

# Microbiological Profile of Vaginosis among Women of Reproductive Age Group Attending a Tertiary Care Hospital

RENU MATHEW, SUDHAKSHINA.R, M.KALYANI, S.JAYAKUMAR, BINESH LAL, SHAMEEM BANU

## ABSTRACT

**Background and Objective:** Although Nugent's criterion is considered as the gold standard, routinely a combination of various methods is used for the diagnosis of bacterial vaginosis. In the present study, we compared the culture, Spiegel's criteria and Amsel's criteria with the Nugent's method for the diagnosis of bacterial vaginosis.

**Materials and Methods:** Five hundred and twenty seven women who attended the Government Maternity Hospital and a tertiary care centre in south India for antenatal care or for any other complaint formed the study population. The diagnosis of bacterial vaginosis was done by culture and Amsel's, Nugent's and Spiegel's criteriae. The positive predictive value, the negative predictive value and the sensitivity and specificity of these methods in comparison with Nugent's criteria, considering it as the gold standard, were calculated. The statistical analysis

was done by using the Chi Square test or the Fisher's exact test as was appropriate.

**Results:** In comparison with Nugent's criteria, the positive predictive value, the negative predictive value and the sensitivity and specificity of Amsel's criteria were found to be 80.4%, 94.8%, 78% and 95.6% and those of Spiegel's criteria were found to be 77.5%, 100%, 100% and 93.2%. The culture was 51% sensitive and 88.7% specific, the positive predictive value was 85.5% and the negative predictive value was 58%. We diagnosed 100 (19%) cases of bacterial vaginosis by Nugent's method, 129 (24%) cases by Spiegel's method, 97 (18%) cases by Amsel's criteria and by 88 (16.7%) cases by culture.

**Conclusion:** Amsel's and Spiegel's criteriae were comparable with Nugent's criteria for the diagnosis of bacterial vaginosis. Culture was the least sensitive method for the diagnosis of bacterial vaginosis.

**Key Words:** Amsel's criteria, Bacterial vaginosis, Methods of diagnosis, Nugent's criteria, Spiegel's criteria

## KEY MESSAGE

- Amsel's and Spiegel's criteriae were comparable with Nugent's criteria for the diagnosis of bacterial vaginosis.
- Culture was the least sensitive method for the diagnosis of bacterial vaginosis.

## INTRODUCTION

Bacterial vaginosis is a common clinical condition in women of the reproductive age group [1]. It represents a unique and complex change in the flora of the vagina, which is characterized by a reduction in the prevalence and the numbers of lactobacilli and an increase in the concentration of *Gardnerella vaginalis* and the resident anaerobic bacteria [1]. Most of the women are asymptomatic, but some women with bacterial vaginosis have a foul smelling, thin, homogeneous, frothy, vaginal discharge [1],[2]. In addition to being a nuisance infection, bacterial vaginosis can lead into a variety of obstetric and gynaecological complications such as preterm birth and pelvic inflammatory disease (PID) [1],[2]. As it is just an overgrowth of the normal flora of the vagina without inflammation, there is no single best method for the diagnosis of bacterial vaginosis [1],[2]. Most often, multiple criteriae are used for the diagnosis of bacterial vaginosis. One of the methods of diagnosis is the Amsel's composite criteria which includes clinical diagnosis and a few simple laboratory tests [3].

Bacterial vaginosis can also be diagnosed by Spiegel's and Nugent's criteriae [4]. Both the criteriae are based on the evaluation

of the normal flora in gram stained smears of vaginal discharge. In the present study, we compared the culture, Amsel's criteria and Spiegel's criteria with Nugent's criteria, while considering it as gold standard for diagnosis of bacterial vaginosis [5],[6].

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

Five hundred and twenty seven women who attended two hospitals in south India for antenatal care and the insertion or the removal of an intrauterine contraceptive device, with complaints of discharge, abdominal pain or any other complaint formed the study population. The study had the approval of the Institutional Ethics Committee.

Married women in the age group of 21–35 years and women with or without vaginal discharge complaints were included. Women who were menstruating at the time of the specimen collection and women who were on medication for any bacterial, fungal, parasitic or viral infections for up to one month prior to the specimen collection were excluded. A detailed clinical history of each woman was taken and their vaginal swabs were collected. The vaginal swabs were used for gram staining, for the determination of the pH of the vagina,

Whiff's test and culture. The diagnosis of bacterial vaginosis was done by Nugent's criteria, Amsel's criteria, Spiegel's criteria and by culture. The parameters that were necessary to decide the efficacy of the diagnostic tests, namely the positive predictive value, the negative predictive value and the sensitivity and specificity were calculated in comparison with Nugent's criteria, considering it as gold standard. The statistical analysis was done by using the Chi Square test or the Fisher's exact test as was appropriate.

### Diagnosis by Amsel's Criteria

Amsel's composite criteria includes a homogeneous vaginal discharge, pH of the vagina > 4.5, the presence of clue cells in the gram stained vaginal discharge smears and a positive Whiff's test. According to Amsel, if 3 of the 4 criteriae were positive, the patient was considered to have bacterial vaginosis [3].

**Vaginal pH determination:** Vaginal secretions or discharges were collected from the lateral vaginal walls with a cotton swab and they were then transferred onto strips of pH paper (Qualigens Fine Chemicals, India) and were compared with a standardized colourimetric reference chart to estimate the actual pH [4,7].

**Whiff's test:** A drop of vaginal discharge was mixed with a drop of 10% potassium hydroxide which was taken on a slide. A fishy smell indicated a positive test [8].

**Clue cells:** The vaginal discharge was smeared on clean glass slides, air dried, heat fixed and stained by Gram's Method by using an acetone alcohol (1:1) mixture as a decolouriser and dilute Carbol Fuchsin as the counter stain. The vaginal epithelial cells were completely covered by gram variable coccobacilli, so that their edges which normally had a sharply defined cell border, became indistinct or stippled and were considered as clue cells [9] [Table/Fig-1].

### Diagnosis by Culture

The vaginal swabs were inoculated on appropriate culture media and they were incubated at 37°C for 24 to 48 hours. For the isolation of aerobes and facultative anaerobes, Columbia blood agar and Mac Conkey's agar were used [10]. For the isolation of *G. vaginalis*, Columbia human blood bilayer agar with Tween 80 and a *G. vaginalis* selective supplement was used [11]. These plates were incubated in a candle jar with a piece of wet, sterile cotton placed in it to provide a humid environment. For anaerobes, Columbia laked human blood agar with a neomycin supplement was used [12]. These plates were incubated in an *Anaero Hi Gas Pack*™ anaerobic jar (Hi Media Laboratories, Pvt. Ltd., Mumbai, India). Aerobes, facultative anaerobes and obligate anaerobes were

identified by their colony morphologies, gram staining and standard biochemical reactions [10, 12]. All the media, reagents and discs were obtained from Hi Media Laboratories, Pvt. Ltd., Mumbai. Those women in whom the culture showed a predominant growth of *G. vaginalis* or an anaerobe or both were considered as positive for bacterial vaginosis by culture [2].

### Diagnosis by Nugent's Criteria

Each bacterial morphotype was quantitated under an oil immersion objective (1000 ×) by using the following scheme: 1+, <1 per field; 2+, 1 to 5 per field; 3+, 6 to 30 per field and 4+, > 30 per field. The large, gram-positive rods were considered as lactobacillus morphotypes; the small, gram-negative to gram-variable rods were considered as *G. vaginalis* and the *Bacteroides* spp. morphotypes and the curved gram-variable rods were considered as the *Mobiluncus* spp. morphotypes. The scoring was done as shown in [Table/ Fig-2]. These scores were added up to yield a final score of 0 to 7 or more. The criterion for bacterial vaginosis was a score of 7 or higher; a score of 4 to 6 was considered as intermediate, and a score of 0 to 3 was considered as normal [3],[4],[5].

### Diagnosis by Spiegel's Criteria

When the gram staining showed predominance (3 to 4+) of the lactobacillus morphotype with or without the *Gardnerella* morphotype, it was interpreted as normal. When the gram staining showed a mixed flora which consisted of gram-positive, gram negative, or gram-variable bacteria and when the lactobacillus morphotype was decreased or absent (0 to 2+), the gram stain was interpreted as consistent with bacterial vaginosis [4].

Methods of diagnosis	Results	Diagnosis of bacterial vaginosis by Nugent's criteria			P value
		Nugent's score > 7 n = 100	Nugent's score (0-6) n = 427	Total n = 527	
Amsel's criteria	Bacterial vaginosis	78	19	97	< 0.01
	Normal	22	408	430	
Spiegel's criteria	Bacterial vaginosis	100	29	129	< 0.01
	Normal	0	398	398	
Culture	Bacterial Vaginosis	51	37	88	< 0.01
	Normal	49	290	339	

[Table/Fig-2]: Comparison of diagnosis of bacterial vaginosis by culture, Amsel's and Spiegel's criteria with the gold standard Nugent's criteria


*Score	lactobacillus morphotypes	G vaginalis and Bacteroides spp. morphotypes	Curved gram variable rods
0	4+	0	0
1	3+	1+	1+ or 2+
2	2+	2+	3+ or 4+
3	1+	3+	
4	0	4+	

[Table/Fig-1]: Nugent's method of diagnosis of bacterial vaginosis

\*For each smear whatever the organism and their numbers seen scores were given. These scores were added up to yield a final score of 0 to 7 or more. The criterion for bacterial vaginosis was a score of 7 or higher; a score of 4 to 6 was considered intermediate, and a score of 0 to 3 was considered normal

## RESULTS

The results of the diagnosis of bacterial vaginosis which was done by Amsel's criteria, culture, Nugent's criteria and Spiegel's criteria are shown in [Table/Fig-3]. We diagnosed 100 (19%) cases of bacterial vaginosis by Nugent's method, 129 (24%) cases by Spiegel's method, 97 (18%) cases by Amsel's criteria and 88 (16.7%) cases by culture. In comparison with Nugent's criteria, the positive predictive value, the negative predictive value, and the sensitivity and specificity of Amsel's criteria were found to be 80.4%, 94.8%, 78% and 95.6% and those of Spiegel's criteria were found to be 77.5%, 100%, 100% and 93.2%. The culture was 51% sensitive and 88.7% specific, the positive predictive value was 85.5% and the negative predictive value was 58%. The statistical analysis showed that all the 4 methods could be used as a means of diagnosis of bacterial vaginosis ( $p < 0.01$ )



**[Table/Fig-3]:** Photograph of gram stained smear of vaginal discharge showing clue cells

## DISCUSSION

Here, we conducted a study on 100 cases of bacterial vaginosis which were diagnosed by the gold standard method, Nugent's criteria [5],[6]. It classifies gram stained vaginal smears into normal, intermediate and bacterial vaginosis, based on the gram stain scoring system. The standardized score had an improved inter center reliability as compared to the Spiegel's criteria which divided the gram stained vaginal smears into only 2 categories, normal or bacterial vaginosis [4],[5],[6]. In a previous study where women with intermediate flora were followed up to 3 months, some of them developed bacterial vaginosis, some continued to have intermediate vaginal flora and some reverted to the normal flora patterns [13]. So, it is evident that women with intermediate flora must be considered separately. Hence, the Spiegel's criteria which divides women into only 2 categories, bacterial vaginosis and normal, is not as popular as Nugent's method. There are many studies which have tried to formulate better the gram stain scoring systems, but they are not as popular as the Nugent's method of diagnosis of bacterial vaginosis [14],[15].

Previous studies have shown that the diagnosis of bacterial vaginosis by Amsel's criteria was less sensitive than the gram stain interpretation [3],[16]. This low sensitivity may be because many cases of bacterial vaginosis are asymptomatic. In the present study, Amsel's method was found to be 78% sensitive and 95.6% specific as compared to Nugent's method. The diagnosis by Amsel's criteria requires a minimum of 3 to 5 vaginal swabs from each patient [3],[16]. It was observed that routinely, only a single swab was sent to the laboratory to rule out bacterial vaginosis in the hospitals where the study was carried out. This might be the reason why the diagnosis of bacterial vaginosis by Amsel's criteria was unpopular in these places. But Amsel's method is very popular as a means of diagnosis of bacterial vaginosis as has been reported in every research paper on bacterial vaginosis [3],[4],[6].

Culture is the gold standard method for the diagnosis of most of the bacterial diseases; however, culture cannot become the gold standard for the diagnosis of bacterial vaginosis, as the organisms which are involved in bacterial vaginosis cannot be isolated in the laboratory easily and as normal women also have this flora in their vagina in small numbers.

The rate of bacterial vaginosis, when it was diagnosed by Nugent's scoring system, was 19%. Indian studies which were conducted on the general population have shown a similar prevalence [2],[17].

Hospital based studies tend to over report the cases of bacterial vaginosis, as they invariably collect vaginal swabs from women with a vaginal discharge. Even if this was a hospital based study, it simulated the general population due to its large sample size. Our study population consisted of women who attended these hospitals for a routine antenatal check up or for some other routine problems, irrespective of whether they had an abnormal discharge or not. Most of the women were asymptomatic or they had not noticed the abnormal discharge or the foul smell. This might be the reason why under routine circumstances, bacterial vaginosis goes undiagnosed [18],[19].

## CONCLUSION

Amsel's and Spiegel's criteria were comparable with Nugent's criteria for the diagnosis of bacterial vaginosis. Culture was the least sensitive method for the diagnosis of bacterial vaginosis.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors are grateful to Manipal University for providing the facilities for performing the study. We are grateful to the clinicians who were working in the obstetrics and the gynaecology departments of the hospitals which were under study, for helping with sample collection. We are also grateful to the statistician, Mr. Shashidhar Kotian, Associate Professor, Department of Community Medicine, Kasturba Medical College, Mangalore, Manipal University for helping us with the statistics.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Sobel JD. Bacterial vaginosis. *Annu Rev Med* 2000;51:349-56.
- [2] Rao PS, Devi S, Shriyan A, Rajaram M, Jagdishchandra K. Diagnosis of bacterial vaginosis in a rural set up: comparison of the clinical algorithm, smear scoring and culture by using a semiquantitative technique. *Indian J Med Microbiol* 2004;22(1):47-50.
- [3] Dadhwal V, Hariprasad R, Mittal S, Kapil A. Prevalence of bacterial vaginosis in pregnant women and the predictive value of clinical diagnosis. *Arch Gynecol Obstet* 2009, [Epub ahead of print]
- [4] Honest H, Bachmann LM, Knox EM, Gupta JK, Kleijnen J, Khan KS. The accuracy of various tests for bacterial vaginosis in predicting preterm birth: a systematic review. *BJOG*. 2004;111(5):409-22.
- [5] Mohanty S, Sood S, Kapil A, Mittal S. Interobserver variation in the interpretation of the Nugent's scoring method for the diagnosis of bacterial vaginosis. *Indian J Med Res* 2010;131:88-91.
- [6] Demba E, Morison L, Maartem Schim VDL, et al. Bacterial vaginosis, the vaginal flora patterns and the vaginal hygiene practices in patients who presented with the vaginal discharge syndrome in Gambia, West Africa. *BMC Infect Dis* 2005;5:12-24.
- [7] Ferris DG, Francis SL, Dickman ED, Miler-Miles K, Waller JL, McClendon N. Variability of vaginal pH determination by patients and clinicians. *J Am Board Fam Med*. 2006; 19:368-73.
- [8] Cohrssen A, Anderson M, Merrill A, McKee D. Reliability of the Whiff's test in clinical practice. *J Am Board Fam Pract*. 2005;18:561-2.
- [9] Silonie S. Clue cell. *Indian J Dermatol Venerol Leprol*. 2006; 72: 392-93.
- [10] Collee JG, Miles RS. Tests for the identification of bacteria. In Mackie and McCartney Practical Medical Microbiology, 13th ed. Collee JG, Fraser AG, Duguid JP, Marmion BP (eds) Edinburgh: Churchill Livingstone 1989; 141-60.
- [11] Betty AF, Daniel FS, Alice SW. Non branching catalase negative, gram positive bacilli. In Bailey and Scott's Diagnostic Microbiology, 12th ed. Betty AF, Daniel FS, Alice SW (eds) St. Louis, Missouri: Mosby Elsevier. 2007; 305-06.
- [12] Betty AF, Daniel FS, Alice SW. Laboratory considerations. In Bailey and Scott's Diagnostic Microbiology, 12th ed. Betty AF, Daniel FS, Alice SW (eds) St. Louis, Missouri: Morby Elsevier 2007; 463-77.
- [13] Hillier SL, Krohn MA, Nugent RP Gibbs RS. Characteristics of three vaginal flora patterns which were assessed by gram staining among pregnant women. *Am J Obstet Gynecol* 1992;166:938-44.
- [14] Ison CA, Hay PE. Validation of a simplified grading of gram stained vaginal smears for use in genitourinary medicine clinics. *Sex Transm Infect* 2002;78:413-15.

- [15] Verhelst R, Verstraelen H, Claeys G, Verschraegen G, Van Simaey L, De Ganck C *et al.* Comparison between gram staining and culture for the characterization of the vaginal microflora: Definition of a distinct grade that resembles the grade I microflora and a revised categorization of the grade I microflora. *BMC Microbiol* 2005;5:61–72.
- [16] Beverly ES, Hua YC, Qiong JW, Zariffard MR, Mardge HC, Gregory TS. Utility of Amsel's Criteria, Nugent's Score, and quantitative PCR for *Gardnerella vaginalis*, *Mycoplasma hominis*, and *Lactobacillus* spp. for the diagnosis of bacterial vaginosis in human immunodeficiency virus-infected women. *J Clin Microbiol* 2005;43:4607–12.
- [17] Madhivanan P, Krupp K, Chandrasekaran V, Karat C, Arun A, Cohen CR, *et al.* Prevalence and correlates of bacterial vaginosis among young women of the reproductive age group in Mysore, India. *Indian J Med Microbiol* 2008;26:132–7.
- [18] Purwar M, Agarwal V, Bhagat B. Bacterial vaginosis in early pregnancy and adverse pregnancy outcomes. *J Obstet Gynecol Res* 2001;27:175–81.
- [19] Lin KW, LoBrano MB. Screening for bacterial vaginosis in pregnancy to prevent preterm deliveries. *Am Fam Physician* 2009;79:697–68.

**AUTHOR(S):**

1. Dr. Renu Mathew
2. Ms. Sudhakshina R
3. Dr. M.Kalyani
4. Dr. S.Jayakumar
5. Dr. Binesh Lal
6. Dr. Shameem Banu

**PARTICULARS OF CONTRIBUTORS:**

1. MD, Professor of Microbiology  
Saveetha Medical College & Hospital,  
Saveetha University, Saveetha Nagar,  
Thandalam, Chennai - 602 105  
Tamilnadu, India.
2. MSc (Medical Microbiology)  
Saveetha Medical College,  
Saveetha University, Saveetha Nagar,  
Thandalam, Chennai - 602 105  
Tamilnadu, India.
3. MD, Professor of Microbiology  
Saveetha Medical College & Hospital,  
Saveetha University, Saveetha Nagar,  
Thandalam, Chennai - 602 105  
Tamilnadu, India.
4. MD, Associate Professor of Microbiology  
Saveetha Medical College & Hospital,  
Saveetha University, Saveetha Nagar,  
Thandalam, Chennai - 602 105  
Tamilnadu, India.

5. MD, Assistant Professor of Microbiology,  
Saveetha Medical College & Hospital,  
Saveetha University, Saveetha Nagar,  
Thandalam, Chennai - 602 105  
Tamilnadu, India.
6. MD, Professor & Head of Microbiology,  
Saveetha Medical College & Hospital,  
Saveetha University, Saveetha Nagar,  
Thandalam, Chennai – 602 105  
Tamilnadu, India.

**PLACE OF STUDY:**

Saveetha Medical College & Hospital,  
Saveetha University, Saveetha Nagar,  
Thandalam, Chennai - 602 105, Tamilnadu, India

**NAME, ADDRESS, TELEPHONE, E-MAIL ID OF THE CORRESPONDING AUTHOR:**

Dr. Renu Mathew, Professor of Microbiology,  
Saveetha Medical College & Hospital,  
Saveetha University, Saveetha Nagar,  
Thandalam, Chennai – 602 105  
Tamilnadu, India  
Mobile no: 9841101062 / Land line: 044-49522213  
Fax: 044-26811999  
Email: renumathews@yahoo.com

**DECLARATION ON COMPETING INTERESTS:**

No competing Interests.

Date of Submission: Jul 04, 2011  
Date of peer review: Aug 18, 2011  
Date of acceptance: Sep 10, 2011  
Date of Publishing: Dec 25, 2011