

1 **Rapid implementation of SARS-CoV-2 emergency use authorization RT-PCR**  
2 **testing and experience at an academic medical institution**

3  
4 P. Velu<sup>1</sup>, A. Craney<sup>1</sup>, P. Ruggiero<sup>2</sup>, J. Siple<sup>2</sup>, L. Cong<sup>2</sup>, Erika M. Hissong<sup>2</sup>, M. Loda<sup>1</sup>, L.  
5 F. Westblade<sup>1,3</sup>, M. Cushing<sup>1</sup>, and H. Rennert<sup>1\*</sup>

6  
7 <sup>1</sup>Department of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine, Weill Cornell Medicine, New York,  
8 NY; <sup>2</sup>NewYork-Presbyterian Hospital-Weill Cornell Medicine, New York, NY; <sup>3</sup>Division of  
9 Infectious Diseases, Department of Medicine, Weill Cornell Medicine, New York, NY

10

11

12 Running title: SARS-CoV-2 testing by real-time RT-PCR

13

14 Keywords: coronavirus disease 19 (COVID-19), New York City, real-time reverse  
15 transcription-polymerase chain reaction (rRT-PCR), severe acute respiratory syndrome  
16 coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2)

17

18

19 \*Correspondence to: Hanna Rennert

20 Department of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine

21 Weill Cornell Medicine

22 545 East 68 Street, New York, NY 10065

23 Email: har2006@med.cornell.edu

24

25 **ABSTRACT**

26 An epidemic caused by an outbreak of severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2  
27 (SARS-CoV-2) in China in December 2019 has since rapidly spread internationally, requiring  
28 urgent response from the clinical diagnostics community. We present a detailed overview of  
29 the clinical validation and implementation of the first laboratory-developed real-time reverse-  
30 transcription-PCR (rRT-PCR) test offered in the NewYork-Presbyterian Hospital system  
31 following the emergency use authority (EUA) guidance issued by the US Food and Drug  
32 Administration. Validation was performed on nasopharyngeal and sputum specimens  
33 (n=124) using newly designed dual-target rRT-PCR (Altona RealStar® SARS-CoV-2  
34 Reagent) for detecting of SARS-CoV-2 in upper respiratory and lower respiratory tract  
35 specimens, including bronchoalveolar lavage and tracheal aspirates. Accuracy testing  
36 demonstrated excellent assay agreement between expected and observed values. The limit  
37 of detection (LOD) was 2.7 and 23.0 gene copies/reaction for nasopharyngeal and sputum  
38 specimens, respectively. Retrospective analysis of 1,694 tests from 1,571 patients revealed  
39 increased positivity in older patients and males compared to females, and an increasing  
40 positivity rate from approximately 20% at the start of testing to 50% at the end of testing three  
41 weeks later. Our findings demonstrate that the assay accurately and sensitively identifies  
42 SARS-CoV-2 in multiple specimen types in the clinical setting and summarizes clinical data  
43 from early in the epidemic in New York City.

44

45

46

47

## 48 INTRODUCTION

49 The novel coronavirus SARS CoV-2 is a member of the *Betacoronavirus* genera in the  
50 subfamily *Coronavirinae*, which is known to cause respiratory illness and gastroenteritis  
51 in humans and other mammals [1, 2]. Two other *Betacoronavirus* that have met with  
52 global attention are SARS-CoV (2002) and MERS-CoV (2012). An outbreak of  
53 respiratory disease caused by SARS-CoV-2, first detected in Wuhan, China at the end of  
54 December 2019, rapidly spread to other countries, including the United States [3, 4],  
55 resulting in New York City in particular becoming an epicenter of the pandemic [5]. Given  
56 the devastating impact on the healthcare system and the need for accurate and quick  
57 diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2 infection the United States Food and Drug Administration  
58 (FDA) has established a rapid pathway for using laboratory-developed tests (LDTs) that  
59 was outlined in a guidance document published on February 29, 2020 [6]. According to  
60 this guidance SARS-CoV-2 testing may be performed by CLIA-certified high-complexity  
61 molecular laboratories under Emergency Use Authorization (EUA) according to a set of  
62 recommendations regarding the minimum validation required for ensuring the analytical  
63 and clinical validity of the test. Details of the test and validation must be submitted by the  
64 laboratory to the FDA through an EUA application within 15 days of initiating testing, after  
65 which testing may continue provisionally until a decision by the FDA is rendered.

66  
67 The Center for Disease Control (CDC) and the New York State Department of Health  
68 (NYS DOH) had designed and manufactured new test kits for SARS-CoV-2. However,  
69 very few laboratories were able to get access to these reagents, and their use has been  
70 limited by the need for specific instruments, which were not available in our institution.  
71 Additionally, limited access to SARS-CoV-2 RNA reference control material presented a  
72 significant hurdle to the validation process. The FDA EUA announcement allowed  
73 laboratories to procure SARS-CoV-2 RNA from the World Reference Center for Emerging  
74 Viruses and Arboviruses (WRCEVA) or the National Institutes of Health (NIH) Biodefense  
75 and Emerging Infections Research Resources Repository (BEI).

76  
77 The scale of demand for diagnostic testing and the shortage of supplies led to the need  
78 for a high throughput diagnostic test that could be readily implemented in a variety of

79 laboratories. Here we describe how in less than five days, our institution validated and  
80 submitted for FDA EUA approval the research use only (RUO) RealStar® SARS-CoV-2  
81 Reagent Kit 1.0 (Altona Diagnostics) test. Comparable validation studies that can take  
82 months were completed within a week. We also detail workflow considerations and  
83 results from three weeks of testing from March 11, 2020, through March 31, 2020, during  
84 the early days of the COVID-19 outbreak in New York City.

85

## 86 **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

### 87 *SARS-CoV-2 RNA control material*

88 We obtained SARS-CoV-2 RNA reference material from WRCEVA (University of Texas  
89 Medical Branch, Galveston, TX, Strain USA\_WA1/2020, Lot TVP 23156, RNA  
90 preparation date 2/21/2020) for use in clinical evaluation and limit of detection (LOD)  
91 studies. We used this RNA reference material to perform LOD dilution series experiments  
92 and to create contrived positive samples for accuracy studies by spiking it into pooled  
93 leftover negative patient specimens.

94

### 95 *Validation samples and clinical cohort*

96 An in-house validation panel consisting of a total of 124 contrived samples and patient  
97 specimens, including NP (64) and sputum (60) specimen types, was used for the  
98 validation. Samples were obtained from individuals suspected of respiratory tract  
99 infections. All NP samples had been clinically tested for the presence of twenty-one  
100 common respiratory viruses using our institution's respiratory virus panel, the  
101 commercially available BioFire FilmArray® Respiratory Pathogen 2 (RP2) panel (BioFire  
102 Diagnostics, LLC, Salt Lake City, USA). Reactive clinical samples consisted of four  
103 patient specimens confirmed to have SARS-CoV-2 by the New York City-Department of  
104 Health and Mental Hygiene (NYC-DOH) using the NYS-DOH SARS-CoV-2 EUA assay  
105 and samples contrived by spiking WRCEVA RNA material into pooled leftover negative  
106 clinical specimens.

107

108 Additionally, we performed a retrospective analysis of patient characteristics on 1,694  
109 consecutive upper respiratory tract (URT) specimens tested on the assay obtained from

110 1,571 patients with high suspicion for COVID-19 that were treated at NewYork  
111 Presbyterian Hospital (NYPH) campuses from March 11 to March 31, 2020. The IRB  
112 Committee at Weill Cornell Medicine (WCM) approved this study.

113

#### 114 *Real time reverse-transcription PCR testing*

115 Automated extraction of total nucleic acid (TNA) was performed on 200  $\mu$ L of NP swab  
116 viral transport media (VTM) following an off-board lysis viral inactivation step, using the  
117 QIA Symphony DSP Virus/Pathogen Mini Kit coupled on the QIA Symphony SP (Qiagen,  
118 Germantown, MD), with a resulting eluate volume of 60  $\mu$ L. The viral inactivation step  
119 was performed in a class 2 biosafety cabinet using personal protective equipment  
120 following our hospital biosafety policies. For sputum, 100  $\mu$ L of specimen was first  
121 treated with 0.3% dithiothreitol (DTT) solution (1:1 ratio) and incubated at 37° C for 30  
122 minutes to reduce viscosity. One-step reverse transcription to cDNA and rRT-PCR of  
123 viral targets (Envelope and Spike genes) and internal control (IC) was performed using  
124 10  $\mu$ L TNA eluate and the RealStar® SARS-CoV-2 real-time RT-PCR Kit 1.0 (Altona  
125 Diagnostics GmbH, Hamburg, Germany) on the Rotor-Gene Q Thermocycler (Qiagen) for  
126 a total volume of 30  $\mu$ L per reaction. PCR amplification and detection were performed  
127 using multi-color fluorescent dye-labeled probes for the identification and differentiation  
128 of B-betacoronavirus (B- $\beta$ CoV) and SARS-CoV-2 specific RNA and the detection of the  
129 IC within one reaction, allowing for higher throughput testing compared to the CDC assay.  
130 Samples in which both the E gene target (all B- $\beta$ CoV) and the S gene target (SARS-CoV-  
131 2 specific), or the S gene target only were detected within the first 40 cycles of  
132 amplification were considered “Detected”. Samples with cycle threshold (Ct) values  $\geq$   
133 40.0 were considered negative. Each run contained an external positive control (1:10<sup>3</sup>  
134 WRCEVA RNA dilution), positive kit control (synthetic B- $\beta$ CoV and SARS-CoV-2 RNA),  
135 SARS-CoV-2 NP negative control, and a non-template control (NTC).

136

#### 137 *Assay Performance characteristics*

138 The FDA EUA mechanism specified four distinct performance characteristics consisting  
139 of limit of detection (LOD), inclusivity (analytical sensitivity) cross-reactivity (analytical  
140 specificity), and clinical evaluation (accuracy) studies. For the LOD studies, SARS-CoV-

141 2 inactivated virus or RNA spiked into artificial or real clinical matrix was acceptable, as  
142 long as the matrix was from the most difficult specimen type accepted for testing on the  
143 clinical assay (in decreasing order of difficulty: sputum, other lower respiratory tract  
144 specimens, and NP or oropharyngeal (OP) swabs collected and transported in viral  
145 transport media). NP and sputum samples were tested on the Altona RealStar® rRT-PCR  
146 assay to ensure the absence of SARS-CoV-2 and pooled for use as a matrix for spiking  
147 in RNA for LOD studies and accuracy studies. Six ten-fold serial dilutions ( $1 \times 10^1$  to  $1 \times$   
148  $10^7$ ) were performed with three replicates at each concentration by spiking WRCEVA  
149 RNA reference material (60,000 pfu/ $\mu$ L stock WRCEVA RNA reference material;  $\sim 6 \times 10^7$   
150 genomic copies/ $\mu$ L) into NP and sputum eluates obtained from pooled-negative patient  
151 NP or sputum specimens. The dilutions at the LOD were performed by spiking 1  $\mu$ L of  
152  $1:10^5$  dilution to 60  $\mu$ L eluate, yielding a concentration of 0.01 pfu/ $\mu$ L = 10 pfu/mL  
153 ( $\sim 10,000$  copies/mL). Assay performance at the determined LOD was confirmed with at  
154 least 20 additional replicates for each type of sample (sputum and NP).

155  
156 For the accuracy studies, a total of 64 positive (34 NP and 30 sputum specimens,  
157 respectively) specimens and 60 negative (30 NP swabs and 30 sputum) specimens that  
158 tested negative for SARS-CoV-2 were used. Positive specimens were either contrived  
159 positive samples generated by spiking WRCEVA RNA reference material into pooled  
160 leftover negative NP or sputum specimens or real patient specimens, as described above.  
161 Twenty of the contrived clinical specimens were spiked at a concentration of 1x-2x LoD,  
162 with the remainder of samples spanning the assay testing range. FDA defines the  
163 acceptance criteria for the performance as 95% agreement at 1x-2x LOD, and 100%  
164 agreement at all other concentrations and negative specimens [6].

165  
166 Inclusivity and cross-reactivity studies used a combination of *in silico* and *in vitro*  
167 approaches. As the primer and probe sequences were proprietary to the kit  
168 manufacturer, we included the results of their *in silico* analysis in our EUA application.  
169 Additional studies to determine cross-reactivity were performed in our laboratory by  
170 testing 10 NP samples that were positive by the RP2 for the four human coronaviruses

171 NL63 (n=2), 229E (n=2), OC43 (n=4), or HKU1 (n=2), defined as high priority pathogens  
172 from the same genetic family by the FDA.

173

#### 174 *Data analysis and statistical methods*

175 Data analyses, including statistics and plot generation, were performed using R  
176 programming language v 3.6.0 [7]. LOD was determined through a probit regression  
177 model using the glm function following CLSI EP17A2E Guidance with Application to  
178 Quantitative Molecular Measurement Procedures [8].

179

## 180 **RESULTS**

### 181 Validation of Assay

#### 182 *a. Limit of detection*

183 Dilution series studies on pooled negative NP specimens spiked with WRCEVA RNA  
184 reference material, with three replicates across a viral range of 1 gene copy/reaction to  
185 1,000,000 gene copies/reaction (1 to 6 log<sub>10</sub>), demonstrated an accurate and linear  
186 response across five logs of detection for NP and four logs of detection for sputum (**Table**  
187 **1, Figure 1**). Probit analysis was applied to the NP data after an additional five replicates  
188 of testing were performed at 0.8, 0.6, 0.5, 0.4, and 0.2 gene copies/reaction, and  
189 narrowed the LOD to 2.7 gene copies/reaction at 95% detection rate (**Figure 2**). A similar  
190 LOD series and probit analysis was performed on sputum at 80, 60, 50, 40, and 20 gene  
191 copies/reaction, and resulted in a lower sensitivity with a LOD of 23.0 gene  
192 copies/reaction at 95% detection rate in sputum compared to NP specimens. For both  
193 NP and sputum specimens, 20/20 and 23/23 additional replicates tested at their LODs,  
194 respectively, resulted as positive.

195

#### 196 *b. Inclusivity and Specificity*

197 The *in silico* analysis for inclusivity that was performed by the manufacturer of the kit  
198 found 100% homology of the E gene and S gene forward and reverse primers and probes  
199 with 563 whole-genome sequences of SARS-CoV-2 published in GISAID and NCBI as of  
200 3/16/2020 [9]. The *in silico* analysis for cross-reactivity that was performed by the  
201 manufacturer found that the S gene and E gene forward and reverse primers and probes

202 had less than 80% homology with the vast majority of 40 different pathogens (125 strains  
203 total) tested (see Supplementary Material). In cases with greater than 80% homology,  
204 cross-reactivity was not a concern as only the forward or reverse primer, but never both  
205 primers were affected, thus rendering amplification impossible. Additionally, all ten  
206 samples that had human coronaviruses NL63, 229E, OC43, or HKU1 detected by RP2  
207 panel tested negative for SARS-CoV-2 on the RealStar® rRT-PCR assay.

208

### 209 *c. Clinical evaluation-Accuracy*

210 All 30 NP specimens that tested negative on the RP2 panel also tested negative on the  
211 SARS-CoV-2 rRT-PCR assay (**Table 2**). Leftover VTM from these negative specimens  
212 was pooled to create a sample matrix for the LOD and contrived positive sample studies.  
213 Clinical evaluation studies resulted in the detection of SARS-CoV-2 in all specimens  
214 contrived by spiking WRCEVA RNA reference material (n=20) into pooled SARS-CoV-2  
215 negative NP VTM or sputum and all four positive patient samples tested by NYC-DOH  
216 (**Table 2** and **Supplementary Table 1**). The high-positive patient sample run at  
217 successive dilutions (n=10) remained positive throughout the range of concentrations (1:2  
218 to 1:1,024; Ct range, 22-31) (**Figure 1**). Similar clinical evaluation studies were performed  
219 for sputum specimens (**Table 2** and **Supplementary Table 2**), also with 100%  
220 concordance. Validation studies performed on bronchoalveolar lavage (BAL) and  
221 tracheal aspirate specimens and additional sample collection systems (**Table 3** and  
222 **Supplementary Material including Tables 3 and 4**) showed 100% accuracy.

223

### 224 *Clinical cohort characterization*

225 The Altona rRT-PCR SARS-CoV-2 test was used to test NP and OP swabs from March  
226 11, 2020, to March 30, 2020. Starting March 30, 2020, our institution deployed the higher  
227 throughput Roche cobas 6800 SARS-CoV-2 rRT-PCR test (Roche Molecular Systems,  
228 Inc; Branchburg, NJ) [10] to meet increasing specimen volumes. During the initial phase  
229 with only Altona testing, 1,694 tests were performed on 1,372 NP (40% positive), 57 OP  
230 (19% positive), and 311 NP/OP (25% positive) swab specimens from 1,571 patients. Ct  
231 values were not significantly different for the E gene, S gene, and IC targets between  
232 positive NP, OP, or NP/OP samples (**Supplementary Figure 1**). The number of tests



233 with indeterminate or B- $\beta$ CoV results were 5 and 4, respectively, all in NP swab samples.  
234 The mean Ct for E gene, S gene, and IC targets in positive samples were 23.0 (11.1-  
235 40.7), 22.5 (10.3-40.6), and 29.6 (27.0-38.4), respectively (**Figure 3**). Using Ct value of  
236 the S target gene as a surrogate for viral burden, the upper respiratory tract specimens  
237 could be classified into three groups: high (Ct <20; n=222, 34%), medium (Ct 20 -  
238 30, n =335, 52%), and low (Ct > 30, n = 89, 13.8%). Over three weeks of testing, more  
239 than 75% of positive samples could be classified as having medium to high viral burden.

240  
241 Of 135 patients with repeat testing, only 17 had different results on the second test  
242 including 13 patients who first tested negative but subsequently tested positive and three  
243 patients who had virus detected in one specimen type but not the other (NP swab but not  
244 OP swab detected n=1; NP/OP swab but not NP swab detected n=1, and OP swab but  
245 not NP swab detected n=1). One inpatient initially tested positive with B- $\beta$ CoV, and then  
246 positive with medium viral burden SARS-CoV-2 two days later. Twelve of the thirteen  
247 patients who converted from negative to positive were initially tested at the Emergency  
248 Department (ED). On repeat testing performed within three days, 5 had low viral burden,  
249 5 had medium viral burden, and 2 had high viral burden on the positive test. Of the ten  
250 patients with low-medium viral burden, nine subsequently tested positive as inpatients 1-  
251 3 days later, and the tenth tested positive at the ED 3 days later. Two patients tested  
252 positive with high viral burden the next day as inpatients. The thirteenth patient tested  
253 negative as an inpatient and then with high viral burden as an inpatient seven days later.  
254 Of note, while most of the patients in the dataset presented with symptoms and were  
255 being tested for suspected infection with SARS-CoV-2, obstetrics and gynecology (OB)  
256 patients in the labor and delivery wards were being universally screened for SARS-CoV-  
257 2 as a pre-procedural measure to determine if personal protective equipment would be  
258 required during interactions with healthcare workers. This group consisted of 102 female  
259 patients with a 7% positivity rate.

260  
261 Means of turn-around-times from test order to result and time-in-lab to result were 19.8  
262 (13.1-26.2) hours and 11.9 (7.0-24.0) hours, respectively. The percentage of tests with  
263 detected SARS-CoV-2 increased as the weeks progressed, and settled at approximately

264 50% from 3/21/2020 to 3/30/2020 (**Figure 4a**). Most of the samples were from the ED  
265 (n=911), followed by inpatient wards (n=492) and outpatient clinics (n=113) (**Table 4**),  
266 and the highest positivity rate was in the ED with 50% of patients with detected SARS-  
267 CoV-2 (p=0.0005). There was a significant difference in the age (p=0.0005) and gender  
268 (p=0.005), with lower rates of detected virus in younger patients and female patients. Only  
269 7% of patients 18 years and under had detected virus. Within female patients, older  
270 female patients (>55 years, n=346) tested positive with greater frequency than younger  
271 female patients (<55 years, n=438) (p=0.001), while this was not the case with male  
272 patients in the same age ranges (p=0.09) (**Figure 4b**). This effect was diminished after  
273 removing patients from the labor and delivery ward (102 patients, 7% positive) who were  
274 being screened universally regardless of symptoms (p=0.03). There was no significant  
275 difference in the frequency of positive tests in different race groups (p=0.385).

276  
277 Lower respiratory tract specimens, including sputum, BAL, and tracheal aspirates, were  
278 accepted starting 4/17/2020. As of May 15, 2020, ten sputum, 30 BAL, and 101 tracheal  
279 aspirate specimens had been received from 115 patients, with 0%, 13%, and 23%,  
280 respectively, showing detectable SARS-CoV-2. Indeterminate results were reported for  
281 three tracheal aspirate samples. The mean Ct values for E gene, S gene, and I.C. targets  
282 in positive LRT samples (n=27) were 27.3 (7.7-39.1), 26.7 (6.7-38.5), and 31.4 (27.9-  
283 44.7), respectively (**Figure 3**). Ct values were not significantly different for the E gene, S  
284 gene, and IC targets between positive BAL and tracheal aspirate samples  
285 (**Supplementary Figure 1**). The mean number of LRT samples received per day was 7  
286 (range 1-25), which was significantly lower compared to the number of URT specimens  
287 tested (mean 85; range 12-176). Given the small sample size, additional statistics on  
288 clinical cohort characteristics were not calculated for LRT specimens.

## 289 290 **DISCUSSION**

291 Since the end of December 2019, when China first reported cases of the novel  
292 coronavirus disease to the World Health Organization (WHO), SARS-CoV-2 has spread  
293 to dozens of countries around the world, including the United States. A rapid and accurate  
294 diagnosis of infectious disease is critical for managing outbreaks. Given the increasing

295 number of people infected with SARS-CoV-2 and the lack of any commercially available  
296 tests, on February 4, 2020, the FDA in the U.S. opened a pathway that allowed  
297 laboratories to implement laboratory-developed tests to meet this diagnostic need. The  
298 CDC made their validated kits available through Integrated DNA Technologies, but the  
299 kits were very limited in number and were only approved for use with specific instruments,  
300 reagents, and controls. Due to a surge in demand for SARS-CoV-2 testing, issues with  
301 scaling up numbers of tests per run using the CDC method, and the limited availability of  
302 kits, on February 29, 2020, the FDA issued a new policy to help expedite the availability  
303 and capacity of diagnostic testing in the U.S. [6]

304  
305 Altona Diagnostics launched the RealStar<sup>®</sup> SARS-CoV-2 Real-Time RT-PCR Kit as soon  
306 as the disease spread to Europe on February 20. Prototype kits were sent to reference  
307 centers for testing and confirmation of functionality with clinical samples [11]. The  
308 reagents were designed as a dual target assay and manufactured according to GMP  
309 guidelines such that the ready to use kit allowed for rapid detection of all lineage B-  
310 betacoronaviruses and SARS-CoV-2 specific RNA in a single reaction. Laboratories  
311 could also use the reagents with a wide range of different extraction and real-time  
312 thermocycler instruments, allowing for greater flexibility in implementation. The first batch  
313 of reagents arrived in our laboratory within five days from ordering on Friday, March 6,  
314 2020, around the same time, we received the WRCEVA RNA reference material. The  
315 requirements for obtaining the WRCEVA RNA reference material were 1) that it was used  
316 for diagnostics in a CLIA-certified, high complexity lab, and 2) the laboratory was planning  
317 to submit an EUA application to the FDA. This RNA reference control was instrumental  
318 for the timely development of the EUA test, and notably, many laboratories had difficulties  
319 obtaining controls. At the same time, a well-characterized in-house collection of  
320 respiratory NP swabs and sputum samples had been collected and saved in the clinical  
321 microbiology laboratory, allowing for the preparation of a negative pool of samples for  
322 generating the LOD dilution and accuracy samples as described in the Methods section.

323  
324 Accuracy studies of NP and sputum samples in our laboratory showed excellent overall  
325 agreement between the expected and obtained results for contrived clinical specimens

326 and patient samples tested by NYC-DOH. A highly sensitive test is crucial for the  
327 detection and identification of SARS-CoV-2 in individuals exhibiting signs and symptoms  
328 of a respiratory infection to allow early initiation of therapy. The LODs for the NP and  
329 sputum samples were 2.7 gene copies/reaction and 23.0 gene copies/reaction,  
330 respectively, suggesting a slightly higher analytical sensitivity for the NP specimens  
331 compared to sputum. Overall sensitivity results for this assay by specimen type has been  
332 in agreement with the LODs reported in the literature by other studies [11, 12]. Of note,  
333 even though the sputum samples had a lower analytical sensitivity, higher viral loads have  
334 been reported in sputum specimens compared to NP swab specimens, with LRT samples  
335 being the most likely specimen type to test positive for the virus in COVID-19 patients  
336 [13]. Based on these favorable validation results, we decided to start routine SARS-CoV-  
337 2 testing with the RealStar® SARS-CoV-2 rRT-PCR reagents on March 11, 2020. The  
338 entire FDA-EUA validation, followed by a successful go-live testing day, took only four  
339 days from receipt of the reagents and RNA reference control in the laboratory.

340  
341 Overall during this time, we have tested 1,694 URT (40% positive) and 141 LRT (25%  
342 positive) specimens, from 1,571 and 115 patients, respectively. The lower number of  
343 LRT compared to URT specimens reflects hospital policy, restricting LRT testing to  
344 intubated patients that needed clearance of isolation (two negative NP swabs plus one  
345 negative LRT specimen) or patients with high suspicion for COVID-19 with repeat  
346 negative testing by RT-PCR (two negative NP swabs).

347  
348 In the cohort of patients tested over three weeks by our assay, positive results were seen  
349 more frequently in older males compared to younger and female patients, which has been  
350 supported by several studies [14, 15]. Post-menopausal women have been reported to  
351 have a greater risk of hospitalization compared to non-menopausal women attributed to  
352 the protective effect of estrogen [16]. In this study, older women were more likely to test  
353 positive for SARS-CoV-2 compared to younger female patients. However, the difference  
354 in detection rate between older and younger women was diminished after removing  
355 obstetrics patients screened universally regardless of symptoms, highlighting the

356 importance of restricting comparisons of positivity rates to groups of patients subjected to  
357 similar selection criteria and warranting the importance of carefully designed studies.

358  
359 Among the obstetrics patients, only 7% tested positive for SARS-CoV-2, which is similar  
360 to the prevalence (13.5%) obtained for women admitted at delivery at other NYPH  
361 campuses [17]. We did not see any differences in the number of positive tests by race,  
362 but this was early in the epidemic in New York City. The ED likely had more positive tests  
363 since patients tend to be more acutely symptomatic there compared to ambulatory clinics.  
364 The percentage of positive tests increased steadily and settled at around 50% three  
365 weeks into the epidemic, with later testing on other platforms showing daily positivity rates  
366 as high as 75-80% as the epidemic reached its peak in specific boroughs (unpublished  
367 data). In this study, 13 patients tested positive after initial negative results in the ED,  
368 suggesting they had sufficient symptoms to warrant inpatient admission despite negative  
369 testing. This conversion may be due to increased viral burden on subsequent days post-  
370 infection, or due to better sampling [18].

371  
372 In summary, we described the clinical development and implementation of an FDA EUA  
373 laboratory validated rRT-PCR test for SARS-CoV-2 in our academic institution, providing  
374 a road map to assist others in establishing similar tests. We also described the clinical  
375 and testing characteristics of the first cohort of COVID-19 patients admitted to our  
376 institution during the early days of the viral outbreak in NYC.

377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386

387 **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

388 We would like to thank all the dedicated medical technologists and health care  
389 professionals who performed and assisted in testing at the clinical laboratories of NYPH-  
390 WCM. We also thank Dr. Scott C. Weaver, World Reference Center for Emerging Viruses  
391 and Arboviruses (WRCEVA), for providing us with viral RNA control material, and Altona  
392 Diagnostics for their prompt supply of reagents and support.

393

394 Competing interests: None declared.

395 Ethical approval: Obtained.

396

397

398

399

## 400 REFERENCES


- 401 1. Lorusso, A., et al., Novel coronavirus (SARS-CoV-2) epidemic: a veterinary  
402 perspective. *Vet Ital*, 2020. **56**(1): p. 5-10.
- 403 2. Wei, X., X. Li, and J. Cui, Evolutionary perspectives on novel coronaviruses  
404 identified in pneumonia cases in China. *Natl Sci Rev*, 2020. **7**(2): p. 239-242.
- 405 3. Chen, L., et al., Clinical Characteristics of Pregnant Women with Covid-19 in  
406 Wuhan, China. *N Engl J Med*, 2020.
- 407 4. Chen, N., et al., Epidemiological and clinical characteristics of 99 cases of 2019  
408 novel coronavirus pneumonia in Wuhan, China: a descriptive study. *Lancet*,  
409 2020. **395**(10223): p. 507-513.
- 410 5. Goyal, P., et al., Clinical Characteristics of Covid-19 in New York City. *N Engl J*  
411 *Med*, 2020.
- 412 6. Policy for Diagnostics Testing in Laboratories Certified To Perform High  
413 Complexity Testing Under the Clinical Laboratory Improvement Amendments  
414 Prior to Emergency Use Authorization for Coronavirus Disease-2019 During the  
415 Public Health Emergency; Immediately in Effect Guidance for Clinical  
416 Laboratories and Food and Drug Administration Staff (FEDERAL REGISTER).  
417 Accessed on March 1, 2020.
- 418 7. Team, R.C., R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R  
419 Foundation for Statistical Computing. Vienna, Austria, 2019.
- 420 8. Chen, F., CLSI EP17A2E Guidance with Application to Quantitative Molecular  
421 Measurement Procedures. R Function Library, 2016.
- 422 9. Global Initiative on Sharing All Influenza Data (GISAID), <https://www.gisaid.org/>,  
423 2020. Accessed on April 30, 2020.
- 424 10. Craney, A.R., et al., Comparison of Two High-Throughput Reverse Transcription-  
425 Polymerase Chain Reaction Systems for the Detection of Severe Acute  
426 Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2. *J Clin Microbiol*, 2020.
- 427 11. Konrad, R., et al., Rapid establishment of laboratory diagnostics for the novel  
428 coronavirus SARS-CoV-2 in Bavaria, Germany, February 2020. *Euro Surveill*,  
429 2020. **25**(9).

- 430 12. Corman, V.M., et al., Detection of 2019 novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV) by real-  
431 time RT-PCR. Euro Surveill, 2020. **25**(3).
- 432 13. Wang, W., et al., Detection of SARS-CoV-2 in Different Types of Clinical  
433 Specimens. JAMA, 2020.
- 434 14. Tian, S., et al., Characteristics of COVID-19 infection in Beijing. J Infect, 2020.  
435 **80**(4): p. 401-406.
- 436 15. Lai, C.C., et al., Asymptomatic carrier state, acute respiratory disease, and  
437 pneumonia due to severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-  
438 2): Facts and myths. J Microbiol Immunol Infect, 2020.
- 439 16. Ting Ding, J.Z., Tian Wang, Pengfei Cui, Zhe Chen, Jingjing Jiang, Su Zhou, Jun  
440 Dai, Bo Wang, Suzhen Yuan, Wenqing Ma, Lingwei Ma, Yueguang Rong, Jiang  
441 Chang, Xiaoping Miao, Xiangyi Ma, Shixuan Wang, A Multi-hospital Study in  
442 Wuhan, China : Protective Effects of Non-menopause and Female Hormones on  
443 SARS-CoV-2 infection.  
444 <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.03.26.20043943v1>, 2020.
- 445 17. Sutton, D., et al., Universal Screening for SARS-CoV-2 in Women Admitted for  
446 Delivery. N Engl J Med, 2020.
- 447 18. Natalie N. Kinloch, G.R., Chanson J. Brumme, Winnie Dong, Weiyan Dong,,  
448 R.B.J. Tanya Lawson, Julio S.G. Montaner, Victor Leung, Marc G. Romney,, and  
449 N.M. Aleksandra Stefanovic, Christopher F. Lowe, Zabrina L. Brumme,  
450 Suboptimal biological sampling as a probable cause of false-negative COVID-19  
451 diagnostic test results.  
452 <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.05.05.20091728v1.full.pdf>, 2020.  
453  
454  
455



456 **FIGURES**

457




458

459


460 **Figure 1.** Limit of detection (LOD) studies. Ct values for the LOD serial dilution study  
461 using WRCEVA RNA reference material spiked in pooled negative **(A)** nasopharyngeal  
462 (NP) specimen eluate and **(B)** sputum specimen eluate. Six ten-fold dilutions were  
463 performed starting at 1,000,000 gene copies/reaction and ending at 1 gene copy/reaction.  
464 The apparent LOD was between 1 and 10 gene copies/reaction for NP specimens and  
465 between 10 and 100 gene copies/reaction for sputum specimens.

466

467



468




469

470

471 **Figure 2.** LOD of NP and sputum by probit analysis. Additional serial dilution studies  
 472 were performed using WRCEVA RNA reference material spiked in pooled negative **(A)**  
 473 NP specimen eluate and **(B)** sputum specimen eluate to determine the LOD. Five  
 474 replicates (A, B, C, D, E) of six ten-fold dilutions were performed starting at 1,000 gene  
 475 copies/reaction and ending at 0.1 gene copies/reaction for NP and five replicates of three  
 476 ten-fold dilutions were performed starting at 100 gene copies/reaction and ending at 1  
 477 gene copies/reaction for sputum. An additional five replicates were performed at 0.8, 0.6,


478 0.5, 0.4, and 0.2 gene copies/reaction for NP and 80, 60, 50, 40, and 20 gene  
479 copies/reaction for sputum. Probit analysis showed LOD to be **(C)** 2.7 gene  
480 copies/reaction for NP and **(D)** 23.0 gene copies/reaction for sputum.  
481

482



483

484 **Figure 3.** Distribution of Ct values for E gene, S gene, and Internal Control targets for all  
485 upper respiratory tract (URT) and lower respiratory tract (LRT) specimens with detected  
486 SARS-CoV-2. Mean Ct values between URT and LRT specimens were significantly  
487 different for the E gene ( $p=0.006$ ) and S gene ( $p=0.03$ ) but not the I.C. ( $p=0.7$ ), though  
488 the much smaller sample size for LRT is noted.  
489



491

492

493 **Figure 4.** SARS-CoV-2 results by date and distribution by gender and age. **A)** Positivity  
494 of URT specimens tested by rRT-PCR at NYP-WCMC over the first three weeks of  
495 implementation. **B)** Age distribution histograms with overlays of normalized density  
496 curves corresponding to age distribution (yellow) and SARS-CoV-2 positivity (red) in  
497 tested patients by gender. Patients that were universally screened at labor and delivery  
498 were removed from this analysis.

499 **TABLES**

500

Dilution	Gene copies per reaction	Number run		Number detected		Percent		Cy5 (S gene) Mean Ct		FAM™ (E gene) Mean Ct		JOE™ (I.C.) Mean Ct	
		NP	SPU	NP	SPU	NP	SPU	NP	SPU	NP	SPU	NP	SPU
1:10	10 <sup>6</sup>	3	3	3	3	100%	100%	14.6	13.1	15.2	14.5	30.6	33.0
1:10 <sup>2</sup>	10 <sup>5</sup>	3	3	3	3	100%	100%	18.0	16.5	18.7	17.9	29.0	30.4
1:10 <sup>3</sup>	10 <sup>4</sup>	3	3	3	3	100%	100%	20.9	19.9	21.6	21.4	28.3	30.8
1:10 <sup>4</sup>	10 <sup>3</sup>	3	3	3	3	100%	100%	24.6	23.8	25.2	25.3	29.4	29.7
1:10 <sup>5</sup>	10 <sup>2</sup>	3	26	3	26	100%	100%	27.9	31.1	28.4	31.0	30.2	29.8
1:10 <sup>6</sup>	10	23	3	23	0	100%	0%	32.3	ND	32.0	ND	30.8	29.7
1:10 <sup>7</sup>	1	3	3	0	0	0%	0%	ND	ND	ND	ND	29.8	29.8

501  
 502 **Table 1.** Limit of detection studies were performed for NP VTM (NP) and sputum (SPU)  
 503 specimen types with three replicates at each dilution. An additional twenty (NP) and  
 504 twenty-three (SPU) specimens were tested at the estimated LOD of 10 gene  
 505 copies/reaction and 100 gene copies/reaction, respectively.

Validation sample	altona SARS-CoV2 rRT-PCR			
	NP-VTM		Sputum	
	Positive	Negative	Positive	Negative
*Positive (contrived)	30	0	30	0
Positive (patient)	4	0	1	0
Negative (patient)	0	30	0	30
Total	64	60	31	31

\*SARS-CoV-2 contrived positive samples generated with RNA control spiked into pooled negative eluate or dilutions of a high positive clinical sample.

506  
507 **Table 2.** Accuracy studies for NP and sputum. Clinical evaluation of the RealStar® SARS-  
508 CoV-2 rRT-PCR assay using automated QIA Symphony total nucleic acid (TNA) extraction  
509 followed by rRT-PCR targeting the E and S coronavirus genes on an in-house validation  
510 panel consisting of patient and contrived samples for NP (124 ) and sputum (62).  
511  
512

513

<b>Specimen Type</b>	<b>Cy5 (S gene) Mean Ct</b>	<b>FAM™ (E gene) Mean Ct</b>	<b>JOE™ (I.C.) Mean Ct</b>	<b>Number tested</b>	<b>Correctly classified</b>
NP swab	28.8 (20.6-37.2)	28.8 (20.8-37.7)	29.6 (28.6-30.8)	34+/30-	100%
Sputum	24.1 (16.2-30.0)	24.2 (17.0-29.2)	30.2 (29.4-32.3)	31+/30-	100%
BAL	23.4 (16.9-29.3)	23.5 (17.1-29.4)	30.4 (28.6-32.4)	20+/20-	100%
Trach asp	22.1 (10.0-43.0)	19.7 (10.1-32.1)	34.1 (29.7-42.4)	5+/5-	100%

514

515 **Table 3.** Summary table of accuracy studies for all specimen types. Mean and range of  
516 Ct values are shown for positive samples. The number of positive (either contrived  
517 through spiking RNA into a negative matrix or actual patient samples) and negative  
518 specimens are also noted along with the percent of specimens that were correctly  
519 classified as positive or negative.

520



521

Feature	All Patients n=1579	Positive 38%	Negative 62%	p-value
Age (years)	Overall: 53.4 (0.1-120.3)	Overall: 57.5 (1.3-120.3)	Overall: 51.1 (0.1-97.5)	0.0005*
	0-18 80	0-18 7%	0-18 93%	
	19-35 295	19-35 30%	19-35 70%	
	36-55 420	36-55 40%	36-55 60%	
	56-85 656	56-85 47%	56-85 53%	
>85 128	>85 30%	>85 70%		
Gender	F 784	F 31%	F 69%	0.005*
	M 778	M 46%	M 54%	
	Unsp. 3	Unsp. 33%	Unsp. 66%	
Race	Asian 101	Asian 28%	Asian 72%	0.385
	Black 171	Black 36%	Black 64%	
	Declined 173	Declined 40%	Declined 60%	
	Other 210	Other 45%	Other 55%	
	White 488	White 32%	White 68%	
Location	Emergency 911	Emergency 50%	Emergency 50%	0.0005*
	Inpatient 492	Inpatient 18%	Inpatient 82%	
	Outpatient 113	Outpatient 35%	Outpatient 65%	

522

523 **Table 4.** Summary table of patient characteristics. For race, “Declined” and “Other”  
 524 categories were not used when performing the Chi-squared test for significance. An  
 525 additional 63 tests were performed at low numbers at several other locations; these were  
 526 not included in the table.

527