A customizable multiplex protein microarray for antibody testing and its application for tick-borne and other infectious diseases.

Hari Krishnan Krishnamurthy[1]*, Vasanth Jayaraman[1], Karthik Krishna[1], Tianhao Wang[1], Kang Bei[1], Chithra Suresh[2], Shiny Matilda[2], Alex J Rai[3], Renata Welc-Falęciak[4], Agnieszka Pawełczyk[5], Lucas S. Blanton[6], Aleš Chrdle[7], Andrea Fořtová[8], Daniel Růžek[9], Gheyath K. Nasrallah[10], Laith J. Abu-Raddadi[10], Duaa W. Al-Sadeq[10], Marah Abed Alhakim Abdallah[10], Daniele Lilleri[11], Chiara Fornara[11], Piera D'Angelo[11], Milena Furione[11], Maria Söderlund-Venermo[12], Klaus Hedman[12], Dimosthenis Chochlakis[13], Anna Psaroulaki[13], Eirini Makridaki[13], Artemis Ntoula[13], John J. Rajasekaran[1].

1 Vibrant Sciences LLC., San Carlos, CA, United States of America

2 Vibrant America LLC., San Carlos, CA, United States of America

3 Columbia University, Irving Medical Center, Dept. of Pathology & Cell Biology

4 Department of Parasitology, Faculty of Biology, University of Warsaw, Diagnostic Laboratory of Parasitic Diseases and Zoonotic Infections, Biological and Chemical Research Centre, Warsaw, Poland.

5 Department of Immunopathology of Infectious and Parasitic Diseases, Medical University of Warsaw, 3C Pawińskiego Street, 02-106, Warsaw, Poland

6 Department of Internal Medicine, Division of Infectious Diseases, University of Texas Medical Branch, Galveston, TX 77555, USA.

7 Department of Infectious Diseases, Hospital Ceske Budejovice, Ceske Budejovice, Czech Republic; Royal Liverpool University Hospital, Prescot St, Liverpool L7 8XP, UK.

8 Veterinary Research Institute, Brno, Czech Republic; Faculty of Science, Masaryk University, Brno, Czech Republic

9 Institute of Parasitology, Biology Centre of the Czech Academy of Sciences, Ceske Budejovice, Czech Republic; Veterinary Research Institute, Brno, Czech Republic, Faculty of Science, Masaryk University, Brno, Czech Republic.

10 Biomedical Sciences Department, College of Health Sciences, Qatar University, Doha P.O. Box 2713, Qatar.

11 Microbiologia e Virologia, Fondazione IRCCS Policlinico San Matteo, 27100 Pavia, Italy.

12 Virology, University of Helsinki, Haartmaninkatu 3, FI-00290, Helsinki, Finland.

13 Laboratory of Clinical Microbiology and Microbial Pathogenesis, School of Medicine, University of Crete, PC 70013, Heraklion – Crete – Greece.

Corresponding Author: * hari@vibrantsci.com (HKK)

Vasanth Jayaraman: vasanth.jayaraman@vibrantsci.com

Karthik Krishna: karthik@vibrantsci.com

Tianhao Wang: tianhao.wang@vibrantsci.com

Kang Bei: kang@vibrantsci.com

Chithra Suresh: chithra.s@vitasoft-tech.com

Shiny Matilda: shiny.m@vitasoft-tech.com

Alex J Rai: ajr2170@cumc.columbia.edu

Renata Welc-Falęciak: rwelc@biol.uw.edu.pl

Agnieszka Pawełczyk: agnieszka.pawelczyk@wum.edu.pl

Lucas Blanton: lsblanto@utmb.edu

Aleš Chrdle: chrdle.ales@nemcb.cz

Andrea Fořtová: fortova@vri.cz

Daniel Růžek: ruzekd@paru.cas.cz

Gheyath K. Nasrallah: gheyath.nasarallah@qu.edu.qa

Laith J. Abu-Raddadi: lja2002@qatar-med.cornell.edu

Duaa W. Al-Sadeq: da1206066@student.qu.edu.qa

Marah Abed Alhakim Abdallah: marah.hakim3@gmail.com

Daniele Lilleri: d.lilleri@smatteo.pv.it

Chiara Fornara: c.fornara@smatteo.pv.it

Piera D'Angelo: p.dangelo@smatteo.pv.it

Milena Furione: m.furione@smatteo.pv.it

Maria Söderlund-Venermo: maria.soderlund-venermo@helsinki.fi

Klaus Hedman: klaus.hedman@helsinki.fi

Dimosthenis Chochlakis: surreydimos@hotmail.com

Anna Psaroulaki: psaroulaki@uoc.gr

Eirini Makridaki: rmakridaki@yahoo.gr

Artemis Ntoula: artemisntoula@gmail.com

John J. Rajasekaran: jjrajasekaran@vibrantsci.com

Abstract

Tick-borne infections are the most common vector-borne diseases in the USA. Ticks harbor and spread several infections with Lyme disease being the most common tickborne infection in the US and Europe. Lack of awareness about tick populations, specific diagnostic tests, and overlapping symptoms of tick-borne infections can often lead to misdiagnosis affecting treatment and the prevalence data reported especially for non-Lyme tick-borne infections. The diagnostic tests currently available for tick-borne diseases are severely limited in their ability to provide accurate results and cannot detect multiple pathogens in a single run. The multiplex protein microarray developed at Vibrant was designed to detect multiple serological antibodies thereby detecting exposure to multiple pathogens simultaneously. Our microarray in its present form can accommodate 400 antigens and can multiplex across antigen types, whole cell sonicates, recombinant proteins, and peptides. A designed array containing multiple antigens of several microbes including *Borrelia burgdorferi*, the Lyme disease spirochete, was manufactured and evaluated. The immunoglobulin M (IgM) and G (IgG) responses against several tick-borne microbes and other infectious agents were analyzed for analytical and clinical performance. The microarray improved IgM and IgG sensitivities and specificities of individual microbes when compared with the respective gold standards. The testing was also performed in a single run in comparison to multiple runs needed for comparable testing standards. In summary, our study presents a flexible multiplex microarray platform that can provide quick results with high sensitivity and specificity for evaluating exposure to varied infectious agents especially tick-borne infections.

Keywords: Tick-borne infections, Lyme disease, multiplex, microarray, immunoglobulin, tick bite, co-infections, infectious disease.

Introduction

Most vector-borne infections in the USA can be attributed to pathogens transmitted via tick bites. Of all tick-borne infections identified to date, Lyme disease is the most prevalent infection [1]. Lyme disease is a potentially serious bacterial infection transmitted by ticks and was first reported in the mid-1970s in the USA. The etiological agent was identified later as *Borrelia burgdorferi* [2,3,4]. Several studies have reported the presence of co-infections along with Lyme disease [5] including *Babesia spp*. [6], *Bartonella spp*. [7], *Ehrlichia spp*. [8], *Anaplasma phagocytophilum* [8], Powassan Virus [9], *Toxoplasma gondii* [10], *Rickettsia spp*. [11], tick-borne encephalitis virus [12], and West Nile virus [13]. Additionally, prolonged exposure to Lyme and other tick-borne infections could potentially weaken the patient's immune system increasing the risk of infections like Epstein Barr virus [14], cytomegalovirus [14], parvovirus B19 [5], coxsackie virus [15], HSV-1 [16], HSV-2 [16], and HHV-6 [14].

Ticks have been shown to transmit more than one infectious agent in a single bite. For instance, a study by Wormser et al. showed that there was a chance of getting infected with *A. phagocytophilum* (30%) and *B. microti* (24%) along with Lyme disease [17]. Currently, multi-tiered testing is carried out for diagnosing tick-borne infections [18] (https://tinyurl.com/yeyxevve). In this method, the infectious agents are tested sequentially, starting with Lyme disease. This method is time-consuming and can often lead to delayed diagnosis, accompanied with high cost to the patient [18, 19] (https://tinyurl.com/yeyxevve). Testing for multiple infections in a single run can help physicians arrive at an accurate diagnosis especially since Lyme disease shares symptoms with other vector-borne co-infections [20]. The existing diagnostic assays possess various limitations that restrict their applicability in the diagnosis of these infections. The diagnosis of Lyme disease and other

infections using several blot-based and single-plex ELISA tests remain rudimentary in terms of arriving at a diagnostic conclusion [21]. Additionally, blot-based assays may have overlapping proteins with similar mass requiring additional testing to tease out the specific antigen to which the antibody is bound. A multiplex system can detect the biomarkers of Lyme disease, potential co-infections, and other infections in a single run. A serology-based multiplexing system may be preferred to a PCR multiplex system mainly due to its accessibility, for instance using dried blood spots [22]. Additionally, serology overcomes the issue of low availability of genetic material due to the transient nature of some of these organisms [23]. A serological-based system is also ideal for population screening and surveillance since it can indicate past exposure to a pathogen.

Our customisable protein microarray design includes antigens physically separated by design unlike blot assays and can multiplex across species. Multiplexing can also be done across antigen types such as recombinant proteins, peptides, and lysates simultaneously. This method can lower test costs since all the manufacturing is automated using bio customised semiconductor processes similar to how electronic chips are made. The multiplex microarray has three main advantages over the existing technologies. It has an ultra-high-density array surface with high reproducibility and better throughput. It can detect a large number of antibodies against varied infectious agents at the same time. Detection of antibodies can be performed using low sample volumes with low cost and a fast turnaround time [21]. Given the flexible nature of the multiplex platform, we aimed to provide a multiplexed testing solution for Lyme, its co-infections, and other possible infections of interest.

Materials and Methods

Patients Sera

The sera from 2990 individuals were collected after seeking appropriate Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval under respective collaborators (Supplementary Table 6). Table 1 lists the provided samples for Lyme disease, co-infections, and other infections along with the counts, respective collaborators and methods used to ascertain the clinical diagnosis by the physician. These reference sera were tested at Vibrant America Clinical Labs (CLIA and CAP accredited facility) by laboratory personnel in a blinded manner. The sera from healthy patients were considered negative and were used to set the cut-off values and were investigated under IRB exemption (work order #1-1574995-1) determined by the Western Institutional Review Board (WIRB) to employ de-linked and de-identified human specimens and medical data for research findings. The negative sera were collected from across the US including endemic and nonendemic regions for these infections.

Processing of Wafers

Wafers were functionalized as described previously [21,24] (https://tinyurl.com/mr9ctppy). Briefly, silicon wafers were exposed to an environment of pure oxygen for 2h followed by washing (deionized Water) and coating (1% (vol/vol) with 3-aminopropyltriethoxysilane (APTES) in N-methylpyrrolidone (NMP). Curing was carried out at 120 °C for 60 minutes under an N2 atmosphere and humidity-controlled environment. Coating and incubation of the wafer with a co-polymer solution of poly (L-lysine) and poly (lactic acid) for 24h were carried out to increase the binding efficiency of the surface on to which the antigens were immobilized via passive adsorption/hydrophobic interactions with the copolymers [Figure 1].

Immobilization of Antigens

The antigens included in the assay are listed in Table 2. Pathogens transmitted by ticks and their respective antigens for potential future additions are listed in Figure 2 [25-30] (https://tinyurl.com/37dprsy7). The recombinant antigens were expressed in *E. coli* bacteria using full-length cDNA coding for the respective antigens fused with a hexa histidine purification tag. The whole cell sonicate was obtained from organisms cultured according to ATCC protocols prior to lysing them which yielded a cocktail of the cell membrane, cell wall, and cytosolic proteins. Peptide antigens were synthesized by photolithography as shown in our previous publications [31,32]. The capture antigens including the recombinant antigens that mimic the natural pathogen and the whole-cell sonicate were incubated on the wafer at a concentration of 1.0 μg/ml and reacted for 24h at 4 °C. The unbound antigens were removed by washing with aqueous phosphate buffer and the unreacted substrate was quenched with a blocking solution containing BSA and glycine. The immobilized antigens were classified with unique identifiers assigned to each wafer. In this study, we employed the microarray to detect Lyme disease, co-infections, and other agents of interest including, *B. microti*, *B. henselae*, *A. phagocytophilum*, *E. chaffeensis*, *R. typhi*, Powassan virus , tick-borne encephalitis virus, West Nile virus, coxsackie virus, cytomegalovirus, Epstein Barr virus, parvovirus B19, *T. gondii*, HSV-1, HSV-2, and HHV-6 [Figure 2].

Pillar Plate Assembly

Individual wafers were stealth diced into 0.70 x 0.70mm^2 microchips for each antigen. A standard die-sorting system was used to pick and place these wafers onto individual carrier tapes. The carrier tapes were then placed onto a high-throughput surface mount technology (SMT) component placement system. Finally, microchips were mounted onto 24 pillar plates and each pillar contains 87 microchips with each chip designated for one antigen – recombinant protein, peptide or whole cell sonicates [Figure 1].

Immunochip assay and Antibody detection

Serum samples were probed using 1:20 dilution on the pillar plate and incubated for 1h at room temperature followed by alternate washing and incubation as described previously [21]. The plate was then incubated for an hour with the secondary antibody (1:2000 dilution of Goat Anti-Human IgG HRP and Goat Anti-Human IgM HRP individually) and washed with TBST buffer followed by DI Water. The plates were left for drying preceding the addition of chemiluminescent substrate and the performance of chemiluminescent imaging. An enhanced IgM sensitivity was achieved by pre-reacting the sera with proprietary assay components leading to IgG stripping prior to IgM testing.

The detection of multiplex antibodies is based on the chemiluminescent immunoassay and can be performed using <200 μL of serum. Sample dilution, multi-step incubation, and multi-solution washing are programmed into liquid handlers. The immunochip has the capacity to assay 192 individual specimens in 2h. Raw chemiluminescent signals for each probe are extracted and converted into intensity plots by an in-house reporter software. This method of automatic antigen detection can dramatically shorten the turnaround time, reduce the cost of labor and instrument, and eliminate the need for manual handling and subjective interpretation of the WB or IB test results when compared to the traditional two-tiered testing recommended by the CDC. All the antibodies are detected in a single run.

Data analysis

An in-house software extracts the chemiluminescent signals from the generated images which were converted to intensity plots. The average intensity of each antibody was compared with the cut-off values assigned for each antigen to track seropositivity.

Results

Custom Protein Microarray Platform

The main components of the Immunochip platform include multiple silicon-based 0.70 × 0.70 mm^2 microchips that are laser diced from antigen-immobilized wafers, a customized 24 well compatible plate containing 24 pillars, each containing 87 microchips that are picked and placed into a multiplex microarray assembly, and a high-resolution imager capable of simultaneously detecting chemiluminescent signals from labelled antigen–antibody reactions at each microchip throughout the multiplex microarray (Figure 1). Each chip can be considered analogous to an individual band in a Western blot; however, the proteins are physically separated eliminating cross-reactive issues usually seen in blot-based assays for proteins with similar mass. Figure 1 provides an overview of the microarray manufacturing process. Figure 2 shows the individual chips that are placed in each pillar, a single serum sample will be applied to each pillar thereby assaying the antibodies in serum against all antigens at the same time.

Analysis of serological response

The Vibrant tick-borne disease panel tests for IgG and IgM antibodies for Lyme disease and other infectious agents as mentioned in Table 2 and Figure 2. The IgM and IgG immune responses were analysed, and the clinical sensitivities and specificities were tabulated in Table 3. The samples reacted with a specific immunoreactive epitope of the 87 different antigens that were being tested. The immunoreactivity of these antigens was contrasted with that of the controls.

Enhanced IgM Assay

IgM antibodies are the primary antibodies produced by the immune system during infections, but they make up only 5% to 10% of all the circulating antibodies [33]. An in-house IgM assay was developed to remove most IgG antibodies and other non-specific proteins from the serum prior to the IgM immunoassay. This helped to increase the sensitivity and specificity of the assay. Human IgG was removed by incubating the serum with a purified goat anti-human (GAH) IgG Fc fragment and proprietary assay reagents.

Analytical Performance

The analytical performance of the immunochip was evaluated for precision (repeatability/reproducibility), analytical sensitivity, reportable range, linearity, and matrix equivalency studies. Samples for negatives, low or moderate positives, and high positives were run with duplication to determine the analytical performance metrics. The precision study used a panel of 11 samples and was run over a period of 20 days with 2 duplicates per run and 4 runs per day. The results are tabulated as shown in Supplementary Table 1. Lot to Lot reproducibility was also tested to check for variation in the manufacturing of the pillar plates by running a panel of 11 samples with 5 replicates per run, 3 runs per day over a period of 5 days using 3 manufactured lots. The results are tabulated as shown in Supplementary Table 2. Testing of protein-free serum matrix samples and low antibody concentration samples with 2 replicates per run, 2 runs per day over a period of three days was used to determine analytical sensitivity. The limit of blank (LoB) and limit of quantitation (LoQ) was calculated using the mean and standard deviation of the blank and the low antibody concentration samples as shown in Supplementary Table 3. The linearity and reportable range were verified by running samples with varying levels of antibodies and checking assay

recovery, the results are tabulated in Supplementary Table 4. Matrix equivalence studies are shown in Supplementary Table 5. The potential interference of specific endogenous and exogenous substances with the immunochip was evaluated by performing an interfering substance study. The interfering substances tested were 60 mg/dl bilirubin, 100 mg/ml cholesterol, 1000 mg/ml triglycerides, 1000 mg/ml hemoglobin, and 6 g/dl albumin. There was no interference between the immunochip and the substances tested at the mentioned levels.

Clinical Sensitivity and Specificity

Table 3 provides an overview of the IgG and IgM sensitivities measured by the Vibrant microarray. This is compared with the sensitivities and specificities of the current gold standard tests for the particular pathogen. The Vibrant microarray was able to achieve high sensitivities and specificities when compared with the gold standards for each pathogen. Supplementary Table 7 provides more details on the gold standard diagnostic tests for the pathogens along with the modes of transmission and their endemic regions.

Evaluating the antigens of *Borrelia burgdorferi*

In this study, individual antigens of *B. burgdorferi* were tested for reactivity with IgG and IgM antibodies (Table 4). The heat map (Figure 3) shows the performance metrics of the different antigens. Testing for Lyme disease since 1994 has been based on conventional two-tiered testing (CTTT) where an enzyme immunoassay (EIA) is followed by a specific immunoblot for a definitive diagnosis. Recently, CTTT has been replaced with a modified two-tier testing (MTTT) in which an EIA using whole cell sonicate is followed by an EIA using C6 peptide. This shows the increasing shift away from blot-based testing to conventional ELISA. MTTT removes the burden of immunoblots which are tedious to run,

more expensive and could have subjective interpretation of bands [49]. Complete replacement of immunoblots can be done using a microarray platform such as the one described here. The full data set would be available to the physicians to make a nuanced diagnosis instead of a narrow subset of antigens run on ELISAs.

Discussion

Ticks are among the most important sources of vector-borne infections in the US [50]. The spread of ticks across the US has been steadily increasing over the past decades. In parallel, the discovery of novel pathogens that are spread by ticks has also seen dramatic increases [51]. Currently, there are 11 major tickborne diseases according to the CDC namely, Lyme disease, babesiosis, ehrlichiosis, Rocky Mountain spotted fever, Southern tick-associated rash illness, tick-borne relapsing fever, tularemia, anaplasmosis, Colorado tick fever, and Powassan encephalitis [52] (https://www.cdc.gov/ticks/diseases/index.html). Patients are rarely tested for all possible infections that could be transmitted via a tick bite [53]. The current diagnostic tests are severely limited in distinguishing various tick-borne infections and several studies have revealed that non-Lyme tick-borne infections are heavily underdiagnosed [54].

Among varied testing options PCR and serology-based assays are reliable and most widely used. PCR has several advantages as it detects pathogenic DNA/RNA which conclusively proves the organism's presence. It has high specificity and has a high throughput with assay run times of about 2 hours. It can also detect the infection during its early stages [55]. There are however certain drawbacks to testing using PCR, especially with tickborne infections. Pathogens transmitted by ticks may be transient in the blood resulting in false negative PCR

results in tick-borne diseases, namely, *B. burgdorferi*, *R. typhi*, *T. gondii*, HSV-1, EBV, TBEV, and WNV [23]. PCR testing requires specialised laboratories and equipment for testing. PCR may not detect all strains and variants and is limited to detecting known pathogens [56]. Multiplexing using PCR is limited due to fixed number of analytes that can be parallelly read using PCR instrumentation.

Serology-based testing has several advantages when it comes to tick-borne infection testing. It has the ability to comprehensively assess immune responses and simultaneously detect exposure to multiple pathogens including previous and unresolved infections. Testing two times with a time interval in between can also help diagnose active infections based on altered serum antibody profiles. Simultaneous detection of antibodies against multiple tick-borne pathogens using a single sample and providing a comprehensive view of the patient's immune response is a key advantage of serology-based multiplex testing [23]. The testing can also be done in resource poor settings with collection using a dried blood spot [22]. Serological testing can diagnose tick-borne diseases even in the later stages when pathogen detection through molecular methods becomes more challenging [23,57]. It also reduces the risk of false negatives [57]. Serological multiplex testing being cost-effective can also contribute to surveillance and epidemiological studies by providing valuable data on the prevalence and distribution of tick-borne diseases, enhancing our understanding of disease dynamics [58]. However, serological studies have their own limitations. Serological testing may not be able to detect early/recent infections. It relies heavily on the timing of sample collection and the host's immune responses. In certain cases, molecular testing may be needed to confirm serological testing [23]. Despite all this, the benefits of serology testing outweigh its limitations which is why it is recommended by the CDC as the standard of testing for Lyme disease.

Apart from PCR and ELISA serology tests, IFA and culture methods have also been suggested for diagnosing tick-borne infections. Testing using IFA is limited due to a lack of standardized antigenic targets, the subjective establishment of positive thresholds, and cross reactivity. These factors can result in varying accuracy of IFA results across laboratories [23]. Furthermore, Bacterial or viral cultures are not recommended for the diagnosis of tick-borne infections. This is due to the time-consuming nature of the test, the need for special media, and procedures that are only performed at specific laboratories [61].

This study employed a serology-based microarray developed at Vibrant to multiplex Lyme and other tick-borne infections along with a few other infections of interest. The uniqueness of the microarray lies in the application of the immunodominant antigens that eliminate nonspecific binding with high sensitivity needed for accurate diagnosis. Antigens could be evaluated in a multiplex setting to gauge their performance with clinical samples to pick the ideal set of antigens for any infection. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first report on the broad panel of antigens for Lyme disease and its co-infection testing in such a flexible format. The structure of the Vibrant pillar plate is designed to encompass 400 probe chips at each pillar facilitating the detection of an array of co-infections in a single run, saving cost, labor, and time. Further compaction of the chip allows improved performance by enhancing multiplexing and widening its clinical applications. The microarray platform is advantageous over other existing gold standards for tick-borne diseases and was able to overcome several of their limitations. Average time for multitier testing for several tickborne pathogens could take several months whereas the microarray technology takes only about a day to perform [21]. The microarray detected 17 tick-borne and other infections along with Lyme disease with sensitivities and specificities listed in Table 3.

In conclusion, the protein microarray with a multiplex of antigens was validated for Lyme and its co-infections. The impact of simultaneous testing of co-infections leads to focused and efficacious therapeutic recommendations. This approach caters to the diagnostic needs of patients owing to its high sensitivity and specificity, affordable cost, quick availability of results, and low sample volume requirement. Measures for syndromic surveillance, diagnostic preparedness in disease outbreak investigations, personal protection, and education of clinical health professionals and patients could pave the way for controlling tick-borne infections better. As the known repertoire of antigens increases, this flexible microarray format can be customised to include these new antigens. Future editions could also include other infections/agents namely Colorado tick fever, heartland virus, rickettsiosis, Rocky Mountain spotted fever, Southern tick-associated rash illness, tick-borne relapsing fever, and tularemia which can be tested in parallel. Novel antigens for pathogens which may include whole cell sonicates, recombinant proteins or peptide epitopes can be added as the science progresses leading to continuous improvement in diagnostic technology for detecting tick-borne infections.

Declarations:

Author Contributions

Conception and study design: HKK, JJR, VJ. Performing experiments: KK, TW. Analysis and interpretation: KB, KK. Writing-original draft: HKK, CS, SM. Review and editing: HKK, CS, AJR, RWF, AP, LSB, AC, AF, DR, GKN, LJA, DWA, MAA, DL, CF, PD, MF, MSV, KH, DC, AP, EM, and AN. Sample resources: RWF, AP, LSB, AC, AF, DR, GKN, LJA, DWA, MAA, DL, CF, PD, MF, MSV, KH, DC, AP, EM, and AN. All authors reviewed and approved the final manuscript.

Competing interests

The authors have read the journal's policy and the authors of this manuscript have the following competing interests: CS and SM are paid employees of Vibrant America LLC. KK, VJ, TW, KB, HKK, and JJR are paid employees of Vibrant Sciences LLC. The other authors are academic collaborators who provided samples and assisted in the review and editing of the manuscript. AJR is a paid consultant of Vibrant America LLC. Vibrant America offers commercial testing for Lyme disease and other infectious diseases and could benefit from increased testing.

Funding

Vibrant America provided funding for this study in the form of salaries for authors [CS, SM, KK, VJ, TW, KB, HKK, JJR]. The funders had no role in study design, data collection, analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript.

Acknowledgment

Vibrant Sciences LLC developed the microarray technology showcased in the publication. All IP associated with the microarray manufacture and diagnostics belongs to Vibrant Sciences. The specific roles of authors are stated in the author contribution section.

Availability of Data

The data used to support the findings of this study can be acquired from Vibrant America LLC.

References

1. Rochlin, I., & Toledo, A. (2020). Emerging tick-borne pathogens of public health importance: a mini-review. *J Med Microbiol*, *69*(6), 781–791.

2. Burgdorfer, W., Barbour, A. G., Hayes, S. F., Benach, J. L., Grunwaldt, E., & Davis, J. P. (1982). Lyme disease—a tick-borne spirochetosis?. *Science*, *216*(4552), 1317-1319.
3. Johnson, R. C., Schmid, G. P., Hyde, F. W., Steigerwalt, A. G., & Brenner, D. J. (1984). Borrelia burgdorferi sp. nov.: etiologic agent of Lyme disease. *International Journal of Systematic and Evolutionary Microbiology*, *34*(4), 496-497.
4. Steere, A. C., Strle, F., Wormser, G. P., Hu, L. T., Branda, J. A., Hovius, J. W., ... & Mead, P. S. (2016). Lyme borreliosis. *Nature reviews Disease primers*, *2*(1), 1-19.
5. Berghoff, W. (2012). Chronic Lyme Disease and Co-infections: Differential Diagnosis. *Open Neurol J*, *6*(Suppl 1), 158–178.
6. Knapp, K. L., & Rice, N. A. (2015). Human Coinfection with Borrelia burgdorferi and Babesia microti in the United States. *J Parasitol Res*, *16*(3), 385–391.
7. Angelakis, E., Billeter, S. A., Breitschwerdt, E. B., Chomel, B. B., & Raoult, D. (2010). Potential for Tick-borne Bartonelloses. Emerg Infect Dis, 16(3), 385–391.
8. Ismail, N., Bloch, K. C., & McBride, J. W. (2010). Human Ehrlichiosis and Anaplasmosis. *Clin Lab Med*, *30*(1), 261–292.
9. Hart, C. E., Middleton, F. A., & Thangamani, S. (2022). Infection with Borrelia burgdorferi Increases the Replication and Dissemination of Coinfecting Powassan Virus in Ixodes scapularis Ticks. *Viruses*, *14*(7), 1584.
10. Ben-Harari, R. R. (2019). Tick transmission of toxoplasmosis. *Expert Review of Anti-infective Therapy*, *17*(11), 911-917.
11. Koetsveld, J., Tijsse-Klasen, E., Herremans, T., Hovius, J. W. R., & Sprong, H. (2016). Serological and molecular evidence for spotted fever group Rickettsia and Borrelia burgdorferi sensu lato co-infections in The Netherlands. *Ticks Tick Borne Dis*, *7*(2), 371-7.
12. Gustafson, R., Svenungsson, B., Gardulf, A., Stiernstedt, G., & Forsgren, M. (1990). Prevalence of tick-borne encephalitis and Lyme borreliosis in a defined Swedish population. *Scand J Infect Dis*, *22*(3), 297-306.
13. Lawrie, C. H., Uzcátegui, N. Y., Gould, E. A., & Nuttall, P. A. (2004). Ixodid and argasid tick species and West Nile virus.
14. Smith, A., Oertle, J., Warren, D., & Prato, D. (2015). Chronic Lyme Disease Complex and Its Commonly Undiagnosed Primary and Secondary Co-Infections. *Open Journal of Medical Microbiology*, *5*(3).
15. Freundt, E. C., Beatty, D. C., Stegall-Faulk, T., & Wright, S. M. (2005). Possible Tick-Borne Human Enterovirus Resulting in Aseptic Meningitis. *J Clin Microbiol*, *43*(7), 3471–3473.
16. Gylfe, A., Wahlgren, M., Fahlén, L., & Bergström, S. (2002). Activation of latent Lyme borreliosis concurrent with a herpes simplex virus type 1 infection. *Scand J Infect Dis*, *34*(12), 922-4.
17. Wormser, G. P., McKenna, D., Scavarda, C., Cooper, D., El Khoury, M. Y., Nowakowski, J., ... & Wong, S. J. (2019). Co-infections in persons with early Lyme disease, New York, USA. *Emerging infectious diseases*, *25*(4), 748.
18. Quest diagnostics. (2018). *Tick-borne Diseases*. Quest Diagnostics.
19. Drew, D., & Hewitt, H. (2006). A qualitative approach to understanding patients' diagnosis of Lyme disease. *Public Health Nursing*, *23*(1), 20-26.

20. Beck, S., Nakajima, R., Jasinskas, A., Abram, T. J., Kim, S. J., Bigdeli, N., ... & Zhao, W. (2022). A protein microarray-based respiratory viral antigen testing platform for COVID-19 surveillance. *Biomedicines*, *10*(9), 2238.
21. Jayaraman, V., Krishna, K., Yang, Y., Rajasekaran, K. J., Ou, Y., Wang, T., Bei, K., Krishnamurthy, H. K., Rajasekaran, J. J., Rai, A. J., & Green, D. A. (2020). An ultra-high-density protein microarray for high throughput single-tier serological detection of Lyme disease. *Scientific Reports*, *10*, 18085.
22. Grossberg, A. N., Koza, L. A., Ledreux, A., Prusmack, C., Krishnamurthy, H. K., Jayaraman, V., Granholm, A. C., & Linseman, D. A. (2021). A multiplex chemiluminescent immunoassay for serological profiling of COVID-19-positive symptomatic and asymptomatic patients. *Nature communications*, *12*(740).
23. Tokarz, R., Mishra, N., Tagliafierro, T., Sameroff, S., Caciula, A., Chauhan, L., Patel, J., Sullivan, E., Gucwa, A., Fallon, B., Golightly, M., Molins, C., Schriefer, M., Marques, A., Briese, T., & Lipkin, W. I. (2018). A multiplex serologic platform for diagnosis of tick-borne diseases. *Sci Rep*, *8*(3158).
24. Rajasekaran, J. J., Jayaraman, V., Wang, T., Bei, K., Krishnamurthy, H, K. (2016). Methods, systems, and arrays for biomolecular analysis. *Patent No. 9417236B2*. United States.
25. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2022, August 5). *Tickborne Diseases of the United States*. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Retrieved September 8, 2023.
26. Alhassan, A., Liu, H., McGill, J., Cerezo, A., Jakkula, L. U. M. R., Nair, A. D. S., Winkley, E., Olson, S., Marlow, D., Sahni, A., Narra, H. P., Sahni, S., Henningson, J., & Ganta, R. R. (2019). Rickettsia rickettsii Whole-Cell Antigens Offer Protection against Rocky Mountain Spotted Fever in the Canine Host. *Infection and immunity*, *87*(2), e00628-18.
27. Blanc, G., Ngwamidiba, M., Ogata, H., Fournier, P. E., Claverie, J. M., & Raoult, D. (2005). Molecular evolution of rickettsia surface antigens: evidence of positive selection. *Molecular biology and evolution*, *22*(10), 2073-2083.
28. Pornwiroon, W., Bourchookarn, A., Paddock, C. D., & Macaluso, K. R. (2009). Proteomic analysis of Rickettsia parkeri strain portsmouth. *Infection and immunity*, *77*(12), 5262–5271.
29. Kubelkova, K., & Macela, A. (2021). *Francisella* and Antibodies. *Microorganisms*, *9*(10), 2136.
30. Zhu, Y., Wu, Y., Chai, Y., Qi, J., Peng, R., Feng, W. H., & Gao, G. F. (2017). The Postfusion Structure of the Heartland Virus Gc Glycoprotein Supports Taxonomic Separation of the Bunyaviral Families Phenuiviridae and Hantaviridae. *Journal of virology*, *92*(1), e01558-17.
31. Marietta, E. V., Choung, R. S., Van Dyke, C. T., Brantner, T. L., Rajasekaran, J. J., Pasricha, P. J., Wang, T., Bei, K., Krishna, K., Krishnamurthy, H. K., Snyder, M. R., Jayaraman, V., & Murray, J. A. (2016). Determination of B-Cell Epitopes in Patients with Celiac Disease: Peptide Microarrays. *PLoS One*, *11*(1), e0147777.
32. Rostamkolaei, S. K., Choung, R. S., Ju, J. M., Marietta, E. V., Van Dyke, C. T., Rajasekaran, J. J., Jayaraman, V., Wang, T., Bei, K., Rajasekaran, K. E., Krishna, K., Krishnamurthy, H. K., & Murray, J. A. (2019). Synthetic Neoepitopes of the

Transglutaminase-Deamidated Gliadin Complex as Biomarkers for Diagnosing and Monitoring Celiac Disease. *Gastroenterology*, *156*(3), 582-591.e1.

33. Terry, W. D., & Fahey, J. L. (1964). SUBCLASSES OF HUMAN GAMMA-2-GLOBULIN BASED ON DIFFERENCES IN THE HEAVY POLYPEPTIDE CHAINS. *Science*, *146*(3642), 400-1.
34. Moore, A., Nelson, C., Molins, C., Mead, P., & Schriefer, M. (2016). Current guidelines, common clinical pitfalls, and future directions for laboratory diagnosis of Lyme disease, United States. *Emerging infectious diseases*, *22*(7), 1169.
35. Ortiz, J. F., Millhouse, P. W., Cox, Á. M., Campoverde, L., Kaur, A., Wirth, M., & Atoot, A. (2020). Babesiosis: appreciating the pathophysiology and diverse sequela of the infection. *Cureus*, *12*(10).
36. Allizond, V., Costa, C., Sidoti, F., Scutera, S., Bianco, G., Sparti, R., ... & Musso, T. (2019). Serological and molecular detection of Bartonella henselae in specimens from patients with suspected cat scratch disease in Italy: A comparative study. *PloS one*, *14*(2), e0211945.
37. Reller, M. E., & Dumler, J. S. (2018). Development and clinical validation of a multiplex real-time quantitative PCR assay for human infection by Anaplasma phagocytophilum and Ehrlichia chaffeensis. *Tropical medicine and infectious disease*, *3*(1), 14.
38. Stewart, A. G., & Stewart, A. G. (2021). An update on the laboratory diagnosis of Rickettsia spp. infection. *Pathogens*, *10*(10), 1319.
39. Thomm, A. M., Schotthoefer, A. M., Dupuis, A. P., Kramer, L. D., Frost, H. M., Fritsche, T. R., ... & Kehl, S. C. (2018). Development and validation of a serologic test panel for detection of Powassan virus infection in US patients residing in regions where Lyme disease is endemic. *Msphere*, *3*(1), e00467-17.
40. Reusken, C., Boonstra, M., Rugebregt, S., Scherbeijn, S., Chandler, F., Avšič-Županc, T., ... & GeurtsvanKessel, C. H. (2019). An evaluation of serological methods to diagnose tick-borne encephalitis from serum and cerebrospinal fluid. *Journal of Clinical Virology*, *120*, 78-83.
41. Sambri, V., Capobianchi, M. R., Cavrini, F., Charrel, R., Donoso-Mantke, O., Escadafal, C., ... & Zeller, H. (2013). Diagnosis of west nile virus human infections: overview and proposal of diagnostic protocols considering the results of external quality assessment studies. *Viruses*, *5*(10), 2329-2348.
42. Bryant, P. A., Tingay, D., Dargaville, P. A., Starr, M., & Curtis, N. (2004). Neonatal coxsackie B virus infection—a treatable disease?. *European journal of pediatrics*, *163*, 223-228.
43. A Ross, S., Novak, Z., Pati, S., & B Boppana, S. (2011). Overview of the diagnosis of cytomegalovirus infection. *Infectious Disorders-Drug Targets (Formerly Current Drug Targets-Infectious Disorders)*, *11*(5), 466-474.
44. Jenson, H. B. (2004). Virologic diagnosis, viral monitoring, and treatment of Epstein-Barr virus infectious mononucleosis. *Current Infectious Disease Reports*, *6*, 200-207.
45. Manaresi, E., Gallinella, G., Zuffi, E., Bonvicini, F., Zerbini, M., & Musiani, M. (2002). Diagnosis and quantitative evaluation of parvovirus B19 infections by real□time PCR in the clinical laboratory. *Journal of medical virology*, *67*(2), 275-281.

46. Souza, I. M. F. N. B. D., Siqueira, V. D. S., Ribeiro, I. D. C., Moraes, L. S. P., Prado, D. P. G. D., Rezende, S. R., ... & Rezende, H. H. A. (2023). Molecular and serological diagnosis of toxoplasmosis: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Revista do Instituto de Medicina Tropical de São Paulo*, *65*, e19.
47. Singh, A., Preiksaitis, J., & Romanowski, B. (2005). The laboratory diagnosis of herpes simplex virus infections. *Canadian Journal of Infectious Diseases and Medical Microbiology*, *16*(2), 92-98.
48. Norton, R. A., Caserta, M. T., Hall, C. B., Schnabel, K., Hocknell, P., & Dewhurst, S. (1999). Detection of human herpesvirus 6 by reverse transcription-PCR. *Journal of clinical microbiology*, *37*(11), 3672-3675.
49. Lipsett, S. C., Branda, J. A., & Nigrovica, L. E. (2019). Evaluation of the Modified Two-Tiered Testing Method for Diagnosis of Lyme Disease in Children. *J Clin Microbiol*, *57*(10), e00547-19.
50. Eisen, R. J., Kugeler, K. J., Eisen, L., Beard, C. B., & Paddock, C. D. (2017). Tick-Borne Zoonoses in the United States: Persistent and Emerging Threats to Human Health. *ILAR J*, *58*(3), 319–335.
51. Paddock CD, Lane RS, Staples JE, et al. (2016). CHANGING PARADIGMS FOR TICK-BORNE DISEASES IN THE AMERICAS. In: Forum on Microbial Threats; Board on Global Health; Health and Medicine Division; National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. Global Health Impacts of Vector-Borne Diseases: Workshop Summary. Washington (DC): National Academies Press (US).
52. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2022, March 24). *Diseases Transmitted by Ticks*. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Retrieved August 31, 2023.
53. Brown Marusiak, A., Hollingsworth, B. D., Abernathy, H., Alejo, A., Arahirwa, V., Mansour, O., Giandomenico, D., Schmitz, J., Williams, C., Barbarin, A. M., & Boyce, R. M. (2022). Patterns Testing for Tick-Borne Diseases and Implications for Surveillance in the Southeastern US. *JAMA network open*, *5*(5), e2212334.
54. Institute of Medicine (US) Committee on Lyme Disease and Other Tick-Borne Diseases: The State of the Science. (2011). Diagnostics and Diagnosis. In *Critical Needs and Gaps in Understanding Prevention, Amelioration, and Resolution of Lyme and Other Tick-Borne Diseases: The Short-Term and Long-Term Outcomes: Workshop Report*. National Academies Press (US).
55. Elnifro, E. M., Ashshi, A. M., Cooper, R. J., & Klapper, P. E. (2000). Multiplex PCR: optimization and application in diagnostic virology. *Clin Microbiol Rev*, *13*(4), 559-70.
56. Liu, H. Y., Hopping, G. C., Vaidyanathan, U., Ronquillo, Y. C., Hoopes, P. C., & Moshirfar, M. (2019). Polymerase chain reaction and its application in the diagnosis of infectious keratitis. *Medical Hypothesis, Discovery and Innovation in Ophthalmology*, *8*(3), 152.
57. Leeflang, M. M., Ang, C. W., Berkhout, J., Bijlmer, H. A., Van Bortel, W., Brandenburg, A. H., Van Burgel, N. D., Van Dam, A. P., Dessau, R. B., Fingerle, V., Hovius, J. W., Jaulhac, B., Meijer, B., Van Pelt, W., Schellekens, J. F., Spijker, R., Stelma, F. F., Stanek, G., Verduyn-Lunel, F., Zeller, H., … Sprong, H. (2016). The diagnostic accuracy of serological tests for Lyme borreliosis in Europe: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMC infectious diseases*, *16*, 140.

58. Hilton, E., DeVoti, J., Benach, J. L., Halluska, M. L., White, D. J., Paxton, H., & Dumler, J. S. (1999). Seroprevalence and seroconversion for tick-borne diseases in a high-risk population in the northeast United States. *Am J Med*, *106*(4), 404-9.
59. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). (1995). Recommendations for test performance and interpretation from the Second National Conference on Serologic Diagnosis of Lyme Disease. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*, *44*(31), 590-1.
60. Aguero-Rosenfeld, M. E., Wang, G., Schwartz, I., & Wormser, G. P. (2005). Diagnosis of lyme borreliosis. *Clin Microbiol Rev*, *18*(3), 484-509.
61. Theel, E. S., Aguero-Rosenfeld, M. E., Pritt, B., Adem, P. V., & Wormser, G. P. (2019). Limitations and Confusing Aspects of Diagnostic Testing for Neurologic Lyme Disease in the United States. *J Clin Microbiol*, *57*(1), e01406-18.

Table 1 Sample Cohort

Pathogen	N	Source (scientist/company)	Basis of Diagnosis
Borrelia burgdorferi	298	CDC, Private Clinics	RT-PCR, Physician
Babesia microti	70	Parasitology Laboratory, Wadsworth Center (NYSDOH)	RT-PCR, Blood Smear
Babesia microti	118	Seracare, Boca Bio, Private Clinics	Serology, RT-PCR
Babesia microti	26	Renata Welc-Falęciak (University of Warsaw), Agnieszka Pawełczyk (Warsaw Medical University)	Physician
Bartonella henselae	119	Private clinics	RT-PCR, Physician
Bartonella henselae	26	Renata Welc-Falęciak (University of Warsaw), Agnieszka Pawełczyk (Warsaw Medical University)	Physician
Bartonella henselae	10	Dimosthenis Chochlakis (University of Crete)	Physician
Anaplasma phagocytophilum	118	Private clinics, Boca Bio	RT-PCR, Serology
Anaplasma phagocytophilum	26	Renata Welc-Falęciak (University of Warsaw), Agnieszka Pawełczyk (Warsaw Medical University)	Physician
Ehrlichia chaffeensis	120	Private clinics, Boca Bio	RT-PCR, Serology
Ehrlichia chaffeensis	26	Renata Welc-Falęciak (University of Warsaw), Agnieszka Pawełczyk (Warsaw Medical University)	Physician
Rickettsia typhi	70	Lucas Blanton (University of Texas Medical Branch)	Physician
Rickettsia typhi	124	Private clinics	RT-PCR, Physician
Powassan virus	127	Private clinics	RT-PCR, Physician
Tick-borne encephalitis	111	Daniel Rużek (Czech Academy of Sciences)	Physician

Tick-borne encephalitis	124	Private clinics	RT-PCR, Physician
West Nile virus	20	Gheyath K. Nasrallah (Weill Cornell Medicine-Qatar)	Physician
West Nile virus	124	Private clinics	RT-PCR, Physician
Coxsackie virus	45	iSpecimen	Serology
Coxsackie virus	124	Private clinics	RT-PCR, Physician
Cytomegalovirus	43	DLS	Serology
Cytomegalovirus	138	Daniele Lilleri (Fondazione IRCCS Policlinico San Matteo)	Physician
Cytomegalovirus	96	Private Clinics	RT-PCR, Physician
Cytomegalovirus	37	Seracare	Serology
Epstein Barr virus	20	Gheyath K. Nasrallah (Weill Cornell Medicine-Qatar)	Physician
Epstein Barr virus	43	Seracare	Serology
Epstein Barr virus	14	iSpecimen	Serology
Epstein Barr virus	96	Private clinics	RT-PCR, Physician
Parvovirus B19	124	Private clinics	RT-PCR, Physician
Toxoplasma gondii	24	Seracare	Serology
Toxoplasma gondii	124	Private clinics	RT-PCR, Physician
HSV-1	20	Gheyath K. Nasrallah (Weill Cornell Medicine-Qatar)	Physician
HSV-1	31	Seracare	Serology
HSV-1	96	Private clinics	RT-PCR, Physician
HSV-2	19	Gheyath K. Nasrallah (Weill Cornell Medicine-Qatar)	Physician
HSV-2	27	Seracare	Serology
HSV-2	96	Private clinics	RT-PCR, Physician
HHV-6	20	Gheyath K. Nasrallah (Weill Cornell Medicine-Qatar)	Physician
HHV-6	96	Private clinics	RT-PCR, Physician

Table 1 provides an overview of the pathogens used in the study along with the total number of samples, basis of diagnosis, and sample source.

Table 2 Overview of pathogens and antigens

Pathogen(Tick, if any)	***Antigen***
B. burgdorferi (*I. scapularis*)	VlsE1, C6 peptide, DbpB, OspC, p28, p30, OspA, OspB, BmpA, p41, p45, p58, p66, p83-93, WCS B31, WCS 297.

B. mayonii (*I. scapularis*)	Whole cell sonicate
B. afzelii (*I. ricinus, I. persulatus*)	BmpA,DbpA,OspA,OspC,p100
B. garinii (*I. ricinus, I. persulatus*)	DBpA,OspC
B. bavariensis (*I. uriae, I. persulcatus)*	p58,VLsE1, DbpA
B. spielmanii (*I. ricinus*)	DBpA,OspC
B. hermsii (*O. hermsi*)	Whole cell sonicate
B. turicatae (*O. turicatae)*	Whole cell sonicate
B. miyamotoi (*I. dentatus, I. ricinus, I. scapularis, I. pacificus*)	GlpQ
B. andersonii (*I. dentatus*)	Whole cell sonicate
B. maritima (*I. spinipalpis*)	Whole cell sonicate
B. californiensis (*I. jellisonii, I. spinipalpis, I. pacificus*)	Whole cell sonicate
B. bissettiae (*I.scapularis, I. persulatus, I. spinipalpis, I. pacificus*)	Whole cell sonicate
B. lusitaniae (*I. Ricinus*)	Whole cell sonicate
B. valaisiana (*I. ricinus, I. nippopensis, I. columnae*)	Whole cell sonicate
B. yangtzensis (*I. granulatus, I. nipponensis*)	Whole cell sonicate
B. turcica (*H. aegypticum)*	Whole cell sonicate
Babesia microti (*I. ricinus, I. scapularis*, blood transfusions, perinatal)	IRA, p32, p41, WCS
Babesia duncani (*I. ricinus, I. scapularis*, blood transfusions, perinatal)	Whole cell sonicate
Bartonella henselae	17kDa, 26kDa, SucB
Bartonella elizabethae	Whole cell sonicate
Bartonella vinsonii	Whole cell sonicate
Bartonella quintana	Whole cell sonicate
Anaplasma phagocytophilum (*I. scapularis, I. ricinus*)	MSP5, MSP2, OmpA
Ehrlichia chaffeensis (*Amblyomma americanum*)	Whole cell sonicate
Rickettsia typhi (Flea *Xenopsylla cheopis, Ctenocephalides felis*)	Omp B, surface antigen
Powassan virus (*Hemaphysalis longicornis, I. scapularis, I.cookei*)	Whole cell sonicate
Tick-borne encephalitis virus (*I. ricinus, I. persulcatus*)	Whole cell sonicate
West Nile virus (*I. ricinus, O. moubata*)	Whole cell sonicate
Coxsackie virus (*Amblyomma americanum*)	Whole cell sonicate
Cytomegalovirus	EIA, gB,p150,p28,p52,pp65,p38
Epstein Barr virus	EA, EBNA1, VCA gp125,p18, p23
Parvovirus B19	VLP VLP2,VLP VP1/VP2 Co Capsid
Toxoplasma gondii (Multiple Ticks)	WCS, MIC3,p24,p29,p30

HSV-1	Whole cell sonicate
HSV-2	Whole cell sonicate
HHV-6	Whole cell sonicate

Table 2 consists of all the pathogens and their respective antigens.

Table 3 Antigen sensitivities

Pathogen	IgM		IgG		IgM+IgG		Gold Std [34-48]	
	Sensitivity	Specificity	Sensitivity	Specificity	Sensitivity	Specificity	Sensitivity	Specificity
	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)
Borrelia burgdorferi	60	100	94	100	100	100	Early: 30-40 Late: 70-100	95-100
Babesia microti	79	98	91	97	99	96	70-80	94-100
Bartonella henselae	81	99	96	99	100	98	100	96.8
Anaplasma phagocytophilum	94	100	100	100	100	100	80-100	95-100
Ehrlichia chaffeensis	84	100	100	99	100	99	83	100
Rickettsia typhi	86	100	83	100	97	100	80-100	91-100
Powassan virus	100	100	100	100	100	100	89	35-84
Tickborne encephalitis	78	99	92	99	93	98	94-100	>95
West Nile virus	25	100	80	100	85	100	80-95	94-100
Coxsackie virus	56	100	100	100	100	100	94-97	100
Cytomegalovirus	100	100	100	100	100	100	89.2	95
Epstein Barr virus VCA	100	100	96	100	97	100	80-95	>95
Epstein Barr virus EBNA1	95	100	96	100	97	100	80-95	>95
Parvovirus B19	90	99	98	98	99	97	>90	>90
Toxoplasma gondii	100	99	100	100	100	99	>90	>95
HSV-1	100	100	98	100	98	100	97-100	98
HSV-2	100	100	98	100	98	100	97-100	98
HHV-6	95	100	95	100	95	100	>95	>95

Table 3 shows the IgG, IgM, and IgG+IgM sensitivities and specificities obtained using the Vibrant microarray and a comparison with the sensitivities and specificities of the current gold standard for respective pathogens.

Table 4 Individual antigen sensitivities (*B. burgdorferi*)

Antigen	IgM	IgG
VlsE1	61%	91%
C6	39%	60%
B31	37%	48%
B297	36%	57%
p18	6%	41%
p23	47%	68%
p28	4%	28%
p30	5%	35%
p31	17%	38%
p34	16%	41%
p39	29%	66%
p41	34%	53%
p45	5%	35%
p58	5%	35%
p66	7%	39%
p93	32%	60%

Table 4 shows the IgG and IgM values for the individual antigens of *Borrelia burgdorferi*


STEP 01
Silicon Wafer Substrate
STEP 02
Surface Functionalization
STEP 03
Protein Immobilization
STEP 04
Stealth Dicing using Laser
STEP 05
Taping, Picking and Placing
STEP 06
Assemble Arrays
Wafer 1
Surface 1
Protein 1
Wafer 2
Surface 2
Protein 2
Wafer N
Surface N
Protein N


Babesia microti IRA
Babesia microti p32
Babesia microti p41
Babesia microti WCS
Borrelia burgdorferi VlsE1
Borrelia burgdorferi C6 peptide
Borrelia burgdorferi (OspC)
Borrelia burgdorferi (OspA)
Borrelia burgdorferi (OspB)
Borrelia burgdorferi BmpA
Borrelia burgdorferi p41
Borrelia burgdorferi p45
Borrelia burgdorferi p58
Borrelia burgdorferi p66
Borrelia burgdorferi p83-93
Borrelia burgdorferi WCS B31
Borrelia burgdorferi WCS 297
Bartonella elizabethae
Bartonella vinsonii
Bartonella quintana
Ehrlichia chaffeensis
Powassan virus WCS
Cytomegalovirus EIA
Cytomegalovirus gB
Cytomegalovirus p150
Cytomegalovirus p28
Cytomegalovirus p52
Cytomegalovirus pp65
Cytomegalovirus p38
Babesia duncani WCS
Bartonella henselae 17kDa
Bartonella henselae 26kDa
Bartonella henselae SucB
West Nile virus WCS
Coxsackie virus WCS
Anaplasma phagocytophilum MSP5
Anaplasma phagocytophilum MSP2
Anaplasma phagocytophilum OmpA
Tick-borne Encephalitis virus WCS
Epstein Barr virus EA
Epstein Barr virus EBNA1
Epstein Barr virus VCA
Epstein Barr virus gp125
Epstein Barr virus p18
Epstein Barr virus p23
Rickettsia typhi Omp B
Rickettsia typhi surface antigen
Parvovirus VLP VLP2
Parvovirus VLP VP1/VP2 Co Capsid
HSV-1 WCS
HSV-2 WCS
HHV-6 WCS
Toxoplasma gondii WCS
Toxoplasma gondii MIC3
Toxoplasma gondii p24
Toxoplasma gondii p29
Toxoplasma gondii p30
Future Additions:
Rickettsia rickettsi rompA
Rickettsia rickettsi rompB
Rickettsia parkeri OmpA
Rickettsia parkeri OmpB
Rickettsia parkeri PS 120
Rickettsia parkeri 17kDa
Francisella tularensis LPS O antigen
Heartland virus Gn
Heartland virus Gc
Colorado tick fever virus WCS
Bourbon virus WCS
Borrelia lonestari WCS
Borrelia mayonii WCS
Borrelia afzelii BmpA
Borrelia afzelii DbpA
Borrelia afzelii OspA
Borrelia afzelii OspC
Borrelia afzelii p100
Borrelia garinii DBpA
Borrelia garinii OspC
Borrelia bavariensis p58
Borrelia bavariensis VLsE1
Borrelia bavariensis DbpA
Borrelia spielmanii DBpA
Borrelia spielmanii OspC
Borrelia hermsii WCS
Borrelia turicatae WCS
Borrelia miyamotoi GlpQ
Borrelia andersonii WCS
Borrelia maritima WCS
Borrelia californiensis WCS
Borrelia bissettiae WCS
Borrelia lusitaniae WCS
Borrelia valaisiana WCS
Borrelia yangtzensis WCS
Borrelia turcica WCS