

**Role of CRP as an independent predictor of severity in community acquired pneumonia.**¹Dr Mir Waseem, ²Dr Mir Nadeem, ³Dr Saba Maqbool¹Senior resident Dept of Medicine SKIMS Medical College.² Postgraduate Scholar Dept of Medicine GMC Srinagar.³Junior Resident SKIMS Medical College.**Correspondence Author:** Dr Mir Nadeem, Postgraduate Scholar Dept of Medicine GMC Srinagar, India.**Type of Publication:** Original Research Paper**Conflicts of Interest:** Nil**Introduction**

CAP is commonly defined as an acute infection of the pulmonary parenchyma that is associated with at least some symptoms of acute infection, accompanied by the presence of an acute infiltrate on a chest radiograph or auscultatory findings consistent with pneumonia (such as altered breath sounds and/or localised rales), in a patient not hospitalised or residing in a long-term-care facility for ≥ 14 days before onset of symptoms. Symptoms of acute lower respiratory infection may include several (in most studies, at least 2) of the following: fever or hypothermia, rigors, sweats, new cough with or without sputum production or change in colour of respiratory secretions in a patient with chronic cough, chest discomfort, or the onset of dyspnea. Most patients also have nonspecific symptoms, such as fatigue, myalgias, abdominal pain, anorexia, and headache (1). Pneumonia is the leading cause of death in world and sixth most common cause of death in the United States. From 1979 through 1994, the overall rates of death due to pneumonia and influenza increased by 59% (on the basis of ICD-9 codes on death certificates) in the United States [2]. Much of this increase is due to a greater proportion of persons aged ≥ 65 years; however, age-adjusted rates also increased by 22%, which suggests that other factors may have contributed to a changing epidemiology of pneumonia, including a greater

proportion of the population with underlying medical conditions at increased risk of respiratory infection. Annually, 2–3 million cases of CAP result in ~ 10 million physician visits, 500,000 hospitalisations, and 45,000 deaths in the United States [3, 4]. The incidence of CAP that requires hospitalisation is estimated to be 258 persons per 100,000 population and 962 per 100,000 persons aged ≥ 65 years [4]. Although mortality has ranged from 2% to 30% among hospitalised patients in a variety of studies, the average is $\sim 14\%$ [5]. Mortality is estimated to be $< 1\%$ for patients not hospitalised [5,6]. The incidence of CAP is heavily weighted toward the winter months. Community acquired pneumonia is a common disorder with an incidence of 20 % to 30 % in developing countries compared to 3% to 4% in developed countries [7]. C-reactive protein (CRP) is an acute phase protein produced primarily in the liver and is stimulated by cytokine release, primarily interleukin-6. Small studies suggest that an elevated CRP is relatively nonspecific and is not directly related to severity [8,9]. On the basis of this evidence, the 2004 update of the British Thoracic Society (BTS) guidelines does not recommend admission CRP as a marker of severity. However, the guidelines recommend measurement of CRP as a useful marker of treatment

failure in community-acquired pneumonia[10] A CRP that fails to fall by 50% or more within 4 days of admission is indicative of adverse outcomes such as empyema[11]It is well recognised that elevated concentrations of pro inflammatory cytokines correlate with severity and outcome of sepsis[12,13] and it has been shown that elevated CRP is an independent predictor of mortality in acutely ill patients[14]This has not been specifically examined in community-acquired pneumonia. No previous studies have examined whether a low CRP can exclude severe community-acquired pneumonia.

Aims and objectives

To study role of CRP as an independent predictor of severity in community acquired pneumonia.

Materials and methods

This prospective study was conducted in department of pulmonary and internal medicine skims soura. All patients who attended medical out patient department (opd) and the patients who were admitted with provisional diagnosis of community acquired pneumonia were taken in the study and the total of 60 patients were studied All the eligible patients with diagnosis of CAP who did not require hospitalisation were put on empirical antibiotic therapy and were followed on out basis and were contacted on telephone. Patients admitted directly to internal medicine ward or through emergency were assessed within 4 hours of admission. The initial assessment included detailed history and clinical examination. Routine investigation at admission included complete blood count with ESR ,kidney function test ,liver function test ,LDH ,arterial blood gas analysis , chest roentgenogram, ECG, thoracocentesis with analysis of pleural fluid (ph, total cell count , differential cell count , LDH , amylase ,gram staining and culture). Gram staining and culture of respiratory secretions and blood

culture were performed where ever feasible /indicated . A semi quantitative test for CRP was performed at admission and repeated at day 4. The CRP kit used was manufactured by Randox laboratories ltd.

Inclusion criteria

The main inclusion criteria was presentation to hospital with diagnosis of community acquired pneumonia(CAP) . CAP was defined as per ideo guidelines

Exclusion criteria

Hospital acquired pneumonia ,active thoracic or extra thoracic malignancy ,conditions likely to cause diagnostic confusion or where chest radiographic changes are equivocal (pulmonary fibrosis ,allergic bronchopulmonary aspergillosis) , chronic lung disease (copd, bronchiectasis ,chronic asthma), immunosuppression ,solid organ transplant ,chronic liver disease ,hematological disorders including malignancies ,other acute comorbid illness leading to physiological or metabolic derangements such that pneumonia severity assessment would be inappropriate (eg acute pulmonary embolism ,cystic fibrosis , steroid use)

Statistical Analysis

All data were analyzed using SPSS version 20 (SPSS Inc., Chicago, Ill). Descriptive statistics of demographic and clinical variables are presented as median (interquartile range) unless otherwise stated. The Mann-Whitney U test was used for the comparison of 2 groups of continuous data. Sensitivity, specificity, negative predictive value, positive predictive value, and the area under the receiver operator characteristic (ROC) curve was use for comparison of predictive tests. A 2 x 2 table using the Fisher's exact test was used to compare readmissions before day 4. For all analyses, a 2-tailed P value of <.05 was considered statistically significant. We used multiple logistic regression to compare the outcomes of interest in patients with elevated CRP (> 100 mg/L) compared with

patients with lower CRP levels (100 mg/L).outcome to be seen the primary outcome of interest was 30-day mortality. Secondary outcomes were need for mechanical ventilation and/or inotropic support and development of complicated pneumonia (lung abscess, empyema, or complicated para- pneumonic effusion).

Results

Table 1 Presenting symptoms in studied patients n=60		
Symptoms	Number n1 =	Percentage (%)
Cough with expectoration	60	100
Breathlessness	39	65
Altered sensorium	27	45
Hemoptysis	6	10
Pleuritic chest pain	2	3

Total number of patients was 60 with age of patients ranged from 16 to 80 years with mean age of 48.70 ±17.15 years ,there were 32 females (53%) and 28 males (47%). The youngest patient was 16 yrs old female.Presenting symptoms in studied patients are shown in table 1.

Table 2 clinical examination of patients n=60		
Clinical finding	Number n1=	Percentage (%)
Crepts	54	90
Bronchial breathing	24	40
Pleural rub	12	20

Table 2 clinical examination of patients n=60		
Signs of effusion	10	16
Wheeze	6	10
Tachycardia	30	50
Encephalopathy	27	45
Fever	48	80
Hypotension	18	30
Hepatomegaly	3	5

Clinical examination of patients showed findings on presentation as shown in table 2.

It was observed that CRP levels were significantly increased in 45% of patients . The raised CRP levels and outcome within 30 days of admission are shown in table 3.

Table 3 CRP levels in studied patients and outcome within 30 days of admission n=60			
	CRP > OR = 100 mg/L	CRP <100mg/l	P value
Total	n=27(45%)	n=33(55%)	
Mortality	11(41%)	1(3%)	<0.0001
Ventilation need/inotropic support	11(41%)	1(3%)	<0.0001
Complicated pneumonia	2(7%)	2(7%)	0.85

C reactive protein levels and adverse outcomes within 30 days of admission shown in table4

CRP(mg/l)	n=60	Complicated pneumonia (%)	Invasive ventilation/tonotropic support (%)	Mortality (%)
>or=200	7	15	86	86
150-199	16	6	19	25
100-149	4	0	25	25
<100	28	4	4	4
<50	5	0	0	0
Statistical analysis	Chi-square	0.043	12.979	12.979
	Df	4	4	4
	P value	.839(ns)	<.0001	<.0001

CRP as an independent predictor of severity in cap shown in table 5

ratio(LR-)			
Positive predictive value(ppv)	0.407	0.245	0.593
Negative predictive value(npv)	0.97	0.847	0.995
Odd ratio (or)	22	2.500	497.114
Relative risk (rr)	13.444	2.080	277.602
Test	Chi square tests		
	CHI -SQUARE		P value
Pearson uncorrected	13.199		<0.0001
Yates corrected	10.974		<0.0001
Mantel -haenzel	12.979		<0.0001

	Mortality		
CRP >100 mg/l	No	Yes	Total
Test positive	16	11	27
test negative	32	1	33
Total	48	12	60
	Estimated value	95% confidence interval	
		Lower limit	Upper limit
Prevalence	0.2	0.111901	0.327037
Sensitivity	0.91667	0.597539	0.995635
Specificity	0.666667	0.514865	0.79192
Likelihood ratio(LR+)	2.75	1.78	4.248
Likelihood	0.125	0.019	0.825

Discussion

In the present study the mean age of patients was 48.70±17.15 years and the age range was 16 to 80 yrs with 32 females and 28 males . In our study the most common symptoms of the patients were cough with expectoration (100%) followed by breathlessness(65%),altered sensorium (40%),hemoptysis (10%), and pleuritic chest pain (3%),which was consistent with study carried by Naoyuki Miyashita et al(15) and other study is Shah et al (16). Clinical examination on day 1 revealed 80% patients were febrile ,30% had hypotension ,50% had tachycardia ,crepts were present in

90% patients, 40% had bronchial breathing, 20% pleural rub, 16% had signs of effusion. Same results were found in study by S. Bansai et al (17). In our study group of all patients 20% required invasive ventilation and/or inotropic support, complicated pneumonia developed in 7% of patients, hospital stay was prolonged in 20% of patients. The 30 day mortality was 20%. The mortality rate of CAP varied in different centres from 5.7% in British thoracic society multi centric study (18) to a higher mortality of 21% to 25% in other (19,20). In our study elevated CRP more than or equal to 100mg/l was associated with not only increased 30 day mortality but also a marker of invasive ventilation and/or inotropic support. The high negative predictive value of CRP below 100mg/l for each of these outcomes can reassure clinicians and has potential to aid the initial decision to admit or discharge patient from hospital, the findings were also consistent with studies by Garcia Vazquez E, Martinez JA et al (21). One more observation noted in our study was that seen and as recommended by British thoracic society using repeat measurement of CRP on day 4 patients can be differentiated as high risk or low risk currently, on admission risk scoring is seen but in hospital risk severity scoring is not used, there is no reason why severity assessment should not be used in admitted patients and the finding in our study that patients in whom CRP falls by 50% or more in 4 days have low 30 days mortality, need for mechanical ventilator and/or inotropic support and complicated pneumonia should be of value to clinicians, these findings were consistent with James D. Chalmers et al (22).

Conclusion

1. Low admission CRP levels <100 mg/l effectively excludes severe community acquired pneumonia and can be used as an adjunct to clinical judgement to identify low risk patients who may be safely

discharged. CRP <100 provides high negative predictive value for mortality.

2. In patients admitted to hospital a CRP level that falls by 50% or more in four days indicate a low risk of 30 days mortality, use of mechanical ventilation and/or inotropic support or development of complicated pneumonia.

References

1. John G Bartlett, Scott F Dowell, Lionel A Mandell, Thomas M File, Jr., Daniel M Musher, Michael J Fine Practice Guidelines for the Management of Community-Acquired Pneumonia in Adults *Clinical Infectious Diseases*, Volume 31, Issue 2, 1 August 2000, Pages 347-382,
2. Pinner RW, Teutsch SM, Simonsen L, et al. Trends in infectious diseases mortality in the United States, *JAMA*, 1996, vol. 275 (pg. 189-93)
3. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention Premature deaths, monthly mortality and monthly physician contacts: United States, *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*, 1997, vol. 46 pg. 556
4. Marston BJ, Plouffe JF, File TM, et al. Incidence of community-acquired pneumonia requiring hospitalizations: results of a population-based active surveillance study in Ohio. Community-Based Pneumonia Incidence Study Group, *Arch Intern Med*, 1997, vol. 157 (pg. 1709-18)
5. Fine MJ, Smith MA, Carson CA, et al. Prognosis and outcomes of patients with community-acquired pneumonia, *JAMA*, 1996, vol. 275 (pg. 134-41)
6. Fine MJ, Auble TE, Yealy DM, et al. A prediction rule to identify low-risk patients with community-acquired pneumonia, *N Engl J Med*, 1997, vol. 336 (pg. 243-50)
7. Karetzky, M. 1988. Community-acquired pneumonia. In: Brandstetter RD, Karetzky M, Cunha BA,

- editors. The Pneumonias. New York: Springer-Verlag; 1993: pg 25-48.
8. Smith RP, Lipworth BJ, Cree IA, et al. C-reactive protein. A clinical marker in community-acquired pneumonia. *Chest*. 1995;108(5):1288-1291.
 9. Garcia Vazquez E, Martinez JA, Mensa J, et al. C-reactive protein levels in community-acquired pneumonia. *Eur Respir J*. 2003;21(4): 702-705.
 10. British Thoracic Society. Guidelines for the Management of Community Acquired Pneumonia in Adults—2004 Update. London, UK: British Thoracic Society; 2004.
 11. Hansson LO, Hedlund JU, Ortqvist AB. Sequential changes of inflammatory and nutritional markers in patients with community-acquired pneumonia. *Scand J Clin Lab Invest*. 1997;57:111-118.
 12. Martin C, Saux P, Mege JL, et al. Prognostic values of serum cytokines in septic shock. *Intensive Care Med*. 1994;20:272-277.
 13. Hedlund J. Community-acquired pneumonia requiring hospitalisation. Factors of importance for the short- and long-term prognosis. *Scand J Infect Dis Suppl*. 1995;97:1-60.
 14. Lobo SM, Lobo FR, Bota DP, et al. C-reactive protein levels correlate with mortality and organ failure in critically ill patients. *Chest*. 2003; 123:2043-2049.
 15. Miyashita, Naoyuki et al. Clinical Presentation of Community-Acquired *Chlamydia pneumoniae* Pneumonia in Adults CHEST , Volume 121 , Issue 6 , 1776 - 1781
 16. Shah BA, Singh G, Naik MA, Dhobi GN. Bacteriological and clinical profile of Community acquired pneumonia in hospitalized patients. *Lung India* 2010;27:54-7.
 17. Bansal S, Kashyap S, Pal LS, Goel A. Clinical and Bacteriological profile of community acquired pneumonia in Shimla, Himachal Pradesh. *Indian J Chest Dis Allied Sci* 2004;46:17-22.
 18. Macfarlane J. Community acquired pneumonia. *Br J Dis Chest* 1987;81:116-27.
 19. Ortqvist A, Hedlund J, Grillner L, Jalonen E, Kallings I, Leinonen M, et al. Aetiology, outcome and prognostic factors in community acquired pneumonia requiring hospitalization. *Eur Respir J* 1990;3:1105-13.
 20. Pachon J, Prados MD, Capote F, Cuello JA, Garnacho J, Verano A. Severe community acquired pneumonia: Etiology, prognosis and treatment. *Am Rev Respir Dis* 1990;142:369-73.
 21. Garcia Vazquez E, Martinez JA, Mensa J, et al. C-reactive protein levels in community-acquired pneumonia. *Eur Respir J*. 2003;21(4): 702-70.
 22. C-Reactive Protein Is an Independent Predictor of Severity in Community-acquired Pneumonia Chalmers, James D. et al. The American Journal of Medicine , Volume 121 , Issue 3 , 219 - 225.