medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.28.20164038; this version posted July 30, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

Initial evaluation of a mobile SARS-CoV-2 RT-LAMP testing strategy

Christina M. Newman[1^], Dawn M. Dudley[1^], Roger W. Wiseman[1,2], Matthew T. McLaughlin[1], Julie A. Karl[1], Miranda Strauss[2], Andrea M. Weiler[2,3], Mason I. Bliss[2,3] , Mitchell D. Ramuta[1], Cecilia G. Shortreed[1], Amelia K. Haj[1], Anna S. Heffron[1], Corrie B. Burmeister[1], Kristi L. Hall[1], Thomas C. Friedrich[2,3], Shelby L. O'Connor[1,2], David H. O'Connor[1,2]

^ these authors contributed equally

1 Department of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Madison, WI 53706, USA.

2 Wisconsin National Primate Research Center, Madison, WI 53706, USA.

3 Department of Pathobiological Sciences, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Madison, WI, 53706, USA

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.28.20164038; this version posted July 30, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

Abstract (50 words)

SARS-CoV-2 control in the United States is hampered by limited testing capacity. We evaluated a simple, outdoor, mobile RT-LAMP assay workflow where self-collected saliva is tested for SARS-CoV-2 RNA. 195 volunteers were tested over 8 days. Testing results were 100% concordant with qRT-PCR, with all but one person testing SARS-CoV-2-negative.

Body (799 words)

More than 50,000,000 SARS-CoV-2 tests have been performed in the United States, yet it is estimated that between 80-95% of infected individuals are not tested [1,2]. Because transmission can occur before symptoms manifest, delays in reporting prevent timely isolation of infected individuals. The current testing regimen fails to effectively identify and notify infected individuals and reduce transmission, creating a major barrier to safe returns to workplaces and schools.

We obtained Institutional Review Board approval to prototype a simple, mobile, non-diagnostic SARS-CoV-2 testing workflow. Replication-competent SARS-CoV-2 is rarely recovered from individuals whose nasopharyngeal swab viral loads are less 1E+6 copies / mL, while peak respiratory viral loads exceeding 1E+10 copies / mL have been observed [3]. Furthermore, detection of virus in saliva is correlated with presence of virus in nasopharyngeal swab samples [4]. Therefore, we reasoned that a cost-effective testing strategy that detects at least 1E+6 copies / mL in saliva and provides near real-time results could be effective in identifying those at greatest risk of infecting others, encouraging isolation and follow-up diagnostic testing.

After providing informed consent, volunteers self-collect at least 50 µL of saliva into a 1000 µL pipette tip placed inside a 1.5 mL “safe-lock” microcentrifuge tube. The volunteer disinfects the outside of the tube thoroughly with a pre-moistened disinfectant wipe. The sample is heated to 65°C for 30 minutes to inactivate SARS-CoV-2 [5] and then to 98°C for 3 minutes to improve nucleic acid detection and inactivate saliva enzymes. The inactivated saliva is then centrifuged for two minutes in a benchtop centrifuge. 50 µL of the supernatant is added to 50 µL of 1x phosphate buffered saline, and 3 µL of this mixture is added in duplicate to 17 µL of a colorimetric reverse-transcriptase loop-mediated isothermal amplification (RT-LAMP) reaction mix containing SARS-CoV-2-specific primers, building on an approach described in [6]. The LAMP reactions are then heated for 30 minutes at 65°C. Reaction vessels are photographed with a smartphone before and after this incubation. A colorimetric change from pink/orange to yellow is scored relative to inactivated SARS-CoV-2 that is directly added as a positive control in each batch of reactions at a concentration of 1,000 copies per reaction (corresponding to a calculated saliva viral load of 6.6E+5 copies / mL). These ready-to-run positive control standards must be stored at -80°C; storage at -20°C led to inconsistent performance in two early runs which were resolved after changing storage conditions.

From July 16 to July 23, this testing approach was used 5 times at 3 different locations in the Madison, WI area. 195 adult volunteers were tested across the 3 locations (each separate consent document constitutes a volunteer; some individuals volunteered more than once during the study). 192 of the 195 volunteers also consented to additional research testing of residual saliva leftover after RT-LAMP; 7 of these samples contained no residual saliva. RT-LAMP did not detect SARS-CoV-2 nucleic acids in 194 tests; 1 test was positive in one of two replicates. The single positive test was repeated immediately in 6 RT-LAMP reactions and was negative in all 6, suggesting either a false positive or a low-abundance true positive. To evaluate these possibilities, we tested the single positive saliva sample individually by an in-house qRT-PCR assay using the

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.28.20164038; this version posted July 30, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

CDC primers [7]. qRT-PCR gave an N1 primer set viral load of 8.58E+03 copies / mL, well below the 1E+06 copies / mL threshold we anticipated for RT-LAMP sensitivity. The sample also tested positive with a non-quantitative CDC N2 primer set. The remaining 184 negative saliva samples were pooled in batches of 6 to determine the rate at which RT-LAMP testing failed to detect true positives. None of the pools had detectable SARS-CoV-2 RNA in this qRT-PCR assay.

The excellent performance of this RT-LAMP workflow suggests that it could be extremely useful for non-diagnostic, mobile, "winnowing" testing of places at high risk for close-contact, indoor SARS-CoV-2 transmission: schools, workplaces, places of worship, prisons, etc. Rapid, sub-2-hours availability of results enables people with potential SARS-CoV-2 infections to self-isolate quickly and then obtain diagnostic testing, while the low per-test cost allows for short-interval serial testing to identify incident infections and reduce the duration of their exposure to others. While the RT-LAMP workflow is not as sensitive as diagnostic PCR tests in laboratory testing, its detection threshold is sufficient to identify most individuals who have viral loads consistent with live virus shedding who likely pose the greatest risk of transmission [8,9]. Replicating the performance of this initial testing may be challenging with less skilled operators and in other settings; nonetheless, this approach offers a promising alternative to PCR-based testing that can be easily deployed in various environments to test the hypothesis that frequent, rapid turnaround testing can enable safe returns to work and schools.

Acknowledgments

This work was made possible by financial support through NIH Rapid Acceleration of Diagnostics (contract number pending). Additional funding was provided by both Wisconsin National Primate Research Center (WNPRC) and from Wisconsin Alumni Research Foundation COVID-19 Challenge. We are grateful for the assistance of both the University of Wisconsin Institutional Biosafety Committee and the Health Sciences Institutional Review Board at University of Wisconsin-Madison. We acknowledge Christopher E. Mason, PhD Cornell-Weill Medical School and Alison Kriegel, PhD Medical College of Wisconsin as well as public employees from Racine, WI in their partnership to this project. David Beebe, Nate Grubaugh, and Kristian Andersen provided useful technical discussions. We are grateful to the study volunteers and organizations that allowed us to evaluate this mobile testing strategy. Finally, we acknowledge the acute need for dramatically expanded access to testing that remains in the United States months after the beginning of the pandemic, which has spurred us to evaluate the strategy described here as one way to address this need.

Regulatory oversight

This work was performed under approved UW-Madison Health Sciences IRB Protocol #2020-0855.

Data availability

RT-LAMP protocols and information about mobile testing are available at https://openresearch.labkey.com/wiki/Coven/page.view?name=field-testing

References

1. Silverman JD, Hupert N, Washburne AD (2020) Using influenza surveillance networks to estimate state-specific prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 in the United States. Sci Transl Med

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.28.20164038; this version posted July 30, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

2. Havers FP, Reed C, Lim T, Montgomery JM, Klena JD, Hall AJ et al. (2020) Seroprevalence of Antibodies to SARS-CoV-2 in 10 Sites in the United States, March 23-May 12, 2020. JAMA Intern Med

3. Pan Y, Zhang D, Yang P, Poon LLM, Wang Q (2020) Viral load of SARS-CoV-2 in clinical samples. Lancet Infect Dis 20: 411-412.

4. Azzi L, Carcano G, Gianfagna F, Grossi P, Gasperina DD, Genoni A et al. (2020) Saliva is a reliable tool to detect SARS-CoV-2. J Infect 81: e45-e50.

5. BEI Resources (2020) SARS-Related Coronavirus 2, Isolate USA-WA1/2020, Heat Inactivated. Available: https://www.beiresources.org/Catalog/antigen/NR-52286.aspx via the Internet.

6. Lalli MA, Chen X, Langmade SJ, Fronick CC, Sawyer CS, Burcea LC et al. (2020) Rapid and extraction-free detection of SARS-CoV-2 from saliva with colorimetric LAMP. medRxiv

7. Vogels CBF, Brito AF, Wyllie AL, Fauver JR, Ott IM, Kalinich CC et al. (2020) Analytical sensitivity and efficiency comparisons of SARS-CoV-2 RT-qPCR primer-probe sets. Nat Microbiol

8. Arons MM, Hatfield KM, Reddy SC, Kimball A, James A, Jacobs JR et al. (2020) Presymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 Infections and Transmission in a Skilled Nursing Facility. N Engl J Med 382: 2081-2090.

9. Wölfel R, Corman VM, Guggemos W, Seilmaier M, Zange S, Müller MA et al. (2020) Virological assessment of hospitalized patients with COVID-2019. Nature 581: 465-469.