A New Model to Determine the Personal Reference Interval of Tests in Laboratory Medicine: A Preliminary Study

Abdurrahman Coskun[1,2], Mustafa serteser[1,2], Coskun Cavusoglu[1], Meltem Kilercik[1,2], Ibrahim Unsal[1]

[1]Acıbadem Labmed Clinical Laboratories, [2]Acıbadem Mehmet Ali Aydınlar University School of Medicine, Department of Medical Biochemistry

Corresponding Author: Abdurrahman Coskun, MD, Acibadem Mehmet Ali Aydinlar University School of Medicine, Department of Medical Biochemistry, Istanbul, Turkey

Telephone: +90 532 744 66 83

Fax: +90 216 576 51 20

Coskun2002@gmail.com

Abstract

The concept of personalized medicine has become popular within the last decade. However, personalized medicine needs correct diagnosis and monitoring of patients which can be done by using personalized reference intervals of laboratory tests. In this paper we proposed a model based on within subject biological variation to calculate the personalized reference intervals of tests requested by physicians for the diagnosis of diseases. We used the data of adult patients admitted to check-up units and calculated the personal reference intervals. If the patients are on steady-state, only a few data are sufficient to calculate the personal reference intervals. The model is very simple and can be used by physicians safely and easily.

Introduction

Physicians usually make their decisions based on the patients data produced in the medical laboratories. They compare patients' data with the reference data and make diagnosis accordingly. Usually a reference interval (RI) is used for comparison, and if the patient data is located within the RI of analytes, the test result is accepted as normal, otherwise it is considered pathological. However, the RIs are not personalized reference intervals (prRI) and not specific to patients, they are obtained from the populations. In other words physicians compare individuals' data with the population data. The population is not homogenous and therefore the data obtained from the population is not always represent the individuals. Additionally population based RIs are not universal and different RIs can be obtained from different

populations, instruments, methods, reagents etc. Various techniques have been developed to overcome this problem. For example population data are partitioned to subgroups to represent individuals and it is recommended that each laboratory should determine their own RI of the tests analyzed in the laboratory (1). Although these recommendations seem reasonable, they are not easily achievable in practice. For example, despite partition to subgroups it is not possible to obtain population based RI which fits the individuals as his/her own RI. Additionally, for laboratories it is not cost effective to change the population based RI when necessary, because changing RI is time consuming and very expensive and consequently laboratories usually prefer RIs recommended by manufacturers or make some modifications on previous RIs. All these interventions does not solve the problem and personalized RIs remains a major requirement.

In the present study we aimed to derive personalized reference intervals (prRI) using patients own data derived from the laboratory information system.

Methods

We randomly selected different analytes commonly requested by physicians. All data used to calculate the prRI were derived from the check-up unit of Acibadem healthcare group. The research project was approved by University Ethical Committee. No subjects were diagnosed a known disease. For each analytes we selected 10 different subjects and for each subjects we used 10 consecutive measurements results. Theoretically it is possible to calculate prRI by using only 2 measurement results of the analyte, however such prRI may not be adequately reliable in clinical practice and therefore we used more than 2 data for each analytes.

Furthermore, we increased the number of measurement results from 2 to 10 to observe the changes of prRI of each analytes.

We used a mathematical model based on within subject biological variation to derive prRI. The CV_I of analytes were obtained from EFLM biological variation database (3).

We used two steps algorithm to develop prRI:

Step 1: we determined the set point of the analytes for each subject by using the following equation (1,2).

$$n = \left[z \; x \; \frac{\sqrt{CV_A^2 + CV_I^2}}{D} \right]^2 \qquad \text{(I)}$$

where *n* is the number of samples required to estimate the homeostatic set points, CV_A is analytical variation, CV_I is the within-subject biological variation and D is the allowed percentage deviation from the true homeostatic set point. Eq. (I) can be solved for D as given below:

$$D = z \; x \; \sqrt{\frac{CV_A^2 + CV_I^2}{n}} \qquad \text{(II)}$$

Increasing number of measurements will decrease the deviation around true homeostatic set point and numerically D will decrease proportionally with the square root of the *n*. In Eqt. (II) CV_A, CV_I and z can be accepted as constants and in this case the Eqt. (II) will be simplified as given below:

$$D = \frac{k}{\sqrt{n}} \qquad \text{(III)}$$

Where k is the $z \times (CV_I^2+CV_A^2)^{1/2}$. For desirable performance the analytical CV can be accepted as 0.5CVi and in this case the equation (III) can be simplified as given below:

$$D = z \times \sqrt{\frac{1.25 \times CV_I^2}{n}} \quad \text{(IV)}$$

Step 2: From the equation (IV) we estimate the deviation around set point. We hypothesized that the Gaussian combination of CV_I and D will yield the total variation around the true homeostatic set point calculated by using the patients' data. For 95% probability, the total variation around true homeostatic set point can be estimated by using the following equation:

$$TV_{set}^2 = z^2 \times (V_s^2 + V_i^2) \quad \text{(V)}$$

Where TV_{set} is the total variation around true homeostatic set point, V_s is the variation of set point and V_I is the within subject biological variation of the analytes and z is constant and can be accepted as 1.96 for 95% probability.

Equation (II) and (V) can be combined to obtain the equation of prRI as given below:

$$TV_{set}^2 = z^2 \times \left(\frac{CV_A^2+CV_I^2}{n} + CV_i^2\right) \quad \text{(VI)}$$

$$TV_{set} = z \times \sqrt{\frac{CV_A^2+(n+1)\times CV_i^2}{n}} \quad \text{(VII)}$$

For desirable performance, equations (IV) and (V) can be combined to get the final equation of prRI as given below:

$$TV_{set}^2 = z^2 \, x \left(\frac{1.25 \, x \, CV_I^2}{n} + \, CV_i^2 \right) \quad \text{(VIII)}$$

This equation can be further simplified as given below:

$$TV_{set} = \, z \, x \sqrt{\frac{(n+1.25) x CV_i^2}{n}} \quad \text{(IX)}$$

It should be noted that the total variation around set point is independent of the concentration of analytes. It is a function of analytical and within subject biological variation.

$$prRI = \, mean \, of \, measured \, results \pm TV_{set} \quad \text{(X)}$$

This equation can be arranged as given below:

$$prRI = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} R_i}{n} \pm z \, x \sqrt{\frac{CV_A^2 + (n+1) x CV_i^2}{n}} \quad \text{(XI)}$$

where R_i is the measurement results, *n* is the number of measurements.

For desirable performance

$$prRI = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} R_i}{n} \pm z \, x \sqrt{\frac{(n+1.25) x CV_i^2}{n}} \quad \text{(XII)}$$

Results

Table 1 shows the prRI of triglyceride and LDH of 2 different subjects. As shown in the Table 1, after the second measurements the prRI does not change dramatically.

There is slight difference between the prRI obtained by using 3 or 10 measurements to calculate prRIs. This situation can be seen in Figures 1 and 2 for red blood cell and cholesterol as well. The prRIs of these analytes are located within the population based RIs (popRI). Increasing the number of measurements does not change the prRI dramatically. There are only slightly changes and these changes can be clinically neglected.

Table 2 shows the prRI of 5 different subjects for cholesterol. The prRI of cholesterol may be different among different subjects.

Discussion

The concept of personalized medicine has become popular within the last decade. However, personalized medicine needs correct diagnosis and monitoring of patients and for these purpose patients tests results should be compared with prRIs, not popRIs.

For the first time we developed an algorithm to derive personal specific RI. Additionally, we have shown that only a few data of test results is sufficient to obtain reliable prRI. This algorithm is based on consecutive measurements results and can be used in almost all laboratories.

BV is a powerful tool used in QC in laboratory medicine. It has two main components: Within-subject BV (CV_I) and between-subject BV (CV_G). CV_I is the variability around the homeostatic set point of the analytes. On the other hand CV_G is the variability between the homeostatic set points of different subjects (1). Theoretically, the within-subject variation of an analytes can be accepted as the prRI of the analyte. Because there is a physiological variation around the homeostatic set

point of the analytes and CV_I represents the limits of this variation with a given probability such as 95%. If we know the set point of an analyte than it will be possible to calculate the prRI of the analytes using the following equation:

prRI = set point ± 1.96 CVI

However, the problem is that we are not sure about the exact value of set point. To overcome this problem we can make estimation within a given percentage using Eqt (II). As shown in this equation to make a reliable estimate we need at least more than 1 data to make statistical calculation. The critical point is that the decisive factor is the CV_I of the measurand rather than the number of measurements results (n). Because, in Eqt (XI) and (XII) 'n' is present in both numerator and denominator and therefore has no serious effect on the results. If the person is on steady-state, i.e. the data are stable, only a few measurements will be sufficient to calculate the prRIs of an analyte. If the patient is not on steady-state, the mean value will be different and therefore steady-state is important to obtain reliable prRIs.

In this study we used the popRI as the reference interval to make comparisons with the prRIs and we propose to use prRI with the popRI particularly if we have only one or two data for a measurands. Additionally if an analytes is used in clinical practice for the first time, we advise to determine the popRI of the analytes and then calculate the prRI.

prRI is superior to popRI because the between subject BV create a deviation between subjects. Theoretically the popRI and prRI can be used interchangeably if the set points of individuals are the same, in other words the CV_G of the measurands must be zero which is not realistic.

Conclusion

We believe that prRI is one of the big step in personalized medicine and can be easily calculated in any healthcare services. It does not require sophisticated technologies, expensive experiments etc. It needs only a few measurement results which can be obtained in almost all healthcare services.

References

1. Fraser CG. Biological variation: from principles to practice. Washington, DC: AACC Press; 2001.
2. Coşkun A, Carobene A, Kilercik M, Serteser M, Sandberg S, Aarsand AK, et al. Within-subject and between-subject biological variation estimates of 21 hematological parameters in 30 healthy subjects. Clin Chem Lab Med 2018;56:1309–18.
3. Aarsand AK, Fernandez-Calle P, Webster C, Coskun A, GonzalesLao E, Diaz-Garzon J, et al. The EFLM Biological Variation Database. Available at: https://biologicalvariation.eu/. Accessed January 2020.

Figure Legends

Figure 1.

The personalized reference interval of red blood cell calculated by using the data of red blood cell measurements of an adult person (male). UL: upper limit of population based reference interval; LL: lower limit of population based reference interval; ul: upper limit of personalized reference interval; ll: lower limit of personalized reference interval

Figure 2.

The personalized reference interval of cholesterol calculated by using the data of serum cholesterol measurements of an adult person (male).

Table 1. Personalized reference intervals of triglyceride and LDH of two different subjects. The desirable analytical CV is accepted as 0.5 CVi.

				Calculation based on desirable analytical CV				Calculation based on laboratory analytical CV			
	Test Results	n	Mean	D	TV(set)	prRI-LL	prRI-UL	D	TV(set)	prRI-LL	prRI-UL
Trigliserit (PopRI: 50-150 mg/dL)	44	1	44,0	43,2	57,9	**18,5**	**69,5**	38,7	54,7	**19,9**	**68,1**
	38	2	41,0	30,5	49,2	**20,8**	**61,2**	27,4	47,3	**21,6**	**60,4**
	41	3	41,0	24,9	46,0	**22,2**	**59,8**	22,4	44,6	**22,7**	**59,3**
	30	4	38,3	21,6	44,2	**21,3**	**55,2**	19,4	43,2	**21,7**	**54,8**
	46	5	39,8	19,3	43,2	**22,6**	**57,0**	17,3	42,3	**23,0**	**56,6**
	29	6	38,0	17,6	42,4	**21,9**	**54,1**	15,8	41,7	**22,1**	**53,9**
	39	7	38,1	16,3	41,9	**22,2**	**54,1**	14,6	41,3	**22,4**	**53,9**
	42	8	38,6	15,3	41,5	**22,6**	**54,7**	13,7	41,0	**22,8**	**54,5**
	46	9	39,4	14,4	41,2	**23,2**	**55,7**	12,9	40,7	**23,4**	**55,5**
	57	10	41,2	13,7	41,0	**24,3**	**58,1**	12,3	40,5	**24,5**	**57,9**
LDH (PopPI: 81-234 IU/L)	159	1	159,0	11,0	15,0	**135,2**	**182,8**	11,4	15,3	**134,7**	**183,3**
	145	2	152,0	7,8	12,8	**132,5**	**171,5**	8,1	13,0	**132,3**	**171,8**
	138	3	147,3	6,3	12,0	**129,7**	**165,0**	6,6	12,1	**129,5**	**165,2**
	147	4	147,3	5,5	11,6	**130,2**	**164,3**	5,7	11,7	**130,1**	**164,4**
	144	5	146,6	4,9	11,3	**130,0**	**163,2**	5,1	11,4	**129,9**	**163,3**
	141	6	145,7	4,5	11,1	**129,5**	**161,9**	4,7	11,2	**129,4**	**162,0**
	157	7	147,3	4,2	11,0	**131,1**	**163,5**	4,3	11,1	**131,0**	**163,6**
	149	8	147,5	3,9	10,9	**131,4**	**163,6**	4,0	11,0	**131,3**	**163,7**
	133	9	145,9	3,7	10,8	**130,1**	**161,7**	3,8	10,9	**130,0**	**161,8**
	125	10	143,8	3,5	10,8	**128,3**	**159,3**	3,6	10,8	**128,3**	**159,4**

n: number of measurements; popRI: population based reference interval; D: the allowed percentage deviation from the true homeostatic set point; TV(set): Total variation around true homeostatic set point; prRI: personalized reference interval; LL: lower limit; UL: Upper limit

Table 2. Personalized reference intervals of Cholesterol of 5 different subjects (male). PopRI: 82-200 mg/dL

Subjects number	n	Mean	D, (%)	TV(set), (%)	prRI-LL	prRI-UL
1	3	165,67	6,85	12,44	**145,05**	**186,28**
	10	163,30	3,75	11,04	**145,26**	**181,34**
2	3	162,33	6,85	12,44	142,14	182,53
	10	162,70	3,75	11,04	144,73	180,67
3	3	185	6,85	12,44	**161,98**	**208,02**
	10	184,2	3,75	11,04	**163,86**	**204,54**
4	3	174,67	6,85	12,44	152,93	196,40
	10	178,80	3,75	11,04	159,05	198,55
5	2	164,67	6,85	12,44	**144,18**	**185,15**
	10	173,70	3,75	11,04	**154,52**	**192,88**

n: number of measurements; popRI: population based reference interval; D: the allowed percentage deviation from the true homeostatic set point; TV(set): Total variation around true homeostatic set point; prRI: personalized reference interval; LL: lower limit; UL: Upper limit



Figure 1



Figure 2