



Evaluation of analytical calibration based on least-squares linear regression for instrumental techniques: A tutorial review



Francisco Raposo *

Instituto de la Grasa, Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas (IG-CSIC), Campus Universitario Pablo de Olavide, Carretera de Utrera km 1, Edificio 46, 41013 Seville, Spain

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

Analytical calibration
Calibration error
Correlation coefficient
Determination coefficient
Least-squares method
Linear regression
Linearity assessment

ABSTRACT

The analytical calibration of an instrumental method is very important, being considered as a key point in method validation. There are different validation guidelines; showing that analytical calibration process variety prevails in terms of nomenclature, methodology employed and acceptance criteria. Very common mistakes in the analytical calibration process are the use of correlation and/or determination coefficients as a test for linearity, the negligence in the heteroscedasticity of the experimental data and selection of appropriate weighting factor, misunderstanding about the regression through the origin and using zero-point calibration. Once the calibration function is established, their linearity can be confirmed by using different procedures such as graphical plots, statistical significance tests and numerical parameters. In particular, deviation from back-calculated concentrations expressed in the form of percentage of relative error (%RE) can be considered very useful for unambiguous linearity evaluation. Some case studies were included to explain the linearity assessment from a practical viewpoint.

© 2016 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

Contents

1. Introduction	168
2. Calibration of analytical methods	169
2.1. Calibration: general concepts	169
2.2. Analytical calibration: stages	169
2.2.1. Stage 1: planning the experiments for the calibration study	169
2.2.2. Stage 2: fitting the experimental data by regression triplet	171
3. Linearity as validation performance parameter	173
3.1. General approach	173
3.1.1. Linear versus non-linear regression models	173
3.1.2. Clarification of linearity concept	173
3.2. Evaluation of linearity	173
3.2.1. Graphical mode	173
3.2.2. Non-graphical mode	174
4. Evaluation of linearity: case studies	177

Abbreviations: AIC, Akaike's information criterion; ADL, average deviation from linearity; AOAC, association of official analytical chemists; ANOVA, analysis of variance; AUT, automatically; BC, back-calculated; Cal-VG, calibration section of validation guidelines; C.I, confidence interval; CS, case study; CVDL, coefficient of variation of deviations from linearity; DOF, degree of freedom; DEV, deviation from back-calculated concentrations; EMA, European medicines agency; ESTD, external standard; GOF, goodness of fit; GRA, graphical; H_A , alternative hypothesis; H_0 , null hypothesis; ICH, international conference of harmonization; ICP, inductive coupled plasma; INAB, Irish national accreditation board; ISTD, internal standard; IUPAC, International union of pure and applied chemistry; j , calibration levels; JRC-FCM, Joint research centre–food contact material; k , calibration replicates; LIN, linearity; LLQ, lowest limit of quantification; LOF, lack-of-fit; N , number of calibration data; MAN, Mandel; NATA, national association of testing authorities of Australia; OLS, ordinary least-squares; PAR, peak area ratio; PE, pure error; QC, quality coefficient; r , correlation coefficient; R^2 , determination coefficient; RE, relative error; REG, regression; RES, residuals; RR, relative residual; RSE, residual standard error; RTO, regression through origin; SE, standard error; SSDL, sum of squares of deviations from linearity; SLO, slope; SQT, significance of quadratic term; STA, statistically; SWGTOX, scientific working group for forensic toxicology; TOST, two-one sided test; US FDA, United States food and drug administration; USP, United States pharmacopeia; VFAs, volatile fatty acids; WF, weighting factor; WLS, weighted least squares; ZPC, zero point calibration.

* Tel: +34 954611550; fax: +34 954616790.

E-mail address: fraposo@cica.es

4.1.	Linearity Plots	178
4.1.1.	Experimental design	178
4.1.2.	Calibration data: X (amount-mg/tablet) versus Y (signal-arbitrary units)	178
4.1.3.	Sensitivity values	178
4.1.4.	Evaluation of linearity	178
4.2.	ANOVA test	178
4.2.1.	Experimental design	178
4.2.2.	Calibration data: X (mg/mL) versus Y (absorbance units)	179
4.2.3.	Calculation of variances	179
4.2.4.	F-test values	179
4.2.5.	Evaluation of linearity	179
4.3.	LOF test	179
4.3.1.	Experimental design	179
4.3.2.	Calibration data: X (amount-ng) versus Y (PAR of serotonin/IS)	179
4.3.3.	Error sum squares calculation (see reference 53)	179
4.3.4.	Degrees of freedom calculation (see reference 53)	179
4.3.5.	Calculation of associated variances ($\sigma^2 = SS/DOF$)	179
4.3.6.	F-test values	179
4.3.7.	Evaluation of linearity	179
4.4.	Mandel's test	180
4.4.1.	Experimental design	180
4.4.2.	Calibration data: X (concentration-mM) versus Y (signal-arbitrary units)	180
4.4.3.	Quadratic regression output	180
4.4.4.	Calculation of variances	180
4.4.5.	F-test values (see reference 65 for calculation)	180
4.4.6.	Evaluation of linearity	180
4.5.	Significance of quadratic term (SQT)	180
4.5.1.	Experimental design	180
4.5.2.	Calibration data: X (concentration) versus Y (response)	180
4.5.3.	Quadratic regression output	180
4.5.4.	Mean squares calculation (Statgraphic® Plus 5.0 software was used)	180
4.5.5.	F-test values	180
4.5.6.	Evaluation of linearity	180
4.6.	%RSD _{slope} (SLO)	180
4.6.1.	Experimental design	180
4.6.2.	Calibration data: X (concentration- $\mu\text{g/mL}$) versus Y (PA signal-arbitrary units)	180
4.6.3.	%RSD _{slope} calculation	180
4.6.4.	Evaluation of linearity	180
4.7.	Quality coefficient (QC)	180
4.7.1.	Experimental design	180
4.7.2.	Calibration data: X (concentration-ng/mL) versus Y (absorb.-arbitrary units)	180
4.7.3.	QCs calculation	180
4.7.4.	Evaluation of linearity	180
4.8.	RE as function of RTO and ZPC	180
4.8.1.	Experimental data	181
4.8.2.	Calibration data: X (concentration-ng/mL) vs Y (signal-arbitrary units- 10^{-3})	181
4.8.3.	Evaluation of linearity	181
4.9.	RE as function of regression fitting technique (OLS/WLS)	181
4.9.1.	Experimental data	181
4.9.2.	Calibration data: X (concentration-ng/mL) versus Y (signal-arbitrary units)	181
4.9.3.	Evaluation of linearity	181
5.	Calibration tutorial: full regression analysis and evaluation of linearity	181
5.1.	Experimental data	182
5.2.	Calibration data: X (concentration-ng/mL) versus Y (PAR of n-C5/IS)	182
5.3.	Evaluation of calibration curve	182
6.	Conclusions	183
	Acknowledgements	183
	References	183

1. Introduction

The validation is required in analytical chemistry to demonstrate the performance of the method and the reliability and consistency of the analytical results. Therefore, before an analytical method can be implemented for routine use, it must first be validated to demonstrate that it is suitable for its intended purpose. Several chemical organizations have developed at national or international level different validation guidelines in the field of analytical chemistry. Among them, some international well known

validation references are provided by the Association of Official Analytical Chemists (AOAC) [1], the International Union of Pure and Applied Chemistry (IUPAC) [2], the analytical chemistry group EURACHEM [3,4] and the European Medicines Agency (EMA) [5]. On the other hand, some validation guidelines have been published at national level by regulatory authorities such as US FDA (the United States Food and Drug Administration) [6], USP (the United States Pharmacopeia) [7], ANVISA (National Health Surveillance Agency of Brazil) [8], INAB (Irish National Accreditation Board) [9] and NATA (National Association of Testing Authorities of Australia)

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/1247695>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/1247695>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com)