

 **Eurachem**
A focus for analytical chemistry in Europe

 **METHOD VALIDATION IN ANALYTICAL SCIENCE**
Current Practices & Future Challenges
WORKSHOP - 9&10 MAY 2016 - GENT - BELGIUM

WG2 – Planning of validation studies

Convenor:
Vicki Barwick

 **Eurachem**
A focus for analytical chemistry in Europe

Outcome of WG 1.1-2 (LS)

- WG participants
- Belgium 11111111111111
- Steel analysis
- Official Medical control auth.
- Water analysis 11
- Sweden 111
- Medical lab. 11
- Czech 11
- Univesity (Pham.) 1
- University (Research) 111
- Austria
- University X-Ray
- Agricultural related tests 111
(incl. research, animal prod.)
- Ireland
- Italy
- Food safety (contamintants etc.)

Outcome of WG 1.1-2 (LS)

- Iran
- Consultant
- UK
- Setting specifications on methods for UK Ph.
- Nuclear power supply
- Textile
- Fruits and vegetables
- Poland
- NAB (expec. water labs., fuel)
- NAB
- Food & Feed (trace elements)
- PU field
- Greece
- University (food & environmental)



What are the different planning approaches applied in different fields?

- Easy to find info on 'raw ingredients' of a validation but difficult to plan the detail – especially in labs that carry out a wide range of analysis on different materials using different techniques
- In-house protocol based on external guidance
- Generally studying one parameter at a time rather than combined experiments
 - Interested in multi-performance parameter approach described by Steve!


Outcome of WG 1.1-2 (LS)


- What are the different planning approaches applied in different fields?
- Follow specific regulations (Food & feed)
 - nat./EU/International regulations (necessary to be aware)
 - depending of the sample types (matrices)
 - requires a case by case planning of Val. studies
- Different regulations for eg. Cd & Cu
 - requires different approaches in val.. studies (different limit values etc.)
- Too many demands on how to validate a method
 - different (not-harmonized) approaches from different authorities
 - more active approach from EU / ISO or other authorities in harmonizing requirements



What are the protocols available


- Are there any specified protocols/formats for specific fields?
 - Pharmaceuticals – ICH guidelines – but still some decisions to be made by the lab on no. replicates
 - Microbiology – in-house SOP based on external guidelines
 - General – there are guidelines but few protocols
 - Don't forget books with good examples!
 - There are 'local' regulations in certain sectors which give more details
 - A limited number of sectors/regions have very detailed protocols (e.g. UK MCERTS)


 **Eurachem**
A focus for analytical chemistry in Europe

 **METHOD VALIDATION IN ANALYTICAL SCIENCE**
Current Practices & Future Challenges
WORKSHOP - 9&10 MAY 2016 - GENT - BELGIUM

How do you decide about the extent of validation needed?

- **Strategies for optimising/combining experiments and/or information**
 - Screening vs confirmations – less validation for screening (selectivity/specificity/LOD)
 - Confirmation – full validation
 - Factors to consider:
 - Time (particularly for ad-hoc methods)
 - Customer requirements
 - Equipment/staff availability
 - Scope of method – range of sample types
 - Verification vs validation
 - Requirements of relevant regulations in terms of extent of validation and performance targets

 **Eurachem**
A focus for analytical chemistry in Europe

 **METHOD VALIDATION IN ANALYTICAL SCIENCE**
Current Practices & Future Challenges
WORKSHOP - 9&10 MAY 2016 - GENT - BELGIUM

How do you decide about the extent of validation needed?

- **Deciding number of replicates**
 - Look at external guidance for help
 - Follow internal SOPs
 - Based on previous experience
 - Ensure that required working range is covered
 - Ensure measurements are made on different days
 - Replication should cover whole method not just end measurement (independent reps)

Outcome of WG 1.1-2 (LS)

- How do you decide about the extent of validation needed?
 - Strategies for optimising/combining experiments and/or information
- If you follow the exact procedure in a Standard method only verification against "known" results is needed!
 - what to compare with
 - use of reference materials
 -
- Use data from ILCs (PTs)
 - for validation and/or verification
- Spiking experiments for verification of a standard method "better than doing nothing"
 -
- Does the laboratory always have all the needed "tools" for doing validation/verification
 - checklist on available tool as part of planning
 - The question is whether it is good enough?

Outcome of WG 1.1-2 (LS)

- Pharm: Meth. delivered by producer + some methods to be developed by laboratory
Interlaboratory studies on ruggedness – securing safe transfer of method to other labs.
- For some fields reference methods (or techniques) exists (related to regulation)
 - comparison mandatory
 - good performance in a PT is not always enough
- Validation of basic chemical method – and a quick (instrumental) method
 - comparisons

**What are the challenges experienced in different areas?**

- Varied types of analysis in a lab so not possible to have a single protocol
- Lack of reference materials
- General availability of suitable standards or other materials for evaluating different parameters
- Protocols/guidance assume that labs have access to suitable materials
- Assigning values to in-house standards where no/limited availability of external standards

**What are the challenges experienced in different areas?**

- Not always possible to meet initial performance targets so may need further development – takes time!
- Limited information to enable setting performance targets (particularly when working with 'novel' compounds)
- Inconsistent definitions/interpretation between different guidelines (e.g. LOD)
- Audits – differing interpretations of requirements



When is a verification sufficient – and when is a (partial) (re)validation required?

- When can adaption of a method so that it can be performed in a particular laboratory be handled by verification...
- ...or when is it to be considered as a modification which requires validation?
- Change in matrix/analyte/level
- If a change is made, carry out an impact assessment to determine the extent of revalidation required
- Periodic review of methods (defined interval) to decide whether method is still fit for purpose
 - Any significant changes? Re-validation required?
- Review of QC/PT
- Quality incidents (e.g. complaints)

- Verification – fewer parameters/less replication
 - Standard methods (externally validated)
 - Minor changes to method

Outcome of WG 1.1-2 (LS)

- When is a verification sufficient – and when is a (partial) (re)validation required?
 - When can adaption of a method so that it can be performed in a particular laboratory be handled by verification...
 - ...or when is it to be considered as a modification which requires validation?
- Also influenced by regulatory requirements in some cases
- Different approaches for eg. clean water and waste water
 (approach build up through accreditation – no formal requirements!)
- Clinical field:
 - requirements seems to increase along with new techniques coming up (e.g. in microbiology)
- Scope description of method is important
 - influences what is needed in terms of validation and (not least) verification
 - e.g. in relation to potential interference problems



What information should a good validation protocol contain?

- Method scope & outline of method
- Purpose of study (validation/verification)
- Explanation strategy (particularly any limitations)
- Samples (no of samples), matrices, levels etc, RMs/standards
- Performance parameters & performance criteria
 - Level of replication
- Sequence of analysis
- Calculations of parameters and statistical tests
- References to any key documents
- Documentation of validation – sufficient data available for someone else to verify claims

Outcome of WG 1.1-2 (LS)

- What information should a good validation protocol contain?
- The relevant val. characteristics
- Scope of the method
 - based on demand from clients
 - information about purpose of test + background and composition of samples
 - sometimes given in regulation
- Formal requirements (regulations)
- Levels, replicates, materials, time-frame

Outcome of WG 1.1-2 (LS)

- Challenges in finding appropriate reference materials
- Verification vs. validation
 - be aware of not using the term "verified" methods (not having the same value among clients)
- Recent developments in knowledge about e.g. contaminants etc. can call for re-validation
 - follow development of what is really "fit for the purpose"