

Verification of the Abbott Alinity m Resp-4-Plex Assay for detection of SARS-CoV-2, influenza A/B, and respiratory syncytial virus

Running Title: Verification of Alinity m Resp-4-Plex Assay

word count abstract: 115

word count manuscript: 2,556

Annie Cheng^a, Stefan Riedel,^{a,b} Ramy Arnaout,^{a,b,c} James E. Kirby,^{a,b,#}

^aDepartment of Pathology, Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center, Boston, MA, USA

^bHarvard Medical School, Boston, MA, USA

^cDivision of Clinical Informatics, Department of Medicine, Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center, Boston, MA USA 02215

[#]Corresponding Author

James E. Kirby

Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center

330 Brookline Avenue - YA309

Boston, MA 02215

jekirby@bidmc.harvard.edu

Phone: 617-667-3648

Fax: 617-667-4533

1 **Abstract**

2 COVID-19 symptomology may overlap with other circulating respiratory viruses that may also
3 cause severe disease and for which there are specific and potentially life-saving treatments. The
4 Abbott Alinity m Resp-4-Plex assay is a multiplex PCR assay that simultaneously detects and
5 differentiates infection with SARS-CoV-2, influenza A, influenza B, and respiratory syncytial
6 virus (RSV). We characterized its accuracy, precision, and analytical sensitivity. All were found
7 to be robust for measures examined. In the context of sample-to-answer, near random access
8 automation on the Alinity m platform, we believe that the Resp-4-Plex assay offers significant
9 utility in addressing the current needs of the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic and future needs during
10 anticipated endemic circulation of SARS-CoV-2 with other respiratory viruses.

11

12 **Keywords**

13 SARS-CoV-2, influenza, respiratory syncytial virus, multiplex, nucleic acid amplification
14 technology, molecular diagnostics

15 **Introduction**

16 SARS-CoV-2, influenza A/B, and RSV may cause respiratory infection with significant
17 morbidity and mortality. Respiratory disease signs and symptoms for these viruses overlap, and,
18 therefore, it is not possible to reliably differentiate between them on clinical grounds alone,
19 especially early during the course of disease. SARS-CoV-2 and influenza, especially, have
20 significant implications in terms of transmission inside and outside of hospital settings and
21 therefore require reliable methods for diagnosis. RSV, although primarily thought of as a serious
22 pathogen in young children, can also cause bronchiolitis and pneumonia in adults. Depending on
23 the stage of illness, there are therapeutics with varying efficacy for SARS-CoV-2, influenza, and
24 RSV. Therefore, sensitive detection and differentiation of these viruses are valuable clinical
25 determinations.

26 With social distancing and masking during the COVID pandemic, the circulation of
27 influenza and other respiratory viruses almost ceased in many locations (1). Presumably,
28 however, with less than 100% vaccine efficacy for influenza, waning immunity to circulating
29 respiratory viruses over a large population cohort, and reopening of our societies, circulation of
30 influenza and RSV will rebound and likely exceed normal levels for some time (2). At the same
31 time, SARS-CoV-2 will likely become endemic, potentially adopting a seasonal cycle with
32 enhanced transmission during the winter as observed in the United States during the winters of
33 2020 and 2021 (3). It will therefore be critical to be able to test both patients and staff for high
34 consequence respiratory pathogens to avert potential nosocomial transmission and to identify the
35 most advantageous therapeutic options for patients with serious illness.

36 A multiplex testing option for high consequence testing options would address these
37 specific diagnostic needs. The Abbott Alinity m Resp-4-Plex assay in March 2021 received
38 emergency use authorization designation for detection of SARS-CoV-2, influenza A, influenza B
39 and RSV. Approved sample types are either a nasopharyngeal swab collected by a health care
40 provider or a nasal swab specimen self-collected in a healthcare setting. The multiplex, reverse-
41 transcription real-time PCR assay targets the RdRp and N genes of SARS-CoV2: the matrix gene
42 of influenza A; the nonstructural 1 gene of influenza B, and the matrix gene of RSV. An internal
43 control is spiked into each sample in the form of armored RNA encoding a segment of the
44 hydroxypyruvate reductase gene from the pumpkin plant, *Cucurbita pepo*. It controls for
45 appropriate extraction and amplification in each reaction. Each amplicon is detected by a real-
46 time probe with a distinct fluorophore with the exception that both probes for the SARS-CoV-2
47 targets are detected with the same fluorophore. The primers and probes for the SARS-CoV-2
48 target are the same as those used in the singleplex Abbott RealTime SARS-CoV-2 and Alinity m
49 SARS-CoV-2 assays, whose performance characteristics have been examined in prior literature
50 (4-6). Cycle threshold numbers (Ct) determined on the Alinity m instrument in the Resp-4-Plex
51 assay are determined based on a fluorescence cutoff. They are used along with the inflection
52 point of the amplification curve at the maximum amplification efficiency (the max ratio) (7) for
53 qualitative assessment of target positivity and negativity (personal communication, Joshua
54 Koster, Abbott Molecular).

55 Here we describe characterization of accuracy, precision, and limit of detection of the
56 Alinity m Resp-4-Plex assay determined as part of normal quality assurance activities prior to
57 adoption for clinical use in our clinical laboratory.

58

59 **Materials and Methods**

60 **Accuracy.** Results from prior determinations either by Cepheid Xpert® Xpress Flu; direct
61 fluorescent antigen testing for influenza A/B, RSV, adenovirus, and parainfluenza 1, 2 and 3
62 and/or shell vial culture on R-Mix-Too monolayers (Quidel Corporation, San Diego, CA);
63 and/or reference laboratory testing at Eurofin ViraCor using the TEM-PCR assay (8) were
64 considered predicate comparator assays as enumerated. Samples were divided for Resp-4-Plex
65 testing on the two Alinity m instruments at our institution. As there was no difference in
66 performance on these identical systems results are presented in aggregate. Discrepant resolution
67 included repeat testing of samples as available using Resp-4-Plex on the second Alinity m
68 platform and/or using the Cepheid Xpert® Xpress SARS-CoV-2/Flu/RSV assay. Data for
69 individual sample is listed in Table S1.

70

71 **Analytical sensitivity.** For limit of detection studies, the AccuPlex SARS-CoV-2, Flu A/B and
72 RSV Verification Panel (catalogue #0505-0183, LGC SeraCare, Milford, MA) with individual
73 members at defined equal concentrations, quantified by digital droplet PCR, were initially
74 diluted to 1E4, 5E3, 1E3, 5E2, 2E2, 1E2, 5E1, 2.5E1, 1E1 and 0.5E1 target amplicon genome
75 copies per mL and tested by Resp-4-Plex in quadruplicate. Each panel member consists of
76 either part or the entire genome of the target virus cloned into a replication incompetent Sindbis
77 virus. The Sindbis virus is an enveloped, single-stranded, RNA genome virus that serves as a
78 surrogate and control for all processes in the assay including extraction. The linearity of
79 amplification of each assay was determined by least squares linear regression based on Ct
80 values obtained from each screening concentration, and PCR efficiency was determined using
81 slope of the regression line using the ThermoFisher calculator:

82 [https://www.thermofisher.com/us/en/home/brands/thermo-scientific/molecular-](https://www.thermofisher.com/us/en/home/brands/thermo-scientific/molecular-biology/molecular-biology-learning-center/molecular-biology-resource-library/thermo-scientific-web-tools/qpcr-efficiency-calculator.html)
83 [biology/molecular-biology-learning-center/molecular-biology-resource-library/thermo-](https://www.thermofisher.com/us/en/home/brands/thermo-scientific/molecular-biology/molecular-biology-learning-center/molecular-biology-resource-library/thermo-scientific-web-tools/qpcr-efficiency-calculator.html)
84 [scientific-web-tools/qpcr-efficiency-calculator.html](https://www.thermofisher.com/us/en/home/brands/thermo-scientific/molecular-biology/molecular-biology-learning-center/molecular-biology-resource-library/thermo-scientific-web-tools/qpcr-efficiency-calculator.html). Three dilutions bracketing the potential
85 limit of detection cutoff were tested again with twenty replicates each to establish the LoD for
86 each analyte. The 95% detection threshold and confidence intervals were extrapolated by
87 Logistic regression in Prism 9 for MacOS (GraphPad, San Diego, CA). LoD analysis was only
88 performed on a single Alinity m instrument.

89

90 **Results**

91 **Accuracy**

92 To determine accuracy, the Resp-4-Plex assay was run using clinical samples that were
93 previously determined to be positive for the constituent viruses. Ten samples previously
94 determined to be SARS-CoV-2 positive using the Alinity m SARS-CoV-2 singleplex assay
95 were tested using Resp-4-Plex. All were positive for SARS-CoV-2. Although the Ct values for
96 SARS-CoV-2 on Resp-4-Plex were a mean -1.81 ± 0.58 lower than fractional cycle numbers
97 on the singleplex assay, the assays were highly correlated with one another ($R^2 = 0.99$) (Fig
98 1A).

99 Twelve samples previously determined to be influenza A positive by Cepheid Xpress
100 Flu were tested using Resp-4-Plex. All tested positive influenza A. A single sample tested with
101 Resp-4-Plex also yielded a positive RSV result with a high Ct value of 32.46 (see limit of
102 detection analysis below). The test was repeated using Resp-4-Plex on the second Alinity m

103 instrument and gave qualitatively and quantitatively almost identical results. The sample was
104 then tested using the Cepheid Xpress SARS-CoV-2/Flu/RSV assay and was influenza A
105 positive, RSV negative. This sample was interpreted as a potential Xpress RSV false negative
106 based on low viral load.

107 Ten samples previously determined to be influenza B positive using the Cepheid Xpress
108 Flu assay were tested using Resp-4-Plex. All tested positive for influenza B. A single sample
109 tested with Resp-4-Plex also yield a positive RSV result. The test was repeated using Resp-4-
110 Plex on the second Alinity m instrument and gave similar results. The sample was then tested
111 using the Cepheid Xpress SARS-CoV-2/Flu/RSV assay and was influenza B positive, RSV
112 positive. This sample was resolved as an influenza B/RSV true positive.

113 Ten samples previously determined to be RSV positive using a combination of direct
114 fluorescence antigen testing and/or shell vial culture and a single sample determined to be RSV
115 positive by TEM-PCR were tested using Resp-4-Plex. All were positive for RSV.

116 Eighteen samples previously determined to be negative for viruses by direct fluorescent
117 antigen testing and/or shell vial culture, five of which were also negative by TEM-PCR, were
118 tested using Resp-4-Plex. Sixteen samples were negative for the viruses detected by Resp-4-
119 Plex. One sample tested with Resp-4-Plex yield as positive result for influenza B with a high Ct
120 value of 34.2. The test was repeated using Resp-4-Plex on the second Alinity m instrument and
121 gave similar results. The sample was then tested using the Cepheid Xpress SARS-CoV-
122 2/Flu/RSV assay and was influenza B positive. A second sample (also negative by TEM-PCR)
123 yielded a positive result for influenza A with Resp-4-Plex with a high Ct value of 36.53 and a
124 positive result for RSV with a lower Ct value of 21.82. The test was repeated using Resp-4-Plex
125 on the second Alinity m instrument and gave similar results. The sample was then tested using

126 the Cepheid Xpress SARS-CoV-2/Flu/RSV assay and was influenza A negative (however, with
127 a Ct value of 38.6) and RSV positive (Ct value of 23.4). The sample was resolved as likely true
128 positive on Resp-4-Plex for influenza A and RSV.

129 Six samples positive for Adenovirus or Parainfluenza virus 1, 2, or 3 by direct
130 fluorescent antigen testing, one sample positive for parainfluenza, two samples positive for
131 adenovirus or parainfluenza virus by shell vial culture, 1 sample positive for enterovirus by
132 TEM-PCR and three samples positive for low pathogenicity coronaviruses by TEM-PCR were
133 tested using Resp-4-Plex. All samples were negative for the viruses detected by Resp-4-Plex.

134

135 **Analytical Sensitivity**

136 For SARS-CoV-2, the LoD screen demonstrated excellent linearity with $R^2 = 0.98$ and a
137 97% PCR efficiency (Fig. 1B). The manufacturer's claimed LoD was confirmed through twenty
138 replicates at 50, 25 and 10 copies/mL using the SeraCare reference material, yielding 100%,
139 100% and 80% detection, respectively. The LoD was therefore ≤ 25 copies per mL with an Ct
140 value of 35.72 \pm 0.54 at 25 copies/mL. The logistic regression was non-convergent and
141 therefore an extrapolated LoD could not be established.

142 For influenza A, the LoD screen demonstrated excellent linearity with $R^2 = 0.97$ and
143 93% PCR efficiency. The manufacturer's claimed LoD was confirmed through twenty
144 replicates at 50, 25 and 10 copies/mL using the SeraCare reference material, yielding 100%,
145 80% and 30% detection, respectively. The LoD was therefore \leq to 50 copies per mL with an
146 Ct value of 37.18 \pm 0.67 at 50 copies/mL. By logistic regression, the LoD was 47 copies/mL
147 (95% confidence interval ~25-125 copies/mL).

148 For influenza B, the LoD screen demonstrated excellent linearity with an $R^2 = 0.97$ and a

149 101% PCR efficiency. The manufacturer's claimed LoD was confirmed through twenty
150 replicates at 50, 25 and 10 copies/mL using the SeraCare reference material, yielding 100%,
151 90% and 70% detection, respectively. The LoD was therefore \leq to 50 copies per mL with an
152 Ct value of 35.94 \pm 0.73 at 50 copies/mL. By logistic regression, the LoD was 36 copies/mL
153 (95% confidence interval ~18-178 copies/mL).

154 For RSV, the LoD screen demonstrated excellent linearity with an $R^2 = 0.97$ and 97%
155 PCR efficiency. The manufacturer's claimed LoD was confirmed through twenty replicates at
156 50, 25 and 10 copies/mL using the SeraCare reference material, yielding 100%, 90% and 75%
157 detection, respectively. The LoD was \leq to 50 copies per mL with an Ct value of 35.75 \pm 0.70
158 at 50 copies/mL. By logistic regression the LoD was 39.8 copies/mL (95% confidence interval
159 ~18-1000 copies/mL).

160

161 **Precision**

162 Intra-run precision was determined by using pooled samples, positive for each of the
163 four viruses, and a negative pool. Each pool was tested in quadruplicate on each of the two
164 Alinity m instruments with each individual test for each specific virus performed on each of the
165 Assay Processing Units (APU) #1 through #4 on each instrument, so that every APU was tested
166 during the precision testing. Inter-run precision was verified by testing the pools for each virus
167 on each alinity m instrument again on additional two separate days. Qualitative intra-run and
168 inter-run precision results were 100% correlated as expected.

169 Although Resp-4-Plex is a qualitative assay, we also assessed quantitative precision by
170 comparison of Ct values in replicates. Coefficients of variation (CV) varied from 0.6 to 2.5%
171 across all viruses tested on both instruments in intra-run precision comparisons and from 0.4%

172 to 2.9% in inter-run precision comparisons. The precision of the Ct values for positive controls
173 run during the validation on Alinity m #1 (n=4) and Alinity m #2 (n=5) instruments, run once
174 per day of testing, was also examined. C.V.'s on individual instruments for each assay were all
175 less than 1%. There was no statistical difference between the positive control Ct values run on
176 Alinity #1 and Alinity #2 for the four viruses (Fig. 1C), with significance considered $P \leq 0.05$,
177 with comparisons performed using the Kruskal-Wallis test. Therefore, reproducibility of both
178 instruments appeared essentially identical for the Resp-4-Plex assay.

179

180 **Discussion**

181 The Resp-4-Plex assay is welcome addition to targeted respiratory panel options that
182 will be necessary in a post-COVID world. It appeared highly accurate, sensitive, and precise.
183 The three discrepancies with comparator methods, specifically detection of co-infections, could
184 be attributed to enhanced detection by Resp-4-Plex. This was because: (1) the second virus was
185 detected on repeat testing by Resp-4-Plex on a second Alinity m platform, (2) the second virus
186 was detected by the alternative Cepheid respiratory panel, and/or (3) the second virus had a
187 very high Ct value, near its limit of detection, and therefore plausibly may have been below the
188 limit of detection of the comparator assays. Overall, our experience was consistent with
189 qualitative detection data described in the EUA product insert, although our data set was
190 significantly smaller in size.

191 Notably, the LoD for each individual virus was robust with high amplification
192 efficiencies even in the context of a multiplex assay and testing of quality control material in
193 which all four targets were present in equivalent amounts. In fact, the limit of detection for

194 SARS-CoV-2 in Resp-4-Plex (~25 copies/mL) was below that determined in our analysis of the
195 SARS-CoV-2 SinglePlex assay (~50 copies/mL, data not shown). The multiplex and singleplex
196 SARS-CoV-2 assays were also extremely well correlated ($R^2 = 0.99$).

197 Furthermore, the Ct values were also log-linearly correlated with the quantitative
198 standard at and above the limit of detection of the assays with excellent PCR efficiencies.
199 Notably, Ct values or their equivalent (e.g. fractional cycle number (7)) may vary significantly
200 between platforms at the same viral load level and for difference viruses (9). Furthermore, they
201 vary inversely with viral load which is intuitively confusing to end users. We ultimately believe
202 that SARS-CoV-2 results should be reported selectively as a viral load, as most intuitively
203 understood by clinicians, benchmarked against a universal standard (6). In particular, there are
204 several situations where viral load values are helpful, for example, to distinguish between
205 reinfection versus persistent low levels of mRNA that may last months after a prior infection,
206 and to evaluate likely infectivity in the appropriate contexts. The log-linear performance of the
207 Resp-4-Plex assays suggest that future conversion to a quantitative readout, i.e., a viral load,
208 should easily be supported and we believe will provide additional utility for patient
209 management. Furthermore, our previous study with the Abbott RealTime SARS-CoV-2 assay
210 (6) and the singleplex Alinity m SARS-CoV-2 assay (data not shown) supports a method for
211 accurately calculating the viral load from Ct measurements without the absolute need for a
212 standard curve, and/or extending viral load determinations beyond limits of available calibrator
213 material.

214 Taken together, we verified the performance characteristics of a new molecular multiplex
215 respiratory panel assay on the Alinity m molecular system.. This platform notably provides high
216 throughput; sample-to-answer, random access and semi-batch functionality with a 115 minute

217 sample to answer turn around time for prioritized specimens; and an ability to load and perform
218 multiple different tests at one time. We believe this assay and platform will be especially useful
219 in fulfilling future needs, in situations where SARS-CoV-2, influenza A, influenza B and RSV
220 circulate at significant levels, and where these viruses need to be detected and differentiated for
221 optimal patient management.

222

223 **Acknowledgements**

224 We thank the Abbott Molecular Group for providing test reagents and LGC SeraCare control
225 material for this work under a COVID-19 Diagnostics Evaluation Agreement. RA was a
226 recipient of grant support from Abbott Molecular under a clinical study agreement.

227

228 **References**

- 229 1. Olsen SJ, Azziz-Baumgartner E, Budd AP, Brammer L, Sullivan S, Pineda RF, Cohen C,
230 Fry AM. 2020. Decreased Influenza Activity During the COVID-19 Pandemic - United
231 States, Australia, Chile, and South Africa, 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*
232 69:1305-1309.
- 233 2. Baker RE, Park SW, Yang W, Vecchi GA, Metcalf CJE, Grenfell BT. 2020. The impact
234 of COVID-19 nonpharmaceutical interventions on the future dynamics of endemic
235 infections. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 117:30547-30553.
- 236 3. Byun WS, Heo SW, Jo G, Kim JW, Kim S, Lee S, Park HE, Baek JH. 2021. Is
237 coronavirus disease (COVID-19) seasonal? A critical analysis of empirical and
238 epidemiological studies at global and local scales. *Environ Res*
239 doi:10.1016/j.envres.2021.110972:110972.
- 240 4. Hirschhorn JW, Kegl A, Dickerson T, Glen WB, Jr., Xu G, Alden J, Nolte FS. 2021.
241 Verification and Validation of SARS-CoV-2 Assay Performance on the Abbott m2000
242 and Alinity m Systems. *J Clin Microbiol* doi:10.1128/jcm.03119-20.
- 243 5. Smith KP, Cheng A, Chopelas A, DuBois-Coyne S, Mezghani I, Rodriguez S, Talay M,
244 Kirby JE. 2020. Large-scale, in-house production of viral transport media to support
245 SARS-CoV-2 PCR testing in a multi-hospital healthcare network during the COVID-19
246 pandemic. *medRxiv* doi:10.1101/2020.04.29.20085514.
- 247 6. Arnaout R, Lee RA, Lee GR, Callahan C, Cheng A, Yen CF, Smith KP, Arora R, Kirby
248 JE. 2021. The Limit of Detection Matters: The Case for Benchmarking Severe Acute
249 Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 Testing. *Clin Infect Dis* doi:10.1093/cid/ciaa1382.

- 250 7. Shain EB, Clemens JM. 2008. A new method for robust quantitative and qualitative
251 analysis of real-time PCR. *Nucleic Acids Res* 36:e91.
- 252 8. Han J, Swan DC, Smith SJ, Lum SH, Sefers SE, Unger ER, Tang Y-W. 2006.
253 Simultaneous Amplification and Identification of 25 Human Papillomavirus Types with
254 Templex Technology. *Journal of Clinical Microbiology* 44:4157-4162.
- 255 9. Binnicker MJ. 2020. Challenges and Controversies to Testing for COVID-19. *Journal of*
256 *Clinical Microbiology* 58:e01695-20.
- 257

258 **Author Contribution Statement.**

259 Annie Cheng conceptualized and performed experiments. Stefan Riedel reviewed and edited
260 manuscript and aided in formal analysis. Ramy Arnaout reviewed and edited the manuscript and
261 aided in formal analysis. James Kirby wrote the initial manuscript draft and aided in
262 conceptualization and formal analysis.

263

Figure Legend






Figure 1. Performance of the Resp-4-Plex Assay. (A) Cycle threshold (Ct) results from the SARS-CoV-2 test in the Alinity m Resp-4-Plex multiplex assay and fractional cycle numbers (FCN) (7) from the Alinity m SARS-CoV-2 singleplex assay were highly correlated when testing patient samples spanning the analytical measurement range of these tests. (B) Amplification of the SARS-CoV-2 targets in the Resp-4-Plex assay was log-linear when examined in the range at and above the limit of detection. Data points shown are the mean and standard deviation of Ct values for 4 replicate measurements. (C) Data points for positive control Ct values for each individual assay in Resp-4-Plex, tested on four to five separate days on two separate Alinity instruments, were highly correlated and not statistically (n.s.) different between instruments.

A**B****C**