CLINICAL AND LABORATORY STANDARDS INSTITUTE®

October 2014

EP05-A3

Evaluation of Precision of Quantitative Measurement Procedures; Approved Guideline—Third Edition

This document provides guidance for evaluating the precision performance of quantitative measurement procedures. It is intended for manufacturers of quantitative measurement procedures and for laboratories that develop or modify such procedures.

A guideline for global application developed through the Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute consensus process.

Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute

Setting the standard for quality in medical laboratory testing around the world.

The Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute (CLSI) is a not-for-profit membership organization that brings together the varied perspectives and expertise of the worldwide laboratory community for the advancement of a common cause: to foster excellence in laboratory medicine by developing and implementing medical laboratory standards and guidelines that help laboratories fulfill their responsibilities with efficiency, effectiveness, and global applicability.

Consensus Process

Consensus—the substantial agreement by materially affected, competent, and interested parties—is core to the development of all CLSI documents. It does not always connote unanimous agreement, but does mean that the participants in the development of a consensus document have considered and resolved all relevant objections and accept the resulting agreement.

Commenting on Documents

CLSI documents undergo periodic evaluation and modification to keep pace with advancements in technologies, procedures, methods, and protocols affecting the laboratory or health care.

CLSI's consensus process depends on experts who volunteer to serve as contributing authors and/or as participants in the reviewing and commenting process. At the end of each comment period, the committee that developed the document is obligated to review all comments, respond in writing to all substantive comments, and revise the draft document as appropriate.

Comments on published CLSI documents are equally essential, and may be submitted by anyone, at any time, on any document. All comments are managed according to the consensus process by a committee of experts.

Appeals Process

When it is believed that an objection has not been adequately considered and responded to, the process for appeals, documented in the CLSI Standards Development Policies and Processes, is followed.

All comments and responses submitted on draft and published documents are retained on file at CLSI and are available upon request.

Get Involved—Volunteer!

Do you use CLSI documents in your workplace? Do you see room for improvement? Would you like to get involved in the revision process? Or maybe you see a need to develop a new document for an emerging technology? CLSI want to hear from you. We are always looking for volunteers. By donating your time and talents to improve the standards that affect your own work, you will play an active role in improving public health across the globe.

For additional information on committee participation or to submit comments, contact CLSI.

Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute
940 West Valley Road, Suite 2500
Wayne, PA 19087 USA
P: +1.610.688.0100
F: +1.610.688.0700
www.clsi.org
standard@clsi.org

ISBN 1-56238-967-X (Print)
ISBN 1-56238-968-8 (Electronic)
ISSN 1558-6502 (Print)
ISSN 2162-2914 (Electronic)

EP05-A3
Vol. 34 No. 13
Replaces EP05-A2
Vol. 24 No. 25

Volume 34 Number 13

Evaluation of Precision of Quantitative Measurement Procedures; Approved Guideline—Third Edition

Robert J. McEnroe, PhD
A. Paul Durham
Marc D. Goldford
Marina V. Kondratovich, PhD
Samir Lababidi, PhD
Robert Magari, PhD
Jonathan Guy Middle, PhD
James F. Pierson-Perry
Jeffrey E. Vaks, PhD

Abstract

Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute document EP05-A3—*Evaluation of Precision of Quantitative Measurement Procedures; Approved Guideline—Third Edition* provides guidance for evaluating the precision of *in vitro* diagnostic quantitative measurement experimental designs and includes recommendations for establishing precision performance. Included are guidelines for duration, experimental designs, materials, data analysis, summarization, and interpretation—techniques adaptable for a wide spectrum of measurands and systems of complexity. These guidelines are intended for manufacturers or developers of clinical laboratory measurement procedures, and for users who wish to determine their own performance characteristics. A balance is created in the document between complexity of design and analysis, and simplicity of operation.

Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute (CLSI). *Evaluation of Precision of Quantitative Measurement Procedures; Approved Guideline—Third Edition*. CLSI document EP05-A3 (ISBN 1-56238-967-X [Print]; ISBN 1-56238-968-8 [Electronic]). Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute, 950 West Valley Road, Suite 2500, Wayne, Pennsylvania 19087 USA, 2014.

Suggested Citation*

CLSI. *Evaluation of Precision of Quantitative Measurement Procedures; Approved Guideline—Third Edition.* CLSI document EP05-A3. Wayne, PA: Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute; 2014.

Previous Editions:

December 1981, December 1982, February 1999, August 2004

Reaffirmed:

September 2019

ISBN 1-56238[illegible]67-X (Print)
ISBN 1-562[illegible]96[illegible]8 (Electronic)
ISSN 155[illegible]502 (Print)
ISSN 21[illegible]2914 (Electronic)

*EP05-A3 was initially released in September 2014. Users with a September 2014 version of EP05-A3 should contact CLSI at customerservice@clsi.org to request the current edition.

Committee Membership

Consensus Committee on Evaluation Protocols

James F. Pierson-Perry
Chairholder
Siemens Healthcare Diagnostics, Inc.
Newark, Delaware, USA

Mitchell G. Scott, PhD
Vice-Chairholder
Barnes-Jewish Hospital
St. Louis, Missouri, USA

Karl De Vore
Bio-Rad Laboratories
Irvine, California, USA

Robert J. McEnroe, PhD
Roche Diagnostics, Inc.
Indianapolis, Indiana, USA

James H. Nichols, PhD, DABCC, FACB
Vanderbilt University School of Medicine
Nashville, Tennessee, USA

Gene Pennello, PhD
FDA Center for Devices and Radiological Health
Silver Spring, Maryland, USA

Megan E. Sawchuk, MT(ASCP)
Centers for Disease Control and Prevention
Atlanta, Georgia, USA

Document Development Committee on Evaluation of Precision

Robert J. McEnroe, PhD
Chairholder
Roche Diagnostics, Inc.
Indianapolis, Indiana, USA

Victor R. De Jesus, PhD
Centers for Disease Control and Prevention
Atlanta, Georgia, USA

Marc D. Goldford
r2 Diagnostics
South Bend, Indiana, USA

Walter W. Hauck, PhD
USP
Rockville, Maryland, USA

Ming Jin, PhD
University of Illinois Medical Center
Chicago, Illinois, USA

Samir Lababidi, PhD
FDA Center for Biologics Evaluation and Research
Rockville, Maryland, USA

Robert Maggiore, PhD
Beckman Coulter
Miami, Florida, USA

Jonathan Guy Middle, PhD
Birmingham, United Kingdom

James F. Pierson-Perry
Siemens Healthcare Diagnostics, Inc.
Newark, Delaware, USA

Staff

Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute
Wayne, Pennsylvania, USA

Luann Ochs, MS
Senior Vice President – Operations
Staff Liaison

Ron S. Quicho, MS
Project Manager

Megan L. Tertel, MA
Editorial Manager

Joanne P. Christopher, MA
Editor

Patrice E. Polgar
Editor

Acknowledgment

CLSI and the Consensus Committee on Evaluation Protocols gratefully acknowledge the following individuals for their help in preparing this document:

Marina V. Kondratovich, PhD
FDA Center for Devices and
Radiological Health
Silver Spring, Maryland, USA

Jeffrey E. Vaks, PhD
Roche Molecular Systems
Pleasanton, California, USA

Contents

Contents (Continued)

Foreword

Current clinical laboratory literature contains numerous examples of product evaluations. For characterizing basic precision types, many of these examples use the basic concepts, designs, and analyses discussed in this guideline. In special cases, more complex and customized experimental designs have been used for both published studies and regulatory purposes. However, there remains a strong need in the clinical laboratory community for the basic rationales and approaches described in this document for assessing the precision performance characteristics of quantitative measurement procedures.

The great diversity of *in vitro* diagnostic devices currently available makes it impossible to recommend a single experimental design for all measurement procedures and associated devices. Nevertheless, requirements for materials, procedures, data analysis, and interpretation must be adaptable for the widest possible variety of measurands and instruments. In developing the standardized protocols in this document, many recommendations for duration, inclusion of QC procedures, and methods of determining the relevant sources of variation were carefully considered. The resulting protocols represent a balance between complexity of design and data analysis, and simplicity of implementation and efficiency. This document was written to provide general guidance consistent with other international consensus standards.

KEY WORDS

Analysis of variance

Evaluation protocol

Experimental design

Imprecision

Outliers

Precision

Precision profile

Quality control

Repeatability

Reproducibility

Variance components

Within-laboratory precision

Overview of Changes

The third edition narrows the scope of EP05 by limiting its discussion of single-site experimental designs to procedures suitable for establishing or validating precision performance characteristics. Accordingly, EP05 is now addressed primarily to manufacturers and developers. Recommendations for end-user laboratories for verifying repeatability and within-laboratory precision claims can be found in CLSI document EP15[1]. The precision verification protocol in that guideline has been tailored for compatibility with EP05's single-site study designs.

The single-site protocol familiar from previous editions of EP05—calling for measurements on 20 days, with two runs per day and two replicates per run for a given sample, reagent lot, etc.—is retained in this third edition as a standardized experiment for use by manufacturers and developers in evaluating the repeatability and within-laboratory (within-device) precision of a measurement procedure (or "assay").

No matter how the performance characteristics are established, it is important that the assessments be verifiable, and that they characterize precision over a substantial period of time and across most of the assay's stated measuring interval. The single-site experimental designs described in EP05 meet these requirements (see Chapter 3). It is expected that the original "20×2×2" design will continue to serve well for the great majority of quantitative assays used in clinical laboratories. However, extensive guidance was added on how to optimize the design for a given assay in light of its sources of variation and their relative magnitudes and interrelationships (see Chapter 2).

Moreover, in recognition of the wide diversity of quantitative devices in use today, which differ in character and complexity, variants of the 20×2×2 design are also discussed. Appendix C is devoted to advanced models—multifactor designs—for use when a two-factor design lacks the ability to do justice to the major sources of

NOTE:

The **original 20×2×2 protocol** is expected to continue to serve well for most assays.

NOTE:

New to EP05 is an ancillary multisite protocol for estimating **reproducibility.**

NOTE:

EP05 now includes a **tutorial** on precision concepts for the nonstatistician.

IMPORTANT NOTE:

The user should have access to software for variance component analysis, such as **CLSI's StatisPro.**

variation affecting an assay's within-laboratory precision. Depending on the assay, some of these models should also prove useful to manufacturers for the insights they can yield both during assay development and optimization and after the assay enters routine production.

New to EP05 is a second standardized experiment: a multisite protocol calling, minimally, for repeated measurements at three sites on five days. Both 3 (sites) × 5 (days) × 5 (replicates per day) and 3 (sites) × 5 (days) × 2 (runs per day) × 3 (replicates per run) implementations are described (see Chapter 4). This ancillary protocol addresses site-to-site variability and estimates of reproducibility. It has been tailored for suitability in the context of validating a new assay, when such a study may be required due to the assay's character and/or to regulatory demands.

To help foster understanding of basic concepts, the new edition includes an extensive tutorial for the nonstatistician (see Section 1.5). Numerical examples illustrating a single-site 20 × 2 × 2 study and a complete multisite 3 × 5 × 5 study are presented in the appendixes.

Due to the complex nature of the calculations in this guideline, it is recommended that the user have access to a computer and statistical software such as StatisPro™ method evaluation software from CLSI.

Consistency With International Standards

EP05 is largely consistent with recommendations in the ISO 5725 series of standards, particularly ISO 5725-3.[2] EP05's single-site study incorporates the basic concepts in ISO 5725-2.[3] Whereas the ISO 5725 perspective places primary emphasis on interlaboratory sources of variation, EP05 has focused on within-laboratory sources of variation accumulating over time. However, EP05's newly introduced multisite study addresses site-to-site sources of variation and estimates of reproducibility.

Furthermore, while the ISO 5725 series requires characterizing both repeatability and reproducibility across the entire measuring interval, this is encouraged (but not required) in EP05.

Chapter 1

Introduction

This chapter includes:

- Document scope and limitations
- Standard precautions information, as applicable
- Terminology: definitions, abbreviations, and symbols
- Introduction to basic concepts: a tutorial on precision and precision evaluation studies

Evaluation of Precision of Quantitative Measurement Procedures; Approved Guideline—Third Edition

1 Introduction

1.1 Scope

This document provides guidance for studies intended to establish the within-site precision performance characteristics of quantitative measurement procedures used in clinical laboratories, and also for studies addressing site-to-site variability. Multiple experimental protocols are described, along with considerations on how to select and optimize the protocol(s) best suited for a specific measurement procedure (or "assay") and its intended use.

1.1.1 Intended Users

Intended users of this document are:

- Developers of a new measurement procedure who wish to establish its precision characteristics, be it a manufacturer that wants to distribute the product to multiple laboratories, or a clinical laboratory developing it for their own use
- End users who modify an existing assay and therefore need to reassess its precision performance
- Users who want to understand how precision performance estimates are established and/or want to perform rigorous precision assessments of their own
- Manufacturers in need of advanced methods (see Appendix C) for obtaining deeper insights into the precision characteristics of a quantitative measurement procedure during assay development, optimization, and routine manufacture

It is assumed that readers of this document have some familiarity with statistical data analysis, including basic analysis of variance (ANOVA), or access to statistical support resources. Section 1.5 provides a brief introduction to several of the basic concepts involved; while CLSI document EP15[1] includes a detailed discussion of one-way ANOVA.

NOTE:

For guidance on **verifying precision claims,** consult CLSI document EP15.[1]

1.1.2 Limitations on Use

Those wishing only to verify a manufacturer's claims for the precision of a quantitative clinical measurement procedure should follow the guidance in CLSI document EP15.[1]

The protocols in this document may not be applicable to some quantitative measurement procedures for which appropriate test materials do not exist. In particular, the standardized single-site and multisite procedures are not directly applicable to measurement procedures involving samples with **inadequate stability** (eg, RBC count or blood gas determinations)