

1 **Title: Pooled Sample Testing for SARS-CoV-2 Using Rapid RT-PCR COVID-19 Tests**

2 **Authors:** Bethany Hyde, MHA,<sup>1</sup> Prat Verma, MS, MBA,<sup>1</sup> Ethan M. Berke, MD MPH<sup>1</sup>

3 **Affiliations:** <sup>1</sup>UnitedHealth Group, Minnetonka, MN, USA

4 **Running Title:** Pooled Sample Testing for SARS-CoV-2

5 **Keywords:** COVID-19, testing, PCR, polymerase chain reaction, pooled samples, SARS-CoV-2

6

7 **Abstract (50 words)**

8 We tested an operationally efficient way to pool samples on a rapid, point-of-care PCR device  
9 and examined the limit of detection of SARS-CoV-2 for various pool sizes. Pooled testing  
10 maintained testing performance similar to individual sample PCR testing, offering the potential  
11 for scalable rapid testing at lower cost with less supplies.

12

13 **Pooled Sample Testing for SARS-CoV-2 Using a Rapid RT-PCR COVID-19 Test (799**  
14 **words)**

15 Given the often asymptomatic presentation of COVID-19 and the potential for viral spread  
16 before the onset of symptoms, reliable and repeatable testing is necessary to slow the pandemic.  
17 New models of testing are required that can be self-administered, offer rapid results, and be  
18 deployed in a variety of settings. Pooled sampling allows for cost-effective testing at improved  
19 scale. Samples are combined and jointly tested with a single lab test. If the test is negative, all  
20 samples are considered negative. If the test is positive, each sample may be tested individually to  
21 determine which sample is positive.

22 Abdalhamid et al. found that for communities with a 5% prevalence rate, pooling five samples in  
23 one test provided a 57% reduction in the total number of tests needed compared to individual  
24 testing.(1) Lohse et al. found that up to 30 samples could be combined while preserving  
25 diagnostic accuracy.(2)

26 Using pooled samples on a point-of-care device allows for the additional advantage of rapid  
27 result turnaround and simplification of logistics, allowing for isolation decisions to be made in  
28 real time. To advance this concept, we tested an operationally efficient way to pool samples on a  
29 rapid-resulting PCR device and examined the limit of detection of SARS-CoV-2 for various pool  
30 sizes on a point-of-care test.

31 **The Study**

32 Optum Labs, the research and development unit at UnitedHealth Group, performed this research  
33 under an IRB approved protocol. We held testing events over the course of several weeks where  
34 asymptomatic employees were tested. All participants validated they were not experiencing any

35 symptoms at the time of testing using both a daily symptom-checking application, ProtectWell,  
36 plus a symptom check at time of testing.

37 We determined pool sizes based on the number of participants and the number of swabs each  
38 participant provided, using a convenience sample approach. Participants provided 1–3 self-  
39 collected anterior nares swabs, from both nostrils. For a given pool, each individual participant  
40 swab was inserted in a single dilution buffer tube, provided with the test, for the pool and  
41 agitated for a minimum of 10 seconds. Subsequent individual swabs were similarly exposed to  
42 dilution buffer until the pool contained all samples. We used a portable, rapid RT-PCR device  
43 (Visby Medical, San Jose, CA) to test all pools per manufacturer instructions.

44 A second swab collected at the same time was run individually for each participant on either  
45 another Visby RT-PCR device or BioRad RT-PCR to ascertain the status of each member of the  
46 pool. All participants were negative for SARS-CoV-2.

47 Using the remaining dilution solution from the pools, we calculated a target viral load of the  
48 sample based on remaining volume and added various concentrations of positive control  
49 (ZeptoMetrix NATSARS(COV2)-ERC1) to the dilution solution. Positive control was added to  
50 the sample with a lab pipette to ensure accurate measurement, and a repeat pooled test was  
51 performed with the original negative participants plus the viral control.

52 The portable RT-PCR device detected low levels of positive control in pools of up to 15  
53 participants (Table 1). For pools larger than 15 participants, the device was less consistent unless  
54 the viral copies/mL were increased. However, at these large pool sizes the device detected  
55 presence of virus at 9,483 viral copies per milliliter—lower than the limit of detection for many

56 COVID-19 tests approved by the FDA , and in the performance range of some approved RT-  
57 PCR methods.

58 We created one additional pool with a known positive participant's sample combined with 14  
59 other participants who were known negative. This pool was positive. The positive participant  
60 was 12 days from exposure and substantially recovered from COVID-19. Interestingly, the  
61 individual's sample was read as negative on a BioRad PCR machine, which has a published limit  
62 of detection of 10,000 viral copies/mL.

### 63 **Conclusions**

64 This study validates that pooled testing is a compelling way to increase testing capacity while  
65 still using high performance testing technology. Further analysis is needed to clearly define the  
66 limit of detection in pools greater than 15 participants.

67 This study had several limitations. Pool sizes were opportunistic rather than formulaic. In most  
68 pools, positive control was added via a pipette to ensure exact measurements, but in a few  
69 limited cases the amount of positive control was approximated.

70 While the dilution buffer can preserve a sample for approximately two hours before degrading,  
71 in a few cases the sample may have been processed up to an hour after collection (most samples  
72 were processed in 30 minutes or less). Our observations support that testing as soon as possible  
73 after introduction into the dilution buffer increases the performance of the test, particularly in  
74 detecting low viral loads in larger pools.

75 Despite these limitations, this work demonstrates the potential of pooled testing with pool sizes  
76 of 15 more to improve operational efficiency while reducing cost and supplies and maintaining  
77 testing performance similar to other PCR testing approaches.

78

79 **Author Bio** (first author only, unless there are only 2 authors)

80 Bethany Hyde, MHA is a director of research and development at Optum Labs, where  
81 she supports a variety of research initiatives including COVID-19 testing, sexually transmitted  
82 infections, and chronic kidney disease.

83 **References**

- 84 1. Abdalhamid, B et al. Abdalhamid B, Bilder CR, McCutchen EL, Hinrichs SH, Koepsell  
85 SA, Iwen PC. Assessment of specimen pooling to conserve SARS CoV-2 testing  
86 resources. *Am J Clin Pathol*. 2020 May 5;153(6):715-718. doi: 10.1093/ajcp/aqaa064.
- 87 2. Lohse S, Pfuhl T, Berkó-Göttel B, Rissland J, Geißler T, Gärtner B, Becker SL,  
88 Schneitler S, Smola S. Pooling of samples for testing for SARS-CoV-2 in asymptomatic  
89 people. *Lancet Infect Dis*. 2020 Nov;20(11):1231-1232. doi: 10.1016/S1473-  
90 3099(20)30362-5.

91

92 Address for correspondence: Bethany Hyde, Optum Labs, UnitedHealth Group, 5995 Opus  
93 Parkway, Minnetonka, MN 55343, USA; email: [bethany\\_hyde@uhg.com](mailto:bethany_hyde@uhg.com)

94

95

96 Comparison of COVID-19 pooled samples and viral copies per mL.

		Pool Size (Number of Samples)						
		5	10	12	13	15	20	25
Viral Copies per mL	190		POS					
	284		POS					
	379		NEG		NEG			
	522		POS					
	569						NEG	
	664						NEG	
	948	POS	NEG			POS		
	1897			POS		NEG	INVALID	NEG
	2845						NEG	
	3129					POS		
	3793						NEG	
	4741		POS			POS	POS NEG NEG	NEG
	5690					POS		
	9483		POS			POS	POS NEG	POS
	14224						NEG	
18966						POS		

97

98