

# Poor performance of two rapid immunochromatographic assays for anti-Japanese encephalitis virus immunoglobulin M detection in cerebrospinal fluid and serum from patients with suspected Japanese encephalitis virus infection in Laos

#### Onanong Sengvilaipaseuth<sup>a</sup>, Josée Castonguay-Vanier<sup>a,b</sup>, Anisone Chanthongthip<sup>a</sup>, Ooyanong Phonemixay<sup>a</sup>, Soulignasack Thongpaseuth<sup>a</sup>, Manivanh Vongsouvath<sup>a</sup>, Paul N. Newton<sup>a,b</sup>, Tehmina Bharucha<sup>a,c,\*</sup> and Audrey Dubot-Pérès<sup>a,b,d</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Lao-Oxford-Mahosot Hospital-Wellcome Trust Research Unit (LOMWRU), Microbiology Laboratory, Mahosot Hospital, Vientiane, Lao People's Democratic Republic; <sup>b</sup>Centre for Tropical Medicine and Global Health, Nuffield Department of Medicine, University of Oxford, Churchill Hospital, Oxford, UK; <sup>c</sup>Division of Infection and Immunity, University College London, London, UK; <sup>d</sup>UMR 'Émergence des Pathologies Virales' (EPV), Aix-Marseille Université, IRD 190, Inserm 1207, EHESP, IHU Méditerranée Infection, Marseille, France

\*Corresponding author: E-mail: t.bharucha@doctors.org.uk

Received 9 July 2017; revised 4 October 2017; editorial decision 24 October 2017; accepted 24 October 2017

**Background:** Japanese encephalitis virus (JEV) is a leading identified cause of encephalitis in Asia, often occurring in rural areas with poor access to laboratory diagnostics. We evaluated two rapid diagnostic tests (RDTs) for anti-JEV immunoglobulin M (IgM) detection.

**Methods:** Consecutive cerebrospinal fluid and serum from 388 patients (704 samples) with suspected JEV infections admitted to six hospitals in Laos were tested with one of two SD-Bioline anti-JEV IgM RDTs and the World Health Organization standard anti-JEV IgM enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay (ELISA; Panbio Japanese Encephalitis–Dengue IgM Combo ELISA.

**Results and Conclusions:** The performance of both RDTs showed strikingly low sensitivity in comparison to anti-JEV IgM antibody capture ELISA (2.1–51.4%), suggesting low sensitivity of the RDTs. We highlight the fundamental prerequisite to validate RDTs prior to use to ensure that they meet standards for testing.

**Keywords:** Central nervous system infection, Immunoassays, *Japanese encephalitis virus*, Laos, Rapid diagnostic tests, South-East Asia

## Introduction

Japanese encephalitis virus (JEV) is a leading cause of encephalitis in Asia, with an estimated 69 000 cases per year, 30–50% associated neurological sequelae and 30% mortality.<sup>1</sup> It is also an important cause of undifferentiated fever.<sup>2</sup> Patients live predominantly in poor, rural communities, often with limited access to laboratory diagnostics. Our knowledge of the true extent of the burden of JEV is limited by the accuracy and accessibility of currently available diagnostic tests.<sup>3,4</sup>

Evidence for the utility of point-of-care diagnostic tests in resource-constrained settings is steadily accumulating.<sup>5,6</sup> They are, indeed, rapid, easy to use, do not require specific technical knowledge or equipment and have demonstrable accuracy for

some pathogens, such as *Plasmodium* spp. and *Dengue virus* (DENV). However, the tests need to be rigorously evaluated, including field testing, before implementation for diagnosis.

Rapid tests for detecting JEV infection have been reported, although none appear to be in routine use.<sup>7–10</sup> Three of the tests are not convenient for rural diagnostics, requiring overnight incubations and multiple washing steps with various reagents, and one has only been optimized and validated for use in swine. We performed an evaluation of two Standard Diagnostics' Bioline (SD-Bioline) anti-JEV immunoglobulin M (IgM) rapid diagnostic tests (RDTs) in a study of consecutive cerebrospinal fluid (CSF) and serum of patients with suspected JEV infections in Lao People's Democratic Republic (Laos).

<sup>©</sup> The Author(s) 2017. Published by Oxford University Press on behalf of Royal Society of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene. This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/ by/4.0/), which permits unrestricted reuse, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

# Materials and methods

#### **Ethical statement**

This evaluation was part of studies of the causes of central nervous system (CNS) infections and undifferentiated fever in Laos. Written informed consent was obtained from all recruited patients or responsible guardians. Ethical clearance was granted by the Ethical Review Committee of the Faculty of Medical Sciences, National University of Laos and the Oxford University Tropical Research Ethics Committee, Oxford, UK.

#### Patients

Patients of any age admitted to four hospitals in Vientiane (Mahosot, Sethatirat, Mother and Child, and Friendship) with suspected CNS infection, without contraindications for lumbar puncture (LP), and who gave informed consent were included.<sup>11</sup> No formal definition for CNS infection was used for recruitment, which was at the discretion of the responsible physician, reflecting local clinical practice. We also included in- and outpatients from two hospitals outside Vientiane (Luang Namtha in northwest Laos and Salavan in southern Laos), ages 5–49 years, with fever of <9 days without obvious causes, admission tympanic temperature of  $\geq$ 38°C, including suspected CNS infection, who gave written informed consent.<sup>12</sup> Blood and/or CSF were collected at admission and a follow-up blood sample was taken at discharge. Serum and CSF were aliguoted and frozen at  $-80^{\circ}$ C.

#### JEV RDT

SD-Bioline JE IgG/IgM RDT (catalogue number 48FK20; Standard Diagnostics, Kyonggi-do, South Korea) and SD-Bioline JEV IgM (catalogue number 48FK10; Standard Diagnostics) are immunochromatographic assays for the qualitative detection of anti-JEV IgM antibody from serum, plasma and whole blood. The first group of patients, with undifferentiated fever or suspected CNS infections, were tested using the IgG/IgM RDT. After this test was discontinued, a second group of patients with suspected CNS infection were tested using the IgM RDT. Serum and CSF were tested in this study as per the manufacturer's instructions. A 5  $\mu$ l sample was applied to the small 'S' well on the cassette, then four drops of diluent (provided with the kit) were applied on the larger round well. The IgG/IgM RDT was tested on one set of samples read by four readers. The IgM RDT was then tested on a second set of samples from different patients by two readers. A valid test showed a pink line 'C' in the result window and a positive result (detection of anti-JEV IgM) with a pink line 'M' for the IgG/IgM test or line 'T' for the IgM test. Results were reported as positive or negative. We did not analyse the anti-JEV IgG RDT results or perform anti-JEV IgG enzyme-linked immunosorbent assays (ELISAs). The RDTs were tested on acute and convalescent serum and CSF, although CSF testing is not included as part of the instructions from the manufacturer.

#### Panbio ELISA

Detection of anti-JEV IgM using anti-JEV IgM antibody capture (MAC)-ELISA is the World Health Organization recommended test for diagnosing JEV infection. The Japanese Encephalitis-Dengue IgM Combo ELISA kit (catalogue number E-JED01C; Panbio ELISA; Inverness Medical Innovations, Brisbane, QLD, Australia, formerly Panbio Ltd) is a commercial anti-JEV MAC-ELISA kit that is combined with an anti-DENV IgM test to differentiate IgM against DENV and JEV. The test was performed according to the manufacturer's instructions, and reported as anti-JEV or anti-DENV IgM positive, equivocal or negative.<sup>13</sup> Anti-DENV IgM positive or equivocal and anti-JEV IgM equivocal were interpreted as anti-JEV IgM negative.

#### Statistical analysis

Anti-JEV MAC-ELISA (Panbio ELISA) was used as a reference standard ('the best available method for establishing the presence or absence of the target condition') for the calculation of RDT sensitivity and specificity.<sup>14</sup> ELISA and RDT results were analysed in a 2×2 table, with sensitivity and specificity (95% confidence intervals [CIs]) calculated using STATA 13.1 (StataCorp, College Station, TX, USA).<sup>15</sup>

# **Results and discussion**

Two hundred patients (337 samples), 54 with undifferentiated fever and 146 with CNS presentations, were tested by SD-Bioline JE IgG/IgM RDT and 188 CNS presentations (367 samples) were

	Study group	1 (SD-Bioline JEV I	gG/IgM RDT)	Study group 2 (SD-Bioline JEV IgM RDT)					
Admitting hospital	Mahosot	Luang Namtha	Salavan	Mahosot	Sethatirat	Mother and Child	Friendship		
Number of patients	140	39	21	143	7	18	20		
Age (median, interquartile range)	26 (17–40)	18 (10–26)	18 (13–28)	28 (16–40)	35 (26–48)	6 (3-8)	30 (20–39)		
Sex, n (% female)	19 (13.6)	19 (48.8)	7 (33.3)	60 (42.0)	3 (43.0)	5 (28.0)	3 (15.0)		
Clinical presentation*, n (% suspected CNS infection)	140 (100)	5 (12.8)	1 (4.8)	143 (100)	7 (100)	18 (100)	20 (100)		

 Table 1.
 Summary of patients included in the study

\*The clinical inclusion criterion for study group 1 was either suspected central nervous system (CNS) infection or undifferentiated fever and for study group 2 was only suspected CNS infection.

tested by SD-Bioline JEV IgM RDT. A summary of the patient characteristics is presented in Table 1.

Both RDTs demonstrated very low sensitivity with the Panbio ELISA: 51.4% (95% CI 34.0–68.6) for suspected CNS infections and 16.0% (95% CI 4.5–36.1) for undifferentiated fever with the SD-Bioline JE IgG/IgM RDT and 2.1% (95% CI 0.1–11.1) for

suspected CNS infections with the SD-Bioline JEV IgM RDT, suggesting low sensitivity of the assay. See Table 2 for individual analyses of CSF, acute and convalescent serum for the two RDTs for patients with suspected CNS infections and undifferentiated fever. The Panbio ELISA detected anti-JEV IgM in 28% of patients, consistent with published data.<sup>1</sup>

**Table 2.** 2x2 Tables comparing anti-JEV IgM detection by Panbio ELISA kit and SD-Bioline JEV RDT results for serum, CSF, all samples and allpatients

RDT         POS         12         1         13         RDT         POS         0         0         RDT         POS         0         0         NEG         17         29         46         NEG         0         0         0         NEG         140         180           Total         29         30         59         Total         0         0         0         0         NEG         40         140         180           Sensitivity (95% CI): 41.4% (23.5–61.0)         Sensitivity (95% CI):         Sensitivity (95% CI): 100% (97.4–100)         Sensitivity (95% CI): 100% (97.4–100)           Acute serum         Panbio ELISA         Convalescent serum         Panbio ELISA         Sensitivity (95% CI): 10.0% (0.0–8.8)         Sensitivity (95% CI): 10.0% (0.0–8.8)         Sensitivity (95% CI): 10.0% (0.0–8.8)         Sensitivity	SD-Bioline JE IgG/IgM RDT <sup>a</sup>								SD-Bioline JEV IgM RDT <sup>b</sup>						
POS         NEG         Total         POS         NEG         Total         POS         NEG         Total           RDT         POS         12         1         13         RDT         POS         0         0         0         NEG         Total         40         140         188           Total         29         30         59         Total         0         0         0         Total         40         140         188           Sensitivity (95% CI): +1.4% (23.5-6.10)         Sensitivity (95% CI): -         Specificity (95% CI): 100% (97.4-100)           Acute serum         Pols         Acute serum         Pols         NEG         Total         POS         NEG         Total           RDT         POS         NEG         Total         8.3         9.1         Total         8.3         9.1         Total         4.0         1.2         1.2         1.2         1.2         1.2         1.2         1.2         1.2	Suspected CNS infection					Undifferentiated fever				Suspected CNS infection					
RDT         POS         12         1         13         RDT         POS         0         0         RDT         POS         0         0         NEG         17         29         46         NEG         0         0         0         NEG         100         100         100         100         100         100 <th>CSF</th> <th colspan="2">CSF Panbio ELISA<sup>c</sup></th> <th></th> <th colspan="2">CSF</th> <th colspan="2">Panbio ELISA<sup>c</sup></th> <th></th> <th>CSF</th> <th></th> <th>Panbic</th> <th colspan="2">Panbio ELISA<sup>c</sup></th>	CSF	CSF Panbio ELISA <sup>c</sup>			CSF		Panbio ELISA <sup>c</sup>			CSF		Panbic	Panbio ELISA <sup>c</sup>		
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$			POS	NEG	Total			POS	NEG	- Total			POS	NEG	Total
Total         29         30         59         Total         0         0         0         Total         40         140         180           Sensitivity (95% CI): 41.4% (23.5-61.0)         Sensitivity (95% CI): 95% CI): 95% CI): 95% CI): 95% CI): 95% CI): 95% CI): 100% (97.4-100)         Sensitivity (95% CI): 100% (97.4-100)           Acute serum         Panbio ELISA         Sensitivity (95% CI): 17.7% (15.7-84.3)         Sensitivity (95% CI): 100% (95.7-100)         Sensitivity (95% CI): 100% (88.8-100)         Sensitivity (95% CI): 100% (97.1-100)           Convalescent         Panbio ELISA         Convalescent         Panbio ELISA         Sensitivity (95% CI): 100% (95.7-100)         Sensitivity (95% CI): 100% (95.7-100)	RDT	POS	12	1	13	RDT	POS	0	0	0	RDT	POS	0	0	0
Sensitivity (95% CI): 41.4% (23.5–61.0)         Sensitivity (95% CI): -         Sensitivity (95% CI): 0.0% (0.0–8.8)           Specificity (95% CI): 96.7% (82.8–99.9)         Specificity (95% CI): -         Sensitivity (95% CI): 100% (97.4–100)           Acute serum         Panbio ELISA         Acute serum         Panbio ELISA         Acute serum         Panbio ELISA           NEG         4         0         4         RDT         POS         NEG         Total         8         83         91         Total         18         31         46         NEG         40         123         163           Sensitivity (95% CI): 17.7% (15.7–84.3)         Sensitivity (95% CI): 16.7% (3.6–41.4)         Sensitivity (95% CI): 100% (97.1–100)         Sensitivity (95% CI): 100% (97.1–100)         Specificity (95% CI): 100% (95.7–100)         Specificity (95% CI): 100% (88.8–100)         Sensitivity (95% CI): 10.0% (0.0–8.8)           Specificity (95% CI): 17.7% (15.7–84.3)         Sensitivity (95% CI): 100% (95.7–100)         Specificity (95% CI): 100% (88.8–100)         Specificity (95% CI): 10.0% (97.1–100)           Convalescent serum         Panbio ELISA         Convalescent serum         Panbio ELISA         Convalescent serum         Panbio ELISA           RDT         POS         NEG         Total         23         26         49         Total         71         0		NEG	17	29	46		NEG	0	0	0		NEG	40	140	180
Specificity (95% CI): 96.7% (82.8–99.9)         Specificity (95% CI): -         Specificity (95% CI): 100% (97.4–100)           Acute serum         Panbio ELISA         Acute serum         Panbio ELISA         Acute serum         Panbio ELISA         Acute serum         Panbio ELISA           RDT         POS         NEG         Total         POS         NEG         Total         POS         NEG         Total         POS         NEG         40         123         163           RDT         POS         NEG         483         87         NEG         15         31         46         NEG         40         123         163           Sensitivity (95% CI): 17.7% (15.7–84.3)         Sensitivity (95% CI): 16.7% (3.6–41.4)         Sensitivity (95% CI): 0.0% (0.0–8.8)         Specificity (95% CI): 100% (97.1–100)         Specificity (95% CI): 100% (97.1–		Total	29	30	59		Total	0	0	0		Total	40	140	180
Acute serum         Panbio ELISA           RDT         POS         4         0         4         RDT         POS         3         0         3         RDT         POS         0 <td colspan="3">Sensitivity (95% CI): 41.4% (23.5–61.0)</td> <td colspan="5">Sensitivity (95% CI): —</td> <td colspan="5">Sensitivity (95% CI): 0.0% (0.0–8.8)</td>	Sensitivity (95% CI): 41.4% (23.5–61.0)			Sensitivity (95% CI): —					Sensitivity (95% CI): 0.0% (0.0–8.8)						
POS         NEG         Total         POS         NEG         Total         POS         NEG         Total           RDT         POS         4         0         4         RDT         POS         3         0         3         RDT         POS         0	-			Specifi					Specificity (95% CI): 100% (97.4–100)						
RDT         POS         4         0         4         RDT         POS         3         0         3         RDT         POS         0         <	Acute	Acute serum Panbio ELISA			Acute serum Pa		Panbic	inbio ELISA		Acute serum		Panbio ELISA			
NEG         4         83         87         NEG         15         31         46         NEG         40         123         163           Total         8         83         91         Total         18         31         49         Total         40         123         163           Sensitivity (95% CI): 17.7% (15.7-84.3)         Sensitivity (95% CI): 16.7% (3.6-41.4)         Sensitivity (95% CI): 100% (95.7-100)         Sensitivity (95% CI): 100% (88.8-100)         Sensitivity (95% CI): 100% (97.1-100)         Sensitivity (95% CI): 100% (97.1-100)         Sensitivity (95% CI): 100% (95.7-100)         Sensitivity (95% CI): 100% (88.8-100)         Sensitivity (95% CI): 100% (97.1-100)         Sensitivity (95% CI): 100% (97.1-100)           Convalescent         Panbio ELISA         Convalescent         Panbio ELISA         Sensitivity (95% CI): 100% (95.7-100)         Sensitivity (95% CI): 100% (95.8-100)         Sensitivity (95% CI): 10.0% (95.8-100)         Sensitivity (95% CI): 10.0% (80.5-100)           RDT         POS         NEG         Total         23         26         49         Total         7         17         24           Sensitivity (95% CI): 75.0% (42.8-94.5)         Sensitivity (95% CI): 100 (86.8-100)         Sensitivity (95% CI): 10.0% (80.5-1			POS	NEG	Total			POS	NEG	- Total			POS	NEG	Total
NEG         4         83         87         NEG         15         31         46         NEG         40         123         163           Total         8         83         91         Total         18         31         49         Total         40         123         163           Sensitivity (95% CI): 17.7% (15.7-84.3)         Sensitivity (95% CI): 16.7% (3.6-41.4)         Sensitivity (95% CI): 100% (95.7-100)         Sensitivity (95% CI): 100% (88.8-100)         Sensitivity (95% CI): 100% (97.1-100)         Sensitivity (95% CI): 100% (97.1-100)         Sensitivity (95% CI): 100% (95.7-100)         Sensitivity (95% CI): 100% (88.8-100)         Sensitivity (95% CI): 100% (97.1-100)         Sensitivity (95% CI): 100% (97.1-100)           Convalescent         Panbio ELISA         Convalescent         Panbio ELISA         Serum         Serum         Serum	RDT	POS	4	0	4	RDT	POS	3	0	3	RDT	POS	0	0	0
Sensitivity (95% CI): 17.7% (15.7–84.3)       Sensitivity (95% CI): 100% (95.7–100)       Sensitivity (95% CI): 16.7% (3.6–41.4)       Sensitivity (95% CI): 0.0% (0.0–8.8)         Specificity (95% CI): 100% (95.7–100)       Sensitivity (95% CI): 100% (88.8–100)       Sensitivity (95% CI): 100% (97.1–100)         Convalescent       Panbio ELISA       Convalescent       Panbio ELISA       Convalescent       Panbio ELISA       Convalescent       Panbio ELISA         RDT       POS       NEG       Total       POS       NEG       Total       POS       NEG       Total       POS       NEG       10       10         Sensitivity (95% CI): 75.0% (42.8–94.5)       Sensitivity (95% CI): 17.4% (5.0–38.8)       Sensitivity (95% CI): 14.3% (0.4–57.9)       Sensitivity (95% CI): 100% (80.5–100)       Sensitivity (95% CI): 14.3% (0.4–57.9)       Sensitivity (95% CI): 100% (80.5–100)         All patients       Panbio ELISA       All patients       Panbio ELISA       All patients       Panbio ELISA       All patients       Pois NEG       Total         RDT       POS       NEG       Total       19       RDT       POS       NEG       Total       POS       NEG       Total         RDT       POS       NEG       To		NEG	4	83	87		NEG	15	31	46		NEG	40		163
Specificity (95% CI): 100% (95.7–100)       Specificity (95% CI): 100% (88.8–100)       Specificity (95% CI): 100% (97.1–100)         Convalescent serum       Panbio ELISA       Pos       NEG       Total       Total <td></td> <td>Total</td> <td>8</td> <td>83</td> <td>91</td> <td></td> <td>Total</td> <td>18</td> <td>31</td> <td>49</td> <td></td> <td>Total</td> <td>40</td> <td>123</td> <td>163</td>		Total	8	83	91		Total	18	31	49		Total	40	123	163
Specificity (95% CI): 100% (95.7–100)       Specificity (95% CI): 100% (88.8–100)       Specificity (95% CI): 100% (97.1–100)         Convalescent serum       Panbio ELISA       Pos       NEG       Total       Total <td colspan="3"></td> <td colspan="5">Sensitivity (95% CI): 16.7% (3.6–41.4)</td> <td colspan="5"></td>				Sensitivity (95% CI): 16.7% (3.6–41.4)											
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $				2					2						
POS       NEG       Total       POS			Panbio ELISA				Panbio ELISA				Panbio ELISA				
RDT       POS       9       0       9       RDT       POS       4       0       4       RDT       POS       1       0       7         NEG       3       77       80       NEG       19       26       45       NEG       6       17       23         Total       12       77       89       Total       23       26       49       Total       7       17       24         Sensitivity (95% CI): 75.0% (42.8-94.5)       Sensitivity (95% CI): 17.4% (5.0-38.8)       Sensitivity (95% CI): 14.3% (0.4-57.9)       Sensitivity (95% CI): 100% (80.5-100)       Specificity (95% CI): 100% (80.5-100)       Specificity (95% CI): 100% (80.5-100)         All patients       Panbio ELISA       All patients       Panbio ELISA       All patients       Panbio ELISA       All patients       Pos       NEG       Total       Pos       NEG       Total         RDT       POS       NEG       Total       Pos       4       0       4       RDT       POS       NEG       Total         Med       17       10       127       NEG       21       29       50       NEG       40       4         NEG       17       110       127       NEG       21 <th< td=""><td>Sere</td><td></td><td>POS</td><td>NEG</td><td>Total</td><td>5616</td><td></td><td>POS</td><td>NEG</td><td>- Total</td><td>5616</td><td></td><td>POS</td><td>NEG</td><td>Total</td></th<>	Sere		POS	NEG	Total	5616		POS	NEG	- Total	5616		POS	NEG	Total
Total       12       77       89       Total       23       26       49       Total       7       17       24         Sensitivity (95% CI): 75.0% (42.8–94.5)       Sensitivity (95% CI): 17.4% (5.0–38.8)       Sensitivity (95% CI): 14.3% (0.4–57.9)       Specificity (95% CI): 100% (80.5–100)       Specificity (95%	RDT	POS				RDT	POS				RDT	POS			1
Total       12       77       89       Total       23       26       49       Total       7       17       24         Sensitivity (95% CI): 75.0% (42.8–94.5)       Sensitivity (95% CI): 17.4% (5.0–38.8)       Sensitivity (95% CI): 14.3% (0.4–57.9)       Sensitivity (95% CI): 14.3% (0.4–57.9)       Sensitivity (95% CI): 14.3% (0.4–57.9)       Sensitivity (95% CI): 100% (80.5–100)       Specificity (95%		NEG	3	77	80		NEG	19	26	45		NEG	6	17	23
Specificity (95% CI): 100% (95.3-100)       Specificity (95% CI): 100 (86.8-100)       Specificity (95% CI): 100% (80.5-100)         All patients       Panbio ELISA       All patients       Panbio ELISA       All patients       Panbio ELISA       All patients       Panbio ELISA       Pos       NEG       Total         RDT       POS       18       1       19       RDT       POS       4       0       4       RDT       POS       1       0       7         NEG       17       110       127       NEG       21       29       50       NEG       48       140       188         Sensitivity (95% CI): 51.4% (34.0-68.6)       Sensitivity (95% CI): 16.0% (4.5-36.1)       Sensitivity (95% CI): 2.1% (0.1-11.1)       Sensitivity (95% CI): 2.1% (0.1-11.1)		Total	12	77			Total	23	26			Total	7	17	24
Specificity (95% CI): 100% (95.3-100)       Specificity (95% CI): 100 (86.8-100)       Specificity (95% CI): 100% (80.5-100)         All patients       Panbio ELISA       All patients       Panbio ELISA       All patients       Panbio ELISA       All patients       Panbio ELISA       Pos       NEG       Total         RDT       POS       18       1       19       RDT       POS       4       0       4       RDT       POS       1       0       7         NEG       17       110       127       NEG       21       29       50       NEG       48       140       188         Sensitivity (95% CI): 51.4% (34.0-68.6)       Sensitivity (95% CI): 16.0% (4.5-36.1)       Sensitivity (95% CI): 2.1% (0.1-11.1)       Sensitivity (95% CI): 2.1% (0.1-11.1)															
POS         NEG         Total         POS         NEG         Total         POS         NEG         Total           RDT         POS         18         1         19         RDT         POS         4         0         4         RDT         POS         1         0         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1								, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,							
RDT         POS         18         1         19         RDT         POS         4         0         4         RDT         POS         1         0         1           NEG         17         110         127         NEG         21         29         50         NEG         47         140         18           Total         35         111         146         Total         25         29         54         Total         48         140         188           Sensitivity (95% CI): 51.4% (34.0-68.6)         Sensitivity (95% CI): 16.0% (4.5-36.1)         Sensitivity (95% CI): 2.1% (0.1-11.1)	All patients Panbio ELISA			All patients Panbio ELISA			All pat	ients	Panbio ELISA						
RDT         POS         18         1         19         RDT         POS         4         0         4         RDT         POS         1         0         1           NEG         17         110         127         NEG         21         29         50         NEG         47         140         18           Total         35         111         146         Total         25         29         54         Total         48         140         188           Sensitivity (95% CI): 51.4% (34.0-68.6)         Sensitivity (95% CI): 16.0% (4.5-36.1)         Sensitivity (95% CI): 2.1% (0.1-11.1)			POS	NEG	Total			POS	NEG	Total			POS	NEG	Total
NEG         17         110         127         NEG         21         29         50         NEG         47         140         187           Total         35         111         146         Total         25         29         54         Total         48         140         187           Sensitivity (95% CI): 51.4% (34.0-68.6)         Sensitivity (95% CI): 16.0% (4.5-36.1)         Sensitivity (95% CI): 2.1% (0.1-11.1)         Sensitivity (95% CI): 2.1% (0.1-11.1)	RDT	POS				RDT	POS				PDT	POS			1
Total         35         111         146         Total         25         29         54         Total         48         140         188           Sensitivity (95% CI): 51.4% (34.0–68.6)         Sensitivity (95% CI): 16.0% (4.5–36.1)         Sensitivity (95% CI): 2.1% (0.1–11.1)         Sensitivity (95% CI): 2.1% (0.1–11.1)	ND1					NDT					NDT				
Sensitivity (95% CI): 51.4% (34.0-68.6)         Sensitivity (95% CI): 16.0% (4.5-36.1)         Sensitivity (95% CI): 2.1% (0.1-11.1)															
Specificity (95% CI): 99.1% (95.1-100)         Specificity (95% CI): 100% (88.1-100)         Specificity (95% CI): 100% (97.4-100)	Specificity (95% CI): 99.1% (95.1–100)			Sensitivity (95% CI): 16.0% (4.5–36.1) Specificity (95% CI): 100% (88.1–100)				Sensitivity (95% CI): 2.1% (0.1–11.1) Specificity (95% CI): 100% (97.4–100)							

<sup>a</sup>SD-Bioline JE IgG/IgM test and <sup>b</sup>SD-Bioline JEV IgM test (RDT), both produced by Standard Diagnostics, Kyonggi-do, South Korea. Positive (POS)='M' (IgM) for the IgG/IgM assay and 'T' (test) for the IgM assay, and 'C' (control) lines visible; negative (NEG)=only 'C' line visible. IgG results are not presented. The study was performed in two phases: (1) SD-Bioline JEV IgG/IgM RDT tested on 200 patients with assays read by four independent investigators (interreader agreement 99.4% [95% CI 97.9–99.9]) and (2) SD-Bioline JEV IgM RDT tested on 188 patients with assays read by two independent investigators (interreader agreement 100% [95% CI 99.0–100]).

<sup>c</sup>JEV-Dengue IgM Combo ELISA kit (Panbio ELISA), Inverness Medical Innovations, Brisbane, Australia (formerly Panbio Ltd). Positive (POS)=JEV IgM positive, negative (NEG)=JEV IgM negative or equivocal, with cut-offs calculated according to the manufacturer's instructions. For the patient data, positive (POS) refers to CSF and/or serum positive for anti-JEV IgM and negative (NEG) is all available samples negative.

RDTs are currently being used for the diagnosis of a wide range of infectious diseases. SD-Bioline RDT assays for dengue, trypanosomiasis and HIV have been shown to have good diagnostic accuracy.<sup>16-19</sup> We found that these two JEV RDTs had low sensitivity with reference to ELISA. Similar results for some malaria RDTs have been reported.<sup>20</sup> The JEV RDTs were supplied directly from the manufacturer and used within the expiry date. Sensitivity was higher for convalescent as compared with acute serum, and this is likely due to higher JEV IgM titres arising over time.<sup>21</sup> The manufacturer's in-house assessment reported in the product leaflet for the IgM RDT involved 375 samples with a reported sensitivity and specificity >90% compared with the SD-Bioline anti-JEV MAC-ELISA (catalogue number 48EK10; Standard Diagnostics). In our study, the specificity was consistently high (>90%). Interreader agreement between the two readers was 99.4% (95% CI 97.9–99.9) for the IgG/IgM RDT and 100% (95% CI 99.0-100) for the IgM RDT. Discrepant results were excluded from the analysis. The positive control strip was valid in 700/704 tests (99.4%) and the four invalid tests were repeated successfully.

Limitations of the study include that the evaluation was only in one country and that the sera from the undifferentiated fever study<sup>11</sup> were not consecutive. We have reported sensitivity and specificity in comparison with ELISA, therefore interpretation of these results should be considered with caution. Indeed, the field is further complicated by very little evidence on the comparability between the many different anti-JEV and anti-DENV antibody ELISAs.<sup>13</sup> We used a different ELISA system than that used by the manufacturer as stated in their product leaflet. Additionally, cross-reactivity with other antigenically similar flaviviruses were not evaluated, such as confirming ELISA results by the plaque reduction neutralization test (PRNT)—the gold standard and testing RDT against anti-DENV IgM/IgG-positive serum.<sup>22</sup>

The potential use of RDTs in the diagnosis and surveillance of neglected tropical diseases such as JEV is still emerging. Our results highlight the fundamental prerequisite to validate RDTs prior to use to ensure that they meet standards for testing.<sup>16-19</sup> There is the potential for cross-reactivity with other flaviviruses circulating in a region, and results must be interpreted with this in mind. Simple, reliable and cost-effective rapid tests are still urgently needed for the diagnosis of JEV infection.

**Authors' contributions:** OS and JCV designed the study under the supervision of MV, PNN and ADP. OS, JCV, AC, OP and SP performed the laboratory work. TB performed the data analysis and interpretation, and drafted the manuscript under the supervision of ADP and PNN. All authors read and approved the final version.

Acknowledgements: We are very grateful to the patients and to Bounthaphany Bounxouei, the Director of Mahosot Hospital, the late Dr Rattanaphone Phetsouvanh, Director of the Microbiology Laboratory, the late Thaksinaporn Taojaikong, Phoudthasane Yongvongsithi and the staff of the wards and Microbiology Laboratory of Mahosot Hospital for their technical help and support, Chanphomma Vongsamphan, the Director of the Department of Health Care, Ministry of Health, and Bounkong Syhavong, Minister of Health, Lao People's Democratic Republic for their

very kind help and support. We are very grateful to the people who organized sample collection for the undifferentiated fever, Mayfong Mayxay, Microbiology Laboratory of Mahosot Hospital, Dr Phouvieng Douangdala and Dr Saythong Inthalath, Luang Namtha Provincial Hospital and Dr Phouthalavanh Souvannasing, Salavan Provincial Hospital.

Funding: None.

Competing interests: None.

Ethical approval: None.

## References

- 1 Wang H, Liang G. Epidemiology of Japanese encephalitis: past, present, and future prospects. Ther Clin Risk Manag. 2015;11:435–48.
- 2 Mayxay M, Castonguay-Vanier J, Chansamouth V, et al. Causes of non-malarial fever in Laos: a prospective study. Lancet Glob Health 2013;1(1):e46–54.
- 3 Bharucha T, Chanthongthip A, Phuangpanom S, et al. Pre-cut filter paper for detecting anti-Japanese encephalitis virus IgM from dried cerebrospinal fluid spots. PLoS Negl Trop Dis. 2016;10(3):e0004516.
- 4 Dubot-Peres A, Sengvilaipaseuth O, Chanthongthip A, et al. How many patients with anti-JEV IgM in cerebrospinal fluid really have Japanese encephalitis? Lancet Infect Dis. 2015;15(12):1376–7.
- 5 Drancourt M, Michel-Lepage A, Boyer S, et al. The point-of-care laboratory in clinical microbiology. Clin Microbiol Rev. 2016;29(3):429-47.
- 6 Choi JR, Hu J, Wang S, et al. Paper-based point-of-care testing for diagnosis of dengue infections. Crit Rev Biotechnol. 2017;37(1):100–11.
- 7 Solomon T, Thao LT, Dung NM, et al. Rapid diagnosis of Japanese encephalitis by using an immunoglobulin M dot enzyme immunoassay. J Clin Microbiol. 1998;36(7):2030–4.
- 8 Li Y, Hou L, Ye J, et al. Development of a convenient immunochromatographic strip for the diagnosis of infection with Japanese encephalitis virus in swine. J Virol Methods. 2010;168(1–2):51–6.
- 9 Shrivastva A, Tripathi NK, Parida M, et al. Comparison of a dipstick enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay with commercial assays for detection of Japanese encephalitis virus-specific IgM antibodies. J Postgrad Med. 2008;54(3):181–5.
- 10 Zhang YH, Yu WF, Cai J, et al. A rapid method for detection of flavivirus antigens: staphylococcal co-agglutination test using monoclonal antibodies to Japanese encephalitis virus. Acta Virol. 1989;33(1):24–31.
- 11 Dittrich S, Rattanavong S, Lee SJ, et al. Orientia, rickettsia, and leptospira pathogens as causes of CNS infections in Laos: a prospective study. Lancet Glob Health. 2015;3(2):e104–12.
- 12 Mayxay M, Castonguay-Vanier J, Chansamouth V, et al. Causes of non-malarial fever in Laos: a prospective study. Lancet Glob Health. 2013;1:e46–54.
- 13 Moore CE, Blacksell SD, Taojaikong T, et al. A prospective assessment of the accuracy of commercial IgM ELISAs in diagnosis of Japanese encephalitis virus infections in patients with suspected central nervous system infections in Laos. Am J Trop Med Hyg. 2012;87:171–8.
- 14 US Food and Drug Administration. Statistical guidance on reporting results from studies evaluating diagnostic tests. Rockville, MD: US FDA; 2007.
- 15 StataCorp. Stata statistical software: release 13. College Station, TX: StataCorp; 2013.
- 16 Kim YJ, Park S, Premaratna R, et al. Clinical evaluation of rapid diagnostic test kit for scrub typhus with improved performance. J Korean Med Sci. 2016;31(8):1190–6.

- 17 Kosack CS, Page AL, Beelaert G, et al. Towards more accurate HIV testing in sub-Saharan Africa: a multi-site evaluation of HIV RDTs and risk factors for false positives. J Int AIDS Soc. 2017;19(1): 1–12.
- 18 Bisser S, Lumbala C, Nguertoum E, et al. Sensitivity and specificity of a prototype rapid diagnostic test for the detection of *Trypanosoma brucei gambiense* infection: a multi-centric prospective study. PLoS Negl Trop Dis. 2016;10(4):e0004608.
- 19 Blacksell SD, Doust JA, Newton PN, et al. A systematic review and meta-analysis of the diagnostic accuracy of rapid immunochromato-

graphic assays for the detection of dengue virus IgM antibodies during acute infection. Trans R Soc Trop Med Hyg. 2006;100(8):775–84.

- 20 Berhane A, Russom M, Bahta I, et al. Rapid diagnostic tests failing to detect *Plasmodium falciparum* infections in Eritrea: an investigation of reported false negative RDT results. Malar J. 2017;16(1):105.
- 21 Burke DS, Nisalak A, Ussery MA, et al. Kinetics of IgM and IgG responses to Japanese encephalitis virus in human serum and cerebrospinal fluid. J Infect Dis. 1985;151:1093–9.
- 22 Kuno G. Serodiagnosis of flaviviral infections and vaccinations in humans. Adv Virus Res. 2003;61:3–65.