

RT-LAMP has high accuracy for detecting SARS-CoV-2 in saliva and naso/oropharyngeal swabs from asymptomatic and symptomatic individuals

Short title: RT-LAMP for detecting SARS-CoV-2 in saliva and naso/oropharyngeal swabs

†Stephen P. Kidd^{1,2}, †Daniel Burns^{4,3}, Bryony Armson^{1,2,4}, Andrew D. Beggs⁵, Emma L. A. Howson⁶, Anthony Williams⁷, Gemma Snell⁷, Emma L. Wise^{1,8}, Alice Goring¹, Zoe Vincent-Mistiaen⁹, Seden Grippon¹, Jason Sawyer¹⁰, Claire Cassar¹⁰, David Cross¹⁰, Thomas Lewis¹⁰, Scott M. Reid¹⁰, Samantha Rivers¹⁰, Joe James¹⁰, Paul Skinner¹⁰, Ashley Banyard¹⁰, Kerrie Davies¹¹, Anetta Ptasinska⁵, Celina Whalley⁵, Jack Ferguson⁵, Claire Bryer⁵, Charlie Poxon⁵, Andrew Bosworth⁵, Michael Kidd^{5,12}, Alex Richter¹³, Jane Burton¹⁴, Hannah Love¹⁴, Sarah Fouch¹, Claire Tillyer¹, Amy Sowood¹, Helen Patrick¹, Nathan Moore¹, [‡]Michael Andreou¹⁵, [‡]Nick Morant¹⁶, Rebecca Houghton¹, Joe Parker¹⁷, Joanne Slater-Jefferies¹⁷, Ian Brown¹⁰, Cosima Gretton², Zandra Deans², Deborah Porter², Nicholas J. Cortes^{1,9}, Angela Douglas², Sue L. Hill², *Keith M. Godfrey^{18,19}, *Veronica L. Fowler^{1,2}

¹Hampshire Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, Department of Microbiology, Basingstoke and North Hants Hospital, Basingstoke, UK

²NHS Test and Trace Programme, Department of Health and Social Care, UK

³School of Electronics and Computer Science, University of Southampton, UK

⁴vHive, School of Veterinary Medicine, University of Surrey, Guildford, UK

⁵University Hospitals Birmingham NHS Foundation Trust, Birmingham, UK

⁶The Pirbright Institute, Ash Road, Pirbright, Woking, UK

⁷University of Southampton & Division of Specialist Medicine, University Hospital Southampton, UK

⁸School of Biosciences and Medicine, University of Surrey, Guildford, UK

⁹Gibraltar Health Authority, Gibraltar, UK

¹⁰Animal and Plant Health Agency, New Haw, Addlestone, Surrey, UK

¹¹Leeds Teaching Hospitals NHS Trust and University of Leeds, UK

¹²Public Health West Midlands Laboratory, Birmingham, UK

¹³Institute of Immunology and Immunotherapy, University of Birmingham, UK

¹⁴High Containment Microbiology, National Infection Service, Public Health England, Porton Down, UK

¹⁵OptiSense Limited, Horsham, West Sussex, UK

¹⁶GeneSys Biotech Limited, Camberley, Surrey, UK

¹⁷National Biofilms Innovation Centre, University of Southampton, UK

¹⁸NIHR Southampton Biomedical Research Centre, University of Southampton and University Hospital, UK

¹⁹MRC Lifecourse Epidemiology Centre, University of Southampton, UK

†Denotes co-first authorship; *Senior author; *Corresponding author

[‡]Supplied reagents free of charge but did not assist in study design or data analysis.

Corresponding author: Keith M. Godfrey, kmg@soton.ac.uk, MRC Lifecourse Epidemiology Centre (University of Southampton), University Hospital Southampton, Mailpoint 95, Southampton SO16 6YD, UK.

Tables: 5, Figures: 4

Running title: Saliva SARS-CoV-2 detection by RT-LAMP
NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

41

42 Grant numbers and sources of support: OptiGene Ltd. supplied reagents free of charge for this study. This
43 work was partially funded by a UK Department of Health and Social Care award to the University of
44 Southampton (Grant Reference Number 2020/032 (Feasibility study for city-wide testing using saliva 315
45 based LAMP testing)). The views expressed are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the
46 Department of Health and Social Care. KMG is supported by the UK Medical Research Council
47 (MC_UU_12011/4), the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR Senior Investigator (NF-SI-0515- 318
48 10042) and NIHR Southampton Biomedical Research Centre (IS-BRC-1215-20004)) and the British Heart
49 Foundation (RG/15/17/3174). For part of this project, Emma Howson was on secondment at GeneSys
50 Biotech Ltd., which was part funded by The Pirbright Institute Flexible Talent Mobility Account (FTMA)
51 under BBSRC grant BB/S507945/1. ADB is currently supported by a Cancer Research UK Advanced
52 Clinician Scientist award (C31641/A23923) and his laboratory is supported by CRUK Centre Birmingham
53 (C17422/A25154) and the Birmingham Experimental Cancer Medicine Centre (C11497/A25127). VLF, SPK,
54 BA and ZD were on secondment to the Department of Health and Social Care for a period during this
55 study. APHA laboratory activities and expertise was supported by both the Safe and Certain project
56 APHACSKL0085 and Defra project APHANSOM0416.

57 Disclosures: MA is an employee of OptiSense Limited, and NM an employee of GeneSys Biotech Limited;
58 neither had any role in study design or data analysis. KMG is part of an academic consortium that has
59 received research funding from Abbott Nutrition, Nestec, BenevolentAI Bio Ltd. and Danone.

60

61

62 **Abstract**

63 Previous studies have described RT-LAMP methodology for the rapid detection of SARS-CoV-2 in
64 nasopharyngeal (NP) and oropharyngeal (OP) swab and saliva samples. This study describes the validation
65 of an improved sample preparation method for extraction free RT-LAMP and defines the clinical
66 performance of four different RT-LAMP assay formats for detection of SARS-CoV-2 within a multisite
67 clinical evaluation. Direct RT-LAMP was performed on 559 swabs and 86,760 saliva samples and RNA RT-
68 LAMP on extracted RNA from 12,619 swabs and 12,521 saliva from asymptomatic and symptomatic
69 individuals across healthcare and community settings. For Direct RT-LAMP, overall diagnostic sensitivity
70 (DSe) of 70.35% (95% CI 63.48-76.60%) on swabs and 84.62% (79.50-88.88%) on saliva was observed, with
71 diagnostic specificity (DSp) of 100% (98.98-100.00%) on swabs and 100% (99.72-100.00%) on saliva when
72 compared to RT-qPCR; analysing samples with RT-qPCR *ORF1ab* C_T values of ≤ 25 and ≤ 33 , DSe of 100%
73 (96.34-100%) and 77.78% (70.99-83.62%) for swabs were observed, and 99.01% (94.61-99.97%) and
74 87.61% (82.69-91.54%) for saliva, respectively. For RNA RT-LAMP, overall DSe and DSp were 96.06%
75 (92.88-98.12%) and 99.99% (99.95-100%) for swabs, and 80.65% (73.54-86.54%) and 99.99% (99.95-
76 100%) for saliva, respectively. These findings demonstrate that RT-LAMP is applicable to a variety of use-
77 cases, including frequent, interval-based testing of saliva with Direct RT-LAMP from asymptomatic
78 individuals that may otherwise be missed using symptomatic testing alone.

79

80

81 Introduction

82 Rapid diagnostic testing to identify and isolate symptomatic and asymptomatic individuals potentially
83 transmitting infectious viral pathogens is an essential requirement of any pandemic response. The novel
84 *betacoronavirus*, SARS-CoV-2, initially identified after an outbreak of viral pneumonia in Wuhan, China in
85 December 2019¹, has rapidly spread throughout the world, causing over 223 million confirmed cases and
86 over 4.6 million deaths (<https://coronavirus.jhu.edu/> - September 10, 2021).

87 Conventional diagnostics for SARS-CoV-2 consist of RNA enrichment followed by reverse-transcriptase
88 quantitative real-time PCR (RT-qPCR) against one or more viral gene targets². However, this methodology
89 requires sample inactivation, RNA extraction and RT-qPCR thermal cycling, meaning that the time from
90 sample-to-result can often be several hours, and requires centralised equipment and personnel trained
91 in Good Laboratory Practice to perform testing.

92 The utility of reverse-transcriptase loop mediated isothermal amplification (RT-LAMP) for the detection
93 of SARS-CoV-2 both from extracted RNA (RNA RT-LAMP) and directly from NP/OP swabs (Direct RT-
94 LAMP)³ has previously been shown. RT-LAMP utilises a rapid and stable DNA polymerase that amplifies
95 target nucleic acids at a constant temperature. This removes the requirement for conventional thermal
96 cycling allowing RT-LAMP reactions to be performed in shorter reaction times using less sophisticated
97 platforms.

98 In a study of 196 clinical samples³, testing of RNA extracted from NP/OP swabs collected into viral
99 transport media (VTM) using RNA RT-LAMP demonstrated a diagnostic sensitivity (DSe) of 97% and a
100 diagnostic specificity (DSp) of 99% in comparison to RT-qPCR of the ORF1ab region of SARS-CoV-2. For
101 Direct RT-LAMP on crude swab samples, the DSe and DSp were 67% and 97%, respectively. When a cycle
102 threshold (C_T) cut-off for RT-qPCR of < 25 was considered, reflecting the increased likelihood of detecting
103 viral RNA from active viral replication, the DSe of Direct RT-LAMP increased to 100%³.

104 However, the collection of a swab sample is invasive and during the time of the pandemic there have
105 been considerable shortages in swab supplies. Exploring the use of alternative sample types that are both
106 easy to collect and more comfortable from a sampling perspective^{4,5,6} is desirable particularly when
107 repeat sampling is performed^{7,8,9}. Saliva presents an ideal bio-fluid that fulfils both these objectives and
108 previous studies have shown that SARS-CoV-2 is readily detectable in such a sample type^{10,11,12-18}. To
109 improve the diagnostic sensitivity of previously described saliva Direct RT-LAMP³, optimisation of saliva
110 preparation for the detection of SARS-CoV-2 was undertaken utilising a cohort of 3100 saliva samples
111 from an asymptomatic population¹⁹ of healthcare workers; where saliva was diluted 1:1 in Mucolyse™,
112 followed by a 1 in 10 dilution in 10% (w/v) Chelex® 100 Resin ending with a 98°C heat step prior to RT-
113 LAMP which resulted in optimal sensitivity and specificity.

114 Despite the benefits of this optimisation, the protocol added additional steps and reagents which
115 increased chance for user error and made the automation of the process more challenging. This study
116 therefore aimed to investigate a simpler process using a novel reagent, RapiLyze (OptiGene Ltd,
117 Camberley, UK), which is a sample dilution buffer, followed by a two-minute heat-step. This novel sample
118 preparation method was evaluated in combination with Direct RT-LAMP using samples collected from
119 symptomatic National Health Service (NHS) patients and symptomatic and asymptomatic healthcare staff.

120

121 **Methods**

122 **Ethical statement**

123 All relevant ethical guidelines have been followed, and any necessary IRB and/or ethics committee
124 approvals have been obtained. National Research Ethics Service Committee West Midlands - South
125 Birmingham 2002/201 Amendment Number 4. All necessary written participant consent has been
126 obtained and the appropriate institutional forms have been archived.

127 **Testing sites**

128 The OptiGene Ltd. SARS-CoV-2 RT-LAMP assay was evaluated in nine sites, comprising Basingstoke and
129 North Hampshire Hospital & Royal Hampshire County Hospital, Hampshire Hospitals NHS Foundation
130 Trust; University Hospital Southampton; Animal and Plant Health Agency/MRC Lifecourse Epidemiology
131 Unit (University of Southampton); Public Health Lab Manchester/CMFT; Leeds Teaching Hospitals NHS
132 Trust; University Hospitals Birmingham (UHB) NHS Foundation Trust/Institute of Cancer & Genomic
133 Science University of Birmingham; High Containment Microbiology, National Infection Service, Public
134 Health England, Porton Down and Public Health University Laboratory, Gibraltar Health Authority,
135 Gibraltar, UK.

136 **Clinical samples**

137 Nasopharyngeal (NP) and oropharyngeal (OP) swabs were collected from asymptomatic and symptomatic
138 individuals and placed in viral transport media (VTM).

139 Drooled saliva samples were collected at the start of the day; prior to eating, drinking, teeth brushing, or
140 using a mouthwash. Saliva was transferred into the specimen pot directly or via a clean teaspoon,
141 according to a standardised protocol. Samples from UHB deposited saliva straight into the collection pot.

142 **Log reduction of SARS-CoV-2 for the heat and lysis steps used independently and sequentially**

143 We determined the viral inactivation kinetics of the best sample preparation condition(s), evaluating the
144 effect of the heat and lysis steps on the viral inactivation of SARS-CoV-2 as determined by infectivity
145 assays. All inactivation experiments were conducted under Containment Level 3 Containment and as such

146 were undertaken at APHA. Heat inactivation experiments were conducted utilising high titre live SARS-
147 CoV-2 virus spiked into pools of saliva collected from APHA staff or in tissue culture supernatant (TCSN).
148 Early experiments demonstrated that saliva had a high toxicity for tissue culture cells, even after heat
149 inactivation demonstrating that toxicity was likely not enzymatic. As such further inactivation was
150 undertaken on live virus TCSN. Comparison was also undertaken of Betapropiolactone (BPL) inactivated
151 virus and live virus.

152 **RNA extraction**

153 RNA was extracted using a range of different methods available at each participating site:

154 *Maxwell® RSC Viral Total Nucleic Acid Purification Kit*

155 In a class 1 microbiological safety cabinet (MSC) within a containment level 3 laboratory, 200 µl of sample
156 was added to 223 µl of prepared lysis solution (including 5 µl per reaction of Genesig® Easy RNA Internal
157 extraction control, Primerdesign Ltd, Chandler's Ford, UK). Samples were then inactivated for 10 minutes
158 at room temperature within the MSC and 10 minutes at 56°C on a heat block before automated RNA
159 extraction using a Maxwell® RSC48 Instrument (Promega UK Ltd., Southampton, UK). RNA was eluted in
160 50 µl of nuclease-free water (NFW).

161 *MagMAX™CORE Nucleic acid 140 purification kit*

162 10 µl of sample (diluted in 190µl DEPC treated water) was added to 700 µl of prepared lysis solution.
163 Samples were then inactivated for 10 minutes at room temperature within the safety cabinet before
164 automated RNA extraction using a Kingfisher Flex (Thermo Fisher, Basingstoke, UK). RNA was eluted in 90
165 µl of NFW.

166 *Roche FLOW system*

167 RNA extraction was carried out on a MagNA Pure 96 (MP96) extraction robot using the MagNA Pure 96
168 DNA and Viral Nucleic Acid Small Volume kit (Roche, Basel, Switzerland) and the Pathogen 200 universal
169 protocol v4.0.

170 *Qiagen QIASymphony*

171 RNA extraction was carried out using the QIASymphony Virus/Bacteria Mini Kit (Qiagen, Hilden, Germany)
172 by the CellFree200 Default IC protocol with a 60 µl extract elution volume.

173 **SARS-CoV-2 Real-Time RT-qPCR**

174 RNA was analysed using a range of different methods available at each site:

175 *CerTest VIASURE SARS-CoV-2 real time qPCR assay*

176 Single step RT-qPCR against the *ORF1ab* region and *N1* gene target of SARS-CoV-2 was carried out using
177 the CerTest VIASURE SARS-CoV-2 real time PCR kit (CerTest Biotech SL, Zaragoza, Spain) according to
178 manufacturer's instructions for use (IFU) on either the Thermo Fisher QuantStudio 5 or BioMolecular
179 Systems (Queensland, Australia) MIC instruments, using 5 µl of extracted RNA per reaction. RNA extracted
180 using the Maxwell® RSC Viral Total Nucleic Acid Purification Kit was analysed using this assay.

181 *COVID-19 genesig® Real-Time qPCR assay*

182 Single step RT-qPCR against the *ORF1ab* region of SARS-CoV-2 was carried out using the COVID-19
183 genesig® Real-Time PCR assay real time PCR assay (Primerdesign Ltd, Chandler's Ford, UK) according to
184 manufacturer's instructions for use (IFU) on BioMolecular Systems MIC instruments, using 5 µl of
185 extracted RNA per reaction. RNA extracted using the Maxwell® RSC Viral Total Nucleic Acid Purification
186 Kit was analysed using this assay.

187 *Corman et al. Real-Time qPCR assay*

188 Single step RT-qPCR against the *E* gene target of SARS-CoV-2 was carried out with the Corman *et al.*²
189 primers using the AgPath-ID™ PCR kit (Thermo Fisher) according to manufacturer's instructions for use
190 (IFU) on an Aria qPCR Cycler (Agilent, Cheshire, UK) and results analysed using the Agilent AriaMX 1.5
191 software, using 5 µl of extracted RNA per reaction. RNA extracted using the MagMAX™ CORE Nucleic acid
192 purification kit were analysed using this assay.

193 RT-qPCR was carried out on an Applied Biosystems Fast 7500 PCR thermocycler in standard run mode
194 using the SARS-CoV-2 *E* gene Sarbeco assay using MS2 as an internal extraction control and aliquots of
195 SARS-CoV-2/England/2/2020 as a positive control. The master mix comprised *E*- gene F and R primers and
196 TM-P (400 nM, 400 nM and 200 nM final concentration respectively), MS2 primers and TM probe (20 nM,
197 20 nM and 40 nM final concentration respectively), 4 x TaqMan® Fast Virus 1-Step Master Mix made up
198 with molecular-grade nuclease free water (Ambion) to a final volume of 15 µl. 5 µl of AVE buffer extract
199 was used at a template and added to the 15 µl mastermix. Cycling conditions were 55°C for 10 min,
200 followed by 94°C for 3 min and 45 cycles of 95°C for 15 s and 58°C for 30 s.

201 *SARS-CoV-2 (2019-nCoV) CDC qPCR Probe Assay*

202 Single step RT-qPCR against the *N1* and *N2* gene targets of SARS-CoV-2 was carried out using integrated
203 design technologies kit (IDT; Catalogue number: 10006606) according to manufacturer's instructions for
204 use (IFU) on either a LC480 II or ABI 7500 FAST instrument. RNA extracted on Qiagen QIASymphony and
205 the Roche FLOW system were analysed using this RT-qPCR assay.

206 **RT-LAMP**

207 RT-LAMP assays were performed using OptiGene Ltd. COVID-19_RT-LAMP kits, as described previously³,
208 with the following modifications. The COVID-19_RNA RT-LAMP KIT-500 kit was used for RNA RT-LAMP
209 and the COVID-19_Direct PLUS RT-LAMP KIT-500 was used for Direct RT-LAMP directly on
210 oropharyngeal/nasopharyngeal swabs or saliva samples. The COVID-19_Direct PLUS RT-LAMP KIT-500 kit
211 also includes a sample preparation buffer, RapiLyze. For RNA RT-LAMP 5 µl of extracted RNA was added
212 to the reaction. For the Direct PLUS RT-LAMP, 50 µl sample (swab VTM or neat saliva) was added to 50 µl
213 RapiLyze, vortexed and placed in a dry heat block pre-heated to 98°C for 2 mins. 5 µl of the treated sample
214 was added to each reaction.

215 The anneal temperature (Ta) that confirmed a positive result for Direct RT-LAMP was modified to 81.5°C
216 and 85.99°C because of the effect of RapiLyze buffer on the reaction.

217

218 **SARS-CoV-2 viral culture of clinical samples across a C_T range**

219 For culture, 100 µl and 100 µl of a 1 in 10 dilution of samples 1-6 (predicted lower C_T values) and 100 µl
220 samples 7-26 (with higher predicted C_T values) were added to a 25 cm² flasks containing 80% confluent
221 Vero E6 cells and allowed to adsorb for 1 hour. Five ml of Minimum Essential Medium (MEM) (Gibco) +
222 HEPES (Gibco, Thermo Fisher, Basingstoke, UK) + 4% foetal calf serum FCS (Sigma) + 1 x antibiotic-
223 antimycotic (Gibco) was added to each flask and incubated for 1 week at 37°C. Two negative control flasks
224 to which 100 µl MEM + 4% FCS was added in place of sample, were set up in parallel. Cultures were
225 checked visually for cytopathic effect (CPE). Where CPE was not observed after 1 week, 500 µl of
226 supernatant was passed into a fresh flask containing Vero E6 cells for a further two passages. At the
227 beginning and end of each passage 140 µl of supernatant was collected for SARS-CoV-2 RT-qPCR as
228 described before.

229 To determine the sensitivity of the isolation method for SARS-CoV-2 from clinical samples, a virus stock
230 titred by plaque assay (HCM/V/53), a passage 3 working bank grown from SARS-CoV-2 Strain England 2,
231 from Public Health England, was diluted in MEM to give virus dilutions containing 1000, 100, 10, 1, 0.1
232 and 0.01 PFU. The virus was added to duplicate flasks containing Vero E6 cells and AVL. After 72 hours of
233 incubation flasks were checked for CPE, and for those where CPE was observed the supernatant was
234 collected for RT-qPCR. Any flasks not showing CPE after 7 days were passed on to fresh cells and
235 resampled as described above.

236 Data analysis

237 Overall diagnostic sensitivity and specificity (including 95% Clopper-Pearson confidence intervals) were
238 calculated by the aggregation of individual site data for each method (RNA and Direct RT-LAMP) for each
239 sample type (swabs and saliva). To demonstrate the effectiveness of detecting samples with higher viral
240 load, confusion matrices are quoted where the threshold for *positive* sample inclusion varies, i.e., for C_T
241 ≤ 25 , only positive samples with $C_T \leq 25$ are included.

242 To account for site heterogeneity, a bivariate meta-analysis model is additionally applied at the site level
243 to produce a summary of sensitivity and specificity for each method and sample type²⁰. Within-study
244 variability for sensitivity $\rho_{se,i}$ and specificity $\rho_{sp,i}$ are assumed to follow independent binomial
245 distributions

$$246 \quad x_{se,i} \sim B(n_{se,i}, \rho_{se,i}), \quad x_{sp,i} \sim B(n_{sp,i}, \rho_{sp,i})$$

247 where $x_{se,i}, x_{sp,i}$ represent the number testing positive for site i respectively, and $n_{se,i}, n_{sp,i}$ represent
248 the number testing positive and negative by RT-qPCR for site i respectively. The between-study
249 heterogeneity is represented by a bivariate normal distribution for the logit-transformed sensitivity $\mu_{se,i}$
250 and specificity $\mu_{sp,i}$

$$251 \quad \begin{pmatrix} \mu_{se,i} \\ \mu_{sp,i} \end{pmatrix} \sim N \left(\begin{pmatrix} \mu_{se} \\ \mu_{sp} \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_{se}^2 & \sigma_{se,sp} \\ \sigma_{se,sp} & \sigma_{sp}^2 \end{pmatrix} \right)$$

252 where μ_{se}, μ_{sp} represent the expected logit sensitivity and specificity, $\sigma_{se}^2, \sigma_{sp}^2$ represent the between-
253 study variance in the logit sensitivity and specificity, and $\sigma_{se,sp}$ represents the covariance between the
254 logit sensitivity and specificity. For Direct RT-LAMP, we fit a univariate normal distribution for the logit-
255 transformed sensitivity only, due to the absence of false positives across all sites.

256 In addition, the sensitivity as a function of viral load was assessed for RNA RT-LAMP and Direct RT-LAMP
257 on both swab and saliva samples. This was performed through the conversion of each sample C_T value to
258 viral load in gene copies/ml for all sample sets. As the relationship between C_T value and viral load varied
259 according to the RT-qPCR method used; a dilution series was utilised for each method to standardise
260 these values for two of the four aforementioned RT-qPCR methods (CerTest VIASURE SARS-CoV-2 real
261 time PCR kit, and Corman *et al* RT-qPCR assay *E* gene), which was used for testing 100% of the swab
262 samples, 90% of the saliva samples used for Direct RT-LAMP, and 83% of the saliva samples used for RNA
263 RT-LAMP. The logarithm of the viral load was then fitted to the C_T values for both methods using linear
264 regression followed by converting the C_T values to viral load based on which method had been used to
265 evaluate the samples. For the remaining samples ($n=56$) that utilised one of the other two RT-qPCR
266 methods for which viral load was not standardised against a C_T value, the conversion derived from the

267 CerTest VIASURE SARS-CoV-2 real time PCR kit dilution series was applied, the assumption that the *N* gene
268 C_T values are the most similar^{21–23}.

269 For the CerTest VIASURE SARS-CoV-2 real time PCR kit, the following relationship between log viral load
270 and C_T value was applied:

271
$$\log_{10} V = (45.257 - C_T) / 3.523$$

272 and similarly, for the Corman *et al* RT-qPCR assay:

273
$$\log_{10} V = (45.806 - C_T) / 3.717$$

274 where *V* represents the viral load in copies/ml.

275 Viral load was grouped according to the following categories (in copies/ml): $<10^3$, 10^3 - 10^4 , 10^4 - 10^5 , 10^5 -
276 10^6 , 10^6 - 10^7 and $>10^7$ then the diagnostic sensitivity was calculated according to viral load group with
277 associated Clopper-Pearson 95% confidence intervals.

278 The site meta-analysis was produced using R 3.5.3. Confusion matrices, sensitivity, specificity, sensitivity
279 as a function of viral load calculations, and the production of scatter graphs showing the relationship
280 between RT-LAMP results and C_T were performed using Python 3.8.6.

281

282 **Results**

283 **Optimisation of sample preparation conditions**

284 Heat inactivation experiments demonstrated that SARS-CoV-2 was completely inactivated by heating at
285 60°C (20 min plus) or ≥70°C (after 2, 5 or 10 min) (Supplemental Table S1). Importantly optimised RapiLyze
286 Sample Lysis Buffer did not inactivate live virus on its own without a heat step. Further, inactivation at
287 56°C was not 100% effective at shorter incubation times, and additionally showed a loss in sensitivity
288 following a 4 x 2-fold dilution (Supplemental Table S2, P07102) at 10 and 30 minutes. Following
289 optimisation of heat inactivation of live virus, pre-treatment of samples was assessed to determine any
290 impact of pre-treatment on assay sensitivity. Interestingly, a pre-treatment 70°C for 5 mins carried out
291 on spiked samples prior to the proposed direct RT-LAMP assay had no effect on subsequent LAMP or PCR
292 results. It recommended that even if a pre-treatment is effective in inactivating the virus that downstream
293 processes are carried out in UV hoods or with effective air-flow management to prevent cross
294 contamination of the direct RT-LAMP assay. Comparison of Betapropiolactone (BPL) inactivated virus and
295 live virus demonstrated that BPL inactivation has resulted in lower sensitivity of detection using direct RT-
296 LAMP. BPL inactivated virus is therefore not an ideal substitute for live virus in spiking experiments. Any
297 conclusions on assay sensitivity or performance have consequently been drawn from experiments on
298 spiking of live virus in TCSN or saliva carried out in containment. Spiking of live virus into pooled saliva has
299 demonstrated that direct detection by RT-LAMP is possible in samples that give a C_T below 25/26 with
300 extraction and PCR.

301 **RNA RT-LAMP**

302 VTM from 12,619 NP/OP swabs were assayed. 265 swab samples were from known symptomatic
303 individuals and 2073 swab samples were from known asymptomatic individuals. The clinical status of the
304 remaining samples (n= 10,281) was unknown.

305 12,521 neat saliva samples were assayed, none of which were from known symptomatic individuals.
306 12,365 of these samples were from known asymptomatic individuals. The clinical status of the remaining
307 saliva samples (n= 156) was unknown.

308 **Direct RT-LAMP**

309 VTM from 559 NP/OP swabs were assayed. 170 swab samples were from known symptomatic individuals
310 and 310 samples were from known asymptomatic individuals and the clinical status of the remaining swab
311 samples (n= 79) was unknown.

312 86,760 neat saliva samples were assayed. 93 samples were from known symptomatic individuals and
313 86,593 samples were from known asymptomatic individuals. The clinical status of the remaining samples

314 (n= 74) was unknown. In addition, 10 separate longitudinal daily saliva samples were provided from one
315 individual as a time course from development of symptoms to three days post resolution of symptoms.

316 **RNA RT-LAMP on NP/OP swabs**

317 A total of 12,619 swab samples were assayed by RNA RT-LAMP, of which 254 were RT-qPCR positive and
318 12,365 were RT-qPCR negative. RNA RT-LAMP detected 244 of the 254 positives (Figure 1 and Table 1).
319 Only one of the 12,365 samples negative by RT-qPCR was positive by RNA RT-LAMP. 588 samples were
320 tested in duplicate and 12,031 were tested as single replicates. Of those samples tested in duplicate seven
321 were detected by RNA RT-LAMP in only a single replicate (C_T s 27.00, 32.66, 33.14, 33.16, 34.07, 35.05,
322 and 37.20 all of these had received at least one freeze thaw before analysis. Overall diagnostic sensitivity
323 (DSe) was 96.06% (95% CI 92.88-98.12) and specificity (DSp) 99.99% (95% CI 99.95-100.00), which is
324 corrected to DSe 95.98% (95% CI 92.70-97.83) and DSp 99.99% (95% CI 99.94-100.00) after site meta-
325 analysis. Diagnostic sensitivity of samples with a $C_T \leq 25$ (n= 123) was 100.00% (95% CI 96.76-100.00) and
326 specificity 99.99% (95% CI 99.95-100.00), and of samples with a $C_T \leq 33$ (n=180) was 98.65% (95% CI 96.10-
327 99.72) and specificity 99.99% (95% CI 99.95-100.00).

328 **Direct RT-LAMP on NP/OP swabs**

329 559 swab samples were assayed by Direct RT-LAMP of which 199 were RT-qPCR positive and 360 were
330 RT-qPCR negative. Direct RT-LAMP detected 140 of the 199 samples positive by RT-qPCR (Figure 1 and
331 Table 2). 195 samples were tested in duplicate and 364 tested as single replicates. Seven of 195 samples
332 tested in duplicate were positive by Direct RT-LAMP in only one replicate (C_T 27.51, 27.95, 28.15, 28.15,
333 28.87, 28.92, and 28.95) all these samples had received at least one freeze thaw before analysis. Overall
334 diagnostic sensitivity was 70.35% (95% CI 63.48-76.60) and specificity 100% (95% CI 98.98-100). After
335 correction by site meta-analysis, the DSe is corrected to 67.59% (95% CI 53.71-78.94). Diagnostic
336 sensitivity of samples with a $C_T \leq 25$ (n= 113) was 100% (95% CI 96.34-100) and specificity 100% (95% CI
337 98.98-100), and of samples with a $C_T \leq 33$ (n= 182) was 77.78% (95% CI 70.99-83.62) and specificity 100%
338 (95% CI 98.98-100).

339 **RNA RT-LAMP on saliva**

340 Saliva samples numbering 12,521 were assayed by RNA RT-LAMP of which 155 were RT-qPCR positive and
341 12,366 were RT-qPCR negative. RNA RT-LAMP detected 133 of the 155 samples that were positive by RT-
342 qPCR (Figure 1 and Table 3). Only one of the 12,366 samples negative by RT-qPCR was positive by RNA
343 RT-LAMP. 44 samples were tested in duplicate and 12,477 were tested as single replicates. All samples
344 tested in duplicate were positive in both replicates. Overall diagnostic sensitivity was 80.65% (95% CI
345 73.54-86.54) and specificity 99.99% (95% CI 99.95-100), which is corrected to DSe 79.05% (95% CI 68.87
346 – 86.55) and DSp 99.99% (95% CI 99.74-100) after site meta-analysis. Diagnostic sensitivity of samples

347 with a $C_T \leq 25$ ($n= 74$) was 100% (95% CI 93.73-100) and specificity 99.99% (95% CI 99.95-100), and of
348 samples with a $C_T \leq 33$ ($n= 150$) was 87.32% (95% CI 80.71-92.31) and specificity 99.95 (95% CI 99.95-
349 100.00).

350 **Direct RT-LAMP on saliva**

351 86,760 saliva samples were tested by Direct RT-LAMP of which 247 were RT-qPCR positive and 7,195 were
352 RT-qPCR negative (79,318 were negative on RT-LAMP but were not tested by RT-qPCR) (Figure 1 and Table
353 4). Direct RT-LAMP detected 209 of the 247 samples positive by RT-qPCR. 83 samples were tested in
354 duplicate and 86,677 were tested as single replicates. Nine of the 83 samples tested in duplicate were
355 negative in one of the duplicates and all these samples had received at least one freeze thaw before
356 analysis (C_T 20.27, 21.28, 22.01, 24.42, 25.85, 27.35, 28.52, and 30.37). Overall diagnostic sensitivity was
357 84.62% (95% CI 79.50-88.88) and specificity 100% (95% CI 99.72-100). After correction by site meta-
358 analysis, DSe is corrected to 84.24% (95% CI 55.03-95.89). Diagnostic specificity was calculated using only
359 the confirmed RT-qPCR negative samples. Diagnostic sensitivity of samples with a $C_T \leq 25$ ($n= 126$) was
360 99.01% (95% CI 94.61-99.97) and specificity 100.00% (95% CI 99.72-100), and of samples with a $C_T \leq 33$
361 ($n= 237$) was 87.61% (95% CI 82.69-91.54) and specificity 100% (95% CI 99.72-100).

362 **Relationship between cycle threshold (C_T) value and time to positivity (T_p)**

363 The relationship between C_T value and T_p was explored with the results shown in Figure 1. Whilst there
364 is a weak linear relationship between C_T value and T_p across all methods and sample types, a stronger
365 linear relationship was observed in swab samples with $R^2 = 0.431$ for RNA RT-LAMP and $R^2 = 0.462$ for
366 Direct RT-LAMP. There was a notably weaker linear relationship in saliva samples $R^2 = 0.201$ for RNA RT-
367 LAMP and $R^2 = 0.204$ for Direct RT-LAMP. For RNA RT-LAMP, there was a notable increase in T_p variance,
368 $\sigma_{T_p}^2$, after $C_T = 20$ across both sample types. On saliva samples, $\sigma_{T_p}^2 = 0.81$ for $C_T \leq 20$, and $\sigma_{T_p}^2 = 20.41$
369 for $C_T > 20$; on swabs samples, $\sigma_{T_p}^2 = 1.96$ and $C_T \leq 20$, and $\sigma_{T_p}^2 = 15.72$ for $C_T > 20$. Given the relationship
370 between C_T value and viral load, this indicates that T_p is not a reliable indicator for viral load beyond the
371 $C_T = 20$ threshold.

372 **SARS-CoV-2 viral culture of clinical samples across a C_T range**

373 Although not a large sample size; a negative result via Direct RT-LAMP indicates that the presence of
374 culturable virus is less probable and for samples with a $C_T > 25$ (RDRP/ORF1ab target) recoverable virus is
375 less likely (Table 5). The sensitivity of 1 PFU/ml of the viral culture assay is presented in Supplemental
376 Table S3. No CPE was observed in the flasks inoculated with 0.1 or 0.01 PFU after the two passes. AVL
377 samples were taken from the flasks at the beginning and end of each passage and the C_T values of the
378 extracted nucleic acids shown in Supplemental Table S3.

379 Individual time course

380 In the time course experiment SARS-CoV-2 RNA was detected from day 5 (at the onset of symptoms) up
381 to day 12 post suspected initial exposure using Direct RT-LAMP and up to day 13 by RNA RT-LAMP,
382 encompassing the full six days where symptoms were recorded, Supplemental Table S4.

383 Performance of RT-LAMP across viral load groups

384 The sensitivity of the RNA and Direct RT-LAMP assays across viral load groups is shown in Figure 2. For
385 RNA RT-LAMP, samples which were positive by RT-qPCR containing $>10^5$ copies/ml were consistently
386 identified as positive with no samples returning a negative result. Below this copy number, sensitivity is
387 reduced for both saliva and NP/OP swab samples, reaching $\sim 60\%$ in NP/OP swab samples exclusively with
388 viral loads $<10^3$ copies/ml, and an approximately linear drop in sensitivity from 100% to 0% between viral
389 loads of 10^5 and 10^3 copies/ml respectively in saliva samples. For Direct RT-LAMP, all but one saliva sample
390 were detected above 10^6 copies/ml. On swab samples, sensitivity is reduced on samples containing below
391 $<10^5$ copies/ml, dropping from 85% at viral loads of 10^5 – 10^6 copies/ml, to 30% in the 10^4 – 10^5 range. On
392 saliva samples, sensitivity is reduced in the 10^4 – 10^5 range to a sensitivity of 80% but then reduces further
393 within the 10^3 – 10^4 range, to 30%.

394 Site meta-analysis

395 Site-level confusion matrices, sensitivity, and specificity per method and sample type are shown in Figures
396 3 and 4. For specificity, heterogeneity between sites was minimal for all combinations of method and
397 sample type, with the random effects model matching the overall aggregated sample calculation. For
398 sensitivity, heterogeneity was minimal between sites for RNA RT-LAMP. However, for Direct RT-LAMP,
399 sensitivity showed significant overall heterogeneity (bivariate model variance: $\sigma_{se}^2 = 1.817$ on saliva
400 samples; $\sigma_{se}^2 = 0.228$ on swab samples). Between-site variations in the viral load of the samples tested
401 contributed a minority of the heterogeneity, but sensitivity was consistently high in samples with higher
402 viral loads (i.e., $>10^6$ copies/ml, as shown in Figure 2), while being more heterogeneous between sites in
403 samples with lower viral loads. Sensitivity at lower viral loads was highest in the sites with the most
404 established testing programmes.

405

406 Discussion

407 Testing of human populations for SARS-CoV-2 nucleic acid has been hampered by both logistical (e.g.,
408 swab availability) and physical (e.g., discomfort from repeat swab testing) constraints. The aim of this
409 study was to evaluate an optimised sample preparation method, building upon previously published
410 methods for the extraction-free detection of SARS-CoV-2 by RT-LAMP primarily from saliva^{3,19}. The

411 salivary glands are reported to be early targets of SARS-CoV-2 infection²⁴, and studies have demonstrated
412 the detection of high viral loads of SARS-CoV-2 from saliva, similar to those observed from
413 nasopharyngeal/oropharyngeal swabs^{15,25–27}. Collection of saliva is non-invasive and does not require a
414 trained individual or specialist consumables for collection of a quality sample. Utilising a non-invasive
415 sampling method should open testing to more individuals who dislike or are unable to tolerate having a
416 nasopharyngeal/oropharyngeal swab taken²⁸. Additionally, several studies have demonstrated that SARS-
417 CoV-2 viral RNA could be detected from saliva for a similar duration post onset of clinical signs when
418 compared to combined NP/OP swabs^{29–31}, highlighting saliva as a valuable tool for SARS-CoV-2 detection.

419 Direct detection negates the requirement for RNA extraction^{32,33}, for which there has previously been
420 competition for reagents and often requires expensive extraction equipment including liquid handling
421 automation. This extraction-free method decreases turnaround time from sample collection to result.
422 The Direct RT-LAMP method is straight forward and rapid, allowing the test to be performed in a wide
423 range of settings, including near-patient hospital laboratories and pop-up or mobile laboratories.
424 However, previously evaluated extraction-free sample preparation methods using RT-LAMP from saliva
425 samples have demonstrated reduced sensitivity^{3,19}, likely due to the inhibitory factors found within saliva
426 that may affect molecular tests such as RT-LAMP and RT-qPCR^{34,35}. The simple sample preparation method
427 evaluated in the study aimed to improve upon these methods by utilising the addition of a novel
428 proprietary reagent, RapiLyze[®], designed to neutralize common sample inhibitors. A subsequent heat
429 step of 98°C for two minutes prior to addition to the RT-LAMP master mix renders SARS-CoV-2 inactive as
430 confirmed by infectivity analysis using live virus inactivation studies (Supplemental Tables S1 and S2).
431 Downstream steps are then able to proceed outside of traditional containment level laboratory settings
432 broadening its clinical utility.

433 This study utilised high numbers of combined naso/oropharyngeal swabs (n= 559) and saliva samples (n
434 = 86,760) for the evaluation of this novel sample preparation method in combination with the Direct RT-
435 LAMP assay. RNA RT-LAMP was also performed on >25,000 samples for comparison, providing updated
436 values for the performance of the assay reported previously^{3,19,36}. Correlation between C_T value and
437 sample viral copy number has been demonstrated within this and other studies, with lower C_T values (C_T
438 <25 and <33) indicating a higher probability that the sample contains recoverable active virus, and
439 consequently the likelihood that the individual may be infectious to others^{4,25,37–40}. As a result, the RNA
440 and Direct RT-LAMP assays were compared with RT-qPCR results in groups with three different C_T cut-off
441 values: <45, <33 and <25. This was completed so that the performance of the assays in different clinical
442 scenarios (use case) could be determined: (i) C_T <45: does the RT-LAMP assay (either RNA or Direct)
443 compare with RT-qPCR for all reportable C_T values?; (ii) C_T <33: can the RT-LAMP assay detect those
444 individuals that have a medium-high levels of viral RNA in their specimens, with an *ORF1ab* target being

445 analogous with viral copy number because it is exclusively a genomic target²²; and (iii) $C_T < 25$: can the RT-
446 LAMP assay detect those individuals that have a high level of viral RNA in their specimens?

447 Diagnostic sensitivity for RNA RT-LAMP on swab and saliva samples was improved when compared to a
448 previous report utilising this method³, with values of >96% and >80%, respectively when considering all
449 C_T values, and 100% for both sample types when considering $C_T < 25$ with these samples having a high
450 probability of containing replicating virus for over 24,000 samples tested. Direct RT-LAMP sensitivity on
451 swab samples was also improved from the previous method with 100% sensitivity for $C_T < 25$, 77.78% for
452 $C_T < 33$ and 70.35% for $C_T < 45$ across 559 samples used for this evaluation. In contrast, sensitivity for Direct
453 RT-LAMP on saliva was in general higher than that determined for swabs ($C_T < 33 = 87.61\%$, $C_T < 45 =$
454 84.62%), apart from the group with C_T values below < 25 , which had a reported sensitivity of 99.01%.
455 These results support previous reports which demonstrate comparable performance when comparing
456 paired swabs and saliva samples^{41,42}, and that one sample type is not superior to the other. Interestingly,
457 the diagnostic sensitivity for RNA and Direct RT-LAMP for saliva samples was almost equivalent (80.65%
458 and 84.62%, respectively) suggesting that RNA extraction may not even be required when performing
459 testing on saliva samples. Direct RT-LAMP also demonstrates a higher sensitivity than a wide variety of
460 lateral flow tests (LFTs) in the $C_T < 25$, $C_T \geq 25$ and overall categories, with the overall sensitivity of Direct
461 RT-LAMP on saliva samples achieving a higher overall sensitivity than 94 out of 96 LFTs previously
462 evaluated⁴³. We found that the correlation between PCR C_T value and the Direct RT-LAMP T_p was weaker
463 for saliva than for swabs, which may reflect the PCR C_T value being from a naso-pharyngeal swab and
464 recognised time course differences between initial viral infection of the salivary glands and later infection
465 of the respiratory tract^{26,30}.

466 Previous studies have described the importance of identifying asymptomatic individuals, particularly
467 those with high viral loads^{28,44–48}. The ability of the Direct RT-LAMP assay to reliably detect individuals
468 with medium-high viral loads in a simple to collect, non-invasive sampling process highlights the suitability
469 of this assay for both symptomatic and asymptomatic population screening. This is particularly important
470 in healthcare and care home staff where the use of asymptomatic COVID-19 screening would reduce the
471 risk of onward transmission of SARS-CoV-2, consequently maintaining NHS capacity and Social Care
472 capacity and more importantly, reducing the risk to vulnerable individuals present within those
473 environments³⁶.

474 It is important to note that when designing surveillance strategies for asymptomatic infection testing as
475 an intervention to reduce transmission, frequency of testing and result turnaround time may be
476 considered more significant than diagnostic sensitivity⁴⁹. 'Gold standard' tests with high sensitivity such
477 as RT-qPCR generally need to be performed in centralised testing facilities, often resulting in increased
478 reporting times, leading to a less effective control of viral transmission⁴⁹. In contrast, point of care tests

479 such as Lateral flow tests (LFT)^{50,43} or those requiring only a basic/mobile laboratory set-up such as Direct
480 RT-LAMP, which have the ability to produce rapid results, can be performed frequently e.g., daily or
481 multiple times per week. Consequently, the likelihood of sampling an individual when their viral load is
482 highest as seen in the early, often pre-symptomatic stages of infection increases, maximising the
483 probability of rapidly detecting infectious cases, allowing prompt isolation. In this use case sampling and
484 testing frequency using a rapid assay with suitable accuracy in detection of medium-high viral loads, but
485 not necessarily optimal sensitivity over the whole range including low to very low viral loads, is desirable
486 or necessary^{49,51}. Frequent on-site testing of asymptomatic NHS healthcare workers using Direct RT-LAMP
487 has been successfully implemented in the pilot study described here; and continues to be utilised. Direct-
488 RT-LAMP has also been used in a mass community based pilot in school and higher education settings³⁶,
489 to identify those individuals who may have been missed when surveillance relies only on symptomatic
490 individuals coming forward for testing. With the use of mobile or pop-up laboratories, Direct RT-LAMP
491 could also be used for risk-based mass testing, for example, targeting specific geographical areas or
492 vulnerable groups. The potential also exists for lyophilisation of the Direct RT-LAMP reagents reported in
493 other studies^{52,53}, which would minimise the necessity for trained personnel by reducing pipetting steps
494 and the requirement for a cold chain, allowing greater capacity of the assay in multi-use case scenarios
495 including point-of-care and in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs).

496 Several experiments typical of a diagnostic performance evaluation were not performed as part of this
497 study, as they had been performed and reported previously. This included both analytical specificity,
498 which when tested against a panel of respiratory pathogens causing indistinguishable clinical signs to
499 COVID-19, demonstrated a high level of analytical specificity (100% in this case)³ and analytical sensitivity
500 of the Direct RT-LAMP, which is reported to detect 1000 cp/ml^{3,36,41}. Additionally, the RNA and Direct RT-
501 LAMP assays evaluated as part of this study have been shown to reliably detect the emerging variants of
502 concern (VOC) including the B.1.1.7 alpha variant, the 501Y.V2 beta variant, the P1 gamma variant and
503 the new rapidly spreading B.1.617.2 delta variant^{54,55} (<https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/news-sars-cov-2-variant> (accessed June, 2021). The emergence of further VOC could lead to a criticism of the
504 RT-LAMP assay due its reliance on a single target, *ORF1ab*, where mutations in the target region in a
505 sample could lead to false negatives. For RT-qPCR this has been observed during the current pandemic⁵⁶⁻
507 ⁵⁸ where at least a dual target assay is recommended⁵⁹. However, this is less likely to occur for the RT-
508 LAMP assay used in this pilot evaluation. Firstly, due to the multiple sets of primer pairs utilised, three
509 pairs, with two pairs within the target region. This builds in redundancy to mutation not unlike a duplex
510 RT-qPCR. Secondly, the ORF1ab region is highly conserved and crucial for viral replication and fitness in
511 SARS-CoV-2. As a result, these regions are well maintained using a proofreading system via the nsp14
512 protein⁶⁰ resulting in a more stable genome compared to many other RNA viruses.

513 The authors highlight the importance of incorporating an inhibition control into the next iteration of the
514 RT-LAMP assays. Although the paired RT-LAMP and RT-qPCR data from this study show a good correlation
515 and any false negative results were likely due to the analytical sensitivity of the RT-LAMP assay, not
516 sample driven inhibition. To this end, a control primer set by OptiGene Ltd was evaluated (PS-0010),
517 targeting the human ribosomal protein LO gene. Preliminary analysis of the inhibition control primers
518 showed consistent detection across 279 saliva and 381 combined naso/oropharyngeal swab samples
519 using both RNA and Direct RT-LAMP (manuscript in preparation). Incorporation of this inhibition control
520 into the RT-LAMP assays would alleviate a potential limitation of the current assays and further support
521 quality assurance for use within a clinical diagnostic setting. One further limitation to LAMP assays is the
522 potential for contamination from assay product which can be significant. LAMP assays produce vast
523 amounts which can persist in the environment not only causing potential false positive results in
524 subsequent testing but also anomalous results in laboratory workers who are part of a SARS-CoV-2 testing
525 programme⁶¹. Therefore, it is crucial that appropriate waste streams are in place to mitigate this risk.

526 This study demonstrated high sensitivity and specificity for a novel sample preparation method used for
527 SARS-CoV-2 Direct RT-LAMP, particularly in samples from which the individual would likely be considered
528 infectious, highlighting the usefulness of saliva as a simple to collect, non-invasive sample type. The highly
529 sensitive RNA RT-LAMP assay provides a rapid alternative with a reliance on differing reagents and
530 equipment to RT-qPCR testing, thus providing additional diagnostic capacity and redundancy through
531 diversity. Direct RT-LAMP may complement existing surveillance tools for SARS-CoV-2 testing including
532 other point-of-care and laboratory-based diagnostics and is applicable to a variety of clinical scenarios,
533 such as frequent, interval-based testing of asymptomatic individuals that may be missed when reliance is
534 on symptomatic testing alone. However, care should be taken when considering frequency of testing,
535 messaging around the role and interpretation of asymptomatic rapid tests, integration of data storage
536 and access, and the challenges faced when scaling up surveillance to large populations.

537 The role out of a new testing strategy can often throw up interesting and unexpected experiences. These
538 collective experiences and lessons learnt from setting up an NHS asymptomatic staff testing programme
539 using Direct RT-LAMP will be shared in a future publication.

540

541 **Conclusions**

542 Rapid diagnostic testing at scale to identify and isolate symptomatic and asymptomatic individuals
543 potentially transmitting infectious SARS-CoV-2 is an essential part of the response to the COVID-19
544 pandemic. RT-LAMP on both extracted RNA and directly on crude samples potentially provides faster
545 turnaround times than reverse-transcriptase quantitative real-time PCR testing, with a higher sensitivity
546 and specificity than antigen lateral flow devices. Increasing evidence points to potential benefits of SARS-

547 CoV-2 testing using saliva rather than nasopharyngeal/oropharyngeal swabs, therefore a multi-site
548 evaluation of an improved simple sample preparation method for Direct SARS-CoV-2 RT-LAMP was
549 undertaken. This study demonstrated that the RNA RT-LAMP assay has high sensitivity and specificity,
550 providing a rapid alternative to RT-qPCR testing with a reliance on differing reagents and equipment. The
551 simple SARS-CoV-2 Direct RT-LAMP preparation method also demonstrated high sensitivity and specificity
552 for detecting SARS-CoV-2 in saliva and naso/oropharyngeal swabs from asymptomatic and symptomatic
553 individuals, notably in saliva samples from which the individual would likely be considered infectious. The
554 findings highlight the usefulness of saliva as a simple to collect, non-invasive sample type, potentially
555 applicable for interval-based testing of asymptomatic individuals.

556

557

558

559 References

- 560 1. Zhang J, Dong X, Cao Y, Yuan Y, Yang Y, Yan Y, Akdis C, Gao Y. Clinical characteristics of 140
561 patients infected with SARS-CoV-2 in Wuhan, China. *Allergy Eur J Allergy Clin Immunol*, 2020,
562 75:1730–41
- 563 2. Corman VM, Landt O, Kaiser M, Molenkamp R, Meijer A, Chu DKW, Bleicker T, Brünink S,
564 Schneider J, Schmidt ML, Mulders DGJC, Haagmans BL, Van Der Veer B, Van Den Brink S,
565 Wijsman L, Goderski G, Romette JL, Ellis J, Zambon M, Peiris M, Goossens H, Reusken C,
566 Koopmans MPG, Drosten C. Detection of 2019 novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV) by real-time RT-
567 PCR. *Eurosurveillance*, 2020, 25:23–30
- 568 3. Fowler VL, Armson B, Gonzales JL, Wise EL, Howson ELA, Vincent-Mistiaen Z, Fouch S, Maltby CJ,
569 Grippon S, Munro S, Jones L, Holmes T, Tillyer C, Elwell J, Sowood A, de Peyer O, Dixon S, Hatcher
570 T, Patrick H, Laxman S, Walsh C, Andreou M, Morant N, Clark D, Moore N, Houghton R, Cortes NJ,
571 Kidd SP. A highly effective reverse-transcription loop-mediated isothermal amplification (RT-
572 LAMP) assay for the rapid detection of SARS-CoV-2 infection. *J Infect*, 2020, 82:117–25
- 573 4. Moreira VM, Mascarenhas P, Machado V, Botelho J, Mendes JJ, Taveira N, Almeida MG.
574 Diagnosis of SARS-Cov-2 Infection by RT-PCR Using Specimens Other Than Naso- and
575 Oropharyngeal Swabs: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis Vânia. *Diagnostics*, 2021, 11
576 de Paula Eduardo F, Bezinelli LM, de Araujo CAR, Moraes JVV, Birbrair A, Pinho JRR, Hamerschlak
577 N, Al-Hashimi I, Heller D. Self-collected unstimulated saliva, oral swab, and nasopharyngeal swab
578 specimens in the detection of SARS-CoV-2. *Clin Oral Investig*, 2021.
579 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00784-021-04129-7>
- 580 6. Kuo A, Teo J, Choudhury Y, Tan IB, Cher CY, Chew SH, Wan ZY, Tim L, Cheng E, Lin L, Oon E, Tan
581 MH. Saliva is more sensitive than nasopharyngeal or nasal swabs for diagnosis of asymptomatic
582 and mild COVID-19 infection. *Sci Rep*, 2021, 11:3134
- 583 7. Ott IM, Strine MS, Watkins AE, Boot M, Kalinich CC, Harden CA, Vogels CBF, Casanovas-Massana
584 A, Moore AJ, Muenker MC, Nakahata M, Tokuyama M, Nelson A, Fournier J, Bermejo S, Campbell
585 M, Datta R, Cruz CSD, Farhadian SF, Ko AI, Iwasaki A, Grubaugh ND, Wilen CB, Wyllie AL. Stability
586 of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in nonsupplemented saliva. *Emerg Infect Dis*, 2021, 27:1146–50
- 587 8. Matic N, Stefanovic A, Leung V, Lawson T, Ritchie G, Li L, Champagne S, Romney MG, Lowe CF.
588 Practical challenges to the clinical implementation of saliva for SARS-CoV-2 detection. *Eur J Clin
589 Microbiol Infect Dis*, 2021, 40:447–50
- 590 9. Fajnzylber J, Regan J, Coxen K, Corry H, Wong C, Rosenthal A, Worrall D, Giguel F, Piechocka-
591 trocha A, Atyeo C, Fischinger S, Chan A, Flaherty KT, Hall K, Dougan M, Ryan ET, Gillespie E,
592 Chishti R, Li Y, Jilg N, Hanidziar D, Baron RM, Baden L, Tsibris AM, Armstrong KA, Kuritzkes DR,
593 Alter G, Walker BD, Yu X, Li JZ, Consortium M. SARS-CoV-2 viral load is associated with increased
594 disease severity and mortality. *Nat Commun*, 2020, 11:5493

- 595 10. Borghi E, Massa V, Zuccotti G, Wyllie AL. Testing Saliva to Reveal the Submerged Cases of the
596 COVID-19 Iceberg. *Front Microbiol*, 2021, 12:10–2
- 597 11. Lee RA, Herigon JC, Benedetti A, Pollock NR, Denkinger CM, Scholar G. Performance of Saliva,
598 Oropharyngeal Swabs, and Nasal Swabs for SARS-CoV-2 Molecular Detection: a Systematic
599 Review and Meta-analysis, 2021:1–17
- 600 12. Wong SCY, Tse H, Siu HK, Kwong TS, Chu MY, Yat F, Yau S, Yu I, Cheung Y, Wing C, Tse S, Poon KC,
601 Cheung KC, Wu TC, Wai J, Chan M, Cheuk W, Lung DC. Posterior Oropharyngeal Saliva for the
602 Detection of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2), 2020, 2:2939–46
- 603 13. Iwasaki S, Fujisawa S, Nakakubo S, Kamada K, Yamashita Y, Fukumoto T, Sato K, Oguri S, Taki K,
604 Senjo H, Sugita J, Hayasaka K, Konno S, Nishida M, Teshima T. Comparison of SARS-CoV-2
605 detection in nasopharyngeal swab and saliva. *J Infect*, 2020, 81:e145–7
- 606 14. Aydin S, Benk IG, Geckil AA. May viral load detected in saliva in the early stages of infection be a
607 prognostic indicator in COVID-19 patients? *J Virol Methods*, 2021, 294
- 608 15. Zhu J, Guo J, Xu Y, Chen X. Viral dynamics of SARS-CoV-2 in saliva from infected patients. *J Infect*,
609 2020, 81:e48–50
- 610 16. Azzi L, Baj A, Alberio T, Lualdi M, Veronesi G, Carcano G, Ageno W, Gambarini C, Maffioli L,
611 Saverio S Di, Gasperina DD, Genoni AP, Premi E, Donati S, Azzolini C, Grandi AM, Dentali F,
612 Tangianu F, Sessa F, Maurino V, Tettamanti L, Siracusa C, Vigezzi A, Monti E, Iori V, Iovino D, Letto
613 G, Grossi PA, Tagliabue A, Fasano M. Rapid Salivary Test suitable for a mass screening program to
614 detect SARS-CoV-2: A diagnostic accuracy study. *J Infect*, 2020, 81:e75–8
- 615 17. Yokota I, Shane PY, Okada K, Unoki Y, Yang Y, Inao T, Sakamaki K, Iwasaki S, Hayasaka K, Sugita J,
616 Nishida M, Fujisawa S, Teshima T. Mass Screening of Asymptomatic Persons for Severe Acute
617 Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 Using Saliva. *Clin Infect Dis*, 2021, 73:e559–65
- 618 18. Masse S, Bonnet C, Vilcu AM, Benamar H, Swital M, van der Werf S, Carrat F, Hanslik T, Blanchon
619 T, Falchi A. Are posterior oropharyngeal saliva specimens an acceptable alternative to
620 nasopharyngeal sampling for the monitoring of sars-cov-2 in primary-care settings? *Viruses*,
621 2021, 13:1–11
- 622 19. Howson ELA, Kidd SP, Armson B, Goring A, Sawyer J, Cassar C, Cross D, Lewis T, Hockey J, Rivers
623 S, Cawthraw S, Banyard A, Anderson P, Rahou S, Andreou M, Morant N, Clark D, Walsh C, Laxman
624 S, Houghton R, Slater-Jefferies J, Costello P, Brown I, Cortes N, Godfrey KM, Fowler VL.
625 Preliminary optimisation of a simplified sample preparation method to permit direct detection of
626 SARS-CoV-2 within saliva samples using reverse-transcription loop-mediated isothermal
627 amplification (RT-LAMP). *J Virol Methods*, 2021, 289
- 628 20. Reitsma JB, Glas AS, Rutjes AWS, Scholten RJPM, Bossuyt PM, Zwinderman AH. Bivariate analysis
629 of sensitivity and specificity produces informative summary measures in diagnostic reviews. *J*
630 *Clin Epidemiol*, 2005, 58:982–90

- 631 21. Bhargava A. Dynamic aspects of ORF1ab and N RNA cycle threshold values among COVID-19
632 patients in China. *Infect Genet Evol*, 2021, 87:104657
- 633 22. Alexandersen S, Chamings A, Bhatta TR. SARS-CoV-2 genomic and subgenomic RNAs in diagnostic
634 samples are not an indicator of active replication. *Nat Commun*, 2020, 11:6059
- 635 23. Xu T, Chen C, Zhu Z, Cui M, Chen C, Dai H, Xue Y. Clinical features and dynamics of viral load in
636 imported and non-imported patients with COVID-19. *Int J Infect Dis*, 2020, 94:68–71
- 637 24. Huang N, Pérez P, Kato T, Mikami Y, Okuda K, Gilmore RC, et al. SARS-CoV-2 infection of the oral
638 cavity and saliva. *Nat Med*, 2021, 27:892–903
- 639 25. To KKW, Tsang OTY, Leung WS, Tam AR, Wu TC, Lung DC, Yip CCY, Cai JP, Chan JMC, Chik TSH,
640 Lau DPL, Choi CYC, Chen LL, Chan WM, Chan KH, Ip JD, Ng ACK, Poon RWS, Luo CT, Cheng VCC,
641 Chan JFW, Hung IFN, Chen Z, Chen H, Yuen KY. Temporal profiles of viral load in posterior
642 oropharyngeal saliva samples and serum antibody responses during infection by SARS-CoV-2: an
643 observational cohort study. *Lancet Infect Dis*, 2020, 20:565–74
- 644 26. Tan SH, Allicock O, Armstrong-Hough M, Wyllie AL. Saliva as a gold-standard sample for SARS-
645 CoV-2 detection. *Lancet Respir Med*, 2021, 2600:19–21
- 646 27. Savelle ES, Winnett A, Romano AE, Porter MK, Shelby N, Akana R, Ji J. Quantitative SARS-CoV-2
647 viral-load curves in paired saliva and nasal swabs inform appropriate respiratory sampling site
648 and analytical test sensitivity required for earliest viral detection. *MedRxiv*, 2021:1–37
- 649 28. Yang Q, Saldi TK, Gonzales PK, Lasda E, Decker CJ, Tat KL, Fink MR, Hager CR, Davis JC, Ozeroff
650 CD, Muhlrud D, Clark SK, Fattor WT, Meyerson NR, Paige CL, Gilchrist AR, Barbachano-Guerrero
651 A, Worden-Sapper ER, Wu SS, Brisson GR, McQueen MB, Dowell RD, Leinwand L, Parker R,
652 Sawyer SL. Just 2% of SARS-CoV-2-positive individuals carry 90% of the virus circulating in
653 communities. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*, 2021, 118:1–6
- 654 29. Uwamino Y, Nagata M, Aoki W, Fujimori Y, Nakagawa T, Yokota H, Sakai-Tagawa Y, Iwatsuki-
655 Horimoto K, Shiraki T, Uchida S, Uno S, Kabata H, Ikemura S, Kamata H, Ishii M, Fukunaga K,
656 Kawaoka Y, Hasegawa N, Murata M. Accuracy and stability of saliva as a sample for reverse
657 transcription PCR detection of SARS-CoV-2. *J Clin Pathol*, 2021, 74:67–8
- 658 30. Wyllie AL, Fournier J, Casanovas-Massana A, Campbell M, Tokuyama M, Vijayakumar P, et al.
659 Saliva or Nasopharyngeal Swab Specimens for Detection of SARS-CoV-2. *N Engl J Med*, 2020,
660 383:1283–6
- 661 31. Vogels CBF, Watkins AE, Harden CA, Brackney DE, Shafer J, Wang J, et al. SalivaDirect: A
662 simplified and flexible platform to enhance SARS-CoV-2 testing capacity. *Med*, 2021, 2:263-
663 280.e6
- 664 32. Buck MD, Poirier EZ, Cardoso A, Frederico B, Canton J, Barrell S, et al. SARS-CoV-2 detection by a
665 clinical diagnostic RT-LAMP assay. *Wellcome Open Res*, 2021, 6:9
- 666 33. Kellner MJ, Matl M, Ross JJ, Schnabl J, Handler D, Heinen R, Schaeffer J, Hufnagl P, Indra A,

- 667 Dekens MP, Fritsche-Polanz R, Födinger M, Zuber J, Allerberger F, Pauli A, Brennecke J, BioCenter
668 Program V. Head-to-head comparison of direct-input RT-PCR and RT-LAMP against RT-qPCR on
669 extracted RNA for rapid SARS-CoV-2 diagnostics. *MedRxiv*, 2021:2021.01.19.21250079
- 670 34. Ochert AS, Boulter AW, Birnbaum W, Johnson NW, Teo CG. Inhibitory effect of salivary fluids on
671 PCR: Potency and removal. *PCR Methods Appl*, 1994, 3:365–8
- 672 35. Wilson IG. Inhibition and facilitation of nucleic acid amplification. *Appl Environ Microbiol*, 1997,
673 63:3741–51
- 674 36. Department of Health and Social Care. Rapid evaluation of OptiGene RT-LAMP assay (direct and
675 RNA formats). Department of Health and Social Care. United Kingdom. 2020
- 676 37. La Scola B, Le Bideau M, Andreani J, Hoang VT, Grimaldier C, Colson P, Gautret P, Raoult D. Viral
677 RNA load as determined by cell culture as a management tool for discharge of SARS-CoV-2
678 patients from infectious disease wards. *Eur J Clin Microbiol Infect Dis*, 2020, 39:1059–61
- 679 38. Bullard J, Dust K, Funk D, Strong JE, Alexander D, Garnett L, Boodman C, Bello A, Hedley A,
680 Schiffman Z, Doan K, Bastien N, Li Y, van Caesele PG, Poliquin G. Predicting infectious severe
681 acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 from diagnostic samples. *Clin Infect Dis*, 2020,
682 71:2663–6
- 683 39. Wölfel R, Corman VM, Guggemos W, Seilmaier M, Zange S, Müller MA, Niemeyer D, Jones TC,
684 Vollmar P, Rothe C, Hoelscher M, Bleicker T, Brünink S, Schneider J, Ehmann R, Zwirgmaier K,
685 Drosten C, Wendtner C. Virological assessment of hospitalized patients with COVID-2019.
686 *Nature*, 2020, 581:465–9
- 687 40. Marc A, Keroui M, Blanquart F, Bertrand J, Mitjà O, Corbacho-Monné M, Marks M, Guedj J.
688 Quantifying the relationship between SARS-CoV-2 viral load and infectiousness. *Elife*, 2021,
689 10:e69302
- 690 41. Fowler DV, Douglas DA, Godfrey PK, Williams PA, Beggs PA, Kidd S, Cortes DN, Wilcox PM, Davies
691 DK, Smith M, Hill PDS. Critical evaluation of the methodology used by Wilson-Davies et al., (2020)
692 entitled “Concerning the Optigene Direct LAMP assay, and it`s use in at-risk groups and hospital
693 staff.” *J Infect*, 2021, 82:282–327
- 694 42. Hanson KE, Barker AP, Hillyard DR, Gilmore N, Barrett JW, Orlandi RR, Shakir SM. Self-collected
695 anterior nasal and saliva specimens versus healthcare worker-collected nasopharyngeal swabs
696 for the molecular detection of SARS-CoV-2. *J Clin Microbiol*, 2020, 58:e01824-20
- 697 43. Scheiblauer H, Filomena A, Nitsche A, Puyskens A, Corman VM, Drosten C, Zwirgmaier K, Lange
698 C, Emmerich P, Müller M, Knauer O, Nübling CM. Comparative sensitivity evaluation for 122 CE-
699 marked rapid diagnostic tests for SARS-CoV-2 antigen, Germany, September 2020 to April 2021.
700 *Eurosurveillance*, 2021, 26:1–13
- 701 44. Nikolai LA, Meyer CG, Kremsner PG, Velavan TP. Asymptomatic SARS Coronavirus 2 infection:
702 Invisible yet invincible. *Int J Infect Dis*, 2020, 100:112–6

- 703 45. Marks M, Millat P, Ouchi D, Roberts C, Alemany A, Corbacho-Monné M, Ubals M, Vall-Mayans M,
704 G-Beiras C, Prat N, Ara J, Clotet B, Mitjà O. Transmission of COVID-19 in 282 clusters in Catalonia,
705 Spain: A cohort study. *Lancet Infect Dis*, 2021, 21:6290
- 706 46. Byambasuren O, Cardona M, Bell K, Clark J, McLaws ML, Glasziou P. Estimating the extent of
707 asymptomatic COVID-19 and its potential for community transmission: Systematic review and
708 meta-analysis. *J Assoc Med Microbiol Infect Dis Canada*, 2020, 5:223–34
- 709 47. Buitrago-Garcia D, Egli-Gany D, Counotte MJ, Hossmann S, Imeri H, Ipekci AM, Salanti G, Low N.
710 Occurrence and transmission potential of asymptomatic and presymptomatic SARS-CoV-2
711 infections: A living systematic review and meta-analysis. *PLoS Med*, 2020, 17:e1003346
- 712 48. Johansson MA, Quandelacy TM, Kada S, Prasad PV, Steele M, Brooks JT, Slayton RB, Biggerstaff
713 M, Butler JC. SARS-CoV-2 Transmission from People without COVID-19 Symptoms. *JAMA Netw*
714 *Open*, 2021, 4:1–8
- 715 49. Larremore DB, Wilder B, Lester E, Shehata S, Burke JM, Hay JA, Tambe M, Mina MJ, Parker R.
716 Test sensitivity is secondary to frequency and turnaround time for COVID-19 screening. *Sci Adv*,
717 2021, 7:1–11
- 718 50. Lee LYW, Rozmanowski S, Pang M, Charlett A, Anderson C, Hughes GJ, Barnard M, Peto L, Vipond
719 R, Sienkiewicz A, Hopkins S, Bell J, Crook DW, Gent N, Walker AS, Peto TEA, Eyre DW. SARS-CoV-2
720 infectivity by viral load, S gene variants and demographic factors and the utility of lateral flow
721 devices to prevent transmission. *Clin Infect Dis*, 2021, May:ciab421
- 722 51. Kissler SM, Fauver JR, Mack C, Olesen SW, Tai C, Shiu KY, Kalinich CC, Jednak S, Ott IM, Vogels
723 CBF, Wohlgemuth J, Weisberger J, DiFiori J, Anderson DJ, Mancell J, Ho DD, Grubaugh ND, Grad
724 YH. Viral dynamics of acute SARS-CoV-2 infection and applications to diagnostic and public health
725 strategies. *PLoS Biol*, 2021, 19:1–17
- 726 52. Howson ELA, Armson B, Madi M, Kasanga CJ, Kandusi S, Sallu R, Chepkwony E, Siddle A, Martin P,
727 Wood J, Mioulet V, King DP, Lembo T, Cleaveland S, Fowler VL. Evaluation of Two Lyophilized
728 Molecular Assays to Rapidly Detect Foot-and-Mouth Disease Virus Directly from Clinical Samples
729 in Field Settings. *Transbound Emerg Dis*, 2017, 64:861–71
- 730 53. Armson B, Walsh C, Morant N, Fowler VL, Knowles NJ, Clark D. The development of two field-
731 ready reverse transcription loop-mediated isothermal amplification assays for the rapid
732 detection of Seneca Valley virus 1. *Transbound Emerg Dis*, 2019, 66:497–504
- 733 54. Horby P, Huntley C, Davies N, Edmunds J, Ferguson N, Medley G, Hayward A, Cevik M, Semple C.
734 NERVTAG note on B.1.1.7 severity. *Sage*, 2021:5–8
- 735 55. Tegally H, Wilkinson E, Giovanetti M, Iranzadeh A, Fonseca V, Giandhari J, et al. Emergence and
736 rapid spread of a new severe acute respiratory syndrome-related coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2)
737 lineage with multiple spike mutations in South Africa. *MedRxiv*, 2020, 2
- 738 56. Vanaerschot M, Mann SA, Webber JT, Kamm J, Bell SM, Bell J, Hong SN, Nguyen MP, Chan LY,

- 739 Bhatt KD, Tan M, Detweiler AM, Espinosa A, Wu W, Batson J, Dynerman D, Wadford DA,
740 Puschnik AS, Neff N, Ahyong V, Miller S, Ayscue P, Tato CM, Paul S, Kistler AL, DeRisi JL, Crawford
741 ED. Identification of a Polymorphism in the N Gene of SARS-CoV-2 That Adversely Impacts
742 Detection by Reverse Transcription-PCR. *J Clin Microbiol*, 2020, 59:e02369-20
- 743 57. Hasan MR, Sundararaju S, Manickam C, Mirza F, Al-Hail H, Lorenz S, Tang P. A Novel Point
744 Mutation in the N Gene of SARS-CoV-2 May Affect the Detection of the Virus by Reverse
745 Transcription-Quantitative PCR. *J Clin Microbiol*, 2021, 59:e03278-20
- 746 58. Artesi M, Bontems S, Göbbels P, Franckh M, Maes P, Boreux R, Meex C, Melin P, Hayette M-P,
747 Bours V, Durkin K. A Recurrent Mutation at Position 26340 of SARS-CoV-2 Is Associated with
748 Failure of the E Gene Quantitative Reverse Transcription-PCR Utilized in a Commercial Dual-
749 Target Diagnostic Assay. *J Clin Microbiol*, 2020, 58:e01598-20
- 750 59. Wang R, Hozumi Y, Yin C, Wei G-W. Mutations on COVID-19 diagnostic targets. *Genomics*, 2020,
751 112:5204–13
- 752 60. Rausch JW, Capoferri AA, Katusiime MG, Patro SC, Kearney MF. Low genetic diversity may be an
753 Achilles heel of SARS-CoV-2. *Proc Natl Acad Sci*, 2020, 117:24614 LP – 24616
- 754 61. Robinson-McCarthy LR, Mijalis AJ, Filsinger GT, de Puig H, Donghia NM, Schaus TE, Rasmussen
755 RA, Ferreira R, Lunshof JE, Chao G, Ter-Ovanesyan D, Dodd O, Kuru E, Sesay AM, Rainbow J,
756 Pawlowski AC, Wannier TM, Angenent-Mari NM, Najjar D, Yin P, Ingber DE, Tam JM, Church GM.
757 Laboratory-Generated DNA Can Cause Anomalous Pathogen Diagnostic Test Results. *Microbiol*
758 *Spectr*, 2021, 9:1–9
- 759
760

761 **Tables**

762

763 **Table 1.** Diagnostic sensitivity and specificity of RNA RT-LAMP on swabs compared with RT-qPCR

		RT-qPCR Pos	RT-qPCR Neg	Total		%	95% CI
C_T <45 Swab	RNA RT-LAMP Pos	244 [†]	1	245	DSe	96.06	92.88-98.12
	RNA RT-LAMP Neg	10	12364	12374	DSp	99.99	99.95-100
	Total	254	12365				
		RT-qPCR Pos	RT-qPCR Neg	Total		%	95% CI
C_T <33 Swab	RNA RT-LAMP Pos	219	1	220	DSe	98.95	96.10-99.72
	RNA RT-LAMP Neg	3	12364	12367	DSp	99.9	99.95-100
	Total	222	12365				
		RT-qPCR Pos	RT-qPCR Neg	Total		%	95% CI
C_T <25 Swab	RNA RT-LAMP Pos	112	1	113	DSe	100	96.76-100
	RNA RT-LAMP Neg	0	12364	12364	DSp	99.9	99.95-100
	Total	112	12365				

764 [†]Five samples included in this number were positive by RT-qPCR but did not have an associated C_T value due to being assayed
765 on a platform that did not produce a C_T value. DSe: Diagnostic sensitivity. DSp: Diagnostic specificity

766

767 **Table 2.** Diagnostic sensitivity and specificity of Direct RT-LAMP on swabs compared to RT-qPCR

		RT-qPCR Pos	RT-qPCR Neg	Total		%	95% CI
C_T <45 Swab	Direct RT-LAMP Pos	140	0	140	DSe	70.35	63.48-76.60
	Direct RT-LAMP Neg	59	360	419	DSp	100	98.98-100
	Total	199	360				
		RT-qPCR Pos	RT-qPCR Neg	Total		%	95% CI
C_T <33 Swab	Direct RT-LAMP Pos	140	0	140	DSe	77.78	70.99-83.62
	Direct RT-LAMP Neg	40	360	400	DSp	100	98.98-100
	Total	180	360				
		RT-qPCR Pos	RT-qPCR Neg	Total		%	95% CI
C_T <25 Swab	Direct RT-LAMP Pos	99	0	99	DSe	100	96.34-100
	Direct RT-LAMP Neg	0	360	360	DSp	100	98.98-100
	Total	99	360				

768 DSe: Diagnostic sensitivity. DSp: Diagnostic specificity

769

770

771

772

773

774 **Table 3.** Diagnostic sensitivity and specificity of RNA RT-LAMP on saliva compared to RT-qPCR

		RT-qPCR Pos	RT-qPCR Neg	Total		%	95% CI
C_T <45 Saliva	RNA RT-LAMP Pos	125	1	126	DSe	80.65	73.54- 86.54
	RNA RT-LAMP Neg	30	12365	12395	DSp	99.99	99.95-100
	Total	155	12366				
		RT-qPCR Pos	RT-qPCR Neg	Total		%	95% CI
C_T <33 Saliva	RNA RT-LAMP Pos	124	1	125	DSe	87.32	80.71- 92.31
	RNA RT-LAMP Neg	18	12365	12383	DSp	99.99	99.95-100
	Total	142	12366				
		RT-qPCR Pos	RT-qPCR Neg	Total		%	95% CI
C_T <25 Saliva	RNA RT-LAMP Pos	57	1	58	DSe	100	93.73-100
	RNA RT-LAMP Neg	0	12365	12365	DSp	99.99	99.95-100
	Total	57	12366				

775 DSe: Diagnostic sensitivity. DSp: Diagnostic specificity

776

777 **Table 4.** Diagnostic sensitivity and specificity of Direct RT-LAMP on saliva compared to RT-qPCR.

		RT-qPCR Pos	RT-qPCR Neg	Total		%	95% CI
C_T<45 Saliva	Direct RT-LAMP Pos	209	0	209	DSe	84.62	79.50- 88.88
	Direct RT-LAMP Neg	38	7195*	7233	DSp	100.00	99.95- 100.00
	Total	247	7195				
		RT-qPCR Pos	RT-qPCR Neg	Total		%	95% CI
C_T <33 Saliva	Direct RT-LAMP Pos	205	0	205	DSe	87.61	82.69- 91.54
	Direct RT-LAMP Neg	29	7195*	7224	DSp	100.0	99.95- 100.00
	Total	234	7195				
		RT-qPCR Pos	RT-qPCR Neg	Total		%	95% CI
C_T <25 Saliva	Direct RT-LAMP Pos	100	0	100	DSe	99.01	94.61- 99.97
	Direct RT-LAMP Neg	1	7195*	7196	DSp	100.0	99.95- 100.00
	Total	101	7195				

778 *85,177 samples were negative on RT-LAMP but only 7,196 were confirmed negative by RT-qPCR. Only those which
779 were confirmed negative by RT-qPCR were included in the calculations.

780

781

782

783

784 **Table 5.** Viral culture of positive VTM from oro/pharyngeal swabs and assay results.

Sample	Direct RT-LAMP	RNA RT-LAMP	C _T values for each RT-qPCR assay			CPE
			Genesig RDRP gene	VIASURE	SARS-CoV-2 E gene Sarbeco assay	
				ORF1ab		
1	POS	POS	19.9	18.7	17.8	CPE+
2	POS	POS	21.3	19.9	19.0	CPE+
3	POS	POS	21.6	19.1	18.5	CPE+
4	POS	POS	22.6	20.8	19.8	CPE+
5	POS	POS	22.9	21.6	21.0	CPE+
6	POS	POS	23.7	20.6	20.6	CPE+
7	NEG	POS	-	ND	ND	No CPE
8	NEG	POS	39.2	ND	ND	No CPE
9	NEG	POS	35.2	ND	ND	No CPE
10	NEG	NEG	34.6	ND	ND	No CPE
11	NEG	POS	35.4	ND	ND	No CPE
12	NEG	POS	36.2	ND	ND	No CPE
13	POS	POS	35.8	ND	ND	No CPE
14	POS	POS	34.5	ND	ND	No CPE
15	NEG	POS	35.1	ND	ND	No CPE
16	POS	POS	30.0	ND	ND	No CPE
17	POS	POS	32.3	ND	ND	No CPE
18	NEG	POS	34.6	ND	ND	No CPE
19	POS	POS	31.3	ND	ND	No CPE
20	NEG	POS	30.3	ND	ND	No CPE
21	NEG	POS	30.0	ND	ND	No CPE
22	NEG	POS	31.5	ND	ND	No CPE
23	NEG	POS	30.7	ND	ND	CPE+
24	POS	POS	29.9	ND	ND	No CPE
25	POS	POS	29.4	ND	ND	No CPE
26	NEG	POS	28.2	ND	ND	CPE+

785 Samples were taken through 3 passages. ND: not done.

786

787

788

789 **Figure Legends**

790 **Figure 1.** Time to positivity [Tp] in minutes plotted against RT-qPCR Cycle Threshold [Cr] for each combination of
791 method and sample type. Samples which were negative by RT-qPCR are not shown. Samples which were negative
792 by RT-LAMP are shown with 0 time to positivity. Results of linear ordinary least squared regression are shown for
793 samples which were RT-LAMP positive with the regression line and corresponding 95% confidence interval
794 represented by the blue line and light blue shaded regions respectively.

795 **Figure 2.** Performance of the RNA RT-LAMP and Direct RT-LAMP assays on both saliva and swab samples according
796 to viral load groupings.

797 **Figure 3.** Forest plots for Direct RT-LAMP per sample type showing site heterogeneity in sensitivity and specificity,
798 with overall estimates and the resulting expected sensitivity and specificity retrieved from each respective bivariate
799 random effects model.

800 **Figure 4:** Forest plots for RNA RT-LAMP per sample type showing site heterogeneity in sensitivity and specificity,
801 with overall estimates and the resulting expected sensitivity and specificity retrieved from each respective bivariate
802 random effects model.

803

804

805

806

807

808

809

810


811

812

813

814

815 **Figure 1**



816

817


818

819

820

821

822 **Figure 2**




823

824

825 **Figure 3**

Direct RT-LAMP Saliva

Site	TP	FP	FN	TN	Sensitivity (95% CI)	Specificity (95% CI)
Animal and Plant Health Agency	144	0	12	5867	0.92 [0.87, 0.96]	1.00 [1.00, 1.00]
Hampshire Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust	42	0	18	527	0.70 [0.57, 0.81]	1.00 [0.99, 1.00]
Institute of Cancer & Genomic Science	16	0	0	52	1.00 [0.79, 1.00]	1.00 [0.93, 1.00]
Manchester University NHS Foundation Trust	7	0	8	749	0.47 [0.21, 0.73]	1.00 [1.00, 1.00]
Overall	209	0	38	7195	0.85 [0.80, 0.89]	1.00 [1.00, 1.00]
Random effects model					0.84 [0.55, 0.96]	1.00 [1.00, 1.00]



826


827

828

829

Direct RT-LAMP Swabs

Site	TP	FP	FN	TN	Sensitivity (95% CI)	Specificity (95% CI)
Division of Virology, Porton Down	7	0	12	0	0.37 [0.16, 0.62]	Not estimatable
Gibraltar Health Authority	31	0	11	11	0.74 [0.58, 0.86]	1.00 [0.72, 1.00]
Hampshire Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust	63	0	19	349	0.77 [0.66, 0.85]	1.00 [0.99, 1.00]
Leeds Teaching Hospitals NHS Trust	39	0	17	0	0.70 [0.56, 0.81]	Not estimatable
Overall	140	0	59	360	0.70 [0.63, 0.77]	1.00 [0.99, 1.00]
Random effects model					0.68 [0.54, 0.79]	1.00 [0.99, 1.00]




830

831

832 **Figure 4**

RNA RT-LAMP Saliva

Site	TP	FP	FN	TN	Sensitivity (95% CI)	Specificity (95% CI)
Hampshire Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust	78	1	14	3154	0.85 [0.76, 0.91]	1.00 [1.00, 1.00]
Institute of Cancer & Genomic Science	1	0	0	3645	1.00 [0.03, 1.00]	1.00 [1.00, 1.00]
Manchester University NHS Foundation Trust	18	0	9	2371	0.67 [0.46, 0.83]	1.00 [1.00, 1.00]
University Hospital Southampton NHS Foundation Trust	28	0	7	3195	0.80 [0.63, 0.92]	1.00 [1.00, 1.00]
Overall	125	1	30	12365	0.81 [0.74, 0.87]	1.00 [1.00, 1.00]
Random effects model					0.79 [0.69, 0.87]	1.00 [1.00, 1.00]



833


834

835

836

RNA RT-LAMP Swabs

Site	TP	FP	FN	TN	Sensitivity (95% CI)	Specificity (95% CI)
Division of Virology, Porton Down	19	0	1	0	0.95 [0.75, 1.00]	Not estimatable
Hampshire Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust	205	1	8	10601	0.96 [0.93, 0.98]	1.00 [1.00, 1.00]
Institute of Cancer & Genomic Science	0	0	0	1459	Not estimatable	1.00 [1.00, 1.00]
Manchester University NHS Foundation Trust	1	0	1	302	0.50 [0.01, 0.99]	1.00 [0.99, 1.00]
University Hospital Southampton NHS Foundation Trust	14	0	0	2	1.00 [0.77, 1.00]	1.00 [0.16, 1.00]
Overall	239	1	10	12364	0.96 [0.93, 0.98]	1.00 [1.00, 1.00]
Random effects model					0.96 [0.93, 0.98]	1.00 [1.00, 1.00]



837

838

839 **Supplemental Information**

840

841 **Supplemental Table S1:** Serial dilution of Patient VTM ($C_T = 19$) 1:1 VTM into Lysis Buffer and 98°C heat treatment
842 without and without heat pre-treatment at 56°C for 10 or 30 minutes.

P07553 ($C_T = 19$)	1:2	1:4	1:8	1:16	1:36	1:64	1:128	1:256	1:512	1:1024	1:2048
VTM 1:1 into Lysis + 98°C	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D
	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D
56°C 10 mins pre-treat 1:1 VTM into lysis +98°C	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	ND
	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	ND
56°C 30 mins pre-treat 1:1 VTM into lysis +98°C	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	ND	D	ND	ND
	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	ND	ND	ND

843 D – RNA Detected, ND – RNA Not Detected, by Direct RT-LAMP.

844

845

846 **Supplemental Table S2 -** Serial dilution of Patient VTM (C_T 19.00 to 32.08) 1:1 VTM into Lysis Buffer and 98°C heat
847 treatment without and without heat pre-treatment at 56°C for 10 or 30 minutes.

Patient VTM	P07553 (C_T 19)	P01127 (C_T 23.97)	P07102 (C_T 32.08)	P07392 (C_T 24.55)	P01071 (C_T 20.54)
VTM into 1:1 Lysis + 98°C	D	D	D	D	D
	D	D	D	D	D
56°C 30 mins pre-treat 1:1 VTM into lysis + 98°C	D	D	ND	D	D
	D	D	ND	D	D

848 D – RNA Detected, ND – RNA Not Detected, by Direct RT-LAMP.

849

850

851 **Supplemental Table S3 - Sensitivity of the viral culture assay – 1 PFU/ml**

Number of PFU added to AVL/flask	E Gene RT-PCR assay			Growth (CPE)	
	C _T value of dilution (AVL)	Baseline Mean C _T value from flasks	Final Mean C _T value from flasks	Flask 1	Flask 2
1000	19.64	25.0	12.2	+	+
100	22.65	28.4	11.8	+	+
10	26.00	31.8	11.9	+	+
1	28.73	35.0	12.6	+	+
0.1	32.11	37.6	37.3	-	-
0.01	34.43	39.8	37.7	-	-

852

853

854

855 **Individual time course**

856 **Supplemental Table S4 - RT-LAMP results of time course from symptom onset**

Days post suspected exposure	Direct RT-LAMP			RNA RT-LAMP			RT-qPCR C _T		Observed Symptoms
	Tp 1	Tp 2	Result	Tp 1	Tp 2	Result	ORF1ab	N	
5	09:18	09:32	POS	11:09	10:50	POS	23.31	26.47	Onset: Sore throat. Blocked nose. Headache. Lack of appetite. Fever.
6	10:32	11:34	POS	10:34	10:40	POS	21.16	24.03	Sore throat. Headache. Restless sleeping. Tired
7	10:19	13:40	POS	11:39	09:59	POS	24.47	27.30	Headache. Restless sleeping. Tired. Loss of smell and taste.
9	09:31	09:14	POS	08:35	09:37	POS	28.55	31.89	Tired. Loss of smell and taste.
11	13:14	11:47	POS	16:44	16:39	POS	26.44	29.06	Tired. Loss of smell and taste.
12	09:10	10:09	POS	12:42	12:01	POS	26.13	29.19	Tired. Improvement in smell and taste.
13	NEG	NEG	NEG	14:06	12:56	POS	28.16	30.62	Significant improvement in all symptoms
14	NEG	NEG	NEG	NEG	NEG	NEG	38.05	40.73	None
16	NEG	NEG	NEG	NEG	NEG	NEG	36.11	NEG	None
17	NEG	NEG	NEG	NEG	NEG	NEG	NEG	NEG	None

857 Time to positivity in minutes [Tp]; Cycle Threshold [C_T]; Negative [NEG]; positive [POS]

858