

Reducing Adenoviral Patient Infected Days (RAPID) Planning Study: Agreement between Clinician and AdenoPlus[™] in the Diagnosis of Adenoviral Conjunctivitis (Ad-Cs)

Mary K Migneco, OD FAAO^a, Mae Gordon, PhD^a, Andrew Hartwick, OD PhD FAAO^b, Julie Huecker, MS^a, Spencer Johnson, OD FAAO^c, Jennifer Harthan, OD FAAO^d, Christina Morettin OD FAAO^d, Ellen Shorter, OD FAAO^e, Tammy Than, MS OD FAAO^f

^aWashington University, St. Louis, ^bOhio State University, ^cNortheastern State University, ^dIllinois College of Optometry, ^eIllinois Eye and Ear Infirmary, ^fUniversity of Alabama, Birmingham

Introduction

There is no FDA-approved treatment for adenoviral conjunctivitis (Ad-Cs) Ad-Cs is a prevalent and highly contagious eye infection that affects 6 million people each year in the United States.¹ Conjunctivitis can be caused by bacteria, viruses, allergens and toxin exposure, which makes the diagnosis of Ad-Cs especially challenging. Cheung reported that 42% of patients presenting with classic, unilateral conjunctivitis were misdiagnosed as Ad-Cs using viral culture.²



The timely and accurate diagnosis of Ad-Cs is crucial to the success of future studies. Clinical treatment trials for Ad-Cs are likely to fail if a large number of patients enrolled are misdiagnosed. For instance, a treatment that is 80% successful will appear to be only 56% successful if 30% of the patients in the trial are misdiagnosed as having Ad-Cs.³

AdenoPlus[™] (RPS, Sarasota FL), the first CLIA waived point-of-care immunoassay, has been developed to aid clinicians in the differential diagnosis of Ad-Cs and has been reported to have a sensitivity of 90% and specificity of 96%.4

The RAPID (Reducing Adenoviral Patient-Infected Days) study is a 2-year NEI/NIH-funded planning study designed to estimate key parameters for a randomized trial that determines whether an in-office application of commercially available 5% Betadine (Povidone-iodine, Alcon Laboratories, Inc., Fort Worth, TX) is effective at reducing viral load and improving symptoms in patients with Ad-Cs. A positive test on the AdenoPlus[™] immunoassay is required as entry criteria for all patients enrolled this study.

Purpose

In this study we compare patient-reported symptoms and clinician-graded signs in patients presenting with a red eye that were AdenoPlus-positive to those that had a clinician-reported diagnosis of likely Ad-Cs

RAPID Planning Study: Methods

- All participating study sites had IRB approval.
- ۲ Patients \geq 18 years of age, who presented with a new onset red eye with symptoms \leq 4 days, were invited to participate and informed consent was obtained.
- ۲ Enrolled patients completed a symptom survey (Table 1) and a clinical evaluation, including visual acuity, lymph node palpation, and slit lamp examination.
- If a patient presented with both eyes affected, the eye with earlier onset was selected. If onset was simultaneous, one eye was selected randomly by a coin toss.
- Based on clinical examination and patient symptoms, clinicians classified probable causes of red eye (bacterial, allergic, dry eye, environmental irritation, contact lens related, or adenoviral) on a scale of "definitely not", "probably not", "probably yes", or "definitely yes". Clinician classifications of "probably yes" and "definitely yes" for Ad-Cs were grouped together and compared to patients with AdenoPlus-positive results.
- In addition to AdenoPlus[™] testing, conjunctival samples were collected at each visit. Samples • were sent for quantitative PCR (qPCR) analysis to assess changes in adenoviral load over time.





AdenoPlus[™] Negative

AdenoPlus[™] Positive

All patients with a positive AdenoPlus[™] test were eligible for randomization. Randomized patients ٠ received a one-time, in-office lavage of either artificial tears or Betadine 5% sterile ophthalmic prep solution and were followed with clinical exams for up to 21 days.

Results

Written Info Examiner-A Medical and Snellen Vis (Pinhole if \ Lymph Node Slit Lamp Ex Signs and F Clinician Pre AdenoPlus Test Display Swab for gF conjunctiva Randomiza (Betadine 5) Pt. receives

Patient characteristics

- 71% female.

Agreement between clinician-reported diagnoses and AdenoPlus[™] test results

in RAPID.



- eyes).

Table 1. Procedures completed at the baseline and follow-up visits. Procedures in unshaded boxes are performed on screened patients; those in shaded boxes are performed on patients with a positive AdenoPlusTM test who were eligible for treatment randomization. The patient and examiners were both masked to which treatment was received throughout the follow-up period.

Procedure	Screening Exam Pts. ≥ 18 yrs. presenting w red eye	Follow-up Exams Randomized Pts. at 1-2, 4-5, 7, 14, 21 days
rmed Consent	Х	n/a
dministered Symptom Survey	Х	Х
l Ocular History	Х	Х
ual Acuity 'A worse than 20/20)	Х	Х
e Palpation	Х	Х
xamination, Grading of Ocular Iuorescein Staining	Х	Х
ediction of Pink Eye Etiology	Х	n/a
M Testing and Photograph of	Х	Continue RPS testing until 2 negative results
CR Analysis Inferior nasal	Х	Х
ion to artificial tears or 5% PVP-I %)	Randomized treatment by unmasked examiner	n/a
artificial tears	Х	X

48 patients with red eye were screened at 4 clinical sites. (35 at Washington University in St. Louis, 6 at University of Alabama-Birmingham, 4 at Illinois College of Optometry, and 3 at Northeastern State University).

Mean age: 40.6 ± 13.4 years.

Clinicians diagnosed Ad-Cs in 75% (36 of 48 eyes) and other causes in 25% (12 of 48 eyes). A positive AdenoPlusTM test result was obtained in 33% (16 of 48 eyes).

Table 2. Comparison of Ad-Cs diagnosis by clinicians and AdenoPlus[™] result for 48 patients screened

	AdenoPlus [™] result		
Clinician Prediction of Conjunctivitis Etiology	AdenoPlus™ Positive	AdenoPlus [™] Negative	All
	Ν	Ν	Ν
ably/Definitely Ad-Cs	14	22	36
\d-Cs	2	10	12
	16	32	48

Agreement of Clinician and AdenoPlus[™] is 50% (24 of 48) <u>unadjusted</u> for chance agreement.

Agreement of Clinician and AdenoPlus[™] is 0.14 (kappa) <u>adjusted</u> for chance agreement.

Sensitivity = 88% (14 Ad-Cs diagnoses by clinicians were among 16 AdenoPlus-positive eyes).

False positive rate = 69% (22 Ad-Cs diagnoses by clinicians were among 32 AdenoPlus-negative

Clinicians diagnosed bacterial co-infection in 14 of the 48 eyes (29%).

14 (29%) of the 48 patients met eligibility criteria and were randomized. All but 2 of 14 patients completed follow-up to 21 days.

Results

Figure 1. Patient-reported symptoms (median values shown) for 16 patients with AdenoPlus-positive tests and 36 patients diagnosed as Ad-Cs by clinicians. On scale 0 = not at all bothersome and 10 = very bothersome.



Figure 2. Clinician-graded signs (on slit lamp examination) for 16 patients with AdenoPlus-positive tests and 36 patients diagnosed as Ad-Cs by clinicians. On scale 1 = absent, 5 = severe, data shown reflects those graded 3 or greater.



Conclusions

- those with clinical diagnoses of Ad-Cs.
- condition.

References

- Med Sci. Sep 2008;336(3):254-264.
- 2003;17(3):356-363.

Support

The Reducing Adenoviral Patient-Infected Days (RAPID) Study is funded by National Eye Institute grant 1R34EY023633-01A1. This work was also supported by a National Eye Institute Center Core Grant (P30EY002687) and an unrestricted grant to the Department of Ophthalmology and Visual Sciences from Research to Prevent Blindness. Clinical Trial Registration: https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT02472223

Our results indicate that patients with a positive AdenoPlus[™] test were likely (88% sensitivity) to have been clinically diagnosed as having an Ad-Cs etiology for their red eye.

However, a high proportion of patients that were clinically diagnosed with Ad-Cs had a negative AdenoPlus[™] test (69% false positive rate). No single clinical sign or symptom was found to significantly distinguish the two patient groups, those with AdenoPlus-positive test results versus

Using a positive AdenoPlusTM test criteria as the gold-standard criteria, the false positive rate among clinicians was 69%. If 69% of the patients enrolled in a therapeutic trial were misdiagnosed, a new therapy that was 80% effective would appear to be less than 40% effective. In other words, a valid treatment could potentially be mistakenly found to be non-effective.

This work further highlights the challenges associated with the identification of the correct etiology for conjunctivitis. Accurate diagnosis of Ad-Cs is essential for clinical trials of potential treatments for this

Udeh BL, Schneider JE, Ohsfeldt RL. Cost effectiveness of a point-of-care test for adenoviral conjunctivitis. Am J

Cheung D, Bremner J, Chan JT. Epidemic kerato-conjunctivitis--do outbreaks have to be epidemic? Eye (Lond). Apr

Gordon, MO et al. Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci June 2015, Vol. 56, 6197. Sambursky R, Tauber S, Schirra F, Kozich K, Davidson R, Cohen EJ. The RPS adeno detector for diagnosing adenoviral conjunctivitis. Ophthalmology. Oct 2006;113(10):1758-1764.