



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.

Elsevier hereby grants permission to make all its COVID-19-related research that is available on the COVID-19 resource centre - including this research content - immediately available in PubMed Central and other publicly funded repositories, such as the WHO COVID database with rights for unrestricted research re-use and analyses in any form or by any means with acknowledgement of the original source. These permissions are granted for free by Elsevier for as long as the COVID-19 resource centre remains active.



## Short Communication

# Conservation of nucleotide sequences for molecular diagnosis of Middle East respiratory syndrome coronavirus, 2015



Yuki Furuse\*, Michiko Okamoto, Hitoshi Oshitani

Department of Virology, Tohoku University Graduate School of Medicine, 2-1 Seiryō-machi, Aoba-ku, Sendai, Japan

## ARTICLE INFO

## Article history:

Received 31 July 2015

Received in revised form 21 September 2015

Accepted 22 September 2015

**Corresponding Editor:** Eskild Petersen, Aarhus, Denmark.

## Keywords:

Middle East respiratory syndrome coronavirus

Diagnosis

Laboratory

Genome

Sequence

Evolution

## SUMMARY

Infection due to the Middle East respiratory syndrome coronavirus (MERS-CoV) is widespread. The present study was performed to assess the protocols used for the molecular diagnosis of MERS-CoV by analyzing the nucleotide sequences of viruses detected between 2012 and 2015, including sequences from the large outbreak in eastern Asia in 2015. Although the diagnostic protocols were established only 2 years ago, mismatches between the sequences of primers/probes and viruses were found for several of the assays. Such mismatches could lead to a lower sensitivity of the assay, thereby leading to false-negative diagnosis. A slight modification in the primer design is suggested. Protocols for the molecular diagnosis of viral infections should be reviewed regularly after they are established, particularly for viruses that pose a great threat to public health such as MERS-CoV.

© 2015 The Authors. Published by Elsevier Ltd on behalf of International Society for Infectious Diseases. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

## 1. Introduction

Middle East respiratory syndrome coronavirus (MERS-CoV) is an enveloped virus with a positive-sense RNA genome. Infection with the virus causes severe respiratory symptoms in humans, with a case fatality rate as high as 37%.<sup>1</sup> Camels may be a source of infection to humans.<sup>2</sup> Human-to-human transmission is also possible, but this requires close contact, such as health care-related contact without proper measures for infection control and prevention.<sup>3</sup> The earliest case of MERS was reported in Jordan, and MERS-CoV was subsequently isolated from cases in Saudi Arabia only a short time later.<sup>4</sup> Since then, infections have been endemic mainly in the Middle East. However, MERS-CoV has spread sporadically to other areas, including Europe, North America, Africa, and Southeast and East Asia, by travelers from the Middle East.<sup>5</sup>

The laboratory diagnosis of MERS-CoV infection is mainly performed using real-time reverse transcription PCR (RT-PCR) to detect viral RNA in specimens. Interim recommendations from the World Health Organization (WHO) in 2015 for the laboratory testing of MERS-CoV included protocols for RT-PCR that were developed by the University Hospital Bonn and the US Centers for

Disease Control and Prevention.<sup>6–9</sup> This document included seven assays: (1) the UpE assay, which is considered highly sensitive and is recommended for screening,<sup>7</sup> (2) the ORF1a assay, which is considered equally as sensitive as the UpE assay,<sup>6</sup> (3) the ORF1b assay, which is considered less sensitive than the ORF1a assay,<sup>6,7</sup> and the (4) N2 and (5) N3 assays, which can complement UpE and ORF1a assays for screening and confirmation.<sup>8,9</sup> To date, these assays have shown no cross-reactivity with other human coronaviruses.<sup>6–8</sup> Sequencing protocols for further confirmation, namely the (6) RdRpSeq and (7) NSeq assays, were also developed.<sup>6</sup>

Because MERS-CoV is an RNA virus that can evolve rapidly, there remains concern that these protocols may not be suitable for the detection of current MERS-CoV because of a mismatch among sequences in the primer/probe regions. This study was performed to analyze recent viral genomic nucleic acid sequences and to discuss the efficacy of the RT-PCR protocols for the molecular diagnosis of MERS-CoV infections.

## 2. Methods

As of July 29, 2015, sequence data for 386 MERS-CoV were available at ‘Virus Variation’ (<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/genome/viruses/variation>; GenBank accession numbers of the sequence data analyzed are available upon request). The data

\* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: [furusey.tohoku@gmail.com](mailto:furusey.tohoku@gmail.com) (Y. Furuse).

**Table 1**  
Conservation of the primer and probe region sequences of the WHO-recommended assays for the molecular diagnosis of MERS-CoV

Assay	Regions	Sequence (5' to 3') <sup>a</sup>	Conservation <sup>b</sup>
UpE	Forward primer	G 'C' AACGCGGATTAGTT	99% (115/116)
	Reverse primer	GCCTCTACACGGGACCCATA	100% (115/115)
	Probe	C 'T' CTTACATAATCGCCCCGAGCTCC	99% (115/116)
ORF1a	Forward primer	CCACTACTCCCATTTCGTCAG	100% (119/119)
	Reverse primer	CAGTATGTGTAGTGCGCATATAAGCA	100% (119/119)
	Probe	TTGCAAATTGGCTTGCCCCACT	100% (119/119)
ORF1b	Forward primer	TTCGATGTTGAGGGTGCTCAT	100% (116/116)
	Reverse primer	TCACACCAGTTGAAAATCCTAATTG	100% (115/115)
	Probe	CCCGTAATGCATGTGGCACCAATGT	100% (116/116)
N2	Forward primer	GGCACTGAGGACCCACGTT	100% (127/127)
	Reverse primer	TTG 'C' GACATACCCATAAAAGCA	99% (126/127)
	Probe	CCCCAAATTGCTGAGCTTGCTCTACA	100% (126/126)
N3	Forward primer	GGGTGTACTCTTAAT 'G' CCAATTC	95% (125/131)
	Reverse primer	TCT 'G' TCCTGTCTCCGCCAAT	99% (130/131)
	Probe	ACCCC 'T' GCGCAAATGCTGGG	92% (120/131)
RdRpSeq	Forward primer	TGCTATWAGTGCTAAGAATAGRGC	100% (119/119)
	Reverse primer	GCATWGCNCW 'G' TCACACTTAGG	0% (0/110)
	'Corrected reverse primer'	GCATWGCNCWATCACACTTAGG	100% (120/120)
	Reverse-nested primer	CACTTAGGRTARTCCCAWCCCA	100% (120/120)
NSeq	Forward primer	CCTTCGGTACAGTGGAGCCA	100% (127/127)
	Reverse primer	GATGGG 'G' TT 'G' CCAACACAAAC	49% (53/108)
	'Modified reverse primer'	GATGGGRTTRCCAACACAAAC	99% (107/108)
	Forward-nested primer	TGACCCAAAGATCCCAACTAC	100% (128/128)

WHO, World Health Organization; MERS-CoV, Middle East respiratory syndrome coronavirus.

<sup>a</sup> The position of the mismatched nucleotide is indicated with quotation marks.

<sup>b</sup> In parenthesis: number of sequences perfectly matched/number of sequences available for the region.

included viruses detected between 2012 and 2015, including viral sequences from the big outbreak in eastern Asia in 2015.<sup>1</sup> Data for these 386 sequences, including complete as well as partial genome sequences, were obtained and analyzed. Sequence data were aligned with ClustalW to assess genetic changes in the nucleotide sequences of the primer and probe regions of the assays described above. The numbers of viral sequences that matched the primer/probe sequences perfectly were counted.

### 3. Results and discussion

As mentioned in the Introduction above, the UpE, ORF1a, N2, and N3 assays can be used for screening because of their high sensitivity.<sup>6–9</sup> Among these, only the primer and probe designs of the ORF1a assay showed 100% conservation of all sequence data available today (Table 1). Minor mismatches were found for the UpE assay (one nucleotide substitution in two sequences) and N2 assay (one nucleotide substitution in one sequence), and significant mismatches were found for the N3 assay. The primer/probe regions were found to be well conserved, except for the N3 assay. In addition, mismatches were not found in the 3' end region of primers for the UpE and N2 assays (Table 1). The sensitivity of the assays may not be greatly affected. No mismatches were found for the ORF1b assay.

With regard to the sequencing assays, no sequence data that matched the sequence of the reverse primer for the RdRpSeq assay was found. However, a single common mismatch in all sequence data was found. When the mismatched nucleotide was corrected, the RdRpSeq assay matched all the sequence data perfectly ('corrected reverse primer', Table 1). In addition, viral sequences of the reverse primer region for the NSeq assay were not highly conserved; the sequence matched only 49% of strains. Based on these results, the use of a modified reverse primer for the assay is suggested, in order to reduce the possibility of a mismatch ('modified reverse primer', Table 1).

Several mismatches among viral sequences in the primer/probe regions for molecular diagnosis were identified in this study. Such mismatches could lead to a lower sensitivity of the assay, thereby leading to false-negative diagnosis. The mismatched sequence data

could have been generated by errors in PCR or sequencing during viral nucleotide sequence analysis because of the incorporation of the wrong nucleotide.<sup>10</sup> However, it is more likely that the RNA virus has evolved and that this has accidentally resulted in the induction of mutation/s in the region targeted by the primer/probe for RT-PCR, only 2 years after the establishment of the protocols. Fortunately, no or few mismatches were found for most of the MERS-CoV screening assays. Nevertheless, protocols for the molecular diagnosis of viral infections should be reviewed regularly after they are established, particularly for viruses that pose a great threat to public health such as MERS-CoV.

### Acknowledgement

This research was supported by the Japan Initiative for Global Research Network on Infectious Diseases (J-GRID) from the Japan Agency for Medical Research and Development, AMED. The funding source had no involvement in the study design, in the collection, analysis, and interpretation of the data, in the writing of the manuscript, or in the decision to submit the manuscript for publication.

*Conflict of interest:* All authors declare no conflicts of interest.

### References

- World Health Organization. Middle East respiratory syndrome coronavirus (MERS-CoV). Republic of Korea: WHO; 2015.
- Azhar EI, El-Kafrawy SA, Farraj SA, Hassan AM, Al-Saeed MS, Hashem AM, Madani TA. Evidence for camel-to-human transmission of MERS coronavirus. *N Engl J Med* 2014;**370**:2499–505.
- Mailles A, Blanckaert K, Chaud P, van der Werf S, Lina B, Caro V, et al; First cases of Middle East Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus (MERS-CoV) infections in France, investigations and implications for the prevention of human-to-human transmission, France, May 2013. *Euro Surveill* 2013;**18**(24), pii: 20502.
- Zaki AM, van Boheemen S, Bestebroer TM, Osterhaus AD, Fouchier RA. Isolation of a novel coronavirus from a man with pneumonia in Saudi Arabia. *N Engl J Med* 2012;**367**:1814–20.
- World Health Organization Regional Office for Europe. Middle East respiratory syndrome coronavirus (MERS-CoV): situation update and cases reported in the Netherlands. WHO; 2014.
- Corman VM, Muller MA, Costabel U, Timm J, Binger T, Meyer B, et al. Assays for laboratory confirmation of novel human coronavirus (hCoV-EMC) infections. *Euro Surveill* 2012;**17**(49), pii: 20334.

7. Corman VM, Eckerle I, Bleicker T, Zaki A, Landt O, Eschbach-Bludau M, et al. Detection of a novel human coronavirus by real-time reverse-transcription polymerase chain reaction. *Euro Surveill* 2012;**17**(39). pii: 20285.
8. Lu X, Whitaker B, Sakthivel SK, Kamili S, Rose LE, Lowe L, et al. Real-time reverse transcription-PCR assay panel for Middle East respiratory syndrome coronavirus. *J Clin Microbiol* 2014;**52**:67–75.
9. World Health Organization. Laboratory testing for Middle East respiratory syndrome coronavirus—interim guidance (revised). WHO; 2015.
10. Keohavong P, Thilly WG. Fidelity of DNA polymerases in DNA amplification. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 1989;**86**:9253–7.