1	Repeat Testing of Mpox Specimens with Late CTs Improves Detection of Potential False
2	Positive Cases
3	
4	Ryan C. Shean <sup>1,2</sup> , Weston C. Hymas <sup>2</sup> , Jeremy Klein <sup>2</sup> , Michael Pyne <sup>2</sup> , David R. Hillyard <sup>1,2</sup> ,
5	Benjamin T. Bradley <sup>1,2,#</sup>
6	
7	<sup>1</sup> Department of Pathology, University of Utah, Salt Lake City UT, USA
8	<sup>2</sup> ARUP Laboratories, Salt Lake City, UT, USA
9	
10	#Address correspondence to Ben T. Bradley, <u>Ben.Bradley@hsc.utah.edu</u>
11	Running Title: MPXV repeat testing improves false positive detection
12	Keywords: Monkeypox virus, mpox, MPXV, false positive, PCR

## 13 Abstract

The global outbreak of mpox necessitated the rapid development of clinical assays for 14 monkeypox virus detection. While the majority of mpox specimens have high viral loads with 15 corresponding early CT values, reports have indicated some specimens with late CT values can 16 represent false positive results. To mitigate this risk, the Centers for Disease Control and 17 18 Prevention (CDC) published an advisory recommending repeat testing of all specimens with CT values  $\geq$ 34. However, limited experimental data was available to support this specific cutoff. In 19 this study, we examine whether a more conservative approach in which all specimens with CT 20 21 values  $\geq 29$  are repeated would improve the detection of potential false positive results. 22 Compared to the CDC algorithm, our approach identified an additional 20% (5/25) of potential false positive results. To assess the impact of this cutoff on laboratory workload, we estimated 23 the expected increase in test volume and turnaround time (TAT) relative to the CDC method. 24 Using a lower repeat threshold, test volume increased by 0.7% and the mean TAT for positive 25 specimens increased by less than 15 minutes. Overall, a lower threshold than recommended by 26 the CDC for repeating late CT mpox specimens may reduce the number of false positives 27 reported while minimally impacting testing volume and TAT. 28 29

### 30 Introduction

Monkeypox virus (MPXV) is a double stranded DNA virus in the Orthopoxvirus genus, 31 which also includes variola virus, the causative agent of smallpox. In July 2022 the World Health 32 Organization declared a Public Health Emergency of International Concern due to an outbreak of 33 MPXV with sustained human-to-human transmission in multiple non-endemic countries<sup>1</sup>. At the 34 35 beginning of the outbreak, testing capacity in the United States was limited to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) and members of the Laboratory Response Network. In 36 June 2022, clinical laboratories, using the assay developed by the CDC, began adding additional 37 testing capacity<sup>2</sup>. This was followed over the subsequent weeks by other clinical microbiology 38 laboratories that either adapted the CDC assay or validated their own laboratory developed test in 39 accordance with recommendations from the FDA<sup>3</sup>. Additionally, several manufacturers received 40 emergency use authorization (EUA) for orthopoxvirus or MPXV-specific assays following the 41 EUA declaration on September 17<sup>th</sup>, 2022. 42 The majority of specimens collected from individuals with mpox have demonstrated high 43 viral loads with corresponding early CT values<sup>4</sup>. However, shortly after the outbreak began, 44 reports of false positive mpox cases began to surface. In a series of three false positive cases, all 45 specimens had late CT values ranging from 34.3 to 36.7<sup>5</sup>. In September 2022, the CDC 46 published an advisory recommending repeat testing of all specimens with CT values  $\geq 34^6$ . Due 47 to the limited data surrounding the utility of this cutoff, our institution adopted a more 48 49 conservative strategy of repeating all positive specimens with a  $CT \ge 29$  from 9/15/22 to 11/4/22.

Here we present a retrospective analysis of this data to better understand the clinical and

51 laboratory impact of a more stringent repeat threshold.

52

### 53 Materials and Methods

#### 54 MPXV PCR testing

55	Detection of monkeypox virus at ARUP was performed as previously described <sup>4</sup> . In
56	brief, specimens received as dry swabs were resuspended in PBS prior to further processing.
57	DNA from VTM and dry swabs was extracted and amplified on the Roche cobas 6800 platform.
58	Roche omni channel reagents with lab-developed primers and probes were used for detection of
59	a conserved region of the polymerase gene present in non-variola orthopoxviruses <sup>7</sup> .
60	
61	Data extraction and labeling
62	Data for individual specimens were extracted from the Laboratory Information System
63	(LIS) at the end of the study period. All tests with a completed time logged in the LIS between
64	00:00 on $9/15/22$ and $23:59$ on $11/4/22$ were included. Information gathered for each specimen
65	included a unique deidentified specimen ID, unique deidentified patient ID, age and sex of
66	patient, initial CT value (CT1), CT value of repeated test if performed (CT2), swab type (Dry,
67	VTM, or Other), collection site, collection time, in-lab time, and completion time. Samples were
68	retrospectively classified based on their CT1 value as "detected" or "not detected". "Detected"
69	specimens were samples with $CT1 < 50$ . "Not detected" specimens were samples with $CT1 = 50$

70 (value provided by the instrument when no amplification curve is detected). "Detected"

specimens were further sub-categorized as "positive", "low positive", or "indeterminate" based

on CT1 and CT2 results. "Positive" specimens were samples with CT1 <29. "Low positive"

specimens were samples with CT1 values between  $\geq 29$  and < 50 and CT2 values < 50.

"Indeterminate" specimens also had CT1 values between  $\geq 29$  and < 50 but with a CT2 value =

50. Nine specimens had their CT2 values excluded because the CT1 values were <29. These

76	samples were repeated due to run control failures or when collected from pediatric patients (all
77	pediatric specimens were repeated regardless of CT value). The impact of repeat testing on
78	pediatric specimens was previously examined <sup>8</sup> . 21 specimens with a CT1 $\geq$ 29 failed to undergo
79	repeat testing due to low specimen volume. These were classified as "detected" and excluded
80	from sub-categorization.
81	
82	Ethics, data analysis, and statistics
83	University of Utah granted an IRB exemption ID#00158025. Deidentified data was
84	processed in Python 3.8 and detailed statistical analysis was performed in R v4.2 <sup>9</sup> .
85	
86	Results
87	Descriptive epidemiology of MPXV PCR testing
88	A total of 4,233 specimens were analyzed over the 51-day study period with an average
89	of 88.2 tests per day (Fig. 1). During this period, MPXV was initially detected in 18.7%
90	(790/4,233) of specimens. Of the 790 specimens in which MPXV was detected 23.3% (184/790)
91	had a CT1 at or above the repeat threshold of CT 29 and were repeated. Of the 184 tests that
92	were repeated 86.4% (159/184) produced a valid CT2 signal and were classified as "low
93	positive". 13.6% (25/184) of these specimens failed to repeat and were classified as
94	"indeterminate". Total testing volume decreased by an average of 1.8 tests/day over the study
95	period, however, detection rate and rate of low positives remained relatively stable.
96	Specimens were collected from 3,111 individuals over the study period (Table 1). The
97	average age of tested individuals was 34.4 years (SD 17.0) and 68.2% of patients were male.
98	Overall, there was a significant association between categorical result and sex (Pearson's Chi-

99	squared test p<0.05). In cross-group comparisons, male individuals comprised a smaller
100	proportion of negative results (62.7%) than either positive (93.0%) or low positive (92.8%)
101	results (pairwise Bonferroni corrected Pearson's chi-squared tests p<0.008). There was no
102	significant association between age of patient and result.
103	
104	A Lower Repeat Threshold Improves Specificity of MPXV Detection
105	For samples with MPXV detected, the mean CT1 value was 20.5 (SD 4.0) for positives,

34.3 (SD 3.1) for low positives, and 37.6 (SD 3.6) for indeterminate samples. The average CT2 106 107 for low positives was 33.9 (SD 3.3). Per our algorithm, repeat testing was not performed for positive samples and CT2 values for indeterminate specimens were set at 50 (i.e. no valid curve). 108 109 There was good correlation between the CT1 and CT2 of low positive specimens with an r-110 squared of 0.8 and standard error of 0.03 (Figure 2). During the study period a total of 184 specimens were repeated according to our algorithm. While the majority of specimens (86.4%, 111 159/184) detected MPXV upon repeat testing, 13.6% (25/184) of samples failed to repeat and 112 were subsequently categorized as indeterminate. CT1 values for indeterminate specimens ranged 113 from 29.5 to 44.2. (Figure 3). While 80% (20/25) of these samples were at or above the CDC's 114 115 recommended repeat threshold of 34, there were five specimens (CT1 values 29.5, 30.8, 31.1, 32.4, 33.3) below this cutoff. Compared to this study's repeat algorithm, the CDC's algorithm 116 had a sensitivity of 100% (95% CI: 97.7% – 100%) and a specificity of 80% (95% CI: 59.3% – 117 118 93.17%) for MPXV detection in specimens with CT1 values  $\geq 29$ .

119

120 A Lower Repeat Threshold Minimally Impacts Test Volume and Turn-around Times

121	As repeat testing could lead to unsustainable testing volume or prolonged turn-around
122	times (TAT), we examined changes in testing volume and TAT associated with repeat thresholds
123	of 29 or 34 as compared to a no-repeat baseline. Sub-analyses were performed assuming a mpox
124	prevalence of 3%, 10%, 18% (the average overall detection rate during our study period), and
125	30%. The increase in testing volume ranged from $0.6\%$ to $6.0\%$ and $0.5\%$ to $4.8\%$ for a repeat
126	threshold of 29 or 34, respectively (Figure 4A). During the study period, using a lower repeat
127	threshold of 29 led to an additional 1.4 tests per day as compared to the CDC's recommendation.
128	TAT was assessed based on the time from specimen receipt to final result (i.e. in-lab TAT)
129	due to variations in specimen shipping practices. Overall, the mean in-lab TAT for positive
130	specimens increased by 0.15 to 1.82 hours depending on the prevalence of mpox and repeat
131	threshold employed. When comparing TAT between repeat thresholds, using a CT of 29 versus
132	34 for repeat testing prolonged the mean in-lab TAT of positive specimens by less than 30
133	minutes (Figure 4B). On a per specimen basis, the average in-lab TAT was 33.1 hours (SD 16.2)
134	for all samples, 31.9h (SD 14.2) for positives, 31.7h (SD 14.7) for negatives, 61.8h (SD 21.4) for
135	low positives and 63.6h (SD 25.7) for indeterminate samples. Repeating a specimen added an
136	average of 31.7h (SD 29.1) to the in-lab TAT. However, time to receipt remained the largest
137	contributor to overall TAT at 72.8h (SD 43.0) (Figure 5).
138	

# 139 Discussion

Here we assess over 4,000 MPXV PCR results from a large reference laboratory to
examine the impact of repeating late CT specimens on patient results. We found that a reflex CT
of 29 as compared to 34 potentially reduces the number of false positive results reported. We also

143 demonstrate that regardless of the repeat threshold selected, there is minimal impact to testing144 volume and TAT.

False positive results may be due to a number of pre-analytic factors including 145 mislabeling, sampling error, or contamination of collection devices and reagents<sup>10,11</sup>. There are 146 also a variety of analytic errors that can occur such as pipetting error and specimen cross-147 contamination<sup>12</sup>. From the perspective of a clinical microbiology laboratory, closed tube systems 148 and a reduction in the number of technicians handling the specimen can lower contamination 149 rates; however, no system is perfect<sup>13</sup>. Specific challenges to preventing cross-contamination 150 151 during the mpox epidemic included the high prevalence of positive samples (18% during the study period) and the relatively high level of MPXV DNA within positive specimens (mean CT 152 of 20.5 for positive specimens). These problems are not unique to MPXV and may be seen in 153 154 other viruses with extremely high viral loads, such as BK virus. False positive results have previously been shown with PCR assays for BK virus, including on the instrument used in this 155 study<sup>14</sup> 156

A central question to this study is whether the specimens we categorized as indeterminate 157 (i.e. those which failed to repeat) represent a false positive result or are an artifact of stochastic 158 159 effect near the assay's limit of detection (LOD). When validating our assay, we established the 97.5% (39/40 repeats) LOD at 80 copies per reaction which corresponded to an average CT of 160 39.5 (SD 1.03, 95% CI 37.8 – 41.6). Thus, we are reasonably confident that specimens at or 161 162 below this CT value should consistently repeat as detected. In this study, 72% (18/25) of indeterminate specimens had a CT value less than our LOD of 39.5. Therefore, we believe the 163 164 majority of indeterminate results, and in particular those identified only by the lower cutoff, 165 represent false positive results.

166	Despite the CDC's recommendation, there has been little uniformity in the adoption of
167	MPXV repeat cutoffs. Of the 6 MPXV assays granted emergency use authorization, only one
168	outlines a repeat strategy <sup>15</sup> . For this specific assay, the repeat threshold is set between a CT of 38
169	and 40 with the assay's LOD determined to be at a CT of 36.0 (100 copies/mL). Selecting a
170	repeat threshold above an assay's LOD provides limited clinical utility as specimens which fail
171	to repeat have a higher likelihood of representing the stochastic effect of low DNA
172	concentrations. We selected a repeat threshold 10 cycles lower than the established LOD to more
173	confidently identify cases which fail to repeat as false positives.
174	This study is unique in that it analyzes mpox specimens collected from sites across the
175	US and includes a relatively large cohort. During the study period, we reported approximately
176	13% of the total number of mpox tests registered by the $CDC^{16}$ . However, these results may not
177	translate uniformly to other laboratories. Labs with a lower throughput who have not automated
178	this process or use a different instrument may experience different sources of error which could
179	impact the likelihood of false positives. Limitations of this study include its retrospective and
180	descriptive nature, use of data from a single reference laboratory, and limited clinical data to
181	adjudicate indeterminate specimens.

While the initial surge of mpox cases has abated, the question of whether this virus will endemically circulate in humans remains<sup>17,18</sup>. Currently, data from the CDC and our institution show a positivity rate of approximately 10%, arguing that laboratories will continue to face testing challenges related to specimens with late CT values. As these results may have significant social and psychological impact, reducing false positive mpox results is critical<sup>19,20</sup>. The CDC's recommendations provide a suitable starting point for laboratories performing mpox testing;

- 188 however, each laboratory should carefully inspect the performance of its assay to determine the
- 189 optimal repeat thresholds.

### 191 References

- 192 (1) WHO Director-General's statement at the press conference following IHR Emergency
- 193 Committee regarding the multi-country outbreak of monkeypox 23 July 2022.
- 194 https://www.who.int/director-general/speeches/detail/who-director-general-s-statement-on-
- 195 the-press-conference-following-IHR-emergency-committee-regarding-the-multi--country-
- 196 outbreak-of-monkeypox--23-july-2022 (accessed 2023-06-19).
- 197 (2) Affairs (ASPA), A. S. for P. HHS Expanding Monkeypox Testing Capacity to Five
- 198 Commercial Laboratory Companies. HHS.gov.
- 199 https://www.hhs.gov/about/news/2022/06/22/hhs-expanding-monkeypox-testing-capacity-
- five-commercial-laboratory-companies.html (accessed 2023-06-19).
- 201 (3) Health, C. for D. and R. Monkeypox (mpox) and Medical Devices. FDA.
- 202 https://www.fda.gov/medical-devices/emergency-situations-medical-devices/monkeypox-
- 203 mpox-and-medical-devices (accessed 2023-09-08).
- 204 (4) Lieberman, N. A. P.; Mathias, P. C.; Bradley, B. T.; Greninger, A. L. Clinical Performance
- and Trends during the First Two Months of Monkeypox Virus PCR Testing at Two United
- 206 States Reference Labs. J. Clin. Microbiol. **2022**, 60 (12), e01371-22.
- 207 https://doi.org/10.1128/jcm.01371-22.
- 208 (5) Minhaj, F. S.; Petras, J. K.; Brown, J. A.; Mangla, A. T.; Russo, K.; Willut, C.; Lee, M.;
- Beverley, J.; Harold, R.; Milroy, L.; Pope, B.; Gould, E.; Beeler, C.; Schneider, J.; Mostafa,
- 210 H. H.; Godfred-Cato, S.; Click, E. S.; Borah, B. F.; Galang, R. R.; Cash-Goldwasser, S.;
- 211 Wong, J. M.; McCormick, D. W.; Yu, P. A.; Shelus, V.; Carpenter, A.; Schatzman, S.; Lowe,
- D.; Townsend, M. B.; Davidson, W.; Wynn, N. T.; Satheshkumar, P. S.; O'Connor, S. M.;
- 213 O'Laughlin, K.; Rao, A. K.; McCollum, A. M.; Negrón, M. E.; Hutson, C. L.; Salzer, J. S.;

214	CDC Monkeypo	x Emergency	Response 7	Team; CDC N	<i>Ionkeypox</i>	Emergency	Response
	<b>2</b>				~ .		

- 215 Team. Orthopoxvirus Testing Challenges for Persons in Populations at Low Risk or Without
- 216 Known Epidemiologic Link to Monkeypox United States, 2022. MMWR Morb. Mortal.
- 217 Wkly. Rep. 2022, 71 (36), 1155–1158. https://doi.org/10.15585/mmwr.mm7136e1.
- 218 (6) 08/23/2022: Lab Advisory: Mpox Virus Testing Considerations to Prevent False Positive
- 219 Test Results. https://www.cdc.gov/locs/2022/08-23-2022-Lab-Advisory-
- Monkeypox\_Virus\_Testing\_Considerations\_Prevent\_False\_Positive\_Test\_Results.html
   (accessed 2023-06-18).
- 222 (7) Li, Y.; Olson, V. A.; Laue, T.; Laker, M. T.; Damon, I. K. Detection of Monkeypox Virus
- with Real-Time PCR Assays. J. Clin. Virol. Off. Publ. Pan Am. Soc. Clin. Virol. **2006**, 36
- 224 (3), 194–203. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcv.2006.03.012.
- 225 (8) Ma, A.; Bradley, B. T. Clinical Testing of Pediatric Mpox Specimens: Unique Features and
- 226 Challenges in a Low Prevalence Population. J. Clin. Virol. Off. Publ. Pan Am. Soc. Clin.

227 Virol. **2023**, 163, 105447. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcv.2023.105447.

- (9) R Core Team. R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing; R Foundation for
  Statistical Computing: Vienna, Austria, 2023.
- 230 (10) Najat, D. Prevalence of Pre-Analytical Errors in Clinical Chemistry Diagnostic Labs in
- Sulaimani City of Iraqi Kurdistan. PLOS ONE **2017**, 12 (1), e0170211.
- 232 https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0170211.
- 233 (11) Sotoudeh Anvari, M.; Gharib, A.; Abolhasani, M.; Azari-Yam, A.; Hossieni Gharalari, F.;
- 234 Safavi, M.; Zare Mirzaie, A.; Vasei, M. Pre-Analytical Practices in the Molecular
- Diagnostic Tests, A Concise Review. Iran. J. Pathol. **2021**, 16 (1), 1–19.
- 236 https://doi.org/10.30699/ijp.2020.124315.2357.

- 237 (12) Taylor, S. C.; Nadeau, K.; Abbasi, M.; Lachance, C.; Nguyen, M.; Fenrich, J. The Ultimate
- 238 qPCR Experiment: Producing Publication Quality, Reproducible Data the First Time.
- 239 Trends Biotechnol. **2019**, 37 (7), 761–774. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tibtech.2018.12.002.
- 240 (13) Rahbari, R.; Moradi, N.; Abdi, M. rRT-PCR for SARS-CoV-2: Analytical Considerations.
- 241 Clin. Chim. Acta Int. J. Clin. Chem. **2021**, 516, 1–7.
- 242 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cca.2021.01.011.
- 243 (14) Fritzsche, A.; Berneking, L.; Nörz, D.; Reucher, S.; Fischer, N.; Roggenkamp, H.;
- 244 Aepfelbacher, M.; Rohde, H.; Pfefferle, S.; Lütgehetmann, M. Clinical Evaluation of a
- 245 Laboratory-Developed Quantitative BK Virus-PCR Assay Using the Cobas® Omni Utility
- 246 Channel. J. Virol. Methods **2021**, 290, 114093.
- 247 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jviromet.2021.114093.
- 248 (15) Health, C. for D. and R. Monkeypox (mpox) Emergency Use Authorizations for Medical
- 249 Devices. FDA. https://www.fda.gov/medical-devices/emergency-use-authorizations-
- 250 medical-devices/monkeypox-mpox-emergency-use-authorizations-medical-devices
- 251 (accessed 2023-09-19).
- 252 (16) Non-Variola Orthopoxvirus and Mpox Virus Laboratory Testing Data | Mpox | Poxvirus |
- 253 CDC. https://www-cdc-gov.ezproxy.lib.utah.edu/poxvirus/mpox/response/2022/2022-lab-
- 254 test.html (accessed 2023-09-08).
- (17) Reardon, S. What Does the Future Look like for Monkeypox? Nature 2022, 610 (7931),
- 256 250–252. https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-022-03204-7.
- (18) Mega, E. R. Why Scientists Fear Monkeypox Spreading in Wild Animals. Nature 2022.
  https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-022-03048-1.

- 259 (19) Happi, C.; Adetifa, I.; Mbala, P.; Njouom, R.; Nakoune, E.; Happi, A.; Ndodo, N.;
- Ayansola, O.; Mboowa, G.; Bedford, T.; Neher, R. A.; Roemer, C.; Hodcroft, E.; Tegally,
- 261 H.; O'Toole, Á.; Rambaut, A.; Pybus, O.; Kraemer, M. U. G.; Wilkinson, E.; Isidro, J.;
- Borges, V.; Pinto, M.; Gomes, J. P.; Freitas, L.; Resende, P. C.; Lee, R. T. C.; Maurer-Stroh,
- 263 S.; Baxter, C.; Lessells, R.; Ogwell, A. E.; Kebede, Y.; Tessema, S. K.; de Oliveira, T.
- 264 Urgent Need for a Non-Discriminatory and Non-Stigmatizing Nomenclature for
- 265 Monkeypox Virus. PLoS Biol. **2022**, 20 (8), e3001769.
- 266 https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.3001769.
- 267 (20) Turpin, R. E.; Mandell, C.; Camp, A. D.; Davidson Mhonde, R. R.; Dyer, T. V.; Mayer, K.
- 268 H.; Liu, H.; Coates, T.; Boekeloo, B. O. Monkeypox-Related Stigma and Vaccine
- 269 Challenges as a Barrier to HIV Pre-Exposure Prophylaxis among Black Sexual Minority
- 270 Men. Int. J. Environ. Res. Public. Health **2023**, 20 (14), 6324.
- 271 https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph20146324.
- 272

Result	Patients (n, %)	Mean Age (y, SD)	Gender
Positive	446 (14.3%)	35.5 (10.3)	93.0% M 7.0% F 0.0% U
Low Positive	98 (3.15%)	32.9 (11.9)	92.9% M 6.1% F 1.0% U
Indeterminate	16 (0.51%)	33.9 (11.7)	75.0% M 25.0% F 0.0% U
Negative	2542 (81.7%)	34.3 (18.1)	62.7% M 37.1% F 0.2% U
Total	3111 (100%)	34.4 (17.0)	68.2% M 31.6% F 0.2% U

274	<b>Table 1</b> – Patient characteristics by MPXV detection result
-----	---

275



Figure 1 – 7-Day Rolling Averages of Test Volume, Total Positivity Rate, and Low Positivity
Rate

Total test volume is represented by the blue line and measured in tests per day on the left Y-axis.

281 Percent of total tests with MPXV detected (CT1 <50) and percent of specimens falling within the

repeat threshold (CT1  $\geq$ 29 and <50) are indicated by the green and red lines, respectively.

283 Positivity rates are measured relative to the total test volume and mapped to the right Y-axis.



## 285

### 286 Figure 2 – Variation of CT Values on Repeat Testing

287 Comparison of CT values for initial (CT1) vs. repeated (CT2) tests during the study period,

including both low positive results (CT1  $\geq$ 29 to <50; CT2 <50) and indeterminate results (CT1

 $\geq 29$  to  $\leq 50$ ; CT2 = 50). The CDC's recommended repeat threshold (CT  $\geq 34$ ) is represented by

red dotted line. Linear best fit line and 95% confidence interval for low positive results are

represented by the blue line and gray shading. R-squared value for low-positive only results was

292 0.8. The r-squared value decreased to 0.43 when indeterminate results were included.



## 295 Figure 3 – Distribution of Indeterminate Results by CT1

296 Cumulative percentage of indeterminate results in our study distributed by CT1 value. Each point 297 represents one indeterminate result. Red dotted line represents the CDC's recommended repeat 298 testing cutoff (CT  $\geq$ 34).

299







A) Comparison of repeat thresholds on overall test volume based on different levels of mpox
prevalence in the test population. Y-axis represent relative increase in volume versus a no-repeat
approach. B) Comparison of repeat thresholds on mean in-lab TAT for specimens with MPXV
detected based on prevalence. Y-axis represents the mean increase of in-lab TAT in hours versus
a no-repeat approach.





## **309** Figure 5 – Turn Around Time by Final Result

310 Breakdown of turn-around time by final assigned result. All times are in hours. Total time

between collection and completion shown on top arrow. Values are provided as mean with

312 standard deviation in parenthesis.