

Need of interdisciplinary competence and the role of the Department of Health in the Struggle against Lyme borreliosis

W.O. Pavan

S U M M A R Y

Lyme borreliosis is the most frequent vector-borne disease in North America and Europe. Currently the most important way to face it is prevention with the diffusion of correct information. The principal goals of prevention are to avoid tick bites and to stop the progression of the disease. These results are obtained by a correct behavior and, in case of a tick bite, by proper procedures that can reduce the risk of infection. Patients need to be instructed about the correct tick removal method and about the possible signs and symptoms of the disease. The use of prophylactic antimicrobials following a tick bite is not recommended. Due to the problems of scarce sensitivity, specificity and standardization, serological tests should not be used as screening method.

K E Y W O R D S

Lyme
borreliosis,
prevention

Lyme borreliosis (LB) is the most frequent vector-borne disease in North America and Europe. However, certain confusion still exists, partly due to the scarce circulation of correct information (1, 2, 3, 4). In Italy (5) there is scarce perception of this pathology and the tendency to submit information to the mass-media by "apparent experts" has often furnished incorrect and also risky information.

Due to the impossibility to eliminate the vector or the reservoirs (6, 7), and because no vaccination is available in Europe, currently the most important way to face LB is prevention (8, 9). This implicates the necessity for faultless information that is actively distributed among physicians as well as laymen. What has happened in Italy and in other countries, however, shows that there is a lack of such information, with the result

that people today are familiar with rickettsial diseases or have heard about the so-called "killer tick" but don't know the real facts about the problems associated with LB. Nevertheless we are in an advantageous situation for at least two reasons: 1) LB has not yet reached diffusion equal to that in the USA or in some European countries close to us; 2) we can utilize the experience from the USA and are therefore able to avoid the same mistakes that have been made there.

The activity of spreading correct information is one of the assignments of the Department of Health, but every physician should provide competent advice. Scientifically well-founded information must not be confused with contradictory information and alarming and unserious news needs to be avoided (10, 11, 12).

Prevention is an effective method, when performed

correctly. The principal goals of prevention are to avoid tick bites and to stop the progression of the disease.

The avoidance of tick bites is best obtained by suitable clothing and a correct behavior, during outdoor activities, and with a correct and frequent maintenance of gardens and parks. In case of a tick bite, it is again a proper procedure that can reduce the risk of infection and consequent manifestation of LB (13).

In LB endemic areas, the infection rate of ticks with *Borrelia burgdorferi* is up to 5-20%. Thus it has to be suspected, as a matter of principle, that a tick that is attached to a person in such areas could be infected. It has been shown that the risk of infection increases after 36-48 hours from the beginning of the blood meal of the tick. Accordingly, a prompt removal of the tick notably reduces the risk of a transmission of spirochetes.

All the traditional removal methods, i.e. application of various agents on the tick such as alcohol, gasoline, oil, nail-polish, heat etc. to facilitate its detachment, have to be avoided. These methods induce regurgitation in the tick with consequent increase of the risk. The correct method to remove the tick is to pull it out with fine tweezers, which have to be set on to the skin as close as possible, and then applying an antibiotic locally (14, 15, 16). After that the patient should daily and carefully observe, at least for 30-40 days, the tick bite site for the development of a skin lesion suspicious of LB, the pathognomonic erythema migrans. The patient should also pay attention to extracutaneous manifestations of LB, as well as to manifestations of other infections. Pa-

tients need to be instructed about possible signs and symptoms and the time interval from the tick bite to disease, which may last several months. This observation is crucial in order to be able to initiate an appropriate treatment as early as possible.

Weighing both the risk and the consequences of developing LB, including late manifestations, for persons bitten and the costs and adverse effects of prophylactic antimicrobials, a routine prescription of antibiotics following a tick bite is not recommended (17, 18, 19). During the observation, if it is necessary to use antibiotics for other reasons, they must be effective also on LB. The dosage and time for the treatment must last three weeks. The purpose is to avoid a "decapitated LB", as happened in the past with the syphilis.

Given the problems with sensitivity, specificity and standardization, serological tests should not be used as screening method because, with many false results, they are useless in this setting (20, 21, 22, 23). We must remember that up to 15% of healthy people result positive because of a precedent exposure or due to cross-reactions, so that a serological reactivity alone is not synonymous with disease (24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29); moreover, antibodies to *Borrelia burgdorferi* are not detectable within the early weeks after an infectious tick bite, which means that a negative serological titer after a bite does not exclude the infection. Finally, the diagnosis of LB is mainly clinical, while laboratory is a valid help but not sufficient to make the diagnosis (30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38).

REFERENCES

1. CDC. Wharton M, Chorba TL, Vogt RL, Morse DL, Buehler JW. Lyme disease: case definition for public health surveillance. MMWR 1990; 39 (RR-13): 19-21.
2. Sigal LH. Lyme disease: primum non nocere. J Infect Dis 1995; 171: 423-24.
3. Sigal LH. The Lyme disease controversy. Social and financial costs of misdiagnosis and mismanagement. Arch Intern Med 1996; 156: 1493-1500.
4. Sigal LH. Overdiagnosis and overtreatment of Lyme disease leads to inappropriate Health Service use. Clin Exp Rheumatol 1999; 17: 41.
5. Trevisan G, Pavan WO, Rorai E. Malattia di Lyme segnalazione di un caso a Cavarzere (Venezia). G Ital Dermatol Venereol 1991; 126: 435-37.
6. Jaenson TGT, Fish D, Ginsberg HS, Gray JS, Mather TN, Piesman J. Methods for control of tick vectors of Lyme Borreliosis. Scand J Infect Dis 1991; Suppl. 77: 151-57.
7. Olsén B, Jaenson TGT, Noppa L, Bunikis J, Bergström S. A Lyme borreliosis cycle in seabirds and *Ixodes uriae* ticks. Nature 1993; 362: 340-42.
8. Schutzer SE, Brown T, Holland BK. Reduction of Lyme disease exposure by recognition and avoidance of high-risk areas. Lancet 1997; 349: 1668.
9. McCaulley ME. The costs of Lyme disease. Arch Intern Med 1997; 157: 817.
10. Aronowitz RA. Lyme disease: the social construction of a new disease and its social consequences. Milbank Q 1991; 69: 79-112.
11. Lyme borreliosis. WHO Bulletin OMS 1994; 72, 4: 677-78.
12. Nahass RG, Herman DJ, Hirsh EJ. Lyme disease: public education key to appropriate care. Arch Intern Med 1997; 157: 697.

13. Herrington JE Jr, Campbell GL, Bailey RE, Cartter ML, Adams M, Frazier EL, Damrow TA, Gensheimer KE. Predisposing factors for individuals' Lyme disease prevention practices: Connecticut, Maine and Montana. *Am J Public Health* 1997; 87: 2035-38.
14. Needham GR. Evaluation of five popular methods for tick removal. *Pediatrics* 1985; 75: 997-1002.
15. Kammholz LP. Variation on tick removal. *Pediatrics* 1986; 78: 378-79.
16. Schwartz BS, Goldstein MD. Lyme disease in outdoor workers: risk factors, preventive measures and tick removal methods. *Am J Epidemiol* 1990; 131: 877-85.
17. Agre F, Schwartz R. The value of early treatment of deer tick bites for the prevention of Lyme disease. *Am J Dis Child* 1993; 147: 945-47.
18. Fix AD, Strickland GT, Grant J. Tick bites and Lyme disease in an endemic setting, problematic use of serologic testing and prophylactic antibiotic therapy. *JAMA* 1998; 279: 206-10.
19. Barbour AG. Expert advice and patient expectations, laboratory testing and antibiotics for Lyme disease. *JAMA* 1998; 279: 239-40.
20. Sigal LH. Lyme Disease: testing and treatment. Who should be tested and treated for Lyme disease and how? *Rheum Dis Clin North Am* 1993; 19: 79-93.
21. Ley C, Le C, Olshen EM, Reingold AL. The use of serologic tests for Lyme disease in a prepaid health plan in California. *JAMA* 1994; 271: 460-63.
22. Seltzer EG, Shapiro ED. Misdiagnosis of Lyme disease: when not to order serologic tests. *Pediatr Infect Dis J* 1996; 15: 762-63.
23. Reid CM, Schoen RT, Evans J, Rosenberg JC, Horwitz RI. The consequences of overdiagnosis and overtreatment of Lyme disease: an observational study. *Ann Intern Med* 1998; 128: 354-62.
24. Steere AC, Taylor E, McHugh GL, Logigian EL. The overdiagnosis of Lyme disease. *JAMA* 1993; 269: 1812-16.
25. Lutwick LI. Borrelia seropositive with no symptoms of Lyme disease. *Lancet* 1994; 343: 1442
26. Cooke WD, Bartenhagen NH. Seroreactivity to Borrelia burgdorferi antigens in the absence of Lyme disease. *J Rheumatol* 1994; 21: 126-31.
27. Cunha BA. Overdiagnosing and overtreating Lyme disease. *Emerg Med Clin North Am* 1994; 8: 30-36.
28. Sigal LH, Fish D, Magnarelli LA, Nadelman RB, Wormser GP, Pachner AR, Steere AC, Halperin JJ, Lesser RL, Ilowite NT, Shapiro ED. A Symposium: National Clinical Conference on Lyme disease. *Am J Med* 1995; 98 (suppl. 4A): 1-84.
29. CDC. Recommendations for test performance and interpretation from the Second National Conference on Serologic Diagnosis of Lyme Disease. *MMWR* 1995; 44, 31: 590-91.
30. Rahn DW, Malawista SE. Lyme disease: recommendations for diagnosis and treatment. *Ann Intern Med* 1991; 114: 472-81.
31. Dressler F, Whalen JA, Reinhardt BN, Steere AC. Western blotting in the serodiagnosis of Lyme disease. *J Infect Dis* 1993; 167: 392-400.
32. Dressler F. Serologic testing in the diagnosis of Lyme borreliosis. *Acta Derm APA* 1994; 1/2: 83-8.
33. Weber K, Pfister HW. Clinical management of Lyme borreliosis. *Lancet* 1994; 343: 1017-20.
34. Rahn DW. Lyme disease – where's the bug ? *N Engl J Med* 1994; 330: 282-83.
35. Coyle PK, Luft BJ. Management of Lyme disease. *Curr Opin Infect Dis* 1995; 8: 444-49.
36. Sigal LH. Lyme disease overdiagnosis: causes and cure. *Hosp Pract* 1996; 31: 13-28.
37. Nichol G, Dennis DT, Steere AC, Lightfoot R, Wells G, Shea B, Tugwell P. Test-treatment strategies for patients suspected of having Lyme disease: a cost-effectiveness analysis. *Ann Intern Med* 1998; 128: 37-48.
38. Liegner KB, McCaulley ME, Blaauw AAM, van der Linden S, Tugwell P, Steere AC, Weinstein A. Guidelines for the clinical diagnosis of Lyme disease. *Ann Intern Med* 1998; 129: 422-23.

A U T H O R ' S *Walter Oscar Pavan MD, Emilia-Romagna Region, Lyme Borreliosis*
A D D R E S S *Regional Referral Centre, Department of Health, Corso Baccarini 16, 48018*
Faenza, Italy, e-mail: wopavan@libero.it