Bioanalytical Method Validation & Its Pharmaceutical Application

Mangalge Mangesh[1], Ajagunde B.R.[2], Shyamlila Bawage[3], Boje Vivek[4]
[1,2,3,4]*Latur College of Pharmacy, Hasegaon, Tq-Ausa, Dist. Latur, Maharashtra 413512, India*

***Abstract* - Bioanalytical methods, supported a spread of physico-chemical & biological techniques like chromatography, immunoassay & mass spectrometry, must be validated before & through use to offer confidence within the results created. it's the method want to establish that a quantitative analytical method is appropriate for biomedical use. Bioanalytical Method Validation includes all of the trials that determine that a exact method used for quantitative measurement of analytes during a given biological matrix, like blood, plasma, serum, or urine is reliable & reproducible for the intended use.**

The present document focuses on the consistent evaluation of the key bioanalytical validation parameters is debated. These validation parameters are described, alongside an example of validation methodology applied within the case of chromatographic methods used in bioanalysis, taking in account to the present Food & Drug Administration (FDA) guidelines & EMA guidelines.

***Index Terms* - Bioanalytical Method Validation, Validation Parameters, Application, FDA & EMA guidelines.**

INTRODUCTION

A bioanalytical method may be a set of procedures intricate inside the collection, processing, storing, & examination of a biological matrix for a compound. Bioanalytical method validation (BMV) is that the development wants to establish that a quantitative analytical method is fit for biomedical applications. Reassurances on the standard of the tactic & its reliability come from adopting a minimum series of validation experiments & obtaining satisfactory results. Characterization of the steadiness of analytes in biological samples collected during clinical studies alongside that of critical assay reagents, including analyte stock solutions, is recognized as a crucial component of bioanalytical assay validation. Bioanalytical method validation includes all of the procedures that demonstrate that a specific method used for quantitative measurement of analytes during a given biological matrix, like blood, plasma, serum, or urine, is reliable & reproducible for the intended use.

Validation involves documenting, through the utilization of specific laboratory investigations, that the performance characteristics of the tactic are suitable & reliable for the intended analytical applications. the pharmaceutical industry to review & redefine aspects of the event & validation of bioanalytical procedures for the quantification of this therapeutics in biological environments in support of preclinical & clinical studies.

WHY VALIDATE BIOANALYTICAL METHODS?

The motive for validating a bioanalytical process is to demonstrate the performance & reliability of a way & hence the confidence which will be placed on the results. additionally, Shah et al. has stated that everyone bioanalytical methods must be validated if the results are wont to support registration of a brand-new drug or the reformulation of an existing one. Validation involves documenting, through the utilization of specific laboratory investigations, that the performance characteristics of the tactic are suitable & reliable for the intended analytical applications.

NEED OF BIOANALYTICAL METHOD VALIDATION

1. it's essential to used well-characterized & fully validated bioanalytical methods to yield reliable results which will be satisfactorily interpreted.
2. it's known that bioanalytical procedures & techniques are continuously undergoing changes &

improvements; they're at the leading edge of the technology.
3. it's also important to emphasise that every bioanalytical technique has its own characteristics, which can from analyte to analyte, definite validation criteria may have to be developed for every analyte.
4. the relevance of the technique can also be influenced by the last word objective of the study. When sample analysis for a given study is conducted at quite one site, it's necessary to validate the bioanalytical method(s) at each site & supply appropriate validation information for various sites to determine interlaboratory reliability.

COMMON TERMINOLOGY UTILIZED IN BIOANALYTICAL METHODS VALIDATION

1. Accuracy

The degree of nearness of the detected concentration to the known true concentration. it's typically measured as relative error. Accuracy is usually termed as trueness. Accuracy is decided by replicate analysis of samples containing known amounts of the analyte. Accuracy should be measured utilize a minimum of 5 determinations per concentration. A minimum of three concentrations within the range of expected study sample concentrations is suggested. The average should be within fifteen percent of the par value except at LLOQ, where it shouldn't deviate by over twenty percent

2. Precision

The precision of a bioanalytical method may be a measure of the random error & is defined because the nearness of agreement among a sequence of measurements got from multiple sampling of alike homogeneous sample under the prescribed conditions. Measurement of scatter for the concentrations got for replicate samplings of a homogeneous sample.

Precision should be measured employing a minimum of 5 determinations per concentration. A minimum of three concentrations within the range of expected concentrations is suggested. The precision determined at each concentration level shouldn't exceed 15% coefficient of variation (CV) apart from the LOQ where it shouldn't exceed 20% CV. Precision could also be considered at three levels: repeatability, intermediate precision & reproducibility,

a. Repeatability

Repeatability expresses the analytical variability under an equivalent operating condition over a brief interval of your time (within-assay, intra-assay). Repeatability means how the tactic performs in one lab & on one instrument, within a given day. Precision measured under the most effective condition possible.

b. Intermediate Precision

the influence of added random effects in laboratories, constant with the intended usage of the procedure, for instance, different days, analysts or equipment, etc. Intermediate precision refers to how the tactic performs, both qualitatively & quantitatively, within one lab, but now from instrument-to-instrument & from day-to-day. Precision measure of the within laboratory variation thanks to different days, analysts, equipment's, etc.

c. Reproducibility

Reproducibility is that the precision among laboratories, isn't required for submission, but are often taken under consideration for standardisation of analytical procedures. Ability of the tactic to yield similar concentration for a sample when measured on different occasions. Reproducibility refers to how that method performs from lab-to-lab, from day-to-day, from analyst-to-analyst, & from instrument-to-instrument, again in both qualitative & quantitative terms.

3. Linearity

The ability of the bioanalytical procedure to get test results that are directly proportional to the concentration of analyte within the sample within the range of the quality curve. The concentration range of the calibration curve should a minimum of span those concentrations expected to be measured within the study samples. If the entire range can't be described by one calibration curve, two calibration ranges are often validated. It should be kept in mind that the accuracy & precision of the tactic are negatively affected at the extremes of the range by extensively expanding the range beyond necessity. Correlation coefficients were most generally wanting to test linearity.

4. Selectivity & Specificity

The ability of the bioanalytical method to measure & differentiate the analytes within the presence of components which will be expected to be present. These could include metabolites, impurities, degradants, or matrix component. Selectivity is that

the documented demonstration of the power of the bioanalytical procedure to discriminate the analyte from interfering components. it's usually defined as "the ability of the bioanalytical method to live unequivocally & to differentiate the analytes within the presence of components, which can be expected to be present". Analyses of blank samples of the acceptable biological matrix (plasma, urine, or other matrix) should be obtained from a minimum of six sources. Each sample must be tested for interference, & selectivity should be confirmed at the lower limit of quantification (LLOQ). These interferences may arise from the constituent of the biological matrix under study.

5. Limit of detection (LOD)

The lowest amount of analyte which will be detected but not quantified. The calculation of the LOD is hospitable misinterpretation as some bioanalytical laboratories just measure all-time low amount of a reference solution which will be detected et al. there's an overall agreement that the LOD should represent the littlest detectable amount or concentration of the analyte of interest.

6. Limit of Quantitation

The quantitation limit of individual analytical procedures is that the lowest amount of analyte during a sample, which may be quantitatively determined with suitable precision.

7. Quantification range

The range of concentration, including the LLOQ & ULOQ which will be steadfastly & reproducibly quantified by suitable correctness & precision through the utilization of a

concentration response bond. The FDA Bioanalytical Method Validation document defines the lower limit of quantification (LLOQ) & therefore the upper limit of quantification (ULOQ) as following,

a. Lower limit of quantification (LLOQ)

The lowest concentration of an analyte during a sample which will be quantitatively determined with a suitable precision & accuracy.

b. Upper limit of quantification (ULOQ)

The highest amount of an analyte during a sample which will be quantitatively determined with a suitable precision & accuracy.

Several approaches exist so as to estimate the lower limit of quantification (LLOQ). a primary approach is predicated on the well-known signal-to-noise (S/N) ratio approach. A 10:1 S/N is taken into account to be sufficient to discriminate the analyte from the ground noise. the opposite approaches are based on the "Standard Deviation of the Response & therefore the Slope". The computation for LLOQ is:

$LLOQ = 10\sigma/S$

Where σ is that the variance of the response & S = the slope of the calibration curve. Another approach to estimate the LLOQ is to plot the RSD versus concentrations getting ready to the expected LLOQ.

8. Standard curve (Calibration curve)

The standard curve for a bioanalytical procedure is that the existing relationship, within a specified range; between the response (signal, e.g., area under the curve, peak height, absorption) & therefore the concentration (quantity) of the analyte within the sample i.e., Calibration (standard) curve is that the relationship between instrument response & known concentrations of the analyte. it's also called as calibration curve. This standard curve should be described preferably by an easy monotonic (i.e., strictly increasing or decreasing) response function that provides reliable measurements, i.e., accurate results as discussed thereafter.

9. Recovery

The extraction efficiency of an analytical process, reported as a percentage of the known amount of an analyte carried through the sample extraction & processing steps of the tactic. Recovery pertains to the taking out productivity of an analytical technique within the limits of variability. Regaining of the analyte needn't be 100%, but the extent of recovery of an analyte & of the inner standard should be consistent, precise, & reproducible. Recovery experiments should be performed by comparing the analytical results for extracted samples at three concentrations (low, medium, & high) with unextracted standards that represent 100% recovery. It even be given by absolute recovery,

10. Stability

The chemical or physical stability of an analyte during a given matrix under specific conditions for given time intervals. The condition under which the steadiness is decided is essentially hooked in to the character of the analyte, the biological matrix, & therefore the anticipated period of time of storage (before analysis). The FDA guidelines on bioanalytical method validation also because the recent AAPS/FDA report require evaluating analyte stability at different stages. Stability should be confirmed for each step of sample

preparation & analysis, also because the conditions used for long-term storage. They also include the evaluation of the analyte stability within the biological matrix through several freeze–thaw cycles, bench-top stability (i.e., under the conditions of sample preparation), future stability at for example−20 ◦C or−70 ◦C (i.e., during storage conditions of the samples) & stability of samples on the auto-sampler.

APPLICATION OF VALIDATED METHOD TO ROUTINE DRUG ANALYSIS

In general, biological samples will be analysed with one resolve without duplicate analysis if the assay technique has suitable variability as definite by validation data. this is often true for procedures where precision & accuracy variability's routinely fall within acceptable tolerance limits.
The following recommendations should be noted in applying a bioanalytical method to routine drug analysis:
1. A matrix-based standard curve should contain a minimum of six standard points, excluding blanks (either single or replicate), covering the whole range.
2. The QC samples should be wont to accept or reject the run. These QC samples are matrix spiked with analyte.
3. Response Function: Typically, identical curve fitting, weighting, & goodness of fit determined during pre-study validation should be used for the quality curve within the study. Response function is decided by appropriate statistical tests supported the particular standard points during each run within the validation. Changes within the response function relationship between pre-study validation & routine run validation indicate potential problems.
4. System suitability: supported the analyte & technique, a selected SOP (or sample) should be identified to make sure optimum operation of the system used.
5. Any required sample dilutions should use like matrix (e.g., human to human) obviating the necessity to include actual within-study dilution matrix QC samples.
6. Sample Data Reintegration: An SOP or guideline for sample data reintegration should be established. This SOP or guideline should explain the explanations for reintegration & the way the reintegration is to be performed.
7. Repeat Analysis: it's important to determine an SOP or guideline for repeat analysis & acceptance criteria. This SOP or guideline should explain the explanations for repeating sample analysis. Reasons for repeat analyses could include repeat analysis of clinical or preclinical samples for regulatory purposes, inconsistent replicate analysis, samples outside of the assay range, sample processing errors, breakdown, poor chromatography, & inconsistent pharmacokinetic data.

CONCLUSION

Bioanalysis & therefore the production of pharmacokinetic, toxicokinetic & metabolic data plays a fundamental role in pharmaceutical research & development involved within the drug discovery & development process. Therefore, the information must be produced to the suitable scientific standards & specifications laid by the various regulatory agencies across the world. Bioanalytical methods must be validated to objectively demonstrate the fitness for his or her intended use. this text highlights the precise Recommendations & Applications of bioanalytical method in routine drug analysis for drug discovery & development. It might be used as a suggestion in developing a bioanalytical method for the routine analysis & different biological processes. It provides information for the bioavailability, bioequivalence & therapeutic drug monitoring studies.

REFERENCES

[1] U.S. Department of Health & Human Services Food & Drug Administration Center for Drug Evaluation & Research (CDER) Center for Veterinary Medicine (CVM), (2001) Guidance for Industry, Bioanalytical Method Validation.
[2] Kollipara S, Bende G, Agarwal N, Varshney B, Paliwal J et al. (2011) Internatioanl guidelines for Bioanalytical method Validation: A Comparison & Discussion on Current Scenario. Chromatographia 73:201-217.
[3] Bansal S, DeStefano A (2007) Key Elements of Bioanalytical Method Validation for Small Molecules. The AAPS J 9: E109-E114.
[4] Blume H, Brendel E, Brudny-Kloppel M, Grebe S, Lausecker B et al. (2011)

Workshop/Conference Report on EMA Draft Guideline on Validation of
[5] Bioanalytical Methods. Euro J of Pharma Sci 42: 300–305.
[6] European Medicines Agency Guideline on Bioanalytical Method Validation. Committee for Medicinal Products for Human Use (2011).
[7] Buick AR, Doig MV, Jeal SC, Land GS, McDowall RD et al. (1990) Method validation in the bioanalytical laboratory. J of Pharma & Biomed Anal 8: 629-637.
[8] Yadav AK, Singh SK, Yashwant, Verma S (2012) Bioanalytical Method Validation – How, How Much & Why: A Reaseach Perspective. Int J of Nat Prod Sci 1: 123.
[9] www.Cpharmaguide.com
[10] Patil S, Pandurang ND, Kuchekar BS (2009) Bioanalytical method development & validation: Guidelines Latest reviews, pharmainfo.net 7: 1-8.
[11] Tiwari G, Tiwari R (2010) Bioanalytical method validation: An updated review. Pharma Methods 1: 25–38.
[12] Wal P, Kumar B, Bhandari A, Rai AK, Wal A et al. Bioanalytical Method Development– Determination of Drugs in Biological Fluids. J of Pharma Sci & Tech 2: 333-347.
[13] U.S. Department of Health & Human Services Food & Drug Administration Center for Drug Evaluation & Research (CDER) Center for Veterinary Medicine (CVM) (2013) Guidance for Industry, Bioanalytical Method Validation, (Revision 1).
[14] James CA, Breda M, Frigerio E (2004) Bioanalytical method validation: a risk-based approach? J of Pharma & Biomed Anal 35: 887–893.
[15] SOP 12: Validation of Bioanalytical Methods. (2003) Onkologie 26: 52–55.
[16] Gilbert MT, Barinov-Colligon I, Miksic JR (1995) Cross-validation of bioanalytical methods between laboratories. J of Pharma & Biomed Anal 13: 385-394.
[17] Rozet E, Dewe W, Morello R, Chiap P, Lecomte F et al. (2008) Risk-based approach for the transfer of quantitative methods: Bioanalytical applications. J of Chroma A 1189: 32–41.
[18] Murugan S, Pravallika N, Sirisha P, Chandrakala K (2013) A Review on Bioanalytical Method Development & Validation by Using LC-MS/MS. J of Chem & Pharma Sci 6: 41-45.
[19] Hartmann C, Massart DL, McDowall RD (1994) An analysis of the Washington Conference Report on bioanalytical method validation. J of Pharma & Biomed Anal 12: 1337-1343.
[20] Causon R (1997) Validation of chromatographic methods in biomedical analysis Viewpoint & discussion. J of Chrom B 689: 175-180.
[21] Tur F, Eva Tur, Lentheric I, Mendoza P, Encabo M et al. (2013) Validation of an LC– MS bioanalytical method for quantification of phytate levels in rat, dog & human plasma J of Chroma B 928: 146– 154.
[22] Gil J, Cabrales A, Reyes O, Morera V, Betancourt L et al. (2012) Development & validation of a bioanalytical LC–MS method for the quantification of GHRP-6 in human plasma. J of Pharma & Biomed Anal 60: 19– 25.
[23] Rozet E, Marinia RD, Ziemonsa E, Boulangerb B, Hubert Ph et al. (2011) Advances in validation, risk & uncertainty assessment of bioanalytical methods. J of Pharma & Biomed Anal 55: 848–858.
[24] Boulanger B, Rozet E, Moonen F, Ruda S, Hubert P et al. (2009) A risk-based analysis of the AAPS conference report on quantitative bioanalytical methods validation & implementation. J of Chroma B 877: 2235–2243.
[25] Pandey S, Pandey P, Tiwari G, Tiwari R (2010) Bioanalysis in drug discovery & development. Pharma Methods 1: 14–24.
[26] Novakova L (2013) Challenges in the development of bioanalytical liquid chromatography–mass spectrometry method with emphasis on fast analysis. J of Chroma A 1292: 25–37.
[27] Frank TP, Olaf HD, Frank M (2007) Validation of new methods. Forensic Sci Int 165: 216–224.
[28] U.S. Department of Health & Human Services Food & Drug Administration Center for Drug Evaluation & Research (CDER) Center for Veterinary Medicine (CVM) (2013) Guidance for Industry, Bioanalytical Method Validation.
[29] McPolin O (2009) Validation of analytical method for the pharmaceutical analysis, Mourne training services.

[30] Kelley M, DeSilva B (2007) Key Elements of Bioanalytical Method Validation for Macromolecules. The AAPS J 9: E156-E163.

[31] Braggio S, Barnaby RJ, Grossi P, Cugola M (1996) A strategy for validation of bioanalytical methods. J of Pharma & Biomed Anal 14: 375-388.

[32] Unal DO, Guler S, Erol DD (2009) Development & Validation of Bioanalytical Method for Determination of Flurbiprofen from Human Plasma by Liquid Chromatography. Hacettepe Uni J of the Faculty of Pharmacy 29: 25-35.

[33] Whitmire M, Ammerman J, de Lisio P, Killmer J, Kyle D et al. (2011) LC-MS/MS Bioanalysis Method Development, Validation & Sample Analysis: Points to Consider When Conducting Nonclinical & Clinical Studies in Accordance with Current Regulatory Guidances. J of Anal & Bioanal Tech 4: 1-10.

[34] Lang JR, Bolton S (1991) A comprehensive method validation strategy for bioanalytical applications in the pharmaceutical industry - 2. Statistical analyses. J of Pharma & Biomed Anal 9: 435-442.

[35] Karnes HT, Shiu G, Shah VP (1991) Validation of bioanalytical methods Pharma Res 8: 221–225.

[36] Chau CH, Rixe O, McLeod H (2008) Validation of Analytic Methods for Biomarkers Used in Drug Development. Clin Cancer Res 14: 5967-5976.

[37] Kalakuntla RR, Kumar KS (2009) Bioanalytical Method Validation: A Quality Assurance Auditor View Point. J of Pharma Sci & Res 1: 1-10.

[38] Dadgar D, Burnett PE, Choc MG, Gallicano K, Hooper JW et al. (1995) Application issues in bioanalytical method validation, sample analysis & data reporting. J of Pharma & Biomed Anal 13: 89-97.

[39] Dawes ML, Bergum JS, Schuster AE, Anne-Franc¸ Aubry O et al. (2012) Application of a design of experiment approach in the development of a sensitive bioanalytical assay in human plasma. J of Pharma & Biomed Anal 70: 401– 407.

[40] Goncalves D, Alves G, Soares-da-Silva P, Falcao A (2012) Bioanalytical chromatographic methods for the determination of catechol-O-methyltransferase inhibitors in rodents & human samples: A review. Analytica Chimica Acta 710: 17– 32.

[41] Behnischa PA, Hosoe K, Shin-ichi S (2001) Bioanalytical screening methods for dioxins & dioxin-like compounds—a review of bioassay/biomarker technology. Envir Int 27: 413–439.