

1 **Routine respiratory metagenomics service for intensive care unit patients**

2 Themoula Charalampous^{1*}, PhD, Adela Alcolea-Medina^{1,2*}, MPhil, Luke B. Snell^{1,3*}, MRCP,
3 Christopher Alder^{1,3}, MSc, Mark Tan¹, MSc, Tom G.S. Williams³, MB BChir, Noor Al-Yaakoubi¹,
4 MSc, Gul Humayun¹, MSc, Christopher I.S. Meadows^{4,5}, MBBS, Duncan L.A. Wyncoll⁴, MBBS,
5 Paul Richard⁴, MBBS PhD, Carolyn J. Hemsley³, BM BCh, Dakshika Jeyaratnam³, MD, William
6 Newsholme³, MBBS, Simon Goldenberg³, FRCPath, Amita Patel^{1,3}, BSc, Fearghal Tucker², PhD,
7 Gaia Nebbia³, FRCPath, Mark Wilks⁶, PhD, Meera Chand⁷, MBBS, Penelope R. Cliff², PhD,
8 Rahul Batra^{1,3}, MD, Justin O'Grady⁸, PhD, Nicholas A. Barrett⁴, MBBS, and Jonathan D.
9 Edgeworth^{1,3,^+} MB PhD.

10 ¹ Centre for Clinical Infection and Diagnostics Research, Department of Infectious Diseases,
11 School of Immunology and Microbial Sciences, King's College London, London

12 ² Infection Sciences, Synnovis, London

13 ³ Department of Infectious Diseases, Guy's and St Thomas' Hospital NHS Foundation Trust,
14 London

15 ⁴ Critical Care Directorate, Guy's and St Thomas' Hospital NHS Foundation Trust, London

16 ⁵ Faculty of Life Sciences and Medicine, King's College, London

17 ⁶ Queen Mary University

18 ⁷ The UK Health Security Agency (UKHSA)

19 ⁸ Oxford Nanopore Technologies (ONT), Oxford, UK.

20 *These authors contributed equally

21 ^Senior author +Corresponding author: themoula.charalampous@kcl.ac.uk for respiratory
22 metagenomics and Jonathan.Edgeworth@gstt.nhs.uk for clinical

23 **Abstract**

24 **Background:**

25 Respiratory metagenomics (RMg) needs evaluation in a pilot service setting to determine
26 utility and inform implementation into clinical practice.

27 **Methods:**

28 Feasibility, performance and clinical impacts on antimicrobial prescribing and infection
29 control were recorded during a pilot RMg service for patients with suspected lower
30 respiratory tract infection (LRTI) on two general and one specialist respiratory intensive care
31 units (ICU) at Guy's & St Thomas NHS foundation Trust, London.

32 **Results:**

33 RMg was performed on 128 samples from 87 patients during the first 15-weeks providing
34 same-day results for 110 samples (86%) with median turnaround time of 6.7hrs (IQR 6.1-7.5
35 hrs). RMg was 92% sensitive and 82% specific for clinically-relevant pathogens compared
36 with routine testing. 48% of RMg results informed antimicrobial prescribing changes (22%
37 escalation; 26% de-escalation) with escalation based on speciation in 20/24 cases and
38 detection of acquired-resistance genes in 4/24 cases. Fastidious or unexpected organisms
39 were reported in 21 samples including anaerobes (n=12), *Mycobacterium tuberculosis*,
40 *Tropheryma whipplei*, cytomegalovirus and *Legionella pneumophila* ST1326, which was
41 subsequently isolated from the bed-side water outlet. Application to consecutive severe
42 community-acquired LRTI cases identified *Staphylococcus aureus* (two with *SCCmec* and
43 three with *luk F/S* virulence determinants), *Streptococcus pyogenes* (*emm1*-M1uk clone), *S.*
44 *dysgalactiae* subspecies *equisimilis* (STG62647A) and *Aspergillus fumigatus* with multiple
45 treatments and public-health impacts.

46 **Conclusions:**

47 RMg provides frequent diverse benefits for treatment, infection control and public health.
48 The combination of rapid comprehensive results, alongside revealing and characterising a
49 hidden burden of infections makes the case for expediting routine service implementation.

50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

61 **Introduction**

62

63 Community and hospital acquired lower-respiratory tract infections (LRTI) are caused by an
64 expanding range of mono-microbial and polymicrobial infections. This presents significant
65 challenges identifying or excluding microbial cause(s). Typically, samples are tested by
66 different methodologies with results returned at different times over subsequent days (1).
67 Culture remains the gold-standard for bacterial identification, despite being slow, having
68 suboptimal sensitivity particularly after antibiotic treatment and inability to detect many
69 fastidious organisms. Multiplex PCR-testing detects many pathogens and can add value to
70 early decision-making, but they target a restricted repertoire, do not provide genomic detail
71 and cannot exclude infection.

72

73 RMg has potential to become a first-line test for severe pneumonia, given its ability to
74 identify essentially any microbe in a clinical sample along with antimicrobial resistance and
75 virulence determinants (2). Retrospective and prospective proof-of-concept studies and case
76 series have been published (3-8) but none have demonstrated feasibility and the breadth of
77 impact from a single test as a routine daily service. We developed a 6-hour nanopore
78 sequencing workflow (6) and evaluated its potential during the COVID-19 pandemic (2). Here
79 we present results implementing RMg into pilot service for ventilated ICU patients.

80 **Methods**

81 **Setting and sample collection**

82

83 RMg testing was offered to a 41-bed medical, surgical and specialist respiratory ICU that
84 included an Extracorporeal Membrane Oxygenation (ECMO) service, Monday to Friday
85 between November 22nd-December 15th 2021 and January 4th-March 25th 2022. Pilot service
86 provision was agreed by the Critical Care Governance & Audit Committee under the NHS
87 Quality Improvement and Patient Safety (QIPS) governance process as previously described
88 (9) (QIPS reference 2021:13023). Duty intensivists selected mechanically ventilated (MV)
89 patients to have additional RMg testing alongside culture and 16S rRNA sequencing
90 performed by the clinical laboratory. Decision criteria were based on the potential for a rapid
91 result to assist with diagnosis or exclusion of LRTI and antibiotic prescribing decisions.
92 Respiratory samples were retrieved prospectively from ICU at 8.30am with results aimed
93 before 5pm. Representative severe CA-LRTI cases from the first 8 weeks of the following
94 influenza season (winter 2022) are also presented, which were absent from the pilot
95 conducted during the COVID-19 pandemic.

96 **Respiratory metagenomic sequencing workflow**

97

98 In total 128 samples were processed for RMg sequencing which included 111
99 bronchoalveolar lavages (BAL), 3 tracheal aspirates, 8 non-direct bronchoalveolar lavages
100 (NDL) and 6 pleural fluids. RMg testing involved saponin-based host depletion, microbial
101 extraction, library preparation and nanopore sequencing as previously described (2, 6, 10)
102 (Figure 1). Every RMg run also included quality controls (no template control (NTC), positive
103 control (PC) and a competitive spiked-in internal control (IC) to identify run or single-sample
104 failures and contamination. Method detailed in supplementary material.

105

106 Time-point data analysis was performed using an in-house pipeline
107 (<https://github.com/GSTT-CIDR/RespiratoryCmg>) incorporating taxonomic classification,
108 antimicrobial resistance (AMR) gene detection and sequence-based typing (SBT). The k-mer
109 based classifier Centrifuge (11), was used for microbial identification using the FDA-ARGOS
110 database (12), curated with only respiratory organisms containing 673 microbial sequences.
111

112 *Reporting of RMg results*

113
114 Sequencing reports generated at 30 minutes and 2 hours were interpreted following the
115 Standard Operating Procedure (SOP). Bacteria were reported using 30 minutes sequence-
116 data when representing $\geq 1\%$ total microbial reads and fungi if ≥ 5 reads were detected, and
117 with Centrifuge score ≥ 8000 . Microorganisms reported from the RMg workflow in this study
118 were referred to as 'respiratory pathogens' or 'pathogens' and they were defined as
119 microorganisms causing respiratory infection in ICU patients. A list of reportable organisms
120 was compiled and followed for reporting. The list was based on previous LRTI studies (1, 2,
121 12-14) and previous findings from the archives of microbiological culture in the last 5 years
122 collected from the clinical laboratory (Table S10). Organism-specific reporting criteria were
123 also set for certain organisms (such as *E. faecium* and anaerobes) - reporting is described in
124 detail in supplementary material.

125
126 Acquired resistance genes reporting restricted to extended-spectrum beta lactamases in
127 *Enterobacterales*, SCCmec in *Staphylococcus aureus* and Vancomycin-resistance gene clusters
128 in *Enterococcus faecium* were included in 2 hour sequence reports (2).
129

130 Clinical sequence reports were uploaded as a pdf-file to the ICU electronic health record after
131 scientific and medical review. Results were also communicated by email or verbally to the
132 duty intensivist and infectious diseases doctor (Figure 1C). RMg performance was compared
133 with routinely requested tests. Discrepant results were investigated using routine 16S rRNA
134 sequencing testing or an in-house pathogen-specific targeted qPCR.

135 **Data Availability**

136 Sequencing data presented in this study are available to the European Nucleotide Archive
137 (ENA) under project number PRJEB59568.

138 **Funding**

139 This work was supported by the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) Biomedical
140 Research Centre programme of Infection and Immunity (RJ112/N027), Guy's & St. Thomas'
141 Charity (<https://www.gsttcharity.org.uk/>; TR130505) and the Medical Research Council
142 (MR/W025140/1; MR/T005416/1 for LBS and GN) and (MC_PC_19041).

143 **Patient management and impacts of RMg**

144 Clinical, microbiology and antimicrobial prescribing data were collected prospectively from all
145 MV-ICU patients having at least one LRT sample collected during the pilot, alongside RMg.
146 Samples from patients in non-pilot critical care areas were excluded for downstream analysis
147 and data collection. RMg-based antimicrobial treatment changes and findings of infection
148 control or public health importance communicated by email or phone calls the same day.
149 RMg results and impacts were reviewed biweekly by multidisciplinary team of three
150 intensivists, an infectious disease doctor, two microbiologists and a pharmacist. Clinical

151 implications of unexpected or discrepant results or any adverse impacts of interventions in
152 response to RMg results were reviewed.

153 **Results**

154 **Clinical and microbiological characteristics of ventilated ICU patients**

155
156 172 ventilated patients admitted to ICU during the 15-week period had 422 LRT samples
157 cultured. In total 128/422 (30%) LRT samples from 87/172 (51%) patients had additional RMg
158 testing (Figure 1A). Clinical characteristics of RMg tested patients was similar to non-tested
159 patients apart from more COVID-19 infections (33% vs 21%) and ECMO therapy (38% vs 5%).
160 (Table 1). 9/172 (5%) patients had any LRT sample growing Gram-negative bacteria (GNB)
161 phenotypically-resistant to first-line empiric treatment of hospital-acquired LRTI (piperacillin-
162 tazobactam) and 3 patients had vancomycin-resistant *E. faecium* (VRE) or carbapenem
163 resistant *P. aeruginosa*. No cases of MRSA or carbapenem-resistant Enterobacterales were
164 reported (Table S1).

165 **RMg performance against routine testing**

166 RMg was performed on samples sent for new suspected community-acquired (CA)-LRTI
167 (23%), at the start (29%) or during (34%) an episode of suspected hospital-acquired (HA)-LRTI
168 or for other reasons (14%) (Table 2). These included 15/128 samples failed QC ((n=7 patients
169 (Table S2)) and 3/128 samples were also excluded due to patients (n=3) admitted to different
170 acute wards. These samples were excluded from further analysis and performance of RMg
171 was calculated using the remaining samples (n=110). The median TAT from sample receipt to
172 RMg reporting was 6.7hrs (interquartile range 6.1-7.5 hrs; maximum 30.5 hrs), with 90%
173 having same-day final reports. This compared with verbal communication of interim culture
174 results when available the following afternoon (median 29hrs) and final reports generated at
175 median of 40hrs.

176
177 In 44/48 culture-positive samples RMg was in agreement with culture findings. RMg missed
178 culture-reported organisms in 4/48 samples. All missed organisms were reported as scanty
179 growth by culture (*S. aureus* [P2 and P77] and *K. pneumoniae* [P7 and P9] (Figure S1). RMg
180 did not detect clinically-relevant organisms in 51/62 samples reported as 'negative for
181 pathogens' by culture. These included 25/51 samples reported as 'negative' or 'no growth' by
182 culture and 26/51 samples reported positive for commensal or non-clinically-relevant
183 organisms (such as *Candida* spp.) (Figure S1). Clinically-relevant organisms were detected by
184 RMg in 11/62 samples – these included *S. aureus* (n=3), *E. faecium* (n=2), anaerobic bacteria
185 (n=4), *C. striatum* (n=1) and *C. koseri* (n=1).

186
187 Based on these findings RMg was 92% (95% CI, 80-98%) sensitive and 82% (95% CI, 71%-91%)
188 specific on a per-sample basis compared with culture. Only 3/11 findings were not confirmed
189 via confirmatory testing (Table S3) which increased specificity of RMg to 94% (95% CI, 85-
190 99%). The increase in specificity after including confirmatory testing was mostly due to RMg
191 identifying bacteria at low levels and organisms subsequently identified in other samples
192 types in the same patients (Table S3). Overall RMg reported organisms not reported by
193 routine testing in 26/110 (17%) samples of which 15/26 were culture-positive samples. These
194 included DNA viruses (HSV-1 (n=5) and CMV (n=1)) and bacteria ((n=9) (data file S1)).
195 Additional RMg findings in culture-positive samples were not considered false-positive
196 findings.

197 RMg findings were also compared against findings from routine 16S rRNA sequencing. In
198 total 85/110 RMg samples were also send for additional 16S rRNA sequencing by the clinical
199 laboratory from which 50/85 (59%) samples were concordant with RMg findings. From the
200 remaining samples 25/85 (29%) were discordant and 10/85 (12%) samples both test were in
201 agreement for ≥ 1 microbial detection.

202

203 Acquired resistance genes were also reported in 5 samples, *vanA* [P88], *bla_{SHV}* [P96, P115 and
204 P122] and *bla_{CTX-M}* [P117]. RMg missed *K. pneumoniae bla_{CTX-M}* in one patient [Figure 2
205 patient D and sample P110] but it was identified by repeat sequencing using MinION flow-cell
206 that has higher sequencing yields (13)(data-file S1).

207 **Impacts on antibiotic treatment**

208 RMg contributed to treatment decisions in 88/110 (80%) cases (Table 2). In 24 (22%) cases,
209 antibiotics were started (n=10) or escalated (n=14) based on detecting organisms with
210 intrinsic (n=20) or acquired resistance (n=4) to current therapy, the majority (87%) that day
211 (Table 2). In 29 (26%) cases, antibiotics were de-escalated or stopped predominantly the
212 following morning ward round (n=22/29 cases (76%)). De-escalation occurred in 66% (19/29)
213 of cases when RMg detected no clinically-relevant organisms (13 no organisms, 3 upper
214 respiratory tract commensals, 3 *Candida spp*). All de-escalation cases were followed up. One
215 patient had antibiotics re-started to treat *P. aeruginosa* cultured from a respiratory sample
216 taken 3 days after RMg informed stopping of antibiotics [P78]. The patient was otherwise
217 progressing well and left ICU few days later. Clinical details of all cases are in data-file S2,
218 with representative timelines for 3 HA-LRTI cases in Figure 2 cases A-C.

219

220 For 35 (32%) patients, antimicrobials were not changed but contributions to prescribing
221 decisions were recorded, mostly by reassuring clinicians of no unexpected pathogens.
222 Thereby preventing escalation, particularly in heavily immunosuppressed patients and with
223 persistent inflammation on antimicrobial treatment (n=11). RMg results also prompted early
224 immunomodulation for suspected inflammatory lung conditions (n=7) after excluding
225 pathogens (Table 3).

226

227 Anaerobes detected in 12 samples (10 BALs and 2 PFs) were deemed clinically-relevant based
228 on clinical findings and absence of alternative plausible pathogens. Patients with CA-LRTI
229 (n=8) had history of aspiration and patients with HA-LRTI (n=4) had received antimicrobials
230 for between 5-12 days, some of which lacked anaerobic activity. Antibiotics were started
231 (n=4), de-escalated (n=3) or continued (n=5). Conversely their exclusion from a clinically-
232 suspected lung abscess and empyema prompted a diagnosis of lung infarction with hydro-
233 pneumothorax and shortening of planned antibiotic course from 6 weeks to 5 days (Table
234 S4).

235

236 22/110 (20%) RMg findings had no recordable impact either because infection was diagnosed
237 at another site (n=8), results were not acted upon (n=6) or decisions were made before
238 results were returned (n=4) (Table 3).

239

240 **Information for infection control**

241

242 Same-day communication of one VRE and two ESBL cases prompted early institution of
243 barrier precautions. The VRE (P88 and Figure 2C) was only cultured from a rectal swab
244 requested during follow up, in response to RMg results. Additionally, *K. variicola* (3 patients)
245 transmission based on overlapping ward-stays was investigated using RMg data. *K. variicola*

246 from 2/3 patients had 99.9999% genetic similarity implicating patient-to-patient transmission
247 (genetic similarity also confirmed by whole genome sequencing of the isolate).

248

249 **Unexpected organisms reported by RMg**

250

251 RMg reported organisms not generally detectable by tests requested during initial patient
252 investigation in 9 samples that were classified as unexpected. *L. pneumophila* ST1326
253 (serogroup 10) was an ICU-acquired infection 13 days post-cardiothoracic surgery [P123],
254 confirmed by PCR but not urinary antigen testing. The same sequence type was isolated from
255 the adjacent hand-basin tap water (Figure 2 case A), so new water filters were fitted to
256 prevent further cases. *M. tuberculosis* was detected in a patient admitted with haemoptysis
257 few months after starting anti-tuberculous therapy that was interpret as dead organisms so
258 no action was taken. That sample and 4 further samples were auramine and culture negative.
259 *Tropheryma whipplei* [P103] was detected in a patient with HA-LRTI post thymoma resection
260 prompting ceftriaxone treatment and follow up by infectious diseases but the significance
261 remained uncertain. CMV detection in a patient with Jo-1 anti-synthetase deficiency
262 prompted plasma viral load testing which was positive (log 3.5-3.6). It was considered
263 clinically-relevant and ganciclovir was commenced [P35]. HSV-1 was detected in 5 samples,
264 but all were considered non-pathogenic reactivation.

265 **Representative cases from 2021/2022 winter season**

266

267 8 severe CA-LRTI cases were admitted over an 8 week period of which 6 were co-infections
268 with influenza (Table S5A). RMg identified Panton Valentine Leukocin (PVL)-*S. aureus* (3), *S.*
269 *pyogenes* (2), *S. pneumoniae* (2), *S. dysgalactiae* (1), *L. pneumophila* (1) and *A. fumigatus* (1).
270 Only one streptococcus (*S. pneumoniae*) was cultured. Treatment was escalated in 3 cases
271 that day (addition of linezolid, intravenous immunoglobulin or ambisome (Figure 2E-2H).
272 PVL-*S. aureus* and *S. pyogenes* cases were reported to public health that day. Subsequent
273 analysis of RMg data identified one *S. pyogenes* as *emm1*-M1uk clone and the *S. dysgalactiae*
274 as subspecies *equisimilis* (STG62647A).

275

276 16 additional patients had RMg testing of which the most important result was unexpected
277 HSV-2 in a patient with new hepatitis and suspected drug rash post-vascular surgery (Figure 2
278 case D and table S5). High dose acyclovir was started that day. Subsequent plasma and rash
279 swab samples were HSV-2 positive.

280 **Discussion**

281

282 RMg must demonstrate consistent additional clinical benefits beyond current practice to be
283 implemented as a routine first-line test for severe pneumonia on ICU (14, 15). We configured
284 laboratory and clinical pathways into a daily RMg service framework to identify five benefit
285 overlapping categories. Firstly, earlier provision of results than culture usually provides
286 (median 40 hours vs 6.7 hours from RMg) to improve initial antimicrobial treatment. This
287 occurred in almost half of patients and was predominantly due to species identification
288 rather than acquired resistance genes, which were uncommon in this cohort. Secondly,
289 identification of organisms that are hard to identify by culture or are suppressed by prior
290 antibiotics. Anaerobes with or without *S. milleri* were found in 10% of samples, similar to a
291 previous study using the same service framework (9) and have been identified in other RMg
292 studies (7). Anaerobes are a long-recognised (7, 16-18) but overlooked cause of LRTI (19),
293 perhaps due to difficulties with detection. De-escalating antibiotics to target anaerobes could

294 have significant benefit for antimicrobial stewardship given their frequent detection. Thirdly,
295 providing an actionable “negative” result when no (clinically-relevant) organisms are
296 detected, which RMg is uniquely placed to provide. No adverse consequences were identified
297 in cases when de-escalation took place, however safe de-escalation always requires, close
298 monitoring, confidence in sample quality and an understanding of methods limitations and
299 reporting thresholds. This is particularly relevant in acutely unwell patients or when
300 considering immunomodulation for clinically-suspected inflammatory lung conditions. The
301 fourth category was identifying AMR organisms for infection control. One VRE and 2 ESBL
302 cases prompted early institution of barrier precautions. Detection of the VRE was unlikely
303 without RMg testing.

304
305 These first four categories represent improvements to the routine culture pathway, but the
306 final category was identifying organisms currently requiring targeted molecular tests that
307 were not requested by intensivists. Some proved clinically-important such as the CMV, HSV-2
308 and *L. pneumophila* cases, with the latter prompting interventions to prevent further cases.
309 In contrast, the 5 HSV-1, *M. tuberculosis* and probably the *T. whipplei* cases were not
310 significant; although, all would be in different clinical contexts (20-22). Providing unexpected
311 or un-requested results can prompt unnecessary investigation and treatment; however,
312 identifying benefits in about a third of cases as found here could be considered an acceptable
313 yield.

314
315 Utility of this fifth “molecular” category is extended when the additional information
316 provided by pathogen sequencing is considered. Targeting the water supply as the source of
317 *L. pneumophila*-ST1326 required sequence-based typing, not just organism identification, as
318 did confirming *K. variicola* transmission (2). RMg applied to severe CA-LRTI cases identified
319 virulence factors (*luk f/S*) and emerging virulent clones missed by culture (*S. dysgalactiae*
320 STG62647A and *S. pyogenes emm1*-M1uk) (23). The latter is of particular public health
321 significance given its link with severe paediatric infections and deaths, first announced by
322 UKHSA 8 weeks after this case (24, 25). Finally, demonstrating ability to assess genotypic
323 azole resistance in *A. fumigatus* sequence from RMg data would be a significant
324 improvement to current fungal AMR testing.

325
326 This study has limitations. Only 3 samples maximum were processed per day due to limited
327 operator availability so the proportionate impact may reduce, when extended to all
328 respiratory samples. Reported sample-failure rate (12%) was mostly due to a defective DNA-
329 extraction batch or operator-introduced contamination which is a recognised current
330 limitation of RMg (26, 27). This can be addressed by reducing hands-on-time via automation.
331 Only phenotypes from acquired-resistance elements were reported, however, expansion to
332 phenotypic prediction caused by other AMR mechanisms (mutational) to increase RMg-
333 usability in settings with higher AMR rates is required. Finally, this workflow is not designed
334 to detect RNA viruses and has not been assessed for other DNA viruses, so workflows that
335 additionally detect these organisms should be evaluated (28).

336
337 In conclusion, this pilot service demonstrates the clinical utility of RMg testing in a routine
338 setting reporting organisms usually detected by culture alongside fastidious and/or
339 uncultivable organisms while also providing genomic information for AMR prediction and/or
340 identifying hospital-acquired infections and emerging hyper-virulent community clones
341 aiding infection controls decisions. Realising all these benefits for individual patients and the
342 wider healthcare system will require change to current practice by many professional groups
343 working more closely together in the same acute timeframe (29). Implementation still
344 requires further technology refinement, addressing accreditation and regulatory

345 requirements, along with gathering data from larger multi-centre studies and health-
346 economic analyses (27, 30). Nevertheless, given recognised gaps in preparedness highlighted
347 by the COVID-19 pandemic (31-33) and increasing AMR (34, 35), this study gives both
348 encouragement and urgency to introduce metagenomics for evaluation as standard of care in
349 acute care pathways (36, 37).

350 **Figures**

351

352 Figure 1. Schematic overview of the study.

353 Overview of the patient cohort and sample set included in the RMg pilot service (A). The
354 metagenomics regime followed on a daily basis when samples were requested for RMg
355 service. Steps outlined include sample collection until reporting results to ICU physicians (B).
356 Respiratory metagenomic end-to-end clinical pathway (C). MV= Mechanically-ventilated;
357 LRT= lower respiratory tract; RMg= Respiratory metagenomics; QC= quality control.

358

359 Figure 2. Patient ICU-timelines illustrating integration of RMg results into antimicrobial
360 treatment and infection control decisions.

361 Hospital-acquired LRTI

362 A) ICU acquired *L. pneumophila* ST1326 pneumonia. Unexpected bacteria prompting
363 antibiotic escalation, infection control and public health interventions. B) *P. aeruginosa* VAP-
364 LRTI. New bacterial pathogen in patient with severe COVID-19 pneumonitis prompting
365 antibiotic escalation. C) ICU-acquired vancomycin resistant *E. faecium*. Unexpected AMR-
366 bacteria with patient & infection control impact. D) Unexpected disseminated reactivation of
367 HSV-2.

368 Community-acquired LRTI

369 E) Influenza with secondary *S. pyogenes* infection F) Influenza with secondary PVL-MRSA and
370 *S. pyogenes* infection. G) Influenza with secondary PVL-MSSA and *S. dysgalactiae* infection.
371 H) Influenza with secondary invasive aspergillosis prompting urgent treatment.

372 Details of each case are presented in supplementary material.

373

374

375

376

377

378

379

380

381

382

383

384

385

386

387

388

389

390

391 **Tables**

392

393 **Table 1. Clinical characteristics and routine microbiological testing of the patient cohort**
 394 **during 2021-2022 winter season.**

395

	Patients with RMg (n=87) ¹	Patients without RMg (n=85)
PATIENT DETAILS		
Age	53 (39-65)	62 (53-71)
Sex (F)	30 (34%)	27 (32%)
ECMO	33 (38%)	4 (5%)
Reason for admission		
Respiratory infection		
COVID	29 (33%)	18 (21%)
LRTI (other)	20 (23%)	17 (20%)
CAP	7 (8%)	4 (5%)
Medical (non-respiratory)	13 (15%)	14 (17%)
Cardiothoracic surgery	7 (8%)	16 (19%)
Other surgery	7 (8%)	11 (13%)
Septic shock	4 (5%)	5 (6%)
RESPIRATORY CULTURE²		
Number of LRT samples	242	180
Gram negative organisms	99 (41%)	76 (42%)
Gram positive organisms	35 (14%)	31 (17%)
<i>Candida</i> spp	85 (35%)	67 (37%)
<i>Candida</i> spp only	50 (21%)	36 (20%)
<i>Aspergillus</i> spp.	2 (1%)	0
No growth or URTF	81 (33%)	48 (27%)

396

397

398

399

400

401

¹Clinical details at time of each RMg test presented in data-file S2. These include patients excluded post-downstream data analysis. ²Organisms cultured from all LRT samples collected during the 15-week study period are in Table S1.

402 **Table 2. Antimicrobial treatment changes in response to RMg results**

403

404

405

406

407

408

409

410

411

412

413

414

415

416

417

418

419

420

421

422

423

424

425

426

Indication for RMg testing	N=128
CA-LRTI	30 (23%)
HA- LRTI	80 (63%)
- Start of episode	37 (29%)
- During episode	43 (34%)
- Other ¹	18 (14%)
Antibiotic prescribing ²	N=110 ³
Receiving antibiotics start of RMg test day	89 (81%)
Receiving antibiotics end of RMg test day	98 (89%)
De-escalation: antibiotics stopped with RMg ⁴	29
- Same day	7 (24%)
- Next day ⁵	22 (76%)
Meropenem	15
Piperacillin-Tazobactam	6
Linezolid	5
Other	3
Escalation: antibiotics started with RMg ⁶	24
- Same day	21 (87%)
- Next day ⁷	3 (13%)
Meropenem	10
Linezolid	4
Other	10

427

428

429

430

431

432

433

434

¹ Includes where the focus of infection was uncertain at time of testing, to exclude respiratory infection pre-immunomodulation or after completing therapy for LRTI. ²15 patients had antibiotics started or stopped for reasons not linked with the RMg result.

³Excludes samples failed at QC (n=15) or sent from non-pilot critical care areas (n=3).

⁴Antifungals were stopped in 3 patients in response to RMg results ⁵2 patients had antibiotics

stopped on second day after testing. ⁶Antifungals were started for 5 patients in response to

RMg results ⁷3 patients had antibiotics started in response to RMg results two days after

receipt of the result

435 **Table 3. Categorising impact of respiratory metagenomic results on antibiotic prescribing**

436

Treatment category	Organisms identified by RMg ¹	Antibiotic changes
START OR ESCALATE TO ACTIVE ANTIMICROBIALS N=24 [22%]	AmpC Enterobacterales (9); Anaerobes (3); <i>Candida</i> spp (2); <i>P. aeruginosa</i> (3); VRE (1); ESBL <i>K. pneumoniae</i> (1); <i>H. influenzae</i> and <i>K. variicola</i> (1) ² ; <i>H. influenzae</i> and <i>M. morgani</i> (1); <i>E. faecium</i> (2); <i>C. striatum</i> (1)	STARTED: Meropenem (10); Linezolid (3); Linezolid & Anidulafungin (1); Ciprofloxacin (1); Piperacillin-Tazobactam (2); Ciprofloxacin (1); Other (6)
DE-ESCALATE OR STOP N=29 [26%]	No significant organisms (29) (comprising no organisms (13), <i>Candida</i> spp (3), URTF (3) Anaerobes (3); MSSA (2); <i>K. variicola</i> & <i>H. influenzae</i> (3); <i>E. faecalis</i> (1); <i>E. coli</i> (1)	STOPPED: Meropenem (6); Piperacillin-Tazobactam (4); Piperacillin-Tazobactam & Gentamicin (2); Linezolid (1); Meropenem & Linezolid (4); Meropenem & Other (5); Co-amoxiclav (1); Ciprofloxacin (1); Levofloxacin (2); Other (3)
PREVENT ESCALATION, REASSURE OR INFORM OTHER THERAPY N=35 [32%]	No significant organisms: No organisms (10), <i>Candida</i> spp only (3), URTF (2); Anaerobes (6); <i>K. pneumoniae</i> (3); Other Enterobacterales (4); MSSA (4); <i>Candida</i> spp. [with MSSA] (1), <i>C. striatum</i> (1), <i>E. faecium</i> (1)	Reassure correct antimicrobial chosen (17); Exclude organisms to bring forward immunomodulation (7). Exclude untreated organisms in complex or immunosuppressed patients (8) Persistent inflammation on current antibiotics (3)
NO TREATMENT IMPACT N=22 [20%]	No significant organisms: No organisms (11), <i>C. albicans</i> (2), <i>K. pneumoniae</i> (3), other Enterobacterales (3) and 1 each of <i>P. aeruginosa</i> , <i>E. faecalis</i> , MSSA (2)	Clinical concern prevented de-escalation in response to RMg result (6); Potential or proven infection at other site (8); Delay returning result (4); Missed information [resistance] (2); quantity of organism (1) organism missed (1)

437 Impact categories were: I) earlier appropriate antimicrobials where the result prompted changes to
 438 existing therapy to target the identified organism(s), II) de-escalating antimicrobials where the result
 439 contributed to stopping or narrowing antimicrobial spectrum III) prevent antimicrobial escalation,
 440 reassuring that current therapy was appropriate or informing non-antimicrobial treatment therapy
 441 and IV) no identified benefit for range of reasons.

442 ¹Organisms identified by RMg in monomicrobial and polymicrobial LRT samples. ²*K. variicola* and *H.*
 443 *influenzae* grown but susceptibilities not available. *H. influenzae* resistant to coamoxiclav but patient
 444 improving and extubated so patient completed 5 day course. Coamoxiclav started 2 days later. ESBL=
 445 Extended spectrum b-lactamases, MSSA=methicillin-sensitive *S. aureus*, URTF= Upper respiratory tract
 446 flora. VRE= Vancomycin-resistant *E. faecium*

447

448 References


449

- 450 1. Cookson W, Cox MJ, Moffatt MF. New opportunities for managing acute and chronic
451 lung infections. *Nature reviews Microbiology*. 2018;16(2):111-20.
- 452 2. Charalampous T, Alcolea-Medina A, Snell LB, Williams TGS, Batra R, Alder C, et al.
453 Evaluating the potential for respiratory metagenomics to improve treatment of secondary
454 infection and detection of nosocomial transmission on expanded COVID-19 intensive care
455 units. *Genome Medicine*. 2021;13(1):182.
- 456 3. Wilson MR, Sample HA, Zorn KC, Arevalo S, Yu G, Neuhaus J, et al. Clinical
457 Metagenomic Sequencing for Diagnosis of Meningitis and Encephalitis. *New England Journal*
458 *of Medicine*. 2019;380(24):2327-40.
- 459 4. Gu W, Deng X, Lee M, Sucu YD, Arevalo S, Stryke D, et al. Rapid pathogen detection
460 by metagenomic next-generation sequencing of infected body fluids. *Nature medicine*.
461 2021;27(1):115-24.
- 462 5. Street TL, Barker L, Sanderson ND, Kavanagh J, Hoosdally S, Cole K, et al. Optimizing
463 DNA Extraction Methods for Nanopore Sequencing of *Neisseria gonorrhoeae* Directly from
464 Urine Samples. *Journal of clinical microbiology*. 2020;58(3).
- 465 6. Charalampous T, Kay GL, Richardson H, Aydin A, Baldan R, Jeanes C, et al. Nanopore
466 metagenomics enables rapid clinical diagnosis of bacterial lower respiratory infection. *Nature*
467 *biotechnology*. 2019;37(7):783-92.
- 468 7. Mu S, Hu L, Zhang Y, Liu Y, Cui X, Zou X, et al. Prospective Evaluation of a Rapid
469 Clinical Metagenomics Test for Bacterial Pneumonia. *Frontiers in cellular and infection*
470 *microbiology*. 2021;11:684965.
- 471 8. Blauwkamp TA, Thair S, Rosen MJ, Blair L, Lindner MS, Vilfan ID, et al. Analytical and
472 clinical validation of a microbial cell-free DNA sequencing test for infectious disease. *Nature*
473 *Microbiology*. 2019;4(4):663-74.
- 474 9. Baldan R, Cliff PR, Burns S, Medina A, Smith GC, Batra R, et al. Development and
475 evaluation of a nanopore 16S rRNA gene sequencing service for same day targeted treatment
476 of bacterial respiratory infection in the intensive care unit. *Journal of Infection*.
477 2021;83(2):167-74.
- 478 10. Justin Joseph O'grady GLK, Themoula CHARALAMPOUS, Alp AYDIN, Riccardo SCOTTI,
479 inventorMethod for digesting nucleic acid in a sample. United Kingdom patent
480 WO2021105659A1. 2109 03/06/2021.
- 481 11. Kim D, Song L, Breitwieser FP, Salzberg SL. Centrifuge: rapid and sensitive
482 classification of metagenomic sequences. *Genome research*. 2016;26(12):1721-9.
- 483 12. Sichtig H, Minogue T, Yan Y, Stefan C, Hall A, Tallon L, et al. FDA-ARGOS is a database
484 with public quality-controlled reference genomes for diagnostic use and regulatory science.
485 *Nature Communications*. 2019;10(1):3313.
- 486 13. Jeck WR, Iafrate AJ, Nardi V. Nanopore Flongle Sequencing as a Rapid, Single-
487 Specimen Clinical Test for Fusion Detection. *The Journal of Molecular Diagnostics*.
488 2021;23(5):630-6.
- 489 14. Peacock S. Health care: Bring microbial sequencing to hospitals. *Nature*.
490 2014;509(7502):557-9.
- 491 15. Armstrong GL, MacCannell DR, Taylor J, Carleton HA, Neuhaus EB, Bradbury RS, et al.
492 Pathogen Genomics in Public Health. *New England Journal of Medicine*. 2019;381(26):2569-
493 80.
- 494 16. Yamasaki K, Kawanami T, Yatera K, Fukuda K, Noguchi S, Nagata S, et al. Significance
495 of Anaerobes and Oral Bacteria in Community-Acquired Pneumonia. *PLOS ONE*.
496 2013;8(5):e63103.


- 497 17. Mandell LA, Niederman MS. Aspiration Pneumonia. *New England Journal of*
498 *Medicine*. 2019;380(7):651-63.
- 499 18. Mukae H, Noguchi S, Naito K, Kawanami T, Yamasaki K, Fukuda K, et al. The
500 Importance of Obligate Anaerobes and the *Streptococcus anginosus* Group in Pulmonary
501 Abscess: A Clone Library Analysis Using Bronchoalveolar Lavage Fluid. *Respiration*.
502 2016;92(2):80-9.
- 503 19. Metlay JP, Waterer GW, Long AC, Anzueto A, Brozek J, Crothers K, et al. Diagnosis
504 and Treatment of Adults with Community-acquired Pneumonia. An Official Clinical Practice
505 Guideline of the American Thoracic Society and Infectious Diseases Society of America.
506 *American Journal of Respiratory and Critical Care Medicine*. 2019;200(7):e45-e67.
- 507 20. Guo Y, Li L, Li Z, Sun L, Wang H. Tropheryma whipplei Detection by Nanopore
508 Sequencing in Patients With Interstitial Lung Disease. *Front Microbiol*. 2021;12:760696.
- 509 21. Qin S, Clausen E, Nouraie SM, Kingsley L, McMahon D, Klerup E, et al. Tropheryma
510 whipplei colonization in HIV-infected individuals is not associated with lung function or
511 inflammation. *PLoS One*. 2018;13(10):e0205065.
- 512 22. Zhang WM, Xu L. Pulmonary parenchymal involvement caused by Tropheryma
513 whipplei. *Open medicine (Warsaw, Poland)*. 2021;16(1):843-6.
- 514 23. Tatsuno I, Isaka M, Matsumoto M, Hasegawa T. Prevalence of emm1 Streptococcus
515 pyogenes having a novel type of genomic composition. *Microbiology and immunology*.
516 2019;63(10):413-26.
- 517 24. Agency UHS. Group A streptococcal infections: report on seasonal activity in England,
518 2022 to 2023. UKHSA; 2023.
- 519 25. Jain N, Lansiaux E, Reinis A. Group A streptococcal (GAS) infections amongst children
520 in Europe: Taming the rising tide. *New microbes and new infections*. 2023;51:101071.
- 521 26. Street TL, Sanderson ND, Kolenda C, Kavanagh J, Pickford H, Hoosdally S, et al. Clinical
522 Metagenomic Sequencing for Species Identification and Antimicrobial Resistance Prediction
523 in Orthopedic Device Infection. *Journal of clinical microbiology*. 2022;60(4):e0215621.
- 524 27. Chiu CY, Miller SA. Clinical metagenomics. *Nature Reviews Genetics*. 2019;20(6):341-
525 55.
- 526 28. Alcolea-Medina A, Charalampous T, Snell LB, Aydin A, Alder C, Maloney G, et al.
527 Novel, Rapid Metagenomic Method to Detect Emerging Viral Pathogens Applied to Human
528 Monkeypox Infections. 2022.
- 529 29. Edgeworth J. Respiratory metagenomics: route to routine service. . *Current Opinion*
530 *in Infectious Diseases* (in press). 2023
- 531 30. Govender KN, Street TL, Sanderson ND, Eyre DW. Metagenomic Sequencing as a
532 Pathogen-Agnostic Clinical Diagnostic Tool for Infectious Diseases: a Systematic Review and
533 Meta-analysis of Diagnostic Test Accuracy Studies. *Journal of clinical microbiology*.
534 2021;59(9):e0291620.
- 535 31. CDC. COVID-19: U.S. Impact on Antimicrobial Resistance, Special Report 2022. COVID-
536 19 & Antimicrobial Resistance; 2022.
- 537 32. Murray CJ, Ikuta KS, Sharara F, Swetschinski L, Aguilar GR, Gray A, et al. Global
538 burden of bacterial antimicrobial resistance in 2019: a systematic analysis. *The Lancet*.
539 2022;399(10325):629-55.
- 540 33. Laxminarayan R. The overlooked pandemic of antimicrobial resistance. *The Lancet*.
541 2022;399(10325):606-7.
- 542 34. Sulayyim HJA, Ismail R, Hamid AA, Ghafar NA. Antibiotic Resistance during COVID-19:
543 A Systematic Review. *International journal of environmental research and public health*.
544 2022;19(19).
- 545 35. Langford BJ, Soucy JR, Leung V, So M, Kwan ATH, Portnoff JS, et al. Antibiotic
546 resistance associated with the COVID-19 pandemic: a systematic review and meta-analysis.

547 Clinical microbiology and infection : the official publication of the European Society of Clinical
548 Microbiology and Infectious Diseases. 2022.
549 36. Topol E. Preparing the healthcare workforce to deliver the digital future. 2019;. 2019.
550 37. Topol E. Ground Truths [Internet]2022. Available from:
551 <https://erictopol.substack.com/p/a-culture-of-blood-cultures>.
552


A. Patient cohort







B. Respiratory metagenomic Daily Workflow






C. Respiratory metagenomics end-to-end clinical pathway



A**B**

C**D**



G**H**