

Evaluation of an automated rapid phenotypic antimicrobial susceptibility testing (ASTar, Q-linea AB) applied directly on blood cultures bottles positive for Gram-negative pathogens

Isabella Banchini^{1^}, Eva Caterina Borgatti^{1^}, Claudio Foschi^{1,2}, Tiziana Lazzarotto^{1,2}, Simone Ambretti^{1,2}

¹Section of Microbiology, Department of Medical and Surgical Sciences, Alma Mater Studiorum - University of Bologna, Italy;

²Microbiology Unit, IRCCS Azienda Ospedaliero-Universitaria di Bologna, Italy

[^]Isabella Banchini and Eva Caterina Borgatti contributed equally to this work and share first authorship

SUMMARY

We evaluated the performance of a new rapid phenotypic antimicrobial susceptibility test (ASTar; Q-linea AB) on Gram-negative bacilli, directly from positive blood cultures bottles. MIC values obtained by the routine reference method (Microscan, Beckman Coulter) were compared to the ones provided by the tested method (ASTar). ASTar demonstrated an overall essential agreement of 98% and a category agreement of 96.1%. The overall rate of major errors and very major errors was 2.5% and 3.3%, respectively.

ASTar can represent a rapid, simple, and reliable method to speed up information about antimicrobial susceptibility of Gram-negative pathogens from positive blood culture bottles.

Received February 02, 2024

Accepted April 07, 2024

Bloodstream infections (BSIs) represent a global burden of disease, with high morbidity and mortality rates (Fleischmann *et al.*, 2016). Gram-negative bacilli (GNB) cause between one-quarter and one-third of BSIs worldwide (Santoro *et al.*, 2020). In this context, early and optimal initiation of an active antibiotic treatment is one of the most critical issues to improve outcome of patients suffering from BSIs and to reduce healthcare-associated costs (Roncarati *et al.*, 2021). Unfortunately, the global emergence of multi-drug resistance in GNB means that it is no longer possible to reliably predict antimicrobial susceptibility based on the identification of bacterial species alone (Perez *et al.*, 2013). The spread of antimicrobial resistance may lead to the use of broad-spectrum therapies for empiric treatment of GNB BSIs, greatly increasing the risk of treatment inappropriateness, higher toxicity, higher costs, and further selection of bacterial resistance (Marquet *et al.*, 2015). For this reason, antimicrobial susceptibility testing (AST), in-

cluding MIC (minimum inhibitory concentration) determination using broth microdilution, is crucial for determining optimal antimicrobial treatment (Göransson *et al.*, 2023). Over recent years, several methods have been developed to speed up the determination of MIC values and to detect antibiotic resistance in GNB from positive blood culture bottles (BCs) (Descours *et al.*, 2018; Banerjee *et al.*, 2021). In this study we evaluated the performance of a new rapid phenotypic AST (ASTar; Q-linea AB, Uppsala, Sweden) in GNB from positive BCs.

From September to October 2022, we analysed a total of 43 BCs collected from patients with Gram-negative bacteraemia at the Microbiology Unit of 'IRCCS Azienda Ospedaliero-Universitaria' of Bologna (Italy). Samples were randomly selected and only monomicrobial blood cultures were included. Samples were first processed with the standard routine workflow adopted by the laboratory (Foschi *et al.*, 2016). Briefly, positive BC bottles (BACTEC, Becton Dickinson Diagnostic Systems, Franklin Lakes, NJ, USA) were analysed by Gram-staining, conventional subculture on solid media, and rapid identification using MALDI-TOF mass spectrometry (MS). When GNB were detected, the bacterial pellets obtained by BC broth centrifugation were inoculated onto chocolate agar. After incubation for 1.5 h at 35-37°C, bacterial growth was used for species identification by MAL-

Key words:

Antimicrobial susceptibility testing; antimicrobial resistance; MIC; rapid AST; blood cultures.

Corresponding author:

Claudio Foschi

E-mail: claudio.foschi2@unibo.it

DI-TOF MS (Bruker Daltonics, Bremen, Germany) and for conventional antimicrobial susceptibility testing (AST) by microdilution assay (MicroScan Walkaway; Beckman Coulter, Atlanta, USA), requiring about 16 hours of incubation.

In parallel, the samples were analysed with ASTar system (Q-linea), following the manufacturer's instructions (Göransson *et al.*, 2023). As described elsewhere (Göransson *et al.*, 2023), ASTar is an automated rapid phenotypic AST method, performed directly from positive BCs (0.8-1 mL of sample from positive BC bottles is loaded into the cartridge), able to provide results of MIC values in about 6 hours. ASTar is based on time lapse microscopy to measure the concentration of bacteria present at given times in wells containing microdilutions in scaled broth of the anti-

microbial agents.

ASTar uses concentration determination to produce a controlled final inoculum according to EUCAST guidelines, and microscopy is used to generate MIC values. Considering that ASTar cannot provide bacterial identification, species information needs to be entered into the system before results can be reported.

Retrospectively, we compared MIC values (interpreted following EUCAST guidelines, www.eucast.org) obtained by the routine reference method (Microscan) with those provided by the tested method (ASTar). Afterwards, the following parameters were evaluated:

1) 'Category Agreement' (CA), calculated as the total number of isolates tested using ASTar that yielded a MIC result in the same categorical interpretation (e.g., susceptible, resistant) of the reference method;

Table 1 - List of the strains included in the study. For each group of microorganisms, the resistance rate obtained by the reference method (Microscan, Beckman Coulter) and stratified by the antimicrobials, is reported. In addition, the MIC values of resistant strains are provided. /=NOT TESTED or NOT REPORTED.

Resistance rate	<i>Escherichia coli</i> (n=17)	<i>Klebsiella spp.</i> (n=10)	<i>Enterobacter spp.</i> (n=6)	<i>Pseudomonas aeruginosa</i> (n=5)	<i>Serratia marcescens</i> (n=3)	<i>Acinetobacter baumannii</i> (n=2)
Amoxicillin-clavulanate	64.7% (11/17) MIC: >32 (6); 32 (2); 16 (3)	60% (6/10) MIC: >32 (5); 16 (1)	/	/	/	/
Ampicillin	76.4% (13/17) MIC: >8 (13)	100% (10/10) MIC: >8 (10)	/	/	/	/
Cefepime	23.5% (4/17) MIC: >8 (4)	60% (6/10) MIC: >8 (6)	33.4% (2/6) MIC: >8 (2)	0	0	/
Cefotaxime	29.4% (5/17) MIC: >32 (5)	60% (6/10) MIC: >32 (6)	50% (3/6) MIC: >32 (2); 16 (1)	/	/	/
Ceftazidime	41.1% (7/17) MIC: >32 (2); 32 (2); 16 (1); 8 (2)	40% (4/10) MIC: >32 (3); 8 (1)	50% (3/6) MIC: >32 (1); 16 (1); 8 (1)	0	0	/
Ceftazidime-avibactam	0	0	16.7% (1/6) MIC: >8 (1)	0	0	/
Ceftolozane-tazobactam	0	30% (3/10) MIC: >64 (1); 64 (1); 4 (1)	33.4% (2/6) MIC: >4 (2)	0	0	/
Ciprofloxacin	23.5% (4/17) MIC: >1 (4)	20% (2/10) MIC: >1 (2)	33.4% (2/6) MIC: >1 (2)	0	0	50% (1/2) MIC: >1 (1)
Ertapenem	0	30% (3/10) MIC: >2 (3)	50% (3/6) MIC: >2 (3)	/	0	/
Meropenem	0	10% (1/10) MIC: >64 (1)	16.7% (1/6) MIC: 16 (1)	0	0	50% (1/2) MIC: >64 (1)
Amikacin	0	10% (1/10) MIC: 16 (1)	0	0	0	50% (1/2) MIC: >16 (1)
Gentamicin	17.6% (3/17) MIC: >4 (3)	20% (2/10) MIC: >4 (2)	0	/	0	50% (1/2) MIC: >4 (1)
Piperacillin-tazobactam	0	40% (4/10) MIC: >128 (3); 16 (1)	33.3% (2/6) MIC: >16 (1); 16 (1)	0	0	/
Trimethoprim/sulfamethoxazole	41.1% (7/17) MIC: >4/76 (7)	50% (5/10) MIC: >4/76 (5)	16.7% (1/6) MIC: >4/76 (1)	/	33.4% (1/3) MIC: >4/76 (1)	/
Tigecycline	0	/	0	/	/	/

- 2) 'Essential Agreement' (EA), calculated by determining the number of test results that were within ± 1 doubling dilution of the MIC value determined by the reference method;
- 3) 'major errors' (ME), indicating the percentage of susceptible isolates falsely determined by the tested method to be resistant, calculated with the number of susceptible isolates as the denominator, and
- 4) 'very major errors' (VME), indicating the percentage of resistant isolates falsely determined by the method tested to be sensitive, calculated with the number of resistant isolates as the denominator.

This study was conducted in compliance with the Helsinki Declaration and Italian regulations. No ethical approval was required since the study was purely observational, with data anonymized for analysis and presented in aggregated form.

Most of BCs analysed were positive for *Escherichia coli* (17/43) and *Klebsiella pneumoniae* (11/43), followed by *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* (5/43), *Serratia marcescens* (3/43), *Acinetobacter baumannii* (2/43), *Klebsiella aerogenes* (2/43), *Enterobacter spp.* (2/43), and *Klebsiella oxytoca* (1/43). The list of strains included in the analysis is shown in Table 1.

The AS[®]Tar system demonstrated an overall EA of 98% and a CA of 96.1% compared to the reference method. The overall rate of ME and VME was 2.5% and 3.3%, respectively. Among all the beta-lactams tested, piperacillin-tazobactam showed the lowest CA, whereas

both carbapenems (i.e., ertapenem and meropenem) were characterized by an excellent CA (100%). Gentamicin and ceftolozane-tazobactam showed the highest rate of VME (16.7% and 20%, respectively). Detailed results are presented in Table 2.

Until now, only very few data are available about the AS[®]Tar system; thus, this work expands knowledge on the accuracy and performance of this new method.

Our data are in line with the recent results presented by Göransson *et al.* showing that the AS[®]Tar system delivers reproducible results with overall EA and CA of >95%, with an overall rate of major discrepancies of 0.9%, and that of very major discrepancies of 2.4% (Göransson *et al.*, 2023). In agreement with our observations, the same authors found that gentamicin showed the highest rate of VME (>16%) (Göransson *et al.*, 2023).

AS[®]Tar can represent a rapid, simple, and reliable method to speed up information about antimicrobial susceptibility of GNB from positive BC bottles. These included the Gram-negative pathogens responsible for most cases of bacteraemia/sepsis, such as *Escherichia coli* and *Klebsiella pneumoniae* (Ohnuma *et al.*, 2023). Further studies, including a larger panel of samples and species, are needed for thorough evaluation of the cost-benefit ratio of this method applied to the management of septic patients. Even though other works will be necessary to assess the clinical outcomes, laboratory workflow, or health economic benefits of the AS[®]Tar system, the rapid availability of MIC

Table 2 - Accuracy study results for each antimicrobial. CA=Category Agreement'; EA= 'Essential Agreement'; ME= major errors: percentage of susceptible isolates falsely determined by the tested method to be resistant, calculated with the number of susceptible isolates as the denominator; VME= 'very major errors: percentage of resistant isolates falsely determined by the method tested to be sensitive, calculated with the number of resistant isolates as the denominator. Only valid microorganisms-drug combinations were included in the analysis.

Antimicrobial agent	EA	CA	ME	VME
Ampicillin	100% (17/17)	100% (17/17)	0%	0%
Amoxicillin-clavulanate	96.3% (26/27)	88.9% (24/27)	22.2% (2/9)	5.9% (1/17)
Piperacillin-tazobactam	97.6% (40/41)	90.2% (37/41)	8.6% (3/35)	0%
Cefepime	100% (34/34)	97.4% (37/38)	0%	0%
Cefotaxime	93.9% (31/33)	93.9% (31/33)	0%	7.1% (1/14)
Ceftazidime	97.6% (40/41)	92.7% (38/41)	0%	0%
Ceftazidime-avibactam	100% (41/41)	97.6% (40/41)	0%	0%
Ceftolozane-tazobactam	97.5% (39/40)	95.0% (38/40)	2.9% (1/35)	20% (1/5)
Ciprofloxacin	97.6% (42/43)	90.7% (39/43)	0%	0%
Amikacin	100% (43/43)	100% (43/43)	0%	0%
Gentamicin	97.4% (37/38)	97.4% (37/38)	0%	16.7% (1/6)
Tigecycline	100% (36/36)	100% (36/36)	0%	0%
Trimethoprim/sulfamethoxazole	97.2% (35/36)	97.2% (35/36)	4.5% (1/22)	0%
Ertapenem	97.2% (35/36)	100% (36/36)	0%	0%
Meropenem	97.7% (42/43)	100% (43/43)	0%	0%
Total	98.0%	96.1%	2.5%	3.3%

values/AST results could probably reduce the length and cost of hospitalization, as well as mortality rates.

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank Dr. Giacomo Nigrisoli for providing excellent support during data analysis. This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors. Q-linea AB provided the kit for the experiments, but the company had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, the decision to publish, or the preparation of the manuscript.

References

- Banerjee R., Komarow L., Virk A., Rajapakse N., Schuetz A.N., Dylla B., et al. (2021). Randomized Trial Evaluating Clinical Impact of RAPID Identification and Susceptibility Testing for Gram-negative Bacteremia: RAPIDS-GN. *Clin Infect Dis.* **73**, e39-e46.
- Descours G., Desmurs L., Hoang T.L.T., Ibranosyan M., Baume M., Ranc A.G., et al. (2018). Evaluation of the Accelerate Pheno™ system for rapid identification and antimicrobial susceptibility testing of Gram-negative bacteria in bloodstream infections. *Eur J Clin Microbiol Infect Dis.* **37** (8), 1573-1583.
- Fleischmann C., Scherag A., Adhikari N.K., Hartog C.S., Tsaganos T., et al.; International Forum of Acute Care Trialists. (2016). Assessment of Global Incidence and Mortality of Hospital-treated Sepsis. Current Estimates and Limitations. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med.* **193** (3), 259-72.
- Foschi C., Compri M., Smirnova V., Denicolò A., Nardini P., Tamburini M.V., et al. (2016). Ease-of-use protocol for the rapid detection of third-generation cephalosporin resistance in Enterobacteriaceae isolated from blood cultures using matrix-assisted laser desorption ionization-time-of-flight mass spectrometry. *J Hosp Infect.* **93**, 206-210.
- Göransson J., Sundqvist M., Ghaderi E., Lisby J.G., Molin, Y., Eriksson E., et al. (2023). Performance of a System for Rapid Phenotypic Antimicrobial Susceptibility Testing of Gram-Negative Bacteria Directly from Positive Blood Culture Bottles. *J Clin Microbiol.* **61** (3), e0152522.
- Marquet K., Liesenborgs A., Bergs J., Vleugels A., Claes N. (2015). Incidence and outcome of inappropriate in-hospital empiric antibiotics for severe infection: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Crit Care.* **19** (1), 63.
- Ohnuma T., Chihara S., Costin B., Treggiari M., Bartz R.R., Raghunathan K., Krishnamoorthy V. (2023). Epidemiology, Resistance Profiles, and Outcomes of Bloodstream Infections in Community-Onset Sepsis in the United States. *Crit Care Med.* **51** (9), 1148-1158.
- Perez K.K., Olsen R.J., Musick W.L., Cernoch P.L., Davis J.R., Land G.A., et al. (2013). Integrating rapid pathogen identification and antimicrobial stewardship significantly decreases hospital costs. *Arch Pathol Lab Med.* **137**, 1247-1254.
- Roncarati G., Foschi C., Ambretti S., Re M.C. (2021). Rapid identification and detection of β -lactamase-producing Enterobacteriaceae from positive blood cultures by MALDI-TOF/MS. *J Glob Antimicrob Resist.* **24**, 270-274.
- Santoro A., Franceschini E., Meschiari M., Menozzi M., Zona S., Venturelli C., et al. (2020). Epidemiology and Risk Factors Associated With Mortality in Consecutive Patients With Bacterial Bloodstream Infection: Impact of MDR and XDR Bacteria. *Open Forum Infect Dis.* **7** (11), ofaa461.