



**Eurachem**

A Focus for Analytical Chemistry in Europe

**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



**Eurachem**

A Focus for Analytical Chemistry in Europe

**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