OPEN ACCESS

Saudi Journal of Pathology and Microbiology

Abbreviated Key Title: Saudi J Pathol Microbiol
ISSN 2518-3362 (Print) | ISSN 2518-3370 (Online)
Scholars Middle East Publishers, Dubai, United Arab Emirates
Journal homepage: https://saudijournals.com

Original Research Article

Clinical Microbiology in India: Diagnostic Innovations, Implementation Barriers and Future Research Priorities

Ms. Jignyasa Pattanaik[1]*, Mr. Krishna Kumar[2], Dr. J.K. Pattanaik[3], Ms. Sanskriti Tripathy[4], Dr. Tridibesh Tripathy[5]

[1]Pursuing Master's in Applied and Clinical Microbiology at Centurion University of Technology and Management, Bhubaneswar, Odisha
[2]Pursuing Master's in Health Technology Assessment at Manipal Academy of Higher Education, Karnataka
[3]MD in Homoeopathy, Faculty, Homoeopathic Medical College, Berhampur, Govt of Odisha, Odisha, India
[4]Pursuing M.Sc. in Medical & Pharmaceutical Biotechnology in Hochschule Fresenius University of Applied Sciences, Idstein, Hessen State, Germany, B. Tech in Biotechnology, Bennett University, Greater Noida, Uttar Pradesh, India
[5]BHMS (Utkal University, Bhubaneswar), MD (BFUHS, Faridkot), MHA (TISS, Mumbai), Ph.D. in Health Systems Studies (TISS, Mumbai), Homoeopathic & Public Health Expert, Visiting Professor, Master of Public Health (Community Medicine) program, Department of Social Work, Lucknow University, Lucknow, UP, India

DOI: https://doi.org/10.36348/sjpm.2026.v11i09.003 | **Received:** 25.09.2026 | **Accepted:** 17.11.2026 | **Published:** 20.11.2026

***Corresponding author:** Ms. Jignyasa Pattanaik
Pursuing Master's in Applied and Clinical Microbiology at Centurion University of Technology and Management, Bhubaneswar, Odisha

Abstract

Clinical microbiology plays a vital role in the diagnosis and management of infectious diseases, antimicrobial susceptibility testing, and antimicrobial resistance (AMR) surveillance. In India, diagnostic practices have evolved from conventional culture-based methods towards automated systems, molecular diagnostics, rapid point-of-care testing, and sequencing-based technologies. However, the implementation of these innovations remains challenged by disparities in healthcare infrastructure, affordability, workforce capacity, and laboratory quality assurance. This scoping review aims to examine the evolution of clinical microbiology in India, evaluate the contributions of conventional and advanced diagnostic technologies, identify barriers to their implementation, and highlight research priorities for strengthening diagnostic services. A scoping review approach was adopted to explore literature published between 2005 and 2026 concerning diagnostic innovations, clinical microbiology practices, antimicrobial resistance surveillance, and implementation challenges, with particular emphasis on India and relevant evidence from comparable healthcare settings. The literature was examined thematically to identify technological developments, comparative diagnostic considerations, health-system barriers, and gaps in clinical and economic evidence. The reviewed literature indicates a transition towards integrated diagnostic approaches combining conventional microbiology with molecular and advanced diagnostic technologies. Molecular assays offer opportunities for rapid pathogen identification and detection of selected resistance determinants, while sequencing-based methods support broader pathogen characterization and epidemiological surveillance. Nevertheless, conventional culture and phenotypic antimicrobial susceptibility testing remain essential for organism recovery and comprehensive susceptibility assessment. Major implementation barriers include unequal access to diagnostic facilities, inadequate infrastructure, limited trained personnel, quality-control challenges, affordability, and difficulties in translating diagnostic innovations into routine clinical practice. The evidence also highlights the need for stronger evaluations of clinical utility, antimicrobial prescribing outcomes, cost-effectiveness, and sustainable implementation. The evolution of clinical microbiology in India involves not only technological advancement but also the challenge of ensuring equitable, reliable, and sustainable diagnostic services. Integrating conventional and advanced diagnostic methods, strengthening laboratory capacity, and generating context-specific clinical and economic evidence are essential to improve diagnostic decision-making and antimicrobial resistance surveillance. Future research should prioritize implementation feasibility, affordability, patient outcomes, and access to advanced diagnostics across diverse healthcare settings.

Keywords: Clinical microbiology, molecular diagnostics, antimicrobial resistance, antimicrobial susceptibility testing, diagnostic innovation, point-of-care testing, scoping review.

Copyright © 2026 The Author(s): This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution **4.0 International License (CC BY-NC 4.0)** which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium for non-commercial use provided the original author and source are credited.

INTRODUCTION

Clinical microbiology is a fundamental component of modern healthcare, providing essential information for the diagnosis, treatment, prevention, and surveillance of infectious diseases. Accurate and timely identification of infectious agents supports appropriate antimicrobial therapy, infection prevention and control, and the management of antimicrobial resistance (AMR). Historically, clinical microbiology laboratories have relied primarily on conventional techniques, including microscopy, bacterial culture, biochemical identification, and antimicrobial susceptibility testing (AST). Although these methods remain indispensable in routine diagnostic practice, their limitations include prolonged turnaround times, dependence on viable organisms, and the requirement for trained personnel and appropriate laboratory infrastructure. The changing demands of healthcare, together with advances in molecular biology, automation, and analytical technologies, have encouraged the development of faster and more sensitive diagnostic approaches [1–4].

In India, the evolution of clinical microbiology is closely associated with the development of medical services, infectious disease control, public health laboratories, and microbiological research. Historical accounts of colonial medical services and vaccine research illustrate the early relationship between microbiological knowledge, disease prevention, and public health practice in the Indian subcontinent [5, 6]. Over time, clinical microbiology expanded beyond conventional organism identification to include systematic antimicrobial resistance monitoring, laboratory quality assurance, and the application of advanced diagnostic technologies. However, the transition has not been uniform across healthcare settings. Differences in institutional resources, laboratory capacity, geographical accessibility, and financial constraints continue to influence the availability and quality of diagnostic services in India [7, 8].

Advances in diagnostic technology have substantially broadened the capabilities of clinical microbiology laboratories. Molecular methods, including polymerase chain reaction (PCR)-based assays and nucleic acid amplification tests, enable the detection of pathogen-specific genetic material and, in selected applications, resistance-associated genetic markers. These approaches can reduce diagnostic turnaround times and improve the detection of pathogens that are difficult to identify using conventional methods. Similarly, matrix-assisted laser desorption/ionization time-of-flight mass spectrometry (MALDI-TOF MS) has emerged as a rapid method for identifying microorganisms based on their protein profiles [2, 3, 9]. Indian studies examining MALDI-TOF MS and molecular diagnostic applications provide examples of how these technologies are being evaluated and implemented in clinical and public health laboratories [10–14]. Nevertheless, faster identification does not automatically guarantee improved patient outcomes, as the clinical benefits of advanced diagnostics depend on appropriate specimen collection, result interpretation, timely communication, and the availability of effective treatment options.

Despite these developments, conventional culture-based methods remain important because they can provide viable isolates for phenotypic antimicrobial susceptibility testing and further epidemiological investigation. Consequently, rapid molecular diagnostics and culture-based techniques should not necessarily be considered competing alternatives; their relative usefulness depends on the clinical indication, pathogen, resistance mechanism, diagnostic infrastructure, and available resources. Economic considerations are particularly important in India, where healthcare facilities operate under different financial and operational constraints. Studies evaluating the costs of tuberculosis diagnostic strategies and the investment requirements of resistance-testing laboratories highlight the importance of considering affordability, testing capacity, and resource allocation alongside diagnostic performance [15–18]. Therefore, comparisons of diagnostic approaches should consider diagnostic accuracy, turnaround time, clinical utility, and cost-effectiveness rather than analytical performance alone.

Unequal access to diagnostic services remains another important challenge. The availability of advanced testing may vary between urban and rural areas, public and private institutions, and tertiary-care centres and secondary-care facilities. Barriers may include the cost of instruments and reagents, inadequate infrastructure, shortages of trained personnel, maintenance requirements, limited sample-transport networks, and weaknesses in laboratory quality systems. Research examining barriers to point-of-care testing in India and the experiences of external quality assurance programmes illustrates the importance of implementation conditions in determining whether diagnostic innovations can be translated into routine practice [7, 19, 20]. More recently, research on national laboratory accreditation and point-of-care molecular technologies has continued to highlight the relationship between quality assurance, accessibility, and the practical implementation of diagnostic services [21, 22]. These challenges are particularly relevant to resource-limited settings, where diagnostic decentralisation and affordable technologies may improve access but require appropriate validation, training, and quality control.

The evolution of clinical microbiology is also closely linked to the growing threat of AMR in India. Reliable pathogen identification and susceptibility testing are essential for detecting resistance patterns, informing empirical treatment policies, and supporting

antimicrobial stewardship programmes. Indian research has documented resistance trends in clinically important pathogens, including *Salmonella enterica* serovar Typhi, while subsequent initiatives have sought to strengthen national AMR surveillance and laboratory capacity [23–25]. The establishment of the Antimicrobial Resistance Surveillance and Research Network represents an important step towards coordinated resistance monitoring. However, surveillance findings must be interpreted in the context of participating institutions, specimen selection, laboratory capacity, and the populations represented. Data generated predominantly by participating tertiary-care or referral centres may not fully reflect resistance patterns in secondary-care hospitals or community-acquired infections. Furthermore, the availability of diagnostic results alone may not ensure appropriate antibiotic prescribing; effective translation into clinical practice requires timely reporting, clinician engagement, and functional antimicrobial stewardship programmes [25–27].

Recent developments, including MALDI-TOF MS, nucleic acid-based diagnostics, molecular resistance testing, and diagnostic stewardship interventions, indicate continuing progress towards faster and more targeted infectious disease management [10–14, 22, 27, 28]. However, important questions remain regarding the extent to which these innovations have improved routine clinical decision-making, their affordability across different healthcare settings, and their contribution to equitable access to quality diagnostics. Evidence is also needed to clarify how diagnostic innovations interact with laboratory accreditation, external quality assurance, AMR surveillance, and antimicrobial stewardship. Although individual studies have examined specific technologies, diseases, economic considerations, or implementation challenges, an integrated assessment of the historical development of clinical microbiology in India and the relationships among diagnostic performance, healthcare accessibility, laboratory capacity, and stewardship remains valuable.

Against this background, the present review aims to examine the evolution of clinical microbiology in India, from conventional culture-based methods to contemporary molecular and proteomic diagnostic technologies. It will compare conventional and rapid diagnostic approaches in terms of diagnostic accuracy, turnaround time, clinical utility, and cost-effectiveness; assess geographical, infrastructural, and financial barriers affecting access to advanced diagnostics; explore the contribution of laboratory advances and AMR surveillance to antibiotic prescribing and antimicrobial stewardship; and identify limitations in the representativeness of existing surveillance data, particularly for secondary-care hospitals and community-acquired infections. By synthesising historical, technological, economic, and health-system evidence, this review seeks to identify priority research gaps and inform future strategies for strengthening accessible, affordable, reliable, and clinically useful microbiological diagnostics across India's diverse healthcare settings.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Study Design

The study design adopted here is ‘scoping review’ of the published articles related to this paper. This scoping review aims to map the available evidence on the evolution of clinical microbiology in India, with particular emphasis on diagnostic innovations, implementation barriers, antimicrobial resistance (AMR) surveillance, and future research priorities. The review will examine the transition from conventional culture-based methods to molecular and proteomic diagnostic technologies, their diagnostic and clinical applications, their economic implications, and the factors influencing equitable access to microbiological diagnostics across Indian healthcare settings.

The review methodology is informed by the Joanna Briggs Institute (JBI) guidance for scoping reviews, and reporting will follow the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses Extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR), where applicable.

Research Questions

The first objective of the study is to examine the evolution of clinical microbiology in India. The second is to evaluate the contributions of conventional and advanced diagnostic technologies. The third is to identify barriers to their implementation. The fourth is to highlight research priorities for strengthening diagnostic services.

Research Questions (RQ) are clubbed under the objectives. The first RQ is under the first objective. The second RQ is under the second objective. The third RQ is under the third objective. The last two RQs are under the fourth objective.

The review is guided by the following research questions that are related to the respective objectives.

1. How has clinical microbiology in India evolved from conventional culture-based methods to molecular diagnostics, and what barriers limit the implementation of advanced diagnostic technologies?
2. How do conventional culture-based methods and rapid molecular diagnostics compare in diagnostic accuracy, turnaround time, clinical utility, and cost-effectiveness in Indian healthcare settings?
3. What geographical, infrastructural, and financial barriers contribute to unequal access to advanced clinical microbiology diagnostics

across public and private healthcare facilities in India?

4. To what extent have advances in clinical microbiology and antimicrobial resistance surveillance influenced antibiotic prescribing and antimicrobial stewardship in Indian hospitals?
5. How representative are India's antimicrobial resistance surveillance data of secondary-care hospitals and community-acquired infections, and what evidence gaps remain?

Review Framework

The review questions are structured using the Population–Concept–Context (PCC) framework recommended for scoping reviews.

- **Population:** Patients, healthcare professionals, clinical microbiology laboratories, and healthcare institutions involved in infectious disease diagnosis and AMR surveillance.
- **Concept:** Historical development of clinical microbiology, diagnostic innovations, diagnostic performance, clinical utility, economic evaluation, implementation barriers, laboratory quality, AMR surveillance, and antimicrobial stewardship.
- **Context:** Indian healthcare settings, including public and private hospitals, tertiary-care centres, secondary-care facilities, community-level services, and national surveillance programmes.

Information Sources and Search Strategy

A comprehensive literature search is conducted using electronic databases, including PubMed/MEDLINE, Scopus, and Google Scholar, subject to access. Additional relevant publications are identified by examining the reference lists of selected articles and relevant reports from Indian diagnostic, laboratory quality assurance, and AMR surveillance programmes.

The search cover publications from 2005 to 2026. Earlier publications are included when they provide essential historical or conceptual background.

Search terms combine keywords relating to clinical microbiology, diagnostic technologies, healthcare accessibility, economic evaluation, laboratory quality, AMR surveillance, and India. An example search strategy is:

("clinical microbiology" OR "diagnostic microbiology" OR "microbiological diagnosis") AND ("India" OR "Indian") AND ("molecular diagnostics" OR "culture-based diagnosis" OR "MALDI-TOF" OR "diagnostic accuracy" OR "turnaround time" OR "cost-effectiveness" OR "laboratory quality" OR "antimicrobial resistance" OR "antimicrobial stewardship" OR "access barriers").

Search strategies are adapted to each database. The search date, database name, complete search string, and number of records retrieved are documented.

RESULTS

Evolution of clinical microbiology in India

The reviewed literature indicates a gradual transition in clinical microbiology from conventional culture-based identification and phenotypic antimicrobial susceptibility testing (AST) towards automated identification, nucleic acid amplification tests, molecular resistance detection, and sequencing-based approaches. However, this transition has not occurred uniformly across healthcare settings. Conventional culture and phenotypic AST remain important because they provide viable isolates for susceptibility testing and further characterization, whereas molecular methods can identify selected pathogens or resistance genes more rapidly when appropriate assays are available [4, 12].

The review by Asokan *et al.,* describes the expanding role of polymerase chain reaction (PCR), next-generation sequencing (NGS), digital PCR, isothermal amplification, and CRISPR-based technologies in pathogen detection, resistance surveillance, and outbreak investigation [12]. In India, the expansion of molecular testing during the COVID-19 pandemic also increased diagnostic infrastructure and experience with molecular techniques [20]. Nevertheless, availability of advanced technology does not necessarily indicate its routine integration into all clinical microbiology laboratories [12, 22, 29].

The evolution is therefore better understood as a transition towards integrated diagnostic practice rather than the complete replacement of conventional microbiology.

Table 1: Evolution of clinical microbiology and the contribution of diagnostic innovations

Diagnostic phase	Representative methods	Major contribution	Continuing limitation
Conventional microbiology	Microscopy, staining, culture and biochemical identification	Organism recovery and phenotypic characterization	Growth-dependent diagnosis and potentially prolonged turnaround time
Phenotypic susceptibility testing	Disc diffusion and minimum inhibitory concentration (MIC) testing	Demonstrates antimicrobial susceptibility under standardized conditions	Results require organism recovery and appropriate testing

Diagnostic phase	Representative methods	Major contribution	Continuing limitation
Automated microbiology	Automated identification and blood-culture systems	Improved workflow, standardization and laboratory throughput	Equipment, maintenance and trained personnel are required
Molecular diagnostics	Conventional PCR, real-time PCR and multiplex panels	Rapid detection of targeted pathogens and selected resistance determinants	Restricted target coverage, cost and interpretation challenges
Advanced molecular approaches	NGS, metagenomic sequencing and digital PCR	Broader pathogen detection, genomic characterization and surveillance	Infrastructure, bioinformatics, validation and cost constraints
Point-of-care and decentralized diagnostics	Cartridge-based nucleic acid amplification and rapid tests	Potentially expands access and shortens diagnostic pathways	Affordability, field validation, sustainability and equitable deployment

Evidence base: Asokan *et al.,* [12]; Modgil *et al.,* [22]; Sharma *et al.,* [29].

Evidence for diagnostic innovation and its clinical relevance

The literature identifies several advantages of newer diagnostic technologies, particularly rapid pathogen identification, detection of selected antimicrobial resistance determinants, and improved surveillance. However, diagnostic performance must be distinguished from clinical effectiveness. A test may detect a pathogen or resistance gene rapidly without necessarily demonstrating that its implementation reduces mortality, antibiotic consumption, hospital stay, or total treatment costs.

Evidence from India illustrates this distinction. Modgil *et al.,* examined diagnostic access and capacity across 14 healthcare institutions in two Indian states and identified gaps in testing capacity, equipment, quality control and data management. The study also found that the point-of-care technologies assessed did not satisfy all three criteria of clinical preparedness, scalability and sustainability [22]. These findings suggest that innovation must be evaluated alongside real-world feasibility and health-system readiness.

Table 2: Diagnostic innovations, expected benefits and evidence limitations

Diagnostic approach	Potential clinical or laboratory benefit	Evidence limitation relevant to India
PCR and multiplex molecular assays	Faster detection of targeted organisms and resistance genes	Performance depends on assay targets, specimen type and validation
Automated identification and AST	More standardized and efficient laboratory workflows	Unequal access to equipment, consumables and maintenance
NGS and metagenomic sequencing	Detection of a broad range of microbial sequences and genomic characterization	Interpretation, contamination, cost and clinical validation remain important
Rapid point-of-care tests	Potential for earlier clinical decisions and decentralized testing	Readiness, affordability, scalability and sustainability may limit implementation
Laboratory information and digital reporting systems	Improved reporting, data management and communication with clinicians	Digital infrastructure, interoperability and data quality require strengthening

Sources: Asokan *et al.,* [12]; Modgil *et al.,* [22]; Sharma *et al.,* [29].

The evidence therefore supports the contribution of diagnostic innovation but does not establish that every advanced technology is superior to conventional methods in every clinical setting. Comparative evaluation should consider sensitivity, specificity, turnaround time, actionable results, antimicrobial prescribing, patient outcomes and implementation costs.

Implementation barriers in Indian healthcare settings

A major finding across the literature is that the availability of diagnostic technology and its routine clinical use are separate issues. Barriers include insufficient laboratory infrastructure, uneven geographic distribution of services, limited trained personnel, inadequate quality assurance, affordability, and fragmented pathways for validating and introducing new tests.

Modgil *et al.,* reported disparities in access to antimicrobial resistance diagnostics between urban and rural areas and between hilly and plains regions. Their assessment of 14 healthcare institutions identified gaps in equipment, testing capacity, quality control and data management [22]. Separately, Sharma *et al.,* identified weaknesses in field validation, regulatory and implementation pathways, funding, and coordination between developers and healthcare systems [29].

These findings demonstrate that developing a diagnostic assay is only one part of implementation. Its clinical value depends on whether the test can be

validated, procured, performed reliably, interpreted correctly and incorporated into treatment decisions.

Table 3: Evidence-based implementation barriers and their implications

Barrier	Evidence from the literature	Implication for clinical microbiology
Unequal geographic access	Diagnostic access varies between urban and rural and between hilly and plains settings [22]	Patients may not receive timely microbiological testing
Infrastructure and equipment gaps	Assessments of 14 healthcare institutions found deficiencies in equipment and diagnostic capacity [22]	Limits routine testing and timely results
Quality assurance and validation	Laboratory quality gaps and difficulties with field validation have been reported [22, 29]	Test performance in routine clinical settings may differ from controlled evaluations
Financial and sustainability constraints	Affordability and sustainable deployment remain challenges for rapid diagnostics [22, 29]	Promising technologies may not be maintained or scaled
Workforce and data-management limitations	Gaps in technical capacity and data management have been reported [22]	Reduces reliability, interpretation and clinical integration
Fragmented adoption pathways	Indigenous rapid diagnostic developers have faced disconnected routes from development to healthcare uptake [29]	Innovations may fail to reach routine clinical practice
Limited implementation evidence	Laboratory performance does not by itself demonstrate improved patient outcomes or cost-effectiveness	Further clinical and economic evaluations are needed

Sources: Modgil *et al.,* [22]; Sharma *et al.,* [29].

Antimicrobial resistance surveillance and the continuing role of conventional microbiology

The evolution of clinical microbiology is closely connected to antimicrobial resistance (AMR) surveillance. Conventional culture and AST provide phenotypic evidence of susceptibility, while molecular assays can identify specific resistance genes or mechanisms. These approaches can complement one another, because detection of a resistance gene does not always establish the complete phenotypic susceptibility profile of an isolate.

Consequently, a major priority is not simply replacing conventional methods with molecular testing, but developing diagnostic pathways that combine appropriate organism identification, phenotypic susceptibility testing, molecular detection when indicated, quality assurance and timely reporting.

Table 4: Complementary roles of conventional and advanced diagnostics

Evaluation criterion	Conventional culture and AST	Molecular and advanced diagnostics
Pathogen identification	Requires growth and subsequent identification	Can detect targeted microbial nucleic acids directly from eligible specimens
Resistance assessment	Measures phenotypic susceptibility	Detects selected resistance genes or molecular markers
Turnaround time	Depends on organism growth and subsequent testing	Often shorter for targeted assays; varies by platform and workflow
Organism recovery	Can provide viable isolates for further testing	Direct detection alone may not provide a viable isolate
Breadth of detection	Depends on culture conditions and methods used	Depends on assay targets; sequencing may offer broader detection
Resource requirements	Media, laboratory facilities and quality-controlled workflows	Instrumentation, reagents, validation, expertise and sometimes bioinformatics
Best role in practice	Organism recovery and phenotypic susceptibility assessment	Rapid targeted diagnosis, selected resistance detection and genomic investigation

Interpretation based on the diagnostic approaches discussed by Asokan *et al.,* [12] and the implementation literature [22, 29].

Identified research gaps

Although the literature documents substantial technological progress, important questions remain concerning the extent to which diagnostic innovation has translated into equitable access, improved clinical outcomes and sustainable laboratory practice in India.

The evidence from Indian studies shows that access, validation, quality assurance and implementation remain significant concerns [22, 29]. Broader reviews describe technological developments and their applications but also acknowledge challenges involving costs, expertise, infrastructure and standardization [12]. These findings support a need to synthesize technological progress alongside health-system implementation rather than examining diagnostic innovation in isolation.

Table 5: Research gaps, supporting evidence and future research priorities

Identified research gap	Supporting evidence	Why further research is needed
Uneven access to advanced diagnostics	Geographic disparities and laboratory-capacity gaps were reported across 14 healthcare institutions [22]	To understand differences in access across regions and levels of healthcare
Limited evidence on real-world implementation	Challenges in field validation and fragmented uptake pathways were documented for indigenous diagnostics [29]	To assess whether promising technologies perform effectively in routine practice
Insufficient integration of clinical and economic outcomes	Reviews identify cost and implementation challenges, while diagnostic accuracy alone cannot establish clinical benefit [12, 22, 29]	To evaluate whether faster diagnosis improves treatment decisions and provides value for money
Gaps in diagnostic quality and standardization	Laboratory quality-control and validation challenges have been reported [22, 29]	To identify approaches for consistent, reliable testing
Unclear comparative roles of conventional and molecular methods	Both approaches offer different diagnostic information and operational requirements [4, 12]	To determine which tests are appropriate for particular infections and healthcare settings
Inadequate understanding of sustainable decentralization	Point-of-care technologies face affordability, scalability and sustainability challenges [22]	To identify feasible models for district and resource-constrained laboratories
Need for stronger research-to-policy translation	Disconnected adoption pathways have been described for indigenous diagnostic innovations [29]	To support coordinated validation, procurement and implementation policies

Sources: Asokan *et al.,* [12]; Modgil *et al.,* [22]; Sharma *et al.,* [29].

The gaps above should be interpreted as evidence-supported areas requiring further synthesis and investigation, rather than proof that no previous review has addressed them. Establishing the novelty of the proposed review will require comparing its scope with existing reviews and documenting the search results.

Results mapped to the research questions

The findings can be organized to directly answer the three proposed research questions.

Table 6: Evidence addressing the research questions

Research question	Findings supported by the reviewed literature	Overall interpretation
RQ1. How has clinical microbiology in India evolved from conventional culture-based methods to molecular diagnostics, and what barriers limit implementation?	Diagnostic practice has expanded to include PCR, sequencing and rapid diagnostic platforms. Infrastructure, quality assurance, affordability, workforce capacity and implementation pathways remain important barriers [12, 22, 29].	Technological progress has occurred, but implementation remains uneven.
RQ2. How do conventional culture-based methods and advanced diagnostic technologies differ in their contributions to clinical microbiology?	Culture enables organism recovery and phenotypic susceptibility testing, whereas molecular methods can rapidly identify targeted pathogens or resistance determinants. Their performance and clinical utility depend on the method, specimen, target and setting [4, 12].	The methods are complementary; their comparative value should be assessed for specific clinical indications.
RQ3. What are the major research gaps and future priorities for clinical microbiology in India?	Evidence identifies diagnostic access disparities, validation challenges, quality gaps and sustainability concerns [22, 29]. Broader reviews identify cost, expertise and standardization as continuing challenges [12].	Future research should integrate diagnostic performance, clinical utility, economic evaluation and equitable implementation.

Evidence: Asokan *et al.,* [12]; Modgil *et al.,* [22]; Sharma *et al.,* [29].

DISCUSSION

The present scoping review examines the evolution of clinical microbiology in India, focusing on diagnostic innovations, implementation barriers, and future research priorities. The findings indicate that the field is undergoing a transition from conventional culture-dependent methods towards an integrated diagnostic approach incorporating automation, molecular diagnostics, rapid point-of-care testing, and sequencing-based technologies. However, the central finding is that technological advancement has not automatically translated into equitable access, consistent implementation, or demonstrable improvements in patient outcomes across healthcare settings. The evolution of clinical microbiology must therefore be evaluated not only in terms of diagnostic innovation but also in terms of clinical usefulness, laboratory readiness, affordability, and sustainability.

Evolution from conventional microbiology to advanced diagnostics

Conventional culture, microscopy, biochemical identification, and phenotypic antimicrobial susceptibility testing (AST) have formed the foundation of clinical microbiology for decades. These methods remain essential because they support organism recovery, characterization, and susceptibility assessment. Nevertheless, culture-dependent workflows can delay organism identification, particularly when pathogens grow slowly, patients have received prior antimicrobial treatment, or organisms are difficult to cultivate. These limitations have encouraged the development of rapid molecular and sequencing-based approaches [4, 12].

Molecular diagnostics have expanded the capacity to detect specific pathogens and selected antimicrobial resistance determinants without waiting for conventional organism growth. Multiplex PCR can identify several predefined targets in a single assay, while next-generation sequencing and metagenomic approaches offer broader opportunities for pathogen detection, genomic characterization, and surveillance [12]. These developments are particularly relevant to the diagnosis of complex infections and the investigation of emerging pathogens.

However, advanced diagnostics should not be considered universal replacements for conventional microbiology. Molecular assays may miss organisms outside their target panels, and detecting microbial nucleic acid does not necessarily establish the presence of viable organisms or prove that the detected microorganism is responsible for the patient's clinical condition. Similarly, the identification of a resistance gene does not always provide a complete phenotypic susceptibility profile. Consequently, conventional culture and AST continue to provide complementary information that may be necessary for definitive clinical interpretation and antimicrobial selection.

The most appropriate direction for clinical microbiology in India is therefore an integrated diagnostic model in which conventional and advanced methods are selected according to the suspected infection, specimen type, clinical urgency, available resources, and required diagnostic information.

Implementation barriers in the Indian healthcare system

A major finding of this review is the gap between the availability of diagnostic innovations and their effective implementation in routine healthcare. The challenges are not exclusively technological; they also involve infrastructure, workforce capacity, financial resources, laboratory quality systems, and coordination between diagnostic developers and healthcare providers.

Modgil *et al.,* reported disparities in access to antimicrobial resistance diagnostics across 14 healthcare institutions in two Indian states, highlighting differences in diagnostic capacity and challenges involving equipment, quality control, and data management [22]. These findings suggest that the benefits of diagnostic innovation may be distributed unevenly across geographical areas and levels of healthcare. A technology available in a well-equipped tertiary-care hospital may not be feasible in a district hospital or a resource-constrained laboratory.

Furthermore, advanced platforms require trained personnel, reliable electricity and equipment maintenance, consistent reagent supplies, appropriate quality assurance, and systems for interpreting and communicating results. Where these requirements are not met, diagnostic technologies may be underutilized even after procurement. Investment decisions should therefore consider the full diagnostic pathway rather than the purchase price of an instrument alone.

These findings support the need for implementation strategies tailored to different healthcare settings. Tertiary-care hospitals may benefit from comprehensive molecular platforms, whereas district-level laboratories may require simpler, affordable, and robust assays supported by referral networks. Such approaches could improve access without assuming that every healthcare facility requires the same technology.

Clinical utility and the relationship between rapid diagnosis and patient outcomes

An important distinction emerging from this review is the difference between diagnostic performance and clinical utility. Sensitivity, specificity, and turnaround time are important measures of test performance, but they do not independently establish

whether a diagnostic innovation improves patient management.

A rapid test may identify a pathogen earlier than culture, yet its clinical benefit depends on whether the result is accurate, available when a treatment decision is being made, understood by clinicians, and used to modify management appropriately. If molecular results are delayed in reporting, not communicated effectively, or interpreted without clinical context, their potential advantage may be diminished. Conversely, a timely and actionable result may support earlier targeted therapy, more appropriate antimicrobial use, and avoidance of unnecessary treatment.

The value of rapid diagnostics is therefore closely linked to antimicrobial stewardship. Earlier pathogen identification and detection of selected resistance determinants may help clinicians initiate appropriate treatment or reconsider empirical antimicrobial therapy. However, the direction and magnitude of this effect depend on the infection, the assay, the local resistance epidemiology, and the availability of effective treatment alternatives. Diagnostic technology alone cannot guarantee reductions in antibiotic consumption or antimicrobial resistance.

For India, future evaluations should examine not only whether a diagnostic test identifies pathogens accurately but also whether its introduction changes prescribing practices, time to appropriate therapy, treatment failure, length of hospital stay, mortality, and other clinically meaningful outcomes. These endpoints would provide stronger evidence for deciding which innovations should be incorporated into routine clinical practice.

Implications for antimicrobial resistance surveillance

The relationship between diagnostic innovation and antimicrobial resistance (AMR) surveillance represents another important dimension of the evolution of clinical microbiology. Culture and phenotypic AST provide evidence of susceptibility under standardized laboratory conditions, while molecular methods can identify selected resistance determinants and support the investigation of transmission and emerging resistance mechanisms [4, 12, 25, 30].

These approaches have different but complementary roles. Phenotypic testing can reveal susceptibility patterns that are not fully predicted by the resistance genes included in a molecular assay. Molecular testing, in contrast, may provide earlier information about selected resistance mechanisms and can support genomic epidemiology when appropriate sequencing and analytical capacity are available.

The implications extend beyond individual patient care. Reliable microbiological data can support hospital antibiograms, local empirical-treatment guidelines, outbreak investigations, and national surveillance. However, the usefulness of surveillance depends on the representativeness, quality, comparability, and timely reporting of laboratory data. Inconsistent testing practices and gaps in laboratory capacity can limit the interpretation of resistance trends across institutions.

Strengthening clinical microbiology in India therefore requires investment in standardized AST, external quality assessment, laboratory information systems, and coordination between hospital laboratories and surveillance networks. Molecular diagnostics should strengthen these systems rather than function as isolated technological additions.

Economic evaluation and affordability of diagnostic innovations

Affordability is a critical consideration when evaluating advanced diagnostic technologies in India. Although molecular assays and sequencing-based approaches may reduce time to identification, their overall economic value cannot be determined from test speed or instrument cost alone. Reagents, equipment procurement, maintenance, staff training, quality assurance, bioinformatics, repeat testing, and downstream clinical decisions all contribute to the total cost of implementation.

A more expensive test may provide value if it leads to earlier appropriate treatment, prevents unnecessary antimicrobial use, shortens hospital stays, or avoids additional diagnostic procedures. Conversely, a technically advanced test may offer limited economic benefit if its results do not change clinical management or if the required infrastructure is underutilized.

The available implementation literature highlights the importance of affordability and sustainable deployment [22, 29]. However, evidence of diagnostic feasibility should not be interpreted as proof of cost-effectiveness. These are separate questions requiring different forms of evaluation.

Future studies should compare diagnostic strategies using clearly defined economic outcomes, including cost per test, cost per additional correct diagnosis, cost per appropriate treatment decision, budget impact, and, where suitable, cost-effectiveness measures. Evaluations should also consider the perspective of the analysis, such as the hospital, healthcare system, or patient.

For India, economic evaluations should use locally relevant costs and account for differences between public and private healthcare facilities, urban

and rural settings, and tertiary-care and district-level laboratories. Such evidence would help decision-makers determine which technologies should be adopted, where they should be deployed, and whether centralized or decentralized testing provides better value.

The research gap: from technological development to implementation evidence

The most important contribution of this review is its emphasis on the need to connect diagnostic innovation with implementation and health-system outcomes. Existing literature describes developments in molecular diagnostics and their potential applications [12], while studies from Indian healthcare settings identify gaps in access, diagnostic capacity, quality assurance, and implementation [22, 29]. Together, these findings demonstrate that technological progress and effective adoption are distinct stages of diagnostic development.

Nevertheless, the available evidence presented in this review does not establish that every aspect of this problem is unexplored. Rather, it identifies areas where further synthesis and primary research are needed.

First, comparative evidence should establish how conventional and advanced diagnostic approaches perform across different infections and healthcare settings. Second, clinical studies should determine whether faster or more comprehensive detection translates into meaningful changes in antimicrobial prescribing and patient outcomes. Third, economic evaluations should assess affordability, cost-effectiveness, and budget impact under Indian healthcare conditions. Finally, implementation studies should investigate how workforce capacity, laboratory infrastructure, quality systems, procurement, and referral networks influence successful adoption.

These gaps support a shift in research priorities from asking whether a new diagnostic technology works under study conditions to examining whether it works reliably in routine practice, improves clinical decisions, remains affordable, and can be sustained at scale.

CONCLUSION

The evolution of clinical microbiology in India reflects a significant transition from conventional culture-based methods towards automated systems, molecular diagnostics, rapid point-of-care testing, and sequencing-based technologies. These innovations offer opportunities to improve pathogen identification, antimicrobial resistance detection, outbreak investigation, and clinical decision-making. However, conventional culture and phenotypic antimicrobial susceptibility testing remain essential components of diagnostic practice, highlighting the importance of integrating traditional and advanced methods rather than treating them as competing approaches.

The findings of this review emphasize that the major challenge lies not only in developing advanced diagnostic technologies but also in ensuring their effective implementation across India's diverse healthcare settings. Unequal access to laboratory infrastructure, limited workforce capacity, quality-assurance challenges, financial constraints, and difficulties in translating diagnostic innovation into routine clinical practice may restrict their widespread adoption. Furthermore, improvements in diagnostic speed and analytical performance do not necessarily translate into better patient outcomes or cost-effectiveness without appropriate clinical and economic evidence.

Future research should prioritize comparative diagnostic evaluations, clinical utility studies, locally relevant economic assessments, strengthened antimicrobial resistance surveillance, and implementation research, particularly in rural and resource-constrained healthcare settings. Collaboration among clinical microbiologists, clinicians, researchers, diagnostic developers, and policymakers will be essential to establish sustainable and evidence-based diagnostic pathways.

In conclusion, the future of clinical microbiology in India depends on bridging the gap between diagnostic innovation and practical implementation. An integrated, affordable, quality-assured, and context-appropriate diagnostic system can help translate technological progress into timely diagnosis, more rational antimicrobial use, improved patient care, and stronger public health surveillance. This approach is fundamental to building an equitable and sustainable clinical microbiology infrastructure capable of responding to India's evolving infectious disease and antimicrobial resistance challenges.

Declaration: The lead author thanks all the co-authors for their contribution in the article.

Conflict of Interest: Nil

Funding: Nil

Ethical Issues: Nil

REFERENCES

1. Van Eldere, J. Changing needs, opportunities and constraints for the 21st century microbiology laboratory. Clinical Microbiology and Infection, 2005, 11 (Suppl. 1): 15–18. DOI:10.1111/j.1469-0691.2005.01085.x.
2. Fairfax, M. R., & Salimnia, H. Diagnostic Molecular Microbiology: A 2013 Snapshot, Clinics in Laboratory Medicine, V33, i04, December 2013. DOI: 10.1016/j.cll.2013.08.003.

3. Khardori, N. Future of Diagnostic Microbiology, Indian Journal of Medical Microbiology, V32, i04, 2014. DOI:10.4103/0255-0857.142233.
4. Lagier, J. C., Edouard, S., Pagnier, I., Mediannikov, O., Drancourt, M., & Raoult, D. Current and Past Strategies for Bacterial Culture in Clinical Microbiology, Clinical Microbiology Reviews, V28, i01, January 2015, pp. 208–236. DOI:10.1128/CMR.00110-14
5. Mushtaq, M. U. Public Health in British India: A Brief Account of the History of Medical Services and Disease Prevention in Colonial India, Indian Journal of Community Medicine, V34, i01, January 2009, pp. 6–14. DOI:10.4103/0970-0218.45369.
6. Chakrabarti, P. "Living versus Dead": The Pasteurian Paradigm and Imperial Vaccine Research, Bulletin of the History of Medicine, V84, i03, 2010, pp. 387–423. DOI:10.1353/bhm.2010.0019.
7. Engel, N., Ganesh, G., Patil, M., Yellappa, V., Pant Pai, N., Vadnais, C., & Pai, M. Barriers to Point-of-Care Testing in India: Results from Qualitative Research Across Different Settings, Users and Major Diseases, PLOS ONE, V10, i08, 14 August 2015, Article e0135112. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0135112.
8. Fleming, K. A., Horton, S., Wilson, M. L., Atun, R., DeStigter, K., Flanigan, J., *et al.,* The Lancet Commission on Diagnostics: Transforming Access to Diagnostics, The Lancet, V398, 2021, pp. 1997–2050. DOI:10.1016/S0140-6736(21)00673-5.
9. Panda, A., Kurapati, S., Samantaray, J. C., Srinivasan, A., & Khalil, S. MALDI-TOF Mass Spectrometry Proteomic-Based Identification of Clinical Bacterial Isolates, Indian Journal of Medical Research, V140, i06, December 2014, pp. 770–777.
10. Keri, V. C., Gupta, A., Mohapatra, S., Soneja, M., Kapil, A., Xess, I., *et al.,* Early Organism Identification by MALDI-TOF-MS Decreases the Time to Appropriate Antibiotic Modifications for Common Bacterial Infections, Le Infezioni in Medicina, V32, i03, 2024, pp. 330–339. DOI:10.53854/liim-3203-7.
11. Srivastava, S., Shankar, A., Sharad, N., Ningombam, A., Farooque, K., & Mathur, P. Bacterial Identification Using MALDI-TOF Mass Spectrometry in Positive Blood Cultures: A Pilot Study, Journal of Biological Methods, V12, i02, March 2025. DOI: 10.14440/jbm.2025.0119.
12. Asokan, S., Choudekar, A., Jagadeesan, A., Rudresh, S. M., Ali, A., Napte, S. U., *et al.,* Molecular Diagnostics in Clinical Microbiology: Advances, Applications, and Future Directions, Diagnostic Microbiology & Infectious Disease, V114, 2026, Article 117223. DOI: 10.1016/j.diagmicrobio.2025.117223.
13. Ramalingam, G., Krishnan, S., Mukhopadhyay, L., Gupta, N., Patchaiyappan, M., Subramani, K., *et al.,* External Quality Assurance of Molecular Serotype Detection of Dengue Virus RNA Among Virus Research and Diagnostic Laboratories in India, Frontiers in Cellular and Infection Microbiology, 03 September 2026. DOI:10.3389/fcimb.2026.1919409.
14. Roy, N. S., Bala, K., Bordoloi, T., Sethi, P., Shankar, V., Mohan, A., & Singh, U. B. Performance of Molecular Diagnostics in Strengthening Tuberculosis Detection and Drug Resistance Surveillance: A Comparative Study with Conventional Methods, International Journal of Mycobacteriology, V15, i02, April–June 2026. DOI: 10.4103/ijmy.ijmy_79_26.
15. Suen, S. C., Bendavid, E., & Goldhaber-Fiebert, J. D. Cost-Effectiveness of Improvements in Diagnosis and Treatment Accessibility for Tuberculosis Control in India, International Journal of Tuberculosis and Lung Disease, V19, i09, September 2015, pp. 1115–1122. DOI:10.5588/ijtld.15.0158.
16. Sohn, H., Kasaie, P., Kendall, E., Gomez, G. B., Vassall, A., Pai, M., & Dowdy, D. Informing Decision-Making for Universal Access to Quality Tuberculosis Diagnosis in India: An Economic-Epidemiological Model, BMC Medicine, V17, 2019, Article 155. DOI:10.1186/s12916-019-1384-8.
17. Bashir, S., Sarin, S., Chadha, S. S., Kalra, A., ThekkePurakkal, A. S., Duraisamy, K., *et al.,* Strengthening Resistance Testing for Tuberculosis in India: Investment Cost, Throughput, and Efficiency of New Laboratories, Tuberculosis, V136, 2022, Article 102245. DOI: 10.1016/j.tube.2022.102245.
18. Yadav, R. N., Verma, A. K., & Kaushik, G. Laboratory Cost Analysis of Conventional and Newer Molecular Tests for Diagnosis of Presumptive Multidrug-Resistant Tuberculosis Patients, Journal of Global Infectious Diseases, V14, i03, July–September 2022. DOI: 10.4103/jgid.jgid_309_21.
19. Wattal, C., Oberoi, J. K., Goel, N., Datta, S., Raveendran, R., & Prasad, K. J. Experience of Indian Association of Medical Microbiology External Quality Assurance Scheme Centre, New Delhi: Challenges and Quality Assessment of Clinical Microbiology Laboratories, Indian Journal of Medical Microbiology, V37, i04, October 2020, DOI: 10.4103/ijmm.IJMM_19_362.
20. Murugesan, M., Raveendran, R., Kannangai, R., Ramasamy, J., Ray, P., Gope, M., *et al.,* Indian Microbiology EQAS-Registered Laboratory's Capacity Building and Infection Control Practices During the COVID-19 Pandemic in India: Lessons Learnt and Gaps Identified, Indian Journal of Medical Microbiology, V43, 2023, pp. 51–57. DOI:10.1016/j.ijmm.2022.11.006.

© 2026 | Published by Scholars Middle East Publishers, Dubai, United Arab Emirates

21. Parikh, K. D., & Rupani, M. P. Exploring the Impact of National Laboratory Accreditation on Quality and Practices: A Qualitative Study from a Government Medical College in Western India, BMC Health Services Research, V25, 2025, Article 1005. DOI:10.1186/s12913-025-13195-6.
22. Modgil, V., Saha, S., Taneja, N., Mukherjee, A., Joshi, N., Mitra, A., *et al.,* Enhancing Access to Antimicrobial Resistance Diagnostics for the Marginalised: Challenges and Opportunities of Point-of-Care Technologies, Journal of Global Antimicrobial Resistance, V44, 2025, pp. 281–286. DOI: 10.1016/j.jgar.2025.06.023.
23. Satyaseela M P. A Brief Historical Perspective of Antimicrobial Resistance in India, Public Health, Perspective, mbio, American Society for Microbiology, V07, i05, May 2026. DOI:10.1128/mbio.03548-25.
24. Menezes, G. A., Harish, B. N., Khan, M. A., Goessens, W. H. F., & Hays, J. P. Antimicrobial Resistance Trends in Blood Culture Positive Salmonella Typhi Isolates from Pondicherry, India, 2005–2009, Clinical Microbiology and Infection, V18, i03, March 2012. DOI:10.1111/j.1469-0691.2011.03530.x.
25. Walia, K., Madhumathi, J., Veeraraghavan, B., Chakrabarti, A., Kapil, A., Ray, P., Singh, H., Sistla, S., & Ohri, V. C. Establishing Antimicrobial Resistance Surveillance & Research Network in India: Journey So Far, Indian Journal of Medical Research, V149, i02, February 2019, pp. 164–179. DOI:10.4103/ijmr.IJMR_226_18.
26. Krishnamoorthy, Y., Govindan, D., Karunakaran, M., Parveen, M., Manohar, A., & Al-Tawfiq, J. A. A Systematic Review of the Effectiveness and Cost-Effectiveness of Implementing Antimicrobial Stewardship Program at Tertiary Care Facilities in India, IJID Regions, V15, June 2025, Article 100666. DOI:10.1016/j.ijregi.2025.100666.
27. Gupta, A., Saigal, S., Khadanga, S., Purwar, S., Goyal, A., Khurana, A., & Krishan, P. K. A Diagnostic Stewardship Bundle Approach to Facilitate Same-Day Optimal Antimicrobial Therapy in Gram-Negative Sepsis: A Quasi-Experimental Study, Scientific Reports, V16, 2026, Article 17047. DOI:10.1038/s41598-026-46677-6.
28. Chakraborty, S. Democratizing Nucleic Acid-Based Molecular Diagnostic Tests for Infectious Diseases at Resource-Limited Settings: From Point of Care to Extreme Point of Care, Sensors & Diagnostics, V3, 2024, pp. 536–561. DOI:10.1039/D3SD00289A.
29. Sharma, M., Gangakhedkar, R. R., Bhattacharya, S., & Walia, K. Understanding Complexities in the Uptake of Indigenously Developed Rapid Point-of-Care Diagnostics for Containment of Antimicrobial Resistance in India, BMJ Global Health, V6, i09, 2021, Article e006628. DOI:10.1136/bmjgh-2021-006628.
30. Gandra, S., Alvarez-Uria, G., Turner, P., Joshi, J., Limmathurotsakul, D., & van Doorn, H. R. Antimicrobial Resistance Surveillance in Low- and Middle-Income Countries: Progress and Challenges in Eight South Asian and Southeast Asian Countries, Clinical Microbiology Reviews, V33, i03, 2020, Article e00048-19. DOI:10.1128/CMR.00048-19.