1 2	Performance evaluation of the BD SARS-CoV-2 reagents for the BD MAX <sup>TM</sup> system
3	Karen Yanson, <sup>a</sup> William Laviers, <sup>a</sup> Lori Neely, <sup>a</sup> Elizabeth Lockamy, <sup>a</sup> Luis Carlos Castillo-
4	Hernandez, <sup>b</sup> Christopher Oldfied, <sup>c</sup> Ronald Ackerman, <sup>d</sup> Jamie Ackerman, <sup>d</sup> Daniel A Ortiz, <sup>e</sup> Sixto
5	Pacheco, <sup>f</sup> Patricia J Simner, <sup>g</sup> Stephen Young, <sup>h</sup> Erin McElvania, <sup>i</sup> and Charles K Cooper, <sup>a,#</sup>
6	
7	<sup>a</sup> Becton, Dickinson and Company, BD Life Sciences – Integrated Diagnostic Solutions, 7
8	Loveton Circle, Sparks, MD, USA
9	<sup>b</sup> CTMD Research, 2328 S. Congress Ave., STE 1-E, Palm Springs, FL, USA
10	<sup>c</sup> Fellows Research Alliance, Inc., 1 Oglethorpe Professional Blvd, Suite 204, Savannah, GA,
11	USA
12	<sup>d</sup> Comprehensive Clinical Research, LLC, 603 Village Blvd, Suite 301, West Palm, FL, USA
13	<sup>e</sup> William Beaumont Hospital, 3601 W 13 Mile Rd, Royal Oak, MI, USA
14	<sup>f</sup> BioCollections Worldwide, Inc., 5735 NE 2nd Avenue, Miami, FL, USA
15	<sup>g</sup> Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine, Department of Pathology, Division of Medical
16	Microbiology, Meyer B1-125D, 600 N. Wolfe Street, Baltimore, MD, USA
17	<sup>h</sup> Tricore Reference Laboratory, 1001 Woodward Place, N.E., Albuquerque, NM, USA
18	<sup>i</sup> NorthShore University Health System, Department of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine, 2650
19	Ridge Avenue, Evanston, IL, USA
20	
21	#To whom correspondence should be addressed:
22	Charles K. Cooper, MD
23	Vice President of Medical Affairs
24	Becton, Dickinson and Company, BD Life Sciences – Integrated Diagnostic Solutions
25	7 Loveton Circle, Sparks MD 21152, USA
26	Phone: 410-316-4984

- 27 E-mail: Charles\_K\_Cooper@bd.com
- 28
- 29 Financial Support: This work was supported by Becton, Dickinson and Company, BD Life
- 30 Sciences Integrated Diagnostic Solutions (7 Loveton Circle, Sparks, MD 21152, USA).
- 31
- 32 **Running title:** BD SARS-CoV-2 assay for MAX

# 33 ABSTRACT

### 34 Background

The RT-qPCR assay for detecting SARS-CoV-2 virus is the favorable approach to test suspected
COVID-19 cases. However, discordant results can occur when two or more assays are compared.
Variability in analytical sensitivities between assays, among other factors, may account for these
differences in reporting.

39

40 Methods

41 The limits of detection (LOD) for the BD SARS-CoV-2 Reagents for BD MAX<sup>TM</sup> System

42 ("MAX SARS-CoV-2 assay"), the Biomerieux BioFire<sup>®</sup> Respiratory Panel 2.1 ("BioFire SARS-

43 CoV-2 assay"), the Roche cobas SARS-CoV-2 assay ("cobas SARS-CoV-2 assay"), and the

44 Hologic Aptima® SARS-CoV-2 assay Panther® ("Aptima SARS-CoV-2 assay") RT-qPCR

45 systems were determined using a total of 84 contrived nasopharyngeal specimens with seven

46 target levels for each comparator. The positive and negative percent agreement (PPA and NPA,

47 respectively) for the MAX SARS-CoV-2 assay were compared to the Aptima SARS-CoV-2

48 assay in a post-market clinical study utilizing 708 paired nasopharyngeal specimens collected

49 from suspected COVID-19 cases. Discordant results were further tested by the cobas and BioFire

50 SARS-CoV-2 assays.

51

52 Results

53 The measured LOD for the MAX SARS-CoV-2 assay (251 copies/mL) was comparable to the

54 cobas SARS-CoV-2 assay (298 copies/mL) and the BioFire SARS-CoV-2 assay (302

55 copies/mL); the Aptima SARS-CoV-2 assay had a LOD of 612 copies/mL. The MAX SARS-

- 56 CoV-2 assay had a PPA of 100% (95%CI: [97.3%-100.0%]) and a NPA of 96.7% (95%CI:
- 57 [94.9%-97.9%]) when compared to the Aptima SARS-CoV-2 assay.
- 58
- 59 Conclusions
- 60 The MAX SARS-CoV-2 assay exhibited a high analytical sensitivity and specificity for SARS-
- 61 CoV-2 detection. The clinical performance of the MAX SARS-CoV-2 assay agreed with another
- 62 sensitive EUA cleared assay.
- 63
- 64 KEY WORDS
- 65 BD MAX, SARS-CoV-2, Hologic Aptima, COVID-19, RT-qPCR, discordance

# 66 **INTRODUCTION**

- 67 Since December 2019, when a cluster of cases was first reported in Wuhan, China, the COVID-
- 68 19 pandemic, caused by the SARS-CoV-2 virus, has been a major public health crisis,

69 globally.(1) As of mid-May 2021, more than 160 million cases and 3.3 million deaths have been

70 identified, worldwide, with more than 32.8 million cases and 582 thousand deaths in the U.S.

alone.(2) Rapid transmission and lack of treatment make it difficult to mitigate the pandemic.(3)

72 Isolating suspected patients and executing effective contact tracing is critical for managing the

rad of the disease.(4) Diagnosis of COVID-19, through accurate detection of SARS-CoV-2 is

the first step in guiding healthcare providers to triage patients, determine the treatment plan, and

75 quarantine suspected contacts.

76

77 Diagnostic testing methodology for SARS-CoV-2 detection has been rapidly implemented in 78 response to the pandemic.(5) The molecular or nucleic acid testing using the real-time, reverse 79 transcriptase-quantitative polymerase chain reaction (RT-qPCR) assay has been a standard way 80 to detect SARS-CoV-2 and diagnose COVID-19.(6) RT-qPCR-based assays are effective for 81 SARS-CoV-2 nucleic acid detection in upper respiratory specimens collected through swab 82 sampling.(7, 8) This approach generally exhibits advantages in sensitivity and specificity in 83 specimens collected from nasopharyngeal, oropharyngeal, mid-turbinate nasal, or anterior nasal 84 swabs. Although the overall turnaround time has been lengthy traditionally, the implementation 85 of molecular testing on automated platforms has helped to ensure better turn-around-times for 86 RT-qPCR testing while maintaining a high level of performance for detection of SARS-CoV-2. 87

5

1.1

TTO D

\*\*\*

COLUD 10

00

88	In response to the COVID-19 pandemic, World Health Organization (WHO) and the U.S. Food
89	and Drug Administration (FDA) issued emergency use authorization (EUA) for the development
90	of <i>in vitro</i> diagnostic assays.(5, 9) Several manufactures have developed RT-qPCR platforms for
91	SARS-CoV-2 testing. Most of them are intended for testing nasal, nasopharyngeal, and
92	oropharyngeal swab samples collected from individuals suspected of having COVID-19. The BD
93	SARS-CoV-2 Reagents for BD MAX <sup>TM</sup> System ("MAX SARS-CoV-2 assay;" Becton,
94	Dickinson and Company; BD Life Sciences – Integrated Diagnostics Solutions, Sparks, MD,
95	USA) utilizes multiplexed primers and probes that are designed to amplify two unique regions of
96	the SARS-CoV-2 nucleocapsid (N) gene, N1 and N2, and the human ribonucleases P (RNase P)
97	gene and received FDA EUA on April 8, 2020.(10) Following the initial EUA, two
98	modifications were authorized (on March 10, 2021) by the FDA for the assay: (a) an increase to
99	the cutoff for the N2 channel, (b) an improvement to the probe chemistry to reduce the
100	background fluorescence.(11)
101	
102	The objective here was to assess the performance of the modified MAX SARS-CoV-2 assay for
103	detection of SARS-CoV-2 in nasopharyngeal specimens collected consecutively from

104 individuals suspected of COVID-19. The analytical sensitivity was first determined for the MAX

105 SARS-CoV-2 assay and three other commercial SARS-CoV-2 RT-qPCR assays: the Biomerieux

106 BioFire<sup>®</sup> Respiratory Panel 2.1 ("BioFire SARS-CoV-2 assay;" Biomerieux, BioFire

107 Diagnostics, Salt Lake City, UT, USA), the Roche cobas SARS-CoV-2 assay ("cobas SARS-

- 108 CoV-2 assay;" Roche Diagnostics, Indianapolis, IN, USA), and the Hologic Aptima® SARS-
- 109 CoV-2 assay Panther® System ("Aptima SARS-CoV-2 assay;" Hologic, Marlborough, MA,
- 110 USA). The clinical performance of the MAX SARS-CoV-2 assay was further examined by

- 111 determining the positive percent and negative percent agreements (PPA and NPA, respectively)
- 112 with the Aptima SARS-CoV-2 assay. The utilization of multiple assays here facilitated
- 113 comprehensive discordant testing in the absence of an established clinical reference standard
- 114 SARS-CoV-2 PCR-based assay.

#### 115 METHODS AND MATERIALS

#### 116 Specimens and assays

117 The first study compared the analytical sensitivity of the MAX SARS-CoV-2 assay, the BioFire

- 118 SARS-CoV-2 assay, the cobas SARS-CoV-2 assay, and the Aptima SARS-CoV-2 assay. A total
- 119 of 84 contrived nasopharyngeal specimens were prepared for each commercial assay. The
- 120 specimens were diluted in universal viral transport media to generate a panel consisting
- 121 replicates of six concentrations (22, 67, 200, 600, 1800, and 5400 copies/mL) for each assay. An
- 122 additional negative control level was also prepared for each panel.

123

124 The second study involved post-market clinical testing and involved 1,376 specimens from four

125 collection sites in the U.S. (Table S1). The specimens included prospective as well as

126 consecutively collected remnant nasopharyngeal swabs from symptomatic patients suspected of

127 COVID-19 by their healthcare providers. There were 64 specimens that had an Aptima SARS-

128 CoV-2 result but were not tested on MAX SARS-CoV-2. There were also 288 specimens that

129 were enrolled but were not tested on either Aptima SARS-CoV-2 or MAX SARS-CoV-2 since

the positive target goal was attained. Overall, 708 paired specimens were utilized for testing and

131 analysis. Demographic information for compliant specimens with reportable results is shown in

132 Table S2. The study protocol was approved by the Advarra Institutional Review Board and de-

133 identified specimens from collection sites were used for testing. Written, informed consent was

134 obtained prior to any trial-related procedures. This study was conducted according to the

135 principles set forth by the Declaration of Helsinki and Good Clinical Practice.

136

130

137 Data analysis

138	The analytical sensitivity values for the four assays were determined by calculating the limit of
139	detection (LOD) using probit regression analysis. The point estimate for LOD is the lowest
140	detectable concentration of SARS-CoV-2 at which approximately 95% of all (true positive)
141	replicates test positive. Goodness-of-fit test was performed using Pearson and deviance
142	correlation methods. Only data following normality or having at least two functional data points
143	from a comparator yielded an appropriate statistical fit.
144	
145	For the post-market clinical study, the primary outcome measures were PPA and NPA point
146	estimates (with calculated 95% confidence intervals [95% CI] using the Wilson score method)
147	for the MAX SARS-CoV-2 assay, compared to the reference assay, Aptima SARS-CoV-2.
148	Cohen's kappa coefficient was utilized to gauge the agreement between two raters (reference
149	versus index test) to classify results into mutually exclusive categories. $K = (P_0^{-P}e)/1 - P_e (<0, 0, and 0)$
150	>0 indicate agreements worse than, no better or worse than, and better than that expected by
151	chance). Acceptance criteria for the MAX SARS-CoV-2 assay for FDA-EUA clearance for
152	SARS-CoV-2 were $\geq$ 95% for both PPA and NPA.(9) Only compliant and reportable results for
153	both MAX SARS-CoV-2 and comparator assays were included. This article was prepared
154	according to STARD guidelines for diagnostic accuracy studies reporting.(12) Data will be made
155	publicly available upon publication and upon request for peer review.

9

# 156 **RESULTS**

157 The MAX SARS-CoV-2 assay was subjected to a series of validations to determine the impact 158 (if any) on analytical sensitivity and specificity resulting from the cutoff change on the N2 159 channel and the modification to the probe chemistry.(10) As shown in Table 1, the LOD of the 160 MAX SARS-CoV-2 assay was obtained and compared to three other commercially available 161 SARS-CoV-2 RT-qPCR assays, specifically, the BioFire SARS-CoV-2, the cobas SARS-CoV-2, 162 and the Aptima SARS-CoV-2 assays. From a total of 84 contrived nasopharyngeal specimens 163 with seven target levels, the MAX SARS-CoV-2 assay had the lowest LOD (251 copies/mL), but 164 was comparable to cobas SARS-CoV-2 (298 copies/mL for Target 2) and BioFire SARS-CoV-2 165 (302 copies/mL) assays. The Aptima SARS-CoV-2 assay showed the highest LOD (612 166 copies/mL), but was within a 2-fold concentration range of the other assays. 167 168 In the clinical evaluation study, a total of 708 specimens tested were included for paired analysis. 169 Among all analyzed samples, 138 were positive by both MAX SARS-CoV-2 and Aptima SARS-170 CoV-2 assays, while 551 tested negative by both assays. Therefore, MAX SARS-CoV-2 testing 171 resulted in a PPA of 100% (95%CI: [97.3%-100.0%]) and a NPA of 96.7% (95%CI: [94.9%-172 97.9%]), when compared to the Aptima SARS-CoV-2 assay (Table 2). Discordant results were 173 observed from 19 specimens that were positive with the MAX SARS-CoV-2 assay but negative 174 by the Aptima SARS-CoV-2 assay (Table 3). Among these, 5 specimens were N1 positive/N2 175 positive, 11 specimens were N1 positive/N2 negative, and 3 specimens were N1 negative/N2 176 positive. The BioFire SARS-CoV-2 and the cobas SARS-CoV-2 assays were utilized for 177 discrepancy testing. Of the 19 discordant specimens, 4 tested positive by the cobas SARS-CoV-2 178 assay and 5 were positive by the BioFire SARS-CoV-2 assay. One of the specimens did not 179 generate a reportable result from either the cobas SARS-CoV-2 assay or the BioFire SARS-CoV-

- 180 2 assay. Five (5) of the 19 discordant specimens did not have sufficient volume for BioFire
- 181 SARS-CoV-2 testing and 5 did not yield valid results from the cobas SARS-CoV-2 assay due to
- 182 a low volume error. Overall, 7 of 19 MAX SARS-CoV-2-positive specimens were also positive
- 183 in discordant testing. Further analysis revealed that only one of the specimen results
- 184 corresponded to the MAX SARS-CoV-2 Ct values less than 30 (specimen ID #9 in Table 3); the
- 185 other results were either at, or close to, the LOD for the MAX SARS-CoV-2 assay.

### 186 **DISCUSSION**

187 On March 10, 2021, the FDA provided EUA for the modified MAX SARS-CoV-2 RT-qPCR 188 assay, which eliminated the condition of follow-up testing for a MAX SARS-CoV-2 assay 189 presumptive positive.(11) Here, the MAX SARS-CoV-2 assay showed a relatively low LOD 190 (251 copies/mL) when compared with three other RT-qPCR EUA assays. The clinical study, 191 incorporating 708 real-world specimens, resulted in 100% PPA and 96.7% NPA performance 192 values for MAX SARS-CoV-2 when compared to the reference assay, and met FDA EUA 193 acceptance criteria of greater than 95% for PPA and NPA. This work demonstrates that the MAX 194 SARS-CoV-2 assay has excellent analytical sensitivity and clinical agreement for detection of 195 SARS-CoV-2. 196

197 In this study, the MAX SARS-CoV-2 assay was first compared to the Aptima SARS-CoV-2 198 assay. Nineteen (19) discordant results occurred from 708 paired specimens. Upon discordant 199 method testing, five specimens were positive by at least one additional RT-qPCR assay and two 200 additional specimens were positive for cobas SARS-CoV-2 Target 2 (sarbecovirus). Several 201 factors, including primer design, type of polymerase employed, reaction conditions, and template 202 purity could all impact the analytical sensitivity of PCR.(13) In the absence of a consensus 203 clinical reference standard for detection of SARS-CoV-2 via nucleic acid amplification, it is 204 difficult to adjudicate, with certainty which of the remaining 14 positive specimens by the MAX 205 SARS-CoV-2 assay were truly positive. The benchmarking data here demonstrated that the 206 MAX SARS-CoV-2 assay had the lowest LOD of the four assays tested. Interestingly, the 207 genomic organization of SARS-CoV-2 viral RNA includes the open reading frame 1 (ORF1) and 208 several subgenomic regions encoding the structural proteins, such as spike protein (S), envelope

12

(E), membrane protein (M), and nucleocapsid (N) (Figure S1A). Among these subgenomic

209

210 regions, the N gene expresses the most abundant transcript, and could provide a higher starting 211 amount of template, giving the MAX SARS-CoV-2 assay a lower apparent LOD.(14) In 212 addition, the larger input volume associated with the MAX SARS-CoV-2 assay could facilitate a 213 lower LOD by further providing more template from which to amplify (Figure S1B).(10) 214 215 As the genetic mutations of SARS-CoV-2 virus quickly evolve to account for several novel viral 216 variants that exhibit higher transmission and mortality rate, whether the current RT-qPCR assays 217 can accurately detect the virus becomes the topic of interest. (15, 16) If genetic mutations occur 218 within the target regions of the SARS-CoV-2 primer, proper primer and probe binding may be 219 affected and fail to detect the presence of the virus, correctly.(17) To date, multiple mutations 220 have been mapped out and most of them are identified at the ORF1 region, followed by S, N, M, 221 and E gene (Figure S1A).(18) It is important to note that the mutations occur on S gene often 222 result in changes of viral transmission. The specificity of the N1 and N2 primer sets used by 223 MAX SARS-CoV-2 assay was determined using an *in silico* approach to compare with all 224 329,434 available SARS-CoV-2 sequences in the GISAID database as of January 21, 2021. 225 Alignments against the N gene showed that both N1 and N2 primer/probe sets are a perfect 226 match to 93.8% of sequences in the database, 96.8% of the sequences are a perfect match to the 227 N1 primer set region, and 97.0% are a perfect match to the N2 primer set region. In total, 99.9% 228 are a perfect match to either the N1 or the N2 region primer set. Additionally, N1 and N2 primers 229 showed no significant combined homologies with human genome regions, other coronaviruses, 230 or human microflora that would predict potential false positive RT-qPCR results. On the other 231 hand, with Aptima and cobas SARS-CoV-2 assays recognizing ORF1 gene and BioFire SARS-

13

CoV-2 assay targeting the S and M genes, the detection of mutated SARS-CoV-2 may be missed
(Figure S1A and B).(10, 19-21)

234

235	Although the RT-qPCR testing method is a highly sensitive and favorable approach to detect
236	SARS-CoV-2 virus, the positive results do not rule out bacterial infection or co-infection with
237	other viruses. On the other hand, negative results do not preclude SARS-CoV-2 infection, and
238	should be considered in conjunction with clinical observations, medical history, and
239	epidemiological information. Furthermore, all factors mentioned in the previous paragraphs
240	could potentially affect the detection ability of the system and one hundred percent agreement
241	between assays should not be expected. While the false negative result creates a major public
242	health concern for mitigating the pandemic, the false positive may produce unnecessary stress on
243	workforce management and treatment planning for other diseases.(22-24) Without the gold
244	standard test available to which the results of the RT-qPCR can be compared, combining the
245	clinical presentations with the test results may better diagnose the infectious status of COVID-
246	19.(23, 25, 26)

247

248 *Limitations* 

Not all discordant specimens were tested by two other assays, cobas SARS-CoV-2 and BioFire
SARS-CoV-2, due to the specimen volume available.

251

252 Conclusions

253 MAX SARS-CoV-2 assay has two targets specific for the N gene of the SARS-CoV-2 virus that 254 contributes to the high analytical sensitivity and specificity in detecting the virus. MAX SARS-

- 255 CoV-2 assay exhibited strong clinical agreement to another EUA assay with more positives
- 256 detected as confirmed by the discordant methodology.

# 257 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

- 258 We thank Yu-Chih Lin, Ph.D. (Becton, Dickinson and Company, BD Life Sciences Integrated
- 259 Diagnostic Solutions) for the input on the content of this manuscript and editorial assistance. We
- 260 thank Stanley Chao and Yongqiang Zhang (Becton, Dickinson and Company, BD Life Sciences
- 261 Integrated Diagnostic Solutions) for statistical support. The individuals acknowledged here
- have no additional funding or additional compensation to disclose. We are grateful to the study
- 263 participants who allowed this work to be performed.
- 264

# 265 AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

All authors contributed to the interpretation of the data, critically revised the manuscript for

267 important intellectual content, approved the final version to be published, and agree to be

accountable for all aspects of the work.

269

### 270 FUNDING

271 This study was funded by Becton, Dickinson and Company, BD Life Sciences – Integrated

272 Diagnostic Solutions. Non-BD employee authors received research funds to support their work

for this study.

274

# 275 POTENTIAL CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

KY, WL, LN, EL, and CKC are employees of Becton, Dickinson and Company. All authorsdeclare no conflicts of interest.

# 278 **REFERENCES**

- 279 1. Zhu N, Zhang D, Wang W, Li X, Yang B, Song J, Zhao X, Huang B, Shi W, Lu R, Niu
- 280 P, Zhan F, Ma X, Wang D, Xu W, Wu G, Gao GF, Tan W, China Novel Coronavirus I,
- 281 Research T. 2020. A Novel Coronavirus from Patients with Pneumonia in China, 2019. N
- 282 Engl J Med 382:727-733.
- Johns Hopkins University and Medicine, Coronavirus Resource Center. 2020. Mortality
   Analyses. https://coronavirus.jhu.edu/data/mortality.
- 285 3. Sanche S, Lin YT, Xu C, Romero-Severson E, Hengartner N, Ke R. 2020. High
- 286 Contagiousness and Rapid Spread of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2.
- 287 Emerg Infect Dis 26:1470-1477.
- 288 4. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Prioritizing COVID-19 Contact Tracing
- 289 Mathematical Modeling Methods and Findings. Accessed February 23, 2021.
- 290 <u>https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/php/contact-tracing/contact-tracing-</u>
- 291 plan/prioritization/mathematicalmodeling.html.
- 292 5. World Health Organization. Global Research Collaboration for Infectious Disease
- 293 Preparedness. COVID 19: Public Health Emergency of International Concern (PHEIC).
- 294 Global Research and Innovation Forum: Towards a Research Roadmap. 02/11/2020-
- 295 02/12/2020. <u>https://www.who.int/blueprint/priority-diseases/key-</u>
- 296 <u>action/Global\_Research\_Forum\_FINAL\_VERSION\_for\_web\_14\_feb\_2020.pdf?ua=1</u>.
- 297 6. Cheng MP, Papenburg J, Desjardins M, Kanjilal S, Quach C, Libman M, Dittrich S,
- 298 Yansouni CP. 2020. Diagnostic Testing for Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome–Related
- 299 Coronavirus 2. Annals of Internal Medicine 172:726-734.

- 300 7. La Marca A, Capuzzo M, Paglia T, Roli L, Trenti T, Nelson SM. 2020. Testing for
- 301 SARS-CoV-2 (COVID-19): a systematic review and clinical guide to molecular and
- 302 serological in-vitro diagnostic assays. Reprod Biomed Online 41:483-499.
- 303 8. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Interim Guidelines for Collecting, Handling,
- and Testing Clinical Specimens for COVID-19. Accessed February 24, 2021.
- 305 <u>https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-nCoV/lab/guidelines-clinical-specimens.html.</u>
- 306 9. U.S. Food and Drug Administration. Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Emergency
- 307 Use Authorization for Medical Devices--In Vitro Diagnostics EUAs.
- 308 <u>https://www.fda.gov/medical-devices/coronavirus-disease-2019-covid-19-emergency-</u>
- 309 <u>use-authorizations-medical-devices/vitro-diagnostics-euas#individual-molecular</u>.
- 310 10. BD SARS-CoV-2 Reagents for BD MAX<sup>TM</sup> System [package insert]. 2020. Becton,
- 311 Dickinson and Company, Sparks-Glencoe, MD, USA.
- 312 11. U.S. Food and Drug Administration. 2021. BD SARS-CoV-2 Reagents for BD MAX
- 313 System Letter of Authorization <u>https://www.fda.gov/media/136813/download</u>.
- 314 12. Bossuyt PM, Reitsma JB, Bruns DE, Gatsonis CA, Glasziou PP, Irwig L, Lijmer JG,
- 315 Moher D, Rennie D, de Vet HC, Kressel HY, Rifai N, Golub RM, Altman DG, Hooft L,
- 316 Korevaar DA, Cohen JF. 2015. STARD 2015: An Updated List of Essential Items for
- 317 Reporting Diagnostic Accuracy Studies. Radiology 277:826-32.
- 318 13. Cha RS, Thilly WG. 1993. Specificity, efficiency, and fidelity of PCR. PCR Methods
  319 Appl 3:S18-29.
- 320 14. Kim D, Lee JY, Yang JS, Kim JW, Kim VN, Chang H. 2020. The Architecture of SARS-
- 321 CoV-2 Transcriptome. Cell 181:914-921 e10.

322	15.	Toyoshima Y, Nemoto K, Matsumoto S, Nakamura Y, Kiyotani K. 2020. SARS-CoV-2
323		genomic variations associated with mortality rate of COVID-19. J Hum Genet 65:1075-
324		1082.
325	16.	Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. SARS-CoV-2 Variant Classifications and
326		Definitions. Accessed April 01, 2021. https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/cases-
327		updates/variant-surveillance/variant-info.html#Concern.
328	17.	Vogels CBF, Brito AF, Wyllie AL, Fauver JR, Ott IM, Kalinich CC, Petrone ME,
329		Casanovas-Massana A, Catherine Muenker M, Moore AJ, Klein J, Lu P, Lu-Culligan A,
330		Jiang X, Kim DJ, Kudo E, Mao T, Moriyama M, Oh JE, Park A, Silva J, Song E,
331		Takahashi T, Taura M, Tokuyama M, Venkataraman A, Weizman OE, Wong P, Yang Y,
332		Cheemarla NR, White EB, Lapidus S, Earnest R, Geng B, Vijayakumar P, Odio C,
333		Fournier J, Bermejo S, Farhadian S, Dela Cruz CS, Iwasaki A, Ko AI, Landry ML,

Foxman EF, Grubaugh ND. 2020. Analytical sensitivity and efficiency comparisons of

335 SARS-CoV-2 RT-qPCR primer-probe sets. Nat Microbiol 5:1299-1305.

18. Takahiko Koyama DP, and Laxmi Parida. 2020. Variant analysis of SARS-CoV-2

337 genomes. Bulletin of the World Health Organization 98:495-504.

- 338 19. Biomerieux BioFire® Respiratory Panel 2.1 (RP2.1) [package insert] 2020. Biomerieux,
- BioFire Diagnostics, Salt Lake City, UT, USA.
- 340 20. Hologic Aptima® SARS-CoV-2 assay (Panther® System) [package insert] 2020.
- 341 Hologic, Marlborough, MA, USA.
- 342 21. Roche Cobas SARS-CoV-2 Qualitative assay for use on the cobas® 6800/8800Systems
- 343 [package insert]. 2020. Roche Diagnostics, Indianapolis, IN, USA.

- 22. Woloshin S, Patel N, Kesselheim AS. 2020. False Negative Tests for SARS-CoV-2
- 345 Infection Challenges and Implications. N Engl J Med 383:e38.
- 346 23. Tahamtan A, Ardebili A. 2020. Real-time RT-PCR in COVID-19 detection: issues
- 347 affecting the results. Expert Rev Mol Diagn 20:453-454.
- 348 24. Katz AP, Civantos FJ, Sargi Z, Leibowitz JM, Nicolli EA, Weed D, Moskovitz AE,
- Civantos AM, Andrews DM, Martinez O, Thomas GR. 2020. False positive reverse
- 350 transcriptase polymerase chain reaction screening for SARS $\Box$ CoV $\Box$ 2 in the setting of
- 351 urgent head and neck surgery and otolaryngologic emergencies during the pandemic:
- 352 Clinical implications. Head & Neck 42:1621-1628.
- 353 25. Wang Y, Kang H, Liu X, Tong Z. 2020. Combination of RT qPCR testing and clinical
- features for diagnosis of COVID  $\Box$  19 facilitates management of SARS  $\Box$  CoV  $\Box$  2
- 355 outbreak. Journal of Medical Virology 92:538-539.
- 356 26. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Options to reduce quarantine for contacts of
- 357 persons with SARS-CoV-2 infection using symptom monitoring and diagnostic testing.
- 358 Accessed December 28, 2020. <u>https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-</u>
- 359 <u>ncov/more/scientific-brief-options-to-reduce-quarantine.html</u>.

	MAX SARS-CoV-2				BioFire SARS-CoV-2			cobas SARS-CoV-2				Aptima SARS-CoV-2						
copies/mL	Ν	SARS P	-CoV-2 os		N1 Pos		N2 Pos	Ν	SAR	S-CoV-2 Pos	Ν	Та	rget 1 Pos	Tar	get 2 Pos	Ν	SARS F	-CoV-2 Pos
0	12	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	12	0	0%	12	0	0%	0	0%	12	0	0%
22	12	3	25%	1	8%	3	25%	12	1	8%	12	0	0%	0	0%	12	0	0%
67	12	4	33%	4	33%	2	17%	12	6	50%	12	3	25%	8	67%	12	1	8%
200	12	10	83%	9	75%	10	83%	12	8	67%	11	7	64%	11	100%	12	4	33%
600	12	12	100%	12	100%	11	92%	12	12	100%	12	12	100%	12	100%	12	11	92%
1800	12	12	100%	12	100%	12	100%	NT	NT	N/A	12	12	100%	12	100%	12	12	100%
5400	12	12	100%	12	100%	12	100%	NT	NT	N/A	12	12	100%	12	100%	12	12	100%
LOD (Log Transformed)		398 (22	24-2239)	427	(240 – 1660)	741 (	353 – 3631)		490 (2	57 – 2138)		447	(263 – 1622)	83	6 (N/A) <sup>a</sup>		813 (49	0 – 2692)
LOD (copies/mL)		251 (18	6 – 427)	271	(205 – 445)	519	(377 – 896) <sup>a</sup>		302 (2	219 – 565)		298	(335 – 509)	77	′ (N/A) <sup>a</sup>		612 (47	<b>'</b> 4 – 918)
<sup>a</sup> bad statistical	fit																	

Table 1. Limit of detection (LOD) of MAX SARS-CoV-2, BioFire SARS-CoV-2, cobas SARS-CoV-2 and A	Aptima SARS-CoV-2.
---	--------------------

**Table 2.** Performance of the MAX SARS-CoV-2 assay for detection of SARS-CoV-2 compared to reference.<sup>a</sup>

	SARS-CoV2	
PPA	100% [97.3%, 100%]	
NPA	96.7% [94.9%, 97.9%]	
MAX (+) / Ref (+)	138	
MAX (+) / Ref (-)	19	
MAX (-) / Ref (+)	0	
MAX (-) / Ref (-)	551	
kappa	0.9187	

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

<sup>a</sup>Reference method was the Aptima SARS-CoV-2 assay.

Specimen ID	MAX N1 Ct1	MAX N2 Ct	MAX RNaseP Ct	cobas Target 1	cobas Target 2	BioFire
1	37.1	-1	24.7	+ (33.86)	+ (35.25)	+
2	34.9	33.2	22.5	-	+ (36.99)	+
3	34.9	-1	21	-	+ (35.27)	QNS
4	37.9	-1	23.4	-	+ (37.02)	QNS
5	-1	35	22.3	INV	INV	+
6	35.3	34.4	26.4	INV	INV	+
7	37.5	-1	24	-	-	+
8	40.2	-1	22.8	-	-	QNS
9 <sup>a</sup>	22.9	24.5	19.7	-	-	QNS
10	38.8	-1	22	INV	INV	-
11	37.4	-1	26.2	INV	INV	-
12	33.3	33.2	28.1	-	-	-
13	39.4	-1	25.1	-	-	-
14	35	-1	25	-	-	-
15	33.8	-1	26.8	-	-	-
16	31.2	-1	29.1	-	-	-
17	-1	35.9	26.8	-	-	-
18	-1	35.5	19.4	-	-	-
19	32.9	33.6	22.5	INV	INV	QNS

Table 3. List of MAX SARS-CoV-2 (+) / Aptima SARS-CoV-2 (-) specimens.

Abbreviations: INV, invalid value; QNS, quantity not sufficient for testing

<sup>a</sup>With the exception of sample 9, all discordant samples exhibit Ct values at or near the limit of detection on the MAX SARS-CoV-2 system.

Cappionional Table II Entennion and compliance caminary.								
Collection Site	Total # Enrolled	# of Compliant Specimens	Reportable Aptima and MAX Result <sup>a</sup>					
A	248	244	110					
В	450	445	237					
С	150	141	130					
D	528	231	231					
Overall	1376	1061	708					

#### Supplemental Table 1. Enrollment and compliance summary.

<sup>a</sup>There were 64 specimens that had an Aptima SARS-CoV-2 result but were not tested on MAX SARS-CoV-2. There were also 288 specimens that were enrolled but were not tested on either Aptima SARS-CoV-2 or MAX SARS-CoV-2 since the positive target goal was reached.

Supplemental Table 2. Demographic information for compliant specimens
with reportable Aptima SARS-CoV-2 and MAX SARS-CoV-2 results.

	Characteristics	% (n/N)
Gondor	Female	59.6% (422/708)
Gender	Male	40.4% (286/708)
	<18 Years	4.2% (30/708)
	18 – 64 Years	79.7% (564/708)
Age Group	≥65 Years	15.8% (112/708)
	Unknown	0.3% (2/708)

# Figure S1



Transcript abundance of subgenomic RNAs: N > S > M > E Variants occurring rate: ORF1ab > S\* > N > M > E

	MAX	Aptima	cobas	BioFire
target gene	N gene	ORF1ab gene	ORF1ab gene	S gene, M gene
input volume	750 µl	500 µl	600 µl	300 µl

Figure S1. (A) Illustration of the genomic structure of SARS-CoV-2 gene based on the MN908497 Wuhan-Hu-1 sequence. Light gray domains are non-structural regions whereas dark gray domains code structural proteins. The order of the transcript abundance of subgenomic RNAs and variants occurring rate on each region are indicated.(14, 18) \*Note that the mutations occur on S gene often impact the transmission of the virus. ORF: open reading frame; S: spike protein; E: envelope; M: membrane protein; N: nucleocapsid.
(B) Summary of the targeted SARS-CoV-2 gene domain and minimum input volume for each RT-PCR system.(10, 19-21)