

1 **Clinical evaluation of BD Veritor™ SARS-CoV-2 and Flu A+B Assay for point-of-care**  
2 **(POC) System**

3  
4 Katherine Christensen,<sup>a</sup> Huimiao Ren,<sup>b</sup> Shirley Chen,<sup>b</sup> Charles K. Cooper,<sup>a</sup> Stephen Young<sup>c,#</sup>

5  
6 <sup>a</sup>Becton, Dickinson and Company, BD Life Sciences – Integrated Diagnostic Solutions, 7  
7 Loveton Circle, Sparks, MD, USA

8 <sup>b</sup>Becton, Dickinson and Company, BD Life Sciences, San Diego, CA, USA

9 <sup>c</sup>Tricore Reference Laboratory, 1001 Woodward Place, N.E., Albuquerque, NM, USA

10

11 **#To whom correspondence should be addressed:**

12 Stephen Young, PhD

13 Title: Medical Director of Research and Clinical Trials

14 Address: 1001 Woodward Place, N.E. Albuquerque, NM 87102

15 Telephone: 505-938-8855

16 Email: [Steve.Young@Tricore.org](mailto:Steve.Young@Tricore.org)

17

18 **##To whom correspondence should be addressed (alternate):**

19 Charles K. Cooper, MD

20 Vice President of Medical Affairs

21 Becton, Dickinson and Company, BD Life Sciences – Integrated Diagnostic Solutions

22 7 Loveton Circle, Sparks MD 21152, USA

23 Phone: 410-316-4984

24 E-mail: [Charles\\_K\\_Cooper@bd.com](mailto:Charles_K_Cooper@bd.com)

25

26 **RUNNING TITLE: SARS-CoV-2/Flu POC test**

27

28 **KEY WORDS**

29 BD Veritor; COVID-19; SARS-CoV-2; Influenza; flu; multiplex antigen assay

30 **ABSTRACT**

31 Differential diagnosis of COVID-19 and/or influenza (flu) at point of care is critical for efficient  
32 patient management and treatment for either of these diseases. Clinical performance of the BD  
33 Veritor™ System for Rapid Detection of SARS-CoV-2 & FluA+B (“Veritor SARS-CoV-2/Flu”)  
34 triplex assay was characterized. The performance for SARS-CoV-2 detection was determined  
35 using two hundred and ninety-eight (298) specimens from patients reporting COVID-19  
36 symptoms within 7 days from symptom onset (DSO) in comparison with Lyra® SARS-CoV-2  
37 RT-PCR Assay (“Lyra SARS-CoV-2”). The Veritor SARS-CoV-2/Flu Assay met the FDA EUA  
38 acceptance criterion with 95% overall agreement for SARS-CoV-2 test when compared to Lyra  
39 SARS-CoV-2. The performance for Flu A and Flu B detection was determined using 75  
40 influenza-positive and 40 influenza-negative retrospective specimens in comparison with the  
41 previously FDA cleared BD Veritor™ System for Rapid Detection of Flu A+B (“Veritor Flu”).  
42 The Veritor SARS-CoV-2/Flu also demonstrated 100% agreement with the Veritor Flu.

## 43 INTRODUCTION

44 Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) and influenza (flu) are two potentially severe respiratory  
45 illnesses that cause morbidity and mortality worldwide. COVID-19 is the result of infection by  
46 SARS-CoV-2, which emerged at the end of 2019.[1] Since then, over 147 million COVID-19  
47 cases and 3.11 million COVID-19-related deaths have been reported worldwide.[2] The highly  
48 contagious nature of SARS-CoV-2, and the lack of any natural immunity in the world's  
49 population, coupled with the fact that there is no efficient treatment for COVID-19, resulted in a  
50 global pandemic and public health crisis starting in 2020 and continuing in 2021. In the US,  
51 more than 32 million COVID-19 cases and over 572,000 COVID-19 deaths have been recorded  
52 through late April 2021.[2] Influenza is caused by influenza viruses (e.g. Flu A and Flu B),  
53 which occur seasonally.[3] With the exception of the 2020-2021 respiratory virus season, there  
54 are an estimated 1 billion cases of influenza-like illness identified each year globally. Within  
55 those cases, 3-5 million are severe, and 29,000-655,000 eventually lead to flu-related deaths.[4,  
56 5] In the US, the 2019-2020 flu season resulted in over 38 million cases involving symptomatic  
57 illness and approximately 22,000 deaths.[6]

58  
59 Patients with COVID-19 often exhibit respiratory symptoms similar to flu, including fever,  
60 cough, fatigue, headache, and muscle aches.[7] Some COVID-19 cases exhibit additional  
61 symptoms, including loss-of-smell/taste and shortness of breath; progression to severe disease  
62 can result in the loss of cardiopulmonary function and death. Although several of the clinical  
63 symptoms for flu overlap with symptoms for COVID-19, the therapeutic approaches for each  
64 illness are significantly different. While anti-viral drugs, such as Tamiflu® or Xofluza®, are  
65 often given to influenza patients, remdesivir and corticosteroids are the primary medications to

66 date that have been utilized to treat COVID-19.[8] The early and rapid differential detection for  
67 SARS-CoV-2 versus influenza viruses is an essential requirement in determining the proper  
68 treatment for patients with the potential for infection by either of these viruses.[8] Accurate  
69 diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2 and/or influenza should also reduce the unnecessary burden placed on  
70 the healthcare system, especially during the respiratory virus seasons (e.g. December to February  
71 in the US).[8]

72  
73 Molecular testing, utilizing real-time polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR) assay technology, is  
74 the standard of care for the detection of most respiratory viral infections.[9, 10] However, this  
75 technique can be relatively labor and time-consuming, and laboratories generally need to have  
76 the necessary infrastructure and training to perform the methodology.[9] In addition, the turn-  
77 around-time for molecular testing conducted in a core laboratory requires additional time for  
78 transporting specimens. Rapid point-of-care (POC) molecular testing has reduced the assay time  
79 to between 15-30 minutes, but the cost of these assays can be prohibitive.[9] For many  
80 decentralized health care settings, a rapid testing platform that supports non-invasive specimen  
81 collection, is easy to use, and at a lower cost, is necessary. Therefore, several rapid antigen tests  
82 were developed to provide a sensitive but less expensive alternative point-of-care assay.[11, 12]

83  
84 The BD Veritor™ System for Rapid Detection of Flu A+B is a US FDA cleared, and the BD  
85 Veritor™ System for Rapid Detection of SARS-CoV-2 is a US FDA EUA authorized, antigen-  
86 based testing system for use in POC settings.[13, 14] The clinical performance of both tests has  
87 been demonstrated by comparing with reference PCR-based assays.[15, 16] However, a triplex  
88 testing platform, which allows for the simultaneous detection of SARS-CoV-2, influenza A and

89 influenza B viruses from one specimen, should help reduce the workflow burden while providing  
90 a differential diagnosis between COVID-19 and influenza.[8] The objective of this study was to  
91 demonstrate the clinical efficacy of a new triplex test, the BD Veritor SARS-CoV-2 & Flu A+B  
92 assay, to detect all three viral targets.

93 **METHODS AND MATERIALS**

94 *Specimens and assays*

95 This study was conducted as part of a US Food and Drug Administration-Emergency Use  
96 Authorization (EUA) submission. Clinical performance data from the BD Veritor™ System for  
97 Rapid Detection of SARS-CoV-2 & Flu A+B (“Veritor SARS-CoV-2/Flu”; Becton, Dickinson  
98 and Company; BD Life Sciences – Integrated Diagnostics Solutions, Sparks, MD, USA) was  
99 compared to both the Lyra® SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR Assay (“Lyra SARS-CoV-2”; QUIDEL,  
100 San Diego, CA, USA) and the BD Veritor™ System for Rapid Detection of Flu A+B (“Veritor  
101 Flu”; Becton, Dickinson and Company; BD Life Sciences – Integrated Diagnostics Solutions,  
102 Sparks, MD, USA). The BD MAX SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR Assay (“MAX SARS-CoV-2”;  
103 Becton, Dickinson and Company; BD Life Sciences—Integrated Diagnostics Solutions, Sparks,  
104 MD, USA) was used to resolve specimens with discrepant results between Veritor SARS-CoV-  
105 2/Flu and Lyra SARS-CoV-2 tests. The Lyra testing was performed according to the  
106 manufacturer’s instructions for use at TriCore Reference Laboratories, while the Veritor testing  
107 was performed internally at Becton, Dickinson and Company (BD Life Sciences – Integrated  
108 Diagnostics Solutions, San Diego, CA and Sparks, MD). The study protocol was approved by the  
109 Advarra Institutional Review Board (IRB).

110  
111 Subjects  $\geq 18$  years of age symptomatic for COVID-19 were enrolled within seven DSO at six  
112 different sites across the US (Table S1) for SARS-CoV-2 testing. Nasal swabs were collected in  
113 duplicate. Two hundred and ninety-eight (298) specimens were collected between October 16  
114 and October 30, 2020. Twenty specimens encountered technical errors and were not used in the  
115 analysis. The study used data from two hundred and seventy-eight (278) subjects for the analysis.

116 All study operators performing the Veritor SARS-CoV-2/Flu assay were blinded to reference  
117 method results.

118  
119 A separate set of retrospective specimens were utilized to evaluate the clinical performance of  
120 Veritor SARS-CoV-2/Flu for Influenza testing. Residual de-identified nasopharyngeal (NP)  
121 swabs collected in universal viral transport (UVT) media were obtained from qualified specimen  
122 vendors. These clinical remnants included 75 influenza-positive specimens, 40 influenza A  
123 positive, 35 influenza B positive, and 40 influenza-negative specimens from subjects ranging  
124 from  $\leq 5$  to  $\geq 60$  years of age. The specimens were tested in a randomized and blinded fashion.  
125 All specimens used in this research were residual de-identified samples available after all  
126 standard of care testing was completed.

127  
128 *Data analysis*

129 The primary outcome measures for this study were positive and negative percent agreement,  
130 PPA and NPA, respectively. Point estimates with 95% confidence interval [95% CI] were  
131 calculated using the Wilson score method for the Veritor SARS-CoV-2/Flu assay, when  
132 compared to each reference method. The US FDA-EUA authorization acceptance criterion for  
133 test sensitivity for SARS-CoV-2 detection is a point estimate  $\geq 80\%$  (PPA) when compared to  
134 RT-PCR approach.[17] The test sensitivity for Flu A and Flu B detection was determined to be  
135 in agreement with the US FDA cleared BD Veritor™ System for Rapid Detection of Flu A+B,  
136 which met the US FDA-EUA authorization acceptance criterion of a point estimate  $\geq 95\%$  (PPA)  
137 with a lower bound of the 95% CI of 85% when compared to PCR assay. The Cohen's kappa  
138 coefficient was applied to gauge agreement between reference and index tests to classify results

139 into mutually exclusive categories.  $K=(P_o - P_e)/1-P_e$  (<0, 0, and >0 indicating agreements worse  
140 than, no better or worse than, and better than that expected by chance). The data presented in this  
141 report met the criteria as defined by the FDA guidance for Veritor SARS-CoV-2/Flu against the  
142 reference assays. This article was prepared according to STARD guidelines for diagnostic  
143 accuracy studies reporting.[18] The data will be available upon request.

144 **RESULTS**

145 This study enrolled 298 specimens from subjects with COVID-19 within 7 days of symptom  
146 onset. Twenty (20) were considered unevaluable specimens and excluded. The remaining 278  
147 specimens were tested with the reference method for SARS-CoV-2, the Quidel Lyra SARS-  
148 CoV-2 assay. The reference method testing resulted in 60 positive and 218 negative SARS-CoV-  
149 2 specimens. The collection procedure at site D deviated from the original protocol and the  
150 integrity of that site's specimens may have been compromised. Although a statistically  
151 significant difference between D site and the five other sites ( $p=0.059$ ) was not observed when  
152 determining data poolability, results that both include and exclude data obtained by D site are  
153 reported. For all sites, Veritor SARS-CoV-2/Flu had PPA and NPA values of 86.7% [95%CI:  
154 75.8, 93.1] and 99.5% [95%CI: 97.4, 99.9], respectively, for the detection of SARS-CoV-2  
155 compared to the reference (Table 1). Excluding the D site, the Veritor SARS-CoV-2/Flu had  
156 PPA and NPA values of 91.5% [95%CI: 80.1, 96.6] and 99.5% [95%CI: 97.0, 99.9],  
157 respectively, for the detection of SARS-CoV-2. The 22-49 years-of-age group had the highest  
158 percentage positive ratio within all positive cases compared to other age groups by both  
159 reference and Veritor SARS-CoV-2/Flu tests (Table 2).

160  
161 Discordant results were observed from nine out of the 278 total specimens (Table S2). Eight  
162 specimens positive by the Lyra SARS-CoV-2 assay were negative by the Veritor SARS-CoV-  
163 2/Flu assay. Two of the eight specimens were associated with Ct values of  $<30$ ; the other six had  
164 Ct values  $\geq 30$  (Table S3). The BD MAX SARS-CoV-2 assay was used to resolve discordant  
165 results. Seven of the eight discordant specimens were positive by the BD MAX SARS-CoV-2

166 assay. The other one was negative by the BD MAX SARS-CoV-2 assay. One specimen positive  
167 by the Veritor SARS-CoV-2/Flu assay was negative by Lyra.

168  
169 The clinical study was conducted in the early part of the 2020-2021 flu season, therefore, the  
170 concurrence of SARS-CoV-2 and influenza virus in this study was non-existent. Only one Flu A  
171 positive and two Flu B positives were reported by Veritor. One Flu B positive reported by  
172 Veritor was also shown as SARS-CoV-2 positive by both Veritor and Lyra reference results.  
173 These three specimens were tested on MAX and resulted as negative suggesting they were false  
174 positives for Flu A and Flu B.

175  
176 Given the lack of prospective Flu A & B samples, the sensitivity of the Flu A and B detection, 75  
177 retrospective residual de-identified positive influenza specimens (40 influenza A positive, 35  
178 influenza B positive) and 40 negative influenza A/B remnant specimens were used to determine  
179 the clinical performance of Veritor SARS-CoV-2/Flu assay. The Veritor<sup>TM</sup> SARS-CoV-2/Flu  
180 results were further compared to results from the comparator method, the FDA cleared BD  
181 Veritor Flu A/B test. The results from this testing were used to determine PPA and NPA values  
182 (Table 3). For Flu A detection, Veritor SARS-CoV-2/Flu had PPA and NPA values of 100%  
183 [95%CI: 91.2, 100] and 100% [95%CI: 95.2, 100], respectively; for Flu B, Veritor SARS-CoV-  
184 2/Flu had PPA and NPA values of 100% [95%CI: 90.0, 100] and 100% [95%CI: 95.5, 100],  
185 respectively (Table 4). Age stratifying the positive samples resulted in the  $\geq 60$  years old group  
186 having the highest Flu A positivity ratio than other age groups (Table 4). However, most Flu B  
187 positive samples fell in the age group ranging from 6 to 59 years old.

188 **DISCUSSION**

189 The results presented here show PPA values for the Veritor SARS-CoV-2/Flu assay compared to  
190 a RT-PCR assay met FDA-EUA acceptance criteria for detection of SARS-CoV-2 (86.7%;  
191 [95%CI: 75.8, 93.1]). Similarly, the Veritor SARS-CoV-2/Flu assay demonstrated an NPA value  
192 of 99.5% for detection of SARS-CoV-2 compared to an RT-PCR reference method. Although a  
193 marginal statistically significant difference between D site and the five other sites ( $p=0.059$ ) was  
194 shown, the PPA both including (86.7%) and excluding (91.5%) D site met the FDA-EUA  
195 acceptance criteria for detecting SARS-CoV-2. Additionally, the Flu detection portion of the  
196 Veritor SARS-CoV-2/Flu assay demonstrated 100% agreement with the 510k cleared BD  
197 Veritor System Flu A+B assay. For Flu A detection, the lower bound of the 95% CI was 91.2%,  
198 and for Flu B detection, the lower bound was 90.0%.

199  
200 Veritor SARS-CoV2/Flu assay showed a reduced capacity to detect SARS-CoV-2 when the  
201 corresponding reference test result had Ct values  $\geq 30$  during discordant testing. This is a  
202 common observation for antigen tests since most assays rely on releasing the protein target that  
203 can flow by capillary action to initiate the antibody-antigen complex and the detection reaction.  
204 Therefore, viable viral particles are required for antigen detection.[19] In contrast, PCR-based  
205 assays detect viral nucleic acid, reflecting viral shedding but not active infection. Viral load and  
206 analytical sensitivity of the reference RT-PCR assay heavily influence the sensitivity of the  
207 antigen test.[19, 20] Thus, RT-PCR-based assays may seem more sensitive, but they do not  
208 necessarily reflect infectivity of COVID-19; whereas, antigen testing is a more specific approach  
209 for SARS-CoV-2 screening (compared to RT-PCR) and aligns with infectiousness of the tested  
210 individual.[21]

211

212 The performance of Veritor SARS-CoV-2/Flu for Flu A and Flu B showed 100% PPA with the  
213 reference method, Veritor Flu, suggesting the same sensitivity for Flu detection. All 278  
214 specimens tested for COVID-19 returned only one positive for Flu A and two positives for Flu  
215 B. These three specimens were further determined as false positives for Flu A and Flu B. This  
216 could be due to a higher infection rate for SARS-CoV-2 or to the low activity of flu during the  
217 time of specimen collection (October, 2020).[22] The 2020-2021 respiratory virus season will  
218 conclude with an extremely low prevalence of influenza-like illness. However, in a season when  
219 the incidence of both COVID-19 and flu cases is high, the differential diagnosis of each agent for  
220 the appropriate therapeutic approach could be less challenging by using the Veritor SARS-CoV-  
221 2/Flu assay. Especially, when the currently available medications for treating both illnesses  
222 differ, and the treatment indications for the diseases do not overlap. Safety concerns for  
223 treatment could arise if false positive or false negative results occur between the two infections.  
224

225 Additionally, proper quarantine and contact tracing are essential steps for preventing the spread  
226 of the infectious disease. Although COVID-19 and influenza share a similar transmission  
227 mechanism and have overlapping clinical symptoms, the quarantine length and the therapeutic  
228 approach for each illness are not the same.[23] After symptoms onset, the recommended  
229 quarantine period is a minimum of 4-5 days for flu,[24] but a minimum of 10 days for COVID-  
230 19.[25] Therefore, the accurate detection of both SARS-CoV-2 and Flu A+B impacts not only  
231 the treatment plan but also the period of quarantine and resulting loss of work and school  
232 attendance. The Veritor SARS-CoV-2/Flu test could provide comparable clinical outcomes to the

233 molecular testing approach by speeding up the diagnosis result to guide and initiate the correct  
234 and timely therapeutic approach.

235  
236 Different technologies are currently available for detecting SARS-CoV-2 and Flu A/B viruses for  
237 the diagnosis of COVID-19 and flu, respectively.[12, 19] Although the RT-PCR-based approach  
238 currently represents the laboratory method of choice due to its relatively high analytic and  
239 clinical sensitivity, rapid tests carry several advantages, including faster turnaround time and  
240 more straightforward implementation in decentralized health care settings for POC purposes.[10,  
241 12] Depending on the infrastructure and available resources in the health care facility, the BD  
242 Veritor SARS-CoV-2/Flu assay could aid the process of distinguishing the detection and  
243 diagnosis of COVID-19 and flu for proper patient triage, disease mitigation, and managing  
244 treatment.

245  
246 *Limitations*

247 The test for Flu A and Flu B was conducted by using materials obtained from pre-selected frozen  
248 remnants. Unbiased subjects with no confirmed diagnosis should be considered for testing.

249  
250 *Conclusions*

251 The Veritor SARS-CoV-2/Flu assay met US FDA-EUA acceptance criteria for SARS-CoV-2  
252 detection. The test sensitivity of the Veritor SARS-CoV-2/Flu assay for Flu A and B detection  
253 was in agreement with the previously cleared Veritor System Flu A+B assay. Dual detection  
254 capability for the etiologic agents causing COVID-19 and influenza will allow efficient  
255 differentiation between the two illnesses and will inform physicians regarding diagnosis and,

256 therefore, the proper treatment and disease management for patients exhibiting similar  
257 symptoms. Dual testing may be especially important for the duration of the COVID-19 pandemic  
258 as it overlaps with flu season and could have a major impact in decentralized health care settings.

259 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

260 We thank Karen Eckert and Yu-Chih Lin for their input on the content of this manuscript. We  
261 thank Yongqiang Zhang (Becton, Dickinson and Company, BD Life Sciences – Integrated  
262 Diagnostic Solutions) for statistical support. We are grateful to the study participants who  
263 allowed this work to be performed.

264

265 **AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS**

266 **Katherine Christensen:** Conceptualization, Methodology, Investigation, Resources, Writing –  
267 Original Draft, Visualization, Project administration. **Huimiao Ren:** Methodology,  
268 Investigation, Formal analysis, Data Curation, Writing – Review & Editing. **Shirley Chen:**  
269 Methodology, Investigation, Formal analysis, Data Curation, Writing – Review & Editing.  
270 **Charles K. Cooper:** Conceptualization, Writing – Review & Editing, Supervision, Funding  
271 acquisition. **Stephen Young:** Conceptualization, Investigation, Resources, Writing – Review &  
272 Editing, Supervision, Funding acquisition.

273

274 **FUNDING**

275 Becton, Dickinson and Company; BD Life Sciences – Integrated Diagnostic Solutions provided  
276 funding to both BD and non-BD employee authors to support this study.

277

278 **POTENTIAL CONFLICTS OF INTEREST**

279 KC, HR, SC, and CC are employees of Becton, Dickinson and Company. The individuals  
280 acknowledged here have no additional funding or additional compensation to disclose.

281

282 **REFERENCES**

- 283 1. Zhu, N., et al., *A Novel Coronavirus from Patients with Pneumonia in China, 2019*. N  
284 Engl J Med, 2020. **382**(8): p. 727-733.
- 285 2. Johns Hopkins University and Medicine, Coronavirus Resource Center, *Mortality*  
286 *Analyses*. 2020. <https://coronavirus.jhu.edu/data/mortality>.
- 287 3. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, *Influenza (Flu)*. Accessed December 16,  
288 2020. <https://www.cdc.gov/flu/about/index.html>.
- 289 4. Iuliano, A.D., et al., *Estimates of global seasonal influenza-associated respiratory*  
290 *mortality: a modelling study*. Lancet, 2018. **391**(10127): p. 1285-1300.
- 291 5. World Health Organization, *Global influenza strategy 2019-2030*. Geneva: 2019.  
292 *Licence: CC BY-NC-SA 3.0 IGO. Cataloguing-in-Publication (CIP) data*. CIP data are  
293 available at <http://apps.who.int/iris>.
- 294 6. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, *Estimated Influenza Illness, Medical Visits,*  
295 *Hospitalizations, and Deaths in the United States-2019-2020 Influenza Season*.  
296 <https://www.cdc.gov/flu/about/burden/2019-2020.html>. 2020.
- 297 7. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, *Similarities and differences between Flu and*  
298 *COVID-19*. Accessed December 28, 2020. <https://www.cdc.gov/flu/symptoms/flu-vs-covid19.htm#:~:text=Flu%20viruses%20can%20cause%20mild,signs%20and%20symptoms%20listed%20above.&text=COVID%2D19%20seems%20to%20cause,loss%20of%20taste%20or%20smell>.
- 302 8. Rubin, R., *What Happens When COVID-19 Collides With Flu Season?* JAMA, 2020.  
303 **324**(10): p. 923-925.

- 304 9. Yarbrough, M.L., et al., *Influence of Molecular Testing on Influenza Diagnosis*. Clinical  
305 chemistry, 2018. **64**(11): p. 1560-1566.
- 306 10. Cheng, M.P., et al., *Diagnostic Testing for Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome–Related*  
307 *Coronavirus 2*. Annals of Internal Medicine, 2020. **172**(11): p. 726-734.
- 308 11. World Health Organization, *Global Research Collaboration for Infectious Disease*  
309 *Preparedness. COVID 19: Public Health Emergency of International Concern (PHEIC).*  
310 *Global Research and Innovation Forum: Towards a Research Roadmap*. 02/11/2020-  
311 02/12/2020. [https://www.who.int/blueprint/priority-diseases/key-](https://www.who.int/blueprint/priority-diseases/key-action/Global_Research_Forum_FINAL_VERSION_for_web_14_feb_2020.pdf?ua=1)  
312 [action/Global\\_Research\\_Forum\\_FINAL\\_VERSION\\_for\\_web\\_14\\_feb\\_2020.pdf?ua=1](https://www.who.int/blueprint/priority-diseases/key-action/Global_Research_Forum_FINAL_VERSION_for_web_14_feb_2020.pdf?ua=1).
- 313 12. Vemula, S.V., et al., *Current Approaches for Diagnosis of Influenza Virus Infections in*  
314 *Humans*. Viruses, 2016. **8**(4): p. 96-96.
- 315 13. BD Veritor™ System for Rapid Detection of Flu A+B [package insert, EUA]. Becton,  
316 Dickinson and Company, Sparks-Glencoe, MD; (2018).
- 317 14. BD Veritor™ System for Rapid Detection of SARS-CoV-2 [package insert, EUA].  
318 Becton, Dickinson and Company, Sparks-Glencoe, MD; (2020).
- 319 15. Nam, M.H., et al., *Clinical performance evaluation of the BD Veritor System Flu A+B*  
320 *assay*. J Virol Methods, 2014. **204**: p. 86-90.
- 321 16. Young, S., et al., *Clinical Evaluation of BD Veritor SARS-CoV-2 Point-of-Care Test*  
322 *Performance Compared to PCR-Based Testing and versus the Sofia 2 SARS Antigen*  
323 *Point-of-Care Test*. J Clin Microbiol, 2020. **59**(1).
- 324 17. U.S. Food and Drug Administration, *Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Emergency*  
325 *Use Authorization for Medical Devices--In Vitro Diagnostics EUAs*.

- 326 <https://www.fda.gov/medical-devices/coronavirus-disease-2019-covid-19-emergency-use->  
327 [authorizations-medical-devices/vitro-diagnostics-euas#individual-molecular.](https://www.fda.gov/medical-devices/coronavirus-disease-2019-covid-19-emergency-use-)
- 328 18. Bossuyt, P.M., et al., *STARD 2015: An Updated List of Essential Items for Reporting*  
329 *Diagnostic Accuracy Studies*. Radiology, 2015. **277**(3): p. 826-32.
- 330 19. La Marca, A., et al., *Testing for SARS-CoV-2 (COVID-19): a systematic review and*  
331 *clinical guide to molecular and serological in-vitro diagnostic assays*. Reprod Biomed  
332 Online, 2020. **41**(3): p. 483-499.
- 333 20. Diao, B., et al., *Diagnosis of Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 Infection by*  
334 *Detection of Nucleocapsid Protein*. medRxiv, 2020: p. 2020.03.07.20032524.
- 335 21. Pekosz, A., et al., *Antigen-Based Testing but Not Real-Time Polymerase Chain Reaction*  
336 *Correlates With Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 Viral Culture*. Clin  
337 Infect Dis, 2021.
- 338 22. Petersen, E., et al., *Comparing SARS-CoV-2 with SARS-CoV and influenza pandemics*.  
339 The Lancet Infectious Diseases, 2020.
- 340 23. Kaur, S.P. and V. Gupta, *COVID-19 Vaccine: A comprehensive status report*. Virus  
341 research, 2020. **288**: p. 198114-198114.
- 342 24. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, *Stay at home when you are sick*. Accessed  
343 December 28, 2020. [https://www.cdc.gov/flu/business/stay-home-when-](https://www.cdc.gov/flu/business/stay-home-when-sick.htm#:~:text=Individuals%20with%20suspected%20or%20confirmed,3%20days%20of%20their%20illness.)  
344 [sick.htm#:~:text=Individuals%20with%20suspected%20or%20confirmed,3%20days%20](https://www.cdc.gov/flu/business/stay-home-when-sick.htm#:~:text=Individuals%20with%20suspected%20or%20confirmed,3%20days%20of%20their%20illness.)  
345 [of%20their%20illness.](https://www.cdc.gov/flu/business/stay-home-when-sick.htm#:~:text=Individuals%20with%20suspected%20or%20confirmed,3%20days%20of%20their%20illness.)
- 346 25. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, *Options to reduce quarantine for contacts of*  
347 *persons with SARS-CoV-2 infection using symptom monitoring and diagnostic testing*.

348            Accessed December 28, 2020. [https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/more/scientific-brief-options-to-reduce-quarantine.html)  
349            [ncov/more/scientific-brief-options-to-reduce-quarantine.html](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/more/scientific-brief-options-to-reduce-quarantine.html).

**Table 1.** Performance of the Veritor SARS-CoV-2/Flu assay for detection of SARS-CoV-2 compared to reference with and without D site.

Collection Site	SARS-CoV2 <sup>a</sup>
<b>D Site</b>	
PPA	69.2% [42.4, 87.3]
NPA	100.0% [89.8, 100]
Veritor (+) / Ref (+)	9
Veritor (+) / Ref (-)	0
Veritor (-) / Ref (+)	4
Veritor (-) / Ref (-)	34
kappa	0.765
<b>Other Sites</b>	
PPA	91.5% [80.1, 96.6]
NPA	99.5% [97.0, 99.9]
Veritor (+) / Ref (+)	43
Veritor (+) / Ref (-)	1
Veritor (-) / Ref (+)	4
Veritor (-) / Ref (-)	183
kappa	0.9316
<b>All Sites</b>	
PPA	86.7% [75.8, 93.1]
NPA	99.5% [97.4, 99.9]
Veritor (+) / Ref (+)	52
Veritor (+) / Ref (-)	1 <sup>b</sup>
Veritor (-) / Ref (+)	8
Veritor (-) / Ref (-)	217
kappa	0.9001

**Abbreviations:** PPA, positive percent agreement; NPA, negative percent agreement

<sup>a</sup>Reference method was the Lyra SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR assay.

<sup>b</sup>Analysis of the Veritor Analyzer raw data demonstrated this specimen's results to be very close to the assay cut-off.

**Table 2.** SARS-CoV-2 positivity distribution by reference method or Veritor SARS-CoV-2/Flu across age groups.

<b>Age group</b>		
<b>Without D Site</b>	<b>Reference n (%)</b>	<b>Veritor SARS-CoV-2/Flu n (%)</b>
<b>18-21 years</b> 3.5% (n=8)	5 (10.6%)	4 (9.1%)
<b>22-49 years</b> 55.0% (n=127)	26 (55.3%)	23 (52.3%)
<b>50-59 years</b> 22.9% (n=53)	6 (12.8%)	7 (15.9%)
<b>60-69 years</b> 13.9% (n=32)	6 (12.8%)	6 (13.6%)
<b>70-79 years</b> 3.5% (n=8)	3 (6.4%)	3 (6.8%)
<b>&gt;=80 years</b> 1.3% (n=3)	1 (2.1%)	1 (2.3%)
<b>Overall (N=231)</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>44</b>
<b>All Sites</b>		
<b>18-21 years</b> 3.6% (n=10)	5 (8.3%)	4 (7.5%)
<b>22-49 years</b> 52.9% (n=147)	31 (51.7%)	25 (47.2%)
<b>50-59 years</b> 22.7% (n=63)	10 (16.7%)	11 (20.8%)
<b>60-69 years</b> 15.1% (n=42)	7 (11.7%)	7 (13.2%)
<b>70-79 years</b> 4.7% (n=13)	6 (10.0%)	5 (9.4%)
<b>&gt;=80 years</b> 1.1% (n=3)	1 (1.7%)	1 (1.9%)
<b>Overall (N=278)</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>53</b>

**Table 3.** Performance of the Veritor SARS-CoV-2/Flu assay for detection of Flu A and Flu B compared to reference.

	<b>Flu A<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>Flu B<sup>a</sup></b>
<b>PPA</b>	100 [91.2, 100]	100 [90.0, 100]
<b>NPA</b>	100 [95.2, 100]	100 [95.5, 100]
<b>Veritor (+) / Ref (+)</b>	40	35
<b>Veritor (+) / Ref (-)</b>	0	0
<b>Veritor (-) / Ref (+)</b>	0	0
<b>Veritor (-) / Ref (-)</b>	75	80
<b>kappa</b>	1	1

**Abbreviations:** PPA, positive percent agreement; NPA, negative percent agreement

<sup>a</sup>Reference method was the BD Veritor System Flu A+B assay

**Table 4.** Influenza positivity distribution by reference method or Veritor SARS-CoV-2/Flu across age groups.

Age group	Reference		Veritor SARS-CoV-2/Flu	
	Influenza A n (%)	Influenza B n (%)	Influenza A n (%)	Influenza B n (%)
<b>≤5 years</b> 13.0% (n=15)	3 (7.5%)	8 (22.9%)	3 (7.5%)	8 (22.9%)
<b>6-21 years</b> 20.0% (n=23)	6 (15%)	13 (37.1%)	6 (15%)	13 (37.1%)
<b>22-59 years</b> 33.9% (n=39)	11 (27.5%)	13 (37.1%)	11 (27.5%)	13 (37.1%)
<b>≥60 years</b> 33.0% (n=38)	20 (50.0%)	1 (2.9%)	20 (50.0%)	1 (2.9%)
<b>Overall</b> (N=115)	40	35	40	35

**Table S1.** SARS-CoV-2 specimens collection sites.

<b>Site</b>	<b>City</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>Enrollment</b>
A	Palm Springs	FL	46
B	Savannah	GA	94
C	Ft. Lauderdale	FL	80
D <sup>a</sup>	Downers Grove	IL	64
E	Chattanooga	TN	11
F	St. Louis	MO	3
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>298</b>

<sup>a</sup>The collection procedure was not consistent with the protocols utilized by other sites. The collection deviation was noted and therefore, the data was reported with and without this site.

**Table S2.** List of discordant specimens.

Specimen ID	Veritor	Lyra	MAX	MAX Ct
1	-	+	+	N1: 29.06, N2: 29.48
2	-	+	+	N1: 26.38, N2: 29.48
3	-	+	-	N/A
4	-	+	+	N1: 30.79, N2: 32.72
5	-	+	+	N1: 30.43, N2: 32.38
6	-	+	+	N1: 38.27, N2: 32.71
7	-	+	+	N1: 31.82, N2: 33.95
8 <sup>a</sup>	+	-	-	N/A

<sup>a</sup>Analysis of the Veritor Analyzer raw data demonstrated this specimen's results to be very close to the assay cut-off.

**Table S3.** Comparison of Veritor SARS-CoV-2/Flu assay results with those from the Lyra SARS-CoV-2 assay, stratified by cycle threshold category, with and without D site.

<b>Without D Site</b>		<b>Lyra SARS-CoV-2</b>	
<b>Veritor SARS-CoV-2</b>	<b>Positive (Ct ≤ 30)</b>	<b>Positive (Ct &gt; 30)</b>	
<b>Positive</b>	42	1	
<b>Negative</b>	0	4	
<b>Total</b>	42	5	
<b>PPA (95% CI)</b>	100% (91.6% - 100%)	20.0% (3.6% - 62.4%)	

  

<b>All Sites</b>		<b>Lyra SARS-CoV-2</b>	
<b>Veritor SARS-CoV-2</b>	<b>Positive (Ct ≤ 30)</b>	<b>Positive (Ct &gt; 30)</b>	
<b>Positive</b>	50	2	
<b>Negative</b>	2	6	
<b>Total</b>	52	8	
<b>PPA (95% CI)</b>	100% (92.6% - 100%)	100% (74.1% - 100%)	

**Abbreviations:** Ct, PCR cycle threshold; PPA, positive percent agreement