

Workshop
Method Validation in Analytical Sciences
Current practices and future challenges

Gent, 9-10 May 2016

Report from WG 3
Validation of qualitative and semi-
quantitative methods

**Validation of qualitative and
semi-quantitative methods**

How to validate methods where data cannot be handled by normal statistics
(e.g. PCR)

- Moderator:
 - Steve Ellison (LGC, UK)



Suggested questions

- What type of qualitative / semi-quantitative methods are you interested in validating?
- What are the different approaches applied in different fields?
- What are the performance criteria used to validate qualitative / semi-quantitative methods?
- What are the documents available for guidance?
- How do you decide about the extent of validation needed?
- Examples of special approaches for planning and data treatment (when the normal approaches are not applicable – e.g. in terms of statistics for the data treatment)



Actual questions

- What does 'qualitative' mean?
- What does 'semi-quantitative' mean?

- What's different about 'qualitative' validation?
 - What special problems does it present?
- ... and what stays the same?
 - What does it have in common with any other method validation?



What does 'qualitative' mean?

- Qualitative
 - Classification (a category, not a number)

 - Examples: Yes/No, Present/Absent, Identity



What does 'semi-quantitative' mean?

- Ordinal scales
 - Absent/Low/Med/High
- 'Binned'
 - 0-10, 10-100 ...
- Quantitative with large uncertainty

- Discussion: Hard to find *purely* semiquantitative examples; often quantitative *expressed* semiquantitatively



What's different about 'qualitative' validation?

- What special problems does it present?
 - Not a number:
 - Results can be counted but not summarised to average, standard deviation etc.

 - This has considerable implications for size of experiments,



... and what stays the same?

- General concepts apply:
 - Detection capability
 - Ruggedness
 - Selectivity/specificity
 - Accuracy (agreement with reference/true value)
 - Precision (result can be reproduced under repeatability/reproducibility conditions)

- ... but these all have quite different interpretation in qualitative context



Any other comments?

- Screening methods do not have the same requirements when included in a larger confirmation process
- Uncertainty is difficult to express
 - Probabilities/response rate not very reliable
- Traceability applies to test conditions
 - Unclear whether one can be 'traceable' to a reference library



Any other comments? (cont)

- Qualitative validation needs a *lot* more observations
- Need to find a balance between 'enough to detect problems' but not so large to go out of business