

Early Investigations of MERS-CoV

Lab – Epi Integration

Dr. Anthony Mounts
3 September 2013



**World Health
Organization**

The Big Questions – MERS-CoV

- **How transmissible?**
 - Secondary attack rate – in households, HCF, work place.
 - R_0
 - Roll of risk factors and settings – e.g. chronic illness and institutions
- **Source of the virus**
 - Animal reservoir
 - Time of emergence
- **Clinical spectrum of severity**
 - Proportion of severe/mild cases
 - Types of complications – e.g. renal failure
- **Exposures that result in human infection**



Types of Protocols Needed

- **Generic interview form with open ended questions**
- **Case control study of exposures**
 - Determine exposures that result in transmission from non-human sources
 - Comparison of index/sporadic cases to random, matched controls
 - Could use serology to determine controls but not critical for a novel, rare infection.
- **Health Care Facilities**
 - Evidence of human-to-human transmission
 - Types of exposures that result in infection (e.g. medical procedures)
 - Case control study of exposed and unexposed HCW
 - Infections or seropositives in cohort of all exposed



Types of Protocols Needed

- **Contact study**
 - Rates of human-to-human transmission (difficult)
 - Spectrum of disease, rates of mild disease (if prospective w/ acute and convalescent sera)
 - Rates of sero(+) in different exposure-type cohorts of case exposure environment(s): e.g. farm, home, workplace, bridge club – not really about contact w/ case
- **Serial cross-sectional surveys of risk groups**
 - Population studies can look at rates of infection
 - Prospective cohort study to determine exposures that result in infection
- **Animal surveys: source of virus**



Laboratory Issues

- **PCR was quickly available and labs offered support**
 - Initial global discussions led to identification of appropriate targets for screening and confirmation
 - Local capacity varied – lab support helped
 - Unclear initially which specimens most appropriate: upper vs. lower
- **Early recommendations included:**
 - Retrospective testing of stored specimens from SARI surveillance
 - Testing of all unexplained pneumonia in affected countries
 - Inclusion of testing in SARI surveillance algorithms.
- **Cost and human resources were limiting factors**



Laboratory Issues

- **Serological assays being developed by multiple institutions on a variety of formats, using different protein substrates**
 - ELISA, IFA, LIPS, protein arrays, neutralization
 - Spike protein, nuclear protein
- **Challenges to development include limited number viruses and positive sera**
 - Difficult to know sensitivity
 - Not possible to know the comparability without standards
 - Antibody kinetics unknown – though Jordanian cases had (+) 1 year later
- **Epi implications:**
 - Very useful for comparing relative positivity of groups of people
 - Need to include controls in sero-epi studies – background rates of positivity related to cross reactivity or previous infection unknown.
 - Not yet possible to use for diagnostic purposes – positives are classified as "probable"



Lessons Learned

- **Serological assays can take a long time to perfect**
 - Actually, they are never perfect but imperfect assays are useful, especially in comparing groups.
 - Serological data, like epi data, are "messy" but can provide critical understanding about risk groups, infection rates, and spectrum of disease
 - International collaboration critical to development.
- **Much misunderstanding among epi about what test means in an individual**
 - Cross-reactivity not widely appreciated or understood
 - No single test is going to be definitive



Thank you for your kind attention