

1 **Assessment of multiplex digital droplet RT-PCR as an accurate diagnosis tool for SARS-**
2 **CoV-2 detection in nasopharyngeal swabs and saliva samples**

3
4 Kévin Cassinari^a, Elodie Alessandri-Gradt^{b,c}, Pascal Chambon^a, Françoise Charbonnier^a,
5 Ségolène Gracias^{b,c}, Ludivine Beaussire^a, Kevin Alexandre^{c,d}, Nasrin Sarafan-Vasseur^a,
6 Claude Houdayer^a, Manuel Etienne^{c,d}, François Caron^{c,d}, Jean Christophe Plantier^{b,c, †},
7 Thierry Frebourg^{a,†}

8
9 ^aDepartment of Genetics, Rouen University Hospital and Inserm U1245, UNIROUEN, Normandie
10 Univ, Normandy Center for Genomic and Personalized Medicine, France.

11 ^bVirology Laboratory, Rouen University Hospital, Rouen, France.

12 ^cResearch Group on Microbial Adaptation, GRAM, EA 2656, UNIROUEN, Normandie Univ, Rouen,
13 France.

14 ^dDepartment of Infectious Diseases, Rouen University Hospital, Rouen, France.

15 † Corresponding authors: Frebourg@chu-rouen.fr / jc.plantier@chu-rouen.fr

16

17 **ABSTRACT (136 words)**

18 RT-qPCR on nasopharyngeal swabs is currently the reference COVID-19 diagnosis method.
19 We developed a multiplex RT-ddPCR assay, targeting six SARS-CoV-2 genomic regions, and
20 evaluated it on nasopharyngeal swabs and saliva samples collected from 130 COVID-19
21 positive or negative ambulatory individuals, who presented symptoms suggestive of mild or
22 moderate Sars-CoV2 infection. The 6-plex RT-ddPCR assay was shown to have 100%
23 sensitivity on nasopharyngeal swabs and a higher sensibility than RT-qPCR on saliva (85%
24 versus 62%). Saliva samples from 2 individuals with negative results on nasopharyngeal
25 swabs were found to be positive. These results show that multiplex RT-ddPCR should
26 represent an alternative and complementary tool for the diagnosis of COVID-19, in particular
27 to control RT-qPCR ambiguous results, and its application to saliva an appropriate strategy
28 for repetitive sampling and testing individuals for whom nasopharyngeal swabbing is not
29 possible.

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

30 Abstract Word Count: 136

31 Body Word Count: 2019

32 Number of Supplementary Tables: 7

33 Number of Figures: 1

34 Number of references: 15

35

36 Key words: COVID-19; SARS-CoV-2; RT-ddPCR; nasopharyngeal swab; saliva, sensitivity

37

38 Conflict of Interest Statement

39 None

40

41 Funding Statement

42 This work was supported by the French Defence Innovation Agency – Agence de l’Innovation
43 de Défense (Contract N°2020 68 0918 00 00 00 00) and Rouen University Hospital.

44

45 Running title: Multiplex RT-ddPCR for SARS-CoV-2

46

47 INTRODUCTION

48 The reference biological method for the diagnosis of the new infectious Coronavirus
49 disease 2019 (COVID-19), related to the severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2
50 (SARS-CoV-2), is the detection in the nasopharyngeal tract of the viral genome, using reverse
51 transcription-quantitative PCR (RT-qPCR). Nasopharyngeal sampling is uncomfortable and
52 the quality of sampling impacts the sensitivity of RT-qPCR (1). RT-qPCR has revealed highly
53 variable viral loads among COVID-19 patients and, in a same patient, according to the time of
54 sampling (2). Numerous RT-qPCR tests, targeting different regions of the viral genome, have
55 been recently developed worldwide. Digital droplet PCR (ddPCR) represents an attractive
56 alternative to qPCR. In ddPCR, the sample is separated in thousands of reactors and positive
57 reactions are detected either with an intercalating agent or with hydrolysis probes (3).
58 Therefore, this method enables the absolute quantification of nucleotide sequences by
59 reducing the quantification of a target sequence to the enumeration of series of positive and
60 negative end-point PCR reactions (4). ddPCR exhibits a higher analytical sensitivity and
61 better reproducibility than qPCR, as shown by different applications in genetic (5) and viral
62 diseases (6). Three studies, based on a 2-plex assay targeting two viral genomic segments,
63 have already highlighted the potential of ddPCR for SARS-CoV-2 detection (7–9). One other
64 advantage of ddPCR, as compared to qPCR, is the facility of multiplexing and this advantage
65 has recently been illustrated for the detection of seasonal influenza virus (10). Moreover,
66 some studies have recently evaluated the interest of RT-qPCR performed on saliva for SARS-
67 CoV-2 detection. These studies have shown that this strategy, as compared to RT-qPCR on
68 nasopharyngeal swabs, has a highly variable sensitivity (30.7%-100%), depending in
69 particular on the mode and conditions of saliva collection (11, 12).

70 In this study, we developed and validated a COVID-19 multiplex RT-ddPCR assay,
71 including six probe-primer sets already validated in qPCR assays and then evaluated the

72 performances of the assay for the detection of SARS-CoV-2 in nasopharyngeal and saliva
73 samples collected in a cohort of patients.

74

75 **PATIENTS AND METHODS**

76 **Patients.** For the validation step of RT-ddPCR, we selected a series of nasopharyngeal
77 swabs with a low viral load, defined on the basis of a Cycle Threshold (CT) >30 in RT-qPCR.
78 For the prospective phase of the study, biological samples were collected from patients
79 presenting at the COVID-19 consultation of Rouen University Hospital, during the first
80 epidemic peak in our area (from April to May 2020). All patients were ambulatory and
81 presented symptoms suggestive of mild or moderate Sars-CoV2 infection. All patients had a
82 deep nasopharyngeal swabbing (Sigma Virocult® system -MWE, Corsham,UK), and then
83 were asked to drool around 2 mL of saliva into a sterile 50 mL Falcon plastic tube (Thermo
84 Fisher Scientific, Illkirch, France), after they gave informed consent. Samples were
85 transferred within 2 h to the laboratory of Virology and then were frozen before subsequent
86 RNA extraction. For all patients with positive RT-qPCR in nasopharyngeal samples, the
87 corresponding saliva was then analyzed by RT-qPCR and RT-ddPCR. Saliva was also
88 analyzed by RT-qPCR and RT-ddPCR in a subset of subjects with negative nasopharyngeal
89 swabs. The protocol was approved by the institutional ethics committee (2020T3-12_RIPH3
90 HPS_2020-A00920-39).

91 **RT-qPCR.** After viral inactivation, two qualitative methods of RT-qPCR were used
92 by the Virology laboratory of Rouen University Hospital for routine diagnosis, depending on
93 the supply stock: (i) an automated method, using Abbott RealTime SARS-CoV-2 EUA test
94 (Abbott Park, IL, USA), performed on 500 µl of nasopharyngeal samples and (ii) RNA
95 extraction from 200 µl of sample (nasopharyngeal swab or saliva), performed using EZ1 DSP
96 virus kit (Qiagen, Hilden, Germany) and EZ1 Advanced XL machine, then RT-qPCR on

97 10µl of extracted RNA, using RealStar® SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR Kit 1.0 (Altona Diagnostics,
98 Hamburg, Germany) and performed on a CFX96™ Real-Time PCR Detection System
99 (BioRad, Californie, USA).

100 **RT-ddPCR.** RT-ddPCR assays were performed using the One-Step RT-ddPCR
101 Advanced Kit for Probes (Bio-Rad Laboratories, Hercules, CA, USA) and the QX200 ddPCR
102 platform (Biorad). Firstly, a 2-plex RT-ddPCR assay was developed on the basis of the
103 French national reference centre COVID-19 RT-qPCR protocol, which targets two regions of
104 the RdRp gene: nCoV_IP2 and nCoV_IP4. Secondly, a 6-plex RT-ddPCR assay including 4
105 additional targets was developed (Supplementary Table 1). These additional targets were
106 selected among primers and probes referenced in the Open COVID-19 Testing Project
107 (<https://covidtestingproject.org/>), on the basis of the amplicon size (<120 bp). The specificity
108 of each primer and probe was checked using the BLASTN program
109 (<https://blast.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/>) across a bank of 2045 viral genomic sequences. All
110 hydrolysis probes were designed with a FAM or HEX fluorophore and quenchers optimized
111 for ddPCR (Iowa Black quencher and an internal ZEN quencher, IDT DNA).

112 Briefly, 9.5 µL of extracted RNA was diluted in a 22 µL final reaction volume
113 containing 5.5 µL of One Step SuperMix (ddPCR supermix for Probes no dUTP, Bio-Rad),
114 2.2 µL of Reverse Transcriptase, 1.1 µL of 300mM DTT and 3 µL of primers and probes mix
115 (final probe concentration: 250 nM each, final primer concentration: 750 nM each). Then,
116 each sample was partitioned into 13000 to 20000 droplets using the QX200 ddPCR Droplet
117 Generator System (Bio-Rad). PCR amplification was then performed on a T1000 thermal
118 cycler (Bio-Rad). This protocol included an initial retro-transcription step (60 min, 50°C, and
119 10 min, 95°C) followed by 40 cycles of cDNA amplification, each cycle including a
120 denaturation step (95°C for 30 sec) and a step of annealing and extension at (58°C for 1 min).
121 A final denaturation step was realized at 98°C for 10 min. The droplet reading and

122 quantification were performed using the QX200 droplet digital reader and data analysis was
123 performed using the 2D module of the QuantaSoft-Pro software (Bio-Rad). Limit of blank
124 (LOB) and limit of detection (LOD) of the assay were determined according to published
125 guidelines (13, 14).

126

127 **RESULTS**

128 **Development and validation of the multiplex RT-ddPCR assay.** For the
129 development of the RT-ddPCR assay, we compared on previously collected nasopharyngeal
130 samples the sensitivity of a 2-plex RT-ddPCR assay targeting nCoV_IP2 and nCoV_IP4
131 (respectively detected in the HEX and FAM channel), to that of a 6-plex RT-ddPCR assay
132 (Fig. 1a), targeting three genomic regions detected in the FAM channel (CN-CDC-1, CN-
133 CDC-2, nCoV-IP4) and three detected in the HEX channel (nCoV_N1, nCoV_IP2,
134 RdRp_Sars_r). As expected, for a given viral load, a higher number of positive droplets was
135 detected with the 6-plex assay, as compared to the 2-plex assay (Fig. 1b). After calculation of
136 the LOD (Supplementary Tables 2 and 3), analysis of serial dilutions of a highly positive
137 sample showed the higher sensitivity of the 6-plex RT-ddPCR assay (Supplementary Table 4).
138 We validated the 6-plex RT-ddPCR assay by analysing 50 low positive nasopharyngeal
139 samples, as determined by RT-qPCR. All these samples were unambiguously detected
140 positive by the 6-plex RT-ddPCR assay (Supplementary Table 5).

141 **Prospective analysis of nasopharyngeal swabs and saliva samples using the 6-plex**
142 **RT-ddPCR assay.** We then prospectively collected nasopharyngeal swabs and saliva samples
143 from 130 patients and 14 were found to have a positive RT-qPCR test on nasopharyngeal
144 swabs. Among the 14 corresponding saliva samples, one was excluded because of an
145 insufficient volume. RT-qPCR analysis of these 13 saliva samples yielded 8 positive and 5
146 negative results, corresponding to a sensitivity of 62% (Supplementary Table 6). The 6-plex

147 RT-ddPCR assay was also positive on the 14 nasopharyngeal swabs. The 6-plex RT-ddPCR
148 assay performed on the 13 saliva samples retrieved 11 positive (including one sample positive
149 and negative in the FAM and HEX channels, respectively) and 2 negative results, indicating a
150 sensitivity of 85% (Supplementary Table 6). The mean ratio of the SARS-CoV-2 load
151 between nasopharyngeal swabs and saliva was estimated, according to RT-ddPCR, to 457
152 with a very large inter-individual variation (Supplementary Table 6).

153 The 6-plex RT-ddPCR assay was also performed on a subset of 18 saliva collected
154 from 116 patients with a negative RT-qPCR test on nasopharyngeal swab. For these 18
155 patients, RT-ddPCR was also negative on nasopharyngeal swabs (Supplementary Table 7).
156 Interestingly, one of the saliva sample (ID: 007) was found positive by RT-ddPCR, this result
157 was confirmed by a second RT-ddPCR analysis and by RT-qPCR which was subsequently
158 performed. For another saliva sample (ID: 017), we obtained values just above the LOD
159 (Supplementary Table 7).

160

161

162 **DISCUSSION**

163 We show in this study the interest of multiplex RT-ddPCR for the diagnosis of
164 COVID-19. The global sensibility of COVID-19 molecular diagnostic methods depends on
165 several factors including the quality of sampling, the integrity of viral RNA, the efficiency of
166 RNA extraction and PCR. As RNA degradation or imperfect retro-transcription of RNA
167 templates may hamper the detection of SARS-CoV-2, especially in samples with a very low
168 viral load, increasing the number of viral targets within the same assay should improve the
169 sensibility of the assay and this is confirmed by our results showing the higher sensibility of
170 the 6-plex RT-ddPCR assay, as compared to the 2-plex PCR assay. Target multiplexing is
171 much easier to be performed in RT-ddPCR than in RT-qPCR. Indeed, ddPCR relies on a final
172 PCR point and does not require, in contrast to RT-qPCR, to optimize PCR conditions for each

173 target. Although target multiplexing has been shown to increase the background noise because
174 of non-specific probes hydrolysis (10), our results show that this does not represent a
175 technical limit of the COVID-19 multiplex RT-dPCR assay.

176 The results that we obtained on nasopharyngeal swabs with a low viral load, as
177 estimated by CT for RT-qPCR, show that RT-ddPCR could be used either as a
178 complementary method to re-analyze samples yielding ambiguous results in RT-qPCR or as
179 an alternative method requiring different reagents and platforms. The analysis of a limited
180 series of saliva samples show that this assay can also be applied to saliva. As previously
181 reported, we confirm that the sensibility of COVID-19 molecular assays performed in saliva
182 is significantly weaker than in nasopharyngeal swabs, probably because of a viral load in
183 average 400 times lower. We show a slightly higher sensibility of the multiplex RT-ddPCR
184 assay (85%), as compared to RT-qPCR (62%) for saliva analyses. It should be highlighted
185 that saliva samples were collected in this study without any specific conditions, while it has
186 been shown that collection of saliva after overnight fasting result in a higher RNA
187 concentration [15]. Therefore, we think that it might be possible to increase the sensibility of
188 the multiplex RT-ddPCR assay on saliva with specific conditions of saliva sampling.

189 One advantage of the SARS-CoV-2 RT-ddPCR assay is its potential to be optimized:
190 (i) Indeed, its sensitivity can probably be increased by the addition of other SARS-CoV-2
191 targets regularly spaced across the viral genome and corresponding to short amplicons
192 (around 70bp), in order to prevent the co-encapsulation of several viral genomic targets within
193 the same droplet. Multiplexing of viral targets is also of interest in the perspective of the
194 mutability of the SARS-CoV-2 genome, which might result in false negative results yielded
195 by molecular assays restricted to a single genomic region; (ii) The assay can also be optimized
196 by the integration of a human gene which would allow to evaluate not only the cellularity of

197 the sample and thus the quality of the sampling, but also the quality of RNA extraction and
198 PCR.

199 As saliva sampling is a non-invasive collection procedure, it represents an appropriate
200 strategy to test repeatedly individuals (e.g. in nursing homes), to test individuals for whom
201 nasopharyngeal swabs are contraindicated or to test large populations suspected to present
202 with a high viral load. In this context, we think that the multiplex RT-ddPCR, which
203 sensitivity may probably be optimized, should be of interest. Our study also illustrates one of
204 the limits of nasopharyngeal swabs. Among 18 individuals with a molecular test negative on
205 nasopharyngeal swabs, the saliva sample was found to be clearly positive in one patient. It
206 reinforces the hypothesis that some of the false negative RT-qPCR results could be related to
207 a lower cellularity of nasopharyngeal swabs, due to suboptimal sampling (1). This idea is
208 supported by the observation that, in a few samples, RT-ddPCR detected a higher viral
209 concentration in saliva than in nasopharyngeal swab. Therefore, saliva sampling may also be
210 considered as supplementary sample in patients with negative tests on nasopharyngeal swabs
211 but with symptoms strongly suggestive of COVID-19.

212

213 **Acknowledgements**

214 We thank Mathieu Castelain, Charlène Martin for logistic support and Anne-Claire Richard,

215 Fabienne De Oliveira for technical assistance.

216 **References**

- 217 1. Kinloch NN, Ritchie G, Brumme CJ, Dong W, Dong W, Lawson T, Jones RB, Montaner
218 JSG, Leung V, Romney MG, Stefanovic A, Matic N, Lowe CF, Brumme ZL. 2020.
219 Suboptimal biological sampling as a probable cause of false-negative COVID-19
220 diagnostic test results. *J Infect Dis*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/infdis/jiaa370>.
- 221 2. He X, Lau EHY, Wu P, Deng X, Wang J, Hao X, Lau YC, Wong JY, Guan Y, Tan X,
222 Mo X, Chen Y, Liao B, Chen W, Hu F, Zhang Q, Zhong M, Wu Y, Zhao L, Zhang F,
223 Cowling BJ, Li F, Leung GM. 2020. Temporal dynamics in viral shedding and
224 transmissibility of COVID-19. *Nat Med* 26:672–675. [https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-020-0869-5)
225 [020-0869-5](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-020-0869-5).
- 226 3. Mazaika E, Homsy J. 2014. Digital Droplet PCR: CNV Analysis and Other
227 Applications. *Curr Protoc Hum Genet* 82:7.24.1-7.24.13.
228 <https://doi.org/10.1002/0471142905.hg0724s82>.
- 229 4. Vogelstein B, Kinzler KW. 1999. Digital PCR. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 96:9236–
230 9241. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.96.16.9236>.
- 231 5. Huggett JF, Cowen S, Foy CA. 2015. Considerations for digital PCR as an accurate
232 molecular diagnostic tool. *Clin Chem* 61:79–88.
233 <https://doi.org/10.1373/clinchem.2014.221366>.
- 234 6. Pinheiro-de-Oliveira TF, Fonseca-Júnior AA, Camargos MF, Laguardia-Nascimento M,
235 Giannattasio-Ferraz S, Cottorello ACP, de Oliveira AM, Góes-Neto A, Barbosa-
236 Stancioli EF. 2019. Reverse transcriptase droplet digital PCR to identify the emerging
237 vesicular virus Senecavirus A in biological samples. *Transbound Emerg Dis* 1360–1369.
238 <https://doi.org/10.1111/tbed.13168>.

- 239 7. Liu X, Feng J, Zhang Q, Guo D, Zhang L, Suo T, Hu W, Guo M, Wang X, Huang Z,
240 Xiong Y, Chen G, Chen Y, Lan K. 2020. Analytical comparisons of SARS-COV-2
241 detection by qRT-PCR and ddPCR with multiple primer/probe sets. *Emerg Microbes*
242 *Infect* 9:1175–1179. <https://doi.org/10.1080/22221751.2020.1772679>.
- 243 8. Suo T, Liu X, Feng J, Guo M, Hu W, Guo D, Ullah H, Yang Y, Zhang Q, Wang X, Sajid
244 M, Huang Z, Deng L, Chen T, Liu F, Xu K, Liu Y, Zhang Q, Liu Y, Xiong Y, Chen G,
245 Lan K, Chen Y. 2020. ddPCR: a more accurate tool for SARS-CoV-2 detection in low
246 viral load specimens. *Emerg Microbes Infect* 9:1259–1268.
247 <https://doi.org/10.1080/22221751.2020.1772678>.
- 248 9. Yu F, Yan L, Wang N, Yang S, Wang L, Tang Y, Gao G, Wang S, Ma C, Xie R, Wang
249 F, Tan C, Zhu L, Guo Y, Zhang F. 2020. Quantitative Detection and Viral Load Analysis
250 of SARS-CoV-2 in Infected Patients. *Clin Infect Dis*.
251 <https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciaa345>.
- 252 10. Leong NKC, Chu DKW, Chu JTS, Tam YH, Ip DKM, Cowling BJ, Poon LLM. A six-
253 plex droplet digital RT-PCR assay for seasonal influenza virus typing, subtyping, and
254 lineage determination. *Influenza and Other Respiratory Viruses* n/a.
255 <https://doi.org/10.1111/irv.12769>.
- 256 11. Baghizadeh Fini M. 2020. Oral saliva and COVID-19. *Oral Oncol* 108:104821.
257 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.oraloncology.2020.104821>.
- 258 12. To KK-W, Tsang OT-Y, Yip CC-Y, Chan K-H, Wu T-C, Chan JM-C, Leung W-S, Chik
259 TS-H, Choi CY-C, Kandamby DH, Lung DC, Tam AR, Poon RW-S, Fung AY-F, Hung
260 IF-N, Cheng VC-C, Chan JF-W, Yuen K-Y. Consistent Detection of 2019 Novel
261 Coronavirus in Saliva. *Clin Infect Dis*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciaa149>.

- 262 13. Hindson CM, Chevillet JR, Briggs HA, Gallichotte EN, Ruf IK, Hindson BJ, Vessella
263 RL, Tewari M. 2013. Absolute quantification by droplet digital PCR versus analog real-
264 time PCR. *Nat Methods* 10:1003–1005. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nmeth.2633>.
- 265 14. Rowlands V, Rutkowski AJ, Meuser E, Carr TH, Harrington EA, Barrett JC. 2019.
266 Optimisation of robust singleplex and multiplex droplet digital PCR assays for high
267 confidence mutation detection in circulating tumour DNA. *Sci Rep* 9.
268 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-019-49043-x>.
- 269
- 270

271 **Figure legend**

272 **FIG 1: Presentation of the 6-plex RT-ddPCR for SARS-CoV-2 detection.**

273 (a) Visualization, using the UCSC Genome Browser (Santa Cruz University,
274 <https://genome.ucsc.edu>) of the SARS-CoV-2 genome (NC_045512v2). Top panel: in blue,
275 list and location of genes (NC_045512.2). Bottom panel: custom track, indicating the genomic
276 location of each targeted integrated in the 6-plex RT-ddPCR (blue: FAM labelled; green:
277 HEX labelled). (b) Representative examples of positive 2-plex (left panel) and 6-plex (right
278 panels) RT-ddPCR assays performed on a RT-qPCR positive nasopharyngeal swab. All spots,
279 except the grey ones, represent positive droplets containing viral genomic material. The 2-
280 plex RT-ddPCR assay targets nCoV_IP2 and nCoV_IP4 located within the RNA-dependent
281 RNA polymerase (RdRp) gene. Blue droplets (FAM fluorescence): positive for the IP4 target;
282 green droplets (HEX fluorescence): positive for the IP2 target; orange droplets (FAM and
283 HEX fluorescence): positive for both IP4 and IP2 targets; grey droplets (no fluorescence):
284 negative. The 6-plex RT-ddPCR assay targets six regions of the viral genome: nCoV_IP2,
285 nCoV_IP4, nCoV_CDC-1 and RdRp_SARSr located within the RdRp gene, N_CoV_N1 and
286 CN_CDC-2 within the Neuramidase gene. Blue droplets (FAM fluorescence): positive for the
287 N_CoV_IP4, CN-CDC-1 and/or CN-CDC-2 targets; green droplets (HEX fluorescence):
288 positive for the N_CoV_IP2, RdRP_SARsR and/or nCoV_N1 targets; orange droplets (FAM
289 and HEX fluorescence): positive for at least one FAM-labelled target and one HEX-labelled
290 target, and grey droplets (no fluorescence): no target. According to the total of FAM and HEX
291 droplets, the results were estimated in the 2-plex and 6-plex RT-ddPCR assays to 7234 and
292 18820 copies per reaction, respectively.

