Diagnosis methods of viral myocarditis; review

Mohammed Mahdi Owiad Al Suliman, Mana Saleh Hadi Al Grad, Thamer Hassan R Alyami, Ghannam Mohammed Ghannam Sharif, Faisal Mohammed Ghannam Sharif, Mohammed Abdullah Ali Qurayshah

Abstract:

In this Review, we describe the etiology, and methods such, CMR, EMB, serological evaluation and direct tissue examination that used for the diagnosis of myocarditis. We conducted a detailed search of several databases (MEDLINE, Evidence-Based Medicine Reviews, and EMBASE) using the following key words: “viral myocarditis; diagnosis; screening; management”. Myocarditis typically arises from infection by a cardiotropic virus complied with by active inflammatory damage of the myocardium. As a disease entity, characterization of myocarditis has been hampered by its heterogeneous clinical demonstrations and varied aetiologies. CMR is an useful complement in establishing the medical diagnosis, although EMB continues to be the existing gold standard. Targeted sample collection directed by CMR and more advanced analysis of biopsy specimens with discovery of viral genomes and immunohistochemical evaluation might result in expanded signs for pursuing EMB. Treatment of myocarditis continues to be largely supportive.

Introduction:

Inning accordance with the existing WHO classification of cardiomyopathies, myocarditis is clinically and pathologically specified as an inflammatory illness of the myocardium identified

by recognized histological, immunological, and immunohistochemical criteria [1], [2].Myocarditis typically results from typical viral infections that have a predilection towards entrance right into the myocardium. Pet designs of viral myocarditis predict a maladaptive post-viral immune-mediated feedback, which brings about ultimate myocardial cell disorder and compromised contractility. Although the pathogenesis is not well defined in people, modern advances in PCR innovation have allowed discovery of enteroviruses, adenoviruses, parvovirus B19, and human herpesvirus 6 in patients with acute myocarditis [3], [4].Several other aetiologies of myocarditis have additionally been implicated, including HIV, Chagas condition, toxins, drugs, and autoimmune phenomena [1], [5].Clinically, myocarditis could show up as acute heart failure, ventricular arrhythmias, or cardiogenic shock, and is associated with substantial morbidity and death [5].Kids identified with acute myocarditis have only a 60% chance of transplantation-free survival at 10 years [6] Myocarditis has been linked as the cause of unexpected cardiac death in young people in up to 12% of cases, and determined as the source of dilated cardiomyopathy in 9% of patients [7].

In medical method, physicians depend on a combination of medical attributes, laboratory analyses, and imaging findings to identify myocarditis. However, a definitive diagnosis counts on endomyocardial biopsy (EMB), a technique supported by the WHO along with clinical statements offered by the AHA and ESC [1], [8].In spite of a clear meaning and the well-established morbidity and death connected with the condition, several patients with medical manifestations of myocarditis do not undergo EMB, the current gold criterion for diagnosis. Taking into consideration these established standards, it is unclear why such diversification exists relating to the evaluation, diagnosis, and treatment of patients with myocarditis.

In this Review, we describe the etiology, and methods such, CMR, EMB, serological evaluation and direct tissue examination that used for the diagnosis of myocarditis.

Methodology:

We conducted a detailed search of several databases (MEDLINE, Evidence-Based Medicine Reviews, and EMBASE) using the following key words: “viral myocarditis; diagnosis; screening; management;”. We limited the search to reports written in English describing studies using human subjects and published up to November 2017.

Discussion:

- **Etiology**

Myocarditis is found after infection of humans with a wide range of viruses (Table 1). RNA infections predominate, with picornaviruses being the most frequently recognized representatives. Coxsackie B viruses are members of this group and in concerning half the situations where the diagnosis was sensibly established myopericarditis was related to infection by these representatives[9].Other picornaviruses such as Coxsackie A, echo and polio are additionally known to trigger myocarditis (Table 1). Just a small number of viruses listed in Table 1 have been separated from the hearts of infected patients; these representatives consist of Coxsackie B, [10] polio, [20] ECHO, [11] and vaccinia. Usually the organization of a particular viral infection with heart problem has been based on serologic research studies, the seclusion or identification of the virus in tissues or fluids other than the heart or pericardial fluid (ie, biopsy samplings, pee, feces, cerebrospinal fluid), or recognition of a characteristic professional picture.

Table 1-Viral Infections Associated With Myocarditis in Humans.

Classification	Virus

RNA core Picornavirust	Coxsackie A+ Coxsackie B ECHO Polio
Orthomyxovirus	Influenza A + B
Paramyxovirus	Rubeola Mumps
Togavirus	Chikunguna Dengue Yellow fever§ Rubella§
Rhabdovirus	Rabies
Arenavirus	Lymphocytic choriomeningitis
DNA core Poxvirus	Variola Vaccinia
Herpesvirus	Varicella-zoster Cytomegalo Epstein-Barr
Adenovirus	Adeno
RNA and DNA cores Unclassified	Hepatitis

- **Diagnostic imaging**

CMR is a beneficial noninvasive imaging modern technology that is specifically useful for patients with myocarditis, by virtue of its ability to spot inflammation, oedema, death, and fibrosis within myocardial tissue [12].A number of imaging sequences exist that can be made use of to differentiate and determine various features related to both acute and chronic myocarditis [13].T2-weighted imaging allows discovery of myocardial oedema and tissue hyperaemia, which are attributes that are made use of as surrogates for myocardial inflammation [14].Contrast imaging with gadolinium enables both detection of very early capillary leakage on the basis of T1-weighted early gadolinium improvement, and accurate medical diagnosis of myocardial necrosis and fibrosis on the basis of late gadolinium enhancement (LGE) [14].LGE is frequently observed in patients with energetic myocarditis in a pattern that stands out from ischaemic myocardial injury. LGE imaging in myocarditis has indicated 2 common patterns of myocardial injury: either an intramural, rimlike pattern involving the septum, or an irregular epicardial distribution involving the side totally free wall of the left ventricle [15]. In a collection of 222

consecutive patients with biopsy-proven myocarditis, the presence of LGE yielded a threat proportion of 8.4 for all-cause mortality and 12.8 for cardiac mortality, independent of signs [16].A research has also revealed that a decrease in the extent of LGE in time is frequently related to an enhancement in LV systolic function in patients with a subepicardial LGE pattern in the LV free wall [15]. By comparison, patients whose intramural septal LGE pattern does not fall back gradually have the tendency to have inadequate end results [15].Although exceptional analysis correlation exists between CMR and EMB in troponin-positive patients without coronary artery disease who present with functions regular with myocarditis, diagnosis is much more tough with LGE in patients with much less inflammation and a prolonged period of symptoms [17].

The ESC placement declaration on diagnosis of myocarditis verifies making use of CMR in scientifically stable patients suspected of having myocarditis before EMB [1].A mix of CMR strategies is advised, including T1-weighted very early gadolinium improvement, LGE, and T2-weighted oedema imaging, which shows, at the tissue level, the existence of oedema, hyperaemia, and irreparable cell injury. This consolidated approach has been described the Lake Louise standards [13].Contemporary CMR techniques made use of to characterize myocardial tissue enable the noninvasive medical diagnosis of myocarditis with high specificity, yet less-than-ideal level of sensitivity. The presence of 2 of the three CMR features listed in the Lake Louise criteria causes a sensitivity of 67%, uniqueness of 91%, positive predictive worth of 91%, and unfavorable predictive value of 69% for the diagnosis of myocarditis [18].The level of sensitivity of CMR for the medical diagnosis of myocarditis is likely to be restricted in patients with moderate myocardial inflammation, owing to inadequate spatial resolution; research studies have revealed that the medical diagnosis is made a lot more regularly by CMR in patients with active myocarditis than in those with borderline myocarditis [17].Various other important

limitations associated with the diagnosis of myocarditis using only CMR is the lack of comprehensive information about the level of inflammation provided by EMB and the failure to recognize particular kinds of myocarditis (viral, bacterial, giant cell, or eosinophilic) that require distinct therapeutic treatment [19].

- **Role of EMB as a diagnostic tool**

EMB, utilizing standardized histopathological (Dallas standards [21] and immunohistochemical diagnostic criteria, is the present gold standard through which a medical diagnosis of myocarditis is made. The Dallas standards define active myocarditis as an inflammatory infiltrate of the myocardium with necrosis and/or deterioration of nearby myocytes not regular of the ischaemic damages associated with coronary artery illness [21].The infiltrates are typically lymphocytic, yet may be neutrophilic or, periodically, eosinophilic, and usually consist of macrophages. 'Borderline myocarditis' is the term used when the inflammatory infiltrate is as well sparse or myocyte injury is not demonstrated [21].The Dallas requirements are restricted, nonetheless, through a high level of interobserver irregularity in pathological interpretation and the lack of ability to detect noncellular inflammatory procedures, and yields diagnostic info in just 10- 20% of patients [2].For that reason, immunohistochemistry with the use of a big panel of monoclonal and polyclonal antibodies is now obligatory to separate the inflammatory elements present and the immunological processes activated [1].According to the WHO definition, active myocarditis is present with immunohistochemical discovery of focal or scattered mononuclear infiltrates (T lymphocytes and macrophages) utilizing a cut-off of > 14 cells per mm2, along with increased expression of HLA class II particles [2].Molecular discovery of viral genomic series in unhealthy myocardium is additionally practical and, when paired with immunohistochemical evaluation, raises the diagnostic accuracy of EMB in addition to supplying an aetiology and offering

prognostic info [22].Whereas the Dallas requirements [21] are not an accurate predictor of bad results, immunohistological proof of inflammatory infiltrates within the myocardium is associated with a raised risk of cardiovascular death and need for heart transplantation. Additionally, when 120 patients with viral myocarditis were prospectively assessed and separated right into two teams on the basis of the absence or existence of enteroviral genomes in EMB examples, death and progression to end-stage cardiomyopathy was significantly better in those with recurring viral genome in the myocardium than in those with no infection detected [23].Significantly, determination of viral genome on repeat EMB was consequently associated with dynamic LV disorder, whereas spontaneous viral clearance was connected with enhancement in systolic function. Information regarding the safety and security of specific therapies can additionally be amassed from information obtained by means of EMB. Detection of details HLA markers on EMB tissue areas combined with the absence of transmittable agents (PCR-negative for viral genome) suggests either primary or postinfectious immune-mediated myocarditis, at which point immunosuppression could be considered [24].

EMB did early in the medical discussion normally generates one of the most diagnostic information. However, EMB appears to be occasionally made use of to make the diagnosis, regardless of time program. In 2007, the AHA/ACC/ESC consensus declaration on the function of EMB in the management of heart disease offered 14 medical situations in which the utility and security of EMB were considered against the threats of executing the procedure [25] A course I recommendation for very early EMB is reserved for patients with swiftly advancing cardiomyopathy refractory to conventional treatment, or unusual cardiomyopathy related to ventricular arrhythmias or conduction disease [25]. However, these referrals were based on application of the Dallas requirements, in which the analysis, prognostic, and healing worth is

limited. The incorporation of immunohistochemical analysis for the detection of swelling, along with viral genome analysis, has enhanced the analysis and prognostic accuracy and efficiency of EMB [24]. Consequently, the 2013 ESC position statement on myocardial illness advocates a much more liberal application of EMB with immunohistochemical and viral genomic evaluation in the examination of patients with suspected myocarditis [1].

- **Serologic Evaluation**

The majority of the viral infections listed in Table 1 were diagnosed by the presentation of at the very least a fourfold increase in specific antibody in paired acute (less than a week) and convalescent (2 weeks or longer) serum specimens. Ordinarily serum antibody is not found up until a few days to a week after the onset of professional condition [26] Originally, IgM antibody exists, getting to peak titers by 2-3 weeks and afterwards declining to undetectable degrees. In contrast, IgG antibody manufacturing peaks later and is the primary immunoglobulin class after the initial month of disease. Characterization of viral antibody manufacturing with respect to the Ig classes is consequently useful in determining the stage of infection.

In the past the frequently used tests for identifying and quantitating virus-specific antibodies depended on the ability of antibodies to bind complement, speed up antigen, inhibit viral interaction with sign cells (eg, hemagglutination-inhibiting antibody [HI], or neutralize infectivity.More lately radioimmunoassays (RIA) and enzyme-linked immunoabsorbant (ELISA) assays have been developed to rapidly identify and quantitate specific antibodies. In some circumstances, IgG is removed from serum by the use of protein An including Staphylococcus aureus, an immunoglobulin-binding reagent, and IgM titers identified by the use of these fast assay techniques [27].The uniqueness of antibodies discovered by different tests differs considerably. This is clearly illustrated in the Coxsackie B virus group, where infection generates

neutralizing and HI antibodies that are kind particular, whereas complement-fixing (CF) antibodies lack this specificity and are of restricted worth in diagnosing these infections.

- **Direct Tissue Examination**

As an option to viral isolation, tissues or fluids may be examined straight for infections or pathognomonic modifications, with making use of light and electro-microscopic strategies. Historically, specific viral diseases, such as cytomegalovirus infection and rabies, were consistently diagnosed by the acknowledgment of characteristic addition bodies in infected cells. Less specific however extremely suggestive modifications are the intranuclear inclusions seen in herpes simplex and varicella zoster viral infection and the intracytoplasmic inclusions seen in vaccinia and smallpox.' Multinucleated giant cells are located in tissues throughout infection with herpes virus, measles virus, myxo-paramyxo viruses, and respiratory syncytial virus.' A searching for of Warthin-Finkeldey giant cells in lymphoid cells, particularly in the appendix and tonsils is specifically symptomatic of measles and could lead to a diagnosis during the prodromal stage of the condition [28].Still other cytologic searchings for during viral infection have been outlined by Craighead.

Viral antigens could likewise be detected in a range of tissues by the use both straight and indirect immunofluorescence methods. These techniques are available for the fast medical diagnosis of viral infection and can be put on both antemortem and postmortem tissues and fluids. However, the dependability of examination results depends on the proper preparation of specimens, the top quality of the reagents utilized, the experience of the detective, and making use of proper devices [29]. Particular troubles develop in using these techniques on myocardial tissue since nonspecific fluorescence is a significant trouble [30].This trouble is even more made complex by the reality that some viruses-for instance, picornaviruses-are not regularly researched

in the laboratory by these methods due to lack of uniqueness and sensitivity of the technique and absence of good reagents [29].In addition, some detectives have located that specific immunofluorescence could not be identified also when high titers of picornaviruses exist in the heart. Consequently, claims that these infections can be identified in human hearts with making use of immunofluorescence needs independent confirmation. When electron microscopy is used in clinical virology, it has a duty in both regular and rapid medical diagnosis. Certain agents can be identified by the particular morphology or by immunologic strategies.

Conclusion:

Myocarditis typically arises from infection by a cardiotropic virus complied with by active inflammatory damage of the myocardium. As a disease entity, characterization of myocarditis has been hampered by its heterogeneous clinical demonstrations and varied aetiologies. CMR is an useful complement in establishing the medical diagnosis, although EMB continues to be the existing gold standard. Targeted sample collection directed by CMR and more advanced analysis of biopsy specimens with discovery of viral genomes and immunohistochemical evaluation might result in expanded signs for pursuing EMB. Treatment of myocarditis continues to be largely supportive.

Reference:

1. Caforio, A. L. et al. Current state of knowledge on aetiology, diagnosis, management, and therapy of myocarditis: a position statement of the European Society of Cardiology Working Group on Myocardial and Pericardial Diseases. Eur. Heart J. 34, 2636–2648 (2013).
2. Richardson, P. et al. Report of the 1995 World Health Organization/International Society and Federation of Cardiology Task Force on the Definition and Classification of Cardiomyopathies. Circulation 93, 841–842 (1996).
3. Breinholt, J. P. et al. Viral epidemiologic shift in inflammatory heart disease: the increasing involvement of parvovirus B19 in the myocardium of pediatric cardiac transplant patients. J. Heart Lung Transplant. 29, 739–746 (2010).
4. Schultz, J. C., Hilliard, A. A., Cooper, L. T. Jr & Rihal, C. S. Diagnosis and treatment of viral myocarditis. Mayo Clin. Proc. 84, 1001–1009 (2009).
5. Magnani, J. W. & Dec, G. W. Myocarditis: current trends in diagnosis and treatment. Circulation 113, 876–890 (2006).
6. Towbin, J. A. et al. Incidence, causes, and outcomes of dilated cardiomyopathy in children. JAMA 296, 1867–1876 (2006).
7. Doolan, A., Langlois, N. & Semsarian, C. Causes of sudden cardiac death in young Australians. Med. J. Aust. 180, 110–112 (2004).
8. Maron, B. J. et al. Contemporary definitions and classification of the cardiomyopathies: an American Heart Association Scientific Statement from the Council on Clinical Cardiology, Heart Failure and Transplantation Committee; Quality of Care and Outcomes Research and Functional Genomics and Translational Biology Interdisciplinary Working Groups; and Council on Epidemiology and Prevention. Circulation 113, 1807–1816 (2006).
9. Gardiner AJS, Short D: Four faces of acute myopericarditis. Br Heart J 1973, 35:433-442.
10. Kibrick S, Benirschke K: Severe generalized disease (encephalohepatomyocarditis) occurring in the newborn period and due to infection with Coxsackievirus, group B. Pediatrics 1958, 22:857-875 .
11. Monif GRG, Lee CW, Hsiung GD: Isolated myocarditis with recovery of ECHO type 9 virus from the myocardium. N Engl J Med 1976, 277:1353-1355.
12. Yilmaz, A. et al. Role of cardiovascular magnetic resonance imaging (CMR) in the diagnosis of acute and chronic myocarditis. Heart Fail. Rev. 18, 747–760 (2013).
13. Friedrich, M. G. et al. Cardiovascular magnetic resonance in myocarditis: A JACC White Paper. J. Am. Coll. Cardiol. 53, 1475–1487 (2009).
14. Abdel-Aty, H. et al. Diagnostic performance of cardiovascular magnetic resonance in patients with suspected acute myocarditis: comparison of different approaches. J. Am. Coll. Cardiol. 45, 1815–1822 (2005).
15. Mahrholdt, H. et al. Presentation, patterns of myocardial damage, and clinical course of viral myocarditis. Circulation 114, 1581–1590 (2006).

16. Grün, S. et al. Long-term follow-up of biopsyproven viral myocarditis: predictors of mortality and incomplete recovery. J. Am. Coll. Cardiol. 59, 1604–1615 (2012).
17. Baccouche, H. et al. Diagnostic synergy of noninvasive cardiovascular magnetic resonance and invasive endomyocardial biopsy in troponinpositive patients without coronary artery disease. Eur. Heart J. 30, 2869–2879 (2009).
18. Gutberlet, M. et al. Suspected chronic myocarditis at cardiac MR: diagnostic accuracy and association with immunohistologically detected inflammation and viral persistence. Radiology 246, 401–409 (2008).
19. Cooper, L. T. et al. The role of endomyocardial biopsy in the management of cardiovascular disease: a scientific statement from the American Heart Association, the American College of Cardiology, and the European Society of Cardiology. Endorsed by the Heart Failure Society of America and the Heart Failure Association of the European Society of Cardiology. J. Am. Coll. Cardiol. 50, 1914–1931 (2007).
20. Jungeblut CW, Edwards DE: Isolation of poliomyelitis virus from the heart in fatal cases. Am J Clin Pathol 1951, 21:601-623.
21. Aretz, H. T. et al. Myocarditis. A histopathologic definition and classification. Am. J. Cardiovasc. Pathol. 1, 3–14 (1987).
22. Dennert, R., Crijns, H. J. & Heymans, S. Acute viral myocarditis. Eur. Heart J. 29, 2073–2082 (2008).
23. Why, H. J. et al. Clinical and prognostic significance of detection of enteroviral RNA in the myocardium of patients with myocarditis or dilated cardiomyopathy. Circulation 89, 2582– 2589 (1994).
24. Leone, O. et al. 2011 consensus statement on endomyocardial biopsy from the Association for European Cardiovascular Pathology and the Society for Cardiovascular Pathology. Cardiovasc. Pathol. 21, 245–274 (2012).
25. Cooper, L. T. et al. The role of endomyocardial biopsy in the management of cardiovascular disease: a scientific statement from the American Heart Association, the American College of Cardiology, and the European Society of Cardiology. Endorsed by the Heart Failure Society of America and the Heart Failure Association of the European Society of Cardiology. J. Am. Coll. Cardiol. 50, 1914–1931 (2007).
26. Lennette EH, Spaulding EH, Traunt JP (eds): Manual of Clinical Microbiology 2nd edition. Washington, DC, American Society for Microbiology, 1974
27. Lennette DA, Specter S, Thompson KD (eds): Diagnosis of Viral Infections: The Role of the Clinical Laboratory. Baltimore, University Park Press, 1979
28. Roberts GBS, Bain AD: The pathology of measles. J Pathol Bacteriol 1958, 76:111-118
29. Lyerla HC: Diagnostic applications of immunofluorescence tests in the virology laboratory, Diagnosis of Viral Infection: The Role of the Clinical Laboratory. Edited by DA Lennette, S Specter, KD Thompson. Baltimore, University Park Press, 1979, pp 103-113

30. Morgante 0, Ambrosie EP, Haraphongse M, Lam RP, Fraser RS: Conjugation of Coxsackievirus types Bl-B6 immunoglobulins with fluorescein isothiocyanate by a "reversed" dialysis method. J Infect Dis 1978, 137:802-809