medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.07.24.23293072; this version posted July 26, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Comparison of the analytical and clinical sensitivity of thirty-four rapid antigen tests with the most prevalent SARS-CoV-2 variants of concern during the COVID-19 pandemic in the UK

Rachel L. Byrne[1], Ghaith Aljayyoussi[1], Caitlin Greenland-Bews[1], Konstantina Kontogianni[1], Dominic Wooding[1], Christopher T. Williams, LSTM Diagnostics group[1], Falcon Steering group, Margaretha de Vos[2], Richard Body[3], Emily R. Adams[1], Camille Escadafal[2], Thomas Edwards[1], Ana I. Cubas-Atienzar[1*]

[1] Centre for Drugs and Diagnostics, Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine, Liverpool, U.K.
[2]FIND, Foundation for Innovative New Diagnostics, Geneva, Switzerland
[3]Manchester University NHS Foundation Trust, UK

*Address correspondence to Ana I. Cubas Atienzar: Ana.cubasatienzar@lstmed.ac.uk

Keywords: rapid diagnostic test (RDT); antigen detection; COVID-19; SARS-CoV-2 variant of concern (VOC), B.1.617.2; Delta; B.1.1.529; Omicron; limit of detection (LOD)

Running title: COVID-19 variant of concern RDT evaluation (max 50 characters)

Conflicts of Interest: Emily R Adams (ERA) is a Director of Epidemics and Neglected Tropical Diseases at Global Access Diagnostics. Camille Escadafal (CE) and Margaretha de Vos (MDV) are employees of FIND. ERA, CE and MDV had no role in data collection and analysis.

Word count: Abstract, 267; Manuscript, 4351

Authors' contributions: The study was conceived by AICA and CE. The study design was developed by AICA, TE and RLB. Data extraction was conducted by LSTM DG, KK, RLB, DW and CGB. Data analysis and interpretation were conducted by RLB, GA, AICA and TE. The initial manuscript was prepared by AICA and RLB. All authors edited and approved the final manuscript.

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.07.24.23293072; this version posted July 26, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Abstract (300 words max) currently 312

Background The continued emergence of SARS-CoV-2 variants of concern (VOC) requires timely analytical and clinical evaluation of antigen-based rapid diagnostic tests (Ag-RDTs) especially those that are recommended for at home use.

Methods The limit of detection (LOD) of 34 Ag-RDTs was evaluated using the most encountered SARS-CoV-2 VOC viral isolates (Alpha, Delta, Gamma, Omicron BA.1, Omicron BA.5) and the wild type (WT). Clinical sensitivity was further evaluated for five Ag-RDT utilising retrospective samples (Alpha, Delta, Omicron BA.1) and one Ag-RDT utilising prospective clinical samples (Delta and Omicron BA.1).

Findings For the WT, Alpha, Delta, Gamma and Omicron (BA.1) variants 22, 32, 29, 31 and 32 of the 34 Ag-RDTs evaluated met the World Health Organisations (WHO) target product profile (TPP), respectively. Of the 31 Ag-RDTs included for Omicron BA.5 evaluation 29 met the WHO TPP. Additionally, the LODs for samples spiked with Omicron BA.5 were significantly lower than all other VOCs included ($p<0.001$). In the retrospective clinical evaluation when comparing RNA copies/mL, the Ag-RDTs detected Alpha and Omicron (BA.1) more sensitively than the Delta VOC. Samples with high RT-qPCR Cts (Ct>25) resulted in reduced test sensitivities across all variants. We used linear regression to model the 50% and 95% LOD of clinical samples and observed statistically similar results for all tests. In the prospective clinical samples, the sensitivity was statistically similar for the Delta VOC 71.9% (CI 95% 53.3-86.6%) and Omicron VOC 84.4% (CI95% 75.3-91.2%).

Interpretation Test performance differs between SARS-CoV-2 VOCs, and high sensitivity was achieved when testing the Omicron BA.5 VOC compared to the WHO Ag-RDT requirements. Continuous evaluations must be performed to monitor test performance.

Funding This work was funded as part of FIND's work as a co-convener of the diagnostics pillar of the Access to COVID-19 Tools (ACT) Accelerator, including support from Unitaid (grant number 2019-32-FIND MDR), the government of the Netherlands (grant number MINBUZA-2020.961444), and the UK Department for International Development (grant number 300341-102). Funding was also obtained from the MRC for RLB and CGB. The Facilitating Accelerated Clinical Evaluation of Clinical Diagnostics for COVID-19 (FALCON C-19) study was funded by the UK National Institute of Health and Care Research (NIHR).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.07.24.23293072; this version posted July 26, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Introduction

Antigen-detection rapid diagnostic tests (Ag-RDTs) offer quick, inexpensive, laboratory-independent diagnostics that can be performed at home by lay individuals (1,2). As such they have been a central pillar of control strategies for SARS-CoV-2 and are now the first line diagnostic in many countries (3). While there has been significant progress in the development and deployment of COVID-19 Ag-RDTs, new challenges continue to arise, including the emergence of variants of concern (VOCs), often associated with new waves of global infections. The most recent VOC, Omicron (B.1.1.529), was first reported in South Africa in November 2021, and by January 2022 became the dominant circulating strain globally comprising 70% of the cases. By March 2022 five Omicron sub-lineages (BA.1, BA.2, BA.3, BA.4 and BA.5) had emerged accounting for all reported global infections (4).

Compared to the ancestral wild-type (WT) and other VOCs (Alpha, Beta, Gamma, and Delta) Omicron cumulated the greatest number of mutations, with 50 throughout the genome involving spike (S), envelope (E), membrane (M) and nucleocapsid (N) proteins (5,6). The majority of Ag-RDTs were developed and evaluated early in the COVID-19 pandemic, utilising WT SARS-CoV-2, with the N protein as a target, due to its high abundance within the virion (7), this rendered predictions of the performance of Ag-RDTs with contemporary viral lineages difficult (8). Further, the N protein of Omicron has more non-synonymous mutations than any other variant (9) with three of these mutations (P13L, DEL31/33 and S413R) unique to the Omicron lineage (10).

Preliminary data on the performance of Ag-RDTs for Omicron remain contradictory in both analytical and clinical evaluations. Initial reports evaluating a small number of brands utilising viral dilutions of Omicron (B.1.1.529) found comparable sensitivities to WT (11,12) and Delta VOC (13,14). However, this is contradicted in a more recent study reporting a loss of sensitivity in four out of seven Ag-RDTs when compared to Delta and two out of seven when compared to WT and other VOCs (Alpha, Beta and

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.07.24.23293072; this version posted July 26, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Gamma) (15). To date there are few published evaluations of Ag-RDTs with Omicron clinical samples and only with the initial B.1.1.529 lineage, reporting inconsistent results when comparing with Delta (15–17). Thus, there is an urgent requirement to perform both analytical and clinical evaluations of Ag-RDTs including the most prevalent BA.5 Omicron sub-lineage.

Methods

Evaluated Ag-RDTs

Thirty-four Ag-RDT brands were evaluated in this study; all were lateral flow assays (LFA), 31 using colorimetric gold nanoparticle detection, two fluorescence and one based on microfluidic immunofluorescence technology (Table 1). The selection of the Ag-RDT resulted from an expression of interest launched by FIND (www.finddx.org) and a scoring process based on defined criteria. This list includes eight Ag-RDTs on the WHO Emergency Use Listing (WHO-EUL) and six tests that are on the waiting list for WHO-EUL approval (18) . Analytical testing was performed on all Ag-RDT brands (Table 1) and a small subset of these were further used for the clinical evaluation on retrospective samples based on brands that showed the best results on clinical diagnostic evaluations under the FIND programme (Covios, Hotgen, Onsite, SureStatus) and widely used in the UK for mass testing (Flowflex). Results on prospectively collected samples are only provided with Biocredit.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.07.24.23293072; this version posted July 26, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

RDT brand	Test/Company/Country	Target Ag	Principle	Approval
ActiveXpress	ActivXpress+ COVID-19 Ag Complete Kit/Edinburgh Genetics Ltd./UK	N	G	CE
AllTest	SARS-CoV-2 Antigen Rapid Test/Hangzhou AllTest Biotech Ltd./China	N	G	CE
Biocredit	Biocredit COVID-19 Ag/Rapidgen Inc./Rep. Korea	N	G	CE/ WHO EUL
Bioperfectus	SARS-CoV-2 Ag Rapid Test/ Jiangsu Bioperfectus Tech. Ltd./China	N	G	CE
Core	COVID-19 Ag Test/Core Technology Ltd./China	N	G	CE
Covi-Go	Covigo/Mologic Ltd./UK	N	G	CE/ UA
Covios	Covios COVID-19 Ag Test device/ Mologic Ltd./UK	N	G	CE
Espline	ESPLINE SARS-CoV-2/Fujirebio Diagnostics Inc./Japan	N	G	CE
Excalibur	Rapid SARS-CoV-2 Antigen test card/ Excalibur Healthcare Services/UK	N	G	CE
Flowflex	Flowflex SARS-CoV-2 Ag Rapid Test/Acon Biotech, Ltd./China	N	G	CE/ WHO EUL
Fortress	CoV Ag Nasal Swab Rapid test/Zhejian Orient Gene Biotech/ China	N	G	CE
Genedia	GENEDIA W COVID-19 Ag/ Green Cross Medical Sciences/Rep. Korea	N	G	CE
GeneFinder	COVID-19 rapid test GeneFinder/OSANG Health Care/ South Korea	N	G	CE/UA
Hotgen	2019-nCoV Antigen test/ Beijin Hotgen Biotech Ltd./China	N	G	CE
iChroma	iChroma COVID-19 Ag Test/ Boditech Medical Inc./Rep. Korea	N	F	CE
Innova	Innova SARS-CoV-2 Antigen Rapid/ Innova Medical Group Ltd./UK	N	G	CE/UA
Intec	Rapid SARS-CoV-2 Antigen test/Intec Products Inc./China	N	G	CE
Joysbio	SARS-CoV-2 Antigen Rapid Test Kit/ Joysbio Biotechnology Ltd./China	N	G	CE/UA
LumiraDx	LumiraDx SARS-CoV-2 antigen test/ Lumira Dx Ltd./US	N	M	CE/ WHO EUL
Nadal	Nadal COVID-19 Ag Test/Nal von minden GmbH/Germany	N	G	CE
NowCheck	NowCheck COVID-19 Ag test/ Bionote Inc./ Rep. Korea	N	G	CE
Onsite	Onsite COVID-19 Ag Rapid Test/CTKBiotech Inc./USA	N	G	CE/ WHO EUL
PanBio	Panbio COVID-19 Ag Rapid Test/Abbott Rapid Diagnostics/Rep. Korea	N	G	CE/WHO EUL
PerkinElmer	PerkinElmer COVID-19 Antigen Test/PerkinElmer/ Switzerland	N	G	CE/UA
RespiStrip	Respi-Strip COVID-19 Ag/Coris Bioconcept/Belgium	N	G	CE
RighSign	COVID-19 Ag Rapid Test Cassette/Hangzhou Biotets Biotech Ltd./China	N	G	CE
Roche	SARS-CoV-2 Rapid Ag Test/ Roche Diagnostics/Switzerland	N	G	CE
Standard-F	Standard F COVID-19 Ag FIA., SD Biosensor Inc./Rep. Korea	N	F	CE
Standard-Q	Standard Q COVID-19, SD Biosensor Inc./Rep. Korea	N	G	CE/WHO EUL
StrongStep	StrongStep SARS-CoV-2 Ag Rapid Test/Nanjing Liming Bio-Products/US	N	G	CE
SureStatus	Sure-Status COVID-19 Antigen Card Test, Premier Medical Corp./ India	N	G	WHO EUL
Tigsun	Tingsun COVID-19 Ag Rapid test/ Beijin Tigsun Diagnostics Ltd./China	N	G	CE
Wantai	Rapid SARS-CoV-2 Antigen test/ Wantai Biological Pharmacy Ltd./China	N	G	CE
Wondfo	Wondfo 2019-nCoV Antigen Test/ Guangzhou Wondfo Biotech/China	N	G	CE/WHO EUL

Table 1: An overview of the RDT brands used in the study for analytical performance.

RDT: Rapid diagnostic test. Target N: nucleoprotein; Principle G: LFA using gold (colourimetric detection), F: LFA fluoresce detection, M: microfluidic fluorescent technology. CE: CE making as per European Conformity, WHO EUL: WHO Emergency Use Listing, UA: under assessment for WHO Emergency Use Listing.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.07.24.23293072; this version posted July 26, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

SARS-CoV-2 viral culture and Ag-RDT limit of detection

The SARS-CoV-2 isolates were grown in Vero E6 cells (C1008; African green monkey kidney cells) and maintained in culture media (Dulbecco's modified eagle membrane (DMEM) with 2% fetal bovine serum and 0.05 mg/mL gentamycin) as previously described (19,20). The isolates for Alpha (Genbank accession number: MW980115), Delta (SARS-CoV-2/human/GBR/Liv_273/2021), Gamma (hCoV-19/Japan/TY7-503/2021), Omicron (BA.1) (SARS-CoV-2/human/GBR/Liv_1326/2021) and Omicron (BA.5)(SARS-CoV-2/South Africa/CERI-KRISP-K040013/2022) were used evaluate the analytical limit of detection (LOD) of the 34 Ag-RDTs using live virus.

Plaque forming units per millilitre (pfu/mL) of the viral stocks were counted using viral plaque assay as previously described (21) and ten-fold serial dilutions of the viral stock were made starting from 1.0 x 10^6 pfu/mL using DMEM as a diluent. Two-fold dilutions were made below the ten-fold LOD dilution to determine the LOD. The LOD was defined as the lowest dilution at which all three replicates were positive by Ag-RDT. The LODs for WT, Alpha and Gamma VOCs, obtained as part of our previous work utilising the same protocol (20,21), were used here for practicality to compare to the Delta and Omicron lineages LODs.

Retrospective and prospective clinical samples

Clinical samples were collected as part of the 'Facilitating Accelerated Clinical Evaluation of Novel Diagnostic Tests for COVID-19' (FALCON) study (22). Ethical approval was obtained from the National Research Ethics Service and the Health Research Authority (IRAS ID:28422, clinical trial ID: NCT04408170). Nasopharyngeal (NP) swabs in vital transport media (VTM) were collected from consenting symptomatic adults attending the community drive-through COVID-19 test center located in Liverpool John Lennon Airport, UK between January 2021 and March 2022. Clinical specimens were transported to the Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine (LSTM) biosafety level 3 (BSL3) laboratories in insulated UN7737 transport bags and aliquoted and stored at -80°C until further testing.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.07.24.23293072; this version posted July 26, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Prospective clinical samples were collected as part of a diagnostic evaluation of the Biocredit Ag-RDT (Table 1) (23). Participants were enrolled from December 2021 and March 2022 coinciding with the emergence of Omicron. NP swabs in VTM were collected for RT-qPCR followed by another NP swab in the alternate nostril for the BioCredit Ag-RDT evaluation. Specimens were transported to the LSTM BSL3 laboratories as described above and, in this case, processed immediately for Ag-RDT testing.

Samples were confirmed SARS-CoV-2 RNA-positive using the TaqPath™ COVID19 CE-IVD RT-PCR Kit (Thermo Fisher Scientific, USA). Based upon epidemiological data in the UK at the time of enrolment and S gene amplification in the PCR assay, consecutive SARS-CoV-2 positive RT-PCR samples were selected as presumed Alpha if collected between January and March 2021, presumed Delta if collected between June and August 2021 and, presumed Omicron if collected between December 2021 and March 2022. The variant type was later confirmed by whole genome sequencing. A panel of ten SARS-CoV-2 RNA-negative VTM samples were also included as negative controls.

Ag-RDTs testing protocol

All Ag-RDTs were performed as specified by the test specific instructions for use (IFU). For the determination of the LOD using live virus, a specific volume of the serial dilutions was added directly to the extraction buffers at a 1:10 ratio as previously described (19). For the clinical samples, VTM was mixed by pipetting at 1:1 ratio with the extraction buffer of the Ag-RDTs. The dilution factor introduced by the swabs diluted in buffer was accounted for when calculating the viral copy numbers of the tested swab samples. A negative control of only VTM was incorporated to account for any non-specific reaction as previously reported for some Ag-RDT brands when using VTM (19). Results were read by two operators, blinded to each other and if a discrepant result occurred, a third operator acted as a tiebreaker. The visual read out of the Ag-RDT test band was scored on a quantitative scale from 1 (weak positive) - 10 (strong positive). Ag-RDT results were classified as invalid when the control line was absent.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.07.24.23293072; this version posted July 26, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Quantification of viral loads

For quantification of the RNA copy numbers per mL (RNA copies/mL) viral RNA was extracted using QIAmp Viral RNA mini kit (Qiagen, Germany) according to the manufacturer's instructions. The RNA copies/mL were established using the COVID-19 Genesig RT-qPCR kit (PrimerDesign, UK). RT-qPCR testing was carried out using the Rotor-Gene Q (Qiagen, Germany), with a ten-fold serial dilution of quantified in vitro-transcribed RNA incorporated for each PCR run (24). A total of five replicates were tested for each standard curve point, and extracted RNA from each culture dilution was tested in triplicate. The RNA copies/mL for samples was then calculated from the mean Ct value of these replicates.

Whole genome sequencing

Clinical samples underwent whole genome sequencing to confirm the SARS-CoV-2 variant. Sequencing was performed using the ARTIC V3 (LoCost) (25) sequencing protocol on the MinION R.9.4.1 flow cell (Oxford Nanopore Technology, UK). RT-PCR was performed with a two- step PCR initially the Arctic RT PCR 5X LunaScript® RT SuperMix (New England Biolabs, USA) with 8µL of RNA sample, and a thermal cycling profile of 2 minutes at 25°C followed by 10 minutes at 55°C and then one minute at 95°C. This was then followed by the Q5® Hot Start High-Fidelity 2X Master Mix (New England Biolabs, USA) using 10 µM of the ARTIC V4.1 primer pools (Integrated DNA Technologies, USA), and a thermal cycling profile of 30 second at 98 °C for heat inactivation, followed by 25 cycles of a 15 second denaturation at 98 °C and a five-minute annealing/extension at 65°C. Library preparation was carried out using the Ligation Sequencing Kit (SQK-LSK109) and Native Barcoding Expansion Kits (EXP-NBD104 and EXP-NBD114) (Oxford Nanopore Technologies). Basecalling was carried out via MinKnow (v4.2.8), with demultiplexing and read filtering using Guppy (v5.0.7.). The ARTIC pipeline was then used to assemble a consensus

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.07.24.23293072; this version posted July 26, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

genome, BAM files, and variant calling file with *--normalise 200 --threads 4.* Variant calling was carried out using EPI2ME Desktop Agent v3.3.0 with the ARTIC+NextStrain analysis pipeline.

Statistical analysis

Statistical analyses were performed using SPSS V.28.0, Epi Info V3.01 and R scripts. Binomial confidence intervals for sensitivities and specificities were computed using the Wilson score interval. Differences in the analytical LODs of VOCs were compared using Kruskal Wallis with Bonferroni correction for multiple tests. To further analyse analytical sensitivities, we used logistic regression, with RNA copy number as the independent and test outcomes as the dependent variable, yielding detection probabilities for each viral load level.

Results

Analytical sensitivity using cultured SARS-CoV-2 virus

For Omicron sub lineage BA.5, all of the 31 Ag-RDTs evaluated had an LOD ≤ 5.0×10^2 pfu/mL, fulfilling the criteria set by the British Department of Health and Social Care (DHSC) (Figure 1) and all except two brands (RespiStrip and GeneFinder) had an LOD of ≤ 1.0×10^6 RNA copies/mL thus fulfilling the WHO Target Product Profile (TPP) recommendations for SARS-CoV-2 Ag-RDTs (26). Whereas for Omicron BA.1, only 23 of the 34 Ag-RDTs evaluated had an analytical LOD of ≤ 5.0×10^2 pfu/mL and 32 out of 34 (including Biocredit, Core, Covios, Hotgen, Innova, LumiraDx, PerkinElmer and SureStatus, that all fell below the DHSC recommendations) had an LOD of ≤ 1.0×10^6 RNA copies/mL. The more sensitive Ag-RDTs for detecting Omicron BA.1 were AllTest, Bioperfectus, Flowflex, Fortress, Joysbio, Nadal, Onsite, RightSign, Roche, StrongStep, Standard Q, Tingsun and Wondfo (see Figure 1a and 1b) with an LOD ≤ 2.5×10^2 pfu/mL and 4.4×10^4 RNA copies/mL. For both Omicron BA.1 and BA.5 the Ag-RDT brand with the lowest sensitivity was RespiStrip with an LOD of 5.0×10^4 pfu/mL and 9.2×10^6 RNA copies/mL (BA.1) and LOD of 1.0×10^2 pfu/mL and 3.5×10^6 RNA copies/mL (BA.5) respectively.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.07.24.23293072; this version posted July 26, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

For the Delta VOC, 33 out of the 34 Ag-RDTs evaluated had an LOD of ≤ 5.0×10^2 pfu/mL and 31 of the 34 reported an LOD ≤ 1.0×10^6 RNA copies/mL (Figure 1), with Genefinder falling to meet either the DHSC or WHO recommended LOD.

For the Alpha VOC, 7 of the 34 Ag-RDTs evaluated (Biocredit, Genedia, Hotgen, Onsite, RespiStrip, Tigsun and Wondfo) had an analytical LOD of > 5.0×10^2 pfu/mL thus failing to meet the DHSC minimum requirements. With Biocredit and Genedia also falling below the WHO requirement.

For the Gamma VOC, 5 Ag-RDT brands (Flowflex, Hotgen, Innova, Onsite and RespiStrip) failed to meet either the DHSC or WHO requirements with a further 7 Ag-RDT brands falling below the DHSC recommendations. The Ag-RDTs with the greatest sensitivity for a sample positive for Gamma VOC where AllTest, Core Test, InTec, Standard-F, Standard-Q, StrongStep and Surestatus, see figure 1a.

For the WT, the target for which all Ag-RDT brands were originally developed, only 19 and 22 met the DHSC and WHO requirements, respectively.

When comparing only the pfu/mL, we found that tests had significantly higher LODs with Omicron BA.1 compared to Delta (p=0.000) and significantly lower LODs with Omicron BA.5 compared to all other VOCs tested (p=0.001). When comparing RNA copies/mL, the Ag-RDTs detected more sensitively Alpha (p=0.000) than the other VOCs (p=0.000).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.07.24.23293072; this version posted July 26, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .



Figure 1. Heatmap comparing the LODs of 34 Ag-RDT using the Ancestral (WT), Alpha (B.1.1.7), Gamma (P.1), Delta (B.1.617.2) Omicron (BA.1) and Omicron (BA.5) variants on pfu/mL (A) and RNA copies/mL (B). Data of the Ancestral, Alpha and Gamma have been taken from our previously published work (21). Blue colours indicate LODs fulfilling the DHSC (for pfu/mL) and WHO criteria (for RNA copies/mL). * = p≤0.05 between VOCs.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.07.24.23293072; this version posted July 26, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Retrospective samples: SARS-CoV-2 Ag-RDT clinical sensitivity

The clinical sensitivity of five Ag-RDTs brands (Covios, Flowflex, Hotgen, Onsite and SureStatus) was evaluated utilising SARS-CoV-2 Alpha (n=30), Delta (n=56) and Omicron (n=49) positive VTM swabs stored at -80°C, as previously described. Statistically higher viral loads, determined by RT-qPCR, were recorded among individuals positive for Alpha and Omicron infection compared to Delta (p=0.001 and p=0.009 respectively) measured by Kruskal–Wallis (Figure 2).



Figure 2: Boxplot of the SARS-CoV-2 viral load (RNA copies/mL) distribution of RT-qPCR NP swabs collected from participants recruited to FALCON between January 2021 and March 2022. The whiskers show the 95% confidence intervals and the horizontal line the median. Asterisks indicate statistical significance between different VOCs (ns=non-significant, * = p≤0.05, ** = p≤0.01)

We determined the 50% and 95% LODs with Alpha, Delta, and Omicron SARS-CoV-2 positive swab samples for five Ag-RDT brands based on a logistic regression model (Table 2, Figure 3). Overall, the lowest LOD for the Alpha VOC was recorded with Flowflex Ag-RDT (50% LOD 1.58 x 10^4 RNA copies/mL and 95% LOD 2.14 x 10^4 RNA copies/mL), for Delta variant with Onsite Ag-RDT (50% LOD 3.31 x 10^1

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.07.24.23293072; this version posted July 26, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

RNA copies/mL and 95% LOD 3.80 x 10^4 RNA copies/mL) and for Omicron with SureStatus Ag-RDT (50% LOD 1.78 x 10^3 RNA copies/mL and 95% LOD 7.41 x 10^4 RNA copies/mL), which were all statistically similar to the true analytical LOD reported. The Delta variant exhibited the greatest variability between predicted LODs from different Ag-RDTs (table 2) whereas for the true analytical LOD the Alpha VOC showed the greatest variability (figure 1a).

The sensitivity of the Ag-RDTs varied from 70% to 93.3% (Hotgen and Flowflex) for the Alpha VOC. For Delta VOC, the sensitivity ranged from 77.1% to 94.4% (Covios and Onsite) for four of the five Ag-RDTs, with Hotgen reporting a significantly lower sensitivity of 45.1% than Omicron ($p < 0.001$) and Alpha ($p=0.026$). The observed sensitivities for Omicron were consistent across all brands of Ag-RDTs from 86.4% and 100% (Hotgen and Onsite). For samples with low Ct values (<25), the sensitivities were statistically similar for the Covios, Flowlfex, Onsite and SureStatus Ag-RDTs but not for the Hotgen Ag-RDT. For the Delta VOC, the sensitivity of the Hotgen Ag-RDT was significantly lower compared to Omicron ($p < 0.001$) and Alpha ($p=0.011$). Whereas samples with high Ct values (Ct>25) resulted in reduced test sensitivities across all variants, with the greatest sensitivity reported in samples positive with the Omicron VOC.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.07.24.23293072; this version posted July 26, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Table 2: The 50% and 95% limit of detection (LOD) (RNA copies/mL) for five Ag-RDT brands (Covios, Flowflex, Hotgen, Onsite and SureStatus) from 122 clinical NP samples positive for Alpha, Delta and Omicron SARS-CoV-2 VOCs.

		Ag-RDT brand (RNA copies/mL)				
	LOD	Covios	Flowflex	Hotgen	Onsite	SureStatus
Alpha	50%	4.79E+03	1.58E+04	1.82E+05	7.76E+03	4.68E+04
	95%	2.24E+06	2.14E+04	3.55E+08	1.70E+06	1.62E+07
Delta	50%	3.47E+03	4.37E+00	1.26E+06	3.31E+01	3.02E+04
	95%	2.19E+08	1.00E+06	1.00E+12	3.80E+04	2.34E+06
Omicron	50%	1.02E+04	4.47E+03	3.55E+04	0	1.78E+03
	95%	8.71E+05	2.45E+04	1.35E+06	0	7.41E+04



Figure 3: Limit of detection analyses of upper-respiratory samples positive by RT-qPCR for five SARS-CoV-2 Ag-RDT tests (Covios, Hotgen, Onsite, Flowflex and SureStatus) using NP swabs. The log10 RNA copies on the x axis were plotted against a positive (1.0) or negative (0.0) Ag-RDT result on the y axis. Fill curves show logistic regressions of the viral load on the Ag-RDT result; vertical dashed lines indicate log10 RNA copies subjected to the test at which 50% and 95% LOD of the samples are expected positive based on the regression results. No significant differences were observed.

Table 3: The comparison of the sensitivity of five antigen rapid diagnostic tests (Ag-RDTs) between the Alpha, Delta and Omicron variants.
Calculated sensitivities, sample size (in italics) and 95% confidence intervals (CI95%) , are given.

Population	VOC	Covios	Flowflex	Onsite	Hotgen	Surestatus
Total cohort	Alpha	90.0%, *30*	93.3%, *30*	90.0%, *30*	70.0%, *30*	86.7%, *15*
	(CI95%)	73.5-97.9%	77.9-99.2%	73.5-97.9%	50.6-85.3%	59.5-98.3%
	Delta	77.1%, *48*	92.7%, *55*	94.4%, *54*	45.1%, *51*	81.6%, *38*
	(CI95%)	62.6-88.0%	82.4-98.0%	84.6-98.8%	31.1-59.7%	65.7-92.3%
	Omicron	91.7%, *48*	97.9%, *47*	100.0%, *46*	86.4%, *44*	97.9%, *48*
	(CI95%)	80.0-97.9%	88.7-99.9%	92.3-100.0%	72.6-94.8%	88.9-99.9%
	All	85.7%, *126*	94.7%, *132*	95.4%, *130*	65.6%, *125*	90.1%, *101*
	(CI95%)	78.4-91.3%	89.4-97.8%	90.2-98.3%	56.6-73.9%	82.5-95.2%
≤ Ct 25	Alpha	96.3%, 27	100.0%, 27	96.3%, 27	77.8%, *27*	92.3%, *13*
	(CI95%)	81.0-99.9%	87.2-100.0%	81.0-99.9%	57.7-91.4%	64.0-99.8%
	Delta	81.1%, *37*	95.1%, *41*	100.0%, *40*	45.9%, *37*	85.7%, *28*
	(CI95%)	64.8-92.0%	83.4-99.4%	91.2-100.0%	29.5-63.1%	67.3-96.0%
	Omicron	97.6%, *42*	100.0%, *41*	100.0%, *40*	97.4%, *38*	100.0%, *42*
	(CI95%)	87.4-99.9%	91.4-100.0%	91.2-100.0%	86.2-99.9%	91.6-100.0%
	All	91.5%, *106*	98.2%, *109*	99.1%, *107*	73.5%, *102*	94.0%, *83*
	(CI95%)	84.4-96.0%	93.5-99.8%	94.9-100.0%	63.9-81.8%	82.5-95.1%
> Ct 25	Alpha	33.3%, *3*	33.3%, 3	33.3%, 3	0.0%, *3*	50.0%, *2*
	(CI95%)	0.8-9.1%	0.8-9.1%	0.8-9.1%	0.0-7.1%	1.2-98.7%
	Delta	63.6%, *11*	85.7%, *14*	78.6%, *14*	42.9%, *14*	70.0%, *10*
	(CI95%)	30.8-89.1%	57.2-98.2%	49.2-95.3%	17.7-71.1%	34.8-93.3%
	Omicron	50.0%, *6*	83.3%, *6*	100.0%, *6*	16.7%, *6*	83.3%, *6*
	(CI95%)	11.8-88.2	35.9-99.6%	54.1-100.0%	0.4-64.1%	35.9-99.6%
	All	54.9%, *20*	78.2%, *23*	78.2%, *23*	30.5%, *23*	72.2%, *18*
	(CI95%)	31.5-76.9%	56.3-92.5%	56.3-92.5%	13.2-52.9%	46.5-90.3%

Ct= cycle threshold

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.07.24.23293072; this version posted July 26, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.07.24.23293072; this version posted July 26, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .



medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.07.24.23293072; this version posted July 26, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Figure 4: Positive and negative Ag-RDT results according to RT-qPCR cycle threshold (Ct) values.

Prospective samples: SARS-CoV-2 Ag-RDT clinical sensitivity

During the prospective evaluation, 122 participants tested positive by RT-qPCR for SARS-CoV-2. Of them, 32 were the Delta VOC and 90 the Omicron (BA.1) VOC. Samples were immediately tested using the Biocredit (RapiGEN, South Korea) Ag-RDT with 99 yielding a positive Biocredit Ag-RDT result (Sens 81.1%, CI95% 73.1-87.6%). When separated by VOC the sensitivity was lower, but statistically similar, for the Delta VOC 71.9% (CI 95% 53.3-86.6%) compared to the Omicron VOC 84.4% (CI95% 75.3-91.2%). The difference in Ct value between samples positive or negative by Biocredit was significant (Delta p=0.038, Omicron p=0.00007) across both VOCs. Additionally, the intensity of the test band of positive Ag-RDTs was recorded for 119 samples (three excluded due to lien intensity not recorded) with no significance obtained between the two VOCs (Delta and Omicron BA.1).

Discussion

We present the analytical sensitivity of 34 commercially available COVID-19 Ag-RDTs for the detection of the Omicron VOC (BA.1 and BA.5) to Alpha, Gamma and Delta VOCs and WT. Analytically, the majority of Ag-RDTs (94.1%, BA.1 and 93.5%, BA.5) met the WHO criteria outlined in the TPP for SARS-CoV-2 Ag-RDTs (26). When analysing RNA copies/mL, as outlined in the WHO recommendations, the LOD of Omicron VOC BA.5 was statistically lower than the WT and the Alpha VOC but similar to the Gamma, Delta and Omicron BA.1 VOCs. However, when comparing the PFU/mL, recommended by the UK DHSC, tests have significantly lower LODs with Omicron BA.5 than all other VOCs and WT.

The observed discrepancies between RNA copies/mL and PFU/mL are likely attributable to difference in the virus' ability to form plaques and varying ratios of infectious particles to RNA copies present (32). Whilst the PFU/mL measures infectious virus present, RNA copies/mL encompasses all SARS-CoV-2 RNA

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.07.24.23293072; this version posted July 26, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

present including non-infectious or dead virus. For Ag-RDT evaluation, RNA copies/mL is recommended by the WHO and the UK DHSC recommends PFU/mL. It is counterintuitive for organisations to utilise different units of measurements for comparison of Ag-RDTS and a consensus would allow more appropriate evaluation.

As of June 2023, there has been few studies evaluating the performance of Ag-RDTS for the detection of Omicron BA.5 infection, as highlighted in the recent systematic review by Mohammadie *et al* 2023 (27). Whilst BA.5 does not have any lineage defining mutations in the N gene, ~25% of BA.5 sequences do contain an additional N mutation (E136D), and ~11% contain G30. Previous studies have identified specific mutations in the nucleocapsid affecting the sensitivity of Ag-RDTs. The Alpha variant T135I mutation was identified as a cause of false negative result with the Panbio COVID-19 AG-RDT (27), and Additionally, in a study in Italy, viruses harboring mutations A376T and M241I in the nucleocapsid sequence were over-represented in the Panbio antigen-test-negative and PCR-positive samples and resulted in high percentage of false negative results (29).

For 5 of the 34 Ag-RDT brands we present clinical accuracy data utilising clinical respiratory samples positive for SARS-CoV-2 Alpha, Delta and Omicron (BA.1) VOCs. Hotgen consistently performed poorer than other Ag-RDTs, typically falling below the WHO TPP guidance with Onsite the best performing brand overall. For all brands, the clinical sensitivity values obtained with retrospective samples were the highest for Omicron samples. This is in line with other published works comparing Omicron BA.1 to other non-Omicron VOCs (30). A similar trend was observed when using only prospective samples collected when the UK was experiencing the Delta and Omicron waves of infection. A lower sensitivity was recorded for samples positive for the Delta VOC compared to those positive with an Omicron VOC infection on the Biocredit Ag-RDT, as shown in cultured samples by Stanley *et al.,* 2022 (31).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.07.24.23293072; this version posted July 26, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

For all brands in the retrospective cohort the predicted clinical LODs were statistically similar to the analytical LODs obtained with spiked laboratory samples. As clinical evaluation is expensive and often surplus samples are not available for comprehensive testing our data, demonstrating the efficacy of analytical samples, can be used to justify the use of analytical evaluation in the absence of abundant clinical samples.

This study has several strengths; we have carried out an extensive evaluation of the analytical sensitivity of 34 commercially available Ag-RDT brands. This list is inclusive of most WHO-EUL recommended tests and five awaiting approvals, thus of high global high public health relevance. Additionally, we included both viral isolates and clinical specimens to evaluate the Ag-RDT sensitivity. With clinical specimens in this study being attributed to three of the most encountered VOCs; Alpha, Delta and Omicron, we provide a comprehensive evaluation of assay performance of emerging strains with less publicly available data.

Limitations of this study include the use of retrospective frozen specimens instead of fresh swabs as recommended by most Ag-RDT manufacturers. However, prospective clinical evaluation studies rarely include multiple VOCs as their prevalence depends on their time period, and prospective evaluation of multiple RDT brands simultaneously is complicated by the need for a single swab per test. To correct for the potential degradation of RNA after a freeze-thaw cycle, viral RNA was re-tested by RT-PCR at the time of Ag-RDT evaluation and these values were used for comparison. Another limitation of this study is that we did not repeat the LOD experiments for the WT, Alpha and Gamma viral isolates and used the data from previous studies performed in our laboratory with the same protocol and compared it to the newly produced data for the Delta and Omicron VOC isolates.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.07.24.23293072; this version posted July 26, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

To conclude we report similar if not superior LODs for Omicron compared to other non-Omicron VOCs. However, the decreased detection of the Delta VOC in both analytical and clinical samples highlight the need for continuous assessment of Ag-RDTs especially those recommended for at home testing.

References

1. Peeling RW, Olliaro PL, Boeras DI, Fongwen N. Scaling up COVID-19 rapid antigen tests: promises and challenges. Lancet Infect Dis [Internet]. 2021 Sep 1 [cited 2022 Mar 22];21(9):e290–5. Available from: http://www.thelancet.com/article/S1473309921000487/fulltext

2. Cassuto NG, Gravier A, Colin M, Theillay A, Pires-Roteira D, Pallay S, et al. Evaluation of a SARS-CoV-2 antigen-detecting rapid diagnostic test as a self-test: Diagnostic performance and usability. J Med Virol. 2021;

3. World Health Organization (WHO). Antigen-detection in the diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2 infection. 2021.

4. Team. N. https://nextstrain.org/ncov/gisaid/global.

5. Tian D, Sun Y, Xu H, Ye Q. The emergence and epidemic characteristics of the highly mutated SARS-CoV-2 Omicron variant. J Med Virol. 2022 Feb;

6. Shrestha LB, Foster C, Rawlinson W, Tedla N, Bull RA. Evolution of the SARS-CoV-2 omicron variants BA.1 to BA.5: Implications for immune escape and transmission [Internet]. Vol. 32, Reviews in Medical Virology. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd; 2022 [cited 2023 Jan 12]. p. e2381. Available from: https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/rmv.2381

7. FIND. Test Directory.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.07.24.23293072; this version posted July 26, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

8. FDA. SARS-CoV-2 Viral Mutations: Impact on COVID-19 Tests. Omicron Variant: Impact on Antigen Diagnostic Tests. 2021;

9. Wiegand T, McVey A, Nemudraia A, Wiedenheft B, Nemudryi A. The rise and fall of SARS-CoV-2 variants and the emergence of competing Omicron lineages. Medrxiv. 2022;

10. Quaglia F, Salladini E, Carraro M, Minervini G, Tosatto SCE, Le Mercier P. SARS-CoV-2 variants preferentially emerge at intrinsically disordered protein sites helping immune evasion. FEBS J. 2022 Feb;

11. Goderski G, Han W, Stanoeva K, Meijer A. Technical evaluation of SARS-CoV-2 antigen self-tests with Omicron variant: Evaluation Report. 2021.

12. UK Health Security Agency. SARS-CoV-2 variants of concern and variants under investigation in England. Technical briefing 32. 2021.

13. Molenkamp R, Igloi Z. Evaluation of antigen rapid test and PCR test to Omicron variant: detection of Omicron by VirSNP. 2021.

14. Deerain J, Druce J, Tran T, Batty M, Yoga Y, Fennell M, et al. Assessment of the Analytical Sensitivity of 10 Lateral Flow Devices against the SARS-CoV-2 Omicron Variant. McAdam AJ, editor. J Clin Microbiol. 2022 Feb;60(2).

15. Bekliz M, Adea K, Alvarez C, Essaidi-Laziosi M E, C KL et al. Analytical sensitivity of seven SARSCoV-2 antigen-detecting rapid tests for Omicron variant. medRxiv. 2021;

16. Osterman A, Badell I, Basara E, Stern M, Kriesel F, Eletreby M, et al. Impaired detection of omicron by SARS-CoV-2 rapid antigen tests. Med Microbiol Immunol. 2022 Feb;

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.07.24.23293072; this version posted July 26, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

17. Cocherie T, Bastide M, Sakhi S, Zafilaza K, Flandre P, Leducq V, et al. Decreased Sensitivity of Rapid Antigen Test Is Associated with a Lower Viral Load of Omicron than Delta SARS-CoV-2 Variant. Microbiol Spectr [Internet]. 2022 Oct 26 [cited 2023 Jan 9];10(5). Available from: https://journals.asm.org/doi/10.1128/spectrum.01922-22

18. World Health Organization (WHO). Coronavirus disease (COVID-19) Pandemic — Emergency Use Listing Procedure (EUL) open for IVDs. Prequalification of Medical Products (IVDs, Medicines, Vaccines and Immunization Devices, Vector Control).

19. Cubas-Atienzar, Ana I., Kontogianni K, Edwards T, Wooding D, Buist K, Thompson, Caitlin R. Williams CT, et al. Limit of detection in different matrices of 19 commercially available rapid antigen tests for the detection of SARS-CoV-2. Sci Rep. 2021;11(1):1–8.

20. Kontogianni K, Cubas-Atienzar AI, Wooding D, Buist K, Thompson CR, Williams CT, et al. Lateral flow antigen tests can sensitively detect live cultured virus of the SARS-CoV-2 B1.1.7 lineage. Journal of Infection. 2021.

21. Kontogianni K, Bengey D, Wooding D, Buist K, Greenland-Bews C, Williams CT, et al. Analytical evaluation of thirty-two severe acute respiratory syndrome 2 lateral flow antigen tests demonstrates sensitivity remains with the SARS-CoV-2 Gamma lineage. Rev Soc Bras Med Trop. 2022;55:e0016.

22. Medicine. NUSNL of. Facilitating AcceLerated Clinical Validation Of Novel Diagnostics for COVID-19 (FALCON-C19) (FALCON-C19). 2021.

23. FIND. FIND evaluation of SARS-CoV-2 antigen (Ag) detecting tests. Antigen(Ag)-detection RDTs undergoing evaluation. 2022.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.07.24.23293072; this version posted July 26, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

24. Byrne RL, Kay GA, Kontogianni K, Brown L, Collins AM, Cuevas LE, et al. Saliva offers a sensitive, specific and non-invasive alternative to upper respiratory swabs for SARS-CoV-2 diagnosis. medRxiv. 2020.

25. Tyson JR, James P, Stoddart D, Sparks N, Wickenhagen A, Hall G, et al. Improvements to the ARTIC multiplex PCR method for SARS-CoV-2 genome sequencing using nanopore. bioRxiv Prepr Serv Biol [Internet]. 2020; Available from: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/32908977%0Ahttp://www.pubmedcentral.nih.gov/articlerender.fcgi?artid=PMC7480024

26. (WHO) WHO, R&D Blue Print WH (HQ). Target product profiles for priority diagnostics to support response to the COVID-19 pandemic v.1.0. 2020;

27. Mohammadie ZE, Akhlaghi S, Samaeinasab S, Shaterzadeh-Bojd S, Jamialahmadi T, Sahebkar A. Clinical performance of rapid antigen tests in comparison to RT-PCR for SARS-COV-2 diagnosis in Omicron variant: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Rev Med Virol [Internet]. 2023 Mar 1 [cited 2023 Jun 1];33(2):e2428. Available from: https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/rmv.2428

28. Jian MJ, Chung HY, Chang CK, Lin JC, Yeh KM, Chen CW, et al. SARS-CoV-2 variants with T135I nucleocapsid mutations may affect antigen test performance. Int J Infect Dis. 2022;

29. Vecchio C Del, Brancaccio G, Brazzale AR, Lavezzo E, Onelia F, Franchin E, et al. Emergence of N antigen SARS-CoV-2 genetic variants escaping detection of antigenic tests. medRxiv. 2021;

30. de Michelena P, Torres I, Ramos-García Á, Gozalbes V, Ruiz N, Sanmartín A, et al. Real-life performance of a COVID-19 rapid antigen detection test targeting the SARS-CoV-2 nucleoprotein

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.07.24.23293072; this version posted July 26, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

for diagnosis of COVID-19 due to the Omicron variant. J Infect [Internet]. 2022 May 1 [cited 2023 Jun 1];84(5):e64–6. Available from: http://www.journalofinfection.com/article/S0163445322001104/fulltext

31. Stanley S, Hamel DJ, Wolf ID, Riedel S, Dutta S, Contreras E, et al. Limit of Detection for Rapid Antigen Testing of the SARS-CoV-2 Omicron and Delta Variants of Concern Using Live-Virus Culture. J Clin Microbiol. 2022;60(5).

32. Despres HW, Mills MG, Shirley DJ, Schmidt MM, Huang M-L, Jerome KR, et al. Quantitative measurement of infectious virus in SARS-CoV-2 Alpha, Delta and Epsilon variants reveals higher infectivity (viral titer:RNA ratio) in clinical samples containing the Delta and Epsilon variants. medRxiv [Internet]. 2021 Sep 20 [cited 2023 Jun 1]; Available from: /pmc/articles/PMC8475961/

Acknowledgements. We thank all participants who volunteered to take part in the study. In the United Kingdom, special thanks go to the NIHR Clinical Research Network (CRN) for their support with the recruitment, specially to Sue Dowling, to the LSTM Diagnostic group—Kate Buist, Karina Clerkin, Lorna Finch, Helen Savage, Caitlin R Thompson and Rachel Watkins for recruitment, sample collection, and processing, and to the CONDOR steering group—A. Joy Allen, Julian Braybrook, Peter Buckle, Paul Dark, Kerrie Davis, Adam Gordon, Anna Halstead, Charlotte Harden, Colette Inkson, Naoko Jones, William Jones, Dan Lasserson, Joseph Lee, Clare Lendrem, Andrew Lewington, Mary Logan, Massimo Micocci, Brian Nicholson, Rafael Perera-Salazar, Graham Prestwich, D. Ashley Price, Charles Reynard, Beverley Riley, John Simpson, Valerie Tate, Philip Turner, Mark Wilcox, and Melody Zhifang—for oversight of the trial in the United Kingdom. We would like to thank the facilitators of the following SARS-CoV-2 isolates

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.07.24.23293072; this version posted July 26, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

obtained through BEI Resources: Isolate hCoV-19/South Africa/CERI-KRISP-K040013/2022 (Lineage BA.5; Omicron Variant), NR-56798, deposited by Dr. Alex Sigal.