Supplementary Information for

Plastic chip based magnetophoretic immunoassay for pointof-care diagnosis of tuberculosis

Jeonghyo Kim^{1,†}, Minji Jang^{1,†}, Kyoung G. Lee², Kil-Soo Lee³, Seok Jae Lee², Kyung-Won Ro⁴, In Sung Kang⁴, Byung Do Jeong⁴, Tae Jung Park⁵, Hwa-Jung Kim⁶, Jaebeom Lee^{1,*}

¹Departments of Cogno-Mechatronics Engineering, Pusan National University, Busan 46241, Republic of Korea
²Department of Nano Bio Research, National NanoFab Center (NNFC), Daejeon 305-806, Republic of Korea
³Department of Bacterial Respiratory Infections, Center for Infectious Diseases, National Institute of Health, Korea Center for Disease Control and Prevention, Cheongju 28159, Republic of Korea
⁴Scinco R&D Center, 746, Daedeok-daero, Yuseong-gu, Daejeon 34055, Republic of Korea
⁵Department of Chemistry, Chung-Ang University, Seoul 06974, Republic of Korea
⁶Department of Microbiology and Research Institute for Medical Science, College of Medicine, Chungnam National University, Daejeon 35015, Republic of Korea

*Corresponding authors: Jaebeom Lee, PhD; E-mail: jaebeom@pusan.ac.kr

Supplementary Methods

Calculation of LOD

The LOD was calculated by the 3σ criterion method¹, where σ stands for the standard deviation of negative control background data (n=5). In the analytical procedure, total signal (S_t) can be explained by the sum of background signal (S_b) and analyte signal (S_x). And the analyte signal can be expressed as gC_x, where g is the sensitivity of instrument which is equal to the slope of calibration curve. According to this analytical method, LOD of signal (S_{LOD}) is calculated as equation S1,

$$S_{LOD} = S_t - S_b \ge 3.3 \delta_b.$$
 (equation S1)

The S_{LOD} value must be higher than 3.3 times the δ_b to have 99.9% of confidence limit, where the δ_b is standard deviation of the background signal. LOD of concentration (C_{LOD}) can be obtained by substituting the calculated S_{LOD} value for Y in the regression equation for the signalconcentration calibration curve (**Figure 5A**).

Based on these considerations, the resulting S_{LOD} and C_{LOD} are 2.3% and $1.8 \times 10^{-12} \text{ g} \cdot \text{mL}^{-1}$, respectively.

Supplementary Figures



Figure S1. Comparative time-based UV-vis absorbance kinetic plot for magnetophoresis time.



Figure S2. SEM image of bare magnetic micro particles used as the core material for MMP@Au probes.



Figure S3. Particle size distribution for MMPs and MMP@Au NPs.



Supplementary Movie S1. Video clip showing real-time monitoring of the magnetophoresis process before and after coating of the MMP cores with Au shells.

Sputum number	Sex	pcMPI* (<i>n∆ABS</i> , %)	Gold standard		
			AFB test**	MGIT growth unit***	PCR
1	F	9.25	2+	++	MTB
2	F	13.17	2+	++	MTB
3	F	8.13	2+	++	MTB
4	М	8.03	2+	++	MTB
5	F	0.21	2+	++	MTB
6	М	3.96	2+	+	MTB
7	М	-5.02	2+	++	MTB
8	М	-9.84	2+	++	MTB
9	F	17.82	2+	++	MTB
10	М	11.52	2+	+++	MTB
11	М	6.84	2+	++	MTB
Sputum number	Sex	pcMPI* (<i>n∆ABS</i> , %)	Gold standard		
			AFB test**	MGIT growth unit***	PCR
12	F	-0.32	2+	+	NTM (M intracellulare)
13	М	3.90	2+	++	(Mintracellulare)
14	М	-12.52	2+	++	NTM
15	М	-7.35	2+	++	(M.avium) NTM
16	M	1.84	2+	++	(M.avium) NTM (M.avium)

Supplementary Tables

* Values for pcMPI analysis represent $n\Delta ABS$ (%). Higher $n\Delta ABS$ (%) value indicate higher concentration of secretory CFP-10 was monitored.

** Acid-Fast Bacilli (AFB) Smear test

*** Bacterial culture result from BACTEC MGIT 960 instrumentation. Detection signal levels: High (> 1,000 growth unit (GU)) for +++; medium (100 to <1000 GU) for ++; and low (10 to <100 GU) for +. Manufacturer-set threshold was 50 GU.

Table S1. Comparison of results from the pcMPI and conventional diagnostic systems (AFB test, MGIT bacterial culture, PCR) in clinical sputum samples.

Supporting Information References

 Apostol, I.; Miller, K. J.; Ratto, J.; Kelner, D. N. Comparison of Different Approaches for Evaluation of the Detection and Quantitation Limits of a Purity Method: A Case Study Using a Capillary Isoelectrofocusing Method for a Monoclonal Antibody. *Anal. Biochem.* 2009, 385, 101-106.