HARMONISATION OF THE DILUTION FACTOR IN THE FACTOR VIII INHIBITOR TEST **IMPROVES THE BETWEEN-LABORATORY COMPARABILITY**

Piet Meijer¹, Lotte Keetels², Moniek de Maat^{1,3}, Bert Verbruggen¹, Matthijs van Leeuwen².

1. ECAT Foundation, Voorschoten, The Netherlands; 2. University of Nijmegen, The Netherlands; 3. Erasmus University Medical Center, Rotterdam, The Netherlands

Introduction and Objectives:

The comparability of Factor VIII Inhibitor test results hampered by a large between-laboratory variation (30 60%) in the surveys of the external quality assessmen programme (EQAP) of the ECAT Foundation¹. In a small study it has recently been suggested that harmonisatior of the dilution factor of the patient sample advances the between-laboratory comparability of test results² Previous communication to participants in the ECA programme about the appropriate use of the dilution factor learned that the majority of participants did no follow these recommendations. Therefore we conducted a study to investigate how laboratories can be challenged to change their dilutions procedure.

Materials and Methods:

One month prior to a regular survey in the EQAP of the ECAT the participants were informed on the optima dilution procedure. The total of 273 participants were divided into three equal groups. One group received standard letter (control group), one group received a flye with an attention-grabbing lay-out (intervention group and one group received the standard letter in a flye format (mixed group). The purpose of the three differer methods of information was to determine how the method of providing information influenced the implementation of the required improvement. In the EQA survey two inhibitor samples were used: sample 1: 10 BU/mL (to be measured in 10 times dilution) and sample 2: 1 BU/ml (to be measured undiluted). Participants reported there obtained results together with the dilution factor used.

mmended Dilution Factors:			
Inhibitor range (BU/mL)	Dilution Factor		
0.0 - 2.0	Undiluted		
2.1 - 6.0	1 + 2		
6.1 – 20.0	1 + 9		
20.1 - 60.0	1 + 29		

	ution factors in regular ECAT surveys and the proj			
		Low inhibitor (1 BU/mL)	High Inhib (10 BU/m	
	Regular surveys	37.1%	2.4%	
	Project survey	49.8%	17.9%	
		p = 0.002	p < 0.00	
TI in Ia	he table below formed about boratories usin	shows the relation the recommended g these dilution factor Low inhibitor	nship betweer dilution facto ors. High Inhib	
TI in la	he table below formed about boratories usin	shows the relation the recommended g these dilution factor Low inhibitor (1 BU/mL)	nship betweer dilution facto ors. High Inhib (10 BU/m	
TI in la	he table below formed about boratories usin	shows the relation the recommended g these dilution factor Low inhibitor (1 BU/mL) 51.9%	nship between dilution facto ors. High Inhib (10 BU/m 20.8%	
TI In Ia	he table below formed about boratories usin Intervention group Mixed group	A shows the relation the recommended of the recommended of these dilution factors in the recommended of these dilution factors in the recommended of the recommend	nship between dilution facto ors. High Inhib (10 BU/m 20.8% 15.6%	
TI Ia	he table below formed about boratories usin Intervention group Mixed group Control group	 shows the relation the recommended g these dilution factor Low inhibitor (1 BU/mL) 51.9% 40.3% 57.3% 	nship between dilution facto ors. High Inhib (10 BU/m 20.8% 15.6% 17.3%	

References:

1. Meijer, P. and B. Verbruggen, The between-laboratory variation testing: the experience of the external quality assessment progr foundation. Semin Thromb Hemost, 2009. 35(8): p. 786-93. 2. Verbruggen, B., et al., The factor VIII inhibitor assays can be standardized: results of a *workshop.* J Thromb Haemost, 2011. **9**(10): p. 2003-8.

The table below shows betwe the recommended dilution fact	en-laboratory variation (ors (DF).	%) with and without
	Low inhibitor	
	(1 BU/mL)	High Inhibitor (10 BU/mL)
Regular surveys	35 – 55%	30 – 40%
Project survey		
Overall	36.9%	33.6%
Recommended DF	30.0%	27.8%
Suboptimal DF	46.7%	35.1%
	p < 0.001	p = 0.039
variation (%).	nded dilution factors an	d the between-labor
variation (%).	nded dilution factors an Low inhibitor (1 BU/mL)	d the between-labor High Inhibitor (10 BU/mL)
Informed about the recomme variation (%).	nded dilution factors an Low inhibitor (1 BU/mL) 34.1%	d the between-labor High Inhibitor (10 BU/mL) 32.0%
Informed about the recomme variation (%). Intervention group Mixed group	hded dilution factors an Low inhibitor (1 BU/mL) 34.1% 43.0%	d the between-labor High Inhibitor (10 BU/mL) 32.0% 39.3%
Informed about the recomme variation (%). Intervention group Mixed group Control group	nded dilution factors an Low inhibitor (1 BU/mL) 34.1% 43.0% 33.9%	d the between-labor High Inhibitor (10 BU/mL) 32.0% 39.3% 31.7%
	Project survey Overall Recommended DF Suboptimal DF The table below shows the	Project surveyOverall36.9%Recommended DF30.0%Suboptimal DF46.7%p < 0.001

	Low inhibitor (1 BU/mL)	High Inhibitor (10 BU/mL)
Intervention group	34.1%	32.0%
Mixed group	43.0%	39.3%
Control group	33.9%	31.7%
	p < 0.025	p < 0.035

different inhibitor levels. However, the way of informing laboratory professionals seems to have no major effect on the implementation of test improvements.

P-W-103



