Report of a WHO–FIND meeting on diagnostics for Buruli ulcer

Geneva, 26–27 March 2018
Contents

Abbreviations ........................................................................................................................................ iv
1. Background ........................................................................................................................................ 1
2. Meeting summary ............................................................................................................................. 2
3. Key discussion points ....................................................................................................................... 2
  3.1. Targeting mycolactone for the diagnosis of Buruli ulcer .......................................................... 2
  3.2. Protein (MUL_3720) capture assay in the diagnosis of Buruli ulcer ........................................ 3
  3.3. Molecular diagnosis of Buruli ulcer ......................................................................................... 4
  3.4. Histopathology of Buruli ulcer and sample collection ............................................................ 5
  3.5. Challenges in laboratory confirmation of Buruli ulcer ............................................................ 6
  3.6. Target product profiles .......................................................................................................... 6
4. Discussion ........................................................................................................................................ 9
5. Next steps ....................................................................................................................................... 10
6. Key priority activities for the next 5 years and timeline for implementation ........................... 11
Annex. List of participants .................................................................................................................. 12
Abbreviations

BU    Buruli ulcer
ELISA enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay
EQA   external quality assurance
FIND  Foundation for Innovative New Diagnostics
fTLC  fluorescent thin-layer chromatography
LAMP  loop-mediated isothermal amplification
mAbs monoclonal antibodies
PCR   polymerase chain reaction
RDT   rapid diagnostic test
RPA   recombinase polymerase amplification
TPP   target product profile
WHO   World Health Organization
1. Background

The target of the World Health Organization (WHO) roadmap on neglected tropical diseases¹ for Buruli ulcer (BU) is that by 2020, 70% of all cases are detected at an early stage and cured with antibiotics in all countries where the disease is endemic. The Foundation for Innovative New Diagnostics (FIND) is collaborating with WHO to achieve this target for control of the disease. FIND’s main focus is on promoting and supporting the development of new diagnostic tools to improve early detection of BU. The current FIND strategy on BU diagnostics was developed after a meeting of experts convened by WHO and FIND in 2013. Since then, FIND has been working with partners in academia and industry to develop a rapid test for screening and diagnosis at the community level, and to develop a molecular test for confirmatory diagnosis at the microscopy laboratory or district hospital level; and is supporting WHO in the evaluation and implementation of fluorescent thin-layer chromatography (fTLC) to detect mycolactone in lesions from BU suspected cases.

During a meeting of the WHO Technical Advisory Group (TAG) on Buruli ulcer (Geneva, 21 March 2017), a number of problems with laboratory confirmation of BU were identified: (i) low rate of polymerase chain reaction (PCR) confirmation in a number of endemic countries; (ii) long delays in getting results from laboratories; (iii) low participation in external quality assurance (EQA) programme by national reference laboratories; and (iv) lack of funding for sustaining the EQA programme. The TAG noted with satisfaction the progress made to develop diagnostic tests for BU by many research groups; however, considerable time is still needed to optimize methods and to progress them to field testing.

To accelerate progress, WHO and FIND convened a second global meeting at WHO headquarters in Geneva, Switzerland with the aim of establishing an action plan to develop new diagnostic solutions for BU and to create a framework of collaboration to address unmet needs in BU diagnostics.

2. Meeting summary

The meeting was held from 26 to 27 March 2018 to review and discuss the following topics:

- Advances and challenges in the use of fTLC, and new approaches to detecting mycolactone using monoclonal antibodies (mAbs).
- The status of development of rapid diagnostic tests (RDTs) targeting the MUL_3720 protein.
- The role of PCR as a reference test, and hurdles in providing a confirmatory diagnosis and in establishing a quality assurance programme.
- New molecular tools with potential for implementation at a level lower than in the national or regional reference laboratory, such as loop-mediated isothermal amplification (LAMP) and recombinase polymerase amplification (RPA).
- The need to harmonize and standardize methods for collection and preparation of specimens, so samples can be referred for diagnosis and stored for evaluation of new diagnostic tests in optimal conditions.
- Barriers to accessing early diagnosis and treatment, including coordination at the programme level, and lack of adequate diagnostic tools.
- Defining target product profiles (TPPs) to guide the development of new diagnostic tools that can be applied at different levels of the health system. Participants agreed that two TPPs would be developed to address the current gaps: (i) a rapid test for BU diagnosis at the primary health-care level; and (ii) a test for diagnosis of BU that can also assist in treatment monitoring and differential diagnosis at the district hospital or reference centre.

3. Key discussion points

3.1. Targeting mycolactone for the diagnosis of Buruli ulcer

- Preliminary results show that mycolactone or its metabolites may be present in the urine of mice infected with *Mycobacterium ulcerans* and in cases of BU, but further research is needed. Levels of mycolactone in ulcerative lesions decrease with treatment, highlighting its potential as a test of cure. Studies by Johns Hopkins University on liquid chromatography-mass spectrometry using experimental infections in mice and guinea-pigs show that the concentration of mycolactone is highest in the centre of the lesion, which may have implications for collection of samples for mycolactone detection tests.
• The stability of mycolactone for testing requires collection of samples in absolute ethanol and protection from light; the use of plastic tubes is not advised as mycolactone adheres to this material. The use of siliconized or glass tubes is encouraged.

• Data from the mycostudy, presented by the University of Ghana, show variable sensitivity (25–80%) and specificity (35–75%) of fTLC across sites. The method is standardized and appears straightforward, but the interpretation of results can be challenging, especially when swab samples are analysed. The accuracy of the PCR methods from the different national laboratories (with different protocols) used as a reference test in this study might not be ideal and could compromise the results of the evaluation.

• Different mAbs against mycolactone or mycolactone analogues have been developed using a library of either recombinant mAbs and selection with phage and yeast display (Specifica) or mouse hybridoma cells (Swiss Tropical and Public Health Institute). Assemblies of clones producing scFv and full antibodies have been generated by Specifica and the Swiss Tropical and Public Health Institute respectively. These present high affinity, in the range of the mycolactone concentration found in lesions from infected mice and BU cases (1–1000 nM). Preliminary testing has been conducted using competition enzyme-linked immunosorbent assays (ELISAs). With the availability of more synthetic mycolactone, it was proposed that open Fv ELISA and open sandwich assays could be developed, in which antibodies recognizing antibody–mycolactone complexes can be used. Both groups would join forces to work on the development of an RDT using mAbs to detect mycolactone in clinical samples. mAbs for use in the development of a prototype RDT may be ready in less than one year. Studies to assess the stability of mycolactone in stored samples will be needed.

• Access to synthetic mycolactone is an important aspect in the development of mycolactone detecting tests in order to conduct feasibility studies and as a control in the fTLC test. Professor Kishi (Harvard University) has produced large quantities of synthetic mycolactone; some are stored in his laboratory and some at WHO.

3.2. Protein (MUL_3720) capture assay in the diagnosis of Buruli ulcer

• The Swiss Tropical and Public Health Institute has developed 19 mAbs against the M. ulcerans surface protein MUL_3720. With PCR as reference, a pair of mAbs used in a capture ELISA shows very high specificity, but moderate sensitivity (c60%).
Abbott/Standard Diagnostics has produced two prototype RDTs based on selected anti-MUL_3720 mAbs and an avidin-biotin system, which have a sensitivity in the range of 3–6 ng/mL when *M. ulcerans* protein lysates are tested. Prototypes are being produced to test clinical samples.

3.3. Molecular diagnosis of Buruli ulcer

- Evaluation of the performance of PCR/quantitative PCR (qPCR) in multiple centres by an EQA programme led by the Institute of Tropical Medicine, Antwerp has shown improvement by the participating laboratories (during 2009–2014), but some limitations remain: approximately 20% of the laboratories reported false-positive results and 30% were unable to detect weak positive samples; and the participation rate is decreasing. Participation in EQA may depend on the availability of funds for PCR/qPCR reagents, which may also affect confirmation of referred samples. Around 50% of the laboratories use home-brewed DNA extraction methods and the PCR/qPCR methodology used varies among laboratories; thus a quality assurance programme targeting harmonization rather than standardization is preferred.

- A recent study conducted by the Institute of Tropical Medicine, Antwerp and partners in Benin revealed that although clinical diagnosis has higher sensitivity than laboratory tests, it may miss BU cases, especially in the early stages (nodular forms). With declining BU incidence, the accuracy of clinical diagnosis will also decrease. Awareness of BU must therefore be sustained while rapid and cost-effective diagnostic tests are developed, as PCR should be reserved for microscopy-negative BU suspects. However, microscopy for BU is not done in many hospitals.

- Studies on the evaluation of simpler approaches to the molecular diagnosis of BU using stored clinical samples were presented, showing promising results. An evaluation of RPA using stored samples from Ghana, presented by the Kumasi Centre for Collaborative Research in Tropical Medicine, showed 86% sensitivity and 100% specificity in a set of 55 clinical samples from BU suspects. An evaluation of LAMP conducted by the Department of Infectious and Tropical Medicine/KUM, Munich and the Noguchi Memorial Institute for Medical Research on a set of 75 clinical samples from suspected cases of BU in Togo returned 100% sensitivity and specificity. In both studies *IS2404* qPCR was used as the reference. A prospective evaluation of these tests will be conducted and, if successful, may be considered to replace PCR and implemented at a level lower than the regional or national reference laboratory, as they present a number of advantages over PCR, namely: (i) their presentation in a dry reagents-based ready-to-use format
that minimizes preparation steps and avoids a cold chain; and (ii) amplification and detection are conducted in a robust, portable and automated platform. Simple methods for DNA preparation to be used with these two methods are available but need to be evaluated.

3.4. Histopathology of Buruli ulcer and sample collection

- Studies by the Swiss Tropical and Public Health Institute analysing histopathology sections from experimental infection in animals and BU cases show that *M. ulcerans* penetrates the subcutaneous tissue and is unevenly distributed, while mycolactone diffuses beyond the bacterial clumps and is widespread. This finding may have implications for sample collection and diagnosis, making mycolactone a preferred target. Levels of mycolactone decrease with treatment, whereas DNA and bacterial cells remain for some time after treatment; this finding points also to the suitability of mycolactone detection in monitoring of treatment. Microscopy may also assist by identification of a beading pattern, i.e. the loss of solid staining, of acid fast bacilli.

- Adequate collection of test samples is critical to maximize the likelihood of detecting *M. ulcerans* in a lesion from a suspected case. Current methods are based on the use of fine-needle aspirates, mainly for non-ulcerative lesions (nodules, plaques and oedema), and cotton swabs, for ulcers. The Swiss Tropical and Public Health Institute has been evaluating the use of FLOQ® swabs, which are composed of a flocking of nylon fibres that allows 10 times more material to be collected than traditional cotton swabs.

- Samples from suspected BU cases can now be analysed by different methods, and can be stored in collections to be used in feasibility studies of new diagnostic tests. Thus it is important to identify collection formats that are compatible with different downstream applications. As an example, when diagnosis by culture is not the recommended routine method of confirming cases for treatment, it is unnecessary and costly to use culture media to collect and store samples from treatment centres. Storing samples in absolute ethanol is compatible with both mycolactone and DNA detection systems, and while long-term thermal stability of mycolactone is assessed, it is recommended to store samples in glass or siliconized tubes protected from light and at −20°C. This will allow generation of results on mycolactone detection tests that are comparable to DNA detection on the same sample.
3.5. Challenges in laboratory confirmation of Buruli ulcer

- Current challenges in laboratory confirmation were presented from the perspective of the Centre de dépistage et de traitement de l’ulcère de Buruli d’Allada (Benin) and the Institut Pasteur (Côte d’Ivoire). The rate of biological confirmation of BU cases is still low (< 70%) in many countries due to gaps in many links of the referral chain, including sample collection, transport, analysis and reporting of results, namely: (i) poor quality, integrity and information on samples collected; (ii) lack of clarity about when to refer samples for biological confirmation; (iii) delay in transport of samples to the reference laboratory; (iv) poor coordination between national programmes or health centres and reference laboratories; (v) long time to receive the results, (vi) decreased motivation and technical and clinical capacity; and (vii) lower sensitivity than previously believed.

- It is generally understood that the availability of a point-of-care confirmatory test and oral antibiotic therapy would improve case management.

3.6. Target product profiles

- Participants discussed the four use cases describing the application of potential new tests:
  - screening for BU at community level;
  - diagnosis (and confirmation) of BU at community or primary health-care level;
  - diagnosis and confirmation of BU in equipped district-level laboratories and national or regional reference laboratories; and
  - test of cure for BU.

It was agreed that screening at the community level was not a priority given that clinical assessment has an acceptable positive predictive value, and that new tests should fulfil the criteria defined in two different draft TPPs: (i) a rapid test for BU diagnosis at the primary health-care level; and (ii) a test for diagnosis of BU that can optimally assist in treatment monitoring and differential diagnosis at district hospital or reference centre. The preliminary priority features for these two TPPs are described below and will be further refined in consultation with experts in BU diagnostics.
# Target product profile 1 (draft)

## Rapid test for diagnosis of Buruli ulcer at the primary health-care level

### Scope

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Optimal</th>
<th>Minimal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intended use</td>
<td>Confirmation of Buruli ulcer</td>
<td>Confirmation of Buruli ulcer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target population</td>
<td>Suspected cases, early stages</td>
<td>Suspected cases, ulcerated lesions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target operator of the test</td>
<td>Nurse, laboratory technician</td>
<td>Nurse, laboratory technician</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowest setting for implementation</td>
<td>Community, but as part of active case-finding activities</td>
<td>Health centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target analyte</td>
<td>Mycolactone</td>
<td>Protein, DNA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Performance characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clinical sensitivity (assessed in a latent class analysis)</th>
<th>Polymerase chain reaction</th>
<th>Ziehl–Neelsen microscopy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clinical specificity (assessed in a latent class analysis)</td>
<td>Polymerase chain reaction</td>
<td>Ziehl–Neelsen microscopy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strain specificity</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>African strains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of analysis, quantitation</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Test procedure

| Training needs, time (including sample collection) | 1 day | 2 days |
| Sample type                                        | Lesion swab, fine-needle aspirate | Lesion swab, fine-needle aspirate |
| Sample preparation, steps                          | Direct testing on sample | 3–5 steps |
| N° of steps to be performed by operator            | < 3 | < 10 |
| Need to transfer precise volumes                   | No | Acceptable with a disposable transfer device |
| Time to result                                      | < 20 min | Same day |
| Reading system                                      | Visual (naked eye) | Simple reading device |
| Power requirements                                  | None | Battery operated |

### Operational characteristics

| Operating conditions                             | 5–50 °C, 90% relative humidity | 5–40 °C, 80% relative humidity |
| Kit transport                                     | No cold chain required; tolerance of transport stress for a minimum of 1 week at −15 °C to + 50 °C | No cold chain required; tolerance of transport stress for a minimum of 72 h at −15 °C to + 50 °C |
| Kit storage/stability                             | No cold chain required; 24 months at 50 °C, 90% humidity | No cold chain required; > 12 months at 40 °C, 70% humidity |
| Reagents reconstitution                           | All reagents ready to use      | Minor preparation steps, e.g. mixing reagents |
| In use stability                                  | > 1 h for single use test after opening the pouch | > 2 h for single use test after opening the pouch |
**Target product profile 2 (draft)**

Test for diagnosis of Buruli ulcer, to assist in treatment monitoring and differential diagnosis at the district hospital or reference centre

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scope</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Characteristic</strong></td>
<td><strong>Optimal</strong></td>
<td><strong>Minimal</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intended use</td>
<td>Treatment monitoring and differential diagnosis</td>
<td>Confirmation of Buruli ulcer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target population</td>
<td>Suspected cases, early stages</td>
<td>Suspected cases, ulcerated lesions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target operator of the test</td>
<td>Laboratory technician</td>
<td>Laboratory technologist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowest setting for implementation</td>
<td>District hospital</td>
<td>Regional or national reference laboratory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target analyte</td>
<td>DNA</td>
<td>DNA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Performance characteristics**

| Clinical sensitivity (assessed in a latent class analysis) | Polymerase chain reaction | Ziehl–Neelsen microscopy |
| Clinical specificity (assessed in a latent class analysis) | Polymerase chain reaction | Ziehl–Neelsen microscopy |
| Strain specificity | Global | African strains |
| Type of analysis, quantitation | Quantitative | Qualitative |
| Multiplexing | Yes (other pathogens, drug resistance profile) | Not necessary |

**Test procedure**

| Training needs, time | 1 day | 5 days |
| Sample type | Lesion swab, fine-needle aspirate | Lesion swab, fine-needle aspirate |
| Sample preparation, steps | < 10 | < 15 |
| Number of steps to be performed by operator | < 10 | < 15 |
| Need to transfer precise volumes | Accepted | Accepted |
| Time to result | < 1 h | < 2 days |
| Reading system | Accepted | Accepted |
| Power requirements | Accepted | Accepted |

**Operational characteristics**

| Operating conditions | 5–30 °C, 80% relative humidity | 5–25 °C, 60% relative humidity |
| Kit transport | No cold chain required; tolerance of transport stress for a minimum of 1 week at −15 °C to + 50 °C | Cold chain required; ideally refrigerated |
| Kit storage/stability | No cold chain required; < 24 months at 50 °C, 90% humidity | Cold chain required, refrigeration; > 12 months at < 10 °C |
| Reagent reconstitution | Minor preparation steps, e.g. mixing reagents | Major preparation steps, e.g. mixing reagents |
| In-use stability | > 1 h for single use test after opening the reagent bottle | > 2 h for single use test after opening the reagent bottle |
4. Discussion

- Many challenges remain in BU diagnosis, from sample collection and referral to the availability of needed tests. Effective coordination and collaboration among all actors must be ensured to accelerate progress and define a stepwise approach for laboratory diagnosis of BU.

- National and international referral laboratories\(^2\) should work towards the harmonization of PCR processes, and quality assurance programmes (internal and external) should be put in place. A landscape analysis of PCR methods and processes, as well as gaps in the referral and reporting chain, should be conducted.

- PCR tests must perform adequately for both confirmation and as a reference test in the evaluation of new diagnostics. Results from available studies should be reviewed to better understand the diagnostic performance of PCR.

- Results from prospective evaluations of RPA and LAMP will inform the opportuneness of these methods for molecular diagnosis, but would need to be independently assessed by other laboratories.

- fTLC is still under evaluation and funds need to be secured. Reliable PCR protocols must be in place to ensure that the evaluation of fTLC includes a qualified reference test. Pooling samples from the same patient and storage in absolute ethanol solution will aid in the comparison of fTLC and PCR results.

- Teams working on detection of mycolactone with mAbs are ready to collaborate and it is anticipated that testing on stored samples will soon be possible using platforms based on capture ELISA and waveguide-based optical biosensor.

- Mycolactone appears to be a suitable target for treatment monitoring or test of cure.

- Synthetic mycolactone must be made available for studies on mycolactone detection. Professor Kishi has produced some quantities of synthetic mycolactone that can be made available to researchers. However, long-term production should be pursued.

- Evaluation of prototype RDTs detecting MUL_3720 in stored clinical samples is expected in 2018 and will inform the opportuneness of conducting a prospective evaluation.

5. Next steps

• Conduct a landscape analysis of gaps in PCR methods and referral chain for confirmation.
• Develop a quality assurance plan for PCR.
• Harmonize protocols for sample collection, storage and preparation; and develop guidance and training packages if needed.
• Define repositories for clinical samples that can assist in quality assurance activities and evaluation of new diagnostic tests.
• Coordinate groups working on detection of mycolactone with mAbs to accelerate the development of a point-of-care test; ensure availability of synthetic mycolactone.
• Continue evaluation of fTLC and conduct further studies to address the background problems with swabs; ensure that evaluation includes blinded reading of results.
• Monitor progress in the development of LAMP and RPA methods for implementation at a level lower than the national or regional reference laboratory.
• Provide support to national programmes to strengthen laboratory capacity and referral systems.
### 6. Key priority activities for the next 5 years and timeline for implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conduct gap analysis of confirmation by PCR and develop a sustainable quality assurance plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyse need for support to national programmes for strengthening laboratories, capacity and referral systems.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop harmonized protocols for sample collection, storage and processing, and build capacity for collection of clinical samples.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete evaluation and troubleshooting for fTLC. Ensure evaluation includes blinded reading of results.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitor progress in evaluation of LAMP and RPA methods for implementation at a level lower than the national or regional reference laboratory.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carry out collaborative work to develop and evaluate an RDT for mycolactone detection.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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