

'Web course "LC-MS Method Validation"

University of Tartu

https://sisu.ut.ee/lcms_method_validation/

NB! “This table is meant as a general “big picture” comparison between the different guidelines.

The wording in this table does not necessarily exactly match the wording in the guidelines.

For the definitive wording the user must consult the original documents.”

| Validation parameter | FDA 2018 bioanalysis [1] | EMA 2011 bioanalysis [2] | ICH 2005 [3] | Eurachem 2014 [4] |
|----------------------|--|---|---|---|
| Selectivity | Blank from at least 6 individual sources; Acceptance Criteria: Blank and zero: no interference at analyte and IS RTs. Spiked samples: \pm 20% LLOQ. Blank: IS response < 5% of Cals and QCs average IS responses. | Blank from at least 6 individual sources; Acceptance Criteria: Analyte response < 20% of LLOQ; IS response <5% | | Test samples and RMs Candidate and other independent methods Also test samples with suspected interferences |
| Specificity | Assess for interference by cross-reacting molecules, concomitant medications, bio-transformed species, etc. Acceptance Criteria: Same as Selectivity. | | Blanks, matrix-matched samples. Impurities, if applicable: Spiking blanks with impurities and/or excipients. Degradation experiments: light, heat, humidity, acid/base hydrolysis and oxidation | |
| Carryover | Assess impact of carryover on accuracy. Acceptance Criteria: < 20% of LLOQ | Inject blank after a high concentration sample or calibration; Acceptance Criteria: Blank response: < 20% of LLOQ IS response: < 5% | | |

| Validation parameter | FDA 2018 bioanalysis [1] | EMA 2011 bioanalysis [2] | ICH 2005 [3] | Eurachem 2014 [4] |
|---|--|--|---|--|
| Linearity / Calibration Curve | Matrix-matched, Blank, zero, 6 level (inc. LLOQ), Acceptance Criteria: LLOQ \pm 20%, others \pm 15%, 75% (or min. 6 calibrator levels) should meet the criteria, Cal runs need to be reproducible | Matrix-matched, Blank, zero, 3 runs x 6 levels (inc. LLOQ) (optional, 2 parallels), Acceptance Criteria: LLOQ \pm 20%, others \pm 15%, 75% (min. 6 calibrator levels) should meet the criteria 50% per level should meet the criteria | \geq 5 levels Range: assay: from 80 to 120 % of target conc.; content uniformity: from 70 to 130 % of target conc., dissolution testing: +/-20 % over the specified range; impurity: from reporting level to 120% of the specification; | Instrument and method working range. Range of interest: Blank, 6 - 10 levels evenly spaced expected range \pm 10 % / \pm 20 %. Linear range: Blank, 2-3 parallels x 6-10 levels evenly spaced Determine if linear range is fit: Blank, reference materials or spiked sample blanks, 2-3 parallels x 6-10 levels evenly spaced regression plot, residuals plot, regression statistics |
| Accuracy and Precision (A & P) | 3 runs x 4 levels (LLOQ, L, M, H QC) x 5 parallels, Over several days, Within-run and between runs Accuracy: LLOQ: \pm 20% from nominal conc. others: \pm 15% from nominal conc. Precision: LLOQ: \pm 20% RSD others: \pm 15% RSD | Within-run QCs 4 levels (LLOQ, L, M, H) x 5 parallels LLOQ: \pm 20% others: \pm 15% (mean conc. from nominal value or RSD) Between runs QCs 3 runs (LLOQ, L, M, H) 2 different days LLOQ: \pm 20% others: \pm 15% (mean conc. from nominal value or RSD) | Repeatability: 3 levels x 3 parallels OR 6 determinations at target conc. Intermediate precision: Several days, analysts, equipment, etc. Not necessary to study effects individually. Experiment design is encouraged. | Accuracy: Blanks, CRMs and/or spiked samples (if RM not available). 10 parallels per level Alternatively: RM/test sample using candidate method and alternative method. Precision: RMs, surplus test samples or spiked sample blanks at various levels Repeatability: Same analyst, equipment, laboratory, short timescale. 6-15 parallels Intermediate precision: Different analysts, equipment, same laboratory, extended timescale. |

| Validation parameter | FDA 2018 bioanalysis [1] | EMA 2011 bioanalysis [2] | ICH 2005 [3] | Eurachem 2014 [4] |
|---------------------------|--|---|---|---|
| | | | | <p>6-15 parallels for each material.</p> <p>Repeatability and intermediate precision in one study: Different analysts, equipment, same laboratory, extended timescale.</p> <p>6-15 runs x 2 parallels</p> <p>ANOVA to calculate repeatability standard deviation and intermediate precision standard deviation</p> |
| Matrix effect | Matrix effects should be assessed and eliminated. | <p>≥ 6 lots of individual blank matrices Pooled matrix should not be used.</p> <p>CV: ≤ 15 % at L and H levels</p> | | |
| Recovery | QC (L, M, H) extracted samples vs blank extracts spiked post extraction | | | |
| Stability | <p>Stock solution, freeze-thaw, bench-top, long-term, processed sample, auto-sampler</p> <p>3 parallels at L and H</p> <p>Acceptance Criteria: Accuracy: ± 15% of nominal conc.</p> | <p>Stock and working solution, freeze and thaw, short term, long term, processed sample, on-instrument/auto-sampler, At L and H levels</p> <p>Acceptance Criteria: Mean conc. at each level: ±15% of the nominal conc.</p> | | |
| Sensitivity / LLOQ | <p>LLOQ: Lowest non-zero standard</p> <p>Acceptance Criteria: Response at LLOQ ≥ 5 x zero response A & P: ± 20% (3 runs x ≥ 5 parallels)</p> | <p>Lowest calibration standard</p> <p>Acceptance Criteria: LLOQ response ≥ 5 times of blank response</p> | <p>LoD and LoQ: Visual evaluation</p> <p>OR</p> <p>LoD: S/N of 3 or 2:1 LoQ: S/N of 10:1</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Based on response SD and Slope: $LoD = 3.3 \times \frac{\sigma}{slope}$ </p> | <p>CC_α, CC_β refer to EU Commission Decision 2002/657/EC and ISO 11843-2:2007</p> <p>LoD and LoQ: Blank samples, test samples or spiked samples, concentrations of analyte close to or below the expected LOD</p> <p>6 - 15 parallels</p> <p> $LoD = 3 \times s_0'$ $LoQ = k_Q \times s_0'$ </p> |

| Validation parameter | FDA 2018 bioanalysis [1] | EMA 2011 bioanalysis [2] | ICH 2005 [3] | Eurachem 2014 [4] |
|--------------------------------|---|---|---|--|
| | | | $LoQ = 10 \times \frac{\sigma}{slope}$ <p>σ determined from: 1) standard deviation of several blanks 2) calibration graph in LoD region, residual standard deviation or y-intercept standard deviation</p> | For calculation of s_0' (modified standard deviation) refer to the guide, Other alternatives suggested as well. |
| Robustness / Ruggedness | | | <p>System suitability parameters should be established.</p> <p>Examples for study: - stability of analytical solutions; - extraction time. - influence of variations of pH in a mobile phase; - influence of variations in mobile phase composition; - different columns (different lots and/or suppliers); - temperature; - flow rate.</p> | <p>Variables with significant effects must be identified,</p> <p>RMs or test samples,</p> <p>Most effective with experimental designs: e.g. Plackett-Burman experimental design for start.</p> <p>Rank the variables in order of the greatest effect on method performance. Significance tests to determine whether observed effects are statistically significant.</p> |
| Other Validation Runs | 3 QCs (L, M, H) in duplicates Run Acceptance Criteria: Cals: Same as calibration curve. QCs: $\geq 67\%$ of QCs $\pm 15\%$ $\geq 50\%$ of QCs per level $\pm 15\%$ | | | |
| Quality Controls (QC) | <p>Accuracy and Precision: 4 lvls: LLOQ, L, M, H 3 runs x 5 parallels</p> <p>Other runs: At L, M, and H levels QCs in duplicates Nr of QCs: 5% or 6, whichever is higher</p> <p>Acceptance Criteria: $\geq 67\%$ of QCs $\pm 15\%$</p> | <p>All runs (also after validation): Blank, zero Cals: 6 levels QC: ≥ 3 levels (L, M, H) x 2 parallels or $\geq 5\%$, whichever is higher</p> <p>Acceptance Criteria: Cals: LLOQ $\pm 20\%$ Other: $\pm 15\%$ 75% (or min. 6 levels) of Cals</p> | | Every batch should have QCs, stable test samples, blanks and/or standard solutions, control charts are recommended, |

| Validation parameter | FDA 2018 bioanalysis [1] | EMA 2011 bioanalysis [2] | ICH 2005 [3] | Eurachem 2014 [4] |
|---|--|---|--------------|-------------------|
| | ≥ 50% of QCs per level ± 15% | QCs: ≥ 67% of QCs ± 15% ≥ 50% of QCs per level ± 15% | | |
| Dilution | QCs for planned dilutions, 5 replicates per dilution factor, A & P: ± 15% of nominal conc. or RSD | Cover the dilution applied to the study samples. Spiking matrix above the ULOQ and diluting with blank matrix (≥ 5 determinations per dilution factor). A & P: ±15% of nominal conc. or RSD | | |
| Incurred Sample Reanalysis (ISR) | Must reanalyze samples for control: first 1000: 10% remaining: 5% Sample selection: C _{max} and in the elimination phase Acceptance Criteria: 67% ± 20% of the mean | Must reanalyze samples for control: first 1000: 10% remaining: 5% Sample selection: C _{max} and in the elimination phase Acceptance Criteria: 67% ± 20% of the mean | | |
| Repeat Analysis | No re-analysis of individual calibrators and QCs is permitted. Reanalysis should be based on reasons At least the same number of replicates for repeats as originally tested | Example cases: Run did not fulfil the acceptance criterias, IS response significantly differing from cal. or QCs response (if criteria pre-defined), Improper sample injection or malfunction of equipment, Obtained concentration above ULOQ or below LLOQ, Analyte levels in blanks too high, Poor chromatography | | |
| Parallels – Samples that have been taken through the entire measurement procedure (each has had independent sample pretreatment) EMA: LLOQ, L: within three times the LLOQ (low QC), M: around 30 - 50% of the calibration curve range (medium QC), H: at least at 75% of the upper calibration curve range (high QC). FDA: LLOQ, low (L: defined as three times the, LLOQ), mid (M: defined as mid-range), high (H: defined as high-range) | | | | |

| Validation parameter | FDA 2018 bioanalysis [1] | EMA 2011 bioanalysis [2] | ICH 2005 [3] | Eurachem 2014 [4] |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------|-------------------|
| <p>References:</p> <p>1. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Food and Drug Administration, Bioanalytical Method Validation, Guidance for Industry, 2018: https://www.fda.gov/media/70858/download</p> <p>2. Guidance on bioanalytical method validation, European Medicines Agency, 2011: https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/documents/scientific-guideline/guideline-bioanalytical-method-validation_en.pdf</p> <p>3. ICH harmonized tripartite guideline: validation of analytical procedures: text and methodology Q2(R1), International Conference of harmonization of technical requirements for registration of pharmaceuticals for human use 2005: https://database.ich.org/sites/default/files/Q2_R1__Guideline.pdf</p> <p>4. B. Magnusson and U. Örnemark (eds.) Eurachem Guide: The Fitness for Purpose of Analytical Methods - A Laboratory Guide to Method Validation and Related Topics, (2nd ed. 2014): https://www.eurachem.org/images/stories/Guides/pdf/MV_guide_2nd_ed_EN.pdf</p> | | | | |
| <p style="text-align: right;">University of Tartu https://sisu.ut.ee/lcms_method_validation/</p> | | | | |