CLINICAL AND LABORATORY STANDARDS INSTITUTE®

1st Edition

POCT06

Effects of Different Sample Types on Glucose Measurements

This report provides information to assist the clinical and point-of-care staff in result and measurement procedure comparisons of glucose tests.

A CLSI report for global application.

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 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
950 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

POCT06, 1st ed.
May 2015

Effects of Different Sample Types on Glucose Measurements

Mary C. Coyle, MS, MT(ASCP)
Ellis Jacobs, PhD, DABCC, FACB
Ann Chappie, MT(HHS)
Jeff Dahlen, PhD
Bradley S. Karon, MD, PhD
John J. Mahoney
Ronald H. Ng, PhD, DABCC, FACB
Donald R. Parker, PhD, DABCC, FACB, CLASCB
David B. Sacks, MD
Steven Scott

Abstract

Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute document POCT06—*Effects of Different Sample Types on Glucose Measurements* provides information to assist the clinical and point-of-care staff in understanding the potential impact of the use of different sample types on results and measurement procedure comparisons of glucose test systems. The information includes preexamination, examination, and physiological considerations. This report will help clinicians understand how to better design evaluation protocols for technology or devices under consideration. Use of this report by clinicians will also help ensure that even those who adopt new technologies early will do so with the knowledge that ensures patient safety. Use of this report by manufacturers will help ensure they can meet and understand customer requirements in their product design for glucose testing systems.

The impacts of sample type, test methodology, calibration, sample transportation or delay in testing, and frequency are reviewed. The influence of metabolic changes was minimally addressed in CLSI document POCT12[1] and will be expanded upon here in order to help clinicians understand how to decide if metabolic changes are influencing result variances noted in a comparison.

Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute (CLSI). *Effects of Different Sample Types on Glucose Measurements*. 1st ed. CLSI report POCT06 (ISBN 1-56238-901-7 [Print]; ISBN 1-56238-902-5 [Electronic]). Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute, 950 West Valley Road, Suite 2500, Wayne, Pennsylvania 19087 USA, 2015.

POCT06, 1st ed.

Suggested Citation

CLSI. *Effects of Different Sample Types on Glucose Measurements.* 1st ed. CLSI report POCT06. Wayne, PA: Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute; 2015.

Reaffirmed:
June 2020

ISBN 1-56238-901-7 (Print)
ISBN 1-56238-902-5 (Electronic)
ISSN 1558-6502 (Print)
ISSN 2162-2914 (Electronic) Volume 35, Number 8

Committee Membership

Consensus Committee on Point-of-Care Testing

Frank M. LaDuca, PhD, FAHA
Chairholder
Accriva Diagnostics
USA

Ellis Jacobs, PhD, DABCC, FACB
Vice-Chairholder
Alere Inc.
USA

Sheldon M. Campbell, MD, PhD, FCAP
College of American Pathologists
USA

Claudia Dollins, PhD, RAC
FDA Center for Devices and Radiological Health
USA

Karen W. Dyer, MT(ASCP), DLM
Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services
USA

Valerio M. Genta, MD
Sentara Virginia Beach General Hospital
USA

Bob Kaplanis, PBT, MT(ASCP)
Laboratory Sciences of Arizona
USA

Ronald K. Newby
Nova Biomedical Corporation
USA

Monica Thomas, MPA, CLS(ASCP)
Cedars-Sinai Medical Center
USA

Marcia L. Zucker, PhD
ZIVD LLC
USA

Document Development Committee on Comparison of Different Glucose Sample Types

Mary C. Coyle, MS, MT(ASCP)
Co-Chairholder
Roche Diagnostics Corporation
USA

Ellis Jacobs, PhD, DABCC, FACB
Co-Chairholder
Alere Inc.
USA

Ann Chappie, MT(HHS)
FDA Center for Devices and Radiological Health
USA

Jeff Dahlen, PhD
USA

Bradley S. Karon, MD, PhD
Mayo Clinic
USA

Anthony O. Okorodudu, PhD, MBA, DABCC, FACB
The University of Texas Medical Branch
USA

David B. Sacks, MD
College of American Pathologists
USA

Steven Scott
Abbott Diabetes Care
USA

Staff

Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute
USA

Luann Ochs, MS
Senior Vice President – Operations

David E. Sterry, MT(ASCP)
Project Manager

Megan L. Tertel, MA
Editorial Manager

Joanne P. Christopher, MA
Editor

Patrice E. Polgar
Editor

Acknowledgment

CLSI, the Consensus Committee on Point-of-Care Testing, and the Document Development Committee on Comparison of Different Glucose Sample Types gratefully acknowledge the following volunteers for their important contributions to the development of this document:

John J. Mahoney
USA

Ronald H. Ng, PhD, DABCC, FACB
USA

Donald R. Parker, PhD, DABCC, FACB, CLASCB
USA

Contents

Foreword

A variety of glucose test methodologies exist today. Processes for glucose testing in the continuum of care can vary by sample type and methodologies. Clinicians today review glucose results obtained using different methodologies even when the patient is in a single unit of the hospital. It is typical for the patient's chart to include glucose meter system results, as well as laboratory analyzer glucose results. The glucose sample could also be drawn from arterial, capillary, or venous blood and performed on whole blood, plasma, or serum. Any or all of these methodological and sample type variations (as well as user technique, reagent stability, sample handling, site of sampling, and testing environment issues, among other contributing sources of variation) can affect glucose test results.

Laboratorians and clinicians may also conduct comparison studies from time to time, either to evaluate a new or novel technology, or to understand how glucose measurement procedures in their facility relate to one another. As care practices evolve, this report will help inform the study investigator of factors that influence glucose measurement procedure comparisons. For example, hospitals are currently experiencing increased testing frequency for bedside (point-of-care) glucose testing. More frequent hospital use of this method of testing is driven by the use of insulin to maintain an inpatient in euglycemia (tight glycemic control). Although these protocols vary in execution, the typical time interval between glucose tests is determined by the patient's response to the insulin administration. This time interval typically varies from 15 minutes to four hours. A need exists to optimize staff efficiency, minimize patient discomfort, and assure the quality and accuracy of the glucose results while executing these protocols. This document can serve to identify possible causes of differences in glucose test results when different measurement technologies, sampling sites, and/or sample types are used.

The authors of this document acknowledge that trueness, repeatability, and reproducibility of glucose methodologies vary. This document provides guidance on the potential sources of error or variation in glucose test results, particularly when the results are obtained with two different measurement procedures using two different sample types (eg, comparing laboratory venous plasma glucose to meter system capillary whole-blood glucose results).

Key Words

Calibration, glucose, glucose monitors, point-of-care testing, sample types, test measurement procedure comparison

Effects of Different Sample Types on Glucose Measurements

Chapter 1: Introduction

This chapter includes:

- Document scope and applicable exclusions
- Background information pertinent to the document content
- Standard precautions information
- "Note on Terminology" that highlights particular use and/or variation in use of terms and/or definitions
- Terms and definitions used in the document
- Abbreviations and acronyms used in the document

1.1 Scope

This report is designed to help clinicians, system evaluators, regulators, and manufacturers understand the influence of various parameters on glucose test result comparisons and to understand the clinical challenges that exist when glucose methodologies, sample types, and user techniques differ. This report is intended to help discern whether or not a difference between glucose results is caused by 1) the test measurement procedure(s), 2) patient-specific interferences, 3) the protocol, or 4) by some combination of these factors. It also includes consideration for sample type, fluid compartments, physiology, and calibration of the devices.

The intended users of this report are clinicians, point-of-care teams, pathologists, laboratory directors, and manufacturers of glucose testing devices. The information will help users to understand the clinical challenges that exist within the continuum of care when glucose is measured using different methodologies and sample types.

This report is not intended to be used for measurement procedure validation of new technologies.

1.2 Background

Glucose test result comparisons occur in two distinct types of circumstances: single result-to-result comparisons or test measurement procedure evaluations using multiple sample comparisons. In the single result-to-result scenario, a clinician is interested in determining the accuracy of glucose measurement results of the measurement procedure (eg, blood glucose monitoring system [BGMS]) she/he routinely uses for intervention decisions, by direct comparison to the results obtained using a different measurement procedure (eg, a laboratory serum glucose). In the measurement procedure evaluation study, a glucose measurement system assessment is being conducted to understand the differences between two or more measurement procedures. Several factors influence these comparisons. Taking testing differences into consideration during product development continues to help manufacturers provide new testing solutions that better meet the needs of the clinicians and contribute to improved patient care and confidence.