Evaluation of POC measuring systems for Glucose and HbA1c in the hands of the intended users – a Scandinavian cooperation



A. Stavelin¹, E. Eriksson Boija², C. Morken¹, D.K. Kur³, G. Henriksen³, A. Karlsson², S. Ekehaug¹, G. Gidske¹, S. Sandberg¹

¹Noklus, Haraldsplass Deaconess Hospital, Bergen, Norway, ²Equalis AB, Uppsala, Sweden, ³DEKS, Rigshospitalet Glostrup, Denmark

BACKGROUND - AIM

Scandinavian evaluation of laboratory equipment for point of care testing (SKUP) is a cooperation between Equalis (Sweden), DEKS (Denmark) and Noklus (Norway). SKUP provides objective and supplier-independent information about analytical quality and user-friendliness of point-of-care (POC) measuring systems. The reports are valuable tools when selecting fit-for-purpose POC equipment. We present here an overview of the performance of ten POC glucose and five POC HbA1c measuring systems when operated by the intended users.

METHODS

The evaluations were conducted according to a standard protocol, both by experienced lab personnel and under real-life conditions; the measurements on the POC systems for self-monitoring of blood glucose (SMBG) were conducted by lay persons with diabetes, whereas the POC HbA1c measurements were performed in primary healthcare. Native samples from 100 (glucose) and 180 (HbA1c) patients were analysed in each evaluation, and the POC results were compared with a selected comparison method. The POC measuring systems were assessed against pre-defined analytical performance specifications (APSs) for imprecision and accuracy. The user-friendliness was assessed by the intended users, persons with diabetes and healthcare personnel, respectively.

RESULTS

Table 1. Results overview of **SMBG** evaluated against the updated APSs (ISO 15197:2013) and the previous APSs (ISO 15197:2003).

| Evaluated against updated APSs | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|------------------------|--------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------|
| SMBG system | Manufacturer | SKUP evaluation | Measurements performed by | Fulfilling APS for imprecision | Fulfilling APS for accuracy | User- friendliness |
| Actiste | Brighter AB | 2021/120 | BLSs | No | No | Unsatisfactory |
| | | | People with diabetes | No | No | |
| Accu-Chek Instant | Roche Diagnostics | 2017/113 | BLSs | Yes | Yes | Satisfactory |
| | | | People with diabetes | No | Yes | |
| Accu-Chek | Docho | | BLSs | Yes | Yes | Satisfactory |
| Guide | Diagnostics | 2017/112 | People with diabetes | Yes | Yes | |
| Accu-Chek Aviva | Roche Diagnostics | 2014/105 | BLSs | Yes | Yes | Satisfactory |
| | | | People with diabetes | Inconclusive | Yes | |
| mylife Unio | Bionime Corporation | 2013/100 | BLSs | Yes | Yes | Satisfactory |
| | | | People with diabetes | Yes | Yes | |

| Evaluated against previous APS | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|--|
| SMBG system | Manufacturer | SKUP evaluation | Measurements performed by | Fulfilling APS for imprecision | Fulfilling APS for accuracy | User- friendliness | |
| Accu-Chek Mobile | Roche Diagnostics | 2013/99** | BLSs | Yes | Yes | Evaluated in SKUP/2009/74 | |
| Mendor Discreet | Mendor Oy | 2012/95 | BLSs | Yes | Yes | Inconclusive | |
| | | | People with diabetes | Inconclusive | Yes | | |
| Contour XT | Bayer Healthcare | 2012/94 | BLSs | Yes | Yes | Satisfactory | |
| | | | People with diabetes | Yes | Yes | | |
| Accu-Chek Performa | Roche Diagnostics | 2011/933 | BLSs | Yes | Yes | Satisfactory | |
| OneTouch Verio | LifeScan, Johnson & Johnson | 2011/86 | BLSs | Yes | Yes | | |
| | | | People with diabetes | Yes | Yes | Inconclusive | |

Table 2. Results overview of **POC HbA1c** evaluated against various APSs. Note that the results are not directly comparable between all evaluations as the APSs have been updated over the years.

| HbA1c system | Manufacturer | SKUP evaluation | Measurements performed by | Fulfilling APS for imprecision | Fulfilling APS for accuracy | User- friendliness |
|--------------------------------|---|--------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Atellica DCA | Siemens Healthcare Diagnostics, Inc. | 2025/121 | BLSs Personnel in | Inconclusive Inconclusive | No No | Satisfactory |
| cobas b 101 HbA1c | Roche Diagnostics | 2022/129 | PHCC Personnel in PHCC | Yes | No | Inconclusive |
| Afinion 2 Analyzer HbA1c | Abbott Diagnostics Technologies | 2021/126 | BLSs Personnel in | Yes | Yes | Satisfactory |
| cobas b 101 HbA1c | Roche Diagnostics | 2020/117 | PHCC BLSs Personnel in | Inconclusive Yes | No No | Satisfactory |
| InnovaStar | <u>DiaSys</u> Diagnostic | 2014/101 | PHCC BLSs | Yes | No | Satisfactory |
| analyzer Quo-Test | Systems Quotient | , | Personnel in PHCC BLSs | Inconclusive Inconclusive | No Yes | |
| A1c | Diagnostics Ltd | 2012/91 | Personnel in PHCC | Inconclusive | Yes | Satisfactory |

BLS; Biomedical Laboratory Scientist, PHCC; Primary Health Care Centre, SMBG; Self-monitoring of blood glucose, APS; Analytical Performance Specification

Glucose:

Of the ten SMBG, only Actiste did not fulfill the APSs for imprecision and accuracy. Actiste was also the only system rated as unsatisfactory on user-friendliness, while no clear conclusion could be reached for Mendor Discreet and OneTouch Verio.

HbA1c:

Of the five POC systems, only the Afinion 2 Analyzer fulfilled the APSs for both imprecision and accuracy. Atellica DCA, cobas b 101 HbA1c and InnovaStar Analyzer did not meet the accuracy criterion, whereas Quo-Test was inconclusive for imprecision. All POC systems were rated satisfactory on user-friendliness, except cobas b 101 where it was difficult to reach a conclusion.

CONCLUSION – WHY SKUP IS IMPORTANT

SKUP performs comprehensive evaluations of POC measuring systems under real-life conditions. The reports are valuable tools in selecting the appropriate equipment and can thus contribute to improved patient care.



