



HAL
open science

Rapid diagnostic tests for infectious diseases in the emergency department

Donia Bouzid, Marie-Céline Zanella, Solen Kerneis, Benoit Visseaux, Larissa May, Jacques Schrenzel, Vincent Cattoir

► **To cite this version:**

Donia Bouzid, Marie-Céline Zanella, Solen Kerneis, Benoit Visseaux, Larissa May, et al.. Rapid diagnostic tests for infectious diseases in the emergency department. *Clinical Microbiology and Infection*, 2021, 27 (2), pp.182-191. 10.1016/j.cmi.2020.02.024 . hal-02499280

HAL Id: hal-02499280

<https://univ-rennes.hal.science/hal-02499280>

Submitted on 27 Apr 2020

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

1 **Rapid diagnostic tests for infectious diseases in the emergency**
2 **department**

3

4 Running title: RDTs in the ED

5

6 Donia BOUZID^{1,2#}, Marie-Céline ZANELLA^{3,4 #}, Solen KERNEIS^{2,5,6}, Benoît VISSEAU^{2,7}, Larissa
7 MAY⁸, Jacques SCHRENZEL^{3,4,9}, Vincent CATTOIR^{10,11,12*}

8

9 *# These authors contributed equally to this work*

10

11 ¹ AP-HP, Bichat Claude Bernard Hospital, Emergency Department, Paris, France

12 ² University of Paris, IAME, INSERM, Paris, France

13 ³ Laboratory of Bacteriology, Division of Laboratory Medicine and Division of Infectious
14 Diseases, University of Geneva Hospitals, Geneva, Switzerland

15 ⁴ University of Geneva Medical School, Geneva, Switzerland

16 ⁵ AP-HP, Antimicrobial Stewardship Team, Hôpitaux Universitaires Paris Centre-Cochin, Paris,
17 France

18 ⁶ Pharmacoepidemiology and infectious diseases (Phemi), Pasteur Institute, Paris, France

19 ⁷ AP-HP, Bichat Claude Bernard Hospital , Virology, 75018, Paris, France

20 ⁸ Department of Emergency Medicine, University of California-Davis, Sacramento, CA, USA

21 ⁹ Genomic Research Laboratory, Division of Infectious Diseases, Geneva University Hospitals,
22 Geneva, Switzerland

23 ¹⁰ Service de Bactériologie-Hygiène hospitalière, CHU de Rennes, Rennes, France

24 ¹¹ CNR de la Résistance aux Antibiotiques (laboratoire associé 'Entérocoques), Rennes,
25 France

26 ¹² Unité Inserm U1230, Université de Rennes 1, Rennes, France

27

28 *Correspondance: Prof. Vincent Cattoir, CHU de Rennes, Service de Bactériologie-Hygiène
29 hospitalière, 2 rue Henri Le Guilloux, 35033 Rennes Cedex, France. +33-2-99-28-98-28, Fax:
30 +33-2-99-28-41-59, E-mail: vincent.cattoir@chu-rennes.fr.

31

32 Keywords: Rapid diagnosis; Infections; RDT; POC test; ED; Clinical impact.

33

34 Word count: Abstract: 242 words; Text = 2,509 words; 2 Tables; 80 References.

35

36 **Abstract**

37 Background: Rapid diagnostic tests (RDTs) for infectious diseases, with a turn-around time
38 <2 hours, are promising tools that could improve patient care, antimicrobial stewardship and
39 infection prevention in the emergency department (ED) setting. Numerous RDTs have been
40 developed but not necessarily for the ED environment. Their successful implementation in
41 the ED relies on their performance and impact on patient management.

42 Objectives: The aim of this narrative review is to provide an overview of currently available
43 RDTs for infectious diseases in the ED.

44 Sources: PubMed was searched through August 2019 for available studies on RDTs for
45 infectious diseases. Inclusion criteria included: commercial tests approved by the FDA or CE-
46 IVD with data on clinical samples, ability to run on fully-automated systems and result
47 delivery within 2 hours.

48 Content: A non-exhaustive list of representative commercially available FDA or CE approved
49 assays was categorized by clinical syndrome: pharyngitis and upper respiratory tract
50 infection, lower respiratory tract infection, gastrointestinal infection, meningitis and
51 encephalitis, fever in the returning traveler and sexually-transmitted infection including HIV.
52 The performance of tests was described based on clinical validation studies. Further, their
53 impact on clinical outcomes and anti-infective use was discussed with a focus on ED-based
54 studies.

55 Implications: Clinicians should be familiar with the distinctive features of each RDT and
56 individual performance characteristics for each target. Their integration into ED workflow
57 should be pre-planned considering local constraints of given settings. Additional clinical
58 studies are needed to further evaluate their clinical and cost effectiveness.

59 **I. Introduction**

60 Rapid diagnostic tests (RDTs) for infectious diseases have recently been implemented in
61 many laboratories and emergency departments (EDs) with the goal of expediting the
62 diagnosis of infectious diseases, infection prevention, appropriate initial management, and
63 to facilitate antimicrobial stewardship in the ED where rapid clinical decisions must be
64 undertaken in the context of overcrowding and time pressures [1]. Even though multiple
65 RDTs are currently available, their successful implementation in the ED requires careful
66 assessment of performance characteristics, potential benefits to patient care and cost
67 considerations, as well as a well-organized implementation plan to optimize their impact [2].
68 The goal of this narrative review is to provide an overview of currently available RDTs for
69 infectious diseases in the ED with a detailed description of their performance and to discuss
70 their impact on patient care.

71

72 **II. Methods**

73 A comprehensive PubMed search was conducted through August 2019 to identify studies on
74 RDTs for infectious diseases in ED department using the following MeSH and keywords:
75 "RDT", "Point of care", "Panel", "Turnaround time <2hrs", "ED", "Emergency service",
76 "Pharyngitis", "Respiratory tract infection", "URTI", "LRTI", "Influenza", "RSV", "Urinary
77 antigen", "Pneumococcal urinary antigen", "Legionella urinary antigen", "Gastrointestinal
78 infection", "Central nervous system infection", "Meningitis", "encephalitis", "Fever returning
79 traveller", "Sexually transmitted infection" and "STI".

80 Inclusion criteria were: commercial tests approved by the FDA or CE-IVD with data published
81 on clinical samples, ability to run on fully-automated systems and result delivery within 2
82 hours, as supported by Drancourt et al. [3].

83 Assay performance characteristics including sensitivity and specificity are outlined based on
84 published clinical validation studies, whenever available. In the absence of test comparison
85 against a gold standard assay, the reported positive and negative percent agreement in
86 identified clinical studies or manufacturer performance data were not reported to avoid any
87 misinterpretation.

88

89 **III. Overview of available tests**

90 A non-exhaustive list of representative commercially available FDA or CE approved RDTs is
91 provided in Table 1 [4-39]. Of note, all assays discussed in this review are qualitative assays.
92 When available, we describe the evidence for impact of tests on clinical outcomes and anti-
93 infective use in the ED (Table 2) [6, 32, 40-55].

94

95 *II.1. Pharyngitis and upper respiratory tract infections*

96 Upper respiratory tract infection is the leading infectious cause of visits in the ED. In patients
97 with pharyngitis, clinical scoring systems and rapid tests are recommended to target
98 antibiotic use.

99 For group A streptococcus (GAS) pharyngitis diagnosis an immunofluorescence-based assay
100 recently demonstrated higher diagnostic performances compared to an
101 immunochromatographic rapid antigen detection test (RADT) in pediatric patients
102 presenting with pharyngitis with a Mclsaac score ≥ 2 ; the negative predictive value (NPV) of

103 the immunofluorescence-based assay was also higher (92%) in this pediatric population with
104 a GAS prevalence of 37% [4].

105 In patients with a high likelihood of streptococcal infection, guidelines recommend the use
106 of RDTs as they are associated with decreased antibiotic use in pediatric ED populations [56].
107 However, the utility of clinical scores in children appears to be lower than for adults due to
108 the different clinical presentation of sore throat in infants and young children. Point-of-care
109 PCR assays demonstrated improved performance compared to culture or RADT as well
110 reduced unnecessary antibiotic use in a pediatric study [5-7].

111 In patients with ILI (influenza-like illness), implementation of the FILMARRAY® multiplex PCR
112 respiratory panel in the ED was associated with shorter times to diagnosis for all respiratory
113 viruses, shorter duration of antibiotic use, decreased hospitalization rates, shortened length
114 of stay (LOS), and reduced costs [41, 45]. A recent meta-analysis evaluated the clinical
115 impact of molecular RDTs for respiratory viruses by analyzing 56 individual test accuracy
116 studies and showed that, in comparison to conventional molecular assays, RDTs did not
117 reduce antibiotic use and duration, isolation measures or admission rates, but increased use
118 of oseltamivir in influenza positive cases and reduced LOS [57].

119

120 *II.2. Lower respiratory tract infections*

121 The most frequent LRTIs seen in the ED include: acute bronchitis, community-acquired
122 pneumonia (CAP), ILI and acute COPD (chronic obstructive pulmonary disease) exacerbation.

123 Current guidelines recommend that urinary antigen tests for *Streptococcus pneumoniae* and
124 *Legionella pneumophila* serogroup 1 antigens should be performed for CAP patients with
125 severe illness and for legionellosis when clinically or epidemiologically suspected. Rapid

126 multiplex PCR tests from nasopharyngeal swabs for atypical bacteria and respiratory viruses
127 should also be considered.

128

129 *II.2.1. RDTs performed on urine specimens*

130 Rapid urine antigen tests are widely used for the diagnosis of *S. pneumoniae* and
131 *L. pneumophila* respiratory infections. Rapid tests for *S. pneumoniae* detection present
132 sensitivities ranging from 62 to 66% as compared to blood or sputum culture [8]. The
133 performance of *L. pneumophila* urinary antigen detection tests varies according to several
134 factors [9, 58]: (i) assay type, with improved performance for immunofluorescence tests; (ii)
135 sample type, clinical vs. simulated urine samples prepared with strains of *L. pneumophila*
136 serogroup 1 are best detected; (iii) pre-analytic sample processing; (iv) serogroup, with
137 higher sensitivities for *L. pneumophila* serogroup 1. False-positive results can be due to
138 recent *L. pneumophila* or *S. pneumoniae* past infection or pneumococcal vaccination,
139 respectively, warranting cautious interpretation in the absence of concomitant cultures.

140 According to guidelines, antibiotic treatment should be initiated immediately after CAP
141 diagnosis and include empiric therapy of *S. pneumoniae*. Rapid microbiologic confirmation
142 theoretically offers the opportunity for antibiotic de-escalation. However, in practice, the
143 poor sensitivity and specificity of urinary antigen testing for *S. pneumoniae* [48,59] do not
144 allow such de-escalation, and a large proportion of patients remain treated with broader-
145 spectrum antibiotics [49,60,61].

146 *II.2.2 RDTs performed on respiratory specimens*

147 Among panels developed for broad respiratory virus detection from nasopharyngeal
148 samples, several are now available on a fully automatized system with turn-around times
149 (TAT) around 1 hour (Table 1). They allow the detection of all the most common respiratory

150 viruses and some atypical bacteria: *Bordetella pertussis*, *Bordetella parapertussis*,
151 *Chlamydophila pneumoniae* and *Mycoplasma pneumoniae*. Analytical performance
152 characteristics, compared to reference PCR assays, are good to excellent (sensitivity and
153 specificity from 80 to 100% for all targets). Of note, some bacterial targets have been
154 validated with fewer than 10 positive samples, and performance characteristics of bacterial
155 PCR have sometimes been reported to be lower than those of viral PCR [19], highlighting the
156 need for caution when interpreting cumulative performance results. Furthermore, the
157 performance of some panels (Table 1) only consist of percent agreement, which represents a
158 strong- and maybe underappreciated – limitation.

159 For the diagnosis of LRTIs in the ED, a short TAT is a key parameter for relevant therapeutic
160 measures, when targeted treatments and specific infection-prevention measures exist, such
161 as for RSV or influenza [62].

162

163 *II.3. Gastrointestinal (GI) infections*

164 The rapid diagnosis of *Clostridium difficile* infection (CDI) is often based on a 2- or 3-stage
165 diagnostic approach using specific GDH antigen with enzyme immunoassays (EIA),
166 amplification of toxin A/B genes by PCR and detection of toxins A/B by EIA (Table 1). No
167 other enteric bacteria or virus dispose of sensitive rapid diagnostic method except for
168 gastrointestinal multiplex PCR panels. Their performances should be considered separately
169 for each target, and as other syndromic panels, validation studies of some assays were
170 performed among populations with low prevalence of certain targets including *Vibrio* spp.,
171 *Entamoeba histolytica*, *Yersinia enterocolitica* [26]; an important consideration for
172 interpretation of negative results.

173 Very few data have been published on the clinical impact of RDTs for the diagnosis of GI
174 infections in the ED. Additional research is needed to evaluate their impact and cost
175 effectiveness, especially for costly, but POC-friendly, rapid multiplex PCR assays [50,51].

176

177 *II.4. Meningitis and encephalitis*

178 Pneumococcal antigen and cryptococcal antigen detection through immunochromatographic
179 technology are marketed to be used in cerebrospinal fluid samples, with excellent
180 performance and short TAT [27].

181 To date, only one fully-automatized rapid multiplex PCR system is available, the FilmArray
182 ME panel (BioFire, bioMérieux), which provides results in about one hour. Common bacteria
183 and viruses are detected, as well as the yeast *C. neoformans/gattii* (Table 1). Performances
184 have been evaluated retrospectively [30,63]. Both false positive and false negative results
185 are possible, and thus all biological and clinical parameters should be taken into account for
186 result interpretation, especially for uncommon targets such as *Cryptococcus* [64]. These
187 panels are also not intended to be fully exhaustive of all possible pathogens. Finally *Listeria*
188 *monocytogenes* was not tested during the clinical validation study, necessitating specific PCR
189 or cultures if there a high index of suspicion [30].

190 No data are available today on the impact of RDTs on the management of patients with
191 suspicion of meningitis/encephalitis in the ED. A retrospective analysis of 145 pediatric cases
192 of meningitis showed that 20% of infants were discharged in <24 h after an enterovirus-
193 positive result, highlighting some potential benefits of rapid syndromic testing [65]. Further
194 investigation of this approach is needed, especially in adults.

195

196 *II.5. Fever in the returning traveler*

197 Malaria RDTs are critically needed for patients returning from endemic countries. Around
198 90% of cases occur in the WHO African region with *Plasmodium falciparum* being the most
199 prevalent species and accounting for nearly all the mortality. Malaria is diagnosed by three
200 categories of tools: expert light microscopy; immunochromatographic tests (ICTs); and
201 nucleic acid amplification tests (NAATs) [66]. Light microscopy is widely used but requires
202 highly-trained staff. ICTs are cheap and have a sensitivity of minimum 95% compared to
203 microscopy and a specificity of >90% for all *Plasmodium* species [67]. Note that the
204 BinaxNOW malaria test (Alere), able to detect the four *Plasmodium* species, is the only ICT
205 approved by the FDA. Currently, no PCR-based RDT is commercially available. Nonetheless, a
206 LAMP-based molecular test (Malaria LAMP assay; illumigene M; Meridian Biosciences) is
207 commercially available [68]. In a recent prospective trial in returning travelers, this approach
208 showed excellent analytical performance vs microscopy with near 100% accuracy [32].

209 With 96 million dengue infections per year in over 100 tropical and sub-tropical countries
210 with nonspecific symptoms, rapid and accurate testing is important. Unfortunately, rapid
211 ICTs detecting both NS1 antigen and IgM have relatively low performance profiles. Their use
212 should be limited to strong clinical suspicion and confirmed by ELISA or PCR assays [33].
213 There is a need for “multiplex testing” for other arboviruses, e.g. Zika and Chikungunya,
214 that have resulted in large outbreaks.

215

216 *II.6. Sexually-transmitted infections and HIV infection*

217 Many patients seek to EDs for initial care of sexually transmitted infections (STIs). POC
218 testing of STIs could allow treating cases during the initial clinical visit and thus improving
219 adherence to treatment and further transmissions. For syphilis, available RDTs consist of

220 lateral flow immunoassays (LFIAs) detecting treponemal antibodies but unable to distinguish
221 treated from active infection, leading to the risk of overtreatment. However, they may be
222 useful in resource limited settings to avoid congenital syphilis, to reduce neonatal mortality
223 and decrease disease transmissions [69].

224 Some RDT assays allow the individual or simultaneous detection of *C. trachomatis* and *N.*
225 *gonorrhoeae*, with varying performance depending on clinical specimen type (Table 1) [34,
226 35]. Only simultaneous detection will be discussed in this review since dual testing is most
227 clinically relevant. In the ED context, POC testing significantly decreases overtreatment of
228 gonorrhea and trichomoniasis compared to NAAT testing [70]. Implementation of rapid
229 testing for chlamydia and gonorrhea directly from triage using self-collected specimens can
230 dramatically reduce overtreatment [34, 54]. In the future, to significantly reduce the STI
231 burden, particularly for *N. gonorrhoeae* and *M. genitalium* infections, a combination of rapid
232 POC diagnostic and antimicrobial resistance testing will likely be needed.

233 Multiple manufacturers have also developed rapid ICTs for HIV diagnosis. Performance
234 evaluations are generally carried out on plasma or serum but not finger-stick whole blood.
235 Their use should also be cautious in the context of patients with primary infection or wide
236 HIV diversity (HIV-1, HIV-2, HIV-O). Indeed, a recent study demonstrated excellent
237 performance (sensitivity of 100% and specificity >98.5%) for chronically infected patients but
238 with inconsistent results for primary infected patients, even for tests detecting both HIV
239 specific antibodies and p24 antigen [39]. These tests may rarely be falsely negative among
240 HIV positive patients already on antiretroviral therapy [71,72]. While HIV POC testing in the
241 ED has no immediate impact on stewardship, it increases screening rates, general disease
242 awareness and prompt referral to an HIV specialist [73].

243

244 **III. Antimicrobial stewardship and health economics**

245 Most EDs face overcrowding, and POC tests may facilitate discharging or admitting patients
246 more quickly and improving ED throughput while decreasing length of stay (LOS). Various
247 clinical studies have demonstrated a significant impact on reducing antimicrobial duration
248 when rapid diagnostic tests are employed in the ED [54, 74-76]. Conversely, others have
249 failed to obtain such reduction, especially in complex healthcare environments [41, 43]. In
250 this context, multidisciplinary diagnostic stewardship is essential, which refers to the
251 appropriate use of laboratory testing to guide patient management, including treatment, in
252 order to optimize patient outcomes and antibiotic use [77]. Indeed, implementation of new
253 RDTs should rely on multidisciplinary approaches and high-quality evidence supporting their
254 clinical validation and impact.

255 Currently, there is limited data on health economic outcomes related to use of POC tests in
256 the ED, and several of the published studies are based on simulation only [78]. Reductions in
257 ED LOS, wait time and the number of clinic visits required to receive results were reported
258 [79].

259

260 **IV. Workflow and implementation**

261 Appropriate integration of RDTs into the clinical environment is often an overlooked
262 component. Pragmatically, successful implementation depends on three key questions: Who
263 will perform the test? What is the optimal time point of specimen collection? Where should
264 the sample be processed? Questions on appropriate timing and who should be in charge are
265 directly related to the ultimate goal of testing. If the primary objectives are prompt isolation
266 (e.g., POC tests for detection of influenza in patients with ILI), quick administration of anti-

267 infective drugs in critical patients (e.g., malaria in febrile returning traveler) or improved
268 patient throughput, testing might be performed by triage nurses, based on precise and
269 simple clinical case definitions. Conversely, other tests require more complex interpretation
270 or sampling such as LRTI panels and should thus be limited to confirmed pneumonia
271 patients. Training for assay implementation is strongly required, and additional human
272 resources may be needed for timely integration into ED workflow. Clinicians also need to
273 receive regular training on indications and interpretation of RDT results in collaboration with
274 clinical microbiologists [80]. Finally, with the rapid expansion of RDTs in the ED for both
275 infectious and noninfectious syndromes, space and time constraints for instruments should
276 also be anticipated.

277

278 **V. Conclusions**

279 This review provides a non-exhaustive overview of currently commercially available FDA and
280 CE RDTs for infectious diseases in the ED. Most of these assays display adequate analytical
281 performance yet additional high-quality studies are needed to better assess their impact.
282 These assays must be appropriately integrated into ED workflow, taking into account local
283 constraints and priorities. Furthermore, RDTs cannot yet replace conventional methods since
284 they are not exhaustive, have performance limitations, and provide limited data on
285 antimicrobial susceptibility profiles. Finally and most importantly, their clinical and economic
286 impact remains uncertain: there is a need to conduct rigorous studies such as randomized
287 controlled clinical trials, to determine their actual impact on clinical management and
288 outcomes such as time to optimal therapy, length of ED or hospital stay, cost effectiveness,
289 mortality, as well as their role in antimicrobial stewardship interventions.

290

291 Author's contribution

292 MCZ, JS and VC conceived the study. DB and MCZ wrote the first draft. All authors
293 commented on, or edited drafts and approved the final version of the manuscript.

294 Transparency declaration

295 VC reports personal fees from Accelerate Diagnostics, Astellas, bioMérieux, Correvio,
296 Curetis, Eumédica, Menarini, Mylan, Pfizer and Sanofi. SK reports personal fees from
297 Accelerate Diagnostics, bioMérieux and MSD. BV reports personal fees from bioMérieux and
298 Qiagen, and grant from Stat-Dx. LM reports personal fees from Cepheid, Roche, Bio-Rad and
299 Qvella, and research grants from BioFire Diagnostics and Roche. DB, MCZ and JS report no
300 conflicts of interest.

301 Funding information

302 No external funding was received for this work.

303

304

305 **References**

- 306 1. Morley C, Unwin M, Peterson GM, Stankovich J, Kinsman L. Emergency department crowding: A
307 systematic review of causes, consequences and solutions. *PLoS One* 2018;13:e0203316.
- 308 2. Clerc O, Greub G. Routine use of point-of-care tests: usefulness and application in clinical microbiology.
309 *Clin Microbiol Infect* 2010;16:1054-61.
- 310 3. Drancourt M, Michel-Lepage A, Boyer S, Raoult D. The point-of-care laboratory in clinical microbiology.
311 *Clin Microbiol Rev* 2016;29:429-47.
- 312 4. Lacroix L, Cherkaoui A, Schaller D, Manzano S, Galetto-Lacour A, Pfeifer U, et al. Improved Diagnostic
313 Performance of an Immunofluorescence-based Rapid Antigen Detection Test for Group A Streptococci in
314 Children With Pharyngitis. *Pediatr Infect Dis J* 2018;37:206-11.
- 315 5. Faron ML, Ledebouer NA, Granato P, Daly JA, Pierce K, Pancholi P, et al. Detection of Group A
316 Streptococcus in Pharyngeal Swab Specimens by Use of the AmpliVue GAS Isothermal Helicase-Dependent
317 Amplification Assay. *J Clin Microbiol* 2015;53:2365-7.
- 318 6. Rao A, Berg B, Quezada T, Fader R, Walker K, Tang S, et al. Diagnosis and antibiotic treatment of group a
319 streptococcal pharyngitis in children in a primary care setting: impact of point-of-care polymerase chain
320 reaction. *BMC Pediatr* 2019;19:24.
- 321 7. Ralph AP, Holt DC, Islam S, Osowicki J, Carroll DE, Tong SYC, et al. Potential for Molecular Testing for
322 Group A Streptococcus to Improve Diagnosis and Management in a High-Risk Population: A Prospective
323 Study. *Open Forum Infect Dis* 2019;6:ofz097.
- 324 8. Euser SM, Badoux P, Kracht-Kosten L, Yzerman EPF. Evaluation of the Sofia Streptococcus pneumoniae FIA
325 test for the detection of *S. pneumoniae* antigen in urine. *J Med Microbiol* 2018;67:1743-6.
- 326 9. Helbig JH, Uldum SA, Luck PC, Harrison TG. Detection of Legionella pneumophila antigen in urine samples
327 by the BinaxNOW immunochromatographic assay and comparison with both Binax Legionella Urinary
328 Enzyme Immunoassay (EIA) and Biotest Legionella Urin Antigen EIA. *J Med Microbiol* 2001;50:509-16.
- 329 10. Ratliff AE, Duffy LB, Waites KB. Comparison of the illumigene Mycoplasma DNA amplification assay and
330 culture for detection of Mycoplasma pneumoniae. *J Clin Microbiol* 2014;52:1060-3.
- 331 11. Chen L, Tian Y, Chen S, Liesenfeld O. Performance of the Cobas((R)) Influenza A/B Assay for Rapid Pcr-
332 Based Detection of Influenza Compared to Prodesse ProFlu+ and Viral Culture. *Eur J Microbiol Immunol*
333 (Bp) 2015;5:236-45.
- 334 12. Valentin T, Kieslinger P, Stelzl E, Santner BI, Groselj-Strele A, Kessler HH, et al. Prospective evaluation of
335 three rapid molecular tests for seasonal influenza in patients presenting at an emergency unit. *J Clin Virol*
336 2019;111:29-32.
- 337 13. Lee CK, Cho CH, Woo MK, Nyeck AE, Lim CS, Kim WJ. Evaluation of Sofia fluorescent immunoassay
338 analyzer for influenza A/B virus. *J Clin Virol* 2012;55:239-43.
- 339 14. Peters RM, Schnee SV, Tabatabai J, Schnitzler P, Pfeil J. Evaluation of Alere i RSV for Rapid Detection of
340 Respiratory Syncytial Virus in Children Hospitalized with Acute Respiratory Tract Infection. *J Clin Microbiol*
341 2017;55:1032-6.
- 342 15. Gibson J, Schechter-Perkins EM, Mitchell P, Mace S, Tian Y, Williams K, et al. Multi-center evaluation of
343 the cobas((R)) Liat((R)) Influenza A/B & RSV assay for rapid point of care diagnosis. *J Clin Virol* 2017;95:5-9.
- 344 16. Popowitch EB, Miller MB. Performance Characteristics of Xpert Flu/RSV XC Assay. *J Clin Microbiol*
345 2015;53:2720-1.
- 346 17. Pierce VM, Elkan M, Leet M, McGowan KL, Hodinka RL. Comparison of the Idaho Technology FilmArray
347 system to real-time PCR for detection of respiratory pathogens in children. *J Clin Microbiol* 2012;50:364-
348 71.
- 349 18. Loeffelholz MJ, Pong DL, Pyles RB, Xiong Y, Miller AL, Bufton KK, et al. Comparison of the FilmArray
350 Respiratory Panel and Prodesse real-time PCR assays for detection of respiratory pathogens. *J Clin*
351 *Microbiol* 2011;49:4083-8.
- 352 19. Leber AL, Everhart K, Daly JA, Hopper A, Harrington A, Schreckenberger P, et al. Multicenter Evaluation of
353 BioFire FilmArray Respiratory Panel 2 for Detection of Viruses and Bacteria in Nasopharyngeal Swab
354 Samples. *J Clin Microbiol* 2018;56.
- 355 20. Babady NE, England MR, Jurcic Smith KL, He T, Wijetunge DS, Tang YW, et al. Multicenter Evaluation of the
356 ePlex Respiratory Pathogen Panel for the Detection of Viral and Bacterial Respiratory Tract Pathogens in
357 Nasopharyngeal Swabs. *J Clin Microbiol* 2018;56.
- 358 21. Pancholi P, Kelly C, Raczkowski M, Balada-Llasat JM. Detection of toxigenic *Clostridium difficile*:
359 comparison of the cell culture neutralization, Xpert C. difficile, Xpert C. difficile/Epi, and illumigene C.
360 difficile assays. *J Clin Microbiol* 2012;50:1331-5.

- 361 22. Dalpke AH, Hofko M, Zorn M, Zimmermann S. Evaluation of the fully automated BD MAX Cdiff and Xpert
362 C. difficile assays for direct detection of Clostridium difficile in stool specimens. J Clin Microbiol
363 2013;51:1906-8.
- 364 23. Peterson LR, Young SA, Davis TE, Jr., Wang ZX, Duncan J, Noutsios C, et al. Evaluation of the cobas Cdiff
365 Test for Detection of Toxigenic Clostridium difficile in Stool Samples. J Clin Microbiol 2017;55:3426-36.
- 366 24. Sloan LM, Duresko BJ, Gustafson DR, Rosenblatt JE. Comparison of real-time PCR for detection of the tcdC
367 gene with four toxin immunoassays and culture in diagnosis of Clostridium difficile infection. J Clin
368 Microbiol 2008;46:1996-2001.
- 369 25. Eastwood K, Else P, Charlett A, Wilcox M. Comparison of nine commercially available Clostridium difficile
370 toxin detection assays, a real-time PCR assay for C. difficile tcdB, and a glutamate dehydrogenase
371 detection assay to cytotoxin testing and cytotoxigenic culture methods. J Clin Microbiol 2009;47:3211-7.
- 372 26. Buss SN, Leber A, Chapin K, Fey PD, Bankowski MJ, Jones MK, et al. Multicenter evaluation of the BioFire
373 FilmArray gastrointestinal panel for etiologic diagnosis of infectious gastroenteritis. J Clin Microbiol
374 2015;53:915-25.
- 375 27. Binnicker MJ, Jespersen DJ, Bestrom JE, Rollins LO. Comparison of four assays for the detection of
376 cryptococcal antigen. Clin Vaccine Immunol 2012;19:1988-90.
- 377 28. Marcos MA, Martínez E, Almela M, Mensa J, Jiménez de Anta MT. New rapid antigen test for diagnosis of
378 pneumococcal meningitis. Lancet 2001;357:1499-500.
- 379 29. Capaul SE, Gorgievski-Hrisoho M. Detection of enterovirus RNA in cerebrospinal fluid (CSF) using
380 NucliSens EasyQ Enterovirus assay. J Clin Virol 2005;32:236-40.
- 381 30. Leber AL, Everhart K, Balada-Llasat JM, Cullison J, Daly J, Holt S, et al. Multicenter Evaluation of BioFire
382 FilmArray Meningitis/Encephalitis Panel for Detection of Bacteria, Viruses, and Yeast in Cerebrospinal
383 Fluid Specimens. J Clin Microbiol 2016;54:2251-61.
- 384 31. Dimaio MA, Pereira IT, George TI, Banaei N. Performance of BinaxNOW for diagnosis of malaria in a U.S.
385 hospital. J Clin Microbiol 2012;50:2877-80.
- 386 32. Cheaveau J, Nguyen H, Chow B, Marasinghe D, Mohon AN, Yuan H, et al. Clinical Validation of a
387 Commercial LAMP Test for Ruling out Malaria in Returning Travelers: A Prospective Diagnostic Trial. Open
388 Forum Infect Dis 2018;5:ofy260.
- 389 33. Hunsperger EA, Yoksan S, Buchy P, Nguyen VC, Sekaran SD, Enria DA, et al. Evaluation of commercially
390 available diagnostic tests for the detection of dengue virus NS1 antigen and anti-dengue virus IgM
391 antibody. PLoS Negl Trop Dis 2014;8:e3171.
- 392 34. Gaydos CA, Van Der Pol B, Jett-Goheen M, Barnes M, Quinn N, Clark C, et al. Performance of the Cepheid
393 CT/NG Xpert Rapid PCR Test for Detection of Chlamydia trachomatis and Neisseria gonorrhoeae. J Clin
394 Microbiol 2013;51:1666-72.
- 395 35. Iwen PC, Walker RA, Warren KL, Kelly DM, Hinrichs SH, Linder J. Evaluation of nucleic acid-based test
396 (PACE 2C) for simultaneous detection of Chlamydia trachomatis and Neisseria gonorrhoeae in
397 endocervical specimens. J Clin Microbiol 1995;33:2587-91.
- 398 36. Diaz T, Almeida MG, Georg I, Maia SC, De Souza RV, Markowitz LE. Evaluation of the Determine Rapid
399 Syphilis TP assay using sera. Clin Diagn Lab Immunol 2004;11:98-101.
- 400 37. Benzaken AS, Sabido M, Galban EG, Pedroza V, Vasquez F, Araujo A, et al. Field evaluation of the
401 performance and testing costs of a rapid point-of-care test for syphilis in a red-light district of Manaus,
402 Brazil. Sex Transm Infect 2008;84:297-302.
- 403 38. Li J, Zheng HY, Wang LN, Liu YX, Wang XF, Liu XR. Clinical evaluation of four recombinant Treponema
404 pallidum antigen-based rapid diagnostic tests for syphilis. J Eur Acad Dermatol Venereol 2009;23:648-50.
- 405 39. Mourez T, Lemee V, Delbos V, Delaugerre C, Alessandri-Gradt E, Etienne M, et al. HIV rapid screening tests
406 and self-tests: Be aware of differences in performance and cautious of vendors. EBioMedicine
407 2018;37:382-91.
- 408 40. Kose E, Sirin Kose S, Akca D, Yildiz K, Elmas C, Baris M, et al. The Effect of Rapid Antigen Detection Test on
409 Antibiotic Prescription Decision of Clinicians and Reducing Antibiotic Costs in Children with Acute
410 Pharyngitis. J Trop Pediatr 2016;62:308-15.
- 411 41. Rogers BB, Shankar P, Jerris RC, Kotzbauer D, Anderson EJ, Watson JR, et al. Impact of a rapid respiratory
412 panel test on patient outcomes. Arch Pathol Lab Med 2015;139:636-41.
- 413 42. Brendish NJ, Malachira AK, Armstrong L, Houghton R, Aitken S, Nyimbili E, et al. Routine molecular point-
414 of-care testing for respiratory viruses in adults presenting to hospital with acute respiratory illness
415 (ResPOC): a pragmatic, open-label, randomised controlled trial. Lancet Respir Med 2017;5:401-11.
- 416 43. Andrews D, Chetty Y, Cooper BS, Virk M, Glass SK, Letters A, et al. Multiplex PCR point of care testing
417 versus routine, laboratory-based testing in the treatment of adults with respiratory tract infections: a

- 418 quasi-randomised study assessing impact on length of stay and antimicrobial use. *BMC Infect Dis*
419 2017;17:671.
- 420 44. Benirschke RC, McElvania E, Thomson RB, Jr., Kaul KL, Das S. Clinical Impact of Rapid Point-of-Care PCR
421 Influenza Testing in an Urgent Care Setting: a Single-Center Study. *J Clin Microbiol* 2019;57.
- 422 45. Rappo U, Schuetz AN, Jenkins SG, Calfee DP, Walsh TJ, Wells MT, et al. Impact of Early Detection of
423 Respiratory Viruses by Multiplex PCR Assay on Clinical Outcomes in Adult Patients. *J Clin Microbiol*
424 2016;54:2096-103.
- 425 46. Lacroix S, Vrignaud B, Avril E, Moreau-Klein A, Coste M, Launay E, et al. Impact of rapid influenza
426 diagnostic test on physician estimation of viral infection probability in paediatric emergency department
427 during epidemic period. *J Clin Virol* 2015;72:141-5.
- 428 47. Davis S, Allen AJ, O'Leary R, Power M, Price DA, Simpson AJ, et al. Diagnostic accuracy and cost analysis of
429 the Alere i Influenza A&B near-patient test using throat swabs. *J Hosp Infect* 2017;97:301-9.
- 430 48. Bellew S, Grijalva CG, Williams DJ, Anderson EJ, Wunderink RG, Zhu Y, et al. Pneumococcal and Legionella
431 Urinary Antigen Tests in Community-acquired Pneumonia: Prospective Evaluation of Indications for
432 Testing. *Clin Infect Dis* 2019;68:2026-33.
- 433 49. Dinh A, Duran C, Davido B, Lagrange A, Sivadon-Tardy V, Bouchand F, et al. Cost effectiveness of
434 pneumococcal urinary antigen in Emergency Department: a pragmatic real-life study. *Intern Emerg Med*
435 2018;13:69-73.
- 436 50. Axelrad JE, Freedberg DE, Whittier S, Greendyke W, Lebwohl B, Green DA. Impact of Gastrointestinal
437 Panel Implementation on Health Care Utilization and Outcomes. *J Clin Microbiol* 2019;57.
- 438 51. Beal SG, Tremblay EE, Toffel S, Velez L, Rand KH. A Gastrointestinal PCR Panel Improves Clinical
439 Management and Lowers Health Care Costs. *J Clin Microbiol* 2018;56.
- 440 52. Blaschke AJ, Shapiro DJ, Pavia AT, Byington CL, Ampofo K, Stockmann C, et al. A National study of the
441 impact of rapid influenza testing on clinical care in the emergency department. *J Pediatric Infect Dis Soc*
442 2014;3:112-8.
- 443 53. Sanders EJ, Cirro O, Oduor C, Mangi J, Wahome E, Price MA, et al. Point-of-care HIV RNA testing and
444 immediate antiretroviral therapy initiation in young adults seeking out-patient care in Kenya. *AIDS*
445 2019;33:923-6.
- 446 54. May L, Ware CE, Jordan JA, Zocchi M, Zatorski C, Ajabnoor Y, et al. A Randomized Controlled Trial
447 Comparing the treatment of patients tested for chlamydia and gonorrhea after a rapid polymerase chain
448 reaction test versus standard of care testing. *Sex Transm Dis* 2016;43:290-5.
- 449 55. Gaydos CA, Ako MC, Lewis M, Hsieh YH, Rothman RE, Dugas AF. Use of a rapid diagnostic for Chlamydia
450 trachomatis and Neisseria gonorrhoeae for women in the emergency department can improve clinical
451 management: Report of a randomized clinical trial. *Ann Emerg Med* 2019;74:36-44.
- 452 56. Bird C, Winzor G, Lemon K, Moffat A, Newton T, Gray J. A Pragmatic Study to Evaluate the Use of a Rapid
453 Diagnostic Test to Detect Group A Streptococcal Pharyngitis in Children With the Aim of Reducing
454 Antibiotic Use in a UK Emergency Department. *Pediatr Emerg Care* 2018.
- 455 57. Vos LM, Bruning AHL, Reitsma JB, Schuurman R, Riezebos-Brilman A, Hoepelman AIM, et al. Rapid
456 Molecular Tests for Influenza, Respiratory Syncytial Virus, and Other Respiratory Viruses: A Systematic
457 Review of Diagnostic Accuracy and Clinical Impact Studies. *Clin Infect Dis* 2019;69:1243-53.
- 458 58. Beraud L, Gervasoni K, Freydiere AM, Descours G, Ranc AG, Vandenesch F, et al. Comparison of Sofia
459 Legionella FIA and BinaxNOW(R) Legionella urinary antigen card in two national reference centers. *Eur J*
460 *Clin Microbiol Infect Dis* 2015;34:1803-7.
- 461 59. Sinclair A, Xie X, Teltscher M, Dendukuri N. Systematic review and meta-analysis of a urine-based
462 pneumococcal antigen test for diagnosis of community-acquired pneumonia caused by Streptococcus
463 pneumoniae. *J Clin Microbiol* 2013;51:2303-10.
- 464 60. Matta M, Kernéis S, Day N, Lescat M, Hoi AB, Varon E, Gutmann L, Mainardi JL. Do clinicians consider the
465 results of the BinaxNOW Streptococcus pneumoniae urinary antigen test when adapting antibiotic
466 regimens for pneumonia patients? *Clin Microbiol Infect* 2010;16:1389-93.
- 467 61. Schimmel JJ, Haessler S, Imrey P, Lindenauer PK, Richter SS, Yu PC, Rothberg MB. Pneumococcal urinary
468 antigen testing in US hospitals: A missed opportunity for antimicrobial stewardship. *Clin Infect Dis* 2019
469 ;pii: ciz983.
- 470 62. Rogan DT, Kochar MS, Yang S, Quinn JV. Impact of Rapid Molecular Respiratory Virus Testing on Real-Time
471 Decision Making in a Pediatric Emergency Department. *J Mol Diagn* 2017;19:460-7.
- 472 63. Liesman RM, Strasburg AP, Heitman AK, Theel ES, Patel R, Binnicker MJ. Evaluation of a Commercial
473 Multiplex Molecular Panel for Diagnosis of Infectious Meningitis and Encephalitis. *J Clin Microbiol*
474 2018;56.

- 475 64. Lewis PO, Lanier CG, Patel PD, Krolikowski WD, Krolikowski MA. False negative diagnostic errors with
476 polymerase chain reaction for the detection of cryptococcal meningoenkephalitis. *Med Mycol* 2019.
477 65. Blaschke AJ, Holmberg KM, Daly JA, Leber AL, Dien Bard J, Korgenski EK, et al. Retrospective Evaluation of
478 Infants Aged 1 to 60 Days with Residual Cerebrospinal Fluid (CSF) Tested Using the FilmArray
479 Meningitis/Encephalitis (ME) Panel. *J Clin Microbiol* 2018;56.
480 66. Mukkala AN, Kwan J, Lau R, Harris D, Kain D, Boggild AK. An Update on Malaria Rapid Diagnostic Tests.
481 *Curr Infect Dis Rep* 2018;20:49.
482 67. Tedla M. A focus on improving molecular diagnostic approaches to malaria control and elimination in low
483 transmission settings: Review. *Parasite Epidemiol Control* 2019;6:e00107.
484 68. Ponce C, Kaczorowski F, Perpoint T, Miallhes P, Sigal A, Javouhey E, et al. Diagnostic accuracy of loop-
485 mediated isothermal amplification (LAMP) for screening patients with imported malaria in a non-endemic
486 setting. *Parasite* 2017;24:53.
487 69. Tucker JD, Bien CH, Peeling RW. Point-of-care testing for sexually transmitted infections: recent advances
488 and implications for disease control. *Curr Opin Infect Dis* 2013;26:73-9.
489 70. Huppert JS, Taylor RG, St Cyr S, Hesse EA, Reed JL. Point-of-care testing improves accuracy of STI care in
490 an emergency department. *Sex Transm Infect* 2013;89:489-94.
491 71. Sayre N, Poupard M, Nivose PL, Khuong MA. Risk of falsely negative results with rapid HIV tests in HIV-
492 infected patients. *Med Mal Infect* 2018;48:491-2.
493 72. Tan WS, Chow EP, Fairley CK, Chen MY, Bradshaw CS, Read TR. Sensitivity of HIV rapid tests compared
494 with fourth-generation enzyme immunoassays or HIV RNA tests. *AIDS* 2016;30:1951-60.
495 73. Brown J, Shesser R, Simon G, Bahn M, Czarnogorski M, Kuo I, et al. Routine HIV screening in the
496 emergency department using the new US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention Guidelines: results
497 from a high-prevalence area. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr* 2007;46:395-401.
498 74. Green DA, Hitoalij L, Kotansky B, Campbell SM, Peaper DR. Clinical Utility of On-Demand Multiplex
499 Respiratory Pathogen Testing among Adult Outpatients. *J Clin Microbiol* 2016;54:2950-5.
500 75. Gelfer G, Leggett J, Myers J, Wang L, Gilbert DN. The clinical impact of the detection of potential etiologic
501 pathogens of community-acquired pneumonia. *Diagn Microbiol Infect Dis* 2015;83:400-6.
502 76. Keske S, Ergonul O, Tutucu F, Karaaslan D, Palaoglu E, Can F. The rapid diagnosis of viral respiratory tract
503 infections and its impact on antimicrobial stewardship programs. *Eur J Clin Microbiol Infect Dis*
504 2018;37:779-83.
505 77. Patel R, Fang FC. Diagnostic Stewardship: Opportunity for a Laboratory-Infectious Diseases Partnership.
506 *Clin Infect Dis* 2018;67:799-801.
507 78. Weigl BH, Gaydos CA, Kost G, Beyette FR, Jr., Sabourin S, Rompalo A, et al. The Value of Clinical Needs
508 Assessments for Point-of-Care Diagnostics. *Point Care* 2012;11:108-13.
509 79. Loubiere S, Moatti JP. Economic evaluation of point-of-care diagnostic technologies for infectious
510 diseases. *Clin Microbiol Infect* 2010;16:1070-6.
511 80. Le Maréchal M, Agrinier N, Cattoir V, Pulcini C; ABS-CM working group. A nationwide survey on
512 involvement of clinical microbiologists in antibiotic stewardship programmes in large French hospitals. *Eur*
513 *J Clin Microbiol Infect Dis* 2019;38:2235-2241.

Table 1 : Non exhaustive list of commercially available FDA and CE approved point-of-care tests in infectious diseases, classified according to syndrome (or disease) of interest.

Syndrome or disease	Specific test, duplex or panel	Targeted pathogen(s)	Technique	Clinical specimen types	Trade names of some available assays	Tests performance characteristics†			Reference
						Sensitivity	Specificity	TAT	
Upper respiratory tract infections	Specific	<i>Group A Streptococcus</i>	LFIA	Pharyngeal swabs	Sofia® StrepA FIA	84.9%	96.8%	5min	[4]
	Specific	<i>Group A Streptococcus</i>	LFIA	Pharyngeal swab	TestPack Strep A	75.3%	98.1%	5min	[4]
	Specific	<i>Group A Streptococcus</i>	rPCR	Pharyngeal swabs	AmpliVue® GAS Assay	98.3%	93.2%	60min	[5]
	Specific	<i>Group A Streptococcus</i>	rPCR	Pharyngeal swabs	cobas® Liat Strep A Assay	95.5%	99.3%	15min	[6]
	Specific	<i>Group A Streptococcus</i>	rPCR	Pharyngeal swabs	Xpert® Xpress Strep A	100%	79.3%	25min	[7]
Lower respiratory tract infections	Specific	<i>Streptococcus pneumoniae</i>	LFIA	Urine samples	Sofia® <i>S. pneumoniae</i> FIA	66%	100%	10min	[8]
	Specific	<i>Streptococcus pneumoniae</i>	LFIA	Urine samples	BinaxNow™ <i>Streptococcus pneumoniae</i> Antigen Card	62%	98%	15min	[8]
	Specific	<i>Legionella pneumophila</i>	LFIA	Urine samples	BinaxNOW™ <i>Legionella</i> Urinary Antigen Card	79.7%	97.1%	15min	[9]
	Specific	<i>Mycoplasma pneumoniae</i>	LAMP	Throat swabs	Illumigene Mycoplasma Direct DNA amplification assay	87%	97.9%	60min	[10]
	Specific	Influenza A and B	rRT-PCR	NP swabs	Cobas® Influenza A/B assay	IA: 97.5% IB: 96.9%	IA: 97.9% IB: 97.9%	20min	[11]
	Specific	Influenza A and B	rRT-PCR	NP swabs	ID NOW™ INFLUENZA A & B (formerly Alere™ i. Influenza A & B)	NA	NA	15min	[12]
	Specific	Influenza A and B	LFIA	Nasal swabs, NP swabs, NP aspirate/wash	Sofia® influenza A+B FIA	IA: 82.2% IB: 77.8%	IA: 100% IB: 100%	15min	[13]
	Specific	RSV	rRT-PCR	NP swabs/aspirate	ID NOW™ RSV (formerly Alere™ I RSV)	100%	97%	15min	[14]
	Panel	Influenza A/B, RSV	rRT-PCR	NP swabs	Cobas® Influenza A/B & RSV	NA	NA	20min	[15]
Panel	Influenza A/B, RSV	rRT-PCR	nasal wash fluid samples/aspirates and NP swabs	Xpert® Flu/RSV XC	NA	NA	40min	[16]	

	Panel	Human adenovirus, human metapneumovirus, rhinovirus/enterovirus, influenza A, B, parainfluenza, RSV, <i>Bordetella pertussis</i> , <i>Chlamydomphila pneumoniae</i> , <i>Mycoplasma pneumoniae</i>	r(RT-)PCR	NP swabs	BIOFIRE® FILMARRAY® Respiratory Panel	NA	NA	65min	[17, 18]
	Panel	Human adenovirus, Coronavirus, human metapneumovirus, rhinovirus/enterovirus, Influenza A, B, parainfluenza, RSV, Mers-Cov, <i>Bordetella pertussis</i> , <i>Chlamydomphila pneumoniae</i> , <i>Mycoplasma pneumoniae</i> , <i>Bordetella parapertussis</i>	r(RT-)PCR	NP swabs	BIOFIRE® FILMARRAY® Respiratory Panel2 plus (RP2plus)	NA <i>M. pneumoniae</i> : 95.8%	NA <i>M. pneumoniae</i> : 99.7%	45min	[19]
	Panel	Human adenovirus, Coronavirus, human metapneumovirus, human rhinovirus/enterovirus, influenza A, B, parainfluenza, RSV-A/-B, <i>Chlamydia pneumoniae</i> , <i>Mycoplasma pneumoniae</i>	r(RT-)PCR	NP swabs	ePlex® Respiratory Pathogen (RP) Panel	NA	NA	90min	[20]
Gastro-intestinal infections	Specific	<i>C. difficile</i>	rPCR	Stool samples	Xpert® <i>C. difficile</i> BT	21.5%	100%	47min	[21,22]
	Specific	<i>C. difficile</i>	rPCR	Stool samples	Cobas® Cdiff test	92.9%	98.7%	20min	[23]
	Specific	<i>C. difficile</i>	EIA	Stool samples	Xpect™ <i>C. difficile</i> Toxin A/B Test	48%	84%	20min	[24]
	Specific	<i>C. difficile</i>	EIA	Stool samples	VIDAS® <i>C. difficile</i> GDH and VIDAS® <i>C. difficile</i> Toxin A & B	80-89.8%	96.7-97.3%	50min	[25]
	Panel	<i>Campylobacter (jejuni, coli & upsaliensis)</i> , <i>Clostridium difficile (Toxin A/B)</i> , <i>Plesiomonas shigelloides</i> , <i>Salmonella</i> , <i>Yersinia enterocolitica</i> , <i>Vibrio (parahaemolyticus, vulnificus, cholerae)</i> , <i>E. coli O157</i> , <i>Enterococci</i> , <i>E. coli (EAEC)</i> , <i>Enteropathogenic E. coli (EPEC)</i> , <i>Enterotoxigenic E. coli (ETEC) It/st</i> , <i>Shiga-like toxin-producing E. coli (STEC) stx1/stx2</i> , <i>E. coli O157</i> , <i>Shigella/Enteroinvasive E.</i>	rPCR	Stool samples	Biofire® FILMARRAY® GI Panel	100% for 12/22 targets ≥94.5% for an additional 7/22 targets	≥97.1% for all panel targets	60min	[26]

		<i>coli (EIEC), Adenovirus F 40/41, Astrovirus, Norovirus G1/GII, Rotavirus A, Sapovirus (I,II, IV, and V), Cryptosporidium, Cyclospora cayetanensis, Entamoeba histolytica, Giardia lamblia</i>							
Central nervous system infections	Duplex	<i>Cryptococcus neoformans, Cryptococcus gattii</i>	LFIA	Serum, CSF samples	CrAg® LFA	100%	99.8%	20min	[27]
	Specific	<i>S. pneumoniae</i>	LFIA	CSF samples	BinaxNow™ <i>Streptococcus pneumoniae</i> Antigen Card	95.4%-100%	100%	15min	[28]
	Specific	<i>Enterovirus</i>	rRT-PCR	CSF samples	NucliSENS EasyQ® Enterovirus vl.1	NA	NA	120min	[29]
	Panel	<i>E. coli K1, H. influenzae, L. monocytogenes, N. meningitidis, S. pneumoniae, S. agalactiae, enterovirus, HSV-1/2, VZV, CMV, HHV-6, human parechovirus, Cryptococcus neoformans/C. gattii</i>	r(RT-)PCR	CSF samples	BIOFIRE® FILMARRAY® Meningitis/Encephalitis (ME) Panel	<i>E.coli K1</i> : 100% <i>H.influenza</i> : 100% (n=1) <i>L.monocytogenes</i> : NA <i>N.meningitidis</i> : NA <i>S.agalactiae</i> : 0% (n=1) <i>S.pneumoniae</i> : 100% NA	<i>E.coli K1</i> : 99.9% <i>H.influenza</i> : 99.9% <i>L.monocytogenes</i> : 100% <i>N.meningitidis</i> : 100% <i>S.agalactiae</i> : 99.9% <i>S.pneumoniae</i> : 99.2% NA	65min	[30]
Fever in the returning traveler	Specific	<i>Plasmodium spp.</i>	LFIA	Whole blood samples	BinaxNOW® Malaria	All patients 84.2% Patients without antimalarial therapy : 92.9%	99.8%	15min	[31]
	Specific	<i>Plasmodium spp.</i>	LAMP	Whole blood samples	illumigene Malaria DNA amplification assay	98.1%	97.6%	10min	[32]
	Specific	Dengue virus	EIA	Plasma, serum samples	NS1 Ag detection*				[33]
					- Denge NS2 Ag Strip® - OnSite Dengue Ag Rapid Test - Dengue Early Rapid Test - SD Bioline Dengue Duo® IgM detection - Dengue IgG/IgM Rapid Test Device - OnSite Dengue IgG/IgM Combo - SD Bioline Dengue Duo®	52% 40% 60% 59% 63% 46% 89%	77% 76% 75% 78% 91% 86% 80%	30min 30min 20min 20min 20min 30min 20min	
Sexually transmitted infections	Duplex	<i>C. trachomatis, N. gonorrhoeae</i>	rPCR	Vaginal/endocervical and urine samples	Xpert® CT/NG	<i>C. trachomatis</i> in female endocervical, vaginal, urine samples : 97.4%, 98.7%, 97.6% <i>C. trachomatis</i> in male urine samples : 97.5% <i>N. gonorrhoeae</i> in females in endocervical, vaginal, urine samples : 100%, 100%, 95.6% <i>N. gonorrhoeae</i> in males urine	<i>C. trachomatis</i> in female and male samples : ≥99.4% <i>N. gonorrhoeae</i> in female and male samples : ≥99.8%	90min	[34]

					samples : 98%			
Duplex	<i>C. trachomatis, N. gonorrhoeae</i>	rPCR	Endocervical and urethral samples	Gen-probe PACE2C system for <i>Chlamydia trachomatis</i> and <i>Neisseria gonorrhoea</i>	96.3%	98.8%	95min	[35]
Specific	<i>Treponema pallidum</i>	LFIA	Serum, plasma, whole blood samples	DETERMINE™ SYPHILIS TP	95.6-98.4%	97.3-95.7%	15min	[36]
Specific	<i>Treponema pallidum</i>	LFIA	Serum, plasma, whole blood samples	VisiTect® Syphilis	57%	99%	30min	[37]
Specific	<i>Treponema pallidum</i>	LFIA	Serum, plasma, whole blood samples	Syphicheck®-WB	67.4%	98.4%	15min	[38]
Specific	HIV		Blood samples	Antibody detection (sensitivity for HIV-1 M Ab)				[39]
				- EXACTO® TEST HIV Self-test	100%	98.5%	20 min	
				- Genie™ Fast HIV1/2				
				- INSTI® HIV	100%	100%	30 min	
				- Stat-View® HIV1/2	100%	100%	Immediately	
				- Vikia® HIV1/2	100%	100%	20 min	
				Antibody/antigen detection	99.5%	99.5%	30 min	
				Determine™ HIV-1/2 Ag/Ab	100%	Antigen p24: 99.5%	40 min	
				Combo		Antibodies: 100%		

† The performance characteristics of the assays are described as sensitivity and specificity according to published clinical validation studies when available. In the absence of test comparison against a gold standard assay, the reported positive and negative percent agreement in the clinical studies reviewed were not reported to avoid any misinterpretation by the reader.

* Sensitivity has been extracted from the “acute infection” population and specificity has been extracted from the “naïve individuals” population described in the corresponding reference.

Abbreviations : TAT : turn around time; r(RT)-PCR : real-time (reverse transcription-)polymerase chain reaction; EIA : enzyme immunoassay; LFIA : lateral flow immunoassay; LAMP : loop-mediated isothermal amplification; CSF : cerebrospinal fluid; NP : nasopharyngeal; SSTI : skin/soft tissue infection; min : minutes; NA : non available; HSV : herpes simplex virus; VZV : varicella zoster virus; CMV : cytomegalovirus; RSV : respiratory syncytial virus; *E. coli* : *Escherichia coli*; *H. influenza* : *Haemophilus influenzae*; *L. monocytogenes* : *Listeria monocytogenes*; *N. meningitidis* : *Neisseria meningitidis*; *S. pneumoniae* : *Streptococcus pneumoniae*.

Table 2 : Clinical studies evaluating the clinical impact of RDT use in the ED

Syndrom or disease	Approach and targeted pathogens	Test brand	Population	Study design	Findings	Reference
Upper Respiratory tract infections	Group A Streptococcus (GAS) RADT	QuickVue (Quidel)	Infants (n=223)	Single center Prospective study	After using RADT, antibiotic prescriptions decreased by 42.6%	[40]
	Group A Streptococcus (GAS) PCR	Coba Liat Strep A (Roche)	Infants (n=275)	Single center Prospective study	Compared with RADT, POC PCR resulted in significantly greater appropriate antibiotic use (97.1% vs 87.5%; $p=0.0065$)	[6]
Lower Respiratory tract infections	mPCR in the ED vs usual tests in central laboratory	FilmArray (Biofire, bioMérieux)	Infants (n=1,136)	Single center Retrospective study	mPCR in the ED decreases the duration of antibiotic use (from 3.2 to 2.8 days $p=0.003$), the length of inpatient stay (from 3.4 to 3.2 days $p=0.03$).	[41]
	mPCR in the ED vs usual tests in central laboratory	FilmArray (Biofire, bioMérieux)	Adults (n=720)	Single center prospective study	mPCR in the ED decreases the duration of antibiotic use (from 6.5 to 2.9 days, $p=0.0009$), the hospital length of stay (from 6.8 to 5.7 days, $p=0.004$)	[42]
	mPCR in the ED vs usual tests in central laboratory	FilmArray (Biofire, bioMérieux)	Adults (n=606)	Single center Prospective study	No association between respiratory PCR POC testing and length of stay but a reduction in the median time to the first dose of antiviral (from 60.4 to 24h) and appropriate treatment of mycoplasma infection	[43]
	Influenza PCR	Cobas Liat (Roche)	Adults (n=620)	Multicenter Retrospective study	Antivirals were prescribed more often in patients that tested positive by LIAT PCR (82.4%) than in those testing positive by either RIDT or reflex PCR (69.9%; $P < 0.05$)	[44]
	Influenza PCR	FilmArray (Biofire, bioMérieux)	Adults (n=337)	Single center Retrospective study	Diagnosis of influenza by FilmArray was associated with significantly lower odds ratios (ORs) for admission ($P = 0.046$), length of stay ($P = 0.040$), duration of antimicrobial use ($P = 0.032$), and number of chest radiographs ($P = 0.005$).	[45]
	Influenza RADT	QuickVue (InGen)	Infants (n=170)	Single center prospective study	Positive RIDT enabled a significant decrease in orders for chest X-rays (64.4% vs. 45.8%, $p<0.05$) and laboratory tests (71.1% vs. 41.1%, $p<0.05$).	[46]
	Influenza immunoassay	Binax NOW (Alere)	Adults + Infants (n=827)	Multicenter Prospective study	For a cohort of 1000 participants, annual estimated non-diagnostic cost savings with Alere® are €215,040.	[47]
	Pneumococcus (SP) and legionella (LP) urinary antigen	Binax NOW (Alere)	Adults (n=1,941)	EPIC study Multicenter Prospective study	IDSA/ATS indications had 61% sensitivity (95% confidence interval [CI] 49-71%) and 39% specificity (95% CI 37-41%) for SP, and 63% sensitivity (95% CI 44-79%) and 35% specificity (95% CI 33-37%) for LP.	[48]
	Pneumococcus (SP) and legionella (LP) urinary antigen	Binax NOW (Alere)	Adults (n=1,224)	Single center Retrospective	Only 7 tests led to appropriate antimicrobial modification, and since 972 tests had no impact, we estimate that potential cost savings, if the test had not been used, would have been 26,244 € (972 9 27) during a 3 year period, that is 8748 € per year.	[49]

Gastrointestinal infections	GI PCR panel	FilmArray (Biofire, bioMérieux)	Adults + infants (n=9,402)	Cross sectional Retrospective study	Patients who received a GI panel were less likely to undergo any endoscopic procedure (8.4% GI panel versus 9.6% stool culture, $P = 0.008$) or any abdominal radiology (29.4% GI panel versus 31.7%, $P = 0.002$). Within 14 days following stool testing, patients who received a GI panel were less likely to be prescribed any antibiotic (36.2% GI panel versus 40.9%, $p < 0.001$).	[50]
	GI PCR panel	FilmArray (Biofire, bioMérieux)	Adults + infants (n=241)	Single center Retrospective study	The GI panel helped reduce the need for other diagnostic tests, reducing unnecessary use of antibiotics, and leading to a reduction in hospital length of stay.	[51]
Central nervous system infections	Meningitis and encephalitis	FilmArray (Biofire, bioMérieux)	Infants (n=145)	Multicenter Prospective study	FilmArray ME panel results may conduct in a decreased length of stay and in less antimicrobial exposure for infants with low-risk viral infection detected.	[52]
Malaria	Malaria testing	Illumigene Malaria (Meridian Bioscience)	Adults (n=298)	Multicenter Retrospective and prospective study	A cost-benefit analysis suggests savings of up to USD\$13 per specimen using a novel algorithm with this test.	[32]
Genital and sexually transmitted infections	HIV RNA testing (PCR)	Xpert (Cepheid)	Adults (n=706)	Single center Prospective study	The addition of Xpert HIV-1 Qual testing led to an increase in confirmed diagnoses by 25% (from 24 to 30 cases).	[53]
	<i>C. trachomatis</i> and <i>N. gonorrhoeae</i> testing (PCR)	Xpert (Cepheid)	Adults (n=70)	Single center RCT	The use of Xpert CT/NG reduced overtreatment and improved adherence.	[54]
	<i>C. trachomatis</i> and <i>N. gonorrhoeae</i> testing (PCR)	Xpert (Cepheid)	Adult women (n=254)	Single center RCT	Xpert CT/NG reduced overtreatment and improved undertreatment of patients tested in the ED.	[55]

GI, Gastrointestinal; mPCR, Multiplex PCR; RADT, Rapid antigen detection test