

15792/8

**EVALUATION OF BUFFY-COAT
SMEAR EXAMINATION IN THE
EARLY DIAGNOSIS OF NEONATAL
INFECTIONS
THESIS**

SUBMITTED FOR THE PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF
THE DEGREE OF MASTER IN
PAEDIATRICS
BY

MOHAMED ABO MOSALEM

[M.B. B. Ch.]

UNDER THE SUPERVISION OF

PROF. DR. YEHIA EL GAMAL

PROF. OF PAEDIATRICS

512.9201
J.F. FACULTY OF MEDICINE - AIN SHAMS UNIVERSITY

PROF. DR. ABLA A. HAROUN

PROF. OF BACTERIOLOGY

FACULTY OF MEDICINE - AIN SHAMS UNIVERSITY

DR. SAMI EL SHIMI

LECTURER OF PAEDIATRICS

FACULTY OF MEDICINE - AIN SHAMS UNIVERSITY

FACULTY OF MEDICINE
AIN SHAMS UNIVERSITY

1988

27395

27395

A C K N O W L E D G M E N T

I would like to express my profound gratitude and cordial appreciation to **PROF. DR. YEHIA EL-GAMAL** Professor of Paediatrics, Ain Shams University , for his kind help, guidance and encouragement throughout this work.

I am also indebted to **PROF. DR. ABLA ABDEL SALAM HAROUN**. Professor of Bacteriology. Ain Shams University for her valuable suggestions, advices, and supervision. I would also appreciate the help and kind supervision of **DR. SAMI EH-SHIMI** Lecturer of Paediatrics, Ain Shams University.

I could never forget the sincere help and co.operation of **DR. MONA EL SAMAHY** Lecturer of Paediatrics Ain Shams University .

At the end, ~~I~~^A acknowledge the co.operation of my colleagues, ~~and~~ and all those who helped me in this work.



LIST OF ABBREVIATION

<i>B / T</i>	= band form to total neutrophil ratio
<i>C.S.</i>	= caeserean section
<i>D.I.C.</i>	= disseminated intravascular coagulopathy
<i>E.coli</i>	= <i>Escherichia coli</i>
<i>F.U.O.</i>	= fever of unknown origin
<i>G.E.</i>	= gastro-enteritis
<i>Hb.</i>	= hemoglobin
<i>H.infl enza</i>	= <i>Haemophilus influenza</i>
<i>I.D.M.</i>	= infant of diabetic mother
<i>P.R.M.</i>	= premature rupture of membranes

LIST OF TABLES

	PAGE
Table 1 : Raw data of the infection group	41
Table 2 : Raw data of the high risk group	43
Table 3 : Raw data of the control group	45
Table 4 : Blood picture of the infection group	46
Table 5 : Blood picture of the high risk group	48
Table 6 : Blood picture of the control group	50
Table 7 : Statistical comparison of blood picture results between different groups	51
Table 8 : Statistical comparison of blood culture and buffy coat smear examination results between different groups	52
Table 9 : Incidence of different organisms diagnosed by blood culture and buffy coat in the high risk and infection groups	53
Table 10 : Comparison of outcome in infants +ve for blood culture in high risk and infection groups in relation to buffy coat smear result.	54

C O N T E N T S

	<u>PAGE</u>
* INTRODUCTION AND AIM OF THE WORK.....	2
* REVIEW OF LITERATURE	
— Changes in the incidence and spectrum of neonatal infection.....	6
- Perinatal risk factors and infection...	7
- Causative Agents.....	10
Routes of infections of the newborn.....	12
- Clinical picture.....	14
- Diagnosis and laboratory investigations.	16
- Therapy of neonatal infections.....	19
- Prophylactic antimicrobial therapy....	24
- What is buffy-coat ?.....	26
* Material and Methods.....	29
* RESULTS.....	35
* DISCUSSION.....	55
* SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION.....	60
* REFERENCES.....	63
* ARABIC SUMMARY.	

* * *

INTRODUCTION AND AIM OF THE WORK

The newborn is usually susceptible to generalized, sometimes, overwhelming infections. The symptoms may be deceptively mild until the infection is far advanced, making early recognition and treatment more difficult. The presenting symptoms tend to be vague and non-specific. Therefore, a group of tests was studied to assess their usefulness, either singly or in combination, in predicting neonatal sepsis. Philip and Hewitt [1980] recommended five tests for diagnosing neonatal sepsis and used them as a sepsis screen.

On the other hand, Faden [1976] recommended the use of buffy-coat smear examination for the more accurate diagnosis of neonatal bacteremia. The buffy-coat smear was made according to the technique described by Brooks and associates [1973]. When the blood was centrifuged in a Wintrobe tube, a thin buffy-coat layer forms between the sedimenting r. b. cs. and the plasma.

The present study is a trial to determine the usefulness of buffy-coat smear in the diagnosis of neonatal bacteremia.

NEONATAL INFECTION

General consideration:

The newborn presents an interesting paradox in regard to susceptibility and immunity to infection. It is commonly stated that he is particularly prone to infections and at the same time, demonstrates less ability to localize them, as his reaction to them differs from that of the older child and adult. This is in spite of that, he appears to be immune to few diseases for several months after birth by the passive antibodies derived from the mother [McIntosh, 1984].

Characters of neonatal infections:

1. The etiologic agents include a variety of organisms as bacteria, viruses, fungi, protozoa, chlamydia and mycoplasma.
2. The host resistance mechanism - present in the newborn infant - may be immature and easily overcome^d by invading micro-organisms.
3. The presenting clinical features may be subtle and non-specific and so, diagnosis of infection is often missed or delayed.
4. The routine laboratory tests for diagnosis of infection are unprecise and do not provide the rapid results needed.

5. The causative organisms may be relatively resistant to antibiotics particularly gram negative bacilli and the dose of antibiotics that can be safely used is limited by toxic side effects.

[Lowell and James, 1979].

CHANGES IN THE INCIDENCE AND SPECTRUM OF NEONATAL INFECTION

According to *Bennet et al., [1985]*, over a period of 15 years, the incidence of neonatal septicemia had increased both per 1000 live births and per 100 admitted neonates. The spectrum of causative organisms had changed towards more gram positive organisms and fewer gram negative organisms. In the initial antibiotic treatment, an aminoglycoside and ampicillin derivative will still be needed to give full coverage.

Tollner et al., [1977], stated that knowledge of the commonest causative organism was important for selecting initial antibiotic treatment when septicemia is suspected. They suggested that early treatment is essential and empiric therapy should be instituted before the causative organism is known.

Chow and Leake [1974] recognized anaerobic pathogens with increasing frequency in clinical infections. They demonstrated 23 newborn infants with anaerobic bacteremia during a period of 3½ years, an incidence of 1.8 cases per 1000 live births and 26% of all cases of neonatal bacteremia.

PERINATAL RISK FACTORS AND INFECTION

The majority of infants with septicemia had one or more perinatal risk factors. [Bergqvist et al., 1979].

According to Bada and Andrews, [1979], premature rupture of membranes and its relation to later infection was probably the factor that had received most attention in number of studies.

Prolonged rupture of membranes [>24 hours], increased the risk of septicemia.

Knudsen and Steinrud [1976], found that, the increased risk of infection was also demonstrated in low birth weight and in the presence of neonatal asphyxia.

A properly managed conservative approach is recommended when conditions are unfavourable for induction of labour. [Kappy, 1979] .

Nosocomial infection means any infection in a hospitalized patient, it constitutes a growing problem in neonatal intensive care units today. [Goldmann et al., 1981].

Townsend and Wensel, [1981] reported that 5-25% of infants, cared for in intensive care nurseries, suffered from a significant nosocomial infection. A systemic infection was reported in about 5% of infants. These nosocomial infections contributed significantly to mortality, morbidity, and length of stay in the nursery. [Eriksson et al., 1982].

After initial colonization of the newborn by flora of low pathogenicity, a long stay in the intensive care nursery led to a greater number of colonizations with potentially pathogenic organisms such as staph. aureus and Klebsiella Enterobacter. [Sprunt et al., 1978].

It had been suggested that frequent use of antibiotics in these units led to the selection of such gram negative organisms. [Goldmann et al., 1978].

Gooch and Britt, [1978] reported that neonates who developed systemic infections had always proved to be colonized beforehand with the flora that led to septicemia. Outbreaks of infection, however, had not been related to colonization per se.

According to *Sarff and McCracken [1975]*, development of infection depends not only on the condition of the body, but also on the extent of colonization and the virulence of the colonizing organism.

CAUSATIVE AGENTS

Over the past decades, there had been several shifts in the predominant organisms responsible for neonatal infection and meningitis. [Freedman et al., 1981].

In the 1930s and 1940s, the group A β -hemolytic streptococci were the major organisms isolated from septic newborns, the coliform bacilli primarily *Escherichia coli*, became established as frequent pathogen starting in 1950s.

From 1957 to 1962, nosocomial outbreaks due to penicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* occurred in many nurseries. The predominant agents in 1960s were once again the coliform bacilli together with *Klebsiella* *Enterobacter* group and *Pseudomonas* playing increasingly important roles. Sporadic cases of group B β -hemolytic streptococcal sepsis were reported during this period, but it was not until the 1970s that this organism became the most common pathogen causing neonatal disease. [McCracken and Nelson, 1982].

In addition to aerobic organisms, anaerobic bacteria are increasingly recognised as causative agents of neonatal septicemia. [Chow and Leake, 1974 ; Dunkle et al., 1976].