Efficacy of Pre-Donation Screening Tools in Reducing Adverse Reactions among Blood Donors: A Comparative Analysis

Fatemah A. Alanazi[1], Shaqra N. Al Yami[2], Ghada M. Alabdulrahman[3], Sarah A. Alanazi[4], Jehan H. Ben-Hyzam[5], Abdulmajeed A. Alyousef[6]

Health Affairs at the Ministry of National Guard

Abstract

Background: Pre-donation screening is essential for minimizing adverse reactions in blood donors, yet the efficacy of different screening protocols in preventing such reactions varies.

Objective: This study aimed to compare the effectiveness of three pre-donation screening tools in reducing adverse reactions among blood donors.

Methods: A total of 300 donors at a tertiary hospital were randomly assigned to one of three screening protocols: standard (Tool A), comprehensive (Tool B), or rapid (Tool C). Adverse reactions were monitored during and after donation. Statistical analysis was conducted to compare the incidence of reactions across groups.

Results: Comprehensive screening (Tool B) had the lowest incidence of adverse reactions (7%) and no severe reactions. Standard screening (Tool A) resulted in moderate reactions (13%), while rapid screening (Tool C) had the highest reaction rate (23%), including severe cases (3%).

Conclusion: Comprehensive screening was the most effective at reducing adverse reactions, though it required more time. A targeted approach, using comprehensive screening for high-risk donors, is recommended for optimizing donor safety.

Keywords: blood donation, pre-donation screening, adverse reactions, donor safety, screening protocols

Introduction

Blood donation is a critical component of healthcare systems, providing life-saving blood products to millions of patients worldwide. However, despite its importance, a significant challenge in blood donation is ensuring the safety and well-being of the donors themselves. Adverse reactions during or after blood donation, such as dizziness, fainting, nausea, or more severe complications, can discourage repeat donations and potentially reduce the overall donor pool (Thijsen and Masser, 2019). Therefore, implementing effective pre-donation screening protocols to identify high-risk donors is essential for minimizing these reactions and improving donor safety.

Pre-donation screening tools are designed to assess donor eligibility, identify risk factors, and reduce the likelihood of adverse events. These tools typically include medical history questionnaires, hemoglobin testing, blood pressure checks, and hydration assessments (Musel-Winn, 2019). While these screening

measures are standard practice in most blood donation centers, the effectiveness of each tool in preventing adverse reactions can vary, and there is a lack of comprehensive analysis comparing different screening protocols.

Previous studies have highlighted several factors that increase the risk of adverse reactions in blood donors. Younger age, low body weight, first-time donation status, and low hemoglobin levels have been associated with a higher likelihood of reactions such as vasovagal syncope or fainting (Cerhan et al., 2002). However, current screening protocols may not adequately capture all high-risk individuals, leading to variability in the incidence of adverse reactions.

This study aims to address the gap by conducting a comparative analysis of different pre-donation screening tools to determine their effectiveness in reducing adverse reactions. By evaluating the incidence of adverse events across various screening protocols, this research seeks to provide insights into which tools are most effective in identifying high-risk donors and enhancing overall donor safety.

Literature Review

Adverse Reactions in Blood Donation

Blood donation is a vital process for maintaining a sufficient supply of blood products, but it is not without risks for donors. Adverse reactions, such as dizziness, nausea, fainting (vasovagal reactions), hematomas, and in rare cases, more severe complications, can occur during or after donation. These reactions can negatively impact the donor's experience and reduce the likelihood of repeat donations, which is crucial for maintaining a stable donor pool (Thijsen and Masser, 2019). It is estimated that between 2% and 5% of blood donors experience some form of adverse reaction, with younger donors, first-time donors, and those with lower body weight being more susceptible to these events (Thijsen and Masser, 2019).

Importance of Pre-Donation Screening

To minimize the risk of adverse reactions, blood donation centers routinely employ pre-donation screening tools. These tools aim to assess a donor’s suitability by identifying risk factors that may predispose them to adverse reactions. Common screening tools include:

- Medical history questionnaires that screen for underlying health conditions.
- Vital signs assessments, such as blood pressure and pulse rate checks.
- Hemoglobin or hematocrit testing to assess the donor’s blood quality and prevent complications like anemia post-donation (Musel-Winn, 2019).

Each of these tools has been shown to be effective in identifying certain high-risk donors. However, the effectiveness of individual tools in reducing overall adverse reaction rates remains a subject of investigation. While hemoglobin testing can prevent donors with low hemoglobin levels from experiencing post-donation weakness, it may not address other risk factors such as anxiety or dehydration, which also contribute to adverse events (Cerhan et al., 2002).

Common Risk Factors for Adverse Reactions

Several studies have identified risk factors associated with an increased likelihood of experiencing adverse reactions during or after blood donation. Age and body weight have been consistently linked to higher reaction rates, with younger and underweight donors being more vulnerable to vasovagal reactions (Thijsen and Masser, 2019). Additionally, first-time donors tend to experience higher rates of adverse reactions

compared to repeat donors, potentially due to heightened anxiety or lack of familiarity with the process (Gillespie and Hillyer, 2002).

Research also highlights that donors with lower pre-donation blood pressure or those who are not properly hydrated may experience higher incidences of adverse reactions. These findings suggest that additional screening tools, such as hydration assessments or stress management strategies, could help reduce the incidence of adverse reactions in these groups (Thijsen and Masser, 2019).

Evaluation of Pre-Donation Screening Tools

Despite the widespread use of pre-donation screening protocols, there is a lack of comparative studies that evaluate the relative efficacy of these tools in reducing adverse reactions. Most studies focus on individual components, such as the impact of hemoglobin levels or body weight, rather than comparing comprehensive screening approaches (Musel-Winn, 2019). For example, hemoglobin testing alone, while valuable, may not capture other risk factors such as anxiety, dehydration, or low blood pressure.

Additionally, the effectiveness of pre-donation questionnaires can vary based on how well donors understand and respond to the questions. A study by Cerhan et al. (2002) highlighted that while questionnaires are useful for identifying pre-existing medical conditions, they are less effective at predicting donor anxiety or other factors that could lead to vasovagal reactions.

Potential Improvements in Screening Protocols

To enhance the safety of blood donation, several researchers have suggested improvements to existing screening protocols. One proposed enhancement is the incorporation of hydration status assessments, as proper hydration has been shown to reduce the likelihood of fainting or dizziness during donation (Thijsen and Masser, 2019). Additionally, using psychological screening tools to assess anxiety levels in first-time donors could help identify those at higher risk of vasovagal reactions, allowing for targeted interventions such as relaxation techniques (Thijsen and Masser, 2019).

Another area of interest is the use of rapid screening protocols, which aim to streamline the pre-donation process while maintaining safety standards. However, the challenge remains to balance efficiency with thoroughness, as rapid screenings may overlook some high-risk donors (Musel-Winn, 2019).

Gaps in the Literature

While the current literature provides insights into individual pre-donation screening components, there is a significant gap in studies that compare different combinations of screening tools to determine their overall efficacy in reducing adverse reactions. Few studies have explored the cumulative effect of combining medical history assessments with physical and psychological screening measures. This gap presents an opportunity for further research to assess which screening protocols offer the best balance between donor safety and operational efficiency.

This study aims to fill this gap by conducting a comparative analysis of different pre-donation screening tools to determine their effectiveness in identifying high-risk donors and reducing the incidence of adverse reactions. By examining the outcomes of different screening protocols, this research seeks to provide evidence-based recommendations for optimizing donor safety in blood donation centers.

Methodology

Study Design

This study utilized a comparative observational design to assess the efficacy of different pre-donation screening protocols in reducing adverse reactions among blood donors at Tertiary Hospital. The study was conducted over a period of six months. The three pre-donation screening protocols compared were:

1. Tool A: Standard screening using a medical history questionnaire and hemoglobin testing.
2. Tool B: Comprehensive screening, including medical history, hemoglobin testing, blood pressure measurement, and hydration assessment.
3. Tool C: Rapid screening consisting of blood pressure measurement and hemoglobin testing only.

The primary outcome was the incidence of adverse reactions during and immediately after donation, with a focus on identifying which screening tool was most effective at preventing such reactions.

Participant Selection

Participants in this study were voluntary blood donors at Tertiary Hospital, recruited through the hospital's blood donation center. The inclusion criteria were:

- Adults aged 18 and older, of all genders.
- First-time and repeat donors.
- Individuals who completed the pre-donation screening process.

Exclusion criteria included donors with known contraindications for blood donation (e.g., chronic anemia, recent surgeries) or incomplete pre-donation screenings.

A total of 300 donors were enrolled in the study. Donors were randomly assigned to one of the three pre-donation screening protocols. Each protocol group consisted of 100 participants, balanced by gender, age, and donor experience (first-time vs. repeat donors).

Data Collection

Data on adverse reactions were collected by trained staff during and after each donation. Adverse reactions were categorized into minor (e.g., dizziness, nausea, fainting) and severe (e.g., prolonged fainting, hematomas, or other significant complications requiring medical attention).

The data collection process involved:

- Pre-donation assessment: Donors were screened using one of the three protocols based on their random assignment. Relevant health information was documented.
- During donation: Trained personnel monitored donors for immediate reactions, including signs of distress, dizziness, or fainting.
- Post-donation monitoring: Donors were observed for 15 minutes following the donation, and any delayed reactions were recorded. Staff also noted how quickly donors recovered from any minor symptoms.

Each donor's adverse reactions (if any) were recorded in the hospital's blood donation system, along with demographic data such as age, gender, weight, and donation history.

Screening Tools

The following screening tools were compared:

- Tool A (Standard Screening): Medical history questionnaire assessing pre-existing conditions, medications, and lifestyle factors, combined with hemoglobin testing using a finger-prick blood test.
- Tool B (Comprehensive Screening): Includes the medical history questionnaire and hemoglobin testing as in Tool A, but also includes blood pressure measurement and a hydration check (e.g., encouraging donors to drink water before donating).
- Tool C (Rapid Screening): Only includes blood pressure measurement and hemoglobin testing without a medical history questionnaire.

Data Analysis

Data were analyzed using statistical software to compare the efficacy of the three screening tools in reducing adverse reactions. The incidence of adverse reactions was calculated for each screening protocol. The primary analysis included:

- Chi-square tests to compare the proportions of adverse reactions across the three groups.
- Logistic regression analysis to control for potential confounding variables, such as age, gender, and donor experience.
- Time efficiency analysis comparing the average duration of each screening process.

The analysis aimed to identify which screening tool had the lowest incidence of adverse reactions while considering the balance between donor safety and screening time.

Ethical Considerations

Ethical approval for this study was obtained from the ethics committee. All participants were informed about the study's purpose, and written informed consent was obtained prior to participation. Confidentiality was maintained by anonymizing donor data, and participants were informed of their right to withdraw from the study at any time without any impact on their donation status.

The study adhered to ethical guidelines for conducting research on human participants, ensuring donor safety throughout the process. If any donor experienced a severe adverse reaction, they were provided with immediate medical attention, and their data were removed from the analysis to protect their privacy.

Findings

The primary objective of this study was to compare the efficacy of three pre-donation screening protocols (Tool A: Standard Screening, Tool B: Comprehensive Screening, and Tool C: Rapid Screening) in reducing adverse reactions among blood donors. The findings are based on the analysis of data collected from 300 donors, equally divided among the three screening tools.

Participant Demographics

The demographic characteristics of the 300 donors are summarized in the table below:

Characteristic	Tool A (n = 100)	Tool B (n = 100)	Tool C (n = 100)	Total (n = 300)
Mean Age (years)	32.5 ±8.4	34.1 ±7.9	33.2 ±8.1	33.3 ±8.1
Gender (Male/Female)	55/45	52/48	57/43	164/136
First-Time Donors	38	40	35	113

Repeat Donors	62	60	65	187
Mean Weight (kg)	69.4 ±10.2	70.1 ±9.8	68.9 ±10.5	69.5 ±10.2

Incidence of Adverse Reactions

The incidence of adverse reactions was recorded and categorized as either minor (e.g., dizziness, nausea, fainting) or severe (e.g., prolonged fainting, hematomas). The total number of adverse reactions observed in each group is summarized in the table below:

Adverse Reactions	Tool A (n = 100)	Tool B (n = 100)	Tool C (n = 100)	Total (n = 300)
Minor Reactions	12 (12%)	7 (7%)	20 (20%)	39 (13%)
Severe Reactions	1 (1%)	0 (0%)	3 (3%)	4 (1.3%)
Total Reactions	13 (13%)	7 (7%)	23 (23%)	43 (14.3%)

- Tool A (Standard Screening) resulted in a 13% incidence of adverse reactions, with 12% being minor and 1% severe.
- Tool B (Comprehensive Screening) had the lowest incidence of adverse reactions at 7%, all of which were minor. No severe reactions were recorded in this group.
- Tool C (Rapid Screening) showed the highest rate of adverse reactions, with 20% minor and 3% severe reactions.

Time Efficiency

The average time required to complete the screening for each group is shown below:

Screening Tool	Average Screening Time (minutes)
Tool A (Standard)	10 minutes
Tool B (Comprehensive)	15 minutes
Tool C (Rapid)	5 minutes

- Tool C was the quickest, taking an average of 5 minutes per donor but also had the highest rate of adverse reactions.
- Tool B required the longest time (15 minutes) but resulted in the fewest adverse reactions.
- Tool A took 10 minutes on average and had a moderate incidence of adverse reactions.

Statistical Analysis

A chi-square test was performed to compare the incidence of adverse reactions across the three screening protocols. The analysis revealed a significant difference between the groups ($\chi^2 = 15.27$, $p < 0.01$), indicating that the choice of screening tool had a significant effect on the occurrence of adverse reactions.

Logistic regression analysis, controlling for age, gender, and donor experience (first-time vs. repeat donors), showed that Tool B (Comprehensive Screening) was significantly associated with a lower risk of adverse reactions compared to Tool C (Rapid Screening) (OR = 0.25, 95% CI [0.12–0.55], $p < 0.001$).

Summary of Findings
- Comprehensive Screening (Tool B) was the most effective at reducing adverse reactions, with only 7% of donors experiencing minor reactions and no severe reactions.
- Rapid Screening (Tool C), while the fastest protocol, had the highest rate of adverse reactions, with 23% of donors affected, including 3% severe reactions.
- Standard Screening (Tool A) had a moderate rate of adverse reactions (13%) and was faster than Tool B but less effective in preventing reactions.

These findings suggest that while comprehensive screening is more time-consuming, it is significantly more effective at reducing adverse reactions, particularly severe ones.

Discussion

The findings from this study provide valuable insights into the efficacy of various pre-donation screening protocols in reducing adverse reactions among blood donors. By comparing three different screening tools—standard, comprehensive, and rapid—this study highlights the trade-offs between the effectiveness of adverse reaction prevention and the efficiency of the screening process. The results indicate that comprehensive screening (Tool B) was the most effective at reducing adverse reactions, while rapid screening (Tool C) was the least effective, despite being the quickest method.

Efficacy of Screening Protocols

The comprehensive screening protocol (Tool B), which included medical history, hemoglobin testing, blood pressure measurement, and hydration assessment, was associated with the lowest incidence of adverse reactions (7%), and importantly, no severe reactions were recorded in this group. This finding aligns with previous research emphasizing the importance of detailed pre-donation assessments that evaluate multiple risk factors, including hydration status and blood pressure, which have been shown to mitigate the risk of vasovagal reactions (Thijsen and Masser, 2019). The results suggest that a more thorough evaluation of donor health and hydration is crucial for identifying high-risk donors and preventing even minor adverse reactions, which can have long-term effects on donor retention.

In contrast, rapid screening (Tool C), which relied solely on hemoglobin testing and blood pressure measurement, had the highest incidence of adverse reactions (23%), including the highest rate of severe reactions (3%). These results indicate that rapid screening may overlook key risk factors such as dehydration or anxiety, which can predispose donors to adverse reactions. The elevated rate of reactions in this group suggests that while rapid screening protocols may be time-efficient, they compromise donor safety, particularly in first-time donors or those with underlying health risks. This is consistent with the literature, which highlights the need for a comprehensive approach to donor screening, particularly for first-time donors who are more likely to experience adverse reactions (Cerhan et al., 2002).

Standard screening (Tool A), which included a medical history questionnaire and hemoglobin testing, resulted in a moderate incidence of adverse reactions (13%), with a low rate of severe reactions (1%). Although this protocol was more effective than rapid screening, it was still less effective than the comprehensive approach in identifying high-risk donors. The absence of blood pressure measurement and hydration assessment in this tool may account for the higher incidence of adverse reactions compared to Tool B. These findings suggest that while standard screening provides a reasonable balance between time efficiency and safety, the addition of more detailed health assessments can significantly improve donor outcomes.

Trade-Off Between Time Efficiency and Donor Safety

A critical finding of this study is the trade-off between time efficiency and donor safety. Rapid screening (Tool C) was the fastest method, with an average screening time of 5 minutes, but this speed came at the cost of a higher rate of adverse reactions. This protocol's simplicity, while appealing for high-volume donation centers, may not be suitable for ensuring donor safety, particularly when dealing with first-time or younger donors who are at a higher risk for vasovagal reactions (Thijsen and Masser, 2019).

On the other hand, comprehensive screening (Tool B) took the longest time (15 minutes) but resulted in the fewest adverse reactions, suggesting that investing additional time in the screening process can yield significant benefits in terms of donor safety. This finding aligns with Musel-Winn (2019), who argue that a more thorough screening process, while time-consuming, can enhance donor satisfaction and reduce post-donation complications, ultimately improving donor retention.

Standard screening (Tool A) struck a balance between time efficiency (10 minutes) and safety, with moderate success in reducing adverse reactions. While this protocol may be appropriate for repeat donors or in settings where a more streamlined approach is needed, the addition of hydration and blood pressure assessments, as seen in Tool B, may enhance its effectiveness in preventing reactions.

Implications for Blood Donation Centers

The results of this study have important implications for blood donation centers seeking to optimize both donor safety and operational efficiency. The comprehensive screening protocol proved to be the most effective at reducing adverse reactions, particularly severe ones, and should be considered as the standard for high-risk donors, such as first-time or younger donors. However, the longer time required for comprehensive screening may limit its practicality in high-volume donation settings.

For centers that prioritize throughput, standard screening may provide an acceptable balance between safety and efficiency, particularly for repeat donors who are less likely to experience adverse reactions. However, the findings suggest that implementing targeted screening—reserving comprehensive screening for high-risk donors and using standard or rapid screening for low-risk donors—may be an optimal approach.

Rapid screening protocols, while appealing for their efficiency, should be used with caution, particularly in populations at higher risk for adverse reactions. The findings suggest that while rapid screening may be suitable for low-risk donors, such as healthy, repeat donors, it should not be the default protocol for all donors.

Strengths and Limitations

One of the key strengths of this study is its comparative design, which allowed for a direct evaluation of different pre-donation screening tools in a real-world setting. The use of a diverse sample of both first-time and repeat donors enhanced the generalizability of the findings. Furthermore, the study's focus on both minor and severe adverse reactions provides a comprehensive understanding of the impact of different screening protocols on donor safety.

However, there are several limitations to consider. First, the study was conducted at a single tertiary hospital, which may limit the generalizability of the findings to other settings. Second, the sample size, while sufficient for identifying overall trends, may not capture all potential confounding factors, such as

psychological stress or hydration habits before donation. Future studies could explore these factors in more depth to further refine screening protocols.

Recommendations for Future Research

Future research should explore the long-term impact of comprehensive screening protocols on donor retention, as reducing adverse reactions could lead to improved donor satisfaction and a higher likelihood of repeat donations. Additionally, studies should examine the feasibility of personalized screening protocols, where donors are assessed based on their individual risk factors, such as age, weight, and donation history, to determine the most appropriate screening tool.

Further research could also investigate cost-effectiveness, balancing the financial and time costs of implementing comprehensive screening protocols with the potential savings from reduced medical interventions for adverse reactions. Finally, incorporating psychological assessments into screening protocols to evaluate donor anxiety levels could offer new insights into preventing vasovagal reactions, particularly in first-time donors.

Conclusion

This study demonstrates that comprehensive pre-donation screening protocols are the most effective in reducing adverse reactions among blood donors, although they require more time and resources than rapid or standard protocols. While rapid screening may be suitable for low-risk donors, it poses a higher risk of adverse reactions in the general donor population. Blood donation centers should consider adopting a targeted approach, using comprehensive screening for high-risk donors and standard screening for low-risk donors, to optimize both safety and efficiency. Future research should focus on the long-term benefits of comprehensive screening and explore innovative ways to balance donor safety with operational needs.

References:

1. Thijsen, A., &Masser, B. (2019). Vasovagal reactions in blood donors: risks, prevention and management. *Transfusion Medicine*, *29*, 13-22.
2. Musel-Winn, J. R. (2019). *Predicting the blood donor population during a natural disaster event*. Texas Woman's University.
3. Cerhan, J. R., Saag, K. G., Criswell, L. A., Merlino, L. A., &Mikuls, T. R. (2002). Blood transfusion, alcohol use, and anthropometric risk factors for rheumatoid arthritis in older women. *The Journal of Rheumatology*, *29*(2), 246-254.
4. Gillespie, T. W., & Hillyer, C. D. (2002). Blood donors and factors impacting the blood donation decision. *Transfusion medicine reviews*, *16*(2), 115-130.