# Multilaboratory Evaluation of a Novel Lateral Flow Immunochromatographic Assay for Confirming Isolation of Mycobacterium bovis from Veterinary Diagnostic Specimens

Stewart, L., McCallan, L., McNair, J., McGoldrick, A., Morris, R., Moyen, J-L., De Juan Ferre, L., Romero, B., Alonso, E., Parsons, S., Van Helden, P., Araujo, F., & Grant, I. (2017). Multilaboratory Evaluation of a Novel Lateral Flow Immunochromatographic Assay for Confirming Isolation of Mycobacterium bovis from Veterinary Diagnostic Specimens. *Journal of Clinical Microbiology*, *55*(12), 3411-3425. https://doi.org/10.1128/JCM.00728-17

**Published in:**
Journal of Clinical Microbiology

**Document Version:**
Peer reviewed version

**Queen's University Belfast - Research Portal:**
Link to publication record in Queen's University Belfast Research Portal

**Publisher rights**
Copyright © 2017 American Society for Microbiology.This work is made available online in accordance with the publisher's policies. Please refer to any applicable terms of use of the publisher.

**General rights**
Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Queen's University Belfast Research Portal is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

**Take down policy**
The Research Portal is Queen's institutional repository that provides access to Queen's research output. Every effort has been made to ensure that content in the Research Portal does not infringe any person's rights, or applicable UK laws. If you discover content in the Research Portal that you believe breaches copyright or violates any law, please contact openaccess@qub.ac.uk.

Download date:23. Jan. 2022

**Multi-Laboratory Evaluation of a Novel Lateral Flow Immunochromatographic Assay for Confirming Isolation of *Mycobacterium bovis* from Veterinary Diagnostic Specimens**

Linda D. Stewart,[a] Lyanne McCallan,[b] James McNair,[b] Adrian McGoldrick,[c] Rowan Morris,[c] Jean-Louis Moyen,[d] Lucía De Juan Ferré,[e,f] Beatriz Romero,[e] Elena Alonso,[g] Sven D.C. Parsons,[h] Paul Van Helden,[h] Flábio R. Araújo[i], Irene R. Grant[a]#

Institute for Global Food Security, School of Biological Sciences, Queen's University Belfast, Northern Ireland, United Kingdom[a]; Veterinary Sciences Division, Agri-Food and Biosciences Institute, Belfast, Northern Ireland, United Kingdom[b]; Animal and Plant Health Agency Veterinary Inspection Centre Starcross, Exeter, United Kingdom[c]; Laboratoire Départemental d'Analyse et de Recherche de la Dordogne, Coulounieix-Chamiers, France[d]; Centro de Vigilancia Sanitaria Veterinaria (VISAVET), Universidad Complutense, Madrid, Spain[e]; Departamento Sanidad Animal, Facultad de Veterinaria, Universidad Complutense, Madrid[f]; Laboratorio Regional de Sanidad Animal de la Junta de Castilla y León, León, Spain[g]; DST/NRF Centre of Excellence for Biomedical Tuberculosis Research/SAMRC Centre for TB Research/Division of Molecular Biology and Human Genetics, Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences, Stellenbosch University, Tygerberg, South Africa[h]; Empresa Brasileira de Pesquisa Agropecuária (EMBRAPA Gado de Corte), Campo Grande, MS, Brazil[i].

Running Head: Novel *M. bovis*-specific lateral flow device

# Address correspondence to Irene R. Grant, i.grant@qub.ac.uk

29 (Abstract)

30 A novel lateral flow immunochromatographic device (LFD) was evaluated in several
31 veterinary diagnostic laboratories. It was confirmed to be specific for *Mycobacterium bovis*
32 and *M. caprae* cells. The performance of the novel LFD was assessed relative to the
33 confirmatory tests routinely applied after culture (spoligotyping or qPCR) in each laboratory;
34 liquid (MGIT or BacT/Alert) and/or solid (Stonebrink, Coletsos or Lowenstein-Jensen)
35 cultures were tested. In comparison to spoligotyping of acid-fast positive MGIT cultures,
36 percentage agreement between positive LFD and spoligotyping results was excellent in two
37 UK laboratories (97.7-100%), but lower in the Spanish context (76%) where spoligotyping
38 was applied to MGIT cultures previously confirmed to be positive for *M. tuberculosis* complex
39 (MTBC) by qPCR. Certain spoligotypes of *M. bovis* and *M. caprae* were not detected by the
40 LFD in Spanish MGIT cultures. Compared to qPCR confirmation, the percentage agreement
41 between positive LFD and qPCR results was 42.3% and 50% for BacT/Alert and MGIT liquid
42 cultures, respectively, and for solid cultures ranged from 11.1-89.2%, depending on solid
43 medium employed (Coletsos 11.1%, Lowenstein-Jensen 55.6%, Stonebrinks 89.2%).
44 Correlation between the novel LFD and BD MGIT TBc ID test results was excellent when
45 190 MGIT cultures were tested (r = 0.9791; $P<0.0001$), with the added benefit that *M. bovis*
46 was differentiated from another MTBC species in one MGIT culture by the novel LFD. This
47 multi-laboratory evaluation has demonstrated the novel LFD's potential utility as a rapid test
48 to confirm isolation of *M. bovis* and *M. caprae* from veterinary specimens following culture.

49

50 Keywords: *Mycobacterium bovis*, *Mycobacterium caprae*, lateral flow
51 immunochromatographic assay, detection specificity, detection sensitivity, veterinary
52 diagnostics

53

54

55

56 Bovine tuberculosis (bTB), caused primarily by *Mycobacterium bovis*, is endemic in
57 many countries and constitutes a significant economic burden to the agricultural industries
58 (1,2,3). Eradication of bTB is currently one of the biggest challenges facing the cattle
59 industry worldwide and despite intensive eradication efforts over decades, bTB continues to
60 be a problem with global perspective (4,5). Amongst the plethora of factors identified as
61 constraints to eradication are the limitations of existing diagnostic tests (6). Diagnosis of bTB
62 is time consuming, and is compounded in some cases by the presence of non-tuberculosis
63 mycobacteria (NTM) which represent a large and diverse population of mycobacteria which
64 may interfere with diagnosis (7). In addition, although *M. bovis* is the main aetiological agent
65 that causes tuberculosis in domesticated cattle and other wildlife and domesticated species,
66 a very closely related species, *Mycobacterium caprae*, also causes a significant proportion of
67 bTB cases in some European countries (8). Differentiation of NTM from organisms that
68 cause bTB is currently only possible by nucleic acid amplification methods, such as PCR
69 and spoligotyping, which are specific but are technically challenging and require
70 sophisticated instrumentation making them expensive. More rapid, specific and sensitive
71 detection and/or confirmatory methods for *M. bovis* that could potentially replace the
72 currently used non-specific ZN stain and the expensive molecular based techniques are
73 urgently required to expedite accurate diagnosis and reduce cost.
74 Mycobacterial culture is still regarded as the 'gold standard' technique for diagnosis
75 of bTB (9), despite the fact that it is slow and cultures are sometimes subject to overgrowth
76 by contaminants. Culture and identification techniques for *M. bovis* and *M. caprae* from
77 veterinary specimens are not globally standardised, so consequently a range of both liquid
78 and solid culture media are employed in veterinary diagnostic laboratories worldwide. The
79 time taken to isolate these species by culture can be up to 12-14 weeks, and subsequent
80 tests needed to confirm and speciate an isolate (Ziehl-Neelsen (ZN) staining and
81 microscopy, PCR or qPCR, GenoType MTBC test, or spoligotyping) require additional time,
82 cost and staff training and effort. A rapid test to confirm isolation of *M. bovis*, rather than
83 other members of the *M. tuberculosis* complex (MTBC) or an NTM in suspect positive liquid

84 or solid cultures is currently lacking. A novel rapid lateral flow, immunochromatographic
85 (LFD) test to detect *M. bovis*, recently developed at Queen's University Belfast (10), may
86 represent such a confirmatory test.

87 Lateral flow, immunochromatographic tests are an inexpensive, quick and simple-to-
88 use format to visually detect a target of choice (11). Several such tests for detection of *M.*
89 *bovis,* or MTBC species more generally, are available commercially. These detect either
90 serum antibodies to *M. bovis* (BrockTB Stat-Pak® assay or DPP® CervidTB assay, both
91 Chembio Diagnostic Systems, Inc., Medford, NY), or the MPT 64 antigen secreted by
92 members of the MTBC, including *M. bovis*, in liquid culture (BD MGIT TBc Identification Test,
93 Becton, Dickinson and Company, NJ; SD Bioline TB Ag MPT 64, Standard Diagnostics, Inc.,
94 Gyeonggi-do, Republic of Korea; Capilia TB-Neo kit, TAUNS Laboratories, Inc., Shizuoka,
95 Japan). The commercially available MPT 64-based antigen detecting
96 immunochromatographic tests have been shown to be highly reliable for rapid identification
97 of MTBC organisms and as such are considered good alternatives to biochemical and
98 molecular assays (12). However, none of these tests is able to distinguish *M. bovis* from
99 other MTBC species, so the recently developed novel antibody-based LFD test is unique in
100 this respect. In the human clinical TB laboratory setting, the commercially available LFD
101 tests (named above) are being used to differentiate MTBC species from NTM, in order to
102 confirm isolation of MTBC from sputum cultures. According to the MGIT™ Procedure
103 Manual (13), the number of *M. tuberculosis* cells present in a MGIT™ culture whenever it
104 signals positive on the MGIT™ 960 instrument is $10^5$-$10^6$ CFU/ml, which is higher than the
105 limit of detection of the novel LFD (10). Therefore, in the veterinary TB laboratory setting,
106 where the MGIT™ liquid culture system is also used, the novel LFD could potentially be
107 used to quickly confirm isolation of *M. bovis* in liquid cultures of bovine lymph nodes (or other
108 animal specimens) without the need for acid-fast staining and molecular techniques such as
109 spoligotyping or real-time PCR.

110 The overall aim of this study was to determine if the novel LFD would be applicable in
111 the veterinary laboratory setting to confirm isolation of *M. bovis* from diagnostic samples.

112 The objectives of the study were to: (i) evaluate the specificity of the novel LFD for *M. bovis*;
113 (ii) assess the performance of the novel LFD relative to current culture confirmation
114 approaches used in veterinary TB laboratories; (iii) evaluate the compatibility of the LFD with
115 three different liquid mycobacterial culture media (BD MGIT, BioMerieux BacT/ALERT, and
116 Trek Diagnostics VersaTREK Myco); and (iv) evaluate the performance of the novel LFD
117 relative to the commercially available BD MGIT™ TBc ID test for confirming presence of *M.*
118 *bovis* in MGIT cultures in the veterinary diagnostic laboratory setting. Following initial
119 evaluation of the LFD at Queen's University Belfast (QUB) and in the statutory TB culture
120 laboratory at Veterinary Sciences Division, Agri-Food and Biosciences Institute for Northern
121 Ireland (AFBI), evaluation of the novel LFD was extended to four other veterinary TB
122 laboratories.

123

124 **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

125 **Participating laboratories.** The following laboratories were involved in the study: TB
126 Immunology Laboratory, Veterinary Sciences Division, Agri-Food and Biosciences Institute,
127 Stormont, Belfast, Northern Ireland (AFBI); TB Laboratory, Animal and Plant Health Agency
128 Starcross, Exeter, England (APHA); Laboratoire Départemental d'Analyse & de Recherche,
129 Service Analyses Agriculture et Vétérinaire, Dordogne, France (DORDOGNE); Servicio de
130 Micobacterias, Centro de Vigilancia Sanitaria Veterinaria, Madrid, Spain (VISAVET);
131 Laboratorio Regional de Sanidad Animal, León, Spain (LRSA); and Laboratory of
132 Immunology, Embrapa Gado de Corte, Campo Grande, MS, Brazil (EMBRAPA); The Animal
133 TB Research Group, Stellenbosch University, South Africa (SUN).

134 **Description of novel lateral flow device (LFD).** A prototype LFD was developed
135 by researchers at QUB in collaboration with Forsite Diagnostics Limited (now trading as
136 Abingdon Health), York, England, as part of a United Kingdom Department of Environment,
137 Food and Rural Affairs project (Defra SE3271). It is an antibody-based antigen detection
138 test, as defined by Office International des Epizooties (OIE) (14). The device comprises of a
139 nitrocellulose membrane strip with a Test line (T) of an *M. bovis*-specific polyclonal IgG

140 antibody produced by QUB personnel and a Control line (C) of a commercially available anti-
141 mouse IgG antibody, and employs gold nanoparticles coated with an *M. bovis*-specific
142 monoclonal IgG antibody, originally produced by AFBI personnel, as the labelled detector
143 reagent. For Intellectual Property (IP) reasons no further details about the antibodies
144 involved can be provided. Additional detail on the development and optimisation of the *M.*
145 *bovis*-specific LFD is available elsewhere (15). The prototype LFDs used in this study
146 (approx. 1300 tests) were produced by Forsite Diagnostics Limited, and then distributed by
147 QUB to participating laboratories by courier service, along with the required running buffer,
148 blocking reagent and instructions for use.
149 **LFD specificity checks.** Participating laboratories were requested to select cultures for
150 LFD specificity testing, to reflect as broad a range of MTBC and NTM species as were
151 available to them, and as representative a collection of strains for each species as possible.
152 Prior specificity checks on the novel LFD had determined that it did not cross react with a
153 range of Gram positive and Gram negative bacteria that may occur in cattle lymph nodes
154 and human sputum (unpublished data). The majority of strains tested were field isolates
155 whose identification had been confirmed by a molecular method (spoligotyping, RD4/RD9
156 analysis and/or 16S rRNA gene sequencing). The cultures tested had generally been freshly
157 sub-cultured in/on various culture media (dictated by usual laboratory practice), including
158 three different liquid media (MGIT from Becton Dickinson, BacT/ALERT from BioMerieux,
159 versaTREK Myco from Thermofisher) and three different solid agar media (Coletsos,
160 Lowenstein-Jensen and Stonebrink), before testing on the LFD. However, older MGIT and
161 solid mycobacterial cultures were tested in some of the laboratories. When the LFD was
162 used to test liquid cultures, 1 ml of culture was centrifuged at 14,000 rpm for 15 min and the
163 pellet resuspended in 100 µl freshly prepared KPL Detector™ Block (KPL, Inc.,
164 Gaithersburg, MA, USA), before 80 µl was transferred to the sample well of the LFD. When
165 used to test solid cultures, a single colony was thoroughly emulsified in 100 µl KPL blocking
166 solution and then 80 µl was transferred to the sample well of the LFD. In both instances, the
167 LFD result was recorded after 15 min at room temperature, interpreted as follows: *M. bovis*

168 positive if two lines were visible; *M. bovis* negative if only a C line was visible; and 'Invalid
169 test' result if only a T line was present, or neither T nor C lines were present. In the latter
170 case, if additional LFDs were available, the LFD test was repeated with a 10-fold dilution of
171 the resuspended pellet of that particular culture to determine if that yielded a valid result.

172 **Assessment of the performance of the novel LFD applied to liquid and solid**
173 **cultures of veterinary specimens in comparison to current confirmation approaches**.
174 In order to assess the ability of the novel LFD to confirm isolation of *M. bovis***,** each
175 laboratory tested selected liquid and/or solid cultures, whichever were available, and
176 provided LFD results along with results obtained using their currently applied confirmatory
177 approach (ZN staining and spoligotyping, or qPCR) to QUB. Variable numbers of cultures of
178 tissues from different animals (cattle, badgers, wild boar, deer, goats) were tested in each
179 laboratory.

180 At the statutory veterinary TB laboratory in Northern Ireland (AFBI) tissue specimens
181 from skin test reactor cattle, or bovine lymph nodes detected at routine slaughter, are
182 chemically decontaminated and cultured in MGIT liquid culture medium and on Lowenstein-
183 Jensen (LJ), Middlebrook 7H11 and/or Stonebrink slopes. Confirmation of isolation of *M.*
184 *bovis* is carried out by spoligotyping of DNA from acid-fast positive MGIT cultures or from
185 suspect colonies on solid media. In an initial assessment, 240 MGIT cultures were selected
186 to be tested, comprising of 40 each of six different categories of MGIT culture and ZN
187 outcome commonly encountered in this laboratory: (1) MGIT positive, ZN 3+; (2) MGIT
188 positive, ZN 2+; (3) MGIT positive, ZN 1+; (4) MGIT positive, ZN 'atypical'; (5) MGIT positive,
189 ZN negative; (6) MGIT negative, ZN not done. LFD testing did not commence until all
190 samples for all categories became available, so these MGIT cultures were not tested in 'real-
191 time', i.e. as they indicated growth positive on the MGIT 960 machine or completed the 56
192 day incubation period. Rather, they were removed from the MGIT 960 instrument, ZN
193 stained to permit culture categorisation, and then kept in an incubator until all required
194 cultures became available. The 240 MGIT cultures were blind coded before the QUB post-
195 doc tested each culture on the LFD. Subsequently, an additional 105 MGIT cultures were

196 tested in ‘real-time’ by AFBI personnel as soon as possible after they indicated positive on
197 the MGIT 960 instrument, or as they finished the 56 d incubation on the MGIT system.

198 The statutory veterinary TB laboratory in England (APHA Starcross) uses a similar
199 confirmatory approach to AFBI; spoligotyping is used to confirm isolation of *M. bovis* in liquid
200 cultures, but isolates on solid agar are reported on the basis of colony morphology with
201 confirmation by spoligotyping at the herd breakdown level only. At APHA, 190 MGIT cultures
202 were selected for LFD testing, categorised on the basis of solid and liquid culture outcomes
203 and ZN result as follows: (A) solid and MGIT positive, ZN positive; (B1) solid negative, MGIT
204 positive, ZN positive; (B2) solid negative, MGIT positive, ZN negative; and (C) solid and
205 MGIT negative, ZN not done.

206 In contrast to AFBI and APHA TB test procedures, at the laboratories in Spain
207 (VISAVET and LRSA), France (DORDOGNE) and Brazil (EMBRAPA), MGIT liquid culture,
208 or BacT/ALERT and versaTREK Myco liquid culture, and solid culture on Coletsos, LJ (with
209 pyruvate) or Stonebrink media are variously employed after decontamination of veterinary
210 specimens, and real-time qPCR methods, which vary by country, are routinely used to
211 confirm the isolation of MTBC in liquid culture; spoligotyping would only be carried out on
212 some cultures. In the Brazilian laboratory, two qPCR methods targeting TbD1 (16) and
213 Rv2807 (17) are employed. In the French laboratory, a qPCR targeting IS6110 is employed
214 for diagnosis currently (18). The Spanish laboratories use an unpublished qPCR method
215 targeting the region between Rv0953c-Rv0954 for MGIT liquid cultures (Elena Alonso,
216 LRSA, personal communication) and spoligotyping for isolates on solid LJ medium.

217 **Comparison of the performance of novel LFD and commercially available BD**
218 **MGIT™ TBc ID test applied to MGIT™ cultures**. Personnel at the APHA laboratory tested
219 the 190 MGIT cultures of veterinary specimens mentioned above by the BD MGIT™ TBc ID
220 test (Becton Dickinson, Sparks, Maryland, USA) in parallel with the novel LFD test. This
221 permitted direct comparison of the performance of the two LFDs.

222 **Statistical analysis of results.** For each laboratory the percentage of spoligotyping- or
223 qPCR- confirmed cultures that tested positive by the LFD was calculated for liquid or solid

224 cultures, as appropriate. Correlation between numbers of samples positive by LFD and by
225 qPCR at DORDOGNE, VISAVET/LRSA and EMBRAPA was assessed by Spearman's rank
226 correlation coefficient. Cross-tabulation of the novel LFD and BD TBc ID test results for the
227 190 MGIT cultures tested at APHA permitted determination of a Kappa statistic, as a
228 measure of the agreement between the two tests, which was interpreted according to Landis
229 and Koch (22). Fisher's Exact Test was also performed on the results for each LFD and
230 confirmed MGIT culture results (i.e. after spoligotyping of acid-fast positive liquid cultures) to
231 permit estimation of detection sensitivity and specificity of each LFD applied to MGIT
232 cultures of veterinary specimens. Statistical tests were performed using GraphPad Instat®
233 3.10 (GraphPad Software Inc., La Jolla, CA, USA).

234

235 **RESULTS**

236 **Specificity of the novel LFD.** Pure cultures of MTBC species (all except *M. canetti*)
237 plus a broad range of NTM were tested on the novel LFD. Some species were available as
238 liquid cultures and some as solid cultures within the various participating laboratories. In the
239 EMBRAPA laboratory only solid cultures were available, some of which were freshly
240 prepared and others were described as 'old and difficult to emulsify'. LFD test results for all
241 pure liquid and solid cultures tested are summarised in Table 1 and Table 2, respectively. In
242 total 85 different strains of *M. bovis*, 41 of *M. tuberculosis* (all of human origin) and 1-4
243 isolates of 29 different NTM (including both type and field strains) were tested across all of
244 the laboratories. The *M. bovis* isolates tested as part of the specificity evaluation were
245 predominantly from cattle, but also included isolates from goats and wild boar (VISAVET and
246 LRSA), lions, mongooses, baboons, civet, hyena and buffalo (SUN), and badgers
247 (DORDOGNE). The *M. bovis* strains tested represent a broad range of different spoligotypes
248 (some information is provided in footnotes of Tables 1 and 2).

249 Results in Tables 1 and 2 indicate that the novel LFD gave a positive result with *M.*
250 *bovis, M. caprae* and *M. bovis* BCG, and, also with the two strains of *M. pinnipedii* tested.
251 Overall, 41 (95.3%) of the 43 *M. bovis* strains tested as liquid cultures yielded a positive LFD

252 result. In contrast, when solid cultures were tested only 60 (75%) of the 80 *M. bovis* strains
253 tested yielded a positive result (Table 2). Some false negative or 'invalid' LFD results for
254 confirmed *M. bovis* strains (including *M. bovis* BCG) and *M. caprae* strains were
255 encountered, particularly with colonies from Coletsos (9/14 strains in DORDOGNE tested
256 LFD negative), LJ (4/9 and 5/10 strains in DORDOGNE and VISAVET, respectively, tested
257 LFD negative) and Stonebrinks slopes (8/60 strains at EMBRAPA tested LFD negative)
258 (Table 2).

259 **Performance of novel LFD applied to liquid and solid cultures compared to**
260 **confirmation by spoligotyping.** At AFBI, MGIT cultures exhibiting growth are ZN stained
261 and only spoligotyped if acid-fast cells are observed to be present. When 160 MGIT cultures
262 categorised on the basis of growth and ZN result were tested at AFBI, the LFD indicated the
263 presence of *M. bovis* in 118 (98.3 %) of 120 ZN positive MGIT cultures (scored 1+, 2+ or 3+;
264 categories 1-3), in 20 (50 %) of 40 MGIT cultures recorded as having an 'atypical' ZN result
265 (category 4), and in 4 (10%) of 40 ZN negative MGIT cultures (category 5). ZN negative
266 MGIT positive cultures are not routinely spoligotyped at AFBI, so the potential presence of
267 an *M. bovis* spoligotype in the ZN negative MGIT cultures that tested LFD positive cannot be
268 excluded. All 40 growth negative MGIT cultures (category 6) tested negative by the LFD.
269 When positive LFD results were compared with the spoligotyping outcome for the MGIT
270 cultures, there was 100% agreement between an LFD positive culture and the presence of
271 an *M. bovis* spoligotype (Table 3). When AFBI personnel subsequently tested 105 MGIT
272 cultures in 'real-time', i.e. as soon as possible after they had flagged positive on the MGIT
273 960 instrument, there was still 100% agreement between an LFD positive culture and the
274 presence of an *M. bovis* spoligotype, but, as was the case for the categorised MGIT cultures
275 (detailed above), an additional two ZN negative cultures tested LFD positive.

276 At APHA, when 190 routine MGIT cultures of bovine lymph tissue samples
277 categorised on the basis of growth on the MGIT system and ZN result were tested, 90 of the
278 103 MGIT cultures in categories A and B1 were confirmed to contain MTBC by
279 spoligotyping, and 89 contained *M. bovis*. The novel LFD indicated the presence of *M. bovis*

280 in 88 (98.9%) of these 89 *M. bovis* positive MGIT cultures (Table 3). The other two LFD
281 negative but MTBC positive MGIT cultures did contain *M. bovis* in one case (so a false
282 negative LFD result) but another MTBC species in the other case (so a true negative LFD
283 result). None of 87 ZN negative MGIT cultures (categories B2 and C) tested LFD positive.

284 The Spanish laboratories (VISAVET and LRSA) tested MGIT cultures of tissues from
285 four different animal species (cattle, goats, deer and wild boar), in contrast to most other
286 participating laboratories, where cattle tissues were principally cultured. For the purposes of
287 this study, spoligotyping was carried out on the qPCR positive MGIT cultures to confirm if *M.*
288 *bovis* or *M. caprae* were present. Overall, of the 50 VISAVET/LRSA MGIT cultures where
289 either *M. bovis* or *M. caprae* were identified to be present by spoligotyping, 39 MGIT cultures
290 tested LFD positive (76% agreement, Table 3). When the *M. bovis* and *M. caprae*
291 spoligotypes present in the LFD negative MGIT cultures were considered, it became
292 apparent that MGIT cultures containing certain spoligotypes of *M. bovis* (SB0121, SB0134,
293 SB0152, SB0295 and SB0339) and *M. caprae* (SB0157, SB0415 and SB0416), isolated
294 from cattle and goat specimens, had not been detected by the novel LFD (Table 4).

295 **Performance of novel LFD applied to liquid and solid cultures compared to qPCR**
296 **confirmation of MTBC isolation.** Real-time qPCR, rather than ZN staining and
297 spoligotyping of acid-fast cultures, was routinely being used in the non-UK laboratories to
298 confirm the isolation of MTBC from veterinary specimens after liquid and/or solid culture,
299 although different qPCR methods were being used in the three laboratories. Results of
300 liquid culture testing at VISAVET/LRSA and DORDOGNE are shown in Figure 1, and for
301 solid culture testing at EMBRAPA in Figure 2. In these figures results are presented for LFD
302 and qPCR as the number of cultures LFD positive when the $C_T$ value of the MGIT culture, or
303 the emulsified suspect colony, was 'x', and no. of cultures yielding a $C_T$ value of 'x' by qPCR,
304 respectively. Correlation between numbers of cultures testing positive by the two tests was
305 assessed using Spearman's rank correlation coefficient (GraphPad Instat® 3.10). For
306 VISAVET/LRSA results (Figure 1A) there was found to be significant correlation between
307 numbers of cultures testing LFD and qPCR positive for MGIT™ cultures yielding $C_T$ values

308 from 17-26 (Spearman's r = 0.9271; *P*=0.0003), however for cultures yielding $C_T$ values >26
309 there was no significant correlation (Spearman's r = 0.1164; *P*=0.7185) between the two
310 tests. Similarly, for the DORDOGNE results (Figure 1B) there was found to be significant
311 correlation between numbers testing LFD and IS6110 qPCR positive for BacT/ALERT
312 cultures yielding $C_T$ values from 14-27 (Spearman's r = 0.830; *P*=0.0003), however for
313 cultures giving $C_T$ values >27 there was no significant correlation (Spearman's r = 0.1164;
314 *P*=0.7185) between the two tests. These results indicate that the limit of detection of the
315 qPCR methods is lower than that of the LFD, meaning that qPCR applied to liquid cultures
316 will detect higher numbers of MTBC positive cultures than testing by the LFD, however, as
317 the qPCR methods employed are neither *M. bovis* nor *M. caprae* specific the presence of
318 other MTBC species in some of these samples cannot be ruled out.

319 VISAVET/LRSA and DORDOGNE liquid culture test results were also analysed in
320 terms of percentage agreement between positive LFD and qPCR results (Table 3). The
321 percentage agreement between positive LFD and qPCR results at VISAVET/LRSA was 50
322 % (39 of 78 cultures); which was lower than agreement between spoligotyping and LFD
323 results (76 %, 38 of 50 confirmed *M. bovis* or *M. caprae* positive cultures). When $C_T$ values
324 of the 50 cultures confirmed by spoligotyping were considered, all except three had $C_T$
325 values $\leq$ 30, which is consistent with the trend illustrated in Figure 1A. DORDOGNE was the
326 only participating laboratory using the BacT/Alert liquid culture system rather than the MGIT
327 culture system, and it was the only laboratory to report 'invalid' LFD results (i.e. no C line in
328 the presence or absence of a T line) when testing liquid cultures. As a consequence of this,
329 percentage agreement between LFD and qPCR positive results for liquid cultures of
330 veterinary specimens tested at DORDOGNE was lowest at 42.3% (Table 3).

331 EMBRAPA results exclusively represented testing of emulsified colonies from solid
332 cultures of bovine specimens by two different confirmatory qPCRs and LFD (Figure 2).
333 There was significant correlation between numbers of cultures testing LFD positive and
334 TbD1 qPCR positive (Spearman's r = 0.973, *P*=0.0001). For qPCR targeting TbD1, $C_T$
335 values of emulsified colonies from 60 agar slants ranged from 12.5–25.0. Of these, 52

336 (91.2%) of 57 emulsified colonies with $C_T$ values ranging from 12.5–22.5 tested LFD
337 positive, and three with $C_T$ values >23 tested LFD negative (Figure 2A). Similar results were
338 observed with the second qPCR targeting Rv2807 applied to emulsified colonies. There was
339 significant correlation between numbers of cultures testing LFD positive and Rv2807 qPCR
340 positive (Spearman's r = 0.967, *P*=0.0001). For Rv2807 qPCR, $C_T$ values of emulsified
341 colonies from 60 agar slants ranged from 12.64–25.94. Of these, 52 (88.1%) of 59
342 emulsified colonies with $C_T$ values ranging from 12.64–23.0 tested LFD positive, and one
343 with $C_T$ value of 25.94 tested LFD negative (Figure 2B). Both fresh and old confirmed *M.*
344 *bovis* cultures on Stonebrink slopes were tested by EMBRAPA; 89.2 and 82.6% of fresh and
345 old solid cultures, respectively, were confirmed to be *M. bovis* by the LFD (Table 5). No
346 'invalid' LFD results were reported by EMBRAPA (just some difficulties in emulsifying
347 colonies in KPL buffer on occasion); in contrast to the DORDOGNE laboratory where 8 of 9
348 Coletsos cultures and 4 of 9 LJ cultures yielded an 'invalid' result (Table 5). The latter
349 resulted in only 11.1 and 55.6% of solid cultures being confirmed as *M. bovis* by the LFD in
350 the French context (Table 5).

351 **Correlation between the results of the novel LFD and the commercially available**
352 **BD MGIT™ TBc ID test**. A total of 190 MGIT™ cultures of bovine specimens were tested in
353 parallel by the novel LFD and BD MGIT™ TBc ID tests at APHA. Correlation between results
354 was assessed using Spearman's rank correlation coefficient, which indicated significant
355 correlation between results obtained with the two LFDs (r = 0.9791; *P*<0.0001). LFD results
356 are presented as separate 2x2 contingency tables relative to confirmed culture result (on the
357 basis of spoligotyping) for the two LFDs in Table 6. There were two MGIT cultures with
358 discordant results with the two LFD tests – one culture was MTBC positive but confirmed *M.*
359 *bovis* negative by spoligotyping, so correctly tested negative by the novel LFD but positive
360 by the BD MGIT™ TBc ID test, and the other culture was confirmed *M. bovis* positive by
361 spoligotyping and tested falsely negative by the novel LFD but correctly positive by the BD
362 MGIT™ TBc ID test (Table 6). There were an additional two MGIT™ cultures that yielded
363 negative results by both LFD tests when different results were expected; in one case both

364 tests should have yielded positive results because *M. bovis* was confirmed to be present by
365 spoligotyping, and in the other case the BD MGIT$^{TM}$ TBc ID test should have yielded a
366 positive result because an MTBC species other than *M. bovis* was indicated by
367 spoligotyping. When the commercial and novel lateral flow tests were used to confirm the
368 presence of *M. bovis* in MGIT cultures of veterinary specimens, the detection specificity and
369 sensitivity of both LFD tests were comparable - 1.000 and 0.978, respectively, for the novel
370 LFD, and 0.990 and 0.989, respectively, for the BD MGIT TBc ID test.
371

372 **DISCUSSION**

373 Evaluation of the novel LFD test was carried out in multiple veterinary diagnostic laboratories
374 located in different geographic regions, processing specimens from a range of animal
375 species, and using differing bTB diagnostic algorithms,in the hope that the results of the
376 study would provide a wide-ranging assessment of its potential utility as a quick and easy
377 end point test to confirm isolation of *M. bovis* from animal specimens in the veterinary
378 diagnostic context. Veterinary diagnostic laboratories in different countries adopt differing
379 approaches for confirming isolation of MTBC after culture of animal specimens. The bTB
380 diagnostic algorithm adopted is dependent mostly on the current prevalence of tuberculosis
381 in the country, which dictates whether testing is being carried out for disease surveillance,
382 control or eradication purposes. For example, bTB is endemic in Northern Ireland (herd
383 prevalence 7.15% and animal incidence 0.66%, (20)) and England and Wales (herd
384 prevalence ~7.8%, (21,22)), so in the UK context confirmation of isolation of *M. bovis* from
385 bovine specimens is achieved by colony morphology on solid agar or ZN staining and
386 spoligotyping of DNA extracted from acid-fast positive liquid cultures. Spoligotyping
387 facilitates epidemiological studies and provides transmission data required for control and
388 eradication in the UK context. In contrast, herd prevalences of bTB in cattle in France
389 (~0.05%, Jean-Louis Moyen, DORDOGNE, personal communication) and Spain (2.81%,
390 (23)) are lower, but there is a recognised threat of reintroduction of the disease due to
391 wildlife 'spill-back' (24,25). In these contexts a more sensitive qPCR approach to confirming

392 the isolation of *M. bovis* (or *M. caprae* since this species is also encountered) in liquid and
393 solid cultures has been adopted; ZN staining is not routinely employed and all isolates would
394 not necessarily be spoligotyped. Similarly, in Brazil, a recent epidemiological survey
395 indicated the prevalence of TB in infected cattle ranged from 0.035 to 1.3% in the 13 States
396 surveyed (26), so qPCR confirmation methods are adopted.

397 A wide range of NTM and MTBC strains from both solid and liquid cultures was
398 tested to evaluate the specificity of the novel LFD. The results (Tables 1 and 2) confirmed
399 that the LFD was specific for *M. bovis* in the broadest sense, since *M. bovis*, *M. caprae* and
400 *M. bovis* BCG all gave rise to both positive T and C lines on the device. Detection of *M.*
401 *caprae* by the novel LFD would be viewed as beneficial, since this MTBC species is the main
402 aetiological agent of tuberculosis in goats, but also in cattle in certain countries. For
403 example, in Spain around 7% of bTB cases in cattle are due to *M. caprae* (8), and in some
404 central/eastern European countries TB infection in cattle is only due to *M. caprae* (27).
405 However, *M. caprae* strains with different RD4 deletions have been isolated in parts of
406 Europe (ML Boschiroli, personal communication; 28); which may explain some of the
407 negative LFD results obtained for colonies of 5 of 10 *M. caprae* strains from solid
408 LJ/pyruvate medium and 5 of 8 confirmed *M. caprae* positive MGIT liquid cultures tested by
409 VISAVET/LRSA (Table 2). Alternatively, certain spoligotypes may not be detectable by the
410 LFD. In phylogenetic terms, amongst the MTBC species, *M. pinnipedii* and *M. microti* are
411 closest to *M. bovis*, *M. caprae* and *M. bovis* BCG (27). A positive result on the novel LFD
412 was obtained with the single liquid and single solid cultures of *M. pinnipedii* tested, however,
413 this *Mycobacterium* sp. is primarily isolated from seals and is rarely encountered in cattle or
414 food animals (29). *M. microti* can sometimes be encountered in cats, badgers or wild boars
415 in the UK and French contexts, but rarely in food animals (30) so it is advantageous that the
416 two liquid cultures and one solid culture of *M. microti* tested negative with the novel LFD.

417 Once the detection specificity of the LFD had been demonstrated, the diagnostic
418 performance of the LFD was assessed by comparing LFD results with those of current
419 nucleic acid-based confirmatory tests (spoligotyping and qPCR) employed in the various

420 laboratories. Few issues were encountered by personnel using the LFD for the first time, or
421 in interpretation of LFD results. Some false negative, or invalid (no C-line), LFD results
422 occurred, mainly when testing BacT/ALERT liquid cultures or emulsified confirmed *M. bovis*
423 colonies from Coletsos and LJ solid media in the DORDOGNE laboratory (Tables 3 and 5).
424 When testing colonies it may be that cells were not adequately disaggregated and so
425 clumped cells were too big to pass along the LFD to reach the T and C lines to generate a
426 positive result. An alternative explanation could be that too many cells passing along the
427 LFD may have quenched or prevented binding of cell/particle complexes at the T and/or C
428 lines leading to false negative or invalid test outcomes (Dene Baldwin, Abingdon Health,
429 personal communication). In the DORDOGNE laboratory some BacT/ALERT liquid cultures
430 that initially gave a negative or invalid LFD result when retested after 10-fold dilution yielded
431 a valid result (i.e. presence of a C-line) or a clear positive result; which appeared to confirm
432 two things - that too much biomass was the cause of false negative results, and that higher
433 numbers of *M. bovis* were present in positive BacT/ALERT cultures than in positive MGIT
434 cultures. EMBRAPA personnel mentioned difficulties in emulsifying some of the older *M.*
435 *bovis* colonies, however, they did not report any ‘invalid’ LFD results. It is clear that some
436 more optimisation of the LFD test procedure in relation to its application to confirm the
437 identity of suspect colonies from solid culture media and in liquid culture systems other than
438 BD MGIT 960 system would be needed. This would include optimising the density of a
439 colony suspension relative to the universally used McFarland scale before application to the
440 LFD.

441 The results of this study clearly show that the novel LFD performed better relative to
442 culture confirmation by spoligotyping than culture confirmation by qPCR. In the UK
443 laboratories (AFBI and APHA) percentage agreement between spoligotyping and LFD
444 results for liquid MGIT cultures was 97.7-100% (Table 3). Therefore, the LFD could
445 potentially be used instead of ZN and spoligotyping for routine and rapid confirmation of *M.*
446 *bovis* isolation in cultures of veterinary specimens once growth is indicated by the MGIT 960
447 culture system in the UK context. However, since spoligotyping is also carried out to provide

448 valuable epidemiological information (31-35), it is probably unlikely that the LFD test would
449 replace spoligotyping completely in these laboratories. Some extra *M. bovis* positive MGIT
450 cultures were indicated by LFD testing compared to ZN staining, so if the LFD were adopted
451 in the UK context this could potentially more efficiently direct spoligotyping efforts than ZN
452 staining of MGIT cultures currently does. In the Spanish context percentage agreement
453 between the spoligotyping and LFD results was lower at 76%. Results suggest that isolates
454 of certain spoligotypes of both *M. bovis* (SB0121, SB0134, SB0152, SB0295 and SB0339)
455 and *M. caprae* (SB0157, SB0415 and SB0416) were not being detected by the LFD (Table
456 4). However, it should be noted that VISAVET/LRSA did not apply ZN staining prior to
457 spoligotyping of qPCR positive MGIT cultures; which may also have contributed to the lower
458 percentage agreement figure.

459 Various qPCR methods are routinely employed to confirm the isolation of MTBC
460 species in liquid or solid cultures from veterinary diagnostic specimens in the non-UK
461 laboratories (DORDOGNE, VISAVET/LRSA and EMBRAPA). It is evident from the results of
462 this study that the novel LFD is less sensitive than qPCR. This is not a surprising finding
463 given that the limit of detection of the LFD is $10^4$-$10^5$ *M. bovis* cells/ml of sample (10) and the
464 limit of detection of qPCR methods for MTBC is generally much lower than this (18); for
465 example, the limit of detection of the French IS6110 qPCR is 3 genomic units (Jean-Louis
466 Moyen, DORDOGNE, personal communication). Results presented in Figures 1 and 2
467 suggest that the limit of detection of the novel LFD is whatever number of *M. bovis* cells a $C_T$
468 value in the mid to high 20s corresponds to. This number may differ depending on the qPCR
469 method employed, but is likely to be a reasonably high number of *M. bovis*, which would
470 concur with the limit of detection of the LFD previously determined using spiked faeces and
471 dilutions of *M. bovis* cultures at QUB (10). Unfortunately, information on what number of *M.*
472 *bovis* cells equates to a $C_T$ value in the mid-20s was not obtainable from any of the three
473 laboratories concerned; in these laboratories the qPCR methods were being used
474 qualitatively and not for quantification.

475 During this study, liquid and/or solid cultures of veterinary specimens from a variety
476 of animal species were tested in the participating laboratories. In the AFBI, APHA and
477 DORDOGNE laboratories, liquid cultures of principally cattle and some badger specimens
478 were tested by the novel LFD. In the EMBRAPA laboratory exclusively cattle cultures
479 isolated on solid media were tested. However, in the VISAVET and LRSA laboratories MGIT
480 liquid cultures tested were of cattle, goats, deer and wild boar specimens. The LFD seemed
481 to perform less well on cattle and goat liquid cultures in the Spanish context; several *M.*
482 *bovis* and *M. caprae* spoligotypes were seemingly not detectable by the LFD (Table 4). In
483 Spain around 7% of bTB cases in cattle are due to *M. caprae* (8), and TB cases in goats in
484 Spain can be caused by either *M. bovis* or *M. caprae* (36). It has previously been reported
485 that 62 different spoligotypes were identified amongst MTBC isolates collected from wild
486 ungulates and livestock in Spain (37). Given the diversity of MTBC spoligotypes that are
487 encountered in the Spanish veterinary diagnostic context, perhaps it is the case that certain
488 spoligotypes of *M. bovis* and *M. caprae* occurring in Spanish animals are not detectable by
489 the combination of antibodies (originally generated using *M. bovis* AF2122/97, a UK cattle
490 strain with spoligotype SB0140) employed on the LFD. This may also explain the negative
491 LFD results obtained for 5 (50%) of 10 pure cultures of *M. caprae* tested from solid medium
492 (Table 2) and 12 (24%) of 50 MGIT cultures of Spanish veterinary specimens with low qPCR
493 $C_T$ values that were confirmed to contain either *M. bovis* or *M. caprae* by spoligotyping
494 (Table 4).
495 Commercially available antibody-based LFD tests, which target MPT64 or MPT70
496 secreted antigens, not whole cells, and detect MTBC species more generally have been .
497 The BD MGIT TBc ID immunochromatographic assay has been comprehensively evaluated
498 in human clinical TB laboratories to speciate mycobacterial isolates to the level of MTBC or
499 NTM (38-42). The BD LFD and other similar commercially available MPT64-based LFD
500 tests perform very well in the clinical TB context and have been found to be good
501 alternatives to biochemical and molecular assays for identification to the level of MTBC
502 species in cultures of respiratory specimens (12). To our knowledge, there have been no

previous reports of the BD MGIT TBc ID test being evaluated for use in the veterinary TB diagnostic setting. In this latter context, *M. bovis* and *M. caprae* (in certain geographic regions), rather than *M. tuberculosis,* are the MTBC species most commonly isolated, and confirmation of isolation of *M. bovis* or *M. caprae* is achieved by spoligotyping, or of MTBC isolation more broadly by a specific qPCR. A quicker and cheaper confirmatory test, that is able to confirm isolation of *M. bovis* or *M. caprae* but doesn't require expensive equipment, or a lot of staff training or time, should be an attractive proposition for a veterinary TB laboratory. During this study the performance of the novel LFD was found to be comparable to that of the BD MGIT TBc ID test for confirming isolation of *M. bovis* in MGIT liquid cultures of veterinary specimens at APHA in terms of detection sensitivity and specificity. However, the extra differentiation between *M. bovis* and other species of the MTBC possible using the novel LFD would potentially be a more attractive proposition for the APHA laboratory than simply confirming isolation of MTBC.

In conclusion, evaluation of the novel LFD in multiple veterinary TB laboratories in various parts of the world has demonstrated that the novel LFD could find application in the veterinary diagnostic setting to confirm isolation of *M. bovis* or *M. caprae* (depending on geographical context) in liquid cultures (assuming sufficient cell numbers are present), and also to test suspect colonies from solid culture media. The LFD was shown to have excellent specificity for this purpose, and its unique ability to differentiate *M. bovis* and *M. caprae* from other MTBC and NTM was clearly demonstrated; in contrast to other commercially available antibody-based LFD tests. The novel LFD possessed sufficient sensitivity to confirm the isolation of *M. bovis* or *M. caprae* in liquid cultures once they indicated positive on the MGIT 960 or BACT/Alert culture systems, with a few exceptions.

**Acknowledgments**

This research was financed by the European Regional Development Fund under the European Sustainable Competitiveness Programme for Northern Ireland 2007-2013 via a Proof-of-Concept Grant from Invest Northern Ireland. APHA staff were funded under Defra

531 project SB4300. We thank all the personnel in the various laboratories who contributed in
532 any way to generation of the results presented.

533 The study was conceived by I.G. and L.S.; LFD evaluation and data collection were
534 conducted by L.S., L.McC., J.McN., J-L.M., L.De J., E.A., R.M., A.McG., S.P. and F.A.; data
535 analysis and interpretation were conducted by I.G. in consultation with L.McC., J-L.M.,
536 L.deJ., B.R., E.A., S.P. and F.A; and I.G. and L.S. wrote the first draft of the manuscript. All
537 authors contributed to the final manuscript.

538

539 **REFERENCES**

540 1. **Reynolds D**. 2006. A review of tuberculosis science and policy in Great Britain. Vet.
541 Microbiol. 112: 119-126

542 2. **Butler A, Lobley M, Winter M**. 2010. Economic Impact Assessment of Bovine.
543 Tuberculosis in the South West of England CRPR Research Report No. 30.
544 www.centres.ex.ac.uk/crpr/publications/3. **Amanfu W**. 2006. The situation of tuberculosis
545 and tuberculosis control in animals of economic interest. Tuberculosis 86: 330-335

546 4. **Reviriego Gordejo FJ, Vermeersch JP.** 2006. Towards eradication of bovine
547 tuberculosis in the European Union. Vet Microbiol **112**:101–109.

548 5. **More SJ, Radunz B, Glanville RJ.** 2015. Lessons learned during the successful
549 eradication of bovine tuberculosis from Australia. Vet Rec **177**:224-232.

550 6. **Schiller I, Oesch B, Vordermeier HM, Palmer MV, Harris BN, Orloski KA, Buddle,**
551 **BM, Thacker TC, Lyashchenko KP, Waters WR.** (2010), Bovine Tuberculosis: A Review of
552 Current and Emerging Diagnostic Techniques in View of their Relevance for Disease Control
553 and Eradication. Transboundary and Emerging Diseases, 57: 205–220.

554 7. **Biet F, Boschiroli ML.** 2014. Non-tuberculous mycobacterial infections of veterinary
555 relevance. Research in Veterinary Science, 97 (Suppl.) (2014), pp. S69-S77

556 8. **Rodríguez S, Bezos J, Romero B, de Juan L, Álvarez J, Castellanos E, Moya N,**
557 **Lozano F, Javed MT, Sáez-Llorente JL, Liébana E, Mateos A, Domínguez L, Aranaz A.,**

558 **and The Spanish Network on Surveillance and Monitoring of Animal Tuberculosis.**
559 2011. *Mycobacterium caprae* infection in livestock and wildlife, Spain. Emerg. Infect. Dis. **17:**
560 532-535.

561 9. **Office International des Epizooties.** 2009. Chapter 2.4.7. – Bovine Tuberculosis. In
562 OIE Terrestrial Manual 2009.
563 https://web.oie.int/eng/normes/MMANUAL/2008/pdf/2.04.07_BOVINE_TB.pdf (last
564 accessed 10 March 2017).
565 10. **Stewart LD, Tort N, Meakin P, Argudo JM, Nzuma R, Reid N, Delahay RJ, Ashford**
566 **R, Montgomery WI, Grant IR.** 2017. Development of a novel immunochromatographic
567 lateral flow assay specific for *Mycobacterium bovis* cells and its application in combination
568 with immunomagnetic separation to test badger faeces. BMC Veterinary Research
569 **13:**131. DOI: 10.1186/s12917-017-1048-x
570 11. **Eltzov E, Guttel S, Adarina LYK, Sinawang PD, Ionescu RE, Marks RS.** 2015. Lateral
571 flow immunoassays – from paper strip to smartphone technology. Electroanalysis **27**:1-
572 16.
573 12. **Yin X, Zheng L, Lin L, Hu Y, Zheng F, Hu Y, Wang Q.** 2013. Commercial MPT64-
574 based tests for rapid identification of *Mycobacterium tuberculosis* complex: a meta-
575 analysis. J Infect **67:**369-377.
576 13. **Siddiqi SH, Rüsch-Gerdes S.** 2006. MGIT™ Procedure Manual. Foundation for
577 Innovative New Diagnostics, Geneva, Switzerland. http://www.finddx.org/wp-
578 content/uploads/2016/02/mgit_manual_nov2006.pdf.
579 14. **Office International des Epizooties.** 2014. Validation Guideline 3.6.2. Development
580 and optimisation of antigen detection assays. In OIE Validation Guidelines 2014,
581 http://www.oie.int/fileadmin/Home/eng/Health_standards/tahm/GUIDELINE_3.6.2_ANTIG
582 EN_DETECT.pdf .
583 15. **Department of Environment, Food and Rural Affairs.** 2014. EVID4 Final Report on
584 Defra Project SE3271: Development and field validation of a rapid immunomagnetic

585 separation-lateral flow (IMS-LF) test for detecting *Mycobacterium bovis* infection in
586 badgers and/or badger setts.
587 http://randd.defra.gov.uk/Document.aspx?Document=13141_SE3271.pdf.
588 16. **Araújo CP, Osório ALAR, Jorge KSG, Ramos CAN, Filho AFS, Vidal CES, Roxo E,**
589 **Nishibe C, Almeida NF, Fonseca Júnior AAJr, Silva MR, Barbosa Neto JD,**
590 **Cerqueira VD, Zumárraga MJ, Araújo FR.** 2014. Detection of *Mycobacterium bovis* in
591 bovine and bubaline tissues using nested-PCR for TbD1. PLoS ONE **9:** e91023.
592 17. **Araújo CP, Osório ALAR, Jorge KSG, Ramos CAN, Filho AFS, Vidal CE, Vargas**
593 **AP, Roxo E, Rocha AS, Suffys PN, Fonseca AA Jr, Silva MR, Barbosa Neto JD,**
594 **Cerqueira VD, Araújo FR.** 2014. Direct detection of *Mycobacterium tuberculosis*
595 complex in bovine and bubaline tissues through nested-PCR. Braz J Microbiol **45:**633-
596 640.
597 18. **Courcoul A, Moyen J-L, Brugere L, Faye S, Henault S, Gares H, Boschiroli M-L.**
598 2014. Estimation of sensitivity and specificity of bacteriology, histopathology and PCR
599 for the confirmatory diagnosis of Bovine Tuberculosis using Latent Class Analysis. PLoS
600 ONE **9(3):** e90334.
601 19. **Landis JR, Koch GG.** 1977. The measurement of observer agreement for categorical
602 data. Biometrics **33:**159-174.
603 20. **Department of Agriculture, Environment and Rural Affairs.** 2016. Bovine
604 Tuberculosis in Northern Ireland Annual Report 2015. https://www.daera-
605 ni.gov.uk/publications/bovine-tuberculosis-northern-ireland-annual-reports.
606 21. **Baker C.** 2015. Bovine TB Statistics: Great Britain. Briefing Paper Number 6081.
607 http://researchbriefings.parliament.uk/ResearchBriefing/Summary/SN06081.
608 22. **Animal and Plant Health Agency.** 2016. Bovine tuberculosis in England in 2015.
609 Epidemiological analysis of the 2015 data and historical trends.
610 https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/584527/tb-
611 epidemiology-england-2015.pdf.

612 23. **Ministerio de Agricultura y Pesca Alimentación y Medio Ambiente, Spain.** 2017.
613 Programa Nacional de Erradicacion de Tuberculosis Bovina Presentado por España para
614 el año 2017. http://www.mapama.gob.es/es/ganaderia/temas/sanidad-animal-higiene-
615 ganadera/pnetb_2017_3_tcm7-443753.pdf.
616 24. **Gortazar C, Vicente J, Boadella M, Ballesteros C, Galindo RC, Garrido J, Aranaz A,**
617 **de la Fuente J.** 2011. Progress in the control of Bovine Tuberculosis in Spanish wildlife.
618 Vet Microbiol. **151:**170-178.
619 25. **Hars J, Richomme C, Rivière J, Faure E, Boschiroli ML**. 2012. Dix années de
620 surveillance de la tuberculose bovine dans la faune sauvage française et perspectives.
621 Bull Epidémiol. **52:**1-5.
622 26. **Ferreira Neto JS, Bicca da Silveira G, Medeiros Rosa B, Picão Gonçalves VS,**
623 **Hildebrand Grisi-Filho JH; Amaku M, Augusto Dias, R, Ferreira F, Heinemann MB,**
624 **Oliveira Telles E, Pereira Lage A**. 2016. Analysis of 15 years of the National Program for
625 the Control and Eradication of Animal Brucellosis and Tuberculosis, Brazil. Semina:
626 Ciências Agrárias **37**(5,Suppl 2): 3385-3402.
627 27. **Rodriguez-Campos S, Smith NH, Boniotti MB, Aranaz A.** 2014. Overview and
628 phylogeny of *Mycobacterium tuberculosis* complex organisms: implications for
629 diagnostics and legislation of bovine tuberculosis. Res Vet Sci **97:**S5-S19.
630 28. **Domogalla J, Prodinger WM, Blum H, Krebs S, Gellert S, Müller M, Neuendorf E,**
631 **Sedlmaier F, Büttnera M.** 2013. Region of Difference 4 in Alpine *Mycobacterium caprae*
632 Isolates Indicates Three Variants. J Clin Microbiol 51(5):1381–1388.
633 29. **Loeffler SH, de Lisle GW, Neill MA, Collins DM, Price-Carter M, Paterson B, Crews**
634 **KB.** 2014. The seal tuberculosis agent *Mycobacterium pinnipedii*, infects domestic cattle
635 in New Zealand: Epidemiological factors and DNA strain typing. J. of Wildlife Dis:50, No.
636 2. 180-187.
637 30. **Kremer K, Van Soolingen D, van Embden J, Hughes S, Inwald J, Hewinson G**.
638 1998. *Mycobacterium microti*: more widespread than previously thought. J Clin Microbiol
639 **36:**2793-2794.

640 31. **Roring S, Hughes MS, Beck L-A, Skuce RA, Neill SD.** 1998. Rapid diagnosis and
641 strain differentiation of Mycobacterium bovis in radiometric culture by spoligotyping. Vet
642 Microbiol **61:**71-80.
643 32. **Skuce RA, Neill SD.** 2001. Molecular epidemiology of *Mycobacterium bovis*: exploiting
644 molecular data. Tuberculosis **81:**169-175.
645 33. **Smith NH, Gordon SV, de la Rua-Domenech R, Clifton-Hadley RS, Hewinson RG.**
646 2006. Bottlenecks and broomsticks: the molecular evolution of *Mycobacterium bovis.*
647 *Nature Rev Microbiol* **4:**670-681.
648 34. **Zhang J, Abadia E, Refregier G, Tafaj S, Boschiroli ML, Guillard B, Andremont**
649 **A, Ruimy R, Sola C.** 2010. *Mycobacterium tuberculosis* complex CRISPR genotyping:
650 improving efficiency, throughput and discriminative power of 'spoligotyping' with new
651 spacers and a microbead-based hybridization assay. J Med Microbiol **59(3):**285-294.
652 35. **Hauer A, De Cruz K, Cochard T, Godreuil S, Karoui C, Henault S, Bulach T, Bañuls**
653 **A-L, Biet F, Boschiroli ML.** 2015. Genetic evolution of *Mycobacterium bovis* causing
654 tuberculosis in livestock and wildlife in France since 1978. PLoS One **10(2)**: e0117103.
655 36. **Gortazar C, Vicente J, Samper S, Garrido JM, Fernandez-de-Mera IG, Garin P,**
656 **Juste RA, Martin C, Acevedo P, de la Fuente M, Hofle U.** 2005. Molecular
657 characterisation of *Mycobacterium tuberculosis* complex isolates from wild ungulates in
658 south-central Spain. Vet Res **36:**43-52.
659 37. **Rodríguez S, Romero B, Bezos J, de Juan L, Alvarez J, Castellanos E, Moya N,**
660 **Lozano F, González S, Sáez-Llorente JL, Mateos A., Domínguez L, Aranaz A.** 2010.
661 High spoligotype diversity within a *Mycobacterium bovis* population: clues to
662 understanding the demography of the pathogen in Europe. Vet Microbiol **141**:89-95.
663 38. **Said HM, Ismail N, Osman A, Velsman C, Hoosen AA.** 2011. Evaluation of TBc
664 identification immunochromatographic assay for rapid identification of *Mycobacterium*
665 *tuberculosis* complex in samples from broth cultures. J Clin Microbiol **49:**1939-1942.

666 39. **Yu M-C, Chen H-Y, Wu M-H, Huang W-L, Kuo Y-M, Yu F-L, Jou R.** 2011. Evaluation
667 of the rapid MGIT TBc Identification test for culture confirmation of *Mycobacterium*
668 *tuberculosis* complex strain detection. J Clin Microbiol **49:**802-807.
669 40. **Martin A, Bombeeck D, Fissette K, de Rijk P, Hernández-Neuta I, Del Portillo P,**
670 **Palomino JC.** 2011. Evaluation of the BD MGIT TBc Identification Test (TBc ID), a rapid
671 chromatographic immunoassay for the detection of *Mycobacterium tuberculosis* complex
672 from liquid culture. J Microbiol Meth **84:**255-257.
673 41. **Barouni AS, Alnajh ZB, Aboguttaia NB, Alamri WM.** 2012. Evaluation of the BD
674 MGIT$^{TM}$ TBc identification test for rapid identification of *Mycobacterium tuberculosis*
675 complex from positive BACTEC MGIT 960 cultures in a routine laboratory work. Afr J
676 Microbiol Res **6(5):**1065-1068.
677 42. **Machado D, Ramos J, Couto I, Cadir N, Narciso I, Coelho E, Viegas S, Viveiros M.**
678 2014. Assessment of the BD MGIT TBc Identification test for the detection of
679 *Mycobacterium tuberculosis* complex in a network of mycobacteriology laboratories.
680 BioMed Res Int **2014:**398108.
681

682 **Table 1.** Multi-laboratory assessment of the specificity of the novel LFD by testing pure cultures of *M. tuberculosis* complex and non-
683 tuberculous *Mycobacterium* spp. grown in liquid culture media. All liquid cultures tested signalled positive on the respective culture systems
684 and, therefore, contained high numbers of mycobacteria (>$10^6$ CFU/ml) at time of testing.

685

686

| Test *Mycobacterium* sp. | QUB 7H9/OADC | DORDOGNE BacT/ALERT® | DORDOGNE versaTREK® Myco | VISAVET/LRSA MGIT™ | SUN MGIT™ | No. (%) LFD positive/ total no. cultures tested |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | No. LFD positive / No. tested | | | | | |
| ***M. tuberculosis* complex:** | | | | | | |
| *M. bovis* | 6/6* | 4/4 | 8/8 | - | 23/25 | 41/43 (95.3) |
| *M. caprae* | - | 1/1 | 1/1 | - | - | 2/2 (100) |
| *M. bovis* BCG | 1/1 | - | - | - | - | 1/1 (100) |
| *M. pinnipedii* | - | - | - | 1/1 | - | 1/1 (100) |
| *M. africanum* | - | 0/1 | 0/1 | - | - | 0/2 (0) |
| *M. microti* | - | 0/1 | 0/1 | - | - | 0/2 (0) |
| *M. tuberculosis* | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | - | 0/41 | 0/44 (0) |
| **Non-tuberculous mycobacteria:** | | | | | | |
| *M. abscessus* | - | - | - | - | 0/1 | 0/1 (0) |
| *M. asiaticum* | - | - | - | - | 0/1 | 0/1 (0) |
| *M. avium subsp. avium* | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | - | 0/4 (0) |
| *M. avium subsp. paratuberculosis* | 0/10 | 0/2 | 0/2 | - | - | 0/14 (0) |
| *M. chelonae* | - | - | - | - | 0/1 | 0/1 (0) |
| *M. columbiense* | - | - | - | 0/1 | - | 0/1 (0) |
| *M. diernhoferi* | - | - | - | - | 0/1 | 0/1 (0) |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *M. elephantis* | - | - | - | - | 0/1 | 0/1 (0) |
| *M. fortuitum* | 0/1 | - | - | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/3 (0) |
| *M. gordonae* | 0/1 | - | - | - | - | 0/1 (0) |
| *M. hassiacum* | - | - | - | - | 0/1 | 0/1 (0) |
| *M. hiberniae* | 0/1 | - | - | - | - | 0/1 (0) |
| *M. interjectum* | - | - | - | - | 0/1 | 0/1 (0) |
| *M. intracellulare* | 0/1 | - | - | 0/1 | - | 0/2 (0) |
| *M. kansasii* | 0/1 | 1/1 (v. weak)** | 0/1 | 0/1 | - | 1/4 (25) |
| *M. lentiflavum* | - | - | - | - | 0/1 | 0/1 (0) |
| *M. marinum* | 0/1 | - | - | 0/1 | - | 0/2 (0) |
| *M. moriokaense* | - | - | - | - | 0/1 | 0/1 (0) |
| *M. nonchromogenicum* | - | 0/1 | 0/1 | | - | 0/2 (0) |
| *M. paraffinicum* | - | - | - | - | 0/1 | 0/1 (0) |
| *M. parascrofulaceum* | - | - | - | - | 0/1 | 0/1 (0) |
| *M. peregrinum* | - | - | - | 0/1 | - | 0/1 (0) |
| *M. porcinum* | - | - | - | - | 0/1 | 0/1 (0) |
| *M. scrofulaceum* | 0/1 | - | - | - | - | 0/1 (0) |
| *M. simiae* | - | - | - | - | 0/1 | 0/1 (0) |
| *M. smegmatis* | 0/1 | - | - | 0/1 | - | 0/2 (0) |
| *M. terrae* | 0/1 | - | - | - | - | 0/1 (0) |
| *M. vulneris* | - | - | - | - | 0/1 | 0/1 (0) |
| *M. xenopi* | 0/1 | - | - | - | - | 0/1 (0) |

705 -, not tested

706 * *M. bovis* spoligotypes tested – SB0140, SB0129, SB0273, SB0142, SB0263 and SB0145, according to Mbovis.org database.

707 ** very weak T-line observed, but slightly increasing blocking buffer concentration prevented this false positive result.

708 **Table 2.** Multi-laboratory assessment of the specificity of the novel LFD involving pure
709 cultures of *Mycobacterium tuberculosis* complex and non-tuberculous *Mycobacterium* spp.
710 grown on different solid culture media (Coletsos, Lowenstein-Jensen (LJ) or Stonebrink).
711 Data represent number of solid cultures LFD positive of the total number of solid cultures
712 tested in each case.

713

| | DORDOGNE | | VISAVET/LRSA | EMBRAPA | No. (%) LFD positive/ total no. cultures tested |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Test *Mycobacterium* sp.** | **Coletsos medium** | **Lowenstein-Jensen (LJ) medium** | **LJ/pyruvate medium** | **Stonebrink medium** | |
| ***M. tuberculosis* complex:** | | | | | |
| *M. bovis* | 3/11* | 5/9* | - | 52/60 | 60/80 (75.0) |
| *M. caprae* | 1/1 | - | 5/10** | - | 6/11 (54.5) |
| *M. bovis* BCG | 1/2* | - | - | - | 1/2 (50) |
| *M. pinnipedii* | 1/1 | - | - | - | 1/1 (100) |
| *M. africanum* | 0/1 | - | - | - | 0/1 (0) |
| *M. microti* | - | - | 0/1 | - | 0/1 (0) |
| *M. tuberculosis* | 0/1 | - | - | - | 0/1 (0) |
| **Non-tuberculous mycobacteria:** | | | | | |
| *M. avium subsp. avium* | 0/1 | - | - | 0/1 | 0/2 (0) |
| *M. chelonae* | - | - | - | 0/1 | 0/1 (0) |
| *M. fortuitum* | - | - | - | 0/1 | 0/1 (0) |
| *M. kansasii* | 0/1 | - | - | - | 0/1 (0) |
| *M. nonchromogenicum* | 0/1 | - | - | - | 0/1 (0) |

714 -, not tested
715 *Dordogne laboratory reported Control (C) line absent, with and/or without positive Test (T)
716 line, so LFD result was 'Invalid'.
717 ** *M. caprae* spoligotypes tested by VISAVET/LRSA: SB0416, SB0418, SB2205, SB2281,
718 according to Mbovis.org database.
719
720

**Table 3.** Performance of novel LFD test applied to liquid mycobacterial cultures (BD MGIT or BioMerieux BacT/Alert) of specimens from a range of animal species in comparison with usual confirmatory test(s) applied in multiple veterinary diagnostic laboratories.

| Laboratory (Country) | Liquid culture system employed (No. cultures tested) | Animal species represented | Confirmatory test(s) routinely applied to liquid cultures | No. cultures confirmed *M. bovis* or MTBC positive[3] | No. cultures LFD positive | % of confirmed cultures testing LFD positive |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| AFBI (N. Ireland, UK) | MGIT (240 categorised[1]) | Cattle, | Ziehl-Neelsen stain + | 132 | 141 | 100[4] |
| | MGIT (105 real-time[2]) | badgers | spoligotyping | 38 | 40 | 100[4] |
| APHA (UK) | MGIT (190 categorised[1]) | Cattle, badgers | Ziehl-Neelsen stain + spoligotyping | 89 | 88 | 98.9 |
| DORDOGNE (France) | BacT/Alert (52) | Cattle, badgers | qPCR | 52 | 22 | 42.3 |
| VISAVET/LRSA (Spain) | MGIT (78) | Cattle, goat, wild boar, | qPCR | 78 | 39 | 50.0 |
| | | deer | Spoligotyping[5] | 50 | 38 | 76.0 |

[1] Cultures were categorised before LFD testing, as described in Materials and Methods section, and were held in an incubator until all cultures in each category became available before LFD testing commenced.
[2] Cultures were tested as soon as possible after they indicated growth positive on the MGIT 960 instrument, with minimal additional incubation time before LFD testing commenced.
[3] Confirmation as *M. bovis* when spoligotyping applied, but otherwise confirmation to MTBC level by qPCR.
[4] The LFD detected 9 and 3 extra *M. bovis* positive MGIT cultures than spoligotyping for the categorised and real-time cultures, respectively.
[5] Spoligotyping identified all the strains as MTBC but only 50 were identified as *M. bovis* or *M. caprae* with the spoligotyping profile. A breakdown of the spoligotyping results by animal species is provided in Table 4.

**Table 4.** Breakdown of spoligotyping results for 78 qPCR positive MGIT cultures tested at VISAVET/LRSA and for the 39 MGIT cultures that tested LFD positive.

| Origin of specimen | *M. bovis* spoligotype present | | *M. caprae* spoligotype present | | Unable to assign spoligotype[4] | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | No. | No. LFD + | No. | No. LFD + | No. | No. LFD + |
| Cattle (n=40) | 25 | 17[1] | 1 | 1 | 14 | 1 |
| Goats (n=18) | 11 | 10[2] | 7 | 4[3] | 0 | 0 |
| Wild boar (n=17) | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 |
| Deer (n=3) | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |

[1] LFD did not detect eight confirmed *M. bovis* positive MGIT cultures containing five different spoligotypes (3 x SB0121, 2 x SB0295, SB0134, SB0339 and SB0152).

[2] LFD did not detect one confirmed *M. bovis* positive MGIT culture containing spoligotype SB0121.

[3] LFD did not detect three confirmed *M. caprae* positive MGIT cultures containing three different spoligotypes (SB0415, SB0416 and SB0157).

[4] Cultures tested MTBC positive by qPCR and spoligotyping, but neither *Mycobacterium* species nor a specific spoligotype could be assigned.

1 **Table 5.** Performance of novel LFD test applied to colonies from solid cultures of confirmed *M. bovis* cattle isolates in two veterinary diagnostic
2 laboratories.

| Laboratory (Country) | Solid culture medium employed (No. of cultures tested) | LFD result[1] | | | % of cultures confirmed as *M. bovis* by LFD |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Positive | Negative | Invalid | |
| | | No. of cultures | | | |
| DORDOGNE (France) | Coletsos (9) | 1 | 0 | 8 | 11.1 |
| | Lowenstein-Jensen (9) | 5 | 0 | 4 | 55.6 |
| EMBRAPA (Brazil) | Stonebrink: | | | | |
| | Fresh sub-cultures (37) | 33 | 4 | 0 | 89.2 |
| | Old cultures (23) | 19 | 4 | 0 | 82.6 |

3 [1] LFD result is ‘positive’ when both C-line and T-line are visible, ‘negative’ if only C-line is visible and ‘Invalid’ if no C-line was present along with
4 a positive T-line.

5

6 **Table 6.** Comparison of the ability of the novel LFD and the commercially available BD
7 MGIT™ TBc ID test to confirm the presence of *Mycobacterium bovis* in 190 MGIT cultures of
8 bovine lymph tissue tested by APHA. Data were analysed by Fisher's exact test and Kappa
9 interrater test.

| LFD test result | MGIT culture +[1] | MGIT culture - | Kappa statistic (95% CI) | Detection sensitivity (95% CI) | Detection specificity (95% CI) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Novel LFD + | 88 | 0 | 0.979 | 0.978 | 1.000 |
| Novel LFD - | 2 | 100 | (0.950-1.000) | (0.922-0.997) | (0.963-1.000) |
| MGIT TBc ID test + | 89 | 1 | 0.979 | 0.989 | 0.990 |
| MGIT TBc ID test - | 1 | 99 | (0.950-1.000) | (0.940-0.999) | (0.946-0.999) |

10 [1] Only recorded as 'Culture +' when presence of *M. bovis* was confirmed by spoligotyping.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17 **Figure legends**

18 **Figure 1.** Comparison of the numbers of liquid cultures at (A) VISAVET/LRSA (MGIT
19 cultures) and (B) DORDOGNE (BacT/ALERT cultures) testing positive by the novel LFD
20 (light bars) and by MTBC-specific qPCR (and spoligotyping in case of VISAVET/LRSA data)
21 (dark bars).

22 **Figure 2.** Comparison of the numbers of confirmed *M. bovis* solid cultures tested at
23 EMBRAPA testing positive by novel LFD (light bars) and two qPCR methods (dark bars): (A)
24 TbD1 qPCR and (B) Rv2807 qPCR.







25

26







27