1

# Safe and effective pool testing for SARS-CoV-2 detection

2

Marie Wunsch<sup>1,2</sup>, Dominik Aschemeier<sup>1</sup>, Eva Heger<sup>1</sup>, Denise Ehrentraut<sup>3</sup>, Jan
Krüger<sup>3</sup>, Martin Hufbauer<sup>1</sup>, Adnan S. Syed<sup>1</sup>, Gibran Horemheb-Rubio<sup>1</sup>, Felix
Dewald<sup>1,2</sup>, Irina Fish<sup>1</sup>, Maike Schlotz<sup>1,2</sup>, Henning Gruell<sup>1,2</sup>, Max Augustin<sup>4</sup>, Clara
Lehmann<sup>4</sup>, Rolf Kaiser<sup>1</sup>, Elena Knops<sup>1</sup>, Steffi Silling<sup>1,5</sup>, Florian Klein<sup>1,2,5</sup>

7

8 <sup>1</sup>University of Cologne, Faculty of Medicine and University Hospital Cologne, Institute 9 of Virology, Fürst-Pückler-Straße 56, 50935 Cologne, Germany; <sup>2</sup>University of 10 Cologne, Center for Molecular Medicine Cologne, Robert-Koch-Straße 21, 50931 Cologne, Germany; <sup>3</sup>Cologne Excellence Cluster on Cellular Stress Responses in 11 Aging-Associated Diseases (CECAD), University of Cologne, Joseph-Stelzmann-12 13 Straße 26, 50931 Cologne, Germany; <sup>4</sup>University of Cologne, Department I of Internal Medicine, Division of Infectious Diseases, Kerpener Str. 62, 50937 Cologne, 14 Germany; <sup>5</sup>These authors contributed equally to this article 15

- 16
- 17 Corresponding author: Florian Klein
- 18
- 19 Keywords: SARS-CoV-2; pool testing; surveillance
- 20

# 21 Abstract

Background / Objectives The global spread of SARS-CoV-2 is a serious public health issue. Large-scale surveillance screenings are crucial but can exceed diagnostic test capacities. We set out to optimize test conditions and implemented high throughput pool testing of respiratory swabs into SARS-CoV-2 diagnostics.

Study design In preparation for pool testing, we determined the optimal pooling strategy and pool size. In addition, we measured the impact of vortexing prior to sample processing, compared pipette- and swab-pooling method as well as the sensitivity of three different PCR assays.

Results Using optimized strategies for pooling, we systematically pooled 55,690 samples in a period of 44 weeks resulting in a reduction of 47,369 PCR reactions. In a low prevalence setting, we defined a preferable pool size of ten in a two-stage hierarchical pool testing strategy. Vortexing of the swabs increased cellular yield by a factor of 2.34, and sampling at or shortly after symptom onset was associated with higher viral loads. By comparing different pooling strategies, pipette-pooling was more efficient compared to swab-pooling.

37 Conclusions For implementing pooling strategies into high throughput diagnostics, 38 we recommend to apply a pipette-pooling method, using pool sizes of ten samples, 39 performing sensitivity validation of the PCR assays used, and vortexing swabs prior 40 to analyses. Our data shows, that pool testing for SARS-CoV-2 detection is feasible 41 and highly effective in a low prevalence setting.

## 42 **1. Introduction**

43

44 The SARS-CoV-2 pandemic is a serious public health problem of unprecedented 45 magnitude in recent times. In particular individuals at older ages or with comorbidities 46 are at a high risk to develop an acute respiratory distress syndrome (ARDS) requiring 47 hospitalization and intensive care [1]. Therefore, it is essential to control person-to-48 person transmission in order to protect vulnerable individuals and limit the number of 49 severe cases. Until herd immunity is achieved by vaccination, nonpharmaceutical 50 interventions need to be applied. Many countries could successfully contain the 51 spread of COVID-19 through social distancing or lock-down measures, contact 52 tracing, quarantine, and large-scale testing in the ongoing pandemic [2,3]. In order to 53 control viral transmission when lifting lock-down strategies, large-scale testing and 54 surveillance are critical interventions. These approaches are based on frequent tests 55 of individuals e.g. by rapid antigen-based tests or reverse transcription-real-time PCR 56 (rRT-PCR) to detect SARS-CoV-2 in swab specimens. However, large-scale 57 surveillance screenings can exceed the test capacities of diagnostic laboratories.

58 Pooling swab specimens for PCR testing can increase test capacities and limit 59 the consumption of reagents [4]. Pool testing is highly efficient in a setting of low 60 disease prevalence and the availability of highly sensitive test methods [5]. It can be 61 applied to enable surveillance screenings of asymptomatic individuals in public 62 institutions e.g. hospitals, schools or retirement homes, which carry a high risk for 63 superspreading events and severe disease courses. When pool testing is 64 established, test conditions need to be optimized including (a) the type of pooling 65 strategy and pool sizes, (b) sample preparation and pooling method, (c) the quality of SARS-CoV-2 detection by PCR. In this study, our aim was to determine and 66

- 67 implement the optimized pool testing procedure into the diagnostic routine for SARS-
- 68 CoV-2 detection.

# 69 **2. Materials and Methods**

70

### 71 2.1 Pool testing algorithm

Pooling efficiency was computed using a web tool published by Bilder and colleagues
[5,6]. Calculations were performed assuming a test sensitivity of 99% or 95% and a
test specificity of 99%. The expected number of tests was computed for different pool
sizes as described [5].

76

# 77 2.2 Swab specimens

Oropharyngeal or combined nasal/oropharyngeal swabs were collected and transferred into MSwab<sup>™</sup> Medium, UTM-RT/mini (COPAN Diagnostics, Murrieta, CA), BD ESwab<sup>™</sup> (Becton & Dickinson, Sparks, MD, USA), Sigma Transwab® Purflock® (Medical Wire & Equipment, Corsham, Wiltshire, England), or PBS. All specimens were processed at the Institute of Virology, University Hospital of Cologne within 12 hours after collection. Samples were stored for validation procedures at -80°C.

85

## 86 **2.3 Samples, clinical data and Ethics**

All samples and clinical data were collected on the wards or outpatient departments
of the University Hospital of Cologne. No identifying data were used for the patient's
characterization. According to §15 subparagraph 3 (Professional Code for Physicians
in Germany) ethical principles of WMA Declaration of Helsinki were respected.
The study was approved by the Institutional Review Board (Ethics Committee) of the
Medical Faculty, University Hospital Cologne, Germany (ethical vote no. 20-1638).

93

#### 94 **2.4** Sample preparation and pooling

95 After arrival in our laboratory, samples were vortexed 5 seconds, and 96 preselected to be tested individually or in pools. To determine the cellular content of 97 the same specimens before and after vortexing, human  $\beta$ -globin-gene quantification 98 was performed as published [7].

99 For the pipette-pooling method and to simulate various pool sizes, positive 100 specimens with various Ct-values were combined with increasing volumes of 101 negative samples combined as a stock, accordingly. For the swab-pooling method, 102 nine SARS-CoV-2 negative and one positive swab were used. After removal of the 103 transport medium, 1.2 ml PBS was added to the tube containing the swab and 104 vortexed 5 seconds. The PBS was then transferred to the next swab tube and 105 vortexed. Following this principle, ten swabs were merged. Preparation time was 106 measured.

107

108 2.5 Reverse transcription, amplification and detection with three instruments 109 (Instrument I) Nucleic acid extraction of 500 µl sample volume was performed using 110 the MagNA Pure® 96 DNA and Viral NA Large Volume Kit eluted in 100 µl elution buffer. followed by amplification on LightCycler® 480 II (Roche Diagnostics, 111 112 Mannheim, Germany) according to the manufacturer's instructions. Detection of 113 SARS-CoV-2 was conducted using the RealStar® SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR Kit 1.0 114 (altona Diagnostics, Hamburg, Germany) or LightMix® SarbecoV E-gene plus equine 115 arteritis virus (EAV) control (TibMolBiol, Berlin, Germany). (Instrument II) Processing 116 of swabs was implemented with Panther Fusion® Hologic® and SARS-CoV-2 was 117 detected using 5  $\mu$ l of total RNA in 20  $\mu$ l of LightMix® SarbecoV E-gene plus  $\beta$ -globin 118 as internal control (TibMolBiol, Berlin, Germany). As second target the N-gene was 119 amplified (inhouse primer sets in multiplex PCR, data unpublished). (Instrument III) 120 Detection of SARS-CoV-2 was performed on a Roche cobas® 6800 using the

cobas® SARS-CoV-2 kit targeting the E-gene/ORF-1a/b regions according to
manufacturer's protocol. SARS-CoV-2 was quantified using dilution series of cell
culture supernatant extrapolated to approved standards (INSTAND e.V., Düsseldorf,
Germany), measured on all instruments, and Ct-values adjusted to Instrument III
(Ct<sub>a</sub>).

126

#### 127 **2.6 Data analysis**

128 For correlation analysis, a spearman's rank correlation was used. For comparing  $\beta$ -129 globin-gene concentrations, a Mann-Whitney test was performed. To assess 130 statistical differences in Ct-values comparing pooling methods or PCR assays, a 131 multiple comparison one-way ANOVA was used. For comparing preparation times 132 and for matched-pair analysis, a paired t-test was used. The amplification factor was 133 calculated as published [8], Kruskal-Wallis test was performed. GraphPadPrism 7.0 134 (GraphPad Software, Inc.) was used for statistical analysis. Figures were created 135 using Adobe Illustrator 18.1 (Adobe Inc.).

### 136 **3. Results**

137

#### 138 **3.1** Hierarchical pool testing

Pool testing can be performed using different strategies. In this study we conducted two-stage hierarchical pooling procedures (Figure 1A). Swab samples were combined and tested in a single PCR reaction. If the pool test was positive, the remaining sampling material of the included specimens was retested separately to detect the infected individual. If the pool test was negative, all individuals were declared as not infected [5,9,10].

Pool testing efficiency depends on the disease prevalence. Bilder and colleagues [5,6] proposed an algorithm to compute the expected number of tests when performing two-stage hierarchical pool testing (Figure 1B and C). As the disease prevalence increases, the reduction of PCR tests declines due to the retesting of individual samples of positive pools. However, the pooling efficiency of smaller pool sizes declines more slowly compared to pooling 20 or more samples.

At the time pool testing was initiated, the positivity rate at the University Hospital of Cologne was 3.88% (Figure 1D). However, by excluding samples of symptomatic individuals and recently positive tested persons, the positivity rate of pooled samples was below 0.1%.



medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.08.20205781; this version posted April 8, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license.

**Figure 1** <u>Hierarchical pool testing for SARS-CoV-2 detection</u>. A: Illustration of the two-stage hierarchical pool testing strategy. B: The reduction of PCR tests compared to individual testing (continuous lines are nonlinear regression curves, outer dotted lines are 95% or 99% test sensitivity, respectively) and C: the expected number of tests for different pool sizes are shown. Calculations were performed as published [6,9]. D: The mean positivity rate per week of tests performed at the University Hospital of Cologne and in Germany (as published [11]) are shown.

- 163
- 164

#### 165 **3.2 Pooling method and sensitivity of the PCR assays**

166 Pool testing requires optimal sample conditions in order to minimize false negative 167 results. Pre-analytic factors can influence the test results. We could not detect a 168 significant difference in viral loads indicated by Ct-values comparing oropharyngeal 169 swabs with combined nasal/oropharyngeal swabs. However, samples taken in the 170 late phase of infection had significantly lower viral loads compared to earlier 171 timepoints (Supplementary Figure 2A and B). Therefore, pool testing needs to be 172 sensitive and safe in detecting even low virus concentrations. We investigated 173 whether vortexing increases the number of cells released from the swabs (Figure 174 2A). We measured the  $\beta$ -globin-gene concentration in the medium of n=33 swabs 175 without vortexing and of the same specimens after 5 seconds of vortexing. The 176 average increase of  $\beta$ -globin concentration after vortexing was 2.34-fold (95% CI 177 1.622-3.057; p=0.0001). In addition, we could detect SARS-CoV-2 in three 178 specimens in which vortexing reduced the Ct-value from 33.39 to 32.79, from 28.50 179 to 28.19 and from 35.58 to 32.87, respectively.

180

181 We compared two pooling strategies. For the pipette pooling, transport medium from 182 each of ten storage tubes were combined into one test tube. For the swab pooling, 183 transport medium was removed, PBS added to a first tube containing the swab, 184 vortexed, and transferred into a second swab tube followed by vortexing. After the 185 PBS had traveled through all ten swab tubes, it was transferred into a test tube 186 (Figure 2A). To test feasibility of both methods, four operators processed n=6 pools 187 applying both methods, respectively. The mean processing time was 3 minutes, 47 188 seconds for a swab-based pool (95% CI: (2 min,59sec.)-(4min,36sec.)) and 1 189 minute, 55 seconds for a pipette-based pool (95% CI: (1min,33sec.)–(2min,16sec.)).

190 In order to investigate the sensitivity, we generated 16 different pools with 191 each of the two pooling methods, by merging one SARS-CoV-2-positive sample with 192 nine negative samples, respectively (Figure 2A bottom right). The mean Ct of 193 individually tested samples was 28.41 (95% CI 26.17-30.66), 30.77 for the swab 194 pooling method (95% CI 28.79-32.75), and 31.18 for the pipette pooling method 195 (95% CI 28.92–33.44). There was no significant difference between Ct-values of the 196 two pooling methods. With both methods there was a single pool, which yielded a 197 negative test result (triangle shape in Figure 2A).

198 To compare the detection rates of three PCR systems used in our diagnostic 199 laboratory, ten-fold dilution series of n=20 SARS-CoV-2-positive samples were 200 simultaneously tested on three instruments (I, II, and III, referring to the Roche 201 LightCycler® 480 II, the Hologic Panther Fusion®, and Roche Cobas® 6800 202 System). Ct-values for e-gene amplification, included in all assays, were analyzed as 203 they yielded similar Ct-values compared to the second viral target, respectively 204 (Supplementary Figure 1C). As shown in Figure 2B and E, instrument I and III could 205 detect all undiluted samples whereas instrument II only detected 18 out of 20 206 samples. The mean Ct-values of the undiluted samples were 27.48 (95% CI 25.4-

207 29.57) for instrument I, 31.55 (95% CI 28.77–34.33) for instrument II and 28.44 (95% CI 26.13-30.75) for instrument III (Figure 2D). When diluting the samples 10-fold, 208 209 instruments I and III could still detect all samples, whereas the detection rate of 210 instrument II was 70%. Instrument III could still detect 95% of samples at a 1:100 211 dilution and showed a slower decline of the detection rate compared to instruments I 212 and II. The amplification factors for the three instruments were 1.957 (CI 1.867-213 2.149), 1.906 (CI 1.879-2.153) and 2.240 (CI 2.074-2.407), respectively (Figure 2C). 214 The lowest detectable copy number was 200 copies for instrument I, 2,000 for 215 instrument II, and 20 copies for instrument III as determined using two INSTAND 216 standards (Figure 2F).

To determine the detection-rate for different pool sizes, 25 positive samples with Ct-values ranging from 18.96 to 34.99 were each diluted in a stock of negative specimens and tested in duplicates on instrument III. All pools were SARS-CoV-2positive, however, for two pools the 1:20 and 1:50 dilution resulted in one negative and one positive replicate, respectively (Figure 2G).



223 Figure 2 Validation of the pooling method and determining PCR sensitivity.

A: β-globin concentration in individual specimens before and after vortexing (n=33). A

225 Mann-Whitney test was performed. Sample preparation time was measured for four

226 different operators preparing n=10 samples in 6 replicates. Swab-pooling and pipette-227 pooling are illustrated, and processing time was measured for four operators 228 preparing n=6 pools with a size of 10 each (paired t-test was performed). Ct-values 229 are displayed for n=16 single positive specimens (ctrl) as well as for each positive 230 specimen in a pool prepared either by the pipette or swab pooling method, 231 respectively, and tested on instrument I. Negative test results are highlighted by the 232 triangle shape. B: Ten-fold dilution series of n=20 SARS-CoV-2-positive samples, 233 tested with three PCR assays. C: The amplification factor was calculated for dilution 234 series containing five Ct-values. D: The mean and standard deviation of Ct-values 235 and E: detection rate of n=20 undiluted samples are shown. F: Lowest detectable 236 SARS-CoV-2 copy number G: Ct-values of n=25 positive samples combined with a 237 stock of negative specimens in a 1:5, 1:10, 1:20 and 1:50 dilution, respectively, 238 tested on instrument III. \*\*p ≤0.01, \*\*\*p ≤ 0.001, \*\*\*\*p ≤0.0001

239

240

3.3 Integration of pool testing into the diagnostic routine of SARS-CoV-2
 detection

243 The above experiments suggested the following as the optimal pool test conditions 244 for SARS-CoV-2 detection: (a) pooling 10 samples using the two-stage hierarchical 245 strategy; (b) vortexing the swab specimens before pooling; (c) applying the pipette-246 pooling method, and (d) utilizing Instrument III for PCR testing. We set up a pool 247 testing facility, implemented features for pool testing into the laboratory software, and 248 systematically pooled up to 488 samples per day (Figure 3A). In order to limit the 249 number of positive samples run in pools, we preselected samples supported by 250 algorithms of the laboratory software. Patients that had been tested positive for 251 SARS-CoV-2 before or showed COVID-19-like symptoms were tested individually.

Pool testing was performed for surveillance screenings of patients and staff of as well
as for every patient admitted to the University Hospital of Cologne.

254 The mean percentage of reduced PCR tests was 85.77%. Decreased savings of PCR reactions were due to retesting caused by technical issues or positive tested 255 256 pools. Within 44 weeks, 55,690 samples were tested in pools and only 4.7% 257 (n=2,640 samples) had to be retested individually (Figure 3B). As Figure 3C shows, 258 5,681 pools were analyzed from which 195 were positive. Another 86 pools were 259 retested due to technical issues. In total, 47,369 PCR reactions were saved by pool 260 testing. The Ct-values of 128 positive pools and the respective individual positive 261 sample strongly correlated ( $r_s = 0.97$ , Cl 0.96-0.98, p<0.0001) with a mean Ct-value 262 of 30.39 for pools and 27.38 for individual samples (Figures 3 D and E). Ct-values of 263 individual positive samples were adjusted to Instrument III. 82.86% of the samples 264 displayed Ct-values  $\leq$ 35 and 17.14% >35 (Figures 3 F and G).



### 266 Figure 3 Performance of high-throughput pool testing for SARS-CoV-2 detection. A:

267 Pool testing started on April 9, 2020. The number of pooled samples per day and the 268 percentage of reduced PCR tests compared to individual testing (blue line) are 269 displayed. B: The number of samples tested in pools and C: the number of pools 270 tested during a period of 44 weeks are shown. D: Correlation of Ct-values of n=128 271 positive pools and the respective individual positive sample. E: Ct-values (grey dots) 272 and mean (black line) of positive pools and the respective individual positive sample. 273 F: Violin plot of adjusted Ct-values (Ct<sub>a</sub>) of n=175 individual positive samples 274 detected in pools. Dotted lines represent quartiles and median. G: number of 275 individual positive samples displaying adjusted  $Ct_a$ -values  $\leq 35$  (red) and >35 (grey), 276 as a Ct-value greater than 35 correlates with low infectivity (as published [12-16]).

#### **4.** Discussion

278

279 Large-scale testing and surveillance screenings enable the rapid detection of clusters 280 of infections and help preventing superspreading events and uncontrolled 281 transmission of the virus until herd immunity by vaccination is reached. However, test 282 capacities are limited and PCR tests are cost-intensive. Pool testing is a feasible 283 option to enable high-throughput screenings without overwhelming capacities of 284 diagnostic laboratories. To our knowledge, this is the first systematic investigation 285 addressing various aspects of pool testing for SARS-CoV-2 detection. However, 286 reports on this topic have recently been published [17-31].

287 Eberhardt and colleagues suggest forming subgroups if a pool yields a 288 positive result [20]. SARS-CoV-2-infected individuals need to be rapidly detected in 289 order to apply quarantine measures and perform contact tracing. Therefore, pooling 290 strategies need to be time efficient as well as suitable for high-throughput screenings. 291 Following these considerations, we decided to use two-stage hierarchical pool testing 292 with a pool size of ten samples. Increasing pool sizes, and forming subgroups after a 293 positive result, could further improve test efficiency [20] but would delay the test 294 result for the individual specimen. In a low prevalence setting with restricted test 295 resources and a neglectable time aspect, for instance in developing countries, 296 increasing pool sizes and forming subgroups is a reasonable option. Another 297 approach is the combinatorial pool testing strategy [24,25,32]. Here, samples are 298 assigned into multiple pools which enables the detection of infected individuals in a 299 single round of testing. In our study, we used the hierarchical testing strategy due to 300 logistics of a high-throughput diagnostic setting.

301 Pre-analytical handling can substantially impact test sensitivity, however, 302 limited data on this topic are available. Test results are influenced by improper

303 transport conditions, variations of the sampling device (flocked vs. cotton swabs), the 304 transport media [33,34] as well as the anatomical structure of the pharynx 305 (Mallampati score). We could not observe differences in Ct-values comparing 306 oropharyngeal and combined nasal/oropharyngeal specimens. This is in line with 307 findings of Woelfl et al., describing no differences in viral loads or detection rates 308 when comparing nasopharyngeal and oropharyngeal specimens [35]. In addition, 309 high viral concentrations and detection rates in salvia compared to nasopharyngeal 310 swabs were reported [29,36] and saliva samples can be used for pool testing [37].

In our study, different operators performed specimen collection, which could be a limitation of the data, as analyzed by Basso and colleagues. Two different operators collected 70 swabs each and a high variability of test results was observed [38]. This effect should not be underestimated.

315

We developed a feasible pooling procedure that can readily be implemented in diagnostic routines. The preparation for pool testing contained besides extensive technical investigations, also changes in the laboratory logistics and adaptions of the laboratory software. The data communicated here will contribute to the process of finding and implementing a consensus pool testing strategy enabling larger test capacities to effectively combat the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic.

- 322 **Funding** This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in
- 323 the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.
- 324
- 325 **Conflict of interest** We declare no competing interests.
- 326

# 327 Acknowledgments

328 We would like to thank all members of the Institute of Virology and our colleagues of

329 the Department I of Internal Medicine and the Institute of Medical Statistics and

- 330 Computational Biology, University Hospital of Cologne for supporting our work.
- 331

## 332 Authors' contributions

333 Planned and conducted experiments (MW, DA, EH, DE, JK, GHR, IF, MS, SS, MH, 334 ASS); conceptualised the laboratory work (MW, EH, SS, FK, EK, RK); 335 performed/helped with data analysis and interpretation (MW, HG, MA, SS, FK); wrote 336 the manuscript draft (MW); provided clinical data, conceptualised sample collection 337 (FD, MA, CL); made substantial revisions to the article drafts for important intellectual 338 content (EH, HG, SS, FK); gave final approval for publication (FK); conceived and 339 designed the overall study (FK); contributed equally to this article (FK, SS). All 340 authors read and approved the final manuscript.

## 341 References

- [1] Zhou F, Yu T, Du R, Fan G, Liu Y, Liu Z, et al. Clinical course and risk factors for mortality
  of adult inpatients with COVID-19 in Wuhan, China: a retrospective cohort study. Lancet
  2020.
- 345 [2] Gilbert M, Dewatripont M, Muraille E, Platteau J-P, Goldman M. Preparing for a
   346 responsible lockdown exit strategy. Nat Med 2020;26:643-644.
- 347 [3] Dehning J, Zierenberg J, Spitzner FP, Wibral M, Neto JP, Wilczek M, et al. Inferring
- change points in the spread of COVID-19 reveals the effectiveness of interventions. Science2020.
- 350 [4] Van TT, Miller J, Warshauer DM, Reisdorf E, Jernigan D, Humes R, et al. Pooling
- 351 nasopharyngeal/throat swab specimens to increase testing capacity for influenza viruses by
- 352 PCR. J Clin Microbiol 2012;50:891-896.
- [5] Bilder CR, Iwen PC, Abdalhamid B, Tebbs JM, McMahan CS. Tests in short supply? Try
- 354 group testing. Significance (Oxford, England) 2020;17:15.
- 355 [6] Bilder CR, A Shiny app for pooled testing. (https://bilder.shinyapps.io/PooledTesting/),
- 356 accessed 26 June 2020.
- 357 [7] van Duin M, Snijders PJ, Schrijnemakers HF, Voorhorst FJ, Rozendaal L, Nobbenhuis
- 358 MA, et al. Human papillomavirus 16 load in normal and abnormal cervical scrapes: an 359 indicator of CIN II/III and viral clearance. Int J Cancer 2002;98:590-595.
- 360 [8] Ruijter J, Ramakers C, Hoogaars W, Karlen Y, Bakker O, Van den Hoff M, et al.
- 361 Amplification efficiency: linking baseline and bias in the analysis of quantitative PCR data.
- 362 Nucleic Acids Res 2009;37:e45-e45.
- [9] Bilder CR, Iwen PC, Abdalhamid B. Pool size selection when testing for SARS-CoV-2.
  Clin Infect Dis 2020.
- 365 [10] Black MS, Bilder CR, Tebbs JM. Optimal retesting configurations for hierarchical group
- testing. Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series C, Applied statistics 2015;64:693.
- 367 [11] Robert-Koch-Institute, Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19). Daily Situation Report of
- 368 the Robert Koch Institute, Updated status for Germany 24 June 2020.

- 369 (https://www.rki.de/DE/Content/InfAZ/N/Neuartiges\_Coronavirus/Situationsberichte/2020-06-
- 370 24-de.pdf?\_\_blob=publicationFile), accessed 15 July 2020.
- [12] Singanayagam A, Patel M, Charlett A, Lopez Bernal J, Saliba V, Ellis J, et al. Duration of
- 372 infectiousness and correlation with RT-PCR cycle threshold values in cases of COVID-19,
- 373 England, January to May 2020. Euro Surveill 2020;25.
- [13] Tom MR, Mina MJ. To Interpret the SARS-CoV-2 Test, Consider the Cycle Threshold
- 375 Value. Clin Infect Dis 2020;71:2252-2254.
- 376 [14] Kampf G, Lemmen S, Suchomel M. Ct values and infectivity of SARS-CoV-2 on
- 377 surfaces. The Lancet Infectious Diseases 2020.
- [15] Iwasaki A. What reinfections mean for COVID-19. The Lancet Infectious Diseases2021;21:3-5.
- 380 [16] Walsh KA, Jordan K, Clyne B, Rohde D, Drummond L, Byrne P, et al. SARS-CoV-2
- detection, viral load and infectivity over the course of an infection. J Infect 2020;81:357-371.
- 382 [17] Lohse S, Pfuhl T, Berkó-Göttel B, Rissland J, Geißler T, Gärtner B, et al. Pooling of
- 383 samples for testing for SARS-CoV-2 in asymptomatic people. Lancet Infect Dis 2020.
- 384 [18] Hogan CA, Sahoo MK, Pinsky BA. Sample pooling as a strategy to detect community
- 385 transmission of SARS-CoV-2. JAMA 2020;323:1967-1969.
- 386 [19] Mishra B, Behera B, Mohanty M, Ravindra A, Ranjan J. Challenges and issues of SARS-
- 387 CoV-2 pool testing. Lancet Infect Dis 2020.
- 388 [20] Eberhardt JN, Breuckmann NP, Eberhardt CS. Challenges and issues of SARS-CoV-2
- 389 pool testing. Lancet Infect Dis 2020.
- 390 [21] Lee J, Kim SY, Sung H, Lee SW, Lee H, Roh KH, et al. Challenges and issues of SARS-
- 391 CoV-2 pool testing. Lancet Infect Dis 2020.
- 392 [22] Ben-Ami R, Klochendler A, Seidel M, Sido T, Gurel-Gurevich O, Yassour M, et al. Large-
- 393 scale implementation of pooled RNA extraction and RT-PCR for SARS-CoV-2 detection. Clin
- 394 Microbiol Infect 2020.
- 395 [23] Yelin I, Aharony N, Shaer Tamar E, Argoetti A, Messer E, Berenbaum D, et al.
- 396 Evaluation of COVID-19 RT-qPCR test in multi-sample pools. Clin Infect Dis 2020.

397 [24] Cleary B, Hay JA, Blumenstiel B, Gabriel S, Regev A, Mina MJ. Efficient prevalence
398 estimation and infected sample identification with group testing for SARS-CoV-2. medRxiv
399 2020.

400 [25] Shental N, Levy S, Wuvshet V, Skorniakov S, Shalem B, Ottolenghi A, et al. Efficient

401 high-throughput SARS-CoV-2 testing to detect asymptomatic carriers. Science Advances402 2020;eabc5961.

403 [26] Garg J, Singh V, Pandey P, Verma A, Sen M, Das A, et al. Evaluation of sample pooling
404 for diagnosis of COVID-19 by Real time PCR- A resource saving combat strategy. J Med
405 Virol 2020.

406 [27] Clark AE, Lee FM. Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2)

407 Screening With Specimen Pools: Time to Swim, or Too Deep for Comfort? Clin Infect Dis408 2020.

409 [28] Mulu A, Alemayehu DH, Alemu F, Tefera DA, Wolde S, Aseffa G, et al. Evaluation of 410 sample pooling for screening of SARS CoV-2. PLoS ONE 2021;16:e0247767.

411 [29] Ambrosis N, Martin Aispuro P, Belhart K, Bottero D, Crisp RL, Dansey MV, et al. Active

412 Surveillance of Asymptomatic, Presymptomatic, and Oligosymptomatic SARS-CoV-2-

413 Infected Individuals in Communities Inhabiting Closed or Semi-closed Institutions. Front Med

414 (Lausanne) 2021;8:640688.

[30] Bish DR, Bish EK, El-Hajj H, Aprahamian H. A robust pooled testing approach to expand
COVID-19 screening capacity. PLoS ONE 2021;16:e0246285.

417 [31] Sawicki R, Korona-Glowniak I, Boguszewska A, Stec A, Polz-Dacewicz M. Sample

418 pooling as a strategy for community monitoring for SARS-CoV-2. Sci Rep 2021;11:3122.

419 [32] Cleary B, Hay JA, Blumenstiel B, Harden M, Cipicchio M, Bezney J, et al. Using viral

420 load and epidemic dynamics to optimize pooled testing in resource-constrained settings.

421 Science translational medicine 2021.

[33] Daley P, Castriciano S, Chernesky M, Smieja M. Comparison of flocked and rayon
swabs for collection of respiratory epithelial cells from uninfected volunteers and
symptomatic patients. J Clin Microbiol 2006;44:2265-2267.

- 425 [34] Moore C, Corden S, Sinha J, Jones R. Dry cotton or flocked respiratory swabs as a
- 426 simple collection technique for the molecular detection of respiratory viruses using real-time
- 427 NASBA. J Virol Methods 2008;153:84-89.
- 428 [35] Wölfel R, Corman VM, Guggemos W, Seilmaier M, Zange S, Müller MA, et al. Virological
- 429 assessment of hospitalized patients with COVID-2019. Nature 2020;581:465-469.
- 430 [36] Wyllie AL, Fournier J, Casanovas-Massana A, Campbell M, Tokuyama M, Vijayakumar
- 431 P, et al. Saliva or Nasopharyngeal Swab Specimens for Detection of SARS-CoV-2. N Engl J
- 432 Med 2020.
- 433 [37] Watkins AE, Fenichel EP, Weinberger DM, Vogels CB, Brackney DE, Casanovas-
- 434 Massana A, et al. Pooling saliva to increase SARS-CoV-2 testing capacity. MedRxiv 2020.
- 435 [38] Basso D, Aita A, Navaglia F, Franchin E, Fioretto P, Moz S, et al. SARS-CoV-2 RNA
- 436 identification in nasopharyngeal swabs: issues in pre-analytics. Clinical Chemistry and
- 437 Laboratory Medicine (CCLM) 2020;1.





