

**DIAGNOSIS OF DIABETES MELLITUS USING GLYCATED HEMOGLOBIN
(A1C): THE NIGERIAN PERSPECTIVE**

Abstract

Background: Diabetes is an international public health issue. International Expert Committee recommended an alternative diagnostic index testing for diabetes using glycated (A1C).

Objective - This study aimed to determine whether A1C test should be used for diagnosing diabetes mellitus in Nigeria

Methods: By assessing the strength of WHO recommendation and the feasibility and resources implication in Nigeria setting

Results: The strength of the recommendation was rated as good by the quality of evidence but not applicable at population level due to high cost and scarce availability of A1C test

Conclusion: The adoption of A1C test as a diagnostic test at present is problematic. Therefore plasma glucose measurements should still be adopted for the diagnosis of Diabetes Mellitus while the A1C assay could be used for monitoring diabetes

Keywords: Diabetes, A1C test, Plasma glucose measurement, Nigeria.

Introduction

Diabetes Mellitus is a metabolic disorder characterized by chronic hyperglycemia and disturbances of carbohydrates, fat and protein metabolism resulting from defects in insulin secretion, insulin action, or both [1]. Diabetes has been declared an International Public health issue because it has a major and deleterious impact on both individual and national productivity

Before 2009, the diagnosis of diabetes were based on plasma glucose values either casual plasma glucose value $\geq 200\text{mg/dL}$ (11.1mmol/L) with classic symptoms of diabetes, fasting plasma $\geq 126\text{mg/dL}$ (7mmol/L) or 2hr postload plasma glucose $\geq 200\text{mg/dL}$ during the oral glucose tolerance test (OGTT) [2]

Owing to the inconvenience of measuring fasting plasma glucose levels or performing an OGTT and day-to-day variability in glucose, an alternative to glucose measurements for the diagnosis of diabetes has long been sought. HbA1C has now been recommended by an international committee and by America Diabetes Association (ADA) as a means to diagnose diabetes [3]

35 A report published in 2009 by an international Expert Committee on the role of A1C in the
36 diagnosis of diabetes recommended that A1C can be used to diagnose diabetes and that the
37 diagnosis can be made if the A1C level is $\geq 6.5\%$ [3]. The committee also recommendation
38 that

39 Diagnosis should be confirmed with a repeat A1C test unless clinical symptoms and plasma
40 glucose level, $\geq 11.1\text{mmol/L}$ (200mg/dL) are present in which case further testing is not
41 required. Expert committee recommended that persons with A1C level between 6.0 and 6.5
42 were at particularly high risk and might be considered for diabetes prevention interventions
43 Furthermore, WHO agreed that each country should decide whether it is appropriate for its
44 own circumstances. The aim of this article is to systematically review the recommendations
45 by analyzing the advantages and disadvantages of using A1C to diagnose diabetes in a
46 multiethnic population such as Nigeria.

47 2. Glycated Hemoglobin (A1C)

48 Glycated hemoglobin was initially identified as abnormal hemoglobin in patients with
49 diabetes over 40years [4]. After that discovery, numerous small studies were conducted
50 correlating it to glucose measurements resulting in the idea that A1C could be used as an
51 objective measure of glycemic control. The A1C-Derived Average Glucose (ADAG) study
52 included 643 participants representing a range of A1C levels. It established a validated
53 relationship between A1C and average glucose across a range of diabetes types and patients
54 population (5). A1C was introduced into clinical use in the 1980s and subsequently has
55 become a cornerstone of clinical practice [6] A1C reflects average plasma glucose over the
56 previous eight to twelve weeks [7]. It can be performed at any time of the day and does not
57 require any special preparation such as fasting. These properties have made it the preferred
58 test for assessing glycemic control in people with diabetes. More recently there has been
59 substantial interest in using it as a diagnostic test for diabetes and as a screening test for
60 persons at high risk for diabetes.

61 3. Evidence for the use A1C

62 In conformity with introducing a new diagnostic assay, reliable estimates of clinical
63 sensitivity and specificity have been obtained from both literature and clinical outcome
64 studies. The relationship between A1C and prevalent retinopathy is similar to that of plasma
65 glucose [8]. This relationship was originally reported in the Pima Indians [9] and has also
66 been observed in several populations including Egyptians [10], in the NHANES study in the
67 USA [11], and in Japanese [12]. Overall, the performance of A1C has been similar to that of
68 fasting or 2h plasma glucose. For all three measures of glycemia, the value above which the

69 prevalence of retinopathy begins to rise rapidly has differed to some extent between studies.
 70 Although AIC gives equal or almost equal sensitivity and specificity to glucose measurement
 71 as a predictor of prevalent retinopathy it is not available in many parts of the world and in
 72 general, it is not known which is better for predicting microvascular complications
 73 It is unclear whether AIC or plasma glucose is better for predicting the development of
 74 retinopathy, but a recent report from Australia has shown that a model including AIC for
 75 predicting incident retinopathy is as good as or possibly better than one including FPG [13].

76 4. Analytical Performance Consideration

77 In evaluation of the performance characteristics of a candidate method, precision, accuracy,
 78 analytical range, detection limit, and analytical specificity are of prime importance

79 There are aspects of the measurement of AIC that are problematic. Although in some
 80 laboratories the precision of AIC measurement is similar to that of plasma glucose, global
 81 consistency with both assays remains a problem. Whether it is the glucose or AIC assay that
 82 is used, consistent and comparable data that meet international standards are required. This is
 83 starting to happen in many countries but obviously is still not standard across Nigeria within
 84 the six geopolitical zones of Nigeria, it is expected that results for glucose and AIC should be
 85 consistent between laboratories. This is yet to be achieved across the country

86 The National Glycohemoglobin Standardization Program (NGSP) [14] was established
 87 following the completion of the Diabetes complications and control Trait (DCCT) for many
 88 years it was the sole basis for improved harmonization of AIC assays. More recently, the
 89 International Federation of Clinical Chemists (IFCC) established a working group on AIC in
 90 an attempt to introduce an International Standardization Program [15]. An important part of
 91 this effort was establishment of reference method procedures for AIC. Currently, both the
 92 NGSP and the IFCC base their evaluations on reference method procedures that have further
 93 enhanced the harmonization of AIC assays across manufacturers. In USA, the college of
 94 American Pathologists (CAP) has mandated more stringent criteria for individual assays to
 95 assigned values for materials provided in CAP proficiency programme [16].

96 The WHO consultation reviewed the evidence on the relationship between AIC and prevalent
 97 incident microvascular complications. This shows that AIC and glucose cut-off points
 98 associated with prevalent and incident microvascular complications in available studies. In
 99 view of the outcome of this evidence and of the advances in technology over recent years,
 100 WHO agreed that AIC may be used to diagnose diabetes providing that appropriate
 101 conditions apply, i.e. standardized assay, low coefficient of variability and calibration against
 102 IFCC Standards

5. Advantages and Disadvantages of Assays for Glucose and AIC

5.1 Advantages for AIC as Diagnostic Tool

AIC has a greater pre-analytical stability than blood glucose because glucose assays require some stringent requirements e.g. fasting for FPG and administration of glucose load before collection of specimen for 2hr-PG. Fasting is not needed for AIC assessment and no acute perturbations (e.g. stress, diet, exercise, and smoking) affect AIC. Indeed, AIC can be measured anytime, irrespective of fasting or feeding. Even when preparation to glucose testing is optional, plasma glucose values may still be misleading as a result of improper processing of blood. Stringent requirements are necessary for rapid processing, separation and storage of plasma or serum minimally at 4°C

Biological variability of AIC is lower than that of FPG. When the same subjects have two assessments of the available glucose-related parameters, the correlation is stronger among the individual AIC measurements than among FPG or 2-h PG measurements. The coefficients of variation of AIC FPG and 2h.PG are 3.6, 5.7, and 16.6% respectively [17]. This reflects of course both biological and analytical variability. Studies have shown that two required assessments of FPG to diagnose diabetes can provide quite unreliable information, whereas AIC, especially if measured twice as recommended, provides more robust clinical information [18]. Standardization of AIC assay is not inferior to standardization of glucose assay. A great effort was made in the US and other countries to make reproducible AIC across laboratories with an effective standardization program. Such a programme is to provide more reliable information to physicians who monitor diabetic patients [19]. The standardization is expected to minimize laboratory biases and is a prerequisite to use AIC not only for monitoring but also for diagnosing diabetes. However, this level of standardization is yet to be achieved in our laboratories.

Although it is generally believed that glucose assay is highly reproducible across laboratories, this is not true. A recent survey conducted in 6,000 US laboratories clearly documented a significant bias of glucose assessment in as many as 4.1% of them, yielding a misclassification of glucose tolerance in 12% of subjects [20]. Therefore, the argument that AIC cannot be used for diabetes diagnosis because of poor standardization is no longer tenable

AIC captures chronic hyperglycaemia better than two assessments of fasting or 2-h oral glucose tolerance test plasma glucose. Hyperglycemia is regarded as the biochemical hallmark of diabetes. However, FPG and 2-h PG indicate a moment of a single day.

Therefore, a diagnostic tool gauging chronic rather than spot hyperglycemia is certainly preferable.

5.2 Disadvantages For AIC As Diagnostic Tool

Diabetes is clinically defined by high blood glucose and not by glycation of proteins. If AIC is considered the primary diagnostic tool, this will lead to a major change in the pathophysiological consideration defining diabetes. Subsequently, AIC is a poor marker of important pathophysiological abnormalities featuring diabetes

Humans spend most of their time in postprandial or post absorptive states that are deranged in diabetes. AIC is a poor indicator of what occurs in the postprandial state. AIC captures only chronic hyperglycemia, but it will miss acute hyperglycemia. Normal blood glucose levels 2hr after glucose load indicates a good β -cell capacity, whereas high 2-h OGTT glucose levels document an impairment of β -cell function [21]. Recent study has shown that AIC is a weaker correlate of insulin resistance and insulin secretion in studies of metabolism compared with FPG and 2-h PG [22]. Diabetes diagnosis based on AIC misses a large proportion of asymptomatic early cases of diabetes that can only be identified by the OGTT. AIC sensitivity is inferior compared with fasting blood glucose at the population level. Also people with impaired glucose tolerance (IGT) in whom the efficacy of diabetes prevention has been unequivocally proven [23] cannot be detected by AIC.

AIC is better associated with chronic complications than FPG. Research findings have shown that in the general population, FPG is a poor marker of future cardiovascular disease (CVD) events, whereas 2-h OGTT and AIC are good predictions [24, 25]. Therefore, microangiopathic complications (retinopathy) are associated with AIC as strongly as with FPG and AIC is better related to cardiovascular disease than FPG. Individual susceptibility to glycation might be an additional benefit of AIC assessments. In addition, AIC can be used concomitantly for diagnosing and initiating diabetes monitoring. Using the same biomarker for diagnosing and monitoring diabetes might be an advantage.

Epidemiological studies carried out in the general population showed that AIC and plasma glucose (FPG and/or 2-h OGTT) identify partially different groups of diabetic subjects [26]. AIC $\geq 6.5\%$ identifies approximately 30-40% of previously undiagnosed patients with diabetes [27]. A larger percentage is detected by FPG (approximately 50%) and 2-h PG (approximately 90%). The ethnic differences in AIC compared with glucose measurements were also well demonstrated in the diabetes prevention program population [28]. Nigeria is a multiethnic nation which is at a disadvantage of using AIC as a diagnostic assay. AIC-based diagnosis for diabetes has substantially different consequences for diabetes prevalence across

ethnic groups and populations. AIC has significant differences in various ethnic groups which are poorly understood and characterized.

AIC is affected by several interferences; severe illness may shorten red-cell life and artificially reduce AIC values. Abnormal hemoglobins significantly interfere with AIC assay [29]. Abnormal hemoglobins are not uncommon in many regions of the world including Nigeria. Also there are several clinical conditions that influence erythrocyte turnover (e.g., malaria, chronic anemia, major blood loss, hemolysis, urea, pregnancy, smoking and various infections) that are responsible for misleading AIC data.

Standardization of AIC assay is poor, even in Western Countries, and standardization of glucose assay would be easier to implement. Using the same biomarker for diagnosing and monitoring diabetes might have negative effects. In Nigeria, AIC is still not readily available and its cost is so high that is unprofitable to prefer AIC over simple and inexpensive glucose measurements in diagnosing of diabetes.

6.0 Conclusion

The overall performance of AIC has been similar to that of fasting or 2-h plasma glucose. AIC gives equal or almost equal sensitivity and specificity to glucose measurement as a predictor of prevalent retinopathy. In addition, the use of AIC can avoid the problem of day-to-day variability of glucose values and importantly avoids the need for the person to fast and to have preceding dietary preparations. Obviously these are advantages for early identification and treatment of diabetes which have been strongly advocated over the years

Despite the utility and convenience of AIC compared with measures of plasma glucose for diagnosing diabetes, there is the need to balance these against its drawbacks in Nigeria situation. AIC maybe affected by a variety of genetic, haematologic and illness-related factors. The most common important factors in this control affecting AIC are hemoglobinopathies certain, anemia, and disorders associated with accelerated red cell turnover such as malaria which is endemic in our country. AIC is still unavailable in many parts of Nigeria, despite being recognized as a valuable tool in diabetes management. In addition the AIC assay is not currently well enough standardized in laboratories for its use to be recommended at this time. Another major factor against the use of AIC concerns costs and availability of AIC tests. Considering our own circumstances, based on cost, availability of equipment, population characteristics, lack of national quality assurance system and affordability of individuals, it is inappropriate to recommend the use of AIC for diagnosing diabetes in Nigeria at this time

Instead, we should ensure that reliable blood glucose measurements are generally available at all levels of our health care while AIC should be reserved for monitoring purpose.

Reference

1. World Health Organization. Definition, Diagnosis and classification of Diabetes mellitus and its complications.
Part 1: Diagnosis and classification of Diabetes Mellitus WHO/NCD/NCS/99.2 ed. Geneva, World Health Organization 1999.
2. World Health Organization. Use of glycated hemoglobin (HbA/C) in the diagnosis of diabetes Mellitus.2011,4-10
3. International Expert Committee report on the role of the AIC assay in the diagnosis of diabetes. Diabetes care 2009, 32:1427-1334.
4. Rahbar S, Blumenfeld O, Ranney HM; Studies of an usual hemoglobin in Patients with diabetes Mellitus BiochemBiophys Res commun, 1969, 36:838-843
5. Nathan DM, Knenen J, Borg R. Translating the AIC assay into estimated average glucose value. Diabetes care, 2008, 31: 1473-1478.
6. Massi-Benedetti M. Changing target in the treatment of type 2 diabetes. Curr. Med. Res Opin, 2006,22 suppl 2:55-13
7. Nathan DM, Turgen H, Regar S. Relationship between glycated hemoglobin levels and mean glucose levels over time. Diabetologia 2007, 50:2239-2244.
8. McCance DR, Hanson RL, Charles MA. Comparison of tests for glycated hemoglobin and fasting and two hour plasma glucose concentrations as diagnostic methods for diabetes. BMJ, 1994, 308:1323-1328.
9. Emzo B, Tuomiletito J. The pros and cons of diagnosing diabetes with AIC Diabetes care, 34:2011.34: 184-190.
10. Engelgan MM, Thompson TJ, Herman WH .Comparison of fasting and two hours glucose and HbAIC levels for diagnosing diabetes. Diagnostic criteria and performance revisited. Diabetes care, 1997, 20: 785-791.
11. Report of the Expert Committee on the Diagnosis and classification of Diabetes Mellitus. Diabetes care, 1997, 20:1183-1197.
12. Miyazaki M, Kubo M, Kiyohara Y. Comparison of diagnostic methods for diabetes mellitus based on prevalence of retinopiohy in a Japanese population: the Hisayama study. Diabetologia, 2004, 47: 1411-1415.
13. Tapp RJ, Tikellis G, Wong TY. Longitudinal association of glucose metabolism with retinopathy: results from the Australian Diabetes Obesity and Lifestyle (AusDiab) study. Diabetes care, 2008, 31: 1349-1354.
14. Little RR, Rohlfing CL, Wiedmeyer HM. The national glycohemoglobin standardization program: a five-year progress report. Clin Chem, 2001, 47:1985-1992.
15. Hoelzel W, Wey Kamp C, Jeppson JO. IFCC reference system for measurement of hemoglobin AIC in human blood and the national standardization schemes in the United States. Japan and Sweden: a method-comparison study Chin Chem, 2004, 50: 166-174.

16. Goldstein DE, Little RR, Lorenz RA. Tests of glycemia in diabetes. *Diabetes care* 2004, 27: 1761-1773.
17. Selvin E, Cramiceanu CM, Brancati FL, Coresh J. Short-term Variability in measures of glycemia and implications for the classification of diabetes. *Arch intern. Med* 2007, 167:1545-1551.
18. Rohlfing C, Wiedmeyer HM, Little R. Biological Variation of glycohemoglobin *Clin Chem* 2002, 48, 1116-1118.
19. Consensus Committee. Consensus statement on the worldwide standardization of the hemoglobin A1C measurement: The American Diabetes Association. European Association for the study of Diabetes, International Federation of Clinical Chemistry and Laboratory Medicine and the international Diabetes Federation. *Diabetes care* 2007, 30: 2399-2400.
20. Miller WG, Myers GL, Ashwood ER state of in trueness and inter laboratory harmonization for 10 analytes in general Clinical Chemistry. *Arch Pathol Lab Med* 2008, 132: 838-846.
21. Abdul-Ghani MA, Lyssenko V Toumi T, Defrunzo RA, Group L, The shape of plasma glucose concentration curve during OGTT predicts future risk of type 2 diabetes. *Diabetes metab Res Rev* 2010, 26: 280-286.
22. Lorenzo C, Wagenknecht LE, Hanley AJG, Reuters MJ, Kanter AJ, Haffner SM. A1C between 5.7 and 6.4% as a marker for identifying pre-diabetics, insulin sensitivity and secretion, and cardiovascular risk factors: the insulin Resistance Atherosclerosis study (IRAS). *Diabetes Care* 2010; 33: 2104-2109
23. Tuomi lehto J, Lindstorm J, Eriksson JG. Prevention of type 2 diabetes mellitus by changes in lifestyle among subjects with impaired glucose tolerance. *N.Engl J Med* 2001; 344: 1343- 1350
24. The DECODE study group, on behalf of the European Diabetes Epidemiology Group. Glucose tolerance and cardiovascular mortality. Comparison of fasting and 2-h diagnostic criteria. *Arch Intern Med* 2001; 161: 397-404
25. Khan KT, Wareham N, Bingham S, Luben R, Welch A, Day N. Association of hemoglobin A1C with cardiovascular disease and mortality in adults: the European prospective investigation into cancer in Norfolk. *Ann Intern Med* 2004; 141: 1413-1420
26. Cowie CC, Rusi KF, Byrd-Holt DD. Prevalence of diabetes and high risk for diabetes using A1C criteria in the US population in 1988-2006. *Diabetes Care* 2010; 33: 552-568
27. Carson AP, Reynolds K, Fonseca VA, Muntner P. Comparison of A1C and fasting glucose criteria to diagnose diabetes among US adults. *Diabetes Care* 2010; 33: 95-97
28. Herman WH, Ma Y, Uwaifo G. differences in A1C by race and ethnicity among patients with impaired glucose tolerance in the Diabetes Prevention Program *Diabetes Care* 2007; 30: 2453-2457.
29. Hahassors A, Drakopoulos I, Katritsis D, Chiotinis N, Korovesis S, Makris K. Measurement of glycated hemoglobin (HbA1C) with automated POCT instrument in comparison with HPLC and automated immunochemistry method: evaluation of the influence of hemoglobin variants. *Clin Chem Lab Med* 2006; 44; 223-227