1	Performance evaluation of the Xpert MTB/XDR test for the detection of drug
2	resistance to Mycobacterium tuberculosis among people diagnosed with tuberculosis
2	in South Africa
<u>л</u>	
5	Shaheed Vally Omar ^a , Gail Louw ^{b,c} , Farzana Ismail ^a , Xiaohong Liu ^c , Dumsani
6	Ngcamu ^a , Thabisile Gwala ^a , Minty van der Meulen ^a , Lavania Joseph ^a
7	^a Centre for Tuberculosis, National TB Reference Laboratory, National Institute for
8	Communicable Diseases a division of the National Health Laboratory Service,
9	Johannesburg, South Africa
10	^b Cepheid (PTY) LTD, Johannesburg, South Africa
11	^c Cepheid, Sunnyvale, California, USA
12	
13	
14	Corresponding author: shaheedvo@nicd.ac.za
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
29	
30	
31	
32	
33	
34	NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

35 Abstract

36

Background: Tuberculosis (TB) remains a significant public health concern in South Africa, with high incidence rates and a growing burden of drug-resistant TB. This study aimed to assess the diagnostic performance of the Xpert MTB/XDR test, a novel molecular assay, for detecting drug resistance in TB patients using archived sputum sediments.

42

43 Methods: The study involved a comprehensive analysis of 322 samples collected from presumptive TB patients between 2016 - 2019 across South Africa, previously 44 characterized by phenotypic and genotypic methods. The Xpert MTB/XDR test was 45 evaluated for its ability to detect resistance to isoniazid (INH), ethionamide (ETH), 46 fluoroquinolones (FLQ), and second-line injectable drugs (SLID) compared to 47 phenotypic drug susceptibility testing (pDST) and whole-genome sequencing (WGS). 48 The Xpert MTB/RIF Ultra and G4 tests were performed to determine agreement with 49 50 this test for TB detection.

51

Findings: The Xpert MTB/XDR test performance showed excellent sensitivity and specificity for detecting Mycobacterium tuberculosis (*M. tuberculosis*), with a sensitivity of 98.3% and specificity of 100% compared to culture. The sensitivities using a composite reference standard, pDST and sequencing, were over 90% for INH, FLQ, AMK, KAN, and CAP resistance, meeting the WHO target product profile criteria for this class. A lower sensitivity of 65.9% for ETH resistance was observed, driven by the limited targets covered by the assay.

59

Interpretation: The Xpert MTB/XDR test offers a promising solution for the rapid detection of drug-resistant TB in South Africa. It could significantly enhance TB control efforts in this setting and contribute to improved patient care and management.

- 64
- 65

66 Keywords: drug-resistant, TB, molecular, XDR, diagnostic

- 67
- 68

69

70 Introduction

71

Progress in achieving the 2018 UN High-Level Meeting targets has been 72 poor for multidrug-resistant (MDR)/Rifampicin 73 exceptionally Resistant (RR) tuberculosis (TB) with only 55% of the target achieved between 2018-2022 (1). In a 74 recent commentary on diagnostics for TB, the authors succinctly summarized the 75 situation as "... if we cannot find TB, we cannot treat TB. And if we cannot treat TB, 76 77 we cannot end TB", highlighting the central role of diagnostics to address the gaps 78 (2).

79

Over the past decade, South Africa has made significant progress towards the 80 prevention and management of TB disease and drug-resistant TB since adopting the 81 WHO's recommended diagnostic technologies and therapies. South Africa is now 82 one of six high-burden countries that achieved the 2020 End TB Strategy milestones 83 of a 20% reduction in TB incidence rates (3) and has sustained this milestone in 84 2021 (4). It is ranked as one of the WHO's top 30 high-burden countries MDR/RR-TB 85 (4) and has a disproportionate burden on the African continent, with 32% 86 (6781/21402) of the laboratory-confirmed cases reported from this country alone (1). 87 88

One of the key elements for meeting the End TB strategy (5), is the recommendation to use WHO-endorsed rapid molecular tests, such as the Xpert[®] MTB/RIF ("G4") (Cepheid, Sunnyvale, CA, USA) for the diagnosis of TB and the detection of rifampicin (RIF) resistance in patients presumptive of TB rather than smear microscopy (6) and was fully implemented in 2013 with a subsequent transition to Xpert[®] MTB/RIF Ultra ("Ultra") in 2017.

95

Another target set in the WHO End TB Strategy is for all MDR/RR-TB patients to be tested for fluoroquinolone (FQ) resistance. In 2022, only 50% of all MDR/RR-TB patients were tested globally (1). The Bruker-Hain GenoType MTBDR*plus* and GenoType MTBDR*s/* line probe assays (LPAs) and phenotypic drug susceptibility test (DST) based where genotypic methods are not available have been implemented nationally. However, these assays require specialized facilities and it can take between 1-4 weeks for results to be available (7, 8).

103

An important priority highlighted by WHO has been for a TB DST that is fast, with low 104 technical skill and minimal infrastructure requirements (9). In response, Cepheid 105 announced the release of the Xpert[®] MTB/XDR test in July 2020, a test capable of 106 detecting resistance using melt curve analysis by targeting associated mutations to 107 isoniazid (INH), ethionamide (ETH), fluoroquinolones (FLQ), and second-line 108 injectable agents (SLID), such as kanamycin (KAN), amikacin (AMK) and 109 capreomycin (CAP) (10). The WHO have since endorsed the MTB/XDR test as a low 110 complexity molecular sputum-based reflex test for the detection of resistance to 111 these drugs in confirmed *M. tuberculosis* positive specimens (6). The test targets 112 resistance conferring mutations in the katG and fabG1 genes, ahpC-oxyR intergenic 113 region and *inhA* promoter for INH; *inhA* promoter mutations only for ETH resistance; 114 the gyrA and gyrB quinolone resistance determining regions (QRDR) for FLQ; and 115 the rrs gene and the eis promoter region for SLID. It reports low-level resistance to 116 INH and FLQ and also calls resistance to select SLID base on mutations detected. 117

118

The main study that assessed the clinical performance of the Xpert MTB/XDR test 119 120 was conducted at 2 study sites (South Africa and China), however the data presented in this manuscript is focused on the South Africa data set only. 121

122

This study aimed to evaluate the performance of the Xpert MTB/XDR test to detect 123 drug resistance using phenotypic DST and whole genome sequencing (WGS) 124 restricted to test targets as the reference standard and success rate of the assay 125 compared to the G4 and Ultra test. 126

127

Materials and Methods 128

Ethics 129

The study was conducted at the Centre for Tuberculosis, National TB Reference 130 Laboratory at the National Institute for Communicable Diseases a division of the 131 National Health Laboratory Service in Johannesburg, South Africa. Ethical approval 132 M160667 for this study was obtained from the University of the Witwatersrand, 133 Johannesburg Human Research Ethics Committee. 134

135

Sample Eligibility Criteria 136

Archived sputum sediments, prepared from sputum specimens collected between 29 November 2016 to 20 June 2019 from people with presumptive TB, representative of all nine provinces in South Africa, were used in this study. These samples were characterized by phenotypic and genotypic methods and stored at -70°C.

141

M. tuberculosis positive and *M. tuberculosis* negative specimens were included for 142 evaluation if a minimum volume of 1mL frozen sputum sediment was available for 143 testing (11). For *M. tuberculosis* positive specimens, documented results for smear 144 145 microscopy, positive culture result on the BD BACTEC Mycobacterial Growth Indicator Tube 960 (MGIT) platform (BD Biosciences, Sparks, MD, USA) and/or 146 Lowenstein Jensen (LJ) media were required. In addition, pDST results for isoniazid, 147 ethionamide, amikacin, kanamycin, capreomycin and moxifloxacin/levofloxacin on 148 the MGIT platform; sequencing results for katG, inhA promoter, fabG1, oxyR-ahpC 149 150 intergenic region, gyrA, gyrB, rrs and eis promoter; and G4 or Ultra test results were also required. 151

152

For *M. tuberculosis* negative specimens, documented results indicating negative culture result on MGIT and/or LJ media was required. Specimens that were previously thawed were excluded from the study.

156

157 Specimen Processing Procedures

Concentrated sediments were prepared from induced or expectorated sputum and 158 subsequently stored at -70°C. These specimens were assigned a unique de-159 identified specimen ID by a third-party individual not actively involved in the study. 160 Subsequently, the specimens were decontaminated using 161 a commercial NaLC/NaOH kit, Alphatec NAC-PAC[™] Red (Alpha-Tec Systems, Inc, Vancouver, 162 WA, USA), with a final concentration of 1.5% sodium hydroxide as per manufactures 163 instruction. Two drops of the sediment were used to prepare a smear for Auramine-164 O staining and were graded in accordance with Global Laboratory Initiative 165 Guidelines (12). 166

167

A 500µL aliquot of the sediment was inoculated into a MGIT tube and incubated at
 37°C in the MGIT 960 system (BD Biosciences, Sparks, MD, USA), until the culture
 flagged positive or 42 days to a negative result as per the manufacturers instruction.

The MGIT positive cultures were confirmed to be MTB complex by antigen testing (TBCheck, BD, Sparks, USA) and were inspected for contamination by visual observations, Ziehl Neelsen (ZN) staining and on blood agar prior to performing pDST.

175

176 Reference method testing (pDST and WGS)

The MGIT 960 platform and BD Epicentre TBeXiST module (BD Biosciences, Sparks, MD, USA) was used to perform pDST as previously described (13) which included, INH, ETH, FLQ (moxifloxacin(MXF), levofloxacin (LEV) and ofloxacin (OFL)) and SLID (AMK, KAN and CAP). Testing was performed for all MTB/XDR drug targets using the 2018 updated WHO recommended critical concentrations (14). Whole genome sequencing (WGS) and variant analysis was performed as previously described (15).

184

186

185 **Specimen testing**:

Xpert MTB/RIF; Xpert MTB/RIF ULTRA and Xpert MTB/XDR test

Sediments were thawed at room temperature prior to testing and were randomly assigned for processing on either the G4 or Ultra tests using the GeneXpert 6-colour module system (Cepheid, Sunnyvale, USA). All sediments were tested on the MTB/XDR test on the GeneXpert 10-colour module system.

191

192 Briefly, a 1,2mL aliquot of sediment was transferred to a 15mL conical screw-cap tube and the sample reagent (SR) was added at a 1:3 ratio. The SR-sample mix was 193 homogenized at room temperature by vigorous shaking 10-20 times and incubated 194 for 10 minutes, followed by vigorous shaking for 10-20 times before further 195 incubation for 5 minutes. The SR-sample mix was then used to load either the G4 or 196 Ultra tests and the MTB/XDR test in accordance with the manufacturer's instructions 197 using the appropriate GeneXpert system. If an "ERROR", "INVALID" or "NO 198 RESULT" result was obtained by specimen testing, the specimen was re-tested once 199 200 if sufficient specimen was available. If the re-test result was also non-determinant, the specimen was reported as such. 201

202

203 Discrepant result resolution

Discrepant results were defined as specimens where the MTB/XDR test and either 204 pDST or sequencing results were not in agreement. These discrepant results were 205 categorized as either a false positive result, which indicates a positive MTB/XDR test 206 result with a negative pDST/or sequencing result or a false negative result, which 207 indicates a negative MTB/XDR test result with a positive pDST/ sequencing result. 208 Specimens with discrepant results were investigated as follows: a) the specimen was 209 re-tested on the Xpert MTB/XDR test, if sufficient volume remained; b) the specimen 210 was tested using either sequencing or pDST that detected the targets that were not 211 212 in agreement; c) standard of care data associated with the specimen were reviewed to determine the absence or presence of target mutations associated with specific 213 drug resistance and d) the site confirmed that the data from source document 214 215 matched the data captured electronically.

216

217 Performance Analysis

Clinical performance of MTB/XDR test was evaluated using the following outcome 218 measures: 1) the positive percentage agreement (PPA) and negative percentage 219 agreement (NPA) for *M. tuberculosis* detection against G4 or Ultra, 2) sensitivity and 220 221 specificity for *M. tuberculosis* detection using MGIT culture as the reference standard; and 3) sensitivity and specificity compared to pDST (for FLQ, the final 222 result was generated considering all drugs tested for this evaluation) and sequencing 223 as reference standard independently and in combination as a composite reference 224 225 for resistance detection of INH, ETH, FLQs and SLID. The composite reference test results were categorized as "Resistant" if either pDST or Sequencing results were 226 "Resistant"; "Susceptible" if both pDST and sequencing were "Susceptible". Analysis 227 was performed using RStudio Team (2020) (RStudio: Integrated Development for R. 228 RStudio, PBC, Boston, MA) and the 95% confidence intervals were determined 229 using the Wilson score methods. 230

231

We also assessed the ability of the MTB/XDR test to: 1) identify low levels of resistance to INH and FLQ (MXF) based on the detection of resistance causing mutations which typically result in borderline minimal inhibitory concentration (MIC) values that are close to the breakpoint drug concentration used in phenotypic resistance testing; 2) identify resistance to KAN only, KAN and AMI, or cross-

resistance to all three SLID and, 3) identify non-determinate rates. Non-determinate 237 test results were excluded from the performance analysis. 238

239

240

241

Results 242

Specimen characteristics 243

A total of 324 specimens were eligible for inclusion, of these 2 were excluded due to 244 insufficient specimen volume (Figure 1). The final data analysis was done on 322 245 specimens which comprised of 46.0% females, 50.3% males and 3.7% of the 246 specimens with unknown sex (Table 1). Additionally, the median age was 37 years 247 (13 – 85) among individuals who had specimens included (Table 1). As shown in 248 Table 1, a positive MGIT culture result was obtained in 92.2% (297/322) of 249 specimens with 74.4% smear positive. A total of 100 specimens were tested on the 250 G4 test, 86.0% (86/100) were MTB positive and 74.4% (64/86) of these were RIF 251 resistant (Table 1, Figure 1). Additionally, 222 specimens were tested on the Ultra 252 test, with a positive result obtained for 91.9% (204/222) of which 30.4% (62/204) 253 254 were RIF resistant, 68.6% (140/204) RIF sensitive and 1% (2/204) RIF indeterminate (Table 1, Figure 1). An MTB Trace detected result was obtained in 1.8% (4/222) of 255 specimens tested on the Ultra test (Table 1, Figure 1). Overall, 8.7% (28/322) of the 256 specimens were negative by the G4 and Ultra tests (Table 1, Figure 1). 257

258

Diagnostic performance of MTB/XDR test for the detection of *M. tuberculosis* 259

The sensitivity of the MTB/XDR test for the detection of *M. tuberculosis* in smear 260 positive, smear negative and overall was 99.5% (95%CI: 97.5 - 99.9), 94.7% 261 (95%CI:87.2 - 97.9) and 98.3% (95%CI: 96.1, 99.3). The specificity was 100% (95% 262 CI: 86.7 – 100) (Table 2). 263

264

The PPA and NPA for MTB/XDR in *M. tuberculosis* detection relative to the G4 test 265 were 98.8% (95%CI: 93.7-99.8) and 100.0% (95%CI: 78.5-100.0), respectively 266 (Table 2). In this instance, the MTB/XDR test failed to detect one sample, with a 267 scant microscopy grading, identified as positive (i.e. MTB detected) by the G4 test. 268 Similarly, the PPA and NPA for MTB/XDR in *M. tuberculosis* detection relative to the 269 Ultra test was 99.5% (95%CI: 97.3-99.9) and 100.0% (95%CI: 78.5-100.0), 270

- respectively (Table 2). A smear negative sample identified as MTB Trace Detectedby the Ultra test was not detected by the MTB/XDR test.
- 273
- 274
- 275

276 Non-determinate rate

The initial non-determinate rate (ND) observed for the MTB/XDR test was 3.1% (10/322) (Data not shown). Of these 0.6% were due to "No Result" and 2.5% due to "Error" results obtained by the MTB/XDR test. Repeat testing of these specimens rendered a valid result with final ND rate of 0% (Data not shown).

281

Diagnostic performance of the MTB/XDR test for drug resistance prediction

The diagnostic performance of the MTB/XDR test against pDST, sequencing and the

composite reference test for all drugs are shown in Figure 2, 3 and 4, respectively.

285

286 Isoniazid & Ethionamide

Results for the test and reference standard for INH were available for 291 samples. The sensitivity and specificity to detect INH resistance compared to pDST was 90.7% (95% CI: 84.8 – 94.5) and 98.7% (95% CI: 95.3 - 99.6), respectively (Figure 2) while compared to WGS was 98.5% (95% CI: 94.6 – 99.6) and specificity of 99.4% (95% CI: 96.6 – 99.9) respectively (Figure 3). Using a composite reference, the sensitivity was 90.1% (95% CI: 84.1 – 94.0) and a specificity of 99.3% (95% CI: 96.3 – 99.9) (Figure 4).

294

The prediction of low level of INH resistance using sequencing as reference test was 100% (Supplementary Table 2). The majority (95.8%; 23/24) of samples with low level INH resistance detected harbored the C-15T mutation in the *inhA* promoter and 4.2% (1/24) samples showed the T-8A mutation in the *inhA* promoter (Supplementary Table 2).

300

Ethionamide (ETH) resistance prediction on the MTB/XDR test is based on detection of mutations in the *inhA* promoter. The sensitivity and specificity in detecting ETH resistance using pDST as the reference was 64.7% (95% CI: 55.6 – 72.8) and 98.2% (95%CI: 93.8 – 99.5) respectively (Figure 2). Using WGS and limited to analysis of

the *inhA* promoter only the sensitivity was 97.6% (95% CI: 91.6 – 99.3) (Figure 3). 305 Using the composite reference, the sensitivity was 65.9% (95% CI: 57.1 – 73.6) and 306 specificity of 100% (Figure 3; Figure 4). 307

- 308
- 309

Fluoroquinolones (FLQs) 310

A total of 231 samples had available results for both the test and pDST for FLQ and 311 the sensitivity was 90.6% (95% CI: 81.0 – 95.6) (Figure 2). A total of 289 samples 312 313 had available results for both the test and WGS and the sensitivity was 95.1% (95% CI: 86.5 – 98.3) (Figure 3). Using a composite reference, the sensitivity was 90.6% 314 (95% CI: 81.0 – 95.6) (Figure 4). The specificity was 100% against pDST, WGS and 315 the composite reference (Figure 2, Figure 3, Figure 4). 316

317

The ability of the MTB/XDR test to accurately predict low level of FLQ resistance 318 using sequencing as the reference test was 100% (Supplementary Table 3). The 319 distribution of these gyrA mutations were Ala90Val (66.7%; 10/15), Asp94Ala (20%; 320 3/15) and Ser91Pro (13.3%; 2/15) (Supplementary Table 3). 321

322

323

Second-line Injectable drugs (AMK, KAN, CAP)

A total of 228 samples had available results for both MTB/XDR and AMK pDST while 324 it was lower for KAN (n=166) and CAP (n=167). The sensitivity in detecting 325 resistance to AMK, KAN and CAP using pDST as the reference were 96.2% (95%CI: 326 87.0 - 98.9); 84.6% (95%CI: 66.5 - 99.3) and 84.0 (95%CI: 65.3 - 93.6), respectively 327 (Figure 2). The respective sensitivities were higher using WGS as the reference: 328 98.0% (95%CI: 89.7 - 99.7) for AMK, 98.1% (95%CI: 89.9 - -99.7) for KAN and 329 98.0% (95%CI: 89.5 - -99.7) for CAP (Figure 3). Using the composite reference, the 330 sensitivity was 96.2% (95%CI: 87.0 - 98.9) for AMK, 92.7% (95%CI: 82.7 - 97.1) for 331 KAN and 92.5% (95% CI:82.1 – 97.0) for CAP (Figure 4). All SLIDs had a specificity 332 of 100% for pDST, sequencing and the composite reference test. 333

334

The ability of the MTB/XDR test to accurately predict resistance to the different 335 SLIDs were 100% for each of the anti-TB drugs, with cross-resistance between the 336 SLIDs predicted by the A1401G mutation in the rrs gene (Data not shown). 337 Additionally, resistance to KAN only was predicted by the C-12T mutation in the eis 338

promoter with resistance to both KAN and AMK predicted by the C-14T mutation in the *eis* promoter (Data not shown).

- 341
- 342
- 343

344 Discrepant result resolution

A total of 74 discrepant results were identified between the MTB/XDR test and pDST, with 70 false negative and 4 false positive results identified across all drugs tested (Figure 2).

348

Four out of four (100%) of the false positive results were resolved by WGS that identified mutations predicting INH and ETH resistance, indicating that the initial susceptible pDST result for both INH and ETH were incorrect.

352

Sixty-four out of seventy false negative results (91.4%) were resolved by WGS that 353 showed the absence of target gene mutations predicting resistance to INH, FLQ, 354 SLIDs and ETH, indicating that the initial resistant pDST result obtained for the drug 355 356 targets were likely incorrect in these specimens. The false negative results in six specimens (8.6%) were not resolved by WGS, and the cause of the discrepancy was 357 further investigated. One specimen that was identified as INH resistant by pDST, but 358 INH susceptible by the MTB/XDR test, showed the presence of a Leu203Leu fabG1 359 360 mutation that was not identified by the MTB/XDR test. Three specimens that were identified as FLQ resistant by pDST, but FLQ susceptible by the MTB/XDR test 361 showed the presence of a Asp94Gly (n=2) and Ala90Val mutation (n=1) in the gyrA 362 gene. One specimen that was identified as KAN, AMK and CAP resistant by pDST, 363 but susceptible by MTB/XDR showed the presence of a A1401G mutation in the rrs 364 gene. Further investigation confirmed heteroresistance, however, the rrs mutant melt 365 peak was below the detection threshold of the MTB/XDR test and therefore reported 366 as KAN, AMK and CAP susceptible. Lastly, one specimen identified by the 367 MTB/XDR test as ETH susceptible, but resistant by pDST, had a G-17T mutation in 368 the *inhA* promoter region, which was initially missed by the MTB/XDR test. 369

370

A total of 11 discrepant results were identified between the MTB/XDR test and sequencing, with 10 false negative results and 1 false positive result identified

(Figure 3). One false positive result was identified with the MTB/XDR test reporting
an INH resistant result and sequencing showing an INH susceptible result, although
this specimen showed a C-52A mutation in the *ahpC* region, which was not
considered associated with INH resistance by the study site.

377

Out of the 10 false negative results, one specimen was identified as INH susceptible 378 by MTB/XDR test but had a *fabG1* mutation identified by sequencing. Further 379 investigation failed to identify a root cause of the discrepancy, thereby indicating that 380 381 the MTB/XDR test incorrectly reported this specimen as INH susceptible. The second specimen was incorrectly processed, and no INH resistance causing 382 mutation was identified upon resequencing. Three specimens, identified by the 383 MTB/XDR test as FLQ susceptible, was identified as FLQ resistant by sequencing 384 with the detection of Asp94Gly (n=2) and both Asp94Gly and Asp94Asn (n=1) 385 mutations in the gyrA gene. The gyrA double mutation of Asp94Gly and Asp94Asn 386 was below the detection threshold of the MTB/XDR test due to hetero-resistant 387 populations and was therefore not identified as FLQ resistance by the test. AMK, 388 KAN and CAP resistance was not detected by the MTB/XDR test in one specimen 389 390 since the A1401G rrs mutant peak was below the detection threshold of the test. Lastly, ETH resistance was not detected by the MTB/XDR test in one specimen due 391 to a mixed culture and in a second specimen due to a specimen swop that showed 392 no *inhA* promoter mutation upon re-sequencing. 393

394

395 Discussion

396

The demonstrated diagnostic performance of the MTB/XDR test for *M. tuberculosis* 397 detection met the overall sensitivity ($\geq 80\%$) and specificity ($\geq 98\%$) requirements 398 relative to culture as outlined in the guidance for next-generation DST by the WHO 399 (16), with a 98.3% sensitivity and specificity of 100% specificity observed in the 400 current study. The diagnostic performance of the MTB/XDR test was comparable to 401 Ultra (pooled sensitivity 90.9% (95%CI: 86.2 - 94.7)); pooled specificity 95.6% 402 (95%CI: 93.0 - 97.4)) and G4 test (pooled sensitivity of 84.7% (78.6 - 89.9)) and 403 pooled specificity of 98.4% (95%CI: 97.0 – 99.3) as previously described (17). This 404 was also seen in the current study with high levels of agreement between the 405 MTB/XDR and the G4 and Ultra. This can be attributed to the similar limit of 406

detection (LoD) of the MTB/XDR (71.9 CFU/mL (95%CI: 58 to 100)) compared to the 407 G4 (86.9 CFU/mL (95%CI (72 to 110)) (10). The LoD of Ultra (15.6 CFU/mL), 408 however, is lower than that of MTB/XDR (11). Interestingly, the diagnostic sensitivity 409 of the MTB/XDR test in culture positive, smear negative specimens (94.7%) was 410 better than in Ultra (pooled sensitivity of 77.5% (95%CI: 67.6 to 85.6)) and G4 411 (pooled sensitivity of 60.6% (95%CI: 48.4 to 71.7)) as previously described (17). This 412 indicates that although the MTB/XDR test is a reflex test to be used in M. 413 tuberculosis positive cases (excluding 'Trace'), its ability to accurately detect M. 414 415 tuberculosis in sputum specimens is on par with Ultra and G4. Further studies on processing specimens with MTB 'Trace' detected by Ultra which are expected to be 416 lower than the LoD of MTB/XDR and are for reflex testing is required. The MTB/XDR 417 test was able to successfully detect more than 98% of MTB samples detected by the 418 G4 (98.8%) and ULTRA (99.5%) tests, with each comparator test failing to detect 419 420 one sample each. These were both smear negative and in the case of ULTRA a trace result. These finding are supportive of using the MTB/XDR test as a reflex 421 422 using the MTB/RIF tests as an indicator for the follow-on testing.

423

424 The clinical performance of the MTB/XDR test performance demonstrated by the current study is similar to previous studies (18, 19) with sensitivity of >84% observed 425 for INH, SLIDs and FLQ relative to pDST. The sensitivity for predicting resistance to 426 INH, FLQ and AMK also met the minimum requirement of the target product profile 427 for next-generation pDST (sensitivity of >90% for INH, FLQ and sensitivity of ≥80% 428 for AMK) as specified by the WHO (9, 16). In contrast, lower sensitivity of the MTB 429 XDR test in predicting ETH resistance (sensitivity of 64.7% (95%CI: 55.6 - 72.8)) 430 compared to pDST was demonstrated in the current study, with sensitivity estimates 431 comparable to previously published studies (18, 19). This is due to the inclusion of 432 only the *inhA* promoter target as a proxy for ETH resistance in the MTB/XDR test, 433 since mutations in additional targets (e.g. ethA) have been identified to confer 434 resistance to ETH in clinical specimen from TB patients (20, 21). 435

436

When considering sequencing alone, the clinical performance of the MTB/XDR assay for all drug targets increased to >95% sensitivity and >99% specificity (Figure 3). The lowest sensitivity was observed for FLQ (95.1%) due to the presence of heteroresistant *gyr*A populations in each of these isolates which were below the limit

of detection in the clinical specimen. Similarly, the A1401G (rrs) mutation was 441 identified but at a level below detection of the MTB/XDR assay. The overall 442 sensitivities showed a slight decrease for most drugs and an expected significant 443 decrease for ETH with specificities remaining at >99% against the composite 444 reference standard (Figure 4). Sensitivities of >90% were observed for INH and 445 FLQ, >92% for KAN and CAP, and >96% for AMK which meet the minimum criteria 446 for the target product profile for next generation DST assays. The lower sensitivity of 447 65.9% (95%CI: 57.1-73.6) observed for ETH compared to 97.6% relative to 448 449 sequencing, was suggestive of the presence of additional mutations in targets not covered by the assay or false ETH resistance on phenotypic DST. The latter cannot 450 be confirmed since pDST was not performed for discordant results, however ETH 451 pDST is known to be unreliable (22). Based on these findings ETH resistance can 452 be ruled in and not ruled out using the MTB/XDR assay, in agreement with previous 453 454 observations (23).

455

Overall, the sensitivities observed for the composite reference were comparable to 456 those previously reported in a geographically diverse setting for INH (90.1% vs 457 458 94.0%) and FLQ (90.6% vs 94%) and higher for AMK (96.2% vs 73.0%), KAN (92.7% vs 86.0%), CAP (92.5% vs 61.0%) and ETH (65.9% vs 54.0%) (23). The 459 improved sensitivities highlight the accuracy of the assay in predicting resistance, 460 particularly for INH, FLQ, AMK, KAN and CAP, in our setting. The higher 461 performance observed when using sequencing as a reference is due to evaluation of 462 the regions targeted by the assay only and not considering all resistance conferring 463 mutations across the genome. Further, due to the restricted analysis for sequencing, 464 the discordance observed between phenotypic susceptibility testing and the 465 MTB/XDR test could not be resolved. 466

467

The performance of the Xpert XDR in our study for INH resistance detection relative to pDST was similar to the GenoType MTBDRplus 90.7% (95% CI: 84.8 – 94.5) vs 93% (95% CI: 90 – 95) for INH, however, sensitivity for FLQ resistance detection was lower than the GenoType MTBDRsI 90.6% (95%CI: 81.0 – 95.6) vs 95% (95%CI: 91 - 97) (ref 20). When considering performance relative to sequencing, resistance detection by Xpert XDR for INH was superior to the GenoType

474 MTBDRplus 98.5% (95%CI: 94.6 – 99.6) and equivalent to GenoType MTBDRsl for
475 FLQ 95.1 (95%CI: 86.5 – 98.3).

476

Two shorter standardized regimens for DR-TB are currently recommended by WHO: 477 a regimen for MDR/RR-TB where the injectable agent has been replaced by BDQ 478 (used for 6 months), in combination with levofloxacin (LFX)/moxifloxacin (MXF), 479 ethionamide (ETH), EMB, high-dose INH, PZA and CFZ for 4 months in the 480 intensive phase; and a 6-month regimen for that includes the new anti-TB agent, Pa, 481 482 which was also recommended by WHO in 2020 for use under operational research conditions, in combination with BDQ and LZD (24). LPAs have been recommended 483 by the WHO for the detection of *Mycobacterium tuberculosis* (*M. tuberculosis*) strains 484 resistant to rifampicin, in both smear positive and smear negative sputum specimens 485 (25, 26). Currently, these LPAs are being used at-scale in South Africa, however, 486 delayed result reporting is a common problem experienced with routine use mainly 487 due to technical aspects such as sample batching. Another challenge with LPAs is 488 489 its poor sensitivity on smear negative specimens that require repeat testing on cultured isolates. In a recent study, done at two sites in South Africa the median time 490 491 to LPA results ranged between 5.4 – 23.1 days (27). These delays negatively impact TB control, allowing for the continued transmission of drug resistant M. The test is 492 capable of determining level of resistance for both INH and FLQ based on the 493 interpretation of melt-curves detecting the presence of associated mutations. This 494 495 allows for supporting clinical management by making available the use of both highdose INH and MFX for patient management, particularly patients requiring a salvage 496 regimen. tuberculosis strains and result in inadequate management of patients. 497 Alternative assays providing the same information are still not readily available. Next-498 generation sequencing-based technologies show early promise, however, none have 499 matured sufficiently to an end-to-end in vitro diagnostic assay ready for routine use. 500

501

The NHLS is a key partner of the National TB Program and adapts to having the latest and most sensitive diagnostic capability to further strengthen the program. South Africa was the first country to implement the GeneXpert MTB/RIF and GeneXpert MTB/RIF Ultra assay, at scale, as a smear microscopy replacement technology in 2011 and one of the first to perform susceptibility testing for new and repurposed anti-TB drugs (Bedaquiline and Linezolid) as part of diagnosis. Further

diagnosis was improved, particularly in HIV co-infected TB-disease individuals,
through replacement of GeneXpert MTB/RIF assay with the Xpert MTB/RIF Ultra
assay in 2017 with South Africa again taking the lead. These efforts have aided in
improved management of people diagnosed with TB and drug-resistant TB, thereby
reducing South Africa's burden of disease.

513

NHLS has fully implemented this technology following of the WHO recommendation 514 to strengthen the detection and management of drug-resistant TB, an emerging 515 516 global threat. The deployment of the assay leverages the existing instrument network and testing capacity, increases utilization and thereby maximizes efficiency. The 517 potential benefits are a reduction in public health expenditure, a reduction in the 518 number of repeat tests (through the traditional testing modalities) and a significantly 519 improved turnaround time. Ultimately, turnaround time improvements benefit those 520 individuals' requiring treatment by enabling clinicians to take earlier appropriate 521 management decisions impacting treatment outcomes. 522

- 523
- 524

525 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

526

527 We thank the study investigators, clinical research coordinators, and laboratory staff 528 at the Centre for Tuberculosis, NICD/NHLS for their diligent efforts.

The study sponsor (Cepheid) provided the investigational product, funding and administrative and logistical support to this study site. The sponsor was involved in the design, conduct and execution of the clinical study, and assisted in monitoring and collection of data. The sponsor participated in the interpretation of the data and preparation of the manuscript. GL and XL are Cepheid employees.

534 SVO, LJ, FI, DN, TG, MvdM collected the data and performed the experiments. XL 535 performed the statistical analysis. SVO and GL drafted the manuscript. All authors 536 reviewed and critiqued the draft manuscript and approved the final manuscript prior 537 to submission for publication.

538

539

Tables & Figures



Figure 1. Flowchart illustrating the diagnostic characteristics of the sediments.

544 MTB/RIF POSITIVE constitutes MTB Detected; MTB/RIF Ultra POSITIVE constitutes MTB Detected Very Low, 545 MTB Detected Low, MTB Detected Medium, MTB Detected High; MTB/RIF Ultra TRACE constitutes MTB Trace

546 Detected; MTB/RIF or MTB/RIF Ultra NEGATIVE constitutes MTB Not Detected; RIF RES indicates Rifampicin 547 Resistant, RIF SENS indicates Rifampicin Sensitive, RIF IND indicates Rifampicin Indeterminate.

563 Table 1: Demographics and diagnostic characteristics of specimens included in the analysis

	Overall (N=322)
Demographic Characteristics	
Sex	
Female	148 (46.0%)
Male	162 (50.3%)
N/A	12 (3.7%)
Age (Years)	
Median [Min, Max)	37 (13-85)
MGIT culture / AFB smear	
% Culture positive [n/N]	92.2% [297/322]
% smear positive [n/N]	74.4% [221/297]
% smear negative [n/N]	25.6% [76/297]
% Culture negative [n/N]	7.8% [25/322]
G4	
%G4 results [n/N]	31.1% [100/322]
% Positive ^a [n/N]	86.0% [86/100]
% RIF RES ^d [n/N]	74.4% [64/86]
% RIF SENS ^e [n/N]	25.6% [22/86]
% Negative ^c [n/N]	14.0% [14/100]
Ultra	-
% Ultra results [n/N]	68.9% [222/322]
% Positive [∞] [n/N]	91.9% [204/222]
% RIF RES [®] [n/N]	30.4% [62/204]
% RIF SENS [†] [n/N]	68.6% [140/204]
% RIF IND ^g [n/N]	1.0% [2/204]
%Trace ^d [n/N]	1.8% [4/222]
RIF IND ^g [n/N]	100% [4/4]
% Negative ^c [n/N]	6.3% [14/222]

564

^aG4 Positive constitutes MTB Detected

^bUltra Positive constitutes MTB Detected Very Low, MTB Detected Low, MTB Detected Medium, MTB Detected 565

566 High

- 567 ^cG4 or Ultra Negative constitutes MTB Not Detected
- ^dUltra Trace constitutes MTB Trace Detected 568
- 569 ^eRIF RES indicates Rifampicin Resistant
- 570 ^fRIF SENS indicates Rifampicin Sensitive
- 571 ^gRIF IND indicates Rifampicin Indeterminate
- 572
- 573
- 574

575 **Table 2:** Performance summary of the MTB/XDR test relative to MGIT culture, G4 and Ultra test for

576 *M. tuberculosis* detection.

	Sensitivity/PPA (95% CI)	Specificity/NPA (95% CI)
MGIT Culture ^a		
Overall	98.3% (96.1 – 99.3)	100% (86.7 – 100)
Culture positive, Smear positive	99.5% (97.5 – 99.9)	N/A
Culture positive, Smear negative	94.7% (87.2 – 97.9)	N/A
G4 ^b	98.8% (95%CI: 93.7-99.8)	100.0% (95%CI: 78.5-100.0)
Ultra ^b	99.5% (95%CI: 97.3-99.9)	100.0% (95%CI: 78.5-100.0)

577

^a Diagnostic Performance of MTB/XDR test in *M. tuberculosis* detection relative to MGIT culture was assessed by

578 sensitivity and specificity.
 ^b Diagnostic performance of MTB/XDR test in *M. tuberculosis* detection relative to G4 and Ultra was assessed by
 580 PPA and NPA.

581

582

Target	Total	TP	FN	ΤN	FP							Sens. (95%CI)	Spec. (95%CI)
INH	291	127	13	149	2					F	●⊣	90.7 (84.8 - 94.5)	98.7 (95.3 - 99.6)
FLQ	231	58	6	167	0						●⊣	90.6 (81.0 - 95.6)	100 (97.8 - 100)
AMK	228	50	2	176	0					F		96.2 (87.0 - 98.9)	100 (97.9 - 100)
KAN	166	22	4	140	0				F	•		84.6 (66.5 - 93.8)	100 (97.3 - 100)
CAP	167	21	4	142	0				⊢	•		84 (65.3 - 93.6)	100 (97.4 - 100)
ETH	230	75	41	112	2				⊢-●-			64.7 (55.6 - 72.8)	98.2 (93.8 - 99.5)
							20	40	60		100		
						0	20	40	60	80	100		
								Sens	sitivity				

583 584

Figure 2: Performance of the MTB/XDR test in predicting resistance to INH, FLQ, AMK, KAN, CAP,

585 ETH relative to pDST. TP -True Positive, FN – False Negative; TN – True Negative; FP – False

586 Positive; Sens. – Sensitivity; Spec.- Specificity

587

588

Target	Total	TP	FN	TN	FP							Sens. (95%CI)	Spec. (95%CI)
INH	291	128	2	160	1						H	98.5 (94.6 - 99.6)	99.4 (96.6 - 99.9)
FLQ	289	58	3	228	0						⊢ ●+	95.1 (86.5 - 98.3)	100 (98.3 - 100)
AMK	286	50	1	235	0						—	98 (89.7 - 99.7)	100 (98.4 - 100)
KAN	286	51	1	234	0						⊢-•	98.1 (89.9 - 99.7)	100 (98.4 - 100)
CAP	286	49	1	236	0						—	98 (89.5 - 99.7)	100 (98.4 - 100)
ETH	292	81	2	209	0						—	97.6 (91.6 - 99.3)	100 (98.2 - 100)
						_							
						0	20	40	60	80	100		
								Sens	itivity				

589 590

Figure 3: Performance of the MTB/XDR test in detection of resistance to INH, FLQ, AMK, KAN, CAP,

ETH relative to sequencing. TP -True Positive, FN – False Negative; TN – True Negative; FP – False
Positive; Sens. – Sensitivity; Spec.- Specificity

593

ſ

Target	Total	TP	FN	TN	FP					Sens. (95%CI)	Spec. (95%CI)
INH	291	128	14	148	1				⊢●⊣	90.1 (84.1 - 94.0)	99.3 (96.3 - 99.9)
FLQ	289	58	6	225	0				⊢● −	90.6 (81.0 - 95.6)	100 (98.3 - 100)
AMK	286	50	2	234	0				⊢ ●	96.2 (87.0 - 98.9)	100 (98.4 - 100)
KAN CAR	286	51 ⊿o	4	231	0					92.7 (82.7 - 97.1)	100 (98.4 - 100) 100 (98.4 - 100)
ETH	292	81	42	169	0			— —	-	65.9 (57.1 - 73.6)	100 (97.8 - 100)
						0 20	40	60	80 100		
							Sensi	tivity			
gure 4	1: Perf	orman	ce of t	he MT	B/XD	R test in de	etectior	n of re	sistance	to INH, FLQ, AM	IK, KAN, CAP,
TH rela	ative to	the co	ompos	site test	. TP	-True Posit	tive, FN	N – Fa	alse Nega	tive; TN – True I	Negative; FP –
alse Po	ositive;	Sens.	– Ser	nsitivity	; Spe	c Specific	city				

SUPPLEMENTARY DATA 635

636

637 Supplementary Table 1: Performance of MTB/XDR test compared to MGIT Culture stratified by

smear status 638

				Culture		
			Positive	Negative		
		Smear +	Smear -	Overall Culture +	Overall Culture -	Total
	MTB Detected	220	72	292	0	292
MTB/XDR Test	MTB Not Detected	1	4	5	25	30
	Total	221	76	297	25	322
Performance in C Sensitivity: 99.5% Performance in C Sensitivity: 94.7% Performance Ove Sensitivity: 98.3% Specificity: 100% (Culture Positive Sm (220/221), 95% CI: Culture Positive Sm (72/76), 95% CI: 87 Frall: (292/297), 95% CI: 95 25/25), 95% CI: 86.7	near Positiv 97.5, 99.9 near Negati v 7.2, 97.9 96.1, 99.3 7.100	e group: /e group:			

639

640

641 Supplementary Table 2: Low Level INH resistance prediction by MTB/XDR test relative to inhA

promoter mutations identified by sequencing 642

		Total	
	C-15T (<i>inhA</i> promoter)	T-8C (<i>inhA</i> promoter)	
Low Level INH Resistance Detected by MTB/XDR test	23	1	24
Total	23 (95.8%)	1 (4.2%)	24 (100%)

643

644 Supplementary Table 3: Low level FLQ resistance prediction by MTB/XDR test relative to gyrA

645 mutations identified by sequencing

	Ala90Val (gyrA)	Asp94Ala (gyrA)	Ser91Pro (gyrA)	Total
Low Level FLQ Resistance Detected by MTB/XDR test	10	3	2	15
Total	10 (66.7%)	3 (20.0%)	2 (13.3%)	15 (100.0%)

646

Poforoncos: C 1 7

647 648	Refe	rences.
649	1.	World Health Organization. 2023. Global tuberculosis report 2023. Geneva:
650		World Health Organization; 2023. Licence: CC BY-NC-SA 3.0 IGO. World
651		Health Organization.
652	2.	Pai M, Dewan PK, Swaminathan S. 2023. Transforming tuberculosis
653		diagnosis. Nat Microbiol 8:756–759.
654	3.	World Health Organization. 2021. Global tuberculosis report 2021. Geneva:
655		World Health Organization; 2021. Licence: CC BY-NC-SA 3.0 IGO. World
656		Health Organization.
657	4.	World Health Organization. 2022. Global tuberculosis report 2022. Geneva:
658		World Health Organization; 2022. Licence: CC BY-NC-SA 3.0 IGO. World
659		Health Organization.
660	5.	World Health Organization. 2022. Implementing the end TB strategy: the
661		essentials, 2022 update. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2022. Licence:
662		CC BY-NC-SA 3.0 IGO. World Health Organization.
663	6.	WHO. 2021. WHO consolidated guidelines on tuberculosis. Module 3:
664		diagnosis - rapid diagnostics for tuberculosis detection, 2021 update. Geneva:
665		World Health Organization; 2021. Licence: CC BY-NC-SA 3.0 IGO. World
666		Health Organization.
667	7.	Iruedo J, O'Mahony D, Mabunda S, Wright G, Cawe B. 2017. The effect of
668		the Xpert MTB/RIF test on the time to MDR-TB treatment initiation in a rural

669	setting: a cohort study in South Africa's Eastern Cape Province. BMC Infect
670	Dis 17:91.

- 8. Naidoo P, Toit E, Dunbar R, Lombard C, Caldwell J, Detjen A. 2014. A
- 672 Comparison of Multidrug-Resistant Tuberculosis Treatment Commencement
- Times in MDRTBPlus Line Probe Assay and Xpert MTB/RIF-Based
- Algorithms in a Routine Operational Setting in Cape Town. PLoS ONE.
- 9. World Health Organization. 2014. Meeting report: High-priority target product
- 676 profiles for new tuberculosis diagnostics: report of a consensus meeting;
- 677 World Health Organization (2014). (WHO/HTM/TB/2014.18). World Health

678 Organization.

- 10. Cao Y, Parmar H, Gaur RL, Lieu D, Raghunath S, Via N, Battagalia S, Cirillo
- 680 DM, Denkinger C, Georghiou S, Kwiatkowski R, Persing D, Alland D,
- 681 Chakravorty S. 2020. Xpert MTB/XDR: A ten-color reflex assay suitable for
- point of care settings to detect isoniazid-, fluoroquinolone-, and second line
- 683 injectable drug-resistance directly from *Mycobacterium tuberculosis* positive
- sputum. BioRxiv https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.08.288787.

11. Chakravorty S, Simmons AM, Rowneki M, Parmar H, Cao Y, Ryan J, Banada

686 PP, Deshpande S, Shenai S, Gall A, Glass J, Krieswirth B, Schumacher SG,

- Nabeta P, Tukvadze N, Rodrigues C, Skrahina A, Tagliani E, Cirillo DM,
- 688 Davidow A, Denkinger CM, Persing D, Kwiatkowski R, Jones M, Alland D.
- 2017. The New Xpert MTB/RIF Ultra: Improving Detection of Mycobacterium
- 690 tuberculosis and Resistance to Rifampin in an Assay Suitable for Point-of-
- 691 Care Testing. MBio 8.

- Global Laboratory Initiative. 2014. Mycobacteriology Laboratory Manual. First
 Edition, April 2014. Stop TB Partnership.
- 13. Rüsch-Gerdes S, Pfyffer GE, Casal M, Chadwick M, Siddiqi S. 2006.
- 695 Multicenter laboratory validation of the BACTEC MGIT 960 technique for
- 696 testing susceptibilities of Mycobacterium tuberculosis to classical second-line
- drugs and newer antimicrobials. J Clin Microbiol 44:688–692.
- 698 14. World Health Organization. 2018. Technical Report on critical concentrations
- 699 for drug susceptibility testing of medicines used in the treatment of drug-
- resistant tuberculosis. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2018
- 701 (WHO/CDS/TB/2018.5). Licence: CC BY-NC-SA 3.0 IGO. . World Health
- 702 Orgaization.
- 15. Ismail NA, Ismail F, Joseph L, Govender N, Blows L, Kaniga K, Omar SV.
- 2020. Epidemiological cut-offs for Sensititre susceptibility testing of
- 705 Mycobacterium tuberculosis: interpretive criteria cross validated with whole
- genome sequencing. Sci Rep 10:1013.
- World Health Organization. 2021. Target product profile for next-generation
 drug-susceptibility testing at peripheral centres. Geneva: World Health
 Organization; 2021. Licence: CC BY-NC-SA 3.0 IGO. World Health
 Organization.
- 711 17. Zifodya JS, Kreniske JS, Schiller I, Kohli M, Dendukuri N, Schumacher SG,
 712 Ochodo EA, Haraka F, Zwerling AA, Pai M, Steingart KR, Horne DJ. 2021.
 713 Xpert Ultra versus Xpert MTB/RIF for pulmonary tuberculosis and rifampicin

714	resistance in adults	with presumptive	pulmonary tuberculosi	is. Cochrane
-----	----------------------	------------------	-----------------------	--------------

- 715 Database Syst Rev 2:CD009593.
- 18. Truden S, Sodja E, Žolnir-Dovč M. 2023. Drug-Resistant Tuberculosis on the
- 717 Balkan Peninsula: Determination of Drug Resistance Mechanisms with Xpert
- 718 MTB/XDR and Whole-Genome Sequencing Analysis. Microbiol Spectr
- 719 11:e0276122.
- 19. Katamba A, Ssengooba W, Sserubiri J, Semugenze D, William KG, Abdunoor
- 721 N, Byaruhanga R, Turyahabwe S, Joloba ML. 2023. Evaluation of Xpert ®
- 722 MTB/XDR test for susceptibility testing of Mycobacterium tuberculosis to first
- and second-line drugs in Uganda. medRxiv
- 724 https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.04.03.23288099.
- Vilchèze C, Jacobs WR. 2014. Resistance to Isoniazid and Ethionamide in
 Mycobacterium tuberculosis: Genes, Mutations, and Causalities. Microbiol
 Spectr 2.
- 728 21. World Health Organization. 2021. Catalogue of mutations in Mycobacterium
- tuberculosis complex and their associatoin with drug resistance. Geneva:
- 730 World Health Organization; 2021. Licence: CC BY-NC-SA 3.0 IGO. World
- 731 Health Organization.
- Varma-Basil M, Prasad R. 2015. Dilemmas with ethionamide susceptibility
 testing of Mycobacterium tuberculosis: A microbiologist & physician's
 nightmare. Indian J Med Res 142:512–514.

735	23.	Penn-Nicholson A, Georghiou SB, Ciobanu N, Kazi M, Bhalla M, David A,
736		Conradie F, Ruhwald M, Crudu V, Rodrigues C, Myneedu VP, Scott L,
737		Denkinger CM, Schumacher SG, Xpert XDR Trial Consortium. 2021. Clinical
738		evaluation of the Xpert MTB/XDR assay for rapid detection of isoniazid,
739		fluoroquinolone, ethionamide and second-line drug resistance: A cross-
740		sectional multicentre diagnostic accuracy study. medRxiv
741		https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.05.06.21256505.
742	24.	Conradie F, Bagdasaryan TR, Borisov S, Howell P, Mikiashvili L, Ngubane N,
743		Samoilova A, Skornykova S, Tudor E, Variava E, Yablonskiy P, Everitt D,
744		Wills GH, Sun E, Olugbosi M, Egizi E, Li M, Holsta A, Timm J, Bateson A,
745		Crook AM, Fabiane SM, Hunt R, McHugh TD, Tweed CD, Foraida S, Mendel
746		CM, Spigelman M, ZeNix Trial Team. 2022. Bedaquiline-Pretomanid-Linezolid
747		Regimens for Drug-Resistant Tuberculosis. N Engl J Med 387:810–823.
748	25.	World Health Organization. 2016. The use of molecular line probe assay for
749		the detection of resistance to isoniazid and rifampicin: policy update. World
750		Health Organization.
751	26.	World Health Organization. 2016. The use of molecular line probe assays for
752		the detection of resistance to second-line anti-tuberculosis drugs. Policy
753		guidance . World Health Organization.
754	27.	Centner C, Dolby T, Hayes C, Zemanay W, Brown P, Munir R, David A, Rie eta
755		F, Nicol M, Brink A, Tagliani E, Cirillo D, Ruhwald M, Scott L, Cox H, Penn-
756		Nicholson A. 2022. Reflex commercial second-line genotypic susceptibility
757		testing of residual rifampicin-resistant sputum specimens: a two-site

- diagnostic laboratory-based feasibility study in South Africa. 4d. Molecular
- diagnostics (including POCT and syndromic testing). P1078. ECCMID.

760