

Gastrointestinal Pathogen Nucleic Acid Detection Panel Testing for Infectious Diarrhea

Policy Number: 2023T0604G
Effective Date: October 1, 2023

[Instructions for Use](#)

Table of Contents	Page
Application	1
Coverage Rationale	1
Documentation Requirements	2
Applicable Codes	2
Description of Services	3
Clinical Evidence	3
U.S. Food and Drug Administration	10
References	10
Policy History/Revision Information	11
Instructions for Use	11

Community Plan Policy

- [Gastrointestinal Pathogen Nucleic Acid Detection Panel Testing for Infectious Diarrhea](#)

Application

UnitedHealthcare Commercial

This Medical Policy applies to all UnitedHealthcare Commercial benefit plans.

UnitedHealthcare Individual Exchange

This Medical Policy applies to Individual Exchange benefit plans in all states except for Colorado.

Coverage Rationale

The following are proven and medically necessary:

- Multiplex polymerase chain reaction (PCR) panel testing of gastrointestinal pathogens of up to 5 targets when performed as part of an evaluation that includes blood cultures for an individual with **any** of the following:
 - Diarrhea for more than 7 days with any of the following:
 - Fever; or
 - Bloody or mucoid stools; or
 - Severe abdominal cramping or tenderness; or
 - Signs of sepsis
 - Suspected enteric fever (i.e., typhoid or paratyphoid) in an individual with a history of recent travel to an endemic region (e.g., south-central Asia, Southeast Asia, and southern Africa) or who has consumed foods prepared by people with recent endemic exposure
- Multiplex PCR panel testing of gastrointestinal pathogens of up to 11 targets for the evaluation of persistent diarrhea in an individual with **any** of the following:
 - At risk for Clostridium difficile (C. difficile) colitis and has had diarrhea for more than 7 days with any of the following:
 - Fever; or
 - Bloody or mucoid stools; or

- Severe abdominal cramping or tenderness; or
- Signs of sepsis
- Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome (AIDS)
- On immunosuppressive medications either following an organ transplant or when used for treatment of an auto-immune disease
- Other condition causing immunosuppression and other stool diagnostic studies have failed to yield a pathogenic organism

Due to insufficient evidence of efficacy, multiplex PCR panel testing of gastrointestinal pathogens is unproven and not medically necessary for evaluating all other indications not listed above as proven and medically necessary.

Documentation Requirements

Benefit coverage for health services is determined by the member specific benefit plan document and applicable laws that may require coverage for a specific service. The documentation requirements outlined below are used to assess whether the member meets the clinical criteria for coverage but do not guarantee coverage of the service requested.

CPT Codes*	Required Clinical Information
Gastrointestinal Pathogen Nucleic Acid Detection Panel Testing for Infectious Diarrhea	
87505	Medical notes documenting the following, when applicable: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Current diagnosis ● History of illness and date of onset ● Co-morbidities ● Results of blood cultures and other lab tests ● Number of pathogen targets being tested ● Physician treatment plan based on the results of panel testing
87506	
87507	

*For code descriptions, refer to the [Applicable Codes](#) section.

Applicable Codes

The following list(s) of procedure and/or diagnosis codes is provided for reference purposes only and may not be all inclusive. Listing of a code in this policy does not imply that the service described by the code is a covered or non-covered health service. Benefit coverage for health services is determined by the member specific benefit plan document and applicable laws that may require coverage for a specific service. The inclusion of a code does not imply any right to reimbursement or guarantee claim payment. Other Policies and Guidelines may apply.

CPT Code	Description
0369U	Infectious agent detection by nucleic acid (DNA and RNA), gastrointestinal pathogens, 31 bacterial, viral, and parasitic organisms and identification of 21 associated antibiotic-resistance genes, multiplex amplified probe technique
87505	Infectious agent detection by nucleic acid (DNA or RNA); gastrointestinal pathogen (e.g., Clostridium difficile, E. coli, Salmonella, Shigella, norovirus, Giardia), includes multiplex reverse transcription, when performed, and multiplex amplified probe technique, multiple types or subtypes, 3-5 targets
87506	Infectious agent detection by nucleic acid (DNA or RNA); gastrointestinal pathogen (e.g., Clostridium difficile, E. coli, Salmonella, Shigella, norovirus, Giardia), includes multiplex reverse transcription, when performed, and multiplex amplified probe technique, multiple types or subtypes, 6-11 targets
87507	Infectious agent detection by nucleic acid (DNA or RNA); gastrointestinal pathogen (e.g., Clostridium difficile, E. coli, Salmonella, Shigella, norovirus, Giardia), includes multiplex reverse transcription, when performed, and multiplex amplified probe technique, multiple types or subtypes, 12-25 targets

CPT® is a registered trademark of the American Medical Association

Description of Services

A variety of viruses, bacteria, and parasites can cause gastrointestinal (GI) infections. Testing for parasites and viral etiologies for community-acquired diarrhea is not necessary since this type of diarrhea is generally self-limited, managed by supportive care and hydration, and virus specific therapy is not available to treat this condition. After bacteria pathogens are ruled out, travelers' diarrhea with symptoms may require traditional ova and parasite stool examination and/or specific protozoa antigen or molecular testing.

Traditional methods of diagnosis include bacterial culture, microscopy with and without special stains and immunofluorescence, and antigen testing. Culture-independent techniques have been developed that use polymerase chain reaction (PCR) or real-time PCR and reverse-transcription PCR to amplify targets and detect the ribonucleic acid (RNA) or deoxyribonucleic acid (DNA) of potential pathogens. In addition to single pathogen diagnostic tests, gastrointestinal (GI) pathogen nucleic acid detection panels simultaneously test for the presence of multiple pathogenic microbes in a stool sample (Palavecino, 2015).

Clinical Evidence

Multiplex Polymerase Chain Reaction (PCR) Panel Testing

In 2022 Truong et al. (included in the Hayes report below) performed a comparative study assessing the impact of multiplex gastrointestinal PCR testing (GI-PCR) on the management of infectious diarrhea in children. A GI-PCR (BioFire FilmArray) was performed on each stool sample from 172 children. Data was collected prospectively on the children's healthcare management before and after GI-PCR results. The criteria for performing stool analysis were mucous/bloody diarrhea and or traveler's diarrhea (n = 130), GI-PCRs were positive for 12 patients (70%). The main pathogens were enteroaggregative *E. coli* (n = 39; 23%), enteropathogenic *E. coli* (n = 34; 20%), *Shigella*/EIEC (n = 27; 16%) and *Campylobacter* (n = 21; 12%). Compared with stool cultures, GI-PCR enabled the detection of 21 vs 19 *Campylobacter*, 12 vs 10 *Salmonella*, 27 *Shigella*/EIEC vs 13 *Shigella*, 2 vs 2 *Yersinia enterocolitica*, 1 vs 1 *Plesiomonas shigelloides*, respectively. The authors concluded the GI-PCR's results impacted the medical management of gastroenteritis for almost one-fourth of the children and particularly the appropriate antibiotic treatment prior to stool culture results.

A prospective randomized cohort study was performed in 2022 by Montasser et al. comparing the sensitivity and rapid method for detection of the multiplex PCR with conventional methods. The study included 200 stool samples from participants between February 2019 and December 2021 where bacteria were identified using both methods. The identified organisms using conventional cultures; were *Shigella* (27%), *Aeromonas* species (10%) and EHEC (O157) (8%). When using multiplex PCR *Shigella* was the most identified pathogen (detected in 40.5% of positive samples) followed by *Aeromonas* (30%), EHEC (20%) and *Campylobacter* species (1%). Diagnostically the evaluation of multiplex PCR in relation to conventional methods showed sensitivity of 100% for *Shigella*, EHEC and *Aeromonas* with specificity of 88.5%, 92.4% and 77.8%. However, in diagnosis of *Campylobacter* and negative predictive value (NPV) when evaluating multiplex PCR in relation to conventional methods showed specificity of 99% and 100%. In conclusion multiplex PCR is an accurate and rapid method of detection of common intestinal pathogens causing severe gastroenteritis.

In an effort to further investigate potential quality improvements in clinical management, use of antibiotics, and in-hospital infection transmission in children with acute diarrhea, Yoo et al. (2021) analyzed use of the BioFire® FilmArray® Gastrointestinal Panel (GI Panel) in a prospective study with a matched historical cohort. Participants in the prospective study included children younger than 19 years of age with new onset diarrhea. A 1:1 matched historical cohort of children diagnosed with acute gastroenteritis (AGE) during the 4 years prior to this investigation was analyzed as well. Children in the prospective cohort received stool testing using the GI Panel in addition to conventional methods. A total of 182 individuals with suspected infectious diarrhea were included in the prospective cohort. The median age was 3.8 years and 64.3% were male. Participants in this cohort were divided into two subgroups: community-onset diarrhea (85.7%) and hospital-onset diarrhea (14.3%). The GI Panel had a higher pathogen-positivity rate for community-onset diarrhea (58.3%) compared to both conventional studies (42.3%) and in the historical cohort (31.4%). Reporting time after admission averaged 25 hours for the GI Panel and 72 hours for the historical cohort. In addition, there was a reduction in antibiotic use in the prospective cohort compared to the historical cohort (35.3% vs 71.8%). In the prospective cohort, 126 different pathogens from 91 stool samples were identified by the GI Panel and in the historical cohort, 51 pathogens were identified from 49 stool samples. Of the 26 patients with hospital-onset diarrhea, a single pathogen was detected in 64.3% of the children and two or more pathogens were detected in 35.7%. Test

results were used to make clinical decisions regarding isolation/precaution measures in-hospital. However, there were discrepancies between the results of the GI Panel and traditional, routine testing in the prospective cohort; although the GI Panel showed high detection rates of the pathogens included in the panel, 50% of the pathogens that were positive in the standard conventional studies and negative in the GI Panel were bacteria that are not included in FilmArray, but rather cultured from stool, highlighting the importance of stool cultures in the pathogenic diagnosis of AGE. The authors concluded that the rapid turnaround time of the GI Panel test and the high positivity rate of the panel demonstrates clinical benefit for children with acute diarrhea, including potentially reducing the use of antibiotics and enabling early use of infection precautions and/or isolation.

Chang et al. (2021) performed a systematic review and meta-analysis comparing and evaluating accuracy of the BioFire FilmArray and Luminex xTAG multiplex PCR gastrointestinal (GI) panels. Eleven studies occurring prior to December 1, 2019 and including a total of 7,085 stool samples met eligibility criteria. The FilmArray panel demonstrated higher sensitivity (> 0.90) than xTAG GPP (0.81-0.95) for the majority of pathogens, with the exception of Rotavirus A (equal sensitivity). Overall, multiplex PCR testing was highly accurate with a specificity ≥ 0.98 for all pathogens except *Yersinia enterocolitica*. According to the study results, xTAG GPP and FilmArray GI panel accurately detect more than 90% of common enteropathogens with, high sensitivity, specificity and a shorter turnaround time. As such, the researchers state that multiplex platforms can have a significant impact on clinical management by reducing the time to identify a pathogen, influencing outcome by initiating treatment earlier, altering anti-microbial stewardship, and optimizing infection control. Although this systematic review included a large volume of samples and robust analysis following the Cochrane guideline, there are limitations in the review. The data on FilmArray was relatively few and did not allow subgroup analyses for some rare pathogens. In addition, the patient characteristics such as age, symptoms, and travel history varied among the studies that were included, and the number of studies (11) may be insufficient for some of the sensitivity analyses. There were also five studies that included discordant analysis which could increase the sensitivity and specificity due to potentially elevating the true positive and negative cases.

Machiels et al. (2021) published results of a cross-sectional study evaluating clinical impact of using BioFire FilmArray, a broad, multiplex gastrointestinal panel, on individuals with gastroenteritis in a Dutch tertiary care center. FilmArray was tested in parallel with either one or a combination of standardly performed PCR panel tests based on clinical symptoms and history of illness. Testing was performed on 182 individuals. FilmArray detected one or more pathogens in 39.6% of the participants and routine testing detected one or more pathogens in 28.6% of the participants. Time to receive results, including transport time, decreased from a median of 53 hours for the standard testing to 16 hours for FilmArray. The authors state that this decrease in time to receive results could have resulted in 3.6 saved antibiotic days, earlier (29 hours) removal from isolation for 26 patients, and prevention of additional imaging in five patients. Limitations of this study include the small sample size, retrospective design and the single-site of testing.

A 2020 systematic review and meta-analysis by Meyer et al. sought to analyze and report the pathogens identified through the use of a multiplex molecular array (BioFire FilmArray) in individuals with gastroenteritis. Publications reporting pathogens that had been identified via FilmArray were searched and the proportions of pathogens identified were then pooled. A total of 14 studies including 17,815 patients were included in the analysis. Of these, 39% (7,071) had positive FilmArray results. In addition, 18.1% of individuals had co-infections with more than one pathogen. Pathogens identified were as follows, in order of frequency: EPEC (27.5%), *Clostridium difficile* (19.3%), Norovirus (15.1%), EAEC (15%), *Campylobacter* spp (11.8%), *Salmonella* spp (8.1%), ETEC (7.3%), Rotavirus (7.3%), Sapovirus (7.1%), STEC (5.2%), *Shigella*/EIEC (4.9%), *Giardia lamblia* (4%), Adenovirus (3.8%), *Cryptosporidium* spp (3.8%), Astrovirus (2.8%), *Yersinia enterocolitica* (1.7%), *Escherichia coli* O157 (1.1%), *Plesiomonas shigelloides* (1.1%), *Cyclospora cayetanensis* (0.7%), *Vibrio* spp (0.5%), *Vibrio cholerae* (0.3%) and *Entamoeba histolytica* (0.3). FilmArray was able to identify one or more pathogens in 48.2% of individuals tested versus 16.7% using standard conventional diagnostics in the studies that had control groups with microbiological examination of stool performed using methods other than FilmArray. The authors indicate that although the FilmArray panel was positive in 39.7% of patients with gastroenteritis, the carriage rates of identified organisms must be considered. They further propose that restricted ordering of molecular panels specific to those patients who might benefit from targeted treatment could provide clinical value by quickly identifying the pathogen and treating appropriately, and that future studies should focus on determining which of the identified pathogens in a test result are responsible for symptoms present and whether co-infections are associated with a more severe disease presentation.

Leli et al. (2020) evaluated and compared the diagnostic yield of the FilmArray gastrointestinal panel to that of routine stool culture for etiological diagnosis of infectious diarrhea. Stool samples (n = 183) collected as part of routine care from March 2016 to March 2019 were included in this retrospective analysis. Samples were then cultured and tested by FilmArray and the

following results from the comparison of diagnostic accuracy between culture and FilmArray with respect to *Campylobacter*, *Salmonella*, *Shigella*, *Yersinia enterocolitica* and Shiga-like toxin producing *E. coli* 0157 were reported: 100% (95% CI: 85-100%) sensitivity; 93.4% (95% CI: 87.9-96.6%) specificity; 74.3% (95% CI: 57.5-86.4%) positive predictive value; 100% (95% CI: 96.7-100%) negative predictive value; 2.9% (95% CI: 1.6-5.1) positive likelihood ratio; zero negative likelihood ratio. The FilmArray gastrointestinal panel identified 34.5% more pathogens than traditional culture methods ($p = 0.001$). The authors concluded that FilmArray identified a spectrum of pathogens and had good diagnostic performance when compared to standard culture for the diagnosis of infectious diarrhea. However, the study lacks clinical data and was performed in a single site in a community hospital setting, thus the pathogen detection rate cannot be completely generalized and positive results for *C. difficile* and viruses were not confirmed with alternative or reference methods.

Pouletty et al. (2019) utilized multiplex PCR on stool samples to determine pathogen distribution of traveler's diarrhea (TD) in children traveling from tropical countries. From August 2014 to October 2015, children with TD admitted to two university hospitals were included in the prospective study. The FilmArray GI PCR panel was used to identify 22 pathogens. Comparisons for the detection of *Salmonella*, *Shigella* and *Campylobacter* by PCR and culture were made. Prevalence of extended spectrum beta-lactamase (ESBL) producing Enterobacteriaceae was also evaluated. In 58 (98%) of the 59 children, at least one pathogen was recognized. This included 9 enteropathogenic bacteria, 5 viruses and 2 parasites. The detection of enteropathogenic bacteria by multiplex PCR was enhanced by 25%. Enteroaggregative *E. coli* ($n = 32$), enteropathogenic *E. coli* ($n = 26$), enterotoxigenic *E. coli* ($n = 19$), *Salmonella enterica/enteroinvasive E. coli/Shigella* ($n = 16$ each), *Cryptosporidium*, sapovirus ($n = 11$ each), *Campylobacter jejuni*, norovirus ($n = 10$ each), rotavirus ($n = 9$), *Giardia* ($n = 8$) and Shiga-toxin producing *E. coli* ($n = 4$) were the most frequent pathogens identified. Co-infections ($n = 52$) were reported including bacteria and viruses ($n = 21$), multiple bacteria ($n = 14$), or bacteria and parasites ($n = 10$). ESBL were found in 28 cases. The authors concluded that PCR performed on stools demonstrated a high prevalence of diverse enteric pathogens and coinfections in children with TD. Multiplex PCR optimized the number of treated patients by 27% compared with culture. The authors concluded that because major enteropathogenic bacteria were detected more often by PCR, the technique may allow earlier and more appropriate antibiotic treatment and increase the number of correctly diagnosed patients. Noted limitations of this study include the lack of controls involving traveling children without diarrhea and non-traveling children, the lack of PCR testing for all the children admitted for TD, and patient recruitment solely from the emergency department (these children likely had more severe symptoms). Lastly, comparison of this study's results with other existing studies should be considered cautiously, as techniques and pathogens detected were not the same.

Axelrad et al. (2019) performed a retrospective analysis of 5,986 patients who underwent traditional stool culture testing from December 2012-February 2015 and 9,402 patients who had FilmArray GI panel testing from March 2015 to May 2017. Clinical management and health care utilization of patients following testing was evaluated. A total of 2,746 (29.2%) of the specimens tested positive on the FilmArray panel compared to 246 (4.1%) testing positive with stool cultures. Patients who underwent FilmArray testing were less likely to have an endoscopic procedure (8.4%) versus 9.6% who had stool culture ($p = 0.002$). Patients tested by FilmArray were also less likely than those who had stool culture testing to be prescribed antibiotics (36.2% vs. 40.9%, $p < 0.001$). In their study, the authors reported that patients tested by PCR were 12.5%, 7.3% and 11.4% less likely to have endoscopy, abdominal imaging and antibiotics prescribed, respectively. With a higher sensitivity and decreased turnaround time, multiplex PCR stool testing has the promise of optimizing health care and lowering costs, but the authors also recommend additional studies to determine how PCR results impact clinical management decisions and overall impact on patient care.

The Seegene Allplex Gastrointestinal, Luminex xTAG Gastrointestinal Pathogen Panel, and BD MAX Enteric Assays were compared by Yoo et al. (2019) to determine efficiency of gastrointestinal pathogen detection from 858 clinical stool samples. Positive percentage agreements of Seegene, Luminex, and BD MAX were 94% (258 of 275), 92% (254 of 275), and 78% (46 of 59), respectively. Luminex showed a low negative percentage agreement for *Salmonella* ($n = 31$). For viruses, positive/negative percentage agreements of Seegene and Luminex were 99%/96% and 93%/99%, respectively. The authors suggested that these assays are promising for the detection of gastrointestinal pathogens simultaneously.

A prospective study from the Alberta Provincial Pediatric Enteric Infection Team was conducted by Kellner et al. (2019) between December 2014 and March 2018 to determine agreement for the bacterial pathogens of interest between stool bacterial culture methods and the Luminex xTAG gastrointestinal pathogen panel (GPP). The primary outcome was bacterial pathogen detection agreement from a cohort of 3,089 children with gastroenteritis. This was measured as overall percent agreements, positive percentage agreement (PPA), and Cohen's K, between stool bacterial culture and the GPP for bacterial pathogens sought by both detection methods: *Campylobacter* spp, *E. coli* 0157, *Salmonella* spp and *Shigella* spp. A secondary

analysis targeted Salmonella spp. which included phenotype assessment, additional testing of GPP-negative/culture positive isolate suspensions with the GPP, and in-house and commercial confirmatory nucleic acid testing of GPP positive/culture negative extracts. The overall percentage agreement between the two testing methods was > 99% for each individual pathogen and 98.9% (95% CI, 98.5%,99.3%) for all combined pathogens. Overall, PPA was 83% (73/88; 95% CI, 73.1%,89.8%). Cohen's K was > 0.70 for E.coli 0157, Shigella spp. and Salmonella spp and 0.89 for Campylobacter spp. Salmonella spp., the most frequently identified pathogen, was detected from the samples of 64 patients; 12 (19%) by culture only, 9 (14%) by GPP only, and 43 (67%) by both technologies. Positive percent agreement for Salmonella spp. was 78.2% (95%CI 64.6%, 87.8%). Isolate suspensions from 12 patients with GPP negative/culture positive for Salmonella tested positive by GPP. GPP positive/culture negative samples tested positive using additional assays for 0/2 Campylobacter/positive specimens, 0/4 E.coli 0157-positive samples, 0/9 Salmonella-positive samples and 2/3 Shigella-positive samples. For rectal swab and stool samples, the median cycle threshold (C_T) values, determined using quantitative PCR, were higher for GPP-negative/culture positive samples than for GPP-positive/culture positive samples (for rectal swabs, 36.9% [interquartile range {IQR}, 33.7, 37.1] vs. 30 [IQR, 26.2, 33.2], respectively [p = 0.002]; for stool samples, 36.9 [IQR, 33.7, 37.1] versus 29.0 [IQR, 24.8, 30.8], respectively [p = 0.001]). The authors concluded that GPP overall had high concordance with culture methods, however the PPA was suboptimal for shared bacterial targets. Salmonella spp identification by GPP had a propensity for false positives and negatives. Therefore, the accuracy of GPP and other nucleic-acid amplification (NAAT) assays requires further studies to determine clinical validity and utility before culture replacement is considered.

The clinical validity of molecular testing for adult outpatients with diarrhea and the validation of the Infectious Disease Society of America (IDSA) 2017 testing recommendation was the primary objective of Clark et al. (2019). The IDSA recommends FDA-approved molecular testing panels for increased sensitivity and decreased turn-around times vs. bacterial cultures for the detection of enteric pathogens even though these molecular methods have not proven cost-effective and may not have a significant effect on clinical management. A retrospective chart review from the University of Virginia was performed for 629 samples using the FilmArray Gastrointestinal Panel for adults with diarrhea between March 2015 and July 2016. This review revealed that 127/629 (20.2%) of specimens had a detected pathogen; the most common identified were enteropathogenic E.coli (47,7.5%), norovirus (24,3.8%), enteroaggregative E. coli (14,2.2%), Campylobacter (9,1.4%) and Salmonella (9,1.4%). Clinical yield was low, resulting in antimicrobial treatment indicated for 18(2.9%) of patients and any change in clinical management indicated for 33 (5.2%) of patients. Following the 2017 IDSA guidelines which recommend diagnostic testing for patients with fever, abdominal pain, bloody stool, or an immunocompromising condition, would have reduced testing by 32.3% without significantly reducing clinical yield (sensitivity, 97%; 95%CI, 84.2%-99.9%; negative predictive value, 99.5%; 95% CI, 97.3%-100.0%). In conclusion, the authors claimed that the IDSA guidelines were validated as sensitive but not specific clinical criteria for the use of diagnostic testing and demonstrated that following these guidelines could reduce testing by one-third without reducing clinical yield.

Beckman and Ferrieri (2019) compared the integrity of Verigene Enteric Pathogens (PCR/microarray) test to traditional enteric culture methods for identifying Salmonella and Shigella from stool samples from February 2016 to August 2016. Positive bacterial pathogen samples underwent confirmatory cultures. Valid results were in 3,767/3,795 (99.3%) samples; 487 (13.2%) were positive for at least one bacterial and/or viral pathogen by Verigene and 45.5% tested positive for one or more bacterial pathogens. The most frequently identified pathogens by PCR/microarray were norovirus (50.3%), Campylobacter (18.3%), Salmonella (13.7%) and Shigella (5.8%). Agreement between positive culture-based testing and PCR/microarray was 85.3%. PCR/microarray testing revealed 95.2% and 87.5% sensitivity and 99.8% and 99.8% specificity for Salmonella and Shigella, respectively, compared with cultures. Based on their findings, the authors surmised that the Verigene PCR/microarray platform reliably produced valid stool-test results for common bacterial/viral causes of acute diarrhea in addition to detecting pathogens not identified using culture-based methods.

Performance characteristics of PCR for the detection of Salmonella compared to the gold standard of culture were evaluated by Hapuarachchi et al. (2019). The sensitivity and specificity of PCR using the BD MAX Enteric Bacterial Panel was compared to those of enrichment culture during a nine-month prospective study; all stool samples underwent both PCR and culture for Salmonella. Selenite enrichment culture for salmonella was confirmed using the API 10S and serotyping. A sample size of 6,372 stool culture and PCR pairs were studied. The Salmonella prevalence was reported as 1.2%. The sensitivity, specificity, positive predictive value and negative predictive value of PCR vs. culture was 89% (67/75), 99.8% (6286/6297), 86% (67/78) and 99% (6286/6294), respectively. The conclusion was made that using the BD MAX Enteric Bacterial Panel, enrichment culture was significantly more sensitive than PCR for detecting salmonella in stool samples. The authors, therefore, recommended that when PCR testing is used, concurrent enrichment culture testing for salmonella be performed in parallel.

Tilmanne et al. (2019) compared the results of molecular testing methods and routine diagnostic methods for the detection of acute gastroenteritis (AGE) in symptomatic children and asymptomatic controls. A total of 178 patients admitted to a pediatric emergency department from two hospitals in Brussels from May 2015 to October 2016 were included in the study; 165 asymptomatic controls originated from the same hospitals. Stool samples were taken from all participants and analyzed for common pathogenic bacteria (culture), virus (immunochromatography) and parasites (microscopy). The Luminex Gastrointestinal Pathogen Panel was used for the detection of common enteropathogens using multiplex-PCR. An enteropathogen was detected in 62.4% (111/178) of cases when combining the two methods (56.2% (100/178) by Luminex, 42.7% (76/178) with routine methods) and 29.1% (48/165) of controls (24.2% (40/165) by Luminex and 10.3% (17/165) by routine methods). *Campylobacter*, *Shigella*, *Yersinia* were missed by Luminex, but detected by culture method. However, Luminex detected *Salmonella* more often than routine methods (29/178 (16.3%) vs. 7/178 (3.9%), $p < 0.05$). The authors raised concerns about the pathogens missed by Luminex vs. those detected by culture. While the high positivity and rapid turnaround time for diagnosis of AGE by Luminex is promising, their concern was noted regarding difficulty of result interpretation due to high positivity rates in cases and controls.

One hundred fifty-two stool samples were tested using Verigene® enteric pathogens test, BioFire FilmArray™ gastrointestinal panel and Luminex XTAG® gastrointestinal pathogen panel to compare the performance of each platform. Huang et al. (2019) studied the three platforms for the detection of *Campylobacter*, *Salmonella*, *Shigella*, Shiga-toxin-producing *E. coli*, norovirus, and rotavirus. Reported sensitivities and specificities of the assays were: *Campylobacter*, BioFire (100,100), Verigene (83.3,99.3), Luminex (91.7,100); *Salmonella*, BioFire (95.8,100), Verigene (83.3,100), Luminex (79.2,110); *Shigella*, BioFire (100,100), Verigene (95.4,99.1), Luminex (100,100); *E. coli*, BioFire (100,100), Verigene (91.7,100), Luminex (91.7,100); norovirus, BioFire (94.7,99.3), Verigene (89.0,100), Luminex (89.5,100); and rotavirus, BioFire (100,98.6), Verigene (71.4,100), Luminex (100,100). Each multiplex panel detected the majority of gastrointestinal pathogens when compare to traditional culture-based testing methods; however, the authors added that Verigene and BioFire testing platforms offer rapid, on-demand testing in a moderately complex testing environment, while Luminex with its higher complexity has greater throughput in a single batch.

In a 2018 Molecular Test Assessment (updated in 2022), Hayes conducted an evaluation of multiplex molecular panels for gastrointestinal infections. The report addressed tests including xTAG (15 targets), FilmArray (22 targets), Verigene (9 targets) and BioCode (17 targets) and found an overall low body of evidence related to study quality, lack of a clear, ideal standard test and a lack of evidence regarding clinical utility. However, the report notes that based on the evidence reviewed, xTAG and FilmArray panels showed high clinical validity for most of the available pathogenic targets compared to conventional testing methods. Evidence for clinical utility was more limited. Additionally, although multiplex panels are likely to better detect co-infections, several of the targets in the test were rarely detected (e.g., *Vibrio* spp. and *Yersinia enterocolitica*), making evaluation of clinical validity for those tests impossible.

In a prospective observational study, Keske et al. (2018) aimed to detect the etiological agents of acute diarrhea by a molecular gastrointestinal pathogen test (MGPT) and assess the impact of MGPT on antimicrobial stewardship programs (ASP) for inpatients. Consequent patients who had acute watery diarrhea and fever for more than 72 hours or acute bloody diarrhea, were included in the study. ASP was implemented in acute diarrhea cases and the outcomes were compared in the pre-ASP and post-ASP periods. An FDA-cleared multiplexed gastrointestinal PCR panel system, the BioFire FilmArray which detects 20 pathogens in stool, was used. In total, 699 patients were included. In 499 (71%) patients, at least one pathogen was detected, and 176 out of 499 (36%) were inpatients. The most commonly detected pathogens in acute diarrhea were EPEC, EAEC, ETEC, *Norovirus*, STEC, and *Campylobacter* species. The authors found that MGPT detected high rates of *C. difficile* in children and of *Salmonella* spp., as well as relatively high rates of *Campylobacter* spp., which are hard to isolate by routine stool culture. According to the authors, using MGPT in clinical practice significantly decreased the unnecessary use of antibiotics. Inappropriate antibiotic use decreased in the post-ASP period compared with the pre-ASP period among inpatients (43% and 26%, respectively). However, this was a single center study. In addition, the authors state that the detection of pathogens using MGPT does not mean that the detected pathogen is the cause of diarrhea, so test results should be interpreted carefully.

Beal et al. (2017) assessed the clinical impact of a comprehensive molecular test, the BioFire FilmArray gastrointestinal (GI) panel, which tests for common agents of infectious diarrhea in approximately 1 hour. Patients with stool cultures submitted were tested on the GI panel (n = 241 patients; 223 were hospitalized and 18 were evaluated in the emergency department) and were compared with control patients (n = 594) from the year prior. The most common organisms detected by the GI panel were enteropathogenic *Escherichia coli* (EPEC, n = 21), norovirus (n = 21), rotavirus (n = 15), sapovirus (n = 9), and *Salmonella* (n = 8). Patients tested on the GI panel had an average of 0.58 other infectious stool tests compared with 3.02 in the control group.

The numbers of days on antibiotic(s) per patient were 1.73 in the cases and 2.12 in the controls. Patients with the GI panel had 0.18 abdomen and/or pelvic imaging studies per patient compared with 0.39 in the controls. The average length of time from stool culture collection to discharge was 3.4 days in the GI panel group versus 3.9 days in the controls. According to the authors, the GI panel improved patient care by rapidly identifying a broad range of pathogens which may not have otherwise been detected, reducing the need for other diagnostic tests, reducing unnecessary use of antibiotics, and leading to a reduction in hospital length of stay. This study suggests that the use of multiplex molecular panels result in an improvement in patient clinical outcomes in the setting of hospitalized patients with diarrhea.

Freeman et al. (2017) conducted a systematic review of the evidence for the clinical effectiveness for three multiplex gastrointestinal pathogen panel (GPP) tests (xTAG, FilmArray and Faecal Pathogens B). Twenty-three studies that included patients with acute diarrhea presenting at a community or hospital setting compared GPP tests with standard microbiology techniques. An evidential finding of the review is that GPP testing produces a greater number of pathogen-positive findings than conventional testing, but the clinical importance and consequence of these additional positive findings is uncertain. According to the authors, GPP testing can correctly identify the same positive cases as conventional methods, but GPP testing adds more false positive results which cause unnecessary treatment and potentially a delayed return to normal activities. The authors stated that an additional limitation of GPP tests is that although the presence of bacterial pathogens is identified there is no bacterial culture to support either antimicrobial susceptibility testing or subtyping to support public health surveillance. Culturing from positive samples may be required to guide antimicrobial treatment or public health investigation when these are required.

Buss et al. (2015) evaluated the clinical validity of the FilmArray GI Panel and standard bacterial culture testing. In this cross-sectional study, prospectively collected samples submitted for stool culture were used to evaluate the clinical validity (n = 1556). The majority of the specimens (86.8%) were collected from outpatients, with hospitalized and emergency room patients represented by 10.5% and 2.7% of the total study population, respectively. Cultures were set up within 4 days of specimen collection. FilmArray was performed by blinded BioFire personnel for comparator testing. With respect to standard methods of detection, results suggest that FilmArray is associated with sensitivities ranging from 94.5% to 100% and specificities ranging from 97.1% to 100% across pathogen types.

Khare et al. (2014) conducted a comparative evaluation of the FilmArray GI Panel and the Luminex xTAG GI pathogen panel using stool samples submitted for routine GI testing such as culture, antigen testing, and individual real-time PCR 9 (n = 500). The FilmArray GI Panel targeted 23 pathogens and the Luminex xTAG panel targeted 11 pathogens. Of the samples tested, 230 were prospectively collected and 270 were retrospectively collected. Results suggest the sensitivity of FilmArray across targets ranged from 91.7% to 100% and the specificity ranged from 96.6% to 100% among the prospectively collected specimens. Sensitivity ranged from 95.8% to 100% and specificity ranged from 90.8% to 100% for xTAG. Several targets had lower sensitivity for the retrospectively analyzed samples. Although more than half of the samples were retrospectively analyzed with multiplex assay, data was provided separately for the prospective and retrospective samples.

Clinical Practice Guidelines

American College of Gastroenterology (ACG)

In 2021, Kelly et al. published an ACG clinical guideline addressing *C. difficile*. This guideline recommends that “*C. difficile* infection (CDI) testing algorithms should include both a highly sensitive and highly specific testing modality to help distinguish colonization from active infection”. The guideline also points out that because nucleic acid amplification testing (NAAT) cannot distinguish asymptomatic colonization from active infection, use of a 2-step algorithm is preferred for optimal diagnostic accuracy.

The 2016 ACG Clinical Guidelines for Diagnosis, Treatment, and Prevention of Acute Diarrheal Infections in Adults makes the following diagnosis recommendations (Riddle et al., 2016):

- Stool diagnostic studies may be used if available in cases of dysentery, moderate-to-severe disease, and symptoms lasting > 7 days to clarify the etiology of the patient’s illness and enable specific directed therapy (Strong recommendation, very low level of evidence).
- Traditional methods of diagnosis (bacterial culture, microscopy with and without special stains and immunofluorescence, and antigen testing) fail to reveal the etiology of the majority of cases of acute diarrheal infection. If available, the use of Food and Drug Administration-approved culture independent methods of diagnosis can be recommended at least as an adjunct to traditional methods (Strong recommendation, low level of evidence).

Infectious Diseases Society of America (IDSA)

An IDSA (2018) Clinical Practice Guideline for Laboratory Diagnosis of Infectious Diseases includes the following statements on culture-independent NAATs: “Highly multiplexed assays allow for the detection of mixed infections, where the importance of each pathogen is unclear, and they may allow for the detection of pathogens, such as enteroaggregative *E. coli* or sapovirus, where the indication for therapy is unclear. Culture-independent methods should not be used as test of cure as they will detect both viable and nonviable organisms.” The guideline also acknowledges that culture independent testing methods have a faster turnaround time than culture and have been reported to be more sensitive than culture, resulting in higher rates of detection.

The 2017 IDSA Practice Guidelines for the Diagnosis and Management of Infectious Diarrhea list the following recommendations (Shane et al., 2017):

- People with fever or bloody diarrhea should be evaluated for enteropathogens for which antimicrobial agents may confer clinical benefit, including *Salmonella enterica* subspecies, *Shigella*, and *Campylobacter* (strong recommendation, low level of evidence).
- Enteric fever should be considered when a febrile person (with or without diarrhea) has a history of travel to areas in which causative agents are endemic, has had consumed foods prepared by people with recent endemic exposure, or has laboratory exposure to *Salmonella enterica* subspecies *enterica* serovar Typhi and *Salmonella enterica* subspecies *enterica* serovar Paratyphi (strong recommendation, moderate level of evidence).
- Stool testing should be performed for *Salmonella*, *Shigella*, *Campylobacter*, *Yersinia*, *C. difficile*, and STEC in people with diarrhea accompanied by fever, bloody or mucoid stools, severe abdominal cramping or tenderness, or signs of sepsis (strong recommendation, moderate level of evidence). Bloody stools are not an expected manifestation of infection with *C. difficile* (strong recommendation, moderate level of evidence).
- Stool testing should be performed under clearly identified circumstances for *Salmonella*, *Shigella*, *Campylobacter*, *Yersinia*, *C. difficile*, and STEC in symptomatic hosts (strong recommendation, low level of evidence). Specifically,
 - Test for *Yersinia enterocolitica* in people with persistent abdominal pain (especially school-aged children with right lower quadrant pain mimicking appendicitis who may have mesenteric adenitis), and in people with fever at epidemiologic risk for yersiniosis, including infants with direct or indirect exposures to raw or undercooked pork products.
 - In addition, test stool specimens for *Vibrio* species in people with large volume rice-water stools or either exposure to salty or brackish waters, consumption of raw or undercooked shellfish, or travel to cholera-endemic regions within 3 days prior to onset of diarrhea.
- A broad differential diagnosis is recommended in immunocompromised people with diarrhea, especially those with moderate and severe primary or secondary immune deficiencies, for evaluation of stool specimens by culture, viral studies, and examination for parasites (strong, moderate). People with acquired immune deficiency syndrome (AIDS) with persistent diarrhea should undergo additional testing for other organisms including, but not limited to, *Cryptosporidium*, *Cyclospora*, *Cystoisospora*, *microsporidia*, *Mycobacterium avium* complex, and cytomegalovirus (strong recommendation, moderate level of evidence).
- Diagnostic testing is not recommended in most cases of uncomplicated traveler’s diarrhea unless treatment is indicated. Travelers with diarrhea lasting 14 days or longer should be evaluated for intestinal parasitic infections (strong, moderate). Testing for *C. difficile* should be performed in travelers treated with antimicrobial agent(s) within the preceding 8–12 weeks. In addition, gastrointestinal tract disease including inflammatory bowel disease (IBD) and postinfectious irritable bowel syndrome (IBS) should be considered for evaluation (strong recommendation, moderate level of evidence).
- Blood cultures should be obtained from infants younger than 3 months of age, people of any age with signs of septicemia or when enteric fever is suspected, people with systemic manifestations of infection, people who are immunocompromised, people with certain high-risk conditions such as hemolytic anemia, and people who traveled to or have had contact with travelers from enteric fever–endemic areas with a febrile illness of unknown etiology (strong recommendation, moderate level of evidence).
- Culture-independent, including panel-based multiplex molecular diagnostics from stool and blood specimens, and, when indicated, culture-dependent diagnostic testing should be performed when there is a clinical suspicion of enteric fever (diarrhea uncommon) or diarrhea with bacteremia (strong recommendation, moderate level of evidence).

American Society of Transplantation Infectious Diseases Community of Practice

La Hoz and Morris (2019) recommended that “for the diagnosis of SOT (solid organ transplant) recipients with suspected gastrointestinal infections”, gastrointestinal multiplex molecular assays are recommended to identify *Cryptosporidium*, *Cyclospora*, and *Giardia*.

U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA)

This section is to be used for informational purposes only. FDA approval alone is not a basis for coverage.

There are several commercial multiplex polymerase chain reaction (PCR) kits that have been cleared through the FDA 510(k) clearance process. These include xTAG gastrointestinal pathogen panels (GPPs); FilmArray Panels; Verigene panels; and BioCode GPPs.

To locate marketing clearance information for a specific panel, search the FDA 510(k) premarket notification database available at: <https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/scripts/cdrh/cfdocs/cfpmn/pmn.cfm>. (use Product Codes PCH and PCI). (Accessed November 16, 2022)

References

- Axelrad J, Freedberg D, Whittier S, et al. Impact of gastrointestinal panel implementation on health care utilization and Outcomes. *J Clin Microbiol*. 2019 Feb 27;57(3):e01775-18.
- Beal SG, Tremblay EE, Toffel S, et al. A gastrointestinal PCR panel improves clinical management and lowers health care costs. *J Clin Microbiol*. 2017 Dec 26;56(1). pii: e01457-17.
- Beckman AK, Ferrieri P. Prospective investigation of an automated PCR/nucleic acid microarray-based platform for enteric pathogen testing. *Lab Med*. 2019 Oct 10;50(4):390-395.
- Buss SN, Leber A, Chapin K, et al. Multicenter evaluation of the BioFire FilmArray gastrointestinal panel for etiologic diagnosis of infectious gastroenteritis. *J Clin Microbiol*. 2015 Mar;53(3):915-25.
- Chang L-J, Hsiao C-J, Chen B, et al. Accuracy and comparison of two rapid multiplex PCR tests for gastroenteritis pathogens: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMJ Open Gastro* 2021;8:e000553.
- Clark SD, Sidlak M, Mathers AJ, et al. Clinical yield of a molecular diagnostic panel for enteric pathogens in adult outpatients with diarrhea and validation of guidelines-based criteria for testing. *Open Forum Infect Dis*. 2019 Apr 16;6(4):ofz162.
- Freeman K, Mistry H, Tsertsvadze A, et al. Multiplex tests to identify gastrointestinal bacteria, viruses and parasites in people with suspected infectious gastroenteritis: a systematic review and economic analysis. *Health Technol Assess*. 2017 Apr;21(23):1-188.
- Hayes, Inc. Genetic Test Evaluation Report. Multiplex molecular panels for diagnosis of gastrointestinal infection. Landsdale, PA: Hayes, Inc.; December 18, 2018. Updated October 31, 2022.
- Hapuarachchi CT, Jeffery KJM, Bowler I. Stool PCR may not be a substitute for enrichment culture for the detection of salmonella. *J Med Microbiol*. 2019 Mar;68(3):395-397.
- Huang R, Johnson C, Pritchard L, et al. Performance of the Verigene® enteric pathogens test, Biofire FilmArray™ gastrointestinal panel and Luminex xTAG® gastrointestinal pathogen panel for detection of common enteric pathogens. *Diagn Microbiol Infect Dis*. 2016 Dec;86(4):336-339.
- Kellner T, Parsons B, Chui L, et al. Comparative evaluation of enteric bacterial culture and a molecular multiplex syndromic panel in children with acute gastroenteritis. *J Clin Microbiol*. 2019 May 24;57(6):e00205-19.
- Kelly CR, Fischer M, Allegretti JR, et al. ACG Clinical Guidelines: prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of clostridioides difficile infections. *Am J Gastroenterol*. 2021;116(6):1124-1147.
- Keske Ş, Zabun B, Aksoy K, et al. Rapid molecular detection of gastrointestinal pathogens and its role in antimicrobial stewardship. *J Clin Microbiol*. 2018 Apr 25;56(5). pii: e00148-18.
- Khare R, Espy MJ, Cebelinski E, et al. Comparative evaluation of two commercial multiplex panels for detection of gastrointestinal pathogens by use of clinical stool specimens. *J Clin Microbiol*. 2014 Oct;52(10):3667-73.
- La Hoz R, Morris M. Intestinal parasites including Cryptosporidium, Cyclospora, Giardia, and Microsporidia, Entamoeba histolytica, Strongyloides, Schistosomiasis, and Echinococcus: Guidelines from the American Society of Transplantation Infectious Diseases Community of Practice. *Clin Transplant*. 2019 Sep;33(9):e13618.

Leli C, Di Matteo L, Gotta F, et al. Evaluation of a multiplex gastrointestinal PCR panel for the aetiological diagnosis of infectious diarrhea. *Infect Dis (Lond)*. 2020 Feb;52(2):114-120.

Machiels JD, Cremers AJH, van Bergen-Verkuyten MCGT, et al. Impact of the BioFire FilmArray gastrointestinal panel on patient care and infection control. *PLoS One*. 2020 Feb 6;15(2):e0228596.

Meyer J, Roos E, Combescure C, et al. Mapping of aetiologies of gastroenteritis: a systematic review and meta-analysis of pathogens identified using a multiplex screening array. *Scand J Gastroenterol*. 2020 Dec;55(12):1405-1410.

Miller JM, Binnicker MJ, Campbell S, et al. A Guide to Utilization of the Microbiology Laboratory for Diagnosis of Infectious Diseases: 2018 Update by the Infectious Disease Society of America and the American Society for Microbiology. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2018;67(6):e1-e94.

Montasser K, Osman HA, Abozaid H, et al. Multiplex PCR: Aid to more-timely and directed therapeutic intervention for patients with infectious gastroenteritis. *Medicine (Baltimore)*. 2022 Oct 14;101(41):e31022.

Palavecino, E. One sample, multiple results. *American Association of Clinical Chemistry*. 2015. Available at: <https://www.aacc.org/publications/cln/articles/2015/april/one-sample-multiple-results>. Accessed October 31, 2022.

Pouletty M, De Pontual L, Lopez M, et al. Multiplex PCR reveals a high prevalence of multiple pathogens in traveler's diarrhea in children. *Arch Dis Child*. 2019 Feb;104(2):141-146.

Riddle MS, DuPont HL, Connor BA. American College of Gastroenterology (ACG) Clinical Guideline: diagnosis, treatment, and prevention of acute diarrheal infections in adults. *Am J Gastroenterol*. 2016 May;111(5):602-22.

Shane AL, Mody RK, Crump JA, et al. 2017 Infectious Diseases Society of America Clinical Practice Guidelines for the diagnosis and management of infectious diarrhea. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2017 Nov 29;65(12):1963-1973.

Tilmanne A, Martiny D, Quach C, et al. Enteropathogens in paediatric gastroenteritis: Comparison of routine diagnostic and molecular methods. *Clin Microbiol Infect*. 2019 Dec;25(12):1519-1524.

Truong J, Cointe A, Le Roux E, et al. Clinical impact of a gastrointestinal PCR panel in children with infectious diarrhoea. *Arch Dis Child*. 2022 Jun;107(6):601-605.

Yoo IH, Kang HM, Suh W, et al. Quality improvements in management of children with acute diarrhea using a multiplex-PCR-based gastrointestinal pathogen panel. *Diagnostics (Basel)*. 2021 Jun 28;11(7):1175.

Yoo J, Park J, Lee H, et al. Comparative evaluation of Seegene Allplex Gastrointestinal, Luminex xTAG Gastrointestinal Pathogen Panel, and BD MAX Enteric Assays for detection of gastrointestinal pathogens in clinical stool specimens. *Arch Pathol Lab Med*. 2019 Aug;143(8):999-1005.

Policy History/Revision Information

Date	Summary of Changes
10/01/2023	<p>Application</p> <p>Individual Exchange Plans</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Removed language indicating this Medical Policy does not apply to Individual Exchange benefit plans in the states of Massachusetts, Nevada, and New York <p>Supporting Information</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Archived previous policy version 2023T0604F

Instructions for Use

This Medical Policy provides assistance in interpreting UnitedHealthcare standard benefit plans. When deciding coverage, the member specific benefit plan document must be referenced as the terms of the member specific benefit plan may differ from the standard plan. In the event of a conflict, the member specific benefit plan document governs. Before using this policy, please check the member specific benefit plan document and any applicable federal or state mandates. UnitedHealthcare reserves the right to modify its Policies and Guidelines as necessary. This Medical Policy is provided for informational purposes. It does not constitute medical advice.

This Medical Policy may also be applied to Medicare Advantage plans in certain instances. In the absence of a Medicare National Coverage Determination (NCD), Local Coverage Determination (LCD), or other Medicare coverage guidance, CMS allows a Medicare Advantage Organization (MAO) to create its own coverage determinations, using objective evidence-based rationale relying on authoritative evidence ([Medicare IOM Pub. No. 100-16, Ch. 4, §90.5](#)).

UnitedHealthcare may also use tools developed by third parties, such as the InterQual® criteria, to assist us in administering health benefits. UnitedHealthcare Medical Policies are intended to be used in connection with the independent professional medical judgment of a qualified health care provider and do not constitute the practice of medicine or medical advice.