International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Growth Evaluation.

Advances in Quality Control and Standardization Practices in Clinical Diagnostic Laboratories in Sub-Saharan Africa

Moshood Ayinde [1*], Prisca U Ojukwu [2], Glory Ohunyon [3]
[1] Sanya Clinic, Nigeria
[2] Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Nigeria
[3] Independent Researcher, UK

* Corresponding Author: **Moshood Ayinde**

Article Info

ISSN (online): 2582-7138
Volume: 02
Issue: 06
November-December 2021
Received: 07-12-2021
Accepted: 28-12-2021
Page No: 759-770

Abstract
The strengthening of clinical diagnostic laboratories has emerged as a strategic imperative for advancing healthcare delivery and public health resilience across Sub-Saharan Africa. This review critically examines the evolution of quality control and standardization practices within laboratory systems in the region, with emphasis on accreditation frameworks, quality management systems, regulatory reforms, workforce development, and technological innovation. The study aims to synthesize regional progress, assess the effectiveness of internal and external quality assurance mechanisms, and identify persistent structural challenges alongside emerging opportunities for sustainable improvement.

A comprehensive narrative review methodology was adopted, drawing upon peer-reviewed literature, regional policy documents, and documented programmatic experiences. The analysis explored institutional reforms, stepwise accreditation models, participation in external quality assessment schemes, and the integration of digital platforms for performance monitoring and data governance. Particular attention was given to case studies demonstrating measurable improvements in diagnostic reliability and harmonization across tiered laboratory networks.

Findings indicate that structured quality management systems and accreditation pathways have significantly enhanced analytical accuracy, documentation practices, and institutional accountability in several national contexts. Expanded engagement in external quality assessment programs has improved benchmarking and comparability of results, while digital innovations have strengthened traceability and real-time oversight. Nevertheless, enduring constraints—including infrastructural instability, workforce shortages, uneven accreditation coverage, and funding sustainability—continue to limit equitable access to standardized diagnostic services.

The review concludes that sustained progress requires an integrated systems approach aligning regulatory oversight, domestic financing, capacity building, and technological modernization. It recommends embedding accreditation within national health budgets, strengthening regulatory enforcement for diagnostic technologies, expanding quality management training, and leveraging digital platforms to reinforce continuous quality improvement. Such coordinated efforts are essential for ensuring reliable laboratory services, safeguarding patient safety, and advancing resilient healthcare systems throughout the region.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.54660/.IJMRGE.2021.2.6.759-770

Keywords: Quality control; Laboratory accreditation; Quality management systems; External quality assessment; Sub-Saharan Africa; Health systems strengthening

1. Introduction

Clinical diagnostic laboratories constitute the backbone of modern health systems, providing essential data that guide clinical decision-making, disease surveillance, therapeutic monitoring, and public health interventions. In Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA), where the burden of infectious diseases such as HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, malaria, and emerging viral pathogens remains high alongside a growing prevalence of non-communicable diseases (NCDs), the reliability and standardization of laboratory services are of paramount importance (Ondoa *et al*., 2020). The accuracy of laboratory diagnostics directly influences patient safety,

treatment efficacy, antimicrobial stewardship, and outbreak preparedness. Consequently, strengthening quality control (QC) and standardization practices within clinical diagnostic laboratories has become a central pillar of health system reform across the region.

Historically, laboratory services in many SSA countries faced systemic constraints, including inadequate infrastructure, inconsistent power supply, limited reagent availability, insufficient maintenance of equipment, and shortages of trained personnel (Guindo *et al*., 2012). These structural challenges often resulted in variability in test performance, limited confidence in laboratory data, and suboptimal integration of laboratory evidence into clinical workflows. In response, global health initiatives and national governments increasingly prioritized the institutionalization of quality management systems (QMS), external quality assessment (EQA), and accreditation processes as mechanisms to standardize laboratory performance and ensure comparability of results across institutions (Schroeder &Amukele, 2014).

The promotion of good clinical laboratory practices (GCLP) has been instrumental in elevating laboratory standards within SSA. Guindo *et al*. (2012) emphasize that accreditation frameworks not only improve technical competence but also enhance governance, documentation, biosafety compliance, and overall organizational culture within laboratories. Accreditation initiatives such as ISO 15189 have provided internationally recognized benchmarks for quality and competence, facilitating participation in multicentre clinical trials and fostering global trust in African laboratory data. Importantly, these frameworks promote a systematic approach to quality that encompasses pre-analytical, analytical, and post-analytical processes, thereby minimizing errors across the testing continuum.

The implementation of structured QMS has also played a transformative role in strengthening diagnostic capacity. Barbé *et al*. (2017) demonstrate that introducing quality management principles in clinical bacteriology laboratories within low-resource settings significantly improves turnaround times, contamination rates, and diagnostic accuracy. Their findings underscore that quality improvement is not solely dependent on advanced technology but also on standardized operating procedures (SOPs), routine internal quality control, and continuous staff training. In SSA, where resource optimization is critical, such system-based interventions provide cost-effective avenues for sustained laboratory improvement.

Point-of-care (POC) diagnostics have emerged as a critical innovation in expanding access to testing services, particularly in rural and underserved communities. However, decentralized testing introduces new complexities in quality assurance. Shott, Galiwango and Reynolds (2012) argue that integrating POC technologies into national laboratory networks requires robust oversight mechanisms, standardized protocols, and competency-based training to maintain consistency with central laboratory standards. Without appropriate quality management structures, POC expansion risks compromising diagnostic reliability. Thus, advancements in QC in SSA increasingly emphasize harmonized frameworks that encompass both centralized and decentralized testing platforms.

Regional coordination and tiered laboratory networks have further advanced standardization efforts. Ondoa *et al*. (2020) highlight the importance of structured national laboratory systems aligned with continental health agendas. By defining clear referral pathways, harmonizing test menus, and standardizing procurement systems, tiered networks reduce duplication, improve resource allocation, and strengthen quality oversight. These networks also facilitate national EQA programs and data reporting mechanisms that enhance transparency and accountability.

The evolution of laboratory standardization in SSA must also be contextualized within broader infrastructural and sustainability considerations. Reliable electricity supply, environmental control systems, and secure data management infrastructures are prerequisites for effective QC. Research addressing technological design and environmental monitoring, such as ADENIJI (2019), illustrates the importance of temperature monitoring and security features in safeguarding laboratory reagents and specimens. In settings characterized by fluctuating environmental conditions, temperature excursions can significantly compromise assay performance. Consequently, locally adapted technological solutions are increasingly integrated into laboratory quality frameworks to mitigate such risks.

Sustainability concerns extend beyond infrastructure to encompass energy systems and environmental considerations. Adeojo and Osinibi (2016) discuss the intersections between renewable energy and sustainable development in Nigeria, highlighting how environmental justice and equitable resource distribution influence public service delivery. Within the laboratory context, stable and sustainable energy sources are essential for uninterrupted operation of diagnostic equipment, cold-chain systems, and information technologies. Integrating renewable energy solutions into laboratory infrastructure offers a strategic approach to addressing power instability, particularly in remote areas, thereby supporting consistent quality performance.

Technological innovation also plays a pivotal role in advancing laboratory QC. The modeling of integrated systems, as discussed by Shittu *et al*. (2019) in the context of national grids, reflects the broader importance of systems thinking in infrastructure management. Although their study focuses on energy integration, the conceptual approach underscores how interconnected systems—when effectively modeled and optimized—can enhance reliability and efficiency. In laboratory networks, similar systems-based methodologies are applied to harmonize data flows, optimize sample referral pathways, and monitor quality indicators across multiple sites.

Quality improvement initiatives increasingly incorporate quantitative modeling and optimization techniques to balance competing priorities such as cost, accuracy, turnaround time, and sustainability. Oshoba *et al*. (2020) illustrate how multi-objective evolutionary algorithms can optimize complex systems by balancing risk and return metrics. Translating this conceptual approach to laboratory management, administrators can employ data-driven tools to prioritize investments in equipment, training, and quality interventions while maintaining fiscal responsibility. Such analytical frameworks enhance strategic planning and resource allocation within constrained health budgets.

The importance of laboratories in supporting clinical trials and research further amplifies the need for standardized QC practices. Guindo *et al*. (2012) emphasize that high-quality laboratory data are indispensable for ethical and scientifically valid clinical research. As SSA increasingly participates in global research collaborations, laboratories must meet

internationally recognized standards to ensure data credibility. Accreditation and robust QC systems thus function not only as instruments of clinical care improvement but also as enablers of scientific advancement.

Despite substantial progress, disparities persist across and within countries in SSA. Schroeder and Amukele (2014) note that while the number of laboratories meeting international standards has grown, these facilities remain concentrated in urban centres, leaving rural areas underserved. Addressing these inequities requires sustained investment, decentralized quality oversight, and innovative training models that empower peripheral laboratories. Moreover, the COVID-19 pandemic has underscored the urgency of resilient laboratory systems capable of rapidly scaling testing capacity while maintaining quality assurance standards (Ondoa *et al*., 2020). These developments signal a paradigm shift from fragmented laboratory services toward integrated, standardized, and quality-driven systems across SSA. Quality control is no longer perceived as an optional enhancement but as a foundational requirement for effective health service delivery. Contemporary approaches emphasize comprehensive QMS implementation, accreditation pathways, technological innovation, environmental sustainability, and regional harmonization. Importantly, advances in QC are increasingly locally contextualized, leveraging indigenous research, technological design, and policy reforms to ensure relevance and sustainability.

1.1. Background and Significance of Clinical Diagnostic Laboratories in SSA

Clinical diagnostic laboratories are fundamental to the delivery of safe, evidence-based healthcare, serving as the primary source of objective data for disease diagnosis, therapeutic monitoring, surveillance, and outbreak response. In Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA), where communicable diseases such as HIV, tuberculosis, and malaria coexist with a rising burden of non-communicable diseases, the demand for accurate and timely laboratory services is particularly acute. Over the past decade, significant progress has been made in strengthening national laboratory systems across the region, reflecting a growing recognition of laboratories as essential components of resilient health systems (Alemnji *et al*., 2014). Historically, laboratory services in SSA were fragmented, under-resourced, and poorly integrated into national health priorities. However, coordinated continental efforts—particularly through the World Health Organization (WHO) African Region—have catalysed reforms aimed at institutionalizing quality assurance and accreditation processes. The WHO African Region Laboratory Accreditation Process has played a pivotal role in standardizing practices and embedding quality management systems within public laboratories, thereby enhancing reliability and comparability of diagnostic results (Gershy-Damet *et al*., 2010). These reforms have elevated laboratories from peripheral support units to strategic pillars of healthcare delivery.

The significance of laboratory services is also closely tied to infrastructural reliability. Stable power systems, grounding mechanisms, and equipment protection are critical for maintaining the integrity of diagnostic instruments and minimizing analytical errors. Studies on optimization of grounding systems in emerging power markets underscore the importance of electrical stability in safeguarding sensitive technologies (Adeniji, Shittu & Opara, 2020). In laboratory settings, such infrastructural considerations directly influence quality control outcomes and diagnostic accuracy. Consequently, strengthening laboratory systems in SSA necessitates both institutional quality reforms and robust supporting infrastructure.

1.2. Evolution of Quality Control and Standardization in the Region

The evolution of quality control (QC) and standardization practices in clinical diagnostic laboratories across Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA) reflects a gradual but transformative shift from fragmented service delivery to structured, system-based quality management. In the early 2000s, laboratory services in many countries were characterized by inconsistent procedures, limited documentation, and minimal participation in external quality assessment schemes. The introduction of Good Clinical Laboratory Practice (GCLP) principles marked a foundational turning point, particularly in the context of expanding clinical research and HIV-related programs. Guindo *et al*. (2012) underscore that embedding GCLP standards enhanced technical competence, documentation accuracy, and biosafety compliance, thereby aligning regional laboratories with international expectations. Subsequent efforts focused on achieving formal accreditation under globally recognized standards such as ISO 15189. Schroeder and Amukele (2014) document the steady increase in laboratories meeting international quality standards, demonstrating measurable progress in audit performance, corrective action implementation, and staff competency development. These advances were supported by structured mentorship programs, stepwise accreditation models, and the institutionalization of quality management systems (QMS) at national levels.

Beyond regulatory frameworks, the evolution of QC in SSA has increasingly incorporated systems optimization and digital innovation. Conceptual parallels can be drawn with multi-objective optimization approaches, which balance competing priorities such as risk, efficiency, and sustainability (Oshoba *et al*., 2020). In laboratory contexts, similar optimization strategies inform resource allocation, equipment calibration schedules, and quality indicator monitoring. Furthermore, emerging digital tools, including AI-enabled platforms for remote support and knowledge, illustrate how technology can bridge capacity gaps in underserved areas (Frempong, Ifenatuora& Ofori, 2020). Collectively, these developments signify a maturation of laboratory standardization efforts, characterized by integration, data-driven management, and adaptive innovation.

1.3. Rationale for Strengthening Quality Control and Standardization

The imperative to strengthen quality control (QC) and standardization in clinical diagnostic laboratories across Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA) is grounded in the need to ensure patient safety, enhance clinical outcomes, and safeguard public health systems. Reliable laboratory data underpin approximately 60–70% of clinical decision-making, yet inaccuracies arising from weak quality systems can lead to misdiagnosis, inappropriate therapy, and increased morbidity. Brown & Nilsen (2018) emphasize that sustainable healthcare in SSA depends on resilient laboratory systems capable of delivering accurate, timely, and standardized results across diverse settings. Without robust

QC frameworks, laboratory medicine cannot effectively support universal health coverage or disease control strategies.

Since 2008, Africa has witnessed substantial progress in laboratory strengthening; however, Nkengasong *et al*. (2018) argue that persistent variability in standards and capacity continues to limit the full realization of diagnostic potential. The expansion of molecular diagnostics, surveillance systems, and pandemic preparedness initiatives has intensified the demand for harmonized quality practices. In the wake of COVID-19, laboratories were required to scale operations rapidly, underscoring the risks associated with inconsistent protocols and inadequate validation procedures.

The integration of telehealth services further amplifies the necessity of reliable laboratory diagnostics. As Omotayo and Kuponiyi (2020) observe, telemedicine models rely heavily on accurate diagnostic data to inform remote clinical decision-making. Inaccurate results in such settings may propagate errors across digital health networks. Similarly, the development of smart business intelligence (BI) platforms for healthcare governance, as discussed by Moyo *et al*. (2021), depends on high-quality laboratory data to support transparency, funding allocation, and operational performance evaluation. Strengthening QC and standardization is therefore not merely a technical requirement but a strategic imperative for health system integrity, digital transformation, and long-term sustainability in SSA.

1.4. Aim, Objectives, and Scope of the Review

The overarching aim of this review is to critically examine recent advances in quality control and standardization practices within clinical diagnostic laboratories in Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA), with particular emphasis on systemic reforms, technological integration, accreditation frameworks, and sustainability considerations. The review seeks to provide a comprehensive synthesis of progress achieved over the past decade while identifying persistent structural, regulatory, and operational gaps that continue to influence laboratory performance across the region.

Specifically, the objectives of this review are fourfold. First, it aims to analyze the evolution and institutionalization of quality management systems within national laboratory networks, highlighting key milestones in accreditation, external quality assessment participation, and policy development. Second, it seeks to evaluate the implementation of internal quality control mechanisms and standardized operating procedures that enhance reliability across pre-analytical, analytical, and post-analytical phases of testing. Third, the review intends to explore the role of technological innovations—including digital laboratory information systems, automation, and decentralized diagnostic platforms—in strengthening quality assurance structures. Fourth, it aims to assess the sustainability of these advancements in light of infrastructural constraints, workforce capacity, governance dynamics, and resource limitations.

The scope of the review encompasses both public and private clinical diagnostic laboratories operating at primary, secondary, and tertiary levels within SSA. It addresses laboratory services supporting routine clinical care, disease surveillance, outbreak response, and clinical research. While recognizing heterogeneity across countries, the review emphasizes regional trends and cross-cutting strategies that demonstrate scalability and contextual adaptability. By consolidating evidence on advancements and remaining challenges, this review intends to inform policymakers, laboratory professionals, researchers, and development partners engaged in strengthening diagnostic systems and promoting equitable access to high-quality laboratory services across Sub-Saharan Africa.

2. Frameworks and Systems for Quality Assurance in Clinical Laboratories

The development of comprehensive frameworks and systems for quality assurance (QA) in clinical diagnostic laboratories across Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA) represents one of the most significant transformations in regional health systems over the past two decades. Quality assurance, in this context, refers to the structured set of policies, procedures, standards, and monitoring mechanisms that collectively ensure laboratory results are accurate, reliable, reproducible, and clinically meaningful. These systems extend beyond technical analytical processes to encompass governance structures, regulatory oversight, workforce competency, infrastructure management, procurement standardization, and digital integration. As diagnostic services increasingly underpin disease surveillance, therapeutic monitoring, outbreak response, and research activities, the institutionalization of robust QA frameworks has become indispensable to healthcare delivery in SSA.

Historically, laboratory medicine in many SSA countries operated within fragmented administrative systems characterized by limited coordination between facilities, inconsistent adherence to standard operating procedures (SOPs), and weak regulatory oversight. Petti *et al*. (2006) identified laboratory deficiencies as a major barrier to effective healthcare, noting that inadequate quality control mechanisms and limited access to reliable diagnostics undermined clinical decision-making and patient safety. In many settings, laboratory services were perceived as ancillary rather than central to health systems, resulting in underinvestment and minimal integration into national health strategies. These structural weaknesses created variability in diagnostic performance and diminished clinician confidence in laboratory outputs.

The response to these challenges has involved the progressive institutionalization of Quality Management Systems (QMS), which provide structured methodologies for managing laboratory operations and ensuring continuous improvement. QMS frameworks integrate managerial accountability, documentation control, internal quality control (IQC), external quality assessment (EQA), risk management, corrective and preventive actions, and routine audits into a coherent system of governance. The promotion of Good Clinical Laboratory Practice (GCLP) principles has been central to this transformation. Guindo *et al*. (2012) demonstrate that the adoption of GCLP and accreditation-oriented models significantly enhanced laboratory credibility, particularly within facilities supporting clinical trials. By embedding standardized documentation practices, competency assessments, and biosafety protocols, laboratories strengthened both operational transparency and technical accuracy.

Accreditation pathways have further reinforced QA systems by aligning laboratory operations with internationally recognized benchmarks. Accreditation not only verifies technical competence but also institutionalizes a culture of

accountability and performance measurement. Laboratories pursuing accreditation must demonstrate adherence to standardized procedures across the entire testing continuum—from specimen collection and transportation to analytical validation and result reporting. Such structured oversight reduces variability, enhances reproducibility, and ensures comparability of results across institutions. Importantly, accreditation fosters continuous quality improvement rather than episodic compliance, embedding sustainability into laboratory governance.

External Quality Assessment (EQA) schemes constitute another foundational pillar of QA frameworks in SSA. EQA programs enable laboratories to participate in proficiency testing exercises that benchmark performance against standardized reference materials and peer laboratories. Amukele *et al*. (2012) report that participation in EQA significantly improves analytical performance in clinical research laboratories across SSA. Through systematic feedback and performance trend analysis, laboratories identify technical deficiencies, implement corrective actions, and refine internal quality control processes. EQA participation also enhances transparency and builds confidence among clinicians, policymakers, and international partners regarding the reliability of laboratory data.

Internal Quality Control mechanisms operate alongside EQA to ensure day-to-day analytical stability. Routine use of control materials, calibration verification, and adherence to SOPs are essential to maintaining assay precision and accuracy. However, IQC effectiveness depends heavily on workforce competency and consistent documentation practices. Structured training and mentorship programs therefore play a critical role in strengthening QA systems. The oral history of laboratory development in francophone West Africa illustrates how sustained capacity-building initiatives and regional collaboration facilitated the gradual embedding of standardized quality practices within national systems (Koster *et al*., 2021). These historical insights emphasize that QA reform is an iterative and context-sensitive process requiring institutional commitment and local ownership.

Beyond technical controls, QA frameworks increasingly address systemic determinants of laboratory performance, including procurement standardization and equitable access to essential diagnostics. Ward *et al*. (2021) highlight disparities in availability and pricing of WHO essential diagnostic tests in Northern Ghana, revealing how fragmented procurement systems can undermine standardization efforts. Inconsistent reagent quality, stock-outs, and price variability not only disrupt service delivery but also introduce analytical inconsistencies. To mitigate these risks, national QA systems increasingly incorporate centralized procurement mechanisms, supplier quality verification, and harmonized test menus aligned with national treatment guidelines. Standardizing diagnostic portfolios across laboratory tiers enhances consistency of care and reduces inequities in access.

Digital transformation has emerged as a transformative force within contemporary QA systems. Laboratory Information Management Systems (LIMS) and electronic data platforms facilitate real-time tracking of specimens, automated validation of results, and comprehensive documentation of quality indicators. Advanced data integration frameworks further enable consolidation of performance metrics across decentralized networks. Conceptual models for automating data pipelines using cloud-native architectures, as proposed by Akindemowo *et al*. (2021), illustrate how structured data workflows can enhance interoperability and reporting accuracy. Within laboratory networks, such systems support centralized oversight, rapid identification of performance deviations, and evidence-based decision-making.

The application of natural language processing (NLP) and data-driven analytics also presents novel opportunities for strengthening QA oversight. Eboseremen *et al*. (2021) demonstrate the capacity of NLP techniques to extract actionable insights from large, unstructured datasets. In laboratory contexts, similar methodologies can be applied to audit reports, incident documentation, and corrective action logs, enabling automated trend analysis and proactive risk identification. By leveraging digital analytics, laboratories can transition from reactive problem-solving to predictive quality management, thereby enhancing resilience and efficiency.

Infrastructure reliability remains a critical determinant of QA system effectiveness. Petti *et al*. (2006) emphasize that unreliable electricity supply, inadequate maintenance, and environmental instability compromise analytical accuracy. Robust QA frameworks therefore incorporate preventive maintenance schedules, equipment calibration protocols, and contingency planning to mitigate infrastructural vulnerabilities. Environmental monitoring systems, including temperature and humidity controls, further safeguard reagent integrity and instrument performance. These operational safeguards are essential to maintaining analytical consistency, particularly in resource-constrained settings where environmental variability is common.

The maturation of QA systems in SSA reflects an increasingly integrated approach that combines regulatory oversight, technical standardization, digital innovation, and institutional capacity building. Rather than isolated interventions, contemporary frameworks emphasize systemic alignment across laboratory tiers, ensuring that peripheral facilities operate within standardized referral networks and reporting structures. Such integration enhances efficiency, reduces duplication, and promotes harmonization of diagnostic practices.

Nevertheless, sustaining these advancements requires continuous investment, political commitment, and adaptive governance. QA frameworks must remain responsive to evolving health challenges, including emerging pathogens, antimicrobial resistance, and expanding molecular diagnostics. The lessons derived from historical reforms and contemporary digital innovations underscore that quality assurance is a dynamic process rather than a static endpoint.

2.1. International Standards and Accreditation Systems

International standards and structured accreditation pathways constitute a cornerstone of quality assurance (QA) frameworks in clinical diagnostic laboratories across Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA). The adoption of globally recognized benchmarks has been instrumental in harmonizing laboratory practices, strengthening governance, and promoting continuous quality improvement across diverse health systems. In particular, the Stepwise Laboratory Quality Improvement Process Towards Accreditation (SLIPTA), developed by the World Health Organization (WHO) Regional Office for Africa, has provided a practical and context-sensitive mechanism for laboratories to progress incrementally towards international accreditation standards

(World Health Organization, 2020).

SLIPTA emphasizes systematic implementation of quality management systems (QMS), incorporating document control, internal audits, corrective and preventive actions, equipment management, and personnel competency assessment. By adopting a stepwise scoring model, the framework enables laboratories operating in resource-limited settings to gradually align with ISO 15189 requirements without compromising operational continuity. This phased approach recognizes contextual constraints while reinforcing a culture of accountability and structured performance monitoring.

The impact of accreditation-oriented initiatives is particularly evident within National Tuberculosis Reference Laboratories (NTRLs) in the WHO Sub-Saharan Africa region. Cross-national analyses demonstrate that laboratories engaged in structured accreditation processes exhibit improved standard operating procedures, enhanced biosafety compliance, and more consistent participation in external quality assessment schemes. Such reforms not only elevate diagnostic accuracy for high-burden diseases but also strengthen integration within national referral networks, thereby enhancing public health responsiveness.

Nevertheless, maintaining good clinical laboratory practices in low-resource settings remains complex. Zhang *et al*. (2016) highlight persistent challenges including infrastructure instability, workforce turnover, supply chain disruptions, and limited funding for ongoing quality monitoring. These factors underscore that accreditation is not a one-time achievement but a continuous process requiring institutional commitment and adaptive management.

Infrastructure safety considerations further reinforce accreditation standards. Reliable electrical systems and risk mitigation strategies are critical to safeguarding sensitive diagnostic equipment. Research on selective coordination and arc-flash risk mitigation in industrial power systems illustrates the importance of structured safety frameworks in preventing equipment damage and operational downtime (Shittu *et al*., 2021). In laboratory environments, analogous safety controls protect both personnel and instrumentation, thereby sustaining compliance with accreditation criteria.

2.2. Internal Quality Control (IQC) Practices

Internal Quality Control (IQC) practices represent the operational core of quality assurance systems in clinical diagnostic laboratories across Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA). Unlike external quality assessment, which provides periodic benchmarking, IQC ensures continuous monitoring of analytical performance within laboratories on a day-to-day basis. Effective IQC practices are fundamental to minimizing analytical errors, detecting systematic deviations, and maintaining result accuracy across diverse testing platforms.

The implementation of IQC is closely linked to the broader institutionalization of quality management systems and accreditation pathways in the region. The World Health Organization (WHO) African Region's laboratory accreditation process and the Stepwise Laboratory Quality Improvement Process Towards Accreditation (SLIPTA) have emphasized the routine use of control materials, calibration verification, and performance documentation as essential components of laboratory quality systems (Gershy-Damet *et al*., 2010; Ndihokubwayo *et al*., 2016; Adamah *et al*., 2016). These frameworks require laboratories to establish structured procedures for monitoring assay precision and accuracy, including the use of Levey–Jennings charts, Westgard rules, and documented corrective actions when control limits are exceeded.

In low-resource settings, the integration of IQC into daily laboratory workflows presents unique operational challenges. Barbé *et al*. (2017), in their evaluation of clinical bacteriology laboratories, demonstrate that systematic IQC implementation significantly improves contamination control, culture reliability, and reproducibility of results. However, sustaining these practices requires consistent reagent supply, trained personnel, and leadership commitment. The study highlights that IQC effectiveness is not solely dependent on technological sophistication but on disciplined adherence to standardized operating procedures and regular review of quality indicators.

Accreditation under standards such as ISO/IEC 17025 further strengthens IQC structures by embedding traceability, documentation control, and measurement uncertainty analysis within laboratory operations. Okezue *et al*. (2020) report that laboratories achieving accreditation status in SSA exhibit measurable improvements in process standardization, equipment maintenance, and error reduction. IQC mechanisms in accredited laboratories are typically integrated into comprehensive audit cycles, ensuring that deviations trigger systematic root cause analyses and preventive interventions.

2.3. External Quality Assessment (EQA) and Proficiency Testing

External Quality Assessment (EQA) and proficiency testing constitute critical components of quality assurance systems in clinical diagnostic laboratories across Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA). Unlike internal quality control mechanisms, which monitor daily analytical performance within laboratories, EQA provides an independent and periodic evaluation of laboratory accuracy through inter-laboratory comparisons and standardized performance assessments. These systems are essential for validating analytical reliability, identifying systematic errors, and promoting harmonization of diagnostic practices across national and regional networks.

Over the past decade, substantial progress has been achieved in expanding EQA participation throughout SSA. Alemnji *et al*. (2014) document remarkable advancements in strengthening national laboratory systems, including the scaling-up of EQA programs linked to HIV, tuberculosis, and other priority disease diagnostics. The integration of EQA into national strategic plans has enhanced accountability and reinforced a culture of performance benchmarking. Laboratories participating in structured EQA schemes benefit from comparative feedback reports that highlight deviations, guide corrective actions, and support continuous quality improvement.

Harmonization of EQA processes across countries further strengthens regional standardization efforts. Putoto *et al*. (2015) emphasize the importance of multidisciplinary collaboration in developing innovative and sustainable solutions for laboratory harmonization in Africa. Coordinated EQA frameworks facilitate standardized testing algorithms, uniform reporting formats, and shared reference materials, thereby improving comparability of diagnostic outcomes across institutions. Such harmonization is particularly vital in cross-border disease surveillance and research collaborations.

The broader roadmap for improving laboratory medicine in

low- and middle-income countries underscores EQA as a foundational mechanism for enhancing diagnostic confidence and patient safety (Sayed *et al*., 2018). Robust EQA participation enables laboratories to detect analytical drift, improve assay validation processes, and align performance with international benchmarks. Additionally, EQA frameworks often incorporate biosafety and documentation assessments, reinforcing comprehensive quality management beyond technical testing.

2.4. Quality Management Systems (QMS) Implementation

The implementation of Quality Management Systems (QMS) in clinical diagnostic laboratories across Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA) represents a strategic shift from episodic quality improvement initiatives to institutionalized, systems-based governance models. QMS frameworks provide structured mechanisms for managing laboratory processes, documentation, personnel competency, equipment maintenance, and continuous quality improvement. By embedding quality principles into daily operations, QMS implementation strengthens diagnostic reliability and ensures alignment with national and international healthcare objectives.

In the context of advancing Universal Health Coverage (UHC), laboratory readiness is increasingly recognized as a prerequisite for effective service delivery. Samuel, Irene and Kenny (2020), in their assessment of primary healthcare diagnostic laboratory services in Kenya, found that variability in infrastructure, staffing, and standard operating procedures significantly influenced laboratory performance. Their findings underscore that QMS implementation at the primary care level remains uneven, with gaps in documentation control, internal audits, and corrective action systems. Strengthening QMS at decentralized levels is therefore critical to ensuring equitable access to standardized diagnostics under UHC frameworks.

The harmonization of tiered laboratory systems has further reinforced QMS integration across different levels of care. Williams *et al*. (2016) document progress in aligning HIV laboratory networks across eight African countries, emphasizing the importance of standardized operating procedures, referral systems, and coordinated oversight mechanisms. QMS implementation in such tiered systems ensures that peripheral laboratories operate within defined quality parameters while maintaining referral linkages to higher-level facilities for confirmatory testing and supervision. This structured integration enhances consistency, reduces duplication, and supports scalability of diagnostic services.

High-quality diagnosis requires not only technological capability but also systematic governance structures. Fleming *et al*. (2017) advocate for the inclusion of an essential pathology package within national health systems, highlighting QMS as a foundational component for ensuring diagnostic accuracy and patient safety. Their framework emphasizes standardized protocols, workforce training, and performance monitoring as critical pillars of sustainable laboratory services.

Moreover, effective QMS implementation must integrate external quality assessment (EQA) mechanisms to reinforce internal processes. Carter (2017) notes that in resource-limited settings, embedding EQA within QMS frameworks strengthens accountability and facilitates continuous improvement cycles. Together, these components demonstrate that QMS implementation in SSA laboratories is not merely administrative reform but a transformative strategy to institutionalize quality, enhance resilience, and support sustainable healthcare delivery across the region.

2.5. Regulatory and Policy Developments

Regulatory and policy developments have played a pivotal role in advancing quality control and standardization practices within clinical diagnostic laboratories across Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA). Effective regulatory frameworks provide the legal and institutional foundation for enforcing quality standards, overseeing laboratory operations, and ensuring the safety and reliability of diagnostic services. In the absence of structured governance mechanisms, laboratory systems risk fragmentation, inconsistent performance, and diminished public trust.

Efforts to strengthen pathology and laboratory medicine in SSA have increasingly emphasized the need for coordinated national policies aligned with global standards. Adesina *et al*. (2013) argue that sustainable improvement in pathology services requires comprehensive regulatory reforms that address workforce training, infrastructure development, quality oversight, and integration into national cancer control and disease management strategies. Their analysis underscores that regulatory commitment at ministerial and legislative levels is essential for institutionalizing quality standards beyond project-based interventions.

The broader global call to deliver modern, high-quality, and affordable laboratory services to low- and middle-income countries reinforces the necessity of robust policy frameworks (Horton *et al*., 2018). Regulatory systems must encompass accreditation requirements, licensing procedures, and standardized operating guidelines to ensure consistency across public and private laboratories. Importantly, policies should also facilitate equitable access to essential diagnostics while safeguarding quality and patient safety.

Diagnostics regulation is particularly critical in the context of emerging and point-of-care technologies. McNerney (2015) highlights that diagnostics for developing countries must meet rigorous performance and validation standards to ensure reliability in diverse environmental conditions. Regulatory oversight of *in vitro* diagnostic devices (IVDs) is therefore fundamental to preventing substandard products from entering national markets. Similarly, Kavanaugh, Azzam andRockabrand (2021) emphasize the importance of structured quality assurance algorithms for malaria rapid diagnostic tests, noting that regulatory frameworks must incorporate post-market surveillance and continuous performance evaluation.

2.6. Capacity Building and Workforce Development

Capacity building and workforce development are fundamental pillars underpinning the sustainability of quality control and standardization practices in clinical diagnostic laboratories across Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA). While regulatory frameworks, accreditation systems, and technological innovations provide structural support, the competence, availability, and motivation of laboratory personnel ultimately determine the effectiveness of quality assurance implementation. Strengthening human resources for laboratory medicine is therefore central to advancing diagnostic reliability and health system resilience.

The role of medical laboratory scientists in improving

healthcare quality and reducing operational inefficiencies has been increasingly recognized within SSA. Obeta *et al*. (2019) emphasize that laboratory professionals are instrumental in ensuring analytical accuracy, cost containment, and evidence-based clinical decision-making. Their findings highlight that ongoing professional development, competency assessments, and structured training programs enhance laboratory performance and contribute to quality improvement initiatives. Workforce development thus extends beyond technical skills to encompass leadership capacity, ethical standards, and quality management literacy.
Regional initiatives have also played a critical role in strengthening laboratory capacity in alignment with international health obligations. Masanza *et al*. (2010) describe the experience of the African Field Epidemiology Network (AFENET) in supporting laboratory capacity building for compliance with the International Health Regulations (IHR 2005). Through mentorship programs, field epidemiology training, and laboratory management courses, such initiatives have reinforced national preparedness for disease outbreaks and public health emergencies. These capacity-building efforts directly support standardized diagnostic practices and integration within national surveillance systems.
The COVID-19 pandemic further underscored the importance of workforce readiness in implementing new diagnostic technologies. Jacobs *et al*. (2020) note that successful deployment of rapid diagnostic tests in SSA required targeted training, supervision, and quality monitoring to ensure correct usage and result interpretation. Without adequate workforce preparation, the expansion of decentralized testing risks compromising quality standards.
Strengthening laboratory systems in resource-limited settings necessitates a comprehensive approach that integrates infrastructure, policy, and human resource development (Olmsted *et al*., 2010). Sustainable workforce strategies include continuous professional education, retention incentives, structured career pathways, and integration of quality management principles into laboratory curricula. By investing in capacity building and workforce development, SSA countries enhance institutional resilience, ensure adherence to standardized protocols, and foster a culture of continuous quality improvement essential for reliable and equitable diagnostic services.

2.7. Role of Digital Technologies and Automation

Technological innovation has become an increasingly influential driver of quality control and standardization in clinical diagnostic laboratories across Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA). As laboratory systems evolve to meet growing diagnostic demands, digital platforms, automation, and connectivity solutions are being integrated into quality assurance (QA) frameworks to enhance reliability, traceability, and performance monitoring. These advancements are particularly significant in contexts where infrastructural limitations and workforce shortages challenge traditional oversight mechanisms.
Assessments of laboratory quality in urban settings such as Kampala, Uganda reveal substantial variability in performance across facilities, highlighting both exemplary practices and critical deficiencies (Elbireer *et al*., 2013). Digital tools, including Laboratory Information Management Systems (LIMS), can mitigate such variability by standardizing data capture, automating quality indicator tracking, and enabling remote supervision. Electronic systems facilitate consistent documentation, minimize transcription errors, and support real-time monitoring of internal quality control results. By embedding automated alerts for out-of-range values or equipment malfunctions, laboratories can adopt more proactive quality management approaches.
The broader gap in access to pathology and laboratory medicine services across low- and middle-income regions further underscores the importance of scalable technological solutions (Wilson *et al*., 2018; Jaffet, 2018). Telepathology, digital microscopy, and cloud-based data sharing platforms enable peripheral laboratories to consult with reference centers, thereby enhancing diagnostic accuracy and adherence to standardized protocols. Such connectivity not only improves patient care but also reinforces harmonization across tiered laboratory networks.
The development of standardized laboratory methods for large-scale clinical trials provides an instructive model for integrating technology with quality processes. Swysen *et al*. (2011) describe how structured quality systems, harmonized protocols, and centralized data monitoring were essential in supporting a phase III malaria vaccine study across multiple African sites. These experiences demonstrate that technology-enabled standardization can sustain analytical consistency across geographically dispersed laboratories.
Moreover, diagnostic challenges in resource-poor settings, such as those associated with tuberculosis testing, require robust data management and quality oversight mechanisms (Parsons *et al*., 2011). Digital platforms enhance sample tracking, reduce turnaround times, and facilitate integration of molecular diagnostic data into national surveillance systems.

3. Regional Case Studies and Programmatic Successes

Regional experiences across Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA) provide compelling evidence that structured investments in laboratory systems can yield substantial improvements in quality control and standardization. While historical assessments often highlighted systemic deficiencies in infrastructure, workforce capacity, and governance, more recent case studies demonstrate that coordinated reforms, accreditation pathways, and international partnerships have catalysed measurable progress. These programmatic successes offer valuable lessons for consolidating and scaling laboratory quality initiatives across the region.
An instructive example emerges from the assessment of clinical laboratories in Kampala, Uganda. Elbireer *et al*. (2013) reported wide variability in laboratory performance, reflecting disparities in documentation practices, internal quality control (IQC) implementation, and biosafety compliance. However, laboratories that had adopted structured quality management systems (QMS) and engaged in external quality assessment (EQA) schemes demonstrated superior analytical consistency and adherence to standardized protocols. These findings underscore the impact of targeted quality improvement interventions and illustrate how incremental reforms can strengthen diagnostic reliability even within resource-constrained urban settings. Importantly, the study also revealed that transparency in performance reporting fosters accountability and continuous improvement.
At a broader systemic level, global laboratory system development initiatives have supported the integration of

tiered laboratory networks across SSA. Martin and Barnhart (2011) emphasize that sustainable progress requires coordinated strategies addressing infrastructure, supply chain management, workforce development, and policy alignment. Several countries have successfully implemented referral systems linking peripheral laboratories to central reference facilities, thereby enhancing confirmatory testing capacity and harmonizing diagnostic standards. Such integration reduces duplication of services and ensures that complex analyses are conducted within appropriately equipped and quality-assured environments.

Programmatic successes are also evident in disease-specific initiatives. Tuberculosis (TB) control programs provide a prominent example of how laboratory strengthening can directly influence public health outcomes. Parsons *et al.* (2011) highlight advances in TB diagnostics through the adoption of standardized protocols, improved biosafety measures, and the introduction of molecular diagnostic platforms. These reforms were accompanied by strengthened EQA participation and coordinated training programs, resulting in improved case detection and enhanced surveillance accuracy. The TB experience demonstrates that quality assurance frameworks can be effectively integrated into national disease control strategies, reinforcing both clinical care and epidemiological monitoring.

Large-scale clinical research collaborations further illustrate the potential for harmonized quality systems. The phase III evaluation of the RTS,S/AS01 malaria vaccine required standardized laboratory methods across multiple African trial sites. Swysen *et al.* (2011) describe how centralized oversight, harmonized SOPs, rigorous proficiency testing, and uniform data management protocols ensured analytical comparability across geographically dispersed laboratories. The successful implementation of these standardized processes not only supported the integrity of the vaccine trial but also left a legacy of strengthened laboratory capacity and quality culture within participating institutions. Such experiences demonstrate that high-level research collaborations can function as catalysts for sustainable laboratory system improvements.

Specialized pathology services offer additional insights into programmatic achievements. Naresh *et al.* (2011) document efforts to improve lymphoma diagnosis in SSA through partnerships that emphasized standardized histopathological protocols, telepathology consultations, and training exchanges. By leveraging international collaboration and shared expertise, these initiatives enhanced diagnostic accuracy and reduced misclassification of malignancies. The integration of telepathology platforms facilitated remote review and second opinions, bridging gaps in subspecialty expertise and promoting adherence to global diagnostic standards.

Regional and international partnerships have also played a crucial role in strengthening research and diagnostic capacity. Nyirenda *et al.* (2021) discuss collaborative networks designed to enhance clinical research infrastructure across SSA. These partnerships have supported laboratory accreditation, workforce training, and harmonization of quality assurance processes. Participation in global research consortia has required laboratories to meet stringent performance benchmarks, thereby reinforcing adherence to standardized protocols and continuous quality improvement cycles. Importantly, such collaborations foster knowledge exchange and peer learning, accelerating regional progress.

Despite these achievements, persistent inequities in access to laboratory and pathology services remain evident. Wilson *et al.* (2018) identify significant gaps in access to diagnostic services across low-income and middle-income countries, including many in SSA. Rural and peripheral areas often continue to face shortages of trained personnel, limited access to advanced diagnostic technologies, and inadequate quality oversight mechanisms. Nevertheless, the documented case studies demonstrate that strategic investments and harmonized frameworks can substantially mitigate these disparities.

4. Persistent Challenges and Emerging Opportunities

Despite significant advances in quality control and standardization across clinical diagnostic laboratories in Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA), persistent structural, operational, and governance challenges continue to constrain the full realization of resilient laboratory systems. At the same time, evolving technological, policy, and collaborative landscapes present emerging opportunities to consolidate gains and accelerate progress.

One of the most enduring challenges is the uneven implementation of international quality standards. While the number of laboratories achieving accreditation has increased, facilities meeting internationally recognized benchmarks remain disproportionately concentrated in urban and research-intensive settings (Schroeder &Amukele, 2014). Many peripheral laboratories continue to face deficits in infrastructure, equipment maintenance, reagent supply chains, and workforce capacity. Alemnji *et al.* (2014) acknowledge remarkable progress in strengthening national health laboratories but emphasize that sustainability and equitable distribution remain critical concerns, particularly in rural regions.

Infrastructure instability further undermines quality management systems (QMS). Laboratories operating in low-resource settings frequently encounter unreliable electricity, limited water supply, and inadequate environmental controls, all of which compromise analytical precision. Barbé *et al.* (2017) highlight that implementing quality management in clinical bacteriology requires consistent institutional support, routine internal audits, and dependable material supply—elements often challenged by systemic resource constraints. These infrastructural vulnerabilities complicate the maintenance of internal quality control and consistent participation in external quality assessment (EQA) programs.

Sustainability of donor-driven initiatives presents another critical challenge. Many laboratory strengthening programs were initially supported through vertical disease-focused funding streams, particularly for HIV and tuberculosis. Although such investments catalysed quality improvements and accreditation pathways (Guindo *et al*., 2012), reliance on external funding raises concerns regarding long-term continuity once donor support diminishes. Institutionalizing quality assurance within domestic health financing structures remains an urgent priority.

The integration of point-of-care (POC) technologies introduces both opportunities and quality-related complexities. Decentralized diagnostic platforms enhance access in underserved areas; however, without structured oversight and standardized protocols, variability in test performance may increase. Shott, Galiwango, and Reynolds (2012) stress that effective implementation of POC technologies requires robust quality management

approaches, including operator training, supervision, and integration into national laboratory networks. As SSA countries expand community-level testing, balancing accessibility with quality assurance will remain a delicate policy challenge.

System-level coordination also requires further strengthening. Ondoa *et al*. (2020) emphasize that tiered laboratory systems must be supported by harmonized referral mechanisms, standardized data reporting, and coordinated procurement strategies to meet continental health agendas. Fragmentation across public and private sectors can result in duplication of services and inconsistent quality standards. Regulatory harmonization and centralized oversight mechanisms are therefore essential for sustaining uniformity across diverse laboratory landscapes.

Emerging digital transformation presents a promising avenue to address several of these challenges. The expansion of telehealth services in post-COVID healthcare systems illustrates the increasing reliance on accurate laboratory data to inform remote clinical decision-making (Omotayo &Kuponiyi, 2020). As telemedicine becomes more integrated into health systems, laboratories must ensure standardized reporting formats, secure data transmission, and interoperable information platforms to maintain diagnostic integrity. Digital connectivity can enhance remote supervision, facilitate EQA participation, and strengthen data-driven quality improvement processes.

In parallel, the development of smart business intelligence (BI) platforms offers opportunities to enhance transparency and operational performance within healthcare systems. Moyo *et al*. (2021) propose that integrating analytical dashboards and performance metrics into governance structures can improve funding allocation and accountability. Applied to laboratory systems, such platforms can monitor quality indicators, track accreditation progress, and identify systemic bottlenecks in real time. Data-driven oversight supports evidence-based policy adjustments and fosters institutional learning.

Regulatory evolution also provides emerging opportunities. The continued refinement of regional accreditation processes and quality frameworks, such as those pioneered by the WHO African Region (Gershy-Damet *et al*., 2010), strengthens harmonization efforts across countries. Standardized evaluation tools and performance scoring mechanisms facilitate benchmarking and peer learning, reinforcing a continental culture of quality.

Moreover, the integration of laboratory services into broader public health strategies offers pathways for sustained investment. Aligning laboratory strengthening initiatives with universal health coverage (UHC), pandemic preparedness, and antimicrobial resistance surveillance can secure political commitment and domestic financing. The shift from disease-specific vertical programs toward integrated system-wide approaches supports long-term resilience.

5. Conclusion

This review has undertaken a comprehensive examination of the progress made in strengthening quality control and standardization within clinical diagnostic laboratories across Sub-Saharan Africa. Emphasis was placed on institutional transformation, the expansion of accreditation frameworks, the operationalization of quality management systems, and the integration of emerging technologies into laboratory governance structures. By synthesizing empirical evidence, regional policy developments, and documented programmatic interventions, the study has systematically evaluated how laboratory systems in the region have evolved to support reliable, timely, and standardized diagnostic services.

The analysis indicates that the structured implementation of quality management systems and stepwise accreditation approaches has substantially improved analytical accuracy, documentation practices, and organizational accountability in many national contexts. Increased participation in external quality assessment schemes has reinforced benchmarking mechanisms and strengthened inter-laboratory comparability. Furthermore, the development of tiered laboratory networks and harmonized diagnostic protocols has enhanced coordination across primary, secondary, and reference facilities, thereby promoting consistency in clinical decision-making. Collaborative research partnerships and capacity-building initiatives have further embedded a culture of continuous quality improvement within institutional frameworks.

Notwithstanding these achievements, persistent challenges remain. Infrastructure instability, supply chain constraints, uneven distribution of accredited laboratories, and workforce limitations continue to impede universal access to high-quality diagnostic services. Dependence on externally funded initiatives also raises concerns regarding long-term sustainability and domestic ownership of quality assurance programs.

The findings underscore that enduring progress requires a holistic systems-based approach that integrates regulatory reform, sustainable financing, workforce development, and technological modernization. It is recommended that national governments institutionalize accreditation within domestic health budgets, strengthen regulatory oversight of diagnostic technologies, expand training in quality management across all laboratory tiers, and harness digital innovations for real-time performance monitoring. Strengthened regional harmonization and collaborative oversight mechanisms will further consolidate the comparability of standards across borders. Sustained commitment to these strategic priorities will be essential for reinforcing diagnostic reliability, enhancing patient safety, and advancing resilient and equitable healthcare systems throughout the region.

References

1. Adamah M, Mangelinck-Noël N, Kan-Dapaah K, Ottah DG, Salifu A, Dozie-Nwachukwu SO, *et al*. A maiden edition of the AUSTECH 2015 International Conference Book of Abstracts [Internet]. 2016. Available from: http://repository.aust.edu.ng/xmlui/handle/123456789/330
2. Adeniji IO, Shittu H, Opara IS. Optimization of grounding systems for medium-voltage distribution networks in emerging power markets. IRE J. 2020;3(11):19.
3. Adeniji OI. Design and construction of a temperature monitoring device with security features [dissertation]. 2019.
4. Adeojo OO, Osinibi OM. Assessing the intersections between renewable energy, sustainable development, and the challenges of environmental justice in Nigeria. Interdiscip Environ Rev.

2016;17(2):149–166.
5. Adesina A, Chumba D, Nelson AM, Orem J, Roberts DJ, Wabinga H, *et al*. Improvement of pathology in sub-Saharan Africa. Lancet Oncol. 2013;14(4):e152–e157.
6. Akindemowo AO, Erigha ED, Obuse E, Ajayi JO, Adebayo A. A conceptual framework for automating data pipelines using ELT tools in cloud-native environments. J Front Multidiscip Res. 2021;2(1):440–452.
7. Alemnji GA, Zeh C, Yao K, Fonjungo PN. Strengthening national health laboratories in sub-Saharan Africa: a decade of remarkable progress. Trop Med Int Health. 2014;19(4):450–458.
8. Amukele TK, Michael K, Hanes M, Miller RE, Jackson JB. External quality assurance performance of clinical research laboratories in sub-Saharan Africa. Am J Clin Pathol. 2012;138(5):720–723.
9. Barbé B, Yansouni CP, Affolabi D, Jacobs J. Implementation of quality management for clinical bacteriology in low-resource settings. Clin Microbiol Infect. 2017;23(7):426–433.
10. Brown A, Nilsen LB. Laboratory medicine in sub-Saharan Africa: strengthening systems for sustainable healthcare. 2018.
11. Carter JY. External quality assessment in resource-limited countries. Biochem Med. 2017;27(1):97–109.
12. Eboseremen BO, Adebayo AO, Essien IA, Ofori SD, Soneye OM. The role of natural language processing in data-driven research analysis. Int J Multidiscip Res Growth Eval. 2021;2.
13. Elbireer AM, Jackson JB, Sendagire H, Opio A, Bagenda D, Amukele TK. The good, the bad, and the unknown: quality of clinical laboratories in Kampala, Uganda. PLoS One. 2013;8(5):e64661.
14. Fleming KA, Naidoo M, Wilson M, Flanigan J, Horton S, Kuti M, *et al*. High-quality diagnosis: an essential pathology package. In: Disease Control Priorities. 3rd ed. 2017.
15. Frempong D, Ifenatuora GP, Ofori SD. AI-powered chatbots for education delivery in remote and underserved regions. 2020.
16. Gershy-Damet GM, Rotz P, Cross D, Belabbes EH, Cham F, Ndihokubwayo JB, *et al*. The WHO African region laboratory accreditation process: improving the quality of laboratory systems. Am J Clin Pathol. 2010;134(3):393–400.
17. Guindo MA, Shott JP, Saye R, Diakité ML, Sanogo S, Dembele MB, *et al*. Promoting good clinical laboratory practices and accreditation in sub-Saharan Africa. Am J Trop Med Hyg. 2012;86(4):573.
18. Horton S, Sullivan R, Flanigan J, Fleming KA, Kuti MA, Looi LM, *et al*. Delivering modern, high-quality, affordable pathology services to LMICs: a call to action. Lancet. 2018;391(10133):1953–1964.
19. Jacobs J, Kühne V, Lunguya O, Affolabi D, Hardy L, Vandenberg O. Implementing COVID-19 rapid diagnostic tests in sub-Saharan Africa: a review. Front Med. 2020;7:557797.
20. Jaffet MF. Factors affecting the implementation of quality management systems by national tuberculosis reference laboratories in WHO sub-Saharan Africa region [Internet]. 2018.
21. Kavanaugh MJ, Azzam SE, Rockabrand DM. Malaria rapid diagnostic tests: review and recommendations. Diagnostics. 2021;11(5):768.
22. Koster W, Ndione AG, Adama M, Guindo I, Sow I, Diallo S, *et al*. An oral history of medical laboratory development in Francophone West Africa. Afr J Lab Med. 2021;10(1):1–10.
23. Martin R, Barnhart S. Global laboratory systems development: needs and approaches. Infect Dis Clin. 2011;25(3):677–691.
24. Masanza MM, Nqobile N, Mukanga D, Gitta SN. Laboratory capacity building for IHR (2005) in resource-poor countries. BMC Public Health. 2010;10(Suppl 1):S8.
25. McNerney R. Diagnostics for developing countries. Diagnostics. 2015;5(2):200–209.
26. Moyo TM, Taiwo AE, Ajayi AE, Tafirenyika S, Tuboalabo A, Bukhari TT. Designing smart BI platforms for healthcare funding transparency. 2021.
27. Naresh KN, Raphael M, Ayers L, Hurwitz N, Calbi V, Rogena E, *et al*. Lymphomas in sub-Saharan Africa: improving diagnosis and care. Br J Haematol. 2011;154(6):696–703.
28. Ndihokubwayo JB, Maruta T, Ndlovu N, Moyo S, Yahaya AA, Coulibaly SO, *et al*. Implementation of WHO stepwise laboratory quality improvement process. Afr J Lab Med. 2016;5(1):1–8.
29. Nkengasong JN, Mbopi-Keou FX, Peeling RW, Yao KE, Zeh CE, Schneidman M, *et al*. Laboratory medicine in Africa: then, now, and future. Lancet Infect Dis. 2018;18(11):e362–e367.
30. Nyirenda T, Bockarie M, Machingaidze S, Nderu M, Singh M, Fakier N, *et al*. Strengthening clinical research capacity in sub-Saharan Africa. Int J Infect Dis. 2021;110:54–61.
31. Obeta MU, Maduka KM, Ofor IB, Ofojekwu NM. Improving quality and cost in healthcare delivery in Nigeria. Int J Bus Manag Invent. 2019;8(3):8–19.
32. Okezue MA, Adeyeye MC, Byrn SJ, Abiola VO, Clase KL. Impact of ISO/IEC 17025 laboratory accreditation in sub-Saharan Africa. BMC Health Serv Res. 2020;20(1):1065.
33. Olmsted SS, Moore M, Meili RC, Duber HC, Wasserman J, Sama P, *et al*. Strengthening laboratory systems in resource-limited settings. Am J Clin Pathol. 2010;134(3):374–380.
34. Omotayo OO, Kuponiyi AB. Telehealth expansion in post-COVID healthcare systems. ICONIC Res Eng J. 2020;3(10):496–513.
35. Ondoa P, Ndlovu N, Keita MS, Massinga-Loembe M, Kebede Y, Odhiambo C, *et al*. Preparing laboratory systems to advance diagnostics in Africa. Afr J Lab Med. 2020;9(2):1103.
36. Oshoba TO, Aifuwa SE, Ogbuefi E, Olatunde-Thorpe J. Portfolio optimization with evolutionary algorithms. 2020.
37. Parsons LM, Somoskövi Á, Gutierrez C, Lee E, Paramasivan CN, Abimiku AL, *et al*. Laboratory diagnosis of tuberculosis in resource-poor countries. Clin Microbiol Rev. 2011;24(2):314–350.
38. Petti CA, Polage CR, Quinn TC, Ronald AR, Sande MA. Laboratory medicine in Africa: a barrier to

effective healthcare. Clin Infect Dis. 2006;42(3):377–382.
39. Putoto G, Cortese A, Pecorari I, Musi R, Nunziata E. Harmonization of clinical laboratories in Africa. Diagnosis. 2015;2(2):129–135.
40. Samuel M, Irene M, Kenny K. Readiness of primary healthcare diagnostic laboratory services in Kenya. J Health Environ Res. 2020;6(4):128–142.
41. Sayed S, Cherniak W, Lawler M, Tan SY, El Sadr W, Wolf N, *et al*. Improving pathology and laboratory medicine in LMICs. Lancet. 2018;391(10133):1939–1952.
42. Schroeder LF, Amukele T. Medical laboratories meeting international standards in sub-Saharan Africa. Am J Clin Pathol. 2014;141(6):791–795.
43. Shittu H, Opara IS, Elumilade RA, Liadi KO, Adeniji IO. Hydrogen as a secondary energy carrier. IRE J. 2019;3(1):628–643.
44. Shittu ISMA, Adeniji IO, Elumilade RA, *et al*. Selective coordination and arc-flash risk mitigation strategies. IRE J. 2021;4(8):19.
45. Shott JP, Galiwango RM, Reynolds SJ. Quality management approach for point-of-care HIV diagnostics. J Trop Med. 2012;2012:651927.
46. Swysen C, Vekemans J, Bruls M, Oyakhirome S, Drakeley C, Kremsner P, *et al*. Standardized laboratory methods for malaria vaccine trials. Malar J. 2011;10:223.
47. Ward CL, Guo MZ, Amukele TK, Abdul-Karim A, Schroeder LF. Availability and prices of WHO essential diagnostics in West Africa. J Appl Lab Med. 2021;6(1):51–62.
48. Williams J, Umaru F, Edgil D, Kuritsky J. Progress in harmonizing tiered HIV laboratory systems. Glob Health Sci Pract. 2016;4(3):467–480.
49. Wilson ML, Fleming KA, Kuti MA, Looi LM, Lago N, Ru K. Access to pathology and laboratory services. Lancet. 2018;391(10133):1927–1938.
50. World Health Organization. Guide for the stepwise laboratory quality improvement process towards accreditation (SLIPTA) in the WHO African Region. 2020.
51. Zhang HL, Omondi MW, Musyoka AM, Afwamba IA, Swai RP, Karia FP, *et al*. Challenges of maintaining good clinical laboratory practices in low-resource settings. Am J Clin Pathol. 2016;146(2):199–206.