

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,^a Huimiao Ren,^b Shirley Chen,^b Charles K. Cooper,^a Stephen Young^{c,#}

5
6 ^aBecton, Dickinson and Company, BD Life Sciences – Integrated Diagnostic Solutions, 7
7 Loveton Circle, Sparks, MD, USA

8 ^bBecton, Dickinson and Company, BD Life Sciences, San Diego, CA, USA

9 ^cTricore 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

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

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 ≥ 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 ≤ 5 to ≥ 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 ≥ 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 VeritorTM 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 ≥ 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 ≥ 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 [authorizations-medical-devices/vitro-diagnostics-euas#individual-molecular](https://www.fda.gov/medical-devices/coronavirus-disease-2019-covid-19-emergency-use-
327 <a href=).
- 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. [sick.htm#:~:text=Individuals%20with%20suspected%20or%20confirmed,3%20days%20of%20their%20illness](https://www.cdc.gov/flu/business/stay-home-when-
344 <a href=).
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 ^a |
|-----------------------|------------------------|
| D Site | |
| 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 |
| Other Sites | |
| 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 |
| All Sites | |
| PPA | 86.7% [75.8, 93.1] |
| NPA | 99.5% [97.4, 99.9] |
| Veritor (+) / Ref (+) | 52 |
| Veritor (+) / Ref (-) | 1 ^b |
| Veritor (-) / Ref (+) | 8 |
| Veritor (-) / Ref (-) | 217 |
| kappa | 0.9001 |

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

^aReference method was the Lyra SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR assay.

^bAnalysis 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.

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

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

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

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

^aReference 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 (%) |
| ≤5 years 13.0% (n=15) | 3 (7.5%) | 8 (22.9%) | 3 (7.5%) | 8 (22.9%) |
| 6-21 years 20.0% (n=23) | 6 (15%) | 13 (37.1%) | 6 (15%) | 13 (37.1%) |
| 22-59 years 33.9% (n=39) | 11 (27.5%) | 13 (37.1%) | 11 (27.5%) | 13 (37.1%) |
| ≥60 years 33.0% (n=38) | 20 (50.0%) | 1 (2.9%) | 20 (50.0%) | 1 (2.9%) |
| Overall (N=115) | 40 | 35 | 40 | 35 |

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

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

^aThe 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 ^a | + | - | - | N/A |

^aAnalysis 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.

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

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

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