



**QUEEN'S  
UNIVERSITY  
BELFAST**

## Community-Acquired Pneumonia in Children: the Challenges of Microbiological Diagnosis

Rodrigues, C. M. C., & Groves, H. (2018). Community-Acquired Pneumonia in Children: the Challenges of Microbiological Diagnosis. *Journal of Clinical Microbiology*, 56(3), 1-9. <https://doi.org/10.1128/JCM.01318-17>

### Published in:

Journal of Clinical Microbiology

### Document Version:

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

### Queen's University Belfast - Research Portal:

[Link to publication record in Queen's University Belfast Research Portal](#)

### Publisher rights

Copyright 2018 the authors.

This is an open access article published under a Creative Commons Attribution License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the author and source are cited.

### General rights

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Queen's University Belfast Research Portal is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

### Take down policy

The Research Portal is Queen's institutional repository that provides access to Queen's research output. Every effort has been made to ensure that content in the Research Portal does not infringe any person's rights, or applicable UK laws. If you discover content in the Research Portal that you believe breaches copyright or violates any law, please contact [openaccess@qub.ac.uk](mailto:openaccess@qub.ac.uk).

### Open Access

This research has been made openly available by Queen's academics and its Open Research team. We would love to hear how access to this research benefits you. – Share your feedback with us: <http://go.qub.ac.uk/oa-feedback>



# Community-Acquired Pneumonia in Children: the Challenges of Microbiological Diagnosis

C. M. C. Rodrigues,<sup>a,b</sup> H. Groves<sup>c,d</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Department of Zoology, University of Oxford, Oxford, United Kingdom

<sup>b</sup>Department of Paediatric Infectious Diseases and Immunology, Great North Children's Hospital, Newcastle Upon Tyne, United Kingdom

<sup>c</sup>Centre for Experimental Medicine, Queens University, Belfast, United Kingdom

<sup>d</sup>Department of Paediatrics, Royal Belfast Hospital for Sick Children, Belfast, United Kingdom

**ABSTRACT** Community-acquired pneumonia (CAP) is the leading cause of mortality in children under 5 years of age globally. To improve the management of CAP, we must distinguish CAP from other common pediatric conditions and develop better diagnostic methods to detect the causative organism, so as to best direct appropriate resources in both industrialized and developing countries. Here, we review the diagnostic modalities available for identifying viruses and bacteria in the upper and lower respiratory tract of children, with a discussion of their utility and limitations in diagnosing CAP in children.

**KEYWORDS** bacterial, community-acquired pneumonia, diagnostics, molecular, PCR, viral

Community-acquired pneumonia (CAP) remains an important cause of morbidity and mortality in both industrialized and developing countries. Of all the children who died before their fifth birthday in 2013, pneumonia was the single most important disease, accounting for 14.9% ( $n = 935,000$ ) of cases (1). However, despite being among the three most common infectious causes of death worldwide, pneumonia, diarrhea, and measles showed the greatest reductions between 2000 and 2013, suggesting that inroads are being made in preventing, recognizing, and treating these conditions. Improvements in access to health care, vaccination programs, living conditions, and nutrition are key to further reducing CAP mortality, and failure to do so is likely to disproportionately affect children in developing countries and directly influence their CAP incidence.

Traditionally, medical practitioners, having formulated a differential diagnosis from a constellation of clinical signs and symptoms, will utilize diagnostic tests to determine illness etiology. However, the diagnostic challenge of childhood CAP lies in the broad range of presenting features and the absence of an accepted gold standard diagnostic test. Furthermore, the diverse age range within pediatric practice adds to this challenge differences in immune development and vaccination status and reliance on caregivers for detailed patient histories. In addition, many diagnostic methods are initially validated in adult populations, which can make interpretation in the pediatric setting more difficult.

The definition of CAP varies between different sources; on a pathological level, pneumonia is considered infection of the lung parenchyma, i.e., lower respiratory tract (LRT) infection by microorganisms (2). CAP is defined clinically as “the presence of signs and symptoms of pneumonia in a previously healthy child due to an infection which has been acquired outside hospital” by both the British Thoracic Society (BTS) and the

Accepted manuscript posted online 13 December 2017

**Citation** Rodrigues CMC, Groves H. 2018. Community-acquired pneumonia in children: the challenges of microbiological diagnosis. *J Clin Microbiol* 56:e01318-17. <https://doi.org/10.1128/JCM.01318-17>.

**Editor** Colleen Suzanne Kraft, Emory University

**Copyright** © 2018 Rodrigues and Groves. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

Address correspondence to C. M. C. Rodrigues, [charlene.rodrigues@gtc.ox.ac.uk](mailto:charlene.rodrigues@gtc.ox.ac.uk).

**TABLE 1** Clinical features of community-acquired pneumonia<sup>a</sup>

| Degree of illness | Description of clinical features for:  |  |  |
|-------------------|--|--|--|
|                   | Developing countries, all age groups   | Industrialized countries   |  |
|                   |  | Infants  | Older children   |
| No CAP            | No signs of pneumonia or severe pneumonia  |  |  |
| Mild or moderate  |  | Temp <38.5°C<br>RR <50/min<br>Mild recession<br>Taking full feeds  | Temp <38.5°C<br>RR <50/min<br>Mild dyspnea<br>No vomiting  |
| Severe            | Fast breathing:<br>≥50/min (2–11 mo)<br><br>≥40/min (1–5 yr)<br><br>Chest indrawing  | Temp >38.5°C<br>RR >70/min<br>Moderate to severe recession<br>Respiratory distress<br>Tachycardia<br>Capillary refill time >2 s<br>Intermittent apnea<br>Not taking full feeds | Temp >38.5°C<br>RR >50/min<br>Moderate to severe recession<br>Respiratory distress<br>Tachycardia<br>Capillary refill time >2 s<br>Not taking full feeds |
| Very severe       | Cough or difficulty in breathing with:<br>Oxygen saturation <90% or central cyanosis<br>Severe respiratory distress (e.g., grunting, very severe chest indrawing)<br>Signs of pneumonia with a general danger sign (inability to breastfeed or drink, lethargy or reduced level of consciousness, convulsions) |  |  |

<sup>a</sup>Clinical features of community-acquired pneumonia (CAP) as described by the World Health Organization (WHO) for diagnosis of CAP in developing countries (7) and by British Thoracic Society Guidelines applicable for infants and older children in industrialized countries (3). RR, respiratory rate.

Infectious Diseases Society of America (IDSA), acknowledging that in resource-poor settings, chest X-rays (CXR) are not always available to aid diagnosis (3, 4).

### CLINICAL RECOGNITION OF CAP

Children can present with CAP at different stages of illness and with clinical features that are difficult to discriminate from other common pediatric diagnoses. Symptoms of CAP, including fever, cough, dyspnea, wheeze, chest or abdominal pain, lethargy, vomiting, and headache, can also be indicators of sepsis, congenital heart disease, profound anemia, malaria, or acute asthma (3), as can the typical examination findings of tachypnea, tachycardia, hypoxia, respiratory distress (grunting, nasal flaring, recession, and abdominal breathing), and crackles or wheeze on auscultation. The extent to which these signs are present with CAP is highly variable, which adds to the diagnostic complexity (Table 1).

Historically, World Health Organization (WHO) guidance on recognition of pneumonia relied on tachypnea as an indicator of CAP requiring treatment with oral antibiotics, prioritizing sensitivity over specificity to avoid missing cases of disease in settings where late diagnosis could result in increased mortality. Such an approach may lead to overdiagnosis, as demonstrated in an observational study in four Indian hospitals. Follow-up of 516 children diagnosed with WHO-defined pneumonia at presentation who were reassessed by pediatricians 4 days later only found 35.9% to have pneumonia, and the remainder were recategorized with wheeze (42.8%), mixed disease (18.6%), and nonrespiratory illness (2.7%) (5). Accordingly, this approach does not discriminate between pulmonary pathologies and may lead to overuse of antibiotics. Indeed, research into use of the WHO guidelines in low-income countries has identified overdiagnosis of pneumonia in cases of wheezing, with consequent underdiagnosis of asthma, leading to significant respiratory morbidity and, perhaps, even mortality (6).

However, the benefit of the updated WHO guidance for CAP lies in the use of simple clinical signs to direct optimal antibiotic therapy. For instance, children aged 2 to 59 months with cough and/or difficulty breathing can be treated with oral amoxicillin in

**TABLE 2** Distribution of pathogens identified from children with CAP within different global regions<sup>a</sup>

| Pathogen                     | % of patients positive for pathogen in: |               |              |              |               |                 |
|------------------------------|---|---------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|-----------------|
|                              | United Kingdom                          | United States | Kenya        | The Gambia   | Nigeria       | India           |
| <b>Viruses</b>               |   |               |              |              |               |                 |
| RSV                          | 21.2                                    | 28.0          | 34           | 4.0          | 30.4          | 24.1            |
| Rhinovirus                   | 8.5                                     | 27.0          | NT           | —            | —             | 10.5            |
| hMPV                         | 0.7                                     | 13.0          | 3.0          | —            | —             | 2.8             |
| Influenza virus              | 7.4 (A, B)                              | 7.0 (A, B)    | 5.8 (only A) | 2.0 (only C) | 17.3 (only A) | 3.5 (A, B, C)   |
| Bocavirus                    | 3.3                                     | —             | —            | 4.0          | —             | —               |
| Adenovirus                   | 6.9                                     | 11.0          | 3.8          | 4.0          | —             | 3.7             |
| Parainfluenza virus          | 4.3 (types 1–4)                         | 7.0           | 3.8 (type 3) | —            | 19.5 (type 3) | 7.5 (types 1–4) |
| <b>Bacteria</b>              |   |               |              |              |               |                 |
| <i>S. pneumoniae</i>         | 17.4                                    | 4.0           | NT           | 91.0         | 5.1           | 5.7             |
| <i>H. influenzae</i>         | 2.3                                     | —             | NT           | 23.0         | —             | 0.8             |
| Group A <i>Streptococcus</i> | 10.5                                    | 1.0           | NT           | —            | —             | —               |
| <i>S. aureus</i>             | 2.3                                     | 1.0           | NT           | 6.0          | 37.3          | 0.8             |
| <i>M. pneumoniae</i>         | 9.9                                     | 8.0           | NT           | —            | —             | 4.3 (serology)  |
| <i>Moraxella catarrhalis</i> | 2.3                                     | —             | NT           | —            | —             | —               |
| <i>Klebsiella pneumoniae</i> | 0.8                                     | —             | NT           | —            | 15.3          | 0.2             |

<sup>a</sup>Pathogens from children with CAP within different global regions were identified using a variety of samples obtained from the patients as part of clinical and research studies and tested using both traditional culture and molecular tests; the studies are described in Table 3. NT, not tested; —, results for these organisms were not available in the respective studies; RSV, respiratory syncytial virus; hMPV, human metapneumovirus.

the absence of red flag signs, which include inability to drink, persistent vomiting, seizures, lethargy, reduced consciousness, stridor, or severe malnutrition (7). Industrialized countries typically have greater access to CXR as a diagnostic adjunct in children admitted to hospital, with consolidation, infiltrates, and air bronchograms visible in a lobar or diffuse pattern. The value of chest radiography is clear in excluding complications like pleural effusion, necrotizing pneumonia, or other diagnoses, including cardiac failure with pulmonary edema. However, it is important to note that clinical signs and chest radiography often have poor agreement in ambulatory patients, and thus, the BTS guidelines do not recommend routine CXR in suspected childhood CAP patients who are managed in the community (3). Nevertheless, attempts have been made to correlate clinical findings with radiological evidence of pneumonia for the development of improved clinical tools to use in resource-poor settings. United Kingdom and U.S. studies show that tachypnea has the greatest correlation and that additional symptoms, such as dyspnea/hypoxia or fever/hypoxia, may increase sensitivity (8, 9). A meta-analysis of 18 studies from low-, middle-, and high-income countries identified the best prediction of radiological pneumonia as being achieved using a combination of the following clinical signs: tachypnea of >50/min at any age, grunting, chest in-drawing, and nasal flaring (10). We have already highlighted the challenge in defining a reference standard for clinical CAP diagnosis, and accordingly, studies in this meta-analysis display considerable heterogeneity, thereby limiting the interpretation of findings.

### ESTABLISHING CAP ETIOLOGY

CAP can be caused by viruses, bacteria, or both. These causative agents are indistinguishable on the basis of clinical features alone; the diagnostic difficulty is primarily due to the inability to isolate the causative organism from the lower respiratory tract, as few young children have productive sputum or positive blood sample cultures (3). Older children and adults can produce sputum for examination under microscopy and culture. This is much more difficult in younger children, who typically do not expectorate. Table 2 outlines the range of viral and bacterial pathogens isolated from cases of childhood CAP in six studies worldwide; descriptions of the studies are given in Table 3 (11–16). Interestingly, studies from The Gambia, India, and the United Kingdom appeared to have higher proportions of *Streptococcus pneumoniae* isolated, which suggests a potentially region-specific etiology for childhood CAP.

**TABLE 3** Studies of pathogen detection in children with CAP within different global regions<sup>a</sup>

| Region         | Specimen types and laboratory tests used <sup>b</sup>   | Study size   | Age of children | Reference |
|----------------|---|--|-----------------|-----------|
| United Kingdom | Blood culture, blood pneumococcal real-time PCR, NP PCR, pleural fluid culture/pneumococcal antigen testing/PCR, ETT aspirate/BAL fluid for culture/PCR | 160  | 0–16 yr         | 11        |
| United States  | Blood cultures, whole-blood PCR, NP/OP PCR, pleural fluid culture/PCR, BAL fluid or ETT aspirate culture  | 2,222  | <18 yr          | 12        |
| Kenya          | Blood culture and nasal wash fluid for real-time PCR and DNA sequencing   | 759  | 1 day–12 yr     | 13        |
| The Gambia     | Lung and pleural aspirate culture for nonmolecular serotyping, singleplex and multiplex PCR, 16S rRNA PCR, MLST, molecular serotyping                   | 53   | 2–59 mo         | 14        |
| Nigeria        | Blood culture, IFA, serology  | 205 blood cultures, 122 viral tests                    | <5 yr           | 15        |
| India          | Blood culture, BAL fluid culture/PCR, NPA culture/PCR/multiplex PCR, serology   | 2,285 blood culture, 2,323 NPA, 428 NPA multiplex PCRs | 1 mo–12 yr      | 16        |

<sup>a</sup>Data from the studies are given in Table 2.

<sup>b</sup>The specimen types and laboratory tests used for analysis of pathogen detection are listed. NP, nasopharyngeal; OP, oropharyngeal; IFA, immunofluorescence analysis; BAL, bronchoalveolar lavage; ETT, endotracheal tube; MLST, multilocus sequence typing.

### VIRAL DIAGNOSTIC TECHNIQUES

Clinical virology diagnosis has been revolutionized over the past 2 decades with the introduction of nucleic acid-based detection. The majority of respiratory tract infections in children are viral in origin, and both the BTS and IDSA guidelines for management of childhood CAP recommend viral testing of nasopharyngeal secretions and/or nasal swabs by PCR or immunofluorescence (3, 4). PCR has been demonstrated to have greater sensitivity than virus isolation in cell culture, shell vial culture, and immunofluorescence testing and is now the mainstay of respiratory virus detection in industrialized countries (17). While rapid antigen detection testing (RADT) for respiratory syncytial virus (RSV) and influenza virus is still in conventional use due to its low cost and fast results, this technique has relatively poor sensitivity in comparison to that of nucleic acid-based detection methods (18).

Thus, multiplex PCR, enabling the detection of numerous pathogens simultaneously without additional time or sampling, is used extensively (17, 19). The results of multiplex PCR assays are rapid and typically available within 1 to 6 h, and as the availability of this technology grows, competition is decreasing prices, making the technology more affordable, which is essential for implementation in the developing world setting (19). Indeed, some laboratories are developing custom kits with performance comparable to that of commercial ones at a much-reduced cost (20). It is worth noting, however, that despite this, multiplex PCR is an expensive technology, and while publications often cite the use of over 20 targets, the selection of multiplex kits is based on a range of factors, including local expertise, funding structures, and the panel of pathogens detected, which has the disadvantage of leading to variations in practice between hospital centers (21).

Following the introduction of multiplex PCR technology in routine diagnosis of childhood CAP, the presence of multiple viral agents is more commonly seen, with rates of 30 to 40% and up to four different viruses present in individual children (17). The significance of this remains unclear. For particular viral pathogens, such as RSV infection, it is understood that coinfection with other respiratory tract viruses can worsen disease severity. However, there is conflicting evidence regarding the impact of other viral coinfections on the severity of respiratory tract infections. Additionally, it is worth noting that among healthy controls tested, PCR can also be positive for one or more viruses. These findings may be explained by the high number of infections occurring in children in quick succession, with overlapping viral shedding. However, it also highlights a potential pitfall of PCR for diagnosing etiological pathogens, as the challenge remains to establish whether a detected virus is causing or associated with CAP or

indeed simply represents carriage/colonization (19). This is exemplified by the recently identified human bocavirus (hBoV), which has been detected in children with lower respiratory tract disease (reported rates range from 1.5% to 13%). With up to an 83% coinfection rate, it is uncertain whether hBoV is indeed an etiologic agent, an exacerbating factor, or an incidentally detected bystander (22). Notably, for a number of viruses, detection in asymptomatic children is very infrequent (influenza, 0%; RSV, 1.9%; and human metapneumovirus [hMPV], 1.5%), and therefore, it is likely that the presence of one of these viruses in a symptomatic individual is highly suggestive of an etiological role (23). The use of copy number/cycle threshold ( $C_T$ ) in quantitative real-time PCR (qRT-PCR) as a semiquantitative estimate of viral load value has been explored to assess the clinical significance of a detected virus. With rhinovirus infections in childhood, a higher viral load (lower  $C_T$  value) in nasal swab samples has been associated with increased likelihood of LRT infection (24). However, there are several factors that can influence  $C_T$  values, including variations in the period of viral shedding and differences in sampling and laboratory techniques, and thus, the full role of this technique in daily clinical practice is unclear at the time of writing.

Determining viral etiology is still more problematic in countries without routine molecular diagnostic facilities. Immunofluorescence, serology, and viral culture have been used previously; however, these may underestimate the burden of viral CAP. A Kenyan study used PCR methods on nasal washing samples and identified viruses in 425 of 759 children with clinically very severe/severe pneumonia (Tables 2 and 3) (13). Studies in children have demonstrated high specificity and negative predictive values for the detection of parainfluenza and adenovirus in nasopharyngeal aspirate samples, but discordance remains between bronchoalveolar lavage and nasopharyngeal aspirate samples in the detection of bacterial infections (25). However, the paired sample numbers included in these studies are relatively small, making the true agreement unclear, and further work is needed on the implications for clinical management.

In view of the limited availability of antiviral therapies for respiratory diseases, specific viral identification may be considered unnecessary, as for most cases, supportive therapy alone is sufficient. However, the clinical benefits of rapid and specific microbial identification of CAP include optimizing antibiotic use and reduction in nosocomial transmission through effective patient cohorting (26). A Cochrane review of rapid viral PCR diagnosis did not demonstrate reduced antibiotic use in an emergency department setting; however, a more recent large, single-center study in New York, demonstrated that the implementation of multiplex PCR testing resulted in less antibiotic usage and reduced chest radiography (27, 28). The findings at this referral pediatric hospital may not be generalizable to all pediatric care settings, but they highlight a promising benefit of novel viral diagnostic testing, and certainly, the clinical impact of multiplex PCR requires further evaluation. Furthermore, as new specific antiviral therapies, such as novel RSV therapies, undergo clinical trials, the accurate diagnosis of viral etiology will become increasingly important for children who become extremely unwell or who are immunocompromised (29).

### BACTERIAL DIAGNOSTICS TECHNIQUES

It is well-accepted that bacterial infection commonly follows viral infection; although the pathogenesis is not fully elucidated, it is thought to relate to inflammation arising secondary to viral infection (4). The most common pathogens include *Streptococcus pneumoniae*, *Haemophilus influenzae* (including nontypeable strains), and *Staphylococcus aureus*. Atypical causes include *Mycoplasma pneumoniae*, *Chlamydia pneumoniae*, and *Legionella pneumophila*. For accurate pathogen identification, the principle of obtaining a sample directly from the lung not contaminated by host flora would be optimal. Lung aspiration provides such a sample; it is invasive and rarely performed but has historically contributed significantly to the understanding of bacterial causes of CAP. Using molecular diagnostics as well as bacterial culture can increase the diagnostic benefits of lung aspiration. In a study of 55 Gambian children with clinically or radiologically confirmed CAP, lung aspiration samples were tested using culture and

molecular techniques (single/multiplex PCR and multilocus sequence typing). By additionally applying molecular methodology to cultures of 53 lung aspirate and pleural fluid samples, the identification of an organism increased, with samples yielding 91% *S. pneumoniae*, 23% *H. influenzae*, and 6% *S. aureus*. Interestingly, viral identification alone in these LRT samples was extremely low, at 2%, compared with the rates of identification in the previous studies sampling the nasopharynx. Bacterial and viral codetection was noted in 19% of samples, while bacterial-bacterial codetection was more likely, at 40%, with *S. pneumoniae* and *H. influenzae* at 21% (14). Interpretation of the presence of these potentially pathogenic organisms in the lungs of children with radiological CAP remains challenging, as pathogen detection alone cannot confirm causation. In this regard, we may achieve greater insight and interpretation of studies of lung aspirate samples with the increasing understanding of the lung microbiome.

Routine microbiological investigations for bacterial causes of CAP include blood culture, sputum culture, serology for atypical bacteria (*Mycoplasma* spp. and *Chlamydia* spp.), and pneumococcal antigen detection/PCR, as well as culture of pleural fluid where samples are available. The role of blood culture in CAP diagnostics is limited. A recent meta-analysis found that only 9.89% of blood cultures taken are positive in hospitalized children with severe CAP, with substantial false-positive rates (30). These results are perhaps unsurprising, given that cultures may be taken with concomitant antibiotic use and infection is generally localized to lung parenchyma. In fact, a study undertaken by Andrews et al. noted that universal blood sample culturing would require 118 blood samples to be taken in order to identify a single bacteremia that would result in a meaningful antibiotic change (31). This supports both BTS and IDSA CAP guidelines advocating the use of blood sample cultures only in patients with severe CAP admitted to intensive care or with complications, due to its wide availability, the difficulty of confirming clinical and radiological diagnoses, and the potential for organism identification and antibiotic sensitivity information in these high-risk children (3, 4).

As discussed previously, sputum culture is challenging to achieve in young children but has been shown to be of benefit in children hospitalized with CAP. The use of induced sputum production via the administration of hypertonic saline using a nebulizer, followed by chest wall percussion, is generally well tolerated, although coughing and wheezing can occur. However, this procedure can result in contamination with upper respiratory tract (URT)-colonizing organisms, leading to false interpretations of pathogenesis. One way to avoid such contamination is the use of bronchoalveolar lavage and culture, but this procedure is very invasive and is therefore limited to specialized units and intensive care settings. In addition to microbiological culture, the developing role of matrix-assisted laser desorption ionization–time of flight mass spectrometry (MALDI-TOF MS) in clinical laboratories is allowing rapid and accurate identification of organisms that may previously have been interpreted as pathogenic. This still requires the growth of a bacterial colony as an input sample but may help identify commensal bacteria with more certainty than traditional biochemical testing, preventing inappropriate antibiotic use. It must be noted, however, that the results are limited by the reference databases, which require regular updating (32).

Serological testing in pneumonia, performed 14 days apart, is still considered the gold standard for *Mycoplasma pneumoniae* detection, but this is complex clinically, and in practice, treatment is often commenced empirically based on clinical suspicion (33). Similarly, pneumococcal serology is also considered too complex for routine clinical use, and obtaining convalescent-phase samples does not alter the management of acute CAP. Detection of pneumococcal antigen in urine has low specificity in young children (3).

In view of these challenges in identifying a causative bacterial agent, a pragmatic approach of therapy with broad-spectrum antibiotics is typically employed. While advantageous clinically, in this era of emerging antibiotic resistance, the identification of specific bacteria may prove beneficial. As with viral diagnostics, the use of PCR is a major development in the detection of respiratory bacterial pathogens. In fact, multi-

plex PCRs for throat and nasal swabs that include a panel of viruses as well as bacterial pathogens (e.g., *Mycoplasma pneumoniae* or *Bordetella pertussis*) are now being used to increase etiological yield in CAP (34). The employment of this technology has revealed high rates of bacterial and viral coinfection, the significance of which is a source of ongoing investigation, in the pediatric setting in particular. While molecular testing has greatly improved sensitivity in the detection of bacterial pathogens in CAP, its role in discriminating between infection and colonization is less clear. For example, in a recent study of *Mycoplasma pneumoniae*, 21.2% of asymptomatic children had positive mycoplasma PCR testing (35). Although a small, single-center study, this result highlights the diagnostic challenge this new technology presents. Further studies on the significance of these detected pathogens and correlation with clinical findings are needed to help differentiate carriage from infection.

Furthermore, new molecular techniques, such as multilocus sequence typing of bacterial isolates, have an emerging role in epidemiological tracking of hospital and community outbreaks of bacterial CAP, as well as in the characterization of antibiotic resistance mechanisms and insights into the carriage and transmission of organisms. At the time of writing, this work was largely restricted to the research setting, but in future, it will provide large-scale surveillance data regarding the organisms that cause bacterial CAP, in particular changes in *S. pneumoniae* carriage and disease in the context of vaccination (36).

### FUTURE INSIGHTS FOR DIAGNOSTICS

As detailed above, the development of nucleic acid-based detection methods has dramatically altered the microbiological diagnosis of CAP. Future research is required to understand viral and bacterial colonization of the respiratory tract and the relevance of the detection of multiple viral agents in CAP pathogenesis, with consideration given to consecutive versus simultaneous detection of multiple pathogens. Across both the developed and the developing world, greater vaccine coverage against *H. influenzae* type b and pneumococcus is contributing to alterations in the epidemiology of bacterial CAP, and viruses are increasingly recognized as a substantial cause of CAP. Accordingly, point-of-care (POC) tests to accurately differentiate between viral and bacterial pneumonia are urgently needed. Several tests that employ either real-time PCR or isothermal amplification technology are being developed for POC testing of childhood infectious diseases (Table 4). Integration of the steps required for POC real-time PCR has been developed in the Cepheid GeneXpert and the Roche IQuum Liat analyzers. Indeed, the GeneXpert MTB/RIF test for detection of *M. tuberculosis* complex and rifampin resistance has been endorsed by the WHO for POC testing of tuberculosis (TB) resistance. However, these instruments are expensive to purchase and require complex sample preparation to mitigate the risk of PCR inhibition, which may limit the availability, utility, and therefore, implementation of the tests in resource-poor settings worldwide or in primary care (37).

Therefore, the development of novel amplification technologies is vital to address these limitations. One such recent development is the loop-mediated isothermal amplification (LAMP) method, where samples are amplified without the need for thermal cycling (38). This provides many advantages over PCR, including a simplified procedure, reduced time to detection, and more compact, less expensive detection equipment. Several LAMP assays have recently been validated with performance comparable to that of PCR, including LAMP assays for the detection of *S. pneumoniae* and group B *Streptococcus*, as well as a pertussis assay, which was noted to be 2.5 times faster than real-time PCR, with sensitivity of 96.55% and specificity of 99.46% (39). This technology, therefore, may prove invaluable in POC microbiology in developing countries; however, further optimization is required to enhance sensitivity in respiratory virus detection and in the detection of multiple pathogens.

To assess current research directions for molecular testing in childhood CAP, we performed a comprehensive search of all active clinical trials registered in the United Kingdom, European, WHO, and U.S. clinical trial databases. This strategy identified 11



**TABLE 4** Summary of current active clinical trials on the use of molecular testing for childhood CAP<sup>a</sup>

| Study identifier | Test type <sup>b</sup>     | Study summary/measures <sup>b</sup>   | Age group            | End date |
|------------------|----------------------------|---|----------------------|----------|
| NCT02957136      | POC diagnostic test        | RCT to assess effect of near-POC testing on antibiotic and anti-influenza medication use in ED patients (FilmArray respiratory panel; Biofibres Diagnostics, LLC)   | 1–101 yr             | Aug 2018 |
| NCT02018198      | POC diagnostic test        | Single group assignment diagnosis study to investigate FebriDx POC diagnostic test vs standard assessment in febrile URTI   | >2 yr                | May 2017 |
| NCT02668237      | Multiplex PCR/urinary test | Use of multiplex PCR and antigenic urinary test diagnostic strategy vs standard in ED   | 3 mo–18 yr           | Jun 2016 |
| NCT03075111      | POC diagnostic test        | Retrospective external validation of novel IVD assay for differentiation of bacterial vs viral etiology of patients with acute febrile disease  | 3 mo–18 yr           | Dec 2018 |
| NCT03029299      | POC diagnostic test        | Randomized crossover intervention study measuring time duration from initial visit to receipt of appropriate therapy following implementation of the FilmArray RP EZ POC test   | 0–100 yr             | Jun 2017 |
| NCT02929680      | Respiratory panel test     | Prospective clinical evaluation of the FilmArray LRTI panel vs culture (BioFire Diagnostics)  | Child, adult, senior | Dec 2017 |
| NCT03052088      | POC diagnostic test        | Prospective clinical validation of sensitivity/specificity of novel (CE-IVD marked) diagnostic assay (ImmunoXpert) in differentiating bacterial vs viral etiologies in pediatric patients with suspicion of respiratory tract infection | >3 mo                | Jul 2019 |
| NCT00342589      | Oral wash PCR testing      | Study to examine effectiveness of PCR on samples obtained using a simple oral wash for diagnosis of pneumocystis infection  | 3–99 yr              | Jul 2018 |
| NCT02880384      | PCR panel                  | Study to compare no. of CAP pathogens detected using current diagnostic bundle vs no. detected using FilmArray LRTI version 2.0 IUO PCR panel (BioFire Diagnostics)   | Child, adult, senior | Dec 2018 |
| NCT02851771      | POC diagnostic test        | Interventional single group study using POC testing to expand the etiological diagnosis strategy of pneumonia   | Child, adult, senior | Oct 2019 |
| ISRCTN66872125   | Multiple test modalities   | Prospective study on etiology, diagnostics, clinical management, impact, and outcomes of SLS and ARI across Europe  | <6 yr                | Dec 2018 |

<sup>a</sup>Data were obtained from searches of UK Clinical Trials Gateway, EU Clinical Trials Register, ISRCTN registry, International Clinical Trials Registry Platform (ICTRP) Search Portal, and ClinicalTrials.gov online databases.

<sup>b</sup>POC, point of care; RCT, randomized controlled trial; ED, emergency department; URTI, upper respiratory tract infection; IVD, *in vitro* diagnostic; LRTI, lower respiratory tract infection; RP, respiratory panel; SLS, sepsis-like syndrome; ARI, acute respiratory tract infection.

current trials involving molecular testing for childhood CAP, which are summarized in Table 4. Due for completion by the end of 2019, these studies include POC testing and clinical applicability trials for directing patient therapy/management. The results of these and future trials may answer some of the questions surrounding the clinical application of molecular testing in microbial diagnosis and help inform clinical practices regarding their role in the diagnosis and management of childhood CAP. With the current significant limitations of diagnostics in CAP, the advent of new technologies and the prospect of rapid POC testing are very exciting. For the clinician, the ability to rapidly diagnose CAP and to distinguish at diagnosis the specific etiological agent, whether bacterial, viral, or both, would prove invaluable in directing the appropriate use of antibiotics and is likely to transform the way we deliver care to these children in future.

## REFERENCES

- Liu L, Oza S, Hogan D, Perin J, Rudan I, Lawn JE, Cousens S, Mathers C, Black RE. 2015. Global, regional, and national causes of child mortality in 2000–13, with projections to inform post-2015 priorities: an updated systematic analysis. *Lancet* 385:430–440. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(14\)61698-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(14)61698-6).
- Lodha R, Kabra SK, Pandey RM. 2013. Antibiotics for community-acquired pneumonia in children. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2013: CD004874. <https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.CD004874.pub4>.
- Harris M, Clark J, Coote N, Fletcher P, Harnden A, McKean M, Thomson A, British Thoracic Society Standards of Care Committee. 2011. British Thoracic Society guidelines for the management of community acquired pneumonia in children: update 2011. *Thorax* 66:ii1–ii23. <https://doi.org/10.1136/thoraxjnl-2011-200598>.
- Bradley JS, Byington CL, Shah SS, Alverson B, Carter ER, Harrison C, Kaplan SL, Mace SE, McCracken GH, Moore MR, St Peter SD, Stockwell JA, Swanson JT. 2011. The management of community-acquired pneumonia in infants and children older than 3 months of age: clinical practice guidelines by the Pediatric Infectious Diseases Society and the Infectious Diseases Society of America. *Clin Infect Dis* 53:e25–e76. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/cir531>.
- Gowraiah V, Awasthi S, Kapoor R, Sahana D, Venkatesh P, Gangadhar B, Awasthi A, Verma A, Pai N, Seear M. 2014. Can we distinguish pneumonia from wheezy diseases in tachypnoeic children under low-resource conditions? A prospective observational study in four Indian hospitals. *Arch Dis Child* 99:899–906. <https://doi.org/10.1136/archdischild-2013-305740>.
- Ostergaard MS, Nantanda R, Tumwine JK, Aabenhus R. 2012. Childhood asthma in low income countries: an invisible killer? *Prim Care Resp J* 21:214–219. <https://doi.org/10.4104/pcrj.2012.00038>.
- World Health Organization. 2014. Revised WHO classification and treatment of childhood pneumonia at health facilities. WHO, Geneva, Switzerland.

- zerland. [http://www.who.int/maternal\\_child\\_adolescent/documents/child-pneumonia-treatment/en/](http://www.who.int/maternal_child_adolescent/documents/child-pneumonia-treatment/en/).
8. Wingerter SL, Bachur RG, Monuteaux MC, Neuman MI. 2012. Application of the World Health Organization criteria to predict radiographic pneumonia in a US-based pediatric emergency department. *Pediatr Infect Dis J* 31:561–564. <https://doi.org/10.1093/INF.0b013e31824da716>.
  9. Clark JE, Hammal D, Spencer D, Hampton F. 2007. Children with pneumonia: how do they present and how are they managed? *Arch Child* 92:394–398. <https://doi.org/10.1136/adc.2006.097402>.
  10. Rambaud-Althaus C, Althaus F, Genton B, D'Acremont V. 2015. Clinical features for diagnosis of pneumonia in children younger than 5 years: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Lancet Infect Dis* 15:439–450. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099\(15\)70017-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099(15)70017-4).
  11. Elemraid MA, Sails AD, Eltringham GJA, Perry JD, Rushton SP, Spencer DA, Thomas MF, Eastham KM, Hampton F, Gennery AR, Clark JE. 2013. Aetiology of paediatric pneumonia after the introduction of pneumococcal conjugate vaccine. *Eur Respir J* 42:1595–1603. <https://doi.org/10.1183/09031936.00199112>.
  12. Jain S, Williams DJ, Arnold SR, Ampofo K, Bramley AM, Reed C, Stockmann C, Anderson EJ, Grijalva CG, Self WH, Zhu Y, Patel A, Hymas W, Chappell JD, Kaufman RA, Kan JH, Dansie D, Lenny N, Hillyard DR, Haynes LM, Levine M, Lindstrom S, Winchell JM, Katz JM, Erdman D, Schneider E, Hicks LA, Wunderink RG, Edwards KM, Pavia AT, McCullers JA, Finelli L. 2015. Community-acquired pneumonia requiring hospitalization among U.S. children. *N Engl J Med* 372:835–845. <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa1405870>.
  13. Berkley JA, Munywoki P, Ngama M, Kazungu S, Abwao J, Bett A, Las-sauniere R, Kresfelder T, Cane PA, Venter M, Scott JA, Nokes DJ. 2010. Viral etiology of severe pneumonia among Kenyan infants and children. *JAMA* 303:2051–2057. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2010.675>.
  14. Howie SRC, Morris GAJ, Tokarz R, Ebruke BE, Machuka EM, Ideh RC, Chimah O, Secka O, Townend J, Dione M, Oluwalana C, Njie M, Jallow M, Hill PC, Antonio M, Greenwood B, Briese T, Mulholland K, Corrah T, Lipkin WI, Adegbola RA. 2014. Etiology of severe childhood pneumonia in The Gambia, West Africa, determined by conventional and molecular microbiological analyses of lung and pleural aspirate samples. *Clin Infect Dis* 59:682–685. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciu384>.
  15. Johnson A-WBR, Osinusi K, Aderele WI, Gbadero DA, Olaleye OD, Adeyemi-Doro FAB. 2008. Etiologic agents and outcome determinants of community-acquired pneumonia in urban children: a hospital-based study. *J Natl Med A* 100:370–385. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0027-9684\(15\)31269-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0027-9684(15)31269-4).
  16. Mathew JL, Singhi S, Ray P, Hagel E, Saghafian-Hedengren S, Bansal A, Yberg S, Sodhi KS, Kumar BV, Nilsson A. 2015. Etiology of community acquired pneumonia among children in India: prospective, cohort study. *J Glob Health* 5:050418. <https://doi.org/10.7189/jogh.05.020418>.
  17. El Kholi AA, Mostafa NA, Ali AA, Soliman MMS, El-Sherbini SA, Ismail RI, El Basha N, Magdy RI, El Rifai N, Hamed DH. 2016. The use of multiplex PCR for the diagnosis of viral severe acute respiratory infection in children: a high rate of co-detection during the winter season. *Eur J Clin Microbiol Infect Dis* 35:1607–1613. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10096-016-2698-5>.
  18. Kim D-K, Poudel B. 2013. Tools to detect influenza virus. *Yonsei Med J* 54:560. <https://doi.org/10.3349/yjmj.2013.54.3.560>.
  19. Krause JC, Panning M, Hengel H, Henneke P. 2014. The role of multiplex PCR in respiratory tract infections in children. *Dtsch Arztebl Int* 111: 639–645. <https://doi.org/10.3238/arztebl.2014.0639>.
  20. Malhotra B, Swamy MA, Reddy PVJ, Kumar N, Tiwari JK. 2016. Evaluation of custom multiplex real-time RT-PCR in comparison to Fast-Track Diagnostics respiratory 21 pathogens kit for detection of multiple respiratory viruses. *Virology* 13:91. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12985-016-0549-8>.
  21. Salez N, Vabret A, Leruez-Ville M, Andreoletti L, Carrat F, Renois F, de Lamballerie X. 2015. Evaluation of four commercial multiplex molecular tests for the diagnosis of acute respiratory infections. *PLoS One* 10: e0130378. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0130378>.
  22. Broccolo F, Falcone V, Esposito S, Toniolo A. 2015. Human bocaviruses: possible etiologic role in respiratory infection. *J Clin Virol* 72:75–81. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcv.2015.09.008>.
  23. Self WH, Williams DJ, Zhu Y, Ampofo K, Pavia AT, Chappell JD, Hymas WC, Stockmann C, Bramley AM, Schneider E, Erdman D, Finelli L, Jain S, Edwards KM, Grijalva CG. 2016. Respiratory viral detection in children and adults: comparing asymptomatic controls and patients with community-acquired pneumonia. *J Infect Dis* 213:584–591. <https://doi.org/10.1093/infdis/jiv323>.
  24. Chu HY, Englund JA, Strelitz B, Lacombe K, Jones C, Follmer K, Martin EK, Bradford M, Qin X, Kuypers J, Klein EJ. 2016. Rhinovirus disease in children seeking care in a tertiary pediatric emergency department. *J Pediatr Infect Dis Soc* 5:29–38. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jpids/piu099>.
  25. Lu AZ, Shi P, Wang LB, Qian LB, Zhang XB. 2017. Diagnostic value of nasopharyngeal aspirates in children with lower respiratory tract infections. *Chin Med J (Engl)* 130:647–651. <https://doi.org/10.4103/0366-6999.201595>.
  26. Ginocchio CC. 2011. Strengths and weaknesses of FDA-approved/cleared diagnostic devices for the molecular detection of respiratory pathogens. *Clin Infect Dis* 52(Suppl 4):S312–S325. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/cir046>.
  27. Doan Q, Enarson P, Kisson N, Klassen TP, Johnson DW. 2012. Rapid viral diagnosis for acute febrile respiratory illness in children in the emergency department. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 16:CD006452. <https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.CD006452.pub3>.
  28. Subramony A, Zachariah P, Krones A, Whittier S, Saiman L. 2016. Impact of multiplex polymerase chain reaction testing for respiratory pathogens on healthcare resource utilization for pediatric inpatients. *J Pediatr* 173:196–201 e2. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpeds.2016.02.050>.
  29. Broadbent L, Groves H, Shields MD, Power UF. 2015. Respiratory syncytial virus, an ongoing medical dilemma: an expert commentary on respiratory syncytial virus prophylactic and therapeutic pharmaceuticals currently in clinical trials. *Influenza Other Respir Viruses* 9:169–178. <https://doi.org/10.1111/irv.12313>.
  30. Iroh Tam PY, Bernstein E, Ma X, Ferrieri P. 2015. Blood culture in evaluation of pediatric community-acquired pneumonia: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Hosp Pediatr* 5:324–336. <https://doi.org/10.1542/hpeds.2014-0138>.
  31. Andrews AL, Simpson AN, Heine D, Teufel RJ, II. 2015. A cost-effectiveness analysis of obtaining blood cultures in children hospitalized for community-acquired pneumonia. *J Pediatr* 167:1280–1286. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpeds.2015.09.025>.
  32. Wieser A, Schneider L, Jung J, Schubert S. 2012. MALDI-TOF MS in microbiological diagnostics-identification of microorganisms and beyond (mini review). *Appl Microbiol Biotechnol* 93:965–974. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00253-011-3783-4>.
  33. Lakhanpaul M. 2004. Community acquired pneumonia in children: a clinical update. *Arch Dis Child Educ Pract Ed*. 89:ep29–ep34. <https://doi.org/10.1136/adc.2004.056192>.
  34. Gowin E, Bartkowska Sniatkowska A, Jonczyk-Potoczna K, Wysocka-Leszczynska J, Bobkowski W, Fichna P, Sobkowiak P, Mazur-Melewska K, Bręborowicz A, Wysocki J, Januszkiewicz-Lewandowska D. 2017. Assessment of the usefulness of multiplex real-time PCR tests in the diagnostic and therapeutic process of pneumonia in hospitalized children: a single-center experience. *Biomed Res Int* 2017:8037963. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2017/8037963>.
  35. Spuesens EBM, Fraaij PLA, Visser EG, Hoogenboezem T, Hop WCJ, van Adrichem LNA, Weber F, Moll HA, Broekman B, Berger MY, van Rijsoort-Vos T, van Belkum A, Schutten M, Pas SD, Osterhaus ADME, Hartwig NG, Vink C, van Rossum AMC. 2013. Carriage of *Mycoplasma pneumoniae* in the upper respiratory tract of symptomatic and asymptomatic children: an observational study. *PLoS Med* 10:e1001444. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1001444>.
  36. Carrico JA, Sabat AJ, Friedrich AW, Ramirez M, ESCMID Study Group for Epidemiological Markers (ESGEM). 2013. Bioinformatics in bacterial molecular epidemiology and public health: databases, tools and the next-generation sequencing revolution. *Euro Surveill* 18:20382. <https://doi.org/10.2807/ese.18.04.20382-en>.
  37. Niemz A, Ferguson TM, Boyle DS. 2011. Point-of-care nucleic acid testing for infectious diseases. *Trends Biotechnol* 29:240–250. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tibtech.2011.01.007>.
  38. Notomi M, Mori Y, Tomita N, Kanda H. 2015. Loop-mediated isothermal amplification (LAMP): principle, features, and future prospects. *J Microbiol* 53:1–5. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12275-015-4656-9>.
  39. Brotons P, de Paz HD, Esteva C, Latorre I, Muñoz-Almagro C. 2016. Validation of a loop-mediated isothermal amplification assay for rapid diagnosis of pertussis infection in nasopharyngeal samples. *Expert Rev Mol Diagn* 16:125–130. <https://doi.org/10.1586/14737159.2016.1112741>.