Manuscript FiledRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.14.21255494; this version posted April 20, 2021. The copyright holder for this respertences to display the preprint in perpetuity.

- 1 Title: Two Stage Hierarchical Group Testing Strategy to Increase SARS-CoV-2 Testing Capacity at an Institution of
- 2 Higher Education: A Retrospective Analysis
- 3 **Authors:** Troy Ganz<sup>1</sup>, Markus Waithe-Alleyne<sup>1</sup>, Deirdre Slate<sup>1</sup>, Rachel Donner<sup>1</sup>, Kevin Hines<sup>1</sup>, Gyorgy
- 4 Abel<sup>1,2</sup>, Jared Auclair<sup>1</sup>
- 5 1. Life Science Testing Center, Northeastern University, Burlington, Massachusetts, USA
- 6 2. Lahey Hospital & Medical Center, Burlington, Massachusetts, USA
- 7 Text pages: 9; Tables: 1; Figures: 3
- 8 **Corresponding Authors:**
- 9 Jared Auclair, Ph.D.
- 10 Technical Supervisor, Life Science Testing Center
- 11 Northeastern University Innovation Campus in Burlington
- 12 Department of Chemistry and Chemical Biology
- 13 145 South Bedford Street
- 14 Burlington, MA 01803
- 15 j.auclair@northeastern.edu
- 16 <sub>781-238-8402</sub>
- <sup>17</sup> Gyorgy Abel, M.D.
- 18 Lahey Hospital & Medical Center
- 19 41 Mall Road
- 20 Burlington, MA 01805
- 21 gyorgy abel@hms.harvard.edu
- 22 781.744.8951

# 23 Abstract:

24	Population testing for severe acute respiratory syndrome 2 (SAR-CoV-2) is necessary owing to the possibility of
25	viral transmission from asymptomatic cases, yet scarcity of reagents and equipment has added to the cost-
26	prohibitive implementation of screening campaigns at institutions of higher education. The high analytical
27	sensitivities of leading nucleic acid amplification diagnostic methods allow for group testing to increase testing
28	capacity. A feasibility study was performed using an optimized testing configuration model for pooling three, five,
29	and ten samples. Following the standard RNA extraction and purification workflow for quantitative reverse
30	transcriptase polymerase chain reaction (RT-qPCR) method using Thermo Fisher TaqPath™ COVID-19 multiplex
31	primers and probes for the ORF1ab, N, and S genes, matrix and dilution effects were assessed using pooled
32	negative samples as the diluent. Probit analysis produced a limit of detection of 16075 (ORF1ab), 1308 (N), and
33	1180182 (S) genomic copy equivalents per milliliter. Trials comparing neat to 1:5 dilution for 34 weak-to-strongly
34	positive samples demonstrated average threshold cycle ( $C_T$ ) shifts of 2.31±1.16 (ORF1ab), 2.23±1.12 (N), and
35	2.79±1.40 (S). Notwithstanding observed S gene dropouts, the false negative rate was unaffected. As the ratio of
36	asymptomatic positive to symptomatic positive SARS-CoV-2 infected individuals was approximately 4:1 and the
37	average prevalence was 0.16% since we started testing in August 2020, pooled testing was identified as a viable,
38	cost-effective option for monitoring the Northeastern University community.

# 39 Introduction:

40	The emerging pandemic of coronavirus disease (COVID-19), sourced from the novel strain of beta-coronavirus
41	known as Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2), has had a severe impact on global
42	healthcare systems [1,2]. Institutions of higher education (IHE) have been confronted with the conflicting
43	obligations to guarantee a standard quality of education while ensuring the safety of their faculty, staff, and
44	students during the pandemic. For universities with shared living, dining, transportation, and classroom learning
45	arrangements, the greater requirements of risk management must be weighed against the economic loss of closing
46	for an indeterminate period [3,4]. Further pressures are imposed upon IHE in urban environments as positive
47	correlations of transmission have been observed with factors such as reduced air quality and higher population
48	density [5]. As with other respiratory infections, transmission is facilitated by viral shedding in the upper
49	respiratory tract that may release viral particles in the form of aerosols ( $\leq$ 5 µm) or droplets (>5 µm) to contaminate
50	the surrounding air or surfaces, and spread via fomites, coughing, sneezing, and exhalation from symptomatic, as
51	well as pre-symptomatic and asymptomatic, carriers [6]. Along with recommended measures for risk management
52	such as physical distancing, obligatory personal hygiene, and mask wearing, a rigorous screening and surveillance
53	campaign provides the most effective response.
54	Quantitative reverse transcriptase polymerase chain reaction (RT-qPCR) is the most sensitive method for early
55	detection of SARS-CoV-2 when compared to other available analytical methodologies (e.g., lateral flow
56	immunoassay), which require larger viral titers or longer periods of seroconversion following infection [7,8].
57	Nasopharyngeal, nasal (nares), or oropharyngeal respiratory samples, and saliva have been evaluated through
58	several RT-qPCR platforms; the added benefit being upper respiratory collections are less invasive than
59	venipuncture for serological testing, resulting in better patient compliance [8]. Drawbacks coincide with the sharp
60	increase in global demand for medical and testing supplies such as personal protective equipment (PPE; gloves,
61	gowns, surgical and N95 masks), collection swabs and containers, transport and lysis buffers, nucleic acid
62	extraction and amplification kits, consumables such as micropipette tips, analytical equipment, as well as qualified

63 technical personnel as the high-complexity format of RT-qPCR testing schema requires a reliable supply chain of

- 64 critical materials.
- 65 Group testing, or sample pooling, is an attractive method to increase testing capacity without a need for
- 66 additional resources or training. Since the introduction of the methodology by Dorfman in 1943, subsequent
- 67 studies have generated models to predict optimal group sizes within a test's analytical sensitivity and relative cost
- as factors of dilution and individual repeat testing, or deconvolution, must be considered [10,11]. Pressured by the
- 69 COVID-19 pandemic, investigators have sought to validate SARS-CoV-2 group testing on available molecular
- platforms [12,13,14,15]. The following investigation sought to define an ideal group size with respect to the cost of
- the current protocol while retaining an acceptable analytical sensitivity.
- 72 Methods:

#### 73 Sample Collection

- 74 The study was conducted at the Life Science Testing Center (LSTC; Burlington, MA, USA) for Northeastern
- 75 University (NEU) students, faculty, and staff within the United States Northeast (MA, ME) regional campuses.
- 76 Population surveillance includes sample collection from symptomatic, pre-symptomatic, asymptomatic, and
- vninfected individuals.
- 78 Anterior nasal swabs were collected in 3 mL BD Vacutainer® (without additives) tubes and transported dry
- 79 at ambient temperature. Processing involved addition of 3 mL viral transport medium (VTM; Redoxica, Little Rock,
- 80 AR, USA) and shaking at 1000 rpm for 5 minutes. Specimens are stable for <72 hours at 2-8°C and indefinitely at -
- 81 80°C.

### 82 Modeling

Our prospective workflow can be modeled using an adaptive two-stage hierarchical algorithm, whereby results from the master pool direct repeat testing of the individual samples. An optimal testing configuration is a result of several parameters including disease prevalence, group size, and analytical sensitivity and specificity. Significant to our protocol, success of the MS2 phage extraction control defines an additional retesting criterion that may be interpreted to impact the master pool. Utilizing a web-based R application (www.chrisbilder.com/shiny/), a

variable was included to reflect the probability of MS2 failure (invalid) to achieve estimated reductions for pools of
size 3, 5, and 10. Sensitivity was set to 95% based on the calculated limit of detection, while specificity was set to
99% under the combined influence of the MS2 control and operator review. Results were depicted to distinguish
the number of tests required for 1000 samples as informed by both the Shiny app and the modified version for
each group size with respective invalid rates and prevalence using Excel.

#### 93 RNA Extraction and RT-qPCR

- 94 SARS-CoV-2 RNA was extracted from 200 µL of sample using the MagMAX<sup>™</sup> Viral/Pathogen Nucleic Acid Isolation
- 95 Kit (Thermo Fisher Scientific, Waltham, MA, USA) on semi-automated Agilent™ Bravo liquid handlers (Agilent
- 96 Technologies, Santa Clara, CA, USA). Briefly, each well in a 1 mL 96-well plate is prepared with 5 μL proteinase K,
- 97 200 μL sample, 275 μL lysis buffer/binding beads, and 5 μL MS2 phage control. It is then shaken for 2 minutes at
- 98 1,050 rpm and incubated for 5 minutes at 65°C. Incubation on a magnetic plate at room temperature allows
- 99 aspiration of waste material and a sample undergoes three cycles of resuspension/aspiration in 165 μL wash
- 100 buffer, 165 μL 80% ethanol, and 50 μL elution buffer, respectively. After final separation event, 50 μL of purified
- 101 RNA solution is transferred to a fresh 1 ml 96-well plate.
- 102 RT-qPCR was performed according to the U.S. FDA emergency use authorization (EUA) instructions for use (IFU)
- 103 for TaqPath<sup>™</sup> COVID-19 Combo kit (Thermo Fisher Scientific, Waltham, MA, USA), which is a multiplex assay to
- 104 detect SARS-CoV-2 open reading frame (ORF) 1ab, nucleocapsid (N), and spike (S) genes, in addition to a spiked-
- 105 in MS2 phage extraction control (reporter dyes FAM, VIC, ABY, and JUN, respectively). The sample volume of 25 μL
- 106 involves 10 µL of purified RNA and 15 µL of reaction mix that includes TaqPath<sup>™</sup> 1-Step Multiplex Master Mix (No
- 107 ROX<sup>™</sup>), primers, and probes. Thermal profile parameters involve a 2-minute UNG incubation cycle at 25°C, a 10-
- 108 minute reverse transcriptase incubation cycle at 53°C, a 2-minute activation cycle at 95°C, followed by 40 cycles of
- a 3-second denaturation at 95°C and 30-second anneal/extension cycle at 60°C on Applied Biosystems<sup>™</sup> 7500 Fast
- 110 Dx Real-Time PCR Instrument (Thermo Fisher Scientific, Waltham, MA, USA).

- 112 Relative genome copy equivalents (GCE) were calculated via averaged standard curves using all (16) 7500 Fast Dx
- 113 RT-PCR instruments in house, whereby threshold cycle (C<sub>T</sub>) measurements for 5000, 1000, 500, 250, 100, 50, 10,
- and 5 gce/µL were evaluated for three lots of TaqPath<sup>™</sup> COVID-19 Positive Control.

#### 115 Matrix Effect Study

- 116 The C<sup>T</sup> values for 6 moderate-to-weakly positive samples [ORF1ab:26.19±4.68; N:27.15±4.35; S:26.61±5.06] were
- compared in parallel dilution series of 1:2, 1:4, 1:8, 1:16, 1:32, and 1:64 using either VTM (standard) or Negative
- 118 Sample Pool (matrix), prepared from 16 confirmed negative samples, as diluent. Results were converted to a
- 119 Matrix Effect factor using the formula:  $ME = -(((Matrix C_T/Standard C_T) * 100) 100)$ , whereby a factor of
- 120 100 is subtracted from the percent ratio of results to produce a normalized value indicating the magnitude of the
- suppression or enhancement imparted by the matrix diluent. To correct for the inverse relationship of  $C_{\tau}$  value to
- 122 concentration, the equation was negated; therefore, a negative ME value indicates suppression, while a positive
- 123 ME value indicates enhancement.

#### 124 Pooled Probit Analysis

125 Replicates of moderate-to-weak positive sample pools [12 – ORF1ab:27.76±0.82, N:28.85±0.18, S:28.28±0.54 C<sub>T</sub>; 8 126 - ORF1ab:27.08±0.22, N:28.07±0.25, S:27.41±0.34 C<sub>1</sub>] were produced in two series dilution assays using negative 127 sample pool material as the diluent. The first involved 12 replicates ranging from neat to 1:2, 1:4, 1:8, 1:16, 1:32, 128 1:64, 1:128, and 1:256 dilutions while the second involved 8 replicates ranging from neat to 1:10, 1:20, 1:40, 1:80, 129 1:160, 1:320, 1:640, and 1:1280 dilutions; negative sample pools additionally assayed neat separately to rule out 130 presence of interfering substances. Results that met the TaqPath<sup>™</sup> method qualitative criteria of <37 C<sub>T</sub> were 131 counted in the proportion of success rate and the average C<sub>T</sub> value for each gene of those results were converted 132 to a relative GCE per milliliter. The Probit of the success rate was produced with Excel® formula 5+NORMSINV(P) 133 and was plotted against the log<sub>10</sub> of the GCE. The 95% confidence interval was calculated from the linear regression 134 analysis to evaluate the limit of detection (LoD).

135 1:5 Dilution Trials

- 136 Thirty-four strong-to-weak positive samples [ORF1ab:21.52±5.37; N:22.11±5.36; S:21.77±5.71] were assayed neat
- and at 1:5 dilution, in singlet, using negative sample material as the diluent to determine a predictable shift in
- 138 C<sub>T</sub> value. The neat sample was extracted from 200 μL and the 1:5 dilution was extracted from 40 μL of positive
- sample diluted in 160 μL of negative sample material.
- 140 **Results**:
- 141 Demographics
- 142 Since LSTC establishment in July 2020, the site has performed over 500,000 tests (ca. January 2021) with
- an overall positivity rate of 0.16%. Cohort descriptions for the positive sample repository used in this
- 144 study included symptomatic (19.6%; 44% male, 56% female) and asymptomatic (80.4%; 55% male, 45% female)
- 145 patients within their respective age ranges: 18-24 (63%), 25-31 (17%), 32-49 (13%), and >50 (7%).
- 146 Matrix Effect Study
- 147 Of the 77 data-points generated, 31 trials (40.3%) demonstrated signal suppression by the negative sample matrix,
- 148 whereas 46 trials (59.7%) demonstrated an enhanced signal. Focusing on the range of 2 to 8 pooled samples, a
- more equally distributed effect is observed with 48% of 46 datapoints showing average suppression of -1.64±1.77,
- 150 -1.32±1.27, and -4.46±6.19 while 52% showed an average enhancement of 3.67±4.32, 1.53±0.89, and 3.28±2.87 for
- 151 ORF1ab, N and S gene, respectively (Figure 1). Additionally, 37% of the 2-8 sample pools reported a ME within one
- unit. Thus, with average C<sub>T</sub> values of 27.6±0.58, 27.9±0.34, and 29.2±0.44, a matrix effect of 1 would elicit a
- 153 C<sub>T</sub> value shift of ±0.28, ±0.28, and ±0.29 for ORF1ab, N, and S genes, respectively. Furthermore, only 17% of 2-8
- sample pools reported an ME greater than 5, which translates to a  $C_{T}$  value shift of >1 cycle.

### 155 Pooled Probit Analysis

- 156 The LOD for each of the SARS-CoV-2 genes using negative sample pool as diluent was 16,075 gce/mL,
- 157 1,308 gce/mL, and 1,180,182 gce/mL for the ORF1ab, N, and S genes, respectively. Regressions for the ORF1ab and
- 158 N gene were more reliable than for the S gene ( $R^2 = 0.28$ ), which may be indicative of the reaction mechanism.
- 159 A qualitative LOD would implement TaqPath<sup>™</sup> testing algorithm of 2/3 genes resulted with C<sup>+</sup> of <37, and LSTC
- 160 intends to deconvolute a pool with at least 1/3 genes present (Table 1).

### 161 **1:5 Dilution Trials**

- 162 Diluting positive SARS-CoV-2 sample in negative sample material at a 1:5 dilution produced an average shift of the
- 163 C<sub>T</sub> value by 2.31±1.16, 2.23±1.12, and 2.79±1.40 cycles for ORF1ab, N, and S gene, respectively (Figure 2). Paired t-
- 164 test analysis comparing neat and diluted groups for each gene showed no statistically significant difference, with p-
- values of 0.0878, 0.0988, and 0.0527 for OFR1ab, N, and S gene, respectively. Consistent with the matrix effect
- 166 study and probit analysis, the S gene exhibited the least sensitivity with 12% of trials losing signal (Figure
- 167 2C). Nevertheless, each trial met TaqPath<sup>™</sup> testing algorithm for 2/3 genes testing positive to require
- 168 deconvolution.
- 169 **Discussion**:
- 170 This study has established an optimal pool size of five specimens to provide a cost-effective bandwidth with
- 171 respect to prevalence and rate of repeat testing while insignificantly impacting the analytical sensitivity for the
- 172 Thermo Fisher<sup>™</sup> TaqPath<sup>™</sup> COVID-19 Combo Kit.
- 173 The pandemic has disproportionately affected the mission of IHE with an impact ranging from increased
- 174 maintenance costs to the academic performance of students. Pre-symptomatic COVID-19 infections are credited
- 175 with a greater rate of transmission than asymptomatic infections and a correlation with age has been observed
- 176 with younger populations demonstrating higher rates of asymptomatic cases [16,17]. In the Northeastern
- 177 University community 80.4% of positive cases from August 2019 to January 2021 were asymptomatic individuals,
- 178 of which 76% were between the age of 18-27; this data is consistent with results from the University of Georgia
- 179 [18]. The Northeastern University student community is required to test every three days (+/- 1 day) and
- 180 employees on site five days a week are expected to test at least twice a week.
- 181 Under non-pooling conditions, the sum of assays informed by the MS2 control could be expressed as E = n + 1,
- where *E* is the expected number of tests and *n* is the probability of repeat testing due to absence of MS2 signal.
- 183 Pursuant to LSTC protocol, an MS2 failure is repeated once and further representation for the total assays could be
- expressed as  $E = (n + 1) + (n^2)$ . Our modeling indicates the number of repeated testing due to MS2 failure is
- 185 higher at lower group sizes. It may serve as the deciding factor at a prevalence upwards of 1% since labor costs

186 may outweigh a less than 50% reduction in materials (Figure 3). Furthermore, group testing is an environmentally 187 conservative measure that aligns with 'green laboratory' efforts by minimizing the requirements for non-188 biodegradable materials, toxic chemical waste, and energy consumption [19]. Additional stage hierarchical and 189 array methods may also increase group testing efficiency for diseases of low prevalence [20]. 190 Multiplex RT-qPCR has been sought to increase assay sensitivity for the detection of SARS-CoV-2, yet inherent 191 limitations arise from increased competition in reaction kinetics [21]. The genomic architecture of SARS-CoV-2 192 exhibits extensive secondary structure with regions consisting of high base pairing content thought to be 193 mechanistically advantageous for the transcription and thermodynamic stability of sub-genomic RNA [22]. Further 194 consideration that retro-transcription occurs from the 3' direction suggests cDNA production from the N gene with 195 less deviation than the S and ORF1ab genes. Concurrent with our results, the N gene demonstrated the greatest 196 stability within the negative sample matrix, which was confirmed by a limit of detection 1 and 3 orders of 197 magnitude less than the ORF1ab and S genes, respectively. Recent identification of a SARS-CoV-2 variant of 198 concern (VOC) 202012/01 has been associated with several mutations in the S gene including a deletion at position 199 69 and 70 to cause S-gene target failure by the TaqPath COVID-19 method [23]. Due to the enhanced binding 200 interactions of VOC 202012/01 spike protein with the target angiotensin converting enzyme 2 (ACE-2), estimates 201 suggest the increased transmissibility will permit strain predominance in the United States by spring 2021 [24]. 202 While no genomic sequence data was available for the samples used in this study, it is important to consider the 203 international nature of the university population as many Northeastern students are from abroad. Accurate 204 assessment of the origins of predominant strains is further challenged by the transience of personal interactions in 205 urban environments. It is also notable that Northeastern campuses in Boston, Massachusetts and Portland, Maine 206 experience significant in-state commuter traffic. 207 Results from this retrospective study are consistent with recent reports confirming an insignificant effect on the 208 false negative rate for pools of similar size; additionally, our average C<sup>T</sup> value shifts were precise [14,15]. Probit

- analysis is applicable to the bimodal output of RT-qPCR for LoD analysis. As all constituent samples of positive
- 210 pools initially tested positive for all three genes, the data supports a mechanistic basis for the substantial reduction

- in S-gene sensitivity, which may align with current S-gene target failure hypotheses [23,24]. Our report pioneered a
- 212 quantification of the matrix effect for RT-qPCR to improve analyte stability. This study was not able to comment on
- the logistical impacts of deconvolution, which could potentially prolong the <48-hour turn-around-time regularly
- scheduled testing may require, yet the evidence presented in this study supports pooling as a means of addressing
- 215 supply chain restrictions. Aliquoting samples to 96-well plates prior to pooling limits operator errors and improved
- 216 workflow of maintaining operator audit logs and having a well-functioning laboratory information management
- 217 system (LIMS) program enables easy results review.

# 219 Conflict of Interest

220 The authors declare no conflict of interest.

## 221 Ethical Statement

- 222 Retrospective samples were deidentified for study purposes in accordance with IRB approval by the Northeastern
- 223 University Office of Human Subject Research Protection (HSRP).

## 224 Acknowledgements:

- 225 The authors would like to thank Dr. Christopher Bilder for accommodating our inquiries as well as acknowledge the
- tireless efforts of all at the LSTC.

227									
228	Ref	ferences:							
229	1.	Zhu, N., D. Zhang, W. Wang, X. Li, B. Yang, J. Song, X. Zhao, B. Huang, W. Shi, R. Lu, P. Niu, F. Zhan, X. Ma, D. Wang, W. Xu,							
230		G. Wu, G. F. Gao, W. Tan: A Novel Coronavirus from Patients with Pneumonia in China, 2019. New England Journal of							
231		Medicine 2020, 382(8):727-733							
232	2.	Emanuel EJ, Persad G, Upshur R, Thome B, Parker M, Glickman A, Zhang C, Boyle C, Smith M, Phillips JP: Fair Allocation of							
233		Scarce Medical Resources in the Time of Covid-19. New England Journal of Medicine 2020, 382:2049-2055. doi:							
234		10.1056/NEJMsb2005114							
235	3.	Paltiel, A. D., A. Zheng and R. P. Walensky: Assessment of SARS-CoV-2 Screening Strategies to Permit the Safe Reopening of							
236		College Campuses in the United States. JAMA Network Open 2020, 3(7): e2016818.							
237	4.	Cheng, S. Y., C. J. Wang, A. C. Shen and S. C. Chang: How to Safely Reopen Colleges and Universities During COVID-19:							
238		Experiences From Taiwan. Ann Intern Med 2020. 173(8): 638-641.							
239	5.	Sharifi, A. and A. R. Khavarian-Garmsir: The COVID-19 pandemic: Impacts on cities and major lessons for urban planning,							
240		design, and management. Sci Total Environ 2020, 749: 142391.							
241	6.	Jayaweera, M., H. Perera, B. Gunawardana and J. Manatunge: Transmission of COVID-19 virus by droplets and aerosols: A							
242		critical review on the unresolved dichotomy. Environ Res 2020 188: 109819.							
243	7.	Corman, V. M., O. Landt, M. Kaiser, R. Molenkamp, A. Meijer, D. K. Chu, T. Bleicker, S. Brünink, J. Schneider, M. L. Schmidt,							
244		D. G. Mulders, B. L. Haagmans, B. van der Veer, S. van den Brink, L. Wijsman, G. Goderski, J. L. Romette, J. Ellis, M. Zambon,							
245		M. Peiris, H. Goossens, C. Reusken, M. P. Koopmans and C. Drosten: Detection of 2019 novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV) by							
246		real-time RT-PCR. Eurosurveillance 2020, 25(3).							
247	8.	Sethuraman, N., S. S. Jeremiah and A. Ryo: Interpreting Diagnostic Tests for SARS-CoV-2. Jama 2020 323(22): 2249-2251.							
248	9.	Ward, S., A. Lindsley, J. Courter and A. Assa'ad: Clinical testing for COVID-19. J Allergy Clin Immunol 2020, 146(1): 23-34.							
249	10.	Robert, D.: The Detection of Defective Members of Large Populations. The Annals of mathematical statistics 1943, 14(4):							
250		436-440.							
251	11.	Hitt, B.D.: Group testing identification: Objective functions, implementation, and multiplex assays [Doctoral dissertation,							
252		University of Nebraska-Lincoln] 2020, UNL Digital Commons. <u>http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/</u>							
253	12.	Abdalhamid, B., C. R. Bilder, J. L. Garrett and P. C. Iwen: Cost Effectiveness of Sample Pooling to Test for SARS-CoV-2.							
254		Journal of Infection in Developming Countries 2020, 14(10): 1136-1137.							

- 255 13. Yelin, I., N. Aharony, E. S. Tamar, A. Argoetti, E. Messer, D. Berenbaum, E. Shafran, A. Kuzli, N. Gandali, O. Shkedi, T.
- 256 Hashimshony, Y. Mandel-Gutfreund, M. Halberthal, Y. Geffen, M. Szwarcwort-Cohen and R. Kishony: Evaluation of COVID-
- 257 19 RT-qPCR Test in Multi sample Pools. Clinical Infectious Disease 2020, 71(16): 2073-2078.
- 258 14. Alcoba-Florez, J., H. Gil-Campesino, D. García-Martínez de Artola, O. Díez-Gil, A. Valenzuela-Fernández, R. González-
- 259 Montelongo, L. Ciuffreda and C. Flores: Increasing SARS-CoV-2 RT-qPCR testing capacity by sample pooling. International
- Journal of Infectious Disease 2021, 103: 19-22.
- 261 15. Chong, B. S. W., T. Tran, J. Druce, S. A. Ballard, J. A. Simpson and M. Catton: Sample pooling is a viable strategy for SARS-
- 262 CoV-2 detection in low-prevalence settings. Pathology 2020, 52(7): 796-800.
- 263 16. Moghadas, S. M., M. C. Fitzpatrick, P. Sah, A. Pandey, A. Shoukat, B. H. Singer and A. P. Galvani: The implications of silent

transmission for the control of COVID-19 outbreaks. PNAS USA 2020, 117(30): 17513-17515.

- 265 17. Oran, D. P. and E. J. Topol Prevalence of Asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 Infection: A Narrative Review. Annals of Internal
- 266 Medicine 2020, 173(5): 362-367
- 267 18. Ebell, M. H., C. Chupp and M. Bentivegna: A high proportion of SARS-CoV-2-infected university students are asymptomatic.
   268 Journal of Family Practice 2020, 69(9): 428-429.
- 269 19. Lopez, J. B., D. Jackson, A. Gammie and T. Badrick: Reducing the Environmental Impact of Clinical Laboratories. Clinical
  270 Biochemical Review 2017, 38(1): 3-11.
- 20. Hou, P., J. M. Tebbs, D. Wang, C. S. McMahan and C. R. Bilder: Array testing for multiplex assays. Biostatistics 2020, 21(3):
  417-431.
- 273 21. Ishige, T., S. Murata, T. Taniguchi, A. Miyabe, K. Kitamura, K. Kawasaki, M. Nishimura, H. Igari and K. Matsushita: Highly
- 274 sensitive detection of SARS-CoV-2 RNA by multiplex rRT-PCR for molecular diagnosis of COVID-19 by clinical laboratories.
- 275 Clin Chim Acta 2020, 507: 139-142.
- 276 22. Tavares, R. C. A., G. Mahadeshwar, H. Wan, N. C. Huston and A. M. Pyle: The global and local distribution of RNA structure
   277 throughout the SARS-CoV-2 genome. Journal of Virology 2020
- 278 23. Bal, A., G. Destras, A. Gaymard, K. Stefic, J. Marlet, S. Eymieux, H. Regue, Q. Semanas, C. d'Aubarede, G. Billaud, F. Laurent,
- 279 C. Gonzalez, Y. Mekki, M. Valette, M. Bouscambert, C. Gaudy-Graffin, B. Lina, F. Morfin and L. Josset: Two-step strategy for
- the identification of SARS-CoV-2 variant of concern 202012/01 and other variants with spike deletion H69-V70, France,
- August to December 2020. Eurosurveillance 2021, 26(3).

- 282 24. Galloway, S. E., P. Paul, D. R. MacCannell, M. A. Johansson, J. T. Brooks, A. MacNeil, R. B. Slayton, S. Tong, B. J. Silk, G. L.
- 283 Armstrong, M. Biggerstaff and V. G. Dugan: Emergence of SARS-CoV-2 B.1.1.7 Lineage United States, December 29, 2020-
- 284 January 12, 2021. Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report 2021, 70(3): 95-99.

## Tables:

Analyte	Replicates detected at respective GCE/mL				slope	y-int	R^2	Probit (95% CI) GCE/mL
	1495	995	280	163				
ORF1ab	[0 (1 0]	[4/0]	[2] (2]	[2 (4 2]	1.24	1.43	0.91	16075
	[8/12]	[4/8]	[3/8]	[2/12]				
	823	447	298	148				
Ν					2.71	-1.79	0.82	1308
	[7/8]	[6/8]	[3/12]	[2/8]				
	-	3733	2147	425				
S					0.72	2.27	0.28	1180182
	-	[5/8]	[2/12]	[2/8]				

 Table 1: Limit of Detection (LoD) Results of SARS-CoV-2 ORF1ab, N and S gene in negative sample material. Ratio

 of successes for trials that produced less than 100% hit rate provided with corresponding concentration in genome

 copy equivalents per milliliter. Slope, y-intercept, and R-squared coefficient of probit analysis used to achieve limit

of detection.

**Figures:** 



Figure 1



Figure 2



Figure 3

## Figure Legends:

**Figure 1: Matrix effect (ME) of diluting positive SARS-CoV-2 sample in negative sample material at 1:2, 1:4, 1:8, 1:16, 1:32, and 1:64 series dilutions.** ME factor describes relative enhancing (positive value), or suppressive (negative value) effect of negative sample material on SARS-CoV-2 detection.

**Figure 2: Dilution trials comparing neat to 1:5 dilution of positive SARS-CoV-2 sample in negative patient material.** Cycle threshold (C<sub>1</sub>) values for ORF1ab (A), N (B), and S (C) gene observed for each trial (p>0.05).

## Figure 3: Number of PCR reactions required for testing 1,000 patient samples with respect to pool size, prevalence

**rate.** Dark grey prevalence rates: predicted number of tests including the invalid rate (n). Light grey prevalence rates: predicted number of tests without inclusion of invalid rate.