



August 2008

# I/LA21-A2

## Clinical Evaluation of Immunoassays; Approved Guideline—Second Edition

This document addresses the need for clinical evaluation of new immunoassays and new applications of existing assays, as well as multiple assay formats and their uses. As a guide to designing and executing a clinical evaluation, this document will aid developers of “in-house” assays for institutional use, developers of assays used for monitoring pharmacologic effects of new drugs or biologics, and clinical and regulatory personnel responsible for commercializing products.

.....

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 Standards Development Policies and Process document.

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 1-56238-674-3  
ISSN 0273-3099

I/LA21-A2  
Vol. 28 No. 22  
Replaces I/LA21-A  
Vol. 22 No. 9

---

## Clinical Evaluation of Immunoassays; Approved Guideline—Second Edition

Volume 28 Number 22

Marilyn M. Lightfoote, MD, PhD  
Dorothy J. Ball, PhD  
W. Harry Hannon, PhD  
John C. Ridderhof, DrPH  
Robert F. Vogt, Jr., PhD

### Abstract

Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute document I/LA21-A2—*Clinical Evaluation of Immunoassays; Approved Guideline—Second Edition* addresses all aspects of the clinical evaluation of immunoassays developed for commercial or in-house use.

Existing CLSI documents provide guidance for assessing analytical performance, methods comparison, and clinical accuracy of laboratory tests. This document focuses on unique characteristics of immunoassays, and provides a guide to designing, executing, and analyzing a clinical evaluation. In addition, this document will aid developers of “in-house” assays for institutional use, developers of assays used for monitoring pharmacologic effects of new drugs or biologics, and clinical and regulatory personnel responsible for commercializing products.

The elements of this guideline include: 1) a development plan for an effective analysis and evaluation; 2) a discussion of the planning and design considerations that are necessary for a successful evaluation; 3) a description of requirements for conducting the evaluation through monitoring and database management; and 4) a brief review of the analytical performance measures that must be in place before testing clinical specimens.

Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute (CLSI). *Clinical Evaluation of Immunoassays; Approved Guideline—Second Edition*. CLSI document I/LA21-A2 (ISBN 1-56238-674-3). Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute, 950 West Valley Road, Suite 2500, Wayne, Pennsylvania 19087 USA, 2008.

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@cls.org](mailto:customerservice@cls.org); Website: [www.clsi.org](http://www.clsi.org).



Copyright ©2008 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. *Clinical Evaluation of Immunoassays; Approved Guideline—Second Edition*. CLSI document I/LA21-A2. Wayne, PA: Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute; 2008.

### **Proposed Guideline**

September 1999

### **Approved Guideline**

June 2002

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

August 2008

ISBN 1-56238-674-3

ISSN 0273-3099

## Committee Membership

### Area Committee on Immunology and Ligand Assay

**Dorothy J. Ball, PhD**  
Chairholder  
Abbott  
Irving, Texas

**Robin G. Lorenz, MD, PhD**  
Vice-Chairholder  
University of Alabama at  
Birmingham  
Birmingham, Alabama

Joan H. Howanitz, MD  
SUNY Brooklyn  
Brooklyn, New York

Marilyn M. Lightfoote, MD, PhD  
FDA Center for Devices and  
Radiological Health  
Silver Spring, Maryland

Tom H. Stahlberg  
PerkinElmer Life Sciences  
Turku, Finland

Robert F. Vogt, Jr., PhD  
Centers for Disease Control and  
Prevention  
Atlanta, Georgia

Ronald J. Whitley, PhD  
University of Kentucky Med. Ctr.  
Lexington, Kentucky

#### Advisors

W. Harry Hannon, PhD  
Centers for Disease Control and  
Prevention  
Atlanta, Georgia

Gerald E. Marti, MD, PhD  
FDA Center for Biologics  
Evaluation and Research  
Bethesda, Maryland

Per N. J. Matsson, PhD  
Phadia AB  
Uppsala, Sweden

Robert M. Nakamura, MD  
Scripps Clinic & Research  
Foundation  
La Jolla, California

Thomas A. O'Brien, PhD  
Bridgewater, New Jersey

Jelili Ojodu, MPH  
Association of Public Health  
Laboratories  
Silver Spring, Maryland

Robert F. Ritchie, MD  
Foundation for Blood Research  
Scarborough, Maine

Donald R. Tourville, PhD  
Zeus Scientific, Inc.  
Raritan, New Jersey

Daniel Tripodi, PhD  
The Sage Group  
Branchburg, New Jersey

Robert W. Veltri, PhD  
Johns Hopkins Hospital  
Baltimore, Maryland

Philip R. Wyatt, MD, PhD  
York Central Hospital, Toronto  
North York, Ontario, Canada

#### Staff

Clinical and Laboratory Standards  
Institute  
Wayne, Pennsylvania

Lois M. Schmidt, DA  
*Vice President, Standards  
Development and Marketing*

Ron Quicho  
*Staff Liaison*

Patrice E. Polgar  
*Project Manager*

Melissa A. Lewis  
*Editor*

### Acknowledgment

CLSI and the Area Committee on Immunology and Ligand Assay gratefully acknowledge the following individuals for their help in preparing the approved-level, second edition of this guideline:

Marilyn M. Lightfoote, MD, PhD  
Chairholder  
FDA Ctr. for Devices/Rad. Health  
Silver Spring, Maryland

Dorothy J. Ball, PhD  
Abbott  
Irving, Texas

W. Harry Hannon, PhD  
Centers for Disease Control and Prevention  
Atlanta, Georgia

John C. Ridderhof, DrPH  
Centers for Disease Control and Prevention  
Atlanta, Georgia

Robert F. Vogt, Jr., PhD  
Centers for Disease Control and Prevention  
Atlanta, Georgia



**Contents**

Abstract.....i

Committee Membership..... iii

Foreword..... vii

1 Scope..... 1

2 Introduction..... 1

3 Standard Precautions..... 1

4 Terminology..... 2

    4.1 A Note on Terminology ..... 2

    4.2 Definitions ..... 2

    4.3 Abbreviations/Acronyms ..... 5

5 Establishment of Analytical Performance.....6

    5.1 Assay Components .....6

    5.2 Specimen Requirements .....9

    5.3 Assay Design Criteria .....9

6 Clinical Evaluation: Planning and Design ..... 11

    6.1 Investigator’s Manual ..... 12

    6.2 Ethical Considerations ..... 14

    6.3 Clinical Evaluation Protocol ..... 16

    6.4 Clinical Evaluation Objectives ..... 18

    6.5 Selection of Investigator and Evaluation Site ..... 19

    6.6 Evaluating Performance Characteristics ..... 20

    6.7 Study Population..... 25

7 Conducting the Clinical Evaluation ..... 26

    7.1 Monitoring Clinical Evaluations..... 26

    7.2 Database Management ..... 27

    7.3 Quality Assurance of Data Integrity ..... 28

    7.4 Retention of Records ..... 29

8 Analysis of Clinical Evaluation Data..... 29

    8.1 Performance of Statistical Tests..... 29

    8.2 Documentation of Performance Characteristics ..... 30

    8.3 Clinical Evaluation Summary ..... 30

References..... 33

Additional References..... 36

Appendix. 95% Confidence Ranges for 0.98 Sensitivity and 0.98 Specificity..... 37

Summary of Consensus Comments and Working Group Responses ..... 38

Summary of Delegate Comments and Working Group Responses ..... 41

The Quality Management System Approach ..... 52

Related CLSI Reference Materials ..... 53





## Foreword

This document updates previous guidelines describing the requirements for the clinical evaluation of immunoassays. In preparing this guideline, the working group considered three areas of need regarding the clinical use of immunoassays: 1) for laboratories engaged in the development of immunoassays for use within their institutions, this guideline will provide direction in designing an evaluation of the assay's clinical performance; 2) for those scientists involved in evaluating new therapeutic agents, this guideline will provide direction in establishing immunoassays as reliable clinical end points; and 3) for manufacturers of *in vitro* diagnostic assays, this guideline will provide a checklist to review against their approach to addressing regulatory requirements for commercialization of products.

For the purposes of this document, clinical performance refers to correct classification (ie, clinical [diagnostic] sensitivity and specificity) and does not refer to clinical utility, which may include the effects of environment, economy, and patient outcomes. While there is mention of an assay's analytical performance, users should refer to existing CLSI documents (see the Related CLSI Reference Materials section) and to other sources for more detailed information.

Because the scope of this document does not limit its application to industry or to the clinical or research laboratory, the working group has used the term *clinical evaluation* in place of "clinical study" or "clinical trial." While considered interchangeable from the working group's perspective, the reader should use the term that is appropriate for his or her institution.

It should also be acknowledged that there are different types of evaluations for new assays, including comparative and clinical. Comparative evaluations are typically performed when the laboratorian is considering substituting an assay from one manufacturer with another from a different manufacturer. While having its own unique forms of execution and analyses, this evaluation is simply comparing one assay to another without the postulation of any clinical questions. See the related reference for comparative evaluations (see CLSI/NCCLS document EP09).<sup>1</sup> While it may involve a comparative approach, the clinical evaluation is required for the application of a new assay, a new analyte (measurand), or for a new, intended use of an existing analyte (measurand).

In the assay development to implementation/commercialization continuum, this guideline addresses the activities associated with preclinical testing and clinical evaluation requirements, evaluation design, and analysis. While written for immunoassay developers, the information has broad application to other clinical and research assay formats.

### This Revision

During the revision process, the working group updated the content and expanded the current document for assessment of immunoassays to include specific details on selection and use of test specimen panels; specimen library collections; reference panels including specimen commutability issues; and sample size considerations for evaluation studies. An appendix was also added to guide the user in sample size selections. Numerous revisions were made to enhance and ensure global applications.

### Key Words

clinical evaluation, clinical evaluation investigator, clinical performance characteristics, database management, diagnostic evaluation, diagnostic performance characteristics, evaluation population, informed consent, institutional review board, pilot evaluation, sponsor, statistical tests



## **Clinical Evaluation of Immunoassays; Approved Guideline—Second Edition**

### **1 Scope**

This document provides specific recommendations for the clinical evaluation of new immunoassays and new applications of existing assays, as well as multiple assay formats and their uses. It focuses on unique characteristics of immunoassays, and provides a guide to designing, executing, and analyzing a clinical evaluation.

The intended users of this guideline are developers of “in-house” assays for institutional use, developers of assays used for monitoring pharmacologic effects of new drugs or biologics, and clinical and regulatory personnel responsible for commercializing products.

### **2 Introduction**

*In vitro* diagnostic (IVD) assay development occurs in multiple environments, each with different requirements for the actual use of the assay. Developers that manufacture and market their assays are required to obtain approval in accordance with regulations in countries where the product is being registered or used. (Consult appropriate local regulations and institutional policies for specific applications.) Others may develop assays that do not require the same extent of testing and review. For example, clinical and research laboratories may develop assays for use within their institutions, thereby limiting the assay’s use to a select patient population. Another example is the development of research assays for use in monitoring pharmacologic effects or unfavorable reactions. A third example is the development of assays for point-of-care (POC) testing, which require evaluation under conditions in which the assay is performed. This document addresses the need for clinical evaluation of new immunoassays and new applications of existing assays, as well as multiple assay formats and their uses. Whatever the intended use, the assay can only provide medical benefit when it has undergone adequate clinical evaluation.

Separated into four basic sections, this guidance is intended to provide all assay developers with a consistent approach to establishing clinical performance characteristics. First, the immunoassay (preclinical) evaluation is described, including recommendations for establishing analytical performance. Second, the planning and design of the clinical evaluation is discussed. Third, a description of conducting the clinical evaluation is given; and fourth, analysis and summary documentation is reviewed.

### **3 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 infectious agents and thus are more comprehensive than universal precautions, which are intended to apply only to transmission of blood-borne pathogens. Standard and universal precaution guidelines are available from the US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.<sup>2</sup> For specific precautions for preventing the laboratory transmission of all infectious agents from laboratory instruments and materials and for recommendations for the management of exposure to all infectious disease, refer to CLSI document M29.<sup>3</sup>