

1 Less Haste, More Speed: Does delayed blood culture loading lead to adverse incubation time or yield?

2 Gavin Deas,¹ Fergus Hamilton^{1,2}, Philip Williams¹

3

4

5 1. Bristol Royal Infirmary, Marlborough Street, Bristol BS2 8HW

6 2. MRC Integrative Epidemiology Unity, Bristol, BS6 5ES

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16 Funding:

17 PW is funded by Medical Research Council grant MR/T005408/1. FH is funded by the NIHR Clinical
18 Lectureship programme. For the purpose of open access, the author(s) has applied a Creative Commons
19 Attribution (CC BY) licence to any Author Accepted Manuscript version arising from this submission.

20

21

22 Highlights

- 23 • The UK SMI stipulates blood cultures be loaded within 4 hours of being taken
- 24 • The effect on yield has not been determined for delayed loading
- 25 • We found overall that there was a marginal 0.3% loss of yield per hour delay
- 26 • There was a significant loss of *Streptococcus pyogenes* at 3.2% per hour delay

27

28 Abstract

29 Background

30 Blood culture remains a vital diagnostic tool in the acutely unwell patient. The UK
31 Standards for Microbiology Investigations (SMI) stipulate pre-analytical requirements
32 that are aimed at increasing yield and reducing turnaround time. The requirement to
33 load blood cultures onto incubators within 4 hours has shown to reduce turnaround
34 time but limited evidence exists as to whether it improves yield.

35 Methods

36 We extracted blood culture results including organism growth, time to detection (TTD),
37 location and time of sample collection from 4 hospitals in Southwest England. We then
38 used mixed effects, Bayesian linear and logistic regression models to examine the
39 effect of predictor variables like time to loading (TTL) on the response variable of growth
40 or TTD. We used generalised additive models to explore non-linearity.

41 Results

42 449,191 culture sets were analysed, 398,077 of which had enough data to include in the
43 final analysis. 37,255 sets flagged positive (9.36%) of which 21,330 were considered
44 pathogens. Our primary analysis identified a small decrease in yield with each hour
45 delay in loading, OR 0.997 (95% credible interval, CrI 0.994 - 1.001). This effect was
46 largest in *Streptococcus pneumoniae*, *agalactiae* and *pyogenes*. In our analysis on TTD,
47 culture sets spend 10.98 (95% CrI 7.8 – 13.2) minutes less incubating for each hour
48 delay. There was no convincing non-linearity in either of these effects.

49 Conclusion

50 There is a marginal loss of growth for every hour a blood culture is left unincubated,
51 with the loss of recovery of *Streptococcus pyogenes* and other streptococci most
52 common. There was no evidence of a reduction in Gram-negatives, anaerobes, or
53 yeasts. There was a small decrease in TTD for delayed sets. This analysis suggests there
54 is only marginal benefit in reducing time to load blood cultures on incubators.

55

56

57

58

59

60 Background

61 Blood culture remains a standard and common method for diagnosing bacteraemic
62 patients and is often used in the setting of the acutely unwell, undifferentiated patient
63 groups [1]. Although culture remains the gold standard, it is recognised that it is
64 insensitive, with many patients remaining culture-negative despite clear clinical
65 evidence of infection [2] [3] [4]. Additionally, due to the requirement for culture and
66 identification results are often not available to clinicians for more than 24 hours from
67 sampling. As such, many organisations have set standards for blood culture in an
68 attempt to increase both the speed of turn around (time to positivity, TTP) and yield of
69 blood culture [5].

70 In the UK, the Standards for Microbiology Investigation (SMI) for Sepsis and Systemic or
71 Disseminated Infections includes recommendations to load samples onto an incubator
72 within 4 hours of collection [6]: the time to load (TTL). This pre-analytical requirement
73 for TTL goes alongside other requirements on the inoculum size with volume
74 requirements and bottle numbers to increase the clinical utility of the test [6]. The
75 evidence supporting the recommendation on TTL includes an effect on total time
76 between collection and pathogen detection (TTP) [7].

77 Remarkably the effect of reduced TTL on yield is still not clearly understood. It seems
78 plausible that earlier incubation of blood cultures could improve yield, particularly of
79 pathogens that are temperature sensitive. However, some evidence supports pre-
80 incubation as *decreasing* yield, a paradoxical result that has not been widely explored
81 [8]. Although studies [9] [10] have been performed of in-vitro analysis of spiked blood
82 cultures, it is not clear that these analyses reflect the reality of clinical microbiological
83 sampling where microbiological load is often unknown, and patients may have received
84 antimicrobials or other treatments that might alter microbial growth [11]. As such, we
85 performed a large (>300,000 blood culture bottles) analysis on the effect of TTL on a)
86 yield, and b) time to detection.

87

88 Methods

89 *Setting and study inclusion*

90 This is a retrospective observational analysis of the blood culture pathway in 4
91 hospitals in the Southwest of England, including 2 district general hospitals and 2
92 tertiary referral centres. They saw a combined 31,398 patients in March 2024 in their
93 emergency departments and have an overnight bed base of 2,664 [12]. Each site has
94 blood culture (BACTEC FX) incubation machines. All blood culture bottles sent to our
95 laboratory from the 1st January 2017 to 30th June 2024 were analysed. Culture sets are
96 taken in line with local antisepsis protocol at clinician's decision. Blood culture sets
97 were processed in line with UK SMI 12; briefly bottles are loaded continuously onto
98 automated incubators as soon as they arrived in the laboratory. Fluorescence based
99 automated alerts indicate a positive result and identification of organisms is provided
100 through gram stain, antigenic grouping, matrix-assisted laser desorption ionization –
101 time of flight (MALDI-TOF), and VITEK2 (bioMérieux) automated antimicrobial
102 susceptibility testing.

103 *Clinical data*

104 We collected information on samples received on a) ward and hospital, b) timing of the
105 blood culture (collection, loading, result, MALDI-TOF result), and c) date. The ICE
106 (Integrated Clinical Environment™) requesting system was used to establish sample
107 collection time. The BD BACTEC FX incubator collects loading time (TTL) and time to
108 detection (TTD) automatically. Duplicate sets of blood cultures were removed, and the
109 fastest TTD was treated as the TTD. Organisms were classified into pathogenic
110 organisms or contaminants by the authors, based on whether they pose clinical
111 significance to patients on a population basis. Although any organism can be
112 considered pathogenic or a contaminant given the right circumstance, we chose
113 organisms that pose significant clinical disease, form the mainstay of clinical
114 microbiological work, and those that the Standards of Microbiological Investigation aim
115 to target [6]. This list is available in supplementary material 1.

116 *Statistical methods*

117 Descriptive statistics of the sources, TTD and TTL, and organism are provided. Naïve
118 linear and logistic regression analysis, unadjusted and adjusted Bayesian modelling
119 was performed and generalized additive models are used to fit splines to explore the
120 presence of non-linearity. One potential problem with analysing time to loading is that
121 estimates of growth are biased by the physical location of wards and hospitals and
122 whether samples were taken during laboratory operating hours. A ward that we might

123 expect to have a high positivity rate, for example an intensive care unit, being far from
124 the laboratory would produce a paradoxical effect of an increased time to loading
125 correlating with positive culture. To overcome this, we built a mixed effects model that
126 accounted for ward and site, with wards nested within hospitals. Formally, we allowed
127 a random intercept for each ward, nested within each hospital, essentially allowing
128 each ward to have its own baseline positive rate. We then ran logistic regression (for
129 yield) and linear regression (for TTD), assuming a fixed effect for both (i.e. that the effect
130 on yield of delay was the same across wards and sites). There are 8 sites: each of the 4
131 hospitals were divided into emergency departments and inpatient groups, and there
132 were 107 wards in total. Due to the large number of wards and to allow model fitting, we
133 used a Bayesian model with weakly informative priors. Statistical analysis was
134 performed using R 4.2.2 utilising the CRAN package brms [13]. Akaike Information
135 Criterion values were used to choose optimal model fitting.

136 The logistic/linear regressions models chosen took the form ($growth \sim TTL + working\ day$
137 $+ year + (1 | site/ward)$) and ($TTD \sim TTL + working\ day + year + organism + (1 | site/ward)$),
138 where *working day* was a binary variable of the sample being taken between 0900-1700.
139 This was used on the dataset with all isolates and then subsequently on a subset with
140 pathogenic isolates only. Pathogen specific analysis for the most common isolates (n >
141 250) and for anaerobic and fungal growth was also performed. The code is supplied in
142 Supplementary Material 2.

143 *Ethics*

144 All data used in this study was anonymised at source on extraction from the clinical
145 systems. No patient identifiable information was ever extracted, simply the ward,
146 location, time of sample, and whether it was positive (including the organism isolated).
147 As such, ethical approval was not required [14].

148

149

150

151

152

153

154

155

156

157 Results

158 *Descriptive statistics*

159 449,191 sets of blood cultures
 160 were collected. This averaged out
 161 at 189.45 sets per day and 71.12
 162 sets per 1000 bed days. Entries
 163 with data loss for the loading time,
 164 time on incubator, organism
 165 identification, or polymicrobial
 166 culture samples were removed
 167 leaving 398,077 sets. 37,255 sets
 168 flagged positive (9.36%) of which
 169 21,330 were considered
 170 pathogenic and 15,925 (4.0%)
 171 contaminants: with 14,752 of the
 172 contaminants being coagulase
 173 negative staphylococci. The
 174 mean time to loading (TTL) was 4.07 Hours (median 2.92 Hrs; Q1 1.35 Hrs; Q3 5.52 Hrs).
 175 A density plot of total cultures received is show in Figure 2 broken down by site which
 176 clearly shows that the TTL was different across differing sites. This data is also shown
 177 in Table 1, alongside data on the average positivity rate at each site.





Figure 1 Flow chart of culture set inclusion



178

Figure 2 A) density plot showing logarithmic distribution of Time to loading per site. B) A density plot showing time to detection per site.

179

180 Table 1 highlights the problem with naïve regression without accounting for ward
 181 structure. Emergency Departments (ED) have a very high level of positivity, as expected,
 182 but in one setting (Site 4 Emergency), the mean TTL is extremely low, as the laboratory is
 183 very closely co-located to this ED. A naïve regression analysis of this site would identify
 184 this as suggesting a decreased TTL leads to increased yield, but this may just reflect the
 185 colocation of this laboratory and ED. In contrast, the ED in Site 3 has the highest TTL
 186 and a very high rate of positivity: a naïve analysis here would identify the opposite
 187 association here.

188

Source	Mean TTL	Median TTL	SD	N	Rate
Site 4 Emergency	1.15	0.50	2.25	18185	0.13
Site 1 Emergency	2.51	1.57	2.57	22784	0.15
Site 1 AAU	2.98	1.95	2.90	8752	0.08
Site 1 AMU	3.06	1.95	3.12	4881	0.08
Site 1 Emergency MIU	3.62	2.60	3.25	8871	0.09
Site 1 Delivery suit	3.83	2.77	3.23	4090	0.04
Site 2 Paediatric Emergency	3.87	2.87	3.40	13640	0.08
Site 3 SAU	4.06	2.82	3.61	3546	0.08
Site 2 Emergency	4.12	2.85	4.04	22152	0.13
Site 2 Cardiac ICU	4.24	3.38	3.44	5663	0.07
Site 1 Nephrology	4.32	2.85	4.09	3894	0.11
Site 2 Medical ward	4.43	3.57	3.51	3668	0.08
Site 3 Haematology	4.45	3.28	3.57	7063	0.1
Site 2 Paediatric oncology	4.59	3.70	3.60	5609	0.07
Site 3 Paediatric	4.77	3.45	3.83	3411	0.07
Site 2 Delivery suite	4.90	4.08	3.44	5555	0.03
Site 2 Neonatal ICU	4.98	4.14	3.45	3732	0.08
Site 3 Emergency	5.10	3.88	3.89	32008	0.13
Site 3 MAU	5.11	3.80	4.05	5727	0.1
Site 2 Haem/oncology	5.32	4.18	3.81	7458	0.07
Site 1 ITU	5.59	4.63	3.99	13890	0.11
Site 2 Haematology	5.66	4.45	3.90	14211	0.07
Site 3 ITU	6.05	4.83	4.25	6157	0.09
Site 3 Emergency MIU	6.55	5.35	4.41	4400	0.13

189


190 Table 1 Top 25 sources for blood cultures, showing mean, median, standard deviation, 1st and 3rd quantile for the time to
 191 loading, number of cultures received and the positivity rate for that site; ordered by TTL.

192

193 *Decreased TTL leads to a marginal increase in yield in both unadjusted regression and*
194 *in mixed effects models.*


195 In an unadjusted regression model, there was strong evidence of a small effect (OR per
196 hour, 0.986 95% credible interval, CrI 0.983 – 0.990). This can be interpreted as a 1.4%
197 decrease in yield for each hour delay. In contrast, our mixed effects model accounting
198 for site level variation had weaker evidence of an even smaller effect, an OR for growth
199 of 0.997 (95% CrI 0.994 - 1.001) per hour: e.g. a decrease of around 0.3% per hour.

200 We then performed non-linear modelling to show this and identify if there was a
201 threshold effect where yield suddenly decreased. The unadjusted model is shown in
202 Figure 3, and mixed-effect adjusted model in Figure 4. In the unadjusted model, there
203 was clear evidence of non-linearity and even non-monotonicity with a large decrease in
204 yield over the period 0-4hrs, but then almost no effect until ~12hrs, with a subsequent
205 decrease in yield when the TTL increased after 12h. In contrast, when accounting ward
206 level effects and time in the mixed-effects model, we see no evidence of non-linearity
207 nor a threshold effect, and the data was consistent with a small, linear effect in
208 reducing yield. The Akaike Information Criterion (AIC) values were smaller for the model
209 that accounted for covariates in both the linear and non-linear models,



210

211 Figure 3 Generalized additive model plot of estimate against time to loading for growth with 95% credible intervals.



212

213 Figure 3 Generalized additive model plot of estimate against time to loading for growth with 95% credible intervals, adjusted for
214 location, year, and working day.


215

216 Considering specific groups of pathogens; the adjusted model for yeasts identified no
217 effect (OR for growth from TTL was 1.01, 95% CrI 0.98 - 1.03), nor for anaerobes (OR
218 0.98, 95%CrI 0.95 – 1.00).

219 *Loading blood culture bottles quickly leads to proportionately less time on the*
220 *incubator: reducing overall time to positivity in two ways.*


221 The unadjusted model identified that for every hour loaded earlier, there was an
222 increase of 0.21 hours (95%CrI 0.16-0.27) of TTD. In the mixed effects model we saw a
223 similar effect: 0.18 hours (95%CrI 0.13 – 0.24). This suggests that for every hour
224 increase in time to loading there is 10.98 (95% CrI 7.8 – 13.2) minutes less TTD. As the
225 total time to positivity is TTL + TTD, this means that some of the benefit of loading earlier
226 is reduced by longer time to detection, and is consistent with bacterial growth occurring
227 prior to loading, whilst in the culture set is in transit, but at a reduced rate. We did not
228 identify any evidence of non-linearity, as expected.

229



230

231 Figure 4 Generalized additive model of time to loading on time to detection with 95% credible intervals, without adjustment.



232

233 Figure 5 Generalized additive model of time to loading on time to detection with 95% credible intervals adjusted for location,
 234 working day, organism and year.

235 *The effect on yield is dependent on the species of microorganisms: with a large effect*
 236 *on Streptococci including S. pyogenes*

237 It is well established that different organisms have differing growth rates in culture, and
 238 it may be that the effect of delayed loading on yield is species specific. Table 2 shows
 239 the list of isolates with greater than 250 occurrences with the mean time to loading and
 240 time to detection, exclusive of contaminants. *Escherichia coli* was the most common
 241 pathogen.

Organism	Mean TTL	Mean TTD	SD TTL	N
<i>Streptococcus pneumoniae</i>	2.85	11.75	2.52	760
<i>Streptococcus pyogenes</i>	2.88	11.24	2.72	352
<i>Streptococcus dysgalactiae</i>	2.97	10.78	2.96	457
<i>Streptococcus agalactiae</i>	3.31	10.49	2.83	469
<i>Escherichia coli</i>	3.34	13.93	2.84	6261
<i>Staphylococcus aureus</i>	3.34	19.93	2.70	3526
<i>Proteus mirabilis</i>	3.37	17.66	2.87	423
<i>Serratia marcescens</i>	3.38	17.72	2.69	267
<i>Pseudomonas aeruginosa</i>	3.44	21.07	2.82	678
<i>Enterococcus faecalis</i>	3.45	16.35	2.84	532
<i>Klebsiella oxytoca</i>	3.53	15.54	2.78	304

<i>Klebsiella pneumoniae</i>	3.55	15.29	2.85	1107
<i>Enterococcus faecium</i>	3.61	16.50	2.79	655
<i>Enterobacter cloacae complex</i>	3.79	14.62	2.79	440
<i>Streptococcus mitis/oralis</i>	3.87	15.77	2.97	283
<i>Enterobacterales</i>	4.11	14.21	2.81	317


242

243 Table 2 Table of the isolates occurring more than 250 times, exclusive of contaminants, with mean TTL, median TTL and
244 number of isolates; ordered by ascending mean TTL.

245 As we know that at the organism is unknown at the time of the blood culture being
246 taken, and that the laboratory management of blood cultures is generally independent
247 of the clinical management, so we should expect the time to loading to be broadly
248 similar for each species. However, Table 2 demonstrates subtle differences in mean
249 TTL, *Streptococcus pneumoniae*, *dysgalactiea* and *pyogenes* have the quickest mean
250 TTL.

251 As this difference is not due to earlier loading, this is likely due to decreased yield with
252 longer TTL in some species. For example, if a species cannot survive for more than 8hrs
253 in a culture set before being loaded, then we will only get positive results for this
254 species when the TTL is < 8hrs, lowering the mean TTL. We therefore repeated our
255 above analysis focusing on each pathogen using the same approach for these common
256 pathogens.

257 Figure 8 shows a forest plot with 95% credible intervals for the most common isolates
258 and their odds ratio of growth from the TTL. The organisms showed the strongest effect
259 for TTL reducing yield were *Streptococcus pneumonia*, *agalactiea* and *pyogenes*.



260


261 **Figure 7 Forest plot for the estimate of growth per organism, adjusted for location, working day and year.**

262 The beta haemolytic *streptococci* appear to be significantly affected by delays in

263 loading, an odds ratio for *Streptococcus pyogenes* of 0.97 (95%CrI 0.93 – 1.0 per hour

264 delay. This means that delaying loading *S. pyogenes* by 4 hours might lead to a loss of

265 11.4% of yield. *Streptococcus pneumoniae* may be explained by the known phenomena
266 of autolysis [15].



267

268 Figure 9 Forest plot of estimate on species time to detection from TTL

269 Figure 9 shows the relationship between the estimates on TTD and mean TTL for each
270 organism listed in Table 2. Unsurprisingly, most isolates have figures below 0, meaning
271 TTD is reduced for each hour they are delayed in getting to the laboratory, with the
272 largest effects for the other *Enterobacteriales* species and the beta haemolytic
273 *Streptococci*. For all species, estimates were larger than 1: the bacterial growth before
274 loading was never fast enough to mean that delayed loading had no effect on the overall
275 time to positivity.

276

277 Discussion

278 This analysis of blood culture loading showed that a longer time to loading (TTL) was
279 associated with a minimally lower rate of positivity, with an OR of 0.997 (95%CrI 0.994 -
280 1.001) for each hour. This was largely driven by loss of beta and alpha haemolytic
281 *Streptococci*. The unique feature of *S pneumoniae* exhibiting autolysis may explain [15]
282 its estimate and loss of growth within delayed blood culture bottles. The loss of *S*
283 *pyogenes* is of both clinical and public health concern, a loss of up to 11.4% if cultures
284 arrive in the laboratory at 4 hours from sampling. Invasive *S pyogenes* is a severe
285 infection and can lead to seeding to distant sites, requiring prolonged antibiotics and
286 multiple surgical interventions. Correctly diagnosing *Streptococcal* bacteraemia would
287 reduce broad spectrum antimicrobial use, increase public health intervention and
288 prevention, as well as improving diagnostic stewardship. In this the overall effect of
289 earlier loading was small, suggesting that marginal benefit in overall yield would be
290 expected by reducing the time to load. Whether the effect on delayed transport to the
291 laboratory on yield is worth investing in infrastructure to reduce is debatable; it is well
292 known that other factors have effects on yield that are far greater than that described
293 here, principally blood volume [16].

294 *Comparisons with previous literature*

295 Venturelli et al published an observational study on time to loading and positivity rates
296 in 2017. They report the results of 50,955 culture results and found a similar effect (OR
297 of 0.997, 95%CI:0.994-0.999) for growth for each hour in delay which matches our main
298 result. However, they did not detect differences in sub-analysis of pathogens. Their
299 laboratory only accepted culture sets in working hours but otherwise worked similarly
300 our own laboratory [17]. A similar analysis from Canada noted that *Streptococcal*
301 *species* were not recovered from blood cultures at the most distant sites, which had
302 higher TTL. They found a similar OR for growth of 0.998 (95%CI 0.994 – 1.003) in logistic
303 regression analysis [18].

304 Conversely, an interventional study of ICU patients' blood culture sampling showed an
305 increase in yield with increasing delay, 20.7% off site vs. 14.2% on site, $p < 0.001$ [19].
306 Their study had significantly fewer sets analysed at only 250 in each arm. Invitro studies
307 have shown that time to loading at less than 24 hours has no decrease in yield, and that
308 pre-loading temperature control at room temperature is also of no consequence [20].
309 Taken together these would suggest that there is, at best, a marginal improvement in
310 yield with decreasing TTL.

311 The effect of TTL on time to positivity and TTD suggest that cultures spent less time on
312 the incubators if they were loaded with a longer delay with a negative coefficient of –

313 0.18, around 11 minutes quicker per hour delay. This is different to previous
314 publications and the sources cited for the UK SMI where a coefficient of greater than 0
315 is described, suggesting that for every hour delay there is an increased TTD [21] [22].
316 This could be explained by the relatively short delay times here compared to the other
317 studies, which looked at a difference of 12 hours or more between groups; or that the
318 bottles here are subject to low level incubation whilst on the wards in our group that
319 was not the case in the published groups, a factor that cannot be accounted for.

320 *Strengths and limitations*

321 The strength of this model is that it accounts for different patient populations within the
322 hospital by nesting wards within hospital sites in the multilevel Bayesian model, in this
323 way we also account for the effect of baseline positivity areas being different distances
324 to the laboratory, adjustment in this manner means that OR for growth dramatically
325 falls to very little compared to the unadjusted analysis. One unaccounted for factor is
326 that blood cultures are an imperfect test, and it is assumed in clinical practice that
327 even negative blood cultures in an antibiotic naive patient may harbour pathogens. This
328 means that we have no objective measurement for the presence of growth when
329 looking at the various predictor variables, and as such the forest plots showing the
330 estimate of growth from time to loading for the most common pathogens is relative to
331 each other and not to an objective reference organism. This as an observational study
332 and although we cannot rule out differences in loading time and practices that might
333 affect yield, we cannot prove it.

334

335

336

337

338

339

340

341

342

343

344

345 Conclusion

346 This analysis found that time to loading was independently and negatively correlated
347 with a loss of yield at around 0.3% per hour, with a significant loss in some
348 *Streptococci*. However, there is no clear evidence that this pre-analytic requirement
349 affects yield for other pathogens.

350

351

352

353

354

355

356

357

358

359

360

361

362

363

364

365

366

367

368

369

370

371

372

373

374

375 References

376

- [1] MD, MSc1,2 Manu Shankar-Hari, MAS3 Gary S. Phillips, MD4 Mitchell L. Levy, and et al, "Developing a New Definition and Assessing New Clinical Criteria for Septic Shock," *JAMA*, pp. doi:10.1001/jama.2016.0289, 2016.
- [2] Li X, Mei A, Li P, Liu Y, Li X, Li W, Wang C, Xie S. Duan H, "The diagnostic value of metagenomic next-generation sequencing in infectious diseases. ," *BMC Infect Dis.*, pp. doi: 10.1186/s12879-020-05746-5., 2021 Jan.
- [3] de Vries CR, Ruffin F, Sharma-Kuinkel B, Park L, Hong D, Scott ER, Blair L, Degner N, Hollemon DH, Blauwkamp TA, Ho C, Seng H, Shah P, Wanda L, Fowler VG, Ahmed AA. Eichenberger EM, "Microbial Cell-Free DNA Identifies Etiology of Bloodstream Infections, Persists Longer Than Conventional Blood Cultures, and Its Duration of Detection Is Associated With Metastatic Infection in Patients With *Staphylococcus aureus* and Gram-Negative Bactere," *Clin Infect Dis.*, pp. doi: 10.1093/cid/ciab742., 2022 Jun.
- [4] Jewell E, Maile MD, Cinti SK, Bateman BT, Engoren M. Sigakis MJG, "Culture-Negative and Culture-Positive Sepsis: A Comparison of Characteristics and Outcomes. ," *Anesth Analg*, pp. doi: 10.1213/ANE.0000000000004072., 2019 Nov.
- [5] NHEngland. (2023, March) A national review of blood culture pathway processes to support better antimicrobial stewardship and improved patient safety. [Online]. <https://www.england.nhs.uk/wp-content/uploads/2022/06/B0686-improving-the-blood-culture-pathway-executive-summary-v1-1.pdf.pdf>
- [6] UKHSA Standards Unit Specialised Microbiology and Laboratories. (2024) UK SMI S 12 Sepsis and systemic or disseminated. [Online]. <https://www.rcpath.org/static/3f51b8e5-1ebe-469d-a79f3a3323bfaec9/7e38a3d1-fdc7-4c6e-aadc7e55b698ef26/uk-smi-s-12i1-sepsis-and-systemic-or-disseminated-infection-january-2023-pdf.pdf>
- [7] Caroline Rönnerberg , Masako Mildh, Måns Ullberg, and Volkan Ozenci, "Transport time for blood culture bottles: underlying factors and its consequences," *Diagn Microbiol Infect Dis*, pp. doi: 10.1016/j.diagmicrobio.2013.03.031., 2013.
- [8] Holt HM, Petersen IS, Østergaard C, Bruun B. Lemming L, "Bactec 9240 blood culture system: to preincubate at 35 degrees C or not? ," *Clin Microbiol Infect.*, pp. doi: 10.1111/j.1469-0691.2004.00969.x, 2004 Dec.
- [9] Roberts T, Soeng S, Cusack TP, Dance DAB, Lee SJ, Reed TAN, Hinfonthong P, Sihalath S, Sengduangphachanh A, Watthanaworawit W, Wangrangsimakul T, Newton PN, Nosten FH, Turner P, Ashley EA Ling CL, "Impact of delays to incubation and storage temperature on blood culture results: a multi-centre study," *BMC Infect Dis.*, pp. doi: 10.1186/s12879-021-05872-8, 2021 Feb.

- [10] Bills AR, Lang DL, Ruschell G, Heiter BJ, Bourbeau PP, Sautter RL, "Effects of delayed-entry conditions on the recovery and detection of microorganisms from BacT/ALERT and BACTEC blood culture bottles.," *J Clin Microbiol.*, pp. doi: 10.1128/JCM.44.4.1245-1249.2006., 2006 Apr.
- [11] Li C, Rosener B, Mitchell A, Noto Guillen M, "Antibacterial activity of nonantibiotics is orthogonal to standard antibiotics," *Science*, pp. doi: 10.1126/science.adk7368. , 2024 Apr.
- [12] NHSEngland. (2024, March) A&E Attendances and Emergency Admissions 2023-24. [Online]. <https://www.england.nhs.uk/statistics/statistical-work-areas/ae-waiting-times-and-activity/ae-attendances-and-emergency-admissions-2023-24/>
- [13] PC, Bürkner, "brms: An R Package for Bayesian Multilevel Models using Stan," *Journal of Statistical Software*, p. doi.org/10.18637/jss.v080.i01, 2017.
- [14] NHS Health Research Authority. (2024) HRA decision tool. [Online]. <https://www.hra-decisiontools.org.uk/ethics/EngresultN1.html>
- [15] P García, M Paz González, E García, JL García, and R Lopez, "The molecular characterization of the first autolytic lysozyme of *Streptococcus pneumoniae* reveals evolutionary mobile domains," *Mol Microbiol*, pp. doi: 10.1046/j.1365-2958.1999.01455.x, 1999.
- [16] M Rele , D Cowley, JP Buttery, N Curtis, and TG Connell, "How reliable is a negative blood culture result? Volume of blood submitted for culture in routine practice in a children's hospital," *Pediatrics*, pp. 119:891-6., 2007.
- [17] Righi E, Borsari L, Aggazzotti G, Busani S, Mussini C, Rumpianesi F, Rossolini GM, Girardis M. Venturelli C, "Impact of Pre-Analytical Time on the Recovery of Pathogens from Blood Cultures: Results from a Large Retrospective Survey," *PLoS One*, pp. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0169466., 2017 Jan.
- [18] Rafipour D, Gorn I, Sabri E, Sant N, Desjardins M. Deslandes V, "Effect of delayed entry of blood culture bottles in BACTEC automated blood culture system in the context of laboratory consolidation.," *Sci Rep.*, pp. doi: 10.1038/s41598-022-05246-3., 2022 Jan.
- [19] Kuhn SO, Vollmer M, Scheer C, Fuchs C, Rehberg S, Balau V, Hahnenkamp K, Bohnert JA, Gründling M. Schwarzenbacher J, "On-site blood culture incubation shortens the time to knowledge of positivity and microbiological results in septic patients.," *PLoS One.*, pp. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0225999., 2019 Dec.
- [20] Roberts T, Soeng S, Cusack TP, Dance DAB, Lee SJ, Reed TAN, Hinfonthong P, Sihalath S, Sengduangphachanh A, Watthanaworawit W, Wangrangsimakul T, Newton PN, Nosten FH, Turner P, Ashley EA. Ling CL, "Impact of delays to incubation and storage temperature on blood culture results: a multi-centre study.," *BMC Infect Dis.* , pp. doi: 10.1186/s12879-021-05872-8., 2021 Feb.

- [21] Yan JJ, Chien ML, Chen HM, Wu HM, Wu JJ, Janapatla RP, "Effect of overnight storage of blood culture bottles on bacterial detection time in the BACTEC 9240 blood culture system.," *J Microbiol Immunol Infect.*, pp. doi: 10.1016/S1684-1182(10), 2010 Apr.
- [22] Inuma Y, Takakura S, Nagao M, Matsushima A, Shirano M, Ichiyama S, Saito T, "Delayed insertion of blood culture bottles into automated continuously monitoring blood culture systems increases the time from blood sample collection to the detection of microorganisms in bacteremic patients.," *J Infect Chemother.* , pp. doi: 10.1007/s10156-008-0664-6, 2009 Feb.
- [23] H M Holt, I S Petersen, C Østergaard, B Bruun L Lemming 1, "Bactec 9240 blood culture system: to preincubate at 35 degrees C or not?," *Clin Microbiol Infect*, pp. DOI: 10.1111/j.1469-0691.2004.00969.x, 2004.
- [24] An Im De Sutter, Natalija Keber, Hilde Habraken, Thierry Christiaens Mieke L van Driel 1, "Different antibiotic treatments for group A streptococcal pharyngitis," *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*, pp. doi: 10.1002/14651858.CD004406.pub2., 2010.
- [25] van der Bij AK, Goessens W, Verbrugh HA, Vos MC, Kerremans JJ, "Immediate incubation of blood cultures outside routine laboratory hours of operation accelerates antibiotic switching.," *J Clin Microbiol.* , pp. doi: 10.1128/JCM.01092-09, 2009 Nov.
- [26] Lieven van der Velden, Fidel Vos, Johan Mouton, and P Sturm, "Clinical impact of preincubation of blood cultures at 37°C," *J Clin Microbiol*, pp. doi: 10.1128/JCM.00552-10, 2011.
- [27] Takashi Saito et al., "Delayed insertion of blood culture bottles into automated continuously monitoring blood culture systems increases the time from blood sample collection to the detection of microorganisms in bacteremic patients," *J Infect Chemother*, pp. doi: 10.1007/s10156-008-0664-6., 2009.