Summary of Influenza Activity in New Mexico for Week Ending January 22, 2005:
- Eighteen of the 18 sentinel sites reported a total of 4530 patient visits, of which 28(0.62%) were for an influenza-like illness. The previous week ending January 15 reported 0.80% influenza-like illness.
- NMDOH received reports of 27 patients with positive influenza (14 influenza A, 13 influenza B) tests using rapid testing. There were one report of positive influenza A culture (subtyped as H3), and 7 reports of influenza B culture (five of which have been subtyped as Sichuan-like).
- 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 eleven influenza B virus isolates (9 subtyped as Sichuan-like) and five influenza A virus isolates* (four subtyped as H3) 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 January 22, 2005, fifteen clinical laboratories reported performing 263 rapid or DFA tests, of which 14(5.3%) were positive for influenza A and 13(4.9%) were positive for influenza B.
- Since October 24, 2004, NMDOH has received reports of 44(2.96%) positive influenza A tests, 45(3.03%) positive influenza B tests and 4(0.27%) indistinguishable positive influenza out of 1484 rapid tests performed at 16 clinical laboratories.

*These cases may also be counted among the rapid test positive results.

Influenza-related Pediatric Mortality
As of the week ending January 15, 2005, two cases of influenza-associated pediatric death have been reported nationally to CDC. One report came from the Bureau of Health in Maine and one from the Department of Health in Massachusetts. No cases have been reported to the NMDOH.

---

1 Influenza-like Activity (ILI) is defined as Fever (≥ 100°F [37.8°C], oral or equivalent) AND cough and/or sore throat in absence of a KNOWN cause other than influenza.
2 Some rapid influenza tests cannot differentiate between types A and B.
Flu Activity in the Region
For the week ending January 15, 2005 (the most recent data available), influenza activity was reported as “widespread” by Texas, “regional” by Colorado, Idaho and Nevada, “local” by Arizona, Utah and Wyoming and “sporadic” by Montana and New Mexico. There were 5 reports of influenza A (H3N2) virus, 14 influenza A that were not subtyped and 11 influenza B viruses in the Mountain region (Arizona, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah and Wyoming).³

National Flu Surveillance and Laboratory Activity
For the week ending January 15, 2005, 390 (14.6 %) of 2,672 specimens tested for influenza viruses were positive. Of these 50 were influenza A (H3N2) virus, 299 were influenza A that were not subtyped, and 41 were influenza B viruses. Nationwide 2.6% of patient visits to U.S. sentinel providers were due to influenza-like-illness. Ten states reported widespread activity, 14 states reported regional activity, 11 states reported local activity and 15 states reported sporadic activity nationally. More information on national surveillance can be found at http://www.cdc.gov/flu/weekly/.

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: http://www.health.state.nm.us/flu/ or the CDC web page: http://www.cdc.gov/ncidod/diseases/flu/fluavirus.htm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Level</th>
<th>ILI activity*/Outbreaks</th>
<th>Laboratory data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No activity</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>And No lab confirmed cases³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sporadic</td>
<td>Not increased And</td>
<td>Isolated lab-confirmed cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not increased And</td>
<td>Lab confirmed outbreak in one institution³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Increased ILI in 1 region**; ILI activity in other regions is not increased And Recent (within the past 3 weeks) lab evidence of influenza in region with increased ILI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Increased ILI in ≥2 but less than half of the regions And Recent (within the past 3 weeks) lab confirmed influenza in the affected regions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institutional outbreaks (ILI or lab confirmed) in ≥2 and less than half of the regions And Recent (within the past 3 weeks) lab confirmed influenza in the affected regions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

³ All data are preliminary and change as more reports are received after the end of the reporting week.
| Widespread | Increased ILI and/or institutional outbreaks (ILI or lab confirmed) in at least half of the regions | And | Recent (within the past 3 weeks) lab confirmed influenza in the state. |

* 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.
† 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 predictive 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.
‡ Institution includes nursing home, hospital, prison, school, etc.
**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.
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