ABSTRACT

Since 2007, the Netherlands is faced with the largest outbreak of Q fever ever reported. In the last four years, over 4000 cases have been reported. The course of the epidemic and possible factors associated with this sudden surge in cases of Q fever is described and the preventive measures in the veterinary sector and the outbreak management of this unique epidemic are summarised. Finally, the latest data on clinical presentation and diagnostic and therapeutic dilemmas of Q fever in the Netherlands are reviewed.

KEYWORDS

Coxiella, Q fever, the Netherlands

INTRODUCTION

Since 2007, the Netherlands is faced with the world’s largest outbreak of Q fever with over 4000 notified cases. Q fever is caused by Coxiella burnetii, a small, Gram-negative obligate intracellular bacterium, phylogenetically related to Legionellales. Transmission occurs through inhalation of infected aerosols. The reservoir consists mainly of dairy goats and sheep, but excretion of Coxiella has also been described in other cattle and rodents. Small outbreaks associated with parturient pets such as cats and dogs have also been reported. The animals shed the bacterium in urine and faeces, and in very high concentrations in birth by-products. C. burnetii is extremely infectious as was illustrated by an experiment demonstrating that inhalation of a single bacterium could cause seroconversion in humans. It was classified as a category B bioterrorism agent.

EPIDEMIOLOGY AND CONTROL OF Q FEVER IN THE NETHERLANDS

The epidemic in the Netherlands is concentrated in the southern part of the country, in the provinces of Brabant, Gelderland and Limburg, although increasing numbers are being reported from the Northern provinces. A seroprevalence study performed on samples that were collected in a national immunisation survey in 2006 (PIENTER-2) showed a low seropositivity rate for Q fever of 2.4% just before the outbreak, indicating that the epidemic in 2007 was indeed newly emerging and did not merely reflect heightened awareness of physicians for Q fever. Already in 2007, an association with intense goat farming in the region was suggested. In 2008, a large human cluster of Q fever in an urban area was clearly linked to a dairy goat farm with a Q fever related abortion episode a few weeks before the first human cases presented. The high relative risk (31.1 [95% CI 16.4 to 59.1]) to contract Q fever when living within a 2 km radius of a dairy goat farm compared with persons living more than 5 km away supported this hypothesis. Although most cases seem to be related to dairy farming, transmission from non-dairy sheep has also been described in a small epidemic of at least 28 cases among patients and staff of a psychiatric institution. Besides proximity to urbanisation, multiple other environmental factors are involved in the transmission of Q fever from infected farms. Hunink and colleagues showed a correlation between higher vegetation density and higher groundwater levels and lower transmission of Q fever from infected farms in various regions in the Netherlands. Since Coxiella is extremely resistant to heat and desiccation, it can survive in the environment for many months. Outbreaks of this magnitude are unprecedented. Recent European outbreaks in Germany and Switzerland were limited to a short epidemic without significant recurrences in the following years. Up until 2007, an average of 20 cases of human Q fever were reported.
yearly in the Netherlands. The reason for the surge in clinical problems in humans and animals is still unclear. Possible explanations include the increase of the dairy goat population (from 5,000 in 1985 to over 375,000 in 2009) and changes in livestock management. Moreover, the type of goat husbandry has changed with some farms hosting thousands of animals. In contrast to other countries, the Netherlands has a high incidence of Q fever, which affects both humans and animals. The disease is often asymptomatic in humans, but can cause fever and flu-like symptoms. Epidemiological research has shown that the spread of Q fever is influenced by several factors, including active case finding, awareness campaigns, and vaccination programs. In the Netherlands, preventive measures were taken to control the spread of the disease, including culling of infected animals, prohibition of the spread of manure, and compensation for farmers. These measures had a positive effect on limiting the disease, although the factors responsible for the decrease in cases are not fully understood. It seems that the disease is under-reported, as indicated by the high number of cases reported in the literature. In conclusion, Q fever is a serious disease that poses a significant public health threat. Further research is needed to understand the factors that influence its spread and to develop effective control measures.
performed only after delivery in 28% of patients, often because of obstetric complications, creating a selection bias. Interpretation of these results is therefore difficult. Two large seroprevalence studies found no significant association between seropositivity for *Coxiella* and adverse pregnancy outcome.\(^{21,22}\) A study among pregnant women in the area of the first outbreak in the Netherlands in 2007 showed evidence of recent infection in three out of 19 women (16%). This was significantly higher than in the surrounding regions.\(^{43}\) A retrospective study in the highly endemic area in the southern part of the Netherlands showed no significant correlation of seropositivity for Q fever during early pregnancy and adverse pregnancy outcome.\(^{46}\) To further investigate the effect of Q fever on pregnancy, a randomised controlled trial was started in the spring of 2010 evaluating the effect of a screen and treat policy of pregnant women in this area.

**Post Q fever fatigue syndrome**

Following acute Q fever, patients frequently report a long-lasting and debilitating fatigue. A study performed after an outbreak of acute Q fever in the United Kingdom showed 20% of patients suffered from chronic fatigue syndrome after ten years of follow-up, compared with 4% of controls.\(^{44}\) A study among abattoir employees in Australia showed that 28% of patients with proven acute Q fever still fulfilled the CDC criteria of chronic fatigue syndrome at five years after infection compared with none of seronegative controls.\(^{45}\) A case-control study among 54 patients who contracted acute Q fever in the first year of the epidemic in the Netherlands showed that after one year, over 50% still reported severe fatigue compared with 26% of controls.\(^{46}\) The aetiology of this severe fatigue, referred to as QFS (Q fever Fatigue Syndrome), still remains to be elucidated. Cytokine dysregulation resulting from chronic immune stimulation and modulation by persistence of *Coxiella* or its antigens has been hypothesised.\(^{47}\) Genotyping of patients suffering from QFS showed significant differences in HLA-DRB1*11 and interferon-γ intron 1 microsatellite compared with controls.\(^{48-49}\) Some reports suggest persistence of *Coxiella* or antigenic non-viable cell residues in bone marrow.\(^{50,51}\) Studies evaluating antibiotic treatment for QFS have shown conflicting results.\(^{54-55}\) QFS leads to considerable morbidity and a high socioeconomic burden related to increased use of healthcare facilities and absence from work.

**Diagnosis of Q fever**

Analysis of specimens from various infected dairy farms has shown that 14 different strains circulate in the Netherlands, but one is predominantly present in the highly endemic area (Roest HJ, unpublished data). Isolation of *Coxiella* from blood culture specimens of Q fever patients is difficult since it is an obligatory intracellular organism. In addition, chronic infection often resides in tissues (e.g., heart valves or vascular aneurysms) and shedding into peripheral blood occurs in very low concentrations. Culture of *Coxiella* requires very specific procedures and a biosafety level 3 laboratory, which is not available to most hospitals. Until now, culture of the pathogen has been successful in only one patient in the Netherlands, in whom *Coxiella* was cultured from a resected heart valve (Roest HJ, personal communication). Diagnosis of acute Q fever is based on serology, the reference method being immunofluorescence assay (IFA). A seroconversion of a fourfold rise in antibody titre is diagnostic for acute Q fever.\(^{16}\) An important drawback in diagnosis based on serology is that antibody production does not usually occur until a few weeks after onset of clinical symptoms. PCR on serum has been shown to have a high sensitivity (98%) for acute Q fever in seronegative patients and is a useful diagnostic tool for early diagnosis.\(^{53}\) An algorithm for the diagnosis of acute Q fever in the Netherlands, designed by the Dutch working group on diagnostics of acute Q fever (an initiative of the National Institute for Public Health and the Environment (RIVM) and the Dutch Association for Medical Microbiology), has been published very recently.\(^{54}\) There has been a substantial reduction of the diagnostic delay in the Netherlands from 82 days in 2007 to 20 days in 2009.\(^{55}\) Because treatment has to be started before laboratory confirmation, physicians have to rely on clinical signs to guide the decision to start empiric therapy for Q fever. Antibiotic treatment of community acquired pneumonia in a high endemic region should include an agent active against *Coxiella burnetii*.\(^{56}\) Diagnosis of chronic Q fever remains difficult. Because the infection persists intracellularly, PCR on peripheral blood is not always positive. Imaging techniques can be useful to localise infection. Infected aneurysms or vascular prostheses can be identified by 18F-fluorodeoxyglucose (FDG) positron emission tomography (PET) or CT. In case of endocarditis, however, diagnosis is often more complex. The original Duke criteria developed for diagnosing infective endocarditis include vegetations and positive blood cultures as major criteria. However, vegetations are often absent in Q fever endocarditis\(^{57}\) and as mentioned above, *Coxiella* does not grow in conventional blood culture media. Therefore a revision of the Duke criteria has been proposed in which a serological profile compatible with chronic Q fever has been added to the major criteria.\(^{59}\) Serology is therefore an important tool in the evaluation of the development of chronic disease. *Coxiella burnetii* displays a unique antigenic variance in surface polysaccharides (phase 1 and phase 2 antigens). This can be used to distinguish between acute and chronic infection.
In acute infection, mainly phase 2 antibodies develop and convalescent sera show low titres of phase 1 antibodies, whereas chronic infection is characterised by high titres of phase 1 antibodies. Most literature on determination of cut-off values for establishing the diagnosis of chronic Q fever originates from the French National Reference Centre for Rickettsial Diseases (NRC) and this group has proposed a cut-off value for IgG to phase 1 proteins of 1:800 for the diagnosis of chronic Q fever. The cut-off value was also adopted by the revised Duke criteria. In the Netherlands, however, a substantial percentage of patients showed much higher titres of IgG1 during the first months after acute infection. There seems to be a considerable difference between the serological method used in the Netherlands (Focus diagnostics) and the method used in the NRC in France. This was recently illustrated by a case report of serological follow-up after acute Q fever, which showed high titres to IgG1 comparable with those found in Dutch patients but much lower when tested in the NRC in France. In 2009, a provisional guideline was published in the Netherlands proposing a new cut-off value for IgG1 of 1:4096 (or an IgG1 equal to IgG2) (www.medischcontact.artsennet.nl). However, when using this algorithm, 40% of patients with proven chronic Q fever (signs and or symptoms compatible with chronic Q fever and persistently positive PCR on blood or positive PCR on resected valves or aneurysms) who presented at the Radboud Expertise Centre for Q fever do not fulfil these criteria (table 1). The Netherlands Society for Medical Microbiology (NVMM) is currently developing a new guideline for the diagnosis of chronic Q fever in the Netherlands.

**TREATMENT OF Q FEVER**

Comparative trials regarding the optimal antibiotic treatment for acute Q fever are sparse, often retrospective and sometimes show conflicting results. Doxycycline is the preferred choice, but the new-generation quinolones such as moxifloxacin are also active against *C. burnetii*. Clarithromycin has also been shown to be effective and co-trimoxazole is the treatment of choice in children younger than 8 years of age. Although the national guidelines for treating community acquired pneumonia (CAP) issued by the Dutch Working Party on Antibiotic Policy (SWAB) and the Dutch College of General Practitioners (NHG) recommend doxycycline for first-line treatment of CAP, the alternative regimens in these guidelines do not routinely cover *C. burnetii*. Nevertheless, most general practitioners in the highly endemic region are aware of this problem and treat their patients with either doxycycline or moxifloxacin. A survey among general practitioners in this region showed that 95% would consider Q fever as a possible pathogen when suspecting a pneumonia and would start empiric treatment with doxycycline. The move away from doxycycline in the proposed update of the NHG guidelines for treatment of pneumonia by general practitioners seems inappropriate for endemic regions and may lead to increased numbers of chronic infections.

The optimal treatment of chronic Q fever consists of doxycycline and hydroxychloroquine. The latter increases the intralysosomal pH and thereby achieves a bactericidal effect in vitro when combined with doxycycline, whereas doxycycline alone is only bacteriostatic. Based on a retrospective study, a minimum duration of 18 months of combination therapy has been recommended with target levels of doxycycline of 5 mg/L. This long-term therapy is associated with significant adverse effects and photosensitisation has been described in 100% of patients on long-term therapy. Other frequently reported side effects include nausea, headache and dizziness. Regular evaluation by an ophthalmologist is recommended because of possible irreversible maculopathy due to hydroxychloroquine. Maintaining optimal adherence to therapy therefore requires intensive counselling and therapeutic drug monitoring.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Patient</th>
<th>Localisation of infection</th>
<th>IgG1 titre at diagnosis</th>
<th>IgG2 titre at diagnosis</th>
<th>PCR Q fever Blood</th>
<th>PCR Q fever Tissue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M, 75 y</td>
<td>Endocarditis</td>
<td>8192</td>
<td>32768</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M, 62 y</td>
<td>Aneurysm</td>
<td>2048</td>
<td>4096</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M, 69 y</td>
<td>Endocarditis</td>
<td>65536</td>
<td>65536</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M, 69 y</td>
<td>Endocarditis</td>
<td>16384</td>
<td>16384</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M, 57 y</td>
<td>Aneurysm</td>
<td>1024</td>
<td>4096</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M, 68 y</td>
<td>Aneurysm</td>
<td>4096</td>
<td>4096</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M, 75 y</td>
<td>Endocarditis</td>
<td>&gt;4096</td>
<td>&gt;4096</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M, 62 y</td>
<td>Aneurysm</td>
<td>1024</td>
<td>&gt;4096</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M, 67 y</td>
<td>Aneurysm</td>
<td>2048</td>
<td>2048</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F, 60 y</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>8192</td>
<td>4096</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PREVENTION OF Q FEVER IN HUMANS

The preventive measures taken in the veterinary sector have been aimed at reducing the spread of C. burnetii in the environment and thereby limiting the transmission to humans. Human vaccination is a different approach to preventing Q fever in individuals with a high risk of exposure to Coxiella. An effective whole-cell vaccine is available in Australia and has been extensively used in persons with high occupational risks such as abattoir employees. In this population, it has been proven to be highly effective. Because administering this vaccine to patients with pre-existing immunity increases the risk of local and systemic inflammatory reactions, prior infection needs to be excluded by skin testing and serology. Recently, the Health Council of the Netherlands issued an advice on vaccinating patients with increased risk of chronic Q fever with this whole cell vaccine (http://www.gezondheidsraad.nl/nl/adviezen/vaccinatie-van-mensen- tegen-q-koorts-eerste-advies). The target population has been defined as patients with underlying cardiac conditions (the same category of patients who would also qualify for endocarditis prophylaxis according to current guidelines), as well as patients with a known (aortic) aneurysm or vascular prostheses.

Since Q fever is highly endemic in the southern part of the Netherlands and infection can be asymptomatic, there is a possible risk of transmission through blood transfusion. Preliminary results indicate that in 2009 C. burnetii DNA was present in a small percentage of blood donations in this area (indicated by positive PCR on donated blood).59 Sanquin, the Dutch blood supply foundation, has instituted screening of donated blood in the high-incidence area as a precautionary measure.

CONCLUSION

Although it appears that the epidemic of Q fever in the Netherlands is now subsiding, physicians are still faced with growing numbers of patients suffering from long-term sequelae of Q fever such as chronic infection and Q fever fatigue syndrome. Optimal management of these conditions is still unclear and further research is needed to improve diagnostic strategies, to evaluate treatment, and to prevent chronic infections.
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