Clinical impact of the rapid molecular detection of RSV and influenza A and B viruses in the emergency department

Nicolas Yin[1*], Marc Van Nuffelen[2], Magali Bartiaux[3], Thierry Préseau[4], Inge Roggen[5], Sabrina Delaunoy[1], Bhavna Mahadeb[1], Hafid Dahma[1], Laurent Busson[1], Olivier Vandenberg[6,7,8], Marie Hallin[1,7].

1. Department of Microbiology, Laboratoire Hospitalier Universitaire de Bruxelles – Universitair Laboratorium Brussel (LHUB-ULB), Université Libre de Bruxelles (ULB), Brussels, Belgium
2. Emergency Department, Erasme University Hospital, Université Libre de Bruxelles (ULB), Brussels, Belgium
3. Emergency Department, Saint-Pierre University Hospital, Université Libre de Bruxelles (ULB), Brussels, Belgium
4. Emergency Department, Brugmann University Hospital, Université Libre de Bruxelles (ULB), Brussels, Belgium
5. Emergency Department, Queen Fabiola Pediatric University Hospital, Université Libre de Bruxelles (ULB), Brussels, Belgium
6. Clinical Research and Innovation Unit, Laboratoire Hospitalier Universitaire de Bruxelles – Universitair Laboratorium Brussel (LHUB-ULB), Université Libre de Bruxelles (ULB), Brussels, Belgium
7. Centre for Environmental Health and Occupational Health, School of Public Health, Université Libre de Bruxelles (ULB), Brussels, Belgium
8. Division of Infection and Immunity, Faculty of Medical Sciences, University College London, London, United Kingdom

* Corresponding author

E-mail: nicolas.yin@lhub-ulb.be

Abstract

Introduction: Using respiratory viruses' rapid diagnostic tests in the emergency department could allow better and faster clinical management. Point-of-care PCR instruments now provide results in less than 30 minutes. The objective of this study was to assess the impact of the use of a rapid molecular diagnostic test, the cobas® Influenza A/B & RSV Assay for use on Roche's cobas® Liat® instrument, during the clinical management of emergency department patients.

Methods: Patients (adults and children) requiring admission or suffering from an underlying condition at risk of respiratory complication were prospectively recruited in the emergency department of four hospitals in the Brussels region. Physician's intentions regarding admission, isolation, antibiotic, and antiviral use were collected before and after performing the rapid molecular test. Additionally, a comparison of the analytical performance of this test against antigen rapid tests and viral culture was performed as well as a time-to-result evaluation.

Results: Among 293 patients recruited, 90 had a positive PCR whereas 44 had a positive antigen test. PCR yielded a sensitivity of 100% for all targets. Antigen tests yielded sensitivities ranging from 66.7% for influenza B to 83.3% for the respiratory syncytial virus (RSV). The use of PCR allowed a decrease in the overall need for isolation and treatment by limiting the isolation of negative patients and the antibiotic use for positive patients. Meanwhile, antiviral treatments better targeted patients with a positive influenza PCR.

Conclusion: The use of a rapid influenza and RSV molecular test improves the clinical management of patients admitted to the emergency department by providing a fast and reliable result. Their additional cost compared to antigen tests should be balanced with the benefit of their analytical performance, leading to efficient reductions in the need of isolation and antibiotic use.

42 # Introduction

43 The COVID-19 pandemic highlighted the need for rapid and trustworthy diagnostic tests for respiratory
44 tract infections, to assess patients' potential infectiousness and to set containment measures [1,2].
45 Various authors have previously demonstrated that a fast and reliable diagnosis of respiratory infections
46 improved the clinical management during the seasonal epidemics of respiratory syncytial virus (RSV) and
47 influenza A and B viruses [3,4]. In Europe, before the COVID-19 pandemic, universal healthcare rarely
48 took the molecular diagnostic of these infections in charge, limiting their prescription in favor of less
49 expensive antigen tests. In Belgium for instance, SARS-CoV-2 PCR detection is now reimbursed, but for
50 RSV and Influenza A and B viruses only antigen detection is [5]. However, compared to RT-PCR, the
51 sensitivity of these antigen rapid diagnostic tests was estimated to be as low as 53.9% in adults and
52 64.6% in children regarding influenza A [6] and 74% in children regarding RSV [7]; impairing the clinical
53 value of a negative result considerably. Furthermore, clinical judgment, followed by PCR or point-of-care
54 testing (POCT), were found to be cost-effective in a setting where influenza probability was high [8]. Fast
55 "sample-in, result-out" PCR instruments such as the Roche cobas® Liat® are now providing point-of-care
56 PCR results in less than 30 minutes (a run on the instrument is completed in 21 minutes once the sample
57 is loaded; the hands-on time is approximately 5 minutes) [9]. The objective of this study is to assess the
58 impact of the use of the cobas® Liat® Influenza A/B & RSV assay on the clinical management of
59 emergency department (ED) patients requiring admission or presenting an underlying condition at risk
60 of respiratory complication.

61 # Material and Methods

62 ## Population and data collection

63 Patients attending the ED of four hospitals located in the Brussels area of Belgium were prospectively
64 recruited. Inclusion criteria were either a pre-test indication of hospitalization or an underlying situation
65 at risk of respiratory complication following influenza infection as described by the European Centre for
66 Disease Prevention and Control and the US Centers for Disease Control (age ≥ 65 years old or < 2 years
67 old, pregnancy, chronic medical conditions, immunocompromised patient, etc.) [10,11]. When including
68 the patient and prescribing the test, physicians indicated their intentions regarding antimicrobial
69 treatment, isolation, and hospitalization by answering a questionnaire. The same questionnaire was
70 completed again once the PCR results were available to evaluate the post-test intentions. The informed
71 consent of each participant or their guardian was collected. The ethics' committee of each hospital
72 approved the study.

73 ## Specimen collection and analyses

74 Accepted samples were nasopharyngeal swabs in 3mL of universal transport medium (UTM).
75 Nasopharyngeal aspirates diluted with 3 mL of UTM were also accepted for children. Approximately
76 200µL were immediately used to perform a rapid PCR using the cobas® Liat® Influenza A/B & RSV assay
77 (Roche Diagnostics, Indianapolis, IN) following manufacturer's instructions in a 24/7 on-site laboratory
78 or in a point-of-care setting. PCR results were instantly transmitted towards the result servers. PCR time-
79 to-result was assessed for PCR realized in on-site laboratories by the delay between the prescription
80 time indicated by the physician and the results validation time, which is the time it became available for
81 the physician. In addition, antigen rapid diagnostic tests (RDT) were performed after the PCR using Influ
82 A+B K-Set (Coris BioConcept) for Influenza A and Influenza B detection, and RSV K-SeT (Coris
83 BioConcept) for RSV detection on the same sample (200µL/test). Upon arrival in the virology laboratory,

84 1 mL of UTM was also inoculated on confluent Vero (African green monkey kidney), MRC5 (human lung)
85 and LLC-MK2 (rhesus monkey kidney) cell cultures (Vircell) in 24-well or 6-well tissue culture plates
86 (Greiner-Bio One). Cultures were incubated at 36°C in a 5% CO_2 atmosphere for 2 weeks for the Vero
87 and LLC-MK2 cells and 3 weeks for the MRC5 cells. The media were replaced weekly. Cultures were
88 examined every two to three days using an inverted microscope. Hemadsorption was performed on the
89 LLC-MK2 cells at the end of the second week of incubation.

90 Statistical analysis

91 To assess the analytical performances of a molecular detection technique against culture and antigen
92 detection, a composite reference standard was constructed as recommended [12]. Samples considered
93 as positive for a viral pathogen were defined as those testing positive for this viral pathogen by at least 2
94 of the 3 techniques used, negative as those that tested negative by at least 2 of the 3 techniques.
95 Statistical analyses were performed using Analyse-it® for Microsoft Excel v5.30.4. Proportion variations
96 between pre-test and post-test clinical intentions were evaluated using the McNemar-Mosteller exact
97 test.

98 Results

99 Two hundred ninety-three patients were recruited including 68 children (< 15 years old) (Table 1).
100 Among them, 71 had a positive rapid PCR result for influenza A only, 10 for influenza B only, 1 for both
101 influenza A and B, 8 for RSV and 203 were negative for all the targets. The positive agreement between
102 PCR and RDT ranged from 36.3% (4/11) for influenza B to 62.5% (5/8) for RSV. One sample was positive
103 for influenza A using RDT although negative using culture and PCR. Likewise, one sample was positive for
104 influenza A using culture although negative using PCR and RDT. Thus, using the composite reference
105 standard, PCR reached a sensitivity of 100% for the 3 viruses targeted (Table 2).

Table 1: Population characteristics

Age (years)	Female	Male	Overall
Overall	123	170	293
< 15	25	43	68
15-65	63	63	126
> 65	35	64	99

Table 2: Analytical performance (Se: Sensitivity, Sp: Specificity) and Wilson 95% confidence interval (CI) of Cobas® Liat Influenza A/B & RSV assay (PCR), antigen tests (RDT) and viral culture for the diagnostic of Influenza A, B and RSV using a composite reference standard

		Reference			
Test	**Result**	**Positive**	**Negative**	**Total**	**Performance (95% CI)**
Influenza A					
- PCR	Positive	49	23	72	Se = 100% (92.7-100%)
	Negative	0	221	221	Sp = 90.6% (86.3-93.6%)
- RDT	Positive	34	1	35	Se = 69.4% (55.5-80.5%)
	Negative	15	243	258	Sp = 99.6% (97.7-99.9%)
- Culture	Positive	42	1	43	Se = 87.5% (75.3-94.1%)
	Negative	6	241	247	Sp = 99.6% (97.7-99.9%)
Influenza B					
- PCR	Positive	6	5	11	Se = 100% (61.0-100%)
	Negative	0	282	282	Sp = 98.3% (96.0-99.3%)
- RDT	Positive	4	0	4	Se = 66.7% (30.0-90.3%)
	Negative	2	287	289	Sp = 100% (98.7-100%)
- Culture	Positive	6	0	6	Se = 100% (61.0-100%)
	Negative	0	284	284	Sp = 100% (98.7-100%)
RSV					
- PCR	Positive	6	2	8	Se = 100% (61.0-100%)
	Negative	0	285	285	Sp = 99.3% (97.5-99.8%)
- RDT	Positive	5	0	5	Se = 83.3% (43.6-97%)
	Negative	1	287	288	Sp = 100% (98.7-100%)
- Culture	Positive	5	0	5	Se = 100% (56.6-100%)
	Negative	0	285	285	Sp = 100% (98.7-100%)

Clinical intentions regarding admission were not influenced by the result of the test (Table 3). However, an overall decrease of the intentions of admission in isolation (odds ratio (OR) = 0.381; 95% confidence interval (CI) = 0.200 – 0.692)), antibiotic use (OR = 0.486; CI = 0.261 – 0.876) and oseltamivir use (OR = 0.543; CI = 0.320 – 0.903) was observed. These trends were the result of both a sharp decrease of isolation intentions for people with a negative PCR (OR = 0.077; CI = 0.015 – 0.242) and an increase of

116 isolation intentions for people with a positive PCR (OR = 4.333; CI = 1.191 – 23.707). Similarly, patients
117 with a positive PCR were less likely to be prescribed antibiotics (OR = 0.235; CI = 0.058 – 0.721) and
118 oseltamivir treatment was more specifically prescribed for patients with an influenza positive PCR (OR =
119 12.500; CI = 3.117 – 108.889), including for patients with a positive PCR for which the result of the RDT
120 ended negative (OR = 8.500; CI = 2.018 – 75.851). Positive RDT alone would not have resulted in a
121 significant increase in isolation (OR = +∞; CI = 0.660 – +∞).

122 Two hundreds eighty-four (97.3%) samples were analyzed in a 24/7 on-site laboratory and the remaining
123 in the ED as a point-of-care. The median time-to-result of the PCR in the laboratory was 60 minutes (CI =
124 53 – 76 minutes) with a 90th percentile of 164 minutes.

125 *Table 3: Clinical impact of the positive (+) and negative (-) results of the PCR and antigen rapid diagnostic test (RDT) for*

126 *respiratory syncytial virus (RSV) and influenza A and B viruses (flu)*

Intention	Pre-test	Post-test	Odds ratio (95% confidence interval)	p-value*
Admission	175/261	172/261	0.850 (0.418 – 1.708)	0.74
- PCR +	45/78	41/78	0.429 (0.072 – 1.877)	0.34
- RDT +	19/37	18/37	0.667 (0.056 – 5.820)	1.00
- PCR -	130/183	131/183	1.077 (0.470 – 2.488)	1.00
Isolation**	78/148	52/148	0.381 (0.200 – 0.692)	0.0009
- PCR +	25/38	35/38	4.333 (1.191 – 23.707)	0.0213
- PCR +, RDT -	13/22	19/22	3.000 (0.749 – 17.228)	0.1460
- RDT +	12/16	16/16	+∞ (0.660 – +∞)	0.1250
- PCR -	53/110	17/110	0.077 (0.015 – 0.242)	<0.0001
- RDT -	66/132	36/132	0.286 (0.137 – 0.553)	<0.0001
Antibiotic use	117/249	98/249	0.486 (0.261 – 0.876)	0.0145
- PCR +	30/75	17/75	0.235 (0.058 – 0.721)	0.0072
- PCR +, RDT -	15/38	9/38	0.333 (0.058 – 1.336)	0.1460
- RDT +	15/37	8/37	0.125 (0.003 – 0.932)	0.0391
- PCR -	87/174	81/174	0.700 (0.327 – 1.457)	0.3915
- RDT-	102/212	90/212	0.586 (0.302 – 1.103)	0.1038
Oseltamivir use	61/245	40/245	0.543 (0.320 – 0.903)	0.0170
- PCR flu +	14/67	37/67	12.500 (3.117 – 108.889)	<0.0001
- PCR flu +, RDT -	7/36	22/36	8.500 (2.018 – 75.851)	0.0007
- RDT flu +	7/31	15/31	+∞ (1.707 – +∞)	0.0078
- PCR flu -	47/178	3/178	0.000 (0.087 – 0.087)	<0.0001

*McNemar-Mosteller exact test **among those with both a pre- and post-test admission intention

127 ## Discussion

128 Previous studies already underlined the impact of the rapid detection of influenza and RSV in the
129 management of patients [13–16]. We showed that an overall significant decrease of antibiotic
130 prescription could be obtained by providing a relevant diagnostic tool combining speed and sensitivity.
131 The excellent sensitivity of the cobas® Liat® assay allowed an optimized assessment of the need for
132 isolation for the inpatients, ensuring a proper isolation for almost all infected patients, which likely led
133 to a reduction of nosocomial transmission. Indeed, less than half of patients with a positive PCR had also
134 a positive RDT underlining the importance to use a molecular test efficiently improving antibiotic and
135 antiviral stewardship while offering a real assessment for the need of a costly hospitalization in isolation.
136 The overall decrease of the isolation indications for patients with a negative test should be balanced

137 with the clinical presentation of the patient to prevent the nosocomial transmission of eventual other
138 respiratory pathogens. Nevertheless, in a pandemic context where isolation resources can be scarce, the
139 use of a negative reliable test to decrease the need for isolation should be considered.

140 In our study, the median time of response from the laboratory was 60 minutes for a less than 30-minute
141 assay. Nevertheless, the time-to-result in this setting is dependent of the overall workload in the on-site
142 laboratory. Using this assay as a POCT at the ED would certainly decrease the time-to-result while
143 increasing the autonomy of the ED team regarding the general management of the workflow and the
144 real-time adaptation of the indications depending on the current level of bed occupancy and the
145 epidemic situation.

146 However, such a strategy has a cost and should be further examined through a medico-economic study
147 to better determine the optimal target population, while taking into account the subsequent decrease
148 of nosocomial outbreaks and the targeted use of individual protection equipment and antibiotics. In a
149 Dutch study, the daily direct cost of isolating patients ranged from €28 (£23/$31) to €41 (£34/$46) [17].
150 At the time of writing, the price of the cobas® Liat® Influenza A/B & RSV was 39€/test (£33/$44)
151 (excluding instruments and workforce). In Belgium, an antigen test is reimbursed 8.06€ (£6.74/$9.00)
152 per target (maximum 3) and a viral culture, 45.17€ (£37.75/$50.48). The savings will likely balance the
153 costs of performing a PCR instead of RDTs and viral cultures for inpatients during seasonal epidemic.

154 Even if we were able to evaluate the cobas® Liat® Influenza A/B & RSV assay in the laboratory, this study
155 was prematurely interrupted by the surge of the COVID-19 pandemic in Belgium in March 2020. This
156 event prevented us to evaluate the benefit of the use of this assay as a POCT because this assay was not
157 anymore relevant for the epidemic at the time. The need for human and technical resources also
158 prevented us to cross check PCR-only positive tests with another molecular method leading here to a
159 likely underestimation of the specificity and the need to use a composite reference standard to balance

160 the well-known lesser sensitivity of RDT and culture. It also restricted the number of RSV and influenza B
161 infections. However, the pandemic allowed us to later use the cobas® Liat® SARS-CoV-2 & Influenza A/B
162 assay as a POCT in the ED. This implementation raised biosafety concerns, as this assay requires the
163 transfer by pipetting of the transport medium to the reagent tube, which can be considered as a
164 projection and lead to aerosolization risks. To solve this, the loading of the reagent tube with the UTM
165 was done at bedside, by the operator performing the sampling wearing personal protection equipment.
166 The sealed tube was then transported to the instrument located in a separate room [18].

167 In conclusion, using a rapid molecular assay, such as the cobas® Liat® Influenza A/B & RSV, improves the
168 clinical management of patients by refining the indications of isolation, antibiotic, and antiviral
169 treatment thanks to better analytical performances than RDTs. Using this instrument as a POCT in the
170 ED could provide an efficient 24/7 solution to dispatch inpatients and take at-risk outpatients in charge
171 swiftly and optimally.

Acknowledgment

We wish to thank the nurses of the emergency department of our hospitals for their amazing work and their collaboration in this study. We would like to thank Dustin DeMeglio for his help in English writing.

References

1. Vandenberg O, Martiny D, Rochas O, van Belkum A, Kozlakidis Z. Considerations for diagnostic COVID-19 tests. Nat Rev Microbiol. 2021 Mar;19(3):171–83.

2. Sheridan C. Coronavirus testing finally gathers speed. Nat Biotechnol [Internet]. 2020 Nov 5 [cited 2020 Dec 20]; Available from: http://www.nature.com/articles/d41587-020-00021-z

3. Maltezou HC. Nosocomial influenza: new concepts and practice: Curr Opin Infect Dis. 2008 Aug;21(4):337–43.

4. Bont L. Nosocomial RSV infection control and outbreak management. Paediatr Respir Rev. 2009 Jun;10:16–7.

5. Nomenclature des prestations de santé [Internet]. Sect. Biologie Clinique - Article 24. Available from: https://www.inami.fgov.be/SiteCollectionDocuments/nomenclatureart24_20210701_01.pdf

6. Chartrand C, Leeflang MMG, Minion J, Brewer T, Pai M. Accuracy of Rapid Influenza Diagnostic Tests: A Meta-analysis. Ann Intern Med. 2012 Apr 3;156(7):500.

7. Chartrand C, Tremblay N, Renaud C, Papenburg J. Diagnostic Accuracy of Rapid Antigen Detection Tests for Respiratory Syncytial Virus Infection: Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. Tang Y-W, editor. J Clin Microbiol. 2015 Dec;53(12):3738–49.

191 8. Lee BY, McGlone SM, Bailey RR, Wiringa AE, Zimmer SM, Smith KJ, et al. To Test or to Treat? An
192 Analysis of Influenza Testing and Antiviral Treatment Strategies Using Economic Computer
193 Modeling. Galvani AP, editor. PLoS ONE. 2010 Jun 23;5(6):e11284.

194 9. Gibson J, Schechter-Perkins EM, Mitchell P, Mace S, Tian Y, Williams K, et al. Multi-center
195 evaluation of the cobas ® Liat ® Influenza A/B & RSV assay for rapid point of care diagnosis. J Clin
196 Virol. 2017 Oct;95:5–9.

197 10. European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control. Factsheet about seasonal influenza
198 [Internet]. [cited 2021 Jul 27]. Available from: https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/en/seasonal-
199 influenza/facts/factsheet

200 11. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Influenza Antiviral Medications: Summary for
201 Clinicians [Internet]. [cited 2021 Jul 27]. Available from:
202 https://www.cdc.gov/flu/professionals/antivirals/summary-clinicians.htm

203 12. Banoo S, Bell D, Bossuyt P, Herring A, Mabey D, Poole F, et al. Evaluation of diagnostic tests for
204 infectious diseases: general principles. Nat Rev Microbiol. 2010 Dec;8(S12):S16–28.

205 13. Bonner AB, Monroe KW, Talley LI, Klasner AE, Kimberlin DW. Impact of the Rapid Diagnosis of
206 Influenza on Physician Decision-Making and Patient Management in the Pediatric Emergency
207 Department: Results of a Randomized, Prospective, Controlled Trial. PEDIATRICS. 2003 Aug
208 1;112(2):363–7.

209 14. Rahamat-Langendoen J, Groenewoud H, Kuijpers J, Melchers WJG, Wilt GJ. Impact of molecular
210 point-of-care testing on clinical management and in-hospital costs of patients suspected of
211 influenza or RSV infection: a modeling study. J Med Virol. 2019 Aug;91(8):1408–14.

212 15. Falsey AR, Murata Y, Walsh EE. Impact of rapid diagnosis on management of adults hospitalized
213 with influenza. Arch Intern Med. 2007 Feb 26;167(4):354–60.

214 16. Busson L, Bartiaux M, Brahim S, Konopnicki D, Dauby N, Gérard M, et al. Contribution of the
215 FilmArray Respiratory Panel in the management of adult and pediatric patients attending the
216 emergency room during 2015–2016 influenza epidemics: An interventional study. Int J Infect Dis.
217 2019 Jun;83:32–9.

218 17. van Dijk MD, Voor in 't holt AF, Polinder S, Severin JA, Vos MC. The daily direct costs of isolating
219 patients identified with highly resistant micro-organisms in a non-outbreak setting. J Hosp Infect.
220 2021 Mar;109:88–95.

221 18. Yin N, Debuysschere C, Decroly M, Bouazza F-Z, Collot V, Martin C, et al. SARS-CoV-2 Diagnostic
222 Tests: Algorithm and Field Evaluation From the Near Patient Testing to the Automated Diagnostic
223 Platform. Front Med. 2021;8:650581.

224