

1 Pooled RNA sample reverse transcriptase real time PCR assay for SARS CoV -2

2 infection: a reliable, faster and economical method.

3

4 Ekta Gupta¹, Abhishek Padhi¹, Arvind Khodare¹, Reshu Aggarwal¹, Krithiga Ramachnadr¹,

5 Vibha Mehta¹, Mousumi Kilikdar¹, Shantanu Dubey², Guresh Kumar³, Shiv Kumar Sarin^{4*}.

6

7 1. Department of Clinical Virology, Institute of Liver and Biliary Sciences, New Delhi.

8 2. Department of Hospital Operations, Institute of Liver and Biliary Sciences, New

9 Delhi.

10 3. Department of research, Institute of Liver and Biliary Sciences, New Delhi.

11

12 4. Department of Hepatology, Institute of Liver and Biliary Sciences, New Delhi.

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

13. **Keywords: COVID 19 laboratory diagnosis, Real time PCR, pool testing**

Running title : Pooled RNA sample real time PCR assay for SARS-CoV2

14 **Corresponding Author:**

15 Prof. Shiv Kumar Sarin

16 Senior Professor, Hepatology

17 Institute of Liver and Biliary Sciences

18 Vasant Kunj, New Delhi, India

19 Email : sksarin@ilbs.in, shivsarin@gmail.com

20 **Alternate corresponding author**

21 Dr Ekta Gupta

22 Professor, Clinical virology

23 Institute of Liver and Biliary Sciences

24 Vasant Kunj, New Delhi, India

21 **ABSTRACT**

22 **Background**

23 Corona virus disease 2019 (COVID-19) which initially started as a cluster of pneumonia
24 cases in the Wuhan city of China has now become a full blown pandemic. Timely diagnosis
25 of COVID-19 is the key in containing the pandemic and breaking the chain of transmission.
26 In low and middle income countries availability of testing kits has become the major bottle
27 neck in testing. Novel methods like pooling of samples are the need of the hour.

28 **Method**

29 Extracted RNA samples were randomly placed in pools of 8 on a 96 well plate. Both
30 individual RNA (ID) and pooled RNA RT-qPCR for the screening E gene were done in the
31 same plate and the positivity for the E gene was seen.

32 **Results**

33 The present study demonstrated that pool testing with 8 RNA samples can easily detect even
34 up to a single positive sample with Ct value as high as 38. The present study also showed that
35 the results of pool testing is not affected by number of positive samples in a pool.

36 **Conclusion**

37 Pooling of 8 RNA samples can reduce the time and expense by one eighth, and can help
38 expand diagnostic capabilities, especially during constrained supply of reagents and PCR kits
39 for the diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2 infection.

40 INTRODUCTION

41 Corona virus disease 2019 (COVID-19) is a severe acute respiratory infection caused by the
42 novel corona virus, severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) [1].
43 Initially started as cluster of cases from Wuhan, China [2] it has now spread to over 200
44 countries with 1,436,198 confirmed and 85, 522 deaths [3]. The laboratory diagnosis of
45 SARS-CoV-2 is based primarily on nucleic acid amplification test (NAAT) like real time
46 reverse transcriptase PCR (RT-qPCR). With an acute shortage of diagnostic kits the present
47 testing strategies mainly focus on testing the symptomatic individuals. But detecting the
48 carrier or asymptomatic individuals holds the key in containing the spread of the infection
49 into the community. Earlier the infected person is identified, sooner the spread of the
50 infection can be contained and the surveillance machinery can be activated for contact tracing
51 and ultimately break in the chain of transmission of the virus. Most of the countries have

52 imposed lockdown to contain the infection but afterwards when the cases are expected to
53 take a vertical trajectory, scaling up the testing would be a major challenge [4] . Innovative
54 methods to conserve kits and reagents and human resources needs to be explored to enhance
55 the testing. Pooling the diagnostic tests has been applied in other infectious diseases and is
56 especially attractive as it requires no additional training, equipment, or materials. In this
57 method, perfected over the years [5] [6] [7] , samples are mixed and tested at a single pool,
58 and subsequent individual tests are performed, only if the pool tests positive.

59 We undertook this study to evaluate a novel protocol of pooling of RNA samples/elutes in
60 performance of PCR for SARS CoV- 2 virus. We were extremely careful that the limits of
61 dilution, do not compromise the sensitivity and specificity of the results.

65

66

67

68

69 **METHODOLOGY**

70 **Sample Collection:**

71 Combined nasopharyngeal and oropharyngeal swabs were collected by healthcare workers
72 and transported in a 3 ml viral transport media(VTM) maintaining proper cold chain and sent
73 to the virology laboratory of Institute of Liver and biliary sciences, New Delhi, India. A
74 volume of 200 microlitre (μ l) of the sample was further processed for viral nucleic acid
75 extraction by Qiasymphony DSP Virus/ Pathogen mini kit (Qiagen GmbH,Germany) as per
76 the manufacturers protocol in elutes of 60 μ l each [8]. Each sample was subjected to the
77 addition of 10 μ l of spiked extraction control (EAC) at the time of extraction itself, to check
78 the validity of the extraction procedure.

79 **PERFORMANCE OF RT-qPCR IN THE LABORATORY**

80 The 5 μ l of the extracted RNA elute/sample was subjected to RT-qPCR for the qualitative
81 detection of SARS-CoV-2 RNA utilizing with AgPath-IDTM One-Step RT-PCR Reagents

82 (Thermo Fisher Scientific) using a Applied biosystem (ABI) 7500 Real Time PCR system
83 (Thermo Fisher Scientific) and LightMix® SarbecoV E-gene (TIB MOLBIOL). Reactions
84 were heated to 55⁰ C for 5 minutes for reverse transcription, denatured in 95⁰ C for 5
85 minutes and then 45 cycles of amplification were carried out for 95°C for 5 seconds and 60⁰C
86 for 15 seconds using FAM parameter for E gene. This assay targets the detection of E gene
87 for SARS as well as nCoV-2. The primer details are given in Table 1. All samples that were
88 screened positive for E gene were confirmed by performance of RT-qPCR for the detection
89 of specific RdRP gene of SARS-CoV-2 using LightMix® Modular SARS-CoV-2 RdRP (TIB
90 MOLBIOL) using similar PCR conditions as described above.

91 **POOLING OF SAMPLES FOR THE RT-qPCR**

92 RNA samples that were obtained after extraction were randomly pooled initially in pools of
93 2, 4, 6, 8, 16 RNA elutes on a 96 well plate. The best results matching with individual RNA

94 test (ID) was seen in pools of 2, 4 and 8 samples. Subsequently, pools of 8 RNA elutes on a
95 96 well plate were used as shown in figure 1. Both ID and pooled RNA RT-qPCR for the
96 screening E gene was done in the same plate (figure 1). 5 μ l of the RNA sample was taken for
97 the PCR and pooling of 5 μ l (8x5= 40 μ l) was done for the pooled test. After thorough
98 mixing, 5 μ l of the pooled RNA was taken for the pooled PCR. The volume of RNA sample
99 was kept similar in both the ID as well as pooled PCR so that assay sensitivity is not affected.
100 ID PCR and pooled PCR was performed in the same run , keeping the entire conditions
101 uniform.
102 Results were seen on the ABI software and each reaction was read for E gene after
103 confirmation of the performance of EAC as well as positive control and negative control
104 results. Ct value for each positive test was recorded and as per the WHO criteria, sample with
105 Ct value \leq 40 were considered as positive. All initial E gene positive were confirmed as

106 positive if RdRP gene was also detected with Ct value \leq 40.

107 **STATISTICAL ANALYSIS**

108 The data was compared for the ability of detection of E gene by ID test and pooled test using

109 one sample paired t-test (Table 1). Data of Ct value is shown as mean \pm standard deviations.

110 The agreement between Ct values obtained for positive sample in one positive sample pool

111 with ID test was done applying intra class correlation ICC followed by Bland and Altman

112 graph. A P value of 0.05 or less was considered statistically significant.

113 **ETHICAL APPROVAL**

114 The study was approved by the Institutional ethics committee and patient consent form was

115 waived off because of the use of deidentified discarded RNA samples.

116 **RESULTS**

117 **POOL TEST Vs ID TEST RESULTS**

118 Out of 280 samples that were tested, 40 were positive and 240 negative for SARS CoV-2 E

119 gene with a positivity rate of 16.7% (95 CI; 12.2%-22.0%).All 40 were also positive for

120 RdRP gene. Results were communicated to the patients as per the ID test results obtained.

121 All the clinical details were de-identified, delinked and kept anonymised as per the

122 Government of India data safety policy. Overall 35 pools were made from these samples. On

123 comparing the performance of pool test with ID test pools concordance in performance was

124 seen in 34 pools. Overall sensitivity of the pool test keeping ID test as gold standard was

125 95.4%, specificity 100%, positive predictive value 100% and negative predictive value of

123 92.86%.

124 There were 13 pools where all the ID tests were negative and pool results were also negative.

125 In 22 pools one or more positive sample was detected in the ID test (Table 2). Pools were
126 further classified based on the number of positive samples present in them. There were 11
127 pools with 1 positive sample in each pool, 5 with 2 positive sample in each pool, 5 with 3
128 positive samples in each and 1 with 4 positive samples in it. 21 out of 22 (95.4%) pools could
129 correctly identify the positive test. In 1 pool which had 1 positive and 7 negative samples, the
130 ID test result showed delayed Ct at 39, therefore it was missed. The sample was however
131 positive for the RdRP gene and was given a positive result.

132 **EFFECT OF POOLING ON THE CT VALUE OF THE POSITIVE RESULT**

133 In a positive test apart from getting a fluorescence curve the cycle number at which the
134 fluorescence starts is also important, this is measured as Ct value. WHO has defined the
135 criteria that any test which gives fluorescence after 40 cycles should not be considered as
136 positive [9] . We wanted to see the effect of dilution on the Ct value of the positive result. Ct

137 values of positive samples in ID test were compared with Ct values in pool test (Table 2).The
138 pools having only 1 sample positive in them ,the Ct values were similar to the ID test (p value
139 =0.04).In pools with more than 1 positive sample the mean Ct value of positive as ID was
140 compared with Mean Ct in pool ,the overall mean CT value of ID was 32.68 while in a
141 pooled testing it was 34.24 only an increase in Ct value of 1.56 very much with in the
142 reporting criteria of being called as positive. This clearly shows that the dilution did not alter
143 the Ct value of the positive result and a positive will be reported as positive despite pooling.

144 **EFFECT OF NUMBER OF POSITIVE SAMPLES IN A POOL**

145 We tried to look at the effect of presence of number of positive samples in a pool. As the
146 number of positive samples in a pool increased the difference in the mean Ct value decreased
147 (figure 2). More the number of positives in a pool, more accurate the result of the pool
148 testing. When there were 4 positive samples in a pool, the mean ID Ct value were identical to

149 mean pool Ct (Table 2).

150 On evaluating the performance of pools with only 1 positive sample in it, a bland and altman

151 graph (figure 3) showed an intra class agreement of 57.3% [(-29.4% to 88.7%) ,p=0.024].

152 The reliability coefficient was found to be 74.5% . All tests were within 2 SD limit except 1.

153 The limit of biasness were -8.4 to 2.3.

154

155 **DISCUSSION**

156 This novel study demonstrates that pooling of RNA samples can be done without loss of

157 sensitivity and specificity. The results show that pooled test and ID test for the SARS-CoV-2

158 PCR, has demonstrated that pool testing with 8 RNA samples can easily detect even upto a

159 single positive sample with Ct value as high as 38. The present study also showed that the

160 results of pool testing is not affected by number of positive samples in a pool. Pool testing
161 thus can be easily applied for faster PCR results. The data encourages wide spread of the
162 technique for the diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2 infection as it saves time and expensive PCR
163 reagents during the constrained shipping and supplies. Pooled testing has been used in many
164 infectious diseases as a simple cost effective method to enhance the speed of diagnosis
165 especially when large samples have to be tested during epidemic screening [10], pooling has
166 been proven to work for RT-qPCR [7] [11] , a time-consuming step for which the reagents
167 are expected to be in short supply [12].

168 The WHO declared COVID-19 as a global pandemic on March 11th, 2020 [13]. As aptly
169 described by the WHO director general, the *mantra* of “detect, protect and treat” should be
170 followed to break the chain of transmission of SARS-CoV-2 [14]. Early diagnosis and
171 prompt treatment can substantially reduce the number of prospective cases. Hence, laboratory

172 diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2 holds the key in containing and restricting the COVID-19
173 pandemic. PCR remains the gold standard for the diagnosis of COVID-19 infection
174 especially in symptomatic individual, but limited supply of diagnostic kits and reagents are
175 major bottle neck in expediting testing of COVID-19 in the community [4]. Furthermore,
176 mass testing of samples should be done to escalate testing and even extend to asymptomatic
177 cases [15]. India a country of over 1.3 billion population [16] testing for COVID-19 has been
178 a great challenge. Government of India through the Indian Council of Medical Research
179 (ICMR) has established a robust network of laboratories in the form of Viral research and
180 diagnostic laboratories (VRDL) [17]. These VRDLs have taken a lead in the real time
181 diagnosis of COVID-19 in India. Still to match up to such a humongous population of India,
182 we need some fast and rapid solutions to intensify the testing. Hence a testing method where
183 a large number of samples can be tested and consuming minimal testing kits and reagent is

184 the need of the hour. Pooled testing can solve this problem. In another study on pool testing

185 of samples maximum number of pooling of samples was assessed and in this study they
186 found that pooling of samples upto a pool of 64 samples together can be done without
187 effecting the results [18].

188 In the present study, the pool size was limited to 8 based on the preliminary analysis done by
189 us on determination of pool size (unpublished data). Pooling of samples can be done at
190 various levels ,prior to RNA extraction that is at the time of sample collection, putting the
191 nasopharyngeal/ oropharyngeal swabs into a common viral transport media(VTM). By doing
192 so the major bottle neck of RNA extraction can be removed. Pooling can also be done by
193 pooling the VTMs and doing common extraction for pooled VTM samples, here the
194 limitation is that in case a pool is positive individual sample collection has to be done at the
195 patient level. Pooling RNA samples are easy to do in a laboratory as any pool turns out to be
196 positive ID test can be performed and result can be declared.

197 It can be argued that the sample size of our study is small. However, in the interest of
198 widespread need to enhance testing facilities and capabilities, the present study makes a
199 seminal contribution. In future, mathematical and computational model can be applied to
200 design appropriate pool size and increase the pool size further for SARS-CoV-2 testing.
201 Pooling of samples is essentially important in monitoring the infection in cohesive groups
202 such as quarantine facilities, health care workers, community surveillance and diagnosing the
203 asymptomatic cases. The infection load in these groups may be low but even a single positive
204 case amongst such groups can activate the surveillance system and quarantine the affected
205 group and prevent the further spread in the community.

206 **CONCLUSION**

207 As the COVID-19 pandemic spans across the globe, implementation of expanded testing in
208 larger population groups is the only way out. We recommend that testing the pooled samples,
209 if done properly, is reliable, and can take the fight of detecting COVID-19 to the next level at
210 the earliest.

211

212 CONFLICT OF INTEREST

213 None

214

215 FUNDING

216 None

217 **CONTRIBUTORS**

218 EG, SKS conceived and designed the study. AP, AK, RA, KR, VM, MK, SD did the
219 literature search. Laboratory data were collected by AK. Data analysis was done by
220 GK. EG interpreted the data. EG, AP and SKS drafted and prepared the manuscript.

221

222 **Acknowledgements:** We acknowledge all the technical staff involved in testing and ICMR
223 for providing the Primers and probes for the conduct of RT-q PCR.

224 **REFERENCES**

225 1. Naming the coronavirus disease (COVID-19) and the virus that causes it.
226 <https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019/technical->

- 227 guidance/naming-the-coronavirus-disease-(covid-2019)-and-the-virus-that-causes-it.
228 Accessed 15 Mar 2020
- 229 2. Zhu N, Zhang D, Wang W, et al (2020) A Novel Coronavirus from Patients with
230 Pneumonia in China, 2019. *New England Journal of Medicine* 382:727–733
- 231 3. Novel Coronavirus (2019-nCoV) situation reports.
232 <https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019/situation-reports>.
233 Accessed 13 Apr 2020
- 234 4. Wuhan, China, faces such a shortage of coronavirus test-kits that people say getting one
235 is like “winning the lottery.” [https://www.businessinsider.fr/us/wuhan-coronavirus-](https://www.businessinsider.fr/us/wuhan-coronavirus-china-shortage-test-kits-lottery-2020-1)
236 [china-shortage-test-kits-lottery-2020-1](https://www.businessinsider.fr/us/wuhan-coronavirus-china-shortage-test-kits-lottery-2020-1). Accessed 10 Apr 2020
- 237 5. Nguyen NT, Bish EK, Aprahamian H (2018) Sequential prevalence estimation with
238 pooling and continuous test outcomes. *Stat Med* 37:2391–2426
- 239 6. Bilder CR, Tebbs JM (2012) Pooled-testing procedures for screening high volume
240 clinical specimens in heterogeneous populations. *Stat Med* 31:3261–3268
- 241 7. Arnold ME, Slomka MJ, Coward VJ, Mahmood S, Raleigh PJ, Brown IH (2013)
242 Evaluation of the pooling of swabs for real-time PCR detection of low titre shedding of
243 low pathogenicity avian influenza in turkeys. *Epidemiol Infect* 141:1286–1297
- 244 8. QIASymphony DSP Virus/Pathogen Kit - QIAGEN Online Shop.
245 [https://www.qiagen.com/us/products/discovery-and-translational-research/dna-rna-](https://www.qiagen.com/us/products/discovery-and-translational-research/dna-rna-purification/multianalyte-and-virus/qiasymphony-dsp-viruspathogen-)
246 [purification/multianalyte-and-virus/qiasymphony-dsp-viruspathogen-](https://www.qiagen.com/us/products/discovery-and-translational-research/dna-rna-purification/multianalyte-and-virus/qiasymphony-dsp-viruspathogen-)
247 [kits/#orderinginformation](https://www.qiagen.com/us/products/discovery-and-translational-research/dna-rna-purification/multianalyte-and-virus/qiasymphony-dsp-viruspathogen-). Accessed 10 Apr 2020
- 248 9. Tang Y-W, Schmitz JE, Persing DH, Stratton CW (2020) The Laboratory Diagnosis of
249 COVID-19 Infection: Current Issues and Challenges. *Journal of Clinical Microbiology*.

250 <https://doi.org/10.1128/JCM.00512-20>

251 10. Abel U, Schosser R, Süß J (1999) Estimating the prevalence of infectious agents using
252 pooled samples: Biometrical considerations. *Zentralblatt für Bakteriologie* 289:550–563

253 11. Taylor SM, Juliano JJ, Trotman PA, Griffin JB, Landis SH, Kitsa P, Tshefu AK,
254 Meshnick SR (2010) High-Throughput Pooling and Real-Time PCR-Based Strategy for
255 Malaria Detection. *Journal of Clinical Microbiology* 48:512–519

256 12. Thermo Fisher to produce millions of coronavirus diagnostic tests - STAT.

257 [https://www.statnews.com/2020/03/14/thermo-fisher-to-produce-millions-of-](https://www.statnews.com/2020/03/14/thermo-fisher-to-produce-millions-of-coronavirus-diagnostic-tests/)
258 [coronavirus-diagnostic-tests/](https://www.statnews.com/2020/03/14/thermo-fisher-to-produce-millions-of-coronavirus-diagnostic-tests/). Accessed 10 Apr 2020

259 13. WHO Director-General’s opening remarks at the media briefing on COVID-19 - 11

260 March 2020. [https://www.who.int/dg/speeches/detail/who-director-general-s-opening-](https://www.who.int/dg/speeches/detail/who-director-general-s-opening-remarks-at-the-media-briefing-on-covid-19--11-march-2020)
261 [remarks-at-the-media-briefing-on-covid-19-- 11-march-2020](https://www.who.int/dg/speeches/detail/who-director-general-s-opening-remarks-at-the-media-briefing-on-covid-19--11-march-2020). Accessed 15 Mar 2020

262 14. WHO Director-General’s opening remarks at the media briefing on COVID-19 - 13

263 March 2020. [https://www.who.int/dg/speeches/detail/who-director-general-s-opening-](https://www.who.int/dg/speeches/detail/who-director-general-s-opening-remarks-at-the-mission-briefing-on-covid-19---13-march-2020)
264 [remarks-at-the-mission-briefing-on-covid-19---13-march-2020](https://www.who.int/dg/speeches/detail/who-director-general-s-opening-remarks-at-the-mission-briefing-on-covid-19---13-march-2020). Accessed 15 Mar 2020

- 265 15. Peto J (2020) Covid-19 mass testing facilities could end the epidemic rapidly. *BMJ*.
266 <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.m1163>
- 267 16. Population, total - India | Data.
268 <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SP.POP.TOTL?locations=IN>. Accessed 10 Apr
269 2020
- 270 17. Gupta N, Potdar V, Praharaj I, et al (2020) Laboratory preparedness for SARS-CoV-2
271 testing in India: Harnessing a network of Virus Research & Diagnostic Laboratories.
272 *Indian J Med Res*. https://doi.org/10.4103/ijmr.IJMR_594_20
- 273 18. Yelin I, Aharony N, Shaer-Tamar E, et al (2020) Evaluation of COVID-19 RT-qPCR
274 test in multi-sample pools. medRxiv 2020.03.26.20039438

275

276

277 **Figures Legends**

278 **Figure 1: Scheme for pooling the samples on a 96 well plate.**

279 **Figure 2: Effect of number of positive samples in a pool.**

555
280

281

556

5782 **Figure 3: Performance of single positive sample pool**

283

284

285

286

287

288




Figure 1: Scheme for pooling the samples on a 96 well plate




Figure 2: Effect of number of positive samples in a pool .




Figure 3: Performance of single positive sample pool

Table 1: Primers and probes for the RT-qPCR

Gene	Oligonucleotide	Sequence
E gene	E_Sarbeco_F	ACAGGTACGTTAATAGTTAATAGCGT
	E_Sarbeco_P1	FAM-ACACTAGCCATCCTTACTGCGCTTCG-BBQ
	E_Sarbeco_R	ATATTGCAGCAGTACGCACACA
RdRP gene	RdRp_SARSr-F	GTGARATGGTCATGTGTGGCGG
	RdRp_SARSr-P2	FAM-CAGGTGGAACCTCATCAGGAGATGC-BBQ
	RdRp_SARSr-R	CARATGTTAAASACACTATTAGCATA

FAM: 6-carboxyfluorescein; BBQ: blackberry quencher.

Table 2: Comparison between the mean Ct values of individual test and pool test in different pool combinations.

Pool of 8 RNA samples		E gene detection			
Pool combinations	Total Number of Pools	Not detected in number of pools	Mean of ID test Ct value (\pm SD)	Mean of Pool test Ct value (\pm SD)	P value
1 positive + 7 negative	11	1	33.1 (\pm 3.3)	35.6 (\pm 3.3)	0.041
2 positive + 6 negative	5	0	30.4 (\pm 3.7)	33(\pm 3.1)	0.134
3 positive + 5 negative	5	0	34.2 (\pm 3.7)	34.9(\pm 2.6)	0.581
4 positive + 4 negative	1	0	31.7 (\pm 4.6)	31.7	-
8 negative	13	13	NA		-
Total	35	14			

Ct : cycle threshold ,RNA :ribonucleic acid ,ID :individual

Table 3: Comparison of individual test Ct value with pool test Ct value in the positive samples pool.

S. No.	Pool with 1 positive sample(n= 11)		Pool with 2 positive Sample(n=5)		Pool with 3 positive Sample(n= 5)		Pool with 4 positive sample(n= 1)		
	ID Ct	Pool test Ct	ID Ct	Pool Ct	ID Ct	Pool Ct	ID Ct	Pool Ct	
1.	29	32.13	28.9	32.3	39.82	34.09	31.72	31.72	
2.	38	39	36.1		29.12		30.73		
3.	33.1	34.78	31.7	32.4	30.3	26.69			
4.	33.8	35.7	28.5		39.1	37.81			
5.	34.46	39.1	31.5	29.1	37.72	38.32	31.72		
6.	31.05	35.94	23.9		31.72			36.35	
7.	33.37	36.06	27.74	33.32	36.82	36.35			
8.	29.17	29.17	27.74		35.97				
9.	32.7	34.13	33.26	37.74	35.56	31.61			
10.	30.26	39.78	34.36		34.37				
11.	39.1	Negative			38	33.89			
12.					29.19				
13.					32.7	31.61			
14.					29.17				
15.					33.37				
Mean	33.1	35.6	30.4	33.0	34.2	34.9		31.7	31.7
SD	3.3	3.3	3.7	3.1	3.7	2.6		4.6	

Table 1: Primers and probes for the RT-qPCR

Gene	Oligonucleotide	Sequence
E gene	E_Sarbeco_F	ACAGGTACGTTAATAGTTAATAGCGT
	E_Sarbeco_P1	FAM-ACACTAGCCATCCTTACTGCGCTTCG-BBQ
	E_Sarbeco_R	ATATTGCAGCAGTACGCACACA
RdRP gene	RdRp_SARSr-F	GTGARATGGTCATGTGTGGCGG
	RdRp_SARSr-P2	FAM-CAGGTGGAACCTCATCAGGAGATGC-BBQ
	RdRp_SARSr-R	CARATGTTAAASACACTATTAGCATA

FAM: 6-carboxyfluorescein; BBQ: blackberry quencher.

Table 2: Comparison between the mean Ct values of individual test and pool test in different pool combinations.

Pool of 8 RNA samples		E gene detection			
Pool combinations	Total Number of Pools	Not detected in number of pools	Mean of ID test Ct value (\pm SD)	Mean of Pool test Ct value (\pm SD)	P value
1 positive + 7 negative	11	1	33.1 (\pm 3.3)	35.6 (\pm 3.3)	0.041
2 positive + 6 negative	5	0	30.4 (\pm 3.7)	33(\pm 3.1)	0.134
3 positive + 5 negative	5	0	34.2 (\pm 3.7)	34.9(\pm 2.6)	0.581
4 positive + 4 negative	1	0	31.7 (\pm 4.6)	31.7	-
8 negative	13	13	NA		-
Total	35	14			

Ct : cycle threshold ,RNA :ribonucleic acid ,ID :individual

Table 3: Comparison of individual test Ct value with pool test Ct value in the positive samples pool.

S. No.	Pool with 1 positive sample(n= 11)		Pool with 2 positive Sample(n=5)		Pool with 3 positive Sample(n= 5)		Pool with 4 positive sample(n= 1)			
	ID Ct	Pool test Ct	ID Ct	Pool Ct	ID Ct	Pool Ct	ID Ct	Pool Ct		
1.	29	32.13	28.9	32.3	39.82	34.09	31.72	31.72		
2.	38	39	36.1		29.12		30.73			
3.	33.1	34.78	31.7	32.4	30.3	34.09	26.69			
4.	33.8	35.7	28.5		39.1	37.81				
5.	34.46	39.1	31.5	29.1	37.72	38.32				
6.	31.05	35.94	23.9		31.72			36.35		
7.	33.37	36.06	27.74	33.32	36.82	36.35				
8.	29.17	29.17	27.74		35.97				36.35	
9.	32.7	34.13	33.26	37.74	35.56	36.35				
10.	30.26	39.78	34.36		34.37		36.35			
11.	39.1	Negative			38	33.89				
12.					29.19			33.89		
13.					32.7	31.61				
14.					29.17				31.61	
15.					33.37	31.61				
Mean	33.1	35.6	30.4	33.0	34.2	34.9	31.7			31.7
SD	3.3	3.3	3.7	3.1	3.7	2.6	4.6			




Figure 1: Scheme for pooling the samples on a 96 well plate




Figure 2: Effect of number of positive samples in a pool




Figure 3: Performance of single positive sample pool