

1 ***Development and Evaluation of A CRISPR-based Diagnostic***

2 ***For 2019-novel Coronavirus***

3 Tieying Hou^{1,*}, Weiqi Zeng^{2,3,*}, Minling Yang^{2,*}, Wenjing Chen^{2,*}, Lili Ren⁴, Jingwen Ai⁵, Ji
4 Wu¹, Yalong Liao¹, Xuejing Gou², Yongjun Li², Xiaorui Wang², Hang Su², Bing Gu^{6,7,#},
5 Jianwei Wang^{4,#}, Teng Xu^{2,3,#}

6
7 ¹Laboratory Medicine, Provincial People's Hospital, Guangdong Academy of Medical Sciences
8 Guangzhou, Guangdong 510000, China

9 ²Vision Medicals, Guangzhou, Guangdong 510000, China

10 ³Key Laboratory of Animal Gene Editing and Animal Cloning in Yunnan Province and College of
11 Veterinary Medicine, Yunnan Agricultural University, Kunming 650201, China

12 ⁴NHC Key Laboratory of Systems Biology of Pathogens and Christophe Mérieux Laboratory, IPB,
13 CAMS-Fondation Mérieux, Institute of Pathogen Biology (IPB), Chinese Academy of Medical Sciences
14 (CAMS) & Peking Union Medical College, Beijing 100730, China

15 ⁵Department of Infectious Diseases, Huashan Hospital affiliated to Fudan University, Shanghai 200040,
16 China

17 ⁶Medical Technology School of Xuzhou Medical University, Xuzhou 221004, China

18 ⁷Department of Laboratory Medicine, Affiliated Hospital of Xuzhou Medical University, Xuzhou 221006,
19 China

20
21 *These authors contributed equally to this study.

22 #For Correspondence:

23 Teng Xu txu@visionmedicals.com

24 Vision Medicals, Guangzhou, Guangdong 510000, China

25
26 Jianwei Wang wangjw28@163.com

27 NHC Key Laboratory of Systems Biology of Pathogens and Christophe Mérieux Laboratory, Institute of

28 Pathogen Biology, Chinese Academy of Medical Sciences and Peking Union Medical College, Beijing
29 100730, China

30

31 Bing Gu gb20031129@163.com

32 Department of Laboratory Medicine, Affiliated Hospital of Xuzhou Medical University, Xuzhou 221006,
33 China

34

35 ***Background***

36 The recent outbreak of infections by the 2019 novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV), the third
37 zoonotic CoV has raised great public health concern. The demand for rapid and accurate
38 diagnosis of this novel pathogen brought significant clinical and technological challenges.
39 Currently, metagenomic next-generation sequencing (mNGS) and reverse-transcription PCR
40 (RT-PCR) are the most widely used molecular diagnostics for 2019-nCoV.

41 ***Methods***

42 2019-nCoV infections were confirmed in 52 specimens by mNGS. Genomic information was
43 analyzed and used for the design and development of an isothermal, CRISPR-based
44 diagnostic for the novel virus. The diagnostic performance of CRISPR-nCoV was assessed
45 and also compared across three technology platforms (mNGS, RT-PCR and CRISPR)

46 ***Results***

47 2019-nCOVs sequenced in our study were conserved with the Wuhan strain, and shared
48 certain genetic similarity with *SARS-CoV*. A high degree of variation in the level of viral

49 RNA was observed in clinical specimens. CRISPR-nCoV demonstrated a near single-copy
50 sensitivity and great clinical sensitivity with a shorter turn-around time than RT-PCR.

51 ***Conclusion***

52 CRISPR-nCoV presents as a promising diagnostic option for the emerging pathogen.

53 ***Keywords***

54 2019-nCoV, SARS-CoV-2, CRISPR, metagenomic next-generation sequencing, diagnosis

55 INTRODUCTION

56 Since the beginning of 2020, a surging number of pneumonia caused by infections of a novel
57 coronavirus (2019-nCoV) have been identified in China, especially Wuhan, a metropolitan
58 city with a population of over 10 million.[1, 2] In recent days, the outbreak has affected
59 multiple countries and caused worldwide impact.[3-6] Currently, nucleic-acid based tests
60 have been widely used as the reference method for the diagnosis of 2019-nCoV.[7] As of
61 now, more than 30,000 individuals have been identified with 2019-nCoV infection. As the
62 epidemic develops, there are increasing demands for rapid and sensitive diagnostics for the
63 novel pathogen.

64 Coronaviruses (CoVs) are positive-sense, single-strand RNA viruses, with four major
65 structural proteins including spike (S), membrane (M), envelop (E) and nucleoprotein (N).[8,
66 9] Prior to 2019-nCoV, there were six CoVs that were known to be pathogenic to humans:
67 *HCoV-OC43*, *HCoV-NL63*, *HCoV-HKU1*, *HCoV-229E* and highly transmissible and
68 pathogenic *SARS-CoV* and *MERS-CoV*. [10-12]

69 The epidemic of 2019-nCoV was first discovered by metagenomic next-generation
70 sequencing (mNGS) in which the novel virus was found to be a new pathogenic member of
71 the betacoronavirus genus but shared only about 79% in genetic similarity with *SARS*.[8, 9]
72 Currently, metagenomics and RT-PCR are two molecular approaches most commonly used
73 diagnostics for this novel virus. [13,14] However, the diagnostic performance of different
74 molecular methods have not been investigated.

75 Although CRISPR/Cas has been widely used as a programmable tool for gene editing since
76 2013, the collateral, promiscuous cleavage activities of a unique group of Cas nucleases only
77 discovered recently and harnessed for in vitro nucleic acid detection.[15-19]

78 Here, to address this question and the expanding clinical needs, we developed CRISPR-nCoV,
79 a rapid assay for 2019-nCoV detection, and compared the diagnostic performance among
80 three different technological platforms: metagenomic sequencing, RT-PCR and CRISPR. To
81 our knowledge, this is the first report on cross-platform comparison and the evaluation of an
82 isothermal, CRISPR-based assay for 2019-nCoV that's rapid, sensitive and with low
83 instrument requirement.

84

85 **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

86 **Study participants and sample collection**

87 This study used excess RNA samples from patients with suspected 2019-nCoV infection
88 based on clinical, chest imaging and epidemiological evidence. No patient identifiable
89 information was collected. The only data collected from the samples were types of specimens
90 (nasopharyngeal swab or bronchoalveolar lavage fluid), the concentrations and volumes of
91 the purified total RNA. A total of sixty-one 2019-nCoV-suspected samples were included in
92 this study. Among which, 52 was confirmed positive by mNGS. This study was approved by
93 the ethical review committee of Institute of Pathogen Biology, Chinese Academy of Medical
94 Sciences & Peking Union Medical College. Written informed consent was waived given the
95 context of emerging infectious diseases.

96

97 **mNGS Assay for 2019-nCoV**

98 The RNA concentrations were measured by a Qubit Fluorometer (Thermo Fisher Scientific,
99 Carlsbad, CA, USA). Sequencing libraries were constructed by a transposase-based
100 methodology with ribosomal RNA depletion (Vision Medicals, China). Sequencing was
101 performed on a Nextseq sequencer (Illumina, San Diego, CA). At least 10 million single-end
102 75bp reads were generated for each sample. Quality control processes included removal of
103 low-complexity reads, low-quality reads and short reads, as well as adapter trimming. Reads
104 derived from host genome were then removed. Taxonomic assignment of the clean reads was
105 performed by aligning against the reference databases, including archaea, bacteria, fungi,
106 human, plasmid, protozoa, univec, and virus sequences. A negative control sample was
107 processed and sequenced in parallel for each sequencing run for contamination control.

108

109 **Phylogenetic analysis**

110 Phylogenetic trees were constructed based on the genome sequences by means of the
111 maximum-likelihood method. Alignment of multiple sequences was performed with the
112 ClustalW program (MEGA software, version 7.0.14).

113

114 **Cas13a protein and other reagents**

115 The open reading frame (ORF) of Cas13a was synthesized after codon optimization. The
116 Cas13a ORF was then cloned into expression vector Pc013 and transfected into E.
117 coli BL21, which were first grown at 37°C and incubated with IPTG at 16°C. Proteins were
118 purified from lysed bacteria using the Ni-NTA protocol. Aliquots of purified protein were
119 stored at -80°C. Other reagents were purchased from Sangon Co., Ltd. (Shanghai, China),
120 including DTT (A100281), EDTA (A100105), TritonX-100 (A110694), NP-40 (A100109),
121 Chelex-100 (C7901) etc.

122

123 **Strains and human DNA**

124 Pure human DNA were purchased from Solarbio Co.,Ltd. (Beijing, China), and eluted in
125 nuclease-free water. *Bacterial and viral* strains were purchased from the American Type
126 Culture Collection (ATCC), China General Microbiological Culture Collection Center
127 (CGMCC) or BDS (Guangzhou, China).

128

129 **Oligos and gRNA**

130 Primer with an appended T7 promoter used in the RPA amplification for *Orflab*
131 amplification were forward primer 5'-TAAT ACGA CTCA CTAT AGGG ACAT AAAC
132 AAGC TTTG TGAA GAAA TGCT GGAC-3' and reverse primer 5'-TTGA GCAG TAGC
133 AAAA GCTG CATA TGAT GGAA GG-3'. gRNA for *Orflab* (5'-GGGG AUUU AGAC
134 UACC CCAA AAAC GAAG GGGA CUA AACA AACU CUGA GGCU AUAG CUUG

135 UAAG GUU-3') and ssRNA probe (5'-6-FAM-UUUU UC-BHQ1) were used for the
136 CRISPR detection following RPA amplification.

137

138 **CRISPR-nCoV**

139 The CRISPR-nCoV test combines an Recombinase Polymerase Amplification (RPA) step
140 and a following T7 transcription and Cas13 detection step as described previously. Briefly,
141 reactions containing 2.5µl of sample, 0.4 µM of each primer, 1× reaction buffer, 14 mM of
142 magnesium acetate and the RT-RPA enzyme mix were incubated at 42°C for 30 min. After
143 that, the CRISPR reaction mix consisting of the amplification product, 33.3 nM of gRNA,
144 66.7nM of Cas13, 5mM of each NTP, 1µl T7 RNA polymerase (New England Biolabs) and
145 166 nM of ssRNA reporter was incubated at 42°C and monitored for fluorescence signal.
146 Fluorescent signals were collected for the duration of 10 min.

147

148 **Plasmid construction**

149 A 420bp genomic fragment of *Orf1ab* encompassing 310bp upstream and 82bp downstream
150 of the gRNA target site was synthesized and inserted into pUC57. These sequences
151 represented 11788-12207bp in the 2019-nCoV genome. This *Orf1ab* plasmid was purified and
152 used as positive control.

153

154 **Evaluation of limit of detection (LoD)**

155 For the evaluation of LoD by the number of DNA copies, DNA of the 2019-nCoV plasmid
156 was purified and the concentration was determined by a Qubit (Thermo Fisher,
157 Massachusetts). The copy number concentration was then calculated based the weight and the
158 length of fragment. Serial dilution with nuclease-free water was done to achieve desired
159 concentrations. 2.5µl of extracted DNA at each titer was used as templates. Ten replicates
160 were performed at each data point near detection limit.

161

162 **Statistical analysis**

163 Comparative analysis was conducted by Pearson χ^2 test, Fisher exact test, the Student's t-test
164 or log-rank test where appropriate. Data analyses were performed using SPSS 22.0
165 software. P values <0.05 were considered significant, and all tests were 2-tailed unless
166 indicated otherwise.

167

168 **RESULTS**

169 **Identification of 2019-nCoV by mNGS**

170 In order to develop a targeted assay for the novel virus, we obtained total RNA samples
171 from 61 cases suspected for 2019-nCoV infection and subjected them to metagenomic
172 next-generation sequencing (mNGS), the method by which this novel virus was initially
173 identified. Briefly, RNA was reverse-transcribed into cDNA to prepare for the sequencing
174 library. Each library was subjected to high-throughput sequencing. Sequenced reads were

175 aligned to a curated database for taxonomic classification and identification of 2019-nCoV
176 genomic sequences.

177 Among the 61 suspected nCoV specimens, we were able to confirm 52 cases with read
178 numbers mapping to the novel virus across 6 orders of magnitudes (median read of 1,484,
179 from 2 to 19,016,501). The median genome coverage and sequencing depth was 46.8%
180 (2.8%-100%) and $12.0\times$ ($1.0\times$ -7870.1 \times), respectively (Figure 1A). These findings indicate a
181 high degree of variation in viral loads of nCoV infections. As shown in the phylogenetic trees,
182 2019-nCoV genome identified in our specimens were highly conserved with the Wuhan
183 strain and closest to *SARS-CoV* (Figure 1B).

184 With these genomic information, we aimed to identify target regions of 2019-nCoV by
185 searching for sequences that were i) within the *Orflab*, *N* or *E* genes of the viral genome; ii)
186 conserved among strains of the novel virus; iii) differentiable from other pathogenic
187 coronaviruses. By analyzing the genetic similarity among the 52 cases 2019-nCoV and other
188 pathogenic CoVs (Figure 1C), we identified two potential target sequences in *Orflab* and one
189 in the *N* gene (data not shown).

190

191 **Development of CRISPR-nCoV**

192 We seek to develop a rapid, highly sensitive and simple-to-use assay by taking advantage
193 of both the polymerase-mediated DNA amplification by RPA and the CRISPR/Cas-mediated
194 enzymatic signal amplification for improved sensitivity (Figure 2A). Moreover, the

195 isothermal nature of such an assay abolished the demand for sophisticated instruments such as
196 thermal cyclers as for PCR-based assays.

197 Based on the three potential target sequences we identified, multiple sets of RPA primers
198 and CRISPR gRNAs were designed and screened. Among these, the set that targeted *Orflab*
199 showed the best overall performance of sensitivity and specificity, and therefore, was used to
200 develop CRISPR-nCoV in this study for further evaluation (data not shown).

201 We then sought to determine its analytical sensitivity by serial dilution at various
202 concentrations. As shown in Figure 2B, CRISPR-nCoV consistently detected 7.5 copies of
203 2019-nCoV in all 10 replicates, 2.5 copies in 6 out of 10 , and 1.25 copies in 2 out of 10 runs.
204 These data indicate that CRISPR-nCoV had a near single-copy sensitivity. To confirm its
205 specificity, we tested CRISPR-nCoV with DNA from human cells as well as a panel of
206 microbes including i) bacteria commonly found in respiratory infections: *S. pneumonia*, *H.*
207 *influenza*, *M. pneumonia*, *C. pneumonia*, *B. pertusiss*; ii) human Coronaviruses: *HCoV-OC43*,
208 *HCoV-NL63*, *HCoV-HKU1*, *HCoV-229E*; iii) other viruses commonly found in respiratory
209 infections: *Adenovirus Type-3*, *H. Influenza B (Victoria)*, *H influenza A (H3N2)*, *HPIV-1*,
210 *RSV-A*; and iii) other bacteria: *S. mitis*, *S. pyogenes*, *S. aureus*, *E. coli*, *E. facecaiiis*. None of
211 the above interference samples triggered a false positive reaction (Figure 2C). Altogether,
212 these analytical assessments suggest CRISPR-nCoV as a promising molecular assay for
213 2019-nCoV detection with great sensitivity and specificity.

214

215 **Evaluation of CRISPR-nCoV in Clinical Specimens**

216 Upon completion of the analytical assessment, we further evaluated the diagnostic
217 potential of CRISPR-nCoV in clinical specimens. A total of 114 RNA samples from clinical
218 respiratory samples were included in the evaluation, which consisted of 61 suspected nCoV
219 cases (among which 52 confirmed and 9 ruled-out by mNGS), 17 nCoV-/hCoV+ cases and
220 36 samples from healthy subjects (Figure 3A).

221 When conducting the CRISPR-nCoV assay, a positive control (PC) DNA and a
222 no-template control (NC) were included in parallel for each run. Florescent signal from NC
223 was used to normalize the signal and generate corresponding fold-change values (FC). We
224 noticed that there were clear distinction in signal patterns of the reactions. Specifically, the
225 fluorescent signal curve either remained flat as a negative curve (e.g. the NC runs) or had a
226 distinguishable positive signal curve (e.g. the PC runs). The negative curves yielded a
227 maximal FC value of 1.4, whereas the positive ones had a minimal FC value of 5.0. A cut-off
228 was set 3.0 which was set for a complete separation (Figure S1). Consistently, this cut-off
229 offered the optimal sensitivity and specificity as confirmed by an ROC analysis (data not
230 shown).

231 CRISPR-nCoV demonstrated a sensitivity of 100% by detecting all 52
232 2019-nCoV-positive cases. No false positives were found in all 62 negative cases, including
233 all the hCoV-infected ones (Figure 3B), suggesting promising clinical sensitivity and
234 specificity of CRISPR-nCoV.

235

236 **Diagnostic Performances Among Technological Platforms**

237 We further set out to compare the diagnostic performances among mNGS, RT-PCR and
238 CRISPR. Using mNGS as the reference, PCR- and CRISPR-nCoV both had a specificity of
239 100% in our study. PCR-nCoV was able to detect the virus in 90.4% (47/52) of the positive
240 cases, with Ct's ranging from 28.8 to 40.4 and a median Ct of 35.8. It worth noting that the 5
241 false negative samples by PCR-nCoV had a median mNGS read number of 550, which is
242 much lower than that of the other positive samples at 2,381 reads, suggesting a lower titer of
243 the virus in these samples. CRISPR showed a greater sensitivity by detecting all 52
244 nCoV-confirmed cases (100%), with FC values ranging from 5.0 to 66.3 and a median FC of
245 22.8 (Figure 4A).

246 When the reaction turn-around time (TAT) is compared, the CRISPR-nCoV reaction
247 requires only 40 minutes, which is the least among the three and includes 30 minutes of DNA
248 amplification and 10 minutes of Cas reaction. PCR-nCoV requires about 1.5 hours for a
249 completion run of the PCR program. mNGS takes approximately 20 hours, which includes 8
250 hours of library preparation, 10 hours of sequencing and 2 hours of bioinformatic analysis.
251 Because a positive result may be determined before completing the PCR program, we
252 calculated the effective TAT as the time when the florescent signal reached the threshold. As
253 showed in Figure 4B, CRISPR-nCoV presented a significant advantage in effective TAT over
254 PCR and mNGS.

255 Altogether, we demonstrated a CRISPR-based assay for 2019-nCoV that offered shorter
256 turn-around time and great diagnostic value, even in under-resourced settings without the
257 need of thermal cyclers. Our study also emphasized strength and weakness of different

258 methodologies which should be fully considered when applied in different diagnostic
259 settings.

260

261 **DISCUSSION**

262 Recent progresses in molecular diagnostic technologies, especially mNGS, allowed rapid,
263 initial identification of this novel pathogenic agent at the beginning of the current 2019-nCoV
264 epidemic.[8] Through acquiring the genome sequences of the novel virus, RT-PCR assays
265 were quickly developed for targeted 2019-nCoV detection.[14] However, the sudden
266 outbreak of 2019-nCoV created a dramatic burden not only on the society, but also on public
267 health.

268 The center of this epidemic, Wuhan city alone, hosts a population of over 10 millions.
269 The surging demand for rapid screening and identification of 2019-nCoV posts a great
270 challenge on the diagnostics.[20] mNGS is the method originally used for the identification
271 of this new viral species and considered as one of the most important references.[8] However,
272 its wider application is limited by its cost and longer TAT of nearly a day. An RT-PCR assay
273 for 2019-nCoV is faster and more affordable. Nevertheless, the need for a thermo cycler by
274 PCR-based diagnostics hinders its use in low-resource settings and curbs the assay
275 throughput. Besides their lower demand for sophisticated temperature controlling instruments,
276 isothermal molecular methods are advantageous owing to its faster nucleic acid amplification.
277 However, there have been debates over the specificity of such methods. The current
278 discovery of the collateral activity of certain Cas family members, provides a great

279 opportunity to take advantage of both the sensitivity of an isothermal assay and the specificity
280 of the CRISPR system.[21] As we demonstrated in this study, CRISPR-nCoV was able to
281 deliver comparable sensitivity and specificity as mNGS within as short as 40 minutes.

282 As a result of the rapid outbreak, the targeted assays (PCR and CRISPR) were designed
283 and developed based on limited genetic information on 2019-nCoV. Cautions should be taken
284 that certain unknown genomic variations may produce critical impact on the assay efficiency.
285 For example, a mutation or polymorphic site that abrupt the binding of the very 3' end of a
286 PCR primer may cause a drastic reduction in sensitivity. Although not without its own
287 shortcomings on TAT and costs, NGS-based assays demonstrated a great level of sensitivity
288 and should still be used for continuous monitoring of genetic drifts in the viral genome. These
289 information will provide valuable insights not only from a public health standpoint, but also
290 to guide necessary optimization of targeted assay development.

291

292

293 **REFERENCE**

- 294 1. Zhu N, Zhang D, Wang W, et al. A novel coronavirus from patients with pneumonia in China, 2019 [J].
295 NEW ENGL J MED, 2020.
- 296 2. Li Q, Guan X, Wu P, et al. Early Transmission Dynamics in Wuhan, China, of Novel
297 Coronavirus-Infected Pneumonia[J]. NEW ENGL J MED, 2020.
- 298 3. Wu J T, Leung K, Leung G M. Nowcasting and forecasting the potential domestic and international
299 spread of the 2019-nCoV outbreak originating in Wuhan, China: a modelling study[J]. The Lancet,

- 300 2020.
- 301 4. Phan L T, Nguyen T V, Luong Q C, et al. Importation and human-to-human transmission of a novel
302 coronavirus in Vietnam[J]. NEW ENGL J MED, 2020.
- 303 5. Rothe C, Schunk M, Sothmann P, et al. Transmission of 2019-nCoV infection from an asymptomatic
304 contact in Germany[J]. NEW ENGL J MED, 2020.
- 305 6. Holshue M L, DeBolt C, Lindquist S, et al. First case of 2019 novel coronavirus in the United
306 States[J]. NEW ENGL J MED, 2020.
- 307 7. Corman V M, Landt O, Kaiser M, et al. Detection of 2019 novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV) by
308 real-time RT-PCR[J]. Eurosurveillance, 2020, 25(3): 2000045.
- 309 8. Lu R, Zhao X, Li J, et al. Genomic characterisation and epidemiology of 2019 novel coronavirus:
310 implications for virus origins and receptor binding[J]. The Lancet, 2020.
- 311 9. Ren L L, Wang Y M, Wu Z Q, et al. Identification of a novel coronavirus causing severe pneumonia in
312 human: a descriptive study[J]. Chinese Medical Journal, 2020.
- 313 10. Su S, Wong G, Shi W, et al. Epidemiology, genetic recombination, and pathogenesis of
314 coronaviruses[J]. Trends in microbiology, 2016, 24(6): 490-502.
- 315 11. Weiss S R, Navas-Martin S. Coronavirus pathogenesis and the emerging pathogen severe acute
316 respiratory syndrome coronavirus[J]. Microbiol. Mol. Biol. Rev., 2005, 69(4): 635-664.
- 317 12. De Groot R J, Baker S C, Baric R S, et al. Commentary: Middle East respiratory syndrome
318 coronavirus (*MERS-CoV*): announcement of the Coronavirus Study Group[J]. Journal of virology,
319 2013, 87(14): 7790-7792.
- 320 13. Gu W, Miller S, Chiu C Y. Clinical metagenomic next-generation sequencing for pathogen
321 detection[J]. Annual Review of Pathology: Mechanisms of Disease, 2019, 14: 319-338.

- 322 14. Bustin S A. INVITED REVIEW Quantification of mRNA using real-time reverse transcription PCR
323 (RT-PCR): trends and problems[J]. *Journal of molecular endocrinology*, 2002, 29: 23-39.
- 324 15. Koonin EV, Makarova KS. CRISPR-Cas: evolution of an RNA-based adaptive immunity system in
325 prokaryotes. *RNA BIOL*. 2013;10(5):679-86.
- 326 16. Chen JS, Ma E, Harrington LB, Da Costa M, Tian X, Palefsky JM, et al. CRISPR-Cas12a target
327 binding unleashes indiscriminate single-stranded DNase activity. *Science (New York, NY)*. 2018 Apr
328 27;360(6387):436-9.
- 329 17. Ai JW, Zhou X, Xu T, et al. CRISPR-based Rapid and Ultra-sensitive Diagnostic Test for
330 *Mycobacterium Tuberculosis*. *Emerging Microbes & Infections*, 2019.
- 331 18. Harrington LB, Burstein D, Chen JS, Paez-Espino D, Ma E, Witte IP, et al. Programmed DNA
332 destruction by miniature CRISPR-Cas14 enzymes. *Science (New York, NY)*. 2018 Nov
333 16;362(6416):839-42.
- 334 19. Myhrvold C, Freije CA, Gootenberg JS, Abudayyeh OO, Metsky HC, Durbin AF, et al.
335 Field-deployable viral diagnostics using CRISPR-Cas13. *Science (New York, NY)*. 2018 Apr
336 27;360(6387):444-8.
- 337 20. Munster V J, Koopmans M, van Doremalen N, et al. A novel coronavirus emerging in China—key
338 questions for impact assessment[J]. *NEW ENGL J MED*, 2020.
- 339 21. Myhrvold C, Freije C A, Gootenberg J S, et al. Field-deployable viral diagnostics using
340 CRISPR-Cas13[J]. *Science*, 2018, 360(6387): 444-448.

341

342

343 **Figure 1.** (A) Number of mNGS reads mapped to the genome of 2019-nCoV in 52 positive
344 cases; (B) Phylogenetic tree of 2019-nCoVs and other pathogenic CoVs; (C) 2019-nCoV
345 gene structure and CRISPR target region. Nucleotide identity among 52 cases of 2019-nCoV
346 cases included in this study, between 2019-nCoV (NC_045512.2) and other pathogenic
347 CoVs . Brief gene locations are presented above and the target region for CRISPR-nCoV is
348 indicated in Grey.


349 **Figure 2.** (A) Schematic diagram of CRISPR-nCoV. The collateral nuclease activity of Cas
350 proteins are activated upon specific binding of gRNA to the *Orflab* gene. Fluorescent signal
351 produced from cleaved probes is captured and indicates the presence of 2019-nCoV.

352 (B-C) Analytical assessment of the sensitivity and specificity of CRISPR-nCoV. Evaluation
353 was performed by testing contrived samples with indicated titers of 2019-nCoV (B), and
354 various microbes as interfering materials (C).

355 **Figure 3.** Summary of the cohort and CRISPR-results. (A) A total of 114 specimens included
356 in this study, including 52 cases positive for 2019-nCoV and 62 negative cases. (B) Results
357 of CRISPR-nCoV in different sample groups. Positives and negatives were called based on
358 the fold change and cutoff values.

359 **Figure 4.** (A) Result summary on the 2019-nCoV-suspected samples by mNGS,
360 CRISPR-nCoV and PCR-nCoV; (B) Kaplan–Meier curve of 2019-nCoV positive rate by
361 CRISPR and PCR. * Log-rank test, $P < 0.001$.


362



363

364

Figure 1.




365

366

Figure 2.

367

368




369

370

Figure 3.

371

372



373

374

Figure 4.

375