



Standard Practice for Determination of Precision and Bias of Applicable Test Methods of Committee D19 on Water¹

This standard is issued under the fixed designation D2777; 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. Statements of precision and bias in test methods are required by the Form and Style for ASTM Standards, “Section A21. Precision and Bias (Mandatory).” In principle, all test methods are covered by this practice.

1.2 Except as specified in 1.4, 1.5, and 1.6, 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 This practice also provides guidance to task groups for conducting limited-scale collaborative studies (known as “comparability studies”) for test methods that have been revised, when such revision includes substantive modifications. Examples of substantive modifications may include, but are not limited to, changes in mandatory or allowable instrumentation, reagents, reaction times, etc.

1.3.1 Changes to applicable water matrices in the Scope of a method may constitute a substantive modification under this provision. However, recognize that even the original collaborative study may not have used all the various matrix types specified in the method’s original Scope.

1.3.2 A method’s concentration-range extension that is deemed to merit additional collaborative testing (even without a method modification that would otherwise be considered substantive) shall require a full collaborative study, as described in Sections 7.1-7.5, but only at Youden-pair concentrations representative of the extended range. Note that such a collaborative study could involve as little as a single-sample Youden-pair study in a single reproducible matrix.

1.3.3 Whether a revision to a test method includes substantive modification shall be determined by consensus of the Committee.

1.4 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.

1.4.1 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.

1.4.2 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)).

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

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

1.5 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.

1.6 This paragraph relates to special exemptions not clearly acceptable under 1.4 or 1.5. 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

¹ This practice is under the jurisdiction of ASTM Committee D19 on Water and is the direct responsibility of Subcommittee D19.02 on Quality Systems, Specification, and Statistics.

Current edition approved Jan. 1, 2013. Published February 2013. Originally approved in 1969. Last previous edition approved in 2012 as D2777 – 12. DOI: 10.1520/D2777-13.

cannot be achieved will meet both ASTM requirements (1)² and the related requirements of this practice. In addition, Committee D19, through a Main Committee ballot, may approve publication of a “Preliminary” Standard Method for a period not to exceed 5 years. Preliminary Standards must contain a minimum of a single-operator precision-and-bias statement and a Quality Control section based on the single operator data. Publication of a Preliminary Standard is conditional on the approval of a full D2777 collaborative study design for the standard. Precision-and-bias statements authorized by this paragraph shall include the date of approval by Committee D19.

1.7 Per Section A21.2.3 of the ASTM Form and Style Manual the committee may delay an interlaboratory study for a new method and include a temporary statement in the Precision and Bias Section that addresses only single operator precision (“repeatability”). This statement is valid for five years from the initial publication date. In this case, a single laboratory study shall be conducted in accordance with Section 7.6.

1.8 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.

1.9 All studies, even those exempt from some requirements under Sections 1.4 through 1.8, shall receive approval from the Results Advisor before being conducted (see Section 8) and after completion (see Section 13).

1.10 This practice satisfies the QC requirements of Practice **D5847**.

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

2. Referenced Documents

2.1 ASTM Standards:³

D1129 Terminology Relating to Water

D1141 Practice for the Preparation of Substitute Ocean Water

D1193 Specification for Reagent Water

D4375 Practice for Basic Statistics in Committee D19 on Water

D5790 Test Method for Measurement of Purgeable Organic Compounds in Water by Capillary Column Gas Chromatography/Mass Spectrometry

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

³ For referenced ASTM standards, visit the ASTM website, www.astm.org, or contact ASTM Customer Service at service@astm.org. For *Annual Book of ASTM Standards* volume information, refer to the standard’s Document Summary page on the ASTM website.

D5847 Practice for Writing Quality Control Specifications for Standard Test Methods for Water Analysis

D5905 Practice for the Preparation of Substitute Wastewater

D6091 Practice for 99a??%/95a??% Interlaboratory Detection Estimate (IDE) for Analytical Methods with Negligible Calibration Error

D6512 Practice for Interlaboratory Quantitation Estimate

E177 Practice for Use of the Terms Precision and Bias in ASTM Test Methods

E178 Practice for Dealing With Outlying Observations

E456 Terminology Relating to Quality and Statistics

E691 Practice for Conducting an Interlaboratory Study to Determine the Precision of a Test Method

E1169 Practice for Conducting Ruggedness Tests

2.2 ASTM Adjuncts:

DQCALC Microsoft Excel-based software for the Interlaboratory Quantitation Estimate (IQE)⁴

3. Terminology

3.1 *Definitions*—For definitions of terms used in this practice, refer to Terminologies **D1129**, **D4375** and **E456**, and Practice **E177**.

3.2 Definitions of Terms Specific to This Standard:

3.2.1 *accuracy, n*—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, n*—the persistent positive or negative deviation of the average value of a test method from the assumed or accepted true value.

3.2.3 *comparability study, n*—a collaborative study that incorporates side-by-side evaluation of the test method before and after a substantive modification to a test method.

3.2.4 *degrees of freedom, n*—the total number of replicates analyzed across all laboratories/analysts minus the number of laboratories/analysts.

3.2.5 *laboratory, n*—a single and completely independent analytical system with its own specific apparatus, source of reagents, set of internal standard-operating procedures, etc.

3.2.5.1 *Discussion*—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.

3.2.6 *limited validation study, n*—in a test method, a validation study that does not fulfill all D2777 requirements for a full-scale collaborative study, but that can be used for re-validation of revised methods.

3.2.7 *operator, n*—usually the individual analyst within each laboratory who performs the test method throughout the collaborative study.

3.2.7.1 *Discussion*—However, for complicated test methods, the operator may be a team of individuals, each performing a specific function throughout the study.

3.2.8 *precision, n*—the degree of agreement of repeated measurements of the same property, expressed in terms of

⁴ Available from ASTM International Headquarters. Order Adjunct No. ADJDQ-CALC. Original adjunct produced in 2007.

dispersion of test results about the arithmetical-mean result obtained by repetitive testing of a homogeneous sample under specified conditions.

3.2.8.1 *Discussion*—The precision of a test method is expressed quantitatively as the standard deviation computed from the results of a series of controlled determinations.

3.2.9 *substantive modification, n*—in a test method, a change (or changes) that is deemed by the Committee to be of such magnitude that the change might affect the precision-and-bias data published with the original method.

3.3 Acronyms—

3.3.1 *MDL, n*—method detection limit

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 1.4, 1.5, and 1.6. Upon receipt of concurrence, the collaborative test is conducted, data analyzed, and precision-and-bias statements formulated by the task group. Estimates of the lower limits of quantitation and detection may also be developed. 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. Optionally, the detection

and quantitation values provide estimates of the level at which most laboratories should be able to achieve confident detection and meet the minimum precision (expressed as relative standard deviation) expected.

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.

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 E1169 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 task group intends to evaluate the method characteristics of detection and quantification, Practice D6091 (Interlaboratory Detection Estimate) or Standard Practice D6512 (Interlaboratory Quantitation Estimate), or both, should be evaluated and the recommendations for study designs incorporated. Determining detection capability and absolute bias for measurements at background is especially critical for methods (such as radiochemical methods) that do not censor measurement results (for example, against a critical level, MDL or reporting level).

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

6.3.1.1 *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.

6.3.1.2 *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 precision and 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) at any one concentration 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 D1129.

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 1.4.2), 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 D1193 or a synthetic medium, such as the

substitute wastewater described in Practice D5905 or the substitute ocean water described in Specification D1141, 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 1.4.2, 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 non-linear 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 interlaboratory comparisons, concentrations should be selected to comply with the requirements of the IQE. Study concentrations, except additional concentrations needed in the trace range to characterize detection below the range of calibration should generally be rather uniformly distributed over the range of the test method.

NOTE 1—The precision and bias statement is only valid for the range of the data included in the study, so care should be taken to assure that trace concentrations and upper bound of the linear range are considered in establishing the study concentrations.

7.2.6.1 Study samples with concentrations at or near a detection limit can produce non-quantitative results from 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 remaining quantitative data (that is, eliminating the non-numeric data) under such circumstances can produce misleading precision-and-bias estimates. In general, if at a single concentration or Youden pair, more than $\frac{1}{3}$ of the data are non-numeric, the concentration/pair should be excluded from the precision and bias determination. Therefore, when designing the study, carefully consider instructions to laboratories on censoring practices, typical levels of detection and minimum calibration and consider including more concentrations in the study than the minimum required. Results from analyses of Youden pairs at or near the detection limit can be included in this traditional statistical analysis (and thus the working range of the method extended) if it turns out that most laboratories report quantified results.

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 1.6. 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 in preparing the samples or spiking concentrates, up to half the concentration levels may be represented by blind duplicates rather than Youden pairs, 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 D1129 and Practice E177). As discussed in Practice E177, 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.

7.6 A temporary Precision and Bias statement that addresses only repeatability (see 1.6) shall follow the procedures of 7.1 through 7.5 to the extent possible.

7.6.1 Repeatability for each concentration level shall be based on a minimum of seven retained replicate determinations. Adequate replicate concentrations should be used to insure that there are at least seven values will be usable after eliminating outliers.

7.6.2 Replicates of each concentration shall be true replicate concentrations, not comprised of Youden pairs.

7.6.3 The analyst should be blinded with respect to the true concentration at each level.

7.6.4 At least three concentrations covering the range of the test method shall be included for each matrix tested.

7.6.5 The temporary Precision and Bias statement commonly will be based on results from a single laboratory. However, two or more laboratories or analysts may be used and their results pooled to form the repeatability estimate. Fewer than seven replicates may be analyzed within each laboratory or analyst as long as there are at least six “degrees of freedom” for repeatability (the single operator standard deviation). Degrees of freedom are calculated as the total number of replicates analyzed across all laboratories/analysts minus the number of laboratories/analysts. Interlaboratory results, such as interlaboratory standard deviation (“reproducibility”) may be reported with a clear statement that the results are based on

data not in accordance with D2777 and are to be considered only illustrative of potential results. A description of the data actually used (number of laboratories and/or analysts) shall be included in any case.

7.6.6 All other requirements for collaborative studies shall apply to the repeatability study. References to Youden pairs shall be construed as references to replicate samples. References to interlaboratory results or comparisons shall be ignored.

7.7 In cases where a test method has been revised and the revision is deemed to have included substantive modification to the method (see Section 1.3), a comparability study must be completed whenever it is feasible to do so. At any rate, a limited validation study must be completed when a full comparability study is not feasible.

7.7.1 The comparability study shall follow the general principles of the full-scale Collaborative Test, as outlined in Sections 7.1 through 7.5, above, with following exceptions, which describe the minimum requirements for the comparability study.

7.7.1.1 Three laboratories providing usable data shall participate in the comparability study.

7.7.1.2 One representative, reproducible matrix shall be tested, as described in Section 7.2.5.

7.7.1.3 Two concentrations of the analyte(s) shall be tested, representing low and high levels with respect to the method’s intended range. Triplicates of each concentration level, comprising true replicate concentrations, not Youden pairs, shall be prepared for each laboratory. Concentrations used shall be identical for each laboratory, which shall be blind with respect to the true concentration values.

7.7.1.4 Each laboratory shall conduct analysis of the samples using both the original method as written before revision and the proposed revised method. Each sample shall be processed through the method, original or revised, in its entirety prior to analysis of another test sample, even when the methods are identical with regard to their initial or final steps. Ideally, laboratories should alternate in their use of the original and revised methods, or randomize their order, although this may not be possible in many cases due to limited space, availability of equipment, or other limiting factors.

7.7.2 In cases where it is not feasible to perform a comparability study, such as when it is not possible or practical to expect a laboratory to operate the two different procedures, different instruments, etc., a limited validation study shall be performed in lieu.

7.7.2.1 Three laboratories providing usable data shall participate in the study.

7.7.2.2 One representative, reproducible matrix shall be tested, as described in 7.2.5.

7.7.2.3 Three concentrations of the analyte(s) shall be tested, covering the method’s intended range. Triplicates of each concentration level, comprising true replicate concentrations, not Youden pairs, shall be prepared for each laboratory. Concentrations used shall be identical for each laboratory, which shall be blind with respect to the true concentration values.

7.7.3 All other requirements for collaborative studies shall apply to the comparability or limited validation study. References to Youden pairs shall be construed as references to replicate 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 or whether it can offer some other explanation that may preclude the use of these data, or both.

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 [E178](#).

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 2—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*—In cases where blind duplicates are used, the calculation of s_o is:

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

where m is the number of usable pairs of duplicates.

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 i th 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

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

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:

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

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.

11.4.4 Calculations from a single laboratory study or less than full collaborative study, used to fulfill the requirement for a temporary Precision and Bias statement (1.6) shall be based on the repeatability standard deviation as discussed in Practice E691. Where two or more laboratories or analysts are used for this purpose, a reproducibility standard deviation may be calculated based on E691. Consultation with the Results Advisor or other experts may be necessary in some cases.

11.4.5 Calculations from a comparability study or limited validation study for substantively modified methods shall be based on the repeatability and reproducibility standard deviations as discussed in Practice E691.

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 D2777 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, $\bar{x}$ —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.

12.1.5 Precision and bias results, following the requirements of 12.1.3, from a comparability study, or limited validation study for a substantively modified method, shall be reported after the precision-and-bias statement from the method as originally published, as well as after any subsequent precision-and-bias statement resulting from previous comparability or limited validation studies. Where a full comparability study has been performed, it should be reported side-by-side with the original full comparability study, to enable direct comparison to results obtained from the original study; these side-by-side data must be reported in the full method, not in an Appendix or Annex. Statistical comparisons may be presented between precision and/or bias results obtained from each version of the method. However, this practice makes no attempt to prescribe “acceptable” p-values, confidence intervals, variance ratios, or the like.

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 1.4, 1.5, or 1.6, 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 DXXXX 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).

12.5 Where the IDE detection estimate has been established for a method, the quality control section should state the determined value, the units, and the model used for characterizing the standard deviation. The DQCALC software provided by ASTM provides a report of this information.

12.6 Where the IQE quantitation estimate(s) has been established for a method, the quality control section should state the Percent Relative Standard Deviation (for example, 10 %, 20 %, 30 %, or combinations thereof), the determined value, the units and the model used for characterizing the standard deviation. The DQCALC software provided by ASTM provides a report of this information.

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.

NOTE 3—The output file from the DQCALC software contains all information required to document the detection and quantitation 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; detection; interlaboratory study; method bias; method precision; method recovery; quantitation; round-robin study; statistical analysis; Youden study design

APPENDIXES

(Nonmandatory Information)

X1. APPROVAL OF STUDY DESIGN

X1.1 Using Test Method **D5790** 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.

TO: D-19 Results Advisor
 FROM: Robin Austermann 9/30/91
 Task Group Chairman 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 Participant'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

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 X2.1 Example of Usable Data

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

^ARejected as a nonquantitative response.

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 (<i>XBAR</i>)	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 (<i>S_T</i>)	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 (<i>S_O</i>)	0.40		0.48		0.80	
Analyst relative standard deviation, %	32.60		9.68		3.94	

TABLE X2.3 DL & QL Summary^A

ILSD Model	Units	LC	DE	QE10 %	QE20 %	QE30 %
HYBRID	ppb	0.9148	1.602709	5.0509682	1.8722709	1.1991723

^A This table is located under the DLs & QLs tab of the DQCALC workbook.

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 and Quantitation Sample Discussion

Where trace analysis is important to the use of the method, study samples at low concentrations (including blanks) need to be included both for P&B determinations and for detection and quantitation limit estimation. For these methods it is important to inform the participants of the nature of the study and to instruct them to not censor data at the laboratory specific reporting limit. The laboratories should be instructed to report all numeric data output from the instrument system without additional censoring. This should include reporting of negative numbers.

-[It is recommended that in the single laboratory trial preceding the round robin that the %RSD be determined at each concentration and the detection level estimated (interpolated point at which 33 %RSD is achieved by the laboratory). This value can then be utilized by the study supervisor in selection of sample concentrations.]

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]

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000
1001
1002
1003
1004
1005
1006
1007
1008
1009
1010
1011
1012
1013
1014
1015
1016
1017
1018
1019
1020
1021
1022
1023
1024
1025
1026
1027
1028
1029
1030
1031
1032
1033
1034
1035
1036
1037
1038
1039
1040
1041
1042
1043
1044
1045
1046
1047
1048
1049
1050
1051
1052
1053
1054
1055
1056
1057
1058
1059
1060
1061
1062
1063
1064
1065
1066
1067
1068
1069
1070
1071
1072
1073
1074
1075
1076
1077
1078
1079
1080
1081
1082
1083
1084
1085
1086
1087
1088
1089
1090
1091
1092
1093
1094
1095
1096
1097
1098
1099
1100
1101
1102
1103
1104
1105
1106
1107
1108
1109
1110
1111
1112
1113
1114
1115
1116
1117
1118
1119
1120
1121
1122
1123
1124
1125
1126
1127
1128
1129
1130
1131
1132
1133
1134
1135
1136
1137
1138
1139
1140
1141
1142
1143
1144
1145
1146
1147
1148
1149
1150
1151
1152
1153
1154
1155
1156
1157
1158
1159
1160
1161
1162
1163
1164
1165
1166
1167
1168
1169
1170
1171
1172
1173
1174
1175
1176
1177
1178
1179
1180
1181
1182
1183
1184
1185
1186
1187
1188
1189
1190
1191
1192
1193
1194
1195
1196
1197
1198
1199
1200
1201
1202
1203
1204
1205
1206
1207
1208
1209
1210
1211
1212
1213
1214
1215
1216
1217
1218
1219
1220
1221
1222
1223
1224
1225
1226
1227
1228
1229
1230
1231
1232
1233
1234
1235
1236
1237
1238
1239
1240
1241
1242
1243
1244
1245
1246
1247
1248
1249
1250
1251
1252
1253
1254
1255
1256
1257
1258
1259
1260
1261
1262
1263
1264
1265
1266
1267
1268
1269
1270
1271
1272
1273
1274
1275
1276
1277
1278
1279
1280
1281
1282
1283
1284
1285
1286
1287
1288
1289
1290
1291
1292
1293
1294
1295
1296
1297
1298
1299
1300
1301
1302
1303
1304
1305
1306
1307
1308
1309
1310
1311
1312
1313
1314
1315
1316
1317
1318
1319
1320
1321
1322
1323
1324
1325
1326
1327
1328
1329
1330
1331
1332
1333
1334
1335
1336
1337
1338
1339
1340
1341
1342
1343
1344
1345
1346
1347
1348
1349
1350
1351
1352
1353
1354
1355
1356
1357
1358
1359
1360
1361
1362
1363
1364
1365
1366
1367
1368
1369
1370
1371
1372
1373
1374
1375
1376
1377
1378
1379
1380
1381
1382
1383
1384
1385
1386
1387
1388
1389
1390
1391
1392
1393
1394
1395
1396
1397
1398
1399
1400
1401
1402
1403
1404
1405
1406
1407
1408
1409
1410
1411
1412
1413
1414
1415
1416
1417
1418
1419
1420
1421
1422
1423
1424
1425
1426
1427
1428
1429
1430
1431
1432
1433
1434
1435
1436
1437
1438
1439
1440
1441
1442
1443
1444
1445
1446
1447
1448
1449
1450
1451
1452
1453
1454
1455
1456
1457
1458
1459
1460
1461
1462
1463
1464
1465
1466
1467
1468
1469
1470
1471
1472
1473
1474
1475
1476
1477
1478
1479
1480
1481
1482
1483
1484
1485
1486
1487
1488
1489
1490
1491
1492
1493
1494
1495
1496
1497
1498
1499
1500
1501
1502
1503
1504
1505
1506
1507
1508
1509
1510
1511
1512
1513
1514
1515
1516
1517
1518
1519
1520
1521
1522
1523
1524
1525
1526
1527
1528
1529
1530
1531
1532
1533
1534
1535
1536
1537
1538
1539
1540
1541
1542
1543
1544
1545
1546
1547
1548
1549
1550
1551
1552
1553
1554
1555
1556
1557
1558
1559
1560
1561
1562
1563
1564
1565
1566
1567
1568
1569
1570
1571
1572
1573
1574
1575
1576
1577
1578
1579
1580
1581
1582
1583
1584
1585
1586
1587
1588
1589
1590
1591
1592
1593
1594
1595
1596
1597
1598
1599
1600
1601
1602
1603
1604
1605
1606
1607
1608
1609
1610
1611
1612
1613
1614
1615
1616
1617
1618
1619
1620
1621
1622
1623
1624
1625
1626
1627
1628
1629
1630
1631
1632
1633
1634
1635
1636
1637
1638
1639
1640
1641
1642
1643
1644
1645
1646
1647
1648
1649
1650
1651
1652
1653
1654
1655
1656
1657
1658
1659
1660
1661
1662
1663
1664
1665
1666
1667
1668
1669
1670
1671
1672
1673
1674
1675
1676
1677
1678
1679
1680
1681
1682
1683
1684
1685
1686
1687
1688
1689
1690
1691
1692
1693
1694
1695
1696
1697
1698
1699
1700
1701
1702
1703
1704
1705
1706
1707
1708
1709
1710
1711
1712
1713
1714
1715
1716
1717
1718
1719
1720
1721
1722
1723
1724
1725
1726
1727
1728
1729
1730
1731
1732
1733
1734
1735
1736
1737
1738
1739
1740
1741
1742
1743
1744
1745
1746
1747
1748
1749
1750
1751
1752
1753
1754
1755
1756
1757
1758
1759
1760
1761
1762
1763
1764
1765
1766
1767
1768
1769
1770
1771
1772
1773
1774
1775
1776
1777
1778
1779
1780
1781
1782
1783
1784
1785
1786
1787
1788
1789
1790
1791
1792
1793
1794
1795
1796
1797
1798
1799
1800
1801
1802
1803
1804
1805
1806
1807
1808
1809
1810
1811
1812
1813
1814
1815
1816
1817
1818
1819
1820
1821
1822
1823
1824
1825
1826
1827
1828
1829
1830
1831
1832
1833
1834
1835
1836
1837
1838
1839
1840
1841
1842
1843
1844
1845
1846
1847
1848
1849
1850
1851
1852
1853
1854
1855
1856
1857
1858
1859
1860
1861
1862
1863
1864
1865
1866
1867
1868
1869
1870
1871
1872
1873
1874
1875
1876
1877
1878
1879
1880
1881
1882
1883
1884
1885
1886
1887
1888
1889
1890
1891
1892
1893
1894
1895
1896
1897
1898
1899
1900
1901
1902
1903
1904
1905
1906
1907
1908
1909
1910
1911
1912
1913
1914
1915
1916
1917
1918
1919
1920
1921
1922
1923
1924
1925
1926
1927
1928
1929
1930
1931
1932
1933
1934
1935
1936
1937
1938
1939
1940
1941
1942
1943
1944
1945
1946
1947
1948
1949
1950
1951
1952
1953
1954
1955
1956
1957
1958
1959
1960
1961
1962
1963
1964
1965
1966
1967
1968
1969
1970
1971
1972
1973
1974
1975
1976
1977
1978
1979
1980
1981
1982
1983
1984
1985
1986
1987
1988
1989
1990
1991
1992
1993
1994
1995
1996
1997
1998
1999
2000
2001
2002
2003
2004
2005
2006
2007
2008
2009
2010
2011
2012
2013
2014
2015
2016
2017
2018
2019
2020
2021
2022
2023
2024
2025
2026
2027
2028
2029
2030
2031
2032
2033
2034
2035
2036
2037
2038
2039
2040
2041
2042
2043
2044
2045
2046
2047
2048
2049
2050
2051
2052
2053
2054
2055
2056
2057
2058
2059
2060
2061
2062
2063
2064
2065
2066
2067
2068
2069
2070
2071
2072
2073
2074
2075
2076
2077
2078
2079
2080
2081
2082
2083
2084
2085
2086
2087
2088
2089
2090
2091
2092
2093
2094
2095
2096
2097
2098
2099
2100
2101
2102
2103
2104
2105
2106
2107
2108
2109
2110
2111
2112
2113
2114
2115
2116
2117
2118
2119
2120
2121
2122
2123
2124
2125
2126
2127
2128
2129
2130
2131
2132
2133
2134
2135
2136
2137
2138
2139
2140
2141
2142
2143
2144
2145
2146
2147
2148
2149
2150
2151
2152
2153
2154
2155
2156
2157
2158
2159
2160
2161
2162
2163
2164
2165
2166
2167
2168
2169
2170
2171
2172
2173
2174
2175
2176
2177
2178
2179
2180
2181
2182
2183
218

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]

[Title of the study]

Laboratory Name: _____ Lab Code: _____

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

[Table for MDLs/analytes]

[Title of the study]

Laboratory Name: _____ Lab Code: _____

Sample Matrix: Name of the matrix

[Table for data/analytes]

ASTM International
1140
19th Street
West Conshohocken, PA 19380
U.S.A.
Phone: 610-660-4555
Fax: 610-660-4556
Email: service@astm.org
Web: www.astm.org

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?

Were any numeric data censored? If so, why?

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 Steiner, E. H., *op. cit.*, 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.

ASTM International takes no position respecting the validity of any patent rights asserted in connection with any item mentioned in this standard. Users of this standard are expressly advised that determination of the validity of any such patent rights, and the risk of infringement of such rights, are entirely their own responsibility.

This standard is subject to revision at any time by the responsible technical committee and must be reviewed every five years and if not revised, either reapproved or withdrawn. Your comments are invited either for revision of this standard or for additional standards and should be addressed to ASTM International Headquarters. Your comments will receive careful consideration at a meeting of the responsible technical committee, which you may attend. If you feel that your comments have not received a fair hearing you should make your views known to the ASTM Committee on Standards, at the address shown below.

This standard is copyrighted by ASTM International, 100 Barr Harbor Drive, PO Box C700, West Conshohocken, PA 19428-2959, United States. Individual reprints (single or multiple copies) of this standard may be obtained by contacting ASTM at the above address or at 610-832-9585 (phone), 610-832-9555 (fax), or service@astm.org (e-mail); or through the ASTM website (www.astm.org). Permission rights to photocopy the standard may also be secured from the ASTM website (www.astm.org/COPYRIGHT/).