regions (e.g., popliteal, inguinal, epitrochlear, axillary, multiple cervical regions), with notation of the location, size (normal, <1 cm), presence or absence of tenderness, and consistency (soft, firm, or shotty) and of whether the nodes are matted (i.e., connected and moving together). Of note, palpable epitrochlear nodes are always pathologic. Of patients presenting with lymphadenopathy, 75% have localized findings, and the remaining 25% have generalized lymphadenopathy (i.e., that involving more than one anatomic region). Localized lymphadenopathy in the head and neck region is found in 55% of patients, inguinal lymphadenopathy in 14%, and axillary lymphadenopathy in 5%. Determining whether the patient has generalized versus localized lymphadenopathy can help narrow the differential diagnosis, as various infections present differently.

Skin The fact that many infections have cutaneous manifestations gives the skin examination particular importance in the evaluation of patients **(Chaps. 24, 25e, 72, and 156)**. It is important to perform a complete skin exam, with attention to both front and back. Specific rashes are often extremely helpful in narrowing the differential diagnosis of an infection **(Chaps. 24 and 25e)**. In numerous anecdotal instances, patients in the intensive care unit have had "fever of unknown origin" that was actually due to unrecognized pressure ulcers. Moreover, close examination of the distal extremities for splinter hemorrhages, Janeway lesions, or Osler's nodes may yield evidence of endocarditis or other causes of septic emboli.

Foreign Bodies As previously mentioned, many infections are caused by members of the indigenous microbiota. These infections typically occur when these microbes escape their normal habitat and enter a new one. Thus, maintenance of epithelial barriers is one of the most important mechanisms in protection against infection. However, hospitalization of patients is often associated with breaches of these barriers—e.g., due to placement of IV lines, surgical drains, or tubes (such as endotracheal tubes and Foley catheters) that allow microorganisms to localize in sites to which they normally would not have access **(Chap. 168)**. Accordingly, knowing what lines, tubes, and drains are in place is helpful in ascertaining what body sites might be infected.

DIAGNOSTIC TESTING

Laboratory and radiologic testing has advanced greatly over the past few decades and has become an important component in the evaluation of patients. The dramatic increase in the number of serologic diagnostics, antigen tests, and molecular diagnostics available to the physician has, in fact, revolutionized medical care. However, all of these tests should be viewed as adjuncts to the history and physical examination—not a replacement for them. The selection of initial tests should be based directly on the patient's history and physical exam findings. Moreover, diagnostic testing should generally be limited to those conditions that are reasonably likely and treatable, important in terms of public health considerations, and/or capable of providing a definitive diagnosis that will consequently limit other testing.

White Blood Cell (WBC) Count Elevations in the WBC count are often associated with infection, though many viral infections are associated with leukopenia. It is important to assess the WBC differential, given that different classes of microbes are associated with various leukocyte types. For example, bacteria are associated with an increase in polymorphonuclear neutrophils, often with elevated levels of earlier developmental forms such as bands; viruses are associated with an increase in lymphocytes; and certain parasites are associated with an increase in eosinophils. **Table 144-2** lists the major infectious causes of eosinophilia.

Inflammatory Markers The erythrocyte sedimentation rate (ESR) and the C-reactive protein (CRP) level are indirect and direct measures of the acute-phase response, respectively, that can be used to assess a patient's general level of inflammation. Moreover, these markers can be followed serially over time to monitor disease progress/resolution. It is noteworthy that the ESR changes relatively slowly, and its measurement more often than weekly usually is not useful; in contrast, CRP concentrations change rapidly, and daily measurements can be useful in the appropriate context. Although these markers are sensitive indicators of inflammation, neither is very specific. An extremely elevated ESR (>100 mm/h) has a 90% predictive value for a serious underlying disease **(Table 144-3)**. Work is ongoing to identify other potentially useful inflammatory markers (e.g., procalcitonin, serum amyloid A protein); however, their clinical utility requires further validation.

Analysis of Cerebrospinal Fluid (CSF) Assessment of CSF is critical for patients with suspected meningitis or encephalitis. An opening pressure should always be recorded, and fluid should routinely be sent for cell counts, Gram's stain and culture, and determination of glucose and protein levels. A CSF Gram's stain typically requires $>10^5$ bacteria/mL for reliable positivity; its specificity approaches 100%. **Table 144-4** lists the typical CSF profiles for various infections. In general, CSF with a lymphocytic pleocytosis and a low glucose concentration suggests either infection (e.g., with *Listeria*, *M. tuberculosis*, or a fungus) or a noninfectious disorder (e.g, neoplastic meningitis, sarcoidosis). Bacterial antigen testing of CSF (e.g., latex agglutination tests for *Haemophilus influenzae* type b, group B *Streptococcus*, *S. pneumoniae*, and *Neisseria meningitidis*) is not recommended as a screening assay, given that these tests are no more sensitive than Gram's stain; however, these assays can be helpful in presumptively identifying organisms seen on Gram's stain. In contrast, other antigen tests (e.g., for *Cryptococcus*) and some CSF serologic testing (e.g., for *Treponema pallidum*, *Coccidioides*) are highly sensitive and are useful for select patients. In addition, polymerase chain reaction (PCR) analysis of CSF is increasingly being used for the diagnosis of bacterial (e.g., *N. meningitidis*, *S. pneumoniae*, mycobacteria) and viral (e.g., herpes simplex virus, enterovirus) infections; while these molecular tests permit rapid diagnosis with a high degree of sensitivity and specificity, they often do not allow determination of antimicrobial resistance profiles.

Cultures The mainstays of infectious disease diagnosis include the culture of infected tissue (e.g., surgical specimens) or fluid (e.g., blood, urine, sputum, purulence from a wound). Samples can be sent for culture of bacteria (aerobic or anaerobic), fungi, or viruses. Ideally, specimens are collected before the administration of antimicrobial therapy; in instances where this order of events is not clinically feasible, microscopic examination of the specimen (e.g., Gram-stained or potassium hydroxide [KOH]–treated preparations) is particularly important. Culture of the organism(s) allows identification of the etiologic agent, determination of the antimicrobial susceptibility profile, and—when there is concern about an outbreak—isolate typing. While cultures are extremely useful in the evaluation of patients, determining whether culture results are clinically meaningful or represent contamination (e.g., a non-*aureus*, non-*lugdunensis* staphylococcal species growing in a blood culture) can sometimes be challenging and requires an understanding of the patient's immune status, exposure history, and microbiota. In some cases, serial cultures to demonstrate clearance of the organism may be helpful.

Pathogen-Specific Testing Numerous pathogen-specific tests (e.g., serology, antigen testing, PCR testing) are commercially available, and many hospitals now offer some of these tests in-house to facilitate rapid turnaround that ultimately enhances patient care. The reader is directed to relevant chapters on the pathogens of interest for specific details. Some of these tests (e.g., universal PCRs) identify organisms that currently are not cultivable and have unclear relationships to disease, thereby complicating diagnosis. As these tests become more commonplace and the work of the Human Microbiome Project progresses, the relevance of some of these previously unrecognized bacteria to human health will likely become more apparent.