

1 **Assessment of SARS-CoV2 genome sequence recovery from four lateral flow device**
2 **products available in the UK.**

3
4 Kuiama Lewandowski, Matthew Stokes, Alexandra Alexandridou, Abigail Fenwick, Mia L. White,
5 Jack Crook, Karly-Rai Rogers-Broadway, Catherine Ryan, Deborah A. Williamson, Richard
6 Vipond, Steven T. Pullan.

7 Affiliation: UK Health Security Agency, Specialised Microbiology and Laboratories.
8

9 Acknowledgements

10 This study was funded in part by WHO grant 2023/1385507. The authors would like to thank the Porton Diagnostic
11 Evaluation and Innovation team and the wider UKHSA Pathogen Genomics Sequencing Laboratory team for their help
12 and support.

13 The views expressed are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the funding bodies or the Department of
14 Health and Social Care.

15
16 **Abstract** (word count: 175)

17 Lateral flow tests have played a key role in the response to the COVID-19 pandemic and are likely
18 to be a major component of diagnostic strategies to combat future outbreaks of infectious disease.
19 One challenge posed by widescale use of lateral flow tests in the community is the loss of
20 sequence information to track virus evolution and epidemiology.

21
22 Beyond their primary diagnostic function, it has been demonstrated that recovery of viral RNA for
23 genome sequencing purposes is possible, from positive lateral flow devices (LFDs).

24 To assess the robustness and broader applicability of this process, we assessed SARS-CoV-2
25 RNA recovery and sequencing from the four major LFDs in use in the UK.

26
27 Testing both cultured virus and residual clinical nasal swab samples demonstrated that
28 sequencing from LFD eluates is possible, at clinically relevant titres, within a reasonable
29 processing time frame post-use, and gave sequences concordant with routine methods, but
30 results varied across the four devices used.

31 This highlights the requirement for refinement of existing LFDs or of second-generation LFD
32 design, where sequencing is an intended output from positive LFDs.

36 Introduction

37 Genomic sequencing of SARS-CoV-2 has had a major role in the public health response to the
38 COVID-19 pandemic, enabling mapping of viral transmission at global and local levels, informing
39 infection control measures, and identifying and tracking the emergence of new variants (1).

40
41 Viral transport media from nasal/oral swabs have been the most widely utilised sample source for
42 SARS-CoV-2 WGS pipelines. Typically, these have been residual material from diagnostic
43 testing, taken forward for genome sequencing (most commonly via whole genome tiling amplicon-
44 based methods) upon positivity (2). However, point-of-care lateral flow device (LFD) tests,
45 including self-test kits are replacing PCR as diagnostics in many settings (3), meaning
46 opportunities for genomic characterisation of circulating variants are increasingly limited.

47
48 Multiple studies have demonstrated the possibility of retrieving viral nucleic acid from positive
49 LFDs. *Martin et al., 2022* described an approach for whole-genome sequencing of SARS-CoV-2
50 from positive LFDs and demonstrated the application of this technique to PanBio and InnoScreen
51 devices collected as part of clinical care. The same device brands were also used to demonstrate
52 detection and whole genome sequencing of non-SARS-CoV-2 respiratory viruses present on the
53 COVID-19 LFD (5). *Macori et al., 2022* demonstrated SARS-Cov-2 sequencing was possible from
54 PanBio and Clinitest devices. *Rector et al., 2022* demonstrated that genomic material of SARS-
55 COV-2, influenza virus, adenovirus and rotavirus can also be retrieved from their corresponding
56 positive LFDs, tested across 9 different device brands (Roche, FlowFlex, Newgene, Coris, Alltest,
57 Boson, OrientGene, AMP and Nadal), showing stability for up to three months post-use storage
58 at room temperature, but noting that there were significant differences in RNA yields obtained
59 from different device buffers, highlighting the requirement for individual device testing prior to
60 routine use in sequencing.

61
62 In this study we aim to perform an assessment of sequencing from the LFD, focussed on those
63 LFD brands currently in use in the UK, with a focus on the feasibility of performing the analysis in
64 real-world relevant processing time frame.

65
66

67 **Methods**

68 **Lateral Flow Devices assessed**

69 Four brands of SARS-COV-2 LFD widely used in the UK were procured for assessment for
70 recovery of SARS-COV-2 genomic material :

- 71 • FlowFlex COVID-19 Antigen Rapid Test (FlowFlex)
- 72 • COVID-19 SureScreen Lateral Flow Self-Test (SureScreen)
- 73 • OrientGene Rapid Covid-19 (Antigen) Self-Test (OrientGene)
- 74 • INNOVA SARS-CoV-2 Rapid Antigen Test (Innova)

75

76 **Inactivated SARS-COV-2**

77 Cell-cultured and X-ray-irradiation-inactivated SARS-COV-2 virions were provided by Virology
78 and Pathogenesis group, UKHSA Porton Down. A dilution series of samples was produced
79 ranging from 10^5 to 10^1 PFU/ml (RT-qPCR C_t vales of 18, 25, 28, 32 and 35).

80

81 **Clinical samples**

82 Anonymous residual VTM from nasal swab samples was provided from routine UKHSA SAR-
83 COV-2 surveillance sequencing.

84

85 **LFD loading**

86 Mock or clinical samples were diluted 1:1 v/v with the corresponding LFD sample loading buffer
87 and 70 μ l applied to the device via pipette. After 15 min the LFD result was read. Ambient
88 incubation was continued for 45 min before elution.

89

90 **Addition of preservatives**

91 Where stated, 70 μ l of the tested preservative were added to the device via the sample loading
92 port once the result had been read. Viral sample titre for all preservative testing 10^3 PFU/ml (RT-
93 qPCR C_t 25).

94

95

96 **LFD Elution**

97 **Strip removal method**

98 The LFD was opened manually along the join line of the outer casing, the internal strip was
99 removed using two pairs of tweezers, placed into a 2 ml tube containing 700 μ l of MagMAX

100 Viral/Pathogen Binding Solution (extraction buffer) and incubated for 60 min prior to nucleic acid
101 extraction.

102

103 **Centrifugation method**

104 700 µl of extraction buffer was added to the LFD via the sample loading port. The device was
105 placed inside a 50 ml falcon tube, laid flat (face up) and incubated for 60 min. The tube containing
106 the LFD was centrifuged at 2000 rpm for 2 min to elute the extraction buffer from the device into
107 the falcon tube prior to nucleic acid extraction.

108

109 **Nucleic Acid extraction**

110 Samples were extracted via the KingFisher Flex platform using the MagMAX Viral/Pathogen
111 Nucleic Acid Isolation kits and 700µl of sample input, as per manufacturer's instructions.

112

113 **SARS-COV-2 Sequencing and lineage calling**

114 Samples were processed by the UKHSA Pathogen Genomics SARS-Cov-2 Sequencing Service,
115 utilising the ARTIC network tiling amplicon scheme protocol (8), with primer scheme version 5.3.2.
116 (SARS-CoV-2 version 5.3.2 scheme release - Laboratory - ARTIC Real-time Genomic
117 Surveillance) and sequenced on an Oxford Nanopore GridION X5. Data analysis was performed
118 by following the ARTIC network nanopore protocol for nCoV2019 (10) and lineage determined via
119 Pangolin (11).

120

121 **RT-qPCR**

122 RT-qPCR was performed using New England Biolabs, Luna SARS-CoV-2 RT-qPCR Multiplex
123 Assay Kit. Assays were performed as per manufacturer's instructions for the multiplex detection
124 of 2019-nCoV_N1 and 2019-nCoV_N2 targets. Reported C_t values are for the N1 target.

125

126

127 **Results/Discussion**


128

129 **Preliminary testing of recovery utilising inactivated SARS-COV-2**

130 A titration range of inactivated SARS-COV-2 virions was used to assess the four device brands,
131 with genomic material recovered by removal of the test strip (see methods).

132 We observed recovery of sufficient sequence information for lineage assignment (Typically > 70%
133 of total genome) at both 10^5 and 10^3 PFU/ml concentrations (Equivalent to a sample C_T of 18 and
134 25 respectively) from three of the four devices tested (Figure 1). SureScreen being the exception,
135 with reduced genome recovery across all concentrations tested. Samples with a concentration of
136 10^2 and above consistently produced a positive LFD on all brands tested.

137



138

139 **Figure 1. Percentage of total genome sequence recovered following elution of SARS-COV-**
140 **2 virions from four brands of LFDs.** Red line indicates 70% genome recovery (approximation
141 of level required for lineage determination).

142


143 **Clinical sample testing**

144 To assess recoverability from a clinically relevant sample type, we tested 40 residual nasal swab
145 VTM samples (used in COVID-19 surveillance sequencing). Residual material from each sample
146 was loaded upon each of the four LFD types for direct comparison.

147 Results again varied across devices. From OrientGene and Innova devices 80% of samples
148 achieved sufficient coverage for variant calling, whereas for FlowFlex and SureScreen devices
149 only 25 and 20% of samples produced sufficient genome coverage respectively (Figure 2).

150 In all cases where a lineage call was achieved, they were concordant with the expected result
151 from initial sample sequencing.

152



153

154 **Figure 2. Percentage of total genome sequence recovered following elution of clinical**
155 **samples across each of the four devices. Red line indicates 70% genome recovery.**


156

157 Elution efficiency and genome recovery

158 To assess efficiency of elution of viral nucleic acid from the LFDs, and the effect upon sequence
159 recovery, RT-qPCR was performed on a subset of the clinical samples and corresponding LFD
160 eluates. A similar level of reduction in viral concentration was seen between the primary sample
161 and the LFD eluate for all devices (Figure 3) with mean C_t increases being 14.9 from FlowFlex,
162 13.3 from Surescreen, 11.4 from OrientGene and 12.5 from Innova.

163 No clear correlation was seen between the C_t of the eluted material and the percentage of genome
164 recovered for FlowFlex and Surescreen devices. For OrientGene and Innova devices a trend was
165 observed of C_t below 30 being sufficient to provide >70% genome recovery consistently, with
166 higher C_t values providing more mixed results (Figure 4).


167



168

169 **Figure 3. qRT-PCR C_t from original sample and in the corresponding material eluted from**
170 **LFD.**

171




172
173 **Figure 4. Comparison of percentage consensus genome sequence recovery from clinical**
174 **samples compared to the viral titre of material eluted from the used LFDs. Red line indicates**
175 **70% genome recovery.**

176
177
178 **Process optimisation and evaluation of the centrifugation method using clinical samples**

179 Experiments initially followed the procedure for LFD strip extraction as set out by *Martin et al.*,
180 2022. This process is time consuming and labour intensive, therefore, we set out to test the
181 process of elution of sample in extraction buffer directly from the LFD via centrifugation as
182 described by *Macori et al.*, 2022.

183
184 For initial comparison the irradiated SARS-CoV-2 series, was processed in triplicate, across three
185 time points, on each device by both methods. LFD centrifugation provided equivalent or improved
186 genome coverage for all device brands (See Supplemental Table 1). A further comparison
187 between the two extraction methods was made using residual clinical samples. The clinical

188 samples tested were not paired but comprised of two batches containing samples with a clinically
189 representative C_t range. Results from elution by centrifugation remained comparable to those
190 from the strip removal extraction method when using clinical samples (Figure 5). The percentage
191 of samples with a positive lineage call, comparing strip removal to centrifugation was 21.7% to
192 29.4%, 21.7% to 17.7%, 78.2% to 76.4% and 78.2% to 76.4%, for FlowFlex, SureScreen,
193 OrientGene and Innova devices respectively.
194




195
196 **Figure 5. Distribution of percentage consensus genome sequence recovery following**
197 **elution via strip removal (opened) or centrifugation (spun) method from clinical samples**
198 **for all four LFD devices tested. Red line indicates 70% genome recovery.**
199

200 **Assessment of sample viability upon LFDs over seven days of ambient incubation.**

201 Real-world use of LFDs as a sample source for sequencing applications raises logistical issues
202 that are likely to include delays between initial sample LFD testing and laboratory processing,
203 particularly in home-use scenarios. We set out to assess the impact of delayed time of LFD
204 sample receipt and processing on the ability to recover informative genome sequences. An
205 irradiated SARS-CoV-2 dilution series was used to assess the effect of such delays ranging up to
206 seven days in duration. Stability of the nucleic acid in the used LFD as measured by genome
207 sequence recovery was assessed for each device, from dilution in LFD buffer without being run
208 on the device to running followed by multiple days incubation upon the device post-use, at room
209 temperature, prior to extraction (Figure 6).

210
211 Decreased genome recovery was seen with increased delay time for all devices. The highest titre
212 tested (equivalent C_t 18) provided sufficient genomic coverage for multiple days on FlowFlex,
213 OrientGene and Innova devices (Figure 4) but the signal rapidly degraded on Surescreen devices.
214 The C_t 25 equivalent sample showed inconsistent signal over multiple days on OrientGene and
215 Innova devices but was rapidly degraded on FlowFlex and SureScreen devices.



216
217 **Figure 6. Percentage consensus genome sequence recovery following elution of a range**
218 **of titres of SARS-COV-2 virions from the four LFD devices tested. Buffer indicates**
219 **incubation in buffer without being run on a device. Red line indicates 70% genome recovery.**
220
221

222 **The effect of delayed time to elution on recovery from LFDs using residual clinical sample**
223 **material**

224 Residual clinical samples were used to assess the effect of delayed time to elution on recovery
225 from LFDs. Ten clinical samples were tested on each of 4 LFD brands over the course of 3 days.
226 Decreased genome recovery is seen over time in all cases, but OrientGene and Innova devices
227 still provided sufficient genome coverage for lineage calling from 60% and 50% of clinical samples
228 tested after 2 days incubation. FlowFlex and SureScreen produced reduced genome coverage
229 from the samples tested, even in the absence of delayed recovery (Table 1).

230

231

	Percent of samples with Lineage Call		
	Day 0	Day 1	Day 2
FlowFlex	30	20	0
SureScreen	30	20	0
OrientGene	90	60	60
Innova	80	70	50

232 **Table 1. Percentage of clinical samples from which sufficient genome sequence was**
233 **recovered from each LFD brand following either immediate extraction for sequencing (Day**
234 **0) or ambient incubation on the device (Day 1, Day 2).**


235

236

237 **The effect of nucleic acid preservatives on recovery from LFDs over five days of ambient**
238 **incubation**

239 Addition of three RNA stabilising agents to devices post running of a mid-titre SARS-COV-2 mock
240 sample (10^3 PFU.ml) show varied results. DNA/RNA shield and RNALater preserved RNA and
241 allowed near complete genome sequencing after 5 days room temperature incubation on both
242 OrientGene and Innova devices. Inhibisure was similarly effective on the Innova device but
243 showed no preservative effect on OrientGene devices. Results on FlowFlex were inconsistent for
244 all preservatives tested (Figure 7).

245



246

247 **Figure 7. The effect of nucleic acid preservatives on genome recovery from LFDs over five**

248 **days of ambient incubation. Red line indicates 70% genome recovery.**

249 Discussion

250 In this study we set out to assess the feasibility of SARS-CoV-2 amplicon sequencing using LFD
251 eluates from four major LFD brands currently in use in the UK, with the aim of generating a
252 protocol that could subsequently be expanded to other potential use settings, such as support for
253 future variant monitoring programs. The LFDs used in this study were not designed to be
254 compatible for use with downstream genomic studies, as such device performances are not a
255 reflection of their ability to detect SARS-CoV-2 when used for their intended purpose.

256
257 Our evaluation using inactivated SARS-COV-2 observed recovery of sufficient sequence
258 information for lineage assignment at titres as low as 10^3 PFU/ml (sample Ct ~25) from three of
259 the four evaluated major devices currently in use within the UK.

260
261 Our assessment of genome recovery from 40 residual clinical nasal swab samples (C_t range from
262 13 to 24) for each LFD type found reduced genome recovery for clinical samples from FlowFlex
263 and SureScreen devices (25% and 20% of samples with a lineage call respectively) when
264 compared to OrientGene and Innova devices (80% and 80% of samples with a lineage call
265 respectively).

266
267 Rector *et al.*, 2022 tested a range of LFD brands, using stored nasopharyngeal samples, they
268 found that LFD buffer components can be deleterious for the viral genetic material, resulting in
269 lower RNA concentrations and interfering with sequencing. In our study, a similar reduction in
270 viral concentration was seen in LFD eluates of all brands compared to the originating clinical
271 samples. Indicating that reduced elution efficiency is unlikely to be the cause of poorer genome
272 recovery via amplicon sequencing in some devices. Increased levels of fragmentation or the
273 presence of inhibitors may be significant factors.

274
275 The process of removing strips from LFD casings for nucleic acid extraction is time consuming,
276 labour intensive and not feasible for use in high throughput processing. Work by Macori *et al.*,
277 2022 described an extraction method by centrifugation. In our study, we confirmed LFD
278 centrifugation provided equivalent or improved genome coverage for all device brands.

279
280 Decreased genome recovery was seen with increased delay time for all devices. OrientGene and
281 Innova showed the best recovery over time, with 60/70% of samples showing sufficient stability
282 after two days to retrieve near complete genome sequences. For all LFD brands considerable

283 loss of recovery from clinically representative titrations was seen from day three onwards.
284 Interestingly, Martin *et al.*, 2022 found that SARS-CoV-2 genomes could be successfully
285 recovered from Abbott and InnoScreen brand test devices up to 8 days after initial sample
286 collection.

287
288 The addition of commercial nucleic-acid-stabilising reagents to devices after run completion
289 showed promise. Both RNALater and DNA/RNA shield showed preservative effect over several
290 days upon the typically best yielding devices, OrientGene and Innova, as has been observed by
291 Moso *et al.*, 2024 for multiple RNA viruses on the PanBio COVID-19 device. Neither preservative
292 however improved the recovery from the FlowFlex device.

293
294 LFDs are not designed to be compatible with extracting genetic material suitable for sequencing.
295 However, building on the observations of *Martin et al.*, 2022 and others, we have verified that it is
296 feasible to retrieve adequate genetic material for targeted amplicon sequencing from some of
297 these devices. Our work extends this finding to various LFDs currently deployed in the UK,
298 showing that genomic recovery varies across different devices. Accordingly, a comprehensive
299 assessment of each LFD type is required to determine its suitability as a genomic sequencing
300 sample source.

301
302 Consideration should be given as to whether future iterations of LFDs should incorporate the
303 capability to efficiently sequence pathogens from the eluate as a design requirement or how this
304 could otherwise be achieved efficiently and effectively.

305
306 We suggest the following next steps:

- 307 1. Conduct a comprehensive comparative study to quantify the efficiency of genomic
308 recovery across different LFD brands and models working with representative
309 suppliers. This study should aim to identify factors that influence the variability in
310 recovery rates.
- 311 2. Engage with LFD manufacturers to share findings and collaborate on the
312 development of next-generation devices that include the efficient recovery of genetic
313 material as a key design objective.
- 314 3. Work towards establishing a set of guidelines or standards for evaluating LFD
315 suitability as sources of genetic material for sequencing. These guidelines may help
316 streamline the assessment process for new or existing LFD types.

317 **References**

- 318 1. Marjanovic S, Romanelli RJ, Ali GC, Leach B, Bonsu M, Rodriguez-Rincon D, Ling T.
319 COVID-19 Genomics UK (COG-UK) Consortium: Final Report. *Rand Health Q.* 2022 Aug
320 31;9(4):24. PMID: 36238008; PMCID: PMC9519096.
- 321 2. COVID-19 Genomics UK (COG-UK) consortium. An integrated national scale SARS-CoV-
322 2 genomic surveillance network. *Lancet Microbe.* 2020 Jul;1(3):e99-e100. doi:
323 10.1016/S2666-5247(20)30054-9. Epub 2020 Jun 2. PMID: 32835336; PMCID:
324 PMC7266609.
- 325 3. Eyre DW, Futschik M, Tunkel S, Wei J, Cole-Hamilton J, Saquib R, Germanacos N,
326 Dodgson AR, Klapper PE, Sudhanva M, Kenny C, Marks P, Blandford E, Hopkins S, Peto
327 TEA, Fowler T. Performance of antigen lateral flow devices in the UK during the alpha,
328 delta, and omicron waves of the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic: a diagnostic and observational
329 study. *Lancet Infect Dis.* 2023 Aug;23(8):922-932. doi: 10.1016/S1473-3099(23)00129-9.
330 Epub 2023 Mar 28. PMID: 37001541; PMCID: PMC10048397.
- 331 4. Martin GE, Taiaroa G, Taouk ML, Savic I, O'Keefe J, Quach R, Prestedge J, Krysiak M,
332 Caly L, Williamson DA. Maintaining genomic surveillance using whole-genome
333 sequencing of SARS-CoV-2 from rapid antigen test devices. *Lancet Infect Dis.* 2022
334 Oct;22(10):1417-1418. doi: 10.1016/S1473-3099(22)00512-6. Epub 2022 Aug 4. PMID:
335 35934015; PMCID: PMC9352270.
- 336 5. Moso MA, Taiaroa G, Steinig E, Zhanduisenov M, Butel-Simoes G, Savic I, Taouk ML,
337 Chea S, Moselen J, O'Keefe J, Prestedge J, Pollock GL, Khan M, Soloczynskij K,
338 Fernando J, Martin GE, Caly L, Barr IG, Tran T, Druce J, Lim CK, Williamson DA. Non-
339 SARS-CoV-2 respiratory viral detection and whole genome sequencing from COVID-19
340 rapid antigen test devices: a laboratory evaluation study. *Lancet Microbe.* 2024
341 Apr;5(4):e317-e325. doi: 10.1016/S2666-5247(23)00375-0. Epub 2024 Feb 12. PMID:
342 38359857.
- 343 6. Rector A, Bloemen M, Schiettekatte G, Maes P, Van Ranst M, Wollants E. Sequencing
344 directly from antigen-detection rapid diagnostic tests in Belgium, 2022: a gamechanger in
345 genomic surveillance? *Euro Surveill.* 2023 Mar;28(9):2200618. doi: 10.2807/1560-
346 7917.ES.2023.28.9.2200618. PMID: 36862099; PMCID: PMC9983067.
- 347 7. Macori G, Russell T, Barry G, McCarthy SC, Koolman L, Wall P, Sammin D, Mulcahy G,
348 Fanning S. Inactivation and Recovery of High Quality RNA From Positive SARS-CoV-2
349 Rapid Antigen Tests Suitable for Whole Virus Genome Sequencing. *Front Public Health.*

350 2022 May 3;10:863862. doi: 10.3389/fpubh.2022.863862. PMID: 35592078; PMCID:
351 PMC9113430.

352 8. Josh Quick, Lauren Lansdowne 2024. ARTIC SARS-CoV-2 sequencing protocol v4
353 (LSK114). protocols.io <https://dx.doi.org/10.17504/protocols.io.bp2l6n26rgge/v4>

354 9. <https://community.artic.network/t/sars-cov-2-version-5-3-2-scheme-release/462>

355 10. <https://github.com/artic-network/artic-ncov2019>

356 11. Áine O'Toole, Emily Scher, Anthony Underwood, Ben Jackson, Verity Hill, John T
357 McCrone, Rachel Colquhoun, Chris Ruis, Khalil Abu-Dahab, Ben Taylor, Corin Yeats,
358 Louis Du Plessis, Daniel Maloney, Nathan Medd, Stephen W Attwood, David M Aanensen,
359 Edward C Holmes, Oliver G Pybus, Andrew Rambaut (2021) Virus Evolution
360 DOI:10.1093/ve/veab064

361

362

363

364

365

366

367 **Supplemental**

FlowFlex

Viral Titre PFU/ML	Day 0		Day 1		Day 2	
	Opened	Spun	Opened	Spun	Opened	Spun
10 ⁵	97.7	98.48	94.91	97.59	78.04	83.6
10 ³	78.85	93.21	31.46	84.53	11.22	36.94
10 ²	23.31	58.32	3.57	39.25	3.46	28.4
10 ¹	4.51	17.75	1.11	3.23	0	1.18
10 ⁰	0	4.55	0	0	0	0

SureScreen

Viral Titre PFU/ML	Day 0		Day 1		Day 2	
	Opened	Spun	Opened	Spun	Opened	Spun
10 ⁵	62.62	70.04	0	7.68	21.64	26.44
10 ³	1.16	19.78	0	1.19	8.13	6.79
10 ²	1.19	4.51	0	0	23.57	0
10 ¹	0	4.48	0	0	0.85	0
10 ⁰	0	0	0	0	0	0

OrientGene

Viral Titre PFU/ML	Day 0		Day 1		Day 2	
	Opened	Spun	Opened	Spun	Opened	Spun
10 ⁵	97.7	99.45	99.44	98.5	97.67	98.51
10 ³	74.38	98.49	89.33	93.13	45.31	88.67
10 ²	33.41	86.53	40.83	53.68	12.5	37.63
10 ¹	5.08	72.18	11.39	0	2.05	9.06
10 ⁰	1.15	38.31	0	1.19	1.09	4.59

Innova

Viral Titre PFU/ML	Day 0		Day 1		Day 2	
	Opened	Spun	Opened	Spun	Opened	Spun
10 ⁵	97.69	99.43	98.52	99.43	97.7	92.43
10 ³	73.91	97.58	79.04	97.28	64.61	82.06
10 ²	59.2	94.39	39.97	86.7	18.37	49.65
10 ¹	8.11	75.53	7.92	29.53	0	1.09
10 ⁰	0	30.95	0.98	2.25	0	0

368

369 **Supplementary Table 1. Comparison of percentage consensus genome sequence recovery**
 370 **following elution via strip removal (opened) or centrifugation (spun) method of a range of**
 371 **titres of SARS-COV-2 virions of all four LFD devices tested. Colour coded from green (high)**
 372 **to red (low) coverage.**