

1 **Clinical Impact of Multiplex Molecular Diagnostic Testing in Children with Acute**
2 **Gastroenteritis Presenting to An Emergency Department: A Multicenter Prospective Study**

3
4 Andrew T. Pavia,¹ Daniel M. Cohen,² Amy L. Leber,² Judy A. Daly,³ Jami T. Jackson,⁴ Rangaraj
5 Selvarangan,⁴ Neena Kanwar,⁴ Jeffrey M. Bender,⁵ Jennifer Dien Bard,⁵ Ara Festekjian,⁵ Susan
6 Duffy,⁸ Chari Larsen,¹ Kristen M. Holmberg,⁶ Tyler Bardsley,⁷ Benjamin Haaland,⁷ Kevin M.
7 Bourzac,⁶ Christopher Stockmann,^{1†} Kimberle C. Chapin,⁹ Daniel T. Leung,^{1,3}

8
9 Author Affiliations:

10 ¹Departments of Pediatrics and Internal Medicine, Spencer Fox Eccles School of Medicine,
11 University of Utah, Salt Lake City, UT, USA

12 ²Department of Pediatrics, Nationwide Children’s Hospital, Columbus, OH, USA

13 ³Department of Pathology, Spencer Fox Eccles School of Medicine, University of Utah, Salt Lake
14 City, UT, USA

15 ⁴Children’s Mercy Hospital, Kansas City, MO, USA

16 ⁵Children’s Hospital of Los Angeles; Keck School of Medicine, University of Southern California,
17 Los Angeles, CA, USA

18 ⁶bioMérieux, Salt Lake City, UT, USA,

19 ⁷Department of Population Health Sciences, University of Utah School of Medicine, Salt Lake
20 City, UT, USA

21 ⁸Department of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine, Rhode Island Hospital, Alpert Medical
22 School, Brown University, Providence, RI, USA

23 ⁹ Department of Emergency Medicine, Hasbro Children’s Hospital, Alpert Medical School,
24 Brown University, Providence, RI, USA

25 †Deceased

26

27 Corresponding author:

28 Andrew T. Pavia MD, Division of Pediatric Infectious Diseases, University of Utah Spencer Fox
29 Eccles School of Medicine, 295 Chipeta Way, Salt Lake City, UT 84108.

30 andy.pavia@hsc.utah.edu. Fax 801 385-3789, Tel 801 560-4607

31

32 Running Title: Impact of Multiplex PCR in Pediatric Gastroenteritis

33

34 Keywords: Gastroenteritis, diarrhea, multiplex panels, diagnosis, outcomes, pediatric,
35 polymerase chain reaction

36

37 Registration: ClinicalTrials.gov identifier NCT02248285

38

39 Funding: This work was supported by National Institute of Allergy and Immunology at the
40 National Institutes of Health [grant number R01AI104593] to KMB; additional funding from
41 BioFire Diagnostics (now bioMérieux)

42

43 Disclosures:

44

45
46 Word count: 3370
47 Abstract word count: 242
48
49 34 references

50 **Abstract:**

51 **Background:** Multiplex molecular diagnostic panels have greatly enhanced detection of
52 gastrointestinal pathogens. However, data on the impact of these tests on clinical and patient-
53 centered outcomes are limited.

54 **Methods:** We conducted a prospective, multicenter, stepped-wedge trial to determine the
55 impact of multiplex molecular testing at five academic children's hospitals in children
56 presenting to the ED with acute gastroenteritis. Caregivers were interviewed on enrollment and
57 again 7-10 days after enrollment to determine symptoms, risk factors, subsequent medical
58 visits, and impact on family members. During the pre-intervention period, diagnostic testing
59 was performed at the discretion of clinicians. During the intervention period, multiplex
60 molecular testing was performed on all children with results available to clinicians. Primary
61 outcome was return visits to a health care provider within 10 days of enrollment.

62 **Results:** Potential pathogens were identified by clinician ordered tests in 19/571 (3.3%) in the
63 pre-intervention period compared to 434/586 (74%) in the intervention period; clinically
64 relevant pathogens were detected in 2.1% and 15% respectively. In the multivariate model
65 adjusting for potential confounders, the intervention was associated with a 21% reduction in
66 the odds of any return visit (OR 0.79; 95% CI 0.70-0.90). Appropriate treatment was prescribed
67 in 11.3% compared to 19.6% during the intervention period(P=0.22).

68 **Conclusions:** Routine molecular multiplex testing for all children presenting to the ED with AGE
69 detected more clinically relevant pathogens and led to a 21% decrease in return visits.
70 Additional research is needed to define patients most likely to benefit from testing.

71 INTRODUCTION

72 Acute gastroenteritis is a major cause of emergency department (ED) visits and hospitalization
73 in countries with advanced economies and a major cause of death and disability worldwide.[1,
74 2] For many children with gastroenteritis, rehydration, antiemetics, and reassurance are the
75 only therapy needed. However, a range of bacterial and protozoal infections may require
76 definitive diagnosis and targeted therapy.[3, 4] Multiplex molecular diagnostic panels available
77 in recent years greatly enhance detection of a wide range of pathogens.[5-10] The potential
78 benefits of rapid and accurate detection include decreased health care utilization, decreased
79 parental anxiety, appropriate antimicrobial therapy, and improved infection control and
80 outbreak recognition.[11] The potential negative consequences include overtreatment of
81 incidentally detected organisms, increased cost, and the potential failure to provide isolates to
82 public health laboratories for molecular characterization.[12]

83 Relatively few studies to date have prospectively evaluated the impact of multiplex molecular
84 testing on improving clinical and patient-centered outcomes. We conducted a multicenter
85 prospective pre-post intervention study to evaluate the direct and indirect impact of the
86 introduction of a multiplex molecular diagnostic panel on care for children presenting to
87 pediatric Emergency Departments (EDs) with acute gastroenteritis.

88

89 METHODS

90 **Design:** The objective of the FilmArray GI Panel IMPACT (Implementation of a Molecular
91 Diagnostic for Pediatric Acute Gastroenteritis) study was to determine the clinical impact of

92 multiplex molecular diagnostic testing for stool pathogens versus clinician-selected diagnostic
93 testing in children presenting to EDs with acute gastroenteritis. We conducted a prospective,
94 multicenter pragmatic-stepped wedge study at five academic children’s hospitals.
95 **(Supplemental Figure 1)** Children were enrolled between April 2015 and September 2016.
96 Enrollment was staggered in a stepped-wedge fashion with the goal of reducing the potential
97 impact of seasonal variation on the etiology of diarrhea. The start of the study, however, was
98 impacted based on each institution’s timeline for completing study. The study was approved by
99 the institutional review board at each institution.

100 **Eligibility:** Children <18 years presenting to the ED or on-site urgent care center were eligible if
101 they had symptoms of gastroenteritis (diarrhea or nausea/vomiting as a chief complaint) for at
102 least 24 hours. Children were excluded if symptoms were present <24 hours or ≥ 14 days, if a
103 diagnosis other than gastroenteritis was apparent (e.g. appendicitis, inflammatory bowel
104 disease), if they or a family member had been previously enrolled in the study, or if informed
105 consent could not be obtained.

106 **Study procedures and intervention:** Written informed consent was obtained from parents or
107 legal guardians; children provided assent as age-appropriate. Trained study personnel
108 interviewed subjects using a standardized questionnaire at enrollment. The questionnaire
109 included demographic information, symptoms, epidemiologic exposures and previous
110 treatment. Study personnel interviewed subjects again by telephone 7-10 days after
111 enrollment to determine duration of illness, subsequent medical visits, tests or treatment,
112 secondary illness in the family, and impact on family members. Medical charts were

113 systematically abstracted after the final contact to collect laboratory tests ordered, results,
114 treatments prescribed, hospital admission and return visits.

115 All children were asked to provide a stool specimen during the visit or within 48 hours for
116 multiplex PCR testing, regardless of whether the testing was ordered for clinical purposes.

117 Specimens were placed in Cary-Blair transport medium. During the pre-intervention period,
118 diagnostic testing was at the discretion of the clinicians in the ED. Stool specimens were stored
119 and later tested by multiplex PCR, but results were not available to the clinicians or patients.

120 After roughly 100 evaluable patients were enrolled in the pre-intervention period, each site
121 prepared to transition to the intervention period.

122 Before initiating the intervention period, clinicians in each ED were educated about the
123 multiplex PCR panel, including performance characteristics, clinical features of each pathogen,
124 recommended management, and explanations in patient-friendly language

125 (<http://cstockmann.github.io/IMPACT/index.html>). Stool samples from children enrolled in the
126 intervention period were tested by multiplex PCR in real-time at the hospital laboratory (with
127 results generally available within ~1-4 hours of receipt) and communicated to the ED. If the
128 patient had been discharged before results were available, clinicians contacted the family by
129 the next morning. Clinicians were free to order additional testing at their discretion.

130 During the pre-intervention period, children were included in the analysis regardless of whether
131 a specimen was provided for multiplex PCR; during the intervention period, children were
132 excluded if they could not provide a stool specimen within 48 hours of enrollment.

133 **Laboratory testing:** Clinician-selected testing was performed in the hospital laboratory by
134 standard methods and included stool culture, *Clostridiodes difficile* testing by EIA or nucleic acid
135 amplification, rotavirus and adenovirus antigen detection by EIA, norovirus detection by nucleic
136 acid amplification, or protozoal detection by microscopy or EIA for *Giardia lamblia/duodenalis*
137 and *Cryptosporidium*. We used the BIOFIRE FILMARRAY Gastrointestinal (GI) Panel assay for
138 multiplex PCR testing (bioMérieux, Salt Lake City, UT). This platform detects 22 pathogens.
139 **(Supplemental Table 1)** [5] During the intervention period, when pathogens of public health
140 significance were detected by PCR (*Campylobacter spp.*, *Salmonella spp.*, Shiga toxin-producing
141 *Escherichia coli* [STEC],STEC, *Shigella spp./EIEC*), specimens were reflexed to culture and/or sent
142 to Public Health laboratories.

143 **Outcome measures:** The primary outcome was return visits to a health care provider within 10
144 days of enrollment. Secondary outcomes included number of return visits, return visit to ED or
145 hospitalization, number of pathogens detected, number of potentially treatable pathogens
146 detected (*Campylobacter*, *Shigella*, *Vibrio sp.*, *Yersinia*, *Plesiomonas*, *Cryptosporidium*,
147 *Cyclospora cayetanensis*, *Entamoeba histolytica* and *G. lamblia*), clinically relevant pathogens
148 detected – e.g. those that might alter care (potentially treatable pathogens plus those for which
149 withholding antibiotics is important, i.e. *Salmonella* and STEC), and the proportion of children
150 receiving appropriate treatment. Since the clinical significance of *C. difficile* detection by PCR
151 alone in outpatients is challenging to interpret, we reported total detections and detection of *C.*
152 *difficile* as the sole pathogen in children >2 years of age but did not define it as a potentially
153 treatable pathogen. We also measured the impact on secondary illness in family members,

154 absence from daycare, school, and work, parental response to knowing the diagnosis, and
155 detection of outbreaks.

156 **Statistical analysis:** Power calculations were based on historical data on return visits for
157 patients with gastroenteritis seen at Primary Children’s Hospital showing a mean of 0.5
158 additional healthcare encounters per patient within seven days of the initial encounter. Sample
159 size was limited by funding to 1100, providing 70% power to detect a 25% reduction in return
160 visits with an alpha of 0.05.

161 Patient characteristics, clinical findings, tests ordered, pathogens detected, and outcomes were
162 summarized using descriptive statistics for pre and post-intervention periods and compared
163 using chi-squared or Mann-Whitney Wilcoxon tests for categorical or continuous data.

164 Differences were presented as odds ratios and exact confidence intervals. To account for
165 imbalances in the study periods, the primary analyses of the impact of multiplex molecular
166 diagnostic testing on return visits (any return, ED return or hospitalization, and number of
167 return visits within 10 days of enrollment) was based on logistic or negative binomial
168 generalized estimating equations models, as appropriate, accounting for within site clustering,
169 and adjusted for patient age, insurance, illness duration, pathogen type, gender, race, ethnicity,
170 diarrhea, fever, constipation, number of stools in last 24 hours, and quarter by year.[13, 14] The

171 consistency of the estimated impact of multiplex molecular diagnostic testing across
172 subpopulations of interest defined by site, gender, race, patient age, and illness duration was
173 assessed via subgroup analyses mirroring the full analysis. To assess the impact of a *Shigella*
174 outbreak in Kansas City during the time of study, we conducted sensitivity analyses omitting
175 Children’s Mercy Hospital (CMH) observations. [15]

176 **RESULTS**

177 **Demographics**

178 Between April 2015 and September 2016, we enrolled 1,157 patients (571 in the pre-
179 intervention period and 586 in the intervention period). **(Figure 1)** The mean age was 4.9 years;
180 64% were under 5 years of age. **(Table 1)** Race/ethnicity and season of enrollment differed
181 between the pre-intervention and intervention periods as a result of the staggered enrollment
182 by site. **(Table 1 and supplemental Figure 1)**. The majority of children presented with vomiting
183 and diarrhea; diarrhea was bloody in 13% **(Table 2)**. More children in the intervention period
184 had diarrhea and more had fever in the pre-intervention period. Symptoms were present for a
185 median of 2 days (IQR: 1-5) before presentation.

186 **Microbiology**

187 During the pre-intervention period, clinicians ordered etiologic testing on 80 (14%) of 571
188 patients. **(Table 2)**. Diagnostic tests were more likely to be ordered if the stool was reported as
189 bloody (33/52 [64%]) than non-bloody (43/402 [11%]; Odds Ratio [OR] 14.0, 95% Confidence
190 Intervals [CI] 7.6-27.7). Testing was not associated with reported fever; tests were obtained in
191 40/324 (12.4%) children with fever and 38/239 (15.9%) without fever (OR 0.75; 95% CI 0.46-
192 1.20).

193 Clinician-ordered testing detected a pathogen in 19 (3.3%) of 571 patients during the pre-
194 intervention period, including 14 (2.5%) with a treatable pathogen and 16 (2.8%) with a
195 clinically relevant pathogen. **(Table 3)** Stool was available for batched testing by multiplex
196 testing in 375/571 patients during the pre-intervention period. A total of 383 potential

197 pathogens were detected in 262 patients (70%). Viral pathogens were detected in 135 (36%);
198 EPEC, norovirus, *C. difficile*, and *Shigella*/EIEC were the most commonly detected pathogens
199 overall. *C. difficile* was detected in 43 (11.5%) of 375 children by molecular testing, however, *C.*
200 *difficile* was the sole pathogen in only 8 children ≥ 2 years of age.

201 During the pre-intervention period, potentially treatable pathogens were detected by multiplex
202 molecular testing in 65 (17.3%) of 375 patients tested compared to 12 (2.1%) of 571 children by
203 clinician ordered testing (difference 14.3%, 95% CI 10.3%-18.2%; $P < 0.001$). Clinically relevant
204 pathogens were detected in 84 (22.4%) by multiplex molecular testing compared to 14 (2.5%)
205 by clinician-ordered testing (difference 18.6%; 95% CI 14.1%-23.0%; $P < 0.001$).

206 During the intervention period, 627 potential pathogens were detected by multiplex molecular
207 testing in 434 (74%) of 571 children. Norovirus, *C. difficile*, EPEC and sapovirus were the most
208 common pathogens detected. Only 23 children (3.9%) with *C. difficile* were ≥ 2 years of age and
209 had no other pathogens detected. Viral pathogens were detected in 294 patients (50%) during
210 the intervention period, significantly more than during the pre-intervention period (36%;
211 $P < 0.001$). *Shigella spp.*/EIEC was detected less frequently during the intervention period (24
212 [4.1%] vs 33 [8.8%]; $P = 0.003$). This was driven by a community-wide outbreak of *Shigella* in
213 Kansas City impacting CMH during the pre-intervention period. Multiplex PCR results were
214 available and shared with the family before leaving the ED in 141 (24%) cases.

215

216 **Outcomes**

217 The likelihood of follow-up visits was not significantly lower during the intervention period in
218 univariate analysis. During the intervention period 186 (32%) children had at least one follow-
219 up visit with a health care provider after the enrollment visit to the ED compared to 174 (30%)
220 during the pre-intervention period (OR 1.06 95% CI 0.82-1.37). Of these 54 (9.2%) were
221 hospitalized or returned to urgent care or the ED during the intervention period, compared to
222 53 children (9.3%) during the pre-intervention period (OR 1.00; 95% CI 0.66-1.53).

223 During intervention period, children with a viral pathogen detected were less likely to have a
224 return visit (75 of 294 [26%]) compared to those without a virus detected (111 of 292 [38%], OR
225 0.56; 95% CI 0.39-0.79; P = 0.001). This was not the case during the pre-intervention period (39
226 of 135 [29%] vs 72 of 240 [30%]; OR 0.95 95% CI 0.60-1.51). During the intervention period
227 children who were enrolled in winter were less likely to have a repeat visit (62 of 217 [29%]
228 compared to 21 of 44 [48%]; OR 0.44; 95% CI 0.23-.85; P= 0.01) during the pre-intervention
229 period. Conversely, during the intervention period those enrolled during summer were more
230 likely to have a return visit (28 of 66 [42%] vs. 86 of 305 [28%]; OR 1.9; 95% CI 1.08-3.2; P =
231 0.023).

232 In the multivariate model adjusting for age, insurance, illness duration, pathogen type, sex,
233 race, ethnicity, diarrhea, fever, number of stools, and quarter by year of patient presentation,
234 the intervention was associated with a 21% reduction in the odds of any return visit (OR 0.79;
235 95% CI 0.70-0.90; P=<0.001; Table 4). Multivariate results for the number of return visits were
236 similar (rate ratio 0.83; 95% CI 0.70-0.97; P=0.023; Table 4). However, multivariate analyses did
237 not show a statistically significant difference between pre- and post-intervention periods in ED
238 visits or hospitalizations (OR 0.93; 95% CI 0.57-1.51; p=0.771).

239 Multivariate sensitivity analyses omitting CMH to account for the *Shigella spp.* outbreak yielded
240 similar results for any return visit (OR 0.74; 95% CI 0.68-0.80; P<0.001; Supplemental Table 1;
241 number of return visits rate ratio 0.77; 95% CI 0.72-0.83; P<0.001). In the sensitivity analysis the
242 odds of return to the ED or hospitalization was reduced during the intervention period (OR
243 0.70; 95% CI 0.56-0.86; P=0.001).

244 Results of multivariate analyses of any return visit within subgroups were broadly consistent
245 with the main analysis (**Figure 2**). Analyses restricted to individual sites had substantial
246 uncertainty due to collinearity between intervention periods and time within site. The
247 sensitivity analysis omitting observations from CMH because of the *Shigella spp.* outbreak were
248 similar to the main analysis with slightly greater point estimates of the reduction in rate of
249 return visits. (**Supplemental table 2**) There was no significant difference between the pre- and
250 intervention periods in the proportion of children who received an antibiotic in the ED (3.5% vs
251 4.1%) or after discharge (4.2% vs 3.8%) in univariate or multivariate analysis. (**Table 3**)
252 However, numerically more patients received the appropriate treatment for a potentially
253 treatable pathogen during the intervention period with multiplex molecular testing; 12 (19.6%)
254 of 61 vs 7 (11.3%) of 62 (P=0.22) and appropriate treatment for *Shigella*; 11 (46%) of 24 vs 7
255 (21%) of 33 (P = 0.08).

256 Impact of illness on the family was notable. Half of caregivers in both periods reported missing
257 work (median 2 days; IQR 1-3.5). Diarrhea developed in one or more family contacts after the
258 child was enrolled in 30% of cases. These factors did not differ by intervention period. Of 413
259 caregivers in the intervention arm who reported learning the etiology of their child's illness in

260 the intervention period, 215 (52%) reported they were “very comfortable” caring for their
261 child’s illness compared to 304 (53%) of caregivers in the pre-intervention period.

262 **DISCUSSION**

263 Recent technological advances have resulted in the availability of rapid, sensitive, and
264 comprehensive molecular diagnostics for diarrheal illness.[7, 8]. Compared with the wealth of
265 evidence supporting rehydration for pediatric gastroenteritis management, there is a paucity of
266 studies demonstrating impact of these diagnostics on health and patient-centered outcomes,
267 their cost effectiveness, or when they are most useful. [7, 16, 17] In this multi-center
268 prospective pragmatic study, we found that among children presenting to EDs with
269 gastroenteritis, the use of a multiplex molecular diagnostic was associated with a 21%
270 reduction in the likelihood of return visits to healthcare compared with clinician-selected
271 diagnostic testing. As in other studies, we found that multiplex molecular testing substantially
272 increased detection of potential pathogens, including treatable pathogens and those that
273 warranted withholding of empiric antibiotics. Awareness of diagnostic testing results was not
274 associated with increased caregiver comfort in caring for the child’s illness.

275 We prospectively compared clinician-, patient-, and family-based outcomes before and after
276 introduction of a multiplex molecular diagnostic for children presenting to an ED with
277 gastroenteritis. The pre-intervention and intervention periods were not balanced for a number
278 of key variables associated with diarrheal disease, and our unadjusted analysis showed no
279 differences in likelihood of follow-up visits. After adjusting for factors including demographics,
280 pathogen type, and season, we found a 21% reduction in odds of any return visits to healthcare
281 (OR 0.79; 95% CI 0.70-0.90), our primary endpoint. Stratified analyses suggested the effect was

282 most pronounced in children with a viral pathogen detected (OR 0.56; 95% CI 0.39-0.79), and
283 children enrolled in the winter (OR 0.44; 95% CI 0.23-0.85), the season with the highest rates of
284 viral gastroenteritis.[18] Knowledge of a virus as cause of illness may have reduced clinician and
285 patient uncertainty about the clinical course and need for re-evaluation.

286 Advantages of molecular diagnostics over traditional stool culture include increased sensitivity
287 for pathogen detection and faster turnaround time, potentially resulting in improvements in
288 appropriate use of antibiotics. We found that multiplex molecular testing of all patients
289 identified a potentially treatable pathogen in a higher proportion (17.3%) of patients during the
290 pre-intervention period compared to clinician-ordered testing (3.2%) as well as clinically
291 relevant pathogens (22% vs 2.8%). We did not detect a significant improvement in overall
292 appropriate antibiotic prescribing among children with a treatable pathogen, although
293 consistent with other studies, fewer than 20% of children had a treatable pathogen in either
294 period.[9, 19, 20] We observed an increase in percentage of patients with *Shigella spp./EIEC*
295 who received appropriate antibiotics during the intervention period although this was not
296 statistically significant ($p = 0.08$). Knowledge of the outbreak in the pre-intervention period may
297 have increased appropriate empiric therapy, and therefore reduced the impact of the
298 intervention. Recent observational studies have shown that introduction of a multiplex GI PCR
299 panel was associated with improvements in the selection and duration of antimicrobial therapy
300 [7, 10] [21] [22] [23]

301 The burden of pediatric gastroenteritis extends beyond the patient, and includes significant
302 nonmedical costs, the largest of which are foregone earnings due to missed work and
303 transportation costs. Half of caregivers reported missing work, and approximately 30% of

304 household contacts subsequently developed diarrhea. Although we did not observe differences
305 in days of work missed with the intervention, it is likely that the decrease in return visits
306 translates to economic benefits. Cost savings attributable to a multiplex diagnostic panel has
307 been shown in an inpatient population [16, 21, 22] and in an a study of adult based on claims
308 data[24], but not to our knowledge among pediatric ED patients. Future studies are warranted
309 to examine the cost impacts and cost-effectiveness.

310 Further studies are needed to identify the types of patients most likely to benefit from
311 molecular diagnostics, as opposed to the “test all” strategy used in this study. Unfortunately,
312 existing recommendations for selecting patients most likely to have bacterial infection do not
313 perform optimally.[25] Novel strategies for stewardship of molecular diagnostics are
314 needed[26, 27], including the development of clinical decision support tools.[28, 29]

315 The patterns of organisms detected found in our study is consistent with prior studies using
316 multiplex detection for children with diarrhea in high-income countries. We found EPEC,
317 norovirus, and *C. difficile* to be the most commonly detected pathogens overall, similar to
318 previous studies.[9, 20] However, interpreting the results of molecular detection of potential
319 pathogens can be challenging, since not all molecular detections correspond to the etiology of
320 symptoms due to detection of asymptomatic carriage or lack of specificity of the target.[30]

321 This is particularly problematic for EPEC and *C. difficile*. We did not observe increased
322 prescription of drugs for *C. difficile*, despite increased detection. EPEC was commonly detected
323 (>15% of samples), but the clinical interpretation of detection of the single gene target (*eae*) is
324 unknown. Case-control studies using molecular diagnostics, such as ones already conducted in
325 other settings [31] [32] are urgently needed in the US to determine the relevance of organisms

326 detected through various gene targets. Quantitative PCR thresholds from case-control studies
327 may increase specificity. [33]

328 Our study has limitations. First, despite the stepped-wedge design of the enrollment across
329 sites, none of the sites were able to capture the same months during the pre- and post-
330 intervention period. Thus, our analysis required adjustment by season and time of year.
331 Second, a *Shigella* outbreak occurred at one site during the study[15], which led to a higher
332 proportion of *Shigella* detected than would be expected. However, our sensitivity analyses
333 excluding this site confirmed the results. Third, only 24% of children were able to get results
334 before discharge from the ED because of failure to produce a specimen. Use of rectal swabs
335 might improve this and increase the impact of diagnosis.[34] Fourth, power was modest. Lastly,
336 a larger proportion (15% vs. 4%) of those enrolled in the pre-intervention phase were lost to
337 follow-up compared to the intervention phase.

338 In conclusion, in a multi-center prospective pragmatic study of a multi-pathogen molecular
339 diagnostic panel for pediatric gastroenteritis, we found that use of panel improved pathogen
340 detection and decreased likelihood of return visits to healthcare. Further research is needed to
341 identify patients most likely to benefit from the use of these tests and to optimize the cost
342 effectiveness of different diagnostic approaches to pediatric gastroenteritis.

343

344 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

345 We thank Julian Dorsch, Tania Baca, and the ED physicians, pharmacists and research
346 coordinators who made this study possible. We are indebted to the families who participated.

347

Table 1: Demographic and exposure characteristics by study period

Patient characteristics	Pre-intervention N =571	Post-intervention N =586	p-value
Female gender	300 (52.5%)	272 (46.4%)	0.037
Race			<0.001
White	237 (42%)	343 (59%)	
Black	149 (26%)	135 (23%)	
Other/Unknown	185 (32%)	108 (18%)	
Ethnicity			<0.001
Hispanic/Latino	181 (32 %)	167 (29%)	
Non-Hispanic or Latino	363 (64%)	412 (70%)	
Not specified/refused	27 (5%)	7 (1%)	
Age (Mean/Median)	4.9 (3)	4.9 (3)	0.94
Age Group			0.15
<6 months	53 (9.3%)	63 (11%)	
6-23 months	164 (29%)	83 (31%)	
2-4 years	155 (27%)	122 (21%)	
5-11 years	132 (23%)	150 (12%)	
12-17 years	67 (12%)	68 (12%)	
Underlying Medical Condition	144 (25%)	158 (27%)	0.50
Immunosuppressed	3 (2%)	6 (4%)	0.51
Insurance			0.46
Public	375 (66%)	368 (63%)	
Private	170 (30%)	194 (33%)	
None/Other	26 (5%)	24 (4%)	
Attend pre-school or daycare	85 (32.8%)	72 (28.7%)	0.20
Pet or animal exposure	320 (65%)	331 (65%)	0.97
International travel (past month)	9 (2%)	14 (3%)	0.33
Season			<0.001
Summer (Jul-Sep)	310 (54%)	66 (11%)	
Fall (Oct-Dec)	94 (16%)	202 (34%)	
Winter (Jan-Mar)	45 (8%)	214 (37%)	
Spring (Apr-Jun)	122 (21%)	104 (18%)	

Table 2: Clinical features at presentation, and tests ordered by study period

	Pre-Intervention N= 571	Post-intervention N=586	P value
Fever	324 (57%)	291 (50%)	0.0123
Vomiting	450 (79%)	459 (78%)	0.98
Vomiting duration in days before enrollment (median [IQR])	2 (1-3)	2 (1-3)	0.29
Diarrhea	473 (83%)	547 (93%)	<0.0001
Diarrhea duration in days before enrollment (median [IQR])	2 (1-5)	3 (2-5)	0.077
Median stools/day	4 (1-7)	5 (2-8)	<0.0001
Bloody diarrhea	52 (11%)	74 (13%)	0.25
Antibiotics prescribed before ED visit	20 (3.5%)	13 (2.2%)	0.19
Antibiotics prescribed during ED stay	19 (3%)	24 (4%)	0.40
Admitted to hospital	81 (14%)	96 (16%)	0.30
Diagnostic testing			
Stool culture ordered	70 (12%)	85 (14%)	0.26
STEC study ordered	33 (6%)	44 (8%)	0.24
Viral studies ordered	10 (2%)	15 (3%)	0.34
<i>C. difficile</i> studies ordered	28 (5%)	30 (5%)	0.87
Ova and parasite exam ordered	17 (3%)	24 (4%)	0.30
<i>Giardia/Cryptosporidia</i> DFA ordered	15 (3%)	17 (3%)	0.78

Table 3 Pathogens detected by clinician-ordered standard of care tests and by multiplex PCR by study period. During Pre-intervention period, multiplex PCR testing was performed on stored stool specimens and not available to clinicians. During Intervention period multiplex testing was performed in real-time and available to clinicians.

	Pre-Intervention		Intervention	
	Standard of care clinician-ordered tests (N=571)	Multiplex PCR (N=375) (Clinician blinded to results)	Standard of care clinician-ordered tests (N=586)	Multiplex PCR (N=586) (Results available to clinician)
Bacteria				
<i>Campylobacter</i>	4 (0.7%)	13 (3.5%)	1 (0.2%)	11 (1.9%)
<i>Salmonella</i>	2 (0.4%)	11 (2.9%)	6 (1.0%)	18 (3.1%)
<i>Shigella/EIEC</i>	9 (1.6%)	33 (8.8%)	4 (0.8%)	24 (4.1%)*
<i>Plesiomonas</i>		0 (0)		2 (0.3%)
<i>Yersinia</i>		0 (0)		2 (0.3%)
STEC	4 (0.7%)	14 (3.7%)	1 (0.2%)	14 (2.4%)
<i>E. coli</i> O157	4 (0.7%)	3 (0.8%)	1 (0.2%)	3 (0.5%)
ETEC		10 (2.7%)		6 (1.0%)
EAEC		21 (5.6%)		36 (6.1%)
EPEC		76 (20%)		67 (11.4%)
<i>C. difficile</i>	2 (0.4%)	43 (11.5%)	6 (0.6%)	94 (16.0%)†
<i>C. difficile</i> no virus and age ≥ 2 years	1 (0.2%)	8 (2.1%)	1 (0.2%)	23 (3.9)
Viruses				
Adenovirus F 40/41	1 (0.2%)	33 (8.8%)	1 (0.2%)	61 (10.4%)
Astrovirus		6 (1.6%)		43 (7.3%)*
Norovirus GI/GII		57 (15.2%)		148 (25.3%)*
Rotavirus	2 (0.4%)	16 (4.3%)	1 (0.2%)	12 (2.0%)
Sapovirus		31 (8.3%)		66 (11.3%)

Any viral pathogen	3 (0.6%)	135 (36%)	2 (0.4%)	294 (50%)*
Protozoa		18 (3.1)		23 (3.9%)
<i>Cryptosporidium</i>		10 (2.7%)		14 (2.4%)
<i>Cyclospora</i>		0 (0)		0 (0)
<i>Giardia</i>		9 (2.4%)		9 (1.5%)
At least 1 potential pathogen	19 (3.3%)	262 (70%)	15 (3%)	434 (74%)
Any treatable pathogen **	14 (2.5%)	65 (17.3%)	5 (0.9%)	61 (10.4%)
Any clinically relevant pathogen††	16 (2.8%)	84 (22.4%)	12 (2%)	88 (15%)

* P <0.01 for difference between pre-intervention and intervention prevalence by multiplex PCR

† P<0.05 for difference between pre-intervention and intervention prevalence by multiplex PCR

** Defined as: *Campylobacter*, *Shigella*, *Vibrio sp.*, *Yersinia*, *Plesiomonas*, *Cryptosporidium*, *Cyclospora cayetanensis*, *Entamoeba histolytica* and *G. lamblia*.

†† Defined as *Campylobacter*, *Shigella*, *Vibrio sp.*, *Yersinia*, *Plesiomonas*, *Cryptosporidium*, *Cyclospora cayetanensis*, *Entamoeba histolytica*, *G. lamblia*, *Salmonella sp.*, and *STEC*.

Table 4: Multivariate analysis of association with any return visit, number of return visits, and and ED visit or hospitalization.

Characteristic		Any return visit		Number of return visits		ED visit or hospitalization	
		Odds ratio (95% CI)	p-value	Rate ratio (95% CI)	p-value	Odds ratio (95% CI)	p-value
Intervention	(yes vs no)	0.79 (0.70, 0.90)	0.0003	0.83 (0.70, 0.97)	0.0226	0.93 (0.57, 1.51)	0.7708
Age	(<6 months vs 6-23 months)	1.24 (0.99, 1.56)	0.0595	1.26 (0.99, 1.59)	0.0602	1.05 (0.45, 2.45)	0.9151
	(2-4 years vs 6-23 months)	0.88 (0.71, 1.10)	0.2645	1.01 (0.86, 1.18)	0.9284	1.21 (0.80, 1.83)	0.3678
	(5-11 years vs 6-23 months)	0.68 (0.50, 0.93)	0.0160	0.86 (0.68, 1.10)	0.2246	0.82 (0.45, 1.47)	0.5004
	(12-17 years vs 6-23 months)	1.17 (0.80, 1.71)	0.4203	1.26 (1.01, 1.57)	0.0376	3.00 (1.53, 5.9)	0.0014
Insurance	(Private vs Public)	1.20 (0.87, 1.66)	0.2660	1.54 (0.87, 2.74)	0.1392	1.08 (0.75, 1.56)	0.6940
	(Other/None vs Public)	0.63 (0.35, 1.14)	0.1289	1.36 (0.90, 2.05)	0.1417	0.41 (0.18, 0.93)	0.0319
Illness Duration	(per 7 days)	1.61 (1.06, 2.47)	0.0270	1.37 (1.12, 1.69)	0.0022	1.55 (1.26, 1.90)	<0.0001
Sex	(Female vs Male)	0.90 (0.76, 1.06)	0.2089	1.06 (0.91, 1.23)	0.4559	1.01 (0.71, 1.43)	0.9760
Race	(Black vs White)	0.49 (0.37, 0.66)	<0.0001	0.61 (0.47, 0.78)	<0.0001	0.68 (0.45, 1.05)	0.0836
	(Other/Unknown vs White)	0.67 (0.47, 0.95)	0.0241	0.78 (0.62, 1.00)	0.0471	0.82 (0.64, 1.06)	0.1276
Ethnicity	(Hispanic vs Non-Hispanic))	1.15 (0.87, 1.54)	0.3218	1.05 (0.80, 1.37)	0.7472	0.89 (0.55, 1.42)	0.6171
Diarrhea	(yes vs no)	1.36 (0.90, 2.05)	0.1455	1.23 (0.87, 1.72)	0.2411	0.75 (0.37, 1.53)	0.4302
Fever	(yes vs no)	1.35 (1.02, 1.77)	0.0347	1.32 (1.06, 1.65)	0.0149	1.60 (0.74, 3.44)	0.2325
Constipation	(yes vs no)	1.17 (0.67, 2.04)	0.5907	1.02 (0.67, 1.54)	0.9428	1.01 (0.48, 2.14)	0.9796
Number of Stools	(per 10 stools)	1.09 (0.96, 1.25)	0.1797	1.07 (0.96, 1.18)	0.2080	1.57 (1.27, 1.93)	<0.0001
Quarter by Time	(Spring 2015 vs Summer 2015)	0.93 (0.75, 1.15)	0.4958	1.12 (0.95, 1.32)	0.1691	0.55 (0.38, 0.81)	0.0020
	(Fall 2015 vs Summer 2015)	1.10 (0.87, 1.40)	0.4178	1.10 (0.83, 1.44)	0.5115	0.92 (0.56, 1.52)	0.7504
	(Winter 2016 vs Summer 2015)	1.22 (0.88, 1.71)	0.2380	1.75 (1.42, 2.15)	<.0001	1.14 (0.77, 1.68)	0.5228
	(Spring 2016 vs Summer 2015)	1.82 (1.32, 2.51)	0.0003	1.35 (1.04, 1.76)	0.0260	1.51 (0.97, 2.36)	0.0665
	(Summer 2016 vs Summer 2015)	2.15 (1.39, 3.33)	0.0006	1.26 (0.94, 1.70)	0.1210	1.09 (0.73, 1.61)	0.6783
Pathogen Type	(Bacteria vs No Pathogen)	0.99 (0.49, 1.99)	0.9723	0.97 (0.60, 1.55)	0.8847	1.31 (0.86, 1.99)	0.2079
	(Virus vs No Pathogen)	0.68 (0.42, 1.10)	0.1172	0.81 (0.40, 1.64)	0.5571	0.80 (0.65, 0.99)	0.0391
	(Protozoa vs No Pathogen)	1.40 (0.78, 2.50)	0.2624	0.95 (0.61, 1.49)	0.8317	0.39 (0.08, 2.05)	0.2667
	(C diff vs No Pathogen)	0.83 (0.27, 2.61)	0.7559	1.06 (0.81, 1.38)	0.6862	0.26 (0.05, 1.29)	0.0987
	(Missing vs No Pathogen)	1.02 (0.54, 1.95)	0.9432	0.75 (0.56, 1.00)	0.0533	1.12 (0.69, 1.83)	0.6392

Supplemental Table 1: Pathogens detected by multiplex PCR and those considered “treatable” or “clinically actionable,” defined as either treatable or the use of antibiotics would be potentially harmful

Pathogen	Treatable	Clinically actionable
Bacteria		
<i>Campylobacter spp. (C. jejuni, C. coli, C. upsaliensis)</i>	X	X
<i>C. difficile</i> toxin A/B		
<i>Plesiomonas shigelloides</i>	X	X
<i>Salmonella spp.</i>		X
<i>Yersinia enterocolitica,</i>	X	X
<i>Vibrio spp. (V. parahaemolyticus, V. vulnificus, V. cholerae)</i>	X	X
Enteraggregative <i>E. coli</i> [EAEC]		
Enteropathogenic <i>E. coli</i> [EPEC]		
Enterotoxigenic <i>E. coli</i> [ETEC]		
Shigatoxin-producing <i>E. coli</i> [STEC]		X
<i>Shigella spp./</i> Enteroinvasive <i>E. coli</i> [EIEC]	X	X
Viruses		
adenovirus F 40/41		
astrovirus		
norovirus GI/GII		
rotavirus A		
sapovirus		
Protozoa		
<i>Cryptosporidium spp.</i>	X	X
<i>Cyclospora cayatensi</i>	X	X
<i>Entamoeba histolytica</i>	X	X
<i>Giardia lamblia</i>	X	X

Supplemental Table 2: Sensitivity multivariate analysis results for return visit endpoints without CMH observations.

Characteristic		Any return visit		Number of return visits		ED visit or hospitalization	
		Odds ratio (95% CI)	p-value	Rate ratio (95% CI)	p-value	Odds ratio (95% CI)	p-value
Intervention	(yes vs no)	0.74 (0.68, 0.80)	<0.0001	0.77 (0.72, 0.83)	<0.0001	0.70 (0.56, 0.86)	0.0010
Age	(<6 months vs 6-23 months)	1.11 (1.00, 1.23)	0.0524	1.37 (1.15, 1.63)	0.0005	0.78 (0.35, 1.73)	0.5338
	(2-4 years vs 6-23 months)	0.88 (0.69, 1.14)	0.3353	1.02 (0.85, 1.22)	0.8277	1.04 (0.64, 1.69)	0.8836
	(5-11 years vs 6-23 months)	0.74 (0.52, 1.05)	0.0907	0.95 (0.80, 1.13)	0.5737	0.99 (0.59, 1.68)	0.9732
	(12-17 years vs 6-23 months)	1.35 (1.00, 1.81)	0.0477	1.17 (1.00, 1.36)	0.0490	3.60 (1.81, 7.14)	0.0003
Insurance	(Private vs Public)	1.22 (0.86, 1.73)	0.2706	1.47 (0.74, 2.92)	0.2754	1.07 (0.69, 1.67)	0.7666
	(Other/None vs Public)	0.70 (0.34, 1.45)	0.3396	1.30 (0.78, 2.17)	0.3094	0.33 (0.06, 1.84)	0.2058
Illness Duration	(per 7 days)	1.44 (0.97, 2.14)	0.0706	1.26 (1.08, 1.48)	0.0035	1.41 (1.31, 1.52)	<0.0001
Sex	(Female vs Male)	0.91 (0.74, 1.11)	0.3429	1.04 (0.89, 1.22)	0.6183	1.07 (0.73, 1.56)	0.7310
Race	(Black vs White)	0.45 (0.34, 0.58)	<0.0001	0.56 (0.46, 0.70)	<0.0001	0.53 (0.35, 0.79)	0.0020
	(Other/Unknown vs White)	0.76 (0.60, 0.96)	0.0219	0.85 (0.71, 1.02)	0.0793	0.96 (0.85, 1.08)	0.4984
Ethnicity	(Hispanic vs Non-Hispanic)	1.11 (0.80, 1.54)	0.5274	1.01 (0.75, 1.36)	0.9508	0.93 (0.52, 1.67)	0.8129
Diarrhea	(yes vs no)	1.47 (0.97, 2.23)	0.0710	1.27 (0.86, 1.89)	0.2292	1.12 (0.70, 1.79)	0.6350
Fever	(yes vs no)	1.28 (0.94, 1.73)	0.1141	1.28 (1.00, 1.64)	0.0481	1.69 (0.69, 4.16)	0.2550
Constipation	(yes vs no)	0.95 (0.63, 1.43)	0.8099	0.90 (0.64, 1.26)	0.5258	0.90 (0.41, 1.98)	0.7860
Number of Stools	(per 10 stools)	1.09 (0.93, 1.27)	0.2910	1.06 (0.94, 1.19)	0.3176	1.53 (1.23, 1.91)	0.0002
Quarter by Time	(Spring 2015 vs Summer 2015)	0.80 (0.65, 0.97)	0.0261	1.02 (0.89, 1.16)	0.8248	0.45 (0.35, 0.59)	<.0001
	(Fall 2015 vs Summer 2015)	0.97 (0.71, 1.32)	0.8272	0.97 (0.76, 1.25)	0.8304	0.74 (0.47, 1.19)	0.2184
	(Winter 2016 vs Summer 2015)	1.14 (0.95, 1.36)	0.1556	1.63 (1.43, 1.86)	<.0001	1.07 (0.72, 1.59)	0.7496
	(Spring 2016 vs Summer 2015)	1.78 (1.50, 2.12)	<.0001	1.19 (1.11, 1.28)	<.0001	1.28 (0.89, 1.85)	0.1803
	(Summer 2016 vs Summer 2015)	1.72 (1.69, 1.76)	<.0001	1.21 (1.03, 1.42)	0.0215	0.93 (0.61, 1.43)	0.7488
Pathogen Type	(Bacteria vs No Pathogen)	0.98 (0.37, 2.56)	0.9623	0.92 (0.51, 1.66)	0.7798	-*	-
	(Virus vs No Pathogen)	0.60 (0.36, 0.98)	0.0419	0.57 (0.24, 1.36)	0.2042	-	-
	(Protozoa vs No Pathogen)	1.47 (0.59, 3.64)	0.4089	0.81 (0.60, 1.09)	0.1645	-	-
	(C diff vs No Pathogen)	0.55 (0.12, 2.58)	0.4471	1.08 (0.77, 1.53)	0.6463	-	-
	(Missing vs No Pathogen)	0.80 (0.48, 1.35)	0.4088	0.70 (0.53, 0.92)	0.0099	-	-

*Pathogen type was removed due to model instability.

Figure 1: Consort diagram of subject disposition






Figure 2: Forest plot of subgroup analyses for any return visits.*



*Odds ratio estimates are for the intervention effect; control variables are quarter by year of patient presentation, subject age, insurance, illness duration, race, ethnicity, diarrhea, fever, constipation, number of stools, film array grouping, and sex; models use all control variables except specific subgroup variable; race subgroup models do not control for film array grouping and insurance due to collinearity.

Supplemental Figure 1: Time course of enrollment in Pre-intervention and Intervention periods by study site



REFERENCES

1. Jones TF, McMillian MB, Scallan E, et al. A population-based estimate of the substantial burden of diarrhoeal disease in the United States; FoodNet, 1996-2003. *Epidemiol Infect* **2007**; 135(2): 293-301.
2. G. B. D. Diarrhoeal Disease Collaborators. Estimates of the global, regional, and national morbidity, mortality, and aetiologies of diarrhoea in 195 countries: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2016. *Lancet Infect Dis* **2018**; 18(11): 1211-28.
3. Shane AL, Mody RK, Crump JA, et al. 2017 Infectious Diseases Society of America Clinical Practice Guidelines for the Diagnosis and Management of Infectious Diarrhea. *Clin Infect Dis* **2017**; 65(12): e45-e80.
4. Guarino A, Ashkenazi S, Gendrel D, et al. European Society for Pediatric Gastroenterology, Hepatology, and Nutrition/European Society for Pediatric Infectious Diseases evidence-based guidelines for the management of acute gastroenteritis in children in Europe: update 2014. *J Pediatr Gastroenterol Nutr* **2014**; 59(1): 132-52.
5. Buss SN, Leber A, Chapin K, et al. Multicenter evaluation of the BioFire FilmArray gastrointestinal panel for etiologic diagnosis of infectious gastroenteritis. *J Clin Microbiol* **2015**; 53(3): 915-25.
6. Binnicker MJ. Multiplex Molecular Panels for Diagnosis of Gastrointestinal Infection: Performance, Result Interpretation, and Cost-Effectiveness. *J Clin Microbiol* **2015**; 53(12): 3723-8.

7. Cybulski RJ, Jr., Bateman AC, Bourassa L, et al. Clinical impact of a Multiplex Gastrointestinal PCR Panel in Patients with Acute Gastroenteritis. *Clin Infect Dis* **2018**.
8. Khare R, Espy MJ, Cebelinski E, et al. Comparative evaluation of two commercial multiplex panels for detection of gastrointestinal pathogens by use of clinical stool specimens. *J Clin Microbiol* **2014**; 52(10): 3667-73.
9. Stockmann C, Pavia AT, Graham B, et al. Detection of 23 Gastrointestinal Pathogens Among Children Who Present With Diarrhea. *J Pediatric Infect Dis Soc* **2017**; 6(3): 231-8.
10. Torres-Miranda D, Akselrod H, Karsner R, et al. Use of BioFire FilmArray gastrointestinal PCR panel associated with reductions in antibiotic use, time to optimal antibiotics, and length of stay. *BMC Gastroenterol* **2020**; 20(1): 246.
11. Fang FC, Patel R. 2017 Infectious Diseases Society of America Infectious Diarrhea Guidelines: A View From the Clinical Laboratory. *Clin Infect Dis* **2017**; 65(12): 1974-6.
12. Marder EP, Cieslak PR, Cronquist AB, et al. Incidence and Trends of Infections with Pathogens Transmitted Commonly Through Food and the Effect of Increasing Use of Culture-Independent Diagnostic Tests on Surveillance - Foodborne Diseases Active Surveillance Network, 10 U.S. Sites, 2013-2016. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep* **2017**; 66(15): 397-403.
13. Freedman DA. On The So-Called "Huber Sandwich Estimator" and "Robust Standard Errors". *The American Statistician* **2006**; 60(4): 299-302.
14. Zeger SL, Liang KY. Longitudinal data analysis for discrete and continuous outcomes. *Biometrics* **1986**; 42(1): 121-30.

15. Kanwar N, Jackson J, Bardsley T, et al. Impact of Rapid Molecular Multiplex Gastrointestinal Pathogen Testing in Management of Children during a Shigella Outbreak. *J Clin Microbiol* **2023**; 61(3): e0165222.
16. Beal SG, Tremblay EE, Toffel S, Velez L, Rand KH. A Gastrointestinal PCR Panel Improves Clinical Management and Lowers Health Care Costs. *J Clin Microbiol* **2018**; 56(1).
17. Freeman K, Mistry H, Tsertsvadze A, et al. Multiplex tests to identify gastrointestinal bacteria, viruses and parasites in people with suspected infectious gastroenteritis: a systematic review and economic analysis. *Health technology assessment (Winchester, England)* **2017**; 21(23): 1-188.
18. Payne DC, Parashar UD. Rapid advances in understanding viral gastroenteritis from domestic surveillance. *Emerg Infect Dis* **2013**; 19(8): 1189.
19. Denno DM, Shaikh N, Stapp JR, et al. Diarrhea etiology in a pediatric emergency department: a case control study. *Clin Infect Dis* **2012**; 55(7): 897-904.
20. Nicholson MR, Van Horn GT, Tang YW, et al. Using Multiplex Molecular Testing to Determine the Etiology of Acute Gastroenteritis in Children. *J Pediatr* **2016**; 176: 50-6 e2.
21. Cotter JM, Thomas J, Birkholz M, Ambroggio L, Holstein J, Dominguez SR. Clinical Impact of a Diagnostic Gastrointestinal Panel in Children. *Pediatrics* **2021**; 147(5).
22. Axelrad JE, Freedberg DE, Whittier S, Greendyke W, Lebwohl B, Green DA. Impact of Gastrointestinal Panel Implementation on Health Care Utilization and Outcomes. *J Clin Microbiol* **2019**; 57(3).
23. Brendish NJ, Beard KR, Malachira AK, et al. Clinical impact of syndromic molecular point-of-care testing for gastrointestinal pathogens in adults hospitalised with

- suspected gastroenteritis (GastroPOC): a pragmatic, open-label, randomised controlled trial. *Lancet Infect Dis* **2023**.
24. Moon RC, Bleak TC, Rosenthal NA, et al. Relationship between Diagnostic Method and Pathogen Detection, Healthcare Resource Use, and Cost in U.S. Adult Outpatients Treated for Acute Infectious Gastroenteritis. *J Clin Microbiol* **2023**; 61(2): e0162822.
 25. Tarr GAM, Chui L, Lee BE, et al. Performance of Stool-testing Recommendations for Acute Gastroenteritis When Used to Identify Children With 9 Potential Bacterial Enteropathogens. *Clin Infect Dis* **2019**; 69(7): 1173-82.
 26. Messacar K, Parker SK, Todd JK, Dominguez SR. Implementation of Rapid Molecular Infectious Disease Diagnostics: the Role of Diagnostic and Antimicrobial Stewardship. *J Clin Microbiol* **2017**; 55(3): 715-23.
 27. Tarr GAM, Tarr PI. Pediatric Enteric Diagnostic Stewardship: The Right Test in the Right Context. *Pediatrics* **2021**; 147(5).
 28. Nelson EJ, Khan AI, Keita AM, et al. Improving Antibiotic Stewardship for Diarrheal Disease With Probability-Based Electronic Clinical Decision Support: A Randomized Crossover Trial. *JAMA Pediatr* **2022**; 176(10): 973-9.
 29. Brintz BJ, Howard JI, Haaland B, et al. Clinical predictors for etiology of acute diarrhea in children in resource-limited settings. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis* **2020**; 14(10): e0008677.
 30. Tarr GAM, Tarr PI, Freedman SB. Clinical interpretation of enteric molecular diagnostic tests. *Clin Microbiol Infect* **2019**; 25(12): 1454-6.
 31. Kotloff KL, Nataro JP, Blackwelder WC, et al. Burden and aetiology of diarrhoeal disease in infants and young children in developing countries (the Global Enteric

- Multicenter Study, GEMS): a prospective, case-control study. *Lancet* **2013**; 382(9888): 209-22.
32. Alsuwaidi AR, Al Dhaheri K, Al Hamad S, et al. Etiology of diarrhea by multiplex polymerase chain reaction among young children in the United Arab Emirates: a case-control study. *BMC Infect Dis* **2021**; 21(1): 7.
 33. Liu J, Platts-Mills JA, Juma J, et al. Use of quantitative molecular diagnostic methods to identify causes of diarrhoea in children: a reanalysis of the GEMS case-control study. *Lancet* **2016**; 388(10051): 1291-301.
 34. Freedman SB, Xie J, Nettel-Aguirre A, et al. Enteropathogen detection in children with diarrhoea, or vomiting, or both, comparing rectal flocced swabs with stool specimens: an outpatient cohort study. *Lancet Gastroenterol Hepatol* **2017**; 2(9): 662-9.