Published in final edited form as:

Transfusion. 2015 March ; 55(3): 680–689. doi:10.1111/trf.12941.

It's time to phase-in *RHD* genotyping for patients with a serological weak D phenotype

S. Gerald Sandler, Willy A. Flegel, Connie M. Westhoff, Gregory A. Denomme, Meghan Delaney, Margaret A. Keller, Susan T. Johnson, Louis Katz, John T. Queenan, Ralph R. Vassallo, and Clayton D. Simon

Department of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine, MedStar Georgetown University Hospital, Washington, DC; Department of Transfusion Medicine, Clinical Center, National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, MD; Immunohematology and Genomics Laboratory, New York Blood Center, New York, NY; Diagnostic Laboratories, BloodCenter of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, WI ; Red Cell Genomics Laboratory, Puget Blood Center, and the Department of Laboratory Medicine, University of Washington, Seattle, WA; National Molecular Laboratory, American Red Cross Biomedical Services, Philadelphia, PA; (TBA) Laboratory, BloodCenter of Wisconsin ; Medical Office, Americas Blood Centers, Washington, DC; Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, MedStar Georgetown University Hospital; Medical Office, American Red Cross Biomedical Services, Philadelphia, PA; Armed Services Blood Program, (Address TBA)

In 2014, the College of American Pathologists (CAP) Transfusion Medicine Resource Committee (TMRC) reported the results of a survey of more than 3100 laboratories concerning their policies and procedures for testing serological weak D phenotypes and administration of Rh immune globulin (RhIG).¹ Among the findings of this survey is the observation that there is a lack of standard practice in the United States for interpreting the RhD type when a serological weak D phenotype is detected. In some laboratories, an individual with a serological weak D phenotype, especially if a blood donor, is interpreted to be RhD-positive. In the same or other laboratories, especially if a serological weak D phenotype is detected in a female of child-bearing potential, the individual is likely to be managed as RhD-negative for transfusions and, if pregnant, considered a candidate for RhIG. Also, the performance characteristics of serological typing methods for RhD vary. For patients, including pregnant women, the majority of laboratories have policies and procedures that do not use the indirect antiglobulin (weak D) test, thereby avoiding detection of a serological weak D phenotype so that the RhD type will be interpreted to be RhD-negative. Other laboratories typically perform a weak D test for the same category of

Correspondence: S. Gerald Sandler, MD; Department of Laboratory Medicine; MedStar Georgetown University Hospital; 3800 Reservoir Road, NW, Washington, DC 20007. Tel: 202-444-8520; Fax: 202-444-2440; sandlrg@gunet.georgetown.edu.

Conflict of interest:

WAF receives royalties for *RHD* genotyping. GAD is named as an inventor of granted red cell genotyping European Patents Serial No. 2298784 and 2298785, currently owned by Canadian Blood Services. MAK receives financial support from Life Technologies for genotyping software development consulting, has received research support from BioArray and has been on Immucor's speakers bureau. RV receives research support from Fenwal. SGS, CMW, MD, STJ, LK, JTQ and CDS have no conflicts of interest.

Disclaimers:

The recommendations and opinions expressed are those of the authors, not their institutions or organizations. The views expressed do not necessarily represent the view of the National Institutes of Health, the Department of Health and Human Services, or the U.S. Federal Government.

patients. For blood donors and newborns, it is standard practice for laboratories to have policies and procedures for RhD typing to ensure that serological weak D phenotypes are detected and interpreted as RhD-positive.¹

The goal of these RhD typing practices is to protect RhD-negative persons from inadvertent alloimmunization to the D antigen by exposure to RhD-positive RBCs, including RBCs expressing a serological weak D phenotype. Although there has not been a recent prospective study in the United States, it is estimated that current RhD typing practice, together with contemporary obstetrical practices for administration of antepartum and postpartum RhIG, is 98.4 to 99 percent successful in preventing RhD alloimmunization and RhD hemolytic disease of the fetus/newborn.² However, there are unwarranted consequences associated with the practice of not determining the *RHD* genotype of persons with a serological weak D phenotype, including unnecessary injections of RhIG and transfusion of RhD-negative RBCs -- always in short supply -- when RhD-positive RBCs could be transfused safely.

CAP's TMRC reviewed the current status of *RHD* genotyping and proposed that selective integration of *RHD* genotyping in laboratory practices could improve the accuracy of RhD typing results, reduce unnecessary administration of RhIG in women with a serological weak D phenotype, and decrease unnecessary transfusion of RhD-negative RBCs to recipients with a serological weak D phenotype.¹ In response to the findings of the CAP TMRC survey, AABB and CAP convened a Work Group on *RHD* Genotyping and charged it with developing recommendations to clarify clinical issues related to RhD typing in persons with a serological weak D phenotype. As an initial step for formulating recommendations, the Work Group reviewed the current state of molecular science of *RHD*, including more than 140 publications covering background;¹⁻¹² D variants with anti-D;¹³⁻²⁹ molecular basis of serological weak D phenotypes;³⁰⁻⁹² reviews, editorials and commentaries;⁹³⁻¹²⁹ technical resources;¹³⁰⁻¹⁴² and standards and guidelines.¹⁴³⁻¹⁴⁹ This Commentary summarizes the proceedings and recommendations of the Work Group.

HISTORY AND ORGANIZATIONAL POLICIES

The first report of a D variant antigen, initially named D^u, was published in 1946.⁴ To ensure that RBCs with a serological weak D phenotype would not be transfused inadvertently as RhD-negative, the first edition of AABB *Standards* (1958) required testing for D^u if a donor's blood typed as RhD-negative by direct agglutination using "anti-D typing serum."¹⁴⁴ In contrast, *Standards* (1958) regarded a direct agglutination method using "anti-D serum" to be "sufficient" for RhD typing for transfusion recipients.¹⁴⁴ This strategy, namely, typing blood donors by a method that interprets a serological weak D phenotype as RhD-positive, and typing patients by a method that typically interprets a serological weak D phenotype as RhD-negative, has persisted for more than 50 years. Indeed, the current (29th) edition of *Standards* (2014) requires a method to detect weak expression of D for blood donor RBCs, but considers a weak D test for transfusion recipients to be "unnecessary," with the exception that testing for weak D is required for RBCs from a fetus or newborn of an RhD-negative mother to determine the mother's candidacy for RhIG.¹⁴⁹ The 10th edition of *Standards* (1981) addressed recommendations for RhD typing for the administration of

RhIG for the first time and recommended that a woman's candidacy for receiving RhIG be determined by the same method as that for RhD typing blood donors.¹⁴⁴ Thus, a woman with a serological weak D phenotype, i.e., a positive weak D test result, was interpreted to be RhD-positive and not a candidate for RhIG. The American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists (ACOG) addressed the issue of administration of RhIG in women with a serological weak D phenotype for the first time in a 1981 practice bulletin.¹⁴⁵ ACOG recommended that RhD-negative women "whether Du positive or Du negative" were candidates for RhIG. That recommendation was reversed within a few months to read that "[a] woman who is genetically Du-positive is Rh-positive and administration of Rh immune globulin is unnecessary."¹³⁰ In 1992, the Du variant was renamed as weak D.⁷ The ACOG guidance remains unchanged in the most recent ACOG practice bulletin (1999) which recommends that women with a serological weak D phenotype should be considered RhD-positive and not receive RhIG.¹⁴⁶ The consequence of this guidance is that the RBCs of a pregnant woman who inherited a serological weak D phenotype may or may not be typed for RhD by a method that detects a serological weak D phenotype, depending on the laboratory's policy, and she may or may not receive antepartum- and postpartum RhIG.

RhD typing practice in the United States changed following the introduction of monoclonal anti-D reagents in the 1980s.¹³¹⁻⁴ Monoclonal antibodies have increased sensitivity and can detect many RBCs with weak D expression as RhD-positive on initial testing. They can also be selected for specificity. Fatal hemolytic disease of the fetus/newborn has been associated with anti-D formed by women with a partial DVI phenotype,^{20, 25} which is the basis for the requirement that monoclonal anti-D reagents licensed in the United States not detect RBCs with partial DVI as RhD-positive by initial testing.¹³⁷ The goal of the FDA requirement is to protect females of childbearing potential with a partial DVI phenotype from being typed as RhD-positive. RBCs with a partial DVI phenotype will be typed as RhD-positive as donors when a weak D test is performed.⁸ Hence, the 22nd edition of Standards (2003) recommended that "if the woman's test for D antigen is negative, a test for weak D is not required."¹⁴⁷ That standard persists in the current 29th edition of Standards (2014).¹⁴⁹

SEROLOGICAL WEAK D PHENOTYPES AND MOLECULARLY-DEFINED WEAK D TYPES

Serological studies have distinguished three broad categories of D variants, namely, weak D, partial D and DEL, from wild-type or conventional D. More than 200 *RHD* alleles are categorized by mutations that lead to qualitative and/or quantitative changes in serological expression of the D antigen (see, www.uni-ulm.de/~fwagner/RH/RB2/; also: <http://www.isbtweb.org/working-parties/red-cell-immunogenetics-and-blood-group-terminology/blood-group-terminology/blood-group-allele-terminology/>).

Serological weak D phenotypes

A serological weak D phenotype is defined as reactivity of RBCs with an anti-D reagent giving no or weak (2+) reactivity in initial testing, but agglutinating moderately or strongly with antihuman globulin.^{7, 119, 136, 148} Many serological weak D phenotypes are associated with one or more amino acid substitutions in the RhD protein predicted to be within or

below the RBC membrane causing decreased antigen expression on the red cell surface.³¹ The prevalence of serological weak D phenotypes varies by race and ethnicity.¹¹⁹ Serological weak D phenotypes are the most common D variants detected in Europe and the United States. An estimated 0.2% to 1.0% of Caucasians inherit *RHD* genes that code for serological weak D phenotypes and the majority are associated with weak D type 1, 2 or 3.^{31, 36, 102} Reports of the prevalence of serological weak D phenotypes also varies depending on the method (manual tube versus automated analyzer), anti-D reagent (polyspecific serum versus monoclonal blend) and whether potentiating reagents (bromelin) were used.^{103, 136}

Most data concerning *RHD* alleles and the risk of alloimmunization associated with serological weak D phenotypes are derived from observational studies in central Europe.^{32, 33, 55, 75} These studies indicate that transfusion recipients with weak D type 1, 2 or 3, in the homozygous or hemizygous state, are not at risk for forming alloanti-D when exposed to conventional RhD-positive RBCs.^{55, 75} Approximately 95% of Caucasians in central Europe with a serological weak D phenotype have weak D type 1, 2, or 3 and can be managed safely as RhD-positive. The absence of alloimmunization in persons with weak D type 1, 2 or 3 is likely due to the fact that the distinct *RHD* allele codes for all epitopes of RhD, although present at lower surface density than on wild-type RBCs.³¹ Alloimmunization has been observed with certain other weak D types, including weak D type 4.2,^{33, 55} (DAR),³¹ type 11,^{33, 55} type 15,^{33, 55} type 21,⁷¹ and type 57.⁶⁰

The Work Group reviewed published and unpublished reports to determine whether weak D types 4.0 and 4.1 should be recommended as weak D types that can be managed safely as RhD-positive. There are no published reports of allo- or autoanti-D in persons with weak D type 4.1 in large European cohorts^{55, 75} despite their prevalence^{33, 56} and frequent transfusions with RhD-positive RBCs.⁵⁶ The Work Group identified published exceptions for weak D type 4.0, notably, 3 cases with anti-D in Germany,⁵⁵ 9 in France⁷⁵, 1 in Tunisia⁹¹ and 3 in the United States.⁸⁹ Only 1 patient in Europe among these 16 case reports has been shown to form an alloanti-D;⁷⁵ the 15 other patients formed autoanti-D. There are additional unpublished observations of alloanti-D in the racially- and ethnically-diverse patient populations in the United States (C. Westhoff, unpublished data, 2014). The Work Group limited its recommendation to manage serological weak D phenotypes as RhD-positive to weak D types 1, 2 and 3 until more data are available.

Partial D phenotypes

Partial D phenotypes are associated with amino acid substitutions in the RhD protein on the RBC surface and lack D epitopes.³¹ Many RBCs expressing a partial D antigen agglutinate by immediate spin using an anti-D reagent and are interpreted to be RhD-positive. Commercially-marketed panels of monoclonal reagents are available to differentiate a number of partial D types. The percentage of persons with a partial D phenotype who form anti-D after transfusion with RhD-positive RBCs or delivery of an RhD-positive newborn is not known. However, there are many reports of RhD-positive persons, presumed to have a partial D phenotype, who formed anti-D.¹³⁻²⁹ The presence or absence of anti-D does not distinguish between serological weak D and partial D phenotypes.¹²⁷ The most common

partial D phenotypes in Europe are DNB,⁴⁰ DVI,⁸ and DVII.¹²⁸ In the United States, most persons expressing partial D phenotypes are of African ancestry. The Work Group did not address management of partial D phenotypes, except if the RhD variant is expressed as a serological weak D phenotype, since the Work Group's charge focused on clinical management of patients with a serological weak D phenotype.

DEL Phenotypes

DEL phenotypes present by conventional blood typing as RhD-negative and are not detected serologically unless adsorption and elution studies are performed.^{41, 148} The Asian-type DEL displays the complete repertoire of RhD antigen epitopes.^{38, 72, 92} DEL phenotypes, which are found more commonly among persons of Asian ancestry, do not present as a serological weak D phenotype. Therefore, the Work Group did not formulate a recommendation for managing DEL phenotypes, although DEL phenotypes have been implicated as the cause of RhD alloimmunization when RhD-negative/DEL-positive RBCs were unknowingly transfused to RhD-negative recipients.^{48,50, 142}

POTENTIAL BENEFITS OF *RHD* GENOTYPING FOR PATIENTS WITH SEROLOGICAL WEAK D PHENOTYPES

Pregnant Women

The Work Group recommends that *RHD* genotyping be performed when discordant RhD typing results are encountered and/or when a serological weak D is identified in a female of childbearing potential. The Work Group estimates that if *RHD* genotyping were performed in RhD-negative women with a serological weak D phenotype in the United States, approximately 13,360 of these women could be managed as RhD-positive, avoiding the injection of approximately 24,700 doses of RhIG annually. To calculate this estimate, the Work Group extrapolated data from studies of the prevalence of serological weak D phenotypes and the number predicted to genotype as *RHD* weak D type 1, 2 or 3 in RhD-negative individuals, as follows (Fig. 1). There are an estimated 3,812,000 pregnancies annually in the United States, based on the prediction of 3,953,000 births annually and adjusted for multiple births per pregnancy.¹⁴⁰ Of these 3,812,000 pregnancies, approximately 556,500 ($14.6\% \times 3,812,000$) are expected to occur in RhD-negative women, as 14.6% represents the overall prevalence of RhD-negative individuals among racially- and ethnically-mixed populations in the United States.¹³⁵ Extrapolating from data from central Europe,^{8,31, 56} the Work Group estimated that of these pregnant women typed as RhD-negative, 16,700 ($3.0\% \times 556,550$) will have a serological weak D phenotype. The 3.0 percent estimate was calculated using a value of 0.44 percent for serological weak D phenotypes among RhD-positive and RhD-negative individuals in central Europe^{8,31, 56} and a 14.6 percent overall prevalence of RhD-negative individuals among racially- and ethnically-mixed populations in the United States.¹³⁵ Approximately 80% of serological weak D phenotypes in the ethnically mixed population in the United States are weak D types 1, 2 or 3 (C. Westhoff, unpublished experience, 2014). Therefore, an estimated 13,360 pregnant women, often typed as RhD-negative but having a serological weak D phenotype ($80\% \times 16,700$) are expected to have an *RHD* genotype that could be managed safely as RhD-positive every year in the United States. Presently, most pregnant women with a

serological weak D phenotype in the United States are managed as RhD-negative and, therefore, most of these pregnant women will receive at least one unnecessary antepartum injection of RhIG and as many as 25% of these women may receive a second injection because of first-trimester bleeding or an invasive procedure¹³⁹. An additional 60 percent (8,016) of these women with a serological weak D phenotype will receive an unnecessary postpartum injection of RhIG because they will deliver an RhD-positive or weak D-positive newborn.¹³⁹ Thus, as many as 24,700 (13,360 + 3,340 + 8,016) antepartum and postpartum injections of RhIG may be administered annually to 13,360 women with a serological weak D phenotype who could be managed safely without RhIG as RhD-positive. The number of doses of RhIG saved increases with future pregnancies since, once identified, women with a weak D type 1, 2 or 3 could be managed as RhD-positive without repeat *RHD* genotyping.

While RhIG was one of the greatest medical advances of the 1960s, almost eliminating the mortality and morbidity of Rh hemolytic disease of the fetus/newborn, there are fiscal, safety, and ethical issues when biological products such as RhIG, are administered unnecessarily. Initially, RhIG was manufactured from pooled human plasma from mothers who had stillborns due to RhD alloimmunization. As the need for RhIG rapidly grew, RhD-negative male donors were paid to be injected with RhD-positive RBCs to maintain high anti-D titers as the main source of plasma for RhIG. There are no reports of transmission of hepatitis B virus, hepatitis C virus or human immunodeficiency virus caused by RhIG manufactured in the United States, but since RhIG is manufactured from pooled human plasma there is a potential risk for transmission of infection. An additional safety issue relates to the lifelong risk which occurs when an RhD-negative volunteer is intentionally alloimmunized to RhD to manufacture RhIG and subsequently requires a transfusion where RhD-negative RBCs are not readily available. The problem increases with travel to certain regions of Asia and Africa where RhD-negative blood is rare. The ethical issues are not only the unnecessary administration of a blood product, but also the source of human plasma containing high-titer anti-D that is required for manufacturing RhIG. Thus, the paid-donor market for anti-D is supported, in part, by unnecessary injections of RhIG.

Transfusion Recipients

The Work Group recommends that *RHD* genotyping be performed when discordant RhD typing results are encountered and/or a serological weak D is identified in a transfusion recipient. It anticipates that if this practice were implemented in the United States, a potential 17,520 transfusion recipients with a serological weak D phenotype could be managed as RhD-positive, avoiding the transfusion of as many as 47,700 units of RhD-negative RBCs annually. The potentially decreased requirement for RhD-negative RBCs, if a complete phase-in for *RHD* genotyping could be achieved, was calculated as follows (Fig. 2). Approximately 13,600,000 units of RBCs were transfused to 5,000,000 recipients in the United States in 2011.¹³⁸ Of these 13,600,000 units, a minimum of 1,985,600 ($14.6\% \times 13,600,000$) are RhD-negative¹³⁵ and of the 5,000,000 recipients, approximately 730,000 ($14.6\% \times 5,000,000$) are RhD-negative.¹³⁵ Thus, an average of 2.72 units of RhD-negative red blood cells are transfused to each RhD-negative patient ($1,985,000 \div 730,000$). The same data for calculating the estimate for pregnant women (above) was used to calculate the 21,900 RhD-negative transfusion recipients who will express a serological weak D

phenotype ($730,000 \times 3.0\%$) and the 17,520 who will have a weak D type 1, 2 or 3, which could be managed safely as RhD-positive ($730,000 \times 3.0\% \times 80\%$). Also, those estimates were applied to calculate the 47,700 units of RhD-negative RBCs that would be transfused to these recipients who could be managed as RhD-positive ($17,520 \times 2.72$). The Work Group appreciates that these calculations provide only a good faith estimate of the potential long-term impact of *RHD* genotyping on the requirements for RhIG and for collecting RhD-negative red blood cells. The calculations do not account for the different requirements by geography, race and ethnicity, as well as the many other factors that determine the requirements for RhD-negative red blood cells for transfusion. Currently, recipients of emergent transfusion may require RBCs before the results of *RHD* genotyping would be available. However, patients requiring chronic transfusion, at greatest risk for alloimmunization, the results of an once-in-a-lifetime *RHD* genotyping would ideally be available for all subsequent transfusions. The Work Group anticipates that manufacturers and reference laboratories will recognize the need for a more rapid turnaround of *RHD* genotyping results such that methods with quicker processing will evolve. Intra- and inter-organizational integration of electronic medical records will facilitate recognition of persons with a serological weak D phenotype and allow application of prior *RHD* genotyping results to selecting the most appropriate RhD type for transfusing RBCs.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Work Group recommends that *RHD* genotyping be performed whenever a discordant RhD typing result and/or a serological weak D phenotype is detected in patients, including pregnant women, newborns and potential transfusion recipients. It is anticipated that the immediate benefit will be fewer unnecessary injections of RhIG and increased availability of RhD-negative RBCs for transfusion.

Persons whose *RHD* genotype is weak D type 1, 2 or 3 should be managed as RhD-positive with regard to administration of RhIG and/or selection of blood components for transfusion. To facilitate implementation of this recommendation, the Work Group developed an Algorithm for Resolving Serological Weak D Phenotype Test Results (Fig. 3). Phasing in *RHD* genotyping in clinical practice will be most effective if manufacturers of *RHD* genotyping assays and systems offer basic cost-effective tests designed to identify the most prevalent and clinically-relevant *RHD* genotypes. The Work Group recognizes that most hospitals and healthcare facilities will not encounter a sufficient number of persons with a serological weak D phenotype to support in-house *RHD* genotyping. In these situations, samples for *RHD* genotyping should be referred to a reference laboratory to promote standardization of laboratory methods and the economy of large-scale testing. Reference laboratories performing RBC genotyping services should offer tiered services, beginning with affordable first-tier testing, so that the most prevalent and clinically-relevant *RHD* genotypes can be detected.

For women with a serological weak D phenotype associated with *RHD* genotypes *other* than weak D type 1, 2 or 3, the Work Group recommends that these women receive conventional prophylaxis with RhIG, including postpartum RhIG if the newborn is RhD-positive or has a serological weak D phenotype. Clinicians and investigators are encouraged to publish

alloimmunization outcomes of pregnancies and transfusions of individuals with *RHD* genotypes for which the risk of RhD alloimmunization is unknown.

Lastly, members of the Work Group emphasize the concept of a “phase-in” for implementing of these recommendations. We believe that it is time for *RHD* genotyping all patients whose routine RBC typing has resulted in detection of a serological weak D phenotype. While recognizing the lack of comprehensive cost/benefit analyses, the Work Group concludes that it is time to begin to phase-in selective *RHD* genotyping. It is the intent of this Commentary to increase awareness of the available molecular science and promise of *RHD* genotyping and, thereby, to shorten the time for achieving the full benefits of a more comprehensive implementation of *RHD* genotyping. Phasing-in *RHD* genotyping will apply modern genomic methods for more precise decision making in obstetrical practice and transfusion medicine. It will foster the application of genomic science to promote more personalized and accurate medical care.¹²⁹

Acknowledgments

Support came from the Intramural Research Program of the NIH Clinical Center (WAF).

Background

1. Sandler SG, Roseff S, Dormen RE, Shaz BH, Gottschall J. for the CAP Transfusion Medicine Resource Committee. Policies and procedures related to testing for weak D phenotypes and administration of Rh immune globulin/Results and recommendations related to supplemental questions in the comprehensive transfusion medicine survey of the College of American Pathologists. Arch Pathol Lab Med. 2014; 138:620–5. [PubMed: 24786120]
2. Bowman J. Thirty-five years of Rh prophylaxis. Transfusion. 2003; 43:1661–6. [PubMed: 14641860]
3. Ceppellini R, Dunn LC, Turry M. An interaction between alleles at the Rh locus in man which weakens the reactivity of the *Rh₀* factor (*D^u*). Proc Natl Acad Sci USA. 1955; 41:283–8. [PubMed: 16589665]
4. Stratton F. A new Rh allelomorph. Nature. 1946; 158:25–6. [PubMed: 21064942]
5. Mourant, AE.; Kopec, AC.; Domaniewska-Sobczak, K. The distribution of the human blood groups and other polymorphisms. 2. London: Oxford University Press; 1976.
6. Salmon, C.; Cartron, JP.; Rouger, P. The Human Blood Groups. New York: Masson; 1984.
7. Agre PC, Davies DM, Issitt PD, Lamy BM, Schmidt PJ, Treacy M, Vengelen-Tyler V. A proposal to standardize terminology for weak D antigen. Transfusion. 1992; 32:86–7. [PubMed: 1731444]
8. Wagner FF, Kasulke D, Kerowgan M, Flegel WA. Frequencies of the blood groups ABO, Rhesus, D category VI, Kell, and of clinically relevant high-frequency antigens in South-Western Germany. Infusionsther Transfusionsmed. 1995; 22(5):285–90. [PubMed: 8924742]
9. Rouillac C, Gane P, Cartron JP, Le Pennec PY, Colin Y. Molecular basis of the altered antigenic expression of RhD in weak D (*D^u*) and RhC/e in *R^N* phenotypes. Blood. 1996; 87:4853–61. [PubMed: 8639859]
10. Huang CH. Molecular insights into the Rh protein family and associated antigens. Curr Opin Hematol. 1997; 4:94–103. [PubMed: 9107525]
11. Beckers EA, Faas BHW, Ligthart P, Overbeeke MA, von dem Borne AE, van der Schoot CE, van Rhenen DJ. Lower antigen site density and weak D immunogenicity cannot be explained by structural genomic abnormalities or regulatory defects of the *RHD* gene. Transfusion. 1997; 37:616–23. [PubMed: 9191822]
12. Sandler SG, Gottschall JL. Postpartum Rh immunoprophylaxis. Obstet Gynecol. 2012; 120:1428–38. [PubMed: 23168770]

D Variants (Unidentified) With Anti-D

13. Argall CI, Ball JM, Trentelman E. Presence of anti-D antibody in the serum of a DU patient. *J Lab Clin Med.* 1953; 41:895. [PubMed: 13061812]
14. Weiner AS, Geiger J, Gordon EB. Mosaic nature of the Rho blood factor of human blood. *Exp Med Surg.* 1957; 15:75–82. [PubMed: 13438011]
15. White CA, Stedman CM, Frank S. Anti-D antibodies in D- and Du-positive women: a cause of hemolytic disease of the newborn. *Am J Obstet Gynecol.* 1983; 145:1069–75. [PubMed: 6404173]
16. Ostgård P, Fevang F, Komstad L. Anti-D in a “D-positive” mother giving rise to a severe hemolytic disease of the newborn. A dilemma in antenatal immunohaematological testing. *Acta Paediatr Scand.* 1986; 75:175–8. [PubMed: 3082104]
17. Mayne KM, Allen DL, Bowel PJ. Partial D women with anti-D alloimmunization in pregnancy. *Clin Lab Haematol.* 1991; 13:239–44. [PubMed: 1724416]
18. Domen RE, Hoetge GA. Alloanti-D following transfusion in patients with the weak D (Du) phenotype [abstract]. *Blood.* 1997; 90(suppl 1, pt 2):130b.
19. Brandstadter W, Brandstadter M. Morbus haemolyticus neonatorum durch anti-D bei faktor D^u der Mutter. *Zentralblatt für Gynäkologie.* 1970; 6:176. [PubMed: 5001845]
20. Lacey PA, Caskey CR, Werner DJ, Moulds JJ. Fatal hemolytic disease of the newborn due to anti-D in an Rh-positive DU variant mother. *Transfusion.* 1983; 23:91–4. [PubMed: 6404025]
21. Simmons RT, Krieger VI. Anti-Rh (D) antibodies produced by isoimmunization in an Rh positive woman of the unusual genotype (CDue/CdE). *Med J Aust.* 1960; 2:1021–2.
22. Hill Z, Vacl J, Kalasová E, Calábková M, Pintera J. Haemolytic disease of the newborn due to anti-D antibodies in a Du positive mother. *Vox Sang.* 1974; 27:92–4. [PubMed: 4212047]
23. Zaino EC, Applewhaite F. Antibodies to part of the Rh0 antigen complex occurring in two women with Rh0 variants. *Transfusion.* 1975; 15:256–9. [PubMed: 805484]
24. Kimball, MG.; Andrews, L.; Konugres, AA. Hemolytic disease of the newborn caused by anti-D in a Du positive woman [abstract]. *Proceedings of the Massachusetts Association of Blood Banks Ninth Annual Spring Seminar; April 1981; p. 109*
25. Stedman CM, White CA. Fatal hydrops fetalis caused by anti-D in a mother with partial D. *Obstet Gynecol.* 2004; 104:194–5. [PubMed: 15229027]
26. Cannon M, Pierce R, Taber EB, Schucker J. Fatal hydrops fetalis caused by anti-D in a mother with partial D. *Obstet Gynecol.* 2003; 102:1143–5. [PubMed: 14607035]
27. Kahwash E, Leonard J, Lockwood W. A 60-year-old Rh(D)-positive women with anti-D in her serum. *Lab Med.* 2004; 35:413–4.
28. Prasad MR, Krugh D, Rossi KQ, O’Shaughnessy. Anti-D in Rh positive pregnancies. *Am J Obstet Gynecol.* 2006; 195:1158–62. [PubMed: 17000249]
29. Yazer MH, Triulzi DJ. Detection of anti-D in D+ recipients transfused with D+ red blood cells. *Transfusion.* 2007; 47:2197–201. [PubMed: 17714422]

Molecular Basis of Serological Weak D Phenotypes

30. Flegel WA, Gassner C, Müller TH, Schönitzer D, Schunter F, Wagner FF. The molecular basis of weak D. *Vox Sang.* 1998; 74(Suppl. 1):55.
31. Wagner FF, Gassner C, Müller TH, Schönitzer D, Schunter F, Flegel WA. Molecular basis of weak D phenotypes. *Blood.* 1999; 93:385–93. [PubMed: 9864185]
32. Hemker MB, Ligthart PC, Berger L, van Rhenen DJ, van der Schoot CE, Maaskant-van PA. *DAR*, a New RhD variant involving exons 4, 5, and 7, often in linkage with *ceAR*, a new Rhce variant frequently found in African blacks. *Blood.* 1999; 94:4337–42. [PubMed: 10590079]
33. Wagner FF, Frohmajer A, Ladewig B, Eicher NI, Lonicer CB, Müller TH, Siegel MH, Flegel WA. Weak D alleles express distinct phenotypes. *Blood.* 2000; 95:2699–708. [PubMed: 10753853]
34. Flegel WA, Khull S, Wagner FF. Primary anti-D immunization by weak D type 2 RBC. *Transfusion.* 2000; 40(4):428–34. [PubMed: 10773054]

35. Avent ND, Liu W, Scott ML, Jones JW, Voak D. Site directed mutagenesis of the human Rh D antigen: molecular basis of D epitopes. *Vox Sang.* 2000; 78(Suppl. 2):83–9. [PubMed: 10938935]
36. Müller TH, Wagner FF, Trockenbacher A, Eicher NI, Flegel WA, Schonitzer D, Schunter F, Gassner C. PCR screening for common weak D types shows different distributions in three Central European populations. *Transfusion.* 2001; 41(1):45–52. [PubMed: 11161244]
37. Wagner FF, Ernst M, Sonneborn HH, Flegel WA. A D(V)-like phenotype is obliterated by A226P in the partial D DBS. *Transfusion.* 2001; 41(8):1052–8. [PubMed: 11493738]
38. Wagner FF, Frohmajer A, Flegel WA. *RHD* positive haplotypes in D negative Europeans. *BMC Genet.* 2001; 2:10. [PubMed: 11495631]
39. Legler TJ, Maas JH, Köhler M, et al. *RHD* sequencing: a new tool for decision making on transfusion therapy and provision of Rh prophylaxis. *Transfus Med.* 2001; 11:383–8. [PubMed: 11696232]
40. Wagner FF, Eicher NI, Jorgensen JR, Lonicer CB, Flegel WA. DNB: a partial D with anti-D frequent in Central Europe. *Blood.* 2002; 100:2253–6. [PubMed: 12200394]
41. Shao CP, Maas JH, Su YQ, Köhler M, Legler TJ. Molecular background of Rh D-positive, D-negative, D(el) and weak D phenotypes in Chinese. *Vox Sang.* 2002; 83:156–61. [PubMed: 12201845]
42. Flegel WA, Curin-Serbec V, Delamaire M, Donvito B, Ikeda H, Jorgensen J, Kumpel BM, Le Pennec P-Y, Pisacka M, Tani Y, Uchikawa M, Wendel S, Wagner FF. Section 1B: Rh flow cytometry. Coordinator's report Rhesus index and antigen density: an analysis of the reproducibility of flow cytometric determination. *Transfus Clin Biol.* 2002; 9:33–44. [PubMed: 11889898]
43. Wagner FF, Ladewig B, Flegel WA. The *RHCE* allele *ceRT*: D epitope 6 expression does not require D-specific amino acids. *Transfusion.* 2003; 43:1248–54. [PubMed: 12919427]
44. Wagner FF, Moulds JM, Tounkara A, Kouriba B, Flegel WA. *RHD* allele distribution in Africans of Mali. *BMC Genet.* 2003; 4:14. [PubMed: 14505497]
45. Ansart-Pirenne H, Asso-Bonnet P-Y, Le Pennec M, Roussel M, Patereau C, Noizat-Pirenne F. RhD variants in whites; consequences for checking clinically relevant alleles. *Transfusion.* 2004; 44:1282–6. [PubMed: 15318849]
46. Denomme GA, Wagner FF, Fernandez BJ, Wei Li, Flegel WA. Partial, weak D types, and novel *RHD* alleles among 33, 864 multiethnic patients: implications for anti-D alloimmunization and prevention. *Transfusion.* 2005; 45:1554–60. [PubMed: 16181204]
47. Wagner FF, Moulds JM, Flegel WA. Genetic mechanisms of *Rhesus box* variation. *Transfusion.* 2005; 45:338–44. [PubMed: 15752150]
48. Wagner T, Körmöcz GF, Buchta C, et al. Anti-D immunization by DEL red blood cells. *Transfusion.* 2005; 45:520–6. [PubMed: 15819672]
49. Chen Q, Flegel WA. Random survey for *RHD* alleles among D+ European persons. *Transfusion.* 2005; 45:1183–91. [PubMed: 15987365]
50. Yasuda H, Ohto H, Ishikawa Y. Secondary anti-D immunization by Del red blood cells. *Transfusion.* 2005; 45:1581–4. [PubMed: 16181208]
51. Doescher A, Flegel WA, Petershofen EK, Bauerfeind U, Wagner FF. Weak D type 1.1 exemplifies another complexity in weak D genotyping. *Transfusion.* 2005; 45:1568–73. [PubMed: 16181206]
52. Esteban R, Montero R, Flegel WA, Wagner FF, Subirana L, Parra R, Ribera A, Nogues N. The D category VI type 4 allele is prevalent in the Spanish population. *Transfusion.* 2006; 46:616–23. [PubMed: 16584438]
53. Flegel WA, Wagner FF, Chen Q, Schlanser G, Frame T, Westhoff CM, Moulds MK. The *RHCE* allele *ceCF*: the molecular basis of Crawford (RH43). *Transfusion.* 2006; 46:1334–42. [PubMed: 16934069]
54. Lüttringhaus TA, Cho D, Ryang DW, Flegel WA. An easy *RHD* genotyping strategy for D- East Asian persons applied to Korean blood donors. *Transfusion.* 2006; 46:2128–37. [PubMed: 17176325]
55. Flegel WA. How I manage donors and patients with a weak D phenotype. *Curr Opin Hematol.* 2006; 13:476–83. [PubMed: 17053462]

56. Yu X, Wagner FF, Witter B, Flegel WA. Outliers in RhD membrane integration are explained by variant *RH* haplotypes. *Transfusion*. 2006; 46:1343–51. [PubMed: 16934070]
57. Avent ND, Martinez A, Flegel WA, Olsson ML, Scott ML, Nogues N, Pisacka M, Daniels GL, van der Schoot E, Muniz-Diaz E, Madgett TE, Storry JR, Beiboer SH, Maaskant-van Wijk PA, von Zabern I, Hacker A, Jimenez E, Tejedor D, Lopez M, Chamacho E, Cheroute G, Hacker A, Jinoch P, Svobodova I, de Haas M. The BloodGen project: toward mass scale comprehensive genotyping of blood donors in the European Union and beyond. *Transfusion*. 2007; 47(Suppl 1): 40S–6S. [PubMed: 17593285]
58. Flegel WA. Blood group genotyping in Germany. *Transfusion*. 2007; 47(Suppl 1):47S–53S. [PubMed: 17593286]
59. Yan L, Wu J, Zhu F, Hong X, Xu X. Molecular basis of D variants in Chinese persons. *Transfusion*. 2007; 47(3):471–7. [PubMed: 17319828]
60. Le Maréchal C, Guerry C, Benech C, Burlot L, Cavelier B, Porra V, Delamaire M, Férec C, Chen JM. Identification of 12 novel *RHD* alleles in western France by denaturing high-performance liquid chromatography analysis. *Transfusion*. 2007; 47:858–63. [PubMed: 17465951]
61. Polin H, Danzer M, Hofer K, Gassner W, Gabriel C. Effective molecular *RHD* typing strategy for blood donations. *Transfusion*. 2007; 47:1350–5. [PubMed: 17655577]
62. Flegel WA, von Zabern I, Doescher A, Wagner FF, Vytisková J, Písacka M. DCS-1, DCS-2 and DFV share amino acid substitutions at the extracellular RhD protein vestibule. *Transfusion*. 2008; 48:25–33. [PubMed: 17900276]
63. Christiansen M, Samuelsen B, Christiansen L, Morbjerg T, Bredahl C, Grunnet N. Correlation between serology and genetics of weak D types in Denmark. *Transfusion*. 2008; 48:187–93. [PubMed: 17900277]
64. Flegel WA, von Zabern I, Wagner FF. Six years' experience performing *RHD* genotyping to confirm D-red blood cell units in Germany for preventing anti-D immunization. *Transfusion*. 2009; 49:465–71. [PubMed: 19243542]
65. Touinssi M, Chapel-Fernandes S, Granier T, Bokilo A, Bailly P, Chiaroni J. Molecular analysis of inactive and active *RHD* alleles in native Congolese cohorts. *Transfusion*. 2009; 49:1353–60. [PubMed: 19351380]
66. Flegel WA, von Zabern I, Doescher A, Wagner FF, Strathmann KP, Geisen C, Palfi M, Pisacka M, Poole J, Polin H, Gabriel C, Avent ND. D variants at the RhD vestibule in the weak D type 4 and Eurasian D clusters. *Transfusion*. 2009; 49:1059–69. [PubMed: 19309476]
67. Bugert P, Scharberg EA, Geisen C, von Zabern I, Flegel WA. RhCE protein variants in Southwestern Germany detected by serological routine testing. *Transfusion*. 2009; 49:1793–802. [PubMed: 19453980]
68. Avent ND, Martinez A, Flegel WA, Olsson ML, Scott ML, Nogues N, Pisacka M, Daniels GL, Muniz-Diaz E, Madgett TE, Storry JR, Beiboer S, Maaskant-van Wijk PM, von Zabern I, Jimenez E, Tejedor D, Lopez M, Camacho E, Cheroute G, Hacker A, Jinoch P, Svobodova I, van der Schoot E, de Haas M. The Bloodgen Project of the European Union, 2003-2009. *Transfus Med Hemother*. 2009; 36:162–7. [PubMed: 21113258]
69. Wang D, Lane C, Quillen K. Prevalence of *RHD* variants, confirmed by molecular genotyping, in a multiethnic prenatal population. *Am J Clin Path*. 2010; 134:438–42. [PubMed: 20716800]
70. Schmid P, von Z I, Scharberg EA, Wagner FF, Flegel WA. Specific amino acid substitutions cause distinct expression of JAL (RH48) and JAHK (RH53) antigens in RhCE and not in RhD. *Transfusion*. 2010; 50:267–9. [PubMed: 20233350]
71. McGann H, Wenk RE. Alloimmunization to the D antigen by a patient with weak D type 21. *Immunohematology*. 2010; 26:27–9. [PubMed: 20795315]
72. Shao C-P. Transfusion of RhD-positive blood in “Asian type” DEL recipients. *N Engl J Med*. 2010; 362:472–3. [PubMed: 20130261]
73. Krog GR, Clausen FB, Berkowicz Jørgensen L, Rieneck K, Nielsen LK, Dziegiel MH. Is current serologic RhD typing of blood donors sufficient for avoiding immunization of recipients? *Transfusion*. 2011; 51:2278–85. [PubMed: 21569040]

74. Szczepura S, Osipenko L, Freeman K. A new fetal RHD genotyping test: Costs and benefits of mass testing to target antenatal anti-D prophylaxis in England and Wales. *BMC Pregnancy Childbirth*. 2011; 11:5. [PubMed: 21244652]
75. Pham BN, Roussel M, Peyrard T, Beolet M, Jan-Lasserre V, Gien D, Ripaux M, Bourgouin S, Kappler-Gratias S, Rouger P, Le Pennec PY. Anti-D investigations in individuals expressing weak D Type 1 or weak D Type 2: allo- or autoantibodies? *Transfusion*. 2011; 51:2679–85. [PubMed: 21658048]
76. Chen Q, Li M, Li M, Lu XS, Lü R, Sun J, Liu Z. Molecular basis of weak D and DEL in Han population in Anhui Province, China. *Chin Med J (Engl)*. 2012; 125:3251–5. [PubMed: 22964318]
77. Brajovich MEL, Boggione CT, Biondi CS, Racca AL, Tarragó M, Nogués N, Muñoz-Díaz E, Cotorruelo CM. Comprehensive analysis of *RHD* alleles in Argentineans with variant D phenotypes. *Transfusion*. 2012; 52:389–96. [PubMed: 21883261]
78. Fichou Y, Chen JM, Le Maréchal C, Jamet D, Dupont I, Chuteau C, Durousseau C, Loirat MJ, Bailly P, Férec C. Weak D caused by a founder deletion in the *RHD* gene. *Transfusion*. 2012; 52:2348–55. [PubMed: 22420867]
79. Srijinda S, Suwanasophon C, Visawapoka U, Pongsavee M. RhC[sic] phenotyping, adsorption/elution test, and SSP-PCR: the combined test for D-eluate phenotype screening in Thai RhD-negative blood donors. *ISRN Hematology*. 2012 article 358316.
80. Cruz BR, Chiba AK, Moritz E, Bordin JO. *RHD* alleles in Brazilian blood donors with weak D or D-negative phenotypes. *Transfus Med*. 2012; 22(2):84–9. [PubMed: 22211984]
81. Moussa H, Tsochandaridis M, Chakroun T, Jridi S, Abdelneji B, Hmida S, Silvy M, Bailly P, Gabert J, Levy-Mozziconacci A, Jemni-Yacoub S. Molecular background of D-negative phenotype in the Tunisian population. *Transfus Med*. 2012; 22:192–8. [PubMed: 22420413]
82. Kacem N, Chakroun T, Moussa H, Abdelkefi S, Houissa B, Chiaroni J, Jemni Yacoub S. *RHD* zygosity assignments based on most probable genotype and hybrid *Rhesus box* detection in Tunisia. *Transfus Med*. 2012; 22:362–6. [PubMed: 22757646]
83. Hussein E, Teruya J. Weak D types in the Egyptian population. *Am J Clin Path*. 2013; 139:806–11. [PubMed: 23690125]
84. Martin FO, de Menezes SS, Chiba AK, Langhi DM Jr, Nardoza LM, Chiattoni CS, Bordin JO. *RHD* gene polymorphisms in alloimmunized RhD-negative individuals with high rate of racial admixture. *Transfus Apher Sci*. 2013; 48:113–6. [PubMed: 23276724]
85. Fichou Y, Le Maréchal C, Jamet D, Bryckaert L, Ka C, Audrézet MP, Le Gac G, Dupont I, Chen JM, Férec C. Establishment of a medium-throughput approach for the genotyping of *RHD* variants and report of nine novel rare alleles. *Transfusion*. 2013; 53(8):1821–8. [PubMed: 23228153]
86. Pham BN, Roussel M, Gien D, Andre-Botte C, Ripaux M, Auxerre C, Le Pennec PY. Molecular analysis of patients with weak D and serologic analysis of those with anti-D (excluding type 1 and type 2). *Immunohematology*. 2013; 29:55–62. [PubMed: 24094237]
87. Orzi ska A, Guz K, Polin H, Pelc-Kłopotowska M, Bednarz J, Giele y ska A, Sliwa D, Kowalewska M, Pawłowska E, Włodarczyk B, Malaga M, mudzin A, Krzemienowska M, Srivastava K, Michalewska B, Gabriel C, Flegel WA, Brojer E. *RHD* variants in Polish blood donors routinely typed as D- *Transfusion*. 2013; 53(Suppl 2):2945–53. [PubMed: 23634715]
88. Abdelrazik AM, Elshafie SM, Ezzat Ahmed GM, Abdelaziz HM. Combining serology and molecular typing of weak D role in improving D typing strategy in Egypt. *Transfusion*. 2013; 53(Suppl 2):2940–4. [PubMed: 23362929]
89. Chou ST, Jackson T, Vege S, Smith-Whitley K, Friedman DF, Westhoff CM. High prevalence of red blood cell alloimmunization in sickle cell disease despite transfusion from Rh-matched minority donors. *Blood*. 2013; 122:1062–71. [PubMed: 23723452]
90. Reid ME, Halter Hipsky C, Hue-Royce K, Hoppe C. Genomic analysis of RH alleles to improve transfusion therapy in patients with sickle cell disease. *Blood Cells Mol Dis*. 2014; 52:195–202. [PubMed: 24309423]
91. Ouchari M, Chakroun T, Abdelkefi S, Romdhane H, Houissa B, Yacoub SJ. Anti-D- auto-immunization in a patient with weak D type 4.0. *Transfusion Clinique et Biologique*. 2014; 12:43–6. [PubMed: 24365172]

92. Gu J, Wang D-X, Shao C-P, Wang J, Sun A-Y, Huang L-H, Pan Z-L. Molecular basis of DEL phenotype in the Chinese population. *BMC Medical Genetics*. 2014; 15:54. [PubMed: 24884404]

Reviews, Editorials and Commentaries

93. Flegel WA, Wagner FF, Müller TH, Gassner C. Rh phenotype prediction by DNA typing and its application to practice. *Transfus Med*. 1998; 8:281–302. [PubMed: 9881423]
94. Flegel WA, Wagner FF. Molecular genetics of RH. *Vox Sang*. 2000; 78(Suppl 2):109–15. [PubMed: 10938938]
95. Flegel WA, Wagner FF. Molekularbiologie von partial D und weak D: Bedeutung für die Arbeit in der Blutzentrale. *MTA Dialog*. 2002; 8(3):662–5.
96. Avent ND, Reid M. The Rh blood group system: a review. *Blood*. 2000; 15:375–87. [PubMed: 10627438]
97. Flegel WA, Wagner FF. Molecular biology of partial D and weak D: implications for blood bank practice. *Clin Lab*. 2002; 48:53–9. [PubMed: 11833677]
98. Westhoff CM. The Rh blood group system in review: A new face for the next decade. *Transfusion*. 2004; 44:1663–73. [PubMed: 15504174]
99. Pisacka M, Vytiskova J, Zavadil J, Karasova R, Kralova M, Prosicka M, Flidrova H, Flegel WA, Wagner FF. Slabé a variantní RhD antigeny – charakteristiky a frekvence typu, vyšetřovaných v letech 1997–2002 v Referenční laboratorii pro imunohematologii. *Transfúze A Hematologie Dnes*. 2004; 9:37–47.
100. Wagner FF, Flegel WA. Review: the molecular basis of the Rh blood group phenotypes. *Immunohematology*. 2004; 20:23–36. [PubMed: 15373666]
101. Flegel WA. Homing in on D antigen immunogenicity. *Transfusion*. 2005; 45:466–8. [PubMed: 15819664]
102. Garratty G. Do we need to be more concerned about weak D antigens? *Transfusion*. 2005; 45:1547–51. [PubMed: 16181202]
103. Westhoff CM. Review: The Rh blood group D antigen...dominant, diverse, difficult. *Immunohematology*. 2005; 21:155–163. [PubMed: 16472017]
104. Flegel WA. Molecular genetics of *RH* and its clinical application. *Transfus Clin Biol*. 2006; 13:4–12. [PubMed: 16563832]
105. Engelfriet CP, Reesink HW. Testing for weak D. *Vox Sang*. 2006; 90:140–53. [PubMed: 16523560]
106. Noizat-Pirenne F, Verdier M, Lejealle A, Mercadier A, Bonin P, Peltier-Pujol F, Fialaire-Legendre A, Tournamille C, Bierling P, Ansart-Pirenne H. Weak D phenotypes and transfusion safety: where do we stand in daily practice? *Transfusion*. 2007; 47:1616–20. [PubMed: 17725725]
107. Westhoff CM. The structure and function of the Rh antigen complex. *Semin Hematol*. 2007; 44:42–50. [PubMed: 17198846]
108. Westhoff CM. Rh complexities: serology and DNA genotyping. *Transfusion*. 2007; 47:17S–22S. [PubMed: 17593281]
109. Flegel WA, Denomme GA, Yazer MH. On the complexity of D antigen typing: a handy decision tree in the age of molecular blood group diagnostics. *JOGC*. 2007; 29:746–52. [PubMed: 17825140]
110. Westhoff CM. Molecular genotyping for *RHD*: what (not) to do? *Transfusion*. 2007; 47:1337–9. [PubMed: 17655574]
111. Flegel WA. The genetics of the Rhesus blood group system. *Dtsch Ärzteblatt*. 2007; 104:A651–7.
112. Flegel, WA.; Wagner, FF. Genotyping of Red Blood Cell, Granulocyte and Platelet Antigens: Current Applications in the German-Speaking Countries. In: Scharf, RE., editor. *Progress and Challenges in Transfusion Medicine, Hemostasis and Hemotherapy*. Freiburg: Karger; 2008. p. 189-98.
113. Westhoff CM. The potential of blood group genotyping for transfusion medicine practice. *Immunohematology*. 2008; 24:190–5. [PubMed: 19856724]

114. Denomme GA, Dake LR, Vilensky D, Ramyar L, Judd WJ. Rh discrepancies caused by variable reactivity of partial and weak D types with different serologic techniques. *Transfusion*. 2008; 48:473–8. [PubMed: 18067505]
115. Denomme GA, Flegel WA. Applying molecular immunohematology discoveries to standards of practice in blood banks: now is the time. *Transfusion*. 2008; 48:2461–75. [PubMed: 19054376]
116. Flegel WA. Molecular genetics and clinical applications for *RH*. *Transfus Apher Sci*. 2011; 44:81–9. [PubMed: 21277262]
117. Sandler SG, Li W, Langeberg A, Landy H. New Laboratory Procedures and Rh Blood Type Changes in a Pregnant Woman. *Obstet Gynecol*. 2012; 119:426–8. [PubMed: 22270426]
118. Wagner FF. *RHD* PCR of D-negative blood donors. *Transfusion Med Hemather*. 2013; 40:172–81.
119. Daniels G. Variants of RhD-current testing and clinical consequences. *Br J Haematol*. 2013; 161:461–7. [PubMed: 23432139]
120. Flegel WA, Roseff S, Tholpady A. Phasing-in *RHD* genotyping. *Arch Pathol Lab Med*. 2014; 138:585–8. [PubMed: 24786114]
121. Wagner FF, Ladewig B, Angert KS, Heymann GA, Eicher NI, Flegel WA. The *DAU* allele cluster of the *RHD* gene. *Blood*. 2002; 100:306–11. [PubMed: 12070041]
122. Flegel WA. Are weak D RBCs really immunogenic? *Transfusion*. 2006; 46:1063–4.
123. Wolinsky H. A mythical beast: increased attention highlights the hidden wonders of chimeras. *EMBO Rep*. 2007; 8:212–4. [PubMed: 17330063]
124. Flegel WA. Will MICA glitter for recipients of kidney transplants? *N Engl J Med*. 2007; 357:1337–9. [PubMed: 17898104]
125. Quill E. Blood-matching goes genetic. *Science*. 2008; 319(5869):1478–9. [PubMed: 18339916]
126. Ramsey G. Q&A: giving Rh immune globulin to obstetrical patients with weak-D phenotypes. *AABB News*. 2011:6–7.
127. Flegel WA, Denomme GA. Allo- and autoanti-D in weak D types and in partial D. *Transfusion*. 2012; 52:2067–9. [PubMed: 22946976]
128. von Zabern I, Wagner FF, Moulds JM, Moulds JJ, Flegel WA. D category IV: a group of clinically relevant and phylogenetically diverse partial D. *Transfusion*. 2013; 53(Suppl 2):2960–73. [PubMed: 23461862]
129. Willard, H.; Ginsburg, GS. *Genomic and personalized medicine*. 1. Philadelphia PA: Elsevier; 2009.

Technical Resources

130. Konugres AA, Polesky HF, Walker RH. Rh immune globulin and the Rh-positive, Du variant mother. *Transfusion*. 1982; 22:76–7. [PubMed: 6801831]
131. Lowe AD, Green SM, Voak D, Gibson T, Lennox ES. A human-human monoclonal anti-D by direct fusion with a lymphoblastoid line. *Vox Sang*. 1986; 51:212–6. [PubMed: 3101287]
132. Jones J, Scott ML, Voak D. Monoclonal anti-D specificity and Rh D structure: criteria for selection of monoclonal anti-D reagents for routine typing of patients and donors. *Transfus Med*. 1995; 5:171–84. [PubMed: 8593521]
133. Jones J, Filbey D. Selection of monoclonal antibodies for the identification of D variants: ability to detect weak D and to split epD2, epD5 and epD6/7. *Vox Sang*. 1996; 70:173–9. [PubMed: 8740011]
134. Scott ML, Voak D, Jones JW, Avent ND, Liu W, Hughes-Jones N, Sonneborn H. A structural model for 30 Rh D epitopes based on serological and DNA sequence data from partial D phenotypes. *Transfus Clin Biol*. 1996; 3(6):391–6. [PubMed: 9018796]
135. Garratty G, Glynn SA. McEntire for the Retrovirology Epidemiology Donor Study. ABO and Rh(D) phenotype frequencies of different racial/ethnic groups in the United States. *Transfusion*. 2004; 44:703–6. [PubMed: 15104651]

136. Jenkins CM, Johnson ST, Bellissimo DB, Gottschall JL. Incidence of weak D in blood donors typed as D positive by the Olympus PK 7200. *Immunohematology*. 2005; 21:152–4. [PubMed: 16472016]
137. Judd WD, Moulds M, Schlanser G. Reactivity of FDA-approved anti-D reagents with partial D red blood cells. *Immunohematology*. 2005; 21:146–8. [PubMed: 16472014]
138. Whitaker, BI.; Hinkins, S. The 2011 National Blood Collection and Utilization Survey Report. US Department of Health and Human Services; OMB Number 0990-0313
139. Hawk AF, Chang EY, Shields SM, Simpson KN. Costs and clinical outcomes of noninvasive fetal RhD typing for targeted prophylaxis. *Obstet Gynecol*. 2013; 122:579–85. [PubMed: 23921866]
140. US Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. National Center for Health Statistics, National Vital Statistics System. National Vital Statistics Reports. 2013; 62(3) Births: Preliminary data for 2012.
141. Flegel WA, Chiosea I, Sachs UJ, Bein G. External quality assessment in molecular immunohematology: the INSTAND proficiency test program. *Transfusion*. 2013; 53(Suppl 2): 2850–8. [PubMed: 24111785]
142. Kim K-H, Kim K-E, Woo K-S, Han J-Y, Kim J-M, Park KU. Primary anti-D immunization by DEL red blood cells. *Korean J Lab Med*. 2009; 29:361–5. [PubMed: 19726900]

Standards and Guidelines

143. Scientific Committee of the Joint Blood Council, Standards Committee of the American Association of Blood Banks. Standards for a Blood Transfusion Service. 1. Washington, DC: Joint Blood Council; 1958. p. 10
144. Oberman, HA., editor. Standards for Blood Banks and Transfusion Services. 10. Washington, DC: American Association of Blood Banks; 1981.
145. American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists. The selective use of Rho (D) immune globulin (RhIG). Technical Bulletin #61. 1981
146. American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists. Prevention of Rh D alloimmunization/ number 4, May1999 (Replaces Educational Bulletin Number 147, October 1990). *Int J Gynecol Obstet*. 1999; 66:63–70.
147. Friley, J., editor. Standards for Blood Banks and Transfusion Services. 22. AABB; Bethesda, MD: 2003.
148. Fung, MK.; Grossman, BJ.; Hillyer, CD.; Westhoff, CM., editors. Technical Manual. 18. AABB; Bethesda, MD: 2014.
149. Levitt, J., editor. Standards for Blood Banks and Transfusion Services. 29. AABB; Bethesda, MD: 2014.

Fig. 1.

Unnecessary RhIG Injections. Of 3,953,000 live births in the United States each year, an estimated 13,360 mothers have a serological weak D phenotype which, if confirmed by *RHD* genotyping, could be managed as RhD-positive. Adjusting for antepartum and postpartum dosing, *RHD* genotyping of pregnant women with a serological weak D phenotype could prevent 24,700 unnecessary injections of RhIG.

Fig. 2.

Unnecessary Transfusion of RhD-negative RBC Units. Of 5,000,000 individuals transfused annually in the United States, an estimated 17,520 with a serological weak D phenotype will, in the absence of indirect antiglobulin testing, be typed as RhD-negative. If their *RHD* genotype were determined, they could be managed safely as RhD-positive. Since the average number of RBC units is 2.7 per recipient, *RHD* genotyping could make 47,700 units of RhD-negative RBCs available to patients who require them.

Result of RhD Typing by Manual Tube or Automated Methods in Initial Testing

Fig. 3.
Algorithm for resolving serological weak D phenotype test results by *RHD* genotyping to determine candidacy for Rh immune globulin (RhIG) and RhD type for transfusions.