

1 **Xpert MTB/RIF Ultra is highly sensitive for the diagnosis of tuberculosis lymphadenitis**
2 **in an HIV-endemic setting**

3 Stephanie Minnies¹⁺, Byron W.P. Reeve¹⁺, Loren Rockman¹, Georgina Nyawo¹, Charissa C.
4 Naidoo¹, Natasha Kitchin², Cornelia Rautenbach^{3,4}, Colleen A. Wright⁵, Andrew Whitelaw^{3,4},
5 Pawel Schubert^{4,5}, Robin M. Warren¹, Grant Theron^{1*}

6 **Affiliations:**

7 ¹DSI-NRF Centre of Excellence for Biomedical Tuberculosis Research, South African Medical
8 Research Council Centre for Tuberculosis Research, Division of Molecular Biology and
9 Human Genetics, Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences, Stellenbosch University, South
10 Africa

11 ²Department of Psychiatry, Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences, Stellenbosch University,
12 South Africa

13 ³Division of Medical Microbiology, Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences, Stellenbosch
14 University, South Africa

15 ⁴National Health Laboratory Services, Cape Town, South Africa

16 ⁵Division of Anatomical Pathology, Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences, Stellenbosch
17 University, South Africa

18 **Corresponding author:**

19 Prof Grant Theron, Room 2035, 2nd Floor, Biomedical Research Institute, Division of
20 Molecular Biology and Human Genetics, Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences, Francie
21 Van Zijl Drive, Tygerberg, South Africa, 7550. E-mail: gtheron@sun.ac.za. Telephone: +27
22 21 938 9693

23 ⁺Contributed equally

24 **Keywords:** Xpert MTB/RIF Ultra, diagnostic accuracy, tuberculosis lymphadenitis

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

25 **Abstract**

26 Background: Tuberculosis lymphadenitis (TBL) is the most common extrapulmonary TB
27 (EPTB) manifestation. Xpert MTB/RIF Ultra (Ultra) is a World Health Organization-endorsed
28 diagnostic test, but performance data for TBL, including on non-invasive specimens, are
29 limited.

30 Methods: Fine needle aspiration biopsies (FNABs) from outpatients (≥ 18 years) with
31 presumptive TBL (n=135) underwent: 1) routine Xpert (later Ultra once programmatically
32 available), 2) a MGIT960 culture (if Xpert- or Ultra-negative, or rifampicin-resistant), and 3)
33 study Ultra. Concentrated paired urine underwent Ultra. Primary analyses used a
34 microbiological reference standard (MRS).

35 Results: In a head-to-head comparison (n=92) of FNAB study Ultra and Xpert, Ultra had
36 increased sensitivity [91% (95% confidence interval 79, 98) vs. 72% (57, 84); p=0.016] and
37 decreased specificity [76% (61, 87) vs. 93% (82, 99); p=0.020], and detected patients not on
38 treatment. HIV nor alternative reference standards affected sensitivity and specificity. In
39 patients with both routine and study Ultras, the latter detected more cases [+20% (0, 42);
40 p=0.034] and, further indicative of potential laboratory-based room-for-improvement, false-
41 negative study Ultras had more PCR inhibition than true-positives. Study Ultra “false-
42 positives” had less mycobacterial DNA than “true-positives” [trace-positive proportions 59%
43 (13/22) vs. 12% (5/51); p<0.001]. Exclusion or recategorization of “traces” removed potential
44 benefits offered over Xpert. Urine Ultra had low sensitivity [18% (7, 35)].

45 Conclusions: Ultra on FNABs is highly sensitive and detects more TBL than Xpert. Patients
46 with FNAB Ultra-positive “trace” results, most of whom will be culture-negative, may require
47 additional clinical investigation. Urine Ultra could reduce the number of patients needing
48 invasive sampling.

49 247/250

50 **Background**

51 Tuberculosis (TB) is a leading cause of morbidity and mortality globally. In 2019,
52 extrapulmonary TB (EPTB) represented 16% of new TB cases reported [1] and, in HIV-
53 positive populations, can account up to 50% of all TB [2]. TB lymphadenitis (TBL) accounts
54 for 35% of all EPTB [3, 4]. South Africa, with high TB and HIV burden [1], is particularly
55 affected by EPTB and TBL.

56 TBL is typically diagnosed by examining fine needle aspiration biopsies (FNABs) from
57 affected lymph nodes. This requires specialised sampling and facilities, and tests have
58 suboptimal sensitivity [5]. One widely-used test is Xpert MTB/RIF (Xpert; Cepheid, USA); a
59 semi-automated real-time PCR that rapidly detects *Mycobacterium tuberculosis* complex
60 (MTBC) DNA and rifampicin resistance [6, 7]. A systematic review and meta-analysis showed
61 heterogeneity in the sensitivity of FNAB Xpert vs. microbiological [83% (95% confidence
62 interval: 71, 91) and composite reference standards [81% (72, 88)] [8]. Specificities were 94%
63 (88, 97) and 99% (95, 100), respectively [8]. Most EPTB diagnostic algorithms recommend
64 culture after a negative Xpert [9], however, this creates delay. Better TBL tests are needed.

65 One potential test is Xpert MTB/RIF Ultra (Ultra), which offers improved sensitivity over
66 Xpert for pulmonary TB, partly enabled by, in addition to *rpoB*, amplification of multi-copy
67 insertion elements (*IS6110*, *IS1081*) [10]. Data on Ultra for TBL are emerging: one
68 retrospective evaluation tested ten Xpert-negative, culture-positive FNABs and found half to
69 be Ultra-positive [11]; another retrospective evaluation (n=25) reported sensitivity and
70 specificity of 94% (71-77) and 100% (63-72), respectively [12]; and a prospective evaluation
71 (n=73) reported a sensitivity and specificity of 78% (40-97) and 78% (66-87), respectively
72 [13]. No studies included head-to-head Xpert and Ultra data. Additionally, since Ultra's advent,
73 algorithms for TBL diagnosis remain essentially unchanged from the Xpert era – culture is still

74 recommended in Ultra-negative patients. Whether this is needed or, conversely, if culture is
75 needed to confirm positive Ultra results due to specificity concerns associated with the new
76 trace semi-quantitation category [10, 14], requires investigation.

77 Lastly, FNABs are rarely collected in primary care; patients are referred to district or tertiary
78 facilities, resulting in care cascade gaps [15]. If an Ultra has high sensitivity and specificity on
79 an easily accessible fluid like urine, the need for invasive sampling could be mitigated;
80 potentially drastically reducing provider and patient economic and time costs. To our
81 knowledge, urine Ultra for TBL is unevaluated.

82 We evaluated the head-to-head diagnostic accuracy of Xpert and Ultra on FNABs, and Ultra
83 on urine in patients with presumptive TBL in a tertiary hospital setting in an HIV-endemic in
84 South Africa. We hypothesised Ultra would show improved sensitivity compared to Xpert.

85 **Methods and materials**

86 Ethics statement

87 The study was approved by the Stellenbosch University Human Research Ethics Committee
88 and Tygerberg General Hospital (TGH) (both N16/04/050).

89 Patient recruitment

90 135 outpatients (≥ 18 years) with presumptive TBL (swollen lymph node) undergoing routine
91 referral and investigation at a tertiary referral clinic at TGH in Cape Town, South Africa, were
92 consecutively recruited from 25 January 2017-12 March 2019 and gave FNABs and urine.
93 Patients who received TB treatment ≤ 60 days prior were excluded.

94 Fine needle aspirate collection

95 FNABs were collected by multiple needle passes using a 23-gauge needle and 10 ml syringe.
96 While the needle was inserted, negative suction with a cutting motion was applied for
97 aspiration. The first two passes were used for routine cytology. From each pass, two slides
98 were prepared: the first airdried for Rapidiff staining and the second spray-fixed for
99 Papanicolaou staining (~ 25 μ l total volume used per pass) (**Figure 1**). The remaining syringe
100 contents were flushed into 1.5 ml TB transport medium [16]. The third pass (5-50 μ l) was
101 collected into 700 μ l 5% saline (Ysterplaat Medical Supplies, Cape Town, South Africa).

102 Xpert, Ultra, and culture

103 *Routine testing:* Xpert (version 1; Cepheid, USA) was done programmatically from 25 January
104 2017–9 April 2018 by the government programmatic laboratory [National Health Laboratory
105 Service (NHLS)] who did Ultra (version 1) thereafter [17]. Sample reagent (2 ml; Cepheid,
106 USA) was added to 500 μ l of aspirate-containing 1.5 ml TB transport medium (4:1 ratio) and
107 2 ml of the mixture used for Xpert or Ultra [18, 19]. Per the algorithm, if a specimen was Xpert-

108 or Ultra-positive and rifampicin-susceptible, culture was not done. If Xpert- or Ultra-negative,
109 or Xpert- or Ultra-positive and rifampicin-resistant, 500 µl aspirate-containing TB transport
110 medium was inoculated into a MGIT960 liquid culture without NALC-NaOH decontamination
111 (**Figure 1**). If a non-actionable (not positive or negative) [14] Xpert or Ultra occurred, the
112 remaining 500 µl TB transport medium was used to repeat the test.

113 *Study testing:* The third pass in 700 µl saline was tested with Ultra (version 3; study Ultra)
114 using a 2:1 sample reagent ratio [19]. Study Ultra was done irrespective of whether routine
115 Xpert or Ultra was done.

116 *MTBC typing and drug susceptibility testing:* MTBDR*plus* was done on culture-positive
117 isolates for speciation and drug susceptibility testing.

118 Urine Ultra

119 5-20 ml urine stored at -80 °C were centrifuged (1811×g, 10 min, room temperature) and the
120 supernatant removed until 700 µl remained, which was tested with Ultra (2:1 sample reagent
121 volume ratio) [19].

122 Patient treatment and follow-up

123 Treatment decisions were programmatic without study involvement (no study results reported
124 for patient management). Attempts were made to telephonically follow-up patients at least 12
125 weeks after recruitment at which point TB treatment initiation status were recorded and, if
126 treatment started, treatment response was queried. Patients were lost-to-follow-up if at least
127 two calls were unsuccessful, and messages were unreturned for each timepoint.

128 Definitions

129 *Patient groups:* Patients were designated definite, probable, or non-TB using different
130 reference standards. For the microbiological reference standard (MRS), definite TB was
131 culture-positive and/or cytology-positive on FNABs, and non-TBs culture- and cytology-

132 negative on FNABs. Unclassifiable patients had no positive MRS test, culture contaminated or
133 not done, and cytology not done. **Supplementary Table 1** has the extended microbiological
134 standard (eMRS) and composite reference standard (CRS) definitions.

135 *Other definitions:* Xpert or Ultra actionable results for TB were MTBC-detected and
136 rifampicin-susceptible, rifampicin-resistant or rifampicin-indeterminate, or MTBC not
137 detected [14]. For culture, actionable results were positive or negative for MTBC. For cytology,
138 the presence or absence of granulomatous inflammation was recorded.

139 Statistical analysis

140 We included patients in head-to-head analyses if they had actionable routine index test (Xpert
141 or Ultra), study Ultra, and culture results (or, if culture was non-actionable, a cytology result
142 was available). Proportion tests [20] were done using STATA version 16.0 (StataCorp, College
143 Station Texas, USA) and GraphPad Prism version 8.0.1 (GraphPad Software, San Diego,
144 USA). Venn diagrams were made with InteractiVenn [21]. Differences in diagnostic accuracy
145 metrics were calculated using proportion tests or McNemar's test as appropriate. STARD
146 guidelines were followed [22].

147 **Results**

148 Patient characteristics

149 Of 135 patients, 44% (59/135) were definite TB and 56% (75/135) non-TBs per the MRS.

150 Characteristics are compared in **Table 1**.

151 FNAB index test results

152 76% (103/135) of patients had routine Xpert requested [6/103 (6%) not done] and 24%

153 (32/135) routine Ultra requested [3% (1/32) not done]. Non-actionable results for routine

154 Xpert, routine Ultra and study Ultra were 0% (0/97), 6% (2/31), and 3% (4/135), respectively.

155 41% (40/97) of routine Xperts were positive (remainder negative). For routine Ultra, 38%

156 (11/29) were positive and, for study Ultra, 74/131 positive (56%; $p=0.070$ vs. routine Ultra)

157 (**Figure 2**). In a head-to-head comparison of patients with actionable results from each test

158 (study Ultra, routine Xpert, culture, cytology) 37% (22/59), 8% (5/59), 20% (12/59) and 24%

159 (14/59) were positive by each test (**Figure 3A**; study Ultra had the highest yield). 12% (7/59)

160 of these patients with at least one positive result were exclusively detected by study Ultra

161 (cytology exclusively detected two). This proportion detected only by study Ultra (and hence

162 were negative by routine Xpert and/or cytology) increased to 22% (13/59) when culture results,

163 which are not available for rapid clinical decision making, were omitted.

164 Diagnostic accuracy and yield of study Ultra and routine Xpert on FNABs

165 *Overall*: When Ultra was compared head-to-head to Xpert using the MRS ($n=92$) (**Table 2**),

166 Ultra had improved sensitivity [91% (95% confidence interval: 79, 98) vs. 72% (57, 85);

167 $p=0.016$] and decreased specificity [76% (61, 87) vs. 93% (82, 99); $p=0.020$]. Ultra's positive

168 predictive value (PPV) [79% (66, 89) vs. 92% (78, 98); $p=0.114$] and negative predictive value

169 (NPV) were like Xpert's [90% (76, 97) vs. 77% (64, 87); $p=0.105$]. Conclusions were

170 unchanged for non-head-to-head comparisons, eMRS or CRS (**Table 2, Supplementary**

171 **results**). Compared to MTBDR*plus* on isolates, no false-negative or false-positive Ultra
172 rifampicin-resistance results occurred, however, numbers were small, precluding precise
173 accuracy estimates (**Supplementary Results**).

174 *HIV*: Sensitivities and specificities did not differ in HIV-positives vs. -negatives for study Ultra
175 or routine Xpert (**Table 2**). Within HIV-positives, Ultra had improved sensitivity [97% (82,
176 100) vs. 76% (56, 96); $p=0.022$] and similar specificity [79% (59, 92) vs. 93% (76, 99);
177 $p=0.127$] to Xpert.

178 *Trace semi-quantitation exclusion or reclassification*: When study Ultra traces were excluded,
179 sensitivity [-1% (-17, 11); $p=0.836$] and specificity [+7% (-9, 24); $p=0.400$] were unchanged.
180 When trace results were reclassified as negative, sensitivity decreased [-13% (-25, 1), $p=0.014$]
181 and specificity increased [+9% (-2, 19), $p=0.046$] (**Table 2**).

182 *Ultra PCR inhibition*: An analysis of sample processing control (SPC) C_T values
183 (**Supplementary Figure 1**; higher values indicate more inhibition) showed more inhibition in
184 study Ultra positives than -negatives [25.80 (IQR: 24.78-27.33) vs. 25.20 (24.55-26.05);
185 $p=0.024$]. Furthermore, false-negatives were more inhibited than true-positives [26.10 (25.10-
186 28.60) vs. 25.10 (24.00-25.50); $p=0.001$]; suggesting inhibition contributes to diminished
187 sensitivity.

188 *Relationship with bacterial load*: Neither Study Ultra nor routine Xpert C_T correlated with
189 bacillary load measured using culture time-to-positivity (**Supplementary Figure 2**) in FNABs.

190 Comparison of study Ultra true-positive and false-positives

191 False-positives had less bacterial load than true-positives [IS6110/IS1081 C_T 19.00 (IQR:
192 16.40-21.60) vs. 24.85 (19.88-28.15); $p<0.001$], a greater proportion were hence “trace” [59%
193 (13/22) vs. 12% (6/51); $p<0.001$] (**Table 4**). Less inhibition was also observed for the former
194 group [SPC C_T 25.05 (24.45-25.95) vs. 26.10 (25.10-28.60); $p=0.005$]. More study Ultra true-
195 positives were on treatment at follow-up than Ultra false-positives [92% (44/48) vs. 27%

196 (6/22); $p < 0.001$] as more true-positives were positive using a routine test than the false-
197 positives [98% (50/51) vs. 27% (6/22); $p < 0.001$]. The proportions of patients with previous TB
198 in false- vs. true-positives were similar [27% (6/22) vs. 35% (18/51); $p = 0.503$]. The
199 characteristics of true- and false-positives are in **Table 4** and false-positives per patient
200 information in **Supplementary Table 3**.

201 Study vs. routine Ultra FNAB results

202 *Concordance:* In patients who received both study and programmatic Ultras, 55% (17/31) were
203 study Ultra-positive and 35% (11/31) routine Ultra-positive. The former detected +20% (95%
204 confidence interval: 0, 42) more TBL (**Table 3**).

205 *PCR inhibition:* SPC C_T analysis showed no difference between study and routine Ultra [25.10
206 (IQR: 24.35-25.85) vs. 25.50 (24.20-26.50); $p = 0.081$] (**Supplementary Figure 1A**).

207 Urine Ultra yield, sensitivity and specificity, and non-actionable results

208 Urine Ultra had low sensitivity [18% (7, 35)] and high specificity [98% (88, 100)] (head-to-
209 head comparisons with FNAB study Ultra in **Supplementary Table 4**). Of concentrated urines
210 tested with (n=84), 8% (7/84) were non-actionable and 100% (7/7) of these resolved to
211 actionable when unconcentrated urine was tested (one unconcentrated urine was now Ultra-
212 positive). None of the 18 HIV-negative patients had any positive urine Ultra. 12% (7/57) HIV-
213 positives were urine Ultra-positive (six of seven detected by both positive MRS and study Ultra
214 FNAB result; **Figure 3C**). In other words, when urine Ultra was attempted amongst HIV-
215 positives, 11% (7/64, 3 of which were trace) were positive, meaning that universal concentrated
216 urine Ultra testing in HIV-positives with presumptive TBL could reduce the number of FNABs
217 required for TB diagnosis as few are non-actionable.

218 Patient treatment status at follow-up

219 96% (130/135) of patients were followed-up [median (IQR: 37 (16-65) weeks since
220 recruitment] and 52% (68/130) of those had initiated treatment. Of these, 74% (50/68) had been
221 classified as definite TB and 26% (18/68) as non-TB per the MRS. Of the definite TBs, 88%
222 (44/50) were study Ultra-positive whereas, for the non-TBs, 33% (6/18) were study Ultra-
223 positive. Of the remaining study Ultra-positives followed-up, 29% (20/70) were not placed on
224 treatment [in 65% (13/20) of these, study Ultra was the only positive test], indicating potential
225 missed opportunities for treatment initiation. Regarding the clinical status in patients who
226 started treatment, 94% (64/68) reported treatment completion and, of these, 94% (60/64)
227 reported feeling clinically well. 3% (4/130) patients were documented to have died (one of the
228 four had a positive test result that was exclusively study Ultra positive; none of these four were
229 placed treatment).

230 **Discussion**

231 Our key findings are: 1) study Ultra on FNABs had, compared to Xpert, improved sensitivity
232 and decreased specificity, and outperformed routine Ultra (tests unaffected by HIV and
233 alternative reference standards); 2) approximately 3 in 10 study Ultra-positives had not been
234 placed on treatment, indicating opportunities to improve TBL treatment with Ultra; 3)
235 excluding study Ultra trace results improved specificity (more so than reclassifying to negative)
236 without large sensitivity costs relative to treating Ultra trace results as positive; 4) Urine Ultra
237 had low sensitivity but could reduce the proportion of presumptive TBL patients who require
238 a FNAB in our setting, and 5) Ultra false-negative results are associated with PCR inhibition.
239 These data show high sensitivity of Ultra on FNABs for TBL with the inclusion of trace-
240 positive results (without which sensitivity benefits over Xpert are not seen).

241 Ultra on FNABs had increased sensitivity than Xpert, suggesting Ultra is rapid initial test for
242 TBL. Ultra did still not detect, however, approximately 1 in 10 TBL cases; indicating a
243 sustained need for more sensitive tests (especially those that use non-invasive specimens) and
244 a continued role for reflex tests for downstream testing of Ultra-negative FNABs. Importantly,
245 like was done previously for Xpert [23], we showed one likely cause of Ultra false-negativity
246 is increased PCR inhibition, suggesting that optimised specimen processing workflows to
247 better remove interfering agents are still needed to boost sensitivity.

248 Notably, Ultra had suboptimal specificity (two in ten MRS-negative people were study Ultra-
249 positive). One reason may be that culture and cytology have limitations as reference standards
250 for EPTB [8]. Notably, this finding mirrors prior work on TBL that used tissue in addition to
251 fluid biopsies for Ultra, where a specificity of 78% vs. culture was observed [13]. However,
252 when compared to an eMRS including microbiological tests such as FNAB culture as well as
253 culture and Ultra on non-site-of-disease fluids, FNAB Ultra specificity was 100% in that study.

254 In contrast, we applied microbiological tests only to FNABs and did not exhaustively sample
255 anatomical sites [24], which might underestimate specificity.

256 Ultra false-positivity was more frequent in patients with less mycobacterial DNA and, in
257 contrast to pulmonary TB, FNAB Ultra false-positivity was not associated with prior TB [14].
258 The true nature of these Ultra “false-positives” in EPTB requires clarification and is an
259 important topic for future research (in our setting, most “false-positive” patients with
260 presumptive pulmonary TB remain well without treatment) [25, 26]. Such “false-positive”
261 results could be caused by *M. tuberculosis* in FNABs that are not culturable using conventional
262 methods like MGIT960. For example, in animal models, *M. tuberculosis* DNA in lymph nodes
263 is detectable during re-activation of TB, despite no pathological evidence of disease and no
264 culturability. *M. tuberculosis* is hypothesised to then disseminate throughout the body from the
265 lymph node [27]. Moreover, we observed no correlation in bacterial load measured using
266 between Ultra and culture, further supporting the presence of *M. tuberculosis* DNA in the
267 absence of culturability.

268 Critically, if Ultra trace results were excluded or reclassified to elevate specificity, Ultra would
269 lose sensitivity benefits versus Xpert, however, this sensitivity loss was less for the former
270 strategy than the latter; suggesting exclusion is the preferred strategy for handling trace.

271 When routine and study Ultra concordance were analysed, study Ultras had higher yield. This
272 may be due to specimen processing (e.g., more sample reagent is used for routine Ultras
273 compared to study Ultras) or cartridge version differences but is overall indicative of an area
274 to improve the diagnosis of TBL within the programme.

275 Few studies examined Ultra on urine [28-30] and none in patients investigated for TBL. Urine
276 Ultra may obviate the need for invasive sampling (and hence referral to a specialised facility,

277 and associated costs and delays). Despite concentration [31], low yield and sensitivity were
278 observed for urine Ultra, suggesting it could marginally reduce FNAB collection
279 (approximately 1/10). Such a strategy is undermined by elevated non-actionable result rates
280 and cost effectiveness, including the number-needed-to-test, would require prospective
281 investigation and modelling, however, we expect the utility of such an approach to be further
282 enhanced with better urine tests [32].

283 These results have strengths and limitations. Our study was pragmatic and routine culture not
284 always done and, although our MRS included cytology, multiple cultures (including on
285 specimens from other anatomical sites) may improve specificity estimates. Furthermore,
286 multiple FNAB passes were done to obtain adequate volumes that could have introduced
287 sampling variation, however, FNABs were collected using a standardised protocol by a single
288 health worker.

289 In conclusion, in a routine clinical setting in patients with presumptive TBL, Ultra detects more
290 TBL than Xpert and would result in more people placed on treatment. This is driven by the
291 added benefit of trace results. Furthermore, programmatic Ultra testing can be optimised on
292 the diagnostic laboratory front, as study Ultra had better performance. Urine Ultra could reduce
293 invasive sampling and associate delays but there remains a need for better urine-based tests for
294 TBL. We recommend that a positive FNAB Ultra result be used to initiate treatment, however,
295 patients with a negative Ultra still require confirmatory testing and many patients with a trace-
296 positive result will be culture-negative. Our study supports Ultra's use for TBL diagnosis.

297 References

- 298 1. World Health Organization, *Global tuberculosis report*. 2020.
- 299 2. Sharma, S. and A. Mohan, *Extrapulmonary tuberculosis*. Indian Journal of Medical
300 Research, 2004. **120**: p. 316-353.
- 301 3. Derese, Y., et al., *Comparison of PCR with standard culture of fine needle aspiration*
302 *samples in the diagnosis of tuberculosis lymphadenitis*. The Journal of Infection in
303 Developing Countries, 2012. **6**(01): p. 53-57.
- 304 4. Gautam, H., et al., *Cervical tuberculous lymphadenitis: clinical profile and diagnostic*
305 *modalities*. International journal of mycobacteriology, 2018. **7**(3): p. 212.
- 306 5. Zeka, A.N., S. Tasbakan, and C. Cavusoglu, *Evaluation of the GeneXpert MTB/RIF*
307 *assay for rapid diagnosis of tuberculosis and detection of rifampin resistance in*
308 *pulmonary and extrapulmonary specimens*. Journal of clinical microbiology, 2011.
309 **49**(12): p. 4138-4141.
- 310 6. Dheda, K., et al., *Point-of-care diagnosis of tuberculosis: Past, present and future*.
311 *Respirology*, 2013. **18**(2): p. 217-232.
- 312 7. Chakravorty, S., et al., *The new Xpert MTB/RIF Ultra: improving detection of*
313 *Mycobacterium tuberculosis and resistance to rifampin in an assay suitable for point-*
314 *of-care testing*. MBio, 2017. **8**(4): p. e00812-17.
- 315 8. Denkinger, C.M., et al., *Xpert MTB/RIF assay for the diagnosis of extrapulmonary*
316 *tuberculosis: a systematic review and meta-analysis*. European Respiratory Journal,
317 2014. **44**(2): p. 435-446.
- 318 9. Schnippel, K., et al., *Diagnosing Xpert MTB/RIF-negative TB: Impact and cost of*
319 *alternative algorithms for South Africa*. 2013. **103**(2): p. 101-106.
- 320 10. García-Basteiro, A.L., et al., *Point of care diagnostics for tuberculosis*. *Pulmonology*,
321 2018. **24**(2): p. 73-85.
- 322 11. Bisognin, F., et al., *Improvement of Mycobacterium tuberculosis detection by Xpert*
323 *MTB/RIF Ultra: A head-to-head comparison on Xpert-negative samples*. PloS one,
324 2018. **13**(8): p. e0201934.
- 325 12. Perez-Risco, D., et al., *Evaluation of the Xpert MTB/RIF ultra assay for direct detection*
326 *of Mycobacterium tuberculosis complex in smear-negative extrapulmonary samples*.
327 *Journal of clinical microbiology*, 2018. **56**(9): p. e00659-18.
- 328 13. Antel, K., et al., *Diagnostic accuracy of the Xpert MTB/Rif Ultra for tuberculosis*
329 *adenitis*. 2020. **20**(1): p. 1-8.
- 330 14. Mishra, H., et al., *Xpert MTB/RIF Ultra and Xpert MTB/RIF for diagnosis of*
331 *tuberculosis in an HIV-endemic setting with a high burden of previous tuberculosis: a*
332 *two-cohort diagnostic accuracy study*. 2020.
- 333 15. Naidoo, P., et al., *The South African tuberculosis care cascade: estimated losses and*
334 *methodological challenges*. The Journal of infectious diseases, 2017. **216**(suppl_7): p.
335 S702-S713.
- 336 16. Wright, C.A., et al., *Mycobacterial transport medium for routine culture of fine needle*
337 *aspiration biopsies*. Archives of disease in childhood, 2010. **95**(1): p. 48-50.

- 338 17. World Health Organization, *Global tuberculosis report*. . 2019.
- 339 18. World Health Organization, *Xpert MTB/RIF implementation manual: Technical and*
340 *operational 'how-to': practical considerations*. 2014.
- 341 19. Cepheid, *Xpert MTB/RIF Ultra Product Brochure*. 2017.
- 342 20. Girdler-Brown, B. and L.N. Dziki, *Hypothesis tests for the difference between two*
343 *population proportions using Stata*. Southern African Journal of Public Health, 2018.
344 **2(3)**: p. 63-68.
- 345 21. Heberle, H., et al., *InteractiVenn: a web-based tool for the analysis of sets through Venn*
346 *diagrams*. 2015. **16(1)**: p. 169.
- 347 22. Cohen, J.F., et al., *STARD 2015 guidelines for reporting diagnostic accuracy studies:*
348 *explanation and elaboration*. BMJ open, 2016. **6(11)**: p. e012799.
- 349 23. Theron, G., et al., *Determinants of PCR performance (Xpert MTB/RIF), including*
350 *bacterial load and inhibition, for TB diagnosis using specimens from different body*
351 *compartments*. Scientific reports, 2014. **4(1)**: p. 1-10.
- 352 24. Spener-Gomes, R., et al., *Examination of respiratory specimens improves*
353 *microbiological diagnosis of patients with presumptive extrapulmonary tuberculosis*.
354 *International Journal of Infectious Diseases*, 2021.
- 355 25. Theron, G., et al., *False-positive Xpert MTB/RIF results in retested patients with*
356 *previous tuberculosis: frequency, profile, and prospective clinical outcomes*. Journal of
357 *clinical microbiology*, 2018. **56(3)**.
- 358 26. Theron, G., et al., *Xpert MTB/RIF results in patients with previous tuberculosis: can*
359 *we distinguish true from false positive results?* Clinical Infectious Diseases, 2016.
360 **62(8)**: p. 995-1001.
- 361 27. Ganchua, S.K.C., et al., *Lymph nodes—The neglected battlefield in tuberculosis*. 2020.
362 **16(8)**: p. e1008632.
- 363 28. Andama, A., et al., *Accuracy and incremental yield of urine Xpert MTB/RIF Ultra*
364 *versus Determine TB-LAM for diagnosis of pulmonary tuberculosis*. 2020. **96(1)**: p.
365 114892.
- 366 29. Atherton, R.R., et al., *Detection of Mycobacterium tuberculosis in urine by Xpert*
367 *MTB/RIF Ultra: a useful adjunctive diagnostic tool in HIV-associated tuberculosis*.
368 2018. **75**: p. 92-94.
- 369 30. Cresswell, F.V., et al. *Standardized urine-based tuberculosis (TB) screening with TB-*
370 *lipoarabinomannan and Xpert MTB/RIF Ultra in Ugandan adults with advanced*
371 *human immunodeficiency virus disease and suspected meningitis*. in *Open forum*
372 *infectious diseases*. 2020. Oxford University Press US.
- 373 31. Peter, J.G., et al., *The Diagnostic Accuracy of Urine-Based Xpert MTB/RIF in HIV-*
374 *Infected Hospitalized Patients Who Are Smear-Negative or Sputum Scarce*. PloS one,
375 2012. **7(7)**: p. e39966.
- 376 32. Bulterys, M.A., et al., *Point-of-care urine LAM tests for tuberculosis diagnosis: a status*
377 *update*. Journal of clinical medicine, 2020. **9(1)**: p. 111.

378

379

380 **Acknowledgments**

381 The authors thank the National Health Laboratory Services, Tygerberg Hospital, Cape Town,
382 South Africa. The authors also thank Ruth Wilson, Lucille Cupido, Roxanne Higgitt, Selisha
383 Naidoo and Zaida Palmer. Research reported in this publication was supported by the South
384 African Medical Research Council. The content is the solely the responsibility of the authors
385 and does not necessarily represent the official views of the South African Medical Research
386 Council. The work was funded by the South African Medical Research Council, Stellenbosch
387 University Faculty of Health Sciences, and the National Research Foundation. GT
388 acknowledges funding from the EDCTP2 programme supported by the European Union (grant
389 SF1401, OPTIMAL DIAGNOSIS) and the National Institute of Allergy and Infection Diseases
390 of the National Institutes of Health (U01AI152087). Cepheid donated cartridges but did not
391 have a role in study design or result interpretation.


392 **Figure legends**

393 **Figure 1:** Specimen collection and diagnostic testing in participants with presumptive TB
394 lymphadenitis. Abbreviations: FNAB, fine needle aspirate; TB, tuberculosis; Ultra, Xpert
395 MTB/RIF Ultra; Xpert, Xpert MTB/RIF.

396 **Figure 2:** Overview of different FNAB-based test results. Tests done as part of the routine
397 diagnostic algorithm (Xpert later replaced by Ultra, cytology, and culture) and the study (Ultra)
398 are shown. Study Ultra detected TB in most culture-positive FNABs and some culture-negative
399 FNABs. Italicised text indicates programmatic testing (programmatic algorithm adherence
400 imperfect). Data are n/N (%). Abbreviations: RIF, rifampicin; TB, tuberculosis; Ultra, Xpert
401 MTB/RIF Ultra; Xpert, Xpert MTB/RIF.

402 **Figure 3:** Venn diagrams showing positive results from different FNAB tests (after the 104th
403 participant, Ultra was routinely done instead of Xpert) and urine Ultra. **(A)** Study Ultra, routine
404 Xpert, culture and cytology results in 59 patients. Study Ultra was positive in seven FNABs
405 undetected by routine Xpert. **(B)** Routine Ultra results relative to Study Ultra, routine Ultra,
406 culture, and cytology in 19 patients. Study Ultra was exclusively positive in 36% (7/19) FNABs
407 not detected by routine Ultra, culture and cytology, and had the highest yield. **(C)** Urine Ultra
408 results relative to FNAB study Ultra and the MRS in 57 HIV-positive patients (Urine Ultra
409 negative in all HIV-negatives). Urine Ultra detects less TBL than FNAB study Ultra but could
410 obviate the need for TB diagnostic FNABs in some patients. Data are n/N (%). Abbreviations:
411 FNAB, fine needle aspirate; MRS, microbiological reference standard; TB, tuberculosis; Ultra,
412 Xpert MTB/RIF Ultra; Xpert, Xpert MTB/RIF.

413 **Figure 1**




414

415

416

417

418 **Figure 2**



419

420 †One routine Xpert-positive, rifampicin (RIF)-susceptible patient had a contaminated culture but was study Ultra-
421 positive, RIF-resistant and 32 routine Xpert-positive, rifampicin (RIF)-susceptible patients had no culture per the
422 **Figure 1** algorithm.

423 ‡One routine Ultra was trace-positive RIF-indeterminate.

424 *Culture not normally requested per the routine algorithm.

425 Ultra results under cytology subheadings (in the last row of boxes) are routine not study Ultras.


426 Missing data: In patients with a routine Xpert-negative result, one had a contaminated culture and two were culture

427 not done. Two routine Ultras were non-actionable. Three FNABs did not have cytology done.

428

429 **Figure 3**

430



431

432 **Table 1:** Demographic and clinical characteristics by microbiological reference standard
 433 status. Definite TBs were more likely to be younger, have an involved neck or breast lymph
 434 node (vs. another anatomical site) and, if HIV-positive, a lower CD4 count than non-TBs. Data
 435 are n (%) or median (IQR).

	Overall (n=135)	Definite-TB (n=59)	Non-TB (n=75)
Demographics			
Age (years)	36 (29-46.5)	34 (27-41)	39 (31.5-47.5) p=0.019
Female	72/135 (53)	30/59 (51)	42/75 (56) p=0.553
Clinical characteristics			
HIV-positive	77/133 (58)	35/58 (60)	41/74 (55) p=0.569
CD4 count (cells/ μ l)	183 (66-304)	147 (43-281)	219 (156-358) p=0.012
Previous TB	42/135 (31)	19/59 (32)	22/75 (29) p=0.720
Pulmonary TB	38/42 (90)	17/59 (29)	20/75 (27) p=0.783
Extrapulmonary TB	4/42 (10)	2/59 (3)	2/75 (3) p=0.807
Involved site			
Neck	92/134 (67)	53/59 (90)	39/75 (52) p<0.001
Thorax	16/134 (12)	4/59 (7)	12/75 (16) p=0.102
Breast	9/134 (7)	0/59 (0)	9/75 (12) p=0.006
Other	17/134 (13)	2/59 (3)	15/75 (20) p=0.004

436 Missing data: HIV, two; CD4, four; lymph node site, one.
 437 One patient was unclassifiable based on case definitions.
 438 “Other” sites included arm (n=3), leg (n=3), groin (n=7), and head (n=4).

439 **Table 2:** Diagnostic accuracy analyses (non-head-to-head above, head-to-head below) of routine Xpert and study Ultra on FNABs using a MRS
 440 (culture and cytology) for *Mycobacterium tuberculosis* complex DNA detection stratified by HIV status. Study Ultra has improved sensitivity
 441 compared to routine Xpert but lower specificity. The relative performances of Xpert and Ultra had similar patterns by HIV status and versus the
 442 eMRS or CRS (**Supplementary Table 2**). Data are %, 95% CI, and n/N.

	Non-head-to-head											
	All patients				HIV-negative				HIV-positive			
	n=96				n=36/96 (38)				n=60/96 (62)			
	Sensitivity	Specificity	PPV	NPV	Sensitivity	Specificity	PPV	NPV	Sensitivity	Specificity	PPV	NPV
Xpert	73 (58, 85) 35/48	92 (80, 98) 44/48	90 (76, 97) 35/39	77 (64, 87) 44/57	65 (38, 86) 11/17	89 (67, 99) 17/19	85 (55, 98) 11/13	74 (52, 90) 17/23	77 (59, 90) 24/31 p=0.343*	93 (77, 99) 27/29 p=0.656*	92 (75, 99) 24/26 p=0.455*	79 (62, 91) 27/34 p=0.627*
	n=130				n=55/128 (43)				n=73/128 (47)			
Ultra	85 (73, 93) 51/60 p=0.121‡	69 (56, 79) 48/70 p=0.003‡	70 (58, 80) 51/73 p=0.018‡	84 (72, 93) 48/57 p=0.343‡	76 (55, 91) 19/25 p=0.427‡	70 (51, 85) 21/30 p=0.111‡	68 (48, 84) 19/28 p=0.260‡	78 (58, 91) 21/27 p=0.750‡	91 (76, 98) 31/34 p=0.125‡ p=0.109*	67 (50, 81) 26/39 p=0.009‡ p=0.768*	70 (55, 83) 31/44 p=0.031‡ p=0.816*	90 (73, 98) 26/29 p=0.267‡ p=0.227*
Δ if traces excluded	-2 (-15, 12) p=0.808§	+15 (1, 30) p=0.041§	+13 (-1, 28) p=0.081§	0 (-13, 13) p>0.999§	-3 (-28, 22) p=0.797§	+21 (1, 41) p=0.076§	+21 (-2, 44) p=0.103§	0 (-22, 22) p>0.999§	-1 (-15, 13) p=0.905§	+12 (-8, 32) p=0.253§	+10 (-9, 28) p=0.332§	0 (-16, 16) p>0.999§
Δ if traces reclassified	-10 (-19, -1) p=0.014§	+18 (8, 29) p<0.001§	+13 (-1, 28) p=0.081§	-4 (-17, 9) p=0.558§	-12 (-29, 5) p=0.083§	+23 (5, 42) p=0.008§	+21 (-2, 44) p=0.103§	-2 (-23, 18) p=0.845§	-9 (-21, 4) p=0.083§	+15 (1, 29) p=0.014§	+10 (-9, 28) p=0.332§	-6 (-21, 11) p=0.517§
	Head-to-head											
	n=92				n=35/92 (38)				n=57/92 (62)			
	Sensitivity	Specificity	PPV	NPV	Sensitivity	Specificity	PPV	NPV	Sensitivity	Specificity	PPV	NPV
	Xpert	72 (57, 84) 33/46	93 (82, 99) 43/46	92 (78, 98) 33/36	77 (64, 87) 43/56	65 (38, 86) 11/17	94 (73, 100) 17/18	92 (62, 100) 11/12	74 (52, 90) 17/23	76 (56, 96) 22/29 p=0.417*	93 (76, 99) 26/28 p=0.832*	92 (73, 99) 22/24 p>0.999*
Ultra	91 (79, 98) 42/46 p=0.016‡	76 (61, 87) 35/46 p=0.020‡	79 (66, 89) 42/53 p=0.114‡	90 (76, 97) 35/39 p=0.105‡	82 (57, 96) 14/17 p=0.244‡	72 (47, 90) 13/18 p=0.074‡	74 (49, 91) 14/19 p=0.217‡	81 (54, 96) 13/16 p=0.593‡	97 (82, 100) 28/29 p=0.022‡ p=0.099*	79 (59, 92) 22/28 p=0.127‡ p=0.622*	82 (65, 93) 28/34 p=0.311‡ p=0.455*	96 (78, 100) 22/23 p=0.076‡ p=0.145*
Δ if traces excluded	-1 (-17, 11) p=0.836§	+7 (-9, 24) p=0.400§	+5 (-11, 20) p=0.576§	0 (-13, 13) p>0.999§	-3 (-32, 24) p=0.791§	+14 (-12, 41) p=0.321§	+11 (-17, 39) p=0.463§	0 (-27, 27) p>0.999§	1 (-10, 10) p=0.937§	+3 (-18, 24) p=0.787§	+1 (-18, 19) p=0.917§	0 (-12, 12) p>0.999§

Δ if traces reclassified	-13 (-25, 1) p=0.014[§]	+9 (-2, 19) p=0.046[§]	+5 (-11, 20) p=0.576 [§]	-10 (-25, 5) p=0.196 [§]	-17 (-42, 6) p=0.083 [§]	+17 (-6, 39) p=0.083 [§]	+11 (-17, 39) p=0.462 [§]	-8 (-35, 18) p=0.542 [§]	-11 (-25, 4) p=0.083 [§]	+3 (-7, 14) p=0.317 [§]	+1 (-18, 19) p=0.917 [§]	-11 (-26, 5) p=0.219 [§]
---------------------------------	--	---	--------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	---------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

443 Missing data in the non-head-to-head table: Unclassifiable Ultra, n=1; non-actionable Ultras, n=4; HIV, n=2.

444 Within column p-values: [‡]Xpert vs. Ultra within an analysis (non-head-to-head, head-to-head) in patients of the same HIV status (overall, negative, positive).

445 Within row p-values: ^{*}HIV-negative vs. HIV-positive within an analysis (non-head-to-head, head-to-head).

446 Abbreviations: CI, confidence interval; CRS, composite reference standard; eMRS, extended microbiological reference standard; FNABs, fine needle aspirate biopsies; MRS,

447 microbiological reference standard; NPV, negative predictive value; PPV, positive predictive value; Ultra, Xpert MTB/RIF Ultra; Xpert, Xpert MTB/RIF

448 **Table 3:** Study and routine Ultra concordance in patients with both tests done on FNABs. More
 449 patients were positive by study Ultra (55%) compared to routine Ultra (35%), corresponding
 450 to a 20% incremental yield. Study Ultra had no non-actionable results (column not shown).

		Study Ultra		Total
		Positive	Negative	
Routine Ultra	Positive	10	1	11
	Negative	7	11	18
	Total	18	13	31
	Non-actionable	1	1	2
Δ Study Ultra vs. routine Ultra		+20% (95% confidence interval; CI: 0, 42) p=0.034		

451 Non-actionable Ultra results included 'Error' (n=1) and 'No result' (n=1).

452 Abbreviations: Ultra, Xpert MTB/RIF Ultra; FNABs, fine needle aspirate biopsies.

453 **Table 4:** Comparison of patient and microbiology characteristics by whether study Ultra was
 454 TP or FP per the MRS. FPs were less likely to have been placed on treatment, had less bacterial
 455 load, and were less likely to have been detected by routine Xpert and routine Ultra than TPs.
 456 Data are n (%) or median (IQR).

	Ultra TPs	Ultra FPs
Patient characteristics		
HIV-positive	31/51 (61)	13/22 (59) p=0.892
CD4 count (cells/ μ l)	147.0 (32.00-281.30) (n=30)	208.0 (101.3-286.0) (n=12) p=0.238
Previous TB	18/51 (35)	6/22 (27) p=0.503
‡Patients initiated on TB treatment after 12-week follow-up	44/48 (92)	6/22 (27) p<0.001
If on treatment, did the patient report improved health?	43/44 (98)	6/6 (100) p=0.709
Study Ultra result information		
<i>rpoB</i> C _{Tmin}	25.70 (20.20-28.20) (n=45)	25.70 (20.40-29.10) (n=9) p=0.878
IS6110/IS1081 C _T	19.00 (16.40-21.60) (n=51)	24.85 (19.88-28.15) (n=22) p<0.001
Trace semi-quantitation category	6/51 (12)	13/22 (59) p<0.001
SPC C _T	26.10 (25.10-28.60) (n=51)	25.05 (24.45-24.95) (n=22) p=0.005
Routine Xpert or routine Ultra information		
Positive Xpert	31/42 (74)	3/11 (27) p=0.004
Positive Ultra	7/7 (100)	3/10 (30) p=0.004

457 Missing data: CD4 count, n=2; patients who were lost to follow-up, n=3; unclassifiable routine Xpert results, n=3.
 458 True positive in routine Xpert era not done, n=1; True positive in routine Ultra era non-actionable, n=1; False
 459 positive in routine Ultra not done, n=1.

460 Abbreviations: FP, false-positive; IS6110/IS1081 C_T, cycle threshold value for the Xpert MTB/RIF Ultra
 461 IS6110/IS1081 probe; *rpoB* C_{Tmin}, minimum cycle threshold value from the Xpert MTB/RIF (Ultra) *rpoB* probes;

462 TP, true-positive; Ultra, Xpert MTB/RIF Ultra. [‡]Study Ultra results were not reported for potential patient
463 management.