

63232_Auto_Edited-YJM.docx

Name of Journal: *World Journal of Methodology*

Manuscript NO: 63232

Manuscript Type: MINIREVIEWS

Molecular and serology methods in the diagnosis of COVID-19: An overview

Marcel Silva Luz, Ronaldo Teixeira da Silva Júnior, Gabriella Almeida Santos de Santana, Gabriela Santos Rodrigues, Henrique de Lima Crivellaro, Mariana Santos Calmon, Clara Faria Souza Mendes dos Santos, Luis Guilherme de Oliveira Silva, Qesya Rodrigues Ferreira, Guilherme Rabelo Mota, Heloísa Heim, Filipe Antônio França da Silva, Breno Bittencourt de Brito, Fabrício Freire de Melo

Abstract

Coronavirus disease-19 (COVID-19) has become a pandemic, being a global health concern since December 2019, when the first cases were reported. Severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2), COVID-19 causal agent, is a β -coronavirus that has on its surface the spike (S) protein, which helps in its virulence and pathogenicity towards the host. Thus, effective and applicable diagnostic methods to this disease come as an important tool for the management of the patients. The use of the molecular technique polymerase chain reaction (PCR), which allows the detection of the viral RNA through nasopharyngeal swabs, is considered the gold standard test for the diagnosis of COVID-19. Moreover, serological methods, such as Elisa and rapid tests are able to detect SARS-CoV-2-specific IgA, IgM and IgG in positive patients, being important alternative techniques for the diagnostic establishment and epidemiological surveillance. On the other hand, reverse transcription loop-mediated isothermal amplification also proved to be a useful diagnostic method for that infection, mainly because it does not require a sophisticated laboratory apparatus and has similar specificity and sensibility to PCR. Complementarily, imaging exams provide findings of typical pneumonia, such as the ground-glass opacity radiological pattern on chest

computed tomography scanning, which, along with laboratory tests, assist in the diagnosis of COVID-19.

Key Words: COVID-19; Pandemic; Diagnosis; Polymerase chain reaction; Molecular biology; Serology

Luz MS, da Silva Júnior RT, Santos de Santana GA, Rodrigues GS, Crivellaro HL, Calmon MS, dos Santos CFSM, Silva LGO, Ferreira QR, Mota GR, Heim H, Silva FAFD, de Brito BB, de Melo FF. Molecular and serology methods in the diagnosis of COVID-19: An overview. *World J Methodol* 2022; In press

Core Tip: Coronavirus disease-19 is a disease that has as gold standard diagnostic method the viral RNA detection through polymerase chain reaction (PCR). On the other hand, techniques such as serology with detection of IgM and IgG antibodies, imaging and laboratory tests also assist in the diagnosis of severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 infection. Moreover, the reverse transcription loop-mediated isothermal amplification has similar specificity and sensibility to PCR. In this review, we discuss the main diagnostic methods and their uses in the current pandemic.

INTRODUCTION

In December 2019, severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) was identified as responsible for severe cases of pneumonia in Wuhan, China, which culminated in the description of a new disease: Coronavirus disease-19 (COVID-19)^[1]. As a result of the large number of affected countries and high potential of viral infection, the World Health Organization declared COVID-19 as a pandemic in March 2020. Up to December 2020, 66243918 cases and 1528984 global deaths were officially confirmed^[2]. SARS-CoV-2 is an single-stranded RNA, enveloped virus, which has the ability to attach to the angiotensin-converting enzyme 2 cell receptor, due to the expression of the S protein on the viral envelope, and, then, enter the host tissues^[3]. The *Coronaviridae* family is made up of viruses historically known to cause diseases either in animals and humans. The SARS and MERS outbreak in 2002 and 2012, respectively, granted them a wider visibility in the scientific community^[4]. Furthermore, the dissemination potential of SARS-CoV-2 is far higher than the others, due to structural differences in the S protein^[5]. The most common signs and symptoms of COVID-19 include fever, dry cough, shortness of breath, myalgia, ageusia, anosmia, headache, rhinorrhea, nausea, vomiting, and diarrhea^[6] and most patients showing severe symptoms are often affected by chronic disease. In addition, disturbed immune status, increased age, and obesity are strongly correlated to higher mortality rates^[7]. Reverse transcription polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR) is considered as the gold standard test for the diagnosis of COVID-19, due to its highly widespread and reliable technique performed in laboratories worldwide^[8]. In addition, immunoenzymatic and immunochromatographic assays as well as reverse transcription loop-mediated isothermal amplification (RT-LAMP) are other diagnostic methods that have been applied in this field. Of note, clinical and epidemiological analysis, chest radiography and tomography, and laboratorial findings are crucial tools for an accurate diagnosis and appropriate evaluation of patients^[9]. This article aims to review the main aspects of COVID-19 diagnostic methods, providing updated information on that issue, with

emphasis on molecular biology techniques and serology tests used in the detection of SARS-CoV-2 infection.

2 **RT-PCR**

RT-PCR is considered as the gold standard method in COVID-19 diagnosis, due to rapid detection, average of 3-4 h, and high sensibility and specificity^[10]. The sample is usually taken through nasopharyngeal swab^[11]. However, a systematic review and meta-analysis with 7 studies showed that bronchoalveolar lavage fluid had a higher positivity rate in the detection of SARS-CoV-2^[12].

The test analysis usually starts from a sample collected from nasal and oropharyngeal swabs^[13]. It is then divided in several steps that occur in different preset temperatures in order to provide reverse transcription and nucleic acid amplification^[14]. The result is thus analyzed through probes marked with fluorescent dyes that enhance the sensitivity of the test^[15]. The analysis of fecal samples, especially in children^[16], may be used as well, as the virus can remain viable for approximately 5 wk after patient respiratory samples are negative for SARS-CoV-2 RNA^[17].

RT-PCR is considered the actual main method as a result of its fastness, reproducibility and mitigation of false-positive results^[18]. The test shows good sensitivity and specificity, such as 94% and 100%, respectively (Table 1)^[19-28]. Studies have also pointed to a level of detection (LoD) that can vary from 3.8 to 23 copies/mL of viral RNA and showed no cross-reactivity with circulating respiratory viruses^[20].

However, in a study with 610 patients from Wuhan, China, eighteen presented a positive RT-PCR result after two consecutive negative results, which might be owing to insufficient viral material, test handling error, or incorrect collection processing^[21]. This is an alert to the need for a pattern in sampling procedures and alignment between the test and the patient's clinical manifestation, in order to achieve a higher diagnostic accuracy^[22].

RT-LAMP

Commented [H1]: Please confirm whether it is right or not. If not, please cite the Refs. 23-28 before Ref. 29.

Loop-mediated isothermal amplification (LAMP) is a DNA amplification technique under isothermal conditions in a sample with 4 or 6 primers, which, in contrast to RT-qPCR, does not require sophisticated laboratory apparatus, although it has similar specificity and sensitivity rates^[29]. The visualization through pH-sensitive dyes, without the need of expensive instrumentation is also a vantage of this test^[30]. As SARS-CoV-2 is a RNA virus, the test is therefore called RT-LAMP, due to the need for RTase in order to amplify RNA sequences^[29].

The RT-LAMP is a fast test, providing results within 30 min^[31], moreover, unpurified samples can be directly used^[32]. Studies also show that when the template has more than 200 copies of viral RNA, amplification curves appear within 15 min^[33], which means an even quicker diagnosis. In addition, studies describing a LoD of 2 copies of viral RNA in a 25 µL reaction^[34], sensitivity rates that varies from 80%^[26] to 97.5%^[27], concomitantly with no cross-reactivity with other respiratory pathogens (high specificity)^[33,35], and lower cost endorse that the diagnosis of COVID-19 through LAMP needs to be considered^[36,37].

However, a meta-analysis including 138 articles showed that RT-LAMP sensitivity (86.3%) is lower than that of RT-PCR (96.2%)^[38]. Furthermore, carry-over contamination, which can lead to false positive results, are common in LAMP reactions, probably as a consequence of aerosol formed from the products of the test^[34]. This phenomenon highlights the need of laboratories with good practice of molecular biology and separate spaces to deal with the components of the test, as well as more studies about the efficacy of all types of genes and primers used in this test.

SEROLOGICAL TESTS

Serological tests have become even more available during the COVID-19 pandemic. Consequently, research on their role as auxiliary diagnostic methods for SARS-CoV-2 infection has experienced exponential growth^[39]. Thereby, these tests may support the COVID-19 diagnosis, especially when there is a longer period of symptoms with

negative RT-PCR assays in a patient with a suspected infection by SARS-CoV-2^[40]. Moreover, its use allied to RT-PCR greatly increases the diagnostic sensibility^[41].

Among the serological tests commonly used for diagnosis of COVID-19, the ELISA, the Chemiluminescence immunoassay (CLIA), and the immunochromatographic assay (LFA) stand out. The ease, agility, and point-of-care testing are great advantages associated with the use of these tests^[42]. However, they may often show low sensitivity, high requirement of equipment^[39,42] or cross-reactivity with other pathogens, such as SARS-CoV-1^[43]. A study also showed a cross-reactivity of 26% in serological tests for COVID-19 during acute Zika virus infection^[44].

The sensitivity of the test is strictly related to the elapsed time from the beginning of symptoms, being more useful 15 d after the onset of clinical manifestations, especially regarding the detection of isolated IgG^[45]. In that context, a meta-analysis including 40 studies evaluated the presence of anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgG during the first symptomatic week, and the rates of false-negative diagnoses ranged from 44% to 87%^[46]. Therefore, simultaneous analysis of IgM and IgG antibodies, as they have different emergence times, may increase the serological test sensitivity^[39,47]. Although some studies compare IgG with other antibodies, such as IgA, to analyze any increase in the effectiveness of serological surveillance, the results are not promising^[48].

The overall specificity for all types of antibodies was higher than 98%. The average sensibility for IgG detection ranges from 80% to 85%, with CLIA being the most sensitive, followed by ELISA, and, with much lower performance, the LFA tests^[42,45]. IgM evaluation showed a sensitivity of 80.9% for CLIA, 84.5% for ELISA, and 51.4% with LFA. This study also demonstrated that in the use of combined IgM/IgG tests, the CLIA performance was higher than ELISA and LFA, with results of 97.3%, 90.5% and 85.8%, respectively^[45].

Sensitivity and specificity differences according to the viral protein analyzed are also documented: S protein is more specific, but N and RBD proteins are more sensitive in patients with mild infection^[47,49]. Therefore, research on antibodies against different

antigens may be useful in order to improve diagnostic methods, avoiding false-negatives and reaching a higher diagnostic accuracy.

ANTIGEN DETECTION METHODS

Viral antigen is a molecule with immunogenic potential that can be targeted by diagnostic tests through a reaction with monoclonal antibodies. Several antigen detection tests have started to be studied aiming for the development of alternatives for the rapid diagnosis of the COVID-19^[50,51]. The results of the test with nasopharyngeal secretions are ready within 15 min^[52], and it can be performed either through immunochromatography, with rapid detection, or ELISA, with better sensitivity^[50].

The average sensitivity of antigen detection tests is around 50%-70% and they are 100% specific^[51,53]. Of note, the performance of those tests may be influenced by higher or lower viral loads as well as by the specific antigen used. In that context, studies have shown different results when this method was evaluated, and the sensitivity values varied from 30.2%^[52] to 93.9%^[54]. Overall, higher rates of accurate diagnosis in antigen tests were greatly correlated with early infection, when the viral load of the upper respiratory tract is higher^[55].

Therefore, although the COVID-19 diagnosis through antigen detection has a high specificity and is faster and cheaper than RT-PCR, the precise time of usage of this test is crucial to a proper detection of the virus antigens^[52]. That said, the current gold standard diagnostic test for COVID-19 is still more reliable, because its use is associated with lower rates of false negative results^[56]. Nevertheless, utilization of antigen detection tests, with additional research, could turn into a viable option in the current pandemic context.

COMPLEMENTARY DIAGNOSTIC METHODS

Chest computed tomography findings

The chest computed tomography (CT) has been used as an alternative and complementary method for COVID-19 diagnosis, since CTs can detect pulmonary

abnormalities even when RT-PCR results turn negative^[57] for highly suspect cases with clinical symptoms^[58] in early days of infection^[59].

The chest CT diagnosis works through analysis of the variation in imaging findings that occur according to the disease progression and severity^[60]. The pulmonary imaging abnormalities start to appear around four days after the first symptoms, and have their findings peak more visible following the second week of clinical manifestations^[58].

Accordingly, the most predominant COVID-19 pneumonia imaging changes are ground-glass opacity (GGO) lesions with or without consolidations, peripheral and bilateral lung distribution of the disease and multilobar lung involvement, predominantly in the lower lobes^[61,62]. Some less common CT manifestations are the crazy-paving pattern, GGOs with consolidation, interlobular septal thickening, and pleural effusion^[63]. Regarding sensitivity, chest CT scans are highly sensible to COVID-19 lung abnormalities^[64], mainly in high-risk symptomatic cases^[65].

However, these imaging findings have low specificity^[63]. A study performed with 1014 patients showed an average specificity of 25%^[28], probably due to other viral pneumonias leading to similar imaging alterations, a fact that limits the use of this method in areas with high prevalence of other respiratory tract infections^[64]. Moreover, chest CT exams can detect no abnormalities in some asymptomatic or mild symptomatic cases^[63], making CT scans more of a complementary diagnostic test than a definitive one. Table 1 summarizes the sensitivity, specificity, time to result, and limitations of the diagnostic methods discussed in this review so far.

Laboratory findings

Patient's reports from Wuhan show recurrent cases of lymphocytopenia since the beginning of the infections in China^[66]. Besides that, studies also show a relevant frequency of patients with leukocytosis during SARS-CoV-2 infection^[67]. A meta-analysis showed that non-surviving patients had an expressive increase in leukocyte count, total bilirubin, seric ferritin, IL-6, as well as lymphocytes count reduced^[68]. Thus,

leukocyte series elevation can represent worse prognostic and high risk of unfavorable outcomes.

Increases in the levels of lactate dehydrogenase (LDH) and C reactive protein (CRP) were also highlighted and associated with pulmonary and myocardial lesions, especially in severe patients^[69]. Low serum albumin rates and high levels of alanine aminotransferase (ALT) and aspartate aminotransferase (AST) points to possible liver complication, which is very common in acute phases of the disease in patients with a severe infection^[70,71]. Furthermore, the association of these points with elevation in renal biomarkers (for example, creatinine), coagulation measures and heart and muscle injury scores suggest potential progression to multiple organ failure in severe patients^[68]. Thereby, elevated levels of D-dimer, fibrin degradation products and fibrinogen can be observed during the course of the disease, with the D-dimer alterations being the most common^[72]. A study related that expressive levels of these coagulation parameters were observed in severe patients with worse prognosis, while mild disease patients or in early stages had normal measures^[73,74]. In addition, thrombocytopenia is also a possible laboratory finding in COVID-19. A meta-analysis reported that platelet count was minor in severe disease and even smaller in non-surviving^[74]. These findings might be indicative of disease progression and coagulation disorders, which means that the tracking of these signs is very important while managing patients^[74,75].

Moreover, possible co-infections of Sars-CoV-2 and bacterial infections might cause neutrophilia and leukocytosis, associated with lymphocytopenia, without increasing inflammatory factors, such as D-dimer and CRP^[76]. Therefore, laboratory findings have proven to be a helpful option as a complementary diagnosis. It is also suitable in the visualization of possible comorbidities in patients with COVID-19, and as an indicator of disease severity.

Regarding possible treatments for the disease, several studies are being carried out, in order to test the efficacy of drugs, foods and mineral supplements against COVID-19. Lymecycline and Famotidine, for example, are being studied as a potential treatment for COVID-19^[77,78], due to a possible ability to bind some SARS-CoV-2

structures (M^{Pro}, spike protein, RdRp, and furin) and have an anti-inflammatory action^[79], respectively. However, there are, up to this moment, not enough evidence and controlled clinical trials to affirm its efficacy against the disease. In addition, mineral supplements as zinc (Zn) have, apparently, some antiviral properties that could be used against SARS-CoV-2 infection, such as a capability of modulating the host's immune response and attenuating the cytokine storm caused by COVID-19^[80]. However, a randomized clinical trial of 214 patients, showed that the Zn supplementation had no significant benefits^[81].

CONCLUSION

Notably, the use of serology and antigen detection tests has important limitations, since false negative results are common. Nonetheless, in a pandemic context, these methods are crucial for epidemiological surveillance. RT-PCR remains as the gold standard test and should be preferred to diagnose COVID-19. However, the high potential of RT-LAMP, given that it is a fast and affordable test, should be considered in diagnostic propedeutics. In addition, the laboratory and imaging findings play important roles as complementary diagnostic tools aiding in patients' management.

3%

SIMILARITY INDEX

PRIMARY SOURCES

1	Wwww.Medrxiv.Org Internet	32 words — 1%
2	covid19dataportal.es Internet	21 words — 1%
3	Marie Dubert, Benoit Visseaux, Valentina Isernia, Lila Bouadma et al. "Case report study of the first five COVID-19 patients treated with remdesivir in France", International Journal of Infectious Diseases, 2020 Crossref	18 words — 1%
4	www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov Internet	17 words — 1%

EXCLUDE QUOTES ON
EXCLUDE BIBLIOGRAPHY ON

EXCLUDE MATCHES < 1%