medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.02.21258097; this version posted June 4, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Rapid and Sensitive Detection of SARS-CoV-2 Infection Using Quantitative Peptide Enrichment LC-MS/MS Analysis

Running title:

Quantitative Peptide Affinity LC-MS/MS Analysis of SARS-CoV-2

Authors

Andreas Hober[1,2], Tran-Minh Khue Hua[1,2], Dominic Foley[3], Thomas McDonald[3], Johannes P.C. Vissers[3], Rebecca Pattison[3], Samantha Ferries[3], Sigurd Hermansson[3], Ingvar Betner[3], Mathias Uhlen[1,2], Morteza Razavi[4], Richard Yip[4], Matthew E. Pope[4], Terry W. Pearson[4], N. Leigh Anderson[4], Amy Bartlett[3], Lisa Calton[3], Jessica J. Alm[5], Lars Engstrand[5], Fredrik Edfors[1,2,*]

Affiliations

1. Science for Life Laboratory, Solna, Sweden
2. The Royal Institute of Technology, Division of Systems Biology, Department of Protein Science, School of Chemistry, Biotechnology and Health, Stockholm. Sweden
3. Waters Corporation, Wilmslow, UK; Milford, MA; Stockholm, Sweden
4. SISCAPA Assay Technologies, Inc., Washington DC; Victoria BC Canada
5. Karolinska Institutet, Department of Microbiology, Tumor and Cell Biology & National Pandemic Center, Karolinska Institutet, Solna, Sweden

*Corresponding author (fredrik.edfors@scilifelab.se)

Keywords

LC-MS, MRM, SARS-CoV-2, NCAP, RT-PCR, digest, peptide, SISCAPA, affinity

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.02.21258097; this version posted June 4, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Abstract

Reliable, robust, large-scale molecular testing for SARS-CoV-2 is essential for monitoring the ongoing Covid-19 pandemic. We have developed a scalable analytical approach to detect viral proteins based on peptide immunoaffinity enrichment combined with liquid chromatography - mass spectrometry (LC-MS). This is a multiplexed strategy, based on targeted proteomics analysis and read-out by LC-MS, capable of precisely quantifying and confirming the presence of SARS-CoV-2 in PBS swab media from combined throat/nasopharynx/saliva samples.

The results reveal that the levels of SARS-CoV-2 measured by LC-MS correlate well with their corresponding RT-PCR readout. The analytical workflow shows similar turnaround times as regular RT-PCR instrumentation with quantitative readout of viral proteins corresponding to cycle thresholds (Ct) equivalents ranging from 21 to 34. Using RT-PCR as a reference, we demonstrate that the LC-MS-based method has 100% estimated specificity and 83.3% estimated sensitivity when analyzing clinical samples collected from asymptomatic individuals. These results suggest that a scalable analytical method based on LC-MS has a place in future pandemic preparedness centers to complement current virus detection technologies.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.02.21258097; this version posted June 4, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Introduction

The severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) [1], leading to the coronavirus disease 2019 (Covid-19), has had a significant impact on human health globally, with more than 160 million confirmed cases [2], assessed May 30th, 2021. The effect of the pandemic is devastating and has led to lockdowns of urban areas across the globe as a response to contain any potential outbreaks [3]. To monitor the disease, huge investments have been directed towards infrastructure for large-scale testing for ongoing Covid-19 infection [4]. Population-wide screening or cohort testing in the vicinity of an outbreak epicenter is an essential pillar in the global fight against Covid-19 and an indispensable contribution to currently ongoing vaccination programs that pave the way for re-opening societies when entering the endemic phase. Thus, specific molecular diagnostic tools suitable for efficient disease monitoring will play a key role when countries slowly lift their bans on public gatherings, events, and global travel.

The diagnostic method called Real-Time - Polymerase Chain Reaction (RT-PCR) [5] is the most widely used technology for detecting SARS-CoV-2 and was established within days after the virus genome was released [6]. The method is considered as the gold standard by WHO for diagnosing patients with Covid-19 in routine clinical practice. Large-scale laboratories dedicated to PCR-based diagnosis rapidly mobilized worldwide in the early phase of the pandemic, which led to a sudden global shortage of diagnostic reagents [7]. The PCR tests generally have high analytical sensitivity and specificity, even for patient-collected samples, often in the range of 95-100% [8] when evaluated in clinical settings. The observed variance between tests can be partly explained by the inherent sensitivity of the PCR reaction itself or by pre-analytical biases [9]. The PCR method suffers from technical problems affecting the results [10] and includes the risk of contamination from amplicons, sample cross-contamination, degraded probes, non-specific amplification, cross-reactivity towards other viruses, all of which could lead to either false

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.02.21258097; this version posted June 4, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

positive (FP) and false-negative (FN) results. The viral genes can be amplified to detect the virus within days of infection, but the high sensitivity has been subjected to criticism since it can detect genetic material in circulation not only days after but also multiple weeks after the first day of symptom onset [11]. The current level of the clinical false-positive rate (FPR) associated with PCR tests is unknown but is dependent on what type of PCR kit and criteria have been used. Some studies report that it can be as much as 4% at certain test facilities [12]. This type of error has the potential to cause the most harm in a scenario entering post Covid-19 when large-volume screening is performed in communities with low prevalence [13]**.**

As a response, rapid tests have been deployed that either detect nucleic acids or viral antigens. These rapid tests show similar specificity to PCR-based assays [14], but several studies have shown that they lack sufficient sensitivity if compared to RT-PCR [10,15]. Antigen tests require affinity reagents, which is an initial bottleneck and a significant hurdle to overcome in the initial phase of a pandemic but can scale massively once they have been generated. However, the rapid tests are less sensitive and only provide a binary readout (positive/negative), which can be hard to interpret and the antigen is rarely specified [16]. Due to their rapid turnaround and affordability, these tests can thus be deployed in millions and aid in large-scale screening efforts and by repeated testing over time, accuracy can be greatly improved [17,18].

In contrast to traditional PCR-tests or antigen rapid tests, LC coupled to Multiple Reaction Monitoring (MRM) tandem MS detection offers a straightforward assay toward pre-defined targets. Turning to MS measurements to detect SARS-CoV-2 in samples directly addresses the issue of specificity and the risk of returning false-positive results as the measurement benefits from the fundamental properties of MS detection of peptides through multiple specific product ions [19] -= essentially absolute structural (sequence-based) specificity through direct physical detection of analyte molecules. The instrumentation provides reliable quantification for absolute

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.02.21258097; this version posted June 4, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

protein concentration determination and modern MS instrumentation offers unsurpassed specificity, high precision, excellent quantitative performance and high analytical sensitivity.

When combining these features with affinity reagents, such as antibodies, assays can reach very high sensitivities and low levels of a protein can be detected even in complex matrices. The combination of immuno-based strategies with mass spectrometry read-out can complement each other and provide target-specific protein quantification [20]. In fact, it is an ideal combination for rapid detection and reliable quantification of low abundance proteins. Stable isotope labeled (SIL) standards and capture by anti-peptide antibodies (SISCAPA) [21] enables multiplexed analysis of pre-digested clinical saliva samples using peptide-reactive antibodies, selective for SARS-CoV-2 peptides, immobilized onto magnetic beads. Spiked SIL peptide standards further improve precise protein measurements performed by MRM [22]. The use of LC-MS for protein quantification of SARS-CoV-2 peptides eliminates the dependence on PCR reactions and any issues related to unspecific amplification thanks to the selectivity achieved at three different levels: first by the antibody; secondly by the mass spectrometric read-out and; finally the internal standard. As a proof of concept, we analyzed clinical samples collected from asymptomatic individuals screened for ongoing disease by RT-PCR. Samples were taken from the upper respiratory tract (throat/nasopharynx/saliva) and a set of 48 PCR positive and 40 RT-PCR negative samples were detected and quantified using SISCAPA immuno-affinity peptide enrichment with LC-MS. The application of immuno-affinity peptide enrichment is typically associated with the detection of protein disease markers in body fluids, such as, plasma or dried blood spot samples. Here, the novel application of the technology is demonstrated to detect and quantify infection by analyzing the protein complement of viruses at relevant levels, which are proven difficult to reach without enrichment [23]. This study thereby presents a precise and complementary approach to RT-PCR to reliably detect SARS-CoV-2 in a research or clinical setting and a possible route forward to support population-wide screening.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.02.21258097; this version posted June 4, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Material and Methods

Sample collection

The study was performed in accordance with the declaration of Helsinki and the study protocol ("Jämförande studier av Covid-19 smitta och antikroppssvar i olika grupper i samhället") was approved by the Ethical Review Board of Linköping, Sweden (Regionala etikprövningsnämnden, Linköping, DNR - 2020-06395). A three-point collection (throat, nasal, saliva) was performed by participants using a self-sampling collection kit (Sansure Biotech, Changsha, China) containing phosphate buffered saline (1X PBS, 137 mM NaCl; 2.7 mM KCl; 4.3 mM Na2 HPO4; 1.47 mM KH2PO4). All tests were self-sampled by a three-point collection procedure (throat, nasopharynx, saliva). Clinical samples collected by swabs were dipped into the sample collection tube and transported to the laboratory within eight hours. All samples were heat inactivated to ensure that the core temperature of the vial reached at least 56°C for 30 min.

RT-PCR

Samples were analyzed using a RT-PCR test from Sansure Biotech (Changsha, China) according to FDA-EUA guidelines. The Novel Coronavirus (2019-nCoV) Nucleic Acid Diagnostic Kit was used for quantitative detection of the ORF-1ab and the N gene of novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV). Briefly, samples are lysed at room temperature for at least 10 minutes to allow for RNA release by chemical lysis using Sample Release Reagent (Sansure Biotech). The presence or absence of SARS-CoV-2 RNA was determined by RT-PCR combined with multiplexed fluorescent probing, which targets a SARS-CoV-2 specific region of ORF-1ab (FAM) and N gene (ROX) together with the human Rnase P internal control (Cy5). The RT-PCR analysis was performed using a CFX96 Real□Time PCR Detection System (Bio-Rad, Hercules, CA) programmed with the following RT-PCR protocol according to the manufacturer's instruction [50°C, 30 min; 95°C 1 min] followed by 45 cycles of [95°C 30 s, 60°C 30 s]. The RT-PCR results

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.02.21258097; this version posted June 4, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

were interpreted according to instructions. Positive [FAM/ROX Amplification, Ct <40]. Negative [FAM/ROX No amplification; Cy5 Amplification, Ct <40].

Immuno-Affinity Peptide Enrichment LC-MS

Materials

Recombinant nucleocapsid protein (NCAP) was from R&D systems, Minneapolis, MN, trypsin from Worthington, Lakewood, NJ, and anti-peptide antibodies from SISCAPA Assay Technologies, Washington DC. All other chemicals were from MilliporeSigma, St. Louis, MI, unless stated otherwise.

Calibrator preparation

NCAP digest, protocol described below, was used for calibration and quantitation of viral proteins. A serial dilution from 2.2 pmol/µL NCAP to 10,000, 2,000, 400, 80, 16, and 3 amol/µL was performed consecutively in pooled negative sample background.

Samples

Clinical samples subjected to two freeze-thaw cycles prior were anonymized and two control pools were established by pooling randomly chosen samples based on their RT-PCR result (Ct <30 [High Pool], 30≤Ct<33 [Low Pool]). A total of 180 µl from each sample was used per enrichment experiment.

Protein extraction and digestion

20 µL of Denaturant Mixture (1 % (w/v) RapiGest (Waters Corporation, Milford, MA) in 1 M tetraethylammonium bromide, 50 mM dithiothreitol) were aliquoted into the collection plate (Waters Corporation). Next, 180 µL of the diluted NCAP and samples were carefully transferred from the collection tubes into the same plate. The plate was incubated on a heater-shaker at

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.02.21258097; this version posted June 4, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

500 rpm at 56°C for 15 min followed by the addition of 50 µL trypsin solution (7.3 mg/mL trypsin in 10 mM HCl). After mixing at 500 rpm for 30 s. the samples were digested at 37°C for 30 min and thereafter quenched by addition of trypsin stopping agent (0.22 mg/mL of Tosyl-L-lysyl-chloromethane hydrochloride in 10 mM HCl) at a final concentration of 37 µg/mL The sample plate was mixed at 500 rpm for 30 s and incubated at room temperature for 5 min. The samples were spiked with 20 µL of SIL peptide mixture solution and mixed thoroughly on a shaker at 500 rpm for 30 s.

Peptide Enrichment

The antibody-coupled magnetic bead immune adsorbents corresponding to four SIL peptides (ADETQALPQR-$^{13}C_6{}^{15}N_4$, AYNVTQAFGR-$^{13}C_6{}^{15}N_4$, DGIIWVATEGALNTPK-$^{13}C_6{}^{15}N_2$, and NPANNAAIVLQLPQGTTLPK-$^{13}C_6{}^{15}N_2$) were resuspended fully by vortex mixing. The suspension of each anti-peptide antibody tube was mixed together in 1:1 ratio and 40 µL of the mixture was added to each digest. The plate was mixed at 1400 rpm to ensure that beads were resuspended and thereafter incubated for one hour at 800 rpm at room temperature. After one hour incubation, the plate was placed on a magnet array (SISCAPA Assay Technologies). As soon as the beads had settled on the sides of each well (typically one min), the supernatant was removed. 150 µL of wash buffer (0.03% CHAPS, 1xPBS) was added to each sample and the beads were fully resuspending at 1400 rpm for 30 s and 450 rpm for another 30 s. The plate was placed on the magnet array again and the supernatant was removed. This step was repeated three times. The beads were subsequently resuspended in 50 µL elution buffer (0.5 % formic acid, 0.03% CHAPS, 1X PBS) and incubated for 5 min at room temperature. The beads were discarded by transferring the eluent to a QuanRecovery plate (Waters Corporation) for LC-MS analysis.

LC-MS Detection and Quantification

Chromatography was performed on an ACQUITY UPLC I-Class FTN system, with Binary Solvent Manager and column heater (Waters Corporation). 20 µL of the enriched sample was

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.02.21258097; this version posted June 4, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

injected onto a ACQUITY Premier Peptide BEH C18, 2.1 mm x 50 mm, 1.7 µm, 300 Å column (Waters Corporation) and separated using a gradient elution of mobile phase A containing laboratory LC-MS grade de-ionised water with 0.1% (v/v) formic acid, and mobile phase B containing LC-MS grade acetonitrile with 0.1% (v/v) formic acid. The gradient elution was performed at 0.6 mL/min with initial inlet conditions at 5% B, increasing to 28% B over 4.5 min, followed by a column wash at 90% B for 0.6 min and a return to initial conditions at 5% B. The total run time was 5.7 min, with a 6.5 min injection-to-injection cycle time.

A Xevo TQ-XS tandem MS (Waters Corporation, Wilmslow, UK) operating in positive electrospray ionization (ESI+) was used for the detection and quantification of the peptides. The instrument conditions were as follows: capillary voltage 0.5 kV, source temperature 150°C, desolvation temperature 600°C, cone gas flow 150 L/h, and desolvation gas flow 1000 L/h. The MS was calibrated at unit mass resolution for MS1 and MS2. Light and heavy labelled peptides were detected using MRM mode of acquisition with experimental details overviewed in **Table 1**. A graphical overview of the experimental workflow is shown in **Fig. 1**.

TargetLynx XS (Waters Corporation) was used to process the raw LC-MS data, *i.e.*, signal processing (mean smoothing and background subtraction), peak detection (area and height) and quantification of the MRM chromatograms, including the calculation of the quantifier ion to qualifier ion ratio. The quantified data were exported as tables (**Supplementary Table 1**) and additional analysis and visualization carried out using Python 3.

Table 1. MRM transitions and MS method details target NCAP SARS-CoV-2 peptides.

peptide	MRM	MRM transition type	cone voltage (V)	collision energy (V)	retention time (min)	scan window (min)
ADETQALPQR	564.8 > 400.2	Quantifier	35	19	1.09	0.6 – 1.4
	564.8 > 584.4	Qualifier	35	20		
	564.8 > 712.4	Qualifier	35	24		
	569.8 > 410.2	SIL	35	19		
AYNVTQAFGR	563.8 > 679.4	Quantifier	35	19	2.49	2.0 – 3.0
	563.8 > 578.3	Qualifier	35	18		
	563.8 > 892.5	Qualifier	35	19		
	568.8 > 689.4	SIL	35	19		
DGIIWVATEGALNTPK	562.3 > 643.4	Quantifier	35	14	4.12	3.6 – 4.8
	562.3 > 572.3	Qualifier	35	18		
	562.3 > 700.4	Qualifier	35	14		
	565.2 > 708.4	SIL	35	14		
NPANNAAIVLQLPQGTTLPK	687.4 > 841.5	Quantifier	35	18	3.92	3.6 – 4.2
	687.4 > 766.4	Qualifier	35	23		
	687.4 > 865.5	Qualifier	35	23		
	690.4 > 849.5	SIL	35	18		

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.02.21258097; this version posted June 4, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.02.21258097; this version posted June 4, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .



Figure 1. Experimental workflow for immuno-affinity peptide (SISCAPA) enrichment LC-MS of NCAP SARS-CoV-2 peptides. Swab sample extracts were subjected to tryptic digestion, SIL standards added to the tryptic digest solution, and magnetic beads coupled with specific anti-peptide antibodies incubated to allow binding of the peptides. Unbound peptides are removed and the target peptides eluted and measured using MRM analysis with LC-MS.

RESULTS

The application of LC-MS to detect tryptic digest peptides of SARS-CoV-2 proteins has been successfully demonstrated [23-30]. However, these studies also highlight that the technique can be hampered by matrix effects, *i.e.,* analysis interferences arising from the constituent components of swab (preservation) media or other matrices, as well as base sensitivity, to be able to reach clinically relevant detection levels, suggesting the need for clean-up, *e.g.*, solid

phase-based extraction, and/or affinity enrichment [23,31]. Moreover, commonality can be observed within the results of these studies in terms of which tryptic digest peptides are typically

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.02.21258097; this version posted June 4, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

detected by means of LC-MS. NCAP is the most abundant viral SARS-CoV-2 protein with an estimated ~ 300 – 1,000 copies per virion particle [32,33], making it, because of the relatively high number of NCAP copies per virion, an attractive target for LC-MS based detection compared to other viral proteins. A number of NCAP candidate peptides was therefore evaluated in terms of and LC-MS behavior, *i.e.*, sensitivity and linear dynamic range, and peptide immunoassay suitability [34]. The LC-MS MRM response of a number of candidate NCAP SIL peptides is shown in **Supplementary Fig. 1**, ranking the peptides in descending order of MRM sensitivity. From this set of peptides, primarily based on both MRM response and peptide immunoassay suitability, peptide AYNVTQAFGR was found to be one of the best surrogate peptide candidates, but, equally importantly, it is not significantly affected to date by known SARS-CoV-2 virus mutations (https://www.gisaid.org/). Other evaluated peptides, but not discussed in detail, included ADETQALPQR, DGIIWVATEGALNTPK and NPANNAAIVLQLPQGTTLPK, of which the basic quantitative characterization results are summarized in **Supplementary Fig. 2 to 4**, respectively.

Method Characterization

The LC-MS MRM data were processed using TargetLynx XS and with a cut-off threshold algorithm based on peptide peak height and area thresholds, as well as quantifier to qualifier ion ratio threshold (30%). In other words, using two different consistently measured peptide fragment ions, *i.e.* MRM transitions, to confirm the presence of SARS-CoV-2 proteins. Typical detection examples for the quantifier, qualifier and SIL MRM transitions are shown in the (A) panel of **Fig. 2**. An internal standard SIL corrected LC-MS calibration curve for NCAP peptide AYNVTQAFGR detected in a spiked nasopharyngeal swab matrix solution is shown in the (B) panel of **Fig. 2**, covering a linear dynamic range from 3 to 50,000 amol/µL, providing > 4 orders of linear dynamic range, meanwhile affording an LLOQ amount of 3 amol/µL of AYNVTQAFGR

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.02.21258097; this version posted June 4, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

peptide (with precision ≤20%, bias ±20% and S/N >10:1 (peak-to-peak)), which equates to an on-column amount of 60 amol. Shown as well are example quantifier and qualifier MRM chromatograms of positive (**Fig. 2C**) and negative (**Fig. 2D**) SARS-CoV-2 PBS swab samples. The selectivity of the method is highlighted by the complete absence of signal in the MRM chromatogram of the negative SARS-CoV-2 sample (**Fig. 2D**).

The precision of the method was evaluated at 3, 10, 400 and 25,000 amol/µL for NCAP AYNVTQAFGR peptide and NCAP protein spiked into PBS and viral transport medium (VTM, Liofilchem, Italy). Samples were analyzed in replicates of, 5-over-5 separate occasions. The inter- and intra-day precision values of the method, as summarized in **Table 2**, were shown to be ≤18.9 %CV.



medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.02.21258097; this version posted June 4, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Figure 2. MRM chromatograms quantifier, qualifier, and SIL peptide AYNVTQAFGR **(A)**, calibration curve peptide AYNVTQAFGR **(B)**, and example intensity-scaled chromatograms of positive (mean Ct 31) **(C)** and negative (blank) **(D)** SARS-CoV-2 swab samples, respectively.

QC samples were shown to be stable on the autosampler at 10°C over 48 hours following re-analysis and comparison to a stored calibration line.

Table 2. Intra- and inter=day method precision (n = 5) when monitoring SARS-CoV-2 NCAP peptide AYNVTQAFGR using immuno-affinity peptide enrichment LC-MS (MRM).

	precision (% CV)							
	intra (concentration [amol/µL])				inter (concentration [amol/µL])			
	3	10	400	25,000	3	10	400	25,000
peptide-spiked PBS	12.0	11.1	5.8	5.2	-	-	-	-
NCAP-spiked PBS	18.9	3.9	4.8	6.4	-	-	-	-
peptide-spiked VTM	12.5	6.8	2.4	3.0	15.5	10.2	6.8	4.7
NCAP-spiked VTM	13.2	10.2	2.4	2.9	11.6	17.6	18.5	11.1

- not tested

Sample Analysis

The samples analyzed by LC-MS and RT-PCR where compared. The High and Low Pools were analyzed in triplicate with a precision of 3.0% CV and 12.2% CV, respectively. Example quantifier and qualifier LC-MS MRM chromatograms of peptide AYNVTQAFGR are shown in the two bottom panes of **Fig. 2**, respectively. The results shown in **Fig. 3A** suggests good (inverse) correlation between the LC-MS ($\log_2$ transformed quantifier response, *i.e*, SIL corrected quantifier peak area) and the RT-PCR (Ct) data, which has also been noted in other so-called 'non-enriched' studies [23]. For visualization purposes only, missing values were imputed. For the LC-MS results, the lowest response divided by three was used, mimicking a

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.02.21258097; this version posted June 4, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

noise level using a 3:1 signal-to-noise ratio for differentiation of signal from noise. Missing RT-PCR values were replaced with the lowest reported Ct values associated with negative diagnosis plus 1, assuming an additional required RT-PCR cycle. The results shown in **Fig. 3B** represent the LC-MS data in an alternative, quartile distribution-based format, suggesting that differentiation between sample types is feasible and that the detected abundances are significantly different (p = 0.00018; Mann-Whitney U test).



Figure 3. LC-MS (log_2 quantifier response) vs. RT-PCR (Ct) read-out correlation **(A)** and quartiles distribution of the LC-MS results **(B)**. Color labeling is based on RT-PCR diagnoses (green = negative SARS-Cov-2; blue = positive SARS-CoV-2); grey = not detected or inconclusively identified by LC-MS.

Following CLSI EP 12-A2 User Protocol for Evaluation of Qualitative Test Performance guidance, a summary of the sample analysis results are shown in a 2x2 contingency table format in **Fig. 4**, using the RT-PCR results as a reference, estimated sensitivity and specificity values for LC-MS are 83.3% and 100%, respectively. The 95% score confidence interval limits for sensitivity calculations, were 70.4% to 91.3% and for specificity were 91.2% to 100%. Accordingly, the agreement between RT-PCR and LC-MS was strong (kappa value of 0.82 (95% CI 0.70 – 0.94). When analyzing samples above the estimated LLOQ (3 amol/µL which approximates to Ct ≤30) the estimated sensitivity is improved to 94.7% with the corresponding

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.02.21258097; this version posted June 4, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

95% score confidence interval limits for sensitivity 82.7% to 98.5%. Further work will look at adding a secondary confirmatory peptide to the cut-off algorithm. However, RT-PCR does not distinguish between infectious virus and non-infectious nucleic acids [35], whereas LC-MS will only detect one or multiple peptides from the protein complement of the virus. This has implications on the interpretation of RT-PCR Ct levels itself in terms of infectious *vs.* non-infectious classification of patient samples but also for determining the true sensitivity and specificity of complementary and/or alternative methods. Peptide levels have not been evaluated in the context of infectiousness yet, but other conditions, such as sample storage prior to LC-MRM/MS can also give rise to analytical variance due to the inherited difference in stability between RNA and proteins. Additionally, Ct values are not universally applicable as they differ between manufacturers and methods [35,36], which enforces the need of methods that are capable of determining viral load more accurately. On the other hand, based on the results shown in **Fig. 3**, it can also be claimed that, in this study, patient samples were collected at infectious stage, since the RT-PCR results correlate well with LC-MS, which is believed to read and quantify the (infectious and replicating) virus protein complement [37].



Figure 4. Output class (LC-MS) vs. target class (RT-PCR) contingency matrix, used to calculate the estimated sensitivity and specificity of the SARS-CoV-2 immuno-affinity peptide enrichment LC-MS

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.02.21258097; this version posted June 4, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

method The LC-MRM/MS performance is based on RT-PCR results obtained from 48 positive and 40 negative samples.

CONCLUSION

Any diagnostic test result should be interpreted in the context of the probability of disease, but also include proper internal controls to ensure a high level of clinical specificity when used as a tool for large-scale screening. The unsurpassed specificity of mass spectrometers combined with antibodies is an attractive route forward for a future molecular pandemic surveillance system. The SISCAPA peptide enrichment method ensures high sensitivity and low risk of reporting false positives due to a-specific binding [37], whereas LC-MS MRM acquisition affords high detection specificity. This is achieved by multiple factors that greatly outperforms RT-PCR and rapid antigen test in theory. First, antibodies are used to selectively enrich for the target peptide in a complex mixture. This helps increase the overall analytical sensitivity while LC-MS readily can distinguish between peptides in the separation and MRM steps. Secondly, internal standards added to the sample enable accurate and robust quantification. This provides an internal standard reference trace for every analyte and can help distinguish between false positive chromatographic peaks based on retention time and ion ratios, that in RT-PCR experiment would be reported as a positive due to the absence of internal standards and since each gene is detected by a single reporter dye.

The sensitivity can be further improved by increasing the sample load if needed. Additionally, the number of viral protein targets can also be scaled by introducing additional anti-peptide antibodies into the sample mixture. This would allow for an LC-MS based viral protein panel analysis method where relevant peptides, also including relevant spike-peptides for mutation surveillance, are monitored in an endemic scenario, either covering new emerging SARS-CoV-2 strains or other viruses, such as influenza or respiratory syncytial viruses.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.02.21258097; this version posted June 4, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

We show that the SISCAPA technology is an attractive route forward for future molecular pandemic surveillance systems. The accuracy of the LC-MS-based method would tolerate low levels of positive samples without compromising the positive predictive value of large-scale screening efforts, and thereby providing a next-generation platform for disease surveillance and an attractive alternative to today's RT-PCR based technologies.

Data and materials availability

The proteomics data have been deposited to Panorama Public [38] (https://panoramaweb.org/sars-cov-2_siscapa.url; login: panoramareviewer@gmail.com, pwd: scilifelab), allowing for access to raw files and integrated peak areas from as well as visualization of LC-MRM/MS chromatograms.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare the following competing financial interest(s): D.F, T.M, J.V, R.P, S.F, I.B, S.H, A.B, L.C are employed by Waters Corporation. M.R, R.Y, M.E.P, T.W.P and N.L.A are employed by SISCAPA Assay Technologies.

References

1. Wu F, Zhao S, Bin Yu, Chen Y-M, Wang W, Song Z-G, et al. A new coronavirus associated with human respiratory disease in China. Nature. Nature Publishing Group; 2020;579: 265–269. doi:10.1038/s41586-020-2008-3

2. Dong E, Du H, Gardner L. An interactive web-based dashboard to track COVID-19 in real time. The Lancet Infectious Diseases. Elsevier; 2020;20: 533–534. doi:10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30120-1

3. Hale T, Angrist N, Goldszmidt R, Kira B, Petherick A, Phillips T, et al. A global panel database of pandemic policies (Oxford COVID-19 Government Response Tracker). Nat Hum Behav. Nature Publishing Group; 2021;5: 529–538. doi:10.1038/s41562-021-01079-8

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.02.21258097; this version posted June 4, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

4. Baker MG, Wilson N, Anglemyer A. Covid-19 Notes: Successful Elimination of Covid-19 Transmission in New Zealand. The New England Journal of Medicine. NEJM Group; 2020. doi:10.1056/NEJMc2025203

5. Freeman WM, Walker SJ, Vrana KE. Quantitative RT-PCR: pitfalls and potential. BioTechniques. 1999;26: 112–22– 124–5. doi:10.2144/99261rv01

6. Corman VM, Landt O, Kaiser M, Molenkamp R, Meijer A, Chu DK, et al. Detection of 2019 novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV) by real-time RT-PCR. Euro Surveill. 2020;25. doi:10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2020.25.3.2000045

7. Woolston C. “Does anyone have any of these?”: Lab-supply shortages strike amid global pandemic. Nature. 2021. doi:10.1038/d41586-021-00613-y

8. Altamirano J, Govindarajan P, Blomkalns AL, Kushner LE, Stevens BA, Pinsky BA, et al. Assessment of Sensitivity and Specificity of Patient-Collected Lower Nasal Specimens for Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 Testing. JAMA Netw Open. American Medical Association; 2020;3: e2012005–e2012005. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2020.12005

9. Lippi G, Simundic A-M, Plebani M. Potential preanalytical and analytical vulnerabilities in the laboratory diagnosis of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19). Clin Chem Lab Med. 2020;58: 1070–1076. doi:10.1515/cclm-2020-0285

10. Perchetti GA, Huang M-L, Mills MG, Jerome KR, Greninger AL. Analytical Sensitivity of the Abbott BinaxNOW COVID-19 Ag Card. Journal of Clinical Microbiology. American Society for Microbiology Journals; 2021;59. doi:10.1128/JCM.02880-20

11. Lan L, Xu D, Ye G, Xia C, Wang S, Li Y, et al. Positive RT-PCR Test Results in Patients Recovered From COVID-19. JAMA. American Medical Association; 2020;323: 1502–1503. doi:10.1001/jama.2020.2783

12. Surkova E, Nikolayevskyy V, Drobniewski F. False-positive COVID-19 results: hidden problems and costs. The Lancet Respiratory Medicine. Elsevier; 2020;8: 1167–1168. doi:10.1016/S2213-2600(20)30453-7

13. Healy B, Khan A, Metezai H, Blyth I, Asad H. The impact of false positive COVID-19 results in an area of low prevalence. Clin Med (Lond). Royal College of Physicians; 2021;21: e54–e56. doi:10.7861/clinmed.2020-0839

14. Weissleder R, Lee H, Ko J, Pittet MJ. COVID-19 diagnostics in context. Sci Transl Med. American Association for the Advancement of Science; 2020;12. doi:10.1126/scitranslmed.abc1931

15. Fitzpatrick MC, Pandey A, Wells CR, Sah P, Galvani AP. Buyer beware: inflated claims of sensitivity for rapid COVID-19 tests. Lancet. Elsevier; 2021;397: 24–25. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(20)32635-0

16. Sethuraman N, Jeremiah SS, Ryo A. Interpreting Diagnostic Tests for SARS-CoV-2. JAMA. American Medical Association; 2020;323: 2249–2251. doi:10.1001/jama.2020.8259

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.02.21258097; this version posted June 4, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

17. Mina MJ, Parker R, Larremore DB. Rethinking Covid-19 Test Sensitivity — A Strategy for Containment. N Engl J Med. Massachusetts Medical Society; 2020. doi:10.1056/NEJMp2025631

18. Ramdas K, Darzi A, Jain S. “Test, re-test, re-test”: using inaccurate tests to greatly increase the accuracy of COVID-19 testing. Nat Med. Nature Publishing Group; 2020;26: 810–811. doi:10.1038/s41591-020-0891-7

19. Gillette MA, Carr SA. Quantitative analysis of peptides and proteins in biomedicine by targeted mass spectrometry. Nature Methods. Nature Research; 2013;10: 28–34. doi:10.1038/nmeth.2309

20. Whiteaker JR, Paulovich AG. Peptide immunoaffinity enrichment coupled with mass spectrometry for peptide and protein quantification. Clin Lab Med. 2011;31: 385–396. doi:10.1016/j.cll.2011.07.004

21. N Leigh Anderson, Norman G Anderson, Lee R Haines, Darryl B Hardie, Robert W Olafson A, Pearson TW. Mass Spectrometric Quantitation of Peptides and Proteins Using Stable Isotope Standards and Capture by Anti-Peptide Antibodies (SISCAPA). American Chemical Society; 2004. doi:10.1021/pr034086h

22. Brun V, Masselon C, Garin J, Dupuis A. Isotope dilution strategies for absolute quantitative proteomics. Journal of Proteomics. 2009;72: 740–749. doi:10.1016/j.jprot.2009.03.007

23. Van Puyvelde B, Van Uytfanghe K, Tytgat O, Van Oudenhove L, Gabriels R, Bouwmeester R, et al. Cov-MS: A Community-Based Template Assay for Mass-Spectrometry-Based Protein Detection in SARS-CoV-2 Patients. JACS Au. American Chemical Society; 2021. doi:10.1021/jacsau.1c00048

24. Freire-Paspuel B, Garcia-Bereguiain MA. Clinical Performance and Analytical Sensitivity of Three SARS-CoV-2 Nucleic Acid Diagnostic Tests. The American Journal of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene. The American Society of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene; 2021;104: 1516. doi:10.4269/ajtmh.20-1484

25. Gouveia D, Grenga L, Gaillard JC, Gallais F, Bellanger L, Pible O, et al. Shortlisting SARS-CoV-2 Peptides for Targeted Studies from Experimental Data-Dependent Acquisition Tandem Mass Spectrometry Data. Proteomics. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd; 2020;20: 2000107. doi:10.1002/pmic.202000107

26. Ihling C, Tänzler D, Hagemann S, Kehlen A, Hüttelmaier S, Arlt C, et al. Mass Spectrometric Identification of SARS-CoV-2 Proteins from Gargle Solution Samples of COVID-19 Patients. J Proteome Res. American Chemical Society; 2020. doi:10.1021/acs.jproteome.0c00280

27. Cardozo KHM, Lebkuchen A, Okai GG, Schuch RA, Viana LG, Olive AN, et al. Establishing a mass spectrometry-based system for rapid detection of SARS-CoV-2 in large clinical sample cohorts. Nat Commun. Nature Publishing Group; 2020;11: 1–13. doi:10.1038/s41467-020-19925-0

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.02.21258097; this version posted June 4, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

28. Saadi J, Oueslati S, Bellanger L, Gallais F, Dortet L, Roque-Afonso A-M, et al. Quantitative Assessment of SARS-CoV-2 Virus in Nasopharyngeal Swabs Stored in Transport Medium by a Straightforward LC-MS/MS Assay Targeting Nucleocapsid, Membrane, and Spike Proteins. J Proteome Res. American Chemical Society; 2021. doi:10.1021/acs.jproteome.0c00887

29. Cazares LH, Chaerkady R, Weng SHS, Boo CC, Cimbro R, Hsu H-E, et al. Development of a Parallel Reaction Monitoring Mass Spectrometry Assay for the Detection of SARS-CoV-2 Spike Glycoprotein and Nucleoprotein. Anal Chem. American Chemical Society; 2020. doi:10.1021/acs.analchem.0c02288

30. Gouveia D, Miotello G, Gallais F, Gaillard JC, Debroas S, Bellanger L, et al. Proteotyping SARS-CoV-2 Virus from Nasopharyngeal Swabs: A Proof-of-Concept Focused on a 3 Min Mass Spectrometry Window. J Proteome Res. American Chemical Society; 2020. doi:10.1021/acs.jproteome.0c00535

31. Renuse S, Vanderboom PM, Maus AD, Kemp JV, Gurtner KM, Madugundu AK, et al. Development of mass spectrometry-based targeted assay for direct detection of novel SARS-CoV-2 coronavirus from clinical specimens. medRxiv. Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory Press; 2020;: 2020.08.05.20168948. doi:10.1101/2020.08.05.20168948

32. Parks JM, Smith JC. How to Discover Antiviral Drugs Quickly. N Engl J Med. Massachusetts Medical Society; 2020. doi:10.1056/NEJMcibr2007042

33. Bezstarosti K, Lamers MM, van Kampen JJA, Haagmans BL, Demmers JAA. Targeted proteomics as a tool to detect SARS-CoV-2 proteins in clinical specimens. bioRxiv. Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory; 2020;: 2020.04.23.057810. doi:10.1101/2020.04.23.057810

34. Whiteaker JR, Zhao L, Abbatiello SE, Burgess M, Kuhn E, Lin C, et al. Evaluation of large scale quantitative proteomic assay development using peptide affinity-based mass spectrometry. Mol Cell Proteomics. 2011;10: M110.005645. doi:10.1074/mcp.M110.005645

35. Engelmann I, Alidjinou EK, Ogiez J, Pagneux Q, Miloudi S, Benhalima I, et al. Preanalytical Issues and Cycle Threshold Values in SARS-CoV-2 Real-Time RT-PCR Testing: Should Test Results Include These? ACS Omega. American Chemical Society; 2021. doi:10.1021/acsomega.1c00166

36. van Kasteren PB, van der Veer B, van den Brink S, Wijsman L, de Jonge J, van den Brandt A, et al. Comparison of seven commercial RT-PCR diagnostic kits for COVID-19. J Clin Virol. 2020;128: 104412. doi:10.1016/j.jcv.2020.104412

37. Hoofnagle AN, Wener MH. The fundamental flaws of immunoassays and potential solutions using tandem mass spectrometry. Journal of Immunological Methods. 2009;347: 3–11. doi:10.1016/j.jim.2009.06.003

38. Sharma V, Eckels J, Taylor GK, Shulman NJ, Stergachis AB, Joyner SA, et al. Panorama: A Targeted Proteomics Knowledge Base. American Chemical Society; 2014. doi:10.1021/pr5006636

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.02.21258097; this version posted June 4, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .



Supplementary Figure 1. Peak area (MRM sensitivity) SIL ($^{13}C_6{}^{15}N_2$ C-terminal K or $^{13}C_6{}^{15}N_4$ C--terminal R labeled) NCAP peptides as function of peptide and detergent (CHAPS) concentration.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.02.21258097; this version posted June 4, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .



Supplementary Figure 2. Calibration curve for ADETQALPQR over the range 3-50,000 amol/µL



Supplementary Figure 3. Calibration curve for NPANNAAIVLQLPQGTTLPK over the range 3-50,000 amol/µL

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.02.21258097; this version posted June 4, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .



Supplementary Figure 4. Calibration curve for DGIIWVATEGALNTPK over the range 3-2,000 amol/µL