1	Rapid implementation of SARS-CoV-2 emergency use authorization RT-PCR								
2	testing and experience at an academic medical institution								
3									
4	P. Velu <sup>1</sup> , A. Craney <sup>1</sup> , P. Ruggiero <sup>2</sup> , J. Sipley <sup>2</sup> , L. Cong <sup>2</sup> , Erika M. Hissong <sup>2</sup> , M. Loda <sup>1</sup> , L.								
5	F. Westblade <sup>1,3</sup> , M. Cushing <sup>1</sup> , and H. Rennert <sup>1*</sup>								
6									
7	<sup>1</sup> Department of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine, Weill Cornell Medicine, New York,								
8	NY; <sup>2</sup> NewYork-Presbyterian Hospital-Weill Cornell Medicine, New York, NY; <sup>3</sup> Division of								
9	Infectious Diseases, Department of Medicine, Weill Cornell Medicine, New York, NY								
10									
11									
12	Running title: SARS-CoV-2 testing by real-time RT-PCR								
12									
13	Keywords: coronavirus disease 19 (COV/ID-19) New York City real-time reverse								
14	transprintion polymorooo chain reaction (rPT DCP), new Tork City, real-time reverse								
15	transcription-polymerase chain reaction (TRT-PCR), severe acute respiratory syndrome								
16	coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2)								
17									
18									
19	*Correspondence to: Hanna Rennert								
20	Department of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine								
21	Weill Cornell Medicine								
22	545 East 68 Street, New York, NY 10065								
23	Email: har2006@med.cornell.edu								
24									

### 25 ABSTRACT

An epidemic caused by an outbreak of severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 26 (SARS-CoV-2) in China in December 2019 has since rapidly spread internationally, requiring 27 urgent response from the clinical diagnostics community. We present a detailed overview of 28 the clinical validation and implementation of the first laboratory-developed real-time reverse-29 transcription-PCR (rRT-PCR) test offered in the NewYork-Presbyterian Hospital system 30 following the emergency use authority (EUA) guidance issued by the US Food and Drug 31 Validation was performed on nasopharyngeal and sputum specimens 32 Administration. (n=124) using newly designed dual-target rRT-PCR (altona RealStar® SARS-CoV-2 33 Reagent) for detecting of SARS-CoV-2 in upper respiratory and lower respiratory tract 34 specimens, including bronchoalveolar lavage and tracheal aspirates. Accuracy testing 35 36 demonstrated excellent assay agreement between expected and observed values. The limit of detection (LOD) was 2.7 and 23.0 gene copies/reaction for nasopharyngeal and sputum 37 specimens, respectively. Retrospective analysis of 1,694 tests from 1,571 patients revealed 38 increased positivity in older patients and males compared to females, and an increasing 39 40 positivity rate from approximately 20% at the start of testing to 50% at the end of testing three weeks later. Our findings demonstrate that the assay accurately and sensitively identifies 41 42 SARS-CoV-2 in multiple specimen types in the clinical setting and summarizes clinical data from early in the epidemic in New York City. 43

44

45 46

-0

# 48 **INTRODUCTION**

The novel coronavirus SARS CoV-2 is a member of the *Betacoronavirus* genera in the 49 subfamily Coronavirinae, which is known to cause respiratory illness and gastroenteritis 50 in humans and other mammals [1, 2]. Two other *Betacoronavirus* that have met with 51 global attention are SARS-CoV (2002) and MERS-CoV (2012). 52 An outbreak of respiratory disease caused by SARS-CoV-2, first detected in Wuhan, China at the end of 53 December 2019, rapidly spread to other countries, including the United States [3, 4], 54 resulting in New York City in particular becoming an epicenter of the pandemic [5]. Given 55 the devastating impact on the healthcare system and the need for accurate and quick 56 diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2 infection the United States Food and Drug Administration 57 (FDA) has established a rapid pathway for using laboratory-developed tests (LDTs) that 58 59 was outlined in a guidance document published on February 29, 2020 [6]. According to this guidance SARS-CoV-2 testing may be performed by CLIA-certified high-complexity 60 molecular laboratories under Emergency Use Authorization (EUA) according to a set of 61 recommendations regarding the minimum validation required for ensuring the analytical 62 63 and clinical validity of the test. Details of the test and validation must be submitted by the laboratory to the FDA through an EUA application within 15 days of initiating testing, after 64 65 which testing may continue provisionally until a decision by the FDA is rendered.

66

67 The Center for Disease Control (CDC) and the New York State Department of Health (NYS DOH) had designed and manufactured new test kits for SARS-CoV-2. However, 68 very few laboratories were able to get access to these reagents, and their use has been 69 70 limited by the need for specific instruments, which were not available in our institution. 71 Additionally, limited access to SARS-CoV-2 RNA reference control material presented a significant hurdle to the validation process. The FDA EUA announcement allowed 72 laboratories to procure SARS-CoV-2 RNA from the World Reference Center for Emerging 73 Viruses and Arboviruses (WRCEVA) or the National Institutes of Health (NIH) Biodefense 74 and Emerging Infections Research Resources Repository (BEI). 75

76

The scale of demand for diagnostic testing and the shortage of supplies led to the need for a high throughput diagnostic test that could be readily implemented in a variety of

<sup>79</sup> laboratories. Here we describe how in less than five days, our institution validated and
<sup>80</sup> submitted for FDA EUA approval the research use only (RUO) RealStar® SARS-CoV-2
<sup>81</sup> Reagent Kit 1.0 (Altona Diagnostics) test. Comparable validation studies that can take
<sup>82</sup> months were completed within a week. We also detail workflow considerations and
<sup>83</sup> results from three weeks of testing from March 11, 2020, through March 31, 2020, during
<sup>84</sup> the early days of the COVID-19 outbreak in New York City.

85

### 86 MATERIALS AND METHODS

#### 87 SARS-CoV-2 RNA control material

We obtained SARS-CoV-2 RNA reference material from WRCEVA (University of Texas Medical Branch, Galveston, TX, Strain USA\_WA1/2020, Lot TVP 23156, RNA preparation date 2/21/2020) for use in clinical evaluation and limit of detection (LOD) studies. We used this RNA reference material to perform LOD dilution series experiments and to create contrived positive samples for accuracy studies by spiking it into pooled leftover negative patient specimens.

94

# 95 Validation samples and clinical cohort

96 An in-house validation panel consisting of a total of 124 contrived samples and patient specimens, including NP (64) and sputum (60) specimen types, was used for the 97 98 validation. Samples were obtained from individuals suspected of respiratory tract infections. All NP samples had been clinically tested for the presence of twenty-one 99 common respiratory viruses using our institution's respiratory virus panel, the 100 commercially available BioFire FilmArray® Respiratory Pathogen 2 (RP2) panel (BioFire 101 102 Diagnostics, LLC, Salt Lake City, USA). Reactive clinical samples consisted of four 103 patient specimens confirmed to have SARS-CoV-2 by the New York City-Department of Health and Mental Hygiene (NYC-DOH) using the NYS-DOH SARS-CoV-2 EUA assay 104 and samples contrived by spiking WRCEVA RNA material into pooled leftover negative 105 clinical specimens. 106

107

Additionally, we performed a retrospective analysis of patient characteristics on 1,694 consecutive upper respiratory tract (URT) specimens tested on the assay obtained from

1,571 patients with high suspicion for COVID-19 that were treated at NewYork
Presbyterian Hospital (NYPH) campuses from March 11 to March 31, 2020. The IRB
Committee at Weill Cornel Medicine (WCM) approved this study.

113

#### 114 Real time reverse-transcription PCR testing

Automated extraction of total nucleic acid (TNA) was performed on 200 µL of NP swab 115 viral transport media (VTM) following an off-board lysis viral inactivation step, using the 116 117 QIAsymphony DSP Virus/Pathogen Mini Kit coupled on the QIAsymphony SP (Qiagen, Germantown, MD), with a resulting eluate volume of 60  $\mu$ L. The viral inactivation step 118 was performed in a class 2 biosafety cabinet using personal protective equipment 119 following our hospital biosafety policies. For sputum, 100 µL of specimen was first 120 treated with 0.3% dithiothreitol (DTT) solution (1:1 ratio) and incubated at 37° C for 30 121 minutes to reduce viscosity. One-step reverse transcription to cDNA and rRT-PCR of 122 123 viral targets (Envalope and Spike genes) and internal control (IC) was performed using 10 µL TNA eluate and the RealStar® SARS-CoV-2 real-time RT-PCR Kit 1.0 (altona 124 125 Diagnostics Gmbh, Hamburg, Germany) on the Rotor-Gene Q Thermocyler (Qiagen) for a total volume of 30 µL per reaction. PCR amplification and detection were performed 126 using multi-color fluorescent dye-labeled probes for the identification and differentiation 127 of B-betacoronavirus (B- $\beta$ CoV) and SARS-CoV-2 specific RNA and the detection of the 128 IC within one reaction, allowing for higher throughput testing compared to the CDC assay. 129 130 Samples in which both the E gene target (all B- $\beta$ CoV) and the S gene target (SARS-CoV-2 specific), or the S gene target only were detected within the first 40 cycles of 131 amplification were considered "Detected". Samples with cycle threshold (Ct) values  $\geq$ 132 40.0 were considered negative. Each run contained an external positive control (1:10<sup>3</sup>) 133 WRCEVA RNA dilution), positive kit control (synthetic B-&CoV and SARS-CoV-2 RNA), 134 135 SARS-CoV-2 NP negative control, and a non-template control (NTC).

136

#### 137 Assay Performance characteristics

The FDA EUA mechanism specified four distinct performance characteristics consisting
 of limit of detection (LOD), inclusivity (analytical sensitivity) cross-reactivity (analytical
 specificity), and clinical evaluation (accuracy) studies. For the LOD studies, SARS-CoV-

2 inactivated virus or RNA spiked into artificial or real clinical matrix was acceptable, as 141 long as the matrix was from the most difficult specimen type accepted for testing on the 142 143 clinical assay (in decreasing order of difficulty: sputum, other lower respiratory tract specimens, and NP or oropharyngeal (OP) swabs collected and transported in viral 144 transport media). NP and sputum samples were tested on the altona RealStar® rRT-PCR 145 assay to ensure the absence of SARS-CoV-2 and pooled for use as a matrix for spiking 146 in RNA for LOD studies and accuracy studies. Six ten-fold serial dilutions (1 x 10<sup>1</sup> to 1 x 147 10<sup>7</sup>) were performed with three replicates at each concentration by spiking WRCEVA 148 RNA reference material (60,000 pfu/ $\mu$ L stock WRCEVA RNA reference material; ~6:10<sup>7</sup> 149 genomic copies/µL) into NP and sputum eluates obtained from pooled-negative patient 150 NP or sputum specimens. The dilutions at the LOD were performed by spiking 1  $\mu$ L of 151 1:10<sup>5</sup> dilution to 60  $\mu$ L eluate, yielding a concentration of 0.01 pfu/uL=10pfu/mL 152 (~10,000copies/mL). Assay performance at the determined LOD was confirmed with at 153 least 20 additional replicates for each type of sample (sputum and NP). 154

155

156 For the accuracy studies, a total of 64 positive (34 NP and 30 sputum specimens, respectively) specimens and 60 negative (30 NP swabs and 30 sputum) specimens that 157 tested negative for SARS-CoV-2 were used. Positive specimens were either contrived 158 positive samples generated by spiking WRCEVA RNA reference material into pooled 159 leftover negative NP or sputum specimens or real patient specimens, as described above. 160 Twenty of the contrived clinical specimens were spiked at a concentration of 1x-2x LoD, 161 with the remainder of samples spanning the assay testing range. FDA defines the 162 163 acceptance criteria for the performance as 95% agreement at 1x-2x LOD, and 100% agreement at all other concentrations and negative specimens [6]. 164

165

Inclusivity and cross-reactivity studies used a combination of *in silico* and *in vitro* approaches. As the primer and probe sequences were proprietary to the kit manufacturer, we included the results of their *in silico* analysis in our EUA application. Additional studies to determine cross-reactivity were performed in our laboratory by testing 10 NP samples that were positive by the RP2 for the four human coronaviruses

NL63 (n=2), 229E (n=2), OC43 (n=4), or HKU1 (n=2), defined as high priority pathogens
from the same genetic family by the FDA.

173

#### 174 Data analysis and statistical methods

Data analyses, including statistics and plot generation, were performed using R programming language v 3.6.0 [7]. LOD was determined through a probit regression model using the glm function following CLSI EP17A2E Guidance with Application to Quantitative Molecular Measurement Procedures [8].

179

#### 180 **RESULTS**

## 181 Validation of Assay

### 182 a. Limit of detection

Dilution series studies on pooled negative NP specimens spiked with WRCEVA RNA 183 reference material, with three replicates across a viral range of 1 gene copy/reaction to 184 1,000,000 gene copies/reaction (1 to 6  $log_{10}$ ), demonstrated an accurate and linear 185 186 response across five logs of detection for NP and four logs of detection for sputum (Table **1**, Figure 1). Probit analysis was applied to the NP data after an additional five replicates 187 188 of testing were performed at 0.8, 0.6, 0.5, 0.4, and 0.2 gene copies/reaction, and narrowed the LOD to 2.7 gene copies/reaction at 95% detection rate (Figure 2). A similar 189 190 LOD series and probit analysis was performed on sputum at 80, 60, 50, 40, and 20 gene copies/reaction, and resulted in a lower sensitivity with a LOD of 23.0 gene 191 copies/reaction at 95% detection rate in sputum compared to NP specimens. For both 192 193 NP and sputum specimens, 20/20 and 23/23 additional replicates tested at their LODs, 194 respectively, resulted as positive.

195

### 196 b. Inclusivity and Specificity

The *in silico* analysis for inclusivity that was performed by the manufacturer of the kit found 100% homology of the E gene and S gene forward and reverse primers and probes with 563 whole-genome sequences of SARS-CoV-2 published in GISAID and NCBI as of 3/16/2020 [9]. The *in silico* analysis for cross-reactivity that was performed by the manufacturer found that the S gene and E gene forward and reverse primers and probes had less than 80% homology with the vast majority of 40 different pathogens (125 strains
total) tested (see Supplementary Material). In cases with greater than 80% homology,
cross-reactivity was not a concern as only the forward or reverse primer, but never both
primers were affected, thus rendering amplification impossible. Additionally, all ten
samples that had human coronaviruses NL63, 229E, OC43, or HKU1 detected by RP2
panel tested negative for SARS-CoV-2 on the RealStar® rRT-PCR assay.

208

# 209 c. Clinical evaluation-Accuracy

All 30 NP specimens that tested negative on the RP2 panel also tested negative on the 210 SARS-CoV-2 rRT-PCR assay (**Table 2**). Leftover VTM from these negative specimens 211 was pooled to create a sample matrix for the LOD and contrived positive sample studies. 212 213 Clinical evaluation studies resulted in the detection of SARS-CoV-2 in all specimens contrived by spiking WRCEVA RNA reference material (n=20) into pooled SARS-CoV-2 214 negative NP VTM or sputum and all four positive patient samples tested by NYC-DOH 215 (Table 2 and Supplementary Table 1). The high-positive patient sample run at 216 217 successive dilutions (n=10) remained positive throughout the range of concentrations (1:2) to 1:1,024; Ct range, 22-31) (Figure 1). Similar clinical evaluation studies were performed 218 219 for sputum specimens (Table 2 and Supplementary Table 2), also with 100% Validation studies performed on bronchoalveolar lavage (BAL) and 220 concordance. 221 tracheal aspirate specimens and additional sample collection systems (Table 3 and Supplementary Material including Tables 3 and 4) showed 100% accuracy. 222

223

# 224 Clinical cohort characterization

225 The Altona rRT-PCR SARS-CoV-2 test was used to test NP and OP swabs from March 11, 2020, to March 30, 2020. Starting March 30, 2020, our institution deployed the higher 226 throughput Roche cobas 6800 SARS-CoV-2 rRT-PCR test (Roche Molecular Systems, 227 Inc; Branchburg, NJ) [10] to meet increasing specimen volumes. During the initial phase 228 with only Altona testing, 1,694 tests were performed on 1,372 NP (40% positive), 57 OP 229 (19% positive), and 311 NP/OP (25% positive) swab specimens from 1,571 patients. Ct 230 values were not significantly different for the E gene, S gene, and IC targets between 231 232 positive NP, OP, or NP/OP samples (**Supplementary Figure 1**). The number of tests

with indeterminate or B- $\beta$ CoV results were 5 and 4, respectively, all in NP swab samples. The mean Ct for E gene, S gene, and IC targets in positive samples were 23.0 (11.1-40.7), 22.5 (10.3-40.6), and 29.6 (27.0-38.4), respectively (**Figure 3**). Using Ct value of the S target gene as a surrogate for viral burden, the upper respiratory tract specimens could be classified into three groups: high (Ct <20; n=222, 34%), medium (Ct 20 -30, n =335, 52%), and low (Ct > 30, n = 89, 13.8%). Over three weeks of testing, more than 75% of positive samples could be classified as having medium to high viral burden.

Of 135 patients with repeat testing, only 17 had different results on the second test 241 including 13 patients who first tested negative but subsequently tested positive and three 242 patients who had virus detected in one specimen type but not the other (NP swab but not 243 OP swab detected n=1; NP/OP swab but not NP swab detected n=1, and OP swab but 244 not NP swab detected n=1). One inpatient initially tested positive with B-BCoV, and then 245 positive with medium viral burden SARS-CoV-2 two days later. Twelve of the thirteen 246 patients who converted from negative to positive were initially tested at the Emergency 247 248 Department (ED). On repeat testing performed within three days, 5 had low viral burden, 5 had medium viral burden, and 2 had high viral burden on the positive test. Of the ten 249 250 patients with low-medium viral burden, nine subsequently tested positive as inpatients 1-3 days later, and the tenth tested positive at the ED 3 days later. Two patients tested 251 252 positive with high viral burden the next day as inpatients. The thirteenth patient tested negative as an inpatient and then with high viral burden as an inpatient seven days later. 253 254 Of note, while most of the patients in the dataset presented with symptoms and were being tested for suspected infection with SARS-CoV-2, obstetrics and gynecology (OB) 255 256 patients in the labor and delivery wards were being universally screened for SARS-CoV-2 as a pre-procedural measure to determine if personal protective equipment would be 257 required during interactions with healthcare workers. This group consisted of 102 female 258 patients with a 7% positivity rate. 259

260

Means of turn-around-times from test order to result and time-in-lab to result were 19.8 (13.1-26.2) hours and 11.9 (7.0-24.0) hours, respectively. The percentage of tests with detected SARS-CoV-2 increased as the weeks progressed, and settled at approximately

50% from 3/21/2020 to 3/30/2020 (Figure 4a). Most of the samples were from the ED 264 (n=911), followed by inpatient wards (n=492) and outpatient clinics (n=113) (**Table 4**), 265 266 and the highest positivity rate was in the ED with 50% of patients with detected SARS-CoV-2 (p=0.0005). There was a significant difference in the age (p=0.0005) and gender 267 (p=0.005), with lower rates of detected virus in younger patients and female patients. Only 268 7% of patients 18 years and under had detected virus. Within female patients, older 269 female patients (>55 years, n=346) tested positive with greater frequency than younger 270 female patients (<55 years, n=438) (p=0.001), while this was not the case with male 271 patients in the same age ranges (p=0.09) (Figure 4b). This effect was diminished after 272 removing patients from the labor and delivery ward (102 patients, 7% positive) who were 273 being screened universally regardless of symptoms (p=0.03). There was no significant 274 difference in the frequency of positive tests in different race groups (p=0.385). 275

276

Lower respiratory tract specimens, including sputum, BAL, and tracheal aspirates, were 277 accepted starting 4/17/2020. As of May 15, 2020, ten sputum, 30 BAL, and 101 tracheal 278 279 aspirate specimens had been received from 115 patients, with 0%, 13%, and 23%, respectively, showing detectable SARS-CoV-2. Indeterminate results were reported for 280 281 three tracheal aspirate samples. The mean Ct values for E gene, S gene, and I.C. targets in positive LRT samples (n=27) were 27.3 (7.7-39.1), 26.7 (6.7-38.5), and 31.4 (27.9-282 283 44.7), respectively (Figure 3). Ct values were not significantly different for the E gene, S gene, and IC targets between positive BAL and tracheal aspirate samples 284 (Supplementary Figure 1). The mean number of LRT samples received per day was 7 285 (range 1-25), which was significantly lower compared to the number of URT specimens 286 287 tested (mean 85; range 12-176). Given the small sample size, additional statistics on clinical cohort characteristics were not calculated for LRT specimens. 288

289

### 290 **DISCUSSION**

Since the end of December 2019, when China first reported cases of the novel coronavirus disease to the World Health Organization (WHO), SARS-CoV-2 has spread to dozens of countries around the world, including the United States. A rapid and accurate diagnosis of infectious disease is critical for managing outbreaks. Given the increasing

number of people infected with SARS-CoV-2 and the lack of any commercially available 295 tests, on February 4, 2020, the FDA in the U.S. opened a pathway that allowed 296 297 laboratories to implement laboratory-developed tests to meet this diagnostic need. The CDC made their validated kits available through Integrated DNA Technologies, but the 298 kits were very limited in number and were only approved for use with specific instruments, 299 300 reagents, and controls. Due to a surge in demand for SARS-CoV-2 testing, issues with scaling up numbers of tests per run using the CDC method, and the limited availability of 301 kits, on February 29, 2020, the FDA issued a new policy to help expedite the availability 302 and capacity of diagnostic testing in the U.S. [6] 303

304

Altona Diagnostics launched the RealStar<sup>®</sup> SARS-CoV-2 Real-Time RT-PCR Kit as soon 305 306 as the disease spread to Europe on February 20. Prototype kits were sent to reference centers for testing and confirmation of functionality with clinical samples [11]. The 307 308 reagents were designed as a dual target assay and manufactured according to GMP guidelines such that the ready to use kit allowed for rapid detection of all lineage B-309 310 betacoronaviruses and SARS-CoV-2 specific RNA in a single reaction. Laboratories could also use the reagents with a wide range of different extraction and real-time 311 312 thermocycler instruments, allowing for greater flexibility in implementation. The first batch of reagents arrived in our laboratory within five days from ordering on Friday, March 6, 313 314 2020, around the same time, we received the WRCEVA RNA reference material. The requirements for obtaining the WRCEVA RNA reference material were 1) that it was used 315 316 for diagnostics in a CLIA-certified, high complexity lab, and 2) the laboratory was planning 317 to submit an EUA application to the FDA. This RNA reference control was instrumental for the timely development of the EUA test, and notably, many laboratories had difficulties 318 At the same time, a well-characterized in-house collection of 319 obtaining controls. respiratory NP swabs and sputum samples had been collected and saved in the clinical 320 microbiology laboratory, allowing for the preparation of a negative pool of samples for 321 generating the LOD dilution and accuracy samples as described in the Methods section. 322 323

Accuracy studies of NP and sputum samples in our laboratory showed excellent overall agreement between the expected and obtained results for contrived clinical specimens

and patient samples tested by NYC-DOH. A highly sensitive test is crucial for the 326 detection and identification of SARS-CoV-2 in individuals exhibiting signs and symptoms 327 328 of a respiratory infection to allow early initiation of therapy. The LODs for the NP and sputum samples were 2.7 gene copies/reaction and 23.0 gene copies/reaction, 329 respectively, suggesting a slightly higher analytical sensitivity for the NP specimens 330 331 compared to sputum. Overall sensitivity results for this assay by specimen type has been in agreement with the LODs reported in the literature by other studies [11, 12]. Of note, 332 even though the sputum samples had a lower analytical sensitivity, higher viral loads have 333 been reported in sputum specimens compared to NP swab specimens, with LRT samples 334 being the most likely specimen type to test positive for the virus in COVID-19 patients 335 [13]. Based on these favorable validation results, we decided to start routine SARS-CoV-336 2 testing with the RealStar<sup>®</sup> SARS-CoV-2 rRT-PCR reagents on March 11, 2020. The 337 entire FDA-EUA validation, followed by a successful go-live testing day, took only four 338 days from receipt of the reagents and RNA reference control in the laboratory. 339

340

Overall during this time, we have tested 1,694 URT (40% positive) and 141 LRT (25% positive) specimens, from 1,571 and 115 patients, respectively. The lower number of LRT compared to URT specimens reflects hospital policy, restricting LRT testing to intubated patients that needed clearance of isolation (two negative NP swabs plus one negative LRT specimen) or patients with high suspicion for COVID-19 with repeat negative testing by RT-PCR (two negative NP swabs).

347

In the cohort of patients tested over three weeks by our assay, positive results were seen 348 349 more frequently in older males compared to younger and female patients, which has been 350 supported by several studies [14, 15]. Post-menopausal women have been reported to have a greater risk of hospitalization compared to non-menopausal women attributed to 351 the protective effect of estrogen [16]. In this study, older women were more likely to test 352 positive for SARS-CoV-2 compared to younger female patients. However, the difference 353 354 in detection rate between older and younger women was diminished after removing obstetrics patients screened universally regardless of symptoms, highlighting the 355

importance of restricting comparisons of positivity rates to groups of patients subjected to
 similar selection criteria and warranting the importance of carefully designed studies.

358

Among the obstetrics patients, only 7% tested positive for SARS-CoV-2, which is similar 359 to the prevalence (13.5%) obtained for women admitted at delivery at other NYPH 360 361 campuses [17]. We did not see any differences in the number of positive tests by race, but this was early in the epidemic in New York City. The ED likely had more positive tests 362 since patients tend to be more acutely symptomatic there compared to ambulatory clinics. 363 The percentage of positive tests increased steadily and settled at around 50% three 364 weeks into the epidemic, with later testing on other platforms showing daily positivity rates 365 as high as 75-80% as the epidemic reached its peak in specific boroughs (unpublished 366 367 data). In this study, 13 patients tested positive after initial negative results in the ED, suggesting they had sufficient symptoms to warrant inpatient admission despite negative 368 testing. This conversion may be due to increased viral burden on subsequent days post-369 370 infection, or due to better sampling [18].

371

In summary, we described the clinical development and implementation of an FDA EUA laboratory validated rRT-PCR test for SARS-CoV-2 in our academic institution, providing a road map to assist others in establishing similar tests. We also described the clinical and testing characteristics of the first cohort of COVID-19 patients admitted to our institution during the early days of the viral outbreak in NYC.

377

378

379

380

381

382

383

384

385

386

# 387 **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

We would like to thank all the dedicated medical technologists and health care professionals who performed and assisted in testing at the clinical laboratories of NYPH-WCM. We also thank Dr. Scott C. Weaver, World Reference Center for Emerging Viruses and Arboviruses (WRCEVA), for providing us with viral RNA control material, and Altona Diagnostics for their prompt supply of reagents and support.

- 394 Competing interests: None declared.
- 395 Ethical approval: Obtained.
- 396
- 397
- 398

399

# 400 **REFERENCES**

- Lorusso, A., et al., Novel coronavirus (SARS-CoV-2) epidemic: a veterinary
   perspective. Vet Ital, 2020. 56(1): p. 5-10.
- Wei, X., X. Li, and J. Cui, Evolutionary perspectives on novel coronaviruses
  identified in pneumonia cases in China. Natl Sci Rev, 2020. 7(2): p. 239-242.
- 405 3. Chen, L., et al., Clinical Characteristics of Pregnant Women with Covid-19 in
  406 Wuhan, China. N Engl J Med, 2020.
- 407 4. Chen, N., et al., Epidemiological and clinical characteristics of 99 cases of 2019 408 novel coronavirus pneumonia in Wuhan, China: a descriptive study. Lancet,
- 409 2020. **395**(10223): p. 507-513.
- 410 5. Goyal, P., et al., Clinical Characteristics of Covid-19 in New York City. N Engl J
  411 Med, 2020.
- 412 6. Policy for Diagnostics Testing in Laboratories Certified To Perform High
- 413 Complexity Testing Under the Clinical Laboratory Improvement Amendments
- 414 Prior to Emergency Use Authorization for Coronavirus Disease-2019 During the
- 415 Public Health Emergency; Immediately in Effect Guidance for Clinical
- 416 Laboratories and Food and Drug Administration Staff (FEDERAL REGISTER).
- 417 Accessed on March 1, 2020.
- 418 7. Team, R.C., R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R
- 419 Foundation for Statistical Computing. Vienna, Austria, 2019.
- 420 8. Chen, F., CLSI EP17A2E Guidance with Application to Quantitative Molecular
  421 Measurement Procedures. R Function Library, 2016.
- 422 9. Global Initiative on Sharing All Influenza Data (GISAID), <u>https://www.gisaid.org/</u>,
  423 2020. Accessed on April 30, 2020.
- 10. Craney, A.R., et al., Comparison of Two High-Throughput Reverse Transcription-
- 425 Polymerase Chain Reaction Systems for the Detection of Severe Acute
- 426 Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2. J Clin Microbiol, 2020.
- 427 11. Konrad, R., et al., Rapid establishment of laboratory diagnostics for the novel
  428 coronavirus SARS-CoV-2 in Bavaria, Germany, February 2020. Euro Surveill,
  429 2020. 25(9).

430	12.	Corman, V.M., et al., Detection of 2019 novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV) by real-
431		time RT-PCR. Euro Surveill, 2020. <b>25</b> (3).
432	13.	Wang, W., et al., Detection of SARS-CoV-2 in Different Types of Clinical
433		Specimens. JAMA, 2020.
434	14.	Tian, S., et al., Characteristics of COVID-19 infection in Beijing. J Infect, 2020.
435		<b>80</b> (4): p. 401-406.
436	15.	Lai, C.C., et al., Asymptomatic carrier state, acute respiratory disease, and
437		pneumonia due to severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-
438		2): Facts and myths. J Microbiol Immunol Infect, 2020.
439	16.	Ting Ding, J.Z., Tian Wang, Pengfei Cui, Zhe Chen, Jingjing Jiang, Su Zhou, Jun
440		Dai, Bo Wang, Suzhen Yuan, Wenqing Ma, Lingwei Ma, Yueguang Rong, Jiang
441		Chang, Xiaoping Miao, Xiangyi Ma, Shixuan Wang, A Multi-hospital Study in
442		Wuhan, China : Protective Effects of Non-menopause and Female Hormones on
443		SARS-CoV-2 infection.
444		https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.03.26.20043943v1, 2020.
445	17.	Sutton, D., et al., Universal Screening for SARS-CoV-2 in Women Admitted for
446		Delivery. N Engl J Med, 2020.
447	18.	Natalie N. Kinloch, G.R., Chanson J. Brumme, Winnie Dong, Weiyan Dong,,
448		R.B.J. Tanya Lawson, Julio S.G. Montaner, Victor Leung, Marc G. Romney,, and
449		N.M. Aleksandra Stefanovic, Christopher F. Lowe, Zabrina L. Brumme,
450		Suboptimal biological sampling as a probable cause of false-negative COVID-19
451		diagnostic test results.
452		https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.05.05.20091728v1.full.pdf, 2020.
453		
454		







Figure 1. Limit of detection (LOD) studies. Ct values for the LOD serial dilution study 460 using WRCEVA RNA reference material spiked in pooled negative (A) nasopharyngeal 461 (NP) specimen eluate and (B) sputum specimen eluate. Six ten-fold dilutions were 462 performed starting at 1,000,000 gene copies/reaction and ending at 1 gene copy/reaction. 463 The apparent LOD was between 1 and 10 gene copies/reaction for NP specimens and 464 between 10 and 100 gene copies/reaction for sputum specimens. 465



<sup>470</sup> 

Figure 2. LOD of NP and sputum by probit analysis. Additional serial dilution studies were performed using WRCEVA RNA reference material spiked in pooled negative (A) NP specimen eluate and (B) sputum specimen eluate to determine the LOD. Five replicates (A, B, C, D, E) of six ten-fold dilutions were performed starting at 1,000 gene copies/reaction and ending at 0.1 gene copies/reaction for NP and five replicates of three ten-fold dilutions were performed starting at 100 gene copies/reaction and ending at 1 gene copies/reaction for sputum. An additional five replicates were performed at 0.8, 0.6,

478 0.5, 0.4, and 0.2 gene copies/reaction for NP and 80, 60, 50, 40, and 20 gene
479 copies/reaction for sputum. Probit analysis showed LOD to be (C) 2.7 gene
480 copies/reaction for NP and (D) 23.0 gene copies/reaction for sputum.



483

**Figure 3**. Distribution of Ct values for E gene, S gene, and Internal Control targets for all upper respiratory tract (URT) and lower respiratory tract (LRT) specimens with detected SARS-CoV-2. Mean Ct values between URT and LRT specimens were significantly different for the E gene (p=0.006) and S gene (p=0.03) but not the I.C. (p=0.7), though the much smaller sample size for LRT is noted.



#### тс

492

**Figure 4.** SARS-CoV-2 results by date and distribution by gender and age. **A)** Positivity of URT specimens tested by rRT-PCR at NYP-WCMC over the first three weeks of implementation. **B)** Age distribution histograms with overlays of normalized density curves corresponding to age distribution (yellow) and SARS-CoV-2 positivity (red) in tested patients by gender. Patients that were universally screened at labor and delivery were removed from this analysis.

# 499 TABLES

500

Dilution	Gene copies per reaction	Numb run	er	Nun dete	nber ected	Percer	nt	Cy5 gene) Mean	(S Ct	FAM <sup>™</sup> gene) Mean C	(E Ct	JOE <sup>⊤</sup> Mean	<sup>M</sup> (I.C.) Ct
		NP	SPU	NP	SPU	NP	SPU	NP	SPU	NP	SPU	NP	SPU
1:10	10 <sup>6</sup>	3	3	3	3	100%	100%	14.6	13.1	15.2	14.5	30.6	33.0
1:10 <sup>2</sup>	10 <sup>5</sup>	3	3	3	3	100%	100%	18.0	16.5	18.7	17.9	29.0	30.4
1:10 <sup>3</sup>	10 <sup>4</sup>	3	3	3	3	100%	100%	20.9	19.9	21.6	21.4	28.3	30.8
1:10 <sup>4</sup>	10 <sup>3</sup>	3	3	3	3	100%	100%	24.6	23.8	25.2	25.3	29.4	29.7
1:10 <sup>5</sup>	10 <sup>2</sup>	3	26	3	26	100%	100%	27.9	31.1	28.4	31.0	30.2	29.8
1:10 <sup>6</sup>	10	23	3	23	0	100%	0%	32.3	ND	320	ND	30.8	29.7
1:10 <sup>7</sup>	1	3	3	0	0	0%	0%	ND	ND	ND	ND	29.8	29.8

501

**Table 1.** Limit of detection studies were performed for NP VTM (NP) and sputum (SPU)

specimen types with three replicates at each dilution. An additional twenty (NP) and

504 twenty-three (SPU) specimens were tested at the estimated LOD of 10 gene

505 copies/reaction and 100 gene copies/reaction, respectively.

Validation	altona SARS-CoV2 rRT-PCR							
sample	NF	P-VTM	Sputum					
	Positive	Negative	Positive	Negative				
*Positive (contrived)	30	0	30	0				
Positive (patient)	4	0	1	0				
Negative (patient)	0	30	0	30				
Total	64	60	31	31				

\*SARS-CoV-2 contrived positive samples generated with RNA control spiked into pooled negative eluate or dilutions of a high positive clinical sample.

506

507 **Table 2.** Accuracy studies for NP and sputum. Clinical evaluation of the RealStar® SARS-

508 CoV-2 rRT-PCR assay using automated QIAsymphony total nucleic acid (TNA) extraction

followed by rRT-PCR targeting the E and S coronavirus genes on an in-house validation

510 panel consisting of patient and contrived samples for NP (124) and sputum (62).

511

513

Specimen Type	Cy5 (S gene) Mean Ct	FAM™ (E gene) Mean Ct	JOE™ (I.C.) Mean Ct	Number tested	Correctly classified
NP swab	28.8 (20.6-37.2)	28.8 (20.8-37.7)	29.6 (28.6-30.8)	34+/30-	100%
Sputum	24.1 (16.2-30.0)	24.2 (17.0-29.2)	30.2 (29.4-32.3)	31+/30-	100%
BAL	23.4 (16.9-29.3)	23.5 (17.1-29.4)	30.4 (28.6-32.4)	20+/20-	100%
Trach asp	22.1 (10.0-43.0)	19.7 (10.1-32.1)	34.1 (29.7-42.4)	5+/5-	100%

514

**Table 3.** Summary table of accuracy studies for all specimen types. Mean and range of Ct values are shown for positive samples. The number of positive (either contrived through spiking RNA into a negative matrix or actual patient samples) and negative specimens are also noted along with the percent of specimens that were correctly classified as positive or negative.

521

	11		1			1		nn
Feature	All Patients n=1579		Positive 38%			Negative 62%		p-value
	Overall: 53.4	(0.1-120.3)	Overall:	57.5	(1.3-	Overall: 5	1.1 (0.1-	0.0005*
	0-18	80	120.3)			97.5)		
	19-35	295	0-18		7%	0-18	93%	
Age	36-55	420	19-35		30%	19-35	70%	
(years)	56-85	656	36-55		40%	36-55	60%	
	>85	128	56-85		47%	56-85	53%	
			>85		30%	>85	70%	
	F	784	F		31%	F	69%	
Gender	M	778	M		46%	M	54%	0.005*
	Unsp.	3	Unsp.		33%	Unsp.	66%	
	Asian	101	Asian		28%	Asian	72%	
	Black	171	Black		36%	Black	64%	
Race	Declined	173	Declined		40%	Declined	60%	0.385
	Other	210	Other		45%	Other	55%	
	White	488	White		32%	White	68%	
Location	Emergency	911	Emergen	cy	50%	Emergency	50%	
	Inpatient	492	Inpatient	2	18%	Inpatient	82%	0.0005*
	Outpatient	113	Outpatien	t	35%	Outpatient	65%	

522

**Table 4.** Summary table of patient characteristics. For race, "Declined" and "Other" categories were not used when performing the Chi-squared test for significance. An additional 63 tests were performed at low numbers at several other locations; these were not included in the table.