

PDF hosted at the Radboud Repository of the Radboud University Nijmegen

The following full text is a publisher's version.

For additional information about this publication click this link.

<http://hdl.handle.net/2066/171999>

Please be advised that this information was generated on 2021-06-13 and may be subject to change.

- malignancies. *J Antimicrob Chemother.* 2011;66:371–4. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/jac/dkq450>
4. De Pauw B, Walsh TJ, Donnelly JP, Stevens DA, Edwards JE, Calandra T, et al. Revised definitions of invasive fungal disease from the European Organization for Research and Treatment of Cancer/Invasive Fungal Infections Cooperative Group and the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases Mycoses Study Group (EORTC/MSG) Consensus Group. *Clin Infect Dis.* 2008;46:1813–21. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1086/588660>
 5. de Fontbrune FS, Denis B, Meunier M, Garcia-Hermoso D, Bretagne S, Alanio A. Iterative breakthrough invasive aspergillosis due to TR(34)/L98H azole-resistant *Aspergillus fumigatus* and *Emicella sublata* in a single hematopoietic stem cell transplant patient. *Transpl Infect Dis.* 2014;16:687–91. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/tid.12231>

Address for correspondence: Stéphane Bretagne, Laboratoire de Parasitologie-Mycologie, Hôpital Saint Louis, 1 rue Claude Vellefaux, 75010, Paris, France; email: stephane.bretagne@sls.aphp.fr

In Response:

Jan W.M. van der Linden, Maiken C. Arendrup, Willem J.G. Melchers, Paul E. Verweij

Author affiliations: Radboud University Medical Center, Nijmegen, the Netherlands (J.W.M. van der Linden, W.J.G. Melchers, P.E. Verweij); Statens Serum Institut, Copenhagen, Denmark (M.C. Arendrup)

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.3201/eid2201.151308>

In Response: Alanio et al. comment that the prevalence of azole-resistant *Aspergillus* disease may differ, depending on location of the hospital where patients are admitted and the patients' underlying disease (1). Determining local or regional epidemiology, especially in areas where azole-resistant isolates are found in the environment, is indeed important. These isolates commonly harbor the TR₃₄/L98H or TR₄₆/Y121F/T289A resistance mechanism. Patients may inhale azole-resistant spores in the air and subsequently develop azole-resistant disease, even when they have never been treated with azoles (2). Although risk for inhalation of azole-resistant *Aspergillus* spores arguably might be similar for all patients, surveillance of *Aspergillus* isolates in the Netherlands indicates that resistance rates vary among hospitals. When all *A. fumigatus* isolates cultured from patients were investigated for azole resistance, resistance rates in the Netherlands ranged from 4.3% to 19.2% in 2013 and 3.8% to 13.3% in 2014 (3). The highest and lowest resistance rates were found in hospitals only 39 km from each other, supporting the observation made by Alanio et al. about variations in prevalence of azole-resistant *Aspergillus* disease (1).

More detailed surveillance is required to determine if local treatment guidelines should be reassessed. Two recent

studies in the Netherlands investigated the risk of azole-resistant invasive aspergillosis in high-risk populations. One study conducted in a 33-bed tertiary-care university hospital intensive-care unit (ICU) showed that 26% of culture-positive patients with presumed invasive aspergillosis harbored azole-resistant isolates, a proportion 14% higher than that found in other departments in the hospital ($p = 0.06$) (4). The second study, which investigated azole resistance in the primary routine culture (including respiratory cultures) of 105 ICU and hematology patients, showed that the resistance rate (24.6%) for hematology patients was higher than the rate (4.5%) for ICU patients (5). Other countries have also reported higher prevalence of resistance in high-risk populations than in other populations.

One problem with assessing prevalence of azole resistance is that the recovery of *A. fumigatus* in culture may vary considerably among different patient groups. A recent audit in our hematology department over the past 5 years indicated that *A. fumigatus* was cultured in only 35% of patients who underwent bronchoalveolar lavage as part of a diagnostic work-up for pulmonary infection (P.E. Verweij, unpub. data). This outcome indicates that in culture-negative patients, presence of azole resistance will be missed.

In agreement with Alanio et al. (1), recent studies show a need to determine frequency of azole resistance at the hospital level and within different patient groups or departments. Although surveillance of unselected clinical cultures provides resistance rates at a national level and offers information about the epidemiology of resistance mechanisms, regular audits in specific patient populations are warranted to determine the frequency of azole resistance among different risk groups. These audits will enable clinicians to determine whether reassessment of azole monotherapy as a primary treatment option is necessary. Given the low and variable rates of positive cultures, culture-negative patients should also be included in azole-resistance surveillance programs.

References

1. Alanio A, Denis B, Hamane S, Raffoux E, Peffault de Latour R, Menotti J, et al. Azole resistance of *Aspergillus fumigatus* in immunocompromised patients with invasive aspergillosis. *Emerg Infect Dis.* 2016;22:157–8.
2. van der Linden JW, Snelders E, Kampinga GA, Rijnders BJ, Mattsson E, Debets-Ossenkopp YJ, et al. Clinical implications of azole resistance in *Aspergillus fumigatus*, the Netherlands, 2007–2009. *Emerg Infect Dis.* 2011;17:1846–54. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3201/eid1710.110226>
3. Verweij PE. Azole resistance in *Aspergillus fumigatus*. In: NethMap 2015. Consumption of antimicrobial agents and antimicrobial resistance among medically important bacteria in the Netherlands. The Hague: National Institute for Public Health and the Environment; 2015. p. 113–5.
4. Russcher A, van Paassen J, Dofferhoff PA, Kuijper EJ. High azole resistance rate of *Aspergillus fumigatus* at intensive care unit in a Dutch tertiary hospital. *Ned Tijdschr Med Microbiol.* 2014;22:S121.

5. Fuhren J, Voskuil WS, Boel CHE, Haas PJA, Meis JF, Kusters JG. High prevalence of azole resistance in *Aspergillus fumigatus* isolates from high risk patients. *J Antimicrob Chemother*. 2015; 70:2894–8. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/jac/dkv177>

Address for correspondence: Jan W.M. van der Linden, Department of Pediatrics, Radboud University Medical Centre Nijmegen, PO Box 9101, 6500 HB Nijmegen, The Netherlands; email: Jan.vanderLinden@radboudumc.nl

Schistosomiasis Screening of Travelers to Corsica, France

Antoine Berry, Luc Paris, Jérôme Boissier, Eric Caumes

Author affiliations: Toulouse University Hospital, Toulouse, France (A. Berry); Public Assistance Hospitals of Paris, Paris, France (L. Paris, E. Caumes); University of Perpignan Via Domitia, Perpignan, France; National Centre of Scientific Research, Perpignan (J. Boissier)

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.3201/eid2201.151290>

To the Editor: As members of the French Ministry of Health Working Group on autochthonous urinary schistosomiasis, we read with interest the 2 recently published articles regarding schistosomiasis screening of travelers to Corsica, France (1,2). Surprisingly, the authors of both articles lacked evidence to support the diagnosis of schistosomiasis in most of what they referred to as confirmed cases. The diagnostic standard for confirmation of urinary schistosomiasis is identification of eggs by microscopic examination of urine samples (3–5). If this criterion were applied in both reports, only 1 patient of the 7 allegedly confirmed cases would actually be confirmed.

The low sensitivity of microscopy is well known. Therefore, different serologic tests have been developed, including Western blot (WB). In the study based on travelers from Italy (1), the SCHISTO II WB IgG test (LDBIO Diagnostics, Lyon, France) was used. This test, available since 2015, is based on both *Schistosoma haematobium* and *S. mansoni* antigens and has not been evaluated by anyone other than the manufacturer. Moreover, the authors did not report any details regarding the molecular weight and number of specific bands observed on the strip.

In the study by authors from the GeoSentinel Surveillance Network (2), both cases that could have been infected after 2013, since exposure occurred only in 2014, and 4 cases which reported bathing in rivers in Corsica other than the Cavu River had just 1 weakly positive serologic screening test. Hence, irrespective of the criteria for a confirmed case of schistosomiasis described above, it appears difficult

to conclude that confirmation could rely on only 1 positive serologic test, even a WB.

Altogether, these 2 studies identified only 1 patient with parasitological evidence of infection that was attributable to the already known 2013 focus in Cavu River. Therefore, these articles do not provide evidence of transmission of schistosomiasis in Corsica after 2013 or outside the Cavu River.

References

1. Beltrame A, Zammarchi L, Zuglian G, Gobbi F, Angheben A, Marchese V, et al. Schistosomiasis screening of travelers from Italy with possible exposure in Corsica, France. *Emerg Infect Dis*. 2015;21:1887–9. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3201/eid2110.150869>
2. Gautret P, Mockenhaupt FP, von Sonnenburg F, Rothe C, Libman M, Van De Winkel K, et al. Local and international implications of schistosomiasis acquired in Corsica, France. *Emerg Infect Dis*. 2015;21:1865–8. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3201/eid2110.150881>
3. Gryseels B, Strickland GT. Schistosomiasis. In: Magill AJ, Ryan ET, Hill DR, Solomon T, editors. *Hunter's tropical medicine and emerging infectious diseases*, 9th ed. London: Elsevier Saunders; 2013. p. 868–83.
4. Maguire JH. Trematodes. Schistosomes and other flukes. In: Mandell GL, Bennett JE, Dolin JE, editors. *Mandell, Douglas, and Bennett's principles and practice of infectious diseases*, 7th ed. Philadelphia: Churchill Livingstone Elsevier Philadelphia; 2010. p. 3595–3606.
5. World Health Organization. WHO recommended surveillance standards. 2nd ed. WHO/CDS/CSR/ISR/99/2/EN. Geneva: The Organization; 2015. p 107 [cited 2015 July 22]. http://www.who.int/csr/resources/publications/surveillance/WHO_CDS_CSR_ISR_99_2_EN/en

Address for correspondence: Antoine Berry, Service de Parasitologie-Mycologie, IFB, Hôpital Purpan, Centre Hospitalier Universitaire de Toulouse, TSA 40031–31059 Toulouse, CEDEX 9, France; email: berry.a@chu-toulouse.fr

In Response:

Anna Beltrame, Lorenzo Zammarchi, Gianluca Zuglian, Federico Gobbi, Andrea Angheben, Valentina Marchese, Monica Degani, Antonia Mantella, Leila Bianchi, Carlotta Montagnani, Luisa Galli, Matteo Bassetti, Alessandro Bartoloni, Zeno Bisoffi

Author affiliations: Sacro Cuore Hospital, Negrar, Italy (A. Beltrame, F. Gobbi, A. Angheben, V. Marchese, M. Degani, Z. Bisoffi); Santa Maria Misericordia University Hospital of Udine, Udine, Italy (G. Zuglian, M. Bassetti); University of Florence School of Medicine, Florence, Italy (L. Zammarchi, A. Mantella, A. Bartoloni); Anna Meyer Children's University Hospital, Florence, Italy (L. Bianchi, C. Montagnani, L. Galli)

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.3201/eid2201.151590>