# CHRISTIAN MEDICAL COLLEGE

DEPARTMENT OF CLINICAL BIOCHEMISTRY

CMC EXTERNAL QUALITY ASSURANCE SCHEME

MONTHLY SUMMARY REPORT - NOVEMBER 2023

PC-1024

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Lab Name | MEDRAY CLINICS PVT LTD | Lab No | 17475 |
| Constituent Group | Chemistry I | Date of Result Entered : | 20/11/2023 |
| PT item | Lyophilized human serum based | Date of Report Published : | 05/12/2023 |

| Sl.No | Analyte | Method / Principle Name | Analyzer Name | No of Participants | DV | Participants CV | Participants SD | Your Value | SDI | U |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | GLUCOSE | GOD-POD | Any Analyser (Automation / Semi Automation ) | 1139 | 93.46 | 6.69 | 6.25 | 88 mg/dL | -0.87 | 0.37 |
| 2 | UREA | Urease UV / GLDH | Any Analyser (Automation / Semi Automation ) | 711 | 91.14 | 8.85 | 8.06 | 109.4 mg/dL | 2.26 | 0.60 |
| 3 | CREATININE | Jaffes End point | Any Analyser (Automation / Semi Automation ) | 338 | 1.11 | 12.49 | 0.14 | 1.35 mg/dL | 1.73 | 0.02 |
| 4 | T.BILIRUBIN | Diazonium salt ( Colorimetric ) / Jendrassik | Any Analyser (Automation / Semi Automation ) | 998 | 7.38 | 12.06 | 0.89 | 7.76 mg/dL | 0.43 | 0.06 |
| 5 | T-PROTEIN | Biuret - Colorimetric | Any Analyser (Automation / Semi Automation ) | 1156 | 4.13 | 10.84 | 0.45 | 4.03 g/dL | -0.22 | 0.03 |
| 6 | ALBUMIN | BCG - colorimetric | Any Analyser (Automation / Semi Automation ) | 823 | 2.55 | 9.64 | 0.25 | 2.57 g/dL | 0.08 | 0.02 |
| 7 | CALCIUM | Arsenazo III | Any Analyser (Automation / Semi Automation ) | 938 | 8.17 | 7.36 | 0.60 | 10.2 mg/dL | 3.38 | 0.04 |
| 8 | URIC ACID | Enzymatic / Uricase Colorimetric | Any Analyser (Automation / Semi Automation ) | 1000 | 3.67 | 15.36 | 0.56 | 4.02 mg/dL | 0.62 | 0.04 |
| 9 | CHOLESTEROL | CHOD-PAP | Any Analyser (Automation / Semi Automation ) | 1071 | 73.71 | 10.36 | 7.64 | 80.45 mg/dL | 0.88 | 0.47 |
| 10 | TRIGLYCERIDE | GPO-PAP / Enzymatic Colorimetric / End Point | Any Analyser (Automation / Semi Automation ) | 1070 | 166.27 | 7.19 | 11.95 | 166.49 mg/dL | 0.02 | 0.73 |
| 11 | HDL | Direct method / Enzymatic colorimetric | Any Analyser (Automation / Semi Automation ) | 836 | 20.98 | 13.04 | 2.74 | 23.1 mg/dL | 0.77 | 0.19 |
| 12 | AST | UV kinetic(with & without PLP (P-5-P)) | Any Analyser (Automation / Semi Automation ) | 1140 | 111.95 | 13.93 | 15.59 | 128 U/L | 1.03 | 0.92 |
| 13 | ALT | UV kinetic(with & without PLP (P-5-P)) | Any Analyser (Automation / Semi Automation ) | 1129 | 29.54 | 15.14 | 4.47 | 38.2 U/L | 1.94 | 0.27 |
| 14 | ALP | PNP AMP kinetic | Any Analyser (Automation / Semi Automation ) | 936 | 105.34 | 11.90 | 12.53 | 152.2 U/L | 3.74 | 0.82 |

| SDI Range | Interpretation |
|---|---|
| Within -1.00 to +1.00 | Excellent. |
| Within ±1.01 to ±2.00 | Good. |
| Within ±2.01 to ±2.99 | Accept with caution. Warning Signal. |
| Beyond ±3.0 | Unacceptable performance. Action Signal. |

LAB ADDRESS :
MEDRAY CLINICS PVT LTD
NO.962, 12TH MAIN ROAD, NEAR RELIANCE DIGITAL HALL 2ND STAGE, INDIRA NAGAR
BANGALORE
KARNATAKA560008

External Quality Assurance Scheme - Print Monthly Summary

Pamela Christudoss

Coordinator Contact Details:
Email:clinqc@cmcvellore.ac.in
Contact Number: 0416-2283102

Dr. Pamela Christudoss
CMC EQAS Coordinator
Christian Medical College, Vellore

Homogeneity and Stability of the sample is passed.
Data in CMC EQAS reports is confidential
CMC EQAS does not sub contract any components
******* End of Report ******

Repeated

# MEDRAY DIAGNOSTICS
## INDIRANAGAR

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| No.:16 | Sample ID:EQAS REPEAT NOV | Bed No.: | Sample Type:Serum |
| | Gender:Male | Age: | |
| rtment: | Doctor: | Diagnosis: | Case No.: |
| rk: | | | |

Register Date:02-01-2024 17:04:08

| No. | Test Name | Result | Hint | Unit | Reference range |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | [CAL1]Calcium | 7.99 | H | mg/dl | 0.00~1.00 |
| 2 | [ALP1]ALP | 123.4 | | U/L | 40.0~406.0 |

Checker:admin Examiner: BANGALORE Report Date:06-12-2023 17:28:0

A

# Investigation checklist/Form

**Survey information:** _____

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Survey Name | EQAS | Analyzer name/Model | AUTOCHEM XPERT |
| Date survey received | Aug-23 | Date of analysis performed | 20-11-2023 |
| Date survey result submitted | 20-11-2023 | Date of report receipt | 20-12-2023 |
| Investigation performed by | | Date of evaluation | 05-12-2023 |

**Unacceptable parameter Name:** **Date of retesting:**

| Specimen | Analyte | Reported value | Repeated value | Intended/peer group value |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| EQAS Sample | Calcium | 10.2 | 7.99 | 8.17 |

**Root cause Analysis**

| | Yes | No | NA |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Clerical** | | | |
| 1. Was the results correctly transcribed from instrument readout or report? | ✓ | | |
| 2. Was the correct instrument /method reagent reported on the result form? | ✓ | | |
| 3. Does the result reported on the result form match the result found on the proficiency testing evaluation report ? | ✓ | | |
| **Procedural** | | | |
| 1. Was the written procedure followed? | ✓ | | |
| 2. Were the reagents within their open stability limit during analysis? | ✓ | | |
| 3. Were Quality Control results acceptable and without bias? | ✓ | | |
| 4. Were dilutions performed correctly? | ✓ | | |
| **Analytical** | | | |
| 1. Was the most recent calibration acceptable and within established limits at the time of testing? | ✓ | | |
| 2. Does a review of the past proficiency testing results indicate evenly distributed data without bias? | ✓ | | |
| 3. Was the intended result within measuring range for the instrument? | ✓ | | |
| 4. Was instrument maintenance performed on schedule? | ✓ | | |
| 5. Does a review of records indicate that there were no related instrument test problems noted prior to or after the proficiency testing as performed? | ✓ | | |
| **PT /EQAS material** | | | |
| 1. Was proficiency testing material received in the laboratory within an appropriate time after shipment? | ✓ | | |
| 2. Was proficiency testing material received at the appropriate temperature? | ✓ | | |
| 3. Were results graded in the appropriate peer group based on the method reported on the result form? | ✓ | | |

**Conclusion /Summary:**

**Type of error**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Method related | | Survey evaluation problem | |
| Technical process related | | Other (define below) | ✓ |
| Clerical | | | |

**Preventive actions (If any)** After calbiration again sample conf process.

**Review and approval:**

A. [signature]

6-12-2023.

# Investigation checklist/Form

**Survey information:** _____

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Survey Name** | EQAS | **Analyzer name/Model** | AVIO CHEM 1PERT |
| **Date survey received** | Aug-23 | **Date of analysis performed** | 20-11-2023 |
| **Date survey result submitted** | 20-11-2023 | **Date of report receipt** | 20-11-2023 |
| **Investigation performed by** | | **Date of evaluation** | 05-12-2023 |

**Unacceptable parameter Name:** **Date of retesting:**

| Specimen | Analyte | Reported value | Repeated value | Intended/peer group value |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| EQAS SAMPLE | ALP | 152.2 | 123.4 | 105.3 |

| Root cause Analysis | Yes | No | NA |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Clerical** | | | |
| 1. Was the results correctly transcribed from instrument readout or report? | ✓ | | |
| 2. Was the correct instrument /method reagent reported on the result form? | ✓ | | |
| 3. Does the result reported on the result form match the result found on the proficiency testing evaluation report ? | ✓ | | |
| **Procedural** | | | |
| 1. Was the written procedure followed? | ✓ | | |
| 2. Were the reagents within their open stability limit during analysis? | ✓ | | |
| 3. Were Quality Control results acceptable and without bias? | ✓ | | |
| 4. Were dilutions performed correctly? | ✓ | | |
| **Analytical** | | | |
| 1. Was the most recent calibration acceptable and within established limits at the time of testing? | ✓ | | |
| 2. Does a review of the past proficiency testing results indicate evenly distributed data without bias? | ✓ | | |
| 3. Was the intended result within measuring range for the instrument? | ✓ | | |
| 4. Was instrument maintenance performed on schedule? | ✓ | | |
| 5. Does a review of records indicate that there were no related instrument test problems noted prior to or after the proficiency testing as performed? | ✓ | | |
| **PT /EQAS material** | | | |
| 1. Was proficiency testing material received in the laboratory within an appropriate time after shipment? | ✓ | | |
| 2. Was proficiency testing material received at the appropriate temperature? | ✓ | | |
| 3. Were results graded in the appropriate peer group based on the method reported on the result form? | ✓ | | |

**Conclusion /Summary:**

**Type of error**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Method related** | | **Survey evaluation problem** | |
| **Technical process related** | | **Other (define below)** | ✓ |
| **Clerical** | | | |

**Preventive actions (If any)** After calbiration again Sample was repeated.

**Review and approval:**

6-12-2023