Illumina vs Thermo Fisher Ion Torrent: NGS Platform Comparison 2026

Published August 7, 2026 27 min read

Illumina vs Thermo Fisher Ion Torrent: NGS Platform Comparison 2026

Executive Summary

Illumina and Thermo Fisher Scientific's Ion Torrent product line are two established, but not exclusive, NGS platform families. Illumina's sequencing by synthesis (SBS) chemistry detects each base optically via fluorescently labeled nucleotides, while Thermo Fisher's ion semiconductor sequencing detects each base electrochemically by measuring pH changes released during DNA polymerization (Source: ncbi.nlm.nih.gov). The independent comparative accuracy evidence cited in this article is principally from legacy instruments: a 2012 benchtop study found Illumina error rates "below 0.4%" and a higher rate for Ion Torrent PGM (Source: pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov). Most cited comparisons involve older-generation Ion Torrent PGM and Proton instruments, not current Genexus or S5 Prime systems; therefore, these results do not establish a current-generation accuracy ranking.

On cost, a 2020 peer-reviewed methods study found Illumina MiSeq per-sample costs of $76.25 to $81.07 at 16-sample multiplexing versus over $124 for comparable Ion Torrent S5 and PGM runs (Source: pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov). On turnaround time, Thermo Fisher's Genexus System is marketed as delivering results in "as little as 24 hours" with roughly 20 minutes of total hands-on time (Source: thermofisher.com), a marked contrast to the multi-week turnaround that peer-reviewed literature describes as typical of conventional clinical NGS workflows.

Both companies offer FDA-approved oncology diagnostic assays. Illumina's TruSight Oncology Comprehensive was approved in August 2024 as "the first US FDA-approved, distributable comprehensive genomic profiling IVD kit with pan-cancer companion diagnostic claims" (Source: prnewswire.com). Thermo Fisher's Oncomine Dx Target Test, expanded in 2024 beyond its original 2017 non-small cell lung cancer approval to cover additional tumor types, is validated for use with the Ion PGM Dx System. The distinct Oncomine Dx Express Test is the IVD assay used with the Genexus Dx System. In its 2023 market estimate, Grand View Research valued the global NGS market at over $8 billion and projected it would reach "$33.15 billion by 2030, registering a CAGR of 21.66%" (Source: prnewswire.com). That estimate reported oncology as the largest application segment in 2022.

Illumina reported $4.34 billion in fiscal year 2025 revenue, "flat compared to 2024" (Source: investor.illumina.com), while Thermo Fisher's much larger, diversified business reported $44.6 billion in total FY2025 revenue, within which the genetic sciences segment housing Ion Torrent grew to $2.87 billion, a rise the company's own annual filing attributes largely to acquisition activity rather than organic sequencing growth (Source: stocktitan.net). Neither platform is categorically superior. Illumina's paired-end, fluorescence-based architecture may fit high-throughput research and comprehensive genomic profiling where per-run output matters, while Thermo Fisher markets the Genexus system around rapid, low-touch specimen-to-report workflows. The available sources do not establish comparative superiority or broad adoption of Genexus across decentralized, community-hospital, or point-of-care settings. Clinical deployment requires a locally validated workflow and applicable regulatory authorization for the intended use.

Introduction and Background

Next-generation sequencing (NGS), the collective term for massively parallel DNA sequencing technologies that read millions of DNA fragments simultaneously rather than one strand at a time as with older Sanger sequencing, has become the default method for genomic research, clinical oncology testing, infectious disease surveillance, and reproductive health screening. As of August 2026, the global NGS market has grown into a multibillion-dollar industry, with Grand View Research valuing it at over $8 billion in 2023 and projecting growth to $33.15 billion by 2030 (Source: prnewswire.com).

Illumina and **Thermo Fisher Scientific**, through its **Ion Torrent** product line, represent two technically distinct NGS platform families within a competitive market. Illumina relies on sequencing by synthesis (SBS) chemistry, which uses fluorescently labeled nucleotides read by optical imaging. Ion Torrent uses ion semiconductor sequencing, an optics-free approach that measures pH changes released as DNA polymerase incorporates each base (Source: ncbi.nlm.nih.gov). This report compares these two platform families across technical capability, adoption, accuracy, cost, and clinical suitability, drawing on vendor specification sheets, peer-reviewed benchmark studies, and market research to identify potential use-case fit as of 2026.

Choosing between the two is rarely just an accuracy question. Laboratories weigh read length and error profile against turnaround time, capital and per-sample cost, workflow automation, and how outputs integrate with downstream systems. In regulated clinical use, laboratories must validate their complete testing workflow and meet the requirements applicable to the assay and intended use; sequencing chemistry alone does not establish

compliance.

Illumina: Sequencing by Synthesis Platforms

Capabilities

Illumina's core chemistry, sequencing by synthesis (SBS), works by incorporating one fluorescently labeled, chemically blocked nucleotide per cycle and imaging the result before removing the block and repeating the cycle: "A fluorescently labeled reversible terminator is imaged as each dNTP is added and then cleaved to allow incorporation of the next base," per the company's own technology overview (Source: illumina.com). Because each cycle produces an optical image rather than an electrochemical signal, Illumina states its chemistry "virtually eliminates errors and missed calls associated with strings of repeated nucleotides (homopolymers)" (Source: illumina.com), a category of error that has historically challenged non-optical sequencing methods.

Illumina's current flagship chemistry, branded XLEAP-SBS and introduced with the NovaSeq X Series, is described by the company as delivering "up to 2x faster incorporation speed, up to 3x greater accuracy, and engineered for longer reads" relative to prior-generation SBS chemistry (Source: illumina.com). The current instrument portfolio spans four tiers. The **NovaSeq X Plus**, the highest-throughput system, uses a 25B flow cell configuration that Illumina specifies as supporting roughly 64 human genomes per flow cell at 30x coverage (Source: illumina.com), with a minimum quality threshold at its longest 2x300bp read configuration of "75% of bases higher than Q30" (Source: illumina.com). The mid-range **NextSeq 1000/2000** reaches up to 540 gigabases (Gb) of output using its P4 reagent kit at 2x150bp read length (Source: illumina.com), with a higher quality bar of "90% of bases higher than Q30" across most read-length configurations (Source: illumina.com). The benchtop **MiSeq i100** targets smaller panels and rapid-turnaround applications, offering an output range of 1.5 to 30 Gb and a maximum read length of 2x500bp (Source: illumina.com), with run times Illumina markets as roughly "4x faster than the MiSeq System" it replaces, "with sequencing run times as fast as four hours" (Source: illumina.com). At the entry level, the compact **iSeq 100** produces "a maximum output of 1.2 Gb" per run (Source: illumina.com), completing its fastest (1x36bp) run in 9.5 hours with more than "85% of bases higher than Q30" (Source: illumina.com). Notably, the iSeq 100 pairs Illumina's fluorescence-based SBS chemistry with complementary metal-oxide semiconductor (CMOS) sensor technology, described by Illumina as coupling "Illumina SBS chemistry with complementary metal-oxide semiconductor (CMOS) technology" to shrink instrument size and cost "while maintaining the high data accuracy of SBS" (Source: illumina.com), a reminder that CMOS-based miniaturization and Ion Torrent-style semiconductor base calling are distinct engineering concepts that should not be conflated.

Adoption

At the NovaSeq X Series launch, Illumina said the flagship system "can generate more than 20,000 whole genomes per year" (Source: prnewswire.com), a figure the company described as 2.5 times the throughput of its prior sequencer generation. Illumina's own corporate fact sheet cites an "active installed base ~21,000" sequencing systems worldwide (Source: illumina.com), and independent market analysts continue to describe the company as the category leader: MarketsandMarkets' 2025 competitive assessment states that "Illumina (Star) leads with a large installed base of clinical and research sequencers" (Source: marketsandmarkets.com). Trade-press retrospectives describe Illumina's historical dominance in similar terms: by 2014, the company "held 70% of the genome sequencing market and their machines accounted for over 90%" of DNA sequence data produced worldwide, according to one industry account, though this figure reflects a decade-old snapshot rather than a current, independently sourced 2026 share estimate (Source: frontlinegenomics.com). In a 2026 interview, an Illumina executive stated that per-genome sequencing costs have fallen to "as low as $200" from a much higher historical starting point (Source: investmentreports.co).

On the clinical side, Illumina's TruSight Oncology Comprehensive received FDA approval in August 2024 as, in the company's words, "the first US FDA-approved, distributable comprehensive genomic profiling IVD kit with pan-cancer companion diagnostic claims" (Source: prnewswire.com). The assay "uses targeted next-generation sequencing to detect variants in 517 genes" and runs on the Illumina NextSeq 550Dx instrument (Source: prnewswire.com), and a CE-marked version had already been available in Europe since 2022, two years ahead of US approval (Source: prnewswire.com). The assay also appears on the FDA's public registry of authorized companion diagnostic devices (Source: fda.gov).

Strengths and Limitations

Independent peer-reviewed benchmarking of legacy platforms generally found lower error rates for Illumina than for older Ion Torrent instruments. A widely cited 2012 benchtop platform comparison reported Illumina raw error rates "below 0.4%" (Source: pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov). The separate 2014 study discussed below evaluated a specific 16S rRNA mock-community workflow; its calculated values included library-preparation error and are not absolute platform error rates. A 2015 study also reported differing overlap among variant callers on Illumina and Ion Proton data; those inter-caller results are not truth-set accuracy measures and are discussed further below.

The platform's principal limitations are commercial and workflow-related rather than chemical. Neither Illumina nor Thermo Fisher publishes list prices for its sequencing instruments, requiring institutions to request formal quotes, and Illumina's shorter, paired-end read architecture (up to 2x500bp on the MiSeq i100, shorter on higher-throughput systems) is less suited to applications that specifically benefit from long, contiguous single reads.

Thermo Fisher Ion Torrent: Semiconductor Sequencing Platforms

Capabilities

Ion semiconductor sequencing dispenses with fluorescent labels and optical imaging entirely. As one peer-reviewed characterization puts it, the technology works by "measuring pH rather than light to detect polymerisation events": each time a DNA polymerase incorporates a nucleotide, it releases a hydrogen ion, and an ion-sensitive sensor beneath each sequencing well detects the resulting pH change (Source: ncbi.nlm.nih.gov). A separate peer-reviewed review of the technology describes its foundational innovation as performing the sequencing entirely on a standard semiconductor sensor chip rather than through a camera-based optical system.

Thermo Fisher's current instrument lineup centers on two families. The **Ion Torrent Genexus System**, the company's flagship integrated platform, is marketed as delivering "NGS test results in as little as 24 hours" from specimen to report (Source: thermofisher.com), with a workflow requiring "a total of 20 minutes of hands-on time for the entire workflow" and only two manual touchpoints (Source: thermofisher.com). Its companion Genexus Purification System is designed to "go from sample to NGS-ready plate in just minutes" of hands-on time (Source: thermofisher.com). The clinical, in vitro diagnostic version, the Genexus Dx System, similarly "delivers biomarker results in as little as 24 hours" (Source: thermofisher.com).

The **Ion GeneStudio S5 series** (S5, S5 Plus, and S5 Prime) remains Thermo Fisher's modular, higher-throughput semiconductor sequencing platform, with chip options spanning roughly 2 million to 280 million reads per run and turnaround times ranging from about three hours on the fastest chip and instrument combination to over 21 hours on higher-output configurations, according to the company's official specification sheet (Source: documents.thermofisher.com). Instrument pricing is not publicly listed for either the Genexus or S5 series; buyers must request a formal quote, though a reagent kit, Genexus Controls, is listed at a public price of $1,764.00 (Source: thermofisher.com).

Adoption

Thermo Fisher introduced the Genexus System in November 2019, marketing it as "the first fully integrated, next-generation sequencing (NGS) platform featuring an automated specimen-to-report workflow that delivers results economically in a single day" (Source: prnewswire.com), an early-access clinical user quoted as being able to "go from a biological sample to a report with practically zero intervention from the operator" (Source: prnewswire.com).

On companion diagnostics, Thermo Fisher's Oncomine Dx Target Test, which the FDA describes as "a laboratory test designed to detect genetic changes" in tumor tissue (Source: fda.gov), was originally approved in June 2017 and covered contemporaneously as "the first next-generation sequencing (NGS)-based Companion Diagnostic (CDx) test that simultaneously screens tumor samples for biomarkers" tied to multiple approved lung cancer therapies at once (Source: globenewswire.com). The assay has since expanded to additional tumor types, including cholangiocarcinoma and thyroid cancers, detecting "certain genetic changes in tissue samples from people with non-small cell lung cancer" and other indications per its current FDA approval record (Source: fda.gov). Trade press covering a 2024 expansion confirmed the "Ion Torrent Oncomine Dx Target test has received approval from the US Food and Drug" Administration for a glioma-related indication (Source: genomeweb.com). Thermo Fisher reports "100% overall percent agreement (OPA), positive percent agreement (PPA) and negative percent agreement (NPA) for BRAF" against FDA-approved reference methods (Source: thermofisher.com). This assay is likewise listed on the FDA's public registry of authorized companion diagnostic devices (Source: fda.gov).

Strengths and Limitations

The Genexus platform's principal advantage is speed and workflow simplicity. Independent peer-reviewed literature frames conventional clinical NGS turnaround as a persistent bottleneck, with one study noting that "the average turnaround of next-generation sequencing (NGS) reports is over 2 weeks" at many institutions (Source: ncbi.nlm.nih.gov), against which a same-day or multi-day Genexus result represents a substantial workflow improvement, particularly for community hospitals without dedicated genomics staff (discussed further in the Case Studies section below).

The platform's documented limitation is a homopolymer-related error signature inherent to pH-based base calling. A peer-reviewed characterization of the technology found "homopolymer errors responsible for between 96" and 97 percent of total sequencing error on a widely used Ion Torrent chemistry generation, tracing the effect to "inaccurate flow-calls, which introduced indels at a raw rate of 2.84%" on that platform (Source: ncbi.nlm.nih.gov), concluding that, at the time, the platform did not yet achieve the accuracy of competing light-based sequencing technologies. This

and several other independent accuracy comparisons cited in this report concern earlier-generation Ion Torrent PGM and Ion Proton instruments rather than current Genexus or S5 Prime chemistry; neither this report's research nor Thermo Fisher's own product pages surfaced a directly comparable, current-generation quantitative error-rate figure, leaving buyers to weigh vendor specifications against dated independent literature when evaluating current instruments.

Feature Comparison

Table 1 below summarizes representative specifications across each company's current instrument tiers, drawn from the vendor specification pages and spec sheets cited above.

SPECIFICATION	ILLUMINA NOVASEQ X PLUS	ILLUMINA NEXTSEQ 1000/2000	ILLUMINA MISEQ I100 SERIES	THERMO FISHER ION TORRENT GENEXUS	THERMO FISHER ION GENESTUDIO S5 SERIES
Detection method	Fluorescence (SBS, XLEAP-SBS chemistry)	Fluorescence (SBS)	Fluorescence (SBS)	Ion semiconductor (pH / hydrogen ion)	Ion semiconductor (pH / hydrogen ion)
Max read length	Up to 2x300bp on the 1.5B flow cell; 25B flow cells support up to 2x150bp	Up to 2x300bp with P1/P2 reagents; the maximum 540 Gb P4 configuration is 2x150bp (Illumina specifications	2x500bp	Single read, chemistry dependent	Single read; up to 600 bp on specified Ion 520 and Ion 530 chip configurations
Max output per run	Approximately 16 to 21 Tb with dual flow cells	NextSeq 1000: up to 240 Gb (P2); NextSeq 2000: up to 540 Gb (P4)	1.5 to 30 Gb; 30 Gb requires the MiSeq i100 Plus 100M flow cell	Chip and workflow dependent	Up to 20–25 Gb per Ion 550 chip run; 40–50 Gb from two Ion 550-chip runs in one day on the S5 Prime
Fastest sequencing run time / reported workflow turnaround	Approximately 14 to 48 hours (sequencing run time, not specimen-to-report turnaround)	8 hours for a P1 2x50 run; approximately 8–44 hours depending on reagent kit and read configuration (Illumina specifications	As fast as 4 hours	As little as 24 hours, specimen to report	As fast as approximately 3 hours (fastest chip/instrument pairing)
Hands-on time	Not published	Not published	Not published	Approximately 20 minutes for the full workflow	Not published
List pricing	Quote required	Quote required	Quote required	Quote required (reagent kit from $1,764)	Quote required

Table 1 shows that the two companies compete less on any single specification than on overall workflow philosophy. Illumina's systems maximize per-run output and read-pair architecture for large-scale genomic and oncology panels, while Thermo Fisher's Genexus platform optimizes for minimal hands-on labor and same-day turnaround, at some cost to maximum achievable output per run. Neither company publishes instrument list prices, a common practice for capital equipment of this class; both require a formal quote request, making direct sticker-price comparison impossible from public sources alone.

Performance and Benchmarks

The cited independent, peer-reviewed comparisons are historical studies of specific earlier-generation instruments and workflows; they do not establish a current-generation performance ranking. A 2012 benchtop comparison measured an Ion Torrent PGM raw error rate of "1.78% for Ion Torrent" against Illumina's sub-0.4% figure cited earlier, and found that the PGM "didn't generate reads at all for long (> 14-base) homopolymer tracts" (Source: pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov). A 2014 16S rRNA methods paper found a higher calculated per-base error frequency for Ion Torrent than Illumina in its mock-community workflow and noted that then-current Ion Torrent chemistries offered longer continuous reads of up to 400 bp (Source: pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov). A 2015 variant-caller study compared overlap among calls made by several callers on Illumina and Ion Proton data. Its approximately 92 percent Illumina and 15.5 percent Ion Proton figures describe inter-caller overlap, not concordance with a truth set; differences in caller counts and pipelines prevent using them as a direct measure of platform accuracy.

Cost comparisons show a more mixed picture and depend heavily on sample multiplexing level. A 2020 peer-reviewed methods study found that when "sequencing 16 samples on an Illumina MiSeq 500V2 Nano run," per-sample cost came to $76.25 and $81.07 across two configurations, while at the same multiplexing level an "Ion Torrent S5 510 chip run closely matched the cost per sample" of an older Ion Torrent PGM run, both landing above $124 per sample (Source: pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov). The same study also documented indels in genome consensus sequences generated from Ion Torrent datasets even in areas of high read coverage, consistent with the homopolymer-driven error pattern reported elsewhere in the literature. *Table 2* below summarizes the independent benchmark findings referenced in this section.

STUDY (YEAR)	PLATFORMS COMPARED	METRIC	FINDING
Benchtop comparison (2012)	Illumina MiSeq vs. Ion Torrent PGM	Raw error rate	Illumina below 0.4 percent; Ion Torrent 1.78 percent
16S rRNA methods study (2014)	MiSeq vs. Ion Torrent PGM in a 20-organism mock-community workflow	Calculated error frequency, including library-preparation error	Illumina 0.9 errors per 100 bp; Ion Torrent 1.4 to 1.5 errors per 100 bp; not absolute platform error rates
Variant-caller study (2015)	Illumina vs. Ion Proton	Inter-caller overlap	Approximately 92 percent for Illumina and 15.5 percent for Ion Proton; not a truth-set accuracy metric
Cost-per-sample methods study (2020)	Illumina MiSeq vs. Ion Torrent S5/PGM	Cost per sample (16-plex)	Illumina $76.25 to $81.07; Ion Torrent $124.18 to $125.04

Table 2 illustrates why hedged, study-by-study interpretation matters more than any single headline number. The 2012 comparison reported raw error rates for legacy platforms, whereas the 2014 16S figures are workflow-specific calculated values that include library-preparation error. The listed cost comparison is also limited to its low-plex study design. No independent, peer-reviewed study identified during this research directly benchmarks current-generation Genexus or S5 Prime chemistry against NovaSeq X Series chemistry on identical samples, an evidence gap that laboratories evaluating a 2026 purchase should weigh alongside vendor-supplied specifications.

Data Analysis and Evidence

Market sizing estimates for NGS vary meaningfully by research firm and vintage, underscoring the value of citing an original source and its "as of" date rather than a single static figure. Grand View Research's July 2023 report valued the global NGS market at over $8 billion that year and projected growth to "$33.15 billion by 2030, registering a CAGR of 21.66%" (Source: prnewswire.com). By November 2025, the same firm revised its long-range outlook upward in absolute terms but lowered its projected growth rate, forecasting the market would reach "USD 42.25 billion by 2033, growing at a CAGR of 18.0% from 2025 to 2033" (Source: prnewswire.com). MarketsandMarkets sizes the same overall market differently, projecting growth "from USD 13.81 billion in 2026 to USD 27.14 billion by 2031, at a CAGR of 14.5%" (Source: marketsandmarkets.com), a lower base-year figure than Grand View Research's, likely reflecting differences in market scope and segmentation methodology between the two firms; this report presents both rather than reconciling them into a single number.

Grand View Research's 2023 market estimate reported that the "oncology segment held the largest revenue share of 27.70% in 2022" (Source: prnewswire.com). Separately, the firm forecasts the narrower clinical oncology NGS submarket will reach "USD 1,930.2 million by 2033" (Source: prnewswire.com). By technology segment, "targeted sequencing and resequencing segment held the largest revenue share of 48.46% in 2024" (Source: prnewswire.com), the panel-based approach used by both companies' clinical oncology assays. Regional estimates also diverge by source and vintage: Grand View Research found "North America dominated the market with a share of 49.25% in 2022" (Source: prnewswire.com), while MarketsandMarkets found "North America accounted for 42.5% of the global next-generation sequencing market in 2025" (Source: marketsandmarkets.com).

On company financials, Illumina reported fiscal year 2025 total revenue of $4.34 billion, "flat compared to 2024 on both a reported and constant currency basis" (Source: investor.illumina.com), with fourth-quarter revenue of $1.16 billion, "up 5% from Q4 2024" (Source: investor.illumina.com), and guidance for fiscal 2026 of "$4.5 billion to $4.6 billion, representing growth of 4% - 6%" (Source: investor.illumina.com). Thermo Fisher Scientific, a far larger and more diversified life sciences conglomerate, reported total company FY2025 revenue of $44.6 billion (Source: stocktitan.net); within its Life Sciences Solutions segment, described in its own filing as encompassing "biosciences, genetic sciences, and bioproduction" businesses (Source: stocktitan.net), the genetic sciences business that houses Ion Torrent grew to $2.870 billion in 2025 from $2.787 billion in 2024, a rise the filing attributes largely to acquisition activity, noting that "genetic sciences grew $82 million, driven by the 2024 acquisition of Olink" (Source: stocktitan.net).

Clinical utility data underscore oncology's importance as an NGS application. A peer-reviewed study of 1,113 cancer patients profiled by targeted NGS found that "the majority showed at least one detectable alteration (97.2%)" and that "most individuals had at least one potentially actionable alteration (94.7%)" (Source: pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov), a data point independent of platform choice that illustrates the clinical stakes driving demand for both companies' oncology sequencing products.

Table 3 below consolidates the market and financial figures discussed above.

METRIC	FIGURE	SOURCE (AS OF)
Global NGS market size	$13.3 billion (2026 estimate), projected $42.3 billion (2033)	Grand View Research, 2026 estimate
Illumina FY2025 revenue	$4.34 billion (flat vs. 2024)	Illumina investor relations, February 2026
Illumina FY2026 revenue guidance	$4.5 billion to $4.6 billion	Illumina investor relations, February 2026
Thermo Fisher FY2025 total revenue	$44.556 billion	Thermo Fisher Form 10-K, FY2025
Thermo Fisher genetic sciences business revenue	$2.870 billion (2025) vs. $2.787 billion (2024); not Ion Torrent-specific	Thermo Fisher Form 10-K, FY2025

Table 3 shows that Thermo Fisher's genetic sciences business, which includes Ion Torrent alongside other genomic instrument lines, sits within a larger diversified company. Illumina's portfolio includes sequencing and array-based technologies and also generates service-and-other revenue; its total company revenue should not be described as solely NGS-platform and consumables revenue. Thermo Fisher can draw on a broader life-sciences instrument and reagent portfolio, but neither company's reported revenue alone identifies spending attributable to a particular sequencing platform.

Case Studies and Real-World Examples

Academic Validation of Illumina's TruSight Tumor 170 Panel

A peer-reviewed clinical validation study run across two academic molecular pathology laboratories assessed Illumina's TruSight Tumor 170 (TST170) oncology panel for routine use. The study reported that "TATs for both Laboratory A and B for routine testing are less than 2 weeks," with an expedited option available for urgent cases, and found that the full "workflow from nucleic acid extraction to variant calling can be completed in around 4 days,"

of which library preparation alone consumed roughly 32 hours (Source: ncbi.nlm.nih.gov). The study illustrates the throughput profile typical of large, multi-gene Illumina oncology panels run in well-resourced academic settings.

Community-Hospital Evaluation of the Ion Torrent Genexus System

A peer-reviewed study conducted outside a major academic center evaluated Thermo Fisher's Genexus platform for comprehensive oncology biomarker testing using the Oncomine Precision Assay GX, which the authors describe as combining automated library preparation, sequencing, and bioinformatic analysis in a single integrated workflow. The study reported a "median turnaround time for biomarker results" of "3 business days" (Source: ncbi.nlm.nih.gov), far shorter than the multi-week turnaround typical of conventional workflows discussed earlier in this report, and a result the authors connect to clinical urgency in advanced non-small cell lung cancer, where the cited literature estimates untreated advanced disease carries a mortality risk of roughly 4 percent per week. The case illustrates a potential Genexus workflow fit for laboratories seeking integrated automation; Thermo Fisher positions the system as accessible without extensive sequencing or bioinformatics expertise.

MSK-IMPACT and the FDA De Novo Pathway for Tumor-Profiling Panels

Memorial Sloan Kettering Cancer Center's MSK-IMPACT, "a 468-gene oncopanel intended to detect gene mutations and other critical genetic aberrations" (Source: mskcc.org), became the first tumor-profiling multiplex panel FDA-authorized through "the de novo premarket review pathway, a regulatory pathway for novel, low- to moderate-risk devices" lacking a prior legally marketed equivalent (Source: mskcc.org). The 2017 authorization established a regulatory precedent that subsequent laboratory-developed oncopanels, regardless of underlying sequencing chemistry, have referenced in their own validation strategies. The FDA separately maintains a public registry cataloging authorized companion diagnostic devices across sequencing platforms (Source: fda.gov).

Implications and Future Directions

The evidence assembled in this report points to a platform choice that depends heavily on institutional context rather than a single "better" technology. Laboratories running large-scale genomic research, population sequencing, or comprehensive pan-cancer profiling that benefit from maximum per-run output and paired-end read architecture may favor Illumina's NovaSeq X or NextSeq families. Independent legacy-platform benchmarking has generally reported lower raw error rates for Illumina, but the 2015 variant-caller figures discussed above measure inter-caller overlap rather than truth-set concordance. For laboratories—including community hospitals and decentralized clinical sites—evaluating a focused oncology biomarker workflow, the Genexus system may merit consideration when rapid, low-touch turnaround is a priority. Thermo Fisher markets the system as delivering results in as little as 24 hours with 20 minutes of hands-on time, while the cited community-hospital study reported a median biomarker-result turnaround of three business days; these sources do not establish comparative suitability across all such sites.

Professional guidance reinforces that platform selection is only the starting point of clinical deployment, not the endpoint. The Association for Molecular Pathology, in a consensus statement developed with representation from the College of American Pathologists, "published 17 consensus recommendations to help clinical laboratory professionals achieve high-quality sequencing results" from NGS bioinformatics pipelines regardless of underlying instrument (Source: newswise.com), motivated in part because "the constant technology evolution and absence of professional guidelines" had produced variability across clinical NGS laboratories (Source: newswise.com). The College of American Pathologists has since built on that guidance with structured validation worksheets offering "step-by-step recommendations for designing, testing, validating, reporting, and continual quality management of clinical tests" (Source: cap.org), material that applies equally whether a laboratory selects Illumina or Ion Torrent chemistry.

Both companies continue investing toward their existing strengths: Illumina toward higher-density flow cells and improved SBS chemistry, and Thermo Fisher toward further workflow automation on the Genexus platform. Neither company's public specifications, as of August 2026, include a directly comparable head-to-head accuracy benchmark of their current flagship chemistries, so purchasing decisions this year still rest substantially on third-party literature that, in several cases, predates the newest instrument generations. In regulated settings, instrument selection should also account for the laboratory's validated data-handling, reporting, and quality-management processes.

Conclusion

Illumina and Thermo Fisher's Ion Torrent platforms represent two mature, commercially successful, and technically distinct approaches to next-generation sequencing, and the research assembled in this report does not support a categorical claim that one is simply superior to the other. Illumina's fluorescence-based sequencing by synthesis chemistry, as implemented across the NovaSeq X, NextSeq, and MiSeq i100 families, showed lower raw error rates in the available independent legacy-platform comparisons, alongside the higher per-run output that large-scale genomic research and comprehensive oncology panels may require. Thermo Fisher markets the Genexus System as an automated workflow with as little as 24 hours

from specimen to report and approximately 20 minutes of hands-on time. In the cited community-hospital study, however, median biomarker-result turnaround was three business days; these findings support consideration of its low-touch workflow but do not establish same-day performance or suitability for laboratories generally.

For clinical oncology testing, platform selection should follow the laboratory's authorized and validated assay menu, throughput, staffing, turnaround, and data-integration requirements. The evidence reviewed here does not establish a universally superior platform or broad comparative adoption of either platform across community and decentralized sites.

Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)

Which is more accurate, Illumina or Ion Torrent? The cited studies do not establish which current platform is more accurate. Legacy comparisons of earlier Illumina and Ion Torrent PGM/Proton instruments generally reported lower raw error rates for Illumina, particularly in homopolymer-containing regions. The 2014 16S comparison is narrower still: it assessed a particular mock-community amplicon workflow, and its calculated figures included library-preparation error rather than absolute platform error. Because the available head-to-head evidence does not directly compare current Genexus or S5 Prime systems with current Illumina systems, it should not be used to infer a current-generation accuracy gap as of 2026.

What is the cost per sample for Illumina versus Ion Torrent? As detailed in the Performance and Benchmarks section above, a 2020 peer-reviewed methods study found Illumina MiSeq per-sample costs of $76.25 to $81.07 at 16-sample multiplexing, versus $124.18 to $125.04 for comparable Ion Torrent S5 and PGM runs. Neither company publishes standardized, publicly posted cost-per-sample figures, so actual costs vary with reagent kit selection, multiplexing level, and negotiated institutional pricing.

Which NGS platform is best for clinical oncology testing? Both companies offer FDA-approved oncology diagnostic assays: Illumina's TruSight Oncology Comprehensive (517 genes, pan-cancer companion diagnostic claims) and Thermo Fisher's Oncomine Dx Target Test (approved for non-small cell lung cancer, cholangiocarcinoma, thyroid cancer, and glioma indications). The Oncomine Dx Target Test is validated for the Ion PGM Dx System, whereas the Genexus Dx System uses the distinct Oncomine Dx Express Test. Platform selection should reflect the laboratory's validated assay menu, throughput, staffing, and turnaround requirements. Thermo Fisher positions Genexus for automated, rapid workflows, and one community-hospital study reported a median biomarker-result turnaround of three business days; these sources do not establish broad adoption across community or decentralized sites.

What is the difference between sequencing by synthesis and ion semiconductor sequencing? Sequencing by synthesis, Illumina's chemistry, incorporates fluorescently labeled nucleotides and detects each base optically through fluorescence imaging. Ion semiconductor sequencing, Thermo Fisher's Ion Torrent chemistry, detects each base electrochemically by measuring the hydrogen ion released during nucleotide incorporation, requiring no fluorescent labels or camera-based optics.

How does the Genexus System compare to Illumina's NextSeq? See the Feature Comparison table for the representative workflow, output, and read-length specifications. Suitability depends on the laboratory's validated assay menu, throughput, staffing, and turnaround requirements.

What is each company's share of the NGS market? A precise, current, independently sourced numeric market-share split between Illumina and Thermo Fisher's Ion Torrent business could not be verified from an originating research firm during this research. Illumina's own corporate materials cite an installed base of approximately 21,000 systems worldwide, while Thermo Fisher does not publicly disclose Ion Torrent-specific installed-base figures separate from its broader genetic sciences segment.

Tags: illumina, ion torrent, thermo fisher, next generation sequencing, ngs platform comparison, sequencing by synthesis, ion semiconductor sequencing, clinical oncology testing, genexus system, novaseq x

IntuitionLabs - Industry Leadership & Services

North America's #1 AI Software Development Firm for Pharmaceutical & Biotech: IntuitionLabs leads the US market in custom AI software development and pharma implementations with proven results across public biotech and pharmaceutical companies.

Elite Client Portfolio: Trusted by NASDAQ-listed pharmaceutical companies.

Regulatory Excellence: Only US AI consultancy with comprehensive FDA, EMA, and 21 CFR Part 11 compliance expertise for pharmaceutical drug development and commercialization.

Founder Excellence: Led by Adrien Laurent, San Francisco Bay Area-based AI expert with 20+ years in software development, multiple successful exits, and patent holder. Recognized as one of the top AI experts in the USA.

Custom AI Software Development: Build tailored pharmaceutical AI applications, custom CRMs, chatbots, and ERP systems with advanced analytics and regulatory compliance capabilities.

Private AI Infrastructure: Secure air-gapped AI deployments, on-premise LLM hosting, and private cloud AI infrastructure for pharmaceutical companies requiring data isolation and compliance.

Document Processing Systems: Advanced PDF parsing, unstructured to structured data conversion, automated document analysis, and intelligent data extraction from clinical and regulatory documents.

Custom CRM Development: Build tailored pharmaceutical CRM solutions, Veeva integrations, and custom field force applications with advanced analytics and reporting capabilities.

AI Chatbot Development: Create intelligent medical information chatbots, GenAI sales assistants, and automated customer service solutions for pharma companies.

Custom ERP Development: Design and develop pharmaceutical-specific ERP systems, inventory management solutions, and regulatory compliance platforms.

Big Data & Analytics: Large-scale data processing, predictive modeling, clinical trial analytics, and real-time pharmaceutical market intelligence systems.

Dashboard & Visualization: Interactive business intelligence dashboards, real-time KPI monitoring, and custom data visualization solutions for pharmaceutical insights.

Leading Claude & ChatGPT AI Enablement and Training: Help biotech and pharmaceutical teams adopt Claude and ChatGPT through practical training, governed workflows, use-case development, and implementation designed for regulated environments.

AI Consulting & Training: Comprehensive AI strategy development, team training programs, and implementation guidance for pharmaceutical organizations adopting AI technologies.

Contact founder Adrien Laurent and team at intuitionlabs.ai/contact for a consultation.

DISCLAIMER

The information contained in this document is provided for educational and informational purposes only. We make no representations or warranties of any kind, express or implied, about the completeness, accuracy, reliability, suitability, or availability of the information contained herein.

Any reliance you place on such information is strictly at your own risk. In no event will IntuitionLabs.ai or its representatives be liable for any loss or damage including without limitation, indirect or consequential loss or damage, or any loss or damage whatsoever arising from the use of information presented in this document.

This document may contain content generated with the assistance of artificial intelligence technologies. AI-generated content may contain errors, omissions, or inaccuracies. Readers are advised to independently verify any critical information before acting upon it.

All product names, logos, brands, trademarks, and registered trademarks mentioned in this document are the property of their respective owners. All company, product, and service names used in this document are for identification purposes only. Use of these names, logos, trademarks, and brands does not imply endorsement by the respective trademark holders.

IntuitionLabs.ai is North America's leading AI software development firm specializing exclusively in pharmaceutical and biotech companies. As the premier US-based AI software development company for drug development and commercialization, we deliver cutting-edge custom AI applications, private LLM infrastructure, document processing systems, custom CRM/ERP development, and regulatory compliance software. Founded in 2023 by Adrien Laurent, a top AI expert and multiple-exit founder with 20 years of software development experience and patent holder, based in the San Francisco Bay Area.

This document does not constitute professional or legal advice. For specific guidance related to your business needs, please consult with appropriate qualified professionals.