

1 **Performance of three rapid antigen tests against the SARS-CoV-2 Omicron variant**

2

3 **Authors**

4 Sanjat Kanjilal^{1,2}, Sujata Chalise^{2,3}, Adnan Shami Shah^{2,3}, Chi-An Cheng^{2,3}, Yasmeen Senussi^{2,3},
5 Rockib Uddin⁴, Vamsi Thiriveedhi⁴, Ha Eun Cho⁴, Seamus Carroll⁴, Jacob Lemieux⁴, Sarah
6 Turbett⁴, David R Walt^{2,3}

7

8 **Affiliations**

9 ¹ Department of Population Medicine, Harvard Medical School and Harvard Pilgrim Healthcare
10 Institute, Boston, MA

11 ² Department of Pathology, Brigham & Women's Hospital and Harvard Medical School, Boston,
12 MA

13 ³ Wyss Institute for Biologically Inspired Engineering, Harvard University, Boston, MA

14 ⁴ Division of Infectious Diseases, Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston, MA

15

16 **Corresponding author**

17 Sanjat Kanjilal, MD MPH

18 Department of Population Medicine, Harvard Medical School and Harvard Pilgrim Healthcare
19 Institute

20 Boston, MA 02215

21 Email: skanjilal@bwh.harvard.edu

22

23 **Word count**

24 1838

25 **Abstract**

26 Rapid antigen detection tests (RADTs) for severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2
27 (SARS-CoV-2) are now in widespread use in the United States. RADTs play an important role in
28 maintaining an open society but require periodic reassessment to ensure test performance
29 remains intact as the virus evolves. The nucleocapsid (N) protein is the target for the majority of
30 RADTs and the SARS-CoV-2 Omicron variant has several N protein mutations that are previously
31 uncharacterized. We sought to assess the impact of these mutations by testing 30 Omicron
32 variant samples across a wide range of viral loads on three widely used RADTs: the iHealth
33 COVID-19 Antigen Rapid Test, the ACON Laboratories FlowFlex COVID-19 Antigen Home Test,
34 and the Abbott BinaxNOW COVID-19 Antigen Card, using 30 Delta variant samples as a
35 comparator. We found no change in the analytic sensitivity of all three RADTs for detection of
36 Omicron versus Delta, but noted differences in performance between assays. No RADT was able
37 to detect samples with a cycle threshold (Ct) value of ≥ 27.5 for the envelope gene target on the
38 Roche cobas RT-PCR assay. Epidemiologic studies are necessary to correlate these findings
39 with their real-world performance.

40 Introduction

41 Diagnostic testing for infection by severe acute coronavirus syndrome 2 (SARS-CoV-2) remains
42 a cornerstone of efforts to control the coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic. The
43 reliance on centralized laboratory-based testing has eased with the introduction of rapid antigen
44 tests, which are now available over-the-counter in the US or provided by the federal government.
45 These assays can be self-administered, require little to no equipment and provide results within
46 15 minutes. The ability to test at the point of care with the onset of symptoms or prior to gatherings
47 places them in a key role for maintaining an open society.

48 The SARS-CoV-2 nucleocapsid (N) is the most abundant protein expressed by the virus^{1,2} and is
49 the target of the majority of rapid antigen detection tests (RADTs). Detection of the analyte is
50 achieved through recombinant antibodies conjugated to gold nanoparticles that target specific
51 epitopes on the N protein. The antigen-antibody complexes are carried by capillary action to a
52 second set of antibodies which immobilize and concentrate the nanoparticles, making them visible
53 to the naked eye. Mutations in the N protein have been previously described to cause decreases
54 in antigen test sensitivity³, therefore periodic reassessment of test performance is necessary as
55 new variants arise. The Omicron variant is characterized by a mutation (P13L) and a deletion
56 (Δ 31-33) near the N-terminal domain and two mutations adjacent to each other in the linker
57 domain (R203K and G204R)⁴. We sought to characterize the impact of these newly described
58 mutations on the analytic sensitivity of three widely used RADTs for at-home testing: the
59 BinaxNOW COVID-19 Antigen Card (Abbott, Scarborough, Maine), the iHealth COVID-19
60 Antigen Rapid Test (Sunnyvale, California), and the FlowFlex COVID-19 Antigen Home Test
61 (ACON Laboratories, San Diego, California), using their performance versus the Delta variant as
62 a comparator.

63 **Methods**

64 We collected 30 samples positive for the Omicron variant and 30 samples positive for the Delta
65 variant from patients presenting to the Massachusetts General Hospital for clinical care between
66 November 30 2021 and December 27 2021, except for nine Delta samples which were obtained
67 between August and November 2021. Samples were collected from the anterior nares of patients,
68 placed in universal transport medium and run on the cobas SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR assay (Roche
69 diagnostics, Pleasanton, California), which targets regions of the envelope (*E*) and *ORF1ab*
70 genes. Variant calls were made using a combination of the TaqPath COVID-19 Combo Kit
71 (ThermoFisher, Waltham, Massachusetts) to assess for spike gene target failure (SGTF), a proxy
72 for the $\Delta 69-70$ spike mutation, and the TaqMan SARS-CoV-2 Mutation Panel (ThermoFisher,
73 Waltham, Massachusetts), which amplifies a set of 6 spike protein mutations that characterize
74 major variants of concern, including the Omicron and Delta variants. One sample was positive for
75 only one target (K417N) due to having very low amounts of nucleic acid, but was assumed to be
76 Omicron as it also had SGTF. All other samples were verified using multiple targets from the
77 mutation panel. For each variant, we chose 10 samples with *E* gene cycle threshold (Ct) values
78 of < 20 , 10 samples with Ct values between 20 and 30 and 10 samples with Ct values > 30 .
79 Samples were not heat-inactivated.

80 For each RADT, we mixed the kit-supplied swab with 50 μ L of sample for 15 seconds and then
81 followed each assay's instructions for use. Samples underwent one freeze-thaw cycle prior to
82 examination on the iHealth assay and two freeze-thaw cycles for all other assays. Assays were
83 run in duplicate for each RADT and results were evaluated after a 15 minute incubation period by
84 two independent readers blinded to the variant status and Ct value of the sample. Samples were
85 run for all three RADTs over a 2 day period. Chi-squared tests were used to compare the
86 distribution of results by variant for a given RADT and logistic regression was used to estimate

87 the impact of variant and RADT on the likelihood of test positivity after controlling for Ct values.

88 This study was deemed non-human subjects research and approved by the Mass General

89 Brigham Institutional Review Board (protocol 2021P003604).

90 Results

91 For all three RADTs, there were no significant differences in the analytic sensitivity for the Omicron

92 variant relative to the Delta variant. Table 1 shows the proportion of samples positive by Ct value

93 range, RADT and variant.

Ct value range and RADT	n/total (%) positive	
	Delta variant	Omicron variant
Overall		
Abbott BinaxNOW	15/30 (50%)	13/30 (43%)
ACON FlowFlex	15/30 (50%)	15/30 (50%)
iHealth COVID-19 Antigen	17/30 (57%)	17/30 (57%)
≤20		
Abbott BinaxNOW	9/10 (90%)	10/10 (100%)
ACON FlowFlex	10/10 (100%)	10/10 (100%)
iHealth COVID-19 Antigen	10/10 (100%)	10/10 (100%)
20 - 30		
Abbott BinaxNOW	6/10 (60%)	3/10 (30%)
ACON FlowFlex	5/10 (50%)	5/10 (50%)
iHealth COVID-19 Antigen	7/10 (70%)	7/10 (70%)
≥30		
Abbott BinaxNOW	0/10 (0%)	0/10 (0%)
ACON FlowFlex	0/10 (0%)	0/10 (0%)
iHealth COVID-19 Antigen	0/10 (0%)	0/10 (0%)


94 **Table 1: Proportion of tests positive by Ct value range, RADT and variant.** There were no
 95 statistically significant differences in the proportion of tests positive by variant for any of the three
 96 RADTs overall, nor within the three Ct value ranges.

97 Table 2 shows median Ct values and interquartile ranges by test result and the range of Ct value
 98 overlap between negative and positive tests, stratified by RADT.

RADT and result	Median Ct (IQR)		Overlap range (Ct)
	Negative	Positive	
Abbott BinaxNOW			
Delta variant	31.1 (5.5)	19.2 (3.5)	19.6 - 27.1
Omicron variant	33.8 (6.7)	19.1 (2.3)	22.7 - 25.4
ACON FlowFlex			
Delta variant	31.1 (5.5)	19.2 (3.2)	25.7 - 27.1
Omicron variant	34.0 (6.6)	19.1 (4.9)	24.7 - 24.9
iHealth COVID-19 Antigen			
Delta variant	31.8 (3.8)	19.6 (3.2)	N/A
Omicron variant	34.6 (2.2)	19.7 (5.5)	N/A

99 **Table 2: Median Ct values and overlap in Ct values between negative and positive results**
 100 **by RADT and variant.**

101 Figure 1 depicts the distribution of test results by RADT, variant and Ct value. For the BinaxNOW
 102 there was overlap between negative and positive results in the Ct 19 to 27 range. When excluding
 103 one negative Delta variant sample that was an outlier, the BinaxNOW overlap range shrinks to 22
 104 to 27. For the FlowFlex there was overlap in positive and negative samples in the Ct 24 to 27
 105 range, while for the iHealth COVID-19 Antigen Test there was perfect discrimination between
 106 negative and positive results using a Ct value threshold of 27.5. No RADT was positive for
 107 samples with an *E* gene Ct value of >27.5 on the cobas SARS-CoV-2 assay.



108

109 **Figure 1: Distribution of Ct values by RADT, variant and test result.** Boxes indicate median
110 Ct and interquartile ranges. Shaded pink areas represent the range of Ct values for which there
111 was overlap between negative and positive RADT test results. There was no overlap in positive
112 and negative tests for the iHealth COVID-19 Ag test.

113 In multivariate analyses, variant type did not predict the odds of test positivity after controlling for
114 Ct value and RADT, however the BinaxNOW had an 89% (95% CI 36% - 99%, $p = 0.02$) lower
115 odds of being positive relative to the iHealth COVID-19 Antigen RADT. There was no statistically
116 significant difference in the odds of being positive between the iHealth COVID-19 Antigen and the
117 FlowFlex RADTs.

118 Discussion

119 The emergence and spread of successive SARS-CoV-2 variants has come to define the COVID-
120 19 pandemic over the past year and requires continual reassessment of vaccines, therapeutics
121 and diagnostics. In this study, we show that three widely utilized RADTs for at-home diagnosis of
122 SARS-CoV-2 infection continue to perform as expected despite a number of mutations in their
123 target, the nucleocapsid protein. While there was no difference in the analytic sensitivity of RADTs
124 between Delta and Omicron variant samples, we note differences in the performance by assay
125 type. These results should be interpreted with caution given our relatively small sample size. We
126 also note a non-significant trend towards decreased detection of the Omicron variant for the
127 Abbott BinaxNOW, which we have noted in a prior study from our group using a different sample
128 set⁵.

129 Three studies examining the analytic sensitivity of the BinaxNOW against the Omicron variant
130 have shown no statistically significant changes in test performance⁶⁻⁸. However, most of these
131 studies were either very small or did not compare Omicron and Delta samples side by side. A
132 comparison of the Abbott Panbio COVID-19 Ag Rapid Test to other RADTs available on the
133 Australian market using viral culture from a single Delta variant and Omicron variant sample
134 showed equivalent sensitivities across a range of dilutions⁶. In contrast, a similar study by Bekliz
135 et al using viral culture and paired clinical samples did find attenuated analytic sensitivity for
136 detection of Omicron by the Panbio test, relative to the Delta variant⁹. The Panbio uses the same
137 N protein epitopes as the BinaxNOW, which is marketed in the United States. The reasons for
138 these differing results are not fully known, but they highlight the need for a repeat study using a
139 larger set of samples with Ct values in the 20 to 30 range to resolve whether the BinaxNOW and
140 Panbio assays have lower analytic sensitivity for Omicron.

141 The largest clinical study examining the BinaxNOW was performed at a community testing site in
142 San Francisco during a time when rates of test positivity exceeded 40%⁸. The BinaxNOW was
143 able to reliably detect positive samples up to a Ct of 30 for the PCR assay used in this study.
144 While this value is higher than our detection threshold of 27.5 cycles for the *E* gene of the cobas
145 SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR assay, this could be explained by differences in reaction efficiencies,
146 thresholding algorithms and a host of other factors as opposed to true differences in viral loads¹⁰.
147 Direct comparison of Ct values between studies is challenging as distributions can have
148 systematic biases across platforms.

149 No samples were RADT positive above a Ct value of 27.5 on our RT-PCR assay, but how this
150 threshold relates to infectivity is an open question. The risk of SARS-CoV-2 transmission
151 increases in direct proportion with the viral load of the index patient¹¹ but is also dependent on the
152 duration of exposure, the presence of masks, ventilation, host immunity, symptomatology and
153 characteristics of the virus variant¹². Infectivity is a multidimensional phenomenon that involves
154 numerous variables operating on continuous scales, therefore it is difficult to assign a single Ct
155 value as a threshold without additional data correlating results with contact tracing.

156 The iHealth COVID-19 test has been distributed to millions of US citizens through a free
157 distribution program offered by the federal government. To our knowledge, this study is the first
158 to independently evaluate the performance of this assay against the Omicron variant. While both
159 the iHealth and FlowFlex RADTs performed well with our sample set, the iHealth test had a trend
160 towards higher sensitivity and also had the best discrimination between positive and negative
161 tests. The BinaxNOW had positive and negative results across an overlap of eight PCR cycles,
162 corresponding to a 256-fold difference in the amount of virus present in a sample, assuming a
163 reaction efficiency of 100%. The range of overlap for the FlowFlex was limited to 3 PCR cycles,
164 which is an 8-fold difference in the amount of virus present in a sample. While the reasons for the

165 overlap at these viral loads is not known, a significant number of people tested during an outbreak
166 may have levels that fall within this range. Further study is necessary to understand whether this
167 variation is reproducible in other contexts.

168 The major limitation of our study is the sample size, which limits drawing statistically significant
169 conclusions regarding small differences in test performance. A larger study is warranted to further
170 investigate the differences seen between our RADTs, as even small differences can have a large
171 impact when scaled to the population level. Another limitation is our use of frozen samples in
172 universal transport media rather than direct testing from a patient, but we would not expect there
173 to be a major impact from one to two freeze-thaws on assay performance and the volume of
174 analyte used in each assay was optimized in an earlier study for mimicking real-world
175 performance¹². A major strength of this study was the ability to compare three different RADTs
176 using identical clinical samples, which allows for a robust comparison of performance.

177 In summary, the analytic sensitivity versus Omicron remains stable in our head-to-head
178 comparison of three of the most common RADTs in use in the United States. However, there
179 were differences in inter-assay performance that warrant further study. Our findings will provide
180 a degree of assurance that at-home testing should perform as expected compared to prior waves
181 and also sets a baseline for comparison with future SARS-CoV-2 variants.

182 **Acknowledgements**

183 This study was funded by a grant from the Massachusetts Consortium for Pathogen Readiness.

184 **Conflicts of interest**

185 None.

186 Bibliography

- 187 1. Kim, D. *et al.* The Architecture of SARS-CoV-2 Transcriptome. *Cell* **181**, 914-921.e10
188 (2020).
- 189 2. Kim, D. *et al.* A high-resolution temporal atlas of the SARS-CoV-2 translome and
190 transcriptome. *Nat Commun* **12**, 5120 (2021).
- 191 3. Bourassa, L. *et al.* A SARS-CoV-2 Nucleocapsid Variant that Affects Antigen Test
192 Performance. *J Clin Virol* **141**, 104900 (2021).
- 193 4. CoVariants.org. <https://covariants.org/variants/21K.Omicron>. Accessed Feb 2 2022.
- 194 5. Kanjilal, S. *et al.* Analytic sensitivity of the Abbott BinaxNOW™ lateral flow
195 immunochromatographic assay for the SARS-CoV-2 Omicron variant. *Medrxiv*
196 2022.01.10.22269033 (2022) doi:10.1101/2022.01.10.22269033.
- 197 6. Deerain, J. *et al.* Assessment of the analytical sensitivity of ten lateral flow devices against
198 the SARS-CoV-2 omicron variant. *J Clin Microbiol* jcm0247921 (2021)
199 doi:10.1128/jcm.02479-21.
- 200 7. Regan, J. *et al.* Detection of the omicron variant virus with the Abbott BinaxNow SARS-
201 CoV-2 Rapid Antigen Assay. *Medrxiv* 2021.12.22.21268219 (2021)
202 doi:10.1101/2021.12.22.21268219.
- 203 8. Schrom, J. *et al.* Direct Comparison of SARS Co-V-2 Nasal RT- PCR and Rapid Antigen
204 Test (BinaxNOW(TM)) at a Community Testing Site During an Omicron Surge.
205 2022.01.08.22268954 (2022) doi:10.1101/2022.01.08.22268954.
- 206 9. Bekliz, M. *et al.* Sensitivity of SARS-CoV-2 antigen-detecting rapid tests for Omicron
207 variant. *Medrxiv* 2021.12.18.21268018 (2022) doi:10.1101/2021.12.18.21268018.
- 208 10. Rhoads, D. D. & Pinsky, B. A. The truth about SARS-CoV-2 cycle threshold values is
209 rarely pure and never simple. *Clin Chem* hvab146- (2021) doi:10.1093/clinchem/hvab146.
- 210 11. Marks, M. *et al.* Transmission of COVID-19 in 282 clusters in Catalonia, Spain: a cohort
211 study. *Lancet Infect Dis* **21**, 629–636 (2021).
- 212 12. Meyerowitz, E. A., Richterman, A., Gandhi, R. T. & Sax, P. E. Transmission of SARS-
213 CoV-2: A Review of Viral, Host, and Environmental Factors. *Ann Intern Med* (2020)
214 doi:10.7326/m20-5008.
- 215 13. Perchetti, G. A., Huang, M.-L., Mills, M. G., Jerome, K. R. & Greninger, A. L. Analytical
216 Sensitivity of the Abbott BinaxNOW COVID-19 Ag Card. *J Clin Microbiol* **59**, (2021).