



UK Biobank Biomarker Project

Details of assays and
quality control
information for the
urinary biomarker data

Version 1.0

Date: 28/10/2016

Prepared by: Daniel Fry, Rachael Almond, Mark Gordon &
Stewart Moffat

Prepared for: UK Biobank Showcase

Contents

| | | |
|---------------------------------------|--|----------|
| 1.0 | Introduction | 3 |
| 2.0 | Assay Selection & Project Scope | 3 |
| 3.0 | Assay Equipment and Information | 3 |
| 3.1 | Results Outside of the Analytical Range | 4 |
| 4.0 | Assay Performance Characteristics | 5 |
| 5.0 | ISO 17025 Quality Accreditation | 6 |
| Appendix 1 – Expert Advisors | | 7 |
| UK Biobank Enhancements Working Group | | 7 |
| Biomarker Expert Working Group | | 7 |
| Design Phase Expert Working Group | | 8 |

Document Version Control

| <i>Version</i> | <i>Issued</i> | <i>Changes</i> |
|----------------|------------------|---------------------------|
| <i>v1.0</i> | <i>1/11/2016</i> | <i>None - first issue</i> |

1.0 Introduction

In order to enhance further the value of the UK Biobank resource to researchers, UK Biobank has embarked on a project to measure a wide range of biochemical markers in biological samples collected at baseline (2006-2010) in all 500,000 participants (and also in the samples provided by 20,000 participants who returned for a “Repeat Assessment” in 2012/ 2013).

The project seeks to measure biomarkers in three matrices – urine, packed red blood cells (PRBC) and serum – using a phased analysis approach.

This document is provided as a companion document to the urinary biomarker data available through the UK Biobank Showcase.

It is intended to provide basic information on:-

- Assay selection & project scope
- Methods and equipment
- Urinary assay performance characteristics
- Quality system and scope of accreditation

2.0 Assay Selection & Project Scope

Overall, 36 biomarkers were selected for assay in all 500,000 participants, full details of which can be found at <http://www.ukbiobank.ac.uk/uk-biobank-biomarker-panel/>

They were selected for analysis because they represent established risk factors for disease, are established diagnostic measures, or characterise phenotypes not otherwise well assessed.

The project was co-ordinated by the Enhancement Working Group, with input from external experts, where required (listed in Appendix 1 – Expert Advisors).

This document focuses on the urinary biomarkers only.

3.0 Assay Equipment and Information

Table 1 below lists the urine assays conducted together with details of the manufacturer of the assay, the units, principle of measurement and analytical range of the instrument.

| Assay | Assay Manufacturer | Analysis Method | Units of Measurement | Manufacturer's Analytical Range |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------------|
| Microalbumin | Randox Bioscience, UK | Immuno-turbidimetric | mg/L | 6.7 - 200 |
| Enzymatic Creatinine | Beckman Coulter (UK), Ltd | Enzymatic | µmol/L | 88 - 44200 |
| Potassium | Beckman Coulter (UK), Ltd | ISE Ion Selective Electrode | mmol/L | 2 - 200 |
| Sodium | Beckman Coulter (UK), Ltd | ISE Ion Selective Electrode | mmol/L | 10 - 400 |

Table 1: Instrumentation and assays

All tests were carried out on a single Beckman Coulter AU5400 clinical chemistry analyser using the manufacturer's reagents and calibrators except urinary microalbumin which used reagents and calibrators sourced from Randox Bioscience, UK.

The Beckman Coulter AU5400 series clinical chemistry analyser (Figure 1) uses a photometric measurement¹ for the determination of creatinine and microalbumin concentration and a potentiometric² measurement for the determination of sodium and potassium concentration.



Figure 1: Beckman Coulter AU5400 Series Clinical Chemistry Analyser

3.1 Results Outside of the Reportable Range

Each assay was validated against the manufacturer's performance information. Linearity experiments determined the reportable range. For each assay, the observed reportable range covered the manufacturer's analytical range. The manufacturer's analytical ranges for the four assays are listed in Table 1.

Showcase data only includes valid results (results returned by the instrument that are within the reportable range); where a valid result was not obtained, the result field is left empty and an accompanying entry is made in the result flag field indicating the reason for the null result.

Where the reason for the null result is that the returned value is greater than the top of the analytical range, then the result flag comprises the value of the top of the analytical range preceded by a ">".

Similarly where the reason for the null result is that the returned value is less than the bottom of the analytical range, then result flag comprises the value of the bottom of the analytical range preceded by a "<", as shown in Table 2.

¹ Photometric measurements make use of a change in optical density of a fluid (from the reagent blank) to determine the concentration of an analyte

² Potentiometric measurements (via the Ion-Selective Electrode (ISE) module) make use of the electrical potential generated by ions in a sample passing through a crown ether membrane electrode. A membrane potential is developed according to the Nernst Equation for a specific ion from which the ion concentration can be calculated

| Assay | If instrument result is... | Result flag value |
|-------------------------------|--|---------------------|
| Sodium (mmol/L) | Below the bottom of the reportable range | <10 |
| | Above the top of the reportable range | >400 |
| Potassium (mmol/L) | Below the bottom of the reportable range | <2.0 |
| | Above the top of the reportable range | >200 |
| Creatinine (µmol/L) | Below the bottom of the reportable range | <88 |
| | Above the top of the reportable range | >44200 ³ |
| Microalbumin (mg/L) | Below the bottom of the reportable range | <6.7 |
| | Above the top of the reportable range | >200 ⁴ |

Table 2: Result Flags

Additional information:

The analysis method for urinary sodium and potassium involves a pre-dilution of sample step, no further dilution is taken.

The analysis method for urinary microalbumin and creatinine assays allows samples with results exceeding the upper analytical limit of the assay to be diluted and re-analysed. Where a sample has been diluted to produce a result in the analytical range the Showcase data will show a validated result that appears to exceed the analytical range.

4.0 Assay Performance Characteristics

As noted above, each assay method was validated or verified against the manufacturers’ performance information⁵ prior to commencing analysis. In addition, throughout the project detailed quality and method performance protocols were carried out to maintain confidence that the assays were performing to the manufacturers’ specification.

One element of the quality protocol was the bracketing of participant samples with Internal Quality Control (IQC) samples of known high and low concentration. IQC samples were run prior to each batch of participant samples (opening bracket) and after each batch (closing bracket)⁶. Participant results were validated into the dataset if both the opening and closing IQC results were within the set control limits for the analytical process.

³ Refer to additional Information section.

⁴ As footnote 3.

⁵ The performance targets used were those provided by the assay reagent supplier; for the creatinine, sodium and potassium assay methods performance targets were provided Beckman Coulter and for the microalbumin assay method performance targets were provided by Randox Bioscience, UK.

⁶ The batch size maximum was set at 300 samples; typically IQC brackets were run every 100 samples

Table 3 provides information on assay performance, summarising the Coefficients of Variation⁷ (CVs) derived from the IQC data for each assay over the period of the project.

| Biomarker | IQC level | IQC material in the range ⁸ | CV (%) | Comment |
|--------------|-----------|--|--------|--|
| Sodium | Low | 74-77 mmol/L | 0.99 | 3 IQC lots used |
| | High | 166-173 mmol/L | 0.82 | 4 IQC lots used |
| Potassium | Low | 29-30 mmol/L | 1.10 | 3 IQC lots used |
| | High | 79-84 mmol/L | 1.18 | 4 IQC lots used |
| Microalbumin | Low | 21-27 mg/L | 2.08 | 3 IQC lots used; 7 reagent lots used; 8 combinations |
| | High | 51-67 mg/L | 1.85 | 3 IQC lots used; 7 reagent lots used; 9 combinations |
| Creatinine | Low | 6645-7320 µmol/L | 2.09 | 3 IQC lots used; 10 reagent lots used; 11 combinations |
| | High | 16890-17665 µmol/L | 2.10 | 4 IQC lots used; 10 reagent lots used, 12 combinations |

Table 3 – Assay performance of urine methods

Additional information:

Each assay was registered on the WEQAS General Urine Chemistry EQA scheme and assay performance externally verified via the results returned from participation in this scheme.

A sample selection algorithm was implemented to ensure no bias or drift was introduced to the assay as a consequence of the order of sample analysis.

5.0 ISO 17025 Quality Accreditation

The Biomarker Project was run under a strict quality regime. All assays were conducted under systems designed for and consistent with the internationally recognised standard for testing and calibration laboratories - ISO17025.

During the project the UK Biobank laboratories were successfully externally audited against the ISO17025 standard. From the 17th December 2015, the UK Biobank laboratories have accreditation to ISO17025 as a testing laboratory. The urine methods supporting the biomarker project for sodium, potassium and creatinine and microalbumin appear on the scope of accreditation (UKAS accreditation reference: 8975).

⁷ Coefficient of variation is a standardized measure of dispersion of a frequency distribution; it is defined as the ratio of the standard deviation to the mean and is widely used to express the precision and repeatability of an assay. A low CV indicates a well-controlled assay

⁸ For each assay, a number of IQC lots were used; the table presents the range of lot means

Appendix 1 – Expert Advisors

The tables below list (in alphabetical order) the members of the UK Biobank Enhancements Working Group which initiated the project, the Design Phase Expert Group who led on the selection of markers and assays, and the Biomarker Expert Working Group who guided and advised the project during its operational phase.

The UK Biobank project team would like to acknowledge the support and express thanks to all those who contributed their time and expertise to this project.

UK Biobank Enhancements Working Group

| Individuals Name | Organisation |
|---------------------------------|---|
| <i>Chair:</i> Prof Paul Elliott | Imperial College, London |
| Associate Prof Naomi Allen | University of Oxford/UK Biobank |
| Dr Rachael Almond | UK Biobank |
| Prof Sir Rory Collins | University of Oxford/UK Biobank |
| Prof Frank Kelly | Kings College London |
| Dr Tim Peakman | UK Biobank |
| Prof Naveed Sattar | University of Glasgow |
| Prof Augustin Scalbert | International Agency for Research on Cancer, Lyon |
| Dr Simon Sheard | UK Biobank |
| Dr Ioanna Tzoulaki | Imperial College, London |
| Prof Anthony Whetton | University of Manchester |

Previous members: Prof Mark Caulfield (London); Prof John Gallacher (Oxford); Prof Alan Silman (Oxford); Prof Nick Wareham (Cambridge).

Biomarker Expert Working Group

| Individuals Name | Organisation |
|----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Associate Prof Naomi Allen | University of Oxford/UK Biobank |
| Dr Rachael Almond | UK Biobank |
| Mrs Karen Chung | University of Oxford |
| Mr Richard Chung | University of Oxford |
| Mr Daniel Fry | UK Biobank |
| Mr Mark Gordon | UK Biobank |
| Dr Michael Hill | University of Oxford |
| Dr Gareth McClean | University of Oxford |
| Mr Stewart Moffat | UK Biobank |
| Dr Simon Sheard | UK Biobank |
| Mrs Jane Wintour | University of Oxford |

Design Phase Expert Working Group

| Individuals Name | Organisation |
|-------------------------|--|
| Prof Jane Armitage | University of Oxford |
| Prof Peter Burney | Imperial College, London |
| Dr Karen Canfell | University of Sydney, Australia |
| Prof Robert Clarke | University of Oxford |
| Prof John Danesh | University of Cambridge |
| Prof Paul Foster | Moorfields Eye Hospital, London |
| Dr Silvia Franceschi | International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC), Lyon, France |
| Dr Marc Gunter | Imperial College, London (now IARC) |
| Prof Ian Hall | University of Nottingham |
| Dr Anna Hansell | Imperial College, London |
| Prof Nick Harvey | MRC Life-course Epidemiology Unit, University of Southampton |
| Dr Michael Hill | University of Oxford |
| Prof Debbie Jarvis | Imperial College, London |
| Prof Tim Key | University of Oxford |
| Prof Michael Kidd | Flinders University, Adelaide, Australia |
| Prof Dave Leon | London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine, London |
| Prof Gordon Lowe | University of Glasgow |
| Dr Teri Manolio | National Institute of Health, Bethesda, USA |
| Prof Stephen MacMahon | George Institute, University of Sydney/University of Oxford |
| Prof Naveed Sattar | University of Glasgow |
| Prof Liam Smeeth | London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine, London |
| Prof David Strachan | St George's Hospital, London |
| Prof Martin Tobin | University of Leicester |
| Prof Paolo Vineis | Imperial College, London |
| Prof Cyrus Cooper | MRC Life-course Epidemiology Unit, University of Southampton |