RT-qPCR-based tests for SARS-CoV-2 detection in pooled saliva samples for massive population screening to monitor epidemics.

Michał Różański¹, Aurelia Walczak-Drzewiecka¹, Jolanta Witaszewska², Ewelina Wójcik²,
Arkadiusz Guziński², Bogumił Zimoń², Rafał Matusiak², Joanna Kazimierczak², Maciej Borowiec³,
Katarzyna Kania⁴, Edyta Paradowska⁴, Jakub Pawełczyk⁵, Jarosław Dziadek⁵, Jarosław Dastych^{1,2}

1. Laboratory of Cellular Immunology, Institute of Medical Biology of PAS, Lodz, Poland
2. Proteon Pharmaceuticals S.A., Lodz, Poland
3. Department of Clinical Genetics, Medical University of Lodz, Lodz, Poland
4. Laboratory of Virology, Institute of Medical Biology of PAS, Lodz, Poland
5. Laboratory of Mycobacterium Genetics and Physiology, Institute of Medical Biology of PAS, Lodz, Poland

Number of text pages: 21

Number of tables: 4

Number of figures: 5

Short running head: Saliva screening for SARS-CoV-2

Funding: This work was funded by Proteon Pharmaceuticals S.A. and statutory funds of the Institute of Medical Biology of PAS

Conflict of interest: Jarosław Dastych is the CEO of Proteon Pharmaceuticals S.A., which offers the presented method as a commercial service.

Corresponding author:

Jarosław Dastych (jdastych@proteonpharma.com)

Proteon Pharmaceuticals S.A.

Tylna 3A, 90-364 Łódź, Poland

24 **Abbreviations:**

25	RT	- reverse transcriptase
26	RT-qPCR	- quantitative reverse transcription polymerase chain reaction
27	IVD	- <i>in vitro</i> diagnostics (certificate)
28	dNTP	- deoxyribonucleotide triphosphate
29	DEPC	- diethyl pyrocarbonate
30	GAPDH	- glyceraldehyde 3-phosphate dehydrogenase
31	Tm	- melting temperature
32	Ct	- threshold cycle (in quantitative PCR)
33	CI	- confidence interval
34	HBSS	- Hanks' balanced salt solution
35	PPE	- personal protective equipment

Abstract

Swab, quantitative, reverse transcription polymerase chain reaction (RT-qPCR) tests remain the gold standard of diagnostics of SARS-CoV-2 infections. However, these tests are costly and time-consuming, and swabbing limits their throughput. We developed a 3-gene, seminested RT-qPCR test with SYBR green-based detection, optimized for testing pooled saliva samples for high-throughput diagnostics of epidemic-affected populations. The proposed two-tier approach depends on decentralized self-collection of saliva samples, pooling, 1st-tier testing with the mentioned highly sensitive screening test and subsequent 2nd-tier testing of individual samples from positive pools with the *in vitro* diagnostic (IVD) test. The screening test was able to detect 5 copies of the viral genome in 10 µl of isolated RNA with 50% probability and 18.8 copies with 95% probability and reached Ct values that were highly linearly RNA concentration-dependent. In the side-by-side comparison (testing artificial pooled samples), the screening test attained slightly better results than the commercially available IVD-certified RT-qPCR diagnostic test (100% specificity and 89.8% sensitivity vs. 100% and 73.5%, respectively). Testing of 1475 individual clinical samples pooled in 374 pools of 4 revealed 0.8% false positive pools and no false negative pools. In weekly prophylactic testing of 113 people within 6 months, a two-tier testing approach enabled the detection of 18 infected individuals, including several asymptomatic individuals, with a fraction of the costs of individual RT-PCR testing.

Introduction

In the spring of 2020, the world faced the emerging threat of the novel coronavirus SARS-CoV-2 causing COVID-19 disease. In a relatively short time since its identification, this virus led to a COVID-19 pandemic that, according to the WHO Report of March 02, 2021, reached over 140 million cases and 3 million deaths (<https://www.who.int/publications/m/item/weekly-epidemiological-update-on-covid-19---20-april-2021>, Access April 20, 2021). SARS-CoV-2 belongs to the β -coronavirus genus, and its genetic material is positive-sense single-stranded RNA of nearly 30 kilobases in length. Such a global pandemic is unprecedented in the age of molecular biology and molecular test-based epidemiology. This has resulted in the worldwide research and development of new approaches for diagnostics, vaccination and treatment to control rapidly evolving epidemic situations. In March 2020, the first vaccines, including those based on mRNA and genetically modified adenoviruses, were approved for use and introduced in population-wide vaccination programs^{1,2}. Until then, diagnostic tests along with social distancing biosafety protection were the only methods to control the epidemic. The first employed diagnostic method for SARS-CoV-2 was RT-qPCR-based identification of the virus's genetic material in nasopharyngeal swabs, and RT-PCR-based virus detection is still considered the gold standard in COVID-19 testing³. While at least 1.9 billion tests have been performed worldwide (Retrieved from: <https://www.worldometers.info/coronavirus/> access April 04, 2021), it was perhaps not enough to significantly limit the global spread of SARS-CoV-2. However, this massive diagnostic effort provided critical data supporting public health efforts. There are examples showing the possibility of locally reducing the scale of the epidemic by combining mass testing for the virus with isolating infected people and taking other safety measures. For example, an analysis of testing-based public health activities in Wuhan shows that the spread of the virus has slowed down in the population. The time of doubling the number of patients first increased from 2 to 4 days and then even to 19 days⁴. Similarly results were observed in South Korea. The adopted model of fighting the epidemic contributed to gaining control over the coronavirus in just 3 weeks thanks to, inter alia, mass testing of the population⁵. The introduction of mass testing in Australia made it possible to keep the incidence low and even eliminate new cases (<https://www.health.gov.au/news/health-alerts/novel-coronavirus-2019-ncov-health-alert/coronavirus-covid-19-current-situation-and-case-numbers> access April 04, 2021), similar to Israel⁶. Thus, one potentially

effective strategy of controlling SARS-CoV-2 spreading by anti-epidemic measures other than vaccination is mass-scale testing that allows as many people as possible to be tested as quickly as possible.

We decided to develop a new screening RT-qPCR-based test dedicated to the massive screening needed to monitor spreading infections in populations during pandemic crises. The specific goals were a) high sensitivity; b) suitability for quantitative measurements; c) good performance in biologic samples pooled from multiple individuals d) open-source (at minimal level competes for unique resources with other diagnostics) adaptable to different locally available sources of test components. The last goal reflected our experience with a pandemic-related impact on the availability of dedicated commercial diagnostic tests. As a result, we developed a seminested RT-qPCR SARS-CoV-2 test based on SYBR green detection that meets the above criteria. Furthermore, we have developed a protocol for routine repetitive testing of large groups of individuals allowing us to perform such tasks at a significantly lower cost than regular PCR-based diagnostic testing. This protocol employs saliva, rather than swabs, as self-collected saliva samples are well suited for massive pooling tests.

Materials and Methods

Biological material

The usage of anonymized samples from patients of the Center of Molecular Diagnostics of Pathogens, Proteon Pharmaceuticals S.A. in the study was approved by the Bioethical Committee at the University of Lodz (Res. nr 3/KBBN-UL/I/2020-21). The study was conducted in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki and the good clinical practice guidelines. Written informed consent was obtained from all participants before study entry. Titrated, heat-inactivated SARS-CoV-2 virus was obtained from BEI Resources, Catalog No. NR-52286. Samples of genomic RNA isolated from human coronaviruses HCoV 229E and HCoV NL63 and respiratory syncytial viruses RSV A2001/3-12 and RSV B1 were obtained from BEI Resources. Titrated SARS-CoV-2 RNA isolated from Vero cell culture was a kind gift from Prof. Krzysztof Pyrc (Jagiellonian University).

Reagents

SuperScript IV Reverse Transcriptase (CN: 18090200), dNTP mix 10 mM (CN: R0193), RNaseOUT™ Recombinant Ribonuclease Inhibitor (CN: 10777019) and DEPC-treated water (CN: 750024) were purchased from Thermo Fisher Scientific. DNA Taq Polymerase (CN: E2500) and attached 10x Polymerase Buffer B (with 15 mM MgCl₂) were purchased from EURx. LightCycler® 480 SYBR Green I Master mix (CN: 04887352001) was purchased from Roche, and the Maxwell® RSC Viral Total Nucleic Acid Purification Kit (CN: AS1330) was purchased from Promega.

DiaPlexQ™ Novel Coronavirus (2019-nCoV) Detection Kit (CN: SQD52-K100; SolGent Co. Ltd.) and 2019-Novel Coronavirus (2019-nCoV) Triplex RT-qPCR Detection Kit (CN: CD302-02; Vazyme) were used as reference IVD tests for SARS-CoV-2 detection.

Sample collection, pool design and RNA isolation

Saliva samples in 5 ml polypropylene tubes packed in double plastic bags were first heat inactivated at 90°C for 15 min in a dry oven. Following inactivation, pooling samples were created by combining four 75 µl aliquots of individual saliva samples into one 300 µl sample, and either pooled or individual samples were processed according to the instructions of isolation RNA using the Maxwell® RSC Viral Total Nucleic Acid Purification Kit with the Maxwell® RSC 48 Instrument (Promega). Briefly, 300 µl saliva was mixed with 330 µl lysis buffer containing proteinase K, incubated at 56°C for 10 min and briefly centrifuged. Next, each sample was applied to separate wells of disposable cartridges in an RNA Maxwell® RSC 48 Instrument for semi-automatic RNA extraction.

Choice of conservative regions in SARS-CoV-2 genome

First, 94155 genome sequences were downloaded from the GisAid database, including 94139 SARS-CoV-2 and 16 non-SARS-CoV-2 genomes (Appendix 1, access 07.09.2020). Then, one reference genome (NC_045512.2) was chosen from which sequences of RdRp, Spike and N genes were selected. Using BLAST 2.9.0+ (default parameters) and reference gene sequences as queries, desired genes were extracted from the remaining SARS-CoV-2 genomes. Sequences were aligned in MAFFT(v7.310) with adjustment of direction and the FFT-NS-1 method to build a full MSA (multiple sequence alignment) and to find conservative regions

among selected sequences. Moreover, as a control for the reaction, consensus sequences of the human GAPDH gene were extracted from 5 transcriptional variants: 1,2,3,4 and 7 (NM_002046.7, NM_001256799.3, NM_001289745.3, NM_001289746.2 and NM_001357943.2).

Primer design and verification

Sets of primers (Table 1) targeting the mentioned fragments were designed using the open access software UGENE (v.35). Then, the primers' sensitivity and specificity were verified. For this purpose, all *Coronaviridae* genomes marked as complete were downloaded from the nucleotide database (NCBI). First, non-SARS-CoV-2 genomes were chosen for specificity analysis, resulting in 2802 sequences. Then, from all SARS-CoV-2 genomes, any incomplete duplicates or sequences shorter than 90% of the reference NC_045512.2 genome were deleted, and 80770 SARS-CoV-2 were used for the sensitivity analysis. *In silico* PCR was conducted (https://github.com/egonozer/in_silico_pcr, accessed November 2020) with the mismatch threshold set to 1 bp. In this way, a set of primers (both seminested and detection primers) was chosen. Primers were synthesized by Genomed, Poland and purified by high-performance liquid chromatography. Parameters of primers (GC content, T_m and self-complementarity) were analyzed in Oligo Calc (<http://biotools.nubic.northwestern.edu/OligoCalc.html> access September 2020). Primers used in the screening test were routinely premixed and stored as ready-to-use stock solutions with each primer concentration of 10 µM in ultrapure water; details are listed in Table 2.

Design of seminested RT-PCR

The first step of the procedure consisted of reverse transcription of viral RNA and 20 cycles of multiplex PCR. First, 5 µl of Mastermix 1 (Table 3) and 10 µl of RNA solution were added to each well in a 96-well PCR plate. The plate was sealed, incubated in a thermal cycler for 4 minutes at 65°C (initial denaturation of RNA) and 1 minute at 56°C (reverse primers annealing), and then immediately chilled to 4°C in a cooling block. Next, the sealing film was removed, and 10 µl of Mastermix 2 (Table 3) was added to each well. The plate was sealed again, and thermal cycling was performed, as presented in Table 4. The PCR product was diluted 30x in ultrapure water in a standard flat-bottomed 96-well plate, shaken for 5 minutes at 750 rpm on an orbital plate shaker and used in the second nested qPCR reaction.

Nested qPCR of individual viral genes and human controls was performed in duplicate in separate wells of 384-well plates. Each reaction mix consisted of 5 µl of LightCycler® 480 SYBR Green I Master Mix (2x), 0.3 µl of proper detection primer mix (Table 2), 1.7 µl of water and 3 µl of 30x diluted product of the first PCR. Detection plates were assembled by an automatic pipetting station (FasTrans, Analytik Jena AG). qPCR was performed on a LightCycler® 480 Instrument II (Roche) with the following cycling conditions: 5 min of initial denaturation at 95°C; 45 cycles of 10 s at 95°C, 12 s at 56°C and 20s at 72°C with SYBR green fluorescence measurement; product melting curve measurement was performed with 8 measurements per °C.

Cross reactivity with RNA of selected respiratory viruses

Genomic RNA standards of human respiratory viruses were used according to the manufacturer's instructions. 5 µl of HCoV 229E, 10 µl HCoV NL63, 2 µl RSV A2001/3-12, and 5 µl RSV B1 were added per reaction and tested according to the main protocol of the method. As a positive control, additional reactions were performed with primers specific for these viruses (Table 1). In control reactions, RNA was transcribed to cDNA with a single reverse primer. The first PCR step was omitted, and 3 µl of undiluted cDNA sample was directly used as a matrix for qPCR.

RNA-based Ct calibration curve

Titred SARS-CoV-2 RNA isolated from infected Vero cell culture was serially diluted in ultrapure water. At each concentration, reverse transcription coupled with seminested PCR was performed in duplicate, followed by qPCR in triplicate for each gene, resulting in 18 qPCR replicates in total and 6 for each individual gene. Only data points with correct melting temperatures were employed for further analysis. Ct values were plotted against logarithmic concentration of viral RNA, and linear regression curves were fitted to data using GraphPad Prism software.

Establishing criteria for SARS-CoV-2 detection in screening tests

First, melting curves from both reference viral RNA standards and from clinical samples with high probability of being true positives were used to determine the melting temperature range for specific PCR products in qPCR outcome for viral gene detection. Next, the Ct threshold distinguishing positive from negative qPCR outcomes for viral gene detection was determined by parallel analysis of RNA from a set of pooled saliva

samples with a screening test and reference test (DiaPlexQTM). To this end, 7 representative SARS-CoV-2-positive saliva samples (with different viral loads) and 20 negative saliva samples were used. Each positive sample was pooled by combining 3, 5 or 7 randomly chosen negative samples. Each pool was prepared in duplicate (but with different negative samples). All prepared pools as well as individual saliva samples (positive and negative) were isolated according to the described protocol and tested with the screening and reference test. Data from this experiment were also employed to determine the number of positive qPCR replicates needed to consider the clinical pooled saliva sample as positive.

Estimation of the probability of obtaining a positive result

Data points from calibration curve preparation were extracted. For each tested concentration of viral RNA, the number of positive (determined according to criteria of SARS-CoV-2 detection in screening test) replicates of viral genes (N, spike and RdRp) was divided by the total number of tested viral replicates (n=18). The result is an observed probability ($\hat{p}$) of obtaining a positive replicate of the viral gene at a given concentration of viral RNA. As the criteria of positive screening tests may assign to each replicate only a value of 1 or 0, we assumed that the variable was Bernoulli's binomial distribution. We used the normal distribution approximation approach to calculate the 95% confidence interval (CI) of the data:

$$\hat{p} \pm 1.96 \sqrt{\frac{\hat{p}(1 - \hat{p})}{n}}$$

where p is an observed probability, 1.96 is a coefficient for the 95% confidence interval and n is the number of tested samples. Subsequently, values for upper and lower CI for each point were recalculated into probability of obtaining positive result of whole test (probability of obtaining at least 4 positive replicates out of total 6 replicates at given p):

$$p_{positive} = \hat{p}^6 + 6\hat{p}^5(1 - \hat{p}) + 15\hat{p}^4(1 - \hat{p})^2$$

where $\hat{p}$ is an observed probability for a single replicate and $p_{positive}$ is the probability for the whole test to give a positive result. Newly calculated intervals were plotted against logarithmic concentration of viral RNA, and a four-parameter logistic curve was used to calculate P_{50} and P_{95} (concentration at which test has 50% and 95% chance to give positive outcome, respectively). Curve fitting was performed in GraphPad Prism software.

RNA isolation efficiency

From a group of SARS-CoV-2 negative (confirmed by 2019-Novel Coronavirus (2019-nCoV) Triplex RT-qPCR diagnostic test, Vazyme), heat inactivated, frozen saliva samples, 21 specimens were randomly chosen. Subsequently, samples were divided into seven three-element groups, and saliva within groups was equally pooled and mixed, forming 7 averaged saliva representations. Each pooled sample was aliquoted by 500 μ l into 4 test tubes, and 10 μ l of HBSS (control) or proper dilution of standard: titrated, heat-inactivated SARS-CoV-2 virus in HBSS was added. Next, RNA was isolated, and a screening test was performed. RNA isolation efficiency was calculated based on measured Ct values and the Ct calibration curve; theoretical viral load was calculated for each gene replicate. Subsequently, that value was multiplied by the volume coefficient of 26.7 (which converts [n/10 μ l of RNA] into [n/ml of saliva]: 10 μ l of RNA sample out of 80 μ l of RNA isolate from 300 μ l of saliva sample) and divided by the initial viral load in the saliva sample.

Economic analysis of pooled screening test

Center of Molecular Diagnostics of Pathogens, Proteon Pharmaceuticals S.A. provided information on costs included in testing viral samples according to the gold standard diagnostic approach (based on commercially available one-step RT-qPCR diagnostic kits, isolation of RNA, disposables, PPE, labor and other direct costs of diagnostics). The summarized costs were considered as reference 100% - the whole cost of standard diagnostic test per sample. Subsequently, the cost of the screening test was calculated based on the following premises: 1) positive cases were randomly distributed among the tested population with an even distribution; 2) the test had ideal sensitivity and specificity; and 3) if the pool provided a positive result, each sample within the pool was subsequently tested individually with reference, validated, diagnostic tests. Three pooling factors were chosen for analysis: 4-, 8- and 12-fold. For each case, the baseline cost of the screening test is the cost of testing a pool with a screening test (seminested qPCR with SYBR green detection) divided by a pooling factor. Then, the number of positive pools in the tested population is assessed based on the percent of positive individuals in the population and the chosen pooling factor (with the use of elementary combinatorics equations). The number of positive pools was next multiplied by the pooling factor and cost of the diagnostic test per sample, and the result was divided by the number of individual samples in the tested population. Such a variable component was added to a baseline, and the result was the total cost of the screening test.

Results

Validation of primer design

Bioinformatic specificity analysis revealed that the chosen detection primers were specific to 99.857% of the analyzed *Coronaviridae* genomes with four false positive results, while this test was 99.995% sensitive towards SARS-CoV-2 genomes with four negative results. A summary of this information is presented in the confusion matrix in Figure 1.

Criteria of SARS-CoV-2 detection in screening test

Melting temperatures of specific qPCR products for viral genes: data from several independent experiments using several different matrix RNA sources (tittered standard RNA or RNA isolated from BEI standard or RNA isolated from clinical samples) were analyzed. Data from samples with high probability of being true positive measurements (both replicates similar, T_m close to preliminary measured values and $C_t < 30$ cycle) were extracted. Melting temperatures for individual genes were as follows (mean $\pm$ 3xSD ($^{\circ}$ C), number of data points): RdRp 78.25 $\pm$ 0.311, 140; spike 80.27 $\pm$ 0.319, 140; N 80.72 $\pm$ 0.322, 140; GAPDH 78.99 $\pm$ 0.445, 344. Considering the screening purpose of the test, we intentionally chosen slightly wider threshold values to keep overall output oversensitive rather than overspecific, especially because weaker signals (higher C_t values) tended to deviate more. Finally, the chosen qualification rules for each gene were selected as follows: “to be considered specific, the measured melting temperature must lie within the following intervals (center of an interval $\pm$ deviation ($^{\circ}$ C)): 78.3 $\pm$ 0.35 for RdRp; 80.3 $\pm$ 0.35 for Spike; 80.7 $\pm$ 0.35 for N; 79.0 $\pm$ 0.50 for GAPDH”. Representative melting curves are presented in Figure 2A. The thermal cycler used in this study (LightCycler 480) always saves a colder peak as T_{m1} and a warmer peak as T_{m2} in the case of a two-product melting curve, regardless of the height of such peaks; if the case of two products occurred, we checked both measured melting temperatures against the chosen threshold. In the next series of experiments, seven SARS-CoV-2-positive saliva samples were pooled in duplicate with a pooling factor of 4-, 6- or 8-fold, with randomly chosen negative samples (as described in Materials and Methods), and RNA was isolated. The screening test was able to correctly identify 20/20 negative samples, 7/7 not pooled positive samples, 13/14 four-fold pooled positive samples, 12/14 six-fold pooled samples and 12/14 eight-fold pooled samples, which gives 100% specificity and 89.8% sensitivity within the experiment. As a reference, the validated diagnostic

test DiaPlexQTM was able to identify 20/20 negative samples, 5/7 not pooled positives, and 10/14, 10/14 and 9/14 pooled positives, reaching 100% specificity and 73.5% sensitivity, respectively. To compare Ct values of each viral gene in pooled samples that were revealed as positive by screening test with Ct values in corresponding single positive samples, Δ Ct values (number of cycles of delay in pooled samples) were calculated and presents as follows (pooling factor, mean $\pm$ SD, n): P4, 3.28 $\pm$ 2.73, 80; P6, 4.20 $\pm$ 2.34, 72; P8, 4.17 $\pm$ 1.81, 70. Data from this experiment were also used to optimize qualification criteria for the screening test to make it more sensitive or more selective (Figure 2B) by choosing the number of replicates of viral genes that need to be positive to consider a tested sample as positive. The optimal threshold rule was chosen to read as follows: “at least 4 of a total of 6 viral replicates must be positive (proper Tm and Ct values) to consider the tested sample as positive”.

Quantitative performance of screening test

Titrated SARS-CoV-2 RNA was utilized to generate calibration curves for the Ct values of individual genes tested in the screening test. The results are presented in Figure 3A. For each gene across the whole tested concentration range, the relation between the obtained Ct values and logarithm of viral RNA concentration was highly linear. Slight difference between viral genes was observed. The RdRp product tended to result in somewhat smaller Ct values than the other two genes. This trend matches the results obtained in testing clinical saliva samples. After comparing 42 positive samples in which all 6 replicates of viral genes were positive, the Ct values were as follows (mean $\pm$ SD, n=84): 21.67 $\pm$ 5.66 for RdRp; 24.34 $\pm$ 6.22 for Spike; 25.44 $\pm$ 5.91 for N. The results for RdRp differed significantly ($P<0.05$) from those for the two other genes, between which there were no significant differences (ANOVA with Sheffé’s *post hoc* test).

Based on Ct values for minimal RNA concentration that still gives detectable positive signal (from calibration curve experiment), a Ct value of 36 was chosen as a threshold value above which amplification was considered nonspecific by default. In the case of the control human gene (GAPDH) Ct values were extracted from several independent experiments in which RNA isolated from individual or pooled saliva samples was tested. GAPDH from 243 tested samples had a mean Ct value of 20.53 with an SD of 1.61, and the highest Ct value reached in the tested population was 26.39. Therefore, we decided to use a slightly higher threshold value of 28.0, above which, probably due to inefficiency of RNA isolation or too high of an inhibitor load in a sample, the result of the test is questionable.

Based on the results collected during the preparation of calibration curves, the probability of obtaining a positive result of the screening test, depending on the viral RNA concentration in the tested sample, was estimated. A logistic curve was fitted to the calculated probability values (Figure 3B); the P_{50} value was reached at a concentration of 4.86 ± 0.11 genome copies per 10 μ l of RNA sample (mean $\pm$ SEM), and the P_{95} value was 18.8 ± 0.75 .

Next, we assessed the efficiency and reproducibility of viral RNA isolation. Seven representative saliva samples were used as carriers for 10^4 , 10^5 and 10^6 viral particles/ml; subsequently, RNA was isolated according to a standard protocol, and a screening test was performed. Only 54% of viral gene replicates at a concentration of 10^4 /ml were positive, and thus for further analysis, only two higher concentrations (which were 100% positive) were used. The results are presented in Figure 3C. The median RNA isolation efficiency was equal to 5.00%, with lower and upper quartiles equal to 1.33% and 11.09%, respectively. This value is somewhat dependent on the concentration of viral particles in the source material ($3.42\times$ higher median for the 10^6 /ml group than 10^5 /ml) and strongly dependent on individual saliva sample parameters ($13.2\times$ difference between the highest and lowest efficient saliva samples). To complete the methodology of quantitative measurements, an experimental cross reactivity test with RNA isolated from four respiratory viruses was performed and revealed no amplification in viral genes of the screening test. The results are presented in Figure 3D. None of the replicates of viral genes shown in a figure can be considered specific according to assumed test thresholds (T_m and C_t values). GAPDH, the control gene, showed specific amplification because the RNA samples were derived from human cell cultures.

Economic analysis of pooled screening test

The results of the comparison of the cost of screening pooled test to individual (IVD certified) diagnostic testing are presented in Figure 4. This analysis suggests that pooling of samples has economic justification only when the predicted number of positive cases in the tested population is below 30%. At the higher prevalence of infection, cost of the pooling approach per sample exceeds the cost of the individual diagnostic tests and negatively affects workflow organization (additional RNA isolation and detection steps), significantly delaying the results. However, in the case of lower prevalence, the presented approach may significantly decrease the cost of testing large groups of people. Comparing different pooling factors, the 4-fold option seems to be the most cost effective, assuring the lowest overall cost in the widest range of higher

positive case ratios and maintaining a very good baseline cost. Higher pooling factors present better economic outcomes only in the screening population with a relatively low prevalence of infection (<2.5% of positive cases in the population). It should also be taken under consideration that the cost of pooled testing is highly sensitive to the false positive ratio of the screening test; therefore, such a test must be highly sensitive for screening purposes but also provide high specificity.

Validation of screening test in routine use

We performed multiple rounds of monitoring of employees of two institutions involved in the study for SARS-CoV-2 infection (involving a total of 113 people who decided to take part in our study). Testing was performed on weekly basis. All positive pools were unraveled, and individual samples were tested using a reference test (IVD certified commercial diagnostic test). In selected rounds, negative pools were also unraveled, and individual samples were tested with a reference test. The data on the performance of the screening test under such a scenario are presented in Figure 5. The screening test showed a 0.80% false positive rate, defined as the number of pools assigned as positive by the screening test outcome that did not contain at least one individual component categorized as positive or inconclusive in the reference test after unraveling the pool, divided by the total number of pools tested in screening. In 22 unraveled negative pools, there was no false negative defined as a pool tested as negative with at least one individual component categorized as positive or inconclusive in the reference test.

Discussion

We have developed and characterized a qPCR-based method for the detection of SARS-CoV-2 dedicated to massive testing using pooled saliva samples. Tests have been employed in practice in a two-tier approach, in which each pool positive in the screening test is unraveled and individually tested using a standard diagnostic test. The idea of massive screening of populations for the presence of viruses is being explored in different countries with different testing methodologies. One potential method of such testing is based on simple point-of-care rapid tests such as antigen tests^{7,8} or LAMP-based genetic tests^{9,10}. Such an approach has certain obvious advantages, such as decentralization of testing, fast turnover of test results, and relatively low cost. On the other hand, available, rapid individual tests do not have sufficient sensitivity to identify infected individuals at the earliest phase of infection (prior to onset of symptoms) and asymptomatic carriers¹¹.

Massive screening of populations performed with the use of such tests has resulted in unsatisfactory outcomes in several countries, among which testing of almost the entire country population of Slovakia is a well-publicized example¹². On the other hand, testing over 7 million people in the Chinese city Qingdao in October 2020 that employed PCR-based, pooled, screening test allowed to nip the epidemics in the bud¹³. Comparison of the further development of epidemics in Slovakia and Quindao after the publication date of the articles cited above seems to further support the better outcome of Quindao screening (John Hopkins University SARS-CoV-2 worldspread map: <https://coronavirus.jhu.edu/map.html>, access April 07, 2021).

Our approach for massive PCR-based screening for SARS-CoV-2 is based on the detection of viral RNA in saliva. While nasopharyngeal swabs are still considered by the WHO as the diagnostic gold standard, there is already a bulk of literature data validating saliva as a diagnostic specimen. Several clinical studies comparing nasopharyngeal swabs and saliva as diagnostic specimens have been performed on a relatively large number of patients in different countries and have demonstrated comparable sensitivity and specificity of both diagnostic approaches^{14,15,16,17,18}. This conclusion is also supported by a systematic review of 28 original reports¹⁹ and by a meta-analysis of clinical data representing 16 clinical trials performed on 5922 patients who showed 83.2% sensitivity of saliva-based tests compared to 84.8% nasopharyngeal swabs²⁰. Taking into account comparable sensitivity, it should be stressed that saliva-based testing has a significant advantage over swabs in screening children in schools, where the discomfort of performing swabs may prevent compliance with routine testing^{21,22,23}. It is also preferable in terms of mitigating the risk of exposure of medical personnel to infection, as self-collected samples could be directly delivered to designated drop-off points, which allow scattered sample collection without involving additional healthcare workers.

The proposed seminested qPCR with SYBR green-based detection of viral RNA based on the combination of the Ct threshold and range of Tm (Figure 2A and 2B) showed high sensitivity and specificity. The sensitivity allows for the detection of 5 copies of the viral genome (probability > 50%) and 95% probability of detection of 18.8 copies of the genome in 10 µl of isolated RNA, which is comparable to the sensitivity of qPCR detection based on fluorescent hybridization probes. According to the manufacturer manuals of both IVD reference tests used in this study (DiaPlexQ™ (SolGent) and Triplex (Vazyme)), both tests have a limit of detection of 200 genomes per milliliter of sample prior to RNA isolation (2 copies/10 µl) in nasopharyngeal swabs. Screening test in saliva showed the threshold of detection of 27 copies/10 µl. The direct comparison of

published sensitivity thresholds is challenging because of different RNA isolation methods and different diagnostic specimens employed. Additionally, the limit of detection values published for a group of diagnostic assays officially approved until half of 2020 varied by 10,000-fold²⁴. However, in side-by-side comparison, our test in saliva-based testing performs as well as Triplex (data not shown) and slightly better than DiaPlexQ™. Our data suggest that practical test sensitivity will be limited by isolation of the RNA step; samples with a lower number of viral particles may limit detection even to 5% of the sensitivity observed with the reference RNA solution and allow the detection of approximately 27 viral particles in 10 µl of saliva (>50% chance of detection) (Figure 3C). Relatively high sensitivity is matched by high specificity demonstrated *in silico* (Figure 1) and experimentally (Figure 3D). This method also showed good linearity within a wide range of viral RNA concentrations (Figure 3A) and viral load (Figure 3C). This is expected because SYBR green-based qPCR is well fitted for quantification of nucleic acids and makes the proposed method applicable in a quantitative approach for detecting the viral load in SARS-CoV-2-infected patients. In particular, quantitative measurements of SARS-CoV-2 RNA concentration in saliva are well correlated with the clinical outcome of infection^{23,25}. High sensitivity of detection of viral RNA allowed for effective test application to pooled biological samples in this method, which demonstrated 100% specificity and 89.8% sensitivity in pools of saliva factored by 4, 6, and 8. This is consistent with published data on the application of fluorescent hybridization probe-based qPCR tests to pooled saliva samples, where there was 90-94% conformity with individual testing²⁶. The test has already been implemented on a small scale for the routine testing of a group of 113 employees with promising results as the first tier of a two-tier testing approach. With such an approach, testing pooled saliva samples shows significant cost savings compared to individual testing based on commercially available IVD RT-qPCR tests (Figure 4). Our results revealed that pooling saliva samples for the detection of SARS-CoV-2 infection support testing with substantial cost savings, especially at lower prevalence levels. The similar results have been obtained by other authors^{18,27,28}. Implementation of the developed test for routine testing generated data for 1475 individual samples combined into 374 pooled samples that demonstrated very good test performance, with 0.8% false positives and undetectable false negatives for 88 individually analyzed samples (Figure 5). The lack of false negatives suggests that our pooled saliva-based qPCR testing may have a much lower false negative ratio than previously prognosed for saliva pools factored by 2-, 4-, 8-, 16 and 32 at the level of 10%²⁹. It is worth mentioning that routine testing based on this test several times led to the detection of SARS-CoV-2 infection in asymptomatic persons, preventing

them from coming to work and most likely decreasing the risk of virus transmission among coworkers. This difficult to objectively control but repeatable observation is well aligned with the output of an *in silico* model of epidemics in hospitals predicting that weekly screening by saliva-based PCR tests would be able to detect 95% of symptomatic and 30% of asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infections and reduce numbers of new infections^{30,31}. Furthermore, the cumulative percentage of employees identified in prophylactic screening as SARS-CoV-2-positive was 15.9%, which is nearly threefold larger than the 6.21% of cumulative positive cases for the whole Polish population as of April 1, 2021 (John Hopkins University Map <https://coronavirus.jhu.edu/map.html>) and for a particular region (Voivodeship of Lodz with 6.53% of cumulative positive cases vs. 6.95% of the mean for the whole country, according to data from the Polish Ministry of Health at April 15, 2021). At the same time, the average percentage of positives per number of individual tests was 1.22%, which is well below the 5% maximum threshold suggested by the WHO as a prerequisite for effective monitoring of epidemic dynamics (https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/searo/indonesia/covid19/who-situation-report-11.pdf?sfvrsn=3e0fb6c8_2, access April 16 2021). This is once again in contrast with the percentage of positives reported in diagnostic tests in Poland that, since the middle of October 2020, continuously exceeded 20% with a peak of 59% at 16.11.2020, and a temporary fading period, with a positive level of approximately 10-15% at the turn of January and February of 2021 (Polish Ministry of Health). Taken together, these data support the validity of the proposed analytical approach for prophylactic screening of selected populations for infection during COVID-19 epidemics.

Acknowledgements

We acknowledge Prof. Krzysztof Pyrc from Jagiellonian University for sharing standardized SARS-CoV-2 RNA sample. The following reagent was deposited by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and obtained through BEI Resources, NIAID, NIH: SARS-Related Coronavirus 2, Isolate USA-WA1/2020, Heat Inactivated, NR-52286. The following reagents was obtained through BEI Resources, NIAID, NIH: Genomic RNA from Human Respiratory Syncytial Virus, A2001/3-12, NR-44227; Genomic RNA from Human Respiratory Syncytial Virus, B1 BPR-348-00, NR-4052; Genomic RNA from Human Coronavirus NL63, NR-470; Genomic RNA from Human Coronavirus 229E, NR-52726.

Literature

1. Poland GA, Ovsyannikova IG, Kennedy RB: SARS-CoV-2 immunity: review and applications to phase 3 vaccine candidates. *Lancet* 2020 Nov 14;396(10262):1595-1606
2. Shang W, Yang Y, Rao Y, Rao X: The outbreak of SARS-CoV-2 pneumonia calls for viral vaccines. *NPJ Vaccines* 2020 Mar 6;5:18
3. Rahbari R, Moradi N, Abdi M: rRT-PCR for SARS-CoV-2: Analytical considerations. *Clin Chim Acta*. c 2021 May;516:1-7
4. Lau H, Khosrawipour V, Kocbach P, Mikolajczyk A, Schubert J, Bania J, Khosrawipour T: The positive impact of lockdown in Wuhan on containing the COVID-19 outbreak in China. *J Travel Med* 2020 May 18;27(3):taaa037
5. Jung J, Kim MN, Kim SH: Universal Screening with Sample Pooling in Preoperative Patients as Long-term Strategy in the COVID-19 Pandemic. *J Korean Med Sci* 2020;35(33):e309
6. Ben-Ami R, Klochendler A, Seidel M, Sido T, Gurel-Gurevich O, Yassour M, Meshorer E, Benedek G, Fogel I, Oiknine-Djian E, Gertler A, Rotstein Z, Lavi B, Dor Y, Wolf DG, Salton M, Drier Y; Hebrew University-Hadassah COVID-19 Diagnosis Team: Large-scale implementation of pooled RNA extraction and RT-PCR for SARS-CoV-2 detection. *Clin Microbiol Infect* 2020 Sep;26(9):1248-1253
7. Cerutti F, Burdino E, Milia MG, Alice T, Gregori G, Bruzzone B, Ghisetti V: Urgent need of rapid tests for SARS CoV-2 antigen detection: Evaluation of the SD-Biosensor antigen test for SARS-CoV-2. *J Clin Virol* 2020 Nov;132:104654
8. Linares M, Pérez-Tanoira R, Carrero A, Romanyk J, Pérez-García F, Gómez-Herruz P, Arroyo T, Cuadros J: Panbio antigen rapid test is reliable to diagnose SARS-CoV-2 infection in the first 7 days after the onset of symptoms. *J Clin Virol* 2020 Dec;133:104659
9. Augustine R, Hasan A, Das S, Ahmed R, Mori Y, Notomi T, Kevadiya BD, Thakor AS: Loop-Mediated Isothermal Amplification (LAMP): A Rapid, Sensitive, Specific, and Cost-Effective Point-of-Care Test for Coronaviruses in the Context of COVID-19 Pandemic. *Biology (Basel)* 2020 Jul 22;9(8):182

452 10. Rödel J, Egerer R, Suleyman A, Sommer-Schmid B, Baier M, Henke A, Edel B, Löffler B: Use of the
453 variplex™ SARS-CoV-2 RT-LAMP as a rapid molecular assay to complement RT-PCR for COVID-19
454 diagnosis. J Clin Virol 2020 Nov;132:104616

455 11. Mahase E: Covid-19: Innova lateral flow test is not fit for “test and release” strategy, say experts. BMJ
456 2020; 371 :m4469

457 12. Holt E: COVID-19 testing in Slovakia. Lancet Infect Dis 2021 Jan;21(1):32

458 13. Xing Y, Wong GWK, Ni W, Hu X, Xing Q: Rapid Response to an Outbreak in Qingdao, China. N Engl J
459 Med 2020 Dec 3;383(23):e129

460 14. Yokota I, Shane PY, Okada K, Unoki Y, Yang Y, Inao T, Sakamaki K, Iwasaki S, Hayasaka K, Sugita J,
461 Nishida M, Fujisawa S, Teshima T: Mass screening of asymptomatic persons for SARS-CoV-2 using saliva.
462 Clin Infect Dis 2020 Sep 25:ciaa1388

463 15. Okamura S, Akamatsu N, Kitajima T, Nakabayashi K, Fukumoto S, Katayama T, Mizutani Y, Kiyomoto
464 H, Yamada H: Screening of COVID-19 polymerase chain reaction tests using saliva for pregnant women and
465 their partners in Himeji city. J Obstet Gynaecol Res 2021 Apr;47(4):1253-1255

466 16. Senok A, Alsuwaidi H, Atrah Y, Al Ayedi O, Al Zahid J, Han A, Al Marzooqi A, Al Heialy S, Altrabulsi
467 B, AbdelWareth L, Idaghdour Y, Ali R, Loney T, Alsheikh-Ali A: Saliva as an Alternative Specimen for
468 Molecular COVID-19 Testing in Community Settings and Population-Based Screening. Infect Drug Resist.
469 Infect Drug Resist 2020 Oct 1;13:3393-3399

470 17. Altawalah H, AlHuraish F, Alkandari WA, Ezzikouri S: Saliva specimens for detection of severe acute
471 respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 in Kuwait: A cross-sectional study. J Clin Virol 2020 Nov;132:104652

472 18. Herrera LA, Hidalgo-Miranda A, Reynoso-Noverón N, Meneses-García AA, Mendoza-Vargas A, Reyes-
473 Grajeda JP, et al.: Saliva is a reliable and accessible source for the detection of SARS-CoV-2. Int J Infect Dis
474 2021 Apr;105:83-90

475 19. Fernandes LL, Pacheco VB, Borges L, Athwal HK, de Paula Eduardo F, Bezinelli L, Correa L, Jimenez
476 M, Dame-Teixeira N, Lombaert IMA, Heller D: Saliva in the Diagnosis of COVID-19: A Review and New
477 Research Directions. J Dent Res 2020 Dec;99(13):1435-1443

478 20. Butler-Laporte G, Lawandi A, Schiller I, Yao M, Dendukuri N, McDonald EG, Lee TC: Comparison of
479 Saliva and Nasopharyngeal Swab Nucleic Acid Amplification Testing for Detection of SARS-CoV-2: A
480 Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. JAMA Intern Med. 2021 Mar 1;181(3):353-360

481 21. Santos CN, Rezende KM, Oliveira Neto NF, Okay TS, Braz-Silva PH, Bönecker M: Saliva: an important
482 alternative for screening and monitoring of COVID-19 in children. Braz Oral Res 2020 Nov 20;34:e0125

483 22. Yee R, Truong TT, Pannaraj PS, Eubanks N, Gai E, Jumarang J, Turner L, Peralta A, Lee Y, Dien Bard J:
484 Saliva Is a Promising Alternative Specimen for the Detection of SARS-CoV-2 in Children and Adults. J Clin
485 Microbiol 2021 Jan 21;59(2):e02686-20

486 23. Chua GT, Wong JSC, To KKW, Lam ICS, Yau FYS, Chan WH, Ho PPK, Duque JSR, Yip CCY, Ng
487 ACK, Wong WHS, Kwong JHY, Leung KFS, Wan PT, Lam K, Wong ICK, Kwok J, Ho MHK, Chan GCF,
488 Lau YL, Ip P, Kwan MYW: Saliva viral load better correlates with clinical and immunological profiles in
489 children with coronavirus disease 2019. Emerg Microbes Infect 2021 Dec;10(1):235-241

490 24. Arnaout R, Lee RA, Lee GR, et al: SARS-CoV2 Testing: The Limit of Detection Matters. Preprint.
491 bioRxiv 2020;2020.06.02.131144

492 25. Silva J, Lucas C, Sundaram M, Israelow B, Wong P, Klein J, Tokuyama M, Lu P, Venkataraman A, Liu F,
493 Mao T, Oh JE, Park A, Casanovas-Massana A, Vogels CBF, Muenker CM, Zell J, Fournier JB, Campbell M,
494 Chiorazzi M, Ruiz Fuentes E, Petrone M, Kalinich CC, Ott IM, Watkins A, Moore AJ, Nakahata MI,
495 Grubaugh ND, Farhadian S, Dela Cruz C, Ko A, Schulz WL, Ring AM, Ma S, Omer S, Wyllie AL, Iwasaki
496 A: Saliva viral load is a dynamic unifying correlate of COVID-19 severity and mortality. medRxiv [Preprint]
497 2021 Jan 10

498 26. Barat B, Das S, De Giorgi V, Henderson DK, Kopka S, Lau AF, Miller T, Moriarty T, Palmore TN,
499 Sawney S, Spalding C, Tanjutco P, Wortmann G, Zelazny AM, Frank KM: Pooled Saliva Specimens for
500 SARS-CoV-2 Testing. J Clin Microbiol 2020 Dec 1;JCM.02486-20

501 27. Watkins AE, Fenichel EP, Weinberger DM, Vogels CBF, Brackney DE, Casanovas-Massana A, Campbell
502 M, Fournier J, Bermejo S, Datta R, Dela Cruz CS, Farhadian SF, Iwasaki A, Ko AI, Grubaugh ND, Wyllie
503 AL: Pooling saliva to increase SARS-CoV-2 testing capacity. medRxiv [Preprint] 2020 Sep
504 3:2020.09.02.20183830

505 28. Pasomsub E, Watcharananan SP, Boonyawat K, Janchompoo P, Wongtabtim G, Suksuwan W,
506 Sungkanuparph S, Phuphuakrat A: Saliva sample as a non-invasive specimen for the diagnosis of coronavirus
507 disease 2019: a cross-sectional study. Clin Microbiol Infect 2021 Feb;27(2):285.e1-285.e4

508 29. Yelin I, Aharony N, Tamar ES, Argoetti A, Messer E, Berenbaum D, Shafran E, Kuzli A, Gandali N,
509 Shkedi O, Hashimshony T, Mandel-Gutfreund Y, Halberthal M, Geffen Y, Szwarcwort-Cohen M, Kishony R:
510 Evaluation of COVID-19 RT-qPCR Test in Multi sample Pools. Clin Infect Dis 2020 Nov 19;71(16):2073-
511 2078

512 30. Zhang K, Shoukat A, Crystal W, Langley JM, Galvani AP, Moghadas SM: Routine saliva testing for the
513 identification of silent coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) in healthcare workers. Infect Control Hosp
514 Epidemiol 2021 Jan 11:1-5

515 31. Vilches TN, Nourbakhsh S, Zhang K, Juden-Kelly L, Cipriano LE, Langley JM, Sah P, Galvani AP,
516 Moghadas SM: Multifaceted strategies for the control of COVID-19 outbreaks in long-term care facilities in
517 Ontario, Canada. medRxiv [Preprint] 2020 Dec 7:2020.12.04.20244194

518 **Table 1.** Primers used in the study

Name	5'->3' Sequence	Product		
		size	Target	Primer type
		[bp]		
RpRp_F	GAAATCAATAGCCGCCACTAGAG	153	SARS-CoV-2	Detection
RpRp_R	GGCATGGCTCTATCACATTTAGG	153	SARS-CoV-2	Detection
Spike_F	AGAAGTCCCTGTTGCTATTCATGC	199	SARS-CoV-2	Detection
Spike_R	TGCCCCGCCGAGGAGAATTAGT	199	SARS-CoV-2	Detection
N_F	CGCGATCAAAACAACGTCGGC	96	SARS-CoV-2	Detection
N_R	GGAATTTAAGGTCTTCCTTGCCATG	96	SARS-CoV-2	Detection
GAPDH_F	CGACCACTTTGTCAAGCTCATTTCC	72/175	Human	Detection
GAPDH_R	ATGAGGTCCACCACCCTGTTG	72/175	Human	Detection
N_nestF	AGGAACCTAAATTGGGTAGTCTTG	307	SARS-CoV-2	semi-nesting
Spike_nestR	GTGACATAGTGTAGGCAATGATGG	242	SARS-CoV-2	semi-nesting
RpRp_nestR	CGAGCAAGAACAAGTGAGGCC	192	SARS-CoV-2	semi-nesting
229E_F	ACACAAAAGGGTGATGCTGC	195	HCo V229E	Detection
229E_R	TATTAAGGGGCCAACCAGCG	195	HCo V229E	Detection
NL63_F	CCCATGCTGCTGTTGATTCC	106	HCo VNL63	Detection
NL63_R	GCCACTATAACACTCAACCCG	106	HCo VNL63	Detection
A2001_F	ATGGTGCAGGGCAAGTGATG	110	RSVA2001/3-12	Detection
A2001_R	ACACCTCCACAACCTTGTTCAT	110	RSVA2001/3-12	Detection
B1_F	AGTTGGGAGGAGAAGCTGGA	105	RSV B1	Detection
B1_R	GCATTGCCTAGGACCACACT	105	RSV B1	Detection

519

520 **Table 2.** Primer mixes used in this study

Primer mix name	Content
Primer mix 1	N_R, Spike_nestR, RdRp_nestR, GAPDH_R
Primer mix 2	N_nestF, Spike_F, RdRp_F
GAPDH mix	GAPDH_F, GAPDH_R
RdRp mix	RdRp_F, RdRp_R
Spike mix	Spike_F, Spike_R
N mix	genN_F, genN_R

521

522 **Table 3.** Composition of the reaction mix in the first step of the reaction

	Reagent	vol. [μl]
Mastermix 1	RNA sample	10
	Water	3.75
	Primer mix 1	0.25
	dNTPs	1
Mastermix 2	Water	6
	EurX 10x buf. B	2.5
	Rnase OUT	0.5
	Primer mix 2	0.25
	SuperScript® IV RT	0.5
	EurX Taq DNA Polymerase	0.25

523

524 **Table 4.** Thermal profile of the first PCR

Temp.	Time	Step
23°C	5 min	initial elongation
52°C	20 min	reverse transcription
95°C	5 min	inactivation of RT
95°C	20 s	denaturation
56°C	30 s	x20 annealing
72°C	45 s	elongation
4°C	∞	

525

Figure legends

Figure 1. Specificity of primer pairs used in screening test. Bioinformatic confusion matrix of chosen primer pair sequences vs. SARS-CoV-2 genomes and other *Coronaviridae* genomes.

Figure 2. Criteria of the test result assignment. A: Derivatives of the representative melting curves of the tested genes in the screening test and mean T_m values. Black bars on top: temperature intervals within which the measured T_m value is considered specific for each gene. B: Sensitivity and specificity of the seminested SARS-CoV-2 screening test depending on the positive result criterion. The percentage of true positive samples ($n=49$) and true negative samples ($n=20$) which were qualified correctly depending on the number of positive replicates of viral genes (in total of 6) in the screening test that was chosen as a threshold. Dotted lines: respective parameters, achieved by validated diagnostic test.

Figure 3. Quantitative performance of the screening test. A: RNA-based Ct calibration curves for individual genes. Mean $\pm$ SD, $n=6$. Dashed lines: linear regression curves fitted to data. The calculated curve equations and coefficients of determination are listed on the right side. Linear fitting $P<0.0001$ for each gene. Dotted horizontal line: threshold Ct value for specific amplification. B: Probability of obtaining positive results of the screening test depending on viral RNA concentration in a sample. Black points/whiskers: 95% confidence intervals with the center of each interval marked. Gray line: four parameter logistic curve fitted to data. P_{50} value presented as the mean $\pm$ SEM. C: Efficiency of RNA isolation: number of copies calculated from Ct calibration curve divided by number of viral particles added to saliva samples. Each point represents efficiency calculated independently from a single viral gene replicate. Red lines/whiskers: median and interquartile range. Data points presented as total are also analyzed by groups, depending on virus concentration or saliva sample used as a carrier for isolation. The significance of differences between groups was calculated with ANOVA. No *post hoc* tests were performed. D: Experimental verification of cross-reactivity with selected respiratory viruses. Ct values for individual genes obtained by qPCR in a seminested screening test using RNA samples of chosen non-SARS-CoV-2 respiratory viruses; C: control primer pair specific to each virus. Upper dashed line: last cycle of the reaction; points above indicate samples with no detectable amplification. Lower dotted line: chosen threshold for specific amplification; points above are considered nonspecific by default.

553 **Figure 4.** Economics of screening test. Comparative costs of testing using epidemic pooling tests and
 554 individual diagnostic tests employing a one-step, multiplex RT-qPCR SARS-CoV-2 commercial kit. Data are
 555 normalized against the cost of individual testing using commercial diagnostic tests (100%, horizontal line) and
 556 for both methods include the cost of reagents, disposable, PPE, labor, laboratory equipment and overheads.

557 **Figure 5.** Results of routine use of the screening test; *false negative ratio calculated only from unraveled
 558 negative pools (which include 88 individual samples).

A

B

1 475 individual samples

374 pools

23 positive

351 negative

23

22

pools unraveled

pools unraveled

18

2

3

true
positive

inconclusive

false
positive
(0.80%)

0

false
negative
(0.00%)*