

Cystic Fibrosis Newborn Screening in a Portuguese Centre: Are we Complying with European Recommendations?

Rastreio Neonatal de Fibrose Quística num Centro de Referência: Estaremos a Cumprir com as Recomendações Europeias?

Bernardo Camacho ¹, Carolina Constant^{2,3*}, Luísa Pereira^{2,3}, Celeste Barreto^{2,3}

***Autor Correspondente/Corresponding Author:**

Carolina Arez Constant [carolina.constant@chln.min-saude.pt]
Avenida Professor Egas Moniz, 1649-035 Lisboa, Portugal
ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6596-1596>

doi: 10.48687/ljsj.137

Keywords: Cystic Fibrosis/diagnosis; Infant, Newborn; Neonatal Screening; Portugal

Palavras-chave: Fibrose Quística/diagnóstico; Rastreio Neonatal; Recém-Nascido

Dear editor,

It has been nearly 40 years since the first newborn screening (NBS) program for cystic fibrosis (CF) was implemented.¹ In Portugal the screening was introduced in October 2013 as a pilot study, being fully integrated in the national program for early diagnosis in December 2018. It implies a dried blood sample between the third and sixth day of age, where an immunoreactive trypsin (IRT) value is obtained. If IRT is over 65 mg/dL, the level of pancreatitis-associated protein (PAP) is obtained. If PAP level is higher than 1.6 mg/dL, a second dried blood sample is obtained, between the third and fourth weeks of age. If the second IRT level is higher than 50 mg/dL, the infant is CF NBS-positive and is referred to a CF centre for sweat chloride test (SCT) and genetic testing, if deemed adequate.²⁻⁴ CF is diagnosed when, in an infant with suggestive symptoms, or a family history of CF, or a positive NBS for CF, two SCT >

60 mmol/L are obtained and/or two disease-causing CF mutations are detected through DNA analysis.⁵

We retrospectively analysed the data on children with positive NBS for CF assessed at our centre between October 2013 and December 2021, then calculated the rate of false positives, false negatives, the positive predictive value, and sensitivity of the programme, in our population.

During this time, 54 infants were referred from the NBS program. Among these, 22 (40%) were confirmed to have CF through SCT. Two infants were also diagnosed with CF, despite a negative NBS. Patients' characteristics are described in Table 1.

1. Department of Paediatrics, Hospital Central do Funchal, Funchal, Portugal. **2.** Cystic Fibrosis Reference Centre, Pediatric Pulmonology Unit, Department of Paediatrics, Hospital de Santa Maria, Centro Hospitalar Universitário Lisboa Norte, Lisbon, Portugal. **3.** University Clinic of Paediatrics, Faculty of Medicine, Medical Academic Centre of Lisbon, Lisbon, Portugal.

Recebido/Received: 22/11/2022 – **Aceite/Accepted:** 25/11/2022 – **Publicado online/Published online:** 30/12/2022 – **Publicado/Published:** 30/12/2022

© Author(s) (or their employer(s)) and Lusiadas Scientific Journal 2022. Re-use permitted under CC BY-NC. No commercial re-use.

© Autor (es) (ou seu (s) empregador (es)) e Lusiadas Scientific Journal 2022. Reutilização permitida de acordo com CC BY-NC. Nenhuma reutilização comercial.

Table 1. Clinical features and laboratory findings of infants with a positive screening and a CF diagnosis

	Positive screening + CF diagnosis (n=22)
Diagnostic age (day), median (IQR)	32.8 (21.2 - 38)
Age at first evaluation (day), median (IQR)	38.5 (22.7 - 40.2)
Sweat Test (mean, mEq/L) median (IQR)	83.05 (73.75-90)
Pancreatic insufficiency, n (%)	20 (90.9)
Genetic analysis	
At least one <i>F508del</i> mutation, n (%)	20 (90.9)
Homozygous for <i>F508del</i> mutations, n (%)	11 (50)
First evaluation	
Birth weight (gr), median (IQR)	3035 (2455 - 3265)
Steatorrhea, n (%)	16 (72.7)
Insufficient weight gain, n (%)	9 (40.9)
Reluctance to feeding, n (%)	2 (9)
Irritability, n (%)	2 (9)
Respiratory symptoms, n (%)	5 (22.7)
Microbiology	
Age at first sputum sample collection (day), median (IQR)	43.5 (40 - 61.7)
Bacteria identified in first sputum sample, n (%)	14 (63.6)
<i>Pseudomonas aeruginosa</i> , n (%)	3 (13.6)
<i>Escherichia coli</i> , n (%)	6 (27)
<i>Staphylococcus aureus</i> , n (%)	6 (27)

Fourteen infants were male (63%), the mean age at diagnosis was 33 days (min. 11, max. 83) and the mean age at the first evaluation in a CF centre was 38.5 days (min. 17, max. 110). Eleven (50%) infants were homozygous for *F508del/p.Phe508del* mutation and 91% had at least one *F508del/p.Phe508del* mutation. The mean SCT level was 83.05 mmol/L (IQR 73,75 - 90), 91% of the infants were pancreatic insufficient at presentation and 63% had bacterial growth in sputum samples at first evaluation.

The sensitivity of the screening program in our population was 91% and the positive predictive value (PPV) was 40%. The rate of false negatives was 8% and false positives 60%.

The European Cystic Fibrosis Society (ECFS) recommends that NBS programmes should aim for a minimum PPV of 30%, a minimum sensitivity of 95%.⁵ Previous reports showed that countries have different strategies regarding the NBS program, and only 62% of the countries met the recommended PPV and 69% the recommended sensitivity.⁶

In our study, the program showed a sensitivity of 91%. However, these results represent only one of the five Portuguese CF centres. Furthermore, the sample was small, with only 22

infants with CF and 2 infants with a negative screening that were later diagnosed with CF. Both infants had less common *CFTR* mutations (one was homozygous for Y569D|p.Tyr569Asp, the other heterozygous *F508del/p.Phe508del / L206W|p.Leu-206Trp*) and additionally the second one was pancreatic sufficient at diagnosis.

The ECFS also recommends that CF NBS-positive infants should be observed in a CF centre by 35 days after birth, on average, and never more than 58 days.⁵ Our infants were observed for the first time at our centre at 38.5 days of age.

Countries must reflect critically on their NBS programmes, so they can be optimized, and become as efficient as possible. This can only be done through quality monitoring, reassessment, and dialogue between those responsible. This local retrospective assessment demonstrated good program performance locally, however, further studies are needed to verify if the recommendations are met at a national level.

Awards and previous presentations

The following report was presented in the form of an oral communication in the “Jornadas da Sociedade Portuguesa de Pneumologia Pediátrica e Sono” in May 2022.

Responsabilidades Éticas

Conflitos de Interesse: Os autores declaram não possuir conflitos de interesse.

Suporte Financeiro: O presente trabalho não foi suportado por nenhum subsídio o bolsa ou bolsa.

Proveniência e Revisão por Pares: Não comissionado; revisão externa por pares.

Ethical Disclosures

Conflicts of Interest: The authors have no conflicts of interest to declare.

Financial Support: This work has not received any contribution grant or scholarship.

Provenance and Peer Review: Not commissioned; externally peer reviewed.

Contributorship Statement

BC: Bibliographical search, study design, data collection, drafting of the article

CC, CB and LP: Study design, critical reviewing of the content of the article

Declaração de Contribuição

BC: Pesquisa bibliográfica, delineamento do estudo, colheita de dados, redação do artigo

CC, CB e LP: Desenho do estudo, revisão crítica do conteúdo do artigo

References

1. Travert G, Heeley M, Heeley A. History of Newborn Screening for Cystic Fibrosis-The Early Years. *Int J Neonatal Screen.* 2020;6:8. doi: 10.3390/ijns6010008.
2. Marcão A, Barreto C, Pereira L, Vaz LG, Cavaco J, Casimiro A, et al. Cystic Fibrosis Newborn Screening in Portugal: PAP Value in Populations with Stringent Rules for Genetic Studies. *Int J Neonatal Screen.* 2018;4:22. doi: 10.3390/ijns4030022.
3. Nayir Buyuksahin H, Emiralioglu N, Ozsezen B, Ademhan Tural D, Sunman B, Guzelkas I, et al. Cystic fibrosis newborn screening: Five-year experience

from a tertiary care center. *Pediatr Pulmonol.* 2022;57:403-10. doi: 10.1002/ppul.25778.

4. Naehrlich L. The Changing Face of Cystic Fibrosis and Its Implications for Screening. *Int J Neonatal Screen.* 2020;6:54. doi: 10.3390/ijns6030054.
5. Castellani C, Duff AJ, Bell SC, Heijerman HG, Munck A, Ratjen F, et al. ECFS best practice guidelines: the 2018 revision. *J Cyst Fibros.* 2018;17:153-78. doi: 10.1016/j.jcf.2018.02.006.
6. Barben J, Castellani C, Dankert-Roelse J, Gartner S, Kashirskaya N, Linnane B, et al. The expansion and performance of national newborn screening programmes for cystic fibrosis in Europe. *J Cyst Fibros.* 2017;16:207-13. doi: 10.1016/j.jcf.2016.12.012.