

Selection, Use and Interpretation of Proficiency Testing (PT) Schemes

Third Edition 2021

ERRATA

The following pages provide editorial corrections to the corresponding elements of the above Guide. Amendments are indicated in colour.

Errata version	Issue date	Remarks
1.1	13-05-2021	Corrections to section 7.2.5 (Alternative performance evaluation approaches)
1.2	02-08-2021	Corrected numbering of definitions in section 3, and updated following publication of EA-4/18 G:2021 Reference [7] updated in Bibliography

7.2.5. Alternative performance evaluation approaches

Some PT schemes use a simple difference between assigned value and participant result, often denoted D , as an indication of performance. This can also be expressed as a percentage of the assigned value, $D\%$.

$$D_i = x_i - x_{pt}$$

$$D_i\% = 100 (x_i - x_{pt})/x_{pt}$$

The difference D or $D\%$ is usually compared with a criterion based on fitness for purpose or expected performance. These have the advantage of simplicity for an analyst familiar with the field, but do not have a consistent interpretation for different characteristics.

.....
Mis-numbered definition for ‘Proficiency testing provider (PT provider)’ corrected from 3.17 to 3.5

Definitions 3.5 to 3.18, renumbered to 3.6 to 3.19

Text in updated definitions 3.11, 3.13, 3.15, 3.16, 3.17, 3.18 revised to reflect the publication of the revised EA-4/18

Reference [7] in bibliography updated to reflect publication of EA-4/18 G:2021