Performance assessment of a *Trypanosoma cruzi* chimeric antigen in multiplex liquid
 microarray assays

- linerourrag
- 3

Accepted Manuscript Posted Online

Journal of Clinical Microbiology 4

Fred Luciano Neves Santos,^{a,e}# Paola Alejandra Fiorani Celedon,^b Nilson Ivo Tonin
Zanchin,^c Amanda Leitolis,^b Sandra Crestani,^b Leonardo Foti,^{b,c} Wayner Vieira de
Souza,^d Yara de Miranda Gomes,^{d,e} Marco Aurélio Krieger^{b,c,e}

8

9 Gonçalo Moniz Institute, FIOCRUZ-BA, Salvador, Bahia, Brazil^a; Molecular Biology
10 Institute of Paraná, Curitiba, Paraná, Brazil^b; Carlos Chagas Institute, FIOCRUZ-PR,
11 Curitiba, Paraná, Brazil^c; Aggeu Magalhães Institute, FIOCRUZ-PE, Recife,
12 Pernambuco, Brazil^d; Programa Integrado de Doença de Chagas, Instituto Oswaldo
13 Cruz, FIOCRUZ-RJ, Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil^e

14

15 #Address correspondence to Fred Luciano Neves Santos, fred.santos@bahia.fiocruz.br.

16

17 Short title: LMA-based CD detection using chimeric antigens

18 Abstract

Diagnosing chronic Chagas disease (CD) requires antibody-antigen detection methods, 19 traditionally based on enzymatic assay techniques whose performance depend on the 20 21 type and quality of antigen used. Previously, 4 recombinant chimeric proteins from Instituto de Biologia Molecular do Paraná (IBMP-8.1 to -8.4) comprising immuno-22 dominant regions of diverse Trypanosoma cruzi antigens showed excellent diagnostic 23 24 performance in enzyme-linked immunosorbent assays. Considering that next-generation platforms offer improved CD diagnostic accuracy with different T. cruzi-specific 25 recombinant antigens, we assessed the performance of these chimeras in liquid 26 27 microarrays (LMAs). The chimeric proteins were expressed in Escherichia coli and purified by chromatography. Sera from 653 chagasic and 680 healthy individuals were 28 used to assess the performance of these chimeras in detecting specific anti-T. cruzi 29 30 antibodies. Accuracies ranged from 98.1-99.3%, and diagnostic odds ratio values were 3,548 for IBMP-8.3, 4,826 for IBMP-8.1, 7,882 for IBMP-8.2, and 25,000 for IBMP-31 32 8.4. A separate sera bank (851 samples) was employed to assess cross-reactivity with 33 other tropical diseases. Leishmania spp., a pathogen with high genome sequence similar 34 to T. cruzi, showed cross-reactivity rates ranging from 0-2.17%. Inconclusive results 35 were negligible (0-0.71%). Bland-Altman and Deming regression analysis based on 200 36 randomly selected CD-positive and -negative samples demonstrated interchangeability with respect to CD diagnostic performance in both singleplex and 37 38 multiplex assays. Our results suggested that these chimeras can potentially replace 39 antigens currently used in commercially available assay kits. Moreover, the use of a 40 multiplex platform, like LMA assays employing 2 or more IBMP antigens, would abrogate the need for 2 different testing techniques when diagnosing CD. 41

- 43 Keywords: Human Chagas disease; *Trypanosoma cruzi*; Chimeric antigens; Liquid
- 44 microarray; Singleplex and Multiplex assays

45 Chagas disease (CD) is a life-threatening neglected tropical condition affecting 46 approximately 5.7 million people in 21 Latin America countries, of which Brazil, Mexico, and Argentina are home to >60% of the estimated total number of infected 47 individuals (1). Human migration has contributed to the worldwide distribution of 48 49 infection, transforming this disease into a global health problem (2, 3). The vector-borne 50 protozoan parasite Trypanosoma cruzi is the causative agent of CD, whose transmission 51 occurs mainly when contaminated urine/feces of hematophagous insects of the 52 Triatominae family enters a bite site wound or mucosal membrane, blood transfusions, and the consumption of contaminated beverages or food (4). 53

54 Two distinct stages occur during the natural course of CD progression. Initially, an acute phase presents as a non-specific oligosymptomatic febrile illness, lasting for 55 approximately 2-3 months with abundant parasitemia. A small number of cases are 56 57 accompanied by myocarditis and other lethal complications. This parasite can only be observed by staining thick and thin blood smears during the initial phase. During the 58 59 lifelong chronic stage, parasites remain hidden in target tissues, notably in the digestive 60 system and cardiac muscles. This phase is initially characterized by an asymptomatic clinical course lasting 2-3 decades, after which approximately 10% and 20% of infected 61 62 individuals develop digestive and heart complications, respectively (5). Due to low 63 parasitemia and high levels of specific anti-T. cruzi antibodies, diagnosis in the chronic phase is traditionally performed by serological methods, including enzyme-linked 64 65 immunosorbent assays (ELISAs), indirect immunofluorescence assays, and indirect 66 hemagglutination inhibition assays (6). Because no standardized reference test is commercially available, the World Health Organization advises the use of two distinct 67 techniques for CD diagnosis (7), and the Brazilian Health Ministry recommends 2 68 69 serological methods involving distinct antigen preparations, both of which must be

4

Journal of Cli<u>nica</u>

Journal of Cli<u>nica</u>

performed concomitantly (6). Next-generation diagnostic platforms have improved the
accuracy of CD diagnosis by using different *T. cruzi*-specific recombinant proteins in a
variety of detection systems, such as chemiluminescence (8), surface plasmon resonance
(9, 10), and bead-based technologies, including cytometry bead arrays (11) and liquid
microarrays (LMAs) (12).

In endemic countries, the screening of blood donors for T. cruzi is mandatory to 75 76 prevent CD transmission by blood transfusions. Accordingly, numerous tests must be performed on a daily basis in these areas. LMA is considered appropriate for detecting 77 and quantifying multiple analytes in multiplex assays, using relatively small sample 78 79 volumes with high-throughput potential. Using this technique, it is possible to incorporate up to 500 color-coded fluorescent magnetic bead sets, each with 2 spectrally 80 different fluorophore ratios, making each bead set distinguishable by its fluorescence 81 82 emission when excited by a laser (13, 14). Because LMA technology permits the detection of many analytes simultaneously in each test sample, this method could 83 84 potentially be singularly employed for CD diagnosis, as a substitute for ELISAs and 85 other traditional serological methods. These serological assays employ either fractionated lysates of T. cruzi at the epimastigote stage or recombinant proteins, which 86 87 can produce inconclusive results or cross-reactivity with related diseases. Therefore, 88 chimeric proteins have been proposed to improve the assay's accuracy to diagnose chagasic. Recently, a phase I study was performed with 4 chimeric proteins from 89 90 Instituto de Biologia Molecular do Paraná (IBMP-8.1, -8.2, -8.3, and -8.4) to detect 91 specific anti-T. cruzi antibodies using both ELISA and LMA (15), demonstrating that 92 each antigen accurately discriminated CD-positive from CD-negative samples. In 93 addition, no significant differences were observed with respect to the diagnostic 94 performances of the ELISA and LMA test methods. Data from a subsequent phase II

98

99 RESULTS

LMA performance. Using 1,333 sera from Ch and NCh individuals, the LMA 100 101 performance and RI distributions of all IBMP chimeras were assessed, as shown in Fig. 1. AUC values were >99%, revealing excellent overall diagnostic accuracy. IgG levels 102 in Ch samples were variable, ranging from 4.52 for IBMP-8.3 and 4.98 for IBMP-8.4 to 103 104 5.19 for IBMP-8.2 and 5.55 for IBMP-8.1. Out of 653 Ch samples, IBMP-8.4-LMA showed 99.1% sensitivity with only 6 cases classified as false negatives; with these 105 samples 4 were also classified as false negatives for all other antigens. Higher numbers 106 107 of false negatives were observed for IBMP-8.1 (15 cases), IBMP-8.2 (11 cases), and IBMP-8.3 (20 cases), with corresponding sensitivity values of 97.7%, 98.3%, and 108 109 96.9%, respectively. Nevertheless, no statistically significant differences were detected 110 with respect to IBMP protein sensitivity. Regarding the NCh samples, the IBMP chimeras showed specificity values >99.0%, and RI values ≤ 0.13 for all chimeras, with 111 statistical differences observed only in relation to IBMP-8.2. 112

Relatively few Ch and NCh samples were considered inconclusive: 3 (0.23%) in the IBMP-8.1 assay, 5 (0.38%) in the IBMP-8.2 assay, 12 (0.90%) in the IBMP-8.3 assay, and 3 (0.23%) in the IBMP-8.4 assay. IBMP-8.4 was found to most accurately diagnose CD (99.3%), followed by IBMP-8.2 (99.0%), IBMP-8.1 (98.4%), and IBMP-8.3 (98.1%). The Youden index was the highest for IBMP-8.4 (98.6%), followed by the IBMP-8.2 (97.6%), IBMP-8.1 (96.8%), and IBMP-8.3 (96.1%) proteins. The test

120 7,882 for IBMP-8.2, 4,826 for IBMP-8.1, and 3,548 for IBMP-8.3.

Potential cross-reactivity (RI \geq 1.0) of the IBMP chimeras was assessed using 121 122 serum samples from 851 individuals with unrelated diseases. As shown in Fig. 2, the incidence of cross-reactivity was negligible: 0.12% (1/851) for IBMP-8.1 and IBMP-123 8.4, 0.24% (2/851) for IBMP-8.2, and 0.59% (5/581) for IBMP-8.3. Moreover, a very 124 125 low frequency of inconclusive results was observed: 0.12% (1/851) for IBMP-8.1, 0.71% (6/851) for IBMP-8.2, and 0.47% (4/851) for IBMP-8.3 (Fig. 2). Notably, we 126 found no inconclusive results in relation to the IBMP-8.4 protein. Regarding the 127 128 Leishmania spp. samples, none exhibited any cross-reactivity with the 4 IBMP chimeras, and only 1 showed an inconclusive result with respect to IBMP-8.3. 129

Comparison of singleplex vs. multiplex IBMP antigen performance. No 130 131 significant differences were observed with respect to LMA performance when assaying 100 Ch and 100 NCh samples, in singleplex or multiplex assays (Fig. 3). The AUCs 132 133 were >99.7%. The level of agreement between the expected results ranged from 95.0%(к 0.950 [0.907–0.993]) for IBMP-8.1 to 99.0% (к 0.990 [0.970–1.01]) for IBMP-8.2, 134 while the IBMP-8.3 and-8.4 chimeras showed 100% agreement. Despite the high level 135 of agreement seen and the consistency in performance of the parameters evaluated, NCh 136 samples yielded lower signals when assayed with IBMP-8.1, IBMP-8.3, and IBMP-8.4 137 in the multiplex assay. Regarding the Ch samples, differences in RI values were 138 139 observed only in the samples assayed by the IBMP-8.1 chimera in multiplex assays. For 140 comparison purposes, ELISA performances are also described in Fig. 3.

Fig. 4 graphically illustrates the strength of agreement between the singleplex
and multiplex data for each protein assayed by Deming regression fit analysis (left
panels) and Bland–Altman plots (right panels). The IBMP-8.1 antigen multiplex aligned

19.5 to 5.89%) with the LoA ranging between -183.0% and 169.8%. Although Deming regression fit analysis indicated significant proportional bias, Bland-Altman analysis presented no significant bias with respect to the means, as the line of equality fell within the confidence interval. We observed that all data points fell within the LoAs, which is consistent with the expectation that only 5% would fall outside these limits. The IBMP-8.2 antigen (Fig. 4B) showed good agreement between the singleplex and multiplex assays, with an R-squared value of 0.88, an intercept of -0.2306 (95% CI: -0.4291 to -0.0320), and a slope of 1.1441 (95% CI: 1.0589 to 1.2313). The mean bias was 8.01% 155 156 (95% CI: 2.9 to 13.12%) with LoA values ranging from -64.3% to 80.3%, which indicated statistical significance since the line of equality fell outside the CI. We 157 158 observed 8 points (4.0%) outside the LoAs, which is consistent with the 5% 159 expectation. Fig. 4C shows a good fit between these 2 methods using IBMP-8.3, with an *R*-squared value of 0.90, an intercept of -0.1099 (95% CI: -0.2751 to 0.0554), and a 160 161 slope of 0.9814 (95% CI: 0.9081 to 1.0546). The mean bias was -23.36% (95% CI: -162 28.98 to -17.74%) with LoA values ranging from -102.8% to 56.1%. Despite the absence of significance regarding the slope under Deming regression analysis, the mean 163 164 bias derived from Bland–Altman analysis indicated that the multiplex results were up to 165 -23.36% less than those obtained with the singleplex method. Nine points (4.5%) fell 166 beyond the LoAs. For IBMP-8.4 (Fig. 4D), the correlation coefficient between the 2 singleplex and multiplex tests was 0.77. Deming regression analysis showed a slope of 167 168 1.5553 (95% CI: 1.3609 to 1.7498) and an intercept of -0.2360 (95% CI: -0.5851 to

poorly with the singleplex method under Deming regression fit analysis, with an

equation of y = -0.2268 + 2.3293x, an intercept of -0.2268 (95% CI: -1.0042 to 0.5506),

a slope of 2.3293 (95% CI: 1.8478 to 2.8109), and an *R*-squared value of 0.76 (Fig. 4A).

The mean bias derived from the Bland-Altman difference plot was -6.6% (95% CI: -

8

Journal of Clinica

0.1131), while the Bland–Altman plot showed a mean bias of -26.42% (95% CI: -36.95
to -15.89). The slope value is indicative of significant proportional bias, as evidenced by
an up to 20% variation between the results obtained with the singleplex and multiplex
techniques. Just 1 point (0.5%) fell outside the LoA.

173

174 DISCUSSION

175 The T. cruzi IBMP recombinant antigenic proteins employed herein have already been 176 shown to be sensitive and specific for CD diagnosis when assessed by ELISA (16), although their performances using other approaches remains to be elucidated. A phase-I 177 178 study, previously conducted by our group using ELISAs and LMAs, showed high performance when these antigens were assayed using a small set of samples comprised 179 of only 300 sera from CD-positive and CD-negative individuals (15). Here, we 180 181 expanded the sample size to 1,333 sera and found AUC values higher than 99% for all 4 182 proteins. These data are in accordance with results from a phase-II study, where these 183 same proteins were tested by ELISA (16), thereby indicating the high discriminative 184 power these antigens potentially possess with respect to other diagnostic platforms. Most importantly, these IBMP chimeric proteins provided much better AUC values than 185 186 did T. cruzi cell lysates, single recombinant proteins, or other recombinant chimeric 187 proteins commonly used in diagnostic kits (17, 18). In addition, differences higher than 4.40 were seen between the RI signals from the positive and negative samples for all 188 189 proteins, providing further evidence of their high discriminatory capability. Moreover, 190 the RI signals obtained from positive samples assayed by LMA were up to 56% 191 stronger than those previously obtained by ELISA (16). Conversely, the average RI 192 signals from negative samples were 32% lower by LMA. Finally, the total number of 193 inconclusive results was very low, ranging from 0.23% to 0.90%, again reinforcing the

9

lournal of Clinical Microbiology

JCM

lournal of Clinical Microbioloav optimal discriminatory power of these IBMP proteins combined with next-generationdiagnostic platforms.

Performance assessments were carried out with the LMA assays to determine the 196 197 diagnostic sensitivity, specificity, and accuracy for CD. Despite the fact that no differences were observed in sensitivity and specificity, the IBMP-8.4 protein produced 198 199 more accurate results than IBMP-8.2. Nonetheless, this difference was almost negligible 200 considering that the 95% CI values practically overlapped. LMA assay performance was 201 comparable to previously published data with ELISAs (16). With the exception of the IBMP-8.2 antigen, both testing methods offered similar performance. When evaluated 202 203 by LMA, the IBMP-8.2 protein showed 99.0% accuracy, while it showed 96.6% accuracy by ELISA. According to a previous study, the lower value obtained by ELISA 204 was probably due to the amino acid sequence of this protein, which impaired its 205 206 recognition by specific anti-T. cruzi antibodies from CD-positive samples collected in 207 distinct geographical regions (16). However, this discrepancy in accuracy may also be 208 the result of characteristics inherent to each diagnostic platform used. Indeed, the MFI 209 of the detection antibody corresponds to an average of 100 bead readings, i.e., a single 210 serum sample is analyzed 100 times per antigen versus just once in an ELISA reaction. 211 This level of precision improves the limit of detection by LMA assays (13, 19). These 212 performance results were corroborated by the J index and DOR. In addition to accuracy, the J index measures the effectiveness of a diagnostic marker by considering the 213 214 sensitivity and specificity together as a single parameter, and we found that the J index 215 value was >0.96 for all chimeras. The DOR is a global performance parameter that 216 summarizes the diagnostic accuracy of a given testing method (20). It can vary from 0 217 to infinity, with higher values indicating improved discriminatory diagnostic testing. 218 The DOR for IBMP-8.4 (25,000) was greater than that obtained for IBMP-8.1 (4,826),

IBMP-8.2 (7,882), and IBMP-8.3 (3,548). These data agree with data from a previous
study using ELISA that highlighted the IBMP-8.4 protein as the best antigen for
diagnosing CD (16).

222 Considering the large number of sera from patients with unrelated diseases used 223 to assess cross-reactivity, the small number of samples that cross-reacted was irrelevant. 224 This was expected due to the low similarity between the IBMP sequences and those 225 deposited in the NCBI database for other pathogens, including Leishmania spp. Furthermore, cross-reacting samples also presented a weak RI signal. Similarly, 226 inconclusive results using this same panel were statistically irrelevant, particularly with 227 228 respect to IBMP-8.1 and -8.4. These findings are consistent with previous results obtained when assessing cross-reactivity in ELISAs (16). As such, the authors are 229 confident that all of these chimeric proteins can be safely employed in diagnostic 230 231 platforms in areas endemic for CD, as well as other infectious diseases.

232 We also comparatively assayed 100 CD-positive and 100 CD-negative samples 233 by the singleplex and multiplex LMA approaches. Both methods were highly efficient 234 in distinguishing CD-positive and CD-negative samples. Regarding the CD-positive samples, a significant difference was seen in the RI signal intensity only with respect to 235 236 the IBMP-8.1 protein, whereas, in the CD-negative samples, lower RI signals for 237 IBMP-8.1, -8.3, and -8.4 proteins were observed in multiplex assays compared to singleplex assays. Despite these discrepancies, the performance parameters were 238 239 identical for both methods. Deming regression analysis showed a substantial 240 proportional bias for the IBMP-8.1, -8.2, and -8.4 proteins, suggesting that these 241 methods are not in complete agreement throughout the measurement range involving CD-positive and CD-negative samples, as evidenced by the Bland-Altman plots, 242 243 especially regarding IBMP-8.1 and IBMP-8.4. This finding indicates a highly linear

JCM

lournal of Clinical Microbiology

244 nature of multiplex assays, compared with the singleplex approach. Regression analysis 245 also showed a systematic negative bias only with respect to the IBMP-8.2 protein, 246 indicating that results obtained using this antigen under multiplex assays were slightly 247 higher, by a constant amount, than those produced by the singleplex method. This was 248 probably due to inadequate blanking, a mis-set 0 calibration point, or some other type of 249 interference in the assay (21). Although this bias seems to indicate a substantial 250 difference between the singleplex and multiplex LMA techniques, it does not affect diagnostic accuracy, i.e., both methods are sufficiently interchangeable for CD 251 diagnosis. As multiplex assays inherently involve similar analysis time and serum 252 253 volumes when compared to singleplex methods, multiplex methods are crucial for assessing outbreaks involving the screening of large populations, as well as for routine 254 testing at blood donation centers. Furthermore, multiplex approaches can be used to 255 256 effectively screen for several diseases concomitantly, differently from traditional 257 serological testing, in which only 1 condition is evaluated. Thus, multiplexing not only 258 reduces costs, analysis time, and the serum volume required, but it also enables the 259 incorporation of multiple markers for infectious diseases (14, 22, 23), cancer, and other 260 conditions (24-26). Although LMA-based technology offers several advantages, it 261 nonetheless requires a significant laboratory infrastructure, a well-trained workforce, 262 and substantial financial investment.

In conclusion, the results described herein indicate that these 4 *T. cruzi* IBMP recombinant antigenic proteins can be safely used for CD diagnosis in both LMA platforms evaluated, as well as in ELISA-based assays (16). Moreover, the accuracy of LMA was shown not to vary among these IBMP antigens, regardless of using singleplex or multiplex techniques, suggesting that these chimeras can potentially replace those currently used in commercially available assay kits. Accordingly, a

269 multiplex LMA assay employing 2 or more IBMP antigens would abrogate the need for

using 2 different tests when diagnosing CD.

271

272 MATERIALS AND METHODS

Ethical considerations. The Institutional Review Board (IRB) for Human Research at
the Aggeu Magalhães Institute of the Oswaldo Cruz Foundation (Recife, PernambucoBrazil) provided ethical approval to conduct this study (CAEE: 15812213.8.0000.5190).
To protect patients' privacy, the IRB required that samples be coded to mask patient
identification, thus eliminating the need for verbal or written consent.

278 Subjects and sample collection. Human sera, previously collected, were provided by the biorepositories of the Hemope Foundation (Recife, Pernambuco), the 279 Central Laboratory for Public Health-LACEN (Recife, Pernambuco), the Reference 280 281 Laboratory for Chagas Disease (Fiocruz-Recife, Pernambuco), the Molecular Biology Institute of Paraná (IBMP-Paraná), and the Laboratory for Research on Chagas Disease 282 (Federal University of Goiás-Goiás). Samples from 653 chagasic (Ch) and 680 non-283 284 chagasic (NCh) individuals were utilized to assess the performance of T. cruzi IBMP chimeras in diagnosing CD by LMA. This panel was composed of samples from 285 286 endemic and non-endemic Brazilian states (Bahia-BA, Minas Gerais-MG, Goiás-GO, 287 Pernambuco-PE, and Paraná-PR), as well as from Brazilian and international commercial suppliers (National Panel for Blood Screening Quality Control, Fiocruz, RJ, 288 289 Brazil; Boston Biomedical Inc., Norwood, MA, USA; SeraCare Life Sciences Inc., 290 Milford, MA, USA). Samples from individuals with dengue virus (n = 50), hepatitis B 291 virus (n = 160), hepatitis C virus (n = 98), human immunodeficiency virus (n = 144), 292 human T-cell lymphotropic virus (n = 109), leishmaniasis (n = 18), leptospirosis (n = 109), lep 293 92), rubella virus (n = 15), measles (n = 21), and syphilis (n = 144) were used to assess

cross-reactivity between the IBMP chimeras and proteins associated with unrelated
diseases. Before LMA analysis, all sera were re-evaluated using 2 commercial ELISA
tests, namely the Imuno-ELISA Chagas test (Wama Diagnostica, São Paulo, Brazil;
batch 14D061) and the ELISA Chagas III test (BIOSChile, Ingeniaría Genética S.A.,
Santiago, Chile; batch 1F130525) (27). Each sample was assigned a numeric code in the
laboratory to ensure a blinded analysis.

300 Acquisition of recombinant chimeric proteins. Immuno-dominant sequence 301 selection, synthetic gene construction, and recombinant chimeric protein expression were performed, as previously described (15). Briefly, T. cruzi synthetic gene constructs 302 303 were obtained from a commercial supplier (GenScript, Piscataway, NJ, USA) and subcloned into the pET28a expression vector (Novagen, Madison, WI, USA). Chimeric 304 antigens were expressed as soluble proteins in Escherichia coli BL21-Star (DE3) cells 305 306 grown in LB medium supplemented with 0.5 M isopropyl- β -D-1-thiogalactopyranoside 307 (IPTG). Recombinant expression of the chimeras was checked by sodium dodecyl 308 sulfate-polyacrylamide gel electrophoresis (28). Chimeras were purified by both ion-309 exchange and liquid affinity chromatography. Concentrations were determined by performing a fluorimetric assay (Qubit 2.0, Invitrogen Technologies, Carlsbad, CA, 310 311 USA).

312 IBMP antigen coupling to microsphere beads and in-house LMA procedures. The IBMP antigen-coupling protocol employed herein was performed as 313 previously described (15). Briefly, 2×10^6 microsphere beads were washed with 314 activation buffer (100 mM sodium phosphate, pH 6.3) and chemically activated using 1-315 316 ethyl-3-(3-dimethylaminopropyl) carbodiimide hydrochloride and N-317 hydroxysulfosuccinimide (Sigma, St. Louis, MO, USA), both diluted to 50 mg/mL of ultrapure water (18.2 M Ω). Activated beads were subsequently incubated with 200 μ L 318

319

320 These suspensions were incubated at 250 rpm under horizontal agitation for 2 h at 37°C. 321 Next, the beads were washed 3 times with wash buffer (PBS, containing 1% BSA, 0.05% Tween 20). The final bead suspensions were adjusted to a concentration of $50 \times$ 322 10^3 microspheres/mL in wash buffer and stored overnight at 2–8°C in low-binding 323 tubes. For LMA analysis, a previously prepared E. coli lysate (diluted to 2%) (29) was 324 mixed with 50 μ L of serum sample (diluted 1:200) and 50 μ L of bead suspension, 325 placed in a 96-well plate, and incubated under agitation for 15 min at 37°C. The beads 326 were then washed twice. Phycoerythrin-conjugated, goat anti-human IgG (Moss 327 Substrates, Pasadena, MA, USA), diluted 1:1,000, was added and the plates were 328 incubated under agitation for 15 min at 37°C. The beads were then washed with sheath 329 fluid and resuspended in 200 μ L of the same solution. For the multiplex LMA assay, 330 2,500 beads of each set were mixed together in a final volume of 50 μ L/well, following 331 332 the assay protocol described above. The results were interpreted using a Luminex 200 BioAnalyzer (Luminex Corp. Austin, TX, USA) with xPONENT software (version 333 3.1.871.0). For bead identification, a minimum of 100 beads bearing a unique 334 335 fluorescent signature was detected per region, measured in terms of the median fluorescence intensity (MFI) per sample in accordance with the manufacturer 336 instructions. 337

of antigen diluted in coupling buffer at previously determined concentrations (15).

338 Singleplex vs. multiplex LMA. A total of 100 Ch and 100 NCh samples were 339 randomly selected to compare the performance and concordance among the IBMP 340 chimeric antigens, either singleplexed (assayed individually using a single bead type) or 341 multiplexed (each antigen assayed together with different bead types).

342 Data analysis. Data were encoded and analyzed using Prism graphing software,
343 version 6 (GraphPad, San Diego, CA, USA). Descriptive statistics are presented as

Journal of Clinical

344	geometric means ± standard deviation (SD). The Shapiro–Wilk test was used to test data							
345	normality, and homogeneity of variance was verified using Levene's test. When these 2							
346	assumptions were confirmed, Student's t test was used for sample comparisons;							
347	otherwise, the Wilcoxon signed-rank test was employed. All analyses were 2-tailed, and							
348	a $p < 0.05$ was considered significant. Cut-off point analysis was used to establish							
349	maximum MFI to distinguish positive and negative samples. The threshold was set b							
350	determining the greatest area under the receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curves							
351	Data are displayed via scatter plot and are presented in terms of the reactivity index (RI,							
352	i.e., ratio of the sample MFI to the cut-off MFI), with results ≥ 1.00 considered positive.							
353	RI values within $1.0 \pm 10\%$ were considered indeterminate and deemed as inconclusive							
354	(shown as a gray zone). LMA performance was evaluated using a dichotomous							
355	approach with respect to sensitivity, specificity, accuracy, Youden index (J), the							
356	likelihood ratio, and the diagnosis odds ratio (DOR) (30). Confidence intervals (CI)							
357	were calculated to assess the precision of these parameters, with a confidence level of							
358	95%. Singleplex vs. multiplex LMA results were compared using Cohen's kappa							
359	coefficient (κ), the Bland–Altman plot, and Deming regression analysis. The strength of							
360	agreement was interpreted as nearly perfect (0.81 < $\kappa \le 1.0$), substantial							
361	$(0.61 < \kappa \le 0.80)$, moderate $(0.41 < \kappa \le 0.60)$, fair $(0.21 < \kappa \le 0.40)$, slight $(0 < \kappa \le 0.20)$,							
362	or poor ($\kappa \le 0$) agreement (31). Bland–Altman plots with limits of agreement (LoAs)							
363	were generated to assess the variability and magnitude between the singleplex and							
364	multiplex assays (32). Deming regression was used to mathematically determine the							
365	agreement between the singleplex and multiplex techniques, as well as proportional bias							
366	(slope, 95% CI) and systematic bias (intercept, 95% CI). Deming regression analysis							
367	revealed a null hypothesis when the intercept and slope were 0 and 1, respectively. A							

Journal of Clinical Microbiology 368 checklist and flowchart (Fig 5) are provided according to the Standards for the369 Reporting of Diagnostic accuracy studies (STARD) guidelines (33).

370

371 Acknowledgements

This work was supported by Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Científico e 372 373 Tecnológico-CNPq (404242/2012-0), Fundação de Amparo à Ciência e Tecnologia do 374 Estado de Pernambuco-FACEPE (APQ-1257-2.11/12), and RVE Finep (01.13.0283.00ref. 0473/12). Yara de Miranda Gomes, Wayner Vieira de Sousa, and Marco Aurélio 375 376 Krieger are research fellows supported by CNPq Proc. Numbers 304543/2012-8, 377 306222/2013-2, and 590032/2011-9, respectively. The funders had no role in study 378 design, data collection and interpretation, or the decision to submit the work for publication. 379

380

381 **Competing interests:** The authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

NO NO

382 **References**

383 1. World Health Organization. 2015. Chagas disease in Latin America: a
epidemiological update based on 2010 estimates. Wkly Epidemiol Rec 90:33-44
2. Schmunis GA, Yadon ZE. 2010. Chagas disease: a Latin American healt
386 problem becoming a world health problem. Acta Trop 115:14-21
387 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actatropica.2009.11.003.
388 3. Manne-Goehler J, Reich MR, Wirtz VJ. 2015. Access to care for Chagas diseas
in the United States: a health systems analysis. Am J Trop Med Hyg 93:108-113
390 https://doi.org/10.4269/ajtmh.14-0826.
4. Amato Neto V, Lopes M, Umezawa ES, Aveiro Ruocco M, Dias JC. 2000
392 Outras formas de transmissão do <i>Trypanosoma cruzi</i> . Rev Patol Trop 29:115
393 129.
5. Rassi A Jr, Rassi A, Marcondes de Rezende J. 2012. American trypanosomiasi
395 (Chagas disease). Infect Dis Clin North Am 26:275-291
396 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.idc.2012.03.002.
397 6. Ministério da Saúde. Secretaria de Vigilância em Saúde. 2005. Brazilia
Consensus on Chagas disease. Rev Soc Bras Med Trop 38:7-29.
3997. World Health Organization. 2007. WHO consultation on international biological
400 reference preparations for Chagas diagnostic tests
401 http://www.who.int/bloodproducts/ref_materials/WHO_Report_1st_Chagas_BF
402 P_consultation_7-2007_final.pdf.
403 8. Abras A, Gállego M, Llovet T, Tebar S, Herrero M, Berenguer P, Ballart C
404 Martí C, Muñoz C. 2016. Serological diagnosis of chronic Chagas disease: is
405 time for a change? J Clin Microbiol 54:1566-1572
406 https://doi.org/10.1128/JCM.00142-16.

Journal of Clinical Microbiology

JCM

obiology.

Clinica

ournal of

407 9. Luz JG, Souto DE, Machado-Assis GF, de Lana M, Kubota LT, Luz RC, Damos
408 FS, Martins HR. 2015. Development and evaluation of a SPR-based
409 immunosensor for detection of anti-*Trypanosoma cruzi* antibodies in human
410 serum. Sens Actuators B Chem 212:287-296.
411 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.snb.2015.01.135.

10. Luz JG, Souto DE, Machado-Assis GF, de Lana M, Luz RC, Martins-Filho OA,
Damos FS, Martins HR. 2016. Applicability of a novel immunoassay based on
surface plasmon resonance for the diagnosis of Chagas disease. Clin Chim Acta
454:39-45. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cca.2015.12.025.

416 11. Teixeira-Carvalho A, Campos FM, Geiger SM, Rocha RD, de Araújo FF, Vitelli-Avelar DM, Andrade MC, Araújo MS, Lemos EM, de Freitas Carneiro 417 Proietti AB, Sabino EC, Caldas RG, Freitas CR, Campi-Azevedo AC, Elói-418 419 Santos SM, Martins-Filho OA. 2015. FC-TRIPLEX Chagas/Leish IgG1: a multiplexed flow cytometry method for differential serological diagnosis of 420 421 Chagas disease and leishmaniasis. PLoS One 10:e0122938. 422 https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0122938.

423 12. Foti L, Fonseca BP, Nascimento LD, Marques CF, da Silva ED, Duarte CA,
424 Probst CM, Goldenberg S, Pinto AG, Krieger MA. 2009. Viability study of a
425 multiplex diagnostic platform for Chagas disease. Mem Inst Oswaldo Cruz
426 104:136-141.

Hoare R, Thompson KD, Herath T, Collet B, Bron JE, Adams A. 2016.
Development, characterisation and application of monoclonal antibodies for the
detection and quantification of infectious salmon anaemia virus in plasma
samples using Luminex bead array technology. PLoS One 11:e0159155.
https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0159155.

432

433

434

435



14. Christopher-Hennings J, Araujo KP, Souza CJ, Fang Y, Lawson S, Nelson EA,

Clement T, Dunn M, Lunney JK. 2013. Opportunities for bead-based multiplex

assays in veterinary diagnostic laboratories. J Vet Diagn Investig 25:671-691.

https://doi.org/10.1177/1040638713507256.

453 76:197-205. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.diagmicrobio.2013.02.028.

454 19. Kuller L, Watanabe R, Anderson D, Grant R. 2005. Development of a whole455 virus multiplex flow cytometric assay for antibody screening of a specific
456 pathogen-free primate colony. Diagn Microbiol Infect Dis 53:185-193.

Journal of <u>Clinica</u>

457 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.diagmicrobio.2005.05.012.

458 20. Glas AS, Lijmer JG, Prins MH, Bonsel GJ, Bossuyt PM. 2003. The diagnostic 459 odds ratio: a single indicator of test performance. J Clin Epidemiol 56:1129460 1135.

461 21. Westgard JO. 2008. How do you use statistics to estimate analytical errors?, p 462 137-152. *In* Westgard JO (ed), Basic Method Validation. 3rd ed. Madison: 463 Westgard QC, Inc., Madison, WI.

Leva A, Eibach D, Krumkamp R, Käsmaier J, Rubbenstroth D, Adu-Sarkodie Y,
May J, Tannich E, Panning M. 2016. Diagnostic performance of the Luminex
xTAG gastrointestinal pathogens panel to detect rotavirus in Ghanaian children
with and without diarrhoea. Virol J 13:132. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12985-0160588-1.

- 23. Caboré RN, Piérard D, Huygen K. 2016. A Belgian serosurveillance/
 seroprevalence study of diphtheria, tetanus and pertussis using a luminex xMAP
 technology-based pentaplex. Vaccines 4:16.
 https://doi.org/10.3390/vaccines4020016.
- 24. Argiris A, Lee SC, Feinstein T, Thomas S, Branstetter BF, Seethala R, Wang L, 473 474 Gooding W, Grandis JR, Ferris RL. 2011. Serum biomarkers as potential 475 predictors of antitumor activity of cetuximab-containing therapy for locally advanced head Oncol 47:961-966. 476 and neck cancer. Oral 477 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.oraloncology.2011.07.034.
- 478 25. Djoba Siawaya JF, Roberts T, Babb C, Black G, Golakai HJ, Stanley K, Bapela
 479 NB, Hoal E, Parida S, van Helden P, Walzl G. 2008. An evaluation of
 480 commercial fluorescent bead-based luminex cytokine assays. PLoS One
 481 3:e2535. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0002535.

26. Shadfan BH, Simmons AR, Simmons GW, Ho A, Wong J, Lu KH, Bast RC Jr,
McDevitt JT. 2015. A multiplexable, microfluidic platform for the rapid
quantitation of a biomarker panel for early ovarian cancer detection at the pointof-care. Cancer Prev Res (Phila) 8:37-48. https://doi.org/10.1158/19406207.CAPR-14-0248.

27. Santos FL, de Souza WV, Barros Mda S, Nakazawa M, Krieger MA, Gomes
Yde M. 2016. Chronic Chagas disease diagnosis: A comparative performance of
commercial enzyme immunoassay tests. Am J Trop Med Hyg 94:1034-1039.
https://doi.org/10.4269/ajtmh.15-0820.

491 28. Laemmli UK. 1970. Cleavage of structural proteins during the assembly of the
492 head of bacteriophage T4. Nature. 227:680-685.

29. Crestani S, Leitolis A, Lima LF, Krieger MA, Foti L. 2016. Enhanced targetspecific signal detection using an Escherichia coli lysate in multiplex microbead
immunoassays with *E. coli*-derived recombinant antigens. J Immunol Methods
435:17-26. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jim.2016.05.002.

30. Ouchchane L, Rabilloud M, Boire J-Y. 2009. Sensibilité, spécificité et valeurs
prédictives, p 49-78. *In* Beuscat R, Bénichou J, Roy P (ed), Évaluation des
méthodes d'analyse appliquées aux sciences de la vie et de la santé Biostatistique, vol 2. Omniscience, Paris, France.

31. Landis JR, Koch GG. 1977. The measurement of observer agreement for
categorical data. Biometrics 33:159-174.

32. Bland JM, Altman DG. 1986. Statistical methods for assessing agreement
between two methods of clinical measurement. Lancet 1:307-310.

33. Bossuyt PM, Reitsma JB, Bruns DE, Gatsonis CA, Glasziou PP, Irwig L, Lijmer
JG, Moher D, Rennie D, de Vet HC, Kressel HY, Rifai N, Golub RM, Altman

507	DG, Hooft L, Korevaar DA, Cohen JF, STARD Group. 2015. STARD 2015: an
508	updated list of essential items for reporting diagnostic accuracy studies. BMJ
509	351:h5527. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.h5527.

Journal of Clinical Microbiology

Microbiology

Fig 1 Singleplex IBMP chimeric antigen assay of serum samples from chagasic (Ch) and non-chagasic (NCh) individuals. The cut-off value was established as reactivity index = 1.0, and the shadowed area represents the gray zone (RI = 1.0 ± 0.10). Geometric means ($\pm 95\%$ CI) are represented by horizontal lines with corresponding results for each group. Acc, accuracy; AUC, area under the curve; DOR, diagnostic odds ratio; J index, Youden index; LR, likelihood ratio; Sen, sensitivity; Spe, specificity.

516

Fig 2 Analysis of IBMP chimera cross-reactivity with sera from individuals with 517 518 **unrelated diseases.** The cut-off value was established as reactivity index = 1.0, and the shadowed area represents the gray zone (RI = 1.0 ± 0.10). Geometric means ($\pm 95\%$ CI) are 519 represented by horizontal lines, with the corresponding results shown for each group. CR, 520 521 cross-reaction); DENG, Dengue; HBV, hepatitis B virus; HCV, hepatitis C virus; HIV, human immunodeficiency virus; HTLV, human T-cell lymphotropic virus; IR, inconclusive 522 523 results; LEIS, leishmaniasis; LEPT, leptospirosis; MEAS, measles; RI, reactivity index; 524 RUBE, rubella virus; SYPHI, syphilis.

525

Fig 3 Singleplex and multiplex IBMP chimeric antigen assays of serum samples from chagasic (Ch) and non-chagasic (NCh) individuals. The cut-off value was established as reactivity index = 1.0, and the shadowed area represents the gray zone (RI = 1.0 ± 0.10). Geometric means ($\pm 95\%$ CI) are represented by horizontal lines, with the corresponding results shown for each group. Acc, accuracy; AUC, area under the curve; EIA, ELISA; LMA-M, multiplex liquid microarray; LMA-S, singleplex liquid microarray; RI, reactivity index; Sen, sensitivity; Spe, specificity.

Fig 4 Deming regression fit (left) and Bland–Altman plots (right) comparing singleand multiplex methods of detecting anti-*T. cruzi* IgG, using the IBMP-8.1 (A), IBMP8.2 (B), IBMP-8.3 (C), and IBMP-8.4 (D) chimeras.

Fig 5 STARD flowchart. Standards for the Reporting of Diagnostic Accuracy Studies
(STARD) description of the study design.

25

Journal of Clinical Microbiology



Accepted Manuscript Posted Online

Microbiology



Microbiology Microbiology

IR (%)	0 0 1 (0.69%) 0		0 1 (0.12%) 0	1 (0.63%) 0 2 (1.39%)	1 (0.92%) 0 0	2 (1.39%) 6 (0.71%)	0 0 1 (1.02%) 0 2 (1.83%)	1 (5.56%) 0 0 0 0 4 (0.47%)	
CR (%)	0 0 1 (0.69%) 0 0		0 1 (0.12%) 0	000		2 (1.39%) 2 (0.24%)	0 2 (1.25%) 0 1 (0.69%) 0	0 2 (2.17%) 0 0 5 (0.59%)	0 0 0 0 0 0 1 (0.69%) 1 (0.12%)
RI (95%CI)	0.10 ± 0.02 0.08 ± 0.01 0.07 ± 0.01 0.07 ± 0.01 0.06 ± 0.01	0.06 ± 0.03 0.05 ± 0.01 0.08 ± 0.02 0.08 ± 0.02	0.08 ± 0.02 0.07 (±0.01) 0.08 ± 0.02	0.12 ± 0.02 0.09 ± 0.02 0.14 ± 0.02	0.15 ± 0.03 0.06 ± 0.04 0.13 ± 0.02 0.04 ± 0.02 0.04 ± 0.02	0.12 ± 0.01	0.13 ± 0.04 0.14 ± 0.02 0.09 ± 0.02 0.07 ± 0.01 0.09 ± 0.02	0.07 ± 0.05 0.14 ± 0.03 0.08 ± 0.02 0.15 ± 0.06 0.15 ± 0.02 0.11 ± 0.01 0.11 ± 0.01	$\begin{array}{c} 0.02 \pm 0.01\\ 0.06 \pm 0.01\\ 0.05 \pm 0.01\\ 0.05 \pm 0.01\\ 0.07 \pm 0.01\\ 0.07 \pm 0.01\\ 0.05 \pm 0.01\\ 0.05 \pm 0.01\\ 0.05 \pm 0.01\\ 0.06 \pm 0.02\\ 0.06 \pm 0.01\\ 0.06 \pm 0.02\\ 0.06 \pm 0.01\\ 0.06 \pm 0.02\\ 0.06 \pm 0.01\\ 0.01 \pm 0.02\\ 0.00 \pm 0.02$
	DENG HBV HIV HTLV	LEIS LEPT RUBE MEAS	SYPHI TOTAL DENG	HBV HCV HIV	HTLV LEIS LEPT RUBE MFAS	SYPHI	DENG HBV HIV HTLV	LEIS LEPT RUBE MEAS SYPHI TOTAL	DENG HBV HCV HIV HIV LEIS LEPT RUBE MEAS SYPHI TOTAL
	4	ا ا ا ا ا ا ا ا ا ا ا ا ا ا ا ا ا ا ا	23,61- меж- гев, гев, гев, на, на, на, на, соби	· · ·		246HI WEV2 FEB1 FEB1 HLTA HLTA HLTA HLTA HLTA HLTA HLTA HLTA		акын ••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••	Reset
	xəbni ytivit	Reac		xəpui (Reactivit		tivity index	Reac	Reactivity index
	r.8-9M81			2 · 8	- 9 M 8 I		£.8-9	INBI	15.8-9 M 81



Microbiology





