

1 **Evaluation of the effects of SARS-CoV-2 genetic mutations on diagnostic RT-PCR**  
2 **assays**

3  
4 Takeru Nakabayashi<sup>1</sup>, Yuki Kawasaki<sup>1</sup>, Koichiro Murashima, Kazuya Omi and Satoshi  
5 Yuhara\*

6  
7 H.U. Group Research Institute G.K., 51, Komiya-machi, Hachioji-shi, Tokyo 192-0031,  
8 Japan

9  
10 <sup>1</sup>These authors contributed equally to this work.

11 \*Corresponding Author: Satoshi Yuhara.

12 Address: 51 Komiya-cho, Hachioji-shi, Tokyo 192-0031, Japan

13 Telephone number: +81-42-649-3870

14 E-mail: [satoshi.yuhara@hugp.com](mailto:satoshi.yuhara@hugp.com)

15 Running title: Genetic mutations affect RT-PCR assays of SARS-CoV-2

16 Keywords: SARS-CoV-2, RT-PCR

17  
18 **Abstract**

19 Several mutant strains of severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-  
20 2) are emerging. Mismatch(es) in primer/probe binding regions would decrease the  
21 detection sensitivity of the PCR test, thereby affecting the results of clinical testing. In  
22 this study, we conducted an in silico survey on SARS-CoV-2 sequence variability within  
23 the binding regions of primer/probe published by the Japan National Institute of  
24 Infectious Diseases (NIID) and Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). In  
25 silico analysis revealed the presence of mutations in the primer/probe binding regions.  
26 We performed RT-PCR assays using synthetic RNAs containing the mutations and  
27 showed that some mutations significantly decreased the detection sensitivity of the RT-  
28 PCR assays.

29 Our results highlight the importance of genomic monitoring of SARS-CoV-2 and  
30 evaluating the effects of mismatches on PCR testing sensitivity.

31  
32 **Introduction**

33 Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic is caused by the SARS-CoV-2 virus  
34 (1), and the global number of cases has reached 63 million as of December 2020 (2).  
35 COVID-19 infection is diagnosed via the detection of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in  
36 nasopharyngeal, nasal, or saliva specimens by performing the RT-PCR method with the

37 protocol established by the National Institute of Infectious Diseases (NIID) and Centers  
38 for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) that has been widely used in Japan.

39 The primers and probes for RT-PCR are designed to detect the conserved region of the  
40 SARS-CoV-2 RNA sequence. Hence, it is crucial to assess the impact of gene mutations  
41 observed in primer/probe binding sites on the sensitivity of SARS-CoV-2 detection.  
42 Several *in silico* surveys have shown the emergence of mutant strains that exhibit  
43 mismatches in the primer/probe binding regions; however, these studies did not assess the  
44 effect of such mutations on PCR testing (3, 4).

45 Here, we conducted an *in silico* survey of sequence variability within the binding regions  
46 of primers/probes used in the NIID and CDC protocols and evaluated the detection  
47 sensitivity of RT-PCR performed using synthetic RNAs containing frequently observed  
48 mutations. We showed that certain primer/probe-template mismatches significantly  
49 decreased the sensitivity of RT-PCR assays. Our survey suggests the necessity of  
50 monitoring mutations in the viral genome sequence under *in silico* conditions and  
51 evaluating the impact of mutations on diagnosis sensitivity to avoid false negatives.

52

## 53 **Materials and Methods**

54 The whole-genome sequence data of SARS-CoV-2 were downloaded from the GISAID  
55 database (July 6, 2020) (5). Genome data with the total length comprising less than 29,000  
56 bases and derived from non-human hosts were excluded (59,621 sequences in total). The  
57 region spanning from 27,500th to 29,500th base pairs of each sequence containing the  
58 amplification region was extracted, and the sequences that contained N in this region were  
59 filtered out (47,836 sequences in total). We aligned the primer and probe sequences  
60 developed by NIID and CDC (Table 1) against the nucleotide sequences using *glsearch36*  
61 (version 36.3.8g) (6). The frequency of occurrence of mismatch between primer and  
62 probe sequences was calculated. For each amplification region, we selected the three most  
63 frequently observed sequences, in addition to the sequences with mutations at the 3' end  
64 of the primer binding sites. Oligo DNA sequences with these mutations or those identical  
65 to the reference sequence (NC\_045512.2) (1) were synthesized using GeneArt Strings  
66 DNA Fragments (Thermo Scientific). For NIID\_N1, CDC\_N1, and CDC\_N2, the oligos  
67 with 150 bp upstream and downstream sequences of the amplification regions were  
68 synthesized. For NIID\_N2, the oligos with 76 bp upstream and 150 bp downstream  
69 sequences of the amplification regions were synthesized owing to the palindromic  
70 sequences observed at approximately 80 bp upstream of the amplification region affecting  
71 the oligo synthesis. *In vitro* transcription was performed with the synthesized oligos using  
72 the CUGA *in vitro* transcription kit (Nippon Gene, Tokyo, Japan), and the synthetic RNA

73 was purified using RNAClean XP (Beckman Coulter, CA, USA). The synthetic RNA was  
74 quantified using NanoDrop (Thermo Scientific) and analyzed using TapeStation (Agilent  
75 Technologies). A total of 10,000 copies of synthetic RNA were used in the assay. RT-PCR  
76 was performed according to the manufacturer's instructions or the manual provided by  
77 NIID ([https://www.niid.go.jp/niid/images/epi/corona/2019-nCoVmanual20200217-  
78 en.pdf](https://www.niid.go.jp/niid/images/epi/corona/2019-nCoVmanual20200217-en.pdf)) using the THUNDERBIRD Probe One-step qRT-PCR Kit (Toyobo).

79

## 80 **Results**

81 The alignment between the top three most frequently occurring mutations in the SARS-  
82 CoV-2 virus genome and primers/probes from NIID and CDC is shown in Figure 1. The  
83 forward primer of CDC\_N1 showed one nucleotide mismatch with 1.59% (761/47,836)  
84 of viral sequences. The incidence rates of the other mismatches were less than 0.5%,  
85 which was set as the threshold for sequencing errors in previous studies (4, 7). The  
86 forward primer of NIID\_N1 (No.4), the reverse primer of NIID\_N1 (No.5), the forward  
87 primer of NIID\_N2 (No.1), the reverse primer of CDC\_N1 (No.4), and the forward primer  
88 of CDC\_N2 (No.4) had nucleotide mismatches at the 3' end of the primer binding sites  
89 with 0.015% (7/47,836), 0.0021% (1/47,836), 0.17% (83/47,836), 0.0021% (1/47,836),  
90 and 0.0063% (3/47,836) of viral sequences, respectively.

91 Next, we performed RT-PCR assays using synthetic RNA with the mismatches shown  
92 in Table 1. As expected, when using the synthetic RNAs with mismatches at the 3' end of  
93 the primer binding site (the forward primer of NIID\_N1 (No.4), the reverse primer of  
94 NIID\_N1 (No.5), and the forward primer of CDC\_N2 (No.4)), the Ct value increased  
95 (2.77~6.29) compared to that observed when using synthetic RNA with reference  
96 sequences. Furthermore, when RNA with a mismatch at the 3' end of the NIID\_N2 primer  
97 binding site (No.1) was used, it was not detected by PCR. In contrast, the mismatch in the  
98 reverse primer of CDC\_N1 (No.4) exerted only minor effects on the Ct value (0.51), even  
99 though there was a mismatch at the 3' end of the primer binding site. For the reverse  
100 primer of NIID\_N1 (No.3) and the reverse primer of NIID\_N2 (No.2), the mismatches in  
101 the middle of the primer binding sites had effects on the Ct value (3.07, 4.82, respectively).

102

## 103 **Discussion**

104 In the present study, we conducted an in silico survey of mismatches in the binding  
105 regions of primer/probe published by NIID and CDC, which are primarily used in Japan.  
106 We also investigated the effects of SARS-CoV-2 genomic mutations on the detection  
107 sensitivity of RT-PCR testing. The detection sensitivity of RT-PCR assays decreased with  
108 most synthetic RNAs containing mutants with mismatched nucleotides at the 3' end of

109 the primer binding sites. However, in the case of the reverse primer of CDC\_N1, a  
110 mismatch at the 3' end of the primer had little effect on the sensitivity of RT-PCR. Some  
111 primer mismatches in the middle of the primer binding regions had certain effects on  
112 sensitivity. These results indicated that it is difficult to predict the effects of mismatches  
113 on the detection sensitivity of RT-PCR assays using only in silico screening.

114 In both the CDC and NIID methods, the primer/probe was designed with two different  
115 regions of the N gene (NIID\_N1 and NIID\_N2 for NIID, CDC\_N1, and CDC\_N2 for  
116 CDC) of SARS-CoV-2. At present, no virus strains are known that exhibit mutations in  
117 both the NIID\_N1 and NIID\_N2 regions or both the CDC\_N1 and CDC\_N2 regions.  
118 However, to avoid false-negative diagnoses, it is important to monitor mutations in the  
119 viral genome sequence and evaluate the effects of these mutations on the detection  
120 sensitivity not only under in silico as well as experimental conditions.

121

#### 122 **Conflict of interest**

123 The authors declare that there are no conflicts of interest.

124

125

126 **References**

- 127 1. Wu F, Zhao S, Yu B, Chen YM, Wang W, Song ZG, Hu Y, Tao ZW, Tian JH, Pei  
128 YY, Yuan ML, Zhang YL, Dai FH, Liu Y, Wang QM, Zheng JJ, Xu L, Holmes  
129 EC, Zhang YZ. 2020. A new coronavirus associated with human respiratory  
130 disease in China. *Nature* 579:265–269.
- 131 2. Coronavirus disease (COVID-19) situation reports.
- 132 3. Osório NS, Correia-Neves M. 2020. Implication of SARS-CoV-2 evolution in the  
133 sensitivity of RT-qPCR diagnostic assays. *Lancet Infect Dis*. Lancet Publishing  
134 Group.
- 135 4. Khan KA, Cheung P. 2020. Presence of mismatches between diagnostic PCR  
136 assays and coronavirus SARS-CoV-2 genome. *R Soc Open Sci* 7:200636.
- 137 5. Shu Y, McCauley J. 2017. GISAID: global initiative on sharing all influenza data  
138 – from vision to reality. *Eurosurveillance*. 22: 30494.
- 139 6. Pearson WR. 2000. Flexible sequence similarity searching with the FASTA3  
140 program package. *Methods Mol Biol* 132:185–219.
- 141 7. Nagy A, Jiřinec T, Jiřincová H, Černíková L, Havlíčková M. 2019. In silico re-  
142 assessment of a diagnostic RT-qPCR assay for universal detection of Influenza A  
143 viruses. *Sci Rep* 9:1630.
- 144

(a)	No.	Forward	Probe	Reverse	Number of occurrences	Frequency (%)
	NC_045512.2	CACATTGGCACCCGCAATC	ACTTCCTCAAGGAACAACATTGCCA	CAAGCCTCTTCTCGTTCCTC	47,243	98.76
	1	.....	.....	.....A.....	115	0.24
	2	..T.....	.....	.....	56	0.12
<b>NIID_N1</b>	3	.....	.....	.....T.....	38	0.08
	4	.....T.....	.....	.....	7	0.01
	5	.....	.....	.....G.....	1	0.00
(b)	No.	Forward	Probe	Reverse	Number of occurrences	Frequency (%)
	NC_045512.2	AAATTTGGGGACCAGGAAC	ATGTCGCGCATTGGCATGGA	GTTGACCTACACAGGTGCCA	47,455	99.20
<b>NIID_N2</b>	1	.....T.....	.....	.....	83	0.17
	2	.....	.....	.....T.....	29	0.06
	3	.....	.....	.....T.....	25	0.05
(c)	No.	Forward	Probe	Reverse	Number of occurrences	Frequency (%)
	NC_045512.2	GACCCCAAAATCAGCGAAAT	ACCCCGCATTACGTTGGTGGACC	CAGATTCAACTGGCAGTAACCAGA	46,516	97.24
	1	.....	..T.....	.....	761	1.59
<b>CDC_N1</b>	2	.....	.....	..G.....	114	0.24
	3	.....	.....	.....A.....	45	0.09
	4	.....	.....	.....T.....	1	0.00
(d)	No.	Forward	Probe	Reverse	Number of occurrences	Frequency (%)
	NC_045512.2	TTACAAACATTGGCCGCAA	ACAATTTGCCCCAGCGCTTCAG	TTCTTCGGAATGTCGCGC	47,431	99.15
	1	.....	.....T.....	.....	82	0.17
	2	.....	.....T.....	.....	44	0.09
<b>CDC_N2</b>	3	.....T.....	.....	.....	27	0.06
	4	.....G.....	.....	.....	3	0.01

145

146

147

148

149

150

151

152

**Fig. 1.** Sequence variants in primers and probe binding regions for NIID\_N1 (a),

NIID\_N2 (b), CDC\_N1 (c), and CDC\_N2 (d).

Sequence variants in 47,836 viral genome sequences aligned to the primer/probe binding regions (5' to 3') along with the number of sequence variants and the frequency of each variant in descending order. The dots indicate identical nucleotides with the primers and probes.

153 **Table 1.** Experimentally evaluated primer and probe sequences analyzed in this study.

Primer Group	Primers Name	Primer sequences (5'->3')
CDC_N1	2019-nCoV_N1-F	GACCCCAAATCAGCGAAAT
	2019-nCoV_N1-R	TCTGGTTACTGCCAGTTGAATCTG
	2019-nCoV_N1-P	ACCCCGCATTACGTTTGGTGGACC
CDC_N2	2019-nCoV_N2-F	TTACAAACATTGGCCGCAA
	2019-nCoV_N2-R	GCGCGACATTCCGAAGAA
	2019-nCoV_N2-P	ACAATTTGCCCCAGCGCTTCAG
NIID_N1	N_Sarbeco_F1	CACATTGGCACCCGCAATC
	N_Sarbeco_R1	GAGGAACGAGAAGAGGCTTG
	N_Sarbeco_P1	ACTTCCTCAAGGAACAACATTGCCA
NIID_N2	NIID_2019-nCoV_N_F2	AAATTTTGGGGACCAGGAAC
	NIID_2019-nCoV_N_R2	TGGCAGCTGTGTAGGTCAAC
	NIID_2019-nCoV_N_P2	ATGTCGCGCATTGGCATGGA

154

155

156

157 **Table 2.** Effects of mismatches in synthetic RNAs on RT-PCR sensitivity.

	<b>Templates</b>	<b>Average Ct value</b>	<b><math>\Delta</math>Wuhan</b>
<b>NIID_N1</b>	Wuhan-Hu-1	29.41	-
	No.1	29.21	-0.19
	No.2	29.66	0.26
	No.3	32.47	3.07
	No.4*	32.17	2.77
	No.5*	34.46	5.06
<b>NIID_N2</b>	Wuhan-Hu-1	25.21	-
	No.1*	Undetermined	>14
	No.2	30.02	4.82
	No.3	25.7	0.5
<b>CDC_N1</b>	Wuhan-Hu-1	24.18	-
	No.1	24.12	-0.08
	No.2	25	0.8
	No.3	24.59	0.39
	No.4*	24.71	0.51
<b>CDC_N2</b>	Wuhan-Hu-1	24.13	-
	No.1	25.49	1.39
	No.2	24.84	0.74
	No.3	25.29	1.19
	No.4*	30.39	6.29

158 Each Ct value is the mean value of three technical replicates.  $\Delta$ Wuhan indicates the  
 159 difference in Ct values between the mutated and reference sequences. Asterisks indicate  
 160 the primers that had mismatched nucleotides at the 3' end of the primer binding sites.

161