Title: Comparison of two commercial molecular tests and a laboratory-developed modification of the CDC 2019-nCoV RT-PCR assay for the qualitative detection of SARS-CoV-2 from upper respiratory tract specimens

Running title: 3 assays to detect SARS-CoV-2

Authors: Nicholas M. Moore^{a,b,c*}, Haiying Li^a, Debra Schejbal^a, Jennifer Lindsley^a, and Mary K. Hayden^{a,b}

Affiliations:

^aDepartment of Pathology, Rush University Medical Center, Chicago, Illinois

^bDepartment of Internal Medicine, Division of Infectious Diseases, Rush University Medical Center, Chicago, Illinois

^cDepartment of Medical Laboratory Science, Rush University, Chicago, Illinois

Corresponding author: Nicholas Moore, nicholas_moore@rush.edu

ABSTRACT

We compared the ability of 2 commercial molecular amplification assays [*RealTime* SARS-CoV-2 on the *m2000* (Abbott) and ID NOW™ COVID-19 (Abbott)] and a laboratory-developed test [modified CDC 2019-nCoV RT-PCR assay with RNA extraction by eMag® (bioMérieux) and amplification on QuantStudio™ 6 or ABI 7500 Real-Time PCR System (Life Technologies)] to detect SARS-CoV-2 RNA in upper respiratory tract specimens. Discrepant results were adjudicated by medical record review. 200 nasopharyngeal swab specimens in viral transport medium (VTM) were collected from symptomatic patients between March 27 and April 9, 2020. Results were concordant for 167 specimens (83.5% overall agreement), including 94 positive and 73 negative specimens. The *RealTime* SARS-CoV-2 assay on the *m2000* yielded 33 additional positive results, 25 of which were also positive by the modified CDC assay but not by the ID NOW™ COVID-19 assay. In a follow-up evaluation, 97 patients for whom a dry nasal swab specimen yielded negative results by the ID NOW™ COVID-19 assay had a paired nasopharyngeal swab specimen collected in VTM and tested by the *RealTime* SARS-CoV-2 assay; SARS-CoV-2 RNA was detected in 13 (13.4%) of these specimens. Medical record review deemed all discrepant results to be true positives. The ID NOW™ COVID-19 test was the easiest to perform and provided a result in the shortest time: as soon as 5 minutes for positive and 13 minutes for negative result. The *RealTime* SARS-CoV-2 assay on the *m2000* detected more cases of COVID-19 infection than the modified CDC assay or the ID NOW™ COVID-19 test.

KEYWORDS: Covid-19, SARS-CoV-2, coronavirus, novel coronavirus, RT-PCR

INTRODUCTION

In December 2019, a cluster of patients with pneumonia of unknown origin was linked to exposure to a wet market in Wuhan, Hubei Province, China (1). Very quickly, a novel betacoronavirus was isolated from a lower respiratory tract sample from one patient and the full genome of the virus was sequenced (2). This novel coronavirus, which was named SARS-CoV-2 for its genetic homology to SARS-CoV, spread rapidly across the globe (3-10). As of April 29, 2020, more than 3 million cases of SARS-CoV-2 infection had been identified worldwide, with over 200,000 deaths; approximately one-third of cases have been identified in the United States.

Laboratory testing plays a critical role in defining the disease characteristics and epidemiology of an emerging infectious pathogen such as SARS-CoV-2, and in controlling its spread. Early on, laboratory testing for SARS-CoV-2 in the U.S. was performed only at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) laboratories in Atlanta, GA using a reverse transcriptase polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR) assay that was developed there (11). Subsequently, the CDC test was to be implemented in all state public health laboratories, but roll out was slow due to technical problems. Following the declaration of a public health emergency, the US Food and Drug Administration (FDA) moved to allow *in vitro* diagnostic assays under an Emergency Use Authorization (EUA) in an attempt to expedite test development by commercial and clinical laboratories. The majority of assays approved through EUA are nucleic acid amplification tests that target conserved regions of the SARS-CoV-2 genome. Abbott Molecular received authorization for the *RealTime* SARS-CoV-2 assay to be performed on the *m2000* real-time platform on March 18, 2020 (12). The ID NOW™ COVID-19 assay was granted approval under the EUA on March 27, 2020. *In vitro* diagnostic device (IVD) assays with EUA status from commercial manufacturers do not undergo usual FDA review under the *De Novo* request or the 510(k) premarket notification; as such, limited data comparing these assays are available.

In this study, we compared the performance of two commercial EUA IVD assays and a laboratory developed test that is a modification of the CDC RT-PCR assay for the qualitative detection of SARS-CoV-2 RNA directly from upper respiratory tract specimens.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Clinical samples. For the initial evaluation of the three test systems, we collected nasopharyngeal swab specimens in 3mL M4-RT viral transport medium (VTM) (Remel, Lenexa, KS) from symptomatic (fever or cough or shortness of breath) adult and pediatric outpatients, emergency department (ED) patients, and inpatients at Rush University Medical Center (RUMC) or Rush Oak Park Hospital (ROPH); both hospitals are in metropolitan Chicago, IL. Specimens were collected between March 27 and April 9, 2020, and tested within 72 hours of collection; specimens were held refrigerated at 4°C if all testing could not be completed on the same day.

In a separate follow up evaluation, symptomatic patients who had a negative result on a dry nasal swab that was tested at the point of care by the ID NOW™ COVID-19 system also had a paired nasopharyngeal swab sample collected and transported to the on-site clinical microbiology laboratory for testing by *RealTime* SARS-CoV-2 on the *m2000*.

Age, sex, and location of swab collection were extracted from the electronic medical record (EMR) for all patients. The study was reviewed and given expedited approval by the RUMC institutional review board, with a waiver of written informed consent.

Modified CDC assay. We validated and implemented a modification of the CDC 2019-nCoV assay (11) for clinical use in our laboratory; this was the first SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR assay we adopted during the COVID-19 pandemic. This assay targets two regions of the nucleocapsid (N) gene of the SARS-CoV-2 genome. The human RNase P (RP) gene target is included and used as specimen extraction and amplification control.

Nucleic acids were purified and extracted using the eMAG[®] automated nucleic acid sample extraction system (bioMérieux, Marcy l'etoile, France). Briefly, total nucleic acids were extracted from VTM using a programmed input sample volume of 200µL into 2000µL of easyMAG[®] lysis buffer with the Specific B protocol to which a final eluted volume of purified nucleic acids was 50µL. We utilized the TaqPath™ 1-step RT-qPCR master mix (Life Technologies, Frederick, MD) and the 2019-nCoV CDC EUA kit (Integrated DNA Technologies, Coralville, IA) for target detection. Amplification and real-time detection was performed on the ABI 7500 Real-Time PCR System (Life Technologies) with software version 2.3, or on the QuantStudio™ 6 Flex Real-time PCR system (Life Technologies) using software version 1.4. The total sample volume per reaction was 15µL of master mix, combined primer/probe mix, and nuclease free water and 5µL of eluted sample. Assay run parameters were as described in the CDC protocol (11). Samples that gave a cycle threshold (C_t) value <40 for both N1 and N2 targets were considered positive. Samples negative for both N1 and N2 targets had to have a positive amplification curve for the RP gene to be considered a valid negative result. Samples that gave a C_t value <40 for either N1 or N2 targets were considered inconclusive and repeat testing was performed per CDC protocol. If results were still inconclusive after repeat testing, a result of inconclusive was reported. Validation results for the laboratory-modified CDC assay are not shown.

Abbott Molecular SARS-CoV-2 assay. Next, we verified the *RealTime* SARS-CoV-2 assay (Abbott Molecular, Des Plaines, IL), which is a qualitative real-time assay performed on the Abbott *m2000* platform (12). The system includes the *m2000sp* instrument with automated extraction of nucleic acids using the DNA (total nucleic acid) sample preparation kit in batches of up to 96 samples. The *RealTime* SARS-CoV-2 assay utilizes two real-time detection probes: one probe combined for the N and RNA-dependent RNA polymerase (RdRP) genes, and a second probe for the internal control to assess overall performance, including nucleic acid extraction and possible PCR inhibition. Nasopharyngeal swab samples were heat inactivated at 56°C for 35±5 minutes prior to testing. Automated extraction was

performed using a sample input volume of 500µL VTM, followed by automated addition of amplification pack reagents and extracts (40µL volume used for PCR amplification and detection). Two controls (one positive and one negative) provided by the manufacturer were included with each run of patient samples. Amplification curves were interpreted by the *m2000rt* system and reported as detected or not detected.

In our initial verification of the *RealTime* SARS-CoV-2 assay, we tested 25 nasopharyngeal swab samples in which SARS-CoV-2 RNA gene sequences had been detected by the laboratory-modified CDC assay, and 30 samples in which SARS-CoV-2 RNA samples were not detected. There was 100% positive and negative agreement between results of the 2 assays [median C_t values on the modified CDC assay for positive samples, 25.93 (IQR, 20.3 - 28.87) for N1 and 24.6 (IQR, 19.4 - 28.35) for N2].

ID NOW™ COVID-19 assay. The third SARS-CoV-2 molecular assay introduced to our laboratory was the ID NOW™ COVID-19 (formerly Alere i), an isothermal nucleic acid amplification test for SARS-CoV-2 RNA that targets the RdRp gene (13). Following an initial 3 minute warm-up of the test system, 200µL of VTM was added to elution buffer in the sample base using the provided disposable transfer pipette, then mixed for 10 seconds with the pipette. Using the sample transfer device, the sample was transferred into the test cartridge, the lid was closed and the instrument automatically initialized the assay. The ID NOW does not report C_t values to the user. The instrument software interprets amplification data, and final results are reported on screen as positive, negative, or invalid.

Estimation of RNA concentration in respiratory samples. We tested purified genomic RNA from a reference strain of SARS-CoV-2, isolate USA-WA1/2020 (catalog# NR-52285, lot# 70033320) (BEI Resources, Manassas, VA) to generate standard curves for the laboratory-modified CDC assay and the *RealTime* SARS-CoV-2 assay in order to estimate the concentration of SARS-CoV-2 genome equivalents in nasopharyngeal swab samples. We serially diluted the standard and tested the dilution series in

triplicate. The ID NOW™ COVID-19 assay does not provide Ct values, so we could not generate a standard curve for this system.

Data analysis. Because there is no reference standard for SARS-CoV-2 detection by RT-PCR, sensitivity and specificity of the assays could not be determined. Instead, we calculated overall, positive, and negative agreement for the 3 assays (<http://www.medcalc.org>). Box plots for comparing C_t values between groups were created using SPSS version 22 (IBM, Armonk, NY). Discordant results were adjudicated by medical record review (M.K.H.) to assess whether the patients' clinical courses were consistent with COVID-19 infection.

RESULTS

Clinical overview. Specimens from 200 unique patients were included in this study. The first 94 samples tested for this study were collected consecutively. Subsequently, we enriched for positive samples by including all samples in which SARS-CoV-2 RNA was detected by the *RealTime* SARS-CoV-2 assay on the m2000 – our standard assay during the study period – and also the next negative sample after the positive sample. Mean age was 50 ± 17 years and 54% were women. Seventy-nine (40%) patients were hospitalized, 29 (36%) of whom were in an intensive care unit; 76 (38%) were cared for in an ambulatory location, including 55 (72%) who were seen in a designated COVID-19 screening clinic; and 45 (23%) were seen in an ED.

Assay performance using nasopharyngeal swab samples in viral transport medium. There were 94 (47%) samples in which SARS-CoV-2 gene sequences were detected by all assays and 73 (36.5%) samples in which SARS-CoV-2 RNA was detected by none of the assays (Table 1). The median cycle number (C_n) for positive samples by the *RealTime* SARS-CoV-2 assay was 15.34 (IQR, 11.27 - 18.13), or approximately 447 genome equivalents/ μ L (Figure 1). Overall agreement among the three assays was 83.5% (95% CI, 77.7% - 88.0%). Two-way positive and negative agreement between results is shown in Table 2. Positive agreement ranged from 75.2% to 100%, with the lowest agreement between the *RealTime* SARS-CoV-2

and the ID NOW™ COVID-19 assays. Negative agreement ranged from 92.4% (laboratory-modified CDC assay versus *RealTime* SARS-CoV-2 assay) and 100% (laboratory-modified CDC assay versus ID NOW™ COVID-19 assay, and ID NOW™ COVID-19 assay versus *RealTime* SARS-CoV-2 assay).

For the laboratory-modified CDC assay, SARS-CoV-2 target RNA sequences were detected in 119 (60%) samples. Six (3%) samples gave an initial inconclusive result. Upon repeat testing, 4 yielded valid results: 3 were detected and 1 was not detected. The remaining 2 (0.01%) samples repeated as inconclusive (only one of the two targets amplified in the specimen) (Table 1). The median C_t value for positive samples was 30.29 (IQR, 25.40 – 34.55) for N1 target and 30.20 (IQR, 25.12 – 34.55), which corresponds to an RNA concentration of approximately 150 genome equivalents/μL of sample (calculated using N1 standard curve) (Figure 1).

The *RealTime* SARS-CoV-2 on the *m2000* assay yielded 127 (63.5%) positive results and no invalid results (Table 1). The median C_n value for positive samples was 17.27 (IQR, 13.27 - 21.40), which correlates to an RNA concentration of approximately 147 genome equivalents/μL of sample (Figure 1). The ID NOW™ COVID-19 assay yielded 94 (47%) positive results (Table 1). Five (0.03%) samples first gave invalid results; 3 resolved after repeat testing and the remaining 2 repeated as invalid.

Analysis of discordant results. There were 33 (17%) samples that yielded discordant results across the three assays (Table 1). Eight discordant samples were not detected or gave inconclusive results by the laboratory-modified CDC assay but were detected by the *RealTime* SARS-CoV-2 assay. The median C_n value for these samples on the *RealTime* SARS-CoV-2 was 27.73 (IQR, 27.37 – 28.40), or approximately 0.34 genome equivalents/μL (Figure 2). Thirty-three samples (including 2 invalid samples) were not detected by the ID NOW™ COVID-19 but were detected by the *RealTime* SARS-CoV-2 assay; 25 of these were also detected by the laboratory-modified CDC assay. The median C_n values for these samples on the *RealTime* SARS-CoV-2 were 21.42 (IQR, 20.80 - 23.88), or approximately 13.3 genome

equivalents/ μ L; differences among median values were statistically significant (Kruskal-Wallis $p < .001$) (Figure 2).

Medical record review resolved all discrepant results in favor of the positive result (127 true positives). The *RealTime* SARS-CoV-2 assay detected significantly more cases of COVID-19 than either the laboratory-modified CDC assay [8 (4%) undetected cases, SD 0.014, 95% CI, 0.013 – 0.067] or the ID NOW™ COVID-19 assay [33 (16.5%) undetected cases, SD 0.026, 95% CI, 0.11 – 0.22]; the difference in detection between the laboratory-modified CDC assay and the ID NOW™ COVID-19 assay was also significant.

Assessment of dry nasal swabs tested by the ID NOW™ COVID-19 assay. To analyze the performance of the ID NOW™ COVID-19 assay further, we tested its performance using dry nasal swab samples and compared results to those from paired nasopharyngeal samples tested by the *RealTime* SARS-CoV-2 assay. Ninety-seven patients were included in this evaluation. Mean age of patients was 59 ± 17 years, and 48 (48%) were women. Thirteen (13.4%) paired nasopharyngeal samples yielded positive results by the *RealTime* SARS-CoV-2 assay. C_n values of these samples ranged from 9.2-29.2. SARS-CoV-2 RNA was not detected in the remaining 84 (86.6%) samples.

Workflow analysis. Differences among key aspects of workflow for each of the three assays and platforms are summarized in Table 3. We estimate that we can batch test and report results for 58 samples by the laboratory-modified CDC assay, and 94 samples by the *RealTime* SARS-CoV-2 assay, in an 8-hour shift. The ID NOW™ COVID-19 assay, which was developed for point of care, requires the least hands-on time and provides the fastest results. However, throughput is limited (1 sample/instrument/5-15 minutes).

DISCUSSION

Rapid, accurate detection of COVID-19 is essential to ensure speedy and appropriate patient management, outbreak containment, and to better understand the global epidemiology of the virus.

Laboratory testing to date has relied primarily on the amplification and detection of viral gene sequences in upper respiratory tract specimens. As new test kits are made available through the EUA pathway, laboratories are confronted with the dilemma of deciding which test or platform to adopt for SARS-CoV-2 detection. Additionally, laboratory directors are faced with numerous questions from clinicians regarding performance characteristics of the tests. Responding to these questions is difficult, since EUA requires only limited test validation (14); assays approved under EUA have not been evaluated in clinical trials, and robust performance data from real world assessments are lacking.

Results of the current study help to fill this knowledge gap. We found significant differences in detection of SARS-CoV-2 viral sequences among the *RealTime* SARS-CoV-2 assay on the *m2000*, the laboratory-modified CDC assay, and the ID NOW™ COVID-19 assay. The *RealTime* SARS-CoV-2 assay on the *m2000* detected the most cases, followed by the laboratory-modified CDC assay, and then the ID NOW™ COVID-19 assay. Discrepant results were observed almost exclusively in samples with higher C_t values, i.e., lower viral titer. These findings suggest differences in lower limit of detection of the assays. For the laboratory-modified CDC RT-PCR assay, this might be explained in part by smaller input sample volumes for extraction (200μL) and amplification (5μL), compared to 500μL extraction and 40μL amplification volumes in the *RealTime* SARS-CoV-2 assay on the *m2000*, i.e., there is more available target for amplification and detection in the *RealTime* SARS-CoV-2 assay on the *m2000*. Our results comparing the *RealTime* SARS-CoV-2 assay on the *m2000* and the ID NOW™ COVID-19 assay are concordant with those of Harrington et al, who reported increased detection of SARS-CoV-2 RNA gene sequences by the *RealTime* SARS-CoV-2 assay compared to the ID NOW™ COVID-19 assay (15).

In order to eliminate confounding that could have been introduced by testing different sample types on different systems, we evaluated aliquots of the same nasopharyngeal swab/viral transport medium in all three assays. At the time of this study, nasopharyngeal swab specimens in viral transport medium were deemed acceptable sample types for the 3 assays that we assessed. Following the

completion of our study, the manufacturer amended the package insert of the ID NOW™ COVID-19 assay to state that testing viral transport medium could lead to false-negative results. However, in our subsequent analysis of dry nasal swab samples tested by the ID NOW™ COVID-19 assay and paired nasopharyngeal swabs tested by the *RealTime* SARS-CoV-2 assay on the *m2000*, we continued to see more true positive results by the *RealTime* SARS-CoV-2 assay on the *m2000* assay, suggesting that false-negative results were not due entirely to dilution.

We observed differences in turnaround time, workflow, and throughput among the three tests. The *RealTime* SARS-CoV-2 assay on the *m2000* had the longest runtime of the three assays: approximately 8 hours for one full run of 94 samples. Runtime of the laboratory-developed CDC assay was similar, but the throughput was less (58 samples in an 8-hour shift). The ID NOW™ COVID-19 assay was the easiest to perform and yielded the fastest results; positive results are generated in as few as 5 minutes, which is faster than any other test system available currently in the United States. Ease of use and speed are advantages in settings without laboratory expertise, or when rapid results are needed. The assay platform is small and can be utilized at near-patient settings, thereby increasing the overall testing capacity for SARS-CoV-2 within healthcare facilities. Availability of different platforms provides beneficial flexibility to meet testing needs of different populations and different healthcare settings.

Our study has limitations. Because there is not a reference standard for SARS-CoV-2 infection, we were unable to calculate sensitivity or specificity of the assays. Instead, we calculated percent agreement, which is appropriate when a non-standard reference method is utilized to compare assay performance (16). We resolved discrepant results through review of patient medical records, which may have introduced bias, since concordant test results were not confirmed in the same way (17). We enriched for samples that were positive by the *RealTime* SARS-CoV-2 assay on the *m2000*, which may have biased in favor of this test. However, our inability to detect any samples that yielded a positive result by either of the other two assays under evaluation and a negative result by the *RealTime* SARS-

CoV-2 assay in this study, or in our initial verification of the assay, suggests that the effect of bias is small. Not all testing was performed on the same day due to workflow and personnel limitations, although all testing was completed within 72 hours of sample collection. Storage of specimens at ambient room (22°C) or refrigerated (4°C) temperature has been shown to have little impact on detection of other RNA viruses by RT-PCR (18).

In conclusion, we found that The *RealTime* SARS-CoV-2 assay on the *m2000* detected more cases of COVID-19 infection than the modified CDC assay or the ID NOW™ COVID-19 test. The ID NOW™ COVID-19 test provided fastest results, and the small footprint of the instrument and ease of use are advantages in settings without technical expertise. Both tests are welcome additions to the COVID-19 testing armamentarium, and increase nationwide testing capacity for COVID-19.

Acknowledgements

The following reagent was obtained through BEI Resources, NIAID, NIH: Genomic RNA from SARS-Related Coronavirus 2, Isolate USA-WA1/2020, NR-52285.

References

1. Zhu N, Zhang D, Wang W, Li X, Yang B, Song J, Zhao X, Huang B, Shi W, Lu R, Niu P, Zhan F, Ma X, Wang D, Xu W, Wu G, Gao GF, Tan W, China Novel Coronavirus I, Research T. 2020. A Novel Coronavirus from Patients with Pneumonia in China, 2019. *N Engl J Med* **382**:727-733.
2. Wu F, Zhao S, Yu B, Chen YM, Wang W, Song ZG, Hu Y, Tao ZW, Tian JH, Pei YY, Yuan ML, Zhang YL, Dai FH, Liu Y, Wang QM, Zheng JJ, Xu L, Holmes EC, Zhang YZ. 2020. A new coronavirus associated with human respiratory disease in China. *Nature* **579**:265-269.
3. Young BE, Ong SWX, Kalimuddin S, Low JG, Tan SY, Loh J, Ng OT, Marimuthu K, Ang LW, Mak TM, Lau SK, Anderson DE, Chan KS, Tan TY, Ng TY, Cui L, Said Z, Kurupatham L, Chen MI, Chan M, Vasoo S, Wang LF, Tan BH, Lin RTP, Lee VJM, Leo YS, Lye DC, Singapore Novel Coronavirus Outbreak Research T. 2020. Epidemiologic Features and Clinical Course of Patients Infected With SARS-CoV-2 in Singapore. *JAMA* doi:10.1001/jama.2020.3204.
4. Bernard Stoecklin S, Rolland P, Silue Y, Mailles A, Campese C, Simondon A, Mechain M, Meurice L, Nguyen M, Bassi C, Yamani E, Behillil S, Ismael S, Nguyen D, Malvy D, Lescure FX, Georges S, Lazarus C, Tabai A, Stempfelet M, Enouf V, Coignard B, Levy-Bruhl D, Investigation T. 2020. First cases of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) in France: surveillance, investigations and control measures, January 2020. *Euro Surveill* **25**.
5. Spiteri G, Fielding J, Diercke M, Campese C, Enouf V, Gaymard A, Bella A, Sognamiglio P, Sierra Moros MJ, Riutort AN, Demina YV, Mahieu R, Broas M, Bengner M, Buda S, Schilling J, Filleul L, Lepoutre A, Saura C, Mailles A, Levy-Bruhl D, Coignard B, Bernard-Stoecklin S, Behillil S, van der Werf S, Valette M, Lina B, Riccardo F, Nicastrì E, Casas I, Larrauri A, Salom Castell M, Pozo F, Maksyutov RA, Martin C, Van Ranst M, Bossuyt N, Siira L, Sane J, Tegmark-Wisell K, Palmerus M, Broberg EK, Beaute J, Jorgensen P, Bundle N, Pereyaslov D, Adlhoch C, Pukkila J,

- Pebody R, Olsen S, et al.** 2020. First cases of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) in the WHO European Region, 24 January to 21 February 2020. *Euro Surveill* **25**.
6. **Mousavi SH, Shah J, Giang HTN, Al-Ahdal TMA, Zahid SU, Temory F, Paikan FM, Karimzadeh S, Huy NT.** 2020. The first COVID-19 case in Afghanistan acquired from Iran. *Lancet Infect Dis* doi:10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30231-0.
7. **Silverstein WK, Stroud L, Cleghorn GE, Leis JA.** 2020. First imported case of 2019 novel coronavirus in Canada, presenting as mild pneumonia. *Lancet* **395**:734.
8. **Holshue ML, DeBolt C, Lindquist S, Lofy KH, Wiesman J, Bruce H, Spitters C, Ericson K, Wilkerson S, Tural A, Diaz G, Cohn A, Fox L, Patel A, Gerber SI, Kim L, Tong S, Lu X, Lindstrom S, Pallansch MA, Weldon WC, Biggs HM, Uyeki TM, Pillai SK, Washington State -nCoV VCIT.** 2020. First Case of 2019 Novel Coronavirus in the United States. *N Engl J Med* **382**:929-936.
9. **Kim JY, Choe PG, Oh Y, Oh KJ, Kim J, Park SJ, Park JH, Na HK, Oh MD.** 2020. The First Case of 2019 Novel Coronavirus Pneumonia Imported into Korea from Wuhan, China: Implication for Infection Prevention and Control Measures. *J Korean Med Sci* **35**:e61.
10. **Ghinai I, McPherson TD, Hunter JC, Kirking HL, Christiansen D, Joshi K, Rubin R, Morales-Estrada S, Black SR, Pacilli M, Fricchione MJ, Chugh RK, Walblay KA, Ahmed NS, Stoecker WC, Hasan NF, Burdsall DP, Reese HE, Wallace M, Wang C, Moeller D, Korpics J, Novosad SA, Benowitz I, Jacobs MW, Dasari VS, Patel MT, Kauerauf J, Charles EM, Ezike NO, Chu V, Midgley CM, Rolfes MA, Gerber SI, Lu X, Lindstrom S, Verani JR, Layden JE, Illinois C-IT.** 2020. First known person-to-person transmission of severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) in the USA. *Lancet* doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30607-3.
11. **CDC.** 2020. 2019-Novel Coronavirus (2019-nCoV) Real-Time RT-PCR Diagnostic Panel Services DoHaH, Atlanta, GA. <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/downloads/rt-pcr-panel-for-detection-instructions.pdf>.

- 309 12. **Abbott.** Abbott RealTime SARS-CoV-2 Assay Package Insert., *on* Abbott Molecular, Inc.
310 https://www.molecular.abbott/sal/9N77-095_SARS-CoV-2_US_EUA_Amp_PI.pdf. Accessed
311 March 19, 2020.
- 312 13. **Abbott.** ID NOW COVID-19 Package Insert., *on* Abbott Diagnostics Scarborough, Inc.
313 <https://www.fda.gov/media/136525/download>. Accessed March 29, 2020.
- 314 14. **FDA.** Policy for Diagnostics Tests for Coronavirus Disease-2019 during the Public Health
315 Emergency. <https://www.fda.gov/media/135659/download>. Accessed March 17, 2020.
- 316 15. **Harrington A, Cox B, Snowdon J, Bakst J, Ley E, Grajales P, Maggiore J, Kahn S.** 2020.
317 Comparison of Abbott ID Now and Abbott m2000 methods for the detection of SARS-CoV-2
318 from nasopharyngeal and nasal swabs from symptomatic patients. J Clin Microbiol
319 doi:10.1128/JCM.00798-20.
- 320 16. **CLSI.** 2008. User Protocol for Evaluation of Qualitative Test Performance; Approved Guideline--
321 Second Edition. CLSI document EP12-A2. Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute, Wayne, PA.
- 322 17. **McAdam AJ.** 2000. Discrepant analysis: how can we test a test? J Clin Microbiol **38**:2027-2029.
- 323 18. **Druce J, Garcia K, Tran T, Papadakis G, Birch C.** 2012. Evaluation of swabs, transport media, and
324 specimen transport conditions for optimal detection of viruses by PCR. J Clin Microbiol **50**:1064-
325 1065.

326

327 **Table 1.** Detection of SARS-CoV-2 RNA by laboratory-modified CDC 2019-nCoV RT-PCR assay, *RealTime* SARS-CoV-2 on the *m2000*, and ID
 328 NOW™ COVID-19*

No. samples tested (N=200)	Laboratory-modified CDC 2019-nCoV RT-PCR	<i>RealTime</i> SARS-CoV-2 on the <i>m2000</i>	ID NOW COVID-19
94	Detected	Detected	Detected
73	Not detected	Not detected	Not detected
23	Detected	Detected	Not detected
2	Detected	Detected	Invalid ^a
6	Not detected	Detected	Not detected
2	Inconclusive ^b	Detected	Not detected

329 *Categories with zero samples are not shown.

330 ^aInvalid defined as a sample that gave neither a positive nor a negative result.

331 ^bInconclusive defined as a sample that gave a C_t value <40 for either N1 or N2 targets.

332 **Table 2.** Performance agreement for detection of SARS-CoV-2 RNA by laboratory-modified CDC 2019-nCoV RT-PCR assay, *Rea/Time* SARS-CoV-2
 333 on the *m2000*, and ID NOW™ COVID-19 (N=200 samples)

Assay comparison (A/B)	Positive Percent Agreement (95% CI)		Assay comparison (A/B)	Negative Percent Agreement (95% CI)
LDT+/m2000+	100 (96.9, 100)		LDT-/2000-	92.4 (84.2, 97.2)
LDT+/ID NOW+	80.3 (71.9, 87.1)		LDT-/ID NOW-	100 (95.4, 100)
m2000+/ID NOW+	75.2 (66.7, 82.5)		m2000-/ID NOW-	100 (95.4, 100)

334 Abbreviations: LDT, laboratory-modified CDC 2019-nCoV RT-PCR assay; m2000, *Rea/Time* SARS-CoV-2 on the *m2000*; ID NOW, ID NOW™ COVID-
 335 19.

336 **Table 3.** Workflow analysis comparing laboratory-modified CDC 2019-nCoV RT-PCR, Abbott *m2000* SARS-CoV-2, and ID NOW™ COVID-19 assays

Parameter ^a	Laboratory-modified CDC 2019-nCoV RT-PCR	<i>Real</i> Time SARS-CoV-2 on the <i>m2000</i>	ID NOW™ COVID-19
Off-board lysis	Yes	No	No
Specimen processing & set up	1.75	1.00	0.03
Instrument extraction time	1.30	4.0	0.05
Amplification & real-time detection	1.25	2.25	0.22
Manual interpretation and result entry	0.5	0.75	.02
Total time to result ^b	4.8	8.0	0.27
No. samples processed in 8-hour shift per instrument	58 ^c	94 ^d	32 ^e

337 ^aTimes are per batch for the in-house LDT and Abbott *m2000* assays, and per sample for the ID NOW.

338 ^bTime from sample processing through result reporting

339 ^cA maximum of 58 clinical samples, not including external positive control, negative control, negative template control, RNase P control.

340 ^dA maximum of 94 clinical samples.

341 ^eAssumes continuous processing of 32 clinical samples, all with negative results.

342 **Figure 1.** SARS-COV-2 Standard Curves for laboratory-modified CDC 2019-nCoV RT-PCR assay and
 343 *RealTime* SARS-CoV-2 on the *m2000* assay. Values shown represent mean $\pm$ SEM of three independent
 344 replicates. Trend line equations: Laboratory-modified CDC assay (N1), $y = -2.054 \ln(x) + 40.585$, $R^2 = 1.0$;
 345 laboratory modified CDC assay (N2), $y = -1.966 \ln(x) + 40.022$, $R^2 = 0.99$; *RealTime* SARS-CoV-2 on the
 346 *m2000* assay, $y = -1.729 \ln(x) + 25.899$, $R^2 = 0.99$. *Only 2 of 3 replicates amplified and are included in
 347 estimate.

348 **Figure 2.** Comparison of C_t values among samples detected by each of the three assays, as measured by
349 the *RealTime* SARS-CoV-2 on the *m2000* standard curve. Median C_t value differences were statistically
350 significant (**Kruskal-Wallis $p < 0.001$ for all comparisons). Abbreviations: LDT, laboratory-modified CDC
351 2019-nCoV RT-PCR assay; *m2000*, *RealTime* SARS-CoV-2 on the *m2000*; ID NOW, ID NOW™ COVID-19.