

**FALSE NEGATIVE TESTING OF TWO HIV ANTIBODY ELISAs IN
COMPARISON WITH A COMBINED ANTIGEN-ANTIBODY ELISA IN
A HOSPITAL-BASED BLOOD BANK IN NORTH CENTRAL NIGERIA.**

ABSTRACT:

Background: Global strategies with targets for making safe blood universally available by 2020 and the elimination of HIV transmission by 2030 have been set throwing a burden of care on hospital-based blood banks in Nigeria to deploy appropriate strategies towards meeting them.

Aims and Objectives: To assess false positive and false negative test results obtained with two third generation HIV antibody screening tests (Determine™ HIV- 1/2 and Dia Pro HIV 1/2/0 ELISA) in comparison with a combined HIV antigen-antibody ELISA in a hospital-based blood bank in North central Nigeria with respect to blood safety and availability.

Materials and methods: This was a cross sectional study carried out on the serum of four hundred and forty blood donors predominantly males and family donors/family replacement donors to evaluated the proportion of false negative (FN) and false positive (FP) test results obtained with Determine™ HIV- 1/2 and Dia Pro HIV 1/2/0 ELISA that are commonly used to safeguard blood donations against TT-HIV and ensure blood availability in Nigeria. These assays were compared with Genscreen ®PLUS HIV Ag- Ab ELISA (a combined HIV antigen-antibody ELISA or 4th Generation ELISA and data analysed using prism pad statistical package version 5.

Results: False negative (FN) tests results were recorded as 60.98% and 46.34% for Determine™ HIV 1/2/0 and HIV Dia Pro HIV 1/2/0 respectively related to the sensitivities (39.02% and 53.50%) and specificities (100% and 99.50%) of Determine™ HIV 1/2/0 and HIV Dia Pro HIV 1/2/0 respectively. The proportion of FP test results were found to be 0 and 4.88 percent for Determine™ HIV 1/2/0 and HIV Dia Pro HIV 1/2/0 respectively.

Conclusion: The two third generation antibody ELISAs demonstrate low performance with respect to the proportion of false negative test results when compared with Genscreen ®PLUS HIV Ag-Ab ELISA.

31 **Recommendation:** Hospital-based blood banks should be supported to deploy only the
32 combined HIV antigen-antibody ELISA for all blood donors and donations in order to ensure
33 blood safety and availability.

34 **Key Words:** Antibody ELISA, Combined Ag-Ab ELISA; False Positive; False Negative;
35 Transfusion-transmissible HIV; Nigeria;

36 1. Introduction:

37 Laboratory testing for human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) has been introduced since
38 1980s for individual patient-based diagnosis as well as high-risk and low-risk population-
39 based screening either as Enzyme – Linked Immuno-sorbent Assay (ELISA) or non-ELISA-
40 based techniques. (1) These tests target specific parts of HIV including its gene sequence,
41 gene products or measures the hosts' antibodies and are associated with varying quality
42 parameters including the proportions of false positive and false negative rates, sensitivity and
43 specificities which bear consequences on patients, care givers and society. The HIV Nucleic
44 acid amplification test (NAAT) currently deployed in resource endowed settings (RES) but
45 not universally available to resource limited settings (RLS) because of its expense, technical
46 demands and logistic challenges detects the infectious particles or antigens even before
47 antibodies are produced allowing for earlier detection of primary HIV infection in high risk
48 groups and narrows the diagnostic window and residual risk of transfusing an infectious
49 blood by over 50 percent. (2)(3) In low resource economies, HIV antibody-based tests either
50 as rapid Diagnostic Tests (HIV-RDT) [defined as those tests that can be completed in less
51 than 30 minutes and do not require instrumentation and can be read visually] (4) or manual
52 plate Enzyme Immuno Assays (EIA) are the traditional methods utilized in securing blood
53 donations from TT-HIV. The World Health Organization (WHO) has recommended that,
54 donated blood should be screened for HIV using a highly sensitive and specific anti-HIV-1
55 anti-HIV-2 immunoassay or a combined HIV antigen-antibody immunoassay (EIA/CLIA)
56 that is capable of detecting subtypes specific to the country or region and in its absence, a
57 highly sensitive and specific anti-HIV-1 anti-HIV-2 rapid assay could be used in laboratories
58 with small throughput, remote areas or emergency situations. (5) Quintessentially, NAAT is
59 desirable but not compulsorily recommended for safeguarding blood supplies and in its place
60 different methodologies are usually deployed in different regions of the world dependent on
61 the local hospital or national recommendation which often specifies that such test must
62 identify all possible HIV infections in that setting.

63 Hospital-based HIV testing for blood transfusion is only aimed at “screening” to identify
64 blood donors or blood units testing HIV seronegative so as to be channeled towards
65 transfusion while those that test seropositive are given little consideration and the action often
66 require a referral to a treatment centre wherever it exists for diagnosis. In the case of an
67 infectious blood unit detected, it is discarded with implicating financial and man-hour
68 wastages. The interpretation of all antibody-based HIV screening test requires some form of
69 conversion from a contentious measurement scale to a discontinuous scale as positive or
70 negative test result. When measured against standards, test sensitivity, specificity, positive
71 and negative predictive values usually differ and no single test has both 100% sensitivity and
72 100% specificity nor 100% positive and 100% negative predictive values. (1)

73 HIV antibody assays deployed for blood safety and availability programmes are ideally
74 expected to be extremely sensitive and able to detect all known HIV subtypes tested without
75 having to record false negative results and be absolutely specific to minimize false positive
76 tests (6)

77 However, discrepancies in test methodologies usually arise from the proportion of false
78 positive and false negative test results which bear implications to patients, practitioners and
79 governments. In order to improve efficiency, most blood transfusion centres screening for
80 HIV set up their cut off value at high sensitivity to minimize the number of false negative
81 results and refer blood donors with positive test results to other clinicians for repeat
82 diagnostic testing and treatment. (1) In realization that, even the best methods for HIV
83 screening are capable of producing false positive and false negative results, Constantine and
84 Zink (7) advised on careful and appropriate selection of HIV tests. A false negative test result
85 is observed where a potential blood donor is identified as being HIV sero-negative when in
86 fact such donor has the infection when tested on a gold standard test or method. On the other
87 hand, a false positive test result is observed where a potential blood donor is screened as
88 being HIV sero-positive when indeed he or she does have HIV infection as tested with by a
89 gold standard test or method. In many resource-limited settings (RLS) in Africa, the
90 organization of hospital-based transfusion service is peculiar; hospitals are generally “stand
91 alone” entities relying on their lean financial budgets to run the reputedly high-cost services
92 associated with blood transfusion. Their responsibilities revolve around all the key aspects of
93 blood transfusion including blood donor recruitment, blood collection, screening for
94 transfusion transmissible infections, processing into components and products as well as
95 cross-matching and clinical utilization for transfusion in individual centres or hospitals. In

this setting, the logistics for donor assessment and counselling is often weak paving way for unprofessionalism and paucity of safe blood donors who are truly voluntary, altruistic and non-remunerated. (8) Such deviances potentially compromises quality practices giving rise to unchecked high false positive testing of blood donors, unnecessary donor deferrals and stigmatization. Many researchers including Philips et al (9) have submitted on the importance of evaluating HIV screening tests in the population of intending use before widespread application. (1) As the global target of ensuring a zero HIV transmission by 2030 (10) gets close at hand, RLS must brace up to achieve set targets.

This study therefore, sought to assess false positive and false negative test results obtained with two third generation HIV antibody screening test in comparison with a combined antigen-antibody test (fourth generation assay) in a hospital-based blood bank in north central Nigeria with its implications on blood safety and availability.

2. Methodology:

This cross sectional study aimed at evaluating for false negative and false positive test results in two HIV antibody assays (Determine™ HIV- 1/2 and Dia Pro HIV 1/2/0 ELISA) used to safeguard blood donations against transfusion transmissible HIV at the blood bank unit of Jos University Teaching Hospital(JUTH), in north Central Nigeria. These HIV assays were compared with GENSCREEN®PLUS HIV Ag- Ab ELISA (combined HIV antigen-antibody ELISA or 4th Generation ELISA) considering reports that, 4th generation ELISAs are similar in performances with NAAT.(3)

Four hundred and forty (440) blood donors of both sexes aged between 18 and 55 years, who presented and met the inclusion criteria i.e. fulfilled the conditions to donate blood in Nigeria and consented to participate in this study were enrolled between May and August 2008. Those who did not meet the minimum criteria to donate blood and or declined to give informed consent were excluded. A validated questionnaire was administered by trained research assistants to identify donors' bio-data and their relevant characteristics. Ten (10) milliliters of venous blood was collected from ante-cubital vein of all the blood donors using a large bore needle to avoid haemolysis and under aseptic conditions. Haemostasis was secured and the collected blood emptied into a clean evacuated tube without an anticoagulant. The process of serum extraction and storage was carried out using standard methods (11)(12). The serum collected was screened for HIV antibodies using Determine™ HIV 1/2 manufactured by Abbott Japan Co. Ltd, Minato-Ku, Tokyo-Japan and thereafter, tested with Dia Pro HIV 1/2/0 EIA and Genscreen®Plus HIV Ag- Ab ELISA manufactured by

diagnostic Bioprobes Sx/Italy and BIO-RAD laboratories, 3 Bd Raymond Poincaré, Marnes La Couquette-France respectively. All reagents were sourced from commercial vendors within the country and a cold chain was maintained in the transport, delivery and storage of the reagents until its eventual utilization for testing. All procedures were carried out following the manufacturers' recommendations strictly

All ethical standards were strictly adhered to. Ethical approval for the study was obtained from the ethical committee of JUTH and all blood donors participating in the study gave an informed written consent.

Statistical Analysis: The combined HIV antigen-antibody ELISA Genscreen®Plus HIV Ag-Ab ELISA was used to validate the two HIV antibody testing methods for False-Negative (FN), false positive (FP), negative predictive value (NPV), positive predictive value (PPV) together with the variation of sensitivity, specificity and risk ratios (of what?? vs what??)

Please explain how the point estimate rate is computed and what is the exposure and the non exposure variable) were calculated using the Graph Pad Prism 5 Statistical Package. A p-value ≤ 0.05 was taken as level of significance for interpretation of data using Fishers Exact Test.

3. RESULTS:

Table 1: Contingency table of Determine™ HIV 1/2/0 versus Genscreen®PLUS HIV Ag-Ab ELISA among blood donors.

	Genscreen®PLUS HIV Ag-Ab POSITIVE	Genscreen®PLUS HIV Ag-Ab NEGATIVE	TOTAL
Determine™ POSITIVE	16	0	16
Determine™ NEGATIVE	25	399	424
TOTAL	41	399	440

150

151 Table 2: contingency table of Dia Pro HIV 1/2/0 versus Genscreen ®PLUS HIV Ag-
 152 Ab ELISA among blood donors.

153

	Genscreen ®PLUS HIV Ag-Ab POSITIVE	Genscreen ®PLUS HIV Ag-Ab NEGATIVE	TOTAL
Dia Pro HIV 1/2/0 POSITIVE	22	2	24
Dia Pro HIV 1/2/0 NEGATIVE	19	397	418 416
TOTAL	41	399	440

154

155

156

157

158

159

160

161

162

163

164

Table 3: False Negative, False Positive and some laboratory considerations of Determine™ HIV 1/2/0 and HIV Dia Pro HIV 1/2/0 HIV-antibody assays in comparison with Genscreen®PLUS HIV Ag-Ab ELISA among blood donors.

Parameter	Determine™ HIV 1/2/0 vs Genscreen®PLUS HIV Ag-Ab ELISA	HIV Dia Pro HIV 1/2/0 vs Genscreen®PLUS HIV Ag-Ab ELISA
Total number of blood donors	440	440
True Positive	16	22
False Positive	~~25~~ 0	2
True Negative	399	397
False Negative	~~0~~ 25	19
Sensitivity	39.02%	~~53.50%~~ 22/41=53.65%
Specificity	100%	99.50%
Proportion of False Negative	60.98%	46.34%
Proportion of False positive	0	~~4.88%~~ 2/399=0.5%
Positive predictive Value	100%	~~99.5%~~ 22/24=91.67%
Negative Predictive Value	94.1%	95.4%
Relative Risk (%FN of what?? vs what??) Please explain how the point estimate rate is computed and what is the exposure and the non exposure variables	~~16.96 (95% CI 11.59-24.81)~~	~~20.07 (95% CI 12.73-31.65)~~
Odds Ratio (%FN of what?? vs what??) Please explain how the point estimate rate is computed and what is the exposure and the non exposure variables	~~517 (95% CI 30.13-8871)~~	~~229.8 (95% CI 50.3-1050)~~
P<0.05	< 0.0001	< 0.0001
Statistical Significance	Yes	Yes

KEY: CI- Confidence interval.

170

171 4. DISCUSSION:

172 Hospital-based transfusion centres in RLS can reduce the proportion of false negative testing
173 by deploying appropriate HIV testing methods to scale up their provision of safe blood and
174 by identifying truly infectious blood donors or blood units thereby ensuring availability of
175 blood donors and avoid unnecessary discard of donated blood units through proactive
176 assessments of assays used in this setting.

177 This study evaluating proportions of false negative and false positive test results observed
178 with two third generation HIV assays [(Determine™ HIV 1/2/0; a HIV-RDT and HIV Dia
179 Pro HIV 1/2/0; a manual plate-based EIA)] in comparison with Genscreen®PLUS HIV Ag-
180 Ab ELISA (Fourth generation ELISA) has found that, 60.98% and 46.34% false negative
181 (FN) tests results were recorded for Determine™ HIV 1/2/0 and HIV Dia Pro HIV 1/2/0
182 respectively. The high false negative rates relate to the sensitivities (39.02% and 53.50%) and
183 specificities (100% and 99.50%) of Determine™ HIV 1/2/0 and HIV Dia Pro HIV 1/2/0
184 respectively reported. (Table1)

185 While Mbaya (13) reported an evaluation of Determine RDT by WHO wherein false positive
186 and false negative rates were low resulting in a reported sensitivity and specificity of 100%
187 99.6% respectively, thereby grouping it as an acceptable test method falling within the
188 acceptable clinical sensitivity $\geq 99\%$ for RDT and 100% for EIAs and a clinical specificity
189 of $\geq 98\%$ for RDT and EIAs (12), our findings in this study were different for the two assays
190 used for blood safety and availability in this setting. (12) The high proportion of FN rate arise
191 from the low sensitivity of the two assays in comparison with the Fourth generation ELISA.
192 These findings show that statistically significant relationship ($p < 0.001$) exists and suggest
193 that these two assays inefficient in preventing TT-HIV infections when deployed for blood
194 safety interventions in RLS like our hospital-based blood transfusion centre. Generally, other
195 researchers have also reported on FN test results arising from deploying commercially
196 available assays.(14), (15) (16) (17), (18),(19)

197 Even though FN test results are expected to be low among blood donors, a low risk group for
198 transfusion-transmissible infection (TTIs) coupled with the rigid pre donation screening
199 procedures usually put in place to defer those with identifiable risks, it is found to be high in
200 our present study. Previous studies in different parts of Africa have reported high false
201 negative test results. In Ethiopia, Dessie et al (14) in a related hospital-based study compared

HIV antibody tests (Determine) with a combined antigen antibody HIV assay, also reported a high proportion of FN and a low sensitivity of the RDT. In Ghana, the residual risk of TT-HIV despite it being tested for HIV was reported to be high warranting recommendation for urgent intervention by internal and external quality control bodies in a bid to scale up blood transfusion safety. (16) In another study at a national blood centre in Abidjan, Cote d'Ivoire, amongst a safer population of blood donors and with trained personnel and equipment's, Saravit et al (15) estimated that, 6-12% of the total infected units, would result from false negative test results. (15) Reports in South African hospital-based transfusion practice are rare probably because of the functional South African Blood Transfusion Service that has successfully implemented NAAT in their transfusion system generally. However, surveillance in other settings suggest FN HIV antibody test results with some assays in settings like STI clinics. Quintessentially, it has been opinioned by some workers that, for a valid decision making process regarding the ideal time to test for HIV with some assays, the use of a table of probabilities of falsely-negative HIV test results in the pre- and post-test HIV counselling be adopted suggesting the probability of a false-negative result to be 0.01 at 80 days' post-exposure for third-generation tests and at 42 days for fourth-generation tests. (20) False-negative test results occur in the pre-seroconversion phase during primary HIV infection (diagnostic window when low antibody titres are below detectable cut-off levels of the assay). Other conditions including genetic variability (not well represented by the antigen profile contained in the assay) and atypical seroconversions, delayed or absent immune response in the very early or advanced stages of infection and laboratory reporting errors and problems inherent to the assay with respect to its format and design. (6) Besides FN HIV antibody test results have been reported in patients on antiretroviral therapy.

This study also found the proportion of false positive (FP) test to be 0 and 4.88 percent for DetermineTM HIV 1/2/0 and HIV Dia Pro HIV 1/2/0 respectively; whereas DetermineTM HIV 1/2/0 did not record any false positive test result, HIV Dia Pro HIV 1/2/0 EIA gave a proportion approximating 5 percent. Rahman et al(21) also recorded a similar insignificant HIV false positive test result (especially with that obtained with the RDT in our study) amongst the Pakistan population. However, other workers have observed on a contrary for instance that; HIV RDTs may use a restricted target antigen range making them more susceptible than other immunoassays like western blot and line immune assay (LIA) to produce high false positive test result. (22),(23) Relatedly, in a Ghanaian study evaluating the diagnostic accuracy of five hospital-based blood bank testing facilities that used rapid

immunochromatographic assays (RIA) in screening blood donors/blood units in the absence of a standardized screening procedure for blood bank testing facilities in the country, the mean false positive was 11.1% and values as high as 28.0% reported in one centre. (24) False positive test results have been reported due to factors including difference in constituent reagents, antigens, testing formants and personal operator errors, cross reactivity of HIV-1 and Hepatitis B virus, vaccination for influenza flu and the presence of HLA antibodies amongst others. (21) While some authors have reported on the causes of FP RDT(22), the cause of this varied FP test result is not clear. It may have been influenced by the specificity of the EIA compared with the RDT.

Minimizing FP HIV test results in hospital-based blood transfusion systems or centres is important in ensuring prudent management of blood supplies by averting unnecessary deferral of blood donors or wastages and higher costs arising from discarding tainted units of scarce blood sourced in this LRS. Besides, the fact that blood donation may be wasted because it is labelled sero-positive when in fact the blood donor or unit is negative; donors may develop apathy and loss of confidence in the services offered in that health facility especially if it is a protracted occurrence. Rahman et al(21) has also highlighted on some implications of high false positive test results to include psychosocial issues at the time of donation, shortage of blood supply especially if less common blood groups like Rhesus Negative) are involved, loss of blood donor pool for the hospital, and exhaust already meagre resources available to the hospital-based transfusion centre. (21) In a comprehensive review of handicaps impeding quality attainment including the provision of safe and available blood supplies in hospital-based transfusion centres in Africa, factors such as high cost of blood services amidst lean budgets, high dependence on external funding, paucity of voluntary non-remunerated blood donors, poor coordination of transfusion services with low operational quality systems have been reported. (8) The cumulative effect of these factors breeds FP results and contributes to an overall negative impact on the blood supplies of the country. Generally, concerns of compromised blood safety and availability abound in most African countries like Nigeria with weakened nationally coordinated Blood Transfusion services poor reagents/assay sourcing, storage, transportation, discrepancy in technical procedures and interpretation of HIV test results, poorly regulated quality testing supervision and oversight have bridged differing levels of transfusion quality in different countries even within the same country, state, province or region. Weak detection of HIV in blood donors or donations due to false positive testing of donors leads to unnecessary deferrals or wastages of blood units and reduces blood availability in hospital settings.

The negative predictive value (NPV) of 94.1% and 95.9% for DetermineTM HIV 1/2/0 and HIV Dia Pro HIV 1/2/0 respectively found in this study is low. A high NPV > 99% indicates a very high chance that, a negative result obtained with the assay is truly HIV-uninfected and this is the expectation for a screening test deployed in blood donation screening. The findings of a low NPV < 99% in our study, suggest that, the deployment of these two tests in our population of blood donors is likely to result in lower detection rates and such donors even though screened negative have potentials for being false and HIV infected. In overcoming this, implies deploying further test algorithms(25) either as single or parallel testing strategies that are diagnostically effective but more costly. Such practice risks adding preventable cost to the already resource limited and financially constrained hospital-based transfusion system. considering that such costs are ultimately transferred to the blood recipient giving the absence of health insurance policies in place, Such false testing in RLS breeds increased morbidity and mortality amongst health care seekers in hospital-based services.

The positive predictive value (PPV) in our study has been found to be 100% and 91.67% for Determine and Dia Pro HIV 1 /2/ 0 respectively. A positive predictive value is the proportion of blood donors who test positive and who actually have the disease by comparison with the gold standard. Other workers have reported varying PPV for different commercially available HIV assays in different populations.(26)(27)The findings in our study suggest Determine demonstrating itself as an excellent assay with a high PPV that correctly identifies all Positive donors or units for HIV while Dia Pro is weak with a low PPV and capable of deferring or allowing wastages of about 83/1000 blood donors arising from positive testing. In our population where the total donor population is less than 10/1000 and resources are generally scarce, HIV tests with high values of PPV may be counterproductive for an effective management of a hospital-based transfusion service. This finding of low PPV of Dia Pro HIV 1 /2 /0 is a significant concern on the impact this may have on recruitment, nurturing and retention of blood donors in dare efforts to change this predominantly family donor population to VNRBD that will guarantee safe and available blood supplies by 2020. Considering also that, Dia Pro HIV 1 /2 /0 is also a manual plate ELISA technique where the cost of testing is comparable to Genscreen ®PLUS HIV Ag-Ab ELISA, it may add no value in its being deployed for HIV screening in hospital-based settings. While the high PPV for DetermineTM HIV 1/2/0 may suggest its usefulness in diagnostic and surveillance studies or initiatives, its utilization in blood donor or donation screening in a high risk population

masquerading as low risk group and where safety and availability of blood is a priority is not supported by our findings

Ensuring blood availability through improved practices has become a topical public health initiative globally that is targeted at scaling up the total number of safe blood units collected annually in order to meet set target of unpaid donor population by 2020.(28) A recent review of blood donor deferral periods for men who have sex with men (MSM) from an earlier recommendation of lifetime deferral to a deferral of 12 months since the last sexual contact with another man based on justification that, an HIV infection acquired at least one year earlier should be readily detected by the blood screening tests routinely performed on donated blood samples before they are released for use, and the observation that Australia's decision to revise its policy from lifetime deferral to 12- month deferral for MSM led to no detected change in the safety of the blood supply.(29) (30)(31) With this recommendation coming into effect, a vast majority of MSM excluded under this policy earlier due to perceived risk of HIV transmission through blood donation can now be availed the opportunity to exercising their civic activity and contribute towards improving the current blood donation rates. (31) Even at this, there are emerging suggestions for the FDA to further review downward from 12 months to approximately 2-3 weeks and to accept donations without deferral from low-risk MSM who meet specific behavior-based criteria and their blood screened with the more sensitive NAAT testing in order to reduce the risk of window-period transmission for continued blood safety and the fairness of the blood donation policy. (31) Relatedly, there are also situations where blood donors are seronegative but have NAAT positive results or have negative NAAT even though they have been repeatedly tested seropositive or reactive with screening test for antibody, but negative or indeterminate HIV-1 Western blot results. Such donors are usually permanently deferred from blood donation but in this new trend of revision aimed at improving donor availability, evolving reentry criteria are being put in place to reduce the number permanently deferred because of such NAAT result. (32),(33)

There are also revised recommendations for determining eligibility of donors of human tissues, cells and those who have received human derived clotting factors.(31)

Hospital-based transfusion centres must not be left behind in improving blood availability. In Africa, although it is almost three decades since member nations resolved to promote the development of national blood services based on voluntary non-remunerated donation of blood, to enact effective legislation governing the operation of blood services, and to make other actions necessary to protect and promote the health of blood donors and of recipients of

blood and blood products, including monitoring the reagents deployed for preventing TT-HIV, (34) only few countries have achieved 100% voluntary unpaid blood donation which is the cornerstone of safe blood supply and availability through the development of their National Blood Transfusion Services (NBTS). Much of the challenges mitigating the establishment of NBTS hinge on high costs of services in general. In this instance, while some blood transfusion practitioners and managers attempt to consider costs and quality of life in developing practices (35) , many others priorities cost effectiveness consideration without an adequate concurrent appraisal of their impacts on the quality of life saved and the overall blood safety and availability program. Yet, there is an unresolved debate on whether adopting cost-effectiveness or quality of life-saved approaches should form the pillar of consideration in HIV care. (1)

False negative and FP test results arising from HIV test assays create difficulties in correctly associating quality of life saved in different HIV risk groups that present as donors as a comparison with the laboratory cost of equipment, reagents and personnel associated with these tests. Giving this scenario, the prevalent but often financially constrained hospital-based transfusion services adopt cost saving rather than quality of life saved considerations in adopting screening test to be deployed for safeguarding transfusion against TT-HIV in RLS. Quintessentially, the findings of FP, FN, NPV and PPV rates obtained with these two assays suggest that, HIV-antibody tests show enormous compromise to the quality of life saved and even impinges on costs with attendant wastages from wrongful discard of blood units or disqualification of blood donors.

Recent comparative reports from experiences of developed countries particularly in Europe and America seem to question the economy of adopting NAAT testing in their blood transfusion system as no statistically significant relationship was found between NAAT and prevention of TT-HIV thereby failing to justify the continued utilization of NAAT in screening for TT-HIV in their truly low risk population of blood donors while finding more applicability and significance of NAAT testing in screening blood donors or units in RLS for TT-HIV(2).

5. CONCLUSION:

The two third generation antibody ELISAS demonstrate low performance with respect to the proportion of false negative test results when compared with Genscreen ®PLUS HIV Ag-Ab ELISA and could potentially compromise the quality of blood sourced, encourage wastages and wrongful discard of blood units or disqualification of blood donors.

6. RECOMMENDATIONS:

Hospital-based blood banks should be supported to deploy only the combined HIV antigen-antibody ELISA for all blood donors and donations. Further studies on the prevalent subtypes amongst blood donors in our population and the factors responsible for our findings is recommended.

References:

1. Albritton WL, Vittinghoff E, Padian NS. Human immunodeficiency virus testing for patient-based and population-based diagnosis. *J Infect Dis.* 1996;174(Suppl 2):S176–81.
2. El Ekiaby M LN and AJP. Nucleic acid testing (NAT) in high prevalence-low resource settings. *Biologicals.* 2010;28(1):59–64.
3. Chatterjee K, Coshic P, Borgohain M, Premchand, Thapliyal RM, Chakroborty S, et al. Individual donor nucleic acid testing for blood safety against HIV-1 and hepatitis B and C viruses in a tertiary care hospital. *Natl Med J India.* 2012;25(4):207–9.
4. WHO. Hiv Assays: Operational Characteristics. Who [Internet]. 2015;1–84. Available from: http://www.who.int/diagnostics_laboratory/publications/Report16_final.pdf
5. World Health Organization. Screening Donated Blood for Transfusion Transmissible Infections-Recommendations. Who [Internet]. 2010;45. Available from: <http://www.who.int/bloodsafety/ScreeningDonatedBloodforTransfusion.pdf>
6. Preiser W, Brink NS, Hayman A, Waite J, Balfe P, Tedder RS. False-negative HIV antibody test results. *J Med Virol* [Internet]. 2000;60(1):43–7. Available from: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10568762>
7. Constantine NT, Zink H. HIV testing technologies after two decades of evolution. Vol. 121, *Indian Journal of Medical Research.* 2005. p. 519–38.
8. Orkuma JA, Maanongun MT. Hospital-based Clinical Transfusion Process Audit and Quality Improvement in Africa : A Critical Review. 2017;7(3):1–16.
9. Phillips S, Granade TC, Pau CP, Candal D, Hu DJ, Parekh BS. Diagnosis of human immunodeficiency virus type 1 infection with different subtypes using rapid tests. *Clin Diagn Lab Immunol* [Internet]. 2000;7(4):698–9. Available from:

396 [http://www.pubmedcentral.nih.gov/articlerender.fcgi?artid=95937&tool=pmcentrez&](http://www.pubmedcentral.nih.gov/articlerender.fcgi?artid=95937&tool=pmcentrez&rendertype=abstract)
397 [endertype=abstract](http://www.pubmedcentral.nih.gov/articlerender.fcgi?artid=95937&tool=pmcentrez&rendertype=abstract)

398 10. UNAIDS 2016–2021 Strategy 37. In: 37th PCB. 2016. p. 1–26.

399 11. Aphi CDCWHO. Guidelines for Appropriate Evaluations of HIV Testing
400 Technologies in Africa CDC WHO. 2004;1–66.

401 12. WHO. Hiv Assays: Laboratory performance and Operational Characteristics of rapid
402 diagnostic tests. Who. 2015;1–84.

403 13. Mbanya D. Use of quality rapid diagnostic testing for safe blood transfusion in
404 resource-limited settings. Clin Microbiol Infect. 2013;19(5):416–21.

405 14. Dessie A, Abera B, Walle F WD and TW. Evaluation of Determine HIV rapid
406 diagnostic test by 4th generation ELISA. Ethiop Med J. 2008;46(1):1–5.

407 15. Savarit D, De Cock KM, Schutz R, Konate S, Lackritz E, Bondurand A. Risk of HIV
408 infection from transfusion with blood negative for HIV antibody in a west African city.
409 Br Med J [Internet]. 1992;305(6852):498–502. Available from:
410 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Cit](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=1327367)
411 [ation&list_uids=1327367](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=1327367)

412 16. Elliot Eli Dogbe1 and FA. Diagnostic accuracy of blood centers in the screening of
413 blood donors for viral markers. Pan Afr Med J. 2015;20(20):119.

414 17. Preiser W, Brink NS, Hayman a, Waite J, Balfe P, Tedder RS. False-negative HIV
415 antibody test results. J Med Virol [Internet]. 2000;60(1):43–7. Available from:
416 <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10568762>

417 18. Busch MP, Watanabe KK, Smith JW, Hermansen SW, Thomson RA. False-negative
418 testing errors in routine viral marker screening of blood donors. Transfusion.
419 2000;40(5):585–9.

420 19. Gray RH, Makumbi F, Serwadda D, Lutalo T, Nalugoda F, Opendi P, et al.
421 Limitations of rapid HIV-1 tests during screening for trials in Uganda: Diagnostic test
422 accuracy study. Br Med J. 2007;335(7612):188–90.

423 20. Taylor D, Durigon M, Davis H, Archibald C, Konrad B, Coombs D, et al. Probability

- 424 of a false-negative HIV antibody test result during the window period: a tool for pre-
425 and post-test counselling. *Int J STD AIDS*. 2015;26(4):215–24.
- 426 21. Rahman MU, Khan SA, Lodhi Y. Unconfirmed reactive screening tests and their
427 impact on donor management. *Pakistan J Med Sci*. 2008;24(4):517–9.
- 428 22. Klarkowski D, O'Brien DP, Shanks L, Singh KP. Causes of false-positive HIV rapid
429 diagnostic test results. *Expert Rev Anti Infect Ther*. 2014;12(1):49–62.
- 430 23. Sheikh AA, Sheikh AS, Sheikh NS, Rafi-U-Shan, Malik MT, Afridi F. High frequency
431 of false positive results in HIV screening in blood banks. *J Ayub Med Coll Abbottabad*
432 [Internet]. 2004;16(1):28–31. Available from:
433 [http://ovidsp.ovid.com/ovidweb.cgi?T=JS&PAGE=reference&D=med5&NEWS=N&](http://ovidsp.ovid.com/ovidweb.cgi?T=JS&PAGE=reference&D=med5&NEWS=N&AN=15125176)
434 [AN=15125176](http://ovidsp.ovid.com/ovidweb.cgi?T=JS&PAGE=reference&D=med5&NEWS=N&AN=15125176)
- 435 24. Diagnostic accuracy of blood centers in the screening of blood donors for viral
436 markers.
- 437 25. Eller LA, Eller MA, Ouma BJ, Kataaha P, Bagaya BS, Olemukan RL, et al. Large-
438 scale human immunodeficiency virus rapid test evaluation in a low-prevalence
439 ugandan blood bank population. *J Clin Microbiol*. 2007;45(10):3281–5.
- 440 26. Clark JL, Coates TJ, Lescano AG, Castillo R, Meza R, Jones FR, et al. Different
441 positive predictive values of commercially available human immunodeficiency virus
442 enzyme-linked immunosorbent assays. *Clin Vaccine Immunol* [Internet].
443 2006;13(2):302–3. Available from:
444 [http://www.pubmedcentral.nih.gov/articlerender.fcgi?artid=1391948&tool=pmcentrez](http://www.pubmedcentral.nih.gov/articlerender.fcgi?artid=1391948&tool=pmcentrez&rendertype=abstract)
445 [&rendertype=abstract](http://www.pubmedcentral.nih.gov/articlerender.fcgi?artid=1391948&tool=pmcentrez&rendertype=abstract)
- 446 27. Liu P, Shi Z, Wang C, Yang H, Li L, Dai Y, et al. The false-positive and false-negative
447 predictive value of HIV antibody test in the Chinese population. *J Med Screen*.
448 2008;15(2):72–5.
- 449 28. WHO. Voluntary unpaid blood donations must increase rapidly to meet 2020 goal
450 [Internet]. Who. 2016. p. 2020. Available from:
451 <http://www.who.int/mediacentre/news/releases/2016/world-blood-donor-day/en/>
- 452 29. FDA. Revised Recommendations for Reducing the Risk of Human Immunodeficiency

- 453 Virus Transmission by Blood and Blood Products: Guidance for Industry [Internet].
454 2015. p. 1–27. Available from:
455 <http://www.fda.gov/BiologicsBloodVaccines/GuidanceComplianceRegulatoryInformation/Guidance>
456
- 457 30. BROAD INSTITUTE:Donation working G on B. Reply to the Food and Drug
458 Administration Request for Comments. 2016. p. 1–13.
- 459 31. FDA. Revised Recommendations for Determining Eligibility of Donors of Human
460 Cells , Tissues , and Cellular and Tissue-Based Products Who Have Received Human-
461 Derived Clotting Factor Concentrates Guidance for Industry. Guid Ind. (November
462 2016).
- 463 32. FDA. Blood Products Advisory Committee [Internet]. Vol. 2011. 2007. Available
464 from: http://www.fda.gov/ohrms/dockets/AC/07/briefing/2007-4300B2_01.htm
- 465 33. Research. C for BE and. Blood Products Advisory Committee, 94th Meeting. Reentry
466 for Donor Deferred Because of HIV or HCV NAT serological test results. 2009.
- 467 34. World Health Organisation. Availability, safety and quality of blood products
468 WHA63.12. 2010;(May):1–4. Available from:
469 http://apps.who.int/gb/ebwha/pdf_files/WHA63/A63_R12-en.pdf
- 470 35. Tagny CT, Nguetack-Tsague G, Fopa D, Ashu C, Tante E, Ngo Balogog P, et al. Risk
471 factors for human immunodeficiency virus among blood donors in Cameroon:
472 evidence for the design of an Africa-specific donor history questionnaire. Transfusion.
473 2017;57(8):1912–21.

474