

# IMMUNOASSAY METHOD AS DIAGNOSTIC TOOL FOR ENTERIC AMOEBIASIS AND CRYPTOSPORIDIOSIS IN SOME RURAL COMMUNITIES, OF KWARA STATE, NIGERIA

## ABSTRACTS

**Background:** Laboratory diagnosis of enteric amoebiasis and cryptosporidiosis in rural communities and urban cities in sub-Saharan Africa depends on use of microscopic method that has been adjured to be unspecific, more sensitive and specific methods are needed such as immunoassay method.

**Objective:** This study compared the use of antigen capture immunoassay and microscopy techniques in detecting antigen and cysts of *Entamoeba histolytica* and oocysts *Cryptosporidium* respectively in fecal specimens of individuals in rural communities of Kwara State, Nigeria.

**Methods:** Wet preparation and formol ether concentration of fecal specimens were examined for cysts of *Entamoeba histolytica* and MZN stained fecal concentration were examined for oocysts of *Cryptosporidium* using microscope, then human *Cryptosporidium* and *Entamoeba histolytica* antigen capture immunoassay were also used for diagnosis of these parasites in the fecal specimens.

**Result:** Microscopic method detected 25 (15.6%) cysts of *Entamoeba histolytica/dispar* complex, and 42 (26.2%) of oocysts *Cryptosporidium*, while immunoassay method detected significantly higher values of 31 (19.4%) and 47 (29.4%) respectively. Microscopy cannot be used to differentiate pathogenic *Entamoeba histolytica* from non-pathogenic *Enatamoeba dispar* which immunoassay method can do.

**Conclusion:** Antigen capture enzyme immunoassay method is a better tool in diagnosis of amoebiasis and cryptosporidiosis in rural communities, preventing unnecessary treatment of individuals harboring nonpathogenic amoeba species and higher detection of pathogenic species.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Protozoan parasitic diseases contribute significantly to the burden of infectious diseases worldwide. Most of these infections and death from protozoan parasitic diseases affect people in low income areas and rural communities of the developing countries. Conditions such as inadequate methods of fecal disposal, poor water supply, poor personal hygienic practice and low level of health education are contributory factors to disease occurrence [1, 2]. These parasites can cause significant illness even in developed countries. The WHO [3] reported that

diarrheal disease affects far more individual than any other illness, even in regions that include high-income countries.

Several species of enteric protozoa are associated with diarrheal illness in rural human communities; such include *Giardia lamblia*, *Entamoeba histolytica*, *Cryptosporidium*, *Isospora belli*, *Cyclospora* and *Microsporidium*. The commonest causes of diarrheal disease among these are *E. histolytica* and *Cryptosporidium*. They are well recognized as agents of diarrheal episodes in children and adults in developing countries [2] and [4]. The Walsh [5] reported further that about approximately 500 million people worldwide are infected annually with *E. histolytica*, resulting in symptomatic illness and death in about 50 million and 100,000 persons respectively. The vast majority (about 90%) of individual infected with *Entamoeba* species are colonized by nonpathogenic strain *E. dispar* [6]. The traditional method of diagnosis of enteric amoebiasis in rural communities of developing countries relies on microscopic examination of feces for typical morphology of trophozoites or cysts of the parasite. This makes diagnosis difficult because the pathogenic species *E. histolytica* is morphologically identical to the nonpathogenic species, *E. dispar* and *E. moshkovskii*, hence microscopy is generally considered insufficient to differentiate these species [7].

The diagnosis of cryptosporidiosis is generally undertaken by identification of oocysts in feces of the patient using modified Ziehl-Neelsen staining. The small size and subtle staining characteristic of *Cryptosporidium* species have contributed to the difficulties of identifying this parasite in routine stool preparations [8]. Other authors have opined that identification of morphological characters of *Cryptosporidium* is unreliable and relatively time-consuming with light microscopy [9, 10].

The aim of this study was to evaluate the use of enzyme-immunoassay method in diagnosis of amoebiasis and cryptosporidiosis in rural communities of Ogboro and Malete, Moro Local Government Area of Kwara State, Nigeria. This method was compared with the microscopic method of wet mount preparation with Lugols iodine stained, formol ether concentrated method for cysts *Entamoeba* species and Modified Ziehl-Neelsen (MZN) stained on formol ether concentrated method for oocysts *Cryptosporidium* species respectively.

## 2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

## 2.1 Study Site

This study was carried out in two communities of Moro Local Government Area, of Kwara State. The two communities were Malete and Ogboro, both consisted of predominantly farmer, with few school teachers, community health staff; while others are pretty traders and artisans.

## 2.2 Sample Collection

The subjects were the pupils of the two primary schools and adults in the communities. Consent was obtained from the village heads, clan/family heads or their representative at community level; from the local health authority and teaching service commission/school heads. Signed consent forms from parents were received with samples from pupils. Adult samples were from patients that required laboratory investigation for intestinal ailments through primary healthcare centers in the communities. The assistance of community health officers and laboratory technicians in charge of the centers was obtained. Institutional consent was obtained from Community Development Centre (CDC) of Kwara State University. Subjects were given labeled, universal screw capped plastic bottle to bring early morning fecal sample. The samples were collected from August, 2014 through May, 2015.

## 2.3 Sample Examination

Samples were collected both at the school assembly for the pupils and samples for adults were collected from the health centers. These were examined as soon as they reached the Microbiology laboratory of Kwara State University, Malete. Macroscopic and microscopic examinations were carried out as previously described [8].

Wet preparation of fecal samples in normal saline stained with Lugols iodine; Ridley modified formol ether concentration technique also was used to improve recovery of the cysts and oocysts of protozoan parasites from the samples that were missed on routine wet mount preparation. The sediments were examined for cysts with aid of Lugols iodine and the second slide was stained with modified Ziehl-Neelsen (MZN) method to detect oocysts of *Cryptosporidium* species [9].

## 2.4 Immunoassay method

Fresh fecal sample in 5 ml of normal saline were preserved in the refrigerator at 4°C until all the samples were harvested. Human cryptosporidium antigen detection (Cry-Ag) ELISA kit (MBS2600132) sourced from MY Bioscience Company (California) was removed from the refrigerator and left at room temperature to acclimatize.

Human *Entamoeba histolytica* antigen detection (EH-Ag) ELISA kit (BS108889) purchased from MY Bioscience Company (California) was used to detect antigen of *E. histolytica* according to manufacturer's protocol from the preserved stool samples. The tests were carried out according to manufacturer's manual using automated ELISA Bio-Rad microplate reader.

## 2.5 Statistical analysis

The data were analyzed by using statistical package of SPSS 21.0 software and Wilks' Lambda, Chi-Square test was used for comparison of qualitative data, the risk was estimated by using odds ratio and 95% confidence interval. Significance was considered at *p* value less than 0.05. Sensitivity and specificity were calculated.

## 3. RESULTS

### 3.1. *Entamoeba histolytica*

A total of 160 fecal samples were collected and analyzed in this study. *Entamoeba* cysts identified using microscopic method were *Entamoeba histolytica/dispar*, *E. coli* and *Iodamoeba buetschlii*. A total of 25 (15.6%) of the samples had *Entamoeba histolytica/dispar* and 35 (21.9%) had non-pathogenic *Entamoeba*. Fecal distribution of the amoebae detected using microscopy and immunoassay method is presented in Table 1.

**Table 1: Sex distribution of amoebae in fecal samples and immunoassay detection of *Entamoeba histolytica***

|                              |            | Microscopy     |                      | Immunoassay |
|------------------------------|------------|----------------|----------------------|-------------|
| <i>E. histolytica/dispar</i> |            | <i>E. coli</i> | <i>I. buetschlii</i> | ELISA       |
| Positive                     | 25 (15.6%) | 24 (15.0%)     | 11 (6.9%)            | 31 (19.4%)  |

|              |             |             |             |             |
|--------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Negative     | 175 (84.4%) | 176 (85.0%) | 149 (93.1%) | 129 (80.6%) |
| <b>Total</b> | <b>160</b>  | <b>160</b>  | <b>160</b>  | <b>160</b>  |

111

112 The microscopy method detected 25 (15.6%) of *E. histolytica/dispar* complex while the

113 immunoassay method detected 31 (19.4%). Immunoassay method is more specific for *E.*

114 *histolytica* and had 6 (3.75%) more than what microscopy detected, in addition microscopy

115 method cannot distinguish *E. histolytica* and *E. dispar*. Using Chi-Square ( $\chi^2$ ) to test for efficacy

116 of the two techniques in detecting *E. histolytica/dispar* complex and *E. histolytica* by microscopy

117 and immunoassay respectively, there was a significant difference between microscopy and

118 immunoassay at  $\chi^2$  (1df, n=160) =95.328,  $p < 0.05$ . Immunoassay method detected 31 (19.4%) of

119 *E. histolytica* while microscopy detected 25 (15.6%) *E. histolytica/dispar* complex, there was

120 significant sensitivity variation (Wilks' Lambda = 0.656,  $F(1984) = 9.2$   $p=0.000$ ).

### 121 3.2 *Cryptosporidium*

122 The formol ether concentration of fecal samples stained with modified Ziehl-Neelsen (MZN)

123 method detected 42 (26.2%) while the immunoassay method detected 47 (26.2%) in the subjects

124 that participated in this study. Fecal detection of *Cryptosporidium* in the methods is shown in

125 Table 2.

126 **Table 2: Fecal detection of *Cryptosporidium* in both MZN stained and immunoassay**

127 **methods**

| Fecal MZN Stained Samples |             | Fecal Immunoassay samples |             |
|---------------------------|-------------|---------------------------|-------------|
| Positive                  | Negative    | Positive                  | Negative    |
| 42 (26.2%)                | 118 (73.8%) | 47 (29.4%)                | 113 (70.6%) |
| <b>Total</b>              | <b>160</b>  | <b>160</b>                | <b>160</b>  |

128

129 There was higher detection of *Cryptosporidium* by immunoassay method 47 (29.4%) than MZN  
130 stained method 42 (26.2%). There was significant relationship between MZN stained and  
131 immunoassay using Chi-Square ( $\chi^2$ ) (1df, n = 160) = 0.3894, p < 0.05.

#### 132 4. Discussion

133 This study included pupils were asymptomatic carrier of Entamoebae and Cryptosporidium and  
134 patients presenting with symptoms of intestinal illness that sought for medical attention in rural  
135 communities of Moro Local Government (LGA) area. In these communities and several others in  
136 developing countries, the major laboratory method of diagnosis of intestinal parasitic illness is by  
137 use of microscopy. Direct microscopic examination is undoubtedly the gold standard for the  
138 diagnosis of intestinal parasitic diseases with advantages of being inexpensive and easy to  
139 operate compared to immunoassay method. Accurate diagnosis of *E. histolytica* is difficult  
140 because it is based on morphology and size of iodine stained/trichome stained cysts and nuclei of  
141 *Entamoeba* species, thus depends on proficiency and experience. Although cysts of *E. coli*, *E.*  
142 *moshkovski* and *E. polecki* may readily be differentiate by experienced microscopist, *E. histolytica*  
143 and *E. dispar* cannot be differentiated on basis of microscopic morphology<sup>5</sup>. In addition *E.*  
144 *dispar* is recognized as a non-pathogenic species of amoeba; it has to be differentiated from  
145 pathogenic species *E. histolytica*. In this study microscopy detected 25 (15.6%) of *E.*  
146 *histolytica/dispar* complex while the immunoassay method detected 31 (19.4%) of *E. histolytica*;  
147 there was significant difference between the two methods. This indicated that a significant  
148 individual that harbor this pathogenic species may not be detected and so not treated even though  
149 they may have symptoms.

150 Previous studies indicated that *E. dispar* can be ten times as common as *E. histolytica* in endemic  
151 regions of West and South Africa [2, 10]. This report and our current finding support the need  
152 for use of immunoassay method that is more specific for diagnosis of pathogenic species. A more  
153 sensitive and specific technique that even differentiate other nonpathogenic species of  
154 Entamoeba complex such as *E. coli*, *E. moshkovski*, *E. polecki*, *E. dispar* and *E. hartmanni* is  
155 Multiplex PCR [11]. However, this molecular method is more expensive and required highly  
156 trained personal than the immunoassay method [12].

There was huge difference in detection of *Cryptosporidium* using modified ZN stained with 42 out of 160 (26.2%) to immunoassay with 47 out of 160 (29.4%). This difference may lead to significant margin of error and individuals that were infected but not detected by microscopy. Reasons that may be adduced to low detection by modified ZN stained method are the small size and subtle staining characteristics of *Cryptosporidium* in stool preparations [13].

Previous reports also collaborated out finding, that antigen detection method by immunoassays are more sensitive than the conventional staining method and more effective in cases where oocysts numbers are low [14] and [15]. However, this antigen detection immunoassay is not as specific and sensitive as molecular methods, which can further differentiate *Cryptosporidium* into various species. Both immunoassay and molecular methods are more expensive and required trained hands that are not readily available in rural communities.

In conclusion, *E. histolytica* and *Cryptosporidium* are important intestinal protozoan parasites associated with diarrheic conditions in sub-Saharan African. Diagnosis based on use of microscopy and MZN stained slides for *E. histolytica* and *Cryptosporidium* respectively are not specific and sensitive enough for detection of intestinal illnesses caused by these parasites. We have demonstrated that immunoassay method is more sensitive and specific method of diagnosis of these parasites even in rural settings.

## REFERENCES

1. Okeke IN, O. Ojo O, Lamikanra A, J.B. Kaper JB. Etiology of acute diarrhea in adults in southwester Nigeria. *Journal of Clinical Microbiology*, 2003; 41: 4525-4530.
2. Babatunde SK, Ameen N, Ajiboye AE, Adedayo RM, Sunday O. *Cryptosporidium* and Other Intestinal Protozoan Parasites in rural communities of Moro Local Government Area, Kwara State, Nigeria. *Online International Journal of Microbiology Research*, 2013; 1(1): 8-13.
3. World Health Organization, Global water supply and sanitation assessment, WHO, 2000 Geneva.
4. World Health Organization; Guideline on standard operating procedure for microbiology parasitology examination of feces. 2006; chapter-20

- 185 5. Walsh JA. Problems in Recognition and diagnosis of amoebiasis. Estimation of Global  
186 Magnitude of Morbidity and Mortality. Rev. infectious Diseases, 1986; 8: 228-236
- 187 6. Haque R, Mondal D, Kirkpatrick BD *et al.* Epidemiologic and clinical characteristics of  
188 acute diarrhea with emphasis on *Entamoeba histolytica* infections in preschool children  
189 in an urban slum of Dhaka, Bangladesh. Am. J. trop. Med. Hyg. 2003, 69: 398-405.
- 190 7. Tanyuksel M, Petri WA. Laboratory diagnosis of amoebiasis. Clin. Microbiol. Rev. 2003;  
191 16:713-729
- 192 8. Cheesbrough M. District laboratory practice in tropical countries, part 1, Cambridge  
193 University press. 2005. pp 86-100.
- 194 9. World Health Organization; Guidelines on standard operating procedure for  
195 microbiology parasitological examination of feces. 2006; chapter-20
- 196 10. Wasike WE, Kutima HL, Muya SM, Wamachi A. Epidemiology of *Cryptosporidium* spp  
197 and other enteric parasites in children up to five years of age in Bungoma County, Kenya.  
198 Journal of Biological and Food Science Research. 2015; 4(1); 1-6
- 199 11. Dawah IS, Inabo HI, Jatau ED. Comparative study of Microscopy with ELISA antibody  
200 based amoebiasis diagnosis in patients presenting with dysentery at government hospitals  
201 in Kaduna metropolis. Continental Journal of Biomed Science, 2010; 4: 43-49.
- 202 12. Gachuhi S. Obonyo M, Odhiambo R, Swierczewski B, Mwakubambanya R.  
203 Differentiation of *Entamoeba histolytica* and *Entamoeba dispar* Complex by Multiplex  
204 Polymerase Chain Reaction. Sch. Acad. J. Biosci. 2014; 2(11): 762-767
- 205 13. Ramana KV, Kranti PG. Conventional Microscopy versus molecular and immunological  
206 methods in the diagnosis of amoebiasis. Ann Med. Health Sci. Research, 2012; 2(2): 211-  
207 212
- 208 14. Garcia LS, Shimizu RY, Bernard CN. Detection of *Giardia lamblia*, *Entamoeba*  
209 *histolytica/dispar* and *Cryptosporidium* antigens in human fecal specimens using Triage  
210 parasites panel enzyme immunoassay. J. Clin. Microbiol. 2000; 38: 3337-3340
- 211 15. Ungar, BL. Enzyme-linked immunoassay for detection of *Cryptosporidium* antigens in  
212 fecal Specimen. J.Clin. Microbiol.1990; 28(11): 2491-2495.
- 213 16. Gaafar MR. Evaluation of enzyme immunoassay techniques for diagnosis of the most  
214 common intestinal protozoa in fecal samples. International J. Infect. Dis. 2011; 5(8):  
215 e541-e544.