

1 Title

2 Towards a Buruli Ulcer Rapid Diagnostic Test that Targets Mycolactone

3

4 Authors

5 Marina Siirin,¹ Bijan Pedram,¹ Maria J. Gonzalez-Moa,¹ Louisa Warryn,^{2,3} Rie Yotsu,^{4,5} Jean M. Saunders,¹

6 Aaron E. Saunders,⁶ Richard K. Baldwin,⁶ Jessica L. Porter,⁷ Timothy P. Stinear,⁷ Israel Cruz-Mata,^{8,9}

7 Dziejzom Komi de Souza,^{8,10} Gerd Pluschke,^{2,3} Marco A. Biamonte¹

8

9 1. Drugs & Diagnostics for Tropical Diseases, San Diego, California, United States of America

10 2. Swiss Tropical and Public Health Institute, Allschwil, Switzerland.

11 3. University of Basel, Basel, Switzerland.

12 4. School of Tropical Medicine and Global Health, Nagasaki University, Nagasaki, Japan

13 5. Department of Tropical Medicine, Tulane School of Public Health and Tropical Medicine, New
14 Orleans, Louisiana, United States of America

15 6. NanoComposix, a Fortis Life company, San Diego, California, United States of America

16 7. Department of Microbiology and Immunology, Doherty Institute, University of Melbourne,
17 Victoria, Australia

18 8. Foundation for Innovative New Diagnostics (FIND), Geneva, Switzerland.

19 9. National School of Public Health, CIBERINFEC, Instituto de Salud Carlos III, Madrid, Spain.

20 10. Noguchi Memorial Institute, Accra, Ghana.

21 Abstract

22 We report the development of a prototype rapid diagnostic test for Buruli ulcer, an ulcerative necrotizing
23 skin disease caused by *M. ulcerans*. The test was designed to detect mycolactone, a metabolite unique to
24 *M. ulcerans*. The chief technical challenge was to develop a simple workflow to extract trace amounts of
25 mycolactone from wound exudates collected with a swab and, after a concentration step, to visualize the
26 mycolactone by means of a lateral flow assay. This was achieved by utilizing a mouse monoclonal antibody
27 specific for mycolactone and magnetic gold nanoshells. The latter are a novel class of reporter particles
28 consisting of a ferrite core, a silica gel middle layer that serves to decrease the overall density of the
29 nanoparticle and facilitate its resuspension in aqueous media, and an outer layer of gold, which provides
30 a dark coloration through plasmon resonance effects. These nanoparticles, once conjugated to the anti-
31 mycolactone antibody, enable the immunomagnetic concentration of the targeted analyte and its
32 detection by lateral flow assay. The test procedure can be conducted within 2 hours with a magnetic rack
33 and no powered instrumentation is required. The test can detect as little as 3.5–7 ng of mycolactone
34 collected on a swab.

35 Author summary

36 Buruli ulcer is a neglected tropical disease that affects the poorest of the poorest in Africa. Even young
37 people can harbor large ulcers, with raw flesh directly exposed. While antibiotic treatments exist, there
38 are no simple methods to diagnose the disease. Here, we attempted to detect mycolactone, a small
39 molecule produced by the bacteria that causes Buruli ulcer. One difficulty was the sample type to be used,
40 as the open wounds are sampled with a swab. The question was how to extract mycolactone from the
41 swab and then detect it by means of a rapid diagnostic test, without using sophisticated equipment. We
42 tried to answer this question by combining monoclonal antibodies specific for mycolactone and novel
43 magnetic nanoparticles to concentrate and visualize mycolactone with a rapid test.

44 Introduction

45 Buruli ulcer (BU) is a progressive necrotizing skin infection caused by *Mycobacterium ulcerans*. The disease
46 starts as a painless papule which can progress to a nodule and eventually degenerate into a large ulcer
47 where the skin no longer covers the underlying tissue [1, 2]. Buruli ulcer has been reported in 34 countries
48 [3], and is mostly found in rural areas of West Africa, though a recrudescence has been noted in Australia
49 [4] where its transmission has been ascribed to possums and other animal reservoirs [5, 6]. In 2019, before
50 the COVID-19 pandemic which affected active case finding campaigns, 2,271 new cases were recorded
51 worldwide, and the incidence rate remained at the same level with 2,121 cases reported in 2022 [7]. The
52 disease is believed to be vastly under-reported partly due to its presence in very remote communities
53 hindering access to care, and also because of the lack of awareness, of reporting system, and of field-
54 friendly diagnostic tools [8].


55 Buruli ulcer remains one of the neglected tropical diseases (NTDs) in need of improved diagnostic tests.
56 With oral antibiotic treatment available [9], decentralizing diagnosis would facilitate strategies for early
57 detection, timely treatment, and prevention of permanent disability. However, there are no diagnostics
58 suitable for point-of-care applications. The well-established diagnostics are based on direct *M. ulcerans*
59 pathogen confirmation by *in vitro* culture (definitive positive diagnosis), PCR, smear examination for acid-
60 fast bacilli, or histopathology. These diagnostics require either a sophisticated laboratory or have low
61 sensitivity. An isothermal amplification technique (LAMP assay) has been proposed as alternative to PCR
62 and, while not commercial, is promising [10, 11]. A method based on thin layer chromatography has also
63 been evaluated and works better with fine needle aspirates from nodules than with swabs from open
64 wounds [12, 13].

65 Given the importance of securing new diagnostic tools for Buruli ulcer and to help guiding the
66 development of new diagnostic tools, the World Health Organization (WHO) in consultation with different

67 partners developed a preliminary Target Product Profile (TPP) in 2018 [14] which was revisited in 2022
68 [15]. The TPP served as the starting point for the efforts described herein. Of particular relevance to this
69 work was the desire stated in the TPP to see a diagnostic test capable of detecting mycolactone.
70 Mycolactone is a unique metabolite of *M. ulcerans* composed of a macrolide core substituted with a fatty-
71 acid sidechain (MW = 743.02). Mycolactone has cytotoxic, immunosuppressive, and analgesic effects that
72 induce the large debilitating skin lesions that develop when the infection is not treated [16]. It is further
73 believed that because mycolactone production is related to the viability of the mycobacterium, a
74 mycolactone test has the potential to be used not only for diagnosis, but also to assess response to
75 treatment and cure.

76 Here, we report the development of a prototype rapid test for Buruli ulcer, formatted as a lateral flow
77 assay capable of identifying mycolactone as the disease biomarker. The test was specifically designed to
78 isolate trace amounts of mycolactone from wound exudates, and then analyze the concentrated
79 mycolactone on a lateral flow assay with minimal sample processing.

80



81


82

83 **Figure 1.** Structures of (1) mycolactone A/B isomer mixture, (2) biotinylated analog PG-204, and (3) acetyl analog

84 PG-119.

85 Materials and Methods

86 **Assay Principle.** We devised a competitive lateral flow assay featuring two innovations. The first was the
87 use of a mouse monoclonal antibody specific for mycolactone [17], which has previously shown value in
88 an ELISA [18, 19]. The second innovation was the use of custom-made nanoparticles specifically designed
89 to enable immunomagnetic concentration of the analyte mycolactone while being darkly colored and
90 providing a visual signal when run on a lateral flow test. These nanoparticles, dubbed magnetic gold
91 nanoshells (Mag-GNS) consist of a ferrite center, a silica gel middle layer, and a gold outer shell (**Figure 2**).
92 The ferrite center allows for magnetic concentration, the silica gel layer encapsulates the ferrite and lowers
93 the overall density of the nanoparticles allowing for their resuspension in aqueous media, and the gold
94 shell surface absorbs light extremely efficiently due to plasmon resonance effects. This quantum physics
95 phenomenon comes into play when metal nanoparticles reach the nm scale, in this case creating a dark
96 brown-gray color, nearly black, a surprising hue for a gold particle. The gold shell is further functionalized
97 with carboxylic acid groups for covalent conjugation to a detector antibody, and was custom made by
98 nanoComposix, a Fortis LifeScience Company (San Diego, CA, USA).



99


100 **Figure 2. Magnetic gold nanoshells.** Schematics and transmission electron
101 microscopy views of the particles being built starting from a ferrite core, which is
102 then coated with silica gel (greyish), which is in turn studded with gold crystals
103 (little black dots), used as nucleation points to grow the gold shell.

104 In parallel, a test strip was developed as shown in **Figure 3**, where a sample pad (glass fiber), nitrocellulose,
105 and an absorbent pad were laminated onto a backing card. The key property of the strip was a test line
106 made of a mixture of biotinylated mycolactone analog PG-204 (**Figure 1**) and polystreptavidin, which
107 effectively immobilized the PG-204 probe at the test line. The strip also included a control line of anti-
108 mouse antibody to capture magnetic gold nanoshells that migrated past the test line. The strip was placed
109 in a plastic cassette for ease of use and transportation.

110 Combined with the magnetic nanoshells covalently conjugated to an anti-mycolactone antibody, the strip
111 allowed for a competitive assay. If the sample to be analyzed is devoid of mycolactone, then the conjugate
112 binds to PG-204, itself immobilized on the test line, and produces a black test line. Conversely, if the test
113 sample contains significant amounts of mycolactone, the latter saturates the binding sites on the anti-
114 mycolactone antibody, and the conjugate is no longer captured by PG-204 at the test line. In summary, the
115 resulting test line intensity is inversely proportional to the concentration of mycolactone in the sample.

116

117



118

119

120

121

122

123

124

125

126

127


128 **Assay workflow.** We envisioned that the workflow of the finished assay would be as shown in **Figure 4**,

129 with its components described in the next paragraphs of the Materials and Methods section. The magnetic

130 nanoshells, after being conjugated to anti-mycolactone antibody (the “conjugate”), would be lyophilized

131 for storage and transportation, and reconstituted in the laboratory or at the point of care. Next, a swab

132 containing a wound exudate would be transferred to a tube containing extraction buffer (step 1). The
133 reconstituted magnetic nanoparticles would be added (step 2), incubated with the extracted sample to
134 capture the mycolactone (step 3), and concentrated by means of a magnetic rack (step 4). The supernatant
135 would be removed (step 5) and the magnetic nanoshells resuspended in chase buffer (step 6) before being
136 added to the lateral flow assay (step 7).



137

138

139

Figure 4. Assay workflow, as initially envisioned.

140 **Monoclonal antibodies.** The generation of mouse monoclonal antibodies to mycolactone has been
141 previously described [17]. The clone chosen for this application was JD5.1, produced by Swiss TPH (Basel,
142 Switzerland) purified from hybridoma culture supernatants by affinity chromatography using a HiTrap
143 Protein A HP column (Cytiva). Two other anti-mycolactone clones were deprioritized: JD5.11 which gave
144 problems with reproducibility, and clone LW2.2 which appeared to have slower binding kinetics.

145 **Conjugate.** Magnetic gold nanoshells were conjugated to mouse monoclonal antibody JD5.1 using
146 EDC/sulfo-NHS chemistry. The magnetic nanoshells conjugated to JD5.1 will be referred to below as “the
147 conjugate”.

148 **Lyophilization of the conjugate (optional).** The conjugate was stored at 4 °C, and either used as such in
149 solution, or later in the development cycle, in order to match the workflow of **Figure 4**, was freeze-dried
150 as 3% solution in lyophilization medium (5% sucrose, 5% trehalose, 0.1% surfactant 10G in deionized
151 water).

152 **Mycolactone and mycolactone analogs.** Synthetic mycolactone A/B, biotinylated analog PG-204, and
153 acetyl analog PG-119 were prepared by the group of Prof. Altmann, ETH-Z, and stored frozen at –20 °C in
154 DMSO [20, 21]. Mycolactone sourced from WHO in ethyl acetate gave inferior results for reasons that were
155 not investigated and was not further used (data not shown).

156 **Test strips.** The test strips were built using a glass fiber pad (Ahlstrom grade 8951), nitrocellulose type
157 CNPF-SN12, 10 µM (MDI, Advanced Microdevices PVT. LTD) and an absorbent pad (Ahlstrom, grade 222)
158 affixed to a 300 x 60 mm backing card (Lohmann LC-58803) with 2 mm overlaps. The strips were 4 x 60
159 mm, placed in an off-the-shelf cassette.

160 **Extraction buffer.** Mycolactone was extracted from simulated or real samples using an extraction buffer
161 made of 100 mM triethanolamine (TEA). When testing contrived samples, the pH was adjusted to 7.8.
162 Upon re-optimization with clinical samples, the optimal pH was found to be 10.4. For evaluation of clinical
163 samples, addition of a Heterophilic Blocking Reagent (HBR) was found to be necessary to eliminate matrix
164 effects. For these samples, a heterophilic blocking tube (Scantibodies, cat# PN 3IX762) was reconstituted
165 with 0.5 mL of extraction buffer and used in optimized amounts for each lot of conjugate, at a final
166 concentration of 2–5%. The TEA buffer was stored in glass bottles at room temperature, and HBR was
167 prepared and stored in 1.5 mL Axygen vials (Axygen, cat# MCT-150-L-C) at 4°C.

168 **Chase buffer.** The chase buffer was prepared with 2% proprietary detergent, 0.1% proprietary surfactant,
169 0.1% casein (Sigma, cat# G7078-500G) prepared by incubation in sodium tetraborate decahydrate pH 8.5
170 at 37 °C for 24 hours, and 0.05% Proclin (Sigma, cat# 48912-U) in PBS. The pH was adjusted with sodium
171 hydroxide to pH 8.9 for experiments with clinical samples.

172 **Simulated wound exudate and other test materials.** Based on a published biochemical analysis of wound
173 fluids from leg ulcers [22], we concluded that wound fluid could be approximated by mixing equal volumes
174 of negative human serum (NHS, ConeBio, cat# 4090) and PBS (FisherScientific, cat# 28372). We called this
175 1:1 mixture of NHS:PBS Simulated Wound Exudate (SWE). Positive simulated samples were prepared by
176 spiking SWE with synthetic mycolactone A/B prepared from a mycolactone stock solution (1 mg/mL in
177 DMSO) diluted in ethanol by a factor of 135 to reach a 10 µM concentration. Positive controls were
178 prepared each containing 7 ng of mycolactone per sample, by diluting 1 µL of 10 µM mycolactone in
179 ethanol to a final volume of 75 µL with SWE (for testing without a swab) or by diluting 1 µL of 10 µM
180 mycolactone in ethanol to a final volume of 50 µL with SWE (for testing with a swab). Sterile swabs with
181 a flock-tipped applicator and polystyrene handle (Copan, Cat #25-3306-H BT) were used for testing with
182 swabs.

183 **Clinical wound exudates.** Wound swab extracts from cases that were initially suspected to be Buruli ulcer
184 but later found to be PCR-negative (**Figure 8**) were kindly provided by Dr. Anthony Ablordey from the
185 Noguchi Memorial Institute for Medical Research, University of Ghana. Those extracts were received
186 already extracted in water instead of TEA. Additional samples were collected from suspected Buruli ulcer
187 lesions but that proved negative for mycolactone with our rapid test were provided by The Pasteur Center
188 in Cameroon, Yaoundé, Cameroon, Pasteur Institute Côte d'Ivoire, Abidjan, Côte d'Ivoire, and Hope
189 Commission International, Abidjan, Côte d'Ivoire.

190 Clinical samples from Ghana were taken at the hospital or health centres as part of the routine diagnostic
191 procedure and case confirmation recommended by WHO and sent to the Noguchi Memorial Institute for
192 Medical Research (NMIMR) for analysis. Ethical approval for collection and use of patients' samples was
193 obtained from the Institutional Review Board of the Noguchi Memorial Institute for Medical Research
194 (NMIMR; Study number: NMIMR-IRB CPN 024/18–19). Patients were required to sign an informed
195 consent. To ensure anonymity, personal information such as names, and other personal identifiers
196 associated with patient's samples were replaced with codes. Similarly, Clinical Samples from Ivory Coast
197 and Cameroon were collected under IRB approved protocols for the sake of this study and with informed
198 consent. The protocols were cleared by the Comité National d'Ethique des Sciences de la Vie et de la Santé,
199 Ministère de la Santé, Côte d'Ivoire, 2021, IRB 000111917 and the Comité National d'Ethique de La
200 Recherche pour la Santé Humaine, Ministère de la Santé, Cameroun, IRB 2021/06/1367.

201 **Mycobacteria cultures.** *Mycobacterium marinum* and *Mycobacterium ulcerans* were cultured as
202 previously described [23].

203 **Procedure to run the assay using a simulated sample and no swabs (Figure 4 Steps, 2-7).** For the sake of
204 simplicity, most of the assay development work was carried out without a swab, skipping steps 0 and 1 of
205 Figure 4. Instead, 75 μ L of negative SWE or positive (mycolactone spiked) SWE were placed in a 1.5 mL
206 Axygen vial (Axygen, cat# MCT-150-NC) and diluted with 0.5 mL of extraction buffer. Then 1–2 μ L of
207 conjugate Mag-GNS-JD5.1 in solution (OD= 20, or an equivalent of the reconstituted lyophilized conjugate)
208 was added to the extract, vortexed briefly, and incubated for 30 min, then placed on a magnetic rack to
209 concentrate the nanoparticles for 30 min. During incubations the vials were protected from the light to
210 avoid mycolactone degradation. The conjugate was concentrated with a neodymium magnet (Poichekailov
211 magnetic racks, US, [24]), the supernatant was removed and the particles resuspended in 2 drops
212 (approximately 60 μ L) of chase buffer and transferred to the test sample port. The test developed for 30

213 min prior to imaging and quantitation with a benchtop reader (Leelu v3.0, Lumos Diagnostics, Carlsbad,
214 CA).

215 **Procedure to run the assay using a simulated sample absorbed onto a swab (Figure 4, Steps 1-7).** To
216 simulate a clinical specimen absorbed on a swab, a swab (Copan, 25-3306-H BT) was placed in an Axygen
217 vial containing 50 μ L of positive or negative SWE until all the liquid was absorbed. Next, the swab was
218 placed in a fresh 1.5 mL Axygen vial and extracted with 0.5 mL of extraction buffer. The swab was rotated
219 3–5 times in the extraction buffer while pressing against the sides of the vial, left in the vial for 5 min, and
220 pressed against the wall while rotating and lifting to recover as much liquid as possible. The swab was
221 discarded, and the next steps (steps 2–7) were conducted with the extract as described in the previous
222 paragraph for SWE.

223 **Procedure to run the assay with clinical wound exudates (with HBR, pH 10.4 buffer).** The retrospective
224 PCR negative clinical wound swabs from Ghana had been extracted in water prior to receipt. These
225 samples were tested with two methods (1) as received, following the protocol for simulated extracts and
226 (2) by first adding 10x concentrated TEA extraction buffer to final x1 concentration to improve conjugate
227 collection on a magnet. A heterophilic blocking reagent (HBR) was added to clinical wound extracts at 2–
228 5% concentration to prevent possible interference of the conjugate with heterophilic antibodies or other
229 matrix effects, then samples were tested the same as described for the simulated extract.

230 **Quantification.** Test line intensities were quantified with a benchtop reader (Leelu v3.0, Lumos
231 Diagnostics, Carlsbad). We investigated both the test line intensity alone, as well as the ratio between test
232 and control line (T/C) with the latter giving the most reproducible results.

233 **Statistical Analysis.** P-values were calculated using GraphPad Prism, version 10, assuming Gaussian
234 distributions, and not assuming equal standard deviations (Welch's correction).

235 Results

236 **Optimal conditions.** As described under Materials and Methods, based on limited literature [12] our initial
237 estimate was that clinically relevant concentrations of mycolactone would be 15–150 ng/swab. Opting for
238 a conservative approach, we aimed at developing a test that could detect half of the lowest amount that
239 we were expecting to find in swabs (*i.e.*, approximately 7.5 ng of mycolactone). To standardize the testing
240 method and to overcome the paucity of clinical materials, we prepared contrived samples in which wound
241 exudate was simulated by using a 1:1 mixture of negative human serum and PBS. The simulated exudate
242 was then spiked with known amounts of synthetic mycolactone A/B.

243 Assay optimization was extensive and is not described herein. Optimization was first performed with
244 simulated wound exudates, without employing a swab. With this initial set of optimized conditions, the
245 contrived sample (50–75 μL) was diluted in extraction buffer (0.5 mL, pH 7.8), and incubated with the
246 magnetic conjugate (1–2 μL , OD 20) for 30 minutes. The magnetic conjugate was then recovered by placing
247 it on a magnetic rack for 30 minutes, removing the supernatant, and adding 2 drops (approximately 60 μL)
248 of chase buffer (pH = 7.4). The resuspended nanoparticles were then added to the sample port of the
249 cassette, and the assay ran for 30 minutes before analysis.

250 These conditions worked well with contrived samples but as described below, failed when using clinical
251 samples. This triggered a second round of optimization, which led to increasing the pH of the extractions
252 and chase buffers while leaving the other parameters unchanged. Thus, when using clinical samples, we
253 employed a TEA extraction buffer adjusted to pH = 10.4 instead of pH = 7.8 (0.5 mL). The incubation with
254 the magnetic conjugate (1–2 μL , OD 20, 30 min) remained the same, and so did the magnetic conjugate
255 recovery method (magnetic rack, 30 min, and removing the supernatant). The newly optimized chase
256 buffer was adjusted to a pH = 8.9 instead of pH = 7.4 (2 drops). The rest of the procedure was not modified:
257 the resuspended nanoparticles were then added to the sample port of the cassette, after which the test


258 developed over 30 minutes. The fully optimized conditions can be found in the Instructions for Use
259 included in the Supplementary Information.

260 **Limit of detection with simulated wound exudate.** Samples of mycolactone A/B serially diluted in ethanol
261 were added to the simulated wound exudates and processed according to the optimized conditions
262 described in the previous two paragraphs. At this stage of development, the extraction buffer had a pH =
263 7.8 and the chase buffer had a pH = 7.4. The intensity of the test and control lines were quantified with a
264 benchtop reader. The more mycolactone in the sample, the more it competes with PG-204 immobilized
265 at the test for binding the conjugate. Hence, the higher the mycolactone concentration, the lower the test
266 line intensity. When looking at the test with the unaided eye (**Figure 5**), the test line could be easily seen
267 if no mycolactone was present, and the test line became barely visible when 7 mg of mycolactone were
268 added to the simulated wound exudate. Similarly, when quantifying the intensity of the test lines with a
269 benchtop reader (**Figure 6**), the intensity decreased from approximately 0.08 reader units in the absence
270 of mycolactone to 0.02 units in the presence of 7 ng mycolactone, and the difference was statistically
271 significant ($p=0.006$). All samples contained the same amount of DMSO, indicating that the dose response
272 was due to mycolactone and was not an artifact due to DMSO.

273

274

275



276

277

Figure 5. Limit of detection of the rapid test using simulated samples spiked

278

with synthetic mycolactone (n=3). Visually, a difference can be seen between


279

no mycolactone and 7 ng of mycolactone, where the latter causes a nearly

280

complete inhibition of the test line.

281



282

283

Figure 6. Limit of detection of the rapid test using simulated samples spiked

284

with synthetic mycolactone. When measured with a reader, the difference

285


between no mycolactone and 7 ng of mycolactone is statistically significant ($p <$

286

0.05).

287 **Specificity with cell cultures of different mycobacteria strains.** Having developed a test that appeared to
288 have the desired analytical sensitivity, we next evaluated its specificity. This was done by comparing
289 supernatants from laboratory-grown cell cultures of *M. ulcerans* and *M. marinum*, a non-pathogenic
290 mycobacterium lacking the giant 174 kb symbiotic plasmid pMUM001 responsible for mycolactone
291 production in *M. ulcerans*. As shown in **Figure 7**, *M. ulcerans* supernatant, which contains mycolactone,
292 led to an inhibition of the test line, while *M. marinum* cell cultures, which do not contain mycolactone, did
293 not inhibit the test line formation, demonstrating that our assay shows no cross-reactivity with *M.*
294 *marinum* samples.

295




296

297 **Figure 7. Cross-reactivity testing the assay with *M. ulcerans* vs *M. marinum***
298 **supernatant.** While *M. ulcerans* produces mycolactone leading to an inhibited
299 signal at the test line, *M. marinum* does not synthesize mycolactone and
300 therefore the test line remains visible.

301

302 **Test results with swabs and simulated wound exudates.** Having in hand a test that was analytically
303 sensitive and specific, we next investigated the use of a swab. The concern was that a swab would be

304 mandatory for sample collection but that mycolactone, being so lipophilic with a calculated logP of 9.0
305 [25], may stick to the fibers of which the swab is made, and not be easily extracted into an aqueous
306 solution. To investigate this matter, an aliquot of 50 μ L SWE was deposited on a swab and then extracted
307 with the extraction buffer for 5–10 min. As reference, the same SWE was directly diluted with extraction
308 buffer, without using a swab. The tests showed a nearly identical behavior when directly diluting the SWE
309 in extraction buffer (not using a swab) versus first absorbing the SWE onto a swab and then extracting it
310 (**Figure 8A**). Based on the quantification of the test line intensities, we calculated that 80% of the
311 mycolactone was recovered from the swab, and the remaining 20% were left within the extract trapped in
312 the swab fibers. Additionally, the swabs containing simulated samples could be stored for at least 48 hours
313 at 4 °C before extraction without noticeable degradation of mycolactone (**Figure 8B**). This feature is useful
314 for shipping samples from the field to a local laboratory.



315

316 **Figure 8. A. Effect of swab on test results and sample stability when absorbed**
317 **on a swab.** Panel A. The test results are not impacted if simulated wound exudate
318 is pre-absorbed on a swab. Panel B. Once absorbed on a swab, simulated wound
319 exudates are stable for at least 48 hours at 4 °C.

320 **Optimizing the test conditions to real wound exudates.** Having established the performance of the test
321 with simulated wound exudates, we moved to real wound exudates, collected from ulcers in Buruli ulcer-
322 endemic areas (Ghana). Contrary to simulated wound exudates, real clinical wound exudates collected in
323 the field represented a challenging matrix that varied from patient-to-patient and included blood and
324 various other debris (**Figure 9**).

325




326

327 **Figure 9. Aspect of 6 different wound exudate extracts as received from Ghana.**

328 To our surprise, both the test and control line frequently disappeared, even though the samples had tested
329 negative for Buruli Ulcer by PCR. Some clinical samples contained debris and particulates, sometimes in
330 large amounts and possibly deriving from herbal medications and necrotic tissues. These debris interfered
331 with the test, although could not explain alone all the cases where test and control lines disappeared.

332 Several parameters were optimized to achieve 100% validity (*i.e.*, control line always visible) with clinical
333 swabs. First, we reasoned that the test employs mouse monoclonal antibodies, and that heterophilic
334 antibodies present in the wound exudates may have a deleterious impact, especially when using endemic
335 samples from populations often exposed to rodents. This risk was mitigated by adding Heterophilic-
336 Blocking Reagents (HBR) which led to a significant improvement of the line intensities (**Figure 10**).

337



338

339

Figure 10. HBR rescues the control line with negative wound swabs and

340

improves the aspect of all tests. The test line intensity determined with a visual

341

score card is indicated on the cassettes next to the test line.

342

Second, we removed the particulate material from the swab extracts by centrifugation. This can be done

343

easily in the laboratory but not in the field. Alternatively, doubling the amount of buffer with which the

344

mycolactone is extracted from the swab (1.0 mL instead of 0.5 mL) lowered the impact of particulate on

345

magnetic nanoparticle recovery (data not shown). Third, increasing the pH of both the extraction buffer

346

(from 7.8 to 10.4) and chase buffer (from 7.4 to 8.9) increased the intensity of both the control and test

347


lines (**Figure 11**). Taken together, these modifications provided 100% validity, as judged by the presence of

348

a visible control line in all of the 207 clinical swabs analyzed.

349

350



351


352 **Figure 11. Increasing the pH of the extraction buffer from 7.9 to 10 leads to stronger**
353 **control lines (left panel) and test line intensity (right panel) when testing simulated**
354 **wound exudate samples, either not spiked with mycolactone (negative; -ve) or spiked**
355 **with 7 ng mycolactone (positive; +ve).**

356

357 **Calibration curve and limit of detection (LOD) with real wound exudates.** After optimizations (sample
358 centrifugation, addition of HBR and pH optimization of extraction and chase buffers) were introduced we
359 re-examined the dose-response curve using real exudates extracted with TEA pH 10.4. Wound extracts
360 from LFA-negative lesions were pooled, and then spiked with synthetic mycolactone. Rather than reporting
361 the absolute intensity of the test line as we did in the original LOD testing (**Figures 5, 6**), the test to control
362 (T/C) line ratios were calculated, leading to more consistent results (**Figure 12**). In the absence of
363 mycolactone, the T/C ratio was around 0.9. The presence of 3.7 ng of mycolactone/sample gave a T/C ratio
364 in the 0.42–0.44 range that was easily distinguished from the T/C ratio obtained without mycolactone.
365 Hence, under fully optimized conditions, the LOD was around 3.7 ng of mycolactone using extracts from
366 clinical samples as the sample matrix.

367

368



369

370

Figure 12. Mycolactone dose response in pooled Buruli ulcer negative swab extracts from Cameroon spiked with synthetic mycolactone A/B. T/C – test-to-control line ratio quantified with Lumos Leelu benchtop reader.

371

372

373

374

Additional work. Additional work that is not described herein included the freeze-drying of the conjugate, and the demonstration that once lyophilized the conjugate is stable for at least 2 weeks at 40°C, allowing for it to be shipped to disease endemic countries and field settings without prohibitive cold-chain requirements. We also demonstrated that a positive control could be made with mycolactone analog PG-119 (**Figure 1**). Analog PG-119, which lacks the side-chain of mycolactone, is also detected by monoclonal antibody JD5.1, with the same or better sensitivity as mycolactone A/B. This offers two major advantages, as PG-119 is easier to synthesize and is not photosensitive.

378

379

380

381 Discussion

382 **Target product profile.** Based on the WHO target product profile (TPP) for Buruli ulcer, we developed a
383 rapid diagnostic tests (RDT) targeting mycolactone. While the TPP specifies mycolactone as the analyte of
384 choice, it does not specify the required limit of detection. Based on very limited literature data [12, 26],
385 we inferred that a test capable of detecting 15 ng of mycolactone would provide the required clinical
386 sensitivity. To be conservative, we defined that the limit of detection (LOD) should be 7 ng of mycolactone
387 per sample or lower. It remains to be seen if this truly translates to proper clinical sensitivity [27].

388 Developing a mycolactone-based test was difficult for several reasons. Firstly, the matrix in which
389 mycolactone is found is complex. The disease starts as a papule, that turns into a nodule, and eventually
390 into a large open wound (ulcer). Nodules can be sampled by means of fine needle aspirates, while wounds
391 are sampled with swabs. Since people are more likely to seek treatment after the appearance of an ulcer,
392 we elected to detect mycolactone in wound exudates collected with swabs. Wound exudates are an
393 unusual matrix for lateral flow assay development, as they vary in physical appearance and composition
394 from one person to another – for instance some lesions can be relatively dry and others exudative. Another
395 limitation of wound exudates is that they are available only in small amounts, unlike more mainstream
396 matrices such as plasma or urine. Furthermore, the amount of mycolactone in wound exudates can only
397 be limited, in part because *M. ulcerans* replicates slowly, therefore generating only low concentrations of
398 mycolactone, and because mycolactone is photodegradable [28] and hence can be cleared from the
399 wound. Another complication is that it is not always clear if patients have applied herbal medications or
400 other topical treatments to the ulcer and how that may affect the viability of *M. ulcerans* and its ability to
401 produce mycolactone, and if those treatments have potential to interfere with the test. Finally,
402 mycolactone is a highly hydrophobic molecule (cLogP = 9.0) [29, 30], and therefore has low affinity for
403 aqueous mediums and can stick to laboratory plasticware.

404 The developed Buruli ulcer RDT was configured as a competitive assay to detect mycolactone using novel
405 magnetic gold nanoshells, mycolactone-specific monoclonal antibodies [17] and a biotinylated probe.
406 Unlike normal RDTs, a mycolactone concentration step was required. This was accomplished by leveraging
407 the magnetic properties of the nanoparticles, allowing the assay to be performed in under two hours, with
408 minimal equipment (**Figure 1**). We initially noticed a strong difference between simulated wound exudate,
409 prepared by mixing equal volumes of negative human serum and PBS, which gives clean test results, and
410 real wound exudates which gave in some cases invalid tests, with no test line and no control line. In these
411 problematic cases, the nanoparticles seemed to be especially difficult to recover magnetically. This
412 behavior was tentatively ascribed to the presence of heterophilic antibodies recognizing the mouse anti-
413 mycolactone antibody, and either modifying the charge of the surface of the gold nanoparticle or causing
414 the nanoparticles to cross-link with each other and complicating their recovery. Regardless of whether this
415 rationale is correct or not, the unwanted absence of control line could be corrected by adding HBR to the
416 extraction buffer and by using higher pH in the extraction and chase buffers. The addition of HBR added
417 an extra step to the workflow presented in Figure 1, and the final workflow can be found in Supplementary
418 Information section (**Figure S1 and Instructions for Use**).

419 The limit of detection of the assay was 3.7–7 ng mycolactone per sample analyzed, and this was estimated
420 to be sufficient for the test to be clinically relevant. We verified that the magnetic nanoparticles could be
421 freeze-dried and be stable in this format at 40 °C for at least 2 weeks for shipping purposes. We also verified
422 that mycolactone is stable for at least 2 days at 4 °C once absorbed on a swab, enabling the samples to be
423 transported from the field to a district laboratory. The materials (swabs, vials) selected in this publication
424 were compatible with mycolactone and allowed for maximum recovery.

425 In conclusion, a prototype RDT was developed that met the WHO TPP specification of detecting
426 mycolactone as the biomarker, and that met the self-imposed requirement of detecting at least 7 ng of

427 mycolactone in wound exudate. The test also met most of the WHO TPP parameters in that it was stable
428 for transportation at ambient temperature, and that a stable positive control was developed. Detailed
429 instructions for use were compiled and are available in the Supplementary Information. Based on this data,
430 the prototype was deemed worthy of advancing to field evaluations, with fresh clinical samples. These
431 results will be reported elsewhere.

432 Supporting Information

- 433 • Instructions for Use (pdf)
- 434 • Finalized workflow (Figure S1)
- 435 • Aspect of nanoparticles on the rack (Figure S2)

436 Acknowledgements

437 This work received financial support from FIND through funding from Medicor Foundation, UBS Optimus
438 Foundation, Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC), KfW-BMBF and Global Health
439 Innovative Technology (GHIT) Fund. The funders played no role in the decision to publish.

440 The authors thank all those involved in sample collection and field testing of the device, including Dr. Sara
441 Eyangoh, Mr. Hycenth Numfor, and Ms. Valerie Donkeng Donfack and the team from Buruli Ulcer
442 Laboratory Network (BU-LABNET), Centre Pasteur du Cameroun, Dr. Aka N'guetta and Dr. David Coulibaly
443 from the Institute Pasteur de Côte d'Ivoire, Mr. Aubin Yao from the Hope Commission International, Côte
444 d'Ivoire and the team from the National Buruli Ulcer Control Program of Côte d'Ivoire. And Dr. A. Ablordey
445 and his team at the Noguchi Memorial Institute for Medical Research.

446 References

- 447 1. Guarner J. Buruli Ulcer: Review of a Neglected Skin Mycobacterial Disease. *J Clin Microbiol.*
448 2018;56(4). Epub 20180326. doi: 10.1128/JCM.01507-17. PubMed PMID: 29343539; PubMed Central
449 PMCID: PMCPMC5869816.
- 450 2. Yotsu RR, Suzuki K, Simmonds RE, Bedimo R, Ablordey A, Yeboah-Manu D, et al. Buruli Ulcer: a
451 Review of the Current Knowledge. *Curr Trop Med Rep.* 2018;5(4):247-56. Epub 20180928. doi:
452 10.1007/s40475-018-0166-2. PubMed PMID: 30460172; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC6223704.
- 453 3. Omansen TF, Erbowor-Becksen A, Yotsu R, van der Werf TS, Tiendrebeogo A, Grout L, et al. Global
454 Epidemiology of Buruli Ulcer, 2010-2017, and Analysis of 2014 WHO Programmatic Targets. *Emerg Infect*
455 *Dis.* 2019;25(12):2183-90. doi: 10.3201/eid2512.190427. PubMed PMID: 31742506; PubMed Central
456 PMCID: PMCPMC6874257.
- 457 4. Bartley B, O'Brien D. Buruli ulcer - A neglected tropical disease in the Barwon region of Victoria,
458 Australia: An emerging public health threat with local and national ramifications. *Emerg Med Australas.*
459 2023;35(4):697-701. Epub 20230504. doi: 10.1111/1742-6723.14235. PubMed PMID: 37454363.
- 460 5. Vandelannoote K, Buultjens AH, Porter JL, Velink A, Wallace JR, Blasdell KR, et al. Statistical
461 modeling based on structured surveys of Australian native possum excreta harboring *Mycobacterium*
462 *ulcerans* predicts Buruli ulcer occurrence in humans. *Elife.* 2023;12. Epub 20230414. doi:
463 10.7554/eLife.84983. PubMed PMID: 37057888; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC10154024.
- 464 6. Muleta AJ, Lappan R, Stinear TP, Greening C. Understanding the transmission of *Mycobacterium*
465 *ulcerans*: A step towards controlling Buruli ulcer. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis.* 2021;15(8):e0009678. Epub
466 20210826. doi: 10.1371/journal.pntd.0009678. PubMed PMID: 34437549; PubMed Central PMCID:
467 PMCPMC8389476.

- 468 7. WHO. Number of New Reported Cases of Buruli Ulcer. Available from:
469 [https://www.who.int/data/gho/data/indicators/indicator-details/GHO/number-of-new-reported-cases-](https://www.who.int/data/gho/data/indicators/indicator-details/GHO/number-of-new-reported-cases-of-buruli-ulcer)
470 [of-buruli-ulcer](https://www.who.int/data/gho/data/indicators/indicator-details/GHO/number-of-new-reported-cases-of-buruli-ulcer).
- 471 8. Timothy JWS, Pullan RL, Yotsu RR. Methods and Approaches for Buruli Ulcer Surveillance in Africa:
472 Lessons Learnt and Future Directions. *Methods Mol Biol.* 2022;2387:87-102. doi: 10.1007/978-1-0716-
473 1779-3_10. PubMed PMID: 34643905.
- 474 9. O'Brien DP, Friedman ND, Walton A, Hughes A, Athan E. Risk Factors Associated with Antibiotic
475 Treatment Failure of Buruli Ulcer. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother.* 2020;64(9). Epub 20200820. doi:
476 10.1128/AAC.00722-20. PubMed PMID: 32571813; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC7449191.
- 477 10. Beissner M, Phillips RO, Battke F, Bauer M, Badziklou K, Sarfo FS, et al. Loop-Mediated Isothermal
478 Amplification for Laboratory Confirmation of Buruli Ulcer Disease-Towards a Point-of-Care Test. *PLoS Negl*
479 *Trop Dis.* 2015;9(11):e0004219. Epub 20151113. doi: 10.1371/journal.pntd.0004219. PubMed PMID:
480 26566026; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC4643924.
- 481 11. Frimpong M, Frimpong VNB, Numfor H, Donkeng Donfack V, Amedior JS, Deegbe DE, et al. Multi-
482 centric evaluation of Biomeme Franklin Mobile qPCR for rapid detection of *Mycobacterium ulcerans* in
483 clinical specimens. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis.* 2023;17(5):e0011373. Epub 20230525. doi:
484 10.1371/journal.pntd.0011373. PubMed PMID: 37228126; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC10246808.
- 485 12. Sarfo FS, Le Chevalier F, Aka N, Phillips RO, Amoako Y, Boneca IG, et al. Mycolactone diffuses into
486 the peripheral blood of Buruli ulcer patients--implications for diagnosis and disease monitoring. *PLoS Negl*
487 *Trop Dis.* 2011;5(7):e1237. Epub 20110719. doi: 10.1371/journal.pntd.0001237. PubMed PMID:
488 21811642; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC3139662.
- 489 13. Akolgo GA, Partridge BM, T DC, Amewu RK. Alternative boronic acids in the detection of
490 Mycolactone A/B using the thin layer chromatography (f-TLC) method for diagnosis of Buruli ulcer. *BMC*

- 491 Infect Dis. 2023;23(1):495. Epub 20230727. doi: 10.1186/s12879-023-08426-2. PubMed PMID: 37501134;
492 PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC10373253.
- 493 14. FIND. Report of a WHO–FIND meeting on diagnostics for Buruli ulcer 2018. Available from:
494 [https://www.finddx.org/wp-](https://www.finddx.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/12/20180901_tpp_ntds_buruli_who_cds_FV_EN.pdf)
495 [content/uploads/2022/12/20180901_tpp_ntds_buruli_who_cds_FV_EN.pdf](https://www.finddx.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/12/20180901_tpp_ntds_buruli_who_cds_FV_EN.pdf).
- 496 15. WHO. Target product profile for a rapid test for diagnosis of Buruli ulcer at the primary health-care
497 level 2022. Available from: [https://iris.who.int/bitstream/handle/10665/353982/9789240043251-](https://iris.who.int/bitstream/handle/10665/353982/9789240043251-eng.pdf?sequence=1)
498 [eng.pdf?sequence=1](https://iris.who.int/bitstream/handle/10665/353982/9789240043251-eng.pdf?sequence=1).
- 499 16. Hall B, Simmonds R. Pleiotropic molecular effects of the Mycobacterium ulcerans virulence factor
500 mycolactone underlying the cell death and immunosuppression seen in Buruli ulcer. Biochem Soc Trans.
501 2014;42(1):177-83. doi: 10.1042/BST20130133. PubMed PMID: 24450648.
- 502 17. Dangy JP, Scherr N, Gersbach P, Hug MN, Bieri R, Bomio C, et al. Antibody-Mediated Neutralization
503 of the Exotoxin Mycolactone, the Main Virulence Factor Produced by Mycobacterium ulcerans. PLoS Negl
504 Trop Dis. 2016;10(6):e0004808. Epub 20160628. doi: 10.1371/journal.pntd.0004808. PubMed PMID:
505 27351976; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC4924874.
- 506 18. Warryn L, Dangy JP, Gersbach P, Gehringer M, Schafer A, Ruf MT, et al. Development of an ELISA
507 for the quantification of mycolactone, the cytotoxic macrolide toxin of Mycobacterium ulcerans. PLoS Negl
508 Trop Dis. 2020;14(6):e0008357. Epub 20200626. doi: 10.1371/journal.pntd.0008357. PubMed PMID:
509 32589646; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC7347236.
- 510 19. Warryn L, Dangy JP, Gersbach P, Gehringer M, Altmann KH, Pluschke G. An Antigen Capture Assay
511 for the Detection of Mycolactone, the Polyketide Toxin of Mycobacterium ulcerans. J Immunol.
512 2021;206(11):2753-62. Epub 20210524. doi: 10.4049/jimmunol.2001232. PubMed PMID: 34031146;
513 PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC8176938.

- 514 20. Gehringer M, Mader P, Gersbach P, Pfeiffer B, Scherr N, Dangy JP, et al. Configurationally Stabilized
515 Analogs of *M. ulcerans* Exotoxins Mycolactones A and B Reveal the Importance of Side Chain Geometry
516 for Mycolactone Virulence. *Org Lett.* 2019;21(15):5853-7. Epub 20190711. doi:
517 10.1021/acs.orglett.9b01947. PubMed PMID: 31295000.
- 518 21. Scherr N, Gersbach P, Dangy JP, Bomio C, Li J, Altmann KH, et al. Structure-activity relationship
519 studies on the macrolide exotoxin mycolactone of *Mycobacterium ulcerans*. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis.*
520 2013;7(3):e2143. Epub 20130328. doi: 10.1371/journal.pntd.0002143. PubMed PMID: 23556027;
521 PubMed Central PMCID: PMC3610637.
- 522 22. Trengove NJ, Langton SR, Stacey MC. Biochemical analysis of wound fluid from nonhealing and
523 healing chronic leg ulcers. *Wound Repair Regen.* 1996;4(2):234-9. doi: 10.1046/j.1524-475X.1996.40211.x.
524 PubMed PMID: 17177819.
- 525 23. Porter JL, Tobias NJ, Hong H, Tuck KL, Jenkin GA, Stinear TP. Transfer, stable maintenance and
526 expression of the mycolactone polyketide megasynthase *mls* genes in a recombination-impaired
527 *Mycobacterium marinum*. *Microbiology (Reading).* 2009;155(Pt 6):1923-33. Epub 20090421. doi:
528 10.1099/mic.0.027029-0. PubMed PMID: 19383681.
- 529 24. Magnetic rack separators. Available from: <https://www.ebay.com/usr/pochekailov>.
- 530 25. López CA, Unkefer CJ, Swanson BI, Swanson JMJ, Gnanakaran S. Membrane perturbing properties
531 of toxin mycolactone from *Mycobacterium ulcerans*. *PLoS Comput Biol.* 2018;14(2):e1005972. Epub
532 20180205. doi: 10.1371/journal.pcbi.1005972. PubMed PMID: 29401455; PubMed Central PMCID:
533 PMC5814095.
- 534 26. Sarfo FS, Phillips RO, Rangers B, Mahrous EA, Lee RE, Tarelli E, et al. Detection of Mycolactone A/B
535 in *Mycobacterium ulcerans*-Infected Human Tissue. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis.* 2010;4(1):e577. Epub 20100105.
536 doi: 10.1371/journal.pntd.0000577. PubMed PMID: 20052267; PubMed Central PMCID:
537 PMC2791843.

538 27. 2011 Sea. In the literature report, 1 mL extracts were concentrated to 0.5 mL, and analyzed by
539 HPLC/MS/MS. After this twofold concentration step, mycolactone was present in the 30–300 ng/mL range
540 (40–400 nM) in 20/23 samples, and undetectable in the remaining three. Hence before evaporation,
541 mycolactone concentration was 15–150 ng/mL range (20–200 nM), and the absolute mycolactone content
542 was 15–150 ng/samples in 20/23 (87%) of the patients.

543 28. Marion E, Prado S, Cano C, Babonneau J, Ghamrawi S, Marsollier L. Photodegradation of the
544 Mycobacterium ulcerans toxin, mycolactones: considerations for handling and storage. PLoS One.
545 2012;7(4):e33600. Epub 20120413. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0033600. PubMed PMID: 22514607;
546 PubMed Central PMCID: PMC3326021.

547 29. Nitenberg M, Benarouche A, Maniti O, Marion E, Marsollier L, Gean J, et al. The potent effect of
548 mycolactone on lipid membranes. PLoS Pathog. 2018;14(1):e1006814. Epub 20180110. doi:
549 10.1371/journal.ppat.1006814. PubMed PMID: 29320578; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC5779694.

550 30. Kubicek-Sutherland JZ, Vu DM, Anderson AS, Sanchez TC, Converse PJ, Marti-Arbona R, et al.
551 Understanding the Significance of Biochemistry in the Storage, Handling, Purification, and Sampling of
552 Amphiphilic Mycolactone. Toxins (Basel). 2019;11(4). Epub 20190404. doi: 10.3390/toxins11040202.
553 PubMed PMID: 30987300; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC6520765.

554