



Brief Report

The current state of Clinical Mycology in Eastern and South-Eastern Europe

Cândida Driemeyer ^{1,2}, **Diego R. Falci** ³, **Martin Hoenigl** ⁴,
Oliver A. Cornely ⁵, **Arunaloke Chakrabarti** ⁶, **Jean Pierre Gangneux**⁷,
Esther Segal⁸, **Marika Jürna-Ellam**⁹, **Tadeja Matos**¹⁰, **Jacques F. Meis** ¹¹,
John R. Perfect¹², **Valentina Arsic Arsenijevic**¹³, **Mihai Mares**¹⁴,
Daniela Elena Serban¹⁵ and **Alessandro C. Pasqualotto**^{1,2,*}

¹Graduate Program in Pathology, Federal University of Health Sciences of Porto Alegre (UFCSA), Porto Alegre, Brazil, ²Molecular Biology Laboratory, Santa Casa de Misericórdia de Porto Alegre, Porto Alegre, Brazil, ³School of Medicine, Pontificia Universidade Católica do Rio Grande do Sul, Porto Alegre, Brazil, ⁴Division of Infectious Diseases, Department of Medicine, Medical University of Graz, Graz, Austria; Division of Infectious Diseases and Global Public Health, University of California San Diego, San Diego, CA, USA, ⁵Department I of Internal Medicine, Excellence Center for Medical Mycology (ECMM), University of Cologne, Faculty of Medicine and University Hospital Cologne, Cologne, Germany; Chair Translational Research, University of Cologne, Faculty of Medicine and University Hospital Cologne, Cologne Excellence Cluster on Cellular Stress Responses in Aging-Associated Diseases (CECAD), Cologne, Germany; University of Cologne, Faculty of Medicine and University Hospital Cologne, Clinical Trials Centre Cologne (ZKS Köln), Cologne, Germany; German Centre for Infection Research (DZIF), Partner Site Bonn-Cologne, Cologne, Germany, ⁶Center of Advanced Research in Medical Mycology, WHO Collaborating Center for Reference & Research on Fungi of Medical Importance, National Culture Collection of Pathogenic Fungi; Department of Medical Microbiology, Postgraduate Institute of Medical Education & Research Chandigarh 160012, India, ⁷CHU de Rennes, University of Rennes, INSERM, Irset (Institut de recherche en santé, environnement et travail) - UMR_S 1085, Rennes, France, ⁸Department of Clinical Microbiology and Immunology, Sackler School of Medicine, Tel-Aviv University, ⁹Microbiology Department, Laboratory, Diagnostics Division, North Estonia Medical Centre, Tallinn, Estonia, ¹⁰Institute of Microbiology and Immunology, Faculty of Medicine, University of Ljubljana, Slovenia, ¹¹Department of Medical Microbiology and Infectious Diseases and Centre of Expertise in Mycology Radboudumc/Canisius Wilhelmina Hospital, ECMM Excellence Centre, Nijmegen, The Netherlands, ¹²Division of Infectious Diseases, Department of Medicine, Duke University School of Medicine, Durham, NC, USA, ¹³Faculty of Medicine University of Belgrade, Institute of Microbiology and Immunology, Medical Mycology Reference Laboratory (MMRL), dr Subotica Sreet No 1, 11000 Belgrade, Serbia, ¹⁴Laboratory of Antimicrobial Chemotherapy, Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, "Ion Ionescu de la Brad" University of Life Sciences (IULS), 8 Mihail Sadoveanu Alley, 700489 Iasi, Romania and ¹⁵2nd Clinic of Pediatrics, "Iuliu Hatieganu" University of Medicine and Pharmacy, Emergency Clinical Hospital for Children, Cluj-Napoca, Romania

*To whom correspondence should be addressed. Alessandro C. Pasqualotto, MD, Molecular Biology Laboratory, Av Independencia 155, Santa Casa de Misericórdia de Porto Alegre, 90020-090, Porto Alegre, Brazil. Tel: +55 51 999951614; E-mail: pasqualotto@santacasa.org.br

Received 13 December 2021; Revised 17 February 2022; Accepted 21 February 2022; Editorial Decision 18 February 2022

Abstract

The ability of medical centers in Eastern and South-Eastern Europe to diagnose and treat fungal infections remains unknown. In order to investigate that, here we conducted a cross-sectional online survey, released at both The International Society for Human & Animal Mycology (ISHAM) and European Confederation of

Medical Mycology (ECMM) websites. A total of 31 institutions responded to the questionnaire. Most centers (87.1%, $n = 27$) had access to *Aspergillus* spp. ELISA galactomannan testing as well as to *Cryptococcus* spp. antigen testing (83.9%, $n = 26$). Serological tests were mostly available for *Aspergillus* species (80.6%, $n = 25$); and most institutions reported access to mold-active antifungal drugs (83.9%; $n = 26$), but 5-flucytosine was available to only 29% ($n = 9$) of the participant centers. In conclusion, this study represents the first attempt to document the strengths and limitations of the Eastern and South-Eastern European region for diagnosing and treating fungal diseases.

Lay Summary

Our article is about the availability of diagnostic and treatments tools related to fungal infections in the countries of Eastern and South-Eastern region. Surveys like these are important to understand the gaps and point towards the fungal infections as a global health issue.

Key words: fungal infection, mycology, diagnosis, laboratory, antifungal agents.

Fungal infections still pose a challenge, due to combination of factors including poor awareness of health care workers, limited availability of diagnostic tools, treatment-related toxicities and limited access to antifungal drugs. The epidemiology of fungal infections has been described in many countries around the globe including Eastern and South-Eastern Europe,¹⁻⁶ including epidemiology of rare mold and rare yeast infections,⁷⁻⁹ but knowledge on the availability of antifungal drugs and diagnostic tools in Clinical Mycology in the region remains poorly studied. Moreover, inequities within Europe may result in differences in terms of access to medicines and diagnostic capacity in medical mycology.¹⁰

In order to fill this gap of information, we developed a cross-sectional online survey (www.clinicalsurveys.net, Questback GmbH, Cologne, Germany) that included 29 questions covering different topics in the field of clinical mycology. The survey remained open from June 2019 to May 2020 and was released online at the International Society of Human and Animal Mycology (ISHAM) and the European Confederation of Medical Mycology (ECMM) websites. Institutions were classified according to whether the laboratories potentially met the ECMM criteria for Blue Status, the initial category of the Excellence Centre Initiative (<https://www.ecmm.info/ecmm-excellence-centers>), which are: (i) the ability to identify relevant yeasts and molds; (ii) performance of susceptibility testing on yeasts and molds according to standard procedures; (iii) performance of *Aspergillus* antigen (galactomannan) test; (iv) availability of cryptococcal antigen testing.¹¹ This did not configure an ECMM accreditation, but rather suggested possible candidates for Blue Status, if there was an application from these institutions. Croatia already has an accredited ECMM Excellence Centre Silver since 2018, University Hospital Centre Zagreb Department of Clinical and Molecular Microbiology, and this center did not answer to this survey. The ECMM accreditation process is part of a project which aims to provide expert consultation free of

charge in difficult-to-treat invasive fungal infections clinical cases (ECMM Expert Consultation Service).¹¹

We received 31 answers, from 11 different countries (Figure 1), including Greece ($n = 9$), Croatia ($n = 5$), Russia ($n = 5$), Estonia ($n = 3$), Serbia ($n = 2$), Slovakia ($n = 2$), Czech Republic ($n = 1$), Hungary ($n = 1$), Lithuania ($n = 1$), Romania ($n = 1$) and Slovenia ($n = 1$). Among responders, only Russia and Serbia are not part of the European Union. The survey was answered by laboratory professionals ($n = 12$), academics ($n = 8$), attending physicians ($n = 3$), infectious diseases specialists ($n = 2$), institution directors ($n = 2$) and other professionals who did not fit any of these categories ($n = 3$). One responder did not inform their position. Among responders, 74.2% ($n = 23$) were university hospitals or national institutes of research, 19.4% ($n = 6$) were public hospitals, 6.5% ($n = 2$) were oncology clinics, 3.2% ($n = 1$) were private hospitals and one was an independent laboratory (provides diagnosis to health institutions but does not perform treatment). Multiple selections were allowed in this item.

Regarding performance of microscopy, potassium hydroxide was available for 71.0% ($n = 22$) of institutions, India/China ink for 64.5% ($n = 20$), Giemsa stain for 54.8% ($n = 17$), silver stain for 16.1% ($n = 7$) and calcofluor white for 38.7% ($n = 12$). Fluorescent dyes in general were available for 61.3% ($n = 19$). Automated blood culture monitoring was available for 80.6% ($n = 26$) of institutions.

For fungal species identification, automated identification by VITEK or other commercial methods was available for 67.7% ($n = 21$) of institutions; biochemical tests (classic mycology) were available for 54.0% ($n = 17$), Matrix-Assisted Laser Desorption/Ionization-Time of Flight (MALDI-ToF) for 48.4% ($n = 15$), 32.3% used mounting medium ($n = 12$), and DNA sequencing was accessible for 29.0% ($n = 9$).

Susceptibility testing was available for both yeasts and molds in 67.7% ($n = 21$) of institutions and for yeasts only in 22.6%



Figure 1. Distribution of European institutions participating in this survey. In blue, there are countries from institutions that answered the survey. The marker indicates countries where at least one institution potentially fulfilled the minimum requirements for ECMM Blue Status.

(n = 7). Institutions used E-test strips (77.4%, n = 24), VITEK (41.9%, n = 13), and broth microdilution, following the Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute (CLSI) (35.5%, n = 11) or the European Committee on Antimicrobial Susceptibility Testing (EUCAST) standards (41.9%, n = 13).

Regarding the availability of serological testing, it was mostly available for *Aspergillus* spp. (80.6%, n = 25). This was followed by *Candida* spp. (64.5%, n = 20), *Histoplasma* spp. (16.1%, n = 5) and *Paracoccidioides* spp. (9.7%, n = 3).

Most institutions (87.1%, n = 27) had access to *Aspergillus* spp. ELISA galactomannan testing, and 12.9% (n = 4) had access to the *Aspergillus* spp. lateral flow assay (LFA). *Cryptococcus* spp. latex testing was available for 83.8% (n = 26) of responders; *Cryptococcus* spp. LFA for 3.2% (n = 1), *Histoplasma* spp. antigen detection for 12.9% (n = 4), 1,3- β -Glucan for 51.6% (n = 16) and *Candida* spp. antigen detection for 54.8% (n = 17) of institutions.

Table 1. Molecular tests availability according to the fungal pathogen.

	Molecular tests availability at the institution	Molecular tests performed at outsourced laboratories	Total
<i>Aspergillus</i> spp.	29.9% (n = 9)	16.1% (n = 5)	45.2% (n = 14)
<i>Candida</i> spp.	41.9% (n = 13)	9.7% (n = 3)	51.6% (n = 16)
<i>Pneumocystis</i> spp.	48.4% (n = 15)	3.2% (n = 1)	51.6% (n = 16)
Other fungi	22.6% (n = 7)	6.5% (n = 2)	29.0% (n = 9)

The availability of molecular tests in Eastern and South-Eastern Europe is described in Table 1, and the availability of antifungal drugs is summarized in Table 2.

Therapeutic drug monitoring (TDM) was locally available for itraconazole in 19.4% (n = 6) of institutions, for posaconazole in 32.3% (n = 10), for voriconazole in 29% (n = 9), and for 5-flucytosine in 6.5% (n = 2).

Regarding ECMM requirements for Blue Status, 48.4% (n = 15) of institutions potentially fulfilled the minimum laboratory requirements. These centers were located in Russia (n = 5), Greece (n = 4), Croatia (n = 1), Czech Republic (n = 1), Hungary (n = 1), Serbia (n = 1), Slovakia (n = 1), Slovenia (n = 1).

Considering that antifungal resistance is a growing global health problem,¹² participant institutions were not ready to properly face this challenge, once they reported low access to diagnostic tools, including TDM. The most accessible TDM was to posaconazole, and that was available at only 32.3% (n = 10) of institutions. The limited availability of molecular tests showed in our survey can also pose a problem, resulting in delayed diagnoses.

For instance, 5-flucytosine, considered essential by the World Health Organization, was available to only 29.0% (n = 9) of participant centers, which is alarming considering the high mortality of HIV-associated cryptococcal meningoencephalitis.¹³ Although limited, the region has better availability of 5-flucytosine than other regions of the globe, such as Latin America and Africa (18 and 27%, respectively). At the same time, amphotericin B was available in any of its formulations in 83.9% (n = 26) of institutions in our survey, and in 72% in Latin America and 52.5% in Africa.^{14,15}

Continuous work is necessary in order to reduce health inequities within the European continent and beyond, guaranteeing access to healthcare services in its three dimensions: coverage, affordability and availability of care. According to the World Health Organization, HIV/AIDS is more prevalent in Eastern countries when compared to other European subregions, as well as respiratory underlying conditions, considered important risk factor for fungal infections. For example, of the 136,449 people diagnosed with HIV/AIDS in Europe in 2019, 79.0% were diagnosed in the East (n = 107,842).¹⁶ In some countries, efforts have been made to document the burden of fungal diseases. One example is Hungary, in which the number of difficult to treat and potentially life-threatening mycoses was estimated as at least

Table 2. Availability of antifungal drugs in Eastern and South-Eastern Europe.

Antifungal drug	Availability
Amphotericin B deoxycholate*	41.9% (n = 13)
Amphotericin B lipid complex (ABLC)	35.5% (n = 11)
Liposomal amphotericin B*	54.8% (n = 17)
Other lipid formulations of amphotericin B	16.1% (n = 5)
At least one amphotericin B formulation	83.9% (n = 26)
Anidulafungin	67.7% (n = 21)
Caspofungin	71.0% (n = 22)
Micafungin	64.5% (n = 20)
Fluconazole*	93.5% (n = 29)
Itraconazole*	77.4% (n = 24)
Voriconazole*	87.1% (n = 27)
Posaconazole	64.5% (n = 20)
Isavuconazole	22.6% (n = 7)
Flucytosine*	29.0% (n = 9)
Terbinafine	32.2% (n = 10)

*Part of WHO Model List of Essential Medicines. For Amphotericin B, WHO considers sodium deoxycholate or liposomal complex as an essential medicine.¹⁹

33,000 annually.³ Although Europe is not a main area of endemic mycoses, migration, travel, and increase of immunocompromised population with the advance of oncologic therapies, for example, maintain the burden of invasive fungal diseases.¹⁷

To tackle this problem, an important step would be making relevant fungal infections (such as azole-resistant *Aspergillus spp.* and *Candida auris* infections) notifiable diseases, building more active surveillance systems, monitoring and avoiding possible breakthrough infections.¹⁸ Furthermore, there is a need to improve infection control practices, considering that health-care-associated invasive fungal diseases are also an important cause of morbimortality. Educating health workers facing invasive fungal diseases according to the best evidence available is also an important strategy. Initiatives such as ECMM Expert Consult provide tools to help capacitating and empowering institutions worldwide.¹¹ Improving access to rapid diagnostic methods, such as molecular tests (which were available for only half of institutions), would also strengthen infection control practices in the region.

This survey has some limitations, including the small number of responders. Once the survey was released online through ISHAM and ECMM websites, our data is also restricted to institutions which were aware of these societies. However, this is the first attempt to document the strengths and limitations of the region, regarding the capacity of diagnosis and treatment of fungal infections. Future studies are needed to compare diagnostic capabilities between different regions of Europe to identify areas of highest need. Surveys like these are important to understand the gaps and point towards the fungal infections as a global health issue, identifying the necessity of multidisciplinary actions from stakeholders and policy makers.

Declaration of interest

ACP has received research grants, given paid talks and consulted for Pfizer, Gilead, MSD, United Medical, Teva, and IMMY, not related to this study. DRF has received research support, payment for lectures and consulting fees from United Medical, Gilead, Astellas, MSD, IMMY and Pfizer, not related to this work.

In the last 5 years, DF has received payment for research grants, lectures, advisory boards, and/or travel reimbursements, not related to this study, from Pfizer, GSK, Gilead, MSD and United Medical.

MH has received grants or contracts from NIH, MSD, Gilead, Astellas and Pfizer, not related to this study. MH is also president of the ECMM, unpaid position.

OAC reports grants or contracts from Amplyx, Basilea, BMBF, Cidara, DZIF, EU-DG RTD (101037867), F2G, Gilead, Matinas, MedPace, MSD, Mundipharma, Octapharma, Pfizer, Scynexis; Consulting fees from Amplyx, Biocon, Biosys, Cidara, Da Volterra, Gilead, Matinas, MedPace, Menarini, Molecular Partners, MSG-ERC, Noxxon, Octapharma, PSI, Scynexis, Seres; Honoraria for lectures from Abbott, Al-Jazeera Pharmaceuticals, Astellas, Grupo Biotoscana/United Medical/Knight, Hikma, MedScape, MedUpdate, Merck/MSD, Mylan, Pfizer; Payment for expert testimony from Cidara; Participation on a Data Safety Monitoring Board or Advisory Board from Actelion, Allegra, Cidara, Entasis, IQVIA, Janssen, MedPace, Paratek, PSI, Shionogi; A patent at the German Patent and Trade Mark Office (DE 10 2021 113 007.7); Other interests from DGHO, DGI, ECMM, ISHAM, MSG-ERC, Wiley.

JPG has received payment or honoraria for lectures, presentations, speakers bureaus, manuscript writing or educational events from Gilead and Pfizer, not related to this study.

DES reports grants or contracts from Abbvie, payment or honoraria for lectures, presentations, speakers bureaus, manuscript writing or educational events from Dr. Reddy's, Montavit, Noventure, Nutricia, and Reckitt Benckiser, support for attending meetings from Nestle, not related to this study.

JRP reports advisory panel, consultation or research grants with Pfizer, Scynexis, Cidara, Matinas, Appili, F2G, Astellas, and Minnetronix.

CD, AC, JFM, VAA, ES, MJE, and TM have no conflict of interest to declare.

Author's contributions

CD Writing – Original Draft, Visualization; DRF Writing – Original Draft, Visualization; MH Conceptualization, Methodology, Writing – Review & Editing; OAC Conceptualization, Methodology, Writing – Review & Editing; AC Conceptualization, Methodology, Writing – Review & Editing; JPG Writing – Review & Editing; ES Writing – Review & Editing; MJE Writing – Review & Editing; TM Writing – Review & Editing; JFM Writing – Review & Editing; JRP Writing – Review & Editing; VAA Writing – Review & Editing; MM Writing – Review & Editing; DES Writing – Review and Editing; ACP Writing – Original Draft, Review & Editing, Supervision.

No external funding was received.

References

- Chrdle A, Mallátová N, Vašáková M, Haber J, Denning DW. Burden of serious fungal infections in the Czech Republic. *Mycoses*. 2015; 58: 6–14.
- Klimko N, Kozlova Y, Khostelidi S et al. The burden of serious fungal diseases in Russia. *Mycoses*. 2015; 58: 58–62.
- Sinkó J, Sulyok M, Denning DW. Burden of serious fungal diseases in Hungary. *Mycoses*. 2015; 58: 29–33.

4. Arsenijević VA, Denning DW. Estimated burden of serious fungal diseases in Serbia. *J Fungi*. 2018; 4: 1–13.
5. Osmanov A, Denning DW. Burden of serious fungal infections in Ukraine. *Mycoses*. 2015; 58: 94–100.
6. Mareş M, Moroti-Constantinescu VR, Denning DW. The burden of fungal diseases in Romania. *J Fungi*. 2018; 4: 1–7.
7. Cornely OA, Alastruey-Izquierdo A, Arenz D et al. Global guideline for the diagnosis and management of mucormycosis: an initiative of the European Confederation of Medical Mycology in cooperation with the Mycoses Study Group Education and Research Consortium. *Lancet Infect Dis*. 2019; 19: e405–e421.
8. Hoenigl M, Salmanton-García J, Walsh TJ et al. Global guideline for the diagnosis and management of rare mold infections: an initiative of the European Confederation of Medical Mycology in cooperation with the International Society for Human and Animal Mycology and the American Society for Microbiology. *Lancet Infect Dis*. 2021; 21: e246–e257.
9. Chen SCA, Perfect J, Colombo AL et al. Global guideline for the diagnosis and management of rare yeast infections: an initiative of the ECMM in cooperation with ISHAM and ASM. *Lancet Infect Dis*. 2021; 21: e375–e386.
10. Scholz N. *Addressing Health Inequalities in the European Union*; 2020. doi:10.2861/567478.
11. Koehler P, Denis B, Denning DW et al. European confederation of medical mycology expert consult—An ECMM excellence center initiative. *Mycoses*. 2020; 63: 566–572.
12. Perlin DS, Rautemaa-Richardson R, Alastruey-Izquierdo A. The global problem of antifungal resistance: prevalence, mechanisms, and management. *Lancet Infect Dis*. 2017; 17: e383–e392.
13. Rajasingham R, Smith RM, Park BJ et al. Global burden of disease of HIV-associated cryptococcal meningitis: an updated analysis. *Lancet Infect Dis*. 2017; 17: 873–881.
14. Driemeyer C, Falci DR, Oladele RO et al. The current state of clinical mycology in Africa: a European Confederation of Medical Mycology and International Society for Human and Animal Mycology survey. *The Lancet Microbe*. 2022; 5247: 1–7.
15. Falci DR, Pasqualotto AC. Clinical mycology in Latin America and the Caribbean: a snapshot of diagnostic and therapeutic capabilities. *Mycoses*. 2019; 62: 368–373.
16. World Health Organization EC for DP and C. *HIV/AIDS Surveillance in Europe*. Vol 5. 2020. doi:10.2900/073965.
17. Benedict K, Richardson M, Vallabhaneni S, Jackson BR, Chiller T. Emerging issues, challenges, and changing epidemiology of fungal disease outbreaks. *Lancet Infect Dis*. 2017; 17: e403–e411.
18. Ider BE, Adams J, Morton A, Whitby M, Clements A. Infection control systems in transition: the challenges for post-Soviet Bloc countries. *J Hosp Infect*. 2012; 80: 277–287.
19. OMS. World Health Organization Model List of Essential Medicines. *Mental and Holistic Health: Some International Perspectives*. 2019; 21: 119–134. <https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/325771/WHO-MVP-EMP-IAU-2019.06-eng.pdf?ua=1>.