

1 **Title: Evaluation of two RT-PCR techniques for SARS-CoV-2 RNA detection in**
2 **serum for microbiological diagnosis**

3

4 Author Names and Affiliations:

5 Alexandra Martín Ramírez BSc.¹, Nelly Daniela Zurita Cruz PharmD.¹, Ainhoa
6 Gutiérrez-Cobos MD., PhD.^{1*}, Diego Aníbal Rodríguez Serrano MD., PhD.², Isidoro
7 González Álvaro MD., PhD.³, Emilia Roy Vallejo MD.⁴, Sara Gómez de Frutos
8 PharmD.¹, Leticia Fontán García-Rodrigo PharmD.¹, Laura Cardeñoso Domingo
9 PharmD., PhD.¹.

10

11 Affiliations:

12 ¹Clinical Microbiology Departament. Hospital Universitario de la Princesa, Madrid,
13 Spain.

14 ²Intensive Care Department, Hospital Universitario de la Princesa, Madrid, Spain.

15 ³Rheumatology Department, Hospital Universitario de la Princesa, Madrid, Spain.

16 ⁴Internal Medicine Department, Hospital Universitario de la Princesa, Madrid, Spain.

17

18 A.M.R and N.D.Z.C contributed equally to this article.

19

20 Corresponding author:

21 Ainhoa Gutiérrez Cobos, MD, PhD.

22 Clinical Microbiology Departament . Hospital Universitario de la Princesa

23 C/Diego de León 62

24 28006 Madrid, Spain

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

25 ainhoa.gutierrez@salud.madrid.org

26 ainhoagutierrezcobos@gmail.com

27 Phone: +34 91 520 2103

28 **ABSTRACT**

29 Presence of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in serum (viraemia) in COVID-19 patients has been
30 related to poor prognosis and death.

31 The aim of this study was to evaluate the ability of two commercial reverse real-time-
32 PCR (rRT-PCR) kits, cobas® SARS-CoV-2 (Cobas® test) and TaqPath™ COVID-19
33 CE-IVD RT-PCR Kit (Taqpath™ test), to detect viraemia in COVID-19 patients and
34 their implementation as routine diagnosis in microbiology laboratory.

35 This retrospective cohort study was conducted with 203 adult patients admitted to
36 Hospital Universitario de La Princesa, (89 Intensive Care Unit and 114 ward) with at
37 least one serum sample collected in the first 48 hours from admission. A total 265
38 serum samples were included for study.

39 Evaluation of both rRT-PCR techniques was performed comparing with the gold
40 standard, a Novel Coronavirus (2019-nCoV) Nucleic Acid Diagnostic Kit; considering
41 at least one target as a positive result.

42 Comparison of Cobas® test and Taqpath™ test with the gold standard method, showed
43 high values of specificity (93.75 and 92.19 respectively) and Positive Predictive Value
44 (92.92 and 99.88 respectively). Nevertheless, sensitivity (53.72 and 73.63 respectively)
45 and Negative Predictive Value (32.53 and 42.99 respectively) were lower; Kappa values
46 were 0.35 for cobas® test and 0.56 for Taqpath™ test.

47 For both techniques, differences of viraemia detection between the ICU and non-ICU
48 patients were significant ($p \leq 0.001$).

49 Consequently, SARS-CoV-2 viraemia positive results obtained by both rRT-PCR
50 should be considered good tools and may help in handling COVID-19 patients.

51 Moreover, these methods could be easily integrated in the routine laboratory COVID-19
52 diagnosis and may open new strategies based on an early COVID-19 treatment.

53 **KEY WORDS:** SARS-CoV-2, RNA, serum.

54 **Introduction**

55 Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) is caused by a new type of coronavirus (SARS-
56 CoV-2), that causes a severe acute respiratory syndrome. This novel coronavirus was
57 first described in December 2019 in the city of Wuhan, China (1). At the first of
58 November of 2020, more than a million deaths has been reported worldwide (2).

59 Patients with COVID-19 may develop mild, moderate or severe symptoms like severe
60 pneumonia, acute respiratory distress syndrome (ARDS) or multiple organ failure (3).
61 To reduce the number of people who may end up with these severe symptoms, it is
62 important to improve the diagnosis and, above all, to find tools that help us predict
63 which patients will have a worse clinical outcome. Since the beginning of the COVID-
64 19 pandemic, the samples that have been used the most for the diagnosis have been
65 those of the respiratory tract. Lately it has been reported that the patient's serum may be
66 another sample to consider due to the fact that the presence of RNA of SARS-CoV-2 in
67 serum (called viraemia in this study) is related to unfavorable clinical outcomes and
68 multi-organ damage (4, 5). This has been observed also in 2004, with 75% of the
69 patients studied presenting RNA of SARS-CoV in blood samples (6).

70 The most common tool to detect RNA of SARS-CoV-2 is the real time reverse
71 transcription polymerase chain reaction (rRT-PCR). This technique is highly sensitive,
72 especially if it detects more than two target regions (7). Although most rRT-PCR tests
73 are performed on respiratory tract samples, the genetic material of this novel
74 coronavirus can be detected in other samples also in serum, peripheral blood, feces and
75 other anatomical parts (8). While the faculty of rRT-PCR for respiratory tract samples is
76 well studied, for other kind of samples, as serum, it is not. Therefore, it is important to
77 carry out comparative studies of the different RT-PCRs available to determine the
78 capacity of these techniques to detect SARS-CoV-2 viraemia.

79 The aim of this study is the evaluation the ability of two commercial rRT-PCR assays
80 (cobas® SARS-CoV-2 Test, Roche Diagnostics, USA and TaqPath™ COVID-19 CE-
81 IVD RT-PCR Kit, Thermo Fisher Scientific, USA), used in daily routine practice of
82 COVID-19 diagnosis, to detect SARS-CoV-2 viraemia; and their implementation in a
83 microbiology laboratory.

84

85 **Material and Methods**

86 *Patients and samples*

87 This retrospective cohort study was conducted with 203 adult patients admitted to
88 Hospital Universitario de La Princesa, a tertiary level hospital in Madrid (Spain),
89 between March 1st and April 30th, with at least one serum sample collected in the first
90 48 hours from admission. All patients were symptomatic, with infection by SARS-CoV-
91 2 confirmed by a positive PCR on a nasopharyngeal swab sample. Eighty nine were
92 admitted to the ICU (Intensive Care Unit) with a median age of 65 years (IQR 69-72)
93 and 71.3% male sex; and 114 were admitted to the general ward with a median age of
94 64 years; (IQR 54.3-72) and 66.4% of them men.

95 Serum sampling was part of routine clinical practice. Some patients (50) had subsequent
96 serum samples, which were collected during their hospital admission as part of their
97 routine management. A total of 265 serum samples were included for this study. All
98 samples were conserved at -20 °C until they were tested.

99 *Design of Study*

100 Serum samples were tested with two rRT-PCR: cobas® SARS-COV-2 test (cobas®
101 test), a qualitative assay for detection of SARS-CoV-2 RNA; and TaqPath™ COVID-

102 19 CE-IVD RT-PCR Kit (TaqPath™ test), a multiplex RT-PCR assay for qualitative
103 detection of nucleic acids of SARS-CoV-2. Both are used for routine detection of
104 SARS-CoV-2 from nasopharyngeal swab samples at our hospital.

105 Results obtained by both techniques were compared with results obtained by Novel
106 Coronavirus (2019-nCoV) Nucleic Acid Diagnostic Kit (Sansure Biotech Inc., China), a
107 multiplex PCR test for qualitative detection of nucleic acids of SARS-CoV-2. This
108 technique was the gold standard method due to it has CE (European Conformity In
109 Vitro Device) and FDA (Food and Drug Administration) authorization for use in blood
110 samples. Sansure Biotech reported a positive agreement of the test of 94.34% (95% CI:
111 84.34% ~ 98.82%), and a negative agreement of 98.96 % (95% CI: 96.31% ~ 99.87 %),
112 in a clinical evaluation performed for the Submission to FDA EUA (Emergency Use
113 Authorization) (9).

114 *Sample processing*

115 Test assay of all the three rRT-PCR was carried out with 400 µL of serum, treated
116 previously for virus inactivation with lysis buffer.

117 Cobas® test

118 The assay detects a fragment of the *orf-1ab* region, specific of SARS-COV-2; and a
119 conserved region of *e* gene, a structural enveloped gene, for pan-sarbecovirus detection.
120 Test was performed by cobas® 6800 System (Roche Diagnostics, USA); an automatic
121 platform of nucleic acids extraction and RT-PCR amplification and detection. Serum
122 samples were processed according to manufacturer's indications, following the same
123 protocol used for SARS-CoV-2 detection in respiratory samples. Results were analyzed
124 and interpreted automatically by the cobas® 6800/8800 Software version 1.02.12.1002.

125 TaqPath™ test and Gold Standard Method test

126 TaqPath™ test and gold standard method require a previous nucleic acid extraction
127 from sample, which was performed by the automatic eMAG® Nucleic Acid Extraction
128 System (Biomérieux, France). Extraction was carried out according to eMAG®
129 manufacturer's directions, obtaining purified RNA in 60 µL of elution buffer, which
130 was used to performed both assays.

131 TaqPath™ test detects three specific SARS-CoV-2 genomic regions: *orf-1ab*, *s*, and *n*
132 genes and was carried out using 5 µL of purified RNA, according to the manufacturer's
133 instructions.

134 Gold standard test detects two specific regions of SARS-CoV-2 genome: *orf-1ab* and *n*
135 genes. The nucleic acid amplification was performed according to the kit
136 manufacturer's indications using 10 µL of purified RNA.

137 Both rRT-PCR tests were performed by QuantStudio™ 5 Real Time PCR System
138 (Applied Biosystems, USA). Amplification curves were analyzed with QuantStudio™
139 Design and Analysis software version 2.4.3 (Applied Biosystems, USA). Interpretation
140 of results were done by a clinical microbiologist, means of the amplification curves
141 analysis, considering for a positive target detection: a) a Cycle threshold (Ct) cutoff
142 value of 40; b) curves with typical S-shape or without plateau.

143

144 *Analysis of results*

145 Detection of at least one target was considered as a positive result.

146 Evaluation of viraemia in patients was carried on considering only the results obtained
147 from their first serum sample.

148 Results obtained from all the 265 samples collected were analyzed for the techniques
149 assessment.

150 Statistical analysis was performed using SPSS 25.0 (IBM Corp., USA). Continuous and
151 categorical variables were presented as median (interquartile range, IQR) and n (%),
152 respectively. To analyze differences between detection of viraemia by each technique in
153 patients, according if they have been admitted at ICU or not, a χ^2 test was performed.
154 The Ct of any detected target was recorded and it was calculated the median,
155 interquartile range (IQR) and the 95th percentile for each one. Sensitivity, specificity,
156 positive and negative predictive values and Cohen's Kappa coefficient were calculated
157 for cobas® test and TaqPath™ test, in comparison with the gold standard method.

158

159 **Results**

160 **Viraemia detection in patients**

161 The cobas® test detected viraemia in 50,2% of patients recruited, showing a 65,2% and
162 38,6 % of positive viraemia detection for ICU and non-ICU admitted patients,
163 respectively. On the other hand, TaqPath™ test detected viraemia in 62,6% of of all
164 patients recruited, with a viraemia detection in 75,3 % of patients admitted in ICU, and
165 52,6% in those patients not admitted at ICU had a positive result. For both techniques,
166 differences of viraemia detection between the ICU and non-ICU patients were
167 significant ($p \leq 0.001$). Results are shown in Table 1.

168 Furthermore, the gold standard assay was able to detect the presence of RNA SARS-
169 Cov-2 in 80,8% of patients, with the following distribution: 85.4% and 77.2% for ICU
170 or Non-ICU patients, respectively. No significant differences between both groups were
171 found ($p=0.14$).

172 Table 1: Viraemia detection in patients admitted at ICU or in ward by both evaluated
173 techniques.

		Ward (%)	ICU (%)	Total	p
Cobas® SARS-CoV-2	Negative	70 (61.4)	31 (34.8)	101 (49.8)	0.0002
	Positive	44 (38.6)	58 (65.2)	102 (50.2)	
	Total	114	89	203	
TaqPath™ COVID-19	Negative	54 (47.4)	22 (24.7)	76 (37.4%)	0.001
	Positive	60 (52.6)	67 (75.3)	127 (62.6)	
	Total	114	89	203	

174 p value calculated by χ^2 test

175

176 **Assessment of serum samples**

177 A total of 265 serum samples were analyzed by both rRT-PCR methods: cobas® test
178 and-TaqPath™ test.

179 Comparison between cobas® test and the gold standard showed a 65.66% of
180 concordance, with a kappa coefficient of 0.35. On other hand, comparison of TaqPath™
181 test showed a concordance of 78.11%. A kappa value of 0.52 was obtained.

182 Summarized results of sensitivity, specificity, positive and negative predictive values of
183 both techniques are shown in Table 2.

184 Table 2: Sensitivity, Specificity, positive and negative predictive values and their
185 confidence intervals (95%) of cobas® test and TaqPath™ test compared to the gold
186 standard method.

Assay		Value (%)	CI (95%)	
Cobas® test	Sensitivity	56.72	49.62	63.81
	Specificity	93.75	87.04	100
	Positive predictive value	96.61	92.92	100
	Negative predictive value	40.82	32.53	49.1
TaqPath™ Test	Sensitivity	73.63	67.29	79.97
	Specificity	92.19	84.83	99.54
	Positive predictive value	96.73	93.59	99.88
	Negative predictive value	52.68	42.99	62.37

187 *CI: confidence interval

188

189 Median Ct value of cobas® test targets detected were 36.2 (IQR 34.2-37.1) for *e* gene,
190 and 32.7 (IQR 32.1-34.1) for *orf1ab* gene. The 95th percentiles were 38.72 and 35.21 for
191 *e* and *orf1ab* genes, respectively. On the other hand, median Ct values for each target
192 detected by TaqPath™ test were: 31.91 (IQR 29.92-33.27); 32.46 (30.65-34.31) and
193 31.81 (30.01-32.92) for *s*, *n* and *orf1ab* genes respectively, and the 95th percentile of Ct
194 was 36.91, 37.17 and 37.04 for *s*, *n* and *orf1ab* genes respectively. Ct values of
195 TaqPath™ test are shown in Table 3.

196 Table 3: Number of samples detected with TaqPath™ test in comparison with the gold
197 standard method.

Concordance with reference method	Number of positive samples	Gene	Ct Median	IQR	Ct Range	Number of samples with Ct >P95*
Concordant (Truly positive results)	148	N	31,91	29.92-33.27	29.41-38.48	6
		S	32,46	30.65-34.31	29.83-36.21	0
		Orf1ab	31,81	30.01-32.92	34.84-35.63	0
Concordant (Truly negative results)	59	None target detected	-	-	-	-
Discordant (false positive results)	5	N	37.46	-	36.92-38.80	4
		S	37.47	-	-	1
		Orf1ab	-	-	-	-
		≥2 targets detected	-	-	-	-
Discordant (false negative results)	53	None target detected	-	-	-	-
Total	265		-	-	-	-

198 *P₉₅: The 95th percentile of each target;

199

200 Cobas® test obtained 4 false positive results with only detection of *e* gene and with Ct
201 values from 37.57 to 38 while by TaqPath™ test 5 false positives were detected by
202 detection of one target gene (*n* or *s* genes) only, and the Ct ranged from 36.92 to 38.8.

203 False negative results were obtained by cobas® test for 87 samples, 30 of them with
204 amplification of the two targets of the gold standard method; the rest of false negative
205 samples (57/87) showed amplification of just one target gene. On the other hand, 53
206 false negatives were detected by TaqPath™ test; most of them (42/53) were positive by
207 detection of only one target gene of the gold standard method, meanwhile the rest

208 (11/53), were positive by detection of both, n and orflab genes. There was agreement in
209 45 (85%) of the false negatives obtained by TaqPath™ test with cobas® test.

210

211 **Discussion**

212 To our knowledge, this is the first study which assesses the performance and accuracy
213 of these techniques in serum samples for SARS-CoV-2. The goal of this study is to
214 assess two commercial rRT-PCR assays for SARS-CoV-2 RNA detection in serum
215 samples, to provide clinicians a useful tool in the management of the COVID-19.
216 Although these commercial assays have not been validated for their use in serum or
217 plasma samples, the extraction methods performed in this study are commonly carried
218 out in serum or plasma samples for other viruses (10–12).

219 The preferred method for diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2 is rRT-PCR of upper respiratory
220 tract samples, via nasopharyngeal and oropharyngeal swabs or, in some cases, lower
221 respiratory tract samples (13). However, SARS-CoV-2 have been detected in multiple
222 samples, as saliva, stool, plasma and serum (8, 14). Detection of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in
223 serum samples have been related to progression to a critical disease and death (4, 15)
224 and with the cytokine storm (3). However, most of the studies perform in-house or
225 commercial methods for SARS-CoV-2 detection are not validated in serum or plasma
226 samples (4, 15).

227 In our study the viraemia's percentage showed significant differences ($p \leq 0,001$) in ICU
228 patients respect patients admitted in the ward with the two rRT-PCR assays; supporting
229 previous studies which indicate that presence of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in serum samples
230 is more common in critical patients and could be considered a prognostic indicator
231 (15–17).

232 Comparison between the assessed rRT-PCR kits and the gold standard method showed
233 high specificity and positive predictive values, over 90% in both techniques. These high
234 values point out that a positive result of RNA detection of SARS-CoV-2 in serum
235 samples of patients previously COVID-19 diagnosed are reliable, and should be taken
236 into account for clinicians attending to the patient.

237 Cobas® test showed four false positive results, all of them with the only amplification
238 of *e* gene. According to manufacturer's indications, detection of the *e* gene without
239 amplification of *orf-1ab* region could be due to several factors, mutations in the
240 amplification region of *orf-1ab*, low viral loads, presence of other sarbecovirus or other
241 factors. These results should be considered as presumptive positive results and be
242 retested (18). Moreover, 52 true positive samples had amplification of the *e* gene, so it
243 was decided to consider the amplification of only this target as positive for several
244 reasons. First, because the serum samples collected in this study belonged to previously
245 diagnosed COVID-19 patients. Secondly, according to the WHO (19), SARS-CoV has
246 only been reported just four times since the end of the epidemic on July 2003 (three
247 times associated to laboratory accidents and another one in Southern China). So the
248 probability of the samples with *e* gene amplification without any other targets are due to
249 other sarbecovirus is very low, and other reports considered them as positive too (10).

250 There were five false positive results with TaqPath™ test, all of them with just one
251 target detected and with high Ct values (from 36.92 to 38.80). Even more, these Ct
252 values were over the 95th percentile, which could suggest the probability to obtain these
253 false positive results is low. Therefore, values over 37 are unlikely, and should not be
254 considered, which is in agreement with the last manufacturer's indications (20).
255 However, with this consideration, six concordant results considered as true positive

256 would turn into false negative results, decreasing sensitivity slightly to 72.68% but
257 increasing specificity to 98.33% (supplementary table 1).

258 On the other hand, the negative predictive values obtained with both cobas® test and
259 TaqPath™ test were low (40.82% and 52.68%, respectively), due to the high number of
260 false negative results obtained (87 with cobas® Test and 53 with TaqPath™ test).
261 Moreover, it is remarkable that there was a high coincidence of the false negative results
262 between both assessed techniques, 85% TaqPath™ test being negative with cobas®
263 Test.

264 It is difficult to elucidate the reason of these false negative results, as the three
265 employed rRT-PCR kits are commercial and the design is not available for the
266 customers, presenting differences in the number of targets, and possibly in the sequence
267 or the size of the amplicons, which cause differences in sensitivity of the techniques.
268 Even more, the cobas® test is performed in the automatic close cobas® 6800 system,
269 making more difficult to elucidate the nature of discrepancies. A possible reason is that
270 these samples had low viral loads, decreasing the sensitivity of the assessed techniques.
271 Also, the RNA eluted volume added to the PCR reaction could have influenced because
272 it was the double with the gold standard method compared with the TaqPath™ test.

273 Moving to onboarding to the clinical practice, both techniques can be easily
274 implemented in the diagnosis of COVID-19 in the microbiology laboratory and they can
275 be performed along with the rest of respiratory samples for the diagnosis of SARS-
276 CoV-2. TaqPath™ test is more suitable performing a small number of tests at a time
277 meanwhile the cobas® test should be more useful when it is necessary to analyze high
278 amounts of samples

279 The present study has some limitations. First, the intrinsic analytical variability of PCR
280 can have influenced in the results obtained.

281 Another limitation is the type of sample used in this study. Although serum samples are
282 accepted in the analysis of viraemias, the common samples used in most microbiology
283 laboratories are plasma samples.

284 In conclusion, this study shows that cobas® SARS-CoV-2 Test and TaqPath™ COVID-
285 19 CE-IVD RT-PCR Kit could be useful in SARS-CoV-2 viraemia detection in serum
286 of diagnosed COVID-19 patients. For a better test performance, considering the
287 detection of at least one target obtained with any technique, and in particular with a Ct
288 value under 37 with the TaqPath™ assay. A viraemia positive result may help in
289 handling COVID-19 patients, due to the relationship between viraemia and bad
290 prognosis and mortality recently reported (4, 15). In addition, these techniques are easy
291 to incorporate in the Microbiology laboratory routine for SARS-CoV-2 diagnosis.

292 Finally it could open new treatment strategies based on early COVID-19 treatment (15).

293

294 **Compliance with Ethical Standards:**

295 **Funding:**

296 The authors did not receive any fundings to do the study.

297 **Conflict of Interest:**

298 Authors do not have conflict of interest.

299 **Ethical approval:**

300 All participants enrolled voluntarily, and written informed consent was required to use
301 data for analysis. The study was approved by the Hospital Universitario La Princesa
302 independent ethics research committee (reference number 4267, acta CEIm 21/20).

303 **References**

- 304 1. Cheng ZJ, Shan J. 2020. 2019 Novel coronavirus: where we are and what we
305 know. *Infection* 48:155–163.
- 306 2. WHO. 2020. Coronavirus disease (COVID-19) – World Health Organization.
- 307 3. Chen X, Zhao B, Qu Y, Chen Y, Xiong J, Feng Y, Men D, Huang Q, Liu Y, Yang
308 B, Ding J, Li F. 2020. Detectable serum SARS-CoV-2 viral load (RNAemia) is
309 closely correlated with drastically elevated interleukin 6 (IL-6) level in critically ill
310 COVID-19 patients. *Clin Infect Dis* <https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciaa449>.
- 311 4. Xu D, Zhou F, Sun W, Chen L, Lan L, Li H, Xiao F, Li Y, Kolachalama VB, Li Y,
312 Wang X, Xu H. 2020. Relationship Between serum SARS-CoV-2 nucleic
313 acid(RNAemia) and Organ Damage in COVID-19 Patients: A Cohort Study.
314 *Clinical Infectious Diseases* ciaa1085.
- 315 5. Eberhardt KA, Meyer-Schwickerath C, Heger E, Knops E, Lehmann C, Rybniker
316 J, Schommers P, Eichenauer DA, Kurth F, Ramharter M, Kaiser R, Holtick U,
317 Klein F, Jung N, Di Cristanziano V. 2020. RNAemia Corresponds to Disease
318 Severity and Antibody Response in Hospitalized COVID-19 Patients. *Viruses*
319 12:1045.
- 320 6. Chen W, Xu Z, Mu J, Yang L, Gan H, Mu F, Fan B, He B, Huang S, You B, Yang
321 Y, Tang X, Qiu L, Qiu Y, Wen J, Fang J, Wang J. 2004. Antibody response and
322 viraemia during the course of severe acute respiratory syndrome (SARS)-
323 associated coronavirus infection. *Journal of Medical Microbiology* 53:435–438.

- 324 7. Ji T, Liu Z, Wang G, Guo X, Akbar khan S, Lai C, Chen H, Huang S, Xia S, Chen
325 B, Jia H, Chen Y, Zhou Q. 2020. Detection of COVID-19: A review of the current
326 literature and future perspectives. *Biosensors and Bioelectronics* 166:112455.
- 327 8. Zhang W, Du R-H, Li B, Zheng X-S, Yang X-L, Hu B, Wang Y-Y, Xiao G-F, Yan
328 B, Shi Z-L, Zhou P. 2020. Molecular and serological investigation of 2019-nCoV
329 infected patients: implication of multiple shedding routes. *Emerging Microbes &
330 Infections* 9:386–389.
- 331 9. Novel Coronavirus (2019-nCoV) Nucleic Acid Diagnostic Kit (PCR-Fluorescence
332 Probing) Instructions for use. Version 00.
- 333 10. Wirden M, Larrouy L, Mahjoub N, Todesco E, Damond F, Delagreverie H,
334 Akhavan S, Charpentier C, Chaix M-L, Descamps D, Calvez V, Marcelin A-G.
335 2017. Multicenter comparison of the new Cobas 6800 system with Cobas
336 Ampliprep/Cobas TaqMan and Abbott RealTime for the quantification of HIV,
337 HBV and HCV viral load. *Journal of Clinical Virology* 96:49–53.
- 338 11. Barreiro P, Labarga P, Fernandez-Montero JV, Mendoza C de, Benítez-Gutiérrez
339 L, Peña JM, Soriano V. 2015. Rate and predictors of serum HCV-RNA >6 million
340 IU/mL in patients with chronic hepatitis C. *Journal of Clinical Virology* 71:63–66.
- 341 12. Loens K, Bergs K, Ursi D, Goossens H, Ieven M. 2007. Evaluation of NucliSens
342 easyMAG for Automated Nucleic Acid Extraction from Various Clinical
343 Specimens. *Journal of Clinical Microbiology* 45:421–425.
- 344 13. Pascarella G, Strumia A, Piliengo C, Bruno F, Del Buono R, Costa F, Scarlata S,
345 Agrò FE. 2020. COVID-19 diagnosis and management: a comprehensive review. *J
346 Intern Med* 288:192–206.

- 347 14. To KK-W, Tsang OT-Y, Yip CC-Y, Chan K-H, Wu T-C, Chan JM-C, Leung W-S,
348 Chik TS-H, Choi CY-C, Kandamby DH, Lung DC, Tam AR, Poon RW-S, Fung
349 AY-F, Hung IF-N, Cheng VC-C, Chan JF-W, Yuen K-Y. 2020. Consistent
350 Detection of 2019 Novel Coronavirus in Saliva. *Clinical Infectious Diseases*
351 71:841–843.
- 352 15. Hagman K, Hedenstierna M, Gille-Johnson P, Hammas B, Grabbe M, Dillner J,
353 Ursing J. 2020. SARS-CoV-2 RNA in serum as predictor of severe outcome in
354 COVID-19: a retrospective cohort study. *Clinical Infectious Diseases* ciaa1285.
- 355 16. Hogan CA, Stevens BA, Sahoo MK, Huang C, Garamani N, Gombar S,
356 Yamamoto F, Murugesan K, Kurzer J, Zehnder J, Pinsky BA. 2020. High
357 Frequency of SARS-CoV-2 RNAemia and Association With Severe Disease.
358 *Clinical Infectious Diseases* ciaa1054.
- 359 17. Veyer D, Kernéis S, Poulet G, Wack M, Robillard N, Taly V, L'Honneur A-S,
360 Rozenberg F, Laurent-Puig P, Bélec L, Hadjadj J, Terrier B, Péré H. 2020. Highly
361 sensitive quantification of plasma SARS-CoV-2 RNA sheds light on its potential
362 clinical value. *Clinical Infectious Diseases* ciaa1196.
- 363 18. cobas® SARS-CoV-2 Qualitative assay for use on the cobas® 6800/8800
364 Systems.
- 365 19. WHO. SARS (Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome). World Health Organization.
- 366 20. ThermoFisher Scientific. 2020. TaqPath™ COVID-19 CE-IVD RT-PCR Kit
367 INSTRUCTIONS FOR USE.
- 368

369 Supplementary table 1. Comparison values calculated considering the Ct > P₉₅ as a
370 negative result.

	TaqPath™ COVID-19 Kit	cobas® SARS-Cov-2 Test
Sensitivity	72.68%	55.84%
Specificity	98.33%	93.75%
Positive predictive value	99.3%	96.49%
Negative predictive value	52.68%	40.82%
Kappa coefficient	0.55	0.35

371