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Low Detection Rate of *Bordetella pertussis* Using the BioFire FilmArray Respiratory Panel 2plus
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Syndromic respiratory panels are increasingly used worldwide. Their performance for detection of *Bordetella pertussis* needs to be evaluated. We found that the FilmArray Respiratory Panel 2plus (RP2+) assay, which uses the pertussis toxin promoter target for *B. pertussis*, can only detect highly charged samples. Negative RP2+ results should not be interpreted as an absence of *B. pertussis* in clinical samples.
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*Bordetella pertussis*, the main agent of whooping cough (also called pertussis), continues to cause infections despite high levels of vaccination and has now re-emerged in several countries [1]. Clinical diagnosis of whooping cough is difficult given the nonspecificity of symptoms in adults and vaccinated individuals [2]. Co-infections with viruses (eg, respiratory syncytial virus) may also confound a diagnosis of pertussis in infants, especially if these are the only agents tested for [3]. The laboratory confirmation of whooping cough is therefore essential for accurate diagnosis and treatment of the index case, as well as for surveillance purposes and prevention of disease transmission. Laboratory confirmation mostly relies on direct detection methods on a nasopharyngeal (NP) specimen, such as culture and quantitative polymerase chain reaction (PCR). PCR is the most sensitive approach when performed within the 3 first weeks after disease onset, but molecular *B. pertussis* detection methods suffer from a trade-off between sensitivity and specificity [4]. The target with the highest analytical sensitivity is the insertion sequence IS481, which is repeated >240 times in the *B. pertussis* genome [5]. However, IS481 is also present in *Bordetella holmesii* (range, 28–36 copies) [6], which can also be detected in respiratory samples from patients with whooping cough–like illness [7], as well as in some *Bordetella bronchiseptica* isolates (≤1 copy) [6]. *B. pertussis*–specific PCRs targeting the pertussis toxin promoter region *ptxP* have been described, but these have reduced sensitivity compared with IS481, as only a single copy is present in the genome [4].

The FilmArray Respiratory Panel 2 plus (RP2+) is a multiplex in vitro diagnostic test for the simultaneous and rapid detection of 22 respiratory pathogens (18 viruses and 4 bacteria species including *B. pertussis*) directly from NP samples. It consists of automated nucleic acid extraction, nested multiplex PCR, and analysis of generated end point melting curve data. This multiplex panel presents the advantages of speed and could lead to pertussis diagnosis when the symptoms are not typical. The RP2+ as the previous RP genetic target for *B. pertussis* is *ptxP* [8]. In a recent multicenter evaluation of the FilmArray RP2 in nasopharyngeal swab samples, 2 out of 3 positive *B. pertussis* samples (according to the comparator RP) were detected [9].

The present study aimed to evaluate the performance of the FilmArray RP2+ for detection of *B. pertussis* on clinical samples when compared with a simplex quantitative PCR (qPCR) using the same target, with the IS481 qPCR considered the reference standard.

**METHODS**

**Sample Selection Based on *B. pertussis* Detection With an In-house *ptxP* qPCR**

An in-house control *ptxP* real-time PCR targeting the promoter region of the pertussis toxin gene (named *ptxA–Pr*) was used as the comparator. This assay (*ptxP* qPCR) was previously shown to have a lower limit of detection (LLOD) of 30 CFU per PCR reaction [7]. The selected samples were clinical nasopharyngeal aspirates/swabs from patients with pertussis symptoms (*n* = 13) and were completed with quality control clinical samples (Quality Control for Molecular Diagnostics: www.qcmd.org; *n* = 5), all stored at −80°C at the French National Reference Center of Whooping Cough. All the selected samples were previously analyzed by qPCR and found positive for IS481 and negative for hIS1001 (specific for *B. holmesii* detection). The samples were collected continuously between 2018 and 2019 and tested using the in-house *ptxP* qPCR. Among these samples, we selected 16 to represent a range of positive *ptxP* threshold cycle (Ct) values and 2 samples for being below the detection limit of *ptxP* qPCR (no Ct value with *ptxP*) while
being positive on IS481 qPCR, with Ct values of 34 and 36 for this higher-copy target. The selected samples were coded with a letter designation to be tested blindly with FilmArray RP2+.

All French bacteriological samples were collected, coded, shipped, managed, and analyzed according to the National Reference Center protocols and received approval from the French Supervisory Ethics Authority (CNIL, No. 1474593).

**FilmArray RP2+ Analyses**

Samples were tested using the FilmArray RP2+ according to the manufacturer’s instructions [8]. Briefly, for each sample, 1.0 mL of hydration solution (water) was added to the pouch to rehydrate the reagents. In total, 300 μL of the reserve sample was added to 500 μL of sample buffer mix and thoroughly combined. Then, 300 μL of sample/sample buffer mix was added to the pouch, which was then loaded onto the instrument (system 2.0). Each run contained internal process controls for extraction, dilution, and PCR. The FilmArray test consists of automated nucleic acid extraction, nested multiplex PCR, and analysis of generated end point melting curve data. This process took approximately 1 hour per run. Valid run results were reported as “detected” or “not detected” for each target.

**Performance Analysis**

To compare the performance of RP2+ and in-house ptxP qPCR, all samples were analyzed in parallel by IS481 qPCR (Argene <i>Bordetella</i> R-gene, Biomerieux). The detection rate was estimated based on negative or positive test results of RP2+ and in-house ptxP qPCR compared with IS481, which is considered the reference standard.

**RESULTS**

The results are presented in Figure 1. Twelve samples were positive for <i>B. pertussis</i> using both the FilmArray RP2+ and the in-house ptxP qPCR. The range of ptxP Ct values for these samples was 18–35. In contrast, 4 samples were found to be negative using the FilmArray RP2+ assay; all had a Ct value >35 using the in-house ptxP qPCR. These 4 discrepant samples were retested by the in-house ptxP qPCR, starting from the clinical material, thus including extraction and amplification, and were confirmed positive with Ct values >35 (37–40). Finally, the 2 samples that were negative with the in-house ptxP assay but positive using the qPCR IS481 with a Ct value of 34 and 36, respectively, were also negative with RP2+ (Figure 1). Therefore, while the detection rate for <i>B. pertussis</i> in-house ptxP qPCR was fixed at 89% in our study, the detection rate of RP2+ was 67%, revealing a lower detection rate for RP2+, when considering qPCR IS481 the reference standard.

**DISCUSSION**

The FilmArray respiratory multiplex panel is being increasingly used for diagnosis of respiratory infections. It presents the advantages of multipathogen testing, allowing for detection of nonanticipated pathogens using broad diagnosis coverage. However, multiplexing often comes at the expense of analytical

---

**Figure 1.** Comparison of Ct values obtained with the FilmArray RP2+ and ptxP qPCR. Samples (n = 18, A to R) were ordered by increasing Ct value of the ptxP qPCR. The Ct values of the reference standard IS481 qPCR are indicated by black triangles. Green, red, and purple circles denote samples that were positive for both the ptxP qPCR and RP2+ methods (green), ptxP qPCR only (red), or none (purple). Abbreviation: qPCR, quantitative polymerase chain reaction.
sensitivity [10]. This issue is critical for detection of *B. pertussis*, which can be present at low levels in clinical samples, and the abundance of which quickly decreases over time despite symptoms being present [10, 11]. Previous studies have compared the performance of the first version of the FilmArray RP to qPCR targeting the insertion sequence IS481, which is the most frequently used target for the molecular diagnosis of pertussis. Two of these studies did not find a loss of analytical sensitivity for *B. pertussis* when using the FilmArray RP, but they were designed to assess the entire panel and *B. pertussis* was therefore not their primary focus [12, 13]. Furthermore, in the Pierce et al. study, all samples detected positive by FilmArray RP had low Ct values (<30) with real-time PCR targeting IS481 [13]. Another study compared the performance of the FilmArray RP with the Focus qPCR assay (Focus Diagnostic, Murrieta, CA, USA), which targets IS481. Seventy-one specimens from patients, which had been tested positive for *B. pertussis*, were analyzed and compared. The authors concluded that the FilmArray RP assay detects ~30% less cases of *B. pertussis* than the Focus assay [14]. In a recent multicenter evaluation of the FilmArray RP2 in nasopharyngeal swab samples, only 3 positive *B. pertussis* samples were tested and compared with the previous FilmArray RP [9].

Here, we evaluated the performance of the FilmArray RP2+ to detect *B. pertussis* using a comparative design based on an in-house simplex ptxP target assay. The use of archived frozen clinical samples allowed us to select clinical samples representing a wide range of abundances of *B. pertussis*. We selected a range of positive samples based on ptxP, a single copy target that is known to be very specific, with the advantage of discriminating between *B. pertussis* and other Bordetella spp., *B. holmesii* in particular [7], but less sensitive than the multicycopy golden standard IS481 target for the molecular diagnosis of whooping cough.

As observed in our report, the samples with a ptxP qPCR Ct value >35 (corresponding to IS481 >28) were not detected with the FilmArray RP2+. Hence, although the FilmArray RP2+ shares the advantage of higher specificity than the standard qPCR targeting IS481, it appears less sensitive than the simplex ptxP qPCR assay and a fortiori than the reference standard. Depending on the age of the patient, vaccination status, duration of the cough before biological sampling, and sample quality, a value of Ct IS481 >28 is not infrequent [15, 16]. In 2019, we received at the French National Reference Center of whooping cough 50 clinical samples, one-third of which had a ptxP Ct value >35, implying that one-third of samples would have been missed using RP2+ if it would not have been complemented by qPCR IS481. Most of these samples were from previously vaccinated children or adults, who are more likely to present with atypical symptoms inducing a delay between symptom onset and sampling >3 weeks. This could explain a low bacterial load. Overall, although the number of tested samples is limited, this work calls for caution when interpreting Bp-negative results when the FilmArray RP2+ is used. Depending on the clinical and epidemiological contexts, it may be important to control the negativity of samples using more sensitive, dedicated *B. pertussis* diagnostic methods. Besides, other additional qPCR with good sensitivity targeting sequences such as hIS1001 can be used to discriminate between *B. pertussis* and *B. holmesii*, which is also involved in pertussis-like symptoms.
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