


# Sample Homogeneity, Incurred Sample Repeat Analysis, Data Comparisons and What to Do With It All? - A Case Study



**Luca C. Matassa, Patrick Bennett,**  
Tandem Labs, Salt Lake City, UT;  
**Man-Wai Lo, Eric Woolf,**  
Merck Research Laboratories, West Point, PA

- Regulatory Backdrop:
  - Repeat Analysis
- Analytical Backdrop:
  - Validation and Sample Analysis
- Case Study:
  - Incurred Sample “pk request” Repeat Analysis
  - Investigation
  - Process and Experiments
  - Final Outcome
- Issues & Recommendations
  - Investigations
  - Incurred Sample Repeats

- Section 7 of the recent Crystal City whitepaper discusses reanalysis of incurred samples.
- Repeats give additional assurance that the method gives reproducible results on samples over time

# Analytical Backdrop



- A sensitive, specific, accurate, and reproducible LC/MS/MS assay was validated using a stable label internal standard for the determination of a marketed compound in human plasma.
- The assay validated very well and met all validation guideline requirements
- The validated method was applied for the analysis of 1260 study samples.
- Analysis of study samples proceeded very smoothly with no failed runs.

## Validation data



- Accuracy: within 5%
- Precision: within 10%
- Specificity: within 13% (6 lots at LLOQ; accuracy and precision)
- Analyte recovery: 93.6 to 96.6%
- Retention times and peak shape were consistent throughout the validation.

## Study Data: Red Flag



- Reanalysis was requested for 8 samples because the pharmacokinetic data did not match historical data.
- 50% of the repeated (n=3) sample values deviated by more than 20% from the original values.
  - Differences as high as 133%.
- Investigation was initiated.

# PK Repeat Analysis Results



Sample ID	First Accepted Value (ng/mL)	Repeat Average (ng/mL)	%RSD (Repeats)	% Deviation from 1st Value
1	137	116	6.9	-15.3%
2	45	92	9.47	104%
3	150	115	3.28	-23.3%
4	56.4	86.8	3.2	53.9%
5	112	125	6.48	11.6%
6	38.3	89.2	6.78	133%
7	79.4	71	8.25	-10.6%
8	42.7	66.3	7.65	55.3%

# Investigation Initiation



- What is the source of the irreproducible results?
  - Execution?
    - Switched samples
    - Instrument issues
    - Scientist performance of method
  - Method?
    - Metabolite interferences
    - Poor ruggedness
    - ISTD response
  - Samples?
    - Matrix effects
    - Mislabeled

# Initial Investigation



- No apparent issues related to above items
- More data required to understand the problem
- Decision in discussion with sponsor
  - Run 10 complete subject profiles (n=3)
  - Concurrent to planning analysis tubes were verified to ensure sufficient volume remaining
- Observation made that sample tubes were “overfilled”
  - Headspace less than 10 mm from cap following initial analysis

- Hypothesis
  - Overfilled tubes + concentration gradient = incomplete mixing resulting in irreproducibility
  - Therefore, reanalysis of 3 subject profiles (56 samples) was performed with **hand mixing/inversion** of each individual sample

## Initial Investigation Results (first three profiles)



- Improved pharmacokinetic results
- Excellent within replicate precision
  - Maximum CV < 9%
  - Average CV 3.5%
- Poor correlation to initial results
  - Deviations ranged from 6% to 271%
  - Average deviation of 37%
- Reanalysis halted, consultation with sponsor and investigation expanded

- Positive:
  - Repeats with hand mixing intra-run results were precise & matched historical data
- Negative:
  - Repeat results don't match original
- Conclusion:
  - Our hypothesis is supported but can it be completely proven with data?
- Next Step?
  - Re-assay study with hand mixing OR
  - Get the proof

# Above and Beyond



- Small in-house study design to replicate the conditions of sample collection and handling
- 4 volunteers dosed and blood samples collected/plasma harvested per clinical procedure.
  - Plasma from each sample divided into two groups
  - Each group had a storage tube completely filled and partially filled

# Above and Beyond



- Study variables:
  - One set of full and partially filled tubes were mixed prior to freezing and analysis
  - One set of full and partially filled tubes were **not** mixed prior to freezing or analysis
  - Analysis of aliquots taken from top and middle of the full tubes and top of partial fill
  - Samples analyzed in triplicate on two separate days by two separate analysts

# Results Table Day 1 Analysis: Full Tube/Mixed



Volunteer ID	DAY 1 Triplicate Mean	DAY 1 %CV	%Difference (Top vs Mid)
1 - Top Draw	47.7	0.55	-6.1
1 - Mid Draw	44.8	1.01	
2 - Top Draw	29.3	1.69	-3.8
2 - Mid Draw	28.2	3.01	
3 - Top Draw	37.6	3.19	-4.8
3 - Mid Draw	35.8	5.27	
4 - Top Draw	60.7	4.24	-2.3
4 - Mid Draw	59.3	3.5	

# Results Table Day 1 Analysis : Full tube/No Mix



Volunteer ID	DAY 1 Triplicate Mean	DAY 1 %CV	%Difference (Top vs Mid)
1 - Top Draw	34.9	12.3	39.5
1 - Mid Draw	48.7	1.07	
2 - Top Draw	22.3	6.72	30.5
2 - Mid Draw	29.1	17.6	
3 - Top Draw	19.6	8.97	116.8
3 - Mid Draw	42.5	11.0	
4 - Top Draw	23.6	14.8	224.2
4 - Mid Draw	76.5	3.66	

# Overall Results – Full Tubes



Volunteer ID	DAY 1 Mean	DAY 2 Mean	% Difference Day 1 vs Day 2	Overall %CV
1 – Mix - top	47.7	48.7	2.1	3.5
1 – Mix - mid	44.8	47.5	5.7	
1 – No Mix - top	34.9	21.5	-62.3	43.3
1 - No Mix – mid	48.7	64.2	24.1	
2 – Mix - top	29.3	29.7	1.3	3.0
2 – Mix - mid	28.2	27.9	-1.1	
2 – No Mix - top	22.3	17.4	-28.2	33.2
2 - No Mix – mid	29.1	37.8	23.0	

# Investigation Conclusion



- Ultimate cause of the irreproducibility of repeats = sample in-homogeneity.
  - Mix vs. No Mix & Top vs. Mid aliquot draws
    - Top vs Mid deviation ranged from 31% to 224%
      - Concentration gradient proven
    - %CV significantly higher for unmixed samples vs mixed.
      - Unmixed samples ranged from 33.0% to 62.6%
      - Mixed samples ranged 3.4% to 6.2%
- Decision with sponsor
  - Reanalyze all study samples (n=1) with hand mixing
  - An additional 56 samples (same 3 profiles already assayed) were re-assayed to validate the precision of the study sample results

# Reanalysis Conclusion



- All n=1 repeats were acceptable
- Repeat results for 56 samples
  - 100% within 21% of original
  - 95% (3/56) within 20% of original
  - 84% (47/56) within 15% of original

- Compliance issues
  - Documentation required for the investigation/re-analysis
  - Corrective Action, Investigation Report (CAIR)
- Data comparison - original and repeat data sets
  - Statistical models – not available in Watson
- Process issues – SOP's
  - Pk repeats
  - CAIR
  - Incurred sample repeats

- Most are too sensitive – particularly with precise assays
- Recommendation: Similar to QCs
  - 67% of repeat results within  $\pm 15\%$  of original
  - Be careful of samples within 20% of LLOQ
  - Be careful of samples within 15% of ULOQ

- Investigations
  - Have SOP's in place
  - Involve Client/QAU
  - Complete documentation
- Repeat Analysis
  - Beware of sample mixing issues
  - Keep process simple – SOP driven
  - Choose something realistic based on the complexity of bioanalysis

# Acknowledgements



- **Merck**

- Eric Woolf
- Man-Wai Lo
- Rita Chiou
- Jin Zhang

- **Tandem Labs**

- Scott Reuschel
- Kevin Jessing
- Lailiang Zhai
- Shaundel Percey
- Jim Johnston