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Detection of Chlamydia trachomatis by enzyme immunoassay, immunofluorescence, and cell culture

Mumtaz et al1 presented their evaluation of a commercial enzyme immunoassay (Abbott Laboratories) for detecting Chlamydia trachomatis in urethral and cervical specimens. The hospital and laboratory in which the work was performed has a long and well established research interest in C trachomatis. We present our experience with this enzyme immunoassay in a district general hospital that does not have such an established interest but wishes to provide a rapid and reliable service for the diagnosis of C trachomatis infection. We also simultaneously tested many of our patients using a third technique.

We evaluated 83 cervical specimens by enzyme immunoassay and a McCoy cell culture technique that was essentially similar to that described by Mumtaz et al1 except that cell monolayers were stained with Giemsa. Cell cultures were not passaged. Specimens were taken from women on their first visit to the clinic of genito-urinary medicine, irrespective of their reason for attendance. Fifty five of these patients were also tested by direct immunofluorescence using a fluorescein labelled genus specific monoclonal antibody (Boots-Celltech Diagnostics). Specimens were considered to be positive if 10 or more fluorescing elementary bodies were seen. In each case the swab for enzyme immunoassay was taken before the swab for cell culture. If immunofluorescence was being performed the swab for culture was used to prepare a slide before it was placed in transport medium.

The Table shows the results. C trachomatis was isolated from 20 (24%) samples. Seventeen of these were positive by enzyme immunoassay. Of the three samples negative by enzyme immunoassay, one was positive by immunofluorescence. Two of the three cases that were negative by cell culture but positive by enzyme immunoassay were tested by immunofluorescence, and both were positive. None of the three patients whose samples were negative by cell culture had been treated with antibiotics in the few months before sampling.

Although the number of specimens evaluated was small, our results were similar to those of previous studies.1–4 In addition, the results obtained indicate that specimens positive by enzyme immunoassay but negative by cell culture are not necessarily false positives but may represent the loss of viability of C trachomatis during transport. Our findings also raise some doubt about the use of cell culture as the “gold standard” and the value of defining a “specificity” (the number of healthy subjects with a negative test result divided by the total number of healthy subjects)3 for antigen detection assays.

If the enzyme immunoassay test is compared only with cell culture its specificity in our evaluation was 95% (60/63). Two of the three discrepant results were positive by immunofluorescence, and the third was not tested by this technique. If these results are taken to indicate that these two specimens were positive (and the third specimen dis-regarded) the specificity of enzyme immunoassay may be considered to be 100% (60/60) in our small series. Similarly, the sensitivity of the enzyme immunoassay improves from 85% (17/20) to 86% (19/22) compared with a sensitivity for cell culture of 91% (20/22). Therefore, sensitivity and specificity figures must be interpreted with caution when the reference test is known to have a sensitivity of less than 100%.

In conclusion, although under ideal conditions cell culture may be more sensitive than enzyme immunoassay, in routine diagnostic use this is probably balanced by the failure to isolate C trachomatis from several infected patients. The use of such an enzyme immunoassay has resulted in a considerable improvement in our service, as we no longer encounter the problems of maintaining a cell line of required sensitivity for the reliable isolation of C trachomatis.
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Comparison of methods for detecting Chlamydia trachomatis

Dr Ridgway and others reply as follows: Morgan-Capner et al raise the possibility that apparent false positive results with the new chlamydial antigen detection methods may reflect deficiencies in the cell culture
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