Dear Editors,

up to 50% of all nail diseases are due to mycotic infection [1]. The prevalence of onychomycosis has been increasing since 1950 and also shows an increasing trend with age [2–4]. For these reasons, diagnostics of nail mycosis are of considerable importance. They lay the foundation for a successful therapy and thus also of disease containment. Currently, the combination of microscopic KOH preparations and mycological culture is defined as the diagnostic gold standard [5]. In addition to these two methods, molecular biological techniques (PCR) and direct microscopic evaluation of stained sample preparations are used for the diagnosis of nail mycoses.

In this retrospective study, we compared the three commonly used diagnostic procedures (microscopic KOH preparations, mycological culture, histology) with respect to their diagnostic value. A total of 1359 nail samples from fingernails and toenails, with clinical suspicion of onychomycosis and which were examined between 2013 and 2017 by means of at least one of the three diagnostic procedures at the Clinic for Dermatology in Homburg/Saar, were included. Two hundred and five of these nail samples were examined by all three diagnostic procedures and could thus be used to calculate sensitivity and negative predictive value (NPV). The clinically remarkable samples were all collected as nail clippings. In each case, for both native preparation and culture, subungual curettage material was used for analysis. For histological examination, the preparations were fixated in formalin according to standard procedure, stained with hematoxylin–eosin (HE) and periodic acid–Schiff (PAS) reaction and analyzed by microscopy [6]. For culture purposes, a Sabouraud glucose agar containing 4% glucose was inoculated with the nail material and processed according to a standardized procedure [7]. Examples from all three methods are shown in Figure 3 phase contrast microscopy of a KOH preparation (Figure 3a), microscopy of a nail shard after PAS reaction (Figure 3b), and culture on Sabouraud glucose agar (Figure 3c).

All nail specimens that showed positive fungal detection in at least one diagnostic procedure in addition to clinical suspicion were considered positive for fungal infection. This definition was used as the gold standard for calculating the statistical parameters sensitivity and NPV [8–10]. In this study, all nail samples collected during the stated period were included, regardless of any possible previous antifungal therapy. Of 1359 nail specimens, 544 were positive in at least one diagnostic procedure, resulting in 40% of cases being diagnosed with onychomycosis. Of the 205 nail specimens examined by all three methods, clinical suspicion of onychomycosis was confirmed by at least one diagnostic method in 83 cases (40%). Of the three diagnostic procedures, histologic examination was performed least frequently. It was used in only 347 of the 1359 (26%) cases, whereas the procedures of the previous gold standard, microscopic KOH preparation and culture, were performed in 1222 cases (90%) and 1184 cases (87%), respectively.

The combination of KOH preparations and evaluation of histological specimens by microscopy resulted in the highest sensitivity (94%). Comparing sensitivities from a combination of two methods, the previous gold standard came in third at 86.7%. Histological examination, the procedure with the highest sensitivity for individual application, scored only slightly lower at 80.7%. Individual sensitivity of the KOH preparation followed at 72.3%, with culture techniques scoring 53% (Figure 1). The combination of histology and KOH preparation (96.1%) also ranked first in terms of NPV. The best individually applied procedure was again histology (88.4%) (Figure 2). It can be seen from the number of times each procedure was performed that histological examination of nail shards was not standard procedure during the observed period. Nevertheless, in our study, histology is the procedure with the highest sensitivity (80.7%) and NPV (88.4%).

For combinations of two procedures, we found that both combinations involving histology had higher sensitivity
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**Figure 1** Sensitivity of the different diagnostic methods examined.
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and NPV than the previous gold standard of diagnosis of onychomycosis. In addition, histological examination brings another advantage: it provides evidence of the invasiveness of a fungus [11, 12]. This allows nail mycosis-causing fungi to be distinguished from contaminants [13]. In addition, other diseases can be diagnosed on the basis of the histological preparations if the clinical change in the nail is not due to onychomycosis, although this is often not possible on the nail shards [14, 15]. Finally, collecting nail material for renewed histological examination after therapy allows evaluation of therapeutic success [16]. Clinical differential diagnoses of onychomycoses include onychodystrophies of different origins as well as rare diseases from the spectrum of congenital dyskeratoses or systemic amyloidosis [17, 18].

Despite the aforementioned advantages of microscopic analysis of histologically stained sections, the two methods of the previous gold standard - KOH preparation and culture - remain necessary components of the diagnosis of onychomycosis due to their respective advantages. In their meta-analysis on the diagnosis of onychomycosis, Velasquez-Agudelo et al. concluded that the three methods are
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KOH preparation in a first step, followed by supplemental diagnostics consisting of histological nail examination and evidence in the literature, we recommend the use of staged rapid diagnostic confirmation of onychomycosis. This means of polymerase chain reaction (PCR) is available for swabs and should be employed as a standard component and the extra effort it requires in the diagnosis of nail mycosis. Nonetheless, PCR has not yet been able to establish itself as a routine diagnostic method. This may be due to limited local availability of the method and cost coverage issues. The current guideline on tinea capitis classifies molecular techniques as a complementary method after tissue microscopy and recommends their use in the diagnostic algorithm, despite the fact that the methods are not yet listed in the German EBM services catalog and thus cannot be reimbursed [22].

In conclusion, based on the data shown here and the evidence in the literature, we recommend the use of staged diagnostics consisting of histological nail examination and KOH preparation in a first step, followed by supplementary mycological culture or molecular diagnostics, depending on availability and cost coverage options. Molecular techniques would be of particular advantage in cases where histology and KOH preparations are positive, allowing the time-consuming process of mycological culture, which is associated with rather high rates of false-negative findings, to be bypassed [23]. Histological evaluation, despite the unjust neglect it experiences to date, the additional costs it incurs and the extra effort it requires in the diagnosis of nail mycoses, should routinely be employed as a standard component of the onychomycosis diagnostics toolkit in the future.
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