

INVESTIGATION OF FOODBORNE DISEASES

Mehrdad Tajkarimi

University of California-Davis

VMPHR 25007

(Materials from Dr. Dean O. Cliver & Maha Hajmeer)

Investigating outbreaks

- ◆ Focus on restaurants
- ◆ Not considering outbreaks dispersed in time or place
- ◆ Will not cover “Investigate Outbreaks” or “Seek Sources” sections (read)

Analyze data

- ◆ Preliminary diagnosis, for later *laboratory* confirmation
- ◆ Tabulate signs and symptoms reported by patients
- ◆ Case definition

Table 3. Frequency of signs and symptoms

Signs & symptoms	Cases	%
Diarrhea	260	88
Abdominal cramps	122	41
Fever	116	39
Nausea	105	35
Headache	68	23
Muscular aches	56	19
Chills	55	19
Vomiting	42	14

Analysis continues

- ◆ Diagnosis implies incubation time(s)
- ◆ Tabulate & graph onset times
- ◆ Time intervals $\leq 1/4$ of incubation period

Time of exposure

- ◆ Common source—common incident
- ◆ Subtract incubation period from median onset
- ◆ May use span of onsets to estimate incubation period

Epidemic curve

- ◆ Count total illnesses
- ◆ Determine median onset

Epidemic curve

- ◆ Count total illnesses: 70
- ◆ Determine median onset

Epidemic curve

- ◆ Count total illnesses: 70
- ◆ Determine median onset:
#35 → a.m. on 10th

Meal attendance-attack rate

- ◆ Day/meal
- ◆ Ate/drank vs did not eat/drink
- ◆ Ill; well; total; attack rate (%)
- ◆ Difference in rates (+35%)
- ◆ Relative risk (1/17 L 6.1)
- ◆ *p* value (1/17 L $<10^{-6}$)

Food-specific attack rates

- ◆ Food/beverage
- ◆ Ate/drank vs did not eat/drink
- ◆ Ill; well; total; attack rate (%)
- ◆ Difference in rates (%)
- ◆ Relative risk
- ◆ *p* value

Food-specific attack rates

<u>Food</u>	<u>Rate diff.</u>	<u>Rel. risk</u>	<u><i>p</i> value</u>
Turkey	+65	9.1	<0.000001
Dressing	+43	2.5	0.000005
Peas	+31	1.8	0.0002
Rolls	+23	1.4	0.006

People missing?

If many of the people who attended the meal cannot be accounted for, or for other reasons, it may be necessary to locate *controls* (well) who match the ill persons according to *selected criteria* and get *food histories* from them. Then, one produces a “Case-control vehicle exposure table”

Case-control exposures

- ◆ Food/beverage
- ◆ Cases (ill) vs. Controls (well)
- ◆ Ate; did not eat; total; %
- ◆ Difference (%)
- ◆ Odds ratio
- ◆ *p* value

Case-control exposures

Food	Diff. in %	Odds ratio	<i>p</i> value
Turkey	+37	30.1	<0.0000001
Dressing	+33	6.3	0.000006
Peas	+31	3.9	0.0002
Rolls	+24	2.7	0.007

Stratified analysis

- ◆ Two (or more) highly suspect foods
- ◆ May be eaten together (turkey & dressing; ice cream on pie)
- ◆ Do *stratified analysis*

Stratified analysis (% ill)

Turkey	Dressing		Totals
	Ate	Not	
Ate	73	75	73
Not	0	8	8
Totals	73	30	

Comparisons

- ◆ Difference:
 $(rate, ate) - (rate, didn't)$
- ◆ Relative risk:
 $(rate, ate) \div (rate, didn't)$
- ◆ Odds ratio (case-control):
$$\frac{[(\# \text{ ate, ill}) \cdot (\# \text{ didn't, well})]}{[(\# \text{ ate, well}) \cdot (\# \text{ didn't, ill})]}$$

No common meal?

- ◆ Different people, different times — same restaurant
- ◆ Foods from retail shops, supermarkets, cooked & eaten at home
- ◆ Do *food preference* comparison

Food preference attack rates

- ◆ Food
- ◆ Always (usually) vs never eat; purchased (or not) within *incubation period*
- ◆ Percent difference in attack rates (*substantial N*)

Food preference attack rates

Food	Eat (% ill)	Never eat (% ill)	Differ- ence
Milk "A"	12.8	20.0	-7.2
Milk "B"	9.6	20.3	-10.7
Cheese "X"	17.7	0.0	+17.7
Cheese "Y"	13.8	15.4	-1.6
Cheese "Z"	14.5	12.2	+2.3

Choices

- ◆ Food preference for long-incubation diseases (e.g., hepatitis A)
- ◆ Common, contaminated meal: *retrospective cohort study* (food-specific attack rates, relative risk)

Choices

- ◆ Waterborne outbreaks, sporadic cases of foodborne disease: case-control studies, odds ratio
- ◆ Statistics: relative risk, odds ratio, chi-square, Fisher's exact test

Team assignments

First practice exercise