

1 **Development and comparison of a novel multiple cross displacement amplification**
2 **(MCDA) assay with other nucleic acid amplification methods for SARS-CoV-2 detection**

3

4 Laurence Don Wai Luu¹, Michael Payne¹, Xiaomei Zhang¹, Lijuan Luo¹ and Ruiting Lan^{1*}

5

6 ¹School of Biotechnology and Biomolecular Sciences, University of New South Wales,
7 Sydney, New South Wales, Australia

8

9 *Corresponding Author

10 Email: r.lan@unsw.edu.au

11 Phone: 61-2-9385 2095

12 Fax: 61-2-9385 1483

13

14 Abstract word count: 191

15

16 Keywords: COVID-19, SARS-CoV-2, multiple cross displacement amplification, isothermal
17 amplification, loop-mediated amplification, RT-PCR, MCDA, LAMP, sensitivity,
18 Coronavirus

19 **Abstract**

20 **Objectives**

21 To develop a novel multiple cross displacement amplification (MCDA) assay for COVID-19
22 and compare its speed and sensitivity to existing loop-mediated isothermal amplification
23 (LAMP) and real-time PCR (RT-PCR) methods.

24 **Methods**

25 Two MCDA assays targeting the SARS-CoV-2 N gene and ORF1ab was designed. The
26 fastest time to detection and sensitivity of MCDA was compared to LAMP and RT-PCR
27 using 7 DNA standards and transcribed RNA.

28 **Results**

29 For the N gene, MCDA was consistently faster than LAMP and RT-PCR by 10 and 20
30 minutes, respectively with a fastest time to detection of 5.2 minutes. RT-PCR had the highest
31 sensitivity with a limit of detection of 100 copies/reaction compared with MCDA (1000
32 copies/reaction) and LAMP (5000/reaction). For ORF1ab, MCDA and LAMP had similar
33 speed with fastest time to detection at 9.7 and 8.4 minutes, respectively. LAMP was more
34 sensitive for ORF1ab detection with 500 copies/reaction compared to MCDA (5000
35 copies/reaction).

36 **Conclusions**

37 Different nucleic acid amplification methods provide different advantages. MCDA is the
38 fastest nucleic acid amplification method for COVID-19 while RT-PCR is still the most
39 sensitive. These advantages should be considered when determining the most suitable nucleic
40 acid amplification methods for different applications.

41

42 **Introduction**

43 Rapid, portable and highly sensitive diagnostic tests are essential to controlling the COVID-
44 19 pandemic. RT-PCR is the gold standard for COVID-19 diagnosis¹. However, RT-PCR
45 requires trained personnel, advanced equipment and relatively long assay times making it
46 unsuitable for large-scale community screening of asymptomatic patients. Other tests
47 developed include serological assays that rely on IgM/IgG antibodies which takes ~5 days to
48 appear after symptom onset making them unsuitable for rapid early detection².

49 The development of alternative nucleic acid amplification methods including loop-mediated
50 isothermal amplification (LAMP) may offer improved speed, sensitivity and portability for
51 COVID-19 diagnosis³. Another isothermal nucleic acid amplification method, called multiple
52 cross displacement amplification (MCDA) which uses 10 primers instead of six, has also
53 been suggested to have even higher sensitivity and speed than LAMP but has not yet been
54 developed for COVID-19^{4,5}.

55 Despite claims of increased speed and sensitivity from isothermal amplification methods, no
56 study has directly compared the speed and sensitivity of these three different nucleic acid
57 amplification methods. Hence, here we developed a COVID-19 MCDA assay and compared
58 its speed and sensitivity to existing LAMP and RT-PCR methods.

59

60 **Methods**

61 **MCDA target gene selection**

62 To identify target genes with highly conserved regions and a suitable GC-content for MCDA,
63 1,216 SARS-CoV-2 genomes deposited in GISAID (all available complete, high coverage
64 genomes (>29,000 bp) with low coverage flags excluded up until March 26, 2020)⁶ were
65 aligned against the SARS-CoV-2 reference genome: NC_045512.2 using Snippy (v4.3.6)

66 with the -ctgs flag and default settings (<https://github.com/tseemann/snippy>). A sliding
67 window approach was then applied to identify conserved 300bp windows with GC content
68 >43%, low SNP number, and low total SNP number (total SNPs was defined as the number
69 of strains with a SNP in a given window). Three 300 bp conserved regions were identified
70 and selected for MCDA primer design with two regions in ORF1ab (NC_045512.2: 515-831
71 and 12968-13288) and one in the *N* gene (NC_045512.2: 28345-28647).

72

73 **MCDA primer design**

74 For each region, 4 sets of MCDA primers were designed as previously described⁵. Each
75 primer set consisted of 2 cross-primers (CP1/CP2), 2 displacement primers (F1/F2) and 6
76 amplification primers (C1/C2, D1/D2, R1/R2) (Supplementary Table 1). Non-specific primer
77 binding was assessed using BLASTN against 14 non-SARS-CoV-2 coronaviruses used in
78 Lamb *et al.*⁷, human genome (hg19) and 11 other common bacterial and viral respiratory
79 pathogen/microbiome species.

80

81 **Preparation of DNA/RNA standards**

82 For each region, ~500 bp gene fragments for ORF1ab (NC_045512.2: 416-931 and 12869-
83 13388) and *N* gene (NC_045512.2: 28246-28747) were synthesised with an additional 100 bp
84 up and downstream of the target region (ThermoFisher) (Supplementary Table 2). Each
85 fragment contained a T7 promoter for transcription and M13 adapters for amplification.
86 Seven DNA standards from synthesised gene fragments were prepared (100,000, 10,000,
87 5000, 1000, 500, 250 and 100 copies/ μ l).

88 For RNA, 1 pg of synthesised gene fragments were transcribed overnight at 37°C using T7
89 RNA polymerase (Sigma). Overnight DNA digestion was performed using the turbo DNA
90 free kit (ThermoFisher) and further treated with DNase I (NEB) until all traces of DNA were

91 removed. Complete DNA removal was confirmed after each round of DNase treatment using
92 RT-PCR with the SensiFAST SYBR kit (Bioline) and F1/R1 MCDA primers (Supplementary
93 Table 1). The transcribed RNA was serially diluted and used as input. Since copy number
94 cannot be determined, lowest detectable dilutions were used for sensitivity comparison.

95

96 **Initial evaluation of MCDA primer sets and optimisation of isothermal amplification** 97 **temperature**

98 MCDA reactions were performed using the WarmStart LAMP (DNA and RNA) kit (NEB)
99 which contains a warmstart RTx reverse transcriptase and Bst2.0 polymerase for
100 simultaneous reverse transcription and isothermal amplification. Antarctic thermolabile UDG
101 was also added in each reaction to prevent carryover contamination.

102

103 For each primer set, a primer mix containing: 0.4 μM of F1 and F2, 0.8 μM of C1 and C2, 1.2
104 μM of R1, R2, D1 and D2 and 2.4 μM of CP1 and CP2 was used. Standard desalting purified
105 primers were used for the initial evaluation and optimisation tests while HPLC purified
106 primers were used for sensitivity and speed comparison against LAMP and RT-PCR tests.

107

108 For the initial evaluation of each MCDA primer set, a 10 μl reaction was used and contained:
109 5 μl of 2x WarmStart master mix, 0.2 μl of fluorescent dye, 1.2 μl of MCDA primer mix, 0.2
110 μl of 1U/ μl Antarctic thermolabile UDG (NEB), 0.7 μl of 10 mM dUTP, 1.7 μl of H_2O and 1
111 μl of DNA template (1000 copies/ μl). Specificity of MCDA primer sets were also evaluated
112 using purified human genomic DNA (Sigma) and a microbial community DNA standard
113 (Zymo Research). MCDA reactions were performed in triplicates in the Rotor-Gene Q
114 (Qiagen) with isothermal amplification at either 60°C, 63°C or 65°C for 1 h and real time

115 fluorescence detection every 60 seconds, followed by enzyme inactivation at 95°C for 5 min
116 and a final melt curve from 50°C – 99°C to ensure correct MCDA product.

117

118 **Comparison of MCDA, LAMP and RT-PCR**

119 To compare the speed and sensitivity (limit of detection) of MCDA, LAMP and RT-PCR,
120 published primers targeting the same SARS-CoV-2 MCDA ORF1ab (NC_045512.2: 416-
121 931) and N (NC_045512.2: 28246-28747) regions were used (Supplementary Table 1). For
122 LAMP, two published primer sets from Zhang et al.³ which targeted the same region as our
123 MCDA were compared. For RT-PCR, there were no suitable published primers pairs which
124 targeted the same ORF1ab region, therefore only primers submitted by the National Institute
125 of Health, Thailand against the N gene was compared⁸. All primers were HPLC-purified
126 grade.

127

128 MCDA, LAMP and RT-PCR were tested in three independent runs (biological replicates)
129 using the same aliquot of DNA/RNA. Each run contained 3 technical replicates. The limit of
130 detection was defined as the highest dilution where all 9 replicates (3 biological replicates x 3
131 technical replicates) were detected.

132

133 To reduce between run variations, 10 µl MCDA and LAMP reactions were set up and
134 performed simultaneously in the same run. MCDA reactions were prepared as described
135 above. For LAMP, each 10 µl reaction contained: 5 µl 2x WarmStart master mix (NEB), 0.2
136 µl fluorescent dye (NEB), 0.2 µl 1U/µl Antarctic thermolabile UDG (NEB), 0.7 µl 10 mM
137 dUTP, 1 µl LAMP primer mix, 1.9 µl of H₂O and 1 µl of DNA/RNA template. Each LAMP
138 primer mix contained 16 µM FIP and BIP, 2 µM F3 and B3 and 4 µM LF and LB. MCDA
139 and LAMP isothermal amplification was performed at 65°C as described above.

140

141 For RT-PCR using DNA templates, 10 µl reactions containing 5 µl SensiFAST probe No-
142 ROX mix (Bioline), 0.5 µl primer mix (40 µM F and R, 10 µM probe), 3.5 µl of H₂O and 1
143 µl DNA template were used. The cycling conditions were 95°C for 2 min, followed by 45
144 cycles of 95°C for 15 secs and 55°C for 30 secs.

145

146 For RT-PCR with RNA templates, 10 µl reactions were set up containing 5 µl SensiFAST
147 probe No-ROX One-Step mix (Bioline), 0.5 µl primer mix (40 µM F and R, 10 µM probe),
148 0.1 µl reverse transcriptase (Bioline), 3.4 µl of H₂O and 1 µl RNA template. Reverse
149 transcription was performed at 45°C for 20 minutes followed by RT-PCR amplification as
150 described above for DNA.

151

152 To compare the speed of RT-PCR, cycle threshold (Ct) was converted to time using the
153 following equation: Time = (Ct x 50 sec) + 120 sec. The detection time required for RT-PCR
154 was calculated based on the cycling conditions (45 sec per cycle plus an initial 120 sec hold)
155 and the ramp rate for the Rotor-gene Q (5 sec per cycle). The ramp rate for the Rotor gene Q
156 is 15°C/s for heating and 20°C/s for cooling according to the manufacture's technical
157 information ([https://www.qiagen.com/us/resources/download.aspx?id=2120af5e-8daf-4184-
158 b277-aeb6ef5bbc05&lang=it-IT](https://www.qiagen.com/us/resources/download.aspx?id=2120af5e-8daf-4184-b277-aeb6ef5bbc05&lang=it-IT)).

159

160 **Results**

161 **Development of MCDA assays for SARS-CoV-2 detection**

162 Three 300 bp conserved regions suitable for MCDA primer design were identified from the
163 genome alignment of 1,216 SARS-CoV-2 strains. Two regions, designated as region 1 and 2,
164 belonged to the ORF1ab gene at NC_045512.2 position 515-831 and 12968-13288

165 respectively. One region, designated as region 3, corresponded to the N-gene at
166 NC_045512.2 position 28345-28647. Four MCDA primer sets for each region was designed
167 and evaluated (Supplementary Table 1).

168

169 Each MCDA primer set was initially tested at 3 isothermal amplification temperatures (60°C,
170 63°C and 65°C) using 1000 DNA copies/reaction as the starting template. As seen in Figure
171 1, regardless of the primer sets used, the slowest amplification time was observed at 60°C.
172 Amplification at 63°C and 65°C were similar and 65°C was chosen as the isothermal
173 amplification temperature used.

174

175 To maintain MCDA assay robustness against SNPs which may affect MCDA primer binding
176 and amplification efficiency, primer sets from two different regions were chosen for further
177 development as a duplex assay. Amplification of region 2 was the slowest for all primer sets
178 (Figure 1 D-F) compared with region 1 and 3, taking between 15-25 minutes at 65°C. Primer
179 sets in region 2 also had very high variation between technical replicates (data not shown).
180 Therefore region 2 was removed from further evaluation.

181

182 Region 3 amplification of the N gene was the fastest with primer set 2 followed closely by
183 primer set 3 (Figure 1G-I). Primer set 1 and 4 were the slowest for region 3 and were
184 therefore eliminated from further testing. We also observed that primer set 2 had tighter
185 technical replicates compared to primer set 3 (data not shown), thus region 3 primer set 2 was
186 chosen as our final MCDA primer set for further sensitivity and specificity testing.

187

188 Within region 1, primer set 3 was the slowest with fluorescence appearing at ~35 min (Figure
189 1C). This primer set was removed from further consideration. Primer set 1 was the fastest
190 primers to amplify region 1 and was chosen for inclusion in our MCDA assay.

191

192 Therefore, the final primer sets chosen for MCDA SARS-CoV-2 detection was region 1
193 (ORF1ab) primer set 1 and region 3 (N gene) primer set 2 (Figure 2). Both primer sets
194 showed no non-specific amplification when tested against human and microbial community
195 genomic DNA.

196

197 **Sensitivity and time to detection comparison of MCDA, LAMP and RT-PCR**

198 The sensitivity and speed for MCDA, LAMP and RT-PCR were then compared for two
199 SARS-CoV-2 genes. For the N gene (region 3), detection by MCDA was consistently faster
200 than LAMP, by ~10-13 minutes, for most DNA dilutions tested (Table 1). The average fastest
201 detection time for MCDA was 5.2 minutes at 100,000 copies/reaction while for LAMP it was
202 15 minutes. MCDA also had higher sensitivity with the limit of detection at 1000
203 copies/reaction while for LAMP it was 5000 copies/reaction. This limit of detection was
204 equivalent to a RT-PCR Ct value of 32.4 and 30.3, respectively. A greater number of
205 sporadic detections for higher dilutions were also observed for MCDA compared to LAMP.
206 MCDA was also significantly faster than RT-PCR by ~20 minutes for lower dilutions and 10
207 minutes for higher dilutions. At 100,000 copies/reaction, the detection time for RT-PCR was
208 23 minutes. However, RT-PCR had the highest sensitivity with the limit of detection at 100
209 copies/reaction. Similar results were also observed using RNA template with RT-PCR being
210 the most sensitive technique, detecting RNA at 10^{-6} dilution. For MCDA, the lowest RNA
211 dilution detected was 10^{-4} , with only sporadic detection for LAMP at this dilution.

212

213 For ORF1ab, LAMP was more sensitive than MCDA with the limit of detection at 500
214 copies/reaction and had more sporadic detection at higher dilutions (Table 2). The limit of
215 detection for MCDA was 5000 copies/reaction. LAMP was also slightly faster than MCDA
216 by ~1-3 minutes for concentrations above the limit of detection. The fastest time to detection
217 for ORF1ab LAMP was 8.4 minutes while for MCDA it was 9.7 minutes.

218

219 **Discussion**

220 Our results showed that MCDA is the fastest nucleic acid amplification method tested for
221 COVID-19 detection with detection of the N gene as fast as 5 minutes. However, this was
222 contingent on the gene targeted and the primer design with the NEB designed LAMP assay
223 for ORF1ab³ showing similar speed to our equivalent MCDA ORF1ab assay.

224

225 RT-PCR remains the most sensitive nucleic acid amplification method for COVID-19
226 diagnosis compared to MCDA and LAMP. This result is in agreement with previous LAMP
227 COVID-19 assays which showed RT-PCR having greater sensitivity⁹⁻¹¹. The limit of
228 detection for our MCDA N gene assay was 1000 copies/reaction or an equivalent N gene
229 average Ct value of 32.4 (Table 1). The median RT-PCR Ct value in 324 clinical COVID-19
230 samples from a range disease severity was found to be 31.15 in Singanayagam et al.¹² while
231 in Passomsub et al.¹³ the median N gene Ct value in saliva samples and
232 nasopharyngeal/throat samples were 31.8 and 30.5, respectively. Importantly, this suggests
233 that our MCDA assay is sensitive enough to detect SARS-CoV-2 in a range of saliva, throat
234 and nasopharyngeal clinical samples. Furthermore, Lamb et al.¹⁴ developed a COVID-19
235 LAMP assay with a limit of detection of 0.08 fg or an equivalent RT-PCR Ct value of 30.3

236 and were able to validate their LAMP assay in 19/20 positive clinical COVID samples. The
237 increased sensitivity and speed of our MCDA assay compared to LAMP provides further
238 evidence that MCDA can be used to diagnose clinical samples.

239

240 For MCDA, this is the first study to directly benchmark the speed and sensitivity of MCDA
241 to RT-PCR against the same targets. Previous MCDA studies only compared gel-based PCR⁴,
242 different RT-PCR gene targets^{15,16} or used RT-PCR sensitivity results previously reported in
243 other studies (as 100 copies in different studies may not be equivalent)^{4,5}. In order to
244 benchmark different nucleic acid techniques, we used and recommend the same reaction
245 volume, same machine, same DNA standards and aliquots, and where possible the same run
246 is used.

247

248 This study found that different nucleic acid amplification methods offer different advantages
249 and this should be considered depending on the application. RT-PCR was the most sensitive
250 method tested and should remain the gold standard for COVID-19 diagnosis. However, the
251 portable nature and speed of MCDA makes it suitable for large scale screening of
252 asymptomatic cases where RT-PCR would be too slow. Additionally, reverse transcription
253 and amplification for MCDA and LAMP can occur simultaneously making it even faster than
254 RT-PCR where it is sequential.

255

256 Unlike other diseases, COVID-19 is most infectious and has the highest viral RNA load
257 during or prior to symptom onset¹⁷. Therefore, identifying pre-symptomatic/asymptomatic
258 cases is key to controlling COVID-19. Although MCDA (and other isothermal amplification

259 methods) is less sensitive than RT-PCR, it can still be used to rapidly screen and identify
260 highly infectious pre-symptomatic/asymptomatic cases when viral load is high.

261

262 Rapid test turnaround time is also essential for timely contact tracing and isolation^{18,19},
263 however due to increased COVID-19 cases, increased demand for COVID-19 testing and the
264 longer turnaround time required for RT-PCR, there is a backlog in COVID-19 diagnosis in
265 many countries including the US, with results taking days or weeks to be reported²⁰. The
266 rapid nature of MCDA and other isothermal nucleic acid methods may help relieve the
267 backlog, improve testing turnaround time and help control COVID-19. The addition of a
268 colorimetric dye instead of a fluorescent dye can further simplify MCDA for rapid onsite
269 COVID-19 screening such as at points of entry and aged-care facilities as well as for
270 deployment in resource-limited settings. Further studies in a variety of settings will be
271 required to determine where MCDA and other isothermal nucleic acid methods can offer the
272 greatest advantage.

273 **Competing interests statement**

274 The authors declare no competing interests.

275 **Author Contributions**

276 RL conceived the study. LDWL performed the experiments, analysed the results and drafted
277 the manuscript. MP performed the MCDA target selection and BLAST. XZ and LL designed
278 the MCDA primers. All authors provided critical revision of the manuscript.

279 **Funding**

280 This work was supported by a UNSW school research grant.

281 **Data availability**

282 All data generated or analysed during this study are included in this published article (and its
283 Supplementary Information files).

284 **References**

- 285 1 Corman, V. M. *et al.* Detection of 2019 novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV) by real-time
286 RT-PCR. *Eurosurveillance* **25**, 2000045 (2020).
- 287 2 Guo, L. *et al.* Profiling early humoral response to diagnose novel coronavirus disease
288 (COVID-19). *Clinical Infectious Diseases* (2020).
- 289 3 Zhang, Y. *et al.* Rapid Molecular Detection of SARS-CoV-2 (COVID-19) Virus RNA
290 Using Colorimetric LAMP. *medRxiv* (2020).
- 291 4 Wang, Y. *et al.* Rapid and sensitive isothermal detection of nucleic-acid sequence by
292 multiple cross displacement amplification. *Scientific reports* **5**, 11902 (2015).
- 293 5 Zhang, X., Payne, M., Wang, Q., Sintchenko, V. & Lan, R. Highly Sensitive and
294 Specific Detection and Serotyping of Five Prevalent Salmonella Serovars by Multiple
295 Cross-Displacement Amplification. *The Journal of Molecular Diagnostics* (2020).
- 296 6 Shu, Y. & McCauley, J. GISAID: Global initiative on sharing all influenza data—from
297 vision to reality. *Eurosurveillance* **22** (2017).
- 298 7 Lamb, L. E., Bartolone, S. N., Ward, E. & Chancellor, M. B. Rapid Detection of
299 Novel Coronavirus (COVID19) by Reverse Transcription-Loop-Mediated Isothermal
300 Amplification. *Available at SSRN 3539654* (2020).
- 301 8 Molecular assays to diagnose COVID-19: Summary table of available protocols.
302 **DOI: [https://www.who.int/publications/m/item/molecular-assays-to-diagnose-](https://www.who.int/publications/m/item/molecular-assays-to-diagnose-covid-19-summary-table-of-available-protocols)**
303 **[covid-19-summary-table-of-available-protocols](https://www.who.int/publications/m/item/molecular-assays-to-diagnose-covid-19-summary-table-of-available-protocols)** (2020).
- 304 9 Yu, L. *et al.* Rapid detection of COVID-19 coronavirus using a reverse transcriptional
305 loop-mediated isothermal amplification (RT-LAMP) diagnostic platform. *Clinical*
306 *Chemistry* (2020).
- 307 10 Nagura-Ikeda, M. *et al.* Clinical evaluation of self-collected saliva by RT-qPCR,
308 direct RT-qPCR, RT-LAMP, and a rapid antigen test to diagnose COVID-19. *Journal*
309 *of clinical microbiology* (2020).

- 310 11 Lee, J. Y. H. *et al.* Validation of a single-step, single-tube reverse transcription loop-
311 mediated isothermal amplification assay for rapid detection of SARS-CoV-2 RNA.
312 *Journal of Medical Microbiology*, doi:<https://doi.org/10.1099/jmm.0.001238> (2020).
- 313 12 Singanayagam, A. *et al.* Duration of infectiousness and correlation with RT-PCR
314 cycle threshold values in cases of COVID-19, England, January to May 2020.
315 *Eurosurveillance* **25**, 2001483 (2020).
- 316 13 Pasomsub, E. *et al.* Saliva sample as a non-invasive specimen for the diagnosis of
317 coronavirus disease-2019 (COVID-19): a cross-sectional study. *Clinical Microbiology*
318 *and Infection* (2020).
- 319 14 Lamb, L. E., Bartolone, S. N., Ward, E. & Chancellor, M. B. J. P. o. Rapid detection
320 of novel coronavirus/Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-
321 CoV-2) by reverse transcription-loop-mediated isothermal amplification. *PLoS One*
322 **15**, e0234682 (2020).
- 323 15 Wang, Y., Wang, Y., Weiwei, J., Lin, S. & Shen, A. Establishment and application a
324 multiple cross displacement amplification coupled with nanoparticle-based lateral
325 flow biosensor assay for detection of *Mycoplasma pneumoniae*. *Frontiers in Cellular*
326 *and Infection Microbiology* **9**, 325 (2019).
- 327 16 Zhao, F. *et al.* Establishment and application of multiple cross displacement
328 amplification coupled with lateral flow biosensor (MCDA-LFB) for visual and rapid
329 detection of *Candida albicans* in clinical samples. *Frontiers in cellular and infection*
330 *microbiology* **9**, 102 (2019).
- 331 17 He, X. *et al.* Temporal dynamics in viral shedding and transmissibility of COVID-19.
332 *Nature medicine* **26**, 672-675 (2020).
- 333 18 Rong, X., Yang, L., Chu, H. & Fan, M. Effect of delay in diagnosis on transmission of
334 COVID-19. *Mathematical Biosciences and Engineering* **17**, 2725-2740 (2020).
- 335 19 Kretzschmar, M. E. *et al.* Impact of delays on effectiveness of contact tracing
336 strategies for COVID-19: a modelling study. *The Lancet Public Health* (2020).
- 337 20 The COVID-19 testing debacle. *Nature biotechnology* **38**, 653, doi:10.1038/s41587-
338 020-0575-3 (2020).

339 **Figures**

340 **Figure 1:** Initial evaluation of MCDA primer sets at 3 different isothermal amplification
341 temperature (60°C, 63°C and 65°C). Four MCDA primer sets were designed for each target

342 region chosen. **A-C:** Region 1 ORF1ab: 515-831 **D-E:** Region 2 ORF1ab: 12968-13288 **F-H:**
343 Region 3 N gene:28345-28647.

344

345 **Figure 2:** The nucleotide sequences and position of the final **(A)** ORF1ab and **(B)** N gene
346 COVID-19 MCDA primer sets chosen in this study. Right and left arrows show sense and
347 complementary sequences, respectively while coloured text indicate the position of primers:
348 F1/F2 displacement primers in purple, P1/P2 primers in green, C1/C2 amplification primers
349 in blue, D1/D2 amplification primers in yellow and R1/R2 amplification primers in red.

350 **Tables**

351 Table 1: Comparison of the sensitivity and time to detection for MCDA, LAMP and RT-PCR targeting the N gene from 3 independent runs.

DNA copies per reaction	MCDA average detection time (min)	MCDA reps ^{\$}	LAMP average detection time (min)	LAMP reps ^{\$}	RT-PCR average Ct value	RT-PCR average detection time (min)	RT-PCR rep ^{\$}
100	19.3 ±17.6	5/9	20.9 ±0.4	2/9	35.5 ±0.6*	31.6 ±0.47*	9/9*
250	20.4 ±22.4	4/9	26.7 ±11.4	3/9	34.2 ±0.03	30.5 ±0.03	9/9
500	7.8 ±1	6/9	20.3 ±1	6/9	33.0 ±0.25	29.5 ±0.21	9/9
1,000	10.2 ±3.2*	9/9*	23.5 ±8.6	5/9	32.4 ±0.22	29.0 ±0.19	9/9
5,000	6.5 ±0.1	9/9	17.5 ±0.6*	9/9*	30.3 ±0.68	27.3 ±0.57	9/9
10,000	6.2 ±0.2	9/9	17.3 ±0.7	9/9	29.2 ±0.26	26.3 ±0.22	9/9
100,000	5.2 ±0.1	9/9	15.0 ±0.4	9/9	25.7 ±0.06	23.4 ±0.05	9/9

352 *Limit of detection

353 ^{\$} reps: 3 runs with 3 technical replicates = 9 replicates.

354

355

356

357

358 Table 2: Comparison of the sensitivity and time to detection for MCDA and LAMP targeting ORF1ab from 3 independent runs.

DNA copies per reaction	MCDA average detection time (min)	MCDA reps ^{\$}	LAMP average detection time (min)	LAMP reps ^{\$}
100	55.3	1/9	17.1 ±6.3	3/9
250	46.4 ±15	3/9	11.8 ±0.5	5/9
500	20.2 ±9	8/9	12.2 ±2.1*	9/9*
1,000	13.6 ±3.9	6/9	10.4 ±0.8	8/9
5,000	12.6 ±1.3*	9/9*	9.7 ±0.2	9/9
10,000	11.2 ±0.3	9/9	9.5 ±0.1	9/9
100,000	9.7 ±0.3	9/9	8.4 ±0.1	9/9

359 *Limit of detection

360 ^{\$} reps: 3 runs with 3 technical replicates = 9 replicates.

361

362 **Supplementary Materials**

363 **Supplementary Table 1:** List of MCDA, LAMP and RT-PCR primers used in this study. Bolded MCDA primer names are primers shared
364 between 2 or more primer sets. * indicate primers used in RT-PCR for confirmation of complete DNA removal from transcribed RNA. Red text
365 indicates the final primer sets chosen for the MCDA SARS-CoV-2 assay.

366 **Supplementary Table 2:** List of synthesised gene fragments used as DNA/RNA template for MCDA, LAMP and RT-PCR. Blue indicates
367 universal M13 adapters while red depicts the sequence for T7 promoter.



