

Multicenter study to evaluate diagnostic methods for detection and isolation of *Campylobacter* from stool

Collette Fitzgerald¹ Mary Patrick¹, Robert Jerris², Renee Watson², Melissa Tobin-D'Angelo³, Anthony Gonzalez⁴, Christopher Polage⁵, Katie Wymore⁶, Laura Gillim-Ross⁷, Jennifer Sadlowski⁷, Jan Monahan⁸, Sharon Hurd⁹, Suzanne Dahlberg¹⁰, Mary DeMartino¹¹, Michael Pentella¹¹, Jafar Razeq¹², Celere Leonard¹², Carriane Jung¹², Billie Juni¹³, Trisha Robinson¹³ Rachel Gittelman¹⁴, Charles Garrigan¹⁴, Irving Nachamkin¹⁴ and *Campylobacter* diagnostics working group

¹Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Atlanta, GA, ²Children's Healthcare of Atlanta, GA, ³Georgia Dept. of Health, GA, ⁴Sacramento County Public Health Laboratory, CA, ⁵UC Davis Medical Center, CA, ⁶California Emerging Infections Program, CA, ⁷Colorado Department of Public Health, CO, ⁸Exempla St. Joseph Hospital, Denver, CO, ⁹Connecticut Emerging Infections Program, CT, ¹⁰Yale-New Haven Hospital, CT, ¹¹State Hygienic Laboratory at the University of Iowa, IA, ¹²Maryland Department of Health, MD, ¹³Minnesota Department of Health, MN, ¹⁴University of Pennsylvania School of Medicine, Philadelphia PA.

Modified Abstract

Background: The use of culture independent methods as standalone tests for the direct detection of *Campylobacter* in stool is increasing. We conducted a prospective, multicenter study to evaluate the real-world performance of stool antigen assays in comparison to culture and PCR for detection of *Campylobacter* from stool.

Methods: Stool specimens collected between July and October 2010 from patients in 8 states who were being evaluated for GI illness were tested with the following methods: four *Campylobacter* selective media (CVA, Campy-cefex, mCCDA and CSM), four EIA assays (ProSpecT™ *Campylobacter*, PREMIER™ *CAMPY*, ImmunoCard STAT! (ICS) and Xpect Campy) and PCR (Seegene). Clinical and epidemiologic data were collected from patients whose stool was positive in any of the tests performed.

Results: A total of 3.2% (88/2767) of specimens tested were positive by culture, of which 13.6% (12/88) were negative in all 4 EIA tests. As compared to culture, the sensitivity/specificity/positive predictive values of the EIA tests were: Premier *CAMPY*, 82.6%/97.3%/51.7%, ProSpecT, 83.7%/97.7%/55.7%, ICS, 73.1%/96.1%/39.8% and Xpect Campy, 74.2%/99.4%/80.2%. Of the 206 culture-negative specimens that were positive in one or more of the EIA tests, only 2.9% (6/206) were positive in all four EIA tests, and 76.2% (157/206) were positive in only one of the four EIA tests: ICS (n=67), ProSpecT (n=44), Premier *CAMPY* (n=36), Xpect Campy (n=10). All but one of these 157 specimens was PCR negative. We found significant differences in demographics and clinical symptoms between cases and non-cases.

Conclusions: While convenient to use, the sensitivity and specificity of *Campylobacter* EIA tests was variable. Given the low incidence of *Campylobacter* disease and the performance data generated in this study, we recommend EIA tests should not be used as standalone tests for direct detection of *Campylobacter* in stool.

Laboratory diagnosis of *Campylobacter* infection The problems

- There are currently no national clinical or state public health best practice guidelines for *Campylobacter* diagnostic testing
- The use of stool antigen tests is increasing
 - Guidelines for interpretation and reporting discordant results between non-culture test and culture results for a given specimen do not exist.
 - Current *Campylobacter* case definition requires culture confirmation
- There are no evaluations of the current gold standard – culture

Aim of Study

- We conducted a prospective, multicenter study to evaluate the real-world performance of stool antigen assays in comparison to culture and PCR for detection of *Campylobacter* from stool.

A total of 3.2% (88/2767) of specimens were positive by culture

Number of culture positive specimens (n=88)	Premier <i>CAMPY</i>	ProSpecT	ICS	Xpect Campy	PCR
61	P	P	P	P	P (n=57), Neg (n=3), NT (n=1)
12	Neg	Neg	Neg	Neg	P (n=5), Neg (n=6), NT (n=1)
1	P	Neg	Neg	Neg	P
2	Neg	P	Neg	Neg	Neg
5	P	P	Neg	Neg	P (n=4), Neg (n=1)
1	Neg	P	Neg	P	P
2	P	P	Neg	P	P
2	P	P	P	Neg	P
1	P	Neg	P	P	P
1	NT	NT	Neg	Neg	Neg

Nos. of false negatives: Premier *CAMPY* 15, ProSpecT 14, ICS 24, Xpect Campy 23, PCR 13

225 culture negative specimens were positive in at least one test

# culture negative	Premier <i>CAMPY</i>	ProSpecT	ICS	Xpect Campy	PCR
4	P	P	P	P	P
1	Neg	P	Neg	Neg	P
2	P	P	P	P	Neg
67	Neg	Neg/ Ind	P	Neg/ Inv	Neg
44	Neg	P	Neg	Neg/ inv	Neg
36	P	Neg	Neg	Neg	Neg
10	Neg	Neg/ Ind	Neg	P	Neg
5	P	P	Neg	Neg	Neg
6	Neg	P	P	Neg/ Inv	Neg
3	Neg	P	Neg	P	Neg
24	P	Neg/ Ind	P	Neg	Neg
2	P	P	P	Neg	Neg
2	P	Neg/ Ind	P	P	Neg
19	Neg	Neg	Neg	Neg	P

False positives? Premier *CAMPY* 71, ProSpecT 62, ICS 103, Xpect Campy 17, PCR 19

Results

Performance characteristics of culture and stool antigen tests based on study case definition

	Sensitivity	Specificity	PPV	NPV
Premier <i>CAMPY</i>	82.6%	97.3%	51.7%	99.4%
ProSpecT	83.7%	97.7%	55.7%	99.5%
ICS	73.1%	96.1%	39.8%	99.0%
Xpect Campy	74.2%	99.4%	80.2%	99.1%
PCR	85.7%	99.3%	80.4%	99.5%
Culture	94.6%	100%	100%	99.8%

Comparison of Epidemiologic Characteristics of *Campylobacter* Cases and Non-Cases

– Epidemiologic data is currently available for 212/313 patients that were positive in at least one of the tests performed

	Cases (n=91)			Non-Cases (n=142)			p-value
	#	Total	(%)	#	Total	(%)	
Age: median (range)	26	25	26-77	44.5	26	100	0.0341
Sex: Female	36	87	(41.4%)	76	134	(56.7%)	0.0259
Race: White	60	74	(81.1%)	80	102	(78.4%)	0.6671
Ethnicity: Hispanic	10	73	(13.7%)	11	102	(10.8%)	0.5586
Diarrhea	67	69	(97.1%)	77	92	(83.7%)	0.0062
Bloody diarrhea	24	60	(40.0%)	34	74	(45.9%)	0.4897
Fever	44	64	(68.8%)	39	86	(45.3%)	0.0044
Nausea	36	62	(58.1%)	45	84	(53.6%)	0.5892
Vomiting	25	66	(37.9%)	31	90	(34.4%)	0.6586
Abdominal cramps	54	62	(87.1%)	62	83	(74.7%)	0.0648
Days of illness: med (range)	10	5-29		20	3-60		0.0179
Hospitalized	27	78	(34.6%)	56	102	(54.9%)	0.0068
Prior antibiotic	4	62	(6.5%)	21	85	(24.7%)	0.0036

- Non-cases were significantly more likely than cases to be older, female, hospitalized, haven taken antibiotics prior to illness and have a longer duration of illness; and less likely to have had diarrhea or fever.

Study Design

- Study Sites:** Stool specimens were collected from participating study site hospital, county or state public health laboratories in eight states (CA, CO, CT, GA, IA, MD, MN and PA) from patients with GI illness, on whom routine enteric diagnostic laboratory testing, including *Campylobacter* testing had been ordered.
- Study Period:** July to October 2010
- Methods tested:**
 - Four *Campylobacter* selective media (CVA, Campy-cefex, mCCDA and CSM)
 - Four EIA assays: ProSpecT™ *Campylobacter* (Remel), PREMIER™ *CAMPY* (Meridian Bioscience), ImmunoCard STAT! (ICS, Meridian Bioscience) and Xpect Campy (Remel)
 - PCR (Seegene Inc - Multiplex assay that also detects *Salmonella*, *Shigella*, *Vibrio* and *Clostridium difficile* toxin B)
- All commercial EIA and PCR methods were performed according to manufacturer's instructions
- Associated Data:** Clinical and epidemiologic data were collected from patients whose stool was positive in any of the tests performed.
- Case Definition:** Specimen is culture positive OR Specimen is positive in at least one stool antigen test and the PCR

Conclusions / Next steps

- While convenient to use, the performance characteristics of *Campylobacter* EIA tests was variable.
- Given the low incidence of *Campylobacter* disease and the performance data generated in this study, we recommend that EIA tests should not be used as standalone tests for direct detection of *Campylobacter* in stool.
 - a positive EIA test alone is not sufficient to consider a case "confirmed"
 - laboratories should confirm positive EIA results by culture
- Next steps include:
 - Establishing *Campylobacter* Clinical and Public Health workgroups to develop best practice guidelines for *Campylobacter* diagnostic testing.
 - Review of current *Campylobacter* case definition; update if appropriate.

Acknowledgements

- We thank the Association for Public Health Laboratories for funding this study and Remel, Hardy Diagnostics, Meridian Biosciences, Seegene Inc and Qiagen for providing laboratory supplies.
- This study was approved by institutional review boards at the respective institutions where appropriate.