

This is a preview of "CLSI EP17-A2". Click here to purchase the full version from the ANSI store.



June 2012

# EP17-A2

## Evaluation of Detection Capability for Clinical Laboratory Measurement Procedures; Approved Guideline—Second Edition

This document provides guidance for evaluation and documentation of the detection capability of clinical laboratory measurement procedures (ie, limits of blank, detection, and quantitation), for verification of manufacturers' detection capability claims, and for the proper use and interpretation of different detection capability estimates.

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 clinical 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 clinical 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 addressed according to the consensus process by a committee of experts.

## Appeals Process

If it is believed that an objection has not been adequately addressed, the process for appeals is documented in the CLSI Administrative Procedures.

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

Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute  
950 West Valley Road, Suite 2500  
Wayne, PA 19087 USA  
P: 610.688.0100  
F: 610.688.0700  
[www.clsi.org](http://www.clsi.org)  
[standard@clsi.org](mailto:standard@clsi.org)

ISBN 1-56238-795-2 (Print)  
ISBN 1-56238-796-0 (Electronic)  
ISSN 1558-6502 (Print)  
ISSN 2162-2914 (Electronic)

EP17-A2  
Vol. 32 No. 8  
Replaces EP17-A  
Vol. 24 No. 34

---

## Evaluation of Detection Capability for Clinical Laboratory Measurement Procedures; Approved Guideline—Second Edition

Volume 32 Number 8

James F. Pierson-Perry  
Jeffrey E. Vaks, PhD  
A. Paul Durham, MA  
Christian Fischer, MD  
Cornelius Gutenbrunner, PhD  
David Hillyard, MD  
Marina V. Kondratovich, PhD  
Paula Ladwig  
Robert A. Middleberg, PhD, DABFT, DABCC

### Abstract

Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute document EP17-A2—*Evaluation of Detection Capability for Clinical Laboratory Measurement Procedures; Approved Guideline—Second Edition* provides guidance for evaluating the detection capability of clinical laboratory measurement procedures (ie, limits of blank, detection, and quantitation), for verification of manufacturers' detection capability claims, and for the proper use and interpretation of different detection capability estimates. EP17 is intended for use by manufacturers of *in vitro* diagnostic tests, regulatory bodies, and clinical laboratories.

Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute (CLSI). *Evaluation of Detection Capability for Clinical Laboratory Measurement Procedures; Approved Guideline—Second Edition*. CLSI document EP17-A2 (ISBN 1-56238-795-2 [Print]; ISBN 1-56238-796-0 [Electronic]). Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute, 950 West Valley Road, Suite 2500, Wayne, Pennsylvania 19087 USA, 2012.

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](http://www.clsi.org). If your organization is not a member and would like to become one, and to request a copy of the catalog, contact us at: Telephone: 610.688.0100; Fax: 610.688.0700; E-Mail: [customerservice@clsi.org](mailto:customerservice@clsi.org); Website: [www.clsi.org](http://www.clsi.org)



Copyright ©2012 Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute. Except as stated below, any reproduction of content from a CLSI copyrighted standard, guideline, companion product, or other material requires express written consent from CLSI. All rights reserved. Interested parties may send permission requests to [permissions@clsi.org](mailto: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 procedure manual at a single site. To request permission to use this publication in any other manner, e-mail [permissions@clsi.org](mailto:permissions@clsi.org).

### **Suggested Citation**

CLSI. *Evaluation of Detection Capability for Clinical Laboratory Measurement Procedures; Approved Guideline—Second Edition*. CLSI document EP17-A2. Wayne, PA: Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute; 2012.

### **Proposed Guideline**

March 2004

### **Approved Guideline**

October 2004

### **Approved Guideline—Second Edition**

June 2012

ISBN 1-56238-795-2 (Print)

ISBN 1-56238-796-0 (Electronic)

ISSN 1558-6502 (Print)

ISSN 2162-2914 (Electronic)

## Committee Membership

### Consensus Committee on Evaluation Protocols

**James F. Pierson-Perry**  
**Chairholder**

**Siemens Healthcare Diagnostics**  
**Newark, Delaware, USA**

Rex Astles, PhD, FACB, DABCC  
Centers for Disease Control and  
Prevention  
Atlanta, Georgia, USA

Jonathan Guy Middle, PhD  
University Hospital Birmingham  
NHS Trust  
Birmingham, United Kingdom

**Mitchell G. Scott, PhD**  
**Vice-Chairholder**

**Barnes-Jewish Hospital**  
**Washington University School of**  
**Medicine**  
**St. Louis, Missouri, USA**

Jeffrey R. Budd, PhD  
Beckman Coulter  
Chaska, Minnesota, USA

James H. Nichols, PhD, DABCC,  
FACB  
Baystate Medical Center  
Springfield, Massachusetts, USA

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

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

### Document Development Committee on Detection Capability for Clinical Laboratory Measurements Procedures

**James F. Pierson-Perry**  
**Chairholder**

**Siemens Healthcare Diagnostics**  
**Newark, Delaware, USA**

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

Luann Ochs, MS  
*Senior Vice President – Operations*

**Jeffrey E. Vaks, PhD**  
**Vice-Chairholder**

**Roche Molecular Diagnostics**  
**Pleasanton, California, USA**

Paula Ladwig  
Mayo Clinic  
Rochester, Minnesota, USA

Ron S. Quicho  
*Staff Liaison*

Patrice E. Polgar  
*Project Manager*

Christian Fischer, MD  
Abbott GmbH & Co. KG  
Wiesbaden-Delkenheim, Germany

Robert A. Middleberg, PhD,  
DABFT, DABCC  
National Medical Services, Inc.  
Willow Grove, Pennsylvania, USA

Megan P. Larrisey, MA  
*Editor*

Ryan J. Torres  
*Assistant Editor*

David Hillyard, MD  
University of Utah  
ARUP Laboratories  
Salt Lake City, Utah, USA

#### **Staff**

Clinical and Laboratory Standards  
Institute  
Wayne, Pennsylvania, USA

### Acknowledgment

CLSI and the Consensus Committee on Evaluation Protocols gratefully acknowledge the following volunteers for their important contributions to the development of this document:

A. Paul Durham, MA  
Culver City, California, USA

Cornelius Gutenbrunner, PhD  
Siemens Healthcare Diagnostics Products GmbH  
Marburg, Germany



**Contents**

Abstract..... i

Committee Membership..... iii

Foreword..... vii

1 Scope..... 1

2 Standard Precautions..... 1

3 Terminology..... 1

    3.1 A Note on Terminology ..... 1

    3.2 Definitions ..... 2

    3.3 Abbreviations and Acronyms ..... 4

4 Background..... 5

    4.1 Overview of Detection Capability ..... 5

    4.2 Historical Perspectives..... 6

    4.3 Current Status ..... 8

    4.4 Application to Qualitative Measurement Procedures ..... 9

    4.5 General Notes on Sample Selection..... 9

    4.6 General Notes on Data Collection and Review ..... 10

5 Protocols for Evaluation of the Limit of Blank and Limit of Detection ..... 10

    5.1 Introduction..... 10

    5.2 Selection of Experimental Protocol ..... 11

    5.3 Classical Approach ..... 12

    5.4 Precision Profile Approach..... 18

    5.5 Probit Approach..... 22

6 Protocol for Evaluation of the Limit of Quantitation..... 27

    6.1 Introduction..... 27

    6.2 Specification of Accuracy Goals ..... 28

    6.3 Experimental Design..... 29

    6.4 Experimental Steps ..... 30

    6.5 Data Analysis..... 30

    6.6 Variant Approach: Combined Limits of Detection and Quantitation Evaluation ..... 31

7 Verification of Detection Capability Claims ..... 32

    7.1 Introduction..... 32

    7.2 Verification of a Limit of Blank Claim..... 33

    7.3 Verification of a Limit of Detection Claim..... 34

    7.4 Verification of a Limit of Quantitation Claim ..... 35

8 Reporting Detection Capability ..... 36

    8.1 Interpretations and Reporting Intervals for Quantitative Measurement Procedure Results..... 37

    8.2 Example Labeling for Detection Capability Claims of Quantitative Measurement Procedures..... 39

References..... 40

Appendix A. Worked Example: Evaluation of Limits of Blank and Detection by the Classical Approach..... 42

**Contents (Continued)**

Appendix B. Worked Example: Evaluation of Limit of Detection by the Precision Profile Approach.....47

Appendix C. Worked Example: Evaluation of Limit of Detection by the Probit Approach .....51

Appendix D. Worked Examples: Evaluation of Limit of Quantitation.....54

Appendix E. Worked Example: Verification of Limits of Blank and Detection Claims .....60

Appendix F. Worked Example: Verification of Limit of Quantitation Claim .....61

The Quality Management System Approach .....62

Related CLSI Reference Materials .....63



## Foreword

Detection capability is a fundamental performance characteristic of clinical laboratory measurement procedures, most often serving to denote the low-end boundary of a measurement procedure's measuring interval. However, understanding and evaluating detection capability may often be confusing because of the different types of estimates, experimental protocols, and nomenclature used in manufacturers' product claims, as well as within scientific literature throughout the past several decades.

The use of multiple detection capability estimates arises from a need to reflect increasing quantitative certainty within the low-end region of the measuring interval. This ranges from an upper boundary on blank sample measurements (the limit of blank or LoB), through "yes/no" detection of measurand presence (the limit of detection or LoD), up to the minimal measurand amount that can be quantitated reliably with respect to defined accuracy goals (the limit of quantitation or LoQ). Depending on the particular measurement procedure and its application, one, two, or all three of these estimates may be necessary to adequately characterize performance in the low-end region of the measuring interval.

The LoB and LoD are objective statistical constructs that are calculated solely on the basis of the inherent measurement procedure precision and bias. In contrast, the LoQ reflects performance of the measurement procedure vs a preestablished accuracy goal. This is a more subjective value, because the LoQ for a given measurement procedure may vary among different users or applications depending on what are used as the relevant accuracy goals.

The LoD and LoQ are critical when detection of extremely small amounts of a measurand is necessary to define disease states, screen for presence of disease, identify significant exposure, or reveal the presence or absence of substances such as toxins, pollutants, carcinogens, contaminants, infectious agents, and drugs. Knowledge of these estimates also is important for laboratory measurement procedures that measure circulating levels of tumor markers, hormones, infectious disease agents, therapeutic drugs, and other biomarkers for which low results separate subjects into different disease or exposure categories. Even for measurement procedures that report results in qualitative or semiquantitative units, as long as the measurand is a quantity value the developer can use knowledge of the measurement procedure's detection capability to ensure that the measurement procedure design goals were achieved.

Since its original publication in 2004, EP17 has been widely used by manufacturers of *in vitro* diagnostic products to establish product performance claims and by clinical laboratory personnel to verify the claims, and is recognized internationally by regulatory bodies. The present revision builds on the original document by expanding the evaluation protocols to include molecular measurement procedures and providing a more parametric estimate of LoD, as well as by addressing issues of clarity, protocol experimental design requirements, and data analyses. The document title was changed to reflect a broader focus on detection capability as a whole, rather than confining the document to the scope implied by the previous title, *Protocols for Determination of Limits of Detection and Limits of Quantitation*.

Content of this guideline is aligned with International Organization for Standardization document 11843, *Parts 1–5: Capability of detection*.<sup>1-5</sup>

## Key Words

Analytical sensitivity, functional sensitivity, limit of blank, limit of detection, limit of quantitation, nonparametric statistics, precision profile, probit



## **Evaluation of Detection Capability for Clinical Laboratory Measurement Procedures; Approved Guideline—Second Edition**

### **1 Scope**

This document provides guidelines for the evaluation and verification of detection capability claims of clinical laboratory measurement procedures (ie, limit of blank [LoB], limit of detection [LoD], and limit of quantitation [LoQ]), as well as for their proper use, documentation, and interpretation. This guidance is suitable both for commercial products as well as laboratory-developed tests. It is particularly important for measurement procedures for which the associated measurand's medical decision level is low (ie, approaching zero).

The intended users of this guideline are manufacturers of *in vitro* diagnostic (IVD) reagents, regulatory bodies, and clinical laboratory personnel.

### **2 Standard Precautions**

Because it is often impossible to know what isolates or specimens might be infectious, all patient and laboratory specimens are treated as infectious and handled according to “standard precautions.” Standard precautions are guidelines that combine the major features of “universal precautions and body substance isolation” practices. Standard precautions cover the transmission of all known infectious agents and thus are more comprehensive than universal precautions, which are intended to apply only to transmission of blood-borne pathogens. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention address this topic in published guidelines that focus on the daily operations of diagnostic medicine in human and animal medicine while encouraging a culture of safety in the laboratory.<sup>6</sup> For specific precautions for preventing the laboratory transmission of all known infectious agents from laboratory instruments and materials and for recommendations for the management of exposure to all infectious diseases, refer to CLSI document M29.<sup>7</sup>

### **3 Terminology**

#### **3.1 A Note on Terminology**

As a global leader in standardization, CLSI is firmly committed to achieving global harmonization wherever possible. Harmonization is a process of recognizing, understanding, and explaining differences while taking steps to achieve worldwide uniformity. CLSI recognizes that medical conventions in the global metrological community have evolved differently in the United States, Europe, and elsewhere; that these differences are reflected in CLSI, International Organization for Standardization (ISO), and European Committee for Standardization (CEN) documents; and that legally required use of terms, regional usage, and different consensus timelines are all important considerations in the harmonization process. In light of this, CLSI's consensus process for development and revision of standards and guidelines focuses on harmonization of terms to facilitate the global application of standards and guidelines.

Because of the widespread application of the LoD and LoQ concepts, a variety of terms are in common usage. This document does not attempt to explain or reconcile all of these terms. Terms particular to this document are defined in Section 3.2. However, there are two common terms that have nonstandard usage in the clinical laboratory. To prevent confusion, these terms are discussed in Sections 3.1.1 and 3.1.2.