

1 **Title:** Comparison of two commercial molecular tests and a laboratory-developed modification of the
2 CDC 2019-nCOV RT-PCR assay for the qualitative detection of SARS-CoV-2 from upper respiratory tract
3 specimens

4 **Running title:** 3 assays to detect SARS-CoV-2

5

6 **Authors:** Nicholas M. Moore^{a,b,c*}, Haiying Li^a, Debra Schejbal^a, Jennifer Lindsley^a, and Mary K. Hayden^{a,b}

7

8 **Affiliations:**

9 ^aDepartment of Pathology, Rush University Medical Center, Chicago, Illinois

10 ^bDepartment of Internal Medicine, Division of Infectious Diseases, Rush University Medical Center,
11 Chicago, Illinois

12 ^cDepartment of Medical Laboratory Science, Rush University, Chicago, Illinois

13

14 **Corresponding author:** Nicholas Moore, nicholas_moore@rush.edu

15

16 **ABSTRACT**

17 We compared the ability of 2 commercial molecular amplification assays [*RealTime SARS-CoV-2* on the
18 *m2000* (Abbott) and *ID NOW™ COVID-19* (Abbott)] and a laboratory-developed test [modified CDC 2019-
19 nCoV RT-PCR assay with RNA extraction by eMag® (bioMérieux) and amplification on QuantStudio™ 6 or
20 ABI 7500 Real-Time PCR System (Life Technologies)] to detect SARS-CoV-2 RNA in upper respiratory tract
21 specimens. Discrepant results were adjudicated by medical record review. 200 nasopharyngeal swab
22 specimens in viral transport medium (VTM) were collected from symptomatic patients between March
23 27 and April 9, 2020. Results were concordant for 167 specimens (83.5% overall agreement), including
24 94 positive and 73 negative specimens. The *RealTime SARS-CoV-2* assay on the *m2000* yielded 33
25 additional positive results, 25 of which were also positive by the modified CDC assay but not by the *ID*
26 *NOW™ COVID-19* assay. In a follow-up evaluation, 97 patients for whom a dry nasal swab specimen
27 yielded negative results by the *ID NOW™ COVID-19* assay had a paired nasopharyngeal swab specimen
28 collected in VTM and tested by the *RealTime SARS-CoV-2* assay; SARS-CoV-2 RNA was detected in 13
29 (13.4%) of these specimens. Medical record review deemed all discrepant results to be true positives.
30 The *ID NOW™ COVID-19* test was the easiest to perform and provided a result in the shortest time: as
31 soon as 5 minutes for positive and 13 minutes for negative result. The *RealTime SARS-CoV-2* assay on
32 the *m2000* detected more cases of COVID-19 infection than the modified CDC assay or the *ID NOW™*
33 COVID-19 test.

34

35 **KEYWORDS:** Covid-19, SARS-CoV-2, coronavirus, novel coronavirus, RT-PCR

36 **INTRODUCTION**

37 In December 2019, a cluster of patients with pneumonia of unknown origin was linked to exposure to a
38 wet market in Wuhan, Hubei Province, China (1). Very quickly, a novel betacoronavirus was isolated
39 from a lower respiratory tract sample from one patient and the full genome of the virus was sequenced
40 (2). This novel coronavirus, which was named SARS-CoV-2 for its genetic homology to SARS-CoV, spread
41 rapidly across the globe (3-10). As of April 29, 2020, more than 3 million cases of SARS-CoV-2 infection
42 had been identified worldwide, with over 200,000 deaths; approximately one-third of cases have been
43 identified in the United States.

44 Laboratory testing plays a critical role in defining the disease characteristics and epidemiology of
45 an emerging infectious pathogen such as SARS-CoV-2, and in controlling its spread. Early on, laboratory
46 testing for SARS-CoV-2 in the U.S. was performed only at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention
47 (CDC) laboratories in Atlanta, GA using a reverse transcriptase polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR) assay
48 that was developed there (11). Subsequently, the CDC test was to be implemented in all state public
49 health laboratories, but roll out was slow due to technical problems. Following the declaration of a
50 public health emergency, the US Food and Drug Administration (FDA) moved to allow *in vitro* diagnostic
51 assays under an Emergency Use Authorization (EUA) in an attempt to expedite test development by
52 commercial and clinical laboratories. The majority of assays approved through EUA are nucleic acid
53 amplification tests that target conserved regions of the SARS-CoV-2 genome. Abbott Molecular received
54 authorization for the *Real/Time* SARS-CoV-2 assay to be performed on the *m2000* real-time platform on
55 March 18, 2020 (12). The ID NOW™ COVID-19 assay was granted approval under the EUA on March 27,
56 2020. *In vitro* diagnostic device (IVD) assays with EUA status from commercial manufacturers do not
57 undergo usual FDA review under the *De Novo* request or the 510(k) premarket notification; as such,
58 limited data comparing these assays are available.

59 In this study, we compared the performance of two commercial EUA IVD assays and a laboratory
60 developed test that is a modification of the CDC RT-PCR assay for the qualitative detection of SARS-CoV-
61 2 RNA directly from upper respiratory tract specimens.

62 **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

63 **Clinical samples.** For the initial evaluation of the three test systems, we collected nasopharyngeal swab
64 specimens in 3mL M4-RT viral transport medium (VTM) (Remel, Lenexa, KS) from symptomatic (fever or
65 cough or shortness of breath) adult and pediatric outpatients, emergency department (ED) patients, and
66 inpatients at Rush University Medical Center (RUMC) or Rush Oak Park Hospital (ROPH); both hospitals
67 are in metropolitan Chicago, IL. Specimens were collected between March 27 and April 9, 2020, and
68 tested within 72 hours of collection; specimens were held refrigerated at 4°C if all testing could not be
69 completed on the same day.

70 In a separate follow up evaluation, symptomatic patients who had a negative result on a dry
71 nasal swab that was tested at the point of care by the ID NOW™ COVID-19 system also had a paired
72 nasopharyngeal swab sample collected and transported to the on-site clinical microbiology laboratory
73 for testing by RealTime SARS-CoV-2 on the m2000.

74 Age, sex, and location of swab collection were extracted from the electronic medical record
75 (EMR) for all patients. The study was reviewed and given expedited approval by the RUMC institutional
76 review board, with a waiver of written informed consent.

77 **Modified CDC assay.** We validated and implemented a modification of the CDC 2019-nCoV assay (11) for
78 clinical use in our laboratory; this was the first SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR assay we adopted during the COVID-
79 19 pandemic. This assay targets two regions of the nucleocapsid (N) gene of the SARS-CoV-2 genome.
80 The human RNase P (RP) gene target is included and used as specimen extraction and amplification
81 control.

82 Nucleic acids were purified and extracted using the eMAG® automated nucleic acid sample
83 extraction system (bioMérieux, Marcy l'etoile, France). Briefly, total nucleic acids were extracted from
84 VTM using a programmed input sample volume of 200 μ L into 2000 μ L of easyMAG® lysis buffer with the
85 Specific B protocol to which a final eluted volume of purified nucleic acids was 50 μ L. We utilized the
86 TaqPath™ 1-step RT-qPCR master mix (Life Technologies, Frederick, MD) and the 2019-nCoV CDC EUA kit
87 (Integrated DNA Technologies, Coralville, IA) for target detection. Amplification and real-time detection
88 was performed on the ABI 7500 Real-Time PCR System (Life Technologies) with software version 2.3, or
89 on the QuantStudio™ 6 Flex Real-time PCR system (Life Technologies) using software version 1.4. The
90 total sample volume per reaction was 15 μ L of master mix, combined primer/probe mix, and nuclease
91 free water and 5 μ L of eluted sample. Assay run parameters were as described in the CDC protocol (11).
92 Samples that gave a cycle threshold (C_t) value <40 for both N1 and N2 targets were considered positive.
93 Samples negative for both N1 and N2 targets had to have a positive amplification curve for the RP gene
94 to be considered a valid negative result. Samples that gave a C_t value <40 for either N1 or N2 targets
95 were considered inconclusive and repeat testing was performed per CDC protocol. If results were still
96 inconclusive after repeat testing, a result of inconclusive was reported. Validation results for the
97 laboratory-modified CDC assay are not shown.

98 **Abbott Molecular SARS-CoV-2 assay.** Next, we verified the *RealTime* SARS-CoV-2 assay (Abbott
99 Molecular, Des Plaines, IL), which is a qualitative real-time assay performed on the Abbott *m2000*
100 platform (12). The system includes the *m2000sp* instrument with automated extraction of nucleic acids
101 using the DNA (total nucleic acid) sample preparation kit in batches of up to 96 samples. The *RealTime*
102 SARS-CoV-2 assay utilizes two real-time detection probes: one probe combined for the N and RNA-
103 dependent RNA polymerase (RdRP) genes, and a second probe for the internal control to assess overall
104 performance, including nucleic acid extraction and possible PCR inhibition. Nasopharyngeal swab
105 samples were heat inactivated at 56°C for 35±5 minutes prior to testing. Automated extraction was

106 performed using a sample input volume of 500 μ L VTM, followed by automated addition of amplification
107 pack reagents and extracts (40 μ L volume used for PCR amplification and detection). Two controls (one
108 positive and one negative) provided by the manufacturer were included with each run of patient
109 samples. Amplification curves were interpreted by the *m2000rt* system and reported as detected or not
110 detected.

111 In our initial verification of the *RealTime SARS-CoV-2* assay, we tested 25 nasopharyngeal swab
112 samples in which SARS-CoV-2 RNA gene sequences had been detected by the laboratory-modified CDC
113 assay, and 30 samples in which SARS-CoV-2 RNA samples were not detected. There was 100% positive
114 and negative agreement between results of the 2 assays [median C_t values on the modified CDC assay
115 for positive samples, 25.93 (IQR, 20.3 - 28.87) for N1 and 24.6 (IQR, 19.4 - 28.35) for N2].

116 ***ID NOW™ COVID-19 assay.*** The third SARS-CoV-2 molecular assay introduced to our laboratory was the
117 ID NOW™ COVID-19 (formerly Alere i), an isothermal nucleic acid amplification test for SARS-CoV-2 RNA
118 that targets the RdRp gene (13). Following an initial 3 minute warm-up of the test system, 200 μ L of VTM
119 was added to elution buffer in the sample base using the provided disposable transfer pipette, then
120 mixed for 10 seconds with the pipette. Using the sample transfer device, the sample was transferred
121 into the test cartridge, the lid was closed and the instrument automatically initialized the assay. The ID
122 NOW does not report C_t values to the user. The instrument software interprets amplification data, and
123 final results are reported on screen as positive, negative, or invalid.

124 ***Estimation of RNA concentration in respiratory samples.*** We tested purified genomic RNA from a
125 reference strain of SARS-CoV-2, isolate USA-WA1/2020 (catalog# NR-52285, lot# 70033320) (BEI
126 Resources, Manassas, VA) to generate standard curves for the laboratory-modified CDC assay and the
127 *RealTime SARS-CoV-2* assay in order to estimate the concentration of SARS-CoV-2 genome equivalents
128 in nasopharyngeal swab samples. We serially diluted the standard and tested the dilution series in

129 triplicate. The ID NOW™ COVID-19 assay does not provide Ct values, so we could not generate a
130 standard curve for this system.

131 **Data analysis.** Because there is no reference standard for SARS-CoV-2 detection by RT-PCR, sensitivity
132 and specificity of the assays could not be determined. Instead, we calculated overall, positive, and
133 negative agreement for the 3 assays (<http://www.medcalc.org>). Box plots for comparing C_t values
134 between groups were created using SPSS version 22 (IBM, Armonk, NY). Discordant results were
135 adjudicated by medical record review (M.K.H.) to assess whether the patients' clinical courses were
136 consistent with COVID-19 infection.

137 **RESULTS**

138 **Clinical overview.** Specimens from 200 unique patients were included in this study. The first 94 samples
139 tested for this study were collected consecutively. Subsequently, we enriched for positive samples by
140 including all samples in which SARS-CoV-2 RNA was detected by the *Real/Time* SARS-CoV-2 assay on the
141 m2000 – our standard assay during the study period – and also the next negative sample after the
142 positive sample. Mean age was 50 ± 17 years and 54% were women. Seventy-nine (40%) patients were
143 hospitalized, 29 (36%) of whom were in an intensive care unit; 76 (38%) were cared for in an ambulatory
144 location, including 55 (72%) who were seen in a designated COVID-19 screening clinic; and 45 (23%)
145 were seen in an ED.

146 **Assay performance using nasopharyngeal swab samples in viral transport medium.** There were 94
147 (47%) samples in which SARS-CoV-2 gene sequences were detected by all assays and 73 (36.5%) samples
148 in which SARS-CoV-2 RNA was detected by none of the assays (Table 1). The median cycle number (C_n)
149 for positive samples by the *Real/Time* SARS-CoV-2 assay was 15.34 (IQR, 11.27 - 18.13), or approximately
150 447 genome equivalents/µL (Figure 1). Overall agreement among the three assays was 83.5% (95% CI,
151 77.7% - 88.0%). Two-way positive and negative agreement between results is shown in Table 2. Positive
152 agreement ranged from 75.2% to 100%, with the lowest agreement between the *Real/Time* SARS-CoV-2

153 and the ID NOW™ COVID-19 assays. Negative agreement ranged from 92.4% (laboratory-modified CDC
154 assay versus *Real/Time SARS-CoV-2 assay*) and 100% (laboratory-modified CDC assay versus ID NOW™
155 COVID-19 assay, and ID NOW™ COVID-19 assay versus *Real/Time SARS-CoV-2 assay*).

156 For the laboratory-modified CDC assay, SARS-CoV-2 target RNA sequences were detected in 119
157 (60%) samples. Six (3%) samples gave an initial inconclusive result. Upon repeat testing, 4 yielded valid
158 results: 3 were detected and 1 was not detected. The remaining 2 (0.01%) samples repeated as
159 inconclusive (only one of the two targets amplified in the specimen) (Table 1). The median C_t value for
160 positive samples was 30.29 (IQR, 25.40 – 34.55) for N1 target and 30.20 (IQR, 25.12 – 34.55), which
161 corresponds to an RNA concentration of approximately 150 genome equivalents/µL of sample
162 (calculated using N1 standard curve) (Figure 1).

163 The *Real/Time SARS-CoV-2* on the *m2000* assay yielded 127 (63.5%) positive results and no
164 invalid results (Table 1). The median C_n value for positive samples was 17.27 (IQR, 13.27 - 21.40), which
165 correlates to an RNA concentration of approximately 147 genome equivalents/µL of sample (Figure 1).
166 The ID NOW™ COVID-19 assay yielded 94 (47%) positive results (Table 1). Five (0.03%) samples first gave
167 invalid results; 3 resolved after repeat testing and the remaining 2 repeated as invalid.

168 **Analysis of discordant results.** There were 33 (17%) samples that yielded discordant results across the
169 three assays (Table 1). Eight discordant samples were not detected or gave inconclusive results by the
170 laboratory-modified CDC assay but were detected by the *Real/Time SARS-CoV-2* assay. The median C_n
171 value for these samples on the *Real/Time SARS-CoV-2* was 27.73 (IQR, 27.37 – 28.40), or approximately
172 0.34 genome equivalents/µL (Figure 2). Thirty-three samples (including 2 invalid samples) were not
173 detected by the ID NOW™ COVID-19 but were detected by the *Real/Time SARS-CoV-2* assay; 25 of these
174 were also detected by the laboratory-modified CDC assay. The median C_n values for these samples on
175 the *Real/Time SARS-CoV-2* were 21.42 (IQR, 20.80 - 23.88), or approximately 13.3 genome

176 equivalents/ μ L; differences among median values were statistically significant (Kruskal-Wallis p<.001)
177 (Figure 2).

178 Medical record review resolved all discrepant results in favor of the positive result (127 true
179 positives). The *Rea*/Time SARS-CoV-2 assay detected significantly more cases of COVID-19 than either
180 the laboratory-modified CDC assay [8 (4%) undetected cases, SD 0.014, 95% CI, 0.013 – 0.067] or the ID
181 NOW™ COVID-19 assay [33 (16.5%) undetected cases, SD 0.026, 95% CI, 0.11 – 0.22]; the difference in
182 detection between the laboratory-modified CDC assay and the ID NOW™ COVID-19 assay was also
183 significant.

184 **Assessment of dry nasal swabs tested by the ID NOW™ COVID-19 assay.** To analyze the performance of
185 the ID NOW™ COVID-19 assay further, we tested its performance using dry nasal swab samples and
186 compared results to those from paired nasopharyngeal samples tested by the *Rea*/Time SARS-CoV-2
187 assay. Ninety-seven patients were included in this evaluation. Mean age of patients was 59 \pm 17 years,
188 and 48 (48%) were women. Thirteen (13.4%) paired nasopharyngeal samples yielded positive results by
189 the *Rea*/Time SARS-CoV-2 assay. C_n values of these samples ranged from 9.2-29.2. SARS-CoV-2 RNA was
190 not detected in the remaining 84 (86.6%) samples.

191 **Workflow analysis.** Differences among key aspects of workflow for each of the three assays and
192 platforms are summarized in Table 3. We estimate that we can batch test and report results for 58
193 samples by the laboratory-modified CDC assay, and 94 samples by the *Rea*/Time SARS-CoV-2 assay, in an
194 8-hour shift. The ID NOW™ COVID-19 assay, which was developed for point of care, requires the least
195 hands-on time and provides the fastest results. However, throughput is limited (1 sample/instrument/5-
196 15 minutes).

197 **DISCUSSION**

198 Rapid, accurate detection of COVID-19 is essential to ensure speedy and appropriate patient
199 management, outbreak containment, and to better understand the global epidemiology of the virus.

200 Laboratory testing to date has relied primarily on the amplification and detection of viral gene
201 sequences in upper respiratory tract specimens. As new test kits are made available through the EUA
202 pathway, laboratories are confronted with the dilemma of deciding which test or platform to adopt for
203 SARS-CoV-2 detection. Additionally, laboratory directors are faced with numerous questions from
204 clinicians regarding performance characteristics of the tests. Responding to these questions is difficult,
205 since EUA requires only limited test validation (14); assays approved under EUA have not been
206 evaluated in clinical trials, and robust performance data from real world assessments are lacking.

207 Results of the current study help to fill this knowledge gap. We found significant differences in
208 detection of SARS-CoV-2 viral sequences among the *Real/Time* SARS-CoV-2 assay on the *m2000*, the
209 laboratory-modified CDC assay, and the ID NOW™ COVID-19 assay. The *Real/Time* SARS-CoV-2 assay on
210 the *m2000* detected the most cases, followed by the laboratory-modified CDC assay, and then the ID
211 NOW™ COVID-19 assay. Discrepant results were observed almost exclusively in samples with higher C_t
212 values, i.e., lower viral titer. These findings suggest differences in lower limit of detection of the assays.

213 For the laboratory-modified CDC RT-PCR assay, this might be explained in part by smaller input sample
214 volumes for extraction (200µL) and amplification (5µL), compared to 500µL extraction and 40µL
215 amplification volumes in the *Real/Time* SARS-CoV-2 assay on the *m2000*, i.e., there is more available
216 target for amplification and detection in the *Real/Time* SARS-CoV-2 assay on the *m2000*. Our results
217 comparing the *Real/Time* SARS-CoV-2 assay on the *m2000* and the ID NOW™ COVID-19 assay are
218 concordant with those of Harrington et al, who reported increased detection of SARS-CoV-2 RNA gene
219 sequences by the *Real/Time* SARS-CoV-2 assay compared to the ID NOW™ COVID-19 assay (15).

220 In order to eliminate confounding that could have been introduced by testing different sample
221 types on different systems, we evaluated aliquots of the same nasopharyngeal swab/viral transport
222 medium in all three assays. At the time of this study, nasopharyngeal swab specimens in viral transport
223 medium were deemed acceptable sample types for the 3 assays that we assessed. Following the

224 completion of our study, the manufacturer amended the package insert of the ID NOW™ COVID-19
225 assay to state that testing viral transport medium could lead to false-negative results. However, in our
226 subsequent analysis of dry nasal swab samples tested by the ID NOW™ COVID-19 assay and paired
227 nasopharyngeal swabs tested by the *Rea*/Time SARS-CoV-2 assay on the *m*2000, we continued to see
228 more true positive results by the *Rea*/Time SARS-CoV-2 assay on the *m*2000 assay, suggesting that
229 false-negative results were not due entirely to dilution.

230 We observed differences in turnaround time, workflow, and throughput among the three tests.

231 The *Rea*/Time SARS-CoV-2 assay on the *m*2000 had the longest runtime of the three assays:
232 approximately 8 hours for one full run of 94 samples. Runtime of the laboratory-developed CDC assay
233 was similar, but the throughput was less (58 samples in an 8-hour shift). The ID NOW™ COVID-19 assay
234 was the easiest to perform and yielded the fastest results; positive results are generated in as few as 5
235 minutes, which is faster than any other test system available currently in the United States. Ease of use
236 and speed are advantages in settings without laboratory expertise, or when rapid results are needed.

237 The assay platform is small and can be utilized at near-patient settings, thereby increasing the overall
238 testing capacity for SARS-CoV-2 within healthcare facilities. Availability of different platforms provides
239 beneficial flexibility to meet testing needs of different populations and different healthcare settings.

240 Our study has limitations. Because there is not a reference standard for SARS-CoV-2 infection,
241 we were unable to calculate sensitivity or specificity of the assays. Instead, we calculated percent
242 agreement, which is appropriate when a non-standard reference method is utilized to compare assay
243 performance (16). We resolved discrepant results through review of patient medical records, which may
244 have introduced bias, since concordant test results were not confirmed in the same way (17). We
245 enriched for samples that were positive by the *Rea*/Time SARS-CoV-2 assay on the *m*2000, which may
246 have biased in favor of this test. However, our inability to detect any samples that yielded a positive
247 result by either of the other two assays under evaluation and a negative result by the *Rea*/Time SARS-

248 CoV-2 assay in this study, or in our initial verification of the assay, suggests that the effect of bias is
249 small. Not all testing was performed on the same day due to workflow and personnel limitations,
250 although all testing was completed within 72 hours of sample collection. Storage of specimens at
251 ambient room (22°C) or refrigerated (4°C) temperature has been shown to have little impact on
252 detection of other RNA viruses by RT-PCR (18).

253 In conclusion, we found that The *RealTime* SARS-CoV-2 assay on the *m*2000 detected more
254 cases of COVID-19 infection than the modified CDC assay or the ID NOW™ COVID-19 test. The ID NOW™
255 COVID-19 test provided fastest results, and the small footprint of the instrument and ease of use are
256 advantages in settings without technical expertise. Both tests are welcome additions to the COVID-19
257 testing armamentarium, and increase nationwide testing capacity for COVID-19.

258

259 **Acknowledgements**

260 The following reagent was obtained through BEI Resources, NIAID, NIH: Genomic RNA from SARS-
261 Related Coronavirus 2, Isolate USA-WA1/2020, NR-52285.

262 **References**

- 263 1. **Zhu N, Zhang D, Wang W, Li X, Yang B, Song J, Zhao X, Huang B, Shi W, Lu R, Niu P, Zhan F, Ma X, Wang D, Xu W, Wu G, Gao GF, Tan W, China Novel Coronavirus I, Research T.** 2020. A Novel
264 Coronavirus from Patients with Pneumonia in China, 2019. *N Engl J Med* **382**:727-733.
- 265 2. **Wu F, Zhao S, Yu B, Chen YM, Wang W, Song ZG, Hu Y, Tao ZW, Tian JH, Pei YY, Yuan ML, Zhang YL, Dai FH, Liu Y, Wang QM, Zheng JJ, Xu L, Holmes EC, Zhang YZ.** 2020. A new
266 coronavirus associated with human respiratory disease in China. *Nature* **579**:265-269.
- 267 3. **Young BE, Ong SWX, Kalimuddin S, Low JG, Tan SY, Loh J, Ng OT, Marimuthu K, Ang LW, Mak TM, Lau SK, Anderson DE, Chan KS, Tan TY, Ng TY, Cui L, Said Z, Kurupatham L, Chen MI, Chan M, Vasoo S, Wang LF, Tan BH, Lin RTP, Lee VJM, Leo YS, Lye DC, Singapore Novel Coronavirus Outbreak Research T.** 2020. Epidemiologic Features and Clinical Course of Patients Infected
268 With SARS-CoV-2 in Singapore. *JAMA* doi:10.1001/jama.2020.3204.
- 269 4. **Bernard Stoecklin S, Rolland P, Silue Y, Mailles A, Campese C, Simondon A, Mechain M, Meurice L, Nguyen M, Bassi C, Yamani E, Behillil S, Ismael S, Nguyen D, Malvy D, Lescure FX, Georges S, Lazarus C, Tabai A, Stempfelet M, Enouf V, Coignard B, Levy-Bruhl D, Investigation T.** 2020. First cases of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) in France: surveillance, investigations and control measures, January 2020. *Euro Surveill* **25**.
- 270 5. **Spiteri G, Fielding J, Diercke M, Campese C, Enouf V, Gaymard A, Bella A, Sognamiglio P, Sierra Moros MJ, Riutort AN, Demina YV, Mahieu R, Broas M, Bengner M, Buda S, Schilling J, Filleul L, Lepoutre A, Saura C, Mailles A, Levy-Bruhl D, Coignard B, Bernard-Stoecklin S, Behillil S, van der Werf S, Valette M, Lina B, Riccardo F, Nicastri E, Casas I, Larrauri A, Salom Castell M, Pozo F, Maksyutov RA, Martin C, Van Ranst M, Bossuyt N, Siira L, Sane J, Tegmark-Wisell K, Palmerus M, Broberg EK, Beaute J, Jorgensen P, Bundle N, Pereyaslov D, Adlhoch C, Pukkila J,**

- 285 **Pebody R, Olsen S, et al.** 2020. First cases of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) in the WHO
286 European Region, 24 January to 21 February 2020. *Euro Surveill* **25**.
- 287 6. **Mousavi SH, Shah J, Giang HTN, Al-Ahdal TMA, Zahid SU, Temory F, Paikan FM, Karimzadeh S, Huy NT.** 2020. The first COVID-19 case in Afghanistan acquired from Iran. *Lancet Infect Dis*
288 doi:10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30231-0.
- 290 7. **Silverstein WK, Stroud L, Cleghorn GE, Leis JA.** 2020. First imported case of 2019 novel
291 coronavirus in Canada, presenting as mild pneumonia. *Lancet* **395**:734.
- 292 8. **Holshue ML, DeBolt C, Lindquist S, Lofy KH, Wiesman J, Bruce H, Spitters C, Ericson K, Wilkerson S, Tural A, Diaz G, Cohn A, Fox L, Patel A, Gerber SI, Kim L, Tong S, Lu X, Lindstrom S, Pallansch MA, Weldon WC, Biggs HM, Uyeki TM, Pillai SK, Washington State -nCo VCIT.** 2020.
293 First Case of 2019 Novel Coronavirus in the United States. *N Engl J Med* **382**:929-936.
- 296 9. **Kim JY, Choe PG, Oh Y, Oh KJ, Kim J, Park SJ, Park JH, Na HK, Oh MD.** 2020. The First Case of
297 2019 Novel Coronavirus Pneumonia Imported into Korea from Wuhan, China: Implication for
298 Infection Prevention and Control Measures. *J Korean Med Sci* **35**:e61.
- 299 10. **Ghinai I, McPherson TD, Hunter JC, Kirking HL, Christiansen D, Joshi K, Rubin R, Morales-Estrada S, Black SR, Pacilli M, Fricchione MJ, Chugh RK, Walblay KA, Ahmed NS, Stoecker WC, Hasan NF, Burdsall DP, Reese HE, Wallace M, Wang C, Moeller D, Korpics J, Novosad SA, Benowitz I, Jacobs MW, Dasari VS, Patel MT, Kauerauf J, Charles EM, Ezike NO, Chu V, Midgley CM, Rolfes MA, Gerber SI, Lu X, Lindstrom S, Verani JR, Layden JE, Illinois C-IT.** 2020. First
300 known person-to-person transmission of severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2
301 (SARS-CoV-2) in the USA. *Lancet* doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30607-3.
- 306 11. **CDC.** 2020. 2019-Novel Coronavirus (2019-nCoV) Real-Time RT-PCR Diagnostic Panel Services
307 DoHaH, Atlanta, GA. <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/downloads/rt-pcr-panel-for-detection-instructions.pdf>.

- 309 12. **Abbott.** Abbott RealTime SARS-CoV-2 Assay Package Insert., *on* Abbott Molecular, Inc.
310 https://www.molecular.abbott/sal/9N77-095_SARS-CoV-2_US_EUA_Amp_PI.pdf. Accessed
311 March 19, 2020.
- 312 13. **Abbott.** ID NOW COVID-19 Package Insert., *on* Abbott Diagnostics Scarborough, Inc.
313 <https://www.fda.gov/media/136525/download>. Accessed March 29, 2020.
- 314 14. **FDA.** Policy for Diagnostics Tests for Coronavirus Disease-2019 during the Public Health
315 Emergency. <https://www.fda.gov/media/135659/download>. Accessed March 17, 2020.
- 316 15. **Harrington A, Cox B, Snowdon J, Bakst J, Ley E, Grajales P, Maggiore J, Kahn S.** 2020.
317 Comparison of Abbott ID Now and Abbott m2000 methods for the detection of SARS-CoV-2
318 from nasopharyngeal and nasal swabs from symptomatic patients. *J Clin Microbiol*
319 doi:10.1128/JCM.00798-20.
- 320 16. **CLSI.** 2008. User Protocol for Evaluation of Qualitative Test Performance; Approved Guideline--
321 Second Edition. CLSI document EP12-A2. Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute, Wayne, PA.
- 322 17. **McAdam AJ.** 2000. Discrepant analysis: how can we test a test? *J Clin Microbiol* **38**:2027-2029.
- 323 18. **Druce J, Garcia K, Tran T, Papadakis G, Birch C.** 2012. Evaluation of swabs, transport media, and
324 specimen transport conditions for optimal detection of viruses by PCR. *J Clin Microbiol* **50**:1064-
325 1065.
- 326

327 **Table 1.** Detection of SARS-CoV-2 RNA by laboratory-modified CDC 2019-nCOV RT-PCR assay, *Real/Time* SARS-CoV-2 on the *m*2000, and ID
328 NOW™ COVID-19*

No. samples tested (N=200)	Laboratory-modified CDC 2019-nCOV RT-PCR	<i>Real/Time</i> SARS-CoV-2 on the <i>m</i> 2000	ID NOW COVID-19
94	Detected	Detected	Detected
73	Not detected	Not detected	Not detected
23	Detected	Detected	Not detected
2	Detected	Detected	Invalid ^a
6	Not detected	Detected	Not detected
2	Inconclusive ^b	Detected	Not detected

329 *Categories with zero samples are not shown.

330 ^aInvalid defined as a sample that gave neither a positive nor a negative result.

331 ^bInconclusive defined as a sample that gave a C_t value <40 for either N1 or N2 targets.

332 **Table 2.** Performance agreement for detection of SARS-CoV-2 RNA by laboratory-modified CDC 2019-nCOV RT-PCR assay, *Real*/Time SARS-CoV-2
333 on the *m*2000, and ID NOW™ COVID-19 (N=200 samples)

Assay comparison (A/B)	Positive Percent Agreement (95% CI)	Assay comparison (A/B)	Negative Percent Agreement (95% CI)
LDT+/m2000+	100 (96.9, 100)	LDT-/2000-	92.4 (84.2, 97.2)
LDT+/ID NOW+	80.3 (71.9, 87.1)	LDT-/ID NOW-	100 (95.4, 100)
m2000+/ID NOW+	75.2 (66.7, 82.5)	m2000-/ID NOW-	100 (95.4, 100)

334 Abbreviations: LDT, laboratory-modified CDC 2019-nCOV RT-PCR assay; m2000, *Real*/Time SARS-CoV-2 on the *m*2000; ID NOW, ID NOW™ COVID-
335 19.

336 **Table 3.** Workflow analysis comparing laboratory-modified CDC 2019-nCOV RT-PCR, Abbott *m*2000 SARS-CoV-2, and ID NOW™ COVID-19 assays

Parameter ^a	Laboratory-modified CDC	<i>Real</i> /Time SARS-CoV-2 on	ID NOW™ COVID-19
	2019-nCOV RT-PCR	the <i>m</i> 2000	
Off-board lysis	Yes	No	No
Specimen processing & set up	1.75	1.00	0.03
Instrument extraction time	1.30	4.0	0.05
Amplification & real-time detection	1.25	2.25	0.22
Manual interpretation and result entry	0.5	0.75	.02
Total time to result ^b	4.8	8.0	0.27
No. samples processed in 8-hour shift per instrument	58 ^c	94 ^d	32 ^e

337 ^aTimes are per batch for the in-house LDT and Abbott *m*2000 assays, and per sample for the ID NOW.338 ^bTime from sample processing through result reporting339 ^cA maximum of 58 clinical samples, not including external positive control, negative control, negative template control, RNase P control.340 ^dA maximum of 94 clinical samples.341 ^eAssumes continuous processing of 32 clinical samples, all with negative results.

342 **Figure 1.** SARS-CoV-2 Standard Curves for laboratory-modified CDC 2019-nCOV RT-PCR assay and
343 *Real*/Time SARS-CoV-2 on the *m*2000 assay. Values shown represent mean ± SEM of three independent
344 replicates. Trend line equations: Laboratory-modified CDC assay (N1), $y=-2.054\ln(x) + 40.585$, $R^2=1.0$;
345 laboratory modified CDC assay (N2), $y=-1.966\ln(x) + 40.022$, $R^2 = 0.99$; *Real*/Time SARS-CoV-2 on the
346 *m*2000 assay, $y=-1.729\ln(x) + 25.899$, $R^2=0.99$. *Only 2 of 3 replicates amplified and are included in
347 estimate.

348 **Figure 2.** Comparison of C_t values among samples detected by each of the three assays, as measured by
349 the *Real*/Time SARS-CoV-2 on the *m*2000 standard curve. Median Ct value differences were statistically
350 significant (**Kruskal-Wallis p<0.001 for all comparisons). Abbreviations: LDT, laboratory-modified CDC
351 2019-nCOV RT-PCR assay; *m*2000, *Real*/Time SARS-CoV-2 on the *m*2000; ID NOW, ID NOW™ COVID-19.



