

1 **Clinical management and impact of scarlet fever in the modern era: findings from a cross-sectional**  
2 **study of cases in London, 2018-2019.**

3

4 **M. Trent Herdman<sup>1</sup>, Rebecca Cordery<sup>2</sup>, Basel Karo<sup>1</sup>, Amrit Kaur Purba<sup>2</sup>, Lipi Begum<sup>1</sup>, Theresa**  
5 **Lamagni<sup>1</sup>, Chuin Kee<sup>4</sup>, Sooria Balasegaram<sup>1</sup>, Shiranee Sriskandan<sup>3</sup>**

6 <sup>1</sup> National Infection Service, Public Health England, United Kingdom

7 <sup>2</sup>South London Health Protection Team, Public Health England, United Kingdom

8 <sup>3</sup>Department of Infectious Diseases, Imperial College London, United Kingdom

9 <sup>4</sup>Oak Lodge Medical Centre, London, United Kingdom

10

11 **Abstract:**

12 **Background:** Scarlet fever incidence has risen steeply in recent years, and is associated with wider  
13 outbreaks of severe Group A Streptococcal infections. Yet, few studies of its epidemiology, clinical  
14 features, and management have been undertaken in the antibiotic era.

15 **Aim:** To characterize symptomatology, management, and consequences of scarlet fever and identify  
16 associations with delayed diagnosis.

17 **Design/Setting:** Cross-sectional study of children with scarlet fever in London, 2018-2019.

18 **Methods:** online survey of parents/guardians of children with scarlet fever identified by Health  
19 Protection Teams, recording demographics, symptoms, care-seeking, and management; logistic  
20 regression for factors associated with delayed diagnosis; Cox's regression for consequences of delayed  
21 diagnosis.

22 **Results:** Responses represented 412 cases in a period with 6828 notifications for children 0-14 years  
23 old, and 410 school/nursery outbreaks. 70% first sought care from general practice, and 31% had  
24 multiple consultations. For 28%, scarlet fever was not considered at first consultation: in these cases,  
25 symptoms were frequently attributed to viral infection (60%, 64/106). Delay in diagnosis beyond first  
26 consultation occurred more frequently among children aged 5+ who presented with sore throat (odds  
27 ratio 2.8 vs. 5+ without sore throat; 95%CI 1.3-5.8; P=0.006). On average, cases with delayed diagnosis  
28 took one day longer to return to baseline activities, and required one additional day off school *versus*  
29 those diagnosed at first consultation.

30 **Conclusions:** In assessing children with fever, rash, and sore throat, practitioners should be alert to  
31 the possibility of scarlet fever: it is frequently missed at first consultation, and prompt recognition  
32 speeds clinical recovery and public health management.

33

34 **Keywords** (up to 6, MeSH headings, including primary health care):

35 Scarlet Fever; *Streptococcus pyogenes*; Group A Streptococcal infection; health seeking behaviour;  
36 primary health care; childhood illness.

37 **How this fits in [4 sentences summarising key messages of background and findings]:**

- 38 - In the five years leading up to the pandemic lockdown of 2020, scarlet fever incidence rose  
39 markedly in England and Wales, prompting this investigation of cases in London 2018-2019.  
40 - Prompt recognition of the disease by carers and clinicians can direct timely antibiotic  
41 therapy, limit transmission in the household and community, and direct the identification  
42 and control of outbreaks.  
43 - In this study, delayed diagnosis was more likely to occur among older children presenting  
44 with sore throat—perhaps reflecting a lower index of suspicion in this age group.  
45 - Cases with delayed diagnosis took longer to return to normal activities, and required more  
46 time off from school than those diagnosed at the first consultation.

47

48 **Introduction**

49

50 **Background and Rationale**

51           Scarlet fever results from pharyngeal infection with group A streptococci (GAS) expressing  
52 erythrogenic toxins, classically leading to rash, fever, constitutional symptoms, and localized  
53 symptoms including sore throat(1). Most studies of scarlet fever predate a modern understanding of  
54 streptococcal infections and their treatment(2-4). Incidence of scarlet fever in England and Wales  
55 declined from the 1940s to the mid-2010s, but increased markedly in the five years leading up to the  
56 pandemic lockdown of 2020: this coincided with the emergence of a dominant, more toxigenic lineage  
57 of GAS(5-7). Given the association between scarlet fever and severe GAS infections, including invasive  
58 soft tissue infections and toxic shock syndrome, this upsurge in cases underlined the need to review  
59 clinical practice(5, 8-10).

60           Scarlet fever is a notifiable infectious disease in England, and usually diagnosed on the basis  
61 of symptoms and signs. The triad of rash, sore throat, and fever is typical, but this presentation may  
62 be mistaken for viral infection, delaying the administration of antibiotics(11). Early case recognition  
63 aids implementation of treatment, initiation of which should reduce likelihood of complications and  
64 prevent onward transmission, reducing the incidence of not only scarlet fever itself, but also invasive  
65 GAS infections in cases and contacts(10).

66

67 **Objectives**

68           Prompted by increased scarlet fever notification, we undertook a survey of scarlet fever cases  
69 in London, to characterise the presenting features and healthcare experience, focussing on the timing  
70 of diagnosis and interventions, and impact on cases and their households(10, 12).

71

72 **Methods**

73

74 **Study Design and Recruitment**

75

76 We conducted a cross-sectional, observational study of confirmed or probable scarlet fever  
77 cases using an online survey (SelectSurvey v.4.0, **Supplementary File 1**). Invitations were sent to  
78 parents and guardians of all cases of scarlet fever notified by clinicians to Public Health England (PHE)  
79 Health Protection Teams (HPTs) in March-May 2018 in London. In March-May 2019, a modified  
80 version of the survey (omitting or rewording some questions, adding others) was sent to  
81 parents/guardians of notified sporadic cases plus cases identified as part of notified school outbreaks  
82 (**Supplementary File 2**). Participation was voluntary, anonymised, and approved by a national  
83 Research Ethics Committee (London-Chelsea REC Reference 18/LO/0025; IRAS Reference 225006).  
84 Consent was inferred from survey participation.

85 Public health management of cases and outbreaks was according to national guidelines used  
86 by HPTs(12).

87

88 **Data Analysis**

89 Quantitative data description and analysis were performed using Stata14.2 and GraphPad  
90 Prism7.0 (see **Supplementary Methods** for further details). Ethnicity proportions were compared to  
91 Department for Education primary schools data for London(13). In assessing symptoms and signs,  
92 description was restricted to cases diagnosed by a health professional.

93 To identify variables associated with delayed diagnosis, we compared cases where scarlet  
94 fever was suspected at first contact with a health professional versus those for whom it was not,  
95 restricting to cases formally notified by a health professional. A logistic regression model was  
96 constructed using a stepwise, subtractive approach. Models were compared using Akaike's  
97 information criteria and Bayesian information criteria, with likelihood ratio tests used to address  
98 ambiguous comparisons, and stratifying as required to address effect modification.

99 Consequences of delayed diagnosis were assessed in terms of days until recovery to normal  
100 activity, days of school/nursery missed, and days of work missed by carers, constructing Cox's  
101 proportional hazards regression models (condition of proportionality was met). The model for time to  
102 recovery to normal activity was limited to data from the 2019 survey, as it was not ascertained in 2018.

103

104 **Qualitative textual analysis**

105 Free text volunteered by respondents was coded in NVivo13 and Microsoft Excel using a  
106 thematic matrix for responses concerning perception of scarlet fever, and analysed to characterize  
107 experiences of the illness, accessibility of information and care, experiences of the health service, and  
108 impact on the case and their household, and identify ramifications for providers of clinical practice  
109 and health protection.

110

111

112 **Results**

113 **Baseline characteristics**

114 London HPTs identified 4172 cases of confirmed or probable scarlet fever in children 0-14  
115 years old, and 263 school/nursery outbreaks in 2018, and 2656 cases and 147 school/nursery  
116 outbreaks in 2019. From 1 March-31 May 2018, we contacted parents or guardians of 1703 cases of  
117 scarlet fever notified to London HPTs. From 1 March-31 May 2019 recruitment took place both  
118 through HPT contact with 872 identified scarlet fever cases and through dissemination to parental  
119 networks by outbreak-affected schools/nurseries. Surveys were completed for 477 children, 412 of  
120 whom met the case definition (339 in 2018, and 73 in 2019). In 381 cases (92%), scarlet fever was  
121 diagnosed by a health professional; 31 cases (8%) had a confirmed epidemiological link to an outbreak,  
122 but may not have been diagnosed by a health professional, and hence were excluded from analyses  
123 of clinical features.

124 Demographic and baseline clinical characteristics are described in **Table 1**. Compared to 2015  
125 Department for Education estimates for primary schools in London, responses showed a higher  
126 proportion of White participants (70% vs. 42% in primary schools,  $P<0.001$ ) and lower proportions of  
127 participants of Asian/Asian British (11% vs. 20%,  $P<0.001$ ) and Black/African/Caribbean/Black British  
128 ethnicity (5% vs. 21%,  $P<0.001$ ) (13).

129

130

131 **Clinical characteristics**

132 Rash was the most commonly identified symptom, reported by 89% of respondents (**Table 2**).  
133 However, fever and sore throat were more likely than rash to be noted first. Among respondents  
134 commenting on the timing of the rash relative to other symptoms, 71% (32 of 45 responding) reported  
135 the rash followed other symptoms, with a median one-day delay (IQR 0-2.5 days; range 0-15 days).  
136 Cases with a history of recurrent sore throat were more likely to present with sore throat initially (OR  
137 1.9, 95%CI 1.2-2.9,  $P=0.008$ ), and substantially more likely to experience a sore throat at some point  
138 in the illness (OR 11.3, 95%CI 4.4-29.3,  $P<0.001$ ).

139 70% of respondents characterizing the rash (19/27) described it as sand-papery or rough to  
140 feel, 63% (17/27) as red, 26% (7/27) as comprising small spots, 19% (5/27) as pink, 15% (4/27) as itchy,  
141 and 4% (1/27) as peeling off. Median duration of the rash was 5 days (IQR 3-8 days; range 1-14 days).

142 69% (18/26) reported the rash first appeared on the trunk, 19% (5/26) on the face, and 12% (4/26) on  
143 the arms and legs. Rash was seen in 89% of White cases and 90% of cases of other ethnicities (P=0.75).

144 While most children (71%) eventually experienced fever, rash, and sore throat, the pattern of  
145 symptoms at onset varied with age (**Table 2**). Sore throat was a more common initial symptom among  
146 older cases (OR 3.1, 95%CI 1.9-5.0, P<0.001). Conversely, rash and fever were less likely at onset  
147 among older cases (respectively OR 0.6, 95%CI 0.4-0.9, P=0.014; OR 0.5, 95%CI 0.3-0.8, P=0.001).

148

### 149 **Differential diagnosis and clinical management**

150 **Table 3** summarizes the sources of care sought for cases. Median duration from onset of  
151 symptoms to seeing a health professional was 2 days (IQR 1-3 days; range<1-14 days). For 31% of  
152 cases, additional consultations were undertaken (with 14% requiring three or more consultations).

153 At the first consultation with a doctor, 72% of cases (268/374) had scarlet fever as the  
154 diagnosis (or part of the differential diagnosis). When the diagnosis was delayed, 60% (64/106) had  
155 their illness ascribed to a viral infection, 21% (22/106) to tonsillitis, and 13% (14/106) to pharyngitis.  
156 Throat swabs were taken from 44% of cases (148/338). Of those who knew the results of the swab,  
157 91% (75/82) reported GAS was isolated. Antibiotic prescribing practices are described in  
158 **Supplementary Table S1**: 93% of cases were prescribed an agent consistent with clinical guidelines.

159

### 160 **Burden and impact of disease**

161 80% of cases (329/402) missed school because of their illness, with a median of 3 days lost  
162 (IQR 2-4 days; range 1-14 days). Median time from starting antibiotics to return to normal activity such  
163 as attending school or nursery was 2 days (IQR 1-4 days; range 0-8 days, asked only in 2019, with 71  
164 respondents).

165 For 53% of cases (198/372), at least one carer took time off work, with a median total of 2  
166 days taken as leave (IQR 1-3; range 0-11 days). In 23% of cases (92/398), a carer became ill themselves.  
167 In 22% (67/301), the child's usual carers required additional help with care during the illness—  
168 provided by family members for 80%, friends for 5%, and paid professionals for 15%. In 11% of cases  
169 (37/337), other children in the household also missed school—predominantly because they were  
170 unwell themselves; less frequently because of dependence on the caregiver to transport siblings to  
171 school. In 2019, 43% (34/79) reported other unwell family members: 29 with sore throat, 10 with

172 tonsillitis, 6 with scarlet fever, one each with cellulitis and conjunctivitis (11 households identified  
173 multiple illnesses).

174

#### 175 **Risk factors for delayed diagnosis**

176 In a logistic model for delayed diagnosis among 321 cases in the 2018 survey, the strongest fit  
177 was provided by variables for age (under 5 years vs. 5 and older), sore throat at onset, and interaction  
178 between these variables (**Table 4, Supplementary Table S1**). No other variables affected the model.  
179 Among cases aged 5 and older, those with sore throat present at symptom onset had 2.7 times the  
180 odds of a delayed diagnosis compared to those without (95%CI 1.3-5.8,  $P < 0.01$ ). Among cases aged  
181 under 5, we found no evidence of an association between sore throat and delayed diagnosis (aOR 0.6,  
182 95%CI 0.3-1.5,  $P = 0.33$ ).

183

#### 184 **Consequences of delayed diagnosis**

185 Cases returned to normal activity faster when scarlet fever was considered at the first  
186 consultation (33/52; ascertained in 2019 only), with a median recovery time of 2 days from starting  
187 antibiotics when scarlet fever was considered, vs. 3 when it was not, and a hazard ratio (HR) for  
188 recovery of 0.53 (95%CI 0.28-0.99;  $P = 0.047$ ; **Supplementary Figure S1**). Cases diagnosed without delay  
189 returned to school sooner, with a median of 2 days off (246/298) and 3 days for those with delay  
190 (92/298) (HR 0.77, 95%CI 0.59-0.99;  $P = 0.045$ ). We found no difference in days of work missed by carers  
191 between the two groups, with a median of 2 days missed for both (HR 0.91, 95%CI 0.64-1.29;  
192  $P = 0.592$ ).

193

#### 194 **Qualitative synthesis**

195 In thematic analysis of 194 free-text comments (**Table 5**), some respondents reported  
196 reassurance that a diagnosis was made promptly by practitioners who recognised the syndrome:  
197 others were disappointed that antibiotic treatment was delayed where symptoms were attributed to  
198 viral infection. Representativeness of online resources was questioned, such as the difficulty in finding  
199 depictions of the rash on non-white skin. While some respondents noted rapid recovery and minimal  
200 impact, others recorded spread of streptococcal infections to carers and other household members,  
201 and a wider impact of the time demands and stress of providing care to unwell children.

202



203 **Discussion**

204 **Summary**

205

206           Undertaken at a time of increased incidence, this study provides an important update on the  
207 impact of scarlet fever, identifies opportunities for improved recognition, and highlights the previously  
208 unquantified burden of disease on affected households.

209           Practitioners should be alert to circumstances in which scarlet fever is easily overlooked. In  
210 this survey, a delay in diagnosis among older children was 2.8 times as likely when a sore throat was  
211 present at onset, with symptoms often ascribed to viral infection. Practitioners may have a lower index  
212 of suspicion in this age group, and be less likely to consider the diagnosis at first presentation when  
213 another explanation for symptoms is available. Timely recognition of scarlet fever in this age group  
214 could expedite antibiotic treatment, shorten the period of infectivity, and reduce onward propagation  
215 of GAS.

216           The sand-papery rash of scarlet fever was perceived by most carers, and tended to appear  
217 after other symptoms (median one day later). Rash timing is important in distinguishing scarlet fever  
218 from measles and rubella—which have a longer lag—but can lead to confusion with other viral  
219 exantheams(14). Awareness of the timing and sand-papery character of scarlet fever’s rash may help  
220 practitioners make the diagnosis and commence treatment.

221

222 **Comparison with existing literature**

223

224           Current clinical guidance for sore throat advises primary care physicians to give antibiotics  
225 only when a more serious condition (such as suppurative infection or sepsis) is suspected(15).  
226 FeverPAIN and Centor scores are validated in rapid appraisal for GAS pharyngitis, but scarlet fever falls  
227 outside their scope(16, 17). The rash of scarlet fever—particularly during the season of increased risk  
228 from March to May—should also prompt practitioners to commence antibiotics(18). The public health  
229 importance of prompt diagnosis and treatment is underscored by the 12-fold greater risk of invasive  
230 GAS among scarlet fever household contacts(10). Advice to avoid unnecessary antibiotics for most  
231 sore throats is valuable to antimicrobial stewardship: the caveat is that scarlet fever and other GAS  
232 infections require antibiotics to prevent complications and reduce onward spread.

233           In this study, 80% of children missed school/nursery for a median of 3 days. Time to recovery  
234 and return to school was longer when diagnosis was delayed. As the average primary school pupil

misses 7.4 days a year, this increase is substantial(19). Scarlet fever affected almost 32,000 children in the UK in 2018(20); the direct medical costs, including hospital admissions (1 in 40 case in 2014), plus the risk of secondary GAS infections, and the non-medical costs of childcare and lost education, amount to a sizeable health and economic burden(5, 21).

239

## 240 **Strengths and Limitations**

241 By surveying notified scarlet fever cases, this study draws on the experience of patients and  
242 households accessing primary care. However, our use of an online survey tool introduces a risk of  
243 selection bias. Compared to the population at risk, more cases were white than would be expected by  
244 chance. There may be bias in recognition or notification, given that invasive GAS infection is observed  
245 with higher incidence in ethnicities other than white (22-24). Respondents' observed difficulty finding  
246 illustrations of the rash on non-white skin corroborates under-representation in educational materials  
247 noted elsewhere(25-27). It also highlights the importance of ascertaining ethnicity in general practice  
248 research and surveillance, so that outbreaks affecting specific communities—or obstacles accessing  
249 care—are identified(28).

250

## 251 **Implications for Practice and Research**

252 Differentiating scarlet fever from viral infections presents a clinical challenge: sore throat is  
253 common to both conditions, and the rash of scarlet fever, though characteristic, may be subtle or  
254 delayed. Point-of-care tests may be useful to avoid unnecessary antibiotic prescription. Alertness to  
255 periodic peaks in scarlet fever—from March to May in the UK—and the occurrence of local outbreaks  
256 may help set an appropriate index of suspicion(5). Increased local incidence should drive more  
257 communication with carers about symptoms of concern (such as a sand-papery rash). The need for  
258 sound antimicrobial stewardship should not preclude access to timely clinical diagnosis of scarlet  
259 fever, microbiological testing, and empirical prescribing.

260 The strains of GAS that cause scarlet fever also trigger outbreaks of pharyngitis and invasive  
261 GAS infections. As such, a single case of scarlet fever may signal a larger outbreak of unrecognised GAS  
262 infections(5, 7, 29). Further research into the interplay of scarlet fever and invasive GAS at a  
263 population level will help direct diagnostic and treatment strategies to reduce the impact of such  
264 outbreaks.

265           Meanwhile, effective control of scarlet fever and GAS depends upon the coordinated efforts  
266 of clinicians and public health practitioners to identify cases and outbreaks early, implement  
267 appropriate treatment, and prevent onward transmission.

268

269 **Acknowledgements**

270 We are grateful to carers for taking time to complete the survey, and to PHE London Health Protection  
271 Teams' Surveillance Officers for scarlet fever surveillance and data analysis. We would like to thank  
272 the staff of the London Health Protection Teams and the Field Epidemiology Service for their support  
273 with the study. SS Acknowledges the NIHR Biomedical Research Centre grant awarded to Imperial  
274 College.

275 **Funding**

276 This report was funded by Action Medical Research. It was also funded in part by the Medical Research  
277 Council (grant MR/P022669/1) and the National Institute for Health Research Health Protection  
278 Research Unit (NIHR HPRU) in Healthcare Associated Infections and Antimicrobial Resistance at  
279 Imperial College London in partnership with Public Health England (grant HPRU-2012-10047). The  
280 views expressed are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the NHS, the NIHR, the  
281 Department of Health or Public Health England.

282

283 **Conflicts of Interest**

284 The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

285

286 **References**

- 287 1. Wong SS, Yuen KY. Streptococcus pyogenes and re-emergence of scarlet fever as a public  
288 health problem. *Emerg Microbes Infect.* 2012;1(7):e2.
- 289 2. Warrack JS. The Differential Diagnosis of Scarlet Fever, Measles, and Rubella. *Br Med J.*  
290 1918;2(3018):486-8.
- 291 3. Defining the group A streptococcal toxic shock syndrome. Rationale and consensus  
292 definition. The Working Group on Severe Streptococcal Infections. *JAMA.* 1993;269(3):390-1.
- 293 4. Wesselhoft C, Weinstein L. Medical Progress: Scarlet Fever. *N Engl J Med.* 1945:500-37.
- 294 5. Lamagni T, Guy R, Chand M, Henderson KL, Chalker V, Lewis J, et al. Resurgence of scarlet  
295 fever in England, 2014-16: a population-based surveillance study. *Lancet Infect Dis.* 2018;18(2):180-  
296 7.
- 297 6. Guy R, Williams C, Irvine N, Reynolds A, Coelho J, Saliba V, et al. Increase in scarlet fever  
298 notifications in the United Kingdom, 2013/2014. *Euro Surveill.* 2014;19(12):20749.
- 299 7. Lynskey NN, Jauneikaite E, Li HK, Zhi X, Turner CE, Mosavie M, et al. Emergence of dominant  
300 toxigenic M1T1 Streptococcus pyogenes clone during increased scarlet fever activity in England: a  
301 population-based molecular epidemiological study. *Lancet Infect Dis.* 2019;19(11):1209-18.
- 302 8. Chalker V, Jironkin A, Coelho J, Al-Shahib A, Platt S, Kapatai G, et al. Genome analysis  
303 following a national increase in Scarlet Fever in England 2014. *BMC Genomics.* 2017;18(1):224.
- 304 9. Al-Shahib A, Underwood A, Afshar B, Turner CE, Lamagni T, Sriskandan S, et al. Emergence of  
305 a novel lineage containing a prophage in emm/M3 group A Streptococcus associated with upsurge in  
306 invasive disease in the UK. *Microb Genom.* 2016;2(6):e000059.
- 307 10. Watts V, Balasegaram S, Brown CS, Mathew S, Mearkle R, Ready D, et al. Increased Risk for  
308 Invasive Group A Streptococcus Disease for Household Contacts of Scarlet Fever Cases, England,  
309 2011-2016. *Emerg Infect Dis.* 2019;25(3):529-37.
- 310 11. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. Sore throat (acute): antimicrobial  
311 prescribing. NICE; 2018 26 January 2018. Contract No.: ng84.
- 312 12. Public Health England. Guidelines for the public health management of scarlet fever  
313 outbreaks in schools, nurseries and other childcare settings. Wellington House, London: PHE; 2017.  
314 Report No.: 2017524.
- 315 13. Department for Education. Schools, pupils, and their characteristics: January 2019. 2019  
316 [16/12/2020].

317 14. Garcia JJG. Differential diagnosis of viral exanthemas. *The Open Vaccine Journal*. 2010;3:65-  
318 8.

319 15. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. Sore throat (acute): antimicrobial  
320 prescribing (NG84). NICE; 2018.

321 16. McIsaac WJ, Kellner JD, Aufricht P, Vanjaka A, Low DE. Empirical validation of guidelines for  
322 the management of pharyngitis in children and adults. *JAMA*. 2004;291(13):1587-95.

323 17. Little P, Hobbs FD, Moore M, Mant D, Williamson I, McNulty C, et al. Clinical score and rapid  
324 antigen detection test to guide antibiotic use for sore throats: randomised controlled trial of PRISM  
325 (primary care streptococcal management). *BMJ*. 2013;347:f5806.

326 18. Ebell MH, Smith MA, Barry HC, Ives K, Carey M. The rational clinical examination. Does this  
327 patient have strep throat? *JAMA*. 2000;284(22):2912-8.

328 19. Department for Education. Pupil absence in schools in England: 2018 to 2019. 2020.

329 20. Public Health England. Group A streptococcal infections: first report of seasonal activity,  
330 2018/19: Health Protection Report. PHE; 2019.

331 21. Pfoh E, Wessels MR, Goldmann D, Lee GM. Burden and economic cost of group A  
332 streptococcal pharyngitis. *Pediatrics*. 2008;121(2):229-34.

333 22. Efstratiou A, Lamagni T. Epidemiology of *Streptococcus pyogenes*. In: Ferretti JJ, Stevens DL,  
334 Fischetti VA, editors. *Streptococcus pyogenes : Basic Biology to Clinical Manifestations*. Oklahoma  
335 City (OK)2016.

336 23. O'Loughlin RE, Roberson A, Cieslak PR, Lynfield R, Gershman K, Craig A, et al. The  
337 epidemiology of invasive group A streptococcal infection and potential vaccine implications: United  
338 States, 2000-2004. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2007;45(7):853-62.

339 24. Hoge CW, Schwartz B, Talkington DF, Breiman RF, MacNeill EM, Engler SJ. The changing  
340 epidemiology of invasive group A streptococcal infections and the emergence of streptococcal toxic  
341 shock-like syndrome. A retrospective population-based study. *JAMA*. 1993;269(3):384-9.

342 25. Lester JC, Taylor SC, Chren MM. Under-representation of skin of colour in dermatology  
343 images: not just an educational issue. *Br J Dermatol*. 2019;180(6):1521-2.

344 26. Ebede T, Papier A. Disparities in dermatology educational resources. *J Am Acad Dermatol*.  
345 2006;55(4):687-90.

346 27. Adelekun A, Onyekaba G, Lipoff JB. Skin color in dermatology textbooks: An updated  
347 evaluation and analysis. *J Am Acad Dermatol*. 2021;84(1):194-6.

348 28. de Lusignan S, Correa A, Pathirannehelage S, Byford R, Yonova I, Elliot AJ, et al. RCGP  
349 Research and Surveillance Centre Annual Report 2014-2015: disparities in presentations to primary  
350 care. *Br J Gen Pract*. 2017;67(654):e29-e40.

351 29. Brouwer S, Lacey JA, You Y, Davies MR, Walker MJ. Scarlet fever changes its spots. *Lancet*  
352 *Infect Dis*. 2019;19(11):1154-5.

353

354

**Table 1: Demographic characteristics of participating scarlet fever cases (n=412).**

Baseline Characteristics	All Cases	
	N	(%)
<b>Age Group</b>		
0-2 years	66	(16%)
3-4 years	156	(38%)
5-9 years	177	(43%)
10-16 years	12	(3%)
<i>missing</i>	1	.
<b>Sex</b>		
Female	197	(48%)
Male	212	(51%)
<i>missing/prefer not to say</i>	3	.
<b>Ethnicity</b>		
Asian/Asian British	47	(11%)
Black/African/Caribbean/Black British	21	(5%)
Mixed/Multiple Ethnicities	48	(12%)
White	287	(70%)
Other	5	(1%)
<i>missing/prefer not to say</i>	4	.
<b>School Group</b>		
Nursery/Playgroup	167	(41%)
Reception Class	85	(21%)
Primary School Year 1	48	(12%)
Primary School Year 2	31	(8%)
Primary School Year 3	28	(7%)
School Beyond Year 3	33	(8%)
<i>Missing/none volunteered</i>	20	.
<b>General health prior to scarlet fever</b>		
Ever hospitalized	107	(26%)
Follow-up in out-patient clinic	38	(9%)
Chronic underlying illness <sup>1</sup>	8	(2%)
<b>Upper respiratory tract history</b>		
≥1 episode of sore throat in preceding year	190	(46%)
Previous isolation of GAS	13	(3%)
Previous tonsillectomy	11	(3%)

356 <sup>1</sup>4 report asthma; 3 report recurrent tonsillitis.

358 **Table 2: Reported Symptoms among 381 cases diagnosed with scarlet fever by a health**  
 359 **professional within 4 weeks of survey completion.**

Symptom	Under 5 years old		5 years and older		All ages	
	n/total	(%)	n/total	(%)	n/total	(%)
<b>First Symptom(s) Noted:</b>						
Fever	97/180	(54%)	57/158	(36%)	154/338	(46%)
Sore Throat	48/180	(27%)	84/158	(53%)	132/338	(39%)
Rash	72/180	(40%)	43/158	(27%)	115/338	(34%)
Not Playing/Tiredness	36/180	(20%)	21/158	(13%)	57/338	(17%)
<b>Symptom Ever Noted:</b>						
Rash	187/207	(90%)	149/170	(88%)	336/377	(89%)
Fever	184/204	(90%)	143/166	(86%)	327/370	(88%)
Sore Throat	151/192	(79%)	138/163	(85%)	289/355	(81%)
Tiredness	136/180	(76%)	113/158	(72%)	249/338	(73%)
Enlarged Tonsils	100/155	(65%)	80/124	(65%)	180/279	(65%)
Not Eating	126/180	(70%)	90/158	(57%)	216/338	(64%)
Not Playing	86/180	(48%)	72/158	(46%)	158/338	(47%)
Headache	53/180	(29%)	71/158	(45%)	124/338	(37%)
Pus on Tonsils	54/151	(36%)	47/119	(40%)	101/270	(37%)
Sore Tongue	57/180	(32%)	45/158	(28%)	102/338	(30%)
Stomach Ache	44/180	(24%)	50/158	(32%)	94/338	(28%)
Vomiting	48/180	(27%)	29/158	(18%)	77/338	(23%)
Swollen Tongue	28/180	(16%)	24/158	(15%)	52/338	(15%)
Earache	21/180	(12%)	29/158	(18%)	50/338	(15%)
Diarrhoea	24/180	(13%)	14/158	(9%)	38/338	(11%)

360

361 **Table 3: Crude analysis of demographic and clinical variables associated with delayed diagnosis**  
 362 **(diagnosis of scarlet fever not considered at first consultation with healthcare; n=374):**

Variable		All Cases N	Delayed Diagnosis N (%)	Crude OR	95% CI	Chi squared test P-value
Age (years)	0-2	62	12 (19%)	1.00	.	0.01 (trend)
	3-4	145	37 (26%)	1.43	(0.68-2.98)	
	5-6	88	27 (31%)	1.84	(0.84-4.04)	
	7-16	79	30 (38%)	2.55	(1.15-5.65)	
Sex	Female	176	46 (26%)	1.00	.	0.36
	Male	197	60 (30%)	1.24	(0.79-1.95)	
Ethnicity	White	265	77 (29%)	1.00	.	0.59 (hom)
	Mixed	44	10 (23%)	0.72	(0.34-1.53)	
	Asian	41	11 (27%)	0.90	(0.43-1.88)	
	Black	18	6 (33%)	1.22	(0.44-3.38)	
	Other	5	1 (20%)	0.61	(0.07-5.78)	
Educational setting	Nursery	156	36 (23%)	1.00	.	0.04
	School	200	66 (33%)	1.64	(1.02-2.65)	
Healthy at baseline	Yes	339	97 (29%)	1.00	.	0.96
	No	31	9 (29%)	1.02	(0.45-2.30)	
Past sore throat/ tonsillitis	Yes	175	58 (33%)	1.00	.	0.06
	No	179	43 (24%)	0.64	(0.40-1.01)	
Known SF contact	Yes	125	34 (27%)	1.00	.	0.17
	No	83	30 (36%)	1.51	(0.83-2.76)	
Sore Throat at onset	Yes	128	42 (33%)	1.00	.	0.05
	No	193	44 (23%)	0.60	(0.37-1.00)	
Fever at onset	Yes	147	39 (27%)	1.00	.	0.92
	No	174	47 (27%)	1.02	(0.62-1.68)	
Tiredness at onset	Yes	55	68 (26%)	1.00	.	0.28
	No	266	18 (33%)	0.71	(0.38-1.32)	
Rash at onset	Yes	109	24 (22%)	1.00	.	0.17
	No	212	62 (29%)	1.46	(0.85-2.52)	

363



364 **Table 4: Pathways of care for participating cases.**

Care Pathways (among n responding)	n	(%)
<b>First Source of Advice (332):</b>		
GP	267	(70%)
NHS Direct	39	(10%)
Walk-In Centre	30	(8%)
Hospital Emergency Department	27	(7%)
Internet	26	(7%)
Urgent Care Centre	16	(4%)
Local Pharmacy	14	(4%)
School Nurse	3	(1%)
<b>Initial Differential Included SF (367)</b>	265	(72%)
<b>Repeat visit to HCW Needed (380)</b>	116	(31%)
<b>Source of Second Consultation (116):</b>		
GP	71	(61%)
Emergency Department	14	(12%)
Urgent Care Centre	11	(9%)
Other	5	(4%)
<b>Reason for Second Consultation (116):</b>		
Child developed a new symptom(s)	44	(38%)
Worried that it could be Scarlet Fever	37	(32%)
Asked to come back if not better	19	(17%)
Child could not take prescribed medication	6	(5%)
Called back due to swab result	6	(5%)
Other*	4	(4%)
<b>Hospitalized (326)</b>	7	(2%)

365 \*Two for further investigations, two for specialist consultation.

**Table 5: Thematic analysis of free text comments from respondents to questionnaires, 2018-2019.**

<b>Thematic Analysis:</b>	<b>Implications for Public Health:</b>	<b>Implications for Clinical Practice:</b>
<p><b>Parental perception of the disease</b> Many expressed worry their child could suffer complications, spread the disease to others, or be stigmatized if identified as the source. Some were worried, annoyed, or angry that a late diagnosis could increase these risks.</p>	<p>Parents recognise the importance of scarlet fever and its potential to cause outbreaks, but may require reassurance that serious complications are rare, and that cooperating with the public health response will not be disclosed.</p>	<p>Delays in identifying a condition perceived as consequential could undermine parental trust in the practitioner or institution.</p>
<p><b>Obstacles to obtaining care</b> Several noted that antibiotics were delayed while awaiting swab results, or communication from health professionals. Some felt slow communication of a school outbreak to parents led to delays in controlling transmission.</p>	<p>Timely communication with parents when a school outbreak occurs could aid dissemination of control strategies. Communication with practitioners during outbreaks could increase clinical index of suspicion and promote timely diagnosis and treatment.</p>	<p>Although antibiotics should be avoided for most patients with sore throat, where there is a clinical suspicion of scarlet fever, timely initiation of antibiotics before swab results are known is indicated. Consider swab and issuing prescription for delayed use with clear guidance on when to start.</p>
<p><b>Reflections on clinical care</b> Several observed that the diagnosis was overlooked by health professionals at first consultation: some felt that characteristic symptoms and signs were missed. Others commented on rapid recognition by health professionals.</p>	<p>Parental awareness of scarlet fever and its outbreak potential can help ensure alertness to new incidents, and timely diagnosis and notification. Availability of information materials on line can aid parental decision-making and care seeking.</p>	<p>Timing of presentation can be crucial to reaching diagnosis. Safety-netting advice or planned follow-up can aid recognition and re-assessment.</p>
<p><b>Sources of information</b> Leaflets circulated by schools were valued, and felt to have contributed to identification of more cases. Some noted that their own internet research led them to consider scarlet fever, and access health care. Information sources lacked images of the rash on non-white skin.</p>	<p>Circulation of information through school channels can help guide parents engage with the public health response. Such information must be inclusive, and reflect variation in rash appearance and texture across all types of skin pigmentation.</p>	<p>Practitioners, too, must be alert to the appearance and texture of the rash of scarlet fever on all skin types, and consider scarlet fever in children presenting with fever and skin changes.</p>
<p><b>Recovery</b> Some respondents commented on rapid recovery once antibiotics were started; others observed slow return to normal activity.</p>	<p>This highlights the importance of antibiotics in control of symptoms and elimination of onward transmission, reflected by guidance surrounding exclusion periods.</p>	<p>Parents may be reassured that antibiotics are appropriate and effective in treating scarlet fever and preventing sequelae.</p>
<p><b>Impact on Household</b> Many respondents commented on secondary cases of infection within the household, or fear that other family members would become infected. The impact on parents and carers, both of becoming infected themselves and of providing additional care to unwell children, was evident.</p>	<p>Health protection teams should communicate the risk of secondary household cases, both of scarlet fever and of other GAS infections, in information materials. The household impact on health, missed school, and missed work by carers should figure into calculations of the total burden of the disease.</p>	<p>Alongside notification to aid identification of clustered cases, practitioners should also be alert to the possibility of associated cases of scarlet fever or other GAS infections, and ensure timely clinical assessment of unwell household contacts where appropriate.</p>

## Online Supplementary Material:

### Supplementary File 1: 2018 Online Questionnaire

### Supplementary File 2: 2019 Online Questionnaire

### Supplementary File 3: STROBE Checklist for Cross-Sectional Analysis

## Supplementary Methods for Cross-Sectional Analysis:

### Participants:

Children under 16 with scarlet fever were eligible if notified to London HPTs as confirmed or probable scarlet fever from March 1 to May 31 2018, or March 1 to May 31 2019. In 2018, the parents or guardians of all eligible cases for whom contact details and notification by a clinician could be confirmed were invited for participation; in 2019, parents or guardians were invited for participation after either notification by a clinician or via invitations circulated to parental networks of schools or nurseries with notified outbreaks.

The case definition of scarlet fever was in keeping with PHE guidance definitions of confirmed or probable scarlet fever: for sporadic cases identified through statutory notification (including the index cases of suspected outbreaks), a case constituted a clinical diagnosis of scarlet fever by a health professional (with or without detection of Group A Streptococci on a throat swab); in the context of an established outbreak, cases required a credible report of signs or symptoms consistent with scarlet fever with a close epidemiological link to a confirmed or probable case (with or without confirmation by a health professional).<sup>1</sup>

### Variables Ascertained:

Surveys collected data on demographics, medical history, contact history, symptoms, care-seeking behaviour, diagnoses and clinical management by health professionals, impact upon household caregivers, and knowledge and attitudes regarding scarlet fever on the part of the responding parent or guardian. Survey texts can be found in **Supplementary Files S1 and S2**.

### Data Sources and Measurement:

For analysis of variables associated with delayed diagnosis, the outcome was defined dichotomously as a case for whom scarlet fever was not considered in the differential diagnosis at the first consultation with a clinician (in the recollection of the responding parent or guardian). For analysis of consequences of delayed diagnosis, this dichotomous variable was considered as an exposure, and assessed along with potential confounders and effect modifiers for association with time to resumption of normal activity, time to return to school, and time to parent/guardian's return to work.

### Study Size:

---

<sup>1</sup> Public Health England, *Guidelines for the public health management of scarlet fever outbreaks in schools, nurseries and other childcare settings*, PHE, Editor. 2017, PHE: Wellington House, London.

The study size was determined pragmatically, attempting to contact as many notified cases and schools/nurseries as possible over the course of two high-transmission seasons.

Quantitative Variables:

Age in years was collected as a continuous variable and stratified for multivariable analysis into under 5 and 5 and older to increase statistical power and reflect the age at which school attendance starts. Other demographic and clinical exposure variables were ascertained and analysed dichotomously. Recovery outcomes were ascertained as continuous variables in days in the Cox's proportional hazards regression model.

Missing Data:

Missing values were addressed in regression models by introducing an additional category for unknown values of categorical variables. Cases with missing values for the outcome variables in Cox's regression were excluded from the analysis.

**Supplementary Table S1: Antibiotic prescribing patterns described by respondents (n=339)**

<b>Antibiotic Treatment Characteristics</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>(%)</b>
<b>Antibiotic Prescribed (n=311)</b>		
Penicillin V <sup>1</sup>	235	(76%)
Amoxicillin <sup>2</sup>	44	(14%)
Azithromycin <sup>3</sup>	15	(5%)
Erythromycin	14	(5%)
Other agent	6	(2%)
<b>Recommended Start (n=319)</b>		
Immediate (once prescribed)	303	(95%)
In the event of worsening symptoms	16	(5%)
<b>Prescribed Recommended Duration (n=288)</b>		
Yes	238	(83%)
No	50	(17%)
<b>Took Full Prescribed Course (n=339)</b>		
Yes	294	(87%)
No	45	(13%)
<b>Reason for Stopping Early (n=39)</b>		
Clinical improvement	16	(41%)
Doses excessive	7	(18%)
Unpleasant taste	6	(15%)
Other reasons	10	(26%)

<sup>1</sup>As recommended first line in NICE guidance; <sup>2</sup>As recommended if unable to swallow tablets; <sup>3</sup>As recommended if penicillin-allergic.

**Supplementary Table S2: Stratified model for associations with delayed diagnosis of scarlet fever among cases in 2018 (n=321).**

<b>Stratified exposure variable</b>	<b>% with delayed diagnosis (n/total)</b>	<b>Stratum-specific adjusted OR<sup>1</sup> (95% CI)</b>	<b>Wald test P-value</b>	<b>Likelihood ratio test for interaction P-value</b>
<i>5 years and older</i>				
No sore throat at onset	21% (14/68)	1.00 .		
<b>Sore throat at onset</b>	<b>42% (34/81)</b>	<b>2.79 (1.34-5.82)</b>	<b>0.006</b>	<b>0.009</b>
<i>Under 5 years old</i>				
No Sore throat at onset	31% (11/35)	1.00 .		
<b>Sore throat at onset</b>	<b>17% (8/47)</b>	<b>0.65 (0.27-1.55)</b>	<b>0.328</b>	

**Supplementary Figure S1. Recovery of scarlet fever cases among those in whom diagnosis was delayed or not delayed beyond first consultation with a health professional.** Days elapsed from onset of symptoms to clinical recovery (n=52, Panel A), return to school (n=298, Panel B), and return to work for carers (n=161 Panel C).

