Current and emerging polymyxin resistance diagnostics: a systematic review of established and novel detection methods

Tumisho Mmatumelo Seipei Leshaba^a, Nontombi Marylucy Mbelle^a, John Osei Sekyere^{a#}

^aDepartment of Medical Microbiology, School of Medicine, Faculty of Health Sciences, University of Pretoria, South Africa.

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

Running head: Polymyxin E resistance, current detection methods.

Tweet: “Colistin resistance is a global threat to bacterial infections’ management. Being a last-resort antibiotic for treating of MDR Gram-negative infections, it is important to establish an efficient diagnostic method for routine use in clinical microbiology laboratories. Herein, current & emerging diagnostics for detecting colistin resistance are described to inform clinical diagnostic options.”

Author summary/highlights/importance

- Polymyxin resistance is rapidly increasing, threatening public and veterinary healthcare.
- As one of the last-line antibiotics, polymyxin must be conserved by containing the spread of polymyxin resistance.
- Detecting colistin resistance relies on determining colistin MIC values by standard broth microdilution, which is labour-intensive with longer turnaround time (TAT).
- Other polymyxin resistance diagnostics have been developed to augment or replace the broth microdilution with faster TAT.
- Based on their respective sensitivities, specificities, TAT, skill, and cost, selected phenotypic and molecular assays are recommended for laboratories, according to their financial strengths, to enhance colistin resistance surveillance and control.

31

32 Abstract

33 **Background.** The emergence of polymyxin resistance, due to transferable *mcr*-genes,
34 threatens public and animal health as there are limited therapeutic options. As polymyxin is
35 one of the last-line antibiotics, there is a need to contain the spread of its resistance to
36 conserve its efficacy. Herein, we describe current and emerging polymyxin resistance
37 diagnostics to inform faster clinical diagnostic choices.

38 **Methods.** A literature search in diverse databases for studies published between 2016 and
39 2020 was performed. English articles evaluating colistin resistance methods/diagnostics were
40 included.

41 **Results.** Screening resulted in the inclusion of 93 journal articles. Current colistin resistance
42 diagnostics are either phenotypic or molecular. Broth microdilution (BMD) is currently the
43 only gold standard for determining colistin MICs (minimum inhibitory concentration).

44 Phenotypic methods comprise of agar-based methods such as CHROMagar™ Col-APSE,
45 SuperPolymyxin, ChromID® Colistin R, LBJMR, and LB medium; manual MIC-determiners
46 viz., UMIC, MICRONAUT MIC-Strip (MMS), and ComASP Colistin; automated
47 antimicrobial susceptibility testing (AST) systems such as BD Phoenix, MICRONAUT-S,
48 MicroScan, Sensititre and Vitek 2; MCR-detectors such as lateral flow immunoassay (LFI)
49 and chelator-based assays including EDTA- and DPA-based tests *i.e.* combined disk test
50 (CDT), modified colistin broth-disk elution (CBDE), Colispot, and Colistin MAC test as
51 well as biochemical colorimetric tests *i.e.* Rapid Polymyxin NP test and Rapid
52 ResaPolymyxin NP test. Molecular methods only characterize mobile colistin resistance; they
53 include PCR, LAMP, and whole-genome sequencing (WGS).

54 **Conclusion.** Due to the faster turnaround time (≤ 3 h), improved sensitivity (84-100%), and
55 specificity (93.3-100%) of the Rapid ResaPolymyxin NP test, we recommend this test for
56 initial screening of colistin-resistant isolates. This can be followed by CBDE with EDTA or
57 the LFI as they both have 100% sensitivity and a specificity of $\geq 94.3\%$ for the rapid
58 screening of *mcr*-genes. However, molecular assays such as LAMP and PCR may be
59 considered in well-equipped clinical laboratories.

60 **Keywords:** Colistin resistance; detection methods; *mcr*; diagnostics; Polymyxins

61 1. Introduction

62 The rapid dissemination of multidrug-resistant (MDR) *Acinetobacter spp.*, *Pseudomonas spp.*
63 and carbapenemase-producing *Enterobacterales* (CPE) has been of vital significance to public
64 and veterinary health ^{1,2}. Of particular concern are carbapenem-resistant infections caused by
65 these organisms ³, as they are associated with high mortality rates owing to limited
66 therapeutic options ^{4,5}. The limited pipeline of new antibiotic classes has led to increased use
67 of polymyxin E (colistin) alone or in combination with tigecycline or fosfomycin for the
68 treatment of MDR Gram-negative infections ^{6,7}.

69 Polymyxin (colistin) is of particular value as a last-line antibiotic for treating MDR and
70 carbapenem-resistant Gram-negative infections as it is bactericidal unlike tigecycline, which
71 is bacteriostatic and is not readily available in many countries ⁸. Polymyxin consists of
72 hydrophilic and lipophilic moieties that allow it to have stable polar and hydrophobic
73 interactions with the lipopolysaccharide (LPS) membrane of Gram-negative bacteria ^{9,10}.
74 These interactions result in the destruction of the LPS membrane, causing the cytoplasmic
75 content to leak out, ultimately killing the cell ¹⁰. There are two types of polymyxins, B and E,
76 but this review shall focus on polymyxin E, also known as colistin.

77 Increased use of polymyxin to treat MDR Gram-negative infections has led to the emergence
78 of acquired colistin resistance ¹¹. Several mechanisms that mediate acquired colistin resistance
79 have been identified, the most common being chromosomal mutations and plasmid-borne
80 colistin resistance ^{10,12,13}. Chromosomal mutations result in modification(s) of the LPS
81 membrane using different mechanisms: (i) the addition of 4-amino-4-deoxy-L-arabinose (L-
82 Ara-4N), phosphoethanolamine (pETN) or galactosamine moieties at the 4' or 1' position of
83 lipid A, which reduces the overall anionic charge of the LPS; (ii) overexpression of efflux
84 pumps systems; (iii) overproduction of capsule polysaccharide that reduces the LPS
85 membrane's permeability ^{8,12}.

86 Plasmid-borne colistin resistance involves the acquisition of a mobile colistin resistance (*mcr*)
87 gene that encodes a pETN transferase ⁷. Since the discovery of the first plasmid-borne *mcr*-1
88 gene in *Escherichia coli* in China, other *mcr* variants viz., *mcr*-2, *mcr*-3, *mcr*-4, *mcr*-5, *mcr*-6,
89 *mcr*-7, *mcr*-8, *mcr*-9, and *mcr*-10, have been described worldwide ^{6,14-21}. Currently, the
90 confirmation of polymyxin E resistance relies on the broth microdilution (BMD) ²². Although
91 BMD is the gold standard for colistin susceptibility testing, it is not suitable for routine
92 clinical use as it is time-consuming and associated with methodological issues ²³.
93 Transmissible colistin resistance makes it imperative to establish rapid and reliable methods
94 that will efficiently detect colistin resistance ⁶. As *mcr*-containing plasmids are capable of

transfer between epidemic strains of *Enterobacterales*, rapid detection of colistin resistance could manage the dissemination of colistin resistance in human and animal populations^{6, 23}.

There has been an increasing interest in discovering alternative methods of detecting resistance to colistin arising from both chromosomal mutations and plasmid-borne *mcr* genes^{1, 24}. These methods can be categorized as either phenotypic or molecular methods^{12, 23}. This review aims to summarize and analyse clinical diagnostic methods that are currently available for detecting colistin resistance.

Evidence before this review

Methods used to detect polymyxin resistance have been reviewed^{1, 12, 23}. Bardet and Rolain (2018) narratively described methods used to detect colistin resistance, focusing mainly on their efficiency to detect all mechanisms of colistin resistance. They also analysed methods specifically used to detect plasmid-mediated colistin resistance. Osei Sekyere (2019) provided a comprehensive description of polymyxin resistance and *mcr*-detecting diagnostic methods up to 2018. The review included the composition of culture media, primers, and cycling conditions of PCR methods. Osei Sekyere (2019) summarized the sensitivities, specificities, turnaround time (TAT), skill, relative cost, essential agreement (EA), categorical agreement (CA), major error (ME) and very major error (VME) of polymyxin-resistance detection methods. Since 2018, new evaluation studies have been reported, broadening our understanding and conclusions of the best colistin resistance diagnostics/methods. Therefore, we provide a comprehensive update and an expanded review, based on broader evaluation studies, of all the current diagnostic methods designed to detect colistin resistance.

Literature search strategy

A comprehensive literature search was performed using Pubmed, Web of Science, and ScienceDirect. Articles published in English, from January 2016 to September 2020, were retrieved and screened using the following keywords: “colistin AND resistan*”, “polymyxin AND resistan*” in permutation and combination with “detection” and “diagnostics”, in a factorial order. The search was based on articles that were evaluating methods that are currently used for the detection of colistin resistance and *mcr*-genes. Studies based on epidemiology, risk factors, surveillance, non-English language articles, other reviews, case reports, or case studies were excluded. The inclusion and exclusion methods used in this review are demonstrated in Figure 1. The following data was extracted from the included articles and summarized in Table 1: Diagnostic methods used, types and sample size (in

numbers) of bacterial species used in the evaluation, sensitivity, specificity, EA, CA, ME, VME, relative cost and TAT.

2. Phenotypic tests

Broth Microdilution (BMD)

The Clinical and Laboratory Standard Institute (CLSI) and European Committee on Antimicrobial Susceptibility Testing (EUCAST) have jointly recommended that the MIC (minimum inhibitory concentration) testing of colistin be performed according to the ISO-20776 standard BMD method^{25, 26}. Methods such as agar dilution, disc diffusion and gradient diffusion have been ruled out as it was shown that the large molecular size of colistin makes it poorly diffusible through agar^{1, 26, 27}.

It has been recommended that BMD be used with plain polystyrene trays and colistin sulfate salt without the addition of any surfactants^{26, 28}. The CLSI had initially recommended the addition of polysorbate-80 (P-80) to alleviate the binding of polymyxin to negatively charged polystyrene surfaces (binding of colistin to polystyrene reduces the concentration of colistin)¹. However, there were concerns that the surfactant would act in a synergistic manner with colistin, and is therefore not recommended at this time²⁸. Moreover, several studies have suggested that the loss of colistin concentration could be reduced by minimizing contact with unexposed pipette tips and by storing colistin solution in glass tubes²⁸.

The CLSI and EUCAST have established a colistin susceptible breakpoint of ≤ 2 mg/L and a resistant breakpoint of >2 mg/L for *Acinetobacter spp.* and *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*²⁵. However, only the EUCAST has the same breakpoints for *Enterobacterales* whilst the CLSI has an epidemiological cut-off value of 2 mg/L that defines *Escherichia coli*, *Klebsiella pneumoniae*, *Raoultella ornithiolytica*, *Enterobacter aerogenes* and *Enterobacter cloacae* as either wild type or non-wildtype^{1, 25}.

BMD performed by the reference ISO-20776 method is currently the only gold standard for determining colistin MIC and evaluating CA, EA, ME and VME; yet it is laborious and rarely performed in routine clinical microbiology laboratories¹. Instead, diffusion methods and automated AST systems are more commonly used¹. Chew *et al* (2017) evaluated the detection of *mcr-1* positive *Enterobacterales* by BMD in comparison with commercial automated AST systems viz., Sensititre, Microscan and Vitek 2, and a gradient diffusion test *i.e.*, E-test. This study found that none of the commercial testing methods meet the CLSI recommendation standard for commercial antimicrobial susceptibility testing systems: EA

≥90%, CA ≥90%, VME ≤1.5%, and ME ≤ 3.0%. Even so, the Sensititre and MicroScan were shown to detect 100% of the *mcr-1* positive isolates (Refer to Automated AST systems below)²⁵. The BMD's overall sensitivity could be improved by reducing the susceptible breakpoint to ≤1mg/L and using microtitre plates that were manufactured to reduce adsorption^{25, 28}.

The methodological challenges surrounding the standard BMD have led to interest in finding alternative means for detecting polymyxin resistance in Gram-negative bacteria^{1, 28}. Broth macrodilution method has been shown to be an obvious alternative, as it employs the use of glass tubes instead of polystyrene²⁸. Notwithstanding, the broth macrodilution method is not a popular alternative because it requires the same preparation and TAT as the standard BMD. Hence, commercially available selective media and rapid colorimetric assays have become popular for screening (Table 1)²⁸.

Diffusion and Agar dilution methods

Diffusion methods for colistin susceptibility testing are still commonly used despite being disapproved by the CLSI and EUCAST^{1, 27, 29, 30}. Two of the commercial gradient tests, E-test and MIC Test Strip, performed poorly for colistin-resistant isolates in one study³⁰. Disc diffusion is not an MIC determiner, although it perform similarly to gradient diffusion tests, generating high levels of VMEs (false-susceptible) whilst agar dilution has a tendency of generating higher MICs (which results in high MEs) than the reference method^{1, 25, 27, 28, 30-32}. These findings further support the conclusion that polymyxins are poorly diffused in agar and therefore corroborates the CLSI and EUCAST recommendations to abandon diffusion and agar dilution methods^{27, 30, 32}.

Manual commercial MIC-determiners: UMIC, MMS, and ComASP Colistin

UMIC (Biocentric, Bandol, France), MICRONAUT MIC-Strip (MMS) (MERLIN Diagnostika GmbH, Bornheim, Germany), ComASP Colistin (formerly SensiTest™, Liofilchem, Italy) are non-automated broth microdilution-based tests³⁰. UMIC and MMS both consist of a plastic device with 12 wells that allow for different colistin concentrations to be tested for a single isolate without the need for any additional equipment^{26, 30, 33}. Whilst the ComASP (SensiTest) Colistin, consists of a compact panel for four isolates with freeze-dried antibiotics in seven two-fold dilutions^{5, 34}. Matuschek *et al* (2018) evaluated all three tests, where ComASP had a poor EA for *Acinetobacter* spp., and UMIC was poor for *Acinetobacter* spp. and *P. aeruginosa*. The overall performance of ComASP was improved (as shown in

Table 1) when certain species were removed and *K. pneumoniae* and *E. coli* were tested, suggesting that ComASP is not suitable for testing all species⁵.

UMIC was generally found to lower the MIC of some colistin-resistant isolates, which may result in failure to detect colistin-resistant isolates with low MICs (≤ 8 mg/L)^{26, 33}. More so, UMIC failed to detect four *Stenotrophomonas maltophilia* isolates with MICs ranging from 8mg/L to 32mg/L in one study, although in another study all *S. maltophilia* isolates were detected accordingly^{26, 33}. The MMS had the best correlation to the BMD amongst the three tests; however, there aren't sufficient studies evaluating this test (Table 1)³⁰.

Automated AST systems: BD Phoenix, MICRONAUT-S, MicroScan, Sensititre and Vitek 2

Automated antimicrobial susceptibility testing (AST) systems are of particular interest for colistin susceptibility testing due to their ease of use than the reference BMD^{26, 30}. Several studies have shown that some automated AST systems can achieve results that are relatively similar to those of the reference BMD^{25, 26, 30, 32, 35}. The Sensititre recorded a high rate of agreement with the reference BMD in several studies, particularly demonstrating the highest potential for detecting *mcr*-1-producing *Enterobacterales* together with MicroScan in one study^{25, 26, 30}. However, MicroScan has a tendency of overestimating MICs (which may result in false-resistant isolates) of *E. cloacae*, *Salmonella spp.* and non-fermenters (*A. baumannii*, *P. aeruginosa* and *S. maltophilia*)^{5, 26}. Vitek 2 had the highest rate of VMEs at 36% for *mcr*-1-producing isolates and failed to detect colistin resistance in eight *mcr*-negative *E. cloacae* complex isolates²⁵. However, another study found that Vitek 2 had VMEs of 2.04% for *K. pneumoniae* isolates that were *mcr*-negative³⁶. MICRONAUT-S (MERLIN Diagnostika GmbH, Bornheim, Germany) performed similarly to the Sensititre although it had two VMEs whereas the Sensititre had none³⁰. The Sensititre test is unique as it can be performed manually or semi-automated unlike MicroScan, MICRONAUT-S, Vitek 2 and BD Phoenix that require an automated inoculation delivery system^{26, 30}.

The detection of colistin resistance by BD Phoenix highly agreed with that of the reference BMD method^{32, 35}. Nevertheless, the BD Phoenix 100 system failed to detect colistin-resistant isolates that may have hetero-resistance; the BD Phoenix M50 had 5.7% MEs, all of which were within twofold dilutions, as compared to the reference BMD^{35, 37, 38}. Notably, the BD Phoenix M50 has not been evaluated on strains that exhibit heteroresistance; hence, its evaluation is limited compared to BD Phoenix 100 (Table 1)³⁵.

Chelator-based and non-chelator-based tests

Rapid Polymyxin NP

The Rapid Polymyxin NP is a colorimetric test that is based on glucose metabolism to detect the growth of *Enterobacterales* at a given concentration of a polymyxin (colistin or polymyxin B)¹¹. Resistance to polymyxins is demonstrated by a colour change (orange to yellow) of a pH indicator, *i.e.* phenol red, as a result of acid formation associated with the metabolism of glucose^{11, 39, 40}. Rapid polymyxin NP test is commercially available (ELITechGroup, Puteaux, France) and can also be performed in-house with the preparation of two solutions^{11, 41}. The in-house rapid polymyxin NP test is prepared with stock solutions of polymyxins and a rapid polymyxin NP solution, which consists of cation-adjusted Mueller-Hinton broth powder, phenol red indicator and D(+)-glucose¹¹. This test has demonstrated an excellent detection of colistin resistance in several studies, including detecting colistin resistance directly from blood cultures with a sensitivity of 100%^{40, 42, 43}. However, in a study using ComASP as the reference, the Rapid Polymyxin NP test had a lower specificity than BD Phoenix, Vitek 2 and E-test with *K. pneumoniae* isolates (Table 1)³⁶. In another study, Rapid Polymyxin NP test recorded a lower sensitivity and specificity (71.1% and 88.6%) than E-test, which had a sensitivity and specificity of 80.4% and 95.8% respectively⁴⁴. However, 10 isolates that were included in the calculations of the E-test performance were excluded from the Rapid Polymyxin NP test as they were considered non-evaluable due to no growth in the growth control⁴⁴.

Although the Rapid Polymyxin is limited to use on *Enterobacterales*, the test is easy to perform and the final results can be read in no more than four hours, with the majority of the results being positive in two hours^{31, 32, 42, 45}.

Andrade Screening Antimicrobial Test (ASAT)

Following the Rapid Polymyxin NP test, another colorimetric assay for detecting colistin resistance in *Enterobacterales* was developed¹³. The Andrade Screening Antimicrobial Test (ASAT) was developed using an in-house broth consisting of 10g peptone, 5g sodium chloride, 3g beef extract and 10mL Andrade indicator made with 0.5g acid fuchsin and 16mL NaOH in 100mL water¹³. The evaluation of the ASAT was performed on 300 *Enterobacterales* in tubes containing 175 µL of Andrade broth and colistin at a concentration of 3.8 mg/L¹³. The test achieved a sensitivity and specificity of 90.7% and 100% respectively, where a positive result in the presence of colistin was shown by a change in colour of the Andrade indicator (light pink to magenta)¹³.

The ASAT test was further evaluated against the BD Phoenix using 1096 *Enterobacterales* clinical isolates¹³. However, this evaluation demonstrated discrepancies between the two methods where 10 *E. coli*, seven *K. pneumoniae* and one *E. cloacae* colistin-resistant isolates were accurately detected by ASAT and not by BD Phoenix¹³. Most of the isolates that were not detected by BD Phoenix had colistin MIC values ranging between 4-8 µg/mL and carried *mcr-1* genes¹³. Although most of the colistin-resistant *K. pneumoniae* isolates had colistin MIC values >16 µg/mL and carried *bla_{KPC}* genes, only three isolates with colistin MIC values ≤16 µg/mL showed discrepancies between the two methods¹³.

Rapid Polymyxin Acinetobacter, Rapid Polymyxin Pseudomonas and Rapid Resapolymyxin NP

ElitechGroup introduced Rapid Polymyxin tests for *Acinetobacter* spp. and *Pseudomonas* spp. in October 2018^{46, 47}. Both tests use the same principle as the Rapid Polymyxin NP test as they rely on the colorimetric detection of bacterial metabolism in the presence of a defined concentration of colistin⁴⁷. A positive result by Rapid Polymyxin *Acinetobacter* was read by a change in colour of a pH indicator, phenol red (red to orange or yellow), whereas the Rapid Polymyxin *Pseudomonas* uses bromocresol purple pH indicator (green-yellow to violet)^{47, 48}. Sadek *et al* (2020) evaluated the in-house version of the Rapid Polymyxin *Pseudomonas* test, which agreed with Lescat *et al* (2019), recording 100% sensitivity and a lower specificity of 95%^{47, 48}. However, the Rapid Polymyxin *Acinetobacter* had discrepancies, recording no errors in one study and eight errors (three VMEs and five MEs) in another^{46, 47}.

The Rapid Resapolymyxin NP test was also developed to detect colistin resistance in all colistin-resistant Gram-negative bacteria including *Enterobacterales*, *A. baumannii* and *P. aeruginosa*⁴⁹. The test was carried out by inoculating 20 µL standardized bacterial suspension (3.5 McFarland) in Mueller-Hinton broth containing a final concentration of 3.75 mg/L of colistin sulfate⁴⁹. A 10% concentration of resazurin PrestoBlue was added after three hours of incubating the medium and the results were read over a period of one hour after the addition of resazurin PrestoBlue⁴⁹. The detection of colistin resistance is based on the reduction of blue resazurin to pink resorufin by metabolically active cells in the presence of a defined concentration of colistin⁴⁹.

The evaluation of Rapid ResaPolymyxin NP test showed reliable detection of colistin resistance in non-fermenters and 100 % accuracy in *Enterobacterales*⁴⁹⁻⁵¹. Although the slow growing nature of *Pseudomonas* spp. resulted in an hour delay before a change in colour

could be observed, *Enterobacterales* and *Acinetobacter* spp. were detected in less than four hours^{38, 50}. The Rapid ResaPolymyxin NP test makes up for the limitations of Rapid Polymyxin NP test in testing polymyxin resistance in Gram-negative bacilli (including non-fermenters) regardless of the mechanism of resistance^{49, 50}. Therefore, this test is more suitable for general categorization of colistin-resistant and colistin-susceptible isolates than the Rapid Polymyxin NP test⁵⁰.

EDTA/DPA-based colistin resistance tests

The MCR catalytic domain, phosphoethanolamine (PEtN) transferase, is a zinc metalloprotein, where zinc deficiency reduces colistin MICs in MCR-producing *E. coli*⁵²⁻⁵⁴. The combined disk test, colistin MIC reduction test, modified rapid polymyxin NP test and alteration zeta potential, are four tests that are based on the inhibition of MCR activity by EDTA and have been strategically developed to detect *mcr*-genes⁵².

The combined disk test (CDT) uses 10μL of 100mM EDTA solution, which is impregnated into one of two 10μg colistin disks⁵². The two colistin disks are placed on Mueller Hinton agar plates swabbed with 0.5 McFarland bacterial suspension and incubated for 18 to 24h at 37°C⁵². Results are read as positive if there is an increase of ≥3mm in inhibition zone around the colistin disk containing EDTA as compared to the colistin disk without EDTA⁵². This method has recorded a sensitivity and specificity of 96.7% and 89.6% respectively by the developer⁵². However, a latter study recorded less promising results, with a sensitivity and specificity of 12% and 65.2% respectively, Hence, further evaluation studies must be conducted on this test as the current results seem unreliable⁵⁴.

A pre-diffusion method of the CDT was evaluated, where two colistin disks were placed and allowed to diffuse for 2 hours on MH agar⁵³. The disks were removed and the plates were left at room temperature for 18-24h after which two disks containing 1μmol of EDTA were strategically placed (one exactly where the colistin disk had been placed and the other, at least 30 mm away)⁵³. Diameters of inhibition zones were measured after 18h of incubation and colistin-resistant MCR-positive isolates demonstrated a ≥5mm increase in inhibition zone around the disks⁵³. The pre-diffusion method, using a cut-off value of ≥5mm, improved the CDT to 100% accuracy for *mcr* detection⁵³; it has however not been extensively evaluated to ensure reproducibility and seems more complicated, laborious and time-consuming than the CDT.

Colistin MIC reduction (CMR) test was performed by broth microdilution using MH broth without cation supplementation but with 80µg/mL EDTA solution instead⁵². It was considered that cation supplementation with calcium and magnesium would impair the inhibitory activity of EDTA; moreover, calcium could favour the activity of putative PETN transferases in *E. coli*⁵². Even so, this method did not efficiently detect *mcr*-producers among *Enterobacterales* isolates although different concentrations of EDTA were used^{52, 55}.

Innovatively, EDTA has been added to the Rapid Polymyxin NP test in what is termed the modified rapid polymyxin NP (MPNP) test to enable it to identify MCR producers. MPNP is the Rapid Polymyxin NP test with the addition of two wells filled with colistin-free solution and colistin-containing solution, both with 80µg/mL EDTA⁵². Results were read as positive for the production of MCR-1 PETN transferase if there was no change in colour of red phenol in the presence of colistin and EDTA⁵². The presence of EDTA in the MPNP test successfully detected MCR-1 positive colistin-resistant *E. coli* isolates as demonstrated by a sensitivity and specificity of 96.7% and 100% respectively⁵².

Finally, addition of EDTA results in an alteration of zeta potential of membrane charge, which is measured to determine MCR expression⁵². Particle size and zeta potential of colistin-susceptible and colistin-resistant bacterial cells grown in MH broth with or without 80µg/ml EDTA was measured using a ZETAPALS zeta potential analyser⁵². Colistin-susceptible and colistin-resistant MCR-1 *Enterobacterales* demonstrated zeta potential values between -21.54 and -44.21 mV whilst colistin-resistant MCR-1 positive had ≤-20 mV (-4.20 to -19.34 mV)⁵². In the presence of EDTA, an alteration of zeta potential ranging from -21.13 to -40.81 was observed in colistin-resistant MCR-1 positive *E. coli* isolates⁵². A zeta potential ratio ($R_{zp} = ZP_{+EDTA} / ZP_{-EDTA}$) was calculated for all isolates and a cutoff value of $R_{zp} \geq 2.5$ as a criterion for the presumed detection of MCR-1-positive *E. coli* isolates was established⁵². Alteration of zeta potential yielded a sensitivity and specificity of 95.1% and 100% respectively. However, EDTA had no inhibitory effect on *mcr*-1-positive *K. pneumoniae* isolates⁵².

Colistin broth-disk elution (CBDE)

Simner *et al* (2019) developed the colistin broth-disk elution method (CBDE), which was performed on a collection of *Enterobacterales*, *P. aeruginosa* and *A. baumannii* isolates: four tubes were assigned to each isolate⁵⁶. The four tubes contained 10mL of CA-MHB with colistin disks to yield final concentrations of 0,1,2 and 4 µg/mL, respectively⁵⁶. The tubes

were incubated for 30 minutes at room temperature, allowing colistin to dissolve into the broth, after which 50µL aliquot of 0.5 McFarland standard bacterial suspensions were added to each tube⁵⁶. Colistin MIC values were visually read after 16-20h of incubation at 35°C in ambient air⁵⁶. In this study, CBDE was compared to the reference BMD and Sensititre, where the CBDE had a CA and EA of 98% and 99%, respectively as compared to both BMD methods⁵⁶. Three *mcr-1*-producing *E. coli* isolates resulted in a VME rate of 8% due to one dilution difference by CBDE and BMD; however, no errors were observed when CBDE was compared to BMAD⁵⁶.

Three studies have evaluated the modified version of the CBDE⁵⁷⁻⁵⁹. Bell *et al* (2019) was the first to describe a modified CBDE method. The method was performed as previously described, however 1mM EDTA was used by adding 20µL of 0.5M EDTA to each tube containing CA-MHB and 10µg colistin disks^{58,59}. Fenwick *et al* (2020) added a fifth tube to generate CBDE+EDTA with colistin concentrations of 0, 0.4, 1, 2 and 4 µg/mL, respectively. The CBDE+EDTA method has shown overall sensitivity and specificity of 100% and 94.3-95.8% respectively, for screening the presence of MCR in *Enterobacterales* and *P. aeruginosa*^{58, 59}.

Dalmolin *et al* (2019) evaluated the CBDE method using final volumes of 1mL and 200µL in colistin broth microelution (CBM) and the microelution test (MPT), respectively. The two methods were evaluated on 68 *Enterobacterales*, nine *A. baumannii* and eight *P. aeruginosa* isolates from human and animal samples⁵⁷. Both CBDE methods were performed as previously described, however the CBDE mixture was fractioned in 1mL tubes for the CMB test and 200µL in microtiter plates for MPT test⁵⁷. Additionally, this study evaluated the colistin susceptibility test tube (CSTT), which was performed using one tube with 5mL CA-MHB and 10 µg colistin disk to yield a final concentration of 2 µg/mL⁵⁷. All three methods presented unsatisfactory MEs and VMEs; particularly, they performed poorly for non-fermenters⁵⁷.

Colistin broth-disk elution methods are performed using reagents that are readily available at low cost^{56, 59}. However, CBDE with EDTA could be more suitable for screening *mcr*-positive isolates as CBDE alone tends to underestimate MICs of *mcr*-positive isolates^{56, 58, 59}.

Colistin-MAC test

The colistin-MAC test was designed to detect mcr-genes on the basis of colistin MIC reduction by a fixed concentration (900µg/mL) of dipicolinic acid (DPA)⁶⁰. The test was

carried out in 96-well microtitre plates using CA-MHB with DPA stock solution prepared in dimethyl sulfoxide⁶⁰. Coppi et al (2018) established a cutoff value of ≥ 8 -fold colistin MIC reduction in the presence of DPA for the presumptive identification of mcr-positive isolates. However, a latter study used a different cutoff value, where ≥ 3 twofold MIC reduction in the presence of DPA indicated a positive result⁵⁵. The Colistin MAC test was found to perform well for *E. coli* isolates and ineffective in detecting mcr-genes of *K. pneumoniae* and *Salmonella spp.*^{5, 55, 60}. The lack of inhibitory effect of DPA in *K. pneumoniae* isolates can be attributed to a decrease in DPA permeability or the existence of other mechanisms of colistin resistance in these strains⁶⁰. Moreover, the addition of DPA resulted in reductions and increments in MICs of some isolates, although these adjustments did not affect the accurate sensitivity classification of the isolates⁵. Colispot

Colispot is a test developed by Jouy *et al* (2017), it consists of applying a single drop of 8 mg/L colistin solution on MH agar to detect colistin resistance. The test was initially carried out by applying 10 μ L drop of colistin (twofold concentrations ranging from 0.25 to 256 mg/L) on MH agar inoculated with 10⁵ *E. coli* suspensions⁶¹. Each drop was strategically placed so that their centres were at least 2 cm away from each other to allow for an inhibition zone of >5 mm⁶¹. The colispot test was evaluated on 106 *E. coli* isolated from veterinary faecal samples and 35 mcr-1 positive *E. coli* isolates from bovine samples⁶¹. Susceptible isolates had a clear inhibition zone around colistin drops with concentrations ranging from 0.25 to 4mg/L although the size of inhibition zone was dependent on the colistin concentration tested⁶¹. A clear inhibition zone of 8 to 10 mm was observed with all the susceptible isolates when a single concentration of colistin solution with CLSI/EUCAST bacterial inoculum size and incubation temperature were used⁶¹. This test can be routinely used when performing diffusion methods as it can improve the detection of acquired resistance in *E. coli*⁶¹.

Lateral Flow-Immunoassay

Monoclonal antibodies (MA) were used to develop lateral flow assays to detect MCR-1-producing bacterial isolates⁶². In this study, 177 and 121 *Enterobacterales* isolates from human and animal samples were obtained, respectively⁶². Bacterial colonies were isolated from agar plates, suspended in extraction buffer and dispensed on the MA-containing cassette where they were allowed to migrate for 15 minutes⁶². All MCR-1-producing isolates were

detected accordingly as shown by a pink band on the test line and control line of the assays. Furthermore, this test was able to detect MCR-2-producing isolates⁶². The same assay is currently marketed as the NG-Test MCR-1 by NG Biotech in France⁵⁸. Initially, the evaluation of the NG-Test MCR-1 resulted in eight false-positive results that were ultimately resolved to negatives apart from one isolate that was found to be an MCR-2 producer⁵⁸. Whilst the detection of the MCR-2 product by the NG Test MCR-1 further confirms the results of the developers, cross-reactivity with MCR-2 limits the accuracy of the assay for the MCR-1 producers.⁵⁸ Nonetheless, the lateral flow immunoassays were found to be highly sensitive, easy to use and cost-effective for detecting MCR-1/-2^{58, 62}.

Agar-based screening medium

Superpolymyxin

Superpolymyxin is a selective medium for polymyxin-resistant Gram-negative bacteria that is based on eosin methylene blue agar⁶³. The medium was developed with the optimal colistin concentration of 3.5 µg/mL, 10 µg/mL of daptomycin (to inhibit potential growth of Gram-positive strains) and 5 µg/mL of amphotericin B as an antifungal. Nordmann *et al* (2016) designed Superpolymyxin for screening intrinsic and acquired polymyxin-resistant Gram-negative bacteria as previous screening media containing deoxycholic acids and a high concentration of colistin inhibited the growth of strains with acquired resistance and low MIC values (Table 1).

The use of eosin Y and methylene blue dyes helped distinguish lactose-fermenters (dark brown to purple) from non-fermenters (colourless)¹¹. This medium distinguishes lactose-fermenting *E. coli* (metallic green sheen) from other *Enterobacterales*, including non-fermenting *E. coli* (dark brown to purple)^{64, 65}. However, studies evaluating other selective media against Superpolymyxin have shown a weaker detection of non-fermenters by Superpolymyxin^{63, 66}.

This medium was able to detect colistin-resistant Gram-negative bacteria directly from bacterial culture and clinical samples (*i.e.*, rectal swabs and stool samples) with high sensitivity and specificity^{44, 67, 68}. However, direct inoculation from clinical swabs may result in the growth of colistin-susceptible isolates on the medium, therefore resulting in a poor specificity (as low as 80.45%)^{44, 68}. The poor specificity of Superpolymyxin for clinical samples was suspected to be due to sample storage conditions and bacterial inoculum effect ($\geq 10^6$ CFU/mL)^{44, 67}.

Two studies have recorded a low sensitivity ($\leq 77.3\%$) for *Enterobacter* spp., which may be due to hetero-resistant phenotypes (*i.e.*, may have a small population of bacterial cells with colistin resistance)^{67, 69}. In both studies, the Superpolymyxin plate was inoculated with 10 μ L of a 0.5 McFarland bacterial suspension. Therefore, a higher inoculum for *Enterobacter* spp. was suggested^{67, 69}.

CHROMagar™ COL-APSE.

CHROMagar™ COL-APSE by CHROMagar (Paris, France) is the first selective medium designed to detect and differentiate all *Acinetobacter* spp., *Enterobacterales*, *Pseudomonas* spp. and *Stenotrophomonas* spp.⁶³. The agar plates were prepared in-house using a dehydrated CHROMagar base medium and supplements (S1 and X192) containing colistin sulfate and oxazolidinones to enhance the growth of colistin-resistant Gram-negative bacteria and inhibit that of Gram-positive bacteria⁶³. Swarming by *Proteus* spp. was inhibited by adding p-nitrophenyl glycerol to the medium preparation, which did not disrupt the medium's performance. This makes CHROMagar™ COL-APSE suitable for screening mixed specimens⁶³.

The accuracy in detecting and differentiating colistin-resistant Gram-negative species was evaluated by Osei Sekyere *et al.* (2020), where the morphological appearance of the detected strains was as described by the manufacturer. Moreover, three studies that have evaluated CHROMagar™ COL-APSE agreed that the medium had a high sensitivity in detecting isolates harbouring *mcr* genes^{5, 63, 70}. However, there was significant difference in the sensitivity and specificity recorded by Abdul Momin *et al* (2017) and Osei Sekyere *et al* (2020) (Table 1). The poor performance in the recent study could be due to the use of cultured bacteria instead of using serial dilutions in broth (Table 1)^{5, 63}.

ChromID® Colistin R

ChromID® Colistin R is a chromogenic selective medium that is primarily used for isolating colistin-resistant *Enterobacterales* from clinical stools and rectal swab samples⁷¹. Similar to CHROMagar™ COL-APSE, the medium can differentiate between bacterial species based on morphological appearance of bacterial colonies *i.e.*, *E. coli* (pink to burgundy), *Klebsiella* spp., *Enterobacter* spp., *Serratia* (blue to green), *Salmonella* spp. (white or colourless) and *Proteeae* tribe (beige-brown) (Table 1)^{64, 71}.

The assessment of ChromID® Colistin R and Superpolymyxin using stool and rectal swab samples resulted in an overall better performance by ChromID® Colistin R⁶⁴. The lower limit

of detection (LOD) of this medium being at least one log lower in 69.2% of the isolates detected on both media, whereas Superpolymyxin only had a better LOD for 7.7% isolates⁶⁴. Nonetheless, Superpolymyxin could be directly inoculated with stool or rectal swab samples without a 4-5 hours enrichment step required by ChromID® Colistin R; and the final sensitivity (84.9 to 86.8%) recorded for this medium was achieved after extending the TAT from 24 hours to 48 hours (which also allowed for the detection of an *mcr-1* producing *E. coli* isolate)⁶⁴.

A study by Thiry *et al.* (2019) evaluated this medium against CHROMagar™ COL-APSE on 158 colistin-resistant bovine *E. coli* isolates. Half (48/96) of the isolates considered to be intermediate to the disk diffusion test had MIC > 2 and were able to grow on both media, with two more isolates growing on ChromID® Colistin R alone⁷⁰. Although both media could support the growth of (21/22) *mcr-1*-positive and (13/14) *mcr-2*-positive isolates, CHROMagar™ COL-APSE has an advantage over ChromID® Colistin R as it is not limited to (isolating and differentiating) *Enterobacterales* (Table 1)^{63, 70}

LBJMR medium

Lucie-Bardet-Jean-Marc-Rolain (LBJMR) medium, a polyvalent medium based on Purple agar, has been designed for the isolation of colistin-resistant Gram-negative bacteria as well as vancomycin-resistant Gram-positive bacteria⁶⁶. The medium was developed by adding glucose (7.5 g/L), colistin sulfate (4 µg/mL) and vancomycin (50 µg/mL) to 31g/L Purple agar base⁶⁶. One hundred and forty three bacterial isolates, including colistin-resistant *Enterobacterales* and non-fermentative Gram-negative bacilli were used to evaluate this medium, where the specificity and sensitivity were 100%⁶⁶. The medium was further evaluated on 56 *mcr-1* positive and 10 *mcr-1*-negative chicken and human stool samples as well as two clinical rectal swabs⁶⁶. The study found that the LBJMR could detect *mcr-1* positive isolates with high sensitivity, particularly showing a higher sensitivity for colistin-resistant non-fermenters than Superpolymyxin⁶⁶. Furthermore, the LBJMR medium does not contain daptomycin and amphotericin B, which are used in some of the agar-based media *i.e.* Superpolymyxin, to inhibit the growth of Gram-positive bacteria, including vancomycin-resistant *Enterococcus*⁶⁶

Luria-Bertani (LB) medium

A selective medium for detecting colistin-resistant *Enterobacterales* (including those with *mcr-1* genes) in spiked stools was evaluated⁷². The medium was developed by adding

4mg/mL colistin, 10mg/mL vancomycin, and 5mg/mL amphotericin B to agar medium made with 25g of Luria-Bertani (LB) powder⁷². Nine *Enterobacterales* isolates were collected, seven of which carried *mcr-1* genes⁷². Each of the nine isolates were spiked into donated faecal samples and serially diluted to final concentrations of 10² or 10³ CFU/mL; 0.5 mL of the stool mixture were spiked in 4.5 mL of *Enterobacterales* enrichment (EE) broth and incubated for 24h at approximately 35°C⁷². Afterwards, 10 µL of the spiked EE broth was inoculated onto the LB medium and incubated at 35°C±2°C for 48 hours in ambient air⁷². The selective LB medium demonstrated a sensitivity of 100% (Table 1)⁷².

3. Molecular tests

Amplidiag Carba-R+ MCR assay

The Amplidiag Carba-R+ MCR assay is a multiplex nucleic acid-based test developed for detecting carbapenemase and *mcr-1/-2* genes from rectal swabs and bacterial culture⁷³. The assay was performed retrospectively and prospectively on 215 Gram-negative bacilli and 51 *Enterobacterales* isolates, respectively⁷³. The Amplidiag Carba-R+MCR assay did not detect one GES carbapenemase-producing *P. aeruginosa*. However, all *mcr-1* and *mcr-2*-producing isolates were accurately detected (Table 1)⁷³.

Additionally, this assay was performed on DNA extracted from 100 rectal swabs, including 40 carbapenemase-positive samples: the sensitivity was 92.5%⁷³. Two NDM and one OXA-48 producers were not detected due to a low concentration of bacteria; therefore, the samples were subjected to an overnight enrichment in brain heart infusion with 0.5 µg/mL ertapenem⁷³. The enrichment step allowed for the detection of two of the three samples that were not previously detected. One of the samples was an OXA-48 producing *E. cloacae* with an AcOXA (*Acinetobacter* oxacillinases with carbapenemase activity) gene⁷³. The overall performance of this assay was acceptable, demonstrating sensitivity and specificity ranging from 92-100% and 86-100% respectively⁷³. Moreover, the assay can be performed on cultured bacteria as well as DNA extracted from rectal swabs in no more than three hours (Table 1)⁷³.

AusDiagnostic MT CRE EU assay

AusDiagnostics MT CRE EU assay is a two-step nested multiplex-tandem PCR (MT-PCR) assay by AusDiagnostics (Chesham, UK)⁷⁴. One study evaluated the AusDiagnostics MT CRE EU assay for detecting carbapenemase, *mcr-1*, and *mcr-2* genes⁷⁴. A collection of *Enterobacterales*, *Pseudomonas spp.* and *Acinetobacter spp.*, including carbapenemase or

mcr-1/-2 producers, were used to evaluate the performance of this assay⁷⁴. The assay was performed by suspending two to three bacterial colonies grown overnight on Columbia blood or cystine lactose electrolyte agar in tubes with a sample buffer⁷⁴. The tubes were loaded onto the AusDiagnostics MT processor platform for template extraction and the first round of PCR⁷⁴. Lastly, the nested RT-PCR was performed by loading a 384-PCR plate containing the reaction mix onto the AusDiagnostic MT analyser⁷⁴. The results were automatically read using the AusDiagnostics MT assay software. The assay failed to detect four out of the 22 *mcr* genes; however, the *mcr* genes were also not detected by the reference PCR⁷⁴.

Retrospective and prospective evaluation of the assay resulted in eight and 18 false-positive results, respectively⁷⁴. An overall sensitivity and specificity of 95.5% and 99.8%, respectively, were obtained, which improved to 100% following repeats of the assay⁷⁴. The AusDagnostic MT CRE EU assay detected *mcr-1/-2* genes as well as carbapenemase genes with minimal hands-on time (Table 1)⁷⁴.

Loop-mediated isothermal amplification (LAMP)

Loop-mediated isothermal amplification (LAMP) is a nucleic acid amplification method that allows autocycling strand displacement DNA synthesis at constant temperature using Bst DNA polymerase⁷⁵. The use of LAMP for detecting *mcr-1* gene was first described by two studies^{76, 77}. Zou *et al* (2017) established a LAMP assay for to detect *mcr-1* gene from cultured bacteria and spiked human stools. In this study, the LAMP assay was performed in 25 µL reaction mixtures that contained 20mM Tris-HCl, 10mM KCl, 10mM (NH₄)₂ SO₄, 8mM MgSO₄, 0.8 M betaine, 0.1% Tween-20, 1.4 mM of each dNTP and 8U Bst DNA polymerase⁷⁷. Each reaction mixture had specified amounts of forward and backward inner primers, outer forward and backward primers, loop primers as well as the appropriate amount of DNA template⁷⁷. The mixture was covered with 25µL wax and incubated in a dry bath incubator for 60 minutes at constant temperature, the amplification products were read visually and by turbidimetry⁷⁷. Visual detection was by colour change of a fluorescent metal indicator, a positive reaction was demonstrated by the formation of a magnesium pyrophosphate precipitate, which changed the reaction mixture from orange to green during amplification⁷⁷.

Imirzalioglu *et al* (2017) evaluated the eazyplex SuperBug *mcr-1* kit (Amplex Biosystems GmbH, Giessen, Germany) for the rapid detection of *mcr-1* gene. Colistin-resistant isolates were grown on LB media containing colistin sulfate to prevent the loss of *mcr-1* encoding

plasmid, whilst colistin-susceptible isolates were grown in the absence of colistin⁷⁶. The *mcr*-1-detecting LAMP assays were found to detect *mcr*-1 genes accurately, and the in-house LAMP assay was stated to be more sensitive than conventional PCR assays (Table 1)^{76, 77}.

However, *mcr*-1 detecting LAMP assays cannot detect other potential target genes⁷⁵⁻⁷⁷. Therefore, Zhong *et al* (2019) developed a restriction endonuclease-based multi-LAMP for the detection of multiple *mcr*-genes. Two separate LAMP systems were established, a double-LAMP (*mcr*-2 and *mcr*-5) and triple-LAMP system (*mcr*-1, *mcr*-3 and *mcr*-4) which were performed in 25 µL reaction mixtures⁷⁵. The 25 µL reaction mixture consisted of 12.5 µL LAMP-reaction mix, 1 µL Bst 2.0 polymerase, 1.25 µL primer mix, 8.25 µL nuclease-free water, and 2 µL DNA lysate⁷⁵. Amplification products were detected visually by change in colour of SYBR Green I, which changed from yellow to orange for a positive reaction⁷⁵. Amplification products were also stained with GoldView TM and analysed by electrophoresis on 2% agarose gel⁷⁷. Multiplex detection of *mcr*-1 to *mcr*-5 genes was established through restriction digestion of the LAMP products based on band numbers and fragment lengths using Hind restriction enzyme⁷⁵.

LAMP assays have advantages over conventional PCR in that LAMP is more sensitive, has a shorter processing time of <60 minutes, is relatively easier to run, and multiplex detections can be conducted in the same detection system (Table 1)⁷⁵⁻⁷⁷.

Matrix-assisted laser desorption ionization-time of flight mass spectrometer (MALDI-TOF MS)

MALDI-TOF MS is a technique that is based on the production of mass spectra from whole cells and their contrast to a reference spectrum⁷⁸. This method is widely used for species identification of pathogens in clinical microbiology laboratories. Giordano and Barnini were the first to evaluate the possibility of detecting colistin resistance using MADI-TOF MS⁷⁸. In this study, 139 *K. pneumoniae* isolates from clinical samples were collected, from which protein was extracted for identification using MALDI-TOF MS (Bruker Daltonik GmbH, Bremen, Germany)⁷⁸. The MICs of the isolates were determined by Sensititre using a range of antibiotics including colistin⁷⁸. First, a training set for mass peak analysis was established using 50/139 of the *K. pneumoniae* isolates from which 400 spectra were obtained and used for database entry (Main Spectrum Profile) as well as to classify algorithm models⁷⁸. Finally, the remaining 89/139 isolates were used to conduct the test; 712 spectra were collected from this set⁷⁸. However, from the 712 spectra, 158 were excluded as they constituted flat-line

spectra or outliers, demonstrating identification score below 2.3⁷⁸. Based on the mass signals and intensities of the bacterial protein samples, two-dimensional peak distribution classified the training set spectra into two main groups viz., colR-KPn (colistin-resistant *K. pneumoniae*) and colS-KPn (colistin-susceptible *K. pneumoniae*) isolates⁷⁸.

The newly created database entry consisted of using *MALDI Biotyper RTC* and *MALDI Biotyper* v3.0 to identify *K. pneumoniae* isolates and for the automatic detection of colistin resistance, respectively⁷⁸. The automatic classification of the test set resulted in the correct classification of 71% colR-KPn and 40% colS-KPn⁷⁸. Furthermore, different algorithm models were tested using ClinProTools v3.0 (Bruker Daltonics). The three algorithms tested included the Genetic Algorithm (GA), Supervised Neural Network (SNN) and Quick Classifier (QC)⁷⁸. However, the tested algorithms either had good recognition capability and cross validation but poor classification of colistin resistance or poor recognition capability and acceptable classification of colistin resistance⁷⁸. The GA seemed more promising as it was better suited for biological samples⁷⁸. Therefore, a reliable classification model was created by combining the most relevant peaks detected from the GA algorithm⁷⁸. The resulting peak combination of 4507.28/5142.84 Da from GA demonstrated a sensitivity and specificity of 78% and 89%, respectively⁷⁸.

Three studies have evaluated MALDIxin, a MALDI-TOF-based assay,^{7, 22, 79}. The MALDIxin test was developed to detect pETN modification in lipid A directly from bacterial colonies in less than 15 min^{22, 79}. Dortet *et al* (2018) evaluated MALDIxin on *A. baumannii* isolates, where the mass spectrum in colistin-susceptible isolates was characterised by two sets of peaks at the centre of m/z 1728.1 and m/z 1910.3. The peaks were assigned to bis-phosphorylated hexa-acyl and bis-phosphorylated hepta-acyl lipid A that had 12 to 14 carbons making up the acyl chain, respectively⁷⁹. The mass spectrum in colistin-resistant isolates was observed by two sets of peaks at the centre of m/z 1935.3 and m/z 2033.3, showing $m/z+25$ and $m/z+123$ shifts of mass unit of the bis-phosphorylated hepta-acyl lipid A at m/z 1910.3⁷⁹. The peaks observed at m/z 2033.3 and m/z 1935.3 were assigned to pETN-modified-bis-phosphorylated hepta-acyl and pETN-modified-mono-phosphorylated hepta-acyl lipid A, respectively with an acyl chain of 12 carbons in length⁷⁹. The peaks (m/z 2033.3 and m/z 1935.3) associated with pETN-modified lipid A were observed in all colistin-resistant isolates and were not observed in any of the colistin-susceptible isolates⁷⁹.

Furniss *et al* (2019) and Dortet *et al* (2020) described the optimization of the MALDIxin test for detecting colistin resistance in clinical *E. coli* and *K. pneumoniae* isolates, respectively.

Furniss *et al* (2019) optimized the MALDIxin test by adopting the low-resolution linear mode used by the MALDI Biotyper Sirius system. The optimization was achieved by adding a mild-acid hydrolysis step, which is required for analysis of clinical isolates in negative ion mode⁷. The mild-acid hydrolysis step was performed by resuspending a single bacterial colony grown on MH agar for 18-24h in 200µL distilled water^{7,22}, after which 50-100 µL of 2% acetic acid was added to double-distilled water containing bacterial suspension and heated for 5-15 min at 98-100°C^{7, 22}. For MALDI-TOF analysis, Furniss *et al* (2019) used a MALDI Biotyper Sirius system, whereas Dortet *et al* (2020) used a 4800 Proteomic Analyzer. The optimization of the MALDIxin allowed for the identification of L-Ara4N- and pETN-modified lipid A in *E. coli* and *K. pneumoniae* isolates. Moreover, the optimized methods were able to distinguish between chromosome-encoded and MCR-mediated colistin resistance^{7, 22}.

Microarray

A commercial CT103XL microarray system that allows for the simultaneous detection of *mcr*-1/-2 and β-lactamase genes was evaluated⁸⁰. The study was conducted on 106 *Enterobacteriales* isolates including *mcr*-1 and *mcr*-2 positive strains, as well as carbapenemase and extended-spectrum β-lactamase (ESBL)-producing strains⁸⁰. The CT103XL microarray, which uses a multiplex ligation detection reaction, was performed following bacterial DNA extraction from bacterial cultures⁸⁰. The commercial CT103XL microarray was confirmed to simultaneously detect *mcr*-1/-2 and β-lactamase genes with accuracy, although it failed to detect *mcr*-3, which shares 45% and 47% identity to *mcr*-1 and *mcr*-2, respectively⁸⁰.

Multiple Cross Displacement Amplification coupled with Gold Nanoparticles-Based lateral Flow Biosensor.

A multiple cross displacement amplification (MCDA) method, coupled with gold nanoparticles-based lateral flow biosensor (LFB) assay for detecting *mcr*-1 gene was developed⁸¹. The MCDA reaction was performed on extracted DNA from 59 bacterial isolates, where each 25 µL reaction consisted of 12.5 µL reaction buffer, 1µL Bst DNA polymerase 2.0, 1µL colorimetric indicator, 1.6 µM of each cross primers, 0.4 µM of each displacement primers, 0.4 µM amplification primers and 1 µL DNA template⁸¹. The MCDA reaction systems were then subjected to isothermal temperature (63°C) for 40min, after which the amplification products were analysed using 2% agarose gel electrophoresis, colorimetric indicator and LFB⁸¹. For *mcr*-1 detection by LFB, 0.2 µL of the amplicons was added to the

well of the sample pad, followed by the addition of three drops of running buffer (1% Tween 20 and 0.01 mol/L phosphate-buffered saline)⁸¹. The results were visually read after 1-2 min; a positive result was demonstrated by two red bands, one at the test-line and the other at the control line⁸¹. The results were positive for all *mcr-1* positive isolates and negative for all non-*mcr-1* isolates⁸¹.

The MCDA-LFB assay was further applied to stool samples spiked with 100 µL dilutions of bacterial strains⁸¹. The resulting detection limit was 600fg of *mcr-1* plasmid DNA per microliter in bacterial culture and 4.5×10^3 CFU/mL in the spiked faecal samples⁸¹. The MCDA-LFB has demonstrated the same sensitivity as the *mcr-1* LAMP, which is more sensitive than the conventional PCR. Further, the MCDA-LFB has demonstrated a shorter reaction time^{77, 81}.

Recombinase polymerase amplification (RPA)

The rapid detection of *mcr-1*, using a RPA, has been described⁸². RPA is a novel isothermal amplification method, which can be performed in no more than 30 minutes at body temperature without the need for thermal cycling instruments⁸². This study used basic RPA (B-RPA) and RPA with lateral flow (LF-RPA) on 23 genomic DNA extracted from 20 *mcr-1* positive and three *mcr-1*-negative *Enterobacteriales*⁸². The primers for the B-RPA assay were designed by Clone Manager 8 and validated on three *mcr-1* positive and one *mcr-1* negative DNA samples⁸². The B-RPA was based on the TwistAmp Basic kit reaction system, which was incubated at room temperature for 30 min, after which the amplicons were extracted by phenol/chloroform solution or purified using an amplicon purification kit⁸². The LF-RPA reaction required primers and a probe, which were labelled with biotin and fluorescence⁸². The LF-RPA was based on TwistAmp Nfo kit reaction system, which was incubated as described for the B-RPA⁸². The amplification products for the LF-RPA were diluted at 1:50 with running buffer, after which a downstream operation was carried out⁸².

The results for the B-RPA assay were read by agarose gel electrophoresis, whereas the results for the LF-RPA assay were visually read using Hybridetect 2T dipsticks⁸². A positive *mcr-1* detection by LF-RPA was demonstrated by two purple bands at the test line and the quality control line⁸². Both assays detected the *mcr-1* positive and *mcr-1* negative DNA samples accordingly; therefore, both assays are equally suitable for detecting *mcr-1* genes⁸².

Conventional & real-time PCR and Whole genome sequencing

The presence or absence of *mcr*-genes is determinable by PCR assays and whole-genome sequencing (WGS) as standard ⁷⁶. Whilst WGS is able to characterize the mechanism of resistance and determine the molecular evolutionary trajectory of colistin-resistant isolates, PCR is only able to characterize resistance genes ^{83, 84}. However, WGS technology is limited in settings that lack adequate resources and therefore PCR assays are widely adopted for detecting *mcr*-genes ^{75, 85}.

Nijhuis *et al* (2016) were the first to design a real-time PCR assay for detecting *mcr*-1 from clinical isolates using self-designed primers and probes. The assay was validated on 26 *mcr*-1 positive *E. coli* isolates, where the presence of *mcr*-1 was detected in all 26 isolates ⁸⁶. Additionally, the assay was evaluated on spiked stool samples and the efficiency of the PCR was 102.6% and the LOD was 3-30 cfu/reaction ⁸⁶. However, *mcr*-1 genes were not detected in other colistin-resistant strains *i.e.*, *Klebsiella*, *Enterobacter*, *Pseudomonas*, *Acinetobacter* *etc.*

A multiplex PCR (M-PCR) assay for the simultaneous detection of *mcr*-1 and carbapenem-resistant genes, *bla*_{KPC}, *bla*_{NDM}, *bla*_{IMP}, *bla*_{OXA-48-like}, was described ⁸⁷. The assay was validated on reference strains including *E. coli* A434-59, which contains *mcr*-1 and *bla*_{NDM-1} ⁸⁷. Evaluation of the M-PCR on 127 carbapenem-resistant, eight *mcr*-1-positive and 62 carbapenem-susceptible *Enterobacterales* found the assay to be 100% sensitive and specific ⁸⁷.

Additionally, three studies designed M-PCR assays to detect *mcr*-1 to *mcr*-5 genes ^{4, 85, 88}. The assay designed by Rebelo *et al* (2018) allowed for the simultaneous detection of *mcr* genes and their variants in bovine and porcine isolates ⁸⁵. This study did not use internal amplification controls as they were incompatible with DreamTaq Green PCR Master Mix ⁸⁵. The master mix contains DNA polymerase synthesized in *E. coli* and thus would produce amplicons if 16S rRNA primers are used ⁸⁵.

However, Lescat *et al* (2018) designed a more rapid (<2 hours) M-PCR assay that was compatible with internal controls. Recently, Joussett *et al* (2019) designed and evaluated an M-PCR assay on 50 *E. coli*, 41 *K. pneumoniae* and 12 *Salmonella enterica* isolates (from which a total of 40 were MCR-producers), which was 100% accurate in detecting *mcr*-positive isolates. The assay was additionally performed on 82 *Aeromonas* spp. and 10 *Shewanella* spp. that were previously described as potential originators of *mcr*-3 and *mcr*-4, respectively ⁴. None of the *Aeromonas* spp. were *mcr*-positive, although two *Shewanella* spp.,

S. bicestrii JAB-1 strain and *S. woody* S539 with MICs of 0.25mg/L and <0.12 mg/L respectively, were *mcr-4* positive ⁴. However, cloning *S. bicestrii* JAB-1 genes into *E. coli* TOP10 resulted in an *mcr-4* positive outcome by the PCR assay with a colistin MIC of 4 mg/L ⁴.

Borowiak *et al* (2020) described the detection of *mcr-1* to *mcr-9* in colistin resistant *Salmonella enterica* isolates using an M-PCR (*mcr-1* to *mcr-5*) designed by Rebello *et al* (2018) and a newly designed M-PCR assay (*mcr-6* to *mcr-9*). The assay was performed on 407 colistin-resistant *S. enterica* isolates from animals, animal feed, food and the environment ⁸⁹. Two hundred and fifty-four of the isolates had *mcr* genes. Moreover, the assay detected *mcr-9* in isolates carrying *mcr-1* ⁸⁹. However, two separate frameshift mutations of *mcr-9* were shown to have occurred in the respective isolates as demonstrated by WGS analysis; the mutations are believed to have contributed to non-functional MCR-9 proteins ⁸⁹.

Two studies have described methods for broth enrichment of colistin-resistant *E. coli* followed by real-time PCR to detect *mcr*-genes ^{90, 91}. Chalmers *et al* (2018) were the first to describe a SYBR Green-based real-time PCR method for *mcr-1* and *mcr-2* following enrichment with *E. coli* (EC) broth containing colistin (1µg/mL). All the porcine faecal and chicken caecal samples were screened by real-time PCR after 16h of culture in EC broth ⁹¹. However, none of the *mcr-1* and *mcr-2* genes were detected by PCR in any of the samples after 16h of enrichment ⁹¹. As well, the method described by Chandler *et al* (2020) for detecting *mcr-1* included enrichment using EC broth containing colistin (1µg/mL) and vancomycin (8µg/mL). The method was evaluated on 100 feral swine faecal samples, which were inoculated with one of five different *mcr-1* positive *E. coli* strains ⁹⁰. The bacteria was inoculated at concentrations ranging between 0.1-9.99 CFU/g, 10-49.99 CFU/g, 50-99 CFU/g, 100-149 CFU/g and 200-2,200 CFU/g from which *mcr-1* was detected with 32%, 72%, 88%, 95%, and 98% accuracy by real-time PCR, respectively ⁹⁰.

Four SYBR Green-based real-time PCR assays have been developed for *mcr-1*, *mcr-2*, *mcr-3*, *mcr-4*, and *mcr-5* detection ⁹²⁻⁹⁵. Bontron *et al* (2016) designed a SYBR Green-based real-time PCR assay for detection of *mcr-1* from cultured bacteria and stools. The assay was validated on 20 *Enterobacterales*, where it was found to accurately detect the presence or absence of *mcr-1* at a LOD of 10² cultured bacteria ⁹³. Furthermore, Dona *et al* (2017) described a SYBR Green real-time PCR assay to also detect *mcr-1* from human faecal samples. However, in this study, 20µg of the stool samples were enriched overnight in 10mL LB broth containing 2µg/mL colistin and plated on four selective agar plates prior to DNA

extraction⁹⁵. The real-time PCR accurately identified *mcr-1* harbouring *E. coli* isolates with an LOD of 10¹ and PCR efficiency of ca. 106%⁹⁵.

Li *et al* (2017) also designed a multiplex SYBR Green-based real-time PCR assay for *mcr-1*, *mcr-2* and *mcr-3* detection. The assay was validated on 25 isolates including *mcr-1* positive and *mcr-3* positive strains; the *mcr-2* gene was synthesized in the study due to a lack of *mcr-2*-positive isolates⁹⁴. Although the *mcr* genes were detected with 100% accuracy with a LOD of 10², *mcr-2* was not validated on cultured bacteria⁹⁴. However, in this study all three *mcr* genes could not be simultaneously detected in one reaction unlike when the Taqman probe was used⁹⁴. A more recent study evaluated the SYBR Green-based real-time PCR method proposed by Li *et al* (2017) in detecting and quantifying *mcr-1* to *mcr-3* as well as newly designed assays for *mcr-4* and *mcr-5*⁹². The optimized *mcr-1* to *mcr-5* PCR assays were validated on bacterial isolates⁹². The study found that SYBR Green real-time PCR, followed by melting curve analysis, was more efficient in detecting and quantifying *mcr-1* to *mcr-5* genes in both bacterial isolates⁹². The described assays detected all five *mcr* genes with a lower limit of 10². Moreover, the assays enabled screening of five individual samples in a single reaction⁹².

The parallel detection of *mcr-1*, *mcr-2* and *mcr-8* by real-time PCR using Taqman® probes has been described⁹⁶⁻⁹⁸. Chabou *et al* (2016) designed two quantitative real-time PCR assays with TaqMan® probes for the rapid detection of *mcr-1* gene. Primers and probes were designed to develop the two PCR assays, designated PE1 and PE2⁹⁶. The assays were evaluated on 100 bacterial isolates (18 of which were colistin resistant) and 833 broiler faecal samples⁹⁶. The sensitivity and specificity of both assays were 100%, with a calibration curve that was linear from 10¹ to 10⁸. However, the PE1 assay was recommended for initial screening of *mcr-1* followed by PE2 assay for confirming the results⁹⁶.

Daniels *et al* (2017) developed a multiplexed real-time PCR with TaqMan® probes to detect *mcr-1* and *mcr-2*. The assay was validated on 25 bacterial isolates, some of which were *mcr*-positive⁹⁸. The sensitivity and specificity of the assay was 100%, being able to detect *mcr-1* and *mcr-2* from dilutions containing 8.5 × 10³ and 7.7 × 10³ cfu/mL respectively⁹⁸. A specific real-time PCR assay using TaqMan probes to identify *mcr-8* was designed for the first time by Nabti *et al* (2020). The specificity and sensitivity of the assay were evaluated on 290 bacterial isolates from clinical samples and 250 metagenomic DNA from human stools⁹⁷. The PCR assay accurately detected *mcr-8* from the one positive *K. pneumoniae* isolate with an overall efficiency of 92.64% and a limit of detection of 55 CFU/mL⁹⁷.

4. Conclusion

The rapid dissemination of colistin resistance, mediated by chromosomal mutations and *mcr*-genes, poses a threat to public and veterinary health as colistin is one of the last-line antibiotics. It is important to establish a simple, rapid, and cost-effective diagnostic method that will not discriminate against the mechanism of colistin resistance as well as take into consideration hetero-resistant isolates. Among the available diagnostic assays, the Rapid Resapolymyxin NP test is a promising initial screening method as it can be performed in-house, therefore making it relatively cheap; it is easy to perform and it is not limited to glucose-fermenting colistin-resistant Gram-negative bacteria. Other colorimetric screening methods such as ASAT, Rapid Polymyxin NP, Rapid Polymyxin *Acinetobacter*, and Rapid Polymyxin *Pseudomonas* are species-specific and cannot be used for general screening in high-capacity clinical laboratories.

Likewise, agar-based methods are cheap and can be used as initial screening tools in poorer settings, although most of the agar-based assays fail to detect isolates with hetero-resistance. They also have a longer TAT of 24 hours. Should there be a need to use agar-based assays, CHROMagar COL-APSE was designed to detect and differentiate all colistin-resistant isolates, although it might be relatively expensive than Superpolymyxin and the LBJMR medium, which can be performed in-house. However, the LBJMR medium was found to detect hetero-resistance better than Superpolymyxin. ChromID® Colistin R and Luria-Bertani (LB) media can only be used to screen for *Enterobacterales*.

MIC determiners could also be used for initial screening in highly resourced laboratories, although they relatively require a higher skill than the agar-based tests and the biochemical colorimetric tests. The non-automated MIC strips *i.e.*, UMIC, MMS, and ComASP are cheaper than automated MIC determiners *i.e.*, Microscan, Sensititre, and BD Phoenix. However, automated MIC determiners could be available in most well-resourced clinical laboratories as they are generally used for AST. Non-automated MIC strips are cheaper, require less skill, and recommendable for less-resourced laboratories.

A second screening can be performed to mainly detect *mcr*-production using chelator-based phenotypic assays, which are more suitable although most are subjected to >16h incubation. Moreover, the Lateral Flow assay that detects MCR-1/-2 production could be used for rapid detection. Molecular methods could be considered for the detection of *mcr*-genes in well-resourced clinical microbiology laboratories. Particularly, the LAMP assays could be used as

they were found to be more sensitive than PCR methods. More so, LAMP requires less equipment and has a shorter TAT than PCR and WGS methods.

Funding: none

Acknowledgements: none. We hereby regretfully report the death of our colleague Professor Nontombi Mbelle, who died during the submission of this article. This work is dedicated to her memory.

Transparency declaration: Authors have no conflict of interest to declare.

5. References

1. Vasoo, S. Susceptibility Testing for the Polymyxins: Two Steps Back, Three Steps Forward? *Journal of clinical microbiology* **55**, 2573--2582 (2017).
2. Teo, J.W., Octavia, S., Cheng, J.W. & Lin, R.T., Vol. 90 67--69 (2018).
3. Li, B. *et al.* An enzyme-free homogenous electrochemical assay for sensitive detection of the plasmid-mediated colistin resistance gene *mcr-1*. *Analytical and bioanalytical chemistry* **410**, 4885--4893 (2018).
4. Jousset, A.B. *et al.* Development and validation of a multiplex polymerase chain reaction assay for detection of the five families of plasmid-encoded colistin resistance. *Int J Antimicrob Agents* **53**, 302-309 (2019).
5. Osei Sekyere, J., Sephofane, A.K. & Mbelle, N.M. Comparative Evaluation of CHROMagar COL-APSE, MicroScan Walkaway, ComASPColistin, and Colistin MAC Test in Detecting Colistin-resistant Gram-Negative Bacteria. *medRxiv*, 2019.2012.2017.19015156 (2020).
6. 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. *The Lancet infectious diseases* **16**, 161-168 (2016).
7. Dortet, L. *et al.* Optimization of the MALDIx test for the rapid identification of colistin resistance in *Klebsiella pneumoniae* using MALDI-TOF MS. *J Antimicrob Chemother* **75**, 110-116 (2020).
8. Bialvaei, A.Z. & Samadi Kafil, H. Colistin, mechanisms and prevalence of resistance. *Current Medical Research and Opinion* **31**, 707-721 (2015).
9. Sun, J., Zhang, H., Liu, Y.-H. & Feng, Y. Towards Understanding MCR-like Colistin Resistance. *Trends in Microbiology* **26**, 794-808 (2018).
10. Poirel, L., Jayol, A. & Nordmann, P. Polymyxins: Antibacterial Activity, Susceptibility Testing, and Resistance Mechanisms Encoded by Plasmids or Chromosomes. *Clinical microbiology reviews* **30**, 557-596 (2017).
11. Nordmann, P., Jayol, A. & Poirel, L. Rapid Detection of Polymyxin Resistance in Enterobacteriaceae. *Emerging infectious diseases* **22**, 1038--1043 (2016).
12. Osei Sekyere, J. *mcr* colistin resistance gene: a systematic review of current diagnostics and detection methods. *Microbiologyopen* **8**, e00682 (2019).
13. Rodriguez, C.H. *et al.* In-house rapid colorimetric method for detection of colistin resistance in Enterobacterales: A significant impact on resistance rates. *Journal of chemotherapy (Florence, Italy)* **31**, 432--435 (2019).
14. Xavier, B.B. *et al.* Identification of a novel plasmid-mediated colistin-resistance gene, *mcr-2*, in *Escherichia coli*, Belgium, June 2016. *Euro surveillance : bulletin Europeen sur les maladies transmissibles = European communicable disease bulletin* **21** (2016).
15. AbuOun, M. *et al.* *mcr-1* and *mcr-2* variant genes identified in *Moraxella* species isolated from pigs in Great Britain from 2014 to 2015. *The Journal of antimicrobial chemotherapy* **72**, 2745-2749 (2017).
16. Borowiak, M. *et al.* Identification of a novel transposon-associated phosphoethanolamine transferase gene, *mcr-5*, conferring colistin resistance in d-tartrate fermenting *Salmonella enterica* subsp. *enterica* serovar Paratyphi B. *The Journal of antimicrobial chemotherapy* **72**, 3317-3324 (2017).

- 875 17. Carattoli, A. *et al.* Novel plasmid-mediated colistin resistance mcr-4 gene in *Salmonella* and *Escherichia coli*, Italy
876 2013, Spain and Belgium, 2015 to 2016. *Euro surveillance : bulletin Europeen sur les maladies transmissibles =*
877 *European communicable disease bulletin* **22** (2017).
- 878 18. Carroll, L.M. *et al.* Identification of Novel Mobilized Colistin Resistance Gene mcr-9 in a Multidrug-Resistant,
879 Colistin-Susceptible *Salmonella enterica* Serotype Typhimurium Isolate. *mBio* **10** (2019).
- 880 19. Wang, X. *et al.* Emergence of a novel mobile colistin resistance gene, mcr-8, in NDM-producing *Klebsiella*
881 *pneumoniae*. *Emerging microbes & infections* **7**, 122 (2018).
- 882 20. Wenjuan, Y. *et al.* in *mBio*, Vol. 8 (2017).
- 883 21. Yong-Qiang, Y. *et al.* Novel plasmid-mediated colistin resistance gene mcr-7.1 in *Klebsiella pneumoniae*. *Journal of*
884 *Antimicrobial Chemotherapy (JAC)* **73** (2018).
- 885 22. Furniss, R.C.D. *et al.* Detection of Colistin Resistance in *Escherichia coli* by Use of the MALDI Biotyper Sirius Mass
886 Spectrometry System. *Journal of clinical microbiology* **57** (2019).
- 887 23. Bardet, L. & Rolain, J.-M. Development of New Tools to Detect Colistin-Resistance among Enterobacteriaceae
888 Strains. *Can J Infect Dis Med Microbiol* **2018**, 3095249-3095249 (2018).
- 889 24. Furniss, R.C.D. *et al.* Detection of Colistin Resistance in *Escherichia coli* by Use of the MALDI Biotyper Sirius Mass
890 Spectrometry System. *Journal of Clinical Microbiology* **57**, e01427-01419 (2019).
- 891 25. Chew, K.L., La, M.V., Lin, R.T.P. & Teo, J.W.P. Colistin and Polymyxin B Susceptibility Testing for Carbapenem-
892 Resistant and mcr-Positive Enterobacteriaceae: Comparison of Sensititre, MicroScan, Vitek 2, and Etest with Broth
893 Microdilution. *J Clin Microbiol* **55**, 2609-2616 (2017).
- 894 26. Jayol, A., Nordmann, P., Andre, C., Poirel, L. & Dubois, V. Evaluation of three broth microdilution systems to
895 determine colistin susceptibility of Gram-negative bacilli. *The Journal of antimicrobial chemotherapy* **73**, 1272--
896 1278 (2018).
- 897 27. Simar, S., Sibley, D., Ashcraft, D. & Pankey, G. Colistin and Polymyxin B Minimal Inhibitory Concentrations
898 Determined by Etest Found Unreliable for Gram-Negative Bacilli. *The Ochsner journal* **17**, 239--242 (2017).
- 899 28. Haeili, M., Kafshdouz, M., Pishnian, Z., Feizabadi, M.M. & Martinez-Martinez, L. Comparison of susceptibility
900 testing methods for determining the activity of colistin against Gram-negative bacilli of clinical origin. *Journal of*
901 *medical microbiology* **68**, 60--66 (2019).
- 902 29. Lutgring, J.D. *et al.* Evaluation of the MicroScan Colistin Well and Gradient Diffusion Strips for Colistin
903 Susceptibility Testing in Enterobacteriaceae. *Journal of Clinical Microbiology* **57**, e01866-
904 01818 (2019).
- 905 30. Matuschek, E., Åhman, J., Webster, C. & Kahlmeter, G. Antimicrobial susceptibility testing of colistin—evaluation of
906 seven commercial MIC products against standard broth microdilution for *Escherichia coli*, *Klebsiella pneumoniae*,
907 *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*, and *Acinetobacter* spp. *Clinical Microbiology and Infection* **24**, 865-870 (2018).
- 908 31. Mitton, B., Kingsburgh, C., Kock, M., Mbelle, N. & Strydom, K. Evaluation of an In-House Colistin NP Test for Use in
909 Resource-Limited Settings. *Journal of clinical microbiology* **57**, e00501-00519 (2019).
- 910 32. Jayol, A. *et al.* *Hafnia*, an enterobacterial genus naturally resistant to colistin revealed by three susceptibility
911 testing methods. *The Journal of antimicrobial chemotherapy* **72**, 2507--2511 (2017).
- 912 33. Bardet, L., Okdah, L., Le Page, S., Baron, S.A. & Rolain, J.M. Comparative evaluation of the UMIC Colistine kit to
913 assess MIC of colistin of gram-negative rods. *BMC Microbiol* **19**, 60 (2019).
- 914 34. Carretto, E. *et al.* Clinical Validation of SensiTest Colistin, a Broth Microdilution-Based Method To Evaluate Colistin
915 MICs. *Journal of Clinical Microbiology* **56**, e01523-01517 (2018).
- 916 35. Hong, J.S. *et al.* Evaluation of the BD Phoenix M50 Automated Microbiology System for Antimicrobial
917 Susceptibility Testing with Clinical Isolates in Korea. *Microb Drug Resist* **25**, 1142-1148 (2019).
- 918 36. Malli, E. *et al.* Evaluation of rapid polymyxin NP test to detect colistin-resistant *Klebsiella pneumoniae* isolated in a
919 tertiary Greek hospital. *Journal of microbiological methods* **153**, 35--39 (2018).
- 920 37. Jayol, A., Nordmann, P., Lehours, P., Poirel, L. & Dubois, V. Comparison of methods for detection of plasmid-
921 mediated and chromosomally encoded colistin resistance in Enterobacteriaceae. *Clinical Microbiology and*
922 *Infection* **24**, 175-179 (2018).
- 923 38. Rodriguez, C.H. *et al.* Discrepancies in susceptibility testing to colistin in *Acinetobacter baumannii*: The influence
924 of slow growth and heteroresistance. *International journal of antimicrobial agents* **54**, 587--591 (2019).
- 925

- 926 39. Poirel, L. *et al.* Rapid Polymyxin NP test for the detection of polymyxin resistance mediated by the mcr-1/mcr-2
927 genes. *Diagnostic microbiology and infectious disease* **90**, 7-10 (2018).
- 928 40. Yainoy, S. *et al.* Evaluation of the Rapid Polymyxin NP test for detection of colistin susceptibility in
929 Enterobacteriaceae isolated from Thai patients. *Diagn Microbiol Infect Dis* **92**, 102-106 (2018).
- 930 41. Jayol, A. *et al.* Evaluation of the Rapid Polymyxin NP test and its industrial version for the detection of polymyxin-
931 resistant Enterobacteriaceae. *Diagn Microbiol Infect Dis* **92**, 90-94 (2018).
- 932 42. Jayol, A., Dubois, V., Poirel, L. & Nordmann, P. Rapid Detection of Polymyxin-Resistant Enterobacteriaceae from
933 Blood Cultures. *Journal of clinical microbiology* **54**, 2273-2277 (2016).
- 934 43. Malli, E., Papagiannitsis, C.C., Xitsas, S., Tsilipounidaki, K. & Petinaki, E. Implementation of the Rapid Polymyxin™
935 NP test directly to positive blood cultures bottles. *Diagnostic Microbiology and Infectious Disease* **95**, 114889
936 (2019).
- 937 44. Przybysz, S.M., Correa-Martinez, C., Kock, R., Becker, K. & Schaumburg, F. SuperPolymyxin Medium for the
938 Screening of Colistin-Resistant Gram-Negative Bacteria in Stool Samples. *Frontiers in microbiology* **9**, 2809 (2018).
- 939 45. Dalmolin, T.V. *et al.* Detection of Enterobacterales resistant to polymyxins using Rapid Polymyxins NP test. *Braz J*
940 *Microbiol* **50**, 425-428 (2019).
- 941 46. Malli, E. *et al.* Implementation of the Rapid Polymyxin Acinetobacter Test to Detect Colistin-Resistant
942 Acinetobacter baumannii. *Microbial drug resistance (Larchmont, N.Y.)* (2019).
- 943 47. Lescat, M., Poirel, L., Jayol, A. & Nordmann, P. Performances of the Rapid Polymyxin Acinetobacter and
944 Pseudomonas Tests for Colistin Susceptibility Testing. *Microb Drug Resist* **25**, 520-523 (2019).
- 945 48. Sadek, M., Tinguely, C., Poirel, L. & Nordmann, P. Rapid Polymyxin/Pseudomonas NP test for rapid detection of
946 polymyxin susceptibility/resistance in Pseudomonas aeruginosa. *Eur J Clin Microbiol Infect Dis* **39**, 1657-1662
947 (2020).
- 948 49. Lescat, M., Poirel, L., Tinguely, C. & Nordmann, P. A Resazurin Reduction-Based Assay for Rapid Detection of
949 Polymyxin Resistance in Acinetobacter baumannii and Pseudomonas aeruginosa. *J Clin Microbiol* **57** (2019).
- 950 50. Jia, H. *et al.* Evaluation of resazurin-based assay for rapid detection of polymyxin-resistant gram-negative bacteria.
951 *BMC Microbiol* **20**, 7 (2020).
- 952 51. Germ, J. *et al.* Evaluation of resazurin-based rapid test to detect colistin resistance in Acinetobacter baumannii
953 isolates. *Eur J Clin Microbiol Infect Dis* **38**, 2159-2162 (2019).
- 954 52. Esposito, F. *et al.* Detection of Colistin-Resistant MCR-1-Positive Escherichia coli by Use of Assays Based on
955 Inhibition by EDTA and Zeta Potential. *J Clin Microbiol* **55**, 3454-3465 (2017).
- 956 53. Yauri Condor, K., Gonzales Escalante, E., Di Conza, J. & Gutkind, G. Detection of plasmid-mediated colistin
957 resistance by colistin pre-diffusion and inhibition with EDTA test (CPD-E) in Enterobactereaceae. *Journal of*
958 *Microbiological Methods* **167** (2019).
- 959 54. Clément, M. *et al.* The EDTA-based disk-combination tests are unreliable for the detection of MCR-mediated
960 colistin-resistance in Enterobacteriaceae. *Journal of Microbiological Methods* **153**, 31-34 (2018).
- 961 55. Budel, T. *et al.* Evaluation of EDTA- and DPA-Based Microdilution Phenotypic Tests for the Detection of MCR-
962 Mediated Colistin Resistance in Enterobacteriaceae. *Microb Drug Resist* **25**, 494-500 (2019).
- 963 56. Simner, P.J. *et al.* Two-Site Evaluation of the Colistin Broth Disk Elution Test To Determine Colistin & In
964 Vitro Activity against Gram-Negative Bacilli. *Journal of Clinical Microbiology* **57**, e01163-01118 (2019).
- 965 57. Dalmolin, T.V. *et al.* Elution methods to evaluate colistin susceptibility of Gram-negative rods. *Diagnostic*
966 *Microbiology and Infectious Disease* **96**, 114910 (2020).
- 967 58. Fenwick, A.J. *et al.* Evaluation of the NG-Test MCR-1 Lateral Flow Assay and EDTA-Colistin Broth Disk Elution
968 Methods To Detect Plasmid-Mediated Colistin Resistance Among Gram-Negative Bacterial Isolates. *Journal of*
969 *Clinical Microbiology*, JCM.01823-01819 (2020).
- 970 59. Bell, D.T. *et al.* A Novel Phenotypic Method To Screen for Plasmid-Mediated Colistin Resistance among
971 & Enterobacterales. *Journal of Clinical Microbiology* **57**, e00040-00019 (2019).
- 972 60. Coppi, M. *et al.* A simple phenotypic method for screening of MCR-1-mediated colistin resistance. *Clinical*
973 *microbiology and infection : the official publication of the European Society of Clinical Microbiology and Infectious*
974 *Diseases* **24**, 1-201 (2018).
- 975 61. Jouy, E. *et al.* Improvement in routine detection of colistin resistance in E. coli isolated in veterinary diagnostic
976 laboratories. *Journal of microbiological methods* **132**, 125-127 (2017).

977 62. Volland, H. *et al.* Development and Multicentric Validation of a Lateral Flow Immunoassay for Rapid Detection of
978 MCR-1-Producing Enterobacteriaceae. *Journal of clinical microbiology* **57** (2019).

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

981 64. Girlich, D., Naas, T. & Dortet, L. Comparison of the Superpolymyxin and ChromID Colistin R Screening Media for
982 the Detection of Colistin-Resistant Enterobacteriaceae from Spiked Rectal Swabs. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother*
983 **63** (2019).

984 65. Nordmann, P., Jayol, A. & Poirel, L. A Universal Culture Medium for Screening Polymyxin-Resistant Gram-Negative
985 Isolates. *Journal of clinical microbiology* **54**, 1395--1399 (2016).

986 66. Bardet, L., Page, S.L., Leangapichart, T. & Rolain, J.-M. LBJMR medium: a new polyvalent culture medium for
987 isolating and selecting vancomycin and colistin-resistant bacteria. *BMC microbiology* **17**, 220 (2017).

988 67. Jayol, A., Poirel, L., Andre, C., Dubois, V. & Nordmann, P. Detection of colistin-resistant Gram-negative rods by
989 using the SuperPolymyxin medium. *Diagn Microbiol Infect Dis* **92**, 95-101 (2018).

990 68. van Hout, D. *et al.* The added value of the selective SuperPolymyxin™ medium in detecting rectal carriage of
991 Gram-negative bacteria with acquired colistin resistance in intensive care unit patients receiving selective
992 digestive decontamination. *Eur J Clin Microbiol Infect Dis* **39**, 265-271 (2020).

993 69. Germ, J. & Seme, K.a. Evaluation of a novel epidemiological screening approach for detection of colistin resistant
994 human Enterobacteriaceae isolates using a selective SuperPolymyxin medium. *Journal of microbiological methods*
995 **160**, 117--123 (2019).

996 70. Thiry, D. *et al.* Assessment of two selective agar media to isolate colistin-resistant bovine *Escherichia coli*:
997 Correlation with minimal inhibitory concentration and presence of *mcr* genes. *Journal of Microbiological Methods*
998 **159**, 174--178 (2019).

999 71. García-Fernández, S. *et al.* Performance of CHROMID® Colistin R agar, a new chromogenic medium for screening
1000 of colistin-resistant Enterobacterales. *Diagnostic Microbiology and Infectious Disease* **93**, 1-4 (2019).

1001 72. Turbett, S.E. *et al.* Evaluation of a Screening Method for the Detection of Colistin-Resistant Enterobacteriaceae in
1002 Stool. *Open forum infectious diseases* **6**, ofz211 (2019).

1003 73. Girlich, D. *et al.* Evaluation of the Amplidiag CarbaR+MCR Kit for Accurate Detection of Carbapenemase-Producing
1004 and Colistin-Resistant Bacteria. *Journal of Clinical Microbiology* **57**, e01800-01818 (2019).

1005 74. Meunier, D., Woodford, N. & Hopkins, K.L. Evaluation of the AusDiagnostics MT CRE EU assay for the detection of
1006 carbapenemase genes and transferable colistin resistance determinants *mcr*-1/-2 in MDR Gram-negative bacteria.
1007 *The Journal of antimicrobial chemotherapy* **73**, 3355--3358 (2018).

1008 75. Zhong, L.-L., Zhou, Q., Tan, C.-Y. & Roberts, A.P.a. Multiplex loop-mediated isothermal amplification (multi-LAMP)
1009 assay for rapid detection of *mcr*-1 to *mcr*-5 in colistin-resistant bacteria. *Infect Drug Resist* **12**, 1877--1887 (2019).

1010 76. Imirzalioglu, C. *et al.*, Vol. 61 (2017).

1011 77. Zou, D. *et al.* Sensitive and Rapid Detection of the Plasmid-Encoded Colistin-Resistance Gene *mcr*-1 in
1012 Enterobacteriaceae Isolates by Loop-Mediated Isothermal Amplification. *Frontiers in microbiology* **8**, 2356 (2017).

1013 78. Giordano, C. & Barnini, S. Rapid detection of colistin-resistant *Klebsiella pneumoniae* using MALDI-TOF MS peak-
1014 based assay. *J Microbiol Methods* **155**, 27-33 (2018).

1015 79. Dortet, L. *et al.* Rapid detection of colistin resistance in *Acinetobacter baumannii* using MALDI-TOF-based
1016 lipidomics on intact bacteria. *Scientific reports* **8**, 16910 (2018).

1017 80. Bernasconi, O.J. *et al.*, Vol. 55 3138--3141 (2017).

1018 81. Gong, L. *et al.* Multiple Cross Displacement Amplification Coupled With Gold Nanoparticles-Based Lateral Flow
1019 Biosensor for Detection of the Mobilized Colistin Resistance Gene *mcr*-1. *Frontiers in cellular and infection*
1020 *microbiology* **9**, 226 (2019).

1021 82. Xu, J., Wang, X., Yang, L., Kan, B. & Lu, X. Rapid detection of *mcr*-1 by recombinase polymerase amplification.
1022 *Journal of medical microbiology* **67**, 1682--1688 (2018).

1023 83. Peter, S. *et al.* Whole-genome sequencing enabling the detection of a colistin-resistant hypermutating *Citrobacter*
1024 *werkmanii* strain harbouring a novel metallo-beta-lactamase VIM-48. *International journal of antimicrobial agents*
1025 **51**, 867--874 (2018).

1026 84. Hua, X. *et al.* Colistin Resistance in *Acinetobacter baumannii* MDR-ZJ06 Revealed by a Multiomics Approach.
1027 *Frontiers in cellular and infection microbiology* **7**, 45 (2017).

85. Rebelo, A.R. *et al.* Multiplex PCR for detection of plasmid-mediated colistin resistance determinants, mcr-1, mcr-2, mcr-3, mcr-4 and mcr-5 for surveillance purposes. *Euro surveillance : bulletin Europeen sur les maladies transmissibles = European communicable disease bulletin* **23** (2018).
86. Nijhuis, R. *et al.* Detection of the plasmid-mediated colistin-resistance gene mcr-1 in clinical isolates and stool specimens obtained from hospitalized patients using a newly developed real-time PCR assay. *Journal of Antimicrobial Chemotherapy* **71**, 2344-2346 (2016).
87. Hatrongjit, R., Kerdin, A., Akeda, Y. & Hamada, S. Detection of plasmid-mediated colistin-resistant and carbapenem-resistant genes by multiplex PCR. *MethodsX* **5**, 532--536 (2018).
88. Lescat, M., Poirel, L. & Nordmann, P. Rapid multiplex polymerase chain reaction for detection of mcr-1 to mcr-5 genes. *Diagnostic Microbiology and Infectious Disease* **92**, 267-269 (2018).
89. Borowiak, M. *et al.* Development of a Novel mcr-6 to mcr-9 Multiplex PCR and Assessment of mcr-1 to mcr-9 Occurrence in Colistin-Resistant Salmonella enterica Isolates From Environment, Feed, Animals and Food (2011–2018) in Germany. *Frontiers in Microbiology* **11** (2020).
90. Chandler, J.C. *et al.* Validation of a screening method for the detection of colistin-resistant E. coli containing mcr-1 in feral swine feces. *Journal of microbiological methods* **172**, 105892 (2020).
91. Chalmers, G. *et al.* A method to detect Escherichia coli carrying the colistin-resistance genes mcr-1 and mcr-2 using a single real-time polymerase chain reaction and its application to chicken cecal and porcine fecal samples. *Canadian journal of veterinary research = Revue canadienne de recherche veterinaire* **82**, 312--315 (2018).
92. Tolosi, R. *et al.* Rapid detection and quantification of plasmid-mediated colistin resistance genes (mcr-1 to mcr-5) by real-time PCR in bacterial and environmental samples. *Journal of Applied Microbiology* **n/a** (2020).
93. Bontron, S.v., Poirel, L. & Nordmann, P. Real-time PCR for detection of plasmid-mediated polymyxin resistance (mcr-1) from cultured bacteria and stools. *Journal of Antimicrobial Chemotherapy (JAC)* **71** (2016).
94. Li, J. *et al.* A Multiplex SYBR Green Real-Time PCR Assay for the Detection of Three Colistin Resistance Genes from Cultured Bacteria, Feces, and Environment Samples. *Frontiers in microbiology* **8**, 2078 (2017).
95. Dona, V., Bernasconi, O.J., Kasraian, S., Tinguely, R. & Endimiani, A. A SYBR(®) Green-based real-time PCR method for improved detection of mcr-1-mediated colistin resistance in human stool samples. *J Glob Antimicrob Resist* **9**, 57-60 (2017).
96. Chabou, S., Leangapichart, T. & Okdah, L.a. Real-time quantitative PCR assay with Taqm®(R)) probe for rapid detection of MCR-1 plasmid-mediated colistin resistance. *New microbes and new infections* **13**, 71--74 (2016).
97. Nabti, L.Z. *et al.* Development of real-time PCR assay allowed describing the first clinical Klebsiella pneumoniae isolate harboring plasmid-mediated colistin resistance mcr-8 gene in Algeria. *Journal of global antimicrobial resistance* **20**, 266--271 (2020).
98. Daniels, J.B. *et al.* Development and Validation of a Clinical Laboratory Improvement Amendments-Compliant Multiplex Real-Time PCR Assay for Detection of mcr Genes. *Microb Drug Resist* **25**, 991-996 (2019).

1071

1072

1073

1074

1075

1076

1077

1078

1079

1080

1081

1082 *Figure 1. Literature search strategy and sorting techniques used to obtain articles for inclusion in the systematic*
 1083 *review.*

Table 1. Comparative diagnostic efficiencies of colistin resistance diagnostics

Diagnostic	Species (n)	Sensitivity (%)	Specificity (%)	Relative cost	Relative skill required	Turnaround time (hr)	CA (%)	EA (%)	ME (%)	VME (%)	LOD (CFU/ml or reaction)	Reference
Broth Macrodilution (BMAD)	GNB (109)	100	100	Cheap	Low	16-20	100	100	0	0	NS	Haeili <i>et al.</i> , 2019
Diffusion and Agar dilution methods												
Disc diffusion (Rosco, Taastrup, Denmark)	GNB (109)	76.19	96.59	Cheapest	Low	16-24	92.6	NA	3.4	23.8	NS	Haeili <i>et al.</i> , 2019

Disc diffusion (BBL Sensi-Disc, Becton Dickinson, Sparks, MD)	GNB (109)	76.19	100	Cheapest	Low	16-24	95.4	NA	0	23.8	NS	Haeili <i>et al.</i> , 2019
Diagnostic	Species (n)	Sensitivity (%)	Specificity (%)	Relative cost	Relative skill required	Turnaround time (hr)	CA (%)	EA (%)	ME (%)	VME (%)	LOD (CFU/ml or reaction)	References
Disc diffusion	<i>Hafnia</i> (25)	0	100	Cheapest	Low	16-24	0	NA	0	100	NS	Jayol <i>et al.</i> , 2017
Agar dilution	GNB (109)	100	60.23	Cheap	Low	16-20	67.9	23.8	39.77	0	NS	Haeili <i>et al.</i> , 2019
Selective agar-based media												
Superpoly myxin™	<i>Enterobacterales</i> (94,700,239 1,1430,385)	86.8,87.5,95.2,100,88.9	97.5,99.5,95.3,0,81.6	Cheap	Low	24-48	NA	NA	NA	NA	NS	Girlich <i>et al.</i> , 2019; Germ <i>et al.</i> , 2019; Jayol <i>et al.</i> ,

													2018;Przybyś <i>et al.</i> , 2018; van Hout <i>et al.</i> , 2020
CHROMagar™ COL-APSE	<i>E. coli</i> (158) <i>GNB</i> (89)	96,82.05	97,66.67	Cheap	Low	18-20	NA	NA	NA	NA	NS	Thiry <i>et al.</i> , 2019; Osei Sekyere <i>et al.</i> , 2020	
Diagnostic	Species (n)	Sensitivity (%)	Specificity (%)	Relative cost	Relative skill required	Turnaround time (hr)	CA (%)	EA (%)	ME (%)	VME (%)	LOD (CFU/ml or reaction)	References	
CHROMID® Colistin_R	<i>E. coli</i> 158 <i>Enterobacterales</i> (94)	99, 86.8	97,100	Cheap	Low	18-24	NA	NA	NA	NA	NS	Thiry <i>et al.</i> , 2019; Girlich <i>et al.</i> , 2019;	
LB Medium	<i>Enterobacterales</i> (9)	100	100	Cheap	Low	48	NA	NA	NA	NA	10 ² -10 ³	Turbett <i>et al.</i> , 2019	
Chelator and non-chelator-based assays													

Rapid Polymyxin NP (Commercial)	<i>Enterobacterales</i> (132)	100	96.7	Expensive	Low	2-3	NS	NA	3.48	0	NS	Malli <i>et al.</i> , 2019;
Diagnostic	Species (n)	Sensitivity (%)	Specificity (%)	Relative cost	Relative skill required	Turnaround time (hr)	CA (%)	EA (%)	ME (%)	VME (%)	LOD (CFU/ml or reaction)	References
In-house Rapid polymyxin NP	<i>K. pneumoniae</i> (131) <i>Hafnia</i> spp. (25) <i>Enterobacterales</i> (200,339)	99,100,98, 98.21,98.1, 71.1,100	82,100,98, 100,98.2,8 8.6,95.9	Cheapest	Low	2-4	NS	NA	18.18,0,2, 0,0,1.8,7.4, 0	1.02,0,2,1. 79,1.9,10.2 ,3.85	10 ⁸	Malli <i>et al.</i> , 2018; Jayol <i>et al.</i> , 2017; Dalmolin <i>et al.</i> , 2019; Jayol <i>et al.</i> , 2016; Mitton <i>et al.</i> , 2019; Przybysz <i>et</i>

												al., 2018;Yaino y et al., 2018
ASAT	<i>Enterobacterales</i> (300)	90.7	100	Cheapest	Low	3	NS	NA	0	10.17	NS	Rodriguez et al., 2019a
Rapid <i>Acinetobacter</i>	<i>A. baumannii</i> (21)	100,93.3	100,86.8	Expensive	Low	3-4	100	NA	0,	0,	NS	Lescat et al., 2019; Malli et al., 2019b
Diagnostic	Species (n)	Sensitivity (%)	Specificity (%)	Relative cost	Relative skill required	Tumaround time (hr)	CA (%)	EA (%)	ME (%)	VME (%)	LOD (CFU/ml or reaction)	References
Rapid <i>Pseudomonas</i>	<i>P. aeruginosa</i> (17)	100,100	100,95	Expensive	Low	3-4	100	NA	0,5	0	NS	Lescat et al., 2019; Sadek et al., 2020
Rapid	<i>A.</i>	93.3,100,1	93.3,100,	Cheap	Low	3-4	95.1,100,	NA	3.7,0,4	1.2,0,0,0,	NS	Germ et al.,

Resapolymer NP	<i>baumannii</i> (82, 43,165) <i>Enterobacterales</i> (20,32) <i>P. aeruginosa</i> (49) Gram-negative bacilli (253)	00,100,100	97,100,99,100				cal,99.2, cal		34,0,1.01,0	0,16		2019; Lescat <i>et al.</i> , 2019b; Jia <i>et al.</i> , 2020; Rodriguez <i>et al.</i> , 2019
EDTA-CDT	<i>Enterobacterales</i> (48,92)	12,100	65.2,100	Cheap	Low	18-24	NS,100	NA	NS,0	NS,0	NA	Clément <i>et al.</i> , 2018; Yauri Condor <i>et al.</i> , 2019
EDTA-CMR/BMD	<i>Enterobacterales</i> (92)	93.2	54.2	Cheap	Low	18-24	NS	NS	6.8	45.81	NS	Budel <i>et al.</i> , 2019
Diagnostic	Species (n)	Sensitivity (%)	Specificity (%)	Relative cost	Relative skill required	Turnaround time (hr)	CA (%)	EA (%)	ME (%)	VME (%)	LOD (CFU/ml or reaction)	References

Colistin MAC test	<i>Enterobacterales</i> (92) GNB (84)	84.1, 100	100	Cheap	Low	18-24	NA	NA	0	15.9,0	NS	Budel <i>et al.</i> , 2019; Osei Sekyere <i>et al.</i> , 2020
CBDE	GNB (172)	100	97.76	Cheap	Low	16-20	98	99	0	8	NS	Simner <i>et al.</i> , 2019
CBDE+ED TA	<i>Enterobacterales</i> (85)	100	95.8, 94.3	Cheap	Low	16-20	NS	NS	4.1, 5.75	0	NS	Bell <i>et al.</i> , 2019; Fenwick <i>et al.</i> , 2020
CBM	<i>Enterobacterales</i> (68) NF (17)	95.35,87.5	84,66.67	Cheap	Low	16-20	91.18,76.4 7	95.59,82.3 5	16,33.33	4.65,12.5	NS	Dalmolin <i>et al.</i> , 2020
MPT	<i>Enterobacterales</i> (68) Non-fermenters (17)	88.37, 75	80,77.78	Cheap	Low	16-20	85.29,76.4 7	98.53,76.4 7	20,22.22	11.63,25	NS	Dalmolin <i>et al.</i> , 2020

Diagnostic	Species (n)	Sensitivity (%)	Specificity (%)	Relative cost	Relative skill required	Turnaround time (hr)	CA (%)	EA (%)	ME (%)	VME (%)	LOD (CFU/ml or reaction)	References
CSTT	<i>Enterobacterales</i> (68) NF (17)	93.02,62.5	88,100	Cheap	Low	16-20	91.18,82.35	NA	12	6.98,37.5	NS	Dalmolin <i>et al.</i> , 2020
Lateral Flow immunoassay (NG-TEST MCR-1)	<i>Enterobacterales</i> (298, 138) <i>A. baumannii</i> (50) <i>P.aeruginosa</i> (50)	100	98,99	Expensive	Low-High	<0.25	NA	NA	0	0.34	2.10 ⁸	Volland <i>et al.</i> , 2019; Fenwick <i>et al.</i> , 2020
Commercial MIC determiners												
UMIC	GNB (235)	100	100	Expensive	High	18-24	100	94	0	0	NS	Bardet <i>et al.</i> , 2019

ComASP Colistin (Sensitest)	GNB (84)	87.18	73.33	Expensive	High	16-24	78.57	78.57	26.67	12.82	NS	Osei Sekyere <i>et al.</i> , 2020
Diagnostic	Species (n)	Sensitivity (%)	Specificity (%)	Relative cost	Relative skill required	Turnaround time (hr)	CA (%)	EA (%)	ME (%)	VME (%)	LOD (CFU/ml or reaction)	References
BD Phoenix M50	GNB (131)	100	94.29	Very expensive	High	16-24	98.5	98.5	5.7	0	NS	Hong <i>et al.</i> , 2019
BD Phoenix 100	<i>Hafnia</i> spp. (25) <i>A. baumannii</i> (165) <i>K. pneumoniae</i> (131)	100,48, 68, 95	100,100,10 0,94	Very Expensive	High	16-24	100,	100,	0,0,0,6.06	0,52,32,5.1	NS	Jayol <i>et al.</i> ,2017; Rodriguez <i>et al.</i> ,2019; Malli <i>et al.</i> , 2018
MicroScan	Enterobact erales	89.29,85.7	93.90,76.1	Very	High	16-24	92.7,80.95	NS	6.1,23.81	10.7,14.29	NS	Lutgring <i>et al.</i> , 2019;

	(110) GNB (84)	1	9	expensive								Osei Sekyere <i>et al.</i> , 2020
Vitek 2	<i>K.pneumoniae</i> (131)	98	88	Very expensive	High	18-24	NS	NS	12.12	2.04	NS	Malli <i>et al.</i> , 2018;
Diagnostic	Species (n)	Sensitivity (%)	Specificity (%)	Relative cost	Relative skill required	Turnaround time (hr)	CA (%)	EA (%)	ME (%)	VME (%)	LOD (CFU/ml or reaction)	References
Molecular assays												
Amplidiag® Carba-R+MCR assay	GNB	92-100	86-100	Expensive	High	<3	NA	NA	NA	NA	NS	Girlich <i>et al.</i> , 2019a
AusDiagnostic MT CRE EU	GNB (393)	95.5-100	99.8	Expensive	High	<4	NA	NA	NA	NA	NS	Meunier <i>et al.</i> , 2018

assay												
LAMP- <i>mcr</i> -1	GNB (22)	100	100	Expensive	High	<1	NA	NA	NA	NA	10 ⁸	Zou <i>et al.</i> , 2017
Multiplex-LAMP	<i>Enterobacterales</i> (58)	100	100	Expensive	Very high	<1	NA	NA	NA	NA	10 ⁴ -10 ⁵	Zhong <i>et al.</i> , 2019
Diagnostic	Species (n)	Sensitivity (%)	Specificity (%)	Relative cost	Relative skill required	Turnaround time (hr)	CA (%)	EA (%)	ME (%)	VME (%)	LOD (CFU/ml or reaction)	References
MALDI-TOF MS	<i>K. pneumonia</i> (139)	78	89	Expensive	Very high	?	NA	NA	NA	NA	NS	Giordano and Barnini, 2018
MALDIxin	<i>A.baumannii</i> (17) <i>E. coli</i> (40) <i>K.pneumoniae</i> (81)	100	100	Expensive	Very high	0.25-0.5	NA	NA	NA	NA	NS	Furniss <i>et al.</i> , 2019; Dortet <i>et al.</i> , 2020; Dortet <i>et al.</i> , 2018

MCDA-LFB	GNB (59)	100	100	Expensive	High	<1	NA	NA	NA	NA	600 fg	Gong <i>et al.</i> , 2019
Diagnostic	Species (n)	Sensitivity (%)	Specificity (%)	Relative cost	Relative skill required	Turnaround time (hr)	CA (%)	EA (%)	ME (%)	VME (%)	LOD (CFU/ml or reaction)	References

Multiplex PCR	<i>E. coli</i> (50) <i>K. pneumoniae</i> (41) <i>S. enterica</i> (12, 407) <i>Aeromonas</i> spp. (82) <i>Shewenella</i> spp. (10)	100	100	Very expensive	High	<2-3	NA	NA	NA	NA	NS	Jousset <i>et al.</i> , 2019; Borowiak <i>et al.</i> , 2020
Real-time PCR	<i>E. coli</i> (1110)	32-98	100	Very expensive	High	<3	NA	NA	NA	NA	0.1-2200 cfu/ml	Chandler <i>et al.</i> , 2020
Real-time PCR (SYBR Green)	<i>E. coli</i> (332, 1062)	100	100	Very expensive	High	<3	NA	NA	NA	NA	54 cfu/ml	Chalmers <i>et al.</i> , 2018; Tolosi <i>et al.</i> , 2020;
Diagnostic	Species (n)	Sensitivity (%)	Specificity (%)	Relative cost	Relative skill required	Turnaround time (hr)	CA (%)	EA (%)	ME (%)	VME (%)	LOD (CFU/ml or reaction)	References

Real-time PCR (Taqman)	GNB (23)	100	100	Very expensive	High	<3	NA	NA	NA	NA	10 ³	Daniels <i>et al.</i> , 2019;
Recombinase polymerase amplification	<i>Enterobacterales</i> (23)	100	100	Expensive	High	<0.5	NA	NA	NA	NA	100fg	Xu <i>et al.</i> , 2018
Whole genome sequence	<i>Citrobacter werkmanii</i> (5)	100	100	Most expensive	Highest	<48	NA	NA	NA	NA	NS	Peter <i>et al.</i> , 2018

*Abbreviations: CA= Categorical agreement EA = Essential agreement ME= Minor error VME =Very major error LOD= Limit of detection