

Lodestar DX does not replace urine culture. It answers a narrower question sooner.

This note sets out where culture works and where it leaves patients without an answer, how the two tests run on the same sample, and the boundary both share. It is written for the people who will be asked to govern the test, not to buy it.



Samples continue to the laboratory as normal.

A Lodestar DX result is only useful if the clinician can read the organism against a **current local antibiogram**. That antibiogram is built from cultured isolates. If culture volumes fall, the value of a rapid identification falls with them — and so does the surveillance the whole service depends on. **The two tests are not alternatives, and our own case for the technology collapses without yours.**

Urine culture: where it works — and where it leaves patients without an answer

Culture is the reference standard, and Lodestar DX does not replace it. Both halves below are true at once — and the second half concentrates in recurrent and chronic patients.



Reference standard

Every UTI diagnostic is validated against it



Route to susceptibility

Testing is performed on the cultured isolate



No fixed panel

Grows whatever is present



Quantified, viable growth

cfu/mL — significance and test of cure



Surveillance substrate

Antibiograms are built from its isolates

WHERE IT LEAVES PATIENTS WITHOUT AN ANSWER

Design limits of any growth-based method — not failures of laboratory technique.

THE LIMIT

THE EVIDENCE

SO WHAT — FOR THE PATIENT



After the decision

Full report at 24–72 h from arrival — plus a mean 31 h in transit before testing begins.

The first antibiotic is chosen blind; a wrong choice shows only after a failed course.



Mixed growth = no result

35% of symptomatic women's samples reported as contamination — yet 30–39% of UTIs are truly mixed.

Roughly a third of symptomatic women leave with no answer.



"No growth" is not "no infection"

90.5% of culture-negative symptomatic women were *E. coli* PCR-positive (controls: 5.3%).

A "clear" culture can wrongly close the case on an infected patient.



The culturability bias

Compared with an enhanced culture protocol, standard culture detected just 33% of uropathogens — and only 12% of those other than *E. coli*.

The infections culture is most likely to miss are the ones not caused by *E. coli*.



Never plated at all

16.6% of samples were screened out by flow cytometry and not cultured.

Some symptomatic patients are ruled out by a screen, not a culture.



Suppressed or below threshold

Recent antibiotics; organisms shed in cells; thresholds vary 10^3 – 10^5 cfu/mL between laboratories.

The recently treated patient — who re-presents most — is answered least well.

Cohorts: 24–72 h and 31 h in transit, 16.6% not plated — Drazich-Taylor 2025, n=379 non-pregnant adults, Eastern Pathology Alliance, Norwich.² 35% mixed growth — Diggle 2024, n=199 symptomatic adult women, Public Health Wales, Cardiff.¹ 30–39% true mixed infection — Nityadarshini 2022.⁵ 90.5% *E. coli* PCR-positive among culture-negative symptomatic women (controls 5.3%) — Heytens 2017, n=220, Belgian general practice.³ 33% and 12% — Price 2016, n=150 urogynaecology patients, single US centre; the enhanced protocol is not routine practice.⁴ Significance thresholds — UK SMI B 41.⁷

ON THE SAME SAMPLE

One sample, two tests

Every arrow means the same thing: **the same sample carries on to the laboratory**. Culture is not the fallback — it is the second half of the answer.

