

1 **Evaluating the feasibility, sensitivity, and specificity of next-generation**
2 **molecular methods for pleural infection diagnosis**

3

4 Peter T. Bell^{1,2,3 #}, Timothy Baird^{1,2,4 #}, John Goddard^{1,7}, Olusola S. Olagoke^{2,4}, Andrew Burke^{3,5},
5 Shradha Subedi^{2,6}, Tiana R. Davey^{2,4}, James Anderson^{1,7}, Derek S. Sarovich^{2,4 ^}, and Erin P. Price^{2,4 ^^}

6 #,^ Authors contributed equally

7

8 ¹Department of Respiratory Medicine, Sunshine Coast University Hospital, Birtinya, Queensland,
9 Australia

10 ²Sunshine Coast Health Institute, Birtinya, Queensland, Australia

11 ³School of Medicine, University of Queensland, Herston, Queensland, Australia

12 ⁴Centre for Bioinnovation, University of the Sunshine Coast, Sippy Downs, Queensland, Australia

13 ⁵Department of Respiratory and Thoracic Medicine, The Prince Charles Hospital, Chermside,
14 Queensland, Australia

15 ⁶Department of Infectious Diseases, Sunshine Coast University Hospital, Birtinya, Queensland,
16 Australia

17 ⁷School of Medicine and Dentistry, Griffith University, Sunshine Coast, Queensland, Australia

18

19 ***Corresponding Author**

20 Erin P. Price

21 University of Sunshine Coast

22 eprice@usc.edu.au

23 +61 7 5456 5568

24

25 **Running Title:** Molecular Methods for Pleural Infection Diagnosis

26 **Total Manuscript Word Count:** 3499

27 **Abstract Word Count:** 250

28 **Keywords:** empyema; metagenomics; high-throughput sequencing; parapneumonic effusion; pleural
29 infection; microbiome

30 **Abstract**

31

32 **Rationale.** Pleural infections are common and associated with substantial healthcare cost, morbidity,
33 and mortality. Accurate pleural infection diagnosis remains challenging due to low culture positivity
34 rates, frequent polymicrobial involvement, and non-specific diagnostic biomarkers.

35 **Objective.** To undertake a prospective pilot study examining the feasibility and challenges associated
36 with molecular methods for diagnosing suspected pleural infection.

37 **Methods.** We prospectively characterised 26 consecutive, clinically suspected pleural infections, and
38 10 consecutive control patients with suspected non-infective pleural effusions, using shotgun
39 metagenomics, bacterial metataxonomics, quantitative PCR, and conventional culture.

40 **Results.** We demonstrate the feasibility of culture-independent molecular techniques for diagnosing
41 suspected pleural infection. Molecular methods exhibited excellent diagnostic performance, with each
42 method identifying 54% (14/26) positive cases among the pleural infection cohort, versus 38% (10/26)
43 with culture. Meta-omics methods unveiled complex polymicrobial infections largely missed by culture.
44 Dominant infecting microbes included streptococci (*S. intermedius*, *S. pyogenes*, *S. mitis*), *Prevotella*
45 spp. (*P. oris*, *P. pleuritidis*), staphylococci (*S. aureus*, *S. saprophyticus*), and *Klebsiella pneumoniae*.
46 However, we encountered challenges that complicated pleural infection interpretation, including: i)
47 uncertainties regarding microbial pathogenicity and the impact of prior antibiotic therapy on diagnostic
48 performance; ii) lack of a clinical diagnostic gold-standard for molecular performance comparisons; iii)
49 potential accidental microbial contamination during specimen collection and processing; and iv)
50 difficulties distinguishing background microbial noise from true microbial signal, particularly in low-
51 biomass specimens.

52 **Conclusions.** Our pilot study demonstrates the potential utility and value of molecular methods in
53 diagnosing pleural infection and highlights key concepts and challenges that should be addressed
54 when designing larger prospective trials.

55 **Key messages**

56

57 *What is already known on this topic*

58 Confident pleural infection diagnosis is often challenging due to low culture positivity rates, frequent
59 polymicrobial involvement, and non-specific diagnostic biomarkers. Limitations of conventional
60 diagnostic tests result in prolonged and inappropriately broad-spectrum antimicrobial use, leading to
61 potentially poorer patient outcomes and avoidable adverse effects.

62

63 *What this study adds*

64 We demonstrate the feasibility, utility, and challenges associated with the use of culture-independent
65 molecular techniques for more accurate pleural infection diagnosis in a real-world clinical setting.

66

67 *How this study might affect research, practice, or policy*

68 These data will help to inform the design of larger prospective clinical trials and identify potential
69 obstacles to be overcome as next-generation sequencing technologies become integrated into routine
70 clinical practice.

71 Introduction

72 Pleural infection is a complex, heterogeneous, and challenging clinical entity associated with
73 prolonged hospitalization, significant healthcare costs, and high morbidity and mortality¹⁻⁴. Clinical
74 management frustrations arise due to insensitivities in conventional microbiologic diagnostics (culture-
75 positive rates of only 20-60%⁵⁻⁹), resulting in prolonged and potentially inappropriate broad-spectrum
76 antimicrobial use. Culture-based diagnostic sensitivity is poor due to multiple factors, including empiric
77 antibiotic therapy prior to pleural sampling, low pathogen concentration in pleural fluid, and difficulties
78 in cultivating fastidious microorganisms^{4,10}. These limitations have obscured characterization of the
79 pleural 'microbiome' (i.e. the entire microbial community), hampering clinical progress¹¹.

80 Molecular diagnostics enable culture-independent microbial identification from clinical specimens¹².
81 Such techniques include shotgun metagenomics, metataxonomics, and quantitative PCR (qPCR),
82 each having unique capabilities and drawbacks. Shotgun metagenomics involves total microbiome
83 DNA sequencing of a sample, allowing strain-level detection of bacteria, archaea, fungi, parasites,
84 and DNA viruses, along with their putative functions (e.g. antimicrobial resistance, virulence).
85 However, metagenomics overlooks RNA viruses, and cannot readily differentiate living from dead
86 microbes. Metataxonomics involves next-generation amplicon sequencing of conserved bacterial
87 (16S ribosomal RNA [rRNA]) or fungal internal transcriber spacer (ITS) regions to characterize
88 bacterial or fungal consortia, respectively; however, these methods typically only resolve microbiota to
89 the genus level, and cannot be used for relative taxon quantification due to highly variable 16S
90 rRNA/ITS copy numbers amongst species. Finally, qPCR is an inexpensive, same-day diagnostic
91 method, with broad resolution ranging from strain to domain level; however, this method is typically
92 limited to *a priori* target taxa^{13,14}.

93 Several recent studies have applied culture-independent techniques to characterize pleural infections.
94 This collective work has revealed a pleural microbiome that is often polymicrobial and characterized
95 by a diverse range of classical pathogens and bystander microbes^{7,8,15-21}. Earlier investigations
96 implemented bacterial metataxonomics to profile the bacterial microbiome^{7,8,15,21}; however, three
97 recent studies have implemented metagenomics to more comprehensively profile pleural
98 microbiota^{16,19,20}. Xu *et al.* 2022 found bacterial dominance in 80 adult Chinese patients with pleural
99 infections, most commonly *Streptococcus* and *Prevotella* spp., although fungi were occasionally
100 identified¹⁶. However, the authors only reported taxonomic findings to the genus level, limiting in-

101 depth understanding of microbiome composition and diversity¹⁶. Liu *et al.* 2023 reported on a single
102 case study of viral pleurisy caused by Epstein-Barr virus, which was successfully treated with
103 acyclovir²⁰. Finally, Liu *et al.* 2023 examined microbiomes of pleural and ascitic fluid in 92 specimens
104 retrieved from 32 Chinese children, identifying *Klebsiella pneumoniae* as the dominant pathogen
105 ($n=17$), followed by *Escherichia coli* ($n=9$), and *Acinetobacter baumannii* ($n=7$); yeasts ($n=6$) and
106 several viruses ($n=33$) were also identified¹⁹. In all three studies, metagenomics yielded a higher
107 pathogen positive rate than conventional culture^{16,19,20}.

108 To expand knowledge of the pleural microbiome in other cohorts, we undertook a prospective,
109 observational, single-center pilot study of 26 consecutive patients presenting with suspected pleural
110 infection at an Australian hospital, and 10 consecutive control patients lacking clinical suspicion of
111 pleural infection. Next, we compared the diagnostic performance of microbe-enriched shotgun
112 metagenomics, bacterial metataxonomics, panbacterial qPCR, and panfungal qPCR with
113 conventional culture.

114 **Methods**

115 **Ethics Statement.** The study was approved by The Prince Charles Hospital Human Research Ethics
116 Committee (HREC/2022/QPCH/81858) and the Sunshine Coast Hospital and Health Service
117 Research Governance Office. All participants provided written informed consent.

118 **Study Participants.** All patients ≥ 18 years of age presenting with suspected pleural infection
119 (denoted with a '-P' suffix) admitted between March and November 2022 to the Sunshine Coast
120 University Hospital (SCUH), QLD, Australia, and undergoing a diagnostic and/or therapeutic
121 procedure for suspected pleural infection, were prospectively invited.

122 Due to the lack of a 'gold-standard' pleural infection confirmation test, 'clinical likelihood of pleural
123 infection' was objectively stratified by a specialist respiratory physician using predefined clinical
124 criteria: 1. *Probable Pleural Infection*: (i) clinical evidence of pleural infection based on fever, elevated
125 white cell count with left shift, pleurisy presence, raised inflammatory markers, and suitable clinical
126 presentation; AND (ii) either direct evidence of pleural infection defined as the presence of Gram stain
127 and/or culture positivity on pleural fluid; OR indirect evidence of pleural infection based upon pleural
128 fluid pH < 7.2 as measured on a blood gas analyser and/or glucose < 3.0 mmol/L AND (iii)
129 accompanied by at least two of the following criteria: serum C-reactive protein (CRP) > 100 mg/L;
130 complex pleural fluid and evidence of infection on imaging (pleural fluid loculation/septation on
131 ultrasound and/or computed tomography); fever ($> 38.0^{\circ}\text{C}$). 2. *Possible Pleural Infection*: (i) clinical
132 evidence of pleural infection (as defined in (i) above), AND (ii) negative Gram stain and culture
133 negative on pleural fluid AND pH ≥ 7.2 and glucose > 3.0 mmol/L) AND (iii) accompanied by at least 2
134 of the following criteria: CRP > 100 mg/L; complex (i.e. loculated) pleural fluid collection on imaging;
135 fever ($\geq 38.0^{\circ}\text{C}$). 3. *Unlikely pleural infection*: (i) No clinical evidence of pleural infection, AND (ii) all of
136 the following criteria are met: pleural fluid Gram stain and culture negative with pH ≥ 7.2 , glucose > 3.0
137 mmol/L, serum CRP < 100 mg/L, uncomplicated effusion on CT and or ultrasonographic imaging, and
138 an alternate diagnosis confirmed (i.e. heart failure, malignancy). Based on these criteria, 26
139 consecutive patients with clinically suspected pleural infections were recruited.

140 For the control group, patients with pleural effusions without clinical suspicion for pleural infection at
141 the time of sampling (denoted with a '-C' suffix), were enrolled. These individuals were approached if
142 they had an alternative effusion cause (e.g., malignancy or heart failure), absence of clinical history to

143 support active infection, and simple effusion appearance on ultrasound and/or computed tomography.
144 Patients were excluded if they had prior sampling of the pleural space, any clinical concern for current
145 or recent infection, concomitant abdominal ascites, hepatic hydrothorax, or antibiotic administration
146 within 3 weeks of pleural sampling. Ten participants meeting these criteria were enrolled as non-
147 infected control subjects.

148 **Specimen Collection, Storage, and Processing.** The study scientific and pathology teams were
149 provided participant categorisation by the study clinicians ('-P' vs. '-C') but no other information. For
150 the pleural infection cohort, specimens were collected as soon as practicable using aseptic technique.
151 Antibiotic commencement ranged from 21 days prior to pleural sampling to immediately post-pleural
152 aspiration (**Table S1**). Following 10mL 1% lidocaine subcutaneous administration, between 10 and
153 60mL pleural fluid was collected into two sterile specimen pots. One pot was immediately mixed with
154 7mL stabilization agent²² for total DNA extraction (bacterial metataxonomics and qPCR); the second
155 pot contained only pleural fluid for culture and host DNA depletion and extraction (metagenomics).
156 Specimens were immediately stored at 4°C until processed. In parallel, specimens were also
157 collected for routine microscopy (cell count, white blood cell differential, Gram stain), and biochemistry
158 analyses (pleural fluid pH, protein, glucose, lactate dehydrogenase; serum CRP).

159 Microbial culturing was undertaken by both SCUH's onsite Pathology laboratory and our Research
160 laboratory, with VITEK 2 (bioMérieux, NSW, Australia) or Illumina NovaSeq 6000 whole-genome
161 sequencing (WGS; Australian Centre for Ecogenomics, QLD, Australia) used respectively to confirm
162 species identity. Bacterial metataxonomics was carried out using Illumina MiSeq 300bp V3-V4 16S
163 rRNA amplicon paired-end sequencing²³ (Ramaciotti Centre for Genomics, NSW, Australia).
164 Metagenomic sequencing of host-depleted DNA²⁴ was performed using Illumina NovaSeq 6000
165 150bp paired-end reads (17-27 million reads/sample; Azenta Life Sciences, China). For qPCR
166 analyses, total genomic DNA was tested against panbacterial (16S rRNA)²⁵, panfungal (28S rRNA)²⁶,
167 and human (β -globin)²⁷ qPCR assays to quantify microbial-to-host load. For the panbacterial qPCR
168 assay, a cycles-to-threshold (C_T) cut-off value of 31 was used to delineate pleural infection-positive
169 versus -negative cases. Further methodological details are described in Supplementary Methods.

170 **Statistical Analyses.** To determine diagnostic test performance, '*Probable Pleural Infection*' was
171 used as the infection-positive reference. Specificity, sensitivity, positive predictive value (PPV), and
172 negative predictive value (NPV) were calculated for microbial culture, qPCR, bacterial

- 173 metataxonomics, and metagenomics. Spearman's rank correlation (r_s) was used to determine pleural
174 infection/no-infection diagnostic correlations between the four testing methods.

175 **Results**

176 **Study participants and clinical outcomes.** Twenty-six participants ($n=7$ female; median age=67
177 years [range 20 – 95]) with suspected pleural infection had an exudative pleural effusion as defined
178 by Light's criteria²⁸. Twenty-four (92%) had loculated (complex) pleural effusions on ultrasound and/or
179 computed tomography imaging, with 20 (77%) also having associated lung consolidation at the time
180 of cross-sectional imaging. Twenty-five (96%) underwent intercostal catheter insertion, whereas one
181 underwent diagnostic/therapeutic needle aspiration. All 26 patients received broad-spectrum
182 antimicrobial therapy (**Table S1**). Intrapleural enzyme therapy (5mg DNase and 10 mg tissue
183 plasminogen activator) was administered in 17 participants (65%), and four (15%) required surgical
184 decortication (**Table 1 & Table S2**). Thirty-day mortality was 12% ($n=3$).

185 Among the 10 control subjects, 9 were diagnosed with malignant pleural effusion (MPE), and one with
186 decompensated congestive heart failure (**Table 1 & Table S2**). Thirty-day mortality was not recorded
187 for this cohort.

188 **Conventional culture performance.** Pathology lab testing returned 10 (38%) microbial culture-
189 positive results from the pleural infection cohort (**Table 2**), whereas only six (23%) were culture-
190 positive from Research lab testing; however, there was 100% overlap with the Pathology results.
191 Unexpectedly, pleural fluid from two control participants, SCHI0152-C and SCHI0175-C, cultured
192 *Candida parapsilosis* and *Moraxella osloensis*, respectively, in the Research lab. No microbes were
193 cultured in the control cohort by the Pathology lab.

194 **qPCR performance.** Positive bacterial detection was achieved with panbacterial qPCR in 14/26
195 (54%) suspect pleural infection cases (**Table 2**). All panbacterial qPCR-positive results were also
196 bacteria-positive according to metagenomics and/or bacterial metataxonomics (**Table 2**). One of the
197 10 control cases was panbacterial qPCR-positive, albeit at a borderline C_T value of 30.9; this result
198 was not supported by any of the other tested methods. Panfungal qPCR did not identify fungi in any
199 pleural infection or control cohort specimens.

200 **Bacterial metataxonomic and shotgun metagenomic performance.** Together, bacterial
201 metataxonomics and metagenomics identified 16/26 (62%) suspect pleural infection cases as
202 infection-positive, with 14/26 (54%) cases determined by each individual method. Metagenomics
203 identified 7/14 (50%) cases as polymicrobial, vs. 5/14 (36%) polymicrobial cases using bacterial

204 metataxonomics (**Table 2 & Figure 1**). Despite both methods identifying 14 pleural infection cases
205 each, only 12 overlapped, and only three of these cases were identified as polymicrobial by both
206 methods (**Table 2**). Far fewer taxa were identified by bacterial metataxonomics in two of these three
207 cases (SCHI0131-P, SCHI0172-P) (**Table 2**).

208 **Molecular diagnostics versus microbial culture performance.** Compared with our 'pleural
209 infection-positive' clinical reference classification, all molecular diagnostic methods demonstrated
210 superior sensitivity and NPVs compared with microbial culture (**Table 3**). As expected, specificity and
211 PPVs remained high across all diagnostic methods.

212 Conventional culture somewhat correlated with molecular methods (metagenomics: $r_s=0.56$ [$p<0.001$];
213 bacterial metataxonomics: $r_s=0.39$ [$p=0.05$]; panbacterial qPCR: $r_s=0.39$ [$p=0.05$]) (Figure 3).
214 Metagenomics demonstrated the strongest correlation across methods (bacterial metataxonomics:
215 $r_s=0.69$ [$p<0.001$]; panbacterial qPCR: $r_s=0.69$ [$p<0.001$]; conventional culture: $r_s=0.56$ [$p<0.01$]). The
216 strongest individual correlation was between panbacterial qPCR and bacterial metataxonomics
217 ($r_s=0.85$; $p<0.001$; Figure 3); this result was expected as both methods target the 16S rRNA gene.

218 **Pleural infection aetiology.** A diverse array of oro-naso-hypopharyngeal-, oral-, dental-, respiratory
219 tract-, and gut-associated microbes were detected in the 14 metagenomic infection-positive
220 specimens (**Table 2 & Figure 1**). Streptococci ($n=5$; 2 x *S. intermedius*, 2 x *S. pyogenes*, 1 x *S. mitis*)
221 dominated, followed by *Prevotella* spp. ($n=2$; *P. oris* and *P. pleuritidis*), *Staphylococcus* spp. ($n=2$; *S.*
222 *aureus* and *S. saprophyticus*), and *Klebsiella pneumoniae* ($n=2$) (**Table 2**). Seven (50%) pleural
223 infection cases were monomicrobial according to metagenomics, of which two harboured *S.*
224 *intermedius*, along with one each of *K. pneumoniae*, *S. saprophyticus*, *S. aureus*, *Enterococcus*
225 *faecium*, and *Escherichia coli* (**Table 2 & Figure 2**). In contrast, bacterial metataxonomics identified
226 nine (35%) monomicrobial pleural infection cases, of which four were *Streptococcus* sp., along with
227 one each of *Escherichia-Shigella* sp., *Fusobacterium* sp., *Haemophilus* sp., *Klebsiella* sp., and
228 *Prevotella* sp. (**Table 2 & Figure 2**). Five monomicrobial cases overlapped with the two meta-omics
229 methods; however, bacterial metataxonomics erroneously assigned two monomicrobial pleural
230 infection cases, SCHI0132-P and SCHI0143-P, as '*Streptococcus*', despite the SCHI0132-P isolate
231 being confirmed as coagulase-negative *Staphylococcus* sp. by VITEK 2 (**Table 2**), indicating a
232 probable bacterial metataxonomic database error for this genus.

233 As expected, bacterial metataxonomics failed to identify fungi or viruses in the pleural infection cases,
234 whereas conventional culture and metagenomics both identified the yeast, *Pichia kudriavzevii*, in
235 SCHI0131-P. Metagenomics further identified the fungi *Rhizoctonia solani*, *Wallemia mellicola*,
236 *Meyerozyma guilliermondii*, *Truncatella angustata*, *Cokeromyces recurvatus*, *Bipolaris maydis*,
237 *Candida orthopsilosis*, and *Gilbertella persicaria* in SCHI0131-P (subject suffered from confirmed
238 Boorhaaves syndrome), *Candida dubliniensis* in SCHI0140-P, and *Candida tropicalis*, *Fonsecaea*
239 *pedrosoi*, and *Pyricularia pennisetigena* in SCHI0125-P. In all instances, fungi were in relatively low
240 abundance. Metagenomics also identified bacteriophages in 5/26 infection-positive cases, with
241 *Staphylococcus* phage Andhra seen in SCHI0123-P, SCHI0125-P, SCHI0127-P, and SCHI0128-P,
242 and *Streptococcus* phage SM1 seen in SCHI0131-P. *Staphylococcus* phage Andhra was among the
243 most dominant taxa seen in SCHI0125-P and SCHI0128-P, indicating very high phage levels in
244 pleural fluid; both specimens harboured *S. aureus* according to metagenomics, and SCHI0125-P also
245 had *S. saprophyticus* according to culture and WGS (**Table 2 & Figure 2**).

246 Metagenomics unexpectedly found microbes in 2/10 control cases (**Table 2**). The non-pathogenic
247 DNA virus, adeno-associated dependoparvovirus A, was identified in SCHI0173-C – although no
248 helper virus was observed – and *M. osloensis* was confirmed in SCHI0175-C. *C. parapsilosis* cultured
249 from SCHI0152-C was not detected, suggesting possible operator contamination during specimen
250 collection or processing. Bacterial metataxonomics failed to identify the culture-confirmed *M.*
251 *osloensis* in SCHI0175-C, but identified *Escherichia-Shigella* in SCHI0152-C (1453 reads) and
252 *Corynebacterium* in SCHI0173-C (190 reads), findings that were not supported by the other methods,
253 again likely due to contamination.

254 **Microbiology and clinical outcomes.** Of the three pleural infection cases with a <30-day mortality,
255 two (SCHI0128-P and SCHI0134-P) were infected with *K. pneumoniae*, and two (SCHI0131-P and
256 SCHI0128-P) had polymicrobial infections according to metagenomics. In contrast, no patient
257 surviving beyond 30 days ($n=23$) harbored *Klebsiella* spp. according to any testing method.

258 **Antimicrobial resistance gene detection.** *In silico* antimicrobial resistance gene detection only
259 identified innate drug resistance genes, with no evidence of acquired resistance development in any
260 case (**Table S1**).

261 Discussion

262 Clinical decision-making in suspected pleural infection is challenging due to low culture positivity
263 rates⁵⁻⁸, resulting in frequent diagnostic uncertainty and antimicrobial overuse. Recent work^{7,8,15,16,19}
264 has highlighted potential advantages of molecular methods for diagnosing and determining the
265 aetiology of pleural infection. Our pilot feasibility study adds to this growing body of work, being one of
266 the first studies to apply shotgun metagenomics on pleural infections, and the first to prospectively
267 collect and profile consecutive pleural fluid specimens. Our findings suggest that all three culture-
268 independent molecular techniques tested in our study – metagenomics, bacterial metataxonomics,
269 and panbacterial qPCR – have excellent performance characteristics for pleural infection diagnosis,
270 and may be superior to conventional culture for diagnosis and aetiological confirmation. Panbacterial
271 qPCR stands out as a cost-effective, simple, and same-day diagnostic that could be readily
272 implemented as a routine test for pleural fluid specimens; such a test may assist with both
273 antimicrobial stewardship efforts and rapid treatment decision-making²⁹. In support of its clinical utility,
274 panbacterial qPCR showed excellent diagnostic performance (sensitivity 82%, specificity 95%, PPV
275 93%, NPV 86%) and strong correlation with shotgun metagenomics, bacterial metataxonomics, and
276 conventional culture.

277 In line with recent molecular studies^{7,8,15-17}, we confirm that pleural infections can be either
278 monomicrobial or polymicrobial, with predominant microbes most likely originating from oral, dental, or
279 upper and lower respiratory tract sources, and occasional incursion from gut-borne pathogens (e.g. *E.*
280 *coli*, *Enterococcus faecium*, *K. pneumoniae*) (Table 2). Furthermore, metagenomics and bacterial
281 metataxonomics unveiled greater microbial heterogeneity than could be detected by conventional
282 culture. Similar to recent work^{16,19}, we observed that polymicrobial bacterial infection was also
283 occasionally associated with fungal coinfection (albeit in very low abundance) using metagenomics,
284 confirming the challenging nature of diagnosing and treating complex polymicrobial pleural infections
285 across microbial domains. Streptococcal and staphylococcal phages were also seen in five cases of
286 pleural infection, with their host species not always detected, suggesting possible lytic activity towards
287 their host within the pleural space, or incidental phage transit from other body sites³⁰. Although not
288 examined here, others have shown that phage presence in clinical specimens can negatively impact
289 culture rates³¹. Despite low sample numbers, we found that *K. pneumoniae* presence was associated

290 with greater risk of mortality, consistent with recent bacterial metataxonomic study that showed an
291 association between Enterobacteriaceae and mortality⁸.

292 Immediate antimicrobial administration upon suspicion of pleural infection is important for preventing
293 sepsis³²; however, this practice may negatively affect pleural infection diagnostic rates. Despite this,
294 many prior pleural microbiome studies have identified 100% infection positivity using molecular
295 testing^{7,8,15}. In contrast, only 62% of suspected pleural infections in our study had detectable microbes
296 according to molecular and/or culture assessment. Our lower positivity rate likely reflects our
297 prospective, consecutive recruitment of participants without prior knowledge of culture results or
298 pleural biochemistry, an approach that captures the diagnostic uncertainty facing clinicians in real-
299 world practice. Only two other studies have not used prior knowledge of pleural fluid biochemistry or
300 microbiology for molecular pleural infection identification and characterisation; their infection positivity
301 rate was 70%^{16,17}. Our finding that 38% of suspected pleural infection patients did not have detectable
302 microbes according to any method suggests that a subset of patients with clinically suspected pleural
303 infection may instead have sterile pleural effusions at the time of sampling. In support of this
304 conclusion, these patients had more benign pleural biochemistry using recognised cut-off values (i.e.
305 pH <7.2; glucose <3.0 mmol/L)¹ (**Table 1**). A second possibility is that some infections were missed
306 due to prior antibiotic exposure; however, others have shown that molecular approaches are less
307 impacted by prior antibiotics than conventional culture^{7,16}. A third possibility is that human DNA
308 depletion prior to metagenomic sequencing may have limited our ability to detect extracellular
309 microbial DNA²⁴. To overcome this issue, deeper metagenomic sequencing on total DNA can be
310 conducted; however, such an approach is costly, and risks missing low-abundance microbes due to
311 overwhelming human DNA signal^{24,33}. Prospective randomized trials are needed to understand
312 whether a truncated antibiotic course can be safely used in people with likely sterile effusions as
313 identified with molecular diagnostics, and to quantify the impact of prior antibiotic administration on
314 culture or molecular detection sensitivity.

315 Sensitive molecular assays come with the trade-off that microorganism presence might represent
316 either a contaminant or a bona fide pathogen. To assess this issue, we investigated whether the
317 control group, predominantly comprised of MPEs, had a pleural microbiome. Although most controls
318 had a sterile pleural space, one MPE patient was positive for *Moraxella osloensis* on culture, WGS,
319 and metagenomics. *M. osloensis*, a commensal of human skin and the upper respiratory tract, most

320 commonly causes infection in cancer patients³⁴; it is thus feasible that this patient had an
321 undiagnosed infection alongside their MPE. Three other MPE patients also unexpectedly yielded
322 microbes: *C. parapsilosis* was cultured from SCHI0152-C, and bacterial metataxonomics identified
323 *Corynebacterium* and *Escherichia-Shigella* in SCHI0173-C and SCHI0152-C, respectively; however,
324 these findings were not supported by the other methods. Although specimen or sampling
325 contamination represents the most plausible explanation for these results, a recent bacterial
326 metataxonomic study suggested that non-infective pleural disease may contain unique microbial
327 signatures^{7,35}. Strict aseptic practice during specimen collection and processing can mitigate some of
328 these false-positive cases. However, microbial contamination may still occur at many stages of
329 sample handling and analysis, including procedural contamination (e.g. remnant microbial DNA in the
330 specimen jars or local anaesthetics), or residual DNA from transient microbial seeding of the pleura.
331 In addition, index hopping and 'kitome' contamination are known drawbacks of next-generation
332 sequencing, especially in low-biomass specimens like pleural fluid³³. Careful consideration of these
333 challenges will be important in the design of larger prospective studies. Further studies examining the
334 pleural microbiome across a spectrum of pleural diseases, including in people with MPE and
335 congestive heart failure, will also be illuminating.

336 Other challenges also complicated interpretation of pleural diagnosis and aetiology, including
337 difficulties distinguishing background noise from true microbial signal, lack of appropriate
338 methodology for detecting RNA viruses, and uncertainty regarding microbial causality and
339 pathogenicity (e.g. the role of bystander microbes in pleural disease development and prognosis),
340 particularly in polymicrobial infections. Shotgun metatranscriptomics, which involves total RNA
341 sequencing of microbiome transcripts, may address these difficulties. However, to our knowledge, this
342 technique has not yet been undertaken to investigate pleural infections, so its value in this cohort
343 remains unclear. Perhaps most challenging of all is the current lack of gold-standard clinical
344 diagnostic criteria for pleural infection. In clinical practice, an integrated approach is taken to weigh
345 multiple factors to make a probabilistic diagnosis, including pleural biochemistry, host response, and
346 imaging. In this study, we attempted to standardize integrated probabilistic diagnostic classification by
347 formulating a pragmatic reference standard to compare diagnostic performance between modalities.
348 However, the issue of a validated diagnostic gold-standard remains an unresolved challenge. It is also
349 important to consider the impact of incorporation bias³⁶ when interpreting the performance of

350 conventional culture results, given that such results contribute to the diagnostic 'reference standard',
351 thereby inflating culture performance estimates.

352 In conclusion, this prospective study demonstrates the feasibility of, and challenges associated with,
353 molecular tests for pleural infection diagnosis. Whilst such methods hold great clinical utility and
354 potential superiority in routine pleural infection diagnostics, questions and challenges remain. A large,
355 rigorous study comparing molecular and culture-based diagnostic techniques in pleural infection is
356 now required to further address these opportunities for diagnostic advancement, along with the
357 associated challenges in eventual clinical translation.

358 **Author Contributions:** The authors confirm contribution to the paper as follows: study conception
359 and design, PTB, TB, JG, OSS, AB, DSS, EPP; data collection, PTB, TB, JG, OSS, AB, JA, DSS,
360 EPP; analysis and interpretation of results, PTB, TB JG, OSS, AB, SS, TRD, DSS, EPP; draft
361 manuscript, PTB, TB, DSS, EPP; preparation of manuscript, PTB, JG, OSS, AB, SS, TRD, DSS,
362 EPP. All authors reviewed the results and approved the final version of the manuscript.

363

364 **Funding:** This work was funded by Wishlist Sunshine Coast Hospital Foundation (award 2021-04-
365 CRG to TB, OO, JG, DSS, and EPP) and Advance Queensland (awards AQIRF0362018 to EPP and
366 AQIRF095-2020-CV to OSO). PTB has no funding to declare.

367

368 **Conflicts of Interest Statement:** The authors declare no conflict of interest. The funders had no role
369 in study design, in the collection, analyses, or interpretation of data, in manuscript writing, or in the
370 decision to publish the results.

371

372 **Acknowledgements:** We thank Emma Seaniger and Louise McIntosh for assistance with sample
373 collection and study coordination, Michael Caffery and the Pathology Queensland laboratory
374 scientists for their assistance with culture, and the Australian BioCommons team (led by Ashley
375 Dungan at University of Melbourne, and Melissa Burke at University of Queensland) for providing
376 QIIME 2 training.

377 **Figure Legends**

378

379 **Figure 1. Metagenomic profiles identified from 26 suspected pleural infection specimens and**
380 **10 control cohort specimens.** *Conventional culture positive; ^16S ribosomal RNA (panbacterial)
381 quantitative PCR positive; #Whole-genome sequencing-confirmed (from culture). Dominant taxa are
382 labelled on each bar.

383

384 **Figure 2. Bacterial 16S ribosomal RNA (rRNA) metataxonomic profiles identified from 26**
385 **suspected pleural infection specimens and 10 control cohort specimens.** *Conventional culture
386 positive; ^16S ribosomal RNA (panbacterial) quantitative PCR positive; #Whole-genome sequencing
387 result from culture; ‡Likely incorrect assignment of *Staphylococcus* as *Streptococcus* (1 case
388 confirmed as a coagulase-negative *Staphylococcus* by MALDI-TOF analysis of culture). Dominant
389 taxa are labelled on each bar.

390

391 **Figure 3. Correlation matrix of the pleural infection diagnostic methods used in this study.**
392 1=perfect correlation; -1=no correlation. Conventional culture showed the weakest correlation when
393 compared with each of the three molecular methods.

394 **Table 1. Clinical, Demographic and Outcome Data**

	Suspected Pleural Infection	Non-infectious Pleural Effusion (Control)
Clinical / Demographics		
Number of participants in group, <i>n</i>	26	10
Age in years (median, range)	67 (20-95)	78 (41-87)
Female sex, <i>n</i> (%)	7 (27)	2 (20)
Immunosuppression, <i>n</i> (%)	3 (12)	1 (10)
Fever, <i>n</i> (%)	23 (90)	–
ICU admission, <i>n</i> (%)	6 (23)	–
Biochemical		
Serum White Cell count, cells x10 ⁹ /L (median, range)	14.5 (8.4-33.6)	8.3 (4.3-15.2)
Serum C-reactive protein, mg/L (median, range)	193 (39-547)	56 (5-124)
Serum Procalcitonin, µg/L (median, range)	0.6 (0.1-9.6)	0.2 (0.1-0.3)
Serum LDH, unit/L (median, range)	236 (108-477)	208 (160-391)
Serum Protein, g/L (median, range)	61 (49-76)	62 (45-72)
Fluid LDH, unit/L (median, range)	865 (173-17400)	239 (81-672)
Fluid Protein, g/L (median, range)	46 (23-58)	43 (37-46)
Fluid pH (median, range)	7.0 (6.6-7.5)	7.4 (7.3-7.5)
Fluid glucose, mmol/L (median, range)	3.9 (2.4-11.9)	6.3 (4.6-10.0)
Imaging		
Consolidation, <i>n</i> (%)	20 (80)	–
Complex appearance of effusion, <i>n</i> (%)	24 (92%)	–
Outcome Data		
IPE, <i>n</i> (%)	17 (65)	–
CTS, <i>n</i> (%)	4 (15)	–
30-day mortality, <i>n</i> (%)	3 (12)	–
Pleural infection Likelihood* (%)	1=0%, 2=38.5%, 3=61.5%	1=100%, 2=0%, 3= 0%

395

396 *Abbreviations:* Cardiothoracic Surgical decortication; IPE, Intrapleural Enzyme therapy; LDH, Lactate
 397 dehydrogenase. * 1 = *Unlikely pleural infection*, 2 = *Possible pleural infection*: 3 = *Probable pleural*
 398 *infection*.

Table 2. Pleural space diagnostic performance across 26 pleural infection diagnosed participants and 10 controls with a diagnosed non-pleural infection aetiology

Participant ID	Metagenomic result [#]	Bacterial metataxonomic result [†]	Culture result, Research Lab (WGS result)	Culture result, Pathology Lab (MALDI-TOF result)	Panbacterial qPCR [‡]
Diagnosed with Pleural Infection					
SCHI0123-P	Polymicrobial (<i>Fusobacterium nucleatum</i> , <i>Fusobacterium hwasookii</i> , <i>Staphylococcus</i> phage Andhra, <i>Prevotella loescheii</i> , <i>Rothia mucilaginosa</i> , <i>Enterococcus faecium</i> , <i>Fusobacterium</i> sp. oral taxon 203)	Monomicrobial (<i>Fusobacterium</i>)	NG	NG	Yes (C _I =20.8)
SCHI0125-P	Polymicrobial (<i>Staphylococcus</i> phage Andhra, <i>Prevotella oris</i> , <i>Enterococcus faecium</i> , <i>Streptococcus mitis</i> , <i>Streptococcus anginosus</i> , <i>Escherichia coli</i>^a , <i>Streptococcus pneumoniae</i> , <i>Fonsecaea pedrosoi</i> , <i>Candida tropicalis</i> , <i>Pyricularia pennisetigena</i> , <i>Staphylococcus aureus</i>^{b)})	Monomicrobial (<i>Prevotella</i>)	<i>Escherichia coli</i>^a , <i>Staphylococcus saprophyticus</i>^a	<i>Escherichia coli</i>	Yes (C _I =25.7)
SCHI0126-P	ND	ND	NG	NG	No (C _I =33.9)
SCHI0127-P	Polymicrobial (<i>Streptococcus pyogenes</i> , <i>Staphylococcus</i> phage Andhra, <i>Streptococcus dysgalactiae</i> , <i>Streptococcus agalactiae</i> , <i>Enterococcus faecium</i> , <i>Rothia mucilaginosa</i>)	Monomicrobial (<i>Streptococcus</i>)	Positive (not characterised)	<i>Streptococcus pyogenes</i>	Yes (C _I =27.5)
SCHI0128-P	Polymicrobial (<i>Klebsiella pneumoniae</i> , <i>Staphylococcus</i> phage Andhra, <i>Mycoplasma hyorhinis</i> , <i>Carnobacterium divergens</i> , <i>Actinomyces odontolyticus</i> , <i>Rothia mucilaginosa</i> , <i>Streptococcus mitis</i> , <i>Haemophilus parainfluenzae</i> , <i>Enterococcus faecium</i> , <i>Streptococcus parasanguinis</i> , <i>Staphylococcus aureus</i>)	ND	NG	NG	No (C _I =35.3)

<p>SCHI0131- P^e</p>	<p>Polymicrobial (<i>Streptococcus mitis</i>, <i>Streptococcus anginosus</i>, <i>Streptococcus pneumoniae</i>, <i>Streptococcus</i> sp. oral taxon 431, <i>Streptococcus oralis</i>, <i>Streptococcus salivarius</i>, <i>Gemella haemolysans</i>, <i>Streptococcus pseudopneumoniae</i>, <i>Streptococcus</i> sp. ChDC B345, <i>Streptococcus gordonii</i>, <i>Streptococcus parasanguinis</i>, <i>Streptococcus cristatus</i>, <i>Streptococcus</i> sp. HSISM1, <i>Streptococcus australis</i>, <i>Streptococcus</i> sp. oral taxon 064, <i>Streptococcus</i> sp. FDAARGOS_192, <i>Streptococcus intermedius</i>, <i>Streptococcus</i> sp. A12, <i>Veillonella atypica</i>, <i>Actinomyces odontolyticus</i>, <i>Streptococcus sanguinis</i>, <i>Gemella sanguinis</i>, <i>Streptococcus thermophilus</i>, <i>Capnocytophaga leadbetteri</i>, <i>Streptococcus equinus</i>, <i>Streptococcus viridans</i>, <i>Rothia dentocariosa</i>, <i>Capnocytophaga gingivalis</i>, <i>Veillonella parvula</i>, <i>Rothia mucilaginosa</i>, <i>Streptococcus vestibularis</i>, <i>Streptococcus</i> sp. HSISS2, <i>Prevotella jejuni</i>, <i>Streptococcus constellatus</i>, <i>Streptococcus</i> sp. I-P16, <i>Streptococcus</i> sp. I-G2, <i>Veillonella dispar</i>, <i>Bifidobacterium longum</i>, <i>Streptococcus</i> sp. HSISS3, <i>Gemella morbillorum</i>, <i>Haemophilus influenzae</i>, <i>Streptococcus</i> sp. HSISS1, <i>Atopobium parvulum</i>, <i>Streptococcus dysgalactiae</i>, <i>Streptococcus pyogenes</i>, <i>Streptococcus agalactiae</i>, <i>Staphylococcus aureus</i>, <i>Prevotella salivae</i>, <i>Prevotella melaninogenica</i>, <i>Tannerella</i> sp. oral taxon HOT-286, <i>Actinomyces</i> sp. oral taxon 171, <i>Actinomyces oris</i>, <i>Capnocytophaga sputigena</i>, <i>Haemophilus parainfluenzae</i>, <i>Neisseria subflava</i>, <i>Campylobacter showae</i>, <i>Streptococcus</i> phage SM1, <i>Streptococcus mutans</i>, <i>Streptococcus sobrinus</i>, <i>Streptococcus acidominimus</i>, <i>Lactococcus lactis</i>, <i>Lachnospiraceae</i> bacterium oral taxon 500, <i>Actinomyces naeslundii</i>, <i>Actinomyces viscosus</i>, <i>Capnocytophaga</i> sp. oral taxon 878, <i>Neisseria elongata</i>, <i>Lautropia mirabilis</i>, <i>Fusobacterium periodonticum</i>, <i>Fusobacterium nucleatum</i>, <i>Streptococcus</i></p>	<p>Polymicrobial (<i>Streptococcus</i>, <i>Streptococcus anginosus</i>, <i>Granulicatella</i>, <i>Streptococcus salivarius</i>, <i>Gemella</i>, <i>Prevotella jejuni</i>, <i>Veillonella</i>, <i>Streptococcus constellatus</i>, <i>Prevotella melaninogenica</i>; <i>Neisseria perflava</i>, <i>Neisseria</i>, <i>Fusobacterium periodonticum</i>, <i>Prevotella salivae</i>, <i>Haemophilus influenzae</i>, <i>Leptotrichia</i>, <i>Capnocytophaga gingivalis</i>, <i>Capnocytophaga leadbetteri</i>, <i>Schaalia odontolytica</i>, <i>Neisseria elongata</i>, <i>Atopobium</i>,</p>	<p><i>Pichia kudriavzevii</i>*</p>	<p><i>Pichia kudriavzevii</i>; enteric & mixed anaerobic bacteria</p>	<p>Yes (C₇=17.7)</p>
------------------------------------	--	--	---	---	---------------------------------

	<i>ratti</i> , >70 additional taxa ⁶)	<i>Fusobacterium</i> , <i>Porphyromonas</i> , <i>Bergeyella</i> , <i>Leptotrichia</i> <i>hongkongensis</i> , <i>Oribacterium</i> , <i>Lautropia</i> , <i>Oribacterium</i> , <i>Selenomonas artemidis</i> , <i>Stomatobaculum</i> , <i>Haemophilus</i> , <i>Prevotella</i> <i>shahii</i> , <i>Rothia</i>)			
SCHI0132-P	Monomicrobial (<i>Staphylococcus aureus</i> ^b)	Monomicrobial (<i>Streptococcus</i> ^d)	Positive (not characterised)	Coagulase-negative <i>Staphylococcus</i> sp.	No (C _T =33.5)
SCHI0133-P	ND	ND	NG	NG	No (C _T =33.9)
SCHI0134-P	Monomicrobial (<i>Klebsiella pneumoniae</i>)	Monomicrobial (<i>Klebsiella</i>)	NG	<i>Klebsiella pneumoniae</i>	Yes (C _T =23.5)
SCHI0135-P	ND	ND	NG	NG	No (C _T =34.5)
SCHI0136-P	Monomicrobial (<i>Streptococcus intermedius</i>)	ND	NG	<i>Streptococcus intermedius</i>	Yes (C _T =27.5)
SCHI0140-P	Polymicrobial (<i>Streptococcus pyogenes</i> , <i>Streptococcus dysgalactiae</i> , <i>Candida dubliniensis</i>)	Polymicrobial (<i>Streptococcus</i> , <i>Streptococcus</i>)	NG	<i>Streptococcus pyogenes</i> , <i>Staphylococcus aureus</i>	Yes (C _T =25.2)

		<i>pyogenes</i>)			
SCHI0141-P	ND	ND	NG	NG	No ($C_T=33.5$)
SCHI0143-P	Monomicrobial (<i>Staphylococcus saprophyticus</i>)	Monomicrobial (<i>Streptococcus</i> ^d)	NG	NG	Yes ($C_T=30.1$)
SCHI0148-P	ND	ND	NG	NG	No ($C_T=34.6$)
SCHI0149-P	ND	ND	NG	NG	No ($C_T=31.3$)
SCHI0150-P	ND	Monomicrobial (<i>Haemophilus</i>)	NG	NG	Yes ($C_T=28.1$)
SCHI0157-P	Monomicrobial (<i>Streptococcus intermedius</i>)	Monomicrobial (<i>Streptococcus</i>)	NG	<i>Streptococcus intermedius</i>	Yes ($C_T=24.2$)
SCHI0158-P	ND	Polymicrobial (<i>Fusobacterium</i> , <i>Parvimonas</i> , <i>Eubacterium</i>)	NG	NG	Yes ($C_T=29.2$)
SCHI0159-P	ND	ND	NG	NG	No ($C_T=32.6$)
SCHI0160-P	ND	ND	NG	NG	No ($C_T=32.3$)
SCHI0162-P	ND	ND	NG	NG	No ($C_T=31.2$)
SCHI0163-P	Monomicrobial (<i>Haemophilus parainfluenzae</i>)	Polymicrobial (<i>Haemophilus</i> , <i>Novosphingobium</i>)	NG	NG	Yes ($C_T=23.5$)
SCHI0166-P	Monomicrobial (<i>Escherichia coli</i>)	Monomicrobial (<i>Escherichia-Shigella</i>)	Positive (not characterised)	<i>Escherichia coli</i>	Yes ($C_T=21.5$)
SCHI0169-P	ND	ND	NG	NG	No ($C_T=33.2$)

SCHI0172-P	Polymicrobial (<i>Prevotella pleuritidis</i> , <i>Fusobacterium nucleatum</i> , <i>Prevotella enoeca</i> , <i>Prevotella intermedia</i> , <i>Hallela seregens</i> , <i>Porphyromonas gingivalis</i> , <i>Tannerella forsythia</i> , <i>Prevotella buccae</i> , <i>Prevotella oris</i> , <i>Fusobacterium</i> sp. oral taxon 203, <i>Prevotella nigrescens</i> , <i>Prevotella denticola</i> , <i>Streptococcus pyogenes</i> , <i>Prevotella veroralis</i> , <i>Fusobacterium hwasookii</i> , <i>Prevotella aurantiaca</i> , <i>Bacteroides fragilis</i> , <i>Bacteroides heparinolyticus</i> , <i>Prevotella salivae</i> , <i>Prevotella fusca</i> , <i>Prevotella pallens</i> , <i>Prevotella nanceiensis</i> , <i>Prevotella jejuni</i> , <i>Prevotella oulorum</i> , <i>Prevotella maculosa</i> , <i>Prevotella bivia</i> , <i>Prevotella melaninogenica</i> , <i>Prevotella micans</i> , <i>Prevotella amnii</i> , <i>Prevotella conceptionensis</i> , <i>Enterococcus faecium</i>)	Polymicrobial (<i>Enterococcus</i> , <i>Prevotella pleuritidis</i>)	Positive (not characterised)	<i>Fusobacterium nucleatum</i>	Yes (C _T =20.3)
Diagnosed with non-Pleural infection (Negative Controls)					
SCHI0151-C	ND	ND	NG	NG	No (C _T =32.7)
SCHI0152-C	ND	Monomicrobial (<i>Escherichia-Shigella</i>)	<i>Candida parapsilosis</i>*	NG	No (C _T =35.7)
SCHI0161-C	ND	ND	NG	NG	No (C _T =36.7)
SCHI0164-C	ND	ND	NG	NG	No (C _T =35.9)
SCHI0165-C	ND	ND	NG	NG	No (C _T =32.3)
SCHI0168-C	ND	ND	NG	NG	No (C _T =32.7)
SCHI0170-C	ND	ND	NG	NG	No (C _T =38.7)
SCHI0173-C	Monomicrobial (Adeno-associated dependoparvovirus A)	Monomicrobial (<i>Corynebacterium</i>)	NG	NG	No (C _T =31.3)
SCHI0174-C	ND	ND	NG	NG	Yes (C _T =30.9)
SCHI0175-C	Monomicrobial (<i>Moraxella osloensis</i>)	ND	<i>Moraxella osloensis</i>*	NG	No (C _T =31.9)

Abbreviations: C_T, cycles-to-threshold; MALDI-TOF, matrix-assisted laser desorption/ionisation time-of-flight mass spectrometry; ND, not determined; NG, no growth; PE, pleural effusion. Salmon-coloured cells denote possible false-negative results in the Pleural infection cohort. Bolded text denotes footnoted item; gray-shaded fields indicate discordant negative pleural infection diagnosis. [#]Minimum read threshold of ≥400 reads. [†]Minimum read threshold of ≥40 reads. [‡]Based on TRIzol interphase DNA extraction. ^{*}Cultures subjected to whole-genome sequencing. ^a*Escherichia coli* excluded from the metagenomic output due to its read count being lower than the background (contaminant) signal. ^bNo *S. saprophyticus* or other coagulase-negative staphylococci were identified, suggesting potential taxonomic misassignment or a detection limit issue. ^c*Pichia kudriavzevii* identified in the metagenome data (1963 reads). ^dProbable taxonomic misassignment of certain '*Staphylococcus*' as '*Streptococcus*' using bacterial metataxonomics. ^eSCHI0131-P, yielded exceptionally high and diverse microbial burden across all testing methods; this case differed clinically from others in that the participant had suffered a ruptured oesophagus (Boerhaave syndrome).

Table 3. Comparative diagnostic accuracy of conventional culture and molecular methods for detecting pleural infection when compared to a surrogate gold-standard pleural infection classification of ‘probable pleural infection’*.

	CONVENTIONAL CULTURE	PANBACTERIAL QPCR	BACTERIAL METATAXONOMICS	METAGENOMICS	COMBINED MOLECULAR
SENSITIVITY (95% CI)	70.6 (44.0-89.7)	82.4 (56.6-96.2)	88.2 (63.6-98.5)	82.4 (56.6-96.2)	100 (80.5-100)
SPECIFICITY (95% CI)	100 (82.3-100)	94.7 (74.0-99.9)	94.7 (74.0-99.9)	89.5 (66.9-98.7)	84.2 (60.4-96.6)
PPV (95% CI)	100 (73.5-100)	93.3 (68.1-99.8)	93.8 (69.8-99.8)	87.5 (61.7-98.4)	85 (62.1-96.8)
NPV (95% CI)	79.2 (57.8-92.9)	85.7 (63.7-97.0)	90 (68.3-98.8)	85 (62.1-96.8)	100 (79.4-100)

Abbreviations: CI, confidence interval; NPV, negative predictive value; PPV, positive predictive value; qPCR, quantitative PCR; Combined Molecular, all molecular methods (qPCR, bacterial metataxonomics, metagenomics). **Probable Pleural Infection:* Gram stain and/or culture positive on pleural fluid; or pleural fluid pH < 7.2 and 2 or more of the following: serum C-reactive protein > 100 mg/L; complex pleural fluid on imaging; fever (> 38°C)

References


1. Bedawi EO, Guinde J, Rahman NM, Astoul P. Advances in pleural infection and malignancy. *European Respiratory Review* 2021;30:200002.
2. Cargill TN, Hassan M, Corcoran JP, et al. A systematic review of comorbidities and outcomes of adult patients with pleural infection. *European Respiratory Journal* 2019;54:1900541.
3. Brims F, Popowicz N, Rosenstengel A, et al. Bacteriology and clinical outcomes of patients with culture-positive pleural infection in Western Australia: A 6-year analysis. *Respirology* 2019;24:171-8.
4. Bedawi EO, Ricciardi S, Hassan M, et al. ERS/ESTS statement on the management of pleural infection in adults. *European Respiratory Journal* 2022:2201062.
5. Maskell NA, Batt S, Hedley EL, Davies CW, Gillespie SH, Davies RJ. The bacteriology of pleural infection by genetic and standard methods and its mortality significance. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 2006;174:817-23.
6. Rahman NM, Maskell NA, West A, et al. Intrapleural use of tissue plasminogen activator and DNase in pleural infection. *New England Journal of Medicine* 2011;365:518-26.
7. Shiraishi Y, Kryukov K, Tomomatsu K, et al. Diagnosis of pleural empyema/parapneumonic effusion by next-generation sequencing. *Infect Dis (Lond)* 2021;53:450-9.
8. Kanellakis NI, Wrightson JM, Gerry S, et al. The bacteriology of pleural infection (TORPIDS): an exploratory metagenomics analysis through next generation sequencing. *The Lancet Microbe* 2022;3:e294-e302.
9. Menzies SM, Rahman NM, Wrightson JM, et al. Blood culture bottle culture of pleural fluid in pleural infection. *Thorax* 2011;66:658-62.
10. Boyanova L, Vladimir D, Gergova G, et al. Anaerobic microbiology in 198 cases of pleural empyema: a Bulgarian study. *Anaerobe* 2004;10:261-7.
11. Corcoran JP, Wrightson JM, Belcher E, DeCamp MM, Feller-Kopman D, Rahman NM. Pleural infection: past, present, and future directions. *Lancet Respir Med* 2015;3:563-77.
12. Schlaberg R, Chiu CY, Miller S, Procop GW, Weinstock G. Validation of Metagenomic Next-Generation Sequencing Tests for Universal Pathogen Detection. *Arch Pathol Lab Med* 2017;141:776-86.
13. Marchesi JR, Ravel J. The vocabulary of microbiome research: a proposal. *Microbiome* 2015;3:31.
14. Hilton SK, Castro-Nallar E, Pérez-Losada M, et al. Metataxonomic and metagenomic approaches vs. culture-based techniques for clinical pathology. *Front Microbiol* 2016;7:484.
15. Dyrhovden R, Nygaard RM, Patel R, Ulvestad E, Kommedal Ø. The bacterial aetiology of pleural empyema. A descriptive and comparative metagenomic study. *Clin Microbiol Infect* 2019;25:981-6.
16. Xu H, Hu X, Wang W, et al. Clinical application and evaluation of metagenomic next-generation sequencing in pulmonary infection with pleural effusion. *Infect Drug Resist* 2022;15:2813-24.
17. Gimenez-Miranda L, Samhoury BF, Wolf MJ, et al. Diagnostic Yield of 16S Ribosomal Ribonucleic Acid Gene-Based Targeted Metagenomic Sequencing for Evaluation of Pleural Space Infection: A Prospective Study. *Mayo Clin Proc Innov Qual Outcomes* 2023;7:373-81.
18. Elsheikh A, Bhatnagar M, Rahman NM. Diagnosis and management of pleural infection. *Breathe (Sheff)* 2023;19:230146.
19. Liu G, Wang L, Li X, et al. The value of next-generation metagenomic sequencing in pathogen detection of pleural effusions and ascites from children with sepsis. *Front Cell Infect Microbiol* 2023;13:1130483.
20. Liu XP, Mao CX, Wang GS, Zhang MZ. Metagenomic next-generation sequencing for pleural effusions induced by viral pleurisy: A case report. *World J Clin Cases* 2023;11:844-51.
21. Psallidas I, Kanellakis NI, Bhatnagar R, et al. A pilot feasibility study in establishing the role of ultrasound-guided pleural biopsies in pleural infection (The AUDIO Study). *Chest* 2018;154:766-72.
22. Madden DE, Olagoke O, Baird T, et al. Express yourself: quantitative real-time PCR assays for rapid chromosomal antimicrobial resistance detection in *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* 2022;66:e0020422.
23. Herlemann DP, Labrenz M, Jurgens K, Bertilsson S, Waniek JJ, Andersson AF. Transitions in bacterial communities along the 2000 km salinity gradient of the Baltic Sea. *ISME J* 2011;5:1571-9.
24. Nelson MT, Pope CE, Marsh RL, et al. Human and extracellular DNA depletion for metagenomic analysis of complex clinical infection samples yields optimized viable microbiome profiles. *Cell Rep* 2019;26:2227-40.e5.

25. Nadkarni MA, Martin FE, Jacques NA, Hunter N. Determination of bacterial load by real-time PCR using a broad-range (universal) probe and primers set. *Microbiology (Reading)* 2002;148:257-66.
26. Ahmadi B, Hashemi SJ, Zaini F, et al. A case of onychomycosis caused by *Aspergillus candidus*. *Med Mycol Case Rep* 2012;1:45-8.
27. Klaassen CH, Jeunink MA, Prinsen CF, et al. Quantification of human DNA in feces as a diagnostic test for the presence of colorectal cancer. *Clin Chem* 2003;49:1185-7.
28. Light RW, Macgregor MI, Luchsinger PC, Ball WC, Jr. Pleural effusions: the diagnostic separation of transudates and exudates. *Ann Intern Med* 1972;77:507-13.
29. Insa R, Marin M, Martin A, et al. Systematic use of universal 16S rRNA gene polymerase chain reaction (PCR) and sequencing for processing pleural effusions improves conventional culture techniques. *Medicine (Baltimore)* 2012;91:103-10.
30. Nguyen S, Baker K, Padman BS, et al. Bacteriophage transcytosis provides a mechanism to cross epithelial cell layers. *mBio* 2017;8.
31. Brown-Jaque M, Muniesa M, Navarro F. Bacteriophages in clinical samples can interfere with microbiological diagnostic tools. *Sci Rep* 2016;6:33000.
32. Lim T. Recent advances in the management of pleural sepsis: What is the evidence? *Respirology* 1999;4:207-12.
33. Salter SJ, Cox MJ, Turek EM, et al. Reagent and laboratory contamination can critically impact sequence-based microbiome analyses. *BMC Biol* 2014;12:87.
34. Hadano Y, Ito K, Suzuki J, Kawamura I, Kurai H, Ohkusu K. *Moraxella osloensis*: an unusual cause of central venous catheter infection in a cancer patient. *Int J Gen Med* 2012;5:875-7.
35. Kwok B, Wu BG, Kocak IF, et al. Pleural fluid microbiota as a biomarker for malignancy and prognosis. *Sci Rep* 2023;13:2229.
36. Kea B, Hall MK, Wang R. Recognising bias in studies of diagnostic tests part 2: interpreting and verifying the index test. *Emerg Med J* 2019;36:501-5.

	Metagenomics	Metataxonomics	Panbacterial qPCR	Culture
Metagenomics	1	0.69	0.69	0.56
Metataxonomics		1	0.85	0.39
Panbacterial qPCR			1	0.39
Culture				1




	Metagenomics	Metataxonomics	Panbacterial qPCR	Culture	≥1 molecular method [†]	PSI Gold Standard*
Metagenomics	1	0.69	0.69	0.56	0.8	0.72
Metataxonomics		1	0.85	0.39	0.8	0.83
Panbacterial qPCR			1	0.39	0.76	0.78
Culture				1	0.63	0.75
≥1 molecular method [†]					1	0.85
PSI Gold Standard*						1



PSI cohort

Control cohort



Fusobacterium nucleatum
Streptococcus mitis
Enterococcus faecium
Klebsiella pneumoniae
Streptococcus sp. oral taxon 431
Prevotella enoeca
Rothia mucilaginosa
Prevotella intermedia
Streptococcus intermedius
Candida dubliniensis
Haemophilus parainfluenzae
Streptococcus sp. oral taxon 064
Streptococcus dysgalactiae
Streptococcus sp. A12
Veillonella atypica
Streptococcus agalactiae
Capnocytophaga leadbetteri
Streptococcus viridans
Moraxella osloensis

Staphylococcus phage Andhra
Streptococcus anginosus
Streptococcus pyogenes
Staphylococcus aureus
Streptococcus oralis
Streptococcus salivarius
Streptococcus pseudopneumoniae
Streptococcus gordonii
Actinomyces odontolyticus
Fusobacterium hwasookii
Streptococcus sp. HSISM1
[Halella] seregens
Prevotella loescheii
Fusobacterium sp. oral taxon 203
Escherichia coli
Gemella sanguinis
Streptococcus thermophilus
Prevotella buccae
Capnocytophaga gingivalis

Prevotella oris
Streptococcus pneumoniae
Prevotella pleuritidis
Mycoplasma hyorhinis
Staphylococcus saprophyticus
Gemella haemolysans
Streptococcus sp. ChDC B345
Streptococcus parasanguinis
Carnobacterium divergens
Streptococcus cristatus
Streptococcus australis
Streptococcus sp. FDAARGOS_192
Porphyromonas gingivalis
Adeno-associated dependovirus A
Streptococcus sanguinis
Tannerella forsythia
Streptococcus equinus
Rothia dentocariosa
Prevotella jejunii

PSI cohort

Control cohort

