

**NEW MEXICO INFLUENZA SURVEILLANCE UPDATE from the Epidemiology and Response Division of the New Mexico Department of Health (NMDOH)** Weekly Report ending December 25, 2004

# Summary of Influenza Activity in New Mexico for Week Ending December 25, 2004:

- Seventeen of the 18 sentinel sites reported a total of 3708 patient visits, of which 0.27% were for an influenza-like illness<sup>1</sup>. The previous week ending December 18 reported 0.35 % influenza-like illness.
- NMDOH received reports of two patients with positive influenza A tests using fluorescent antibody method. There were no reports of positive influenza cultures.
- NMDOH reported the state influenza activity as **"SPORADIC"** to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) (see table below for definitions).

# Laboratory Activity in NM:

- To date this season, there has been one influenza B virus isolate\* identified by culture at NMDOH Scientific Laboratory Division (SLD). After the first report of culture-confirmed influenza for the season, influenza activity reported to the CDC includes results from influenza rapid testing, fluorescent antibody (DFA) methods, or cultures.
- For the week ending December 25, 2004, twelve clinical laboratories reported performing 101 rapid or DFA tests, of which 2(1.98%) were positive for influenza A.
- NMDOH has received reports of 3 (0.57%) positive influenza B tests and 2 (0.38%) positive influenza A tests out of 525 rapid tests performed at 16 clinical laboratories since October 24, 2004.

\*This case was also counted among the rapid test positive results.

### **Influenza-related Pediatric Mortality**

As of the week ending December 18, 2004, no cases of influenza-associated pediatric deaths have been reported to NMDOH or nationally to the CDC.

### Flu Activity in the Region

For the week ending December 18, 2004 (the most recent data available), influenza activity was reported as "local" by Colorado and "sporadic" in 8 states in our region (Arizona, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Texas, Utah and Wyoming). There has been one culture report positive for influenza A (not subtyped yet) and 3 culture reports positive for influenza B in the Mountain region (Arizona, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah and Wyoming).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Influenza-like Activity (ILI) is defined as Fever ( $\geq 100^{\circ}$ F [37.8° C], oral or equivalent) AND cough and/or sore throat in absence of a KNOWN cause other than influenza.

## National Flu Surveillance and Laboratory Activity

For the week ending December 18, 2004, 93 (5.5%) of 1,703 specimens tested for influenza viruses were positive. Of these, 26 were influenza A (H3N2) virus, 60 were influenza A that were not subtyped, and 7 were influenza B viruses. Nationwide 2.2% of patient visits to U.S. sentinel providers were due to influenza-like-illness. One state reported widespread activity, 4 states reported regional activity, 10 states reported local activity, 34 states reported sporadic activity and 1 state did not report nationally. More information on national surveillance can be found at <a href="http://www.cdc.gov/flu/weekly/">http://www.cdc.gov/flu/weekly/</a>.

This information is collected by the Infectious Disease Epidemiology Bureau, Epidemiology Response Division, NMDOH. For questions, please call 505-827-0006. For more information on influenza go to the NMDOH web page: <u>http://www.health.state.nm.us/flu/</u> or the CDC web page: <u>http://www.cdc.gov/ncidod/diseases/flu/fluvirus.htm</u>

Activity Level	ILI activity*/Outbreaks		Laboratory data
No activity	Low	And	No lab confirmed cases <sup>†</sup>
Sporadic	Not increased	And	Isolated lab-confirmed cases
	OR		
	Not increased	And	Lab confirmed outbreak in one institution <sup>‡</sup>
	Increased ILI in 1 region**;		Recent (within the past 3 weeks) lab evidence
	ILI activity in other regions	And	of influenza in region with increased ILI
	is not increased		
	OR		
Local	2 or more institutional		Recent (within the past 3 weeks) lab evidence
	outbreaks (ILI or lab		of influenza in region with the outbreaks; virus
	confirmed) in 1 region; ILI	And	activity is no greater than sporadic in other
	activity in other regions is		regions
	not increased		
Regional	Increased ILI in $\geq 2$ but less	And	Recent (within the past 3 weeks) lab confirmed
	than half of the regions		influenza in the affected regions
(doesn't apply	OR		
to states with $\leq 4$	Institutional outbreaks (ILI		Recent (within the past 3 weeks) lab confirmed
regions)	or lab confirmed) in $\geq 2$ and	And	influenza in the affected regions
	less than half of the regions		
Widespread	Increased ILI and/or		Recent (within the past 3 weeks) lab confirmed
	institutional outbreaks (ILI	And	influenza in the state.
	or lab confirmed) in at least		
	half of the regions		

<sup>\*</sup> ILI activity can be assessed using a variety of data sources including sentinel providers, school/workplace absenteeism, and other syndromic surveillance systems that monitor influenza-like illness.

<sup>‡</sup> Institution includes nursing home, hospital, prison, school, etc.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>†</sup> Lab confirmed case = case confirmed by rapid diagnostic test, antigen detection, culture, or PCR. Care should be given when relying on results of point of care rapid diagnostic test kits during times when influenza is not circulating widely. The sensitivity and specificity of these tests vary and the predicative value positive may be low outside the time of peak influenza activity. Therefore, a state may wish to obtain laboratory confirmation of influenza by testing methods other than point of care rapid tests for reporting the first laboratory confirmed case of influenza of the season.

\*\*Region: population under surveillance in a defined geographical subdivision of a state. A region could be comprised of 1 or more counties and would be based on each state's specific circumstances. Depending on the size of the state, the number of regions could range from 2 to approximately 12. The definition of regions would be left to the state but existing state health districts could be used in many states. Allowing states to define regions would avoid somewhat arbitrary county lines and allow states to make divisions that make sense based on geographic population clusters. Focusing on regions larger than counties would also improve the likelihood that data needed for estimating activity would be available.







