

# 1 Multiplex PCR detection of enteric pathogens in a community- 2 based birth cohort in Ecuador: comparison of xTAG-GPP and 3 TaqMan array card assays

4  
5 Stuart Torres Ayala<sup>1 \*</sup>, Lesly Simbaña Vivanco<sup>1 \*</sup>, Nikolina Walas<sup>2 \*</sup>, Kelsey Jesser<sup>3</sup>,  
6 Nicolette A. Zhou<sup>3</sup>, Christine S. Fagnant-Sperati<sup>3</sup>, Hadley R. Burroughs<sup>4</sup>, Gwenyth O. Lee<sup>5</sup>,  
7 Joseph N.S. Eisenberg<sup>6</sup>, Gabriel Trueba<sup>1</sup>, Karen Levy<sup>3</sup>, Benjamin F. Arnold<sup>4,7,8 #</sup>

## 8 Affiliations:

9  
10 <sup>1</sup> Instituto de Microbiología, Universidad San Francisco de Quito, Quito, Ecuador

11 <sup>2</sup> Department of Environmental Health Sciences, University of California, Berkeley, CA, USA

12 <sup>3</sup> Department of Environmental and Occupational Health Sciences, University of Washington, Seattle,  
13 WA, USA

14 <sup>4</sup> Francis I. Proctor Foundation, University of California, San Francisco, CA, USA

15 <sup>5</sup> Rutgers Global Health Institute, Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, New Brunswick, NJ, USA

16 <sup>6</sup> Department of Epidemiology, University of Michigan School of Public Health, Ann Arbor, MI, USA

17 <sup>7</sup> Department of Ophthalmology, University of California, San Francisco, CA, USA

18 <sup>8</sup> Institute for Global Health Sciences, University of California, San Francisco, CA, USA

19  
20 \* STA, LSV, and NW contributed equally

21  
22 # Corresponding Author:

23 Benjamin F. Arnold

24 Associate Professor

25 F.I. Proctor Foundation

26 University of California, San Francisco

27 [ben.arnold@ucsf.edu](mailto:ben.arnold@ucsf.edu)

28 +1 415 - 514 - 3227

29  
30 **Running head:** Comparison of TaqMan and xTAG-GPP assays

31  
32 **Keywords:** multiplex PCR, bacteria, viruses, protozoans, enteric pathogens

## 33 34 35 Abstract

36 We compared the performance of two multiplex platforms, Luminex xTAG Gastrointestinal  
37 Pathogen Panel<sup>®</sup> and TaqMan Array Card, against a panel of 14 enteric pathogen targets in a  
38 community-based birth cohort in Ecuador. We found high levels of agreement and similar  
39 prevalence estimates across most pathogens.

40

## 41 Introduction

42 Enteric pathogens account for a substantial burden of disease among children in low- and middle-  
43 income countries (1). Multiplex qPCR assays such as the Luminex xTAG Gastrointestinal  
44 Pathogen Panel® (GPP) and the TaqMan Array Card (TAC) enable efficient detection of  
45 pathogens in stool compared with single-pathogen PCR or qPCR testing and represent a major  
46 advance in enteric pathogen diagnostics (2,3). Multiplex assays were originally developed and  
47 have been used extensively in clinical settings for early infection diagnosis (4). Epidemiological  
48 studies are increasingly using these assays to characterize the burden of enteric infections,  
49 diarrheal etiology, and intervention impacts (5,6), and as the number of these population-based  
50 studies continues to grow, there is an increasing need to better understand the comparability of  
51 different multiplex assays. GPP is a commercial assay that screens for 15 pathogens while the  
52 TAC assay is customized by individual labs and, for this project, included 30 pathogens. We  
53 compared the performance of the two multiplex assays, GPP and TAC, against a panel of 14  
54 overlapping viral, bacterial, and protozoan enteric pathogen targets in a community-based birth  
55 cohort in Ecuador, a high transmission setting.

## 56 Methods

### 57 *Study Design*

58 ECoMiD is an ongoing longitudinal birth cohort study based in Esmeraldas Province in northern-  
59 coastal Ecuador (7). The protocol was reviewed and approved by institutional review boards at  
60 University of Washington (#STUDY00014270), Emory University (#IRB00101202), Universidad  
61 San Francisco de Quito (#2018–022M), and University of California, San Francisco (#21-33932),  
62 and all participants provided informed consent, with re-consent for each stool sample collection.  
63 The study has enrolled 521 children from communities across a rural-urban gradient and collected  
64 periodic stool samples from study subjects from ages one week to 24 months. To potentially  
65 increase the efficiency of the assay comparison, we considered samples that had been analyzed  
66 by the TAC assay, run earlier in the study, and had a positive result for at least one pathogen in  
67 the GPP assay (n=485 samples). We then selected a random sample stratified by age (6, 12, 18  
68 months) and location (rural accessible by river, rural accessible by road, intermediate, and urban)  
69 to be representative of the cohort (n=156, 13 per stratum). We estimated that 156 samples would  
70 provide 80% power to determine a difference between assays per target using McNemar's test  
71 assuming a 5% alpha and sensitivities of 95.8% (TAC) and 89.6% (GPP), with conditional sensitivity

72 of 98.9% for TAC given a positive by GPP (8) based on TAC and GPP parameters for rotavirus in  
73 clinical samples (2).

74

#### 75 *Laboratory Methods*

76 Stool samples were collected by caregivers in a small, insulated container and field staff collected  
77 samples within 1 hour of sample production if the sample was not refrigerated, or within 3 hours if the  
78 sample was refrigerated and stored in  $-196^{\circ}\text{C}$  portable liquid nitrogen tanks. Samples were  
79 transported monthly to the Universidad San Francisco de Quito for long-term storage at  $-80^{\circ}\text{C}$ .

80

81 Nucleic acids from stool samples (180-220 mg) were extracted using Qiagen QIAamp Fast DNA  
82 Stool Mini Kit (QIAGEN, Germantown, MD) into a proprietary elution buffer, with an added bead  
83 beating step during sample lysis (Jesser et al. *in review*). During the extraction process MS2 and  
84 PhHV were added as an external control assessment of extraction and amplification efficiency.  
85 ZymoBIOMICS Spike-in Controls (Zymo Research) were used as positive controls. Extracted  
86 DNA was aliquoted and stored at  $-80^{\circ}\text{C}$ .

87

88 For GPP testing samples were amplified and hybridized according to the Luminex xTAG GPP kit  
89 protocol. xTAG<sup>®</sup> RNase-free water was used as a negative control and three stocks of known  
90 pathogen DNA (ZeptoMetrix NATrol™ GI Verification Panel 2) were used as positive controls. GPP  
91 gene targets are proprietary but median fluorescence intensity (MFI) values used to determine  
92 positivity are available (**Supplemental Table 1**).

93

94 For TAC testing, extracted nucleic acids from stool samples (20  $\mu\text{L}$ ) were combined with AgPath-  
95 ID One-Step RT-PCR master mix (50  $\mu\text{L}$ ) (Applied Biosystems, Waltham, MA), AgPath-ID One-  
96 Step RT-PCR enzyme (4  $\mu\text{L}$ ) (Applied Biosystems), and nuclease-free water (26  $\mu\text{L}$ ) (Applied  
97 Biosystems) and analyzed for pathogen gene targets using TAC (ThermoFisher Scientific,  
98 Waltham, MA) (**Supplemental Table 2**) with the following cycling conditions:  $45^{\circ}\text{C}$  for 20 minutes,  
99  $95^{\circ}\text{C}$  for 10 minutes, then 40 cycles of  $95^{\circ}\text{C}$  for 15 seconds and  $60^{\circ}\text{C}$  for 1 minute on a  
100 QuantStudio 7 Flex instrument (ThermoFisher Scientific). Positive controls included PhHV, MS2  
101 and the pan *E. coli* gene target *uidA* as well as customized plasmids expressing all known assay  
102 targets (ThermoFisher Scientific and Azenta Life Sciences, South Plainfield, NJ). Nuclease-free  
103 water was used as a no template control on each card. Samples with cycle threshold (Ct) value  
104  $\leq 35$  for any of the gene targets for a pathogen were classified as positive.

105

## 106 *Statistical Methods*

107 We estimated pathogen target prevalence and agreement with exact, binomial 95% confidence  
108 intervals for the 14 targets. Agreement of pathogen target-level results between the two assays  
109 was assessed using McNemar's test and Cohen's kappa (9). Tests did not adjust for multiple  
110 comparisons. We examined MFI and Ct values for samples with discordant TAC and GPP results,  
111 positive by one assay and negative by the other, to determine if discordance was more likely with  
112 lower quantity of sample DNA detected. Analyses were conducted using R (v4.4.0; R Core Team  
113 2024).

## 114 **Results**

115 Two selected samples failed on the GPP assay, so the analysis included 154 samples. Overall,  
116 infection prevalence was similar between assays (**Figure 1**) and agreement was >85% for 13 of  
117 14 pathogen targets (**Table 1**). There were differences in detection between TAC and GPP  
118 assays for five targets (McNemar's  $P < 0.05$ ), with higher prevalence by TAC for rotavirus,  
119 *Campylobacter* spp., and ST-EPEC, and higher prevalence by GPP for *Shigella* spp., and  
120 *Salmonella* spp.. Accounting for agreement due to chance, six targets differed with a kappa  
121 coefficient below 0.6 (**Table 1**), however kappa statistics are influenced by outcome prevalence  
122 so comparison between pathogens should be made with caution given the wide range of  
123 prevalence observed (10). There was very poor agreement between assays for *Salmonella*,  
124 where the GPP assay classified 81% of samples as positive while the TAC assay classified 8%  
125 positive (**Figure 1, Table 1**). The rank order of prevalence was similar between assays with the  
126 exception of rotavirus, ST-EPEC, and *Salmonella*. Across targets, discordance between assays  
127 was more likely for pathogens with MFI values just over the positivity cutoff for GPP (for GPP+,  
128 TAC-, **Supplemental Figure 1**) or Ct value just below 35 for TAC (for TAC+, GPP-,  
129 **Supplemental Figure 2**).

## 130 **Discussion**

131 Prior diagnostic comparison studies of the GPP and TAC assays have focused on tests of  
132 diarrheal samples in clinical settings, and found that the assays were broadly comparable and  
133 had good test performance as clinical diagnostics (2,6). This study aimed to evaluate the assay  
134 performance using community-based samples from young children and found the two assays  
135 were broadly comparable.

136  
137 Consistent negative and positive controls on all GPP plates ruled out lab contamination as an  
138 explanation for the poor agreement between assays for *Salmonella*. Previous studies have noted  
139 high rates of *Salmonella* false positives by GPP (11,12) and at least one large-scale study  
140 excluded GPP *Salmonella* results on this basis (6). The discrepancy between GPP and TAC may  
141 result from differences in the oligonucleotide primers for the pathogen targets used for  
142 *Salmonella*.

143  
144 This study had limitations. First, GPP uses proprietary target sequences — although we assume  
145 that differences between assay target sequences was an important underlying cause for larger  
146 discrepancies, such as for *Salmonella* and rotavirus, we could only infer this through examination  
147 of MFI and Ct values (**Supplemental Figures 1, 2**). Because we had no gold standard measure  
148 of infection across the 14 pathogens, we focused on agreement between the TAC and GPP  
149 assays but were unable to estimate their diagnostic characteristics, such as sensitivity and  
150 specificity. We focused on pathogen-specific comparisons between assays and did not assess  
151 co-infections or number of pathogens detected, which could be of interest in high transmission  
152 settings. We intentionally over-sampled stools that were positive by TAC to at least one target on  
153 the GPP assay to increase power for the comparison, but our sampling approach could inflate  
154 estimates of prevalence. Finally, we did not consider diarrhea symptoms in this analysis, but  
155 results should be representative of pediatric samples (both symptomatic and asymptomatic) in a  
156 high transmission setting.

157  
158 Despite these caveats, this study had many strengths. We tested samples collected in a  
159 community-based cohort, with children enrolled across an urban-rural gradient at the ages when  
160 enteric pathogen burden is highest. The assays included pathogens thought to be major causes  
161 of diarrheal disease burden in lower resource settings (5), and we observed a broad range of  
162 pathogen prevalence in this study. The results thus should inform similar epidemiologic field  
163 studies.

164  
165 **Conclusion:** This comparative analysis provides important guidance on comparing data from  
166 TAC and GPP assays in non-clinical, pediatric samples for both within and across cohort  
167 analyses.

168

## 169 Footnote information

170 **Funding:** This work was funded by the National Institutes of Health (R01A137679 to KL and  
171 JNSE, R01AI162867 to BFA).

172

173 **Competing interests:** The authors declare no competing interests.

174

175 **Data availability:** Data and replication files are available through the Open Science Framework:

176 <https://osf.io/jh64t/> .

177

178 **Conference presentation:** The results will be presented at the 2024 meeting of the American  
179 Society of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene, Oral Presentation Abstract #8373, November 17, 2024,  
180 New Orleans, LA, USA.


## 181 References

- 182 1. Calvopiña M, Eisenberg JNS, Atherton R, Trueba G, Andrade T, Eguiguren M, et al.  
183 Identifying Etiological Agents Causing Diarrhea in Low Income Ecuadorian Communities.  
184 *Am J Trop Med Hyg.* 2014 Sep 3;91(3):563–9.
- 185 2. Chhabra P, Gregoricus N, Weinberg GA, Halasa N, Chappell J, Hassan F, et al.  
186 Comparison of three multiplex gastrointestinal platforms for the detection of gastroenteritis  
187 viruses. *J Clin Virol.* 2017 Oct;95:66–71.
- 188 3. Chang LJ, Hsiao CJ, Chen B, Liu TY, Ding J, Hsu WT, et al. Accuracy and comparison of  
189 two rapid multiplex PCR tests for gastroenteritis pathogens: a systematic review and meta-  
190 analysis. *BMJ Open Gastroenterol.* 2021 Feb;8(1):e000553.
- 191 4. Khare R, Espy MJ, Cebelinski E, Boxrud D, Sloan LM, Cunningham SA, et al. Comparative  
192 Evaluation of Two Commercial Multiplex Panels for Detection of Gastrointestinal Pathogens  
193 by Use of Clinical Stool Specimens. Gilligan PH, editor. *J Clin Microbiol.* 2014  
194 Oct;52(10):3667–73.
- 195 5. Platts-Mills JA, Liu J, Rogawski ET, Kabir F, Lertsethtakarn P, Siguas M, et al. Use of  
196 quantitative molecular diagnostic methods to assess the aetiology, burden, and clinical  
197 characteristics of diarrhoea in children in low-resource settings: a reanalysis of the MAL-ED  
198 cohort study. *Lancet Glob Health.* 2018 Dec;6(12):e1309–18.
- 199 6. Knee J, Sumner T, Adriano Z, Anderson C, Bush F, Capone D, et al. Effects of an urban  
200 sanitation intervention on childhood enteric infection and diarrhea in Maputo, Mozambique:  
201 A controlled before-and-after trial. *eLife.* 2021 Apr 9;10:e62278.
- 202 7. Lee GO, Eisenberg JNS, Uruchima J, Vasco G, Smith SM, Van Engen A, et al. Gut  
203 microbiome, enteric infections and child growth across a rural–urban gradient: protocol for  
204 the ECoMiD prospective cohort study. *BMJ Open.* 2021 Oct;11(10):e046241.
- 205 8. Connor RJ. Sample size for testing differences in proportions for the paired-sample design.  
206 *Biometrics.* 1987 Mar;43(1):207–11.
- 207 9. McHugh ML. Interrater reliability: the kappa statistic. *Biochem Medica.* 2012;22(3):276–82.
- 208 10. Sim J, Wright CC. The Kappa Statistic in Reliability Studies: Use, Interpretation, and  
209 Sample Size Requirements. *Phys Ther.* 2005 Mar 1;85(3):257–68.
- 210 11. Duong VT, Phat VV, Tuyen HT, Dung TTN, Trung PD, Minh PV, et al. Evaluation of  
211 Luminex xTAG Gastrointestinal Pathogen Panel Assay for Detection of Multiple Diarrheal  
212 Pathogens in Fecal Samples in Vietnam. Richter SS, editor. *J Clin Microbiol.* 2016  
213 Apr;54(4):1094–100.
- 214 12. Kellner T, Parsons B, Chui L, Berenger BM, Xie J, Burnham CAD, et al. Comparative  
215 Evaluation of Enteric Bacterial Culture and a Molecular Multiplex Syndromic Panel in  
216 Children with Acute Gastroenteritis. Ledebner NA, editor. *J Clin Microbiol.* 2019  
217 Jun;57(6):e00205-19.



## 218 Figures and Tables

219



220

221 **Figure 1: Infection prevalence for 14 enteric pathogens measured by Luminex xTAG**  
222 **Gastrointestinal Panel (GPP) and TaqMan Array Card (TAC) assays.** Analysis includes 154  
223 samples from children ages 6 to 18 months in Esmeraldas Province, Ecuador 2022-2023. An  
224 asterisk indicates McNemar's  $P < 0.05$  for difference between the two assays. Supplemental Table  
225 3 includes numerical estimates. Created with script: <https://osf.io/4dteq> .

226

227



228 **Table 1: Summary of multiplex PCR test results for Luminex xTAG Gastrointestinal**  
 229 **Pathogen Panel (GPP) and TaqMan Array Card (TAC).** Test results from 154 samples  
 230 measured among children at ages 6 to 18 months in Esmeraldas Province, Ecuador, 2022-2023.  
 231 Test results are summarized by whether they were positive (+) or negative (–) by GPP and TAC.  
 232 Methods include details on estimation of agreement, Cohen’s Kappa, and McNemar’s test for  
 233 differences between assays. Created with script: <https://osf.io/4dteq>.

Assay Target	GPP - TAC -	GPP + TAC -	GPP - TAC +	GPP + TAC +	Agreement % (95% CI)	Kappa (95% CI)	McNemar’s p-value
<b>Viruses</b>							
Adenovirus (40/41)	137	4	3	10	95.5 (90.9, 98.2)	0.72 (0.56, 0.9)	0.71
Norovirus GI	147	0	3	4	98.1 (94.4, 99.6)	0.72 (0.57, 0.9)	0.08
Norovirus GII	138	1	6	9	95.5 (90.9, 98.2)	0.70 (0.54, 0.9)	0.06
Rotavirus	142	0	11	1	92.9 (87.6, 96.4)	0.14 (0.06, 0.2)	<0.01
<b>Bacteria</b>							
<i>Campylobacter</i> spp.	107	3	17	27	87.0 (80.7, 91.9)	0.65 (0.50, 0.8)	<0.01
LT-ETEC	87	10	9	48	87.7 (81.4, 92.4)	0.74 (0.58, 0.9)	0.82
ST-ETEC	130	1	15	8	89.6 (83.7, 93.9)	0.45 (0.32, 0.6)	<0.01
STEC stx1	134	5	1	14	96.1 (91.7, 98.6)	0.80 (0.65, 1.0)	0.10
STEC stx2	142	6	1	5	95.5 (90.9, 98.2)	0.57 (0.42, 0.7)	0.06
<i>Shigella</i> spp.	128	7	1	18	94.8 (90.0, 97.7)	0.79 (0.63, 0.9)	0.03
<i>Salmonella</i> spp.	30	112	0	12	27.3 (20.4, 35.0)	0.04 (-0.00, 0.1)	<0.01
<b>Protozoa</b>							
<i>Cryptosporidium</i> spp.	130	11	7	6	88.3 (82.2, 92.9)	0.34 (0.18, 0.5)	0.35
<i>Entamoeba histolytica</i>	151	2	1	0	98.1 (94.4, 99.6)	-0.01 (-0.16, 0.1)	0.56
<i>Giardia</i> spp.	119	4	11	20	90.3 (84.4, 94.4)	0.67 (0.51, 0.8)	0.07

234  
 235  
 236  
 237

238 **Supplementary Information**

239  
240 **Supplemental Table 1: Luminex Gastrointestinal Pathogen Panel (GPP) assay targets and**  
241 **corresponding median fluorescence intensity (MFI) thresholds for positivity**  
242

Analyte	Threshold for positivity (MFI)
Adenovirus 40/41	≥ 150
<i>Camplobacter</i>	≥ 150
<i>C. difficile</i> Probe-1	≥ 150
<i>C. difficile</i> Probe-2	≥ 150
<i>Cryptosporidium</i>	≥ 250
<i>E. coli</i> O157	≥ 150
<i>E. histolytica</i>	≥ 250
ETEC probe-1	≥ 200
ETEC probe-2	≥ 200
<i>Giardia</i>	≥ 250
Norovirus Probe-1	≥ 200
Norovirus Probe-2	≥ 350
Rotavirus A	≥ 150
<i>Salmonella</i> Probe-1	≥ 100,000 (POS), < 300 (NEG)
<i>Salmonella</i> Probe-2	≥ 200
STEC Probe-1	≥ 150
STEC Probe-2	≥ 150
<i>Shigella</i>	≥ 150
<i>V. cholerae</i>	≥ 150

243  
244

245 **Supplemental Table 2: TaqMan Array Card (TAC) assay gene targets and corresponding**  
 246 **forward (F) and reverse (R) primers and probe (P) sequences.**  
 247

Organism	Gene Target	Sequence
Adenovirus (40/41)	<i>Fiber gene</i>	F, AACTTTCTCTCTTAATAGACGCC R, AGGGGGCTAGAAAACAAAA P, FAM-CTGACACGGGCACTCT-MGB
Norovirus GI	<i>ORF1-ORF2</i>	F, CGYTGGATGCGNTTYCATGA R, CTTAGACGCCATCATCATTYAC P, FAM-TGGACAGGAGATCGC-MGB
Norovirus GII	<i>ORF1-ORF2</i>	F, CARGARBCNATGTTYAGR TGGATGAG R, TCGACGCCATCTTCATTCACA P, FAM-TGGGAGGGCGATCGCAATCT-MGB
Rotavirus	<i>NSP3</i>	F, ACCATCTWCACRTRACCCTCTATGAG R, GGTCACATAACGCCCTATAGC P, FAM-AGTTAAAAGCTAACACTGTCAAA-MGB
<i>Camplobacter jejuni</i>	<i>cadF</i>	F, CWGCTAAACCATARAAAATAAAATTTCTCAC R, YTTTGAAGGTAATTTAGATATGGATAATCG P, VIC-CATTTTGAYGATTTTTGGCTTGA-MGB
	<i>hipO</i>	F, CTTGCGGTCATGATGGACATAC R, AGCACCACCCAAACCCTCTTCA P, FAM-TGCTTGCTGCAAAGTATT-MGB
<i>Camplobacter coli</i>	<i>GlyA</i>	F, AAACCAAAGCTTATCGTGTGC R, AGTGCAGCAATGTGTGCAAT P, FAM-TAAGCTCCAACCTTCATCCG-MGB
LT-EPEC	<i>LT</i>	F, TTCCCACCGGATCACCAA R, CAACCTTGTGGTGCATGATGA P, FAM-CTTGGAGAGAAGAACCCT-MGB
ST-EPEC	<i>STh</i>	F, GCTAAACCAGYAGRGTCCTTCAAAA R, CCCGGTACARGCAGGATTACAACA P, FAM-TGGTCCTGAAAGCATGAA-MGB
	<i>STp</i>	F, TGAATCACTTGACTCTTCAAAA R, GGCAGGATTACAACAAAGTT P, FAM-TGAACAACACATTTTACTGCT-MGB
STEC	<i>stx1</i>	F, ACTTCTCGACTGCAAAGACGTATG R, ACAAATTATCCCCTGWGCCACTATC P, FAM-CTCTGCAATAGGTACTIONCA-MGB
	<i>stx2</i>	F, CCACATCGGTGTCTGTTATTAACC R, GGTCAAAACGCGCCTGATAG P, FAM-TTGCTGTGGATATACGAGG-MGB
<i>Shigella</i> spp.	<i>ipaH</i>	F, CCTTTTCCGCGTTCCTTGA

		R, CGGAATCCGGAGGTATTGC P, VIC-CGCCTTTCCGATACCGTCTCTGCA-MGB
<i>Salmonella enterica</i>	<i>ttr</i>	F, CTCACCAGGAGATTACAACATGG R, AGCTCAGACCAAAGTGACCATC P, FAM-CACCGACGGCGAGACCGACTTT-MGB
<i>Salmonella enterica</i> serovar Typhi	<i>tviB</i>	F, TGTGGTAAAGGAACTCGGTAAA R, GACTTCCGATACCGGGATAATG P, VIC-TGGATGCCGAAGAGGTAAGACGAGA-MGB
	<i>sty0201</i>	F, CGCGAAGTCAGAGTCGACATAG R, AAGACCTCAACGCCGATCAC P, FAM-CAGCCTGCTCCAGAACA-MGB
<i>Cryptosporidium hominus</i>	<i>LIB13</i>	F, TCCTTGAAATGAATATTTGTGACTCG R, AAATGTGGTAGTTGCGGTTGAAA P, FAM-CTTACTTCGTGGCGGCGT-MGB
<i>Cryptosporidium parvum</i>	<i>LIB13</i>	F, TCCTTGAAATGAATATTTGTGACTCG R, TTAATGTGGTAGTTGCGGTTGAAC P, FAM-TATCTCTTCGTAGCGGCGTA-MGB
<i>Cryptosporidium</i> spp.	<i>18S</i>	F, GGGTTGATTTATTAGATAAAGAACCA R, AGGCCAATACCCTACCGTCT P, FAM-TGACATATCATTCAAGTTTCTGAC-MGB
<i>Entamoeba histolytica</i>	<i>18S</i>	F, ATTGTCGTGGCATCCTAACTCA R, GCGGACGGCTCATTATAACA P, FAM-TCATTGAATGAATTGGCCATTT-MGB
<i>Giardia</i> spp.	<i>18S</i>	F, GACGGCTCAGGACAACGGTT R, TTGCCAGCGGTGTCCG P, FAM-CCC GCGGCGGTCCCTGCTAG-MGB


248  
249  
250

251 **Supplemental Table 3: Infection prevalence for 14 enteric pathogens measured by Luminex**  
 252 **xTAG Gastrointestinal Panel (GPP) and TaqMan Array Card (TAC) assays.** Stool samples  
 253 were tested from children at ages 6, 12, and 18 months old in Esmeraldas Province, Ecuador,  
 254 2022-2023. Created with script: <https://osf.io/4dteq> .  
 255

GPP Target	N	GPP pos	GPP Prev (95% CI)	TAC pos	TAC Prev (95% CI)
<b>Viruses</b>					
Adenovirus_40_41	154	14	9.1 (5.1, 14.8)	13	8.4 (4.6, 14.0)
Norovirus_GI	154	4	2.6 (0.7, 6.5)	7	4.5 (1.8, 9.1)
Norovirus_GII	154	10	6.5 (3.2, 11.6)	15	9.7 (5.6, 15.6)
Rotavirus_A	154	1	0.6 (0.0, 3.6)	12	7.8 (4.1, 13.2)
<b>Bacteria</b>					
Campylobacter	154	30	19.5 (13.5, 26.6)	44	28.6 (21.6, 36.4)
ETEC_LT	154	58	37.7 (30.0, 45.8)	57	37.0 (29.4, 45.2)
ETEC_ST	154	9	5.8 (2.7, 10.8)	23	14.9 (9.7, 21.6)
STEC_stx1	154	19	12.3 (7.6, 18.6)	15	9.7 (5.6, 15.6)
STEC_stx2	154	11	7.1 (3.6, 12.4)	6	3.9 (1.4, 8.3)
Shigella	154	25	16.2 (10.8, 23.0)	19	12.3 (7.6, 18.6)
Salmonella	154	124	80.5 (73.4, 86.5)	12	7.8 (4.1, 13.2)
<b>Protozoa</b>					
Cryptosporidium	154	17	11.0 (6.6, 17.1)	13	8.4 (4.6, 14.0)
Entamoeba_histolytica	154	2	1.3 (0.2, 4.6)	1	0.6 (0.0, 3.6)
Giardia	154	24	15.6 (10.2, 22.3)	31	20.1 (14.1, 27.3)

256  
 257

258 **Supplemental Figure 1: Median fluorescence intensity (MFI) values for pathogen targets**  
259 **detected by the Luminex GPP Assay.** Results are categorized according to TaqMan Array Card  
260 (TAC) and Luminex xTAG Gastrointestinal Pathogen Panel (GPP) assay sample results, for  
261 positive (+) and negative (-) detection for each target. Created with script: <https://osf.io/hfv5r> .  
262



263  
264  
265

266 **Supplemental Figure 2: Cycle threshold (Ct) values for pathogen associated gene targets**  
 267 **detected by the TAC Assay.** Multiple gene targets were used for some enteric pathogens in the  
 268 TaqMan Array Card (TAC) panel. In each comparison, the top row label identifies the Luminex  
 269 xTAG Gastrointestinal Pathogen Panel (GPP) target, and the second row identifies the TAC  
 270 target. Results are categorized according to TAC and GPP assay sample results, for positive (+)  
 271 and negative (-) detection for each GPP target. Created with script: <https://osf.io/hfv5r>.



272