RT-PCR/MALDI-TOF diagnostic target performance reflects circulating SARS-CoV-2 variant diversity in New York City

Matthew M. Hernandez^{1,#}, Radhika Banu¹, Ana S. Gonzalez-Reiche², Brandon Gray¹, Paras Shrestha¹, Liyong Cao¹, Feng Chen¹, Huanzhi Shi¹, Ayman Hanna¹, Juan David Ramírez^{1,3}, Adriana van de Guchte², Robert Sebra^{2,4,5,6}, Mount Sinai PSP Study Group^{1,2,7}, Melissa R. Gitman¹, Michael D. Nowak¹, Carlos Cordon-Cardo¹, Ted E. Schutzbank⁸, Viviana Simon^{1,7,9,10}, Harm van Bakel^{2,4}, Emilia Mia Sordillo¹, Alberto E. Paniz-Mondolfi^{1,#}

Affiliations:

¹ Department of Pathology, Molecular, and Cell-Based Medicine, Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai, New York, NY 10029, USA

² Department of Genetics and Genomic Sciences, Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai, New York, NY 10029, USA

³ Centro de Investigaciones en Microbiología y Biotecnología-UR (CIMBIUR), Facultad de Ciencias Naturales, Universidad del Rosario, Bogotá, Colombia.

⁴ Icahn Institute for Data Science and Genomic Technology, Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai, New York, NY 10029, USA

⁵ Black Family Stem Cell Institute, Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai, New York, NY 10029, USA

⁶ Sema4, a Mount Sinai venture, Stamford, CT 06902, USA

⁷ Department of Microbiology, Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai, New York, NY 10029, USA

⁸ Senior Scientific Affairs Manager, Infectious Diseases, Agena Bioscience, San Diego, CA 92121, USA

24 ⁹ Division of Infectious Diseases, Department of Medicine, Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai,
25 New York, NY 10029, USA

26 ¹⁰ The Global Health and Emerging Pathogens Institute, Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai, New
27 York, NY 10029, USA

28

29 # Corresponding authors: matthew.hernandez@mssm.edu, alberto.paniz-mondolfi@mountsinai.org

30 **Running head:** RT-PCR/MALDI-TOF and SARS-CoV-2 variants

31 **Keywords:** RT-PCR; MALDI-TOF; SARS-CoV-2; Delta; variants; diagnostic; dropout

32 Abstract

33 As severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) continues to circulate,
 34 multiple variants of concern (VOC) have emerged. New variants pose challenges for diagnostic
 35 platforms since sequence diversity can alter primer/probe binding sites (PBS), causing false-negative
 36 results. The Agena MassARRAY[®] SARS-CoV-2 Panel utilizes reverse-transcription polymerase chain
 37 reaction and mass-spectrometry to detect five multiplex targets across *N* and *ORF1ab* genes. Herein, we
 38 utilize a dataset of 256 SARS-CoV-2-positive specimens collected between April 11, 2021-August 28,
 39 2021 to evaluate target performance with paired sequencing data. During this timeframe, two targets in
 40 the *N* gene (N2, N3) were subject to the greatest sequence diversity. In specimens with N3 dropout, 69%
 41 harbored the Alpha-specific A28095U polymorphism that introduces a 3'-mismatch to the N3 forward
 42 PBS and increases risk of target dropout relative to specimens with 28095A (relative risk (RR): 20.02;
 43 $p < 0.0001$; 95% Confidence Interval (CI): 11.36-35.72). Furthermore, among specimens with N2
 44 dropout, 90% harbored the Delta-specific G28916U polymorphism that creates a 3'-mismatch to the N2
 45 probe PBS and increases target dropout risk (RR: 11.92; $p < 0.0001$; 95% CI: 8.17-14.06). These findings
 46 highlight the robust capability of Agena MassARRAY[®] SARS-CoV-2 Panel target results to reveal
 47 circulating virus diversity and underscore the power of multi-target design to capture VOC.
 48

49 Introduction

50 Since the recognition and global spread of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19), nucleic acid
51 amplification testing has been the diagnostic mainstay for identifying new severe acute respiratory
52 syndrome coronavirus-2 (SARS-CoV-2) infections. Historically, the majority of diagnostic target primers
53 and probes have been designed from viral genomes characterized early in the pandemic. However, in the
54 two years since the first SARS-CoV-2 genome was identified, viral variants have emerged in response to
55 various evolutionary pressures^{1,2}. Emergence of variants of concern (VOC) and of interest (VOI) poses
56 a hurdle for diagnostic assays as sequence variation generates mismatches to primer/probe binding sites
57 (PBSs), potentially causing target dropout and false-negative results^{3,4}. Failure to promptly detect
58 infections with emerging variants that may be associated with greater transmissibility and infectivity
59 represents a substantive risk for forward transmission in the community.

60 The diagnostic assays that are most robust for detection of SARS-CoV-2 and least affected by
61 viral sequence changes are designed to amplify two or more targets across different viral genes (e.g.,
62 open reading frame 1ab (*ORF1ab*), nucleocapsid (*N*), spike (*S*), and envelope (*E*)). This redundancy can
63 compensate for individual target dropout due to inherent biochemical differences and analytical
64 sensitivities among targets or due to emergent viral genome diversity at PBS sequences. Several groups
65 have demonstrated the utility of platforms with multiple targets to accurately detect emerging SARS-
66 CoV-2 variants^{3,5,6}. Furthermore, target performance patterns on these platforms can be used to
67 elucidate dynamics of circulating variants in communities. Indeed, multiple reports described the use of
68 dropout of diagnostic targets designed at *S*^{5,7,8} or *N*⁹ genes as a screen for PBS-specific polymorphisms
69 that have arisen among emergent SARS-CoV-2 viruses such as the Alpha variant (B.1.1.7 lineage).

70 In early 2021, the Delta variant (B.1.617.2 lineage) of SARS-CoV-2 surged in India¹⁰⁻¹², and
71 soon Delta and its sublineages (AY.x) quickly spread across the globe^{2,13-15}. By Fall 2021, despite

72 increased vaccination rates and infection prevention methods^{16–18}, Delta and its sublineages became
 73 predominant in New York City (NYC) and abroad^{10,13,14}. Given that emergent variants may be
 74 associated with resistance to therapeutic antibodies^{19,20}, increased transmissibility^{12,16,21,22}, or reduced
 75 vaccine effectiveness^{16,17,23,24}, diagnosing new infections is vital. Several mutation-specific assays have
 76 been designed to detect lineage-specific *S* gene mutations in Delta and older variants^{25–27}. However, few
 77 assays have been evaluated for their ability to capture contemporary variants in routine clinical settings,
 78 or to shed light on sequence diversity in virus genes other than Spike (S).

79 We recently reported the power of the Agena MassARRAY® SARS-CoV-2 Panel for detection
 80 of emergent SARS-CoV-2 variants in NYC during the first months of 2021 and the utility of diagnostic
 81 target performance to illuminate sequence diversity among then-predominant Alpha variant genomes²⁸.
 82 This assay combines reverse-transcription polymerase chain reaction and matrix-assisted laser
 83 desorption-ionization time-of-flight mass spectrometry (RT-PCR/MALDI-TOF) to detect five targets in
 84 the SARS-CoV-2 genome. Coincident with the spread of the Delta VOC in NYC, we observed a distinct
 85 change in the target performance patterns that reflect ongoing viral evolution, prompting us to examine
 86 the corresponding genomic sequence data.

87 For the current study, we compared paired RT-PCR/MALDI-TOF diagnostic target data and
 88 genome sequencing data for SARS-CoV-2-positive specimens that were collected from April 11, 2021 –
 89 August 28, 2021, and recovered, deidentified, and sequenced as part of the Mount Sinai Health System
 90 (MSHS) Pathogen Surveillance Program (PSP) at the Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai
 91 (ISMMS). Herein, we utilize a dataset of 256 genomes from SARS-CoV-2-positive clinical specimens
 92 to identify PBS mismatches in the *N* gene and lineage-specific sequence diversity that impacted target
 93 performance patterns on the Agena MassARRAY® SARS-CoV-2 Panel.

94 **Materials and Methods**

95 *Ethics statement*

96 This study was reviewed and approved by the Institutional Review Board of the ISMMS
97 (HS#13-00981).

98 *SARS-CoV-2 specimen collection and testing*

99 Upper respiratory tract (e.g., nasopharyngeal, anterior nares) and saliva specimens collected
100 between April 11, 2021 – August 28, 2021 for SARS-CoV-2 diagnostic testing in the Molecular
101 Microbiology Laboratories (MML) of the MSHS Clinical Laboratory, which is certified under Clinical
102 Laboratory Improvement Amendments of 1988, 42 U.S.C. §263a and meets requirements to perform
103 high-complexity tests were eligible for inclusion in this study. Overall, 177,059 upper respiratory and
104 saliva specimens underwent SARS-CoV-2 clinical testing at MSHS MML during the study period, and
105 subset of 256 were deidentified and underwent SARS-CoV-2 next-generation sequencing as previously
106 described^{28–30}. For this retrospective study, we utilized deidentified data for diagnostic specimens tested
107 on the Agena MassARRAY[®] SARS-CoV-2 Panel and MassARRAY[®] System (Agena, CPM384)
108 platform. Details of processing and SARS-CoV-2 testing of upper respiratory and saliva specimens have
109 been described previously^{28,31}.

110 This RT-PCR/MALDI-TOF assay detects five viral targets: three in the nucleocapsid (*N*) gene
111 (*N1*, *N2*, *N3*) and two in the *ORF1ab* gene (*ORF1A*, *ORF1AB*). Results were interpreted as positive if ≥
112 2 targets were detected or negative if < 2 targets were detected. If no MS2 internal extraction control
113 (IC) and no targets were detected, the result was invalid and required repeat testing of the specimen
114 before reporting. If IC was detected and no targets were detected, the sample was interpreted as
115 negative.

116

117 *SARS-CoV-2 sequencing, assembly and phylogenetic analyses*

118 SARS-CoV-2 viral RNA underwent reverse-transcription, PCR amplification and next-
119 generation sequencing followed by genome assembly and lineage assignment using a phylogenetic-
120 based nomenclature as described by Rambaut et al.³² using the Pangolin v3.1.14 tool and PANGO-
121 v1.2.81 nomenclature scheme³³ as previously described^{29,30}. Ultimately, this yielded 244 complete
122 genomes ($\geq 95\%$ completeness) and 12 partial genomes ($< 95\%$ completeness).

123

124 *Agena target sequence alignment*

125 Agena MassARRAY[®] target detection results were matched to the corresponding genome
126 sequences. Primer and probe sequences for each Agena target were obtained from published FDA EUA
127 documentation for the Agena MassARRAY[®] SARS-CoV-2 Panel (**Table S1**)³⁴. We generated reverse-
128 complement sequences for reverse primers for all five targets and probes that are designed in the reverse
129 orientation (e.g., N1-N3). An unaligned FASTA file including sequence data for the clinical specimens
130 and the Wuhan-Hu-1 reference sequence (NCBI nucleotide: NC_045512.2 (Genbank: MN908947.3))
131 was generated for each of the fifteen primers/probes. Alignment of specimen sequences with each
132 primer/probe sequence was performed using the Multiple Alignment using Fast Fourier Transform
133 (MAFFT) platform^{35,36} as previously described²⁸. To enable inclusion of incomplete genomes that had
134 intact regions sequenced at PBSs, we did not remove uninformative sequences (e.g., with ambiguous
135 letters). Otherwise, the default settings were used to align all sequences to the reference genome, which
136 generated a resulting FASTA alignment file for each primer and probe sequence.

137

138 *Sequence variation in primer/probe target regions*

To examine sequence diversity at each primer/probe PBS region, nucleotide diversity per basepair was calculated using the PopGenome population genomics analysis package in R (v4.1.2)³⁷. Nucleotide diversity per site (π) was calculated by dividing the nucleotide diversity of all sequences within each PBS sliding window by the number of nucleotide sites in each corresponding PBS.

To identify and calculate mismatch frequency at each PBS, custom Unix-code³⁸ was used to identify mismatches at each nucleotide position within each primer and probe sequence as described previously²⁸. PBS mismatch frequency by position of forward/reverse primer and probe sequences were calculated on Microsoft Excel v16.54. To account for differences in completeness of consensus genomes, the number of PBS mismatches was normalized to the number of nucleotides in the PBS of each specimen consensus sequence.

To compare global sequence data for lineages and polymorphisms relevant to this study, we queried publicly-available sequence data from the Global Initiative on Sharing Avian Influenza Data (GISAID) EpiCoV database through their online user interface (<https://www.epicov.org>, accessed October 16, 2021). Using available filters for collection date ranges, amino acid substitutions, and variant classification, we calculated the frequencies of distinct genomes deposited. Specifically, to distinguish nucleotide polymorphisms at SARS-CoV-2 position 28916, we identified the number of variations at the corresponding 215th amino acid in the N protein. We determined nucleotide changes by comparing the codon of the native glycine amino acid (28916-GGU-28918) to the codons of the variant amino acids. These changes (nucleotide change underlined) included cysteine (UGU), serine (AGU), and arginine (CGU) amino acids.

Statistical analyses

For statistical comparison of fraction of PBS with mismatches in genomes with detected targets versus those with dropout, normality was assessed by D'Agostino and Pearson test (GraphPad Prism v9.2.0). All distributions were non-parametric, and thus, a Mann-Whitney test (two-tailed) was performed (GraphPad). To determine if specific mismatches were associated with specific target dropout results, specimens were grouped by (1) presence or absence of the mismatch of interest (in the setting of no other mismatches) and (2) detection or dropout of the target of interest – which resulted in a 2x2 contingency table which underwent association testing by Fisher's exact test. In addition to p-value, relative risk (RR) ratios and 95% confidence intervals (CI) are provided for association testing.

Display Items

All figures are original and were generated using the GraphPad Prism software 9.2.0, Microsoft Excel v16.54, and finished in Adobe Illustrator 2021 (v.25.4.1). Alignment plots were developed using the package ggmsa (v.1.1.0) on R ³⁹ and finished in Adobe Illustrator.

175 Results

176 Of 448 SARS-CoV-2-positive specimens, 117 (26%) had all five targets detected with the
177 remaining having one (n=247) or more (n=84) targets dropout. For the subset of 256 SARS-CoV-2-
178 positive specimens sequenced in our study, all five diagnostic targets were detected in 96 (38%), with
179 the remaining having one (n=140) or more (n=20) targets dropout (**Table S2**).

180 When we calculated weekly detection rates for individual targets among these SARS-CoV-2-
181 positive specimens, the N2 (0.61) and N3 (0.77) targets had the lowest average detection rates (**Figure**
182 **1A**). Notably, N2 and N3 detection rates were lowest at distinct periods of time. Among weeks with ≥ 3
183 SARS-CoV-2-positive specimens sequenced, the N2 detection rate was lowest (0.13) in the week ending
184 July 31, and the N3 detection rate was lowest (0.41) in the week ending May 1. We hypothesized this
185 shift was due to changes in the population of circulating SARS-CoV-2 variants. When we compared
186 individual target detection rates to reported prevalence of variants in NYC during the same time period,
187 we found the N3 detection rate was lowest when the Alpha variant (B.1.1.7 + Q.x) was predominant at
188 33% (**Figure 1B**). Similarly, the N2 detection rate was lowest when the Delta variant (B.1.617.2 +
189 AY.x) comprised 96% of circulating SARS-CoV-2 in NYC. Given these findings, we used diagnostic
190 target and paired genome sequence data to identify mismatches to Agena MassARRAY[®] target PBSs to
191 determine impact of SARS-CoV-2 genomic diversity on diagnostic target performance.

192

193 *Impact of mismatches on target performance*

194 We aligned each diagnostic target PBS to each of the 256 SARS-CoV-2 genome sequences and
195 calculated the number of mismatches to each target PBS for both detected and undetected targets
196 (**Figure 2**). For four targets (N1, N3, ORF1A, ORF1AB), when the individual target was detected there
197 was perfect complementarity (0 mismatches) between genome sequences and forward, reverse, and

198 probe sequences for almost all (>99%) specimens. However, for specimens in which the N2 target was
 199 detected, mismatches occurred both at N2 forward (34.3%) and reverse (46.6%) PBSs (**Figure 2B**).
 200 Specifically, among specimens with detectable N2 target, 1-3 mismatches to the forward PBS and up to
 201 1 mismatch to the reverse PBS were observed.

202 Notably, specimens with N2 target dropout had a significantly greater number of mismatches to
 203 the N2 probe PBS (**Figure 2B**). The same was found for specimens with N3 dropout and mismatches to
 204 the N3 forward PBS (**Figure 2C**). Of interest, more mismatches to the N2 reverse PBS were found for
 205 specimens in which the N2 target was detected than for those with N2 dropout. Indeed, the majority of
 206 specimens with detectable N2 target (85%) harbored mismatches in N2 forward or reverse PBSs, but 0%
 207 of specimens with detectable N2 target harbored mismatches to the N2 probe PBS.

208

209 *Site-specific polymorphisms affect target performance*

210 Because mismatch position in PBSs can affect primer/probes binding to target sites ^{40–43}, we
 211 characterized mismatch frequencies by position in each PBS (**Figure 2**). At least one mismatch was
 212 identified in every target PBS with the exception of the N1 reverse, N3 reverse, and the ORF1AB
 213 forward primers which had zero mismatches to all possible haplotypes in our dataset. To assess the level
 214 of sequence diversity across each target, we calculated the nucleotide diversity per site (π) for each PBS
 215 sequence. Overall, genomes sequenced in this timeframe demonstrated the most diversity at N2 target
 216 PBSs (≥ 0.01260) followed by the N3 forward PBS (0.01075) (**Figure 3B-C**). Diversity at these targets
 217 was at least seven-fold more than that at all other target PBSs. Notably, this diversity corresponded with
 218 a predominance of Delta (56.7%), Alpha (15.7%), , and Iota (16.5%) variant genomes in this dataset.

219 To identify individual mismatches associated with target dropout, we measured the proportion of
 220 genomes with a mismatch at each PBS position and compared this level across specimens that yielded

target detection or dropout (**Figure S1**). From 5'-to-3' direction, there were mismatches to 1st – 3rd bp of the N2 forward primer PBS (SARS-CoV-2 genome positions 28881 – 28883) in genomes that yielded both N2 target detection and dropout (**Figure 3B, Figure S1B**). Overall, there were 192 specimens with at least one mismatch to the first 3 bp of the N2 forward primer. Of these, 49 (26%) had a concurrent trio of substitutions in the *N* gene: G28881A, G28882A, and G28883C; the remaining 143 (74%) harbored a single G28881U substitution. The GGG-to-AAC and the G28881U substitutions were independent of one another and no combinations of the two were detected. The majority of specimens with the trio (88%) had detectable N2 target. In contrast, 78% of specimens with G28881U resulted in dropout which – despite its position at the 5'-end of the N2 forward primer – represents a significant association of G28881U with N2 target dropout ($p<0.0001$).

Interestingly, of 123 genomes with N2 target dropout we identified 111 (90%) that harbored a mismatch at the terminal 3' base of the 22-bp-long N2 probe (**Figure 3B, Figure S1B**). All mismatches are the result of a guanine-to-uracil substitution in the *N* gene (G28916U). This substitution was not identified among any of the 131 specimens with detectable N2 target. In fact, the relative risk of N2 target dropout in the setting of the G28916U substitution was 11.9-times greater than genomes with the native guanine ($p<0.0001$; 95% CI: 8.17-14.06). We also determined that all 111 genomes with the G28916U substitution have the G28881U substitution. The linkage of the G28881U and G28916U polymorphisms likely explains why the former – a 5'-end mismatch to the N2 forward PBS – is associated with N2 target dropout. Indeed, 100% of genomes ($n=32$) that possess the G28881U substitution alone resulted in N2 target detection.

In the current study, of 36 specimens with N3 target dropout, 25 (69%) had a mismatch at the penultimate position of the 3'-end of the 20-bp-long N3 forward primer (**Figure 3C, Figure S1C**). This mismatch corresponded with the adenine-to-uracil substitution in the *ORF8* gene (A28095U) which

causes a 20-fold risk of N3 target dropout relative to genomes with the native nucleotide ($p < 0.0001$; 95% CI: 11.36-35.72) which is consistent with our findings earlier in the pandemic²⁸, prior to the current study period.

We assessed whether the associations between mismatch and corresponding target dropout persist when quantity of virus genomic material in specimens is controlled as previously described²⁸. When analyses are limited to specimens for which all non-N2 targets are detected, the association of the G28916U substitution with N2 dropout remains significant ($p < 0.0001$; RR: 20.2; 95% CI: 14.58-47.48). In addition, when analyses are limited to specimens for which all non-N3 targets are detected, the A28095U substitution remains significantly associated with N3 target dropout ($p < 0.0001$; RR: 31.03; 95% CI: 10.95-91.10). These results indicate that the G28916U and A28095U substitutions are associated with N2 and N3 target dropout, respectively, independent of quantity of SARS-CoV-2.

Lineage-specific variation and target dropout

To determine whether target dropout was the result of lineage-specific variation, we examined phylogenetic lineages of genomes harboring the distinct polymorphisms. Among 25 specimens with N3 target dropout in this study, 23 (92%) belonged to the B.1.1.7 lineage (Alpha variant) and 2 were partial genomes whose phylogenies could not be determined. These specimens were collected from April 11, 2021 (PV36791) through June 30, 2021 (PV37690), which mirrored the prevalence of the Alpha variant in NYC (**Figure 1B**).

We next examined the lineage of genomes harboring the G28916U substitution (**Figure 4**). Of 111 specimens that bore the G28916U polymorphism and resulted in N2 target dropout, the earliest was from July 1, 2021 (PV37692) and the latest from August 21, 2021 (PV38720). All genomes corresponded with lineages and sublineages of the Delta variant. Specifically, these included the

267 B.1.617.2 (n=67) lineage and AY.20 (n=2), AY.23 (n=1), AY.25 (n=22), AY.3 (n=17), AY.33 (n=1),
268 and AY.5 (n=1) sublineages. We did not find the G28916U substitution among any of the other variant
269 lineages in our dataset (**Figure 4A**).

270 We broadened our analyses to interrogate SARS-CoV-2 genomes deposited globally for the
271 G28916U polymorphism. We utilized the publicly-available EpiCoV (GISAID) database and queried
272 2,103,844 sequences collected during the same timeframe of this study (**Figure 4B**). We found the Delta
273 variant (B.1.617.2 + AY.x) was predominant in the deposited genomes comprising 62% of all genomes
274 (n=1,313,492). The majority of these Delta genomes (82%) harbored the G28916U substitution. Of the
275 remaining Delta genome sequences, almost all (99.3%) had the native guanine nucleotide with a
276 minority of sequences (<0.1%) harboring G28916A and G28916C substitutions. The G28916U
277 polymorphism – which results in the G215C amino acid substitution in the N protein – is almost
278 exclusive to Delta variant genomes but was rarely (<0.02%) reported in other variant groups including
279 Alpha (B.1.1.7 + Q.x), Beta (B.1.351 + B.1.351.2 + B.1.351.3), Gamma (P.1 + P.1.x), Lambda (C.37 +
280 C.37.1), and Mu (B.1.621 + B.1.621.1).

281

282 Discussion

283 In the current study, we present a robust assessment of the impact of emergence of SARS-CoV-2
284 variants on detection of individual target genes included in the Agena MassARRAY® SARS-CoV-2
285 Panel, focusing on a five-month period characterized by rapid changes in circulating VOC and VOI.

286 Molecular diagnostic tests to detect SARS-CoV-2, first designed almost two years ago, are
287 challenged by continued viral circulation and rapid viral diversification, with continual emergence of
288 new lineages. At the same time, recognition that some virus variants can demonstrate increased
289 infectivity and disease severity among a broader population that now includes younger individuals
290 ^{2,13,16,17,44} has raised awareness regarding assay sensitivity and risks for missed diagnoses. Although
291 several studies have reported the impacts of viral sequence variation on conventional diagnostic
292 platforms ^{5,7,27,45} or have highlighted, *in silico*, potential interference of variant polymorphisms with
293 publicly-available target sequences ^{42,46,47}, there are limited reports on assay performance *in actu* for
294 detection of the Delta VOC and sublineages, and other recent VOC/VOI.

295 We utilized publicly-available primer/probe sequences of the Agena MassARRAY® SARS-CoV-
296 2 Panel and a deidentified dataset from clinical specimens that included individual target detection data
297 and whole-genome sequencing to generate a snapshot of virus sequence diversity at each target PBS and
298 to determine the extent to which polymorphisms are associated with individual target performance.
299 Interestingly, we found that distinct viral substitutions resulted in N2 and N3 target dropout. Consistent
300 with what we previously reported ²⁸, the A28095U substitution is a B.1.1.7-associated polymorphism
301 that introduces a mismatch at the 3'-end of the N3 forward PBS which results in N3 target dropout.
302 Notably, a marked change in the pattern of target dropout occurred during the course of the study with
303 the introduction of the Delta VOC; we found the G28916U polymorphism unique to a subset of Delta
304 variants results in a 3'-mismatch to the N2 probe and is associated with N2 dropout. Our findings

highlight the robust capability of this multiple-target platform to capture diverse viral variants, as well as the ability of target performance to reflect lineage-specific sequence variation outside the conventional *S* gene.

A number of recent reports have focused on variant panels designed to target a finite number of emergent mutations to discern variant identity, particularly in the first months of 2021. Most panels utilize RT-PCR or novel isothermal technologies (e.g., RT-LAMP, CRISPR/Cas-based, mass-spectrometry) to target specific polymorphisms in the *S* gene that have been ascribed to each of these variants^{25,27,45,48–50}. However, a recent deep analysis of circulating variants across the globe revealed that most of these signature mutations are not under positive selection¹. Therefore, other than a finite number of mutations in the spike protein (e.g., N501Y, S477N, V1176F, N501Y), one can anticipate that other variant-defining polymorphisms may not persist over continued circulation of SARS-CoV-2 and, thus, new target formulations will need to be continuously considered. As most efforts to accommodate new variants have been to redesign primers and probes or include more targets in this region^{45,51}, this may become impractical as inclusion of additional reactions can become costly and introduce more room for error. Furthermore, although multiplexing assays allow for single-pot reactions, the level of target redundancy is limited by the optical detection system as more fluorophores complicate conventional diagnostic methods^{52–54}. Therefore, as the COVID-19 pandemic continues and new variants emerge, there can be great utility in existing assay platforms that target multiple regions outside the *S* gene.

Our findings also highlight the level of sequence diversity observed at each of these five target loci among sequences from VOC/VOI detected through August 2021. Among the Agena MassARRAY® SARS-CoV-2 Panel, *N* gene targets (e.g., N2, N3) are challenged by the greatest level of nucleotide diversity which can result in dropout of each. Consistent with phylogenetic analyses of global sequences

328 ¹, the N2 target region has the greatest sequence diversity. Although, a number of polymorphisms in the
 329 *N* gene are under positive selection ^{1,46,55}, the evolutionary pressures exerted on A28095U (ORF8|K68*)
 330 and G28916U (N|G215C) polymorphisms have not demonstrated positive selection or purported
 331 epistatic interactions ^{1,16}. This is likely due to the earlier timeframes for which each of these
 332 phylogenetic studies were performed (e.g., December 2020 through May 2021) and the lack of robust
 333 functional genomic studies in SARS-CoV-2. Thus, the fate of each of these polymorphisms is unclear
 334 among emergent VOC, and each should be taken into consideration for use of this diagnostic platform
 335 and others that target the same *N* gene regions going forward.

336 As SARS-CoV-2 variants continue to arise, robust platforms with high target redundancy for
 337 virus detection and diagnosis are vital to capture new or existing lineages. As contemporary
 338 polymorphisms undergo selection, evaluation of diagnostic target performance in the clinical setting can
 339 help elucidate ongoing viral dynamics in patient communities and highlight platform target
 340 combinations that should be further optimized. Lastly, our results reinforce the need for continuing
 341 surveillance of assay target result patterns to increase the sensitivity of current molecular tests for
 342 SARS-CoV-2 detection and to assure the adequate diagnosis of COVID-19 worldwide.

343

344 **Code availability**

345 To generate genome sequences, sequencing data were analyzed using a custom reference-based
 346 (MN908947.3) pipeline, https://github.com/mjsull/COVID_pipe⁵⁶. To analyze mismatches to diagnostic
 347 target PBSs, genome sequences were processed using a custom Unix-code
 348 https://github.com/AceM1188/SACOV_primer-probe_analyses³⁸.

349

350 **Data availability**

351 SARS-CoV-2 sequencing read data for all study genomes were deposited in GISAID [www.gisaid.org]
 352 (accessions pending).

References

1. Rochman ND, Wolf YI, Faure G, Mutz P, Zhang F, Koonin EV. Ongoing global and regional adaptive evolution of SARS-CoV-2. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*, 2021, 118
2. Tao K, Tzou PL, Nouhin J, Gupta RK, de Oliveira T, Kosakovsky Pond SL, Fera D, Shafer RW. The biological and clinical significance of emerging SARS-CoV-2 variants. *Nat Rev Genet*, 2021, 22:757–73
3. Artesi M, Bontems S, Göbbels P, Franckh M, Maes P, Boreux R, Meex C, Melin P, Hayette M-P, Bours V, Durkin K. A Recurrent Mutation at Position 26340 of SARS-CoV-2 Is Associated with Failure of the E Gene Quantitative Reverse Transcription-PCR Utilized in a Commercial Dual-Target Diagnostic Assay. *J Clin Microbiol*, 2020, 58
4. Rana DR, Pokhrel N. Sequence mismatch in PCR probes may mask the COVID-19 detection in Nepal. *Mol Cell Probes*, 2020, 53:101599
5. Bal A, Destras G, Gaymard A, Stefic K, Marlet J, Eymieux S, Regue H, Semanas Q, d'Aubarede C, Billaud G, Laurent F, Gonzalez C, Mekki Y, Valette M, Bouscambert M, Gaudy-Graffin C, Lina B, Morfin F, Josset L, COVID-Diagnosis HCL Study Group. Two-step strategy for the identification of SARS-CoV-2 variant of concern 202012/01 and other variants with spike deletion H69-V70, France, August to December 2020. *Euro Surveill*, 2021, 26
6. Tahan S, Parikh BA, Droit L, Wallace MA, Burnham CA, Wang D. SARS-CoV-2 E gene variant alters analytical sensitivity characteristics of viral detection using a commercial RT-PCR assay. *J Clin Microbiol*, 2021. <https://doi.org/10.1128/JCM.00075-21>
7. Brown KA, Gubbay J, Hopkins J, Patel S, Buchan SA, Daneman N, Goneau LW. S-Gene Target Failure as a Marker of Variant B.1.1.7 Among SARS-CoV-2 Isolates in the Greater Toronto Area, December 2020 to March 2021. *JAMA*, 2021, 325:2115–6
8. Braybrook E, Pandey S, Vryonis E, Anderson NR, Young L, Grammatopoulos D. Screening for the alpha variant of SARS-CoV-2 (B.1.1.7) and the impact of this variant on circulating biomarkers in hospitalised patients. *BioRxiv*, 2021. <https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.18.21258699>
9. Sánchez-Calvo JM, Alados Arboledas JC, Ros Vidal L, de Francisco JL, López Prieto MD. Diagnostic pre-screening method based on N-gene dropout or delay to increase feasibility of SARS-CoV-2 VOC B.1.1.7 detection. *Diagn Microbiol Infect Dis*, 2021, 101:115491
10. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, US Department of Health and Human Services. CDC COVID Data Tracker, n.d. <https://covid.cdc.gov/covid-data-tracker/#variant-proportions>. (accessed July 4, 2021)
11. The Delta Variant: What Scientists Know. *The New York Times*, 2021. <https://www.nytimes.com/2021/06/22/health/delta-variant-covid.html>. (accessed July 4, 2021)
12. Dhar MS, Marwal R, Radhakrishnan VS, Ponnusamy K, Jolly B, Bhoyar RC, Sardana V, Naushin S, Rophina M, Mellan TA, Mishra S, Whittaker C, Fatihi S, Datta M, Singh P, Sharma U, Ujjainiya R, Batheja N, Divakar MK, Singh MK, Imran M, Senthivel V, Maurya R, Jha N, Mehta P, Vivekanand A, Sharma P, Arvinden VR, Chaudhary U, Soni N, Thukral L, Flaxman S, Bhatt S, Pandey R, Dash D, et al. Genomic characterization and Epidemiology of an emerging SARS-CoV-2 variant in Delhi, India. *MedRxiv*, 2021:2021.06.02.21258076
13. Malden DE, Bruxvoort KJ, Tseng HF, Ackerson B, Choi SK, Florea A, Tubert J, Takhar H, Aragonés M, Hong V, Talarico CA, McLaughlin JM, Qian L, Tartof SY. Distribution of SARS-CoV-2 Variants in a Large Integrated Health Care System - California, March-July 2021. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*, 2021, 70:1415–9

14. New York City Department of Health. COVID-19: Data. NYC Health COVID-19: Data on Variants, n.d. <https://www1.nyc.gov/site/doh/covid/covid-19-data-variants.page>. (accessed July 4, 2021)
15. The Pango Lineage Nomenclature. Pango Network. PangoNetwork, 2021. <https://www.pango.network/new-ay-lineages/>. (accessed November 29, 2021)
16. Elliott P, Haw D, Wang H, Eales O, Walters CE, Ainslie KEC, Atchison C, Fronterre C, Diggle PJ, Page AJ, Trotter AJ, Prosoplek SJ, COVID-19 Genomics UK (COG-UK) Consortium¹, Ashby D, Donnelly CA, Barclay W, Taylor G, Cooke G, Ward H, Darzi A, Riley S, Robson SC, Loman NJ, Connor TR, Golubchik T, Martinez Nunez RT, Ludden C, Corden S, Johnston I, Bonsall D, Smith CP, Awan AR, Bucca G, Torok ME, Saeed K, et al. Exponential growth, high prevalence of SARS-CoV-2, and vaccine effectiveness associated with the Delta variant. *Science*, 2021:eabl9551
17. Embi PJ, Levy ME, Naleway AL, Patel P, Gaglani M, Natarajan K, Dascomb K, Ong TC, Klein NP, Liao I-C, Grannis SJ, Han J, Stenehjem E, Dunne MM, Lewis N, Irving SA, Rao S, McEvoy C, Bozio CH, Murthy K, Dixon BE, Grisel N, Yang D-H, Goddard K, Kharbanda AB, Reynolds S, Raiyani C, Fadel WF, Arndorfer J, Rowley EA, Fireman B, Ferdinands J, Valvi NR, Ball SW, Zerbo O, et al. Effectiveness of 2-Dose Vaccination with mRNA COVID-19 Vaccines Against COVID-19-Associated Hospitalizations Among Immunocompromised Adults - Nine States, January-September 2021. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*, 2021, 70:1553–9
18. Tenforde MW, Self WH, Adams K, Gaglani M, Ginde AA, McNeal T, Ghamande S, Douin DJ, Talbot HK, Casey JD, Mohr NM, Zepeski A, Shapiro NI, Gibbs KW, Files DC, Hager DN, Shehu A, Prekker ME, Erickson HL, Exline MC, Gong MN, Mohamed A, Henning DJ, Steingrub JS, Peltan ID, Brown SM, Martin ET, Monto AS, Khan A, Hough CL, Busse LW, Ten Lohuis CC, Duggal A, Wilson JG, Gordon AJ, et al. Association Between mRNA Vaccination and COVID-19 Hospitalization and Disease Severity. *JAMA*, 2021. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2021.19499>
19. Liu C, Ginn HM, Dejnirattisai W, Supasa P, Wang B, Tuekprakhon A, Nutalai R, Zhou D, Mentzer AJ, Zhao Y, Duyvesteyn HME, López-Camacho C, Slon-Campos J, Walter TS, Skelly D, Johnson SA, Ritter TG, Mason C, Costa Clemens SA, Gomes Naveca F, Nascimento V, Nascimento F, Fernandes da Costa C, Resende PC, Pauvolid-Correa A, Siqueira MM, Dold C, Temperton N, Dong T, Pollard AJ, Knight JC, Crook D, Lambe T, Clutterbuck E, Bibi S, et al. Reduced neutralization of SARS-CoV-2 B.1.617 by vaccine and convalescent serum. *Cell*, 2021, 184:4220-4236.e13
20. Planas D, Veyer D, Baidaliuk A, Staropoli I, Guivel-Benhassine F, Rajah MM, Planchais C, Porrot F, Robillard N, Puech J, Prot M, Gallais F, Gantner P, Velay A, Le Guen J, Kassis-Chikhani N, Edriss D, Belec L, Seve A, Courtellemont L, Péré H, Hocqueloux L, Fafi-Kremer S, Prazuck T, Mouquet H, Bruel T, Simon-Lorière E, Rey FA, Schwartz O. Reduced sensitivity of SARS-CoV-2 variant Delta to antibody neutralization. *Nature*, 2021, 596:276–80
21. Bolze A, Cirulli ET, Luo S, White S, Wyman D, Rossi AD, Machado H, Cassens T, Jacobs S, Schiabor Barrett KM, Tsan K, Nguyen J, Ramirez JM, Sandoval E, Wang X, Wong D, Becker D, Laurent M, Lu JT, Isaksson M, Washington NL, Lee W. SARS-CoV-2 variant Delta rapidly displaced variant Alpha in the United States and led to higher viral loads. *MedRxiv*, 2021:2021.06.20.21259195
22. Challen R, Dyson L, Overton CE, Guzman-Rincon LM, Hill EM, Stage HB, Brooks-Pollock E, Pellis L, Scarabel F, Pascall DJ, Blomquist P, Tildesley M, Williamson D, Siegert S, Xiong X, Youngman B, Read JM, Gog JR, Keeling MJ, Danon L, Juniper. Early epidemiological signatures of novel SARS-CoV-2 variants: establishment of B.1.617.2 in England. *BioRxiv*, 2021. <https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.05.21258365>

23. Lopez Bernal J, Andrews N, Gower C, Gallagher E, Simmons R, Thelwall S, Stowe J, Tessier E, Groves N, Dabrera G, Myers R, Campbell CNJ, Amirthalingam G, Edmunds M, Zambon M, Brown KE, Hopkins S, Chand M, Ramsay M. Effectiveness of Covid-19 Vaccines against the B.1.617.2 (Delta) Variant. *N Engl J Med*, 2021, 385:585–94
24. Tang P, Hasan MR, Chemaitelly H, Yassine HM, Benslimane FM, Al Khatib HA, AlMukdad S, Coyle P, Ayoub HH, Al Kanaani Z, Al Kuwari E, Jeremijenko A, Kaleeckal AH, Latif AN, Shaik RM, Abdul Rahim HF, Nasrallah GK, Al Kuwari MG, Al Romaihi HE, Butt AA, Al-Thani MH, Al Khal A, Bertollini R, Abu-Raddad LJ. BNT162b2 and mRNA-1273 COVID-19 vaccine effectiveness against the SARS-CoV-2 Delta variant in Qatar. *Nat Med*, 2021. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-021-01583-4>
25. Zhao F, Lu J, Lu B, Qin T, Wang X, Hou X, Meng F, Xu X, Li T, Zhou H, Zhang J, Kan B, Huang Y, Zhang Z, Xiao D. A Novel Strategy for the Detection of SARS-CoV-2 Variants Based on Multiplex PCR-Mass Spectrometry Minisequencing Technology. *Microbiol Spectr*, 2021:e0126721
26. So M-K, Park S, Lee K, Kim S-K, Chung H-S, Lee M. Variant Prediction by Analyzing RdRp/S Gene Double or Low Amplification Pattern in Allplex SARS-CoV-2 Assay. *Diagnostics (Basel)*, 2021, 11
27. Buchta C, Camp JV, Jovanovic J, Radler U, Benka B, Puchhammer-Stöckl E, Müller MM, Griesmacher A, Aberle SW, Görzer I. Inadequate design of mutation detection panels prevents interpretation of variants of concern: results of an external quality assessment for SARS-CoV-2 variant detection. *Clin Chem Lab Med*, 2021. <https://doi.org/10.1515/cclm-2021-0889>
28. Hernandez MM, Banu R, Gonzalez-Reiche AS, van de Guchte A, Khan Z, Shrestha P, Cao L, Chen F, Shi H, Hanna A, Alshammary H, Fabre S, Amoako A, Obla A, Albuquerque B, Helena Patiño L, Ramírez JD, Sebra R, Gitman MR, Nowak MD, Cordon-Cardo C, Schutzbank TE, Simon V, van Bakel H, Sordillo EM, Paniz-Mondolfi AE. Robust clinical detection of SARS-CoV-2 variants by RT-PCR/MALDI-TOF multi-target approach. *BioRxiv*, 2021. <https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.09.09.21263348>
29. Gonzalez-Reiche AS, Hernandez MM, Sullivan MJ, Ciferri B, Alshammary H, Obla A, Fabre S, Kleiner G, Polanco J, Khan Z, Albuquerque B, van de Guchte A, Dutta J, Francoeur N, Melo BS, Oussenko I, Deikus G, Soto J, Sridhar SH, Wang Y-C, Twyman K, Kasarskis A, Altman DR, Smith M, Sebra R, Aberg J, Krammer F, García-Sastre A, Luksza M, Patel G, Paniz-Mondolfi A, Gitman M, Sordillo EM, Simon V, van Bakel H. Introductions and early spread of SARS-CoV-2 in the New York City area. *Science*, 2020, 369:297–301
30. Hernandez MM, Gonzalez-Reiche AS, Alshammary H, Fabre S, Khan Z, van De Guchte A, Obla A, Ellis E, Sullivan MJ, Tan J, Albuquerque B, Soto J, Wang C-Y, Sridhar SH, Wang Y-C, Smith M, Sebra R, Paniz-Mondolfi AE, Gitman MR, Nowak MD, Cordon-Cardo C, Luksza M, Krammer F, van Bakel H, Simon V, Sordillo EM. Molecular evidence of SARS-CoV-2 in New York before the first pandemic wave. *Nat Commun*, 2021, 12:3463
31. Hernandez MM, Banu R, Shrestha P, Patel A, Chen F, Cao L, Fabre S, Tan J, Lopez H, Chiu N, Shifrin B, Zapolskaya I, Flores V, Lee PY, Castañeda S, Ramírez JD, Jhang J, Osorio G, Gitman MR, Nowak MD, Reich DL, Cordon-Cardo C, Sordillo EM, Paniz-Mondolfi AE. RT-PCR/MALDI-TOF mass spectrometry-based detection of SARS-CoV-2 in saliva specimens. *J Med Virol*, 2021. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jmv.27069>
32. Rambaut A, Holmes EC, O'Toole Á, Hill V, McCrone JT, Ruis C, du Plessis L, Pybus OG. A dynamic nomenclature proposal for SARS-CoV-2 lineages to assist genomic epidemiology. *Nat Microbiol*, 2020, 5:1403–7

33. O'Toole Á, Scher E, Underwood A, Jackson B, Hill V, McCrone JT, Ruis C, Abu-Dahab K, Taylor B, Yeats C, du Plessis L, Aanensen D, Holmes E, Pybus O, Rambaut A. pangolin: lineage assignment in an emerging pandemic as an epidemiological tool. Github, n.d. <https://github.com/cov-lineages/pangolin>
34. Agena Bioscience, Inc. MassARRAY® SARS-CoV-2 Panel Instructions for Use. 2021
35. Katoh K, Misawa K, Kuma K-I, Miyata T. MAFFT: a novel method for rapid multiple sequence alignment based on fast Fourier transform. *Nucleic Acids Res*, 2002, 30:3059–66
36. Hu T, Li J, Zhou H, Li C, Holmes EC, Shi W. Bioinformatics resources for SARS-CoV-2 discovery and surveillance. *Brief Bioinform*, 2021, 22:631–41
37. Pfeifer B, Wittelsbürger U, Ramos-Onsins SE, Lercher MJ. PopGenome: an efficient Swiss army knife for population genomic analyses in R. *Mol Biol Evol*, 2014, 31:1929–36
38. Hernandez (AceM1188) MM. AceM1188/SACOV_primer-probe_analyses. Zenodo, 2021. <https://10.5281/zenodo.4920818>. (accessed June 9, 2021)
39. Zhou L, Yu G. ggmsa: Plot Multiple Sequence Alignment using “ggplot2,” 2021
40. Kwok S, Kellogg DE, McKinney N, Spasic D, Goda L, Levenson C, Sninsky JJ. Effects of primer-template mismatches on the polymerase chain reaction: human immunodeficiency virus type 1 model studies. *Nucleic Acids Res*, 1990, 18:999–1005
41. Lefever S, Pattyn F, Hellemans J, Vandesompele J. Single-nucleotide polymorphisms and other mismatches reduce performance of quantitative PCR assays. *Clin Chem*, 2013, 59:1470–80
42. Wang R, Hozumi Y, Yin C, Wei G-W. Mutations on COVID-19 diagnostic targets. *Genomics*, 2020, 112:5204–13
43. Whiley DM, Sloots TP. Sequence variation in primer targets affects the accuracy of viral quantitative PCR. *J Clin Virol*, 2005, 34:104–7
44. Delahoy MJ, Ujamaa D, Whitaker M, O'Halloran A, Anglin O, Burns E, Cummings C, Holstein R, Kambhampati AK, Milucky J, Patel K, Pham H, Taylor CA, Chai SJ, Reingold A, Alden NB, Kawasaki B, Meek J, Yousey-Hindes K, Anderson EJ, Openo KP, Teno K, Weigel A, Kim S, Leegwater L, Bye E, Como-Sabetti K, Ropp S, Rudin D, Muse A, Spina N, Bennett NM, Popham K, Billing LM, Shiltz E, et al. Hospitalizations Associated with COVID-19 Among Children and Adolescents - COVID-NET, 14 States, March 1, 2020-August 14, 2021. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*, 2021, 70:1255–60
45. Nörz D, Pfefferle S, Grunwald M, Fischer N, Aepfelbacher M, Lütgehetmann M. Modifying a Diagnostic SARS-CoV-2 Spike PCR to Turn a Del69/70 Dropout into a Discriminatory On-Target Assay. *J Mol Diagn*, 2021, 23:777–8
46. Jaroszewski L, Iyer M, Alisoltani A, Sedova M, Godzik A. The interplay of SARS-CoV-2 evolution and constraints imposed by the structure and functionality of its proteins. *PLoS Comput Biol*, 2021, 17:e1009147
47. Gand M, Vanneste K, Thomas I, Van Gucht S, Capron A, Herman P, Roosens NHC, De Keersmaecker SCJ. Deepening of In Silico Evaluation of SARS-CoV-2 Detection RT-qPCR Assays in the Context of New Variants. *Genes*, 2021, 12
48. Kline EC, Panpradist N, Hull IT, Wang Q, Oreskovic AK, Han PD, Starita LM, Lutz BR. Multiplex Target-Redundant RT-LAMP for Robust Detection of SARS-CoV-2 Using Fluorescent Universal Displacement Probes. *MedRxiv*, 2021. <https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.08.13.21261995>
49. Jamwal VL, Kumar N, Bhat R, Jamwal PS, Singh K, Dogra S, Kulkarni A, Bhadra B, Shukla MR, Saran S, Dasgupta S, Vishwakarma RA, Gandhi SG. Optimization and validation of RT-LAMP assay for diagnosis of SARS-CoV2 including the globally dominant Delta variant. *Virol J*, 2021, 18:178

50. Arizti-Sanz J, Bradley AD, Zhang YB, Boehm CK, Freije CA, Grunberg ME, Kosoko-Thoroddsen T-SF, Welch NL, Pillai PP, Mantena S, Kim G, Uwanibe JN, John OG, Eromon PE, Kocher G, Gross R, Lee JS, Hensley LE, Happi CT, Johnson J, Sabeti PC, Myhrvold C. Equipment-free detection of SARS-CoV-2 and Variants of Concern using Cas13. MedRxiv, 2021. <https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.11.01.21265764>
51. Chaintoutis SC, Chassalevris T, Balaska S, Mouchtaropoulou E, Tsiolas G, Vlatakis I, Tychala A, Koutsoulis D, Argiriou A, Skoura L, Dovas CI. A Novel Real-Time RT-PCR-Based Methodology for the Preliminary Typing of SARS-CoV-2 Variants, Employing Non-Extendable LNA Oligonucleotides and Three Signature Mutations at the Spike Protein Receptor-Binding Domain. Life, 2021, 11
52. Ahberg CD, Manz A, Neuzil P. Single Fluorescence Channel-based Multiplex Detection of Avian Influenza Virus by Quantitative PCR with Intercalating Dye. Sci Rep, 2015, 5:11479
53. Zhang H, Gaňová M, Yan Z, Chang H, Neuzil P. PCR Multiplexing Based on a Single Fluorescent Channel Using Dynamic Melting Curve Analysis. ACS Omega, 2020, 5:30267–73
54. Zhang H, Yan Z, Wang X, Gaňová M, Chang H, Lašáková S, Korabecna M, Neuzil P. Determination of Advantages and Limitations of qPCR Duplexing in a Single Fluorescent Channel. ACS Omega, 2021, 6:22292–300
55. Martin DP, Weaver S, Tegally H, San EJ, Shank SD, Wilkinson E, Lucaci AG, Giandhari J, Naidoo S, Pillay Y, Singh L, Lessells RJ, NGS-SA, COVID-19 Genomics UK (COG-UK), Gupta RK, Wertheim JO, Nektarenko A, Murrell B, Harkins GW, Lemey P, MacLean OA, Robertson DL, de Oliveira T, Kosakovsky Pond SL. The emergence and ongoing convergent evolution of the N501Y lineages coincides with a major global shift in the SARS-CoV-2 selective landscape. MedRxiv, 2021. <https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.23.21252268>
56. mjsull. mjsull/COVID_pipe: initial release (Version v0.1.0). Zenodo, 2020, April 29. <http://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3775031>

560 Acknowledgments

561 We thank the members of MSHS MML, Simon, and van Bakel laboratories for providing any assistance
562 when needed throughout this study. We are grateful for the continuous expert guidance provided by the
563 ISMMS Program for the Protection of Human Subjects (PPHS).

564 We are thankful for the efforts of the Mount Sinai Pathogen Surveillance Program (PSP) Study Group
565 members: Hala Alshammary, Angela A. Amoako, Jose Polanco, Aria Rooker, Christian Cognigni,
566 Mahmoud H. Awawda, Ashley-Beathrese T. Salimbangon, Zenab Khan, and Zain Khalil.

567 The Research reported in this paper was supported by the National Institutes of Health (NIH) contract
568 number HHSN272201400008C, the NIH Office of Research Infrastructure under award numbers
569 S10OD018522 and S10OD026880, institutional and philanthropic funds (Open Philanthropy Project,
570 #2020-215611), as well as a Robin Chemers Neustein Postdoctoral Fellowship Award (to Dr. Gonzalez-
571 Reiche).

572

573 Author contributions

574 M.M.H., R.B., P.S., A.E.PM., M.R.G., M.D.N., and E.M.S. provided clinical samples for the study.
575 M.M.H., R.B., B.G., P.S., L.C., F.C., H.S., A.H., M.S.PSP.S.G. and A.E.PM. accessioned clinical
576 samples. A.S.GR., A.v.d.G, M.S.PSP.S.G., and H.v.B. performed NGS experiments. R.S. provided NGS
577 services. A.S.GR. performed genome assembly, data curation and genotyping. M.M.H performed
578 alignments and mismatch analyses. M.M.H., R.B., J.D.R., M.R.G., M.D.N., C.C.C., T.E.S., V.S.,
579 H.v.B., E.M.S., and A.E.PM analyzed, interpreted, or discussed data. M.M.H., E.M.S., and A.E.PM.
580 wrote the manuscript. M.M.H., E.M.S., and A.E.PM. conceived the study. E.M.S. and A.E.PM.
581 supervised the study. H.v.B., V.S., and E.M.S. raised financial support.

582 M.M.H. and A.E.PM are the guarantors of this work and, as such, had full access to all of the data in the
583 study and take responsibility for the integrity of the data and the accuracy of the data analysis.

584 **Competing Interests**

585 Robert Sebra is VP of Technology Development and a stockholder at Sema4, a Mount Sinai Venture.

586 This work, however, was conducted solely at Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai. Otherwise, the

587 authors declare no competing interests.

588

589 **Figure Legends**

590 **Figure 1. RT-PCR/MALDI-TOF target detection rate in SARS-CoV-2-positive specimens. (A)**

591 Heatmap depicting the proportion of SARS-CoV-2-positive specimens that have detectable RT-
592 PCR/MALDI-TOF targets (N1, N2, N3, ORF1A, ORF1AB) by week from April 11 through August 28,
593 2021. The total number of SARS-CoV-2-positive specimens and the number of SARS-CoV-2-positive
594 specimens sequenced by pathogen surveillance are depicted above each week (column). Grey boxes
595 indicate weeks where no specimens were positive for SARS-CoV-2 on this platform. (B) Stacked area
596 plots depicting frequencies of SARS-CoV-2 variants reported by publicly-available NYC Department of
597 Health surveillance data within the same timeframe.

598

Figure 2. Frequencies of target PBS mismatches and RT-PCR/MALDI-TOF target detection

results. Number of mismatches normalized to the number of nucleotides in primer/probe binding sites (PBS length) across five diagnostic targets: (A) N1, (B) N2, (C) N3, (D) ORF1A, (E) ORF1AB. Each point represents the calculated mismatches per specimen consensus genome for each target PBS. Violin plots represent the distribution as density of the points grouped by primer/probe sequence (forward (For), reverse (Rev), Probe) and by target detection result (detected (magenta), dropout (turquoise)). Numbers of genomes analyzed for mismatches are depicted above each violin plot. Medians (yellow lines) are depicted and bars above distributions represent statistical comparisons (Mann-Whitney test; *, $P < 0.05$; ****, $P < 0.0001$).

Figure 3. Alignment of SARS-CoV-2 haplotypes to RT-PCR/MALDI-TOF targets. Multiple sequence alignment of haplotype sequences to forward, reverse, and probe binding sites for (A) N1, (B) N2, (C) N3, (D) ORF1A, and (E) ORF1AB targets. In each alignment, the reference sequence (NC_045512.2) is annotated above comprised of color-coded nucleotides. The coordinates of the reference sequence are annotated at the bottom corners of each alignment. Each row represents a haplotype sequence that aligns to the target site. Absolute counts of each haplotype (e.g., Hap_1, Hap_2, etc.) within the dataset and counts stratified by variant lineage (e.g., Alpha, Delta, Iota) are depicted to the right side of each haplotype sequence. Positions of primer/probe sequences are indicated by arrows where tail to arrowhead reflects 5' to 3' directionality. Grey boxes with black dotted borders outline PBSs. Dots represent conserved nucleotides at each position and mismatched nucleotides are indicated. PBS mismatches are indicated by arrows; red arrows reflect mismatches that are significantly associated with target dropout. Notably, the association of the G28881U mismatch to the N2 forward PBS (panel C, red "(U)") with target dropout is distinguished from the G28881A mismatch. Nucleotide diversity (π) of sequences at each PBS is indicated.

624 **Figure 4. Delta-specific substitution interferes with N2 diagnostic target detection.** (A) Stacked bar
625 plots depict the composition of SARS-CoV-2 variants in 254 MSHS genomes tested by RT-
626 PCR/MALDI-TOF. Bar plots reflect absolute number of genomes with N2 target dropout (left) and
627 those with N2 target detection (right). Variant groups are color-coded and genomes with the G28916U
628 polymorphism are depicted by a hatched pattern. (B) Stacked bar plot of publicly-available sequences
629 (GISAID, see methods) from the same timeframe of this study depicting absolute numbers of variant
630 genomes and presence or absence of the G28916U polymorphism. Color-coding and patterns are the
631 same as in (A).
632

Figure 1

A

B

Figure 2

Figure 3

Figure 4