CELLMID STATEMENT IN RESPONSE TO MEDIA ARTICLE

On Thursday, 7 May 2020, the Australian Financial Review (AFR) published an article replete with misstatements, inaccuracies and imputations concerning Cellmid's purchase of the SARS-CoV-2 antibody Point of Care Tests (POCT's) from Wondfo. The article wantonly sets out to damage the Company. Cellmid wishes to advise shareholders of the true position in relation to the Wondfo POCT and absolutely refute the false and malicious comments made in the AFR article.

The title of the article suggests that Cellmid and its Wondfo POCT's are specifically "under review" and their sale is in some way prohibited. The testing currently conducted by the Peter Doherty Institute is a standard condition of all 16 SARS-CoV-2 point of care tests listed on the ARTG for legal supply in Australia and forms a necessary part of the post market surveillance that all 27 sponsors of these POCT's are subject to, including the two other sponsors of the Wondfo POCT. Wondfo and Cellmid are in the exact same position as any other registered manufacturer and sponsor of these antibody tests in Australia. Cellmid received no notification at all from the TGA that the post market surveillance testing is a specific action against it, nor that the testing should affect Cellmid's ability to sell the POCT's.

The puffery in the article suggesting that the Wondfo POCT's that do not work are "worse than useless, they are downright dangerous" is incorrect, misleading and designed to unfairly and wrongfully criticise Cellmid and ultimately undermine its business. To be clear Cellmid only sells its POCT's to registered medical practitioners and provides training for their use. Therefore, there is no "danger" involved with the use of the tests unless the article is suggesting that medical practitioners are inept and/or dangerous.

The article says that Wondfo's antibody tests sold to the UK government did not work sufficiently accurately, according to a subsequent Oxford University study. In response to these claims by overseas media outlets, Wondfo released a statement refuting the spurious allegations and advised that there is absolutely no evidence that the UK government bought US$20 million of POCT's from Wondfo, that those tests were not accurate or that they were subject to any Oxford University study. Wondfo provided Cellmid with a copy of this statement titled "Inaccurate claims in Daily Mail and New York Times" and it is annexed to this announcement. A copy of that statement was also provided to the AFR before it decided to publish the offending article.

Independent validation data on Wondfo's POCT is readily available from the University of California, San Francisco, study[1], which compared ten different SASR-CoV-2 rapid tests. Wondfo's POCT was one of the overall top performing tests in terms of specificity and sensitivity.

The AFR article states "The UK government's desperate gamble on China's Wondfo has left it red faced and ripped off". This is yet another statement made completely

[1] Whitman et al 2020 https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.25.20074856

without any evidentiary support and contrary again to the statement made by Wondfo provided to the AFR.

Generally, the article seeks to suggest that Cellmid has only recently become involved in diagnostics. Again, this is incorrect as our shareholders know well. Cellmid has been involved in diagnostics since 2009. In 2010 it first CE marked its MK-ELISA for the accurate measurement of midkine, an embryonic cytokine, in blood. In 2011 Cellmid licensed its diagnostic technology to Pacific Edge Biotechnology which has since developed CxBladder® using this technology for the diagnosis and management of bladder cancer. Cellmid has been deriving revenue from diagnostics every year since 2011.

The article states that Cellmid verified the POCT's accuracy by the ICMR. Yet again this is incorrect. Cellmid did not commission the study by the National Institute of Virology in India. Wondfo's own studies have been completed in a range of hospitals by clinical investigators, like any other clinical study.

The AFR article appearing as it does in a "gossip" column rises no further than the fact that it has republished old information from other news sources which is contrary to the evidence provided to it by Cellmid. It is clear the publisher neglected to even refer to Cellmid's evidence as professional journalists would be expected to do.