



Deposited via The University of Leeds.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/id/eprint/117551/>

Version: Accepted Version

Article:

Morris, KA, Macfarlane-Smith, LR and Wilcox, MH (2017) Evaluation of the novel artus C. difficile QS-RGQ, VanR QS-RGQ and MRSA/SA QS-RGQ assays for the laboratory diagnosis of Clostridium difficile infection (CDI), and for vancomycin-resistant enterococci (VRE) and methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus (MRSA) screening. European Journal of Clinical Microbiology & Infectious Diseases, 36 (5). pp. 823-829. ISSN: 0934-9723

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10096-016-2867-6>

© Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg 2016. This is an author produced version of a paper published in European Journal of Clinical Microbiology & Infectious Diseases. The final publication is available at Springer via <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10096-016-2867-6>.
Uploaded in accordance with the publisher's self-archiving policy.

Reuse

Items deposited in White Rose Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the White Rose Research Online record for the item.

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.

1 Evaluation of the Novel *artus* C. difficile QS-RGQ, VanR QS-RGQ and MRSA/SA QS-
2 RGQ Assays for the Laboratory Diagnosis of *Clostridium difficile* Infection (CDI), and for
3 Vancomycin-Resistant Enterococci (VRE) and Methicillin Resistant *Staphylococcus*
4 *aureus* (MRSA) Screening.

5
6 Kirsti A. Morris,^a# Louissa R. Macfarlane-Smith,^b and Mark H. Wilcox^{a,c}

7
8 Microbiology Department, Leeds Teaching Hospitals NHS Trust, Leeds, UK^a; Public
9 Health England Leeds Regional Laboratory, Leeds, UK^b; Leeds Institute for Biomedical
10 and Clinical Sciences, University of Leeds, Leeds, UK^c

11
12 # Address correspondence to Kirsti Morris, kirsti.morris@nhs.net. Tel:01133928663

13
14 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

15
16 We thank QIAGEN for supplying the QIASymphony RGQ MDx system, *artus* assays,
17 related reagents and consumables, as well as for their technical expertise. We also
18 thank Cepheid for supplying the Xpert SA/Nasal Complete assays and technical advice.

19
20
21
22
23

24

25 **ABSTRACT**

26 Purpose: *Clostridium difficile*, methicillin resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA) and
27 vancomycin resistant enterococci (VRE) are worldwide prevalent healthcare associated
28 pathogens. We have evaluated three Qiagen *artus* QS-RGQ assays for the detection of
29 these pathogens.

30

31 Methods: We examined 200 stool samples previously tested for *C. difficile* infection, 94
32 rectal swabs previously screened for VRE, and 200 MRSA screening nasal swabs.

33

34 Results: With the routine diagnostic laboratory results being adopted as the gold
35 standard, the sensitivity, specificity, PPVs and NPVs of the *artus* *C. difficile* assay were
36 100%, for the *artus* VanR QS-RGQ assay, 95%, 68%, 44% and 98%, and for the
37 MRSA/SA *artus* assay, 80%, 94%, 93% and 83%, respectively. The *artus* VanR assay
38 detected the *vanA* and/or *vanB* gene in 32% of culture-negative VRE screens, in 71% of
39 these cases only *vanB* was detected. An over-estimation of the rate of faecal VRE
40 colonisation could be due to a patient population with high rates of faecal carriage of
41 non-enterococcal species carrying *vanB*.

42

43 Conclusions: Based on our findings we conclude that all three *artus* QS-RGQ assays
44 could be a useful addition to a diagnostic laboratory, and that optimal choice of assay
45 should be determined according to user needs.

46 **Keywords:** Healthcare acquired infections; MRSA; *C. difficile*; Vancomycin Resistant
47 Enterococci; NAAT

48 **INTRODUCTION:**

49 Healthcare-associated infections (HCAs) are a major cause of morbidity and mortality.
50 [1-3] HCAs can affect patients in any type of setting where they receive care and
51 represent the most frequent adverse event in health care delivery worldwide. [4] Recent
52 systematic reviews have estimated hospital-wide prevalence of HCAs in high-income
53 countries at 7.6% and in low and middle-income countries at 10.1%. [4] *Clostridium*
54 *difficile*, methicillin resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA) and vancomycin resistant
55 enterococci (VRE) are three HCAI pathogens that are particularly prevalent worldwide.

56
57 *Clostridium difficile* infection (CDI) is considered the most common cause of nosocomial
58 infectious diarrhoea among adults in the developed world. [5] The infection is related to
59 antibiotic use and is associated with the overgrowth of *C. difficile* and the production of
60 toxins A and/or B. These toxins cause a range of effects including mild to severe
61 diarrhoea, gut mucosal damage, colitis, and pseudomembranous colitis. Recent figures
62 report CDI as annually causing 1600 deaths in England and Wales, and 29000 deaths
63 in the USA. [6,7] Since the clinical features of health care-associated diarrhea cannot
64 reliably distinguish *C. difficile* from other causes, laboratory confirmation is essential. UK
65 & European guidelines on the diagnosis of CDI recommend glutamate dehydrogenase
66 (GDH) EIA or nucleic acid amplification testing (NAAT) to screen samples, followed by a
67 sensitive toxin detection method. [8]

68

69 Vancomycin-resistant enterococci (VRE) are now amongst the most common HCAI
70 multidrug-resistant organisms. [9,10] Risk factors for nosocomial transmission of VRE
71 include prolonged hospitalization, use of broad spectrum antimicrobials and prior
72 surgery. VRE cause a range of infections including bloodstream, intra-abdominal,
73 surgical-site and urinary tract infections. [9, 11] Altogether, eight types of acquired
74 vancomycin resistance genotypes are known in enterococci with *vanA* being the most
75 prevalent genotype worldwide followed by *vanB*. [12, 13] Phenotypically the *vanA* gene
76 mediates a high-level of resistance to vancomycin and teicoplanin whereas the *vanB*
77 gene confers low- to moderate-level resistance to vancomycin only. Low level
78 vancomycin resistance expression, especially in *vanB* strains, may complicate
79 performance of diagnostic assays assessing the resistance phenotype and predicting
80 the corresponding genotype. During recent years, clusters of infections and
81 colonisations with *vanB* genotype *E. faecium* increased in a number of European
82 countries. [12]

83

84 MRSA is an important cause of HCAs and community-acquired infections. [14, 15]
85 Patients colonized with MRSA serve as reservoirs for auto-infection and/or
86 dissemination to other patients- and healthcare workers. [16, 17] Conventional
87 screening of MRSA is performed using selective and differential agar media, but the
88 results are not available before 18-48 hrs and interpretation can be subjective. Faster
89 detection can be achieved by using PCR-based assays. There is ongoing debate
90 regarding which tests are more appropriate for screening programmes. The increased

91 cost of rapid tests may be offset by savings as a result of reduced cross infection, fewer
92 complications, and better utilization of beds. [18, 19]
93 Rapid and accurate detection of CDI, MRSA and VRE is required to ensure patients
94 receive appropriate antimicrobial treatment and optimised infection prevention
95 interventions. QIAGEN has developed real-time, multiplex, PCR assays for detection of
96 these three HCAI pathogens. The *artus C. difficile* QS-RGQ assay (CE marked and FDA
97 cleared) detects the *tcdA* and *tcdB* genes that encode for *C. difficile* toxin A and toxin B,
98 respectively; the *artus VanR* QS-RGQ (CE marked) assay detects the *vanA* and *vanB*
99 genes of enterococci; the *artus MRSA/SA* QS-RGQ assay (CE marked) detects the
100 *hld1*, *mecA* and *mecC* genes of MRSA. We have evaluated the performance of these
101 three molecular assays in comparison with conventional testing methods.

102

103 **MATERIALS AND METHODS:**

104 We compared the performance of the QIAGEN *artus* assays (QIAGEN, GmbH, Hilden,
105 Germany) with the routine identification methods at the Leeds Teaching Hospitals NHS
106 Trust (LTHT) Microbiology Dept. The *artus* assays were performed on the automated
107 QIASymphony RGQ system (QIAGEN). All samples tested were selected from those
108 submitted to the routine laboratories.

109

110 **Qiagen *artus C. difficile* assay**

111 A total of 200 stool samples received by the routine enteric laboratory between
112 December 2013 and May 2014 from patients aged ≥ 2 years was selected for inclusion
113 in the study. All samples were diarrheal (adopting the shape of the container), had been

114 submitted for glutamate dehydrogenase (GDH) detection and cytotoxin testing (CTT),
115 and had sufficient material to allow for all testing required. The study set comprised 100
116 specimens previously found to be positive for both GDH antigen and cytotoxin
117 production, and 100 GDH-negative specimens. Samples previously GDH and cytotoxin
118 positive were between one day and four months old at the time of testing, negative
119 samples were processed within one week of collection. All samples were stored at 2-
120 5°C prior to testing. Samples were processed with the *artus C. difficile* QS-RGQ assay
121 according to manufacturer's instructions. Previously GDH/CTT-positive stool samples
122 were re-analyzed for the GDH antigen using the *C diff* Chek-60 glutamate GDH assay
123 (Techlab, Blacksburg, VA, USA) according to manufacturer's instructions and also for
124 the presence of cytotoxin. In brief, stool samples were first diluted 1:5 in phosphate-
125 buffered saline before being centrifuged, 20 µl of supernatant were then added to
126 duplicate Vero cell monolayers. One these had been protected by the addition of 20 µl
127 *Clostridium sordelli* antitoxin (Prolab Diagnostics, UK). Vero cells were grown in 96-well
128 flat-bottomed microtitre trays in 160 µl of Dulbecco medium. A positive result was
129 recorded if cell rounding was observed in the unprotected cells only, after 24 or 48
130 hours of incubation at 37°C in the presence of CO₂.

131
132 **Qiagen *artus* VanR QS-RGQ assay**
133 Twenty rectal swabs positive for VRE, as determined by culture on Kanamycin Aesculin
134 Azide (KAA) agar plus vancomycin (E&O Laboratories, Bonnybridge, Scotland) and
135 subsequent MALDI-TOF analysis, were collected from inpatients during April and May
136 2014. A further 74 VRE culture-negative rectal swabs collected during this period were

137 also examined. Transport swabs containing Aimes Medium with charcoal were used
138 (Thermo Fisher Scientific, Loughborough, UK). All samples were stored at 2-5°C prior to
139 analysis and were processed using the *artus* VanR QS-RGQ assay as per
140 manufacturer's instructions.

141

142 **Qiagen *artus* MRSA QS-RGQ assay**

143 In total, 200 nasal swabs processed by the MRSA screening laboratory between
144 January and June 2014 were retrospectively selected for inclusion in the study.
145 Transport swabs containing Aimes Medium with charcoal were used (Thermo Fisher
146 Scientific, Loughborough, UK). One hundred of these samples had previously been
147 determined MRSA positive and 100 MRSA negative, by culture on Brilliance MRSA 2
148 Agar (Oxoid, Basingstoke, UK). All samples were stored at 2-5°C prior to analysis. The
149 MRSA-positive samples were between three weeks and five months old at the time of
150 testing; all negative samples were processed within one week. Previously MRSA-
151 positive samples were first inoculated onto Brilliance MRSA 2 culture medium and
152 subsequently processed using the *artus* MRSA QS-RGQ assay. Previously MRSA-
153 negative swabs were processed with the *artus* assay but were not inoculated onto the
154 culture medium. Sample preparation for the *artus* assay involved placing the swabs into
155 tubes containing 2.5 ml eNat medium (Copan, Brescia, Italy) followed by vigorous
156 swirling. The eNat tubes were then placed directly onto the QIASymphony instrument
157 and the assay performed according to the manufacturer's instructions. Residual sample
158 volumes within the eNat tubes following analyses were processed using the Xpert

159 SA/Nasal Complete assay (Cepheid, Sunnyvale, CA, USA) on the GeneXpert
160 automated platform according to manufacturer's instructions.

161

162 **RESULTS**

163

164 **Qiagen *artus C. difficile* assay**

165 The sensitivity, specificity, PPVs and NPVs of the *artus C. difficile* assay were all 100%
166 (CI 95-100%) when the original results of the diagnostic laboratory algorithm
167 (GDH/CTT) were adopted as the gold standard. Of the 100 GDH/CTT-positive samples
168 re-tested against this algorithm, 96% remained both GDH and CTT positive. A
169 breakdown of the discrepant results is displayed in Table I.

170

171 **Qiagen *artus VanR QS-RGQ* assay**

172 The sensitivity, specificity, PPVs and NPVs of the *artus VanR QS-RGQ* assay were
173 95% (19/20, 95% CI 73-100%), 68% (50/74, 95% CI 56-78%), 44% (19/43, 95% CI 29-
174 60) and 98% (50/51, 95% CI 88-100%) respectively where direct culture followed by
175 MALDI-TOF analysis was adopted as the gold standard. The assay detected the *vanA*
176 and/or *vanB* gene in 32% of culture negative VRE screens. In 71% of these cases
177 (n=17), only *vanB* was detected; in 25% of cases (n=6), both *vanA* and *vanB* were
178 detected with *vanA* alone being detected in the remaining 4% (n=1).

179

180 **Qiagen *artus MRSA QS-RGQ* assay**

181 Of the 200 nasal swabs previously analysed for presence of MRSA by culture, eight
182 MRSA-positive and 32 MRSA-negative swabs gave either an invalid result (n = 19) or
183 an error message (n = 21) with the Xpert SA Nasal Complete assay. The majority of the
184 errors (95%) were due to probe check failures. This was most likely due to the off-label
185 nature of the methodology, specifically the charcoal content of the swab transport
186 medium. These samples were eliminated from the study and results from the remaining
187 160 nasal swabs analysed. Adopting the original culture results as the gold standard,
188 the sensitivity, specificity, PPV and NPV values for the *artus* assay were 64% (58/91,
189 95% CI 53-73%), 94% (64/68, 95% CI 85-98%), 94% (58/62, 95% CI 84-98) and 66%
190 (64/97, 95% CI 56-75) respectively, and for the Xpert assay, 74% (67/91, 95% CI 63-
191 82), 97% (66/68, 95% CI 89-99), 97% (67/69, 95% CI 89-99) and 73% (66/90, 95% CI
192 72-90). The distribution of results obtained from both PCR assays is displayed in Table
193 II. A total of 31 (19.4%) samples gave discordant results. The majority of discrepancies
194 were results which were interpreted by the *artus* assay as *S. aureus*, but designated
195 'not detected' by the Xpert assay (39%), followed by results interpreted as MRSA by the
196 Xpert assay, but designated *S. aureus* by the *artus* assay (32%). The majority of the
197 results from this latter group (9/10) were found to be MRSA positive by culture.

198

199 Of the 92 MRSA-positive swabs, only 71% were positive upon re-culture. There was
200 good correlation between samples which were MRSA-positive upon re-culture, and
201 those samples which were MRSA positive with one or both PCR assays. A second set
202 of statistics was therefore calculated following elimination of results from all swabs that
203 were MRSA-negative upon re-culturing; the sensitivity, specificity, PPV and NPV values

204 for the *artus* assay were then 80% (52/65, 95% CI 68-89), 94% (64/68, 95% CI 85-98),
205 93% (52/56, 95% CI 82-98) and 83% (64/77, 95% CI 72-90), and for the Xpert assay,
206 88% (57/65, 95% CI 77-94%), 97% (66/68, 95% CI 89-99), 97% (57/59, 95% CI 87-99)
207 and 89% (66/74, 95% CI 79-95), respectively.

208 **DISCUSSION**

209

210 There is still conflicting opinion on optimal diagnosis of CDI worldwide [20-23].
211 Inaccurate laboratory results may lead to unnecessary treatment and isolation, and the
212 true cause of the patients' diarrhoea not being further investigated (in the case of false
213 positives), or cross-infection may occur with other patients and overtreatment with
214 empirical antibiotics (in false-negative cases). A GDH test or NAAT are recommended
215 for initial screening of samples because of their very high sensitivities, reported to be
216 79.5-100% [8, 23, 24], followed by a sensitive toxin detection assay.

217

218 In this study the performance of the *artus C. difficile* QS-RGQ assay was equivalent to
219 that of a recommended two-step algorithm when testing samples retrospectively. A
220 limitation of the study was that GDH-positive/CTT-negative samples were not included
221 within the evaluation. However, although the sample selection is not necessarily
222 representative of that seen in a routine hospital setting due to the proportion of positive
223 samples being preselected, this is a useful evaluation of assay performance for the
224 detection of true CDI positives and true CDI negatives. It is possible that excluding
225 GDH-positive/CTT-negative samples may have slightly improved the performance of the
226 *artus C. difficile* assay, however, this comparison most likely gives a more meaningful

227 result in the context of CDI diagnosis as such results do not represent CDI, but possible
228 colonisation.

229

230 It was noted that in previously CTT-positive samples that were toxin-negative upon re-
231 testing, it had either taken 48 hrs for a cytotoxic effect to occur in the initial test, or this
232 effect had only been observed with an undiluted sample. This suggests that there were
233 low levels of toxin in these samples. It is possible that toxin degradation during storage
234 may have lowered the concentration further to an undetectable level. As PCR assays
235 detect the presence of the toxin genes as opposed to the presence of free toxin, the
236 *artus* assay has potential to identify faecal samples as toxin gene positive when they
237 contain low toxin levels that are undetectable by CTT. Studies by Jazmati *et al* (2015)
238 and Moon (2016) found the performance of the *artus C. difficile* to be comparable to that
239 of the Xpert *C. difficile* PCR assay. [25, 26] It must be considered that a proportion of
240 hospitalised patients may have toxigenic *C. difficile* with asymptomatic carriage and
241 diarrhoea due to another cause. However, although a number of publications
242 recommend that NAATs should not be used alone to diagnose CDI, [8, 24, 27, 28] some
243 studies have found good correlation between toxin gene detection and clinical status of
244 the patient. [29, 30]

245

246 As the *artus C. difficile* assay (as with the further two *artus* assays evaluated) has a
247 short turnaround time (3h 40 min for 24 samples which includes approximately 30-40
248 mins hands on time), is user friendly, includes simple interpretation of results, has a
249 high throughput (up to 72 per run) and offers flexibility of the associated platform for

250 detection of other organisms, this assay is a useful addition to the detection of CDI. As
251 there is still no internationally accepted single method for CDI diagnosis, individual
252 laboratories must decide which test will integrate best into their existing workflow. Two-
253 or three-step approaches to the diagnosis of CDI could increase laboratory costs, but
254 these might be offset by reduced total health care costs.

255

256 **Vancomycin-resistant enterococci**

257 As with CDIs, rapid and accurate detection of VRE is essential for adequate patient
258 management including infection prevention measures. Traditional culture-based
259 methods to detect these organisms are often time-consuming, taking up to several days
260 to complete. A number of NAAT assays are now available that can detect either the
261 *vanA* gene, or both *vanA* and *vanB* genes. Assays detecting both of these genes are
262 desirable as a number of European countries have reported increasing numbers of
263 colonisations and infections with *vanB*-type VRE. [12, 31]

264

265 The sensitivity of the *artus* vanR assay in our study (95%) compares favourably with
266 NAATs in previous studies [32]. Although the assay specificity was low (44%), it is
267 possible that the false-positives recorded actually represented genuine VRE positive
268 samples, where bacterial growth was not supported by the culture medium. High rates
269 of *vanB* carriage have previously been reported in the absence of cultivable VRE in
270 fecal/rectal samples and have mostly been attributed to one of two explanations. The
271 first is that *vanB*-type resistance is sometimes difficult to detect since the vancomycin
272 MIC of these strains can be below the antimicrobial susceptibility breakpoint of ≤ 4

273 mg/liter defined by the European Committee on Antimicrobial Susceptibility Testing.
274 (EUCAST) [31, 33, 34] Secondly, non-enterococcal *vanB* genes could results in positive
275 PCR results. These can be found in the gut, especially in anaerobic bacteria like
276 *Clostridium* species. [32, 35-37] In our study the *vanB* gene alone was detected in 71%
277 of these false-positive samples; our culture medium contained 6 mg/l vancomycin, and
278 so either of these explanations is feasible. The *artus* VanR QS-RGQ assay may indeed
279 be more sensitive for the detection of VRE isolates than culture due to the amplification
280 of both *vanA* and *vanB* genes. However, further investigations on *vanB* positive (but
281 *vanA* negative) isolates are needed to further knowledge here. If a patient population
282 has high rates of faecal carriage of non-enterococcal species that contain *vanB*, an
283 over-estimation of the rate of faecal VRE colonisation could result and potentially lead to
284 unnecessary utilization of hospital resources and infection control prevention measures.

285

286 **MRSA**

287 Rapid and accurate detection of MRSA is required to minimize the spread of this
288 organism in healthcare settings. Active screening currently forms an integral part of
289 many MRSA infection control and prevention strategies, with several NAAT assays
290 available for this purpose.

291

292 Although the sensitivity values and NPVs of the *artus* and Xpert assays were low when
293 calculated using the whole sample set, these values were much improved when the
294 33% of swabs originally MRSA culture-positive, but negative upon re-culture, were
295 eliminated from the calculations. It is likely that bacterial degradation occurred during

296 storage, and so these improved figures are more likely representative of assay
297 performance during prospective testing. Our study was performed using an off-label
298 method that incorporated charcoal-containing transport swabs. The invalid samples and
299 the error messages from the Xpert assay were presumed to be due to interfering or
300 inhibiting factors within the charcoal. The sensitivity of the Xpert assay (88%) is
301 comparable to those of other MRSA PCR assays (82-93%), although the sensitivity of
302 the *artus* assay was slightly lower at 80%.

303
304 Specificities of both assays were relatively high (94% and 97% for the *artus* and Xpert
305 assay, respectively) and compare well with other studies (78-99%). [38-42] In most
306 cases (80.5%-90.5%), the two assays were in agreement as to whether MRSA, MSSA
307 or no targets were present. The most common discordant combination was MSSA
308 detected by the *artus* assay but no targets detected by the Xpert assay (12/160).
309 However, in an MRSA screening programme, this would not affect patient management.
310 The second most common discordant category was where the *artus* assay detected
311 MSSA but the Xpert assay detected MRSA (10/160). Such results would affect patient
312 management and are therefore of more concern. Almost all (9/10) of these samples
313 were MRSA positive by culture, which suggests that the *artus* assay misidentified these
314 samples. The Xpert assay, unlike the *artus* assay, does not detect *mecC* variants;
315 however, only 2.6% of samples were designated MRSA by the *artus* assay only, and
316 3/4 of these were culture-negative. This study therefore does not highlight lack of
317 detection of *mecC* variants as a significant issue. Although the Xpert assay is rapid and

318 simple to use when processing smaller sample volumes, the *artus* assay is more
319 efficient when processing larger volumes and is less costly per test.

320

321 As with the *artus C. difficile* and VanR assays, the optimal choice of assay for MRSA
322 screening should be determined according to user needs; for example, the *artus* MRSA
323 assay would be more suited to a laboratory handling high volumes of screening swabs.

324 The three *artus* assays all have high NPVs and are therefore especially suited to
325 screening programmes. The assays can facilitate elimination of negative samples,
326 meaning that confirmatory tests are only needed on a small proportion of these. This
327 could reduce the hands on time required overall and lead to negative results being
328 released more quickly. Additional laboratory-specific factors, including financial
329 considerations and technical expertise, will also be important in deciding between
330 screening methods.

331

332 **COMPLIANCE WITH ETHICAL STANDARDS**

333

334 **Funding:** This study was funded by Qiagen (grant number 403774_Qiagen_2014)

335 **Conflict of interest:** MHW declares that he has the following conflict of interests: I have
336 received consulting fees from Qiagen and grant funding from Cepheid. In addition,
337 QIAGEN supplied the QIASymphony RGQ MDx system, *artus* assays, related reagents
338 and consumables, as well as technical expertise. Cepheid supplied the Xpert SA/Nasal
339 Complete assays and technical advice.

340

341 **Ethical approval:** No ethical approval was required for this study.

342

343 **Informed consent:** No informed consent was required for this study.

344

345 **REFERENCES**

346

347 1. Kara, Devrim, Bayram, Katipoğlu, Kiran, Oruç, Demiray, Apa, Gülfidan (2015) Risk of
348 vancomycin-resistant enterococci bloodstream infection among patients colonized with
349 vancomycin-resistant enterococci. *Braz J Infect Dis* 19: 58-61.

350

351 2. Khanna S, Pardi DS (2010) The growing incidence and severity of *Clostridium difficile*
352 infection in inpatient and outpatient settings. *Expert Rev Gastroenterol Hepatol* 4:409-
353 416

354

355 3. Kock R, Becker K, Cookson B, van Gemert-Pijnen JE, Harbarth S, Kluytmans
356 J, Mielke M, Peters G, Skov RL, Struelens MJ, Tacconelli E, Navarro Torné A, Witte
357 W, Friedrich AW (2010) Methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA): burden of
358 disease and control challenges in Europe. *Euro Surveill* 15: 19688

359

360 4. World Health Organisation (WHO) (2011) Report on the Burden of Endemic Health
361 Care-Associated Infection Worldwide. A systematic review of the literature. Available at
362 <http://www.who.int/en/> [Accessed 11/04/2016]

363

364 5. Walters PR, Zuckerbraun BS (2014) *Clostridium difficile* Infection Clinical Challenges
365 and Management Strategies. *Crit Care Nurse* 34:24-35

- 366
- 367 6. Office for National Statistics (2013) Deaths Involving *Clostridium difficile*, England
368 and Wales, 2012. Statistical Bulletin. 22 Aug
369
- 370 7. White A (2015) Weekly Digest: CDC study reports 29,000 annual US deaths
371 related to *C. difficile*.
372 [http://www.cddep.org/blog/posts/weekly_digest_cdc_study_reports_29000_annual_u](http://www.cddep.org/blog/posts/weekly_digest_cdc_study_reports_29000_annual_us_deaths_related_c_difficile)
373 [s_deaths_related_c_difficile](http://www.cddep.org/blog/posts/weekly_digest_cdc_study_reports_29000_annual_us_deaths_related_c_difficile). [Accessed 13.07.16].
374
- 375 8. Planche TD, Davies KA, Coen PG, Finney JM, Monahan IM, Morris KA, O'Connor L,
376 Oakley SJ, Pope CF, Wren MW, Shetty NP, Crook DW, Wilcox MH (2013) Differences
377 in outcome according to *Clostridium difficile* testing method: a prospective multicentre
378 diagnostic validation study of *C difficile* infection. *Lancet Infect Dis* 13: 936–945
379
- 380 9. Arias CA, Murray BE (2012) The rise of the Enterococcus: beyond vancomycin
381 resistance. *Nat Rev Microbiol* 10:266-278
382
- 383 10. Sreeja S, Sreenivasa Babu PR, Prathab AG (2012) The Prevalence and the
384 Characterization of the Enterococcus Species from Various Clinical Samples in a
385 Tertiary Care Hospital. *J Clin Diagn Res* 6:1486–1488
386
- 387 11. Zirakzadeh A, Patel R (2006) Vancomycin-resistant enterococci: colonization,
388 infection, detection, and treatment. *Mayo Clin Proc.* 81:529-536

- 389
- 390 12. Werner G, Coque TM, Hammerum AM, Hope R, Hryniewicz W, Johnson A, Klare I,
391 Kristinsson KG, Leclercq R, Lester CH, Lillie M, Novais C, Olsson-Liljequist B, Peixe LV,
392 Sadowy E, Simonsen GS, Top J, Vuopio-Varkila J, Willems RJ, Witte W, Woodford N
393 (2008) Emergence and spread of vancomycin resistance among enterococci in Europe.
394 Euro Surveill 13: 19046
- 395
- 396 13. Werner G, Klare I, Fleige C, Geringer U, Witte W, Just HM and Ziegler R (2012)
397 Vancomycin-resistant *vanB*-type *Enterococcus faecium* isolates expressing varying
398 levels of vancomycin resistance and being highly prevalent among neonatal patients in
399 a single ICU. Antimicrob Resist Infect Control 1:21
- 400
- 401 14. Li S, Li J, Qiao Y, Ning X, Zeng T, Shen X (2014) Prevalence and invasiveness of
402 community-acquired methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus*: a meta-analysis.
403 Indian J Pathol Microbiol 57:418-422
- 404
- 405 15. Sastre A, Roberts PF, Presutti RJ (2013) A practical guide to community-acquired
406 MRSA. J Fam Pract 62:624-629
- 407
- 408 16. Leclercq R. (2009) Epidemiological and resistance issues in multidrug-resistant
409 staphylococci and enterococci. Clin Microbiol Infect 15:224–231
- 410

- 411 17. Rohr U, Kaminski A, Wilhelm M, Jurzik L, Gatermann S, Muhr G (2009) Colonization
412 of patients and contamination of the patients' environment by MRSA under conditions of
413 single-room isolation. *Int J Hyg Environ Health* 212:209-215
414
- 415 18. Polisena J, Chen S, Cimon K, McGill S, Forward K, Gardam M (2011) Clinical
416 effectiveness of rapid tests for methicillin resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA) in
417 hospitalized patients: a systematic review. *BMC Infect Dis* 11:336
418
- 419 19. Roisin S, Laurent C, Denis O, Dramaix M, Nonhoff C, Hallin M, Byl B, Struelens MJ
420 (2014) Impact of Rapid Molecular Screening at Hospital Admission on Nosocomial
421 Transmission of Methicillin-Resistant *Staphylococcus aureus*: Cluster Randomised Trial.
422 *PLoS One* 9:e96310
423
- 424 20. Burnham CA, Carroll KC (2013) Diagnosis of *Clostridium difficile* infection: an
425 ongoing conundrum for clinicians and for clinical laboratories. *Clin Microbiol* 26:604–630
426
- 427 21. Hart J, Putsathit P, Knight DR, Sammels L, Riley TV, Keil A (2014) *Clostridium*
428 *difficile* infection diagnosis in a paediatric population: comparison of methodologies. *Eur*
429 *J Clin Microbiol Infect Dis* 33:1555-1564
430
- 431 22. Orellana-Miguel MA, Alcolea-Medina A, Barrado-Blanco L, Rodriguez-Otero J,
432 Chaves-Sánchez F (2013) Algorithm proposal based on the C. Diff Quik Chek Complete

433 ICT device for detecting Clostridium difficile infection. *Enferm Infecc Microbiol Clin*
434 31:97-99
435
436 23. Surawicz CM, Brandt LJ, Binion DG, Ananthakrishnan AN, Curry SR, Gilligan PH,
437 McFarland LV, Mellow M, Zuckerbraun BS (2013) Guidelines for diagnosis, treatment,
438 and prevention of Clostridium difficile infections. *Am J Gastroenterol* 108:478-98
439
440 24. Crobach MJ, Planche T, Eckert C, Barbut F, Terveer EM, Dekkers OM, Wilcox MH,
441 Kuijper EJ (2016) European Society of Clinical Microbiology and Infectious Diseases:
442 update of the diagnostic guidance document for Clostridium difficile infection. *Clin*
443 *Microbiol Infect.* 22 (Suppl. 4): S63-S81
444
445 25. Jazmati N, Wiegel P, Licanin B, Plum G (2015) Evaluation of the Qiagen artus C.
446 difficile QS-RGQ Kit for detection of Clostridium difficile toxins A and B in clinical stool
447 specimens. *J Clin Microbiol* 53:1942-1944
448
449 26. Moon HW, Kim HN, Kim JY, Hur M, Kim H, Yun YM (2016) Performance of the artus
450 C. difficile QS-RGQ kit for the detection of toxigenic Clostridium difficile. *Clin Biochem*
451 pii: S0009-9120(16)30205-3. doi: 10.1016/j.clinbiochem.2016.08.013
452
453 27. Alcalá L, Reigadas E, Marín M, Fernández-Chico A, Catalán P, Bouza E (2015)
454 Comparison of GenomEra C. difficile and Xpert C. difficile as confirmatory tests in a

455 multistep algorithm for diagnosis of *Clostridium difficile* infection. J Clin Microbiol
456 53:332-335
457

458 28. Beneš J, Husa P, Nyč O, Polívková S (2014) Diagnosis and therapy of *Clostridium*
459 *difficile* infection: Czech national guidelines. Klin Mikrobiol Infekc Lek 20:56-66
460

461 29. Bagdasarian N, Rao K, Malani PN (2015) Diagnosis and treatment of *Clostridium*
462 *difficile* in adults: a systematic review. JAMA 313:398-408
463

464 30. Peterson LR, Manson RU, Paule, SM, Hacek, DM, Robicsek A, Thompson RB, Kaul
465 KL (2007) Detection of toxigenic *Clostridium difficile* in stool samples by real-time
466 polymerase chain reaction for the diagnosis of *C. difficile*-associated diarrhoea. Clin.
467 Infect. Dis 45: 1152-1160
468

469 31. Arends JP, Zhou X, Kampinga GA, Meessen NEL, Friedrich AW (2012) Prevalence
470 of phenotypically vancomycin susceptible, but vanB-PCR positive, *Enterococcus*
471 *faecium*: do we overlook VRE vanB carrying strains in our hospital? P1289. Abstr 22nd
472 Eur Congr Clin Microbiol Infect Dis. ESCMID. London, United Kingdom
473

474 32. Anton M, Miller MA, Chong G, Monczak Y (2009) Comparison of PCR and Culture
475 for Screening of Vancomycin-Resistant Enterococci: Highly Disparate Results for *vanA*
476 and *vanB*. J Clin Microbiol 47:4136-4137
477

478 33. Hegstad K, Giske CG, Haldorsen B, Matuschek E, Schonning K, Leegaard TM,
479 Kahlmeter G, Sundsfjord A (2014) Performance of the EUCAST disk diffusion method,
480 the CLSI agar screen method, and the Vitek 2 automated antimicrobial susceptibility
481 testing system for detection of clinical isolates of enterococci with low- and medium-
482 level VanB-type vancomycin resistance: a multicenter study. *J Clin Microbiol* 52:1582–
483 1589

484

485 34. Wijesuriya TM, Perry P, Pryce T, Boehm J, Kay I, Flexman J, Coombs GW, Ingram
486 PR (2014) Low vancomycin MICs and fecal densities reduce the sensitivity of screening
487 methods for vancomycin resistance in Enterococci. *J Clin Microbiol.* 52:2829-2833

488

489 35. Ballard SA, Grabsch EA, Johnson PD, Grayson ML (2005) Comparison of three
490 PCR primer sets for identification of vanB gene carriage in feces and correlation with
491 carriage of vancomycin-resistant enterococci: interference by vanB-containing
492 anaerobic bacilli. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* 49:77–81

493

494 36. Domingo MC, Huletsky A, Giroux R, Boissinot K, Picard FJ, Lebel P, Ferraro MJ,
495 Bergeron MG (2005) High prevalence of glycopeptide resistance genes vanB, vanD,
496 and vanG not associated with enterococci in human fecal flora. *Antimicrob Agents*
497 *Chemother* 9:4784-4786

498

499 37. Graham M, Ballard SA, Grabsch EA, Johnson PDR, Grayson ML (2008) High Rates
500 of Fecal Carriage of Nonenterococcal *vanB* in both Children and Adults. *Antimicrob*
501 *Agents Chemother* 52: 1195–1197
502

503 38. Hee JH, Eu SK, Seok LC (2012) Methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* in
504 Nasal Surveillance Swabs at an Intensive Care Unit: An Evaluation of the LightCycler
505 MRSA Advanced Test. *Ann Lab Med* 32: 407–412
506

507 39. Hos NJ, Wiegel P, Fischer J, Plum G (2016) Comparative evaluation of two fully-
508 automated real-time PCR methods for MRSA admission screening in a tertiary-care
509 hospital. *Eur J Clin Microbiol Infect Dis* 35:1475-1478
510

511 40. Lee S, Park YJ, Park KG, Jekarl DW, Chae H, Yoo JK, Seo SW, Choi JE, Lim JH,
512 Heo SM, Seo JH (2013) Comparative evaluation of three chromogenic media combined
513 with broth enrichment and the real-time PCR-based Xpert MRSA assay for screening of
514 methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* in nasal swabs. *Ann Lab Med* 33:255-260
515

516 41. Patel PA, Schora DM, Peterson KE, Graves A, Boehm S, Peterson LR (2014)
517 Performance of the Cepheid Xpert® SA Nasal Complete PCR assay compared to
518 culture for detection of methicillin-sensitive and methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus*
519 *aureus* colonization. *Diagn Microbiol Infect Dis* 80:32-34
520

521 42. Yam WC, Siu GK, Ho PL, Ng TK, Que TL, Yip KT, Fok CP, Chen JH, Cheng VC,
522 Yuen KY (2013) Evaluation of the LightCycler Methicillin-Resistant Staphylococcus
523 aureus (MRSA) Advanced Test for Detection of MRSA Nasal Colonization. J Clin
524 Microbiol 51:2869-2874

525

526

527

528

529

530

531

532

533

534

535

536

537

538

539

540

541

542

543

544 **Table I: Discrepant GDH/CTT algorithm results**

Result of repeat algorithm testing		No. of samples
GDH	CTT	
-	+	1
+	-	2
-	-	1

545

546 **Table II: Distribution of results obtained from the *artus* MRSA and GeneXpert**

547 **SA/Nasal assays**

<i>artus</i> MRSA result	Xpert SA/Nasal result	No. of samples (%)	No. of samples culture positive (% ^a)
MRSA	MRSA	58 (36.3)	57 (98)
MRSA	MSSA	3 (2.0)	0 (0)
MRSA	No targets detected	1 (0.6)	1 (100)
MSSA	MRSA	10 (6.3)	9 (90)
MSSA	MSSA	18 (11.3)	3 (16.7)
MSSA	No targets detected	12 (7.5)	5 (41.7)
No targets detected	MRSA	1 (0.6)	1 (100)
No targets detected	MSSA	4 (2.5)	1 (25)
No targets detected	No targets detected	53 (33.0)	15 (28)

548 ^a denominator being the number of samples within each individual category