



EP39

A Hierarchical Approach to Selecting Surrogate Samples for the Evaluation of *In Vitro* Medical Laboratory Tests

This guideline establishes a definition of a surrogate sample, provides recommendations for determining when to use surrogate samples, and describes a process for selecting the most appropriate surrogate sample.

.....
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 advances 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.

Appeal Process

When it is believed that an objection has not been adequately considered and responded to, the process for appeal, 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 wants 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

P: +1.610.688.0100

F: +1.610.688.0700

www.clsi.org

standard@clsi.org

A Hierarchical Approach to Selecting Surrogate Samples for the Evaluation of *In Vitro* Medical Laboratory Tests

April Veoukas, BS, JD
Shannon Bennett, MS, MBA, CMQOE(ASQ)
Melissa Barhoover, PhD, RAC
Natalya Benina, MS
Marvin Berman, PhD
Marc D. Goldford, BS
Shiaolan Y. Ho, PhD
Mark D. Kellogg, PhD, MT(ASCP), DABCC, FAACC
Mary Knighten, MT(AMT)

Marina V. Kondratovich, PhD
Gregory Jay Pomper, MD
Paula Ladwig, MS, MT(ASCP)
Fred D. Lasky, PhD
Sangeetha Vijaysri Nair, DVM, PhD
Patrick O'Donnell, BA
Michael Pikulski, PhD, DABCC, FACC
Yvonne Shea, MS
Bin Zhang, MD, MS

Abstract

Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute guideline EP39—*A Hierarchical Approach to Selecting Surrogate Samples for the Evaluation of In Vitro Medical Laboratory Tests* establishes a standard definition of a surrogate sample. It presents a hierarchical approach for determining when to use surrogate samples and selecting an appropriate one. It also describes elements of a surrogate sample plan and includes technical preparation guidance for the characteristic to be measured or detected and for artificial matrix compositions. This guideline provides examples for specific performance study types.

Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute (CLSI). *A Hierarchical Approach to Selecting Surrogate Samples for the Evaluation of In Vitro Medical Laboratory Tests*. 1st ed. CLSI guideline EP39 (ISBN 978-1-68440-130-7 [Print]; ISBN 978-1-68440-131-4 [Electronic]). Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute, USA, 2021.

The Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute consensus process, which is the mechanism for moving a document through two or more levels of review by the health care community, is an ongoing process. Users should expect revised editions of any given document. Because rapid changes in technology may affect the procedures, methods, and protocols in a standard or guideline, users should replace outdated editions with the current editions of CLSI documents. Current editions are listed in the CLSI catalog and posted on our website at www.clsi.org.

If you or your organization is not a member and would like to become one, or to request a copy of the catalog, contact us at:

P: +1.610.688.0100 **F:** +1.610.688.0700 **E:** customerservice@clsi.org **W:** www.clsi.org

Copyright ©2021 Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute. Except as stated below, any reproduction of content from a CLSI copyrighted standard, guideline, derivative product, or other material requires express written consent from CLSI. All rights reserved. Interested parties may send permission requests to permissions@clsi.org.

CLSI hereby grants permission to each individual member or purchaser to make a single reproduction of this publication for use in its laboratory procedures manual at a single site. To request permission to use this publication in any other manner, e-mail permissions@clsi.org.

Suggested Citation

CLSI. *A Hierarchical Approach to Selecting Surrogate Samples for the Evaluation of In Vitro Medical Laboratory Tests*, 1st ed. CLSI guideline EP39. Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute; 2021.

EP39-Ed1

ISBN 978-1-68440-130-7 (Print)

ISBN 978-1-68440-131-4 (Electronic)

ISSN 1558-6502 (Print)

ISSN 2162-2914 (Electronic)

Volume 41, Number 21

Committee Membership

Consensus Council

James R. Petisce, PhD
Chairholder
BD Diagnostic Systems
 USA

Avis Danishefsky, PhD
 FDA Center for Devices and
 Radiological Health
 USA

M. Laura Parnas, PhD, DABCC
 Roche Diagnostics
 USA

Tania Motschman, MS, MT(ASCP)SBB
Vice-Chairholder
 USA

Collette Fitzgerald, PhD
 Centers for Disease Control and
 Prevention
 USA

Victoria Petrides, MS
 Abbott
 USA

Deirdre Astin, MS, MT(ASCP)
 USA

Michelle McLean, MS, MT(ASCP), BS
 Greiner Bio-One, Inc.
 USA

Matthew A. Wikler, M.D., F.I.S.A., MBA
 IDTD Consulting
 USA

Anne T. Daley, MS, MT(ASCP)DLM,
 CMQ/OE(ASQ)CSBB
 USA

James H. Nichols, PhD, DABCC, FAACC
 Vanderbilt University School of
 Medicine
 USA

Document Development Committee on Surrogate Sample Framework

April Veoukas, BS, JD
Chairholder
Abbott Laboratories
 USA

Natalya Benina, MS
 Fujirebio Diagnostics
 USA

Mary Knighten, MT(AMT)
 Diagnostica Stago
 USA

Shannon Bennett, MS, MBA,
CMQOE(ASQ)
Vice-Chairholder
Mayo Clinic
 USA

Cheryl Dobbe, MLT, MT(ASCP)
 Centers for Medicare & Medicaid
 Services
 USA

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

Maureen D. Kellogg, PhD, MT(ASCP),
 DABCC, FAACC
 Boston Children's Hospital
 USA

Gregory J. Pomper, MD
 College of American Pathologists
 USA

Expert Panel on Evaluation Protocols

Paula Ladwig, MS, MT(ASCP)
Chairholder
Mayo Clinic
USA

Jeffrey R. Budd, PhD
 USA

Edward Ki Yun Leung, PhD, DABCC,
 FAACC
 Children's Hospital Los Angeles
 USA

James H. Nichols, PhD, DABCC,
FAACB
Vice-Chairholder
Vanderbilt University School of
Medicine
USA

A. Paul Durham, MA
 APD Consulting
 USA

Stephen Lovell, BS, PhD
 FDA Center for Devices and
 Radiological Health
 USA

Brett Holmquist, PhD, ASCP, DABCC,
 FAACC
 LabCorp - Endocrine Sciences
 USA

Nancy S. Miller, MD
 Boston University School of Medicine
 USA

Valeria L. Alcon, PhD
 Health Canada
 Canada

Jesper V. Johansen, PhD
 Radiometer Medical A/S
 Denmark

Jeffrey E. Vaks, PhD
 Roche Molecular Diagnostics
 USA

J. Rex Astles, PhD, DABCC, FAACC
 Centers for Disease Control and
 Prevention
 USA

Staff

Clinical and Laboratory Standards
 Institute
 USA

Laura Martin
Editorial Manager

Kristy L. Leirer, MS
Editor

Tabitha Kern, MS, MLS(ASCP)^{CM}
Project Manager

Catherine E.M. Jenkins, ELS
Editor

Acknowledgment

CLSI, the Consensus Council, and the Document Development Committee on Surrogate Sample Framework gratefully acknowledge the following volunteers for their important contributions to the development of this guideline:

Melissa Bar Hoover, PhD, RAC
 Diagnostica Stago
 USA

David D. Lasky, PhD
 Lasky Consulting
 USA

Michael Pikulski, PhD, DABCC, FACC
 Sonic Reference Laboratory
 USA

Marvin Berman, PhD
 Abbott Laboratories
 USA

Sangeetha Vijaysri Nair, DVM, PhD
 Hologic, Inc.
 USA

Yvonne Shea, MS
 FDA Center for Devices and
 Radiological Health
 USA

Marc D. Goldford, BS
 Sekisui Diagnostics
 USA

Patrick O'Donnell, BA
 Roche Molecular Diagnostics
 USA

Bin Zhang, MD, MS
 Siemens-Healthineers
 USA

Shiaoan V. Ho, PhD
 Abbott Laboratories
 USA

Contents

Abstract	i
Committee Membership	iii
Foreword	vii
Chapter 1: Introduction	1
1.1 Scope	1
1.2 Background	2
1.3 Standard Precautions	3
1.4 Terminology	3
Chapter 2: Path of Workflow	9
Chapter 3: Samples	13
3.1 Patient Sample	14
3.2 Surrogate Sample	14
Chapter 4: Surrogate Sample Hierarchical Approach	17
4.1 Decision to Use Surrogate Samples	18
4.2 Surrogate Sample Hierarchy	18
4.3 Surrogate Sample Composition	19
Chapter 5: Surrogate Sample Plan	23
5.1 Identifying Needed Samples	25
5.2 Developing a Surrogate Sample Plan	26
Chapter 6: Technical Preparation Techniques	27
6.1 Overview	28
6.2 Determining the Analyte	28
6.3 Selecting the Matrix	30
6.4 Surrogate Sample Stability	30
6.5 Process Steps	31
6.6 Storage	31

Contents (Continued)

Chapter 7: Special Considerations	33
7.1 Qualifying the Surrogate Sample	34
7.2 Demonstrating Comparability	35
7.3 Using Surrogate Samples for More Than One Study	36
7.4 Preparing Blank Surrogate Samples	37
7.5 Creating a Single Signature Score From Multiple Genes	39
7.6 Rare Subtypes	40
7.7 Surrogate Samples for Molecular Assays	41
Chapter 8: Application to Performance Studies	43
8.1 Linearity	44
8.2 Analytical Specificity	46
8.3 Precision	48
8.4 Detection Capability	49
8.5 Matrix Comparison	52
8.6 Method Comparison	54
8.7 Hook Effect	58
8.8 Sample Stability	59
8.9 Carryover	61
8.10 Reagent Stability	62
Chapter 9: Conclusion	65
Chapter 10: Supplemental Information	67
References	68
Additional Resources	72
Appendix A. Surrogate Sample Descriptions and Examples	73
Appendix B. Example Chemical Compositions for Artificial Matrixes	76
Appendix C. <i>Chlamydia trachomatis</i> : Precision/Reproducibility	79
Appendix D. Creatinine: Precision/Reproducibility	101
Appendix E. Total Prostate Specific Antigen: Precision/Reproducibility	106
Appendix F. Albumin: Method Comparison	112
Appendix G. <i>Chlamydia trachomatis</i> : Instrument Carryover	117
The Quality Management System Approach	128
Related CLSI Reference Materials	129

Foreword

Terms such as “contrived,” “altered,” “processed,” “diluted,” “supplemented,” and “simulated” have been used interchangeably to describe substitutions for patient samples. This guideline establishes a uniform term, “surrogate sample,” and definition to describe material(s) that is used as a substitute for body fluid or tissue from a single human individual.

When appropriately characterized patient samples are unavailable, surrogate samples serve an important role in the development, validation, and verification of laboratory tests. Surrogate samples may be needed for many reasons, including limited sample volume or inadequate numbers of patient samples with concentrations at medical decision levels or at the extremes of the analytical measuring interval. A lack of available patient samples may be due to low disease prevalence, invasive sampling methods, or other reasons.

This guideline establishes an approach for selecting, preparing, and using surrogate samples. It describes the principles for creating a surrogate sample plan and presents a hierarchy, by performance study type, for selecting an appropriate surrogate sample. The hierarchical approach is demonstrated through product- and performance-specific examples.

KEY WORDS

Artificial analyte

Pooled

Supplemented

Artificial matrix

Sample plan

Surrogate sample

Hierarchy

Simulated

This page is intentionally left blank.

Chapter 1

Introduction

This chapter includes:

- Guideline's scope and applicable exclusions
- Background information pertinent to the guideline's content
- Standard precautions information
- Terminology information, including:
 - Terms and definitions used in the guideline
 - Abbreviations and acronyms used in the guideline

A Hierarchical Approach to Selecting Surrogate Samples for the Evaluation of *In Vitro* Medical Laboratory Tests

1 Introduction

1.1 Scope

This guideline establishes a definition of “surrogate sample” and an approach for selecting, preparing, and using these samples. It discusses surrogate sample:

- Composition
- Technical preparation
- Selection criteria
- Documentation and planning
- Use in specific performance study types

The intended users of this guideline are *in vitro* diagnostic (IVD) device developers, laboratorians, and regulators. This guideline does not describe performance study design, which is covered in other standards and guidelines (see CLSI document EP19²).

1.2 Background

Development, validation, and verification of laboratory tests depends on the availability of patient samples for testing. When appropriate patient samples are unavailable to validate test performance, using surrogate samples enables more efficient use of biological materials, improves testing efficiency, and facilitates the development of tests for new biomarkers. Patient samples for test development and other uses may be unavailable for several reasons.

Reasons that patient samples cannot be used include:

- Logistical constraints
- Insufficient sample volumes
- Inadequate numbers of samples, such as those with concentrations at medical decision levels (MDLs) or at the extremes of the analytical measuring interval (AMI)
- Technical constraints
- Unsatisfactory samples (ie, that lack the necessary characteristics for a performance study)
- Instability of samples
- Unavailability of blank or negative samples