

1 **Performance evaluation of the BD SARS-CoV-2 reagents for the BD MAX™ system**
2

3 Karen Yanson,^a William Laviers,^a Lori Neely,^a Elizabeth Lockamy,^a Luis Carlos Castillo-
4 Hernandez,^b Christopher Oldfield,^c Ronald Ackerman,^d Jamie Ackerman,^d Daniel A Ortiz,^e Sixto
5 Pacheco,^f Patricia J Simner,^g Stephen Young,^h Erin McElvania,ⁱ and Charles K Cooper,^{a,#}
6

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

8 Loveton Circle, Sparks, MD, USA

9 ^bCTMD Research, 2328 S. Congress Ave., STE 1-E, Palm Springs, FL, USA

10 ^cFellows Research Alliance, Inc., 1 Oglethorpe Professional Blvd, Suite 204, Savannah, GA,

11 USA

12 ^dComprehensive Clinical Research, LLC, 603 Village Blvd, Suite 301, West Palm, FL, USA

13 ^eWilliam Beaumont Hospital, 3601 W 13 Mile Rd, Royal Oak, MI, USA

14 ^fBioCollections Worldwide, Inc., 5735 NE 2nd Avenue, Miami, FL, USA

15 ^gJohns Hopkins University School of Medicine, Department of Pathology, Division of Medical

16 Microbiology, Meyer B1-125D, 600 N. Wolfe Street, Baltimore, MD, USA

17 ^hTricore Reference Laboratory, 1001 Woodward Place, N.E., Albuquerque, NM, USA

18 ⁱNorthShore 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*

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

39

40 *Methods*

41 The limits of detection (LOD) for the BD SARS-CoV-2 Reagents for BD MAX™ System
42 (“MAX SARS-CoV-2 assay”), the Biomerieux BioFire® 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.
71 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
73 spread of the disease.(4) Diagnosis of COVID-19, through accurate detection of SARS-CoV-2 is
74 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

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 *in vitro* 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™ 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® 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
130 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

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. $K=(P_o - P_e)/1 - P_e$ (<0, 0, and
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.

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

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

232 CoV-2 assay targeting the S and M genes, the detection of mutated SARS-CoV-2 may be missed
233 (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*

249 Not all discordant specimens were tested by two other assays, cobas SARS-CoV-2 and BioFire
250 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
262 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**

266 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
268 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
273 for this study.

274

275 **POTENTIAL CONFLICTS OF INTEREST**

276 KY, WL, LN, EL, and CKC are employees of Becton, Dickinson and Company. All authors
277 declare 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.
- 283 2. Johns Hopkins University and Medicine, Coronavirus Resource Center. 2020. Mortality
284 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 [https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/php/contact-tracing/contact-tracing-](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/php/contact-tracing/contact-tracing-plan/prioritization/mathematicalmodeling.html)
291 [plan/prioritization/mathematicalmodeling.html](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/php/contact-tracing/contact-tracing-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. [https://www.who.int/blueprint/priority-diseases/key-](https://www.who.int/blueprint/priority-diseases/key-action/Global_Research_Forum_FINAL_VERSION_for_web_14_feb_2020.pdf?ua=1)
296 [action/Global_Research_Forum_FINAL_VERSION_for_web_14_feb_2020.pdf?ua=1](https://www.who.int/blueprint/priority-diseases/key-action/Global_Research_Forum_FINAL_VERSION_for_web_14_feb_2020.pdf?ua=1).
- 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,
304 and Testing Clinical Specimens for COVID-19. Accessed February 24, 2021.
305 <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-nCoV/lab/guidelines-clinical-specimens.html>.
- 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 [https://www.fda.gov/medical-devices/coronavirus-disease-2019-covid-19-emergency-](https://www.fda.gov/medical-devices/coronavirus-disease-2019-covid-19-emergency-use-authorizations-medical-devices/vitro-diagnostics-euas#individual-molecular)
309 [use-authorizations-medical-devices/vitro-diagnostics-euas#individual-molecular](https://www.fda.gov/medical-devices/coronavirus-disease-2019-covid-19-emergency-use-authorizations-medical-devices/vitro-diagnostics-euas#individual-molecular).
- 310 10. BD SARS-CoV-2 Reagents for BD MAX™ 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 <https://www.fda.gov/media/136813/download>.
- 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](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/cases-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,
334 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.
- 336 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,
339 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.

- 344 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,
349 Civantos AM, Andrews DM, Martinez O, Thomas GR. 2020. False-positive reverse
350 transcriptase polymerase chain reaction screening for SARS-CoV-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
354 features for diagnosis of COVID-19 facilitates management of SARS-CoV-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. [https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-
359 \[ncov/more/scientific-brief-options-to-reduce-quarantine.html\]\(https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/more/scientific-brief-options-to-reduce-quarantine.html\).](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/more/scientific-brief-options-to-reduce-quarantine.html)

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

UVT copies/mL	MAX SARS-CoV-2							BioFire SARS-CoV-2			cobas SARS-CoV-2			Aptima SARS-CoV-2				
	N	SARS-CoV-2 Pos		N1 Pos		N2 Pos		N	SARS-CoV-2 Pos		N	Target 1 Pos	Target 2 Pos		N	SARS-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 (224-2239)		427 (240 – 1660)		741 (353 – 3631)			490 (257 – 2138)			447 (263 – 1622)		83 (N/A) ^a			813 (490 – 2692)	
LOD (copies/mL)		251 (186 – 427)		271 (205 – 445)		519 (377 – 896) ^a			302 (219 – 565)			298 (335 – 509)		77 (N/A) ^a			612 (474 – 918)	

^abad statistical fit

Table 2. Performance of the MAX SARS-CoV-2 assay for detection of SARS-CoV-2 compared to reference.^a

	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

^aReference method was the Aptima SARS-CoV-2 assay.

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

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 ^a	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

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

^aWith 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.

Supplemental Table 1. Enrollment and compliance summary.

Collection Site	Total # Enrolled	# of Compliant Specimens	Reportable Aptima and MAX Result^a
A	248	244	110
B	450	445	237
C	150	141	130
D	528	231	231
Overall	1376	1061	708

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

Figure S1




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)