



Published in final edited form as:

Pediatr Emerg Care. 2020 August ; 36(8): 397–401. doi:10.1097/PEC.0000000000002180.

Rapid Diagnostic Tests for Meningitis and Encephalitis - Biofire®

Eduardo Fleischer, BS¹, Paul L. Aronson, MD, MHS^{2,3,§}

¹Yale School of Medicine, New Haven, CT

²Department of Pediatrics, Section of Pediatric Emergency Medicine, Yale School of Medicine, New Haven, CT

³Department of Emergency Medicine, Section of Pediatric Emergency Medicine, Yale School of Medicine, New Haven, CT

Abstract

Meningitis and Encephalitis (ME) are important causes of morbidity and mortality worldwide. Patients suspected of having ME are often hospitalized and started on empiric antimicrobial treatment, due to the potential adverse consequences of delaying the diagnosis or treatment. Multiplexed polymerase chain reaction (PCR) panels are one of several rapid diagnostic technologies that have the potential to overcome some of the limitations of conventional diagnostic methods for ME. The BioFire® FilmArray® Meningitis/Encephalitis Panel was the first FDA-cleared multiplex PCR for the evaluation of cerebrospinal fluid samples, able to identify 14 organisms in a single test reaction. This newer rapid diagnostic tool has an overall high sensitivity and specificity for the diagnosis of ME with a fast turnaround time, and has the potential to improve resource utilization for patients presenting with suspicion of ME. However, further research is needed to determine its optimal use in the evaluation of patients with suspected ME.

Keywords

Meningitis; encephalitis; BioFire®; FilmArray®

Background:

Meningitis and Encephalitis (ME) are important causes of morbidity and mortality worldwide,^{1–4} and tens of thousands of adults and children are diagnosed with meningitis or encephalitis each year in the United States.^{5,6} Although viral central nervous system (CNS) infections are more common in the U.S.,^{5,6} acute bacterial meningitis is the most rapidly fatal.⁷ In other parts of the world, especially in developing countries, bacterial meningitis represents an even larger cause of morbidity and mortality.^{3,8} Therefore, rapid diagnosis and treatment are essential. For diagnosis, cerebrospinal fluid (CSF) culture, Gram stain and other molecular and cellular analyses of the CSF are frequently employed.^{3,7} However, some

[§]Address Correspondence to: Paul L. Aronson, MD, MHS, Section of Pediatric Emergency Medicine, Yale School of Medicine, 100 York Street, Suite 1F, New Haven, CT, 06511. Phone: 203-785-3849, Fax: 203-737-7447, paul.aronson@yale.edu.

Potential Conflicts of Interest: The authors have no conflicts of interest relevant to this article to disclose.

Financial Disclosure: The authors have no financial relationships relevant to this article to disclose.

of these conventional methods can have limitations in sensitivity and specificity, while the culture can take several days to result.⁷ Due to the potential adverse consequences of delaying the diagnosis or treatment, patients suspected of having ME are often hospitalized and started on empiric antimicrobial treatment while awaiting CSF cultures.^{5,6,9-11} Polymerase chain reaction (PCR)-based methods can improve the process of identifying viral or bacterial pathogens in the CSF by increasing the diagnostic yield and providing faster turnaround times.⁷ For example, viral PCR for enterovirus (EV) and herpes simplex virus (HSV) have become standard of care for diagnosis.¹² Rapid diagnostics have significant potential to improve care, optimize antibiotic utilization, decrease hospitalizations and lower costs for patients presenting with suspicion of ME.^{13,14} These make multiplex molecular assays an attractive option to screen and detect potential pathogens. The BioFire® FilmArray® ME Panel is the only multiplexed PCR assay currently cleared by the Food and Drug Administration (FDA), and is capable of detecting 14 organisms in the CSF.¹⁵ To understand the potential benefits and limitations, and to inform the proper implementation in clinical practice, it is essential to review the scientific literature on the FilmArray® Panel.

Current Approach and Diagnostic Challenges:

A wide array of infectious and non-infectious etiologies can cause ME, which contributes to the challenge in diagnosing these conditions.⁵ CSF culture is considered the gold standard for diagnosis of bacterial meningitis and is essential to determine the antimicrobial susceptibilities of the causative organism.³ The sensitivity of CSF culture has been reported to range from 67~88% although the sensitivity varies depending on the organism and is lower in patients pretreated with antimicrobial agents.³ While viruses are the most common cause of ME in the U.S. in both children and adults, patients are often hospitalized and treated with antimicrobial and sometimes antiviral therapy pending identification of the pathogen, which can take up to 72 hours.^{5,6} The short turnaround time of CSF Gram stain can facilitate more rapid identification of the pathogen in cases of bacterial meningitis. It is also inexpensive and well-validated.³ The sensitivity of Gram stain for bacterial meningitis has been estimated to be in the range of 35~90%,^{3,7,16-19} however it also varies widely depending on the causative organism^{3,7} and is lower in patients pretreated with antimicrobial agents.^{3,7} Although CSF cell count, glucose and protein analysis can also be helpful when trying to differentiate between bacterial and viral meningitis, these tests can also be normal or not characteristic of the causative pathogen.³ Latex agglutination test has been used to aid in the more rapid of diagnosis of bacterial meningitis, however its sensitivity also varies depending on the organism and is lower in samples pretreated with antimicrobial agents, and ultimately may provide limited additional value compared with CSF culture.³

BioFire Diagnostics FilmArray Meningitis/Encephalitis (ME) Panel:

Description

Multiplexed PCR technologies allow for the simultaneous detection and identification of microorganisms in a single test reaction. Currently there are multiple FDA-cleared/approved multiplex PCR respiratory, gastrointestinal and blood panels.^{20,21} Although for years there

have been FDA-approved PCR technologies to test for either enteroviruses or herpes simplex virus-1/2, in October, 2015, the FilmArray® Meningitis/Encephalitis Panel (ME) (BioFire Salt Lake City, UT) was the first FDA-cleared multiplex PCR panel for the evaluation of CSF samples.^{20,21} The FilmArray® ME Panel (hereafter referred to as “ME panel”) is a multiplexed PCR able to identify 14 organisms, which include 7 viruses, 6 bacteria, and 1 fungus (Table 1).²² The ME Panel consists of automated nucleic acid extraction, purification, reverse transcription, PCR, DNA melting analysis and automatic results analysis.^{21,22} A minimum of 0.2 mL of CSF volume is needed, the ME panel is capable of analyzing 12 samples at a time, and less than 2 minutes of hands-on technician time are required. Most important for clinicians is that results are obtained in approximately 1 hour.²¹ Notably, the ME panel is intended to be used jointly with additional clinical, epidemiological and laboratory data, including CSF culture.²² Additionally, the panel is not intended for CSF specimens collected from indwelling CNS medical devices^{22,23} or from patients in whom there is concern for a nosocomial infection, as pathogens which often cause these infections are not included in the ME panel.²⁴

Evidence

There have been multiple investigations that have evaluated the ME panel for the detection and identification of pathogens in pediatric and adult patients assessed for meningitis/encephalitis. The largest prospective study to date by Leber et al, evaluated 1,560 CSF samples, and the sensitivity of the ME panel ranged from 85.7% for HHV-6 to 100% for 9 of the 14 organisms. However, there were limited numbers of samples for many of the organisms and two (*L. monocytogenes* and *N. meningitides*) were not detected in the study. The specificity of the ME panel was reported to be 99.2% or greater for all 14 organisms.²⁵

A recent meta-analysis by Tansarli et al. identified 8 studies that provide data required to estimate the performance of the ME panel through the evaluation of discordant results between the ME panel and reference methods. Using the data from the meta-analysis, we calculated the overall performance characteristics of the ME panel from the 8 studies (Table 2). Additionally, we calculated the combined performance characteristics for the ME panel: pooled sensitivity 90.2% (95% CI: 86.2–93.1), specificity 97.7% (95% CI: 94.6–99.0), positive predictive value (PPV) 85.1% (95% CI: 81.6–88.2), negative predictive value (NPV) 98.5% (95% CI: 97.9–98.9), likelihood ratio positive (LR+) 38.8 (95% CI: 16.6–90.8), likelihood ratio negative (LR-) 0.10 (95% CI: 0.07–0.14). Due to the limited number of studies and sample sizes, the authors of the meta-analysis were not able to calculate sensitivities and specificities of the ME panel for individual organisms in the panel.¹²

From the data gathered by Tansarli et al. from these 8 studies, we also calculated that the overall sensitivity for 5 of the 6 bacterial organisms in the ME panel was 96.8% (95% CI: 92.7–99.0). As the 1 positive case of *L. monocytogenes* was not able to be corroborated, we were not able to include this organism in the calculation of overall sensitivity for the bacterial pathogens in the panel.¹²

Young infants <3 months of age are particularly susceptible to ME.^{6,8,26} Although many studies evaluating the ME panel have included infants in the first 3 month of life^{24,25,27–40}, 2 of the investigations specifically focused on this age group.^{38,40} Arora et al. evaluated the

ME panel in 62 infants 3 months of age and reported a sensitivity of 100% and specificity of 93.4%.⁴⁰ Blaschke et al., however, reported mixed results for infants 60 days of age, including two false positive bacterial pathogens detected by the ME panel. Additionally, larger number of infants had viruses detected with the ME panel than with conventional methods, but it was unclear if these detections were true positive or false positive results.³⁸

Potential Benefits and Limitations

There are multiple potential benefits and limitations of the ME panel (Table 3). Potential clinical benefits include the detection of CSF viruses and bacteria with high sensitivity and specificity, as noted previously.¹² Additional clinical benefits reported in the literature include shorter time to pathogen identification,^{33,35,41} detection of organisms in CSF missed by other conventional studies such as Gram stain^{42,43} or culture,^{31,40,44–46} identification of organisms in samples of patients pretreated with antimicrobial agents,^{31,40,42,43,47} and enhanced implementation of chemoprophylaxis for close contacts.⁴⁷

There is also a possible economic impact of using the ME panel. Given the adverse consequences of delayed or misdiagnosed meningitis/encephalitis, patients suspected of ME are often hospitalized for empiric antimicrobial therapy while awaiting the results of CSF culture.^{9–11} Fast turnaround times of the ME panel (approximately 1 hour) have the potential to optimize resource utilization by decreasing unnecessary hospitalizations,^{9,10} number of other diagnostic tests,^{9,10,13} length of stay,^{9–11,13,33,39} and length of empiric antimicrobial therapy.^{9,10,13} Theoretical models in pediatric and adult patients have suggested that the ME panel can lead to cost savings when compared with current practice standards.^{9,10} A study in adult patients found a significant difference between the median costs per treatment course of antimicrobials for patients who received standard of care testing compared with those in which the ME panel was used.⁴⁸ Another study estimated cost savings of approximately \$1,750 per case with the use of the ME panel in patients with suspected CNS infections, due to faster turnaround times compared with conventional methods.¹¹ These potential cost savings must be evaluated while also taking into account the cost of purchase of the ME panel, the testing itself, and the service of the equipment.^{11,48} The elevated cost of performing each test has been considered a limitation for the implementation of the ME panel in low-income countries.²⁸

The duration of antimicrobial therapy with the implementation of the ME panel has also been evaluated. A study in a pediatric population found a shorter duration of antimicrobial therapy after the implementation of the ME panel (2 vs. 3 days).³³ Additionally, in a study focused on partially-treated bacterial meningitis in adult and pediatric patients, the total duration of antimicrobial treatment was shorter with implementation of the ME panel (9.5 days vs. 15.2 days).⁴⁷ A shorter time to narrowing antimicrobials and a decrease in the number of acyclovir doses has also been reported with use of the ME panel,³⁹ as has an increase in use of narrow-spectrum regimens.⁴⁷ Other studies, however, have provided conflicting results, including a study of adult patients that reported no difference in the duration of antimicrobial therapy with the use of the ME panel.⁴⁹ As a possible mechanism for these findings, some investigations found that significant proportion of patients with negative ME panel results were still continued on antimicrobial therapy.^{32,49} The potential

impact of the implementation of the ME panel on hospital length of stay has also been analyzed. While some studies have reported a shorter duration of hospitalization with use of the ME panel,^{11,33,39} others have found no difference.^{47,49}

There are important limitations of the ME panel. Some investigators have raised concerns for false positives^{12,15,25,50} and false negatives^{12,15,25,51,52} with use of the ME panel. Case reports have described how false positive and/or false negative ME panel results led to delayed diagnosis of the causative pathogen.^{50,51} Studies have also suggested that the ME panel should not replace the cryptococcal antigen test^{12,15,44,51} and culture^{12,51} for patients with suspicion of *C. neoformans/C. gattii* ME. Specifically, some potential false negative results of *C. neoformans/C. gattii* on ME panel have occurred in patients with low burden of disease^{51,53} and/or in patients on antifungal treatment.^{12,22,25,51} Additionally, studies have suggested the possibility that positive antigen results after initiation of therapy may indicate persistence of antigen and not actual detection of live organisms.^{22,25,54} False negative results for viruses may be due to specimens containing low viral loads⁴¹ and to the lower ability of the ME panel to detect viruses when compared to some singleplex assays.^{15,35,55,56} With regards to false positive results, there are concerns for the potential of contamination during collection and processing of CSF samples.^{12,25}

It is also important to highlight that all herpesviruses in the ME panel (HSV-1, HSV-2, CMV, VZV, HHV-6) can establish latent infections. Therefore, a positive result in the ME panel may be due to a primary infection, or alternatively to a latent infection present in the cells retrieved in the specimen (either the CSF or from peripheral blood in a traumatic tap) or reactivation of the virus (with or without true disease).^{15,25,57} This accentuates the importance of evaluating the full clinical scenario when interpreting ME panel results.^{12,25,58,59} In addition, HHV-6 can be integrated into human chromosomes and transmitted vertically giving a positive ME panel result.^{41,58}

Promising Additional Rapid Diagnostic Technologies:

Multiplexed PCR panels, like the BioFire® FilmArray® ME Panel, are one of several rapid diagnostic approaches that have the potential to overcome some of the existing limitations in the diagnosis of CNS infections. Some of these diagnostics employ different PCR-based techniques to improve the diagnostic yield such as, the utilization of nested-PCR (as in the BioFire® FilmArray®), loop-mediated isothermal amplification (LAMP),⁶¹ and 16s ribosomal RNA sequencing (broad-range PCR).⁶² Others employ different approaches for the identification of microorganisms such as matrix-assisted laser desorption ionization-time-of-flight mass spectrometry (MALDI-TOF).⁶³ and metagenomics next-generation sequencing.⁶⁴ All of these offer promising avenues to improve our current strategies to diagnose CNS infections, but require further research.

Conclusions:

The BioFire® FilmArray® Meningitis/Encephalitis Panel is the first FDA-cleared multiplexed PCR capable of simultaneously detecting and identifying 14 organisms in CSF samples. This newer rapid diagnostic tool has an overall high sensitivity and specificity for

CNS infections and has the potential to improve diagnosis and optimize utilization of healthcare resources for patients undergoing evaluation for ME. However, the ME panel should not be used as the sole diagnostic tool in patients with suspected bacterial meningitis, and clinicians should interpret ME panel results in combination with clinical, epidemiological and laboratory data. Additionally, both false positive and false negative results have been reported. A negative ME panel test does not indicate the absence of infection, as only 14 organisms are included in the panel, and a positive test may not necessarily reflect the true disease-causing organism, such as with latent viral infections. More research is needed to guide laboratories and clinicians in determining the optimal use of the ME panel panel in clinical decision-making for pediatric and adult patients undergoing evaluation for CNS infections.

CME Questions:

1. Which of the following viruses are part of the BioFire® FilmArray® ME Panel and are known to cause latent infections?
 - a. HSV-1/2
 - b. CMV
 - c. VZV
 - d. HHV-6
 - e. All of the above
- e) All of the above
2. Which of the following subgroup of organisms are all targets of the FDA-approved version of the BioFire® FilmArray® ME Panel?
 - a. CMV, EBV, *S. Aureus*, *S. agalactiae*, *C. neoformans*
 - b. VZV, HHV-6, *M. Tuberculosis*, *S. pneumoniae*, *S. Aureus*
 - c. HPeV, EV, *S. pneumoniae*, *L. monocytogenes*, *C. neoformans/C. gattii*
 - d. HIV, HPeV, *E. coli K1*, *M. Tuberculosis*, *C. neoformans/C. gattii*
 - e. HSV-1/2, VZV, *S. Aureus*, *N. meningitides*, *M. Tuberculosis*
- c) HPeV, EV, *S. pneumoniae*, *L. monocytogenes*, *C. neoformans/C. gattii*
3. Per the manufacturer, what is the minimum sample volume needed for the BioFire® FilmArray® ME Panel?
 - a. 0.2 mL
 - b. 1.0 mL
 - c. 1.5 mL
 - d. 3.0 mL
 - e. 5.0 mL

- a) 0.2 mL
4. Which of the following has been highlighted as a significant concern in studies evaluating the BioFire® FilmArray® ME Panel?
- High technical expertise required for the processing of samples
 - False positive and false negative results
 - Turnaround time of the assay
 - Amount of CSF volume required
 - Number of samples that can be run at the same time
- b) False positive and false negative results
5. One of the reasons CSF cultures continue to be essential for the evaluation of patients for CNS infections is:
- Higher sensitivity than any other method
 - Higher specificity than any other method
 - Faster turnaround time than most other methods
 - Importance for determining antibiotic susceptibilities
 - Diagnostic yield unchanged on antibiotic pretreated samples
- d) Importance for determining antibiotic susceptibilities

Funding Source:

Dr. Aronson is supported by grant number K08HS026006 from the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ). The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not represent the official views of AHRQ.

References:

- GBD 2015 Neurological Disorders Collaborator Group. Global, regional, and national burden of neurological disorders during 1990–2015: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2015. *Lancet Neurol.* 2017;16(11):877–897. [PubMed: 28931491]
- Erdem H, Inan A, Guven E, et al. The burden and epidemiology of community-acquired central nervous system infections: a multinational study. *Eur J Clin Microbiol Infect Dis.* 2017;36(9):1595–1611. [PubMed: 28397100]
- Brouwer MC, Tunkel AR, van de Beek D. Epidemiology, diagnosis, and antimicrobial treatment of acute bacterial meningitis. *Clin Microbiol Rev.* 2010;23(3):467–492. [PubMed: 20610819]
- Venkatesan A. Epidemiology and outcomes of acute encephalitis. *Curr Opin Neurol.* 2015;28(3):277–282. [PubMed: 25887770]
- Hasbun R, Rosenthal N, Balada-Llasat JM, et al. Epidemiology of Meningitis and Encephalitis in the United States, 2011–2014. *Clin Infect Dis.* 2017;65(3):359–363. [PubMed: 28419350]
- Hasbun R, Wootton SH, Rosenthal N, et al. Epidemiology of Meningitis and Encephalitis in Infants and Children in the United States, 2011–2014. *Pediatr Infect Dis J.* 2019;38(1):37–41. [PubMed: 30531527]
- He T, Kaplan S, Kamboj M, Tang YW. Laboratory Diagnosis of Central Nervous System Infection. *Curr Infect Dis Rep.* 2016;18(11):35. [PubMed: 27686677]

8. Furyk JS, Swann O, Molyneux E. Systematic review: neonatal meningitis in the developing world. *Trop Med Int Health*. 2011;16(6):672–679. [PubMed: 21395927]
9. Duff S, Hasbun R, Ginocchio CC, Balada-Llasat JM, Zimmer L, Bozzette SA. Economic analysis of rapid multiplex polymerase chain reaction testing for meningitis/encephalitis in pediatric patients. *Future Microbiol*. 2018;13:617–629. [PubMed: 29316801]
10. Duff S, Hasbun R, Balada-Llasat JM, Zimmer L, Bozzette SA, Ginocchio CC. Economic analysis of rapid multiplex polymerase chain reaction testing for meningitis/encephalitis in adult patients. *Infection*. 2019;47(6):945–953. [PubMed: 31111325]
11. DiDiodato G, Bradbury N. Cerebrospinal Fluid Analysis With the BioFire FilmArray Meningitis/Encephalitis Molecular Panel Reduces Length of Hospital Stay in Patients With Suspected Central Nervous System Infections. *Open Forum Infect Dis*. 2019;6(4):ofz119. [PubMed: 31041338]
12. Tansarli GS, Chapin KC. Diagnostic test accuracy of the BioFire(R) FilmArray(R) meningitis/encephalitis panel: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Clin Microbiol Infect*. 2019 11 21 [Epub ahead of print]
13. Balada-Llasat JM, Rosenthal N, Hasbun R, et al. Cost of managing meningitis and encephalitis among adult patients in the United States of America. *Int J Infect Dis*. 2018;71:117–121. [PubMed: 29702265]
14. Balada-Llasat JM, Rosenthal N, Hasbun R, et al. Cost of managing meningitis and encephalitis among infants and children in the United States. *Diagn Microbiol Infect Dis*. 2019;93(4):349–354. [PubMed: 30442508]
15. Hanson KE. The First Fully Automated Molecular Diagnostic Panel for Meningitis and Encephalitis: How Well Does It Perform, and When Should It Be Used? *J Clin Microbiol*. 2016;54(9):2222–2224. [PubMed: 27413189]
16. Straus SE, Thorpe KE, Holroyd-Leduc J. How Do I Perform a Lumbar Puncture and Analyze the Results to Diagnose Bacterial Meningitis? *JAMA*. 2006;296(16):2012–2022. [PubMed: 17062865]
17. Fitch MT, van de Beek D. Emergency diagnosis and treatment of adult meningitis. *Lancet Infect Dis*. 2007;7(3):191–200. [PubMed: 17317600]
18. Balamuth F, Cruz AT, Freedman SB, et al. Test Characteristics of Cerebrospinal Fluid Gram Stain to Identify Bacterial Meningitis in Infants Younger Than 60 Days. *Pediatr Emerg Care*. 2018 11 12 [Epub ahead of print]
19. Fleischer E, Neuman MI, Wang ME, et al. Cerebrospinal Fluid Profiles of Infants < 60 Days of Age With Bacterial Meningitis. *Hosp Pediatr*. 2019;9(12):979–982. [PubMed: 31690569]
20. Hanson KE, Couturier MR. Multiplexed Molecular Diagnostics for Respiratory, Gastrointestinal, and Central Nervous System Infections. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2016;63(10):1361–1367. [PubMed: 27444411]
21. Ramanan P, Bryson AL, Binnicker MJ, Pritt BS, Patel R. Syndromic Panel-Based Testing in Clinical Microbiology. *Clin Microbiol Rev*. 2018;31(1).
22. BioFire Diagnostics LLC. The FilmArray ME Panel CE IVD Instruction Booklet RFIT-PRT-0276-02. 5 2016.
23. Dien Bard J, Alby K. Point-Counterpoint: Meningitis/Encephalitis Syndromic Testing in the Clinical Laboratory. *J Clin Microbiol*. 2018;56(4).
24. Radmard S, Reid S, Ciryam P, et al. Clinical Utilization of the FilmArray Meningitis/Encephalitis (ME) Multiplex Polymerase Chain Reaction (PCR) Assay. *Front Neurol*. 2019;10:281. [PubMed: 30972012]
25. Leber AL, Everhart K, Balada-Llasat JM, et al. Multicenter Evaluation of BioFire FilmArray Meningitis/Encephalitis Panel for Detection of Bacteria, Viruses, and Yeast in Cerebrospinal Fluid Specimens. *J Clin Microbiol*. 2016;54(9):2251–2261. [PubMed: 27335149]
26. Group WYIS. Bacterial etiology of serious infections in young infants in developing countries: results of a multicenter study. *Pediatr Infect Dis J*. 1999;18(10):S17–S22. [PubMed: 10530569]
27. Lumley SF, Pritchard D, Dutta A, Matthews PC, Cann K. Multiplex PCR reveals high prevalence of enterovirus and HHV6 in acellular paediatric cerebrospinal fluid samples. *J Infect*. 2018;77(3):249–257.

28. Barnes GK, Gudina EK, Berhane M, et al. New molecular tools for meningitis diagnostics in Ethiopia - a necessary step towards improving antimicrobial prescription. *BMC Infect Dis.* 2018;18(1):684. [PubMed: 30572843]
29. Tarai B, Das P. FilmArray(R) meningitis/encephalitis (ME) panel, a rapid molecular platform for diagnosis of CNS infections in a tertiary care hospital in North India: one- and-half-year review. *Neurol Sci.* 2019;40(1):81–88.
30. Lee SH, Chen SY, Chien JY, Lee TF, Chen JM, Hsueh PR. Usefulness of the FilmArray meningitis/encephalitis (M/E) panel for the diagnosis of infectious meningitis and encephalitis in Taiwan. *J Microbiol Immunol Infect.* 2019;52(5):760–768. [PubMed: 31085115]
31. Boudet A, Pantel A, Carles MJ, et al. A review of a 13-month period of FilmArray Meningitis/Encephalitis panel implementation as a first-line diagnosis tool at a university hospital. *PLoS One.* 2019;14(10):e0223887. [PubMed: 31647847]
32. Chang D, Okulicz JF, Nielsen LE, White BK. A Tertiary Care Center's Experience with Novel Molecular Meningitis/Encephalitis Diagnostics and Implementation with Antimicrobial Stewardship. *Mil Med.* 2018;183(1–2):e24–e27. [PubMed: 29401338]
33. O'Brien MP, Francis JR, Marr IM, Baird RW. Impact of Cerebrospinal Fluid Multiplex Assay on Diagnosis and Outcomes of Central Nervous System Infections in Children: A Before and After Cohort Study. *Pediatr Infect Dis J.* 2018;37(9):868–871. [PubMed: 29406468]
34. Eichinger A, Hagen A, Meyer-Buhn M, Huebner J. Clinical benefits of introducing real-time multiplex PCR for cerebrospinal fluid as routine diagnostic at a tertiary care pediatric center. *Infection.* 2019;47(1):51–58. [PubMed: 30187216]
35. Messacar K, Breazeale G, Robinson CC, Dominguez SR. Potential clinical impact of the film array meningitis encephalitis panel in children with suspected central nervous system infections. *Diagn Microbiol Infect Dis.* 2016;86(1):118–120. [PubMed: 27342782]
36. Graf EH, Farquharson MV, Cardenas AM. Comparative evaluation of the FilmArray meningitis/encephalitis molecular panel in a pediatric population. *Diagn Microbiol Infect Dis.* 2017;87(1):92–94. [PubMed: 27771208]
37. Du B, Hua C, Xia Y, et al. Evaluation of the BioFire FilmArray meningitis/encephalitis panel for the detection of bacteria and yeast in Chinese children. *Ann Transl Med.* 2019;7(18):437. [PubMed: 31700873]
38. Blaschke AJ, Holmberg KM, Daly JA, et al. Retrospective Evaluation of Infants Aged 1 to 60 Days with Residual Cerebrospinal Fluid (CSF) Tested Using the FilmArray Meningitis/Encephalitis (ME) Panel. *J Clin Microbiol.* 2018;56(7).
39. Nabower AM, Miller S, Biewen B, et al. Association of the FilmArray Meningitis/Encephalitis Panel With Clinical Management. *Hosp Pediatr.* 2019;9(10):763–769. [PubMed: 31511395]
40. Arora HS, Asmar BI, Salimnia H, Agarwal P, Chawla S, Abdel-Haq N. Enhanced Identification of Group B Streptococcus and Escherichia Coli in Young Infants with Meningitis Using the Biofire Filmarray Meningitis/Encephalitis Panel. *Pediatr Infect Dis J.* 2017;36(7):685–687. [PubMed: 28114152]
41. Piccirilli G, Chierighin A, Gabrielli L, et al. Infectious meningitis/encephalitis: evaluation of a rapid and fully automated multiplex PCR in the microbiological diagnostic workup. *New Microbiol.* 2018;41(2):118–125. [PubMed: 29620789]
42. Wootton SH, Aguilera E, Salazar L, Hemmert AC, Hasbun R. Enhancing pathogen identification in patients with meningitis and a negative Gram stain using the BioFire FilmArray((R)) Meningitis/Encephalitis panel. *Ann Clin Microbiol Antimicrob.* 2016;15:26. [PubMed: 27101869]
43. Anand V, Holmen J, Neely M, Pannaraj PS, Dien Bard J. The Brief Case: Neonatal Meningitis Caused by *Listeria monocytogenes* Diagnosed by Multiplex Molecular Panel. *J Clin Microbiol.* 2016;54(12):2846–2849. [PubMed: 27881634]
44. Rhein J, Bahr NC, Hemmert AC, et al. Diagnostic performance of a multiplex PCR assay for meningitis in an HIV-infected population in Uganda. *Diagn Microbiol Infect Dis.* 2016;84(3):268–273. [PubMed: 26711635]
45. Dien Bard J, Naccache SN, Bender JM. Use of a Molecular Panel To Aid in Diagnosis of Culture-Negative Meningitis. *J Clin Microbiol.* 2016;54(12):3069–3070. [PubMed: 27682130]

46. Lopez-Amor L, Escudero D, Fernandez J, et al. [Meningitis/Encephalitis diagnosis in ICU using Multiplex PCR system: Is it time of change?]. *Rev Esp Quimioter*. 2019;32(3):246–253. [PubMed: 30980520]
47. Mina Y, Schechner V, Savion M, et al. Clinical benefits of FilmArray meningitis-encephalitis PCR assay in partially-treated bacterial meningitis in Israel. *BMC Infect Dis*. 2019;19(1):713. [PubMed: 31409318]
48. Soucek DK, Dumkow LE, VanLangen KM, Jameson AP. Cost Justification of the BioFire FilmArray Meningitis/Encephalitis Panel Versus Standard of Care for Diagnosing Meningitis in a Community Hospital. *J Pharm Pract*. 2019;32(1):36–40. [PubMed: 29092659]
49. Dack K, Pankow S, Ablah E, Zackula R, Assi M. Contribution of the BioFire((R)) FilmArray((R)) Meningitis/Encephalitis Panel: Assessing Antimicrobial Duration and Length of Stay. *Kans J Med*. 2019;12(1):1–3. [PubMed: 30854160]
50. Gomez CA, Pinsky BA, Liu A, Banaei N. Delayed Diagnosis of Tuberculous Meningitis Misdiagnosed as Herpes Simplex Virus-1 Encephalitis With the FilmArray Syndromic Polymerase Chain Reaction Panel. *Open Forum Infect Dis*. 2017;4(1):ofw245. [PubMed: 28540320]
51. O'Halloran JA, Franklin A, Lainhart W, Burnham CA, Powderly W, Dubberke E. Pitfalls Associated With the Use of Molecular Diagnostic Panels in the Diagnosis of Cryptococcal Meningitis. *Open Forum Infect Dis*. 2017;4(4):ofx242. [PubMed: 29255738]
52. Gonzalez-Donapetry P, Garcia-Rodriguez J, Cendejas-Bueno E. A case of a FilmArray((R)) ME false negative in meningococcal meningitis. *J Infect*. 2019;79(3):277–287.
53. Hanson KE, Slechta ES, Killpack JA, et al. Preclinical Assessment of a Fully Automated Multiplex PCR Panel for Detection of Central Nervous System Pathogens. *J Clin Microbiol*. 2016;54(3):785–787. [PubMed: 26719436]
54. Lu H, Zhou Y, Yin Y, Pan X, Weng X. Cryptococcal antigen test revisited: significance for cryptococcal meningitis therapy monitoring in a tertiary chinese hospital. *J Clin Microbiol*. 2005;43(6):2989–2990. [PubMed: 15956440]
55. Liesman RM, Strasburg AP, Heitman AK, Theel ES, Patel R, Binnicker MJ. Evaluation of a Commercial Multiplex Molecular Panel for Diagnosis of Infectious Meningitis and Encephalitis. *J Clin Microbiol*. 2018;56(4).
56. Nestor D, Thulin Hedberg S, Lignell M, Skovbjerg S, Molling P, Sundqvist M. Evaluation of the FilmArray Meningitis/Encephalitis panel with focus on bacteria and *Cryptococcus* spp. *J Microbiol Methods*. 2019;157:113–116. [PubMed: 30639516]
57. Ericsson AC, Brink M, Studahl M, Bengner M. Reactivation of herpes simplex type 1 in pneumococcal meningitis. *J Clin Virol*. 2015;66:100–102. [PubMed: 25866347]
58. Green DA, Pereira M, Miko B, Radmard S, Whittier S, Thakur K. Clinical Significance of Human Herpesvirus 6 Positivity on the FilmArray Meningitis/Encephalitis Panel. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2018;67(7):1125–1128. [PubMed: 29635334]
59. Sorek N, Ashkenazi S, Livni G, Ben-Zvi H. Neisseria meningitidis and cytomegalovirus simultaneous detection in the filmarray meningitis/encephalitis panel and its clinical relevance. *IDCases*. 2019;17:e00516. [PubMed: 31193598]
60. Morrison JM, Dudas RA, Collins K. The Power and Peril of Panels. *Hosp Pediatr*. 2018;8(11):729–732. [PubMed: 30337337]
61. Lee D, Kim EJ, Kilgore PE, et al. Clinical evaluation of a loop-mediated isothermal amplification (LAMP) assay for rapid detection of *Neisseria meningitidis* in cerebrospinal fluid. *PLoS One*. 2015;10(4):e0122922. [PubMed: 25853422]
62. Srinivasan L, Pisapia JM, Shah SS, Halpern CH, Harris MC. Can broad-range 16S ribosomal ribonucleic acid gene polymerase chain reactions improve the diagnosis of bacterial meningitis? A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Ann Emerg Med*. 2012;60(5):609–620 e602. [PubMed: 22883680]
63. Segawa S, Sawai S, Murata S, et al. Direct application of MALDI-TOF mass spectrometry to cerebrospinal fluid for rapid pathogen identification in a patient with bacterial meningitis. *Clin Chim Acta*. 2014;435:59–61. [PubMed: 24797349]
64. Wilson MR, Sample HA, Zorn KC, et al. Clinical Metagenomic Sequencing for Diagnosis of Meningitis and Encephalitis. *N Engl J Med*. 2019;380(24):2327–2340. [PubMed: 31189036]

Table 1.

Targets of the BioFire® FilmArray® ME Panel

Viruses	Bacteria	Fungi
Cytomegalovirus (CMV)	<i>Escherichia coli K1</i>	<i>Cryptococcus neoformans/Cryptococcus gattii</i>
Enterovirus (EV)	<i>Haemophilus influenzae</i>	
Herpes Simplex Virus-1 (HSV-1)	<i>Listeria monocytogenes</i>	
Herpes Simplex Virus-2 (HSV-2)	<i>Neisseria meningitides</i>	
Human Herpesvirus 6 (HHV-6)	<i>Streptococcus agalactiae</i>	
Human Parechovirus (HPeV)	<i>Streptococcus pneumoniae</i>	
Varicella-Zoster Virus (VZV)		

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Table 2.

Studies of the BioFire® FilmArray® ME Panel included in the 2019 Meta-Analysis

Study	Study Population	Total Number of Samples in the Study	Type of Study	Overall Sensitivity	Overall Specificity	PPV	NPV	Positive Likelihood Ratio (LR +)	Negative Likelihood Ratio (LR -)
Leber et al. ²⁵	Pediatrics and Adults	1560	Prospective	94.2%	97.7%	74.8%	99.6%	41.6	0.06
Arora et al. ⁴⁰	Pediatrics	62	Prospective	100.0%	93.4%	55.6%	100.0%	15.3	0
Lee et al. ³⁰	Pediatrics and Adults	42	Prospective	60.0%	100%	100.0%	86.7%	N/A	0.40
Radmard et al. ²⁴	Pediatrics and Adults	705	Retrospective	85.7%	98.3%	36.8%	99.9%	52.2	0.13
Hanson et al. ⁵³	Pediatrics and Adults	342	Retrospective	91.8%	88.3%	88.4%	91.7%	7.8	0.09
Messacar et al. ³⁵	Pediatrics	138	Retrospective	91.1%	97.9%	95.3%	95.9%	43.3	0.09
Graf et al. ³⁶	Pediatrics	133	Retrospective	92.5%	100.0%	100.0%	93.0%	N/A	0.07
Piccirilli et al. ⁴¹	Pediatrics and Adults	63	Retrospective	85.7%	100.0%	100.0%	77.8%	N/A	0.14

Table 3.

Potential Benefits and Limitations of the BioFire® FilmArray® ME Panel

Potential Benefits	Potential Limitations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Faster turnaround time, diagnosis and definitive treatment/treatment discontinuation^{30,31,34} • Pathogen identification in culture-negative CSF samples from patients with suspected bacterial meningitis^{31,40,44-46} • Detection of organisms in CSF obtained after antimicrobial pretreatment^{31,40,42,43,47} • Enables simultaneous identification of co-infections on the same sample^{7,56} • Ability to test for multiple organisms simultaneously²² • Facilitates proper administration of chemoprophylaxis for close contacts⁴⁷ • Relatively small amount of CSF sample (minimum 0.2 mL) required²² • Limited hands-on time and technical expertise necessary^{12,28} 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern for false positive and false negative tests^{12,15,25,50-52,60} • Not all pathogens able to cause CNS infections are detected by the panel^{22,25,30,31,38,39,41,60} • Unable to provide antimicrobial susceptibilities^{22,25} • Not intended for CSF samples obtained from indwelling CNS medical devices²² • Positive results do not exclude the possibility of a co-infection with an organism not in the panel²² • Relatively high cost of purchase (\$35,550-\$50,000), service (\$4,000/year) and per test (\$~200)^{11,28,48} • Lower ability to detect viruses when compared to some singleplex assays^{15,35,55,56} • Positive results for herpesviruses may be due to latency or reactivation of the virus with or without disease^{15,25}

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript