IgG Against Dengue Virus in Healthy Blood Donors, Zanzibar, Tanzania

Francesco Vairo, Emanuele Nicastri, Salma Masauni Yussuf, Angela Cannas, Silvia Meschi, Mwanakheir AA Mahmoud, Azza H. Mohamed, Paul Mohamed Maiko, Pasquale De Nardo, Nazario Bevilacqua, Concetta Castilletti, Antonino Di Caro, Vincenzo Racalbuto, and Giuseppe Ippolito

We conducted a seroprevalence survey among 500 healthy adult donors at Zanzibar National Blood Transfusion Services. Dengue virus IgG seroprevalence was 50.6% and independently associated with age and urban residence. These data will aid in building a surveillance, preparedness, and response plan for dengue virus infections in the Zanzibar Archipelago.

In eastern Africa, the available evidence indicates that dengue virus serotypes 1, 2, and 3 (DENV-1, -2, -3) are common causes of acute fever (*I*). A recent map of DENV transmission has shown that the virus could be transmitted in most eastern African countries, including mainland Tanzania and the Zanzibar Archipelago (*2*).

In 2010, a PROMED report raised concerns about DENV infections in Tanzania (3). That same year, travelers from Europe and Japan were found to be infected with DENV-3 after they returned from mainland Tanzania or Zanzibar (4–6). In Tanzania, seroprevalence rates for febrile outpatients in Tosomaganga (Iringa Region) and Pemba Island (Zanzibar) in 2007 (7) and in Moshi (Arusha Region) in 2007–2008 (8) were 1.8%, 7.7%, and 10.7%, respectively. To determine DENV circulation in the Zanzibar Archipelago, we assessed the seroprevalence of DENV among adult blood donors at the Zanzibar National Blood Transfusion Services (ZNBTS).

Author affiliations: "L. Spallanzani" National Institute for Infectious Diseases, Rome, Italy (F. Vairo, E. Nicastri, A. Cannas, S. Meschi, P. De Nardo, N. Bevilacqua, C. Castilletti, A. Di Caro, G. Ippolito); Directorate General of Development Cooperation, Rome (F. Vairo, V. Racalbuto); Ministry of Health, Unguja, Zanzibar, Tanzania (M.A.A. Mahmoud, A.H. Mohamed, S.M. Yussuf); and Mnazi Mmoja Hospital, Unguja, Tanzania (P.M. Maiko)

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.3201/eid2003.130150

The Study

We conducted a cross-sectional seroprevalence survey at ZNBTS from September 20 to December 10, 2011. ZNBTS is located in Stone Town, the principal city of the Zanzibar Archipelago. Ethics approval was obtained from the Zanzibar Medical Research Ethical Committee. The sample size was calculated by using methods for proportion. The estimated prevalence was set at 50% because data were not available regarding the true prevalence of the infection in the area. Considering a population of $\approx 1,000,000$ inhabitants and a confidence level of 95%, the sample size was set at 384 donors. Sample size was then increased to 500 donors to account for those lost to follow-up.

During the study period, all consecutive adult donors attending ZNBTS, who had been screened and selected for blood donation, were enrolled in the study. Donors were screened by serologic tests for hepatitis B virus, hepatitis C virus, HIV, and *Trepomena pallidum*; they were selected for blood donation if results of all screening tests were negative. A structured interview was conducted by using a close-ended questionnaire after the donor signed the informed consent form and before the screening.

From each enrolled person, 10 mL of venous blood was collected. After the screening tests, the remaining serum was divided into 2 aliquots: 1 was stored at -20°C at the sample processing site for performance of the IgG ELISA at Mnazi Mmoja Hospital in Unguja, Zanzibar, and 1 was dispatched to the L. Spallanzani National Institute for Infectious Diseases in Rome, Italy, for testing by immunofluorescence assay (IFA) for IgG. At the end of the collection phase, samples were tested by Panbio Dengue IgG Indirect ELISA kit (Inverness Medical Innovations Australia Pty Ltd, Sinnamon Park, Queensland, Australia) according to the manufacturer's instructions. A positive ELISA result was defined as having an index value >1.1. To compensate for the low specificity of the ELISA, we tested samples by IFA with homemade slides and a mix of uninfected and DENV-2 (New Guinea C strain)-infected Vero E6 cells. The diagnostic accuracy of the IFA has been described (9).

Donors were considered positive for IgG against DENV if results of both tests were positive. Discordant results were considered negative. All districts except the urban district were considered rural areas. Univariate association between DENV IgG positivity and donor characteristics was assessed by means of odds ratios (ORs) and 95% CIs, by χ^2 for categorical values, and Student t-test for continuous variables. A multiple logistic regression model using a backward procedure was used. All variables were entered in the backward selection model, and a cutoff level of p = 0.10 was used for subsequent

Table 1. Univariate analysis of characteristics of 500 blood donors according to IgG positivity against dengue virus, Zanzibar, 2011*

Characteristic n = 253, no. (%) n = 247, no (%) Total, N = 500 OR (95% CI) p value Age, mean (±SD) 34 (±9) 30 (±8) 32 (±9) <0.001 Age, for 5-y increase† 1.32 (1.19–1.47) <0.001 Age, y 236 57 (39.6) 87 (60.4) 1444 1 255 81 (43.8) 104 (56.2) 185 1.19 (0.76–1.85) 0.444 26–35 115 (67.3) 56 (32.7) 171 3.13 (1.97–4.98) <0.001 Sex M 243 (50) 243 (50) 486 1 1 Work F 10 (71.4) 4 (28.6) 14 2.5 (0.77–8.07) 0.126 Work Yes 172 (52.4) 156 (47.6) 32.8 1 1 Yes 172 (52.4) 156 (47.6) 32.8 1 1 Yes 172 (52.3) 111 (46.2) 240 1.3 (0.88–1.93) 0.182 Persons in household 1-4 80 (47.1) 90 (52.9) 170 0.8 (0.55–1.16) 0.254		IgG positive,	IgG negative,	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	
Age, for 5-y increase†	Characteristic	n = 253, no. (%)	n = 247, no (%)	Total, N = 500	OR (95% CI)	p value
Age, y 236 57 (39.6) 87 (60.4) 144 1 525 81 (43.8) 104 (56.2) 185 1.19 (0.76-1.85) 0.444 26-35 115 (67.3) 56 (32.7) 171 3.13 (1.97-4.98) <0.001 Sex M 243 (50) 243 (50) 486 1 F 10 (71.4) 4 (28.6) 14 2.5 (0.77-8.07) 0.126 Work Yes 172 (52.4) 156 (47.6) 328 1 No 80 (47.1) 90 (52.9) 170 0.8 (0.55-1.16) 0.254 Persons in household 1-4 80 (47.1) 90 (52.9) 170 1 5-8 129 (53.8) 111 (46.2) 240 1.3 (0.88-1.93) 0.182 29 44 (48.9) 46 (51.1) 90 1.07 (0.64-1.79) 0.779 Bed net use Yes 146 (49.2) 15 (50.8) 297 1 No 107 (52.7 96 (47.3) 203 1.15 (0.80-1.64) 0.436 Insecticide-spraying home Yes 107 (53.5) 93 (46.5) 200 1 No 146 (48.7) 154 (51.3) 300 0.82 (0.57-1.17) 0.290 Flu No 213 (51) 205 (49) 418 1.09 (0.67-1.75) 0.719 Resting water; Yes 223 (50.7) 217 (49.3) 440 1 No 30 (50.8) 29 (49.2) 59 1.00 (0.58-1.73) 0.981 Water storage§ Yes 172 (48.3) 184 (51.7) 356 1 No 82 (56.9) 62 (43.1) 144 1.39 (0.94-2.06) 0.093 Area of living Rural 119 (39.4) 183 (60.6) 302 1	Age, mean (±SD)	34 (±9)	30 (±8)	32 (±9)		<0.001
\$\frac{236}{25}\$ \$87 (39.6) 87 (60.4) 144 1 26-35 115 (67.3) 56 (32.7) 171 3.13 (1.97-4.98) <0.001\$ \[\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc	Age, for 5-y increase†				1.32 (1.19-1.47)	<0.001
\$25	Age, y					
Ze-35 115 (67.3) 56 (32.7) 171 3.13 (1.97-4.98) <0.001 Sex M 243 (50) 243 (50) 486 1 F 10 (71.4) 4 (28.6) 14 2.5 (0.77-8.07) 0.126 Work 7es 172 (52.4) 156 (47.6) 328 1 0.0254 Persons in household 1.4 80 (47.1) 90 (52.9) 170 0.8 (0.55-1.16) 0.254 Persons in household 1.4 80 (47.1) 90 (52.9) 170 1 1 5-8 129 (53.8) 111 (46.2) 240 1.3 (0.88-1.93) 0.182 29 44 (48.9) 46 (51.1) 90 1.07 (0.64-1.79) 0.779 1 1 5-8 129 (53.8) 111 (46.2) 240 1.3 (0.88-1.93) 0.182 29 44 (48.9) 46 (51.1) 90 1.07 (0.64-1.79) 0.779 1 0.779 1 0.00 1.07 (52.7 96 (47.3) 203 1.15 (0.80-1.64) 0.436 1.08 0.436 1 0.436 1.08 0.09	≥36		87 (60.4)	144	1	
Sex M 243 (50) 243 (50) 486 1 F 10 (71.4) 4 (28.6) 14 2.5 (0.77-8.07) 0.126 Work 79es 172 (52.4) 156 (47.6) 328 1 0.8 (0.55-1.16) 0.254 Persons in household 1.4 80 (47.1) 90 (52.9) 170 1 5-8 129 (53.8) 111 (46.2) 240 1.3 (0.88-1.93) 0.182 29 44 (48.9) 46 (51.1) 90 1.07 (0.64-1.79) 0.779 1 0.779 0	≤25	81 (43.8)	104 (56.2)	185	1.19 (0.76–1.85)	0.444
M F F 243 (50) 10 (71.4) 243 (50) 4 (28.6) 486 1 2.5 (0.77-8.07) 0.126 Work Yes 172 (52.4) 50.4 156 (47.6) 156 (47.6) 328 328 328 328 1 1 0.254 Persons in household 1-4 80 (47.1) 90 (52.9) 170 1 1 1 5-8 129 (53.8) 111 (46.2) 240 1.3 (0.88-1.93) 0.182 29 44 (48.9) 46 (51.1) 90 1.07 (0.64-1.79) 0.779 0.779 Bed net use Yes 146 (49.2) 151 (50.8) 297 1 1 0 0 0 0.436 Insecticide-spraying home Yes 107 (53.5) 93 (46.5) 200 1 297 1 1 0 0 0 0.436 Flu Yes 40 (48.8) 42 (51.2) 300 0.82 (0.57-1.17) 0.290 154 (51.3) 300 0.82 (0.57-1.17) 0.290 0 1 0	26–35	115 (67.3)	56 (32.7)	171	3.13 (1.97-4.98)	<0.001
F	Sex					
Work Yes 172 (52.4) 156 (47.6) 328 1 No 80 (47.1) 90 (52.9) 170 0.8 (0.55-1.16) 0.254 Persons in household 1-4 80 (47.1) 90 (52.9) 170 1 1 5-8 129 (53.8) 111 (46.2) 240 1.3 (0.88-1.93) 0.182 29 44 (48.9) 46 (51.1) 90 1.07 (0.64-1.79) 0.779 0.779 Bed net use Yes 146 (49.2) 151 (50.8) 297 1 1 0.436		243 (50)	243 (50)		1	
Yes No 172 (52.4) 80 (47.1) 156 (47.6) 90 (52.9) 328 170 1 2 2 2 2 2 328 170 1 2 2 4 80 (47.1) 90 (52.9) 170 170 0.8 (0.55-1.16) 0.254 0.254 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 1 1 1 2 2 2 2 1 1 1 2 2 2 4 1 3 0.88-1.93) 0.182 0.182 2 2 4 1.3 (0.88-1.93) 0.182 0.182 2 9 4 4 4.8.9) 46 (51.1) 90 1.07 (0.64-1.79) 0.779 0.779 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 1 1 1 2 1 2 1 1 1 1 2 1 1 2 2 1 1 2 2 2 1 3 2 1 3 2 1 3 2 3 4 2	F	10 (71.4)	4 (28.6)	14	2.5 (0.77-8.07)	0.126
No 80 (47.1) 90 (52.9) 170 0.8 (0.55-1.16) 0.254 Persons in household 1.4 80 (47.1) 90 (52.9) 170 1 5-8 129 (53.8) 111 (46.2) 240 1.3 (0.88-1.93) 0.182 ≥9 44 (48.9) 46 (51.1) 90 1.07 (0.64-1.79) 0.779 Bed net use 7 (52.7) 96 (47.3) 297 1 1 No 107 (52.7) 96 (47.3) 203 1.15 (0.80-1.64) 0.436 Insecticide-spraying home Yes 107 (53.5) 93 (46.5) 200 1 No No 146 (48.7) 154 (51.3) 300 0.82 (0.57-1.17) 0.290 Flu Yes 40 (48.8) 42 (51.2) 82 1 Yes 40 (48.8) 42 (51.2) 82 1 No 213 (51) 205 (49) 418 1.09 (0.67-1.75) 0.719 Resting water‡ Yes 223 (50.7) 217 (49.3) 440 1 1	Work					
Persons in household 1-4	Yes	172 (52.4)	156 (47.6)	328	1	
1-4 80 (47.1) 90 (52.9) 170 1 5-8 129 (53.8) 111 (46.2) 240 1.3 (0.88-1.93) 0.182 ≥9 44 (48.9) 46 (51.1) 90 1.07 (0.64-1.79) 0.779 Bed net use Yes 146 (49.2) 151 (50.8) 297 1 No 107 (52.7 96 (47.3) 203 1.15 (0.80-1.64) 0.436 Insecticide-spraying home Yes 107 (53.5) 93 (46.5) 200 1 No 146 (48.7) 154 (51.3) 300 0.82 (0.57-1.17) 0.290 Flu Yes 40 (48.8) 42 (51.2) 82 1 No 213 (51) 205 (49) 418 1.09 (0.67-1.75) 0.719 Resting water‡ Yes 223 (50.7) 217 (49.3) 440 1 No 30 (50.8) 29 (49.2) 59 1.00 (0.58-1.73) 0.981 Water storage§ Yes 172 (48.3) 184 (51.7) 356 1 No 82 (56.9) 62 (43.1) 144 1.39 (0.94-2.06) 0.093 Area of living Rural 119 (39.4) 183 (60.6) 302 1	No	80 (47.1)	90 (52.9)	170	0.8 (0.55-1.16)	0.254
5-8	Persons in household					
≥9 44 (48.9) 46 (51.1) 90 1.07 (0.64-1.79) 0.779 Bed net use Yes 146 (49.2) 151 (50.8) 297 1 No 107 (52.7 96 (47.3) 203 1.15 (0.80-1.64) 0.436 Insecticide-spraying home Yes 107 (53.5) 93 (46.5) 200 1 No 146 (48.7) 154 (51.3) 300 0.82 (0.57-1.17) 0.290 Flu Yes 40 (48.8) 42 (51.2) 82 1 No 213 (51) 205 (49) 418 1.09 (0.67-1.75) 0.719 Resting water‡ Yes 223 (50.7) 217 (49.3) 440 1 No 30 (50.8) 29 (49.2) 59 1.00 (0.58-1.73) 0.981 Water storage§ Yes 172 (48.3) 184 (51.7) 356 1 No 82 (56.9) 62 (43.1) 144 1.39 (0.94-2.06) 0.093 Area of living Rural 119 (39.4) 183 (60.6) 302 1		80 (47.1)	90 (52.9)	170	1	
Bed net use Yes 146 (49.2) 151 (50.8) 297 1 No 107 (52.7 96 (47.3) 203 1.15 (0.80-1.64) 0.436 Insecticide-spraying home Yes 107 (53.5) 93 (46.5) 200 1 No 146 (48.7) 154 (51.3) 300 0.82 (0.57-1.17) 0.290 Flu Yes 40 (48.8) 42 (51.2) 82 1 1 0.719 0.719 Resting water‡ Yes 223 (50.7) 217 (49.3) 440 1 0.981 0.981 Water storage§ Yes 172 (48.3) 184 (51.7) 356 1 1 0.993 Area of living Rural 119 (39.4) 183 (60.6) 302 1 1	5–8	129 (53.8)	111 (46.2)	240	1.3 (0.88-1.93)	0.182
Yes 146 (49.2) 151 (50.8) 297 1 No 107 (52.7) 96 (47.3) 203 1.15 (0.80-1.64) 0.436 Insecticide-spraying home Yes 107 (53.5) 93 (46.5) 200 1 No 146 (48.7) 154 (51.3) 300 0.82 (0.57-1.17) 0.290 Flu Yes 40 (48.8) 42 (51.2) 82 1 1 No 213 (51) 205 (49) 418 1.09 (0.67-1.75) 0.719 Resting water‡ Yes 223 (50.7) 217 (49.3) 440 1 No 30 (50.8) 29 (49.2) 59 1.00 (0.58-1.73) 0.981 Water storage§ Yes 172 (48.3) 184 (51.7) 356 1 No 82 (56.9) 62 (43.1) 144 1.39 (0.94-2.06) 0.093 Area of living Rural 119 (39.4) 183 (60.6) 302 1	<u>></u> 9	44 (48.9)	46 (51.1)	90	1.07 (0.64–1.79)	0.779
No 107 (52.7 96 (47.3) 203 1.15 (0.80-1.64) 0.436 Insecticide-spraying home Yes 107 (53.5) 93 (46.5) 200 1 No 146 (48.7) 154 (51.3) 300 0.82 (0.57-1.17) 0.290 Flu Yes 40 (48.8) 42 (51.2) 82 1 1 No No 213 (51) 205 (49) 418 1.09 (0.67-1.75) 0.719 0.719 Resting water‡ Yes 223 (50.7) 217 (49.3) 440 1 1 No 0.981 Water storage§ Yes 172 (48.3) 184 (51.7) 356 1 1 No No 82 (56.9) 62 (43.1) 144 1.39 (0.94-2.06) 0.093 Area of living Rural 119 (39.4) 183 (60.6) 302 1 1	Bed net use					
Insecticide-spraying home Yes 107 (53.5) 93 (46.5) 200 1 No 146 (48.7) 154 (51.3) 300 0.82 (0.57–1.17) 0.290 Flu Yes 40 (48.8) 42 (51.2) 82 1 No 213 (51) 205 (49) 418 1.09 (0.67–1.75) 0.719 Resting water‡ Yes 223 (50.7) 217 (49.3) 440 1 No 30 (50.8) 29 (49.2) 59 1.00 (0.58–1.73) 0.981 Water storage§ Yes 172 (48.3) 184 (51.7) 356 1 No 82 (56.9) 62 (43.1) 144 1.39 (0.94–2.06) 0.093 Area of living Rural 119 (39.4) 183 (60.6) 302 1	Yes	146 (49.2)	151 (50.8)	297	1	
Yes 107 (53.5) 93 (46.5) 200 1 No 146 (48.7) 154 (51.3) 300 0.82 (0.57-1.17) 0.290 Flu Yes 40 (48.8) 42 (51.2) 82 1 </td <td>No</td> <td>107 (52.7</td> <td>96 (47.3)</td> <td>203</td> <td>1.15 (0.80-1.64)</td> <td>0.436</td>	No	107 (52.7	96 (47.3)	203	1.15 (0.80-1.64)	0.436
No 146 (48.7) 154 (51.3) 300 0.82 (0.57-1.17) 0.290 Flu Yes 40 (48.8) 42 (51.2) 82 1 No 213 (51) 205 (49) 418 1.09 (0.67-1.75) 0.719 Resting water‡ Yes 223 (50.7) 217 (49.3) 440 1 1 No 30 (50.8) 29 (49.2) 59 1.00 (0.58-1.73) 0.981 Water storage§ Yes 172 (48.3) 184 (51.7) 356 1 1 No 82 (56.9) 62 (43.1) 144 1.39 (0.94-2.06) 0.093 Area of living Rural 119 (39.4) 183 (60.6) 302 1	Insecticide-spraying home					
Flu Yes	Yes	107 (53.5)	93 (46.5)	200	1	
Yes 40 (48.8) 42 (51.2) 82 1 No 213 (51) 205 (49) 418 1.09 (0.67-1.75) 0.719 Resting water‡ Yes 223 (50.7) 217 (49.3) 440 1 No 30 (50.8) 29 (49.2) 59 1.00 (0.58-1.73) 0.981 Water storage§ Yes 172 (48.3) 184 (51.7) 356 1 No 82 (56.9) 62 (43.1) 144 1.39 (0.94-2.06) 0.093 Area of living Rural 119 (39.4) 183 (60.6) 302 1	No	146 (48.7)	154 (51.3)	300	0.82 (0.57-1.17)	0.290
No 213 (51) 205 (49) 418 1.09 (0.67-1.75) 0.719 Resting water‡ Yes 223 (50.7) 217 (49.3) 440 1 No 30 (50.8) 29 (49.2) 59 1.00 (0.58-1.73) 0.981 Water storage§ Yes 172 (48.3) 184 (51.7) 356 1 No 82 (56.9) 62 (43.1) 144 1.39 (0.94-2.06) 0.093 Area of living Rural 119 (39.4) 183 (60.6) 302 1	Flu					
Resting water‡ Yes 223 (50.7) 217 (49.3) 440 1 No 30 (50.8) 29 (49.2) 59 1.00 (0.58–1.73) 0.981 Water storage§ Yes 172 (48.3) 184 (51.7) 356 1 </td <td>Yes</td> <td>40 (48.8)</td> <td>42 (51.2)</td> <td>82</td> <td>1</td> <td></td>	Yes	40 (48.8)	42 (51.2)	82	1	
Yes 223 (50.7) 217 (49.3) 440 1 No 30 (50.8) 29 (49.2) 59 1.00 (0.58–1.73) 0.981 Water storage§ 7es 172 (48.3) 184 (51.7) 356 1 No 82 (56.9) 62 (43.1) 144 1.39 (0.94–2.06) 0.093 Area of living Rural 119 (39.4) 183 (60.6) 302 1	No	213 (51)	205 (49)	418	1.09 (0.67-1.75)	0.719
No 30 (50.8) 29 (49.2) 59 1.00 (0.58–1.73) 0.981 Water storage§ Yes 172 (48.3) 184 (51.7) 356 1 No 82 (56.9) 62 (43.1) 144 1.39 (0.94–2.06) 0.093 Area of living Rural 119 (39.4) 183 (60.6) 302 1	Resting water‡					
Water storage§ Yes 172 (48.3) 184 (51.7) 356 1 No 82 (56.9) 62 (43.1) 144 1.39 (0.94–2.06) 0.093 Area of living Rural 119 (39.4) 183 (60.6) 302 1	Yes	223 (50.7)	217 (49.3)	440	1	
Yes 172 (48.3) 184 (51.7) 356 1 No 82 (56.9) 62 (43.1) 144 1.39 (0.94–2.06) 0.093 Area of living Rural 119 (39.4) 183 (60.6) 302 1	No	30 (50.8)	29 (49.2)	59	1.00 (0.58-1.73)	0.981
No 82 (56.9) 62 (43.1) 144 1.39 (0.94–2.06) 0.093 Area of living Rural 119 (39.4) 183 (60.6) 302 1	Water storage§					
Area of living Rural 119 (39.4) 183 (60.6) 302 1	Yes	172 (48.3)	184 (51.7)	356	1	
Rural 119 (39.4) 183 (60.6) 302 1	No	82 (56.9)	62 (43.1)	144	1.39 (0.94-2.06)	0.093
	Area of living					
Urban 134 (67.7) 64 (32.3) 198 3.18 (2.21-4.69) <0.001	Rural	119 (39.4)	183 (60.6)	302	1	
	Urban	134 (67.7)	64 (32.3)	198	3.18 (2.21-4.69)	<0.001

^{*}OR. odds ratio.

selections. Data management and analysis were performed by using STATA version 11 (StataCorp, College Station, TX, USA).

Five hundred persons consecutively attending ZN-BTS were selected for blood donation and, therefore, were eligible to be enrolled in the study. Demographic characteristics of the participants are shown in Table 1. The mean age was 32 years; 97.2% of the participants were male. Most donors had a water storage container (71.2%) and/or resting water near their home (88.0%). Bed nets were used by 59.4% of the donors, but only 40% reported insecticide spraying at home.

Of the 500 blood samples, 253 (50.6%) were positive by both tests, 77 (15.4%) were positive by ELISA and negative by IFA, and 170 (34.0%) were negative by both tests. DENV IgG prevalence was 50.6% (95% CI, 46.2–54.9). Considering IFA as the reference standard, ELISA sensitivity and specificity were 100% and 68.8%, respectively. According to univariate analysis, DENV IgG-positive

donors were significantly more likely to be older (OR 1.32, 95% CI 1.19–1.47) and live in urban districts (OR 3.18 95% CI 2.21–4.69) compared with DENV IgGnegative donors (Table 1). According to multivariate analysis, older age (adjusted OR [AOR] 1.42, 95% CI 1.27–1.61) and living in an urban district (AOR 4.09, 95% CI 2.72–6.17) were independently associated with DENV IgG positivity (Table 2). Moreover, borderline evidence indicated an association of positivity with the presence of resting water near the home (AOR 1.66, 95% CI 0.99–2.76).

Conclusions

We found high DENV IgG seroprevalence (50.6%) in adult blood donors residing in the urban district. The presence of DENV IgG is independently associated with age and urban district residence. Our results, compared with the previous low prevalence rate (7.7%) detected on Pemba island and the Zanzibar Archipelagos in 2007 (7), suggest an endemic pattern of transmission of DENV

[†]Age, 5-y increase is defined as the odds ratio for every 5 years of increase.

[‡]Resting water is defined as any presence of water resting around the house (i.e., ponds, puddles).

SWater storage is defined as any container used to collect rain water with no mention of the size and type of container.

Table 2. Multivariable logistic regression model of odds of having IgG against dengue virus. Zanzibar. 2011*

igo against acrigae viras,	190 against deligae viras, Zarizibar, Zorr					
Covariate†	Adjusted OR (95% CI)	p value				
Age, for 5 y increase‡	1.42 (1.27–1.61)	<0.001				
Water storage§						
Yes	1					
No	1.66 (0.99–2.76)	0.053				
Area of living						
Rural	1					
Urban	4.09 (2.72-6.17)	< 0.001				

*OR, odds ratio.

†Also adjusted for sex, resting water.

‡Age, for 5-y increase is defined as the OR for every 5 years of increase. \$Water storage is defined as any container used to collect rain water with no mention of the size and type of container.

infection in Zanzibar, similar to the situation in other African countries (10). Considering the progressive reduction of laboratory-confirmed malaria cases in Zanzibar and the nonspecific influenza-like symptoms of DENV primary infections, this wide DENV circulation in Zanzibar appears to be largely underdiagnosed. Patients with primary DENV infection are likely to be mistakenly treated with antimalarial drugs on the basis of clinical symptoms, as we observed on Pemba (11).

We cannot determine when the donors in this study were infected. The strong association with age could be explained by the progressively longer exposure of the older donors to the risk for infection. This association could be also explained by the successful malaria vector control initiative (use of long-lasting insecticidal nets, indoor residual spraying and biolarviciding at mosquito breeding sites, and environmental management), which could account for the lower DENV prevalence in the younger population (12). Of note, in our study the proportion of persons who used bed nets and those who did not keep water storage containers near home was quite low.

However, before drawing firm conclusions, a few limitations must be described. First, a high proportion of participants were male. This may have been because of the low proportion of women who donate blood, a consequence of the cultural belief that women are weaker because of blood losses during menstrual periods and pregnancies. This explanation was reported by the workers at ZNBTS and is in accordance with results from a previous study on African immigrants (13). Our sample population was thus less representative of the general population and could have affected the results, either by underestimating or overestimating the inferred prevalence. Second, we did not attempt to detect DENV circulating serotypes in this study; nevertheless, there is evidence of DENV-3 circulation in previous reports about imported DENV cases in Europe and Japan (4-6). Third, no antibody neutralizing assay has been performed to rule out cross-reactions with other circulating flaviviruses, but epidemiologic data from Zanzibar do not indicate outbreaks of other flavivirus infections. Our data constitute the first step toward better defining the circulation of DENV in the Archipelago and toward building up a preparedness and response plan to fight DENV infection.

Acknowledgments

We thank all the staff at ZNBTS for their professional work. We also thank Pierluca Piselli for his valuable advice on data analysis.

The study was funded by the Italian Development Cooperation-Ministry of Foreign Affairs (financial and technical support) and the Ministry of Health "Ricerca Corrente–Istituti di Ricovero e Cura a Carattere Scientifico" (financial support).

Dr Vairo is chief of the Department of the "L. Spallanzani" Institute in Tanzania. His research activities are mainly focused on HIV, TB, and emerging infectious diseases.

References

- World Health Organization. Report of the Scientific Working Group on Dengue, 2006. TDR/SWG/08 [cited 2012 Nov 20]. http://www. who.int/tdr/publications/tdr-research-publications/swg-reportdengue/en/index.html
- Brady OJ, Gething PW, Bhatt S, Messina JP, Brownstein JS, Hoen AG, et al. Refining the global spatial limits of dengue virus transmission by evidence-based consensus. PLoS Negl Trop Dis. 2012:6:e1760.
- Klaassen B. Dengue/DHF update 2010 (23). Tanzania (Dar es Salaam). ProMed. 2010 May 17 [cited 2013 Apr 22]. http://www. promedmail.org, archive no. 20100517.1620.
- Ippolito G. Dengue—Italy ex Tanzania. ProMed. 2010 Jul 9 [cited 2013 Apr 22]. http://www.promedmail.org, archive no. 20100709.2304.
- Moi ML, Takasaki T, Kotaki A, Tajima S, Lim CK, Sakamoto M, et al. Importation of dengue virus type 3 to Japan from Tanzania and Côte d'Ivoire. Emerg Infect Dis. 2010;16:1770–2. http://dx.doi. org/10.3201/eid1611.101061
- Gautret P, Simon F, Hervius Askling H, Bouchaud O, Leparc-Goffart I, Ninove L, et al.; EuroTravNet. Dengue type 3 virus infections in European travelers returning from the Comoros and Zanzibar, February—April 2010. Euro Surveill. 2010;15:19541.
- Vairo F, Nicastri E, Meschi S, Schepisi MS, Paglia MG, Bevilacqua N, et al. Seroprevalence of dengue infection: a crosssectional survey in mainland Tanzania and on Pemba Island, Zanzibar. Int J Infect Dis. 2012;16:e44–6. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/ j.ijid.2011.09.018
- 8. Hertz JT, Munishi OM, Ooi EE, Howe S, Lim WY, Chow A, et al. Chikungunya and dengue fever among hospitalized febrile patients in northern Tanzania. Am J Trop Med Hyg. 2012;86:171–7. http://dx.doi.org/10.4269/ajtmh.2012.11-0393
- Scaramozzino N, Crance JM, Jouan A, DeBriel DA, Stoll F, Garin D. Comparison of flavivirus universal primer pairs and development of a rapid, highly sensitive heminested reverse transcription-PCR assay for detection of flaviviruses targeted to a conserved region of the NS5 gene sequences. J Clin Microbiol. 2001;39:1922–7. http://dx.doi.org/10.1128/JCM.39.5.1922-1927.2001
- Blaylock JM, Maranich A, Bauer K, Nyakoe N, Waitumbi J, Martinez LJ, et al. The seroprevalence and seroincidence of dengue virus infection in western Kenya. Travel Med Infect Dis. 2011;9:246–8. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tmaid.2011.06.005

DISPATCHES

- Nicastri E, Bevilacqua N, Sañé Schepisi M, Paglia MG, Meschi S, Ame SM, et al. Accuracy of malaria diagnosis by microscopy, rapid diagnostic test, and PCR methods and evidence of antimalarial overprescription in non-severe febrile patients in two Tanzanian hospitals. Am J Trop Med Hyg. 2009;80:712–7.
- World Health Organization. World malaria report: 2012. Zanzibar Country Profile [cited 2013 Oct 15]. http://www.who.int/malaria/ publications/country-profiles/profile_tz1_en.pdf
- Polonsky MJ, Renzaho AM, Brijnath B. Barriers to blood donation in African communities in Australia: the role of home and host country culture and experience. Transfusion. 2011;51:1809–19. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1537-2995.2010.03053.x

Address for correspondence: Francesco Vairo, "L. Spallanzani" National Institute for Infectious Diseases (INMI) Via Portuense, 292 00149, Rome, Italy; email: francesco.vairo@inmi.it

