

1 **Standardized and optimized preservation, extraction and quantification techniques for**
2 **detection of fecal SARS-CoV-2 RNA**

3 Aravind Natarajan^{1,2#}, Alvin Han^{3#}, Soumaya Zlitni^{1,2^}, Erin F. Brooks^{2^}, Summer E. Vance^{2^},
4 Marlene Wolfe⁴, Upinder Singh⁵, Prasanna Jagannathan^{3,6}, Benjamin A. Pinsky^{5,7}, Alexandria
5 Boehm⁴, Ami S. Bhatt^{1,2*}

6
7 ¹ Department of Genetics, Stanford University, Stanford, CA, USA.

8 ² Department of Medicine (Hematology, Blood and Marrow Transplantation), Stanford
9 University, Stanford, CA, USA.

10 ³ Department of Microbiology and Immunology, Stanford University, Stanford, CA, USA.

11 ⁴ Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Stanford University, Stanford, CA, USA.

12 ⁵ Department of Medicine (Infectious Diseases and Geographic Medicine), Stanford University,
13 Stanford, CA, USA.

14 ⁶ Department of Medicine (Infectious Diseases), Stanford University, Stanford, CA, USA.

15 ⁷ Department of Pathology, Stanford University, Stanford, CA, USA

16
17 #Contributed equally

18 ^Contributed equally (co-second author)

19 * Address correspondence to: Ami S. Bhatt, 269 Campus Dr, CCSR 1155b, Stanford University,
20 Palo Alto, CA 94305. Tel: (650) 498-4438; Email: asbhatt@stanford.edu.

21

22 **Abstract**

23 COVID-19 patients shed SARS-CoV-2 viral RNA in their stool, sometimes well after
24 they have cleared their respiratory infection. This feature of the disease may be significant for
25 patient health, epidemiology, and diagnosis. However, to date, methods to preserve stool samples
26 from COVID patients, and to extract and quantify viral RNA concentration have yet to be
27 optimized. We sought to meet this urgent need by developing and benchmarking a standardized
28 protocol for the fecal detection of SARS-CoV-2 RNA. We test three preservative conditions for
29 their ability to yield detectable SARS-CoV-2 RNA: OMNIgene-GUT, Zymo DNA/RNA shield
30 kit, and the most common condition, storage without any preservative. We test these in
31 combination with three extraction kits: the QIAamp Viral RNA Mini Kit, Zymo Quick-RNA
32 Viral Kit, and MagMAX Viral/Pathogen Kit. Finally, we also test the utility of two detection
33 methods, ddPCR and RT-qPCR, for the robust quantification of SARS-CoV-2 viral RNA from
34 stool. We identify that the Zymo DNA/RNA shield collection kit and the QiaAMP viral RNA
35 mini kit yield more detectable RNA than the others, using both ddPCR and RT-qPCR assays.
36 We also demonstrate key features of experimental design including the incorporation of
37 appropriate controls and data analysis, and apply these techniques to effectively extract viral
38 RNA from fecal samples acquired from COVID-19 outpatients enrolled in a clinical trial.
39 **Finally, we** recommend a comprehensive methodology for future preservation, extraction and
40 detection of RNA from SARS-CoV-2 and other coronaviruses in stool.

41

42 **Introduction**

43 Severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus-2 (SARS-CoV-2) is an RNA virus from
44 the *Coronaviridae* family¹ that causes coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19). This disease has
45 spread rapidly across the globe and remains a public health threat². COVID-19 is typically
46 considered a respiratory disease, with primary symptoms including cough, sore throat,
47 congestion, anosmia, and dyspnea. However, gastrointestinal (GI) symptoms are also recognized
48 as manifestations of the disease^{3,4}. Further, patients are found to shed viral RNA in their stool up
49 to even 4 months after disease onset, well after they have cleared the infection from their
50 respiratory tissues (unpublished observation, manuscript in preparation). While transmission of
51 SARS-CoV-2 typically occurs through the respiratory tract, some reports indicate the presence of
52 infectious viral particles in patient stool^{5,6}. Whether these are truly infectious and have
53 ramifications for public health remains to be definitively demonstrated. However, from an
54 individual patient health perspective, SARS-CoV-2 antigen is found to persist in the GI tract,
55 promoting evolution of host humoral immunity to variants of the virus⁷. Relatedly, prolonged
56 viral RNA shedding in stool may indicate a superior immune response⁷. Finally, from an
57 epidemiological perspective, researchers monitor SARS-CoV-2 load in sewage as a proxy for the
58 burden of disease within a population⁸. Taken together, monitoring the fecal shedding of SARS-
59 CoV-2 is vital to fully understanding this pathogen and its effect on patient health in addition to
60 informing public health measures. Therefore, a standardized method to handle and process
61 samples for accurate quantification of viral RNA in stool is critical. Notably, the proposed
62 method should allow for external validity and harmonization of data across studies.

63 Accurately quantifying fecal shedding of SARS-CoV-2 RNA is challenging. Stool is a
64 heterogeneous sample matrix that contains numerous PCR inhibitors that impede downstream

65 processes like reverse-transcriptase quantitative polymerase chain reaction (RT-qPCR) for
66 quantifying RNA⁹. Further, stool also contains RNases that can rapidly degrade unprotected
67 RNA. Therefore, it is critical that we use appropriate preservatives that protect RNA in stool and
68 employ extraction methods that effectively recover RNA without co-eluting inhibitors or
69 contaminants. In the absence of a comprehensive, standardized protocol, existing studies of
70 SARS-CoV-2 RNA in stool employ methods that have not yet been optimized. Further, the
71 variability in techniques used across studies makes meta-analysis difficult, hindering our overall
72 understanding of the disease. While there is heterogeneity, the majority of existing studies collect
73 and store stool without any preservative¹⁰⁻¹², dilute stool in PBS at the time of RNA extraction,
74 and employ the QIA-Amp Viral RNA kit from Qiagen for RNA isolation. Unfortunately, the
75 efficiency of these strategies in preserving and extracting SARS-CoV-2 RNA is unknown and
76 has not yet been systematically analyzed. Finally, after RNA extraction, the detection and
77 quantification of RNA by RT-qPCR has elements that have yet to be standardized. While the
78 primer/probe sets that are used are generally consistent, the calling of “positivity” for SARS-
79 CoV-2 RNA often relies on arbitrary thresholds set in the absence of a relevant standard curve¹³⁻
80 ¹⁵. These experimental inconsistencies and the lack of a clearly validated experimental pipeline
81 contribute significantly to heterogeneity in detection and quantification of viral RNA in stool. To
82 overcome these challenges, we sought to test a variety of accessible and common methods for
83 the preservation of stool samples, RNA extraction and detection of viral RNA from stool
84 samples, and present here an optimized pipeline.

85 Therefore, in the current study, we present data comparing the performance of three
86 different stool preservatives, three nucleic acid extraction kits, and two PCR based assays for
87 detecting fecal SARS-CoV-2 RNA. Based on these data, we recommend a pipeline for collecting

88 and processing stool samples for the detection of SARS-CoV-2 RNA. Finally, we validate this
89 standardized pipeline using patient samples collected from a clinical trial. Altogether, our
90 findings here will guide the field towards a more standardized method of robustly measuring the
91 fecal burden of SARS-CoV-2 RNA both in clinical and research settings.

92

93 **Methods**

94 **Preparation of stool samples spiked with SARS-CoV-2 RNA or BCoV attenuated virus.**

95 We used two types of non-clinical stool samples in this study. The first set of samples
96 were acquired from the United States National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST)¹⁶
97 and stored at -80°C. The second were acquired from healthy donors collected as part of the
98 Stanford IRB protocol #42043 (PI: Ami S Bhatt; Title : Genomic, Transcriptomic and
99 Microbiological Characterization of Human Body Fluid Specimens) and stored at -80°C without
100 any preservatives.

101 In most studies, stool samples are collected and stored without a preservative¹⁰⁻¹². They
102 are then resuspended in PBS in a 1:5 ratio (w:v) prior to RNA extraction. As a proxy for these
103 samples, we added 1000 mg of stool to 5 ml of PBS, and describe these as PBS preserved
104 samples through this study. Separately, we also stored samples in the OMNIgene-GUT tube
105 (OG; DNA Genotek; Catalog # OMR-200) and Zymo DNA/RNA Shield (ZY; Zymo Research;
106 Catalog # R1100-250) kit according to the manufacturer's instructions. Briefly, we added 500
107 mg of stool to the OG tube containing 2 mL of preservative to prepare the OG samples, and 1000
108 mg stool to the ZY kit with 9 mL of buffer to prepare the ZY samples. Given shortages in the
109 supply of the ZY kit, we also resorted to recreating this kit in house using 9 mL of the
110 DNA/RNA Shield buffer (Zymo Research; Catalog # R1100-1L; Lot # ZRC195881) in a 15 mL

111 centrifuge tube (VWR; Catalog # 89039-666). Subsequently, where listed, we spiked in synthetic
112 SARS-CoV-2 RNA from ATCC (Catalog # VR-3276SD, Lot # 70034237) at a final
113 concentration of either 10^3 or 10^4 copies per μL of preserved stool sample. For samples spiked
114 with the control bovine coronavirus (BCoV), we prepared BCoV by resuspending one vial of
115 lyophilized Zoetis Calf-Guard Bovine Rotavirus-Coronavirus Vaccine (Catalog # VLN 190/PCN
116 1931.20) in 3 mL of PBS to create an undiluted reagent as per manufacturer's instructions. We
117 then added 60 μL of either undiluted or diluted BCoV (1:10 in PBS) to 3 mL of preserved stool
118 sample. To create an extraction blank control, an equivalent volume of PBS was added to
119 samples labelled "None". All samples were then stored in 1.5 mL DNA LoBind tubes (Fisher
120 Scientific; Catalog # 13-698-791) and immediately frozen at -80°C .

121

122 **Preparation of clinical stool samples**

123 Clinical samples were collected and stored from patients participating in an interventional
124 study of Peginterferon Lambda 1a¹⁷ as described in the original study (manuscript in
125 preparation). Briefly, study subjects were requested to collect samples in both the OG and ZY
126 tubes according to manufacturer's instructions, and samples were stored at room temperature for
127 up to seven days before being processed into cryovials and frozen at -80°C until subsequent use.
128 We directly used OG and ZY preserved samples in the subsequent extraction steps. Where
129 mentioned samples were spiked with 10 μL of attenuated BCoV vaccine per 500 μL of preserved
130 stool sample after thawing an aliquot for extraction.

131

132 **Viral RNA extraction**

133 We spun down 600 μ L of each preserved stool sample at 10,000x *g* for 2 minutes to
134 remove solids from the sample. We then processed 200 μ L of supernatant according to
135 manufacturer's instructions for the QIAamp Viral RNA Mini Kit (Qiagen; Catalog # 52906, Lot
136 #166024216) and Zymo Quick-RNA Viral Kit (Zymo; Catalog # R1035, Lot #206187). In the
137 supernatant processed using the MagMAX Viral/Pathogen Kit (Thermofisher Scientific; Catalog
138 # A42352, Lot #'s 2009063, 2008058) we followed the manufacturer's instructions with the
139 following small exception: samples were processed in 1.5 mL DNA LoBind tubes rather than 1.5
140 mL deep well plates. We eluted RNA from each sample in 60 μ L of the elution buffer included
141 in each kit. The eluted RNA was stored in a 96-well plate at -80°C.

142

143 **Quantification of viral RNA by RT-qPCR**

144 We assembled the RT-qPCR reaction using a Biomek FX liquid handler, adding 5 μ L of
145 eluted RNA to 5 μ L of TaqPath 1-Step RT-qPCR CG mastermix (Applied Biosystems, Catalog #
146 A15300, Lot 2293196), 8.5 μ L of nuclease-free water (Ambion, Catalog # AM9937, Lot
147 2009117), and 1.5 μ L of primer/probe mix. The primer/probe mix was composed of 200 nM each
148 of forward primer, reverse primer and probe (Elim Biopharmaceuticals) with sequences
149 summarized in Table 1. We designed the probes to bear a 5' Fluorescein (FAM) and 3' 5'-
150 Carboxytetramethylrhodamine (TAMRA) dyes.

151 Our RT-qPCR analysis is guided by the Minimum Information for Publication of
152 Quantitative Real-Time PCR Experiments (MIQE) guidelines¹⁸. We used the QuantStudio 12K
153 Flex (Applied Biosystems) to amplify the template using the following thermocycling program:
154 25°C for 2 min, 50°C for 15 min, 95°C for 2 min, 45 cycles of 95°C for 15 sec and 55°C for 30
155 sec with ramp speed of 1.6°C per second at each step. We calculated the quantification cycle (C_q)

156 value using the system software. Standard curves for quantification were generated using a five-
157 point ten-fold dilution of the SARS-CoV-2 ATCC standard from 10^4 to 10^0 copies per μL of
158 template. We calculated the concentration of RNA using a linear regression of the standard
159 curve. We established limit of blank on a plate-by-plate basis; specifically, we turned to the
160 specific plate that an experimental sample was assayed on and picked the lowest C_q among the
161 following controls run in the same plate: the y-intercept of the line of best fit from the standard
162 curve, none (no RNA or BCoV spiked) stool samples, water and elution buffers from the RNA
163 extraction kits as listed in the relevant experiments. RNA concentrations from reactions with C_q
164 values below the LoB were defined as “undetermined”. The concentration of RNA from
165 technical duplicate RT-qPCR reactions were averaged. If one of the two technical duplicate
166 reactions failed to amplify within the range of the standard curve, the viral concentration from
167 that sample was treated as ‘Undetermined’.

168

169 **Quantification of viral RNA by ddPCR**

170 Our ddPCR analysis is guided by the Droplet Digital PCR Applications Guide on QX200
171 machines (BioRad)¹⁹. We assembled the ddPCR reaction using a Biomek FX liquid handler, by
172 adding 5.5 μL of eluted RNA to 5.5 μL Supermix, 2.2 μL reverse transcriptase, 1.1 μL of 300
173 nM Dithiothreitol (DTT), 1.1 μL of 20x Custom ddPCR Assay Primer/Probe Mix (BioRad,
174 Catalog # 10031277) and 6.6 μL of nuclease-free water (Ambion, Catalog # AM9937, Lot
175 2009117). The Supermix, reverse transcriptase and DTT are from the One-Step RT-ddPCR
176 Advanced Kit for Probes (BioRad, Catalog # 1864021). We then processed the assembled
177 reactions on a QX200 AutoDG Droplet Digital PCR System to ensure consistency in droplet
178 generation across samples. Amplification was performed on a BioRad T100 thermocycler using

179 the following thermocycling program: 50°C for 60 min, 95°C for 10 min, 40 cycles of 94°C for
180 30 sec and 55°C for 1 min, followed by 1 cycle of 98°C for 10 min and 4°C for 30 min with
181 ramp speed of 1.6°C per second at each step²⁰.

182 We thresholded the samples to ascertain the value at which a droplet was considered
183 “positive” by applying a multistep process that used the following positive and negative controls
184 included on each plate: ATCC SARS-CoV-2 RNA, RNA extracted directly from attenuated
185 BCoV vaccine prepared in PBS, water and elution buffers. First, we set the threshold between
186 the mean positive and negative amplitudes of these controls to minimize detected copies in the
187 negative controls and to reflect the expected RNA concentration of the positive samples. We
188 then calculated the difference between the mean negative amplitude and the threshold amplitude
189 in the negative control reactions and added it to the mean negative amplitude for each sample.
190 Further, we noted the highest detected copy number in the none (no RNA or BCoV spiked) stool
191 samples as the LoB. Samples with detected copies per μL below the LoB were marked as
192 “Undetermined”. Finally, absolute quantification of nucleic acids using ddPCR relies on the
193 generation of a Poisson distribution of template RNA in droplets, requiring an adequate number
194 of droplets with a negative amplification signal. Therefore, in instances where a reaction has
195 saturated amounts of template, we diluted the sample and performed the assay again to ensure
196 reliable quantification. These dilutions are listed where they were performed. Final copy
197 numbers are reported as copies per μL of target in eluate. This was calculated by multiplying by
198 copies per μL reported in each ddPCR reaction by total reaction volume (22 μL) and dividing by
199 input template volume (5.5 μL).

200

201 **Measurement of dry weight**

202 We first noted down the weight of one 1.5 mL DNA LoBind microcentrifuge tube per
203 sample. Next, we took two biopsy punches using the Integra Miltex Biopsy Punches with
204 Plunger System (Thermo Fisher Scientific; Catalog # 12-460-410) from each of the relevant
205 stool samples and transferred these to microcentrifuge tubes corresponding to the respective
206 samples. The tubes were then weighed, and the respective wet weight was calculated upon
207 subtracting the weight of the empty tube. Next, they were incubated on a heat block at 100°C for
208 72 hours and reweighed. The dry weight was calculated upon subtracting the weight of the empty
209 tube.

210

211 **Data analysis and statistics**

212 We performed statistical analyses using R (version 4.0.0). All statistical analyses were
213 two-sided, performed on the data prior to rounding and statistical significance was assessed at α
214 = 0.05. Unless otherwise stated, we performed the paired T-tests in all comparisons. Linear
215 regressions were plotted using the “ggpubr” package.

216


217 **Results**

218 **Synthetic RNA from ATCC is a reliable positive control and reagent for standard curves.**

219 Having optimal positive controls in the form of standardized control RNA at a precisely
220 defined concentration enables accurate quantification of viral loads from standard curves. While
221 many vendors now provide synthetic SARS-CoV-2 RNA featuring gene targets recommended
222 by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC)²¹ and the German Centre for Infection
223 Research (DZIF)²², preliminary studies have revealed that not all of them are at reliable
224 concentrations²³. Therefore, we tested two synthetic RNA preparations: one from the American

225 Type Culture Collection (ATCC) and one from the United States National Institute of Standards
226 and Technology (NIST) with listed concentrations of 10^5 - 10^6 copies/ μ l and 10^6 copies/ μ l
227 respectively. We chose these positive controls since they are easily accessible to other labs and
228 are from reliable sources. A five-point ten-fold dilution series from a starting concentration of
229 10^4 copies/ μ l to 10^0 copies/ μ l was tested in duplicate ddPCR (Fig. 1a) and quadruplicate RT-
230 qPCR (Fig. 1b) assays targeting the genes for the Envelope protein (E), Nucleocapsid proteins
231 (N1, N2) and RNA dependent RNA Polymerase protein (RdRP)^{21,22}. Notably, the NIST standard
232 was provided in two fragments, with fragment 1 bearing the E, N1 and N2 genes, and fragment 2
233 the RdRP gene²⁴. The dilution series prepared by two different users working with independent
234 aliquots of the standards revealed ATCC's synthetic RNA standard to be a reliable control with
235 high concordance across reactions. ddPCR, which allows for absolute quantification, revealed
236 the starting concentration of these standards to be 10^6 copies/ μ l. While the NIST standards also
237 performed with high concordance within replicates, the concentration of fragment 2 was
238 consistently found to be lower than the stated concentration by an order of magnitude. Further,
239 one out of eight of the RT-qPCR reactions assaying the NIST RNA for the E gene at 10^4 RNA
240 concentration failed to amplify, likely due to an experimental error in the RT-qPCR assay. This
241 result highlights the importance of running RT-qPCR assays in replicates. Given the reliable
242 performance of the synthetic SARS-CoV-2 RNA from ATCC across both ddPCR and RT-qPCR
243 assays testing 4 target genes, we decided to use this reagent across this study (Supplementary
244 Fig. 1a).

245



246 **Fig. 1 Robustness of synthetic SARS-CoV-2 RNA standards from ATCC and NIST.** ddPCR and RT-qPCR
 247 assays targeting four SARS-CoV-2 RNA targets (E, N1, N2, and RdRP) across a five-point ten-fold concentration
 248 range of RNA standards from either ATCC or NIST (indicated on the tab to the right). **a**, The theoretical
 249 concentrations of RNA are plotted on the x-axis and absolute copy number derived from ddPCR is plotted on the y-
 250 axis. All assays were performed in duplicate. **b**, The theoretical concentrations of RNA are plotted on the x-axis and
 251 C_q derived from RT-qPCR is plotted on the y-axis. All assays were performed in quadruplicate. Replicates in red
 252 and blue refer to two independent experiments performed by two users using separate aliquots of samples. Linear
 253 regression is plotted in black and 95% confidence interval is shaded in gray. Samples that did not amplify are
 254 delineated as 'U' for undetermined and not included in the linear regression analysis. Associated statistics are
 255 summarized in Supplementary Table 1 and raw data is provided in Supplementary Information 1.
 256

257

258 **ddPCR and RT-qPCR assays targeting the N1 gene are reliable means of estimating viral**
259 **RNA concentration**

260 We found all four primer/probe sets performed comparably in both the ddPCR and RT-
261 qPCR assays based on accuracy of detection with respect to theoretical input concentration (Fig.
262 1a,b, Supplementary Table 1). Recent work has revealed N1 to be marginally more sensitive at
263 detecting viral RNA from stool (manuscript in preparation). Therefore, we decided to target N1
264 in the rest of this study (Supplementary Fig. 1a). Given the high degree of concordance across
265 replicate ddPCR and RT-qPCR reactions, we averaged results from replicate reactions in
266 subsequent experiments. Further, since ddPCR allows absolute quantification of viral loads with
267 high sensitivity²⁵, while RT-qPCR is a more accessible platform for nucleic acid detection, we
268 employed both techniques across the study to be more widely informative. In both assays, we
269 used the one-step format that combines the reverse transcription and amplification steps in a
270 single reaction for a simpler protocol.

271

272 **Standardized stool samples reveal that preservatives are important and that the ZV**
273 **extraction kit performs best.**

274 We tested three different strategies to identify suitable methods of stool preservation for
275 detection of SARS-CoV-2 viral RNA: a) stool stored without any preservative and resuspended
276 in PBS (PBS), b) stool preserved in the OMNIgene-GUT tube (OG; DNA Genotek), a commonly
277 used preservation kit in microbiome studies²⁶, and c) stool preserved in the Zymo DNA/RNA
278 shield collection kit (ZY; Zymo Research) that is explicitly rated for RNA preservation and virus
279 inactivation.

280 In parallel, we also tested how these preservation methods interact with three different
281 extraction kits - a) MagMAX viral/pathogen nucleic acid isolation kit (MM; Applied


282 Biosystems), a magnetic-bead based protocol that has been successfully used with respiratory
283 samples²⁷, b) QiaAMP viral RNA minikit (QA; Qiagen), a column-based protocol that is used in
284 many studies of fecal SARS-CoV-2 RNA¹⁰⁻¹², c) Quick-RNA viral kit (ZV; Zymo Research),
285 another column based protocol that is rated to be compatible with the ZY stool collection kit. All
286 three of these extraction kits are scalable to a high-throughput format and therefore easily
287 adaptable to clinical laboratories and other large-scale efforts.

288 In order to test and compare all combinations of preservation and extraction methods, we
289 used standardized stool aliquots from NIST. Briefly, these are stool samples collected from a
290 cohort of healthy, omnivorous human donors, which are then homogenized and made available
291 in a ten-fold diluted format¹⁶. We spiked in synthetic SARS-CoV-2 RNA from ATCC (CoV-2
292 RNA) at two different concentrations (10^3 and 10^4 copies/ μL of preserved stool sample) in this
293 standardized stool sample and tested the combination of stool preservation and extraction kits to
294 benchmark their performances across multiple target RNA concentrations (Supplementary Fig.
295 2a). Finally, RNA extractions were performed by two independent users, each in technical
296 duplicates in order to guard against artefacts both across batches by the same user and across
297 users.

298 Among the stool preservatives, more RNA was detected in ZY than OG in both samples
299 spiked with 10^3 and with 10^4 concentrations of CoV-2 RNA when paired with the MM (Paired
300 T-test; $P^{10^3} = 0.020$, $P^{10^4} = 0.006$) and QA (Paired T-test; $P^{10^3} = 0.006$, $P^{10^4} = 0.049$)
301 extraction kits (Fig. 2a, Supplementary Table 2). Notably, ZV appears to efficiently isolate RNA
302 across both preservatives. Next we compared the performance of the three extraction kits.

303 Focusing our attention on the OG and ZY stool preservatives - in OG preserved samples,
304 ZV outperforms MM by yielding more detectable RNA both in samples spiked with 10^3 and with

305 10^4 concentrations of CoV-2 RNA (Paired T-test; $P^{10^3} = 0.017$, $P^{10^4} = 0.014$), while in ZY
 306 preserved samples both kits perform comparably. Across both stool preservatives, MM and ZV
 307 outperform QA (Fig. 2a, Supplementary Table 2). Therefore, in the condition of standardized
 308 NIST stool samples spiked with two different concentrations of SARS-CoV-2 RNA we find that
 309 the ZY preservative and ZV extraction kit outperform the alternatives.



310
 311 **Fig. 2 Efficacy of preservation and RNA extraction of SARS-CoV-2 and BCoV RNA from standardized NIST**
 312 **stool by ddPCR.** Stool samples collected from omnivorous donors and processed into a single standardized matrix
 313 by NIST was spiked with ATCC CoV-2 RNA or BCoV vaccine. Spiked stool was preserved in the OMNIgene-GUT
 314 kit (OG), Zymo DNA/RNA shield buffer (ZY) and PBS (as indicated in the tab on the top). RNA was extracted
 315 from these samples by two independent users, each in duplicate, using the MagMAX Viral/Pathogen Kit (MM;
 316 green), QIAamp Viral RNA Mini Kit (QA; orange) or Zymo Quick-RNA Viral Kit (ZY; purple) as indicated on the
 317 x-axis. RNA was assayed using ddPCR. **a**, Absolute concentration of SARS-CoV-2 RNA assayed by ddPCR
 318 targeting the N1 gene is plotted on the y-axis. NIST stool matrix was spiked with 10^3 (▲) or 10^4 (■) copies of
 319 ATCC synthetic SARS-CoV-2 RNA. **b**, Absolute concentration of BCoV RNA assayed by ddPCR targeting the M
 320 gene is plotted on the y-axis. NIST stool matrix was spiked with 1:10 diluted (▲) or undiluted (■) BCoV vaccine.
 321 Control samples with no spiked in RNA (none; ●) were included in duplicate to estimate LoB. ‘U’ stands for
 322 undetermined and marks samples with no detectable RNA above LoB. Raw data provided in Supplementary
 323 Information 1.
 324

325 Notably, in the PBS preservative we detected SARS-CoV-2 RNA at roughly three orders
326 of magnitude lower in eluates extracted from stool spiked with 10^4 copies per μL of sample
327 compared to OG or ZY. Across stool spiked with 10^3 copies per μL of sample, we failed to detect
328 any target RNA from PBS-preserved samples. We believe this is because the unpackaged
329 SARS-CoV-2 RNA was degraded by RNAses known to be present in stool. While these data
330 suggest that OG and ZY buffers are critical to preserving naked RNA in stool, testing
331 preservatives in the context of unpackaged SARS-CoV-2 RNA may not be representative of
332 clinical samples. This is because we do not yet know whether SARS-CoV-2 RNA shed in stool
333 is in its naked unpackaged state, protected in a encapsulated structure (such as the virus itself,
334 virus-like particles or host-double membrane vesicles), or a combination thereof.

335 Hence, we sought to identify a proxy for SARS-CoV-2 that is not known to cause disease
336 in humans and is thus safe to handle in the laboratory at biosafety level 1. We picked Bovine
337 coronavirus (BCoV), a virus that belongs to the same genus as SARS-CoV-2, *Betacoronavirus*,
338 in the subgenus *Embecovirus*, sharing this taxonomy with other human pathogens (HCoV-HKU1
339 and HCoV-OC43). BCoV and SARS-CoV-2 share a common structural architecture, and are
340 both positive stranded RNA viruses. Further, BCoV can be procured as an over-the-counter
341 attenuated vaccine. Prior to stool based testing, we evaluated the performance of the ddPCR and
342 RT-qPCR assays with the recommended primer/probe set to detect the M gene in BCoV RNA.
343 Towards this, we used RNA extracted directly from the attenuated BCoV vaccine prepared in
344 PBS in the absence of stool. We found both the ddPCR and RT-qPCR assays reliably tracked the
345 seven-point ten-fold dilution of the RNA extracts (Supplementary Fig. 3a,b). Therefore, we next
346 set out to test the same set of stool preservation and viral RNA extraction methods with the
347 standardized NIST stool samples spiked with BCoV. To assess preservative and extraction kit

348 performance across multiple target concentrations, we spiked BCoV both in its undiluted form
349 and at a ten-fold dilution of the stock.

350 In this experiment, we recovered the target BCoV RNA even in PBS albeit at lower
351 concentrations compared to other preservation methods (Fig. 2b). Further, the performance of the
352 OG and ZY stool preservatives and the three RNA extraction kits were consistent with previous
353 observations. Briefly, ZY preservative performs better than OG and PBS in all tested extraction
354 kits, yielding more detectable target RNA (Fig. 2b). This observation is statistically significant
355 (Supplementary Table 2) in all cases except in samples with the highest BCoV spike-in where
356 MM performs comparably across the three preservatives. Given the superior performance of the
357 ZY preservative, we went on to analyze how the three extraction methods fared in this condition.
358 Here, ZV surpasses MM and QA at extracting BCoV RNA at both spike-in concentrations,
359 though the difference between ZV and MM is not statistically significant in samples with the
360 highest concentration of spiked in BCoV.

361 Alongside efforts to extract BCoV RNA from spiked stool samples, each user also
362 extracted RNA directly from the BCoV vaccine without any stool sample. This allows us to
363 evaluate if the extraction kits interact differently with encapsulated RNA, and also serves as a
364 positive control for the extractions. Notably, we find that all extraction kits perform comparably,
365 and reliably extract RNA from the BCoV vaccine (Supplementary Fig. 2b).

366 Finally, we sought to verify our observations using the more commonly used RT-qPCR
367 assay as well. Notably, the RT-qPCR assays (Supplementary Fig. 2c,d) validate trends we
368 observe in the ddPCR assays, but some of the differences in performance we note in the ddPCR
369 assay are no longer significant (Supplementary Table 2). We attribute this to the lower sensitivity
370 of RT-qPCR over ddPCR²⁵. All experiments included stool samples with no spiked-in RNA to

371 establish a reliable limit of blank (LoB). RNA extracted from stool samples spiked with BCoV
372 had to be diluted ten-fold to arrive at a concentration range accurately quantifiable by ddPCR.
373 Similarly, extracts from BCoV vaccine without stool had to be diluted 100-fold. Finally, given
374 the concordance of results from biological replicates from the same user, we limited the number
375 of replicates to one per user in subsequent experiments.

376 Taken together, in the NIST omnivore aqueous stool matrix, ZY best preserves both the
377 SARS-CoV-2 naked RNA and encapsulated RNA from BCoV, a SARS-CoV-2 like
378 *Betacoronavirus* (Supplementary Fig. 1b). Further, the ZV extraction kit is also the best
379 performer across both these sample types. Finally, RNA, both in its unpackaged form and when
380 packaged in a virus is susceptible to loss in PBS without any preservative.

381

382 **ZY preservative and QA extraction kits are broadly more effective in non-standardized** 383 **stool samples**

384 While the NIST stool samples were a useful, standardized preparation, this processed,
385 pooled and diluted standardized stool sample is limited in its representation of regular clinical
386 specimens. Therefore, we next tested the combinations of the preservatives and viral RNA
387 extraction kits using undiluted and unprocessed stool samples from healthy donors, spiked with
388 the SARS-CoV-2 RNA and BCoV standards. We picked the lower concentrations of both the
389 SARS-CoV-2 RNA (10^3) and BCoV (1:10 dilution) from our previous analysis to challenge the
390 sensitivity of the combinations of preservation, extraction and detection techniques tested here.

391 We acquired stool samples from two healthy stool donors, one on an omnivorous diet
392 (Omni) and the other on a vegetarian diet (Veg) (Supplementary Fig. 4a). Across conditions, the
393 concentrations of target RNA detected from these matrices were lower than those from the NIST


394 samples by around an order of magnitude (Fig. 2a, 3a). We used ddPCR to assay the
395 performance of the preservatives and observed that in samples spiked with SARS-CoV-2 RNA,
396 ZY yields more detectable RNA than OG when paired with both the MM (Paired T-test; $P =$
397 $.048$) and QA (Paired T-test; $P = .035$) extraction kits (Fig. 3a, Supplementary Table 3). In the
398 best performing preservative, ZY, all extraction kits perform comparably. Notably, PBS
399 continues to perform poorly, yielding no detectable target RNA in all but one extraction. These
400 results based on unprocessed non-standardized stool samples suggest that it is best to preserve
401 samples in the ZY buffer, and that in this preservative, all three extraction kits can be used with
402 comparable results.

403

404 In the case of RNA encapsulated in BCoV, the two preservatives, OG and ZY, perform
405 comparably in all but one instance; ZY offers an advantage in samples spiked with diluted BCoV
406 (1:10) and extracted with QA (Paired T-test; $P = .034$) (Fig. 3b, Supplementary Table 3). Next,
407 focusing on samples preserved in ZY, all three extraction kits yield comparable amounts of
408 detectable viral RNA. Further, control extractions, with only the BCoV vaccine without any stool
409 included in this batch also yielded comparable amounts of RNA across kits (Supplementary Fig.
410 4b). We note that RNA extracted from stool samples spiked with BCoV had to be diluted ten-
411 fold to arrive at a concentration range accurately quantifiable by ddPCR, and those from BCoV
412 vaccine without stool had to be diluted 100-fold.

413 Unlike the previous experiment with standardized diluted NIST stool, in this set of
414 samples based on unprocessed healthy stool, we observe differences in the performance of
415 ddPCR and RT-qPCR assays (Supplementary Fig. 4c,d). Interestingly, we detected BCoV from
416 the PBS sample extracted with the ZV kit in the RT-qPCR assay, albeit at a high C_q value, but

417 not in the ddPCR assay. This is one exception among all the assays performed in this study, and
 418 likely a false positive. Next, by and large, we were unable to detect the BCoV target in RNA
 419 extracted using the MM kit. This observation makes us suspect that PCR inhibitors are being
 420 coeluted with RNA when using the MM kit. Given these observations, we conclude that QA
 421 performed most reliably at yielding detectable RNA from BCoV spiked into non-standardized
 422 stool.



423 **Fig. 3 Evaluating preservation and extraction of SARS-CoV-2 and BCoV RNA from non-standardized stool**
 424 **samples using ddPCR.** Stool samples were collected from healthy omnivorous (Omni) and vegetarian (Veg) donors
 425 and spiked with ATCC CoV-2 RNA or BCoV vaccine. Spiked stool was preserved in the OMNIgene-GUT kit (OG),
 426 Zymo DNA/RNA shield buffer (ZY) and PBS (as indicated in the tab on the top). RNA was extracted from these
 427 samples by two independent users using the MagMAX Viral/Pathogen Kit (MM; green), QIAamp Viral RNA Mini
 428 Kit (QA; orange) or Zymo Quick-RNA Viral Kit (ZY; purple) as indicated on the x-axis. RNA was assayed using
 429 ddPCR. **a**, Absolute concentration of SARS-CoV-2 RNA assayed by ddPCR targeting the N1 gene is plotted on the
 430 y-axis. Healthy stool samples were spiked with 10^3 (\blacktriangle) copies of ATCC synthetic SARS-CoV-2 RNA. **b**, Absolute
 431 concentration of BCoV RNA assayed by ddPCR targeting the M gene is plotted on the y-axis. Healthy stool samples
 432 were spiked with 1:10 diluted (\blacktriangle) BCoV vaccine. Control samples with no spiked in RNA (none; \bullet) were included
 433 in duplicate to estimate LoB. 'U' stands for undetermined and marks samples with no detectable RNA above LoB.
 434 Raw data provided in Supplementary Information 1.

435 Overall, these experiments comparing the performance of preservatives and extraction
436 kits on non-standardized stool samples revealed that ZY yields more detectable target RNA than
437 OG and PBS (Supplementary Fig. 1b). Further, we are still unable to detect RNA from samples
438 stored in PBS when trying to recover the unpackaged ATCC synthetic RNA spiked into stool.
439 Finally, while all extraction kits perform comparably at extracting unpackaged RNA, QA
440 performs more reliably than MM and ZY at extracting BCoV encapsulated RNA.

441


442 **ZY collection and preservation is more effective than OG in the hands of patients.**

443 Experiments so far studied defined stool samples spiked in with a known amount of
444 target RNA, and transferred to collection kits in a precise, controlled environment. This is useful
445 towards testing kits head-to-head. However, in reality, stool samples are likely to be collected by
446 patients or health-care practitioners outside of well-controlled laboratory spaces. Therefore, it is
447 important to compare the performance of the OG and ZY stool preservatives in this practical use-
448 case setting.

449 To this end, we leveraged a recent large-scale study that captured the dynamics of fecal
450 SARS-CoV-2 viral RNA shedding (unpublished data, manuscript in preparation)¹⁷. Briefly, this
451 study collected stool samples from COVID-19 outpatients that were enrolled in a clinical trial of
452 Peginterferon Lambda-1a in both the OG and ZY preservatives. Further, they extracted RNA
453 using QA and assayed viral load using RT-qPCR.

454 From this data set, we picked instances of paired OG and ZY viral loads determined from
455 samples collected from the same patient at the same time. Out of 172 such samples, 82 did not
456 yield a detectable amount of target RNA in either preservative and were left out of further
457 analysis. Taking the 90 paired samples in which we detected the viral RNA targets in at least one

458 of the preservatives, we plotted their log₁₀-transformed concentrations in a scatter plot (Fig. 4).
459 Here we fitted a linear regression, excluding samples that yielded RNA in only one of the two
460 preservatives since these skewed the regression. Notably, 29 of these paired samples yielded
461 detectable RNA only in ZY, in comparison to 7 in only OG. The linear regression from the
462 paired samples stored in OG and ZY reveals that among samples for which both samples tested
463 positive, OG samples had a roughly 60% lower detected concentration of RNA. Finally, we also
464 calculated the mean of the differences between the log₁₀-transformed viral RNA concentrations
465 from these paired samples, including ones that were only detected in one of the two
466 preservatives. This revealed that ZY preserved samples yielded more RNA by 0.477 log₁₀ units
467 (or ~3 times more) (Independent T-test; $P = 2.36E-07$).



468 **Fig 4. Relationship between yields of SARS-CoV-2 RNA extracted from clinical samples stored in two**
469 **different preservatives.** Paired stool samples were collected in the OMNIgene-GUT kit (OG) and Zymo
470 DNA/RNA shield buffer (ZY) preservatives from COVID-19 outpatients enrolled in a clinical trial of Peginterferon
471 Lambda-1a. RNA from these samples had been extracted using the QIAamp Viral RNA Mini Kit (QA), assayed by
472 RT-qPCR targeting the N1 gene and previously reported. Scatter plot of the reported concentrations of paired stool
473 samples with concentrations derived from the ZY preserved samples on the x-axis and from the OG preserved
474 samples on the y-axis. Linear regression is plotted in black and 95% confidence interval is shaded in gray. Samples
475 that are reported to not have amplified are delineated as 'U' for undetermined and not included in the linear
476 regression analysis. This breaks down as 29 samples that were detected only in the ZY preservative, 7 that were
477 detected only in the OG preservative and 54 that were detected in both. Associated regression equation and statistics
478 are inset on the top right. Color gradient from purple to orange represents the ratio of the concentration of RNA

479 derived from the ZY preserved sample (purple) to that derived from the OG preserved sample (orange). Raw data
480 are provided in Supplementary Information 1.
481

482 While the ZY preservative may be more effective at protecting RNA, it is also possible
483 that the ZY collection kit ends up with more stool compared to the OG kit. In order to address
484 this question we estimated how much of the sample from either of these kits is actually
485 composed of stool. To this end, we randomly selected paired samples collected in the OG and
486 ZY tubes from the biobank of stool samples collected from COVID-19 outpatients enrolled in
487 the aforementioned clinical trial of Peginterferon Lambda-1a (manuscript in preparation).
488 Specifically, each of these pairs was collected from the same patient at the time of enrollment in
489 the study. We took two biopsy punches from each of these 10 stool samples and measured their
490 wet weight. Next, we dried these samples on a heat block for 72 hours and measured their dry
491 weight. The percentage of dry weight to wet weight represents the proportion of patient stool
492 biomass in the original sample. We found that $31.4 \pm 1.6\%$ of sample weight in the ZY
493 preservative corresponds to stool biomass, compared to $13.6 \pm 3.3\%$ of sample weight in the OG
494 preservative (Table 2; Paired T-test; $P = 5.49E-6$). Remarkably, this roughly 3-fold difference in
495 stool biomass tracks closely with the 3-fold difference we observe above in the performance of
496 the two kits. Therefore, likely, the two kits preserve and yield comparable amounts of detectable
497 SARS-CoV-2 RNA, when accounting for the amount of input stool.

498 However, the difference in stool biomass across the two kits is surprising to us, since
499 reading the manufacturer's instructions suggests that the OG kit would end up with a marginally
500 higher concentration of stool. In fact, the experiments with stool from NIST and healthy donors
501 described in this work followed these instructions and added 500 mg of stool to OG (containing
502 2 ml of buffer), and 1000 mg of stool to ZY (containing 9 ml of buffer). We suspect that this
503 difference in stool input we observe in the clinical samples may be the effect of the format of the

504 two kits. Specifically, the OG kit is composed of a specific receptacle of defined volume to
505 collect stool, while the ZY kit is just a standard collection tube with a proprietary buffer
506 (Supplementary Fig. 5). The ZY kit has plenty of room in the tube above the buffer level, so
507 study subjects may have been inclined to load more stool in the ZY kit.

508 Taken together, we find that the ZY kit yields more detectable RNA than the OG kit both
509 with samples prepared in strictly controlled experimental conditions carried out in the laboratory,
510 and on those collected in the field by patients (Supplementary Fig. 1c). This superior
511 performance may be the result of a better preservative, differential usage of these kits, or a
512 combination thereof.

513

514 **Comparing the performance of extraction kits on clinical samples collected in the ZY**
515 **preservative.**

516 Given the superior performance of the ZY preservative in both standardized and clinical
517 samples, we next tested how the three extraction kits perform with “real life” clinical samples
518 preserved in this modality.


519 In order to test the extraction kits, we picked 5 random samples from the Peginterferon
520 Lambda-1a (unpublished data, manuscript in preparation) biobank that were collected in ZY on
521 the day of enrollment, when we expect a higher fecal viral load. Recognizing that there is a high
522 cost to false negatives in the detection of SARS-CoV-2 viral RNA in stool samples, we
523 incorporated a reliable control to track efficiency of RNA extraction, without compromising the
524 yield of the target SARS-CoV-2 RNA. Hence, we took two aliquots of the stool from each of the
525 chosen 5 clinical samples, and spiked undiluted BCoV in one of them as a reference extraction

526 control (Supplementary Fig. 6a). We then extracted RNA from the 10 stool samples using the
527 three extraction kits.

528 Looking at the stool samples with spiked BCoV, we find that QA may perform
529 marginally better than MM and ZV yielding more detectable target RNA, albeit not to statistical
530 significance (Supplementary Fig. 1c, Supplementary Table 4). Comparing the yield of SARS-
531 CoV-2 RNA in samples with (Fig. 5a) and without (Supplementary Fig. 6b) spiked in BCoV
532 reveals that the addition of this control does not significantly affect the yield of RNA (Fig. 5b)
533 with the exception of sample # 4 extracted using QA. Here, inexplicably, we find that the stool
534 sample with spiked BCoV yields SARS-CoV-2 RNA while the unspiked sample does not. We
535 suspect this to be an anomaly warranting further exploration with a larger sample set. However,
536 it appears reasonable to conclude that addition of BCoV does not negatively impact the
537 extraction and detection of SARS-CoV-2 RNA. We also report the detected copies of N1 per
538 gram of stool to normalize the copies of SARS-CoV-2 RNA to the amount of stool placed into
539 the preservative by patients. This does not alter our conclusions regarding the best extraction kit,
540 but given the differing input of stool to various preservative options, we believe that reporting
541 detected copies per gram of stool where possible will best harmonize reported viral loads of
542 SARS-CoV-2 in feces (Supplementary Information 2).

543 We next analyzed the cumulative yield of BCoV RNA from each of these clinical
544 samples and found that samples extracted with the MM and QA kits performed comparably and
545 reliably, whereas BCoV RNA detection was more variable in samples extracted with the ZV kit
546 (Fig. 5c). Therefore, we demonstrate here how an easily accessible, over-the-counter attenuated
547 BCoV vaccine can be leveraged as a reliable spike in control.

548



549 **Fig. 5 Testing efficiency of three extraction kits using clinical samples stored in the ZY preservative and**
 550 **spiked with BCoV.** Stool samples were collected in the Zymo DNA/RNA shield buffer (ZY) preservative from five
 551 COVID-19 outpatients enrolled in a clinical trial of Peginterferon Lambda-1a. All samples were spiked with 10 μL of
 552 undiluted BCoV vaccine. In parallel, the same set of samples were processed without any spike-in. RNA from these
 553 samples were extracted using the MagMAX Viral/Pathogen Kit (MM; green), QIAamp Viral RNA Mini Kit (QA;
 554 orange) or Zymo Quick-RNA Viral Kit (ZY; purple). **a.** RNA from samples with BCoV spiked in were assayed for
 555 SARS-CoV-2 RNA using ddPCR targeting the N1 gene. Anonymized sample identities are listed on the x-axis and
 556 absolute concentration is listed on the y-axis. **b.** Scatter plot of the absolute concentration of SARS-CoV-2 RNA
 557 derived from samples without any spike-in (x-axis) versus those with 10 μL of undiluted BCoV spiked in (y-axis),
 558 measured using ddPCR targeting the N1 gene. Linear regression is plotted in black and 95% confidence interval is
 559 shaded in gray. ‘U’ stands for undetermined and indicates samples without no detectable RNA above the LoB; these
 560 undetermined concentrations samples are not included in the linear regression analysis. Associated regression
 561 equation and statistics are inset on the bottom right. **c.** RNA extracted from samples with BCoV spiked were assayed
 562 for BCoV RNA using ddPCR targeting the M gene. Cumulative box plot of the absolute concentrations of BCoV
 563 RNA across the clinical samples marking the median, first and third quartile and 95% confidence interval. ‘U’
 564 stands for undetermined and marks samples with no detectable RNA above LoB. Raw data provided in
 565 Supplementary Information 1.
 566

567 All results considered, we recommend using the ZY preservative to collect stool samples,
 568 and the QA extraction method to purify SARS-CoV-2 RNA (Supplementary Fig. 7). In instances

569 where variability in extracted RNA yield or coelution of polymerase inhibitors are anticipated,
570 we suggest spiking in 10 µl of BCoV vaccine to 500 µls of stool prior to storage and extraction in
571 order to guard against false negatives. We have validated here that BCoV serves as a reliable
572 control and does not affect the yield of SARS-CoV-2 RNA.

573

574 **Discussion**

575 Fecal shedding of SARS-CoV-2 RNA is emerging as a key manifestation of COVID-19
576 infection with vast implications for patient health and in the epidemiology of the disease.
577 However, methods to collect and preserve patient samples, and to extract viral RNA for the
578 robust detection and quantification of SARS-CoV-2 remain underexplored. Therefore, we
579 compare strategies for each of these steps in the testing of fecal samples and report here an
580 optimized methodology. We have focused our efforts on reagents that are easily available and
581 kits that are scalable to a high-throughput format, therefore enabling straightforward adoption for
582 work in research and clinical laboratories.

583 We tested three different strategies for sample collection and preservation. First, the most
584 common strategy involves collecting stool without any preservative²⁸⁻³⁶. These samples are
585 resuspended in PBS for viral RNA extraction¹⁰. Next, we also tested the OMNIgene-GUT tube
586 (OG) that is widely used in stool collection for gut microbiome analysis. Finally, we included the
587 Zymo DNA/RNA Shield kit (ZY) as a sample preservation method that is explicitly marketed for
588 RNA preservation. Across three different types of stool samples, ZY consistently performed
589 better than OG and PBS, enabling both the recovery of naked, unpackaged SARS-CoV-2 RNA
590 and BCoV RNA encapsulated in a *Betacoronavirus* similar to SARS-CoV-2. Most importantly,
591 analysis of data from a large study of outpatients with mild to moderate COVID-19 further

592 validated the conclusion that ZY was the most effective preservation method. Conclusions from
593 our study in combination with existing evidence that SARS-CoV-2 RNA is susceptible to
594 degradation from freezing stool samples without any preservative¹¹ highlights the critical
595 importance of storing stool samples in an appropriate buffer.

596 Next, we compared three different extraction kits for their potential to effectively isolate
597 viral RNA. Two of these kits, the QIAamp Viral RNA Mini Kit (QA) and Zymo Quick-RNA
598 Viral Kit (ZY) are column based kits, while the MagMAX Viral/Pathogen Kit (MM) is based on
599 magnetic beads. We tested these kits by performing replicate nucleic acid extractions of stool
600 samples prepared in the laboratory spiked with SARS-CoV-2 synthetic RNA or BCoV vaccine.
601 Here we found that the performance of the extraction kits was influenced by the preservative,
602 nature of stool and the target RNA. We focus our discussion on the performance of the extraction
603 kits in combination with the best performing preservative, ZY. Here, we observe that ZV most
604 effectively extracted both the unpackaged SARS-CoV-2 RNA and the packaged BCoV RNA
605 from the standardized, diluted NIST stool samples. However, from non-standardized healthy
606 stool samples and clinical samples, QA performed more consistently, yielding detectable viral
607 RNA across conditions. Notably, while MM performed well in many of the experiments, we find
608 preliminary evidence that this protocol may allow the co-purification of PCR inhibitors. We
609 glean this observation from experiments performed with BCoV spiked into non-standardized
610 healthy stool samples. Taken together, we recommend using the QA extraction kit in tandem
611 with the ZY preservative as a strategy for the robust and sensitive detection of SARS-CoV-2
612 RNA from stool (Supplementary Fig. 7).

613 Stool based testing of SARS-CoV-2 offers unique applications in healthcare. With
614 emerging evidence that prolonged shedding of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in stool may be linked to an

615 improved immune response⁷, there may be an opportunity to leverage fecal testing of RNA as a
616 prognostic marker. Further, if the limited evidence of possible oral-fecal transmission of SARS-
617 CoV-2 proves true, our ability to reliably test stool samples would be vital to controlling the
618 spread of the pandemic as well as to inform healthcare practices such as fecal microbiota
619 transplants. Finally, this option protects healthcare practitioners from having to be in close
620 proximity to patients during sample collection. In all of these applications, it is critical to
621 incorporate strategies to mitigate false negatives. Such false negatives may arise from errors in
622 sample preservation, RNA extraction and presence of inhibitors that affect detection through
623 PCR-based methods. Therefore, in this study, we also evaluate potential controls to guard against
624 instances of such false negatives. We find that the widely accessible, safe, BCoV vaccine can be
625 effectively spiked into stool samples prior to storage and extraction. Recovery of BCoV RNA
626 assayed by targeting the M gene serves as a reliable metric of variation across batches of RNA
627 preparations without affecting the yield of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in the samples. We believe BCoV
628 to be a valuable proxy for SARS-CoV-2 since they belong to the same genus, *Betacoronavirus*,
629 and predominantly share viral architecture. Therefore, using BCoV as a spiked-in control will
630 help gain confidence in negatives as true negatives rather than a result of experimental artifacts
631 (Supplementary Fig. 7).

632 Further, given the clinical implications, it is equally important to avoid false positives in
633 the detection of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in stool. To this end, it is vital to establish a limit of blank
634 (LoB) with every batch of experiments. This allows the confident identification of true positive
635 samples over experimental noise. Guidelines from the Clinical & Laboratory Standards Institute
636 (CLSI; EP17-A) provide a roadmap for a rigorous evaluation of LoB³⁷. We recognize that this is
637 a high bar for non-clinical research laboratories to meet. Alternatively, as demonstrated here,

638 including comparable control stool samples from NIST or healthy donors in every batch of viral
639 RNA extraction and detection will also serve to boost confidence in the detection of SARS-CoV-
640 2 RNA as being a true positive (Supplementary Fig. 7).

641 Finally, it is important to be able to quantify the viral RNA load in stool as a potential
642 indicator of the state and prognosis of infection in patients. To this end, while ddPCR provides a
643 powerful platform capable of determining the absolute concentration of RNA, we recognize this
644 may be cost prohibitive and inaccessible. Therefore, additionally, we demonstrate here
645 experimental strategies that enable the adoption of the more accessible RT-qPCR assay to enable
646 the accurate detection and relative quantification of viral load in samples (Supplementary Fig. 7).
647 Lastly, given differing amounts of stool collected by every patient and in different experiments,
648 we recommend reporting quantified viral RNA load in terms of copies per gram of stool. This
649 enables a normalized dataset that will allow us to harmonize reported fecal viral loads of SARS-
650 CoV-2 RNA across studies.

651 SARS-CoV-2 has been a deadly pathogen causing extensive morbidity and mortality.
652 Given the current understanding of coronaviruses, it is likely that SARS-CoV-2 will not be the
653 last virus of this nature to cause an epidemic. Further, many coronaviruses are capable of
654 infecting the gastrointestinal tract. In this context, we hope that the current work helps create a
655 roadmap for fecal testing of coronavirus infections enabling the robust detection and
656 quantification of viral RNA in stool.

657

658 **Acknowledgements**

659 We thank Jason Andrews, Nasa Sinnott-Armstrong and Renu Verma for guidance on processing
660 stool samples and detection of RNA using RT-qPCR, Angela Rogers and Julie Parsonnet for


661 providing stool and rectal swab samples from patients admitted at Stanford Hospital, Scott
662 Jackson and Stephanie Servetas from NIST for providing us aliquots of standardized stool, the
663 Applied Genetics Group at NIST for aliquots of the SARS-CoV-2 synthetic RNA, Dean Felsher
664 for access to the QuantStudio 12K Flex qPCR machine, Yvonne Maldonado and Jonathan
665 Altamirano for helping acquire funding to support towards this work, Said Attiya and Dhananjay
666 Wagh for guidance on applying ddPCR assays, David Solor-Cordero for assistance setting up the
667 Biomek FX and providing access, Luisa Jiminez and Sopheak Sim for assistance in using the
668 Stanford Functional Genomics Facility and High-Throughput Bioscience Center. We are grateful
669 to the Peginterferon- λ 1a clinical trial team for coordinating procurement of stool samples from
670 outpatients enrolled in this trial. Biorender has been a valuable resource to creating schematic
671 illustrations. This work was supported by a ChemH-IMA grant and the Stanford Dean's
672 Postdoctoral Fellowship (A.N.). The Bhatt lab is supported by NIH R01 AI148623 and R01
673 AI143757. A.H. is supported by an NSF Graduate research fellowship program grant.
674
675 A.N., A.H., S.Z., E.F.B., S.E.V., M.W., A.Bo., and A.S.B. are co-inventors on a U.S. provisional
676 patent application #63/172,045 that has been filed and relates to the methods presented in this
677 manuscript.

678 **Supplementary Figures**

a. Compared SARS-CoV-2 synthetic control RNA from ATCC and NIST. Tested primer/probe pairs targeting 4 different genes.

1. Selected ATCC control RNA
2. Selected primer/probe pair targeting N1 gene

b. Evaluated preservative and extraction methods.




c. Tested preservative and extraction kits with COVID-19 patient stool samples




679 **Supplementary Fig. 1 Schematic illustration of key experiments and results.** a. Comparisons of SARS-CoV-2
 680 synthetic control RNA standards from ATCC and NIST revealed that ATCC performed reliably. Further, the
 681 primer/probe set targeting the N1 gene in SARS-CoV-2 RNA performed well at detecting viral RNA. b.
 682 Standardized stool samples from NIST, and non-standardized stool samples from two healthy donors each on an
 683 omnivorous and vegetarian diet were employed to evaluate various preservatives and extraction methods. Stool
 684 samples were spiked with synthetic SARS-CoV-2 RNA or attenuated BCoV vaccine at defined concentrations.

685 Samples were preserved in the OG, ZY or PBS buffers, and viral RNA was extracted using the MM, QA or ZY kits.
686 Viral RNA was quantified using ddPCR and RT-qPCR targeting the N1 gene in SARS-CoV-2 or the M gene in
687 BCoV. In NIST samples, ZY and ZV performed best while in healthy stool samples, ZY and QA performed best.
688 Although both ddPCR and RT-qPCR performed comparably at detection RNA extracted from NIST samples,
689 ddPCR performed better in RNA extracted from healthy stool samples. **c.** Performance of the preservatives and
690 extraction kits were assessed using clinical samples. In the first experiment (left) viral RNA extracted using QA
691 from 172 paired patient stool samples preserved in the OG and ZY buffers was analyzed. ZY preserved samples
692 yielded more detectable RNA, perhaps because more stool was deposited in this kit. Next, in the second experiment
693 (right) viral RNA was extracted from 5 patient stool samples preserved in ZY using MM, QA and ZV. Here, QA
694 yielded more detectable RNA.
695




696
 697 **Supplementary Fig. 2 Efficacy of preservation and RNA extraction of SARS-CoV-2 and BCoV RNA from**
 698 **standardized NIST stool.** **a.** Two independent users performed this experiment in duplicate. Stool samples
 699 collected from omnivorous donors and processed into a standardized matrix by NIST was spiked with ATCC CoV-2
 700 RNA, a BCoV vaccine or equal volume of PBS (no RNA). Spiked stool was preserved in the OMNIgene-GUT kit
 701 (OG), Zymo DNA/RNA shield buffer (ZY) and PBS. RNA was extracted from these samples using the MagMAX
 702 Viral/Pathogen Kit (MM), QIAamp Viral RNA Mini Kit (QA) or Zymo Quick-RNA Viral Kit (ZY). RNA was
 703 assayed using ddPCR and RT-qPCR targeting the SARS-CoV-2 N1 gene or BCoV M gene. **b.** As an extraction
 704 control, RNA was isolated from the BCoV vaccine directly without the stool matrix using MM (green), QA (orange)
 705 and ZY (purple) kits. Each user included a set of these extractions (indicated in the x-axis). Absolute concentration
 706 of BCoV RNA assayed by ddPCR targeting the M gene is plotted on the y-axis. **c.** RNA extracted using the MM
 707 (green), QA (orange) and ZY (purple) kits are listed on the x-axis, and concentration of SARS-CoV-2 RNA assayed
 708 by RT-qPCR targeting the N1 gene is plotted on the y-axis. NIST stool matrix was spiked with 10^3 (▲) or 10^4 (■)

709 copies of ATCC synthetic SARS-CoV-2 RNA and processed in quadruplicate. **d**, RNA extracted using the MM
710 (green), QA (orange) and ZY (purple) kits are listed on the x-axis, and C_q value of RT-qPCR assays targeting the
711 BCoV M gene is plotted on the y-axis. NIST stool matrix was spiked with 1:10 diluted (\blacktriangle) or undiluted (\blacksquare) BCoV
712 vaccine. Control samples with no spiked in RNA (none; \bullet) were included in duplicate to estimate LoB. ‘U’ stands
713 for undetermined and marks samples with no detectable RNA above LoB. RT-qPCR assays were run in technical
714 duplicates and the mean values are represented here. Raw data provided in Supplementary Information 1.
715




716
 717 **Supplementary Fig. 3 Robustness of primer/probe set at quantifying BCoV.** ddPCR and RT-qPCR assays
 718 targeting M gene from BCoV across a seven-point ten-fold dilution series of RNA extracted from BCoV vaccine.
 719 RNA was extracted using either the MagMAX Viral/Pathogen Kit (MM), QIAamp Viral RNA Mini Kit (QA) or
 720 Zymo Quick-RNA Viral Kit (ZY) as indicated on the tab to the top. **a**, Dilutions of RNA are plotted on the x-axis
 721 and absolute copy number derived from ddPCR is plotted on the y-axis. All assays were performed in duplicate. **b**,
 722 Dilutions of RNA are plotted on the x-axis and C_q derived from RT-qPCR is plotted on the y-axis. All assays were
 723 performed in quadruplicate. Replicates in red and blue refer to two independent experiments performed by two users
 724 using separate extractions of RNA. Linear regression is plotted in black and 95% confidence interval is shaded in
 725 gray. Samples that did not amplify are delineated as 'U' for undetermined and not included in the linear regression
 726 analysis. Associated statistics are summarized in Supplementary Table 1 and raw data is provided in Supplementary
 727 Information 1.
 728





729
 730 **Supplementary Fig. 4 Performance of preservation and extraction of SARS-CoV-2 and BCoV RNA from**
 731 **non-standardized stool samples from healthy donors.** **a.** Two independent users performed this experiment. Stool
 732 samples were collected from healthy omnivorous (Omni) and vegetarian (Veg) donors and spiked with ATCC CoV-
 733 2 RNA or BCoV vaccine or equal volume of PBS (no RNA). Spiked stool was preserved in the OMNIgene-GUT kit
 734 (OG), Zymo DNA/RNA shield buffer (ZY) and PBS. RNA was extracted from these samples using the MagMAX
 735 Viral/Pathogen Kit (MM), QIAamp Viral RNA Mini Kit (QA) or Zymo Quick-RNA Viral Kit (ZY). RNA was
 736 assayed using ddPCR and RT-qPCR targeting the SARS-CoV-2 N1 gene or BCoV M gene. **b.** As an extraction
 737 control, RNA was isolated from the BCoV vaccine directly without the stool matrix using MM (green), QA (orange)
 738 and ZY (purple) kits. Each user included a set of these extractions (indicated in the x-axis). Absolute concentration

739 of BCoV RNA assayed by ddPCR targeting the M gene is plotted on the y-axis. **c**, Concentration of SARS-CoV-2
740 RNA assayed by RT-qPCR targeting the N1 gene is plotted on the y-axis. Healthy stool samples were spiked with
741 10^3 (▲) copies of ATCC synthetic SARS-CoV-2 RNA. **d**, C_q values from RT-qPCR assays of BCoV RNA targeting
742 the M gene are plotted on the y-axis. Healthy stool samples were spiked with 1:10 diluted (▲) BCoV vaccine.
743 Control samples with no spiked in RNA (none; ●) were included in duplicate to estimate LoB. 'U' stands for
744 undetermined and marks samples with no detectable RNA above LoB. Raw data provided in Supplementary
745 Information 1.
746




Not to scale

747
748 **Supplementary Fig. 5 Photographs of the OG and ZY collection and preservation kits** a. The OMNIgene-GUT
749 (OG) collection kit includes a special receptacle of defined volume for the collection of stool samples. This is
750 followed by a tube containing 2 ml of proprietary preservative buffer and a metal ball for homogenizing the sample.
751 b. Zymo DNA/RNA Shield (ZY) kit is a standard collection tube with the proprietary DNA/RNA shield buffer and
752 plenty of room in the tube above the buffer level for collection of stool.
753



754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764

Supplementary Fig. 6 Testing efficiency of three extraction kits using clinical samples stored in the ZY preservative. a. Stool samples were collected in the Zymo DNA/RNA shield buffer (ZY) preservative from five COVID-19 outpatients enrolled in a clinical trial of Peginterferon Lambda-1a. All samples were spiked with 10 μl of undiluted BCoV vaccine. In parallel, the same set of samples were also processed without any spike-in. RNA from these samples were extracted using the MagMAX Viral/Pathogen Kit (MM; green), QIAamp Viral RNA Mini Kit (QA; orange) or Zymo Quick-RNA Viral Kit (ZY; purple). **b.** RNA from samples with no spike in were assayed for SARS-CoV-2 RNA using ddPCR targeting the N1 gene. Anonymized sample identities are listed on the x-axis and absolute concentration is listed on the y-axis. ‘U’ stands for undetermined and marks samples with no detectable RNA above LoB. Raw data provided in Supplementary Information 1.



765
 766 **Supplementary Fig. 7 Recommended guidelines for the effective collection and preservation of stool samples**
 767 **for SARS-CoV-2 viral RNA extraction and detection in stool.** Illustrated here are recommended guidelines for
 768 the detection of SARS-CoV-2 RNA from fecal samples. **a.** Pre-extraction sample preparation. ZY preservation kit is
 769 used for the collection of fecal samples from patients. The successive steps are carried out in a biosafety cabinet
 770 (BSC). ZY kit with stool is vortexed for 15 seconds. 500 μ L of homogenized stool is transferred to an RNase free,
 771 sterile microcentrifuge tube, and spiked with 10 μ L of BCoV vaccine. Sample is then vortexed for 15 seconds to

772 ensure uniform mixing of the BCoV control. Spiked in stool aliquot is then centrifuged at 10,000 x g for 2 minutes
773 and 200 µl of the clarified supernatant is transferred to a fresh microcentrifuge tube for RNA extraction using the
774 QA kit as per manufacturer instructions. RNA is eluted in 60 µl of elution buffer. Viral RNA is quantified in this
775 eluate using ddPCR and/or RT-qPCR as follows. **b.** Absolute concentration of RNA is assayed using the one-step
776 RT-ddPCR advanced kit for probes as recommended¹⁹. Reaction constituents and thermocycling conditions
777 summarized here can be applied to detect the SARS-CoV-2 N1 gene and BCoV M gene. Every assay plate should
778 include three negative controls - water, elution buffer and viral RNA extracted from a healthy stool sample - to
779 determine the Limit of Blank (LoB). Further, every assay plate should include positive controls - QA extracted RNA
780 from BCoV and SARS-CoV-2 synthetic RNA from ATCC. The mean positive and negative amplitudes from these
781 controls are used to guide an appropriate threshold for analysis. The threshold is set between the mean positive and
782 negative amplitudes, such that the negative control does not record presence of viral RNA, while the positive
783 controls reflect the expected RNA concentration. Next, the mean difference between the mean negative amplitude
784 and the threshold amplitude in the negative control reactions is calculated. This difference is added to the mean
785 negative amplitude from every reaction in order to identify a normalized threshold for that specific reaction. **c.**
786 Relative concentration of RNA is assayed using the TaqPath 1-Step RT-qPCR Master Mix, CG as recommended in
787 the manufacturer protocol. Reaction constituents and thermocycling conditions summarized here can be applied to
788 detect the SARS-CoV-2 N1 gene and BCoV M gene. Every 384-well assay plate should include control reactions in
789 quadruplicate. This includes three negative controls - water, elution buffer and viral RNA extracted from a healthy
790 stool sample - to determine the Limit of Blank (LoB). Further, every assay plate should include positive controls -
791 QA extracted RNA from the BCoV vaccine, and a six-point ten-fold dilution series of SARS-CoV-2 synthetic RNA
792 from ATCC starting at 10⁴ copies/µl. Using the control reactions as a reference, inspect the amplification curves of
793 the samples to ensure they are bonafide read-outs and establish a threshold. Disregard C_q values outside the standard
794 curve as “undetermined” since they cannot be used to accurately calculate the viral load. Using a linear regression of
795 the synthetic RNA standards, calculate the relative concentration of viral RNA extracted from the stool sample.
796 Across both ddPCR and RT-qPCR assays, disregard viral loads less than or equivalent to the LoB and back calculate
797 the viral RNA load in the starting samples.
798

799

800 **Tables**

801 **Table 1. Sequences of oligonucleotides used as primers and probes in this study.**

Sample ID	Wet weight	Dry weight	Percent stool (%)	Wet weight	Dry weight	Percent stool
Lambda_248	0.119	0.036	30.252	0.172	0.031	18.023
Lambda_327	0.145	0.043	29.655	0.117	0.011	9.402
Lambda_223	0.101	0.034	33.663	0.168	0.023	13.69
Lambda_264	0.096	0.031	32.292	0.117	0.018	15.385
Lambda_292	0.157	0.049	31.21	0.111	0.013	11.712
Average			31.414			13.642
Std deviation			1.606			3.314

802

803 **Table 2. Measurement of wet weight and dry weight from 5 paired stool samples collected**
 804 **from COVID-19 patients in OG and ZY.**

805

Sample ID	ZY			OG		
	Wet weight	Dry weight	Percent stool biomass (%)	Wet weight	Dry weight	Percent stool biomass (%)
Lambda_248	0.119	0.036	30.252	0.172	0.031	18.023
Lambda_327	0.145	0.043	29.655	0.117	0.011	9.402
Lambda_223	0.101	0.034	33.663	0.168	0.023	13.690
Lambda_264	0.096	0.031	32.292	0.117	0.018	15.385
Lambda_292	0.157	0.049	31.210	0.111	0.013	11.712
Average			31.414			13.642
Std deviation			1.606			3.314

806

807 **Supplementary Tables** (available as attached files)

808 **Supplementary Table 1. Statistical measures from the linear regression of the detection of**
809 **SARS-CoV-2 viral RNA and BCoV RNA.**
810

811 **Supplementary Table 2. Paired t-tests to evaluate the significance of the differential**
812 **performance of preservatives and extraction kits used with NIST stool samples.**
813

814 **Supplementary Table 3. Paired t-tests to evaluate the significance of the differential**
815 **performance of preservatives and extraction kits used with non-standardized healthy stool**
816 **samples.**
817

818 **Supplementary Table 4. Paired t-tests to evaluate the significance of the differential**
819 **performance of extraction kits used with clinical samples stored in ZY preservative.**
820

821

822

823

824 **References**

- 825 1. Coronaviridae Study Group of the International Committee on Taxonomy of Viruses. The
826 species Severe acute respiratory syndrome-related coronavirus: classifying 2019-nCoV and
827 naming it SARS-CoV-2. *Nat Microbiol* **5**, 536–544 (2020).
- 828 2. Zhu, N. *et al.* A Novel Coronavirus from Patients with Pneumonia in China, 2019. *N. Engl.*
829 *J. Med.* **382**, 727–733 (2020).
- 830 3. Brooks, E. & Bhatt, A. S. The Gut Microbiome: A Missing Link in Understanding the
831 Gastrointestinal manifestations of COVID-19? *Cold Spring Harb Mol Case Stud* (2021)
832 doi:10.1101/mcs.a006031.
- 833 4. CDC. Symptoms of Coronavirus. [https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/symptoms-](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/symptoms-testing/symptoms.html)
834 [testing/symptoms.html](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/symptoms-testing/symptoms.html) (2021).
- 835 5. Xiao, F. *et al.* Infectious SARS-CoV-2 in Feces of Patient with Severe COVID-19. *Emerg.*
836 *Infect. Dis.* **26**, 1920–1922 (2020).
- 837 6. Zhang, Y. *et al.* Isolation of 2019-nCoV from a Stool Specimen of a Laboratory-Confirmed
838 Case of the Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19). *China CDC Weekly* **2**, 123–124 (2020).
- 839 7. Gaebler, C. *et al.* Evolution of antibody immunity to SARS-CoV-2. *Nature* 1–6 (2021).
- 840 8. Giacobbo, A., Rodrigues, M. A. S., Zoppas Ferreira, J., Bernardes, A. M. & de Pinho, M. N.
841 A critical review on SARS-CoV-2 infectivity in water and wastewater. What do we know?
842 *Sci. Total Environ.* **774**, 145721 (2021).
- 843 9. Schrader, C., Schielke, A., Ellerbroek, L. & Johne, R. PCR inhibitors – occurrence,
844 properties and removal. *J. Appl. Microbiol.* **113**, 1014–1026 (2012).
- 845 10. Wölfel, R. *et al.* Virological assessment of hospitalized patients with COVID-2019. *Nature*
846 **581**, 465–469 (2020).

- 847 11. Coryell, M. P. *et al.* Validation and testing of a method for detection of SARS-CoV-2 RNA
848 in healthy human stool. *bioRxiv* (2020) doi:10.1101/2020.11.09.20228601.
- 849 12. Mesoraca, A. *et al.* Evaluation of SARS-CoV-2 viral RNA in fecal samples. *Viol. J.* **17**, 86
850 (2020).
- 851 13. Wang, W. *et al.* Detection of SARS-CoV-2 in Different Types of Clinical Specimens. *JAMA*
852 **323**, 1843–1844 (2020).
- 853 14. Cheung, K. S. *et al.* Gastrointestinal Manifestations of SARS-CoV-2 Infection and Virus
854 Load in Fecal Samples From a Hong Kong Cohort: Systematic Review and Meta-analysis.
855 *Gastroenterology* **159**, 81–95 (2020).
- 856 15. Xiao, F. *et al.* Evidence for Gastrointestinal Infection of SARS-CoV-2. *Gastroenterology*
857 **158**, 1831–1833.e3 (2020).
- 858 16. Human Whole Stool (RGM 10162). *NIST Products and Services*
859 [https://www.nist.gov/mml/csd/organic-chemical-metrology/primary-focus-areas/chemical-](https://www.nist.gov/mml/csd/organic-chemical-metrology/primary-focus-areas/chemical-metrology-biosciences/products-and)
860 [metrology-biosciences/products-and](https://www.nist.gov/mml/csd/organic-chemical-metrology/primary-focus-areas/chemical-metrology-biosciences/products-and).
- 861 17. Jagannathan P, Andrews J, Bonilla H, Hedlin H, Jacobson K, Balasubramanian V, Purington
862 N, Kamble S, dr Vries C, Quintero O, Feng K, Ley C, Winslow D, Newberry J, Edwards K,
863 Hislop C, Choong I, Maldonado Y, Glenn J, Bhatt A, Blish C, Wang T, Khosla C, Pinsky B,
864 Desai M, Parsonnet J, Singh U. Peginterferon Lambda-1a for treatment of outpatients with
865 uncomplicated COVID-19: a randomized placebo-controlled trial. *Nat. Commun.*
- 866 18. Bustin, S. A. *et al.* The MIQE guidelines: minimum information for publication of
867 quantitative real-time PCR experiments. *Clin. Chem.* **55**, 611–622 (2009).
- 868 19. *Droplet Digital PCR Applications Guide*. [https://www.bio-](https://www.biorad.com/webroot/web/pdf/lsr/literature/Bulletin_6407.pdf)
869 [rad.com/webroot/web/pdf/lsr/literature/Bulletin_6407.pdf](https://www.biorad.com/webroot/web/pdf/lsr/literature/Bulletin_6407.pdf).

- 870 20. Loeb, S. One-Step RT-ddPCR for Detection of SARS-CoV-2, Bovine Coronavirus, and
871 PMMoV RNA in RNA Derived from Wastewater or Primary Settled Solids. (2020).
- 872 21. Lu, X. *et al.* US CDC Real-Time Reverse Transcription PCR Panel for Detection of Severe
873 Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2. *Emerg. Infect. Dis.* **26**, (2020).
- 874 22. Corman, V. M. *et al.* Detection of 2019 novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV) by real-time RT-
875 PCR. *Euro Surveill.* **25**, (2020).
- 876 23. Jue, E. & Ismagilov, R. F. Commercial stocks of SARS-CoV-2 RNA may report low
877 concentration values, leading to artificially increased apparent sensitivity of diagnostic
878 assays. *medRxiv* 2020.04.28.20077602 (2020).
- 879 24. Cleveland, M. & Vallone, P. *SARS-CoV-2 Synthetic RNA Fragments (RGTM10169)*.
880 <https://github.com/usnistgov/RGTM10169>.
- 881 25. Kuypers, J. & Jerome, K. R. Applications of Digital PCR for Clinical Microbiology. *J. Clin.*
882 *Microbiol.* **55**, 1621–1628 (2017).
- 883 26. Lim, M. Y. *et al.* Changes in microbiome and metabolomic profiles of fecal samples stored
884 with stabilizing solution at room temperature: a pilot study. *Sci. Rep.* **10**, 1789 (2020).
- 885 27. Vogels, C. B. F. *et al.* Analytical sensitivity and efficiency comparisons of SARS-CoV-2
886 RT-qPCR primer-probe sets. *Nat Microbiol* **5**, 1299–1305 (2020).
- 887 28. Yuan, C. *et al.* SARS-CoV-2 viral shedding characteristics and potential evidence for the
888 priority for faecal specimen testing in diagnosis. *PLoS One* **16**, e0247367 (2021).
- 889 29. Chen, Y. *et al.* The presence of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in the feces of COVID-19 patients. *J.*
890 *Med. Virol.* **92**, 833–840 (2020).
- 891 30. Chen, C. *et al.* SARS-CoV-2-Positive Sputum and Feces After Conversion of Pharyngeal
892 Samples in Patients With COVID-19. *Ann. Intern. Med.* **172**, 832–834 (2020).

- 893 31. Fumian, T. M. *et al.* SARS-CoV-2 RNA detection in stool samples from acute
894 gastroenteritis cases, Brazil. *J. Med. Virol.* **93**, 2543–2547 (2021).
- 895 32. Britton, G. J. *et al.* SARS-CoV-2-specific IgA and limited inflammatory cytokines are
896 present in the stool of select patients with acute COVID-19. *medRxiv* (2020)
897 doi:10.1101/2020.09.03.20183947.
- 898 33. Zuo, T. *et al.* Depicting SARS-CoV-2 faecal viral activity in association with gut microbiota
899 composition in patients with COVID-19. *Gut* **70**, 276–284 (2021).
- 900 34. Yin, S. *et al.* The implications of preliminary screening and diagnosis: Clinical
901 characteristics of 33 mild patients with SARS-CoV-2 infection in Hunan, China. *J. Clin.*
902 *Virol.* **128**, 104397 (2020).
- 903 35. COVID-19 Investigation Team. Clinical and virologic characteristics of the first 12 patients
904 with coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) in the United States. *Nat. Med.* **26**, 861–868
905 (2020).
- 906 36. Li, Y. *et al.* Positive result of Sars-Cov-2 in faeces and sputum from discharged patients
907 with COVID-19 in Yiwu, China. *J. Med. Virol.* **92**, 1938–1947 (2020).
- 908 37. Armbruster, D. A. & Pry, T. Limit of blank, limit of detection and limit of quantitation. *Clin.*
909 *Biochem. Rev.* **29 Suppl 1**, S49–52 (2008).

910