

# Same-day diagnosis of tuberculosis by microscopy

Policy statement

WHO Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data

Same-day diagnosis of tuberculosis by microscopy: policy statement.

1. Tuberculosis, Pulmonary - diagnosis. 2. Microscopy. 3. Sputum - microbiology. I. World Health Organization.

ISBN 978 92 4 150160 6

(NLM classification: WF 220)

### © World Health Organization 2011

All rights reserved. Publications of the World Health Organization are available on the WHO web site (<u>www.who.int</u>) or can be purchased from WHO Press, World Health Organization, 20 Avenue Appia, 1211 Geneva 27, Switzerland (tel.: +41 22 791 3264; fax: +41 22 791 4857; e-mail: <u>bookorders@who.int</u>).

Requests for permission to reproduce or translate WHO publications – whether for sale or for noncommercial distribution – should be addressed to WHO Press through the WHO web site (<u>http://www.who.int/about/licensing/copyright\_form/en/index.html</u>).

The designations employed and the presentation of the material in this publication do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the World Health Organization concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries. Dotted lines on maps represent approximate border lines for which there may not yet be full agreement.

The mention of specific companies or of certain manufacturers' products does not imply that they are endorsed or recommended by the World Health Organization in preference to others of a similar nature that are not mentioned. Errors and omissions excepted, the names of proprietary products are distinguished by initial capital letters.

All reasonable precautions have been taken by the World Health Organization to verify the information contained in this publication. However, the published material is being distributed without warranty of any kind, either expressed or implied. The responsibility for the interpretation and use of the material lies with the reader. In no event shall the World Health Organization be liable for damages arising from its use.

Printed by the WHO Document Production Services, Geneva, Switzerland

WHO/HTM/TB/2011.7

## Contents

## Abbreviations

Executi	ve sumr	nary	1
1.	Background 2		
2.	Evidence for policy formulation		2
	2.1	Synthesis of evidence	2
	2.2	Management of declarations of interest	3
3.	Summary of results		
4.	Policy recommendations5		
5.	Intended audience 6		
6.	References 6		
7.	Annexes		.7
	Annex 1: Expert Group members7		
	Annex 2: WHO staff members		
Annex 3:		3: STAG-TB members	10

## Abbreviations

CI	confidence interval
GRADE	grades of recommendation assessment, development and evaluation
LED	light-emitting diode
STAG-TB	Strategic and Technical Advisory Group for Tuberculosis
ТВ	tuberculosis
WHO	World Health Organization

## **Executive summary**

Direct sputum smear microscopy is the most widely used means for the diagnosis of pulmonary tuberculosis (TB) and is available in most primary health-care laboratories at health-centre level. Smear microscopy may, however, be costly and inconvenient for patients, who have to make multiple visits to health facilities to submit multiple sputum specimens over several days. A number of TB control programmes have found high rates of initial patient default as a result, with high mortality recorded in several resource-limited settings.

It has been shown conclusively that good quality microscopy of two consecutive sputum specimens identifies the vast majority (95–98%) of smear-positive TB patients. Conventional case-finding approaches usually involve microscopic examination of 'spot-morning' sputum specimens (in countries with a two-specimen system) or examination of 'spot-morning-spot' sputa (in those with a three-specimen approach). The majority of sputum results are therefore available only on the second or third day after the patient presents to a health service.

In 2009, the strength of the evidence for a 'same-day diagnosis' approach (microscopy of two consecutive sputum specimens on the same day) was assessed by the World Health Organization (WHO), following standards appropriate for evaluating both the accuracy and the effect of new interventions on patients and public health. It was found that there was sufficient generalizable evidence that a same-day diagnosis approach is equivalent, in terms of diagnostic accuracy, to conventional microscopy case-finding strategies. Neveretheless, significant organizational and programme changes would be required to optimize the advantages of same-day diagnosis, to ensure that laboratory results are received back at the health facility and that patients start treatment on the same day. In addition, there is currently no evidence that early diagnosis of TB results in better uptake of treatment or improved treatment outcomes, so that programmes must closely monitor the effect of revised case-finding strategies.

On the basis of these findings, WHO recommends that countries that have successfully implemented current WHO policy for a two-specimen case-finding strategy consider switching to same-day diagnosis, especially in settings where patients are likely to default from the diagnostic process. Countries that are still using the three-specimen case-finding strategy should consider a gradual change to same-day diagnosis, once WHO-recommended external microscopy quality assurance systems are in place and good-quality microscopy results have been documented. It is essential that programmatic, logistic and operational implications at country level be taken into account in implementation of same-day diagnosis.

## Policy statement

## Same-day diagnosis of tuberculosis by microscopy

## 1. Background

Direct sputum smear microscopy is the most widely used means for diagnosing pulmonary TB and is available in most primary health-care laboratories at health-centre level. Smear microscopy may, however, be costly and inconvenient for patients, who have to make multiple visits to health facilities to submit multiple sputum specimens over several days. A number of TB control programmes have found high rates of initial patient default as a result, with high mortality recorded in several resource-limited settings.

It has been shown conclusively that good-quality microscopy of two consecutive sputum specimens identifies the vast majority (95–98%) of smear-positive TB patients. WHO policy on case detection by microscopy was therefore revised in 2007 (1) to recommend a reduction in the number of specimens examined, from three to two in settings with appropriate external quality assurance and documented good-quality microscopy. The case definition was also revised for these settings (1), to one positive smear, defined as one or more acid-fast bacillus in at least 100 microscopic fields. This approach greatly reduces the workload of laboratories, a considerable advantage in countries with a high proportion of smear-negative TB patients due to HIV and/or extrapulmonary disease.

Conventional case-finding approaches usually involve microscopic examination of 'spot-morning' sputum specimens (in countries with a two-specimen system) or examination of 'spot-morning-spot' sputa (in those with a three-specimen approach). Most sputum results are therefore available only on the second or third day after a patient presents to a health service.

Recent research has addressed the diagnostic accuracy of conventional case-finding strategies in comparison with an approach in which two consecutive sputum specimens ('spot-spot') are examined on the same day (so-called 'front-loaded' or 'same-day') and whether patient drop-out from the diagnostic pathway can be reduced as a result.

## 2. Evidence for policy formulation

#### 2.1 Synthesis of evidence

In September 2009, WHO assessed the evidence for a 'same-day' diagnostic approach in a systematic, structured way. The first step was a systematic review and meta-analysis of published and unpublished data with standard methods appropriate for studies of diagnostic accuracy. The second step was the convening of an expert group to evaluate the strength of the evidence, recommend operational and logistical considerations for use of same-day diagnosis in national TB control programmes and identify gaps to be addressed by future research. The third step was presentation of draft recommendations to the WHO Strategic and Technical Advisory group for Tuberculosis (STAG-TB) for endorsement.

In accordance with current WHO standards for evidence assessment in the formulation of policy recommendations, the grades of recommendation assessment, development and evaluation (GRADE) system (2) was used by the Expert Group to assess the findings of the systematic reviews. This approach provides a systematic, structured framework for evaluating both the accuracy of new interventions and their impact on patients and public health.

The Expert Group's findings and the final GRADE evaluation (1) were presented to STAG-TB in November 2009. STAG-TB recognized that the evidence showed that examining two specimens in 1 day was equivalent, in terms of diagnostic accuracy, to existing case-finding strategies but acknowledged that significant organizational and programme changes would be required to optimize the advantages of same-day diagnosis (3). STAG-TB subsequently advised WHO to proceed with policy recommendations on same-day diagnosis and asked WHO to prepare an overarching policy framework to guide the use of new TB diagnostics, methods and approaches at country level (3).

This document provides a pragmatic summary of the evidence and recommendations for sameday diagnosis. It should be read in conjunction with the detailed findings of the Expert Group (which include the GRADE tables) and the WHO framework for using TB diagnostics (1).<sup>1</sup> The framework gives the context for use of one or more of the currently approved WHO diagnostic tools and methods in relation to country infrastructure, resources, TB epidemiology and TB policy reform.

The existing TB diagnostic tools are not mutually exclusive: they can be used in various combinations in country screening and diagnostic algorithms, which are highly setting- and resource-specific. Expert laboratory input is therefore needed to define the most cost-effective and efficient algorithms for individual countries, guided by WHO standards (e.g. for laboratory biosafety) and procedures and in the context of overall, integrated, laboratory strengthening.

#### 2.2 Management of declarations of interest

Expert Group members were asked to submit completed declaration of interest forms, which were reviewed by the WHO secretariat before the Expert Group meeting. None of the members declared any conflict of interest. The declaration of interest statements were summarized by the co-chair of the Expert Group meeting at the start of the meeting. No additional declarations were made.

Selected individuals with intellectual or research involvement in same-day diagnosis were invited as observers to provide technical input and answer technical questions on the methods. These individuals did not participate in the GRADE evaluation and were asked to leave the meeting during the final discussions, when the recommendations were developed. They were also not involved in writing the final meeting report, nor in preparation of the STAG-TB documentation or the final WHO policy statements.

The process for evidence synthesis and policy development was reviewed by the WHO Guidelines Review Committee, and the policy recommendations were approved in June 2010.

The target date for review is 2015.

## 3. Summary of results

The results of seven studies involving 7308 patients were reviewed.

Same-day diagnosis ('spot-spot') versus the conventional strategy ('spot-morning'), with two specimens and direct Ziehl-Neelsen microscopy

Same-day diagnosis was on average 2.8% less sensitive than the conventional approach (95% confidence interval [CI], -5.2% - +0.3%), indicating that this strategy would be no more than 5% worse than the conventional approach. The specificity of the two approaches (with culture as the reference standard) was identical (98%; 95% CI, 97–99%).

As expected, spot specimens were more likely than morning specimens to give low-positivity results, indicating the need for strict internal quality control during smear preparation and meticulous examination of smears.

One large randomized controlled trial (6068 patients at four geographical sites) included data on patient loss to follow-up. Patients assigned to same-day diagnosis were more likely to submit both specimens (drop-out, 2%) than patients screened conventionally (drop-out, 5.8%).

# Same-day diagnosis ('spot-spot morning') versus the conventional strategy ('spot-morning-spot') with three specimens and direct Ziehl-Neelsen microscopy

The 'spot-spot-morning' strategy was 3% more sensitive (71%; 95% CI, 65–77%) than the 'spot-morning-spot' approach (68%; 95% CI, 63–73%), although this difference was not statistically significant. The specificity (with culture as reference standard) was also similar, at 98% (95% CI, 96–99%) and 99% (95% CI, 97–99%), respectively.

In the same randomized controlled trial described above, patients assigned to the 'spot-spotmorning' approach were more likely to submit the third specimen (drop-out, 5.9%) than those assigned to the spot-morning-spot' strategy (drop-out, 6.7%).

#### Same-day diagnosis versus conventional strategies in HIV-infected patients

The above-mentioned randomized controlled trial included data on the performance of the two strategies in a subset of 586 HIV-infected patients. The study was underpowered for this sub-analysis, and the results should therefore be interpreted with caution.

Overall, HIV coinfection seemed to reduce the sensitivity of microscopy, independently of the approach used. In the three-specimen strategy, the sensitivity decreased from 81.3% for HIV-negative to 71.4% for HIV-positive patients screened with the 'spot-spot-morning' approach, and from 68.4% to 51.9% for those screened with the 'spot-morning-spot' strategy. These differences were not statistically significant.

In the two-specimen strategy, the sensitivity decreased from 76.7% for HIV-negative patients to 66.7% for HIV-positive patients screened with the 'spot-spot' approach, and from 68.4% to 50.0% for those screened with the 'spot-morning' approach. These differences were not statistically significant.

# Same-day diagnosis versus conventional strategies with light-emitting diode fluorescence microscopy

The randomized controlled trial mentioned above compared light-emitting diode (LED) microscopy with conventional fluorescence microscopy in a subset of 2303 patients. The study was underpowered for this subanalysis, and the results should therefore be interpreted with caution.

Overall, LED microscopy performed as well as conventional fluorescence microscopy, irrespective of the case-finding approach. With the two-specimen strategy, the sensitivity of LED microscopy (68%; 95% CI, 62–74%) did not differ significantly from that of conventional fluorescence microscopy (72%; 95% CI, 66–77%). The specificity of LED microscopy (95%; 95% CI, 93–96%) was also not statistically different from that of conventional fluorescence microscopy (94%; 95% CI, 92–95%).

In the three-specimen strategy, the sensitivity of LED microscopy (75%; 95% CI, 69–80%) did not differ significantly from that of conventional fluorescence microscopy (74%; 95% CI, 68–79%). The specificity was also similar, at 92% (95% CI, 91–94%) for LED and 93% (95% CI, 91–94%) for conventional fluorescence microscopy.

#### Same-day diagnosis with two smears from a single sputum specimen

Two studies included secondary analyses of the yield from two smears prepared from the same sputum specimen (n = 1849). Overall, the quality of evidence from both studies was rated as low, and the data were therefore excluded.

### 4. Policy recommendations

The GRADE process showed that there was sufficient generalizable evidence that same-day diagnosis (microscopy of two consecutive spot-spot sputum specimens) is equivalent, in terms of diagnostic accuracy, to conventional case-finding strategies by microscopy.

As stated in previous WHO policy guidance, most patients with smear-positive TB are identified by examination of the first two sputum specimens. The proposed same-day diagnostic approach would allow initiation of anti-TB treatment on the same day, which would contribute to lowering patient-related costs and might reduce patient loss in the diagnostic pathway.

Significant organizational and programme changes would, however, be required in order to optimize the advantages of same-day diagnosis, i.e. ensuring that laboratory results are received back at the health facility and that patients start treatment on the same day. In addition, there is currently no evidence that early diagnosis of TB results in better uptake of treatment or improved treatment outcomes, so that programmes must closely monitor the effect of revised case-finding strategies.

The available evidence arose from carefully conducted studies, and replication of their findings under routine programme conditions will depend heavily on key health service and operational considerations, as for any new diagnostic approach or tool.

#### WHO therefore recommends that:

- countries that have implemented the current WHO policy for two-specimen case-finding consider switching to same-day diagnosis, especially in settings where patients are likely to default from the diagnostic pathway;
- countries that are still using the three-specimen case-finding strategy consider a gradual change to same-day diagnosis, once WHO-recommended external microscopy quality assurance systems are in place and good-quality microscopy results have been documented;
- the change to same-day diagnosis be preceded by a detailed assessment of the programme, logistical and operational implications at country level and supported by a carefully phased implementation plan that includes the following:
  - Service providers should be able to initiate or refer patients for treatment on the same day of consultation. This will require training of health staff responsible for requesting sputum smear microscopy and instructing patients on sputum collection and people responsible for registering patients and initiating treatment.
  - Laboratory operations and procedures should be realigned with sputum collection and reporting of results on the same day, within the constraints of existing human resources and laboratory workload. Particular attention must be given to internal quality control and external quality assurance of microscopy procedures.

- The contact time between infectious patients and vulnerable groups attending the same facility should be minimized, especially in settings with a high HIV prevalence or a high burden of drug-resistant TB. Separation and rapid triage of coughing patients is especially important to reduce the risk for TB transmission in health-care settings.
- Monitoring of patient drop-out between laboratory and patient registers and of trends in case detection and treatment outcomes is essential.

WHO will assist countries in implementing same-day diagnosis by facilitating, with partners and technical agencies, a coordinated approach to revised case-finding strategies at country level.

## 5. Intended audience

This policy statement should be used to guide implementation of same-day diagnosis in TB casefinding by microscopy within national TB control programmes. It is intended to be used by national TB control programme managers and laboratory directors, in coordination with external programme consultants, donor agencies, technical advisors, health-care and laboratory staff, other service providers, other relevant government officials and individuals responsible for TB training activities.

## 6. References

- 1. http:// www.who.int/tb/laboratory/policy\_statements/en/index.html
- 2. http://www.gradeworkinggroup.org.
- 3. http://www.who.int/tb/advisory\_bodies/stag/en/index.html

#### 7. Annexes

Annex 1: Expert Group Members

#### **Dr Maryline Bonnet**

Epicentre, c/o MSFCH 78 Rue de Lausanne 116 - CH, 1211 Geneve Switzerland e-mail: <u>maryline.bonnet@geneva.msf.org</u>

#### Dr Saidi Egwaga

National TB/Leprosy Programme Ministry of Health, TB/Leprosy Unit PO Box 9083 Dar Es Salaam Tanzania e-mail: <u>tantci@intafrica.com</u>

#### **Dr Bernard Fourie**

Chief Scientific Officer and Director of South African Operations Medicine in Need Inc. USA and Medicine in Need South Africa (Pty) Ltd PO Box 12660, Queenswood 0121 Pretoria South Africa e-mail: <u>bfourie@medicineinneed.org</u>

#### **Dr Christy Hanson**

Chair of STP Retooling Task Force US Agency for International Development (USAID), USAID/BGH/HIDN/ID 3.7.23, 3rd Floor, Ronald Reagan Bldg 20523-5900 - Washington, DC USA e-mail: chanson@usaid.gov

#### Dr Moses Joloba

Head of National TB Reference Laboratory Department of Medical Microbiology Microbiology-Pathology Building Uganda e-mail: moses.joloba@case.edu

#### Dr Marija Joncevska

Regional laboratory specialist Project HOPE Central Asia 162 Kunaeva st. 050010 Almaty Kazakhstan e-mail: <u>mjoncevska@projecthope.kz</u>

#### Prof Paul R Klatser

Co-Chair of Subgroup on Optimizing Smear Microscopy, STP New Diagnostics Working Group Head of Department KIT Biomedical Research Royal Tropical Institute Meibergdreef 39 1105 AZ Amsterdam The Netherlands e-mail: <u>p.klatser@kit.nl</u>

#### Dr Madhukar Pai

Co-Chair of Subgroup on Evidence Synthesis for TB Diagnostics, STP New Diagnostics Working Group Assistant Professor Department of Epidemiology, Biostatistics & Occupational Health McGill University 1020 Pine Avenue West Montreal, H3A 1A2 Canada e-mail: madhukar.pai@mcgill.ca

#### Dr John Ridderhof

Chair of STP Global Laboratory Initiative Working Group Associate Director for Laboratory Science National Center for Preparedness, Detection and Control of Infectious Diseases, CCID Centers for Disease Control and Prevention 1600 Clifton Rd NE, MS-C12 Atlanta, Georgia 30333 USA e-mail: jridderhof@cdc.gov

#### Dr Bertie Squire

Co-Chair of Subgroup on TB Diagnostics and Poverty, STP New Diagnostics Working Group Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine Pembroke Place Liverpool UNITED KINGDOM Tel: 0044 151 705 3101 e-mail: <u>s.b.squire@liverpool.ac.uk</u>

#### **Dr Karen Steingart**

Francis J. Curry National Tuberculosis Center University of California, San Francisco 3180 18th Street, Suite 101 San Francisco, CA 94110-2028 USA e-mail: karenst@u.washington.edu

#### Mr Javid Syed

TB/HIV Project Director Treatment Action Group 611 Broadway, Suite 308 New York, NY 10012 USA e-mail: javid.syed@treatmentactiongroup.org

#### Dr Armand van Deun

Bacteriology Consultant International Union Against Tuberculosis and Lung Disease Mycobacteriology Unit Institute of Tropical Medicine Nationalestraat 155 B-2000 - Antwerpen Belgium e-mail: avandeun@iuatld.org

#### Dr Adithya Cattamanchi

Assistant Professor of Medicine San Francisco General Hospital Division of Pulmonary and Critical Care Medicine Room 5K1 1001 Potrero Avenue San Francisco, California 94110 Email: <u>acattamanchi@medsfgh.ucsf.edu</u>

#### **Dr Jessica Minion**

Medical Microbiology MSC Epidemiology McGill University 1020 Pine Avenue West Montreal, H3A 1A2 Canada Email: jessica.minion@mail.mcgill.ca

#### **Dr Catharina Boehme**

Foundation for Innovative New Diagnostics (FIND) 71 Avenue Louis-Casai 1216 Geneva Switzerland e-mail: catharina.boehme@finddiagnostics.org

#### Dr C N Paramasivan

Foundation for Innovative New Diagnostics (FIND) 71 Avenue Louis-Casai 1216 Geneva Switzerland e-mail: <u>CN.paramasivan@finddiagnostics.org</u>

#### Dr Eric Adam

Foundation for Innovative New Diagnostics (FIND) 71 Avenue Louis-Casai 1216 Geneva Switzerland email: <u>eric.adam@finddiagnostics.org</u>

#### **Dr Richard Bumgarner**

Independent Consultant Health Economics and Finance Program and Institutional Evaluations Tuberculosis Control Adviser 1715 Abbey Oak Drive Vienna, VA 22182 USA e-mail: <u>richardbumgarner@gmail.com</u>

## Annex 2 : WHO staff members

#### WHO-STB

Leopold Blanc: <u>blancl@who.int</u> Jean Iragena: <u>iragenaj@who.int</u> Paul Nunn: <u>nunnp@who.int</u> Karin Weyer: <u>weyerk@who.int</u> Matteo Zignol: <u>zignolm@who.int</u> Sanne Van Kampen:<u>vankampens@who.int</u>

#### WHO-TDR

L Cuevas: <u>cuevasl@who.int</u> F Moussy: <u>moussyf@who.int</u> Andrew Ramsay: <u>ramsaya@who.int</u> S Swaminathan: <u>swaminathans@who.int</u>

#### WHO-OTHER

WHO Guidelines Review Committee Secretariat: grcsecretariat@who

#### Annex 3: STAG-TB members

#### **Mr Faruque Ahmed**

Director, Health Program BRAC Dhaka Bangladesh

## Ms Olayide Akanni

Executive Director Journalists Against AIDS (JAAIDS) in Nigeria Abuja Nigeria

#### Dr Salah Al Awaidy

Director Department of Communicable Disease Surveillance & Control DGHA, HQ, Ministry of Health Muscat Oman

**Dr R. V. Asokan** RNTCP Project Coordinator Indian Medical Association Punalur - Kerala India

#### Dr Kenneth Castro

Director, Division of TB Elimination Centers for Disease Control and Prevention Atlanta, GA USA

# Dr Jeremiah Muhwa Chakaya STAG-TB Chair

Technical Expert National Leprosy and TB Programme Ministry of Health Nairobi Kenya

**Dr Elizabeth Corbett** Reader in Infectious and Tropical Diseases London School of Tropical Medicine & Hygiene and MLW Research Programme Blantyre Malawi

#### Prof Francis Drobniewski

Director, Health Protection Agency National Mycobacterium Reference Unit Institute for Cell and Molecular Sciences, Barts and the London School of Medicine London United Kingdom

#### Dr Wafaa El-Sadr

Director, CIDER Mailman School of Public Health Columbia University New York, NY USA

#### Dr Paula I Fujiwara

Director, Dept of HIV and Senior Advisor The Union (Paris, France) USA

### Mr Case Gordon

World Care Council Viols en Laval France

#### **Prof Vladimir Malakhov**

National Center for External Quality Assessment in Laboratory Testing of Russian Federation Moscow Russia

#### Dr Mao Tan Eang

Advisor to the Minister of Health Director, National Center for Tuberculosis and Leprosy Control Ministry of Health Phnom Penh Cambodia

#### **Dr Megan Murray**

Associate Professor of Epidemiology Harvard University School of Public Health Department of Epidemiology Boston, MA USA

#### **Dr Yogan Pillay**

Deputy Director General Strategic Health Programmes Pretoria South Africa

#### Dr Minghui Ren

Director-General Department of International Cooperation Ministry of Health Beijing China

#### Dr Marieke van der Werf

Head, Unit Research, Senior Epidemiologist KNCV Tuberculosis Foundation The Hague The Netherlands

#### Dr Rajendra Shukla

Joint Secretary Ministry of Health & Family Welfare New Delhi India

#### **Dr Pedro Guillermo Suarez**

TB & TB-HIV/AIDS Center for Health Services Management Sciences for Health Arlington, VA USA

#### Dr Rosalind G Vianzon

National TB Programme Manager National Center for Disease Control and Prevention Department of Health Manila Philippines

#### Prof Wang Longde

Dean, School of Public Health Peking University Beijing China

#### Dr Yuthichai Kasetjaroen

Director Bureau of Tuberculosis Ministry of Health Bangkok Thailand



For further information please contact:

## **Stop TB Department**

World Health Organization 20 Avenue Appia 1211 Geneva 27 Switzerland

Telephone: + 41 22 791 21 11 Facsimile (fax): + 41 22 791 31 11

Website: http://www.who.int/topics/tuberculosis/en/

