# Evaluation of the BioFire Blood Culture Identification (BCID2) panel for transplant recipients with a bloodstream infection



1- Section of Infectious Diseases, Department of Internal Medicine, Yale University School of Medicine; 2- Department of Laboratory Medicine; 3- Department of Pharmacy Services, Yale-New Haven Hospital; 4- Yale University School of Medicine;

## Background

- The BioFire blood culture identification (BCID2) is a multiplex PCR panel applied to positive blood cultures that detects 43 targets (including bacteria, *Candida* and resistance genes)
- In patients with bloodstream infections (BSI), the BioFire blood culture identification (BCID2) multiplex PCR panel is associated with:
- Decreased time to organism identification<sup>1</sup>
- Decreased time to antimicrobial susceptibility results needed to guide optimal therapy<sup>2</sup>
- While the performance of BCID2 has been evaluated in the general population<sup>3,4,</sup> data for transplant recipients are limited

## Methods

**Design**: Retrospective cohort study **Participants**:

- Solid organ recipients (SOTR) and bone marrow transplant recipients (BMTR) within **2 years of transplantation** with BSI and BCID2
- Positive blood cultures for the same patient and same organism(s) occurring within 14 days of the initial test were considered a single BSI event

**Data collection**: Medical records reviewed for demographics and microbiological data. **Analysis:** Descriptive statistics.

## Objective

We sought to identify the clinical utility of the **BCID2** panel in transplant recipients.

Table 3: Characteristics of unidentified isolated by BCID2

Blood culture #1	Blood culture #2	Age	Transplant type	Syndrome	Pathogenic	Treatment	Outcomes
Achromobacter species		62	Allo-SCT	Neutropenic fever	Yes	Minocycline for 10 days	Alive at last follow up (3/28)
Candida guilliermondii		52	Allo-SCT	Candidemia	Yes	Anidulafungin for 3 months	Alive at last follow up (4/4)
Corynebacterium jeikeium		57	Allo-SCT	MRSA bacteremia	Contaminant	NA	Alive at last follow up (9/6/21)
Enterococcus faecalis*	Leuconostoc lactis	59	Allo-SCT	E. faecalis bacteremia	Contaminant	NA	Died (11/29/21)
Roseomonas mucosa		56	Allo-SCT	Neutropenic fever	Yes	Meropenem for 20 days	Alive at last follow up (3/29)
Sphingopyxis alaskensis		64	Allo-SCT	Asymptomatic screening	Yes	Ciprofloxacin for 7 days	Died (08/16/21)
Sphingopyxis alaskensis		64	Allo-SCT	MSSA bacteremia	Contaminant	NA	Died (08/16/21)
*Not missed							

Age (yea 18 to 30 to 40 to 50 to 60 to 70 to Transpl Allo-So Auto-CAR-T Heart Kidnev Liver Setting Inpat Outpa Blood Centra Peripl Length 2 - 7 da 8-14 15 - 3 31-90 >90 da NA Length 0 - 7 da 8 - 14 15 - 30 31-90 NA

Carlo Foppiano Palacios<sup>1</sup>, David Peaper,<sup>2</sup> Maricar Malinis,<sup>1</sup> Sarah Perrault,<sup>3</sup> Elizabeth Cohen,<sup>3</sup> Joshua Vogel,<sup>4</sup> Marwan M Azar<sup>1,2</sup>

## Results

### **Table 1: Demographics**

	N	%	• A total of <b>29 transplant</b>	N	%
vears)			recipients were identified Organisms detected by biofire		
o 29	5	11.1	One organism	34	75.6
o 39	2	4.4	• 45 positive blood cultures Two organisms	5	11.1
o 49	5	11.1	TS positive block cultures	6	13.3
o 59	13	28.9	underwent BCID2 testing Biofire organisms		
o 69	18	40.0	Candida glabrata	2	4.0
o 79	2	4.4	Mean age was 54 years     Candida krusei	1	2.0
plant type			Enterobacter cloacae complex	2	4.0
-SCT	25	55.6	• BCID2 did not detect 7/51 Enterococcus faecalis	2	4.0
o-SCT	5	11.1	(14%) organisms identified by Enterococcus faecium	8	16.0
-Т	1	2.2	blood cultures Escherichia coli		22.0
rt	0	0.0	<ul> <li>Including monomicrobial</li> <li>Klebsiella pneumoniae group</li> </ul>	9	18.0
iey	10	22.2	(n=6/39) and polymicrobial Not Detected	6	12.0
r	4	8.9			
ig 			(n=1/6) cultures Pseudomonas aeruginosa		6.0
tient		80.0			2.0
oatient	9	20.0	• All 7 organisms not identified		2.0
l culture source ral line	21	46.7	by BCID2 were "off-target"	4	8.0
pheral		40.7 53.3	(not in the BCID2 database) Congruence of organism identification		
h of stay	24	55.5	• All occurred in RMTR	38	_
days	7.0	15.6	Did not identify organism	6	13.3
4 days	4.0	8.9	<b>nothe genic</b> and treated with	1	2.2
30 days		28.9			
90 days		13.3	Monomicrobial (n=39)	33	84.6
days	2.0	4.4	• <b>3 contaminants</b> Polymicrobial (n=6)	5	83.3
,		28.9	Biofire resistance		
h of stay			• BCID2 detected resistance CTX-M	9	19.6
days	15	33.3	markers (CTX-M or Van A/B) van A/B	6	13.0
4 days	6	13.3		19	41.3
30 days	7	15.6		12	26.1
90 days	4	8.9	<ul> <li>Vancomycin resistance(n=6)</li> <li>Accuracy of resistance detection</li> </ul>		
	13	28.9	Correct	15	100.0

### Table 2: BCID2 panel results



BioFire<sup>™</sup> FilmArray<sup>®</sup> Blood Culture Identification Panel BCID/BCID2

- In transplant recipients,
- by conventional testing
- target organisms
- pathogenic
- in transplant recipients
  - But providers should consider the possibility of off-target pathogens when clinically appropriate

- doi:10.1016/j.pathol.2021.02.016
- doi:10.1128/JCM.00543-21
- doi:10.1016/j.mimet.2021.106303

## Disclosures

The authors have no financial disclosures relevant to this study.





### Conclusions

BCID2 detected 86% of organisms and **100% of resistance markers** identified

All 7 (14%) missed cases involved off-• Of which **4 were considered** 

BCID2 is a useful tool for BSI detection

## References

1. Sparks R, Balgahom R, Janto C, Polkinghorne A, Branley J. Evaluation of the BioFire Blood Culture Identification 2 panel and impact on patient management and antimicrobial stewardship. Pathology. 2021;53(7):889-895. 2. Berinson B, Both A, Berneking L, et al. Usefulness of BioFire FilmArray BCID2 for Blood Culture Processing in Clinical Practice. J Clin Microbiol. 2021;59(8):e0054321. 3. Rule R, Paruk F, Becker P, Neuhoff M, Chausse J, Said M. Diagnostic accuracy of the BioFire FilmArray blood culture identification panel when used in critically ill patients with sepsis. J Microbiol Methods. 2021;189:106303. . Rule R, Paruk F, Becker P, Neuhoff M, Chausse J, Said M. Clinical utility of the BioFire FilmArray Blood Culture Identification

panel in the adjustment of empiric antimicrobial therapy in the critically ill septic patient. PLoS One. 2021;16(7):e0254389. Published 2021 Jul 9. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0254389