Comparative Evaluation of CHROMagar COL-*APSE*, MicroScan® Walkaway, ComASP™Colistin, and Colistin MAC Test in Detecting Colistin-resistant Gram-Negative Bacteria

Arnold Karabo Sephofane[1], Nontombi Mbelle[1], John Osei Sekyere[1#]

[1]Department of Medical Microbiology, Faculty of Health Sciences, University of Pretoria, 0084 Prinshof, Pretoria, South Africa

#Address correspondence to John Osei Sekyere**,** jod14139@yahoo.com; u18392467@tuks.co.za

Running head: Evaluation of colistin diagnostics on Gram-negative bacteria.

Highlights

- ✓ **The diagnostic efficiencies, cost, required skill and ease-of-use of colistin-resistance diagnostics were evaluated against the broth microdilution**
- ✓ **The ComASP™ was most sensitive, less skill-requiring and cheap**
- ✓ **The CHROMagar COL-*APSE* was easiest to perform, albeit expensive and less sensitive**
- ✓ **The MicroScan was most expensive, requires advanced skills and was very sensitive, particularly for Enterobacteriaceae without *E. cloacae* and *Salmonella.***
- ✓ **The Colistin MAC test is a better PCR alternative for detecting *mcr* producers in low-resource settings**

Abstract

Background: Colistin has become a critical antibiotic for fatal Gram-negative infections owing to the proliferation of multidrug-resistant carbapenemase-producing bacteria. Thus, cheaper, faster, efficient and easier-to-use colistin diagnostics are required for clinical surveillance, diagnoses and therapeutics.

Methods: The sensitivity, specificity, major error (ME), very major error (VME), categorial agreement, essential agreement, turnaround time (TAT), average cost, and required skill for four colistin resistance diagnostics viz., CHROMagar COL-*APSE,* ComASP™Colistin, MicroScan®, and Colistin MAC Test (CMT) were evaluated against broth microdilution (BMD) using 84 Gram-negative bacterial isolates. A multiplex PCR (M-PCR) was used to screen all isolates to detect the presence of the *mcr-1* to *mcr-5* genes. A 15-point grading scale was used to grade the tests under skill, ease, processing time etc.

Results: *mcr-1* was detected by both M-PCR and CMT in a single *E. coli* isolate. The sensitivity and specificity of CHROMagar COL-*APSE*, MicroScan®, and ComASP™Colistin, were 82.05% and 66.67%, 92.31% and 76.92%, and 100% and 88.89% respectively. The MicroScan® was the most expensive at a cost (per sampe tested) of R221.6 ($15.0), followed by CHROMagar COL-*APSE* (R118.3; $8.0), M-PCR (R75.1; $5.1), CMT (R20.1; $1.4) and ComASP™Colistin (R2.64; $0.2). CHROMagar was the easiest to perform, followed by ComASP™Colistin, M-PCR, MicroScan®, CMT and BMD whilst M-PCR and MicroScan required higher skill.

Conclusions: The ComASP™Colistin was the best performing diagnostic test, with low VME and ME, making it recommendable for routine colistin sensitivity testing in clinical laboratories; particularly, in poorer settings. It is however limited by a TAT of 18-24 hours.

Keywords: colistin resistance; reserve antibiotics; diagnostics; Gram-negative bacteria; *mcr-1*

Introduction

Subsequent to the exponential dissemination of extended-spectrum β-lactamases (ESBLs) in Gram-negative bacteria (GNB) and the increased use of carbapenems to treat infections unresponsive to the penicillins and cephems (cephalosporins and cephamycins), carbapenemase-producing and carbapenem-resistant GNB are becoming common worlwide [1,2]. Thus, carbapenems, which are last-resort antibiotics, are being replaced by colistin, a polymyxin that was discovered many years ago but shelved over nephrotoxicity and neurotoxicity concerns [2,3]. Resistance to colistin, due to its increased use to treat carbapenem-resistant GNB, has also emerged [2–4]. Beginning from 2016, colistin resistance, which hithero was mediated my chromosomal mutations, was found to be also mediated by plasmid-borne *mcr* genes [5,6]. The high fatalities caused by colistin and/or carbapenem-resistant GNB infections have led to their being categorised as high-priority pathogens by the WHO [7,8]. The clinical importance of colistin-resistant GNB (CR-GNB) necessitates an efficient diagnostic protocol for quickly and efficiently detecting them to pre-empt further escalation and mortalities [9].

Several diagnostic assays have been developed to detect CR-GNB, although the CLSI and EUCAST recommend the broth microdilution (BMD) as the standard test for confirming colistin sensitivity [9]. To date, settling on an efficient, fast, cheaper and easy-to-use diagnostic for detecting colistin resistance in routine remains a challenge, particularly in developing countries [9–11]. This is inspite of the fact that several colistin-resistance diagnostics exist, broadly categorised under phenotypic and molecular tests [9]. The phenotypic tests include the culture-based screening media such as CHROMagar COL-*APSE*, LBJMR, Superpolymyxin

etc., MIC (minimum-inhibitory concentration)-determiners such as BMD, E-test, Sensititre (now CHROMagar-COL-*APSE*), MicroScan®, BD-Phoenix®, UMIC, Micronaut-S, and Vitek®, chelator-based assays etc. [9]

We are still behind in the race against antimicrobial resistance and current diagnostics still have a lot of optimisation and evaluation to be done. This is particularly so due to the ever-evolving nature of antimicrobial resistance mechanisms. Owing to the dearth of evaluation studies comparing assays from screening media, MIC-determiners, chelator-based tests, and molecular assays as well as the absence of studies describing the cost and skill component of these tests, this study was undertaken [9]. Due to logistical and reagent availability restrictions and delays, we were only able to compare the following tests selected from the various subsets of colistin diagnostics: CHROMagar COL-*APSE* (screening media), MicroScan® Walkaway system (automated MIC-determiner), ComASP™Colistin (manual MIC-determiner; formerly Sensititre), colistin-MAC test (chelator-based test) and multiplex PCR (molecular assay). By including a cost and required-skill component, we aim to provide data for informing colistin resistance diagnostic choices for under-resourced laboratories.

Methods

Bacterial sampling and colistin sensitivity testing

A total of 84 clinical GNB isolates were used for this study. The isolates were obtained from the National Health Laboratory Services (NHLS), Pretoria, and Ampath laboratories (Johannesburg) with already de-identified patient data. The species of the isolates were determined using the MicroScan® Walkaway ID panels (Beckman Coulter, USA) according to the manufacturer's instructions.

The isolates were screened with BMD using recommended CLSI (Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute) guidelines [12] to identify isolates that were resistant and susceptible to

colistin. The EUCAST breakpoints were used to interpret the results due to an absence of CLSI breakpoint for colistin [9,13]. Genomic DNA was isolated from overnight cultures of the isolates using the Zymo Research Quick-DNA™ miniprep Kit (USA) according to the manufacturer`s instructions. A multiplex PCR (M-PCR) assay was used to determine the presence or absence of mobile colistin resistance genes, *mcr-1* to *mcr-5*, using already described protocols and primers (Table 1) [9,14]. Primers were procured from Inqaba biotechnologies (Pretoria, South Africa).

***Identifying colistin-resistant isolates with CHROMagar™ COL-APSE, MicroScan® Walkaway system, ComASP™ Colistin* and Colistin MAC Test (CMT)**

Fresh 24-hour cultures of the isolates, grown on blood agar (Oxoid, UK), were plated unto already prepared CHROMagar™ COL-*APSE* media (Chromagar, Paris, France) using manufacturer's instructions. The inoculated plates were incubated at 37°C under aerobic conditions overnight and the results were observed by observing different coloured colonies, using the manufacturer`s interpretation criteria for identifying CR-GNB. The media's ability to identify and correctly differentiate CR-GNB species within mixed cultures was assessed and compared to the MicroScan® Walkaway system's species identification.

For the MicroScan analyses, a single colony from the overnight cultures on the blood agar was standardized promptly using the prompt inoculation system provided in the reagent packaging for MicroScan AST (antimicrobial sensitivity testing) and identification (ID) testing. After inoculation, the solution was transferred into the N66 panels and loaded into the instrument for overnight processing. Species identification was obtained and colistin sensitivity results were interpreted according EUCAST breakpoints.

ComASP™ COL(colistin) consists of a compact panel of four tests containing seven two-fold dilutions of dehydrated COL. In this study, a 0.5 McFarland suspension of the isolates was

prepared in a solution of 250mL saline and then diluted to 1:20 in saline (Gibco, Thermo Fisher Scientific, Massachusetts, USA) to obtain the first solution (Solution A). Solution A (0.4mL) was added to a Mueller-Hinton broth (3.6mL) tube to obtain solution B. One hundred microliters of solution B was dispensed into each well and the panels were incubated (Vacutec, US) at 36±2°C for 16 to 20 hours in ambient air. Results were analysed visually using a bright indirect light against a dark background.

The CMT was carried out as described in a study by Coppi *et al*. (2018)[15]. The colistin sulphate concentrations tested ranged from 0.125 to 64µg/mL alone or in combination with DPA (dipicolinic acid) at a fixed concentration of 900 µg/mL. The DPA stock solution was prepared in dimethyl sulphoxide (DMSO) at a concentration of 100mg/mL and stored at -20°C. Cation-adjusted Mueller-Hinton broth was used as the medium for susceptibility testing alongside DPA and DMSO at a fixed concentration of 900 µg/mL and increasing colistin concentrations (0.125-64µg/mL). Wells 11 and 12 were used for growth control whilst well 11 was not inoculated; well 12 was inoculated with the test isolate. Susceptibility testing was carried out in 96-well microtitre trays with results recorded after 20 hours of incubation at 35 ± 2°C. Susceptibility to colistin was interpreted using the EUCAST guidelines. The results were considered as *mcr*-1 positive (a ≥8-fold reduction) or *mcr*-1 negative (a ≤2-fold reduction) in the presence of DPA.

Data and statistical analysis

The results of the various tests were curated in Microsoft Excel and categorised into susceptible and resistant isolates using the BMD results. Using the BMD as the gold standard, the sensitivity, specificity, positive and negative predictive values (PPV and NPV respectively), categorical agreement (CA), essential agreement (EA), major errors (ME) and very major errors (VME) of each test were calculated using the equations 1-8 below.

Equation 1. Sensitivity = $\frac{True\ positives}{True\ positives + False\ negatives}$

Equation 2. Specificity = $\frac{True\ negatives}{False\ positives + True\ negatives}$

Equation 3. Positive predictive value = $\frac{True\ Positives}{True\ positives + False\ positives}$

Equation 4. Negative predictive value = $\frac{True\ negatives}{False\ negatives + True\ negatives}$

Equation 5. Categorical agreement = $\frac{Number\ of\ isolates\ with\ categorical\ agreement \times 100}{Total\ number\ of\ isolates\ tested}$

Equation 6. Essential agreement = $\frac{Number\ of\ isolates\ with\ essential\ agreement \times 100}{Total\ number\ of\ isolates\ tested}$

Equation 7. Major error = $\frac{Number\ of\ tests\ giving\ a\ major\ error \times 100}{Number\ of\ bacteria\ susceptible\ by\ the\ gold\ standard}$

Equation 8. Very major error = $\frac{Number\ of\ tests\ giving\ a\ very\ major\ error \times 100}{Number\ of\ bacteria\ resistant\ by\ the\ gold\ standard}$

Cost and skill (ease of application) analyses

The cost per sample for each of the tests were calculated by dividing the total cost of reagents, including VAT, by the number of samples that were tested by those reagents. Equipment costs, specifically the MicroScan Walkaway system and the thermocycler used for the M-PCR, were not included. The costs were calculated in Rands and converted to US dollars using current exchange rates (12-13/12/2019).

We assessed the required skill and ease of using the various tests by grading the various tests against five parameters: (1) time in hours needed to perform each test; (2) ease in carrying out test; (3) skill or training required (4) requirement for 3rd-party equipment and infrastructure

and (5) cost and access to 3rd-party equipment and infrastructure. The breakdown of the assigned grades, on a scale of 5 to 15 for these five parameters, are shown in Table 2.

Results

The BMD identified 44 isolates as resistant to colistin and 40 as susceptible (Table 3). Only one isolate, an *E. coli,* was found to harbour the *mcr-1* gene per the PCR results (Table 3; Fig. 1). The isolates were identified by the MicroScan® Walkaway to comprise of 12 species viz., *Enterobacter cloacae* (n=27), *Klebsiella pneumoniae* (n=12), *Salmonella enterica* (n=12), *Acinetobacter baumannii* (n=10), *Escherichia coli* (n=9), *Klebsiella oxytoca* (n=4), *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* (n=4), *Proteus mirabilis* (n=2), *Burkholderia cepacia* (n=1), *Hafnia alvei* (n=1), *Providencia stuartii* (n=1), and *Tatumella spp.* (n=1) (Figure 2A).

CHROMagar COL-*APSE* supported the growth of 46 (55%) isolates, which were identified as COL-R (colistin-resistant) isolates with substantial false positives and false negatives (Table 1; Figure 2B & 2C). The cultured isolates resulted in colony growth and identification of 22 isolates (26%) as COL-R coliforms, 15 isolates (18%) as COL-R *Acinetobacter* spp, three isolates (4%) as COL-R *Pseudomonas spp*, and six isolates (7%) as *E. coli*. A total of 38 isolates (45%) were not identified as COL-R by CHROMagar COL-*APSE*, most of which were susceptible (Table 3). It is interesting to note that although this media suppresses the growth of susceptible strains, some grew on it, resulting in a sensitivity and specificity of 82.05% and 66.67% respectively. As well, the species prediction of CHROMagar COL-*APSE* mostly mirrored that of the MicroScan with some few disagreements (Table 3). The CHROMagar COL-*APSE* was thus the least sensitive and least specific among all the tests (Table 4; Figure 3).

However, the ComASP™ had an overall sensitivity of 87.18% and specificity of 73.33%, which respectively increases to 100% and 88.89%. when only *K. pneumoniae* and *E. coli*

results are used (Table 4). The evaluable essential agreement was calculated by evaluating ComASP™ results (≤ 0.25 µg/mL or 16 µg/mL) with BMD results (≤ 0.5µg/mL or≥ 16 µg/mL). The overall evaluable EA was 53%, but with the focus on *K. pneumoniae* and *E. coli* only, the evaluable EA was 66.67%. A PPV and NPV of 73.91% and 86.84% were recorded respectively, with a VME of 12.82% and a ME of 26.67%. ComASP™ had an EA of 78.57%. Compared to what has been done in previous works, where the focus was only on *K. pneumoniae* and *E. coli* [9], the ComASP™ performs better with a sensitivity of 100% and specificity of 88.89%, including a PPV of 92.31% and NPV of 100% (Table 4; Figure 3).

Thus, the ComASP overall results (A, see Figure 3) proved quite more sensitive but less specific than the MicroScan system, which had an overall sensitivity and specificity of 85.71% and 76.19%. When *E. cloacae, Salmonella* and non-fermenting Gram-negatives except Pseudomonas spp. are excluded from the MicroScan results, its sensitivity, but not specificity, increased substantially to 92.31% (Table 4). The CMT was able to identify the only *mcr-1* positive isolate and the 83 non-*mcr*-positive isolates, resulting in a sensitivity and specificity of 100% (Table 4).

In terms of cost per sample, the MicroScan® was the most expensive at a cost of R221.6 ($15.0), followed by CHROMagar COL-*APSE* (R118.3; $8.0), M-PCR (R75.1; $5.1), CMT (R20.1; $1.4) and ComASP™Colistin (R2.64; $0.2). With regards to time and ease of application, the CHROMagar was the easiest to perform, followed by ComASP™Colistin, M-PCR, MicroScan®, CMT and BMD. However, the MicroScan and PCR required 3rd-party equipment and advanced skill that could be a challenge for lower income countries or under-resourced laboratories. With the exception of M-PCR, all the tests had a TAT (turnaround time) of 18-24 hours (Table 5).

Discussion

The importance of colistin in the treatment of fatal infections caused by carbapenem-resistant GNB makes the search for an efficient colistin diagnostic an essential and life-saving exercise. However, finding a diagnostic tool that can be easily adapted into the workflow of routine microbiology laboratories remains a challenge as the recommended colistin sensitivity testing method, the BMD, is labour intensive [9]. Moreover, disc diffusion and E-test, which are simpler to perform, are fraught with inherent errors due to difficulty in colistin diffusion through agar [9]. Several rapid and non-rapid assays have been designed and proposed to help detect colistin directly from clinical samples or from culture, yet challenges still exist in terms of diagnostic performance, TAT, required skill, sample-processing cost etc. [9] In this study, selected culture-based diagnostics were evaluated to determine their relative diagnostic efficiencies viz., sensitivities, specificities, NPV, PPV, ME, VME, EA and CA, required skill, ease of application, requirement for 3rd-party equipment/infrastructure and sample-processing cost to advise clinical and diagnostic laboratories, particularly in resource-constrained settings.

ComASP™ Colistin is a BMD-based method used to determine colistin MICs (Carreto *et al*., 2018)[16]. The 96-well BMD method is a very labour-intensive technique that requires a highly skilled professional, all plates and antibiotic concentrations must be manually prepared, and it is very time-consuming (Table 5) [9]. In this study, ComASP™ was able to successfully give colistin MICs for all tested isolates, with an essential agreement of 78.57%. The assay recorded a CA of 79.76% and a VME of 12.82% (lowest out of all the evaluated tests) and a ME of 26.67%. The VME and ME are high and unacceptable, but this can be explained by the fact that this assay was challenged with Gram-negative bacteria, which include the non-fermenters, compared to other studies where the assay was only used to investigate colistin MICs for *E. coli* and *K. pneumoniae* (Table 6) [17].

Thus, upon excluding results from the non-fermenting Gram-negative bacteria and using only *K. pneumoniae* and *E. coli* as done in previous works [16,18], the ComASP™ performed way better, with a sensitivity and specificity of 100% and 88.89% respectively. A PPV and NPV of 92.31% and 100% were respectively recorded whilst a CA, EA and ME of 95.24%, 66.67% and 8.83% were also respectively obtained; no VMEs were observed (Table 6). The EA could only be calculated by evaluating ComASP™ results (≤ 0.25 µg/mL or 16 µg/mL) with BMD results (≤ 0.5µg/mL or≥ 16 µg/mL), given the differences between the colistin concentrations between the ComASP™ and the BMD. Thus, ComASP™ is best suited for detecting COL-R *K. pneumoniae* and *E coli* isolates as observed in a previous study by Matuschek and coworkers (2018) who concluded that the ComASP™ can reliably identify most COL-R K. *pneumoniae* and *E. coli* isolates [18]. ComASP™ Colistin is easy to perform and interpret the results. It is not too costly and can be easily used in resource poor laboratories.

Overall, the ComASP™ (formerly Sensititre) performed better than the other diagnostics, followed closely by the MicroScan (Figure 3). Notably, these two high-performing tests recorded higher diagnostic performances when certain species that lowered the tests' sensitivities were excluded, suggesting that not all species can be efficiently analysed with these two tests. Specifically, the MicroScan also increased in sensitivity after excluding *E. cloacae, Salmonella* and Gram-negative non-fermenters except *Pseudomonas spp.* Therefore, results on species that performed poorly on these tests should be further verified with other tests that are efficient in detecting colistin resistance in those species to avoid making fatal diagnostic or therapeutic decisions. For instance, laboratories that are already using the MicroScan can augment it with the ComASP. In terms of cost, ease of application and required skill, the ComASP™ further had an advantage over the MicroScan, although it

should be noted that the MicroScan can determine the AST of several antibiotics whilst the ComASP is only designed for colistin [9].

The MicroScan system is laborious due to the daily maintenance of the instrument required and barcoding of the panels. The system is very costly as there are no panels available for only colistin AST. The system also requires highly skilled or trained personnel to operate it (Tables 2 & 5). It is important to take note of factors stated by Jayol and co-workers (2018)[19] that the MicroScan® system`s procedural manual indicates that results for *E. cloacae*, *Salmonella* and non-fermenting Gram-negative bacteria, except *Pseudomonas spp.*, must not be reported. The latter is a major challenge and, in this study, all results for our *E. cloacae*, *Salmonella* and non-fermenting Gram-negative bacteria did not give MIC values as they returned as "Non-readable result" (Table 3). Hence, we only regarded the MicroScan`s results without the *E. cloacae*, *Salmonella* and non-fermenting Gram-negative bacteria except *Pseudomonas* as suitable to evaluate with the other tests. Consequently, the MicroScan was able to detect 92.31% of the isolates that were resistant to colistin by the gold standard. The MicroScan had a low specificity of 76.92% after the ComASP™ Colistin's 88.89 (B; see Figure 3). This is further supported by a study in South Africa by Mohlabeng and colleagues (2017), where the MicroScan`s efficacy in reporting Carbapenemase-Producing *Enterobacteriaceae* was investigated and it was concluded that the MicroScan® Walkaway system is sensitive but lacks specificity [20]. One isolate was falsely detected as susceptible, explaining the 7.69% VME rate.

CHROMagar COL-*APSE* is a selective culture media used to isolate and differentiate colistin-resistant *Acinetobacter*, *Pseudomonas*, *Stenotrophomonas* and *Enterobacteriaceae* species with intrinsic, acquired or novel mechanisms of COL-resistance [21]. CHROMagar successfully isolated and differentiated 46 colistin-resistant isolates, with majority being coliforms, *Acinetobacter* and *Pseudomonas* spp (Figure 2B-C). Interestingly, 7% of the

colistin-resistant isolates were identified to the species level as *E. coli,* including the *mcr*-1 positive *E. coli* isolate, which further supports CHROMagar COL-*APSE*`s ability to recover colistin-resistant isolates with acquired colistin resistance as stated by the developers of the medium [21]. In this study, the CHROMagar had the highest VME and ME, which should be investigated further.

In a previous study, a 100% specificity and sensitivity was recorded for CHROMagar [21] whilst we recorded a specificity of 66.67% and a sensitivity of 82.05%. This discrepancy could be due to the other study's use of serial dilutions in broth whilst we evaluated the performance of the media using cultured bacteria; this might be a limitation in our study that can be further investigated. A recent study by Thiry *et al*. (2019) evaluated CHROMagar COL-*APSE* against CHROMID® Colistin_R and agar disk diffusion and concluded that growth on the media corelates with resistant results on the disk diffusion and not with the presence of the *mcr* genes [10]. Our study supports this as growth on the CHROMagar in this study was observed for most isolates that did have any *mcr* genes in the PCR assay; however, this study had only one *mcr*-positve isolate, limiting a comprehensive comparison and conclusion. Nevertheless, these findings indicate that the mechanism of resistance does not limit the ability of CHROMagar to isolate and differentiate colistin-resistant organisms. CHROMagar COL-*APSE* plates are easy to prepare and interpret the results. Moreover, following the manufacturer`s instructions is easy, and the technique does not require a skilled individual (Tables 2 & 5). The medium is cost effective and only requires overnight incubation until results can be obtained.

The PCR assay detected several bands, majority of which were not specific to any of the described *mcr* genes (Figure 1), indicating that the mechanisms of resistance in these isolates are either intrinsic or novel. However, a single *E. coli* isolate (D1b) was found to be *mcr*-1 positive by the multiplex PCR as shown in Figure 1. The latter is not surprising as previous

works in South Africa has shown the *mcr*-1 gene to be dominant in the country and has been isolated in Johannesburg, Pretoria and Cape Town from *E. coli* isolates [22]. Isolates D3 and B1 showed non-specific bands around the *mcr*-3 and *mcr*-4 genes respectively, but it is unlikely for these isolates to be positive for these genes as *mcr*-3 and *mcr*-4 have not been reported in South Africa. The multiplex PCR is highly sensitive and specific, but it could be confirmed through whole-genome sequencing (WGS) to ascertain the presence or absence of other *mcr*-genes and alleles. The PCR is expensive, quite time-consuming and requires a highly skilled individual to perform and analyse the results (Tables 2 & 5).

The CMT is a DPA chelator-based tool used to detect the presence of *mcr* genes [9]. In our study, no ≥8 fold-increases in MICs were observed for all the *mcr*-negative isolates, consistent with a study by Coppi and colleagues (2018) where their colistin MICs neither changed nor increased or were at most reduced by two folds for 13 *mcr*-negative colistin-resistant strains. Our *mcr*-1 positive *E. coli* isolate had an 8-fold MIC reduction, similar to that reported by Coppi et al. (2018) wherein their 59 *mcr*-1-positive *E. coli* strains had a ≥ 8-fold reduction in colistin MICs in the presence of DPA. Unlike the other tests, the CMT assay cannot detect colistin-resistant isolates that are *mcr*-negative and can be a major limitation in settings where *mcr* genes are absent. Thus, coupled with its laborious and time-consuming nature, it might be difficult for the CMT to be adopted in clinical microbiology laboratories. However, where access to PCR is a challenge or novel *mcr* variants are being sought, it can be a cheaper, albeit time-consuming, alternative.

The presence of only a single *mcr-1*-positve isolate is a major limitation for this study as a single isolate cannot be used to make strong conclusions based on statistical inference. As well, we could not include other rapid screening and biochemical tests such as the SuperPolymyxin, LBJMR, the rapid Polymyxin NP test (RPNP) and commercial RPNP tests [9] due to logistical challenges.

Conclusion

In this study, the ComASP™ was found to be the best-performing MIC determiner because it had the highest sensitivity and specificity with minimal errors but were more costly than the BMD. It is easy to use and can be employed in diagnostic laboratories that seek to conduct colistin susceptibility screening. The assay can be easily used in less-resourced laboratories without the need of a skilled personnel; the only requirement is an appropriate incubator. The MicroScan® walkaway system is a very expensive tool that demands highly skilled personnel and is time-consuming. The MicroScan® walkaway system was the second-best diagnostic with regards to its sensitivity and had the second lowest VMEs and lowest MEs, albeit it was the most expensive. It is also not ideal for colistin AST of non-fermenting Gram-negative bacteria and the BMD must be used to confirm the MicroScan`s colistin AST results for non-fermenters.

CHROMagar COL-*APSE* is costly than the gold standard but can be used in any routine laboratory that has an incubator. However, its diagnostic performance was relatively poor, making it unsuitable for routine use in a diagnostic laboratory. The multiplex PCR is a sensitive and specific tool for detecting plasmid-mediated colistin resistance *mcr* genes, albeit it is expensive (fourth most expensive in this study), requires high skill and cannot be used to guide decisions on therapy. It is however ideal for surveillance in diagnostic laboratories without WGS capabilities for confirming the presence or absence of *mcr* genes in colistin-resistant isolates. The CMT is cost effective for detecting *mcr*-positive isolates, including novel alleles, in a setting without molecular assays such as the multiplex PCR or WGS; however, more work is needed to challenge this technique with different *mcr* positive strains. Further studies must look at WGS and its performance in rapidly detecting *mcr*-harbouring strains of Gram-negative bacteria that are colistin-resistant[23]

Ethical consent

This study is part of an umbrella study with the ethics no 483/2016. Ethical amendment for this study was applied for from the Research Ethics Committee of the Faculty of Health Sciences, University of Pretoria and was approved (ethics reference number 240/2019). Specimens were received and processed at the laboratories of the Department of Medical Microbiology, Faculty of Health Sciences, University of Pretoria. For the protection of patients from whom the specimens were taken, a numerical labelling system was developed to ensure that the identity of the patients remains undisclosed.

Acknowledgements: We acknowledge the kind support of Staff at the NHLS laboratory for their kind support. We are also exceptionally grateful to Kathy-Anne Strydom of Ampath Laboratories, Johannesburg, for donating to us some colistin-resistant strains for the evaluation.

Funding: This work was funded by the University of Pretoria and the National Health Laboratory Services (NHLS)

Transparency declaration: None

Author contributions: *Study design*: JOS; *Supervision:* NMM & JOS; Laboratory work: AKS; Data analyses: AKS & JOS; *Manuscript write-up, tabulations, figures*: JOS

References

1. Kopotsa, K., Osei Sekyere, J. & Mbelle, N. M. Plasmid Evolution in Carbapenemase-Producing Enterobacteriaceae: A Review. *Ann. New* **Accepted**, (2019).

2. Osei Sekyere, J., Govinden, U., Bester, L. A. & Essack, S. Y. Colistin and Tigecycline Resistance In Carbapenemase-Producing Gram Negative Bacteria: Emerging Resistance Mechanisms And Detection Methods. *J. Appl. Microbiol.* **121**, 601–617

(2016).

3. Osei Sekyere, J. Current State of Resistance to Antibiotics of Last-Resort in South Africa: A Review from a Public Health Perspective. *Front. Public Heal.* **4**, 209 (2016).

4. Osei Sekyere, J. & Asante, J. Emerging mechanisms of antimicrobial resistance in bacteria and fungi: advances in the era of genomics. *Future Microbiol.* **13**, 241–262 (2018).

5. Liu, Y.-Y. *et al.* Emergence of plasmid-mediated colistin resistance mechanism MCR-1 in animals and human beings in China: a microbiological and molecular biological study. *Lancet Infect. Dis.* **16**, 161–168 (2016).

6. Poirel, L., Jayol, A. & Nordmann, P. Polymyxins: Antibacterial Activity, Susceptibility Testing, and Resistance Mechanisms Encoded by Plasmids or Chromosomes. *Clin. Microbiol. Rev.* **30**, 557–596 (2017).

7. Rule, R. *et al.* A rare case of Colistin-resistant Salmonella Enteritidis meningitis in an HIV-seropositive patient. *BMC Infect. Dis*. **19**, 806 (2019).

8. World Health Organization. *Global Priority List Of Antibiotic-Resistant Bacteria To Guide Research, Discovery, And Development Of New Antibiotics*. *WHO* (World Health Organization, 2017).

9. Osei Sekyere, J. *Mcr* colistin resistance gene: a systematic review of current diagnostics and detection methods. *Microbiologyopen* e00682 (2018). doi:10.1002/mbo3.682

10. Thiry, D. *et al.* Assessment of two selective agar media to isolate colistin-resistant bovine Escherichia coli: Correlation with minimal inhibitory concentration and presence of mcr genes. *J. Microbiol. Methods* **159**, 174–178 (2019).

11. Jayol, A., Nordmann, P., Lehours, P., Poirel, L. & Dubois, V. Comparison of methods for detection of plasmid-mediated and chromosomally encoded colistin resistance in Enterobacteriaceae. *Clin. Microbiol. Infect.* **24**, 175–179 (2018).

12. Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute (CLSI). Methods for Dilution Antimicrobial Susceptibility Tests for Bacteria That Grow Aerobically; Approved Standard--Tenth Edition. *Broth Microdilution Method* 17–20 (2015).

13. European Committee on Antimicrobial Susceptibility Testing. *Breakpoint tables for interpretation of MICs and zone diameters. Version 9.0, 2019*. (2019). doi:http://www.eucast.org/fileadmin/src/media/PDFs/EUCAST_files/Breakpoint_tables/v_9.0_Breakpoint_Tables.pdf

14. Rebelo, A. R. *et al.* Multiplex PCR for detection of plasmid-mediated mcr-4 and mcr-5 for surveillance purposes. *Euro surveill* **23**, pii=17-00672 (2018).

15. Coppi, M. *et al.* A simple phenotypic method for screening of MCR-1-mediated colistin resistance. *Clin. Microbiol. Infect.* (2017). doi:10.1016/j.cmi.2017.08.011

16. Carretto, E. *et al*. Clinical validation of SensiTest colistin, a broth microdilution-based method to evaluate colistin MICs. *J. Clin. Microbiol.* **56**, (2018).

17. Galani, I., Adamou, P., Karaiskos, I., Giamarellou, H. & Souli, M. Evaluation of ComASP™ Colistin (formerly SensiTest™ Colistin), a commercial broth microdilution-based method to evaluate the colistin minimum inhibitory concentration for carbapenem-resistant Klebsiella pneumoniae isolates. *J. Glob. Antimicrob. Resist.* **15**, 123–126 (2018).

18. Matuschek, E., Åhman, J., Webster, C. & Kahlmeter, G. Antimicrobial susceptibility testing of colistin - evaluation of seven commercial MIC products against standard

broth microdilution for Escherichia coli, Klebsiella pneumoniae, Pseudomonas aeruginosa, and Acinetobacter spp. *Clin. Microbiol. Infect.* (2018). doi:10.1016/j.cmi.2017.11.020

19. Jayol, A., Nordmann, P., André, C., Poirel, L. & Dubois, V. Evaluation of three broth microdilution systems to determine colistin susceptibility of Gram-negative bacilli. *J. Antimicrob. Chemother.* **73**, 1272–1278 (2018).

20. Mohlabeng, R., Shuping, L., Perovic, O. & Singh-Moodley, A. The Efficacy of the MicroScan® Walkaway System in Reporting Carbapenemase-Producing Enterobacteriaceae in Patients with Bacteremia, South Africa. *J Antimicrob Agents* **3**, 2472–1212 (2017).

21. Abdul Momin, M. H. F. *et al.* CHROMagar COL-APSE: a selective bacterial culture medium for the isolation and differentiation of colistin-resistant Gram-negative pathogens. *J. Med. Microbiol.* **66**, 1554–1561 (2017).

22. Newton-Foot, M., Snyman, Y., Maloba, M. R. B. & Whitelaw, A. C. Plasmid-mediated mcr-1 colistin resistance in Escherichia coli and Klebsiella spp. clinical isolates from the Western Cape region of South Africa. *Antimicrob. Resist. Infect. Control* **6**, 1–7 (2017).

23. Stubberfield, E. *et al.* Use of whole genome sequencing of commensal Escherichia coli in pigs for antimicrobial resistance surveillance , United Kingdom , 2018. (2019).

Primer/ probe	Amplified gene	Product size (bp)
mcr1_320bp_fw (AGTCCGTTTGTTCTTGTGGC), mcr1_320bp_rev (AGATCCTTGGTCTCGGCTTG),	mcr-1	mcr-1(320 bp)
mcr2_700bp_fw (CAAGTGTGTTGGTCGCAGTT), mcr2_700bp_rev (TCTAGCCCGACAAGCATACC),	mcr-2	mcr-2 (715 bp)
mcr3_ 900bp_ fw (AAATAAAAATTGTTCCGCTTATG), mcr3_900bp_ rev (AATGGAGATCCCCGTTTTT)	mcr-3	mcr-3 (929 bp)
mcr4_1100bp_fw (TCACTTTCATCACTGCGTTG) mcr4_1100bp_rev (TTGGTCCATGACTACCAATG)	mcr-4	mcr-4 (1116 bp)
mcr5_fw (ATGCGGTTGTCTGCATTTATC)mcr5_fw (ATGCGGTTGTCTGCATTTATC) mcr5_rev (TCATTGTGGTTGTCCTTTTCTG)	mcr-5	mcr-5 (1,644 bp)

Table 1. Primers used in real-time multiplex PCR to detect the mcr-1 to mcr-5 genes

Table 2. Grading criteria and interpretation for the colistin diagnostic tests.

Grading parameters	Grades	Interpretation
Time in hours needed to perform each test	1	Less than 1 hour
	2	1-2 hours
	3	Above 2 hours
Ease in carrying out test	1	Easy
	2	A bit laborious
	3	Taxing or laborious
Skill or training required	1	No skill required
	2	Some/average skill required
	3	Advanced skill required
Requirement for 3rd-party equipment and infrastructure	1	Not required
	2	1-2 required
	3	More than 2 required
Cost and access to 3rd-party equipment and infrastructure	1	Not required
	2	Expensive (<$20,000) and access required
	3	Very expensive (>$20,000) and requires access/permission

Table 3. General Table of results for all the four tests, multiplex PCR and BMD

	BMD		CMT		ComASP™		MicroScan®			CHROMagar™	Multiplex PCR results
Isolate	***MIC***	***Int***[1]	***MIC***	***Int***	***MIC***	***Int***	***MIC***	***Int***	***ID***	***ID***	***mcr-1* to *mcr-5* gene**
Amp1	*32*	*R*	*2*	*mcr- neg*[2]	*□16*	*R*	*□4*	*R*	*K. pneumoniae*	*COL-R*[3] *Coliform*	*Negative*
Amp2	*32*	*R*	*4*	*mcr- neg*	*□16*	*R*	*□4*	*R*	*K. pneumoniae*	*COL-R Coliform*	*Negative*
Amp3	*8*	*R*	*1*	*mcr- neg*	*8*	*R*	*□4*	*R*	*K. pneumoniae*	*COL-R Coliform*	*Negative*
Amp4	*□64*	*R*	*□64*	*mcr- neg*	*□16*	*R*	*□4*	*R*	*K. pneumoniae*	*COL-R Acinetobacter*	*Negative*
Amp5	*0,125*	*S*	*0,125*	*mcr- neg*	*0,25*	*S*	*NR*	*R*	*E. cloacae*	*COL-R E. coli*	*Negative*
Amp6	*0,25*	*S*	*0,125*	*mcr- neg*	*1*	*S*	*NR*	*R*	*E. cloacae*	*COL-R Pseudomonas*	*Negative*
Amp7	*0,5*	*S*	*0,125*	*mcr- neg*	*0,5*	*S*	*NR*	*S*	*A. baumannii*	*COL-R coliform*	*Negative*
Amp8	*0,5*	*S*	*0,5*	*mcr- neg*	*0,5*	*S*	*NR*	*S*	*A. baumannii*	*COL-S*[4] *organism*	*Negative*
Amp9	*0,5*	*S*	*0,5*	*mcr- neg*	*0,5*	*S*	*NR*	*S*	*A. baumannii*	*COL-S organism*	*Negative*
Amp10	*2*	*S*	*0,5*	*mcr- neg*	*2*	*S*	*NR*	*S*	*A. baumannii*	*COL-S organism*	*Negative*
Amp11	*2*	*S*	*0,25*	*mcr- neg*	*4*	*R*	*□4*	*R*	*P. mirabilis*	*COL-S organism*	*Negative*
Amp12	*0,5*	*S*	*0,125*	*mcr- neg*	*2*	*S*	*NR*	*R*	*S. enterica*	*COL-S organism*	*Negative*
Amp13	*0,5*	*S*	*0,125*	*mcr- neg*	*0,5*	*S*	*NR*	*R*	*A. baumannii*	*COL-R Acinetobacter*	*Negative*
Amp14	*2*	*S*	*0,5*	*mcr- neg*	*4*	*R*	*NR*	*S*	*S. enterica*	*COL-S organism*	*Negative*
Amp15	*64*	*R*	*64*	*mcr- neg*	*0,25*	*S*	*NR*	*R*	*A. baumannii*	*COL-S organism*	*Negative*
Amp16	*64*	*R*	*32*	*mcr- neg*	*□16*	*R*	*NR*	*R*	*P. marabilis*	*COL-R Acinetobacter*	*Negative*
Amp17	*□64*	*R*	*64*	*mcr- neg*	*8*	*R*	*□4*	*R*	*E. coli*	*COL-S organism*	*Negative*
Amp18	*0,125*	*S*	*0,125*	*mcr- neg*	*4*	*R*	*NR*	*R*	*A. baumannii*	*COL-S organism*	*Negative*
Amp19	*2*	*S*	*0,5*	*mcr- neg*	*4*	*R*	*NR*	*S*	*S. enterica*	*COL-S organism*	*Negative*
A7a	*4*	*R*	*2*	*mcr- neg*	*4*	*R*	*NR*	*S*	*S. enterica*	*COL-R Acinetobacter*	*Negative*
D5	*32*	*R*	*16*	*mcr- neg*	*□16*	*R*	*□4*	*R*	*K. pneumoniae*	*COL-R Coliform*	*Negative*

[1] Breakpoint interpretation
[2] *Mcr*-negative
[3] Colistin resistant
[4] Colistin susceptible

C9	8	R	4	mcr- neg	16	R	□4	R	E. coli	COL-R E. coli	Negative
H7	4	R	0,5	mcr- neg	8	R	NR	R	B. cepacia complex	COL-R Acinetobacter	Negative
A6	32	R	4	mcr- neg	16	R	□4	R	E. coli	COL-R E. coli	Negative
F7	□64	R	□64	mcr- neg	□16	R	NR	R	E. cloacae	COL-R Acinetobacter	Negative
C1	4	R	0,25	mcr- neg	4	R	NR	R	S. enterica	COL-R Coliform	Negative
I7	0,25	S	8	mcr- neg	□16	R	NR	R	E. cloacae	COL-R Coliform	Negative
G6	□64	R	□64	mcr- neg	□16	R	NR	R	E. cloacae	COL-R Coliform	Negative
G7	2	S	0,125	mcr- neg	16	R	NR	S	E. cloacae	COL-R Coliform	Negative
D3	4	R	0,5	mcr- neg	2	S	NR	R	S. enterica	COL-R Acinetobacter	Negative
D2	4	R	2	mcr- neg	□16	R	NR	R	S. enterica	COL-R Acinetobacter	Negative
G1	□64	R	□64	mcr- neg	□16	R	NR	S	E. cloacae	COL-R Coliform	Negative
E8	□64	R	8	mcr- neg	□16	R	NR	R	E. cloacae	COL-R Coliform	Negative
D4	16	R	64	mcr- neg	□16	R	□4	R	K. pneumoniae	COL-R Coliform	Negative
B1	□64	R	□64	mcr- neg	□16	R	NR	R	A. baumannii	COL-R Coliform	Negative
A7b	4	R	4	mcr- neg	□16	R	□4	R	Hafnia alvei	COL-R E. coli	Negative
A8	□64	R	16	mcr- neg	□16	R	NR	R	E. cloacae	COL-R Coliform	Negative
B6	□64	R	16	mcr- neg	□16	R	NR	R	E. cloacae	COL-R Acinetobacter	Negative
C4	8	R	4	mcr- neg	4	R	NR	R	S. enterica	COL-R Acinetobacter	Negative
A5	□64	R	□64	mcr- neg	□16	R	NR	R	Tatumella species	COL-R Coliform	Negative
F6	□64	R	64	mcr- neg	□16	R	NR	R	E. cloacae	COL-R Coliform	Negative
D1a	8	R	4	mcr- neg	8	R	NR	R	E. cloacae	COL-R Pseudomonas	Negative
D1b	32	R	0,125	mcr- pos	4	R	□4	R	E. coli	COL-R E. coli	Mcr-1
D9	16	R	8	mcr- neg	□16	R	NR	R	S. enterica	COL-R Coliform	Negative
S1	32	R	16	mcr- neg	16	R	NR	R	S. enterica	COL-S organism	Negative
S2	8	R	0,5	mcr- neg	16	R	≤2	S	Pseudomonas aeruginosa	COL-R Acinetobacter	Negative
S3	0,5	S	0,125	mcr- neg	16	R	≤2	S	Pseudomonas aeruginosa	COL-R Acinetobacter	Negative
S4	0,25	S	0,125	mcr- neg	0,5	S	≤2	S	Pseudomonas aeruginosa	COL-R Pseudomonas	Negative

S5	0,5	S	0,125	mcr- neg	0,5	S	≤2	S	Pseudomonas aeruginosa	COL-R Acinetobacter	Negative
S6	32	R	64	mcr- neg	□16	S	NR	S	E. cloacae	COL-S organism	Negative
S7	0,5	S	0,125	mcr- neg	0,5	S	NR	S	E. cloacae	COL-S organism	Negative
S8	0,25	S	0,125	mcr- neg	8	R	NR	S	E. cloacae	COL-S organism	Negative
S9	0,125	S	0,125	mcr- neg	0,25	S	≤2	S	E. coli	COL-S organism	Negative
S10	0,125	S	0,125	mcr- neg	0,25	S	≤2	S	E. coli	COL-S organism	Negative
S11	0,5	S	0,125	mcr- neg	0,25	S	4	R	E. coli	COL-S organism	Negative
S12	0,125	S	0,125	mcr- neg	0,25	S	≤2	S	E. coli	COL-R E. coli	Negative
S13	0,125	S	1	mcr- neg	8	R	≤2	S	K. oxytoca	COL-R Coliform	Negative
S14	0,125	S	0,5	mcr- neg	0,25	S	≤2	S	K. oxytoca	COL-S organism	Negative
S15	1	S	0,25	mcr- neg	0,25	S	≤2	S	K. pneumoniae	COL-R Coliform	Negative
S16	0,125	S	0,125	mcr- neg	0,25	S	≤2	S	K. oxytoca	COLS-organism	Negative
S17	0,25	S	0,125	mcr- neg	0,25	S	≤2	S	K. oxytoca	COL-S organism	Negative
S18	0,25	S	0,125	mcr- neg	0,25	S	4	R	K. pneumoniae	COL-R Coliform	Negative
S19	32	R	64	mcr- neg	0,5	S	≤2	S	K. pneumoniae	COL-S organism	Negative
S20	64	R	16	mcr- neg	0,5	S	≤2	S	E. coli	COL-S organism	Negative
S21	□64	R	□64	mcr- neg	□16	R	□4	R	Providencia stuartii	COL-S organism	Negative
S22	□64	R	16	mcr- neg	□16	R	NR	R	A. baumannii	COL-S organism	Negative
S23	1	S	0,125	mcr- neg	0,5	S	NR	S	A. baumannii	COL-S organism	Negative
S24	0,125	S	0,125	mcr- neg	4	R	NR	S	E. cloacae	COL-R Coliform	Negative
S25	0,25	S	0,125	mcr- neg	0,5	S	NR	S	E. cloacae	COL-S organism	Negative
S26	0,5	S	0,125	mcr- neg	0,25	S	NR	S	E. cloacae	COL-S organism	Negative
S27	0,125	S	0,125	mcr- neg	16	R	NR	S	E. cloacae	COL-R Coliform	Negative
S28	1	S	0,125	mcr- neg	2	S	NR	R	E. cloacae	COL-R Coliform	Negative
S29	1	S	0,125	mcr- neg	0,25	S	NR	S	E. cloacae	COL-S organism	Negative
S30	0,5	S	0,125	mcr- neg	0,5	S	NR	S	E. cloacae	COL-S organism	Negative
S31	0,5	S	0,125	mcr- neg	1	S	NR	R	E. cloacae	COL-S organism	Negative

S32	*2*	*S*	*0,25*	*mcr- neg*	*0,5*	*S*	*NR*	*S*	*E. cloacae*	*COL-S organism*	*Negative*
S33	*1*	*S*	*0,125*	*mcr- neg*	*8*	*R*	*NR*	*R*	*E. cloacae*	*COL-S organism*	*Negative*
S34	*0,25*	*S*	*0,125*	*mcr- neg*	*0,25*	*S*	*≤2*	*S*	*K. pneumoniae*	*COL-S organism*	*Negative*
S35	*1*	*S*	*0,125*	*mcr- neg*	*0,5*	*S*	*□4*	*R*	*K. pneumoniae*	*COL-S organism*	*Negative*
S36	*0,5*	*S*	*0,125*	*mcr- neg*	*0,5*	*S*	*≤2*	*S*	*K. pneumoniae*	*COL-S organism*	*Negative*
S37	*1*	*S*	*0,25*	*mcr- neg*	*0,5*	*S*	*NR*	*S*	*E. cloacae*	*COL-S organism*	*Negative*
S38	*0,5*	*S*	*0,5*	*mcr- neg*	*2*	*S*	*NR*	*S*	*E. cloacae*	*COL-S organism*	*Negative*
S39	*8*	*R*	*1*	*mcr- neg*	*8*	*R*	*NR*	*R*	*S. enterica*	*COL-R Acinetobacter*	*Negative*
S40	*16*	*R*	*1*	*mcr- neg*	*2*	*S*	*NR*	*R*	*S. enterica*	*COL-R Acinetobacter*	*Negative*

Table 4. Diagnostic efficiency/performance of MicroScan, ComASP, and CHROMagar COL-APSE and CMT

Parameter	*MicroScan®(A)*	*MicroScan®(B)*	*ComASP™(A)*	*ComASP™(B)*	*CHROMagar*	*CMT*
True Positive	36	12	34	13	32	1
True Negative	32	10	33	11	30	83
False Positive	10	3	12	2	15	0
False Negative	6	1	5	0	7	0
Total	**84**	**26**	**84**	**26**	**84**	**84**
Sensitivity (%)	85.71	92.31	87.18	100	82.05	100.00
Specificity (%)	76.19	76,92	73.33	88.89	66.67	100.00
PPV (%)	78.26	80	73.91	92.31	68.67	100.00
NPV (%)	84.21	90.91	79.82	100	78.95	100.00
VME (%)	14.29	7.69	12.82	0	17.95	NA
ME (%)	23.81	23.08	26.67	8.83	33.33	NA
CA (%)	80.95	84.62	78.57	95.24	73.81	NA
EA (%)	NC	NC	78.57	66.67	NA	NA

ComASP™ (A) = Test on all Gram-Negative Bacteria. ComASP™ (B)= Test on only *K. pneumoniae* and E. coli. MicroScan® (A) = Test on all Gram-Negative Bacteria. MicroScan® (B) = Test on all isolates excluding *E. cloacae, Salmonella* and non-fermenting Gram-negatives except Pseudomonas. NA, not applicable. NC, not calculated due to absence of actual MICs in many isolates.

Table 5. Diagnostic simplicity, time, required skill, equipment and ease-of-application grading for the evaluated tests: MicroScan, ComASP, CHROMagar COL-APSE, CMT, M-PCR and BMD

Test criteria	Grade					
	CHROMagar COL-APSE (TAT = 18-24 hrs)	ComASP (TAT = 18-24 hrs)	M-PCR (TAT = 1-3 hrs)	MicroScan (TAT* = 18-24 hrs)	CMT (TAT = 18-24 hrs)	BMD (TAT = 18-24 hrs)
Time in hours needed to perform each test	1	1	2	2	3	3
Ease in carrying out test	1	2	2	2	3	3
Required training or skill	1	1	3	3	2	2
Requirement for 3rd-party equipment and/or infrastructure	2	2	2	2	2	2
Cost and access to 3rd-party equipment and/or infrastructure	1	1	2	3	1	1
Total grading	**6**	**7**	**11**	**12**	**11**	**11**

*TAT: turnaround time, M-PCR: multiplex PCR, CMT: colistin MAC Test, BMD: broth microdilution

Table 6. Comparison of performance of ComASP™ colistin in our study with other studies only focusing on K. pneumoniae and E. coli isolates.

	(Matuschek *et al.*, 2018)[18]	(Carreto *et al.*, 2018)[16]	(Galani *et al.*, 2018)[17]	This study
	E. coli & *K. pneumoniae* (n=32, 19COL-R)	*K. pneumoniae* (n=76, 23COL-R)	*K. pneumoniae* (n=392,141COL-R)	*E. coli* & *K. pneumoniae* (n=21,12COL-R)
EA	96%	94.7%	94.9%	66.67%
CA	94%	98.7%	97.2%	95.92%
MEs	15.4%	1.9%	3.98%	8.83%
VMEs	0	0	0.7%	0

EA: essential agreement, CA: categorical agreement, MEs: major error, VME: very major error. Table 6 above indicates ComASP™ results from other studies compared to results in this study. In this study, the CA, MEs and VMEs for ComASP™ Colistin were consistent with other studies but recorded the lowest EA.

Figure 1: Gel electrophoresis run of *mcr-1* to *mcr-5* amplicons for all 84 samples. Image (A) contains results for 18 isolates, (B) contains results for 16 isolates, and (C) and (D) contains 19 isolates each. On the sides are the ladders (L) and controls. The *mcr-1*-positive isolate, D1b, is shown in (B).

Figure 2: A pie chart showing the species distribution of the collected samples according to (A) MicroScan® walkaway system results and (B) CHROMagar COL-APSE results. On (C) is shown the colony morphology on CHROMagar COL-APSE after overnight incubation at ambient air: (i) colistin-resistant *E. coli* are dark-pink to reddish, (ii) colistin-resistant coliforms are metallic blue, (iii) colistin-resistant *Pseudomonas* are translucent, +/- natural pigmentation cream to green, (iv) colistin-resistant *Acinetobacter* are cream(ish) and (v) other Gram-negative colistin-resistant species are colourless.

Figure 3: A graph illustrating the performance of the four colistin diagnostic tests. ComASP had the highest sensitivity, particularly for only *K. pneumoniae* and *E. coli*, followed by the

MicroScan. For *mcr-1*-positive strains, the CMT was as efficient as the PCR. ComASP™ (A) = Test on all Gram-Negative Bacteria. ComASP™ (B)= Test on only K. pneumoniae and E. coli. MicroScan® (A)= Test on all Gram-Negative Bacteria. MicroScan® (B)= Test on all isolates excluding E. cloacae, Salmonella and non-fermenting gram-negatives except Pseudomonas.



1=A11, 2=A12, 3=A13, 4=A14, 5=A15, 6=A16, 7=A17, 8= A18, 9=A19, 10=A7, 11=D5, 12=H7, 13 =C9, 14=F7, 15=A8, 16=I7, 17=C1, 18=G6. +1= Positive control 1 (*mcr*-1), +2= Positive control 2 (*mcr*-5). P - = PCR negative control. E - = Extraction negative control. L= DNA ladder (100bp plus)

(A)



*L= DNA Ladder (100bp plus). 1=G7,2=D3, 3=D2, 4=E8, 5=G1, 6=B1, 7=D4, 8=A7, 9=A8, 10=B6, 11=C4, 12=D5, 13=F6, 14=D1a, 15=D1b, 16=D9. +1= Positive control 1 (*mcr-1*), +2= Positive control 2 (*mcr-5*). E- = Extraction negative control, P - = PCR negative control*

(B)



Labels 1 to 19 represent isolates S1 to S19. L= DNA ladder (100bp plus). +1 = Positive control 1 (mcr-1). +2 = Positive control 2 (mcr-5). E- = Extraction negative control. P- = PCR negative control.

(C)



Labels 1 to 19 represent isolates S22 to S40. L= DNA ladder (100bp plus) +1 = Positive control 1 (mcr-1). + 2 = Positive control 2 (mcr-5). E- = Extraction negative control. P- = PCR negative control.

(D)


Proportion of species identified by MicroScan® Walkaway system
Klebsiella pneumoniae
Klebsiella oxytoca
Enterobacter cloacae
Acinetobacter baumannii
Proteus marabillis
Salmonella enterica
Escherichia coli
Burkholderia cepacia
Hafnia alvei
Tatumella
Providencia stuartii
Pseudomonas aeruginosa


(B)
Species identification of isolates by CHROMager™
COL-APSE
26%
18%
7%
4%
45%
COL-R Colliforms
COL-R Acinetobacter
COL-R E. coli
COL-R Pseudomonas
COL-S organisms


(C)
(ii)
(ii)
(iv)
(i)
(ii)
(iv)
(v)
(v)
(iii)



	ComASP™(A)	ComASP™(B)	MicroScan® (A)	MicroScan® (B)	CHROMager COL-APSE
Sensitivity	87,18	100	85,71	92,31	82,05
Specificity	73,33	88,89	76,19	76,92	66,67
PPV	73,91	92,31	78,26	80	68,09
NPV	86,84	100	84,21	90,91	78,95
CA	79,76	95,24	80,95	84,62	73,81
VME	12,82	0	14,29	7,69	17,95
ME	26,67	8,83	23,81	23,08	33,33
EA	78,57	66,67			