

1 **RESEARCH NOTE**

2 **Real-life performance of a COVID-19 rapid antigen detection test targeting the**  
3 **SARS-CoV-2 nucleoprotein for diagnosis of COVID-19 due to the Omicron**  
4 **variant**

5 Paula de Michelena<sup>1†</sup>, Ignacio Torres<sup>1†</sup>, Ángela Ramos-García<sup>2</sup>, Victoria Gosalbes<sup>3</sup>,  
6 Nidia Ruiz<sup>4</sup>, Ana Sanmartín<sup>5</sup>, Pilar Botija<sup>5</sup>, Sandrine Poujois<sup>1</sup>, Dixie Huntley<sup>1</sup>, Eliseo  
7 Albert<sup>1</sup>, and David Navarro<sup>1,6\*</sup>

8 <sup>1</sup>*Microbiology Service, Clinic University Hospital, INCLIVA Health Research Institute,*  
9 *Valencia, Spain.*

10 <sup>2</sup>*Health Care center Benimaclet, Health Department Clínico-Malvarrosa, Valencia,*  
11 *Spain.*

12 <sup>3</sup>*Health Care center Salvador Pau, Health Department Clínico-Malvarrosa, Valencia,*  
13 *Spain.*

14 <sup>4</sup>*Health Care center Serrería, Health Department Clínico-Malvarrosa, Valencia, Spain.*

15 <sup>5</sup>*Primary Health Directorate, Health Department Clínico-Malvarrosa, Valencia, Spain.*

16 <sup>6</sup>*Department of Microbiology, School of Medicine, University of Valencia, Valencia,*  
17 *Spain.*

18 †Both authors contributed equally to the present work.

19 **\*Correspondence:**

20 David Navarro, Microbiology Service, Hospital Clínico Universitario, Instituto de  
21 Investigación INCLIVA. Av. Blasco Ibáñez 17, 46010 Valencia, Spain. Phone:  
22 34(96)1973500; Fax: 34(96)3864173; Email: [david.navarro@uv.es](mailto:david.navarro@uv.es).

23 **Running title:** Rapid antigen assay for the diagnosis of COVID-19 due to the Omicron  
24 variant.

25 **ABSTRACT**

26 **Objectives:** It has been suggested that rapid antigen detection assays (RADT) may  
27 perform suboptimally in terms of sensitivity for the diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2 Omicron  
28 variant infection. To address this issue, we conducted a prospective study in primary  
29 health centers to evaluate the clinical performance of the Panbio™ COVID-19 Ag  
30 Rapid Test Device in nasopharyngeal specimens (NP) carried out at the point of care.

31 **Methods:** We recruited 244 patients (median age, 40 years; range 2–96; 141 female)  
32 with clinical suspicion of COVID-19 (232 adults and 12 children). 228/244 patients had  
33 been fully vaccinated (two doses) with licensed COVID-19 vaccines prior to  
34 recruitment. Most patients (222/244) were SARS-CoV-2 naïve prior to enrollment.  
35 Patients were tested by RT-PCR and RADT within 5 days since symptoms onset.

36 **Results:** 126 patients (51.6%) tested positive by both RT-PCR and RADT, 90 patients  
37 (36.8%) returned negative results by both assays and 28 patients (11.4%) yielded  
38 discordant results (RT-PCR+/RADT-). No patients tested RT-PCR-/RADT+. Overall  
39 specificity and sensitivity of RADT was 100% (95% CI, 95.9–100%) and 81.8% (95%  
40 CI, 75–87.1%) respectively. The sensitivity of the assay increased from 79.6% (95% CI,  
41 66.4–88.5) when considering specimens collected at days 0–1 after symptoms onset, to  
42 86.4% (95% CI, 66.7–95.3) when grouping the specimens obtained on days 4–5.

43 **Conclusion:** The Panbio™ COVID-19 Ag Rapid Test Device perform well ( $\geq 80\%$   
44 sensitivity) as a point-of-care test for early diagnosis of COVID-19 due to the Omicron  
45 variant in primary healthcare centers.

46 **Keywords:** SARS-CoV-2, Omicron variant, rapid antigen assay, COVID-19, field  
47 performance study

## 48 **INTRODUCTION**

49 A number of commercially available rapid antigen detection tests (RADT) targeting the  
50 SARS-CoV-2 nucleocapsid protein (NP) have been shown to display a sensitivity of  
51 over 80% compared to RT-PCR assays for diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2 infection in  
52 symptomatic individuals, provided that testing is conducted within one week after  
53 symptoms onset [1]. These RADT were optimized for detection of the ancestral Wuhan-  
54 Hu-1 variant, and the emergence of SARS-CoV-2 variants which incorporate non-  
55 synonymous mutations within the amino acid sequence of NP may impact on the  
56 diagnostic efficiency of RADT. In this context, two studies [2,3] showed that the  
57 Panbio™ COVID-19 Ag Rapid Test Device (Abbott Diagnostic GmbH, Jena, Germany)  
58 had decreased sensitivity for detection of SARS-CoV-2 Alpha (B.1.1.7) variant  
59 compared to non-alpha lineages. As in many other countries, the SARS-CoV-2 Omicron  
60 variant has overtaken the Delta variant and currently dominates in Spain. It has been  
61 suggested that RADT may be less sensitive for detecting the Omicron variant [4], but  
62 this assumption lacks support by real-life RADT performance studies. Here, we  
63 conducted a prospective study in primary health centers to evaluate the clinical  
64 performance of the Panbio™ COVID-19 Ag Rapid Test Device in nasopharyngeal  
65 specimens (NP) carried out at the point of care for diagnosis of Omicron variant  
66 COVID-19.

## 67 **METHODS**

### 68 **Patients**

69 In the current observational prospective study, a convenience sample of 244 patients  
70 (median age, 40 years; range 2–96; 141 female) with clinical suspicion of COVID-19,  
71 232 of whom were adults (median age, 41 years; range, 17–96) and 12 children (median  
72 age, 15 years; range, 2–16), attending three randomly selected primary care centers  
73 affiliated to the Clínico-Malvarrosa Health Department in Valencia (Spain) were  
74 recruited between January 10 and January 21. Only patients with symptoms developing  
75 within the previous 5 days were enrolled. The study was approved by the Hospital  
76 Clínico de Valencia (HCU) INCLIVA Research Ethics Committee. Since the testing  
77 strategy was considered as regular clinical practice according to local health authorities,  
78 written informed consent was waived by this committee.

#### 79 **SARS-CoV-2 testing**

80 We collected two NPs per patient, one of which (provided by the manufacturer) was  
81 used for RADT while the other was placed in 3 mL of universal transport medium  
82 (DeltaSwab Virus, Deltalab, Barcelona, Spain) and delivered to the HCU Microbiology  
83 Service for RT-PCR testing. RADT was performed immediately after sampling  
84 following the manufacturer's instructions (reading at 15 min). RT-PCRs were carried  
85 out within 24 h of specimen collection with the TaqPath COVID-19 Combo Kit  
86 (Thermo Fisher Scientific, MS, USA) which targets SARS-CoV-2 ORF1ab, N and S  
87 genes. RNA was extracted using the Applied Biosystems™ MagMAX™  
88 Viral/Pathogen II Nucleic Acid Isolation Kits coupled with Thermo Scientific™  
89 KingFisher Flex automated instrument. The AMPLIRUN® TOTAL SARS-CoV-2  
90 Control (Viracell SA, Granada, Spain) was used as the reference material for SARS-  
91 CoV-2 RNA load quantification [5], for which purpose RT-PCR cycle threshold ( $C_T$ )  
92 values returned by amplification of the NP gene were considered. The S-gene dropout

93 RT-PCR profile was systematically associated with the Omicron variant within the  
94 study period, as confirmed by whole-genome sequencing (not shown).

### 95 **Statistical analyses**

96 Agreement between RAD assay and RT-PCR was assessed using Cohen's  $\kappa$  statistics.  
97 Differences between medians were compared using the Mann–Whitney U-test. Two-  
98 sided  $P$  values  $< 0.05$  were considered significant. Statistical analyses were performed  
99 using SPSS version 25.0 (SPSS, Chicago, IL, USA).

## 100 **RESULTS**

101 Results relevant to interpretation of the data presented herein are as follows. First, 228  
102 of the 244 patients had been fully vaccinated (two doses) with licensed COVID-19  
103 vaccines prior to recruitment. Second, most patients (222 out of 244) were SARS-CoV-  
104 2 naïve prior to enrollment. In all, 126 patients (51.6%) tested positive by both RT-PCR  
105 and RADT and 90 patients (36.8%) returned negative results by both assays. In turn, 28  
106 patients (11.4%) yielded discordant results (RT-PCR+/RADT-). No patients tested RT-  
107 PCR-/RADT+. Concordance between the results provided by the two assays was good  
108 ( $\kappa$ , 0.78; 95% CI, 0.69–0.85). Importantly, time to specimen collection was comparable  
109 ( $P=0.69$ ) between RT-PCR+/RADT+ and RT-PCR+/RADT- patients (median 2 days;  
110 range, 0–5).

111 Overall specificity and sensitivity of RADT was 100% (95% CI, 95.9–100%) and  
112 81.8% (95% CI, 75–87.1%) respectively. As shown in Table 1, RADT assay sensitivity  
113 increased in parallel with SARS-CoV-2 RNA load, reaching 95.6% in specimens with  
114 viral loads  $\geq 7.5$  log<sub>10</sub> copies/ml ( $C_T$ ,  $\leq 20$ ). Interestingly, the sensitivity of the assay  
115 increased from 79.6% (95% CI, 66.4–88.5) when considering specimens collected at

116 days 0–1 after symptoms onset, to 86.4% (95% CI, 66.7–95.3) when grouping the  
117 specimens obtained on days 4–5 (Supplementary Table 1).

118 Overall, RADT negative predictive value for an estimated prevalence of 30% and 35%  
119 (representative of our Health Department during the study period) was 92.8% (95% CI,  
120 85.8–96.5) and 91.1% (95% CI, 82.8–95.6), respectively.

121 As expected, median viral RNA load was significantly higher ( $P<0.0001$ ) in RT-  
122 PCR+/RADT+ specimens than in those returning RT-PCR+/RADT- results (Fig. 1).

## 123 **DISCUSSION**

124 The SARS-CoV-2 Omicron variant carries one or more mutations in the NP gene  
125 (P13L, Del31-33, R203K and G203K) [6] that may impact on the sensitivity of RADT  
126 [4]. The Abbott BinaxNow test (similar to the Panbio™ COVID-19 assay) performed  
127 on nasal specimens was reported to produce false negative results in four individuals  
128 who nonetheless were confirmed to have transmitted the Omicron variant to close  
129 contacts [7]. Likewise, the Panbio™ COVID-19 assay was found to perform worse for  
130 diagnosis of COVID-19 due to vaccine-breakthrough Omicron infection (sensitivity of  
131 36.1%) compared to Delta (sensitivity of 67.7%) [8]. Nevertheless, in that study [8], NP  
132 were diluted in viral transport medium and cryopreserved prior to RADT testing. When  
133 using live virus isolated from clinical specimens, the Panbio™ COVID-19 assay  
134 displayed comparable analytical sensitivity for detection of Omicron and Delta in one  
135 study [9], but lower for Omicron in another [8]. To our knowledge, no published studies  
136 have evaluated the performance of RADT conducted at point of care for diagnosis of the  
137 Omicron variant of COVID-19. In a series comprising mostly vaccinated adult  
138 individuals with no history of SARS-CoV-2 infection prior to enrollment and tested  
139 within 5 days after symptoms onset, we showed the Panbio™ COVID-19 Ag Rapid

140 Test Device to display exquisite specificity and acceptable overall sensitivity (81.8%)  
141 for Omicron diagnosis, both figures exceeding regulatory agency requirements for  
142 temporary approval (at least 98% and 80%, respectively) [1]. In our experience, the  
143 clinical performance of the Panbio™ COVID-19 assay for Omicron variant was  
144 comparable to previous reports for the Wuhan-Hu-1 G614 variant (100% specificity and  
145 sensitivity of 81.4% in non-vaccinated adult patients with a clinical course of <5 days)  
146 [5]. In line with previous findings from our group [5], RADT sensitivity increased in  
147 parallel with SARS-CoV-2 RNA load in NP. Interestingly, the sensitivity of the RADT  
148 assay also appeared to increase with time elapsed after symptoms onset, suggesting that  
149 vaccine-breakthrough Omicron variant infection may be symptomatic even in the  
150 presence of RNA loads below the threshold for viral detection by RADT. Although  
151 speculative, this phenomenon may be related to the reduced capability of the Omicron  
152 variant to antagonize the host cell interferon response [10].

153 The limitations of the current study are as follows. First, Omicron subvariant B.1.529.2  
154 (BA.2), which lacks the 69-70 deletion, may be incorrectly categorized as such based on  
155 the SGTF result; nonetheless, this subvariant could not be identified in sequenced  
156 specimens within the study period in our health department. Second, side-by-side  
157 clinical performance comparison of the RADT for diagnosis of COVID-19 due to  
158 Omicron and other variants of concern was not possible due to the absolute dominance  
159 of the former at the time of study. Third, no cell cultures were performed for specimens  
160 returning discordant RT-PCR/RADT results. Fourth, the small number of children,  
161 SARS-CoV-2-experienced and unvaccinated individuals enrolled precluded conducting  
162 robust subanalyses for these population groups.

163 In summary, we found the Panbio™ COVID-19 Ag Rapid Test Device to perform well  
164 as a point-of-care test for early diagnosis of COVID-19 due to the Omicron variant in

165 primary healthcare centers. Further studies are warranted to evaluate the performance of  
166 this and other RADT for detection of Omicron variant infection in asymptomatic,  
167 pediatric and unvaccinated individuals.

## 168 **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

169 We are grateful to residents and staff at the Microbiology Service of Hospital Clínico  
170 Universitario and medical and nursing staff at primary health centers (Benimaclet,  
171 Serrería and Salvador Pau) recruiting patients for the current study. Ignacio Torres (Río  
172 Hortega Contract; CM20/00090) and Eliseo Albert (Juan Rodés Contract; JR20/00011)  
173 hold contracts funded by the Carlos III Health Institute (co-financed by the European  
174 Regional Development Fund, ERDF/FEDER).

## 175 **FINANCIAL SUPPORT**

176 This research received no public or private financial support.

## 177 **CONFLICTS OF INTEREST**

178 The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

## 179 **AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS**

180 PdM, IT, SP, DH, EA, methodology and data validation. AR-G, VG, NR, AS and PB,  
181 study design and logistics; DN, conceptualization, data analysis and manuscript writing.

## 182 **REFERENCES**

- 183 1. Drain PK. Rapid Diagnostic Testing for SARS-CoV-2. N Engl J Med 2022 Jan 7.  
184 doi: 10.1056/NEJMcp2117115.
- 185 2. Jian MJ, Chung HY, Chang CK, Lin JC, Yeh KM, Chen CW, et al. ARS-CoV-2  
186 variants with T135I nucleocapsid mutations may affect antigen test performance. Int J  
187 Infect Dis 2022;114:112-114.

- 188 3. van Ogtrop ML, van de Laar TJW, Eggink D, Vanhommerig JW, van der Reijden  
189 WA Comparison of the Performance of the PanBio COVID-19 Antigen Test in SARS-  
190 CoV-2 B.1.1.7 (Alpha) Variants versus non-B.1.1.7 Variants. *Microbiol Spectr* 2021;  
191 9:e0088421.
- 192 4. [https://www.fda.gov/medical-devices/coronavirus-covid-19-and-medical-devices/sars-](https://www.fda.gov/medical-devices/coronavirus-covid-19-and-medical-devices/sars-cov-2-viral-mutations-impact-covid-19-tests)  
193 [cov-2-viral-mutations-impact-covid-19-tests](https://www.fda.gov/medical-devices/coronavirus-covid-19-and-medical-devices/sars-cov-2-viral-mutations-impact-covid-19-tests)
- 194 5. Albert E, Torres I, Bueno F, Huntley D, Molla E, Fernández-Fuentes MÁ, et al. Field  
195 evaluation of a rapid antigen test (Panbio™ COVID-19 Ag Rapid Test Device) for  
196 COVID-19 diagnosis in primary healthcare centres. *Clin Microbiol Infect*  
197 2021;27:472.e7-472.e10.
- 198 6. <https://covdb.stanford.edu/page/mutation-viewer/#omicron>.
- 199 7. Adamson B, Sikka R, Wyllie AL, Premssirut P. Discordant SARS-CoV-2 PCR and  
200 Rapid Antigen Test Results When Infectious: A December 2021 Occupational Case  
201 Series. *medRxiv* 2022.01.04.22268770; doi:  
202 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.04.22268770>.
- 203 8. Bekliz M, Perez-Rodriguez F, Puhach O, Kenneth Adea, Marques Melancia S,  
204 Baggio S, et al. Sensitivity of SARS-CoV-2 antigen-detecting rapid tests for Omicron  
205 variant. *medRxiv* 2021.12.18.21268018; doi:  
206 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.12.18.21268018>.
- 207 9. Deerain J, Druce J, Tran T, Batty M, Yoga Y, Fennell M, et al. Assessment of the  
208 analytical sensitivity of ten lateral flow devices against the SARS-CoV-2 omicron  
209 variant. *J Clin Microbiol* 2021;Dec 22:jcm0247921.

210 10. Bojkova D, Widera M, Ciesek S, Wass MN, Michaelis M, Cinatl jr. J. Reduced  
211 interferon antagonism but similar drug sensitivity in Omicron variant compared to Delta  
212 variant SARS-CoV-2 isolates. *BioRxiv* 2022; doi:  
213 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.03.474773>.

#### 214 **FIGURE LEGENDS**


215 **Figure 1.** Box-Whisker plots depicting RT-PCR cycle threshold values ( $C_T$ ) (A) and  
216 viral RNA loads (B) in nasopharyngeal specimens collected from COVID-19 patients  
217 infected with the Omicron variant testing either positive or negative by the Panbio™  
218 COVID-19 Ag Rapid Test Device (Abbott Diagnostic GmbH, Jena, Germany). *P* values  
219 for comparisons are shown.

220

<b>Supplementary Table 1. SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR and Panbio™ COVID-19 Ag Rapid Test results in nasopharyngeal specimens collected from COVID-19 patients according to time elapsed since onset of symptoms</b>		
Panbio™ COVID-19 Ag Rapid Test result in study groups	SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR result	
	No. of positives	No. of negatives
<b>All patients (n=244)</b>		
Positive	126	0
Negative	28	90
<b>Patients tested days 0-1 after symptoms onset (n=71)</b>		
Positive (n=39)	39	0
Negative (n=10)	10	21
<b>Patients tested days 2-3 after symptoms onset (n=129)</b>		
Positive (n=68)	68	0
Negative (n=15)	15	46
<b>Patients tested days 4-5 after symptoms onset (n=44)</b>		
Positive (n=19)	19	0
Negative (n=3)	3	22

<b>Table 1. Overall sensitivity of the Panbio™ COVID-19 Ag Rapid Test Device according to the SARS-CoV-2 RNA load in nasopharyngeal specimens</b>		
RT-PCR cycle threshold value	SARS-CoV-2 RNA load (log <sub>10</sub> copies/ml)	Sensitivity (95% CI)
≤ 20	≥7.5	95.6 (89.2–98.3)
≤ 25	≥5.8	92.6 (86.6–96.1)
≤ 30	≥4.3	87.2 (80.7–91.8)
≤ 35	≥2.7	81.8 (75–87.1)

**A**



**B**

