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Abstract: HCV is a blood borne virus that attacks the liver and can cause chronic hepatitis, liver cirrhosis (27%) and liver cancer (25%). So detection of HCV infection in suspected patients by a reliable rapid method is a need of hours. The present study was conducted to assess comparative efficacy ELISA and rapid screening techniques (ICT) for the diagnosis of HCV amongst suspected viral hepatitis cases. A total of 2512 non-repetitive blood samples from patients of various indoor and OPD department were screened for anti-HCV antibody by both ICT and ELISA taking ELISA as a gold standard. The overall prevalence of HCV was found to be 9.5%. The overall sensitivity and specificity rate of ICT based test was 85.7% and 100% respectively. In comparison ELISA methodology showed both 100% sensitivity and specificity. Although ELAs shows better degree of sensitivity but due to its cost and as it is a time taking procedure it maybe less preferable in comparison to ICT in our resource limited country with high volume of case load.

I. Introduction

HCV infection is a major public health problem with an estimated global prevalence of HCV is 3%. [1,2] There are about 180 million carriers and approximately 4 million people annually are newly infected [2,3]. HCV is a single stranded positive-sense RNA virus, 9.6kb in length and belongs to family flaviviridae and genus Hepacivirus. HCV is a blood-borne virus, and well known risk factors for HCV transmission includes injection drug abuse, [4,5] blood/blood product transfusion. Hepatitis C virus (HCV) can cause asymptomatic infection. [1] The seroprevalence of HCV globally ranges between 0.2-2%. Presently, determination of the seroprevalence of HCV in general population is a priority. [2,3] Community based seroprevalence studies are difficult to conduct in a developing country because of socioeconomic hurdles and logistic difficulties. A tertiary care hospital catering to the needs of a large population represents an important centre for serological surveys. In this study, comparative evaluation was made of ELISA and Rapid Screening Techniques for the diagnosis of HCV amongst suspected viral hepatitis cases attending tertiary care Hospital, eastern India.

II. Materials and Methods

This hospital based observational analytical pilot study was conducted in our tertiary care set up. A total of 2512 no of consecutive, non-repetitive clinical samples were included in this study over a period of one and half month. Informed consent of each patient was taken. Out of these 2512 patients 1708 (68%) were male and remaining were female. , patients of all age group and both sexes of different department of this Hospital (both IPD and OPD) who were advised to undergo Hepatitis-C diagnostic-testing or for Hepatitis-C screening i) before any surgical procedure/Haemodialysis, ii) who were either exposed like repeated blood or blood product receiver or donors or with high risk exposure like IV drug users, undergone tattooing iii) suspected and symptomatic Hepatitis patients as admitted in various wards of this Hospital or attending OPD of different departments(specially Gastro enteroology/Liver clinicand general medicine,who are accidentally and occupationally exposed,v) both voluntary and replacement blood donors who were apparently healthy persons and qualified the donation criteria (age 18 to 60 years and having body weight more than 45 kg) and were advised to be screened for anti-HCV antibody prior to transfusion was included in the study. In present study we used ICT (IMMU CHECK) for detection of HCV infection. For the reconfirmation of ICT results we used 3rd generation ELISA as gold standard (HEPA SCAN).
III. Results

A total of 2512 blood samples from patients of the Department of various indoor department and OPD screened for anti-HCV antibody. The overall prevalence of HCV was found to be .95%. Majority of the patients were in the age group between 19 to 70 years. One thousand and seven hundred (68%) were male and rest (32%) were female. The overall performing activity of ICT with ELISA was depicted in the table one. ELISA methodology seems to have better sensitivity and specificity level in comparison with ICT.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation of HCV rapid ICT kit with ELISA</th>
<th>Total sample (n=2512)</th>
<th>Reactive</th>
<th>Nonreactive</th>
<th>True Positive (TP)</th>
<th>True Negative (TN)</th>
<th>False Positive (FP)</th>
<th>False Negative (FN)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rapid ICT</td>
<td>2512</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2492</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2488</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELISA</td>
<td>2512</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2488</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2488</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ICT=Immuno chromatography test, HCV=Hepatitia C Virus

The overall sensitivity, specificity, positive predictive value and negative predictive value of ICT based test were 85.7%, 100%, 100% and 85.7% respectively. In comparison ELISA methodology showed 100% sensitivity, specificity, positive predictive value and negative predictive value.

| Table no.2 Sensitivity comparison of ELISA and RCT techniques HCV antibody |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| ELISA test (%) | Rapid Test (%) |
| Sensitivity | 100 | 85,7 |
| Specificity | 100 | 100 |
| Positive predictive value | 100 | 100 |
| Negative predictive value | 100 | 85,7 |

IV. Discussions

The overall prevalence rate of HCV infection was .95% with male preponderance (62%). This findings is in accordance with the study of Parimal H. Patel et al [6] but quiet different with the findings of Noor Jahan et al and Bhattacharya et al. [7] These differences may be due to different geographical areas and involvement of different patients group with different risk factors.

The immuno chromatographic screening (rapid kit) has a lower sensitivity (85.7%) in comparison to ELISA (100%) but the specificity rates are same in both cases. A study from Lahore Pakistan reported Sensitivity of ICT, which showed a low detection rate of positive cases in comparison with the ELISA. [7,8] A study from Lahore reported very low sensitivity (44% to 66%) but specificity was fairly high (93% to 100%). [9] A study from Lahore reported 2.35% false positive cases on ICT as compared to ELISA. [9,10] An other study from Pakistan showed 0.15% false positive results on ICT in blood donor screening. [11] A study from Pakistan showed 0.15% false positive results on ICT in blood donor screening. [12] A study from Pakistan showed 0.15% false positive results on ICT in blood donor screening. [13] A study from Cameroon showed 9.1% false positive results in control gro-up and 6.3% in HIV positive patient using ELISA as the gold standard. [14]

V. Conclusion

Data indicate that fewer than half of those infected with HCV may be aware of their infection. The findings suggest that more intensive efforts are needed to identify and test persons at risk for HCV infection.

The estimated number of persons with chronic hepatitis C virus (HCV) infection increased from 2.7 million during 1988-19941 to 3.2 million during 1999-2002. Many infected persons, however, are unknown to the healthcare system because they may be asymptomatic for years, have not been tested for HCV, and only seek medical care for their infection when complications occur as part of the natural progression of untreated infection. Currently, HCV infection is the etiology most frequently associated with newly diagnosed chronic liver disease, and the effect on healthcare utilization is high. The number of healthcare visits associated with hepatitis C increased in ambulatory care settings during 1992-20035 and has remained at a high level through at least 2006.

In all the above studies specificity is consistent with our results, but due to sample size difference variation is seen in term of sensitivity which is not the major concern, because in hospital setup false positive result will be better than a false negative results. Inadequate coating of the antigens on the surface of the immune filter or the nature of Antigens used in rapid tests and ELISA can affect the results. Further-more genetic heterogeneity can affect the serological response. Fall in sensitivity of ICT can also be explained by chance variation, inadequate representation of antigen on rapid device.
Although EIAs shows maximum degree of sensitivity but due to its cost and as it is a time taking procedure it is less preferable. In blood banks where time is the major issue rapid tests is the good substitute of ELISA. Specificity of some rapid kits has increased due to the use of synthetic antigens and due to decrease false negative results therefore the performance of the rapid kits are satisfactory. ICT can be used in blood banks with limited facilities because it is rapid and cheap. It can be used for initial screening only but it could not be the only criteria for diagnosis. Further research with improved sample size and higher techniques are required to found the credibility of such devices for their sensitivity and specificity.
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