Serveur Académique Lausannois SERVAL serval.unil.ch

Author Manuscript
Faculty of Biology and Medicine Publication

This paper has been peer-reviewed but dos not include the final publisher proof-corrections or journal pagination.

Published in final edited form as:

serval
serveur académique lausannois

UNIL | Université de Lausanne
Faculté de biologie et de médecine

1 # Q & A: Automation in the Clinical Microbiology Laboratory

2

3 **Moderator:** Carey-Ann D. Burnham[1*]

4 **Experts:** W. Michael Dunne, Jr.[2], Gilbert Greub[3], Susan M. Novak[4], and Robin Patel[5]

5

6 [1]Department of Pathology & Immunology and Pediatrics, Washington University School of Medicine, St.

7 Louis, MO, [2]bioMerieux, Inc., Durham, NC, [3]Institute of Microbiology, University of Lausanne and

8 University Hospital Center, Lausanne, Switzerland, [4]Southern California Permanente Medical Group—

9 Regional Reference Laboratories, [5]Division of Clinical Microbiology, Mayo Clinic, Rochester, MN

10

11

12 *Address correspondence to this author at:

13 Department of Pathology & Immunology

14 Washington University School of Medicine

15 St. Louis, MO 63110

16 Telephone: (314) 362-1547

17 E-mail: cburnham@path.wustl.edu

18

19   The clinical microbiology laboratory has historically been considered "low-tech", especially when

20   compared to the clinical chemistry laboratory. However, systems are emerging for the clinical

21   microbiology laboratory with the potential to automate almost all areas of testing, including inoculation

22   of primary culture plates, detection of growth on culture media, identification of microorganisms,

23   susceptibility testing, and extraction and detection of nucleic acids in clinical specimens. As a result, the

24   workflow in the microbiology laboratory is changing at a rapid pace and microbiologists have the

25   challenge of selecting the most appropriate, clinically useful, and cost-effective automation for their

26   laboratories. We have asked four experts in this field, from clinical microbiology laboratories in the

27   United States and Europe, as well as from industry, to comment on the feasibility and impact of

28   automation in the clinical microbiology laboratory.

29

30   ***Are you currently using or do you anticipate using an automation platform in***

31   ***your microbiology laboratory? If yes, which sections of your laboratory are***

32   ***automated?***

33   **Robin Patel:** Mayo Clinic's clinical microbiology laboratory has been performing testing since 1911.

34   Although select tests today resemble those performed a century ago, we have many examples of

35   automated, state-of-the-art tests. These include blood cultures, infectious diseases serologic platforms

36   and nucleic acid and proteomic diagnostics, to name a few. For over two decades, microbiology

37   laboratories have been using automated blood culture instruments that "sense" microbial growth in

38   blood culture bottles and "flag" positive bottles for immediate attention by laboratory technologists.

39   Prior to the availability of such systems (in the not-so-distant past), laboratory technologists manually

40 evaluated *each* blood culture bottle on *multiple* occasions. Technologists today could not fathom

41 returning to the manual approach used a mere three decades ago. As with many chemistry tests, a

42 myriad of infectious diseases serologic tests are performed on automated platforms. Nucleic acid

43 diagnostics, which have been used in our laboratory for over two decades, are evolving to automated,

44 "black-box"-type formats. We use a core nucleic acid extraction facility preparatory to downstream

45 molecular microbiology testing. And, several of our nucleic acid amplification platforms are fully

46 automated. Finally, matrix assisted laser desorption ionization time of flight mass spectrometry has

47 revolutionized identification of bacteria and fungi in our laboratory. The success of this automated

48 platform lies in advances in mass spectrometry and bioinformatics. With its implementation, we have

49 been able to not only to reduce turn-around-times but also the associated cost of identification of

50 organisms.

51 **Susan M. Novak:** I direct a high volume laboratory servicing 14 hospitals and >100 clinics in the

52 southwestern United States where automation is a necessity. Our integrated health care system

53 services members in a broad geographic area relying on a centralized reference laboratory for

54 processing and work up of approximately 4000 microbiology specimens per day. Our microbiology

55 laboratory has been automated since 2002 with semi-automated and automated plating

56 instrumentation. Greater than 80% of the microbiology specimens arrive at the central laboratory for

57 processing and plating. Based on the high specimen volume the decision was made years ago to

58 capitalize on the economies of scale and allow centralized plating. This improved the plating quality and

59 mitigated ergonomic injuries by automating repetitive manual functions. Specimen processing delay in

60 the medical centers was another reason our health care system chose to centralize and automate

61 microbiology plating. Our laboratory is anticipated to expand over the next several years. This

62 expansion and increased testing volume will continue to put us in the position to incorporate additional

63   automation into the laboratory setting to continue to meet the goal of cost effective quality laboratory

64   testing.

65   **Gilbert Greub:**   Given the current shortage of financial resources and the concomitant increase in

66   activity of our clinical diagnostic microbiology laboratory of about 4 to 12% per year, we decided to

67   move towards a fully automated bacteriology laboratory. We also considered automation a priority for

68   our serological and molecular diagnostic laboratories. Given the ease to automatically handle samples

69   received in a liquid format, automation of serological laboratories is relatively straightforward. The same

70   is true regarding molecular diagnostic laboratories, as soon as the first steps of DNA extraction have

71   been done.   Thus, in our molecular diagnostic laboratory, we now use automation for most DNA

72   extraction and PCRs.   Automation of PCR was associated with (i) reduced technician workload, (ii)

73   reduced rate of PCR contamination (< 1%), and (iii) reduced time to results (< 24h).

74   In our bacteriology laboratory, since fall 2011, we are using an automated inoculation system

75   which was selected among all systems available at that time based on various criteria including number

76   and diversity of samples daily received in our laboratory. This system considerably reduces the

77   technician workload by automatically inoculating and spreading each sample, labeling and sorting

78   inoculated agar plates and   preparing smears for Gram staining.   For microbial identification we

79   currently use two stand-alone automated systems. In 2015, we will move to a fully automated

80   laboratory, by adding the missing pieces to the puzzle, i.e. smart incubators, high quality digital imaging,

81   automated colony picking system and all required transport belts in-between.

82   *Which features or criteria are/would be most important to you when selecting a*

83   *laboratory automation system?*

84 **Susan M. Novak:** Based on our experiences there are several equally important features that need to

85 be considered when selecting laboratory automation.   Specimen volume, mix and timing of specimen

86 arrival in the laboratory will drive the size of instrumentation, throughput requirements and type of

87 automation. Throughput is a very important metric that must be assessed carefully. The laboratory

88 automation capacity must parallel and support the overall specimen volume of each individual

89 laboratory. In addition to throughput, reliability (mean time to failure) of the automation is extremely

90 important. If adjustments to staffing are based on the implementation of automation it is extremely

91 important to have robust instrumentation that has little down time and negative impact on the day to

92 day work flow. Excessive down time impacts staffing (i.e. overtime) in addition to turn-around-time and

93 even the morale of the staff. Implementation of automation in the laboratory is a complex decision and

94 the negative effect of a poor decision cannot be stressed enough. It is important that vendors realize

95 that they must become partners in helping laboratories work through change management with the

96 staff as automation is integrated into the laboratory setting. Employee "buy in" is critical to the success

97 of a new test or piece of automation. Other criteria are important and it is advisable for laboratories

98 considering automation to get input from colleagues that have prior experience.

99 **Robin Patel:** Several issues bear consideration. Cost is paramount – will the system result in increased

100 or decreased operating costs? Increased costs are associated with instrumentation, reagents and/or

101 disposables. Automated systems should be green; in other words, reagents and disposables should be

102 minimal. Decreased costs would primarily be expected to be personnel-related. Laboratory safety is an

103 important consideration as there may be hazards to laboratory personnel associated with automation,

104 either as a result of exposure to hazardous microorganisms or dangerous equipment. As bizarre as the

105 latter may seem, we have had instruments harm laboratory personnel! Space must also be considered –

106 is there space to accommodate automation (and how much remodeling will be needed)? Automation

107 can "solve" problems in the laboratory. Our technologists and laboratory assistants suffered ergonomic

108 injuries (e.g., as a result of repeat pipetting), which are avoided with automation. Quality control *may* be

109 improved, due to avoidance of human error. The possibility of nucleic acid contamination of molecular

110 diagnostic assays deserves careful consideration, even in the era of automation. Systems must interface

111 with electronic medical records for test ordering and result reporting. Volume throughput must be taken

112 into consideration. Can one system/instrument accommodate the laboratory's volumes? Are modules

113 available so that the system can evolve with changing test volumes? Specimen collection containers may

114 need to be standardized to integrate with automated systems. This seemingly trivial task can be

115 monumental in a large healthcare setting. Instrument evaluation may not always be feasible with full-

116 laboratory automation, impacting the decision-making process (i.e., should the laboratory adopt a

117 specific platform). Laboratories will need to address strategies to validate automation. Finally, as

118 laboratories become more reliant on automation, it will be challenging to deal with system failure (due

119 to instrument breakdown or lack of availability of disposables). Back-up plans will need to be carefully

120 considered. We have experienced multiple situations where we have moved all of a certain type of

121 testing to an automated platform only to experience an inability to utilize the platform due to

122 instrument failure or lack of availability of required disposables (which are often offered from sole

123 source suppliers). In such situations, the laboratory may be stranded in terms of testing. Lack of

124 availability of disposables for commonly used systems may have a substantial impact on healthcare

125 across the nation and around the world.

126

127 ***How would automation impact your laboratory operation and workflow? Will***

128 ***microbiology laboratories make a shift towards "24 hour microbiology"?***

6

129   **Robin Patel:**   In our experience, automation has dramatic affects in these areas. For each system

130   adopted, laboratories need to reevaluate operations, workflow, space and staffing assignments. Our

131   laboratory operates 24/7, so increased automation won't change our routine operating hours! Over the

132   next decade, however, I expect to see more automation, including robotic incubation of culture plates,

133   and automated reading of culture plates, as well as automated identification and antimicrobial

134   susceptibility testing of colonies growing on plates (i.e., using "colony pickers"). Automation of tedious

135   tasks will allow reassignment of staff to high value work areas requiring increased use of their

136   intellectual skills. The microbiology technologist of the future will likely apply some of their expertise via

137   computer interfaces (rather than handling culture plates one-by-one).

138   **Wm. Michael Dunne, Jr.:** If a tree falls in the forest and no one is there to hear it, does it make a sound?

139   It follows that the sooner clinically actionable patient results were provided to clinicians, the sooner

140   appropriate therapy would be administered. This, in turn, could potentially reduce overall length of

141   hospitalization with concomitant reduction of patient care costs, risk for nosocomial infection, and

142   improved outcomes. Time to results (TTR) can be reduced in a number of ways including the use of

143   rapid diagnostic platforms (e.g., real-time PCR) or the performance of testing on a more frequent basis.

144   Automation in microbiology holds the promise of specimen processing on a real-time basis that, when

145   coupled to rapid diagnostic modalities could significantly reduce TTR and, by inference, generate

146   positive patient outcomes. Automation, however, doesn't mean the system runs by itself. Additional

147   shifts of operation require personnel support (at least until artificial intelligence algorithms permit

148   accurate interpretation and processing of cultures in the absence of humans). If pertinent patient

149   results are generated and posted on the laboratory information system in the wee hours but not acted

150   upon by medical personnel, then the opportunity is lost and the additional expense of 24 hour operation

151   is not realized in terms of patient outcome. I recall a situation where the laboratory adopted RT-PCR

152   screening for MRSA. Because of the cost of controls, the test was performed once daily in the

153   afternoon. Upon further evaluation, the results were not reviewed by infection prevention staff until

154   the following morning. If the samples had been plated on MRSA screening media when they were

155   received, the results were available sooner in many cases with similar performance characteristics and

156   an isolate for subsequent testing. This does not necessarily apply to reference laboratory testing where

157   results are billed directly to clients and the additional workload of off-shift testing generates real

158   income. In this case, the decision to offer 24-hour testing is found in the balance sheets where

159   additional revenues are offset by labor expenditures and operational costs. In summary, the answer to

160   this question should be based on at least two options - improved patient outcome and/or improved

161   laboratory income. It would be nice if both were realized.

162

163   **Gilbert Greub:** A 24/24 7/7 availability of some immunochromatographic tests, some direct microscopic

164   examination such as blood smear for *Plasmodium* spp. and of selected PCRs is warranted given the

165   clinical impact and the added value of short time to results. However, given the painfulness of night

166   shift, the associated social cost and the relatively low clinical impact of 24/24 7/7 shift for most

167   microbiology processes, a 24 hour microbiology is not a goal of our core bacteriology laboratory.

168   Nevertheless, automation will clearly modify our workflow and organization. Since agar plates may be

169   automatically checked by digital imaging at regular intervals and sterile plates automatically discarded,

170   time to results is significantly improved, especially if the technician working time is extended for

171   instance from 6 a.m. to 10 p.m. Moreover, moving towards paperless telebacteriology will be a major

172   opportunity to improve the working atmosphere by reading agar plates in quiet offices located next but

173   outside the core laboratory, with an expected gain in quality and productivity.

174

175 *Is a full-laboratory automation system appropriate for all types of laboratories?*

176 *Is there a minimum daily specimen volume required to support an automated*

177 *platform?*

178 **Wm. Michael Dunne, Jr:** The simple answer is "it depends." So what does it depend upon? 1.

179 Scalability and modularity. Can an automated microbiology system be appropriately scaled to

180 accommodate the specimen volume and sample types of individual microbiology laboratories with

181 associated cost adjustments and the potential to increase throughput at a later date? For example, I

182 recall an instrument developed in the early 2000's that would screen 300 urine samples per hour and

183 generate rudimentary identification and susceptibility data for the samples if positive. The problem with

184 this business model was that very few laboratories had volumes to justify purchase of the instrument

185 and a scaled down version wasn't available. The system was also very large and was difficult to get into

186 the laboratory proper without demolition activities. So if a one-size-fits-all option is developed by

187 manufacturers, it might limit the market to very large volume laboratories. Modularity would also allow

188 laboratories of various sizes to implement specific units of the system. 2. Availability of skilled labor. As

189 the pipeline of individuals completing training in clinical laboratory science programs at all degree levels

190 decreases, the competition for their services among laboratories will likely increase with the associated

191 cost of competitive salaries and benefits (supply and demand). The reduced availability of a skilled

192 workforce even in smaller laboratories would likely push the equation in favor of automated systems

193 such that fewer individuals could handle the workload while devoting more time to interpretation and

194 other complex processes. 3. Medical economics. Labor, I believe, still remains the single most costly

195 component of any laboratory budget line item so it would be desirable to stabilize and minimize the

196 effects of rising labor costs and shortages. Reimbursement should also be considered in the equation

9

197 and I can't help but believe that reimbursement rates from third-party payers and government agencies

198 won't be going up any time soon. 4. Specimen complexity. Clearly a laboratory that processes several

199 hundred urine samples per day would be more amenable to automation than one that processes a mix

200 of complex sample types. To get back to the question, the answer obviously lies somewhere in between

201 the office lab that processes 5 throat samples and 10 urine cultures per day and a large university-based

202 or reference laboratory that evaluates hundreds to thousands of mixed sample type cultures daily.

203

204 **Gilbert Greub:** Below a given threshold, the cost of the automated system and its maintenance will

205 outweigh the benefit in term of hands on time and quality. The minimum daily specimen volume

206 required to support an automated platform will be different for each platform and cost-effectiveness

207 studies are warranted to define such cut-off. However, these cost analyses are yet completely lacking

208 for automated microbiology systems. For example, when considering the different inoculation systems

209 currently on the market, it readily appear that they target mid-size laboratories since they may inoculate

210 as many as 180 to 270 agar plates per hour. Such throughput of these inoculation systems is also

211 optimal for larger laboratories that generally use several inoculation systems in parallel to ease

212 workflow organization and to provide the necessary back-up during technical failures. Automated

213 systems are optimal when the workflow is continuous, i.e. the efficiency decreases when samples are

214 processed by batch.

215 **Susan M. Novak:** Because all laboratories are not created equal based on depth and scope of work

216 performed, I do not believe that full laboratory automation systems will be appropriate for all

217 laboratories. Incorporation of full laboratory automation will be highly dependent on specimen volume

218 and the need to become more efficient in the workplace and reduce FTE's associated with manual tasks

219 that can be automated. I believe the medium to large size laboratories will be able to justify full

220   laboratory automation more readily because the purchasing of equipment can be tied to a "return on

221   investment" relative to the amount of staff needed in the laboratory to perform certain tasks. Smaller

222   volume laboratories will perhaps take a modular approach with automation, choosing modules or pieces

223   of automation that support the laboratory.   In speaking with various vendors of plating instrumentation

224   platforms, the cut off for a plating instrument appears to be approximately 200 specimens per day. But

225   some vendors do believe smaller labs could still use this automation.   That said, given that full

226   laboratory automation is new to microbiology, each lab must perform an analysis to determine what

227   automation, if any, would be suitable.

228

229   ***Do you anticipate that adoption of an automated microbiology platform would***

230   ***restrict you to using products from one vendor?***

231   **Susan M. Novak:** This is a very interesting question and one many laboratories that are considering

232   automation in microbiology are most likely grappling with.   Today there are several pieces of

233   automation that have been fixtures in the clinical microbiology laboratory for years (i.e.

234   identification/susceptibility and blood culture systems).   In some laboratory settings, such as ours,

235   specimen plating instruments have been incorporated to meet pre-analytical needs.   Because these

236   instruments are unrelated to one another there has never been the need for connectivity. The need for

237   integration all changes with the onset of full laboratory automation.   For example, if plates are

238   transferred via a conveyor below to a smart incubator with a digital camera and a colony is chosen for

239   identification or susceptibility testing, the plate must be sent to a piece of equipment that can pick the

240   colony and inoculate needed materials. In this scenario, connectivity is a prerequisite to full laboratory

241   automation. How will that occur if each piece of automation is from a different vendor? Just because a

242   laboratory chooses pre-analytical plating instruments or a digital incubator should not mean that the

243   identification/susceptibility instrument would need to be changed or that the laboratory will have the

244   money to do so. The question remains will the software on these systems be "open" and can various

245   instruments from varied manufacturers talk to one another? If this is not the case then this could place

246   a huge burden on the laboratory. Switching out several instruments at once would impact the capital

247   expenditure and also impact the number of validations that need to be performed when integrating new

248   equipment into the laboratory setting.

249   **Gilbert Greub:** Adoption of an automated microbiology platform may restrict the use of products

250   proposed by another vendor. Some companies try to protect their market by proposing automated

251   system with no or very low compatibility with systems from other manufacturers. Fortunately, the

252   increasing awareness of clinical microbiologists of the importance of such technical compatibility is

253   progressively pushing the industry to propose flexible solutions. Moreover, some middleware options

254   are available that may solve some incompatibilities between different automated systems and between

255   an automated system and the laboratory information system (LIS).

256

257   *In an era of laboratory automation, do you think that "routine" microbiology*

258   *will continue to be done by specialized microbiology technologists, or do you*

259   *think that generalists and/or chemistry technologists will be involved in this*

260   *testing?*

261   **Gilbert Greub:** Microbiology laboratories will still need technologists trained in microbiology at several

262   steps, including microscopy and agar plate interpretation, since these activities will still represent a

263   pivotal step governing decision on downstream steps. With automation, the proportion of repetitive

264   tasks requiring limited knowledge will decrease whereas specialized tasks will increase, as will the need

265   for specific skills in information technology (IT).

266   **Wm. Michael Dunne, Jr.:** Yes (another hedge!). On one end of the spectrum, less-complicated

267   processes i.e., specimen accessioning, loading of samples into automated plating systems, reading and

268   interpretation of screening media, pulling, subculturing and preparing gram-stains of positive blood

269   cultures, setting up samples for nucleic acid extraction, antimicrobial susceptibility testing (AST),

270   identification (including MALDI-TOF) and interpretation of certain culture types (e.g., urine) can be

271   readily accomplished by well-trained laboratory technicians and generalists. I am a firm believer,

272   however, that the correct interpretation of more complicated specimen cultures (respiratory, GU, GI,

273   nephrostomy urine, CSF, blood, tissue, abscess material, implants, etc.) in the context of relevant patient

274   information requires more focused training and experience. This is especially true for the interpretation

275   of antimicrobial susceptibility testing results. Heck, I've been a clinical microbiologist for more than 30

276   years and still run across results that I can't explain. That is not to say that generalists and/or clinical

277   chemistry technologists can't gain this level of experience over time, but it requires guidance and

278   mentoring. Automation in microbiology doesn't negate the need for interpretive skills. On the contrary,

279   automated systems should enhance the efficacy of microbiology specialists by allowing them to devote

280   their attention toward problem solving and interpretation of complicated sample results or processes.

281   Further, automation in microbiology has not yet supplanted the need to explain test results to clinicians

282   in a clear and knowledgeable manner or to suggest further supplementary testing. So in my estimation,

283   it would behoove the fully automated clinical microbiology laboratory to establish a good mix of

284   microbiology specialists for training, hierarchical result interpretation, and physician interface with

285   generalists capable of maintaining the accelerated workflow.

286 **Susan M. Novak:** Clinical laboratory scientist pools are diminishing due to many technologists retiring

287 and fewer replacements in the workplace due to the elimination of training programs. I believe that the

288 microbiology laboratory will continue to evolve and change relative to how it appears today. Based on

289 the development of more sophisticated automation and software tools there will be a place for the less

290 specialized laboratorian in microbiology. With the advancement of digital microbiology and integrated

291 software programs perhaps a less skilled laboratorian can review cultures that once required a licensed

292 technologist. That said, microbiology will still need to report clinically relevant information to the

293 provider, since not all bacteria growing from a culture is relevant to the patient condition or illness. The

294 specialized microbiologist will still have a place in the laboratory but it is anticipated that the overall mix

295 will change. Advances in molecular testing have already resulted in the introduction of moderately

296 complex instrumentation that is easy to run and can be run by a generalist or chemistry technologist

297 today lacking microbiology expertise.

298

299 *What are the challenges in bringing full-laboratory automation in microbiology*

300 *to market?*

301 **Wm. Michael Dunne, Jr.:** From my point of view (and, again, factor in 30+ years as a clinical

302 microbiologist), the primary hurdle to overcome toward total laboratory automation in microbiology is

303 perception. Unlike our colleagues in clinical chemistry and hematology who have handled much higher

304 levels of automation for many years, clinical microbiology has traditionally been a very tactile, hands-

305 on, interpretive practice that is equal parts art and science. Converting an analog discipline into a digital

306 one will require a paradigm shift. The process of evaluating microbial growth by holding plates, touching

307 colonies with loops and the associated odors (accidentally acquired of course) would be replaced by

308 high resolution images displayed on a flat screen monitor and robotic manipulation of colonies using

309 robotics. Factors that are driving microbiology in the digital direction include laboratory consolidation

310 and associated workload, an aging skilled workforce with more folks reaching full-time shell-collecting

311 age than those entering the profession, and paper-thin margins on reimbursement for services. It is my

312 feeling that the conversion to automation is happening at a more rapid pace in Europe, Asia and South

313 America than it is in the US at the moment but that might change shortly. To accommodate this trend, a

314 number of modules have been or will be developed which replicate activities that are currently being

315 performed manually. These include specimen processing, incubation, culture evaluation, identification,

316 antimicrobial susceptibility testing, and result reporting. The modules supporting each of these

317 processes must be able to function independently as well as in a coordinated fashion to deliver the

318 desired results whether laboratories select individual components or purchase the whole shooting

319 match. With respect to the latter, laboratories and manufacturers will need to form "partnerships" to

320 gain the level of trust, support and service necessary to keep the systems operating 24 hours/day.

321 Simple functions that we currently take for granted in daily operations become complex problems for

322 engineers in the design process such as handling unusual specimen types, movement of plates and

323 imaging within an incubator without contamination, processing anaerobic cultures, or even something

324 as simple as preparing a purity plate for AST. I could go on but imagine the process of setting up disk

325 diffusion plates by automation and you get the point.

326 Another issue that will certainly generate a fair degree of angst for system providers will be the

327 design of clinical trials to gain regulatory clearance for automated microbiology systems. What would

328 be the reference standard, manually processed cultures? What if the culture evaluation module of an

329 automated system provides additional sensitivity in terms of positive growth detection such that

330 specificity appears decreased relative to a manual methods? Should modules be evaluated individually

331   or as a complete system? These issues will have to be settled with regulatory agencies prior to the onset

332   of clinical trials.

333   To conclude, expanding automation in clinical microbiology is a certainty that will necessitate a

334   change in skill sets and expertise among microbiologists or laboratorians in the future. Individuals

335   coming out of clinical laboratory science programs at any degree level will need to accommodate these

336   changes.   Other major issues that will need to be addressed with the automation of the microbiology

337   laboratory include overall capital outlay, minimizing contamination within the system (moulds,

338   mycobacteria, etc.), instrument maintenance and downtime, and in-house validation processes.

339   **Robin Patel:** Challenges include the varied nature of individual laboratories (sizes, physical layouts, test

340   menus, etc.), cost, and ever-evolving biology (including emerging antimicrobial resistance and

341   description of novel infectious agents). Although, chemistry laboratories have enjoyed the benefit of

342   full-laboratory automation for many years, microbiology laboratories have lagged behind because of

343   their multiple specimen types with varying viscosities and container types and sizes, and because of the

344   wide diversity of organisms detected. This variability has hindered the availability of full-laboratory

345   automation for clinical microbiology laboratories. Technology is rapidly changing and improving,

346   however, such that automation in increasingly used in clinical microbiology laboratories, and full-

347   laboratory automation is becoming possible. However, challenges remain. Platforms are not yet fully

348   developed. Laboratories that are early adopters may face availability of newer, "better" options in the

349   near future, and be "stuck" with "antiquated" platforms (analogous to the ever-changing mobile phone

350   or computer industry). There may be a perception on the part of laboratory technologists that they will

351   be "replaced by machines". My personal perspective is that what will be mainly replaced will be the

352   uninteresting aspects of the job of the laboratory technologist. I find it hard to imagine a scenario where

353   laboratories would not need the expertise of experienced, well-trained microbiologists to oversee

354   microbiology testing.

What is the impact of automation in clinical microbiology on patient care?

Robin Patel: This is an area of tremendous potential. Automation may provide expedited patient results, facilitating prompt diagnosis and treatment and avoidance of unnecessary additional testing and associated costs. (Although it would be intuited that automation would decrease turnaround time for patient results, depending on the system design, turnaround time may be increased.) Automation may increase the availability of results after-hours, necessitating new systems for acting on such results (i.e., at times when healthcare staff is not traditionally available). Automation may avoid falsely positive or negative results associated with human error. Automated reading of culture plates may facilitate recognition of colony growth not appreciated with the naked eye, enabling enhanced sensitivity and earlier detection. Finally, technologic advances will likely bring testing closer to the patient; I predict that some automated microbiology tests will move out of the laboratory, in a variety of formats, including automated patient self-testing (for certain organisms).

Gilbert Greub: During the last ten years, several innovations in microbiology such as MALDI-TOF MS and point of care molecular assays have had major impact on patient care, since these new diagnostic approaches are significantly reducing the time to results. Automation in molecular diagnosis has also contributed to a significant decrease in turnaround time. Automation in clinical microbiology will also have some impact on patient care by improving traceability, reproducibility and quality. This is especially true for automated inoculation system that helps much (i) in term of traceability and (ii) in getting high-quality spreading of the inoculum over the agar plate, with a higher number of isolated colonies that may be used for downstream identification and characterization. Thus, although the precise impact of automation on patient care has not yet been precisely assessed, I am convinced that in addition to the benefit of automation on the laboratory workflow and in avoiding repetitive uninteresting tasks, there is also some benefit of automation on patient care.