

1 **Comparison of Four Molecular *In Vitro* Diagnostic Assays for the Detection of SARS-CoV-2 in**
2 **Nasopharyngeal Specimens**

3

4 Running title: Comparison of Four Molecular Assays for SARS-CoV-2

5

6 Wei Zhen¹, Ryhana Manji¹, Elizabeth Smith¹, Gregory J. Berry^{1,2}

7

8 1. Infectious Disease Diagnostics, Northwell Health Laboratories, Lake Success, NY

9 2. Department of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine, The Donald and Barbara Zucker School of

10 Medicine at Hofstra/Northwell

11

12 Corresponding author:

13 Gregory J. Berry, Ph.D., D(ABMM), Infectious Disease Diagnostics, Northwell Health Laboratories, 450

14 Lakeville Rd., Lake Success, NY 11042

15

16 Phone: 516.224.8506, FAX: 718.224.6585; email: gberry1@northwell.edu

17 **Abstract (limit 250 words):**

18 The novel human coronavirus SARS-CoV-2 was first discovered in the city of Wuhan, Hubei
19 province, China, causing an outbreak of pneumonia in January 2020. As of April 10, 2020, the virus has
20 rapidly disseminated to over 200 countries and territories, causing more than 1.6 million confirmed cases
21 of COVID-19 and 97,000 deaths worldwide. The clinical presentation of COVID-19 is fairly non-specific,
22 and symptoms overlap with other seasonal respiratory infections concurrently circulating in the
23 population. Further, it is estimated that up to 80% of infected individuals experience mild symptoms or
24 are asymptomatic, confounding efforts to reliably diagnose COVID-19 empirically. To support infection
25 control measures, there is an urgent need for rapid and accurate molecular diagnostics to identify COVID-
26 19 positive patients. In the present study, we have evaluated the analytical sensitivity and clinical
27 performance of four SARS-CoV-2 molecular diagnostic assays granted Emergency Use Authorization by
28 the FDA using nasopharyngeal swabs from symptomatic patients. This information is crucial for both
29 laboratories and clinical teams, as decisions on which testing platform to implement are made.

30

31 **Keywords:** SARS-CoV-2, COVID-19, EUA, molecular diagnostics, real-time RT-PCR, nasopharyngeal

32 **Introduction:**

33 A novel human virus, severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2), was
34 identified as the causative agent for an outbreak of viral pneumonia that began in Wuhan, China at the
35 end of 2019 (1). On March 11, the SARS-CoV-2 epidemic was escalated to the level of a global pandemic
36 by the World Health Organization (WHO) (1). The WHO has named the illness caused by SARS-CoV-2 as
37 coronavirus disease-2019 (COVID-19). COVID-19 has since continued to spread across the globe, and as of
38 April 10, 2020, over 1.6 million cases have been confirmed in more than 200 countries and territories,
39 causing over ~97,000 deaths. More than ~460,000 confirmed COVID-19 cases and ~16,000 deaths have
40 been reported in the United States according to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) and
41 database from the Center for System Science and Engineering (CSSE) at Johns Hopkins University (2, 3).

42 SARS-CoV-2 (COVID-19) is the seventh coronavirus known to infect humans; SARS-CoV, MERS-CoV
43 and SARS-CoV-2 can cause severe disease, whereas seasonal coronavirus HKU1, NL63, OC43 and 229E are
44 associated with mild symptoms (4). Coronaviruses are a diverse family of large RNA viruses that are
45 known to be involved in zoonotic transmission between a wide variety of animals and humans.
46 Coronaviruses generally target epithelial cells in the respiratory and gastrointestinal tracts, and viral
47 shedding can occur from these sites. Infection caused by coronaviruses can therefore typically be
48 transmitted through several different routes, including aerosol and fecal-to-oral, with fomites often
49 playing an important role in the infection cycle (5). Notably, coronaviruses possess a distinctive
50 morphological feature, a ring of spike proteins on the outer surface of the virus, giving the appearance of
51 a halo or corona. In addition to inspiring the name of the coronavirus genus, the spike proteins are also
52 essential for infection of host cells. The SARS-CoV-2 spike protein recognizes and binds to the human
53 cellular receptor angiotensin-converting enzyme 2 (ACE2), then subsequently mediates fusion of the viral
54 and host cell membranes, allowing the virus to gain entry (6, 7). The ACE2 receptor is found on epithelial
55 cells of the lungs and small intestines (8).

56 Infection with SARS-CoV-2 can cause mild to severe respiratory illness and symptoms include
57 fever, cough and shortness of breath. However, some populations experience severe, rapidly progressive
58 and fulminant disease. This population includes: older adults and people who have serious underlying
59 medical conditions (e.g. heart disease, diabetes, lung disease and immunosuppression) (9). Unfortunately,
60 many elements, some intrinsic to the virus and others seasonal, have lessened the effectiveness of
61 traditional infection control measures. The combination of high rates of human-to-human transmission
62 ($R_0 = 2.0-2.5$), stability of the virus in aerosols and on surfaces, the fairly non-specific clinical presentation
63 of COVID-19, along with co-incidence with the active season of other respiratory viruses (e.g., influenza,
64 respiratory syncytial virus (RSV)) in many parts of the world, together present a major challenge to stop
65 the pandemic from spiraling into a more severe global health emergency (9, 10).

66 During the early stages of the epidemic, both national and international agencies rushed to
67 initiate the process of mass production of test reagents and issued an Emergency Use Authorization (EUA)
68 for the US CDC COVID-19 real-time RT-PCR assay (11). Despite the collective effort, laboratories are still
69 facing reagent supply shortages, lack of instrument access, an inability to perform high-complexity testing
70 as well as facing increased staffing needs, leaving a gap in the ability of healthcare providers to rapidly
71 diagnose and manage patients. The need to implement a sensitive, accessible, and rapid diagnostic test
72 for the detection of COVID-19 is warranted. In this study, we evaluated the analytical and clinical
73 performance of four SARS-CoV-2 molecular diagnostic assays granted EUA by the FDA, including the
74 modified CDC, DiaSorin Molecular, GenMark, and Hologic assays. These assays are authorized for the
75 qualitative detection of SARS-CoV-2 in clinical specimens obtained from symptomatic patients and were
76 evaluated using nasopharyngeal swab specimens.

77 **Materials and Methods**

78 **Specimen collection and storage.** Sterile nylon, Dacron or rayon swabs with flexible plastic shafts were
79 used to collect nasopharyngeal specimens from each patient. After collection, the swabs were placed into
80 3 ml of sterile Universal Transport Medium (UTM; various manufacturers). Specimens were tested as soon
81 as possible after collection, or if testing was delayed, they were stored for up to 72 h at 2-8°C after
82 collection. Following routine testing, samples were stored frozen ($\leq -80^{\circ}\text{C}$) until comparator testing could
83 be completed.

84
85 **Study design.** A total of 104 retrospective and prospective nasopharyngeal specimens originally submitted
86 for routine COVID-19 testing at Northwell Health Laboratories on the GenMark ePlex SARS-CoV-2 panel
87 were selected for this study. Of the 104 specimens analyzed, 51 were positive and 53 were negative
88 samples. Retrospective frozen samples were thawed, pipetted into separate aliquots, and were tested by
89 the modified CDC assay, DiaSorin Molecular Simplexa COVID-19 Direct assay, and Hologic Panther Fusion®
90 SARS-CoV-2 assay in parallel. Manufacturer's specifications are summarized in **Table 1**. The study
91 population included patients of all ages and both genders presenting with signs and/or symptoms of
92 COVID-19 infection, and low viral loads determined by high cycle threshold (Ct) results generated during
93 routine testing.

94
95 **The New York SARS-CoV-2 Real-time Reverse Transcriptase (RT)-PCR Diagnostic EUA Panel (Modified**
96 **CDC assay).** This assay is a modified version of the CDC 2019-Novel Coronavirus (2019-nCoV) Real-Time
97 RT-PCR Diagnostic EUA Panel validated by the Wadsworth Center using the same primer and probe sets
98 as the CDC assay for nucleocapsid (N) gene N1 and N2 targets and human RNase P gene (RP), but excluding
99 the N3 primer and probe set. A volume of 110 μL patient specimen was extracted by the NucliSENS
100 easyMAG platform (BioMérieux, Durham, NC) according to manufacturer's instructions, with a nucleic

101 acid elution volume of 110 μ L. For each specimen, three Master Mix sets including N1, N2, and RNase P
102 were prepared, and 15 μ L of each master mix was dispensed into appropriate wells, followed by 5 μ L of
103 extracted sample. Each run also included a No Template Control (NTC), Negative Extraction Control and a
104 SARS-CoV-2 Positive Control. Amplification was performed on the Applied Biosystems® 7500 Fast Dx Real-
105 Time PCR System. The results interpretation algorithm for reporting a positive specimen requires both N1
106 and N2 targets to be detected.

107
108 **DiaSorin Molecular Simplexa COVID-19 Direct EUA.** Testing with the DiaSorin Molecular Simplexa COVID-
109 19 Direct EUA assay was performed according to the manufacturer's instructions for use. 50 μ L of Simplexa
110 COVID-19 Direct Kit reaction mix (MOL4150) was added to the “R” well of the 8-well Direct Amplification
111 Disc (DAD) followed by adding 50 μ L of non-extracted nasopharyngeal swab (NPS) sample (collected in
112 approximately 3 mL of Universal Transport Media (UTM, Copan)) to the “SAMPLE” well. Data collection
113 and analysis was performed with LIAISON® MDX Studio software. The assay targets two different regions
114 of the SARS-CoV-2 genome, S gene and ORF1ab, differentiated with FAM and JOE fluorescent probes. An
115 RNA internal control (Q670 probe) is used to detect RT-PCR failure and/or inhibition. The results
116 interpretation algorithm for reporting a positive specimen requires only one of the two targets to be
117 detected (S or ORF1ab gene).

118
119 **GenMark ePlex SARS-CoV-2 EUA panel.** Testing with the ePlex SARS-CoV-2 panel was performed
120 according to the manufacturer's instructions for use. Briefly, after vortexing for 3-5 seconds, 200 μ L of the
121 primary NPS sample was aspirated into the sample delivery device (SDD) provided with the ePlex SARS-
122 CoV-2 panel kit and vortexed once again for 10 seconds. The entire volume of the SDD was dispensed into
123 the sample loading port of the SARS-CoV-2 test cartridge, followed by firmly pushing down on the cap to
124 securely seal the sample delivery port. Each cartridge was bar-coded and scanned with the ePlex

125 instrument and inserted into an available bay. Upon the completion of the assay run, the ePlex SARS-CoV-
126 2 panel report was generated. The GenMark ePlex SARS-CoV-2 panel amplifies and detects the 2019-nCoV
127 virus nucleocapsid (N) gene.

128

129 **Hologic Panther Fusion® SARS-CoV-2 EUA.** The Fusion SARS-CoV-2 assay was performed according to the
130 manufacturer's instructions for use. 500 µL of NPS specimens were lysed by transferring them to a
131 Specimen Lysis Tube containing 710 µL lysis buffer. Input volume per sample for extraction is 360 µL. The
132 Internal Control-S (IC-S) was added to each test specimen and controls via the working Panther Fusion
133 Capture Reagent-S (wFCR-S). Hybridized nucleic acid was then separated from the specimen in a magnetic
134 field. After wash steps, the elution step occurs and outputs 50µL of purified RNA. Then 5µL of eluted
135 nucleic acid is transferred to a Panther Fusion reaction tube already containing oil and reconstituted
136 mastermix. The Panther Fusion® SARS-CoV-2 assay amplifies and detects two conserved regions of the
137 ORF1ab gene in the same fluorescence channel. The two regions are not differentiated and amplification
138 of either or both regions leads to a fluorescent ROX signal. The results interpretation algorithm for
139 reporting a positive specimen requires only one of the two targets to be detected (ORF1a or ORF1b gene).

140 **Table 1.** Overview of four molecular *in vitro* diagnostic EUA assays used in this study.

	2019-Novel Coronavirus (2019- nCoV)	Simplexa™ COVID-19 Direct	ePlex SARS-CoV-2 Test	SARS-CoV-2 Assay
Manufacturer	Modified CDC	Diasorin Molecular	GenMark	Hologic
Sample type	NPS, OPS, Sputum	NPS, NS, BAL	NPS	NPS, OPS
Sample volume required (μl)	110	50	200	500
Extraction required	Yes (manual)	No	Yes (automated)	Yes (automated)
Detection platform/System	ABI 7500 Fast Dx	LIAISON® MDX	ePlex®	Panther Fusion®
Target region of SARS- CoV-2	N (N1 & N2)	S and ORF1ab	N	ORF1ab
Analytical sensitivity per claim	500 copies /mL	500 copies /mL	100,000 copies /mL	1x10 ⁻² TCID ₅₀ /mL

141

142 **Analytical Sensitivity.** Limit of detection (LoD) was performed using a SARS-CoV-2 synthetic RNA
143 quantified control (SARS-CoV-2 Standard) containing five gene targets (E, N, ORF1ab, RdRP and S Genes
144 of SARS-CoV-2) from Exact Diagnostics (SKU COV019, Fort Worth, TX). A starting concentration of 200,000
145 copies/mL control was used to generate a dilution panel. The control was diluted in THE Ambion® RNA
146 Storage Solution (Catalog No. AM7001, ThermoFisher Scientific) and aliquoted for testing in order to
147 obtain a maximum of 12 replicates at the following concentrations: 20,000, 2,000, 1,000, 500, 100, 50,
148 and 5 copies/mL. The LoD was determined by two methods: Positive rate and Probit analyses. Positive
149 rate was determined as the lowest dilution at which all replicates resulted positive with a 100% detection
150 rate. The LoD by Probit was determined as the lowest detectable dilution at which the synthetic RNA
151 quantified control (copies/mL) resulted positive with a 95% probability of detection. The final LoD was
152 based on Probit analyses results and on each manufacturer's claimed results interpretation algorithm.

153

154 **Discordant Analysis.** Results were considered discordant when one molecular assay did not agree
155 qualitatively (Detected or Not Detected) with the other three assay results. In such cases, molecular
156 testing was repeated for the discordant assay.

157

158 **Statistical methods.** The reference standard was established as a "consensus result" which was defined
159 as the result obtained by at least three of the four molecular diagnostic assays. Percent sensitivity,
160 specificity, positivity rate, Kappa, Probit, and two-sided (upper/lower) 95% confidence interval (CI) were
161 calculated using Microsoft® Office Excel 365 MSO software (Microsoft, Redmond, WA). The sensitivity was
162 calculated as $TP/(TP + FN) \times 100$, the specificity was calculated as $TN/(TN + FP) \times 100$, where TP is true-
163 positive results, FN is false-negative results, TN is true-negative results, and FP is false-positive results.
164 Cohen's kappa values (κ) were also calculated as a measure of overall agreement, with values categorized
165 as almost-perfect (>0.90), strong (0.80 to 0.90), moderate (0.60 to 0.79), weak (0.40 to 0.59), minimal

166 (0.21 to 0.39), or none (0 to 0.20) (12-13). Probit analyses were used for the copies/mL determination of
167 the analytical sensitivity study. The dose-response 95th percentile (with 95% confidence interval [CI])
168 model was assessed using the Finney and Stevens calculations (14).

169 **Results**

170 **Analytical Sensitivity.** A serial dilution panel of SARS-CoV-2 control was tested to determine the LoD,
171 defined as the minimum concentration with detection of 100% by positive rate and 95% by Probit analysis.
172 The LoD established by percent positive rate ranged from 1,000 copies/mL by both the GenMark and the
173 modified CDC assays to 50 copies/mL by the DiaSorin Molecular assay (**Table 2**). The LoD results were
174 further subjected to Probit analysis. The 95% detection limit of the CDC assay was 779 ± 27 copies/mL for
175 the N1 gene and 356 ± 20 copies/mL for the N2 gene. For the DiaSorin Molecular assay, the 95% detection
176 limit was 39 ± 23 copies/mL for the S gene and 602 ± 28 copies/mL for ORF1ab. For the Hologic assay, the
177 95% detection limit was 83 ± 36 copies/mL for ORF1ab. Probit analysis could not be performed for the
178 GenMark assay (**Table 2**). The final LoD, according to the assay results interpretation algorithm from each
179 manufacturer, ranged from 1,000 copies/mL by the GenMark assay to 39 ± 23 copies/mL by the DiaSorin
180 Molecular assay (**Table 2**).

181 **Table 2.** Summary of Limit of Detection results.

Molecular Assay	Positive Rate % ^a						Probit (95% CI) ^{bc} copies/mL	Final LoD ^{cd} copies/mL	
	No. of replicates detected at each dilution (copies/mL)								
	2,000	1,000	500	100	50	5			
Modified CDC	N1	4/4 (100%)	8/8 (100%)	7/10 (70%)	1/10 (10%)	0/8 (0%)	1/4 (25%)	779 ± 27	779 ± 27
	N2	4/4 (100%)	8/8 (100%)	10/10 (100%)	6/10 (60%)	3/8 (38%)	0/4 (0%)	356 ± 20	
DiaSorin Molecular	S	1/1 (100%)	10/10 (100%)	10/10 (100%)	10/10 (100%)	8/8 (100%)	0/4 (0%)	39 ± 23	39 ± 23
	ORF1ab	1/1 (100%)	10/10 (100%)	8/10 (80%)	4/10 (40%)	1/8 (13%)	0/4 (0%)	602 ± 28	
GenMark	N	10/10 (100%)	9/9 (100%)	7/10 (70%)	1/10 (10%)	1/4 (25%)	0/4 (0%)	N/A ^e	1,000
Hologic	ORF1ab	3/3 (100%)	9/9 (100%)	12/12 (100%)	12/12 (100%)	5/9 (56%)	0/6 (0%)	83 ± 36	83 ± 36

182 ^a The limit of detection by positive rate for each assay is highlighted in bold

183 ^b CI, confidence interval

184 ^c ±, upper/lower 95%

185 ^d The final LoD was based on each manufacturer's results interpretation algorithm

186 ^e Not applicable

187 **Clinical performance of four EUA SARS-CoV-2 (COVID-19) molecular assays.** Following testing of 104
188 retrospective clinical specimens, the modified CDC, DiaSorin Molecular, and Hologic EUA molecular
189 assays demonstrated a sensitivity of 100% (51/51), while the GenMark ePlex SARS-CoV-2 EUA panel
190 showed a sensitivity of 96% (49/51). A specificity of 100% (53/53) was observed for GenMark and
191 DiaSorin Molecular, while percent specificities ranged from 98% (52/53) for CDC to 96% (51/53) for
192 Hologic (**Table 3**).

193 **Table 3.** Clinical performance comparison of four EUA molecular assays for the detection of SARS-CoV-2
 194 in nasopharyngeal swab specimens (n = 104).

Molecular Assay	Reference Standard ^a		(± 95% CI) ^{bc}			
	Positive	Negative	Kappa (κ) ^d	Sensitivity	Specificity	
Modified CDC	Positive	51	1 ^e	0.98 (0.94-1)	100% (0.93-1)	98% (0.89- 0.99)
	Negative	0	52			
DiaSorin Molecular	Positive	51	0	1.0 (0.99-1)	100% (0.93-1)	100% (0.93-1)
	Negative	0	53			
GenMark	Positive	49	0	0.96 (0.91- 1)	96% (0.87- 0.99)	100% (0.93- 1)
	Negative	2 ^f	53			
Hologic	Positive	51	2 ^g	0.96 (0.91- 1)	100% (0.93- 1)	96% (0.87-0.99)
	Negative	0	51			

195 ^aThe reference standard was defined as the result obtained from at least 3 of the 4 molecular assays.

196 ^b±, upper/lower 95%

197 ^cCI, confidence interval

198 ^dAlmost-perfect (>0.90), strong (0.80 to 0.90), moderate (0.60 to 0.79), weak (0.40 to 0.59), minimal
 199 (0.21 to 0.39), or none (0 to 0.20).

200 ^eThis one sample had a cycling threshold (Ct) of 38.9, 39.6 for N1 and N2 respectively by the CDC assay.

201 ^fCycle threshold (Ct) undetermined.

202 ^gThese two samples had cycle thresholds (Ct) of 36.2 and 38.5 by the Hologic assay.

203 Details for discordant sample analysis are shown in **Table 4**. A total of five discordant samples were found
204 among three out of the four platforms. One false positive sample (NW-104) had Ct values of 38.9 and 39.6
205 for N1 and N2 genes, respectively, on initial testing by the modified CDC assay. After repeating extraction
206 and retesting, the sample was determined to be negative. Two samples (NW-97 & NW-99) were
207 considered false negative by GenMark but positive by the other three methods. After reprocessing and
208 retesting, the GenMark assay was able to detect both samples as positive. Two additional false positive
209 samples (NW-83 & NW-85) were found by the Hologic assay; original samples were retested and were
210 found to be positive and negative, respectively. Following retesting of the five discordant samples, the
211 GenMark ePlex SARS-CoV-2 EUA panel showed an improvement of sensitivity to 100% (51/51).
212 Additionally, a 100% specificity (53/53) was obtained for the CDC assay, while Hologic improved to 98%
213 (52/53) (**Table 4**).

214 **Table 4.** Details of discordant sample analysis.

Sample ID	Reference Standard	SARS-CoV-2 Molecular Assay Results (Ct) ^{ab}				Comment
		Modified CDC (N1/N2)	DiaSorin Molecular (S/ORF1ab)	GenMark	Hologic	
NW-83	NEG	NEG	NEG	NEG	POS (36.2)	Sample was repeated by Hologic and determined POS
NW-85	NEG	NEG	NEG	NEG	POS (38.5)	Sample was repeated by Hologic and determined NEG
NW-97	POS	POS (35.5/ 34.5)	POS (31.9/31.8)	NEG	POS (35.0)	Sample was repeated by GenMark and determined POS
NW-99	POS	POS (35.3/35.0)	POS (29.3/29.9)	NEG	POS (33.0)	Sample was repeated by GenMark and determined POS
NW-104	NEG	POS (38.9/39.6)	NEG	NEG	NEG	Sample was repeated by CDC and determined NEG

215 ^a Discordant sample results are highlighted in bold

216 ^b Ct, Cycle threshold

217 **Workflow evaluation.** Hands-on time (HOT), run time, and overall turnaround time (TAT) to results were
218 assessed for all pre-analytical, analytical, and post-analytical steps for all four platforms. Results of the
219 workflow assessment are shown in **Table 5**. The HOT ranged between all platforms. The longest hands-
220 on time was the Hologic assay at ~2 hours followed by the modified CDC assay with ~1 hour and 30
221 minutes. Very comparable HOT was found for DiaSorin Molecular and GenMark with a range of 16
222 minutes and 12 minutes, respectively. The run time averaged 90 minutes for modified CDC, DiaSorin
223 Molecular, and GenMark. Hologic was the exception with 4 hours with 35 mins of run time (**Table 5**).
224 Overall turn-around time assessment, from sample to results, showed DiaSorin Molecular with the least
225 overall turn-around time to results, followed by GenMark, modified CDC assay and Hologic with the
226 greatest overall time (**Table 5**).

227 **Table 5.** Throughput and workflow evaluation for four EUA molecular SARS-CoV-2 assays.

	SARS-CoV-2 Molecular Assay			
	2019-Novel Coronavirus (2019-nCoV)	Simplexa™ COVID-19 Direct	ePlex SARS-CoV-2 Test	SARS-CoV-2 Assay
Manufacturer	Modified CDC	DiaSorin Molecular	GenMark	Hologic
Throughput (samples per run)	24	8 per disc	6 per tower	120
Input volume per sample/Elution volume	110 µL/110 µL	50 µL/NA	200 µL/NA	360 µL/50µL
Hands-on Time (per run)	~1.5 hr	< 16 min	< 12 min	~2.0 hrs
Assay Run Time	~90 min	~ 90 min	~ 90 min	~4 h 35 min
User Results Interpretation	Yes	No	No	No
Overall Turn-around Time	~3 hr	~1.8 hr	~1.7 hr	~ 6.6 hr

228

229 **Discussion**

230 In this study, we compared four different platforms for the detection of SARS-CoV-2 in patient
231 specimens collected during March and April of the 2020 COVID-19 outbreak in the United States. We were
232 able to make several observations, including LoD, overall workflow comparisons, and how each test
233 performed in a head-to-head clinical comparison. Accurate and actionable results have been at the core
234 of medical decision-making during this current outbreak, both in the inpatient and outpatient setting. For
235 hospitalized patients, results are critical for clinical management as well as infection control and cohorting
236 for bed management. Likewise, results are just as critical in the outpatient setting as the basis for social
237 distancing measures to slow the spread of infection. To that end, false negative results are particularly
238 troubling, since they inevitably lead to more exposures. Turnaround time is also critical for allocation of
239 limited resources, such as the limited availability of isolation rooms and real-time cohorting decisions. In
240 addition, healthcare workers need rapid results to ensure they are not exposing patients whom they are
241 treating. Moreover, levels of personal protective equipment (PPE) required by health care professionals
242 also vary depending on whether a patient is COVID-19 positive, requiring a rapid TAT to preserve precious
243 resources. Considering the transmissibility of SARS-CoV-2, which has recently been estimated to have a
244 basic reproduction number (R0) of 2.2, meaning that on average, each infected person can spread the
245 infection to an additional two persons, a false negative result can be devastating (15, 16). This is especially
246 true in vulnerable patient populations such as the elderly (especially people living in a nursing home or
247 long-term care facility), immunocompromised, and in people with pre-existing medical conditions (17,
248 18).

249
250 Our data suggest that all four PCR methods yielded comparable results ($\kappa \geq 0.96$); however, we
251 did observe a notable difference in the sensitivity of the methods during this large-scale evaluation of EUA
252 *in vitro* diagnostic assays. Our study showed that the DiaSorin Molecular and Hologic Fusion assays out-

253 performed both the modified CDC and GenMark assays when it came to overall LoD, with GenMark having
254 the overall highest LoD of all four platforms evaluated. DiaSorin Molecular had the lowest LoD (39 ± 23
255 copies/mL), closely followed by Hologic (83 ± 36 copies/mL). The modified CDC assay showed a final LoD,
256 of 779 ± 27 copies/mL based on the results interpretation algorithm. It is worth mentioning that this assay
257 requires both targets to be fully detected, thus clinical samples falling in this concentration range would
258 be identified and repeated, potentially generating additional turnaround time and laboratory labor. In
259 contrast, GenMark could only detect 100% of replicates at 1,000 copies/mL, and was not able to reliably
260 detect replicates below 1,000 copies/mL, thus patient specimens below this concentration range could
261 potentially be missed. One important limitation to mention is that sensitivity using Probit analysis could
262 not be calculated for GenMark since Ct values are not available as part of the ePlex system result
263 interpretation.

264
265 The clinical correlation was also consistent with LoD findings, where both the DiaSorin Molecular
266 and Hologic assays had 100% sensitivity and detected all specimens deemed positive by the consensus
267 standard (interpretation of three of four evaluated assays as “gold standard”), whereas GenMark missed
268 two positive specimens (which were subsequently detected by GenMark upon repeat). DiaSorin
269 Molecular and GenMark showed 100% specificity, while Hologic and the CDC assay initially had two and
270 one discordant results, respectively. Repeat testing of these three specimens showed that for Hologic,
271 NW-83 repeated as positive a second time and was therefore potentially a false positive and NW-85 was
272 negative upon repeat, meaning this result could have previously been a false positive as well. The
273 continued discordant result from NW-83 could potentially be attributed to specificity issues, since the
274 assay did not prove to be the most sensitive assay among those used in the study, with DiaSorin Molecular
275 showing a slightly lower LoD. Repeat testing of NW-104 on the modified CDC assay was negative.
276 Considering the LoD of the modified CDC assay, coupled with the fact that both DiaSorin Molecular and

277 Hologic resulted NW-104 as negative, this was likely a false-positive result. While all 4 assays could reliably
278 detect most patients in our study, GenMark lacked sensitivity, initially missing two low-level positive
279 specimens, and this could easily have impacted patient diagnosis by missing true positive patients.

280

281 When it comes to the hands-on and turnaround time of the four assays in this study, the
282 throughput and workflow evaluation are clearly shown in **Table 5** and are based on lab technologist
283 experience in our laboratory. As a routine real-time RT-PCR assay, the modified CDC requires nucleic acid
284 extraction, master mix preparation and PCR setup, standard PCR amplification, as well as interpretation
285 of the results. This involves several manual steps, needing about 1 hr 30 min hands-on time and an
286 approximate overall turnaround time of 3 hours. The DiaSorin Molecular and GenMark assays have
287 comparatively similar hands-on time and turnaround time, based on processing 8 samples per disc on the
288 DiaSorin LIAISON MDX and 6 cartridges per tower in the GenMark ePlex. Clinical laboratories may decide
289 to purchase additional instruments to allow for testing of more samples at a time in order to satisfy patient
290 testing volume requirements. The Hologic Panther Fusion platform has more of an automated workflow,
291 with five samples processed at a time after loading. The sample to answer time for the first five samples
292 is 2 hours and 40 min, followed by 5 results every 5 minutes after loading 120 samples; the total assay run
293 time for 120 specimens is approximately 4 hours and 35 min. It is also important to note that the Hologic
294 platform has longer hands-on time, since the technologist has to load the primers, probes, and other
295 consumables and the fact that 120 clinical samples have to be manually transferred to Sample Lysis Buffer
296 tubes. These steps, especially the pipetting of the specimen into the lysis tube, can be somewhat labor
297 intensive and time consuming, bumping the overall turnaround time for 120 specimens closer to the 7
298 hour mark. It is important to emphasize that each platform has their advantages. For workflow, TAT, and
299 ease of use, the three sample-to-answer platforms (DiaSorin Molecular, Hologic, GenMark) out-
300 performed the modified CDC assay, which is a manual assay requiring many steps, specialized personnel,

301 and separate areas for processing and performing the test. The Hologic platform is more appropriate for
302 high-volume testing, while the DiaSorin Molecular and GenMark systems both work well in an
303 environment where rapid results and lower to moderate testing volumes are required.

304
305 This study has several limitations that should be mentioned. First, this was a single center study
306 and the majority of the specimens were frozen after initial testing on the GenMark assay. While these
307 limitations are present, they have been minimized by the fact that GenMark assay (which was the least
308 sensitive platform in the analysis) actually had a potential competitive advantage, since it was the assay
309 initially performed on fresh specimens. Second, while the number of specimens included in the clinical
310 correlation was only 104, the patient samples spanned the entire range of clinical positives and reflected
311 our overall true positivity rate, which was between 50-60% during this time period of the COVID-19
312 outbreak.

313
314 In summary, we have evaluated four molecular *in vitro* diagnostic assays for the qualitative
315 detection of SARS-CoV-2 in nasopharyngeal specimens. The data from our evaluation suggest that the
316 modified CDC, DiaSorin Molecular, Hologic and GenMark assays performed similarly ($\kappa \geq 0.96$) and that all
317 but the CDC assay can function in a sample-to-answer capacity. The GenMark assay, however, was less
318 sensitive and had a higher LoD than both the DiaSorin Molecular and Hologic assays. When considering
319 the design of all four assays, differences that could affect assay performance could include characteristics
320 such as input volume of initial specimen, RNA purification and elution volume differences, and overall
321 differences in gene targets. The DiaSorin Molecular platform has lower testing volume capability
322 compared to the Hologic assay (8 specimens/disc run vs. 120 specimens loaded at once), but has a faster
323 TAT and less reagent/sample preparation. All of these parameters, along with patient care needs, may

324 assist clinical laboratories to identify and choose the correct testing platform that best fits their needs for
325 the diagnosis of patients infected with this novel human coronavirus.

326

327 **Acknowledgements and Disclosures**

328 We would also like to thank Diasorin Molecular LLC. for providing the reagents used in this study.

329 Gregory Berry has previously given education seminars for Hologic, Inc., and received an Honorarium.

330

331 **References**

- 332 1. WHO. Coronavirus disease (COVID-19) outbreak. World Health Organization, 2020.
333 <https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019> (accessed April 10 , 2020).
- 334 2. CDC. Locations with confirmed COVID-19 cases, global map. Centers for Disease Control and
335 Prevention, 2020. <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-nco> (accessed April 10 , 2020).
- 336 3. Coronavirus COVID-19 Global Cases by the Center for Systems Science and Engineering (CSSE) at
337 Johns Hopkins University (JHU).
338 [https://gisanddata.maps.arcgis.com/apps/opsdashboard/index.html#/bda7594740fd402994234](https://gisanddata.maps.arcgis.com/apps/opsdashboard/index.html#/bda7594740fd40299423467b48e9ecf6)
339 [67b48e9ecf6](https://gisanddata.maps.arcgis.com/apps/opsdashboard/index.html#/bda7594740fd40299423467b48e9ecf6) (accessed April 10 , 2020).
- 340 4. Corman, V. M., Muth, D., Niemeyer, D. & Drosten, C. *Adv. Virus Res.* 2018; 100, 163–188.
- 341 5. Ahmad T, Khan M, Haroon, et al. COVID-19: Zoonotic aspects. *Travel Med Infect Dis.* 2020; DOI:
342 10.1016/j.tmaid.2020.101607. [Epub ahead of print]
- 343 6. Wan Y, Shang J, Graham R, Baric RS, Li F. Receptor Recognition by the Novel Coronavirus from
344 Wuhan: an Analysis Based on Decade-Long Structural Studies of SARS Coronavirus. *J Virol.* 2020;
345 94(7):e00127-20.
- 346 7. Hoffmann M, Kleine-Weber H, Schroeder S, et al. SARS-CoV-2 Cell Entry Depends on ACE2 and
347 TMPRSS2 and Is Blocked by a Clinically Proven Protease Inhibitor. *Cell.* 2020; 181:271-280

- 348 8. Hamming I, Timens W, Bulthuis ML, Lely AT, Navis G, van Goor H. Tissue distribution of ACE2
349 protein, the functional receptor for SARS coronavirus. A first step in understanding SARS
350 pathogenesis. *J Pathol*. 2004; 203(2):631–637.
- 351 9. Report of the WHO-China Joint Mission on Coronavirus Disease.
352 [https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/coronaviruse/who-china-joint-mission-on-covid-19-](https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/coronaviruse/who-china-joint-mission-on-covid-19-final-report.pdf)
353 [final-report.pdf](https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/coronaviruse/who-china-joint-mission-on-covid-19-final-report.pdf). (Accessed April 10, 2020).
- 354 10. N van Doremalen, et al. Aerosol and surface stability of HCoV-19 (SARS-CoV-2) compared to
355 SARS-CoV-1. *N Engl J Med*. 2020; 382: 1564-1567.
- 356 11. [https://www.fda.gov/news-events/press-announcements/coronavirus-covid-19-update-fda-](https://www.fda.gov/news-events/press-announcements/coronavirus-covid-19-update-fda-issues-new-policy-help-expedite-availability-diagnostics)
357 [issues-new-policy-help-expedite-availability-diagnostics](https://www.fda.gov/news-events/press-announcements/coronavirus-covid-19-update-fda-issues-new-policy-help-expedite-availability-diagnostics)
- 358 12. Landis JR, Koch GG. The measurement of observer agreement for categorical data. *Biometrics*.
359 1977; 33(1):159–174.
- 360 13. McHugh ML. Interrater reliability: the kappa statistic. *Biochem Med (Zagreb)*. 2012; 22(3):276–
361 282.
- 362 14. Finney, D. J. and W. L. Stevens . "A table for the calculation of working probits and weights in
363 probit analysis." *Biometrika*. 1948; 35(1-2): 191-201.
- 364 15. Fauci AS, Lane HC, Redfield RR. Covid-19 - Navigating the Uncharted. *N Engl J Med*. 2020;
365 382(13):1268–1269.
- 366 16. Zou L, Ruan F, Huang M, et al. SARS-CoV-2 Viral Load in Upper Respiratory Specimens of Infected
367 Patients. *N Engl J Med*. 2020; 382(12):1177–1179.
- 368 17. CDC. Groups at Higher Risk for Severe Illness. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2020.
369 [https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/need-extra-precautions/groups-at-higher-](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/need-extra-precautions/groups-at-higher-risk.html)
370 [risk.html](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/need-extra-precautions/groups-at-higher-risk.html). (Accessed April 10, 2020).

- 371 18. Holshue ML, DeBolt C, Lindquist S, et al. First Case of 2019 Novel Coronavirus in the United
372 States. *N Engl J Med*. 2020; 382(10):929–936.