

1 Comparison of Commercially Available and Laboratory Developed Assays for *in vitro* Detection  
2 of SARS-CoV-2 in Clinical Laboratories

3

4 Joshua A. Lieberman<sup>1</sup>, Gregory Pepper<sup>1</sup>, Samia N. Naccache<sup>2</sup>, Meei-Li Huang<sup>1,3</sup>, Keith R.

5 Jerome<sup>1,3</sup>, Alexander L. Greninger<sup>1,3</sup>

6

7 <sup>1</sup>Department of Laboratory Medicine, University of Washington Medical Center, Seattle, WA

8 <sup>2</sup>LabCorp Seattle, Department of Microbiology, Seattle, WA

9 <sup>3</sup>Vaccine and Infectious Disease Division, Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center, Seattle, WA

10

11

12 Running Title: Commercial SARS-CoV-2 Assay Comparison

13

14 **Abstract**

15 Multiple laboratory developed tests and commercially available assays have emerged to meet  
16 diagnostic needs related to the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic. To date, there is limited comparison  
17 data for these different testing platforms. We compared the analytical performance of a  
18 laboratory developed test (LDT) developed in our clinical laboratory based on CDC primer sets  
19 and four commercially available, FDA emergency use authorized assays for SARS-CoV-2  
20 (Cepheid, DiaSorin, Hologic Panther, and Roche Cobas) on a total of 169 nasopharyngeal swabs.  
21 The LDT and Cepheid Xpert Xpress SARS-CoV-2 assays were the most sensitive assays for SARS-  
22 CoV-2 with 100% agreement across specimens. The Hologic Panther Fusion, DiaSorin Simplexa,  
23 and Roche Cobas 6800 only failed to detect positive specimens near the limit of detection of  
24 our CDC-based LDT assay. All assays were 100% specific, using our CDC-based LDT as the gold  
25 standard. Our results provide initial test performance characteristics for SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR  
26 and highlight the importance of having multiple viral detection testing platforms available in a  
27 public health emergency.

## 28 Introduction

29           Since the first infection with SARS-CoV-2 was detected in the United States in January  
30 2020 (1), there has been an exponential growth in cases and deaths (2). At the time of this  
31 writing, the US case count exceeds 600,000 with more than 30,000 deaths and considerable  
32 geographic heterogeneity (2, 3). Despite social distancing policies, the outbreak of Covid-19, the  
33 disease caused by SARS-CoV-2, continues to grow and threatens to overwhelm hospital systems  
34 in multiple states (2).

35           The explosion of Covid-19 cases in the United States has highlighted the critical role  
36 diagnostic testing plays in medical and public health decision making in containing and  
37 mitigating the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic. Reliable test results enable appropriate utilization of  
38 scarce hospital resources, including personal protective equipment (PPE) and negative pressure  
39 isolation rooms, as well as public health resources for contact tracing or isolation decision-  
40 making (4). In rapid succession in March 2020, multiple assays have become available including  
41 both FDA-EUA test platforms and laboratory developed tests (LDTs) for use in high-complexity  
42 clinical laboratories. To solve supply chain difficulties, clinical laboratories have had to  
43 implement multiple assays using scarce reagent resources, rendering thorough comparisons  
44 challenging. A clear understanding of the analytical parameters of these options is important to  
45 help guide assay selection by clinical laboratories when supply chain considerations subside (4).

46           Reverse transcription polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR) is the mainstay of SARS-CoV-2  
47 detection *in vitro* (5). FDA EUA authorized assays for SARS-CoV-2 have mostly targeted two loci  
48 of the positive sense, single-stranded RNA virus by real time RT-PCR and are reported  
49 qualitatively. Our laboratory has recently reported that the CDC N2 and WHO E-gene

50 primer/probe sets are among the most sensitive and have detected no false positives in our  
51 LDTs (6). FDA EUA authorized platforms use a variety of different primer/probe sets, resulting in  
52 the potential for differing analytical sensitivities. In addition to differing analytical sensitivities,  
53 commercially available platforms have important operational differences including integrated  
54 sample extraction, run time, random access, and acceptable sample types.

55 Here, the performances of one LDT-EUA assay developed in our clinical laboratory and  
56 four FDA-EUA cleared assays were evaluated for detection of SARS-CoV-2. The FDA-EUA cleared  
57 assays included were: Hologic Panther Fusion (both RUO and EUA versions, EUA version  
58 performed at two study sites), DiaSorin Simplexa COVID-19 Direct (EUA), Cepheid Xpert Xpress  
59 SARS-CoV-2 (EUA), and Roche Cobas 6800 (EUA). Test performance characteristics of each RT-  
60 PCR were determined compared to our reference LDT assay.

61

## 62 **Materials & Methods**

63 **Specimen collection and consensus panel selection.** Nasopharyngeal (NP) swabs ( $N =$   
64 169) were collected from patient specimens submitted to the University of Washington Medical  
65 Center laboratories for clinical diagnostic testing. LDT performance was validated based on  
66 detection of 20 of 20 positives sent by the Washington State Public Health Laboratory in early  
67 March. Residual clinical samples were used for validation/verification of each subsequent  
68 instrument, including a common panel of 26 specimens (12 positive, 1 inconclusive, and 13  
69 negative) tested at UW by the UW CDC EUA-based LDT (CDC LDT), DiaSorin Simplexa (positives  
70 only), Roche Cobas 6800, and tested at LabCorp Seattle on the Cepheid Xpert Xpress, and  
71 Panther Fusion (12 positives only). Additional residual ( $N = 115$ ) specimens were tested at UW

72 on individual assays and compared to the reference method (LDT): Panther Fusion (RUO),  $N =$   
73 36; Panther Fusion (EUA)-UW,  $N = 20$ ; DiaSorin Simplexa (EUA),  $N = 19$ ; Cobas 6800,  $N = 40$ .  
74 Finally, 28 specimens were used to compare the SARS-CoV-2 assay on the UW Panther Fusion  
75 with the DiaSorin Simplexa assay. All same-sample comparisons were performed on specimens  
76 stored at 4°C for less than 72 hours with no freeze-thaws. Inconclusive results (one of two  
77 targets detected) were considered positive due to the high specificity of all assays and limited  
78 cross-reactivity seen for SARS-CoV-2 primer sets. This work was approved under a consent  
79 waiver from the University of Washington Institutional Review Board.

80  
81 **Sample processing.** For the UW CDC LDT, total nucleic acid (NA) was extracted from  
82 200µL of VTM on the Roche MP96 and eluted in 50µL of elution buffer. Real-time RT-PCR was  
83 set up on 5µL of eluate using the CDC N1, N2, and RP (or Exo internal control) primers and run  
84 on ABI 7500 real-time PCR instruments as reported previously (6). For the Hologic Panther  
85 Fusion, 500µL of VTM was transferred to lysis buffer in manufacturer-provided tubes and  
86 loaded directly on the instrument. For the DiaSorin Simplexa and Cepheid Xpert Xpress, 50µL or  
87 300µL of VTM sample respectively was loaded directly into the reaction cartridge with  
88 integrated sample process. For the Roche Cobas 6800, 600µL of specimen VTM was added to a  
89 barcoded 12x75mm secondary tube and loaded directly on the instrument.

90  
91 **Results**  
92 **Panther Fusion SARS-CoV-2.** The Panther Fusion SARS-CoV-2 assay was tested first as research  
93 use only (RUO) reagents ( $N = 36$ ), and then again following FDA authorization ( $N = 20$ ). Both

94 Panther Fusion RUO and EUA assays were slightly less sensitive than the CDC-based LDT,  
95 missing one positive/inconclusive in each sample set (Table 1a/b). One additional specimen was  
96 initially negative with the RUO reagents but was detected upon repeat with the Panther Fusion  
97 EUA assay. Discordant specimens were either inconclusive (one target of two detected) or had  
98 high average CTs (>37) by the CDC LDT test. All 29 negative specimens generated “Not  
99 detected” results by the Hologic Panther Fusion SARS-CoV-2 assay.

100

101 **DiaSorin Simplexa SARS-CoV-2.** We next compared the DiaSorin Simplexa SARS-CoV-2 assay to  
102 our CDC-based LDT. All 19 specimens (11 positives and 8 negatives) demonstrated complete  
103 concordance between the two platforms (Table 2a) with lower CTs recovered by the DiaSorin  
104 compared to the LDT on all specimens (average CT difference -2.1 [IQR -2.3 – -1.7]). When we  
105 compared SARS-CoV-2 detection on the DiaSorin Simplexa to the Hologic Panther Fusion, all 16  
106 Hologic Panther Fusion positives were detected by the DiaSorin Simplexa, while the DiaSorin  
107 Simplexa generated one additional positive in the 12 specimens that were negative by the  
108 Hologic Panther Fusion (Table 2b). This discordant specimen was detected by the CDC-based  
109 LDT with CTs of 36.8 (N1) and 35.8 (N2), confirming the DiaSorin Simplexa result.

110

111 **Roche Cobas SARS-CoV-2.** We next compared the Roche Cobas SARS-CoV-2 assay to our CDC  
112 LDT. All 20 negatives demonstrated complete concordance between the two platforms (Table  
113 3). One of the 20 positives was not detected by the Roche assay. This specimen had CTs of 38.0  
114 (N1) and 37.4 (N2) in the LDT. Across the 20 positive specimens, CTs were only slightly higher

115 on the Roche Cobas assay compared to the CDC-based LDT, with an average CT difference of  
116 0.6 [IQR -0.1 – 1.5].

117

### 118 **Five-way same-sample comparison including Cepheid Xpert Xpress SARS-CoV-2 assay**

119 After performing the above pairwise comparisons, we next compared twenty-six specimens (13  
120 positive, 13 negative) from another high-complexity hospital laboratory (LabCorp Seattle). All  
121 26 were also tested on the Cepheid Xpert Xpress SARS-CoV-2 assay (Table 4). All specimens  
122 with CT < 35 on the CDC-based LDT were detected by all platforms, and all specimens not  
123 detected by the Cepheid Xpert were not detected by two other platforms examined (CDC LDT,  
124 Roche Cobas). One of 13 positive specimens was a presumptive positive on the Cepheid assay  
125 (E-gene CT 42.6, N2-gene negative); upon repeat per package insert, the N2-gene was detected  
126 at CT 42.7 but the E-gene was not detected, yielding a positive result. The CDC LDT  
127 demonstrated 100% concordance with the Cepheid Xpert Xpress, also detecting the extremely  
128 low viral load specimen above as an inconclusive (N1 37.4, N2 not detected). No other assay  
129 detected SARS-CoV-2 RNA in this specimen. In addition, the DiaSorin Simplexa failed to detect a  
130 positive specimen that on repeat was detected only by the ORF1ab primer set.

131

### 132 **Discussion**

133 This analysis compared the performance characteristics of several *in vitro* diagnostic real  
134 time RT-PCR assays to detect SARS-CoV-2 in high-complexity clinical laboratories in one of the  
135 early US epicenters of the COVID-19 pandemic. The results demonstrated excellent  
136 performance of a CDC-based LDT and the Cepheid Xpert Xpress, concurring with a previous

137 evaluation that demonstrated high sensitivity of the E-gene and N2 primer sets used by the  
138 Cepheid assay (6). The Panther Fusion was somewhat less sensitive than either the LDT or the  
139 DiaSorin; however, the Panther Fusion detected SARS-CoV-2 RNA in one specimen that was  
140 inconclusive (1 of 2 targets detected, thus presumed positive) by the UW CDC LDT. The Roche  
141 assay performed on the Cobas 6800 platform detected 28/30 positive samples; both of these  
142 discordant specimens had low viral titers (UW CDC LDT  $C_T > 37$ ) and one was the inconclusive  
143 specimen. Therefore, we conclude that all the tested assays show good sensitivity for the  
144 detection of SARS-CoV-2, with the UW CDC LDT and Cepheid Xpert Xpress SARS-CoV-2 assays  
145 having the best and similar sensitivity, followed by the Roche Cobas 6800, DiaSorin Simplexa,  
146 and Panther Fusion SARS-CoV-2 assays.

147 Our results are chiefly limited by the small sample sets used to compare these different  
148 assays as well as asynchronous comparisons that only allowed for pairwise comparisons early in  
149 the pandemic. For instance, these asynchronous panels most greatly affected our CDC LDT  
150 versus Hologic Panther Fusion comparison, which had a greater proportion of high CT positive  
151 specimens that resulted in a lower measured sensitivity for the Panther Fusion. . In clinical  
152 practice, the minor differences in sensitivity are likely to have little effect on Hologic Panther  
153 Fusion SARS-CoV-2 assay performance on VTM specimens, given the CT ranges we have  
154 observed in our clinical populations.

155 Despite their limitations, these data provide a basis for differences in analytical  
156 sensitivity at different CTs that may be seen between platforms. For instance, recent reports  
157 have demonstrated a slightly higher analytical sensitivity of the Cepheid Xpert Xpress SARS-  
158 CoV-2 assay compared to the Roche Cobas SARS-CoV-2 test, and a slightly lower sensitivity of



159 the DiaSorin Simplexa SARS-CoV-2 assay compared to a modified CDC assay, both of which are  
160 concordant with our data (7, 8). We also note that, while analytical sensitivity is of critical  
161 importance, many other considerations factor into assay platform selection including assay  
162 availability, cost, turnaround time, and throughput.

163 Our results provide an early assessment of performance characteristics of five separate  
164 assays for the detection of SARS-CoV-2. During March 2020, reagent availability for SARS-COV-2  
165 RT-PCR assays was heavily constrained, necessitating more limited assay comparisons. All  
166 platforms examined here had acceptable performance criteria for testing during the early part  
167 of this pandemic. As the supply chain for SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR attempts to catch up with testing  
168 demand, we look forward to additional assay comparison data.

169

170 **References**

- 171 1. Holshue ML, DeBolt C, Lindquist S, Lofy KH, Wiesman J, Bruce H, Spitters C, Ericson K,  
172 Wilkerson S, Tural A, Diaz G, Cohn A, Fox L, Patel A, Gerber SI, Kim L, Tong S, Lu X,  
173 Lindstrom S, Pallansch MA, Weldon WC, Biggs HM, Uyeki TM, Pillai SK. 2020. First Case of  
174 2019 Novel Coronavirus in the United States. *N Engl J Med* 382:929–936.
- 175 2. IHME COVID-19 health service utilization forecasting team, Murray CJ. 2020. Forecasting  
176 COVID-19 impact on hospital bed-days, ICU-days, ventilator-days and deaths by US state in  
177 the next 4 months. preprint, *Infectious Diseases (except HIV/AIDS)*.
- 178 3. Dong E, Du H, Gardner L. 2020. An interactive web-based dashboard to track COVID-19 in  
179 real time. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases* S1473309920301201.
- 180 4. Babiker A, Myers CW, Hill CE, Guarner J. 2020. SARS-CoV-2 Testing. *Am J Clin Pathol*.
- 181 5. Corman VM, Landt O, Kaiser M, Molenkamp R, Meijer A, Chu DKW, Bleicker T, Brünink S,  
182 Schneider J, Schmidt ML, Mulders DGJC, Haagmans BL, van der Veer B, van den Brink S,  
183 Wijsman L, Goderski G, Romette J-L, Ellis J, Zambon M, Peiris M, Goossens H, Reusken C,  
184 Koopmans MPG, Drosten C. 2020. Detection of 2019 novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV) by  
185 real-time RT-PCR. *Euro Surveill* 25.
- 186 6. Nalla AK, Casto AM, Huang M-LW, Perchetti GA, Sampoleo R, Shrestha L, Wei Y, Zhu H,  
187 Jerome KR, Greninger AL. 2020. Comparative Performance of SARS-CoV-2 Detection  
188 Assays using Seven Different Primer/Probe Sets and One Assay Kit. *Journal of Clinical*  
189 *Microbiology*.

190 7. Moran A, Beavis KG, Matushek SM, Ciaglia C, Francois N, Tesic V, Love N. 2020. The  
191 Detection of SARS-CoV-2 using the Cepheid Xpert Xpress SARS-CoV-2 and Roche Cobas  
192 SARS-CoV-2 Assays. *Journal of Clinical Microbiology*.

193 8. Rhoads DD, Cherian SS, Roman K, Stempak LM, Schmotzer CL, Sadri N. 2020. Comparison  
194 of Abbott ID Now, DiaSorin Simplexa, and CDC FDA EUA methods for the detection of  
195 SARS-CoV-2 from nasopharyngeal and nasal swabs from individuals diagnosed with COVID-  
196 19. *Journal of Clinical Microbiology*.

197  
198  
199

## Tables

**Table 1a. CDC-based LDT versus Hologic Panther Fusion RUO**

Sample ID	UW LDT		Panther Fusion SARS-CoV-2 (RUO)
	N1 Ct	N2 Ct	Orf1ab/2ab
56	27.2	27.8	23.2
07	26.2	25.5	22.8
46	23.9	25.8	21.4
81	23.8	24	25.5
40	23.8	23.9	23.7
66	17.7	17.1	19.7
26	24.9	24.6	27
85	35.98	35.8	33.5
82	29.1	29.7	29.6
37	23.1	22.3	22
70	29.7	28.9	30.5
29	29.4	28.2	26.3
68	29.4	28	28.3
04	25.9	25.4	24.9
95	35	37	35.3
55	39.2	39	NDET
14	36.3	NDET	35.5

19/19 CDC LDT negatives were negative by Hologic Panther Fusion  
EUA

**Table 1b. CDC-based LDT versus Hologic Panther Fusion EUA**

Sample ID	UW LDT		Panther Fusion SARS-CoV-2 (EUA)
	N1 Ct	N2 Ct	Orf1ab/2ab
100	30	30.4	29
67	20.3	20.8	19.3
76	27.1	27.6	31.1
17	23.4	23.6	20.5
02	18.1	17.2	19.3
59	29.4	29.8	31.7
97	18.4	17	18.9
52	16.8	15.9	16.9
90	36.1	38.4	NDET/38.1
79	38.4	NDET	NDET/NDET

10/10 CDC LDT negatives were negative by Hologic Panther Fusion  
EUA

NDET, Not Detected

**Table 2a. CDC-based LDT versus DiaSorin Simplexa EUA**

Sample ID	UW LDT		UW DiaSorin	
	N1 Ct	N2 Ct	S-gene	ORF1ab
1A Pos	27.9	27.6	25.2	25.6
2A Pos	18.6	19.1	18.0	18.1
3A Pos	27.8	27.5	25.2	26.0
4A Pos	28.2	27.6	25.8	26.5
5A Pos	31.6	31.3	28.5	29.0
6A Pos	33.9	34.6	31.0	31.6
7A Pos	31.1	31.5	28.8	29.2
1C Pos	34.1	33.9	31.5	32.1
2C Pos	33.7	34.6	32.7	32.4
3C Pos	32.4	32.3	29.8	30.4
4C Pos	34.9	34.8	32.7	33.6

8/8 negatives by UW LDT were negative by DiaSorin

**Table 2b. Hologic Panther Fusion EUA versus DiaSorin Simplex EUA**

Sample ID	Panther Fusion	DiaSorin	
	SARS-CoV-2 (EUA)	S-gene	ORF1ab
Orf1ab/2ab			
65	35.2	37.2	32.9
38	33.6	33.7	34
83	31.5	28.5	27.7
13	30.7	27.2	27
39	30.1	30.7	29.2
10	29.6	29.1	28.1
56	28.7	27	26.4
31	26.5	24.4	22.8
33	25.4	24.8	24.4
60	23.3	21.1	20.5
92	22.5	23	23.4
98	21	18.1	17.3
40	18.2	15	14
25	17.9	16.1	15.6
13	16.7	15.1	14.3
52	15.6	13.2	12.3
42*	NDET	31.8	32.7

11/12 negatives by Hologic Panther Fusion EUA were negative by DiaSorin

**Table 3. CDC-based LDT versus Cobas 6800 SARS-CoV-2**

Sample ID	UW LDT		UW Cobas 6800	
	N1 Ct	N2 Ct	ORF1ab	E-gene
136	26.7	27.6	26.9	27.2
560	16.4	16.3	19.0	19.6
578	23.8	24.9	25.4	26.3
757	23.4	24.2	24.7	25.0
982	20.3	20.9	21.9	22.2
853	20.4	21.5	21.6	21.5
998	14.6	15.6	15.9	16.3
334	20.2	21.4	21.5	21.9
571	18.0	18.9	17.9	18.2
108	35.5	35.0	31.8	34.7
188	36.4	35.7	35.4	37.2
599	24.7	25.6	26.7	27.1
995	25.2	26.4	26.4	26.8
336	29.1	29.5	31.1	31.6
866	31.3	31.4	31.1	32.0
232	36.3	36.4	32.3	35.2
323	28.6	28.7	29.5	30.7
309	14.3	15.4	14.5	14.8
277	19.7	21.4	20.4	20.5
018	38.0	37.4	NDET	NDET

20/20 negatives by UW LDT were negative by Cobas 6800

NDET, Not Detected

201

202

203

204

205

206

207

208

**Table 4. Same-sample comparison of five testing platforms for SARS-CoV-2**

Panel ID	UW LDT		UW DiaSorin		UW Cobas 6800		LabCorp Seattle Xpert Xpress Sars-CoV2		LabCorp Seattle Panther Fusion SARS-CoV-2
	N1 Ct	N2 Ct	S-gene	ORF1ab	ORF1ab	E-gene	E-gene	N2 Ct	Orf1ab/2ab
Neg 01	NDET	NDET	N.D.	N.D.	NDET	NDET	NDET	NDET	N.D.
Neg 02	NDET	NDET	N.D.	N.D.	NDET	NDET	NDET	NDET	N.D.
Neg 03	NDET	NDET	N.D.	N.D.	NDET	NDET	NDET	NDET	N.D.
Neg 04	NDET	NDET	N.D.	N.D.	NDET	NDET	NDET	NDET	N.D.
Neg 05	NDET	NDET	N.D.	N.D.	NDET	NDET	NDET	NDET	N.D.
Neg 06	NDET	NDET	N.D.	N.D.	NDET	NDET	NDET	NDET	N.D.
Neg 07	NDET	NDET	N.D.	N.D.	NDET	NDET	NDET	NDET	N.D.
Neg 08	NDET	NDET	N.D.	N.D.	NDET	NDET	NDET	NDET	N.D.
Neg 09	NDET	NDET	N.D.	N.D.	NDET	NDET	NDET	NDET	N.D.
Neg 10	NDET	NDET	N.D.	N.D.	NDET	NDET	NDET	NDET	N.D.
Neg 11	NDET	NDET	N.D.	N.D.	NDET	NDET	NDET	NDET	N.D.
Neg 12	NDET	NDET	N.D.	N.D.	NDET	NDET	NDET	NDET	N.D.
Neg 13	NDET	NDET	N.D.	N.D.	NDET	NDET	NDET	NDET	N.D.
Pos 01	30.7	30.2	29.2	30	30.5	31.1	31.7	33.8	31
Pos 02	28.5	28.7	27.2	28	29.6	30.5	29.2	31.6	29.7
Pos 03	28.6	28.8	27.3	28.4	30.4	32.2	28.7	31.4	31.2
Pos 04	25.2	24.4	22.4	23.8	26.1	26.2	25.4	25.9	25.2
Pos 05*	35.4	35.6	NDET/NDET	NDET/34.5	33.6	36.2	37.6	37.5	35
Pos 06	27.2	26.7	25	26.9	26.4	27.3	26.8	29.5	26.3
Pos 07	26.3	25.5	22.2	23.3	25.9	26.1	26	28.1	24.7
Pos 08	35.8	34.4	33.6	33	31.7	34.1	35.9	38.5	36.3
Pos 09	18	17.6	15.3	16.4	19.4	19.5	18	19.3	18.6
Pos 10	31.9	32.1	31.1	31.1	31.9	33.6	31.7	34.2	32.2
Pos 11	31.3	31.3	28.1	29.2	30.5	32	31.2	34.6	N.D.
Pos 12*	37.4	NDET	NDET	NDET	NDET	NDET	NDET/42.6	42.7/NDET	NDET
Pos 13	32.6	33.9	32.5	32.5	NDET	35.7	38.1	40	37.1

\*Known positive patients in process of clearing virus

NDET, Not Detected

N.D., Not Done

209

210

211