Operationalising TB LAM testing

A use case for standardised implementation in the field

Jeremy Nel Head, Division of Infectious Diseases Helen Joseph Hospital & University of the Witwatersrand

Helen Joseph Hospital

- 500-bed tertiary hospital
- Infectious diseases division falls under department of internal medicine at Helen Joseph Hospital and Wits University.
- ~750 inpatient consults per year.
- 6000 outpatients HIV Clinic, TB Clinic, Infectious Diseases Outpatients



Helen Joseph Hospital: Medical patient profile

- ~42% of medical admissions PLWHIV.
 - Median CD4 = 67 cells/ μ L
 - ¼ diagnosed for the first time
 - Of those previously diagnosed with HIV, ³/₄ on treatment, but
 - Of those on treatment, nearly ½ are failing ART
- AIDS-defining conditions accounted for 40% of the admissions.
- TB in 25% of PLWHIV at time of data collection (probably closer to 30% in total).

U-LAM as a clinician-performed test

Timing "doesn't work": reliability implications

- 25-35 mins "doesn't work"
 - Clinicians don't have dedicated time to wait 25 mins
 - Could set an alarm and come back after 25 mins to read strip...
 - ...but in practice adherence to this was difficult: patient emergencies/priorities, etc.)



Reliability Issue #2: interpreting faint lines









REF 06740101/R1

Reliability issue #3: urine volume

- 60 μ L urine not well-adhered to, even with bulb pipette
- One drop? Two drops? Whole thing?



Stock control

- Strips taken "en masse" frequently stock shortages
- Reference card taken/lost
- Pipettes taken/lost clinicians guessing



Patient selection

Patient selection

Can be confusing (needlessly)

WHO STRONGLY RECOMMENDS USING LF-LAM TO ASSIST IN THE DIAGNOSIS OF ACTIVE TB IN HIV-POSITIVE ADULTS, ADOLESCENTS AND CHILDREN



Interpretation of Results

Clinical implications of U-LAM results

• A negative result doesn't rule out TB.

- NPV of a U-LAM in a high-burden TB setting is poor.
- Clinicians may struggle with this diagnostic reasoning.

• A positive result doesn't mean it's TB.

• Treat as TB, but what to do about possible false positives due to NTM, Nocardia, etc. hasn't been well addressed programmatically.

Recording the results

The problem

- All lab-based tests are digitally recorded, and easily accessible in the future, across the healthcare system.
- Not true of clinician-based tests.
- U-LAM result hand-written in file, but file not easy to retrieve quickly if patient is admitted again to our hospital – and impossible to retrieve if healthcare contact at another facility.

Solutions

Centralising who performs the test

- 2 dedicated, trained nurses
- Training, assessment of reliability/validity
- Test performed "opportunistically" when there's time in their day.
 - In practice, usually performed within 1-4 hours of being dropped off



U-LAM "flow" at our hospital





PROBLEM	SOLUTION
Reliability: timing	2 trained nurses perform all the tests
Reliability: interpreting faint lines	2 trained nurses perform all the tests
Reliability: urine volume	2 trained nurses perform all the tests
Stock control	Nurses keep track of stock & order timeously
Patient selection	Doctor training (ID ward rounds, etc.)
Interpreting U-LAM result implications correctly	Doctor training (ID ward rounds, etc.)
Recording the result accessibly	Results are recorded in one central book (not ideal but better than before)

Conclusions

Conclusions

- Urine LAM as a clinician-performed test had serious reliability issues in our setting.
 - Implications for patient care
 - Implications for research performed using this data
- Solutions: either lab-based, or ≥2 dedicated, trained healthcare workers.
 - Doesn't increase workload and vastly improves reliability.
- Training HCWs on patient selection and test result implications isn't hard but needs to be done.