

1 **Clinical evaluation of the molecular-based BD SARS-CoV-2/Flu for the BD MAX™ System**

2

3 Sonia Paradis, MS,^a Elizabeth Lockamy, PhD,^a Charles K. Cooper, MD,^a Stephen Young, PhD^b

4

5 ^aBecton, Dickinson and Company, BD Life Sciences – Integrated Diagnostic Solutions, 7

6 Loveton Circle, Sparks, MD, USA

7 ^bTricore Reference Laboratory, 1001 Woodward Place, N.E., Albuquerque, NM, USA

8

9 **#To whom correspondence should be addressed:**

10 Stephen Young, PhD

11 Title: Medical Director of Research and Clinical Trials

12 Address: 1001 Woodward Place, N.E. Albuquerque, NM 87102

13 Telephone: 505-938-8855

14 Email: Steve.Young@Tricore.org

15

16 **##To whom correspondence should be addressed (alternate):**

17 Charles K. Cooper, MD

18 Vice President of Medical Affairs

19 Becton, Dickinson and Company, BD Life Sciences – Integrated Diagnostic Solutions

20 7 Loveton Circle, Sparks MD 21152, USA

21 Phone: 410-316-4984

22 E-mail: Charles_K_Cooper@bd.com

23

24 **RUNNING TITLE: SARS-CoV-2, Flu multiplex molecular assay**

25 **ABSTRACT**

26 Efficient and accurate assays for the differential diagnosis of COVID-19 and/or influenza (flu)
27 could facilitate optimal treatment for both diseases. Diagnostic performance related to SARS-
28 CoV-2 and Flu A/B detection was characterized for the BD SARS-CoV-2/Flu for BD MAX™
29 System (“MAX SARS-CoV-2/Flu”) multiplex assay in comparison with BD BioGx SARS-CoV-
30 2 Reagents for BD MAX™ System (“BioGx SARS-CoV-2”) and the Cepheid Xpert® Xpress
31 Flu/RSV (“Xpert Flu”). Two hundred and thirty-five nasopharyngeal specimens were obtained
32 from external vendors. MAX SARS-CoV-2/Flu had positive percent agreement (PPA) and
33 negative percent agreement (NPA) values for SARS-CoV-2 and Flu A/B that met FDA-EUA
34 acceptance criteria of >95%.

35

36 **KEY WORDS**

37 BD MAX; COVID-19; SARS-CoV-2; Influenza; multiplex RT-PCR assay

38 INTRODUCTION

39 Since the report of the first cluster of COVID-19 cases in December 2019, over 100 million
40 COVID-19 cases and 2 million COVID-19-related deaths worldwide have been reported by the
41 end of January, 2021, and the numbers continue to rise.[1] In the US, more than 23 million
42 COVID-19 cases and over 450,000 COVID-19 deaths have been recorded through mid-February
43 2021.[2] Although it is not clear how the 2020-2021 influenza season will impact the health care
44 systems, the 2019-2020 flu season resulted in over 38 million cases involving symptomatic
45 illness and approximately 22,000 deaths in the US.[3] Each year, across the globe, there are an
46 estimated 1 billion cases of influenza, of which, 3-5 million are severe cases and 29,000-655,000
47 lead to influenza-related respiratory deaths.[4] Although current (as of January 2021) [5]
48 influenza activity is low, this virus has the potential of increasing the workload of healthcare
49 workers already overwhelmed by COVID-19.

50
51 Although COVID-19 and influenza spread through a similar mechanism of transmission and
52 have overlapping symptoms, the isolation length and the therapeutic approach for COVID-19
53 patients and influenza patients are not uniform.[6] The recommended isolation period after
54 symptoms onset is a minimum of 4-5 days [7] for flu, whereas it is a minimum of 10 days for
55 COVID-19,[8] impacting absenteeism and contact tracing. The impact of anti-viral drug therapy,
56 which has traditionally been used for influenza patients, is not well-understood for patients with
57 COVID-19; therefore, safety concerns may preclude any potential efficacy. A similar concern
58 exists for drugs such as remdesivir and corticosteroids, which have been used to treat COVID-19
59 patients, but are not approved for use in influenza patients, and may (for example, in the case of
60 corticosteroids) have negative side effects in influenza patients.[6] Because the coincidence of

61 high numbers of both COVID-19 and influenza cases in 2020-2021 and in future respiratory
62 virus seasons could produce a significant strain on the healthcare system,[6] differential
63 diagnosis of COVID-19 and influenza, will be an important component for proper patient triage,
64 management, and treatment.

65
66 Molecular diagnostics for the detection of SARS-CoV-2, including real-time polymerase chain
67 reaction (RT-PCR) assays, have played an important role in the detection of SARS-CoV-2 and
68 diagnosis of COVID-19 due to their high sensitivity.[9] Similarly, RT-PCR-based detection of
69 Influenza A/B (“Flu A/B”) virus nucleic acid has been established for a number of years and is
70 commonly employed to establish an influenza diagnosis.[10] Due to the expected co-occurrence
71 and potential co-infection of SARS-CoV-2 and Flu A/B, a multiplex RT-PCR assay, for
72 detection all three targets, could help provide faster results and improve patient management and
73 treatment.[11] This report describes the performance of the new BD SARS-CoV-2/Flu assay
74 reagents for BD MAX™ System multiplex assay for detection of SARS-CoV-2 and Flu A/B.
75 The comparator reference methods were the BD BioGx SARS-CoV-2 Reagents for BD
76 MAX™ System and Cepheid Xpert® Xpress Flu/RSV. The objective here was to determine the
77 performance characteristics of the new multiplex BD SARS-CoV-2/Flu assay.

78 **METHODS AND MATERIALS**

79 *Specimens and assays*

80 This study, which was conducted as part of a Food and Drug Administration-Emergency Use
81 Authorization (EUA) submission, included data comparing the BD SARS-CoV-2/Flu for BD
82 MAX™ System (“MAX SARS-CoV-2/Flu;” Becton, Dickinson and Company; BD Life
83 Sciences—Integrated Diagnostics Solutions, Sparks, MD, USA) with reference methods, BD
84 BioGx SARS-CoV-2 Reagents for BD MAX™ System (“BioGx SARS-CoV-2;” Becton,
85 Dickinson and Company; BD Life Sciences—Integrated Diagnostics Solutions, Sparks, MD,
86 USA) and Cepheid Xpert® Xpress Flu/RSV (“Xpert Flu;” Cepheid®, Sunnyvale, CA, USA), for
87 detection of SARS-CoV-2 and Flu A/B, respectively. The BioFire® Respiratory 2.1 Panel
88 (“BioFire SARS-CoV-2;” BioFire Diagnostics, Salt Lake City, UT, USA) was used to test
89 specimens for which MAX SARS-CoV-2/Flu and BioGx SARS-CoV-2 provided discrepant
90 results; the cobas® Influenza A/B & RSV assay for use on the cobas® Liat® System (“Liat Flu;”
91 Roche Diagnostics, Indianapolis, IN, USA) was used to test specimens for which MAX SARS-
92 CoV-2/Flu and Xpert Flu provided discrepant results. All assays were performed according to
93 each manufacturer’s instructions for use. MAX SARS-CoV-2/Flu, BioGx SARS-CoV-2, and
94 BioFire SARS-CoV-2 assays were performed at BD Integrated Diagnostics Solutions; Xpert Flu
95 and Liat Flu assays were performed at TriCore Reference Laboratories.

96

97 Nasopharyngeal specimens for SARS-CoV-2 testing were obtained from New York Biologics,
98 Inc. (Southampton, NY, USA) and Trans-Hit Bio (Laval, QC, Canada), and nasopharyngeal
99 specimens for Flu A/B testing were obtained from New York Biologics, Inc (Table S1). Two
100 hundred and thirty-five (235) nasopharyngeal specimens either in Copan Universal Transport

101 Medium (UTM[®]) or in BD Universal Viral Transport (UVT) system (maintained at -65° C ~ -
102 80°C), which were collected between November 30, 2019 to September 3, 2020, were obtained
103 from individuals with ages ranging from ≤5 years of age to ≥60 years of age (Table 1).

104

105 The specimens were collected as part of standard of care (SOC) and the frozen de-identified
106 remnants were used for this research. This article was prepared according to STARD guidelines
107 for diagnostic accuracy studies reporting.

108

109 *Data analysis*

110 The primary outcome measures for this study were positive and negative percent agreement
111 (PPA and NPA, respectively) point estimates (with 95% confidence interval [95% CI] calculated
112 using the Wilson score method) for the MAX SARS-CoV-2/Flu assay, compared to each
113 respective reference assay. The McNemar test was used for 2x2 classification to test the
114 difference between paired proportions. The calculated difference is that of marginal proportions
115 ([total proportion of SARS-CoV-2, Flu A, or Flu B positives] – [total proportion of positives (for
116 each of the three causes) by clinical diagnosis]). A p-value <0.05 was utilized to distinguish
117 significant differences (note here that a p-value >0.05 indicates only that disagreement between
118 the two diagnostics methods is random). The Cohen's kappa coefficient was utilized to gauge the
119 agreement between two raters (reference and test) to classify results into mutually exclusive
120 categories. $K = (P_o - P_e) / (1 - P_e)$ (<0, 0, and >0 indicating agreements worse than, no better or worse
121 than, and better than that expected by chance). Acceptance criteria for the MAX SARS-CoV-
122 2/Flu assay for US FDA-EUA authorization for SARS-CoV-2 was ≥95% for both PPA and
123 NPA. The PPA criteria for Flu A/B was ≥90% (lower bound of the 95%CI ≥80%) and the NPA

124 criteria for Flu A/B was $\geq 95\%$ (lower bound of the 95%CI $\geq 90\%$). Only compliant and
125 reportable results for both MAX SARS-CoV-2/Flu and comparator assays were included in this
126 analysis.

127 **RESULTS**

128 Two hundred and thirty-five (235) specimens were included in this study, from which, three
129 were excluded due to unreportable results from the instrumental failure. From the remaining 232
130 specimens, reference method testing for SARS-CoV-2 (BioGx SARS-CoV-2) and Flu A/B
131 (Xpert Flu), resulted in 52 positive SARS-Cov-2 specimens, 59 positive Flu A specimens, and 60
132 positive Flu B specimens (Table 1). By reference method, 30, 91, and 90 specimens were
133 negative, respectively, for SARS-CoV-2, Flu A, and Flu B. MAX SARS-CoV-2/Flu results were
134 compared to results from each respective reference method to determine PPA and NPA values.
135 MAX SARS-CoV-2/Flu had PPA and NPA values of 96.2% [95%CI: 87.0, 98.9] and 100%
136 [95%CI: 88.7, 100], respectively, for detection of SARS-CoV-2. For Flu A, MAX SARS-CoV-
137 2/Flu had PPA and NPA values of 100% [95%CI: 93.9, 100] and 98.9% [95%CI: 94.0, 99.8],
138 respectively; for Flu B, MAX SARS-CoV-2/Flu had PPA and NPA values of 98.3%
139 [95%CI:91.1, 99.7] and 100% [95%CI: 95.9, 100], respectively (Table 2).

140 **DISCUSSION**

141 The results here show PPA for the MAX SARS-CoV-2/Flu assay with reference assays meet
142 FDA-EUA acceptance criteria for detection of SARS-CoV-2 (96.2%), Flu A (100%; with a
143 lower bound 95%CI of 93.9%), and Flu B (98.3%; with a lower bound 95%CI of 91.1%).
144 Similarly, compared to reference methods, the MAX SARS-CoV-2/Flu assay was associated
145 with NPA values for detection of SARS-CoV-2 (100%), Flu A (98.9%; with a lower bound
146 95%CI of 94.0%), and Flu B (100%; with a lower bound 95%CI of 95.9%) that all met FDA
147 acceptance criteria. During discordant testing, the MAX SARS-CoV2/Flu assay was in
148 agreement with the third assays (i.e. BioFire SARS-Cov-2 assay and Liat Flu assay) for both
149 SARS-CoV-2 negative results and for the Flu A positive result by the MAX SARS-CoV-2/Flu
150 assay. For Flu B, the Liat Flu assay agreed with the Xpert Flu assay negative result. However, all
151 discrepant results were associated with high Ct values (ranging from 37.8 to 39.5). The MAX
152 SARS-CoV-2 showed 100% PPA in specimens with reference method results associated with Ct
153 values ≤ 30 (Table S2). Thus, with its high PPA and NPA for SARS-CoV-2, Flu A, and Flu B,
154 this multiplex assay should reduce specimen collection time and the amount of supplies and
155 reagents necessary to test for both COVID-19 and Flu.

156
157 Different approaches are currently available for the detection of SARS-CoV-2 and Flu A/B for
158 the diagnosis of both COVID-19 and influenza, respectively.[10, 12] Although culture-based
159 assays were originally utilized to establish an influenza diagnosis, RT-PCR-based technology for
160 diagnosis of influenza currently represents the laboratory method of choice due to its relatively
161 high analytic and clinical sensitivity, as well as short turn-around time.[13] Likewise, RT-PCR-
162 based assays appear to have higher sensitivity for detection for SARS-CoV-2 compared to

163 culture-based assays.[14] Rapid testing, such as immunochromatic assays used to detect viral
164 antigen, have been developed for detection of both SARS-CoV-2 and Flu A/B.[9, 10] Although
165 rapid tests carry advantages, including decreased time-to-result and ease of implementation in
166 decentralized health care settings, RT-PCR-based assays have increased analytical sensitivity
167 compared to rapid tests.[10] Ultimately, multiple factors should be considered before
168 determining which strategy should be employed. For example, hospitals and their associated
169 laboratory partners, which have established a streamlined workflow and a relatively fast turn-
170 around-time, can effectively employ RT-PCR-based assays—especially for patients admitted and
171 managed according to their symptoms. This strategy carries the benefit of high sensitivity and
172 the ability to rule out etiologic agents with a high degree of assurance.

173
174 If the coincidence of high numbers of both COVID-19 and influenza cases occurs during flu
175 seasons, differential diagnosis for the appropriate therapeutic approach could be a challenging
176 feat. Although COVID-19 and influenza spread through a similar transmission mechanism and
177 have overlapping symptomology, specific differences between the diseases do exist. For
178 example, COVID-19 seems to involve a longer time to symptom onset than influenza, and may
179 cause more severe illness in vulnerable populations once symptoms develop.[15] Also, the
180 therapeutic approach for COVID-19 patients and influenza patients is not uniform. The impact of
181 blanket anti-viral drug, which has traditionally been used for influenza patients, is not established
182 as a treatment for SARS-CoV-2-positive individuals. Therefore, safety concerns may preclude
183 any potential efficacy. A similar problem exists for drugs such as remdesivir and
184 corticosteroids.[6] Both medications have been used to treat COVID-19 patients, but are not
185 approved for use in influenza patients, and may (in the case of corticosteroids) have adverse side

186 effects in influenza patients. Distinguishing the diagnosis of COVID-19 and influenza, therefore,
187 will be an important component for proper patient triage, management, and treatment.

188

189 *Limitations*

190 This research was conducted by using materials obtained from pre-selected frozen remnants,
191 received after routine care. A study involving prospective collection would better inform on the
192 positive and negative predictive values of the assay.

193

194 *Conclusions*

195 The MAX SARS-CoV-2/Flu assays met US FDA-EUA acceptance criteria for SARS-CoV-2 and
196 Flu A/B detection. Dual detection of the etiologic agents causing COVID-19 and influenza will
197 allow differentiation for those exhibiting common symptoms between the two diseases. This
198 assay should help optimize patient management by decreasing the time and resources required
199 for dual testing. Ultimately, the dual detection method should facilitate an informed decision by
200 physicians on the appropriate treatment for patients exhibiting similar symptoms between the
201 two diseases.

202 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

203 We thank the National Institute of Infectious Diseases, Japan, for providing VeroE6TMPRSS2
204 cells. We also thank Karen Eckert and Karen Yanson (Becton, Dickinson and Company, BD Life
205 Sciences – Integrated Diagnostic Solutions) for their input on the study logistics and content of
206 this manuscript. We thank Yu-Chih Lin and Devin Gary for the editorial assistance. We thank
207 Stanley Chao, Aojun Li, and Yongqiang Zhang (Becton, Dickinson and Company, BD Life
208 Sciences – Integrated Diagnostic Solutions) for statistical support. The individuals acknowledged
209 here have no additional funding or additional compensation to disclose. We are grateful to the
210 study participants who allowed this work to be performed.

211

212 **AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS**

213 All authors contributed to the interpretation of the data, critically revised the manuscript for
214 important intellectual content, approved the final version to be published, and agree to be
215 accountable for all aspects of the work.

216

217 **FUNDING**

218 This study was funded by Becton, Dickinson and Company; BD Life Sciences—Integrated
219 Diagnostics Solutions. Non-BD employee authors received research funds to support their work
220 for this study.

221

222 **POTENTIAL CONFLICTS OF INTEREST**

223 The authors disclose the following conflicts of interest: SP, EL, and CKC are employees of
224 Becton, Dickinson and Company; SY, None.

225

226 **REFERENCES**

- 227 1. Wu Z, McGoogan JM. Characteristics of and Important Lessons From the Coronavirus
228 Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Outbreak in China: Summary of a Report of 72314 Cases From the
229 Chinese Center for Disease Control and Prevention. *JAMA* **2020**; 323:1239-42.
- 230 2. Johns Hopkins University and Medicine, Coronavirus Resource Center. Mortality Analyses.
231 <https://coronavirus.jhu.edu/data/mortality>. **2020**.
- 232 3. Prevention CfDCa. Estimated Influenza Illness, Medical Visits, Hospitalizations, and Deaths
233 in the United States-2019-2020 Influenza Season. [https://www.cdc.gov/flu/about/burden/2019-](https://www.cdc.gov/flu/about/burden/2019-2020.html)
234 [2020.html](https://www.cdc.gov/flu/about/burden/2019-2020.html). **2020**.
- 235 4. Global influenza strategy 2019-2030. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2019. Licence: CC
236 BY-NC-SA 3.0 IGO.
- 237 Cataloguing-in-Publication (CIP) data. CIP data are available at <http://apps.who.int/iris>.
- 238 5. World Helath Organization. Influenza Update - 383. Accessed December 28, 2020.
239 [https://www.who.int/influenza/surveillance_monitoring/updates/latest_update_GIP_surveillance/](https://www.who.int/influenza/surveillance_monitoring/updates/latest_update_GIP_surveillance/en/)
240 [en/](https://www.who.int/influenza/surveillance_monitoring/updates/latest_update_GIP_surveillance/en/).
- 241 6. Kaur SP, Gupta V. COVID-19 Vaccine: A comprehensive status report. *Virus research* **2020**;
242 288:198114-.
- 243 7. Centers for Disease Control. Stay at home when you are sick. Accessed December 28, 2020.
244 [https://www.cdc.gov/flu/business/stay-home-when-](https://www.cdc.gov/flu/business/stay-home-when-sick.htm#:~:text=Individuals%20with%20suspected%20or%20confirmed,3%20days%20of%20their%20illness.)
245 [sick.htm#:~:text=Individuals%20with%20suspected%20or%20confirmed,3%20days%20of%20t](https://www.cdc.gov/flu/business/stay-home-when-sick.htm#:~:text=Individuals%20with%20suspected%20or%20confirmed,3%20days%20of%20their%20illness.)
246 [heir%20illness.](https://www.cdc.gov/flu/business/stay-home-when-sick.htm#:~:text=Individuals%20with%20suspected%20or%20confirmed,3%20days%20of%20their%20illness.)
- 247 8. Centers for Disease Control. Options to reduce quarantine for contacts of persons with SARS-
248 CoV-2 infection using symptom monitoring and diagnostic testing. Accessed December 28,
249 2020. [https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/more/scientific-brief-options-to-reduce-](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/more/scientific-brief-options-to-reduce-quarantine.html)
250 [quarantine.html](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/more/scientific-brief-options-to-reduce-quarantine.html).
- 251 9. Cheng MP, Papenburg J, Desjardins M, et al. Diagnostic Testing for Severe Acute Respiratory
252 Syndrome–Related Coronavirus 2. *Annals of Internal Medicine* **2020**; 172:726-34.

- 253 10. Vemula SV, Zhao J, Liu J, Wang X, Biswas S, Hewlett I. Current Approaches for Diagnosis
254 of Influenza Virus Infections in Humans. *Viruses* **2016**; 8:96-.
- 255 11. Rubin R. What Happens When COVID-19 Collides With Flu Season? *JAMA* **2020**; 324:923-
256 5.
- 257 12. La Marca A, Capuzzo M, Paglia T, Roli L, Trenti T, Nelson SM. Testing for SARS-CoV-2
258 (COVID-19): a systematic review and clinical guide to molecular and serological in-vitro
259 diagnostic assays. *Reprod Biomed Online* **2020**; 41:483-99.
- 260 13. Centers for Disease Control. Influenza (Flu). Accessed December 16, 2020.
261 <https://www.cdc.gov/flu/professionals/diagnosis/overview-testing-methods.htm>.
- 262 14. Pekosz A. Antigen-based testing but not real-time PCR correlates with SARS-CoV-2 virus
263 culture. (In Press). *Clinical Infectious Diseases* **2021**.
- 264 15. Centers for Disease Control. Similarities and differences between Flu and COVID-19.
265 Accessed December 28, 2020. <https://www.cdc.gov/flu/symptoms/flu-vs-covid19.htm#:~:text=Flu%20viruses%20can%20cause%20mild,signs%20and%20symptoms%20listed%20above.&text=COVID%2D19%20seems%20to%20cause,loss%20of%20taste%20or%20smell>.
266
267
268

Table 1. SARS-CoV-2 and influenza positivity by reference method or MAX SARS-CoV-2/Flu across age groups

Age group	Reference			BD MAX SARS-CoV-2/Flu		
	SARS-CoV-2 n (%)	Influenza A n (%)	Influenza B n (%)	SARS-CoV-2 n (%)	Influenza A n (%)	Influenza B n (%)
≤5 years 21.6% (n=50)	0 (0.0)	19 (32.2)	13 (21.7)	0 (0.0)	19 (31.7)	13 (22.0)
6-21 years 19.8% (n=46)	0 (0.0)	12 (20.3)	26 (43.3)	0 (0.0)	12 (20.0)	26 (44.1)
22-59 years 41.8% (n=97)	39 (75.0)	16 (27.1)	16 (26.7)	37 (74.0)	17 (28.3)	15 (25.4)
≥60 years 16.8% (39)	13 (25.0)	12 (20.3)	5 (8.3)	13 (26.0)	12 (20.0)	5 (8.5)
Overall (N=232)^a	52	59	60	50	60	59

^aCompliant and reportable for MAX and comparator assays.

Table 2. Performance of the MAX SARS-CoV-2/Flu assay for detection of SARS-CoV-2, Flu A and Flu B compared to reference

	SARS-CoV2^{a,c}	Flu A^{b,c}	Flu B^{b,c}
PPA	96.2% [87.0%, 98.9%]	100% [93.9%, 100%]	98.3% [91.1%, 99.7%]
NPA	100% [88.7%, 100%]	98.9% [94.0%, 99.8%]	100% [95.9%, 100%]
MAX (+) / Ref (+)	50	59	59
MAX (+) / Ref (-)	0	1	0
MAX (-) / Ref (+)	2	0	1
MAX (-) / Ref (-)	30	90	90
kappa	0.948	0.986	0.986

Abbreviations: PPA, positive percent agreement; NPA, negative percent agreement

^aReference method was the BioGx SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR assay.

^bReference method was the Xpert Flu RT-PCR assay.

^cA statistically significant difference (via McNemar's test on paired proportions was not observed for MAX SARS-CoV-2/Flu for detection of SARS-CoV-2 (-2.4 [95% CI: -5.8, 0.0]; p=0.500), Flu A (0.67 [95% CI: -0.64, 1.97]; p=1.000), or Flu B (-0.67 [95% CI: -1.97, 0.64]; p=1.000).