World Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews
eISSN: 2581-9615 CODEN (USA): WJARAI
Cross Ref DOI: 10.30574/wjarr
Journal homepage: https://wjarr.com/

(REVIEW ARTICLE)

Check for updates

Diagnostic limitations of the classic triad, etiological differentiation, and prognostic predictors in acute meningitis: A structured literature review

Azzahra Kayla Ramadhini [1] and Paulus Sugianto [2,*]

[1] *Medical Study Program, Faculty of Medicine, Universitas Airlangga, Surabaya, Indonesia.*
[2] *Department of Neurology, Faculty of Medicine, Universitas Airlangga, Surabaya, Indonesia.*

World Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews, 2026, 31(01), 610–619

Publication history: Received on 01 June 2026; revised on 08 July 2026; accepted on 10 July 2026

Article DOI: https://doi.org/10.30574/wjarr.2026.31.1.1875

Abstract

Background: Acute meningitis is a time-sensitive neurological emergency. Although clinicians traditionally rely on the classic triad—fever, neck stiffness, and altered mental status—its presentation is frequently variable and inconsistent at the bedside.

Objective: This structured literature review evaluates the diagnostic limitations of the classic triad, differentiates bacterial from viral meningitis, and identifies key prognostic markers of mortality.

Methods: A search was conducted across PubMed, ScienceDirect, and Google Scholar for primary studies published between 2018 and 2024. Following a multi-stage screening focused on adults, 16 studies were selected for narrative synthesis. Results: The classic triad is absent in most cases, occurring in only 40–50% of adult bacterial meningitis cases and 28% of viral meningitis cases, particularly in older or immunocompromised patients. Significant symptom overlap makes prompt cerebrospinal fluid analysis, automated molecular panels, and host biomarkers indispensable for accurate differentiation. Poor outcomes and mortality are strongly predicted by independent factors: advanced age, low Glasgow Coma Scale score, pneumococcal or *Listeria* infections, low CSF white blood cell count, systemic complications (e.g., septic shock), and a critical therapeutic delay exceeding 2 hours from admission.

Conclusion: Clinical management must transition from rigid textbook symptom checklists to an integrated, risk-based approach. The absence of the classic triad should never exclude central nervous system infection. Early risk stratification and rapid diagnostic confirmation are essential to prevent delays and improve survival.

Keywords: Acute Meningitis; Classic Triad; Bacterial Meningitis; Viral Meningitis; Prognostic Markers; Diagnostic Delay.

1. Introduction

Meningitis remains one of the most time-sensitive neurological emergencies in clinical practice. Although its presentation may appear straightforward in textbooks, the disease is often more complex at the bedside. Acute meningitis can progress rapidly, especially when caused by bacterial pathogens, and delayed recognition may lead to neurological sequelae, disability, or death. Despite advances in vaccination, antimicrobial therapy, diagnostic testing, and supportive care, bacterial meningitis continues to carry a high burden of mortality. Recent reports still describe that approximately one in six patients with bacterial meningitis may die, while one in five may develop severe complications.[1] Viral meningitis is generally associated with a better prognosis, yet it is not always a completely benign

* Corresponding author: Paulus Sugianto

Copyright © 2026 Author(s) retain the copyright of this article. This article is published under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0.

condition, as some patients experience persistent symptoms or incomplete recovery after discharge.[2] These facts show that early recognition and appropriate clinical judgment remain essential in meningitis management.

For many years, clinicians have been taught to recognize meningitis through the classic triad of fever, neck stiffness, and altered mental status. This triad is simple, memorable, and clinically useful as an early warning sign of meningeal inflammation. However, many patients do not arrive with the complete triad. Some present only with headache, fever, vomiting, fatigue, or mild changes in behavior. Others may have no obvious neck stiffness during the first examination. This creates a diagnostic problem because the absence of classical findings may lead clinicians to underestimate the possibility of meningitis, especially in the early phase of illness. Furthermore, recent data indicates that this diagnostic ambiguity begins before hospital arrival, where pre-hospital symptoms tend to differ drastically between adult populations and children.[8]

Recent studies have shown that standard clinical symptoms are not reliable in meningitis. In adult bacterial meningitis, the classic triad of fever, headache, and neck stiffness is recorded in only 40–50% of patients and the signs are not specific to bacterial infection alone.[3] A study of adult viral meningitis and encephalitis similarly indicated that the whole classic triad was unusual, but a broader constellation of symptoms, including headache, fever, neck stiffness, and altered mental status, was more beneficial clinically.[4] Similar results were shown in viral meningitis, with headache, neck stiffness and photophobia or hyperacusis being present in just 28% of cases.2 Low sensitivity of the classic triad is also evident in growing regional healthcare settings, indicating its structural inconsistency in wider clinical settings.[16] These results indicate that the conventional triad should not be viewed as a rigorous diagnostic cut-off. Its absence does not exclude meningitis, and overreliance on it may delay further inquiry.

The diagnostic challenge becomes even greater when clinicians need to distinguish bacterial from viral meningitis at the beginning of the disease. This distinction is important because bacterial meningitis requires urgent empirical antibiotics, while viral meningitis often follows a different treatment course. However, the two conditions may overlap clinically. Fever, headache, vomiting, neck stiffness, and altered consciousness can be found in both bacterial and viral meningitis. Bacterial meningitis is more often associated with rapid deterioration, systemic involvement, reduced consciousness, intensive care admission, and higher mortality. Viral meningitis more commonly presents with headache, photophobia, preserved consciousness, and lower fatality risk. Even so, symptoms alone are not reliable enough to determine the cause. To address this gap, modern diagnostic algorithms focus heavily on the integration of advanced host biomarkers, such as procalcitonin and C-reactive protein, alongside automated molecular diagnostics.[6,7] Cerebrospinal fluid analysis, microbiological testing, and inflammatory biomarkers are still needed to support early etiological differentiation.

Prognosis is another essential concern in acute meningitis besides diagnosis. Poor outcomes are not just determined by presence or absence of the conventional trio. Many factors influence them, including age of the patient, immunological state, causative pathogen, neurological condition on admission, cerebrospinal fluid abnormalities, systemic complications, and timing of treatment. A synthesized analysis of the reviewed literature reveals that older age, altered mental status, low Glasgow coma scale score, pneumococcal infection, low cerebrospinal fluid white blood cell count, and delayed antibiotic therapy have been consistently described as independent predictors of poor outcomes and mortality in bacterial meningitis.3,5 These variables suggest that early assessment should go beyond symptom identification to risk classification for adverse outcomes.

Although many studies have discussed meningitis from different perspectives, the existing evidence remains somewhat fragmented. Some studies focus on the clinical presentation of meningitis, others compare etiological patterns, while several examine mortality predictors or treatment delay. Fewer reviews integrate these issues into one clinical narrative: how the inconsistency of the classic triad affects early diagnosis, how bacterial and viral meningitis can be differentiated, and which prognostic markers should alert clinicians to a higher risk of poor outcomes. This gap is important because clinical decisions in meningitis often begin before laboratory confirmation is available.

Therefore, this structured literature review aims to examine the diagnostic limitations of the classic triad in acute meningitis, compare the clinical characteristics of bacterial and viral meningitis, and identify prognostic markers associated with poor outcomes and mortality. By synthesizing these aspects, this review highlights the need to move beyond a symptom-based approach toward a broader diagnostic and prognostic assessment in acute meningitis.

2. Materials and Methods

2.1. Study Design

This study was designed as a structured literature review focusing on the diagnostic and prognostic aspects of acute meningitis. To ensure a methodical approach, the review specifically explored three main themes: the limitations of the classic triad in meningitis diagnosis, the clinical differentiation between bacterial and viral meningitis, and prognostic markers associated with poor outcomes and mortality. Unlike a traditional narrative review, this study utilized a transparent, multi-stage screening process to minimize selection bias.

2.2. Literature Search Strategy

A literature search was conducted using electronic databases, including PubMed, ScienceDirect, and Google Scholar. The search focused on articles published between 2018 and 2024 to ensure that the discussion reflected recent clinical evidence. The keywords used in the search included "acute meningitis," "bacterial meningitis," "viral meningitis," "classic triad," "clinical presentation," "diagnostic limitation," "prognostic factors," "mortality," "treatment delay," and "poor outcome." Boolean operators were used to combine search terms into targeted strings, such as "bacterial meningitis AND prognostic factors," "viral meningitis AND clinical features," and "classic triad AND meningitis."

2.3. Eligibility Criteria

Inclusion criteria were primary original research (retrospective cohort, prospective observational, and cross-sectional design), as well as landmark comprehensive consensus reviews that provide baseline epidemiological data, published in peer-reviewed publications, available in full text, and written in English or Indonesian. Studies were restricted to adult patients to guarantee clinical relevance to the target population, as clinical presentation and prognostic factors are markedly different from pediatric populations. We included studies that directly addressed the diagnosis of meningitis, clinical features, etiology, prognosis, or mortality of meningitis. However, studies were omitted if they were secondary literature, outside the designated time window, or focused solely on pediatric meningitis. Moreover, studies were excluded if they explored non-clinical laboratory mechanisms with no clear clinical applicability or if they did not provide sufficient information on diagnostic features, etiologic distinction, and prognostic results.

2.4. Study Selection and Data Extraction

The selected articles were screened on title, abstract and full-text level. After the initial database extraction, duplicate records were deleted. Two independent rounds of screening were conducted, an initial screening at the abstract level against the eligibility criteria followed by a detailed review of the full-text. Priority was given to articles discussing the classic triad, early clinical presentation, separation of bacterial from viral meningitis, cerebrospinal fluid abnormalities, risk of mortality, delay in treatment and neurological sequelae. Sixteen peer-reviewed studies fulfilled all eligibility criteria and were included in the final analysis. The data gathered from each article were: author name, publication year, study design, study population, etiology of meningitis, primary clinical results, prognostic variables, and relevance to the objectives of the review.

2.5. Data Synthesis

The findings were synthesized narratively using a thematic framework rather than statistically. The selected literature was grouped into three major themes derived from the study objectives. The first theme discussed the inconsistency and limited diagnostic value of the classic triad. The second theme compared bacterial and viral meningitis in terms of onset, clinical manifestations, laboratory support, and diagnostic challenges. The third theme examined prognostic markers associated with poor outcomes, including advanced age, altered mental status, low Glasgow Coma Scale score, pathogen type, delayed antibiotic administration, and mortality.

3. Result and Discussion

3.1. Overview of the Included Literature

The reviewed studies showed that acute meningitis remains difficult to recognize early because its clinical presentation is often less predictable than the classical description suggests. Across the selected literature, three major issues appeared repeatedly: the classic triad is inconsistently present, bacterial and viral meningitis overlap clinically in the early stages, and poor outcomes are more closely related to distinct host or clinical risk factors than to traditional textbook symptoms alone.

Most studies included in this review were cohort, retrospective, and observational designs involving adult populations with acute bacterial, viral, or infectious presentations. This variation allows the synthesis to move effectively from initial clinical recognition to etiological differentiation and outcome prediction. Rather than showing meningitis as a single uniform disease, the synthesized literature suggests that it should be understood as a clinical syndrome with highly variable presentation, severity, and prognosis. To provide a concise yet comprehensive summary of this evidence base, the clinical and methodological profiles of the 16 selected primary studies are systematically detailed in Table 1.

Table 1 Characteristics of the Included Studies

Author and Year	Study Design	Country	Study Population	Main Findings Relevant to the Review
Van de Beek et al. (2021)	Comprehensive Clinical Seminar / Landmark Review	Global / Netherlands	Adult bacterial meningitis.	Demonstrates high mortality (1:6) and complication rates (1:5), while confirming that the classic triad is present in only 40–50% of cases.
Petersen et al. (2023)	Large multicenter prospective cohort study	Denmark	Adults with viral meningitis.	Shows that the classic triad occurs in only 28% of viral cases and identifies a high risk of unfavorable short-term functional recovery.
Rynkevič et al. (2024)	Retrospective observational cohort study	Lithuania	Adult bacterial meningitis.	Notes headache, fever, fatigue, and confusion as most common symptoms, and identifies advanced age, impaired consciousness, and low CSF WBC as key mortality predictors.
Makkawi et al. (2024)	Single-center retrospective experience study	Saudi Arabia	Adult meningitis & encephalitis.	Reports that the full triad is rare, any 2 out of 4 key symptoms improve clinical yield, and antibiotic pretreatment before lumbar puncture is common.
Pomar et al. (2023)	Prospective observational cohort study	Spain	Healthy adults with bacterial meningitis.	Establishes that age ≥ 65, low GCS, septic shock, and acute renal failure serve as strong independent predictors of higher patient mortality.
Ivaska et al. (2024)	Biomarker and diagnostic evaluation study	Global / United Kingdom	Bacterial vs. viral evaluation.	Emphasizes that host inflammatory biomarkers including CRP, procalcitonin, and CSF lactate are essential for early etiological differentiation.
Carter & McGill (2022)	Clinical management update and review	United Kingdom	Adult acute meningitis.	Underscores the clinical necessity of integrating automated molecular diagnostics alongside traditional CSF analysis for rapid, pathogen-specific confirmation.
Hovmand (2023)	Pre-hospital observational study	Denmark	Ambulance / emergency patients with acute bacterial meningitis.	Demonstrates that pre-hospital symptoms differ greatly between adults and children, creating early diagnostic ambiguity before hospital arrival.

Hovmand (2023)	Retrospective observational cohort study	Denmark	Community-acquired bacterial meningitis cohort.	Analyzes structural risk factors associated with therapeutic delay and links late antibiotic implementation directly to unfavorable clinical outcomes.
Eisen (2023)	Multinational community-acquired cohort study	International Collaboration	Adults with community-acquired bacterial meningitis.	Establishes a critical therapeutic threshold where an antibiotic delay exceeding 2 hours from emergency department arrival doubles the risk of mortality.
Sunwoo (2021)	Hospital-based retrospective observational study	South Korea	Adult patients with confirmed bacterial meningitis.	Evaluates etiological outcomes, proving that specific pathogen such as *pneumococcus* cause more severe neurological damage and worse survival rates.
Koelman (2022)	Prospective nationwide cohort study (20-year period)	Netherlands	Adults with pneumococcal meningitis.	Confirms pneumococcal etiology as a potent independent predictor of severe systemic illness, intensive care requirements, and high mortality rates.
Gabor (2022)	Prospective observational study	Vietnam	Patients with central nervous system infections.	Maps regional etiological variations and confirms that textbook clinical symptom profiles are frequently altered or masked in local healthcare settings.
Akaishi (2024)	Nationwide population-based observational study	Japan	Large nationwide pool of patients with acute meningitis.	Utilizes large-scale demographic profiling to reinforce advanced age as a rigid, non-modifiable predictor of mortality in acute presentations.
Bineshfar (2022)	Epidemiologic and radiologic cohort evaluation	Iran	Patients with subacute, chronic, and atypical meningitis presentations.	Details how prolonged or modified clinical courses confound initial triage, requiring advanced molecular or laboratory confirmation when standard markers are absent.
Iftiyastuti (2024)	Cross-sectional regional study	Indonesia	Patients evaluated for meningitis in emerging regional healthcare systems.	Investigates regional screening data to confirm the structural inconsistency and low clinical sensitivity of textbook presentations during initial bedside screening.

3.2. Inconsistency of the Classic Triad in Acute Meningitis

The classic triad has long been used as a practical clinical clue in suspected meningitis. In most clinical teaching, meningitis is associated with fever, neck stiffness, and altered mental status or headache. This combination is easy to remember and remains useful when it is present. However, the reviewed literature suggests that its absence should not reassure clinicians too quickly.

Only about 40–50% of patients with bacterial meningitis present with the classic clinical signs of fever, headache, and neck stiffness.[1,3] Consequently, a substantial proportion of patients may not show the typical classical pattern during the initial evaluation. In a recent investigation of adult infectious meningitis and encephalitis, impaired mental status, headache, and fever were also common, although the full classic triad was rarely identified. In that sample, two of four symptoms (headache, fever, neck stiffness, and altered mental status) had a better clinical yield than waiting for

the complete triad.[4] This is a significant result since it modifies how the triad should be interpreted; the triad may support clinical suspicion when present but should not be considered a mandatory diagnostic criterion. Such diagnostic confusion can easily lead to incorrect initial triage, creating clinical bottlenecks and delaying management before the patient is completely evaluated in the hospital.[8]

A similar pattern is observed in viral meningitis. Only a quarter of individuals with viral meningitis in a large prospective cohort presented with the triad of headache, neck stiffness, and photophobia or hyperacusis.[2] This conclusion is inconsistent with the traditional view that viral meningitis is invariably accompanied by frank meningeal inflammation. In fact, many patients with viral meningitis may present with headache and systemic symptoms, yet neck stiffness or photophobia may be absent or only mild to moderate. Thus, both bacterial and viral meningitis may present in an atypical fashion beyond the textbook pattern, which frequently confounds initial triage in emergency settings.[16]

The reduced sensitivity of the traditional triad can be explained by numerous variables. The presentation of meningitis is determined by several factors, including age, immunological state, time of presentation, causative organism, prior antibiotic exposure, and the degree of inflammatory response. Older adults and immunocompromised patients may exhibit atypically as their inflammatory response may be less robust or evident. Patients who present early in the course of the disease may not exhibit neck stiffness or changed mental status. Meanwhile, patients already treated with antibiotics may have different clinical and laboratory findings. In certain circumstances it is dangerous to rely on the entire trio alone.

The classic triad is therefore better understood as a warning sign rather than a diagnostic threshold. Its presence should increase clinical suspicion, but its absence should not exclude meningitis. This distinction matters because delayed suspicion may postpone lumbar puncture, microbiological testing, and empirical antimicrobial therapy. In bacterial meningitis, such delay can have serious consequences. A more cautious approach is to consider meningitis whenever a patient presents with compatible symptoms such as fever with headache, unexplained altered consciousness, vomiting, photophobia, seizure, focal neurological signs, or systemic infection without a clear source.

3.3. Clinical Differentiation Between Bacterial and Viral Meningitis

Differentiation of bacterial from viral meningitis is one of the most essential clinical decisions in acute meningitis. This distinction has immediate therapeutic implications. Bacterial meningitis requires prompt empiric antibiotic therapy and generally intensive monitoring, whereas viral meningitis is normally managed differently and often carries a reduced risk of death. However, early distinction is not always easy since symptoms may overlap.

Bacterial meningitis is generally associated with a more severe clinical course. Patients may develop rapid deterioration, reduced consciousness, systemic compromise, septic shock, respiratory failure, or renal dysfunction. In a retrospective study of adult bacterial meningitis in Lithuania, the most common symptoms were headache, fever, fatigue, and confusion or sleepiness. More than half of the patients were initially admitted to the intensive care unit, showing the severity of bacterial meningitis in adult populations.[3] Another prospective cohort of bacterial meningitis in previously healthy adults also reported substantial systemic complications, including septic shock and acute renal failure, which were later associated with mortality.[5]

Viral meningitis tends to have a milder course, but it should not be viewed as completely harmless. The large multicenter cohort showed that enteroviruses, herpes simplex virus type 2, and varicella-zoster virus were among the main identified causes of viral meningitis. Although viral meningitis had a better overall prognosis than bacterial meningitis, unfavorable short-term outcomes were still reported in a subset of patients.[2] This is clinically relevant because patients with viral meningitis may experience prolonged symptoms, delayed functional recovery, or inability to return immediately to premorbid activities.

The clinical overlap between bacterial and viral meningitis is one reason why symptoms alone are insufficient. Fever, headache, nausea, vomiting, photophobia, neck stiffness, and altered mental status may appear in both conditions. Bacterial meningitis may be suspected when symptoms progress rapidly or when there is altered consciousness, seizures, systemic toxicity, or hemodynamic instability. Viral meningitis may be more likely when consciousness is preserved, headache and photophobia predominate, and systemic deterioration is limited. Even so, these patterns are not absolute. Some bacterial cases may begin with nonspecific symptoms, while some viral cases may present with severe headache, vomiting, or neurological complaints.

Because of this overlap, cerebrospinal fluid examination remains central to etiological differentiation. Bacterial meningitis is usually associated with neutrophilic pleocytosis, elevated protein, and decreased glucose, while viral

meningitis is more often associated with lymphocytic pleocytosis, normal glucose, and moderately elevated protein. However, these patterns can also vary, especially early in the disease or after antibiotic pretreatment. Therefore, CSF culture, Gram stain, polymerase chain reaction, multiplex molecular panels, and biomarkers such as C-reactive protein, procalcitonin, or CSF lactate may be needed to support diagnosis.[6,7]

Several recent studies also emphasize the growing importance of molecular diagnostics. In one adult cohort, many cases of meningitis and encephalitis had no identified pathogen, and antibiotic pretreatment before lumbar puncture was common.[4] This creates a diagnostic dilemma. Antibiotics should not be delayed when bacterial meningitis is suspected, but antibiotic administration before CSF collection may reduce culture positivity. Molecular tests may partly address this limitation because they can detect pathogens even when culture results are negative. However, access to these tests varies across settings, and clinical judgment remains necessary while awaiting results.

3.4. Diagnostic Implication: Moving Beyond Symptom-Based Recognition

The evidence reviewed in this paper suggests that acute meningitis should not be assessed only through a symptom checklist. A symptom-based approach is useful for initial suspicion, but it has limitations when symptoms are incomplete or atypical. In many cases, clinicians must make early decisions before the diagnosis is confirmed. This is where a broader diagnostic approach becomes important.

A more appropriate approach combines clinical suspicion, neurological examination, disease severity, risk factors, CSF analysis, and microbiological testing. For example, a patient with fever, headache, vomiting, and subtle confusion may still require urgent evaluation even without neck stiffness. Similarly, an older adult with unexplained altered consciousness and systemic infection should raise concern for CNS infection even if the classic triad is incomplete. The key issue is not whether the patient fulfills the full triad, but whether the overall clinical picture is compatible with meningitis.

The reviewed studies also show that etiological patterns differ across regions and populations. In some cohorts, *Streptococcus pneumoniae* and *Neisseria meningitidis* remain dominant causes of bacterial meningitis, while other studies reported increasing roles of *Listeria monocytogenes*, Gram-negative organisms, or unidentified pathogens.[3,4,5] For viral meningitis, enterovirus, HSV-2, and VZV are commonly reported, although a considerable proportion of cases may remain without an identified pathogen.[2] These differences support the need for context-specific diagnostic awareness, especially in settings where vaccination patterns, antibiotic exposure, referral systems, and diagnostic facilities differ.

3.5. Prognostic Markers Associated with Poor Outcomes

The prognosis in acute meningitis depends on a few factors. The evidence examined repeatedly demonstrates that poor outcome is not a simple function of the presence of classical symptoms. However, mortality and poor recovery are more related to host and pathogen variables, neurological condition on admission, laboratory findings, systemic problems, and timing of treatment.

Advanced age is one of the most consistent prognostic factors. Older patients are more vulnerable because they are more likely to have comorbidities, weaker physiological reserve, atypical symptoms, and delayed recognition. In the reviewed bacterial meningitis study, advanced age was associated with lethal outcome.[3] Similarly, in the prospective cohort of previously healthy adults with bacterial meningitis, age 65 years or older was independently associated with higher mortality.[5] These findings suggest that age should be considered early when assessing risk, even when patients do not have obvious comorbid conditions.

Initial neurological status is another important marker. Altered mental status, confusion, sleepiness, and low Glasgow Coma Scale score reflect more severe CNS involvement. These findings may indicate increased intracranial pressure, cerebral edema, extensive inflammation, sepsis-associated encephalopathy, or early neurological complications. Previous studies have identified low level of consciousness as one of the strongest predictors of unfavorable outcomes in bacterial meningitis.[3,5] Clinically, this means that patients who arrive with impaired consciousness should be treated as high risk, regardless of whether the full classic triad is present.

Pathogen type also influences prognosis. Pneumococcal meningitis is repeatedly associated with more severe disease and worse outcomes compared with some other bacterial etiologies.[11,12] In the literature study, clinical characteristics differed by pathogen, and *Listeria monocytogenes*, *Streptococcus pneumoniae*, and *Neisseria meningitidis* were among the most common identified causes.[3] The study also found that patients with *Listeria monocytogenes* meningitis were

older and had longer hospitalization.[3] These differences show that etiology is not only relevant for antimicrobial selection, but also for estimating disease severity and likely outcome.

Systemic problems have also been closely related with death. In this prospective cohort of healthy adults with bacterial meningitis, septic shock and severe renal failure were independently linked with increased death.[5] This finding is clinically relevant since it reveals that bacterial meningitis should not simply be seen as a neurological infection. It can also be systemic inflammatory and septic disease. Patients who are in shock, have organ malfunction or respiratory failure require strong supportive treatment in addition to antimicrobial medication.

Cerebrospinal fluid findings may also have prognostic value. In the Lithuanian cohort, low CSF white blood cell count was associated with lethal outcome, while headache was associated with favorable outcome.[3] At first glance, a low CSF white cell count may appear less severe, but in bacterial meningitis it may reflect an inadequate host inflammatory response or overwhelming infection. Meanwhile, headache may be linked with earlier recognition because it prompts patients to seek care and clinicians to consider CNS infection. This interpretation supports a broader point: prognosis is not always predicted by symptom intensity alone. Sometimes, the absence of expected inflammatory findings may signal a worse host response.

Treatment delay is one of the most clinically important modifiable prognostic factors. Delayed antibiotic administration has been associated with poor outcomes and mortality in bacterial meningitis.[3,5] Crucially, multinational clinical data has established that critical thresholds of therapeutic delay exceeding 2 hours from emergency department arrival significantly increase patient mortality.[10] The challenge is that treatment delay often begins with diagnostic uncertainty. When meningitis is not suspected because the classic triad is absent, lumbar puncture and empirical antibiotics may be postponed. On the other hand, giving antibiotics before lumbar puncture may reduce culture positivity. This creates a practical tension between diagnostic accuracy and timely treatment. The safest clinical principle is that suspected bacterial meningitis should receive immediate empirical therapy, while lumbar puncture and microbiological confirmation should be performed as early as possible when not contraindicated.

3.6. Bacterial and Viral Meningitis: Different Prognostic Patterns

Bacterial and viral meningitis differ not only in treatment urgency but also in prognostic pattern. Bacterial meningitis is more likely to cause death, neurological sequelae, intensive care admission, and systemic complications. Prognosis is influenced by pathogen virulence, host immune status, level of consciousness, organ dysfunction, and speed of antibiotic therapy. In contrast, viral meningitis usually has lower mortality, but it can still cause unfavorable short-term functional outcomes. The reviewed viral meningitis cohort found that outcomes were broadly similar across viral etiologies, and that unfavorable recovery occurred in a notable proportion of patients.[2]

This difference suggests that bacterial meningitis prognosis is often driven by both pathogen and acute disease severity, while viral meningitis recovery may be influenced by host response, symptom burden, and post-infectious effects. The distinction is important because it prevents two common errors. The first error is underestimating bacterial meningitis when the classic triad is incomplete. The second is dismissing viral meningitis as always benign. Both conditions require careful assessment, although the urgency and treatment strategy differ.

3.7. Clinical Synthesis

Taken together, the reviewed literature supports a shift in how acute meningitis is understood clinically. The classic triad remains useful, but it is not sensitive enough to guide diagnosis by itself. Bacterial and viral meningitis share several early symptoms, making clinical differentiation difficult without CSF and microbiological support. Prognostic assessment should begin early and should include age, mental status, pathogen suspicion, systemic complications, CSF findings, and treatment timing.

This synthesis has practical implications. First, clinicians should maintain suspicion for meningitis even when the complete triad is absent. Second, early lumbar puncture should be prioritized when safe, but empirical antibiotics should not be delayed in suspected bacterial meningitis. Third, molecular testing and biomarkers may help improve etiological diagnosis, especially when culture results are negative after antibiotic exposure. Fourth, patients with advanced age, altered consciousness, organ dysfunction, pneumococcal infection, low CSF WBC count, or delayed therapy should be considered at higher risk for poor outcomes.

The central message is that acute meningitis requires more than recognition of classical symptoms. It requires risk-based thinking. A patient does not need to “look textbook” to have meningitis. The absence of the classic triad may mislead clinicians, but a broader assessment can reduce diagnostic delay and improve early management. Therefore,

modern clinical reasoning in meningitis should move beyond the classic triad toward integrated diagnostic and prognostic evaluation.

4. Conclusion

Acute meningitis remains a critical diagnostic and prognostic challenge due to its highly variable and often incomplete clinical presentation. The classic triad of fever, neck stiffness, and altered mental status is still useful as an early clinical warning sign, but it should not be used as a strict diagnostic requirement. Because a significant proportion of patients, especially older adults, immunocompromised individuals, or those in the early stages of illness present without the full triad, its absence should never be used to rule out meningitis or delay further investigation.

Furthermore, clinical symptoms alone are insufficient to differentiate between bacterial and viral etiologies due to significant symptomatic overlap. Bacterial meningitis is generally associated with more rapid deterioration, systemic complications, intensive care admission, and higher mortality, while viral meningitis usually has a better prognosis but may still lead to unfavorable short-term recovery in some patients. Consequently, Cerebrospinal fluid analysis, automated molecular diagnostics, and host biomarkers remain indispensable for early and accurate etiological differentiation.

Ultimately, the prognosis of the patient is dependent on a complex mix of risk factors rather than the strength of the symptoms. Advanced age changed mental status on admission, low Glasgow Coma Scale score, pathogen type, aberrant CSF findings, and systemic complications such as septic shock were strong independent predictors of an unfavorable outcome. Most crucially, the largest modifiable factor to minimize mortality is to reduce treatment delay. This organized literature evaluation ends with the conclusion that modern clinical therapy of acute meningitis must move on from an overreliance on textbook symptom checklists. An integrated approach is needed to avoid delays in diagnosis and enhance patient survival. Clinicians need to have a strong clinical suspicion, combined with rapid diagnostic confirmation and early risk stratification.

Compliance with ethical standards

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to express their sincere gratitude to the Department of Neurology, Faculty of Medicine, Universitas Airlangga, for the guidance and support throughout this study. The authors also sincerely thank the supervisors for their invaluable guidance, constructive feedback, and continuous encouragement during the completion of this research.

Disclosure of conflict of interest

All authors have no conflict of interest.

Statement of ethical approval

Ethical approval was not required for this study because it was based solely on published literature.

References

[1] Van de Beek D, Brouwer MC, Koedel U, Wall EC. Community-acquired bacterial meningitis. Lancet. 2021;398(10306):1171–1183. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(21)00883-7.

[2] Petersen PT, Bodilsen J, Jepsen MPG, Larsen L, Storgaard M, Hansen BR, et al. Clinical features and prognostic factors in adults with viral meningitis. Brain. 2023;146(9):3816–3825. doi:10.1093/brain/awad089.

[3] Rynkevič G, Žilinskas E, Streckytė D, Radzišauskienė D, Mameniškienė R. Etiology, clinical presentation, and outcomes of bacterial meningitis in adult patients: a retrospective study in Lithuania (2018–2021). Med Sci Monit. 2024;30:e942904. doi:10.12659/MSM.942904.

[4] Makkawi S, Alqurashi S, Hubayni W, Almahdawi S, Bahkali S, Alharbi A, et al. The clinical manifestations, risk factors, etiologies, and outcomes of adult patients with infectious meningitis and encephalitis: single center experience. Neurol Int. 2024;16(5):966–975. doi:10.3390/neurolint16050073.

[5] Pomar V, Benito N, Duch P, Colomé M, Rivera A, Domingo P. Acute bacterial meningitis in healthy adult patients: a prospective cohort study. J Clin Med. 2023;12(11):3624. doi:10.3390/jcm12113624.

[6] Ivaska L, Herberg J, Sadarangani M. Distinguishing community-acquired bacterial and viral meningitis: microbes and biomarkers. J Infect. 2024;88(3):106111. doi:10.1016/j.jinf.2024.01.010.

[7] Carter E, McGill F. The management of acute meningitis: an update. Clin Med (Lond). 2022;22(5):396–400. doi:10.7861/clinmed.2022-cme-meningitis.

[8] Hovmand N, Christensen HC, Lundbo LF, Kronborg G, Darsø P, Blomberg SNF, et al. Pre-hospital symptoms associated with acute bacterial meningitis differs between children and adults. Sci Rep. 2023;13:21479. doi:10.1038/s41598-023-48161-x.

[9] Hovmand N, Lundbo LF, Kronborg G, Darsø P, Benfield T. Factors associated with treatment delay and outcome in community acquired bacterial meningitis. IJID Reg. 2023;7:176–181. doi:10.1016/j.ijregi.2023.03.013.

[10] Eisen DP, Hamilton E, Bodilsen J, Køster-Rasmussen R, Stockdale AJ, Miner J, et al. Longer than 2 hours to antibiotics is associated with doubling of mortality in a multinational community-acquired bacterial meningitis cohort. Sci Rep. 2022;12:672. doi:10.1038/s41598-021-04349-7.

[11] Sunwoo JS, Shin HR, Lee HS, Moon J, Lee ST, Jung KH, et al. A hospital-based study on etiology and prognosis of bacterial meningitis in adults. Sci Rep. 2021;11:6028. doi:10.1038/s41598-021-85382-4.

[12] Koelman DLH, Brouwer MC, ter Horst L, Bijlsma MW, van der Ende A, van de Beek D. Pneumococcal meningitis in adults: a prospective nationwide cohort study over a 20-year period. Clin Infect Dis. 2022;74(4):657–667. doi:10.1093/cid/ciab477.

[13] Gabor JJ, Anh CX, Sy BT, Hoan PQ, Quyen DT, The NT, et al. Aetiologies and clinical presentation of central nervous system infections in Vietnamese patients: a prospective study. Sci Rep. 2022;12:18065. doi:10.1038/s41598-022-23007-0.

[14] Akaishi T, Tarasawa K, Fushimi K, Yaegashi N, Aoki M, Fujimori K. Demographic profiles and risk factors for mortality in acute meningitis: a nationwide population-based observational study. Acute Med Surg. 2024;11:e920. doi:10.1002/ams2.920.

[15] Bineshfar N, Rezaei A, Mirahmadi A, Shokouhi S, Gharehbagh FJ, Haghighi M, et al. Evaluation of the epidemiologic, clinical, radiologic, and treatment methods of patients with subacute and chronic meningitis. BMC Neurol. 2022;22:340. doi:10.1186/s12883-022-02873-1.

[16] Iftiyastuti SNB, Rizkita LD, Ihsana N, Selohandono A. The relationship between the classic triad of meningitis and types of meningitis. J La Medihealtico. 2024;5(4):848–856. doi:10.37899/journallamedihealtico.v5i4.1542.