

1 **Assessment and clinical utility of a non-Next-Generation Sequencing based Non-**  
2 **Invasive Prenatal Testing technology**

3

4 Running title: Assessment and clinical utility of a non-NGS based NIPT technology

5

6 U Gormus<sup>1</sup>, A Chaubey<sup>2,3</sup>, S Shenoy<sup>2</sup>, YW Wong<sup>4</sup>, LY Chan<sup>4</sup>, BP Choo<sup>4</sup>, L Orah<sup>1</sup>, A

7 Gousseva<sup>5</sup>, F Persson<sup>5</sup>, L Prensky<sup>6</sup>, E Chin<sup>2</sup> and M Hegde<sup>2</sup>

8 <sup>1</sup>PerkinElmer Genomics Sweden, Sollentuna, Sweden; <sup>2</sup>PerkinElmer Genomics, Pittsburgh,

9 USA; <sup>3</sup>Bionano Genomics, San Diego, USA; <sup>4</sup>DNA LAB, PerkinElmer Genomics Malaysia,

10 Selangor, Malaysia; <sup>5</sup>Vanadis Diagnostics, PerkinElmer Inc, Sollentuna, Sweden;

11 <sup>6</sup>PerkinElmer Inc, Waltham, USA Corresponding author.

12 [Lawrence.Prensky@Perkinelmer.com](mailto:Lawrence.Prensky@Perkinelmer.com)

13

14 **Abstract:**

15 **Background:** Rolling circle replication (RCR) is a novel technology that has not been  
16 applied to cell-free DNA (cfDNA) testing until recently. Given the cost and simplicity  
17 advantages of this technology compared to other platforms currently used in cfDNA analysis,  
18 an assessment of RCR in clinical laboratories was performed. Here, we present the first  
19 validation study from clinical laboratories utilizing RCR technology.

20

21 **Methods:** 831 samples from spontaneously pregnant women carrying a singleton fetus and  
22 25 synthetic samples were analyzed for the fetal risk of Trisomy 21, Trisomy 18 and Trisomy  
23 13 by three laboratories on three continents. All women who provided the samples were  
24 followed to birth, where evaluation for fetal aneuploidies was performed using newborn  
25 examinations and any suspected aneuploidies were confirmed with karyotyping.

26

27 **Results:** The study found rolling circle replication to be a highly viable technology for  
28 clinical assessment of fetal aneuploidies with 100% sensitivity for T21 (95% CI:82.35% -  
29 100.00%); 100.00% sensitivity for T18 (71.51% - 100.00%) and 100.00% sensitivity for T13  
30 analyses (66.37% - 100.00%). The specificities were >99% for each trisomies [99.7%  
31 (99.01% - 99.97%) for T21; 99.5% (98.62% - 99.85%) for T18; 99.7% (99.03% - 99.97%)  
32 for T13], along with a first pass no-call rate of 0.93%.

33

34 **Conclusions:** The study showed that using a rolling circle replication-based cfDNA system  
35 for the evaluation of the common aneuploidies would provide greater accuracy and clinical  
36 utility compared to conventional biochemical screening and comparable results to other  
37 reported cfDNA methodologies.

38 **Keywords:** cell free DNA; noninvasive prenatal screening; noninvasive prenatal testing;  
39 NIPT; NIPS; validation study; rolling circle replication; digital quantification; Prenatal  
40 screening; Aneuploidy

41

## 42 **INTRODUCTION**

43 Trisomies are important chromosomal aberrations often associated with varying degrees of  
44 intellectual disabilities, several health and developmental defects, and whose incidence is  
45 correlated with increasing maternal age[1]. Although the average maternal age has increased  
46 globally in the last 50 years, the incidence of trisomy has significantly decreased during that  
47 time frame due to the increased utilization of improved prenatal screening tests[2].  
48 Historically, these prenatal screening tests consisted of biochemical blood tests and/or  
49 ultrasound scans. These conventional screening tests are still used globally, but due to their  
50 higher false positive rates and lower detection rates, they have started to be replaced by  
51 newer, more accurate technologies using the placental cell-free DNA (cfDNA) circulating in  
52 the maternal blood. Cell-free nucleic acids, also known as extracellular nucleic acids, are  
53 fragments of DNA or RNA molecules that are released from cells into the body fluids.

54 Lo et al were the first to report that a portion of the cell-free DNA in maternal blood was  
55 from the fetus and placenta and to comment on how cell-free fetal DNA was suitable for  
56 prenatal examinations[3]. The introduction of cell-free DNA into prenatal clinical practice  
57 first started through the use of next-generation sequencing (NGS) technology for the  
58 assessment of Trisomy 21 (T21), Trisomy 18 (T18) and Trisomy 13 (T13), and was referred  
59 to as Non-Invasive Prenatal Testing (NIPT)[4,5]. Although NIPT has been shown to be  
60 highly accurate, the next generation sequencing techniques that were used has limited the  
61 global accessibility to this test due to its high cost and complexity. It has been noted that a  
62 considerable cost reduction is necessary to make this approach cost effective enough to be

63 commonly used[6]. Furthermore, the complexity of the NGS-based technologies adds  
64 additional hurdles to the ability of laboratories to implement this test. Vanadis<sup>®</sup> NIPT was  
65 developed without using NGS or polymerase chain reaction (PCR), to enable a cost effective  
66 and high performance cfDNA aneuploidy screening.

67 Vanadis<sup>®</sup> NIPT is a new technology targeting relevant chromosomes based on a digital  
68 molecular quantification in a 96-well microplate[7,8]. The method converts targeted  
69 chromosomal fragments into digitally quantifiable objects through rolling circle replication  
70 and chromosome-specific labeling. The normalized ratio between the number of chromosome  
71 specific objects are then used to calculate the z-score which is mapped to a post-test risk.

72 Here, we report on the clinical performance of the Vanadis<sup>®</sup> NIPT assay in PerkinElmer  
73 Genomics Laboratories.

74

## 75 **MATERIALS AND METHOD**

### 76 **Ethics Statement:**

77 Protocols used for sample collection were approved by the Research Ethics Board of CHU de  
78 Québec (#2016-2989 and #2020-4895). The study was performed in accordance with the  
79 ethical standards of the institutional and/or national research committees.

### 80 **Study Population and Clinical Evaluation:**

81 Validation protocols were written based upon templates relevant to the Vanadis system  
82 (Supplemental A and B). Based on this, a total aggregated set of 831 samples from  
83 spontaneously pregnant women carrying a singleton fetus were analyzed. The inclusion  
84 criteria for participation in this study were pregnant women between the ages of 18 and 50

85 and between 10 and 40 gestational weeks. The women were not selected based on prior risk  
86 and all consented to participate in the study. All subjects were followed to birth, where  
87 evaluation for fetal aneuploidies was performed using newborn examinations and any  
88 suspected aneuploidies were confirmed with karyotyping. 10 milliliters (mL) of blood were  
89 collected from each woman between February 2019 and July 2019 at maternity clinics in  
90 Kuala Lumpur and Quebec. Blood samples were processed as described below, and at least 3  
91 mL of plasma was extracted and sent to PerkinElmer Genomics (PKIG) labs located in  
92 Sollentuna, Sweden; Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia; and Pittsburgh, USA.

93 Ten samples from confirmed T21 positive pregnancies and three samples from confirmed  
94 T18 positive pregnancies and one sample from a confirmed T13 pregnancy were used. Other  
95 trisomy positive control samples (nine of T21, eight of T18 and eight of T13) were purchased  
96 from SeraCare Life Sciences, Inc. (USA) (SeraSeq Trisomy 21 aneuploidy reference material-  
97 0720-0019, Trisomy 13 aneuploidy reference material- 0720-0017, Trisomy 18 aneuploidy  
98 reference material- 0720-0018).

99

#### 100 **Sample collection and preparation:**

101 Blood samples were collected into Cell-Free™ DNA BCT tubes (Streck, Omaha, USA)  
102 from each pregnant woman. After arrival in the lab by courier, study samples were barcoded  
103 with unique subject codes and patient identification numbers and anonymized.

104 Samples were processed in the PKIG lab in Kuala Lumpur and the CHU de Québec-  
105 Université Laval lab in Quebec by using a double centrifugation protocol[8]. All plasma was  
106 separated within 5 days of blood draw and stored in new plasma storage tubes. The plasma  
107 tubes were barcoded with unique subject codes and patient identification numbers were  
108 anonymized. The plasma tubes were stored at  $-80^{\circ}\text{C}$  until processing at a PKIG Laboratory.

109

110 **Test method:**

111 Samples were analyzed using the Vanadis<sup>®</sup> system following existing manuals and  
112 instructions for use. The Vanadis<sup>®</sup> NIPT assay uses a series of enzymatic steps to generate  
113 labelled rolling circle replication products (RCPs) from chromosomal cfDNA targets, as  
114 previously described[7]. Automated extraction of cfDNA from plasma was performed using  
115 the Vanadis Extract<sup>®</sup> platform, followed by continued processing on the Vanadis Core<sup>®</sup>  
116 platform to generate labelled RCPs, which were then imaged and counted using the Vanadis  
117 View<sup>®</sup> instrument. The performance metrics to be evaluated were based on the Z-score  
118 results were calculated with Lifecycle<sup>™</sup> software version 7.2 and exported to an Excel file.

119

120 **Data Analysis and Sample Classification:**

121 Automated data analysis and quality assessment were performed, and chromosomal ratio  
122 calculations were calculated for all approved samples. The results were classified into low or  
123 high risk with a Z-score approach based on each normalized chromosomal ratio and the  
124 sample-specific standard deviation. The Z-score cut-off values were 3.5 for chromosome 21  
125 and 3.15 for chromosomes 18 and 13. The samples that failed the quality assessment were  
126 rejected and classified as ‘no call’. The fetal sex was classified from the number of detected  
127 RCPs from chromosome Y relative to the number of RCPs from the measured autosomal  
128 chromosomes using an adaptive binary classifier[7,8]. Measured fetal fraction, which is  
129 often thought to be a useful quality control metric, was not gathered as recent studies have  
130 shown that it can be significantly incorrect[9].

131

132 **RESULTS**

133 A total of 856 samples (Figure 1) were included in the study, 831 of them were taken from  
134 singleton pregnancies with spontaneous fertilization and 25 were reference material provided  
135 by SeraCare Life Sciences, Inc. (USA). There were eight first pass no call results that were  
136 excluded from calculations (first pass no call rate: 0.93%). The average median maternal age  
137 in the study group was 32 (min:20 years, max: 46 years). The median gestational age was 12  
138 weeks 5 days (min:10 weeks, max: 34 weeks).

139 The results from the test (Table 1) showed 100% sensitivity for T21 [95% Confidence  
140 Interval (CI):82.35% - 100.00%]; 100.00% sensitivity for T18 (95% CI:71.51% - 100.00%)  
141 and 100.00% sensitivity for T13 analyses (95% CI:66.37% - 100.00%). The specificities  
142 were >99% for each trisomies [99.7% (95% CI: 99.01% - 99.97%) for T21; 99.5% (95%  
143 CI:98.62% - 99.85%) for T18; 99.7% (95% CI:99.03% - 99.97%) for T13].

144 No false negative results were detected (FNR: 0%) with low levels of false positive rates  
145 (FPR: 0.24% for T21, 0.47% for T18 and 0.24% for T13).

146 For fetal gender assessment, accuracy was 98.80% (Table 2). Of note, a recent blinded study  
147 at an independent site using improved Y chromosome detection modifications in reagents and  
148 analysis software showed 100% concordance for fetal sex determination between Vanadis  
149 and NGS methods (n= 251 samples; unpublished observations).

150

## 151 **DISCUSSION**

152 Vanadis<sup>®</sup> NIPT is an efficient and cost-effective option for prenatal screening. The test can  
153 be offered to pregnant women starting from the 10th week of gestation and can be integrated  
154 as a first tier choice as prenatal screening analysis as it is more cost-effective than the NGS-

155 based NIPT[10] and has a higher sensitivity and specificity compared to the conventional  
156 biochemical screening[11].

157 This study shows high sensitivity and specificity of Vanadis NIPT analysis. In this sample  
158 set, all aneuploidy cases were detected accurately, thus resulting in a sensitivity of 100% for  
159 trisomy 21, trisomy 18, and trisomy 13 and a  $\geq 99.5\%$  specificity. Specificity would likely be  
160 even higher if a second tube of blood was available for the samples with borderline Z-scores.  
161 Furthermore, if a second sample was available for these patients, then the low first pass no  
162 call rate of 0.93% would likely be reduced to a final no call rate of around 0.1%, based upon  
163 a previous study showing a 87.5% reduction of no calls when a second sample is run on the  
164 Vanadis<sup>®</sup> system[12].

165 Studies have shown that the sensitivity and specificity of NIPT are better than the  
166 conventional screening methods [13-21] which has lead professional societies (such as the  
167 American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists and the Society for Maternal-Fetal  
168 Medicine) to state “Cell-free DNA is the most sensitive and specific screening test for the  
169 common fetal aneuploidies”[11]. NIPT technologies that involve next generation sequencing  
170 have shown that 98 - 100% of common aneuploidies can be detected at a combined false  
171 positive rate of 0.44 - 0.91% [22]), while conventional biochemical screening can range from  
172 50 - 95%, with a false positive rate of 5%, depending upon which screening strategy was  
173 used[23]. By providing higher detection rates and lower false positive and negative rates  
174 compared to conventional screening, NIPT technologies are more clinically effective and lead  
175 to fewer invasive procedures[24].

176 As this study shows, the Vanadis<sup>®</sup> system provided results comparable to those of the more  
177 common NIPT technologies (Table 3). Both groups show similar sensitivities and  
178 specificities, which are greater than those for the conventional biochemical screening, thus

179 emphasizing their clinical utility. Although similar in performance, there is a difference  
180 when it comes to the technological complexity and cost-effectiveness. By removing the need  
181 for PCR and NGS, the installation, hands-on time, bioinformatics and run costs are  
182 automatically significantly lower with the Vanadis system. As has been reported, there is  
183 additionally a cost-savings for medical systems using this technology over sequencing from a  
184 follow-up point of view due to the lower no call rate[10].

185 Irrespective of the technology or methodology, there are some limitations to NIPT analysis  
186 which help to explain discrepancies between the test results and the fetal status. For example,  
187 since the cell-free fetal DNA is mainly produced by the placenta rather than fetus, false  
188 positive results can arise due to placental mosaicism[25-27] or the presence of a vanishing  
189 twin[28,29]. Additionally, false positive results or no call results may appear as a result of  
190 maternal cancer[30] or maternal chromosome anomalies[31]. Other limitations of the assay  
191 could arise from complex chromosomal abnormalities[26,32,33].

192 This study illustrates the high accuracy and clinical utility of Vanadis<sup>®</sup> NIPT compared to  
193 traditional prenatal screening methods for common aneuploidy. As an equally accurate and  
194 reliable NIPT test, Vanadis<sup>®</sup> NIPT can help eliminate the barrier to widespread usage of  
195 prenatal cfDNA for the global pregnancy population by being a technology that is  
196 significantly less complex to run and more cost effective.

197

## 198 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

199 The authors would like to thank Professor Emmanuel Bujold and members of the Perinatal  
200 Biobank of the CHU de Québec-Université Laval for their assistance in collecting and  
201 preparing samples.

202

203 **CONFLICT OF INTEREST**

204 All authors are current or former employees of PerkinElmer Inc.

205

206 **REFERENCES**

- 207 1. Carothers AD, Hecht CA, et al. International variation in reported livebirth  
208 prevalence rates of Down syndrome, adjusted for maternal age. *J. Med. Genet.*  
209 1999;36: 386–393.
- 210 2. Huete-García A, Otaola-Barranquero M, Demographic Assessment of Down  
211 Syndrome: A Systematic Review. *Int J Environ Res Public Health.* 2021 Jan 5;18(1):  
212 352. doi: 10.3390/ijerph18010352.
- 213 3. Lo YM, Corbetta N, et al. Presence of fetal DNA in maternal plasma and serum.  
214 *Lancet.* 1997;350(9076): 485–7.
- 215 4. Dondorp W, de Wert G, et al. Non-invasive prenatal testing for aneuploidy and  
216 beyond: challenges of responsible innovation in prenatal screening. *Eur J Hum Genet.*  
217 2015 Nov;23(11): 1592. doi: 10.1038/ejhg.2015.109. Erratum for: *Eur J Hum Genet.*  
218 2015 Nov;23(11): 1438-50.
- 219 5. Gil MM, Accurti V, et al. Analysis of cell-free DNA in maternal blood in screening  
220 for aneuploidies: updated meta-analysis. *Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol.* 2017  
221 Sep;50(3):302-314. doi: 10.1002/uog.17484. Update in: *Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol.*  
222 2019 Jun;53(6): 734-742.
- 223 6. Ayres AC, Whitty JA, et al. A cost-effectiveness analysis comparing different  
224 strategies to implement noninvasive prenatal testing into a Down syndrome screening  
225 program. *Aust N Z J Obstet Gynaecol.* 2014 Oct;54(5): 412-7. doi:  
226 10.1111/ajo.12223.
- 227 7. Dahl F, Ericsson O, et al. Imaging single DNA molecules for high precision NIPT.  
228 *Sci Rep.* 2018 Mar 14;8(1): 4549. doi: 10.1038/s41598-018-22606-0.

- 229 8. Ericsson O, Ahola T, et al. Clinical validation of a novel automated cell-free DNA  
230 screening assay for trisomies 21, 13, and 18 in maternal plasma. *Prenat Diagn*. 2019  
231 Oct;39(11): 1011-1015. doi: 10.1002/pd.5528.
- 232 9. Persson F, Prensky L. Variability of “Reported Fetal Fraction” in Noninvasive  
233 Prenatal Screening (NIPS). *Clinical Chemistry*. 2021 June;67(6): 863–866. doi:  
234 10.1093/clinchem/hvab014
- 235 10. Huang T, Gibbons C, et al. Prenatal screening for trisomy 21: a comparative  
236 performance and cost analysis of different screening strategies. *BMC Pregnancy*  
237 *Childbirth*. 2020;20: 713.
- 238 11. American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists’ Committee on Practice  
239 Bulletins—Obstetrics; Committee on Genetics; Society for Maternal-Fetal Medicine.  
240 Screening for Fetal Chromosomal Abnormalities: ACOG Practice Bulletin, Number  
241 226. *Obstet Gynecol*. 2020 Oct;136(4): e48-e69
- 242 12. Karlsson F, Ahola T, et al. Evaluation of repeat testing of a non-sequencing based  
243 NIPT test on a Finnish general-risk population. *Acta Obstet Gynecol Scand*. 2021 Feb  
244 11. doi: 10.1111/aogs.14125.
- 245 13. Chiu RW, Akolekar R, et al. Noninvasive prenatal assessment of trisomy 21 by  
246 multiplexed maternal plasma DNA sequencing: large scale validity  
247 study. *BMJ* 2011;342: c7401.
- 248 14. Ehrich M, Deciu C, et al. Noninvasive detection of fetal trisomy 21 by sequencing of  
249 DNA in maternal blood: a study in a clinical setting. *Am J Obstet*  
250 *Gynecol* 2011;204: 205 e1– 11.
- 251 15. Palomaki GE, Kloza EM, et al. DNA sequencing of maternal plasma to detect Down  
252 syndrome: an international clinical validation study. *Genet Med* 2011;13: 913– 20.

- 253 16. Sehnert AJ, Rhees B, et al. Optimal detection of fetal chromosomal abnormalities by  
254 massively parallel DNA sequencing of cell-free fetal DNA from maternal  
255 blood. *Clin Chem* 2011;57: 1042–9.
- 256 17. Sparks AB, Struble CA, et al. Non-invasive prenatal detection and selective analysis  
257 of cell-free DNA obtained from maternal blood: evaluation for trisomy 21 and  
258 trisomy 18. *Am J Obstet Gynecol* 2012;206: 319.e1–9.
- 259 18. Ashoor G, Syngelaki A, et al. Chromosome-selective sequencing of maternal plasma  
260 cell-free DNA for first-trimester detection of trisomy 21 and trisomy 18. *Am J*  
261 *Obstet Gynecol* 2012;206: 322.e1–5.
- 262 19. Norton ME, Brar H, et al. Non-Invasive Chromosomal Evaluation (NICE) Study:  
263 results of a multicenter prospective cohort study for detection of fetal trisomy 21 and  
264 trisomy 18. *Am J Obstet Gynecol* 2012;207: 137.e1–8.
- 265 20. Bianchi DW, Platt LD, et al. Genome-wide fetal aneuploidy detection by maternal  
266 plasma DNA sequencing. *Obstet Gynecol* 2012;119: 890–901.
- 267 21. Nicolaides KH, Syngelaki A, et al. Noninvasive prenatal testing for fetal trisomies in  
268 a routinely screened first-trimester population. *Am J Obstet Gynecol* 2012;207:  
269 374.e1–6.
- 270 22. Rousseau F, Langlois S, et al. Prospective head-to-head comparison of accuracy of  
271 two sequencing platforms for screening for fetal aneuploidy by cell-free DNA: the  
272 PEGASUS study. *Eur J Hum Genet.* 2019;27: 1701–1715.
- 273 23. Gregg AR, Skotko BG, et al. Noninvasive prenatal screening for fetal aneuploidy,  
274 2016 update: a position statement of the American College of Medical Genetics and  
275 Genomics. *Genet Med.* 2016 Oct;18(10): 1056-65.

- 276 24. Chetty S, Garabedian MJ, et al. Uptake of noninvasive prenatal testing (NIPT) in  
277 women following positive aneuploidy screening. *Prenat Diagn.* 2013 Jun;33(6): 542-  
278 6.
- 279 25. Srebniak MI, Diderich KE, et al. Abnormal non-invasive prenatal test results  
280 concordant with karyotype of cytotrophoblast but not reflecting abnormal fetal  
281 karyotype. *Ultrasound Obstet. Gynecol.* 2014;44: 109–111.
- 282 26. Grati FR, Malvestiti F, et al. Fetoplacental mosaicism: Potential implications for  
283 false-positive and false-negative noninvasive prenatal screening results. *Genet. Med.*  
284 2014;16: 620–624.
- 285 27. Hall AL, Drendel HM, et al. Positive cell-free fetal DNA testing for trisomy 13  
286 reveals confined placental mosaicism. *Genet. Med.* 2013;15: 729–732.
- 287 28. Grömminger S, Yagmur E, et al. Fetal Aneuploidy Detection by Cell-Free DNA  
288 Sequencing for Multiple Pregnancies and Quality Issues with Vanishing Twins. *J.*  
289 *Clin. Med.* 2014;3: 679–692.
- 290 29. Curnow KJ, Wilkins-Haug L, et al. Detection of triploid, molar, and vanishing twin  
291 pregnancies by a single-nucleotide polymorphism-based noninvasive prenatal test.  
292 *Am. J. Obstet Gynecol.* 2015;212: 79.e1-9.
- 293 30. Osborne CM, Hardisty E, et al. Discordant noninvasive prenatal testing results in a  
294 patient subsequently diagnosed with metastatic disease. *Prenat Diagn.* 2013 Jun;33(6):  
295 609-11. doi: 10.1002/pd.4100.
- 296 31. Yao H, Zhang L, et al. Noninvasive prenatal genetic testing for fetal aneuploidy  
297 detects maternal trisomy X. *Prenat. Diagn.* 2012; 32: 1114–1116.
- 298 32. Hartwig TS, Ambye L, et al. Discordant non-invasive prenatal testing (NIPT)—A  
299 systematic review. *Prenat. Diagn.* 2017;37: 527–539.

- 300 33. Wang J, Wang ZW, et al. Lower detectability of non-invasive prenatal testing  
301 compared to prenatal diagnosis in high-risk pregnant women. *Ann Transl Med.*  
302 2019;7(14): 319.
- 303 34. VeriSeq NIPT Solution Package Insert (1000000001856 v07) (illumina.com) [Cited  
304 05/20/21] Available from: [https://support.illumina.com/content/dam/illumina-](https://support.illumina.com/content/dam/illumina-support/documents/documentation/chemistry_documentation/dx/veriseq-nipt-solution/veriseq-nipt-sample-prep-package-insert-ceivd-1000000001856-07.pdf)  
305 [support/documents/documentation/chemistry\\_documentation/dx/veriseq-nipt-](https://support.illumina.com/content/dam/illumina-support/documents/documentation/chemistry_documentation/dx/veriseq-nipt-solution/veriseq-nipt-sample-prep-package-insert-ceivd-1000000001856-07.pdf)  
306 [solution/veriseq-nipt-sample-prep-package-insert-ceivd-1000000001856-07.pdf](https://support.illumina.com/content/dam/illumina-support/documents/documentation/chemistry_documentation/dx/veriseq-nipt-solution/veriseq-nipt-sample-prep-package-insert-ceivd-1000000001856-07.pdf)
- 307 35. Hancock S, Ben-Shachar R, et al. Clinical experience across the fetal-fraction  
308 spectrum of a non-invasive prenatal screening approach with low test-failure rate.  
309 *Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol* 2020;56: 422-430
- 310 36. Palomak, G., Deciu C., et al. DNA sequencing of maternal plasma reliably identifies  
311 trisomy 18 and trisomy 13 as well as Down syndrome: an international collaborative  
312 study. *Genet Med* 2012;14: 296–305
- 313

314 **Table one:** Test performance Vanadis<sup>®</sup> NIPT – Aneuploidy (Sweden+Malaysia+USA)

	<b>Trisomy 21</b>	<b>Trisomy 18</b>	<b>Trisomy 13</b>
<b>Total subjects</b>	408+214+234=856	408+214+234=856	408+214+234=856
<b>No calls:</b>	8 (no call rate: 0.93%, with unrepeated samples)		
<b>Without no calls:</b>	848	848	848
<b>True positives †</b>	7(5)+4(0)+8(4)=19	7(6)+2(0)+2(2)=11	6(6)+1(0)+2(2)=9
<b>False positives</b>	2+0+0=2	4+0+0=4	1+0+1=2
<b>True negatives</b>	827	833	837
<b>False negatives</b>	0	0	0
<b>Sensitivity (95% CI)</b>	100.00% (82.35% to 100.00%)	100.00% (71.51% to 100.00%)	100.00% (66.37% to 100.00%)
<b>Specificity (95% CI)</b>	99.76% (99.13% to 99.97%)	99.52% (98.78% to 99.87%)	99.76% (99.14% to 99.97%)

315 †25 out of 39 are SeraCare samples; SeraCare samples are within parentheses

316

317 **Table two:** Test performance Vanadis<sup>®</sup> NIPT – Sex classification

<b>Sweden</b>			<b>Malaysia</b>			<b>USA</b>		
391			214			234		
	<b>Females</b>	<b>Males</b>		<b>Females</b>	<b>Males</b>		<b>Females</b>	<b>Males</b>
Total subjects	166	225	Total subjects	94	120	Total subjects	101	133
No calls	6		No calls	2		No calls	0	
Total subjects (w/o no calls)	164	221	Total subjects (w/o no calls)	92	120	Total subjects (w/o no calls)	101	133
Correct classification	162	220	Correct classification	92	120	Correct classification	98	129
Incorrect classification	2	1	Incorrect classification	0	0	Incorrect classification	3	4
	<b>Females</b>	<b>Males</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>Performance Criteria</b>	<b>Females</b>	<b>Males</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>	
Total subjects	361	478	839	<b>Accuracy</b>	98.79%	98.79%	98.79%	
No calls excluded:	357	474	831					
Correct classification	352	469	821					
Incorrect classification	5	5	10					

318

319 **Table three:** Comparison of Next-Generation Sequencing NIPT vs Vanadis<sup>®</sup> NIPT

	<b>NGS NIPT</b> <sup>5,15,22,34-36</sup>	<b>Vanadis</b> <sup>8,*</sup>
<b>No call results</b>	0.7 - 6.6%	0.1-0.9%
<b>Sensitivity (21)</b>	98.6 – >99.9%	>99.9%
<b>Sensitivity (18)</b>	90 - >99.9%	89 - >99.9%
<b>Sensitivity (13)</b>	91.7 - >99.9%	>99.9%
<b>Specificity (21)</b>	99.5 - 99.9%	99.8 - >99.9%
<b>Specificity (18)</b>	99.7 - >99.9%	99.5%
<b>Specificity (13)</b>	99.0 - 99.8%	99.8 - >99.9%

320 \*Including this study

321

322 **Characteristics of Study Subjects:**

<b>Characteristic</b>	<b>Values</b>
Euploid subjects	817
T21 samples	19 (10 pregnant samples, 9 reference materials)
T18 samples	11 (3 pregnant sample, 8 reference materials)
T13 samples	9 (1 pregnant sample, 8 reference materials)
Maternal age, median (min-max)	32 (20years-46years)
Gestational age, median (min-max)	12weeks 5days (10weeks-34weeks)
First pass no calls	8

323 **Figure 1**

324

325