

1 **Usefulness of quantitative Loop-Mediated Isothermal Amplification Assay in comparison**
2 **with real time PCR for the diagnosis of invasive pneumococcal disease**

3 **Short title: qLAMP assay for IPD diagnosis**

4 Sreeram Chandra Murthy Peela ^{1¶}, Sujatha Sistla ^{1¶*}

5 ¹ Department of Microbiology, Jawaharlal Institute of Postgraduate Medical Education &
6 Research (JIPMER), Dhanvantri Nagar, Gorimedu, Puducherry – 605006, India

7 *Corresponding author

8 Email: sujathasistla@gmail.com

9 ¶These authors contributed equally to this work

10

11 **Abstract**

12 **Background:** Quantitative LAMP (qLAMP) assay is one of the recent and emerging diagnostic
13 tests for infectious diseases. Only a few studies exist comparing this assay with quantitative real-
14 time PCR (qPCR) for the diagnosis of invasive pneumococcal disease (IPD). The present study
15 was performed to compare the diagnostic performance of qLAMP assay with qPCR targeting
16 autolysin gene for the diagnosis of invasive pneumococcal disease.

17 **Methodology/Principal Findings:** Ninety six blood samples and 73 CSF samples from patients
18 clinically suspected with community acquired pneumonia and acute meningitis were tested by
19 qPCR and qLAMP assays using previously published primers and protocols. The qPCR was
20 considered as the gold standard test and the diagnostic performance was assessed by calculating
21 sensitivity, specificity, positive and negative predictive values, and kappa coefficient for the
22 level of agreement between the tests. Chi-squared/Fisher exact test was used to compare
23 categorical variables (positive/negative). Thirty two blood samples and 22 CSF samples were
24 positive by qPCR while 24 and 20 samples were positive by qLAMP assay respectively. The
25 sensitivity of qLAMP assay was only 86.4% and 75% when tested on CSF and blood samples
26 respectively. However, the qLAMP assay was in substantial to almost perfect agreement when
27 compared with qPCR. The results were statistically significant in both sample types ($P < 0.001$).

28 **Conclusions:** The performance of qLAMP assay can vary based on the specimen type. It has
29 very high specificity and had substantial to almost perfect agreement, and thus may be an
30 alternative to qPCR for the diagnosis of IPD.

31 **Keywords:** real-time PCR, real-time LAMP, *Streptococcus pneumoniae*, Invasive pneumococcal
32 disease

33 **Introduction**

34 The Loop Mediated Isothermal Amplification (qLAMP) assay has been used for identification
35 and diagnosis of various pathogens [1–3]. The assay targets six different regions in the primer
36 binding sites, and towards the end of first stage, a stem-loop like structure is formed [1]. The
37 assay uses this loop-like structure for further amplification steps and due to the strand
38 displacement activity of the polymerase used, the assay can proceed isothermally (usually
39 ranging from 60⁰-63⁰C). This advantage circumvents the need for an expensive thermal cycler
40 and the assay can be performed in water bath. To visualize the results, various intercalating dyes
41 or hydroxyl-naphthol blue can be added, or the amplified products can be loaded onto agarose
42 gels where the product shows a ladder-like pattern. The assay can be completed within an hour
43 and around 10⁹ copies of DNA can be produced. It was observed that LAMP assay was more
44 tolerant to various biological substances than PCR. LAMP assay was positive even when 1%
45 serum, plasma or urine was added to the template [4].

46 Owing to its advantages, it has been tested for diagnosis of pneumococcal meningitis, where a
47 minimum of 10 and 10⁴ copies/reaction of template DNA is required by LAMP and PCR
48 respectively to detect pneumococcus in CSF [5]. The assay was further enhanced by using a loop
49 primer, and results were obtained within 30 minutes [6]. The limit of detection for LAMP assay
50 may vary and it can range from 10 – 90 copies per reaction [5,7]. The limit of detection may vary
51 based on the visualization method or the number of replicates used for each dilution. It was also
52 noted in number of studies targeting pneumococci and other pathogens that performance of
53 LAMP and real-time PCR (qPCR) were comparable [2,7–9].

54 As evident from many studies, LAMP assay can be a viable alternative for diagnosis of
55 infectious diseases like IPD. It has the potential to be a point-of-care (POC) test and to

56 investigate outbreaks [10]. The present study was thus undertaken to evaluate the usefulness of
57 qLAMP assay for diagnosis of IPD in comparison with qPCR.

58 **Methods**

59 The study has been approved by the Institute Ethics Committee for Human Studies
60 (JIP/IEC/2015/15/744) and samples collected from May 2015 to August 2018 were included.
61 The samples with sufficient volume of CSF (>0.5ml) and that are negative for any other
62 pathogens by culture were included in the study. Seventy three CSF and 96 blood samples were
63 collected from patients suspected with acute bacterial meningitis (ABM) and community
64 acquired pneumonia (CAP) based on the clinical presentation (S1 Appendix) after obtaining
65 informed consent from the participants or legal guardians. The demographic details are shown in
66 S1 Table. DNA was extracted from these samples using QIAamp DNA Blood Mini kit following
67 manufacturer instructions. The qPCR and qLAMP assays were performed using previously
68 published primers and protocols (S2 Appendix) [6,11]. The 2X real-time PCR master mix
69 (Roche, Basel, Switzerland) and Isothermal Master Mix with intercalating dye (Catalogue
70 number: ISO-001, OptiGene, West Sussex, UK) were used in qPCR and qLAMP assays
71 respectively. Around 2.5µl of DNA was added in qPCR while 5µl was added in qLAMP assay in
72 a total reaction volume of 25µl. The reaction was carried out in ABI QuantStudio 5 (Applied
73 Biosystems, California, USA) by using the standard run settings for TaqMan assay and SYBR-
74 Green assay for qPCR and qLAMP assays respectively. Any sample with $C_T \leq 40$ was
75 considered as positive in qPCR, while samples with $C_T \geq 35$ were retested. Similar to qPCR, the
76 time to detection for amplification was noted as the cycle threshold (C_{LAMP}) values for qLAMP
77 assay. Both C_T and C_{LAMP} were expressed as median with interquartile ranges (IQR). The results
78 by qPCR were considered as true positive. Diagnostic performance of qLAMP assay was

79 estimated by calculating sensitivity, specificity, positive and negative predictive values. The
 80 agreement between two assays was quantified using Cohen’s kappa coefficient and interpreted
 81 accordingly. All the analysis was carried out in OpenEpi v3.01.

82 **Results**

83 Twenty CSF and 24 blood samples were identified to be positive (Table 1) by qLAMP assay,
 84 while 22 and 32 specimens were positive by qPCR. The median C_T values were similar for both
 85 meningitis (28.7; IQR=22.8-33.1) and pneumonia group (28.4; IQR=20.9-30.6) while median
 86 C_{LAMP} values varied slightly (11.9 and IQR=10.5-13.7 and 11 and IQR=8.4-11.8 respectively)
 87 (S2 Table). One CSF specimen negative by qPCR was positive in the qLAMP assay ($C_{LAMP} =$
 88 18.2), while eight blood samples and three CSF samples positive by qPCR were negative by
 89 qLAMP assay. The median C_T values were higher (37.9; IQR=35.7-38.3) in samples negative by
 90 qLAMP assay than those positive by it (24; IQR=18.2-28.8) when both pneumonia and
 91 meningitis groups were analyzed together (S2 Table). The overall sensitivity of qLAMP was
 92 slightly higher while testing CSF specimens, and for both the specimen types (Table 2), the two
 93 assays had substantial to almost perfect agreement (kappa coefficient > 0.8) (Table 1).

		qPCR			Kappa coefficient	P-value
			Positive	Negative		
Blood	qLAMP	Positive	24	0	0.8(0.604,0.996)	<0.001
		Negative	8	64		
		Total	32	64		
CSF	qLAMP	Positive	19	1	0.899(0.67,1.13)	<0.001
		Negative	3	50		

		Total	22	51		
--	--	--------------	----	----	--	--

94 **Table 1:** Comparison of results between real-time PCR (qPCR) and real-time LAMP (qLAMP)
95 assays in blood and cerebrospinal fluid (CSF) samples. 95% Confidence intervals for Kappa
96 coefficient were shown in parentheses

qLAMP	Sensitivity	Specificity	PPV*	NPV#
CSF	86.4(66.7,95.3)	98(88.7,99.7)	95(73.4,99.1)	94.3(84.6,98.1)
Blood	75(57.9,86.6)	100(94.3,100)	100(86.2,100)	88.9(79.6,94.3)

97 **Table 2:** Diagnostic metrics of real-time LAMP (qLAMP) assays in blood and cerebrospinal
98 fluid (CSF) samples. 95% Confidence intervals were shown in parentheses *Positive Predictive
99 Value #Negative Predictive Value

100 Discussion

101 The use of qLAMP assay diagnosis of pneumococcal meningitis as a sensitive and rapid method
102 was described by Kim *et al* [6]. In the present study a closed tube technique for interpretation of
103 the test result was employed to prevent contamination through aerosols. To test the utility of
104 qLAMP assay, all the samples that were positive by qPCR were included along with those
105 negative for pneumococcus. Three CSF and eight blood specimens positive by qPCR were
106 qLAMP-negative. One of the explanations for these qLAMP-negative specimens may be the
107 time lag between the performances of both the molecular assays, where qLAMP was performed
108 after one year on DNA stored at -80°C. Furthermore, all the specimens negative by qLAMP
109 assay had $C_T > 35$, implying a very low concentration of DNA which may have undergone
110 degradation during the prolonged storage. However, qLAMP assay can detect a few additional
111 cases when tested on CSF specimens (one qPCR negative specimen was positive by qLAMP

112 assay in the present study). The same was true in another study where an additional positive
113 result in qLAMP assay was observed [7].

114 For the detection of pneumococcal meningitis, LAMP assay had 100% sensitivity and 83%
115 specificity when compared with PCR [6]. Furthermore, the clinical specificity and negative
116 predictive value (NPV) for LAMP assay while testing on CSF samples was found to be higher.
117 In another study, both the assays showed significant similarity, with 100% sensitivity and 99.3%
118 specificity when testing on multiple specimens from IPD patients [7]. Similar to this finding, in
119 our study the specificity of LAMP assay was 98%, but NPV was only 94.3%. Interestingly, the
120 PPV was 100% for the blood samples and 95% for CSF samples in the present study. While the
121 sensitivity of qLAMP assay was low, the specificity was at par with that reported previously.

122 A few studies found that real-time PCR is more sensitive than qLAMP assay in detecting
123 pneumococci and other microbial pathogens. In a recent study by Hector et al, the limit of
124 detection between qPCR and qLAMP assay varied slightly (90 copies/reaction for qLAMP and
125 20 copies/reaction for qPCR) [7]. Wang *et al* found that the qLAMP assay had a sensitivity of
126 only 89.1% while that of real-time PCR was 91.3% while detecting orf virus [8]. Lin *et al* in
127 their study found that the limit of detection of qLAMP assay was higher than that of real-time
128 PCR (10 fg/ μ l and 1 fg/ μ l respectively) for detection of Toxoplasma in blood [9]. Chen *et al* on
129 the other hand found that the qLAMP assay and real-time PCR had similar limits of detection
130 while targeting Japanese Encephalitis virus [2]. Nevertheless in all these studies, the results of
131 qLAMP assay were in excellent agreement with that of real-time PCR, and hence qLAMP assay
132 can be a viable alternative.

133 The limitations in the present study were: a time gap of one year between performing qLAMP
134 and qPCR assays, and limit of detection for these assays was not calculated. Nonetheless this

135 study was one of the few reports that tried to compare established qPCR assay with the emerging
136 qLAMP assay and testing for both blood and CSF specimens which are frequently tested for the
137 diagnosis of IPD.

138 **Conclusions**

139 The performance of qLAMP assay can vary based on the specimen type used for testing. Owing
140 to its substantial agreement and high specificity when compared with qPCR, it may be
141 considered an alternative test for diagnosis of pneumococcal meningitis and bacteremia.
142 However in samples with low bacterial load, qLAMP assay may produce false negative results.

143 **References**

- 144 1. Notomi T, Okayama H, Masubuchi H, Yonekawa T, Watanabe K, Amino N, et al. Loop-
145 mediated isothermal amplification of DNA. *Nucleic Acids Res.* 2000;28: e63.
146 doi:10.1093/nar/28.12.e63
- 147 2. Chen Z, Liao Y, Ke X, Zhou J, Chen Y, Gao L, et al. Comparison of reverse transcription
148 loop-mediated isothermal amplification, conventional PCR and real-time PCR assays for
149 Japanese encephalitis virus. *Mol Biol Rep.* 2011;38: 4063–4070. doi:10.1007/s11033-010-
150 0525-0
- 151 3. Parida M, Shukla J, Sharma S, Ranghiah Santhosh S, Ravi V, Mani R, et al. Development
152 and Evaluation of Reverse Transcription Loop-Mediated Isothermal Amplification Assay
153 for Rapid and Real-Time Detection of the Swine-Origin Influenza A H1N1 Virus. *J Mol*
154 *Diagn.* 2011;13: 100–107. doi:10.1016/j.jmoldx.2010.11.003

- 155 4. Kaneko H, Kawana T, Fukushima E, Suzutani T. Tolerance of loop-mediated isothermal
156 amplification to a culture medium and biological substances. *J Biochem Biophys Methods*.
157 2007;70: 499–501. doi:10.1016/j.jbbm.2006.08.008
- 158 5. Seki M, Yamashita Y, Torigoe H, Tsuda H, Sato S, Maeno M. Loop-Mediated Isothermal
159 Amplification Method Targeting the *lytA* Gene for Detection of *Streptococcus pneumoniae*.
160 *J Clin Microbiol*. 2005;43: 1581–1586. doi:10.1128/JCM.43.4.1581-1586.2005
- 161 6. Kim DW, Kilgore PE, Kim EJ, Kim SA, Anh DD, Dong BQ, et al. The enhanced
162 pneumococcal LAMP assay: a clinical tool for the diagnosis of meningitis due to
163 *Streptococcus pneumoniae*. *PloS One*. 2012;7: e42954. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0042954
- 164 7. de Paz HD, Brotons P, Esteva C, Muñoz-Almagro C. Validation of a Loop-Mediated
165 Isothermal Amplification Assay for Rapid Diagnosis of Invasive Pneumococcal Disease.
166 *Front Cell Infect Microbiol*. 2020;10: 115. doi:10.3389/fcimb.2020.00115
- 167 8. Wang G, Shang Y, Wang Y, Tian H, Liu X. Comparison of a loop-mediated isothermal
168 amplification for orf virus with quantitative real-time PCR. *Virol J*. 2013;10: 138.
169 doi:10.1186/1743-422X-10-138
- 170 9. Lin Z, Zhang Y, Zhang H, Zhou Y, Cao J, Zhou J. Comparison of loop-mediated isothermal
171 amplification (LAMP) and real-time PCR method targeting a 529-bp repeat element for
172 diagnosis of toxoplasmosis. *Vet Parasitol*. 2012;185: 296–300.
173 doi:10.1016/j.vetpar.2011.10.016

- 174 10. Seki M, Kilgore PE, Kim EJ, Ohnishi M, Hayakawa S, Kim DW. Loop-Mediated
175 Isothermal Amplification Methods for Diagnosis of Bacterial Meningitis. *Front Pediatr.*
176 2018;6. doi:10.3389/fped.2018.00057
- 177 11. Carvalho M da GS, Tondella ML, McCaustland K, Weidlich L, McGee L, Mayer LW, et al.
178 Evaluation and improvement of real-time PCR assays targeting *lytA*, *ply*, and *psaA* genes
179 for detection of pneumococcal DNA. *J Clin Microbiol.* 2007;45: 2460–2466.
180 doi:10.1128/JCM.02498-06
- 181

182 **Supporting information**

183

184 **S1 Appendix:** Criteria for clinical diagnosis

185 **S2 Appendix:** Protocols. *From a stock of 10 μM ; #From a stock of 50 μM

186 **S1 Table:** Demographic details. Frequencies and percentages are shown for each group

187 **S2 Table:** Cycle threshold values. Zero indicates a negative result. C_T – cycle threshold in qPCR;

188 C_{LAMP} – cycle threshold in qLAMP. Any sample with $C_T > 35$ were retested (duplicates) and

189 mean values are shown