The diagnostic accuracy of the point-of-care urine dipstick test in detecting urinary tract infection among symptomatic patients in Nairobi County, Kenya.

Hellen A. Onyango[1,2,3*], Derek J Sloan[1¶], Katherine Keenan[2¶], Mike Kesby[2¶], Caroline Ngugi[3&], Humphrey Gitonga[4&], Robert Hammond[1¶]

[1]School of Medicine, University of St Andrews, Scotland, United Kingdom

[2]School of Geography and Sustainable Development, University of St Andrews, Scotland, United Kingdom

[3]College of Health Sciences, Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology, Nairobi, Kenya

[4]Centre for Microbiology Research, Kenya Medical Research Institute, Nairobi, Kenya.

*Corresponding author

E-mail: hao1@st-andrews.ac.uk (HAO)

¶ These authors contributed equally to this work

& These authors also contributed equally to this work

Abstract

Background: Urinary tract infections (UTIs) are among the most frequently diagnosed bacterial infections and constitute a large proportion of workload in clinical microbiology laboratories. Urine culture is the confirmatory test for UTI. However, most primary care settings routinely use the more rapid, less labour-intensive dipstick. This study assesses the characteristics of a urine dipstick test in predicting a positive urine culture and how best it can be used in resource constrained settings despite its limitations.

Method: A cross-sectional study was conducted at two level-V health facilities in Nairobi County, Kenya. Adults and children presenting with clinical symptoms of UTI were enrolled after obtaining written informed consent. Midstream urine samples were collected. Urinary dipstick was used to identify Nitrites (NIT) and leucocyte esterase (LE) production. Urine was cultured on Cystine Lactose Electrolyte Deficient agar, blood agar and MacConkey agar; and incubated at 37^0C for 24 hours. Urine cultures with pure bacterial colony counts of $\geq 10^4$ cfu/ml were classified as "positive" for UTI.

Results: Of a total of 552 participants enrolled into the study, 124 (23%) were urine culture positive. Prior medication use was associated with culture negativity. With urine culture as the reference standard, urinary dipstick sensitivity was poor overall (using either LE+ or NIT+ to confer a positive dipstick result still only achieved sensitivity of 66.9%). Using combined NIT+ and LE+ to confer a positive dipstick result had the highest specificity (99.2%), alongside a positive predictive value of 91.1%, and a positive likelihood ratio of 35.6. A NIT+ test alone showed highest concordance with urine culture results (percentage agreement: 86%) but still had a Cohen's Kappa value of only 0.5, conferring weak agreement overall.

Conclusion: Dipstick test is a poor surrogate of urine culture. However, the test may be suitable as a 'rule-out' test to exclude UTI, and avoid antibiotic prescription, when both NIT

and LE are negative. Although dipstick continues to be in use in resource constrained settings, poor concordance with urine culture results highlights a need for better near patient tests to diagnose UTI and guide antibiotic decision-making.

Keywords: Urinary tract infection, point of care, dipstick, urine culture, low-and-middle income countries, accuracy.

1. Introduction

UTI is an inflammatory response of the urothelium to bacterial invasion and is among the most frequent community-acquired bacterial infection, affecting more than 150 million individuals globally [1,2]. The disease is associated with morbidity and mortality, particularly among high-risk subpopulations such as children, pregnant women, the elderly and immunocompromised patients [3,4]. Allied to death and disability are prolonged hospital stays, the need for second-line antimicrobial drugs, adverse impacts on the income and livelihoods of individuals, and general economic harm at a national level [5,6].

Prompt diagnosis of urinary tract infection is critical for patient management. However, some people with UTI present with atypical signs and symptoms, whilst others may have UTI symptoms in the absence of infection. This makes the clinical diagnosis a challenge [7], and illustrates the need for laboratory investigations. Quantitative urine culture is the gold standard method for UTI diagnosis despite widely acknowledged limitations of cost, labour intensity and prolonged time to result of between 24-72 hours [8]. These limitations have made urine dipstick a more convenient and frequently used first line laboratory investigation for UTI in primary care settings [9]. In many resource-limited settings it is the only test available [10,11].

Dipstick test is a 10-parameter reagent strip designed to test markers of infection to a range of medical conditions, based on colorimetric principles. Markers which are mainly helpful to detect UTIs are leucocytes esterase (LE) and nitrite (NIT) which detects bacteriuria or pyuria in urine [9]. Nitrite testing detects the presence of bacteria with enzymes that can convert urinary nitrates to nitrites and is associated with members of the family Enterobacterales. Other urinary pathogens such as *Staphylococcus* spp*., Pseudomonas* spp., and *Enterococcus* spp. do not produce nitrate reductase enzymes [8]. This limits the microbiological range of nitrite-mediated detection of UTI. Another limitation is the fact that a minimum bladder incubation period of 4 hours is required for nitrates to be converted to nitrites at reliably detectable levels [7,8].

The leucocyte esterase (LE) test detects whether leucocytes have produced proteins with esterolytic activity that have then hydrolysed ester substrates. LE testing is likely to give a false positive result when urine is highly contaminated with bacterial vaginal flora; when specimens contain eosinophils or *trichomonas* species, both of which can produce esterase; and when the strip is exposed to an oxidizing agent or formalin [7,12,13]. False negative results may arise when urine has high levels of glycosuria and proteinuria; when urine is preserved using boric acid; and when patient is on antibiotic treatment regimen [12]. In addition to nitrites and leucocyte esterase, other urinary dipstick markers of UTI include blood, increased pH, and proteins. However, these are less specific, as they also have many other causes [8].

A previous meta-analysis conducted on the accuracy of urine dipstick test relative to quantitative urine culture found moderate sensitivity (48%) and specificity (91%) in detecting UTIs. The sensitivity was higher in inpatients (58% vs 45%), while the specificity was greater in outpatients (96% vs 45%)[14]. In High Income Countries (HIC), there is widespread

recognition of the urine dipstick test's utility as a preliminary screening tool, guiding clinicians on whether further culture is warranted. However, in Low-and-middle Income (LMICs), most hospitals lack the laboratory capacity to perform urine culture and rely entirely on dipstick for diagnosis. This may result in inappropriate use of antimicrobials. This study quantifies the limitations of dipstick characteristics in settings where it is mostly used without culture back-up and assesses how best it can be utilized despite its limitations.

2. Materials and methods

2.1. Study design

A cross-sectional study was conducted at Mama Lucy Kibaki Hospital (MLKH) and Mbagathi District Hospital (MDH) between 25/05/2022 to 22/04/2023. The hospitals are located within Nairobi County, Kenya, and mostly serve the urban populace. The Kenyan healthcare system is structured in a hierarchical manner, from community-based primary healthcare services through to specialized hospital care. The current structure consists of six levels (I-VI) in ascending order. Both MLKH and MDH are government owned level (V) tertiary health facilities.

2.2. Participant recruitment and sample collection

Adults (≥18 years) and children (5-17 years) were recruited at the outpatient department of MLKH or MDH if they presented with one or more UTI symptoms (increased urinary frequency or urgency, dysuria, burning sensation upon urination, lower abdominal pain, and/or unexplained fever (≥38°C) in children). Participants were taken through the informed consent document in their preferred language (English or Kiswahili). Written informed consent was obtained from adult patients. Assent and consent were obtained for participants aged 13-17 years. Parents/guardians of participants aged ≤13 years consented on their behalf.

122 Participants/guardians who were unable to sign marked the consent form with a thumb print.
123 Potential participants who did not meet the criteria of a presumptive UTI case, or who
124 declined to consent were excluded from the study. A structured questionnaire was used to
125 collect self-reported socio-demographic details such as age, gender, level of education,
126 monthly income, and prior antibiotic intake. Parents/ guardians of children (5-17 years) filled
127 the questionnaire on their behalf. All data were collected electronically using Epicollect5
128 mobile application (https://five.epicollect.net) [15]. Consenting participants were instructed
129 on how to aseptically collect clean catch mid-stream urine into a sterile screw capped
130 universal bottle. All samples were assigned a unique study identification number, transported
131 to the microbiology laboratory, and processed within two hours of collection.

132 2.3. Dipstick test.

133 The dipstick test was conducted using combur-10 test M strips according to the
134 manufacturer's instructions (Combur-10, UK). The urine strip was dipped into approximately
135 10 ml of the urine specimen, removed immediately, and results read after waiting period of
136 2 minutes. The strip was held horizontally adjacent to the reagent colour blocks on the strip
137 container and colours carefully matched. LE was reported as negative, trace, 1+ small, 2+
138 moderate, 3+ large while NIT was recorded as either positive or negative. With reference to
139 the manufacturers guide for interpretation, dipstick testing that produced nitrites or
140 leucocyte esterase greater than trace was taken as positive for UTI. No nitrites or leucocyte
141 esterase were interpreted as negative.

142 2.4. Quantitative urine culture assay

143 A well-mixed 10 µl urine aliquot was plated directly on CLED agar, blood agar (BA) and
144 MacConkey agar (Oxoid, England), and incubated aerobically at 37^0C for 24 hours. A pure

145 bacterial growth yielding colony counts of 10^4 cfu/ml was deemed significant for a UTI
146 infection. Mixed urine cultures (with more than one colony type) or those with either low
147 bacterial colony counts of $<10^4$ cfu/ml, or without microbial growth were interpreted as
148 negative for UTI. Isolates were identified to the species level using colonial morphological
149 characteristics, Gram-staining technique and standard biochemical tests (catalase, coagulase,
150 urease, oxidase, sulfide indole motility, methyl red, citrate utilization)[16].

151 2.5. Statistical analysis

152 Data were downloaded from Epicollect to Microsoft excel for analysis (Microsoft Corp, Red-
153 Mond, Washington, USA). Characteristics of study participants were all presented as
154 categorical variables including age (which was separated into brackets of 5-10, 11-20, 21-30,
155 31-40, 41-50 and >50 years) and average monthly income (which was separated into brackets
156 of <3000, 3000-9900, 10000-24000, 25000-49990, 50000-74900, and 75000-100000 Ksh). Age
157 was also summarised as median and interquartile range (IQR).
158 For urinary dipstick, LE and NIT diagnostic yield were calculated in four ways: LE positive,
159 irrespective of NIT result (LE+), NIT positive irrespective of LE result (NIT+), both NIT and LE
160 positive (NIT+ and LE+), and either NIT or LE positive (NIT or LE+) [17]. Univariate logistic
161 regression was performed to assess the relationship between prior medication exposure and
162 urine culture positivity, with the result expressed as an Odds Ratio (OR) and 95% confidence
163 Interval (CI). The sensitivity, specificity, positive predictive value (PPV), negative predictive
164 value (NPV) and likelihood ratios (LR) were calculated with 95 % CI for dipstick parameters
165 using urine culture as the reference standard. Whilst there is no universal agreement on
166 target performance thresholds for UTI diagnostics, it is generally accepted that diagnostic
167 tests with very high positive +LR (>10) and very low -LR (<0.1) are most useful in ruling in or

168 ruling out a clinical diagnosis respectively[18]. Percentage agreement and Cohen's Kappa
169 coefficient were applied to assess the agreement between dipstick and culture results.
170 Cohen's Kappa results were interpreted as follows: 0-0.2, 'no' agreement; 0.21-0.39,
171 'minimal' agreement; 0.40-0.59, 'weak' agreement; 0.60-0.79, 'moderate' agreement; 0.80-
172 0.90, 'strong' agreement; >0.9, 'perfect' agreement [19].

173 2.6. Ethical statement

174 This study was approved by the University of St. Andrews Teaching and Research Ethics
175 Committee (UTREC), [Approval code. MD15749]; Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and
176 Technology Institutional Ethics Review Board (JKUAT-IERB) [Approval no.
177 JKU/IERC/02316/0166]; National Commission for Science Technology and Innovation
178 (NACOSTI) [Approval no. P/21/12520]. Approvals to access study sites were also obtained
179 from the Nairobi metropolitan services, MLKH and MDH. Each participant in the study
180 provided either a written informed consent or marked the consent form with a thumb print.
181 Although the study involved children, their participation was limited to providing a urine
182 sample under the supervision of their parents/guardians. All questionnaires were completed
183 by parents/guardians on their behalf. The principal investigator was never alone with the
184 children; all interviews were conducted in the presence of an adult. Therefore, certification
185 for working with people in the vulnerable group or the local East African equivalent was not
186 required.

187 3. Results

188 3.1. Characteristics of study participants

189 A total of 622 participants were screened for enrolment into the study. However, 552 were
190 enrolled, 402 at Mama Lucy Kibaki Hospital, 150 at Mbagathi District hospital. Seventy were

excluded for the reasons outlined in **Fig 1.** The median age of the participants was 29 years (IQR:24-36). There were proportionally more females 72% (398/552). Most of the participants had at least a secondary level of education 270 (49%). Among the 552 individuals recruited, 236 (43%) had taken medication within two weeks preceding their enrolment. Of these individuals, 168 (30%) had been on antibiotics, while the remaining 68 (12%) had taken other types of medication. Details of participants characteristics are shown in **Table 1.**

Fig 1: **Participant recruitment flow diagram**. A total of 622 symptomatic adults and child patients were screened for enrolment. Five hundred and fifty-two urine samples were obtained from eligible participants tested using dipstick and culture.

211

212

213 **Table 1: Social- demographic characteristics of study participants**

Variable	Response	n=552
		n (%)
Gender	Male	154 (28)
	Female	398 (72)
Age	5-10	30 (5)
	11-20	49 (9)
	21-30	238 (43)
	31-40	128 (23)
	41-50	67 (12)
	>50	40 (7)
Marital status	Married	258 (52)
	Single	184(37)
	Widowed	37 (7)
	Divorced	15 (2)
Level of education	Pre-primary	17 (3)
	Primary	116 (21)
	Secondary	270 (49)
	Tertiary	149 (27)
Average monthly income (Ksh)	<3000	133 (24)
	3000-9900	110 (20)
	10000-24900	139 (25)
	25000-49900	94 (17)
	50000-74900	68 (12)
	75000-100000	8 (1)
Medication intake	No medication	316 (57)
	Yes-antibiotics	168 (30)
	Yes-others	68 (12)

214

215 3.2. Microbiological characteristics

216 Among 552 urine samples analysed, 124 (22.5%) were positive for UTI (a monoculture
217 bacterial growth of $\geq 10^4$ cfu/ml). Two-hundred-and-thirty-six (43%) participants had taken
218 medication in the two weeks prior to enrolment, and a negative culture result was more likely
219 in those who had taken prior medication (OR: 1.3, 95% CI; 0.64-2.87).

220 The bacterial isolates from positive cultures were characterised and identified to the species
221 level. The proportion of infections attributable to Gram-negative organisms were 97 (78%).
222 The most prevalent uropathogen was *Escherichia coli*, 64 (51.6%). *E. coli* was followed in order
223 of prevalence by *Klebsiella pneumoniae*, 16 (12.9%); *Staphylococcus aureus*, 14 (11.3%);
224 coagulase negative Staphylococcus (CoNS), 7 (5.6%); *Enterococcus faecalis*, 6 (4.8%),
225 *Klebsiella* spp., 5 (4%); *Proteus mirabilis,* 5 (4%); and *Acinetobacter baumanni*, 1(0.8%).
226 *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*, *Proteus vulgaris*, and *Citrobacter koseri* each were 2 (1.6%).
227 The positivity rate from urinary dipstick was dependent on how LE and NIT results were
228 interpreted, as shown in **Fig 2**. If 'NIT+ or LE+' was considered, 187 (34%) of participants were
229 positive, translating to a higher positivity rate than culture. If only 'LE+' was used, 158 (29%)
230 were positive which also exceeded the culture positivity rate. 'NIT+' and 'NIT and LE+' analyses
231 yielded 63 (11%) and 34 (6%) positive results respectively which were lower than the culture
232 positivity rate. In general, dipstick positivity was higher when based on 'LE+' alone, and lower
233 when a 'NIT+' result was required.

234 **Fig 2: UTI prevalence estimation based on dipstick test parameters.** UTI prevalence based
235 on culture was 23%. The LE, NIT or LE estimated UTI prevalence was higher, while NIT, NIT
236 and LE were lower than prevalence based on culture.

237 3.3. Performance characteristics of dipstick using urine culture as a 238 reference

239 Having identified positivity rates from different combinations of urinary dipstick results, it was
240 important to progress to assess performance in relation to the current gold standard urine
241 culture. Results are provided in **Table 2.** Having either NIT+ or LE+ yielded the highest
242 sensitivity of 67%, but overall sensitivity of urine dipstick was poor (ranging from 25-67%).

Having NIT+ and LE+ yielded the highest specificity of 99.3%, and specificity of urine dipstick was generally higher when NIT+ was required as part of a positive result (97.9% for NIT+ and 99.3% for NIT+ and LE+). Similar to specificity, both PPV and +LR were highest when NIT+ was required as part of a positive result (PPV of 85.7% for NIT+ and 91.2% for NIT+ and LE+; +LR of 20.7 for NIT+ and 35.7 for NIT+ and LE+). Overall, NPV ranged from 82-9% and -LR ranged from 0.43-0.66.

249 **Table 2: Diagnostic performance of NIT and LE relative to quantitative urine culture.**

Dipstick parameter		Urine culture		Dipstick performance (95% CI)					
		+	-	Sensitivity % (95% CI)	Specificity % (95% CI)	PPV % (95% CI)	NPV % (95% CI)	+ LR (95% CI)	- LR (95% CI)
LE	+	60	98	48.38 (39.38 – 57.49)	77.10 (72.76 – 80.94)	37.97 (30.48 – 46.06)	83.75 (79.65 – 87.18)	2.11 (1.64-2.17)	0.66 (0.56-0.79)
	-	64	330						
NIT	+	54	9	43.55 (34.76 – 52.73)	97.89 (95.90 – 98.97)	85.71 (74.10 – 92.86)	85.68 (82.19 -88.60)	20.7 (10.52-40.74)	0.57 (0.49-0.67)
	-	70	419						
NIT and LE	+	31	3	25.00 (17.85 – 33.72)	99.29 (97.78 – 99.81)	91.17 (75.18 – 97.69)	82.05 (78.40 – 85.20)	35.66 (11.09-14.69)	0.75 (0.68-0.84)
	-	93	425						
NIT or LE	+	83	104	66.93 (57.84 – 74.96)	75.70 (71.29 – 79.63)	44.38 (37.19 – 51.81)	88.76 (84.96 – 91.72)	2.75 (1.93-2.78)	0.43 (0.36-0.57)
	-	41	324						

Quantitative urine culture was used as the reference test; NIT - Nitrite; LE - Leucocyte Esterase; NIT and LE - Combined nitrites and Leucocyte Esterase; NIT or LE - Either nitrite or leucocyte Esterase; PPV-Positive Predictive Value; NPV- Negative Predictive Value; LR-Likelihood Ratio.

None of age, gender or use of prior medication, including antibiotics, substantially altered any performance characteristics of urinary dipstick compared to a reference of urine culture.

3.4. Concordance between dipstick and culture results.

Further to measuring dipstick performance with culture as a 'gold standard', direct concordance of results was also assessed. Percentage agreement and Cohen's kappa results were both calculated, as shown in **Table 3**, because Cohen's kappa considers the possibility that some concordance may occur by chance. The highest percentage agreement between dipstick and culture occurred when NIT+ was used to denote dipstick positivity (86% agreement, 95% CI: 0.82-0.88) but even then, the Cohen's kappa of 0.5 described only 'weak' agreement.

Table 3: Concordance between Dipstick parameters and quantitative urine culture.

Dipstick parameter	**Concordance with urine culture**		
	(%) Agreement (95% CI)	**Cohen's Kappa (95% CI)**	**Kappa interpretation**
LE	71 (0.66-0.74)	0.23 (0.13-0.33)	Minimal agreement
NIT	86 (0.82-0.88)	0.50 (0.40-0.60)	Weak agreement
NIT and LE	82 (0.78-0.85)	0.32 (0.20-0.44)	Minimal agreement
NIT or LE	73 (0.69-0.77)	0.36 (0.25-0.41)	Minimal agreement

4. Discussion

This study formally quantified the limitations of the urine dipstick test in accurately predicting a positive urine culture, particularly to inform it's use in resource-constrained settings where confirmatory culture may not be available. The overall results show that urine dipstick test is an inadequate tool to assess the probability of a positive urine culture in outpatients with UTI associated symptoms. However, given the test characteristics, the dipstick test may be considered as a rule-out tool for antibiotic prescriptions; a negative dipstick test result characterized by no reaction for both nitrites and leucocyte esterase has very high specificity to predict a negative urine culture, making the diagnosis of UTI unlikely and empirical antimicrobial therapy unnecessary. Implementation of this strategy in an outpatient setting where culture is rarely performed could lead to a reduction in the prescription of antibiotics, thereby contributing to antimicrobial stewardship.

Even though all 552 participants recruited to this study had typical symptoms of UTI, only 124 (23%) were confirmed by positive urine culture, illustrating the difficulty for healthcare providers in deciding on the need for antibiotic prescription based on clinical presentation alone. However, 30% of patients had already taken antibiotics before presentation to hospital out-patient department. This has been demonstrated as a clear predictor of a negative culture result in the present study and in prior literature [16], underlining the challenge of performing and interpreting microbiology test results in a heavily antibiotic pre-exposed population. The overall context highlights the need for development and expanded availability of new, reliable point of care tests to guide decision-making in UTI management.

The urine dipstick test is a complex read-out with different variables reported. In this study, consideration of urine dipstick positivity as 'either NIT+ or LE+' reported a positivity rate of

292 34%. This compares to prior dipstick positivity reports of 54% by Maina *et al* in a similar study
293 in Kenya[11], 73% by Katunzi *et al* in Tanzania[20] and 34% by Dadzie *et al* in Ghana[17].
294 Differences in the care setting and population-specific estimates have been cited as the main
295 sources of heterogeneity of dipstick results between studies[21].
296 In the context of clinical decision-making for infection management, diagnostic tests can be
297 used to 'rule-out' or to 'rule-in' the need for antibiotic therapy. From these data, the
298 requirement for both NIT+ and LE+ to confer dipstick positivity had potential as a good 'rule-
299 out' test due to its high specificity of 99%, albeit with a cautionary note to clinicians that of
300 518 patients who were dipstick negative on this basis, 93 (17.9%) had positive urine cultures.
301 Most uncomplicated UTIs are self-limiting in large patient groups[22], suggesting that an
302 initial missed diagnosis will often have minimal consequences. However, for certain patient
303 groups the balance of risk may be different; e.g., for pregnant women, a missed UTI diagnosis
304 could lead to poor perinatal and maternal outcomes [23]. Overall, the findings concur with a
305 meta-analysis including 14 studies that support the use of urine dipstick test in a rule-out
306 strategy[24]. A similar conclusion was drawn by Deville *et al* in a meta-analysis that included
307 70 publications, despite a considerable variation in settings of the different studies that
308 included both out- and in-patients, emergency department, ante-natal unit, and all levels of
309 care from the community to tertiary care [14]. These results are all contradictory to an older
310 meta-analysis which reported that in many clinical settings, the probability of a positive
311 culture with a negative dipstick test is too high to dismiss the probability of a UTI [25].
312 An alternative, and common, use of the urine dipstick test in resource limited settings is by
313 interpreting the positive results as a tool to support the diagnosis of UTI (rule-in strategy) and
314 as the key result necessary to justify to antibiotic initiation. Whilst 'either NIT+ or LE+' confers
315 the highest sensitivity for any dipstick positivity analysis in this study, the result of 67%

316 sensitivity is still unsatisfactory (1/3 of patients with culture confirmed UTI will be missed).
317 Additionally, the specificity of interpreting the dipstick result in this was low. These findings
318 mirror those of Maina *et al* and Dadzie *et al* who report an overestimation of UTI by 'either
319 NIT+ or LE+' test results compared to culture by 74% and 72% respectively. The consequence
320 may be that some patients who don't need antibiotics will receive them, whilst a concerning
321 proportion of those who need them may not have them prescribed.
322 The greatest overall agreement between urinary dipstick and culture was found when dipstick
323 positivity is reported based on a NIT+ test alone. Therefore, this approach to dipstick
324 interpretation might be the best surrogate for culture positivity if dipstick is the only test
325 available, but the kappa agreement of 0.5 remains weak. In prior studies, the presence of
326 nitrites in urine has been shown to be highly specific for bacteriuria (96.6%-97.5%), but has a
327 low sensitivity of 0-44% for bacteriuria between 10^3-10^5 cfu/ml [7,9,17,26,27]. The typically
328 low sensitivity value for nitrites can be explained by the process of nitrification that requires
329 approximately 4 hours for detectable nitrite levels to be produced in urine [28]. Alternative
330 explanations could be the lack of dietary nitrates, dilution of the nitrite in urine with diuretics,
331 and unreliability of the nitrite test in detecting Gram-positive organisms[8]. Therefore, the
332 presence of nitrites is highly predictive of UTI, but their absence does not exclude it. In a
333 marked contrast, a higher sensitivity of 90% for NIT+ alone, was reported by Sirasaporn *et al*
334 among 56 spinal code injury patients (SCI) in Thailand [29]. While UTI in the general
335 population is based on symptoms, urinalysis and culture, this approach is not applicable to
336 SCI patients as they already have an impaired neurological function and urinary
337 system[30,31]. Perhaps, the difference in target population, diagnostic criterion, and the
338 small sample size could explain the discrepancy between this study and others.

339 The LE+ test alone has a slightly higher sensitivity, and lower specificity when compared to
340 the individual performance of NIT+. The test has poor positive predictive value and minimal
341 agreement with culture (kappa, 0.23). The LE sensitivity of 62.2% reported by Maina *et al*
342 [11], 60% by Dadzie *et al* [17] and 48% by Anith *et al* [9] were all higher than the nitrite test,
343 which mirrors that of the present study. Despite being more sensitive than nitrites, the LE
344 test is not specific for UTI and may be associated with other inflammatory disorders affecting
345 the urinary tract such as vaginitis, chlamydial urethritis or other infections than can elicit an
346 immune response and production of white blood cells [32]. These factors may have
347 contributed to variability in the positive predictive value of LE test from 19% to 88% in prior
348 work, and may also undermine its usefulness in the present dataset [26,33].
349 The diagnostic gains of the urine dipstick assessed through the likelihood ratios (+LR and -LR),
350 ranged from 2.1-30.7 and 0.4-0.7 respectively. Likelihood ratios, which result from the
351 interplay of sensitivity and specificity provide valuable insights into the probability of 'ruling
352 in' or 'ruling out' an infection. According to Guyatt *et al*, diagnostic tests with very high
353 positive +LR (>10) and very low -LR (<0.1) are very useful in ruling in or ruling out a diagnosis
354 respectively[18,34]. Based on this, NIT+, and combined 'NIT+ and LE+' are useful indicators
355 for ruling in a UTI. These findings are comparable to systematic review by John *et al* which
356 reported +LR ranging from 4.27-29.3 and -LR from 0.2-0.5 [24]. However, the ≤0.5 kappa
357 values recorded for all the dipstick parameters suggests a minimal or weak agreement, and
358 consequently, little confidence should be placed on results generated by dipstick in the
359 absence of culture results.
360 This study had some limitations. The study was conducted in two purposively chosen health
361 facilities in an outpatient setting. Generalisation to other settings or patient populations can
362 be challenging, particularly when symptoms associated with UTI may stem from other

363 underlying medical conditions. Optical (naked eye) reading of test strips, as employed in this
364 study may have introduced variations in results accuracy. Reports indicate that automated
365 reading methods using spectrophotometers deliver superior outcomes. By enabling
366 standardized readings, the methods enhance repeatability and reproducibility, indirectly
367 influencing the analytical performance of the tests. Despite the enrolment of over 500
368 participants, the number of positive reference test based on culture was limited by antibiotic
369 intake prior to recruitment into the study and a definition of positivity that required a
370 concentration of 10^4cfu/ml. As the majority (78%) of positive urine cultures were attributable
371 to gram negative bacterial infections, there was insufficient diversity of pathogens to study
372 whether different infecting organisms influenced the diagnostic performance of urinary
373 dipstick results.

374 # 4. Conclusion

375 This study corroborate the widely held view that dipsticks are a poor surrogate for urine
376 culture and are not suitable as definitive method for UTI diagnosis. However, particularly in
377 settings where urine culture is unavailable, the use of urine dipstick test (Negative for both
378 NIT and LE) as a rule out strategy has potential in lower risk patient groups to reduce
379 unnecessary antibiotic prescriptions. Future studies might combine specific UTI symptoms
380 and dipstick test results to explore possible approaches to increase the test's reliability.
381 Finally, the challenges of performing urine culture diagnostics in resource limited settings,
382 calls for research to develop and validate novel near or point of care technologies with better
383 performance characteristics than urinary dipstick.

384

385

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank and appreciate all participants for their participation in the study. We would also like to thank MLKH and MDH for giving us an opportunity to conduct this research, not forgetting the clinicians and laboratory personnel who supported us in data collection.

405 **REFERENCES**

406 1. Öztürk R, Murt A. Epidemiology of urological infections: a global burden. World J Urol
407 [Internet]. 2020;38(11):2669–79. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1007/s00345-019-
408 03071-4

409 2. Li X, Fan H, Zi H, Hu H, Li B, Huang J, et al. Global and Regional Burden of Bacterial
410 Antimicrobial Resistance in Urinary Tract Infections in 2019. J Clin Med. 2022;11(10):1–14.

411 3. Walsh C, Collyns T. The pathophysiology of urinary tract infections. Surg (United Kingdom)
412 [Internet]. 2017;35(6):293–8. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.mpsur.2017.03.007

413 4. Okojie RO, Omorokpe VO. A survey on urinary tract infection associated with two most
414 common uropathogenic bacteria. African J Clin Exp Microbiol. 2018;19(3):111–5.

415 5. E Esteve-Palau, G Solande, F Sánchez, L Sorlí, M Montero, R Güerri, J Villar, S Grau JPH.
416 Clinical and economic impact of urinary tract infections caused by ESBL-producing Escherichia
417 coli requiring hospitalization: A matched cohort study. J Infect. 2015;71(6):667–74.

418 6. Foxman B. Epidemiology of urinary tract infections: Incidence, morbidity, and economic
419 costs. Disease-a-Month. 2003 Feb 1;49(2):53–70.

420 7. Bartlett JG. Laboratory diagnosis of urinary tract infections in adult patients. Infect Dis Clin
421 Pract. 2004;12(6):360–1.

422 8. Graham J C AG. Laboratory diagnosis of urinary tract infection. J Clin Pathol.
423 2001;54(1):911–9.

424 9. Mambatta A, Jayarajan J, Rashme V, Harini S, Menon S, Kuppusamy J. Reliability of dipstick
425 assay in predicting urinary tract infection. J Fam Med Prim Care. 2015;4(2):265.

426 10. Masoud SS, Majigo M, Silago V, Kunambi P, Nyawale H, Moremi N, et al. Utility of dipstick
427 urinalysis in the diagnosis of urinary tract infections among outpatients in Mwanza and Dar
428 es Salaam regions in Tanzania. Bull Natl Res Cent [Internet]. 2024;48(1). Available from:
429 https://doi.org/10.1186/s42269-023-01159-x

430 11. Maina J, Mwaniki J, Mwiti F, Kiiru S, Katana J, Wanja F, et al. Evaluation of the diagnostic
431 performance of the urine dipstick test for the detection of urinary tract infections in patients
432 treated in Kenyan hospitals. Access Microbiol. 2023;5(6):1–13.

433 12. Fuller CE, Threatte GA, Henry JB, Davey FR HC. Basic Examination of Urine. In: Clinical
434 diagnosis and management by laboratory methods. 2001. p. 367–402.

435 13. Nicolle LE, Bradley S, Colgan R, Rice JC, Schaeffer A, Hooton TM. 7 Infectious Diseases
436 Society of America Guidelines.pdf. 2005;

437 14. Devillé WLJM, Yzermans JC, Van Duijn NP, Bezemer PD, Van Der Windt DAWM, Bouter
438 LM. The urine dipstick test useful to rule out infections. A meta-analysis of the accuracy. BMC
439 Urol. 2004;4:1–14.

440 15. Aanensen DM, Huntley DM, Feil EJ, Al-Own F, Spratt BG. EpiCollect: Linking smartphones
441 to web applications for epidemiology, ecology and community data collection. PLoS One.
442 2009;4(9).

443 16. Chesbrough M. District Laboratory Practice in Tropical countries, Part 2, Second Edition.
444 Cambridge University Press, UK; 2006.

445 17. Dadzie I, Quansah E, Puopelle Dakorah M, Abiade V, Takyi-Amuah E, Adusei R. The
446 Effectiveness of Dipstick for the Detection of Urinary Tract Infection. Can J Infect Dis Med
447 Microbiol. 2019;2019.

448 18. Jaeschke R, Guyatt G LJ. Diagnostic tests. In: Guyatt G, Rennie D, eds. In: Chicago, editor.
449 Users' guides to the medical literature. AMA Press; 2002. p. 121–40.

450 19. McHugh ML. Lessons in biostatistics interrater reliability : the kappa statistic. Biochem
451 Medica [Internet]. 2012;22(3):276–82. Available from: https://hrcak.srce.hr/89395

452 20. George Msema B, Leonard K, James K, Lilian N, Akili M, Kennedy Daniel M. Diagnostic
453 accuracy of dipsticks test among clinically suspected urinary tract infected patients at National
454 Hospital, Tanzania. Open J Bacteriol. 2019;3(1):003–7.

455 21. Bafna P, Deepanjali S, Mandal J, Balamurugan N, Swaminathan RP, Kadhiravan T.
456 Reevaluating the true diagnostic accuracy of dipstick tests to diagnose urinary tract infection
457 using Bayesian latent class analysis. PLoS One [Internet]. 2020;15(12 December):1–12.
458 Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0244870

459 22. Vik I, Bollestad M, Grude N, Bærheim A, Damsgaard E, Neumark T, et al. Ibuprofen versus
460 pivmecillinam for uncomplicated urinary tract infection in women — A double-blind ,
461 randomized non- inferiority trial. PLoS Med. 2018;15(5):1–21.

462 23. Schnarr J, Smaill F. Asymptomatic bacteriuria and symptomatic urinary tract infections in
463 pregnancy. Vol. 38, European Journal of Clinical Investigation. 2008. p. 50–7.

464 24. John AS, Boyd JC, Lowes AJ, Price CP. The Use of Urinary Dipstick Tests to Exclude Urinary
465 Tract Infection. Am J Clin Pathol. 2006;126(3):428–36.

466 25. Terry A. Hurlbut, III, M.D, Benjamin Littenberg M. The Diagnostic Accuracy of Rapid
467 Dipstick Tests to Predict Urinary Tract Infection. Am J Clin Pathol. 1991;96(5):582–8.

468 26. Semeniuk H, Church D. Evaluation of the leukocyte esterase and nitrite urine dipstick
469 screening tests for detection of bacteriuria in women with suspected uncomplicated urinary
470 tract infections. J Clin Microbiol. 1999;37(9):3051–2.

471 27. Prah JK, Amoah S, Ocansey DWK, Arthur R, Walker E, Obiri-Yeboah D. Evaluation of
472 urinalysis parameters and antimicrobial susceptibility of uropathogens among out-patients at
473 University of Cape Coast Hospital. Ghana Med J. 2019;53(1):44–51.

474 28. Mahyar A, Ayazi P, Froozesh M, Daneshi-Kohan MM, Barikani A. Can urinary nitrite results
475 be used to conduct antimicrobial option for urinary tract infection in children? Iran J Pediatr.
476 2012;22(2):237–40.

477 29. Duanngai K, Sirasaporn P, Ngaosinchai S. The reliability and validity of using the urine
478 dipstick test by patient self-assessment for urinary tract infection screening in spinal cord
479 injury patients. J Fam Med Prim Care. 2017;6(3):578.

480 30. Jeanne M Hoffman, Rohini Wadhwani, Eve Kelly, Bonnie Dixit DDC. Nitrite and leukocyte

481 dipstick testing for urinary tract infection in individuals with spinal cord injury. J Spinal Cord
482 Med. 2004;27(2):128–32.

483 31. García Leoni ME, De Ruz AE. Management of urinary tract infection in patients with spinal
484 cord injuries. Clin Microbiol Infect. 2003;9(8):780–5.

485 32. Mohanna AT, Alshamrani KM, SaemAldahar MA, Kidwai AO, Kaneetah AH, Khan MA, et al.
486 The Sensitivity and Specificity of White Blood Cells and Nitrite in Dipstick Urinalysis in
487 Association With Urine Culture in Detecting Infection in Adults From October 2016 to October
488 2019 at King Abdulaziz Medical City. Cureus. 2021;13(October 2016):1–7.

489 33. Young JL, Soper DE. Urinalysis and urinary tract infection: Update for clinicians. Infect Dis
490 Obstet Gynecol. 2001;9(4):249–55.

491 34. Deeks JJ, Altman DG. Diagnostic tests 4: likelihood ratios. Bmj. 2004;329(7458):168–9.

492

493

494

495

496

497

498

499

500

501

502

503

504 **SUPPORTING INFORMATION**

505 **S1 Table. Performance of LE.**

506 **S2 Table. Performance of NIT.**

507 **S3 Table. Performance of NIT and LE**

508 **S4 Table. Performance of either NIT or LE**

509 **S1-S4 Tables. Performance characteristics of dipstick parameters across study variables.** The
510 dipstick performance was not influenced by age, gender or prior medication intake.

511 **S5 File. Dipstick manuscript raw data**

512 **S6 File. Participants baseline demographic characteristics**

513

514

515

516


Screened participants
n=622
Excluded (n=65)
Distance =40
Declined =15
Language barrier =10
Eligible participants
n=557
Mid-stream urine
obtained
n=557
Excluded n=5
Insufficient sample
Urine sample tested
n=552
Dipstick
Culture

Figure


40
30
20
10
0
Estimated prevalence (%)
29
11
6
34
23
LE+
NIT+
NIT+ and LE+
NIT+ or LE+
CULTURE
Dipstick parameters

Figure