		CLINICAL BIO CHEMISTRY
	EQAS- ROOT CAUSE ANALYSIS FORM	

EQAS/ILC Programme or Provider Name : CMC EQAS		
Month & Year: April 2024	Cycle No: ✓	Sample No.: —

1. Date sample received		Received by (sign):	**2.** Dates(s) Analysis performed	13.4.24	Done By (sign):
3. Date results submitted	13.4.24	Submitted by(sign):	**4.** Date results/feedback received	8.5.24	Reviewed By (sign):

DETAILS OF UNACCEPTABLE RESULT :

S.No	Analyte Name	Reported result	Result received (Scores)	Acceptable limits
1.	Cholesterol	55 mg/dL	-3.41	|z| < 3.0

EVALUATION OF POSSIBLE SOURCES OF ERROR

1. Clerical error	**Yes**	**No**	**N A**
Was the correct result / value transcribed from the instrument read out to workbook	✓		
Was the correct result / value transcribed from the workbook to EQAS report	✓		
Do the units of measure match between results form and instrument / your lab's unit	✓		
Is the decimal place correct / misplaced	✓		
Does the result reported by you in the result form match with that in the evaluation report	✓		
2. Procedural errors	**Yes**	**No**	**N A**
Was the written / usual procedure followed	✓		
Were reagents prepared according to procedure	✓		
Were the reagents within the open vial stability period (refer kit in use log)	✓		
Were Internal Quality control results acceptable on day of testing EQAS specimens for level I & II	✓		

		CLINICAL BIO CHEMISTRY
	EQAS- ROOT CAUSE ANALYSIS FORM	

3. Analytical Errors:	Yes	No	N A
Was the calibration for the analyte in question done?	✓		
Was calibration status live or expired?	✓		
Was the most recent calibration result acceptable and within established stability limits at the time of EQAS / PT testing?	✓		
Was calibration done after the lot of reagent in use was put into use?	✓		
If there was a major equipment breakdown / maintenance after last EQAS Was recalibration done	✓		
Are the assay parameters in the equipment are as per product insert of analyte ?	✓		
Was the result unacceptable for the same analyte in the previous 2 cycles of EQAS ?		✓	
Are results for the analyte evenly distributed in previous EQAS cycle	✓		
Is there a trend or bias on review of previous EQAS results?		✓	
Do EQAS results show unacceptable results for same range of value (high, normal, low)		✓	
Were the intended results within the measuring range of instrument /kit?	✓		
Was any dilution done during analysis?		✓	
If dilution was done were results multiplied by dilution factor and sent to EQAS provider?		✓	
4. Instrument Maintenance	**Yes**	**No**	**N A**
Were there any equipment maintenance / breakdown just after EQAS /PT specimen analysis (next 1 week period) that could have affected results? (Review Equipment breakdown log)		✓	
Were there any equipment maintenance / change of critical parts just prior to EQAS /PT specimen processing? (Review Equipment breakdown log)		✓	
Were new reagents used / reagent lot changed just prior or after EQAS /PT specimen processing that could have caused problems because of QC results and calibration expiry ?		✓	
5. PT specimen	**Yes**	**No**	**N A**
Were EQAS /PT samples reconstituted correctly according instructions of EQAS provider? Volume of DW, use of glass pipette, swirling, complete dissolution, storage	✓		
Was the water quality good and checked recently	✓		
Were any special instructions provided by the kit instructions performed as indicated?	✓		
Were the correct tests performed on the correct vial of PT specimen? (if more than 1 PT specimen was provided)	✓		
Were your results graded with the appropriate peer group based on the method reported on the result form sent by you ?	✓		

		CLINICAL BIO CHEMISTRY
	EQAS- ROOT CAUSE ANALYSIS FORM	

If **answer** to any of the **above Questions** was '**NO**' record the **corrective action taken** here:

Random error - May be due to pipetting, training given for proper reconstitution of Eqas sample to Technicians.

Investigated By	1st Review By	2nd Review By
S. Kavitha	G. Kavitha	M.G Thi (Dr. M. Gomathi)
Senior Lab technician	Quality Manager	Lab Director
Date: 10.5.24	Date: 10.5.24.	Date: 10.5.24