Designation: D 2777 – 03

An American National Standard

Standard Practice for Determination of Precision and Bias of Applicable Test Methods of Committee D19 on Water[1]

This standard is issued under the fixed designation D 2777; the number immediately following the designation indicates the year of original adoption or, in the case of revision, the year of last revision. A number in parentheses indicates the year of last reapproval. A superscript epsilon (ε) indicates an editorial change since the last revision or reapproval.

1. Scope

1.1 This practice establishes uniform standards for estimating and expressing the precision and bias of applicable test methods for Committee D19 on Water.

1.2 Except as specified in 1.3, 1.4, and 1.5, this practice requires the task group proposing a new test method to carry out a collaborative study from which statements for precision (overall and single-operator standard-deviation estimates) and bias can be developed. This practice provides general guidance to task groups in planning and conducting such determinations of precision and bias.

1.3 If a full-scale collaborative study is not technically feasible, due to the nature of the test method or instability of samples, the largest feasible scaled-down collaborative study shall be conducted to provide the best possible limited basis for estimating the overall and single-operator standard deviations.

1.3.1 Examples of acceptable scaled-down studies are the local-area studies conducted by Subcommittee D19.24 on microbiological methods because of inherent sample instability. These studies involve six or more completely independent local-area analysts who can begin analysis of uniform samples at an agreed upon time.

1.3.2 If uniform samples are not feasible under any circumstances, a statement of single-operator precision will meet the requirements of this practice. Whenever possible, this statement should be developed from data generated by independent multiple operators, each doing replicate analyses on independent samples (of a specific matrix type), which generally fall within specified concentration ranges (see 7.2.5.2(*3*)).

1.3.3 This practice is not applicable to methodology involving continuous sampling or continuous measurement, or both, of specific constituents and properties.

1.3.4 This practice is also not applicable to open-channel flow measurements.

1.4 A collaborative study that satisfied the requirements of the version of this practice in force when the study was conducted will continue to be considered an adequate basis for the precision-and-bias statement required in each test method. If the study does not satisfy the current minimum requirements for a collaborative study, a statement listing the study's deficiencies and a reference to this paragraph shall be included in the precision-and-bias statement as the basis for an exemption from the current requirements.

1.5 This paragraph relates to special exemptions not clearly acceptable under 1.3 or 1.4. With the approval of Committee D19 on the recommendation of the Results Advisor and the Technical Operations Section of the Executive Subcommittee of Committee D19, a statement giving a compelling reason why compliance with all or specific points of this practice cannot be achieved will meet both ASTM requirements **(1)**[2] and the related requirements of this practice. Precision-and-bias statements authorized by this paragraph shall include the date of approval by Committee D19.

1.6 In principle, all test methods are covered by this practice.

1.7 In Section 12 this practice shows exemplary precision-and-bias-statement formats for: (*1*) test methods yielding a numerical measure, (*2*) test methods yielding a non-numerical report of success or failure based on criteria specified in the procedure, and (*3*) test methods specifying that procedures in another ASTM test method are to be used with only insignificant modifications.

1.8 All studies, even those exempt from some requirements under 1.3 or 1.5, shall receive approval from the Results Advisor before being conducted (see Section 8) and after completion (see Section 13).

1.9 This practice satisfies the QC requirements of Practice D 5847.

1.10 It is the intent of this practice that task groups make every effort to retain all the data from their round-robin studies. Values should not be eliminated unless solid evidence exists for

[1] This practice is under the jurisdiction of ASTM Committee D19 on Water and is the direct responsibility of Subcommittee D19.02 on General Specifications, Technical Resources, and Statistical Methods.

Current edition approved Aug. 10, 2003. Published September 2003. Originally approved in 1969. Last previous edition approved in 1998 as D 2777 – 98.

[2] The boldface numbers in parentheses refer to the list of standards at the end of this practice.

their exclusion. The Results Advisor should work closely with the task groups to effect this goal.

2. Referenced Documents

2.1 *ASTM Standards:*

D 1129 Terminology Relating to Water[3]
D 1141 Specification for Substitute Ocean Water[4]
D 1193 Specification for Reagent Water[3]
D 4375 Practice for Basic Statistics in Committee D19 on Water[3]
D 5790 Test Method for Measurement of Purgeable Organic Compounds in Water by Capillary Column Gas Chromatography/Mass Spectrometry[4]
D 5847 Practice for Writing Quality Control Specifications for Standard Test Methods for Water Analysis[4]
D 5905 Practice for the Preparation of Substitute Wastewater[3]
D 6091 Practice for 99 %/95 % Interlaboratory Detection Estimate (IDE) for Analytical Methods with Negligible Calibration Error[3]
D 6512 Practice for Interlaboratory Quantitation Estimate[3]
E 177 Practice for Use of the Terms Precision and Bias in ASTM Test Methods[5]
E 178 Practice for Dealing with Outlying Observations[5]
E 456 Terminology Relating to Quality and Statistics[5]
E 1169 Guide for Conducting Ruggedness Tests[5]

3. Terminology

3.1 *Definitions*—For definitions of terms used in this practice, refer to Terminologies D 1129, D 4375 and E 456, and Practice E 177.

3.2 *Definitions of Terms Specific to This Standard:*

3.2.1 *accuracy*—a measure of the degree of conformity of a single test result generated by a specific procedure to the assumed or accepted true value, and includes both precision and bias.

3.2.2 *bias*—the persistent positive or negative deviation of the average value of a test method from the assumed or accepted true value.

3.2.3 *laboratory*—a single and completely independent analytical system with its own specific apparatus, source of reagents, set of internal standard-operating procedures, etc. Different laboratories will differ from each other in all of these aspects, regardless of how physically or organizationally close they may be to each other.

3.2.4 *operator*—usually the individual analyst within each laboratory who performs the test method throughout the collaborative study. However, for complicated test methods, the operator may be a team of individuals, each performing a specific function throughout the study.

3.2.5 *precision*—the degree of agreement of repeated measurements of the same property, expressed in terms of dispersion of test results about the arithmetical-mean result obtained by repetitive testing of a homogeneous sample under specified conditions. The precision of a test method is expressed quantitatively as the standard deviation computed from the results of a series of controlled determinations.

4. Summary of Practice

4.1 After the task group has assured itself that the test method has had all preliminary evaluation work completed, the task group should prepare the test-method write-up in final form. The plan for collaborative study is developed in accordance with this practice and submitted along with the test-method write-up to the Results Advisor for concurrence except as specified in 1.3, 1.4, and 1.5. Upon receipt of concurrence, the collaborative test is conducted, data analyzed, and precision-and-bias statements formulated by the task group. The final precision-and-bias statistics must be based on usable data from at least six independent laboratories. The statements, with backup data including the reported-results summary, the calculations leading up to the statements, and the test-method write-up with precision-and-bias statements included are submitted to the subcommittee vice-chairman, who in turn sends a copy to the Results Advisor for concurrence before balloting. This procedure assures having an acceptable copy of the collaborative-study results to send to ASTM for items on the main-committee ballot. In most instances, the collaborative study shall be complete before a subcommittee ballot. If the collaborative study is not complete, the test method may go on the ballot as a provisional test method rather than a standard test method. Copies of the test data, approved calculations, and statistical results shall be filed at ASTM Headquarters when the test method is submitted by the subcommittee chairman as an item for the main-committee ballot.

4.1.1 The appendix shows an example of "Form A—Approval of Plans for Interlaboratory Testing," as Fig. X1.1.

4.1.2 For examples of data-reporting forms, see Appendix X3, 6.0.

4.1.3 In addition, the appendix shows a sample calculation of precision and bias from real collaborative-test data, the related table of statistics, and the related precision-and-bias statement.

5. Significance and Use

5.1 Following this practice should result in precision-and-bias statements that can be achieved by any laboratory properly using the test method studied. These precision-and-bias statements provide the basis for generic limits for use in the Quality Control section of the test method.

5.2 The method specifies the matrices for which the test method is appropriate. The collaborative test corroborates the write-up within the limitations of the test design. An extensive test can only use representative matrices so that universal applicability cannot be implied from the results.

5.3 The fundamental assumption of the collaborative study is that the matrices tested, the concentrations tested, and the participating laboratories are a representative and fair evaluation of the scope and applicability of the test method as written.

[3] *Annual Book of ASTM Standards*, Vol 11.01.
[4] *Annual Book of ASTM Standards*, Vol 11.02.
[5] *Annual Book of ASTM Standards*, Vol 14.02.

6. Preliminary Studies

6.1 Considerable pilot work on a test method must precede the determination of its precision and bias **(2,3)**. This pilot work should explore such variables as preservation requirements, reaction time, concentration of reagents, interferences, calibration, and sample size. Potentially significant factors must be investigated and controlled in the written test method in advance of the collaborative test. Also, disregard of such factors may introduce so much variation among operators that results are misleading or inconclusive **(4)** (see 9.3 and 9.4). A ruggedness study conducted in a single laboratory is particularly useful for such investigations and should be conducted to prove a test method is ready for interlaboratory testing (see Guide E 1169 for details).

6.2 Only after a proposed test method has been tried, proved, and reduced to unequivocal written form should a determination of its precision and bias be attempted.

6.3 If the test method will require calculation of a detection estimate (for example, IDE, D 6091) or calculation of a quantitation estimate (for example, IQE, Practice Practice D 6512), or both, then the following guidelines may be followed.

6.3.1 To minimize the number of samples required, data would be gathered in two phases:

Phase I—Single-laboratory characterization. In this phase, the method developer would run a sufficient number of samples at a sufficient number of concentrations to characterize fully response vs. concentration, as well as error vs. concentration. The lowest concentration would be the level of the blank or the lowest concentration that could be measured; the highest concentration would be at the upper limit of the analytical range.

Phase II—. Collaborative study. Using the results of Phase I, the method developer would estimate the minimum number and the magnitude of concentrations necessary to meet the requirements of the documents of interest.

7. Planning the Collaborative Test

7.1 Based upon the task group's knowledge of a test method and the unequivocal write-up, several factors must be considered in planning the collaborative test to assess the precision of the test method properly. The testing variables that must be considered in planning are discussed below. In the collaborative study, it is generally not acceptable to control significant sources of variability that cannot be controlled in routine use of the test method, because this control leads to false estimates of the test-method precision and bias. In addition, the task group must determine within the resources available how best to estimate the bias of the test method.

7.2 *Testing Variables*:

7.2.1 It is desirable to develop a test method's precision statement that indicates the contribution to overall variation of selected causes such as laboratory, operator, sample matrix, analyte concentration, and other factors that may or have been shown to have strong effects on the results. Since any test method can be tried in only a limited number of applications, the standard deviation calculated from the results of a study can be only an estimate of the universe standard deviation. For this reason, the symbol *s* (sample standard deviation) is used herein. The precision estimates generated from the study data will usually be the overall standard deviation (s_T) and the pooled single-operator standard deviation (s_o) for each sample matrix and concentration studied.

7.2.2 Laboratories, operators, sample matrices, and analyte concentrations are the only sources of variability represented in the precision-and-bias statements resulting from the usual collaborative study. These sources may not represent the additional influence that can arise from differences in sample splitting, field preservation, transportation, etc., all of which may influence routine analytical results as shown in the general precision definitions in Terminology D 1129.

7.2.3 *Laboratories*—The final precision-and-bias statistics for each analyte, matrix, and concentration must be based on data from at least six laboratories that passed any outlier tests (see 10.3) (that is, usable data). To be assured of meeting this requirement, it is recommended that usable data be obtained from a minimum of eight independent laboratories. To guarantee eight will provide usable data, it will often be necessary to get ten or more laboratories to agree to participate, because some may not provide data and others may not provide usable data. Maximizing the number of participating laboratories is often the most important thing that can be done to guarantee a successful study.

7.2.4 Even if the single-operator standard deviation is the only statistic to be estimated in the study (see 1.3.2), there should be a minimum of eight operators who provide usable data, so there is assurance of data from six operators after all outlier removal.

7.2.5 *Sample Matrices*—The collaborative study shall be conducted with at least one representative sample matrix, which should be reproducible by subsequent user-laboratories so that they can compare their results with the results of the collaborative study.

7.2.5.1 Typically, a reagent water prepared according to Specification D 1193 or a synthetic medium, such as the substitute wastewater described in Practice D 5905 or the substitute ocean water described in Specification D 1141, is used as the reference matrix. Analytes and matrix may be supplied separately, with the analytes supplied as concentrates for addition to this matrix by each laboratory; alternatively, the reference matrix containing the analyte(s) may be supplied to each participant. Information on how the reference matrix was prepared in the study shall be clear in the precision-and-bias statement of the test method so users can reproduce the study conditions properly.

7.2.5.2 Additional collaborative testing should also be conducted using other matrices specified in the scope of the test method. Since these matrices must be the same for each study participant, they may have to be prepared (or obtained from a single source), preserved, and distributed to all laboratories. As with the reference matrix, analytes may be supplied in a separate spiking solution or already added to the matrix. A particularly attractive matrix might be a standard material available from an organization such as the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST). In a collaborative test, use of uniform sample matrices is necessary since they enable a

more certain comparison with the reference matrix than is possible with matrices supplied separately by each participant.

(1) Use of matrices with naturally occurring, non-zero background levels of the analyte(s) being studied will result in precision-and-bias estimates that will be much more difficult to compare properly with estimates from the reference matrix.

(2) Any matrix spiking that may be necessary shall not significantly change the natural characteristics of the matrix.

(3) With the exception of the kind of limited study described in 1.3.2, the matrix-of-choice approach, in which each participant is expected to acquire his or her own sample of a designated type, should not be used. Such studies are basically incompatible with the statistical approaches employed in this practice. In addition, the presence of variable background concentrations prevents the assignment of a proper mean-concentration level to each precision estimate produced in the study.

7.2.5.3 The same study design should be used for all sample matrices. A separate precision-and-bias statement should be generated for each sample matrix with a brief description of the matrix tested.

7.2.5.4 When studies are available indicating the applicability of the test method for matrices untested in 7.2.5.1 and 7.2.5.2 and not meeting the other requirements of this practice, at the discretion of the task group responsible for the test method and the Results Advisor, and providing the data are analyzed in accordance with Section 10 of this practice, these supporting data may be included in a separate section of the precision-and-bias statement. Included shall be a clear but brief description of the matrices and the study protocol employed. It is the intent of this practice that ultimately, data concerning the precision and bias of the test method in the full range of matrices covered in the scope and analyzed in accordance with this practice, will be made available to the users of the test method.

7.2.6 *Analyte Concentrations*—If pilot work has shown that precision is linear with increasing analyte concentrations, at least three Youden pairs **(5)** (that is, six concentrations) covering the desired range of the test method should be included for each matrix. If the pilot work suggests that the precision should be other than constant or linear, more concentration levels should be analyzed, especially in the nonlinear portions of the expected relationship between precision and concentration. Also, if the desired uses of the method include comparisons (for example, either among laboratories or with a regulatory standard) at or near the estimated detection level of the method, sufficient concentrations should be included in the desired matrix to comply with the requirements of the IDE. Similarly, if it is desired to know the level of quantitation of the method for data to be used in ineterlaboratory comparisons, additional concentrations should be selected to comply with the requirements of the IQE. Study concentrations other than those needed to meet the requirements of the IDE and IQE should generally be rather uniformly distributed over the range of the test method.

7.2.6.1 Study samples with concentrations at or near the detection limit of a test method are likely to produce nonquantitative results from many of the participating laboratories if participants are permitted to use their detection limit to censor their results. Zeroes or less thans that result from this censoring process are non-quantitative results and cannot be included in the statistical analysis of study results specified later in this practice. Conducting the specified statistical analysis on whatever quantitative data are available under such circumstances can produce misleading precision-and-bias estimates. If it is considered necessary to include samples at or near the detection limit, such samples shall be in addition to the minimum required three Youden pairs at concentrations that can be readily measured by qualified laboratories. Data from analyses of the basic three or more Youden pairs that can be quantified can then be statistically analyzed as specified to produce a proper traditional precision-and-bias statement for the test method. Results from analyses of Youden pairs at or near the detection limit can be included in this traditional statistical analysis if it turns out that most laboratories report quantified results. Otherwise, results for low-level samples must be statistically analyzed using specialized procedures (for example, procedures similar to those under development in Subcommittee D19.02), which are beyond the scope of this practice.

7.2.7 Since the order of analyses should not be a source of systematic variability in the study, each participant should either be told to randomize the order of study-sample analyses or be given a specific random order for the analyses.

7.2.7.1 Whenever the time of analyses has been shown to influence the analytical results, close control over the time of analyses will be essential.

7.2.8 If pilot work has shown that the sample container must be of a specific material prepared in a specific manner prior to use, the variation in containers obtained and prepared by the participants will be a random variable and should be treated as such in the planning of the study and in the statistical analysis of the data.

7.2.9 The manner of preservation or other treatment of the sample prior to typical use of the test method (if known to affect the precision or bias, or both, of results) shall be incorporated into the collaborative-study design.

7.3 *Measurement of Precision*:

7.3.1 Every interlaboratory study done to provide precision-and-bias estimates for a D19 test method must use a Youden-pair design rather than a replicate-sample design. Justifiable exceptions to this requirement shall be approved through the process provided in 1.5. In a Youden-pair design, each participant receives (or prepares from a concentrate and a matrix, both of which are furnished by the study) a separate sample *for each analysis required in the study*. Among the set of samples each laboratory analyzes for a specific matrix, there are pairs of samples containing similar but usually different analyte concentrations that differ from each other by up to 20 %; the percentage calculation is based on the average of the two samples in the pair. As a matter of convenience to whomever is preparing the samples or spiking concentrates, up to half the Youden pairs may have the same concentration (that is, be blind duplicates), but the participants must have no basis for comparing their single test results from analyses of different study samples.

7.3.2 The only difference in treatment of data from a Youden-pair study is the calculation used to estimate the means and standard deviations; these calculations may be found in Youden and Steiner **(6)**. Once developed, these mean and standard-deviation estimates are treated the same as statistics from a study with the usual replicate design. A detailed example with and without raw experimental data is given in Refs. **(7)** and **(8)**, respectively.

7.3.3 The value of the nonreplicate design is that the single-operator standard-deviation estimates are free of any conscious or unconscious analyst bias. The procedures for calculating overall and single-operator standard deviations are given in 11 and illustrated in Appendix X2.

7.4 *Measurement of Bias*:

7.4.1 The concept of accuracy comprises both precision and bias (see Terminology D 1129 and Practice E 177). As discussed in Practice E 177, there is not a single form that can be universally recommended for statements of accuracy. Since the accuracy of a measurement process is affected by both random and systematic sources of error, measures of both kinds of error are needed. The standard deviation is a universal measure of random sources of error (or precision). Bias is a measure of the systematic errors of a test method.

7.4.2 A collaborative-study evaluation of bias for a specific matrix produces a set of analyte/sample means. The difference between a true value (however defined) and the related mean is an estimate of the average systematic error (that is, bias of the test method).

7.4.3 There are three major approaches commonly used to test a measurement procedure: (*1*) measurement of known materials, (*2*) comparison with other measurement procedures, and (*3*) comparison with modifications of the procedure itself **(9)**. The third approach may involve the standard-addition technique or the simultaneous analysis of several aliquots of different sizes (for example, 0.5, 1, 1.5, 2, 2.5 units). The task group will select the approach that best suits its needs within the resources available to it.

7.4.4 The most likely task-group approach will be the use of known materials. Since reference standards are unlikely to be available, the task group will prepare its samples with added (therefore known to them) quantities of the constituent(s) being tested. The best available chemical and analytical techniques for preparing, stabilizing (if necessary), storing and shipping the prepared samples should be known within the task group and will not be addressed in this practice. However, if the sample-preparation and handling techniques used for the study are different from those expected to be used for samples during routine application of the test method, those differences shall be pointed out in the precision-and-bias statement. Future users of the test method may decide that these differences had an effect on the precision or bias results, or both, from the study.

7.5 *Quality Control During the Study*:

7.5.1 The Quality Control section to appear in the test method must be drafted before the collaborative-study design is made final, and the study design must assure that the collaborative study will produce any background data not otherwise available to complete the final Quality Control section properly. Each part of the draft Quality Control section must be used during the collaborative study, unless insufficient background data exist to establish credible interim required performance criteria for that part.

7.5.2 All quality control data/information produced to meet the requirements of 7.5.1 shall be reported to the task-group chair, along with results from analyses on the study samples.

8. Collaborative Study Design Approval

8.1 After design approval by the task group, the task-group chair (or designee) will summarize the proposed design of the collaborative study. This summary will include: (*1*) the test method (in ASTM format and as approved by the task group) to be tested; (*2*) the analytes to be included in the study; (*3*) the number of samples in accordance with the paired-sample plan of 7.3.1; (*4*) the approach for determining the bias of the test method as exemplified in the collaborative study; (*5*) the range of concentrations covered, and approximate concentration of material in each sample or set; (*6*) the approximate number of laboratories and analysts; (*7*) the matrices and QC samples being tested; (*8*) plans for developing study samples; and (*9*) a copy of the instruction and data-reporting package to be given to each study participant. This summary should be presented to the Results Advisor in the form of a letter.

8.1.1 As an aid, the task group chairman may use, “Form A-Approval of Plans for Interlaboratory Testing,” and in Appendix X1 (a completed example is shown in Fig. X1.1).

8.2 Upon review of the plan, the Results Advisor will advise the task-group chairman whether the plan meets the requirements of this practice or what changes are necessary to meet the requirements of this practice.

8.3 Upon receipt of approval of the collaborative-test plan by the Results Advisor, the task-group chairman (or designee) will conduct the collaborative test.

9. Conducting the Collaborative Study

9.1 A single entity, acting for the task group, will prepare the samples for the collaborative study and ship them to the participants with: (1) instructions for the study; (2) a copy of the exact test method (if not already supplied); and, (3) the participant reporting form (or reporting instructions).

9.1.1 The instructions for the collaborative study shall require sufficient preliminary work by potential collaborators to familiarize them adequately with the test method prior to study measurements. This preliminary familiarization is necessary to ensure that each collaborative study is made by a peer group and that a learning experience is not included in the statistics of the collaborative study. The task group may also develop procedures to qualify prospective collaborators, and this approach is strongly recommended.

9.1.2 Each laboratory should usually supply its own calibration materials, as independent calibration materials are a significant source of interlaboratory variability. However, if the cost of availability of calibration materials is judged to be a significant deterrent to participation, or if currently available materials are inadequate and not considered typical for subsequent routine use of the test method, these materials may be distributed with the study samples. If calibration standards are provided, the precision-and-bias section of the test method

should so note, including the concentrations and matrix of the standards and any specific instructions for their use.

9.1.3 As an aid, the task-group chairman may use the "Sample Template for a Round-Robin Study Workplan," as in Appendix X3.

9.2 The batch of samples containing a specific member of a Youden pair should be clearly marked with a common unique code, informative to the distributors but not informative to the study participants. Samples should be sized to supply more than the minimum amount necessary to participate in the study (with reasonable allowance for pipetting, rinsing, etc.) to allow for trial runs and analytical restarts that may be necessary. A separate set of samples shall be provided for each operator. Sample concentrations should not be easily surmised values (1, 5, etc.). The assignment of samples to the participating laboratories should be randomized within each concentration level. The above recommendations should help assure statistical independence of results.

9.3 A copy of the test method under investigation, the written instructions for carrying out his/her part of the program, and the necessary study samples should be supplied to each operator. No supplementary instructions or explanations (such as by telephone or from a task-group member within a cooperating laboratory) should be supplied to one participant if not to all. Study materials should be distributed from one location, and the operator's reports should be returned to one location.

9.4 The written instructions should cover such items as: (*1*) directives for storing and subdividing the sample; (*2*) preparation of sample prior to using the test method; (*3*) order of analyses of samples (random order within each laboratory is often best); (*4*) details regarding the reporting of study results on the reporting form; and (*5*) the time limit for return of the reporting form.

9.4.1 Laboratories shall be required to report all figures obtained in making measurements, instead of rounding results before recording them. This practice may result in recording one or more significant figures beyond what may be usual in the Report section of the test method. A decision about rounding all data can be made by the task group when the final statistical analyses are performed.

9.4.2 The laboratories shall report results from analyses of study samples without background subtraction and shall also report background levels for every matrix that they use in the study. The task group will make any background corrections that may be necessary.

9.4.3 Zeros and negative numbers should be reported whenever they represent the actual test results produced. Test results should never be censored by a participant. The reporting of "less-than" or "greater-than" results negates the objectivity of subsequent statistical calculations and should be avoided. Zero never should be reported in place of a less-than or other nonquantitative test result.

9.5 The task-group chair (or designee) should monitor the collaborative study to assure that results are reported back within the agreed upon time limit and are free of obvious procedural, transcription, clerical, or calculation errors. Careful design of the reporting form (or reporting instructions) will facilitate this task.

10. Collaborative Study Data Analysis

10.1 For each matrix/analyte, the steps involved by the task-group chair in the data analysis consist of: (*1*) tabulating the data; (*2*) eliminating any laboratories that did not follow significant study instructions, were not in control during the study, or were so consistently high or low that their results are unreasonable (see 10.3); (*3*) for each matrix and analyte concentration studied, calculating the overall and single-operator standard deviations and means from the usable data and calculating the bias from each mean spike recovery (must subtract the mean reported background value whenever necessary); (*4*) tabulating the statistics; (*5*) assembling information required for the research report; and, if desired, (*6*) summarizing these results in a graph or regression equation for the test-method statement.

10.1.1 As an aid to following the steps, the task group chair may find it helpful to review the sample calculations of precision and bias given in Appendix X2.

10.2 *Tabulation of Data*—The data reported by the laboratories shall be made consistent in reporting units and, if possible, in the number of reported values per operator or laboratory **(10)**. Before data tabulation is begun, any unusable data sets (that is, sets generated by laboratories that did not follow significant study instructions or used an unacceptable variation of the test method being studied) shall be removed. Unless each laboratory used its own matrix with a unique background concentration, all bias and precision estimates are to be based on the concentration reported, rather than on background-corrected results.

10.2.1 Sometimes, looking at the histogram of a set of data will help one recognize or understand, or both, the cause of unusual data.

10.3 *Evaluation of Outliers*— Data from this study will be used to develop precision-and-bias statements that are applicable to a "reasonably competent" laboratory properly using the test method. Occasionally, data from an individual laboratory may seem "out of line" in relation to data from the other laboratories to such an extent that it creates doubt as to whether that laboratory did indeed perform the test method properly or is reasonably competent, at least with respect to its ability to use this particular method. An unusual individual data value may also raise the suspicion that, although the other results from that laboratory appear reasonable, "something must have gone wrong" in this instance.

10.3.1 When questionable data are encountered, the first step shall be to contact the laboratory to try to determine whether it followed proper procedure and/or whether it can offer some other explanation that may preclude the use of these data.

10.3.2 If this contact fails to resolve the issue, data may be excluded with the approval of the Results Advisor. The rationale for such exclusion shall a formal test rejecting the data as an outlier in accordance with Practice E 178.

11. Statistical Calculations for Each Matrix, Analyte, and Concentration

11.1 *Calculation of Single-Operator Standard Deviation Estimates*

11.1.1 *Calculation for Youden Pairs*—Estimate the single-operator standard deviation (s_o) from the data pairs available for each Youden pair, analyte, and matrix in the study as follows:

$$s_o = \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{m} (D_i - \bar{D})^2}{2\,(m-1)}} \quad (1)$$

where:

m = the number of usable pairs of results available for that Youden pair, analyte and matrix,
D_i = the difference between the usable value from laboratory i for the Youden sample with the higher true value of the pair minus the usable value from laboratory i for the other sample of the pair, and
$\bar{D}$ = the mean of the m usable D_i values.

NOTE 1—In the calculation of D_i, the sample with the higher true (known) value of the Youden pair is always the same sample for each laboratory, even though its measured value may be lower in any individual laboratory.

11.1.2 *Calculation for Blind Duplicates*—The calculation of s_o for a blind duplicate is:

$$s_o = \sqrt{D_i^2 / 2m} \quad (2)$$

11.2 *Calculation of the Mean ($\bar{x}$) and Overall Standard Deviation (s_T)*—

11.2.1 Let the usable data reported for a specific matrix, analyte, or concentration be designated x_i, i = 1 to n. Then calculate the mean ($\bar{x}$) and overall standard deviation (s_T) as follows:

$$\bar{x} = \frac{\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i\right)}{n} \quad (3)$$

and

$$s_T = \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} (x_i - \bar{x})^2}{n-1}} \quad (4)$$

11.2.2 *Calculation for Blind Duplicates*—When two samples comprise blind duplicates, rather than Youden pairs, follow the above procedure for calculating the mean and overall standard deviation by substituting $(x_{1i} + x_{2i})/2$ for x_i in all cases, where x_{1i} and x_{2i} are the measured values from the blind duplicates obtained by the ith laboratory. A final adjustment of s_T is necessary in order to reflect the standard deviation for a single measurement, rather than the average of two measurements, among laboratories. The required adjustment is given by

$$s_T = \sqrt{s_{T(original)}^2 + \frac{1}{2} s_o^2} \quad (5)$$

where s_o is calculated as in 11.1.2.

11.3 Return to 11.1 for the next matrix, analyte, and concentration, until all statistics have been calculated for every combination studied.

11.4 *Calculation of Bias*

11.4.1 The calculation of the bias of a test method will logically follow the collaborative-study design (7.4). The usual collaborative-study technique will involve reporting the recovery of added (therefore known) amounts of the analytes being measured.

11.4.2 The calculation of bias for a specific matrix, analyte, and concentration is as follows:

$$Bias\ (\%) = 100\,(\bar{x} - b - c)/c \quad (6)$$

where:

$\bar{x}$ = the mean of usable data for that matrix, analyte, and concentration,
c = the true concentration added, and
b = the mean background concentration reported, if necessary.

11.4.3 Where other types of studies are used to develop a true concentration for use in estimation of the test-method bias, special care shall be taken to assure that the other study provides a logical reference value. Consultation with the Results Advisor and other recognized experts may be appropriate in such cases.

12. Format of the Precision and Bias Statement Required in Each Test Method

12.1 For most test methods, a collaborative study will be conducted and the following requirements apply.

12.1.1 A brief note shall provide the reader of the test method with a complete understanding of the collaborative study conducted. At a minimum, this note shall include the number of laboratories that contributed data, the matrices studied, the version of Practice D 2777 followed in designing and analyzing the study data, and any other significant aspects of the study not presented elsewhere in the test method.

12.1.1.1 Regarding significant study aspects that *must* be described, if the analytical conditions used during the collaborative study were more restrictive than those allowed in the test method, it is particularly important that these restrictive conditions be fully described in the precision-and-bias statement of the test method. Results from the collaborative study may not apply to other analytical conditions allowed in the test method.

12.1.2 The following caution shall also be included, "Results of this collaborative study may not be typical of results for matrices other than those studied."

12.1.3 The study results shall always be available in the form of a table, which, for each matrix, analyte, and concentration studied, will usually include the true concentration (c) added to the matrix, and must include the number of values reported, the number of values, and (from the usable data): (*1*) the mean response ($\bar{X}$), (*2*) bias as a percent of c, and (*3*) the overall standard deviation (s_T). For each matrix, analyte, and Youden pair of sample concentrations, the table shall include the number of usable data *pairs* and the single-operator standard deviation (s_o) estimated from these pairs of usable

values. This table shall be included in the test method. Equivalent mathematical or graphical relationships of the mean (or bias), s_T and s_o, to true concentration (mean background + spike) may be provided also. If a matrix had a naturally occurring, non-zero background level for this analyte, the mean background level may be determined by employing the Method of Standard Additions, using the mean responses from all of the laboratories for each level versus the true spike-addition concentrations. This mean background concentration shall also be reported in this table, and the bias estimates shall be calculated from the recovery of the true spikes, (that is, *x*—average background). This table shall always be included in the research report provided to the Results Advisor and filed at ASTM Headquarters. If the full table is not included in the test method, at least a listing of the true concentrations studied for each matrix and analyte, and the number of usable values for each, shall be included in the precision-and-bias statement.

12.1.4 Mathematical or graphical relationships developed from the study results shall represent the general way precision and bias vary with concentration. These relationships can be very helpful to a test-method user, who must estimate the precision and bias at a specific concentration within the range studied. Graphs that simply connect the estimates from the collaborative study (connect the dots) are not acceptable. Mathematical relationships shall be accompanied by some indication of the goodness of their fit to the study statistics, unless those statistics are given in the test method.

12.2 If there is some reason why a full collaborative study could not be done, the precision-and-bias statement shall present a complete justification with reference to 1.3, 1.4, or 1.5, whenever appropriate. If a special exemption was approved by Committee D19 on the recommendation of the Results Advisor and the Technical Operations Section of the Executive Subcommittee of Committee D19, the date of that exemption shall also be provided.

12.3 *Test Methods with Non-Numerical Reports*:

12.3.1 When a method specifies that a test result is a non-numerical report of success or failure based on criteria in the procedure, the statement on precision and bias should read as follows:

12.3.1.1 *Precision and Bias*—No statement is made about either the precision or the bias of Method D XXXX for measuring (insert here the name of property), since the result merely states whether there is conformance to the criteria for success specified in the procedure.

12.4 *Test Methods Specifying Other Procedures*:

12.4.1 When a method specifies that the procedures in another ASTM method are to be used, a statement such as the following should be used to assure the user that precision-and-bias statements apply.

12.4.1.1 *Precision and Bias*—The precision and bias of this test method of measuring (insert here the name of the property) are as specified in Method (insert here the designation of the other method).

13. Approval of Data Analysis and Statements

13.1 Approval of the precision-and-bias statement shall be obtained from the Results Advisor before the test method is submitted for committee ballot, providing him/her with a copy of:

13.1.1 All test data resulting from the collaborative test.

13.1.2 All statistical calculations.

13.1.3 A summary of the final statistical estimates in tabular form.

13.1.4 A copy of the final test method, including the precision-and-bias statement based on the study results.

13.1.5 A copy of every document given to the participants during the collaborative study.

13.1.6 A complete list of the laboratories (names, addresses, principal contact, etc.) that participated in the study. Do not identify the source of specific study data using anything other than randomly assigned laboratory numbers or codes. The relationship between these numbers/codes and the contributing laboratories must be held strictly confidential.

13.1.7 A description of how the study samples were prepared, etc.

13.1.8 Any background information that may have influenced the results, and any other information required for the research report, along with a copy of correspondence documenting approval by the Results Advisor.

13.1.9 Once satisfied with this study file, the Results Advisor shall see that it is sent to ASTM for filing as the official research report.

13.2 *Experimental Data*—The precision-and-bias statement in the test method shall include a footnote indicating where the supporting data can be found. The footnote shall read as in the following example:

Supporting data for the precision-and-bias statements have been filed at ASTM Headquarters. Request RR:D_____.

14. Keywords

14.1 collaborative study; interlaboratory study; method bias; method precision; method recovery; round-robin study; statistical analysis; Youden study design

TO: D-19 Results Advisor

FROM: Robin Austermann — Task Group Chairman — 9/30/91 — Date

The following details for a proposed collaborative study are respectfully submitted for your review and approval:

X.1.1 Test method title (inc. draft number and date): "Measurement of Purgeable Organic Compounds in Water by Capillary Column Gas Chromatography/Mass Spectrometry," Draft 3, dated 7/18/91

Copy of test method in ASTM format and as approved by Task Group, see ATTACHMENT # 1

X.1.2 Analyte(s): 68 analytes, 3 surrogates (See Attachment #4)

X.1.3 Procedure for estimating bias: Spike recovery after background correction.

X.1.4 Number of Youden sample pairs 5 (Minimum of 3 req.)

X.1.5 Intended operating range of test method: 0.1 – 80

and approx. mean concentration of each sample pair in study: 0.2, 1, 5, 20, 75

Units (spelled out): micrograms / litre

X.1.6 Estimated number of laboratories 73 and analysts 73 (Should be ≥ 8 labs to guarantee 6 values after outlier testing.)

X.1.7 Matrices being tested (at least 1 reproducible matrix): Reagent Water, Drinking Water, Ground Water, Wastewater, TCLP Leachate Buffer.

X.1.8 QC Samples being tested: Known QC spike with each matrix (8-10 samples). Also surrogate spike recoveries.

X.1.9 Plans for developing study samples: ATTACHMENT # 2

X.1.10 Participant's instruction package: ATTACHMENT # 3

X.1.11 Particiapnt's data reporting form: ATTACHMENT # 4

Approved by _____ D-19 Results Advisor — _____ Date

FIG. X1.1 Approval of Study Design: Form A—Approval of Plans for Interlaboratory Testing

APPENDIXES

(Nonmandatory Information)

X1. APPROVAL OF STUDY DESIGN

X1.1 Using Test Method D 5790 also known as USEPA Method 524.2, as an example, Fig. X1.1 was sent by the Task Group Chair to the Results Advisor for his approval before preparation of the samples for the interlaboratory study actually began.

TABLE X2.1 Example of Usable Data

	Concentration in µg/L					
Laboratory or Analyst	Sample 5 0.88	Sample 3 1.10	Sample 8 4.41	Sample 6 5.29	Sample 7 17.64	Sample 4 22.05
1	1.08	1.24	4.45	5.71	19.21	23.82
6	2.35	0.96	4.53	5.24	17.14	21.43
8	1.30	1.30	4.90	6.80	21.70	25.60
15	1.20	1.40	3.90	4.80	15.70	18.70
21	2.20	0.93	4.90	4.00	16.90	18.10
25	1.21	1.10	4.50	5.37	17.90	22.22
26	1.20	1.20	4.40	4.90	16.70	21.50
27	1.10	1.00	4.30	5.80	22.10	26.60
31	0.80	0.00[A]	5.30	5.50	19.10	24.03
47	1.10	1.20	4.10	5.30	17.90	22.40
49	1.00	1.30	4.90	5.40	12.80	18.70
52	1.20	1.10	4.80	5.60	19.80	23.50
56	1.00	1.30	4.70	5.80	19.30	24.10

[A]Rejected as a nonquantitative response.

X2. SAMPLE CALCULATION OF PRECISION AND BIAS

X2.1 The following is a sample of the precision and bias calculations from an example set of data.

X2.2 Example data are presented in Table X2.1, as suggested in 10.2. Note that values shown represent analytical results after correction for background concentration by the task group or its representative, the study coordinator.

X2.3 There are no less-than values to reject as unusable; however, the zero reported by Laboratory 31 for Sample 3 is not considered to be a legitimate quantitative response and is therefore rejected as unusable. Under normal study conditions, Laboratory 31 would be contacted to resolve questions regarding their zero response, but this contact was not possible for preparation of this example.

X2.4 Table X2.2 contains the final statistics.

TABLE X2.2 Final Statistical Summary

Sample Number	5	3	8	6	7	4
Number of usable values	13	12	13	13	13	13
True concentration (*C*) µg/L	0.88	1.10	4.41	5.29	17.64	22.05
Mean Recovery (*XBAR*)	1.29	1.17	4.59	5.40	18.17	22.36
Percent recovery	146.33	106.29	104.10	102.11	103.02	101.41
Overall standard deviation (S_T)	0.46	0.15	0.38	0.65	2.48	2.65
Overall relative standard deviation, %	35.50	12.91	8.24	11.99	13.64	11.85
Number of usable pairs	12		13		13	
Single-operator standard deviation (S_O)	0.40		0.48		0.80	
Analyst relative standard deviation, %	32.60		9.68		3.94	

X3. SAMPLE TEMPLATE FOR A ROUND-ROBIN-STUDY WORKPLAN

[Title of Study]

[ASTM Interlaboratory Collaborative Study Workplan]

Please Read All Instructions Before Proceeding with Collaborative Lab Work

Laboratory Name: _____

Operator Name: _____

Operator Telephone: _____

Your Lab Code for Identification is: _____ Date Sent: _____

Use this code number on all submitted data report forms and questionnaire.

Immediately inspect the contents of the collaborative kit for missing items, leaking bottles, etc. If any discrepancy is noted, call for immediate replacement.

Method Author and Task Group / Collaborative Chairperson
[Name of study chairperson]
[Affiliation of study chairperson]
Office: [Phone number]
FAX: [FAX number]
E-Mail: [e-mail address]

[Title of study]

PARTICIPANT'S INSTRUCTIONS

1.0 Introduction

[Name of organization sponsoring the study] is undertaking an ASTM interlaboratory collaborative study to [purpose of the study].

The Method is currently under review by ASTM Subcommittee [Number and name of subcommittee]. The next action is to have several users evaluate the method for precision and bias from [Number] sample matrices — [Name(s) of matrices included in study].

You are asked to be a participant in the collaborative study because of your experience in this field. Your results and comments will be compiled with several other laboratories performing the same method, and will be submitted to ASTM for approval.

All submitted results will be considered the property of [Name of organization sponsoring the study] with all rights to their use; results will not be identified by laboratory in any published reports.

If you have any questions concerning the test method, its performance, calibration, standard or sample preparation, dilutions, or method interpretation, please contact

[Name and contact information of study chairperson]

The collaborative will begin [Starting date] and the completed data package will be due by [Due date] and will include:

1) The data report forms.
2) Print out of all standard and sample data, and results.
3) The laboratory notebook documenting your work, calculations, and comments.
4) The completed questionnaire.
5) A back-up copy of the project data on the enclosed 3.5-inch diskette.

Return to task group and collaborative chairperson:

[Name and mailing address of study chairperson]

The true values for the spiking solutions, your processed results, and the overall test-method performance will be sent to each participant after all participants return their data. Any corrections to the reported data will not be accepted after the true values have been distributed.

2.0 Packing List

2.1 Materials and Reagents to be Supplied by Study Coordinator

-Collaborative Instruction Manual, and the Proposed Test Method

-[List of all standards and samples to be used in the study]

-One blank disk to backup the acquired data for archival purposes.

-Laboratory Notebook

2.2 Materials to be Supplied by the Participant

-[List of all items to be supplied by participant]

3.0 Preliminary Testing Prior to Initiation of the Collaborative

Before initiating the collaborative it is important to ensure that the instrumentation is performing according to manufacturers' specifications.

3.1 System Preparation

-[Provide instructions for method set-up.]

3.2 Evaluation of Test Standards

-[It is recommended that the study coordinator provide reagent-water test standards of known concentration to the collaborative participants to establish initial demonstration of performance and thus ensure that the participants' method is operating properly prior to the analysis of the collaborative-study samples. Instructions for the analysis of the test standards are provided in this section.]

4.0 Collaborative Study Determinations

Prior to the analysis of collaborative-study samples, the system must first be calibrated in order to verify linearity.

4.1 Preparation of Working Calibration Standards and Development of Calibration Curve

-[Provide instructions for the preparation and analysis of method-calibration standards and development of the calibration curve.]

4.2 Quality Control (QC) Standard

Table 1 presents the composition of the QC Stock Standard.

-[It is recommended that the study coordinator provide or require the analysis of a QC standard at regular intervals (i.e. 10 % or 20 % frequency) throughout the analysis of the collaborative-study samples to ensure proper instrument operation and calibration. Instructions for the preparation and analysis of the QC standard are provided in this section.]

Table 1. Composition of QC Stock Standard

4.3 Method Detection Limit (MDL) Standard

Table 2 presents the composition of the MDL Stock Standard.

-[It is recommended that the study coordinator determine a MDL for the method during the collaborative study. Instructions for the preparation and analysis of the MDL standard are provided in this section.]

Table 2. Composition of MDL Stock Standard

4.4 Preparation of Collaborative Study Sample Matrices

-[Provide instructions for the preparation of the collaborative-study samples.]

5.0 Sample Analysis Protocol

-[Provide instructions for the analysis of the collaborative-study samples. Include information on how often analysis reagents need to be prepared, calibration frequency, required analysis order (if any), analysis of blanks and any additional QA/QC standards, final data management and analysis, etc.]

6.0 Data Report Format

Report determined concentrations on the attached Data Report Forms: one form per sample matrix. Report all numerical values. Do not replace numerical values with zeroes or “less than” values.

DATA REPORTING FORMS

ASTM Interlaboratory Collaborative Study—Data Report Form

[Title of the study]

Laboratory Name: _____ Lab Code: _____

Sample Matrix: Calibration Standards, Response Linearity

Day [Number] Calibration

[Table of standards/analytes to be measured]

ASTM Interlaboratory Collaborative Study—Data Report Form

[Title of the study]

Laboratory Name: _____ Lab Code: _____

Sample Matrix: QC Standard Calculated Amounts

[Table of QC standards/analytes]

ASTM Interlaboratory Collaborative Study—Data Report Form

[Title of the study]

Laboratory Name: _____ Lab Code: _____

Sample Matrix: Method Detection Limit Study for [Name of matrix]

[Table for MDLs/analytes]

ASTM Interlaboratory Collaborative Study—Data Report Form

[Title of the study]

Laboratory Name: _____ Lab Code: _____

Sample Matrix: Name of the matrix

[Table for data/analytes]

Operate your instrument according to the manufacturer's instructions, and this test method. Please complete this questionnaire to document your specific operating conditions, any deviations you made, and any observations.

Laboratory Name: _____ Lab Code: _____

Operator Name & Title: _____

Telephone: _____ FAX#: _____ E-mail: _____

Date Started: _____ Date Completed: _____ Date Mailed: _____

Instrument Used: _____

[Entries for any other instrument or data-handling information desired]

Describe any difficulties you encountered using this method.

Did the QC Standard fall outside the 99 % confidence interval? Describe.

Did the instrument drift significantly during the course of the analysis? If yes, during/after which sample matrix?

Your comments, observations, or changes to the method.

REFERENCES

(**1**) ASTM Circular Letter No. 587 dated May 20, 1975.

(**2**) *ASTM Manual for Conducting an Interlaboratory Study of a Test Method*, *ASTM STP 355*, ASTM, 1964, p. 1.

(**3**) Youden, W. J., and Steiner, E. H., *Statistical Manual of the Association of Official Analytical Chemists*, Association of Official Analytical Chemists, Washington, DC, 1975, pp. 33–36.

(**4**) *ASTM Manual on Quality Control of Materials*, *ASTM STP 15-C*, ASTM, 1951, pp. 55–118.

(**5**) Youden, W. J., and Steiner, E. H., *ibid*., p. 27.

(**6**) Youden, W. J., and Seiner, E. H., *op. cil*., pp. 21–26.

(**7**) Winter, J., Britton, P., Clements, H., and Kroner, R., "EPA Method Study 8, Total Mercury in Water," *EPA-600/4-77-012*, Environmental Monitoring and Support Laboratory, Office of Research and Development, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Cincinnati, OH, February 1977, p. 76.

(**8**) Winter, J. A., and Clements, H. A.," Interlaboratory Study of the Cold Vapor Technique for Total Mercury in Water," *Symposium on Water Quality Parameters*, *ASTM STP 573*, ASTM, 1975, pp. 556–580.

(**9**) Youden, W. J., "How to Evaluate Accuracy," *Precision Measurement and Calibration—Statistical Concepts and Procedures*, NBS Special Publication 300, Vol 1, Edited by H. H. Ku, Superintendent of Documents, U.S. G.P.O., Washington, DC, 1969, p. 363.

(**10**) Steiner, E. H., "Planning and Analysis of Results of Collaborative Results," Youden, W. J., and Steiner, E. H., op. cit., pp. 73-74.