1 **Reverse Transcription-Loop-Mediated Isothermal Amplification (RT-LAMP) is** 2 **an effective alternative for SARS-CoV-2 molecular detection in middle-income** 3 **countries**

4 Oscar Escalante-Maldonado¹, Margot Vidal-Anzardo^{1,4}, Fernando Donaires¹, Gilmer
5 Solis-Sanchez¹, Italo Gallesi¹, Luis Pampa-Espinoza¹, Maribel Huaranga¹, Nancy
6 Rojas Serrano¹, Coralith García², Eddie Angles-Yanqui^{3,4}, Ronnie Gustavo Gavilán¹,
7 Ricardo Durães-Carvalho⁶, Cesar Cabezas¹, Paulo Vitor Marques Simas^{1,5,6}

8

9 1. Instituto Nacional de Salud, Lima, Peru

10 2. Hospital Nacional Cayetano Heredia, Lima, Peru

11 3. Hospital Nacional Arzobispo Loayza, Lima, Peru

12 4. Universidad Peruana Cayetano Heredia, Lima, Peru

13 5. Universidad Nacional Mayor de San Marcos, Lima, Peru

14 6. University of Campinas, Institute of Biology, Laboratory of Animal Virology,
15 Campinas, SP, Brazil

16

17 **Corresponding author:**

18 Oscar Escalante-Maldonado, PhD

19 Nacional Institute of Health, Ministerio de Salud, Jirón Capac Yupanqui 1400, Jesús
20 María 15072, Lima, Peru.

21 Phone: +51 (511) 748-1111 Extension line 2136

22 E-mail: oescalante@ins.gob.pe; oscar.escmal@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Molecular diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2 in developing countries is still a big challenge. The reference standard, RT-qPCR, recommended by WHO, is not widely available, difficulting early identification of cases. Furthermore, the transport logistic between the sample collection point and the laboratory facilities can alter the samples, producing false negative results. RT-LAMP is a cheaper, simpler molecular technique that can be an interesting alternative to be offered in hospital laboratories. We present the evaluation of a RT-LAMP for diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2 in two steps: the laboratory standardization and the clinical validation, comparing it with the standard RT-qPCR. In the standardization phase, limit of detection and robustness values were obtained using RNA from a Peruvian SARS-CoV-2 strain. It presented 100% agreement between triplicates (RT-LAMP agreement with all RT-qPCR reactions that presented $Ct \leq 30$) and robustness (RT-LAMP successful reactions with 80% reaction volume and 50% primer concentration). 384 nasal and pharyngeal swabs collected from symptomatic patients and stored in the INS biobank were tested and we obtained 98.75%, 87.41%, 97.65% and 92.96% for specificity, sensitivity, positive predictive value and negative predictive values respectively. Then, 383 samples from symptomatic patients with less than 15 days of disease, were tested both with the RT-LAMP and with the RT-qPCR, obtaining e 98.8%, 88.1%, 97.7% y 93.3% of specificity, sensitivity, positive predictive value and negative predictive values respectively. The laboratory standardization and the clinical validation presented the same value by Kappa-Cohen index (0.88) indicating an almost perfect agreement between RT-LAMP and RT-qPCR for molecular detection of SARS-CoV-2. We conclude that this RT-LAMP protocol presented high diagnostic performance values and can be an effective alternative for COVID-19 molecular diagnosis in hospitals,

48 contributing to early diagnosis and reducing the spread of virus transmission in the
49 Peruvian population.

50

51 **KEYWORDS:** COVID-19; molecular testing; RT-LAMP; healthcare unit.

52 **1. INTRODUCTION**

53 The World Health Organization (WHO) declared COVID-19 as a pandemic in
54 the beginning of March. Since, the virus has been detected in every continent and
55 produced more than 1 million deaths. Currently, some Latin America countries such
56 as Brazil and Peru are considered pandemic epicenters [1], but many more low and
57 middle –income countries are facing important health constraints.

58 Molecular tests require considerable financial and logistical investments, when
59 compared to other diagnostic tools. The reference standard test suggested by WHO,
60 the Real Time Reverse Transcription Polymerase Chain Reaction (RT-qPCR),
61 requires molecular laboratory facilities, uses expensive equipment (thermocycler),
62 reagents (probes) and specialized staff all of which are not always widely available in
63 these countries. Results are available between 4 and 8 hours of processing [2, 3].

64 In Peru, at the beginning of the pandemic, RT-qPCR was only able to be
65 performed in a standardized way in Lima (capital of the country) in the National
66 Reference Laboratory of Respiratory Viruses of the Instituto Nacional de Salud (INS).
67 Progressively, the diagnosis was extended to regional laboratories in a decentralized
68 manner, but the demand for these tests, in practice, has not been fully met in some
69 places. This situation has led to the concern of the local scientific community for the
70 development of diagnostic alternatives.

71 On the other hand, the simple and low-cost reverse transcription loop-mediated
72 isothermal amplification (RT-LAMP) method could be a good alternative for molecular
73 diagnosis in places where there is no complete laboratory infrastructure, particularly
74 in hospitals. It is an isothermal technique that uses from four to six primers, two/three
75 forward and two/three reverse to identify DNA targets to allow its amplifications. RT-
76 LAMP uses cheaper equipment, is fast (results generally available in almost 50

minutes, without considering sampling and RNA extraction time) and highly sensible [4]. There are several publications about this technique, showing good results when compared to the RT-qPCR method.

Our goal was to develop a RT-LAMP for molecular detection of SARS-CoV-2 and to evaluate its diagnostic performance both through basic laboratory standardization as well as through assessment of diagnostic parameters in patients with clinical suspicion of COVID-19, comparing it with RT-qPCR as the reference standard.

2. MATERIAL AND METHODS

2.1. ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

The laboratory standardization did not need to be sent for evaluation by the Ethics Committee since it is included in the action plan of INS-Peru. Nonetheless, all samples were processed completely anonymously. The clinical validation protocol was submitted to the Ethics Committee of the INS-Peru and approved on August 6th, 2020, under the procedure "Revisión de protocolos en el marco de epidemias, brotes o situaciones de emergencia" as indicates RD No. 283-2020-OGITT-INS.

2.2. EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN

The diagnostic performance values of RT-LAMP in comparison to RT-qPCR were obtained from qualitative and quantitative parameters used for laboratory standardization and clinical assessment. All experiments were conducted under the same conditions (samples, equipment, technicians and environment).

2.3. SAMPLES AND EVALUATION PARAMETERS

102 **2.3.1. LABORATORY STANDARDIZATION**

103 The limit of detection and the robustness (concordance degree of the results
104 when we change primers concentration – 0.5P – and the final volume of reaction–
105 0.8V, 0.6V, 0.5V and 0.4V) were performed using a SARS-CoV-2 Peruvian strain
106 isolated and titred in Vero cell line. The cross-reaction analysis was performed *in*
107 *silico* using multiple sequences alignment between external primers of RT-LAMP and
108 reference sequences for all known human coronaviruses (HCoV) (NC_005831.2,
109 HCoV-NL63; NC_002645.1, HCoV-229E; NC_006213.1, HCoV-OC43 strain ATCC
110 VR-759; NC_006577.2, HCoV-HKU1; NC_004718.3, Severe Acute Respiratory
111 Syndrome-related Coronavirus Type 1; NC_019843.3, Middle East Respiratory
112 Syndrome-related Coronavirus; FJ415324.1, HCoV 4408) and SARS-CoV-2 strains
113 from strains from China (NC_045512.2) and Peru (all complete sequences made
114 available on the GISAID) [5].

115 Specificity, sensitivity positive and negative predictive values were obtained
116 through evaluation of 384 nasal and pharyngeal swabs collected from routine
117 epidemiological screening. From these, 193 were submitted to a new RT-LAMP
118 round by other laboratory technician and equipment to test the reproducibility. The
119 sample size was calculated using the formula for difference between 2 proportions
120 assuming a 90% power and a 95% confidence interval [6] from the total number of
121 samples processed by RT-qPCR (almost 240,000 samples until July 2020).

122

123 **2.3.2. CLINICAL ASSESSMENT**

124 Specificity, sensitivity, positive and negative predictive values were
125 obtained through evaluation of 383 COVID-19 suspected people up to 15 days after
126 symptom onset, from Lima, Peru, assessed in Hospital Cayetano Heredia, Hospital

127 Hipolito Unanue and Hospital Arzobispo Loayza and patients that were treated by
128 home care teams. The sample size was calculated using Epidat software version
129 4.2, considering an estimate of 91.489% sensitivity and 99.531% specificity
130 according to Jiang et al. [7]. People older than 18 years old without a previous
131 diagnosis of COVID-19 by molecular test were included in the study after signature
132 of informed consent. Pregnant women and severe or critical patients were excluded.
133 The validation criteria considered 95% significance level, 5% absolute error and
134 39.5% positivity probability (based in the positive results obtained by RT-qPCR
135 reported by INS-Peru and assuming a loss rate of 20%). Nasal and pharyngeal
136 swabs were performed on each subject, using the Yocon Biology Technology
137 Company sampling kit, which includes viral transport media and flocked dacron
138 swabs. The samples were transported to the INS-Peru using triple containers with
139 cold accumulators, at temperatures between 2 to 8 ° C.

140

141 **2.4. MOLECULAR DETECTION OF SARS-CoV-2**

142 **2.4.1. RNA EXTRACTION**

143 The RNA extraction was performed using GenElute™ Total RNA
144 Purification Kit (Sigma-Aldrich – Merck), according to manufacturers' instructions,
145 then quantified by NanoDrop™ Spectrophotometer and frozen to -80°C until further
146 processing.

147

148 **2.4.2. RT-qPCR REACTION**

149 The primers and probes used in the RT-qPCR reactions standardized by
150 INS-PERU, is available in table 1. The RT-qPCR was performed using Rotor-Gene
151 Multiplex RT-PCR Kit, according to the RT-qPCR standardized and implemented to

COVID-19 diagnosis at the INS-Peru, summarized in the tables 2 (reactions conditions) and 3 (amplification conditions).

Table 1: Target genes, oligonucleotides and probes used in the RT-qPCR reactions. The targets for amplification were RNA dependent RNA polymerase (*RdRp*) specific for SARS-CoV-2 and the Glyceraldehyde-3-Phosphate Dehydrogenase (*GAPDH*), a human constitutive gene. The sample quality, the RNA extraction and amplifications performances were evaluated in a single multiplex reaction using *GAPDH* as internal control.

TARGET	PRIMER / PROBE	SEQUENCE 5' → 3'
<i>RdRp</i>	RdRp_SARSr-F	GTGARATGGTCATGTGTGGCGG
	RdRp_SARSr-P2	FAM-CAGGTGGAACCTCATCAGGAGATGC-BBQ
	RdRp_SARSr-R	CARATGTTAAASACACTATTAGCATA
<i>GAPDH</i>	GAPDH-F	GTGAAGGTCGGAGTCAACGG
	GAPDH-P	ROX-CGCCTGGTCAACAGGGTCGC-BBQ
	GAPDH-R	TCAATGAAGGGGTCATTGATG

Table 2: Conditions of RT-qPCR multiplex reactions for SARS-CoV-2 and *GAPDH* using Capital™ RT-qPCR Probe Mix 4X (Biotechrrabbit).

REAGENTS and CONCENTRATIONS	VOLUME (μL)
RdRp_SARSr-F (10 μM)	0.8
RdRp_SARSr-P2 (10 μM)	0.8
RdRp_SARSr-R (10 μM)	0.4
GAPDH-F (2.5 μM)	0.5
GAPDH-P (2.5 μM)	0.5
GAPDH-R (1.25 μM)	0.4
RTase with RNase inhibitor	1.0
qPCR PROBE MIX	5.0
Nuclease Free Water	5.6
FINAL VOLUME	15.0

Table 3: Conditions of RT-qPCR multiplex amplification for SARS-CoV-2 and *GAPDH* using Capital™ RT-qPCR Probe Mix 4X (Biotechrrabbit).

STEPS	TEMPERATURE	TIME	NUMBER of CYCLES
Reverse	50°C	10 minutes	1

Transcription			
Initial denaturation	95 °C	3 minutes	1
qPCR amplification	95 °C	10 seconds	45
	58 °C	30 seconds	
	40 °C	30 seconds	

167

168 2.4.3. RT-LAMP REACTION

169 The RT-LAMP reactions were performed according to Lamb et al. (2020) [8] using
 170 WarmStart Colorimetric LAMP 2X Master Mix, containing a pH indicator which allows
 171 the colorimetric visualization. The robustness was tested from standard primers
 172 concentration and final volume of reaction. The concentrations of reagents and the
 173 reactions conditions were summarized in table 4.

174 **Table 4:** Conditions of RT-LAMP reactions to detect SARS-CoV-2, according to
 175 Lamb et al. (2020). The primers' names were the same on the original publication.

PRIMERS (100 µM)	Volume (µL)	REAGENTS	Volume (µL)
FIP	16.0	MIX-LAMP	12.5
BIP	16.0	MIX-Primers	2.5
F3	2.0	Water	5.0
B3	2.0	RNA	5.0
LOOP F	4.0	Final Volume	25.0
BUCLE B	4.0	THERMAL CONDITIONS	
Water	56.0	45 minutes at 65°C	
Final Volume	100.0	5 minutes at 80°C	

176

177 2.5. STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

178 Data analysis was performed using the Stata v16.1 statistical package (Stata
 179 Corporation, College Station, Texas, USA); point estimators and 95% confidence
 180 intervals of the clinical-epidemiological characteristics of the people evaluated were
 181 calculated. The values of the diagnostic performance measures of RT-LAMP in
 182 comparison with RT-qPCR were calculated; considering: sensitivity, specificity,

positive and negative predictive value, positive and negative likelihood ratio, area under the ROC curve, Matthews Correlation Coefficient and F1-Score. The degree of concordance between the results of both tests was determined, as well as the agreement using Cohen's Kappa index. These analyzes were carried out for all evaluated cases, as well as in a stratified way according to week of illness. The relationship between time of symptoms and Ct values was established using Pearson's correlation coefficient.

3. RESULTS

3.1. LABORATORY STANDARDIZATION

The limit of detection for SARS-CoV-2 by RT-LAMP was consistent only with those with Ct values < 30 in the RT-qPCR reactions (standard curve presented into figure 1, panel A, and RT-LAMP performance reaction, panel B) and RT-LAMP in table 5. This means that the RT-LAMP test was efficient to detect up to 1000 copies/ μ L of the target gene. In the robustness experiments, high reactions performances were obtained with half of primers concentrations (0.5P) and with 20 μ L of final volume (0.8V from final volume of standard reaction).

Table 5: Comparison of limit of detection between RT-qPCR and RT-LAMP reactions to detect SARS-CoV-2.

SERIAL DILUTION	10^{-1}	10^{-2}	10^{-3}	10^{-4}	10^{-5}	10^{-6}	10^{-7}
CONCENTRATION (number of copies/ μ L)	10^7	10^6	10^5	10^4	10^3	10^2	10^1
Ct VALUES (RT-qPCR)	13.59	16.70	20.37	25.04	29.17	35.12	-
COLOR CHANGE (RT-LAMP)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No

Figure 1: Standard curve of RT-qPCR (panel A) reactions and limit of detection by RT-LAMP (panel B) in two molecular methods to detect SARS-CoV-2.

208 The “cross-reaction analysis” performed *in silico* identified a very low-
 209 similarity degrees between the primers alignment and reference sequences of HCoV
 210 NL-63, HKU1, OC43, 229E, SARS-CoV-1, MERS and HCoV (figure 2: panel A
 211 refers to F3 primer alignment – forward; panel B refers to B3 primer alignment –
 212 reverse). These data, would indicate the absence of amplification of other HCoV, if
 213 they to be present in the sample. The yellow columns correspond to conserved
 214 regions. In addition, when these same primers were aligned with 194 Peruvian
 215 strains made available on GISAID initiative, there was none exclusion of conserved
 216 regions, exhibiting a high-similarity and specificity, which may be designated as
 217 absence of concomitant detection of other HCoV non-SARS-CoV-2.

218

219 **Figure 2:** Multiple sequence alignment between RT-LAMP external primers
 220 F3 and B3 (Lamb et al., 2020) and reference sequences of all known human
 221 coronaviruses and all SARS-CoV-2 Peruvian strains made available on GISAID
 222 initiative. The alignment was conducted in ClustalW using MEGA. The primers
 223 sequences (panel A – F3, panel B – B3) were aligned with all reference sequences of
 224 known HCoV (NC_005831.2, HCoV-NL63; NC_002645.1, HCoV-229E;
 225 NC_006213.1, HCoV-OC43 strain ATCC VR-759; NC_006577.2, HCoV-HKU1;
 226 NC_004718.3, SARS-CoV-1; NC_019843.3, MERS; FJ415324.1, HCoV-4408 and
 227 NC_045512.2, SARS-CoV-2 isolate Wuhan-Hu-1) and all 194 SARS-CoV-2 Peruvian
 228 strains (panel C – F3, panel D – B3). The yellow columns, on the panels A and B,
 229 and asterisks, on the panels C and D, represent conserved regions into *nsp3* gene
 230 fragment between the all known HCoV and all SARS-CoV-2 Peruvian strains
 231 complete genome, respectively.

232

233

234 The positivity obtained for each method, RT-qPCR and RT-LAMP, is
 235 presented in table 6. The values of Cohen’s kappa index comparing the diagnostic
 236 performance between both methods indicated a nearly perfect agreement between
 237 them, with the best agreement on the onset of symptoms.

238 **Table 6:** Results obtained in the laboratory standardization for performance
 239 diagnostic comparison between RT-LAMP and RT-qPCR in the SARS-CoV-2
 240 molecular detection.

RT-LAMP	RT-qPCR		Kappa Index (IC 95%)
	Positive	Negative	
Positive	125 (TP*)	3 (FP [†])	0.88
Negative	18 (FN ^{††})	238 (TN**)	

TP*: True positive; TN**: True negative; FP[†]: False Positive; FN^{††}: False Negative (According to Parik et al., 2008) [9]

3.2. CLINICAL ASSESSMENT

The study population was composed by 51.7% (n = 198) women and 48.3% (n = 185) men, being young adults the most frequent age group (n = 236, 61.6%). The most common symptoms were cough (n = 268, 70.0%) and pharyngeal pain (n = 262, 68.4%). Regarding time of symptom onset, the average was 7.1 ± 3.3 days, and 56.3% belong to the first week after symptom onset patients (group 1) and 43.7% belong to the second week after symptom onset patients (group 2). One case was excluded due to memory bias.

We determined 37.3% positive samples by RT-qPCR and 33.7% by RT-LAMP (table 6). Among the 143 positive results by RT-qPCR, only 20 clinical samples had discordant results with RT-LAMP, 17 were false negatives and 3 were false positives. In group 1, the Ct was between 31.00 and 36.46, with a median of 34.43 (IQR: 34.2, 35.56). In group 2, the Ct values were higher than 37. The true positive data presented significant concordance (p <0.001) between both tests (Kappa index: 88.6; 95% CI between 83.8 and 93.5); being in group 1, 70 of 76 positive cases (Kappa index: 91.8; 95% CI between 86.2 and 97.4), while in group 2, 56 of 67 cases (Kappa index: 84.7; 95% CI between 76.4 and 93.0)] (table 7).

261

Table 6: Clinical and epidemiological data related to the study population (gender, age grouping, signs and symptoms, time of illness onset, positivity by RT-qPCR and by RT-LAMP.

n	%	95% CI
---	---	--------

Gender			
Male	185	48.3	43.2; 53.4
Female	198	51.7	46.6; 56.8
Age Grouping			
Young	62	16.2	12.6; 20.3
Young Adult	236	61.6	56.5; 66.5
Elderly	85	22.2	18.1; 26.7
Signs and symptoms			
Ageusia (loss or impairment of the sense of taste)	19	5.0	3.0; 7.6
Anosmia	37	9.7	6.9; 13.1
Headache	214	55.9	50.7; 60.9
Nasal congestion	127	33.2	28.5; 38.1
Diarrhea	80	20.9	16.9; 25.3
Dyspnea	90	23.5	19.3; 28.1
Joint pain	27	7.0	4.7; 10.1
Sore throat	262	68.4	63.5; 73.0
Muscle pain	113	29.5	25.0; 34.3
Chest pain	67	17.5	13.8; 21.7
Fever or chill	179	46.7	41.7; 51.9
Irritability or Confusion	2	0.5	0.1; 1.9
General discomfort	232	60.6	55.5; 65.5
Nausea or Vomiting	46	12.0	8.9; 15.7
Cough	268	70.0	65.1; 74.5
Time of symptom Onset *			
First week	215	56.3	51.1; 61.3
Second week	167	43.7	38.7; 48.9
Positivity by RT-qPCR			
Negative	240	62.7	57.6; 67.5
Positive	143	37.3	32.5; 42.4
Positivity by RT-LAMP			
Negative	254	66.3	61.3; 71.0
Positive	129	33.7	29.0; 38.7

*Data obtained from 382 patients (one patient was excluded due memory bias).

266

267 **Table 7:** Results from clinical validation, comparing diagnostic performance between
268 RT-LAMP and RT-qPCR for SARS-CoV-2 molecular detection. This data was used to
269 calculate the sensitivity, specificity, predictive positive (PPV) and predictive negative
270 (PNV) values.

RT-LAMP	RT-qPCR		Kappa Index (IC 95%)	Concordance %	p-value
	Positive	Negative			
Overall					
Positive	126 (TP*)	3 (FP [†])	0.88 (0.83; 0.93)	94.8	<0.001
Negative	17 (FN ^{††})	237 (TN ^{**})			

RT-LAMP	RT-qPCR		Kappa Index (IC 95%)	Concordance %	p-value
	Positive	Negative			
First week of symptoms					
Positive	70 (TP*)	2 (FP [†])	0.91 (0.86; 0.97)	96.3	<0.001
Negative	6 (FN ^{††})	137 (TN**)			
Second week of symptoms					
Positive	56 (TP*)	1 (FP [†])	0.84 (0.76; 0.93)	92.8	<0.001
Negative	11 (FN ^{††})	99 (TN**)			

TP*: True positive; TN**: True negative; FP[†]: False Positive; FN^{††}: False Negative (According to Parik et al., 2008) [9].

3.3. DIAGNOSTIC PERFORMANCE of RT-LAMP

The sensitivity was 88.1% (95% CI: 81.6; 92.9) and the specificity, 98.8% (95% CI: 96.4; 99.7). These values presented variations when a stratified evaluation was made by time of symptom onset; where the sensitivity reaches 92.1% in the first week, while for the second it drops to 86.6%. However, the specificity showed minimal variation, with 98.6% and 99.0% for the first and second week respectively (table 8).

The positive predictive value was 97.7%, which showed an increase according to the time of symptom onset, from 97.2%, in the first week, to 98.2%, for the second. It was identified that the overall positive likelihood ratio of the test was 70.5, taking values of 64.0 and 83.6 in the first and second week respectively. Meanwhile, the negative likelihood ratio was 0.12, with values of 0.08 in the first week, and 0.17 for the second. The accuracy tends to show lower results as the time of illness onset progresses.

Table 8: Laboratory and clinical performance of RT-LAMP using RT-qPCR as reference test.

PARAMETERS	LABORATORY STANDARDIZATION		CLINICAL ASSESSMENT					
			Overall		First week of symptoms		Second week of symptoms	
	%	95% CI	%	95% CI	%	95% CI	%	95% CI
Sensitivity*	87.4	80.8; 92.4	88.1	81.6; 92.9	92.1	83.6; 97.0	86.6	72.5; 91.5
Specificity**	98.8	96.4; 99.7	98.8	96.4; 99.7	98.6	94.9; 99.8	99.0	94.6; 100
Positive Predictive Value†	97.7	93.3; 99.5	97.7	93.4; 99.5	97.2	90.3; 99.7	98.2	90.6; 100
Negative Predictive Value‡	93.0	89.1; 95.8	93.3	89.5; 96.1	95.8	91.0; 98.4	90.0	82.8; 94.9
Accuracy	94.5	91.8; 96.6	94.8	92.1; 96.8	96.3	92.8; 98.4	92.8	87.8; 96.2
Area Under curve	93.1	90.3; 95.9	93.4	90.7; 96.2	95.3	92.1; 98.5	91.3	86.7; 95.9
Matthews Correlation Coefficient	88.4	----	88.9	----	91.8	----	85.4	----
F1 Score	92.3	----	92.6	----	94.6	----	90.3	----

*Sensitivity [(TP)/(TP+FN)]; **Specificity [(TN)/(TN+FP)]; †PPV [(TP)/(TP+FP)]; ‡NPV [(TN)/(TN+FN)] (According to Parik et al., 2008) [9].

292 **3.4. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN Ct VALUES AND DINAMICS OF VIRAL** 293 **INFECTION**

294 The overall median Ct value was 29.4 (7.8), 27.6 (8.0) for the first week of
295 symptom onset and 30.5 (7.3) for the second week. The overall median Ct values
296 obtained by RT-qPCR from all positive samples by RT-LAMP was 28.4 (7.0), 27.4
297 (7.4) in the first week, and 29.9 (6.7) in the second. A non-linear trend was found for
298 higher Ct values as there was a longer time of symptom onset. A direct relation of
299 32.6% was identified between the Ct values of the positive cases detected by RT-
300 qPCR with the time of symptom onset ($p = 0.001$). Meanwhile, for the positive cases
301 according to RT-LAMP, the correlation between Ct values and time of symptom onset
302 was 35.0% ($p = 0.001$) (figure 3, table 9).

303
304 **Figure 3:** Distribution of Ct values obtained by RT-qPCR (reference test) using
305 positivity data obtained in the both methods, RT-qPCR and RT-LAMP. The results
306 indicated that the Ct values increase with the course of the disease, suggesting a
307 decrease of viral load.

308 **Table 10.** Correlation between Ct values and time of illness onset.

	Overall		First week of symptoms		Second week of symptoms		Rho†	P-Value
	Positive	Median (RIQ)	Positive	Median (RIQ)	Positive	Median (RIQ)		
RT-qPCR	143	29.4 (7.8)	76	27.6 (8.0)	67	30.5 (7.3)	0.326	0.001
RT-LAMP	126	28.4 (6.9)	70	27.4 (7.4)	56	29.9 (6.7)	0.350	0.001

309 †Spearman's Correlation Coefficient.

310 4. DISCUSSION

311 In Peru, the first measure adopted to contain the virus dissemination was the
312 quarantine that endured between March 16th and June 30th. On this long and difficult
313 time, many diagnostic strategies were implemented and until now, almost 300,000
314 samples have been processed by RT-qPCR only in the COVID-19 Emergency
315 Laboratory from Instituto Nacional de Salud [10]. Even though other molecular
316 biology laboratories have been implemented in different regions of the country, this
317 strategy have not been enough to contain the virus dissemination in our country.
318 Peru is the sixth country of the world in total number of COVID-19 positive cases and
319 the first in the mortality (96 deceased for every 100,000 inhabitants) [11].

320 On the other hand, the sample transport logistics between collection point
321 and processing remains as a problem to overcome. In this sense, the molecular test
322 available at the healthcare unit should be a good strategy to detect on time and
323 control the SARS-CoV-2 transmissibility. To select the best diagnostic strategy, some
324 challenges must be considered. Additionally, It is essential to have clarity about the
325 purpose, regulatory approval, diagnostic accuracy under ideal conditions, data on the
326 diagnostic accuracy in clinical practice and finally, the test's performance used in
327 routine use publicly available [12]. So, the method chosen must no require complex
328 equipment or specialized human resources, must be fast producing results in short
329 time and must be comparable to RT-qPCR, the gold standard molecular method
330 recommended by WHO. Considering all these points, the RT-LAMP can be a feasible
331 alternative for all these requirements.

332 Considering the geographic and economic structure of Peru that implies
333 directly in the logistic transport and epidemiological conditions of several infectious
334 diseases, the Ministry of Health and INS have gradually produced and implemented

335 molecular diagnostic tests based on RT-LAMP method for cholera, febrile disease
336 caused by arboviruses Zika, and Dengue. Since other researchers, during this
337 pandemic, already described several RT-LAMP for SARS-CoV detection [7, 8, 13,
338 14, 15, 16, 17, 18 and 19], the INS Peruvian researchers' team selected the protocol
339 described Lamb et al (2020) to compare its performance diagnostic in comparison
340 with RT-qPCR. This protocol is based in a fast-colorimetric reaction and can provide
341 results in less than 60 minutes after RNA extraction.

342 We compared the diagnostic performance of this specific protocol in two
343 steps of quality verification. The first step was performed as laboratory
344 standardization and, the second one, as clinical validation. In these two phases, 767
345 clinical samples were processed and the results indicated that this protocol have
346 similar diagnostic performance when compared to RT-qPCR. The limit of detection of
347 this method was 1,000 copies/ μ L (table 5 and figure 1), ten times lower than RT-
348 qPCR standardized and implemented in the molecular diagnostic routine by INS.
349 However, this difference should be associated to the target gene for the methods to
350 be different and to be in different *ORFs*. The primers for RT-LAMP were designed to
351 align in the *ORF1a* region, to detect a SARS-CoV-2 *nsp3* gene fragment and the
352 primers for RT-qPCR, into the *ORF1b*, for in *RdRp* gene fragment. Considering the
353 CoV replication, many subgenomic RNA are generated in different quantities and this
354 particular characteristic should be considered in the molecular test using different
355 target gene [20]. From these replication characteristics of Coronaviridae family, the
356 WHO has suggested that the diagnosis should be conducted using primers for
357 Nucleocapsid (*N*) gene or for *ORF1ab* genes. Even so, since the *ORF1ab* represents
358 2/3 of all genome (reference sequence NC_045512.2), it should be considered that
359 the genes located on the 5' genome has less copy during replication cycle.

Therefore, the *nsp3* gene may have a lower amount of RNA during replication when compared to the amount of RNA for the *RdRp* gene, which would justify the lower sensitivity of the RT-LAMP test. To overcome these difficulties, we designed new set of primers for others genome regions, especially for *RdRp*, to properly compare the diagnostic performance considering the same genomic region.

We also showed by *in silico* analysis that the set of primers used for RT-LAMP was really specific to detect the SARS-CoV-2 Peruvian strains and did not present cross-reaction with others HCoV in molecular test (figure 2, panels A and B). We know that this point was a limitation of our study because this analysis should be done in vitro using clinical samples. Furthermore, the INS does not have positive clinical samples for other HCoV. Due to the need to quickly evaluate the performance of this diagnostic method and finally start transferring this technology to the points of attention, the alternative of verifying the occurrence of cross reaction measured by *in silico* analysis was the most appropriate and scientifically feasible at the moment. The perfect identity in the region of primers alignment F3 and B3 with all available SARS-CoV-2 Peruvian strains (figure 2, panels C and D) also indicated specific detection and almost none probability of false negative results due primers specificity.

The robustness evaluation of this RT-LAMP protocol considered variables as primers concentration and final volume of reaction. This strategy focused the fact of the reactions will be performed by people that does not present routine contact with molecular biology techniques. Since the reactions performance was not compromised using half of primers concentrations and eighty percent of final volume of reaction, technical errors that may be made during small volume pipetting.

384 The RT-LAMP presented a high sensitivity and specificity in the both steps of
 385 quality verification (87.4% and 98.7%, 88.1% and 98.8%, available in table 8
 386 obtained by results presented in tables 6 and 7 in the laboratory standardization and
 387 in the clinical validation, respectively). These results were similar to those reported by
 388 Hu et al. (2020) [21] (88.57% and 98.98%, respectively) and lower than described by
 389 Jiang et al. (2020) [8] (91.4% and 99.5%, respectively) and Kitagawa et al. (2020)
 390 [22] (100% and 97.6%, respectively). These differences could be associated to the Ct
 391 values used to establish positivity by RT-qPCR. Furthermore, only the positive
 392 samples that presented Ct values > 30 disagreed with those obtained by RT-LAMP.
 393 So, our results indicated 100% specificity and sensitivity because Ct > 30 exceeds
 394 the minimum number of copies that represents the limit of detection of this protocol.
 395 In addition, the Kappa index about 0.9 showed a virtually perfect agreement between
 396 these tests, indicating that this RT-LAMP protocol can be used as alternative method
 397 of COVID-19 molecular diagnosis at healthcare centers.

398 The area under the curve of the RT-LAMP test was 93.4% for the clinical
 399 assessment. We did not find any article that has reported this aspect for the RT-
 400 LAMP. However, as it is very close to 100%, it reflects that RT-LAMP can be useful
 401 enough to identify infected patients in the active transmission phase.

402 It was found that the RT-LAMP test, when giving a Positive Predictive Value
 403 97.7%, in a similar way to that reported by Jiang et al. (2020) [7], PPV: 97.7%), and
 404 much higher than mentioned by Hu et al. (2020) [21] (PPV: 91.18%), the latter
 405 evaluated 329 nasal and pharyngeal swabs from a cohort of 129 COVID-19 suspects
 406 and serial upper respiratory tract samples from asymptomatic carriers, unlike our
 407 study in which only samples of symptomatic cases. Similarly, when giving a negative
 408 result, the RT-LAMP succeeded in 93.3% of the cases in identifying a person without

409 SARS-CoV-2 infection, which although it is somewhat lower than that reported by
410 Jiang et al. (2020) [7], who found a Negative Predictive Value (NPV) of 98.1%. This
411 difference also could be associated to prevalence obtained in each study.

412 The degree of agreement or concordance in the identification of SARS-CoV-
413 2 between RT-qPCR and RT-LAMP at clinical assessment was 94.8%, which
414 indicated that there was a great concordance degree between the tests, similar to
415 that found in other studies such as the one by Lu et al. (2020) [16], and Kitagawa et
416 al. (2020) [22], where it was always greater than 90%. In contrast, we found 20
417 discordant results between RT-LAMP and RT-qPCR in the clinical assessment, 17
418 false negatives and 3 false positive; Jiang et al. (2020) [7] also found 5 discordant
419 results, 4 false negatives and 1 false positive. Kitagawa et al. (2020) [22] reported
420 only 2 discordant, which were false positives. Hu et al. (2020) [21] also identified 4
421 discordant samples, theoretically false positives; however, these were confirmed as
422 SARS-CoV-2 positive through a genetic sequencing test.

423 When evaluating the performance of the RT-LAMP by time of symptom
424 onset, we found that the sensitivity and the Negative Predictive Value were higher in
425 the first week, and although the Positive Predictive Value and the specificity showed
426 an increase towards the second week, although this increase was not significant. We
427 did not find any article that evaluates the performance of RT-LAMP by time of
428 symptom onset, but RT-qPCR shows greater performance in the first week of
429 symptoms; these findings could be verified with the area under the curve, which from
430 being 95.3% in first week it is reduced to 91.3% at second week of the days onset of
431 symptoms.

432 Within the clinical limitations, it should be mentioned that the RT-LAMP test
433 was only evaluated in symptomatic cases. However, the purpose of this study was to

434 evaluate a simple, sensitive, specific and robust, low-cost diagnostic method to be
435 implemented in healthcare units.

436 Finally, our data allow us to conclude that the RT-LAMP protocol
437 implemented by INS should be the convenient alternative for SARS-CoV-2 detection
438 directly at the healthcare centers in this moment. This strategy can provide
439 appropriate prevention and control measures in all provinces and for decreasing the
440 number of severe and non-severe cases of COVID-19.

441

442 **5. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

443 We thank Pan American Health Organization (PAHO) for providing us the
444 reagents and to establish collaboration to conduct the experiment validations. Our
445 recognition to all the workers of Laboratorio de Microbiología y Biomedicina of INS
446 and all people from other institutions involved in obtaining, handling and processing
447 the samples, in special to Jairo Mendez (PAHO), Rapid Response Team (CDC/INS),
448 Lely Solari, Faviola Valdivia, Helen Horna, Gabriel de Lucio, Yanina Zarate, Iris
449 Pompa, Isidro Antipupa, , Jhon Mayo, Carina Mantari, Kathia Tarqui, Romeo Pomari,
450 Eduardo Juscamayta, Paquita García, Miryam Palomino, Pamela Rios, Priscila Lope,
451 Johana Balbuena, Victor Jiménez, Yolanda Angulo, Yuli Barrios, Paul Pachas,
452 Noemi Flores, and Ana Zeppilli.

453

454 **6. CONFLICT OF INTEREST**

455 The authors declare none conflict of interest.

456

457

458

7. REFERENCES

1. who.int [Internet]. Coronavirus disease (COVID-19) pandemic. [cited 2020 Sep 24]. Available from: <https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019>.
2. Wölfel R, Corman VM, Guggemos W, Seilmaier M, Zange S, Müller MA, et al. Virological assessment of hospitalized patients with COVID-2019. Nature. 2020; 581(7809):465-9. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-020-2196-x>.
3. Deeks JJ, Dinnes J, Takwoingi Y, Davenport C, Spijker R, Taylor-Phillips S, et al. Antibody tests for identification of current and past infection with SARS-CoV-2. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews 2020. <https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.CD013652>.
4. Notomi T, Okayama H, Masubuchi H, Yonekawa T, Watanabe K et al. Loop-mediated isothermal amplification of DNA. Nucleic Acids Res. 2000. Jun 15;28(12):E63. <https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/28.12.e63>. pmid: 10871386; pmcid: PMC102748.
5. gisaid.org [Internet]. Genomic epidemiology of hCoV-19. [cited 2020 Sep 24]. Available from: <https://www.gisaid.org/>.
6. Cochran WG. Técnicas de muestreo, CECSA, México, 1985.
7. Jiang M, Pan W, Arasthfer A, Fang W, Ling L et al. Development and Validation of a Rapid, Single-Step Reverse Transcriptase Loop-Mediated Isothermal Amplification (RT-LAMP) System Potentially to Be Used for Reliable and High-Throughput Screening of COVID-19. Front Cell Infect Microbiol 2020. 10:331. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fcimb.2020.00331>.
8. Lamb LE, Bartolone SN, Ward E, Chancellor MB. Rapid Detection of Novel Coronavirus (COVID-19) by Reverse Transcription-Loop-Mediated Isothermal

- 484 Amplification. PLoS One. 2020 Jun 12; 15(6):e0234682.
485 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0234682>. eCollection 2020.pmid: 32530929.
- 486 9. Parikh R, Mathai A, Parikh S, Chandra Sekhar G, Thomas R. Understanding and
487 using sensitivity, specificity and predictive values. Indian J Ophthalmol. 2008. Jan-
488 Feb; 56(1):45-50. <https://doi.org/10.4103/0301-4738.37595>. pmid: 18158403; pmcid:
489 PMC2636062.
- 490 10. covid19.minsa.gob.pe. [Internet]. Sala Situacional COVID-19 Perú. [cited 2020
491 Sep 24]. Available from: <https://covid19.minsa.gob.pe/>.
- 492 11. coronavirus.jhu.edu/map.html. [Internet]. Coronavirus Resource Center. [cited
493 2020 Sep 24]. <https://coronavirus.jhu.edu/map.html>.
- 494 12. who.int. [Internet]. Kosack CS, Page AL, Klatser PR. A guide to aid the
495 selection of diagnostic tests. 2017. [cited 2020 Sep 24]. Available from:
496 <https://www.who.int/bulletin/volumes/95/9/16-187468/en/>.
- 497 13. Ben-Assa N, Naddaf R, Gefen T, Capucha T, Hajjo H, et al. Direct on-the-spot
498 detection of SARS-CoV-2 in patients. Exp Biol Med (Maywood). 2020. Jul
499 16:1535370220941819. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1535370220941819>. Epub ahead of
500 print. pmid: 32668983; pmcid: PMC7385438.
- 501 14. Huang WE, Lim B, Hsu C-C, Xiong D, Wu W, et al. RT-LAMP for rapid
502 diagnosis of coronavirus SARS-CoV-2. Microb Biotechnol. 2020.
503 <https://doi.org/10.1111/1751-7915.13586>.
- 504 15. Kashira J, Yaqinuddina A. Loop mediated isothermal amplification (LAMP)
505 assays as a rapid diagnostic for COVID-19. Medical Hypotheses, 2020, Volume 141,
506 August, 109786. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mehy.2020.109786>.

16. Lu R, Wu X, Wan Z, Li Y, Jin X, Zhang C. A Novel Reverse Transcription Loop-Mediated Isothermal Amplification Method for Rapid Detection of SARS-CoV-2. Int. J. Mol. Sci. 2020, 21(8), 2826; <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijms21082826>.
17. Osterdahl MF, Lee KA, Lochlainn MN, Wilson S, Douthwaite S, et al. Detecting SARS-CoV-2 at Point of Care: Preliminary Data Comparing Loop-Mediated Isothermal Amplification (LAMP) to PCR. Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3564906> or <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3564906>.
18. Yan C, Cui J, Huang L, Du B, Chen L, Xue G, Li S, Zhang W, Zhao L, Sun Y, Yao H, Li N, Zhao H, Feng Y, Liu S, et al. Rapid and visual detection of 2019 novel coronavirus (SARS-CoV-2) by a reverse transcription loop-mediated isothermal amplification assay. Clin Microbiol Infect. 2020. Jun;26(6):773-779. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cmi.2020.04.001>. Epub 2020 Apr 8. pmid: 32276116; pmcid: PMC7144850.
19. Yu L, Wu S, Hao X, Dong X, Mao L, et al. Rapid Detection of COVID-19 Coronavirus Using a Reverse Transcriptional Loop-Mediated Isothermal Amplification (RT-LAMP) Diagnostic Platform. Clin Chem. 2020. Jul 1; 66(7):975-977. <https://doi.org/10.1093/clinchem/hvaa102>. pmid: 32315390; pmcid: PMC7188121.
20. Case JB, Bailey AL, Kim AS, Chen RE, Diamond MS. Growth, detection, quantification, and inactivation of SARS-CoV-2. Virology 2020. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.virol.2020.05.015>.
21. Hu X, Deng Q, Li J, Chen J, Wang Z, Zhang X, et al. Development and Clinical Application of a Rapid and Sensitive Loop-Mediated Isothermal Amplification Test for SARS-CoV-2 Infection. Spiropoulou CF, editor. mSphere. 2020; 5(4):e00808-20, /msphere/5/4/mSphere808-20.atom. <https://doi.org/10.1128/mSphere.00808-20>.

- 531 22. Kitagawa Y, Orihara Y, Kawamura R, Imai K, Sakai J, Tarumoto N, et al.
532 Evaluation of rapid diagnosis of novel coronavirus disease (COVID-19) using loop-
533 mediated isothermal amplification. Journal of Clinical Virology. 2020; 129:104446.
534 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcv.2020.104446>.

A

B

10-1	10-2	10-3	10-4	10-5	10-6	PC	NC

YELLOW	YELLOW	YELLOW	YELLOW	YELLOW	RED	YELLOW	RED
CT < 30					CT > 30		

MX: Sequence Data Explorer (Alineamiento_2600-8800+PrimerF3.meg)

Data Display Search Groups Highlight Statistics Help

MEGA X X

TA UUC Phe C V P I S O 2 4 ★ - Q Q

✓ Name

✓ 1. Primer F3

✓ 2. NC 045512.2 Severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 isolate Wuhan-Hu-1 complete genome

✓ 3. NC 004718.3 SARS coronavirus Tor2 complete genome

✓ 4. NC 019843.3 Middle East respiratory syndrome coronavirus complete genome

✓ 5. FJ415324.1 Human enteric coronavirus 4408 complete genome

✓ 6. NC 006213.1 Human coronavirus OC43 strain ATCC VR-759 complete genome

✓ 7. NC 005831.2 Human Coronavirus NL63 complete genome

✓ 8. NC 006577.2 Human coronavirus HKU1 complete genome

✓ 9. NC 002645.1 Human coronavirus 229E complete genome

F3

T - - - C C A G A T G A G G A T G A A G A A G A - - - -

- - - - -

- - - - -

C C - - - - -

C C - - - - -

C T T G - - - - -

A G G - - - - -

A G G - - - - -

T G T - - - - -

A G A - - - - -

C A T - - - - -

F3

B

The screenshot displays the MX: Sequence Data Explorer application window. The title bar indicates the file being opened: "MX: Sequence Data Explorer (Alineamiento_2600-8800+PrimerB3RC.meg)".

The main interface includes a menu bar (Data, Display, Search, Groups, Highlight, Statistics, Help) and a toolbar with icons for file operations, viewing options, and search functions.

A list of sequences is shown on the left, all checked:

- Name
- 1. Primers B3 RC
- 2. NC 045512.2 Severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 isolate Wuhan-Hu-1 complete genome
- 3. NC 004718.3 SARS coronavirus Tor2 complete genome
- 4. NC 019843.3 Middle East respiratory syndrome coronavirus complete genome
- 5. FJ415324.1 Human enteric coronavirus 4408 complete genome
- 6. NC 006213.1 Human coronavirus OC43 strain ATCC VR-759 complete genome
- 7. NC 005831.2 Human Coronavirus NL63 complete genome
- 8. NC 006577.2 Human coronavirus HKU1 complete genome
- 9. NC 002645.1 Human coronavirus 229E complete genome

The central pane shows a multiple sequence alignment. A green box highlights a specific column labeled "B3". Within this highlighted column, one position is further emphasized by a yellow background, indicating a site of interest or mutation across the aligned sequences.

C

D

MX: Alignment Explorer (Alig_SARS-CoV-2_194GenCompl+B3_PERU_Editado.fas)

Menu: Data Edit Search Alignment Web Sequencer Display Help

Toolbar: [Icons for file operations, alignment, and search]

Tabs: DNA Sequences | Translated Protein Sequences

Species/Abbrv	Sequence
1. Primers_B3_RC	...TTACACCAAGTTGTTTCAAGACT...
2. NC_045512.2_Severe_acute_respiratory_syndrome_coronavir	GAGGACAAATCAGACAACTACTATTCAAACAATTGTTGAGGTTCAACCTCAATTAGAGATGGAACTTACACCAAGTTGTTTCAAGACTATT
3. hCoV-19/Peru/LAL-INS-056/2020[EPI_ISL_517686]/2020-04-12	GAGGACAAATCAGACAACTACTATTCAAACAATTGTTGAGGTTCAACCTCAATTAGAGATGGAACTTACACCAAGTTGTTTCAAGACTATT
4. hCoV-19/Peru/LAL-INS-070/2020[EPI_ISL_523810]/2020-03-11	GAGGACAAATCAGACAACTACTATTCAAACAATTGTTGAGGTTCAACCTCAATTAGAGATGGAACTTACACCAAGTTGTTTCAAGACTATT
5. hCoV-19/Peru/LAL-INS-084/2020[EPI_ISL_525206]/2020-03-14	GAGGACAAATCAGACAACTACTATTCAAACAATTGTTGAGGTTCAACCTCAATTAGAGATGGAACTTACACCAAGTTGTTTCAAGACTATT
6. hCoV-19/Peru/LOR-INS-058/2020[EPI_ISL_514317]/2020-04-02	GAGGACAAATCAGACAACTACTATTCAAACAATTGTTGAGGTTCAACCTCAATTAGAGATGGAACTTACACCAAGTTGTTTCAAGACTATT
7. hCoV-19/Peru/LOR-INS-079/2020[EPI_ISL_514339]/2020-04-22	GAGGACAAATCAGACAACTACTATTCAAACAATTGTTGAGGTTCAACCTCAATTAGAGATGGAACTTACACCAAGTTGTTTCAAGACTATT
8. hCoV-19/Peru/LOR-INS-080/2020[EPI_ISL_514340]/2020-04-22	GAGGACAAATCAGACAACTACTATTCAAACAATTGTTGAGGTTCAACCTCAATTAGAGATGGAACTTACACCAAGTTGTTTCAAGACTATT
9. hCoV-19/Peru/LOR-INS-081/2020[EPI_ISL_514341]/2020-04-22	GAGGACAAATCAGACAACTACTATTCAAACAATTGTTGAGGTTCAACCTCAATTAGAGATGGAACTTACACCAAGTTGTTTCAAGACTATT
10. hCoV-19/Peru/LOR-INS-082/2020[EPI_ISL_514342]/2020-04-22	GAGGACAAATCAGACAACTACTATTCAAACAATTGTTGAGGTTCAACCTCAATTAGAGATGGAACTTACACCAAGTTGTTTCAAGACTATT
11. hCoV-19/Peru/LIM-UPCH-0004/2020[EPI_ISL_529066]/2020-06-	GAGGACAAATCAGACAACTACTATTCAAACAATTGTTGAGGTTCAACCTCAATTAGAGATGGAACTTACACCAAGTTGTTTCAAGACTATT

Green box highlights region B3: TTACACCAAGTTGTTTCAAGACT