

1 **Clinical evaluation of the Xpert MTB/XDR assay for rapid detection of isoniazid,**
2 **fluoroquinolone, ethionamide and second-line drug resistance: A cross-sectional**
3 **multicentre diagnostic accuracy study**

4

5 **Authors:**

6 Adam Penn-Nicholson, PhD;^{1*} Sophia B. Georghiou, PhD;^{1*} Nelly Ciobanu, MD;², Mubin

7 Kazi, PhD;³ Manpreet Bhalla, MD;⁴ Anura David, MSc;⁵ Francesca Conradie, MBBCh;⁵ Morten

8 Ruhwald, MD;¹ Valeriu Crudu, MD;² Camilla Rodrigues, MD;³ Vithal Prasad Myneedu, MD;⁴

9 Lesley Scott, PhD;⁵ Claudia M Denking, MD;^{1,6} Samuel G Schumacher, PhD;¹ Xpert XDR

10 Trial Consortium**

11

12 ¹ Foundation for Innovative New Diagnostics, Campus Biotech, 9 Chemin des Mines

13 1202 Geneva, Switzerland

14 ² Institute of Phthisiopneumology "Chiril Draganiuc", 13, C. Virnav street

15 MD 2025, Chisinau, the Republic of Moldova

16 ³ P.D. Hinduja Hospital and Medical Research Centre, SVS Rd, Mahim West, Shivaji Park

17 Mumbai, Maharashtra 400016, India

18 ⁴ National Institute of TB and Respiratory Diseases, Sri Aurobindo Marg Near Qutub Minar,

19 Mehrauli, New Delhi, Delhi 110030, India

20 ⁵ University of the Witwatersrand, School of Pathology, York Road, Parktown, Johannesburg,

21 2193, South Africa

22 ⁶ Heidelberg University Hospital, Center of Infectious Diseases, Im Neuenheimer Feld 324,

23 69120 and German Center of Infection Research, Site Heidelberg, Heidelberg, Germany

24 *Authors contributed equally

25 **The members of the Xpert XDR Trial Consortium are listed at the end of this paper.

26

27 **Corresponding author:**

28 Adam Penn-Nicholson

29 adam.penn-nicholson@finddx.org

30 +41 (22) 710 05 91

31 Campus Biotech, 9 Chemin des Mines

32 1202 Geneva, Switzerland

33

34

35 **Abstract:**

36 *Background*

37 The WHO End TB Strategy requires universal drug susceptibility testing and treatment of all
38 people with tuberculosis. However, available second-line diagnostic tools are cumbersome and
39 require sophisticated laboratory infrastructure, and ultimately less than half of those with drug-
40 resistant tuberculosis receive appropriate treatment. Xpert MTB/XDR was developed to help
41 overcome these limitations.

42

43 *Methods*

44 We assessed the diagnostic accuracy of sputum-based Xpert MTB/XDR for isoniazid,
45 fluoroquinolone, ethionamide and second-line injectable resistance detection in adults with an
46 Xpert MTB/RIF or Ultra *Mycobacterium tuberculosis*-positive result against a composite
47 reference standard of phenotypic drug-susceptibility testing and whole genome sequencing
48 (NCT03728725). Participants with pulmonary tuberculosis symptoms and ≥ 1 risk factor for drug
49 resistance were consecutively enrolled between four clinical sites in India, Moldova and South
50 Africa.

51

52 *Findings*

53 Between 31 July 2019 and 21 March 2020, we enrolled 710 patients, of which 611 (86.1%) had
54 results from index and composite reference standard tests and were included in analysis. The
55 sensitivity of Xpert MTB/XDR was 94% for isoniazid, 95% for fluoroquinolones, 54% for
56 ethionamide, 73% for amikacin, 86% for kanamycin, and 61% for capreomycin resistance

57 detection. Specificity was 98-100% for all drugs. Performance was equivalent to line-probe
58 assays. The non-determinate rate of Xpert MTB/XDR was 2.96%.

59

60 *Interpretation*

61 This first prospective, multicentre clinical study of the Xpert MTB/XDR assay demonstrated
62 high diagnostic test accuracy, meeting target product profile criteria for a next-generation drug
63 susceptibility test.

64

65 *Funding*

66 German Federal Ministry of Education and Research through KfW, Dutch Ministry of Foreign
67 Affairs, and Australian Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade.

68

69

70

71 **Research in context:**

72

73 *Evidence before this study*

74 The World Health Organization (WHO) has highlighted the development of expanded, rapid
75 molecular drug susceptibility tests as a key priority to tackle drug-resistant tuberculosis (TB).
76 Prior to the Cepheid Xpert MTB/XDR assay, the only WHO-recommended rapid molecular
77 assay for second-line resistance detection was the Bruker-Hain GenoType MTBDR_{s/l} line probe
78 assay. However, the high complexity of DNA-based hybridization assays limits their use to
79 central reference or regional-level laboratories where the appropriate infrastructure and user
80 expertise can be ensured. In this context, the Xpert MTB/XDR assay is the only lower
81 complexity, automated molecular assay for broader resistance detection suitable for use at lower
82 levels of the laboratory network. We searched PubMed databases for articles evaluating the
83 performance of the sputum-based assay using search terms (tuberculosis or TB) AND (Xpert OR
84 GeneXpert OR cartridge) AND (second-line OR XDR OR "extensively drug-resistant") AND
85 (sputum OR sputa) AND (test OR assay OR diagnostic OR "point of care") AND (performance
86 OR accuracy OR sensitivity OR specificity OR diagnos*). The search was done on 8 Feb 2021
87 with no search date or language restrictions. Our search yielded 51 studies, of which only three
88 reported on a sputum-based cartridge for expanded resistance detection. The first two studies
89 described the assay design approach and reported initial performance metrics for a prototype
90 version of the Xpert MTB/XDR assay. In the third study, the manufacturer demonstrated high
91 performance for the final assay (sensitivity of 94–100% and a specificity of 100% for all drugs
92 except for ethionamide) when compared with sequencing for 314 sputum specimens and

93 sediments. This study was the first assessment of Xpert MTB/XDR assay diagnostic accuracy in
94 a prospective patient cohort.

95

96 *Added value of this study*

97 This is the first clinical study of the diagnostic performance of the Xpert MTB/XDR assay for
98 expanded drug resistance detection. This study was performed independent of the manufacturer
99 in settings of intended use utilizing prospectively collected primary clinical samples. The study
100 employed a comprehensive reference standard using both phenotypic drug susceptibility testing
101 and whole genome sequencing separately, as well as in combination, which allowed a
102 differentiated view of performance of the assay for resistance detection. Moreover, we compared
103 the performance of the assay on direct sputum samples with the performance of the WHO-
104 recommended Bruker-Hain MTBDR*plus* and MTBDR*sl* line probe assays on culture.

105

106 *Implications of all the available evidence*

107 The WHO End TB Strategy calls for early diagnosis and universal access to drug susceptibility
108 testing. With a 10-color calibration to GeneXpert instruments, the Xpert MTB/XDR assay
109 expands upon the drug detection landscape of the Xpert MTB/RIF and Ultra assays and
110 overcomes the limitations of the Bruker-Hain line probe assays to offer an option for lower-level
111 health care centres to conduct rapid, expanded drug susceptibility testing in follow-up to a TB-
112 positive result using existing laboratory infrastructure. Data from this study demonstrates that the
113 Xpert MTB/XDR assay has high performance for a diverse clinical population in the intended
114 setting of use, providing national TB programmes with a valuable tool for expanded drug
115 susceptibility testing for all persons with signs and symptoms of TB.

116 **Background:**

117 In 2010, the World Health Organization (WHO) recommended the use of the Xpert MTB/RIF®
118 assay (“Xpert”, Cepheid, Sunnyvale, CA), an integrated, automated, cartridge-based system for
119 multidrug-resistant tuberculosis (MDR-TB) diagnosis that uses the GeneXpert instrument
120 platform.¹ The assay and its more sensitive WHO-recommended successor, Xpert MTB/RIF
121 Ultra® (“Ultra”), have since been widely adopted in tuberculosis (TB) programmes.² Both assays
122 identify *Mycobacterium tuberculosis* if present in the specimen. However, both assays detect
123 rifampicin (RIF) resistance only, and thus do not provide sufficient information regarding a
124 given strain’s resistance profile necessary to diagnose *M. tuberculosis* resistance to additional
125 drug compounds, including the first-line drug isoniazid (INH), fluoroquinolones (FQ) and any of
126 the injectable compounds [amikacin (AMK), kanamycin (KAN) and/or capreomycin (CAP)].
127 The rapid diagnosis and appropriate treatment of drug-resistant TB (DR-TB) is essential to
128 prevent significant morbidity, mortality and further transmission of TB disease. Given the
129 importance of INH and the FQs, in particular, in current TB and DR-TB patient treatment
130 regimens,^{3–6} it is critical to rule-out resistance to these compounds prior to treatment.

131
132 The novel Xpert MTB/XDR assay is a rapid, sputum-based assay that is indicated for use as a
133 reflex test to any *M. tuberculosis* positive result to test for resistance to INH, FQ, ethionamide
134 (ETH), and second-line injectable drugs (SLI).⁷ A prototype version of the assay showed
135 promising performance for INH and second-line resistance detection in a blinded study of 24
136 clinical sputum samples (sensitivity 75–100%; specificity 94–100%), as well as in a clinical
137 evaluation study (sensitivity 92.7–98.1%; specificity 94.3–99.6%).^{8,9} The assay has since been
138 updated with additional gene targets and the time-to-result shortened to 90 minutes. The final

139 assay detects INH resistance-associated mutations in *katG*, the *inhA* promoter, *fabG1* and the
140 *oxyR-ahpC* intergenic gene region, FQ resistance-associated mutations in *gyrA* and *gyrB*, ETH
141 resistance-associated mutations in the *inhA* promoter, and SLI (AMK, KAN and CAP)
142 resistance-associated mutations in *rrs* and the *eis* promoter. In a retrospective study of 314
143 clinical sputum samples and sediments in two laboratories, the final assay demonstrated high
144 performance compared with sequencing (99.7%, 97.5%, 100%, 96.5%, 94.1% and 88.5% for
145 detection of INH, FLQ, AMK, KAN, CAP and ETH resistance respectively, with a specificity of
146 100% for all the drugs except for ETH, for which the assay demonstrated a specificity of
147 97.3%).¹⁰

148
149 We conducted a cross-sectional, multicentre, diagnostic accuracy study in which the
150 performance of the Xpert MTB/XDR assay on sputum samples was assessed in four reference
151 laboratories in settings of intended use against Mycobacteria Growth Indicator Tube (MGIT)
152 culture phenotypic drug susceptibility testing (pDST) and whole genome sequencing (WGS) as a
153 composite reference standard for the diagnosis of INH, FQ, ETH, AMK, KAN and CAP
154 resistance.

155

156 **Methods:**

157 *Study design and participants*

158 This prospective, multicentre, cross-sectional diagnostic accuracy study (NCT03728725) was
159 sponsored by FIND and conducted with the Phthisiopneumology Institute "Chiril Draganiuc", in
160 Chisinau, Moldova, P.D. Hinduja Hospital and Medical Research Centre in Mumbai, India, the
161 National Institute of TB and Respiratory Diseases (NITRD) in New Delhi, India, and University

162 of the Witwatersrand in Johannesburg, South Africa. The study was conducted in accordance
163 with the 1964 Helsinki declaration and later amendments and approved by the relevant
164 institutional review boards and independent ethics committees. All participants provided
165 informed consent.

166
167 Individuals were recruited at outpatient clinic settings and inpatient hospital settings. Interested
168 individuals were referred to study personnel for additional information and screening. Screening
169 criteria included age 18 years or above, symptoms suggesting pulmonary tuberculosis and at
170 least one risk factor for DR-TB. Participants were consecutively enrolled in the study if they met
171 inclusion criteria, provided informed consent, had a *M. tuberculosis*-positive Xpert or Ultra
172 result with either a RIF-resistant or -sensitive result, and provided at least 3 mL of sputum.
173 Information regarding patient sex, age, weight, height, infection site, previous TB treatment start
174 date and drug regimen, pulmonary symptoms, and HIV status were collected at enrolment.
175 Clinical information and reference test result were not available to operators or readers of the
176 index test at the time of data generation. All data entry was validated with source document
177 verification. Xpert MTB/XDR test results were not shared with clinical staff and did not
178 influence patient treatment options.

179
180 The full study protocol is provided as Supplement S1, and at clinicaltrials.gov (NCT03728725).

181
182 *Procedures*

183 Patients meeting eligibility criteria were asked to provide ≥ 3 mL of sputum as either a single
184 sputum or two consecutively collected and pooled sputa. Samples were homogenized with glass

185 beads and split for testing. Xpert MTB/XDR and acid-fast bacilli smear were performed directly
186 on the homogenized sputum sample. Liquid (MGIT) and solid (LJ) culture were performed using
187 2 mL of decontaminated sputum. MGIT DST was performed for all culture-positive samples for
188 INH, RIF, FQs (moxifloxacin and levofloxacin), ETH, AMK, KAN, and CAP at the WHO-
189 recommended critical concentrations for MGIT DST.^{11,12} Cultured samples underwent
190 subsequent testing by Bruker-Hain GenoType MTBDR*plus*, MTBDR*sl* LPA, and WGS to report
191 high-confidence resistance mutations in relevant gene regions (*katG*, *inhA*, *fabG1*, *ahpC*, *gyrA*,
192 *gyrB*, *rrs*, *eis*, and *tlyA*),¹³ as well as a second Xpert MTB/XDR assay. DNA for WGS was
193 extracted on site from 300 µL positive MGIT culture using Molzym Ultra-Deep Microbiome
194 Prep kits and extracts were sent to MedGenome (Bangalore, India) for WGS (Supplement S2).

195

196 *Statistical analysis*

197 We estimated that 760 total samples would need to be tested for this study to yield 600
198 specimens with full results (accounting for around 20% of culture and molecular tests with
199 invalid and indeterminate results). We estimated that the analysis of 600 specimens would allow
200 us to assess INH, FQ, AMK, KAN, and CAP sensitivity with 95% confidence intervals (based on
201 the Wilson score method), of 7%, 13%, 23%, 16%, and 23%, respectively, and specificity with
202 95% confidence intervals of 3–4%, based upon knowledge of past drug resistance rates for the
203 given sites or regions.¹⁴ More detail on the sample size calculations is provided in the protocol
204 (Supplement S1).

205

206 Primary analyses focused on estimating accuracy (clinical sensitivity and specificity) for INH,
207 ETH, FQ (moxifloxacin or levofloxacin), AMK, KAN, and CAP resistance detection using a

208 composite reference standard. Specimens were labelled as drug-resistant if either pDST or WGS
209 suggested drug-resistance; specimens were labelled as drug-sensitive if both pDST and WGS
210 suggested drug-sensitivity. For each drug, clinical sensitivity was defined as the proportion
211 resistant based on the composite reference standard that tested resistant by Xpert MTB/XDR.
212 Clinical specificity was defined as the proportion susceptible based on the composite reference
213 standard that tested susceptible by Xpert MTB/XDR. For simple proportions (sensitivity and
214 specificity), 95% confidence intervals were computed using the Wilson score method. Primary
215 diagnostic accuracy analyses were carried out across all study sites. All TB samples that
216 generated both Xpert MTB/XDR (resistant or susceptible) and composite reference standard
217 results contributed to the analysis of the diagnostic test accuracy for INH, FQ, ETH, and SLI
218 resistance detection. Non-determinate rates of the Xpert MTB/XDR assay, defined as invalid *M.*
219 *tuberculosis* detection, as well as indeterminate rates, defined as indeterminate results for drug
220 resistance among valid *M. tuberculosis* detection results, were also calculated across study sites
221 as a percentage of all Xpert MTB/XDR tests performed on patient sputa.

222
223 Secondary analyses investigated assay diagnostic accuracy between important subgroups,
224 including: Xpert MTB/XDR performance on direct sputum (“on sputum”) versus cultured
225 isolates (“on isolates”), performance by smear result, performance between clinical sites,
226 performance by patient HIV status and TB pre-treatment status, and performance compared with
227 the Bruker-Hain MTBDR_{plus} and MTBDR_{sl} assays. Detailed definitions for diagnostic test
228 results are given in Supplement S3.

229

230

231 *Role of the funding source*

232 The funders of the study had no role in study design, data collection, data analysis, data
233 interpretation, or writing of the manuscript. The corresponding author had full access to all the
234 data in the study and had final responsibility for the decision to submit for publication.

235

236 **Results:**

237 Between 31 July 2019 and 21 March 2020, 714 patients were screened for eligibility (Figure 1).

238 A total of 710 patients were enrolled, of whom 99 were excluded, mainly as a result of negative
239 cultures for *M. tuberculosis* (n=89) and the remaining 10 for missing or invalid reference or
240 index test results. The initial population of 710 participants had a smear positivity rate of 69%
241 and a culture positivity rate of 87%. The final, analysed population of 611 participants, for which
242 results from both Xpert MTB/XDR and reference standard were available, had a median age of
243 37 years (18–77). Of these participants, 35% were women and 16% were HIV-positive (Figure 1,
244 Table 1); 81% were Xpert MTB/RIF or Ultra RIF-resistant, while 76% were smear-positive for
245 *M. tuberculosis*.

246

247 The Xpert MTB/XDR assay had high diagnostic accuracy for the detection of INH, FQ, AMK,
248 KAN, and CAP resistance in the clinical study (Figure 2). For Xpert MTB/XDR performed
249 directly on sputum, sensitivity and specificity were 94% and 100% for INH resistance detection,
250 94% and 99% for FQ resistance detection, 54% and 100% for ETH resistance detection, 73%
251 and 100% for AMK resistance detection, 86% and 98% for KAN resistance detection, and 61%
252 and 100% for CAP resistance detection compared with a composite reference standard of pDST
253 and WGS.

254
255 There was no notable difference of Xpert MTB/XDR performance when using sputum compared
256 with isolates for the assay sample (Supplement S3). Xpert MTB/XDR invalid rate (i.e.
257 unsuccessful test) was notably higher for smear negative samples than for smear positive
258 samples (6.2% compared with 0.2%), though we detected no notable differences in performance
259 for drug resistance detection based upon smear status (S3). Additionally, there were no
260 performance differences by patient HIV or pre-treatment status (S3).

261
262 There were a few notable Xpert MTB/XDR performance differences by site (Figure 3). The
263 sensitivity of the assay for INH resistance detection was lower in New Delhi (80%; 95% CI 70–
264 88%) than other sites, with WGS revealing the presence of INH resistance mutations that are not
265 included in the Xpert MTB/XDR assay (e.g. *katG* W135* stop codon), though specificity was
266 high (100%) across all sites. Likewise, the sensitivity of the assay for ETH resistance detection
267 was low in New Delhi and Mumbai compared with Moldova and South Africa, though
268 specificity was high across and between sites. For SLI resistance detection, the Xpert MTB/XDR
269 assay sensitivity was also notably lower in New Delhi (26–33%) than for other sites. The
270 sensitivity of the assay for CAP resistance detection was also notably low in Moldova (40%).
271 However, it should be noted that the sensitivity estimates for Xpert MTB/XDR detection of SLI
272 resistance detection in New Delhi and CAP resistance detection in Moldova greatly improved if
273 only pDST was used as a reference standard (67–75% and 56%, respectively, see Supplement
274 S3).

275

276 The overall non-determinate rate for the Xpert MTB/XDR assay was 2.96% (Table 2). Drug
277 resistance indeterminate rates, among valid Xpert MTB/XDR *M. tuberculosis*-detected results,
278 were $\leq 3.5\%$ for all drugs included in the assay.

279
280 The Xpert MTB/XDR assay performed similarly to the Bruker-Hain line probe assays (LPAs)
281 for INH, FQ, AMK, KAN, and CAP resistance detection, even though the Xpert MTB/XDR
282 assay was performed directly on sputum samples while the LPAs were performed only on
283 cultured samples (Table 3). The only difference was for INH resistance detection, as the Xpert
284 MTB/XDR assay demonstrated slightly higher sensitivity, likely attributed to the two additional
285 gene targets in Xpert MTB/XDR that are not found in the MTBDR*plus* assay (i.e. *fabG1* and the
286 *ahpC-oxyR* intergenic region). Of the eight samples that were Xpert MTB/XDR INH-resistant,
287 but MTBDR*plus* INH-susceptible in this study, WGS confirmed that two had *ahpC-oxyR*
288 mutations (i.e. c-10t and c-15t) and three had the *fabG1* L203L mutation in the absence of other
289 mutations. Two of the 8 samples did not have WGS available, though WGS confirmed that the
290 8th sample had a *katG* S315T mutation that was not detected by the LPA.

291

292

293 **Discussion:**

294 This is the first prospective, clinical diagnostic accuracy study of the Xpert MTB/XDR assay for
295 INH, FQ, ETH, and second-line TB drug resistance detection. We found that the Xpert
296 MTB/XDR assay, performed directly on smear-positive and smear-negative sputum specimens,
297 demonstrated high diagnostic accuracy for the detection of INH, FQ, AMK, KAN, and CAP
298 resistance among patients from the three WHO regions of Africa, Europe, and South-East Asia.

299 Importantly, direct Xpert MTB/XDR testing of sputum samples produced results for resistance
300 on all drugs in 96% of tested *M. tuberculosis*-positive specimens with a single, easy-to-use assay.
301 The assay demonstrated slightly better performance for INH resistance detection compared with
302 the Bruker-Hain MTBDR*plus* assay (1.6%, 95% CI 0.2-3.4), as the assay includes two additional
303 gene targets not found in the LPA (i.e. *fabG1* and the *ahpC-oxvR* intergenic region), and
304 equivalent performance for second-line resistance detection compared with the Bruker-Hain
305 MTBDR*sl* assay.

306
307 Notably, specificity was high (>98%) for the detection of all drugs included in the Xpert
308 MTB/XDR assay. Sensitivity of the assay varied by drug target, ranging from 54% for ETH
309 resistance detection to 94% for FQ resistance detection against the composite reference standard.
310 For INH, FQ, and SLI resistance detection, performance estimates met minimal criteria of the
311 WHO target product profile for a next-generation DST assay to be used at peripheral microscopy
312 centres compared with pDST (no criteria have been defined to date for ETH or for a composite
313 reference standard).¹⁵ Furthermore, no performance differences were seen by smear status or
314 patient HIV or pre-treatment status, highlighting the suitability of the test for a diverse patient
315 population.

316
317 Some notable diagnostic performance variations were identified by site. In particular, assay
318 sensitivity for INH resistance detection was lower in New Delhi (80%, 95% CI 70–88%) than for
319 other sites. Most of the Xpert MTB/XDR INH false-negative samples in New Delhi were
320 phenotypically INH-resistant with no high confidence resistance mutation(s) in the gene regions
321 covered by the Xpert MTB/XDR assay. For example, three phenotypically INH-resistant

322 samples from NITRD had *ahpC* t-34a/g mutations that are outside of the coverage of the Xpert
323 MTB/XDR assay. Additionally, two different Indian isolates had stop codons in *katG* (W135*
324 and E607*) that were not identified by the Xpert MTB/XDR assay. Importantly, the
325 MTBDR*plus* LPA also did not identify INH resistance for any of these samples, further
326 suggesting that INH resistance mechanisms outside of those covered by the Xpert MTB/XDR
327 assay and most other current molecular assays might play a role in resistance in this geographical
328 context. Assay sensitivity for ETH resistance detection, in contrast, was low both overall and
329 between sites, likely due to the fact that the Xpert MTB/XDR assay is only capable of detecting
330 ETH resistance-associated mutations in one gene region (i.e. the *inhA* promoter), and so other
331 phenotypic ETH resistance mechanisms, such as *ethA* resistance mutations,¹⁶ were missed by
332 Xpert MTB/XDR, since they are not targeted by the assay. As no graded list of *ethA* resistance
333 mutations currently exists for ETH, and ETH pDST is unreliable,¹⁷ we are unable to comment
334 upon potential improvements in diagnostic performance if *ethA* resistance mutations were
335 included in the assay. The low sensitivity for ETH suggests a role of the assay for ruling-in but
336 not for ruling-out resistance to ETH.

337
338 For SLI resistance detection, Xpert MTB/XDR sensitivity was notably lower in New Delhi (26–
339 33%, depending on the drug) than for the other sites. Upon closer examination, it was determined
340 that 11 of the 14 false-negative results in New Delhi were from specimens that were
341 phenotypically SLI-susceptible but heteroresistant by WGS, with *rrs* c1402a and g1484t
342 mutations present in only a fraction of WGS reads at levels likely undetectable by the Xpert
343 MTB/XDR assay (the *rrs* c1402a mutation was detected in <50% of reads for nine of the 11
344 samples).^{10,18} Ultimately, the clinical relevance of these minor resistant populations is unclear

345 given that these samples were phenotypically SLI-susceptible. If only pDST was considered as a
346 reference standard in this study, the sensitivity of the Xpert MTB/XDR assay would improve to
347 67–75% for the detection of SLI resistance in New Delhi and 75–92% overall. The sensitivity of
348 the assay for CAP resistance detection was also low in Moldova (40%, 95% CI 22–61%), likely
349 due to the fact that certain CAP resistance mutations were present in only a low fraction of
350 generated WGS reads for Xpert MTB/XDR false-negative samples (e.g. the *rrs* c1402a mutation
351 was detected in $\leq 25\%$ of reads for the five CAP-resistant samples that were not detected by
352 Xpert MTB/XDR). Furthermore, a few additional phenotypically CAP-resistant samples did not
353 have any resistance mechanisms detected by WGS, including *tlyA* mutations, suggesting that
354 additional resistance mechanisms outside of those covered by the Xpert MTB/XDR assay might
355 play a role in CAP resistance in Moldova.¹⁹

356
357 The strengths of this study included the enrolment of patients in four diverse sites in three WHO
358 regions, the use of WHO-recommended molecular comparators (Bruker-Hain GenoType
359 MTBDR*plus* and MTBDR*sl*), and the use of a composite reference standard to fully characterize
360 assay performance. To investigate the performance of Xpert MTB/XDR in real-world
361 populations, an effort was made to include diverse clinical populations across different
362 geographical regions widely representative of the TB epidemic. However, differences in local
363 patient populations, laboratories, and *M. tuberculosis* strains may have also contributed to
364 performance variations seen between sites and reflect a limitation of studies including diverse
365 populations. It is important to note that the study did not allow for evaluation of Xpert
366 MTB/XDR assay performance for TB detection. As the study was designed to assess the Xpert
367 MTB/XDR assay as a reflex test to any TB positive result,⁷ only Xpert MTB/RIF and Ultra *M.*

368 *tuberculosis*-positive patients were enrolled in our study, and so no data were available to
369 confirm Xpert MTB/XDR specificity for TB detection. Although previous studies have
370 demonstrated the limit of detection of the Xpert MTB/XDR assay to be equivalent to Xpert
371 MTB/RIF,^{10,18} additional prospective, clinical data would be helpful to support this finding and
372 define best use cases. Furthermore, the study was designed to evaluate a high number of drug-
373 resistant specimens to provide accurate sensitivity estimates, and this was achieved by testing
374 mostly RIF resistant samples, but also meant that sample size was relatively low to assess Xpert
375 MTB/XDR specificity for INH resistance detection. However, given that no false positive results
376 were obtained in this study, overall confidence is high in the specificity of the assay for INH
377 resistance detection.

378
379 As a reflex test to an Xpert MTB/RIF or Ultra TB-positive result, the Xpert MTB/XDR assay
380 allows for rapid extended drug resistance profiling directly from sputum, using existing
381 infrastructure and sample processing procedures, thereby providing a decentralized option for
382 optimized TB treatment. Given the importance of INH in TB treatment regimens,³⁻⁶ as well as
383 the growing concerns regarding INH mono-resistant strains of TB,²⁰ the availability of a sputum-
384 based assay with an expanded landscape for INH resistance detection may be of great value to
385 best direct appropriate TB patient treatment in many contexts. Although the definition of XDR-
386 TB was redefined by WHO in 2021, the assay still presents a crucial diagnostic to identify and
387 direct treatment of INH-resistant TB, FQ-resistant TB, and pre-XDR TB, now defined as *M.*
388 *tuberculosis* strains that fulfil the definition of multidrug-resistant/rifampicin-resistant TB and
389 which are also resistant to any FQ.²¹ The relevance of the assay is underscored given the
390 importance of INH and FQ in current drug-susceptible and drug-resistant treatment regimens,³⁻⁶

391 and the assay fills the need for rapid FQ DST to all-oral, short course drug-resistant TB
392 regimens. While the importance of determining resistance to SLIs has decreased given changing
393 TB treatment guidelines, there is still value in having this information as SLIs remain in
394 widespread use as countries make the switch to all-oral regimens, as well as for patients who fail
395 on these novel regimens. Additional field studies will be necessary to determine the optimal
396 placement of the assay in existing diagnostic and laboratory algorithms and the acceptability and
397 robustness of the GeneXpert instruments with 10-color calibration needed to perform the assay,
398 especially in high burden countries with varying infrastructure capacities.²²

399
400 Overall, the Xpert MTB/XDR assay met the minimal criteria set by the WHO target product
401 profile for a next-generation DST, although sensitivity of the assay for ETH resistance detection
402 was low and performance variations were identified between sites.^{15,23} The introduction and
403 rollout of this rapid sputum-based assay has the potential to greatly improve TB patient diagnosis
404 and management worldwide. Additional studies, including demonstration studies of various
405 implementation approaches, will be critical to define best use cases for the Xpert MTB/XDR
406 assay and ensure optimal impact in improving outcomes for patients with drug-resistant TB.

407

408

409

410 **References:**

411

412 1 Cepheid. Xpert MTB/RIF Package Insert. 2019. <http://www.cepheid.com/us/mtbrif-pi>.

413 2 WHO. Global TB Report 2019. Geneva, Switzerland, 2019

414 https://www.who.int/tb/publications/global_report/tb19_Exec_Sum_12Nov2019.pdf?ua=1

415 .

416 3 WHO. Rapid Communication: Key changes to the treatment of drug-resistant tuberculosis.

417 2019 https://www.who.int/tb/publications/2019/rapid_communications_MDR/en/.

418 4 WHO. Guidelines for treatment of drug-susceptible tuberculosis and patient care (2017

419 update). 2017 https://www.who.int/tb/publications/2017/dstb_guidance_2017/en/.

420 5 WHO. WHO treatment guidelines for isoniazid-resistant tuberculosis: Supplement to the

421 WHO treatment guidelines for drug-resistant tuberculosis. Geneva, Switzerland, 2018.

422 6 WHO. WHO consolidated guidelines on drug-resistant tuberculosis treatment. 2019.

423 7 Xpert MTB-XDR ENGLISH Package Insert 302-3514 Rev A. .

424 8 Chakravorty S, Roh SS, Glass J, *et al*. Detection of isoniazid-, fluoroquinolone-,

425 amikacin-, and kanamycin-resistant tuberculosis in an automated, multiplexed 10-color

426 assay suitable for point-of-care use. *J Clin Microbiol* 2017; **55**: 183–98.

427 9 Xie YL, Chakravorty S, Armstrong DT, *et al*. Evaluation of a rapid molecular drug-

428 susceptibility test for tuberculosis. *N Engl J Med* 2017; **377**: 1043–54.

429 10 Cao Y, Parmar H, Guar R, *et al*. Xpert MTB/XDR: a 10-Color Reflex Assay Suitable for

430 Point-of-Care Settings To Detect Isoniazid, Fluoroquinolone, and Second-Line-Injectable-

431 Drug Resistance Directly from Mycobacterium tuberculosis-Positive Sputum. *J Clin*

432 *Microbiol* 2021; **59**: e02314-20.

- 433 11 WHO. Technical report on critical concentrations for TB drug susceptibility testing of
434 medicines used in the treatment of drug-resistant TB. 2018
435 https://www.who.int/tb/publications/2018/WHO_technical_report_concentrations_TB_drug_susceptibility/en/.
436
- 437 12 WHO. Technical report on critical concentrations for TB drug susceptibility testing of
438 medicines used in the treatment of TB. 2020.
- 439 13 Miotto P, Tessema B, Tagliani E, *et al.* A standardised method for interpreting the
440 association between mutations and phenotypic drug resistance in *Mycobacterium*
441 *tuberculosis*. *Eur Respir J* 2017; **50**: 1701354.
- 442 14 Catanzaro A, Rodwell TC, Catanzaro DG, *et al.* Performance comparison of three rapid
443 tests for the diagnosis of drug-resistant tuberculosis. *PLoS One* 2015; **10**: 1–14.
- 444 15 WHO Report M. Global TB Programme Meeting Report: High-priority target product
445 profiles for new tuberculosis diagnostics: Report of a consensus meeting. Geneva,
446 Switzerland, 2014 DOI:WHO/HTM/TB/2014.18.
- 447 16 Vilchèze C, Jacobs JR. WR. Resistance to isoniazid and ethionamide in *Mycobacterium*
448 *tuberculosis*: Genes, mutations, and causalities. *Microbiol Spectr* 2014; **2**: MGM2-0014–
449 02913.
- 450 17 Theresa E, Werngren J, Groenheit R, *et al.* Systematic review of whole genome
451 sequencing data to predict phenotypic drug resistance susceptibility in Swedish
452 *Mycobacterium tuberculosis* isolates 2016-2018. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* 2020; **64**:
453 e02550-19.
- 454 18 Georghiou SB, Penn-Nicholson A, de Vos M, *et al.* Analytical performance of the Xpert
455 MTB/XDR® assay for tuberculosis and expanded resistance detection. *Diagn Microbiol*

- 456 *Infect Dis* 2021; **in press**.
- 457 19 Georghiou SB, Seifert M, Catanzaro D, *et al*. Frequency and Distribution of Tuberculosis
458 Resistance-Associated Mutations between Mumbai, Moldova, and Eastern Cape.
459 *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* 2016; **60**: 3994–4004.
- 460 20 Karo B, Kohlenberg A, Hollo V, *et al*. Isoniazid (INH) mono-resistance and tuberculosis
461 (TB) treatment success: Analysis of European surveillance data, 2002 to 2014.
462 *Eurosurveillance* 2019. DOI:10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2019.24.12.1800392.
- 463 21 WHO. Meeting report of the WHO expert consultation on the definition of extensively
464 drug-resistant tuberculosis. Geneva, Switzerland, 2021.
- 465 22 Bainomugisa A, Gilpin C, Coulter C, Marais BJ. New Xpert MTB/XDR: added value and
466 future in the field. *Eur Respir J* 2020; **56**. DOI:10.1183/13993003.03616-2020.
- 467 23 Denkinger CM, Dolinger D, Schito M, *et al*. Target product profile of a molecular drug-
468 susceptibility test for use in microscopy centers. *J Infect Dis* 2015.
469 DOI:10.1093/infdis/jiu682.
- 470 24 Dravid A, Natarajan K, Medisetty M, *et al*. Incidence of tuberculosis among HIV infected
471 individuals on long term antiretroviral therapy in private healthcare sector in Pune,
472 Western India. *BMC Infect Dis* 2019. DOI:10.1186/s12879-019-4361-0.

473

474 **Data sharing statement**

475 Individual, de-identified participant data will be shared, including data dictionaries. Other
476 documents that have been made available include the study protocol and statistical analysis plan.
477 Templates of the informed consent forms may be shared upon request. The data will be available
478 immediately following publication with no end date. The data will be shared with anyone who

479 wishes to access the data. The data will be available for any purpose of analyses. For data, please
480 contact the corresponding author.

481

482 **Xpert XDR Trial Consortium members**

483 Catharina Boehme, Sergio Carmona, Sarabjit Chadha, Megha Dhalla, Christine Hoogland,
484 Aurélien Macé, Shweta Mall, Stefano Ongarello, Shakir Reza, Sanjay Sarin, Shubhada Shenai
485 (Foundation for Innovative New Diagnostics, Geneva, Switzerland); Trish Kahamba, Wendy
486 Stevens, Lyndel Singh, Xabisa Makeleni (University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South
487 Africa); Ritu Singhal; Jyoti Arora; Rohit Sarin (National Institute of TB and Respiratory
488 Diseases, New Delhi, India).

489

490 **Acknowledgements**

491 The authors would like to thank the study participants and their families for generously
492 volunteering to participate in this study, as well as the study sites for their time and effort in
493 conducting the study, and assisting with the analysis of the operational data. The authors also
494 thank ACOMED for conduction statistical analysis, MedGenome for WGS and Cepheid for their
495 technical expertise towards the study. Medical writing support was provided by Talya
496 Underwood, MPhil, of Anthos Communications Ltd, UK, funded by the Foundation for
497 Innovative New Diagnostics, according to Good Publication Practice guidelines.

498

499 **Contributors**

500 APN, SBG, CMD, and SGS designed the study; APN, SBG, MR, LS, VPM, CR, VC, CMD,
501 SGS oversaw the study. NC, MK, MB, AD, and FC coordinated the individual study sites.

502 Statistical analysis was undertaken by ACOMED. The manuscript drafts were developed by
503 SBG, APN, CMD, and SGS with input from the authors. All authors contributed to interpretation
504 of data and editing of the article and approved the final version of the manuscript.

505

506 **Declaration of interests**

507 APN, CMD, MR, SBG, and SGS are employed by the Foundation for Innovative New
508 Diagnostics (FIND). FIND is a not-for-profit foundation that supports the evaluation of publicly
509 prioritized tuberculosis assays and the implementation of WHO-approved (guidance and
510 prequalification) assays using donor grants. FIND has product evaluation agreements with
511 several private sector companies that design diagnostics for tuberculosis and other diseases.
512 These agreements strictly define FIND's independence and neutrality with regard to these private
513 sector companies.

514 **Tables**

515

516 **Table 1. Demographics and clinical characteristics of analysed patient cohort.**

	India - Mumbai: Hinduja	India - NITRD: New Delhi	Moldova - PPI: Chisinau	South Africa - WHC: Johannesburg	Total - All participants
N [%]	179 [29%]	120 [20%]	230 [38%]	82 [13%]	611 [100%]
Demographics or clinical characteristics					
Median age [min - max] (years)	31 [18, 77]	30 [18, 72]	43 [18, 70]	36 [18, 64]	37 [18, 77]
% Female sex [n/N]	49% [88/179]	43% [52/120]	20% [45/230]	35% [29/82]	35% [214/611]
% HIV positive [n/N]	2% [1/41]*	0% [0/107]	12% [27/230]	87% [41/47]	16% [69/425]
% Xpert MTB/RIF or Ultra RIF-R [n/N]	82% [146/179]	63% [75/120]	92% [212/230]	74% [61/82]	81% [494/611]
Distribution in diagnostic categories					
% Smear-negative culture-positive [n/N]	24% [42/179]	41% [49/119]	17% [39/230]	20% [16/81]	24% [146/609]
% INH-R based upon composite reference standard [n/N]	84% [146/174]	73% [85/116]	94% [217/230]	88% [51/58]	86% [499/578]
% ETH-R based upon composite reference standard [n/N]	62% [106/170]	29% [32/110]	72% [165/228]	71% [31/44]	61% [334/552]
% FQ-R based upon composite reference standard [n/N]	69% [116/169]	46% [52/113]	25% [56/227]	45% [17/38]	44% [241/547]
% AMK-R based upon composite reference standard [n/N]	15% [25/163]	18% [20/109]	10% [22/226]	55% [22/40]	17% [89/538]
% KAN-R based upon composite reference standard [n/N]	26% [43/163]	19% [21/110]	59% [135/228]	58% [23/40]	41% [222/541]
% CAP-R based upon composite reference standard [n/N]	17% [27/163]	17% [19/109]	11% [25/226]	55% [22/40]	17% [93/538]

517 AMK-R: amikacin-resistant; CAP-R: capreomycin-resistant; ETH-R: ethionamide-resistant; FQ-R: fluoroquinolone-resistant; HIV: human
518 immunodeficiency virus; INH-R: isoniazid-resistant; KAN-R: kanamycin-resistant; N: total number; NITRD: National Institute of TB and
519 Respiratory Diseases; RIF-R: rifampicin-resistant; PPI: Phthisiopneumology Institute; WHC: Wits Health Consortium.

520 * HIV results were available for <50% of patients in Hinduja Hospital. The estimated HIV prevalence among TB-positive patients in Western

521 India is 5%.²⁴

522 **Table 2. Overall Xpert MTB/XDR non-determinate indeterminate rates from testing of**
523 **unprocessed sputum.**

	(%)	n/N
Non-determinate (MTB invalid)*	2.96	21/709
Indeterminate (drug resistance) [†]		
INH resistance	0.30	2/657
ETH resistance	0.15	1/657
FQ resistance	1.37	9/657
AMK resistance	3.50	23/657
KAN resistance	3.20	21/657
CAP resistance	2.89	19/657

524 AMK: amikacin; CAP: capreomycin; ETH: ethionamide; FQ: fluoroquinolones; INH: isoniazid; KAN: kanamycin; MTB: *Mycobacterium*
525 *tuberculosis*; N: number.

526 *Non-determinate cases were those with “Invalid” MTB detection results. MTB detection is based upon detection of *inhA* promoter sequence. Of
527 the 710 patients enrolled in the study, one patient did not have Xpert MTB/XDR performed on sputum (i.e. only culture).

528 †Indeterminant cases were those with “Indeterminate drug resistance” test results among those who had a documented respective “valid Xpert
529 MTB/XDR result with MTB=detected” (drug resistance is only evaluated for specimens where MTB has been detected by the Xpert MTB/XDR
530 assay; 709–21=688 patients had a valid Xpert MTB/XDR result and in 657/688 MTB was detected by the Xpert MTB/XDR assay and thus drug-
531 resistance was evaluated).

532 Note: 96% (628/657) of sputum samples returned resistance calls for all drugs included in the assay. 18 repeats were conducted for initial non-
533 determinate (invalid test result) samples. Of these 18 samples, only one showed any indeterminate results for any drug (1/18 or 5.56% of repeat
534 tests was AMK, KAN, and CAP resistance-indeterminate).

535

536 **Table 3. Xpert MTB/XDR performance on sputum compared with MTBDR_{plus} and**
 537 **MTBDR_{sl} from culture isolates.**

	N*	TP	FP	FN	TN	Sensitivity % (95% CI)	Specificity % (95% CI)
<u>INH-R detection</u>							
MTBDR _{plus}	575	461	0	36	78	93 (90 to 95)	100 (94 to 100)
Xpert MTB/XDR	575	469	0	28	78	94 (92 to 96)	100 (94 to 100)
Diff. [Xpert MTB/XDR - MTBDR _{plus}]	575					+1.6 (+0.2, +3.4)	0.0 (-4.7, +4.7)
<u>FQ-R detection</u>							
MTBDR _{sl}	532	222	2	13	295	95 (91, 97)	99 (97, 100)
Xpert MTB/XDR	532	222	2	13	295	95 (91, 97)	99 (97, 100)
Diff. [Xpert MTB/XDR - MTBDR _{plus}]	532					0.0 (-1.6, +1.6)	0.0 (-1.3, +1.3)
<u>AMK-R detection</u>							
MTBDR _{sl}	511	60	2	22	427	73 (62 to 82)	100 (98 to 100)
Xpert MTB/XDR	511	60	2	22	427	73 (62 to 82)	100 (98 to 100)
Diff. [Xpert MTB/XDR - MTBDR _{plus}]	511					0.0 (-4.5, +4.5)	0.0 (-0.9, +0.9)
<u>KAN-R detection</u>							
MTBDR _{sl}	515	181	5	29	300	86 (81 to 90)	98 (96 to 99)
Xpert MTB/XDR	515	181	5	29	300	86 (81 to 90)	98 (96 to 99)
Diff. [Xpert MTB/XDR - MTBDR _{plus}]	515					0.0 (-1.8, +1.8)	0.0 (-1.2, +1.2)
<u>CAP-R detection</u>							
MTBDR _{sl}	513	53	1	34	425	61 (50 to 71)	100 (99 to 100)
Xpert MTB/XDR	513	53	1	34	425	61 (50 to 71)	100 (99 to 100)
Diff. [Xpert MTB/XDR - MTBDR _{plus}]	513					0.0 (-4.2, +4.2)	0.0 (-0.9, +0.9)

538 AMK-R: amikacin-resistant; CAP-R: capreomycin-resistant; CI: confidence interval; diff: difference; ETH-R: ethionamide-resistant; FN: false
 539 negatives; FP: false positives; FQ-R: fluoroquinolone-resistant; INH-R: isoniazid-resistant; KAN-R: kanamycin-resistant; N: total number; TN:
 540 true negatives; TP: true positives.
 541 Presented data for line probe assays is from culture isolates of matched patients.

542 *Analysis is limited to patients with results on both Xpert MTB/XDR and the respective Hain line probe assay to provide a direct head-to-head
543 comparison. An analysis comparing performance when testing for both Xpert MTB/XDR and LPA was done from culture isolates is available in
544 Supplement S3.

545


546

547 **Figures**

548

549 **Figure 1. Participant enrolment and exclusions.**

550



551


552 AMK: amikacin; CAP: capreomycin; ETH: ethionamide; FQ: fluoroquinolones; INH: isoniazid; KAN: kanamycin; MTBC: *Mycobacterium*
553 *tuberculosis* complex.

554 * Drug-resistant tuberculosis risk factors included: previously received >1 month of treatment for a prior tuberculosis episode (n=286); failing
555 tuberculosis treatment as demonstrated by a positive sputum smear or culture after ≥3 months of standard tuberculosis treatment (n=134); close
556 contact with a known DR-TB case (n=59); newly diagnosed with MDR-TB within the last 30 days (n=305); or previously diagnosed with MDR-
557 TB and failed tuberculosis treatment as demonstrated by a positive sputum smear or culture after ≥3 months of a standard MDR-TB treatment
558 regimen (n=103). Many patients reported more than one risk factor for drug-resistant tuberculosis.

559 † Culture-negative test results were observed in this study as the screening test (Xpert MTB/RIF or Ultra) was performed prior to enrolment on a
560 different sputum sample than the sputum sample that was used for direct Xpert MTB/XDR and culture.

561 ‡ The sum for individual drugs does not correspond to 611 as some samples had no reference standard (phenotypic drug susceptibility testing
562 and/or whole genome sequencing) result for certain drugs.


563 **Figure 2. Sensitivity and specificity of the sputum-based Xpert MTB/XDR assay for**
 564 **resistance detection compared with a composite reference standard of phenotypic DST and**
 565 **WGS.**



566
 567 AMK: amikacin; CAP: capreomycin; ETH: ethionamide; FN: false negatives; FP: false positives; FQ: fluoroquinolones; INH: isoniazid; KAN:
 568 kanamycin; Sens: sensitivity; Spec: specificity; TN: true negatives; TP, true positives.

569
 570
 571

572 **Figure 3. Sensitivity of the Xpert MTB/XDR assay for resistance detection by clinical site,**
 573 **compared with a composite reference standard of phenotypic DST and WGS.**



574

575 AMK: amikacin; CAP: capreomycin; ETH: ethionamide; FN: false negatives; FP: false positives; FQ: fluoroquinolones; INH: isoniazid; KAN:
576 kanamycin; NITRD: National Institute of TB and Respiratory Diseases; PPI: Phthisiopneumology Institute; TN: true negatives; TP, true
577 positives; WHC: Wits Health Consortium.
578 Note: Specificity was above 98% for all drugs and all sites.
579 Note: a table of Xpert MTB/XDR and reference standard discordant results is available in Supplement S3.