Published in final edited form as:

Forensic Sci Int. 2019 July ; 300: 75–81. doi:10.1016/j.forsciint.2019.04.019.

Evaluation of a lateral flow immunoassay for the detection of the synthetic opioid fentanyl

Daniel J. Angelini^{1,*}, Tracey D. Biggs¹, Michele N. Maughan², Michael G. Feasel¹, Edward Sisco³, Jennifer W. Sekowski¹

¹U.S. Army, Research, Development & Engineering Command Edgewood Chemical & Biological Center, Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD USA

²Excet, Inc., Springfield, VA USA

³National Institute of Standards & Technology, Materials Measurement Science Division, Gaithersburg, MD USA

Abstract

In the United States in 2016, 64,000 overdose deaths were reported to be associated with the abuse of opioids, including prescription painkillers (e.g. oxycodone), opiates (e.g. heroin), or synthetic opioids (e.g. fentanyl). The recent spike in the presence of synthetic opioids in lots of heroin distributed on the street present specific and significant challenges to law enforcement. Synthetic opioids are extremely toxic substances, which can easily be inhaled. This type of exposure can lead to accidental overdoses by law enforcement and other first responders answering calls involving illicit drugs containing these substances. Due to this extreme toxicity, it is important for these individuals to have tools that can be easily deployed for accurate presumptive field tests. Currently, there are only a limited number of presumptive tests available for fentanyl detection. In this study, we addressed this technology gap by evaluating newly developed lateral flow immunoassays (LFIs) designed for the detection of fentanyl and its derivatives. These LFIs were

* **Corresponding Author:** Daniel J. Angelini, Ph.D., Research Biologist, U.S. Army Edgewood Chemical Biological Center, RDCB-DRB-D, 8198 Blackhawk Road, Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD 21010, Phone: (410) 436-1322, Fax: (410) 436-2081, daniel.j.angelini2.civ@mail.mil.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS:

1. **Angelini DJ (corresponding author):** conceptualization; data curation; formal analysis; investigation; methodology; project administration; supervision; writing-original draft/review & editing
2. **Biggs TD:** data curation; writing-review & editing
3. **Maughan MN:** data curation; project administration; writing-review & editing
4. **Feasel MG:** data curation; writing-review & editing
5. **Sisco E:** data curation; methodology; resources; writing-review & editing
6. **Sekowski JW:** conceptualization; funding acquisition; writing - review & editing

Declaration of Interest: None

Publisher's Disclaimer: Disclaimer: The views expressed in this manuscript are those of the authors and do not reflect the official policy of the Department of the Army, Department of Defense, or the U.S. Government. The names of commercial manufacturers are provided for identification only and inclusion does not imply endorsement by the Department of the Army, Department of Defense, or the U.S. Government. Certain commercial products are identified in order to adequately specify the procedure; this does not imply endorsement or recommendation by the National Institute of Standards & Technology (NIST), nor does it imply that such products are necessarily the best available for the purpose. This document has been approved for public release with unlimited distribution.

evaluated for effectiveness in different biofluid matrices, following an *in vivo* exposure, cross-reactivity with fentanyl analogs, and in case samples. This study demonstrates that LFIs have the potential to be used by law enforcement for the detection of synthetic opioids.

Keywords

Detection; fentanyl; forensic science; illicit drug; lateral flow immunoassay; opioid

INTRODUCTION:

In 2017, the President of the United States declared the widespread overuse and abuse of opioids a national public health emergency [1]. In addition to overdoses associated with heroin and prescription opioids, there has been an alarming spike in overdose deaths associated with the use of synthetic opioids (e.g. fentanyl, carfentanil); the National Institute on Drug Abuse (NIDA) reported 29,406 overdose deaths associated with these compounds in 2017 [2]. Synthetic opioids are much more dangerous than natural opium derivatives, such as morphine or heroin [3–5] because of their increased relative potency. The scientific literature has reported that fentanyl is approximately 50 times more potent than heroin and 100 times more potent than morphine [4, 6]. Another synthetic opioid that has recently been discovered in seized batches of street heroin is carfentanil [7, 8]. This compound has been reported to be approximately 10,000 times more potent than morphine [5], making it even more dangerous than fentanyl. In fact, carfentanil is so powerful that it has been used to anesthetize polar bears, moose, bighorn sheep and other large game for wildlife tracking studies [9–11]. Due to the extreme potency of these compounds, there is little room for error when adding these compounds to a production lot of street heroin leading to significant increases in the chances of an opioid-induced overdose [12].

Dealing with synthetic opioids, such as fentanyl (and derivatives), has presented special challenges to both law enforcement and first responder personnel due to the extreme toxicity of these compounds. During routine duties, these personnel may accidentally come into contact with heroin that has been laced with synthetic opioids leading to a dangerous situation. For example, accidental exposures leading to significant injuries and hospitalizations of law enforcement agents have been reported [13]. In response to these events, it is essential to provide the law enforcement/first responder/forensic community with the tools necessary to detect these substances in a rapid and cost effective way.

Traditional detection of synthetic opioids follows a two tiered process [14]. The initial phase is typically rapid screening for presumptive identification; these tests usually observe functional group reactivity in a colorimetric assay or by using optical spectrometry for generalized chemical signatures. The goal of this phase is down-select to an illicit compound as rapidly and accurately as possible in order to make an arrest. Also, these initial findings will aid in evidence selection for laboratory-based confirmatory testing. Currently, there are only a limited number of colorimetric tests available to law enforcement or first responders. One of these tests includes the NARK II Fentanyl Reagent (Sirchie; Youngsville, NC) selling for approximately \$20 for 10 tests (\$2/test). These tests have many drawbacks

including the use of caustic chemicals, low reliability, and lack of independent validation [15]. Recent reports have suggested that the limits of detection (LODs) for colorimetric detection assays is at least greater than 10 µg [16]. In addition, there have been reports in the popular media questioning the validity of these types of colorimetric tests [17]. Once the samples have been collected and taken to the laboratory, the second tier of analysis begins. The exacting nature of this tier of testing often utilizes chromatographic separation coupled with one or more forensic analytical chemistry techniques. Most commonly, liquid or gas chromatography (LC or GC) coupled to mass spectroscopy (MS), allows for identification of unknown substances based upon retention time and accurate mass [18, 19].

The use of lateral flow immunoassays (LFIs) are widely used for the detection of specific substances in medicine [20], agriculture [21], environmental science [22], and biodefense [23]. These assays are typically paper-based matrices in which antibodies directed against compounds of interest have been incorporated. LFIs have been shown to be effective at detecting a wide variety of compounds of interest for law enforcement and first responders including illicit drugs [24], pathogens [25], chemicals [26], and substances associated with bioterrorism [23]. The main advantage of these tests is that they are capable of producing results in a short time frame (< 5 minutes), at a minimal cost (~\$2–4 per test), requiring no dangerous chemicals, special laboratory equipment, or extensive training for interpreting the results. Liquid sample, typically in the form of a buffered solution containing a specific analyte, is placed on the absorbent sample pad (either by pipetting or by dipping the sample pad into the test liquid) which allows capillary action to move the liquid up the strip to the test and control lines containing the capture reagents (i.e. antibodies). LFIs are typically either sandwich or competitive assays. Briefly, in sandwich assays, the sample migrates up the test strip and encounters color labeled antibodies designed to detect a specific epitope. If the target compound binds to the antibody, it will then bind to other antibodies impregnated in the test line also specific to the target. This interaction causes a colored line to form, indicating a positive result. Sandwich assays are typically used when the target molecule is large, such as human chorionic gonadotropin in pregnancy tests. In competitive assays, the sample first encounters colored antibody-labeled competitive binding particles. As the sample and colored antibody- labeled competitive binding particles flow over the test line, any target analyte (i.e. fentanyl) present in the sample at a high enough concentration will block the binding site on the capture antibody bound to the test site; therefore, preventing any binding of the colored antibody-labeled competitive particle. Thus, a positive test is indicated by no colored band in the test area. In both assay types, there is a control line containing control antibodies that bind any free color-labeled detection antibodies. The appearance of this band indicates the assay was performed properly. It is interesting to note that the results of the competitive LFI are somewhat counterintuitive, since a positive result is indicated by one line (control line only) and a negative result is indicated by two lines (control line and test line).

In the current study, we evaluated the effectiveness of commercially available competitive LFIs designed to detect the synthetic opioid fentanyl in either urine or saliva. We determined the sensitivity of these assays as well as any cross reactivity with known fentanyl analogs (e.g. carfentanyl). In addition, we evaluated urine and saliva samples from rabbits that had been exposed to fentanyl to determine if the LFIs would perform following an *in vivo*

exposure situation. Finally, we evaluated the LFIs with four individual case samples known to contain fentanyl. Overall, our evaluation suggests that the LFIs designed to detect fentanyl could easily be adapted by either law enforcement or first responders for the field detection of this compound.

MATERIALS AND METHODS:

Fentanyl-Specific LFIs:

Initial studies were performed using both Fentanyl Rapid Test Dipsticks (urine) and the Fentanyl Rapid Test Cassettes (oral fluid) produced by Express Diagnostics Int'l Inc. (Blue Earth, MN) [27, 28]. These assays are competitive LFIs where a single band indicates a positive result and two bands indicate a negative result. The manufacturer has stated that in addition to reactivity to fentanyl, the antibodies used for this LFI cross-react with the metabolite of fentanyl, norfentanyl [27, 28]. For reference, the chemical structures of both fentanyl and norfentanyl are shown in Supplemental Figure 1. In addition to commercial-off-the-shelf (COTS) fentanyl LFIs, custom order fentanyl LFIs were developed by the manufacturer that contained an increased amount of detection antibodies in the test zone and evaluated in this study. For this study, LODs will be considered the fentanyl concentration in which 100 % of the LFIs will produce a positive result. Sensitivity of the assays will be considered the lowest concentration of fentanyl that yields at least a single positive result.

Test Compounds:

Carfentanil, cocaine, fentanyl, heroin, oxycodone, and remifentanyl were purchased as analytical standards (100 µg/mL diluted in methanol) from Cerilliant Corporation (Round Rock, TX). Acetyl fentanyl, butyryl fentanyl, crotonyl fentanyl, cyclopropyl fentanyl, p-fluoroisobutyryl fentanyl (FIBF), 2-furanyl fentanyl, β-hydroxythiol fentanyl, methoxy fentanyl, methyl fentanyl, norfentanyl, and U-47700 were purchased as analytical standards (100 µg/mL diluted in methanol) from Cayman Chemical (Ann Arbor, MI). A complete list of test compounds used in this study is shown in Table 1.

Biofluid Test Matrices:

Both pooled normal human urine and saliva that were certified by the supplier as testing negative for human immunodeficiency virus, hepatitis B, hepatitis C, and syphilis were purchased from Innovative Research (Novi, MI). Phosphate buffered saline (PBS) was purchased from Sigma-Aldrich (St. Louis, MO). For LOD/assay sensitivity analysis, each of the biofluid matrices were spiked with increasing concentrations of the test substances.

LFI Procedures:

Urine LFIs: The LFIs were used according to the manufacturer's recommended protocol with slight modifications [27]. Prior to use, all test materials were allowed to warm to room temperature. Stocks of increasing concentrations of fentanyl analytical standards (or other experimental compounds) were added to either pooled normal human urine or PBS. Then, a 100 µL aliquot of each test concentration was placed in a well of a 96 well plate. The test strip was then submerged (up to the line marked "MAX") into the dilutions for 10 s to 20 s. Following this, the strips were placed face up on a clean, non-porous surface (e.g. aluminum

foil) under a chemical fume hood. The strips were scored for a positive or negative response 5 min to 10 min following exposure to the experimental samples. Finally, images were recorded with a digital camera. An example of both a positive and negative fentanyl urine LFI strip is shown in Figure 1.

Saliva LFIs: These LFIs were used according to the manufacturer's recommended protocol with slight modifications [28]. Prior to use, all test materials were allowed to warm to room temperature. Briefly, the LFIs were removed from the packaging and placed flat on a hard surface. Stocks of increasing concentrations of fentanyl analytical standards (or other experimental compounds) were added to either pooled normal human saliva or PBS. Then, a 120 μ L aliquot of each sample was pipetted into the sample well of a test cassette. The test cassettes were scored 5 min to 10 min after exposure; images of the results were recorded with a digital camera. An example of a positive and a negative fentanyl saliva LFI cassette is shown in Figure 1.

Evaluation of Fentanyl Analogs and Related Compounds: For all compounds tested [except the positive fentanyl control and the 1:10 fentanyl:heroin mixture], a 0.1 μ g/mL working solution was created in PBS. The fentanyl positive control was diluted to a concentration of 2 μ g/mL (or 2000 ng/mL) in PBS. The 1:10 fentanyl:heroin mixture was created by a final heroin dilution of 2 μ g/mL and a final fentanyl dilution of 0.2 μ g/mL. For these tests, 100 μ L of the PBS-analyte solution was pipetted into the well of a 96-well plate and processed for analysis as stated above. For the saliva LFIs, 120 μ L of the PBS-analyte solution was pipetted into the well of the saliva cassette and process as stated above. For additional reference, the chemical structures of the fentanyl analogs are shown in Supplemental Figure 2. The red circles indicate modified areas of the compounds compared to fentanyl.

Case Samples: Street samples from adjudicated cases were obtained from a local forensic laboratory. Case #1 contained a mixture of fentanyl, heroin, and quinine; Case #2 contained a mixture of caffeine, mannitol, and fentanyl; Case #3 contained a mixture of acetyl fentanyl, fentanyl, and heroin; and Case #4 contained a mixture of alprazolam, etizolam, and fentanyl. For reference, the GC-MS chromatograph and the direct analysis in real time (DART)-MS spectra for each case sample are shown in Supplemental Figure 3.

Experimental Animal Exposure: Young adult male New Zealand White rabbits, weighing 2.5 kg to 2.7 kg, were procured from Covance, Inc. (Princeton, NJ) and pair-housed for 3 days before testing. Husbandry, feed/water provisions, and sanitation schedules were carried out in accordance with the *Guide for the Care and Use of Laboratory Animals* [29]. Rabbits were on a cycle of 12 h of light and 12 h of dark. Individual rabbit rooms were maintained at 21 ± 1 °C with 30 % to 70 % relative humidity. Rabbits were housed in a facility that was fully accredited by the Association for Assessment and Accreditation of Laboratory Care International. Rabbits were pair-housed in plastic cages on racks and provided with certified laboratory chow and reverse-osmosis water *ad libitum*, except during testing. Animal care and use for these experiments was approved by the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC) for U.S. Army ECBC (Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD).

Rabbit fentanyl exposures and all animal manipulations were conducted in accordance with a protocol approved by the U.S. Army ECBC IACUC. Exposures took place for each group (n = 4) while the animals were placed in a nose-only exposure chamber, 20 cm³ inner volume, with a flow rate of 19 L/min and under pressure of -0.5 in. H₂O. Chamber concentration was measured in real time using a TSI, Inc. Dust-Trak II, model 8530 aerosol monitor (Shoreview, MN). Two glass fiber filter pads and a 7-stage cascade impactor were used to control for chamber concentration and particle sizing, respectively. Filter pads and stages were analyzed using LC–tandem mass spectrometry (MS-MS) with an Agilent LC triple quadrupole 6490 system (Agilent Technologies, Inc.; Santa Clara, CA). Animal exposure durations were 5 min with 50 % effective concentration-time (ECT₅₀) doses of fentanyl. Unexposed rabbits were used as controls. Euthanasia was performed in accordance with the *American Veterinary Medical Association Guidelines for the Euthanasia of Animals: 2013 Edition* [30]. Rabbits did not have visual or auditory access to the euthanasia of other rabbits. The method of euthanasia was cervical dislocation of the C1 vertebra using a stainless steel RP-3000 rabbit and poultry wringer (MHS, LLC; West Grove, PA). The death of a rabbit was verified by three methods: loss of pupillary light response, retrobulbar reflex, and loss of respiration or cardiac arrest. Sample collection occurred immediately following the cervical dislocation procedure and samples were collected at 30 min, 4 h, and 24 h post-exposure Figure 2. Urine samples were collected using syringes during the necropsies. Saliva samples were collected by buccal lavage using 1 mL cold saline and suction to remove as much saliva as possible (~1.2 mL to 1.4 mL). Both urine and saliva samples were centrifuged at 1000 rpm for 5 min and then stored at -80 °C until use. Urine and saliva samples from the rabbits were processed for fentanyl detection as stated above.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION:

Evaluation of Urine-Specific Fentanyl LFIs:

We evaluated the sensitivity and LOD for both the COTS and custom urine-specific fentanyl LFIs by spiking pooled normal human urine with increasing concentrations of analytical standard fentanyl (Table 2). The LOD for the COTS LFI was determined to be 8 ng/mL and the sensitivity to be 5 ng/mL (75 %). The LOD for the custom LFI was considered 25 ng/mL and its sensitivity to be 8 ng/mL (8 %).

Evaluation of Saliva-Specific Fentanyl LFIs:

We evaluated the sensitivity and LODs for both the COTS and custom saliva-specific fentanyl LFIs by spiking pooled normal human saliva with increasing concentrations of analytical standard fentanyl (Table 3). Both the COTS and custom fentanyl LFIs detected 100 % of the spiked samples at a concentration of 100 ng/mL (LOD). Concentrations as low as 75 ng/mL were detected by the COTS LFIs (at a rate of 60 %), while this same concentration was detected in 69 % of the samples tested in the custom LFIs. Using the custom fentanyl saliva LFI, 50 ng/mL fentanyl was detected at a rate of 18 % (sensitivity). This concentration was undetectable using the COTS saliva LFIs. Interestingly, we were able to increase the sensitivity and LOD of the custom LFI, by switching the test matrix from saliva to PBS. The custom LFI detected 100 % of the samples containing 75 ng/mL fentanyl

(LOD). Also, the sensitivity increased to 25 ng/mL fentanyl (17 % positive) when the test matrix was changed to PBS.

Evaluation of Urine and Saliva from Fentanyl-Exposed Rabbits:

In order to determine if the LFIs were capable of detecting fentanyl in biofluids following an *in vivo* exposure, both urine and saliva samples were collected from adult male New Zealand white rabbits following an aerosolized fentanyl exposure (ECT₅₀, 5 min). Samples were collected at 30 min, 4 h, and 24 h post-exposure as stated above. The custom fentanyl LFIs (urine/saliva) were used for these experiments. The results of these tests are shown in Table 4. Urine collected from the exposed rabbits all tested positive for the presence of fentanyl at both 30 min and 4 h post-exposure. Urine from 3 of the 4 exposed rabbits detected the presence of fentanyl 24 h following the experimental exposure. In addition, only rabbit saliva collected 30 min after the exposure tested positive (3 out of 3; saliva from one rabbit was unreadable on the LFIs). No fentanyl was detected in the rabbit saliva at either 4 or 24 h post-exposure. These results suggest that the LFIs are capable of detecting the presence of fentanyl in urine (up to 24 h) and saliva (up to 30 min) following a potential exposure (Table 4); therefore, it might be possible to use these LFIs as forensic use presumptive tests in overdose cases.

Evaluation of LFI Reactivity for Fentanyl Analogs and Other Related Compounds:

Analogues of fentanyl have been increasingly discovered in lots of seized illegal opioids as well as during post-mortem evaluations of fatal overdoses [31–34]. Since these compounds are likely to be encountered in the field, it is important to determine if the LFIs designed to detect fentanyl will also cross-react with these compounds. To do this, a total of 11 commonly encountered fentanyl analogs were evaluated for reactivity with the custom urine and saliva fentanyl tests at a concentration of 100 ng/mL (Table 5). Five of the 11 fentanyl analogs evaluated tested positive in 100 % of the tests (acetyl fentanyl, cyclopropyl fentanyl, β -hydroxythiol fentanyl, methyl fentanyl, and norfentanyl) at this concentration in either LFI form factor. Butyryl fentanyl, crotonyl fentanyl, p-FIBF, and 2-furanyl fentanyl displayed positive results in ~40 % to 60 % of the tests. Carfentanil, methoxy fentanyl, and remifentanil were undetectable with these LFIs. Additional tests were performed to determine if these compounds were detectable at increased concentrations compared to the initial evaluations (Table 6). Increasing the concentrations of butyryl fentanyl, crotonyl fentanyl, p-FIBF, and 2-furanyl fentanyl to 0.5 μ g/mL caused these compounds to be detected in 100 % of the LFIs tested (urine- or saliva-based LFIs). Both carfentanil (10 μ g/mL) and methoxy fentanyl (1 μ g/mL) were still undetectable with increased concentration tests. In addition to fentanyl analogs, it is also important to evaluate these LFIs for the potential cross-reactivity with other compounds of interest, such as heroin, oxycodone, U-47700, and cocaine (Table 7). These compounds produced negative results in both the urine- and saliva-based LFIs at concentrations of 100 ng/mL. In addition, a 1:10 mixture of fentanyl (100 ng/mL) and heroin (1 μ g/mL) was evaluated for LFI reactivity; all tests produced positive results. Even though the LFIs failed to detect carfentanil, methoxy fentanyl, and remifentanil it is important to note that these LFIs did detect 8 of the 11 fentanyl analogs examined (Tables 5–7). This gives a large amount of coverage of the fentanyl analogs that could be encountered during a drug arrest involving opioids.

Evaluation of Fentanyl-Containing Case Samples:

Fentanyl is almost never found in pure form in street drugs; it is almost always found as a mixture with other illegal substances (e.g. heroin) as well as cutting agents or diluents. Since this is the case, it is important to determine if the fentanyl LFIs are capable of detecting the presence of fentanyl in samples that could likely be encountered in the field. To do this, four fentanyl-containing case samples previously seized by law enforcement were examined. In these studies, each case sample was tested against 6 custom urine-specific LFIs. All LFIs displayed a single band in the control zone, therefore, indicating positive results for fentanyl in each of the case samples examined (Table 8). The actual LFI result images are shown in Supplemental Figure 4. These results indicate that the LFIs used for this study are capable of detecting fentanyl in actual case samples.

CONCLUSIONS:

In this study, we evaluated LFIs developed by Express Diagnostics Int'l, Inc. for the detection of the synthetic opioid fentanyl in urine, saliva, and PBS [27, 28]. The LOD for the COTS versions of the urine- and saliva-based LFIs were 8 and 100 ng/mL, respectively. The sensitivity of these LFIs were determined to be 5 ng/mL (urine) and 75 ng/mL (saliva). The custom urine LFI had different LODs and sensitivities compared to the COTS versions. We identified the LOD to be 25 ng/mL and the sensitivity to be 8 ng/mL (Table 2). For the custom saliva LFIs, the LOD was determined to be 100 ng/mL when fentanyl was diluted in saliva and 75 ng/mL when diluted in PBS (Table 3). The sensitivities increased in the custom saliva LFIs. The sensitivity of these assays were 50 ng/mL for saliva and 25 ng/mL for PBS. In addition to laboratory spiked samples, the custom urine LFIs detected fentanyl in rabbits up to 24 h following a fentanyl exposure (Table 4). Fentanyl was only detected in saliva 30 min following an exposure. We also demonstrated that several fentanyl analogs could be detected using these LFIs (acetyl fentanyl, butyryl fentanyl, crotonyl fentanyl cyclopropyl fentanyl, p-FIBF, 2-furanyl fentanyl, and β -hydroxythiol fentanyl) (Table 5–6). Finally, we demonstrated that these LFIs could detect the presence of fentanyl in actual case samples known to contain fentanyl (Table 8). In conclusion, these data associated with the fentanyl-directed LFIs have demonstrated the potential to be used in the field by law enforcement officers as presumptive fentanyl tests.

Supplementary Material

Refer to Web version on PubMed Central for supplementary material.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS:

The authors would like to thank Dr. Kelly Basi and Mrs. Davi Kristovich (U.S. Army ECBC; Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD) for management and administrative support during this study. Conclusions and opinions presented here are those of the authors and are not the official policy of the U.S. Army, ECBC, or the U.S. Government. Certain commercial products are identified in order to adequately specify the procedure; this does not imply endorsement or recommendation by NIST, nor does it imply that such products are necessarily the best available for the purpose. Funding for this project was provided by the Department of Homeland Security Science & Technology Directorate (HSHQPM-15-X-00119; HSHQPM-17-X-00036).

Abbreviations:

COTS	commercial-off-the-shelf
DART	direct analysis in real time
ECBC	Edgewood Chemical Biological Center
ECT₅₀	50% effective concentration-time
FIBF	p-fluoroisobutyl fentanyl
FYL	fentanyl
GC	gas chromatography
IACUC	Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee
LFI	lateral flow immunoassay
LC	liquid chromatography
LOD	limit of detection
MS	mass spectrometry
NIST	National Institute of Standards & Technology
PBS	phosphate buffered saline

REFERENCES:

- [1]. Salam M, The Opioid Epidemic: A Crisis Years in the Making, New York Times, The New York Times Company, New York, New York, 2017.
- [2]. National Institute on Drug Abuse (NIDA), Overdose Death Rates. <https://www.drugabuse.gov/related-topics/trends-statistics/overdose-death-rates>, (2018).
- [3]. Cowles CE Jr., Mitchell J, Stepp JE, Bewley VZ, Carfentanil: A New and Often Unrecognized Threat, J Spec Oper Med 17(3) (2017) 120–122.
- [4]. Papich MG, Principles of analgesic drug therapy, Semin Vet Med Surg (Small Anim) 12(2) (1997) 80–93. [PubMed: 9159065]
- [5]. Van Bever WF, Niemegeers CJ, Schellekens KH, Janssen PA, N-4-Substituted 1-(2-arylethyl)-4-piperidiny-N-phenylpropanamides, a novel series of extremely potent analgesics with unusually high safety margin, Arzneimittelforschung 26(8) (1976) 1548–51. [PubMed: 12771]
- [6]. Scholz J, Steinfath M, Schulz M, Clinical pharmacokinetics of alfentanil, fentanyl and sufentanil. An update, Clin Pharmacokinet 31(4) (1996) 275–92. [PubMed: 8896944]
- [7]. Misailidi N, Papoutsis I, Nikolaou P, Dona A, Spiliopoulou C, Athanaselis S, Fentanyls continue to replace heroin in the drug arena: the cases of ocfentanil and carfentanil, Forensic Toxicol 36(1) (2018) 12–32. [PubMed: 29367860]
- [8]. Shanks KG, Behonick GS, Detection of Carfentanil by LC-MS-MS and Reports of Associated Fatalities in the USA, J Anal Toxicol 41(6) (2017) 466–472. [PubMed: 28830120]
- [9]. Haigh JC, Lee LJ, Schweinsburg RE, Immobilization of polar bears with carfentanil, J Wildl Dis 19(2) (1983) 140–4. [PubMed: 6887436]
- [10]. Jessup DA, Clark WE, Jones KR, Clark R, Lance WR, Immobilization of free-ranging desert bighorn sheep, tule elk, and wild horses, using carfentanil and xylazine: reversal with naloxone,

diprenorphine, and yohimbine, J Am Vet Med Assoc 187(11) (1985) 1253–4. [PubMed: 4077657]

- [11]. Seal US, Schmitt SM, Peterson RO, Carfentanil and xylazine for immobilization of moose (*Alces alces*) on Isle Royale, J Wildl Dis 21(1) (1985) 48–51. [PubMed: 3981744]
- [12]. Marinetti LJ, Ehlers BJ, A series of forensic toxicology and drug seizure cases involving illicit fentanyl alone and in combination with heroin, cocaine or heroin and cocaine, J Anal Toxicol 38(8) (2014) 592–8. [PubMed: 25217552]
- [13]. Rondinone N, 11 Hartford SWAT Officers Exposed To Heroin, Fentanyl During Drug Raid, Hartford Courant, Hartford, CT, 2016.
- [14]. Cooper D, Jacob M, Allen A, Identification of fentanyl derivatives, J Forensic Sci 31(2) (1986) 511–28. [PubMed: 3711827]
- [15]. Philp M, Fu S, A review of chemical ‘spot’ tests: A presumptive illicit drug identification technique, Drug Test Anal. 10 (2018) 95–108. [PubMed: 28915346]
- [16]. Namera A, Nakamoto A, Saito T, Nagao M, Colorimetric detection and chromatographic analyses of designer drugs in biological materials: a comprehensive review, Forensic Toxicol 29(1) (2011) 1–24.
- [17]. Gabrielson R, Sanders T, How a \$2 roadside drug test sends innocent people to jail, New York Times, The New York Times Group, New York, NY, 2016.
- [18]. Lin DL, Wang SM, Wu CH, Liu RH, Chemical derivatization for the analysis of drugs by GC-MS - A conceptual review, J Food Drug Anal 16(1) (2008) 1–10.
- [19]. Van Nimmen NF, Veulemans HA, Validated GC-MS analysis for the determination of residual fentanyl in applied Durogesic reservoir and Durogesic D-Trans matrix transdermal patches, J Chromatography B 846(no. 1–2) (2007) 264–272.
- [20]. Salminen T, Knuutila A, Barkoff AM, Mertsola J, He Q, A rapid lateral flow immunoassay for serological diagnosis of pertussis, Vaccine 36(11) (2018) 1429–1434. [PubMed: 29426656]
- [21]. Mozola M, Biswas P, Viator R, Feldpausch E, Foti D, Li L, Le QN, Alles S, Rice J, Validation of the Reveal(RR) 2.0 Group D1 Salmonella Test for Detection of Salmonella Enteritidis in Raw Shell Eggs and Poultry-Associated Matrixes, J AOAC Int 99(4) (2016) 1017–1024. [PubMed: 27214854]
- [22]. Valles SM, Strong CA, Callcott AM, Development of a lateral flow immunoassay for rapid field detection of the red imported fire ant, *Solenopsis invicta* (Hymenoptera: Formicidae), Anal Bioanal Chem 408(17) (2016) 4693–703. [PubMed: 27108280]
- [23]. Ramage JG, Prentice KW, DePalma L, Venkateswaran KS, Chivukula S, Chapman C, Bell M, Datta S, Singh A, Hoffmaster A, Sarwar J, Parameswaran N, Joshi M, Thirunavkkarasu N, Krishnan V, Morse S, Avila JR, Sharma S, Estacio PL, Stanker L, Hodge DR, Pillai SP, Comprehensive Laboratory Evaluation of a Highly Specific Lateral Flow Assay for the Presumptive Identification of *Bacillus anthracis* Spores in Suspicious White Powders and Environmental Samples, Health Secur 14(5) (2016) 351–65. [PubMed: 27661796]
- [24]. Plouffe BD, Murthy SK, Fluorescence-based lateral flow assays for rapid oral fluid roadside detection of cannabis use, Electrophoresis 38(3–4) (2017) 501–506. [PubMed: 27862053]
- [25]. Mpoza E, Mukaremera L, Kundura DA, Akampurira A, Luggya T, Tadeo KK, Pastick KA, Bridge SC, Tugume L, Kiggundu R, Musubire AK, Williams DA, Muzoora C, Nalintya E, Rajasingham R, Rhein J, Boulware DR, Meza DB, Abassi M, Evaluation of a point-of-care immunoassay test kit ‘StrongStep’ for cryptococcal antigen detection, PLoS One 13(1) (2018) e0190652. [PubMed: 29304090]
- [26]. Connor TH, Smith JP, New approaches to wipe sampling methods for antineoplastic and other hazardous drugs in healthcare settings, Pharm Technol Hosp Pharm 1(3) (2016) 107–114. [PubMed: 28459100]
- [27]. I. Express Diagnostics Int’l, Fentanyl Rapid Test Dipstick (Urine), Blue Earth, MN, 2017.
- [28]. I. Express Diagnostics Int’l, FYL Rapid Test Cassette (Oral Fluid), Blue Earth, MN, 2017.
- [29]. National Research Council, Guide for the Care and Use of Laboratory Animals, The National Academies Press, 2011.
- [30]. American Veterinary Medical Association, AVMA Guidelines for the Euthanasia of Animals: 2013 Edition, Schaumburg, IL, 2013.

- [31]. Blachman-Forshay J, Nolan ML, McAteer JM, Paone D, Estimating the Risk of Exposure to Fentanyl in New York City: Testing Drug Residue in Used Syringes, *Am J Public Health* 108(12) (2018) 1666–1668. [PubMed: 30359110]
- [32]. Concheiro M, Chesser R, Pardi J, Cooper G, Postmortem Toxicology of New Synthetic Opioids, *Front Pharmacol* 9 (2018) 1210. [PubMed: 30416445]
- [33]. Moody MT, Diaz S, Shah P, Papsun D, Logan BK, Analysis of fentanyl analogs and novel synthetic opioids in blood, serum/plasma, and urine in forensic casework, *Drug Test Anal* 10(9) (2018) 1358–1367. [PubMed: 29633785]
- [34]. O'Donnell J, Gladden RM, Mattson CL, Kariisa M, Notes from the Field: Overdose Deaths with Carfentanil and Other Fentanyl Analogs Detected - 10 States, July 2016-June 2017, *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep* 67(27) (2018) 767–768. [PubMed: 30001560]

Figure 1: Schematic of competitive urine and saliva fentanyl LFIs.

A liquid sample is placed on the absorbent sample pad by either dipping (urine) or pipetting (saliva) which allows capillary action to move the liquid up the strip to the test and control lines containing the capture antibodies. Since these are competitive LFIs, the appearance of a single band in the control zone of the LFI is considered a positive result (right side LFIs), while the appearance of colored bands in both the control and test zones is considered a negative result (left side LFIs). (–) negative result; (+) positive result; C: control zone; FYL: fentanyl; LFI: lateral flow immunoassay; T: test zone; S: sample

Figure 2: Schematic of sample collection from fentanyl exposed rabbits.

Adult male New Zealand white rabbits were untreated or exposed to 1 x EC₅₀ aerosolized fentanyl for 5 min. Urine and saliva samples were collected at 30 min, 4 h, and 24 h post-exposure. A total of 28 samples were collected for analysis.

Table 1:

List of test compounds.

Fentanyl Analogs	Metabolite
Acetyl Fentanyl	Norfentanyl
Butyryl Fentanyl	Related Compounds
Carfentanil	Heroin
Crotonyl Fentanyl	Oxycodone
p-Fluoroisobutyryl Fentanyl (FIBF)	U-47700
2-Furanyl Fentanyl	Mixture
β -Hydroxythiol Fentanyl	1:10 Fentanyl:Heroin
Methoxy Fentanyl	Other
Methyl Fentanyl	Cocaine
Remifentanil	

Table 2:

Analysis of urine-based fentanyl LFIs. Results are reported as the number of positive samples over the total number of samples. The percentage of positive results are shown in parenthesis. Concentrations with 100 % detection of fentanyl are shown in bold. COTS: commercial-off-the-shelf; FYL: fentanyl; LFI: lateral flow immunoassay

Test Matrix: Urine	# Positive Samples/Total (%)	
Fentanyl Concentration (ng/mL)	COTS FYL LFI	Custom FYL LFI
2000	14/14 (100)	9/9 (100)
150	8/8 (100)	Not Evaluated
100	12/12 (100)	8/8 (100)
75	8/8 (100)	Not Evaluated
50	16/16 (100)	12/12 (100)
25	12/12 (100)	13/13 (100)
10	16/16 (100)	2/13 (15)
8	8/8 (100)	1/13 (8)
5	12/16 (75)	0/13 (0)
1	0/8 (0)	Not Evaluated
0	0/14 (0)	0/11 (0)

Table 3:

Analysis of saliva-based fentanyl LFIs. Results are reported as the number of positive samples over the total number of samples. The percentage of positive results are shown in parenthesis. Concentrations with 100 % detection of fentanyl are shown in bold. The third column is results using PBS instead of a saliva matrix.

COTS: commercial-off-the-shelf; FYL: fentanyl; LFI: lateral flow immunoassay; PBS: phosphate buffered saline

Test Matrix: Saliva	# Positive Samples/Total (%)		
Fentanyl Concentration (ng/mL)	COTS FYL LFI	Custom FYL LFI	Custom Saliva LFI (PBS)
2000	12/12 (100)	15/15 (100)	9/9 (100)
150	12/12 (100)	17/17 (100)	12/12 (100)
100	12/12 (100)	17/17 (100)	12/12 (100)
75	9/15 (60)	11/16 (69)	12/12 (100)
50	0/15 (0)	3/17 (18)	8/12 (67)
25	0/15 (0)	0/17 (0)	2/12 (17)
10	0/12 (0)	0/17 (0)	0/12 (0)
5	0/8 (0)	0/14 (0)	0/12 (0)
1	0/8 (0)	0/9 (0)	Not Evaluated
0	0/12 (0)	0/15 (0)	0/10 (0)

Table 4:

Sample analysis from fentanyl exposed rabbits. Results are reported as the number of positive samples over the total number of samples. The percentage of positive results are shown in parenthesis. Concentrations with 100 % detection of fentanyl are shown in bold. FYL: fentanyl; LFI: lateral flow immunoassay

		# Positive Samples/Total (%)	
Condition	Rabbit Number	Custom Urine LFI	Custom Saliva LFI
Unexposed	207	0/6 (0)	0/4 (0)
	208	0/6 (0)	0/4 (0)
30 min Post-Exposure	195	6/6 (100)	4/4 (100)
	196	6/6 (100)	Failed
	199	6/6 (100)	4/4 (100)
	200	6/6 (100)	4/4 (100)
4 hours Post-Exposure	197	6/6 (100)	0/4 (0)
	198	6/6 (100)	0/4 (0)
	201	6/6 (100)	0/4 (0)
	202	6/6 (100)	0/4 (0)
24 hours Post-Exposure	203	6/6 (100)	0/4 (0)
	204	0/6 (0)	0/4 (0)
	205	6/6 (100)	0/4 (0)
	206	6/6 (100)	0/4 (0)
Human Urine (2 µg/mL FYL)		6/6 (100)	
Human Urine		0/6 (0)	
Human Saliva (2 µg/mL FYL)			4/4 (100)
Human Saliva			0/4 (0)

Table 5:

Analysis of fentanyl analogs. Results are reported as the number of positive samples over the total number of samples. The percentage of positive results are shown in parenthesis. Compounds in bold represent 100 % detection of the fentanyl analog. LFI: lateral flow immunoassay

Test Matrix: PBS	# Positive Samples/Total (%)	
Fentanyl Analog (0.1 µg/mL)	Custom Urine LFI	Custom Saliva LFI
Acetyl Fentanyl	7/7 (100)	7/7 (100)
Butyryl Fentanyl	3/7 (43)	2/7 (29)
Carfentanil	0/4 (0)	0/4 (0)
Crotonyl Fentanyl	3/7 (43)	2/7 (29)
Cyclopropyl Fentanyl	7/7 (100)	7/7 (100)
p-Fluoroisobutyryl Fentanyl (FIBF)	4/7 (57)	1/7 (14)
2-Furanyl Fentanyl	4/7 (57)	4/7 (57)
β-Hydroxythiol Fentanyl	7/7 (100)	7/7 (100)
Methoxy Fentanyl	0/7 (0)	0/7 (0)
Methyl Fentanyl	7/7 (100)	7/7 (100)
Norfentanyl	7/7 (100)	7/7 (100)
Remifentanil	0/4 (0)	0/4 (0)

Table 6:

Analysis of increased concentration of fentanyl analogs. Results are reported as the number of positive samples over the total number of samples. The percentage of positive results are shown in parenthesis. Compounds in bold represent 100 % detection of the fentanyl analog. LFI: lateral flow immunoassay; PBS: phosphate buffered saline

Test Matrix: PBS	# Positive Samples/Total (%)	
Test Compounds	Custom Urine LFI	Custom Saliva LFI
Fentanyl (2 µg/mL)	9/9 (100)	9/9 (100)
Butyryl Fentanyl (0.5 µg/mL)	4/4 (100)	1/1 (100)
Crotonyl Fentanyl (0.5 µg/mL)	4/4 (100)	1/1 (100)
p-Fluoroisobutyryl Fentanyl (0.5 µg/mL)	4/4 (100)	1/1 (100)
2-Furanyl Fentanyl (0.5 µg/mL)	4/4 (100)	1/1 (100)
Methoxy Fentanyl (1 µg/mL)	0/4 (0)	0/1 (0)
Carfentanil (10 µg/mL)	0/4 (0)	0/1 (0)

Table 7:

Analysis of other compounds of interest. Results are reported as the number of positive samples over the total number of samples. The percentage of positive results are shown in parenthesis. Compounds in bold represent 100 % detection of the fentanyl analog. LFI: lateral flow immunoassay; PBS: phosphate buffered saline

Test Matrix: PBS	# Positive Samples/Total (%)	
Other Compounds (0.1 µg/mL)	Custom Urine LFI	Custom Saliva LFI
Fentanyl	8/8 (100)	7/7 (100)
Heroin	0/7 (0)	0/7 (0)
Oxycodone	0/7 (0)	0/7 (0)
U-47700	0/7 (0)	0/7 (0)
1:10 Fentanyl:Heroin Mixture	7/7 (100)	7/7 (100)
Cocaine	0/7 (0)	0/7 (0)
PBS	0/8 (0)	0/8 (0)

Table 8:

Analysis of case samples. Tests were performed using the custom urine fentanyl LFIs. Results are reported as the number of positive samples over the total number of samples. The percentage of positive results are shown in parenthesis. Compounds in bold represent 100 % detection of the fentanyl analog. LFI: lateral flow immunoassay

Case #	Contents	# Positive Samples/Total (%)
1	Fentanyl, Heroin, Quinine	6/6 (100)
2	Caffeine, Mannitol, Fentanyl	6/6 (100)
3	Acetyl Fentanyl, Fentanyl, Heroin	6/6 (100)
4	Alprazolam, Etizolam, Fentanyl	6/6 (100)