

EP9-A2
Vol. 22 No. 19
Replaces EP9-A
Vol. 15 No. 17

Method Comparison and Bias Estimation Using Patient Samples;
Approved Guideline—Second Edition

This document addresses procedures for determining the bias between two clinical methods, and the design of a method comparison experiment using split patient samples and data analysis.

A guideline for global application developed through the NCCLS consensus process.



NCCLS...

Serving the World's Medical Science Community Through Voluntary Consensus

NCCLS is an international, interdisciplinary, nonprofit, standards-developing, and educational organization that promotes the development and use of voluntary consensus standards and guidelines within the healthcare community. It is recognized worldwide for the application of its unique consensus process in the development of standards and guidelines for patient testing and related healthcare issues. NCCLS is based on the principle that consensus is an effective and cost-effective way to improve patient testing and healthcare services.

In addition to developing and promoting the use of voluntary consensus standards and guidelines, NCCLS provides an open and unbiased forum to address critical issues affecting the quality of patient testing and health care.

PUBLICATIONS

An NCCLS document is published as a standard, guideline, or committee report.

Standard A document developed through the consensus process that clearly identifies specific, essential requirements for materials, methods, or practices for use in an unmodified form. A standard may, in addition, contain discretionary elements, which are clearly identified.

Guideline A document developed through the consensus process describing criteria for a general operating practice, procedure, or material for voluntary use. A guideline may be used as written or modified by the user to fit specific needs.

Report A document that has not been subjected to consensus review and is released by the Board of Directors.

CONSENSUS PROCESS

The NCCLS voluntary consensus process is a protocol establishing formal criteria for:

- the authorization of a project
- the development and open review of documents
- the revision of documents in response to comments by users
- the acceptance of a document as a consensus standard or guideline.

Most NCCLS documents are subject to two levels of consensus—"proposed" and "approved." Depending on

the need for field evaluation or data collection, documents may also be made available for review at an intermediate (i.e., "tentative") consensus level.

Proposed An NCCLS consensus document undergoes the first stage of review by the healthcare community as a proposed standard or guideline. The document should receive a wide and thorough technical review, including an overall review of its scope, approach, and utility, and a line-by-line review of its technical and editorial content.

Tentative A tentative standard or guideline is made available for review and comment only when a recommended method has a well-defined need for a field evaluation or when a recommended protocol requires that specific data be collected. It should be reviewed to ensure its utility.

Approved An approved standard or guideline has achieved consensus within the healthcare community. It should be reviewed to assess the utility of the final document, to ensure attainment of consensus (i.e., that comments on earlier versions have been satisfactorily addressed), and to identify the need for additional consensus documents.

NCCLS standards and guidelines represent a consensus opinion on good practices and reflect the substantial agreement by materially affected, competent, and interested parties obtained by following NCCLS's established consensus procedures. Provisions in NCCLS standards and guidelines may be more or less stringent than applicable regulations. Consequently, conformance to this voluntary consensus document does not relieve the user of responsibility for compliance with applicable regulations.

COMMENTS

The comments of users are essential to the consensus process. Anyone may submit a comment, and all comments are addressed, according to the consensus process, by the NCCLS committee that wrote the document. All comments, including those that result in a change to the document when published at the next consensus level and those that do not result in a change, are responded to by the committee in an appendix to the document. Readers are strongly encouraged to comment in any form and at any time on any NCCLS document. Address comments to the NCCLS Executive Offices, 940 West Valley Road, Suite 1400, Wayne, PA 19087, USA.

VOLUNTEER PARTICIPATION

Healthcare professionals in all specialties are urged to volunteer for participation in NCCLS projects. Please contact the NCCLS Executive Offices for additional information on committee participation.

Method Comparison and Bias Estimation Using Patient Samples; Approved Guideline—Second Edition

Abstract

NCCLS document EP9-A2—*Method Comparison and Bias Estimation Using Patient Samples; Approved Guideline—Second Edition*, is written for laboratorians as well as manufacturers. It describes procedures for determining the relative bias between two methods, and it identifies factors to be considered when designing and analyzing a method-comparison experiment using split patient samples. For carrying out method-comparison evaluations, an overview of the experiment, sample data recording and calculation sheets, and an overview flowchart and a detailed flowchart for preliminary data examination are included. As an additional aid, a sample scatter plot and bias plot are introduced for those who are unfamiliar with these procedures. The final section contains recommendations for manufacturers' evaluation of bias and statement format for bias claims.

NCCLS. *Method Comparison and Bias Estimation Using Patient Samples; Approved Guideline—Second Edition*. NCCLS document EP9-A2 (ISBN 1-56238-472-4). NCCLS, 940 West Valley Road, Suite 1400, Wayne, Pennsylvania 19087-1898 USA, 2002.

THE NCCLS consensus process, which is the mechanism for moving a document through two or more levels of review by the healthcare 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 NCCLS documents. Current editions are listed in the *NCCLS Catalog*, which is distributed to member organizations, and to nonmembers on request. If your organization is not a member and would like to become one, and to request a copy of the *NCCLS Catalog*, contact the NCCLS Executive Offices. Telephone: 610.688.0100; Fax: 610.688.0700; E-Mail: exoffice@nccls.org; Website: www.nccls.org

EP9-A2
ISBN 1-56238-472-4
ISSN 0273-3099

Method Comparison and Bias Estimation Using Patient Samples; Approved Guideline—Second Edition

Volume 22 Number 19

Jan S. Krouwer, Ph.D.
Daniel W. Tholen, M.S.
Carl C. Garber, Ph.D.
Henk M.J. Goldschmidt, Ph.D.
Martin Harris Kroll, M.D.
Kristian Linnet, M.D., Ph.D.
Kristen Meier, Ph.D.
Max Robinowitz, M.D.
John W. Kennedy



This publication is protected by copyright. No part of it may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, transmitted, or made available in any form or by any means (electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise) without prior written permission from NCCLS, except as stated below.

NCCLS hereby grants permission to reproduce limited portions of this publication for use in laboratory procedure manuals at a single site, for interlibrary loan, or for use in educational programs provided that multiple copies of such reproduction shall include the following notice, be distributed without charge, and, in no event, contain more than 20% of the document's text.

Reproduced with permission, from NCCLS publication EP9-A2—*Method Comparison and Bias Estimation Using Patient Samples; Approved Guideline—Second Edition* (ISBN 1-56238-472-4). Copies of the current edition may be obtained from NCCLS, 940 West Valley Road, Suite 1400, Wayne, Pennsylvania 19087-1898, USA.

Permission to reproduce or otherwise use the text of this document to an extent that exceeds the exemptions granted here or under the Copyright Law must be obtained from NCCLS by written request. To request such permission, address inquiries to the Executive Director, NCCLS, 940 West Valley Road, Suite 1400, Wayne, Pennsylvania 19087-1898, USA.

Copyright ©2002. The National Committee for Clinical Laboratory Standards.

Suggested Citation

(NCCLS. *Method Comparison and Bias Estimation Using Patient Samples; Approved Guideline—Second Edition*. NCCLS document EP9-A2 [ISBN 1-56238-472-4]. NCCLS, 940 West Valley Road, Suite 1400, Wayne, Pennsylvania 19087-1898 USA, 2002.)

Proposed Guideline

January 1986

Tentative Guideline

April 1993

Approved Guideline

December 1995

Approved Guideline—Second Edition

September 2002

ISBN 1-56238-472-4

ISSN 0273-3099

Committee Membership

Area Committee on Evaluation Protocols

Jan S. Krouwer, Ph.D.
Chairholder

Krouwer Consulting
Sherborn, Massachusetts

Daniel W. Tholen, M.S.
Vice-Chairholder

Statistical Services
Traverse City, Michigan

Carl C. Garber, Ph.D.

Quest Diagnostics Assurance
Teterboro, New Jersey

Henk M.J. Goldschmidt, Ph.D.

Tilburg, The Netherlands

Martin Harris Kroll, M.D.

Dallas Veterans Affairs Medical Center
Dallas, Texas

Kristian Linnet, M.D., Ph.D.

Psychiatric University Hospital
Risskov, Denmark

Kristen Meier, Ph.D.

FDA Center for Devices/Rad. Health
Rockville, Maryland

Max Robinowitz, M.D.

FDA Center for Devices/Rad. Health
Rockville, Maryland

Advisors

R. Neill Carey, Ph.D.

Peninsula Regional Medical Center
Salisbury, Maryland

Patricia E. Garrett, Ph.D.

BBI Clinical Laboratories
New Britain, Connecticut

John W. Kennedy

Medstat Consultants
Palo Alto, California

Jacob (Jack) B. Levine, M.B.A.

Bayer Corporation
Tarrytown, New York

Jennifer K. McGeary, M.T.(ASCP), M.S.H.A.
Staff Liaison

NCCLS
Wayne, Pennsylvania

Patrice E. Polgar
Editor

NCCLS
Wayne, Pennsylvania

Donna M. Wilhelm
Assistant Editor

NCCLS
Wayne, Pennsylvania

Acknowledgements

The Area Committee on Evaluation Protocols would also like to recognize the valuable contributions of the members and advisors of the Working Group on Method Comparison and Bias Estimation that developed the first approved edition of this guideline.

John W. Kennedy
R. Neill Carey, Ph.D.
Richard B. Coolen, Ph.D.
Carl C. Garber, Ph.D.
Henry T. Lee, Jr.
Jacob B. Levine
Iris M. Osberg

Active Membership (as of 1 July 2002)

Sustaining Members

Abbott Laboratories
 American Association for
 Clinical Chemistry
 Beckman Coulter, Inc.
 BD and Company
 bioMérieux, Inc.
 CLMA
 College of American Pathologists
 GlaxoSmithKline
 Nippon Becton Dickinson Co., Ltd.
 Ortho-Clinical Diagnostics, Inc.
 Pfizer Inc
 Roche Diagnostics, Inc.

Professional Members

AISAR-Associazione Italiana per lo
 Studio degli
 American Academy of Family
 Physicians
 American Association for
 Clinical Chemistry
 American Association for
 Respiratory Care
 American Chemical Society
 American Medical Technologists
 American Public Health Association
 American Society for Clinical
 Laboratory Science
 American Society of Hematology
 American Society for Microbiology
 American Type Culture
 Collection, Inc.
 Asociación Española Primera de
 Socorros (Uruguay)
 Asociacion Mexicana de
 Bioquímica Clínica A.C.
 Assn. of Public Health Laboratories
 Assoc. Micro. Clinici Italiani-
 A.M.C.L.I.
 British Society for Antimicrobial
 Chemotherapy
 CADIME-Camara De Instituciones
 De Diagnostico Medico
 Canadian Society for Medical
 Laboratory Science—Société
 Canadienne de Science de
 Laboratoire Médical
 Clinical Laboratory Management
 Association
 COLA
 College of American Pathologists

College of Medical Laboratory
 Technologists of Ontario
 College of Physicians and
 Surgeons of Saskatchewan
 ESCMID
 Fundación Bioquímica Argentina
 International Association of Medical
 Laboratory Technologists
 International Council for
 Standardization in Haematology
 International Federation of
 Clinical Chemistry
 Italian Society of Clinical
 Biochemistry and Clinical
 Molecular Biology
 Japan Society of Clinical Chemistry
 Japanese Committee for Clinical
 Laboratory Standards
 Joint Commission on Accreditation
 of Healthcare Organizations
 National Academy of Clinical
 Biochemistry
 National Association of Testing
 Authorities – Australia
 National Society for
 Histotechnology, Inc.
 Ontario Medical Association
 Quality Management Program-
 Laboratory Service
 RCPA Quality Assurance Programs
 PTY Limited
 Sociedade Brasileira de Analises
 Clinicas
 Sociedade Brasileira de
 Patologia Clinica
 Sociedad Espanola de Bioquímica
 Clínica y Patología Molecular
 Turkish Society of Microbiology

Government Members

Association of Public Health
 Laboratories
 Armed Forces Institute of Pathology
 BC Centre for Disease Control
 Centers for Disease Control and
 Prevention
 Centers for Medicare & Medicaid
 Services/CLIA Program
 Centers for Medicare & Medicaid
 Services
 Chinese Committee for Clinical
 Laboratory Standards
 Commonwealth of Pennsylvania
 Bureau of Laboratories

Department of Veterans Affairs
 Deutsches Institut für Normung
 (DIN)
 FDA Center for Devices and
 Radiological Health
 FDA Center for Veterinary
 Medicine
 FDA Division of Anti-Infective
 Drug Products
 Iowa State Hygienic Laboratory
 Massachusetts Department of
 Public Health Laboratories
 National Center of Infectious
 and Parasitic Diseases (Bulgaria)
 National Health Laboratory Service
 (South Africa)
 National Institute of Standards
 and Technology
 New York State Department of
 Health
 Ohio Department of Health
 Ontario Ministry of Health
 Pennsylvania Dept. of Health
 Saskatchewan Health-Provincial
 Laboratory
 Scientific Institute of Public Health;
 Belgium Ministry of Social
 Affairs, Public Health and the
 Environment
 Swedish Institute for Infectious
 Disease Control
 Thailand Department of Medical
 Sciences

Industry Members

AB Biodisk
 Abbott Laboratories
 Abbott Laboratories, MediSense
 Products
 Acrometrix Corporation
 Ammirati Regulatory Consulting
 Anaerobe Systems
 Assessor
 AstraZeneca
 AstraZeneca R & D
 Boston
 Aventis
 Axis-Shield POC AS
 Bayer Corporation – Elkhart, IN
 Bayer Corporation – Tarrytown, NY
 Bayer Corporation – West Haven,
 CT
 Bayer Medical Ltd.
 BD

BD Biosciences – San Jose, CA
 BD Consumer Products
 BD Diagnostic Systems
 BD Italia S.P.A.
 BD VACUTAINER Systems
 Beckman Coulter, Inc.
 Beckman Coulter, Inc. Primary Care Diagnostics
 Beckman Coulter K.K. (Japan)
 Bio-Development SRL
 Bio-Inova Life Sciences International
 Bio-Inova Life Sciences North America
 BioMedia Laboratories Sdn Bhd
 BioMérieux (NC)
 bioMérieux, Inc. (MO)
 Biometrology Consultants
 Bio-Rad Laboratories, Inc.
 Bio-Rad Laboratories, Inc. - France
 Biotest AG
 Blaine Healthcare Associates, Inc.
 Bristol-Myers Squibb Company
 Canadian External Quality Assessment Laboratory
 Capital Management Consulting, Inc.
 Carl Schaper
 Checkpoint Development Inc.
 Chiron Corporation
 ChromaVision Medical Systems, Inc.
 Chronolab Ag
 Clinical Design Group Inc.
 Clinical Laboratory Improvement Consultants
 Cognigen
 Community Medical Center (NJ)
 Control Lab (Brazil)
 Copan Diagnostics Inc.
 Cosmetic Ingredient Review
 Cubist Pharmaceuticals
 Dade Behring Inc. - Deerfield, IL
 Dade Behring Inc. - Glasgow, DE
 Dade Behring Inc. - Marburg, Germany
 Dade Behring Inc. - Sacramento, CA
 Dade Behring Inc. - San Jose, CA
 David G. Rhoads Associates, Inc.
 Diagnostics Consultancy
 Diagnostic Products Corporation
 Eiken Chemical Company, Ltd.
 Elan Pharmaceuticals
 Electa Lab s.r.l.
 Enterprise Analysis Corporation
 Essential Therapeutics, Inc.
 EXPERTech Associates, Inc.
 F. Hoffman-La Roche AG

Fort Dodge Animal Health
 General Hospital Vienna (Austria)
 Gen-Probe
 GlaxoSmithKline
 Greiner Bio-One Inc.
 Helena Laboratories
 Home Diagnostics, Inc.
 Immunicon Corporation
 Instrumentation Laboratory
 International Technidyne Corporation
 IntraBiotics Pharmaceuticals, Inc.
 I-STAT Corporation
 Johnson and Johnson Pharmaceutical Research and Development, L.L.C.
 Kendall Sherwood-Davis & Geck
 LAB-Interlink, Inc.
 Laboratory Specialists, Inc.
 Labtest Diagnostica S.A.
 LifeScan, Inc. (a Johnson & Johnson Company)
 Lilly Research Laboratories
 Macemon Consultants
 Medical Device Consultants, Inc.
 Merck & Company, Inc.
 Minigrip/Zip-Pak
 Molecular Diagnostics, Inc.
 mvi Sciences (MA)
 Nabi
 Nichols Institute Diagnostics (Div. of Quest Diagnostics, Inc.)
 NimbleGen Systems, Inc.
 Nissui Pharmaceutical Co., Ltd.
 Nippon Becton Dickinson Co., Ltd.
 Norfolk Associates, Inc.
 Novartis Pharmaceuticals Corporation
 Ortho-Clinical Diagnostics, Inc. (Raritan, NJ)
 Ortho-Clinical Diagnostics, Inc. (Rochester, NY)
 Oxoid Inc.
 Paratek Pharmaceuticals
 Pfizer Inc
 Pharmacia Corporation
 Philips Medical Systems
 Powers Consulting Services
 Premier Inc.
 Procter & Gamble Pharmaceuticals, Inc.
 The Product Development Group
 QSE Consulting
 Quintiles, Inc.
 Radiometer America, Inc.
 Radiometer Medical A/S
 Roche Diagnostics GmbH
 Roche Diagnostics, Inc.

Roche Laboratories (Div. Hoffmann-La Roche Inc.)
 Sarstedt, Inc.
 SARL Laboratoire Carron (France)
 Schering Corporation
 Schleicher & Schuell, Inc.
 Second Opinion
 Showa Yakuhin Kako Company, Ltd.
 Streck Laboratories, Inc
 SurroMed, Inc.
 Synermed Diagnostic Corp.
 Sysmex Corporation (Japan)
 Sysmex Corporation (Long Grove, IL)
 The Clinical Microbiology Institute
 The Toledo Hospital (OH)
 Theravance Inc.
 Transasia Engineers
 Trek Diagnostic Systems, Inc.
 Versicor, Inc.
 Vetoquinol S.A.
 Visible Genetics, Inc.
 Vysis, Inc.
 Wallac Oy
 Wyeth-Ayerst
 Xyletech Systems, Inc.
 YD Consultant
 YD Diagnostics (Seoul, Korea)

Trade Associations

AdvaMed
 Association of Medical Diagnostic Manufacturers
 Japan Association Clinical Reagents Ind. (Tokyo, Japan)
 Medical Industry Association of Australia

Associate Active Members

20th Medical Group (SC)
 31st Medical Group/SGSL (APO, AE)
 67th CSH Wuerzburg, GE (NY)
 121st General Hospital (CA)
 Academisch Ziekenhuis-VUB (Belgium)
 Acadiana Medical Laboratories, LTD (LA)
 Adena Regional Medical Center (OH)
 Advocate Healthcare Lutheran General (IL)
 Akershus Central Hospital and AFA (Norway)
 Albemarle Hospital (NC)

Allegheny General Hospital (PA)	Clarian Health–Methodist Hospital (IN)	Gateway Medical Center (TN)
Allegheny University of the Health Sciences (PA)	Clendo Lab (Puerto Rico)	Geisinger Medical Center (PA)
Allina Health System (MN)	Clinical Laboratory Partners, LLC (CT)	Grady Memorial Hospital (GA)
Alton Ochsner Medical Foundation (LA)	CLSI Laboratories (PA)	Guthrie Clinic Laboratories (PA)
American Medical Laboratories (VA)	Columbia Regional Hospital (MO)	Hahnemann University Hospital (PA)
Antwerp University Hospital (Belgium)	Commonwealth of Kentucky	Harris Methodist Erath County (TX)
Arkansas Department of Health	Community Hospital of Lancaster (PA)	Harris Methodist Fort Worth (TX)
ARUP at University Hospital (UT)	CompuNet Clinical Laboratories (OH)	Hartford Hospital (CT)
Armed Forces Research Institute of Medical Science (APO, AP)	Cook County Hospital (IL)	Headwaters Health Authority (Alberta, Canada)
Associated Regional & University Pathologists (UT)	Cook Children’s Medical Center (TX)	Health Network Lab (PA)
Aurora Consolidated Laboratories (WI)	Covance Central Laboratory Services (IN)	Health Partners Laboratories (VA)
Azienda Ospedale Di Lecco (Italy)	Danish Veterinary Laboratory (Denmark)	Heartland Regional Medical Center (MO)
Bay Medical Center (MI)	Danville Regional Medical Center (VA)	Highlands Regional Medical Center (FL)
Baystate Medical Center (MA)	Delaware Public Health Laboratory	Hoag Memorial Hospital Presbyterian (CA)
Bbagnas Duzen Laboratories (Turkey)	Department of Health & Community Services (New Brunswick, Canada)	Holmes Regional Medical Center (FL)
Bermuda Hospitals Board	DesPeres Hospital (MO)	Holzer Medical Center (OH)
Bo Ali Hospital (Iran)	DeTar Hospital (TX)	Hopital du Sacre-Coeur de Montreal (Montreal, Quebec, Canada)
British Columbia Cancer Agency (Vancouver, BC, Canada)	Detroit Health Department (MI)	Hôpital Maisonneuve – Rosemont (Montreal, Canada)
Brooks Air Force Base (TX)	Diagnosticos da América S/A (Brazil)	Hospital for Sick Children (Toronto, ON, Canada)
Broward General Medical Center (FL)	Dr. Everett Chalmers Hospital (New Brunswick, Canada)	Hospital Sousa Martins (Portugal)
Calgary Laboratory Services	Doctors Hospital (Bahamas)	Hotel Dieu Hospital (Windsor, ON, Canada)
Carilion Consolidated Laboratory (VA)	Duke University Medical Center (NC)	Houston Medical Center (GA)
Cathay General Hospital (Taiwan)	E.A. Conway Medical Center (LA)	Huddinge University Hospital (Sweden)
CB Healthcare Complex (Sydney, NS, Canada)	Eastern Maine Medical Center	Hurley Medical Center (MI)
Central Peninsula General Hospital (AK)	East Side Clinical Laboratory (RI)	Indiana State Board of Health
Central Texas Veterans Health Care System	Eastern Health (Vic., Australia)	Indiana University
Centre Hospitalier Regional del la Citadelle (Belgium)	Elyria Memorial Hospital (OH)	Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science (Australia)
Centro Diagnostico Italiano (Milano, Italy)	Emory University Hospital (GA)	International Health Management Associates, Inc. (IL)
Champlain Valley Physicians Hospital (NY)	Esoterix Center for Infectious Disease (TX)	Jackson Memorial Hospital (FL)
Chang Gung Memorial Hospital (Taiwan)	Fairview-University Medical Center (MN)	Jersey Shore Medical Center (NJ)
Changi General Hospital (Singapore)	Federal Medical Center (MN)	John C. Lincoln Hospital (AZ)
Children’s Hospital (NE)	Florida Hospital East Orlando	John F. Kennedy Medical Center (NJ)
Children’s Hospital & Clinics (MN)	Foothills Hospital (Calgary, AB, Canada)	John Peter Smith Hospital (TX)
Children’s Hospital Medical Center (Akron, OH)	Fort St. John General Hospital (Fort St. John, BC, Canada)	Kadlec Medical Center (WA)
Children’s Hospital of Philadelphia (PA)	Fox Chase Cancer Center (PA)	Kaiser Permanente Medical Care (CA)
Children’s Medical Center of Dallas (TX)	Fresenius Medical Care/Spectra East (NJ)	Kaiser Permanente (MD)
	Fresno Community Hospital and Medical Center	Kantonsspital (Switzerland)
	Frye Regional Medical Center (NC)	Keller Army Community Hospital (NY)
	Gambro Healthcare Laboratory Services (FL)	Kenora-Rainy River Regional Laboratory Program (Ontario, Canada)

Kern Medical Center (CA)	Michigan Department of Community Health	Reid Hospital & Health Care Services (IN)
Kimball Medical Center (NJ)	Mississippi Baptist Medical Center	Research Medical Center (MO)
King Faisal Specialist Hospital (Saudi Arabia)	Monte Tabor – Centro Italo – Brazileiro de Promacao (Brazil)	Rex Healthcare (NC)
King Khalid National Guard Hospital (Saudi Arabia)	Montreal Children’s Hospital (Canada)	Rhode Island Department of Health Laboratories
King’s Daughter Medical Center (KY)	Montreal General Hospital (Canada)	Riyadh Armed Forces Hospital (Saudi Arabia)
Klinični Center (Slovenia)	MRL Pharmaceutical Services, Inc. (VA)	Royal Columbian Hospital (New Westminster, BC, Canada)
Laboratories at Bonfils (CO)	MRL Reference Laboratory (CA)	Sacred Heart Hospital (MD)
Laboratoire de Santé Publique du Quebec (Canada)	Nassau County Medical Center (NY)	Saint Mary’s Regional Medical Center (NV)
Laboratório Fleury S/C Ltda. (Brazil)	National Institutes of Health (MD)	St. Alexius Medical Center (ND)
Laboratory Corporation of America (NJ)	Naval Hospital – Corpus Christi (TX)	St. Anthony Hospital (CO)
Laboratory Corporation of America (MO)	Naval Surface Warfare Center (IN)	St. Anthony’s Hospital (FL)
LAC and USC Healthcare Network (CA)	Nebraska Health System	St. Barnabas Medical Center (NJ)
Lakeland Regional Medical Center (FL)	New Britain General Hospital (CT)	St-Eustache Hospital (Quebec, Canada)
Lancaster General Hospital (PA)	New England Fertility Institute (CT)	St. Francis Medical Ctr. (CA)
Langley Air Force Base (VA)	New Mexico VA Health Care System	St. John Hospital and Medical Center (MI)
LeBonheur Children’s Medical Center (TN)	North Carolina State Laboratory of Public Health	St. John Regional Hospital (St. John, NB, Canada)
L’Hotel-Dieu de Quebec (Canada)	North Shore – Long Island Jewish Health System Laboratories (NY)	St. Joseph Hospital (NE)
Libero Istituto Univ. Campus BioMedico (Italy)	Northwestern Memorial Hospital (IL)	St. Joseph’s Hospital – Marshfield Clinic (WI)
Louisiana State University Medical Center	O.L. Vrouwziekenhuis (Belgium)	St. Joseph Mercy Hospital (MI)
Maccabi Medical Care and Health Fund (Israel)	Ordre professionnel des technologistes médicaux du Québec	St. Jude Children’s Research Hospital (TN)
Magee Womens Hospital (PA)	Ospedali Riuniti (Italy)	St. Luke’s Regional Medical Center (IA)
Malcolm Grow USAF Medical Center (MD)	The Ottawa Hospital (Ottawa, ON, Canada)	St. Mary of the Plains Hospital (TX)
Manitoba Health (Winnipeg, Canada)	Our Lady of Lourdes Hospital (NJ)	St. Mary’s Hospital & Medical Center (CO)
Martin Luther King/Drew Medical Center (CA)	Our Lady of the Resurrection Medical Center (IL)	St. Paul’s Hospital (Vancouver, BC, Montreal)
Massachusetts General Hospital (Microbiology Laboratory)	Pathology and Cytology Laboratories, Inc. (KY)	St. Vincent Medical Center (CA)
MDS Metro Laboratory Services (Burnaby, BC, Canada)	The Permanente Medical Group (CA)	Ste. Justine Hospital (Montreal, PQ, Canada)
Medical College of Virginia Hospital	Piedmont Hospital (GA)	Salina Regional Health Center (KS)
Medicare/Medicaid Certification, State of North Carolina	Pikeville Methodist Hospital (KY)	San Francisco General Hospital (CA)
Memorial Medical Center (IL)	Pocono Hospital (PA)	Santa Clara Valley Medical Center (CA)
Memorial Medical Center (LA) Jefferson Davis Hwy	Presbyterian Hospital of Dallas (TX)	Santa Clara Valley Medical Center (CA)
Memorial Medical Center (LA) Napoleon Avenue	Queen Elizabeth Hospital (Prince Edward Island, Canada)	Seoul Nat’l University Hospital (Korea)
Methodist Hospital (TX)	Queensland Health Pathology Services (Australia)	Shanghai Center for the Clinical Laboratory (China)
Methodist Hospitals of Memphis (TN)	Quest Diagnostics Incorporated (CA)	South Bend Medical Foundation (IN)
MetroHealth Medical Center (OH)	Quintiles Laboratories, Ltd. (GA)	Southwest Texas Methodist Hospital (TX)
	Regions Hospital	South Western Area Pathology Service (Australia)
		Southern Maine Medical Center Specialty Laboratories, Inc. (CA)

Stanford Hospital and Clinics (CA)	University Hospital (Gent)	VA (San Diego) Medical Center
State of Washington Department of Health	(Belgium)	(CA)
Stony Brook University Hospital (NY)	University Hospitals of Cleveland (OH)	VA (Tuskegee) Medical Center (AL)
Stormont-Vail Regional Medical Center (KS)	The University Hospitals (OK)	VA Outpatient Clinic (OH)
Sun Health-Boswell Hospital (AZ)	University of Alabama-Birmingham Hospital	Vejele Hospital (Denmark)
Sunrise Hospital and Medical Center (NV)	University of Alberta Hospitals (Canada)	Washington Adventist Hospital (MD)
Swedish Medical Center – Providence Campus (WA)	University of Colorado Health Science Center	Washoe Medical Center Laboratory (NV)
Tampa General Hospital (FL)	University of Chicago Hospitals (IL)	West Jefferson Medical Center (LA)
Temple University Hospital (PA)	University of Illinois Medical Center	West Shore Medical Center (MI)
Tenet Odessa Regional Hospital (TX)	University of the Ryukyus (Japan)	Wilford Hall Medical Center (TX)
The Toledo Hospital (OH)	University of Texas M.D. Anderson Cancer Center	William Beaumont Army Medical Center (TX)
Touro Infirmary (LA)	University of Virginia Medical Center	William Beaumont Hospital (MI)
Trident Regional Medical Center (SC)	University of Washington	Williamsburg Community Hospital (VA)
Tripler Army Medical Center (HI)	UZ-KUL Medical Center (Belgium)	Winn Army Community Hospital (GA)
Truman Medical Center (MO)	VA (Denver) Medical Center (CO)	Winnipeg Regional Health Authority (Winnipeg, Canada)
UCSF Medical Center (CA)	Virginia Department of Health	Wishard Memorial Hospital (IN)
UNC Hospitals (NC)	VA (Kansas City) Medical Center (MO)	Yonsei University College of Medicine (Korea)
University College Hospital (Galway, Ireland)	VA (Western NY) Healthcare System	York Hospital (PA)

OFFICERS

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Donna M. Meyer, Ph.D., President CHRISTUS Health	Susan Blonshine, RRT, RPFT, FAARC TechEd	Tadashi Kawai, M.D., Ph.D. International Clinical Pathology Center
Thomas L. Hearn, Ph.D., President Elect Centers for Disease Control and Prevention	Wayne Brinster BD	J. Stephen Kroger, M.D., FACP COLA
Emil Voelkert, Ph.D., Secretary Roche Diagnostics GmbH	Kurt H. Davis, FCSMLS, CAE Canadian Society for Medical Laboratory Science	Willie E. May, Ph.D. National Institute of Standards and Technology
Gerald A. Hoeltge, M.D., Treasurer The Cleveland Clinic Foundation	Lillian J. Gill, M.S. FDA Center for Devices and Radiological Health	Gary L. Myers, Ph.D. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention
F. Alan Andersen, Ph.D., Immediate Past President Cosmetic Ingredient Review	Robert L. Habig, Ph.D. Habig Consulting Group	Barbara G. Painter, Ph.D. Bayer Corporation (Retired)
John V. Bergen, Ph.D., Executive Director	Carolyn D. Jones, J.D., M.P.H. AdvaMed	Judith A. Yost, M.A., M.T.(ASCP) Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services

Contents

Abstract i

Committee Membership v

Active Membership vii

Foreword xv

The Quality System Approach xvi

1 Introduction and Scope 1

 1.1 Overview of the General Comparison Experiment 1

 1.2 Symbols Used in the Text 2

 1.3 Definitions 3

2 Device-Familiarization Period 4

3 Comparison of Methods Experiment 4

 3.1 Test Samples 4

 3.2 Comparative Method 4

 3.3 Range of Measurement 5

 3.4 Number of Samples 5

 3.5 Sample Sequence 6

 3.6 Time and Duration 6

 3.7 Inspection of Data During Collection 6

 3.8 Quality Control 6

 3.9 Documentation of Rejected Data 7

4 Preliminary Data Examination 7

 4.1 Outlier Tests on Within-Method Duplicates 11

 4.2 Plotting the Data 12

 4.3 Visual Check for Linear Relationship 12

 4.4 Visual Check for Between-Method Outliers 12

 4.5 Test for Adequate Range of X 13

5 Linear Regression 14

 5.1 Computations 14

 5.2 Visual Check for Constant Scatter 15

6 Computing Predicted Bias and Its Confidence Interval 16

 6.1 Linear Regression Procedure (When Data Pass Adequate Range
and Uniform Scatter Checks) 16

 6.2 Computing Average Bias Using Partitioned Individual Differences
When Data Fail Adequate Range Check (Partitioned Biases Procedure) 17

 6.3 Computing Predicted Bias Using Partitioned Residuals When
Data Have Nonconstant (Variable) Precision (Partitioned Residuals Procedure) 18

7 Interpreting Results and Comparing to Internal Performance Criteria 18

8 Manufacturer Modifications 19

Contents (Continued)

8.1	Experimental Design	19
8.2	Data Analysis.....	19
8.3	Statement of Bias Performance Claims	19
	References.....	23
	Appendix A. Sample Data Recording Sheet.....	24
	Appendix B. Scatter Plots Derived from Example	26
	Appendix C. Calculation Example.....	30
	Appendix D. Calculation of Deming Slope	35
	Summary of Comments and Working Group Responses	36
	Summary of Delegate Comments and Committee Responses.....	50
	Related NCCLS Publications.....	53

Foreword

The current literature contains many examples of user and manufacturer product evaluations, with many different experimental and statistical procedures¹ for comparing two methods that measure the same analyte. This methodologic variety has caused confusion, and users have reported that comparisons often lack sufficient data and description to be reproducible.

There has also been an increasing awareness that the scope of evaluation procedures appropriate for manufacturers of diagnostic devices is not always appropriate for their users. The manufacturer is concerned with establishing valid and achievable performance claims for bias when compared with a generally accepted standard or reference method. The user might wish to compare a candidate method with a different one than the manufacturer used in establishing the bias claims. The scope of the experimental and data-handling procedures for these two purposes can often differ.

Therefore, in preparing this document, the working group drew on the experience of users and representatives of industry, statisticians, and laboratory and medical personnel. Because of the many *in vitro* diagnostic methods and kits now available, the working group realizes that a single experimental design is not appropriate for all types of user and manufacturer method comparisons. Therefore, this guideline was developed primarily to give conceptual help in structuring an experiment for comparing two methods. To illustrate representative duration, procedures, materials, methods of quality control, statistical data handling, and interpretation of results, an example experiment is presented.

Throughout the development of this protocol, the working group had to decide which procedural and statistical methods to recommend in the example experiment. To respond to the needs of laboratorians and manufacturers, the working group combined input from users of analytical methods, manufacturers of these methods, and representatives of regulatory agencies. The working group also included the recommendations necessary for a scientifically valid comparison. Compromises were necessary to accommodate both the simplicity of operation protocol and the complexity of design and statistical calculations necessary for valid conclusions. This document is adaptable within a wide range of analytes and device complexity.

The focus of this document is the independent establishment of bias performance characteristics. If appropriate, the user is then free to compare these performance estimates with either the manufacturer's labeled claims or the user's own internal criteria.

The working group believes that standard experimental and statistical procedures in user method comparisons will make such evaluations more reproducible and reflective of actual performance, and the statements of evaluation results considerably more reliable. Also, the misuse and misinterpretation of statistical methods, such as regression and correlation, involved in comparing *in vitro* diagnostic devices can seriously impair the usefulness of such evaluations. Therefore, this document is intended to promote the effective use of statistical analysis and data reporting.

Manufacturers of laboratory devices are encouraged to use this guideline to establish and standardize their bias performance claims. Many different forms have been used for such claims, and they have not always been sufficiently specific to allow user verification.

Key Words

Bias, evaluation protocol, experimental design, linear regression, method comparison, quality control, residuals

The Quality System Approach

NCCLS subscribes to a quality system approach in the development of standards and guidelines, which facilitates project management; defines a document structure via a template; and provides a process to identify needed documents through a gap analysis. The approach is based on the model presented in the most current edition of NCCLS HS1- *A Quality System Model for Health Care*. The quality system approach applies a core set of “quality system essentials (QSEs),” basic to any organization, to all operations in any healthcare service’s path of workflow. The QSEs provide the framework for delivery of any type of product or service, serving as a manager’s guide. The quality system essentials (QSEs) are:

QSEs

Documents & Records	Information Management
Organization	Occurrence Management
Personnel	Assessment
Equipment	Process Improvement
Purchasing & Inventory	Service & Satisfaction
Process Control	Facilities & Safety

EP9-A2 Addresses the following Quality System Essentials (QSEs)

Documents & Records	Organization	Personnel	Equipment	Purchasing & Inventory	Process Control	Information Management	Occurrence Management	Assessment	Process Improvement	Service & Satisfaction	Facilities & Safety
					X						

Adapted from NCCLS document HS1— *A Quality System Model for Health Care*.

Method Comparison and Bias Estimation Using Patient Samples; Approved Guideline—Second Edition

1 Introduction and Scope

This document provides both users and manufacturers of clinical laboratory devices with guidance for designing an experiment to evaluate the bias between two methods that measure the same analyte. Ideally, a test (or candidate) method should be compared with a reference method. For users, the comparative method is often the current routine method, however, and the purpose of the evaluation is to determine if the two methods yield equivalent results within the statistical power of the experiment. In this case, determining whether the test method is a suitable replacement for a current method is the primary concern.

This guideline allows the estimation of the bias (expected difference) between two methods at various concentrations. If the comparative method is the same one used by the manufacturer in the statement of claims, it is possible to compare statistically the experimental results to the manufacturer's claims to verify acceptable performance.

1.1 Overview of the General Comparison Experiment

Evaluating an analytical method requires the following:

- Sufficient time for the operators to become familiar with the device's operation and maintenance procedures.
- Sufficient time for the operators to become familiar with the evaluation protocol.
- Assurance that both the test and the comparative methods are in proper quality control throughout the evaluation period.
- Sufficient data to ensure representative results for both the test and the comparative methods. (What constitutes sufficient data will depend on the precision and interference effects of the two methods, the amount of bias between the two methods, the range of sample analyte values available, and the medical requirements of the test.)

During the device familiarization period, the operators of the test and comparative methods must become familiar with all aspects of set-up, operation, maintenance, trouble-shooting, and quality control of both methods. This period can precede other parts of the evaluation process or coincide with the manufacturer's training period. Run routine laboratory quality control procedures on both methods.

After the familiarization period, the method-comparison experiment can begin. The working group recommends that at least 40 patient samples be analyzed over at least 5 operating days. The reliability and effectiveness of the experiment increase by analyzing more samples over more time, while following the manufacturer's recommendations for calibration.

Analyze each patient sample in duplicate using both the test method and the comparative method. Analyze the duplicates for each method within the same run for that method. Whenever possible, at least 50% of the samples run should be outside the laboratory's reference interval.

When the experiment is completed, record the data in a logical manner (such as that which is suggested in the Appendix). Plot the data and assess the diagram visually and statistically for relative linearity,