Title: Implementation and evaluation of a novel real-time multiplex assay for SARS-CoV-2: In-field learnings from a clinical microbiology laboratory

Author names: Eloise Williams¹, Katherine Bond¹, Brian Chong², Dawn Giltrap¹, Malcolm Eaton¹, Peter Kyriakou¹, Peter Calvert¹, Bowen Zhang¹, Mahendra Siwan¹, Benjamin Howden³, Julian Druce², Mike Catton², Deborah A Williamson^{1,2,3}

Author affiliations:

¹ Department of Microbiology, Royal Melbourne Hospital, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia

² Victorian Infectious Diseases Reference Laboratory, The Peter Doherty Institute for Infection and Immunity, Melbourne, Australia

³ Department of Microbiology and Immunology, The University of Melbourne at The Peter Doherty Institute for Infection and Immunity, Melbourne, Australia

1 ABSTRACT

2 The unprecedented scale of testing required to effectively control the coronavirus 3 disease (COVID-19) pandemic has necessitated urgent implementation of rapid 4 testing in clinical microbiology laboratories. To date, there are limited data available 5 on the analytical performance of emerging commercially available assays for severe 6 acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) and integration of these 7 assays into laboratory workflows. Here, we performed a prospective validation study 8 of a commercially available assay, the AusDiagnostics Coronavirus Typing (8-well) 9 assay. Respiratory tract samples for SARS-CoV-2 testing were collected between 1st 10 March and 25th March 2020. All positive samples and a random subset of negative 11 samples were sent to a reference laboratory for confirmation. In total, 2,673 samples 12 were analyzed using the Coronavirus Typing assay. The predominant sample type 13 was a combined nasopharyngeal/throat swab (2,640/2,673; 98.8%). Fifty-four 14 patients were positive for SARS-CoV-2 (0.02%) using the Coronavirus Typing assay; 15 53/54 (98.1%) positive results and 621/621 (100%) negative results were concordant 16 with the reference laboratory. Compared to the reference standard, sensitivity of the 17 Coronavirus Typing assay for SARS-CoV-2 was 100% [95% CI 93.2%-100%], 18 specificity 99.8% [95% CI 99.1%-100%], positive predictive value 98.1% (95% CI 19 90.2%-99.7%] and negative predictive value 100% [95% CI 99.4%-100%]. In many 20 countries, standard regulatory requirements for the introduction of new assays have 21 been replaced by emergency authorizations and it is critical that laboratories share 22 their post-market validation experiences, as the consequences of widespread 23 introduction of a sub-optimal assay for SARS-CoV-2 are profound. Here, we share 24 our in-field experience, and encourage other laboratories to follow suit.

25

26 1. INTRODUCTION

27	The coronavirus disease (COVID-19) pandemic caused by severe acute respiratory
28	syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) is a global public health emergency on an
29	unprecedented scale. One of the fundamental pillars in the prevention and control of
30	COVID-19 is timely, scalable and accurate diagnostic testing. Initial laboratory
31	responses included early characterization and release of the viral whole genome
32	sequence by Chinese investigators in early January 2020 ¹ , which enabled rapid
33	development of real-time reverse-transcription polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR)
34	workflows for detection of SARS-CoV-2. In many settings, testing was initially
35	conducted using in-house RT-PCR assays in public health laboratories ²⁻⁶ .
36	However, the sheer scale of testing required to effectively control this pandemic
37	means there is an urgent need for rapid, sensitive and specific testing in routine
38	clinical microbiology laboratories beyond the public health laboratory setting.
39	
40	In many countries, the need for rapid introduction of SARS-CoV-2 testing has
41	resulted in rapid changes or extensions to existing regulatory frameworks. For
42	example, in the United States (US) the US Food and Drug Association (FDA) began
43	allowing SARS-CoV-2 testing using laboratory-developed tests without prior agency
44	approval on 29 th February 2020, as long as laboratories submitted an Emergency
45	Use Authorization application within 15 days ⁷ . In Australia, the Commonwealth
46	Department of Health exempted medical devices related to the diagnosis,
47	confirmatory testing, prevention, monitoring, treatment or alleviation of COVID-19
48	infection from the requirement for devices to be included in the Therapeutic Goods
49	
	Administration (TGA) Australian Register of Therapeutic Goods (ARTG) ahead of

Laboratory Network of Australasia (PHLN)⁸ and expanded these exemptions to 51

include all accredited pathology laboratories on 22nd March 2020 ⁹. 52

гэ

53	
54	A range of commercially available RT-PCR assays are now approved for use in
55	diagnostic laboratories in Australia ¹⁰ , although to date, there are little published data
56	on the performance characteristics and implementation of these assays in diagnostic
57	microbiology workflows ¹¹ . Here, we describe our initial experience using a
58	commercially-available multiplex two-step nested tandem RT-PCR assay for the
59	detection of coronaviruses that infect humans, including SARS-CoV-2. We
60	demonstrate high sensitivity and specificity for this assay, and describe rapid
61	upscaling and integration into our laboratory workflow.
62	
63	METHODS
64	Study setting, testing timeline and patient populations
65	This study was conducted in the Department of Microbiology, Royal Melbourne
66	Hospital (RMH). RMH is an academic teaching hospital located in central Melbourne,
67	Victoria, Australia, that has approximately 1,400 beds across hospital and
68	community settings. On 25 th January 2020, a dedicated screening clinic for patients
69	with suspected COVID-19 was implemented at RMH 12 , and on 11 th March 2020 a
70	separate clinic was established at RMH for healthcare workers with suspected
71	COVID-19. From 23 rd January to 13 th March 2020, diagnostic testing of RMH patients
72	for SARS-CoV-2 was performed at the Victorian Infectious Diseases Reference
73	Laboratory (VIDRL). On 3 rd March 2020, testing was implemented in the RMH
74	laboratory using the Coronavirus Typing (8-well) panel (AusDiagnostics, Mascot,
75	Australia).

76

77 Patient samples

78	Study samples were collected as part of routine clinical care between 1 st March 2020
79	and 25 th March 2020. Samples comprised combined nasopharyngeal and throat
80	swabs collected in universal transport media (Copan Diagnostics, Murrieta, USA) or
81	Liquid Amies transport media (Copan Diagnostics, Murrieta, USA), sputum, tracheal
82	aspirates, bronchoalveolar lavage and bronchial washings. Victorian Department of
83	Health guidelines during this period limited testing to patients who met at least one
84	clinical (fever or acute respiratory infection) and one epidemiological criteria for
85	COVID-19 (international travel with onset of symptoms within 14 days of return;
86	close contact of confirmed COVID-19 case with onset of symptoms within 14 days of
87	last contact; healthcare or residential aged care workers; aged and residential care
88	residents; patients who are Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander); or patients
89	admitted to hospital with acute respiratory tract infection and fever ¹³ .
90	

91 Diagnostic testing

92 RNA was extracted from 200uL of clinical samples using either the viral RNA mini kit 93 (QIAGEN, Hilden, Germany) on the EZ1 Advanced system (QIAGEN, Hilden, 94 Germany) or the MT-PREP Extractor System (AusDiagnostics, Mascot, Australia). 95 On both platforms, RNA was eluted in 60uL. Extracted RNA was subsequently 96 tested using the Coronavirus Typing assay. This is a two-step, hemi-nested 97 multiplex tandem PCR, with seven coronavirus RNA targets (Table 1) plus a 98 proprietary artificial sequence as an internal control. Currently, it is intended for use 99 as a research use only (RUO) assay, meaning that it can be used for SARS-CoV-2 100 testing as long as the testing laboratory is able to provide robust validation data. The

101	High-Plex 24 system (AusDiagnostics, Mascot, Australia) was used to perform the
102	two-step real-time RT-PCR. In each run, the following controls were used: (i) a
103	negative control comprising PCR grade sterile water; (ii) a proprietary artificial target
104	sequence used as an internal control to monitor sample inhibition, and (iii) an
105	external positive control, which initially comprised SARS-2-CoV complementary DNA
106	(cDNA), pending the availability of gamma-irradiated SARS-CoV-2 in mid-March.
107	
108	In keeping with national guidelines regarding the validation of new diagnostic assays
109	for SARS-CoV-2 ^{14, 15} and in order to generate sufficient validation data, all samples
110	were initially tested in parallel with Victoria's virology reference laboratory, VIDRL. At
111	the reference laboratory, testing was first conducted using an in-house assay for the
112	SARS-CoV-2 RdRp gene ¹⁶ . If positive, subsequent testing for the SARS-CoV-2 E
113	gene was conducted, using previously published primers ² . All samples that tested
114	positive for SARS-CoV-2 using the Coronavirus Typing assay were sent to the
115	reference laboratory for confirmatory testing. Further, a subset of samples that
116	tested negative on the Coronavirus Typing assay were also tested at the reference
117	laboratory in order to provide additional specificity data. Prior to commencement of
118	clinical testing the reference laboratory also provided a blinded quality assessment
119	panel containing a dilution series of samples of standard culture medium spiked in
120	duplicate with gamma-irradiated culture supernatants of a SARS-CoV-2 isolate,

121 described previously ¹⁶.

122

Samples that had a negative result on the Coronavirus Typing assay and the VIDRL
 RdRP assay were considered a true negative result. Samples that had a positive
 result for SARS-CoV-2 on the Coronavirus Typing assay were tested on both the

- 126 RdRP and E gene assays at the reference laboratory. Two concordant positive
- 127 results between the 3 assays were considered a true positive result. Samples with a
- single positive assay result were considered discrepant.
- 129

130 Statistical analyses

- 131 Sensitivity, specificity, positive predictive value and negative predictive value were
- 132 reported with 95% confidence intervals. Spearman's rank correlation was used to
- examine the association between viral concentration and days from symptom onset.
- All statistical analyses were performed using R (version 3.53). A p value \leq 0.05 was
- 135 considered statistically significant.
- 136

137 **RESULTS**

138 Characteristics of the study population and diagnostic testing results

139 Over the study period, a total of 2,673 patient samples were analyzed using the

- 140 Coronavirus Typing assay. The predominant sample type was a combined
- 141 nasopharyngeal/throat swab (2640/2673; 98.8%); with lower respiratory tract

samples comprising 33/2,673 (1.2%) of samples (18 sputa, 7 tracheal aspirates, 4

- bronchial washes and 4 bronchoalveolar lavage specimens). Overall, 1,129 (42%)
- 144 patients were male. The median age of patients was 35 years [interquartile range
- 145 (IQR); 28-50 years]. Most samples were collected through the dedicated COVID-19
- screening clinic in the Emergency Department (2,002/2,673 samples; 74.9%), with
- 147 513/2,673 (19.2%) samples from the dedicated COVID-19 staff testing clinic,
- 148 108/2,673 (4%) from other inpatient wards, 30/2,673 (1.1%) from outpatient clinics
- and 20/2,673 (0.7%) from the intensive care unit.
- 150

164	Assay performance
163	
162	result for SARS-CoV-2 positive results was 13 hours [IQR; 10-21 hours].
161	days [IQR; 1-5 days] and the median turn-around time from sample collection to
160	positive patients, the median time from onset of symptoms to swab collection was 3
159	19 case), suggesting possible community transmission. Of the 54 SARS-CoV-2
158	no clear epidemiological link (no international travel or known contact with a COVID-
157	hospital, however no patients required intensive care unit support. One patient had
156	patients (7%) were healthcare workers. Four patients (7.4%) required admission to
155	known cases of COVID-19 and 15 patients (28%) had both of these risk factors. Four
154	from international travel in the preceding 14 days, 27 patients (50%) were contacts of
153	patients was 40 years [IQR 29-51 years]. Forty-one patients (76%) had returned
152	(0.02%). Of these, 33/54 were male (61%). The median age of PCR-positive
151	Of the 2,673 patient samples tested, 54 patients were positive for SARS-CoV-2

All 54 positive samples were sent to the reference laboratory for confirmation, and a 165 166 random subset of 621/2,673 negative samples (23%) was also tested at the 167 reference laboratory. Of the 54 positive results, 53 were positive on at least one 168 confirmatory assay at VIDRL. Of the 621 randomly selected negative samples that 169 were sent to the reference laboratory, all were confirmed as negative. Compared to 170 the reference standard, sensitivity of the Coronavirus Typing assay for SARS-CoV-2 171 was 100% [95% CI 93.2%-100%], specificity 99.8% [95% CI 99.1%-100%], positive 172 predictive value 98.1% (95% CI 90.2%-99.7%) and negative predictive value 100% 173 [95% CI 99.4%-100%].

174

175	Importantly, there was a single discrepant sample that tested positive on the
176	AusDiagnostics Coronavirus Typing assay, and negative on the RdRP and E gene
177	assays at VIDRL. This sample had a melt curve at the appropriate temperature on
178	the AusDiagnostics assay and had a low semi-quantitative concentration of SARS-
179	CoV-2. Testing of multiple replicates of this sample at VIDRL disclosed a pattern of
180	results typical of a sample at the limit of detection in the reference assays: positive in
181	some replicates at high cycle threshold values, and negative in others (data not
182	shown). This sample was collected 4 days after symptom onset from a patient with
183	who had recently returned from international travel and had contact with a known
184	case of COVID-19. Given the public health consequences of reporting a false-
185	negative result, we elected to report this result as a 'probable low positive result.'
186	
187	The comparative results of the quality assessment panel from the reference
188	laboratory are shown in Supplementary Table 1. All samples were extracted on both
189	the EZ1 Advanced system and the MT-PREP Extractor System. SARS-CoV-2 was
190	detected in all 12 gamma-irradiated SARS-CoV-2 spiked samples from a blinded set
191	of 20 samples using the Coronavirus Typing assay (Supplementary Table 1).
192	
193	Other respiratory pathogens were detected in 191/2,673 (7%) samples, with
194	seasonal coronaviruses accounting for 119/191 (62%) of these infections.
195	Coinfection with SARS-CoV-2 was detected on two occasions, one in combination
196	with RSV and another with human coronavirus OC43 (Supplementary Table 2).
197	
198	A weak inverse correlation was demonstrated between the semi-quantitative

199 assessment of viral concentration of SARS-CoV-2 using the Coronavirus Typing

assay and the time of swab collection after symptom onset ($r^2 = -0.3357$; p=0.01)

201 with the highest viral concentrations detected in the first 24-48 hours after symptom

202 onset (Figure 1).

203

204 Integration into workflow

The number of samples received for SARS-CoV-2 increased rapidly after the

implementation of testing at RMH, with over 200 samples received per day by the

second week of testing (Figure 2A). We undertook an internal audit assessing the

time of day that specimens arrived in the laboratory; we identified that the majority of

samples arrived in the afternoon and evening, rather than in the morning (Figure 2B).

210 This information enabled us to rapidly adjust work rosters for our specialist molecular

scientific staff rostering in order to optimize our SARS-CoV-2 testing workflow. This

adjustment allowed the laboratory to consistently achieve turnaround times of less

than 24 hours for coronavirus testing (Figure 2C).

214

215 **DISCUSSION**

216 Initial diagnostic testing for SARS-CoV-2 in low prevalence, high resource settings

217 was focused in public health labs, generally using in-house real-time RT-PCR

assays recommended to the World Health Organization (WHO)^{2, 15}. However, as the

219 COVID-19 pandemic has rapidly evolved, the focus of testing has shifted to

220 diagnostic testing in clinical microbiology laboratories to enable the delivery of

221 clinical care ⁷. The emergency exemptions instituted by national regulatory bodies

such as the FDA in the US and the TGA in Australia have led to expedited approvals

223 for in-vitro diagnostic tests to be generated based only on information provided by

the manufacturer and limited external validation (https://www.tga.gov.au/covid-19-

test-kits-included-artg-legal-supply-australia). There is thus an urgent need for robust
clinical validation data to support the use of commercial assays for SARS-CoV-2
testing. Here, we provide validation of a commercially-available assay, and describe
how we integrated testing for SARS-CoV-2 into a busy academic hospital laboratory.

230 Our early experience of testing for SARS-CoV-2 is similar to other early data from low incidence settings ^{17, 18}. This initial cohort of patients with COVID-19 was 231 232 predominantly returning international travelers; and half had known contact with a 233 confirmed COVID-19 case. In general, patients were younger than those seen in 234 higher incidence settings where community transmission has been established ¹⁹. 235 These findings may be impacted by selection bias, given the Victorian Department of 236 Health guidelines in place at the time of this study mostly limited testing to those with 237 epidemiological risk factors for COVID-19. At the beginning of this study, only limited community transmission had been established in Australia²⁰, with the situation 238 239 evolving such that on the last date of patient inclusion, 2,799 cases had been 240 confirmed in Australia, with 547 new cases in the previous 24 hours and 11 total 241 deaths²¹. Significant public health measures designed to mitigate the clinical, 242 societal and economic impact of COVID-19 were instituted in a staged manner 243 during this study period including international travel restrictions and increasing 244 social distancing measures ²².

245

Similar to other studies, we describe a correlation between days after symptom
onset and concentration of SARS-CoV-2, with the highest concentrations
demonstrated early after symptom onset, ²³⁻²⁵. This suggests that SARS-CoV-2 can
be transmitted early in disease, even when symptoms are relatively mild and often

prior to patients seeking medical attention and the diagnosis of COVID-19 being
 established. This may account for the efficient person-to-person transmission noted
 ²⁶, particularly within families and social gatherings ^{27, 28}. This finding has significant
 implications for infection control and public health measures required to mitigate this
 disease.

255

256 Compared to a public health laboratory reference standard, we found that the 257 Coronavirus Typing assay had high sensitivity, specificity and negative predictive 258 value, and in our laboratory, was well-suited to medium-throughput testing for SARS-259 CoV-2 (100-200 specimens per day). We hypothesize that the single discrepant 260 result (positive on Coronavirus Typing assay and negative at reference laboratory) 261 was due to technical differences in the assay design, with the Coronavirus Typing 262 assay having a hemi-nested design and high number of PCR cycles – it is possible 263 that these technical differences may result in a lower limit of detection than the public 264 health laboratory reference standard. In addition, testing on the original referred 265 swab after RMH diagnostic testing had been performed may have diminished the 266 quantity of available input material for testing at the reference laboratory.

267

In order to accommodate the rapid introduction of a high-impact new test, it was necessary to undertake considerable changes to the workflow of the laboratory, with a change in our staffing shift patterns towards late afternoon and evening work. Similar to many clinical microbiology laboratories, molecular work in our laboratory is performed by staff with specific skills in molecular biology. However, in order to accommodate changes in shift pattern (and to ensure a larger pool of staff to perform testing) we introduced a rapid training program for non-molecular staff. Collectively,

these workflow changes enabled us to reduce the turn-around time for producing a
SARS-CoV-2 result, which will be important as the pandemic in Australia evolves
towards clinical care of infected patients.

278

Although a limitation of our study is the single-site design, we provide robust

validation data for a testing platform that is widely used across Australia, and has

also been used in the United States and the United Kingdom ²⁹. In this rapidly

evolving pandemic, where standard regulatory requirements for the introduction of

283 new assays have been replaced by emergency authorizations in many countries,

284 including Australia, it is critical that laboratories share their post-market validation

experiences, as the consequences of widespread introduction of a sub-optimal

assay for SARS-CoV-2 are profound.

287

288 COVID-19 has placed unprecedented demands on clinical microbiology laboratories. 289 In conjunction with the public health units, clinical microbiology laboratories were part of the first 'wave' of response to this pandemic ³⁰. Subsequent waves will relate to 290 291 clinical management, critical care and end of life support for those affected by this disease ³¹⁻³³. In Australia, containment and preparedness measures, particularly 292 293 international travel restrictions, allowed time for clinical microbiology laboratories to 294 review diagnostic assays, develop workflows and implement testing prior to the 295 surge in demand. Here we share our pragmatic 'in-field' experience, and encourage 296 other laboratories to follow suit.

297

298

299

300 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

- 301 We thank staff in the Department of Microbiology at the Royal Melbourne Hospital
- and in the Victorian Infectious Diseases Reference Laboratory for technical support.

303

- 304 FUNDING
- 305 No specific funding was received to conduct this work.
- 306

307 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

308 All authors: no conflicts.

309

310 **ETHICS**

- 311 This study was approved as part of routine activities relating to the introduction and
- validation of in-vitro diagnostic devices QA2019134. Validation studies are a core
- 313 part of laboratory work. This validation study was conducted according to the
- 314 guidelines of the National Pathology Accreditation Advisory Council, '*Requirement*
- 315 for quality control, external quality assurance and method evaluation (sixth

316 *edition*)^{,34}.

- All authors had full access to all of the data (including statistical reports and tables)
- in the study.
- 320
- 321
- 322
- 323
- 324

325 **REFERENCES**

- 326 [1] Zhu N, Zhang D, Wang W, et al. A Novel Coronavirus from Patients with Pneumonia
- 327 in China, 2019. *N Engl J Med*. 2020; 382: 727-33.
- 328 [2] Corman VM, Landt O, Kaiser M, et al. Detection of 2019 novel coronavirus (2019-
- 329 nCoV) by real-time RT-PCR. Euro Surveill. 2020; 25.
- 330 [3] Reusken C, Broberg EK, Haagmans B, et al. Laboratory readiness and response for
- novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV) in expert laboratories in 30 EU/EEA countries, January 2020.
- 332 Euro Surveill. 2020; 25.
- 333 [4] Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. CDC 2019 Novel Coronavirus (2019-
- 334 nCoV) Real-Time RT-PCR Diagnostic Panel. Atlanta: Centers for Disease Control and
- 335 Prevention, 2020.
- 336 [5] Chu DKW, Pan Y, Cheng SMS, et al. Molecular Diagnosis of a Novel Coronavirus
- 337 (2019-nCoV) Causing an Outbreak of Pneumonia. *Clin Chem*. 2020.
- 338 [6] Pfefferle S, Reucher S, Norz D, et al. Evaluation of a quantitative RT-PCR assay for the
- detection of the emerging coronavirus SARS-CoV-2 using a high throughput system. *Euro*
- 340 *Surveill*. 2020; 25.
- 341 [7] Sharfstein JM, Becker SJ, Mello MM. Diagnostic Testing for the Novel Coronavirus.
- 342 JAMA. 2020.
- 343 [8] Therapeutic Goods (Medical Devices—Novel Coronavirus) (Emergency) Exemption
- 344 2020. (Cth)
- 345 [9] Therapeutic Goods (Medical Devices Accredited Pathology Laboratories (COVID-19
- 346 Emergency) Exemption 2020. (Cth)
- 347 [10] Australian Govenrment Department of Health: Therapeutic Goods Administration.
- 348 COVID-19 test kits included on the ARTG for legal supply in Australia. Canberra: Australian

- 349 Government Department of Health, 2020. https://www.tga.gov.au/covid-19-test-kits-
- 350 included-artg-legal-supply-australia. Accessed 12th April, 2020.
- 351 [11] Konrad R, Eberle U, Dangel A, et al. Rapid establishment of laboratory diagnostics for
- the novel coronavirus SARS-CoV-2 in Bavaria, Germany, February 2020. Euro Surveill. 2020;
- 353 25.
- 354 [12] Rojek A DM, Camilleri D, Marshall C, Buising K, Walsham N, Putland M. Early clinical
- 355 response to a high consequence infectious disease outbreak at the Royal Melbourne
- Hospital Emergency Department insights from COVID-19. *Med J Aust*. 2020.
- 357 [13] Victorian Department of Health and Human Services. Coronavirus disease 2019
- 358 (COVID-19): case and contact management guidelines for health services and general
- 359 practitioners. Version 15. 2020.
- 360 [14] National Pathology Accreditation Advisory Council. Requirements for the
- development and use of in-house in vitro diagnostic medical devices (IVDs) (Fourth Edition).
- 362 Canberra: Australian Government Department of Health, 2018.
- 363 [15] Public Health Laboratory Network. PHLN guidance on laboratory testing for SARS-
- CoV-2 (the virus that causes COVID-19). Public Health Laboratory Network, 2020.
- 365 [16] Caly L DJ, Roberts J, Bond K, Tran T, Kostecki R, Yoga Y, Naughton W, Taiaroa G,
- 366 Seemann T, Schultz MB, Howden BP, Korman TM, Lewin SR, Williamson DA, Catton M.
- 367 Isolation and rapid sharing of the 2019 novel coronavirus (SARS-CoV-2) from the first
- diagnostis of COVID-19 in Australia. *Med J Aust*. 2020.
- 369 [17] Ng Y, Li Z, Chua YX, et al. Evaluation of the Effectiveness of Surveillance and
- 370 Containment Measures for the First 100 Patients with COVID-19 in Singapore January 2-
- 371 February 29, 2020. *MMWR*. 2020; 69: 307-11.

- 372 [18] Spiteri G, Fielding J, Diercke M, et al. First cases of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-
- 19) in the WHO European Region, 24 January to 21 February 2020. *Euro Surveill*. 2020; 25.
- 374 [19] Onder G, Rezza G, Brusaferro S. Case-Fatality Rate and Characteristics of Patients
- 375 Dying in Relation to COVID-19 in Italy. JAMA. 2020.
- 376 [20] World Health Organization. Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) Situation Report -
- 377 42, 2nd March 2020. Geneva: World Health Organization.
- 378 [21] World Health Organization. Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) Situation Report -
- 379 66, 26 March 2020. Geneva: World Health Organization.
- 380 [22] Australian Govenrment Department of Health. Government response to the COVID-
- 381 19 outbreak. Canberra, 2020. https://www.health.gov.au/news/health-alerts/novel-
- 382 <u>coronavirus-2019-ncov-health-alert/government-response-to-the-covid-19-outbreak</u>.
- 383 Accessed 12th April, 2020.
- 384 [23] To KK, Tsang OT, Leung WS, et al. Temporal profiles of viral load in posterior
- 385 oropharyngeal saliva samples and serum antibody responses during infection by SARS-CoV-
- 386 2: an observational cohort study. *Lancet Infect Dis.* 2020.
- 387 [24] Kim JY, Ko JH, Kim Y, et al. Viral Load Kinetics of SARS-CoV-2 Infection in First Two
- 388 Patients in Korea. J Korean Medl Sci. 2020; 35: e86.
- 389 [25] Zou L, Ruan F, Huang M, et al. SARS-CoV-2 Viral Load in Upper Respiratory Specimens
- 390 of Infected Patients. *N Engl J Med*. 2020; 382: 1177-79.
- 391 [26] Li Q, Guan X, Wu P, et al. Early Transmission Dynamics in Wuhan, China, of Novel
- 392 Coronavirus–Infected Pneumonia. *N Eng J Med*. 2020; 382: 1199-207.
- 393 [27] Pung R, Chiew CJ, Young BE, et al. Investigation of three clusters of COVID-19 in
- Singapore: implications for surveillance and response measures. *Lancet*. 2020; 395: 1039-46.

395	[28]	Chan JF-W, Yuan S, Kok K-H, et al. A familial cluster of pneumonia associated with	
396	the 2019 novel coronavirus indicating person-to-person transmission: a study of a family		
397	cluster	r. Lancet. 2020; 395: 514-23.	
398	[29]	Meunier D, Woodford N, Hopkins KL. Evaluation of the AusDiagnostics MT CRE EU	
399	assay for the detection of carbapenemase genes and transferable colistin resistance		
400	determinants mcr-1/-2 in MDR Gram-negative bacteria. J Antimicrob Chemother. 2018; 73		
401	3355-58.		
402	[30]	Binnicker MJ. Emergence of a Novel Coronavirus Disease (COVID-19) and the	
403	Import	tance of Diagnostic Testing: Why Partnership between Clinical Laboratories, Public	
404	Health	Agencies, and Industry Is Essential to Control the Outbreak. Clin Chem. 2020.	
405	[31]	Poston JT, Patel BK, Davis AM. Management of Critically Ill Adults With COVID-19.	
406	JAMA	2020.	
407	[32]	Murthy S, Gomersall CD, Fowler RA. Care for Critically Ill Patients With COVID-19.	
408	JAMA.	2020.	
409	[33]	Curtis JR, Kross EK, Stapleton RD. The Importance of Addressing Advance Care	
410	Planni	ng and Decisions About Do-Not-Resuscitate Orders During Novel Coronavirus 2019	
411	(COVII	D-19). JAMA. 2020.	
412	[34]	National Pathology Accreditation Advisory Council. Requirements for Quality	
413	Contro	ol, External Quality Assurance and Method Evaluation (Sixth edition 2018). Canberra:	
414	Austra	lian Government Department of Health; 2018.	
415			
416			

- 417
- 418

419 **TABLE**

Table 1. Viral targets present in the AusDiagnostics Coronavirus Typing Assay

	Virus assay	Genetic Target of RT-PCR
		Sequence
	HCoV-HKU1	Nucleocapsid
	HCoV-OC43	Nucleocapsid
	HCoV-229E	Membrane protein
	HCoV-NL63	Membrane protein
	MERS-CoV	Orf1ab
	SARS-CoV	Orf1ab
	SARS-CoV-2	Orf1ab
421	Abbreviations: CoV, coronavirus; HCoV, hum	an coronavirus; MERS, Middle Eastern
422	respiratory syndrome; Orf, open reading fra	ame; SARS, Severe acute respiratory
423	syndrome.	
424		
425		
426		
427		
428		
429		
430		
431		
432		
433		

435 **FIGURE LEGENDS**

- 436 **Figure 1.** Box-plot of Coronavirus Typing assay semi-quantitative concentration
- 437 value relative to the date a nasopharyngeal/throat swab was taken for SARS-CoV-2
- 438 after symptom onset. The solid line represents the median and the whiskers
- 439 represent the interquartile range
- 440 **Figure 2**: A) Number of SARS-CoV-2 tests performed using the Coronavirus Typing
- 441 assay per day; B) Number of samples received by hour of the day for SARS-CoV-2
- 442 during the study period; C) Median turnaround time for SARS-CoV-2 testing from
- sample collection to result availability per day





Figure 1 Legend. Box-plot of Coronavirus Typing assay semi-quantitative concentration value relative to the date a nasopharyngeal/throat swab was taken for SARS-CoV-2 after symptom onset. The solid line represent the median and the whiskers represent the interquartile range

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.03.20117267; this version posted June 5, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission. Figure 2. Characteristics of samples received for SARS-CoV-2 testing during the

validation study period.

С.







medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.03.20117267; this version posted June 5, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission. Figure 2 Legend. A) Number of SARS-CoV-2 tests performed using the Coronavirus

Typing assay per day; B) Number of samples received by hour of the day for SARS-

CoV-2 during the study period; C) Median turnaround time for SARS-CoV-2 testing

from sample collection to result availability per day