

1 **Thoughts and perspectives of metagenome sequencing as a diagnostic tool for**
2 **infectious disease: an interpretive phenomenological study**

3 Hannah Trivett ⁽¹⁾, Alistair C. Darby ⁽¹⁾, Oyinlola Oyeboode ⁽²⁾

4 1. Institute of Infection, Veterinary and Ecological Sciences, Bioscience Building, University of
5 Liverpool. L69 7ZB

6 2. Wolfson Institute of Population Health, Queen Mary University of London, Mile End Road,
7 London. E1 4NS

8 **Correspondence to:** H.trivett@liverpool.ac.uk

9

10 **Abstract**

11 **Background-** Effective infectious disease diagnostics (IDD) are vital for informing clinical
12 decision-making regarding the treatment and patient management of disease and infections.
13 Conventional clinical methods rely upon culture-dependent techniques, and there has been little
14 shift in the acceptance and integration of culture-independent sequencing methods into routine
15 clinical IDD. This study explored stakeholders' experiences within IDD, including those working
16 in clinical settings and those conducting research at the forefront of microbial genomics. We aimed
17 to identify factors driving the development and implementation of metagenome sequencing as a
18 routine diagnostic.

19 **Methods-** Virtual semi-structured interviews were conducted with purposively selected
20 individuals involved in IDD. The interviews explored the experiences of implementing
21 metagenome sequencing as a diagnostic tool and decisions about which diagnostics are used for

22 identifying bacteria-causing infections. Thematic analysis was used to analyse the data, and an
23 Interpretive Phenomenological approach was used throughout.

24 **Results-** Ten individuals were interviewed between July 2021 and October 2021, including
25 Clinical scientists, consultants, and professors in academia. Their experience ranged from no
26 knowledge of metagenome sequencing to an expert understanding of the phenomenon. Five
27 themes emerged: Diagnostic Choice, Infrastructure, Open Data Sharing, COVID-19, and
28 Communication. Participants recognised the need for new diagnostics to be implemented to
29 overcome the limitations of current diagnostic approaches but highlighted the barriers to
30 integrating new diagnostics into clinical settings, such as the impact on clinical decision-making,
31 accreditation, and cost. However, participants felt that lessons could be learnt from using
32 metagenomics in COVID-19 and how other diagnostic platforms have been integrated into clinical
33 settings over the last 20 years.

34 **Conclusions** -The study provided clear evidence to address the knowledge gap in current literature
35 and practice for developing and implementing metagenome sequencing as a potential IDD. The
36 knowledge of new and upcoming genomic diagnostic testing is not equally distributed throughout
37 the UK, impacting the understanding and drive to integrate metagenome sequencing into routine
38 clinical diagnostics. Improvements in access to new diagnostics could improve patient treatment
39 and management and positively impact public health.

40

41

42 **Keywords-** Clinical metagenomics, Interpretive phenomenological analysis, healthcare
43 professionals, infectious disease diagnostics, microbiology

44

45 **Background**

46 The term metagenomics was first published in 1998, referring to directly sequencing a collection
47 of genes from a sample and analysing similarly to a single genome (1). Shotgun metagenomics
48 uses a hypothesis-free, unbiased approach to study the structure and function of the entirety of an
49 environment's nucleotide sequences, including parasites, fungi, bacteria and viruses. The
50 technological advancements in sequencing have made metagenomic next-generation sequencing
51 (mNGS) an attractive choice for clinical personnel to apply metagenomic methods to infectious
52 disease diagnostics (IDD).

53 Current clinical diagnostic methods for bacterial pathogens are culture-dependent, requiring the
54 growth and isolation of organisms using methods like serology, Polymerase Chain Reaction
55 (PCR), and Matrix-assisted laser desorption-ionization time of flight mass spectrometry (MALDI-
56 TOF) [2]. However, they are limited by the need for apriori knowledge of the potential pathogens
57 present, and MALDI TOF is limited by the availability of genomes in curated databases to
58 determine the pathogen present within the sample (3). In addition, in some cases, such as those
59 involving slow-growing organisms, it can take as much as two weeks to cultivate a sample,
60 inhibiting the rapid diagnosis and treatment of some infectious diseases.

61 mNGS can overcome the current limitations of culture-based ‘gold standard’ methods used today
62 in clinical laboratories. Technologies such as Oxford Nanopore offer real-time profiling of
63 bacterial genomes for rapid and accurate pathogen detection. A culture-independent method of
64 surveying the sample site of infection enables clinicians to capture novel pathogens, which may
65 go undetected when using diagnostics such as PCR (4). The cumulation of millions of bacterial
66 sequences provides scopes for mNGS to act as a toolkit identifying pathogens responsible for

67 infections and capturing antimicrobial resistance profiles, functional gene profiling and virulence
68 gene identification simultaneously from a single extracted sample.

69 Yet, whilst mNGS offers the potential to revolutionise IDD with a suite of clinical and surveillance
70 applications, there has been a shortfall in early adoption to bring this diagnostic into clinical use
71 (5). Why clinicians are not utilising the latest mNGS methods is under-researched, with a lack of
72 qualitative research to understand the current diagnostic landscape and to evaluate why the
73 landscape has remained unchanged for many years. Current literature is saturated with publications
74 on clinical metagenomics, covering topics such as its utility and its limitations when applied to the
75 current diagnostic landscape (6–8); however, there is a gap in the literature which contextualises
76 the recent clinical advancements in IDD and the barriers that hinder the implementation of new
77 diagnostic frameworks. Perspectives and opinions of clinical diagnostic stakeholders influence the
78 uptake of new diagnostic technologies. Therefore, collecting qualitative evidence to understand
79 the utility of mNGS in clinical settings and the barriers to its implementation may allow
80 innovations that will move diagnostics into the next-generation sequencing era.

81 This study aimed to explore the opinions and views of individuals within IDD on the utility of
82 mNGS to support the future development of genomic diagnostic methods for routine clinical use.

83

84

85

86

87 **Methodology**

88 The qualitative enquiry undertook an interpretive phenomenological approach (IPA), documenting
89 the lived experiences of stakeholders participating in the study. IPA is a helpful approach many
90 healthcare researchers adopt to allow others to learn from individuals' experiences (9,10). The
91 reporting of this study was facilitated by using the consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative
92 research (COREQ) (11).

93 The study gained ethical approval from the Institute of Life Course and Medical Sciences Research
94 Ethics Committee at the University of Liverpool (Ethical review reference 9855).

95 **Author reflection**

96 The research team was made up of three individuals, including two women and one man. HT is
97 trained to BSc in Microbiology and is undertaking a PhD in Microbial genomics, supervised by
98 AD and OO, who hold PhDs and are professors in Public Health (OO) and Genomics (AD). HT
99 and OO had training, and OO had previous experience in conducting qualitative data collection.
100 The research team described the reasons for doing the research within participant recruitment
101 emails as being to understand the current landscape of clinical diagnostics for infectious diseases
102 and the added value of clinical metagenomics in clinical laboratories, to support the integration
103 and development of clinical metagenomic pipelines fit for routine clinical use.

104 **Participant recruitment**

105 Participants were purposively recruited to ensure clinical perspectives that were information-rich
106 with various viewpoints and experiences from the individuals were obtained. Participants had
107 differing levels of epistemology of the phenomenon to ensure a variety of experiences were
108 covered as well as spanning across geographical location, department, length of service and


109 profession (Table 1, Figure 1). The target number of participants for the study was 10. IPA
110 requires a small sample size of around 5-10 participants, allowing for an in-depth analysis of
111 everyone's experiences (12).

112

113

	Gender	Profession	Knowledge of metagenome sequencing applied to Infectious Disease Diagnostics
P1	Female	Consultant clinical scientist and academic researcher	Expert knowledge
P2	Female	Academic researcher	Expert knowledge
P3	Male	Infectious disease consultant	Some knowledge
P4	Male	Consultant and academic researcher	Good Knowledge
P5	Male	Academic researcher and physician	Expert knowledge
P6	Male	Consultant clinical scientist	Good Knowledge
P7	Female	Infectious disease consultant	No Knowledge
P8	Male	Clinical director	No knowledge
P9	Female	Academia	Expert knowledge
P10	Male	Academia	Expert knowledge

114 **Table 1- Participant demographics**



115

116 **Figure 1 – Map of participants' UK locations. 2 participants are based in London, 1**
117 **Participant is based in the Southeast, and 2 participants are in the East of England. One**
118 **participant was in the West Midlands, and four were in the Northwest.**

119 **Data Collection**

120 Semi-structured interviews took place via Microsoft Teams. HT conducted interviews between
121 July 2021 and November 2021. The semi-structured interview guide was created, informed by a
122 literature review, to allow the interviewer to guide the line of questioning—the open-ended
123 questions provided flexibility in exploring topics that may emerge in interviews. The interview
124 guide was checked by two authors (OO and AD) and piloted before beginning data collection with
125 an individual independent of the study. A copy of the guide was sent to participants before their
126 interviews.

127 **Data analysis**

128 Interviews were video and audio-recorded, and the data were transcribed verbatim in Microsoft
129 Word and analysed using an IPA by HT (2). All data was anonymised, and thematic analysis was
130 conducted. Open coding was performed, identifying experiential statements for each participant,
131 which were then grouped, looking for convergence and divergence between participant
132 experiences; these groups formed the overarching themes of the qualitative enquiry, which were
133 named using words closely linked to the data (13). OO audited the analysis to ensure reliability. A
134 draft of the findings was made available to participants to allow them to check over the study to
135 ensure the information accurately represented their views.

136

137

138

139 Results

140 Ten participants took part in interviews lasting between 30 and 60 minutes. Participant
141 characteristics are shown in Table 1. Five themes were identified from the interviews with all
142 participants, with associated sub-themes (Figure 2).

Diagnostic Choice	Infrastructure	Open data sharing	COVID-19	Communication
<ul style="list-style-type: none">•A diagnostic toolkit for clinical laboratories•The implications of cost•The implications of speed	<ul style="list-style-type: none">•The current landscape of clinical metagenomics•Training and workforce•Accreditation and standardisation•Digitilisation of data	<ul style="list-style-type: none">•A patient's rights to privacy•Sharing data improves surveillance at a local level	<ul style="list-style-type: none">•Proof of concept learning by example•A platform to build capacity	<ul style="list-style-type: none">•Intrahospital communication•Interhospital communication•The public and commercial sector

143

144 Figure 2- Themes and Subthemes

145

146 1. Diagnostic choice

147 Diagnostic choice was highlighted as an important concept which encompasses the variety of
148 methods to identify pathogens causing infections. Participants offered a range of examples
149 currently available. However, the availability of tools was subjective to each hospital, with some
150 having a whole suite of diagnostics, including genomics, serology, MALDI-TOF and other
151 hospitals limited to culture swabbing to screen for infections and limited PCR.

152

153 **A diagnostic toolkit for clinical laboratories**

154 Throughout the interviews, participants reinforced the benefit of introducing mNGS into clinical
155 laboratories, providing another tool to the armoury and increasing the power of choice to suit
156 clinical needs; however, participants did highlight that mNGS diagnostics would not be a one-size-
157 fits-all approach. Instead, there would be a suitable place and right time to use within the spectrum
158 of tools currently available. Clinical scientists and consultants would have to learn when the
159 appropriate time to use metagenomics to diagnose would be.

160 *P4 "There are new molecular tests, and actually, there is a steady stream of the introduction of*
161 *new things to do in response to clinical need. However, there is a set of technologies that are*
162 *finding it harder to get into the clinical place for infectious diseases, of which genome sequencing*
163 *is one."*

164 *P1 "I don't think it's a panacea, I think it's very much part of our toolkit, and there will be things*
165 *that are appropriate to use it for, and there will be things that are less appropriate for it to be*
166 *useful. We have to see it as not one or the other but as a spectrum of clinical choices in terms of*
167 *diagnostics where, just like everything else, I choose the right test for the right question."*

168 **The implication of cost**

169 There was a broad consensus that cost significantly contributed to the choice of diagnostics on
170 offer, which in some cases impacted the development and integration of metagenomics for routine
171 clinical use. Whilst the affordability of genomic machinery and library preparations has reduced
172 considerably since sequencing first came on the horizon, many commercial providers of diagnostic
173 platforms are still directed towards the research sector, where funding is far more accessible

174 through research grants; thus, distribution is geared towards those who can pay. Several
175 participants stressed that their ability to introduce sequencing into the clinical diagnostic
176 frameworks was due to the procurement of research grants rather than funding available directly
177 from the Trusts or government.

178 *P2 "All of the sequencing we did was based on a research budget, so we need, we need substantial*
179 *funding from the NHS in order to roll this out, that's the first thing."*

180 *P1 "If I was working in a normal setting and I wasn't a researcher, then I would have access to*
181 *the training, knowledge, understanding and money it takes to bring these things in to get the data*
182 *that you need to be able to transition it. So, most of our work happens because of the fact that I*
183 *have research funding."*

184 Disparities were seen between smaller district hospitals and those in larger cities with greater
185 access to funding. Participants from smaller hospitals shared their frustrations around the need for
186 more funding to facilitate new diagnostic developments, compared to those from larger city-based
187 hospitals, highlighting the inconsistency in the availability of diagnostics across the UK.
188 Collectively, participants deployed in clinical settings commented on the need for equitable
189 distribution of diagnostics to provide the same level of clinical care for all patients.

190 *P1 "If you're going to make a change across the board, we can't be disadvantaging somebody in*
191 *South Devon just because of where they live. We need to be doing this in an equitable fashion*
192 *where those that need it have access."*

193 Throughout the interviews, the distribution of money was identified as a critical limiting factor to
194 implementing new diagnostic frameworks, requiring a business case model to reflect the cost-

195 effectiveness and patient benefit of introducing metagenomics. Participants within clinical settings
196 acknowledged the need for better collaboration between those on the laboratory frontline and
197 health economists to bring about a strengthened argument to advocate for the successes of
198 sequencing and the direct impact introducing new diagnostics would have on relieving the patient
199 pathways.

200 *P8 "It's been very painful trying to bring those methods on board, and I think it's been very painful*
201 *trying to demonstrate the overall cost-effectiveness. All people look at what the acquisition costs*
202 *are in pathology, and we don't have enough money, and it's just taking that whole health economy*
203 *view, which we are, I think."*

204 **The implication of speed**

205 While cost was a significant barrier to implementing metagenome-based diagnostics, the speed of
206 getting actionable clinical results from metagenomic methods was also a key factor as to why many
207 hospitals do not offer metagenome-based diagnostics in their laboratories. If new technologies can
208 bring about enough change, funders are willing to pay.

209 *P1 "If it gives you enough of a management change, you can usually find a payoff; what you can't*
210 *do is fix time ... If I'm not getting it in a clinically actionable time frame, then it is of interest, it is*
211 *not of use."*

212 *P4 "There needs to be a distributed model for the advancement of infectious diseases diagnostic*
213 *capability, where the testing is done as close to the front line as possible... I think you need to have*
214 *a more local approach with infectious diseases and testing because things need to be faster, and*
215 *people need to understand what the clinical implications are."*

216 The importance of speed was reiterated when addressing technology's overall impact on guiding
217 treatment and patient management. Culture-independent methods of diagnosing infectious
218 diseases must reduce the turnaround time between a patient presenting with symptoms and
219 delivering the correct therapy in response to identifying the causative agent. Participants identified
220 that whilst the processing of samples may be relatively short, the time the sample is on the machine
221 may be too long to provide treatment in a clinically actionable time frame, limiting the uptake in
222 implementing metagenomics as a diagnostic.

223 *P4 "If your result is going to take more than five days to come back, it's probably irrelevant. I*
224 *mean, it's academically interesting, but it's not going to guide therapy."*

225 **2. Infrastructure**

226 Infrastructure embodies the facilities and systems required to establish metagenomic sequencing
227 in clinical settings. The participant's perspectives of infrastructure included physical laboratory
228 space, digital space (such as computational setup and storage), and the workforce and training;
229 collectively, all parts of infrastructure must be addressed for the successful integration of
230 metagenomics.

231 **Current landscape of clinical metagenomics**

232 Participants reflected on various barriers they experienced, stalling the integration of metagenomic
233 diagnostic frameworks. Although participants could see the potential benefits of introducing point-
234 of-care metagenomics, they commented that they had seen a slow uptake with new technologies,
235 lagging behind use in research- many believed they did not have the infrastructure to facilitate
236 implementation.

237 *P6 "It's still so specialised, and should it be? Or should we be able to be offering this as a wider*
238 *method? And I think, I really think we should be; we just don't seem to be able to get across that*
239 *hurdle."*

240 Current UK-centralised models of whole genome sequencing and metagenomic analysis delay
241 response time for directed therapies due to the extended turnaround time of shipment, sequencing,
242 and relaying information to the clinical microbiology team. The bottleneck impacts clinicians'
243 decision-making and could have potential implications of adding to the antimicrobial resistance
244 crisis by administering antibiotics that are not purposefully prescribed for specific bacterial
245 infections. Current responses are primarily to administer empirical treatments before the pathogen
246 is identified. This can prolong the patients' treatment, widening the gap between admission and
247 treatment with specific narrow-spectrum antibiotics better suited for the infection.

248 *P7 "I think it's really important because now we send [a patient sample or isolate] for typing and*
249 *we get a result, I don't know, three weeks later, by which time you know you've already acted on*
250 *basis of your clinical suspicion."*

251 Decentralising laboratories and providing local infrastructure can overcome many of the obstacles
252 documented by the individuals in the study. One participant described their positive experiences
253 of laboratories in another country where mNGS was well sustained in local hospital laboratories.
254 The infrastructure for mNGS offered solutions to barriers seen in the UK, such as turnaround time
255 when metagenomics and genome sequencing were local to the patients.

256 *P9 "In Germany, [there are] small regional centres as well as the Robert Koch Institute in Berlin,*
257 *so they can respond much more quickly in terms of turn-around time because they have all those*
258 *local labs."*

259 **Training and workforce**

260 Currently, Biomedical and Clinical Scientists have few opportunities to access certified training in
261 bioinformatics, a vital skill for interpreting genomic data to impact clinical decisions for the
262 treatment of patients. Participants indicated that re-training and educating current laboratory
263 personnel is essential for the uptake of new diagnostic frameworks, such as metagenomic
264 sequencing, which is unavailable or has limited availability to clinical staff.

265 *P9 "I think it would be invaluable for the diagnostics team to have at least some level of*
266 *[bioinformatic] knowledge because I think that it empowers people also to have the confidence to*
267 *interpret any data that comes through."*

268 Participants based within clinical laboratories expressed that the current array of skills within
269 clinical laboratories lacks the expertise required to establish a full mNGS workflow. Currently,
270 many laboratories rely on local collaborators to interpret bioinformatic data, which has
271 implications for clinicians receiving data within a clinically actionable timeframe. Introducing new
272 team members, such as bioinformaticians, would alleviate the pressures of outsourcing and thus
273 overcome another barrier to implementing metagenomics.

274 *P3 "One of the things that we are struggling with is that we're relying on bioinformatic support*
275 *from elsewhere and not having that on-site."*

276 However, several individuals acknowledged that workforce staffing levels could be better and that
277 introducing new metagenomic diagnostics frameworks may be beyond the current scope of these
278 staff numbers.

279 *P6 "If we are introducing an entirely new workflow, it has a staffing implication and generally,*
280 *labs are poorly staffed at the moment."*

281 **Accreditation and standardisation**

282 Participants working within microbial laboratories shared the constraints they have experienced
283 when bringing new diagnostic techniques to test, validate and roll out. Many reagents are labelled
284 as 'research use only', which restricts clinical usage as the reagents do not qualify for medical
285 application, limiting the availability of reagents that are permitted for medical purposes.

286 *P1 "Accreditation is a nightmare, so all of our tests have to be accredited, so they have to be ISO*
287 *accredited by a group called UKAS who come in and assess us. All of the reagents that are used*
288 *for whole genome sequencing and metagenomics say they're for research use only, and therefore,*
289 *to get accreditation with a whole bunch of research reagents is incredibly difficult."*

290 In addition, providing evidence for the standardisation of diagnostics processes could be improved.
291 One individual highlighted that many clinical samples are small in quantity, meaning processes
292 cannot be standardised with the same sample; data would be varied with no standard control to
293 validate against. The metagenomic pipeline for diagnostics is far-reaching, applying to various
294 sample types and microorganisms; however, participants identified this as challenging. The variety
295 of outcomes from analyses could complicate the standardisation processes as each sample would,
296 in principle, need its validation.

297 *P10 "I think you could validate metagenomics diagnostic service, but the outcome would probably*
298 *not be a diagnosis. The outcome would probably be a data set, you know, because it would be hard*
299 *to put in a random sample, and you come out with an answer because we just don't have enough."*

300 **Digitalisation of data**

301 During the interview process, there were frequent discussions of inadequate internal laboratory
302 systems used for data storage for storing large data sets produced by genomic machinery. Many
303 organisations have begun to digitalise their data storage and management system infrastructure to
304 access patient data, streamlining data accessibility. With extensive data footprints in genomics,
305 IDD departments should engage with other departments to learn from others' experiences in
306 digitalisation to help integrate and develop genomics in healthcare.

307 *P8 "This sort of data won't fit into most laboratory systems, I would suggest. So, there's a lot of*
308 *work ongoing at the moment about digitising cellular pathology, and you might want to piggyback*
309 *onto that to find ways of getting this data stored."*

310 The infrastructure required for the technology spans the whole pipeline from physical laboratory
311 space to data storage to technology for clinical interpretation. Participants questioned their ability
312 to understand and clinically interpret the data. Participants flagged the need for infrastructure that
313 is easy for individuals to get to grips with and that can provide the correct information that is
314 clinically usable, not just laboratory infrastructure and data storage.

315 *P7 "I think all technology has to be right, not just the assay, but the reporting side of things. But*
316 *we need kind of more insight as to how to report them in a clinically useful way."*

317

318

319

320 **3. Open data sharing**

321 Genomic data is often open access and widely shared within the research community. Having data
322 openly available and easy to access accelerates research to find new ways of testing new
323 hypotheses and developing new analysis methods. Participants recognised that challenges are met
324 by the ethical considerations of a patient’s right to privacy versus sharing healthcare data to learn
325 and develop genomic expertise for wider public health benefit.

326 **A patients’ rights to privacy**

327 Open accessibility and the ability to share data are core principles for developing and
328 understanding infectious diseases. However, patient information from clinical records is
329 confidential, and restraints are in place to maintain patient privacy of personal information. Here,
330 we see a conflict between the core principle of healthcare systems respecting a patient's right to
331 privacy and the ability to expand our public data repositories to keep up with evolving infectious
332 diseases and knowledge of diseases.

333 *P10 “Genomics comes from an open data kind of culture, but clinical diagnostics most certainly*
334 *doesn’t for obvious reasons, and so does public health epidemiology. So, there’s a culture clash*
335 *there between whether genomes are public goods, which should be deposited in the public*
336 *database as soon as you get them, versus people’s rights to privacy for their diagnosis, and this is*
337 *the general culture of public health which is more closed which may need changing a little bit.”*

338 **Sharing data improves surveillance at a local level**

339 A comprehensive application of data sharing impacts individual patients for diagnostic purposes
340 and disseminates knowledge and understanding of the disease and epidemiology, guiding

341 therapeutic development. Participants highlighted the positive impact of a local data generation
342 fed into a centralised data repository. This data can guide disease surveillance and be used to
343 understand better infectious diseases and their evolution, similar to what was seen from COG-UK
344 and the developments in the knowledge of COVID-19.

345 *P2 "Data generated locally can be collected for national surveillance, and that's an amazing*
346 *opportunity.... If you had a centralised database, you could get some amazing insights into what's*
347 *happening across the country."*

348

349 **4. COVID-19**

350 COVID-19 was one of the largest modern-day international outbreaks documented, and the use of
351 genomics to identify and survey the virus is a prime example of the utility of metagenomics within
352 public health. Collectively, participants commended the use of metagenomics in this outbreak,
353 offering several benefits they saw from its implementation worldwide.

354 **Proof of concept, learning by example**

355 Participants offered an insight into their experience and opinions of the capabilities of utilising
356 genomics. They believed the COVID-19 model provided proof of concept for further integration
357 as a diagnostic in a clinical setting. COVID-19 provided evidence for rapid delivery of sequencing
358 and its positive impact on public health.

359 *P2 "SARS-CoV-2 is an exemplary example of where sequencing can bring impact to public health*
360 *and individuals, so it's gone beyond proof. It is being used every day and based on that, and I don't*

361 *think there's any going back to thinking that sequencing is some sort of luxury, and so now we*
362 *need to work out where it's going to be used when it's going to be used."*

363 Participants highlighted that in recent years, there had been an uptake in routine whole genome
364 sequencing for several pathogens within the centralised model of the genome sequencing service
365 provision provided in the UK, including Tuberculosis and Salmonella. Most recently,
366 metagenomics was used to identify COVID-19, providing an excellent example of the positive
367 impact metagenome sequencing can have on public health.

368 *P10 "The COVID experience, I think, pushed the argument forward for routine use of sequencing,*
369 *as nothing else has done. There are routine uses of genomics now for TB, Gram-negative*
370 *foodborne pathogens like salmonella, HIV, hepatitis maybe, but those are the exceptions rather*
371 *than the rule of thumb."*

372 **A platform to build capacity**

373 The influx in demand for sequencing technology and reagents from COVID-19 sequencing meant
374 that an increase in manufacturing capacity was established. Increased production of reagents and
375 sequencing platforms has improved the accessibility of consumables to medical laboratories,
376 increasing the likelihood of integrating new diagnostic frameworks into IDD departments.

377 *P1 "The big advantage of all the stuff that's going on for me in the whole genome sequencing world*
378 *is that it is driving manufacturers to make stuff that is useful for me. So even though I'm not getting*
379 *the data, the benefit will be that I now have like the next evolution of Nanopore which means that*
380 *I can run one or two samples instead."*

381 Participants expressed positivity towards what COVID-19 sequencing platforms had done for the
382 visibility of genomic sequencing, pushing forward the case for implementing metagenome
383 sequencing as a routine clinical diagnostic.

384 *P5 "The pandemic and the experiences with sequencing SARS-CoV-2 brought it into very sharp*
385 *focus, and that it has motivated not only governments and health agencies but indeed has started*
386 *to resonate with the public."*

387

388 **5. Communication**

389 Participants collectively acknowledged communication was a driver for implementing mNGS
390 diagnostic frameworks in clinical laboratories, identifying three key relationships that facilitate
391 this: communication channels within hospitals, between hospitals, and between hospitals and other
392 organisations, such as academia and commercial businesses.

393 **Intrahospital communication**

394 Intrahospital communication is defined as the sharing of information within one institution. UK
395 hospital organisation sees departments running independently of one another, with pots of money
396 funding departments in silos and not equal between different disciplines. With departments
397 working autonomously, there needs to be more communication between groups, which can make
398 healthcare disjointed.

399 *P9 "Hospitals are really bad at speaking between disciplines in different clinical care."*

400 One participant compared their experiences of working in UK and German hospitals.
401 Communication channels within hospital departments were more established, with crosstalk
402 between departments, utilising genomic machinery that other departments already have in play.
403 Collaborating within organisations provided efficiency in integrating new technologies, rapidly
404 adopting new diagnostic workflows, and positively impacting patient management and treatment
405 with the latest technology.

406 *P9 "I walked around the big paediatric hospital here in [German city], so this was with the*
407 *infectious disease paediatrician, he took me to the guys that all do the rare diseases, and he goes,*
408 *'we just use all of their Novaseq to do our sequencing. Why would we buy it when they've got it*
409 *down the corridor?' and I'm like, 100%, but I was like a bit like, you know, mind blown because I*
410 *was like, this doesn't necessarily happen in other situations."*

411 **Interhospital communication**

412 Interhospital communication is the sharing of information between multiple sites of clinical
413 organisations. Participants highlighted that early adoption of metagenome sequencing will likely
414 be in larger hospitals. The knowledge and experience of setting up and establishing frameworks
415 should be disseminated to other sites to streamline the integration of metagenomics for other
416 organisations.

417 *P4 "Other places, each one will have their journey, and so it just needs to be focused on. We need*
418 *to learn from a few sites that have started to do it and listen to them like the conversation we're*
419 *having now and share experiences."*

420 However, other participants believed not all hospitals easily communicate their experiences to
421 other microbiology diagnostic teams to help others transition to new mNGS clinical diagnostics.

422 *P1 "I just get really concerned that all of these things happen in pockets and by people do stuff in*
423 *pockets without a strategic view, without them feeding back to the right places. Then actually, it's*
424 *just all of us repeating work."*

425 A few participants focused on their positive collaboration experience during COVID-19, where
426 effective communication between local hospitals and COVID-19 sequencing hubs improved
427 collaborative efforts. This streamlines responses, the use of genome sequencing, and learning from
428 the experiences of others to enhance the integration of these technologies.

429 *P6 "I think it's been really helpful, particularly in our network, there was the weekly meetings have*
430 *been very useful for disseminating information about what we need because there was so much*
431 *change happening; being able to deal with that as a group is better than everyone just doing their*
432 *own thing and essentially duplicating work to deal with problems."*

433 **The public and commercial sector**

434 Involving all participants in implementing new diagnostics for clinical use is vital for innovation.
435 Participants collectively commented on better communication between all parties engaged in
436 clinical diagnostics.

437 *P9 "Definitely a disconnect between the scientists that are maybe trying to drive this forward*
438 *versus the people that are actually in the clinic. I think improving that communication between*
439 *them is really important when we do this."*

440 Participants within clinical settings highlighted that metagenomics is not the first technology
441 system integrated into clinical settings, calling on their experience of MALDI-TOF integration
442 into clinical laboratories. Integration and the development of new technologies require clear
443 communication channels to produce clinically relevant platforms and solve current problems
444 microbial laboratories see today in diagnostics. Improving communication between all parties,
445 academia, industry, and healthcare, would increase productivity in developing clinically relevant
446 products that are fit for purpose.

447 *P8 "Working with manufacturers is important, isn't it. because increasingly, we're seeing the big*
448 *manufacturers trying to set up whole systems for laboratories that integrate. So, there's a blood*
449 *culture machine, there's a MALDI machine, and there's automatic sensitivity testing, there's maybe*
450 *some PCR machines. So, it's getting those manufacturers to develop the platforms to integrate*
451 *metagenomics into the whole laboratory and that that would help move things forward as well."*

452 *P4 "You need to align the funding bodies. We need to bring in all the stakeholders as equal*
453 *partners...I think it needs an insightful, joined up, sort of mutually supporting and engaging*
454 *partnership framework so that everyone can benefit from it."*

455

456

457


458

459

460 **Discussion**

461 The study aimed to assess the opinions and perspectives of stakeholders of IDD, using their
462 experiences to understand the current diagnostic landscape of infectious disease and the
463 implications affecting the integration of metagenomics for routine clinical use. To the best of our
464 knowledge, the findings outlined in this paper contribute to the first interpretative
465 phenomenological account of experiences surrounding this topic.

466 From the analysis, it was clear that the reflections from participants presented a complexity of
467 interrelated components that fell into categories of barriers and/or facilitators that impact the
468 implementation of metagenomics as a routine clinical diagnostic (Figure 3). Almost all participants
469 shared similar perspectives on what they identified as barriers to implementing metagenomics in
470 clinical settings. However, the extent of the impact of these barriers was subjective to the location
471 of participants. These barriers directly correlate with the availability of funds, infrastructure, and
472 relations with local research groups, universities, and commercial partners.



473 **Figure 3- Schematic partitioning of subthemes as barriers and/or facilitators to**
474 **implementing metagenomics as a clinical diagnostic in infectious disease laboratories.**

475

476 The qualitative data was supported by many of the current findings of literature reviews, which
477 discuss similar barriers to metagenomics in clinical laboratories, including lack of training and
478 expertise in the workforce, validation of workflows and lack of physical and digital space (4,14).

479 There is a lack of a systematic approach to help level up IDD suites in clinical settings, which has
480 impacted the uptake of routine mNGS at the local level. Many hospitals participating in pathogen
481 sequencing rely heavily on external laboratories to carry out the workflow. With speed identified
482 as a key barrier for implementing new diagnostics, transitioning away from centralised laboratories
483 and moving sequencing to the source hospital could provide an opportunity to improve the speed
484 of the pathogen identification (15). For cases where mNGS may not be local to the hospital, the
485 practicalities of sending samples away for sequencing and waiting for results to be analysed
486 outside of local hospital infrastructure can make mNGS inefficient in its current form as an external
487 diagnostic. Removing time-consuming processes like preparing samples to be sent to external
488 laboratories, mNGS could be faster than conventional culture-dependent bacterial identification.
489 Offering a rapid turnaround from sample collection at the patient bedside to pathogen identification
490 in less than 24 hours would benefit public health through rapid diagnosis to inform patient
491 treatment and public health management (16–18). When developing new diagnostic methods, the
492 whole workflow must be considered to ensure that methods are fit for purpose. Whilst a diagnostic
493 workflow in research may be faster than current clinical methods available, the difference in
494 infrastructure between research and clinical settings may prove the technology to be inefficient in
495 practice, which could hinder the transition of diagnostic methods into clinical laboratories.
496 Therefore, it is necessary to consider what current infrastructure is available on site and what may
497 be logical and practical investments to facilitate the implementation of new diagnostics.

498 Despite the perceived barriers faced in hospitals delaying metagenomic implementation, it is worth
499 noting that participants were enthusiastic about the potential of new diagnostics in laboratories to
500 be integrated into the suite of tools already offered for infectious diseases. While COVID-19 was
501 challenging for researchers and clinicians, the pandemic positively reinforced the benefits of

502 utilising metagenomics to identify and monitor infectious diseases. High-profile outbreaks and
503 infectious disease events result in an influx of funding and expedite the turnaround time for
504 receiving accreditation, which allows for fast implementation of new technology in clinical
505 settings. Applying metagenomics to clinical samples enables the identification of rare or unknown
506 agents of infectious disease (19,20). In 2022, the UK government implemented a plan for
507 integrating genomics into mainstream healthcare. It followed the 2020 Genome UK: The Future
508 of Healthcare, which outlined an approach to becoming a world leader in the genomic healthcare
509 (21). By bringing genomics to the forefront of diagnostics in healthcare, there is the opportunity
510 to build capacity for the routine use of metagenomics in infectious disease, which will improve
511 guidance for patient treatment and facilitate disease surveillance that is not already part of standard
512 surveillance programmes (22).

513 mNGS has shown great potential for the detection of pathogens of infectious diseases, providing
514 a sensitive method that can profile taxonomy, antimicrobial resistance and virulence through
515 several clinical pilot studies and case reports (23–25). However, evidence of the cost-effectiveness
516 is also required to provide an argument for its added value to clinical laboratories. The operational
517 value must be presented to inform clinical management of the benefit of technologies such as
518 mNGS (6). Evidence must be provided to highlight the method's performance compared to
519 currently available diagnostics and its impact on clinical decision-making. The cost-effectiveness
520 of mNGS could be argued through a cost-effective analysis, which would consider not only the
521 economic benefit of mNGS but its public health impact through Quality Adjusted Life Years and
522 an overall number of infections, similar to that published by Elliot et al. (26).

523

524 **Strength and limitations**

525 This study is the first of its kind to explore the perspectives of individuals involved with clinical
526 metagenomics as an infectious disease diagnostic. Recruitment took place in various locations
527 across England, covering six regions, and included several stakeholders, allowing us to explore
528 the varying perspectives across diverse professions associated with IDD. However, the Southwest
529 and Northeast of England did not have any representation among the participants. Whilst several
530 drivers are key defining features found across all interviews, without representation, it is unknown
531 if the findings apply to England's two regions without representation. One of the key strengths was
532 the diversity in expertise across the researchers, spanning public health policy and genomics in
533 both research and clinical settings, which ensured the question guide was reviewed from various
534 perspectives.

535

536 **Conclusions**

537 The study filled a gap in the literature around what is known about the development and
538 implementation of metagenome sequencing for routine clinical use. It provided clear guidance for
539 user requirements from new diagnostic technologies to incorporate into the current diagnostic
540 landscape. Participants' experiences of existing diagnostic workflows and the bottlenecks within
541 them highlighted key drivers that must be considered when developing new diagnostics fit for
542 purpose, such as cost, speed, and infrastructure. High-profile outbreaks such as COVID-19
543 showcase the utility of metagenomics as a diagnostic tool to benefit public health, which should
544 be used as a learning resource to help innovate IDD with mNGS to bring clinical microbiology
545 into the next-generation sequencing era.

546 **List of abbreviations**

- 547 • Infectious disease diagnostics (IDD)
- 548 • Metagenomic next-generation sequencing (mNGS)
- 549 • Polymerase Chain Reaction (PCR)
- 550 • Matrix-assisted laser desorption-ionization time of flight mass spectrometry (MALDI-
- 551 TOF)
- 552 • Interpretive phenomenological approach (IPA)
- 553 • Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative research (COREQ)

554

555 **Author declarations**

556 • **Ethics approval and consent to participate**

557 The study gained ethical approval from the Institute of Life Course and Medical Sciences
558 Research Ethics Committee at the University of Liverpool (Ethical review reference 9855).

559 All methods were carried out following relevant guidelines. All participants were provided
560 with an information sheet and provided written consent before participating in this study.

561 • **Consent for publication**

562 Written consent at the beginning of the project included taking part in the study and consent
563 to anonymised quotes to be used in publications.

564 • **Availability of data and materials**

565 The dataset (which includes individual transcripts) is not publicly available due to
566 confidentiality.

567

568 • **Competing interests**

569 The authors declare no competing interests.

570 • **Funding**

571 HT and AD are funded by the National Institute for Health and Care Research (NIHR)
572 Health Protection Research Unit in Gastrointestinal Infections (HPRU-GI), a partnership
573 between the UK Health Security Agency, the University of Liverpool and the University
574 of Warwick. The views expressed are those of the author(s) and not necessarily those of
575 the NIHR, the UK Health Security Agency or the Department of Health and Social Care.

576 • **Authors' contributions**

577 HT, OO and AD designed the study. HT collected, and HT and OO analysed the data. HT
578 drafted the manuscript and final version, OO and AD contributed to the writing. All authors
579 approved of the final manuscript. Funding was secured by AD from NIHR.

580 • **Acknowledgements**

581 With thanks to Steve Paterson for help trialling the study guide, along with thanks to Sophie
582 Staniszewska for support during the initial development of this project.

583

584

585

586

587

588

589

590

591 **References**

592

593 1. Wang WL, Xu SY, Ren ZG, Tao L, Jiang JW, Zheng SS. Application of metagenomics in
594 the human gut microbiome. *World J Gastroenterol WJG*. 2015 Jan 21;21(3):803–14.

595 2. Schmitz JE, Stratton CW, Persing DH, Tang YW. Forty Years of Molecular Diagnostics for
596 Infectious Diseases. *J Clin Microbiol*. 2022 Jul 19;60(10):e02446-21.

597 3. Hahn A, Podbielski A, Meyer T, Zautner AE, Loderstädt U, Schwarz NG, et al. On detection
598 thresholds—a review on diagnostic approaches in the infectious disease laboratory and the
599 interpretation of their results. *Acta Trop*. 2020 May 1;205:105377.

600 4. Batool M, Galloway-Peña J. Clinical metagenomics—challenges and future prospects. *Front*
601 *Microbiol* [Internet]. 2023 [cited 2023 Nov 8];14. Available from:
602 <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fmicb.2023.1186424>

603 5. Neyton LPA, Langelier CR, Calfee CS. Metagenomic Sequencing in the ICU for Precision
604 Diagnosis of Critical Infectious Illnesses. *Crit Care*. 2023 Mar 21;27(1):90.

605 6. Gaston DC. Clinical Metagenomics for Infectious Diseases: Progress toward Operational
606 Value. *J Clin Microbiol*. 2023 Feb 2;61(2):e01267-22.

607 7. Goldberg B, Sichtig H, Geyer C, Ledebner N, Weinstock GM. Making the Leap from
608 Research Laboratory to Clinic: Challenges and Opportunities for Next-Generation
609 Sequencing in Infectious Disease Diagnostics. *mBio*. 2015 Dec 8;6(6):10.1128/mbio.01888-
610 15.

611 8. Govender KN, Street TL, Sanderson ND, Eyre DW. Metagenomic Sequencing as a
612 Pathogen-Agnostic Clinical Diagnostic Tool for Infectious Diseases: a Systematic Review
613 and Meta-analysis of Diagnostic Test Accuracy Studies. *J Clin Microbiol*. 2021 Aug
614 18;59(9):10.1128/jcm.02916-20.

615 9. Starks H, Brown Trinidad S. Choose Your Method: A Comparison of Phenomenology,
616 Discourse Analysis, and Grounded Theory. *Qual Health Res*. 2007 Dec 1;17(10):1372–80.

617 10. Peat G, Rodriguez A, Smith J. Interpretive phenomenological analysis applied to healthcare
618 research. *Evid Based Nurs*. 2019 Jan 1;22(1):7–9.

619 11. Tong A, Sainsbury P, Craig J. Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative research
620 (COREQ): a 32-item checklist for interviews and focus groups. *Int J Qual Health Care*. 2007
621 Dec 1;19(6):349–57.

622 12. Tindall L. J.A. Smith, P. Flower and M. Larkin (2009), Interpretive Phenomenological
623 Analysis: Theory, Method and Research. *Qual Res Psychol*. 2009 Nov 25;6(4):346–7.

624 13. Sundler AJ, Lindberg E, Nilsson C, Palmér L. Qualitative thematic analysis based on
625 descriptive phenomenology. *Nurs Open*. 2019 Apr 7;6(3):733–9.

- 626 14. Miller S, Chiu C, Rodino KG, Miller MB. Point-Counterpoint: Should We Be Performing
627 Metagenomic Next-Generation Sequencing for Infectious Disease Diagnosis in the Clinical
628 Laboratory? *J Clin Microbiol*. 2020 Feb 24;58(3):10.1128/jcm.01739-19.
- 629 15. Edgeworth JD. Respiratory metagenomics: route to routine service. *Curr Opin Infect Dis*.
630 2023 Apr;36(2):115–23.
- 631 16. Chen Y, Fan L, Chai Y, Xu J. Advantages and challenges of metagenomic sequencing for the
632 diagnosis of pulmonary infectious diseases. *Clin Respir J*. 2022 Sep 6;16(10):646–56.
- 633 17. Zhu R, Hong X, Zhang D, Xiao Y, Xu Q, Wu B, et al. Application of metagenomic
634 sequencing of drainage fluid in rapid and accurate diagnosis of postoperative intra-
635 abdominal infection: a diagnostic study. *Int J Surg Lond Engl*. 2023 Jun 5;109(9):2624–30.
- 636 18. Greninger AL, Naccache SN, Federman S, Yu G, Mbala P, Bres V, et al. Rapid
637 metagenomic identification of viral pathogens in clinical samples by real-time nanopore
638 sequencing analysis. *Genome Med*. 2015 Sep 29;7(1):99.
- 639 19. Frontiers | Editorial: Metagenomics for epidemiological surveillance in One Health.
640 Available from: <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fmicb.2023.1191946/full>
- 641 20. Stojanovic Z, Gonçalves-Carvalho F, Marín A, Abad Capa J, Domínguez J, Latorre I, et al.
642 Advances in diagnostic tools for respiratory tract infections: from tuberculosis to COVID-19
643 - changing paradigms? *ERJ Open Res*. 2022 Jul;8(3):00113–2022.
- 644 21. GOV.UK. Genome UK: shared commitments for UK-wide implementation 2022 to 2025.
645 Available from: [https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/genome-uk-shared-](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/genome-uk-shared-commitments-for-uk-wide-implementation-2022-to-2025/genome-uk-shared-commitments-for-uk-wide-implementation-2022-to-2025)
646 [commitments-for-uk-wide-implementation-2022-to-2025/genome-uk-shared-commitments-](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/genome-uk-shared-commitments-for-uk-wide-implementation-2022-to-2025/genome-uk-shared-commitments-for-uk-wide-implementation-2022-to-2025)
647 [for-uk-wide-implementation-2022-to-2025](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/genome-uk-shared-commitments-for-uk-wide-implementation-2022-to-2025/genome-uk-shared-commitments-for-uk-wide-implementation-2022-to-2025)
- 648 22. GOV.UK. Genome UK: the future of healthcare. Available from:
649 [https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/genome-uk-the-future-of-healthcare/genome-](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/genome-uk-the-future-of-healthcare/genome-uk-the-future-of-healthcare)
650 [uk-the-future-of-healthcare](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/genome-uk-the-future-of-healthcare/genome-uk-the-future-of-healthcare)
- 651 23. Kamau E, Yang S. Metagenomic Sequencing of Positive Blood Culture Fluid for Accurate
652 Bacterial and Fungal Species Identification: A Pilot Study. *Microorganisms*. 2023
653 May;11(5):1259.
- 654 24. Flurin L, Wolf MJ, Fisher CR, Cano Cevallos EJ, Vaillant JJ, Pritt BS, et al. Pathogen
655 Detection in Infective Endocarditis Using Targeted Metagenomics on Whole Blood and
656 Plasma: a Prospective Pilot Study. *J Clin Microbiol*. 2022 Aug 30;60(9):e00621-22.
- 657 25. Zhou Y, Wylie KM, El Feghaly RE, Mihindukulasuriya KA, Elward A, Haslam DB, et al.
658 Metagenomic Approach for Identification of the Pathogens Associated with Diarrhea in
659 Stool Specimens. *J Clin Microbiol*. 2016 Feb;54(2):368–75.
- 660 26. Elliott TM, Harris PN, Roberts LW, Doidge M, Hurst T, Hajkovicz K, et al. Cost-
661 effectiveness analysis of whole-genome sequencing during an outbreak of carbapenem-

662 resistant Acinetobacter baumannii. Antimicrob Steward Healthc Epidemiol ASHE. 2021 Dec
663 13;1(1):e62.

664