Evaluation of a new lateral flow test for detection of Streptococcus pneumoniae and Legionella pneumophila urinary antigen
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ABSTRACT

Pneumonia is a major cause of morbidity and mortality worldwide. Early diagnosis of the etiologic agent is important in order to choose the correct antibiotic treatment. In this study we evaluated the first commercial combined test for the agents of pneumococcal pneumonia and Legionnaires’ disease based on urinary antigen detection, the ImmuView® Streptococcus pneumoniae and Legionella pneumophila Urinary Antigen Test.

In this evaluation, the new test had a significantly higher sensitivity than the BinaxNOW® lateral flow tests and the Binax® ELIA test. This identifies the ImmuView® S. pneumoniae and L. pneumophila Urinary Antigen Test as a fast and sensitive point of care test for identification of the infectious agent in a major group of patients with pneumonia.

© 2015 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

The most common cause of community-acquired pneumonia is Streptococcus (S.) pneumoniae, but also Legionella (L.) pneumophila plays a major role (O’Brien et al., 2009; Mongardon et al., 2012; von Baum et al., 2008) especially among hospitalised cases.

The clinical symptoms of severe pneumococcal pneumonia and Legionnaires’ disease (pneumonia caused by Legionella) are similar, and it is not possible clinically to distinguish between the two diseases. However, in Denmark the treatment of the two infections is different; S. pneumoniae is usually treated with penicillin, whereas Legionella requires macrolides or quinolones. A fast and correct treatment of the patients correlates with a successful outcome.

Laboratory diagnostic can be performed by culture, PCR, antibody tests on blood, or urine antigen tests for both agents. Urinary antigen tests are especially widely used for Legionnaires’ disease and accounts for more than 80% of the diagnosis in Europe (Beauté et al., 2013; Ginevra et al., 2005). Some countries have introduced national guidelines or recommendations regarding diagnosis and treatment of community-acquired pneumonia (Mandell et al., 2007; Woodhead et al., 2011, and guidelines for UK: http://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/cg191). These guidelines recommend urinary antigen testing for both pneumococcus and Legionella besides X-ray and culture. Since culture is quite time consuming and especially for Legionella is slow and has a relatively low sensitivity, the urinary antigen tests, which are fast and easy to perform, are often the preferred choice.

In this study, we evaluated the first commercially available combined test for pneumococcus and Legionella urinary antigen, the ImmuView® S. pneumoniae and L. pneumophila Urinary Antigen Test. According to the kit insert, the test detects L. pneumophila serogroup 1 and all 92 S. pneumoniae types.

2. Materials & methods

2.1. Urine samples for Legionella urinary antigen tests (sensitivity)

Urine samples from 55 culture confirmed L. pneumophila serogroup 1 cases (36 males, 19 females, median age 63 year [range: 41–82]) and 44 probable serogroup 1 cases (diagnosed by Binax® ELIA, which preferentially detects serogroup 1 (Alere, Scarborough, Marine, USA); 29 males, 15 females, median age 64 year [range: 28–92]) were selected from the routine laboratory at Statens Serum Institut (SSI). All cases were laboratory confirmed according to the ECDC case definition (http://www.ecdc.europa.eu/en/publications/publications/1202-td-eldsn-net-operating-procedures.pdf and http://www.ecdc.europa.eu/en/activities/surveillance/eldsnet/pages/eu%20case%20definition.aspx).

Culture was performed on lower respiratory tract specimens by standard methods. The samples were cultured undiluted and diluted 1:10 on MWY-O and BCYE agar plates (both from SSI Diagnostica, Statens Serum Institut, Denmark). Colonies identified as L. pneumophila were
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2. Materials & methods

2.1. Urine samples for Legionella urinary antigen tests (sensitivity)
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Culture was performed on lower respiratory tract specimens by standard methods. The samples were cultured undiluted and diluted 1:10 on MWY-O and BCYE agar plates (both from SSI Diagnostica, Statens Serum Institut, Denmark). Colonies identified as L. pneumophila were
investigated by the Dresden panel + MAb 3 of the international panel of monoclonal antibodies to determine the serogroup and subgroup (if applicable) of the isolates (Helbig et al., 2002). Among the 55 culture positive serogroup 1 cases 13 were MAb 3/1 positive (Pontiac group) and 42 were MAb 3/1 negative (non-Pontiac group).

In addition to the \textit{L. pneumophila} serogroup 1 cases, we investigated 50 samples from culture confirmed patients, who had infections caused by other \textit{L. pneumophila} serogroups than serogroup 1; twenty-eight samples from patients with \textit{L. pneumophila} serogroup 3 infection, two from serogroup 4, five from serogroup 5, 14 from serogroup 6, and one from a patient with serogroup 15 infection.

The urines were tested without heat treatment. All urines were stored in the freezer at \(-20\, ^\circ\text{C}\) until investigated.

### 2.2. Urine samples for pneumococcus urinary antigen tests (sensitivity)

Ninety-nine urine samples (58 males, 38 females, median age 65 years [range: 6–93]; 3 samples were from anonymous patients) were selected among positive \textit{S. pneumoniae} samples stored at SSI (previously boiled for 10 min, analysed and found positive in the in-house latex agglutination test described below, and stored in the freezer at \(-20\, ^\circ\text{C}\)). Since boiling is a part of the validated procedure, all positive samples have been boiled before analysis. Both lateral tests are intended for investigation of un-boiled samples, so these samples were tested with this deviation from the instruction of the manufacturers.

Moreover, 71 urine samples from patients (anonymous adults above 18 years of age) with positive blood cultures for \textit{S. pneumoniae} were selected for investigation (stored, without boiling, in the freezer at \(-20\, ^\circ\text{C}\) until investigated).

For the samples from the routine laboratory at SSI, exemption for review by the ethical committee system and for obtaining informed consent was obtained from the Committee on Biomedical Research Ethics for the Capital Region (protocol number 2001-54-0200) in accordance with Danish law on quality development projects. Culture positive \textit{S. pneumoniae} urines were covered by the ethical committee protocol number H-3-2013-027.

### 2.3. Binax\textregistered Legionella urinary antigen EIA

The enzyme immunoassay from Alere (Scarborough, Marine, USA), which qualitatively detects the presence of \textit{L. pneumophila} serogroup 1 antigen in urine, was performed according to the instruction of the manufacturer. Briefly, urine samples were added together with anti-\textit{Legionella} HRP conjugate to the microtitre wells, coated with polyclonal antibodies raised against \textit{L. pneumophila} serogroup 1 antigen. After 2 h incubation, the plate was decanted and washed. A colour developer was added. Following another incubation of 15 min the reaction was stopped and the resultant absorbance read on a microplate reader at 450 nm.

### 2.4. ImmuView\textregistered \textit{S. pneumoniae} and \textit{L. pneumophila} Urinary Antigen Test

The lateral flow assay for the qualitative detection of \textit{S. pneumoniae} and \textit{Legionella pneumophila} serogroup 1 antigen in urine from SSI Diagnostica (Hillerød, Denmark) was performed according to the instruction of the manufacturer. Briefly, three drops of patient urine and two drops of running buffer were gently mixed in a test tube. The test strip was inserted. Test results were read after 15 min incubation, interpreted by the presence or absence of visually detectable pink (\textit{S. pneumoniae}) or blue (\textit{L. pneumophila}) coloured lines.

### 2.5. BinaxNOW\textregistered Legionella urinary antigen card and BinaxNOW\textregistered \textit{S. pneumoniae} antigen card

The lateral flow assays from Alere (Scarborough, Marine, USA) for the qualitative detection of \textit{L. pneumophila} serogroup 1 antigen or for detection of \textit{S. pneumoniae} antigen in urine was performed according to the instruction of the manufacturer. Briefly, a swab was dipped into the urine and then inserted into the test card/strip. Reagent buffer was added. Test results were read after 15 min incubation, interpreted by the presence or absence of a visually detectable pink-to-purple coloured line.

### 2.6. In-house serotype-specific latex agglutination test \textit{S. pneumoniae}

The latex agglutination test was performed as described in Stralin et al., 2004. Briefly, urine was boiled for 10 min followed by mixture with the latex-suspension coated with type-specific pneumococcal antisera for identification of the 23-valent pneumococcal vaccine serotypes on a slide. If positive, aggregates occur within approximately 8 s.

### 2.7. Statistics

Statistical analysis was performed using GraphPad Prism 6. An unpaired Student's t-test was used for comparison of sensitivity performance for the selected urinary antigen assays. Comparisons were considered significantly different for \(p<0.05\).
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Results are shown in Fig. 1.
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ImmuView® was also able to detect two out of the 14 serogroup 6 cases and one serogroup 15, which was not found by the BinaxNOW® or the Binax® EIA kit. All other non-serogroup 1 samples were negative in both the ImmuView® and the two Binax® kits.

4. Discussion

Three different lateral flow tests for the diagnosis of L. pneumophila and S. pneumoniae were compared: the ImmuView® S. pneumoniae and L. pneumophila Urinary Antigen Test which detects both agents at one time, the BinaxNOW® Legionella kit and the BinaxNOW® S. pneumoniae kit. All three tests are fast methods for point-of-care diagnosis of the infectious agent in patients presenting with certain types of bacterial pneumonia.

Comparing the ImmuView® with the BinaxNOW® lateral flow test or the Binax® EIA showed that the sensitivity for detection of L. pneumophila serogroup 1 of the ImmuView® was significantly better than the other tests (88.9% compared to 71.7% and 74.7% respectively). Also for other serogroups than serogroup 1, the ImmuView® performed better — even though it only detected a small number of these patients. Both the ImmuView® and the Binax® EIA and BinaxNOW® assays are developed for detection of serogroup 1 antigen. But also other serogroups are involved in human infections. The clinical manifestations and the treatment of these infections are similar for all serogroups, so it is an advantage if the assays identify at least a proportion of these non-serogroup 1 infections.

For unknown reasons, we observed a low sensitivity (42.9%) of the Binax® EIA for cases with MAb 3/1 negative strains, the same strains that reacted very faintly in the BinaxNOW® lateral flow test. This is not in accordance with previous observations (Svarrer et al., 2012).

Comparing the ImmuView® assay with the BinaxNOW® for the detection of S. pneumoniae, showed that the ImmuView® had a significantly higher sensitivity when using boiled samples than the BinaxNOW® (82.8% compared to 61.6%), whereas the difference for the un-boiled samples was not significant (84.5% compared to 77.5%). Whether this is due to decreased sensitivity for boiled samples, or an overall lower sensitivity of the BinaxNOW® assay is not known, but this needs further investigation before a conclusion can be made. Both the ImmuView® and the BinaxNOW® assay is validated for un-boiled urine, but it may still be of interest how the tests perform on boiled samples, which may often be the case for studies on historical samples. Moreover, it cannot be ruled out that rare non-specific reaction can be minimised by boiling the samples (Birtles et al., 1990).

The investigation of 76 urines from patients with culture confirmed urinary tract infections indicates a high specificity of the lateral flow tests. The ImmuView® assay had 100% specificity for L. pneumophila and 99% for S. pneumoniae, which is slightly less than the BinaxNOW® kits which showed 100% specificity for both bacteria. This difference is not statistically significant. The result indicates that non-specific
binding is not an issue, even on un-boiled samples, but further investigation is needed.

The main method for the diagnosis of Legionnaires’ disease in Europe is urinary antigen tests (Joseph et al., 2010). This may contribute to an underestimation of the actual number of cases, since the urinary antigen tests primarily identify serogroup 1 cases. In Denmark, only approximately 60% of the culture-confirmed cases are caused by serogroup 1 infection, and more than 20% are due to serogroup 3, followed by few cases of other serogroups (Kjelsø and Uldum, 2014). We tested 50 samples from cases with other serogroups than serogroup 1, but were only able to identify 13 of them using the ImmuView® kit, and just one using the BinaxNOW® and 6 using the Binax® EIA kit. Even though the ImmuView® assay did find a few of these samples and performed better than the BinaxNOW® and Binax® EIA, this emphasizes the importance of using other methods than the urinary antigen tests, leaving PCR combined with culture as the gold standard in order to be able to identify cases caused by other serogroups.

We are aware that the panel of Legionnaires’ disease cases does not reflect what is seen in a normal diagnostic setting, since the proportion of MAb 3/1 negative cases are vastly overrepresented even for Denmark. The low sensitivity for Binax EIA for this group is unexpected and probably not a general problem, but this must be investigated further.

5. Conclusion

This investigation identified the ImmuView® S. pneumoniae and L. pneumophila Urinary Antigen Test as the most sensitive point-of-care test for patients presenting with pneumonia. Moreover, the ImmuView® also has the benefit of providing both results in one assay, making it easier to perform and cheaper to identify the correct infectious agent. This combined testing also fits very well with the national recommendation in different countries for simultaneous testing for these two agents.
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