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Abstract

Background: Mycobacterium Tuberculosis (TB) detection through quality assured laboratories is an essential element of the World Health Organization (WHO) STOP TB Strategy. For this quality assurance of acid fast bacilli (AFB) stained sputum smear microscopy is essential as AFB Microscopic diagnosis has remained the routine laboratory method for the identification of TB in Ethiopia. This study intended to assess the performance of laboratory professionals in detecting TB bacilli at Hawassa and Hawassa Zuriya health institutions.

Methods: A cross-sectional study design was employed on a total of 67 laboratory professionals working in public health facilities. A standardized pre-validated panel slide and questionnaires were distributed to laboratory professionals along with on-site evaluation by using standard questioner. A total of ten slides per panel given for each professional. Each panel of slides includes 4 negative slide and 6 positive slides of different bacterial density (3 with 1-9 AFB/100 fields, one with 1+ one with 2+ and one with3+). Agreement in detecting of TB bacilli Sensitivity, specificity and predictive values of readings were assessed using SPSS version 20.0

Results: Onsite evaluation showed that about 89% of laboratories has no separate area for TB work as well as 78% have no adequate ventilation very far from the standard Laboratory safety. Nine participants (13.4%) correctly reported all panel slides. A total of 13.74%(92/670) error was reported that include errors of 1.04%(5HFN; 2 HFP) and minor errors of 12.70%(17 LFN and LFP each, and 51 QE). The sensitivity, specificity, positive predictive values (PPV) and negative predictive value (NPV) of participants in detecting TB bacilli as compared to the reference reading were 94.52%, 92.91%, 95.23% and 92.67% respectively.

Conclusion: Laboratory safeties are deficient on most laboratories and there are a lot of technical problems observed during on-site observation. Agreement of the participants with reference reading in the detection of TB bacilli was very good according to national guideline. Though low major error were reported, training and supervisory activities are still important for successful TB control programs.
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1. BACKGROUND

Mycobacterium tuberculosis, the causative agent of tuberculosis (TB), infects almost the third world population and kills around two million people worldwide each year. About 80% of the global TB burden occurs in low-income countries, where pulmonary disease and ditstransmission are most serious public health problems [1].
Ethiopia is one of the 22 high burdened countries and TB remains one of the leading causes of mortality. As to the 2014 WHO report, the rate of all forms of TB is 211 per 100,000 of the population. About 13% of all new TB cases are also HIV co-infected. Moreover, Ethiopia is one of the high TB/HIV and multidrug resistant TB (MDR TB) burden countries [2].

Ethiopia implements the STOP TB strategy of world health organization (WHO) starting from 2006 [3]. One of the components of the directly observed the rapy strategy (DOTS) recommended by the WHO for diagnosis of TB is based on laboratory results of sputum smear microscopy. Hence correct reading of sputum smears is critical in case finding and management for further progress of TB prevention program. In addition the DOTS strategy also recommends quality control of smear microscopy be an integral part of national TB control programmes [2, 3 and 4].

Error in reading sputum microscopy may result in failure to detect persons with active tuberculosis and in reverse unnecessary anti-TB treatment for non-TB cases which predisposes the development of drug resistant tuberculosis (MDR-TB). Therefore quality assurance (QA) system for the sputum microscopy is important to minimizing the false positive and false negative results in the laboratory services [5, 6].

Most study in different part of the world has shown that during on site evaluation and panel testing laboratories didn’t have a split area for TB examination with full safety problems in addition, overall error 13 - 25% were reported. For this most of literatures recommend that continues supervision and training programs are significantly improving the lab professionals in TB microscopic examination [12, 15, and 16]. According to the recommendations made by the national guideline, the quality control system for sputum smear microscopy for tuberculosis contain; internal quality control, quality improvement and external quality assessment which includes proficiency testing of professionals in TB microscope reading[4, 7]. There for the aim of this study is to evaluate the quality performance of laboratories in AFB smear microscopy in peripheral diagnostic centers in Hawassa & Hawassa Zuriya health institutions.

2. METHODS

2.1. Study Setting

Across sectional study was conducted on selected laboratories from October 2015 to January 2016. The study laboratories were include from Hawassa & Hawassa Zuriya governmental health institutions which are under Sidama Zone administrate of Southern nation and nationalities peoples region Which is found about 270 km away from the capital city, Addis Ababa. The study laboratories involve Hawassa referral hospital and Adare hospital in Hawassa, and seven governmental health center laboratories in Hawassa Zuriya. All health institutions are governmental and perform AFB TB examination as a routine test.

2.2. Data Collection and Panel Composition

Data were collected using on site evaluation check list and panel tests. All peripheral laboratories included in the study have employed AFB staining technique for detection of AFB in a sputum smear. Standardized panels containing 10 stained with varying AFB quantities was validated by the Hawassa University referral teaching hospital laboratory. This study panel slide composition with different grades of positivity, 3+,2+,1+,two smears for scanty and five negative in order to evaluate the ability of the lab professionals to properly grade positive slides. The composition of test panels standardized according to WHO manual and Ethiopia Federal Ministry of Health Guidelines [4, 8].

The result was expressed as major or minor error; Major errors were sub classified as; high false positive (HFP): If a negative smear misreadas1+to3+positive, High False Negative (HFN): If a1+to3+positive smear misreads negative. Minor error included; Quantification error: when there is a difference of more than one Grade in a reading a posit ive smear between xaminee and controller, Low False Positive (LFP): when a negative smear misreadas low (1-9AFB/100field) positive and Low False Negative (LFN): when a low (1-9AFB/100field) read as negative result according to the International EQA classification (Table 1).
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Table 1. Evaluation and interpretation of errors between controllers and microscopist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Result of Technician</th>
<th>Result of Expertise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>1-9AFB/100f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correct</td>
<td>LFN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-9AFB/100f</td>
<td>Correct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1+</td>
<td>HFN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2+</td>
<td>HFN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3+</td>
<td>HFN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| HFN, High False Negative; HFP, High False Positive; LFN, Low False Negative; LFP, Low False Positive; QE, Quantification Error

2.3. Scores for Grading

Regarding the score; Set of 10 panel testing slides, each carries 10 points, total possible score of 100. Committing major error (HFP and HFN) result in a score of 0 where as minor error (LFP, LFN and QE (QE = 2 grades difference)) result in scores of 5 points. In general assessment of performance was based on Table 1. Passing score was 80 points and poor performance was <80%. Interpretation of results was done based on International Union against tuberculosis and lung disease (IUATLD) WHO recommended grading of sputum microscopy results using [4, 8].

On-site evaluation of each laboratory was performed using the national on-site evaluation checklist to assess the different aspect of working environment inside TB laboratory [9, 10].

2.4. Data Analysis

Data processing and statistical analysis was performed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) software (Windows version 16.0). The percentages of different types of errors were calculated for smears microscopy center. The sensitivity, specificity, Positive predictive value (PPV), Negative predictive value (NPV) of smear reading by microscopic center laboratory technician was calculated. Chi square test is used to see any association with different variable. The agreement in reading between the peripheral diagnostic centers and the reference laboratory readings was done using kappa statistics and p value less than 0.05 was considered to be statistically significant. Data and materials supporting this study finding presented in the main paper or additional supporting files whenever possible.

2.5. Ethical Consideration

There search proposal was evaluated by the research and ethics committee of Department of Medical Laboratory Science and reviewed and cleared by Institution of Review Board (IRB) of Hawassa University. Prior to data collection, written consent was obtained from the heads of each laboratory personnel. Moreover, written consent was also obtained from laboratory professionals who participated in interview and panel testing. Confidentiality was maintained by coding each facility starting from data collection to analysis.

2.6. Results

A total of 67 laboratory professionals responded to the questionnaires with a response rate of 100%. Forty four (65.7%) of them were from health center and the rest 23(34.3%) were from hospital. about50% of participant responded that they got TB microscopy service training previously and almost 42% of participant laboratory have not involved in EQA. Thirty six (53.7%) of participant were BSc degree and the rest 31(46.3%) were diploma by qualification. The males were 45(67.2%) (Table2).
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Table 2. Frequency distribution of characteristics of laboratory professionals, Hawassa Zuriya, Southern Ethiopia, 2016 (N=67).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45 (67.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>22 (32.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualification</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>31 (46.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>degree</td>
<td>36 (53.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>34 (50.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>27 (40.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;40</td>
<td>6 (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;2 years</td>
<td>13 (19.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5 years</td>
<td>30 (44.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>18 (26.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;10 years</td>
<td>6 (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous training</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>34 (50.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>33 (49.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQA involvement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes with feed back</td>
<td>16 (23.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes but no feed back</td>
<td>23 (34.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>28 (41.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health center</td>
<td>44 (65.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>23 (34.3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. On-Site Evaluation

Regarding on-site evaluation, 44.5% of laboratories have SOP for AFB smear microscopy using ZN technique also about 89% of the study sites have no separate area for TB work. Expired laboratory reagents, and lack of routine maintenance of microscopes were among the problems identified in the peripheral laboratories. Moreover, all laboratories didn’t include control smears during staining procedures. Furthermore, 100% laboratories did not filtered reagents before use, 66.7% of them did not prepare slides with appropriate thickness, and 33.4% had unacceptable background staining (Table 3).

Table 3. On-site evaluation visits of the selected health institution medical laboratories from October 2015 to January 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>On-site evaluation</th>
<th>Number of Laboratory (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Laboratory safety</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOP for AFB smear microscopy using ZN technique</td>
<td>4/9 (44.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No separate area for TB work</td>
<td>8/9 (88.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No adequate ventilation</td>
<td>7/9 (77.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No biohazard waste bin with a lid</td>
<td>7/9 (77.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improper use of PPE</td>
<td>8/9 (88.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laboratory reagents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expired reagents or no label</td>
<td>3/9 (33.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not filtered before use</td>
<td>9/9 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filtered once a month</td>
<td>6/9 (66.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microscope</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate light source</td>
<td>2/9 (22.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective not cleaned after slide examination</td>
<td>8/9 (88.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No routine care/daily maintenance</td>
<td>7/9 (77.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smearing and staining procedures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background staining not acceptable</td>
<td>3/9 (33.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background material doesn’t represent sputum</td>
<td>4/9 (44.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inappropriate smear thickness</td>
<td>6/9 (66.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inappropriate smear size</td>
<td>6/9 (66.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report with grading</td>
<td>2/9 (22.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include control smears</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>0/9 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New batch of reagents</td>
<td>6/9 (66.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>3/9 (33)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There was no statistically significant association between the proportion of errors made by the participants in the detection of TB bacilli and their sex, experience, Qualification, previous training, and EQA involvement. Professionals found in health center and those serving less than 2 year are likely there is statistically significant association with the proportion of errors they made (Table 4).

Table 4. Relationship between score of participant with selected demographic characteristics, Hawassa and Hawassa Zuriya, Southern Ethiopia, 2016 (N = 67).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Passed &gt;80/100 (%)</th>
<th>Failed &lt;80/100 (%)</th>
<th>Chi-square</th>
<th>Degree of freedom</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>36 (80)</td>
<td>9 (20)</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>female</td>
<td>17 (77.3)</td>
<td>5 (22.7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualification</td>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>25 (80.6)</td>
<td>6 (19.4)</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>degree</td>
<td>28 (77.8)</td>
<td>8 (22.2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>20-30</td>
<td>23 (67.6)</td>
<td>11 (32.4)</td>
<td>5.849</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>24 (88.9)</td>
<td>3 (11.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;40</td>
<td>6 (100)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service year</td>
<td>&lt;2 years</td>
<td>7 (53.8)</td>
<td>6 (46.2)</td>
<td>7.66</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2-5 years</td>
<td>26 (86.7)</td>
<td>4 (13.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>14 (77.8)</td>
<td>4 (22.2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;10 years</td>
<td>6 (100)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous training</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>38 (82.6)</td>
<td>8 (17.4)</td>
<td>1.093</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>15 (71.4)</td>
<td>6 (28.6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQA involvement</td>
<td>Yes with feedback</td>
<td>23 (88.5)</td>
<td>3 (11.5)</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes but no feedback</td>
<td>16 (76.2)</td>
<td>5 (23.8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>14 (70)</td>
<td>6 (30)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutions</td>
<td>Health center</td>
<td>12 (52.2)</td>
<td>11 (47.8)</td>
<td>15.36</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>41 (93.2)</td>
<td>3 (16.8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>53 (79.1)</td>
<td>14 (20.9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The type of error committed by the professionals as displayed in Figure 1, it is mainly the minor error like quantification error, Low false negative and Low false positives which account 92.3% of all error and the rest 7.7% are the major errors.

Figure 1. Type of errors committed by study participants Hawassa and Hawassa Zuriya, Southern Ethiopia, 2016

Out of 67 laboratory professionals involved in the panel test, 13.74% (92/670) were reported wrongly that includes major errors of 1.04% (5 HFN; 2 HFP) and minor errors of 12.7% (17 LFN; 17 LFP; and 5 QE). Among the 4 negative slides 2 (0.29%) of the participants made major errors (HFP) and among the 6 positive slides 5 (0.75%) of participants made major error (HFN). On the other hand, 2.53% of participants made minor errors (LFP) on 4 negative slides. The same amount (2.53%) participant also made minor errors (LFN) on the 1-9AFB/100 field slides on all positive slides 7.61% minor error (QE) reported (Table 5).
Agreement of the overall participants with the reference reading on TB detection was 92.67% (Kappa = 0.80). The lowest agreement on detection was found among working in hospital 90.2% agreement with reference reading (Kappa = 0.76) (Table 6).

Overall, the sensitivity, specificity, positive predictive values (PPV) and negative predictive value (NPV) of participants in detecting TB bacilli as compared to the reference reading were 94.52%, 92.91%, 95.23% and 91.88% respectively. Agreement with reference was 92.67% (Kappa = 0.80) on detection of TB bacilli. Assessment across institutions as shown in Table 4, is almost similar within institution.

**PPV* = Positive predictive value 
NPV** = negative predictive value

According to IUATLD/WHO recommended grading of sputum smear microscopy results, 53(79.1%) of the participants were rated as passed, 14(20.9%) were failed. Among 44 participants who worked at hospital, 41(93.2%) were passed, 3(16.8%) were failed. About 82.6% of participants who had TB microscopy training were passed (Table 4).

## 4. DISCUSSION

It is well known that grave deficiencies can occur in the laboratory when insufficient attention is given to the quality of the work product. Many countries including Ethiopia, however, have no complete laboratory EQA program or do not provide sufficient administrative support and attention [8, 11].

Although new diagnostic technologies’ were available, still microscopic examination of sputum smear used in Ethiopia. Therefore, the skill of laboratory personals on AFB examination seriously affects the case management of TB. Consequently, proficiency testing in sputum smear microscopy was essential for a successful TB control program [4].

The overall error in this study was more than 13.74%. About 80% of participants are in acceptable passing score which is 80% [9]. The Overall sensitivity, specificity, PPV and NPV of participants in detecting TB bacilli were 94.52%, 92.91%, 95.23% and 91.88% respectively. These findings were in agreement with our previous finding done in Hawassa town southern Ethiopia (12), also with findings in another place in Ethiopia [13- 16], and elsewhere in the world (17-20). Unlike these studies, our findings reveal comparatively high specificity in detection of TB bacilli indicates that there were very few false positive results.
The agreement on detection of TB bacilli compared to reference reading was 92.67% (kappa = 0.80) which is defined as good agreement based on the Kappa index interpretation (21). The overall agreement in the current study was almost comparable with others study in Ethiopia (12, 14, 15, and 16). However, it is higher than a study conducted in Malaysia which reported 88% agreement (19).

Different type of Errors was reported in all levels of health institution almost in similar fashion. Major error were reported by 7(1.04%) of participants, among these 5(0.75 %) were HPN. Even though the major error committed by the participants is lower than national cut-off point, the possible reason for major error could be due to proficiency in identifying AFB. It is recognized that major errors primarily alter the disease classification and management of a patient. The finding we got is almost similar with others report from Ethiopia, and Tanzania [12, 15, 17, 23 and 24]. But quit very small compared to finding to other similar studies in Ethiopia (22) The main drive of an EQA programmer is to identify this error which suggests that Patients with TB case were not treated on time because of diagnosis miss, resulting in suffering due to the disease; further spread of TB to the population, in addition Patients may lose confidence in the health services or a particular laboratory. The leading error among the minor Error (7.61%) was quantification error and we can say about 76% of all type of error is QE. This shows that lab professionals miss to detect low AFB count from patient sample. Though quantification errors are minor importance, as it doesn’t influence case management, this type of error can differentiate the skill of laboratory personals. The possible reason might be the laboratory personals not perform reading in all part of the fields on the other handwork environment and training level of the laboratory professionals also differ. Our finding seems similar with those previously explained studies in type as well percentage of minor error [12, 15, 16, 17 and 24].

5. CONCLUSION

Laboratory safeties are deficient on most laboratories and there are a lot of technical problems observed during on-site observation. Agreement of the participants with reference reading in the detection of TB bacilli was very good compared to national guide line. Though low major error were reported, training and supervisory activities are still important for successful TB control programs.
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