

1 **Fully automated detection and differentiation of pandemic and endemic coronaviruses**  
2 **(NL63, 229E, HKU1, OC43 and SARS-CoV-2) on the Hologic Panther Fusion**

3

4 Anne Katrin Cordes,<sup>a</sup> William M. Rehrauer,<sup>b</sup> Molly A. Accola,<sup>c</sup> Benno Wölk,<sup>d</sup> Birgitta  
5 Hilfrich,<sup>a</sup> Albert Heim<sup>a#</sup>

6

7 <sup>a</sup>Medical School Hannover, Institute of Virology, Hannover, Germany

8 <sup>b</sup>University of Wisconsin School of Medicine and Public Health, Department of Pathology  
9 and Laboratory Medicine, Madison, Wisconsin, USA

10 <sup>c</sup>University of Wisconsin Hospital and Clinics, Molecular Diagnostics Laboratory, Madison,  
11 Wisconsin, USA

12 <sup>d</sup>LADR Medical Laboratory Dr Kramer & Colleagues, Geesthacht, Germany

13

14 running head: detection of worldwide circulating coronaviruses

15

16

17 # address correspondence to Albert Heim, [heim.albert@mh-hannover.de](mailto:heim.albert@mh-hannover.de)

18

19 **Abstract**

20 The Hologic Panther Fusion (PF) platform provides fully automated CE marked diagnostics  
21 for respiratory viruses, including recently SARS-coronavirus 2 by a transcription mediated  
22 amplification (TMA) assay, but not for the endemic human coronaviruses (hCoV). Therefore,  
23 a laboratory developed multiplexed RT-PCR protocol (LDT) that detects and differentiates  
24 the four hCoV NL63, 229E, HKU1 and OC43 was adapted on the PF.

25 The novel CE marked Aptima SARS-CoV-2 TMA and the LDT for hCoV were validated  
26 with 321 diagnostic specimens from the upper and lower respiratory tract in comparison to  
27 two SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCRs (PF E-gene LDT and genesig RT-PCR, 157 specimens) or the R-  
28 GENE hCoV / hParaFlu RT-PCR (164 specimens), respectively.

29 For the endemic hCoV, results were 96.3% concordant with two specimens discordantly  
30 positive in the PF and four specimens discordantly positive in the R-GENE assay. All  
31 discordantly positive samples had Ct values between 33 and 39. The PF hCoV LDT identified  
32 23 hCoV positive specimens as NL63, 15 as 229E, 15 as HKU1 and 25 as OC43. The Aptima  
33 SARS-CoV-2 TMA gave 99.4 % concordant results compared to the consensus results with a  
34 single specimen discordantly positive. Moreover, 36 samples from proficiency testing panels  
35 were detected and typed correctly by both novel methods.

36 In conclusion, the SARS-CoV-2 TMA and the LDT for hCoV enhanced the diagnostic  
37 spectrum of the PF for all coronaviruses circulating globally for a multitude of diagnostic  
38 materials from the upper and lower respiratory tract.

39

## 40 **Introduction**

41 Human coronaviruses are a common cause for acute respiratory infections of the upper  
42 respiratory tract (1-3), though occasionally infections of the lower respiratory tract have been  
43 described. Especially children, elderly and chronically ill patients are at risk of a more severe  
44 and potentially lethal progress of disease (4-7). Four different human coronaviruses (hCoV  
45 229E, OC43, NL63 and HKU1) are circulating in the human population worldwide. HCoV  
46 229E and OC43 have been known since the 1960s (8, 9). More than three decades later, in  
47 2004, the subtype NL63 (10) and in 2005 HKU1 (11) were identified. In addition to these  
48 hCoVs three zoonotic coronaviruses were discovered: SARS-CoV (causing an outbreak in  
49 2003), MERS-CoV (discovered in 2013 and circulating almost exclusively on the Arabian  
50 Peninsula) and SARS-CoV-2 (a novel *Sarbecovirus* currently pandemic and probably  
51 endemic in future). These cause severe lower respiratory tract infections in humans more  
52 frequently (12, 13). However, many SARS-CoV-2 infections can be asymptomatic or only  
53 associated with mild symptoms especially in children and young adults (14-16).

54 In acute respiratory infections, the rapid diagnosis of a viral etiology is essential for reducing  
55 the amount of prescribed antibiotics and for infection control measures. The introduction of  
56 nucleic acid amplification technologies (NAT) such as polymerase chain reaction (PCR) and  
57 transcription-mediated amplification (TMA) has been a milestone in the diagnosis of  
58 respiratory virus infections in comparison to virus culture and fluorescent-antibody assays  
59 improving sensitivity. Therefore, NAT is now the gold standard of coronavirus diagnostics  
60 (17, 18). However, respiratory samples are processed in batches usually once every working  
61 day for conventional coronavirus PCR diagnostics, thus resulting in long sample to answer  
62 times. Alternatively, coronavirus detection is also provided by highly multiplexed, random  
63 access PCR platforms more rapidly (19-21) but these cannot be adapted to the individual  
64 diagnostics needs of a patient considering his symptoms and the epidemiology of circulating

65 respiratory viruses. For comparison, the Hologic Panther Fusion (PF) system provides a panel  
66 of three CE marked and FDA cleared multiplex real-time PCRs that cover influenza virus A/B  
67 (Flu A/B), respiratory syncytial virus (RSV), parainfluenza virus 1-4 (ParaFlu), human  
68 metapneumovirus (hMPV), adenovirus (AdV) and rhinovirus (RhV) and can be performed  
69 according to the individual diagnostic request. These assays were validated for samples from  
70 the lower respiratory tract in a previous study (22).

71 Recently, a TMA based assay for SARS-CoV-2 became available for the Panther (Aptima  
72 SARS-CoV-2 assay) (23) which is CE marked and FDA cleared for emergency use (EUA) for  
73 samples from the upper respiratory tract (nasopharyngeal swabs, washes and aspirates; nasal  
74 swabs and aspirates, oropharyngeal swabs). In addition, an early laboratory developed real  
75 time PCR for the SARS-CoV E-gene (24) and a FDA EUA cleared RT-PCR for the SARS-  
76 CoV-2 Orflab which is only available in the U.S. (25), can be applied on the PF platform.  
77 However, the endemic human coronaviruses were not yet covered. As these are responsible  
78 for about 13-19.7 % of the respiratory infections (2, 26), we used the PF Open Access tool to  
79 establish and validate a multiplexed laboratory developed test (LDT) that detects and  
80 differentiates the four endemic hCoVs 229E, OC43, NL63 and HKU1.

81

## 82 **Material and Methods**

### 83 **Proficiency testing panels**

84 36 proficiency testing specimens provided by Instand (Düsseldorf, Germany) in the years  
85 2017-2020 (sample numbers 340029 – 340050 and 340052 - 340065) were tested with the  
86 novel LDT for endemic hCoV NL63, 229E, HKU1, OC43 and the Aptima SARS-CoV-2  
87 assay.

### 88 **Panels of diagnostic specimens**

89 In total, 321 patient samples from the upper (URT) and lower respiratory tract (LRT) were  
90 included in the panel.

91 164 patient samples (91 bronchial alveolar lavages (BAL), 41 nasopharyngeal swabs (NPS),  
92 20 pharyngeal lavages (PL), 6 bronchial lavages (BL), 4 tracheal secretions (TS), 2 nasal  
93 swabs (NS)) with a diagnostic request for coronavirus were tested by the hCoV / hParaFlu R-  
94 GENE (Biomerieux, Marcy-l'Étoile, France) as the routine diagnostic procedure and the PF  
95 LDT. Specimens originated between 03/2017 and 02/2020.

96 For validation of the Aptima SARS-CoV-2 TMA, 157 specimens (8 BAL, 125 NPS, 1 PL, 7  
97 BL, 3 TS, 6 NS and 7 tracheal swabs (TRS)) with a diagnostic request for SARS-CoV-2 were  
98 tested in the PF E-gene RT-PCR (24) as the routine diagnostic procedure and subsequently in  
99 the Aptima TMA and the genesig RT-PCR (Primerdesign, Chandler's Ford, UK).

### 100 **Ethical statement**

101 All 321 diagnostic samples originated from patients who had agreed to the anonymised use of  
102 their clinical data at hospital admission (informed consent). As specimens were tested  
103 according to diagnostic requests only and medical data were anonymized and analyzed only  
104 retrospectively, ethical approval is not required in Germany (confirmed by e-mails of the local

105 ethical committee “Ethikkommission der Medizinischen Hochschule Hannover”, 19th of  
106 September, 2019 and 6th of May 2020).

### 107 **Sample preparation**

108 Swabs were re-suspended in 1.5 ml PBS<sup>-</sup>. Liquid samples (lavages and secretions) were  
109 loaded without prior processing of the sample. However, viscous samples were diluted 1:2 in  
110 PBS<sup>-</sup> to avoid clotting in the pipette tip. For testing on the PF, 500 µl of the specimen (patient  
111 specimen and proficiency testing samples) were transferred into a Specimen Lysis Tube  
112 (SLT) that contained 710 µl Specimen Transport Media (STM).

### 113 **Coronavirus (NL63, 229E, HKU1 and OC43) LDT**

114 SLTs were automatically processed on the Panther Fusion system including nucleic acid  
115 extraction, reverse transcription and real time PCR using the Open Access RNA/DNA  
116 enzyme cartridge, the Extraction Reagent-S, the Capture Reagent-S, the Enhancer Reagent-S,  
117 the internal control and the primer and probe recon solution (PPR). The PPR (table 1)  
118 contained coronavirus specific (targeting the respective N gene) as well as internal control  
119 (IC) primers and probes, MgCl<sub>2</sub>, KCl, Tris buffer and nuclease free water (all ThermoFisher,  
120 Waltham, MA, USA). Coronavirus specific primer and probe sequences were published  
121 recently (27) but were labelled with different fluorescent dyes (supplementary table 1).  
122 Stability of the PPR on the Panther Fusion was validated for a period of 14 days  
123 (supplementary table 2).

124 Settings in the PF software for automatic processing were: extraction volume 360 µl and  
125 “sample aspiration height” low. The reverse transcription was performed at 50 °C for 8:28  
126 minutes followed by the activation of the Taq polymerase at 95 °C for 2:00 minutes. The two  
127 step thermocycling protocol consisted of 45 cycles each with a denaturation at 95 °C for 5  
128 seconds and the elongation and fluorescence detection at 60 °C for 22 seconds. Fluorescence

129 analysis settings in the PF software were set as following: The analysis start cycle was set at  
130 10, the baseline correction was enabled and the slope limit was set at 25. As a positivity  
131 criteria the Ct threshold in the channels 1 (FAM for 229E), 2 (HEX for NL63) and 3 (ROX  
132 for HKU1) was set to 200 RFU, in channel 4 (Quasar 670 for OC43) to 300 RFU and in  
133 channel 5 (Quasar 705 for IC) to 1000 RFU. The crosstalk correction was set to 1 % for the  
134 combination of emitter channel 1 and receiver channel 2, as well as the combination of  
135 emitter channel 5 and receiver channel 4. A result was defined as valid if at least one positive  
136 result in channels 1-5 was detected.

### 137 **Aptima SARS-CoV-2 TMA**

138 SLTs were loaded on the Panther Fusion and the assay was performed automatically as  
139 described in the package insert (23).

### 140 **SARS-CoV-2 E gene RT-PCR**

141 The SARS-CoV-2 E gene RT-PCR was performed with the Open Access tool on the Panther  
142 Fusion as described previously (24).

### 143 **HCoV/hParaFlu R-GENE RT-PCR**

144 Nucleic acid extraction was performed on a QIAcube using the DNeasy blood kit (QIAGEN,  
145 Hilden, Germany). Of the eluate, 10 µl were tested by the hCoV / hParaFlu R-GENE assay  
146 (bioMérieux, Marcy-l'Étoile, France) on an ABI 7500 sequence detection system (ABI, Foster  
147 City, CA, U.S.). This assay has been validated previously for multiple types of respiratory  
148 specimens.

### 149 **Genesig SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR**

150 Nucleic acid extraction was performed on a QIAcube using the DNeasy blood kit (QIAGEN,  
151 Hilden, Germany). Of the eluate, 10 µL were tested by the genesig coronavirus COVID-19

152 Real-Time PCR assay (Primerdesign, Chandler's Ford, UK) on an ABI 7500 sequence  
153 detection system.

#### 154 **Amplification efficiency and evaluation of LOD**

155 The amplification efficiency was calculated from serial dilutions of reference samples if  
156 available. Supernatants from cell cultures, positive for 229E, NL63 and OC43 were provided  
157 by the national reference centre for coronaviruses at Charité, Berlin. For SARS-CoV-2,  
158 quantified quality control material "AccuPlex SARS-CoV-2 Verification panel, cat # 0505-  
159 0129" from Seracare (Milford, MA, U.S.) was used. For HKU1, no cell culture supernatant  
160 was available. Therefore, a patient sample that had been tested highly positive in the hCoV /  
161 ParaFlu R-GENE assay was used for estimating the amplification efficiency.

162 For the Aptima SARS-CoV-2, the limit of detection (LOD) was determined from half  
163 logarithmic serial dilutions.

#### 164 **Data analysis and statistics**

165 The amplification efficiency was calculated with the following formula: Amplification  
166 efficiency (E) =  $10^{-1/m}$  (with m being the slope of the amplification curve). For the Aptima  
167 SARS-CoV-2 TMA assay the LOD (95% probability of detection according to 2002/364/EC)  
168 was calculated by probit analysis from 27 replicates of a dilution series of the Accuplex  
169 standard using the statistics program SSPS (Version 15.0). For panels of diagnostic  
170 specimens, concordances of assays and positive percent agreement (PPA) and negative  
171 percent agreement (NPA) of PF assays were calculated. To evaluate the clinical performance  
172 of the Aptima SARS-CoV-2 TMA compared to those of the two other RT-PCRs (Panther  
173 Fusion E-gene LDT and genesig COVID-19 RT-PCR), a consensus result was defined as a  
174 concordant result in at least two of three tests.



## 175 **Results**

### 176 **Amplification efficiencies and LOD**

177 The LOD of the Aptima SARS-CoV-2 TMA was 288 copies/ml (95 % confidence interval  
178 191 – 755 copies/ml) determined as the 95 % probability of detection. In case of 229E, NL63,  
179 OC43 and HKU1 the LODs were not determined due to the limited availability of quantified  
180 reference materials but amplification efficiencies of PCR were calculated. Amplification  
181 efficiencies for 229E, NL63, OC43 and HKU1 were 1.89, 1.92, 2.0 and 1.95, respectively  
182 (figure 1). For SARS-CoV-2 an amplification efficiency cannot be calculated because this  
183 assay uses TMA technology with subsequent hybridization to a SARS-CoV-2 specific probe.

### 184 **Proficiency testing panel specimens and cross-reactivity**

185 36 proficiency testing specimens provided by Instand (Düsseldorf, Germany) were tested with  
186 the hCoV LDT and Aptima SARS-CoV-2 TMA. All samples were detected correctly. From  
187 these samples, 31 were coronavirus positive samples (10 OC43, 3 NL63 and 4 229E, 4 SARS-  
188 CoV-2, 10 MERS-CoV) and 5 were negative for these coronaviruses. As anticipated, MERS-  
189 CoV positive specimens were negative in the hCoV LDT and the Aptima SARS-CoV-2  
190 TMA. Hence, cross-reactivity with MERS-CoV could be excluded. Furthermore, an  
191 inactivated SARS-CoV positive cell culture supernatant originating from 2003 gave a  
192 negative result in the Aptima SARS-CoV-2 TMA.

### 193 **Comparison of test performance for Coronavirus NL63, 229E, HKU1 and OC43** 194 **detection**

195 A panel of 164 archived diagnostic specimens was tested with the Coronavirus LDT on the  
196 Panther Fusion and results were compared to the initial results of the hCoV / ParaFlu R-  
197 GENE assay (table 2). Overall, the concordance of results was 96.3 %. The positive percent  
198 agreement (PPA) of the LDT on the Panther Fusion was determined as 94.9 % and the

199 negative percent agreement (NPA) as 97.6 % in relation to the R-GENE assay. Samples with  
200 discordant results had Ct values of 33, 34, 36 and 39 in the R-GENE assay and 38 (two  
201 samples) in the PF LDT. In contrast to the R-GENE assay, the PF LDT provided  
202 differentiation of hCoV samples: 25 of 77 were identified as OC43, 23 as NL63, 15 as 229E  
203 and 15 as HKU1. Among these, one sample was co-infected with 229E (with a Ct value of 21)  
204 and OC43 (Ct value 32).

### 205 **Diagnostic performance of the Aptima SARS-CoV-2 TMA**

206 Of 157 samples tested, 56 were found to be consensus positive for SARS-CoV-2 RNA in any  
207 two of the three methods (table 3). Thus, the PPA of the Aptima SARS-CoV-2 TMA and of the  
208 PF E-gene RT-PCR were determined as 100.0 % and the NPA as 99.0 %, whereas the genesig  
209 COVID-19 PCR had a PPA of 87.5 % and a NPA of 100 % (table 3). In the LDT SARS-CoV-  
210 2 RT-PCR the median Ct of positive samples was 34.2 (range 17.5 – 40.8) with an  
211 interquartile range of 6.4 and in the genesig RT-PCR the median Ct was 32.7 (range 19.2 –  
212 39.2) and the inter quartile range 6.4. Thus the Aptima SARS-CoV-2 TMA detected multiple  
213 faintly positive samples correctly. Moreover, 23 of 157 samples originated from the lower  
214 respiratory tract and were all detected correctly in the Aptima in comparison to the consensus  
215 result with 15 of these positive for SARS-CoV-2 RNA. Detailed results for various diagnostic  
216 materials are presented in supplementary table 3.

217

## 218 **Discussion**

219 Rapid diagnostics of respiratory virus infections is essential for a quick therapeutic response  
220 as well as for complying hygiene regulations. To optimise the sample-to-answer time, the PF  
221 platform provides random access testing instead of batch-wise testing as in the hCoV /  
222 hParaFlu R-GENE assay and the genesig COVID-19 RT-PCR. Previously, only assays for  
223 influenza virus A/B, respiratory syncytial virus, parainfluenza virus 1-4, human  
224 metapneumovirus, adenovirus and rhinovirus were available for the PF. Due to the SARS-  
225 CoV-2 pandemic, a LDT for the E-gene of SARS-CoV-2 was rapidly established for the open  
226 access capability of the PF (24). Recently, a CE marked and FDA cleared SARS-CoV-2  
227 TMA, which provides dual target detection and a high analytical sensitivity (low LOD)  
228 became available (Aptima SARS-CoV-2) (28, 29).

229 We evaluated the Aptima SARS-CoV-2 assay with a panel of 157 archived diagnostic  
230 specimens which included a multitude of diagnostic materials from the upper and lower  
231 respiratory tract. Although the intended use of the Aptima SARS-CoV-2 is limited to  
232 diagnostic materials from the upper respiratory tract, SARS-CoV-2 RNA was detected with  
233 100 % PPA and 99.0 % NPA. These results compared favorably to other studies, which had  
234 only included nasopharyngeal swabs (94.7 % to 100 % PPA and 98.7 % to 100 % NPA) (28-  
235 30). However, detection of SARS-CoV-2 in materials from the LRT is crucial as it was shown  
236 that nasopharyngeal swabs may turn negative in the course of infection prior to specimens  
237 from the LRT (16, 31-33). Only a single sample gave a discordant (false positive) result in the  
238 Aptima SARS-CoV-2 assay in comparison to the consensus results. However, this sample  
239 was a follow up sample from a patient who was diagnosed as SARS-CoV-2 RNA positive in  
240 previous samples. Therefore, the Aptima SARS-CoV-2 assay may have still detected residual  
241 SARS-CoV-2 RNA due to its very low LOD. In our hands, LOD was determined to be 288  
242 copies/ml, whereas others had a 100 % detection rate at 83 copies/ml also using quality

243 control material from Seracare but with only 20 replicates tested (29). Nevertheless, the LOD  
244 of the Aptima SARS-CoV-2 assay was even lower than the LOD of the E-gene RT-PCR on  
245 the PF (315 copies/ml). Both assays, run automatized on the PF from samples that have been  
246 processed identically before having been loaded onto the platform. On the PF, 360  $\mu$ l of the  
247 sample are pipetted for both assays, however, only 10 % of the extracted nucleic acid is used  
248 for the PCR reaction, while in the TMA the total volume is applied. Although highly  
249 sensitive, the Aptima SARS-CoV-2 assay is highly specific and does not cross-react SARS-  
250 CoV (of 2003), MERS-CoV and the endemic human CoV (29), which was confirmed in our  
251 study by testing proficiency panel specimens. Previously, cross reactivity with other  
252 respiratory viruses was excluded extensively (29).

253 Diagnosis of endemic hCoV infections is not only required in URT infections but also in more  
254 severe LRT infections as e.g. bronchiolitis (5-7). For example, hCoV NL63 binds to the same  
255 cellular receptor as SARS-CoV-2 (34) and can be associated with severe LRT infections (10,  
256 35). Therefore, rapid diagnosis of hCoV infections is essential and can be achieved with the  
257 novel hCoV LDT on the PF. Furthermore, a potential cross immunity to SARS-CoV-2  
258 infection following infection with hCoV was suggested (36). Therefore, detection and  
259 classification of hCoV might be of importance in the future, to predict the prognosis of  
260 SARS-CoV-2 infection. The analysis of 164 diagnostic hCoV specimens from the upper and  
261 lower respiratory tract showed a PPA of 94.9 % and a NPA of 97.6 % compared to the results  
262 of the manual R-GENE RT-PCR. Unfortunately, a precise LOD could not be determined for  
263 the PF LDT due to a lack of quantified reference materials but the high amplification  
264 efficiencies of the PF LDT indeed suggested low LODs. This may also be supported by our  
265 diagnostic experience with the PF LDT in the winter season 2019/2020. 87 of 1732 diagnostic  
266 specimens were tested positive for endemic coronaviruses in the PF LDT. HCoV HKU1  
267 predominated in this season (71 out of 87 coronavirus positive specimens). Other positive  
268 specimens were distributed as following: NL63 10 positives, 229E 4 positives and OC43 2

269 positives. Another limitation of the study was that HKU1 was not included in the panel of  
270 proficiency testing specimens probably because HKU1 cannot be grown in cell culture easily  
271 (37). As the R-GENE assay does not differentiate the endemic hCoV, we could not confirm  
272 that a sample positive for HKU1 in the PF LDT truly contains HKU1 RNA but 13 of 15  
273 samples positive for HKU1 were at least confirmed as hCoV positive in the R-GENE assay.  
274 Moreover, the primer and probe sequences for HKU1 (and all other hCoVs) that had  
275 previously been published (27) were reanalyzed on specificity using Nucleotide Blast (NCBI  
276 PubMed). As no homology of the primer and probe sequences with another than the intended  
277 corresponding hCoV sequence was detected, we presume classification to be correct.

278 A fast and accurate differentiation of respiratory pathogens in patients with respiratory  
279 symptoms is essential to enable sufficient infectious control measures, particularly with  
280 regard to the current SARS-CoV-2 pandemic. Together with the PF respiratory panel, 15  
281 different respiratory viruses (Flu A/B, RSV, ParaFlu 1-4, hMPV, AdV, RhV, hCoV  
282 NL63/229E/HKU1/OC43 and SARS-CoV-2) can be detected within 4 hours from one single  
283 specimen loaded on the PF. Alternatively, a cost saving step by step diagnostic approach is  
284 feasible on the PF, e.g. starting with SARS-CoV-2 testing and if negative, testing for other  
285 respiratory viruses subsequently.

286

## 287 **Acknowledgements**

288 We want to thank Prof. Annemarie Berger (Institute für Medizinische Virologie,  
289 Universitätsklinikum Frankfurt, Germany) for providing us SARS-CoV-1 cell culture  
290 supernatants and Dr. Victor Corman (National Reference Laboratory for Corona Viruses,  
291 Charité, Berlin) for providing us hCoV NL63, OC43 and 229E cell culture supernatants.

292

## 293 **References**

294

- 295 1. Bradburne AF, Bynoe ML, Tyrrell DA. 1967. Effects of a "new" human respiratory virus in  
296 volunteers. *Br Med J* 3:767-769.
- 297 2. Szilagyi PG, Blumkin A, Treanor JJ, Gallivan S, Albertin C, Lofthus GK, Schnabel KC, Donahue  
298 JG, Thompson MG, Shay DK. 2016. Incidence and viral aetiologies of acute respiratory  
299 illnesses (ARIs) in the United States: a population-based study. *Epidemiol Infect* 144:2077-  
300 2086.
- 301 3. Taylor S, Lopez P, Weckx L, Borja-Tabora C, Ulloa-Gutierrez R, Lazcano-Ponce E, Kerdpanich  
302 A, Angel Rodriguez Weber M, Mascarenas de Los Santos A, Tinoco JC, Safadi MA, Lim FS,  
303 Hernandez-de Mezerville M, Faingezicht I, Cruz-Valdez A, Feng Y, Li P, Durviaux S, Haars G,  
304 Roy-Ghanta S, Vaughn DW, Nolan T. 2017. Respiratory viruses and influenza-like illness:  
305 Epidemiology and outcomes in children aged 6 months to 10 years in a multi-country  
306 population sample. *J Infect* 74:29-41.
- 307 4. McIntosh K, Chao RK, Krause HE, Wasil R, Mocega HE, Mufson MA. 1974. Coronavirus  
308 infection in acute lower respiratory tract disease of infants. *J Infect Dis* 130:502-507.
- 309 5. Mayer K, Nellessen C, Hahn-Ast C, Schumacher M, Pietzonka S, Eis-Hübinger AM, Drosten C,  
310 Brossart P, Wolf D. 2016. Fatal outcome of human coronavirus NL63 infection despite  
311 successful viral elimination by IFN-alpha in a patient with newly diagnosed ALL. *Eur J*  
312 *Haematol* 97:208-210.
- 313 6. Ogimi C, Waghmare AA, Kuypers JM, Xie H, Yeung CC, Leisenring WM, Seo S, Choi SM,  
314 Jerome KR, Englund JA, Boeckh M. 2017. Clinical Significance of Human Coronavirus in  
315 Bronchoalveolar Lavage Samples From Hematopoietic Cell Transplant Recipients and Patients  
316 With Hematologic Malignancies. *Clin Infect Dis* 64:1532-1539.
- 317 7. Uhlenhaut C, Cohen JI, Pavletic S, Illei G, Gea-Banacloche JC, Abu-Asab M, Krogmann T,  
318 Gubareva L, McClenahan S, Krause PR. 2012. Use of a novel virus detection assay to identify  
319 coronavirus HKU1 in the lungs of a hematopoietic stem cell transplant recipient with fatal  
320 pneumonia. *Transpl Infect Dis* 14:79-85.
- 321 8. Hamre D, Procknow JJ. 1966. A new virus isolated from the human respiratory tract. *Proc Soc*  
322 *Exp Biol Med* 121:190-193.
- 323 9. McIntosh K, Dees JH, Becker WB, Kapikian AZ, Chanock RM. 1967. Recovery in tracheal organ  
324 cultures of novel viruses from patients with respiratory disease. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*  
325 57:933-940.
- 326 10. van der Hoek L, Pyrc K, Jebbink MF, Vermeulen-Oost W, Berkhout RJM, Wolthers KC,  
327 Wertheim-van Dillen PME, Kaandorp J, Spaargaren J, Berkhout B. 2004. Identification of a  
328 new human coronavirus. *Nature Medicine* 10:368-373.
- 329 11. Woo PC, Lau SK, Chu CM, Chan KH, Tsoi HW, Huang Y, Wong BH, Poon RW, Cai JJ, Luk WK,  
330 Poon LL, Wong SS, Guan Y, Peiris JS, Yuen KY. 2005. Characterization and complete genome  
331 sequence of a novel coronavirus, coronavirus HKU1, from patients with pneumonia. *J Virol*  
332 79:884-895.
- 333 12. Drosten C, Gunther S, Preiser W, van der Werf S, Brodt HR, Becker S, Rabenau H, Panning M,  
334 Kolesnikova L, Fouchier RA, Berger A, Burguiere AM, Cinatl J, Eickmann M, Escriou N, Grywna  
335 K, Kramme S, Manuguerra JC, Muller S, Rickerts V, Sturmer M, Vieth S, Klenk HD, Osterhaus  
336 AD, Schmitz H, Doerr HW. 2003. Identification of a novel coronavirus in patients with severe  
337 acute respiratory syndrome. *N Engl J Med* 348:1967-1976.
- 338 13. Bermingham A, Chand MA, Brown CS, Aarons E, Tong C, Langrish C, Hoschler K, Brown K,  
339 Galiano M, Myers R, Pebody RG, Green HK, Boddington NL, Gopal R, Price N, Newsholme W,  
340 Drosten C, Fouchier RA, Zambon M. 2012. Severe respiratory illness caused by a novel  
341 coronavirus, in a patient transferred to the United Kingdom from the Middle East, September  
342 2012. *Euro Surveill* 17:20290.



- 343 14. Chau NVV, Thanh Lam V, Thanh Dung N, Yen LM, Minh NNQ, Hung LM, Ngoc NM, Dung NT,  
344 Man DNH, Nguyet LA, Nhat LTH, Nhu LNT, Ny NTH, Hong NTT, Kestelyn E, Dung NTP, Xuan TC,  
345 Hien TT, Thanh Phong N, Tu TNH, Geskus RB, Thanh TT, Thanh Truong N, Binh NT, Thuong TC,  
346 Thwaites G, Tan LV. 2020. The natural history and transmission potential of asymptomatic  
347 SARS-CoV-2 infection. *Clin Infect Dis* doi:10.1093/cid/ciaa711.
- 348 15. Dong Y, Mo X, Hu Y, Qi X, Jiang F, Jiang Z, Tong S. 2020. Epidemiology of COVID-19 Among  
349 Children in China. *Pediatrics* 145.
- 350 16. Woelfel R, Corman VM, Guggemos W, Seilmaier M, Zange S, Mueller MA, Niemeyer D,  
351 Vollmar P, Rothe C, Hoelscher M, Bleicker T, Bruenink S, Schneider J, Ehmann R, Zwirgmaier  
352 K, Drosten C, Wendtner C. 2020. Clinical presentation and virological assessment of  
353 hospitalized cases of coronavirus disease 2019 in a travel-associated transmission cluster.  
354 medRxiv doi:10.1101/2020.03.05.20030502:2020.2003.2005.20030502.
- 355 17. Kuypers J, Wright N, Ferrenberg J, Huang ML, Cent A, Corey L, Morrow R. 2006. Comparison  
356 of real-time PCR assays with fluorescent-antibody assays for diagnosis of respiratory virus  
357 infections in children. *J Clin Microbiol* 44:2382-2388.
- 358 18. Mahony JB. 2008. Detection of respiratory viruses by molecular methods. *Clin Microbiol Rev*  
359 21:716-747.
- 360 19. Babady NE, Mead P, Stiles J, Brennan C, Li H, Shuptar S, Stratton CW, Tang YW, Kamboj M.  
361 2012. Comparison of the Luminex xTAG RVP Fast assay and the Idaho Technology FilmArray  
362 RP assay for detection of respiratory viruses in pediatric patients at a cancer hospital. *J Clin*  
363 *Microbiol* 50:2282-2288.
- 364 20. Webber DM, Wallace MA, Burnham CA, Anderson NW. 2020. Evaluation of the BioFire  
365 FilmArray Pneumonia Panel for Detection of Viral and Bacterial Pathogens in Lower  
366 Respiratory Tract Specimens in the Setting of a Tertiary Care Academic Medical Center. *J Clin*  
367 *Microbiol* 58.
- 368 21. Popowitch EB, O'Neill SS, Miller MB. 2013. Comparison of the Biofire FilmArray RP, Genmark  
369 eSensor RVP, Luminex xTAG RVPv1, and Luminex xTAG RVP fast multiplex assays for  
370 detection of respiratory viruses. *J Clin Microbiol* 51:1528-1533.
- 371 22. Ganzenmueller T, Kaiser R, Baier C, Wehrhane M, Hilfrich B, Witthuhn J, Flucht S, Heim A.  
372 2020. Comparison of the performance of the Panther Fusion respiratory virus panel to R-  
373 Gene and laboratory developed tests for diagnostic and hygiene screening specimens from  
374 the upper and lower respiratory tract. *J Med Microbiol* 69:427-435.
- 375 23. Hologic I. 2020. Aptima SARS-CoV-2 (Panther System). Hologic, Inc.,10210 Genetic Center  
376 Drive, San Diego, CA 92121 USA, AW-21491-001 Rev. 001.
- 377 24. Cordes AK, Heim A. 2020. Rapid random access detection of the novel SARS-coronavirus-2  
378 (SARS-CoV-2, previously 2019-nCoV) using an open access protocol for the Panther Fusion. *J*  
379 *Clin Virol* 125:104305.
- 380 25. Hologic I. 2020. SARS-CoV 2 Assay (Panther Fusion System). Hologic, Inc.,10210 Genetic  
381 Center Drive, San Diego, CA 92121 USA, AW-21159-001 Rev. 003.
- 382 26. Davis BM, Foxman B, Monto AS, Baric RS, Martin ET, Uzicanin A, Rainey JJ, Aiello AE. 2018.  
383 Human coronaviruses and other respiratory infections in young adults on a university  
384 campus: Prevalence, symptoms, and shedding. *Influenza Other Respir Viruses* 12:582-590.
- 385 27. Loens K, van Loon AM, Coenjaerts F, van Aarle Y, Goossens H, Wallace P, Claas EJ, Ieven M.  
386 2012. Performance of different mono- and multiplex nucleic acid amplification tests on a  
387 multipathogen external quality assessment panel. *J Clin Microbiol* 50:977-987.
- 388 28. Gorzalski AJ, Tian H, Laverdure C, Morzunov S, Verma SC, VanHooser S, Pandori MW. 2020.  
389 High-Throughput Transcription-mediated amplification on the Hologic Panther is a highly  
390 sensitive method of detection for SARS-CoV-2. *J Clin Virol* 129:104501.
- 391 29. Pham J, Meyer S, Nguyen C, Williams A, Hunsicker M, McHardy I, Gendlina I, Goldstein DY,  
392 Fox AS, Hudson A, Darby P, Hovey P, Morales J, Mitchell J, Harrington K, Majlessi M, Moberly  
393 J, Shah A, Worlock A, Walcher M, Eaton B, Getman D, Clark C. 2020. Performance  
394 characteristics of a high throughput automated transcription mediated amplification test for  
395 SARS-CoV-2 detection. *J Clin Microbiol* doi:10.1128/jcm.01669-20.

- 396 30. Smith E, Zhen W, Manji R, Schron D, Duong S, Berry GJ. 2020. Analytical and Clinical  
397 Comparison of Three Nucleic Acid Amplification Tests for SARS-CoV-2 Detection. *J Clin*  
398 *Microbiol* doi:10.1128/jcm.01134-20.
- 399 31. Marando M, Tamburello A, Gianella P. 2020. False-Negative Nasopharyngeal Swab RT-PCR  
400 Assays in Typical COVID-19: Role of Ultra-low-dose Chest CT and Bronchoscopy in Diagnosis.  
401 *Eur J Case Rep Intern Med* 7:001680.
- 402 32. Ramos KJ, Kapnadak SG, Collins BF, Pottinger PS, Wall R, Mays JA, Perchetti GA, Jerome KR,  
403 Khot S, Limaye AP, Mathias PC, Greninger A. 2020. Detection of SARS-CoV-2 by bronchoscopy  
404 after negative nasopharyngeal testing: Stay vigilant for COVID-19. *Respir Med Case Rep*  
405 30:101120.
- 406 33. Gualano G, Musso M, Mosti S, Mencarini P, Mastrobattista A, Pareo C, Zaccarelli M, Migliorisi  
407 P, Vittozzi P, Zumla A, Ippolito G, Palmieri F. 2020. Usefulness of bronchoalveolar lavage in  
408 the management of patients presenting with lung infiltrates and suspect COVID-19-  
409 associated pneumonia: A case report. *Int J Infect Dis* 97:174-176.
- 410 34. Hofmann H, Pyrc K, van der Hoek L, Geier M, Berkhout B, Pöhlmann S. 2005. Human  
411 coronavirus NL63 employs the severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus receptor for  
412 cellular entry. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 102:7988-7993.
- 413 35. Arden KE, Nissen MD, Sloots TP, Mackay IM. 2005. New human coronavirus, HCoV-NL63,  
414 associated with severe lower respiratory tract disease in Australia. *J Med Virol* 75:455-462.
- 415 36. Mateus J, Grifoni A, Tarke A, Sidney J, Ramirez SI, Dan JM, Burger ZC, Rawlings SA, Smith DM,  
416 Phillips E, Mallal S, Lammers M, Rubiro P, Quiambao L, Sutherland A, Yu ED, da Silva Antunes  
417 R, Greenbaum J, Frazier A, Markmann AJ, Premkumar L, de Silva A, Peters B, Crotty S, Sette A,  
418 Weiskopf D. 2020. Selective and cross-reactive SARS-CoV-2 T cell epitopes in unexposed  
419 humans. *Science* doi:10.1126/science.abd3871.
- 420 37. Pyrc K, Sims AC, Dijkman R, Jebbink M, Long C, Deming D, Donaldson E, Vabret A, Baric R, van  
421 der Hoek L, Pickles R. 2010. Culturing the unculturable: human coronavirus HKU1 infects,  
422 replicates, and produces progeny virions in human ciliated airway epithelial cell cultures. *J*  
423 *Virol* 84:11255-11263.

424  
425



426 **Table 1: Concentrations in PPR and final concentration in the PCR reaction.** The  
427 concentration of the components in the PPR is higher by 1.25 x than in the final PCR reaction.

<b>Substance</b>	<b>Concentration in PPR</b>	<b>Final concentration in PCR</b>
MgCl	3.75 mM	3 mM
KCl	62.5 mM	50 mM
Tris buffer (pH8)	10 mM	8 mM
Primer for IC (fwd and rev)	0.94 $\mu$ M	0.75 $\mu$ M
Probe for IC	0.63 $\mu$ M	0.5 $\mu$ M
HCoV 229E N s (Primer)	0.5 $\mu$ M	0.4 $\mu$ M
HCoV 229E N as (Primer)	0.5 $\mu$ M	0.4 $\mu$ M
HCoV NL63 N s (Primer)	0.5 $\mu$ M	0.4 $\mu$ M
HCoV NL63 N as (Primer)	0.5 $\mu$ M	0.4 $\mu$ M
HCoV OC43 N s (Primer)	0.625 $\mu$ M	0.5 $\mu$ M
HCoV OC43 N as (Primer)	0.625 $\mu$ M	0.5 $\mu$ M
HCoV HKU1 N s (Primer)	0.625 $\mu$ M	0.5 $\mu$ M
HCoV HKU1 N as (Primer)	0.625 $\mu$ M	0.5 $\mu$ M
HCoV 229E (Probe)	0.25 $\mu$ M	0.2 $\mu$ M
HCoV NL63 (Probe)	0.25 $\mu$ M	0.2 $\mu$ M
HCoV OC43 (Probe)	0.625 $\mu$ M	0.5 $\mu$ M
HCoV HKU1 (Probe)	0.625 $\mu$ M	0.5 $\mu$ M

428

429

430 **Table 2: Comparison of the PF LDT and the R-GENE CoV results**

<b>Diagnostic specimens (from URT and LRT)</b>	<b>R-GENE positive</b>	<b>R-GENE negative</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>PF LDT positive</b>	75	2	77
<b>PF LDT negative</b>	4	83	87
<b>Total</b>	79	85	164

431


432

433 **Table 3: Comparison of three SARS-CoV-2 NATs to the consensus results.**

Assay	Consensus result		PPA	NPA
	positive	negative		
<b>Aptima SARS-CoV-2 TMA</b>				
positive	56	1	100 %	99.0 %
negative	0	100		
<b>LDT E-gene RT-PCR</b>				
positive	56	1	100 %	99.0 %
negative	0	100		
<b>Genesig COVID-19 RT-PCR</b>				
positive	49	0	87.5 %	100 %
negative	7	101		
<b>total</b>	56	101		

434

435



436

437 **Figure 1: Amplification efficiency.** For NL63, OC43 and 229E reference material from cell  
438 culture supernatants was applied. For the dilution series of HKU1, a highly positive diagnostic  
439 specimen was used. Each dot represents the mean out of three individual test results. The error  
440 bars display the range of Ct values.

441

442 **Supplementary Table 1:** Primer and probe sequences were used as published by Loens et al. Modifications were adapted for multiplexed use as  
 443 shown in the table. All primers and probes were synthesized HPLC purified.

Name as in Loens et al. (27)	sequence	5' dye	3' quencher	internal quencher	company
<b>HCoV 229E</b>					
Primer 1	CAG TCA AAT GGG CTG ATG CA	-	-	-	Eurogentech
Primer 2	CAA AGG GCT ATA AAG AGA ATA AGG TAT TCT	-	-	-	Eurogentech
Probe A	CCC TGA CGA CCA CGT TGT GGT TCA	FAM	Iowa Black FQ	ZEN (after amino acid 9)	Integrated DNA Technologies
<b>HCoV NL63</b>					
Primer 3	GCG TGT TCC TAC CAG AGA GGA	-	-	-	Eurogentech
Primer 4	GCT GTG GAA AAC CTT TGG CA	-	-	-	Eurogentech
Probe B	ATG TTA TTC AGT GCT TTG GTC CTC GTG AT	HEX	Iowa Black FQ	ZEN (after amino acid 9)	Integrated DNA Technologies
<b>HCoV OC43</b>					
Primer 5	CGA TGA GGC TAT TCC GAC TAG GT	-	-	-	Eurogentech
Primer 6	CCT TCC TGA GCC TTC AAT ATA GTA ACC	-	-	-	Eurogentech
Probe C	TCC GCC TGG CAC GGT ACT CCC T	TYE665	Iowa Black RQ-Sp	-	Integrated DNA Technologies
<b>HCoV HKU1</b>					
864HCOV-HKU1s	TCC TAC TAY TCA AGA AGC TAT CC	-	-	-	Eurogentech
864HCOV-HKU1as	AAT GAA CGA TTA TTG GGT CCA C	-	-	-	Eurogentech
667HCOV-HKU1	TYC GCC TGG TAC GAT TTT GCC TCA	ROX (NHS Ester)	Iowa Black RQ-Sp	-	Integrated DNA Technologies

**Supplementary table 2: Stability of the PPF on the PF.** A PPR was pipetted and loaded onto the PF platform on day 0 and stayed on the platform for fourteen days. The same samples were tested on day 0, 6, 8 and 14.

	<b>Sample</b>	<b>material*</b>	<b>Result Day 0 (Ct value)</b>	<b>Result Day 6 (Ct value)</b>	<b>Result Day 8 (Ct value)</b>	<b>Result Day 14 (Ct value)</b>
1	NC**	BL	negative	negative	negative	negative
2	NC**	NPS	negative	negative	negative	negative
3	229E	NPS	25.5	26.3	26.0	26.4
4	229E	PL	34.4	34.4	33.3	33.9
5	NL63	PL	19.2	18.0	18.8	19.3
6	NL63	BAL	34.4	34.1	34.2	35.0
7	HKU1	BAL	26.9	25.7	27.2	28.7
8	HKU1	BAL	36.6	38.1	36.5	37.5
9	OC43	NPS	23.9	24.3	26.3	24.5
10	OC43	BAL	36.9	39.4	38.7	38.0

\* bronchial alveolar lavages (BAL), bronchial lavages (BL), nasal swabs (NS), nasopharyngeal swabs (NPS), pharyngeal lavages (PL), tracheal swabs (TRS), tracheal secretions (TS)

\*\* negative control (NC)

**Supplementary table 3:** Those samples that were found to be positive in at least two out of three assays were declared as consensus positive. For negative samples the criteria was implemented respectively.

<b>Material*</b>	<b>Aptima SARS-CoV-2</b>		<b>E-gene LDT RT-PCR</b>		<b>Genesig RT-PCR</b>	
	positive of consensus positive	negative of consensus negative	positive of consensus positive	negative of consensus negative	positive of consensus positive	negative of consensus negative
<b>BAL</b>	5/5	3/3	5/5	3/3	4/5	3/3
<b>BL</b>	5/5	2/2	5/5	2/2	4/5	2/3
<b>NS</b>	3/3	3/3	3/3	3/3	3/3	3/3
<b>NPS</b>	38/38	86/87	38/38	86/87	34/38	87/87
<b>PL</b>	0/0	1/1	0/0	1/1	0/0	1/1
<b>TRS</b>	3/3	4/4	3/3	4/4	2/3	4/4
<b>TS</b>	2/2	1/1	2/2	1/1	2/2	1/1

\*bronchial alveolar lavages (BAL), bronchial lavages (BL), nasal swabs (NS), nasopharyngeal swabs (NPS), pharyngeal lavages (PL), tracheal swabs (TRS), tracheal secretions (TS)