Lessons learned from implementation of interferon-gamma release assay to screen for latent tuberculosis infection in a large multicenter observational cohort study in Brazil

Allyson G. Costa^{1,2,3,4}, Brenda K.S. Carvalho^{1,2}, Mariana Araújo-Pereira^{5,6,7}, Hiochelson 1 N.S. Ibiapina^{1,2}, Renata Spener-Gomes^{1,2}, Alexandra B. Souza^{1,2}, Adriano Gomes-Silva⁸, 2 Alice M.S. Andrade^{5,7}, Elisangela C. Silva^{10,11,12}, María B. Arriaga^{5,6,7}, Aline Benjamin⁸, 3 Michael S. Rocha^{7,9}, Adriana S.R. Moreira¹⁰, Jamile G. Oliveira¹³, Marina C. Figueiredo¹⁴, 4 Megan M. Turner¹⁴, Betina Durovni^{8,13}, Solange Cavalcante^{8,13}, Afranio L. Kritski¹⁰, Valeria 5 C. Rolla⁸, Timothy R. Sterling¹⁴, Bruno B. Andrade^{5,6,7}, Marcelo Cordeiro-Santos^{1,2,15*}, and 6 the RePORT Brazil Consortium 7 8 9 ¹Instituto de Pesquisa Clínica Carlos Borborema, Fundação de Medicina Tropical Doutor 10 Heitor Vieira Dourado, Manaus, Brazil; 11 ²Programa de Pós-Graduação em Medicina Tropical, Universidade do Estado do Amazonas, 12 Manaus, Brazil; 13 ³Escola de Enfermagem de Manaus, Universidade Federal do Amazonas, Manaus, Brazil; 14 ⁴Diretoria de Ensino e Pesquisa, Fundação Hospitalar de Hematologia e Hemoterapia do 15 Amazonas, Manaus, Brazil; ⁵Laboratório de Inflamação e Biomarcadores, Instituto Goncalo Moniz, Fundação Oswaldo 16 Cruz, Salvador, Brazil; 17 18 ⁶Faculdade de Medicina, Universidade Federal da Bahia, Salvador, Brazil: 19 ⁷Multinational Organization Network Sponsoring Translational and Epidemiological Research 20 (MONSTER) Initiative, Salvador, Brazil; ⁸Instituto Nacional de Infectologia Evandro Chagas, Fundação Oswaldo Cruz, Rio de Janeiro, 21 22 Brazil: ⁹Instituto Brasileiro para Investigação da Tuberculose, Fundação José Silveira, Salvador, 23 24 Brazil; ¹⁰Programa Acadêmico de Tuberculose, Faculdade de Medicina, Universidade Federal do 25 26 Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil; 27 ¹¹Centro de Biociências e Biotecnologia, Universidade Estadual do Norte Fluminense Darcy Ribeiro, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil; 28 29 ¹²Fundação Saúde do Estado do Rio de Janeiro, Secretaria Estadual de Saúde do Estado do Rio d Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil; 30 ¹³Secretaria Municipal de Saúde do Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil; 31 ¹⁴Division of Infectious Diseases, Department of Medicine, Vanderbilt University School of 32 33 Medicine, Nashville, Tennessee, USA; 34 ¹⁵Faculdade de Medicina, Universidade Nilton Lins, Manaus, Brazil.

- 36
- 37 * **Correspondente:** Marcelo Cordeiro-Santos marcelocordeiro@uea.edu.br.
- 38
- 39 Running Title: IGRA implementation for LTBI screening
- 40
- 41 Abstract

42 Background: Interferon-gamma release assay (IGRA) has emerged as a useful tool in 43 identifying latent tuberculosis infection (LTBI). This assay can be performed through testing 44 platforms, such as QuantiFERON-TB Gold Plus (QFT[®]-Plus). This in vitro test has been 45 incorporated by several guidelines worldwide and has recently been considered for the diagnosis of LTBI by the World Health Organization (WHO). The possibility of systematically 46 implementing IGRAs such as QFT[®]-Plus in centers that perform LTBI screening has been 47 48 accelerated by the decreased availability of tuberculin skin testing (TST) in several countries. 49 Nevertheless, the process to implement IGRA testing in routine clinical care has many gaps. 50 Methods: The study utilized the expertise acquired by the laboratory teams of the Regional 51 Prospective Observational Research in Tuberculosis (RePORT)-Brazil consortium during 52 study protocol implementation of LTBI screening of TB close contacts. Results: RePORT-53 Brazil includes clinical research sites from Brazilian cities and is the largest multicenter cohort 54 of TB close contacts to date in the country. Operational and logistical challenges faced during 55 IGRA implementation in all four study laboratories are described, as well as the solutions that 56 were developed and led to the successful establishment of IGRA testing in RePORT-Brazil. Conclusions: The problems identified and resolved in this study can assist laboratories 57 58 implementing IGRAs, in addition to manufacturers of IGRAs providing effective technical 59 support. This will facilitate the implementation of IGRA testing in countries with a high TB 60 burden, such as Brazil.

- 61 **Keywords:** Tuberculosis, IGRA, QuantiFERON-Plus, LTBI, Screening, Quality control.
- 62

63 Importance

The interferon-gamma release assay (IGRA) has emerged as a useful tool in identifying persons with latent tuberculosis infection (LTBI). Although the implementation of IGRAs is of utmost importance, to our knowledge, there is scarce information on identification of logistical and technical challenges of systematic screening of for LTBI on a large scale. Thus, the problems identified and resolved in this study can assist laboratories implementing IGRAs, in addition to manufacturers of IGRAs providing effective technical support. This will facilitate the implementation of IGRA testing in countries with a high TB burden, such as Brazil.

- 71
- 72

73 **1** Introduction

The World Health Organization (WHO) estimates that one quarter of the global population is infected with *M. tuberculosis* (Mtb) (1, 2). Most individuals exposed to Mtb who become infected are asymptomatic, referred to as latent tuberculosis infection (LTBI). Between 5 to 10% of individuals with LTBI, if not treated with tuberculosis preventive therapy (TPT), can progress to active tuberculosis (TB) during their lifetime (3, 4). Thus, diagnosis and treatment of LTBI is critical to reduce the incidence of active TB and control Mtb transmission.

81 In several countries endemic for TB, such as Brazil, screening for LTBI has traditionally 82 utilized the tuberculin skin test (TST), which consists in the intradermal inoculation of the TB-83 purified protein derivative (PPD) and evaluation for cutaneous induration. However, this test 84 has several limitations, such as false-positive reactions in persons with BCG vaccination or 85 infection with non-tuberculosis mycobacteria, and false-negative reactions in persons with 86 immune suppression (5, 6). Additional issues include the requirement for a return visit to 87 assess the skin for induration within 48-72 hours after PPD inoculation, and the subjective interpretation of the dermal reaction (i.e., inter-reader variability) (7, 8). Recent scientific 88 89 advances in molecular investigations allowed the isolation of Mtb-specific antigens that drive 90 production of interferon-gamma (IFN-y) by specific T-lymphocytes, enabling the development 91 of more specific assays based on cellular recall responses, to identify LTBI (9, 10).

92 The interferon-gamma release assay (IGRA) has emerged as a useful tool in 93 identifying persons with LTBI. This assay can be performed through two distinct testing platforms, such as the enzyme-linked immunosorbent spot (ELISPOT) assay (T-SPOT.TB) 94 or QuantiFERON-TB Gold Plus (QFT[®]-Plus). These in vitro tests have been incorporated into 95 96 several guidelines worldwide and have recently been considered equivalent for the diagnosis 97 of LTBI by the WHO (9, 10). Of note, both IGRA tests have advantages over TST in several 98 aspects, including: (i) they do not require a follow-up visit for obtaining results, and (ii) they use in vitro stimulation of cells from the peripheral blood with Mtb-derived ESAT-6 and CFP-99 100 10 proteins, which are absent in the BCG vaccine as well as in most non-TB mycobacteria, 101 resulting in a higher specificity (11–13). The advantages of the IGRA over the TST indicate 102 that this immunoassay may be a reliable alternative. On the other hand, the use of IGRA 103 results on high costs, the necessity to be carried out in sites using good clinical and laboratory 104 practices and well-trained technical personnel and available equipment's.

The advantages of the IGRA over the TST indicate that this immunoassay may be a reliable alternative to TST. The possibility of systematically implementing IGRAs such as QFT[®]-Plus in centers that perform LTBI screening has been accelerated by the decreased availability of TST in several countries, including Brazil (14). Implementation of QFT[®]-Plus in TB reference centers could facilitate screening, diagnosis, and treatment of LTBI, and thereby reduce the TB burden.

Although the implementation of IGRAs is of utmost importance, to our knowledge, there is scarce information on identification of logistical and technical challenges of systematic screening of for LTBI on a large scale. The present study was designed to fill this gap and provide information that would improve the effectiveness and efficiency of IGRA-based LTBI screening. The operational and logistical challenges faced during IGRA implementation in all

- 116 four study laboratories are also described, as well as the solutions that were developed and 117 which led to the successful establishment of IGRA testing in RePORT-Brazil.
- 118

119 **2** Material and Methods

120 **2.1** Study Design and Laboratory Sites

121 The present investigation was an implementation study performed within a multicenter 122 cohort study (RePORT-Brazil) between 2016 and 2019. It was conducted in five research 123 centers located in four Brazilian cities: Fundação de Medicina Tropical Dr. Heitor Vieira Dourado (FMT-HVD) in Manaus-Amazonas, Instituto Brasileiro para Investigação da 124 Tuberculose (IBIT) in Salvador-Bahia, Secretaria Municipal de Saúde de Duque de Caxias 125 126 (SMS-DC) in Duque de Caxias-Rio de Janeiro, Instituto Nacional de Infectologia Evandro 127 Chagas (INI) and Clínica da Família Rinaldo Delamare, Secretaria Municipal de Saúde do 128 Rio de Janeiro (SMS-RJ) both in Rio de Janeiro-Rio de janeiro (15). The five health centers 129 are located in 3 distinct regions of Brazil, with similar climate conditions (equatorial and 130 tropical), temperature and humidity, showing range 19.9°C to 26.4°C and 77.2 to 85.1%, 131 respectively. (16, 17).

132

133 **2.2** Maintenance and Biosafety of Laboratory Sites

134 Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs), Good Clinical Practice (GCP), Good Clinical 135 Laboratory Practices (GCLP) and other trainings were carried out by the project staff prior to 136 initiating the study. In addition, all sites provided up to date equipment maintenance 137 certifications to ensure test quality and to minimize risks for laboratory technicians who 138 processed biologicals daily.

139

140 2.3 QuantiFERON-TB Gold Plus (QFT®-Plus)

141 Initially QFT-TB Gold in Tube (QFT-GIT) was implemented into the laboratory routine of the RePORT-Brazil consortium, subsequently replaced by QFT[®]-Plus. Every laboratory 142 143 received training on sample collection and processing by the QIAGEN corporation 144 (Chatsworth, CA, USA). Supplementary Figure 1 summarizes QFT[®]-Plus steps. Briefly, venous blood for testing was collected in four tubes (Nil, TB1, TB2 and Mitogen) and 145 146 incubated at 37°C for 20h. After incubation, samples were stored at -20°C until the enzyme-147 linked immunosorbent assay (ELISA) was performed within 2 weeks. IFN-y levels 148 (international units per milliliter [IU/mL]) were quantified with a 4-point standard curve. QFT®-149 Plus Analysis Software was used to generate the results according to the manufacturer's 150 recommendations (18). The software performed a quality control assessment of the assay, 151 generated a standard curve, and provided quantitative (IU/mL) and qualitative (positive, 152 negative, or indeterminate) results.

154 **2.4** Laboratory data of the QFT[®]-Plus implementation process

155 Laboratory information from the QFT[®]-Plus implementation process was evaluated by 156 the teams from all RePORT-Brazil laboratories. Data were obtained from team training, equipment maintenance, and pre-analytical evaluations, such as: type of sample collection, 157 158 place of sample collection and processing, tube identification (ID), transport quality control 159 (types of transport, time and temperature of the samples), and presence of hemolysis, clots and volume of the samples, as well as qualitative results (number of positive, negative and 160 indeterminate tests). All data were entered into the Research Electronic Data Capture 161 (REDCap) platform, reviewed by data managers for quality control (QC), and subsequently 162 163 approved for the study analyses.

164

165 **2.5 Descriptive and Statistical Analysis**

166 Descriptive analyses were performed to characterize the study labs and quality control 167 measurements. Categorical variables were displayed as frequency and percentages and 168 compared using a two-sided Pearson's chi-square test (Yate's correction) or the Fisher's two-169 tailed test in 2x3 or 2x2 tables, respectively. Continuous variables were displayed as median 170 and interguartile ranges (IQR) and tested for Gaussian distribution using the D'Agostino-171 Pearson test. Comparisons of values between two groups of data were performed using the 172 Mann-Whitney U test. The Spearman rank correlation test was carried out to assess 173 relationships between variables. Data analyses were performed using R (version 3.6.3), using Hmisc (version 4.4.1), compare Groups (version 4.4.3), ggplot2 (version 3.3.2) and ggcorrplot 174 175 (version 0.1.3) R packages. All analyses were prespecified. Differences with p-value <0.05 176 were considered statistically significant.

177

178 **2.6 Ethical Approval**

179 The study was conducted according to the principles of the Declaration of Helsinki. 180 The RePORT-Brazil protocol was approved by the institutional review boards at each study 181 site and at Vanderbilt University Medical Center. In additional, the present study was 182 submitted to and approved by the Ethical Committee at Instituto de Pesquisa Clínica Evandro Chagas, Fundação Oswaldo Cruz (FIOCRUZ), under the protocol registration number 183 184 #688.067, Secretaria Municipal de Saude do Rio de Janeiro (SMS/RJ), under the protocol 185 registration number #740.554, Hospital Universitario Clementino Fraga Filho, under the 186 protocol registration number #852.519, Maternidade Climério de Oliveira (MCO), 187 Universidade Federal do Bahia (UFBA), under the protocol registration number #723.168 and 188 Fundação de Medicina Tropical Dr. Heitor Vieira Dourado (FMT-HVD), under the protocol 189 registration number #807.595. The patients, parents or legal guardians read and signed the 190 informed consent form prior to inclusion of the patients in the study. The study fulfills the 191 principles of the Helsinki declaration and the 466/2012 resolution of the Brazilian National 192 Health Council for research involving human participants.

193

194 3 Results

195 **3.1** Interferon-gamma release assay implementation

196 The IGRA/QFT[®]-Plus implementation process started with the checklist provided by 197 QIAGEN Corp. The four laboratories proceeded with the acquisition of equipment (micropipettes, 37°C incubator, centrifuge, refrigerator, freezer -20°C, microplate washer, 198 199 microplate reader and computer), reagents (ultrapure dH_2O and cleaning solutions), consumables (tips, microtubes and solution reservoir), QFT[®]-Plus Tube kit and QFT[®]-Plus 200 201 ELISA kit. Subsequently, laboratory technicians took GCLP and were trained on the steps of collecting, transporting, incubating, and processing samples for laboratory tests. In addition, 202 203 QFT[®]-Plus ELISA kit assays were performed, and a pilot test was carried out, with the 204 objective of including improvement strategies to initiate the study protocol (Figure 1).

205 During the IGRA implementation process, several gaps were identified, even after following all of the recommendations of the manufacturer of the QFT[®]-Plus assay. Initially, 206 the laboratories identified problems related to acquisition of equipment, reagents, and 207 208 consumables. The equipment had to be purchased through the sites, generating additional 209 costs. Furthermore, the microplate washer had problems at the beginning of the ELISA 210 assays, requiring corrective maintenance. QFT[®]-Plus Tube kits and QFT[®]-Plus ELISA kits 211 were imported, which generated logistical problems regarding delivery to the sites. To resolve this problem, delivery of the QFT[®]-Plus Tubes and ELISA kits were directed to one of the 212 213 clinical sites in Rio de Janeiro, which then distributed them to the other laboratories.

214

3.2 Interferon-gamma release assay under routine conditions

216 The five clinical sites started recruiting patients and collecting samples under routine 217 conditions. Prior to starting, the collecting station was organized, accounting for the environment and the tubes to be used in the QFT®-Plus test. These tubes had to be stored 218 219 between 4°C and 25°C and taken out for immediate use only. In addition, the tubes had to be 220 collected in a specific order, following the manufacturer's recommendations, with the Nil tube 221 being collected first, followed by the TB1, TB2 and Mitogen tubes. The tubes containing the 222 samples went through a homogenization process that consisted of several inversions, where 223 all the biological material had to come into contact with the inner surface of the tube (L-motion with exactly 10 inversions). Finally, QFT®-Plus Tubes was packed in boxes with temperatures 224 225 ranging from 17°C to 27°C for transfer to the processing laboratory (Figure 2).

226 After collection at the clinical sites, samples were transported to the four RePORT-227 Brazil laboratories in two different settings, clustered in: Setup A: pertaining to sites 1 and 2, 228 characterized by performing the collection and processing of samples in the same place, with 229 the collection room and laboratory within the same site. Thus, the study staff responsible for 230 collecting and organizing the samples could transport the samples to the laboratory, without 231 requiring a vehicle (bicycle, motorcycle or car) (Figure 2A); Setup B: pertaining to sites 3, 4 232 and 5, characterized by performing the collection and processing of samples in distinct places, 233 with the need for transportation to the laboratory and thus greater demand for time, 234 organization and attention so that there was no excessive tube vibration. This setup required 235 a vehicle (bicycle, motorcycle or car) to transport samples (Figure 2B).

Upon arrival at the labs, samples had to pass a quality check regarding transport time, temperature, tube ID, volume evaluation and the presence of hemolysis or clots. Finally, the samples were processed, incubated at 37°C for 20 hours, aliquots prepared, and the plasma samples frozen at -20°C until the QFT[®]-Plus ELISA was performed.

240

3.3 Interferon-gamma release assay results under routine conditions in two settings

242 Figure 3 summarizes the IGRA/QFT[®]-Plus results under routine conditions in Setup 243 A-B (Figure 3A) and sites 1-5 (Figure 3B) during the four-year study period (2016-2019). These results were obtained after the QFT[®]-Plus ELISA assays were performed by the teams 244 at the sites. For this, the aliquots containing the samples were thawed and used only once. 245 246 In addition to the recommendations indicated by the manufacturer, the laboratories underwent 247 guality control with the results validated by an external laboratory. Setup B had a higher 248 percentage of indeterminate results, mainly in the first years of implementation of QFT[®]-Plus. 249 In addition, the number of samples changed over time for each setup, as follows: 2016 (Setup 250 A = 190; Setup B = 173), 2017 (Setup A = 366; Setup B = 258), 2018 (Setup A = 505; Setup B = 471), 2019 (Setup A = 570; Setup B = 333). Also note that over the years of 251 252 implementation, the indeterminate percentage tended to decrease. This could be associated 253 with the learning process of site personnel. In addition, higher undetermined results were 254 observed in Setup A in 2018 and 2019, specifically at site 1, which could be attributed to a 255 greater number of tests performed in this setup and site.

256

257 **3.4** Non-conformities in Interferon-gamma release assay testing

During the QFT[®]-Plus implementation process, several problems were detected, generating non-conformities, such as samples without an ID, transport with temperature outside the established standard (temperature deviation), sample leakage, and other issues (e.g. transport box change, coagulated samples, or a non-standard set of transport conditions). The proportion of non-conformities is shown in **Figure 4**.

263 The temperature deviation and other non-conformities were noted particularly among 264 Setup B sites (**Supplementary Table 1**) compared to Setup A in all analyzed years (p<0.001). 265 These results were likely due to conditions related to the collection and transportation of samples, since Setup B required sample transport by vehicle. In addition, these gaps 266 267 generated learning opportunities for the teams, which over the years of implementation, 268 decreased the proportion of reported non-conformities. Of note, Setup B also presented 269 significantly higher occurrences of transport box change, coagulated samples, and lack of 270 minimum transport conditions, characterized in the table as "Others" (p<0.001, 271 Supplementary Table 1).

272

273 3.5 Temperature deviation was the main non-conformity in Interferon-gamma 274 release assays

Temperature deviation was the main non-conformity identified in our study. When the occurrence was observed over the quarters of the evaluated years, it occurred mainly in the months with the highest temperatures at the sites, such as spring and summer (3rd, 4th and 1st quarter; **Figure 5**). There was a decrease in this non-conformity over the years of the study period.

280

3.6 Dynamics of the time and temperature between collection and processing of Interferon-gamma release assay samples

The distance between the collection site and the sample processing laboratory directly influenced the time and the temperature variation during transportation (**Table 1**). Setup A showed a significantly shorter time between sending and receiving the samples in all studied years (p<0.001), influencing the temperature variation (delta), which was also significantly less in comparison to Setup B (p<0.001).

Setup A had higher temperature at the time of specimen shipment compared to Setup B, but both Setups had similar temperatures at the time of specimen receipt/arrival. (**Figure 6A, 6B**). Although within the established standard, Setup A had a significantly higher temperature at the time of both shipment and receipt. Despite this, the temperature variation (Δ) was significantly greater in Setup B (**Figure 6C**). This can also be seen when analyzing the data by site (**Supplementary Figure 2**).

Over the years of implementation, the variation in time between sending and receiving samples tended to decrease until 2018, then there was an increase in Δ in 2019. The decrease in time variation was possibly because study and transport became more efficient (collection, sending and processing) with the implementation of the test on the sites. Although we observed this increase in 2019, it is noteworthy that there was an increase in the number of samples analyzed that year.

Finally, a correlation analysis was performed between the Δ (variation of receiving sending) of time and temperature. In this analysis it was possible to note that the Δ° C was directly correlated with the Δ minutes (r = 0.37, p <0.001), and that this variation was particularly seen in Setup B (**Figure 7**).

304

305 **4** Discussion

306 In the IGRA implementation process, gaps were identified mainly in the pre-analytical 307 phase of the QFT[®]-Plus assay. The training of laboratory technicians without experience in sample collection, transporting and processing, with ELISA assays, was straight-forward and 308 309 the learning curve was quick, despite pre-analytical errors identified after the start of the study. Pre-analytical errors have important implications for the reproducibility and accuracy of 310 311 IGRAs, indicating the need to standardize the pre-analytical steps, as shown previously (19). 312 The sites standardized the preventive maintenance process of the equipment, to minimize 313 problems. The delivery of the QFT[®]-Plus Tubes and ELISA kits were directed to one of the 314 clinical sites, which then distributed them to the other laboratories, mitigating import and 315 logistic issues. The steps of collection, transport and processing of the samples started to be

monitored via Case Report Forms (CRFs). The lessons learned at this stage were important
 to create mechanisms for tracking non-conformities, It is noteworthy that the use of CRFs is
 indicated for monitoring non-conformities in clinical trials, however, they can also be used in
 routine laboratory conditions (20).

320 The sample collection, transport, and processing settings (Setup A and B) in the study influenced the results of the QFT[®]-Plus. Setup B had a higher percentage of indeterminate 321 322 and positive results, probably due to the longer time between the collection and processing 323 of the samples, in addition to other variables evaluated here (e.g., temperature of transport, 324 ID of the tubes, and packaging of the samples). It is important to ensure that, in the analytical 325 phase, the laboratory technicians involved in these steps are comfortable with performing 326 QFT[®]-Plus, including simple tasks such as controlling the temperature of the shipping boxes, 327 identifying non-conformities, minimizing errors, and identifying problems in the results 328 generated. It is recommended to include in the QFT[®]-Plus implementation planning a period 329 of adaptation and short retraining, directed at the critical stages of sample collection, transport 330 and processing, with the aim of gradually minimizing or eliminating non-conformities and pre-331 analytical errors. This learning can assist in the quality control of test results and performance, 332 since the reproducibility of IGRA can be influenced by these factors (21).

Biological samples can have different performance or results with respect to the quantity of analytes used and based on this, we must seek the identification of points that cause variation of test results. The laboratory routine can have different components that can cause variability in results, such as different processing rates, variation in processing rates throughout the month, and variation of factors related to the environment (such as temperature) throughout the year (22).

The reproducibility of the test results depends directly on the training of the team, since variation in the "operator" for the collection, homogenization and performance of the test can impact the result. Therefore, the standardization of quality control in the clinical and laboratory spheres is essential so that there are no significant effects on the result. In addition, structural variations between different laboratories can influence the proportion of indeterminate results (21, 23).

345 With regard to immunological molecules that can be released and consumed quickly 346 (in vitro), delays in the start of the incubation of study samples can interfere in the 347 guantification of IFN-y levels, leading to a decrease of up to 0.24 IU/mL after 6 hours (19, 21). Different incubation times, without a specific pattern, can possibly influence test results. 348 349 Therefore, it is important to follow the manufacturer's guidelines (21, 23). The required 350 quantity of final volume of biological sample must always be used, and it is not possible to 351 use volumes smaller or larger than that recommended for the test. Due to the amount of 352 "biological stimulus" available per tube, the amount of IFN-γ released at the end of the test 353 may be affected by variation in the sample volume used (21, 24, 25).

The expansion of the use of IGRAs, such as QFT[®]-Plus, must be well planned, with negotiations with the manufacturer regarding the logistics of delivery of the kits in areas with difficult access. In addition, the sample collection, transport, and processing settings must be evaluated, with the aim of mitigating errors that may interfere with the test results. Training of laboratory technicians is extremely important, and regular training develops a sense of responsibility towards reporting non-conformities and maintaining data quality after initial

implementation. Finally, we believe that some of the problems identified in this study can
 assist laboratories wishing to implement IGRAs, in addition to manufacturers of IGRAs
 providing effective technical support. These findings may facilitate the implementation of
 IGRA testing in countries with a high TB burden, such as Brazil.

364

365 **5** Conflict of Interest

The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

368

369 6 Author Contributions

AGC and MCS established the initial conception and wrote this manuscript. AGC, BKSC, MA-P, HNSI, RS-G, ABS, AG-S, AMSA, ECS, AB, MSR, ASRM, JG and, MCF collected, analyzed, and reviewed the data. AGC, BKSC, MA-P, MMT analyzed data and designed the illustrations and tables. MCF, BD, SC, ALK, VCR, TRS, BBA, MCS supervised the project development, interpreted the data, and reviewed this manuscript. All authors read, discussed the general outline of the article together and approved the final manuscript.

376

377 **7 Funding**

378 The study was supported by the Intramural Research Program of the Fundação 379 Oswaldo Cruz (B.B.A.), Intramural Research Program of the Fundação José Silveira (B.B.A., 380 M.S.R., B.M.F.N.), Departamento de Ciência e Tecnologia (DECIT) - Secretaria de Ciência e 381 Tecnologia (SCTIE) – Ministério da Saúde (MS), Brazil [25029.000507/2013-07 to V.C.R.] 382 and the National Institutes of Allergy and Infectious Diseases [U01-Al069923 to TRS, ABS, 383 GA, BMFN, ATLQ, MCF, MSR, AB, ASRM, JGO, VCR, BD, JRLS, ALK, SC, TRS, BBA, and 384 MCS]. MAP received a fellowship from Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de 385 Nível Superior (Finance code: 001). B.B.A, V.C.R. and A.K. are senior investigators whereas 386 A.B.S. is a PhD fellow from the Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Científico e Tecnológico (CNPq), Brazil. 387

388

3898Acknowledgments

The authors thank the study participants. We also thank the teams of clinical and laboratory platforms of RePORT-Brazil. A special thanks to Elze Leite (FIOCRUZ, Salvador, Brazil), Eduardo Gama (FIOCRUZ, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil), Elcimar Junior (FMT-HVD, Manaus, Brazil), and Hilary Vansell (VUMC, Nashville, USA) for administrative and logistical support.

9 Data Availability Statement

The original contributions presented in the study are included in the article/supplementary material, further inquiries can be directed to the corresponding author/s.

400

401 **10** Contributors: Participating Investigators in RePORT Brazil Consortium

The RePORT Brazil Consortium consists of 12 partner institutions from Brazil 402 403 represented by the following members: Amanda Araújo da Costa (A.A. Costa), Instituto de 404 Pesquisa Clínica Carlos Borborema, Fundação de Medicina Tropical Doutor Heitor Vieira 405 Dourado, Manaus, Brazil; André Luiz Bezerra (A.L. Bezerra), Faculdade de Medicina, 406 Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil; Anna Cristina Calcada Carvalho (A.C.C Carvalho), Faculdade de Medicina, Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro, 407 408 Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, Laboratório de Inovações em Terapias, Ensino e Bioprodutos, 409 Fundação Oswaldo Cruz, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil; Anna Karla Silveira (A.K. Silveira), 410 Faculdade de Medicina, Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil: 411 Betânia M. F. Nogueira (B.M.F. Nogueira), Instituto Brasileiro para Investigação da 412 Tuberculose, Fundação José Silveira, Salvador, Brazil, Multinational Organization Network 413 Sponsoring Translational and Epidemiological Research (MONSTER) Initiative, Salvador, 414 Brazil, Faculdade de Medicina, Universidade Federal da Bahia, Salvador, Brazil; Bruna da 415 Costa Oliveira Lima (B.C.O. Lima), Instituto de Pesquisa Clínica Carlos Borborema, 416 Fundação de Medicina Tropical Doutor Heitor Vieira Dourado, Manaus, Brazil; Bruna Pires 417 de Loiola (B.P. Loiola), Instituto de Pesquisa Clínica Carlos Borborema, Fundação de Medicina Tropical Doutor Heitor Vieira Dourado, Manaus, Brazil; Carolina Arana Schmaltz 418 419 Stanis (C.A. Schmaltz), Instituto Nacional de Infectologia Evandro Chagas, Fundação 420 Oswaldo Cruz, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil; Eline Naiane de Freitas Medeiros (E.N.F. Medeiros), Instituto de Pesquisa Clínica Carlos Borborema, Fundação de Medicina Tropical Doutor 421 Heitor Vieira Dourado, Manaus, Brazil; Francine Peixoto Ignácio (F.P. Ignácio), Instituto 422 423 Nacional de Infectologia Evandro Chagas, Fundação Oswaldo Cruz, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil: 424 Hayna Malta Santos (H.M. Santos), Faculdade de Medicina, Universidade Federal da Bahia, 425 Salvador, Brazil, Laboratório de Inflamação e Biomarcadores, Instituto Goncalo Moniz, 426 Fundação Oswaldo Cruz, Salvador, Brazil; Jéssica Rebouças Silva (J.R. Silva), Faculdade 427 de Medicina, Universidade Federal da Bahia, Salvador, Brazil, Laboratório de Inflamação e Biomarcadores, Instituto Gonçalo Moniz, Fundação Oswaldo Cruz, Salvador, Brazil; João 428 429 Marine Neto (J.M. Neto), Secretaria Municipal de Saúde do Rio de Janeiro - SMS-RJ - Rio 430 de Janeiro, Brazil, Hospital Federal do Andaraí - Ministério da Saúde, Brazil; Leandro Sousa Garcia (L.S. Garcia), Instituto de Pesquisa Clínica Carlos Borborema, Fundação de Medicina 431 Tropical Doutor Heitor Vieira Dourado, Manaus, Brazil; Maria Luciana Silva-Freitas (M.L. 432 433 Silva-Freitas). Laboratório Interdisciplinar de Pesquisas Médicas, Instituto Oswaldo Cruz. 434 FIOCRUZ, Rio de Janeiro, RJ; Mayla Gabriele Miranda de Melo (M.G.M. Melo), Faculdade 435 de Medicina, Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil: Rosa Maria 436 Placido-Pereira (R.S. Placido-Pereira), Laboratório Interdisciplinar de Pesquisas Médicas, 437 Instituto Oswaldo Cruz, FIOCRUZ, Rio de Janeiro, RJ: Samyra Almeida-Da-Silveira (S. 438 Almeida-Da-Silveira), Laboratório Interdisciplinar de Pesquisas Médicas, Instituto Oswaldo 439 Cruz, FIOCRUZ, Rio de Janeiro, RJ; Vanessa de Souza Nascimento (V.S. Nascimento), 440 Instituto Brasileiro para Investigação da Tuberculose, Fundação José Silveira, Salvador,

Brazil; 5. Multinational Organization Network Sponsoring Translational and Epidemiological
 Research (MONSTER) Initiative, Salvador, Brazil, Bahiana School of Medicine and Public

443 Health, Bahia Foundation for the Development of Sciences, Salvador, Brazil.

444

445 **11 Reference**

- World Health Organization (WHO). 2020. Global Tuberculosis Report 2020World
 Health Organization. Geneva.
- 448 2. Houben RMGJ, Dodd PJ. 2016. The Global Burden of Latent Tuberculosis Infection:
 449 A Re-estimation Using Mathematical Modelling. PLOS Med 13:e1002152.
- 450 3. WHO. 2020. WHO | Global tuberculosis report 2019World Health Organization.
- 451 4. Horsburgh CR. 2004. Priorities for the Treatment of Latent Tuberculosis Infection in
 452 the United States. N Engl J Med 350:2060–2067.
- 453 5. Farhat M, Greenaway C, Pai M, Menzies D. 2006. False-positive tuberculin skin tests:
 454 what is the absolute effect of BCG and non-tuberculous mycobacteria? Int J Tuberc
 455 Lung Dis 10:1192–204.
- 456 6. Morrison J, Pai M, Hopewell PC. 2008. Tuberculosis and latent tuberculosis infection
 457 in close contacts of people with pulmonary tuberculosis in low-income and middle458 income countries: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Lancet Infect Dis 8:359–68.
- 459 7. Secretaria de Vigilância em Saúde. Departamento de Vigilância das Doenças
 460 Transmissíveis. BM da S. 2014. Técnicas de Aplicação e Leitura da Prova
 461 Tuberculínica.
- 462 8. Brasil. 2019. Manual de recomendações para o Controle da Tuberculose no
 463 BrasilMinistério da Saúde.
- 464 9. Pai M, Behr M. 2016. Latent Mycobacterium tuberculosis Infection and Interferon465 Gamma Release Assays. Microbiol Spectr
 466 https://doi.org/10.1128/microbiolspec.tbtb2-0023-2016.
- 467 10. Lalvani A, Pareek M. 2010. Interferon gamma release assays: principles and practice.
 468 Enferm Infecc Microbiol Clin.
- 469 11. Andersen P, Munk ME, Pollock JM, Doherty TM. 2000. Specific immune-based
 470 diagnosis of tuberculosis. Lancet.
- Ferrara G, Losi M, Meacci M, Meccugni B, Piro R, Roversi P, Bergamini BM, D'Amico
 R, Marchegiano P, Rumpianesi F, Fabbri LM, Richeldi L. 2005. Routine hospital use
 of a new commercial whole blood interferon-γ assay for the diagnosis of tuberculosis
 infection. Am J Respir Crit Care Med https://doi.org/10.1164/rccm.200502-196OC.
- Theel ES, Hilgart H, Breen-Lyles M, McCoy K, Flury R, Breeher LE, Wilson J, Sia IG,
 Whitaker JA, Clain J, Aksamit TR, Escalantec P. 2018. Comparison of the
 QuantiFERON-TB gold plus and QuantiFERON-TB gold in-tube interferon gamma
 release assays in patients at risk for tuberculosis and in health care workers. J Clin
 Microbiol https://doi.org/10.1128/JCM.00614-18.
- 480 14. BRASIL M da S. 2018. Protocolo de vigilância da infecção latente pelo

- 481 Mycobacterium tuberculosis no BrasilMinistério da Saúde.
- 482 15. Arriaga MB, Amorim G, Queiroz ATL, Rodrigues MMS, Araújo-Pereira M, Nogueira
 483 BMF, Souza AB, Rocha MS, Benjamin A, Moreira ASR, de Oliveira JG, Figueiredo
 484 MC, Turner MM, Alves K, Durovni B, Lapa-e-Silva JR, Kritski AL, Cavalcante S, Rolla
 485 VC, Cordeiro-Santos M, Sterling TR, Andrade BB. 2021. Novel stepwise approach to
 486 assess representativeness of a large multicenter observational cohort of tuberculosis
 487 patients: The example of RePORT Brazil. Int J Infect Dis 103:110–118.
- 488 16. IBGE IB de GE. 2021. Mapa do clima no Brasil.
- 489 17. (CDI) CDI. 2021. Dados do clima no Brasil.
- 490 18. QIAGEN. QuantiFERON-TB Gold Plus (QFT-plus) ELISA package insert.
 491 Germantown, USA. 2017. Available at: https://www.quantiferon.com/wp492 content/uploads/2017/10/QFT-plus-ELISA-IFU- L1095849-R02.pdf Accessed on
 493 08/03/2019.
- 494 19. Doberne D, Gaur RL, Banaei N. 2011. Preanalytical Delay Reduces Sensitivity of
 495 QuantiFERON-TB Gold In-Tube Assay for Detection of Latent Tuberculosis Infection.
 496 J Clin Microbiol 49:3061–3064.
- 497 20. Gliklich RE, Dreyer NA, Leavy MB. 2014. Registries for Evaluating Patient Outcomes:
 498 A User's GuideInterfacing Registries with Electronic Health Records, 3rd ed. Agency
 499 for Healthcare Research and Quality.
- Tagmouti S, Slater M, Benedetti A, Kik S V., Banaei N, Cattamanchi A, Metcalfe J,
 Dowdy D, Van Smit RZ, Dendukuri N, Pai M, Denkinger C. 2014. Reproducibility of
 interferon gamma (IFN-γ) release assays a systematic review. Ann Am Thorac Soc
 11:1267–1276.
- 504 22. FRASER CG. 2001. Biological variation: from principles to practice. Washington, DC.
- Whitworth WC, Hamilton LR, Goodwin DJ, Barrera C, West KB, Racster L, Daniels
 LJ, Chuke SO, Campbell BH, Bohanon J, Jaffar AT, Drane W, Maserang D, Mazurek
 GH. 2012. Within-Subject Interlaboratory Variability of QuantiFERON-TB Gold InTube Tests. PLoS One https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0043790.
- 509 24. G. H. Mazurek, W. C. Whitworth DJG. 2012. Affect Of Blood Collection Time On
 510 Quantiferon®-Tb Gold In-Tube Test VariabilityIMMUNODIAGNOSTICS FOR LATENT
 511 TUBERCULOSIS INFECTION AND TUBERCULOSIS.
- 512 25. Gaur RL, Pai M, Banaei N. 2013. Impact of blood volume, tube shaking, and
 513 incubation time on reproducibility of Quantiferon-TB gold in-tube assay. J Clin
 514 Microbiol 51:3521–3526.
- 515
- 516

517 **12 Table and figures Caption**

Figure 1: Description of implementation of IGRA/QFT®-Plus in the study. The first step was to check if all equipment and reagents were available and in good condition. Then, the team was trained to perform the test following Good Clinical Laboratory Practices and according to the manufacturer's recommendations.

Figure 2: Two different conditions for IGRA/QFT[®]-Plus sample collection and processing in the study. A) Setup A: utilized by Sites 1 and 2 and characterized by performing the collection and processing of samples in the same place, without a vehicle. B) Setup B: utilized by Sites 3, 4 and 5, characterized by performing the collection and processing of samples in distinct places, and transportation of the samples by vehicle.

527 **Figure 3: Frequencies of IGRA/QFT®-Plus results in each Setup and Site stratified by** 528 **year of the study.** A) The sites are grouped by Setup A (purple rectangles, site 1 and 2) and 520 Setup B (group regtangles, site 2, 4 and 5). B) Begulta stratified by site

529 Setup B (green rectangles, site 3, 4 and 5). B) Results stratified by site.

Figure 4: Frequencies of conformities and non-conformities of samples in each Setup and Site stratified by year of the study. A) The sites are grouped by Setup A (purple rectangles, site 1 and 2) and Setup B (green rectangles, site 3, 4 and 5). B) Results stratified by site.

- **Figure 5: Number of occurrences of the non-conformity "Temperature deviation" in each Setup and Site stratified by year in period of study.** A) The sites are grouped by Setup A (purple rectangles, site 1 and 2) and Setup B (green rectangles, site 3, 4 and 5). B) Results stratified by site. Color of circles indicates the year of non-conformity register and the size is proportional to the number of occurrences.
- 539 Figure 6: Dynamics of the temperature at the time of shipment and receipt of study 540 samples, and the delta temperature variation over time in each Setup stratified by trimester and year during the study period. A) Average Temperature (°C) of sending 541 542 samples calculated by trimester and year in each setup. B) Average Temperature (°C) of 543 receiving samples calculated by trimester and year in each setup. C) The difference between receiving and sending temperature (Δ) was calculated for each trimester and year in each 544 545 setup. Purple lines indicate Setup A and green lines indicate Setup B. The light green block 546 indicates the limit accepted by the IGRA test manufacturer as acceptable for the storage and 547 handling of the samples (17-27°C).

548 **Figure 7: Correlation between delta temperature variation and delta time variation of** 549 **study.** Purple dots indicate Setup A and green dots indicate Setup B.

550

Table 1: Time and temperature quality control measurements by year in period of study. 551 552 *Setup A: contains Site 1 and 2, characterized by performing the collection and processing of samples in the same place. Setup B: contains Site 3, 4 and 5. It is characterized by performing 553 554 the collection and processing of samples in distinct place; [#]Data were compared between the 555 setups using the Mann-Whitney U test. Bold and italic font indicates statistical significance. 556 \pm The number of samples changes overtime for each Setup, as follow: 2016 (A = 190; B = 557 173), 2017 (A = 366; B = 258), 2018 (A = 505; B = 471), 2019 (A = 570; B = 333). [£]Data are 558 shown as median and interguartile range (IQR).

Parameters	Year	Setup A [*]	Setup B	p-value [#]
Time between sending vs receiving, median [IQR] [£]	2016 [¥]	55.8 [20.1-75.1]	140.0 [102.0-176.0]	< 0.001
	2017	58.7 [22.2-82.8]	121.0 [83.5-155.0]	< 0.001
	2018	61.8 [25.1-90.1]	89.0 [29.0-164.0]	< 0.001
	2019	49.5 [20.1-66.1]	135.0 [96.0-171.0]	< 0.001
Temperature °C (sending samples), median [IQR]	2016	19.6 [18.1-21.2]	17.8 [16.0-19.1]	< 0.001
	2017	21.9 [19.6-24.1]	18.0 [16.0-19.5]	< 0.001
	2018	21.5 [19.3-23.8]	18.3 [16.8-19.8]	< 0.001
	2019	20.6 [19.0-22.2]	18.1 [16.6-19.2]	< 0.001
Temperature °C (receiving samples), median [IQR]	2016	20.1 [18.8-21.4]	[17.9-21.6]	< 0.001
	2017	[20.6-24.1] 21.0	[19.5-22.9]	< 0.001
	2018	[20.0-23.9] 20.7	[18.6-22.9] 20.5	< 0.001
	2019	[19.5-22.1] 0.54	[18.9-22.6] 1.82	< 0.001
Delta Temperature °C (receiving x sending, median [IQR]	2016	[0.0-0.8]	[0.0-3.7]	< 0.001
	2017	[0.0-0.1]	[1.2-4.1] 2.06	< 0.001
	2018	[0.0-0.4]	[0.9-4.1] 2 35	< 0.001
	2019	[0.0-0.2]	[1.1-4.3]	< 0.001

Table 1: Time and temperature quality control measurements by year in period of study.

*Setup A: contains Site 1 and 2, characterized by performing the collection and processing of samples in the same place. Setup B: contains Site 3, 4 and 5. It is characterized by performing the collection and processing of samples in distinct place; [#]Data were compared between the setups using the Mann-Whitney U test. Bold and italic font indicates statistical significance. [¥]The number of samples changes overtime for each Setup, as follow: 2016 (A = 190; B = 173), 2017 (A = 366; B = 258), 2018 (A = 505; B = 471), 2019 (A = 570; B = 333). [£]Data are shown as median and interquartile range (IQR).









Setup B





Setup A

Setup B





