

1 **Title:** Pooling of samples to optimize SARS-CoV-2 diagnosis by RT-qPCR: comparative
2 analysis of two protocols.

3

4 **Running Title: Pooling samples to detect SARS-CoV-2 by RT-qPCR**

5

6 VOLPATO, Fabiana^{a, b, c}; LIMA-MORALES, Daiana^{a, c}; WINK, Priscila Lamb^{a, c, d}, WILLIG,
7 Julia ^{c, e}; PARIS, Fernanda^c; ASHTON-PROLLA, Patricia^{f, e}; BARTH, Afonso Luís^{a, b, c, d*}

8

9 ^a LABRESIS- Laboratório de Pesquisa em Resistência Bacteriana, Centro de Pesquisa
10 Experimental, Hospital de Clínicas de Porto Alegre (HCPA), Porto Alegre, RS, Brazil

11 ^b Programa de Pós-Graduação em Ciências Médicas (PPGCM), Faculdade de Medicina,
12 Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul (UFRGS), Porto Alegre, RS, Brazil

13 ^c Laboratório de Diagnóstico de SARS-CoV-2 (Lab Covid) Hospital de Clínicas de Porto
14 Alegre (HCPA), Porto Alegre, RS, Brazil

15 ^d Programa de Pós-Graduação em Ciências Farmacêuticas (PPGCF), Faculdade de
16 Farmácia, UFRGS, Porto Alegre, RS, Brazil

17 ^e Programa de Residência Multiprofissional do Hospital de Clínicas de Porto Alegre
18 (HCPA), Porto Alegre, RS, Brazil

19 ^f Departamento de Genética, UFRGS, Porto Alegre, RS, Brazil

20 ^e Grupo de Pesquisa e Pós-Graduação e Pós Graduação, HCPA, Porto Alegre, RS, Brazil

21

22 *Corresponding author: Afonso Luís Barth, LABRESIS- Laboratório de Pesquisa em
23 Resistência Bacteriana, Hospital de Clínicas de Porto Alegre, Rua Ramiro Barcelos 2350,
24 Porto Alegre, RS, Brazil, 90.035-903. E-mail: albarth@hcpa.edu.br; Phone:
25 +555133598607.

26 **NOTE:** This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

27 **Abstract**

28 RT-qPCR for SARS-CoV-2 is the main diagnostic test used to identify the novel
29 coronavirus. Several countries have used large scale SARS-CoV-2 RT-qPCR testing as
30 one of the important strategies for combating the pandemic. In order to process the
31 massive needs for coronavirus testing, the usual throughput of routine clinical laboratories
32 has reached and often surpassed its limits and new approaches to cope with this
33 challenge must be developed. This study has aimed to evaluate the use pool of samples
34 as a strategy to optimize the diagnostic of SARS-CoV-2 by RT-qPCR in a general
35 population. A total of 220 naso/orofaryngeal swab samples were collected and tested
36 using two different protocols of sample pooling. In the first protocol (Protocol A); 10 clinical
37 samples were pooled before RNA extraction. The second protocol (Protocol B) consisted
38 of pooling the already extracted RNAs from 10 individual samples. Results from Protocol A
39 were identical (100% agreement) with the individual results. However, for results from
40 Protocol B, reduced agreement (91%) was observed in relation to results obtained by
41 individual testing. Inconsistencies observed were related to RT-qPCR results with higher
42 Cycle Thresholds ($Ct > 32.73$). Furthermore, in pools containing more than one positive
43 individual, the Ct of the pool was equivalent to the lowest Ct among the individual results.
44 These results provide additional evidence in favor of the clinical use of pooled samples for
45 SARS-CoV-2 diagnosis by RT-qPCR and suggest that pooling of samples before RNA
46 extraction is preferable in terms of diagnostic yield.

47

48 **Key-words:** Molecular Diagnostic, Pooling Sample, SARS-CoV-2, RT-qPCR, Massive
49 Testing.

50 **Introduction**

51 Due to the exponential increase of respiratory syndromes by SARS-CoV-2, the
52 World Health Organization (WHO) declared COVID-19 a pandemic of worldwide
53 importance (1). The rapid propagation of the virus significantly increases the demand on
54 the health care system. In response to the challenge of identifying and isolating infected
55 patients, in an attempt to minimize spread of the disease, two different types of tests have
56 been used: real time Reverse Transcriptase Polymerase Chain Reaction (RT-qPCR) for
57 SARS-CoV-2 diagnosis mainly in upper respiratory tract samples and serum IgM and/or
58 IgG antibody detection assays to detect past infection and possibly immunity to the
59 disease.

60 In order to avoid diagnostic cross-reactivity with other endemic coronaviruses, most
61 RT-qPCR assays include primers for at least two different molecular targets, such as
62 nucleocapsid proteins 1 (N1) and 2 (N2) (2). A major advantage of real time assays is that
63 amplification and analysis of the final product are performed simultaneously in a closed
64 system. This procedure minimizes false-positive results associated with amplification of
65 unspecific products (2).

66 Several countries have used RT-qPCR in large scale efforts as a mainstream
67 initiative for combating the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic. To enable massive coronavirus testing
68 thousands of laboratories worldwide have expanded their routine and in several countries
69 high-throughput automated testing was implemented mainly in reference centers. However,
70 many laboratories, especially in underserved areas became overloaded and new
71 approaches to cope with this ever increasing and long lasting challenge are needed,
72 especially in developing countries and if a strategy of massive testing, including
73 asymptomatic individuals is adopted. A few studies have provided encouraging results
74 that support the use of sample pooling as a robust and cost/time-saving approach in this

75 extreme scenario. In this brief report, we provide additional evidence in favor of SARS-
76 CoV-2 RT-qPCR analysis with pooled samples using two different methodologies.

77

78 **Materials and Methods**

79 **Sample Pooling.** A total of 220 samples from different patients were obtained by
80 oro/nasopharyngeal swabbing performed by trained personnel in a single institution.
81 Individual swabs were mixed with 3mL of NaCl 0.9% solution. Two strategies of pooling
82 samples were evaluated: 1) Protocol A: consisted of 10 samples grouped (100 μ L from
83 each sample) before RNA extraction; 2) Protocol B: consisted of 10 samples group (4 μ L of
84 each) after the individual RNA extraction. Results from both protocols were compared to
85 individual analyses of the same samples, performed in parallel to the analysis of the pools.
86 RNA was extracted from all samples using the Abbott m2000sp automated system (Abbott
87 Laboratories, Chicago, USA) and the Abbott Sample Preparation System - 4x24 Preps
88 (Promega Corporation, Wisconsin, USA).

89 **RT-qPCR Reaction.** A previously validated SARS-CoV-2 RT-qPCR protocol following the
90 CDC guidelines and primers was used. In brief, Superscript III (SSIII) one step RT-qPCR
91 system (Thermo Fisher Scientific Inc, California, USA) was used for RT-qPCR reactions.
92 The master mix was composed of 5 μ L of 2X reaction buffer (0.4 mM of each dNTP and 6
93 mM MgSO₄); 0.2 μ L of SuperScript™ III RT/Platinum™ Taq Mix; 0.2 μ L of ROX (dilution
94 1:10); 0.75 μ L of combined primers/probes mix of nCOV1 (N1 primer) or nCOV2 (N2
95 primer) or RP (2019-nCoV RUO Kit, IDT, Integrated DNA Technologies Inc, Iowa, USA)
96 and 4 μ L of extracted RNA. The human ribonuclease P gene (RNase P) was used as
97 internal control to monitor nucleic acid extraction, specimen quality and presence of
98 reaction inhibitors. Thermal cycling was performed at 50°C for 30 min for reverse
99 transcription, followed by 95 °C for 2 min and then 45 cycles of 95°C for 15s, 55 °C for 35s
100 in QuantStudio® 3 Applied Biosystems™ (Applied Biosystems, Massachusetts, USA). The

101 result was considered “negative” when neither N1 nor N2 targets amplified and “positive”
102 when both N1 and N2 targets amplified. RT-qPCR was considered “inconclusive” when
103 only one target (N1 or N2) amplified. Individual samples and pools with positive results had
104 the values of the Cycle Threshold (Ct) recorded. In order to analyze performance of the
105 assays with pooled samples, Ct values of individual and pooled sample runs were
106 compared.

107 To minimize inter-experiment variability (“batch effects”) simultaneous analysis of
108 the individual samples and their corresponding pools was undertaken in the same RT-
109 qPCR reaction. The 220 samples included in this study were sorted in 22 pools with 10
110 clinical samples each, for each protocol. The individual composition of the 22 pools for
111 each protocol (A and B) was as follows: all negative samples (1/22), one inconclusive
112 sample (1/22), only one positive sample (8/22), two positive samples (7/22), three positive
113 samples (3/22), four positive samples (1/22), and five positive samples (1/22) (Table 1)

115 **Results**

116 There was 100% and 91% of agreement when the results from individual and
117 pooled samples with Protocol A (22 of 22) and Protocol B (20 of 22), respectively, were
118 compared. The Cts of the individual samples with positive results ranged from 13.22 to
119 37.14, for both N1 and N2 targets. The Cts of the two individual samples with divergent
120 results in Protocol B were >32.73 – Table 1. RNase P used as a quality control presented
121 very satisfactory results (Cts between 26 to 32).

122 It was possible to observe that Cts (both targets) of pooled samples in Protocol A
123 with positive results in the RT-qPCR tended to be 3 units higher in average when
124 compared to Cts of the individual tested positive samples (Table 1). This increase was
125 also observed in pools of the Protocol B for the N1 target but the Ct of N2 target presented
126 a difference of 4 units in average compared to the individually tested samples. Noteworthy,

127 in pools with more than one positive sample, Ct of the pool was similar to the lowest Ct
128 obtained in the individual analyses of the samples included in the pool (Table 1).

129

130 **Discussion**

131 A rapid and reliable laboratory diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2 infection plays a crucial
132 role for public health interventions related to the new coronavirus pandemic (3). RT-qPCR
133 detection of the virus by oro/nasopharyngeal swabbing is characterized by good sensitivity
134 and high specificity and has been regarded as the "gold standard" for the virus genome
135 detection (4). However, it is still a semi-automated strategy which includes several
136 sequential analytical steps and is associated with significant costs. Sample pooling is a
137 well known approach to optimize time and costs of massive screening strategies for
138 infectious diseases and has been reported as a reliable technique for Hepatitis B, Hepatitis
139 C and Human Immunodeficiency Virus in blood banks (5).

140 In this study, we demonstrate that RT-qPCR with primers for the nucleocapsid of
141 SARS-CoV-2 using pooled samples (10/pool) is able to provide a correct diagnosis even
142 when only one individual sample is positive in the pool. In fact, the pool RT-qPCR analysis
143 identified a positive sample (Protocol A) even when the single sample analysis had a later
144 Ct ($Ct > 32.73$). As previously described, pools with a high number of samples (30
145 samples) may present false-negative results in the RT-qPCR for SARS-CoV-2 especially
146 when a positive sample has a later Ct (6). Therefore, according to our experience, we
147 suggest to make pools with a maximum of 10 samples/pool as this approach increases
148 significantly the diagnostic capacity of the labs without losing quality.

149 However, the size of the pool can accommodate different infection scenarios and it
150 can be adequate if necessary, according to the institution necessity as suggested by
151 Lohse et al (6). It has to be considered that the use of pools would present best

152 performance whether the population in analysis is expected to present low incidence of the
153 COVID-19 such as people without symptoms, for example.

154 The best performance of Protocol A in relation to Protocol B in our study is probably
155 related to a larger volume of each individual clinical sample added to the pool (100µL of
156 clinical sample). Furthermore, Protocol A is operationally straightforward and less time
157 consuming as it requires only one RNA extraction. Moreover, the only pool which
158 contained an individual sample with inconclusive result presented inconclusive result only
159 using the Protocol A.

160 According to Buckingham et al (7), the absolute Ct comparison is only meaningful
161 when comparing experiments using the same reaction conditions. In this study, the
162 individual and pooled samples were tested together in the same experimental run, and
163 using the same reagents. Considering the Ct differences between a positive individual
164 sample and the same sample tested in a pool, we observed an average variation of 3 units
165 of Ct (Protocol A). According to the literature, using the same sample in a 10-fold dilution
166 series, the Ct values differ by ~3.3 units (7). These data corroborate with the Ct variation
167 found in this study between the result of the RT-qPCR for SARS-CoV-2 of the individual
168 sample and of this sample in a pool with nine others. We also found that pools with more
169 than one positive sample present Cts more related to the lower Ct of the sample tested
170 individually.

171 Finally, the results of this study indicate that it is possible to obtain positive results
172 of RT-qPCR for SARS-CoV2 when combining 10 clinical samples in one pool (Protocol A).
173 The pooling of clinical samples would increase significantly test capacity of the
174 laboratories. The use of pools would be much more effective to test clinical samples in
175 scenarios of low prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 as a positive result of the pool will require that
176 all samples be tested individually. In conclusion, to test populations in a large scale, the
177 use of pools is a very useful strategy as an epidemiological screening method.

178 **Acknowledgments**

179 This study received a grant of “Fundação de Apoio a Pesquisa e Ensino do rio
180 Grande do Sul (FAPERGS)” (#20-2551-0000265-9) as well as of “Fundo de Incentivo a
181 Pesquisa e Eventos do Hospital de Clínicas de Porto Alegre (FIPE/HCPA) – (#2020-
182 0163).

183

184 **References**

- 185 1. Sun J, He WT, Wang L, Lai A, Ji X, Zhai X, Li G, Suchard MA, Tian J, Zhou J, Veit
186 M, Su S. 2020. COVID-19: Epidemiology, Evolution, and Cross-Disciplinary
187 Perspectives. *Trends Mol Med* 26:483-495.
188 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.molmed.2020.02.008>
- 189 2. Tang YW, Schmitz JE, Persing DH, Stratton CW. 2020. Laboratory Diagnosis of
190 COVID-19: Current Issues and Challenges. *J Clin Microbiol* 58:e00512-20.
191 <https://doi.org/10.1128/JCM.00512-20>
- 192 3. Lu X, Whitaker B, Sakthivel SKK, Kamili S, Rose LE, Lowe L, Mohareb E, Ellassal
193 EM, Al-sanouri T, Haddadin A, Erdman DD. 2014. Real-Time Reverse
194 Transcription-PCR assay panel for Middle East Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus.
195 *J Clin Microbiol* 52(1):67-75. <https://doi.org/10.1128/JCM.02533-13>
- 196 4. Shen M, Zhou Y, Ye J, Al-maskri AAA, Kang Y, Zeng S, Cai S. 2020. Recent
197 advances and perspectives of nucleic acid detection for coronavirus. *J Pharm Anal*
198 10:97-101. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpha.2020.02.010>
- 199 5. Nguyen T, Bang D D, Wolff A. 2020. 2019 Novel Coronavirus Disease (COVID-19):
200 Paving the road for rapid detection and Point-of-Care diagnostics. *Micromachines*
201 11. <https://doi.org/10.3390/mi11030306>
- 202 6. Lohse S, Pfuhl T, Berkó-Göttel B, Rissland J, Geißler T, Gärtner B. 2020. Pooling of
203 samples for testing for SARS-CoV-2 in asymptomatic people. *Lancet Infect Dis*.
204 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099\(20\)30362-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30362-5)
- 205 7. Buckingham L. 2019. Chapter 6: Nucleic Acid Amplification, p 142-178. *In*
206 Buckingham L. *Molecular Diagnostics: Fundamentals, Methods, and Clinical*
207 *Applications*, 3th ed, F.A. Davis Company.

208 **Table 1:** Cycle Threshold results of pooling samples for detection of SARS-CoV-2 by RT-qPCR.

Pool Identification	Protocol A* Ct N1	Protocol A Ct N2	Protocol B** Ct N1	Protocol B Ct N2	Number of positive samples in the pool	Value of lower Ct positive in the pool N1	Value of lower Ct positive in the pool N2
POOL 1	Negative	Negative	Negative	Negative	0	-	-
POOL 2	35.44	38.46	Negative	Negative	1	32.73	35.05
POOL 3	22.02	22.64	22.26	22.99	2	19.02	19.96
POOL 4	16.66	16.82	16.84	16.78	1	13.54	13.22
POOL 5	20.57	20.98	20.96	21.25	1	17.39	17.85
POOL 6	Negative	27.72	Negative	Negative	Inconclusive	Negative	37.14
POOL 7	24.13	25.31	27.36	29.06	1	20.37	20.23
POOL 8	35.41	38.97	Negative	38.42	1	33,79	36.28
POOL 9	19.35	21.18	19.81	21.53	2	16.06	17.39
POOL 10	21.04	21.94	20.69	20.59	2	18.17	18.82
POOL 11	21.61	23.29	21.48	23.42	5	19.12	18.91
POOL 12	31.21	33.27	30.41	33.23	2	27.07	29.23
POOL 13	20.54	20.32	24.48	25.12	4	20.89	20.55
POOL 14	24.08	27.24	20.79	22.36	3	18.23	19.39
POOL 15	17.00	18.21	16.97	18.18	3	13.55	15.01
POOL 16	28.89	31.42	28.81	31.23	2	25.47	27.17
POOL 17	20.50	21.41	20.96	21.96	3	17.97	18.74
POOL 18	27.57	29.11	26.54	28.7	2	24.05	25.12
POOL 19	21.34	22.06	21.41	22.40	1	18.13	18.59
POOL 20	32.61	34.17	32.54	39.07	1	29.33	30.51
POOL 21	28.02	29.26	26.99	27.26	2	23.68	24.26
POOL 22	19.23	19.73	19.31	19.76	1	16.11	16.74

209 *Protocol A: Pooling of clinical samples prior to perform RNA extraction.

210 **Protocol B: Pooling samples after individual RNA extraction.