Performance evaluation of the point-of-care SAMBA II SARS-CoV-2 Test for detection of SARS-CoV-2

Sonny M Assennato[a*], Allyson V Ritchie[a*], Cesar Nadala[b], Neha Goel[a], Hongyi Zhang[c], Rawlings Datir[d], Ravindra K Gupta[e,f], Martin D Curran[c**], Helen H Lee[a,b**#]

*Assennato and Ritchie contributed equally, author order was decided alphabetically

**Curran and Lee contributed equally

a. Diagnostics for the Real World EU Ltd., Chesterford Research Park, Great Chesterford, UK

b. Diagnostics for the Real World Ltd., San Jose, USA

c. Clinical Microbiology and Public Health Laboratory, PHE Cambridge, Addenbrooke's Hospital, Cambridge, UK

d. Division of Infection and Immunity, University College London, London, UK

e. Department of Medicine, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, UK

f. Africa Health Research Institute, Durban, South Africa

Running Title: SAMBA II SARS-CoV-2 analytical and clinical evaluation

Address correspondence to Dr Helen H Lee, email: hl207@cam.ac.uk

Key words: SAMBA II, SARS-CoV-2, point-of-care, COVID-19

Abstract

Nucleic acid amplification for the detection of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in respiratory samples is the standard method for diagnosis. These tests are centralised and therefore turnaround times can be 2-5 days. Point-of-care testing with rapid turnaround times would allow more effective triage in settings where patient management and infection control decisions need to be made rapidly.

Inclusivity and specificity of the SAMBA II SARS-CoV-2 assay was determined by *in silico* analyses of the primers and probes. Analytical and clinical sensitivity and specificity of the SAMBA II SARS-CoV-2 Test was evaluated for analytical sensitivity and specificity. Clinical performance was evaluated in residual clinical samples compared to the Public Health England reference tests.

The limit of detection of the SAMBA II SARS-CoV-2 Test is 250 cp/mL and is specific for detection of 2 regions of the SARS-CoV-2 genome. The clinical sensitivity was evaluated in 172 clinical samples provided by the Clinical Microbiology and Public Health Laboratory, Addenbrooke's Hospital, Cambridge (CMPHL), which showed a sensitivity of 98.9% (95% CI 94.03-99.97%), specificity of 100% (95% CI 95.55-100%), PPV of 100% and NPV of 98.78% (92.02-99.82%) compared to testing by CMPHLSAMBA detected 3 positive samples that were initially negative by PHE Test.

The data shows that the SAMBA II SARS-CoV-2 Test performs equivalently to the centralised testing methods with a much quicker turnaround time. Point of care testing, such as SAMBA, should enable rapid patient management and effective implementation of infection control measures.

Introduction

The SARS-CoV-2 was first reported in Wuhan, China, in early December 2019 and is the causative agent of coronavirus disease 19 (COVID-19) [1]. It has since spread to over 188 countries/regions around the world [2], causing 317,234 deaths [3]. It was declared a pandemic by the World Health Organisation on the 11th of March 2020 [4]. In Europe, the country with the highest number of deaths is UK, which as of the 17th of May has had 243,694 lab-confirmed cases and 34,636 deaths in all settings [5].

Nucleic acid testing is essential for early diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2 infection as antibody response is often not detected until 7-10 post onset of symptoms [6]. Upper respiratory tract (URT) specimens such as nose and throat swabs generally have high SARS-CoV-2 viral loads upon symptom onset [7]. The standard diagnostic test for SARS-CoV-2 in the UK is done by real-time RT-PCR of the RdRp gene [8], from a combined throat and nose swab sample. The UK has dramatically scaled up testing from 5,000 tests per day in March 2020 to 100,000 tests per day by the end of April. Although this test has good accuracy, the samples must be transported to centralized testing laboratories and batched for processing, which leads to turnaround times of around 48 hours or more. This means treatment of severely ill patients may be suboptimal when other causative pathogens are in the differential diagnosis and those requiring admission or triage with possible COVID-19 maybe unnecessarily isolated or inappropriately cohorted in a COVID-19 ward. This causes obvious bottlenecks in addition to the sheer number of samples that require processing; at present hospital and regional laboratories are at full capacity and a rapid point of care (POC) testing is required.

The SAMBA II nucleic acid testing system was originally designed for HIV testing in

76 POC and resource-limited settings, with CE-marked products for early infant diagnosis
77 [9,10] and viral load monitoring [11-13]. Since 2017, SAMBA HIV tests have been
78 implemented in Uganda, Malawi, Zimbabwe and Central African Republic. The
79 SAMBA II SARS-CoV-2 Test system has now been developed to specifically detect
80 the presence of the novel coronavirus, SARS-CoV-2, in nose and throat swab samples
81 run on the SAMBA II instrument. Test results are available in approximately 1.5 hours.
82 We have here assessed the analytical and clinical performance of the SAMBA II
83 SARS-CoV-2 Test using panels and clinical samples.
84

85 **Materials and Methods**

86 **SAMBA sample preparation, amplification, and detection**

87 For the SAMBA II system, sample preparation, amplification, and detection as well as
88 reading and interpretation of the results are fully automated. The test is carried out in
89 the SAMBA II Assay Module under the control of the SAMBA II Tablet Module as
90 previously described for HIV [9-12], according to the manufacturer's instructions for
91 use. Nose and throat swab samples are preferably resuspended in 2 mL of SAMBA
92 SCoV buffer but the system can be used with viral transport medium (VTM) if the
93 sample is diluted 1:2 with SCoV buffer prior to processing. The input volume for the
94 SAMBA test is 300 μl of which 250 μl is used by the SAMBA II machine as input into
95 the sample preparation. The SAMBA II SARS-CoV-2 Test specifically amplifies and
96 detects two regions of the SARS-CoV-2 genome in the ORF1ab (region 1) and
97 nucleocapsid protein (region 2), reported as two distinct lines on the test strip. A third
98 line on the test strip, the internal control, is present to control for false negatives
99 caused by instrument/reagent problems or inhibition. The presence of one or both test
100 lines indicates a positive result. The presence of just the internal control line indicates

101 a negative result.

102 **Virus inactivation in SAMBA SCoV buffer**

103 SAMBA SCoV buffer, containing Triton x100, is provided with the SAMBA II SARS-
104 CoV-2 Test for sample collection of the nose and throat swabs. Single round of VSV-
105 G pseudotyped lentiviruses were produced by transfecting HEK-293T cells in a 3-
106 plasmid transfection system (HIV Gag-pol expresser under a CMV promoter,
107 luciferase genome reporter and VSV-g envelope) as previously described [14]. Virus
108 supernatant was harvested after 24 hours and filtered. Fifty (50) µL
109 of pseudovirus preparation was added to increasing dilutions of SAMBA SCoV Buffer
110 in duplicates and incubated at room temperature for 5 minutes. 100µL of the virus-
111 reagent prep was then used to infect 1.0×10^6 TZMbl target cells per well in a 96-well
112 plate and incubated at 37°C, 5% CO_2. Forty-eight (48) hours post-infection, luciferase
113 expression was measured using SteadyGlo and a Glomax Luminometer (both
114 Promega).

115

116 ***In silico* inclusivity analysis**

117 The SAMBA-SARS-CoV-2 primers and probes for Orf1ab and N regions were
118 individually evaluated using *in-silico* analysis with respect to 157 SARS-CoV-2
119 sequences in the NCBI database.

120

121 ***In silico* specificity analysis**

122 *In silico* analysis for possible cross-reactions with related human Coronaviruses
123 (Human coronavirus 229E, Human coronavirus OC43, Human coronavirus HKU1,
124 Human coronavirus NL63, SARS-coronavirus and MERS-coronavirus) was conducted

125 by mapping primers in the SAMBA II SARS-CoV-2 Test individually to the sequences
126 downloaded from the NCBI database.
127 An *in silico* analysis for possible cross-reactions with other high-priority organisms was
128 conducted by carrying out a blastn search for each of the SAMBA primers and probes
129 against NCBI databases and retrieving all sequences with homologies > 80%.
130

131 **Panels and samples**

132 Panel members for determination of the limit of detection (LOD) were prepared by
133 making serial dilutions of SARS-CoV-2 RNA from strain 2019-nCoV/Italy-INMI1 from
134 EVAg (code number: 008N-03894) in pooled negative combined nose and throat
135 swab samples to target concentrations of 750, 500, 250, 200, 150 and 100
136 copies/mL.
137 A Coronavirus RNA specificity panel containing hCoV-NL63, hCoV-229E, hCoV-
138 OC43, MERS-CoV and SARS-CoV HKU339849 were sourced from EVAg (code
139 number 011N-03868). RNA samples from this panel were tested at >100,000 cp/test
140 in the SAMBA II test to determine specificity against other human Coronaviruses.
141

142 **Contrived clinical samples**

143 Combined nose and throat swabs were collected from 35 presumed negative
144 individuals using FLOQSwabs (Copan, Italy) and SAMBA SCoV buffer. Thirty
145 contrived positive clinical samples were prepared by spiking known concentrations of
146 SARS-CoV-2 RNA strain 2019-nCoV/Italy-INMI1 (EVAg, Italy) into individual negative
147 specimens to produce final concentrations of 1x LoD (n=3), 2x LoD (n=17), 3x LoD
148 (n=5), 5x LoD (n=3) and 100x LoD (n=2).
149

150 **Clinical evaluation**

151 The clinical performance of the SAMBA II SARS-CoV-2 Test was further evaluated
152 retrospectively with 172 residual blinded combined nose and throat swab samples
153 from CMPHL Cambridge laboratory. These residual samples were from symptomatic
154 individuals with suspected Covid-19 from around the East of England region sent for
155 routine laboratory diagnosis and provided as VTM diluted 1:2 with SAMBA SCoV
156 buffer. In total 172 samples were tested by the SAMBA II SARS-CoV-2 Test and
157 results were compared to the Cambridge RdRp gene (Wuhan) assay on the Rotor
158 gene Q real-time PCR assay routinely used by CMPHL based on the publication by
159 Sridhar et al., 2020 [15]. Results are expressed as positive or negative with a Ct cut
160 off of 36 for positive results. Samples were also tested with the PHE Colindale
161 (Reference Laboratory) assay, based on the publication by Corman et al, 2020 [8],
162 which amplifies a different region of the RdRp gene.

163 For LOD, we used SARS-CoV-2 RNA quantified in cp/mL but in the clinical samples,
164 SAMBA II results were compared to real-time PCR results expressed as Ct number
165 (number of cycles). By systematically testing serial dilutions of samples calibrated in
166 cp/mLby the PHE test a correspondence curve was drawn showing for instance that
167 25 Ct corresponded to 100,000 cp/mL and 30 Ct to 1,000 cp/mL. The curve obtained
168 is added as supplementary information.

169

170 **Research Ethics**

171 Surplus samples obtained from patients known to be symptomatic for COVID-19 and
172 submitted to the CMPHL for routine testing were retrieved before being discarded.
173 These samples were rendered anonymous and provided blinded for the purpose of
174 test validation. Public Health England and NHS Research Ethics Committee have

175 permitted the use of residual samples in this manner, strictly for the purpose of
176 diagnostic assay validation [16]. The evaluation was carried out in accordance with
177 The Use of Human Organs and Tissue act [17].
178
179 **Results**
180 **Viral inactivation by SAMBA SCoV collection buffer**
181 Due to the highly infectious nature of SARS-CoV-2, a proprietary buffer which has a
182 low pH and a strong detergent was developed for the SAMBA SARS-CoV-2 Test for
183 sample collection. The ability of the SAMBA SCoV Buffer to inactivate pseudoviruses
184 was assessed by incubating pseudoviruses with increasing dilutions of
185 SAMBA SCoV Buffer in duplicates at room temperature for 5 minutes. Forty-eight (48)
186 hours post-infection, luciferase expression was measured. Figure 1 shows the plot of
187 $\log_{10}$ relative light units (RLU) of luciferase expression vs concentration of
188 SAMBA SCoV Buffer containing Triton X100. Results show that luciferase activity was
189 insignificant up to 1:128 dilution of the SAMBA SCoV Buffer, indicating that
190 the pseudovirus was inactivated after 5-minute exposure at room temperature (Figure
191 1). For the SAMBA II Test, a 10-minute soaking of the swab in the
192 SAMBA SCoV Buffer is recommended.
193
194 **Limit of detection**
195 The limit of detection (LOD) of the SAMBA II SARS-CoV-2 Test was determined using
196 serial dilutions of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in pooled negative combined nose and throat
197 swab samples. The initial LOD was determined by testing 6 levels at target
198 concentrations of 750, 500, 250, 200, 150 and 100 copies/mL. Each panel member
199 was tested in replicates of 3 (Table 1). The final LOD was confirmed by testing 250

200 copies/mL in replicates of 20, of which all were detected. The results are summarized
201 in Table 1. Therefore, the claimed LOD of the SAMBA II SARS-CoV-2 Test is 250
202 cp/mL.
203
204 **Inclusivity**
205 The SAMBA II SARS-CoV-2 Test primers and probes for Target 1 (Orf 1ab) had 100%
206 match to all but one available SARS-CoV-2 sequence for this region in the NCBI
207 database (n=157). For this one sequence, a single nucleotide mismatch was found
208 that maps to the capture probe with no predicted impact on the assay performance.
209 The primers and probes for Target 2 (N) had 100% identity to all available SARS-CoV-
210 2 sequences for this region in the NCBI database (n=157).
211
212 **Specificity analysis**
213 *In silico* analysis for possible cross-reactions with related human coronaviruses
214 (Human coronavirus 229E, Human coronavirus OC43, Human coronavirus HKU1,
215 Human coronavirus NL63, SARS-coronavirus and MERS-coronavirus) concluded that
216 none of the SAMBA primers had >80% homology to the organisms listed. In addition
217 to *in silico* analysis, the SAMBA II SARS-CoV-2 Test was evaluated for specificity by
218 using >100,000 cp/test of hCoV-NI63, hCoV-229E, hCoV-OC43, MERS-CoV and
219 SARS-CoV RNA as target in the assay. All samples gave negative results in SAMBA
220 showing that both the Orf1ab and N primers and probes in the SAMBA II SARS-CoV-
221 2 were specific.
222 An *in silico* analysis for possible cross-reactions with other high-priority organisms
223 showed that only one SAMBA probe (N region) had greater than 80% homology (81%)
224 to one of the high priority organisms (*Pneumocystis jirovecii* [PJP]). This marginal

225 homology would not impact the performance of the test because the other primers and
226 probes have no homology to *P. jirovecii*. This homology would not be able to compete
227 with 100% homology of the SARS-CoV-2 amplicon to the capture probe.
228
229 **Contrived clinical specimens**
230 Positive (n=30) and negative (n=35) swab samples were contrived from individual
231 nose and throat swab samples collected from 35 individuals and tested with the
232 SAMBA II SARS-CoV-2 Test. Spiked positive samples were tested at 1x LOD (n=3),
233 2x LOD (n=17), 3x LOD (n=5), 5x LOD (n=3) and 100x LOD (n=2) by spiking SARS-
234 CoV-2 RNA into individual negative swab samples. All 35 negative samples were
235 negative and all 30 spiked positive samples were positive when tested with the
236 SAMBA II SARS-CoV-2 Test (Table 2). The overall sensitivity was 100% (95%CI:
237 88.43-100%) and specificity was 100% (95%CI: 90-100%).
238
239 **Clinical evaluation**
240 The clinical performance of the SAMBA II SARS-CoV-2 Test was further evaluated
241 with 172 combined nose and throat samples from symptomatic individuals provided
242 blinded by CMPHL. The samples were provided in Viral Transport Medium (VTM)
243 diluted 1:2 with SAMBA SCoV buffer. After initial testing there were 87 concordant
244 positives, 81 concordant negatives and 4 discrepant results (3 SAMBA positive and
245 one SAMBA negative) compared with the PHE Colindale reference laboratory test
246 (Table 3). The three SAMBA positive samples were repeat positive by SAMBA and on
247 retest by CMPHL they were found to be borderline positive with high CT values for at
248 least one of the target genes on the Colindale or Cambridge (Wuhan) test (Table 4).
249 The one SAMBA negative sample was negative on repeat by SAMBA but was positive

250 by PHE for RdRp using both the Cambridge (Wuhan) and Colindale assays, with Ct
251 values of 28.87 and 31.18 respectively (Table 4). Therefore, there was just 1
252 discrepant sample after retest, a false negative for SAMBA (Table 5). From this data
253 set the SAMBA II SARS-CoV-2 Test has a sensitivity of 98.9% (95% CI 94.03-
254 99.97%), specificity of 100% (95% CI 95.55-100%), PPV of 100% and NPV of 98.78%
255 (92.02-99.82%) when compared to the PHE reference tests. The one SAMBA false
256 negative gave a high Ct value on the PHE test (>31), suggesting low viral load, and it
257 was diluted (1:2) for SAMBA testing, which may explain the false-negative result.
258

259 **Discussion**

260 POC molecular tests for SARS-CoV-2, such as SAMBA II, are required to quickly
261 triage patients as centralised testing can take 2-5 days for results. In addition, POC
262 tests would be extremely useful for non-laboratory residential settings such as prisons,
263 immigration centres, nursing homes and rehabilitative centres. The people living in
264 such facilities tend to be vulnerable populations who are at a higher risk for adverse
265 outcome and for infection due to living in close proximity to others [18] and early
266 identification and implementation of increased infection control measures would
267 reduce spread amongst residents and staff. POC would also be extremely useful in
268 other situations where rapid and accurate results are required e.g organ donation,
269 hospital admissions and emergency surgery. POC molecular tests with rapid
270 turnaround, such as SAMBA II, will be essential not only during high rates of infection
271 but also as the country begins to end the lockdown period and localised outbreaks will
272 need to be managed quickly and efficiently.

273 Our data shows that the SAMBA II SARS-CoV-2 Test is equivalent to centralised
274 testing with excellent sensitivity and specificity. Samples are inactivated in the SAMBA

275 collection buffer and results are available within 86-101 minutes at the POC. High
276 sensitivity and specificity are essential for the appropriate triaging and treatment of
277 incoming patients. The assay has a limit of detection of 250 cp/mL, which is in-line
278 with that claimed by other commercial SARS-CoV-2 tests [19,20]. The specificity of
279 the SAMBA SARS-CoV-2 Test in clinical samples was 100% and the sensitivity was
280 98.9% compared to the centralised molecular testing by CMPHL. This data includes 3
281 positive samples detected by SAMBA that were original negative by centralised testing
282 indicating good sensitivity. Clinical evaluation by Zhen et al [21] comparing the
283 performance of Xpert® Xpress SARS-CoV-2 (Cepheid), ePlex® SARS-CoV-
284 2 (GenMark) and ID NOW™ COVID-19 (Abbott) showed limit of detection of 100
285 cp/mL, 1,000 cp/mL and 10,000 cp/mL and clinical agreement with the reference
286 standard of 98.3%, 91.4% and 87.7% respectively. In another study the Xpert system
287 has been shown to have good agreement with the reference test over a wide range of
288 Ct values, including low positives [22,23] with a positive agreement of 98.9% and
289 negative agreement of 92.0% compared to Roche cobas [22]. The Abbott ID NOW
290 has been shown to have a positive agreement of 73.9% (95% CI: 63.2-82.3%) and
291 negative agreement of 100% (95%CI: 92.9-100%) compared to the lab-based Roche
292 cobas system, with the majority of false negative samples being low viral load (>30 Ct
293 cycles by Roche cobas) [22]. Abbott have since modified the instructions for use to
294 remove the use of swab in transport medium as samples may become too dilute and
295 affect the sensitivity [24].
296 Potential limitations of this study include that the virus inactivation study was carried
297 out using a constructed pseudovirus rather than a SARS-CoV-2 or other coronavirus
298 due to availability. Also clinical samples were collected in VTM and diluted 1:2 in SCoV
299 buffer rather than collected directly into SCoV buffer, which may affect the sensitivity.

Acknowledgements

RKG is funded by Wellcome Senior Fellowship In Clinical Science award no WT108082AIA

References

1. Huang C, Wang Y, Li X, Ren L, Zhao J, Hu Y, Zhang L, Fan G, Xu J, Gu X, Cheng Z, Yu T, Xia J, Wei Y, Wu W, Xie X, Yin W, Li H, Liu M, Xiao Y, Gao H, Guo L, Xie J, Wang G, Jiang R, Gao Z, Jin Q, Wang J, Cao B. 2020. Clinical features of patients infected with 2019 novel coronavirus in Wuhan, China. Lancet 395(10223):497-506.
2. COVID-19 Dashboard by the Center for Systems Science and Engineering (CSSE) at John Hopkins University (JHU). ArcGIS. John Hopkins University. (Accessed 18th May 2020).
3. https://www.worldometers.info/coronavirus/ (Accessed 18th May 2020).
4. World Health Organisation. 2020. WHO Director-General's opening remarks at the media briefing on COVID-19 - 11 March 2020. Available from: https://www.who.int/dg/speeches/detail/who-director-general-s-opening-remarks-at-the-media-briefing-on-covid-19---11-march-2020. (Accessed 10th May 2020)
5. https://coronavirus.data.gov.uk (Accessed 18th May 2020).
6. Grzelak L, Temman S, Plachais C, Grzelak L, Temmam S, Planchais C, Demeret C, Huon C, Guivel F, Staropoli I, Chazal M, Dufloo J, Planas D, Buchrieser J, Rajah MM, Robinot R, Porrot F, Albert M, Chen K, Crescenzo B, Donati F, Anna F, Souque P, Gransagne M, Bellalou J, Nowakowski M, Backovic M, Bouadma I, Le Fevre L, Le Hingrat

Q, Descamps D, Pourbaix A, Yazdanpanah Y, Tondeur L, Besombes C, Ungeheuer M, Mellon G, Morel P, Rolland S, Rey F, Behillil S, Enouf V, Lemaitre A, Creach M, Petres S, Escriou N, Charneau P, Fontanet A, Hoen B, Bruel T, Eloit M, Mouquet H, Schwartz O, van der Werf S. 2020. SARS-CoV-2 serological analysis of COVID-19 hospitalized patients, pauci-symptomatic individuals and blood donors. medRxiv https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.21.20068858

7. Pan Y, Zhang D, Yang P, Poon LIM, Wang Q. 2020. Viral load of SARS-CoV-2 in clinical samples. The Lancet. 20(4):411-412.
8. Corman, VM, Landt O, Kaiser M, Molenkamp R, Meijer A, Chu DKW, Bleicker T, Brnink S, Schneider J, Schmidt ML, Mulders DGJC, Haagmans BL, van der Veer B, van den Brink S, Wijsman L, Goderski G, Romette J-L, Ellis J, Zambon M, Peirlis M, Goossens H, Reusken C, Koopmans MPG, Drosten C. 2020. Detection of 2019 novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV) by real-time RT-PCR. Euro Surveill, 25(3) https://doi.org/10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2020.25.3.2000045
9. Ritchie AV, Goel N, Sembongi H, Lehga J, Farleigh LE, Edemaga D, Wisniewski CA, Lee HH.(2016. Performance evaluation of the point-of-care SAMBA I and II HIV-1 Qual whole blood tests. J Virol Methods. Nov;237:143-149.
10. Ondiek J, Namukaya Z, Mtapuri-Zinyowera S, Balkan S, Elbireer A, Ushiro Lumb I, Kiyaga C, Goel N, Ritchie A, Ncube P, Omuomu K, Ndiege K, Kekitiinwa A, Mangwanya D, Fowler MG, Nadala L, Lee H. 2017. Multi-country validation of SAMBA – A novel molecular point-of-care test for HIV-1 detection in resource-limited setting. J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr. Oct 1;76(2):e52-e57.

350 11. Ritchie AV, Ushiro-Lumb I, Edemaga D, Joshi HA, De Ruiter A, Szumilin E,
351 Jendrulek I, McGuire M, Goel N, Sharma PI, Allain JP, Lee HH. 2014. SAMBA
352 HIV semiquantitative test, a new point-of-care viral-load-monitoring assay for
353 resource-limited settings. J Clin Microbiol. 52(9):3377-83.
354 12. Goel N, Ritchie AV, Mtapuri-Zinyowera S, Zeh C, Stepchenkova T, Lehga J,
355 De Ruiter A, Farleigh LE, Edemaga D, So R, Sembongi H, Wisniewski C,
356 Nadala L, Schito M, Lee H. 2017. Performance of the SAMBA I and II HIV-1
357 Semi-Q Tests for viral load monitoring at the point-of-care. J Virol Methods.
358 Jun;224:39-45.
359 13. Titchmarsh L, Zeh, C, Verpoort T, Allain, J-P and Lee, H.2015. Leukodepletion
360 as a Point-of-Care Method for Monitoring HIV-1 Viral Load in Whole Blood. J. Clin.
361 Microbiol.53(4):1080-1086.
362 14. Gupta RK, Kohli A, McCormick AL, Towers GJ, Pillay D, Parry CM. 2017 Full
363 length HIV-1 Gag determines protease inhibitor susceptibility within *in*
364 *vitro* assays. AIDS. Jul17;24(11):1615-1655.
365 15. Sridhar S, Forrest S, Kean I, Young J, Scott JB, Maes M, Pereira-Dias J,
366 Parmar S, Routledge M, Rivett L, Dougan G, Weekes M, Curran M,
367 Goodfellow I, Baker S. 2020. A blueprint for the implementation of a
368 validated approach for the detection of SARS-Cov2 in clinical samples in
369 academic facilities. bioRxiv https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.14.041319
370 16. Public Health England. 2017. UK Standards for Microbiology
371 Investigations - Evaluations, validations and verifications of diagnostic tests.
372 Issue no. 5, 16 March 2017
373 17. UK Legislation. Human Tissue Act. 2004.

374 18. Infection Prevention and Control guidance for Long-Term Care Facilities in the
375 context of COVID-19: World Health Organisation. [updated 21 March 2020].
376 Available from: https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/331508. (Accessed 11
377 May 2020).
378 19. FDA. 2020. Xpert® Xpress SARS-CoV-2 Instructions for Use, April 2020.
379 https://www.fda.gov/media/136314/download (Accessed 10 May 2020).
380 20. FDA. 2020. Biomerieux ARGENE® SARS-CoV-2 R Gene® Instructions for
381 Use, May 2020. https://www.fda.gov/media/137742/download (Accessed 10
382 May 2020).
383 21. Zhen W, Smith E, Manj R, Schron D, Berry GJ. (2020) Clinical Evaluation of
384 Three Sample-To-Answer Platforms for the Detection of SARS-CoV-2. J. Clin.
385 Microbiol. Apr 24 DOI: 10.1128/JCM.00783-20
386 22. Smithgall MC, Scherberkova' I, Whittier S, Green DA (2020) Comparison of
387 Cepheid Xpert Xpress and Abbott ID Now to Roche cobas for the Rapid
388 Detection of SARS-CoV-2. bioRxiv https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.22.055327.
389 23. Moran A, Beavis KG, Matushek SM, Ciaglia C, Francios N, Tesic V, Love N.
390 2020. The Detection of SARS-CoV-2 using the Cepheid Xpert Xpress SARS-
391 CoV-2 and Roche cobas SARS-CoV-2 Assays. J Clin Microbiol. Apr 17.
392 doi: 10.1128/JCM.00772-2
393 24. Abbott. 2020. ID NOW COVID-19 Technical Brief and Sample Type Labelling
394 Update. April 2020

395 **Figure 1. Viral inactivation as demonstrated by Luminescence from a VSV-G**
396 **pseudotyped reporter virus in descending concentrations of SAMBA Reagent**
397 **(SCoV Buffer).**



398

399

400

401 **Table 1. LOD of the SAMBA II SARS-CoV-2 Test**

Concentration SARS-CoV-2 RNA (cp/mL)	Number tested	Number positive	% positive
750	3	3	100
500	3	3	100
250	**20**	**20**	**100**
200	3	2	66.7
150	3	2	66.7
100	3	0	0

402

403

404

405 **Table 2. Clinical performance in 65 contrived clinical samples**

Concentration SARS-CoV-2 RNA (cp/mL)	Number tested	Number positive	% agreement (95% CI)
1-2x LOD	20	20	100% (86.1-100%)
≥3x LOD	10	10	100 % (74.1-100%)
Negative	35	0	100% (91.5-100%)

406

407 **Table 3. Clinical performance in 172 clinical samples compared to PHE**

408 **reference test (initial results)**

		PHE reference test	
		POSITIVE	**NEGATIVE**
SAMBA SARS-CoV-2 Test	**POSITIVE**	87	3
	NEGATIVE	1	81

409

410

411

412

413

414 **Table 4. Discrepant analysis of 4 samples**

Sample ID	SAMBA		PHE Colindale assay RdRp		PHE Wuhan Cambridge assay		Final result
	Initial result	Repeat result	Initial (Ct)	Repeat (Ct)	RdRp (Ct)	E (Ct)	
1-25	NEG	NEG	POS (31.18)	Not tested	POS (28.87)	Not tested	POS
2-17	POS	POS	NEG	NEG	NEG	POS (34.99)	POS
2-25	POS	POS	NEG (36.58)	POS (33.62)	NEG	NEG	POS
2-38	POS	POS	NEG	NEG	POS (35.09)	POS (34.06)	POS

415

416

417 **Table 5. Clinical performance in 172 clinical samples compared to PHE**

418 **reference test (after retest)**

		PHE reference test	
		POSITIVE	NEGATIVE
SAMBA SARS-CoV-2 Test	POSITIVE	90	0
	NEGATIVE	1	81

419