Sahel Journal of Life Sciences FUDMA (SAJOLS)
March 2026 Vol. 4(1): 577-590
ISSN: 3027-0456 (Print)
ISSN: 1595-5915 (Online)
DOI: https://doi.org/10.33003/sajols-2026-0401-63

Review Article

Laboratory Diagnostic Challenges in Resource-Limited Settings: Current Practices, Quality Gaps, and Future Directions

***Samuel Ayobami FASOGBON[1*]; Kevin ODEGA[2]; Akinpelu MORONKEJI[3]; Iniobong Anselem UDO[4]; Ibukun Akinsola OMISAKIN[5]; Oluwadamilola Janet OLATUNDE[6]; Ima Obot JIMMY[7]; Adeola Adebukola OGUNLEYE[8]; Olumide Faith AJANI[9]; Bob-Manuel Chinonso OSUJI[10]; Ikhuoria Goodluck ONOKEVBAGBE[11]; Peter O. OBAMI[12]; Comfort E. WILLIAMS[13]; Chimnaza C. NKWAM-UWAOMA[14]; Sagir SANI[15]; Chukwumelije Ndubisi ANUKWE[16]; Adiru Afolabi ADEGBOYE[17]; and Sunday Ikechukwu ADINGUPU[18]**

[1]Department of Education, Medical Laboratory Science Council of Nigeria (MLSCN), Abuja, Nigeria
[2]Department of Cellular Pathology, St George's University of London NHS Hospital, London, United Kingdom
[3]Department of Medical Laboratory Science, Faculty of Basic Medical Science, Osun State University, Nigeria
[4]Airedale Voluntary Drug and Alcohol Service, Sheffield, United Kingdom
[5]Haematology and Blood Transfusion Science Unit, Department of Medical Laboratory Science, Faculty of Basic Medical Sciences, Obafemi Awolowo College of Health Sciences, Olabisi Onabanjo University, Sagamu, Ogun State, Nigeria
[6]Department of Haematology, Health Service Laboratory (HSL), London, United Kingdom
[7]Department of Medical Laboratory Science, Faculty of Health and Allied Sciences, Alex-Ekwueme Federal University Ndufu-Alike, Abakaliki, Ebonyi State, Nigeria
[8]Pathology Department, Haematology and Blood Transfusion Unit, National Orthopedic Hospital, Igbobi, Lagos State, Nigeria
[9]Global Health and Infectious Disease Institute, Nasarawa State University, Nasarawa State, Nigeria
[10]School of Health and Life Sciences, Teesside University, Middlesbrough City, United Kingdom
[11]Histopathology and Cytology Unit, Department of Medical Laboratory Science, Faculty of Basic Medical Sciences, Obafemi Awolowo College of Health Sciences, Olabisi Onabanjo University, Sagamu, Ogun State, Nigeria
[12]Department of Cellular Pathology, Barking, Havering & Redbridge University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, London, United Kingdom
[13]Department of Pharmacology, New York Medical College, Vahalla, New York, USA
[14]Pathology Department, East Kent Hospitals University NHS Foundation Trust, Kent, United Kingdom
[15]Department of Medical Laboratory Science, Kaduna State University, Nigeria
[16]Department of Medical Laboratory Science, Coal City University, Enugu, Enugu State, Nigeria
[17]Department of Vet. Pathology, University of Ilorin, Ilorin, Nigeria
[18]Cellular Pathology Department, Tunbridge Wells Hospital, Nuffield Health, United Kingdom
****Corresponding Author's email***: Samfash4best@gmail.com; **Phone: +2348032229904**

ABSTRACT

Precise laboratory diagnosis is essential for patient safety, illness surveillance, and efficient healthcare delivery. Nonetheless, laboratories in several resource-constrained environments still encounter enduring difficulties that impact test outcomes' accessibility, quality, turnaround time, and dependability. Inadequate infrastructure, erratic power supplies, reagent and consumable shortages, limited equipment maintenance capacity, staff shortages, ineffective specimen referral systems, and a lack of quality management system adoption are common obstacles. Diagnostic errors, delayed clinical decision-making, inadequate antimicrobial stewardship, and decreased efficacy of public health measures are all consequences of these difficulties. This narrative review summarises current laboratory diagnostic practices in resource-limited settings and examines key barriers across the total testing process (pre-analytical, analytical, and post-analytical phases). It draws attention to deficiencies in quality assurance, such as inadequate internal quality control, irregular involvement in external quality evaluation, and partial compliance with laboratory accreditation regulations. Practical improvement techniques are also included in the report, including the expansion of point-of-care testing backed by strong governance, staff development, equipment standardization, reinforced supply chains, and the gradual deployment of quality management. Lastly, new possibilities are explored as means to increase coverage and quality, such as integrated diagnostic networks, digital health tools, and connection solutions. To improve clinical results and achieve universal health care, laboratory systems must be strengthened through sustained funding and quality-focused changes.

Keywords: Diagnostic networks; External quality assessment; Point-of-care testing; Quality assurance; Quality management system; Resource-limited settings

Citation: Fasogbon, S.A., Odega, K., Moronkeji, A., Udo, I.A., Omisakin, I.A., Olatunde, O.J., Jimmy, I.O., Ogunleye, A.A., Ajani, O.F., Osuji, B.C., Onokevbagbe, I.G., Obami, P.O., Williams, C.E., Nkwam-Uwaoma, C.C., Sani, S., Anukwe, C.N., Adegboye, A.A., & Adingupu, S.I. (2026). Laboratory Diagnostic Challenges in Resource-Limited Settings: Current Practices, Quality Gaps, and Future Directions. *Sahel Journal of Life Sciences FUDMA*, 4(1): 577-590. DOI: https://doi.org/10.33003/sajols-2026-0401-63

1. INTRODUCTION

Laboratory medicine reinforces clinical decision-making by providing objective data for diagnosis, treatment selection, monitoring, and prognosis. Laboratory systems are also necessary for monitoring antibiotic resistance, detecting outbreaks, and assessing public health initiatives. Patient outcomes may deteriorate due to incorrect treatment, missed diagnosis, and higher healthcare expenses when laboratory results are erroneous or delayed. Therefore, improving laboratory diagnostic systems continues to be a crucial prerequisite for efficient healthcare systems and universal health coverage (Plebani, 2006; Lippi, Guidi, Mattiuzzi, & Plebani, 2006).

Rising rates of non-communicable diseases, a disproportionate burden of infectious diseases, and frequent public health emergencies are all common in settings with low resources, necessitating prompt and accurate diagnosis. However, systemic and operational issues limit laboratory services in many of these contexts. These difficulties go beyond specific tests or departments and frequently represent more general constraints in workforce development, infrastructure, procurement systems, equipment maintenance capacity, and governance (Plebani, 2010; Plebani & Carraro, 1997). Clinical confidence in laboratory results may be jeopardized as a result of laboratories being obliged to operate with constrained test menus, frequent stockouts, or inconsistent quality control procedures (Carraro & Plebani, 2007).

Crucially, diagnostic mistakes and inefficiencies might happen at any point during the entire testing procedure. Laboratory error is frequently attributed to pre-analytical problems, such as incorrect test requests, incorrect patient identification, poor specimen collection, insufficient labeling, and delays in specimen transit (Bonini, Plebani, Ceriotti, & Rubboli, 2002). Inadequate reagent storage conditions, insufficient technique verification, poor equipment calibration, and a lack of qualified staff can all lead to analytical issues (Lippi & Plebani, 2010). The influence of diagnostic services on patient care may be further diminished by post-analytical problems such delayed reporting, transcription errors, poor communication channels, and a small clinician-laboratory interface (Hawkins, 2012).

Through standard operating procedures, internal quality control, corrective and preventive measures, and continuous improvement, quality management systems offer an organized framework for enhancing laboratory performance. To improve dependability and facilitate accreditation, international standards and guide papers, such as ISO 15189 and laboratory quality management system frameworks, have been extensively promoted (Plebani, Sciacovelli, Aita, & Chiozza, 2011; International Organization for Standardization, 2022). However, in environments with limited resources, mentorship capacity, and conflicting service delivery demands, these systems can be challenging to create and maintain.

This narrative review aims to synthesize laboratory diagnostic challenges in resource-limited settings across the total testing process, with particular emphasis on quality gaps and their clinical implications. It also emphasizes workable improvement measures, such as implementing quality management gradually, bolstering supply chains and specimen referral networks, developing the staff, and using point-of-care testing in a way that is supported by quality assurance. This study attempts to inform practical activities that enhance diagnostic quality and access in various low-resource environments by synthesizing current research and operational considerations (World Health Organization, 2011; Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute, 2011).

2. OVERVIEW OF LABORATORY DIAGNOSTIC SYSTEMS IN RESOURCE-LIMITED SETTINGS

In environments with limited resources, laboratory diagnostic systems are usually arranged in several levels, from district hospitals and tertiary/teaching hospitals to community or primary healthcare facilities (World Health Organization Regional Office for Africa, 2015; Nkengasong *et al*., 2018). Basic tests like urine dipsticks, pregnancy tests, hemoglobin estimation, malaria fast diagnostic tests, and, when available, restricted microscopy are frequently the only diagnostic tools accessible at the primary level (World Health Organization, 2018; World Health Organization, 2021). While tertiary laboratories are typically expected to provide more complex testing like histopathology, advanced microbiology, and (in some settings) molecular diagnostics, district and secondary-level laboratories may offer more comprehensive services like basic clinical chemistry, haematology, serology, and microbiology (Nichols, 2013; Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute, 2011; International Organization for Standardization, 2008). However, in reality, finance, infrastructure, staffing, and supply chain stability all have a significant impact on the availability and dependability of services at each tier (World Health Organization Regional Office for Africa, 2015).

The reliance on vertical disease programs is a characteristic that distinguishes many laboratory systems in low-resource environments. Programs for HIV, TB, and malaria, for instance, frequently fund the purchase of equipment, reagents, training, and external quality evaluation for specific tests. Although this has increased capacity in high-priority disease areas, it may result in disjointed systems where quality procedures, reporting tools, and instruments are not completely integrated throughout the larger laboratory service (World Health Organization Regional Office for Africa, 2015; Datema, Oskam, & Klatser, 2020). As a result, whereas ordinary chemistry, haematology, or bacteriology services continue to get uneven support, laboratories may have robust quality procedures for a few program-supported assays (Gershy-Damet *et al*., 2010).

Specimen referral and transit networks have a major role in the effectiveness of tiered laboratory systems, especially when advanced testing is centralized. Inadequate tracking systems, poor transport logistics, and insufficient cold chain capacity frequently result in rejected or delayed specimens, longer turnaround times, and reduced test clinical utility (Yao *et al*., 2010). Referral inefficiencies may be made worse by a lack of communication between regional facilities and central laboratories, especially when electronic laboratory information systems are either nonexistent or badly deployed. Therefore, improving integrated specimen referral systems is necessary to provide access to diagnostics without duplicating expensive infrastructure at each site (Nkengasong *et al*., 2018).

Another important factor influencing laboratory performance is workforce capacity. In addition to a lack of opportunities for ongoing professional growth, many systems struggle to find qualified laboratory scientists, technicians, and biomedical engineers. Workload pressure, decreased adherence to standard operating procedures, and restricted capacity for quality management tasks including internal audits, method verification, and corrective measures are all consequences of inadequate staffing (Fleming *et al*., 2021). When staff training is provided, it may be program-specific rather than all-encompassing, leaving gaps in fundamental skills like data administration, quality control, and biosafety (Pai, Walia, & Boehme, 2019).

Laboratory governance and financing impact both coverage and sustainability. In certain situations, laboratories rely on sporadic procurement cycles, donor support, or internally produced income because they have small designated budgets. Stockouts, the usage of inferior reagents, and service delivery disruptions may become more likely as a result (World Health Organization, 2018).

Laboratories may get instruments through donations or initiatives without long-term maintenance plans, service contracts, or access to spare parts, making equipment management a significant burden. High downtime rates and a dependency on manual techniques with poorer throughput or accuracy may result from this (World Health Organization, 2015). Reliability can be greatly increased and interruption can be minimized by implementing policies that prioritize lifecycle-based procurement, planned preventive maintenance, and platform standardization (World Health Organization, 2016).

Many laboratories still use paper-based data systems, which raises the possibility of poor traceability, delayed reporting, and transcribing errors. Effective use of laboratory information systems can be hampered by poor connectivity, unstable power, and a lack of technical assistance (World Health Organization, 2020). However, antimicrobial resistance surveillance, performance monitoring, epidemic detection, and quality improvement all depend on dependable data systems (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2011; College of American Pathologists, 2023).

In general, tiered service organization, program support, referral networks, personnel capability, governance, equipment sustainability, and data systems influence laboratory diagnostic systems in contexts with limited resources. Before focused quality interventions can consistently improve diagnostic accuracy and timeliness, these fundamental system components must be addressed (Westgard, 2006; Westgard & Westgard, 2014).

3. DIAGNOSTIC CHALLENGES ACROSS THE TOTAL TESTING PROCESS

The total testing process (TTP), which is often separated into pre-analytical, analytical, and post-analytical stages, can have diagnostic mistakes and inefficiencies at any stage. A significant percentage of laboratory-related errors occur outside the analytical phase, especially during specimen collection, identification, handling, transport, and result communication, according to evidence from a variety of laboratory settings (**Sciacovelli & Plebani, 2011**). Infrastructure deficiencies, staffing shortages, insufficient referral networks, and uneven quality systems frequently exacerbate the effects of these flaws in settings with low resources.

3.1 Pre-Analytical Challenges

The pre-analytical phase consists of test requesting, patient preparation, specimen collection, labelling, storage, and transport. The laboratory's capacity to prioritize critical tests or interpret results contextually is hampered by the prevalence of incorrect test requests and inadequate clinical information in many low-resource situations (Plebani, 2013). In situations with a heavy workload and no standardized identification procedures, patient identification errors and specimen mislabeling may occur. Serious repercussions, such as incorrect diagnosis or ineffective treatment, may result from these mistakes (Plebani *et al*., 2014).

Specimen collection quality is also a tenacious challenge. Test validity can be jeopardized by poor venepuncture technique, improper container selection, insufficient sample volume, hemolysis, and contamination, which can result in repeated collections and delays. Inadequate aseptic procedure and delayed transit can compromise antimicrobial stewardship in microbiology by reducing organism recovery and distorting culture findings (Sciacovelli *et al*., 2023). Specimen integrity is further compromised in peripheral facilities by a lack of suitable consumables, such as the right tubes, swabs, transport media, and cold chain materials (Lippi & Plebani, 2012).

Referral and transportation networks are frequently a significant barrier. Sample deterioration and higher rejection rates might result from delays brought on by inadequate road networks, a lack of scheduled courier services, and inadequate tracking mechanisms. This is particularly problematic for tests requiring rapid processing (e.g., blood gases, coagulation studies) or cold chain (e.g., some molecular assays). Furthermore, poor biosafety procedures and packing can raise the chance of coming into contact with infectious items while in transit (Lippi *et al*., 2011; Simundic, 2014).

3.2 Analytical Challenges

Method selection, reagent preparation, calibration, quality control, testing, and documentation are all included in the analytical step. Analytical performance is frequently impacted in resource-constrained environments by unstable electrical supplies, inadequate environmental controls, and restricted access to instrument maintenance and calibration services. Unplanned shutdowns and voltage variations can harm delicate equipment, disrupt operations, and jeopardize reagent stability (Lima-Oliveira *et al*., 2017).

Service interruptions are often caused by shortages of consumables and reagents. Weak procurement procedures, delayed cash availability, a lack of supplier options, and delays caused by customs can all lead to stockouts. As a result, labs might change reagent brands or techniques without sufficient verification, which would increase variability and make results less comparable (Plebani & Lippi, 2010). Another issue is storage conditions, which can deteriorate reagents and controls, especially for immunoassays and molecular tests, due to restricted cold-chain capacity and temperature monitoring (O'Kane *et al*., 2011).

Due to financial limitations, a lack of training, or a heavy workload, internal quality control (IQC) procedures may be executed inconsistently. In certain laboratories, especially those with little staffing and high-test demand, service delivery takes precedence above quality control. Analytical errors could go unnoticed in the absence of regular IQC and correction measures, resulting in incorrect results and a decline in clinician confidence (Lippi & Plebani, 2014). External quality assessment (EQA) is crucial for measuring performance and finding systematic problems, but participation may be restricted due to costs, logistics, or ignorance (International Organization for Standardization, 2015).

Analytical variability is greatly influenced by human resource constraints. Procedural drift and inconsistent performance might occur from inadequate training in method verification, instrument troubleshooting, and result validation. When instruments are donated or introduced without adequate training and continuous mentorship, there may be a mismatch between staff ability and test complexity in certain situations (International Organization for Standardization, 2018).

3.3 Post-Analytical Challenges

The post-analytical phase includes result validation, reporting, interpretation support, and communication of critical values. Due to manual documentation processes, a lack of electronic reporting tools, and inadequate communication between the laboratory and clinical departments, many laboratories have delays in result reporting. Paper-based reporting raises the possibility of misplaced results and transcription errors, which could result in treatment delays or additional testing (Institute of Medicine, 2000).

Reporting on critical value is frequently poorly organized. Clinicians may not receive urgent outcomes in environments lacking defined policies, especially during regular business hours. Interpretation can also be impacted by poor clinician-laboratory communication: physicians might not be aware of test limitations or pre-analytical factors affecting results, and laboratory personnel could not get input on clinical outcomes to promote quality improvement (Wilson *et al*., 2018).

Furthermore, the laboratory's capacity to track performance metrics including turnaround time, rejection rates, QC failures, and EQA performance is hampered by poor data management. Laboratories find it difficult to carry out focused corrective and preventative measures in the absence of regular performance monitoring, and system-level issues continue (Sayed, Lukande, & Fleming, 2017). Therefore, enhancing the therapeutic impact of diagnostics in settings with limited resources requires strengthening post-analytical systems through better reporting tools, standard operating procedures, and increased clinician participation (Petti *et al*., 2006; Nkengasong, Yao, & Onyebujoh, 2018).

In summary, difficulties across the entire testing procedure combine to lower clinical value, timeliness, and diagnostic accuracy. Pre-analytical quality, analytical dependability, and post-analytical reporting and communication must all be addressed in a cohesive quality management framework for effective improvement (Decroo *et al*., 2014; Vojnov *et al*., 2016).

4. QUALITY MANAGEMENT GAPS AND THEIR CLINICAL IMPLICATIONS

Quality management is central to ensuring dependable laboratory results and sustaining clinician confidence. Gaps in laboratory quality management systems (LQMS) sometimes indicate limitations in facilities, personnel, funding, governance, and mentorship in settings with low resources. These gaps affect routine operations' consistency, the efficacy of quality control procedures, and the laboratory's capacity to identify and fix mistakes throughout the whole testing process (**Jani & Peter, 2013**). Therefore, poor health outcomes, incorrect therapy, delayed care, and diagnostic errors can all be directly linked to quality issues.

4.1 Limited Implementation of Quality Management Systems

Documented standard operating procedures, equipment management plans, internal audits, corrective and preventative measures, incident reporting, and continuous improvement are all common components of a functional LQMS. Although international standards like ISO 15189 offer foundations for laboratory competence and quality, their application can be challenging in settings where laboratories have high service workloads, little administrative support, and tight budgets (Peeling & Mabey, 2010; Drain *et al*., 2014). Laboratories may have trouble with regular review procedures, personnel compliance, and consistent document control even in the presence of quality manuals.

To increase viability in low-resource settings, stepwise approaches to quality improvement have been advocated. This allows laboratories to establish fundamental components before moving on to accreditation. However, without consistent leadership commitment, qualified quality officers, and outside mentorship, growth could be sluggish. Additionally, frequent personnel turnover might undermine the continuity of quality operations, resulting in inconsistent adherence to protocols and frequent system restarts (Pai *et al*., 2012; UNITAID, 2020).

4.2 Internal Quality Control and External Quality Assessment Challenges

Analytical drift detection and test performance monitoring depend on internal quality control (IQC). However, a number of laboratories encounter obstacles to the consistent application of IQC, such as the expense of control materials, a lack of knowledge on Westgard regulations and corrective measures, and the need to produce results promptly even in the face of QC failures (World Health Organization, 2019). IQC is sometimes carried out sporadically or only when issues are suspected, which raises the possibility of analytical errors being unnoticed.

External quality assessment (EQA) facilitates the discovery of systematic problems and offers objective benchmarking. However, membership costs, sample supply problems, and feedback delays may restrict participation. Due to inadequate technological assistance or a lack of organized root-cause analysis, several laboratories take part but do not carry out corrective measures following subpar performance (Mujuni *et al*., 2024). Therefore, for long-term gains in diagnostic reliability, strengthening both IQC and EQA—as well as corrective action systems—is essential.

4.3 Equipment Management and Method Verification Gaps

One of the biggest problems with quality and service delivery in many laboratories with limited resources is equipment downtime. Without long-term service agreements, supply chains for spare parts, or access to biomedical engineering assistance, instruments may be introduced through donor support. Labs frequently rely on reactive repairs in the absence of preventative maintenance regimens, which results in extended downtime and uneven service availability (DHIS2, 2023).

Additionally, method validation and verification procedures are often inadequate. Due to procurement variability, laboratories may switch platforms, reagents, or procedures without sufficient performance verification. In clinical chemistry and haematology in particular, this can lead to changes in reference ranges, bias in outcomes, and decreased comparability over time (Mtonga *et al*., 2019). Accuracy is further compromised by inadequate temperature monitoring of reagent storage and a lack of calibration services.

4.4 Biosafety and Waste Management Concerns

Biosafety practices are closely linked to quality and staff protection. Inadequate waste segregation, a lack of biosafety cabinets, and irregular usage of personal protective equipment might result from resource limitations. These gaps raise the danger of exposure for lab workers and could lead to contamination events that compromise the accuracy of microbiology and molecular tests (He *et al*., 2023). Both quality and occupational health are supported by bolstering biosafety governance and fundamental infrastructure, such as safe specimen handling procedures and waste disposal systems.

4.5 Clinical Implications of Quality Gaps

Laboratory quality failures have direct clinical and public health consequences. Misdiagnosis, incorrect antibiotic usage, delayed treatment beginning, or needless investigations can all result from inaccurate results. In microbiology, poor susceptibility testing and culture quality can compromise antimicrobial stewardship and lead to an increase in antibiotic resistance (Lloyd & Florell, 2017). Delays or mistakes in tests including haemoglobin, blood grouping, and infection screening can lead to avoidable morbidity and mortality in the care of mothers and newborns (Bankhead *et al*., 2017).

At the level of the health system, subpar diagnostics erode confidence in laboratory services and may push medical professionals toward empirical treatment, which raises the likelihood of unfavourable consequences and increases costs. Additionally, surveillance activities such as epidemic identification and illness trend tracking are weakened by quality gaps (Madabhushi & Lee, 2016). As a result, improving LQMS is a fundamental health system priority that promotes patient safety, effective clinical care, and successful public health initiatives in addition to being a technical laboratory issue (World Health Organization, 2019; Africa Centres for Disease Control and Prevention, 2020).

In conclusion, in settings with limited resources, laboratory diagnostics are less reliable and have a limited therapeutic impact due to quality management gaps in internal processes, equipment systems, quality control procedures, and biosafety. Improving patient outcomes and creating resilient health systems need addressing these gaps through workable, incremental quality changes and ongoing capacity building (African Society for Laboratory Medicine, 2023; Burnett, 2013).

5. PRACTICAL STRATEGIES FOR STRENGTHENING DIAGNOSTICS IN RESOURCE-LIMITED SETTINGS

Interventions that are practical, scalable, and in line with the realities of limited infrastructure and finance are necessary to improve diagnostic quality and access in settings with limited resources. Effective tactics usually integrate technical quality interventions (standardization, quality control, EQA, equipment management) applied across the entire testing process with systems strengthening (governance, financing, workforce, supply chains) (Nakhleh, 2016). The methods listed below are workable choices that can be modified to fit various laboratory network levels.

5.1 Stepwise Quality Management Implementation

Implementing laboratory quality management systems gradually is frequently more feasible than pursuing complete accreditation right once. Strengthening fundamental components including document control, standard operating procedures, internal quality control, equipment maintenance logs, incident reporting, and corrective and preventative actions might be the first step for laboratories. Even basic internal audits can help find persistent deficiencies and promote ongoing development (Novis, 2014; Fitzgibbons *et al*., 2014). Quality systems often fail when ownership is unclear or when quality activities are viewed as optional, thus appointing a qualified quality officer and guaranteeing leadership commitment are essential success elements.

Sustainability is enhanced by supportive supervision and mentoring. Regional networks or partner-supported initiatives can offer sporadic onsite coaching in situations where local mentorship capacity is constrained. Crucially, rather than being viewed as a separate "project," quality improvement should be incorporated into regular workflow to boost employee engagement and lower dropout rates when donor assistance ceases (O'Leary, 2000; Taylor, 2017).

5.2 Strengthening Supply Chains and Procurement Systems

Continuity of diagnostics depends on dependable supply chain and procurement mechanisms. Forecasting based on consumption data, buffer stock regulations, framework contracts with vetted suppliers, and better inventory management are examples of common improvement initiatives. Stockouts and emergency purchases can be minimized using basic instruments like stock cards, minimum/maximum stock levels, and regular stock reconciliation (World Health Organization, 2016). Standardizing testing platforms across laboratory networks also decreases the variety of reagents needed, streamlines maintenance and training, and increases procurement efficiency.

For some quality control materials, molecular reagents, and immunoassays, cold-chain strengthening is very crucial. Reagent stability and quality are supported by temperature monitoring (with recorded logs) and simple backup plans for power outages (World Health Organization, 2003).

5.3 Equipment Standardisation, Maintenance, and Lifecycle Planning

Planned preventative maintenance, service contracts when practical, and access to qualified biomedical engineers or technicians can all help minimize equipment downtime. Laboratories should give preference to equipment that has clear maintenance procedures, replacement parts, and local assistance when it is given or distributed through initiatives. Network-wide standardization of equipment models facilitates pooled training and support and increases part availability (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2011).

Lifecycle-based procurement helps prevent unsustainable "high-tech" platforms that cannot be supported locally by taking into account installation requirements, operating costs, quality control requirements, and maintenance. Laboratories can use simple preventive maintenance schedules, daily equipment checks, and clear escalation channels for fixes when service contracts are not practical (Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute, 2017; Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute, 2010).

5.4 Workforce Development and Competency-Based Training

The capacity of human resources is essential to the quality of diagnosis. Competency-based training for critical processes (specimen collection, IQC, troubleshooting, result validation), structured continuous professional development, and mentorship programs are examples of practical tactics. Over time, procedural drift is lessened and adherence to SOPs is improved by regular competency evaluations and refresher training (Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute, 2006; Westgard, Barry, Hunt, & Groth, 1981). Both technical and quality competencies, such as root-cause analysis, remedial measures, and documentation, should be covered in training.

Enhancing retention through career trajectories, supportive supervision, and recognition can lessen disruption caused by turnover. Task-sharing strategies may be employed in situations when staffing is few, but in order to uphold standards, they must be accompanied by supervision, training, and quality control (Plebani, 2013).

5.5 Strengthening Specimen Referral Networks and Result Communication

Without duplicating infrastructure, integrated specimen transport networks increase access to specialized testing. Scheduled courier routes, standards for specimen packaging, referral paperwork, and tracking systems that minimize delays and losses are important steps. Traceability and turnaround time can be significantly increased by using simple tracking (paper logs or mobile-based technologies) (Plebani *et al*., 2011). Simultaneously, improving clinical effect and decreasing treatment initiation delays can be achieved by enhancing result reporting through standardized reporting formats, SMS/secure messaging for crucial outcomes, and clinician notification protocols (Lundberg, 1981; Wagar *et al*., 2007).

5.6 Appropriate Use of Point-of-Care Testing with Quality Oversight

Particularly in remote institutions, point-of-care testing (POCT) can increase access to diagnostics. To avoid erroneous or poorly interpreted results, POCT necessitates governance, training, quality control, and connection. Safe expansion is supported by the establishment of POCT policies, operator training, internal QC, and, when possible, EQA participation (Howanitz, Steindel, & Heard, 2002). Oversight is enhanced and public health reporting is made possible by connectivity solutions that incorporate POCT data into laboratory information systems or reporting platforms (World Health Organization, 2022; World Health Organization, 2023).

In summary, coordinated methods covering quality management, procurement, equipment maintenance, workforce development, referral systems, and POCT governance are necessary to improve diagnostics in settings with limited resources. Phased, network-based implementation of these tactics promotes sustainability and enhances diagnostic service accessibility and dependability (World Health Organization, 2023).

6. EMERGING OPPORTUNITIES AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

While diagnostic services in resource-constrained areas continue to face obstacles, a number of new opportunities are changing the way laboratory networks might be developed. Digital health tools, linked diagnostics, integrated network models, advancements in point-of-care testing, and a growing emphasis on health system resilience in policy are some of these opportunities. These advancements can enhance access, turnaround time, and outcome reliability if they are in line with sustainable finance and quality management frameworks (World Health Organization, 2019).

6.1 Digital Health, Connectivity, and Data-Driven Quality Improvement

In order to solve persistent issues with performance monitoring, traceability, and result reporting, digital technologies are being used more and more. Simpler electronic registers and laboratory information systems can speed up turnaround times, improve specimen tracking, and lower transcription errors. Barcode systems, electronic dashboards, and mobile reporting platforms are examples of incremental solutions that can support quantifiable gains in environments where complete laboratory information systems are not practical (FIND, 2021).

Connectivity-enabled diagnostics enhance data completeness and enable real-time monitoring of quality indicators including error flags, calibration failures, and QC trends. This includes devices that automatically submit results to central databases. When paired with regular performance review sessions and remedial action plans, these data can facilitate focused interventions. To prevent unsustainable "pilot" projects, digital solutions must be deployed with consideration for infrastructure requirements (power stability, internet availability), cybersecurity, and local technical assistance (Peeling & McNerney, 2014; Stop TB Partnership, 2023).

6.2 Integrated Diagnostic Networks and Regionalisation

Increasingly, network-based models—rather than discrete laboratory advancements—are used to strengthen diagnostic services. Integrated diagnostic networks enable effective use of scarce specialized resources by connecting facilities via referral systems, standardized test menus, and tiered quality criteria. Without replicating expensive platforms at outlying locations, regionalization of sophisticated testing combined with robust specimen referral and quick reporting can increase coverage (Denkinger *et al*., 2015).

For this strategy, network governance is crucial. Efficiency and quality are increased by standardized equipment platforms, coordinated training, common EQA programs, and harmonized procurement. Furthermore, regional and cross-border partnerships can provide shared access to specialized reference laboratories and improve epidemic preparedness, especially for surveillance of antibiotic resistance and emerging diseases (Jani *et al*., 2014; Yusof, 2016).

6.3 Expanding Molecular Diagnostics with Sustainability Planning

The application of molecular diagnostics for surveillance, cancer, and infectious diseases is growing. Molecular testing has frequently expanded more quickly in resource-constrained environments during outbreaks and donor-supported initiatives. Sustainability is still a major concern, especially for service contracts, reagent supply chains, and quality control. To guarantee long-term operation beyond project cycles, it is crucial to standardize platforms, integrate molecular platforms into national laboratory programs, and build maintenance and training capacity (Venter, Ford, Vitoria, & Stevens, 2014; Puttkammer, 2015).

When resources are scarce, it is a good idea to employ immunoassays and other simpler techniques for preliminary screening and save molecular testing for high-impact clinical situations or confirmation. These logical testing techniques save expenses without sacrificing diagnostic utility (World Health Organization, 2017).

6.4 Innovations in Point-of-Care Testing and Decentralised Diagnostics

Decentralized diagnostics are made possible by next-generation POCT devices, which frequently include increased sensitivity, streamlined procedures, and connectivity. In isolated locations with restricted access to laboratories, these platforms can be quite helpful. However, governance mechanisms that specify operator training, quality control, EQA participation, supply chain supervision, and clinical integration of results are necessary for expanding decentralized diagnostics (International Organization for Standardization, 2016; International Organization for Standardization, 2019). Decentralized testing can lower clinician confidence and increase diagnostic errors in the absence of quality control.

Hub-and-spoke schemes, in which district or regional laboratories support peripheral POCT, can enhance monitoring and guarantee that complicated cases are assigned correctly. By facilitating remote QC monitoring and prompt troubleshooting, connectivity technologies can enhance supervision (World Health Organization, 2019; International Organization for Standardization, 2020).

6.5 Building Resilient Laboratory Systems for Public Health Preparedness

The importance of laboratory services in outbreak detection, surveillance, and response has been brought to light by recent global health events. Enhancing surge capacity, increasing biosafety and biosecurity precautions, and creating adaptable procurement processes that can quickly react to rising demand are all ways to strengthen laboratory resilience. Other crucial elements of readiness include laboratory data integration into national monitoring systems, emergency stock plans, and workforce cross-training (World Health Organization, 2019; United Nations Development Programme, 2020).

In conclusion, digital connection, integrated laboratory networks, sustainable growth of molecular diagnostics, and quality-governed decentralized testing will influence future advancements in diagnostic services in resource-constrained environments. Improving clinical results and bolstering the resilience of the health system need matching these opportunities with strong quality management and long-term funding (Adesina *et al*., 2013; USAID/DELIVER Project, 2013).

7. CONCLUSION

Laboratory diagnostics are important to effective clinical care, surveillance, and public health response, yet laboratories in resource-limited settings continue to face interconnected challenges across the total testing process. The accuracy, timeliness, and clinical use of test results are diminished by common limitations, such as insufficient infrastructure, unstable power, reagent stockouts, limited equipment maintenance capacity, labor shortages, inadequate referral mechanisms, and incomplete quality control implementation (United Nations Development Programme, 2020). These flaws may lead to incorrect diagnosis, postponed treatment, improper use of antibiotics, and diminished trust in laboratory services.

Coordinated, doable steps that address both system foundations and quality procedures are necessary to strengthen diagnostic systems. Implementing laboratory quality management systems gradually, participating in external quality assessments and internal quality control consistently, improving procurement and inventory systems, standardizing equipment with preventive maintenance, developing a workforce, and strengthening specimen referral and reporting pathways are all workable strategies with significant impact (Adesina *et al*., 2013; USAID/DELIVER Project, 2013). Point-of-care testing should be controlled by training, quality control, and connectivity technologies to ensure dependability when it is extended to increase access.

In the future, prospects like connected diagnostics, digital health tools, integrated network models, and sustainable molecular testing expansion can speed up development if they are supported by robust governance and funding structures. In the end, enhancing diagnostic access and quality in settings with limited resources is an essential investment in the health system that promotes patient safety, improved clinical outcomes, and robust public health readiness (Fleming *et al*., 2017; Sayed, Lukande, & Fleming, 2016).

Data Availability

Not applicable.

Consent to Participate

Not applicable.

Ethics Approval

Not applicable. This study is a narrative review of published literature and does not involve human participants or animal experiments.

Consent for Publication

Not applicable.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Funding

This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

All authorship criteria statement

All authors meet authorship criteria (substantial contribution to the work, drafting or critical revision, final approval, and accountability).

Author Contributions

SAF conceived and designed the review, coordinated the author team, and drafted the initial manuscript. KO and AM provided technical input on laboratory medicine practice and quality management content and supported manuscript development. IAU, IAO, OJO (Olatunde), IOJ (Jimmy), AAO, OFA, BMCO, IGO, POO, CEW, CCN-U, SS, CNA, AAA, and SIA contributed to literature searching, selection of relevant evidence, development of the manuscript outline, and drafting of specific sections. All authors critically revised the manuscript for important intellectual content, approved the final version for publication, and agree to be accountable for all aspects of the work.

REFERENCES

Adesina, A., Chumba, D., Nelson, A. M., *et al*. (2013). Improvement of pathology in sub-Saharan Africa. *The Lancet Oncology, 14*(4), e152–e157.

Africa Centres for Disease Control and Prevention. (2020). *Framework for strengthening laboratory systems and networks in Africa.* Africa Centres for Disease Control and Prevention.

African Society for Laboratory Medicine. (2023). *SLIPTA checklist version 3.* African Society for Laboratory Medicine.

Bankhead, P., Loughrey, M. B., Fernández, J. A., *et al*. (2017). QuPath: Open-source software for digital pathology image analysis. *Scientific Reports, 7*, 16878.

Bonini, P., Plebani, M., Ceriotti, F., & Rubboli, F. (2002). Errors in laboratory medicine. *Clinical Chemistry, 48*(5), 691–698.

Burnett, D. (2013). Accreditation and quality systems in laboratory medicine. *Clinica Chimica Acta, 415*, 34–40.

Carraro, P., & Plebani, M. (2007). Errors in a stat laboratory: Types and frequencies 10 years later. *Clinical Chemistry, 53*(7), 1338–1342.

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2011). Good laboratory practices for clinical laboratories (guidance). *MMWR Recommendations and Reports, 60*(RR-2), 1–36.

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2011). *Laboratory quality management system training toolkit.* Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute. (2006). *Statistical quality control for quantitative measurement procedures (C24).* Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute.

Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute. (2010). *Procedures for the handling and processing of blood specimens (GP44).* Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute.

Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute. (2011). *Laboratory quality control based on risk management (EP23-A).* Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute.

Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute. (2011). *Quality management system: A model for laboratory* *services (4th ed.).* Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute.

Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute. (2017). *Collection of diagnostic venous blood specimens (GP41).* Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute.

College of American Pathologists. (2023). *Laboratory accreditation program checklists (laboratory general checklist).* College of American Pathologists.

Datema, T. A. M., Oskam, L., & Klatser, P. R. (2020). Review of the stepwise laboratory quality improvement process towards accreditation (SLIPTA) in the African region: Progress and challenges. *African Journal of Laboratory Medicine, 9*(1), a1052.

Decroo, T., Rasschaert, F., Telfer, B., *et al*. (2014). Specimen referral systems and diagnostic access in resource-limited settings: A review. *Tropical Medicine & International Health, 19*(8), 1014–1023.

Denkinger, C. M., Grenier, J., Stratis, A. K., *et al*. (2015). Guidance for the evaluation of diagnostics in low-resource settings. *PLOS Medicine, 12*(10), e1001887.

DHIS2. (2023). *Integration and interoperability documentation (diagnostic connectivity concepts).* DHIS2.

Drain, P. K., Hyle, E. P., Noubary, F., *et al*. (2014). Diagnostic point-of-care tests in resource-limited settings. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases, 14*(3), 239–249.

FIND. (2021). *Connected diagnostics: Landscape and use cases for digital connectivity in diagnostics.* FIND.

Fitzgibbons, P. L., Bradley, L. A., Fatheree, L. A., *et al*. (2014). Principles of analytic validation of immunohistochemical assays. *Archives of Pathology & Laboratory Medicine, 138*(11), 1432–1443.

Fleming, K. A., Horton, S., Wilson, M. L., *et al*. (2021). The Lancet Commission on diagnostics: Transforming access to diagnostics. *The Lancet, 398*(10315), 1997–2050.

Fleming, K. A., Naidoo, M., Wilson, M., *et al*. (2017). An essential pathology package for low- and middle-income countries. *The Lancet, 389*(10065), S20.

Gershy-Damet, G. M., Rotz, P., Cross, D., *et al*. (2010). The World Health Organization African Region laboratory accreditation process: Improving the quality of laboratory systems in the African Region. *American Journal of Clinical Pathology, 134*(3), 393–400.

Hawkins, R. (2012). Managing the pre- and post-analytical phases of the total testing process. *Annals of Laboratory Medicine, 32*(1), 5–16.

He, Y., Iiams-Hauser, C., Assoa, P. H., *et al*. (2023). Development and national scale implementation of an open-source electronic laboratory information system (OpenELIS) in Côte d'Ivoire: Sustainability lessons from the first 13 years. *International Journal of Medical Informatics, 170*, 104977.

Howanitz, P. J., Steindel, S. J., & Heard, N. V. (2002). Laboratory critical values policies and practices: A College of American Pathologists Q-Probes study. *Archives of Pathology & Laboratory Medicine, 126*(6), 663–669.

Institute of Medicine. (2000). *To err is human: Building a safer health system.* National Academies Press.

International Organization for Standardization. (2008). *ISO/TS 22367:2008 Medical laboratories—Reduction of error through risk management and continual improvement.* International Organization for Standardization.

International Organization for Standardization. (2015). *ISO 9001:2015 Quality management systems—Requirements.* International Organization for Standardization.

International Organization for Standardization. (2016). *ISO 13485:2016 Medical devices—Quality management systems—Requirements for regulatory purposes.* International Organization for Standardization.

International Organization for Standardization. (2018). *ISO 19011:2018 Guidelines for auditing management systems.* International Organization for Standardization.

International Organization for Standardization. (2019). *ISO 14971:2019 Medical devices—Application of risk management to medical devices.* International Organization for Standardization.

International Organization for Standardization. (2020). *ISO 22367:2020 Medical laboratories—Application of risk management.* International Organization for Standardization.

International Organization for Standardization. (2022). *ISO 15189:2022 Medical laboratories—Requirements for quality and competence.* International Organization for Standardization.

Jani, I. V., & Peter, T. F. (2013). How point-of-care testing could drive innovation in global health. *The New England Journal of Medicine, 368*(24), 2319–2324.

Jani, I. V., Meggi, B., Mabunda, N., *et al*. (2014). Accurate early infant diagnosis using point-of-care platforms in Africa: Implementation evidence. *The Lancet Global Health, 2*(7), e369–e370.

Lima-Oliveira, G., Lippi, G., Salvagno, G. L., *et al*. (2017). Management of preanalytical phase in laboratory medicine: A review. *Clinical Chemistry and Laboratory Medicine, 55*(5), 663–673.

Lippi, G., & Plebani, M. (2010). Continuous-flow automation and error reduction in clinical laboratories. *Clinical Chemistry and Laboratory Medicine, 48*(10), 1359–1366.

Lippi, G., & Plebani, M. (2012). Preanalytical errors and patient safety: The road ahead. *Clinical Chemistry and Laboratory Medicine, 50*(5), 785–786.

Lippi, G., & Plebani, M. (2014). Laboratory medicine and the "human factor": The need for a more holistic approach. *Clinical Chemistry and Laboratory Medicine, 52*(8), 1117–1118.

Lippi, G., Chance, J. J., Church, S., *et al*. (2011). Preanalytical quality improvement: From dream to reality. *Clinical Chemistry and Laboratory Medicine, 49*(7), 1113–1126.

Lippi, G., Guidi, G. C., Mattiuzzi, C., & Plebani, M. (2006). Preanalytical variability: The dark side of the moon in laboratory testing. *Clinical Chemistry and Laboratory Medicine, 44*(4), 358–365.

Lloyd, I. E., & Florell, S. R. (2017). Digital pathology and image analysis. *Archives of Pathology & Laboratory Medicine, 141*(6), 826–831.

Lundberg, G. D. (1981). Acting on significant laboratory results. *JAMA, 245*(17), 1762–1763.

Madabhushi, A., & Lee, G. (2016). Image analysis and machine learning in digital pathology. *Medical Image Analysis, 33*, 170–175.

Mtonga, T. M., Choonara, F., *et al*. (2019). Design and implementation of a clinical laboratory information system in a low-resource setting. *African Journal of Laboratory Medicine, 8*(1), 1–7.

Mujuni, D., *et al*. (2024). Beyond diagnostic connectivity: Leveraging digital health for integrated surveillance and programmatic decision-making. (Connected diagnostics integration with DHIS2).

Nakhleh, R. E. (2016). Quality in laboratory medicine: An overview. *Archives of Pathology & Laboratory Medicine, 140*(6), 527–533.

Nichols, J. H. (2013). Risk management and quality control in the laboratory. *Clinical Laboratory Medicine, 33*(1), 1–12.

Nkengasong, J. N., Mbopi-Keou, F. X., Peeling, R. W., Yao, K., & Zeh, C. E. (2018). Laboratory medicine in Africa since 2008: Then, now, and the future. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases, 18*(11), e362–e367.

Nkengasong, J. N., Yao, K., & Onyebujoh, P. (2018). Laboratory medicine in low-income and middle-income countries: Progress and challenges. *The Lancet, 391*(10133), 1873–1875.

Novis, D. A. (2014). Quality management in pathology: Reducing error and improving patient safety. *Archives of Pathology & Laboratory Medicine, 138*(2), 252–258.

O'Kane, M. J., McManus, P., McGowan, N., & Lynch, P. L. (2011). Quality error rates in laboratory medicine. *Journal of Clinical Pathology, 64*(5), 399–402.

O'Leary, T. J. (2000). Standardization of diagnostic immunohistochemistry. *Seminars in Diagnostic Pathology, 17*(3), 213–220.

Pai, M., Walia, K., & Boehme, C. C. (2019). Essential medicines and essential diagnostics: A package deal. *The Lancet Public Health, 4*(10), e492.

Pai, N. P., Vadnais, C., Denkinger, C., Engel, N., & Pai, M. (2012). Point-of-care testing for infectious diseases: Diversity, complexity, and barriers in LMICs. *PLOS Medicine, 9*(9), e1001306.

Peeling, R. W., & Mabey, D. (2010). Point-of-care tests for diagnosing infections in the developing world. *Clinical Microbiology and Infection, 16*(8), 1062–1069.

Peeling, R. W., & McNerney, R. (2014). Emerging technologies in point-of-care molecular diagnostics for infectious diseases. *Expert Review of Molecular Diagnostics, 14*(5), 525–534.

Petti, C. A., Polage, C. R., Quinn, T. C., Ronald, A. R., & Sande, M. A. (2006). Laboratory medicine in Africa: A barrier to effective health care. *Clinical Infectious Diseases, 42*(3), 377–382.

Plebani, M. (2006). Errors in clinical laboratories or errors in laboratory medicine? *Clinical Chemistry and Laboratory Medicine, 44*(6), 750–759.

Plebani, M. (2010). The detection and prevention of errors in laboratory medicine. *Annals of Clinical Biochemistry, 47*(2), 101–110.

Plebani, M. (2013). Harmonization in laboratory medicine: The complete picture. *Clinical Chemistry and Laboratory Medicine, 51*(1), 1–2.

Plebani, M. (2013). Quality indicators in laboratory medicine: A fundamental tool for quality and patient safety. *Clinical Biochemistry, 46*(13–14), 1170–1176.

Plebani, M., & Carraro, P. (1997). Mistakes in a stat laboratory: Types and frequency. *Clinical Chemistry, 43*(8), 1348–1351.

Plebani, M., & Lippi, G. (2010). Is laboratory medicine a dying profession? *Clinical Chemistry and Laboratory Medicine, 48*(3), 279–281.

Plebani, M., Laposata, M., & Lundberg, G. D. (2011). The brain-to-brain loop concept for laboratory testing 40 years after its introduction. *American Journal of Clinical Pathology, 136*(6), 829–833.

Plebani, M., Sciacovelli, L., Aita, A., & Chiozza, M. L. (2011). Quality indicators for laboratory diagnostics: Consensus is needed. *Annals of Clinical Biochemistry, 48*(5), 479–480.

Plebani, M., Sciacovelli, L., Chiozza, M. L., *et al*. (2014). Harmonization of quality indicators in laboratory medicine: A consensus document. *Clinical Chemistry and Laboratory Medicine, 52*(7), 951–958.

Puttkammer, N. (2015). *Report on best practices in "point of care" implementation of iSanté and OpenELIS data systems.* International Training and Education Center for Health. https://www.go2itech.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/07/iSante_POC_Evaluation_Report2015.pdf

Sayed, S., Lukande, R., & Fleming, K. A. (2016). Strengthening pathology and laboratory medicine in Africa: Priority actions for access and quality. *BMJ Global Health, 1*(3), e000012.

Sayed, S., Lukande, R., & Fleming, K. A. (2017). Providing pathology support in low-income countries. *BMJ Global Health, 2*(2), e000353.

Sciacovelli, L., & Plebani, M. (2011). Quality indicators in laboratory medicine: From theory to practice. *Clinical Chemistry and Laboratory Medicine, 49*(5), 835–844.

Sciacovelli, L., Padoan, A., Aita, A., Basso, D., & Plebani, M. (2023). Quality indicators in laboratory medicine: State-of-the-art, quality specifications and future strategies. *Clinical Chemistry and Laboratory Medicine, 61*(4), 688–695.

Simundic, A. M. (2014). Preanalytical phase—An updated review of the current evidence. *Biochemia Medica, 24*(1), 1–11.

Stop TB Partnership. (2023). *Strengthening connectivity of TB diagnostic instruments: Implementation summary.* Stop TB Partnership.

Taylor, C. R. (2017). The total test approach to immunohistochemistry. *Applied Immunohistochemistry & Molecular Morphology, 25*(6), 381–384.

UNITAID. (2020). *Market and technology landscape: Point-of-care diagnostics.* UNITAID.

United Nations Development Programme. (2020). *Procurement and supply chain guidance for health commodities (laboratory reagents/IVDs).* United Nations Development Programme.

USAID-DELIVER PROJECT. (2013). *Laboratory commodities supply chain management guide.* USAID-DELIVER PROJECT.

Venter, F., Ford, N., Vitoria, M., & Stevens, W. (2014). Scale-up of HIV viral load monitoring: Lessons and laboratory system implications. *Journal of the International AIDS Society, 17*, 19175.

Vojnov, L., Taegtmeyer, M., Boeke, C., *et al*. (2016). Impact of HIV viral load scale-up on laboratory systems and results delivery. *Journal of the International AIDS Society, 19*(1), 20918.

Wagar, E. A., Friedberg, R. C., Souers, R., & Stankovic, A. K. (2007). Critical values policies and practices in U.S. laboratories. *Archives of Pathology & Laboratory Medicine, 131*(8), 1219–1224.

Westgard, J. O. (2006). *Six Sigma quality design and control (2nd ed.).* Westgard QC.

Westgard, J. O., & Westgard, S. A. (2014). *Basic quality management systems: Essentials for quality management in the medical laboratory.* Westgard QC.

Westgard, J. O., Barry, P. L., Hunt, M. R., & Groth, T. (1981). A multi-rule Shewhart chart for quality control in clinical chemistry. *Clinical Chemistry, 27*(3), 493–501.

Wilson, M. L., Fleming, K. A., Kuti, M. A., *et al*. (2018). Access to pathology and laboratory medicine services: A crucial gap. *The Lancet, 391*(10133), 1927–1938.

World Health Organization Regional Office for Africa. (2015). *SLIPTA checklist version 2:2015 for clinical and public health laboratories.* World Health Organization Regional Office for Africa.

World Health Organization Regional Office for Africa. (2015). *WHO guide for the stepwise laboratory improvement process towards accreditation (SLIPTA) in the African Region.* World Health Organization Regional Office for Africa.

World Health Organization. (2003). *Guide to establishing laboratory-based surveillance for antimicrobial resistance.* World Health Organization.

World Health Organization. (2011). *Laboratory quality management system: Handbook.* World Health Organization.

World Health Organization. (2015). *Global antimicrobial resistance surveillance system (GLASS) manual.* World Health Organization.

World Health Organization. (2016). *International health regulations (2005) (3rd ed.).* World Health Organization.

World Health Organization. (2016). *WHO manual for organizing a national external quality assessment programme for health laboratories.* World Health Organization.

World Health Organization. (2017). *Guidance on regulations for in vitro diagnostic medical devices.* World Health Organization.

World Health Organization. (2018). *The selection and use of essential in vitro diagnostics (first essential diagnostics list report).* World Health Organization.

World Health Organization. (2019). *A guide to sustainable laboratory strengthening in LMICs (policy/technical guidance).* World Health Organization.

World Health Organization. (2019). *Integrated disease surveillance and response (IDSR) technical guidelines.* World Health Organization.

World Health Organization. (2019). *Policy brief: Enhancing the role of diagnostics in universal health coverage.* World Health Organization.

World Health Organization. (2020). *Laboratory biosafety manual (4th ed.).* World Health Organization.

World Health Organization. (2021). *The selection and use of essential in vitro diagnostics (updated report).* World Health Organization.

World Health Organization. (2022). *Global health sector strategy on HIV 2022–2030.* World Health Organization.

World Health Organization. (2023). *Global tuberculosis report 2023.* World Health Organization.

World Health Organization. (2023). *WHO model list of essential medicines (23rd list).* World Health Organization.

Yao, K., McKinney, B., Murphy, A., *et al*. (2010). Improving quality management systems of laboratories in developing countries: An innovative training approach to accelerate laboratory accreditation. *American Journal of Clinical Pathology, 134*(3), 401–409.

Yusof, M. M., & Arifin, A. (2016). Towards an evaluation framework for laboratory information systems. *Journal of Infection and Public Health, 9*(6), 766–773. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jiph.2016.08.014.