Satzke, C; Turner, P; Virolainen-Julkunen, A; Adrian, PV; Antonio, M; Hare, KM; Henao-Restrepo, AM; Leach, AJ; Klugman, KP; Porter, BD; S-Leo, R; Scott, JA; Nohynek, H; O’Brien, KL; WHO Pneumococcal Carriage Working Group, (2013) Standard method for detecting upper respiratory carriage of Streptococcus pneumoniae: updated recommendations from the World Health Organization Pneumococcal Carriage Working Group. Vaccine, 32 (1). pp. 165-79. ISSN 0264-410X DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vaccine.2013.08.062

Downloaded from: http://researchonline.lshtm.ac.uk/1883913/

DOI: 10.1016/j.vaccine.2013.08.062

Usage Guidelines

Please refer to usage guidelines at http://researchonline.lshtm.ac.uk/policies.html or alternatively contact researchonline@lshtm.ac.uk.

Available under license: http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/2.5/
Standard method for detecting upper respiratory carriage of Streptococcus pneumoniae: Updated recommendations from the World Health Organization Pneumococcal Carriage Working Group

Catherine Satzke\textsuperscript{a,b,c}, Paul Turner\textsuperscript{d,e}, Anni Virolainen-Julkunen\textsuperscript{f}, Peter V. Adrian\textsuperscript{g}, Martin Antonio\textsuperscript{h}, Kim M. Hare\textsuperscript{i}, Ana Maria Henao-Restrepo\textsuperscript{j}, Amanda J. Leach\textsuperscript{i}, Keith P. Klugman\textsuperscript{k},\textsuperscript{l} Barbara D. Porter\textsuperscript{a}, Raquel Sá-Leão\textsuperscript{m}, J. Anthony Scott\textsuperscript{n,o}, Hanna Nohynek\textsuperscript{p}, Katherine L. O’Brien\textsuperscript{q}, on behalf of the WHO Pneumococcal Carriage Working Group\textsuperscript{1}

\textsuperscript{a} Pneumococcal Research, Murdoch Childrens Research Institute, Royal Children’s Hospital, Parkville, VIC, Australia
\textsuperscript{b} Centre for International Child Health, Murdoch Childrens Research Institute, Royal Children’s Hospital, Parkville, VIC, Australia
\textsuperscript{c} Department of Microbiology and Immunology, The University of Melbourne, Parkville, VIC, Australia
\textsuperscript{d} Microbiology Department, Angkor Hospital for Children, Siem Reap, Kingdom of Cambodia
\textsuperscript{e} Centre for Tropical Medicine, University of Oxford, Oxford, United Kingdom
\textsuperscript{f} Department of Infectious Disease Surveillance and Control, National Institute for Health and Welfare, Helsinki, Finland
\textsuperscript{g} MRC/Wits Respiratory and Meningeal Pathogens Research Unit, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South Africa
\textsuperscript{h} Medical Research Council Unit, Banjul, The Gambia
\textsuperscript{i} Child Health Division, Menzies School of Health Research, Charles Darwin University, Darwin, NT, Australia
\textsuperscript{j} Initiative for Vaccine Research, World Health Organization, Geneva, Switzerland
\textsuperscript{k} Rollins School of Public Health, Emory University, Atlanta, GA, USA
\textsuperscript{l} Respiratory and Meningeal Pathogens Research Unit, University of Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South Africa
\textsuperscript{m} Laboratory of Molecular Microbiology of Human Pathogens, Instituto de Tecnologia Química e Biológica, Universidade Nova de Lisboa, Oeiras, Portugal
\textsuperscript{n} KEMRI-Wellcome Trust Research Programme, Kiﬁ, Kenya
\textsuperscript{o} London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine, London, UK
\textsuperscript{p} Vaccine Programme Unit, National Institute for Health and Welfare, Helsinki, Finland
\textsuperscript{q} Department of International Health, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, Baltimore, MD, USA

\textbf{A R T I C L E   I N F O}

\textbf{Article info}

Article history:
Received 8 February 2013
Received in revised form 25 July 2013
Accepted 23 August 2013

\textbf{Keywords:}
Nasopharynx
Carriage
Colonization
Pneumococcus

\textbf{A B S T R A C T}

In 2003 the World Health Organization (WHO) convened a working group and published a set of standard methods for studies measuring nasopharyngeal carriage of Streptococcus pneumoniae (the pneumococcus). The working group recently reconvened under the auspices of the WHO and updated the consensus standard methods. These methods describe the collection, transport and storage of nasopharyngeal samples, as well as provide recommendations for the identification and serotyping of pneumococci using culture and non-culture based approaches. We outline the consensus position of the working group, the evidence supporting this position, areas worthy of future research, and the epidemiological role of carriage studies. Adherence to these methods will reduce variability in the conduct of pneumococcal carriage studies undertaken in the context of pneumococcal vaccine trials, implementation studies, and epidemiology studies more generally so variability in methodology does not confound the interpretation of study findings.

© 2013 Elsevier Ltd. Open access under CC BY-NC-ND license.
1. Introduction

Between 1998 and 2001 the World Health Organization (WHO) convened the Pneumococcal Carriage Working Group. This group was charged with formulating a set of core methods for conducting studies of pneumococcal nasopharyngeal (NP) colonization primarily in the context of pneumococcal conjugate vaccine (PCV) efficacy trials [1]. The PCV efficacy trials led to PCV licensure and now widespread inclusion of PCV in routine immunization programs around the world. Numerous studies of PCV effect on NP colonization were published in the pre-licensure period and were available for consideration by regulators, although no indication was sought for this outcome. PCV impact studies have also included carriage components, thereby providing important lessons about the performance and impact of PCV on a population level [2–4]. Carriage studies have provided the key biological link to the indirect effect of PCV on pneumococcal disease [2], shown that there is no change in the invasiveness of pneumococcal strains since PCV implementation [2,3], anticipated the impact of PCV on cross-reacting serotypes [2,5,6], contributed to the identification of new pneumococcal serotypes [7,8], and have been central to our understanding of antimicrobial resistance evolution and impact [9,10]. The variability in results from pneumococcal carriage studies across diverse epidemiologic settings can be understood to derive from biologic effects rather than methodological differences, in large part because many of the standard pneumococcal carriage methods have been widely adopted.

In the decade since last convening the working group there have been many key accomplishments including sequencing of 90 pneumococcal capsular loci [11], the advent of molecular detection and quantification of pneumococci in NP specimens and serotype-specific detection including improved detection of multiple serotype colonization. There have been significant advances in molecular typing, and in modeling and statistical methods for longitudinal studies of carriage dynamics.

In light of these advances, and the importance of carriage studies, WHO invited an ad hoc group of experts, some of whom participated in the previous working group, to evaluate the state of knowledge, revise the core methods where appropriate, and outline the important scientific questions for the future. In developing this update, the authors reviewed newly published literature pertinent to each aspect of the consensus method, sought unpublished data on relevant issues and wrote a set of draft recommendations. This document was circulated to the working group and formed the basis of a review meeting in Geneva, 29–30th March 2012. The resultant consensus methods were then circulated for final approval. Our recommendations, outlined in detail below, provide researchers with a set of methods that we believe are a minimum set of requirements for pneumococcal carriage studies.

2. Site of sample

It is possible to detect microbial colonization of the upper respiratory tract by sampling the nose, nasopharynx or the oropharynx. We considered the choice between the nasopharynx and oropharynx for detecting pneumococcal carriage (the sensitivity of nasal sampling is covered in Section 3). We have identified nine studies (including one unpublished) that have compared the sensitivity of sampling the nasopharynx and oropharynx of children (Table 1), and five studies for adults (Table 2). It was not possible to extract paired information from all studies, so we compared the sensitivity of NP or oropharyngeal (OP) swabs alone in the detection of pneumococcal carriage against a gold standard of detection by either method when both were sampled in an individual. We restricted our review to studies published from 1975 onwards, as prior to this, swabs were often collected with rigid wooden applicators, which were assumed to be less effective when sampling via the nose than when passed via the mouth.

In children, the additional yield provided by sampling the oropharynx as well as the nasopharynx is relatively small, as the sensitivity of sampling the nasopharynx alone is >90% in seven of nine studies and <80% in only one small study (Table 1). In adults, the advantage to the NP route is not so marked and an ideal strategy involves sampling by both routes (Table 2). Data relating to detection of Haemophilus influenzae, Moraxella catarrhalis, Staphylococcus aureus and respiratory viruses from different sites are described in the Supplementary Material (including Supplementary Table 1).

2.1. Recommendation

For detecting pneumococci in infants and children, we recommend sampling the nasopharynx only. Sampling the oropharynx marginally increases sensitivity but substantially increases the resources required, and may not be acceptable to the study population. For adults, both NP and OP samples should be collected, however if only one sample is possible, collecting from the nasopharynx is more sensitive than from the oropharynx for pneumococci.

2.2. Future research

All studies reviewed here used culture to detect respiratory bacteria. Therefore molecular testing of paired NP/OP samples is needed to establish if the recommendations for anatomic site of sampling apply also to studies using molecular detection of pneumococci.

3. NP and nasal sample collection

Conventional teaching is that nasal specimens are less sensitive than NP samples for detecting pneumococci. We identified only three studies directly comparing NP and nasal sampling methods for detecting pneumococci in children (Supplementary Table 2). Rapola et al. [12] found that pneumococcal isolation rates from NP aspirates, NP swabs and nasal swabs did not differ. The same conclusion was reached by Carville et al. [13] for NP aspirates and nasal swabs, and Van den Bergh et al. [14] for NP swabs and nasal swabs. However, in two of these studies children had respiratory symptoms, either acute respiratory infection [12] or rhinorrhea [14], conditions that are known to enhance pneumococcal carriage and possibly affect the sensitivity of detection from nasal specimens. As such, there is currently insufficient evidence to conclude that nasal swabbing is as effective as NP swabbing for the detection of pneumococcal carriage in healthy children. A fourth comparative study [15] found that NP washes performed better than NP swabs, but concluded that the additional gain was not sufficiently large to offset the discomfort and reduced acceptability to study subjects. Lieberman et al. [16] and Gritzfeld et al. [17] found no difference between NP swabs and NP or nasal washes for the detection of pneumococci in adults with respiratory infection (Supplementary Table 2). The adults found nasal washes more comfortable than NP swabbing, but nasal washes were not recommended for children because of the level of participant cooperation required [17].

There are potential disadvantages of nasal/OP aspirates and washes for pneumococcal detection; the methods are difficult to standardize, and frequent washes in an individual hypothetically may disrupt the flora or affect immune responses. Given that nasal

---

1 Abbreviations: CI, confidence interval; NP, nasopharyngeal; OP, oropharyngeal; OTU, operational taxonomic unit; PCV, pneumococcal conjugate vaccine; STGG, Skim milk tryptone-glucose-glycerol; Ult, ultra-low temperature, ≤−70 °C; WHO, World Health Organization.
or NP washing is generally less well tolerated by children, a single NP swab is preferred for the detection of pneumococcal carriage but washes/aspirates are an acceptable method [15]. NP swabbing techniques may vary across studies unless the investigators adhere closely to the standard method, summarized here. Hold the infant or young child’s head securely. Tip their head laterally to the side of the nostril to be sampled. A cotton-tipped applicator should move slightly into the nasopharynx and out of the oropharynx. If resistance occurs, remove the swab and attempt again to take the sample entering through the same or the other nostril. Failure to obtain a satisfactory specimen is often due to the swab not being fully passed into the nasopharynx. Once the swab is in the nasopharynx, located about one-half to two-thirds the distance from the nostril to ear lobe (Fig. 1).

### Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study [ref]</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Study details</th>
<th>No. positive samples (NP)</th>
<th>No. positive samples (OP)</th>
<th>Sensitivity (%) of NP samples (95% CI)</th>
<th>Sensitivity (%) of OP samples (95% CI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hendley et al.</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>27 healthy American children</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>57% (29, 82)</td>
<td>93% (66, 100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Converse and Dillon [2]</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Longitudinal study of 100 healthy American infants, 132 paired swabs</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>95% (86, 99)</td>
<td>88% (77, 95)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray et al. [3]</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Longitudinal study of 82 healthy American children aged &lt;2 years</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>96% (94, 97)</td>
<td>83% (79, 86)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capeding et al. [4]</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Longitudinal study of 296 healthy Filipino infants aged 6–65 weeks</td>
<td>607c</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>95% (93, 97)</td>
<td>35% (31, 39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapola et al. [5]</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>96 Finnish children aged &lt;7 years with acute respiratory infection</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>91% (75, 98)</td>
<td>59% (41, 76)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenberg et al. [6]</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Longitudinal study of 216 healthy Israeli children aged &lt;5 years</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>98% (94, 100)</td>
<td>24% (18, 32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor et al. [7]</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>47 Canadian children with Cystic Fibrosis</td>
<td>12c</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100% (74, 100)</td>
<td>0% (0, 26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katz et al. [8]</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>125 healthy Russian children</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>84% (74, 91)</td>
<td>52% (40, 64)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hare et al. [9]</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>120 Aboriginal children with bronchiectasis</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>98% (93, 100)</td>
<td>16% (5, 27)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

and respiratory viruses by various sampling methods are described in the Supplementary Material (including Supplementary Table 3).


Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study [ref]</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Study details</th>
<th>No. positive samples (NP)</th>
<th>No. positive samples (OP)</th>
<th>No. positive samples (NP or OP)</th>
<th>Sensitivityb of NP samples (95% CI)</th>
<th>Sensitivityb of OP samples (95% CI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hendley et al. [1]</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>24 healthy American adults</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0% (0, 34)</td>
<td>100% (66, 100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenberg et al. [2]</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>216 Israeli mothers of young children</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>58% (39, 75)</td>
<td>55% (36, 72)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watt et al. [3]</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>1994 Native American adults</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>73% (68, 78)</td>
<td>38% (32, 44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieberman et al. [4]</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>300 Israeli adults with respiratory infection</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>81% (64, 92)</td>
<td>36% (21, 54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levine et al. [5]</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>742 Israeli army recruits</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>63% (48, 77)</td>
<td>55% (40, 69)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Number of NP specimens

A single NP swab is unlikely to represent the colonizing bacteria of the upper respiratory tract with complete sensitivity, as these bacteria may not reside uniformly across the mucosal surface, and there is inherent variability in the mucosal surfaces touched by each sample swab. The insensitivity of a single swab has been demonstrated by studies that have sampled the upper respiratory tract twice at the same visit, usually by taking one swab from the nasopharynx and another from the oropharynx (Tables 1 and 2). This prompts two questions: what is the sensitivity of a single NP swab and could this sensitivity be optimized by increasing the number of swabs collected?

3.1. Recommendation

We recommend the NP swab approach for collection of the sample. NP aspirates or washes are also acceptable methods of specimen collection as they have sensitivity for pneumococcal detection equal to, or greater than, that of NP swabs, but may be less tolerated by participants. In the event that NP sampling cannot be implemented, nasal swabs or swabbing visible secretions from nose blowing into a tissue are better than collecting no specimens. However, any deviation from the recommended NP swab should be clearly reported to allow accurate comparisons across studies.

3.2. Future research

All data presented are from studies using culture to detect pneumococci. Specimen collection comparison studies should be undertaken using molecular methods for pneumococcal detection. Direct comparisons of NP and nasal sampling methods in healthy children are also needed.

by the investigator or dropped on the ground) may also be helpful in interpretation.

Because NP specimen collection (by swab or by wash) requires training, demands adherence to the methodology, and is unpleasant for the study subject, and because sometimes even nasal swabs are not well tolerated, alternate methods have been assessed. Leach et al. [19] found that in an Australian population with a high pneumococcal burden, nose blowing into a paper tissue, followed by swabbing and culture of the material on the tissue, was an effective alternative to nasal swabbing when nasal secretions were present. The sensitivity of detecting pneumococcus from nose blowing samples (compared with nasal swabs, and when secretions were visible at the time of sampling) was 97% in Aboriginal children aged 3–7 years and 94% in children aged less than 4 years who were attending urban child care centers. For children without visible secretions, direct NP or nasal sampling was required [19]. Recently, Van den Bergh et al. [14] found that the proportion of pneumococcal-positive cultures was similar when sampling secretions from a tissue (tissue swab 65%, whole tissue 74%), or taking NP and nasal swabs (both 64%) in 66 Dutch children aged 0–4 years with rhinorrhea. Data relating to detection of H. influenzae, M. catarrhalis, S. aureus and respiratory viruses by various sampling methods are described in the Supplementary Material (including Supplementary Table 3).

Fig. 1. Collecting a nasopharyngeal swab.
swab. Taking the combined positive results of the two swabs as a reference gold standard, the sensitivity of a single swab was 95% (95% CIs 88–98%). There was no evidence of a systematic advantage to swabbing either the right or left nostril [15].

4.1. Recommendation

Increasing the number of NP swabs taken at the same time-point does not increase the sensitivity appreciably, but increases the discomfort to the subject. Therefore, we recommend collecting a single NP swab to detect pneumococcal carriage.

4.2. Future research

The study cited for this recommendation used culture-based detection and was confined to a single setting. Additional studies of multiple swabs would contribute meaningfully to the evidence for this recommendation if conducted among children in low prevalence settings, among adults, and/or including molecular methods of detection.

5. Swab material

Ideally, NP swabs used for colonization studies should (1) be safe for use with minimal irritation or side effects, (2) be efficient at extracting micro-organisms from the nasopharynx onto the swab, (3) have no effect on the viability of the isolated pneumococci or any other pathogens (viral or bacterial) to be assayed, (4) allow easy elution of organisms from the swab and (5) be compatible with all intended assays. For example, calcium alginate inhibits some real-time PCR assays resulting in a reduced sensitivity of detection of Bordetella pertussis [20], and natural fibers (e.g. cotton, rayon, or calcium alginate) often contain nucleic acids, which may be detected in whole microbiome sequencing studies (D. Bogaert, unpublished data) or may include inhibitors to pneumococcal growth (e.g. cotton).

Materials that have been widely used in pneumococcal NP clinical studies include calcium alginate, rayon, Dacron and nylon flocked swabs. There are no clinical studies comparing the performance of these materials head-to-head, so any distinctions, if they exist, are inferred from studies of spiked samples and cross study clinical comparisons. Rayon, Dacron and calcium alginate swabs were compared for their ability to culture pneumococci directly from the swab or from the surrounding skin milk tryptone-glucose-glycerol (STGG) medium [21]. Rayon was shown to be superior for culture from both the STGG medium and the swab, followed by calcium alginate and then Dacron. By contrast, Dube et al. found Dacron was superior to rayon in efficiency of pneumococcal elution from the swab into STGG (eluting approximately 44% vs. 8% of the inoculum respectively), and that nylon flocked swabs (eluting 100% of the inoculum) were the most efficient [22]. Collectively these data, along with the generally comparable recovery rates from studies using any of the rayon, calcium alginate or Dacron swabs, suggest that in practice, the majority of swab material currently used in NP studies will collect sufficient bacteria to be detected, and possible differences in the swab materials will most likely appear only in samples with very low yields of organisms.

Recently, flocked nylon swabs have been introduced into clinical practice, on the premise that the protruding nylon fibres improve the recovery of target organisms from the sampled surface, and allow for the rapid elution of collected material into the transport medium. There are no large published clinical studies comparing flocked swabs and other swab types for the recovery of pneumococci from the nasopharynx, although a study with spiked and paired NP samples suggests that flocked swabs are superior to both Dacron and rayon [22], and clinical evidence from other types of sampling (i.e. sampling for viral pathogen detection) indicates that flocked swabs are equivalent or superior to Dacron or rayon swabs in proportion of positive specimens, and the quantity of organism recovered [23–27]. Flocked swabs have been used in a variety of large pneumococcal NP studies with high rates of colonization measured, supporting their use [28,29]. Since flocked swabs are made from inert nylon material, they are unlikely to interfere with any culture or molecular assay. These swabs may also result in higher yields of organisms which would improve the sensitivity of detection, in particular from samples with low density of carriage and minor serotypes. Note that collecting dual swabs (where two swabs are twisted together and inserted into one nostril) can be useful for comparison studies. Unfortunately the flocked swabs that are currently on the market cannot be twisted together.

5.1. Recommendation

NP swabs made from calcium alginate, rayon, Dacron or nylon materials are suitable for culture based carriage studies to determine the circulating serotypes in a population. For molecular analyses, synthetic materials such as nylon or Dacron are preferred as they are less likely to inhibit amplification of DNA. Flocked nylon swabs are superior for the detection of other pathogens such as respiratory viruses.

5.2. Future research

Clinical and laboratory studies to compare nylon flocked swabs, Dacron, rayon and calcium alginate in samples with low pathogen concentrations, would be of value. Studies that include molecular assays and a broad range of pathogen types would be optimal. Production of flocked swabs that can be divided in two may be useful for comparison studies.

6. Swab transport and storage

STGG medium was previously recommended as a swab transport and storage medium [1] because it is non-proprietary, is easily made with commonly available ingredients, is inexpensive and had been successfully used by many groups investigating carriage of pneumococci and other upper respiratory tract bacterial organisms. Interestingly, a recent study investigated NP carriage in 574 Nepalese children using two intertwined rayon swabs. They found that the carriage prevalence was 41% with a NP swab that had been stored in silica desiccant sachets for up to 2 weeks, compared with 59% with a NP swab that had been placed in STGG and processed within 8 h. There was 79% agreement between the two methods. As such, silica desiccant sachets may be useful when there is delayed or limited access to microbiological facilities, although it likely results in an underestimate of the carriage rate and may alter the serotype and/or genotype distribution (David Murdoch, personal communication).

Therefore, although no systematic comparisons have been conducted, consensus is that STGG remains the medium of choice for transport and storage of NP swabs for the present time.

6.1. Sample collection medium

The STGG medium has been adapted from Gibson and Khoury [30] and Gherna [31], and should be produced as described by O’Brien et al. [32]. In brief, mix 2.0 g of skim milk powder, 3.0 g of tryptone soy broth powder, 0.5 g of glucose, and 10 ml of glycerol and dissolve in 100 ml of distilled water. The STGG medium should
be autoclaved before use: dispense 1.0 ml of STGG medium into 1.5 ml screw-capped vials and autoclave for 10 min at 121°C. STGG vials can be stored frozen at −20°C (or colder) or refrigerated until use. A standard volume of 1.0 ml is preferred to allow for comparisons across studies in quantification of pneumococci. The volume of STGG should be reported for all studies. Allow tubes of STGG medium to reach room temperature before use. Usually the milk solids pellet in the bottom of the tube is resuspended by vortexing for 10–20 s, although there is no evidence that this is necessary and in practice this is not always done. Consensus is that STGG medium should be used within 6 months of preparation whether stored frozen or refrigerated. A quality control test for sterility of the STGG medium must be performed on each batch. The ability of STGG medium to support recovery of viable pneumococci should also be checked.

6.2. Inoculation and transport

Immediately following sample collection the NP swab is aseptically placed into the room-temperature STGG, inserting it to the bottom of the STGG medium, raising it slightly and cutting off the shaft with sterile scissors (to enable lid closure), leaving the swab in the STGG media. The closed tube is then placed in a cool box or on wet ice and transported to the laboratory within 8 h. Once in the laboratory, the specimen is vortexed at high speed for 10–20 s to disperse organisms from the swab tip, and immediately processed and stored as described below.

6.3. Processing and storage

To prevent sample loss in the event of freezer failure, we recommend dividing the vortexed specimen into two aliquots, one of ~0.2–0.3 ml, and the second comprised of the remainder of the STGG containing the swab. The two aliquots should preferably be stored in separate freezers.

Several studies have investigated the impact of frozen storage (at −20°C and ULT (ultra low temperature, −70°C or colder)) on the recovery of upper respiratory tract bacterial pathogens including pneumococci in STGG medium over time [15,30,32–37]. These studies have shown minimal or no significant effects of ULT freezing. For example, Abdullahi et al. [15] reported that recovery of pneumococci by culture from fresh and frozen (ULT for two months) NP swab samples in STGG was indistinguishable, although there were differences in the serotype distribution recovered. This could be, at least in part, attributed to the differential capacity of pneumococcal serotypes to survive the freezing process. Kwambana et al. [35] investigated the difference between NP swabs stored in STGG and analyzed within hours of collection, and those analyzed after 30 days of storage at ULT. 16S rRNA gene-based terminal restriction fragment length polymorphism and clone analysis showed that the mean number of operational taxonomic units (OTUs), a measure of overall microbial diversity, decreased after frozen storage, although the changes to the relative abundance of most species was minimal.

Long-term ULT storage has been evaluated with clinical [34] or laboratory-prepared samples (T. Kaijalainen, unpublished data) finding no demonstrable changes in semi-quantitative viability of pneumococcus over a 12 year period.

Our previous recommendations stated that STGG swabs could be held at −20°C for up to six weeks [1]. This recommendation was based on a relatively limited evidence base [32,33] and consensus practice. However, a recent publication found that the numbers of culturable pneumococci declined within 24 h at −20°C [37], suggesting that this temperature may only be suitable for very short periods.

6.4. Recommendation

STGG is recommended as the primary transport and storage medium. Specimen swabs should be transported on wet ice or colder conditions during transport and handling, and be frozen at ULT as soon as possible after collection. Storage at −20°C is acceptable if the specimen will be tested in the short term (within days) but is not recommended for longer term storage. Investigators should consider dividing the original STGG specimen into two or more aliquots and storing these in separate freezers.

6.5. Future research

Efficacy of newer transport media to maintain microorganism viability at room temperature, cold or ULT storage of NP swabs could be evaluated in field settings. Future research should assess the recovery of pneumococci after storage of different aliquots of NP material in STGG medium in different storage conditions, and the impact of long-term frozen storage of STGG samples on the recovery of pneumococci for low-density specimens, particularly to establish guidelines around −20°C storage.

Finally, an assessment of limits of the duration of storage of STGG medium prior to use, at various temperatures but especially frozen, would assist sites with limited ability to produce STGG themselves.

7. Culture for pneumococci

An ideal culture medium should prevent growth of non-pneumococcal species without inhibiting growth of the pneumococci itself. To this end, defibrinated blood agar (from a non-human source such as sheep, horse or goat) supplemented with 5 μg/ml gentamicin has been the most widely used selective medium to culture pneumococci from NP samples [38–40]. For culture of pediatric NP and throat swabs, this medium has been shown to result in a similar yield of pneumococci to anaerobically incubated blood agar plates [41]. The concentration of gentamicin in agar has been shown to have a significant effect on isolation of pneumococci [42]. There are similar yields of pneumococci when culturing respiratory tract specimens on blood agar supplemented with 2.5–5 μg/ml gentamicin compared with culture on plain blood agar or by mouse inoculation [43–45]. Alternative supplements used to improve the isolation of pneumococci by culture include combinations of colistin and nalidixic acid (CNA) or colistin and oxolinic acid (COBA) [46]. Unlike blood agar-gentamicin and COBA, blood-CNA agar does not suppress the growth of staphylococci.

7.1. Recommendation

Blood agar, either Columbia or trypticase soy agar base with sheep, horse, or goat blood, supplemented with 5 μg/ml gentamicin is considered the core primary isolation media. Blood-CNA or COBA agars are acceptable alternatives, whereas human blood agar should never be used [45,47]. Thoroughly mix a fresh or fully-thawed NP swab-STGG specimen using a vortex and inoculate 10 μl onto a selective plate and streak into all four plate quadrants with sterile loops. Some investigators may choose to use larger volumes of STGG medium (e.g. 50 μl or 100 μl). As this will affect the sensitivity of detection, the volume used should be noted when reporting. Incubate the pneumococcal plate(s) overnight at 35–37°C in a CO₂ enriched atmosphere, either by using a candle jar or 5–10% CO₂ incubator. Plates with no growth should be re-incubated for another 24 h before being discarded.
as negative. If required, record the semi-quantitative growth of alpha-hemolytic colonies [1]. Single colonies are then picked and subcultured for analysis, including identification as described below.

7.2. Future research

Culture of NP specimens, by scraping or drilling into the frozen STGG media using a sterile microbiological loop, might permit prolongation of specimen integrity. This technique has been used successfully in the sub-culture of pneumococcal isolates stored in STGG, but requires quantitative validation for use with NP samples.

8. Culture-based broth enrichment of nasopharyngeal samples

Several investigators have applied a culture enrichment step to samples in order to enhance the sensitivity of pneumococcal identification and serotyping methods. For example, Kaltoft et al. [48] demonstrated that a serum broth (beef infusion supplemented with horse serum and blood) improved the ability of traditional methods to detect multiple serotypes. Similarly, Carvalho et al. [49] found that an enrichment step in Todd Hewitt broth supplemented with yeast extract and rabbit serum increased the proportion of specimens with pneumococcus identified, as well as increasing the detection of multiple serotypes by culture and molecular methods.

However, there are some remaining concerns with broth culture-amplification. The pneumococci may be overgrown by other species, and not all pneumococcal strains or serotypes grow at the same rate in vitro [50–52]. Moreover, broth culture enrichment may reduce detection of co-colonization of other species [53], or may not be appropriate for all sample types. In addition, some media components (such as animal serum) may be difficult to access in developing countries.

8.1. Recommendation

There is insufficient evidence to make a recommendation regarding inclusion of a broth culture-based enrichment step for the detection of pneumococci. Quantification of pneumococcal load should not be determined using samples that have undergone broth enrichment.

8.2. Future research

Whole-genome amplification methods may overcome limitations of low amounts of DNA. It would be useful to optimize broth culture-amplification (e.g. by including a selective agent), and to test the effects of broth-culture amplification on culture and molecular-based identification and serotyping methods.

9. Picking pneumococcal colonies for identification and serotyping

These recommendations establish the minimum set of criteria to determine the presence of pneumococci, and the dominant pneumococcal serotype, in order to ascertain the prevalence of pneumococcal carriage and the serotypes present in the overall population under study. Given this objective, there are two main issues to consider: how many colonies to pick, and how to select them. Detecting multiple serotype carriage is important for some epidemiologic questions, but serotyping a few colonies is an insensitive method to detect the true prevalence of multiple serotype carriage [54–56]. For colony selection, the truly random approach (e.g. where the STGG medium is diluted and spread on agar plates to obtain single colonies, then all the colonies are numbered and selected using a list of random numbers) may be optimal statistically, but is considered impractical for routine use. Choosing colonies based on morphology is more efficient [54], but leads to a bias towards detecting those that are morphologically distinct such as serotype 3 or nontypeable (NT) pneumococci [57].

9.1. Recommendation

Select one colony from the selective plate. If more than one morphology is present, this colony should be from the predominant morphology. We also suggest that one colony from each morphology be selected; however they should be recorded and reported separately (e.g. subdominant 1, subdominant 2 in order of prevalence). This allows for collection of information regarding possible multiple serotype carriage, albeit in a biased fashion. If there is only one morphology present, and it is later identified as non-pneumococcus, return to the primary culture plate and repeat colony selection at least once to verify that pneumococci are not present.

10. Culture-based identification of pneumococci

Traditionally, identification of pneumococci has focused on isolates cultured from normally sterile sites that tend to display a classical phenotype, in particular being optochin susceptible and bile soluble. These identification criteria are generally satisfactory for clinical application and are widely applied in diagnostic microbiology. However, alternative pneumococcal forms are frequently cultured from NP specimens [58, 59]. These non-classical forms may give test results normally expected for other members of the viridans group of streptococci [60, 61] and some other viridans group streptococci have been reported to give test results normally expected for S. pseudopneumoniae [65]. These issues create difficulties for identification and differentiation between pneumococci and other oral streptococci in carriage studies.

10.1. Recommendation

Although optochin susceptibility and bile solubility are still considered key tests, we recommend extending the criteria for presumptive identification of pneumococci to encompass non-classical forms of pneumococci (Fig. 2). Further testing by a reference laboratory may be needed if the research question requires a more definitive identification than this algorithm provides. We now recommend that all α-hemolytic colonies growing on selective media are potentially analyzable, rather than just those with ‘typical pneumococcal colony morphology’ [66], and reiterate that the optochin test culture plate is incubated in 5% CO₂ atmosphere, rather than ambient air.

10.2. Future research

Further work is needed to more clearly differentiate pneumococci, particularly the non-classical forms, from other oral microbes. As a clearer understanding of how to fully define the species is achieved, a revised pragmatic definition of pneumococci will be needed for use in carriage studies.
11. Non-culture based identification

Non-culture based techniques have some advantages in detecting pneumococci from NP samples: they do not require viable organisms, preserve the original composition of the NP sample and, depending on the methods used, provide a detailed characterization and quantification of the pneumococci within a sample.

The detection of pneumococci in a NP swab by a non-culture method is complicated by the intrinsic complexity of the sample, the low numbers of pneumococci in the sample and by difficulties in interpreting the epidemiological relevance when pneumococcal genetic material is detected in culture-negative samples. The sample is a representation of the NP microbiome, which contains numerous bacterial species and may include close relatives of pneumococci such as *S. pseudopneumoniae*, *Streptococcus mitis* and other streptococcal species that also inhabit this niche [68].

The ideal method for non-culture identification in NP swabs should unequivocally detect the pneumococcus with high sensitivity and specificity; it should also be rapid, easy to perform, inexpensive, and deployable on a large scale. In the last decade, several non-culture methods aiming to detect pneumococci in biological samples have been developed including PCR-based strategies targeting specific DNA markers such as *rpoA* [69], *sodA* [70], *tuf* [71], *recA* [72], *piaA* [73], *Spn9802* [74], *ply* [75], a 181-bp pneumococcal-specific fragment [76], 16S-rDNA [77], *psaA* [78], and *lytA* [79–81]. For many of these methods specificity problems have been detected [64,65,82,83]. For others, there has been insufficient validation against diverse collections of close relatives of pneumococci. In addition, there is an increasing body of more sophisticated methods that, although promising, may not be easily applied in routine analysis of NP samples [84–87]. While there is currently no gold standard method for non-culture identification of pneumococci from NP swabs [63,88,89], the *lytA* real-time PCR assay described by Carvalho et al. [81] is widely used and appears to be species-specific. However, given the capacity of pneumococci to exchange genes with other oral streptococci [88,90] a multilocus approach such as used in multilocus sequence typing (MLST), microarray or whole genome-sequencing may prove valuable [64,91,92].

11.1. Recommendation

Culture should remain the gold standard for detection of pneumococci in NP swab samples. Investigators may wish to complement culture detection with a non-culture technique; the method we currently recommend is *lytA* real-time PCR [81].

11.2. Future research

A systematic laboratory validation of non-culture methods against large collections of nasopharyngeal and non-classical isolates is needed to guide future recommendations. Studies that are designed to determine the clinical relevance of pneumococcal culture-negative but DNA-positive samples are needed.

12. Serotyping

12.1. Quellung

The current standard method for serotyping of pneumococcal isolates is the capsular reaction/swelling test (Quellung reaction or Neufeld test) [1]. The traditional method described by Lund [93], Austrian [94] and the Statens Serum Institut [95] using ×100 magnification with oil immersion, is still widely used in Europe and North America. In Australia and Papua New Guinea, the ‘dry’ method using ×40 magnification without oil [96] has been in use since at least the 1970s (M. Gratten, personal communication). The ‘dry’ method is quicker and simpler than the ‘wet’ method using oil immersion [97] but there is no evidence to suggest that one method is superior to the other. Phase contrast microscopy improves the visibility of the capsule, however it is not essential in conducting the Quellung reaction.

Since publication of our previous recommendation, 11 European reference laboratories participated in the validation of pneumococcal serotyping [98]. A high degree of agreement was found between the Quellung test and other serotyping methods, including latex agglutination and gel diffusion. Specifically, there was no significant difference in the percentage of mistypings (39 out of 735 serotypings) by the Quellung method (5.2%, six laboratories) compared to the non-Quellung methods (5.7%, five laboratories) [98]. An inter-laboratory quality control program conducted in four laboratories over ten years found a serotyping concordance of 95.8% using Quellung [99]. Although costly and time-consuming, the Quellung reaction may be preferred in laboratories with suitably experienced staff and a comprehensive set of antisera.

12.2. Latex agglutination

Compared with Quellung, latex agglutination is less expensive, easier to learn, and does not require a microscope. It may therefore be more suitable for settings with limited budgets and training capacity. Commercial reagents are available; alternatively latex reagents can be produced and validated in-house. In the latter case antibodies from commercial antisera are passively bound onto latex particles under aseptic conditions [100,101]. Latex reagents produced in-house must undergo careful quality control. Reagents are stored at 4 °C. As the long-term viability of these reagents is unknown, they should be quality control tested at least annually. Reactions should be conducted using reagents at room-temperature, on a glass surface, using a consistent inoculum of fresh, low passage pneumococci.

12.3. New serotyping methods

Recently, a variety of new serotyping methods have been developed including phenotypic methods that rely on antigen detection,
Table 3

Key advantages and disadvantages of selected serotyping methods.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Key advantages</th>
<th>Key disadvantages</th>
<th>Example references</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phenotypic detection</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quellung</td>
<td>Gold standard, high sensitivity and specificity</td>
<td>Requires experience to interpret, typing sera are expensive</td>
<td>[1,2]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latex agglutination</td>
<td>High sensitivity and specificity, relatively simple to interpret</td>
<td>Commercial latex reagents are expensive, in-house latex reagents require extensive QC lab procedures to prevent mis-interpretation of results needed</td>
<td>[3-5]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dot blot</td>
<td>Cost effective – uses highly diluted typing sera</td>
<td>Lack of specificity through cross-reactions, subjective interpretation requires significant optimization for each serotype</td>
<td>[6]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microbead assays e.g. Flow cytometry or Luminox</td>
<td>High throughput, sensitivity and specificity similar to Gold standard methods, can be designed to detect capsular polysaccharide products</td>
<td>Expensive capital equipment, may need expensive polyclonal typing serum and serotype-specific monoclonal antibodies, technically demanding, particularly in assay optimisation and set-up</td>
<td>[7-12]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Genotypic detection**

| Multiplex PCR     | Highly sensitive (although less than individual PCRs), detection of non-viable organisms, can be coupled with different detection methods (e.g. hybridisation, bead-based or mass-spectrometry), technically straightforward | Not quantitative, risk of amplicon contamination, closely related serotypes cannot be discriminated and are detected as a group | [11,13–19]         |
| Real-time PCR     | Extremely sensitive, detection of non-viable organisms, semi-quantitative     | Closely related serotypes cannot be discriminated and are detected as a group      | [20,21], Panahhos-Baccalà et al., unpublished data |
| Microarray        | Large number of serotypes detected, array can include targets for all serotypes, including virulence factors and antimicrobial resistance markers, may be able to measure relative abundance, detection of non-viable organisms | Expensive reagents and equipment required, operator needs a reasonably high level of technical expertise, particularly for interpretation of unusual findings, can be difficult to distinguish closely related serotypes, although has capacity to include multiple targets for each serotype. | [3,22,23] |

| Single PCR with Sequencing | Only one primer set used, detection of non-viable organisms, can be coupled with different detection methods (e.g. hybridisation, bead-based or mass-spectrometry) | May be difficult to fully discriminate between all serotypes | [24,25] |

and those that are genotype based. Several of these new methods are summarized in Table 3. Examples of genotypic methods include microarray [102–105], single or multiplex real-time PCR ([106,107], Paranhos-Baccalá et al., unpublished data), single-plex PCR combined with sequencing [108,109] and multiplex PCR [110–112]. Multiplex PCR products are usually detected by gel electrophoresis, but may also be detected by mass-spectrometry [113]. DNA hybridization [114,115] or automated fluorescent capillary electrophoresis [116] for example. Phenotypic methods include the dot blot assay [117,118], latex agglutination (see Section above) and bead-based assays on a flow-cytometry or Luminex-based platform [119–124].

In general, methods that involve antibody-antigen reactions are prone to cross reactivity although this is reduced where a significant amount of bound antibody is required for serotype identification, such as capsule swelling reactions (Quellung), or in methods that involve quantitative detection of bound antibody (flow-cytometry or Luminex) [123,125]. Improvements to these methods can be made through the absorption of non-specific reactive antibodies [117] and the use of monoclonal antibodies [124]. In the case of genotype detection, the primary limitations are the sequence diversity of the capsular loci, which can lead to target mismatches, and the inability to discriminate between closely related serotypes. The continued production of new sequence data should result in better target selection and primer/probe design that can produce results with similar sensitivity and specificity to the gold standard methods.

For pure pneumococcal cultures, many methods are valid, and the most appropriate one will depend on the study setting. As such, we do not recommend a particular method over another, except to note that the particular method’s performance should be rigorously validated against the Quellung test.

Serotyping pneumococci directly from the NP sample is more challenging. As mentioned in Section 11, pneumococci may be present in low numbers (leading to low sensitivity), and/or as a small proportion of the NP cells (i.e., compared with cells from other organisms or the host), leading to low specificity. Divergent homologues of pneumococcal capsule genes also have been found in non-pneumococcal species [126]. Furthermore, the clinical relevance of identifying serotype-specific DNA in a culture-negative sample is not known.

12.4. Recommendation

Serotyping of pure pneumococcal isolates using Quellung by the wet or dry method is considered the core method. Latex agglutination serotyping may also be used. Many new serotyping methods are being developed, and although some may be valid there is currently insufficient evidence to provide recommendations. Serotyping directly from the NP specimen is insufficiently developed to recommend as a core method.

12.5. Future research

Assessment of the assay and clinical performance of new serotyping methods, particularly when testing directly from the NP sample is needed.

13. Multiple serotype carriage

Carriage of multiple pneumococcal serotypes is relatively common, particularly in areas where the carriage rate and disease burden are high [54,112,127,128]. Multiple carriage usually involves carriage of a major serotype, together with one or more minor serotype populations. Although it is clear that standard serotyping methods underestimate multiple carriage [49,55], the clinical and public health relevance of multiple carriage is less well established. Theoretically, detection of minor serotypes may help to predict the shift in serotype distribution following pneumococcal vaccination, particularly in high burden settings [129], and allow a better understanding of how epidemic serotypes emerge in some populations. Recent data using new serotyping methods suggest that the impact of vaccination on multiple serotype carriage may be complex [87,130].

To some extent, our understanding is limited by the methods used to detect and characterize multiple carriage. Ideally, a new method should detect multiple serotypes directly from the specimen (i.e., without a culture step which may alter the relative proportions of various strains) without false positive reactions, and be quantitative, affordable, practical and capable of detecting all known serotypes. Although many potential methods have recently been developed they have not been sufficiently validated. The PneuCarriage project has compared 20 serotyping methods from 15 research groups, including their ability to detect multiple serotype carriage, using a well-characterized reference bank of samples (Satze et al., manuscript in preparation). This project will provide further information on suitable methods for detecting multiple serotype carriage with high sensitivity and specificity.

13.1. Recommendation

Current methods routinely underestimate the prevalence of multiple serotype carriage. Although many new techniques are in development, there is insufficient evidence to make a recommendation. For studies where multiple carriage is relevant, we recommend retaining the original STGG specimens for future assessment when optimal methods are defined.

13.2. Future research

A thorough comparison of methods to detect NP carriage of multiple pneumococcal serotypes from pneumococcal cultures and directly from specimens is needed. The clinical and public health importance of multiple serotype carriage needs to be determined.

14. Storage and recovery of isolates

Several storage methods, such as lyophilization, or ULT storage on commercially available chemically-treated beads, are appropriate for long-term storage of pure pneumococcal isolates. However, our recommendations for storage of pneumococcal isolates in STGG media are consistent with the 2003 methods [1], but with some minor amendments to reflect the breadth of consensus practice.

14.1. Recommendation

The storage of at least one tube of each pneumococcal isolate is recommended. To do this inoculate (using a swab or loop) a fresh, overnight, pure lawn culture into suitable media, such as STGG, under aseptic conditions. After ensuring the growth is homogeneous, for example by a short vortex step, freeze at ULT. Short-term storage (<12 months) of these high-titer stocks at −20 °C in a non-defrosting freezer is acceptable, although survival will decrease over this time [33,37].

To recover the isolate, a small amount of frozen material can be scraped from the surface of the STGG medium, or the entire volume thawed and an aliquot taken. The scraping or aliquot is then usually inoculated onto solid medium to check for purity of the isolate. Recovery of isolates should be undertaken aseptically, with a view to minimizing temperature fluctuations of the stored isolate by, for example, keeping tubes on dry-ice (or if necessary, and for short
periods, wet ice) when handling them, and only processing a few tubes at a time.

14.2. Future research

Investigation of the effect of vortexing and frozen storage on recovery, identification (e.g., optochin susceptibility) and serotyping (e.g., production of capsule) is needed. The performance of simpler storage media could be validated.

15. Shipping of isolates

There are many methods available for shipping of pneumococcal isolates. These include using STGG, silica gel desiccant sachets (stable for a fortnight at room-temperature or a month at 4 °C [66,131]), Dorset media, Amies transport media, chocolate or similar agar slopes, or lyophilization. There is no evidence base for preferring one method over another.

15.1. Recommendation

Any of the methods outlined above, or others that are shown to be equally as effective are acceptable.

15.2. Future research

Comparison of effectiveness of different transport methods could be undertaken, although it is likely that many would prove satisfactory.

16. Epidemiological role of carriage studies

In previous sections we have provided a core methodology to perform pneumococcal NP carriage studies. We now consider the role of these carriage studies, especially in the context of pneumococcal disease control.

Significant attention is being directed to whether and how NP studies of pneumococcal ecology in communities can be used to infer or predict disease impact. As the understanding of the quantitative relationship between colonization and disease matures, the role of NP colonization outcomes as a tool for evaluating the global rollout of PCV and other pneumococcal vaccines could become more central. The gold standard for such assessments has to date been population-based surveillance of invasive pneumococcal disease (IPD) as exemplified by the Active Bacteriological Core Surveillance of the Centers for Disease control in the USA [132]. This requires a significant clinical and diagnostic microbiology infrastructure, not present in many developing countries. Further, the collection of IPD isolates requires a clinical environment in which the great majority of suspected cases of meningitis receive a lumbar puncture, and a sufficient number of blood cultures are taken to recognize an impact of PCV, given that blood culture will detect only 2–3% of pediatric pneumonias prevented by PCV [133]. An alternate to IPD surveillance is syndromic surveillance for changes in pneumonia hospitalization or death following PCV introduction. These types of studies have relied on large networks of electronic surveillance [134] not available in developing countries, and can measure only the aggregate effect of a reduction in vaccine type disease and replacement. While such an approach based on just one or a few hospitals may be possible, this depends on the care-seeking behavior of those most at risk for serious morbidity and mortality [135]; in many settings those are the very children with least access to the health facility study sites. There are also considerable variations in the numbers of cases over time depending on comorbidities such as the severity of the influenza season [134] and the impact of antiretroviral rollout if HIV is a significant risk for pneumonia hospitalization in the community [136]. Thus these studies are not likely to be a primary strategy to detect the impact of PCVs and when undertaken are at risk of being confounded by changes in pneumonia burden or mortality trends unrelated to pneumococcal disease (e.g., respiratory viral epidemics, malaria).

The assessment of carriage of vaccine type and non-vaccine type pneumococci is a direct, pathogen-specific measure of PCV impact that is an indicator of the success or failure of a PCV rollout program [129]. Cross sectional studies of carriage in the target age group of PCV, as well as in older children and adults, will give a measure of herd protection. Detection of important serotypes in developing countries (such as type 1) may still be done in carriage studies if the subjects are carefully chosen, by including the detection of carriage in subjects with pneumonia on arrival at health care facilities. Detection of such rarely carried types in pneumonia patients may reflect an etiological role of those types in pneumonia [137]. Carriage studies focused on young children with respiratory illness will identify the group at risk for pneumococcal disease but also provide access to older siblings who are often transmitters of the pathogen, and mothers who may be key to measurement of herd protection in adults. Cross sectional studies may detect changes in the distribution of vaccine type carriage as soon as a year post PCV introduction if sample size is sufficient, with detection of profound changes in distribution and herd protection, if present, by 3–4 years post PCV [138]. While carriage studies will not likely be a direct measure of reduction in disease burden due to PCV, they offer a direct measure of program effectiveness and the nature of replacing pathogens, including an assessment of the impact of PCV on the NP microbiome.

There are emerging data suggesting that quantitative detection of carriage using microbiological methods, but also more easily by quantitative PCR, may be diagnostic of pneumonia in adults [139]. These methods may also reflect co-infection with respiratory viruses in children [140] which may be a significant risk for pneumonia hospitalization [141]. The antimicrobial susceptibility profile of carried pneumococci may be used to inform treatment algorithms for pneumococcal disease in developing countries [142]. Quantitative molecular methods may increase the sensitivity of detection of pneumococcal carriage, and may also detect more easily than culture an impact of PCV on density of carriage. The detection of serotypes in carriage can be used together with the global distribution of those types in IPD [143] to develop an invasiveness index that may be predictive of the likelihood of invasive disease replacement due to emerging types detected in carriage. There are advances in work linking the NP and IPD post-PCV impact results, thereby providing a means to predict IPD impact using NP carriage [147].

Carriage studies are also important for the assessment of the serotype-specific basic reproductive number (R0) of the pneumococcus in developing countries; whole genome sequencing of carriage strains pre- and post-PCV introduction in developing countries may give insight into the evolution of this pathogen in response to PCV. The human is the natural reservoir of the pneumococcus and more studies are needed on a human challenge model [144].

The pathway for licensure of novel pneumococcal vaccines such as those using pneumococcal proteins as conjugates, proteins given with existing formulations of PCV, protein alone or killed whole cell vaccine will depend in large part on proof-of-principle for impact on pneumonia or ability to induce herd protection by the demonstration of an impact on carriage. We speculate that carriage studies will likely be central to the further development and licensure of these novel vaccines [145].

There are few data on the sensitivity of culture to detect pneumococcal carriage. Demonstration of carriage may increasingly be
performed using molecular techniques such as quantitative PCR, microarray, or mass spectrometry based methods. The expression profile of pneumococci in carriage may differ from pneumococci invading the host, as may the host proteomic response to carriage or disease. It is likely that future carriage studies will increasingly use molecular methods to detect carriage including analysis of gene expression, density of carriage and impact on the microbiome. Carriage detection should be an essential part of assessing novel pneumococcal vaccines, and measuring the impact and safety of PCV or other pneumococcal vaccines on human populations.

17. Conclusions

These WHO core methods provide an update on the options available and recommended approaches for studies of pneumococcal carriage. The consistent application of these methods in studies will provide the best opportunity to ensure that any observed differences in colonization are not confounded by differences in the specimen collection, handling or laboratory methods. A recent assessment of adherence to the core methods in published NP studies indicates that some but not all of the recommendations are being fully adopted [146]. As evidenced in this update, for some aspects of the recommended method there are few appropriately designed comparative studies to make definitive statements on preference. In these situations, best practice is to some degree a matter of expert opinion, field experience and a reflection of imperfect data. For study sites that have ongoing NP colonization studies, investigators may decide that consistency in methods over time is more important than modifying their methods now to those recommended here. In such cases a bridging study comparing the results of NP colonization using existing and the core methods would help to clarify the degree to which study findings are modified by the chosen methods. Notwithstanding these limitations, the application of these core methods allows researchers around the world to have confidence in carriage study results, and allows them to contribute to our understanding of the pneumoccus and its control through vaccines.
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