

1 **Title:** Performance evaluation of nine reference centers for effective surveillance of *Leishmania*-infected  
2 Phlebotomine sand flies and basis for technical recommendations

3 **Short title:** Performance evaluation of reference centers in *Leishmania* surveillance

4

5 **Authors:** Jorian Prudhomme<sup>1\*\$</sup>, Aymeric Delabarre<sup>1\*</sup>, Bulent Alten<sup>2</sup>, Umut Berberoglu<sup>3</sup>, Eduardo Berriatua<sup>4</sup>,  
6 Gioia Bongiorno<sup>5</sup>, José Manuel Cristovao<sup>6</sup>, Maya Davidovich-Cohen<sup>7</sup>, Trentina Di Muccio<sup>5</sup>, Ozge Erisoz Kasap<sup>2</sup>,  
7 Eleonora Fiorentino<sup>5</sup>, Oscar D. Kirstein<sup>7</sup>, Edwin Kniha<sup>8</sup>, Carla Maia<sup>6</sup>, Mesut Mungan<sup>3</sup>, Clara Muñoz-Hernández<sup>4,9</sup>,  
8 Muhammed Nalçaci<sup>10</sup>, Gizem Oguz Kaskan<sup>2</sup>, Yusuf Ozbel<sup>10</sup>, Seray Ozensoy Toz<sup>10</sup>, Ricardo Parreira<sup>6</sup>, Katharina  
9 Platzgummer<sup>8</sup>, Ceylan Polat<sup>2</sup>, José Risueño<sup>4</sup>, Liora Studentsky<sup>7</sup>, Gamze Varol<sup>3</sup>, Julia Walochnik<sup>8</sup>, Kardelen  
10 Yetişmiş<sup>10</sup>, Florence Robert-Gangneux<sup>1</sup>

11

## 12 **Affiliations**

13 1. Univ Rennes, Inserm, EHESP, Irset (Institut de Recherche en Santé Environnement Travail), UMR\_S 1085,  
14 35000, Rennes, France

15 2. Hacettepe University, Ankara, Turkey

16 3. Turkish Ministry of Health, Ankara, Turkey

17 4. University of Murcia, Murcia, Spain

18 5. Istituto Superiore di Sanità, Rome, Italy

19 6. Global Health and Tropical Medicine, GHTM, LA-REAL, Instituto de Higiene e Medicina Tropical,  
20 Universidade NOVA de Lisboa, Lisbon, Portugal

21 7. Jerusalem Public Health Laboratories, Ministry of Health, Jerusalem, Israel

22 8. Institute of Specific Prophylaxis and Tropical Medicine, Center for Pathophysiology, Infectiology and  
23 Immunology, Medical University of Vienna, Kinderspitalgasse 15, 1090 Vienna, Austria

24 9. Health and Biotechnology Research Group (SaBio), Institute for Game and Wildlife Research (IREC), CSIC-  
25 UCLM-JCCM, Ciudad Real, Spain

26 10. Ege University Graduate School of Natural and Applied Sciences, Department of Biology, Bornova, Izmir,  
27 Türkiye

28 \* These authors contributed equally to the work

29 \$ Corresponding author

30 E-mail: [jorian.prudhomme@hotmail.fr](mailto:jorian.prudhomme@hotmail.fr) (JP)

**NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.**

## 31 **Abstract**

### 32 **Background**

33 Leishmaniasis, caused by *Leishmania* protozoan parasites transmitted by Phlebotomine sand flies, is a significant  
34 public health concern in the Mediterranean basin. Effective monitoring of *Leishmania*-infected sand flies requires  
35 standardized tools for comparing their distribution and infection prevalence. Consistent quantitative PCR (qPCR)  
36 conditions and efficient DNA extraction protocols are crucial for reliable results over time and across regions.  
37 However, there is currently a lack of technical recommendations for *Leishmania* DNA detection, which needs to  
38 be addressed. This study aimed to compare various DNA extraction protocols and conduct a qPCR based External  
39 Quality Assessment (EQA) through a multicenter study involving nine reference laboratories.

### 40 **Methodology/Principal findings**

41 EQA samples were prepared using *Leishmania infantum* and *L. major* strains, at different concentration from 10<sup>1</sup>  
42 to 10<sup>4</sup> parasites/mL and distributed to participating centers. All centers, except one, detected all *Leishmania*  
43 concentrations, demonstrating diagnostic proficiency. The ability to detect low concentrations highlighted the  
44 robustness of the qPCR assay used, although Cq value variations suggested differences in sensitivity due to  
45 technical capabilities and/or extraction kit performances.  
46 Reported comparative analysis of seven DNA extraction methods identified the EZ1 DSP Virus® Kit and  
47 QIAamp® DNA mini-kit as the most efficient, supporting their use for standardized protocols. The study also  
48 evaluated the impact of lyophilization and shipment conditions, finding no compromise in *Leishmania* detection,  
49 despite slight Cq value variations. In addition to EQA samples, experimentally infected sand fly have been  
50 included to mimic sample field condition. All centers detected positive samples, with variable Cq values, reflecting  
51 differences in individual infection load.

### 52 **Conclusion and significance**

53 Overall, the study underscores the importance of standardized protocols and continuous quality assurance to  
54 maintain high diagnostic validity, crucial for effective surveillance of leishmaniasis, especially in field settings  
55 with low infection densities. Continuous training and calibration are essential to ensure uniform diagnostic  
56 performance across laboratories, enhancing epidemiological surveillance and disease control strategies.

57

58 Keywords: *Leishmania*, qPCR, DNA extraction, multicenter trial, quality control

## 59 **Author Summary**

60 Leishmaniasis is a disease caused by *Leishmania* parasites, transmitted by sand flies, and poses a major health risk  
61 in the Mediterranean region. Monitoring the spread of infected sand flies is crucial for controlling the disease. This  
62 study focused on improving the methods used to detect *Leishmania* in sand flies by comparing different DNA  
63 extraction techniques and assessing the accuracy of these methods across nine reference laboratories. All centers,  
64 except one, efficiently detected all *Leishmania* concentrations, demonstrating proficiency in diagnostic protocols.  
65 Moreover, we found that two specific DNA extraction kits, the EZ1 DSP Virus® Kit and QIAamp® DNA mini-  
66 kit, were the most effective for *Leishmania* detection. We also tested how sample preparation and shipping  
67 conditions affected the results, ensuring that our methods would work in real-world settings. Even under these  
68 conditions, the detection methods proved reliable. This work helps to standardize the detection of *Leishmania*,  
69 making surveillance more accurate and consistent. Continuous training and calibration are essential to ensure  
70 uniform diagnostic performance across laboratories, enhancing epidemiological surveillance and disease control  
71 strategies

72

## 73 **Introduction**

74 Leishmaniasis is a disease caused by parasites of the genus *Leishmania* and transmitted by the bite of Phlebotomine  
75 sand flies. This parasitic infection is endemic in territories around the Mediterranean basin, where it represents a  
76 significant public health concern (1). Leishmaniasis clinical manifestations are diverse, ranging from cutaneous  
77 lesions, which may cause disfiguring ulcers on exposed parts of the body, to visceral disease with infiltration of  
78 the lymph nodes, spleen, liver, and bone marrow, causing pancytopenia and being fatal if untreated (2, 3). Despite  
79 the significant health impact of leishmaniasis worldwide, there is no substantial evidence indicating a rise in the  
80 incidence of autochthonous human cases in Europe. However, the disease remains often underreported, leading to  
81 a possible underestimation of its true burden (4). Hypothesis confirmed by a notable increase of autochthonous  
82 canine leishmaniasis cases (5). Furthermore, the geographical distribution of leishmaniasis is changing. New foci  
83 of infection are emerging in areas previously considered non-endemic, while old foci are re-emerging (5-7).  
84 Triggering factors contributing to these evolving scenario include climate change, which affects the distribution  
85 and behavior of sand fly vectors, increased movement of people and animals and trade activities, which can cause  
86 parasite introduction into new areas. Overall, the dynamic epidemiology of leishmaniasis in Europe underscores  
87 the need for vigilant surveillance and reporting systems.

88 Effective epidemiologic surveillance of *Leishmania*-infected sand flies could be considered an essential tool for  
89 understanding and controlling the spread of leishmaniasis. To achieve this goal, standardized protocols are required  
90 to accurately compare the distribution areas and the prevalence of sand fly infection. Real-time quantitative PCR  
91 (qPCR), which is a sensitive and specific method for detecting *Leishmania* DNA, plays a crucial role in this process  
92 (8). Utilizing consistent amplification conditions and similar extraction protocols across different laboratories is  
93 vital for ensuring that the results are comparable over time and across various geographical areas (9). Moreover,  
94 reliable data merged from different regions can help in mapping the spread of the disease and in understanding the  
95 factors driving its transmission, such as climate change, urbanization, and movements of infected hosts and vectors  
96 (10).

97 Despite the importance of these techniques, there is currently a lack of evaluation in nucleic acid extraction and  
98 qPCR techniques for *Leishmania* diagnosis. This deficiency represents a significant gap in the epidemiologic  
99 surveillance framework. Without standardized and validated methods, the reliability of data collected from  
100 different studies can be compromised, making it difficult to draw accurate comparisons and conclusions.

101 Laboratory efficiency has been compared throughout European countries for the diagnosis of other parasitic or  
102 fungal diseases, such as toxoplasmosis (11), histoplasmosis (9) and *Pneumocystis* pneumonia (12). Regarding  
103 leishmaniasis, a European study (13) has previously compared the accuracy of species identification by molecular  
104 methods, but no such initiative has been implemented for evaluating *Leishmania* detection by qPCR.

105 In this context, the objectives of this study were twofold: (i) to analyze the performance of various DNA extraction  
106 protocols for detecting *L. infantum* and *L. major*, by qPCR and (ii) to conduct an External Quality Assessment  
107 (EQA) through a multicenter study involving nine reference laboratories, participating in the European project  
108 CLIMOS (<http://www.climos-project.eu>) which collects data on sand fly infections. This study aimed at ensuring  
109 the reliability and comparability of *Leishmania* detection methods from sand flies across different regions and  
110 laboratories, thereby enhancing the accuracy of epidemiological surveillance and contributing to more effective  
111 disease control strategies.

112

## 113 **Methods**

### 114 *Participants and study design*

115 The Laboratory of Parasitology of Rennes University/Institut National de la Santé et de la Recherche Médicale  
116 (INSERM) (Rennes, France), which is a reference laboratory for the diagnosis of leishmaniasis and other parasitic  
117 and fungal infections, was in charge of developing standard operation procedures (SOP) for *Leishmania* extraction

118 from sand flies and oversaw the implementation of the EQA program for CLIMOS. The Rennes Lab prepared the  
119 EQA samples and evaluated the various extraction methods used by eight European and non-European laboratories  
120 involved in the project, located in 6 countries, including: the so-called reference center (INSERM, Rennes, France),  
121 Ege University (EGE, Izmir, Turkey), Hacettepe Universitesi (HACETTEPE, Ankara, Turkey), Institute of  
122 Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, Universidade Nova de Lisboa (UNL, Lisboa, Portugal), Jerusalem Public Health  
123 laboratories, Ministry of Health (IMOH, Jerusalem, Israel), Istituto Superiore di Sanita (ISS, Roma, Italy),  
124 Medizinische Universitaet Wien (MEDUNI VIENNA, Wien, Austria), Turkiye Cumhuriyeti Saglik Bakanligi  
125 (MOH, Ankara, Turkey) and Universidad de Murcia (UM, Murcia, Spain). The participating centers other than  
126 the reference center were designated as “Center 1 to Center 8”. The EQA program for *Leishmania* DNA extraction  
127 and qPCR analysis involved testing cultured parasites and experimentally infected sand flies.

#### 128 *Sand fly samples*

129 For all experiments and EQA samples, we used *Phlebotomus perniciosus* from well-adapted laboratory colonies.  
130 Sand flies were provided by Istituto Superiore di Sanita (ISS) (Roma, Italy) and Hacettepe Universitesi (HU)  
131 (Ankara, Turkey) for uninfected specimens, and by Charles University (CUNI) (Prague, Czech Republic) for  
132 experimentally infected ones (14).

#### 133 *Leishmania strains and preparation of EQA samples*

134 Two strains of *Leishmania* were used, *L. infantum* #REN-12-02 and *L. major* #REN-22-02 (both cryopreserved at  
135 the Biological Resource Center of the Rennes University Hospital and Leishmaniasis Reference Center of  
136 Montpellier University Hospital) for the comparison of DNA extraction techniques, preparation of EQA samples  
137 and EQA validation. Promastigotes were maintained in an incubator at 26°C by weekly transfers in T25 flask  
138 containing M199 medium (Sigma) supplemented with 10% inactivated fetal calf serum, 1% HEPES, 1%  
139 Penicillin-Streptomycin, 1% hypoxanthin, 0.2% hemin, 0.1% biotin and 0.4% biopterin.

140 Five serial 1:10 dilutions of each strain containing  $10^5$ ,  $10^4$ ,  $10^3$ ,  $10^2$  and  $10^1$  parasite/mL were prepared, starting  
141 with, 1 mL of homogenized broth culture. Dilutions were carried out in a 5% formalinized Dulbecco’s phosphate-  
142 buffered saline (DPBS) solution. Promastigotes were counted using the standardized KOVA cell chamber system,  
143 according to the protocol established by the supplier (Kova International, California, USA). To ensure accuracy,  
144 the counting was realized in 3 cells and by two different operators. Ready to used, parasite suspensions were  
145 aliquoted into 1.5 mL tubes and directly stored at -20 °C or lyophilized and stored at -20°C until use. A set of

146 lyophilized samples was kept at room temperature for 3 weeks to evaluate the impact of storage conditions on  
147 qPCR results.

148 *EQA sample processing*

149 All centers received a panel of ten EQA samples, consisting of eight lyophilized (*i.e. L. major* and *L. infantum* at  
150  $10^4$ ,  $10^3$ ,  $10^2$  and  $10^1$  parasite/mL) and two liquid samples (*i.e.* one uninfected and one experimentally infected  
151 sand fly in 200  $\mu$ L of PBS). At reception, samples were stored at  $-20^\circ\text{C}$  until further testing. Lyophilized samples  
152 were rehydrated with 200  $\mu$ L of PCR-quality water and sand fly samples were processed like any sand fly collected  
153 from the field for analysis, *i.e.* grinded in a final volume of 700  $\mu$ L of PBS and incubated at  $56^\circ\text{C}$  during 2 hours  
154 with proteinase K. Then, extractions were realized with an extraction volume of 400  $\mu$ L (200  $\mu$ L of EQA and 200  
155  $\mu$ L lysis buffer) and an elution volume between 50 and 90  $\mu$ L according to each center technique and equipment  
156 (Table 1).

*Table 1. Methods used for Leishmania nucleic acids extraction and detection in the different center*

Center	Extraction kit	Extraction device	Elution volume	Amplification device
Reference center	EZ1 DSP Virus® Kit	EZ1 extraction device	90	StepOne Real-time PCR System
1	RSC Blood DNA®	Maxwell RSC® 16 instrument	50	Biorad iQ5
2	Allprep® DNA/RNA micro kit	Handmade	90	Biorad CFX96 Real-time system
3	QIAmp® viral RNA mini kit	Handmade	90	Rotor Gene 3000
4	Kit 1: RSC Viral TNA®	Maxwell RSC® 16 instrument	90	QuantStudio™ 5 Real-Time PCR
	Kit 2: RSC Blood DNA®		50	
5	Allprep® DNA/RNA mini kit	Handmade	90	StepOnePlus Real-time PCR System
6	EZ1&2 virus mini® kit	EZ1 extraction device	90	Biorad CFX96 Real-time system
7	DNeasy® Blood & Tissue Kit	Handmade	90	Rotor-Gene Q
8	Mag-Bind® Blood & Tissue DNA Kit	TissueLyser II	90	Biorad CFX96 Real-time system

157 All partners employed the same qPCR method (15) based on the amplification of a kinetoplast DNA (kDNA)  
158 minicircle sequence with primers and Taqman probe: 5'-CTT-TTC-TGG-TCC-TCC-GGG-TAGG, 5'-CCA-CCC-  
159 GGC-CCT-ATT-TTA-CAC-CAA and 5' FAM-TTT-TCG-CAG-AAC-GCC-CCT-ACC-CGC-3' TAMRA,  
160 respectively, provided by the reference center. Each 25  $\mu$ L qPCR reaction mix included 5  $\mu$ L of DNA sample, 12.5  
161  $\mu$ L of TaqMan Universal Master Mix 2X and a final concentration of 0.5  $\mu$ M of primers and 0.2  $\mu$ M of probe.  
162 DNA was amplified using the following conditions: initial step at  $95^\circ\text{C}$  for 10 min, followed by 45 cycles of 15  
163 sec at  $95^\circ\text{C}$  and 1 min at  $60^\circ\text{C}$ . Participating centers used their own qPCR device (Table 1), realized the  
164 amplification in triplicates and included their own positive and negative controls. The qPCR threshold cycle (Cq)

165 defined as the cycle at which near logarithmic product amplification takes place, was used as a semi-quantitative  
166 measure of parasite DNA concentration (16).

#### 167 *Comparison of DNA extraction techniques*

168 As the amplification method was the same for all participating centers, we suspected that variations might appear  
169 related, at least partly, to the extraction method used. Therefore, we undertook the evaluation of seven extraction  
170 methods, including some used by the participating centers (Table 1), and additional ones which were designed to  
171 purify total nucleic acids and could offer the opportunity to detect simultaneously *Phlebovirus*, also transmitted  
172 by sand flies.

173 Seven kits were compared for *Leishmania* DNA extraction, including the following five manual extraction kits:  
174 EZ1 DSP Virus® Kit using EZ1 extraction device (Qiagen, Hilden, Germany), RNeasy® mini kit (Qiagen, Hilden,  
175 Germany), QIAamp® DNA mini kit (Qiagen, Hilden, Germany), Allprep® DNA/RNA mini kit (Qiagen, Hilden,  
176 Germany), QIAamp® viral RNA mini kit (Qiagen, Hilden, Germany) and two automated extraction kits: RSC  
177 Viral TNA® (Promega, Southampton, England) and RSC Blood DNA® (Promega, Southampton, England) using  
178 Maxwell RSC® 48 instrument (Promega). Amplifications were realized using a QuantStudio™ 5 Real-Time PCR  
179 System (Applied Biosystems®, Thermo Fisher Scientific®, Villebon-sur-Yvette, France). Liquid samples,  
180 containing parasite suspensions, aliquoted in small vials and stored at -20°C were used for this evaluation, to avoid  
181 possible variations due to the lyophilization process and reconstitution. Extractions were performed in triplicate  
182 from 3 independent vials of each concentration, according to the manufacturer's instructions. Amplifications were  
183 also performed in triplicates, using 5 µL of DNA in a final volume of 25 µL as described above.

#### 184 *Assessment of external conditions potentially influencing individual performances*

185 First, the variability of *Leishmania* spp. DNA detection of infected sand flies using seven individuals extracted  
186 with the same kit was assessed (EZ1 DSP Virus ® Kit using EZ1). Then, the process (*i.e.* lyophilization and  
187 shipment conditions) was tested through three experiments. The impact of lyophilization was assessed by DNA  
188 extraction of *L. infantum* and *L. major* aliquots at four concentrations ( $10^4$ ,  $10^3$ ,  $10^2$  and  $10^1$ ), before and after  
189 lyophilization. Second, to ensure there was no impact of shipment conditions on sample quality, results obtained  
190 with samples stored at room temperature (RT) for 3 weeks and samples stored at -20°C for the same time, before  
191 DNA extraction and amplification were compared. Third, the potential inhibitory effect of sand fly DNA on the  
192 detection of low amounts of *Leishmania* DNA was tested. For this purpose, pools of sand flies (30 individuals, 15  
193 males and 15 females) were spiked with 100 or 1000 *Leishmania* (*L. major* or *L. infantum*) promastigotes and

194 grinded in a final volume of 700  $\mu$ L of PBS, mimicking usual practice for field studies. The same numbers of  
195 *Leishmania* without sand flies were used as controls. Homogenates were submitted to a 2-hour heating step with  
196 proteinase K at 56°C before DNA extraction. Two hundred  $\mu$ L were used for DNA extraction using EZ1 DSP  
197 Virus® Kit (Qiagen, Hilden, Germany) according to the manufacturer's instructions and eluted in 90  $\mu$ L of elution  
198 buffer.  
199 Amplification was carried out using a QuantStudio™ 5 Real-Time PCR device (Applied Biosystems®).  
200 Extractions and amplifications were performed in triplicates.

#### 201 *Statistical analysis*

202 Results were presented as mean  $\pm$ SD of quantification cycle (Cq) values of amplification of each parasite  
203 concentration for each center. They were compared using two-way ANOVA or mixed-effects analyses (if missing  
204 data were present) and a Tukey's multiple comparisons test as post-hoc analyses. All analyses and graphics were  
205 realized with GraphPad ® Prism Software version 9.

206

## 207 **Results**

#### 208 *Multicenter qPCR analysis of EQA samples*

209 Results of DNA amplification by qPCR of the two *Leishmania* species at four different concentrations, obtained  
210 by the eight centers, are provided in Fig 1. All centers correctly amplified positive samples except center 6 which  
211 failed to amplify *L. infantum* at 10<sup>1</sup>/mL concentration. For *L. infantum*, mean Cq values across centers ranged from  
212 approximately 26 to 32, 29 to 32 and 31 to 36 for the 10<sup>4</sup>/mL, 10<sup>3</sup>/mL and 10<sup>2</sup>/mL parasite concentrations,  
213 respectively (Fig 1A). Similarly, the mean Cq values obtained for *L. major* showed notable inter-center variations,  
214 with overall higher mean Cq values compared to those obtained in the *L. infantum* assay (Fig 1B). The mean Cq  
215 values ranged from 26 to 38 for samples with 10<sup>4</sup>/mL parasites and from approximately 30 to 45 for samples with  
216 10<sup>2</sup>/mL parasites. At the lowest *L. major* concentration of 10<sup>1</sup>/mL parasites, Cq values ranged from 33 to 43. All  
217 participating centers also accurately detected the samples containing a *L. infantum* experimentally infected sand  
218 fly, with variable mean Cq ranging from 22 to 42 (Fig 2).

#### 219 *Comparison of extraction protocols*

220 For both *L. infantum* and *L. major*, the use of EZ1 DSP Virus® Kit, QIAamp® DNA mini kit, Allprep®  
221 DNA/RNA mini kit, and RSC Blood® DNA yielded the lowest Cq values for all concentrations, indicating they



222 are the most efficient kits in extracting DNA from *Leishmania*. Even though these four kits were associated with  
 223 low Cq values, extraction with EZ1 DSP Virus Kit offered the best overall efficiency since mean Cq values were  
 224 significantly lower than those for other kits at most *L. infantum* and *L. major* concentrations (Tables 2 & 3).  
 225 Conversely, RNeasy® mini kit, QIAamp viral RNA® mini kit, and RSC Viral TNA® showed higher Cq values,  
 226 indicating lower efficiency in extracting DNA. The detailed comparisons between the various extraction kits for  
 227 *L. infantum* are depicted in Fig 3A and p-values are summarized in Table 2, and those for *L. major* are illustrated  
 228 in Fig 3B and summarized in Table 3.  
 229

*Table 2. Detailed P-value for Tukey's multiple comparisons test between extraction kits for Leishmania infantum*

Kit compared	Concentration				
	10 <sup>1</sup>	10 <sup>2</sup>	10 <sup>3</sup>	10 <sup>4</sup>	10 <sup>5</sup>
EZ1 DSP Virus® Kit vs RSC Blood DNA®	0.0003	<0.0001	<0.0001	<0.0001	<0.0001
EZ1 DSP Virus® Kit vs QIAamp® viral RNA mini kit	0.5302	<0.0001	<0.0001	<0.0001	<0.0001
EZ1 DSP Virus® Kit vs RNeasy® mini kit	0.0014	<0.0001	<0.0001	<0.0001	0.0001
EZ1 DSP Virus® Kit vs RSC Viral TNA®	NA	0.0275	<0.0001	<0.0001	<0.0001
EZ1 DSP Virus® Kit vs Allprep® DNA/RNA mini kit	0.0009	<0.0001	<0.0001	<0.0001	<0.0001
EZ1 DSP Virus® Kit vs QIAamp® DNA mini kit	0.5452	<0.0001	0.0001	<0.0001	<0.0001
RSC Blood DNA® vs QIAamp® viral RNA mini kit	0.9680	0.0188	0.0086	0.0067	<0.0001
RSC Blood DNA® vs RNeasy® mini kit	0.1585	0.2685	0.2256	0.0366	0.0028
RSC Blood DNA® vs RSC Viral TNA®	NA	0.5402	<0.0001	<0.0001	0.0048
RSC Blood DNA® vs Allprep® DNA/RNA mini kit	0.3833	0.1166	0.6613	0.7066	<0.0001
RSC Blood DNA® vs QIAamp® DNA mini kit	0.0019	<0.0001	0.0167	0.0030	0.2812
QIAamp® viral RNA mini kit vs RNeasy® mini kit	>0.9999	0.6866	0.6467	0.9988	0.0754
QIAamp® viral RNA mini kit vs RSC Viral TNA®	NA	>0.9999	<0.0001	0.1162	<0.0001
QIAamp® viral RNA mini kit vs Allprep® DNA/RNA mini kit	0.8537	0.0016	0.0016	0.0011	0.8189
QIAamp® viral RNA mini kit vs QIAamp® DNA mini kit	0.6189	0.0002	0.0002	<0.0001	<0.0001
RNeasy® mini kit vs RSC Viral TNA®	NA	0.9847	<0.0001	0.0671	0.0016
RNeasy® mini kit vs Allprep® DNA/RNA mini kit	0.0317	0.0273	0.0214	0.0064	0.1029
RNeasy® mini kit vs QIAamp® DNA mini kit	0.0054	0.0012	0.0015	0.0004	0.0049
RSC Viral TNA® vs Allprep® DNA/RNA mini kit	NA	0.2586	<0.0001	<0.0001	<0.0001
RSC Viral TNA® vs QIAamp® DNA mini kit	NA	0.0941	<0.0001	<0.0001	0.0106
Allprep® DNA/RNA mini kit vs QIAamp® DNA mini kit	0.0010	0.0525	<0.0001	0.0002	<0.0001

NA: Not available due to an excessive amount of missing data for some kits at low concentrations.

Table 3. Detailed P-value for Tukey's multiple comparisons test between extraction kits for *Leishmania major*

Kit compared	Concentration				
	10 <sup>1</sup>	10 <sup>2</sup>	10 <sup>3</sup>	10 <sup>4</sup>	10 <sup>5</sup>
EZ1 DSP Virus® Kit vs RSC Blood DNA®	<0.0001	0.0924	<0.0001	<0.0001	<0.0001
EZ1 DSP Virus® Kit vs QIAamp® viral RNA mini kit	<0.0001	0.0084	<0.0001	<0.0001	<0.0001
EZ1 DSP Virus® Kit vs RNeasy® mini kit	<0.0001	0.0004	<0.0001	<0.0001	<0.0001
EZ1 DSP Virus® Kit vs RSC Viral TNA®	0.4009	<0.0001	<0.0001	<0.0001	<0.0001
EZ1 DSP Virus® Kit vs Allprep® DNA/RNA mini kit	<0.0001	0.0111	<0.0001	<0.0001	0.0001
EZ1 DSP Virus® Kit vs QIAamp® DNA mini kit	0.0001	0.4043	<0.0001	<0.0001	<0.0001
RSC Blood DNA® vs QIAamp® viral RNA mini kit	0.9878	0.2849	0.9720	0.1075	<0.0001
RSC Blood DNA® vs RNeasy® mini kit	0.9882	0.0010	0.0033	0.0001	<0.0001
RSC Blood DNA® vs RSC Viral TNA®	>0.9999	0.0114	0.0155	<0.0001	0.8399
RSC Blood DNA® vs Allprep® DNA/RNA mini kit	>0.9999	0.1010	0.9988	0.0246	0.0091
RSC Blood DNA® vs QIAamp® DNA mini kit	0.2100	0.1149	0.8099	0.3685	0.0043
QIAamp® viral RNA mini kit vs RNeasy® mini kit	0.6184	0.6500	0.1607	0.0018	0.0001
QIAamp® viral RNA mini kit vs RSC Viral TNA®	>0.9999	0.0055	0.0294	<0.0001	<0.0001
QIAamp® viral RNA mini kit vs Allprep® DNA/RNA mini kit	0.9581	0.9851	0.9197	0.9973	0.4575
QIAamp® viral RNA mini kit vs QIAamp® DNA mini kit	0.0512	0.0352	0.9998	0.0080	0.0003
RNeasy® mini kit vs RSC Viral TNA®	0.9973	0.0302	0.2577	0.8465	0.0001
RNeasy® mini kit vs Allprep® DNA/RNA mini kit	0.9992	0.0445	0.0020	0.0018	0.0464
RNeasy® mini kit vs QIAamp® DNA mini kit	0.0643	0.0001	0.0099	0.0001	0.0001
RSC Viral TNA® vs Allprep® DNA/RNA mini kit	>0.9999	0.0236	0.0131	<0.0001	0.0114
RSC Viral TNA® vs QIAamp® DNA mini kit	0.9407	0.0507	0.0223	<0.0001	0.0005
Allprep® DNA/RNA mini kit vs QIAamp® DNA mini kit	0.2013	0.0002	0.5560	<0.0001	0.0210

230 *Assessment of external conditions*

231 The variability of infection levels in seven sand flies experimentally infected with *L. infantum* is presented in Fig  
 232 4. The data presented highlight significant differences in infection intensity among infected individuals, with mean  
 233 Cq values ranging from 17 to 38, for sand fly DNA extracts obtained using the same assay (EZ1 DSP Virus® Kit).  
 234 The impact of lyophilization, shipment conditions and presence of sand fly DNA in mean Cq values of EQA  
 235 samples is depicted in Fig 5A, 5B and 5C, respectively. Lyophilization showed no impact on mean Cq values for  
 236 low parasite concentrations (10<sup>1</sup> and 10<sup>2</sup> for *L. infantum*, 10<sup>1</sup> for *L. major*). Instead, Cq were significantly greater  
 237 for higher parasites concentrations (10<sup>3</sup> for *L. infantum*, 10<sup>2</sup> and 10<sup>3</sup> for *L. major*) (Fig 5A). No influences of the  
 238 storage conditions were noticed, as preservation at -20°C compared to room temperature showed no significant  
 239 differences in mean Cq values (Fig 5B). Moreover, the presence of DNA from 30 sand flies did not affect  
 240 *Leishmania* spp. detection at low concentrations. In fact, the efficiency of *L. major* DNA amplification was even  
 241 better in presence of sand flies (lower Cq values, p-<0.05) (Fig 5C).

242

## 243 **Discussion**

244 The implementation of reliable techniques is crucial when they form the core of pathogen surveillance programs,  
245 comparing endemicity levels between countries. The CLIMOS project, which aims to combine various parameters  
246 (including sand fly density and infection rates), to develop an algorithm for predicting hotspots or the spread of  
247 sand fly-borne diseases (SFBDs), must be supported by accurate data. In this context, it was pertinent to implement  
248 standard operating procedures to ensure high performance among research centers involved in sand fly and SFBDs  
249 surveillance, using the same qPCR amplification method (15) and amplification conditions, to normalize the  
250 interpretation of results. However, depending on their own equipment and facilities, the project partners used  
251 different extraction methods and qPCR devices. Thus, it was necessary to confirm that centers had comparable  
252 performances. With this aim, the Laboratory of Parasitology of Rennes, highly reputed center for evaluation of  
253 molecular techniques in the field of human diagnosis (17-19), was in charge of the implementation of an external  
254 quality assessment program.

255 Overall, all centers but one reliably detected all EQA samples corresponding to *L. infantum* and *L. major*  
256 concentrations ranging from  $10^1$  to  $10^4$ /mL. The remaining center did not detect *L. infantum* ( $10^1$ /mL) and detected  
257 *L. major* ( $10^1$ /mL) only once. Lower sensitivity in qPCR amplification detection could be related to mistakes in  
258 sample manipulation, such as inaccurate pipetting, or to a comparatively lower performance of the DNA extraction  
259 method or of the qPCR master mix used. Unfortunately, it was not possible to retest the  $10^1$ /mL samples due to  
260 lack of DNA. Notwithstanding this, this laboratory was able to amplify the sample containing  $10^1$ /mL *L. major*  
261 and all other samples with higher parasite concentrations. The implications of failing to detect low parasite  
262 concentrations are probably low, given that most infected sand flies are likely to contain large parasite numbers,  
263 as demonstrated in the present study. The ability of all centers to detect low concentrations of *Leishmania*  
264 demonstrates that all partners are duly trained in performing surveillance of *Leishmania*-infected sand flies.  
265 Standardization of these methods enables to track changes in infection rates accurately and identify emerging  
266 hotspots of transmission. For instance, consistent use of qPCR allows the detection of even low levels of parasite  
267 DNA in sand flies, which is critical for early warning and timely intervention in areas where leishmaniasis is  
268 spreading. However, the variability in the EQA Cq values provides critical insights into the performance and  
269 sensitivity of the diagnostic assay employed. The observed differences in mean Cq values could be attributable to  
270 the technical proficiency of the operator, the differences between equipment and positive threshold setting, the  
271 DNA extraction kit used, or sample-related factors. The EQA process was evaluated and validated before shipment  
272 to ensure reliable comparison of laboratory performances. The variations in DNA yield post-lyophilization could

273 partially explain some discrepancies between centers but would hardly explain the high range of Cq observed for  
274 a same concentration. Noteworthy, no significant impact of shipment conditions was observed, thus sample  
275 degradation is unlikely to be responsible for the lower sensitivity observed for some laboratories. This finding  
276 highlights the need for ongoing training and standardization to ensure uniform diagnostic performance across  
277 different laboratories.

278 All centers were able to detect *Leishmania* DNA in the sample containing a sand fly experimentally infected with  
279 *L. infantum*, although differing in quantification cycle (Cq) values. This difference underscores the heterogeneity  
280 in host-pathogen interactions at the individual level, even under standardized infection conditions. Indeed, this  
281 variability could be the result of fluctuations which are expected and deemed normal within the context of  
282 experimental infection, influenced by factors such as the size of the blood meal and the age of the sand fly, among  
283 others (20). Despite these variations, the effectiveness of all centers in detecting positive samples was evident,  
284 showcasing their proficiency in handling the diagnostic protocols.

285 After ruling out problems of curve interpretation and Cq threshold variations, extraction methods were evaluated,  
286 as a potential source of variability. Results suggest that the choice of the extraction kit may markedly influence  
287 the sensitivity of *Leishmania* DNA detection. Taken together, these results may help to understand the  
288 discrepancies in Cq values observed between centers. It was observed that the EZ1 DSP Virus® Kit and QIAamp  
289 ® DNA mini kit had the best performances for both *Leishmania* species amplification, independently of the  
290 parasite concentration. Implementing these kits across laboratories could standardize and improve the consistency  
291 and reliability of *Leishmania*-infected sand fly detection. As expected, the use of automated extraction systems,  
292 such as the EZ1® robot or Maxwell® device, led to reduced variability, as shown by low error types of triplicate  
293 extractions. Despite the superior performance of some DNA extraction kits, it is important to insist that all of them  
294 yielded suitable DNA template for effective qPCR detection of *Leishmania*-infected sand flies. However, there  
295 remains room for improvement in analyzing low concentrations to ensure high diagnostic validity in *Leishmania*  
296 spp. surveillance programs.

297 As might be expected, the kits developed specifically for DNA extractions (such as EZ1 DSP Virus® Kit,  
298 QIAamp® DNA mini kit, Allprep® DNA/RNA mini kit, and RSC Blood® DNA) outperformed those designed  
299 for RNA-extraction (such as RNeasy® mini kit and QIAamp® viral RNA mini kit), with avoidance of the DNAase  
300 digestion step. These finding implies that field studies aiming at monitoring sand fly-borne infections, *i.e.*  
301 *Leishmania* and phleboviruses, such as CLIMOS, should use a total nucleic acid extraction kit (*e.g.* Allprep®

302 DNA/RNA mini kit) for both pathogens, or use two extraction kits designed for DNA and RNA purification,  
303 respectively.

304 To conclude, all participating centers were proficient in carrying out the diagnostic protocols in the EQA. The  
305 detailed comparisons and analyses of different extraction kits for *Leishmania* underscore the importance of  
306 selecting the appropriate protocol to ensure high-quality DNA amplification. The benefit of automated extraction,  
307 support their adoption across laboratories. While all tested kits are effective, optimizing protocols for low  
308 concentration samples remains a key area for improvement to enhance the exhaustive and reliable detection of  
309 *Leishmania* in field studies. These results emphasize the importance of standardized protocols and continuous  
310 quality assurance to maintain high diagnostic accuracy, which is essential for effective leishmaniasis surveillance  
311 in field settings where low concentrations of infection are common.

312

### 313 **Acknowledgment**

314 The authors thank Nazli Ayhan, Rémi Charrel and Laurence Thirion from the UVE laboratory (Unité des Virus  
315 Emergents, Marseille, France) for EQA vials lyophilization. They also thank Jovana Sadlova and Petr Volf from  
316 Charles University (Department of Parasitology, Prague, Czech Republic) for providing infected sand flies and  
317 Jean-Pierre Gangneux (Université de Rennes, Rennes, France) for providing the *Leishmania* strains. And finally,  
318 they thank the General Directorate of Public Health/National Parasitology Reference Laboratory (Ankara, Turkey)  
319 for local support.

320

### 321 **Funding statement**

322 This study is co-funded by European Commission grant 101057690 and UKRI grants 10038150 and 10039289,  
323 and is catalogued by the CLIMOS Scientific Committee as CLIMOS number 011 ([http:// www.climos-project.eu](http://www.climos-project.eu)).

324 The contents of this publication are the sole responsibility of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views  
325 of the European Commission, the Health and Digital Executive Agency, or UKRI. Neither the European Union  
326 nor granting authority nor UKRI can be held responsible. The funders had no role in study design, data collection  
327 and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript. For the purposes of Open Access, the authors  
328 have applied a CC BY public copyright licence to any Author Accepted Manuscript version arising from this  
329 submission. The six Horizon Europe projects, BlueAdapt, CATALYSE, CLIMOS, HIGH Horizons, IDAlert, and  
330 TRIGGER, form the Climate Change and Health Cluster.

331

## 332 **Author Contributions**

333 F.R-G. and J.P. conceptualized the study, A.D. acquired data on extraction conditions, J.P, A.D. and F.R-G  
334 analyzed extraction protocols, F.R-G and J.P. analyzed EQA results, J.P and A.D. wrote the manuscript with the  
335 support of F.R-G. J.P., A.D., B.A., U.B., E.B., G.B., J.M.C., M.D.C., T.D.M., O.E.K., E.F., O.D.K., E.K., C.M.,  
336 M.M., C.M.H., M.N., G.O.K., Y.O., S.O.T., R.P., K.P., C.P., J.R., L.S., G.V., J.W. and K.Y. analyzed EQA. F.R-G  
337 edited the manuscript, all authors reviewed and approved the final version of the manuscript.

338

## 339 **Data availability**

340 All resources used in this article are provided in the article and all the analyses are detailed allowing the assessment  
341 or verification of the manuscript's findings.

342

## 343 **Conflicts of Interest**

344 The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest.

345

## 346 **Figure legends**

347 Fig 1. PCR results for EQA samples of *Leishmania infantum* (A) and *Leishmania major* (B) promastigotes at  
348 indicated concentrations by participating centers (mean Cq  $\pm$  SD of triplicate amplification).

349 Fig 2. Detection of *Leishmania infantum* DNA from an infected sand fly. Real-time quantitative PCR results of  
350 participating centers (mean Cq  $\pm$  SD of triplicate amplification).

351 Fig 3. Efficiency of *Leishmania infantum* (A) and *Leishmania major* (B) detection following nucleic acids  
352 extraction using various kits. Results show mean Cq  $\pm$  SD of triplicate amplification for each parasite  
353 concentration.

354 Fig 4. Variability of infection levels in sand flies infected with *Leishmania infantum* under laboratory conditions.  
355 Results show mean Cq  $\pm$  SD of triplicate amplification for each individual sand fly (7 specimens).

356 Fig 5. Impact of lyophilization (A), temperature of storage (B), sand fly DNA inhibitors (C) on the efficiency of  
357 *Leishmania* DNA amplification. ns: not significant; \* p<0.05; \*\* p<0.01; \*\*\* p<0.001.

## 358 **References**

- 359 1. Antoniou M, Gramiccia M, Molina R, Dvorak V, Volf P. The role of indigenous phlebotomine sandflies  
360 and mammals in the spreading of leishmaniasis agents in the Mediterranean region. *Euro Surveill*. 2013; 18(30):  
361 20540.
- 362 2. Kaye PM, Cruz I, Picado A, Van Bocxlaer K, Croft SL. Leishmaniasis immunopathology - impact on  
363 design and use of vaccines, diagnostics and drugs. *Seminars in Immunopathology*. 2020; 42(3): 247-64.
- 364 3. Mann S, Frasca K, Scherrer S, Henao-Martínez AF, Newman S, Ramanan P, et al. A review of  
365 leishmaniasis: current knowledge and future directions. *Current Tropical Medicine Reports*. 2021; 8: 121-32.
- 366 4. Maia C, Conceicao C, Pereira A, Rocha R, Ortuno M, Munoz C, et al. The estimated distribution of  
367 autochthonous leishmaniasis by *Leishmania infantum* in Europe in 2005-2020. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis*. 2023; 17(7):  
368 e0011497.
- 369 5. Maia C, Cardoso L. Spread of *Leishmania infantum* in Europe with dog travelling. *Vet Parasitol*. 2015;  
370 213(1-2): 2-11.
- 371 6. Aoun K, Bouratbine A. Cutaneous leishmaniasis in North Africa: a review. *Parasite*. 2014; 21(14): 1-9.
- 372 7. Ozbilgin A, Toz S, Harman M, Gunasti Topal S, Uzun S, Okudan F, et al. The current clinical and  
373 geographical situation of cutaneous leishmaniasis based on species identification in Turkey. *Acta Trop*. 2019; 190:  
374 59-67.
- 375 8. Galluzzi L, Ceccarelli M, Diotallevi A, Menotta M, Magnani M. Real-time PCR applications for diagnosis  
376 of leishmaniasis. *Parasit Vectors*. 2018; 11(273): 1-13.
- 377 9. Wilmes D, Hagen F, Verissimo C, Alanio A, Rickerts V, Buitrago MJ. A multicentre external quality  
378 assessment: A first step to standardise PCR protocols for the diagnosis of histoplasmosis and coccidioidomycosis.  
379 *Mycoses*. 2023; 66(9): 774-86.
- 380 10. Tabachnick W. Challenges in predicting climate and environmental effects on vector-borne disease  
381 epistystems in a changing world. *J Exp Biol*. 2010; 213(6): 946-54.
- 382 11. Kaiser K, Van Loon AM, Pelloux H, Ferrandiz J, Picot S, Wallace P, et al. Multicenter proficiency study  
383 for detection of *Toxoplasma gondii* in amniotic fluid by nucleic acid amplification methods. *Clin Chim Acta*. 2007;  
384 375(1-2): 99-103.
- 385 12. Gits-Muselli M, White PL, Mengoli C, Chen S, Crowley B, Dingemans G, et al. The fungal PCR  
386 initiative's evaluation of in-house and commercial *Pneumocystis jirovecii* qPCR assays: toward a standard for a  
387 diagnostics assay. *Med Mycol*. 2020; 58(6): 779-88.

- 388 13. Van der Auwera G, Bart A, Chicharro C, Cortes S, Davidsson L, Di Muccio T, et al. Comparison of  
389 *Leishmania* typing results obtained from 16 European clinical laboratories in 2014. Euro Surveill. 2016; 21(49):  
390 1-11.
- 391 14. Vaselek S, Prudhomme J, Myskova J, Lestinova T, Spitzova T, Banuls A, et al. Comparative study of  
392 promastigote- and amastigote-Initiated infection of *Leishmania infantum* (Kinetoplastida: Trypanosomatidae) in  
393 *Phlebotomus perniciosus* (Diptera: Psychodidae) conducted in different biosafety level laboratories. J Med  
394 Entomol. 2020; 57(2): 601-7.
- 395 15. Mary C, Faraut F, Lascombe L, Dumon H. Quantification of *Leishmania infantum* DNA by a real-time  
396 PCR assay with high sensitivity. J Clin Microbiol. 2004; 42(11): 5249-55.
- 397 16. Gomes Y, Cavalcanti MP, Lira R, Abath F, Alves L. Diagnosis of canine visceral leishmaniasis:  
398 biotechnological advances. The Veterinary Journal. 2008; 175(1): 45-52.
- 399 17. Brenier-Pinchart M-P, Filisetti D, Cassaing S, Varlet-Marie E, Robert-Gangneux F, Delhaes L, et al.  
400 Molecular diagnosis of toxoplasmosis: multicenter evaluation of the *Toxoplasma* RealCycler universal PCR assay  
401 on 168 characterized human samples. The Journal of Molecular Diagnostics. 2022; 24(6): 687-96.
- 402 18. Brenier-Pinchart M-P, Robert-Gangneux F, Accoceberry I, Pichard S, Garnaud C, Fricker-Hidalgo H, et  
403 al. Multicenter comparative assessment of the TIB MolBiol *Toxoplasma gondii* detection kit and four laboratory-  
404 developed PCR assays for molecular diagnosis of toxoplasmosis. The Journal of Molecular Diagnostics. 2021;  
405 23(8): 1000-6.
- 406 19. Robert-Gangneux F, Brenier-Pinchart M-P, Yera H, Belaz S, Varlet-Marie E, Bastien P. Evaluation of  
407 *Toxoplasma* ELITE MGB real-time PCR assay for diagnosis of toxoplasmosis. J Clin Microbiol. 2017; 55(5):  
408 1369-76.
- 409 20. Volfová V, Jančářová M, Volf P. Sand fly blood meal volumes and their relation to female body weight  
410 under experimental conditions. Parasit Vectors. 2024; 17(1): 1-9.

411






Figure 1




Figure 2




Figure 3





Figure 4



medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.19.24313901>; this version posted September 22, 2024. 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. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).





Figure 5