

Harmonisation of the diagnostic performances of ELISA tests for C. burnetii antibodies in ruminants: optimal positivity thresholds and performance reassessment

Laureline Rivière, Elodie Rousset, Elsa Jourdain, Marie Laure

Delignette-Muller, T. Lurier

▶ To cite this version:

Laureline Rivière, Elodie Rousset, Elsa Jourdain, Marie Laure Delignette-Muller, T. Lurier. Harmonisation of the diagnostic performances of ELISA tests for C. burnetii antibodies in ruminants: optimal positivity thresholds and performance reassessment. SBED Conference 2024: Insights in Action, Jan 2024, Bruxelles, Belgium. . hal-04513507

HAL Id: hal-04513507 https://hal.inrae.fr/hal-04513507

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



Harmonisation of the diagnostic performances of ELISA tests for *C. burnetii* antibodies in ruminants: optimal positivity thresholds and performance reassessment

Laureline Rivière^{1, 2*}, Elodie Rousset³, Elsa Jourdain¹, Marie-Laure Delignette-Muller², Thibaut Lurier¹

1- UMR INRAE VetAgro Sup EpiA; 2 - UMR CNRS Université Lyon 1 VetAgro Sup 5558; 3 – ANSES Q fever RNL *corresponding author: laureline.riviere@vetagro-sup.fr

Context

- Several ELISAs are available for the serological diagnosis of *C. burnetii* infection in ruminants.
- None can be considered as a gold standard or as a reference test.
- **Differences between their diagnostic performances** (Lurier *et al.* 2021) \Rightarrow decrease the agreement between the test results from different veterinary laboratories, and \Rightarrow limits the comparability of surveillance data.
- Harmonisation of the tests is possible by changing their positivity thresholds.
 - Proposed ROC curves estimation methods (ordered multinomial model Wang et al. 2007 and mixture model – Choi et al. 2006) are not applicable due to the conditional dependency of the tests and to the non-Gaussian distribution of their quantitative measurement.

Objectives

- Identify the positivity thresholds that maximise the agreement between the tests.
- Estimate the impact of changing the thresholds.

Method

- Data: results of three ELISAs from 1258 cattle, 1474 goats and 1432 sheep.
- Thresholds maximising Hubert's kappa were identified using a differential evolution algorithm.
- The uncertainty around these optimal thresholds was estimated by bootstrapping.
- Sensitivities and specificities of the tests at the optimal thresholds were estimated by Bayesian inference using the hierarchical zero-inflated beta-binomial latent class **model** previously described by Lurier *et al*. (2021).

Results

Optimal positivity thresholds

Impact of the threshold change

- **Diagnostic performances**

Optimal thresholds are different (higher or lower) from the manufacturers' thresholds.

The uncertainty around the optimal thresholds is high, but should be interpreted with caution as the coverage of these bootstrap intervals is not guaranteed in this case.



At the optimal thresholds, the sensitivities of tests 1 and 2 increased without major changes in their specificities. The **sensitivity of test 3 decreased** while its **specificity increased**. The sensitivities and specificities are **closer** from one test to another.



Sensitivity and specificity of the tests at manufacturers' and optimal thresholds and their 95% credibility intervals

Observed disagreement

The proportion of discordant cases is **divided by approximately 2** compared to the manufacturers' thresholds (e.g. from 20 to 12% for goats).

Species

Manufacturers' thresholds 🔺 Optimal thresholds

Manufacturers' thresholds and thresholds that maximise Hubert's kappa and their 95% bootstrap intervals

Apparent prevalence

The apparent prevalences are more similar from one test to another at the optimal thresholds (e.g. in sheep they range from 7.7 to 17% at the manufacturers' thresholds and from 8.7 to 10.3% at the optimal thresholds).

Findings of the study Improved harmonisation of the test results and of their diagnostic performances \rightarrow Improved comparability of surveillance data

Discussion and perspective

The increase in sensitivity of tests 1 and 2 estimated in this study is not consistent with the increase in their thresholds compared to the manufacturers' ones.

The development of methods to evaluate ROC curves in the absence of a gold standard, especially considering the conditional dependence between tests, remains an important area for future research.

Choi, Syngjoo, Raymond Fisman, Douglass Gale, and Sachar Kariv. 2006. 'Substantive and Procedural Rationality in Decisions under Uncertainty'. UC Berkeley: Experimental Social Science Laboratory (Xlab). Retrieved from https://escholarship.org/uc/item/12t0k785

Lurier, Thibaut, Elodie Rousset, Patrick Gasqui, Carole Sala, Clément Claustre, David Abrial, Philippe Dufour, et al. 2021. 'Evaluation Using Latent Claustre, David Abrial, Philippe Dufour, et al. 2021. 'Evaluation Using Latent Claustre, David Abrial, Philippe Dufour, et al. 2021. 'Evaluation Using Latent Claustre, David Abrial, Philippe Dufour, et al. 2021. 'Evaluation Using Latent Claustre, David Abrial, Philippe Dufour, et al. 2021. 'Evaluation Using Latent Claustre, David Abrial, Philippe Dufour, et al. 2021. 'Evaluation Using Veterinary Research 52 (1): 56. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13567-021-00926-w.

Wang, Chong, Bruce W. Turnbull, Yrjö T. Gröhn, and Søren S. Nielsen. 2007. 'Nonparametric Estimation of ROC Curves Based on Bayesian Models When the True Disease State Is Unknown'. Journal of Agricultural, Biological, and Environmental Statistics 12 (1): 128–46. https://doi.org/10.1198/108571107X178095.