similar for
143 symptomatic participants and asymptomatic participants (92.3% vs. 92.6%) (P = 1.0). It was also
144 similar for high-risk exposure groups, both symptomatic (80.0%; 95% CI 44.4% - 97.5%) and
145 asymptomatic (81.8%; 95% CI 48.2% - 97.7%) (Table 2). The specificity for symptomatic
146 participants was 96.6% (95% CI 93.6% - 98.4%) and for asymptomatic participants was 98.6%
147 (95% CI 97.5% - 99.3%). Among symptomatic individuals the PPV was 72.7% (95% CI 54.5% -
148 86.7%) and the NPV was 99.2% (95% CI 98.2% - 100%).). Among asymptomatic individuals
149 the PPV was 71.4% (95% CI 53.7% - 85.4%) and the NPV was 99.7% (95% CI 99.0% - 100%).
150 Mean C_T values were similar for the asymptomatic and symptomatic groups (28.6 vs 27) (P =
151 0.2). The test showed 100% sensitivity at C_T count 30 or below in both the symptomatic and
152 asymptomatic populations (Figure 1).

153

154 DISCUSSION

155 This single center prospective study at a state-owned walk-up testing site showed high
156 sensitivity, specificity, and NPV for the rapid antigen test in both symptomatic and
157 asymptomatic children. The sensitivity was 92.3% in symptomatic participants, and all but one
158 of these 26 RT-PCR positive participants were tested within 7 days of symptom onset. The
159 sensitivity in asymptomatic population was nearly identical at 92.6%, with an NPV of nearly
160 100%. Cycle threshold counts were similar for symptomatic and asymptomatic individuals and
161 rapid tests showed 100% sensitivity in both these groups at C_T count less than 30, which signifies
162 higher viral loads and greater transmissibility. Our point estimate of BinaxNOW rapid antigen
163 test sensitivity in children is above the 80% threshold set by the US Food & Drug Administration

164 (FDA) for Emergency Use Authorization (EUA) for both symptomatic and asymptomatic
165 children.¹⁴ Our results show that rapid antigen tests provide a reliable means to diagnose and
166 screen for COVID-19 in children. The near 100% NPVs for both symptomatic and asymptomatic
167 children, including some children with recent high-risk exposures, should provide providers and
168 parents with assurance that a negative rapid antigen test with this product can be trusted. These
169 data also provide support to the use of these tests as part of a “test-to-stay” approach in schools.¹⁵
170 Because our study showed that roughly 30% of positive antigen tests were false positives, it
171 would be prudent to confirm all positive antigen tests with a PCR test.

172
173 Our study shows higher sensitivity and NPV but lower specificity and PPV than other pediatric
174 studies.^{8,9} Differences could be related to higher viral load from prevalent delta variant during
175 the study period as most of the prior pediatric studies were conducted before the delta variant
176 became widespread.¹⁶ Additionally, ambient conditions for kit storage and use, variation in
177 quality of the test kit between lots, and the skill of our experienced testers may also explain
178 higher sensitivity in our study.¹⁷

179
180 Our study has a few limitations. The results from a single-site with over one-year of experience
181 in high volume testing may not be generalizable to all situations. However, with implementation
182 of best practices, similar accuracy would be expected.¹² Our study enrolled only a small number
183 of children with high-risk exposure and the estimates of accuracy had broad confidence interval.
184 However, the results are similar to overall symptomatic and asymptomatic groups. Additionally,
185 three of the four false negative tests in the high-risk exposure group were tested within 3 days of
186 exposure and samples were likely collected too early for detection by a rapid antigen test.

187

188 Given the short turn-around-time, low cost, and ease of use, this test could play an important role
189 in allowing children to limit absence from school and other activities while in quarantine or
190 awaiting PCR test results especially for asymptomatic children. It may assist in implementing
191 test-to-stay strategies, where exposed school children are allowed to continue uninterrupted in-
192 person learning given frequent testing for one week after exposure.¹⁸ The higher accuracy
193 reported in our study also underscores the magnitude of missed opportunity in failing to make
194 this important tool widely available to schools. If further studies with the extremely transmissible
195 omicron variant show very high viral load and rapid antigen accuracy, these tests could become
196 one of most valuable tools used to fight current and future COVID-19 variants.

197

198 **Acknowledgements**

199

200 **Conflict of Interest and Financial Disclosures:**

201 Dr. Manabe reports institutional grants (to Johns Hopkins) from National Institutes of Health,

202 Becton-Dickinson, Centers for Disease Control, and Baltimore City Health Department and

203 institutional receipt (to Johns Hopkins) of equipment, materials, drugs, medical writing, gifts or

204 other services from Hologic, Becton Dickinson, Roche, Cepheid, and ChemBio.

205

206 Dr. Robinson reports institutional grants (to Johns Hopkins) from National Institutes of Health,

207 Becton-Dickinson, Centers for Disease Control, and institutional receipt (to Johns Hopkins) of

208 equipment, materials, drugs from Becton Dickinson.

209

210 All other authors report no conflicts of interests.

211

212 **Funding:** No funding support was received for this study. BinaxNOW test kits were provided by

213 the Maryland Department of Health, free of cost.

214

References

1. Kates J, Tolbert J, Rouw A. An Update on Vaccine Roll-Out for 5-11 Year-olds in the U.S. Kaiser Family Foundation. Published December 8, 2021. Accessed December 22, 2021. <https://www.kff.org/coronavirus-covid-19/issue-brief/an-update-on-vaccine-roll-out-for-5-11-year-olds-in-the-u-s/>
2. Children and COVID-19 Vaccination Trends. American Academy of Pediatrics (AAP). Published December 17, 2021. Accessed December 22, 2021. <http://www.aap.org/en/pages/2019-novel-coronavirus-covid-19-infections/children-and-covid-19-vaccination-trends/>
3. Rosenberg ES. New COVID-19 Cases and Hospitalizations Among Adults, by Vaccination Status — New York, May 3–July 25, 2021. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep.* 2021;70. doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm7034e1
4. HKUMed finds Omicron SARS-CoV-2 can infect faster and better than Delta in human bronchus but with less severe infection in lung. Li Ka Shing Faculty of Medicine, The University of Hong Kong (HKUMed). Published December 15, 2021. Accessed December 22, 2021. <https://www.med.hku.hk/en/news/press/20211215-omicron-sars-cov-2-infection>
5. Dorn E, Hancock B, Sarakatsannis J, Viruleg E. COVID-19 and education: The lingering effects of unfinished learning. *McKinsey & Company*. Published online July 27, 2021:15.

6. Chwe H, Quintana A, Lazer D, et al. The COVID States Project #17: COVID-19 test result times. Published online February 10, 2021. doi:10.31219/osf.io/rz34x
7. Pekosz A, Parvu V, Li M, et al. Antigen-Based Testing but Not Real-Time Polymerase Chain Reaction Correlates With Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 Viral Culture. *Clin Infect Dis Off Publ Infect Dis Soc Am*. Published online January 20, 2021:ciaa1706. doi:10.1093/cid/ciaa1706
8. Shaikh N, Friedlander EJ, Tate PJ, et al. Performance of a Rapid SARS-CoV-2 Antigen Detection Assay in Symptomatic Children. *Pediatrics*. doi:10.1542/peds.2021-050832
9. Sood N, Shetgiri R, Rodriguez A, et al. Evaluation of the Abbott BinaxNOW rapid antigen test for SARS-CoV-2 infection in children: Implications for screening in a school setting. *PLOS ONE*. 2021;16(4):e0249710. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0249710
10. CDC. COVID Data Tracker. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Published March 28, 2020. Accessed September 1, 2021. <https://covid.cdc.gov/covid-data-tracker>
11. Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) – Symptoms. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Published February 22, 2021. Accessed December 22, 2021. <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/symptoms-testing/symptoms.html>

12. Siddiqui ZK, Chaudhary M, Robinson ML, et al. Implementation and Accuracy of BinaxNOW Rapid Antigen COVID-19 Test in Asymptomatic and Symptomatic Populations in a High-Volume Self-Referred Testing Site. *Microbiology Spectrum*. Published online December 1, 2021. doi:[10.1128/Spectrum.01008-21](https://doi.org/10.1128/Spectrum.01008-21)

13. Abbott. BinaxNOW COVID-19 Ag Card. Published online December 2020. Accessed August 16, 2021. <https://www.fda.gov/media/141570/download>

215

14. Food and Drug Administration. 2021. Antigen template for test developers. Version October 26, 2020. From the Policy for Coronavirus Disease-2019 tests during the public health emergency (revised). <https://www.fda.gov/regulatory-information/search-fda-guidance-documents/policy-coronavirus-disease-2019-tests-during-public-health-emergency-revised>. Template available at <https://www.fda.gov/media/137907/download>. Accessed on June 14.

216

15. CDC. Transmission of SARS-CoV-2 in K-12 Schools. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Published December 17, 2021. Accessed December 26, 2021. https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/science/science-briefs/transmission_k_12_schools.html

16. Bolze, A., Luo, S., White, S., Cirulli, E.T., Wyman, D., Dei Rossi, A., Machado, H., Cassens, T., Jacobs, S., Schiabor Barrett, K.M. and Tanudjaja, F., 2021. SARS-CoV-2


variant Delta rapidly displaced variant Alpha in the United States and led to higher viral loads.

17. Li B, Deng A, Li K, et al. Viral infection and transmission in a large, well-traced outbreak caused by the SARS-CoV-2 Delta variant. *medRxiv*. Published online January 1, 2021:2021.07.07.21260122. doi:10.1101/2021.07.07.21260122

18. Nemoto N, Dhillon S, Fink S, et al. Evaluation of Test to Stay Strategy on Secondary and Tertiary Transmission of SARS-CoV-2 in K–12 Schools — Lake County, Illinois, August 9–October 29, 2021. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*. 2021;70(5152). doi:[10.15585/mmwr.mm705152e2](https://doi.org/10.15585/mmwr.mm705152e2)

Figures

Figure 1. CT counts for symptomatic and asymptomatic participants



217

*Darker dots represent false negative rapid antigen results

218 **Tables**

219 Table 1. Demographics of Children Presenting for COVID-19 Diagnostic Testing with
 220 Concurrent RT-PCR and Rapid Antigen Test, Baltimore, 2021

Characteristics	Asymptomatic	Symptomatic
Female	49.9%	44.2%
Age	9 (6-12) ^a	7 (4-11) ^a
Race		
White	40.0%	45.9%
African American	36.6%	32.5%
Other	23.4%	23.6%
Ethnicity		
Hispanic	10.1%	8.9%

221 ^aData presented as median (interquartile range).

222

223 Table 2. Antigen Test Accuracy Rates Compared to RT-PCR as Reference Standard

Exposure Group	Positive/Total (%)		Sensitivity N (%) [95% CI]	Specificity N (%) [95% CI]
	RT-PCR	Rapid Antigen Test*		
Overall	55/1054 (5.2)	71/1054 (6.7)	51/55 (92.7) [82.4 – 98.0]	979/999 (98.0) [96.9 - 98.8]
Symptomatic* * - All	26/290 (9.0)	33/290 (11.4)	24/26 (92.3) [74.9 - 99.1]	255/264 (96.6) [93.6 - 98.4]
Symptomatic – ≤ 7 days of symptoms	25/275 (9.1)	32/275 (11.6)	23/25 (92.0) [74.0 - 99.0]	241/250 (96.4) [93.3 - 98.3]
Symptomatic – High Risk Exposure	10/50 (20)	10/50 (20)	8/10 (80.0) [44.4 - 97.5]	38/40 (95.0) [83.1 - 99.4]
Asymptomatic** ** - All	27/756 (3.6)	35/756 (4.6)	25/27 (92.6) [75.7 - 99.1]	719/729 (98.6) [97.5 - 99.3]
Asymptomatic – High Risk Exposure	11/152 (7.2)	10/152 (6.6)	9/11 (81.8) [48.2 - 97.7]	140/141 (99.3) [96.1 – 100.0]

- 224 *There were no inconclusive or invalid Rapid antigen results
- 225 ** Symptom status data was missing for 8 participants, including 4 participants with rapid antigen positive results
- 226 RT-PCR= Reverse Transcription Polymerase Chain Reaction
- 227 CI = Confidence Interval