

Human Herpesvirus 6 Positivity on the FilmArray Meningitis/ Encephalitis Panel Needs Clinical Interpretation.

Amy Slenker MD

Lehigh Valley Health Network, amy_k.slenker@lvhn.org

Tricia L Royer

Lehigh Valley Health Network

Tibisay Villalobos MD

Lehigh Valley Health Network, tibisay.villalobos@lvhn.org

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarlyworks.lvhn.org/medicine>



Part of the [Infectious Disease Commons](#)

Published In/Presented At

Slenker, A. K., Royer, T. L., & Villalobos, T. (2019). Human Herpesvirus 6 Positivity on the FilmArray Meningitis/Encephalitis Panel Needs Clinical Interpretation. *Clinical infectious diseases : an official publication of the Infectious Diseases Society of America*, 69(1), 192–194. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciz058>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by LVHN Scholarly Works. It has been accepted for inclusion in LVHN Scholarly Works by an authorized administrator. For more information, please contact LibraryServices@lvhn.org.

incidence eventually falls faster among the unvaccinated than among vaccinees, bringing these 2 incidence rates closer together. Thus, later in the influenza season, vaccine effectiveness (VE) can artifactually seem to wane (unless susceptibility is measured and adjusted for).

For this kind of bias to arise, the groups compared must have differential depletion of their susceptible individuals. In our vaccinee-only study, the groups compared were persons vaccinated earlier in the year vs those vaccinated later in the year. Before influenza begins to circulate, there is no depletion of susceptibles. After influenza begins to circulate—and if there really is no waning of VE—the rate of depletion of susceptibles among the vaccinees will be the same regardless of when they were vaccinated. In this no-waning scenario, there is no potential for bias related to depletion of susceptibles.

(If VE really does wane, then the early vaccinees would be less protected than the later vaccinees and would get more depleted of their susceptibles. In this case, the amount of waning would be underestimated rather than exaggerated.)

However, bias in the direction of exaggerating waning is potentially introduced by the inclusion of persons who are vaccinated after the influenza season is under way and have less time to be depleted. To address this concern, we restricted our analysis to the 90% of our study population that was vaccinated before 1 December (before the influenza season ever started in Northern California during the 2010–2016 study period), and our estimate of waning changed very little. (Our estimate of the increased odds of influenza with every 28 days since vaccination went from 1.16 to 1.18.)

Notes

Financial support. This work was supported by the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases, National Institutes of Health (grant number 1R01AI107721-01).

Potential conflicts of interest. All authors: No reported conflicts. All authors have submitted

the ICMJE Form for Disclosure of Potential Conflicts of Interest. Conflicts that the editors consider relevant to the content of the manuscript have been disclosed.

G. Thomas Ray, Ned Lewis, and Bruce Fireman

Kaiser Permanente Vaccine Study Center and Division of Research, Kaiser Permanente Medical Care Program, Northern California Region, Oakland

References

1. Ray GT, Lewis N, Klein NP, et al. Intra-season waning of influenza vaccine effectiveness. *Clin Infect Dis* 2018; 68:1623–30.
2. Lipsitch M. Challenges of vaccine effectiveness and waning studies [manuscript published online ahead of print 10 September 2018]. *Clin Infect Dis* 2018. doi:10.1093/cid/ciy773.

Correspondence: G. T. Ray, Kaiser Permanente Vaccine Study Center and Division of Research, Kaiser Permanente, 2000 Broadway, Oakland, CA 94612 (tom.ray@kp.org).

Clinical Infectious Diseases® 2019;69(1):191–2

© The Author(s) 2018. Published by Oxford University Press for the Infectious Diseases Society of America. All rights reserved. For permissions, e-mail: journals.permissions@oup.com. DOI: 10.1093/cid/ciy1085

Human Herpesvirus 6 Positivity on the FilmArray Meningitis/Encephalitis Panel Needs Clinical Interpretation

TO THE EDITOR—We read with interest the article by Green et al [1] regarding the clinical significance of human herpesvirus 6 (HHV-6) positivity on the FilmArray meningitis/encephalitis (ME) panel. We have had a similar experience and would like to add our own institution's findings to this interesting topic.

Our institution, Lehigh Valley Health Network (LVHN), is made up of 7 hospitals serving the suburban and rural areas surrounding Allentown, Pennsylvania. The ME panel was introduced 23 February 2016 to 3 of these hospitals, including our large 800-bed tertiary care center and children's hospital. Notably, LVHN performs kidney and pancreas solid organ transplants only. As previously described, this panel is a multiplex cerebrospinal fluid nucleic acid test that

detects 14 different targets with excellent sensitivity and specificity and a rapid turnaround time [1, 2].

We reviewed all of the cases of HHV-6 positive ME panel results from 23 February 2016 to 24 September 2018. Each patient's electronic medical record was reviewed for the following information: demographics, comorbidities, test results, radiology results, treatments, and 30-day mortality. Three providers reviewed the cases and then formulated a consensus to determine potential causality: an infectious disease specialist (A. K. S.), a transplant infectious disease specialist (T. L. R.), and a pediatric infectious disease specialist (T. V.). The authors assigned either (1) primary infection, including congenital infection, or the following regarding HHV-6 encephalitis: (2) unlikely, (3) possible, or (4) probable HHV-6 encephalitis [3–7]. This study was approved by the institutional review board at LVHN.

A total of 1516 ME panels were performed during the study period. Nineteen patients (1.3%) were identified with a positive HHV-6 result. HHV-6 was the fourth most common organism identified after enterovirus (60), herpes simplex virus type 2 (24), and varicella zoster virus (20), after excluding duplicate testing. Nine patients (47%) were ≤18 years of age and 10 (53%) were >18 years of age. Eight (88%) of the pediatric cases were thought to represent primary HHV-6 infection, resulting in a rapid discontinuation of antibiotics. Upon review, none of the adult cases was thought to represent HHV-6 encephalitis and the patients were discharged with a myriad of alternative diagnoses (Table 1). Interestingly, 3 of the adult patients were inappropriately treated with ganciclovir and in 1 patient this test result caused a delay in diagnosis of steroid-responsive encephalitis.

We support the authors' conclusions that this diagnosis should only be

Table 1. Case Series of Patients With Human Herpesvirus 6 Positivity

Age	Sex	Comorbidities	Presentation	CSF WBC, cells/mL	ID Consultation	MRI Consistent	Antiviral	HHV-6 Diagnosis	Diagnosis
2 wk	F	None	Fever, shortness of breath	21	Yes	NP	No	Primary infection	RSV bronchiolitis, HHV-6 infection
81 y	F	Hypothyroidism, HTN	Falls	3	No	NP	No	Unlikely	Ambulatory dysfunction
9 mo	F	None	Fever, vomiting	12	No	NP	No	Primary infection	HHV-6 infection
80 y	F	Crohn disease	Seizure	51	Yes	No	No	Unlikely	PRES
26 y	F	Sjogren syndrome	Fever, leg ulcer, headache	1	Yes	No	No	Unlikely	Headache
63 y	F	Hodgkin lymphoma in remission, splenectomy	Pain and weakness in legs	38	Yes	No	No	Unlikely	Varicella zoster radiculitis
1 y	F	None	Seizure	0	Yes	No	No	Primary infection	HHV-6 infection
56 y	F	DM, morbid obesity	Progressive lower extremity weakness	0	No	No	No	Unlikely	Guillain-Barré syndrome
1 y	F	Chronic lung disease	Seizure	0	No	No	No	Primary infection	HHV-6 infection
18 y	F	AML in remission	Headache	2	No	No	No	Unlikely	Dental abscess
2 y	F	None	Fever, tremors	0	No	No	No	Primary infection	HHV-6 infection
60 y	M	ITP	Confusion, "driving erratically"	26	Yes	No	Ganciclovir	Unlikely	Catastrophic antiphospholipid syndrome
3 wk	M	None	Fever	22	Yes	No	No	Primary infection	HHV-6 infection
1 wk	M	None	Vomiting, hypothermia	21	Yes	NP	No	Primary infection	Congenital vs postnatal HHV-6 infection
2 y	M	None	Fever, shaking	0	No	NP	No	Primary infection	HHV-6 infection
39 y	M	DM type 1, drug abuse	Fever, left-sided weakness	179	Yes	No	Ganciclovir	Unlikely	Drug-induced toxic/anoxic encephalopathy
29 y	F	Obesity	Headache, cranial nerve palsy	194	Yes	No	Ganciclovir	Unlikely	Steroid-responsive encephalitis
56 y	F	Seizures, hypothyroidism	Seizures, encephalopathy	18	No	No	No	Unlikely	Serotonin syndrome
40 y	F	Fibromyalgia, Roux-en-Y gastric bypass	Headache	9	Yes	NP	No	Unlikely	Headache

Abbreviations: AML, acute myelogenous leukemia; CSF, cerebrospinal fluid; DM, diabetes mellitus; HHV-6, human herpesvirus type 6; HTN, hypertension; ID, infectious disease; ITP, idiopathic thrombocytopenic purpura; MRI, magnetic resonance imaging; NP, not performed; PRES, posterior reversible encephalopathy syndrome; RSV, respiratory syncytial virus; WBC, white blood cell.

entertained in the right clinical situation, that is, in patients with immunosuppression and consistent imaging findings and laboratory results. We support the use of a result comment to guide providers on the interpretation of a positive HHV-6 result.

Note

Potential conflicts of interest. All authors: No reported conflicts. All authors have submitted the ICMJE Form for Disclosure of Potential Conflicts of Interest. Conflicts that the editors consider relevant to the content of the manuscript have been disclosed.

Amy K. Slenker,^{1,✉} Tricia L. Royer,¹ and Tibisay Villalobos²

¹Division of Infectious Diseases, Lehigh Valley Health Network, and ²Department of Pediatrics, Section of Infectious Diseases, Lehigh Valley Children's Hospital, Allentown, Pennsylvania

References

1. Green DA, Pereira M, Miko B, Radmard S, Whittier S, Thakur K. Clinical significance of human herpesvirus 6 positivity on the FilmArray meningitis/encephalitis panel. *Clin Infect Dis* **2018**; 67:1125–8.
2. Leber AL, Everhart K, Balada-Llasat JM, et al. Multicenter evaluation of Biofire FilmArray meningitis/encephalitis panel for detection of bacteria, viruses, and yeast in cerebrospinal fluid specimens. *J Clin Microbiol* **2016**; 54:2251–61.
3. Strausbaugh LJ, Caserta MT, Mock DJ, Dewhurst S. Human herpesvirus 6. *Clin Infect Dis* **2001**; 33:829–33.
4. Leong HN, Tuke PW, Tedder RS, et al. The prevalence of chromosomally integrated human herpesvirus 6 genomes in the blood of UK blood donors. *J Med Virol* **2007**; 79:45–51.
5. Ogata M, Satou T, Kadota J, et al. Human herpesvirus 6 (HHV-6) reactivation and HHV-6 encephalitis after allogeneic hematopoietic cell transplantation: a multicenter, prospective study. *Clin Infect Dis* **2013**; 57:671–81.
6. Sauter A, Ernemann U, Beck R, et al. Spectrum of imaging findings in immunocompromised patients with HHV-6 infection. *AJR Am J Roentgenol* **2009**; 193:W373–80.
7. Zerr DM. Human herpesvirus 6 and central nervous system disease in hematopoietic cell transplantation. *J Clin Virol* **2006**; 37(Suppl 1):S52–6.

Correspondence: A. K. Slenker, Lehigh Valley Health Network, Division of Infectious Diseases, 1250 S Cedar Crest Blvd, Ste 200, Allentown, PA 18103 (amy_k.slenker@lvhn.org).

Clinical Infectious Diseases[®] **2019;69(1):192–4**
© The Author(s) 2019. Published by Oxford University Press for the Infectious Diseases Society of America. All rights reserved. For permissions, e-mail: journals.permissions@oup.com. DOI: 10.1093/cid/ciz058