

## Viral interference cannot be concluded from datasets containing only symptomatic patients

Downloaded from: https://research.chalmers.se, 2024-09-20 11:24 UTC

Citation for the original published paper (version of record):

Norden, R., Lindh, M., Nilsson, S. et al (2021). Viral interference cannot be concluded from datasets containing only symptomatic patients. The Lancet Microbe, 2(1): E9-. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S2666-5247(20)30219-6

N.B. When citing this work, cite the original published paper.

research.chalmers.se offers the possibility of retrieving research publications produced at Chalmers University of Technology. It covers all kind of research output: articles, dissertations, conference papers, reports etc. since 2004. research.chalmers.se is administrated and maintained by Chalmers Library

02

## Viral interference cannot be concluded from datasets containing only symptomatic patients

In the study by Anchi Wu and colleagues,<sup>1</sup> the authors claim that rhinovirus reduces susceptibility to influenza A virus through a mechanism known as viral interference, basing their conclusions on viral detection rates in clinical samples and in-vitro experiments. We agree that viral interference might contribute to a reduction in the number of coinfections. However, this conclusion cannot be drawn from their data. as calculating the expected number of co-infections in a sample of nonrandomly selected patients is not statistically accurate.

To exemplify this point, assume that two viruses, X and Y, both with a prevalence of infection of 2%, were independently present in a population of 10000 individuals, and that all individuals had samples taken on the same day. We then expect to find  $10\,000 \times 0.02 \times 0.02 = 4$  individuals infected with both viruses, and individuals each infected 196 with either X or Y viruses. Further assume that, of 800 individuals with symptoms, 404 carry pathogens other than X or Y. Supplementary figure 1A (appendix) shows contingency tables with the expected number of individuals in the whole population and in the symptomatic population infected with X, Y, X and Y, or neither. Calculation of the expected number of individuals co-infected with X and Y from the contingency table of symptomatic individuals gives an expected number of  $200 \times 200/800=50$ . Such a calculation leads to the conclusion that the observed number (n=4) is lower than the expected number (n=50); the odds ratio would be 0.042.

This approach was applied in the study by Wu and colleagues,<sup>1</sup> in which they collected data only from patients with symptoms, and calculated the expected number of individuals coinfected with rhinovirus and influenza A virus as 989 × 922/13707=67. Based on this calculation, they concluded that the observed number of coinfections (n=12) was significantly lower than the expected number (n=67). As shown in the above example, this conclusion is not justified, and the mistake illustrates that calculating the expected number of co-infections from observations in datasets including only individuals with symptoms is misleading, as pathogens that are truly independent in the population by such a calculation will appear to be negatively associated with each other (ie, occur as a coinfection less often than expected).

To provide another example, we compared data from the study by Wu and colleagues<sup>1</sup> with that of an ongoing study of 8178 samples referred for testing of respiratory pathogens by a multiplex PCR panel at our centre, over the course of 1 year. As shown in supplementary figure 1B and C (appendix), negative associations were observed when the co-infection frequency was compared with the frequency of infection with each virus alone, not only for rhinovirus and influenza A, but also for several virus pairs. Although Wu and colleagues<sup>1</sup> concluded that viral interference was responsible for these negative associations (at least for rhinovirus and influenza A), we consider that these results reflect what is statistically anticipated. Importantly, we notice that these considerations were also missing from another study on the same topic published in 2019.<sup>2</sup>

Our comment on the interpretation of the clinical data in the study by Wu and colleagues<sup>1</sup> does not argue against the existence of viral interference. However, a study published in 2019 showed that influenza A blocked rhinovirus replication, but that rhinovirus did not interfere with influenza A virus replication in vitro.<sup>3</sup> These results contradict the in-vitro data presented by Wu and colleagues,<sup>1</sup> and these opposing conclusions highlight the difficulties in translating experimental observations to a clinical setting.

We declare no competing interests.

Copyright © 2020 The Author(s). Published by Elsevier Ltd. This is an Open Access article under the CC BY-NC-ND 4.0 license.

## Rickard Nordén, \*Magnus Lindh, Staffan Nilsson, Johan Westin magnus.lindh@microbio.gu.se

Department of Infectious Diseases, Institute of Biomedicine, Sahlgrenska Academy, University of Gothenburg, Gothenburg 41346, Sweden (RN, ML, JW); Department of Mathematical Sciences, Chalmers University of Technology, Gothenburg, Sweden (SN)

- Wu A, Mihaylova VT, Landry ML, Foxman EF. Interference between rhinovirus and influenza A virus: a clinical data analysis and experimental infection study. *Lancet Microbe* 2020; 1: e254–62.
- 2 Nickbakhsh S, Mair C, Matthews L, et al. Virus-virus interactions impact the population dynamics of influenza and the common cold. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 2019; **116**: 27142–50.
- 3 Essaidi-Laziosi M, Geiser J, Huang S, Constant S, Kaiser L, Tapparel C. Interferon-dependent and respiratory virusspecific interference in dual infections of airway epithelia. Sci Rep 2020; 10: 10246.

See Online for appendix