LAMP-BEAC: Detection of SARS-CoV-2 RNA Using RT-LAMP and Molecular Beacons

Scott Sherrill-Mix[1,2], Young Hwang[1], Aoife M. Roche[1], Abigail Glascock[1], Susan R. Weiss[1], Yize Li[1], Arupa Ganguly[3], Leila Haddad[3], Peter Deraska[3], Caitlin Monahan[3], Andrew Kromer[3], Jevon Graham-Wooten[2], Louis J. Taylor[1], Benjamin S. Abella[4], Ronald G. Collman[2], Gregory D. Van Duyne[5], and Frederic D. Bushman[1#]

[1] Department of Microbiology, Perelman School of Medicine, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA 19104
[2] Department of Medicine, Perelman School of Medicine, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA 19104
[3] Department of Genetics, Perelman School of Medicine, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA 19104
[4] Department of Emergency Medicine, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA 19104
[5] Department of Biochemistry and Biophysics, Perelman School of Medicine, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA 19104

Keywords: COVID-19, SARS-CoV-2, loop-mediated isothermal amplification, RT-LAMP, molecular beacon, LAMP-BEAC

[#]corresponding author
bushman@pennmedicine.upenn.edu

Abstract

Background: Rapid spread of SARS-CoV-2 has led to a global pandemic, resulting in the need for rapid assays to allow diagnosis and prevention of transmission. Reverse Transcription-Polymerase Chain Reaction (RT-PCR) provides a gold standard assay for SARS-CoV-2 RNA, but tests are expensive and supply chains are potentially fragile, motivating interest in additional assay methods. Reverse Transcription and Loop-Mediated Isothermal Amplification (RT-LAMP) provides an alternative that uses orthogonal and often less expensive reagents without the need for thermocyclers. The presence of SARS-CoV-2 RNA is typically detected using dyes to report bulk amplification of DNA; however a common artifact is nonspecific DNA amplification, which complicates detection. **Results**: Here we describe the design and testing of molecular beacons, which allow sequence-specific detection of SARS-CoV-2 genomes with improved discrimination in simple reaction mixtures. To optimize beacons for RT-LAMP, multiple locked nucleic acid monomers were incorporated to elevate melting temperatures. We also show how beacons with different fluorescent labels can allow convenient multiplex detection of several amplicons in “single pot” reactions, including incorporation of a human RNA LAMP-BEAC assay to confirm sample integrity. Comparison of LAMP-BEAC and RT-qPCR on clinical saliva samples showed good concordance between assays. We also describe custom polymerases for LAMP-BEAC and inexpensive purification procedures. **Conclusions**: LAMP-BEAC thus provides an affordable and simple SARS-CoV-2 RNA assay suitable for population screening.

Keywords: COVID-19, SARS-CoV-2, coronavirus, loop-mediated isothermal amplification, molecular beacon, LAMP-BEAC

Background

Infection with the beta-coronavirus SARS-CoV-2 causes the disease COVID-19[1]. Transmission typically takes place via droplets or aerosols [2, 3]. The virus was first detected in China in December 2019 and later in most countries. On March 11, 2020, The World Health Organization declared COVID-19 a global pandemic.

Numerous methods have been developed to detect SARS-CoV-2 infection. The most common method is RT-qPCR designed to detect SARS-CoV-2 RNA[4]. RT-qPCR has the advantage of providing accurate and sensitive detection, but supply chain issues have limited testing, motivating the development of additional methods using orthogonal materials. RT-LAMP has been widely studied as an alternative[5-8]. LAMP assays use a “rolling hairpin” mechanism to allow amplification at a single temperature utilizing polymerase enzymes different from those used for PCR, helping avoid supply chain bottle necks. In addition, RT-LAMP can be implemented on neat saliva, or on RNA purified using simple reagents available in bulk[9], again helping bypass supply chain issues and adding robustness to assays.

RT-LAMP assays are typically not as sensitive as RT-qPCR assays[10], but the importance of this varies with the application. Clinical diagnostic tests

typically require high sensitivity. However studies suggest that infected individuals are far more infectious during periods of peak viral loads, so methods for population screening can be adequate even if they only identify samples with high viral loads. A recent study emphasized that frequency of testing and speed of reporting results are much more important than assay sensitivity for reducing transmission, emphasizing the value of assays like RT-LAMP that may be implemented efficiently and inexpensively[10].

However, a complication is that RT-LAMP reactions often result in non-specific amplification in the absence of target, particularly at longer reaction times, limiting sensitivity. This off-target amplification is especially problematic because LAMP reactions are commonly quantified using colorimetric or fluorescent dyes reporting only bulk DNA synthesis. To address these problems, improvements based on sequence-specific detection have been proposed such as incorporating DNA sequencing (LAMP-seq)[11] or CAS enzymes (DETECTR)[12]. These methods are promising, but as presently designed they typically require opening of RT-LAMP tubes and secondary manipulation of reaction products, which has the potential to result in contamination of subsequent reactions with amplification products from previous assays.

Previous research has shown the potential for molecular beacons[13] to allow sequence-specific detection of LAMP products in “single-pot” assays[14, 15]. Here, we adapt molecular beacons to detect SARS-CoV-2 sequences, a method we have named LAMP-BEAC (Fig. 1). Molecular beacons are target-specific oligonucleotides labeled with a fluorophore on one end and a quencher

on the other. The beacons are designed to incorporate complimentary sequences on their 5' and 3' ends such that at low temperatures the ends anneal to form a hairpin bringing the quencher and fluorophore into close proximity and quenching fluorescence. When the target of interest is present, the complementary target-specific beacon sequence anneals to its target, separating the fluorophore from the quencher and greatly increasing the fluorescent signal. The increase in fluorescence resulting from annealing of the beacon probe can be detected without manipulation of the product or opening the reaction tube. Here we describe 1) development of molecular beacons for detection of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in LAMP-BEAC reactions, 2) development of a LAMP-BEAC method to detect human RNA to validate sample integrity, 3) combinations of LAMP-BEAC assays for single-pot multiplex detection, 4) development of custom polymerases allowing inexpensive expression and purification of required enzymes, and 5) use of LAMP-BEAC to screen infected subjects for viral RNA in saliva.

Results

Designing molecular beacons for SARS-CoV-2 RT-LAMP

Several beacons were tested for detection of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in RT-LAMP reactions (Table S1). Optimization required identifying sequence designs that performed properly under the conditions of the RT-LAMP reaction, which is typically run at temperatures around 65°C. Function of the beacon requires that the hairpin remain mostly folded in the hairpin structure at this temperature, while

still opening sufficiently often to allow annealing to the target RT-LAMP cDNA product. The annealed beacon-target cDNA duplex must then be sufficiently stable at 65°C to result in unquenching and an increase in fluorescence. To increase beacon affinity for use at higher temperatures, we substituted multiple dNTP positions within the target sequence of each beacon with locked nucleic acids [14]. Locked nucleic acids reduce the conformational flexibility of dNTPs and make the free energy of nucleic acid annealing more favorable [16]. Several beacons were tested for performance using previously reported RT-LAMP amplicons (Table S1).

Testing LAMP-BEAC

An example of a successful beacon design is Penn-LF-beac (Table S1). The RT-LAMP amplicon targets the orf1ab coding region and was first reported by El-Tholoth and coworkers at the University of Pennsylvania ("Penn")[8]. The favored beacon was designed to target sequences within the forward DNA loop generated during LAMP; thus the beacon is designated Penn loop forward beacon, contracted to Penn-LF-beac.

Figure 2 shows use of the Penn-LF-beac system to detect synthetic SARS-CoV-2 RNA. Tests were carried out with commercial LAMP polymerase and reverse transcriptase preparations. In addition, to avoid possible supply chain problems and allow potential production of reagents in resource limited settings, we produced and purified novel DNA polymerase and reverse

transcriptase enzymes, which were assayed in parallel with commercial preparations for some tests (described below).

To compare standard LAMP amplification with LAMP-BEAC, reactions were prepared containing both the SYTO 9 fluorescent dye (Fig. 2A), which detects bulk DNA by intercalation, and the Penn-LF-beac (Fig. 2B). Reaction products were detected at two wavelengths, allowing separate quantification of the bulk dye and the molecular beacon in single reactions. The standard RT-LAMP showed bulk DNA production at shorter times than with the water control, but the water control did amplify shortly after the positive samples. This spurious late amplification is commonly seen with RT-LAMP, though the mechanism is unclear. The primers may interact with each other to form products and launch amplification, or perhaps the reaction results from amplification of adventitious environmental DNA. In separate tests, synthesis of DNA products was shown to depend on addition of LAMP primers (data not shown).

Reactions detected with the Penn-LF-beac showed more clear-cut discrimination (Fig. 2B). The positive samples showed positive signal after about the same amount of time as for the conventional RT-LAMP. However, no signal was detected for the negative water control. Lack of amplification in negative controls has been reproducible over multiple independent reactions (examples below).

The nature of the products could be assessed using thermal denaturation (Fig. 2C and D). Reactions were first cooled to allow full annealing of complementary DNA strands, then slowly heated while recording fluorescence

intensity. The fluorescent signal of the intercalating dye started high but dropped with increasing temperature in all samples (Fig. 2C), consistent with denaturation of the duplex and release of the intercalating dye into solution. In contrast, the beacon's fluorescent signal in the water controls started at low fluorescence (Fig. 2D), consistent with annealing of the beacon DNA termini to form the hairpin structure (Fig. 1). At temperatures above 70°C the fluorescence modestly increased, consistent with opening of the hairpin and reptation of the beacon as a random coil in solution. For reactions containing the RT-LAMP product and Penn-LF-beac, fluorescence values were high at lower temperatures, consistent with formation of the annealed duplex, then at temperature sufficient for denaturation, the fluorescence values fell to match those of the random coil (Fig. 2D). Thus the LAMP-BEAC assay generates strong fluorescence signals during LAMP amplification in the presence of target RNA but not in negative controls, and the thermal melting properties are consistent with formation of the expected products.

Multiplex LAMP-BEAC assays

We next sought to develop additional LAMP-BEAC assays to allow multiplex detection of SARS-CoV-2 RNA, and to allow parallel analysis of human RNA controls as a check on sample integrity, and so developed several additional beacons (Supplementary Table 1). E1-LB-beac recognizes an amplicon targeting the viral E gene reported in [17], and As1e-LB-beac recognizes the SARS-CoV-2 As1e amplicon reported in [9] targeting the orf1ab

coding region. We also developed a positive control beacon, STATH-LB-beac, to detect a LAMP amplicon targeting the human STATH mRNA (Supplementary Table 1). STATH was chosen because it is abundantly expressed in human saliva, and a tested RT-LAMP amplicon was available [18].

To allow independent detection of each amplicon as a quadruplex assay, each beacon was labeled using fluorophores with different wavelengths of maximum emission. E1-LB-beac was labeled with FAM and detected at 520 nm, STATH-LB-beac was labeled with hexachlorofluorescein (Hex) and detected at 587 nm, As1e-LB-beac was labeled with Tex615 and detected at 623 nm, and Penn-LF-beac was labeled with cyanine-5 (Cy5) and detected at 682 nm.

As an example, the quadruplex LAMP-BEAC assay was tested with contrived samples, in which saliva was doped with synthetic SARS-CoV-2 RNA (Fig. 3). Prior to dilution, saliva was treated with TCEP and EDTA, followed by heating at 95°C, which inactivates both SARS-CoV-2 and cellular RNases[9], and so is part of our sample processing pipeline. The STATH-LB-beac amplicon detected the human RNA control in all saliva samples (Fig. 3A).The E1-LB-beac amplicon consistently detected SARS-CoV-2 RNA down to ~250 copies per reaction (Fig. 3B), and the As1e-LB-beac amplicon detected SARS-CoV-2 RNA to ~250 copies per reaction (Fig. 3C). The Penn-LF-beac amplicon was least sensitive, detecting SARS-CoV-2 RNA consistently only at ~1000 copies per reaction (Fig. 3D); thus the Penn-LF-beac assay reports particularly high numbers of RNA copies.

Melt curve analysis was also carried out (Fig. 3 E-H). Melt curve profiles were distinctive for each beacon, but the overall pattern included high fluorescence in the positive samples and low values in negative samples at lower temperatures, then convergence of positive and negative samples at high temperatures associated with full melting of the beacon and reptation in solution. The melt curve data for each beacon supported correct function and the expected structures of the amplification products.

Assessing LAMP-BEAC performance on clinical saliva samples

We next tested the LAMP-BEAC assay on a set of 20 saliva samples collected during surveillance for potential SARS-CoV-2 infection. Samples were from a clinical sample acquisition site, where subjects were tested by clinical nasopharyngeal (NP) swabbing and RT-qPCR, and also donated saliva for comparison. As controls, two fresh saliva samples were collected at the time of assay, and two negative controls containing water only were compared. Saliva samples were treated with TCEP and EDTA, and heated at 95°C for five minutes to inactivate RNase and SARS-CoV-2 [9]. As an additional check, RNA was purified from the same set of saliva samples and RT-qPCR carried out using a CDC-recommend primer set, allowing investigation of possible differences between NP swabs and saliva as analytes.

The LAMP reaction was carried out using a multiplex with two SARS-CoV-2 LAMP-BEAC assays, As1e-LB-beac and Penn-LF-beac, or As1e-beac along with the human RNA-targeted STATH-LB-beac as a measure of sample integrity.

Bulk DNA synthesis was also monitored using SYTO 9. The sample set was assayed twice to allow comparison of technical replicates (Figure S1). Melt curve analysis of the amplification products was consistent with the expected molecular structures as described above (Figure S1). Bulk DNA amplification was seen in all samples (Figure S1).

Figure 4 compares the final maximum fluorescence values in the LAMP-BEAC assays to RT-qPCR quantitation on the same saliva samples. Of the clinical saliva samples, 19/22 were positive for the STATH RNA control. Three failed for unknown reasons. We note that the clinical samples had been stored for some time and frozen and thawed more than once, possibly leading to RNA degradation. The two fresh saliva samples were both positive for STATH RNA.

Ten of the saliva samples were called positive for SARS-CoV-2 RNA. The fresh SARS-CoV-2 negative saliva samples and the water controls were called negative as expected. Comparing the 10 positive samples to RT-qPCR on saliva showed that all samples with RT-qPCR calls of 100 or more viral RNA copies per microliter of saliva were identified as positive. An independent replication of the assay in another laboratory using LAMP-BEAC to analyze the same samples yielded closely similar results (Supplementary Table S2). Thus the RT-qPCR assay and LAMP-BEAC on saliva samples showed excellent agreement for the higher copy number samples.

We then performed a quadruplex LAMP-BEAC, using Penn-LF-beac, E1-LB-beac, As1e-LB-beac and STATH-LB-beac, on these 20 samples plus an additional 56 saliva samples and compared our results to clinical RT-qPCR on

NP swabs obtained from the same patients to assess performance. If we assume the results from NP swabs represent truth then the LAMP-BEAC had a sensitivity of 0.57 and a specificity of 0.98. The great majority of disagreements between LAMP-BEAC and clinical assay corresponded to samples with low estimated copy numbers. For example, LAMP-BEAC detected all 10 samples with a RT-qPCR estimated copies per μl >1000. Thus the LAMP-BEAC assays correlated perfectly with RT-qPCR on the same saliva samples at high RNA copies. Notably, the single saliva sample called positive by LAMP-BEAC but negative by clinical NP assay was also estimated at $2X10^5$ viral RNA copies/μl by RT-qPCR. A recent study has documented differences between the loads of SARS-CoV-2 RNA at different body sites [19], including oral and nasal sites, potentially accounting at least in part for the observed differences.

We note that the detection shown in Figure 4, using end point fluorescence values and not reaction progression curves, offers a simplified read out of reaction results. That is, advanced qPCR machines are not needed for quantification of product formation using LAMP-BEAC, but rather reaction end points can be used to read out results using a simpler fluorescent plate reader. This may help with bypassing possible supply chain bottlenecks associated with purchasing qPCR machines for SARS-CoV-2 assays.

Laboratory-based production of polymerases required for RT-LAMP

Polymerase enzymes are expensive and potentially subject to supply chain disruptions, so we engineered novel reverse transcriptase and DNA

polymerase enzymes and devised simple purification protocols, allowing inexpensive local production of the required enzymes. HIV-2 reverse transcriptase and the polA large fragment from *Geobacillus stearothermophilus* were each engineered to contain several amino acid substitutions expected to stabilize enzyme folding at higher temperatures (RT) or improve strand displacement activity (Bst). Enzymes were purified and tested as described in the methods. Figure S2 summarizes results of side-by-side assays using lab-purified polymerases and commercial enzyme preparations, which indicate that our novel polymerase enzymes are at least as efficient as commercial preparations.

Discussion

Standard RT-LAMP is an attractive method for assay of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in patient samples due to the simplicity of the method and the use of a supply chain orthogonal to the clinical assay supply chain. However, conventional LAMP typically detects only the presence of amplified bulk DNA, and thus assays can be complicated by nonspecific amplification. Improved specificity can be achieved by sequence-specific detection, and multiple methods have been proposed[11, 12]. However, some of these approaches are complicated by the need to open reaction tubes and manipulate products, creating severe danger of contamination between runs. Here we introduce a convenient method for sequence-specific detection of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in unpurified saliva using molecular beacons—LAMP-BEAC—that does not require

manipulation of reaction products, but can be carried out in a multiplex format in a “single tube”.

The LAMP-BEAC method is not as sensitive as RT-qPCR on purified RNA, but it can be implemented inexpensively, potentially allowing frequent population screening. The reaction set up and incubation can be done in a couple of hours, allowing rapid turn around. Thus the LAMP-BEAC assay meets the needs articulated by modeling studies for effective surveys of asymptomatic populations[10]. To this end, we demonstrate here that LAMP-BEAC works efficiently on inactivated saliva, providing an easily-collected analyte.

Comparison of LAMP-BEAC to RT-qPCR showed better concordance between the RT-qPCR assay carried out on the same saliva samples than for RT-qPCR carried out on eluates from NP swabs. For the assays on saliva, all samples with greater than 1000 viral RNA copies agreed between LAMP-BEAC and RT-qPCR, suggesting that both are similarly effective at identifying samples with high viral RNA copy numbers. The reason for divergence with some of the results for RT-qPCR on NP swabs is unknown—however, differences in viral RNA loads within patients at different body sites is well documented, possibly accounting for this difference[19]. We had one case where the two saliva assays called a sample as positive that was negative on the NP sample, as well as several samples that were positive by NP and negative or low in both saliva assays, suggesting the differences can be in either direction, and that neither sample type is superior.

Recently Vogels et al. reported SalivaDirect, an RT-qPCR assay run on inactivated but unpurified saliva[20]. SalivaDirect uses a duplex single-tube analytical method, with one amplicon targeting SARS-CoV-2 RNA and another targeting a human RNA. This parallels our duplex LAMP-BEAC targeting viral RNA and human STATH RNA (Fig. 4). The SalivaDirect method is rightly popular, but we note that the LAMP-BEAC method does not rely on commercial enzyme mixes, potentially providing more resilience to possible supply chain disruptions. In addition, LAMP-BEAC can be carried out as an end-point assay using a fluorescent plate reader to assess results, thus bypassing the need for quantitative real-time PCR machines.

Conclusions

Addressing the need for increased SARS-CoV-2 testing will likely require multiple well-designed assays ideally taking advantage of independent supply chains—LAMP-BEAC can contribute to meeting this need.

Methods

Design of Molecular Beacons

Beacons were designed to detect product generated using previously published LAMP primer sets. To design beacons targeting the loop region of the LAMP amplification product, we mapped the FIP and BIP primers to the SARS-CoV-2 genome to find the entire forward and backward loop regions of the amplicon

(potentially including regions outside the original LF and LB primers). We then selected GC-rich subsequences within these loops and selected bases for LNA modification based on the predicted change in melting temperature using a stepwise greedy heuristic of consecutively adding the LNA with the highest predicted Tm. Additional nucleotides were then added to the 5' and 3' ends to form a hairpin with predicted melting temperature between 60-65 ºC. Where possible terminal bases of the target sequence were used as part of the hairpin. To allow easy and relatively affordable synthesis, beacons were kept shorter than 25 nt with 6 locked nucleic acids.

Design and purification of polymerases

We initially chose the D422A mutant of the polA large fragment from *Geobacillus stearothermophilus* for LAMP due to its high strand displacement activity [11]. Using strain DSM 13240, the polymerase coding sequence was amplified from genomic DNA, the D422A substitution was incorporated, and the construct was ligated into CDFDuet (Novagen) in-frame with an N-terminal hexahistidine tag. To explore alternative DNA polymerases for LAMP, we generated the R433A and R433P variants, each of which results in disruption of the salt-bridge formed with Asp422 in the wild-type enzyme (pdb 1XWL). The polymerases were expressed in strain BL21(DE3) at 37° for 3 h and purified using Talon (Clontech), heparin sepharose (GE), and MonoQ (GE) chromatography. Purified Bst-LF mutants were concentrated, glycerol added to 10%, and aliquots were flash frozen and stored at -80°C. Primer extension assays using M13 DNA template and ^{3}H-dTTP

labeled dNTPs were used to establish specific activity as described for commercially prepared Bst (NEB).

To demonstrate that RT-LAMP can be performed using a reverse transcriptase generated in-house, we first constructed a synthetic gene for the HIV1 RT p66 (strain NL4-3) subunit containing substitutions expected to confer thermal stability (RTx; NEB). The p66 sequence was inserted into pET29b and the p51 subunit coding sequence was amplified by PCR and inserted in frame with an N-terminal hexahistidine tag in CDFDuet. An alternative RT (RT2m) was produced using a similar philosophy with HIV2 RT as the template (Genbank AAB25033), where thirteen naturally occurring substitutions were incorporated. The full-length subunit was inserted into pCDFDuet and the smaller subunit was fused to a C-terminal hexahistidine tag after Thr436 in pETDuet. For both RTs, the subunits were co-expressed in BL21(DE3) and purified using Talon and heparin sepharose chromatography. The purified enzymes were concentrated, glycerol added to 10%, and aliquots were flash frozen and stored at -80°C. Primer extension assays using poly-A template and ^{3}H-labeled dTTP were used to determine specific activity at 50°C as described for commercial RTx (NEB).

<u>RT-LAMP reaction mixtures</u>

RT-LAMP reactions were prepared by mixing 7.5 μl commercial 2x LAMP master mix (NEB E1700L) or our own LAMP mix (40 mM TrisHCl, pH 8.5, 20 mM $(NH4)_2SO4$, 100 mM KCl, 16 mM MgSO4, 0.2% Tween-20, 2.8 mM each dNTP, 16 μg/ml polA LF, and 2.6-7.7 μg/ml RT) with 1.5 μl of 10x primer/beacon master

mix (final concentration: 1.6 μM FIP/BIP, 0.2 μM F3/B3, 0.4 μM LF/LB, 0.05 μM beacon) and 6 μl of sample and/or water. For multiplexed LAMP reactions, the final total concentration of primers/beacons was maintained e.g. the individual primer/beacon concentrations were halved when two primer sets were added to the same reaction.

Assays using LAMP-BEAC

LAMP-BEAC reactions were performed at 63-65 ºC with fluorescent quantification every 30 seconds on a ThermoFisher QuantStudio 5. Reactions typically completed within 45 minutes but for research purposes data was collected for additional time spans. The synthetic SARS-CoV-2 RNA used as a standard during assay development was obtained from Twist (MT007544.1). After reaction completion, for melt curve analysis, the reaction was heated to 95 ºC for 5 minutes to inactivate any remaining enzyme, cooled to 25 ºC (at a rate of 0.1 ºC/sec) and then slowly heated to 95º C with fluorescence measured every degree.

RT-qPCR to characterize saliva samples

RNA was extracted from ~140 μl saliva using the Qiagen QIAamp Viral RNA Mini Kit. The RT-qPCR assay used the CDC 2019-nCoV_N1 primer-probe set (2019-nCoV_N1-F: GACCCCAAAATCAGCGAAAT, 2019-nCoV_N1-R: TCTGGTTACTGCCAGTTGAATCTG, 2019_nCoV_N1-P: FAM-ACCCCGCATTACGTTTGGTGGACC-IBFQ). The RT-qPCR master mix

contained: 8.5 μl dH_2O, 0.5 μl N1-F (20 μM), 0.5 μl N1-R (20 μM), 0.5 μl N1-P (5 μM), 5.0 μl TaqMan™ Fast Virus 1-Step Master Mix per reaction. 5 μl of extracted RNA was added to 15 μl of prepared master mix for a final volume of 20 μl per reaction. Final concentrations of both 2019-nCoV_N1-F and 2019-nCoV_N1-R primers were 500nM and the final concentration of the 2019-nCoV_N1-P probe was 125nM. The assay was performed using the ThermoFisher QuantStudio 5. The thermocycler conditions were: 5 minutes at 50°C, 20 seconds at 95°C, and 40 cycles of 3 seconds at 95°C and 30 seconds at 60°C.

Abbreviations

PCR: polymerase chain reaction; COVID-19: coronavirus disease from 2019, SARS-CoV-2: severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus number two; RT-LAMP: reverse transcriptase-loop-mediated isothermal amplification.

Declarations

Ethics approval and consent to participate

All sample collection was carried out under IRB-approved protocols (IRB protocol #842613 and #813913). Salivary samples were collected from possible SARS-CoV-2 positive patients at one of three locations: (1) Penn Presbyterian Medical Center Emergency Department, (2) Hospital of the University of Pennsylvania Emergency Department, and (3) Penn Medicine COVID-19 ambulatory testing center. Inclusion criteria including any adult (age>17 years) who underwent

SARS-CoV-2 testing via standard nasopharyngeal swab at the same visit. Patients with known COVID-19 disease who previously tested positive previously were excluded. After verbal consent was obtained by a trained research coordinator, patients were instructed to self-collect saliva into a sterile specimen container which was then placed on ice until further processing for analysis.

Consent for publication

All authors have reviewed the manuscript and consented to allow publication.

Availability of data and materials

All data newly generated in this study is disclosed in the published manuscript.

Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Funding

This work was supported by the Center for Research on Coronaviruses and Other Emerging Pathogens.

Authors contributions

SS-M, BDA, RGC, GVD and FDB designed the study; JG-W, JLT, BSA, and RGC collected clinical specimens; SS-M, YH, AMR, AG, AG, LH, PD, CN, AK

and GVD carried out assays; SRW and YL grew SARS-CoV-2 in tissue culture; SS-M, GVD, and FDB wrote the paper

Acknowledgements

We are grateful to members of the Bushman, Van Duyne and Collman laboratories for help and suggestions. We acknowledge the assistance of the Penn Medicine BioBank, including JoEllen Weaver and Daniel Rader.

Figure Legends

Fig. 1. LAMP-BEAC: RT-LAMP assayed using molecular beacons. The molecular beacon used is shown at the top in the annealed hairpin form, which is quenched. Binding of the beacon to the target complementary sequence separates the fluorescent group and the quencher, allowing detection of fluorescence. The red loops on the beacon indicate locked nucleic acids used to increase binding affinity.

Fig. 2. Reaction progression curves comparing RT-LAMP assayed using an intercalating dye and LAMP-BEAC. A) Conventional RT-LAMP assay detecting SARS-CoV-2 RNA. Time after reaction initiation is shown on the x-axis, relative fluorescence intensity is shown on the y-axis. The RNA used was the Twist commercial positive control; copy numbers in the reaction mixture are shown in the key at the bottom. B) Detection of SARS-CoV-2 RNA using LAMP-BEAC.

Markings are as in A). C) and D) Thermal melting curves to characterize amplification products. The results shown are for reactions in A and B; the key to samples tested is at the bottom. Reaction products were cooled to room temperature, then slowly heated for the melt curve analysis. C) Characterization of products generated using conventional RT-LAMP and the Twist RNA template. The x-axis shows the temperature, the y-axis shows fluorescence intensity. D) Characterization of products generated using LAMP-BEAC. Markings as in A).

Fig. 3. A multiplex LAMP-BEAC method assaying four amplicons. Assays were carried out using a LAMP-BEAC amplicon to detect human STATH RNA (A) and three amplicons to detect SARS-CoV-2 (B-D). For these assays, synthetic SARS-CoV-2 RNA was diluted into saliva (inactivated as described[9]); copies per microliter are shown by the color code in the lower right. For A-D, the x-axis shows time after starting the assay, and the y-axis shows fluorescence intensity. E-H shows melt curve analysis for samples in A-D. For E-H, the x-axis shows temperature, and the y-axis shows fluorescence intensity.

Fig. 4. Validation of multiplexed LAMP-BEAC on 20 clinical samples using multiplexed assays. A) and B) Fluorescence was measured after an hour of LAMP amplification and the maximum endpoint fluorescence observed in any amplification for As1e (A) or Penn (B) lamp primers (y-axis) was compared to previously measured qPCR measurements of SARS-CoV-2 copy number from the same samples (x-axis). Vertical dotted line indicates 100 copies/μl

corresponding to approximately 10,000 RNA copies/ml in the unpurified NP swab eluate. Horizontal dashed line indicates a potential LAMP cutoff of two times the highest fluorescence seen in uninfected saliva controls. C) In the same LAMP reactions, the fluorescence of human STATH gene targeted LAMP beacons was measured and the maximum endpoint value observed compared to those seen in water controls. Dashed line indicates two times the highest fluorescence seen in the water controls.

Supplementary Material

Table S1. Oligonucleotides used in the LAMP-BEAC assay.

Table S2. Clinical samples and results of assays for SARS-CoV-2 and human RNA.

Figure S1. Reaction progression curves for LAMP-BEAC reactions carried out on clinical saliva samples. Each column represents a single sample assayed. Sample names are as in Table S2. Heavy boxes indicate positive samples.

Figure S2. Comparing laboratory-purified and commercial polymerase enzymes using a quadruplex LAMP-BEAC assay of saliva samples spiked with synthetic SARS-CoV-2 RNA. Assays were carried out using an amplicon to detect human

STATH RNA (A) and three amplicons to detect SARS-CoV-2 (B-D). For these assays, synthetic SARS-CoV-2 RNA was diluted into saliva (inactivated as described[9]); copies per microliter are shown by the color code in the lower right. For A-D, the x-axis shows time after starting the assay, and the y-axis shows fluorescence intensity. E-H shows melt curve analysis for samples in A-D. For E-H, the x-axis shows temperature, and the y-axis shows fluorescence intensity. (I-P) Assays are exactly as in A-H, but commercial reverse transcriptase and DNA polymerase (NEB Warm Start LAMP Kit master mix product number E1700L) were used instead of the laboratory designed and purified polymerases.

References

1. Lu R, Zhao X, Li J, Niu P, Yang B, Wu H, Wang W, Song H, Huang B, Zhu N, et al: **Genomic characterisation and epidemiology of 2019 novel coronavirus: implications for virus origins and receptor binding.** *Lancet* 2020, **395:**565-574.
2. Morawska L, Cao J: **Airborne transmission of SARS-CoV-2: The world should face the reality.** *Environ Int* 2020, **139:**105730.
3. van Doremalen N, Bushmaker T, Morris DH, Holbrook MG, Gamble A, Williamson BN, Tamin A, Harcourt JL, Thornburg NJ, Gerber SI, et al: **Aerosol and Surface Stability of SARS-CoV-2 as Compared with SARS-CoV-1.** *N Engl J Med* 2020, **382:**1564-1567.
4. Lieberman JA, Pepper G, Naccache SN, Huang ML, Jerome KR, Greninger AL: **Comparison of Commercially Available and Laboratory-Developed Assays for In Vitro Detection of SARS-CoV-2 in Clinical Laboratories.** *J Clin Microbiol* 2020, **58**.
5. Fang SH, Ocejo R, Sin M, Finer NN, Wood BP: **Radiological cases of the month. Congenital laryngeal atresia.** *Am J Dis Child* 1989, **143:**625-627.
6. Lamb LE, Bartolone SN, Ward E, Chancellor MB: **Rapid detection of novel coronavirus/Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) by reverse transcription-loop-mediated isothermal amplification.** *PLoS One* 2020, **15:**e0234682.
7. Lee SH, Baek YH, Kim YH, Choi YK, Song MS, Ahn JY: **One-Pot Reverse Transcriptional Loop-Mediated Isothermal Amplification (RT-LAMP) for Detecting MERS-CoV.** *Front Microbiol* 2016, **7:**2166.
8. El-Tholoth M, Bau HH, Song J: **A single and two stage, closed-tube, molecular test fo rthe 2019 novel coronavirus (COVID-19) at home, clinic, and points of entry.** *chemrxiv* 2020.
9. Rabe BA, Cepko C: **SARS-CoV-2 detection using an isothermal amplification reaction and a rapid, inexpensive protocol for sample inactivation and purification.** *medRxiv* 2020.
10. Larremore DB, Wilder B, Evan L, Shehata S, Burke JM, Hay JA, Tambe M, Mina MJ, Parker R: **Test sensitivity is secondary to frequency and turn around time for COVID-19 surveillance.** 2020.
11. Schmid-Burgk JL, Schmithausen RM, Li D, Hollstein R, Ben-Shmuel A, Israeli O, Weiss S, Paran N, Wilbeing G, Liebing J, et al: **Lamp-Seq: population scale COVID-19 diagnostics using combinatorial barcoding.** *bioRxiv* 2020.
12. Broughton JP, Deng X, Yu G, Fasching CL, Servellita V, Singh J, Miao X, Streithorst JA, Granados A, Sotomayor-Gonzalez A, et al: **CRISPR-Cas12-based detection of SARS-CoV-2.** *Nat Biotechnol* 2020, **38:**870-874.
13. Antony T, Subramaniam V: **Molecular beacons: nucleic acid hybridization and emerging applications.** *J Biomol Struct Dyn* 2001, **19:**497-504.
14. Bakthavathsalam P, Longatte G, Jensen SO, Manefield M, Gooding JJ: **Locked nucleic acid molecular beacons for multiplex detection of loop mediated**

isothermal amplification. *Sensors and Actuators B: Chemical* 2018, **268:**255-263.

15. Liu W, Huang S, Liu N, Dong D, Yang Z, Tang Y, Ma W, He X, Ao D, Xu Y, et al: **Establishment of an accurate and fast detection method using molecular beacons in loop-mediated isothermal amplification assay.** *Sci Rep* 2017, **7:**40125.
16. Petersen M, Wengel J: **LNA: a versatile tool for therapeutics and genomics.** *Trends Biotechnol* 2003, **21:**74-81.
17. Zhang Y, Ren G, Buss J, Barry AJ, Patton GC, Tanner NA: **Enhancing Colorimetric LAMP Amplkification Speed and Sensitivity with Guanidine Chloride.** *bioRxiv* 2020.
18. Satoh T, Kouroki S, Ogawa K, Tanaka Y, Matsumura K, Iwase S: **Development of mRNA-based body fluid identification using reverse transcription loop-mediated isothermal amplification.** *Anal Bioanal Chem* 2018, **410:**4371-4378.
19. Wyllie AL, Fournier J, Casanovas-Massana A, Campbell M, Tokuyama M, Vijayakumar P, Warren JL, Geng B, Muenker MC, Moore AJ, et al: **Saliva or Nasopharyngeal Swab Specimens for Detection of SARS-CoV-2.** *N Engl J Med* 2020.
20. Vogels CBF, Brackney D, Wang J, Kalinich CC, Ott IM, Kudo E, Lu P, Venkataraman A, Tokuyama M, Moore AJ, et al: **SalivaDirect: Simple and sensitive molecular diagnostic test for SARS-CoV-2 surveillance.** *medRxiv* 2020.

Figure 1


SARS-CoV-2
cDNA
+
Locked nucleic acid
Molecular
beacon
Quenched
Quenched
fluorophore
Quencher
dye
Hybrid
Fluorescent
Unquenched
fluorophore
Quencher
dye

Figure 2


a
520 nm fluorescence (RLU)
2000
1500
1000
500
0
1000
2000
3000
4000
Time (s)
b
587 nm fluorescence (RLU)
30
20
10
0
0
1000
2000
3000
4000
Time (s)
c
520 nm fluorescence (RLU)
3000
2500
2000
1500
1000
500
0
30
40
50
60
70
80
90
Temperature (C)
d
587 nm fluorescence (RLU)
50
40
30
20
10
0
30
40
50
60
70
80
90
Temperature (C)
10k
100
1k
Water

Figure 3


a
Stath
587nm RLU (x1000)
Time (minutes)
e
Stath
587nm RLU (x1000)
Temperature (°C)
b
E1
520nm RLU (x1000)
Time (minutes)
g
E1
520nm RLU (x1000)
Temperature (°C)
c
As1e
623nm RLU (x1000)
Time (minutes)
g
As1e
623nm RLU (x1000)
Temperature (°C)
d
Penn
682nm RLU (x1000)
Time (minutes)
h
Penn
682nm RLU (x1000)
Temperature (°C)
1000
500
250
125
62
31
16
Negative

Figure 4


a
As1e LAMP
Endpoint fluorescence (1000 RLU)
100
80
60
40
20
10^2
10^3
10^4
10^5
10^6
qPCR−estimated copies/ul
b
Penn LAMP
Endpoint fluorescence (1000 RLU)
15
10
5
0
10^2
10^3
10^4
10^5
10^6
qPCR−estimated copies/ul
c
STATH LAMP
Endpoint fluorescence (1000 RLU)
40
30
20
10
Fresh saliva
Patient saliva
Water