Evaluation of mannitol salt agar, CHROMagar Staph aureus and CHROMagar MRSA for detection of meticillin-resistant {Staphylococcus aureus} from nasal swab specimens
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INTRODUCTION

{Staphylococcus aureus} is a major pathogen responsible for nosocomial and community-acquired infection. Meticillin-resistant {S. aureus} (MRSA) has emerged as a nosocomial pathogen of major worldwide importance and is an increasingly frequent cause of community-acquired infections that cause significant morbidity and mortality (Rubin et al., 1999). Colonized personnel can serve as a reservoir for the nosocomial spread of MRSA. Active surveillance and timely identification of MRSA colonization of patients is an important infection control activity that helps to prevent nosocomial spread and is cost-effective (Muto et al., 2003; Wernitz et al., 2005). Our goal was to compare the recovery of MRSA on CHROMagar MRSA with that on other conventional (mannitol salt agar) and chromogenic media (CHROMagar Staph aureus).

METHODS

From October 2004 to May 2005, we evaluated several culture media for their ability to detect MRSA colonization from surveillance nasal swabs. Mannitol salt agar (MSA), CHROMagar Staph aureus (CSA) and CHROMagar MRSA (CSA-MRSA) were evaluated with nasal surveillance specimens for their ability to detect {Staphylococcus aureus} and meticillin-resistant {S. aureus} (MRSA). CSA was found to be more sensitive than MSA in detecting {S. aureus} (98 versus 84.3 %; \( P = 0.03 \)). CSA and CSA-MRSA were equivalent in the ability to detect MRSA at 24 h (89.7 versus 87.2 %) and at 48 h (94.9 versus 94.9 %).

When combined with Staphaurex slide confirmation testing, both CSA and CSA-MRSA were highly specific (100 %) media for detecting MRSA from nasal swab specimens.

Abbreviations: CNS, coagulase-negative staphylococci; CSA, CHROMagar Staph aureus; CSA-MRSA, CHROMagar MRSA; MRSA, meticillin-resistant {S. aureus}; MSA, mannitol salt agar.
Diagnostics) and Vitek 2 (bioMérieux). Confirmed S. aureus strains were tested using the cefoxitin disk test according to Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute (2005) guidelines. Coagulase-negative staphylococci (CNS) were identified using the Vitek 2 ID-GP card.

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

Among the 316 nasal surveillance specimens that were used to compare CSA and MSA, S. aureus was isolated from 51 samples, of which 19 (37.3 %) were MRSA (Table 1). CSA showed higher sensitivity than MSA at 24 h (90.2 versus 76.5 % at 24 h; P = 0.11), although the difference was not statistically different; CSA was significantly more sensitive at 48 h (98.0 versus 84.3 % at 48 h; P = 0.03). For CSA and MSA, it was possible to increase the sensitivity by approximately 8 % by incubating negative plates for an additional 24 h. The specificities of CSA and MSA were 99.3 and 99.6 % at 24 h and 89.4 and 95.8 % at 48 h, respectively, without the use of Staphaurex slide test confirmation. The specificities improved, however, to 99.2 and 100 % for CSA and MSA, respectively, at 24 h and 99.6 and 100 % at 48 h, respectively, when the Staphaurex slide test confirmation was used.

Of the 340 nasal surveillance specimens plated on CSA and CSA-MRSA in the phase II analysis, S. aureus MRSA was isolated from 39 samples (Table 2). CSA recovered 89.7 and 94.9 % MRSA at 24 and 48 h, respectively. CSA-MRSA recovered 87.2 and 94.9 % of the MRSA isolates at 24 and 48 h, respectively (CSA versus CSA-MRSA; P not significant). The specificity of both media combined with the Staphaurex slide test was 100 %. One MRSA strain was missed by CSA plus cefoxitin disk-diffusion testing but picked up by CSA-MRSA. This was due to a culture containing both MRSA and meticillin-susceptible S. aureus (MSSA), and only the MSSA was picked from the CSA medium for cefoxitin disk-diffusion testing.

False positives which occurred at 24 h on CSA/CSA-MRSA were all CNS (n = 2). False positives at 48 h on CSA/CSA-MRSA were mostly CNS, *Staphylococcus epidermidis* (n = 5), *Staphylococcus hominis* (n = 1), *Staphylococcus intermedius* (n = 1), seven unidentified, and *Corynebacterium* spp. (n = 2). The false-positive yellow colonies on MSA were *Bacillus* spp. (n = 2) and CNS (n = 9).

Growth from CSA can be used directly for Staphaurex slide test and susceptibility testing according to the manufacturer’s instructions. Performing the Staphaurex slide test directly from mauve colonies increased the specificity of CSA from 99.2 to 99.6 % at 24 h and from 89.4 to 99.2 % at 48 h.

We also tested 32 random MRSA and 32 CNS from frozen storage. All MRSA and CNS isolates gave the expected phenotypes on both CSA and CSA-MRSA at 24 h.

---

### Table 1. Comparison of MSA and CSA for detection of S. aureus (n = 51) from nasal swab specimens

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Incubation time (h)</th>
<th>Sensitivity (%) (95 % CI)*</th>
<th>Specificity (%)† (95 % CI)</th>
<th>Specificity (%)‡ (95 % CI)</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSA</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>90.2 (78.5, 96.7)</td>
<td>99.3 (97.4, 99.9)</td>
<td>99.2 (97.4, 99.9)</td>
<td>0.11§</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>98.0 (89.5, 99.9)</td>
<td>98.4 (85.1, 92.9)</td>
<td>99.6 (97.9, 99.9)</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSA</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>76.5 (62.5, 87.2)</td>
<td>99.6 (97.9, 99.9)</td>
<td>100 (97.8, 100)</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSA</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>84.3 (71.4, 92.9)</td>
<td>95.8 (92.7, 97.9)</td>
<td>100 (97.8, 100)</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*CI, 95 % confidence interval.
†Without Staphaurex slide test confirmation.
‡With Staphaurex slide test confirmation.
§CSA versus MSA at 24 h.
||CSA versus MSA at 48 h.

### Table 2. Comparison of CSA and CSA-MRSA for detection of MRSA (n = 39) from nasal swab specimens

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Incubation time (h)</th>
<th>Sensitivity (%) (95 % CI)*</th>
<th>Specificity (%)† (95 % CI)</th>
<th>Specificity (%)‡ (95 % CI)</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSA</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>89.7 (75.7, 97.1)</td>
<td>Not done</td>
<td>100 (97.8, 100)</td>
<td>0.7§</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>94.9 (82.7, 99.4)</td>
<td>Not done</td>
<td>100 (97.8, 100)</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA-MRSA</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>87.2 (72.6, 95.7)</td>
<td>99.3 (97.6, 99.9)</td>
<td>100 (97.8, 100)</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA-MRSA</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>94.9 (82.7, 99.4)</td>
<td>94.3 (91.1, 96.7)</td>
<td>100 (97.8, 100)</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*CI, 95 % confidence interval.
†Without Staphaurex slide confirmation test.
‡With Staphaurex slide confirmation test.
§CSA versus CSA-MRSA at 24 h, P = 0.7.
||CSA versus CSA-MRSA at 48 h, P = 1.0.
CNS and Corynebacterium medium had 95.2% sensitivity and detecting S. aureus (bioMérieux) (Perry 2006). Other chromogenic media, such as S. aureus comment on false positives with this medium (Stoakes et al. found a sensitivity of 95% and a high specificity, but did not with other selective media, and for nasal swab specimens, and colleagues compared CHROMagar MRSA medium false positives, as we noted in our survey. Similarly, Stoakes et al. (Flayhart medium for detecting MRSA in nasal swab specimens The results from our study are consistent with the findings from a multicentre study using CHROMagar MRSA medium for detecting MRSA in nasal swab specimens (Flayhart et al., 2005). In that study, CHROMagar MRSA medium had 95.2% sensitivity and >96.7% specificity, CNS and Corynebacterium spp. also occasionally exhibited false positives, as we noted in our survey. Similarly, Stoakes and colleagues compared CHROMagar MRSA medium with other selective media, and for nasal swab specimens, found a sensitivity of 95% and a high specificity, but did not comment on false positives with this medium (Stoakes et al., 2006). Other chromogenic media, such as S. aureus ID (bioMérieux) (Perry et al., 2003) are also available for detecting S. aureus. S. aureus ID supplemented with cefoxitin (MRSA ID) has been developed by the same manufacturer, and shows comparable sensitivity and specificity to those of CSA-MRSA (Perry et al., 2004).

Several groups have used molecular methods for the rapid detection of MRSA from clinical specimens within a few hours (Francois et al., 2003; Warren et al., 2004). Although molecular methods provide same-day results, they have certain disadvantages, including the need to batch clinical specimens, greater technical demands than culture, expensive reagents, and the need for specialized laboratory equipment.

In summary, our results indicate that CSA-MRSA, or CSA plus the cefoxitin disk diffusion test, are highly effective for detecting MRSA from nasal swab specimens, and this is consistent with the performance characteristics reported in several recent studies that have used direct inoculation of nasal swab specimens. The excellent inhibition of resistant Gram-negative organisms as well as nasopharyngeal flora allowed for a clear visualization of highly specific mauve colonies. However, mauve colonies on CSA/CSA-MRSA should be confirmed directly from plates using the Staphaurex slide test or the tube coagulase test before the presumptive reporting of S. aureus/MRSA.
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