


Supplementary Figures






Supplementary Figure 1 - RNA extraction with home-made SPRI beads was published ¹, and validated on hundreds of samples. Evaluation was performed by an approved PCR test kit ². Matched clinical results were extracted with standard kits (mostly Qiagene).

A) E gene Ct values as obtained from the clinic (x-axis) and as obtained after SPRI based extraction. black dashed line indicates the $x=y$ line. Red dashed line indicates the expected offset due to the difference in sample load to the qPCRs (due to different elution volumes). Blue lines indicate the thresholds determining the categories in C.

B) Human internal control Ct values in the same tests show high agreement between extraction methods overall.

C) Confusion Diagram comparing the clinical results vs. the SPRI extraction results - blue circles are the cases on which there was an agreement (overall 87% of tests). Red circles show the cases on which there was disagreement between measurements.

D) SPRI-based extraction and Apha-seq on the viral E amplicon. Purple/teal indicate positive samples when they were pooled/unpooled respectively, green/red are matched negative samples that were pooled/unpooled respectively. Pooled negative samples have significantly less unique molecules relative to their positive counterparts, indicating that cross contamination occurs to a minimal degree that can probably be further optimized.




A**B****C**

Supplementary Figure 2 - Preliminary Optimizations All tests were performed on the E amplicon using a primer-specific qPCR reaction (as shown in Figure 3A).

A) RNA hybridization/extraction we tried different RT enzymes (Maxima/SMART), different hybridization durations (10'-30'), different temperatures prior to hybridization (25C, 50C, 72C), different RT primer concentrations (2 µl of 1/10/100 µM), and different wash regimes (Ax Bx RT). Overall - the melting of the RNA in the input sample seems to be the most important factor.

B) RNA melting temperature pre-heating of samples is crucial (relative to 25C) but as any temperature above 55C seems to yield the same amount of product.

C) RT reaction conditions were also tested relative to the "base" manufacturer's conditions. Signal vs. background (dark red vs. dark blue) yield improved significantly in the MgCl_2 + DMSO condition.


A**B****C**

Supplementary Figure 3: Human Control Amplicon

A) All the targets tested on a pool of negative samples (extension of Figure 5C). “a”/”b” indicate different primer pairs on the same transcript

B) With added human RNA same primers used on the pool of negative samples supplemented with 1 µg of RNA extracted from HEK cells.


C) Attenuating relative amplicon abundance by altering the target-specific PCR primer concentration in the library PCR. Assay is a qPCR test that is target+library specific. There is a dose-response relationship between primer abundance and product abundance (height of blue series, green series). Note that different amplicons might alter the E amplicon yield (height of orange bars, this was not further tested in an independent experiment).




Supplementary Figure 4: RT barcode variations

We pooled 96 differently-barcoded RT primers twice (“A”/”B”) and hybridized these pools in two replicates to a positive sample (“1”/”2”). Plotted are the number of UMIs observed in each such pool/replicate. Each dot is a specific primer. Overall, primers are highly correlated between pools, suggesting that most variation is due to intrinsic properties of the primer or synthesis variation issues. In all replicates >80% of barcodes are within a $\pm 25\%$ range around the mean (not shown).

A



B




Supplementary Figure 5: Sequencing depth and FPR/FNR estimation

A) empirical Ct distribution obtained from the clinic in two different time periods.

B) Simulated Apharseq Scatters of simulated samples in 96 sample batches (see note below). X-axis actual number of molecules in sample, Y-axis is the observed number of molecules, orange samples are positive, blue ones are negative and the dashed line is the cutoff. Inset colored numbers are the confusion matrix - off diagonal entries are False Negative (top right), and False Positive (bottom left) samples. The different plots are with 1/10/100 thousand reads per sample (on average, from left to right).



A	15	8471	617	10202	0	9903	9	13758	700	12805	506	6522
B	34	10728	22	8571	0	21726	0	6347	6	12948	0	12452
C	67	11113	0	15497	37	16063	72	16582	40	17670	2100	8779
D	0	744	0	2419	133	2132	0	1380	0	2947	462	732
E	37	9154	0	12659	0	18489	0	14488	110	15893	3445	3871
F	22	13458	10	11913	0	11914	15	6806	1124	12115	753	9838
G	41	12535	1	7160	0	13224	11	3822	705	8266	328	14050
H	75	8032	5	11144	14	11042	0	7563	91	13086	1131	14270
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12



Supplementary Figure 6: RT primer contaminations in source plate

A) Barcoded ActB RT primers were collected from the even columns of the oligo plate as it arrived from the manufacturer into a single pool and used for RT and library preparation. Clearly there was a significant contamination of oligos from the odd columns in the pool.

B) positive/negative CDFs of the same counts in A, and including the reciprocal test for odd columns of the plate.



Supplementary Figure 7: Internal human control performance in ApharSeq

A) ActB Correlation between RT PCR signal (x-axis) and ApharSeq molecular counts (y-axis). Pearson $r = -0.75$ (p value $< 2.8e-104$).

B) Undetected ActB in samples (i.e. dropout samples) in both techniques is similar (5, 8).

Experiment Specifics

All experiments follow the protocol published in Joseph-Strauss et al³, with the following changes and specifications:

Fig.	bead vol [μl]	sample volume [μl]	lib. frac.	RT primers	Comments	Seq run	pK	Seq format (R1/R2/I1/I2)	internal name
2B	20	320	1	15 μl 100 μM	N/A	Tape	No	N/A	20-06-16_Neg_pools_Zymo_contamination
2C	20	400	1/2	50 μl 100 μM	2 step PCR: 10 cycles for first step, 20 cycles for extension PCR	26/5	No	45/35/8/0	20-05-25_new-E-BC-CHK
2C, 4C	20	320	1/30	15 μl 100 μM	rtPCR-primeScript kit: 25°C 10', 50°C 30'; 94°C 2'; 30 x {94°C 30'', 59°C 30'', 72°C 1'}; 72°C 10 min	15/6, 11/6	No	11/6: 150/0/8/8 15/6: 28/56/8/0	20-06-09_tube-titration
2C	20	320	1	15 μl 100 μM		18/6	No	80/0/8/0	20-06-17_Clinical_Samples_One_Step_E_and_E+N
2C, 4B	20	320	1/2	15 μl 100 μM	2 step PCR: 10 cycles for first step, 20 cycles for extension PCR	2/6	No	38/38/8/8	20-06-02_tube-pools
3B	5	40	1/2	2 μl 10 μM	10 regular library PCR cycles followed by qpcr	qpcr	No	N/A	20-06-08_cross-contaminai on-qPCR
5A	13	320	1/2	15 μl 100 μM		21/6	No	36/40/8/8	20-06-02_tube-pools
5B	5	80	1/2	2 μl 10 μM	2 step PCR: 10 cycles for first step, 23 cycles for extension PCR	28/4	No	30/46/8/8	20-04-27_Human-Two_step_Lib
5C	20	320	1	15 μl 100 μM		24/6	No	80/0/8/0	20-06-22_ActB
3C	20	320	1	15 μl 100 μM		12/7	No	75/0/8/8	CHK_Primers_DWP_Act_N_E_Broad Ct
6	5	320	1/2	15 μl 10 μM	Buffer replacement and low-volume hybridization	25/8	No	20/8/8/56	ApharSeq_10Plates

Supplementary Notes

RT primer performance variation

After experiencing some issues with a batch of barcoded primers we decided to test the primers for variation and contaminations. We pooled 96 primers into a single pool, twice, and hybridized them, as a pool, to a single positive and single negative sample. If any of the primers is contaminated, a library should arise from the negative sample (and then a search for the contamination should ensue). Similarly, any variation in the number of UMIs observed indicates a barcode-specific issue (probably in synthesis or

otherwise prior to the RT reaction). Another test for primer variation can examine differences in the distribution of reads/umi, suggesting PCR amplification biases, but since UMI-counting should mitigate such differences, PCR biases are a lesser concern.

Indeed, when we perform this test (Figure S4) , we see most variation in UMI counts is primer specific. We believe that this is mostly due to synthesis differences. In any event, more than >80% of primers fall within a $\pm 25\%$ range around the mean, indicating that while this issue should be addressed, it is not detrimental to the implementation of ApharSeq on a large scale.

Contamination issues and best practice

While working on the development of the assay we encountered significant PCR contamination issues. Specifically, previous sequencing-ready libraries contaminated PCR reactions and were re-amplified in subsequent experiments. Once we realized this was an issue, we could detect these contaminants experimentally - by including negative controls in the library PCR reactions, and computationally - by the existence of reads with RT primers that weren't used in the specific experiment, and by comparing the UMI pools of previous and current libraries in cases where they shared the same RT primers.

For the time being this issue seems to be under control in our lab. To achieve this, we separated the work space to pre-PCR and post-PCR. No reagent or device is used in both spaces, and there are dedicated lab coats to each space. Any processing performed on the final library - quantification by qbit, tape station, etc. - is done only in the post-PCR space. See Aslanzadeh for more information⁴.

Additionally, we observed contaminations between primers in the synthesized oligo plate we received from the manufacturer. We highly recommend testing each plate as it arrives for primer contaminations and uniformity (see Figure S4, S6 above). This issue seemed to have been solved when we ordered the oligos in dry form and dissolved them individually and carefully in the lab.

Estimated Costs

The cost per reaction is ~1.3\$, prices below are in USD and generally include 17% VAT.

See [per_reaction_calculations](#):

Reagent	Cost per 100k [\$]	% total
Oligos	16,000	12.4%
Beads	3,500	2.7%
Buffer ingredients	8,000	6.2%

Sequencing	17,000	13%
Plastic Consumables	75,000	58%
Enzymatic reactions	4,500	3.5%
other	5,000	3.9%
total	129,000	

A note on RNA capture methods

Since we aimed for an RNA-seq based detection assay, we first needed to extract RNA from the lysed clinical samples with standard, high-throughput nucleic acid cleanup techniques. We tried three different approaches: polyT paramagnetic microbeads (commercial, and home-made variants), paramagnetic microbeads conjugated with viral-specific bait oligos, and SPRI beads for general nucleic acid cleanup.

The viral-specific beads yielded poor results (not shown) and we discontinued this experimental branch. The polyT/SPRI branches gave high viral RNA yields, comparable to common RNA extraction procedures (Figure 1A), and were compatible with downstream standard RT-qPCR kits. We performed extensive tests on SPRI extraction (Figure S1) and performed several library preparation tests based on the SPRI cleanup (Figure S1). These tests demonstrate that it is a viable alternative to the homemade polyT beads we are currently using, and that with further optimizations might even provide higher sensitivity (Figure 1A). Both techniques are based on the Sera-Mag SpeedBeads modified with a carboxylate residue by GE healthcare (Cat# 65152105050250) Both variants allow large scale batch preparation and long term storage and usage. See Rahat et al¹ for more details on the SPRI protocol, and the “Bead conjugation” and “Hybridization and RNA purification ” sections in the methods part of this manuscript.

FNR/FPR estimation by sampling

The Ct distribution was obtained from the clinical virology unit of Hadassah Ein Kerem Hospital. To estimate the false negative/positive rates we perform the following sampling procedure:

Given:

- A pool size (e.g. 96 samples)
- The population-wide positive sample rate (e.g. 5%, a high estimate)
- Background (0.25 was used, i.e. $\frac{1}{4}$ read on average per negative sample), and
- The positive Ct distribution

We sample the number of molecules per sample, assuming that Ct 26 is ~11,000 molecules per assay (~35,000/ml²). A UMI is sampled for each molecule (assuming uniform synthesis), and sequencing errors are introduced. The molecules are pooled, and the total number of reads assigned to the pool (e.g. 96,000 reads in the case of 1,000 reads per sample) is sampled from that pool, with replacement (accounting for PCR amplification). UMIs are collapsed, and unique molecules are counted. The detection threshold was set to arrive at a false positive rate of 1 in 1000 (assuming the background is correct), and the false negative rate is empirically determined by the number of samples that are positive but have less observed molecules than the detection threshold.

References

1. Rahat, A. *et al.* Sars-CoV2 RNA purification with homemade SPRI beads for RT-qPCR test v1 (protocols.io.beswjefe). doi:10.17504/protocols.io.beswjefe.
2. [No title]. <https://www.fda.gov/media/136472/download>.
3. Joseph-Strauss, D. *et al.* SARS-CoV-2 detection with ApharSeq. *protocols.io* doi:10.17504/protocols.io.bjgukjww.
4. Aslanzadeh, J. Preventing PCR amplification carryover contamination in a clinical laboratory. *Ann. Clin. Lab. Sci.* **34**, 389–396 (2004).