medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.12.27.22283924; this version posted January 11, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

# Performance of microbiological tests for tuberculosis diagnostic according to the type of respiratory specimen: a 10-year retrospective study

- 3
- 4 Short title:
- 5 Diagnostic tests for pulmonary tuberculosis
- 6
- 7 Authors
- 8 Marc-Olivier Boldi<sup>1</sup>, Justin Denis-Lessard<sup>1</sup>, Rina Neziri<sup>1</sup>, René Brouillet<sup>2</sup>, Christophe von-
- 9 Garnier<sup>3</sup>, Valérie Chavez<sup>1</sup>, Jesica Mazza-Stalder<sup>3</sup>, Katia Jaton<sup>2</sup>, Gilbert Greub<sup>2,4</sup>, Onya Opota<sup>2</sup>
- 10 11

## 12 Affiliations

- 13 (1) Faculty of Business and Economics, University of Lausanne, Switzerland.
- 14 (2) Institute of Microbiology, Lausanne University and University Hospital of Lausanne,
- 15 Lausanne, Switzerland.
- 16 (3) Pulmonary Division, Lausanne University Hospital, University of Lausanne, Lausanne,17 Switzerland.
- 18 (4) Infectious Diseases Service, Lausanne University and University Hospital of Lausanne,
- 19 Lausanne, Switzerland.
- 20
- 21 Corresponding author: Onya Opota, onya.opota@chuv.ch
- 22
- 23 Key words:
- 24 Tuberculosis, microscopy, PCR, mycobacterial culture, bronchoalveolar lavage, bronchial
- aspirate, sputum, induced-sputum, acid-fast bacilli (AFB).
- 26

### Abstract 27

### **Background:** 28

The microbial diagnosis of tuberculosis (TB) remains challenging and relies on multiple 29 30 microbiological tests performed on different clinical specimens. Polymerase chain reactions

- 31 (PCRs), introduced in the last decades has had a significant impact on the diagnosis of TB.
- 32 However, questions remain about the use of PCRs in combination with conventional tests for
- 33 TB, namely microscopy and culture. We aimed to determine the performance of microscopy,
- culture and PCR for the diagnosis of pulmonary tuberculosis according to the type of clinical 34
- specimen in order to improve the diagnostic yield and to avoid unnecessary, time and labor-35
- 36 intensive tests.

### Methods: 37

- We conducted a retrospective study (2008-2018) on analysis (34'429 specimens, 14'358 38
- 39 patients) performed in our diagnostic laboratory located in the Lausanne University Hospital to
- 40 compare the performance of microbiological tests on sputum, induced sputum, bronchial
- 41 aspirate and bronchoalveolar lavage (BAL). We analysed the performance using a classical
- "per specimen" approach and a "per patient" approach for paired specimens collected from the 42
- 43 same patient.

### 44 **Results:**

- The overall sensitivities of microscopy, PCR and culture were 0.523 (0.489, 0.557), 0.798 45 (0.755, 0.836) and 0.988 (0.978, 0.994) and the specificity were 0.994 (0.993, 0.995), 1 (0.999, 46
- 47 1) and 1 (1, 1). Microscopy displayed no significant differences in sensitivity according to the
- 48 type of sample. The sensitivities of PCR for sputum, induced sputum, bronchial aspirate and
- 49 BAL were, 0.821 (0.762, 0.871), 0.643 (0.480, 0.784), 0.837 (0.748, 0.904) and 0.759 (0.624,
- 0.865) respectively and the sensitivity of culture were, 0.993 (0.981, 0.998), 0.980 (0.931, 50
- 0.998), 0.965 (0.919, 0.988), and 1 (0.961, 1) respectively. Pairwise comparison of specimens 51
- 52 collected from the same patient reported a significantly higher sensitivity of PCR on bronchial
- aspirate over BAL (p < 0.001) and sputum (p < 0.05) and a significantly higher sensitivity of 53
- 54 culture on bronchial aspirate over BAL (p < 0.0001).

### 55 Conclusions:

- 56 PCR displayed a higher sensitivity and specificity than microscopy for all respiratory specimens.
- a rational for a smear-independent PCR-based approach to initiate tuberculosis microbial 57 diagnostic. The diagnosis yield of bronchial aspirate was higher than BAL. Therefore, PCR 58
- 59 should be systematically performed also on bronchial aspirates when available.

### **1. Introduction** 60

61 With over ten million new cases in 2020 and about 1,5 million deaths, tuberculosis represents a major public health concern [1]. Rapid and reliable diagnosis is important to reduce morbidity 62 63 and mortality associated with tuberculosis and to control transmission. When tuberculosis is 64 suspected based on clinical symptoms, epidemiological information and radiological findings, microbial confirmation is key to establish the diagnosis. Despite progress during the last 65 decades, the microbiological diagnosis of tuberculosis continues to be a challenge particularly 66 in paucibacillary disease. Historically, the diagnosis of tuberculosis was based on microscopy 67

and culture. Mycobacterial culture represents the reference method due to a low limit of 68 69 detection (< 10 organisms for liquid cultures) and because it gives access to the strain for 70 phenotypic antibiotic susceptibility test [1,2]. However, culture is challenging due to the slow 71 growth of *M. tuberculosis* and because it requires biosafety level three (BSL3) laboratories [3.4]. 72 Microscopy based on the visualization of acid-fast bacilli provides rapid results (<30 minutes) 73 but has a limited sensitivity and specificity (limit of detection between  $10^3$  and  $10^4$  bacilli per ml) 74 [5]. In order to increase their sensitivity, these tests may need to be repeated over several 75 clinical specimen [1,6,7].

76 More recently, molecular diagnosis, in particular polymerase chain reaction (PCR) have 77 improved the diagnosis of tuberculosis with a limit of detection between 10 and 10<sup>3</sup> colony 78 forming units per ml and a turnaround time between two to six hours [2,6,8,9]. PCR was initially 79 available in laboratories specialized in molecular diagnostics, through methods developed in-80 house assays [10,11]. Commercial all-inclusive systems, such as the GeneXpert system, now 81 allow a greater number of laboratories to perform this analysis independently of a specialized infrastructure [6,8,9,12]. The GeneXpert system not only improved the initial diagnostic of 82 83 tuberculosis but can be used to assess patient's infectious potential, on the basis of the semi-84 quantitative results [2,5,8]. In addition, rapid molecular test also shortens airborne isolation for 85 hospitalized patients with presumptive tuberculosis [13]

86 More than 70% of the tuberculosis infections are pulmonary tuberculosis, for which 87 sputum is the usual specimen collected in adults and older children who are able to collaborate. 88 Other respiratory specimens can be considered when patients are not able to provide sputum 89 or to increase microbial diagnostic yield [10]. This includes induced sputum, obtained by nebulization of sterile hypertonic saline (3% or 7% saline solution inhaled) followed by coughing and 90 91 expectoration of airway secretions, bronchial aspirate, and bronchoalveolar lavages [14,15].

92 In this study, we aimed to assess the performance of the different tests for the microbial 93 diagnostic of tuberculosis according to the type of clinical specimen. Providing robust updated 94 data may enable to choose optimal combination of test and specimen to: i) reach the maximum 95 sensitivity, specificity and negative and predicative value, ii) prioritize the tests and specimens 96 in the situation of limited resources or shortage of material and iii) reduce unnecessary costs.

97 There is no standard method to address the performance of diagnostic tests, particularly 98 for tuberculosis where several microbiological tests on multiple clinical samples are frequently 99 required. We applied data analytics methods that integrate multiple parameters, including, the 100 type of microbiological test, the type of specimens, the sampling period, and the patients. In 101 this study, we performed both a classical "per specimen" method to determine the performance 102 of each diagnostic test and a "per patient" approach comparing paired specimens collected 103 from the same patient.

104 This study provides data to establish diagnostic stewardship guidelines and diagnostic 105 protocols. These data will help to establish more effective strategies to diagnose pulmonary tuberculosis in order to increase the rate of documentation, to accelerate the diagnosis and 106 107 avoid unnecessary testing. In addition, it should provide analytical strategies that may also be 108 suitable to study other infectious diseases while keeping associated medical, social and 109 economic costs to a strict minimum.

### 110

### 2. Material and Methods 111

### 2.1 Study Design and data 112

Our laboratory is located in the Lausanne University Hospital (CHUV), a 1'500 beds tertiary-113 114 care hospital in a low-tuberculosis-prevalence country (Switzerland), with approximately six new cases per year per 100.000 population (Federal Office of Public Health: 115 116 http://www.bag.admin.ch/). The data included microbiology analyses for patients with suspected mycobacterial infection from 2008 to 2018. They were automatically extracted from 117 118 the Laboratory Information System (MOLIS, CGM).

- For all specimens, information regarding the microbial diagnostic of mycobacteria were 119 120 extracted. This included information regarding microscopy, PCR, cultures, molecular and phenotypic resistance genes together with the type of specimen and the date of collection. Each 121 122 specimen was given a unique coded number. Similarly, each patient was given a unique coded number. The database was generated to allow analysis by date of sampling and by patients 123 124 (see Section 2.4). For the microbial diagnostic of the disease, we generated a composite gold standard including microbiological findings and epidemiological and clinical data (see Section 125 126 2.3). The final database included 34'429 specimens corresponding to 14'358 patients, including 127 8'587 sputum, 2'257 induced sputum, 8'610 bronchial aspirate and 4'576 BAL.
- 128

### 2.2 Clinical specimens and mycobacterial diagnostic test 129

130 This study focuses on three microbial diagnostic tests commonly used for the diagnostic of 131 mycobacterial infections, namely (i) microscopy (also named smear microscopy) for the direct detection of acid-fast bacilli (AFB) in clinical specimen, (ii) PCR for the detection of DNA of M. 132 133 tuberculosis complex directly from clinical specimen and (iii) mycobacterial culture. Microscopy 134 consists in acid-fast bacillus staining achieved through a fluorescent auramine-thiazine red 135 staining on a heat-fixed smear as described in [8]. PCR consisted of either an in-house TagMan PCR targeting the multicopy *M. tuberculosis* IS6110 sequence, named PCR "MYTU" [11] or 136 137 using the all-inclusive rapid molecular test Xpert MTB/RIF and Xpert MTB/RIF Ultra (herafter 138 named Xpert) (Cepheid, Ca, USA) [6,8,16]. Mycobacterial culture was achieved using 139 mycobacterial growth indicator tube (MGIT) that consists in culture tubes containing tris 4, 7-140 diphenyl-1, 10-phenonthroline ruthenium chloride pentahydrate, an oxygen-guenched 141 fluorochrome embedded in silicone at their bottom. Utilization of free oxygen for growing 142 bacteria alleviates the fluorochrome guenching, resulting in fluorescence within the tube that 143 can be visualized under UV light, as explained in a previous publication [8].

144 All the microbial analyses were performed on the same sample after splitting it for AFB staining. 145 Xpert analysis and mycobacterial culture [8]. Sputum, induced sputum, bronchial aspirate and bronchoalveolar lavage were processed as previously described [8]. In particular, samples with 146 147 a volume exceeding 3 mL were concentrated by centrifugation (30 minutes, 3000 q). In addition, 148 to increase the homogeneity of the sample before smear preparation, purulent sputum or 149 bronchial aspirates were solubilized with the mucolytic agent N-acetyl-L-cysteine (2% v/v pH 150 6.8) [8].

### 151

### 2.3 Composite gold standard 152

153 Mycobacterial culture is the gold standard for the diagnosis of *M. tuberculosis* because of its lowest limit of detection (LOD < 10 organisms). However, it can be impaired by situation that 154 affect mycobacterial growth such as the introduction of an antibiotic treatment before sampling 155 [2]. We therefore used a composite gold standard based on microbiological results and clinical 156 data. Discrepant results in the diagnostic of active tuberculosis, especially specimen with 157 158 positive MTBC PCR and negative culture for *M. tuberculosis* complex, were manually cured 159 based on clinical and epidemiological data found in medical records. Specimens for which the 160 culture was contaminated by bacteria of the flora were excluded. Specimens with culture 161 positive with nontuberculous mycobacteria qualified as "MOTT" (Mycobacteria other than 162 tuberculosis) were considered negative for *M. tuberculosis*. This resulted in the "Gold Standard" 163 (GS) reference.

164

### 2.4 Performance of the test depending on the clinical specimens 165

We used two different approaches to determine the performance of microbiological tests 166 depending on the clinical specimens. We first used a common "per specimen" approach to 167 determine the global performance of microscopy, PCR, and culture according to the four types 168 of specimens and independently of the patient using the GS as reference. Then, in order to 169 provide more robust data we performed a "per patient" approach. It consists in pairwise 170 171 comparison for specimens collected the same day or during a window of 72 hours for the same 172 patient; indeed, samples from the same patient might not be collected the same day. For each 173 patient, the first sample was paired to the following sample if it was of a different type and within 174 a 72-hour window. All the combinations of the four types of specimens were analyzed using 175 this pairwise approach i) to measure the dependence between each pair of types of specimens 176 and ii) to calculate the performance of one sample type to predict a positive of any of the two 177 sample types.

178

### 179 2.5 Statistics

The performance measures consist in accuracy, sensitivity, specificity, positive and negative 180 predictive values. They were computed using GS as reference. Their respective 95% 181 confidence intervals were computed using the Clopper–Pearson method. The comparisons of 182 proportions were assessed with a two-sided proportion test with Yates' continuity correction. 183 184 The dependence between pairs of types of specimens for the "per patient" approach is 185 measured by the Cohen's Kappa.

186

### 2.6 Ethics committee approval 187

188 This study was approved by the relevant ethics committee, the Commission Cantonale d'Éthique de la Recherche sur l'Être Humain (CER-2020-00136). 189

### 3. Results 191

### 3.1 Global performance of microscopy, PCR and culture for the 192 diagnostic of pulmonary tuberculosis. 193

194 We first determined the global performance of microscopy. The sensitivity, 0.523 (0.489 -195 0.557) and the PPV, 0.767 (0.730, 0.800) of microscopy were limited. The specificity, 0.994 196 (0.993, 0.995), and the NPV 0.982 (0.981, 0.984) were high but must be interpreted according to the low prevalence of microscopy positive specimen 0.036 (0.034, 0.038) (Table 1 and Table 197 198 S1).

- Regarding PCR, we first estimated the individual performance of the in-house TaqMan PCR 199 200 and the rapid molecular test Xpert. The sensitivity of the in-house TagMan PCR, 0.799 (0.743, 0.848) and Xpert 0.812 (0.760, 0.858) were not significantly different (Table S2 and Table S3). 201 202 The specificity for both the in-house TagMan PCR >0.999 (0.999, 1) and Xpert 0.999 (0.997,
- 203 1) were both very high. The NPV were also high but probably increased by the low prevalence 204 of PCR positive specimen (Table S7). Because the two PCR tests displayed similar 205 performance, we considered them as equal for the rest of the study and grouped them as 206 "PCR". The global performance of PCR were: sensitivity 0.798 (0.755, 0.836), specificity 1 207 (0.999, 1), PPV 0.997 (0.983, 1) and NPV 0.988 (0.985, 0.990) (Table 2 and S2).
- The culture displayed the highest performance for the diagnostic of tuberculosis using the GS 208 209 reference with a sensitivity of 0.988 (0.978, 0.994) and a specificity of 1 (1, 1) (Table 3 and 210 Table S3). In summary when considering all the clinical specimen, microscopy displays limited 211 sensitivity, PCR displays a higher sensitivity than microscopy and an excellent specificity and 212 culture displayed the highest sensitivity and specificity.
- 213

### 3.3 Performance of microbiological tests according to the type of 214 specimen using a "per sample" approach or using "per patient" 215 216 pairwise comparisons.

217 We next measured the dependence between the specimens using the "per patient" approach and the Cohen's kappa. Though the Cohen's kappa is itself difficult to interpret and the 218 219 confidence intervals shown in the table were not corrected for multiple comparisons, a large 220 value of kappa means that the two sample bring the same information to some extent and thus 221 provides little "complementary" information and are so-called "supllementary", i.e not really 222 needed. Conversely, a kappa close to zero means that the two sample are "complementary". 223 The results are shown in Table S8, S9, S10 and S11. The data suggested that for each 224 technique, microscopy, PCR, and culture, most samples are supplementary (i.e. not all 225 needed), except i) for microscopy, induced sputum versus bronchial aspirate and BAL, ii) for PCR, sputum versus induced sputum and iii) for the culture, induced sputum versus BAL. 226 227 Because of their low robustness, we do not want to over interpret these results by concluding 228 that the so-called "supplementary" tests don't need to be performed, but this question has to 229 be tackled in additional work since it is however to our knowledge the first study showing such 230 high dependence & redundancy of the various tests.

231

## 232 3.4 Performance of microscopy according to the type of respiratory

### specimen. 233

234 Using the classical "per specimen" approach-the sensitivities of microscopy for all specimen, 235 sputum, induced sputum, bronchial aspirate and BAL were 0.523 (0.489, 0.557), 0.605 (0.562, 236 0.647), 0.362 (0.265, 0.467), 0.362 (0.283, 0.447) and 0.462 (0.356, 0.569) respectively. The 237 sensitivity of sputum was higher than induced sputum (p-value < 0.0001) and bronchial aspirate 238 (p-value < 0.0001) (Table 4 and S4). However, using the "per patient" comparison approach, 239 for paired specimens collected within a window of 72h for the same patient, no significant 240 difference was observed for the various specimens (Table 4,S4 and S9). Altogether, these data 241 suggested a limited benefit of microscopy for tuberculosis microbial diagnosis in a low 242 prevalence setting.

243 244

## 3.5 Performance of PCR according to the type of respiratory 245

- 246 specimen.
- 247 Using the classical "per specimen" approach-the sensitivities of PCR for all specimen, sputum, 248 induced sputum, bronchial aspirate and BAL were 0.798 (0.755, 0.836), 0.821 (0.762, 0.871), 249 0.643 (0.480, 0.784), 0.837 (0.748, 0.904) and 0.759 (0.624, 0.865) respectively. Using the "per 250 patient" pairwise comparison approach, no significant difference in sensitivity was seen 251 between sputum and induced sputum. Using this approach, we found that the sensitivity of 252 bronchial aspirate, was significantly higher than BAL with respectively 0.974 (0.865, 0.999) and 253 0.564 (0.396, 0.722) (p. value 0.0003). The sensitivity of bronchial aspirate was also higher 254 than sputum with respectively 1 (0.753, 1) versus 0.385 (0.139, 0.684) (p-value = 0.017) (Table 255 5,S5 and S10).
- 256 These data suggest, no significant difference in the sensitivity of PCR between sputum and 257 induced sputum when the patient can produce spontaneous sputum. In contrast, bronchial 258 aspirate displays higher sensitivity than sputum and BAL. PCR displayed a high specificity for 259 all the respiratory specimens.
- 260

### 3.6 Performance of culture according to the type of respiratory 261 262 specimen.

263 Using the classical "per specimen" approach-the sensitivity of culture when considering all 264 respiratory specimen was 0.988 (0.978, 0.994). The sensitivities of culture for sputum, induced 265 sputum, bronchial aspirate and BAL were 0.993 (0.981, 0.998), 0.980 (0.931, 0.998), 0.965 (0.919, 0.988), and 1 (0.961, 1). 266

Using the "per patient" comparison of paired specimens, no significant difference in sensitivity 267 268 was seen between the different respiratory specimens expect a superiority of bronchial aspirate 269 over BAL, 0.970 (0.914, 0.994) versus 0.636 (0.538, 0.731) (p. value < 0.0001) (Table 6,S6 and S11). 270

271

### **Discussion** 4. 272

273 The microbial diagnosis of tuberculosis is based on a combination of different microbiological 274 tests that can be performed on different types of clinical samples. We aimed to identify the 275 most efficient tests and specimen in order to guarantee an ideal sensitivity and specificity and to limit the use of unnecessary tests. 276

277 278

### Smear independent diagnostic of tuberculosis 279

280 Our results confirm a limited sensitivity of smear microscopy (0.523). The specificity (0.994) remains high, probably because of the extremely low prevalence (0.036) of positive 281 282 microscopy. Our data suggest a higher sensitivity of microscopy on sputum over the three other samples. This is probably a bias because patients for whom the microbiological 283 284 diagnosis is not made on spontaneous sputum and who therefore need induced sputum or bronchial aspiration and BAL are patients with paucibacillary infections as previously reported 285 286 by Cadena et al [17]. Using a pairwise comparison method to avoid the patient effect, we do not see any significant difference in sensitivity of microscopy between the various clinical 287 288 specimens. With a time to result lower than 30 minutes, microscopy remains virtually the fastest diagnostic test. However, its sensitivity and specificity is limited and it requires a lot of 289 290 work by specialized personnel and the performance of this test may vary depending on the 291 experience of the examiner [8,18]. In a region with a low prevalence of tuberculosis, the 292 question arises of the usefulness of this test. In 2016, we introduced in our laboratory a smear-293 independent algorithm for the diagnostic of tuberculosis [8]. For all the suspicion of 294 tuberculosis the microbial diagnosis is initiated by PCR; microscopy were not achieved 295 anymore in emergency but grouped once per day. In case of suspected pulmonary 296 tuberculosis, we initiated microbial diagnostic by the rapid molecular test Xpert MTB/RIF 297 further replaced by Xpert MTB/RIF Ultra which is used both to detect M. tuberculosis DNA 298 and to address patient infectiousness based on the semi-quantitative result; microscopic 299 analysis was still performed after treatment start, in particular to guide contact tracing and des-isolation decisions [5,8,19]. Another study on the diagnosis of NTM infection also 300 suggested a limited added-value of microscopy when 16S broad range PCR for the detection 301 of NTM is available [18]. Our data suggested that microscopy might be useful only for patients 302 with a high pre-test probability of NTM infections, such as immunocompromised patients or 303 304 patients with clinical and radiological suspicion of having NTM lung disease. In February 2020, 305 we and other diagnostic laboratory experienced an important staff limitation triggered by the 306 SARS-CoV-2 pandemics. Indeed, during the first wave of the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic, the 307 biomedical technicians were reassigned for the management of the SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR tests. In this context, we had to rapidly identify all the unnecessary analysis among which was 308 309 smear microscopy. As an immediate response, we therefore push forward, in February 2020, 310 the smear independent algorithm for the diagnostic of mycobacterial infection. Since then, 311 microscopy for the detection of acid-fast bacilli is achieved only on specific request from 8

312 clinicians or for patients with a confirmed diagnostic of tuberculosis; indeed, microscopy can 313 be useful for treatment follow-up because PCR can remain positive for a long period in 314 patient's respiratory specimens even when a treatment is well conducted and for contact tracing investigations. Microscopy in addition to pan-mycobacterial PCR can also be 315 316 requested when there is a high pre-test probability of NTM infection [18].

317

### Towards less cultures? 318

319 PCR has improved the diagnostic of tuberculosis with a lower limit of detection than 320 microscopy and an increased specificity for PCR targeting specific *M. tuberculosis* DNA 321 sequences such as the IS6110. Culture, the oldest microbiological test for tuberculosis, 322 remains the reference method with the lowest limit of detection [2,3]. The performance of 323 mycobacterial culture, sensitivity (98.8%) and specificity (100%), was calculated using a 324 composite gold standard including all the microbiological tests as well as clinical data. We 325 reported few patients with positive PCR but negative culture. It will therefore be difficult to do 326 without culture. Further optimization strategies could be implemented by selecting the most 327 performant tests on the most efficient clinical samples regarding pulmonary tuberculosis. 328 Thus, we could consider only a combination of (i) samples for PCR-based diagnosis to have 329 short time to results coupled to (ii) a selection of samples to perform the culture warranted to 330 obtain strains for testing susceptibility towards anti-mycobacterial agents and also to 331 guarantee an optimal sensitivity (with delayed results).

332 When pulmonary tuberculosis is suspected, sputum is the usual specimen that is 333 collected. Regarding microscopy, as indicated above there is no significant difference 334 between the different types of clinical samples. On the other hand, with regard to PCR and 335 culture which are much more sensitive and reliable tests we observed differences between 336 the clinical specimens. When looking at sputum and induced sputum we do not see a 337 significant difference in terms of sensitivity for culture. Several studies reported an increased 338 sensitivity of induced sputum over sputum [20,21]. Using the classical approach or the 339 pairwise comparison in the same patient, we did not observe a significant increase in 340 sensitivity with induced sputum compared to spontaneous sputum. However, the pairwise 341 comparisons suggest an increase in the yield of positivity when performing the two specimens. 342 This conclusion should be confirmed by further studies. BAL and bronchial aspirate are generally coupled. The pairwise comparison demonstrates that in the case of tuberculosis the 343 bronchial aspirate (97% of sensitivity) outcompete BAL (63.6% of sensitivity) suggesting a 344 345 limited added benefit of the BAL for the diagnosis of tuberculosis. Bronchial aspirate and BAL 346 are invasive, which make prospective studies hardly conceivable. Therefore, this retrospective 347 study, giving access to 3'570 pairwise comparison including these specimen provide 348 important data on their performance. Bronchoscopy is not only useful for tuberculosis 349 diagnosis but also to investigate other infectious or non-infectious disease [22]. For instance, 350 BAL is a very good specimen for the diagnostic of fungal infection such as *Pneumocystis* 351 jirovecii infections or Aspergillus fumigatus infection [23-25]. In view of these results, it is 352 important to consider bronchial aspiration for the diagnosis of tuberculosis, confirming 353 previous studies [26]. A first step would therefore be to always add a search for mycobacteria 9

on the bronchial aspiration when it is missing in laboratory order. This is what we systematically do in our lab when it is missing. This study provides data for diagnostic stewardship and guidance for physicians and clinical microbiology laboratories. Such data

- 356 357 could also help at defining diagnostic strategies in the setting of staff or reagants shortage or 358 to reduce costs. Indeed, even in low prevalence and high-income country, the infrastructure 359 and trained personnel for the diagnostic of tuberculosis is limited [27]. The SARS-CoV-2 360 pandemics negatively impacted tuberculosis control because of the mobilization of trained staff for other activities or because of the disruption of the supply chain of reagents and 361 362 compounds for tuberculosis diagnostic and treatments [28,29]. In a context of shortage of 363 reagants or other material for mycobacterial culture like the one we encountered during the 364 COVID-19 pandemic, if a prioritization had to be made, it should be done for the benefit of 365 bronchial aspiration; but this should be decided together with the clinician that can help 366 guiding the decision by providing clinical information for each case.
- 367

354

355

## 368 Limits of the study and perspectives

369 Molecular diagnostic significantly improved the microbial diagnostic of tuberculosis, in 370 particular the initial diagnostic, but is not yet generalized worldwide [30], mainly for economical 371 reasons. To assess the real economic impact of the management of tuberculosis a cost-372 benefit analysis for the full replacement of microscopy in favor of PCR should be performed 373 since this study demonstrates the effectiveness of PCR over microscopy [31]. Such analysis should incorporate that, in hospital setting, patients might be isolated in specific negative 374 375 pressure chambers for the duration of the investigation. Such cost-benefit study should also 376 address the risk of nosocomial infection due to delayed diagnostic. Future studies should 377 account for the evolution in practices that may have occurred over the ten years (2008-2018) 378 of the study. It would be worthwhile to relate the data with the evolution of protocols and 379 guidelines that were introduced during the studied period in order not to only add diagnostic 380 tools but also to stop the not useful approaches. This study will also permit to address the 381 dependence between the tests results and many other parameters such as the number of 382 tests, the quality of the clinical specimens and patients characteristics. This will be particularly 383 useful for results interpretation, in particular negative results. Finally, this study is based on a large amount of data over a long period, which was made possible by the fact that all the 384 385 microbial result are in our LIS since 1995. Although, it may not be the case even in high income country labs, comparison of these results with those obtained at other medical centers 386 387 should be performed with the view of cross-validating the robustness of the present results.

388

## 389 Conclusions

This study demonstrates that many improvements have been made in the microbiological diagnosis of tuberculosis. There is no doubt about the added value of molecular diagnosis compared to microscopy to initiate the diagnosis of tuberculosis. The limit of a generalization of independent algorithms in microscopy lies in the access to molecular diagnosis. New technologies such as the GeneXpert, which are supposed to solve this problem, are not yet

395 generalized. Regarding tuberculosis, the limit in this case is not technological but again, 396 economical. This study provides data for diagnostic stewardship and for editing guidelines 397 and diagnosis protocols with the purpose to reduce the medical, social and economic costs 398 associated with tuberculosis. Indeed, even in low prevalence and high-income country, the 399 infrastructure and trained personnel for the diagnostic of tuberculosis is limited. Therefore, 400 there is a need to identify the most efficient tests and specimens in order to guarantee the 401 sensitivity and specificity and to limit the number of unnecessary tests. In addition, it provides 402 analytical strategies that may also be suitable for the study of other infectious diseases.

403

## 404 **5. Acknowledgements**

We are thankful to the Laboratory of Molecular Diagnostic and Mycobacteria of the Institute
of Microbiology of the University of Lausanne and Lausanne University Hospital that perform
the conventional and molecular analysis for the diagnosis of tuberculosis.

408

## 409 6. References

- 410
- 411 1 WHO. Global tuberculosis report 2021. 2021.
- 412 2 van Zyl-Smit RN, Binder A, Meldau R, Mishra H, Semple PL, Theron G, et al.
  413 Comparison of quantitative techniques including xpert mtb/rif to evaluate
  414 mycobacterial burden. *PLOS ONE* 2011; **6**: e28815.
- Palomino JC. Nonconventional and new methods in the diagnosis of tuberculosis:
  Feasibility and applicability in the field. *European Respiratory Journal* 2005; **26**: 339.
- 417 4 Pfyffer GE, Wittwer F. Incubation time of mycobacterial cultures: How long is long enough to issue a final negative report to the clinician? *Journal of clinical microbiology* 2012; **50**: 4188-9.
- 420 5 Opota O, Zakham F, Mazza-Stalder J, Nicod L, Greub G, Jaton K. Added value of
  421 xpert mtb/rif ultra for diagnosis of pulmonary tuberculosis in a low-prevalence setting.
  422 *J Clin Microbiol* 2019; **57**.
- Boehme CC, Nabeta P, Hillemann D, Nicol MP, Shenai S, Krapp F, et al. Rapid
  molecular detection of tuberculosis and rifampin resistance. *N Engl J Med* 2010; **363**:
  1005-15.
- 426 7 Campelo TA, Cardoso de Sousa PR, Nogueira LL, Frota CC, Zuquim Antas PR.
  427 Revisiting the methods for detecting mycobacterium tuberculosis: What has the new millennium brought thus far? *Access Microbiol* 2021; **3**: 000245.
- 4298Opota O, Senn L, Prod'hom G, Mazza-Stalder J, Tissot F, Greub G, et al. Added value430of molecular assay xpert mtb/rif compared to sputum smear microscopy to assess the431risk of tuberculosis transmission in a low-prevalence country. Clin Microbiol Infect4322016; 22: 613-9.
- WHO. Who consolidated guidelines on tuberculosis module 3: Rapid diagnostics for
  tuberculosis detection. 2021.
- 43510WHO. Who consolidated guidelines on tuberculosis module 2: Screening, systematic436screening for tuberculosis disease. 2021.
- 437 11 Greub G, Sahli R, Brouillet R, Jaton K. Ten years of r&d and full automation in 438 molecular diagnosis. *Future Microbiol* 2016; **11**: 403-25.
- 43912Dorman SE, Schumacher SG, Alland D, Nabeta P, Armstrong DT, King B, et al. Xpert440mtb/rif ultra for detection of mycobacterium tuberculosis and rifampicin resistance: A441prospective multicentre diagnostic accuracy study. Lancet Infect Dis 2018; **18**: 76-84.
- 13 Lippincott CK, Miller MB, Popowitch EB, Hanrahan CF, Van Rie A. Xpert mtb/rif assay

443		shortens airborne isolation for hospitalized patients with presumptive tuberculosis in
444		the united states. Clin Infect Dis 2014; 59: 186-92.
445	14	Weiszhar Z, Horvath I. Induced sputum analysis: Step by step. <i>Breathe</i> 2013; <b>9</b> : 300.
446	15	Schaaf HS, Reuter H. Chapter 22 - practical approaches to ordering diagnostic tests.
447		In: Schaaf HS, Zumla AI, Grange JM, et al., eds. <i>Tuberculosis</i> . Edinburgh: W.B.
448		Saunders 2009; 216-26.
449	16	Chakravorty S, Simmons AM, Rowneki M, Parmar H, Cao Y, Ryan J, et al. The new
450		xpert mtb/rif ultra: Improving detection of mycobacterium tuberculosis and resistance
451		to rifampin in an assay suitable for point-of-care testing. <i>MBio</i> 2017; 8.
452	17	Cadena AM, Fortune SM, Flynn JL. Heterogeneity in tuberculosis. Nat Rev Immunol
453		2017; <b>17</b> : 691-702.
454	18	Andenmatten S, Opota O, Mazza-Stalder J, Nicod L, Greub G, Jaton K. Added
455		diagnostic value of 16s rrna gene pan-mycobacterial pcr for nontuberculous
456		mycobacterial infections: A 10-year retrospective study. Eur J Clin Microbiol Infect Dis
457		2019
458	19	Opota O Mazza-Stalder J Greub G Jaton K The rapid molecular test spert mtb/rif
459	10	ultra: Towards improved tuberculosis diagnosis and rifampicin resistance detection
460		Clin Microbiol Infect 2019: 25: 1370-6
461	20	Biswas S Das A Sinha A Das SK Bairagya TD. The role of induced sputum in the
462	20	diagnosis of pulmonary tuberculosis. Lung India : official organ of Indian Chest Society
402		
403	21	Seong GM Lee I Lee IH Kim IH Kim M Lisefulness of sputum induction with
404	21	bypertopic spline in a real clinical practice for bacteriological yields of active pulmonary
400		tubereulesis. Tubereulesis and reaniratory diseases 2014; 76: 162.9
400	22	Cuberculosis. Tuberculosis and respiratory diseases 2014, <b>76</b> . 103-0.
407	22	Sanjeevalari S, Haranar MY, Buggi S. Role of nexible bioinchoscopy in patients with
400		
409	00	Surgery 2018; <b>34</b> : 303-9.
470	23	imbert 5, Meyer I, Palous M, Brossas J-Y, Uzunov M, Toualek F, et al. Aspergillus por
471		In bronchoalveolar lavage fluid for the diagnosis and prognosis of aspergillosis in
472		patients with hematological and hon-hematological conditions. Frontiers in
473	04	Illiciobiology 2010, 9. 1077 Nastritas D. Caraia Videl C. Lamath F. Lichtenstern C. Darrella A. Vahrasahild II.
474	24	Neolytos D, Garcia-vidal C, Lamoth F, Lichtenstein C, Perrella A, Venreschild JJ.
475		invasive aspergiliosis in solid organ transplant patients. Diagnosis, prophylaxis,
470	<b>0</b> E	Derret T. Kritikas A. Heuser DM. Cuiver M. Ceste AT. Joten K. et al. Ability of
4//	25	Perret I, Kniikos A, Hauser Pivi, Guiver M, Coste AT, Jaton K, et al. Ability of
478		quantitative per to discriminate pneumocystis jirovecii pneumonia from colonization. J
479	00	Med Microbiol 2020; 69: 705-11.
480	26	Maltre I, OK V, Morel F, Bonnet I, Sougakoff W, Robert J, et al. Sampling strategy for
481		bacteriological diagnosis of intratnoracic tuberculosis. Respir Med Res 2021; 19:
482	07	
483	27	Cannas A, Pagila MG, Saknoo DC, Vairo F, Doulla B, Ngununi B, et al. Strengthening
484		tuberculosis diagnosis in a low-resource setting: Experience learned in dodoma,
485	~~	tanzania. J Infect Dev Ctries 2013; 7: 676-9.
486	28	Armstrong DT, Tacheny EA, Olinger G, Howard R, Lemmon MM, Dasgupta D, et al.
487		Sars-cov-2 supply shortages and tuberculosis diagnostics: Current issues requiring
488		immediate solutions. J Clin Microbiol 2021; <b>59</b> : e0077821.
489	29	Meneguim AC, Rebello L, Das M, Ravi S, Mathur T, Mankar S, et al. Adapting the
490		services during the covid-19 pandemic in mumbai, india. <i>Int J Tuberc Lung Dis</i> 2020;
491		<b>24</b> : 1119-21.
492	30	Mechai F, Cordel H, Guglielmetti L, Aubry A, Jankovic M, Viveiros M, et al.
493		Management of tuberculosis: Are the practices homogeneous in high-income
494		countries? Front Public Health 2020; 8: 443.
495	31	Dowdy DW, Houben R, Cohen T, Pai M, Cobelens F, Vassall A, et al. Impact and cost-
496		effectiveness of current and future tuberculosis diagnostics: The contribution of
497		modelling. The international journal of tuberculosis and lung disease : the official
498		journal of the International Union against Tuberculosis and Lung Disease 2014; <b>18</b> :
	12	

- 499 500
- 501

### 7. Tables 502

1012-8.

503

### Table 1. Performance of smear microscopy for the diagnostic of 504 pulmonary tuberculosis according of the type of specimen. 505

506 507

> Table 1. Performance of smear microscopy for the diagnostic of pulmonary tuberculosis according of the type of specimen.

	Accuracy	Sensitivity	Specificity	Prevalence	PPV	NPV			
All specimens	0.977 (0.975,0.979) 23219/23763	0.523 (0.489, 0.557) 447/855	0.994 (0.993, 0.995) 22772/22908	0.036 (0.034, 0.038) 855/23763	0.767 (0.730, 0.800) 447/583	0.982 (0.981, 0.984) 22772/23180			
Sputum	0.967 (0.963, 0.971) 8132/8409	0.605 (0.562, 0.647) 320/529	0.991 (0.989, 0.993) 7812/7880	0.063 (0.058, 0.068) 529/8409	0.825 (0.783, 0.861) 320/388	0.974 (0.970, 0.977) 7812/8021			
Induced sputum	0.966 (0.957, 0.973) 2119/2194	0.362 (0.265, 0.467) 34/94	0.993 (0.988, 0.996) 2085/2100	0.043 (0.035, 0.052) 94/2194	0.694 (0.546, 0.817) 34/49	0.972 (0.964, 0.979) 2085/2194			
Bronchial aspirate	0.985 (0.982, 0.988) 8463/8591	0.362 (0.283, 0.447) 51/141	0.996 (0.994, 0.997) 8412/8450	0.016 (0.014, 0.019) 141/8591	0.573 (0.464, 0.677) 51/89	0.989 (0.987, 0.991) 8412/8502			
BAL	0.986 (0.982, 0.989) 4505/4569	0.462 (0.356, 0.569) 42/91	0.997 (0.994, 0.998) 4463/4478	0.020 (0.016, 0.024) 91/4569	0.737 (0.603, 0.845) 42/57	0.989 (0.986, 0.992) 4463/4512			
All p.values in	All p.values in supplementary material.								

510

### Table 2. Performance of PCR for the diagnostic of pulmonary 511 tuberculosis according to the type of specimen. 512

513

Table 2. Performance of PCR for the diagnostic of pulmonary tuberculosis according to the type of specimen.

	Accuracy	Sensitivity	Specificity	Prevalence	PPV	NPV
All specimens	0.988 (0.986, 0.991) 7009/7091	0.798 (0.755, 0.836) 320/401	1 (0.999, 1) 6689/6690	0.057 (0.051, 0.062) 401/7091	0.997 (0.983, 1) 320/321	0.988 (0.985, 0.990) 6770/7091
All	0.988	0.585	1 (0.999,	0.028	0.992	0.988
specimens	(0.985,	(0.513,	1)	(0.025,	(0.954, 1)	(0.985,
microscopy	0.991)	0.654)	6865/6866	0.032)	117/118	0.990)
negative	6982/7066	117/200		200/7066		6865/6948
All	1 (0.987,	1 (0.983,	1 (0.953,	0.734	1 (0.983,	1 (0.953,
specimens	1)	1)	1)	(0.679,	1)	1)
microscopy	286/286	210/210	76/76	0.785)	210/210	76/76
positive				210/286		
Sputum	0.986 (0.980, 0.990) 2525/2562	0.821 (0.762, 0.871) 170/207	>0.999 (0.998, 1) 2355/2355	0.081 (0.071, 0.092) 207/2562	1 (0.979, 1) 170/170	0.985 (0.979, 0.989) 2355/2562
Induced sputum	0.977 (0.962, 0.987) 636/651	0.643 (0.480, 0.784) 27/42	>0.999 (0.994, 1) 609/609	0.065 (0.047, 0.086) 42/609	1 (0.872, 1) 27/27	0.976 (0.961, 0.986) 609/624
Bronchial aspirate	0.993 (0.988, 0.996) 2256/2273	0.837 (0.748, 0.904) 82/98	>0.999 (0.997, 1) 2174/2175	0.043 (0.035, 0.052) 98/2273	0.988 (0.935, 1) 82/83	0.993 (0.988, 0.996) 2174/2175
BAL	0.992 (0.986, 0.996) 1592/1605	0.759 (0.624, 0.865) 41/54	>0.999 (0.914, 1) 1551/1551	0.034 (0.025, 0.044) 54/1605	1 (0.914, 1) 41/41	0.992 (0.986, 0.996) 1551/1564
All p.values in	supplementary	material				

514

### Table 3: Performance of culture for the diagnostic of pulmonary 516

### tuberculosis according to the type of specimen. 517

518

Table 3: Performance of culture for the diagnostic of pulmonary tuberculosis according to the type of specimen.

	Accuracy	Sensitivity	Specificity	Prevalence	PPV	NPV
All specimens	>0.999 (0.999, 1) 24019/24030	0.988 (0.978, 0.994) 871/882	1 (1, 1) 23148/23148	0.037 (0.034, 0.039) 882/24030	1 (0.996, 1) 871/871	1 (0.999, 1) 23148/23159
Sputum	>0.999 (0.999, 1) 8583/8587	0.993 (0.981, 0.998) 543/547	1 (1, 1) 8040/8040	0.064 (0.059, 0.069) 547/8587	1 (0.993, 1) 543/543	1 (0.999, 1) 8040/8044
Induced sputum	1 (0.997, 1) 2255/2257	0.980 (0.931, 0.998) 100/102	1 (0.998, 1) 2155/2155	0.045 (0.037, 0.055) 102/2155	1 (0.964, 1) 100/100	1 (0.997, 1) 2155/2157
Bronchial aspirate	>0.999 (0.999, 1) 8605/8610	0.965 (0.919, 0.988) 136/141	1 (1, 1) 8469/8469	0.016 (0.014, 0.019) 141/8610	1 (0.973, 1) 136/136	0.999 (0.999, 1) 8469/8474
BAL	1 (0.999, 1) 4576/4576	1 (0.961, 1) 92/92	1 (0.999, 1) 4484/4484	0.020 (0.016, 0.025) 92/4576	1 (0.961, 1) 92/92	1 (0.999, 1) 4484/4484
All p.values in	n supplementar	ry material				

519

### Table 4. Sensitivity of microscopy to predict tuberculosis according 521

### to the type of specimen using a 72-hours pairing window in the same 522

### patient. 523

524 525

> Table 4. Sensitivity of microscopy to predict tuberculosis according to the type of specimen using a 72-hours pairing window in the same patient. NPV Sensitivity Sputum versus induced sputum 0.923 (0.640, 0.998) 12/13 n.s 0.997 (0.986, 1) 390/391 n.s Sputum 0.769 (0.462, 0.950) 10/13<sup>n.s</sup> 0.992 (0.978, 0.998) 390/393 <sup>n.s</sup> **Induced Sputum** Sputum versus bronchial aspirate 0.692 (0.386, 0.909) 9/13 <sup>n.s</sup> 0.988 (0.970, 0.997) 337/341 <sup>n.s</sup> Sputum Bronchial aspirate 0.846 (0.546, 0.981) 11/13 <sup>n.s</sup> 0.994 (0.979, 0.999) 337/339 <sup>n.s</sup> Sputum versus BAL 1 (0.631, 1) 8/8 <sup>n.s</sup> 1 (0.987, 1) 280/280<sup>n.s</sup> Sputum BAL 0.750 (0.349, 0.968) 6/8 n.s 0.993 (0.975, 0.999) 280/282 n.s Induced sputum versus bronchial aspirate 0.500 (0.013, 0.987) 1/2 <sup>n.s</sup> 0.982 (0.904, 1) 55/56 <sup>n.s</sup> Induced Sputum **Bronchial aspirate** 0.500 (0.013, 0.987) 1/2<sup>n.s</sup> 0.982 (0.904, 1) 55/56 <sup>n.s</sup> Induced sputum versus BAL Induced Sputum 0.333 (0.008, 0.906) 1/3 <sup>n.s</sup> 0.962 (0.868, 0.995) 50/52 <sup>n.s</sup> 0.667 (0.094, 0.992) 2/3 <sup>n.s</sup> 0.980 (0.896, 1) 50/51 <sup>n.s</sup> BAL Bronchial aspirate versus BAL Bronchial aspirate 0.881 (0.744, 0.960) 37/42 <sup>n.s</sup> 0.999 (0.997, 1.000) 3528/3533 <sup>n.s</sup> 0.714 (0.554, 0.843) 30/42 <sup>n.s</sup> 0.997 (0.994, 0.998) 3528/3540 n.s BAL All p.values in supplementary material

526 527 528

529

### Table 5. Sensitivity of PCR to predict tuberculosis according to the

### type of specimen using a 72-hours pairing window in the same

### patient.

Table 5. Sensitivity of PCR to predict tuberculosis according to the type of specimen							
using a 72-hours pairing window in the same patient.							
	Sensitivity	NPV					
Sputum versus indu	uced sputum						
Sputum	0.667 (0.094, 0.992) 2/3 <sup>n.s</sup>	0.992 (0.958, 1) 129/130 <sup>n.s</sup>					
Induced sputum	0.667 (0.094, 0.992) 2/3 <sup>n.s</sup>	0.992 (0.958, 1) 129/130 <sup>n.s</sup>					
Sputum versus brou	nchial aspirate						
Sputum	0.385 (0.139, 0.684) 5/13 *	0.953 (0.909, 0.979) 161/169 <sup>n.s</sup>					
Bronchial aspirate	1 (0.753, 1) 13/13 *	1 (0.977, 1) 161/161 <sup>n.s</sup>					
Sputum versus BAL	-						
Sputum	0.600 (0.147, 0.947) 3/5 <sup>n.s</sup>	0.985 (0.947, 0.998) 132/134 <sup>n.s</sup>					
BAL	1 (0.478, 1) 5/5 <sup>n.s</sup>	1 (0.478, 1) 132/132 <sup>n.s</sup>					
Induced sputum ver	rsus bronchial aspirate						
Induced sputum	0.857 (0.421, 0.996) 6/7 <sup>n.s</sup>	0.968 (0.833, 0.999) 30/31 <sup>n.s</sup>					
Bronchial aspirate	0.714 (0.290, 0.963) 5/7 <sup>n.s</sup>	0.938 (0.792, 0.992) 30/32 <sup>n.s</sup>					
Induced sputum ver	rsus BAL						
Induced sputum	1 (0.478, 1) 5/5 <sup>n.s</sup>	1 (0.884, 1) 30/30 <sup>n.s</sup>					
BAL	0.600 (0.147, 0.947) 3/5 <sup>n.s</sup>	0.938 (0.792, 0.992) 30/32 <sup>n.s</sup>					
Bronchial aspirate v	versus BAL						
Bronchial aspirate	0.974 (0.865, 0.999) 38/39 ***	0.999 (0.995, 1.000) 1142/1143 **					
BAL	0.564 (0.396, 0.722) 22/39 ***	0.985 (0.977, 0.991) 1142/1159 **					
All p.values in supplem	entary material						

### Table 6. Sensitivity of culture to predict tuberculosis according to

### the type of specimen using a 72-hours pairing window within the

### same patient.

Table 6. Sensitivity of culture to predict tuberculosis according to the type of									
specimen using a 72-hours pairing window within the same patient.									
	Sensitivity	NPV							
Sputum versus indu	uced sputum								
Sputum	0.857 (0.697, 0.952) 30/35 <sup>n.s</sup>	0.987 (0.969, 0.996) 368/373 <sup>n.s</sup>							
Induced sputum	0.800 (0.631, 0.916) 28/35 <sup>n.s</sup>	0.981 (0.962, 0.992) 368/375 <sup>n.s</sup>							
Sputum versus brou	nchial aspirate								
Sputum	0.613 (0.422, 0.782) 19/31 <sup>n.s</sup>	0.964 (0.937, 0.981) 318/330 <sup>n.s</sup>							
Bronchial aspirate	0.903 (0.742, 0.980) 28/31 <sup>n.s</sup>	0.991 (0.973, 0.998) 318/321 <sup>n.s</sup>							
Sputum versus BAL	-								
Sputum	0.895 (0.669, 0.987) 17/19 <sup>n.s</sup>	0.993 (0.974, 0.999) 268/270 <sup>n.s</sup>							
BAL	0.789 (0.544, 0.939) 15/19 <sup>n.s</sup>	0.985 (0.963, 0.996) 268/272 <sup>n.s</sup>							
Induced sputum ver	rsus bronchial aspirate								
Induced sputum	0.692 (0.386, 0.909) 9/13 <sup>n.s</sup>	0.915 (0.796, 0.976) 43/47 <sup>n.s</sup>							
Bronchial aspirate	0.846 (0.546, 0.981) 11/13 <sup>n.s</sup>	0.956 (0.849, 0.995) 43/45 <sup>n.s</sup>							
Induced sputum ver	rsus BAL								
Induced sputum	0.769 (0.462, 0.950) 10/13 <sup>n.s</sup>	0.929 (0.805, 0.985) 39/42 <sup>n.s</sup>							
BAL	0.462 (0.192, 0.749) 6/13 <sup>n.s</sup>	0.848 (0.711, 0.937) 39/46 <sup>n.s</sup>							
Bronchial aspirate v	/ersus BAL								
Bronchial aspirate	0.970 (0.914, 0.994) 96/99***	0.999 (0.997, 1.000) 3471/3474***							
BAL	0.636 (0.538, 0.731) 63/99***	0.990 (0.986, 0.993) 3471/3507***							
All p.values details in su	upplementary material								

### 8. Supplementary material 545

546

### Table S1. P-values for Table 1, performance of smear microscopy 547

### according of the type of specimen. 548

MICROSCOP						sig.cod
Y	Sample1	Sample2	Diff_1m2	p.val	adj.p.val	е
	-		0.0100481	6.31016E-	6.3102E-	
ACCURACY	All specimens	Sputum	6	07	06	***
	All specimens		0.0112914			
ACCURACY	•	Induced sputum	1	0.00118018	0.0118018	*
	All specimens	Bronchial	-	1.04282E-	0.0001042	
ACCURACY		aspirate	0.0079934	05	8	***
	All specimens		-	0.00018404	0.0018404	
ACCURACY	•	BAL	0.0088853	8	8	**
	Sputum		0.0012432	0.82387393		
ACCURACY		Induced sputum	4	9	1	n.s.
	Sputum	Bronchial	-	1.83229E-	1.8323E-	
ACCURACY		aspirate	0.0180416	14	13	***
	Sputum		-	1.73634E-	1.7363E-	
ACCURACY		BAL	0.0189335	10	09	***
		Bronchial	-	5.08274E-	5.0827E-	
ACCURACY	Induced sputum	aspirate	0.0192848	09	08	***
	·	·	-	7.30806E-	7.3081E-	
ACCURACY	Induced sputum	BAL	0.0201767	08	07	***
	Bronchial		-	0.74149137		
ACCURACY	aspirate	BAL	0.0008919	6	1	n.s.
			-	0.00338320	0.0338320	
SENSITIVITY	All specimens	Sputum	0.0821079	6	6	*
	All specimens		0.1611048	0.00427942	0.0427942	
SENSITIVITY	•	Induced sputum	9	9	9	*
	All specimens	Bronchial	0.1611048	0.00055236	0.0055236	
SENSITIVITY		aspirate	9	5	5	**
	All specimens		0.0612685	0.31654015		
SENSITIVITY		BAL	6	4	1	n.s.
	Sputum		0.2432128	1.92189E-	0.0001921	
SENSITIVITY		Induced sputum	1	05	9	***
	Sputum	Bronchial	0.2432128			
SENSITIVITY		aspirate	1	4.0431E-07	4.04E-06	***
	Sputum		0.1433764	0.01436764	0.1436764	
SENSITIVITY		BAL	7	7	7	n.s.
		Bronchial				
SENSITIVITY	Induced sputum	aspirate	0	1	1	n.s.
			-	0.21854228		
SENSITIVITY	Induced sputum	BAL	0.0998363	3	1	n.s.
	Bronchial		-	0.16826052		
SENSITIVITY	aspirate	BAL	0.0998363	9	1	n.s.
			0.0026926	0.01386013	0.1386013	
SPECIFICITY	All specimens	Sputum	5	2	2	n.s.
	All specimens		0.0012060	0.59219501		
SPECIFICITY		Induced sputum	7	3	1	n.s.
	All specimens	Bronchial	-	0.15068156		
SPECIFICITY	A.II	aspirate	0.0014397	1	1	n.s.
	All specimens		-	0.04256828	0.4256828	
SPECIFICITY	•	BAL	0.0025871	2	2	n.s.
	Sputum		-	0.59517745		
SPECIFICITY		Induced sputum	0.0014866	7	1	n.s.

SPECIFICITY	Sputum	Bronchial aspirate	- 0.0041324	0.00143062 3	0.0143062 3	*
SPECIFICITY	Sputum	BAL	- 0.0052797	0.00083902	0.0083902	**
		Bronchial	-	0.17308289		
SPECIFICITY	Induced sputum	aspirate	0.0026458	7	1	n.s.
SDECIEICITY	Induced eputum	DAL	-	0.05332469	0.5332469	<b>n</b> 0
SPECIFICITY	Bronchial	DAL	0.0037931	د 0 40835291	3	n.s.
SPECIFICITY	aspirate	BAL	0.0011473	9	1	n.s.
PREVALENC		_	-	1.84099E-		
	All specimens	Sputum	0.0269285	25	1.841E-24	***
FREVALENC	All specimens	Induced sputum	-	0 11/10082	1	ne
PREVALENC	All specimens	Bronchial	0.0195677	3.18425E-	3.1843E-	11.5.
E		aspirate	8	19	18	***
PREVALENC	All specimens		0.0160634	4.01497E-		4.4.4
	Coutum	BAL	7	08	4.015E-07	***
F	Sputum	Induced sputum	0.0200646	0.00045144	0.0045144	**
	Sputum	Bronchial	0.0464962	1.90752E-	1.9075E-	
E	•	aspirate	6	54	53	***
PREVALENC	Sputum	<b>_</b>	0.0429919	8.81979E-	8.8198E-	1.1.1
		BAL	6	28	27	***
F	Induced sputum	aspirate	0 0264316	7.00002E- 14	7.0000E- 13	***
PREVALENC	induoed oputum	dopilato	0.0229272	9.71951E-	9.7195E-	
E	Induced sputum	BAL	9	08	07	***
PREVALENC	Bronchial	5.41	-	0.16613582		
E	aspirate	BAL	0.0035043	2 459755	2 45975	n.s.
NPV	All specimens	Sputum	0.0004332	-3.43073E- 06	05	***
	All specimens	oputum	0.0320795	6.34282E-	6.3428E-	
NPV		Induced sputum	7	24	23	***
	All specimens	Bronchial	-	1.09507E-	0.0001095	4 4 4
NPV	All specimens	aspirate	0.0070156	0.001/13103	1	
NPV	Air speeimens	BAL	0.0067415	0.00140100	7	*
	Sputum		0.0236243	2.45115E-	2.4512E-	
NPV	-	Induced sputum	5	08	07	***
	Sputum	Bronchial	-	1.38418E-	1.3842E-	***
NPV	Sputum	aspirate	0.0154709	1 30343E-	1 3034E-	
NPV	oputum	BAL	0.0151967	08	07	***
		Bronchial	-	3.82866E-	3.8287E-	
NPV	Induced sputum	aspirate	0.0390952	33	32	***
	Induced coutum	RAI	0 039921	1.88248E-	1.8825E-	***
	Bronchial	DAL	0.0002741	0.95595959	21	
NPV	aspirate	BAL	8	5	1	n.s.
			-	0.03631775	0.3631775	
PPV	All specimens	Sputum	0.0580184	2	2	n.s.
	All specimens	Induced sputum	0.0728462	0.32999978	1	ne
FF V	All specimens	Bronchial	0.1936901	0.00017301	0.0017301	11.5.
PPV		aspirate	3	7	7	**
	All specimens		0.0298817	0.73106541		
PPV				7	4	<b>n</b> o
	Soutum	BAL	4	0 04474574		n.s.
PPV	Sputum	BAL	4 0.1308647 2	7 0.04471574 2	0.4471574	n.s.
PPV	Sputum Sputum	BAL Induced sputum Bronchial	4 0.1308647 2 0.2517085	0.04471574 2 5.44063E-	0.4471574 2 5.4406E-	n.s.
PPV PPV	Sputum Sputum	BAL Induced sputum Bronchial aspirate	4 0.1308647 2 0.2517085 6	0.04471574 2 5.44063E- 07	0.4471574 2 5.4406E- 06	n.s. ***

	Sputum		0.0879001	0.15890288		
PPV		BAL	6	6	1	n.s.
		Bronchial	0.1208438	0.22480548		
PPV	Induced sputum	aspirate	4	1	1	n.s.
			-	0.78458139		
PPV	Induced sputum	BAL	0.0429646	4	1	n.s.
	Bronchial		-	0.06700905	0.6700905	
PPV	aspirate	BAL	0.1638084	1	1	n.s.

### Table S2. P-values for Table 2, performance of PCR according of the 552

### type of specimen. 553

PCR	Sample1	Sample2	Diff_1m2	p.val	adj.p.val	sig.code
ACCURACY	All specimens	Sputum	0.00287789	0.304418176	1	n.s.
ACCURACY	All specimens	Induced	0 01147752	0 010512072	0 10512072	ns
ACCONACT	All specimens	Bronchial	0.01147702	0.010012012	0.10012012	11.5.
ACCURACY	- 	aspirate	-0.0040849	0.123765813	1	n.s.
ACCURACY	All specimens	BAL	-0.0034643	0.283404464	1	n.s.
ACCURACY	Sputum	sputum	0 00859963	0 167946429	1	ns
	Sputum	Bronchial	0.00000000	0.101010120	•	
ACCURACY	Carveture	aspirate	-0.0069627	0.030595877	0.30595877	n.s.
ACCURACY	Sputum	BAL	-0.0063422	0.092258909	0.92258909	n.s.
ACCURACY	Induced sputum	aspirate	-0.0155624	0.001625285	0.01625285	*
ACCURACY	Induced sputum	BAL	-0.0149418	0.007047431	0.07047431	n.s.
ACCURACY	Bronchial aspirate	BAL	0.00062059	0.975120507	1	n.s.
SENSITIVITY	All specimens	Sputum	-0.0232511	0.562771431	1	n.s.
	All specimens	Induced	0 45544704	0.000500000	0.00500000	
SENSITIVITY	All specimens	Bronchial	0.15514784	0.033580028	0.33580028	n.s.
SENSITIVITY		aspirate	-0.0387297	0.467749275	1	n.s.
SENSITIVITY	All specimens	BAL	0.03874573	0.630382277	1	n.s.
	Sputum	Induced	0 1792090	0.017060317	0 17060317	<b>D C</b>
SENSITIVIT	Sputum	Bronchial	0.1703909	0.017009317	0.17009317	11.5.
SENSITIVITY		aspirate	-0.0154787	0.863947971	1	n.s.
SENSITIVITY	Sputum	BAL	0.06199678	0.402691103	1	n.s.
SENSITIVITY	Induced sputum	Bronchial	-0 1938776	0 020002300	0 20002300	ns
SENSITIVITY	Induced sputum	BAI	-0.1164021	0.308470102	0.20002000	n.s.
SENSITIVITY	Bronchial aspirate	BAL	0.07747543	0.343242299	1	n.s.
SPECIFICITY	All specimens	Sputum	-0.0001495	1	1	n.s.
	All specimens	Induced				
SPECIFICITY	All specimens	sputum Bronchial	-0.0001495	1	1	n.s.
SPECIFICITY	All specifiens	aspirate	-0.0001495	1	1	n.s.
SPECIFICITY	All specimens	BAL	-0.0001495	1	1	n.s.
	Sputum	Induced		<b>N</b> 1.4	NIA	
SPECIFICITY	Sputum	sputum Bronchial	0	NA	NA	
SPECIFICITY	oputum	aspirate	0	NA	NA	
SPECIFICITY	Sputum	BAL	0	NA	NA	
		Bronchial	0	NIA	NIA	
SPECIFICITY	Induced sputum		0	NA	NA	
SPECIFICITY	Bronchial aspirate	BAL	0	ΝA	NΔ	
PREVALENC			0			
E	All specimens	Sputum	-0.0242457	1.85046E-05	0.00018505	***
PREVALENC F	All specimens	sputum	-0 012415	0 24121711	1	ns
PREVALENC	All specimens	Bronchial	0.012410	V.27121111		
E		aspirate	0.01343573	0.015178942	0.15178942	n.s.

PREVALENC E	All specimens	BAL	0.0229057	0.000252936	0.00252936	**
PREVALENC E	Sputum	Induced sputum	0.01183074	0.372502519	1	n.s.
PREVALENC E	Sputum	Bronchial aspirate	0.03768143	1.03816E-07	1.0382E-06	***
PREVALENC E	Sputum	BAL	0.04715139	1.47378E-09	1.4738E-08	***
	Induced sputum	Bronchial aspirate	0.02585069	0.011433057	0.11433057	n.s.
E PREVALENC	Induced sputum	BAL	0.03532066	0.000420219	0.00420219	**
E	Bronchial aspirate	BAL	0.00946997	0.157733443	1	n.s.
NPV	All specimens	Sputum	0.0355276	1.72723E-11	1.7272E-10	***
	All specimens	Induced	/	/ / /		
NPV	All specimens	sputum	-0.0212302	0.016901135	0.16901135	n.s.
NPV	All specimens	aspirate	-0.0448089	3.59424E-23	3.5942E-22	***
NPV	All specimens	BAL	-0.0369566	1.0787E-11	1.0787E-10	***
	Sputum	Induced				
NPV	<u> </u>	sputum	-0.0567578	9.29799E-07	9.298E-06	***
NPV	Sputum	Bronchiai aspirate	-0.0803365	8 28082E-41	8 2808E-40	***
NPV	Sputum	BAI	-0 0724842	1 81678E-23	1 8168E-22	***
	•	Bronchial	0.072-10-12	1.010702 20	1.01002 22	
NPV	Induced sputum	aspirate	-0.0235787	4.52576E-11	4.5258E-10	***
NPV	Induced sputum	BAL	-0.0157264	0.006062577	0.06062577	n.s.
NPV	Bronchial aspirate	BAL	0.00785225	0.00031041	0.0031041	**
PPV	All specimens	Sputum	-0.0031153	1	1	n.s.
	All specimens	Induced	0 0021152	1	1	nc
FFV	All specimens	Bronchial	-0.0031155	1	1	11.5.
PPV		aspirate	-0.0031153	1	1	n.s.
PPV	All specimens	BAL	-0.0031153	1	1	n.s.
	Sputum	Induced				
PPV	Constitute	sputum	0	NA	NA	
PPV	Sputum	aspirate	0	NA	NA	
PPV	Sputum	BAI	0	NA	NA	
		Bronchial	0		1.1/1	
PPV	Induced sputum	aspirate	0	NA	NA	
PPV	Induced sputum	BAL	0	NA	NA	
PPV	Bronchial aspirate	BAL	0	NA	NA	

### Table S3. P-values for Table 3, performance of culture according of 555

### the type of specimen. 556

						sig.cod
CULTURE	Sample1	Sample2	Diff_1m2	p.val	adj.p.val	е
ACCURACY	All specimens	Sputum	8.0593E-06	1	1	n.s.
	All specimens		0.0004283	0.7038940		
ACCURACY		Induced sputum	7	2	1	n.s.
	All specimens	Bronchial	0.0001229			
ACCURACY		aspirate	6	0.8740244	1	n.s.
	All specimens			0.3000820		
ACCURACY	0 1	BAL	-0.0004578	1	1	n.s.
	Sputum		0.0004203	0.8005180		
ACCURACY	Creations	Induced sputum	1	8	1	n.s.
ACCURACY	Sputum	aspirate	0.0001149	1	1	n.s.
	Sputum	dopilato	0.00011.0	0.3496985	_	
ACCURACY		BAL	-0.0004658	5	1	n.s.
		Bronchial		0.9656915		
ACCURACY	Induced sputum	aspirate	-0.0003054	9	1	n.s.
	·			0.2068947		
ACCURACY	Induced sputum	BAL	-0.0008861	2	1	n.s.
	Bronchial			0.2457923		
ACCURACY	aspirate	BAL	-0.0005807	2	1	n.s.
				0.5072520		
SENSITIVITY	All specimens	Sputum	-0.005159	4	1	n.s.
	All specimens		0.0071361	0.8889537		
SENSITIVITY		Induced sputum	9	6	1	n.s.
	All specimens	Bronchial	0.0229893	0.0934731	0.9347319	
SENSITIVITY	All	aspirate	4	9	3	n.s.
	All specimens		0 04 0 4 7 4 7	0.5762589	4	
SENSITIVITY	Sputum	BAL	-0.0124/1/	/	1	n.s.
	Sputum		0.0122952	0.5301970	1	nc
SEINSITIVITT	Sputum	induced sputum	0 0 2 0 1 / 0 2	2		11.5.
SENISITIVITY	Oputuin	Bronchial	0.0281483	0.0272888	0.2720005	ns
SENSITIVITT	Sputum	aspirate	0	0 9136470	5	11.5.
SENSITIVITY		RAI	-0.0073126	2	1	n.s.
0211011111		Bronchial	0.0158531	_	-	
SENSITIVITY	Induced sputum	aspirate	5	0.7334086	1	n.s.
SENSITIVITY	Induced sputum	BAI	-0.0196078	0.5232443	1	n.s.
01.101.111	Bronchial	Brit	0.0100070	0.1727312		
SENSITIVITY	aspirate	BAL	-0.035461	5	1	n.s.
SPECIFICITY	All specimens	Sputum	0	NA	NA	
SPECIFICITY	All specimens	Induced sputum	0	NA	NA	
	All specimens	Bronchial				
SPECIFICITY		aspirate	0	NA	NA	
SPECIFICITY	All specimens	BAL	0	NA	NA	
SPECIFICITY	Sputum	Induced sputum	0	NA	NA	
	Sputum	Bronchial	-	<b>N I A</b>	<b>N</b> 1 A	
SPECIFICITY		aspirate	0	NA	NA	

SPECIFICITY	Sputum	BAL	0	NA	NA	
SPECIFICITY	Induced sputum	Bronchial	0	NΔ	NΔ	
			0			
SPECIFICITY	Bronchial	BAL	0	NA	NA	
SPECIFICITY	aspirate	BAL	0	NA	NA	
PREVALENC						
E	All specimens	Sputum	-0.0269968	1.3127E-25	1.3127E-24	***
PREVALENC	All specimens			0.0152636	0.1526368	
E		Induced sputum	-0.0106277	8	1	n.s.
PREVALENC	All specimens	Bronchial	0.0203278			ale ale ale
	All anagimona	aspirate	1	2.1937E-20	2.1937E-19	* * *
	All specimens		0.0165992	1 70965 09	1 70965 07	***
	Sputum	BAL	0.0163691	0.0050946	0.0509465	
F	oputum	Induced sputum	0.0103051	0.0000040	0.0303403 9	ns
- PREVALENC	Sputum	Bronchial	0.0473246	0	J	
E		aspirate	4	3.3813E-56	3.3813E-55	***
PREVALENC	Sputum	•	0.0435960			
E		BAL	5	2.4327E-28	2.4327E-27	***
PREVALENC		Bronchial	0.0309554			
E	Induced sputum	aspirate	8	1.0264E-17	1.0264E-16	***
PREVALENC			0.0272268			
E	Induced sputum	BAL	9	7.7062E-10	7.7062E-09	***
PREVALENC	Bronchial			0.1395297		
E .	aspirate	BAL	-0.0037286	8	1	n.s.
NPV	All specimens	Sputum	2.2288E-05	1	1	n.s.
	All specifiens		0 000475	0.6371934	1	nc
	All specimens	Induced sputum	0.000473	4 0 9038903	1	11.5.
NPV		Bronchial	6.0001130	0.9090903	1	n.s.
	All specimens	aopirato	Ū	0.2934213	_	
NPV		BAL	-0.000475	1	1	n.s.
	Sputum			0.6723950		
NPV		Induced sputum	-0.0004973	9	1	n.s.
	Sputum	Bronchial	0 07755 05			
NPV	Sputum	aspirate	9.2775E-05	1	1	n.s.
	Sputum	DAL	-0.000/073	0.3311067	1	nc
		DAL	0.0004973	0 5676023	1	11.5.
NPV	Induced soutum	bronchiai aspirate	0.0003300 4	6.3070023 6	1	n.s.
NPV	Induced sputum	BAI	0	NA	NA	
	Bronchial		•	0.2473768		
NPV	aspirate	BAL	-0.00059	8	1	n.s.
PPV	All specimens	Sputum	0	NA	NA	
PPV	All specimens	Induced sputum	0	NA	NA	
221	All specimens	Bronchial	-			
PPV	All specimens	aspirate	0	NA	NA	
PPV	All specimens	BAL	0	NA	NA	
PPV	Sputum	Induced sputum	0	NA	NA	
PPV	Sputum	aspirate	0	NA	NA	
PPV	Sputum	BAL	0	NA	NA	
			-			

PPV	Induced sputum	Bronchial aspirate	0	NA	NA
PPV	Induced sputum	BAL	0	NA	NA
	Bronchial				
PPV	aspirate	BAL	0	NA	NA

### Table S4. P-values for Table 4, performance of smear microscopy 559

### according of the type of specimen. 560

561

Table S4. P-values for table 4	, performance o	of smear microso	opy according	g of the type o	Table S4. P-values for table 4, performance of smear microscopy according of the type of specimen.					
Pairwise Comparison Direct										
Exam	Sample1	Sample2	Diff_1m2	p.val	adj.p.val	sig.code				
		Induced								
SENSITIVITY	Sputum	sputum	0.15384615	0.58674615	1	n.s.				
		Bronchial								
SENSITIVITY	Sputum	aspirate	-0.1538462	0.64159157	1	n.s.				
SENSITIVITY	Sputum	BAL	0.25	0.4496918	1	n.s.				
	Induced	Bronchial								
SENSITIVITY	sputum	aspirate	0	1	1	n.s.				
	Induced									
SENSITIVITY	sputum	BAL	-0.3333333	1	1	n.s.				
	Bronchial									
SENSITIVITY	aspirate	BAL	0.16666667	0.10322732	0.61936393	n.s.				
		Induced								
NPV	Sputum	sputum	0.00507604	0.61977665	1	n.s.				
		Bronchial								
NPV	Sputum	aspirate	-0.0058305	0.68707568	1	n.s.				
NPV	Sputum	BAL	0.0070922	0.48184948	1	n.s.				
	Induced	Bronchial								
NPV	sputum	aspirate	0	1	1	n.s.				
	Induced									
NPV	sputum	BAL	-0.0188537	1	1	n.s.				
	Bronchial									
NPV	aspirate	BAL	0.0019746	0.14625681	0.87754084	n.s.				

### Table S5. P-values for Table 5, sensitivity of PCR to predict 563 tuberculosis according to the type of specimen using a 72 72-hours 564 pairing window in the same patient.. 565

<sup>566</sup> 

Table S5. P.values for table 5, sensitivity of PCR to predict tuberculosis according to the type of specimen using a							
72-hours pairing window in t	72-hours pairing window in the same patient						
PAIRWISE COMPARISON							
PCR	Sample1	Sample2	Diff_1m2	p.val	adj.p.val	sig.code	
		Induced					
SENSITIVITY	Sputum	sputum	0	1	1	n.s.	
		Bronchial					
SENSITIVITY	Sputum	aspirate	-0.6153846	0.00293535	0.01761212	*	
SENSITIVITY	Sputum	BAL	-0.4	0.4291953	1	n.s.	
	Induced	Bronchial					
SENSITIVITY	sputum	aspirate	0.14285714	1	1	n.s.	
	Induced						
SENSITIVITY	sputum	BAL	0.4	0.4291953	1	n.s.	
	Bronchial						
SENSITIVITY	aspirate	BAL	0.41025641	5.551E-05	0.00033306	***	
		Induced					
NPV	Sputum	sputum	0	1	1	n.s.	
		Bronchial					
NPV	Sputum	aspirate	-0.0473373	0.01482072	0.08892431	n.s.	
NPV	Sputum	BAL	-0.0149254	0.48447295	1	n.s.	
	Induced	Bronchial					
NPV	sputum	aspirate	0.03024194	1	1	n.s.	
	Induced						
NPV	sputum	BAL	0.0625	0.50109265	1	n.s.	
	Bronchial						
NPV	aspirate	BAL	0.01379293	0.00043168	0.00259007	* *	
SENSITIVITY NPV NPV NPV NPV NPV	Bronchial aspirate Sputum Sputum Induced sputum Induced sputum Bronchial aspirate	BAL Induced sputum Bronchial aspirate BAL Bronchial aspirate BAL BAL	0.41025641 0 -0.0473373 -0.0149254 0.03024194 0.0625 0.01379293	5.551E-05 1 0.01482072 0.48447295 1 0.50109265 0.00043168	0.00033306 1 0.08892431 1 1 0.00259007	*** n.s. n.s. n.s. n.s. n.s. **	

## Table S6. P.values for table 1, sensitivity of culture to predict 569

tuberculosis according to the type of specimen using a 72-hour 570

### pairing window within the same patient. 571

## 572

Table S4. P.values for table 6, sensitivity of culture to predict tuberculosis according to the type of specimen using a 72 72-hours pairing window within the same patient.						
PAIRWISE						
CULTURE	Sample1	Sample2	Diff_1m2	p.val	adj.p.val	sig.code
		Induced				
SENSITIVITY	Sputum	sputum	0.05714286	0.75114104	1	n.s.
		Bronchial				
SENSITIVITY	Sputum	aspirate	-0.2903226	0.01767207	0.10603241	n.s.
SENSITIVITY	Sputum	BAL	0.10526316	0.65640773	1	n.s.
		Bronchial				
SENSITIVITY	Induced sputum	aspirate	-0.1538462	0.64159157	1	n.s.
SENSITIVITY	Induced sputum	BAL	0.30769231	0.22653276	1	n.s.
	Bronchial					
SENSITIVITY	aspirate	BAL	0.33333333	1.0772E-08	6.4633E-08	***
	Induced					
NPV	sputum	0.00526184	0.77818701	1	n.s.	
	Bronchiai	0 0070170	0 04176725	0.25060407	<b>n</b> 0	
	aspirate	-0.0270176	0.04170735	0.25000407	11.5.	
NPV	BAL	0.00729847	0.68809585		n.s.	
	aspirate	0.0406610	0 71342404	1	ne	
		-0.0400019	0.71342494	1	n.s.	
NPV	BAL	0.08074534	0.39206894	1	n.s.	
NPV	BAL	0.00940163	3.2399E-07	1.944E-06	***	
E=sputum (spontaneous expectoration), Induced sputum=Induced sputum, Bronchial aspirate=bronchial aspirate, BAL=Bronchoalveolar lavage.						

573

577

### Table S7. Performance of in-house Taqman PCR and Xpert for the 578 diagnostic of pulmonary tuberculosis. 579

- 580
- 581

## Supplementary table 2. Performance of in-house Taqman PCR and Xpert for the diagnostic of pulmonary tuberculosis.

	Accuracy	Sensitivity	Specificity	Prevalence	PPV	NPV
In-house TaqMan PCR	0.991 (0.988, 0.994) 5493/5542	0.799 (0.743, 0.848) 191/239	>0.999 (0.999, 1) 5302/5303	0.043 (0.038, 0.049) 239/5542	0.995 (0.971, 191/192	0.991 1) (0.988, 0.993) 5302/5350
Xpert	0.975 (0.967, 0.981) 1917/1967	0.812 (0.760, 0.858) 212/261	0.999 (0.997, 1) 1705/1706	0.133 (0.118, 0.148) 261/1967	0.995 (0.974, 212/213	0.972 1) (0.963, 0.979) 1705/1754

582

583

### Table S8. Kappa with 95% confidence intervals. 584

585

	Microscopy	PCR	Culture
Sputum vs Induced sputum	0.73 (0.54,0.92)	0.49 (-0.11,1)	0.78 (0.66,0.9)
Sputum vs Bronchial aspirate	0.79 (0.62,0.97)	0.54 (0.26,0.81)	0.66 (0.50,0.82)
Sputum vs BAL	0.93 (0.80,1)	0.74 (0.40,1)	0.80 (0.65,0.96)
Induced sputum vs Bronchial aspirate	-0.02 (-0.04,0.01)	0.68 (0.34,1)	0.64 (0.37,0.90)
Induced sputum vs BAL	-0.02 (-0.05,0.01)	0.72 (0.36,1)	0.27 (-0.06,0.60)
Bronchial aspirate vs BAL	0.72 (0.62,0.82)	0.69 (0.56,1)	0.75 (0.67,0.83)

586

### Table S9. Contingency table for kappa: microscopy 587

	Induced		
	sputum		
Sputum	1	0	
1	10	5	
0	2	364	
	Bronchial		
	aspirate		
Sputum	1	0	
1	10	1	
0	4	332	
	BAL		
Sputum	1	0	

1	7	1
0	0	278
	Bronc	hial
	aspira	te
Induced	1	0
sputum		
1	0	1
0	1	54
	BAL	
Induced	1	0
sputum		
1	0	1
0	1	50
	BAL	
Bronchial	1	0
aspirate		
1	35	18
0	9	3502

### Table S10. Contingency table for kappa: PCR

	Induced	
	sputum	
Sputum	1	0
1	1	150
0	129	1927
	Bronchia	l
	aspirate	
Sputum	1	0
1	0	147
0	161	1888
	BAL	
Sputum	1	0
1	0	149
0	132	1923
	Bronchia	l
	aspirate	
Induced	1	0
sputum		
1	2	77
0	30	2144
	BAL	
Induced	1	0
sputum		
1	3	2
0	0	30
	BAL	
Bronchial	1	0
aspirate		
1	21	18
0	1141	1033

### Table S11. Contingency table for kappa: culture

	Induced		
	sputum		
Sputum	1	0	
1	23	7	
0	5	368	
	Bronc	hial	
	aspira	te	
Sputum	1	0	
1	16	3	
0	12	318	
	BAL		
Sputum	1	0	
1	13	4	
0	2	268	
	Bronc	hial	
	aspira	te	
Induced	1	0	
sputum			
1	7	2	
0	4	43	
	BAL		
Induced	1	0	
sputum			
1	3	7	
0	3	39	
	BAL		
Bronchial	1	0	
aspirate			
1	60	36	
0	3	3471	