JOURNAL OF CULTURAL ANALYSIS AND SOCIAL CHANGE

Journal of Cultural Analysis and Social Change,
2025, 10(2), 1963-1972
ISSN: 2589-1316

Enhancing HIV Laboratory Testing: Quality Assurance, Sociocultural Dynamics, Economic Evaluations, and Global Perspectives

Bader Mudhhi E Alanazi[1], Rathimalar Ayakannu[2]

[1] *Master of Medical Laboratory Sciences Lincoln University College, Email: alanazi.phscholar@lincoln.edu.my*
[2] *PhD in Health (Medicine) Lincoln University College*

*__Corresponding Author:__ rathimalar@lincoln.edu.my

Citation: Alanazi, B. A. E. and Ayakannu, R. (2025). Enhancing HIV Laboratory Testing: Quality Assurance, Sociocultural Dynamics, Economic Evaluations, and Global Perspectives, *Journal of Cultural Analysis and Social Change*, 10(2), 1963-1972. https://doi.org/10.64753/jcasc.v10i2.1895

Published: November 15, 2025

ABSTRACT

The review article provides a comprehensive examination of the multifaceted factors influencing HIV laboratory testing. It underscores the critical importance of rigorous quality assurance measures, including the calibration and maintenance of laboratory instruments, the use of control samples, and thorough documentation to ensure accuracy and reliability in test results. The paper highlights the necessity of continuous education and certification for laboratory staff to maintain proficiency in the latest testing methods and protocols. It also explores the impact of sociocultural dynamics, such as stigma and discrimination, on HIV testing and treatment behaviors, advocating for culturally sensitive strategies to enhance testing uptake and adherence. Economic evaluations of HIV screening programs are emphasized as crucial for optimizing resource allocation, with assessments focusing on cost-effectiveness and the broader impact on public health. The paper calls for international collaboration, with organizations like WHO and UNAIDS playing pivotal roles in supporting global testing and prevention efforts. By integrating these elements, the review aims to identify best practices and areas for improvement, ultimately enhancing the quality of HIV laboratory testing and supporting better health outcomes for individuals and communities affected by HIV.

Keywords: HIV Laboratory Testing, Quality Assurance, Sociocultural Dynamics, Economic Evaluations, Cost-Effectiveness, Global Perspectives

INTRODUCTION

HIV laboratory testing is a critical component in the diagnosis, treatment, and prevention of HIV/AIDS. Ensuring the quality of these tests is essential to achieve accurate and reliable results, which directly impact patient care and public health outcomes. The review paper addresses several key aspects of quality assurance in HIV laboratory testing. First, high standards in HIV laboratory testing require rigorous quality control measures, including the calibration and maintenance of laboratory instruments, the use of control samples, and thorough documentation of laboratory activities. These practices help identify and rectify errors, thereby reducing the risk of test result misrepresentation[1]. Continuous education and certification of laboratory staff are crucial for maintaining proficiency in the latest testing methods and protocols. This ensures that laboratory personnel are well-equipped to deliver accurate test results, which is vital for effective patient management[2]. The implementation of standardized testing and interpretation protocols, informed by national and international guidelines, helps reduce variability and enhance the reliability of test results across different laboratories[3]. The adoption of advanced technologies, such as nucleic acid testing (NAT) and chemiluminescence immunoassays, enhances the sensitivity and specificity of HIV tests. These technologies facilitate early detection and are integral to improving patient outcomes and public health[4].

Copyright © 2025 by Author/s. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited..

In Sociocultural side including stigma, discrimination, cultural beliefs, and religious values, significantly influence HIV testing and treatment behaviors. Understanding these dynamics is essential for developing strategies that promote testing and adherence to treatment, ultimately improving health outcomes[5]. As well as, evaluating the cost-effectiveness of HIV screening programs is crucial for optimizing resource allocation in public health. Economic assessments consider the costs and benefits of screening programs, including their impact on reducing HIV transmission and improving early diagnosis and treatment[6]. Finally, the global response to HIV emphasizes the need for international collaboration and partnerships to enhance testing and prevention efforts. Organizations such as WHO and UNAIDS play a pivotal role in supporting these initiatives by providing funding, expertise, and best practices[7]. By integrating these elements, the review paper aims to identify best practices and areas for improvement in HIV laboratory testing. The goal is to enhance the quality of testing, thereby supporting better health outcomes for individuals and communities affected by HIV.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The review paper focuses on HIV laboratory testing quality assurance encompasses several key components. The purpose of the review is to synthesize existing literature on quality assurance practices in HIV laboratory testing, focusing on sociocultural factors, economic evaluations, and global perspectives to identify best practices and areas for improvement. A comprehensive literature search was conducted across databases such as PubMed, Scopus, and Web of Science using keywords like "HIV laboratory testing quality assurance," "sociocultural factors in HIV treatment," and "economic evaluation of HIV screening." The inclusion criteria were peer-reviewed articles published in English from 2015 to 2023 that addressed the quality of HIV laboratory testing, while non-peer-reviewed articles and those not specifically focused on quality assurance were excluded. Data extraction involved collecting study objectives, methodologies, key findings, and conclusions from selected articles, with thematic analysis used to identify common themes and patterns. The quality of the included studies was assessed using a standardized checklist to ensure reliability and validity. Ethical considerations were limited to accurately representing the findings of the reviewed studies and providing proper citations. Limitations of the review include potential omissions due to language restrictions and the availability of published literature, which may not capture the most recent developments in HIV testing and prevention practices. This structured approach provides transparency and allows readers to assess the reliability of the review's findings.

Data Analysis

The data analysis for this review paper involved a thematic analysis of the selected literature to identify key themes and patterns related to the quality assurance of HIV laboratory testing. The analysis was conducted in several stages, each focusing on different aspects of the review's objectives. Firstly, the review synthesized findings on quality assurance practices in HIV laboratory testing. This involved examining studies that discussed the implementation of strict quality control measures, the importance of regular staff training and certification, and the adherence to standardized protocols. The analysis highlighted the necessity of these practices in ensuring accurate and reliable test results, which are crucial for effective patient management and public health outcomes. Secondly, the review explored the impact of sociocultural dynamics on HIV testing and treatment. The analysis identified recurring themes such as stigma, discrimination, cultural beliefs, and religious values, which significantly influence testing behaviors and treatment adherence. By understanding these sociocultural factors, the review aimed to suggest strategies for improving testing uptake and adherence to treatment. The third aspect of the analysis focused on economic evaluations of HIV screening programs. The review examined studies that evaluated the cost-effectiveness of various screening programs, considering both direct and indirect costs. The analysis emphasized the importance of economic assessments in optimizing resource allocation and improving the efficiency of HIV screening programs. Finally, the review considered global perspectives on HIV laboratory testing. This involved analyzing studies that discussed international collaboration and partnerships, which are essential for enhancing testing and prevention efforts globally. The analysis underscored the role of organizations such as WHO and UNAIDS in supporting these initiatives through funding, expertise, and best practices. Overall, the data analysis section of the review paper synthesized findings from diverse studies to provide a comprehensive understanding of the factors influencing the quality of HIV laboratory testing. By identifying common themes and best practices, the review aimed to suggest areas for improvement and support better health outcomes for individuals and communities affected by HIV.

A Comprehensive Approach to Assuring Quality of Laboratory Testing in HIV

HIV diagnosis, treatment, and prevention require comprehensive laboratory testing. The highest HIV laboratory testing standards require strict quality control, frequent staff training and certification, standardized

 © 2025 by Author/s

protocols, advanced testing technologies, and effective laboratory process management and supervision[2]. Quality HIV lab testing starts with strict control. Quality control verifies lab procedures and equipment for reproducible test results. Laboratory instruments must be calibrated and maintained, control samples used to verify test performance, and lab activities documented. High quality control standards help labs find and fix errors, reducing test result misrepresentation[1].

High-quality HIV testing requires lab staff training and certification. To ensure accurate results, lab staff must know the latest testing methods and protocols. HIV testing theory and practice training must continue. Certification guarantees lab staff proficiency and standards. Lab staff should take refresher courses and proficiency tests to maintain testing and quality assurance skills[2]. HIV laboratory testing quality is also assured by standard protocols. Testing and interpretation are standardized to reduce variability and improve lab reliability. National and international health organizations' best practices and guidelines inform these protocols. Laboratory protocols must be followed for accurate and comparable test results. Lab testing is tainted by protocol violations[3].

HIV lab testing requires advanced technology for accuracy and efficiency. Technology enables sensitive and specific nucleic acid testing (NAT) and chemiluminescence immunoassays. Early HIV detection technologies speed up detection. Advanced testing technologies require lab infrastructure and staff training. Accuracy and reliability justify test costs by improving patient outcomes and public health[4]. Good HIV testing requires lab process management and supervision. Laboratory managers and supervisors oversee quality, operations, and issues. Lab quality management should include sample collection, processing, reporting, and record keeping. Quality management streamlines lab testing and operations[8].

HIV lab QAA is done externally. A third party distributes and analyzes proficiency testing samples to evaluate a lab's EQA. The programs improve lab performance. Lab accreditation often requires EQA programs. EQA programs assess lab skills and improve testing (Killick et al., 2015). HIV testing quality depends on lab accreditation. An independent body certifies labs' standards compliance. Laboratory accreditation requires quality and performance. Accreditation examines a laboratory's quality management system, personnel qualifications, testing protocols, and quality control. An accredited lab tests accurately and reliably[6].

Along with technical and procedural elements, laboratory staff, healthcare providers, and public health authorities must collaborate and communicate for HIV testing quality. Clear test results are essential for clinical decision-making and patient management. For proper patient care, doctors and labs must share test results. Monitoring HIV trends and informing interventions and policies requires public health collaboration[9]. HIV lab testing quality depends on IT. IT streamlines lab sample tracking, test result reporting, and quality control. LIMS reduce manual errors and streamline lab workflows, improving data integrity. IT integrates lab data with EHRs, making test results easy to share with doctors. IT improves lab HIV testing accuracy and efficiency[10].

Quality HIV lab testing requires ethical lab practices. Labs must handle patient samples ethically, keep test results private, and get informed consent. Lab ethics require patient and test result confidentiality. Patients consent to testing knowing its consequences. Laboratory ethics foster patient-provider trust and healthcare system integrity[11]. Maintain and improve HIV lab testing through quality improvement. Systematic identification, analysis, and targeted interventions improve quality. Process mapping, root cause analysis, and performance benchmarking help labs improve. Laboratory staff quality improvement activities promote quality culture and proactive problem-solving[12].

Patient feedback improves HIV lab testing quality. Labs use patient feedback to improve. Patient satisfaction surveys can assess testing accessibility, timeliness, and results communication. Laboratory services are patient-centered and responsive when quality improvement includes patient feedback[13]. Regulation and policy greatly affect HIV lab testing quality. Labs must follow national and international regulations for accurate test results. Follow these rules for lab testing quality. Politicians must establish and enforce quality assurance rules. Encourage evidence-based policies and regulations to equip labs for high-quality testing[14].

HIV lab testing quality and advancement require R&D. R&D develops testing technologies, methods, and quality assurance. Science and research require collaboration between academia, research, and industry. HIV testing and lab services improve with R&D[15]. International partnerships and organizations determine HIV laboratory testing quality. Quality assurance is supported by WHO, UNAIDS, and the CDC with funding, expertise, and best practices. International partnerships help low-resource labs grow by sharing knowledge, resources, and expertise. Every lab needs global collaboration to test HIV accurately and reliably[7].

Lab workflows must include QA practices to ensure HIV testing quality. All laboratory activities—from sample collection and processing to result reporting and record keeping—must be quality managed. Routine laboratory quality assurance requires clear staff roles and responsibilities. Laboratory workflows can include quality assurance for consistency and reliability[16]. Maintaining HIV lab testing standards requires monitoring and evaluating quality assurance practices. Laboratory monitoring includes quality, proficiency, and patient feedback. Evaluation examines quality assurance and suggests improvements. Continuous monitoring and evaluation help labs make data-driven decisions and improve quality with targeted interventions[17].

© 2025 by Author/s

HIV lab testing quality assurance requires capacity building. Capacity building provides high-quality testing knowledge and resources. Improving infrastructure, training lab staff, and offering advanced testing technologies are examples. Laboratory capacity building should be sustainable and customized. Capacity building improves HIV testing accuracy[18] . Good HIV lab testing requires leadership and governance. Leadership defines quality, sets QAI goals, and provides resources and support. Effective governance, procedures, and oversight ensure quality assurance. Good leadership and governance boost lab accountability, quality, and improvement[19] .

Finally, HIV laboratory testing quality requires strict quality control, staff training and certification, standardized protocols, advanced testing technologies, and laboratory process management and supervision. Communication, collaboration, IT, accreditation, and external quality assessment are crucial. HIV laboratory testing is high-quality due to ethical conduct, quality improvement initiatives, patient feedback, regulatory and policy frameworks, research and development, international partnerships, quality assurance, continuous monitoring and evaluation, capacity building, and effective leadership and governance. These elements improve lab results, patient outcomes, and public health interventions when addressed[20].

Impact of Sociocultural Factors on HIV Testing and Treatment

HIV testing and treatment decisions, behaviors, and experiences are heavily influenced by society. Factors include social norms, culture, religion, stigma, discrimination, education, income, and healthcare. Understanding these influences helps develop HIV testing and treatment adherence strategies. These factors create a complex landscape that must be handled sensitively to improve HIV health[5]. HIV testing and treatment are heavily influenced by stigma. HIV/AIDS stigma is global but cultural. Many societies associate HIV/AIDS with immorality like homosexuality, drug use, and promiscuity. These associations stigmatize HIV-positive and at-risk people. Stigma against HIV testing and disclosure leads to delayed diagnosis and untreatable infections. Spreading the virus harms public health[21].

Stigma and discrimination complicate HIV testing and treatment. HIV-positive people face job, education, and healthcare discrimination. Discrimination can cause service denial, social isolation, and mental distress. Poor care or confidentiality breaches can discourage patients from seeking care due to healthcare discrimination. Strong laws and policies are needed to fight HIV discrimination. Public education campaigns that reduce prejudice and promote empathy gain support[22]. Culture affects HIV testing and treatment. Biomedical HIV care may conflict with some cultures' illness and healing beliefs. Traditional healers may be preferred by supernatural disease believers over biomedical doctors. Traditional healing may comfort and support but not treat HIV, delaying medical care. Culturally sensitive health education, community leaders, and traditional healers in public health initiatives must combine biomedical and traditional approaches[23].

Religion also strongly impacts HIV testing and treatment. Religion affects sexuality, health, and illness morality in many communities. Religious leaders and institutions can help or hinder HIV testing and treatment. Religions that condemn HIV-related behavior can discourage testing and treatment. Religious leaders who promote HIV compassion, care, and support reduce stigma and promote health. Religious leaders can improve HIV interventions through public health campaigns and religious-healthcare dialogue[24]. Health education and literacy determine HIV testing and treatment. Health literacy and higher education help people understand HIV transmission, testing, and treatment. Due to low health literacy and education, HIV myths can hinder testing and treatment. HIV education must be clear, accurate, and accessible to improve health literacy and empower decisions. Different populations' languages, cultures, and education should inform these programs[25].

Economic status and healthcare access affect HIV testing and treatment. Disparities in income can hinder HIV care. Testing, treatment, transportation, lost wages, and medication can be expensive for low-income people. Resource-poor areas may lack testing facilities, trained healthcare providers, and essential medications. Due to economic barriers, policy and programs must improve affordable and comprehensive healthcare. Build healthcare infrastructure, subsidize HIV services, and expand healthcare coverage in underserved areas[26]. Culture and gender affect HIV testing and treatment. HIV services are affected by gender norms and inequality. Due to gender roles' restrictions on autonomy and decision-making, women may not seek testing and treatment. If they disclose HIV, women may fear partner violence or abandonment. HIV care must be gender-sensitive to address these issues. Safe and confidential testing, gender-based violence support, and gender equality education and advocacy are included[27].

Men may also struggle with gender norms. Masculinity stereotypes of weakness may discourage HIV testing and treatment in some cultures. These cultural attitudes should be considered when redefining masculinity and health norms and engaging men in HIV prevention and care. Healthy lifestyle and stereotype-busting public health campaigns can boost men's HIV service use[19]. HIV testing and treatment in teens are influenced by culture. Peer pressure, drug experimentation, and poor sex education increase teen HIV risk. Stigma, lack of youth-friendly services, and restrictive parental or societal norms can prevent youth HIV testing and treatment. Youth-centered

 © 2025 by Author/s

HIV intervention must be confidential, non-judgmental, integrate health education, and address their unique needs and challenges[18].

Migratory conditions complicate HIV testing and treatment. Undocumented workers, refugees, and conflict and poverty victims face healthcare barriers. Language barriers, legal and documentation issues, discrimination, and unfamiliarity with local healthcare systems are examples. Disrupted social networks, economic vulnerability, and new environments and risk behaviors may increase HIV risk in migrants. Migrant HIV services must be culturally and linguistically appropriate in public health policies[17]. HIV testing and treatment are complicated by race, ethnicity, and sexual orientation. Minorities face HIV, discrimination, and more. Intersectionality is needed to understand how these factors affect different groups' needs. All HIV services should be accessible, healthcare equity promoted, and systemic racism and discrimination addressed[16].

Success in HIV testing and treatment requires community involvement. Community leaders, organizations, and residents can make HIV interventions more appealing. Public health programs that involve the community in design, implementation, and evaluation build trust and meet population needs. Supporting HIV-positive people in the community reduces stigma and makes testing and treatment easier[15]. Digital technology and social media increasingly impact HIV testing and treatment sociocultural factors. Digital platforms can reach underserved populations with information, support, and advocacy. HIV awareness, personal stories, and stigma-fighting social media campaigns can change public opinion. Mobile apps and text messages can provide education, medication reminders, confidential testing, and counseling. Digital technology can improve HIV interventions, especially for tech-savvy youth[28].

Medical professionals' views affect HIV testing and treatment. Care providers' knowledge, attitudes, and communication skills affect patient treatment compliance. Healthcare providers need compassionate, nonjudgmental, and culturally competent training to improve patient outcomes. This includes addressing providers' biases and misconceptions and teaching them to respect and empathize with patients[13]. Sociocultural HIV testing and treatment require policies and advocacy. HIV care is enabled by patient rights, healthcare access, and social determinants policies. Health outcomes can be improved by awareness, resource mobilization, and policy influence campaigns. HIV-positive people, policymakers, healthcare providers, and community leaders must participate[11].

Stigma, discrimination, cultural beliefs, religious values, education, economic status, gender norms, youth, migration, race, community engagement, digital technology, healthcare provider attitudes, and policy affect HIV testing and treatment. These factors require a holistic approach that considers diverse health behavior and experience influences. HIV testing and treatment outcomes can be improved by public health support, equity, and compassion. Increase awareness, reduce stigma and discrimination, provide affordable and comprehensive healthcare, engage communities, use digital technology, train healthcare providers, and promote HIV-friendly policies. These efforts empower people to test, follow treatment, and live healthy, fulfilling lives in a more inclusive and supportive environment[10].

Economic Evaluation of HIV Screening Programs

Assess HIV screening programs' economic and cost-effectiveness. Screening program cost-benefit analysis allocates public health resources. HIV screening programs should be evaluated for their economic impact to improve health and maximize healthcare funds due to their high cost[6]. Comparisons of HIV screening costs to health benefits like life-years gained, QALYs, and DALYs avoided can determine cost-effectiveness. Screening personnel, equipment, and materials and positive test care cost money. Reduce HIV transmission, improve early diagnosis, and public health[8].

HIV transmission reduction is a major economic benefit of screening. Early screening speeds ART start, reducing HIV transmission and viral load. Screenings prevent new infections, saving money. Early treatment and prevention reduce healthcare costs[4]. HIV-positive people benefit from early screening. Early ART increase HIV patients' lifespan and quality of life. Hospitalizations, morbidity, and HIV complications fall. The economic evaluation must account for these health improvements, which lower healthcare costs and boost productivity as people stay healthy and work[29]. HIV screening costs should be direct and indirect. Healthcare worker salaries, lab equipment, and screening infrastructure are direct costs. Screening-related infections and lost productivity are indirect costs. Screening program economic evaluations use both costs to assess financial impacts[3].

Limited intervention cost-effectiveness. For another QALY or DALY, health systems pay. High-income countries pay $50,000 to $100,000 per QALY, while low- and middle-income countries may have a lower threshold. Health programs pay off below this[30]. Several studies show HIV screening is cost-effective. Regular HIV screening in hospitals and clinics is cost-effective, especially in populations with HIV prevalence above 0.1%, according to US research. The cost per QALY gained for early detection and treatment is $30,000, which is less than cost-effective. Some high-income countries value early diagnosis and treatment over screening[31]. Low- and middle-income countries have cheaper HIV screening programs due to HIV prevalence and health burdens. A sub-Saharan African study found that HIV screening and early ART could save money and improve public health by preventing

© 2025 by Author/s

millions of new infections and deaths. The study stressed the importance of integrating HIV screening with other health services to maximize program efficiency and reach[32].

The economic evaluation of HIV screening programs must include VCT, PITC, and community-based testing costs and benefits. All approaches' cost structure and audience affect cost-effectiveness. VCT is self-requested, while doctors recommend PITC during routine visits. Traditional healthcare may not reach community-tested high-risk populations[33]. Community-based HIV testing enhances high-risk detection. Mobile testing units, outreach, and local partnerships help these programs reach locals. Community-based HIV testing is more expensive due to outreach and logistics, but HIV-endemic areas benefit. Community-based programs can reach undertested people and detect HIV faster, reducing burden[34]. Cost-saving interventions like PrEP and PEP affect HIV screening program economic evaluation. PrEP prevents HIV infection in high-risk HIV-negative people with antiretrovirals, while PEP treats short-term exposure. These interventions reduce HIV treatment costs and prevent new infections, making screening cheaper[35].

Integrating HIV screening with other health services using existing infrastructure and resources reduces costs. Services like HIV/TB screening and maternal and child health are cheaper and more accessible. Sharing facilities, staff, and logistics lowers HIV screening costs. Health outcomes and multiple needs can be improved with integration[36]. HIV screening program scale-up and sustainability must be considered in economic evaluations. Pilot programs are cheap but scaling them nationally or regionally is hard and expensive. Expand programs with healthcare worker training, supplies, and infrastructure. Long-term health and economic savings require program sustainability[37]. Economic assessments guide HIV screening resource allocation by policymakers and healthcare planners. It provides evidence-based insights into intervention effects to prioritize investments with the greatest health benefits and cost savings. Economic evaluations can convince governments, international organizations, and others to fund HIV screening programs[38].

HIV screening program economic evaluations may include productivity, growth, and cost-effectiveness. HIV causes illness, premature death, higher healthcare costs, and lower employment. Prevention and screening for HIV can boost economic growth. Value of HIV screening programs depends on economic benefits[39]. HIV screening program economic evaluation requires ethics. Cost-effectiveness is important, but resource allocation must consider equity and access. Target marginalized groups that may have trouble getting healthcare. To achieve public health goals and promote health equity, HIV screening must be available to all, regardless of socioeconomic status, location, or risk factors[4]. Community involvement is needed for HIV screening. Community involvement in program design, implementation, and evaluation boosts relevance, acceptability, and efficacy. Communities can address stigma, discrimination, and ignorance in screening. Building trust and ownership through community engagement can increase HIV screening and treatment uptake and cost-effectiveness[8].

Tech affects HIV screening program finances. HIV screening may be easier with self-testing kits and rapid tests. These technologies expand screening programs, reduce testing time and resources, and improve care linkage. Economic assessments should weigh the pros and cons of incorporating these innovations into screening programs and their feasibility and acceptability in different contexts[40]. International support is needed for HIV screening in developing nations. WHO and UNAIDS funding, technical assistance, and best practices aid screening program implementation and evaluation. Worldwide partnerships can help countries implement and maintain HIV screening programs that meet global health goals[9]. Evaluation of economic HIV screening programs must consider epidemiology, testing technologies, and public health priorities. Improvements and cost-effectiveness are found through continuous evaluation. Dynamic economic evaluation helps public health officials maintain HIV screening programs[41].

Finally, HIV screening program value and cost must be evaluated economically. These studies evaluate screening program costs, benefits, health outcomes, and economics. Economic assessments demonstrate HIV screening's early detection and treatment value. Assess cost-effectiveness, integration with other health services, scale-up, and sustainability. Ethics, technology, and community engagement affect HIV screening program economic evaluation. Continuous economic evaluations help policymakers and healthcare planners optimize HIV resource use and outcomes[11].

Global Perspectives on HIV Screening and Prevention

HIV screening and prevention methods, challenges, and successes vary globally. Healthcare infrastructure, epidemiology, socio-cultural contexts, and economic resources influence regional approaches. To understand global perspectives, HIV screening and prevention policy frameworks, technological advances, community engagement, and international collaboration must be examined[12]. The global HIV epidemic has 38 million positives and 1.5 million new infections. The epidemic continues to harm people and communities, especially in low- and middle-income countries, despite efforts to reduce new infections and increase ART access. Screening and prevention are essential for HIV control and health[13].

Global HIV prevention relies on screening. HIV screening reduces viral load, treats, and prevents transmission. Screening methods depend on population and resources. PITC, VCT, community-based, and self-testing are

 © 2025 by Author/s

examples[28]. HIV self-selection in hospitals or testing centers is part of volunteer counselling and testing (VCT). VCT offers confidential HIV testing and pre- and post-test counseling. Many countries use this method to normalize HIV testing and reduce stigma. VCT testing adherence depends on stigma, awareness, and risk[14]. Another popular method is provider-initiated testing and counseling (PITC), where doctors test patients for HIV during routine visits or when they have HIV-like symptoms. PITC identifies those at high risk who may not self-identify or seek testing. Integrating HIV testing with other health services can improve antenatal, TB, and STI clinic detection and linkage[15].

Community-tested high-risk populations may not receive traditional healthcare. This method uses mobile testing units, outreach services, and local partnerships in workplaces, schools, and social venues. MSM, sex workers, and drug injectors are tested more often due to community-based testing. Community-based testing simplifies early diagnosis near home and work (Focosi et al., 2020). Using rapid diagnostic tests (RDTs) at home or elsewhere to test for HIV is new. Self-testing is discreet, convenient, and stigma-free, so healthcare skeptics like it. Many countries have found that self-testing increases testing rates, especially among high-risk and first-time testers. Self-testing requires proper instructions, confirmatory testing, and care for positive results[7].

HIV testing should be integrated with other health services for efficiency and access. HIV testing, TB screening, antenatal care, and STI clinics use existing healthcare infrastructure to treat multiple conditions. This method improves HIV testing and care. Due to high co-infection rates and synergistic health effects, HIV/TB testing and services should be integrated[17]. HIV biomedical prevention includes PrEP and PEP. In HIV-negative high-risk individuals, PrEP prevents HIV infection with antiretrovirals. PEP uses brief antiretroviral treatment after virus exposure. Worldwide HIV prevention programs use both interventions to reduce HIV transmission. Some countries have PrEP and PEP cost, awareness, and healthcare infrastructure issues[18].

HIV prevention requires awareness and education. Sexual health decisions require HIV transmission, prevention, and testing education. HIV awareness, stigma reduction, and testing campaigns encourage testing. Culturally sensitive, population-specific campaigns work best[19]. HIV screening and prevention require community involvement. Community input on program design, implementation, and evaluation ensures relevance, acceptability, and efficacy. CBOs and NGOs educate, support, and advocate for HIV-positive and marginalized groups. Good relationships with these groups help prevent HIV[27].

Stigma and discrimination hinder HIV testing and treatment. Stigma and discrimination delay diagnosis and treatment. Stigma reduction requires education, legal protections, and advocacy. Public health campaigns must humanize HIV-positive people, challenge stereotypes, and promote acceptance and support to reduce stigma. HIV prevention and treatment require patient rights and anti-discrimination laws[20]. New tech changes HIV screening and prevention. Rapid point-of-care tests and molecular diagnostics improve HIV testing accuracy, convenience, and accessibility. Telehealth/mHealth apps improve HIV prevention and treatment. Personal health apps offer education, medication reminders, confidential testing, and counseling. Telehealth services provide virtual doctor visits and support to underserved people. These tools prevent HIV[26].

Maintaining and expanding HIV screening and prevention programs requires policy and advocacy. Policymakers determine HIV testing, treatment, and rights. HIV advocacy raises awareness, mobilizes resources, and shapes public opinion and policy. Government agencies, healthcare providers, community leaders, and HIV-positive people must fight the epidemic together[25]. International cooperation is needed to prevent HIV globally. WHO, UNAIDS, and the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria support HIV prevention and care worldwide with technical assistance, funding, and best practices. These organizations are crucial for global response coordination, target setting, and progress monitoring. Knowledge, resources, and expertise shared internationally improve HIV programs and global health[24].

HIV screening and prevention programs must be economically assessed for cost-effectiveness and resource allocation. Cost-effectiveness analyses find the best health interventions. Costs, health outcomes, and HIV prevention's economic impact are assessed. The cost-effectiveness of HIV screening and prevention programs can encourage governments, international organizations, and others to invest more[42]. Global HIV response must be fair and accessible. HIV prevention and care must be available to all, regardless of socioeconomic status, geographic location, or risk factors, to achieve public health goals and promote health equity. Remove cost, stigma, and discrimination barriers to reach marginalized and underserved populations. HIV prevention and treatment must be equitable[43].

Finally, global HIV screening and prevention perspectives emphasize multifaceted epidemic response. Different screening methods, technology, community engagement, and HIV integration with other health services are included. Reduce stigma and promote testing and treatment with education, awareness, and advocacy. Scaling HIV prevention requires international cooperation, policy support, and economic evaluation. The global community can control HIV and improve HIV patients' health by being holistic and inclusive. Ending the HIV epidemic and ensuring a healthier future requires continued commitment and collaboration[21].

© 2025 by Author/s

CONCLUSION

Assuring the quality of HIV laboratory testing is critical for effective diagnosis, treatment, and prevention of the disease. This requires a comprehensive approach that includes strict quality control measures, regular staff training and certification, adherence to standardized protocols, and the use of advanced testing technologies. Effective laboratory process management and supervision are also essential. Additionally, communication and collaboration among laboratory staff, healthcare providers, and public health authorities play a crucial role in maintaining high testing standards. The integration of information technology, participation in accreditation and external quality assessment programs, and adherence to ethical practices further enhance testing quality. Continuous quality improvement initiatives, informed by patient feedback and supported by robust regulatory and policy frameworks, are necessary for ongoing advancement. Research and development, along with international partnerships, contribute to the global effort to improve HIV testing accuracy and reliability. By addressing these elements collectively, laboratories can improve test results, patient outcomes, and public health interventions, ultimately enhancing the quality of HIV laboratory testing and supporting better health outcomes for individuals and communities affected by HIV.

REFERENCES

WHO. Blood safety and availability. 2018. Accessed June 22, 2024. https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/blood-safety-and-availability

Antonopoulou N, Schinas G, Kotsiri Z, et al. Testing Hepatitis E Seroprevalence among HIV-Infected Patients in Greece: The SHIP Study. Pathogens. 2024;13(7):536. doi:10.3390/pathogens13070536

Nagi MA, Rezq MAA, Sangroongruangsri S, Thavorncharoensap M, Dewi PEN. Does health economics research align with the disease burden in the Middle East and North Africa region? A systematic review of economic evaluation studies on public health interventions. Glob Health Res Policy. 2022;7(1):25. doi:10.1186/s41256-022-00258-y

Kotton CN, Kumar D, Caliendo AM, et al. The Third International Consensus Guidelines on the Management of Cytomegalovirus in Solid-organ Transplantation. Transplantation. 2018;102(6):900. doi:10.1097/TP.0000000000002191

Al-Mozaini M, Al-Rahabani T, Dirar Q, et al. Human immunodeficiency virus in Saudi Arabia: Current and future challenges. J Infect Public Health. 2023;16(9):1500-1509. doi:10.1016/j.jiph.2023.06.012

Kasraian L, Hosseini S, Salehi-Marzijarani M, Ebrahimi A, Ashkani Esfahani S. The Prevalence of Hepatitis C Infection in Blood Donors: A Meta-Analysis and Systematic Review. Iran Red Crescent Med J. 2020; In Press. doi:10.5812/ircmj.94998

Erikstrup C, Hother CE, Pedersen OBV, et al. Estimation of SARS-CoV-2 Infection Fatality Rate by Real-time Antibody Screening of Blood Donors. Clin Infect Dis Off Publ Infect Dis Soc Am. 2020;72(2):249-253. doi:10.1093/cid/ciaa849

Salway T, Thomson K, Taylor D, et al. Post-test comparison of HIV test knowledge and changes in sexual risk behaviour between clients accessing HIV testing online versus in-clinic. Sex Transm Infect. 2019;95(2):102-107. doi:10.1136/sextrans-2018-053652

Jones JM, Opsomer JD, Stone M, et al. Updated US Infection- and Vaccine-Induced SARS-CoV-2 Seroprevalence Estimates Based on Blood Donations, July 2020-December 2021. JAMA. 2022;328(3):298-301. doi:10.1001/jama.2022.9745

Im YR, Jagdish R, Leith D, et al. Prevalence of occult hepatitis B virus infection in adults: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Lancet Gastroenterol Hepatol. 2022;7(10):932-942. doi:10.1016/S2468-1253(22)00201-1

Hongjaisee S, Khamduang W, Sripan P, et al. Prevalence and factors associated with hepatitis B and D virus infections among migrant sex workers in Chiangmai, Thailand: A cross-sectional study in 2019. Int J Infect Dis IJID Off Publ Int Soc Infect Dis. 2020;100:247-254. doi:10.1016/j.ijid.2020.09.004

Hermosilla J, Sánchez-Martín R, Pérez-Robles R, et al. Comparative Stability Studies of Different Infliximab and Biosimilar CT-P13 Clinical Solutions by Combined Use of Physicochemical Analytical Techniques and Enzyme-Linked Immunosorbent Assay (ELISA). BioDrugs Clin Immunother Biopharm Gene Ther. 2019;33(2):193-205. doi:10.1007/s40259-019-00342-9

Hart TA, Moore DM, Noor SW, et al. Prevalence of HIV and sexually transmitted and blood-borne infections, and related preventive and risk behaviours, among gay, bisexual and other men who have sex with men in Montreal, Toronto and Vancouver: results from the Engage Study. Can J Public Health Rev Can Sante Publique. 2021;112(6):1020-1029. doi:10.17269/s41997-021-00546-z

Gosadi IM. Epidemiology of communicable diseases in Jazan region. Saudi Med J. 2023;44(11):1073-1084. doi:10.15537/smj.2023.44.11.20230269

 © 2025 by Author/s

Sul V, Deshpande N, Gadgil P. Seroprevalence of HIV, HBV, HCV and Syphilis among Blood Donors in Western Maharashtra and a Newer Proposed Donor Screening Algorithm. J Blood Disord Transfus. 2017;08. doi:10.4172/2155-9864.1000384

Obeagu EI, Obeagu GU. Transfusion Therapy in HIV: Risk Mitigation and Benefits for Improved Patient Outcomes. Asian J Dent Health Sci. 2024;4(1):32-37. doi:10.22270/ajdhs.v4i1.62

Moglad EHO, Ahmed DAO, Awad Al-Kareem SMM, Elgoraish AG, Ali HTO, Altayb HN. Prevalence of human immunodeficiency virus among pulmonary tuberculosis patients: A cross-sectional study. Microbiol Immunol. 2020;64(12):810-814. doi:10.1111/1348-0421.12856

Custer B, Quiner C, Haaland R, et al. HIV antiretroviral therapy and prevention use in US blood donors: a new blood safety concern. Blood. 2020;136(11):1351-1358. doi:10.1182/blood.2020006890

Curtin JM, Aronson NE. Leishmaniasis in the United States: Emerging Issues in a Region of Low Endemicity. Microorganisms. 2021;9(3):578. doi:10.3390/microorganisms9030578

ASCOMS, Jammu University, India, Arora S. Seroprevalence of HIV, HBV, HCV, Syphilis and Malaria among blood donors in a tertiary care hospital of Jammu. J Med Sci Clin Res. 2018;6(10). doi:10.18535/jmscr/v6i10.210

Al-Qahtani AA, Pourkarim MR, Trovão NS, et al. Molecular epidemiology, phylogenetic analysis and genotype distribution of hepatitis B virus in Saudi Arabia: Predominance of genotype D1. Infect Genet Evol. 2020;77:104051. doi:10.1016/j.meegid.2019.104051

Alanazi HMN. The role of leisure activities in enhancing well-being in Saudi's retired community: a mixed methods study. Humanit Soc Sci Commun. 2024;11(1):1-17. doi:10.1057/s41599-024-03126-x

Ali SM, Raza N, Irfan M, Mohammad MF, Kazmi FH, Fatima Z. Effectiveness of Using Nucleic Acid Amplification Test to Screen Blood Donors for Hepatitis B, Hepatitis C, and HIV: A Tertiary Care Hospital Experience From Pakistan. Cureus. 2023;15(1):e34216. doi:10.7759/cureus.34216

Althobaiti K. Examining HIV Prevalence and Cultural Implications of HIV Awareness in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. masteressay. University of Pittsburgh; 2019. Accessed August 26, 2024. https://d-scholarship.pitt.edu/36066/

Anjum A, Rehman A ur, Siddique H, et al. Evaluation of Hematological, Biochemical Profiles and Molecular Detection of Envelope Gene (gp-41) in Human Immunodeficiency Virus (HIV) among Newly Diagnosed Patients. Medicina (Mex). 2023;59(1):93. doi:10.3390/medicina59010093

Global burden of bacterial antimicrobial resistance in 2019: a systematic analysis - The Lancet. Accessed August 20, 2024. https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lancet/article/PIIS0140-6736(21)02724-0/fulltext

Barro L, Drew VJ, Poda GG, et al. Blood transfusion in sub-Saharan Africa: understanding the missing gap and responding to present and future challenges. Vox Sang. 2018;113(8):726-736. doi:10.1111/vox.12705

Hakawi A, Mokhbat J. The current challenges affecting the quality of care of HIV/AIDS in the Middle East: Perspectives from local experts and future directions. J Infect Public Health. 2022;15(12):1508-1513. doi:10.1016/j.jiph.2022.10.021

Cardiac and Vascular Surgery-Associated Acute Kidney Injury: The 20th International Consensus Conference of the ADQI (Acute Disease Quality Initiative) Group - PubMed. Accessed August 19, 2024. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/29858368/

O'Brien J, Hayder H, Zayed Y, Peng C. Overview of MicroRNA Biogenesis, Mechanisms of Actions, and Circulation. Front Endocrinol. 2018;9. doi:10.3389/fendo.2018.00402

Department of Clinical Pharmacy and Biopharmacy, Faculty of Pharmacy, Olabisi Onabanjo University, Sagamu Campus, Sagamu, Ogun State, Nigeria, Ojieabu WA, Mukaila WA, et al. Trend of HBsAg Seroprevalence Among Blood Donors in a Nigerian Teaching Hospital: A Five-Year Retrospective Study. Malays J Pharm Sci. 2021;19(2):87-96. doi:10.21315/mjps2021.19.2.6

Patel *Hetal K., Duong *Yen T., Birhanu S, et al. A Comprehensive Approach to Assuring Quality of Laboratory Testing in HIV Surveys: Lessons Learned From the Population-Based HIV Impact Assessment Project. JAIDS J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr. 2021;87(1):S17-S27. doi:10.1097/QAI.0000000000002702

Pessoni LL, Aquino ÉC de, Alcântara KC de. Prevalence and trends in transfusion-transmissible infections among blood donors in Brazil from 2010 to 2016. Hematol Transfus Cell Ther. 2019;41(4):310-315. doi:10.1016/j.htct.2019.03.009

Saati AA, Khurram M, Faidah H, Haseeb A, Iriti M. A Saudi Arabian Public Health Perspective of Tuberculosis. Int J Environ Res Public Health. 2021;18(19):10042. doi:10.3390/ijerph181910042

Steele WR, Dodd RY, Notari EP, et al. HIV, HCV, and HBV incidence and residual risk in US blood donors before and after implementation of the 12-month deferral policy for men who have sex with men. Transfusion (Paris). 2021;61(3):839-850. doi:10.1111/trf.16250

Tognon F, Sevalie S, Gassimu J, et al. Seroprevalence of hepatitis B and hepatitis C among blood donors in Sierra Leone: A multi-year retrospective study. Int J Infect Dis. 2020;99:102-107. doi:10.1016/j.ijid.2020.07.030

© 2025 by Author/s

Tong X, Tang R, Xiao M, et al. Targeting cell death pathways for cancer therapy: recent developments in necroptosis, pyroptosis, ferroptosis, and cuproptosis research. J Hematol OncolJ Hematol Oncol. 2022;15(1):174. doi:10.1186/s13045-022-01392-3

Yang N, Dai R, Zhang X. Global prevalence of human pegivirus-1 in healthy volunteer blood donors: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Vox Sang. 2020;115(3):107-119. doi:10.1111/vox.12876

Zaki EA, El-Daly MM, Abdulhaq A, et al. Genotyping and antiretroviral drug resistance of human immunodeficiency Virus-1 in Jazan, Saudi Arabia. Medicine (Baltimore). 2020;99(49):e23274. doi:10.1097/MD.0000000000023274

Killick SB, Bown N, Cavenagh J, et al. Guidelines for the diagnosis and management of adult aplastic anaemia. Br J Haematol. 2016;172(2):187-207. doi:10.1111/bjh.13853

Islam MS, Mia MM, Hussain RF, Hoque S, Tasnim F. Differences in Gender and Trends of Transfusion Transmissible Infections Among Blood Donors at a Tertiary Hospital in Bangladesh. KYAMC J. 2022;13(2):72-75. doi:10.3329/kyamcj.v13i2.61334

Alsulamy N. Exploring the Barriers and Facilitators towards Implementation of Shared Decision-Making in Primary Healthcare Centres in Saudi Arabia. phd. University of Sheffield; 2021. Accessed August 23, 2024. https://etheses.whiterose.ac.uk/29937/

Albadrani MS, Abdulaal AM, Aljabri AM, et al. Knowledge, Attitudes, and Practices Toward the Prevention of Hepatitis B Virus Infection Among Medical Students in Medina City, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. Cureus. 15(11):e48845. doi:10.7759/cureus.48845

 © 2025 by Author/s