

A healthcare professional, likely a laboratory technician or nurse, is shown in profile, wearing a white surgical cap and a white face mask. They are holding a syringe filled with a blue liquid, with a needle inserted into a glass vial containing a yellow liquid. The background is a blurred laboratory setting with blue and green lighting. The text "Blood Culture: A Critical Tool for the Health Care Professional" is overlaid in white at the top right.

Blood Culture: A Critical Tool for the Health Care Professional

Pornrith Pisuttimarn, M.D.



Blood culture

- BSIs are associated with high rates of morbidity and mortality
- blood culture remains the gold standard for its diagnosis



Rapid microbiological investigations

- identification of the causative agent & AST are therefore very important:
 - to adjust the anti-infectious therapy
 - to reduce the spectrum of the anti-infectious therapy
 - to limit the toxicity



Microbe identification

- from a subculture
- from the positive blood culture using nucleic-acid-based methods: hybridization, microarray
- after a bacterial enrichment and purification step to obtain a 'bacterial pellet': MALDI-TOF MS



Blood culture quality

- pre-analytical phase: patient identification criteria, container usage, sample integrity/identification, written orders, collection time & blood culture volume
- analytical phase: quality control performance & sample storage
- post-analytical phase: report accuracy, critical values reporting, TAT & culture contamination rate



Blood culture quality metrics

- quality of BC collection is a key determinant of clinical utility:
 - taking at least two BC sets from different sites
 - inoculation of 8–10 mL blood per bottle
 - restricting contamination to <3% of all cultures



Blood culture quality assurance indicators – collection, processing & reporting

- The RCPA recommends laboratories develop and monitor QAIs to include but are not restricted to:
 - blood volume collected
 - BC contamination rate
 - BC positivity rate
 - timely gram stain report communication to clinicians




Improving the blood culture pathway

- NHS England and NHS Improvement make the following four recommendations for improving the blood culture pathway;
 - recommendation 1: build upon existing national guidance and best practice
 - recommendation 2: implement local monitoring to identify areas for improvement ~ collection-to-load time into the incubator & volume of blood
 - recommendation 3: AMS & AMR to be a core part of clinical leadership and trust governance
 - recommendation 4: improve regulation and accreditation



Changing culture: An intervention to improve blood culture quality in the ED

- single culture sets reduced from 56.2% to 22.8% & 18.8% sustainability
- underfilled bottle rates were also significantly reduced
- skin contaminants were grown from 3.7% of BC sets in the pre-intervention period, improving to 1.5% in the post-intervention period ($P < 0.001$) and 2.1% in the sustainability period ($P = 0.03$)
- total volume of blood cultured was significantly associated with diagnosis of bacteraemia




Association between blood culture turnaround time and clinical prognosis in ED patients with community acquired bloodstream infection: A retrospective study based on electronic medical records

- overall 30-day all-cause mortality rate was 13%
- no statistically significant differences were observed in clinical prognosis between the TAT groups
- in patients with delayed antibiotic treatment (>3 h), a shorter TAT was significantly associated with a fatal outcome




What's Next?



Comparison of time to appropriate antibiotic between using microarray assay and MS technique for identification of positive BCs

- significantly faster bacterial identification and detection of antibiotic resistance (39.34 hours vs. 5 hours, $P = 0.0001$) as well as time to adjust specific antibiotic therapy (75 hours vs. 27.65 hours, $P = 0.0001$)
- earlier appropriate antibiotic therapy (31 hours vs. 0 hours, $P = 0.005$) & decrease unnecessary of antibiotic adjustment (51.4% vs. 37.3%)
- all-cause mortality within 2 weeks was not significantly reduced (11.4% vs. 14.7%), no differences cost of antibiotic therapy and length of hospital stay (13 days vs. 17 days)



Short turnaround time of 7-9 hours from sample collection until informed decision for sepsis treatment using nanopore sequencing

- pathogen identification was possible at as low as 10^2 – 10^4 CFU/mL, achieved after just 2 h of incubation & within 40 min of nanopore sequencing
- all the antimicrobial resistance genes were identified at 10^3 – 10^7 CFU/mL, achieved after incubation for 5 h & only 10 min to 3 h of sequencing
- total TAT from sample collection to the information required for an informed decision on the right antibiotic treatment was between 7 and 9 h



Rapid nanopore sequencing and predictive susceptibility testing of positive blood cultures from intensive care patients with sepsis

- species-level agreement between conventional methods and AST predicted from sequencing was 94.2%, increasing to 100% in monomicrobial infections
- CA was 89.3%, with ME and VME rates of 10.5% & 12.1%
- time to reporting from sequencing could be achieved within 8–16 h from BC positivity
- Oxford Nanopore Technologies-based approaches may be faster but significant improvements in accuracy are required before it can be considered for clinical use



**Thank You for Your
Attention!**