Surveillance of Viral Hepatitis in Hong Kong - 2003 Update Report

Special Preventive Programme Centre for Health Protection Department of Health December 2004

THE SCIENTIFIC WORKING GROUP ON VIRAL HEPATITIS PREVENTION (SWGVHP)

About SWGVHP

The Scientific Working Group on Viral Hepatitis Prevention (SWGVHP) was formed by the Department of Health in 1992. It succeeded the work of the previous Scientific Working Group cum Advisory Committee on Hepatitis B Vaccination. Constituted by professionals in microbiology, public health and clinical fields, the SWGVHP has the following terms of reference:

- To keep under review local and international trends of viral hepatitis infection
- To advise the Government on the strategy on the prevention of viral hepatitis in Hong Kong.

Special Preventive Programme (SPP), Centre for Health Protection (CHP) of the Department of Health provides secretariat support to the SWGVHP.

Membership List

| Dr SS Lee, <i>JP</i> (Chairman) | Consultant, SPP, CHP, Department of Health |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Professor NK Leung, BBS, JP | Hon Consultant Paediatrician, Princess Margaret Hospital |
| Professor CL Lai | Professor, Department of Medicine, The University of Hong Kong |
| Professor John Tam | Professor, Department of Microbiology, Chinese University of Hong Kong |
| Dr WL Lim, <i>JP</i> | Consultant Medical Microbiologist, CHP, Department of Health |
| Dr Betty Young | Consultant Paediatrician, Pamela Youde Nethersole Eastern Hospital |
| Dr CK Lin | Hospital Chief Executive, Hong Kong Red Cross Blood Transfusion Service |
| Dr HY Lo | Consultant Physician, Queen Elizabeth Hospital |
| Dr KT Tse | Consultant, Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, Queen Elizabeth Hospital |
| Dr Nancy Leung | Hepatologist, Department of Medicine, Chinese University of Hong Kong |
| Dr ST Lai | Consultant Physician, Infectious Disease Division, Princess Margaret Hospital |
| Dr Thomas Tsang | Consultant (Community Medicine), Surveillance and Epidemiology Branch, CHP, Department of Health |
| Dr SL Leung | Principal Medical Officer, Family Health Service, Department of Health |
| Dr YY Ho | Consultant (Community Medicine), Food & Environmental Hygiene Department |
| Mr. Thomas Tam | Senior Pharmacist, Department of Health |

<u>Secretariat</u> Dr KH Wong Mr. MK Wong

Senior Medical Officer, SPP, CHP, Department of Health Senior Executive Officer, SPP, CHP, Department of Health

Correspondence

The Secretariat Scientific Working Group on Viral Hepatitis Prevention c/o Special Preventive Programme Office, 5/F Yaumatei Jockey Club Clinic, 145 Battery Street, Yaumatei, Kowloon, HONG KONG.

Telephone:(852) 2780 8622Facsimile:(852) 2780 9580

| Website: | www.hepatitis.gov.hk |
|----------|----------------------|
| E-mail: | hepatitis@dh.gov.hk |

Research Team

This report* was compiled by SPP, CHP of the Department of Health, on behalf of the SWGVHP. Ms Kathy LS Cheng collected, compiled and analysed the data, Dr. KH Wong and Dr. SS Lee wrote the report.

*pdf version of the report can also be downloaded from www.hepatitis.gov.hk.

CONTENTS

| | Page |
|--|------|
| The Scientific Working Group on Viral Hepatitis Prevention | 1 |
| Contents | 3 |
| Preface | 4 |
| Acknowledgements | 5 |
| 1. Commentary | 6 |
| Tabulated results of acute viral hepatitis under the disease notification system | 12 |
| Tabulated results of seroprevalence of hepatitis A and hepatitis E | 16 |
| 4. Tabulated results of seroprevalence of hepatitis B | 19 |
| 5. Tabulated results of seroprevalence of hepatitis C | 30 |
| Abbreviations | 33 |
| References | 34 |

PREFACE

At its 7th meeting on 15 May 1995, the Scientific Working Group on Viral Hepatitis Prevention (SWGVHP) deliberated on the issue of hepatitis surveillance in Hong Kong. The discussions in the meeting led to the suggestions of (a) maintaining a database on the seroprevalence of infective hepatitis in Hong Kong, (b) conducting regular epidemiological studies to supplement existing information on the different forms of infective hepatitis, and (c) alerting the Government, health care providers and researchers on the possible emergence of new epidemiological trends of viral hepatitis. Subsequently, in 1996, 1997, 2000, 2002 and 2003, local epidemiological data on viral hepatitis were collected and published in an "update report" series. The effort represented the first step towards a coordinated system in the description and dissemination of hepatitis surveillance information in Hong Kong.

This is the seventh report on viral hepatitis surveillance that brings updated information as of the end of 2003, for the information of health care professionals working on various aspects of viral hepatitis prevention. In this Report, a new format has been employed in the presentation of data. A commentary of the latest hepatitis epidemiology is followed by tabulated tables and figures categorized by types of hepatitis. Readers are reminded that this Report, similar to previous ones under the same series, is not a primary study but a collection of secondary data on the subject. The original papers and authors should be consulted in case of queries.

In the course of the preparation of the Report, we have received enthusiastic support from health professionals of different agencies. The publication of the Report would not have been possible without their input. We also reckon that the list in the Acknowledgements may not be exhaustive. Much as we tried to be accurate and concise, we are fully aware of the possibility of errors. We welcome criticisms, suggestions and comments of any kind. These would be important in helping us improve the quality of the next Report.

Secretariat Scientific Working Group on Viral Hepatitis Prevention December 2004

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The SWGVHP wishes to thank the following agencies for their input, suggestions or comments in the course of preparing the 2003 Update Report:

CHC-Group Medical Practice Chinese University of Hong Kong Department of Medicine, Princess Margaret Hospital Department of Microbiology, Princess Margaret Hospital Family Health Service, Department of Health Family Planning Association of Hong Kong Government Virus Unit, Centre for Health Protection, Department of Health Health Service of Baptist University of Hong Kong Health Service of City University of Hong Kong Health Service of Lingnam University Hong Kong Red Cross Blood Transfusion Service Pamela Youde Nethersole Eastern Hospital Special Preventive Programme, Centre for Health Protection, Department of Health Surveillance & Epidemiology Branch, Centre for Health Protection, Department of Health University of Hong Kong

1. COMMENTARY

Surveillance Mechanisms of Viral Hepatitis in Hong Kong

1. Similar to many other places worldwide, viral hepatitis is a notifiable disease in Hong Kong. Locally, voluntary reporting was started in as early as 1966 and, since 1974, the disease has become notifiable. However, it was not until 1988 that the reported cases are classified by viral etiology, namely hepatitis A, hepatitis B, non-A non-B hepatitis and unclassified hepatitis. Since 1996, non-A non-B hepatitis is further categorized into hepatitis C, hepatitis E and hepatitis (not elsewhere classified). Under the current reporting system, hepatitis A and B are defined by the presence of IgM anti-HAV and IgM anti-HBc respectively, whereas hepatitis C and E are diagnosed by positive tests for anti-HCV and anti-HEV.

2. Expectedly, virtually all of the reported cases are acute viral hepatitis. While the figures captured under the local system could be a good reflection of the acute disease burden of viral hepatitis, the extent of chronic infections resulting from some hepatitis, notably hepatitis B and C, has to be determined by other mechanisms. Insight of the epidemiology of various forms of hepatitis in Hong Kong can be achieved by an analytical interpretation of regular statistics collected by health care or other institutions, and the information generated from designated studies. This report presents the findings from collation and analysis of viral hepatitis data obtained from the disease notification system, service statistics as well as seroprevalence studies. Much hopeful that the local viral hepatitis picture can be painted accurately and fully, this is certainly limited by the nature and availability of data. The presence of biases in data per se and their interpretation need to be acknowledged in reading this report.

Changing Epidemiology of HAV and HEV

3. Hepatitis A virus (HAV) and hepatitis E virus (HEV) are both transmitted by faecal-oral route. Over the last decades, more data on hepatitis A relative to hepatitis E was available in Hong Kong. Hong Kong is of intermediate endemicity for HAV [1]. Since 1988 with the breakdown of reported hepatitis according to aetiologic agents, the largest epidemic of hepatitis A was in 1992, with over 3500 cases reported (Box 1). In the last decade, annual reported hepatitis A cases were in the range of 300 to 600. In 2003, the number of cases fell to just over 100 (Box 1). As hepatitis A is the biggest contributor to the reported viral hepatitis, the total reported number stroke a record low of 232 in 2003. During the SARS outbreak in the first half of 2003, the number of HIV and sexually transmitted diseases reports had also decreased. Nevertheless, unlike the detection of asymptomatic HIV-infected patients from screening, nearly all of the reported viral hepatitis were in symptomatic patients. One plausible contributing factor is the diminution of social activity, including dinning out, during the SARS period, which led to a reduction of HAV exposure in the community.

4. From the available data, prevalence of hepatitis A infection has been falling. The latest epidemiology of hepatitis A in the local general population can be derived from a study conducted in 2001 [2]. In this household study (Community Research Project for Viral Hepatitis 2001, CRPVH), anti-HAV positivity was less frequent (P<0.001) across all age groups among subjects >21 years [2], than subjects in the same age groups of another study conducted in late 1980s [3]. HAV prevalence has only increased insignificantly in every 10-year age groups of people aged 21-50 [2] when compared with their corresponding 10-year younger age groups [3], signifying an ageing cohort effect with no major infections in the last 10 years [2]. Similar conclusions can be drawn when comparing the late 1980s findings with those of a late 1970s study on local HAV seroprevalence [4]. Overall, these 3 studies suggested that age-specific prevalence of HAV has right-shifted in the last two decades. As of 2001, anti-HAV was present in about 20% of adults below 30 years old while it was over 80% in people aged >=40 in the general Chinese population (Box 5). Besides an increasing prevalence with higher age, people born outside Hong Kong were more likely to test positive for anti-HAV whereas the reverse was true for people of non-labour work [2].

5. Serologic evidence of HEV infection was found in about 19% of adult subjects in the 2001 CRPVH study; people in the 40-49 age group had the highest positivity rate of 24% (Box 6). Unlike HAV infection, a pattern of right shift in HEV seroprevalence was not as prominent when temporal change was analysed. Both the

overall and age-specific HEV prevalence were lower in 2001 [1], when compared with the findings in a study done in late 1980s [5].

Pattern of Hepatitis B in Various Communities

6. Similar to what was observed for HAV, the number of hepatitis B virus (HBV) infections notified in 2003 dropped, to a record low of 98. In a recently published study, over 30% of acute HBV infections reported between 2000 and June 2002 were attributable to unprotected sex, the most important identifiable risk factor amongst all [6]. If sexual contact is becoming a common mode of HBV transmission locally, the observed decline in reported cases of 2003 echoed the fallen attendance at government sexually transmitted disease clinics in the same year.

7. Determining the seroprevalence of HBV also sheds light on how common the infection is in different communities, as well as its chronic disease burden. The various adult communities can be categorized into 3 groups according to the risk of contracting HBV: those (a) without apparent risk, (b) with undetermined risk, and (c) with apparent risk. Groups <u>without apparent risk</u> for which data in 2003 was available include blood donors, university students/staff, pre-marital screening attendees, antenatal women, police officers and new health care workers. Clients coming forward for post-exposure management are those with <u>undetermined risk</u>. Drug users and HIV/AIDS patients are at <u>apparent risk</u> of getting HBV, as a result of risk behaviours and shared transmission routes between human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) and HBV.

8. A majority of the available seroprevalence data in different populations were limited to overall positivity rate of HBV markers. Still, temporal trend can be discerned as most have yearly data for the past decade or so. For groups with some demographic characteristics available, such as age and gender, further analyses have been made per the aggregate data. All of these groups having more data belong to the first category with no apparent HBV risk. Several features on the current pattern of HBV could be observed from the serologic investigations, namely (a) chronic HBV infection is in a general declining trend, (b) HBV prevalence increases with increasing age, and (c) chronic HBV infection is commoner in male than female. A word of caution in the interpretation of data, though, is that HBV testings have been performed for a variety of reasons in different communities, with heterogeneous mix of population characteristics.

9. The temporal decline of hepatitis B markers in most community groups without apparent risk was especially obvious in new blood donors and police officers, whose HBsAg rate in 2003 continued to fall to 3.23% (Box 7) and 4.6% respectively (Box 14). The drop was less prominent in antenatal mothers (Box 12) and newly recruited health care workers (Box 17). After several years of decline, there was a slight rebound of HBsAg rates in university students/staff (Box 10) and pre-marital package service users (Box 11) in 2003 and 2002 respectively. Compared with aforementioned groups, a higher HBsAg prevalence with or without evidence of higher positivity rate of any HBV markers were consistently noted in drug users (Box 19) and HIV-infected patients (Box 20), underscoring their infection risk. Furthermore, due to the underlying immunosuppression, HIV/AIDS patients are more prone to becoming chronically infected with HBV after acute infection [7]. Up to 2003, HBsAg was present at some 10-14% in these two groups of clients for the last few years, which was substantially higher than the 3.5-9% in other clients (Box 21, 22).

10. For some groups, evidence supported age as an important factor of HBsAg prevalence, with a higher proportion of the older population having markers of past infection or being chronically infected. From the 1996 to 2003 data in police officers, the presence of HBV markers progressively increased with each 10-year age group, from 28.6% in officers <=20 years old to 60.3% in officers aged 51-60 years (Box 15). In addition, there was a rise of HBsAg rate with increasing age in police officers, from 5.3% in <=20 years old to 9.4% in 51-60 years old subjects respectively (Box 15). Positive correlation of HBsAg positivity with age was also present in new blood donors of 2003, beyond the age of 30 (Box 8). Similar age pattern was, however, not observed in antenatal women, which showed more or less same HBsAg rate across reproductive ages (Box 13). Similarly, no definite age pattern can be derived from the household study of adult general population conducted in 2001 (Box 16).

11. Male had a higher HBV prevalence than female, as observed in several groups. Overall HBsAg positivity rate was 4.0% in male blood donors and 2.5% in female ones in 2003 (Box 8). Male police officers had a 4.9% HBsAg rate while that was 3.1% in female officers in 2003 (Box 14). From 1996 through 2003, the overall HBsAg rate was 6.9% and 4.1% in male and female police officers respectively (Box 14). Data from the same 8-year period also showed that the presence of HBV markers (anti-HBs or HBsAg) was higher at 39% in male than the 33.2% in female officers (Box 14). The overall HBsAg rate was also higher in male from the 2001 household study (Box 16).

12. Occurrence of new HBV infection is dependent on the interplay of multiple factors, including size of HBV pool, proportion of population being susceptible and chance of exposure to the virus. It is likely that the circulating pool of HBV has reduced over the years in Hong Kong, thereby lessening the risk of exposure which can lead to acute HBV infection. The reduced HBV pool in the community might have resulted from the ever-increasing vaccination coverage in adults (especially young ones), practice of universal precautions in health care settings, predonation blood screening and promotion of safer sex [6]. Nonetheless, the still high HBsAg prevalence, though declining, means a significant disease burden in the years to come. Continued tracking of the trends of new infections and prevalent cases could inform more of the changing HBV situation in our locality.

Current situation of hepatitis C

13. Although HCV shares similar transmission routes with hepatitis B, the two infections may not be of equal prevalence in a locality, as what epidemiological data point to in Hong Kong. While HBV is still prevalent in many populations in Hong Kong, HCV prevails only in isolated communities. Data from new blood donors in the last decade suggested that it is below 0.1% in young adults locally, with the figure in 2003 being 0.068% (95% confidence interval, 0.044%-0.100%) (Box 23). This is much lower than the prevalence of HAV, HBV and HEV. Findings of the household study of the entire spectrum of adult age groups conducted in 2001 further supported the relatively uncommon HCV infection in Hong Kong; the overall positive rate was 0.3% (95% confidence interval, 0.07%-0.94%) (Box 25).

14. Experience of clinicians and virologists has previously confirmed that HCV was common in injecting drug users, haemophilia and other patients requiring frequent blood/blood product transfusions [8]. Results of testing non-random samples from drug users under treatment suggested a decline in the rate of HCV infection from over 70% in 1991/1992 to below 50% in 2000/2001 (Box 26). HIV/AIDS patients, with a proportion being injecting drug users, is the only other group with data showing a comparatively high HCV prevalence (Box 27). The higher HCV prevalence, coupled with the hastened liver disease progression in HIV-infected patients [9], would no doubt result in a unique HCV/HIV coinfection that demands intervention. Limited genotypic studies in Hong Kong has identified that 1b, 6a and 1a were the commonest genotypes locally [10,11], a scenario different from that in western countries [12].

15. Since 2003, a surveillance project has been piloted to enhance understanding of the HCV situation in Hong Kong. Comprising laboratory and clinical reporting, the data was contributed by Hong Kong Red Cross Blood Transfusion Service and Department of Microbiology, Princess Margaret Hospital for the former, and Department of Medicine, Princess Margaret Hospital and Integrated Treatment Centre, CHP, DH for the latter. HCV prevalence in new and repeat blood donors in 2003 was 0.016% (Box 28). HCV antibody screening performed according to medical/clinical conditions or risk of infection at PMH showed an overall prevalence of 8.47%, with high rates occurring in patients who had frequent parenteral exposure (Box 28). The clinical cases reported in year 2003 were, however, too few for meaningful analysis.

2. Tabulated results of acute viral hepatitis under the disease notification system

| Box | Title | Source | Page |
|-------|---|--------|------|
| Box 1 | Number of cases of viral hepatitis reported to the Department of Health between 1966 and 2003 | DH | 13 |
| Box 2 | Reported viral hepatitis from 1966 to 2003 | DH | 14 |
| Box 3 | Breakdown of different types of reported viral hepatitis from 1996 to 2003 | DH | 15 |

| Y | 'ear | A | В | NANB | С | Е | Un- | Hepatitis (not | Total |
|---|---|--|---|--|------------------|--|---|---|--|
| | | | | | | | classified | elsewhere | |
| | | | | | | | | classified) | |
| 1 | 966 | | voluntary reporting since 1966 | | | | | | 386 |
| 1 1 1 1 1 1 | 967 968 969 970 971 972 973 | | | | | | | | 218 191 188 117 357 729 509 |
| 1 | 974 | | notifiable since | | | | | | 639 |
| 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 | 975 976 977 978 979 980 981 982 983 984 985 986 986 | | 1974 | | | | | | 1761 969 1008 1230 964 1554 1738 1814 1783 1780 1601 1425 1554 |
| 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 2 2 2 | 987 988 989 990 991 992 993 994 995 995 996 997 998 999 999 000 001 2002 | 1187 618 1362 1297 3626 874 557 491 264 595 474 426 505 494 267 107 | 250 136 178 150 157 116 112 102 144 100 145 152 137 134 121 98 | 465 154 183 200 301 203 125 55 - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - | - - - 4 | 11 4 16 8 11 26 28 19 | 496 324 261 154 273 80 41 18 - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - | 58 37 29 31 30 23 10 8 | 1554 2398 1232 1984 1801 4357 1273 835 666 477 736 664 617 683 677 430 232 |

Box 1. Number of cases of viral hepatitis reported to the Department of Health between 1966 and 2003 (Data source: DH)



Box 2. Reported viral hepatitis from 1966 to 2003 (Data source: DH)



Box 3. Breakdown of different types of reported viral hepatitis from 1996 to 2003 (Data source: DH)

3. Tabulated results of seroprevalence of hepatitis A and hepatitis E

| Box | Title | Source | Page |
|-------|--|------------------|------|
| Box 4 | Prevalence of anti-HAV in a collection of studies/testings between 1978 and 2003 | Multiple sources | 17 |
| Box 5 | Prevalence of anti-HAV in participants of Community Research Project for Viral Hepatitis (CRPVH) 2001 | DH | 18 |
| Box 6 | Prevalence of anti-HEV in participants of Community Research Project for Viral Hepatitis (CRPVH) 2001 | DH | 18 |

Box 4. Prevalence of anti-HAV in a collection of studies/testings between 1978 and 2003 (Data sources: Multiple sources.)

| Age groups | 1978 | 1987 | 1989 | 1993 | 1995 | 19 | 96 | 1998 | 2000 | 2001 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 |
|---------------|--------|--------|-------|-----------|--------|------|--------|---------------|-------|---------|-------|--------|---------|
| 0 – 10 | 12.9% | 5.3% | 6.8% | | 0 20/ | - | 6 1 % | 5 1 0/ | 0.20/ | 1 590/ | - | F 20/ | 10.2% |
| 11 – 20 | 44.8% | 17.1% | 11.2% | 59.4% (M) | 0.370 | 7.0% | 0.170 | 5.4 /0 | 9.570 | 4.50 /0 | 12.5% | 5.5% | 10.570 |
| 21 – 30 | 75.0% | 53.8% | 58.8% | 53.3% (F) | 11.3% | - | 11.8% | 7.6% | 17.5% | 13.2% | 26.8% | 12.6% | 13.2% |
| 31 – 40 | 82.9% | 85.1% | 83.5% | | 49.0% | - | 37.7% | 40.8% | 35.0% | 41.3% | 53.2% | 46.7% | 52.4% |
| 41 – 50 | 01 10/ | 04 70/ | 91.1% | 94.5% (M) | 70 50/ | - | E0 60/ | 66 70/ | 60.0% | 71 10/ | 88.3% | EO 10/ | 100.00/ |
| >50 | 91.170 | 94.7 % | 93.9% | 91.0% (F) | 70.5% | - | 50.0% | 00.7 % | 00.0% | / 1.170 | 97.7% | 30.1% | 100.0% |
| Data | Λ | В | C | П | F | F | F | E | F | E | G | E | F |
| source | ~ | ы | U | | | 1 | | Ē | | | 9 | Ē | Ľ |

Data sources:

- A. Study on left-over sera of 362 subjects, by Tsang et al of the University of Hong Kong [4]
- B. Study on stored sera of 702 healthy subjects, by Chin et al of the University of Hong Kong.[3]
- C. Study on 1028 serum samples collected from individuals attending a health exhibition, by Lim et al of Department of Health. [13]
- D. Seroprevalence results reported in the press by Lai et al of the University of Hong Kong. [14]
- E. Pre-vaccination screening on students and staff of City University of Hong Kong: 553 (1995), 669 (1996), 608 (1998), 395 (2000), 592 (2001), 371 (2002), students and staff of Baptist University of Hong Kong 240 (2001), 259 (2002), 153 (2003) and students and staff of Lingnan University 125 (2003). [15]
- F. Seroprevalence study in school children by Lee et al of the Chinese University of Hong Kong. [16]
- G. Community Research Project on Viral Hepatitis 2001

Box 5. Prevalence of anti-HAV in participants of Community Research Project on Viral Hepatitis (CRPVH) 2001 (Data source: DH)

| | | Anti-HAV +ve | | |
|-----------|-------------|--------------|------|--|
| Age group | INO. TESTEC | No. | % | |
| 18-29 | 137 | 27 | 19.7 | |
| 30-39 | 223 | 116 | 52.0 | |
| 40-49 | 291 | 248 | 85.2 | |
| 50-59 | 170 | 161 | 94.7 | |
| 60 & over | 115 | 113 | 98.3 | |
| All | 936 | 665 | 71.0 | |

Box 6. Prevalence of anti-HEV in participants of Community Research Project on Viral Hepatitis (CRPVH) 2001 (Data source: DH)

| A | No. Toolod | HEV +ve | | | |
|-----------|------------|---------|------|--|--|
| Age group | NO. TESTED | No. | % | | |
| 18-29 | 137 | 11 | 8.0 | | |
| 30-39 | 222 | 32 | 14.4 | | |
| 40-49 | 290 | 70 | 24.1 | | |
| 50-59 | 170 | 39 | 22.9 | | |
| 60 & over | 115 | 24 | 20.9 | | |
| All | 934 | 176 | 18.8 | | |

4. Tabulated results of seroprevalence of hepatitis B

| Box | Title | Source | Page |
|--------|--|---------------------------------------|------|
| Box 7 | Prevalence of HBsAg in new blood donors from 1990 to 2003 | HKRCBTS | 20 |
| Box 8 | HBsAg prevalence and its gender and age breakdown in first time blood donors in 2003 | HKRCBTS | 20 |
| Box 9 | New hepatitis B infection among repeat donors attending Hong Kong Red Cross Blood Transfusion Service, 2000 to 2003 | HKRCBTS | 20 |
| Box 10 | HBsAg prevalence among university students/staff | CUHC, BUHC & LUHC | 21 |
| Box 11 | HBsAg prevalence from the Premarital Package Service | FPA | 21 |
| Box 12 | HBsAg prevalence in antenatal women from 1990 to 2003 | FHS (DH) & Virus Unit (CHP, DH) | 22 |
| Box 13 | HBsAg prevalence and age breakdown of antenatal mothers | FHS (DH) | 22 |
| Box 14 | Prevalence of hepatitis B markers in police officers, by sex from 1996 to 2003 | DH | 23 |
| Box 15 | Prevalence of hepatitis B markers in police officers, by age from 1996 to 2003 | DH | 24 |
| Box 16 | Prevalence of HBsAg from the Community Research Project on Viral Hepatitis (CRPVH) 2001 | DH | 25 |
| Box 17 | Prevalence of hepatitis B markers in newly recruited health care workers from 2001 to 2003 | DH | 25 |
| Box 18 | Prevalence of hepatitis B markers in persons attending Therapeutic Prevention Clinic of ITC for post-exposure management, from July 1999 to 2002 | ITC (CHP, DH) | 26 |
| Box 19 | Prevalence of hepatitis B markers in drug users from 1990 to 2003 | Virus Unit (CHP, DH) | 27 |
| Box 20 | HBsAg prevalence in HIV/AIDS patients in 1998 and 2000-2003 | ITC (CHP, DH) | 27 |
| Box 21 | HBsAg prevalence in different population groups from 1990 to 2003 | Multiple sources | 28 |
| Box 22 | Trends of HBsAg in selected population groups from 1990 to 2003 | Multiple sources | 29 |

| Year | % HBsAg +ve | | |
|------|-------------|--|--|
| 1990 | 7.97 | | |
| 1991 | 8.04 | | |
| 1992 | 7.38 | | |
| 1993 | 6.70 | | |
| 1994 | 5.87 | | |
| 1995 | 5.99 | | |
| 1996 | 5.62 | | |
| 1997 | 5.20 | | |
| 1998 | 4.89 | | |
| 1999 | 4.44 | | |
| 2000 | 4.15 | | |
| 2001 | 3.98 | | |
| 2002 | 3.64 | | |
| 2003 | 3.23 | | |

Box 7. Prevalence of HBsAg in new blood donors from 1990 to 2003 (Data source: HKRCBTS)

| Box 8. HBsAg preva | alence and its gender and a | age breakdown in first |
|----------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| time blood donors in | n 2003 (Data source: HKRC | BTS) |

| | | Male | | Female | | | |
|-----------|------------|--------------|-------------|-----------|--------------|-----|--|
| Age Group | No tested | HBsAg | 0/ | No tested | HBsAg | 0/ | |
| Age Gloup | NO. LESLEU | No. positive | 5. positive | | No. positive | /0 | |
| 16-19 | 11849 | 327 | 2.8 | 11888 | 234 | 2.0 | |
| 20-29 | 3804 | 245 | 6.4 | 3496 | 146 | 4.2 | |
| 30-39 | 1408 | 63 | 4.5 | 1888 | 47 | 2.5 | |
| 40-49 | 770 | 59 | 7.7 | 1106 | 33 | 3.0 | |
| >49 | 241 | 21 | 8.7 | 282 | 15 | 5.3 | |
| Total | 18072 | 715 | 4.0 | 18660 | 475 | 2.5 | |

Box 9. New hepatitis B infection among repeat donors attending Hong Kong Red Cross Blood Transfusion Service, 2000 to 2003 (Data source: HKRCBTS)

| Year | No. of repeat donors | No. of infection | Incidence of infection (/100000) |
|------|----------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 2000 | 148366 | 14 | 9.4 |
| 2001 | 150420 | 14 | 9.3 |
| 2002 | 151410 | 7 | 4.6 |
| 2003 | 143230 | 6 | 4.2 |

Box 10. HBsAg prevalence among university students/staff (Data source: City University Health Centre (till 2002), Baptist University Health Centre (since 2001) & Lingnam University Health Service (since 2003)

| | Age | d below | 21 | Aged 21 - 30 | | | |
|-------|--------|---------|-------|--------------|----------|-----|--|
| Voar | Total | HBsA | \g+ve | Total | HBsAg+ve | | |
| i cai | no. of | No. | % | no. of | No. | % | |
| | cases | | | cases | | | |
| 1994 | 305 | 7 | 2.3 | 830 | 29 | 3.5 | |
| 1995 | 324 | 10 | 3.1 | 768 | 33 | 4.3 | |
| 1996 | 348 | 4 | 1.1 | 762 | 30 | 3.9 | |
| 1998 | 371 | 5 | 1.3 | 608 | 21 | 3.5 | |
| 2000 | 230 | 7 | 3.0 | 391 | 12 | 3.1 | |
| 2001 | 508 | 13 | 2.6 | 814 | 28 | 3.4 | |
| 2002 | 266 | 10 | 3.8 | 483 | 13 | 2.7 | |
| 2003 | 121 | 5 | 4.1 | 214 | 8 | 3.7 | |

| Box 11. | HBsAg prevalence | from the | Premarital | Package S | ervice (Data |
|---------|------------------|----------|------------|-----------|--------------|
| source: | FPA) | | | | |

| Year | Total no. of cases | HBsAg +ve | | | |
|------|-----------------------|-----------|-----|--|--|
| _ | | No. | % | | |
| 1990 | 17,251 | 1,659 | 9.6 | | |
| 1991 | 19,142 | 1,831 | 9.6 | | |
| 1992 | 18,445 | 1,708 | 9.3 | | |
| 1993 | 19,193 | 1,661 | 8.7 | | |
| 1994 | 16,466 | 1,210 | 7.3 | | |
| 1995 | 16,798 | 1,320 | 7.9 | | |
| 1996 | 19,959 | 1,575 | 7.9 | | |
| 1997 | 17,109 | 1,301 | 7.6 | | |
| 1998 | 13,163 | 897 | 6.8 | | |
| 1999 | 12,686 | 851 | 6.7 | | |
| 2000 | 15,348 | 862 | 5.6 | | |
| 2001 | 16,611 | 844 | 5.1 | | |
| 2002 | 15,077 | 1,033 | 6.9 | | |
| 2003 | 13,489 | 957 | 7.1 | | |

Box 12. HBsAg prevalence in antenatal women from 1990 to 2003 (Data source: FHS, DH and Virus Unit, CHP, DH)

| Voor | No. | HBsA | g +ve | | |
|------|--------|------|-------|--|--|
| real | tested | No. | % | | |
| 1990 | 31749 | 3574 | 11.3 | | |
| 1991 | 30075 | 3278 | 10.9 | | |
| 1992 | 31394 | 3391 | 10.8 | | |
| 1993 | 34221 | 3456 | 10.1 | | |
| 1994 | 32470 | 3247 | 10.0 | | |
| 1995 | 30962 | 3016 | 9.7 | | |
| 1996 | 31508 | 3072 | 9.7 | | |
| 1997 | 25892 | 2417 | 9.3 | | |
| 1998 | 24678 | 2223 | 9.0 | | |
| 1999 | 23934 | 2114 | 8.8 | | |
| 2000 | 19090 | 1701 | 8.9 | | |
| 2001 | 23373 | 2142 | 9.2 | | |
| 2002 | 22202 | 2005 | 9.0 | | |
| 2003 | 13513 | 1179 | 8.7 | | |

Box 13. HBsAg prevalence and age breakdown of antenatal mothers (Data source: FHS, DH)

| Year | No.1 | No. tested (% positive HBsAg) according to age group | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------|-------------|--|--------------|--------------|-------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | 15-19 | 20-24 | 25-29 | 30-34 | >34 | | | | | | | | | |
| 1990 | 1044 (10.3) | 4671 (13.4) | 15228 (10.7) | 7639 (12.6) | 2780 (12.9) | | | | | | | | | |
| 1991 | 987 (10.7) | 4620 (10.7) | 13151(10.4) | 8168 (11.5) | 3063 (11.8) | | | | | | | | | |
| 1992 | 928 (9.6) | 5065 (11.4) | 13093 (10.6) | 8788 (10.6) | 3470 (11.7) | | | | | | | | | |
| 1993 | 984 (9.0) | 5589 (10.5) | 12345 (10.3) | 9395 (11.6) | 3798 (11.0) | | | | | | | | | |
| 1994 | 951 (7.8) | 5723 (9.8) | 11590 (9.7) | 10158 (10.6) | 3998 (10.4) | | | | | | | | | |
| 1995 | 922 (8.4) | 4979 (9.7) | 10619 (9.6) | 10112 (9.8) | 4283 (10.3) | | | | | | | | | |
| 1996 | 842 (7.8) | 4765 (10.3) | 10137(9.5) | 9759 (9.5) | 5908 (10.6) | | | | | | | | | |
| 1997 | 902 (7.1) | 4207 (9.3) | 8895 (9.6) | 7982 (9.3) | 3897 (9.3) | | | | | | | | | |
| 1998 | 911 (5.8) | 3887 (9.2) | 8507(9.3) | 7418 (8.8) | 3851 (9.3) | | | | | | | | | |
| 1999 | 794 (7.7) | 3777 (8.6) | 8068 (9.3) | 7196 (8.2) | 3975 (9.3) | | | | | | | | | |
| 2000 | 618 (6.8) | 2974 (10.1) | 6466 (9.5) | 5818 (8.0) | 3192 (8.7) | | | | | | | | | |
| 2001 | 659 (7.3) | 3516 (9.5) | 8330 (10.1) | 6936 (8.3) | 3915 (9.0) | | | | | | | | | |
| 2002 | 484 (5.0) | 2829 (9.7) | 9120 (9.7) | 6351 (8.5) | 3414 (8.1) | | | | | | | | | |
| 2003 | 354 (4.8) | 1727 (9.7) | 4726 (9.6) | 4357 (8.0) | 2339 (8.2) | | | | | | | | | |

| | Male | | | | | Female | | | | | All | | | | |
|---------------|--------|------------------------|------|--------------------------|-----|--------|---------------|---------------|--------------------------|-----|--------|------------------------|------|--------------------------|-----|
| Year | No. | +ve for HBV markers | | +ve for HBsAg markers | | No. | +ve fo mar | r HBV kers | +ve for HBsAg markers | | No. | +ve for HBV markers | | +ve for HBsAg markers | |
| | lested | No. | % | No. | % | lested | No. | % | No. | % | lested | No. | % | No. | % |
| 1996 | 2080 | 878 | 42.2 | 138 | 6.6 | 413 | 128 | 31.0 | 15 | 3.6 | 2493 | 1006 | 40.4 | 153 | 6.1 |
| 1997 | 4227 | 1836 | 43.4 | 346 | 8.2 | 472 | 178 | 37.7 | 26 | 5.5 | 4699 | 2014 | 42.9 | 372 | 7.9 |
| 1998 | 2316 | 855 | 36.9 | 177 | 7.6 | 284 | 90 | 31.7 | 16 | 5.6 | 2600 | 945 | 36.3 | 193 | 7.4 |
| 1999 | 1399 | 517 | 37.0 | 93 | 6.6 | 322 | 108 | 33.5 | 17 | 5.3 | 1721 | 625 | 36.3 | 110 | 6.4 |
| 2000 | 1300 | 478 | 36.8 | 83 | 6.4 | 244 | 68 | 27.9 | 3 | 1.2 | 1544 | 546 | 35.4 | 86 | 5.6 |
| 2001 | 1058 | 399 | 37.7 | 69 | 6.5 | 221 | 84 | 38.0 | 6 | 2.7 | 1279 | 483 | 37.8 | 75 | 5.9 |
| 2002 | 1374 | 493 | 35.9 | 77 | 5.6 | 270 | 91 | 33.7 | 10 | 3.7 | 1644 | 584 | 35.5 | 87 | 5.3 |
| 2003 | 1415 | 458 | 32.4 | 69 | 4.9 | 259 | 79 | 30.5 | 8 | 3.1 | 1674 | 537 | 32.1 | 77 | 4.6 |
| 1996- 2003 | 15169 | 5914 | 39 | 1052 | 6.9 | 2485 | 826 | 33.2 | 101 | 4.1 | 17654 | 6740 | 38.2 | 1153 | 6.5 |

Box 14. Prevalence of hepatitis B markers in police officers, by sex from 1996 to 2003 (Data source: DH)

| | | | | | | | | Age grou | р | | | | | | |
|---------------|--------|----------------|---------|--------|---------|---------|--------|----------|---------|--------|---------|---------|--------|---------|---------|
| | | <u><</u> 20 | | | 21-30 | | | 31-40 | | 41-50 | | | 51-60 | | |
| Year | No. | % +ve | % +ve | No. | % +ve | % +ve | No. | % +ve | % +ve | No. | % +ve | % +ve | No. | % +ve | % +ve |
| | tested | for HBV | for | tested | for HBV | for | tested | for HBV | for | tested | for HBV | for | tested | for HBV | for |
| | | markers | HBSAg | | markers | HBSAg | | markers | HBSAg | | markers | HBsAg | | markers | HBSAg |
| | | | markers | | | markers | | | markers | | | markers | | | markers |
| 1996 | 9 | 33.3 | 0.0 | 741 | 29.3 | 4.7 | 1155 | 39.7 | 6.8 | 544 | 55.5 | 5.9 | 44 | 59.1 | 18.2 |
| 1997 | 9 | 55.6 | 11.1 | 1500 | 31.5 | 6.1 | 2081 | 42.2 | 7.3 | 999 | 58.2 | 11.4 | 110 | 69.1 | 13.6 |
| 1998 | 225 | 24.9 | 5.8 | 1131 | 30.2 | 5.6 | 828 | 39.1 | 8.3 | 356 | 52.8 | 12.4 | 60 | 58.3 | 6.7 |
| 1999 | 149 | 30.9 | 5.4 | 920 | 32.6 | 5.8 | 428 | 38.6 | 6.8 | 202 | 51.0 | 8.9 | 22 | 50.0 | 9.1 |
| 2000 | 29 | 31.0 | 6.9 | 789 | 30.3 | 6.2 | 460 | 35.7 | 4.3 | 242 | 50.4 | 5.8 | 24 | 50.0 | 4.2 |
| 2001 | 31 | 35.5 | 6.5 | 639 | 34.3 | 5.6 | 339 | 36.3 | 5.6 | 225 | 46.2 | 6.2 | 45 | 57.8 | 8.9 |
| 2002 | 63 | 39.7 | 6.3 | 779 | 30.2 | 4.7 | 443 | 33.2 | 3.6 | 307 | 46.6 | 9.1 | 52 | 65.4 | 3.8 |
| 2003 | 72 | 18.1 | 1.4 | 702 | 27.8 | 4.8 | 505 | 31.1 | 4.6 | 357 | 43.1 | 5.0 | 38 | 47.4 | 2.6 |
| 1996- 2003 | 587 | 28.6 | 5.3 | 7201 | 30.8 | 5.5 | 6239 | 38.7 | 6.5 | 3232 | 52.5 | 8.7 | 395 | 60.3 | 9.4 |

Box 15. Prevalence of hepatitis B markers in police officers, by age from 1996 to 2003 (Data source: DH)

| Box 16. Preval | ence of HBsAg fro | m the Community R | esearch Project on |
|-----------------|-------------------|---------------------|--------------------|
| Viral Hepatitis | (CRPVH) 2001 Stu | dy (Data source: DH |) |

| Ade | | Male | | | Female | | Total | | | |
|-----------|--------|-----------|------|--------|-----------|------|--------------|-----|-------|--|
| Group | No. | HBsAg +ve | | No. | HBsAg +ve | | No. HBsAg +v | | g +ve | |
| | tested | No. | % | tested | No. | % | tested | No. | % | |
| 18-30 | 72 | 6 | 8.3 | 87 | 6 | 6.9 | 159 | 12 | 7.5 | |
| 31-40 | 93 | 5 | 5.4 | 144 | 20 | 13.9 | 237 | 25 | 10.5 | |
| 41-50 | 100 | 20 | 20.0 | 183 | 10 | 5.5 | 283 | 30 | 10.6 | |
| 51 & Over | 111 | 8 | 7.2 | 146 | 7 | 4.8 | 257 | 15 | 5.8 | |
| Total | 376 | 39 | 10.4 | 560 | 43 | 7.7 | 936 | 82 | 8.8 | |

Box 17. Prevalence of hepatitis B markers in newly recruited health care workers from 2001 to 2003 (Data source: DH)

| | | Male | | Female | | | | |
|------|--------|---------------|-----|--------|---------------|-----|--|--|
| Year | No. | +ve for HBsAg | 0/. | No. | +ve for HBsAg | 0/. | | |
| | tested | d No. % | /0 | tested | No. | /0 | | |
| 2001 | 440 | 27 | 6.1 | 613 | 36 | 5.9 | | |
| 2002 | 499 | 23 | 4.6 | 730 | 38 | 5.2 | | |
| 2003 | 373 | 20 | 5.4 | 531 | 27 | 5.1 | | |

Box 18. Prevalence of hepatitis B markers in persons attending Therapeutic Prevention Clinic of ITC for post-exposure management, from July 1999 to 2002 (Data source: ITC, CHP, DH)

| | | Health care workers | | | | Non- Health care workers | | | | Total | | | | | |
|-----------------|--------|---------------------|-------|-----------|----------|--------------------------|---------|-------|-----------|----------|--------|---------|-------|-----------|----------|
| | No. | +ve for | HBsAg | +ve for a | anti-HBs | No. | +ve for | HBsAg | +ve for a | anti-HBs | No. | +ve for | HBsAg | +ve for a | anti-HBs |
| | tested | No. | % | No. | % | tested | No. | % | No. | % | tested | No. | % | No. | % |
| Jul-Dec 1999 | 23 | 2 | 8.7 | 11 | 47.8 | 87 | 13 | 14.9 | 41 | 47.1 | 110 | 15 | 13.6 | 52 | 47.3 |
| 2000 | 77 | 5 | 6.5 | 56 | 72.7 | 218 | 20 | 9.2 | 92 | 42.2 | 295 | 25 | 8.5 | 148 | 50.2 |
| 2001 | 100 | 2 | 2.0 | 75 | 75.0 | 312 | 20 | 6.4 | 142 | 45.5 | 412 | 22 | 5.3 | 217 | 52.7 |
| 2002 | 98 | 9 | 9.2 | 62 | 63.3 | 239 | 21 | 8.8 | 130 | 54.4 | 337 | 30 | 8.9 | 192 | 57.0 |
| Total | 298 | 18 | 6.0 | 204 | 68.5 | 856 | 74 | 8.6 | 405 | 47.3 | 1154 | 92 | 8.0 | 609 | 52.8 |

| Veer | No. | | % +ve | | | | | | |
|------|-------------|------|----------|-----------|------------|--|--|--|--|
| rear | tested HBs/ | | Anti-HBs | Anti-HBc* | Any marker | | | | |
| 1990 | 1067 | 13.4 | 59.0 | 15.7 | 90.8 | | | | |
| 1991 | 1517 | 14.4 | 54.4 | 20.5 | 89.3 | | | | |
| 1992 | 832 | 13.9 | 49.0 | 21.4 | 84.4 | | | | |
| 1993 | 744 | 14.4 | 43.4 | 16.4 | 69.2 | | | | |
| 1994 | 607 | 12.9 | 38.1 | 13.5 | 64.1 | | | | |
| 1995 | 190 | 10.5 | 36.8 | 12.1 | 58.9 | | | | |
| 1996 | 358 | 8.7 | 43.0 | 12.6 | 62.8 | | | | |
| 1997 | 290 | 6.6 | 36.2 | 15.9 | 53.4 | | | | |
| 1998 | 290 | 10.0 | 43.4 | 7.9 | 59.3 | | | | |
| 1999 | 725 | 11.2 | 44.8 | 13.8 | 67.2 | | | | |
| 2000 | 892 | 11.4 | 42.5 | 15.8 | 67.8 | | | | |
| 2001 | 654 | 11.6 | 41.3 | 17.3 | 70.2 | | | | |
| 2002 | 553 | 12.7 | 43.0 | 16.6 | 72.3 | | | | |
| 2003 | 198 | 10.1 | 42.4 | 12.6 | 65.2 | | | | |

Box 19. Prevalence of hepatitis B markers in drug users from 1990 to 2003 (Data source: Virus Unit, CHP, DH)

* Specimens positive for HBsAg were not tested for anti-HBc

| Box 20. HBsAg prevalence i | n HIV/AIDS | patients in | 1998 and | 2000-2003. |
|-----------------------------|------------|-------------|----------|------------|
| (Data source: ITC, CHP, DH) | | | | |

| | Ma | ale | Fer | nale | Total | | |
|------|------------|--------------------|------------|--------------------|------------|--------------------|--|
| Year | No. tested | No. HBsAg + (%) | No. tested | No. HBsAg + (%) | No. tested | No. HBsAg + (%) | |
| 1998 | 140 | 22 (15.7) | 16 | 2 (12.5) | 156 | 24 (15.4) | |
| 2000 | 87 | 9 (10.3) | 21 | 1 (4.8) | 108 | 10 (9.3) | |
| 2001 | 75 | 10 (13.3) | 26 | 1 (3.8) | 101 | 11 (10.9) | |
| 2002 | 119 | 14 (11.8) | 22 | 1 (4.5) | 141 | 15 (10.6) | |
| 2003 | 91 | 12 (13.2) | 13 | 2 (15.4) | 104 | 14 (13.5) | |

| | | _ | | | % HBsAg+ | _ | | | |
|------|---------------------|--|--------------------------|---------------------|--------------------|------------------------|------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------|
| Year | New blood donors | University students/staff (aged 21-30) | Pre-marital screening | Ante-natal women | Police officers | Health care workers | Drug users | Female commercial sex workers | HIV/AIDS patients |
| 1990 | 7.97 | - | 9.6 | 11.3 | - | - | 13.4 | - | - |
| 1991 | 8.04 | - | 9.6 | 10.9 | - | 6.2 | 14.4 | - | - |
| 1992 | 7.38 | - | 9.3 | 10.8 | - | - | 13.9 | - | - |
| 1993 | 6.70 | - | 8.7 | 10.1 | - | 4.4 | 14.4 | - | - |
| 1994 | 5.87 | 3.5 | 7.3 | 10.0 | - | - | 12.9 | - | - |
| 1995 | 5.99 | 4.3 | 7.9 | 9.7 | - | 7 | 10.5 | | - |
| 1996 | 5.62 | 3.9 | 7.9 | 9.7 | 6.1 | 4.2 | 8.7 | 69 | - |
| 1997 | 5.20 | - | 7.6 | 9.3 | 7.9 | - | 6.6 | 0.0 | - |
| 1998 | 4.89 | 3.5 | 6.8 | 9.0 | 7.4 | - | 10.0 | | 15.4 |
| 1999 | 4.44 | - | 6.7 | 8.8 | 6.4 | 2.2 | 11.2 | - | - |
| 2000 | 4.15 | 3.1 | 5.6 | 8.9 | 5.6 | 5.4 | 11.4 | - | 9.3 |
| 2001 | 3.98 | 3.4 | 5.1 | 9.2 | 5.9 | 6.0 | 11.6 | - | 10.9 |
| 2002 | 3.64 | 2.7 | 6.9 | 9.0 | 5.3 | 5.0 | 12.7 | - | 10.6 |
| 2003 | 3.23 | 3.7 | 7.1 | 8.7 | 4.6 | 5.2 | 10.1 | - | 13.5 |

Box 21. HBsAg prevalence in different population groups from 1990 to 2003 (Data source: multiple sources)



Box 22. Trends of HBsAg in selected population groups from 1990 to 2003 (Data source: multiple sources)

5. Tabulated results of seroprevalence of hepatitis C

| Вох | Title | Source | Page |
|--------|---|--|------|
| Box 23 | Anti-HCV prevalence in new blood donors, 1991 to 2003 | HKRCBTS | 31 |
| Box 24 | Anti-HCV prevalence and its gender and age breakdown in new blood donors in 2003 | HKRCBTS | 31 |
| Box 25 | Prevalence of anti-HCV in participants of Community Research Project on Viral Hepatitis (CRPVH) 2001 | DH | 31 |
| Box 26 | Anti-HCV prevalence in drug users on rehabilitation | Virus Unit (CHP, DH) | 32 |
| Box 27 | Anti-HCV prevalence in new HIV/AIDS patients from 2001 to 2003 | ITC (CHP, DH) | 32 |
| Box 28 | Prevalence of hepatitis C from screening of blood donors and clinical testing of patients in a cluster hospital | HKRCBTS & PMH Microbiology Laboratory | 32 |

| Veer | No. of new | Anti-F | ICV+ |
|------|------------|--------|-------|
| rear | donors | No. | % |
| 1991 | 48769 | 17 | 0.035 |
| 1992 | 43674 | 28 | 0.064 |
| 1993 | 36146 | 36 | 0.100 |
| 1994 | 38077 | 24 | 0.063 |
| 1995 | 39778 | 28 | 0.070 |
| 1996 | 40875 | 24 | 0.059 |
| 1997 | 40419 | 35 | 0.087 |
| 1998 | 43756 | 29 | 0.066 |
| 1999 | 40960 | 40 | 0.098 |
| 2000 | 41166 | 24 | 0.058 |
| 2001 | 43415 | 30 | 0.069 |
| 2002 | 42292 | 34 | 0.080 |
| 2003 | 36732 | 25 | 0.068 |

Box 23. Anti-HCV prevalence in new blood donors, 1991 to 2003 (Data source: HKRCBTS)

| Box 24. Anti-HCV prevalence and its gender and age breakdown in new |
|---|
| blood donors in 2003 (Data source: HKRCBTS) |

| | | Male | | Female | | |
|--------------|------------|--------------------------|-------|------------|--------------------------|-------|
| Age Group | No. tested | Anti-HCV No. Positive | % | No. tested | Anti-HCV No. Positive | % |
| 16-19 | 11849 | 2 | 0.02% | 11888 | 2 | 0.02% |
| 20-29 | 3804 | 8 | 0.21% | 3496 | 3 | 0.09% |
| 30-39 | 1408 | 5 | 0.36% | 1888 | 0 | 0.00% |
| 40-49 | 770 | 4 | 0.52% | 1106 | 0 | 0.00% |
| >49 | 241 | 0 | 0.00% | 282 | 1 | 0.35% |
| Total | 18072 | 19 | 0.11% | 18660 | 6 | 0.03% |

Box 25. Prevalence of anti-HCV in participants of Community Research Project on Viral Hepatitis (CRPVH) 2001 (Data source: DH)

| A | No. Tootod | Anti-H | ICV +ve |
|-----------|------------|--------|---------|
| Age group | NO. Tested | No. | % |
| 18-29 | 137 | 0 | 0 |
| 30-39 | 223 | 1 | 0.4 |
| 40-49 | 291 | 0 | 0.0 |
| 50-59 | 170 | 2 | 1.2 |
| 60 & over | 115 | 0 | 0.0 |
| All | 936 | 3 | 0.3 |

Box 26. Anti-HCV prevalence in drug users on rehabilitation (Data source: Virus Unit, CHP, DH)

| Voor | No tootod | Anti-H | ICV+ |
|-----------|------------|--------|------|
| real | NO. lesieu | No. | % |
| 1991/1992 | 134 | 99 | 73.9 |
| 2000/2001 | 210 | 97 | 46.2 |

Box 27. Anti-HCV prevalence in new HIV/AIDS patients from 2001 to 2003 (Data source: ITC, CHP, DH)

| | Ma | ale | Fen | nale | Total | | |
|------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|--|
| Year | No tested | Anti-HCV + | No tested | Anti-HCV + | No tested | Anti-HCV + | |
| | NO. LESIEU | (%) | NO. IESIEU | (%) | NO. IESIEU | (%) | |
| 2001 | 75 | 7 (9.3%) | 26 | 1 (3.8%) | 101 | 8 (7.9%) | |
| 2002 | 118 | 10 (8.5%) | 22 | 1 (4.5%) | 140 | 11 (7.9%) | |
| 2003 | 91 | 14 (15.4%) | 13 | 0 (0.0%) | 104 | 14 (13.5%) | |

Box 28. Prevalence of hepatitis C from screening of blood donors and clinical testing of patients in a cluster hospital (Data source: HKRCBTS, PMH Microbiology Laboratory)

| Category | | No. tested | HCV +ve | |
|---------------------------|---|---------------|---------|-------|
| | | | No. | % |
| 1. PRE-DONATION SCREENING | | 178188 | 28 | 0.016 |
| 2. SCREENING | Pre-transplant | 7 | 0 | 0.00 |
| | Drug users | 167 | 87 | 52.10 |
| | Needlestick injuries | 90 | 1 | 1.11 |
| | Pre-haemodialysis/ peritoneal dialysis | 508 | 5 | 0.98 |
| | Post-renal transplant | 36 | 2 | 5.56 |
| | Haematology | 36 | 1 | 2.78 |
| | Pre-methotrexate | 55 | 0 | 0.00 |
| | History of blood transfusion (mostly Cooley's anemia) | 35 | 2 | 5.71 |
| | Pre-vaccination | 1 | 0 | 0.00 |
| | TOTAL (2) | 935 | 98 | 10.48 |
| 3. CLINICAL INDICATION | | 501 | 30 | 5.99 |
| 4. OTHERS OR UNKNOWN | | 193 | 10 | 5.18 |
| TOTAL (2+3+4) | | 1629 | 138 | 8.47 |

ABBREVIATIONS

| AIDS | Acquired immune deficiency syndrome | |
|----------|---|--|
| Anti-HAV | Antibody against hepatitis A virus | |
| Anti-HBc | Antibody against hepatitis B core antigen | |
| Anti-HBs | Antibody against hepatitis B surface antigen | |
| Anti-HCV | Antibody against hepatitis C virus | |
| Anti-HEV | Antibody against hepatitis E virus | |
| BUHC | Baptist University Health Centre | |
| CHP | Centre for Health Protection | |
| CRPVH | Community Research Project on Viral Hepatitis | |
| CUHC | City University Health Centre | |
| DH | Department of Health | |
| FHS | Family Health Service | |
| FPA | Family Planning Association | |
| HBsAg | Hepatitis B surface antigen | |
| HAV | Hepatitis A virus | |
| HBV | Hepatitis B virus | |
| HCV | Hepatitis C virus | |
| HEV | Hepatitis E virus | |
| HIV | Human immunodeficiency virus | |
| HKRCBTS | Hong Kong Red Cross Blood Transfusion Service | |
| IgM | Immunoglobulin M | |
| IDU | Injecting drug users | |
| ITC | Integrated Treatment Centre | |
| LUHC | Lingnam University Health Centre | |
| PMH | Princess Margaret Hospital | |
| SARS | Severe acute respiratory syndrome | |
| STD | Sexually transmitted disease | |
| | | |

REFERENCES

- 1. Gust ID. 1984. The epidemiology of viral hepatitis. In: Vyas GN, Dienstag JL, Hoofnagle JH, editors: Viral Hepatitis and Liver Disease. Grune & Stratton, Orlando. p 415-421.
- 2. Wong KH, Liu YM, Ng PS, Young BW, Lee SS. Epidemiology of hepatitis A and hepatitis E infection and their determinants in adult Chinese community in Hong Kong. J Med Virol. 2004;72:538-44.
- 3. Chin KP, Lok ASF, Wong LSK, Lai CL, Wu PC. Current seroepidemiology of hepatitis A in Hong Kong. J Med Virol 1991;34:191-3.
- 4. Tsang CW, Chan CL. 1987. Epidemiology of viral hepatitis in Hong Kong. In: New trends in peptic ulcer and chronic hepatitis-Part II. Chronic Hepatitis. Excerpta Medica. p 43-50.
- 5. Lok ASF, Kan WK, Moechli R et al. Seroepidemiological survey of hepatitis E in Hong Kong by recombinant-based enzyme immunoassays. Lancet 1992;340:1205-8.
- 6. CF Ho, KH Wong, CW Chan, et al. Current pattern and course of acute hepatitis B virus infection in Hong Kong. J Gastroenterol Hepatol. 2003;19:602-3.
- Cooley L, Sasadeusz J. Clinical and virological aspects of hepatitis B coinfection in individuals infected with human immunodeficiency virus type-1. J Clin Virol 2003;26:185-93.
- 8. Chan GCB, Lim WL, Yeoh EK. Prevalence of hepatitis C infection in Hong Kong. J Gastroen Hepatol 1992;7:117-20.
- 9. Monga HK, Rodriguez-Barradas MC, Breaux K, et al. Hepatitis C virus infectionrelated morbidity and mortality among patients with human immunodeficiency virus infection. Clin Infect Dis 2001;33:240-7.
- 10. Prescott LE, Simmonds P, Lai CL, Chan NK, Pike I, Yap PL et al. Detection and clinical features of hepatitis C virus type 6 infections in blood donors from Hong Kong. J Med Virol 1996;50:168-75.
- 11. Chan TM, Lau JYN, Wu PC, Lai CL, Lok ASF, Cheng IKP. Hepatitis C virus genotypes in patients on renal replacement therapy. Nephrol Dial Transplant 1998;13:731-4.

- 12. Alter MJ, Kruszon-Moran D, Nainan OV, Mcquillan GM, Gao F, Moyer LA et al. The prevalence of hepatitis C virus infection in the United States, 1988 through 1994. N Engl J Med 1999;341:556-62.
- 13. Lim WL, Yeoh EK. Hepatitis A vaccination. Lancet 1992;339:304.
- 14. Lai CL. Hepatitis A risk heightened. Data quoted in United Daily News dated 10 June 1994.
- 15. Data from CHC-Group Medical Practice, 1995, 1996, 1998, 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003.
- 16. Lee A, Cheng F, Lau L, et al. Changing hepatitis A epidemiology among Hong Kong Chinese adolescents: what are the implications? Public Health 1999; 113:185-8.