

# Microbiology Division Scientific Meeting

General Bacteriology distribution report  
update

Shila Seaton

27<sup>th</sup> November 2013

# Why the change?

- With the advent of new technology being implemented in clinical laboratories for the identification of micro organisms
- Collate data on the common methods being used for identifying the various genera

# New format web reply form

- Modify the web reply form to capture the method(s) used to identify the potential pathogen distributed in the simulated EQA specimen
- Opportunity to enter results if more than one method used
- Scored on an overall reported result

# Results Entry

Laboratory:

Scheme: UK NEQAS for General bacteriology

Distribution: 3332 (CLOSED)

Dispatch date: 25-11-2013

Return results: 16-12-2013

\*\* RESULTS WERE NOT SUBMITTED \*\*

Results shown are your last ONLINE submission and may not reflect subsequent amendments.

If error(s) are shown then NONE of your results were accepted for this distribution.

Status:  NOT submitted

Page: [Info](#) [Spec:1749](#) [Spec:1750](#) [Spec:1751](#) [Final Page](#) [Blank form](#)

Sputum: Cystic fibrosis patient with chest infection. Query significant pathogens.

Specimen : 1749	
Method A (Pathogen 1)	
Result A (Pathogen 1)	
Method A comment (Pathogen 1)	
Method B (Pathogen 1)	
Result B (Pathogen 1)	
Method B comment (Pathogen 1)	
Overall result Pathogen 1	
Pathogen 1 comment	
'	
Method A (Pathogen 2)	
Result A (Pathogen 2)	
Method A comment (Pathogen 2)	
Method B (Pathogen 2)	
Result B (Pathogen 2)	
Method B comment (Pathogen 2)	
Overall result Pathogen 2	
Pathogen 2 comment	
'	
Referral	<input type="radio"/> Not Examined <input type="radio"/> Not referred <input checked="" type="radio"/> Refer

[Reset Specimen 1749](#)

[Save Specimen 1749](#)

Operated by Public Health England  
MS Specialist Microbiology Services  
133-155 Waterloo Road  
Wellington House  
London SE1 8UG

# Results Entry

Laboratory:

Scheme: UK NEQAS for General bacteriology

Distribution: 3332 (CLOSED)

Dispatch date: 25-11-2013

Return results: 16-12-2013

\*\* RESULTS WERE NOT SUBMITTED \*\*

Results shown are your last ONLINE submission and may not reflect subsequent amendments.

If error(s) are shown then NONE of your results were accepted for this distribution.

Status:  NOT submitted

Page: [Info](#) [Spec:1749](#) [Spec:1750](#) [Spec:1751](#) [Final Page](#) [Blank form](#)

Sputum: Cystic fibrosis patient with chest infection. Query significant pathogens.

Specimen : 1749	
Method A (Pathogen 1)	<input type="text"/>
Result A (Pathogen 1)	<input type="text"/>
Method A comment (Pathogen 1)	<input type="text"/>
Method B (Pathogen 1)	<input type="text"/>
Result B (Pathogen 1)	<input type="text"/>
Method B comment (Pathogen 1)	<input type="text"/>
Overall result Pathogen 1	<input type="text"/>
Pathogen 1 comment	<input type="text"/>
'	<input type="text"/>
Method A (Pathogen 2)	<input type="text"/>
Result A (Pathogen 2)	<input type="text"/>
Method A comment (Pathogen 2)	<input type="text"/>
Method B (Pathogen 2)	<input type="text"/>
Result B (Pathogen 2)	<input type="text"/>
Method B comment (Pathogen 2)	<input type="text"/>
Overall result Pathogen 2	<input type="text"/>
Pathogen 2 comment	<input type="text"/>
'	<input type="text"/>
Referral	<input type="radio"/> Not Examined <input type="radio"/> Not referred <input type="radio"/> Refer

[Reset Specimen 1749](#)

[Save Specimen 1749](#)

Operated by Public Health England  
MS Specialist Microbiology Services  
133-155 Waterloo Road  
Wellington House  
London SE1 8UG

# Web entry reporting

- Request for method used from June 2013
- Do not report commensal(s) present
- If you wish enter comments relating to commensals add to the appropriate comments box
- Data collated has shown up to 206 laboratories used the MALDI-ToF and 248 VITEK® instrument

*S. aureus : Distn October 2013*  
*99% correct result*

<b>Method</b>	<b>Total no. participants</b>
	<b>636</b>
<b>Conventional Testing</b>	<b>324</b>
<b>Vitek 2 (all models)</b>	<b>187</b>
<b>MALDI-ToF</b>	<b>142</b>
<b>Phoenix 100</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>Microscan</b>	<b>14</b>

# *S. epidermidis*: Distn October 2013

97% correct

Method	No of participants
	632
Conventional Testing	181
Vitek 2 (all models)	248
MALDI-ToF	206
Phoenix 100	35
Microscan	13

# Anaerobes

- Increase in reporting anaerobes correctly to genus and species level
- Highest accuracy for reporting to species level with a single method was using a MALDI-Tof instrument

# Anaerobes

- *Peptostreptococcus anaerobius*
- Distn 3302 October 2013
- 87% correct to genus level with 8% to species level

# *Peptostreptococcus anaerobius*

- Conventional testing reported the most common method ( 245/539)
- 94% accuracy (126/134) Bruker Biotyper
- 98% accuracy (63/64) bioMerieux VITEK® MS.
- 78% (158/202) bioMerieux VITEK®

# Anaerobes

- *Propionibacterium acnes*
- Distn 3273 August 2013
- 81% correct to genus level with 79% to species level

# *Propionibacterium acnes*

- Most common method reported was conventional, of which 63% (165/261)
- 92% accuracy (119/129) Bruker biotyper
- 93% accuracy (50/54) bioMerieux VITEK® MS.
- 87% (168/191) bioMerieux VITEK®

# *Leuconostoc mesenteroides*

- Educational specimen
- Distn 2385 Sept 2013
- Some 48% achieved the correct result to identifying to species level

# *Leuconostoc mesenteroides*

- Most common method used was Vitek (259)
- Vitek also determined the highest accuracy to species- 19% (50/259)
- Conventional testing did not speciate the organism (189)
- MALDI-ToF users either reported correctly to genus level or mis specified as *L. citreum* (189)

# Summary 1

- Presentation of results by method is more informative
- Participants can compare results between methods
- Opportunity to highlight common issues with methods/instruments
- Potential for improved identification
- Revival of anaerobe identification

## Summary 2

- To date conventional testing is still the predominant method for identification of most organisms
- Vitek is presently the most common automated system used for identification
- MALDI-ToF has given the opportunity to identify anaerobes to species level
- Molecular testing is rarely reported but with the roll out of WGS – watch this space