Cell PRESS

# Biosensor diagnosis of urinary tract infections: a path to better treatment?

**Kathleen E. Mach[1,2], Pak Kin Wong[3] and Joseph C. Liao[1,2]**

[1] Stanford University, Department of Urology and Bio-X Program, 300 Pasteur Drive, S-287, Stanford, CA 94305, USA
[2] Veterans Affairs Palo Alto Health Care System, Palo Alto, CA, USA
[3] University of Arizona, Department of Aerospace and Mechanical Engineering, PO Box 210119, Tucson, AZ 85721, USA

**Urinary tract infection (UTI) is among the most common bacterial infections and poses a significant healthcare burden. The standard culture-based diagnosis of UTI has a typical delay of two to three days. In the absence of definitive microbiological diagnosis at the point of care, physicians frequently initiate empirical broad-spectrum antibiotic treatment, and this has contributed to the emergence of resistant pathogens. Biosensors are emerging as a powerful diagnostic platform for infectious diseases. Paralleling how blood glucose sensors revolutionized the management of diabetes, and how pregnancy tests are now conducted in the home, biosensors are poised to improve UTI diagnosis significantly. Biosensors are amenable to integration with microfluidic technology for point-of-care (POC) applications. This review focuses on promising biosensor technology for UTI diagnosis, including pathogen identification and antimicrobial susceptibility testing, and hurdles to be surpassed in the translation of biosensor technology from bench to bedside.**

## Are better diagnostics needed for urinary tract infections?

Infectious diseases remain one of the greatest challenges to global health. A key barrier towards improving the management of infectious diseases is the absence of rapid and accurate diagnostic information to direct treatment decisions at the POC. Urinary tract infection (UTI) is among the most common bacterial infections and poses a significant healthcare burden [1]. Almost 50% of the global population will experience a UTI at some point in their lives, and those who suffer from recurrent, complicated UTI can have more than three episodes of infection per year [2–6]. As the most common healthcare-associated infection, UTI accounts for more than 30% of infections reported by acute-care hospitals [7–9]. As with most bacterial infections, diagnosis of UTI depends on culturing the clinical sample in a centralized clinical laboratory, and this has a typical delay of two to three days from sample acquisition to delivery of the culture and susceptibility results. This delay is due to the need for sample transport to centralized laboratories and the time required for bacteria to grow on artificial media for phenotypic identification.

In general, UTI is defined as the presence of urinary symptoms (e.g. frequency, dysuria, and pyuria) and $10^4$ cfu/ml or greater uropathogens in urine. Depending on the clinical scenario and the method of urine collection, however, this definition can vary [10]. *E. coli* is the most common cause of UTI, accounting for up to 70% of community-acquired and 50% of hospital-associated UTIs [1]. Other important uropathogens include *Proteus mirabilis, Pseudomonas aeruginosa, Klebisella pneumoniae*, and *Enterococcus* species.

UTI often presents as a clinical conundrum. It is rarely fatal, yet highly morbid and affects all patient demographics. Although effective treatments are available, the associated urinary symptoms are nonspecific and overlap with numerous other non-infectious entities. Furthermore, the presence of bacteria in urine does not always necessitate treatment, but differentiation of asymptomatic bacteriuria from UTI is subjective, particularly in patients with urinary catheters and other neurological or anatomical impairments of the bladder. These challenges, coupled with the inherent delay of urine culture, contribute to widespread mis- and overuse of antibiotics, and this has accelerated the selection of resistant pathogens and decreased the lifespan of antibiotics [11]. The rate of UTI caused by *E. coli* resistant to trimethoprim–sulfamethoxazole is typically greater than 30%, and resistance to fluoroquinolones ranges from 11% to greater than 50% in some patient populations [12–16]. Infections caused by multidrug-resistant pathogens, such as extended-spectrum beta-lactamase (ESBL) *Enterobacteriaceae* [17], methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA) [18], and fluoroquinolone-resistant *Pseudomonas*, are increasingly seen in the urinary tract and are among the most challenging public health issues today [11].

There is significant interest in developing rapid diagnostics for UTI. Widely adopted in the 1980s, the urine dipstick is a simple POC test for assessing leukocyte esterase (produced by white blood cells) and nitrite (found in urine in the presence of nitrate-reducing bacteria) [19]. More recently, automated platforms of urinary flow cytometry capable of rapid detection of bacteria, white blood cells, red blood cells, epithelial cells, casts, crystals, yeasts and spermatozoa, have been developed and widely adopted by centralized laboratories [20,21]. Although rapid, these technologies do not provide microbiological diagnosis and susceptibility information, which remains the cornerstone of diagnosis, and particularly in settings of complicated UTI [22]. Modern clinical microbiology laboratories utilize high-throughput systems (e.g. Vitek) that monitor bacterial $CO_2$ production for antimicrobial susceptibility testing

*Corresponding author:* Liao, J.C. (jliao@stanford.edu).


0165-6147/$ – see front matter. Published by Elsevier Ltd. doi:10.1016/j.tips.2011.03.001 Trends in Pharmacological Sciences, June 2011, Vol. 32, No. 6

(AST) [23,24]. These high-throughput instruments have semi-automated sample processing, but remain relatively slow and are not amenable for POC use.

Rapid and definitive POC diagnosis of UTI would have an enormous favorable impact on its management: timely antibiotic treatment could be initiated and imprecise empirical treatment obviated. The new generation of biosensors based on micro- and nanotechnologies offers the possibility of highly sensitive molecular diagnosis within a compact platform and low power consumption suitable for POC applications. Analogous to how the blood glucose sensors revolutionized the management of diabetes, and how lateral-flow tests have enabled home pregnancy testing, biosensors hold the promise to personalize the treatment of UTI and potentially improve its outcomes. Here we highlight recent developments in molecular UTI diagnostics based on biosensors. Drawing on parallels with other successful biosensors in clinical use today, we discuss the hurdles that remain to be surpassed in translating biosensors for UTI applications. Many comprehensive reviews of the rapidly advancing field of biosensors are available for the interested reader [25–33].

## Biosensors basics

A biosensor is any device or system capable of detecting a biological entity, ranging from lateral-flow test strips for pregnancy testing [34] to cell-based sensors using B-lymphocytes to detect pathogens [35]. In the simplest sense, a biosensor is composed of a recognition element and a signal transducer (Figure 1). Binding of the target (analyte) to the recognition element leads to generation of a measurable signal (e.g. electrons, light, mass effect) that is then detected by the transducer. For quantitative detection, the magnitude of the signal is proportional to the analyte concentration. Common examples of recognition elements include antibodies, enzymes, receptors, nucleic acids, aptamers, and other synthetic molecules. Common transducers include electrodes for electrochemical sensors and CCD cameras for optical sensors [25,26,28,30,32]. Recent technological advances have led to development of ultrasensitive transducers, such as avalanche photodiodes and nanostructure field-effect transistors, which are capable of detection down to the single molecule level [26,36]. To improve detection sensitivity a secondary recognition element (e.g. detector antibody) is frequently used in a 'sandwich' format and is labeled with signaling molecules (e.g. enzymes, fluorophores, nanoparticles, or quantum dots) to amplify the signal further, therefore obviating the need for direct labeling of the analyte.

## What can UTI biosensors learn from the glucose sensor: a model of translation

Almost 50 years after its first description and 30 years after introduction in its current form, the portable blood glucose sensor stands out as the most successful biosensor in commercial use today. Glucose sensors represent over 85% of the $7 billion market on biosensors [27,37]. The glucose sensor is an example of an electrochemical sensor – and here the enzyme glucose oxidase serves as the recognition element that is immobilized on an electrode. The oxidation of glucose in the blood by glucose oxidase produces measurable electroactive species that are detected by the electronic interface [37]. The binding site of the enzyme provides exquisite specificity for glucose and the measured signal is therefore proportional to the blood concentration. By contrast, the home pregnancy test is a lateral-flow assay in which binding of a monoclonal antibody against human choriogonadotropin (hCG) in urine generates a visible color change [38]. For multiplex assays, the most well-known example that is widely used in emergency departments and intensive care units is the i-STAT, a handheld analyzer for common blood chemistry parameters [39]. This is an integrated electrochemical sensor with a set of electrodes of differing electrolyte specificities.

These examples illustrate the crucial aspects of the successful biosensors in the clinical arena – portability, rapidity, and cost-effectiveness – in comparison with their macro-scale counterparts. The epidemic scale of diabetes worldwide, the evidence that strict control of blood glucose improves clinical outcome, and relatively low cost have driven the success of the glucose sensors [40,41]. The simplicity of depositing a drop of blood or urine onto the sensor for rapid readout with minimal or no manipulation by the end-user is another key feature. In the setting of a defined clinical need, the simplicity and cost-effectiveness of these biosensors allowed them to gain wide acceptance. The features of these assays that make them successful can serve as a model to follow for emerging applications of biosensors for molecular diagnostics, including UTI.

Several issues need to be considered in developing biosensor applications for UTI, including sample preparation and matrix management. Furthermore, given the




**Figure 1**. A biosensor is a molecular sensing device composed of a recognition element and transducer. Specific binding of the target analyte to the recognition element generates a measurable signal (e.g. light, electrical current) that is detectable via the transducer [e.g. charge-coupled device (CCD) camera, photodiode, electrode]. Common examples of recognition elements include enzymes, antibodies, and DNA that are able to bind specifically to target analytes, including glucose, ions, protein, and nucleic acids which are indicative of the state of health or disease. The matrix is the biological medium (e.g. blood, urine, saliva) with varying biochemical parameters and nonspecific cells and molecules that could impact upon the performance of the biosensor.

multitude of potential pathogens and polymicrobial UTI in certain settings, the assay needs to have multiplexing capability. In contrast to blood glucose or urine hCG, detecting the target analytes for UTI require multi-step sample preparation steps, including pipetting (i.e. reagent transfer and mixing), centrifugation (separation and concentration) and washing. Although easily performed in a laboratory setting, they are not practical in POC settings. If the target analyte is intracellular (i.e. nucleic acids), an additional step of bacterial lysis is required. For nucleic acid targets at low concentration, intermediate enrichment steps such as PCR can be needed to amplify the target before detection [42]. Although PCR can be used for sensitive detection of nucleic acids, it has shortcomings including additional sample preparation steps to remove potential inhibitors and false positives from urine samples that could contain low levels of skin flora.

The sensitivity of a biosensor can be limited by other factors, such as nonspecific binding and the matrix effect. Particularly for clinical applications, the type of biological matrix (e.g. urine, blood, saliva) can significantly impact upon sample preparation steps and sensor performance. Many of the constituents of urine can vary over a broad range [43,44]. As examples, urine pH can range from 4.5 to 9, and healthy urine has very few cells whereas an infected sample can have concentrations of bacteria and white blood cells greater than $10^8$ cells/ml.

Specifically for UTI, a successful biosensor needs to meet the following criteria: (i) the ability to definitively rule out infection; (ii) the assay needs to be fast, within the POC time-frame to effect treatment planning; (iii) automation of the sample preparation with minimal intervention from the end-user ('plug and play'); (iv) robust assay protocol compatible with urine matrix effect; (v) incorporation of pathogen identification with antimicrobial susceptibility testing; and (vi) sufficiently versatile to be adaptable for different pathogen profiles in different clinical scenarios.

## Rapid diagnostics for UTI: pathogen identification

An example of a biosensor for uropathogen identification is the UTI Sensor Array [45–48]. The sensor-platform is based on an electrochemical sensor array customized with bacterial specific DNA probes as recognition elements. Each of the 16 sensors is modified with a surface layer step (termed self-assembled monolayer) to allow versatility in surface modification and reduce background noise [49,50]. A library of DNA probes targeting the most common uropathogens is immobilized on the sensor surface [45,47]. The detection protocol is based on conversion of hybridization events into quantifiable electrochemical signals.

Figure 2 shows a schematic of detection by the UTI Sensor Array. The urine sample is first lyzed. Bacterial 16S rRNA is then detected by sandwich hybridization of capture and detector oligonucleotide probe pairs. 16S rRNA is an ideal target for pathogen identification because it is one of the most abundant molecules in bacteria and has sequences that are highly conserved as well as sequences unique to individual species [51,52]. The relative abundance of the 16S rRNA (approximately 10 000 copies per cell) precludes the need for nucleic acid amplification [51]. The capture probe is immobilized to the sensor surface and the detector probe is free in solution. The fluorescein-labeled detector probe binds to an anti-fluorescein antibody conjugated to horseradish peroxidase (HRP). The signal is then generated by the redox reaction catalyzed by HRP with $H_2O_2$ as the substrate and TMB as the electron mediator [53]. This multiplex assay uses universal probes targeting 16S rRNA sequences conserved in all bacterial species, as well as genus- and species-specific probes, allowing detection of all bacteria via hybridization to the universal probe and refined typing of the most common causative agents. The UTI Sensor Array currently has an overall detection limit of $10^4$ cfu/ml, which is within the clinical cutoff compared to urine culture [47]. In testing




**Figure 2**. Multiplex pathogen-detection scheme using an array of 16 electrochemical biosensors (UTI Sensor Array). Each sensor is composed of 3 electrodes: working, reference, and counter. **(a)** Lysis of pathogens in urine samples releases the 16S rRNA target. **(b)** Hybridization of the 16S rRNA targets with a cocktail of detector probes labeled with fluorescein (orange sphere). **(c)** Deposition of the 16S rRNA-detector probe hybrid onto the sensor surface (working electrode) for sandwich hybridization with the capture probes. Biotin-labeled (grey sphere) capture probes of different specificities are tethered to the surface of each sensor. **(d)** Binding of the anti-fluorescein horseradish peroxidase (HRP) enzyme tag to the sandwich hybrid. **(e)** Oxidation of the HRP substrate $H_2O_2$ and electron mediator tetramethylbenzidine (TMB) under a fixed voltage generates an electroreduction current. The magnitude of the signal output corresponds to the starting concentration for each pathogen. The limit of detection is $10^4$ cfu/ml. Modified from [47] with permission from the copyright holder, Elsevier.

with patient urine samples, the UTI Sensor Array had 92% overall sensitivity and 97% specificity for pathogen detection compared to urine culture [47,48].

In addition to the UTI Sensor Array, several other technology platforms for rapid molecular diagnostics have been recently described. PCR-based approaches to pathogen identification also show promise as rapid molecular diagnostics for infectious diseases [54]. Recently Lehmann *et al.* demonstrated direct real-time PCR identification of pathogens from patient urine samples [55,56]. The PCR primers they designed for uropathogen detection in this assay had a sensitivity and specificity of 90% and 87%, respectively. For detection of intact bacteria, matrix-assisted laser desorption ionization time-of-flight mass spectrometry (MALDI-TOF MS) has been described [57,58]. For microorganisms, MALDI-TOF MS spectra can be used to differentiate genus and species and potentially even differentiate strains of an organism. Ferreira *et al.* have applied MALDI-TOF MS to the detection of pathogens from urine samples [59–61]. Still at the early stage of technology validation, these technologies share the challenges of implementation in POC settings.

## Antimicrobial susceptibility testing (AST)

Because of the diversity of potential pathogens in the urinary tract, pathogen identification assays need to be complemented by AST to permit selection of appropriate antibiotics for optimal treatment. For current standard clinical laboratory analysis, pathogens must first be cultured and isolated for AST. The pathogen is then grown in the absence and presence of the antibiotics. Growth in the presence of an antibiotic indicates resistance. This phenotypic assay is robust because it remains reliably independent of the genetic basis of the antibiotic resistance.

An alternative approach is to use a genetic approach based on PCR of known resistance-conferring genes or high-throughput microarray of known genetic mechanisms of resistance [62]. PCR-based AST has been clinically successful for the identification and differentiation of methicillin-susceptible *S. aureus* and methicillin-resistant *S. aureus* [63,64]. An important shortcoming of the genotypic approach is that genetic mechanisms of AST are constantly evolving and therefore new resistant strains might not necessarily manifest in screens for known mutations.

Recently we described a biosensor-based AST (b-AST) which combines the versatility of the phenotypic assay with genotypic specificity of the 16S rRNA probes [48]. In this assay, following pathogen identification, 16S rRNA is utilized as a bacterial growth marker for phenotypic AST (Figure 3). Each electrode on the UTI Sensor Array biosensor is tethered with an oligonucleotide probe specific to the bacterial species of interest and is used to measure growth of the pathogen under different antibiotic conditions. Biosensor signals from samples incubated with an antibiotic were comparable in magnitude to biosensor signals from samples incubated without antibiotic, indicating comparable growth and thus antibiotic resistance.




**Figure 3**. Biosensor diagnosis of UTI is significantly faster than standard culture-based approach. Pathogen identification (ID) and biosensor-based antimicrobial susceptibility test (b-AST) can be completed within 1 and 3.5 h, respectively, compared to 1–3 d for standard culture. Reprinted from [48] with permission from the copyright holder, Elsevier.

In laboratory testing with patient samples, the overall accuracy of b-AST was 94% [48], close to the maximum error rate allowed for a new AST to be considered for FDA approval [65]. The major advantage of the biosensor approach over standard AST is time. Because the biosensor specifically detected the pathogen of interest, pathogen isolation through overnight plating is not necessary. The overall assay time is currently 3.5 h, compared to over 18 h for standard AST (Figure 3) [48]. The b-AST approach is inherently compatible with microfluidics, which facilitates the implementation at the POC and allows on-chip sample preparation.

### Sample preparation is a technology bottleneck

A major limitation of many current biosensor assays and molecular diagnostics is the reliance on manual sample-preparation steps. Although many existing 'lab-on-a-chip' platforms have small dimensions, they still require various ancillary equipment to be operational, effectively functioning as a 'chip-in-a-lab' [66–68]. To enable automated sample preparation at the POC, microfluidics technology, or fluidic manipulation at the micron scale, is a core technology that will integrate the reagent transfer, target isolation, and sample-mixing steps in a multi-layered cartridge containing channels, valves, and reagent reservoirs [67,69–72]. Another related technology to simplify sample preparation further is electrokinetics – which allows direct manipulation of the bulk fluid or selective cells and molecules for pumping, mixing, concentration, and separation in microfluidic systems. An inherent advantage of electrokinetics is its compatibility with both optical and electrochemical detection as well as with other microfluidic components [73,74].

Biosensors integrated with a microfluidic cartridge have recently been described [42,66]. These disposable cartridges have majority of the necessary components for sample handling with dimensions comparable to a credit card. The cartridge can be inserted into a portable reader device. Electrochemical sensors are well-suited for integration with microfluidic systems. Perhaps not surprisingly, both the glucose sensor and the i-STAT are electrochemical sensors, illustrating their compatibility with POC applications.

### The future outlook

In the last five years biosensor diagnosis for UTI has moved beyond proof-of-concept to validation with clinical samples, with development of assays for rapid molecular pathogen identification and AST. The UTI Sensor Array offers a promising technology platform without the need for nucleic acid amplification. The current technology bottleneck is at sample preparation and system integration, and this is crucial for the technology to be used in decentralized settings such as clinician offices and emergency departments.

The short-term goal of the rapid UTI diagnostics is not to eliminate but to complement clinical laboratories. Clinical laboratories will still be essential particularly when the rapid test indicates unusual pathogens or unusual susceptibility profiles. Patients occasionally present with UTI caused by the presence of fastidious anaerobic bacteria that are missed by the methods of routine culture [75,76]. Many of the rapid methods for pathogen detection have the potential to identify the presence of a pathogen in these situations and thus direct culture conditions such as anaerobic incubation in the laboratory.

The versatility of the biosensors and the potential for multiplexing also raises the possibility that future UTI diagnostics based on biosensors will, in addition to being faster, be more informative than the current approach. For example, the degree of host response can differ in patients with asymptomatic bacteriuria compared to true UTI, and could be determined by measuring host-immunity proteins in urine. There is considerable interest in the identification and measurement of protein biomarkers that indicate the severity of UTI and can differentiate infections from asymptomatic bacteriuria [77]. Addition of protein biomarker analysis to the biosensor assay could even further improve its diagnostic capability [50].

It is interesting to note that the initial introduction of glucose sensors was met with considerable skepticism over whether these would ever be useful or cost-effective [78,79]. For biosensor diagnosis of UTI – or any POC molecular diagnostic tests for infectious diseases – to succeed, stakeholders including patients, clinicians, and third-party payers will need to carefully assess the utility and the cost-effectiveness of such technology. Test strips for the glucose sensor and home pregnancy tests cost about $5. The charge for urine culture can range from $95 to over $200 according to the California Office of Statewide Health Planning and Development (http://www.oshpd.ca.gov/). If mass-produced, UTI biosensors might only be modestly more expensive than glucose strips or pregnancy tests due to increased complexity, but will probably be less expensive than standard urine culture. Additional cost savings will probably come from decreased utilization of broad-spectrum antibiotics in both inpatient and outpatient settings.

### Conclusions

UTI is a common bacterial infection that affects all patient demographics. There is a significant need for improved diagnostics, including pathogen identification and antimicrobial susceptibility profiling. Evidence-based treatment plans can therefore be implemented and judicious usage of antibiotics applied. Biosensors offer a promising approach for delivering highly sensitive molecular diagnostic testing in POC settings. With continuing technology advancements and clinical acceptance, they will potentially lead to a paradigm-shift for UTI diagnosis and treatment and serve as a model for other common infectious diseases.

#### Acknowledgments

We thank Vincent Gau PhD and members of the Liao and Wong Laboratories for helpful discussions. Supported by National Institutes of Health (NIH)/National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases grant U01 AI082457, Department of Veterans Affairs Merit Review B4872R, and National Science Foundation Collaborative Research Grant 0901440 to J.C.L., and NIH grant DP2 OD007161 to P.K.W.

#### References

1 Foxman, B. (2010) The epidemiology of urinary tract infection. *Nat. Rev. Urol.* 7, 653–660
2 Dielubanza, E.J. and Schaeffer, A.J. (2011) Urinary tract infections in women. *Med. Clin. N. Am.* 95, 27–41
3 Foxman, B. (2002) Epidemiology of urinary tract infections: incidence, morbidity, and economic costs. *Am. J. Med.* 113 (Suppl. 1A), 5S–13S

4 Griebling, T.L. (2005) Urologic diseases in america project: trends in resource use for urinary tract infections in men. *J. Urol.* 173, 1288–1294
5 Griebling, T.L. (2005) Urologic diseases in America project: trends in resource use for urinary tract infections in women. *J. Urol.* 173, 1281–1287
6 Raynor, M.C. and Carson, C.C., 3rd (2011) Urinary infections in men. *Med. Clin. N. Am.* 95, 43–54
7 Klevens, R.M. *et al.* (2007) Estimating health care-associated infections and deaths in U.S. hospitals, 2002. *Public Health Rep.* 122, 160–166
8 Nicolle, L. (2001) Epidemiology of urinary tract infection. *Infect. Med.* 18, 153–162
9 Schappert, S.M. and Burt, C.W. (2006) Ambulatory care visits to physician offices, hospital outpatient departments, and emergency departments: United States, 2001-02. *Vital Health Stat.* 13, 1–66
10 Kunin, C. (1997) Diagnostic methods, In *Urinary Tract Infections: Detection, Prevention, and Management*, Williams &Wilkins, pp. 42–77
11 Boucher, H.W. (2010) Challenges in anti-infective development in the era of bad bugs, no drugs: a regulatory perspective using the example of bloodstream infection as an indication. *Clin. Infect. Dis.* 50 (Suppl. 1), S4–S9
12 Zhanel, G.G. *et al.* (2006) Antibiotic resistance in *Escherichia coli* outpatient urinary isolates: final results from the North American Urinary Tract Infection Collaborative Alliance (NAUTICA). *Int. J. Antimicrob. Agents* 27, 468–475
13 Ho, P.L. *et al.* (2007) Antimicrobial resistance in *Escherichia coli* outpatient urinary isolates from women: emerging multidrug resistance phenotypes. *Diagn. Microbiol. Infect. Dis.* 59, 439–445
14 Johnson, L. *et al.* (2008) Emergence of fluoroquinolone resistance in outpatient urinary *Escherichia coli* isolates. *Am. J. Med.* 121, 876–884
15 Boyd, L.B. *et al.* (2008) Increased fluoroquinolone resistance with time in *Escherichia coli* from >17,000 patients at a large county hospital as a function of culture site, age, sex, and location. *BMC Infect. Dis.* 8, 4
16 Jensen, U.S. *et al.* (2010) Effect of generics on price and consumption of ciprofloxacin in primary healthcare: the relationship to increasing resistance. *J. Antimicrob. Chemother.* 65, 1286–1291
17 Freeman, J.T. *et al.* (2009) Emergence of extended-spectrum beta-lactamase-producing Escherichia coli in community hospitals throughout North Carolina: a harbinger of a wider problem in the United States? *Clin. Infect. Dis.* 49, e30–32
18 Routh, J.C. *et al.* (2009) Increasing prevalence and associated risk factors for methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* bacteriuria. *J. Urol.* 181, 1694–1698
19 Deville, W.L. *et al.* (2004) The urine dipstick test useful to rule out infections A meta-analysis of the accuracy. *BMC Urol.* 4, 4
20 Jolkkonen, S. *et al.* (2010) Screening of urine samples by flow cytometry reduces the need for culture. *J. Clin. Microbiol.* 48, 3117–3121
21 Pieretti, B. *et al.* (2010) Diagnosis of bacteriuria and leukocyturia by automated flow cytometry compared with urine culture. *J. Clin. Microbiol.* 48, 3990–3996
22 Schwartz, D.S. and Barone, J.E. (2006) Correlation of urinalysis and dipstick results with catheter-associated urinary tract infections in surgical ICU patients. *Intensive Care Med.* 32, 1797–1801
23 Eigner, U. *et al.* (2005) Analysis of the comparative workflow and performance characteristics of the VITEK 2 and Phoenix systems. *J. Clin. Microbiol.* 43, 3829–3834
24 Thomson, K.S. *et al.* (2007) Comparison of Phoenix and VITEK 2 extended-spectrum-beta-lactamase detection tests for analysis of *Escherichia coli* and *Klebsiella* isolates with well-characterized beta-lactamases. *J. Clin. Microbiol.* 45, 2380–2384
25 Drummond, T.G. *et al.* (2003) Electrochemical DNA sensors. *Nat. Biotechnol.* 21, 1192–1199
26 Hunt, H.K. and Armani, A.M. (2010) Label-free biological and chemical sensors. *Nanoscale* 2, 1544–1559
27 Lee, T.M. (2008) Over-the-counter biosensors: past, present, and future. *Sensors* 8, 5535–5559
28 Llandro, J. *et al.* (2010) Magnetic biosensor technologies for medical applications: a review. *Med. Biol. Eng. Comput.* 48, 977–998
29 Newman, J.D. and Setford, S.J. (2006) Enzymatic biosensors. *Mol. Biotechnol.* 32, 249–268
30 Oh, K.J. *et al.* (2009) Beyond molecular beacons: optical sensors based on the binding-induced folding of proteins and polypeptides. *Chemistry* 15, 2244–2251
31 Rapp, B.E. *et al.* (2010) Biosensors with label-free detection designed for diagnostic applications. *Anal. Bioanal. Chem.* 398, 2403–2412
32 Ronkainen, N.J. *et al.* (2010) Electrochemical biosensors. *Chem. Soc. Rev.* 39, 1747–1763
33 Wang, J. (2006) Electrochemical biosensors: towards point-of-care cancer diagnostics. *Biosens. Bioelectron.* 21, 1887–1892
34 Eichner, S.F. and Timpe, E.M. (2004) Urinary-based ovulation and pregnancy: point-of-care testing. *Ann. Pharmacother.* 38, 325–331
35 Rider, T.H. *et al.* (2003) A B-cell-based sensor for rapid identification of pathogens. *Science* 301, 213–215
36 Tsutsui, M. *et al.* (2011) Single-molecule identification via electric current noise. *Nat. Commun.* 1, 138
37 Oliver, N.S. *et al.* (2009) Glucose sensors: a review of current and emerging technology. *Diabet. Med.* 26, 197–210
38 Chard, T. (1992) Pregnancy tests: a review. *Hum. Reprod.* 7, 701–710
39 Erickson, K.A. and Wilding, P. (1993) Evaluation of a novel point-of-care system, the i-STAT portable clinical analyzer. *Clin. Chem.* 39, 283–287
40 Kissinger, P.T. (2005) Biosensors – a perspective. *Biosens. Bioelectron.* 20, 2512–2516
41 Newman, J.D. and Turner, A.P. (2005) Home blood glucose biosensors: a commercial perspective. *Biosens. Bioelectron.* 20, 2435–2453
42 Liu, R.H. *et al.* (2004) Self-contained, fully integrated biochip for sample preparation, polymerase chain reaction amplification, and DNA microarray detection. *Anal. Chem.* 76, 1824–1831
43 Chutipongtanate, S. and Thongboonkerd, V. (2010) Systematic comparisons of artificial urine formulas for *in vitro* cellular study. *Anal. Biochem.* 402, 110–112
44 Echeverry, G. *et al.* (2010) Introduction to urinalysis: historical perspectives and clinical application. *Methods Mol. Biol.* 641, 1–12
45 Liao, J.C. *et al.* (2006) Use of electrochemical DNA biosensors for rapid molecular identification of uropathogens in clinical urine specimens. *J. Clin. Microbiol.* 44, 561–570
46 Liao, J.C. *et al.* (2007) Development of an advanced electrochemical DNA biosensor for bacterial pathogen detection. *J. Mol. Diagn.* 9, 158–168
47 Mach, K.E. *et al.* (2009) Multiplex pathogen identification for polymicrobial urinary tract infections using biosensor technology: a prospective clinical study. *J. Urol.* 182, 2735–2741
48 Mach, K.E. *et al.* (2011) A biosensor platform for rapid antimicrobial susceptibility testing driectly from clinical samples. *J. Urol.* 185, 148–153
49 Chaki, N.K. and Vijayamohanan, K. (2002) Self-assembled monolayers as a tunable platform for biosensor applications. *Biosens. Bioelectron.* 17, 1–12
50 Pan, Y. *et al.* (2010) Electrochemical immunosensor detection of urinary lactoferrin in clinical samples for urinary tract infection diagnosis. *Biosens. Bioelectron.* 26, 649–654
51 DeLong, E.F. *et al.* (1989) Phylogenetic stains: ribosomal RNA-based probes for the identification of single cells. *Science* 243, 1360–1363
52 Woo, P.C. *et al.* (2008) Then and now: use of 16S rDNA gene sequencing for bacterial identification and discovery of novel bacteria in clinical microbiology laboratories. *Clin. Microbiol. Infect.* 14, 908–934
53 Gau, V. *et al.* (2005) Electrochemical molecular analysis without nucleic acid amplification. *Methods* 37, 73–83
54 Boehme, C.C. *et al.* (2010) Rapid molecular detection of tuberculosis and rifampin resistance. *N. Engl. J. Med.* 363, 1005–1015
55 Lehmann, L.E. *et al.* (2009) Real-time polymerase chain-reaction detection of pathogens is feasible to supplement the diagnostic sequence for urinary tract infections. *BJU Int.* 106, 114–120
56 Lehmann, L.E. *et al.* (2011) Rapid qualitative urinary tract infection pathogen identification by Septifast real-time PCR. *PLoS ONE* 6, e17146
57 Holland, R.D. *et al.* (1996) Rapid identification of intact whole bacteria based on spectral patterns using matrix-assisted laser desorption/ionization with time-of-flight mass spectrometry. *Rapid Commun. Mass Spectrom.* 10, 1227–1232
58 Holland, T.L. *et al.* (2009) Antibacterial susceptibility testing in the clinical laboratory. *Infect. Dis. Clin. N. Am.* 23, 757–790 vii
59 Ferreira, L. *et al.* (2010) Rapid method for direct identification of bacteria in urine and blood culture samples by matrix-assisted laser desorption ionization time-of-flight mass spectrometry: intact cell vs. extraction method. *Clin. Microbiol. Infect.* DOI: 10.1111/j.1469-0691.2010.03339.x

60 Carbonnelle, E. *et al.* (2011) MALDI-TOF mass spectrometry tools for bacterial identification in clinical microbiology laboratory. *Clin. Biochem.* 44, 104–109
61 Fenselau, C. and Demirev, P.A. (2001) Characterization of intact microorganisms by MALDI mass spectrometry. *Mass Spectrom. Rev.* 20, 157–171
62 Tenover, F.C. (2010) Potential impact of rapid diagnostic tests on improving antimicrobial use. *Ann. N. Y. Acad. Sci.* 1213, 70–80
63 Parta, M. *et al.* (2009) Identification of methicillin-resistant or methicillin-susceptible *Staphylococcus aureus* in blood cultures and wound swabs by GeneXpert. *J. Clin. Microbiol.* 47, 1609–1610
64 Stamper, P.D. *et al.* (2007) Clinical validation of the molecular BD GeneOhm StaphSR assay for direct detection of *Staphylococcus aureus* and methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* in positive blood cultures. *J. Clin. Microbiol.* 45, 2191–2196
65 U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Center for Devices and Radiological Health (2009) *Class II Special Controls Guidance Document: Antimicrobial Susceptibility Test (AST) Systems,* Document 631, Food and Drug Administration
66 Lawi, W. *et al.* (2009) A microfluidic cartridge system for multiplexed clinical analysis. *JALA Charlottesv Va* 14, 407–412
67 Mariella, R., Jr (2008) Sample preparation: the weak link in microfluidics-based biodetection. *Biomed. Microdev.* 10, 777–784
68 Schulze, H. *et al.* (2009) Multiplexed optical pathogen detection with lab-on-a-chip devices. *J. Biophotonics* 2, 199–211
69 Feldman, H.C. *et al.* (2007) AC electrothermal enhancement of hetergeneous assays in microfluidics. *Lab Chip* 7, 1553–1559
70 Liu, J. *et al.* (2003) Solving the 'world-to-chip' interface problem with a microfluidic matrix. *Anal. Chem.* 75, 4718–4723
71 Melin, J. and Quake, S.R. (2007) Microfluidic large-scale integration: the evolution of design rules for biological automation. *Annu. Rev. Biophys. Biomol. Struct.* 36, 213–231
72 Stone, H.A. *et al.* (2004) Engineering flows in small devices: Microfluidics toward a lab-on-a-chip. *Annu. Rev. Fluid Mechanics* 36, 381–411
73 Sin, M.L. *et al.* (2010) Electrothermal fluid manipulation of high-conductivity samples for laboratory automation applications. *JALA Charlottesv Va* 15, 426–432
74 Sin, M.L.Y. *et al.* (2009) Active manipulation of quantum dots using AC electrokinetics. *J. Phys. Chem.* 113, 6561–6565
75 Imirzalioglu, C. *et al.* (2008) Hidden pathogens uncovered: metagenomic analysis of urinary tract infections. *Andrologia* 40, 66–71
76 Sturm, P.D. *et al.* (2006) Urosepsis with Actinobaculum schaalii and Aerococcus urinae. *J. Clin. Microbiol.* 44, 652–654
77 Nanda, N. and Juthani-Mehta, M. (2009) Novel biomarkers for the diagnosis of urinary tract infection-a systematic review. *Biomark Insights* 4, 111–121
78 (1980). Home blood-glucose monitoring: revolution, revelation, or rip-off? *Lancet* 2, 187–188.
79 Harrad, R.H. *et al.* (1983) Intensive attention improves glycaemic control in insulin dependent diabetes without further advantage from home blood glucose monitoring. *Br. Med. J. (Clin. Res. Ed.)* 286, 59