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Management of Coccidioidomycosis

Consider Cocci

Order Lab Studies
Serology or Cultures

Check for
Risk Factors

Check for
Complications

Institute Management

Revised evaluations

Specialty Referral and/or Treatment

Retest
When to Consider Valley Fever?

Summary

• In Arizona, Valley Fever is very common. It should be in the differential often.

• More frequent between the monsoons and the winter rains.

• Settings:
  - Always in community acquired pneumonia
  - Rheumatism
  - Rashes
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Diagnostic Confidence in Coccidioidomycosis

• How good are the tests?
  – What do we know
  – What’s fuzzy.

• How confident do we need to be to optimally manage patients?
Seeing spherules or growing cocci in culture

In the Soil
- Septate Mycelium
- Free Arthrosopes
- Arthrosore Formation
- Disarticulation

In infected tissue
- Rupturing Spherule
- Endosporulating Spherule (Mature)
- Free Endospores
- Immature Spherules
- Mature Spherules

www.vfce.arizona.edu
KOH Examination
Spherule (Silver stain of BAL fluid)
Spherules (Hematoxylin-Eosin stain)
Culture of *Coccidioides* spp.

- **Primary pneumonia**
  - Send patient home with a sputum cup
  - First AM specimen
- **Extrapulmonary lesions**
  - aspiration of abscesses
  - skin biopsies
Coccy Diagnosis Culture

Growth

- Any medium
- Non-pigmented mold in 3-5 days
- Arthroconidia 1-2 wks
Other tests for Coccidioidomycosis

**PCR detection of coccidioidal DNA**
- Research publications have demonstrated feasibility
- Some but not all reference laboratories offer PCR for tissue

**Coccidioidal antigen detection**
- Similar to antigen assay for Histoplasmosis.
- Positive in patients with very extensive disease.
- Send-out to a single reference laboratory.

www.vfce.arizona.edu
Definitive Diagnosis of Coccidioidomycosis

- Identification of spherules in a clinical specimen.
- Probe-confirmed growth of *Coccidioides* spp.
- PCR positive result on a clinical specimen (?)
- Detection of cocci antigen (?)
Detecting Coccidioidal Antibodies

- Serologic tests are most often used for diagnosis of early coccidioidal pulmonary infections.
- If coccidioidal antibodies are detected, this is a very specific result and usually important.
- A negative test does not eliminate the possibility of Valley Fever. Repeated testing improves diagnostic sensitivity.
Evaluating Incidence of Coccidioidomycosis in the Northwest Valley, Arizona – 2008 Serosurvey Results
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Methods - sampling

• Used remnant sera from major commercial lab
• All sera meeting the following criteria were identified:
  — 65+ years old, living in NWV zip codes
  — 65+ years old, living in non-NWV Maricopa County
• Randomly sampled 800 from each group between Feb - Apr 2009
  — Sample size calculations based on assumed disease prevalence of:
    • 3% in NWV
    • 1.5% in non-NWV
## Serosurvey Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NWV (n=797)</th>
<th>Maricopa County (n=797)</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive by ID</td>
<td>9 (1.1%)</td>
<td>6 (0.75%)</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median age (range)</td>
<td>74 years (65-97)</td>
<td>72 years (65-99)</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>383 (49%)</td>
<td>369 (47%)</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CF titer</td>
<td>total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC 1:4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC 1:8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CF 1:2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CF 1:8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CF 1:16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CF 1:32</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CF 1:128</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
So What About the EIA tests?
Suspected Coccidioidal Pneumonia
n=138, first specimens only

**CF or TP Immuno-diffusion Test Results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Type</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Positive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meridian EIA</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRAg2 ELISA</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Wieden et al. JID May ‘96
Sensitivity of TP/CF Testing

- EIA and/or ELISA positive
  - 54%
- TP and/or CF positive
  - 18%
- At least 1/3 of EIA only first specimens were corroborated with subsequent TP/CF positives or positive cultures

**Conclusion:**

Up to 2/3 of early infections detected by newer tests are missed by TP and CF tests.

Wieden et al. JID May ‘96
Specificity of Enzyme Immunoassay for Serologic Coccidioidomycosis Diagnosis Compared to Immunodiffusion
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Research Objective

• To determine the specificity of enzyme immunoassay for coccidioidomycosis diagnosis
  – Compared to immunodiffusion
  – Based on existing laboratory data reported to public health
Need & Relevance

• 60% of the estimated 150,000 U. S. cocci infections per year make AZ the focal point for investigation
• EIA is the easiest and least expensive diagnostic test to perform, but sensitivity and specificity are not clearly defined
• Early in disease the test can be falsely negative
• False positives may occur, especially EIA IgM, leading to additional diagnostic testing and patient anxiety
• EIA results have not been extensively correlated with immunodiffusion (ID)
• ID is used as a confirmatory test for positive EIA results by some laboratories as recommended by Kaufman et al.
Methods

• All Lab Corp cocci serological test results from February 2008 to February 2009 were requested, organized, and reviewed
• Inclusion criteria: data sets with EIA IgM and IgG and ≥ 2 comparison tests (CT) performed the same day
• Tests used for comparison (CT) included:
  – Immunodiffusion IgM and IgG (ID)
  – Complement fixation titers (CF)
  – Tissue/culture diagnosis
• Calculated sensitivity, specificity, and positive/negative predictive values of EIA IgM and IgG combined
• The CT was considered positive if any CT test was positive the day of EIA collection or if tissue/culture diagnosis occurred during the study time period
Methods Continued

- Requested and reviewed the medical records associated with false positive EIA results for:
  - Coccidioidomycosis symptoms
  - Physician diagnosis
  - Subsequent positive CT test results through December 2010
The Initial Results

1445 lab test sets met inclusion criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CT+ (Disease)</th>
<th>CT- (No Disease)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EIA+</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIA-</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1172</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Initial Results
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<th>CT- (No Disease)</th>
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“False Positives”
“False Positives”

• “False Positive” = EIA positive and CT negative
• Medical records reviewed for 125 “False Positives”
  – 31 (25%) “False Positives” had subsequent positive CT test results in the medical record
  – 31 results were re-classified as “True Positives” leaving 94 “False Positives”
• Calculated sensitivity, specificity, PPV, & NPV
Results (N=1445)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CT+ (Disease)</th>
<th>CT- (No Disease)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EIA+</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIA-</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1172</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- EIA sensitivity = 83.8%
- **EIA specificity** = 92.6%
- Positive predictive value = 61.5%
- Negative predictive value = 97.6%
Summary of “False Positive” EIA Results

125 FP based on one test set

- 94 (75%) FP
  - 21 (22%) IgG pos, IgM pos
  - 40 (43%) IgG neg, IgM pos
  - 33 (35%) IgG pos, IgM neg

- 31 (25%) with confirmatory lab tests from medical record
  - 8 (26%) IgG pos, IgM pos
  - 2 (6%) IgG neg, IgM pos
  - 21 (68%) IgG pos, IgM neg

54 of 94 (57%) = IgG+

29 of 31 (94%) = IgG +
Clinical Review of 94 False Positive Results

- 92/94 (97.9%) were associated with documented coccidioidomycosis symptoms
- 76/94 (80.9%) were associated with documented physician-diagnosed disease
Summary

• This is the largest investigation of EIA specificity for coccidioidomycosis diagnosis
• EIA specificity = 93% (PPV 62%) based on laboratory tests alone
• 25% (31/125) of “false positive” EIA results represent lab confirmed disease
• 22% of the remaining 94 “false positive” EIA results are both IgM and IgG positive, increasing the likelihood that they represent true disease
• 57% of all “false positive” EIAs are IgG positive
Limitations

• Repeat serologic test results occurring after December 2010 were not available possibly leading to missed diagnoses

• Serologic test results were reviewed from only one laboratory possibly overlooking tests that would have confirmed disease

• Laboratory methods may vary in different laboratories
Conclusions

• The current practice by some laboratories of confirming all positive EIA results with ID leads to missed coccidioidomycosis diagnoses and an underestimate of disease burden by public health

• Single immunodiffusion/complement fixation tests are not a sufficient “gold standard” for cocci diagnosis

• Association of “false positive” EIA results with coccidioidomycosis symptoms and diagnosis suggests clinical correlation may improve EIA diagnostic utility

• Repeat serologic testing should be considered for “false positive” EIAs
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Is EIA IgM Specific? Yes

- 405 patients with Meridian EIA tests:
  - Only 28 (7%) showed IgM positive with IgG negative.

- Of the 28:
  - 24 were CF and/or immunodiffusion positive.
  - The other four had either culture or histologic confirmation.

Blair et al. Mycopathologia ‘08
Is EIA IgM Specific? No

- Of 2,139 Meridian EIA tests:
  - Only 104 (5%) showed IgM positive with IgG negative.
- 17 patients with IgM only EIA:
  - Only one was confirmed by immunodiffusion at UC Davis (both IDTP and IDCF)
  - Only three (incl. the UCD +) were clinically judged to have coccidioidomycosis.

Kuberski T et al. J Clin Microbiol. ‘10
What about Isolated IgM Pos?

- They are not particularly common (5-15%)
- Different laboratories have yielded different correlations with “likely cocci.”
- Possible causes include:
  - Patient selection.
  - Manufacturer quality control.
  - Differences in performing the assay (especially stringency of the wash step).
How confident do we need to be to optimally manage patients?

• The sicker the patient, the more certain the diagnostics should be.
  – Culture or Histology is best.
  – At the very least immunodiffusion or CF tests.

• Less acutely ill patients whose serologic tests are indeterminate or negative may be managed without a secure diagnosis.
Thank-you
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