

1 **Evaluation of the Performance of Filmarray Blood Culture Identification Panel on**
2 **Detecting Blood Cultures Containing Activated Carbon Powder**

3 Chen Chen, Shang He, Chengbin Wang*

4 *Medical Laboratories of the First Clinical Medical Center, Chinese PLA General Hospital,*
5 *Beijing 100853, China*

6
7 *The corresponding author:

8 Chengbin Wang,

9 No. 28 Fuxing Road, Beijing, China.

10 Email: chengbinwang301cl@126.com

11 Tel.: +86 10 66936881

12

13 **Running title:** Filmarray Blood Culture Identification

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

23 **Abstract:**

24 Objective: The FilmArray Blood Culture Identification (BCID) panel is a rapid microfluidic
25 PCR amplification microbial detection system. Several studies have evaluated its clinical
26 performance on the basis of blood culture bottles containing resins. However, proportion of
27 hospitals in China use bottles with carbon powder, which the performance of FilmArray has
28 not been fully investigated. Therefore, this study is conducted to explore the accuracy of the
29 panel using blood culture bottles with carbon powder. Method: 147 venous blood cultures
30 containing carbon powder were used to assess the microbial and antibiotic resistance
31 detection ability of the FilmArray panel. Outcomes were compared with results of the clinical
32 combination method and their consistency was analyzed. Results: FilmArray detected single
33 microorganism in 121 samples, multiple microorganism in 9 cases and the consistency rate
34 between the two methods was 90.6%. Among the 150 microorganisms detected, 85.1% (40/47)
35 of *staphylococcus* contained the antibiotic resistant *mecA* gene, 15.3% (9/59) of *Enterobacter*
36 detected the *KPC* gene, 7.7% (1/13) of *Enterococcus* has the *vanA* gene and the consistency
37 with their clinical drug-resistant phenotypes were 93.6%, 86.4% and 100%, respectively.
38 Conclusion: The identification rate of the FilmArray BCID panel using venous blood cultures
39 with activated carbon powder was highly consistent with the outcomes of previous
40 researchers using non-carbon powder blood culture bottles. It is capable of providing rapid
41 and reliable results in the detection of pathogens present in automated blood culture systems.
42 Key words: Blood culture, Microorganism Identification, Filmarray BCID Panel, Evaluation

43

44

45 **Introduction**

46 Bloodstream infection (BSI) is a leading cause of death worldwide. Appropriate and timely
47 antimicrobial treatment could significantly reduce the mortality rate for patients with BSI [1].
48 Conventional antimicrobial treatment often includes the use of broad-spectrum antibiotics, a
49 strategy used due to the lack of specific identification of the causative infectious agent in most
50 cases[2]. However, rapid identification (ID) of microbial pathogens responsible for BSIs is
51 critical to reduce infection-related mortality, particularly for patients admitted to the intensive
52 care units (ICU). So far, blood culture (BC) is an essential tool for BSI diagnosis, but its
53 time-consuming turn-around-time obstructs the timely treatment of patients. Several new
54 technologies such as MALDI-TOF mass spectrometer have been adapted by microbiology
55 laboratories to shorten the time spend on microbial identification [3, 4], but it relies on the
56 outcome of the subculture on the agar plate, which may take several additional days after the
57 blood culture.

58 In recent years, number of other new rapid BSI detection platforms, such as molecular assays,
59 digital PCR, PCR/ESI-MS technology *et al* , have emerged [5-8], and each platform has its
60 benefits and limitations[9]. The FilmArray Blood Culture Identification (BCID) panel
61 (BioFire Diagnostics Salt Lake City, UT) is a novel rapid diagnostic method based on
62 multiplex polymerase chain reaction and microfluidic technology to detect common
63 sepsis-related pathogens in an hour, including 19 bacteria and 5 yeasts and three antimicrobial
64 resistance genes, using samples from positive blood culture bottles/broths [10]. Previous
65 studies have evaluated the diagnostic accuracy of the FilmArray BCID panel in comparison to
66 conventional laboratory methods[11-14] on the basis of blood culture bottles or bottles

67 containing resins. Our hospital and many hospitals like us in China, however, mainly use
68 blood culture bottles, especially for the inpatients and the ICU department, containing 32ml of
69 complex media and 8ml of charcoal suspension with an average density of 1.0215 g/mL.
70 Although adding charcoal can bring several benefits such as adsorbing antibiotics in the blood,
71 reducing antibiotics interference, improving positive rate of the blood culture and shortening
72 the turn-around-time, the adsorption is also a double-edged sword. It could affect the
73 extraction of nucleic acid sample and the enzyme activity in the PCR reaction system, which
74 may also disturb the detection of FilmArray BCID panel. To the best of our knowledge, the
75 performance of FilmArray BCID panel on blood culture bottle containing activated carbon
76 has not been properly investigated. Therefore, in this study we tested and verified differences
77 between the culture bottles containing carbon powder detected by the FilmArray BCID panel
78 and a combination of conventional clinical laboratory methods.

79

80 **Materials and Methods**

81 The study was conducted in a 3A grade hospital with a bed capacity of 4400 in China. The
82 study protocol was reviewed and approved by the Biomedical Research Ethics Committee of
83 the PLA General Hospital. Samples of this study were collected from the inpatients in the
84 hospital from January 2017 to June 2018, and consents were obtained from the patients whose
85 samples were used as per the existing agreement to the PLA General Hospital Medical
86 Microbiology laboratories.

87 **Study setting and design**

88 All blood cultures were received as per routine work from all wards and ICU of the hospital
89 covered by the Medical Microbiology Laboratory of the PLA. Per routine processes, 8-10mL
90 blood from the adult patient was injected into the blood culture bottle BACT/ALERT® FA

91 and BACT/ALERT® FN (BioMérieux, Shanghai, CN), respectively, and 3-5ml venous blood
92 from pediatric patient were injected into the special BacT/ALERT® PF blood culture bottles .
93 The blood cultures were then loaded into the automated blood culture continuous monitoring
94 system, BacT-ALERT® 3D 120 (BioMérieux, Shanghai, CN). If no signal was received from
95 a blood culture bottle after seven days, the bottle was retrieved and resulted as ‘no growth
96 after seven days (except for the samples which the doctor asks for extending culture time). If
97 the instrument alarm indicated the bottle had possible positive results, it would then be taken
98 out from the instrument for smear and optical microscopy examination. If there were no
99 bacteria found in the microscope field, the bottle would be loaded into the instrument for
100 more culturing until the positive alarm show up again in next seven day, or it will be reported
101 as “no growth”.

102 **Clinical laboratory identification of positive cultures**

103 For the positive samples examined by the microscope, cultures were isolated and subcultured
104 on Columbia sheep blood agar plate, China blue agar plate and Sabouraud's agar plate, and
105 the anaerobic cultures were cultured on CDC anaerobic agar culture plate in the CO₂
106 incubator. The special bacteria were cultured on its optimal medium according to its cultural
107 properties. After cultured for 16-24 hours, a single colony of each type of colony on the agar
108 plate was identified by VITEK MS (MALDI-TOF mass spectrometer, BioMérieux). If there
109 was no identification result of the mass spectrum database, the microorganism nucleic acid
110 would be extracted for the identification by the next-generation gene sequencing (NGS). This
111 approach was called the clinical combination method.

112 **Antimicrobial susceptibility test of microorganisms**

113 For the microorganisms in samples identified as bacteria, its antimicrobial susceptibility
114 detection would be detected by VITEK 2 compact (BioMerieux). AST-GP 67 card was used
115 for gram-positive bacteria, AST-GN09 card for non-fermentative gram-negative bacteria and

116 AST-GN13 card for fermentative gram-negative bacteria. Other separate drug sensitivity tests
117 would be added for special bacteria according to the identification specifications of the
118 laboratory, which were tested by Kirb-Bauer (K-B) or Epsilometer test (E-test). The drug
119 sensitivity of fungi was determined by VITEK 2 AST-YS01 (BioMerieux) fungal drug
120 sensitivity system.

121 The clinical identification and antimicrobial susceptibility detection were called as the clinical
122 combination method.

123 **Identification of positive cultures by FlimArray BCID panel**

124 Each positive blood culture was run on a single FilmArray BCID panel within eight hours
125 after becoming positive. 100µL of the contents of the blood culture bottle was aspirated,
126 mixed with sample buffer (provided) and loaded into the FilmArray pouch. The pouch was
127 loaded onto the FilmArray instrument, which was connected to a computer system. At the end
128 of the run, a report was automatically generated showing any detectable organism(s) as well
129 as any antimicrobial resistance gene(s) – *mecA*, *vanA/B* and KPC. (Fig.1)

130 **Reference strains in the study**

131 American Type Culture Collection (ATCC) strains were used as external controls and set up
132 by the study. Quality control strains of the BacT/ALERT3D were *Staphylococcus aureus*
133 ATCC 25923, *Escherichia coli* ATCC25922 and *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* ATCC27853.
134 Quality control strains of the VITEK MS were *Staphylococcus aureus* ATCC 25923,
135 *Escherichia coli* ATCC 8739 and *Candida albicans* ATCC90029. The quality control strains
136 of VITEK 2 compact were *Escherichia coli* ATCC25922 for AST-GN13 card, *Staphylococcus*
137 *aureus* ATCC29213 for AST-GP67 card, *Streptococcus pneumoniae* ATCC49619 for
138 AST-GP68 card and *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* ATCC27853 for AST-GN09 card.

139 **Statistical analyses**

140 In this study, identification and antimicrobial susceptibility of organisms obtained by the

141 FlimArray BCID panel were compared to those obtained by the combination method i.e., the
142 VITEK MS methods and next-generation sequencing. If the VITEK MS did not identify any
143 microbial, then NGS results were used as the clinical results. Identification that was brought
144 down to the nearest precision possible (genus/species/complex/subspecies level achievable)
145 by FlimArray BCID panel with respect to the results seen from the combination method was
146 labeled as ‘precisely identified’; organisms, listed in the panel, that were missed or
147 misidentified (genus/species/complex/ subspecies level), were labelled as either ‘missed’ or
148 ‘misidentified’. The number of blood cultures, and the number of organisms, were all used to
149 evaluate the performance of FlimArray BCID panel in the statistical analyses. Sensitivity,
150 specificity, positive predictive value and negative predictive value as well as consistency were
151 analyzed. Calculations were done using IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows (Version 22.0;
152 IBM Corp, Armonk, New York, United States).

153

154 **Results**

155 **Sample information**

156 A total of 147 venous blood culture samples from inpatients were tested in this study and 105
157 of which were males and 42 were females. The age range was from 18 to 92 years.

158 **Outcomes of microbial identification**

159 Five blood culture bottles inoculated with known ATCC organisms were used as external
160 controls on FilmArray. All five external controls yielded the desired identification. Among the
161 147 samples tested by clinical combination methods, 129 of which contained a single
162 microorganism, 9 samples contained more than one type of microorganisms, confirmed by the
163 VITEK MS, and 9 false positive samples were detected. In comparison, FilmArray BCID
164 panel detected 17 negative samples and 130 positive samples from the 147 cases, in which
165 121 had a single positive microorganism (Table 1) and 9 had more than one type of

166 microorganism (Table 2). In the 121 positive samples, 1 was incorrectly identified and in 9
167 samples with multiple microorganisms, 1 was identified as a single microorganism by the
168 clinical combination methods. In addition, 1 sample containing two types of microorganisms
169 was identified as negative by the FilmArray BCID and four samples had negative outcome
170 because the corresponding microorganisms were out of panel's detection range. Moreover,
171 nine samples with "no growth" detected by combination method were identified as negative
172 samples by NGS test.

173 In the 147 samples of this study, 150 strains of microorganisms were identified by the
174 combination method, shown in Table 3, and 135 strains were identified by FilmArray BICD,
175 which was 90.0% of the combination method. However, 15 strains of microorganisms were
176 not identified by the combination method, accounting for 10.0%. There were 64 strains of
177 gram-positive bacteria in the accurate identification, accounting for 92.8% (64/69) of the
178 positive bacteria, 59 strains of gram-negative bacteria, accounting for 86.8% (59/68) of the
179 negative bacteria, and 12 strains of fungi, accounting for 92.3% (12/13) of the total bacteria.
180 The 15 strains not identified by the FilmArray BICD were not included in the identification
181 panel.

182 **Antibiotic sensitivity test**

183 FilmArray BCID panel contains three drug-resistant genes, namely *mecA* of *Staphylococcus*
184 *spp*, *VanA/VanB* of *Enterococcus spp* and KPC of *Enterobacteriaceae*, therefore only these
185 species had the results of drug resistance gene detection. In 150 strains of microorganism
186 detected by combination methods, 40 strains (85.1%) were detected with *mecA* gene among a
187 total of 47 strains of staphylococcus. Of which 37 cases were consistent with the clinical drug
188 resistance phenotype accounting for 93.6%. 1 strain (7.7%) was detected with *vanA* gene
189 among 13 strains of and this finding was consistent with the clinical drug resistance
190 phenotype, accounting for 100%. In 59 strains of *Enterobacterium* detected, 9 strains

191 contained the KPC gene (15.3%), and a total of 52 strains were consistent with the clinical
192 drug resistance phenotype, accounting for 88.1%. Among the detected *Enterobacteriaceae*, 4
193 strains of *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* and 4 strains of *Acinetobacter baumannii* showed
194 insensitivity to carbapenems antibiotics without the detection of *KPC* gene in their genome.
195 One strain of *Klebsiella oxytoca*, which did not contain the *KPC* gene, showed sensitivity to
196 carbapenems. (Table 4)

197 **Sensitivity and specificity of FilmArray BCID panel**

198 A total of 147 blood culture samples were detected by the two methods. The combination
199 method detected 138 positive culture samples, 129 positive samples of single microorganism,
200 and 9 cases of more than two kinds of microorganism. FilmArray BCID detected 130 positive
201 samples, including 121 single microorganism samples and 9 cases with multiple
202 microorganism. By using the combination method as the reference, the overall sample
203 sensitivity of FilmArray was 90.6%, the sensitivity of single microorganism positive sample
204 was 93.8%, the sensitivity of multiple microorganisms was 50.0%, and the overall sensitivity
205 of microbial detection was 90.0%. The specificity and positive predictive value were both
206 100%. The negative predictive value for overall positive blood cultures, blood cultures
207 containing single microorganism and blood cultures containing more than two
208 microorganisms were 40.9%, 52.9% and 64.3%, respectively. The negative predictive value of
209 microorganism was 37.5% (Table 5).

210

211 **Discussion**

212 A sound correlation was found between the FilmArray and combination methods for
213 identification of organisms and resistance genes. An overall identification sensitivity of 89.3%
214 was achieved for organisms identifiable from all blood cultures by FilmArray. This was
215 slightly lower than the overall sensitivity of 92.6% reported in a separate study by

216 Mokshanand Fhooblall *et al.* Higher sensitivity of FilmArray was seen in positive cultures
217 with a single organism (94.2% [129/137] organisms detected) than in cultures with multiple
218 organism (55.5% [5/9] detected) in our study. This was in line with the previous work which
219 also found lower sensitivity for cultures that detected more than one organism. However, no
220 organism, listed in the panel but not detected by the FilmArray, was picked up by combination
221 methods, which is different from other studies.

222 FilmArray BCID panel is a product that can be used to rapidly identify microbes in blood
223 culture. Comparing with the traditional blood culture identification method, this method does
224 not require subculture on the agar plate and identify colonies of bacteria (e.g. Meriere's
225 VITEK 2 Compact system), instead, it relies on the direct multi-PCR amplification with the
226 blood culture without nucleic acid extraction and so approximately 27.9-29.7 h was saved.
227 Moreover, FilmArray can provide information of several common clinical microbial
228 resistance genes, which is beneficial for treating of sepsis patients. It is helpful for the doctors
229 to make quick decisions, and conducive to the management of antibiotics. Two other
230 molecular diagnostic methods, Luminex's Verigen® System and GenMark's ePlex system also
231 offers direct microorganism detection from the blood culture, but GN, GP or FP must be
232 separated before identification and different cards are used. Therefore, the integrated detection
233 system of Filmarray is more convenient and time saving in operation.

234 In terms of performance, FilmArray BCID panel showed a high consistency in the
235 identification of single microbial infection samples with clinical combination methods in this
236 study. The detection rate (90.6%, n=148) of the positive sample with one organism in the
237 samples was similar to that (88.1%, n=2207) of the study carried out by Hossein Salimnia *et*
238 *al.* and the detection rate of the sample with multiple organisms was also relatively close. [15]
239 Only one case of *Staphylococcus aureus* was misidentified as *Staphylococcus spp*, failing to
240 give a more accurate judgment. The 17 samples tested negative by the Filmarray have lead to

241 a big drop in detection specificity, the reason was that these microorganisms were not within the
242 scope of identification by the panel, which is a point of future improvement of this product. At
243 this point, Filmarray and similar detection systems only covers limited number of pathogen
244 species. For example, Fil,marray detects 24 pathogens (including fungi) and 3
245 drug-resistant genes, Verigen could only identify 22 pathogens (no fungi) and 9
246 drug-resistant genes and ePlex can detect 29 pathogens, but no drug-resistant genes. In
247 contrast, MALDI-ToF based VITEK® MS platform is able to identify more than 1,000
248 pathogens, and VITEK 2 can identify 997 antibiotic resistance sensitive phenotypes.
249 Additionally, 2 strains of *Staphylococcus hominis* and 1 strain of *Staphylococcus cephalic*
250 with *mecA* gene detected showed their sensitivity to antibiotics (Table 5), indicating that the
251 genotype and phenotype of these strains were not completely consistent, and so gene
252 detection cannot completely replace phenotype detection.

253 For samples with multiple microbial infections, 4 cases not identified by the Filmarray
254 because the corresponding bacteria were beyond the scope of the panel. In the other 3 cases,
255 the identifications of the combination method were *Enterococcus spp*, but Filmarray detected
256 multiple microorganism, which may be caused by contamination during the detection process.
257 Because the principle of FilmArray BCID panel is PCR technology, contamination is one of
258 the most common problems[16, 17]. How to avoid contamination is also one of the aspects
259 that need to be future improved in this detection reagent.

260 In this study, all the samples are from blood cultures containing carbon powder, the accuracy
261 of detection of the Filmarray was good comparing with the current clinical combination
262 method, and this was consistent with the outcomes of previous researchers using non-carbon
263 powder blood culture bottles. It is capable of providing rapid [18-20] and reliable results in
264 the detection of pathogens present in automated blood culture systems[11, 21], and it can be
265 applied to the special patients[22-24] and the sterile body fluids, such as cerebrospinal, joint,

266 pleural and ascitic fluids, bronchoscopy samples and abscesses[25-27]. The panel can not
267 only save the patient cost (\$30,000 saved per 100 patients tested) but also improve the ASP
268 [28-30]. In addition, because of its simple operation, it reduces the labor intensity and their
269 experience requirement of the staff[31].

270

271 **Acknowledgements**

272 We thank the PLA General Hospital Clinical Microbiology Laboratory team for the helping.
273 Thank BioMerieux (Shanghai) for providing the FilmArray BCID panel kits.

274

275 **References**

- 276 1. Kuti EL, Patel AA, Coleman CI. Impact of inappropriate antibiotic therapy on
277 mortality in patients with ventilator-associated pneumonia and blood stream infection:
278 A meta-analysis. *J Crit Care.* 2008;23:91-100.
- 279 2. Altun O, Almuhayawi M, Ullberg M, et al. Clinical evaluation of the FilmArray blood
280 culture identification panel in identification of bacteria and yeasts from positive blood
281 culture bottles. *J Clin Microbiol.* 2013;51:4130-4136.
- 282 3. Fiori B, D'Inzeo T, Giaquinto A, et al. Optimized Use of the MALDI BioTyper System
283 and the FilmArray BCID Panel for Direct Identification of Microbial Pathogens from
284 Positive Blood Cultures. *J Clin Microbiol.* 2016;54:576-584.
- 285 4. Van den Poel B, Meersseman P, Debaveye Y, et al. Performance and potential clinical
286 impact of Alfred60^{AST} (Alifax®) for direct antimicrobial susceptibility testing on
287 positive blood culture bottles. *Eur J Clin Microbiol Infect Dis.* 2020;39:53-63.
- 288 5. Arne MT, Ekaterina A, Stephan AF, et al. Rapid identification of pathogens, antibiotic

- 289 resistance genes and plasmids in blood cultures by nanopore sequencing. *Sci Rep.*
290 2020;10:7622
- 291 6. Martina T, Silvia Z, Patrizia F, et al. Rapid diagnosis of bloodstream infections in the
292 critically ill: Evaluation of the broad-range PCR/ESI-MS technology. *PloS One*
293 2018;13:e0197436.
- 294 7. Te-Din H, Ekaterina M, Pierre B, et al. Evaluation of the ePlex Blood Culture
295 Identification Panels for Detection of Pathogens in Bloodstream Infections. *J Clin*
296 *Microbiol.* 2019;57(2):e01597-18.
- 297 8. Timothy JA, Hemanth C, Chen-Yin O, et al. Rapid bacterial detection and antibiotic
298 susceptibility testing in whole blood using one-step, high throughput blood digital
299 PCR. *Lab Chip.* 2020;20:477-489.
- 300 9. Fhooblall M, Nkwanyana F, Mlisana K. Evaluation of the BioFire® FilmArray®
301 Blood Culture Identification Panel on positive blood cultures in a regional hospital
302 laboratory in KwaZulu-Natal. *Afr J Lab Med.* 2016;5(1):411-418
- 303 10. MacVane SH, Nolte FS, Burnham CAD. Benefits of Adding a Rapid PCR-Based
304 Blood Culture Identification Panel to an Established Antimicrobial Stewardship
305 Program. *J Clin Microbiol.* 2016;54:2455-2463.
- 306 11. Ward C, Stocker K, Begum J, et al. Performance evaluation of the Verigene®
307 (Nanosphere) and FilmArray® (BioFire®) molecular assays for identification of
308 causative organisms in bacterial bloodstream infections. *Eur J Clin Microbiol Infect*
309 *Dis.* 2015;34:487-496.
- 310 12. Blaschke AJ, Heyrend C, Byington CL, et al. Rapid identification of pathogens from

- 311 positive blood cultures by multiplex polymerase chain reaction using the FilmArray
312 system. *Diagn Micr Infec Dis*. 2012;74:349-355.
- 313 13. Rand KH, Delano JPJDM, Disease I. Direct identification of bacteria in positive blood
314 cultures: comparison of two rapid methods, FilmArray and mass spectrometry. *Diagn*
315 *Microbiol Infect Dis*. 2014;79:293-297.
- 316 14. Bhatti MM, Boonlayangoor S, Beavis KG, et al. Evaluation of FilmArray and
317 Verigene Systems for Rapid Identification of Positive Blood Cultures. *J Clin*
318 *Microbiol*. 2014;52:3433-3436.
- 319 15. Salimnia H, Fairfax MR, Lephart PR, et al. Evaluation of the FilmArray Blood
320 Culture Identification Panel: Results of a Multicenter Controlled Trial. *J Clin*
321 *Microbiol*. 2016;54:687-698.
- 322 16. Kemin X, Sarwat G, Hank W, et al. Blood Culture Contamination in the Clinical
323 Microbiology Laboratory of a Teaching Hospital. *Am J Clin Pathol*.
324 2019;52(9):3433-3436.
- 325 17. Halstead DC, Sautter RL, Snyder JW, et al. Reducing Blood Culture Contamination
326 Rates: Experiences of Four Hospital Systems. *Infect Dis Ther*. 2020;9:389-401.
- 327 18. Messacar K, Hurst AL, Child J, et al. Clinical Impact and Provider Acceptability of
328 Real-Time Antimicrobial Stewardship Decision Support for Rapid Diagnostics in
329 Children With Positive Blood Culture Results. *J Pediatric Infect Dis Soc*.
330 2017;6:267-274.
- 331 19. Michos A, Palili A, Koutouzis EI, et al. Detection of bacterial pathogens in synovial
332 and pleural fluid with the FilmArray Blood Culture Identification System. *ID Cases*.

- 333 2016;5:27-28.
- 334 20. Ray STJ, Drew RJ, Hardiman F, et al. Rapid Identification of Microorganisms by
335 FilmArray Blood Culture Identification Panel Improves Clinical Management in
336 Children. *Pediatr Infect Dis J*. 2016;35:e134-e138.
- 337 21. Bhatti MM, Boonlayangoor S, Beavis KG, et al. Evaluation of FilmArray and
338 Verigene systems for rapid identification of positive blood cultures. *J Clin Microbiol*.
339 2014;52:3433-3436.
- 340 22. Zheng X, Polanco W, Carter D, et al. Rapid identification of pathogens from pediatric
341 blood cultures by use of the FilmArray blood culture identification panel. *J Clin*
342 *Microbiol*. 2014;52:368-4371.
- 343 23. Otlu B, Bayindir Y, Ozdemir F, et al. Rapid Detection of Bloodstream Pathogens in
344 Liver Transplantation Patients With FilmArray Multiplex Polymerase Chain Reaction
345 Assays: Comparison With Conventional Methods. *Transpl P*. 2015;47:1926-1932.
- 346 24. Nakonowska MSB. Rapid Detection of Bloodstream Pathogens in Oncologic Patients
347 with a FilmArray Multiplex PCR Assay. *Pol J Microbiol*. 2018;67:103-107.
- 348 25. Micó M, de Miniac D, González Y, et al. Efficacy of the FilmArray blood culture
349 identification panel for direct molecular diagnosis of infectious diseases from samples
350 other than blood. *Can J Infect Dis Med*. 2015;64:1481-1488.
- 351 26. Altun O, Almuhayawi M, Ullberg M, et al. Rapid identification of microorganisms
352 from sterile body fluids by use of FilmArray. *J Clin Microbiol*. 2015;53:710-712.
- 353 27. Comyn A, Ronayne A, Nielsen MJ, et al. BioFire Film Array Blood Culture
354 Identification Panel for Rapid Detection of Pathogens from Sterile Sites - A Diagnostic

- 355 Accuracy Study. *Open Infect Dis J.* 2018;10:15-22.
- 356 28. MacVane SH, Hurst JM, Boger MS, et al. Impact of a rapid multiplex polymerase
357 chain reaction blood culture identification technology on outcomes in patients with
358 vancomycin-resistant Enterococcal bacteremia. *Infect Dis (Lond).* 2016;48:732-737.
- 359 29. Carreno JJ, Lomaestro BM, Jacobs AL, et al. Assessment of Time to Clinical
360 Response in Patients with Sepsis Treated Before and After Implementation of a
361 Matrix-Assisted Laser Desorption Ionization Time-of-Flight Blood Culture
362 Identification Algorithm. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol.* 2016;37:916-923.
- 363 30. Pardo J, Klinker KP, Borgert SJ, et al. Clinical and economic impact of antimicrobial
364 stewardship interventions with the FilmArray blood culture identification panel. *Diagn
365 Microbiol Infect Dis.* 2016;84:159-164.
- 366 31. McCoy MH, Relich RF, Davis TE, et al. Performance of the FilmArray(R) blood
367 culture identification panel utilized by non-expert staff compared with conventional
368 microbial identification and antimicrobial resistance gene detection from positive
369 blood cultures. *J Med Microbiol.* 2016;65:619-625.
- 370

371 Table 1. Performance of FilmArray BICD on blood culture samples with one type of organism

Filmarray BICD	Identification by combination methods	Precisely identified n (%)	Imprecisely identified n (%)	Missed n (%)
Gram-Positive Bacteria		55(98.2)	1(1.8)	0
<i>Staphylococcus</i>	<i>Staphylococcus capitis</i>	3	-	-
	<i>Staphylococcus haemolyticus</i>	3	-	-
	<i>Staphylococcus hominis</i>	26	-	-
	<i>Staphylococcus epidermidis</i>	9	-	-
<i>Staphylococcus aureus</i>	<i>Staphylococcus aureus</i>	4	1	-
<i>Streptococcus</i>	<i>Streptococcus oralis</i>	2	-	-
<i>Streptococcus pyogenes</i>	<i>Streptococcus pyogenes</i>	1	-	-
<i>Enterococcus</i>	<i>Enterococcus faecium</i>	6	-	-
	<i>Enterococcus faecalis</i>	1	-	-
Gram-Negative Bacteria		54(100)	0	0
<i>Enterobacteriaceae</i>	<i>Salmonella</i>	1	-	-
	<i>Enterobacter aerogenes</i>	1	-	-
<i>Escherichia coli</i>	<i>Escherichia coli</i>	26	-	-
<i>Klebsiella pneumoniae</i>	<i>Klebsiella pneumoniae</i>	16	-	-
<i>Klebsiella oxytoca</i>	<i>Klebsiella oxytoca</i>	1	-	-
<i>Pseudomonas aeruginosa</i>	<i>Pseudomonas aeruginosa</i>	4	-	-
<i>Acinetobacter baumannii</i>	<i>Acinetobacter baumannii</i>	3	-	-
<i>Serratia marcescens</i>	<i>Serratia marcescens</i>	1	-	-
<i>Enterobacter cloacae complex</i>	<i>Enterobacter cloacae complex</i>	1	-	-
Yeast		11(100)	0	0
<i>Candida albicans</i>	<i>Candida albicans</i>	2	-	-
<i>Candida glabrata</i>	<i>Candida glabrata</i>	3	-	-
<i>Candida parapsilosis</i>	<i>Candida parapsilosis</i>	4	-	-
<i>Candida tropicalis</i>	<i>Candida tropicalis</i>	2	-	-
Failed to detect		-	-	8
Not Detected	<i>Bacillus cereus</i>	-	-	1
	<i>Cryptococcus neoformans</i>	-	-	1
	<i>Morganella morganii</i>	-	-	1
	<i>Pantoea agglomerans</i>	-	-	1
	<i>Staphylococcus saccharolyticus</i>	-	-	1
	<i>Myxobacterium</i>	-	-	1
	<i>bacterium burgeri</i>	-	-	1
	<i>Staphylococcus pettenkoferi</i>	-	-	1
False positive blood cultures		9(100)	-	-
Not Detected	No bacteria were cultivated	9	-	-
Total		129(93.5)	1(0.7)	8(5.8)

372

373

374 Table 2. Performance of FilmArray BICD on blood culture samples with more than one type
375 of organism

Filmarray	Identification by combination methods	Precisely identified n (%)	Imprecisely identified n (%)	Missed n (%)
<i>Enterococcus Pseudomonas aeruginosa</i>	<i>Enterococcus Pseudomonas aeruginosa</i>	1	-	-
<i>Enterococcus Escherichia coli</i>	<i>Enterococcus avium Escherichia coli</i>	1	-	-
<i>Enterococcus Escherichia coli</i>	<i>Enterococcus faecium Escherichia coli</i>	1	-	-
<i>Enterococcus Escherichia coli</i>	<i>Enterococcus casseliflavus Escherichia coli</i>	1	-	-
<i>Enterococcus Acinetobacter baumannii</i>	<i>Enterococcus faecium Acinetobacter baumannii</i>	1	-	-
<i>Pseudomonas aeruginosa</i>	<i>Pseudomonas aeruginosa Hydrophila/Caviae Aeromonas</i>	-	1	-
<i>Enterococcus Staphylococcus aureus</i>	<i>Enterococcus faecalis Staphylococcus aureus Streptococcus dysgalactiae</i>	-	1	-
<i>Enterococcus Klebsiella pneumoniae</i>	<i>Enterococcus faecium Klebsiella pneumoniae Escherichia hermannii Hydrophila/Caviae Aeromonas</i>	-	1	-
<i>Enterococcus Candida tropicalis</i>	<i>Stenotrophomonas maltophilia Candida tropicalis</i>	-	1	-
None	<i>Micrococcus luteus Micrococcus lylae</i>	-	-	1
Total		5 (50.0%)	4 (40.0%)	1 (10.0%)

376

377

378 Table 3. Performance of FilmArray BICD on all the organisms detected by combination

379 methods

Filmarray BICD	Identification by combination methods	Precisely identified n (%)	Imprecisely identified n (%)	Missed n (%)
Gram-Positive Bacteria		63(92.8)	1(1.6)	0
<i>Staphylococcus</i>	<i>Staphylococcus capitis</i>	3	/	/
	<i>Staphylococcus haemolyticus</i>	3	/	/
	<i>Staphylococcus hominis</i>	26	/	/
	<i>Staphylococcus epidermidis</i>	9	/	/
<i>Staphylococcus aureus</i>	<i>Staphylococcus aureus</i>	5	1	/
<i>Streptococcus</i>	<i>Streptococcus oralis</i>	2	/	/
<i>Streptococcus pyogenes</i>	<i>Streptococcus pyogenes</i>	1	/	/
<i>Streptococcus agalactiae</i>	<i>Streptococcus agalactiae</i>	1	/	/
<i>Enterococcus</i>	<i>Enterococcus faecium</i>	8	/	/
	<i>Enterococcus faecalis</i>	2	/	/
	<i>Enterococcus casseliflavus</i>	1	/	/
	<i>Enterococcus avium</i>	1	/	/
	<i>Enterococcus</i>	1	/	/
Gram-Negative Bacteria		59(86.8)	/	/
<i>Enterobacteriaceae</i>	<i>Salmonella</i>	1	/	/
	<i>Enterobacter aerogenes</i>	1	/	/
<i>Escherichia coli</i>	<i>Escherichia coli</i>	28	/	/
<i>Klebsiella pneumoniae</i>	<i>Klebsiella pneumoniae</i>	16	/	/
<i>Klebsiella oxytoca</i>	<i>Klebsiella oxytoca</i>	1	/	/
<i>Pseudomonas aeruginosa</i>	<i>Pseudomonas aeruginosa</i>	6	/	/
<i>Acinetobacter baumannii</i>	<i>Acinetobacter baumannii</i>	4	/	/
<i>Serratia marcescens</i>	<i>Serratia marcescens</i>	1	/	/
<i>Enterobacter cloacae complex</i>	<i>Enterobacter cloacae complex</i>	1	/	/
Yeast		12(92.3)	/	/
<i>Candida albicans</i>	<i>Candida albicans</i>	2	/	/
<i>Candida glabrata</i>	<i>Candida glabrata</i>	3	/	/
<i>Candida parapsilosis</i>	<i>Candida parapsilosis</i>	4	/	/
<i>Candida tropicalis</i>	<i>Candida tropicalis</i>	3	/	/
Failed to detect		/	/	15
Not Detected	<i>Bacillus cereus</i>	/	/	1
	<i>Cryptococcus neoformans</i>	/	/	1
	<i>Morganella morganii</i>	/	/	1
	<i>Pantoea agglomerans</i>	/	/	1
	<i>Staphylococcus saccharolyticus</i>	/	/	1
	<i>Myxobacterium</i>	/	/	1
	<i>bacterium burgeri</i>	/	/	1
	<i>Staphylococcus pettenkoferi</i>	/	/	1
	<i>Streptococcus dysgalactiae</i>	/	/	1
	<i>Stenotrophomonas maltophilia</i>	/	/	1
	<i>Hydrophila/Caviae Aeromonas</i>	/	/	2
	<i>Escherichia hermannii</i>	/	/	1
	<i>Micrococcus luteus</i>	/	/	1
	<i>Micrococcus lylae</i>	/	/	1
	Total		134(89.3)	1(0.7)

380

381 Table 4 The distribution of antibiotic resistance marker detected by FilmArray BICD and the
382 drug-resistant phenotype of all the related organisms

Species	Numbers n(%)	Resistant genes (FilmArray)			Antimicrobial susceptibility		
		<i>mecA</i>	<i>vanA/vanB</i>	KPC	S ^a	I	R
<i>Staphylococcus aureus</i>	5(10.6%)	1(100)	/	/	4	0	1
<i>Staphylococcus epidermidis</i>	9(19.2%)	9(100)	/	/	0	0	9
<i>Staphylococcus hominis</i>	27(57.5%)	25(92)	/	/	4	0	23
<i>Staphylococcus cephalis</i>	3(6.4%)	3(66.7)	/	/	1	0	2
<i>Staphylococcus haemolyticus</i>	3(6.4%)	2(100)	/	/	1	0	2
Total	47	40(93.6)	/	/	10	0	37
<i>Enterococcus</i>	13(100)	/	1(7.7)	/	12	0	1
Total	13	/	1(100)	/	12	0	1
<i>Enterobacter aerogenes</i>	1(1.7%)	/	/	1(100)	0	0	1
<i>Salmonella</i>	1(1.7%)	/	/	0(100)	1	0	0
<i>Escherichia coli</i>	29(49.2%)	/	/	1(100)	28	0	1
<i>Klebsiella pneumoniae</i>	17(28.8%)	/	/	7(100)	10	0	7
<i>Klebsiella oxytoca</i>	1(1.7%)	/	/	0(100)	1	0	0
<i>Pseudomonas aeruginosa</i>	6(10.2%)	/	/	0(33.3)	2	1	3
<i>Acinetobacter baumannii</i>	4(6.8%)	/	/	0(0)	0	0	4
Total	59	/	/	9(86.4)	42	1	16

383 a: S: sensitive; I: inhibited; R: Resistant.

384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402

403 Table 5. Performance characteristics of FilmArray BICD compared to combination methods.

Parameter	All positive blood cultures (n = 139)	Positive cultures with one type of organism (121/139)	Positive cultures with more than one type of organism (9/139)	All organism by detected (134/159)
Sensitivity	90.6% 95% CI [84.5-94.9]	93.8% 95% CI [88.1-97.3]	50.0% 95% CI [18.7-81.3]	90.0% 95% CI [84.5-94.9]
Specificity	100% 95% CI [66.4-100]	100% 95% CI [66.4-100]	100% 95% CI [66.4-100]	100% 95% CI [66.4-100]
Positive predictive value	100% 95% CI [N/A]	100% 95% CI [N/A]	100% 95% CI [N/A]	100% 95% CI [N/A]
Negative predictive value	40.9% 95% CI [28.1-51.4]	52.9% 95% CI [36.5-68.8]	64.3% 95% CI [49.2-77.0]	37.5% 95% CI [29.2-53.7]
Cohen's Kappa	0.54	0.66	0.49	0.50

404 Positive blood cultures described are organisms that were on the FilmArray BCID repertoire.

405

