

JCU ePrints

This file is part of the following reference:

Joseph, Hayley (2010) *Lymphatic filariasis elimination: residual endemicity, spatial clustering and future surveillance using the new Filariasis CELISA diagnostic assay*. PhD thesis, James Cook University.

Access to this file is available from:

<http://eprints.jcu.edu.au/12000>



**LYMPHATIC FILARIASIS ELIMINATION:
RESIDUAL ENDEMICITY, SPATIAL CLUSTERING AND
FUTURE SURVEILLANCE USING THE NEW
FILARIASIS CELISA DIAGNOSTIC ASSAY**



**Thesis submitted by Hayley Melissa JOSEPH
BMedLabSci (Hons) JCU
in June, 2010**

**in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the
degree of Doctor of Philosophy
in the School of Public Health, Tropical Medicine
and Rehabilitation Sciences,
James Cook University of North Queensland, Australia**

STATEMENT OF SOURCES DECLARATION

I declare that this thesis is my own work and has not been submitted in any form for another degree or diploma at any university or other institution of tertiary education. Information derived from the published or unpublished work of others has been acknowledged in the text and a list of references is given.

Signature

Date

STATEMENT OF ACCESS

I, the undersigned, the author of this thesis, understand that James Cook University will make it available for use within the University Library and, by microfilm or other means, allow access to users in other approved libraries.

All users consulting this thesis will have to sign the following statement:

In consulting this thesis, I agree not to copy or closely paraphrase it in whole or in part without the written consent of the author; and to make proper public written acknowledgement for any assistance which I have obtained from it.

Beyond this, I do not wish to place any restriction on access to this thesis.

Signature

Date

PREFACE

The research was made possible by ongoing financial support from GlaxoSmithKline (GSK). By using the statistical software, SaTScan, I am obligated to note: “SaTScan™ is a trademark of Martin Kulldorff. The SaTScan™ software was developed under the joint auspices of (i) Martin Kulldorff, (ii) the National Cancer Institute, and (iii) Farzad Mostashari of the New York City Department of Health and Mental Hygiene”.

The research undertaken as part of the thesis was a collaborative effort with the Pacific Programme for the Elimination of Lymphatic Filariasis (PacELF), based in Fiji, and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), based in USA. The bulk of the research from Samoa was a collaborative effort with the World Health Organization (Apia, Samoa) and the Ministry of Health in Samoa.

In general, editorial assistance was provided by my supervisors including advice on data interpretation. Advice on statistical analysis is described in detail below.

Base Shape Files for ArcGIS Version 9.0

Phil Bright (Secretariat to the Pacific Community (SPC), New Caledonia).

Finalisation of Maps (only Samoa)

Adella Edwards (Cartographer, James Cook University (JCU), Australia)

Julian Lawn (JCU, Australia)

Spatial Statistics

Shannon McClintock (CDC, USA)

James Moloney (JCU, Australia)

Categorical and Numerical Statistical Analysis

Petra Buttner (JCU, Australia)

Alan Clough (JCU, Australia)

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank all of the people in the Pacific Islands who participated in this study. If it were not for these people my work would not have been possible.

PhDs are not successful without the guidance and support provided by the student's academic advisors. I was fortunate enough to be advised by Professor Richard Speare, Dr Patrick Lammie and Associate Professor Wayne Melrose. I would like to thank Rick for his guidance with the thesis writing. The man is a mountain of knowledge! I would like to thank Pat for his help with thesis writing, publications and as a sounding post for some of the crazy ideas I've come up with over the past few years. Pat helped me a lot with the spatial studies and I enjoyed "picking his brain" during my six week stay at the CDC, USA.

It is difficult to explain in words the impact my principal supervisor, Associate Professor Wayne Melrose, has had on me both professionally and personally. I am forever indebted to him for his invaluable supervision and advice over these years, which have been paramount in moulding the research scientist I am today. His unconventional approach to science and love of controversial findings has fuelled my interest and love of this topsy-turvy world of research. Wayne is an exceptional supervisor. He always gave me "just enough rope" not to hang myself; he always gave me the space to learn, grow, and pushed me out of that comfort zone, but not too much where I would be left flailing! I will never forget organising my first field trip in the Pacific, where I would be team leader. Wayne was away and I was left to organise all supplies. I was nervous and "wet behind the ears" and didn't know what to expect. I certainly was not used to such isolated conditions. I recall emailing Wayne a series of questions and Wayne (who by this stage was well aware of my over-preparation and anal retentiveness) emailed me back. His email did not consist of answers to my questions, but rather a short and sweet email of: "STOP WORRYING! I am confident in your abilities and have no doubt you will sort out these problems when you're on

the ground..... oh by the way, do not forget the emergency beacon on my desk – you may need it.....” And believe me, there were times when I felt like flicking that switch! Running my own field teams in various countries across the Pacific has provided me with priceless life lessons and memories and I only have Wayne to thank for providing me with this opportunity.

I would like to thank the lovely administrative staff; Ari and Michelle. Especially for never deleting my emails that started with “I have a small favour to ask.....” or ignoring me when I came in to work and began a sentence with “could you hold Chloe while I.....” (Although I am suspicious they loved the second statement so they could get some cuddles! And Chloe, my baby, loved it too!). Furthermore, I would like to thank the Trisha for helping with those fiddly end stages of printing.

Of course I am saving “the best” until last. The constant support of my parents has been paramount and integral to my successes not only in the postgraduate stage of my career, but also my undergraduate study at JCU. The emotional and professional guidance provided by my parents has helped shape the individual I am today. During those times of hardship, which I am sure each PhD student has endured, the love and support of both my parents always saw me through. Furthermore, I will always be appreciative of the endless babysitting provided by my mum during the hours of thesis writing! Secondly, the hours of editing by my dad have greatly improved the readability of the thesis and to him I will always be grateful. Now, dad, as a grandad it’s time to help Chloe with her years of schooling!

To my sister and brother-in-law, Rachel and Mat, you may never quite understand the point of my research, but you were always willing to listen to my rants and complaints when things went wrong and revelled in my jubilation when things succeeded. Furthermore, Rachel helped me with my “thesis-free” days to keep me sane and let our beautiful children play happily together.

Most importantly, I would like to thank my husband, Deep, and my beautiful daughter, Chloe. Deep: how you managed to convince me that a PhD is a good idea I will never know! Now that I am at the end, and have learnt a great deal, I realise that I would never have made it this far without you. You never doubted my abilities and always provided cuddles to put a smile on my face. Chloe: you're an angel of a baby. I would never have been able to get so much thesis writing done without your calm nature. You were always easily comforted and quite happy to occupy yourself with your toys while I madly typed away on the computer. You loved being in the sling on my days in at JCU printing off pages and pages of drafts (and loved even more ripping those drafts to shreds when I was finished with them!). You loved listening to me while I read aloud excerpts of my chapters and giggled when I used my "funny" voice. Let's hope your first words aren't "lymphatic filariasis"..... I love you both dearly. Happy reading!

PRESENTATIONS

Joseph, H., and Melrose, W. Laboratory Diagnosis of Lymphatic Filariasis. Australian Institute of Medical Scientists (AIMS), Cairns, Australia, June 2007

Joseph, H., Lymphatic Filariasis in Samoa; project proposal. Ministry of Health, Samoa, May 2008

Joseph, H., Lammie, P., McClintock, S., Maiava, F., and Melrose, W. Spatial Analysis of Lymphatic Filariasis in Samoa. American Society of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene (ASTMH) conference, New Orleans, USA, Dec 2008

Future Presentations:

Joseph, H., Lammie, P., McClintock, S., Maiava, F., and Melrose, W. First Evidence of Spatial Clustering of Lymphatic Filariasis in an *Aedes polynesiensis* Endemic Area. American Society of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene (ASTMH) conference, Atlanta, USA, Nov 2010

PUBLICATIONS

Joseph, H., and Melrose, W. D. (2010) Applicability of the filter paper technique for detection of antifilarial IgG₄ antibodies using the Bm14 Filariasis CELISA. *Journal of Parasitology Research* doi:10.1155/2010/594687: 6 pages

Weil, G.J., Curtis, K.C., Fischer, P.U., Won, K.Y., Lammie, P.J., **Joseph, H.M.**, Melrose, W.D., and Brattig, N.W., (2010). A multi-centre evaluation of a new antibody test kit for lymphatic filariasis employing recombinant *Brugia malayi* antigen BM-14. *Acta Tropica* [Epub ahead of print]

Dos Santos, M., Armaral, S., Harmen, S., **Joseph, H.**, Fernandes, J. and Counahan, M. (2010). The prevalence of common skin infections in Timor-Leste: A cross sectional survey. *BMC Infectious Diseases* **10**: 61

Future Publications

Joseph, H., Maiava, F., Lammie, P. and Melrose, W. Evaluation of continuing transmission and clustering of residual infection of lymphatic filariasis in Samoa. Part I: epidemiological assessment *In Submission Acta Tropica*

Joseph, H., Moloney, J., Maiava, F., McClintock, S., Lammie, P. and Melrose, W. Evaluation of continuing transmission and clustering of residual infection of lymphatic filariasis in Samoa. Part II: spatial clustering *In Submission Acta Tropica*

Joseph, H., Clough, A., Maiava, F and Melrose, W. Exploratory Study Investigating Factors Influencing Mass Drug Administration (MDA) Compliance for Lymphatic Filariasis in Samoa, *Manuscript in preparation*

Joseph, H., Moloney, J., Maiava, F., Taleo, F., 'Ake, M., Capuano, C. and Melrose, W. Application of the Filariasis CELISA anti-filarial IgG₄ antibody assay in LF surveillance in the South Pacific. *Manuscript in preparation*

ABSTRACT

Lymphatic Filariasis (LF) is a mosquito-transmitted parasitic disease caused by the filarial nematodes *Wuchereria bancrofti*, *Brugia malayi* and *Brugia timori*. In 1997, the 50th World Health Assembly approved a resolution calling for the elimination of LF as a public health problem (WHA50.29). This was deemed achievable with a regime of annual Mass Drug Administrations (MDAs) and, where appropriate, vector control for a minimum of four to six years. The Pacific counterpart was named the Pacific Programme to Eliminate Lymphatic Filariasis (PacELF). In the Pacific, countries which have reached the threshold of < 0.1% circulating filarial antigen (CFA) prevalence in children entered surveillance mode until 2012, whereas countries with persistent transmission planned further MDAs. Successful elimination of LF requires:

- 1) Accurate identification of residual foci of transmission (in countries with persistent transmission);
- 2) Comprehensive surveillance strategies to detect and combat potential resurgence (in countries entering surveillance mode); and,
- 3) Culturally appropriate education campaigns to encourage MDA compliance, as systematic non-compliers become reservoirs of infection.

It is crucial to apply sensitive diagnostic tools which are capable of identifying these areas of residual endemicity or resurgence early. This phase of low prevalence poses particular challenges: “hot spots” may be scattered and ill-

defined and the diagnostic tools measuring microfilaraemia (Mf) and CFA that were successful in the earlier phase of the programme may no longer be adequate because of issues with sensitivity, the requirement for larger sampling sizes, and lag phases before Mf or CFA are detectable in newly infected persons. The addition of antibody serology as a complementary diagnostic tool would provide an earlier warning system, since children born after the interruption of transmission would be antibody negative.

In order to incorporate serology into the LF programme, use of a standardised commercial assay must be used, such as the Filariasis Cellabs Enzyme-Linked Immunosorbent Assay (CELISA). Although the Filariasis CELISA has been manufactured since 2006, it is yet to be investigated for its potential use in large scale sampling. It was the aim of this research to determine:

- 1) The efficacy of the Filariasis CELISA antibody assay;
- 2) Its usefulness as a potential diagnostic tool for the inclusion into the LF programme; and,
- 3) Its role in future surveillance work.

This was achieved by validating the Filariasis CELISA for field applicability, assessing its efficacy for identifying areas of residual endemicity, and investigating the spatial relationships between exposed and infected individuals. In addition, during the progression of the thesis, data became available concerning MDA compliance in Samoa. MDA compliance is also crucial for successful elimination of LF since systematic non-compliers remain as potential reservoirs of infection.

The Filariasis CELISA was easily applicable for field work using whole blood dried onto filter paper. Filter paper sampling had a sensitivity of 92% and a specificity of 77%, when compared to plasma samples. Five thousand four hundred and ninety-eight filter paper samples were assayed from four LF endemic South Pacific countries (Tuvalu, Tonga, Vanuatu, and Samoa). Antibody prevalence rates correlated with cessation of LF transmission in Tonga and Vanuatu, both of which have entered surveillance mode, and ongoing transmission in Samoa and Tuvalu. Most importantly, use of CFA prevalence in children alone, the current World Health Organization (WHO) recommendation, missed vital residual areas of endemic foci in Samoa, as observed by high antibody prevalence in children and Mf positive individuals. This observation required further investigation with an in-depth epidemiological study.

In Samoa, five villages were chosen for prevalence surveys, including Siufaga, which was originally believed to be LF-free. Results showed that the reservoir of infection was the older males and that there was a correlation between transmission (Mf/CFA positivity) and exposure in children. Crucially, ongoing transmission was occurring in Siufaga, as demonstrated by an overall CFA prevalence exceeding 1% and high antibody prevalence in children. CFA testing of children alone would not have identified Siufaga as an area of residual endemicity.

Accurate identification of residual foci of transmission is challenging in areas where *Aedes polynesiensis* is endemic, such as Samoa, since no

geographical clustering of infection has been demonstrated. Results from the aforementioned epidemiological study were spatially linked to household of residence (community based analyses) and/or primary school (school based analyses) of attendance. “Community based” analyses revealed significant spatial clusters of households with infected individuals and a relationship to antibody positive children when they were included in the spatial analysis. Similar results were observed for “school based” analyses. These promising findings are the first evidence of spatial clustering of LF in a day-biting *Ae. polynesiensis* endemic area. In addition, these results are the first evidence of dual clustering of Mf/CFA individuals with exposed children.

In Samoa, MDA non-compliance of infected individuals may contribute to persistent transmission. Exploring why these individuals are non-compliant is of paramount importance to the LF programme. Individuals testing positive for LF and children aged 7 – 10 years were asked to participate in a questionnaire designed to ascertain: 1) level of LF knowledge, (2) compliance, and (3) a number of risk factors. For the infected individuals, there was a significant association between MDA compliance and knowledge of LF and, for the children, this association also extended to use of mosquito protection. This exploratory study highlights the need for restructuring current educational campaigns, and their deliverance, to appropriately target children and the systematically non-compliant infected individuals. In addition, the study highlights the necessity to instigate qualitative studies to explore cultural and religious beliefs; a strong driver of compliance.

The overall findings fill critical gaps in knowledge for the elimination of LF namely:

- 1) Incorporation of antibody serology should be a priority because:
 - a. Certain areas of residual transmission will not be detected using Mf or CFA diagnostic testing alone; and,
 - b. Surveillance requires a diagnostic test capable of detecting resurgence early so that action can be timely.
- 2) In Samoa:
 - a. Identification of spatial clustering has a significant impact on the LF programme in terms of targeted treatment, re-introduction of vector control campaigns and aiding health personnel to locate potential Mf positive cases;
 - b. Previously declared “LF-free” villages may have residual transmission; and,
 - c. New health education campaigns are a necessity for targeting non-compliant individuals.

The addition of antibody serology into the repertoire of LF diagnostic tools holds huge promise for identifying areas of residual endemicity and in future surveillance and control of LF.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	viii
LIST OF TABLES.....	xxi
LIST OF FIGURES	xxiii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	xxviii
CHAPTER 1: GENERAL INTRODUCTION.....	1
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW.....	8
2.1 AETIOLOGY AND EPIDEMIOLOGY	8
2.1.1 <i>Aetiology in the South Pacific</i>	12
2.1.2 <i>Lifecycle of Wuchereria bancrofti</i>	14
2.1.3 <i>Elimination of Lymphatic Filariasis as a Public Health Problem in the South Pacific</i>	17
2.2 CLINICAL PRESENTATION	19
2.2.1 <i>Introduction</i>	19
2.2.2 <i>Asymptomatic Lymphatic Filariasis</i>	20
2.2.2.1 Endemic normals.....	21
2.2.2.2 Asymptomatic microfilaraemics	22
2.2.3 <i>Symptomatic Lymphatic Filariasis</i>	23
2.2.3.1 Acute filarial disease	23
2.2.3.2 Chronic filarial disease	25
2.2.3.3 Tropical eosinophilia.....	29
2.2.4 <i>Drug Regimes</i>	29
2.3 FILARIAL IMMUNITY	35
2.3.1 <i>Introduction</i>	35
2.3.2 <i>Innate Immune Response</i>	36
2.3.3 <i>Adaptive Immune Response</i>	37
2.3.3.1 Introduction	37

2.3.3.2	Humoral immunity	39
2.3.3.2.1	IgG ₁	40
2.3.3.2.2	IgG ₂	41
2.3.3.2.3	IgG ₃	42
2.3.3.2.4	IgG ₄	43
2.3.3.2.5	IgE	45
2.3.3.2.6	IgA	46
2.3.4	<i>Pre-natal Sensitisation</i>	47
2.3.5	<i>Co-infection and Vaccine Efficacy</i>	47
2.4	LABORATORY DIAGNOSIS AND APPLICABILITY	
	IN THE FIELD	50
2.4.1	<i>Introduction</i>	50
2.4.2	<i>Circulating Filarial Antigen (CFA) Assays</i>	52
2.4.2.1	NOW [®] filariasis immunochromatographic test (ICT)	53
2.4.2.2	Og4C3 assay	54
2.4.3	<i>Microfilarial (Mf) Assays</i>	55
2.4.4	<i>Anti-filarial Antibody Assays</i>	57
2.4.4.1	Introduction	57
2.4.4.2	Recombinant antigen assays	58
2.5	NEW LABORATORY TEST: FILARIASIS CELISA	62
2.5.1	<i>Introduction</i>	62
2.5.2	<i>Cross Reactivity and Inter-Laboratory Variation</i>	63
2.6	POST-MDA: DETERMINING IF COUNTRIES ARE	
	FILARIASIS FREE	64
2.6.1	<i>Introduction</i>	64
2.6.2	<i>Resurgence of Lymphatic Filariasis Following Elimination: an Historical Perspective</i>	71
2.6.3	<i>PCR and Mosquito Dissection Tools for Monitoring Lymphatic Filariasis Transmission</i>	73
2.6.4	<i>Choosing the Right Diagnostic Tools for Surveillance</i>	75
2.6.4.1	Filariasis CELISA anti-filarial antibody assay as the answer	76

2.7	USE OF GPS MAPPING WITH DIAGNOSTIC TOOLS TO ASSESS THE EXTENT OF LYMPHATIC FILARIASIS TRANSMISSION.....	78
2.8	SUMMARY.....	79

CHAPTER 3: GENERAL MATERIALS AND METHODS 81

3.1	STUDY SITES.....	81
3.2	LABORATORY DIAGNOSIS OF LYMPHATIC FILARIASIS.....	82
3.2.1	<i>Reagents and Consumables</i>	82
3.2.2	<i>Blood Collection and Storage</i>	82
3.2.3	<i>Elution of Filter Paper</i>	84
3.2.3.1	Filariasis CELISA.....	84
3.2.3.2	The Og4C3 antigen assay.....	85
3.2.4	<i>Microfilarial (Mf) Detection</i>	86
3.2.5	<i>Antigen Detection</i>	87
3.2.5.1	NOW [®] filariasis immunochromatographic test (ICT).....	87
3.2.5.2	The Og4C3 assay.....	88
3.2.6	<i>Antibody Detection</i>	89
3.3	STATISTICAL ANALYSIS.....	90
3.3.1	<i>Normalisation of Data for SPSS Statistical Software Version 17.0</i>	90
3.4	ETHICS APPROVAL.....	91

CHAPTER 4: THE VALIDITY OF THE FILARIASIS CELISA FOR USE AS A LYMPHATIC FILARIASIS DIAGNOSTIC ASSAY	92
4.1 INTRODUCTION.....	92
4.2 AIMS	97
4.3 MATERIALS AND METHODS	98
4.3.1 <i>Cross Reactivity of the Filariasis CELISA With Other Parasites.....</i>	98
4.3.1.1 Multicentre evaluation	98
4.3.1.2 Cross reactivity with <i>Strongyloides</i> sp. sera.....	99
4.3.2 <i>Optimisation of Serum Sample Dilution</i>	100
4.3.3 <i>Optimisation of Filter Paper Sampling for the Filariasis CELISA.....</i>	101
4.3.3.1 Negative control	101
4.3.3.2 Reducing background signal to noise ratio.....	102
4.3.3.2.1 Blocking buffer.....	103
4.3.3.2.2 Hydrogen peroxide	103
4.3.4 <i>Sensitivity and Specificity of Filter Paper Sampling</i>	104
4.3.5 <i>Kit Durability Following Delayed Transportation</i>	105
4.3.6 <i>Effect of Storage Temperature on Reactivity of Filter Paper Samples</i>	106
4.4 RESULTS.....	107
4.4.1 <i>Cross Reactivity of the Filariasis CELISA With Other Parasites.....</i>	107
4.4.1.1 Multicentre evaluation	107
4.4.1.2 Cross reactivity with <i>Strongyloides</i> sp. sera.....	107
4.4.2 <i>Optimisation of Serum Sample Dilution</i>	108
4.4.3 <i>Optimisation of Filter Paper Sampling for the Filariasis CELISA.....</i>	112
4.4.3.1 Negative control	112
4.4.3.2 Reducing background signal to noise ratio.....	113

4.4.3.2.1	Blocking buffer.....	113
4.4.3.2.2	Hydrogen peroxide	114
4.4.4	<i>Sensitivity and Specificity of Filter Paper Sampling</i>	115
4.4.5	<i>Kit Durability Following Delayed Transportation</i>	117
4.4.6	<i>Effect of Storage Temperature on Reactivity of Filter Paper Samples</i>	118
4.5	DISCUSSION.....	121

CHAPTER 5: POST MASS DRUG ADMINISTRATION SURVEYS IN FOUR SOUTH PACIFIC COUNTRIES: DEFINING CESSATION OF LYMPHATIC FILARIASIS TRANSMISSION 135

5.1	INTRODUCTION.....	135
5.2	AIMS	143
5.3	MATERIALS AND METHODS	143
5.3.1	<i>Study Population</i>	143
5.3.1.1	Samoa.....	144
5.3.1.2	Tonga	144
5.3.1.3	Tuvalu	145
5.3.1.4	Vanuatu.....	146
5.3.2	<i>Statistical Analysis and Seroprevalence Mapping</i>	146
5.4	RESULTS.....	147
5.4.1	<i>Study Population</i>	147
5.4.1.1	Samoa.....	148
5.4.1.2	Tonga	156
5.4.1.3	Tuvalu	159
5.4.1.4	Vanuatu.....	162
5.5	DISCUSSION.....	164

**CHAPTER 6: EVALUATION OF CONTINUING TRANSMISSION OF
LYMPHATIC FILARIASIS IN SAMOA USING THE
FILARIASIS CELISA 172**

6.1 INTRODUCTION..... 172
6.2 AIMS 174
6.3 MATERIALS AND METHODS 174
 6.3.1 *Study Area*..... 174
 6.3.2 *Study Population*..... 176
 6.3.3 *Statistical Analysis*..... 178
6.4 RESULTS..... 179
 6.4.1 *Prevalence*..... 179
6.5 DISCUSSION..... 187

**CHAPTER 7: EVIDENCE OF SPATIAL CLUSTERING OF
RESIDUAL INFECTION OF LYMPHATIC FILARIASIS
IN SAMOA 196**

7.1 INTRODUCTION 196
7.2 AIMS..... 200
7.3 MATERIALS AND METHODS 200
 7.3.1 *Study Area and Population*..... 200
 7.3.2 *Diagnostic Testing* 200
 7.3.3 *Spatial Data Collection* 200
 7.3.4 *Statistical Analysis*..... 201
7.4 RESULTS 204
 7.4.1 *Spatial Clustering*..... 204
 7.4.1.1 “Community based” scenario..... 206
 7.4.1.2 “School based” scenario..... 206
7.5 DISCUSSION 210
 7.5.1 *Future Directions and Conclusions*..... 216

CHAPTER 8: EXPLORATORY STUDY INVESTIGATING FACTORS INFLUENCING COMPLIANCE WITH MASS DRUG ADMINISTRATION IN SAMOA	222
8.1 INTRODUCTION	222
8.2 AIMS.....	223
8.3 MATERIALS AND METHODS	223
8.3.1 <i>Study Population</i>	223
8.3.2 <i>Defining MDA Compliance</i>	225
8.3.3 <i>Questionnaire</i>	225
8.3.4 <i>Statistical Analysis</i>	227
8.4 RESULTS	228
8.4.1 <i>CFA Positive Group</i>	228
8.4.1.1 Uni-variable analyses	228
8.4.1.2 Multi-variable analyses.....	230
8.4.2 <i>Children Aged 7 to 10 Years</i>	231
8.4.2.1 Uni-variable analyses	231
8.4.2.2 Multi-variable analyses.....	232
8.5 DISCUSSION	236
 CHAPTER 9: GENERAL DISCUSSION.....	 254
9.1 DISCUSSION	254
9.2 FUTURE DIRECTIONS AND CONCLUSIONS	258
 REFERENCES	 262
 APPENDIX 1: PRODUCT INSERT: THE FILARIASIS CELISA	 320
 APPENDIX 2: PRODUCT INSERT: THE OG4C3 ELISA.....	 325
 APPENDIX 3: HUMAN ETHICS APPROVAL H1423.....	 330

APPENDIX 4: HUMAN ETHICS APPROVAL H2816..... 332

APPENDIX 5: TITRATION OF PNG SERA SAMPLES..... 334

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 2

Table 2.1	Recombinant antigen based antibody assays	60-61
-----------	---	-------

CHAPTER 4

Table 4.1	Demographic information of samples derived from the PNG Serum Bank	101
Table 4.2	Cross-tabulation results for detection of anti-filarial IgG ₄ comparing the new commercial Filariasis CELISA with previous research-based <i>D. immitis</i> ELISA	110
Table 4.3	Cross-tabulation results for the Filariasis CELISA comparing paired plasma and filter paper samples	116
Table 4.4	Cross-tabulation results for the Filariasis CELISA comparing reactivity from paired filter paper samples following 10 months storage at -20°C	120

CHAPTER 5

Table 5.1	Data collected from the post-MDA 2007 national survey in Samoa	150
-----------	--	-----

CHAPTER 6

Table 6.1	Data collected from the post-MDA 2007 national survey in Samoa	175
Table 6.2	Demographics of the individuals residing in the five villages chosen for the study	177
Table 6.3	Prevalence of Mf, CFA and antibodies (Ab) in each of the five villages (%) including 95%-CI	182

CHAPTER 7

Table 7.1	Summary spatial data of the five villages examined.....	205
-----------	---	-----

CHAPTER 8

Table 8.1a	Demographics of CFA positive individuals participating in the questionnaire (n = 153).....	233
Table 8.1b	Demographics of children 7 to 10 years participating in the questionnaire (n = 309).....	233
Table 8.2	Odds ratios (ORs) and 95%-CI for factors compared with MDA compliance in 153 CFA positive individuals in five Samoan villages as determined with uni-variable regression modelling.....	234
Table 8.3	Odds ratios (ORs) and 95%-CI for factors compared with MDA compliance in 153 CFA positive individuals in five Samoan villages as determined with multivariable logistic regression modelling	235
Table 8.4	Odds ratios (ORs) and 95%-CI for factors compared with MDA compliance in 309 children (aged 7 to 10 years) in five Samoan villages as determined with uni-variable regression modelling.....	235
Table 8.5	Odds ratios (ORs) and 95%-CI for factors compared with MDA compliance in 309 children (aged 7 to 10 years) in five Samoan villages as determined with multivariable logistic regression modelling	236

LIST OF FIGURES

CHAPTER 2

- Figure 2.1 The geographical distribution of LF 9
Figure 2.2 The lifecycle of *W. bancrofti* 15

CHAPTER 3

- Figure 3.1 Map of the South Pacific..... 81
Figure 3.2 Preparation and drying of filter paper samples 83
Figure 3.3 Elution of filter paper samples in preparation for the
Filariasis CELISA..... 84
Figure 3.4 Puncturing the tube container to allow free flow of
water for the boiling step in the Og4C3 assay 85
Figure 3.5 The thick blood smear for Mf detection..... 86
Figure 3.6 The ICT 88
Figure 3.7 Shape of the histogram after the frequency of
the data points were plotted using SPSS 17.0 91

CHAPTER 4

- Figure 4.1 LF field survey: Vanuatu 2008..... 97
Figure 4.2 OD absorbance values for 20 sera obtained from
individuals positive for anti-*Strongyloides* sp. antibodies
as measured using the Filariasis CELISA 108
Figure 4.3 OD absorbance values for 12 out of the 96 sera
from individuals residing in PNG as measured
using the Filariasis CELISA 109
Figure 4.4 Antibody (Ab) positivity amongst individuals from PNG
where there is high intensity of LF transmission 111
Figure 4.5 Negative cut-off values of eluates from filter paper
samples as measured using the Filariasis CELISA 113

Figure 4.6	The difference in OD absorbance values of Tongan samples assayed by the Filariasis CELISA; comparing the standard protocol with the addition of a blocking step	114
Figure 4.7	The difference in OD absorbance values of Tongan samples assayed by the Filariasis CELISA; comparing the standard protocol with the addition of incubation with H ₂ O ₂	115
Figure 4.8	Comparison between two batches of kits received by different methods of transport; using titration of the positive control	117
Figure 4.9	Scatter plot demonstrating the agreement relationship between the two batches of kits; one delivered by road (five days) and one by air (two days).....	118

CHAPTER 5

Figure 5.1	Post-MDA survey in Tonga.....	145
Figure 5.2	Prevalence rates of the diagnostic parameters: Mf, CFA and antibody (Ab)	148
Figure 5.3	Mf and CFA prevalence in children ≤ 10 years and the rest of the population tested as part of the post-MDA survey in 2007 in Samoa	150
Figure 5.4	Mf, CFA and antibody (Ab) prevalence across the health districts in Samoa	151
Figure 5.5	Serological mapping for Mf, CFA and antibody prevalence across Samoa	152
Figure 5.6	Mf, CFA and antibody (Ab) prevalence in children ≤ 10 years only across the health districts in Samoa	153
Figure 5.7	Correlation between the prevalence of Mf and CFA positive adults and children in Samoa	154
Figure 5.8	Correlation between CFA prevalence and antibody prevalence in children in Samoa	155

Figure 5.9	Correlation between Mf prevalence and antibody prevalence in children in Samoa	156
Figure 5.10	Mf, CFA and antibody (Ab) prevalence rates in children residing in Tonga	157
Figure 5.11	Seroprevalence map: antibody prevalence of children residing in villages in Tonga	158
Figure 5.12	Mf, CFA and antibody (Ab) prevalence rates in children residing in Tuvalu.....	160
Figure 5.13	Serological mapping for CFA and antibody prevalence in children residing in villages in Tuvalu	161
Figure 5.14	Seroprevalence map: antibody prevalence of children residing in villages in Vanuatu	163

CHAPTER 6

Figure 6.1	Location of the five study villages in Samoa.....	175
Figure 6.2	Blood was collected by fingerprick following registration of participants	179
Figure 6.3	Age specific prevalence of Mf, CFA and total antibody (Ab) prevalence for each of the five villages A) Puapua, B) Tafua, C) Siufaga, D) Falefa and E) Fasitoo-Tai.....	183-185
Figure 6.4	Gender specific prevalence of Mf, CFA and antibodies (Ab) for the total population and children	185
Figure 6.5	Correlation between CFA prevalence and (a) total antibody prevalence, and (b) antibody prevalence in children.....	186
Figure 6.6	Mean OD absorbance values obtained from the Filariasis CELISA for the three groups of individuals: CFA negative, CFA positive and amicrofilaraemic, and, lastly, both CFA and Mf positive	187

CHAPTER 7

Figure 7.1	The “community based” scenario highlighting the spatial clusters of LF exposure and/or infection in each of the five villages: (a) Fasitoo-Tai, (b) Fasitoo-Tai, (c) Siufaga, (d) Puapua, (e) Falefa, and (f) Tafua.....	208
Figure 7.2	The “school based” scenario highlighting the spatial clusters of LF exposure and/or infection in each of the five villages: (a) Fasitoo-Tai, (b) Fasitoo-Tai, (c) Siufaga, (d) Puapua, (e) Falefa, and (f) Tafua.....	209

APPENDIX 6

Figure A6.1	OD absorbance values for 11 out of the 90 sera from individuals residing in PNG as measured using the Filariasis CELISA.....	334
Figure A6.2	OD absorbance values for 11 out of the 90 sera from individuals residing in PNG as measured using the Filariasis CELISA.....	334
Figure A6.3	OD absorbance values for 11 out of the 90 sera from individuals residing in PNG as measured using the Filariasis CELISA.....	335
Figure A6.4	OD absorbance values for 11 out of the 90 sera from individuals residing in PNG as measured using the Filariasis CELISA.....	335
Figure A6.5	OD absorbance values for 11 out of the 90 sera from individuals residing in PNG as measured using the Filariasis CELISA.....	336
Figure A6.6	OD absorbance values for 11 out of the 90 sera from individuals residing in PNG as measured using the Filariasis CELISA.....	336

Figure A6.7	OD absorbance values for 12 out of the 90 sera from individuals residing in PNG as measured using the Filariasis CELISA.....	337
Figure A6.8	OD absorbance values for 12 out of the 90 sera from individuals residing in PNG as measured using the Filariasis CELISA.....	337

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Ab	antibody
ADCC	antibody dependent cellular cytotoxicity
ADL	adenolymphangitis
ADLA	acute dermatolymphangioadenitis
AFL	acute filarial lymphangitis
APCs	antigen presenting cells
Bm	<i>Brugia malayi</i>
Bm14	<i>Brugia malayi</i> 14
BmR1	<i>Brugia malayi</i> recombinant antigen 1
χ^2	Chi-squared
C	control
CDC	Centers for Disease Control and Prevention
CELISA	Cellabs enzyme linked immunosorbent assay
CFA	circulating filarial antigen
CI	confidence intervals
COMBI	Communication for Behavioural Impact
CTS	child transmission survey
DEC	diethylcarbamazine citrate
DNA	deoxyribonucleic acid
°C	degrees Celsius
df	degrees of freedom
DOT	directly observed therapy
EDTA	ethylenediaminetetra-acetic acid
ELISA	enzyme linked immunosorbent assay
<i>g</i>	gravitational force
GIS	geographic information system
GMP	good manufacturing practice
GPELF	Global Programme for the Elimination of Lymphatic Filariasis
GPS	global positioning system
GSK	GlaxoSmithKline
HH	household
HIV	human immunodeficiency virus

H ₂ O ₂	hydrogen peroxide
ICT	immunochromatographic test
IEC	information, education and communication
IFN γ	interferon gamma
Ig	immunoglobulin
IL	interleukin
iL3	infective larvae stage three
IU	implementation unit
JCU	James Cook University
KAP	Knowledge, Attitudes and Practices
kDa	kilodalton
kg	kilogram
km	kilometre
LF	lymphatic filariasis
LPS	lipopolysaccharide
LQAS	lot quality assurance sampling
m	metres
MDA	mass drug administration
μ g	microgram
mg	milligram
μ L	microlitre
mL	millilitre
Mf	microfilariae
n	number of participants
N/A	not applicable
ND	not done
NSW	New South Wales
NK	natural killer
nm	nanometres
NMEA	National Marine Electronics Association
NO	nitric oxide
NPV	negative predictive value
NTD	neglected tropical disease
OCP	onchocerciasis control programme

OD	optical density
Og4C3	<i>Onchocerca gibsoni</i> 4C3
OPD	<i>o</i> -phenylenediamine
OR	odds ratio
PacCARE	PacELF Coordination and Review Group
PacELF	Pacific Programme for the Elimination of Lymphatic Filariasis
PAR	participatory action research
PBS	phosphate buffered saline
PC	phosphorylcholine
PCR	polymerase chain reaction
PICT	Pacific Islands Countries and Territories
PNG	Papua New Guinea
PPV	positive predictive value
QC	quality control
Rad	radius
RMS	root mean square
RNA	ribonucleic acid
RR	relative risk
RTPCR	reverse transcriptase polymerase chain reaction
SD	standard deviation
SPC	Secretariat to the Pacific Community
X	times
T	test
Th	T helper cell
TMB	3,3',5,5'-tetramethylbenzidine
TNF α	tumour necrosis factor alpha
TV	television
VIC	Victoria
vs	versus
Wb	<i>Wuchereria bancrofti</i>
WHA	World Health Assembly
WHO	World Health Organization