



HAL
open science

Evaluation using latent class models of the diagnostic performances of three ELISA tests commercialized for the serological diagnosis of *Coxiella burnetii* infection in domestic ruminants.

T. Lurier, Elodie Rousset, Patrick Gasqui, Carole Sala, Eric Morignat, Clément Claustre, David Abrial, Philippe Dufour, Renée de Crémoux, Kristel Gache, et al.

► To cite this version:

T. Lurier, Elodie Rousset, Patrick Gasqui, Carole Sala, Eric Morignat, et al.. Evaluation using latent class models of the diagnostic performances of three ELISA tests commercialized for the serological diagnosis of *Coxiella burnetii* infection in domestic ruminants.. SBED Conference 2024: Insights in Action, SBED: Society for Bayesian Methods in Epidemiology and Diagnostics, Jan 2024, Bruxelles, Belgium. hal-04513134

HAL Id: hal-04513134

<https://hal.inrae.fr/hal-04513134v1>

Submitted on 20 Mar 2024

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution - NonCommercial - NoDerivatives 4.0 International License

Evaluation using latent class models of the diagnostic performances of three ELISA tests commercialized for the serological diagnosis of *Coxiella burnetii* infection in domestic ruminants.



Conference of the Society for bayesian/advanced methods for epidemiology and diagnostics

2024/01/31



Funded by the European Union



Thibaut Lurier, Elodie Rousset, Patrick Gasqui, Carole Sala, Eric Morignat, Clément Claustre, David Abrial, Philippe Dufour, Renée de Crémoux, Kristel Gache, Marie-Laure Delignette-Muller, Florence Ayrat, Elsa Jourdain




RESEARCH ARTICLE

Open Access



Evaluation using latent class models of the diagnostic performances of three ELISA tests commercialized for the serological diagnosis of *Coxiella burnetii* infection in domestic ruminants

Thibaut Lurier^{1,2,3*} , Elodie Rousset⁴, Patrick Gasqui¹, Carole Sala⁵, Clément Claustre¹, David Abrial¹, Philippe Dufour⁴, Renée de Crémoux⁶, Kristel Gache⁷, Marie Laure Delignette-Muller⁸, Florence Ayrat² and Elsa Jourdain¹

<https://doi.org/10.1186/s13567-021-00926-w>

Serological diagnosis of *Coxiella burnetii* infection

- **ELISA methods are recommended by the OIE**
 - **Three commercialized ELISA tests**
 - Test 1 , commercialized by Idexx
 - Test 2, commercialized by ThermoFisher Scientific
 - Test 3 : commercialized by Innovative Diagnostics Vet
 - **Only few studies about their sensitivity and specificity**
 - *Depending on the test, study and species, estimates vary*
 - *sensitivity from 70 to 100%*
 - *specificity from 90 to 100%*
 - **Not for all tests and/or species**
 - **Sometimes with an important risk of bias**
- ⇒ **No Gold Standard** (reference test with 100% Se and Sp)

Conditional dependence between tests

Are the tests frequently wrong/correct at the same time?

False negative/true positive results, more likely to occur simultaneously

- When the level of antibodies is low/high and difficult/easy to detect with any test
- When the tests target closely related antigens of *C burnetii*

False positive results, less likely to occur simultaneously?

- Observed for bacteria that have antigens closely related to the ones of *C. burnetii* (e.g., *Coxiella*-like tick symbionts) → **cross reactions**

Otherwise, errors are expected to be independent between tests

In our case, conditional dependence between tests are expected

→ has to be taken into account to assess the tests diagnostic performances.


Limits of previous LCM studies

- Five studies which applied LCM with some of the three ELISA tests

Study	Tests included	Se/Sp of test 1	CONDITIONNAL DEPENDENCE		Prior used	Comment
			Assesment	Results		
Horigan et al. 2011	Tests 1, test 2 et test 3 ,CFT	Se=87%, Sp=99%	No	NA	NA	High risk of bias with probable overestimation of Sensitivities
Paul et al. 2013	Test 1 (Blood/Milk)	Se=84% Sp=99%	Yes	“Not significant”	Non Informative	Only test 1 => Latent status might be « is the animal positive with test 1 » ≠ « is the animal truly seropositive »
Lucchese et al. 2016	Test 1 et test 2, CFT	Se=97%, Sp=92%	Yes	Low (almost null)	Non Informative and Informative	Very High Se and Sp estimate, potential bias if test are conditionally dependent
Muleme et al. 2016	Test 1, CFT, Elisa mod, IFA	Se=70% Sp=96%	Yes	Not shown (but low)	Informative (from Horrigan or human studies)	Prior information from potentially highly biased study (Horrigan et al.)
Wood et al. 2019	Test 1, IFA	Se =88% Sp= 98%	Yes	Not shown (but low)	Informative (from Muleme and Horrigan)	Little information about conditional dependence between tests

Objectives of this study

- Estimate the **sensitivity and specificity** values of the three ELISA tests commercialized for Q fever serodiagnosis in ruminants
 - From serum **samples of unknown status** originating from cattle, sheep and goat herds in France
 - With **latent class models** considering the **cross-classified test results** of **the three tests**
 - Accounting for the likely **conditional dependence** between tests



Study sample

- Sub-sample of a larger epidemiologic study (*Gache et al. 2017*) of 23,000 animals sampled from 1,500 randomly selected herds with no history of Q fever vaccination
- Inclusion of 150 animals from 10 herds in each *department*
 - 1,413 cows from 106 herds
 - 1,474 goats from 103 herds
 - 1,432 ewes from 99 herds
- Samples collected and analyzed in 2014 with the three ELISA tests at the NRL for Q fever

Estimation of the frequency of Q fever in sheep, goat and cattle herds in France: results of a 3-year study of the seroprevalence of Q fever and excretion level of *Coxiella burnetii* in abortive episodes

species	Number of	Department									
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
cattle	herds	10	12	11	13	12	12	10	12	13	1
	animals	143	157	150	181	155	161	155	150	152	9
goat	herds	11	11	12	12	11	9	11	1	12	13
	animals	154	161	201	175	152	134	146	11	153	187
sheep	herds	11	11	10	10	11	11	11	10	11	3
	animals	165	162	149	145	155	157	161	146	156	36

Latent class model with conditional dependence between three test (Wang et al. 2017)

Catégorie	Probabilité
$T_1^- T_2^- T_3^-$	$P \times ((1 - Se_1) \times (1 - Se_2) \times (1 - Se_3) + \gamma_{Se000}) + (1 - P) \times (Sp_1 \times Sp_2 \times Sp_3 + \gamma_{Sp000})$
$T_1^- T_2^+ T_3^-$	$P \times ((1 - Se_1) \times Se_2 \times (1 - Se_3) + \gamma_{Se010}) + (1 - P) \times (Sp_1 \times (1 - Sp_2) \times Sp_3 + \gamma_{Sp010})$
$T_1^- T_2^- T_3^+$	$P \times ((1 - Se_1) \times (1 - Se_2) \times Se_3 + \gamma_{Se001}) + (1 - P) \times (Sp_1 \times Sp_2 \times (1 - Sp_3) + \gamma_{Sp001})$
$T_1^- T_2^+ T_3^+$	$P \times ((1 - Se_1) \times Se_2 \times Se_3 + \gamma_{Se011}) + (1 - P) \times (Sp_1 \times (1 - Sp_2) \times (1 - Sp_3) + \gamma_{Sp011})$
$T_1^+ T_2^- T_3^-$	$P \times (Se_1 \times (1 - Se_2) \times (1 - Se_3) + \gamma_{Se100}) + (1 - P) \times ((1 - Sp_1) \times Sp_2 \times Sp_3 + \gamma_{Sp100})$
$T_1^+ T_2^+ T_3^-$	$P \times (Se_1 \times Se_2 \times (1 - Se_3) + \gamma_{Se110}) + (1 - P) \times ((1 - Sp_1) \times (1 - Sp_2) \times Sp_3 + \gamma_{Sp110})$
$T_1^+ T_2^- T_3^+$	$P \times (Se_1 \times (1 - Se_2) \times Se_3 + \gamma_{Se101}) + (1 - P) \times ((1 - Sp_1) \times Sp_2 \times (1 - Sp_3) + \gamma_{Sp101})$
$T_1^+ T_2^+ T_3^+$	$P \times (Se_1 \times Se_2 \times Se_3 + \gamma_{Se111}) + (1 - P) \times ((1 - Sp_1) \times (1 - Sp_2) \times (1 - Sp_3) + \gamma_{Sp111})$

- 8 cross classified test results category
⇒ 7 DL
- Minimum 7 parameters (P, 3xSe, 3xSp)
- Conditional dependences
 - In theory 8 + 8 but :

$$\gamma_{Se100} = \gamma_{Se011} + \gamma_{Se111} - \gamma_{Se000}$$

$$\gamma_{Sp100} = \gamma_{Sp011} + \gamma_{Sp111} - \gamma_{Sp000}$$

$$\gamma_{Se101} = -(\gamma_{Se001} + \gamma_{Se011} + \gamma_{Se111})$$

$$\gamma_{Sp101} = -(\gamma_{Sp001} + \gamma_{Sp011} + \gamma_{Sp111})$$

$$\gamma_{Se110} = \gamma_{Se000} + \gamma_{Se001} - \gamma_{Se111}$$

$$\gamma_{Sp110} = \gamma_{Sp000} + \gamma_{Sp001} - \gamma_{Sp111}$$

$$\gamma_{Se010} = -(\gamma_{Se000} + \gamma_{Se001} + \gamma_{Se011})$$

$$\gamma_{Sp010} = -(\gamma_{Sp000} + \gamma_{Sp001} + \gamma_{Sp011})$$


- So 8 more parameters

⇒ Theoretically identifiable with 3 populations

First latent class model



- **One model by ruminant species**
- Conditional dependence between the three tests modeled with a **fixed effect model** (*Wang et al. 2017*)
- **Each Department is considered as a population**
⇒ 10 populations of approximately 150 individuals each
- Use of **the least informative prior distributions**
⇒ **Beta(0.5, 0.5)** for probability parameters
⇒ **Uniform(-0.5;0.5)** for conditional parameters

Directed acyclique graph




First inference with JAGS

Se et Sp estimées toutes espèces



Simulation


- 10 data set simulating from the estimate obtain with the previous model
- **Important negative bias** with an underestimation of the parameters...



What if we change prior distribution on conditional parameters?



Uniform(-0.5, 0.5)

Cauchy (0,0.05)




Second inference with JAGS

- Priors
 - Loi cauchy (0, 0.039) for conditional dependance parameters



Simulation

- Much better
- But still a relative bias with an overestimation of the Se and very wide credibility intervals



What if we change the model?


Is the departement level the right scale to create population?

There is 10 to 13 herds by departement, let's use this information!

species	Number of	Department									
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
cattle	herds	10	12	11	13	12	12	10	12	13	1
	animals	143	157	150	181	155	161	155	150	152	9
goat	herds	11	11	12	12	11	9	11	1	12	13
	animals	154	161	201	175	152	134	146	11	153	187
sheep	herds	11	11	10	10	11	11	11	10	11	3
	animals	165	162	149	145	155	157	161	146	156	36

Second model


- **One model by ruminant species**
- Conditional dependence between the three tests modeled with a **fixed effect model** (*Wang et al. 2017*)
- **Each herd is considered as a population**
- Modeling of the **within-herd seroprevalence distribution** across all seropositive herds
 - (zero inflated hierarchical beta-binomial distribution)
⇒ Some herd could be free of *C.burnetii*
- **Between-herd seroprevalence** assessed in each department
- Use of **the least informative prior distributions**



Results : test sensitivity and specificity




- **Sensitivity** values are close to the **Cauchy prior model** but still low for two tests in sheep!
- **All tests** seem **highly specific**
 - Slightly lower in cattle



Conditional dependence

- **High between T1 and T2** for **truly seropositive** animals
- lower between **T3 and T1/T2**
- **Negligible for truly seronegative** animals (except in cattle)




Simulation

- **5 scenario of simulation * two priors**
 - Sc1 = « original » scenario (same as estimated in the data)
 - Sc2 = **High Se and Sp**, no conditional dependency
 - Sc3 = **High Se, original Sp and low conditional dependency**
 - Sc4 = **Low Se, Original Sp** and similar conditional dependency
 - Sc5 = **Low Sp for test 3 only**
- Simulation of 100 dataset similar in size of the one of the study
- Analysis by two model with Cauchy(0,0,049) or uniforme(-0.5;0.5) on conditional dependence terms
- Calcul on the 100 dataset of **Mean relative bias, coverage probability** of the 95% CI and the **quadratic error mean**

Result of the simulation study

- Cauchy priori distribution less biased
- **High performances in goats and cattle**
 - Mean bias < -2%
 - Coverage probability > 80%
- **Tendency to underestimate the Se and Sp in sheeps** (-3 to -7%)
- With an acceptable coverage probability (de 79 à 92%)



Discussion

- “**non informative**” prior distribution do not exist?
- “**vaguely informative**” prior distribution can have an important impact on the results
- Simulation studies may help in identifying the issue
- In this case, complexification of the model structure help us to obtaine unbiased estimates of the parameters of interest
- There is an **important risk of biaiis** when we use latent class models that need to be assess in each dataset and application?

References

- Gache, K., Rousset, E., Perrin, J.B., DE Cremoux, R., Hosteing, S., Jourdain, E., Guatteo, R., Nicollet, P., Touratier, A., Calavas, D., Sala, C., 2017. **Estimation of the frequency of Q fever in sheep, goat and cattle herds in France: results of a 3-year study of the seroprevalence of Q fever and excretion level of *Coxiella burnetii* in abortive episodes.** Epidemiol. Infect. 145, 3131–3142. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0950268817002308>
- Horigan, M.W., Bell, M.M., Pollard, T.R., Sayers, A.R., Pritchard, G.C., 2011. **Q fever diagnosis in domestic ruminants: comparison between complement fixation and commercial enzyme-linked immunosorbent assays.** J. Vet. Diagn. Invest. 23, 924–931. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1040638711416971>
- Lucchese, L., Capello, K., Barberio, A., Ceglie, L., Eulalia, G., Federica, Z., Monica, M., Arjan, S., Erika, R., Stefano, M., Natale, A., 2016. **Evaluation of Serological Tests for Q Fever in Ruminants Using the Latent Class Analysis.** Clin. Res. Infect. Dis. 3, 1030.
- Muleme, M., Stenos, J., Vincent, G., Campbell, A., Graves, S., Warner, S., Devlin, J.M., Nguyen, C., Stevenson, M.A., Wilks, C.R., Firestone, S.M., 2016. **Bayesian validation of the indirect immuno-fluorescence assay and its superiority to the enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay and complement fixation test for detecting antibodies against *Coxiella burnetii* in goat serum.** Clin Vaccine Immunol CVI.00724-15. <https://doi.org/10.1128/CVI.00724-15>
- Paul, S., Toft, N., Agerholm, J.S., Christoffersen, A.-B., Agger, J.F., 2013. **Bayesian estimation of sensitivity and specificity of *Coxiella burnetii* antibody ELISA tests in bovine blood and milk.** Prev. Vet. Med. 109, 258–263. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.prevetmed.2012.10.007>
- Whiting, P.F., Rutjes, A.W.S., Westwood, M.E., Mallett, S., Deeks, J.J., Reitsma, J.B., Leeflang, M.M.G., Sterne, J.A.C., Bossuyt, P.M.M., 2011. **QUADAS-2: A Revised Tool for the Quality Assessment of Diagnostic Accuracy Studies.** Ann. Intern. Med. 155, 529–536. <https://doi.org/10.7326/0003-4819-155-8-201110180-00009>
- Wood, C., Muleme, M., Tan, T., Bosward, K., Gibson, J., Alawneh, J., McGowan, M., Barnes, T.S., Stenos, J., Perkins, N., Firestone, S.M., Tozer, S., 2019. **Validation of an indirect immunofluorescence assay (IFA) for the detection of IgG antibodies against *Coxiella burnetii* in bovine serum.** Prev. Vet. Med. 169, 104698. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.prevetmed.2019.104698>

Thank you for your attention

- **Funding**

- ANSES
- DGAL
- GDS France
- INRAE
- VetAgro Sup

- **Acknowledgment**

- the French platform for epidemiological surveillance in animal health (ESA platform)
- The farmers who took part in this study
- The veterinarians who collected the samples
- The Departmental Veterinary laboratories that performed the analyses
- Animal Health Farmers' Organizations that coordinated the study locally



Funded by the
European Union



VetAgro Sup



L'action sanitaire ensemble

GDS
France



anses



MINISTÈRE
DE L'AGRICULTURE
DE L'AGROALIMENTAIRE
ET DE LA FORÊT

INRAE
la science pour la vie, l'humain, la terre