Ganesh A. Chavan et al /J. Pharm. Sci. & Res. Vol. 11(11), 2019, 3606-3617

ISSN:0975-1459
Journal of Pharmaceutical Sciences and Research
www.jpsr.pharmainfo.in

Bioanalytical Development Method and Validation

Ganesh A. Chavan [1]*, Siddhata A. Deshmukh [1], Rajendra B. Patil [2], Suvarna S. Vanjari [2]

[1]*Department of Pharmaceutical Quality Assurance, J.S.P.M's Rajarshi Shahu College of Pharmacy and Research, Survey No.80, Tathawade, Pune 411033.*

[2] *Department of Pharmaceutical Chemistry, J.S.P.M's Rajarshi Shahu College of Pharmacy and Research, Survey No.80, Tathawade, Pune 411033.*

Abstract

Bioanalysis is very essential to understand the pharmacokinetic, toxicologic of drug. It also based on the various types of biological techniques and the physico-chemical, it must be validated for the confidence of good result. In this bioanalysis there develop a new method for validation, accuracy, precision, selectivity. It is also very effective to quantitative analysis of analytes. It play very important role in evaluation and interpretation bioequivalence, pharmacokinetic and toxicokinetic studies. There some guidelines for the bioanalysis. These are also following the GLP and GMP. It develops the new method for quantitative analysis of any drug. It also focuses on the validation parameters. Bioanalysis is very important to understand the drug content in plasma, blood, serum or urine.

Keywords: Application, Bioanalytical development method, Specification, Validation Parameters.

INTRODUCTION

The responsibility of analytical findings could be a matter of nice importance in rhetorical and clinical Materia media. Interpretation of pharmacology is rhetorical and clinical Materia Media. Unreliable results won't solely be opposed in court, however might additionally cause unreasonable legal consequences for the litigator or to wrong treatment of the patient. The importance of validation, a minimum of routine analytical ways, will thus hardly be overestimated. This can be very true within the context of quality management and enfranchisement, which became matters of accelerating importance in analytical materia Media within the recent years. This can be additionally mirrored within the increasing needs of peer-reviewed scientific journals regarding technique validation. Therefore, this subject ought to extensively be mentioned on a world level to achieve an accord on the extent of validation experiments and on acceptance criteria for validation parameters of bioanalytical ways in rhetorical (and clinical) materia medica. Within the last decade, similar discussions are occurring within the closely connected field of pharmacokinetic (PK) studies for registration of prescribed drugs. This can be mirrored by the variety of publications on this subject within the last decade, of that the foremost vital area unit mentioned here.[1]

METHOD DEVELOPMENT

For the bioanalytical development method there are many points which covered, that are bioavailability, chemical structure, solubility, stability, pKa. In this method there first sample preparation, sample separation and sample detection are come. The main point of sample preparation is that it should be clean for analysis. High performance of extraction is done for sample preparation.

There are many methods for the bioanalytical development they are as follow

Extraction method

Liquid-liquid extraction

It is used for the extraction of the solvent and the partitioning. It is based on the two different phase such as aqueous phase and the organic phase.the extraction of substance is done via one liquid phase to another liquid phase. In this aqueous sample is plasma, urine, etc which are mixed with the immiscible solvent for remove analyte into the organic phase. From this we get the clean sample.

Solid phase extraction (SPE)

It having high efficiency, cost-effective, high reproducibility, easy to handle that's why it use very widely for the sample preparation. The main advantage of this is that it separate sample very easy manner and clean. solid phase having four parts that are: conditioning, sample loading, washing and elusion.

Protein precipitation (PPT)

Protein precipitation is use for get the protein. Precipitation can be done by the addition of soluble organic solvent, salt, metal ions or changing the pH which can change the solubility of protein. Samples are centrifuged and then evaporate to dry after that dissolve in suitable sample or use HPLC. The main use of it the it can be used for both hydrophilic and hydrophobic compounds.

Micro extraction techniques

The main use of this technique is that we can handle small volume and decrease the solvents.

Chromatographic method

Reference standards

Calibration standard and quality control sample can be analysing the drug and their metabolites with the help of reference standard. The reference standard where use for the sample preparation. The reference standard where we use it should be identified and pure.

Ligand binding assay (LBA)

The parameters and principle which discuss in this that can be used for the LBA.it having some various unique specifications that should be consider during the assay and method validation.

Separation and detection instrumentation

Liquid chromatography-UV (LC-UV)

High performance liquid chromatography is widely used in bioanalysis. HPLC was used for the separation of drugs

and metabolites because it having column which having wide range of selectivity. HPLC-UV was used for the separation and determination of analytes. UV detectors are cost effective that's why it widely used.

NEED OF BIOANALYTICAL METHOD VALIDATION

It is essential to use well-characterized and absolutely valid bioanalytical ways to yield reliable results that may be satisfactorily taken. It is recognized that bioanalytical methods and techniques are constantly undergoing changes and improvements, and in many instances, they are at the cutting edge of the technology. It is conjointly vital to stress that every bioanalytical technique has its own characteristics, which will vary from analyte to analyte. In these instances, specific validation criteria may need to be developed for each analyte. Moreover, the appropriateness of the technique can also be influenced by the last word objective of the study. At the time of sample analysis, it is necessary for validation of the bioanalytical method sample at each site. To establish inters laboratory reliability at different sites the appropriate validation information was provided.[2]

BIOANALYTICAL METHOD DEVELOPMENT AND VALIDATION

The process by that a selected bioanalytical methodology is developed, validated, and used in routine
Sample analysis can be divided into
1. Reference standard preparation.
2. Assay procedure for bioanalytical method development and establishment.
3. An application of validated bioanalytical method to routine drug analysis and acceptance criteria for the analytical run and/or batch.

TERMINOLOGIES:

Validation

It is accepted that in the course of a typical drug development program, an outlined bioanalytical methodology can endure several modifications. These biological process changes [e.g. addition of a matter, lowering of the lower limit of quantification (LLOQ)] need totally different levels of validation to demonstrate continuity of the validity of an assay's performance. Three totally different levels/types of methodology validations, full validation, partial validation, and cross-validation, area unit outlined and characterized as follows.

Full validation

Full validation is important once developing and implementing a bioanalytical methodology for the primary time for a brand-new drug entity. If metabolites area unit additional to an existing assay for quantification, then full validation of the revised assay is important for all analytes measured.[3]

Partial validation

Partial validations area unit modifications of valid bioanalytical strategies that don't essentially need full revalidations. Partial validation will vary from as very little united assay accuracy and exactitude determination to a "nearly" full validation. Typical bioanalytical methodology changes that comprise this class embrace, however aren't restricted to, bioanalytical methodology transfers between laboratories or analysts, instrument and/or computer code platform changes, amendment in species among matrixes (e.g. rat plasma to mouse plasma), changes in the matrix among a species (e.g. human plasma to human urine), amendment in analytical methodology (e.g. amendment in detection systems) and alter in sample processes procedures.

Cross-validation

Cross-validation could be a comparison of two bioanalytical strategies. Cross-validations area unit necessary once 2 or a lot of bioanalytical strategies' area unit accustomed to generate knowledge among a similar study. For instance, an imaginative valid bioanalytical methodology is the "reference" and therefore, the revised bioanalytical methodology is the "Comparator". The comparisons ought to be done each way in which. Cross-validation with a spiked matrix and subject samples ought to be conducted at every website or laboratory to ascertain inter laboratory dependableness once sample analyses among ones study area unit conducted at quite one site, or quite one laboratory, and will be thought-about once knowledge generated exploitation totally different analytical techniques [e.g. LC-MS (Liquid action mass spectroscopy) vs. enzyme-linked immunosorbant assay (ELISA)] in several studies area unit enclosed in an exceedingly restrictive submission.

VALIDATION PARAMETERS

Linearity

Linearity assesses the power of the strategy to get the check results that area unit directly proportional to the concentration of the analyte within the sample. The linear vary of the strategy should be determined despite the part of drug development. Table 1 indicates North American country Food and Drug Administration (FDA) tips for bioanalytical methodology validation. ICH tips advocate evaluating a minimum of 5 concentrations to assess one-dimensionality. The 5 concentrations levels ought to bracket the higher and lower concentration levels evaluated throughout the accuracy study.[4]

• Assay (finished product or drug substance): 80–120% of the sample concentration. This varies should bracket that of the accuracy study, however. If accuracy samples area unit to be ready at eighty, hundred and a hundred and twenty of nominal, then the dimensional vary ought to be expanded to a minimum of 75–125%.
• Content uniformity method: 70–130% of the sample concentration, unless a wider, more appropriate, range is justified based on the nature of the dosage form (e.g., metered dose inhalers).
• Dissolution method: this needs ±20% of the desired varies. In cases wherever dissolution profiles area unit needed, for the dimensional analysis ought to begin below the standard quantity recovered at the initial pull purpose to a 120% of total drug content.
• Impurity method: news level to a 120% of the specification.

Table 1: US FDA guidelines for bioanalytical method validation

• Impurity and assay technique combined: 100 % level commonplaces are employed for quantification; news level of impurity to a hundred and twenty of assay specification.

The dimensional solutions area unit ready by performing arts serial dilutions of one stock solution; instead, every dimensional answer is also on an individual basis weighed. The ensuing active response for every dimensionality answer is planned against the corresponding theoretical concentration. The nonlinear relationship between concentration and response ought on the dimensional plot which can be visually evaluated. An applied mathematics analysis of the regression curve ought to even be performed, evaluating the ensuing correlation, Y intercept, slope of the regression curve and residual total of squares. A plot of the residual values versus theoretical concentrations might also be useful for evaluating the link between concentration and response. In cases wherever individual impurities' area unit out there, it's a decent apply to determine each relative response factors and relative retention times for every impurity, compared to the active compound. Response factors permit the tip user to utilize commonplace material of the active constituent for quantitation of individual impurities, correcting for response variations. This approach saves the tip user the value of maintaining provides of all impurities and simplifies processing. To work out the relative response factors, dimensional curves for every impurity and therefore, the active compound ought to be performed from the established limit of quantitation to close to 2 hundredth of the impurity specification. The relative response issue will be determined based mostly upon the dimensional curve generated for every impurity.

There is a general agreement that a minimum of the subsequent validation parameters ought to be evaluated for quantitative procedures: property, standardization model, stability, precision, accuracy and limit of quantification. Further parameters which ought to be evaluated embody the limit of detection (LOD), recovery, duplicability and huskiness (robustness).[5]

Selectivity (Specificity)

For every section of development, the analytical technique should demonstrate specificity. The tactic should have the flexibility to unambiguously assess the analyte of interest whereas within the presence of all expected parts, which can encompass degradants, excipients/sample matrix, and sample blank peaks. The sample blank peaks could also be attributed to things like reagents or filters used throughout the sample preparation.

For identification tests, discrimination of the tactic ought to be incontestable by getting positive results for samples containing the analyte and negative results for samples not containing the analyte. The tactic should differentiate between the analyte of interest and compounds with analogous chemical structure which will be gifted. For a high performance liquid activity (HPLC) identification check, peak purity analysis ought to be wont to assess the homogeneity of the height akin to the analyte of interest.

For the assay/related substances strategies, the active peak ought to be adequately resolved from all impurity/degrading peaks, placebo peaks, and sample blank peaks. Resolution from impurity peaks might be assessed by analyzing a spiked answer with all legendary accessible impurities gift or by injecting individual impurities and examination retention to it of the active. Placebo and sample matrix parts ought to be analyzed while not the active gift so as to spot attainable interferences.

If syringe filters area unit to be won't to clarify sample solutions, Associate in The nursing aliquot of filtered sample thinner ought to be analysed for potential interferences. If the impurities/degrades area unit unknown or unavailable, forced degradation studies ought to be performed. Forced degradation studies of the active pharmaceutical ingredient (API) and finished product, victimisation either peak purity analysis or a mass spectral analysis, ought to be performed to assess resolution from potential degradant merchandise.[6]

The forced degradation studies ought to encompass exposing the API and finished product to acid, base, peroxide, heat, and light-weight conditions, till adequate degradation of the active has been achieved. A suitable vary with degradation could also be 10–30% however might vary supported the active being degraded. Over degradation of the active ought to be avoided to forestall the formation of secondary degradants. If placebo material is offered. It ought to be stressed below a similar condition and for a similar length because the API or finished product. The degraded placebo samples ought to be evaluated to confirm that any generated degradants area unit resolved from the analyte peak(s) of interest.

Evaluation of the forced degraded solutions by peak purity analysis employing a photodiode array detector or mass spectral analysis should make sure that the active peak doesn't co-elute with any degradation merchandise generated as a result of the forced degradation. Another, a lot of conservative, approach for the assay/related substances strategies is to perform peak purity analysis or mass spectral analysis on all generated degradation peaks and verify that co-elution doesn't occur for those degradant peaks still because of the active peak.

Whereas, the property experiments for the primary approach will be performed throughout a prevalidation section(now would like for quantification), those for the second approach area unit typically performed along with the exactitude and accuracy experiments throughout the most validation section. As now, it should be mentioned that the term specificity is employed interchangeably with property, though during a strict sense specificity refers to strategies, which manufacture a response for one analyte, whereas property refers to strategies that manufacture responses for variety of chemical entities, which can or might not be distinguished. Selective multianalyte strategies (e.g., for various medications of abuse in blood) ought to after all be able to differentiate all attention-grabbing analytes from one another and from the matrix.[7]

Bioanalytical validation method	US FDA guidelines
Selectivity (specificity)	Analyses of blank samples of the appropriate biological matrix (plasma, urine or other matrix) should be obtained from at least six sources. Each blank should be tested for interference and selectivity should be ensure at LLOQ
Accuracy	Should be measured using a minimum of six determination per concentration. Minimum of three concentrations in the range of expected concentration is recommended for determination of accuracy. The mean should be ±15% of the actual value except at LLOQ, where it should not deviate by ±20. This deviation of mean from the true values serves as the measure of accuracy.
Precision	Precision should be measured using a minimum of five determinations per concentration. Minimum of three concentrations in the range of expected concentrations is recommended. The precision determine at each concentration level should not exceed 15% of the CV except for the LLOQ, where it should not exceed 20% of the CV.
Recovery	Recovery experiments should be performed at three concentrations (low, medium and high) with unextracted standard that represent 100% recovery.
Calibration curve	Should consist of a blank sample (matrix sample processed without internal standard), a zero sample (matrix sample processed with internal standard) and six to eight non- zero sample covering the expected range, including LLOQ
LLOQ	Analyte response should be five times response compared to blank response. Analyte peak should be identifiable, discrete and reproducible with precision of 20% and an accuracy of 80-120%.
Freeze-thaw stability	Analyte stability should be determined after three freeze-thaw cycles. At least three aliquots at each of the low and high concentration should be stored at intended storage temperature for 24 h and thawed at room temperature. When completely thawed, refreeze again for 12-24 h under same conditions. This cycles should be repeated two more times, then analyse on third cycle. Standard deviation of error should be <15%. If analyte is unstable, freeze at -70°C for three freeze-thaw cycle
Short term stabilty	Three aliquot of each of the low and high concentration should be thawed at room temperature and kept at this temperature for 4-24 h and analyzed. Percent deviation should be <15%
Long term stability	At least three aliquot of each of the low and high concentrations at same conditions as study samples. Analyze on three separate occasions. Storage time should exceed the time between the date of first sample collection and the date of last sample analysis
Stock-solution stability	Stability of stock solutions of drug and the internal standard should be evaluated at room temperature for at least 6 h. Percent deviation should be <15%
QC samples	QC samples in duplicates at three concentrations (one near the 3× LLOQ, one in mid-range, on close to high end) should be incorporated at each assay run. At least four out of every six should be within 15%of the respective nominal value. Two of the six may be outside of 15% but not both at the same concentration. Minimum number QCs should at least 5% of total number of unknown samples or six total QCs, whichever is greater

Calibration model

The choice of Associate in Nursing acceptable standardization model is critical for reliable quantification. Therefore, the link between the concentration of analyte within the sample, and therefore, the corresponding detector response should be investigated. This could be done by analyzing spiked standardization samples and plotting the ensuing responses versus the corresponding concentrations. The ensuing normal curves would then be more evaluated by graphical or mathematical strategies, the latter additionally permitting applied math analysis of the response functions. Whereas there's a general agreement that standardization sample ought to be ready in blank matrix which their concentrations should cowl the complete standardization vary, recommendations on what percentage concentration levels ought to be studied with what percentage replicates per concentration level take issue considerably. Within the Conference Report II, "a decent variety of standards to outline adequately the link between concentration and response" was demanded. What is more, it had been declared that a minimum of 5 to eight concentrations levels ought to be studied for linear relationships, and it's going to be additional for nonlinear relationships.

However, no info was given on what percentage replicates ought to be analyzed at every level. The rules established by the ICH and people of the Journal of natural action B additionally needed a minimum of 5 concentration levels. However, once more no specific needs for the quantity of replicate set at every level got. Causon counseled six replicates at each of the six concentrations levels, whereas Wieling et al. used eight concentrations levels in triplicate. This approach permits not solely a reliable detection of outliers however additionally a more robust analysis of the behavior of variance across the standardization vary. The latter is vital for selecting the correct applied math model for the analysis of the standardization curve. The customarily used standard statistical method model for

rectilinear regression is simply applicable for homoscedastic information sets (constant variance over the complete range), whereas just in case of hetero scedasticity (significant distinction between variances at lowest and highest concentration levels), the information ought to mathematically be reworked or a weighted statistical method model ought to be applied. Usually, linear models square measure preferred, but, if necessary, employment of nonlinear models isn't solely acceptable however additionally counselled. However, additional concentration levels square measure required for the analysis of nonlinear models than for linear models.[8]

After outliers are purged from the information, and a model has been evaluated visually and/or by, as an example, residual plots, the model work ought to even be tested by acceptable applied math strategies. The work of unweighted regression models (homoscedastic data) will be taken a look at by the analysis of variance (ANOVA) lack-of-fit test. The widespread observe to gauge a standardization model via its coefficients of correlation or determination isn't acceptable from an applied math purpose of reading.

However, one necessary purpose ought to be unbroken in mind once statistically testing the model fit: the upper the exactness of a way, the upper, the chance to discover a statistically vital deviation from the assumed standardization model. Therefore, the Connexion of the deviation from the assumed model should even be taken under consideration. If the accuracy information (bias and precision) square measure at intervals the desired acceptance limits and another standardization model isn't applicable, slight deviations from the assumed model could also be neglected. Once a standardization model has been established, the standardization curves for different validation experiments (precision, bias, stability, etc.) and for routine analysis will be ready with fewer concentration levels and fewer or no replicates.

Accuracy

Accuracy ought to be performed at a minimum of 3 concentrations levels. For drug substance, accuracy can be inferred from generating acceptable results for precision, linearity, and specificity. For assay ways, the spiked placebo samples ought to be ready in triplicate at eighty, 100 and 120%. If the placebo isn't accessible and can't be developed within the laboratory, the burden of drug product is also varied within the sample preparation step of the analytical methodology to prepare samples at the three levels listed above. In this case, the accuracy study will be combined with methodology exactitude where six sample preparations are prepared at the 100% level, while both the 80 and 120% levels are prepared in triplicate. For impurity/related substances ways, it's ideal if normal material is obtainable for the individual impurities. These impurities' area unit spiked directly into sample matrix at noted concentrations, bracketing the specification level for every impurity. This approach can even be applied to accuracy studies for residual solvent ways wherever the precise residual solvents of interest area unit spiked into the merchandise matrix.

If individual impurities are not available, the placebo can be spiked with drug substance or reference standard of the active at impurity levels, and accuracy for the impurities can be inferred by getting acceptable accuracy results from the active spiked placebo samples. Accuracy ought to be performed as a part of late section a pair of and section three methodologies validations. Qualifications, accuracy can be concluding by obtaining accurate data for precision, linearity, and specificity in early phase method.[9] Stability of the compound(s) of interest should be evaluated in sample and standard solutions at typical storage conditions, which may include room temperature and refrigerated conditions. The content of the keep solutions is evaluated at applicable intervals against freshly ready normal solutions. For assay ways, the modification in active content should be controlled tightly to ascertain sample stability. If impurities are to be monitored in the method sample, solutions can be analyzed on multiple days and the change in impurity profiles can be monitored. Generally, absolute changes within the impurity profiles will be wont to establish stability. If an impurity isn't gift within the initial sample (day 0) however seems at level on top of the impurity specification throughout the course of the steadiness analysis, then this indicates that the sample is not stable for that period of storage. In addition, impurities that are initially present and then disappear, or impurities that are initially present and grow greater than 0.1% absolute, are also indications of solution instability.

During the section three validations, resolution stability, at the side of sample preparation and action lustiness, should also be evaluated. For each sample preparation and action lustiness evaluations, the use of experimental design could prove advantageous in identifying any sample preparation parameters or chromatographic parameters that may need to be tightly controlled in the method. For chromatographic robustness, all compounds of interest, including placebo-related and sample blank components, should be present when evaluating the effect of modifying chromatographic parameters. For HPLC impurity methodology, this may include a sample preparation spiked with an available known impurity at their specification level or, alternatively, a forced degraded sample solution can be utilized. The analytical method should be updated to include defined stability of solutions at evaluated storage conditions and any information regarding sample preparation and chromatographic parameters, which need to be tightly controlled. Sample preparation and chromatographic robustness may also be evaluated during method development. During the actual method validation, evaluations do not require repetition.[10]

Establishment of an applicable qualification/validation protocol needs assessment of many factors, including phase of product development, purpose of the method, type of analytical method, and availability of supplies, among others. There are many approaches that can be taken to perform the testing required for various validations elements, and the experimental approach selected is dependent on the factors listed above. As with any analytical methodology, the defined system suitability criteria of the method should be monitored throughout

both method qualification, and method validation, ensuring that the criteria set for the suitability is appropriate and that the method is behaving as anticipated. The accuracy of a technique is tormented by systematic (bias) additionally as random (precision) error parts. This fact has been taken into account in the definition of accuracy as established by International Organization for Standardization (ISO). However, it should be mentioned that accuracy is commonly wont to describe solely the systematic error part that is, in the sense of bias. In the following, the term accuracy is utilized in the sense of bias which can be indicated in brackets.

Bias

According to ISO, bias is the distinction between the expectations of check results associated an accepted reference price. It may consist of more than one systematic error component. Bias will be measured as a % deviation from the accepted reference price. The term exactness expresses the deviation of the {mean price|mean|average|norm} of an oversized series of measurements from the accepted reference value. It can be expressed in terms of bias. Due to the high employment of analyzing such giant series, trueness is usually not determined during method validation, but rather from the results of a great number of quality control samples (QC samples) during routine application.[11]

Precision and repeatability

Repeatability reflects the closeness of agreement of a series of measurements under the same operating conditions over a short interval of time. For a natural process technique, repeatability can be evaluated by performing a minimum of six replicate injections of a single sample solution prepared at the 100% test concentration.

Alternatively, repeatability can be determined by evaluating the precision from a minimum of nine determinations that encompass the specified range of the method. The nine determinations may be composed of triplicate determinations at each of three different concentration levels, one of which would represent the 100% test concentration.

Intermediate preciseness reflects within-laboratory variations like completely different days, different analysts and different equipment's. Intermediate precision testing can consist of two different analysts, each preparing a total of six sample preparations, as per the analytical method. The analysts execute their testing on completely different day's victimization separate instruments and analytical columns.[12]

The use of experimental design for this study could be advantageous because statistical evaluation of the resulting data could identify testing parameters (i.e., brand of HPLC system) that would need to be tightly controlled or specifically addressed in the analytical method. Results from every analyst ought to be evaluated to confirm grade of agreement between the 2 sets of knowledge. Acceptance criteria for intermediate preciseness area unit obsessed with the sort of testing being performed. Typically, for assay methods, the relative standard deviation (RSD) between the two sets of data must be ≤2.0%, while the acceptance criteria for impurities are dependent on the level of impurity and the sensitivity of the method. Intermediate preciseness could also be delayed till full ICH validation that is usually performed throughout late section two or section three of drug development. However, preciseness testing ought to be conducted by one analyst for early section technique qualification.

Reproducibility reflects the precision between analytical testing sites. Each testing website will prepare a complete of six sample preparations, as per the analytical method.

Results area unit evaluated to confirm applied math equivalence among varied testing sites. Acceptance criteria just like those applied to intermediate preciseness conjointly apply to reliableness.

Repeatability expresses the preciseness underneath a similar in operation conditions over a brief interval of your time. Repeatability is also termed intra-assay precision. Repeatability is usually conjointly termed within-run or within-day preciseness.

Intermediate precision

Intermediate precision expresses within-laboratories variations: different days, different analysts, different equipments, etc. The ISO definition used the term "M-factor different intermediate precision", where the M-factor expresses the number of factors (operator, equipment, or time) that differ between successive determinations. Intermediate preciseness is usually conjointly known as between-run, between-day, or inter-assay preciseness.[13]

Reproducibility

Reproducibility expresses the exactitude between laboratories (collaborative studies, sometimes applied to standardization of methodology). Reproducibility solely has got to be studied, if a way is meant to be utilized in totally different laboratories. Unfortunately, some authors conjointly used the term reliability for within-laboratory studies at the amount of intermediate exactitude. This should, however, be avoided in order to prevent confusion.[14] As already mentioned higher than, exactitude and bias will be calculable from the analysis of QC samples beneath such conditions. As each exactitude and bias will vary considerably over the standardisation vary, it's necessary to judge these parameters a minimum of at 3 concentrations levels (low, medium, high).In the Conference Report II, it had been additional outlined that the low QC sample should be at intervals thrice LLOQ. The Journal of Chromatography B requirement is to study precision and bias at two concentrations levels (low and high), whereas in the experimental design proposed by Wieling et al., four concentrations levels (LLOQ, low, medium, high) were studied.[15]

Causon conjointly steered estimating exactitude at four concentrations levels. Several authors have such acceptance limits for exactitude and/or accuracy (bias). The Conference Reports required precision to be within 15% RSD except at the LLOQ where 20% RSD is accepted. The required bias value should be within ±15% which is true value whereas the LLOQ value is ±20%.[16] The requirements subjected to have criticised in the

conference report by Hartmann et al. They terminated from applied math concerns that it's not realistic to use constant acceptance criteria at totally different levels of exactitude (repeatability, reproducibility) as RSD under reproducibility conditions is usually considerably greater than under repeatability conditions. Furthermore, if precision and bias estimates are close to the acceptance limits, the probability to reject an actually acceptable method (b-error) is quite high. Causon constantly planned acceptance limits of V-J Day RSD for exactitude and ±15% for accuracy (bias) for all concentration levels. The guidelines established by the Journal of activity B needed exactitude to be at intervals 100% RSD for the high QC samples and at intervals two-hundredth RSD for the low QC sample. Acceptance criteria for accuracy (bias) weren't such there.

Again, the proposals on what number replicates at every concentration level ought to be analyzed vary significantly.[17] The Conference Reports and Journal of activity B tips needed a minimum of 5 replicates at every concentration level. However, one would assume that these requirements apply to repeatability studies; at least no specific recommendations are given for studies of intermediate precision or reproducibility. Some a lot of sensible approaches to the present downside are delineated by Wieling et al., Causon, and Hartmann et al. In their experimental design, Wieling et al. analyzed three replicates at each of four concentrations levels on each of 5 days.[15] Similar approaches were suggested by Causon (six replicates at each of four concentrations on each of four occasions) and Hartmann et al. (two replicates at every concentration level on every of eight days). All 3 used unidirectional analysis of variance to estimate within-run exactitude (repeatability) and between-run exactitude (intermediate precision).

In the style planned by Hartmann et al., the degrees of freedom for both estimations are most balanced, namely, eight for within-run precision and seven for between-run precision. In the data for authors of the Clinical Chemistry Journal, an experimental design with two replicates per run, two runs per day over 20 days for each concentration level is recommended.

This allows estimation of not only within-run and between-run standard deviations but also within-day, between-day, and total standard deviations, which are in fact all estimations of precision at different levels. However, it seems questionable if the additional information provided by this approach can justify the high workload and costs, compared to the other experimental designs.[18] Bias estimation can impact daily variations of the calibration curve. Hence the data calculated from several calibration curves is based on bias estimation. In the experimental style of Wieling et al., the results for QC samples were calculated via daily calibration curves. Therefore, the means that from these results at the various concentrations level faithfully mirror the common bias of the strategy at the corresponding concentration level. Alternatively, as described in the same paper, the bias can be estimated using confidence limits around the calculated mean values at each concentration. If the calculated confidence interval includes the accepted true value, one can assume the method to be free of bias at a given level of statistical significance. Another way to check the importance of the calculated bias is to perform a t-test against the accepted true worth. However, even strategies exhibiting a statistically important bias will still be acceptable, if the calculated bias lies at intervals antecedently established acceptance limits.[19]

Limits

Lower limit of quantification

The LLOQ is the lowest amount of an analyte in a sample that can be been quantitatively determined with suitable precision and accuracy (bias). Their square measure totally different approaches to the determination of LLOQ.[20]

LLOQ supported exactitude and accuracy (bias) data: this is often most likely the foremost sensible approach and defines the LLOQ because the lowest concentration of a sample that may still be quantified with acceptable precision and accuracy (bias).As per the conference report, the obtaining standard of these two parameters at LLOQ are 20% RSD for precision and ±20% for bias. Only Causon steered V-day RSD for exactitude and ±15% for bias. It ought to be realized, however, that these parameters must be determined using an LLOQ sample independent from the calibration curve. The superiority of this approach is that the estimation of LLOQ based on a similar quantification procedure used for real samples.[21]

LLOQ based on signal to noise ratio (S/N): This approach can only be applied if there is baseline noise, for example, to chromatographic methods. Signal and noise can then be defined as the height of the analyte peak (signal) and the amplitude between the highest and lowest point of the baseline (noise) in a certain area around the analyte peak. For LLOQ, S/N is typically needed to be capable or bigger than ten. The estimation of baseline noise will be quite tough for bioanalytical strategies, if matrix peaks elute close to the analyte peak.

Upper limit of quantification

The higher limit of quantification (ULOQ) is that the most analyte concentration of a sample that may be quantified with acceptable exactitude and accuracy (bias). In general, the ULOQ is identical with the concentration of the very best standardisation normal.[15]

Limit of detection

Quantification below LLOQ is by definition not acceptable. Therefore, below this worth a technique will solely turn out semi-quantitative or qualitative knowledge. However, it can still be important to know the LOD of the method. According to ICH, it is the lowest concentration of an analyte in a sample which can be detected but not necessarily quantified as an exact value. As per the Conference Report II, the bioanalytical procedure can reliably differentiate from background noise with the help of the lower concentration of analyte in a sample.

Stability

The definition in line with Conference Report II was as follows: The chemical stability of associate degree analyte during a given matrix underneath specific conditions for

given time intervals. Stability of the analyte throughout the entire analytical procedure may be a requirement for reliable quantification. Therefore, full validation of a technique should embrace stability experiments for the varied stages of study, together with storage before analysis.[22]

Long-term stability

The stability in the sample matrix should be established under storage conditions, that is, in the same vessels, at the same temperature, and over a period at least as long as the one expected for authentic samples.

Freeze/thaw stability

As samples are often frozen and thawed, for example, for reanalysis, the stability of analyte during several freeze/thaw cycles should also be evaluated. The Conference Reports require a minimum of three cycles at two concentrations in triplicate, which has also been accepted by other authors.

In-process stability

The stability of analyte underneath the conditions of sample preparation (e.g., ambient temperature over time needed for sample preparation) is evaluated here. There is a general agreement that this type of stability should be evaluated to find out if preservatives have to be added to prevent degradation of analyte during sample preparation.[23-24]

Processed sample stability

Instability will occur not solely within the sample matrix however additionally in ready samples. It is so vital to additionally take a look at the soundness of associate degree analyte within the ready samples underneath conditions of study (e.g., autosampler conditions for the expected maximum time of an analytical run). One should also test the stability in prepared samples under storage conditions, for example, refrigerator, in case prepared samples have to be stored prior to analysis.[25]

Recovery

As already mentioned above, recovery is not among the validation parameters regarded as essential by the Conference Reports. Most authors agree that the value for recovery is not important as long as the data for LLOQ, LOD, precision and accuracy (bias) are acceptable. It will be calculated by comparison of the analyte response when sample workup with the response of an answer containing the analyte at the theoretical most concentration. Therefore, absolute recoveries will typically not be determined if the sample workup includes a derivatization step, as the derivatives are usually not available as reference substances. Nevertheless, the guidelines of the Journal of Chromatography be require the determination of the recovery for analyte and internal standard at high and low concentrations. [26]

Ruggedness (Robustness)

Ruggedness is a measure for the susceptibility of a method to small changes that might occur during routine analysis like small changes of pH values, mobile phase composition, temperature, etc. Full validation must not necessarily include ruggedness testing; it can, however, be very helpful during the method development/prevalidation phase, as problems that may occur during validation are often detected in advance. Ruggedness ought to be tested if a technique is meant to be transferred to a different laboratory.[27]

SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATION FOR BIOANALYTICAL METHOD VALIDATION

• There should be minimum six standard points, excluding blanks, using single or duplicate sample in the matrix based the standard curve. The standard curve ought to the cowl the complete varying of expected concentrations. Standard curve matching is set by applying the best model that adequately describes the concentration–response relationship victimisation acceptable coefficient and applied mathematics tests for goodness of fit.

• It can be measured with acceptable accuracy and precision because LLOQ is the lowest concentration of the standard curve. The LLOQ should be established using at least five samples independent of standards and determining the coefficient of variation (CV) and/or appropriate confidence interval. The LLOQ should serve as the lowest concentration on the standard curve and should not be confused with the LOD and/or the low QC sample. The highest commonplace can outline the ULOQ of Associate in nursing analytical methodology.

• The accuracy and precision can be resolute using minimum of five determinations per concentration level (excluding blank samples) for validation of the bioanalytical method.The {worth|mean|average|norm} ought to be at intervals V-day of the theoretical value, except at LLOQ, wherever it shouldn't deviate by over two-hundredth. The exactitude round the mean shouldn't exceed V-day of the CV, apart from LLOQ, wherever it shouldn't exceed two-hundredth of the CV. Other ways of assessing accuracy and exactitude that meet these limits could also be equally acceptable.

• The accuracy and precision with known concentrations of analyte in biological matrix can be decided. This can be accomplished by analysis of replicate sets of analyte samples of known concentration QC samples from the constant biological matrix. At a minimum, three concentrations representing the entire range of the standard curve should be studied: one within 3× the LLOQ (low QC sample), one near the center (middle QC), and one close to the higher boundary of the quality curve (high QC).

• Method validation data and the accuracy and precision determined include all outliers. Outliers can also be reported as calculations of accuracy and precision excluding values that are statistically determined.

• The stability of the analyte in biological matrix at the intended storage temperatures should be established. The influence of the freeze–thaw cycles (a minimum of 3 cycles at 2 concentrations in triplicate) ought to be studied.

• The stability of the analyte in the matrix at ambient temperature should be evaluated over a time period equal to the typical sample preparation, sample handling, and analytical run times.

• In the case of instrument failure reinjection, reproducibility should be reanalysed.

• By using minimum of six independent sources of the similar matrix, the specificity of the assay methodology should be determined.For combined mass spectrum analysis primarily based ways, however, testing six independent matrices for interference may not be important. In the case of LC-MS and LC-MS-MS primarily based procedures, matrix effects should be investigated to ensure that precision, selectivity, and sensitivity will not be compromised. Method property ought to be evaluated throughout methodology development and throughout methodology validation and might continue throughout application of the strategy to actual studying samples.

• The theoretical concentration of analytes which determine acceptance/rejection criteria for spiked, matrix-based calibration standards and validation QC samples. Specific criteria can be set up in advance and achieved for accuracy and precision range of the standards detected, if applicable.[15]

DOCUMENTATION

The validity of Associate in nursing analytical methodology ought to be established and verified by laboratory studies and documentation of successful completion of such studies ought to be provided within the assay validation report. General and specific SOPs(standard operative procedure) and sensible record keeping square measure a necessary a part of a valid analytical methodology. The knowledge generated for bioanalytical methodology institution and also the QCs ought to be documented and obtainable for data audit and examination.

Documentation for submission to the agency should include.

1. Summary information
2. Method development and establishment
3. For routine sample analysis bioanalytical reports of the application method were established.
4. For method development and establishment and/or to routine sample analysis alternative information was relevant.[15]

Summary information

• It involves analytical method validation, partial revalidation, and cross-validation reports. The table should be in chronological sequence and include assay method identification code, type of assay, and the reason for the new method or additional validation (e.g., to lower the limit of quantitation).

•The assay method used for the summary table validation according to list or protocol. The protocol variety, protocol title, assay type, assay method identification code, and bioanalytical report code should be provided.

• A summary table allowing cross-referencing of multiple identification codes should be provided (e.g., when an assay has different codes for the assay method, validation reports, and bioanalytical reports, especially when the sponsor and a contract laboratory assign completely different codes.)

Documentation for method establishment

Documentation for method development and establishment should include:

• An operational description of the analytical method.

• In validation experiments confirmation of purity and identity of drug standards, metabolite standards, and internal standards used.

• A detail explanation of supporting data and stability studies.

• From studies a relevant description of data was collected to evaluate accuracy, precision, recovery, selectivity, limit of quantification, calibration curve.

• Maintenance of record of intra- and inter-assay precision and accuracy.

• During NDA submissions, information about cross-validation study data is done if applicable.

• Legible annotated chromatograms or mass spectrograms, if applicable and

• Any deviations from SOPs, protocols, or (Good Laboratory Practice) GLPs (if applicable), and justifications for deviations.[29]

Application to routine drug analysis

Documentation of the applying of valid bioanalytical strategies to routine drug analysis ought to embrace the subsequent.

• During routine analyses relevant record of purity and identity of drug standards, metabolite standards, and internal standards.

• Summary tables of information regarding sample processing and storage: which include sample identification, collection dates, storage prior to shipment, information on shipment batch and storage prior to analysis. Information ought to embrace dates, times, sample condition, and any deviation from protocols.

• Summary tables of analytical runs during clinical or preclinical samples: may involves assay run identification, date and time of analysis, assay method, analysts, start and stop times, duration, significant instrumentation and material changes, and any potential issues or deviation from the established method.

• Equations used for back-calculation of results.

• Table regarding the calibration curve data to be used to analyse samples and calibration curve **summary data.**

• Summary information on intra- and inter-assay values of QC samples and data on intra- and inter-assay accuracy and precision from calibration curves and QC samples used for accepting the analytical run. QC graphs and trend analyses additionally to data and outline statistics area unit inspired.

• Data tables from analytical runs of clinical or preclinical samples: Tables should include assay run identification, sample identification, raw data and back-calculated results, integration codes, and/or other reporting codes.

• Complete serial chromatograms from 5 to 20% of subjects, with standards and QC samples: For pivotal bioequivalence studies for marketing, chromatograms from 20% of serially selected subjects should be included. In alternative studies, chromatograms from 5% of randomly selected subjects in each study should be included. Subjects whose chromatograms area unit to be

submitted ought to be outlined before the analysis of any clinical samples.

• Reasons for missing samples.

• Documentation for repeat analyses: The initial and repeat analysis results, the reported result, assay run identification, the reason for the repeat analysis, the requestor of the repeat analysis, and the manager authorizing reanalysis were involved in study records. Repeat analysis of a clinical or diagnosing sample ought to be performed solely beneath a predefined SOP.

• Documentation for re-established data: The documentation which involves assay run recognition, the initial and repeat integration results, the requestor of the reintegration, the investigated result and also manager approved reintegration. Reintegration of a clinical or diagnosing sample ought to be performed solely beneath a predefined SOP.

• Deviations from the analysis protocol or SOP, with reasons and justifications for the deviations.[35]

OTHER INFORMATION

Other information applicable to both method development and establishment and/or to routine sample analysis could include: Lists of abbreviations and any additional codes used, including sample condition codes, integration codes, and new codes, reference lists and legible copies of any references.

SOPs or protocols cover the following areas:

• Calibration standard acceptance or rejection criteria

• Calibration curve acceptance or rejection criteria

• Assay and QC sample run acceptance or rejection criteria

• When all unknown samples are assayed in duplicate values of acceptance criteria were reported

•Clinical or preclinical sample codes and bioassay sample code were given under sample code designations.

APPLICATIONS OF VALIDATED METHOD TO ROUTINE DRUG ANALYSIS

Assays of all samples of associate degree analyte in a biological matrix ought to be completed at intervals the fundamental measure that stability information area unit out there. In general, biological samples will be analyzed with one determination while not duplicate or replicate analysis if the assay methodology has acceptable variability as outlined by validation information.

This is true for procedures wherever preciseness and accuracy variabilities habitually fall at intervals acceptable tolerance limits. For a difficult procedure with a labile analyte where high precision and accuracy specifications may be difficult to achieve, duplicate or even triplicate analyses can be performed for a better estimate of analyte.

The following recommendations ought to be noted in applying a bioanalytical methodology to routine drug analysis.

• A minimum of six standard points except blanks should be observed in matrix standard curve, within the range.

• Response function: For the standard curve within the study express the same curve fitting, goodness and weighing during pre-study validation to be considered.

Response operate is decided by applicable applied math tests supported the particular commonplace points throughout every run within the validation. Changes within the response operate the relationship between pre-study validation and routine run validation indicates potential issues.

• For acceptance or declination of the run, the QC samples may use. These QC samples are matrix spiked with analyte.

• System suitability: Specific SOP is used to identify appropriate operation of the system depending on the analyte and techniques used.

• Any essential sample dilutions should be used like matrix (e.g., human to human) which preclude the importance to incorporate actual within-study dilution matrix QC samples.

• Repeat analysis: It is important to establish an SOP or guideline for repeat analysis and acceptance criteria. This SOP or guideline should explain the reasons for repeating sample analysis. Reasons for repeat analyses may embrace repeat analysis of clinical or diagnosing samples for regulative functions, inconsistent replicate analysis, samples outside of the assay range, sample processing errors, equipment failure, poor chromatography, and inconsistent PK data. Reassays ought to be wiped out triplicate if the sample volume permits. The explanation for the repeat analysis and also the news of the repeat analysis ought to be clearly documented.

• Sample data reintegration: For sample data reintegration an SOP or guideline should be developed. This SOP or guideline should explain the reasons for reintegration and how the reintegration is to be performed. The explanation for the reintegration ought to be clearly delineated and documented. Original and reintegration data should be reported.[28]

ACCEPTANCE CRITERIA FOR THE RUN

The following acceptance criteria ought to be thought of for acceptive the analytical run.

• From the spiking stock solution, standards and QC samples can be developed to maintain solution stability and accuracy. A single supply of the matrix may additionally be used, provided selectivity has been verified.

• Standard curve samples, blanks, QCs, and study samples can be considered within the run.

• Placement of standards and QC samples within a run should be designed for the detection of assay drift over the run.

• Matrix-based standard calibration samples: 75% or a minimum of six standards, when back-calculated (including ULOQ), should fall within 15%, except for LLOQ, when it should be 20% of the nominal value. Values falling outside these limits will be discarded, provided they do not change the established model.

• Specific recommendation for method validation should be provided for both the intra-day and intra-run experiment.

• QC samples: QC samples replicated (at least once) at a minimum of three concentrations [one within 3× of the LLOQ (low QC) one in the midrange (middle QC)and one

approaching the high finish of the vary (high QC)] ought to be incorporated into every run.

The results of the QC samples give the premise of acceptive or rejecting the run.

At least sixty-seven (four out of six) of the QC samples ought to be among V-J Day of their several nominal (theoretical) values; thirty-third of the QC samples (not all replicates at a similar concentration) will be outside the V-J Day of the face value. A confidence interval approach yielding comparable accuracy and preciseness is an acceptable different.

• The minimum number of samples (in multiples of three) should be at least 5% of the number of unknown samples or six total QCs, whichever is greater.

• Samples involving multiple analytes should not be rejected based on the data from one analyte failing the acceptance criteria.

• The data from rejected runs need not be documented, but the fact that a run was rejected and the reason for failure should be recorded.[30]

CONCLUSION

In pharmaceutical research and development bioanalysis and the production of pharmacokinetic, toxicokinetic and metabolic data may have an essential role; therefore, it should be in appropriate scientific standard. For this reason and also they ought to satisfy administrative unit necessities, all bioanalytical methods should be properly validated and documented. The lack of a clear experimental and statistical approach for the validation of bioanalytical methods has led scientists in charge of the development of these methods to propose a practical strategy to demonstrate and assess the reliability of chromatographic methods employed in bioanalysis. The aim of this article is to provide simple to use approaches with a correct scientific background to improve the quality of the bioanalytical method development, and validation process. Despite the widespread availability of different bioanalytical procedures for low-molecular weight drug candidates, ligand binding assay remains of critical importance for certain bioanalytical applications in support of drug development such as for the antibody, receptor, etc. This article offers an inspiration regarding that criteria bioanalysis supported immunochemical assay ought to follow to achieve for correct acceptance. These various essential development and validation characteristics for bioanalytical methodologies have been discussed with a view to improve the standard and acceptance in this area of research.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT:

I wish to thank various people for their contribution to this article Mrs .Suvarna Vanjari, Dr.Rajendra Patil, J.S.P.M's Rajarshi Shahu College of Pharmacy and Research,Tathawade, Pune for their valuable support.

REFERENCES

[1] Thompson M, Ellison SL, Wood R. *Harmonized guidelines for single-laboratory validation of methods of analysis (IUPAC Technical Report).* Pure and Applied Chemistry. 2002 Jan 1;74(5):835-55.

[2] Wood R. *How to validate analytical methods.* TrAC Trends in Analytical Chemistry. 1999 Sep 1;18(9-10):624-32.

[3] McDowall RD. *The role of laboratory information management systems (LIMS) in analytical method validation.* Analytica chimica acta. 1999 May 31;391(2):149-58.

[4] Badola A, Joshi P, Kothiyal P. *International Journal of Trend in Scientific Research and Development (IJTSRD).*

[5] Pulido A, Ruisánchez I, Boqué R, Rius FX. *Uncertainty of results in routine qualitative analysis.* TrAC Trends in Analytical Chemistry. 2003 Oct 1;22(9):647-54.

[6] Kallner A. *Quality specifications based on the uncertainty of measurement.* Scandinavian journal of clinical and laboratory investigation. 1999 Jan 1;59(7):513-6.

[7] Jhang JS, Chang CC, Fink DJ, Kroll MH. *Evaluation of linearity in the clinical laboratory.* Archives of pathology & laboratory medicine. 2004 Jan;128(1):44-8.

[8] Mark H. *Application of an improved procedure for testing the linearity of analytical methods to pharmaceutical analysis.* Journal of pharmaceutical and biomedical analysis. 2003 Sep 15;33(1):7-20.

[9] Geetha G, Raju KN, Kumar BV, Raja MG. *Analytical method validation: an updated.* Review. Int. J. Pharm. Biol. Sci. 2012;1:64-71.

[10] Valcárcel M, Cárdenas S, Gallego M. *Sample screening systems in analytical chemistry.* TrAC Trends in Analytical Chemistry. 1999 Nov 1;18(11):685-94.

[11] Ye C, Liu J, Ren F, Okafo N. *Design of experiment and data analysis by JMP®(SAS institute) in analytical method validation.* Journal of pharmaceutical and biomedical analysis. 2000 Aug 15;23(2-3):581-9.

[12] Nowatzke W, Woolf E. *Best practices during bioanalytical method validation for the characterization of assay reagents and the evaluation of analyte stability in assay standards, quality controls, and study samples.* The AAPS journal. 2007 Jun 1;9(2):E117-22.

[13] Braggio S, Barnaby RJ, Grossi P, Cugola M. *A strategy for validation of bioanalytical methods.* Journal of pharmaceutical and biomedical analysis. 1996 Feb 1;14(4):375-88.

[14] James CA, Breda M, Frigerio E. *Bioanalytical method validation: a risk-based approach?.* Journal of pharmaceutical and biomedical analysis. 2004 Jun 29;35(4):887-93.

[15] Tiwari G, Tiwari R. *Bioanalytical method validation: An updated review.* Pharmaceutical methods. 2010 Oct 1;1(1):25-38.

[16] Boulanger B, Chiap P, Dewe W, Crommen J, Hubert P. *An analysis of the SFSTP guide on validation of chromatographic bioanalytical methods: progresses and limitations.* Journal of pharmaceutical and biomedical analysis. 2003 Aug 8;32(4-5):753-65.

[17] Causon R. *Validation of chromatographic methods in biomedical analysis viewpoint and discussion.* Journal of Chromatography B: Biomedical Sciences and Applications. 1997 Feb 7;689(1):175-80.

[18] Hubert P, Chiap P, Crommen J, Boulanger B, Chapuzet E, Mercier N, Bervoas-Martin S, Chevalier P, Grandjean D, Lagorce P, Lallier M. *The SFSTP guide on the validation of chromatographic methods for drug bioanalysis: from the Washington Conference to the laboratory.* Analytica Chimica Acta. 1999 May 31;391(2):135-48.

[19] Wille SM, Peters FT, Di Fazio V, Samyn N. *Practical aspects concerning validation and quality control for forensic and clinical bioanalytical quantitative methods.* Accreditation and Quality Assurance. 2011 Jun 1;16(6):279.

[20] Zhou S, Song Q, Tang Y, Naidong W. *Critical review of development, validation, and transfer for high throughput bioanalytical LC-MS/MS methods.* Current pharmaceutical analysis. 2005 Jan 1;1(1):3-14.

[21] Kelley M, DeSilva B. *Key elements of bioanalytical method validation for macromolecules.* The AAPS journal. 2007 Jun 1;9(2):E156-63.

[22] Binscheck T, Meyer H, Wellhöner HH. *High-performance liquid chromatographic assay for the measurement of azathioprine in human serum samples.* Journal of chromatography B: Biomedical sciences and Applications. 1996 Jan 26;675(2):287-94.

[23] Kees F, Jehnich D, Grobecker H. *Simultaneous determination of acetylsalicylic acid and salicylic acid in human plasma by high-performance liquid chromatography.* Journal of chromatography B: Biomedical sciences and applications. 1996 Feb 23;677(1):172-7.

[24] Xu RN, Fan L, Rieser MJ, El-Shourbagy TA. *Recent advances in high-throughput quantitative bioanalysis by LC–MS/MS.* Journal of pharmaceutical and biomedical analysis. 2007 Jun 28;44(2):342-55.

[25] Gao L, Li J, Kasserra C, Song Q, Arjomand A, Hesk D, Chowdhury SK. *Precision and accuracy in the quantitative analysis of biological samples by accelerator mass spectrometry: application in microdose absolute bioavailability studies.* Analytical chemistry. 2011 Jun 20;83(14):5607-16.

[26] FDA F. *Guidance for industry: bioanalytical method validation.* http://www. fda. gov/cder/Guidance/4252fnl. pdf. 2001.

[27] Nováková L, Vlčková H. *A review of current trends and advances in modern bio-analytical methods: chromatography and sample preparation.* Analytica chimica acta. 2009 Dec 10;656(1-2):8-35.

[28] Behnisch PA, Hosoe K, Sakai SI. *Bioanalytical screening methods for dioxins and dioxin-like compounds—a review of bioassay/biomarker technology.* Environment International. 2001 Nov 1;27(5):413-39.

[29] Shah VP, Midha KK, Findlay JW, Hill HM, Hulse JD, McGilveray IJ, McKay G, Miller KJ, Patnaik RN, Powell ML, Tonelli A. *Bioanalytical method validation—a revisit with a decade of progress.* Pharmaceutical research. 2000 Dec 1;17(12):1551-7.

[30] Rodbard D, Feldman Y, Jaffe ML, Miles LE. *Kinetics of two-site immunoradiometric ('sandwich') assays—II: Studies on the nature of the-high-dose hook effect.* Immunochemistry. 1978 Feb 1;15(2):77-82.