Since January 2020 Elsevier has created a COVID-19 resource centre with free information in English and Mandarin on the novel coronavirus COVID-19. The COVID-19 resource centre is hosted on Elsevier Connect, the company's public news and information website.

Virology 555 (2021) 111–111

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Virology

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/virology

Corrigendum

Corrigendum to "Analytical and clinical comparison of Viasure (CerTest Biotec) and 2019-nCoV CDC (IDT) RT-qPCR kits for SARS-CoV2 diagnosis" [Virology volume (2021) 154–156]

Byron Freire-Paspuel [a], Patricio Vega-Marino [b], Alberto Velez [b], Marilyn Cruz [b], Franklin Perez [c], Miguel Angel Garcia-Bereguiain [a,*]

[a] One Health Research Group, Universidad de Las Americas, Quito, Ecuador
[b] Agencia de Regulacion y Control de La Bioseguridad y Cuarentena para Galapagos, Puerto Ayora, Ecuador
[c] OneLabt, Santa Elena, Ecuador

1. On the introduction section. The sentence "Also, it was recently authorized for SARS-CoV2 diagnosis in Ecuador. However, it is not included on the list of FDA EUA kits (5) and only an evaluation study for Viasure SARS-CoV-2 RT-qPCR kit has been reported comparing to an automatized system like de Cobas 6800, besides the limited validation provided by manufacturer's manual (6,7)", m **must be replaced by this one: "Also, it was recently authorized for SARS-CoV2 diagnosis in Ecuador. However, it is not included on the list of FDA EUA kits (5) and only a limited validation provided by the manufacturer is available; although there is a recent report evaluating the clinical performance for another Viasure SARS-CoV-2 kit targeting the S gene (6, 7).**
2. On the discussion section. The paragraph: "It came to our attention a recent study about the clinical performance of Viasure SARS-CoV-2 compared to Cobas 6800 system using a total number of 95 samples (6). The authors reported a lost of sensitivity of 30,9% for Viasure SARS-CoV-2 kit, with only 47 out of 68 positive samples detected. However, all the samples that failed to be positive for Viasure SARS-CoV-2 kit had viral loads over 2000 copies/mL of sample (6). Considering the viral loads frequency distribution for SARS-CoV-2 (11, 12), this study would have a bias toward ultra low viral loads below 2000 copies/mL as less than 10% of SARS-CoV-2 positive patients are expected to have those loads (11, 12)", **has to be followed by this sentence one: "Additionally, this Viasure SARS-CoV-2 S gene RT-PCR kit is different to the one evaluated in our study, as different gene targets are used, so the results among both studies are not comparable".**

The authors would like to apologise for any inconvenience caused.

DOI of original article: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.virol.2020.10.010.
* Corresponding author.
E-mail address: magbereguiain@gmail.com (M.A. Garcia-Bereguiain).

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.virol.2020.12.019

Available online 5 January 2021