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## Evaluation Summary

The study conducted at Spectrum Health Systems consisted of a side-by-side comparative analysis of the CardioChek ${ }^{\circledR}$ PA analyzer using PTS Panels ${ }^{\circledR}$ Lipid Panel test strips and Glucose test strips (CardioChek PA test system), compared with the Beckman Coulter AU5400 Clinical Chemistry System and the Roche Integra. The CardioChek PA test system was also compared to one other point-of-care device, the Alere Cholestech LDX ${ }^{\text {® }}$ System. Twenty-one (21) subjects participated in this system evaluation. The results of the individual subjects were analyzed using linear regression analysis and bias estimates. These statistical analyses demonstrate the expected statistical equivalence of the CardioChek PA test system and the reference systems. In addition, the individual results from each donor were assessed as to the degree of agreement in the assignment of heart disease risk using Framingham risk classification. In this analysis, the CardioChek PA test system produced clinically equivalent results to the reference lab results. These combined analyses demonstrate that the CardioChek PA test system may be employed with confidence in this clinical setting.
At the test site, the venous blood was collected by a Polymer Technology Systems, Inc. (PTS) phlebotomist. One (1) lithium heparinized anti-coagulated (green top) tube and one (1) serum clot tube (red top) were collected per participant. An initial fingerstick (fs) sample was collected by a Spectrum Health employee, using a $40 \mu \mathrm{l}$ lithium heparinized glass tube, and analyzed on the Alere Cholestech LDX System. A second fingerstick sample was collected by a PTS technician, using a $40 \mu \mathrm{l}$ and a $15 \mu \mathrm{l}$ lithium heparinized glass tube, and analyzed on two CCPA analyzers. Each venous sample was tested on the CCPA analyzers within thirty (30) minutes of collection. The red top clot tube was allowed to clot for thirty (30) minutes, then immediately centrifuged, and the serum aliquoted into two (2) separate aliquot tubes. The first serum aliquot was transported by courier to Quest Laboratories to be analyzed on the Beckman Coulter AU5400 Clinical Chemistry System. The second serum aliquot was transported directly to PTS and analyzed on the Roche Integra.

## Results

The following graphs and tables show the detailed analyses of the relationship of the results from the CardioChek PA test system (CCPA), the Alere Cholestech LDX System (LDX), the Roche Integra (Integra), and the Beckman Coulter AU5400 Clinical Chemistry System (AU5400).

These analyses indicate that the CCPA and LDX test systems produce clinically equivalent results when compared to the laboratory reference analyzers. The linear regression data shows a strong correlation between the POCT methods and the reference laboratory methods for all analytes tested. Further, the risk classification tables indicate that the CCPA and LDX test systems are clinically equivalent to testing performed within a reference laboratory for all analytes, and accurately places a patient within the appropriate health risk category when compared to that reference method.

Actual paired \% differences with the Integra analyzer ((Comparator Result - Integra Lab Result) $\div$ Integra Lab Result) for venous samples for Total Cholesterol averaged $0.4 \%$ for the CCPA and $0.3 \%$ for the AU5400. The HDL Cholesterol averaged $2.0 \%$ for the CCPA and $3.1 \%$ for the AU5400. The Triglycerides averaged $8.6 \%$ for the CCPA and $8.0 \%$ for the AU5400. The Glucose averaged $-1.6 \%$ for the CCPA and $0.7 \%$ for the AU5400. For the fingerstick samples, the Total Cholesterol was $-3.0 \%$ for the CCPA and $-0.7 \%$ for the LDX. The HDL Cholesterol was $-2.3 \%$ for the CCPA and $-0.4 \%$ for the LDX. The Triglycerides were $17.3 \%$ for the CCPA and $11.2 \%$ for the LDX. The Glucose was $-1.0 \%$ for the CCPA and $-4.4 \%$ for the LDX.

Actual paired \% differences with the AU5400 analyzer ((Comparator Result - AU5400 Lab Result) $\div$ AU5400 Lab Result) for venous samples for Total Cholesterol averaged $0.0 \%$ for the CCPA, HDL Cholesterol averaged $-1.0 \%$ for the CCPA, Triglycerides averaged $2.0 \%$ for the CCPA, and Glucose averaged $-2.1 \%$ for the CCPA. For the fingerstick samples, the Total Cholesterol was $-3.3 \%$ for the CCPA and $-1.0 \%$ for the LDX. The HDL Cholesterol was $-5.0 \%$ for the CCPA and $-3.3 \%$ for the LDX. The Triglycerides were $10.0 \%$ for the CCPA and $4.8 \%$ for the LDX. The Glucose was $-1.6 \%$ for the CCPA and $-4.8 \%$ for the LDX.

The calculated average biases (based upon the linear regression analyses) for the venous samples at the clinical decision points versus the Integra analyzer were $0.2 \%$ for Total Cholesterol, $2.2 \%$ for HDL Cholesterol, and $4.9 \%$ for Triglycerides on the AU5400. For the CCPA, the calculated average biases were $1.3 \%$ for Total Cholesterol, $3.5 \%$ for HDL Cholesterol, and $0.5 \%$ for Triglycerides. The calculated biases for the fingerstick samples were $-2.4 \%$ for Total Cholesterol, $1.2 \%$ for HDL Cholesterol, and 7.6\% for Triglycerides for the CCPA. The fingerstick calculated biases for the LDX were $-1.4 \%$ for Total Cholesterol, $-1.7 \%$ for HDL Cholesterol, and 6.4\% for Triglycerides.

The calculated average biases (based upon the linear regression analyses) for the venous samples at the clinical decision points versus the AU5400 analyzer were $1.1 \%$ for Total Cholesterol, $3.7 \%$ for HDL Cholesterol, and $-4.2 \%$ for Triglycerides on the CCPA. The calculated biases for the fingerstick samples were $-2.5 \%$ for Total Cholesterol, $0.7 \%$ for HDL Cholesterol, and $2.5 \%$ for Triglycerides for the CCPA. The fingerstick calculated biases for the LDX were $-1.6 \%$ for Total Cholesterol, $-1.6 \%$ for HDL Cholesterol, and $1.1 \%$ for Triglycerides.

Linear regression analyses of Glucose were not possible due to all participant data falling within a single risk category, which did not allow data to be calculated with statistical meaning.
Precision analyses were performed by testing ten (10) replicates of three (3) samples for each analyte using PTS Panels ${ }^{\circledR}$ Lipid Panel test strips and Glucose test strips.

## Statistical Analysis Summary

The summary of the linear regression and predicted bias data is shown below. The regression statistics are displayed for each individual instrument used. These data are then used to calculate the predicted biases for each analyte at specific clinical decision values. Note that the predicted biases can only be determined if there are sufficient data in the relevant range.

| Total Cholesterol |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| vs Integra | AU5400 | CCPA V1 | CCPA V2 | CCPA FS | LDX FS |
| N | 21 | 21 | 21 | 21 | 21 |
| slope | 0.99 | 1.06 | 1.09 | 1.02 | 0.92 |
| intercept | 2.4 | -10.5 | -13.8 | -9.3 | 12.0 |
| R | 0.999 | 0.972 | 0.982 | 0.980 | 0.986 |
| vs AU5400 |  | CCPA V1 | CCPA V2 | CCPA FS | LDX FS |
| slope |  | 1.08 | 1.10 | 1.04 | 0.93 |
| intercept |  | -13.5 | -16.5 | -12.2 | 9.9 |
| R |  | 0.975 | 0.983 | 0.983 | 0.987 |


| Clinical Application |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Integra | AU5400 | \% diff | CCPA V1 | \% diff | CCPA V2 | \% diff | CCPA FS | \% diff | LDX FS | \% diff |
| 160 | 161 | 0.45\% | 159 | -0.43\% | 160 | 0.22\% | 155 | -3.38\% | 160 | -0.05\% |
| 200 | 200 | 0.15\% | 202 | 0.89\% | 204 | 1.95\% | 196 | -2.22\% | 197 | -1.55\% |
| 240 | 240 | -0.05\% | 244 | 1.77\% | 247 | 3.10\% | 237 | -1.44\% | 234 | -2.55\% |
| 280 | Insufficient data to calculate (<2 laboratory values in this range) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average bias |  | 0.18\% |  | 0.74\% |  | 1.76\% |  | -2.35\% |  | -1.38\% |


| Clinical Application |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AU5400 | CCPA V1 | \% diff | CCPA V2 | \% diff | CCPA FS | \% diff | LDX FS | \% diff |
| 160 | 158 | -0.94\% | 160 | -0.27\% | 154 | -3.88\% | 159 | -0.46\% |
| 200 | 201 | 0.75\% | 204 | 1.78\% | 195 | -2.35\% | 197 | -1.70\% |
| 240 | 245 | 1.88\% | 248 | 3.16\% | 237 | -1.34\% | 234 | -2.52\% |
| 280 | Insufficient data to calculate (<2 laboratory values in this range) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average bias |  | 0.56\% |  | 1.56\% |  | -2.52\% |  | -1.56\% |


| HDL Cholesterol |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| vs Integra | AU5400 | CCPA V1 | CCPA V2 | CCPA FS | LDX FS |
| N | 21 | 21 | 21 | 21 | 21 |
| slope | 0.99 | 1.04 | 1.14 | 1.13 | 0.94 |
| intercept | 2.6 | -0.9 | -7.4 | -9.2 | 3.3 |
| R | 0.995 | 0.940 | 0.950 | 0.928 | 0.923 |
| vs AU5400 |  | CCPA V1 | CCPA V2 | CCPA FS | LDX FS |
| slope |  | 1.18 | 1.27 | 1.23 | 1.05 |
| intercept |  | -11.3 | -16.9 | -17.2 | -5.1 |
| R |  | 0.956 | 0.942 | 0.905 | 0.924 |


| Clinical Application |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Integra | AU5400 | \% diff | CCPA V1 | \% diff | CCPA V2 | \% diff | CCPA FS | \% diff | LDX FS | \% diff |
| 40 | Insufficient data to calculate (<2 laboratory values in this range) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 60 | 62 | 3.06\% | 61 | 1.97\% | 61 | 2.08\% | 59 | -2.11\% | 60 | -0.53\% |
| 80 | 82 | 1.98\% | 82 | 2.36\% | 84 | 5.17\% | 81 | 1.70\% | 78 | -1.91\% |
| 100 | 101 | 1.33\% | 103 | 2.60\% | 107 | 7.03\% | 104 | 3.99\% | 97 | -2.73\% |
| Average bias |  | 2.12\% |  | 2.31\% |  | 4.76\% |  | 1.19\% |  | -1.72\% |


| Clinical Application |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AU5400 | CCPA V1 | \% diff | CCPA V2 | \% diff | CCPA FS | \% diff | LDX FS | \% diff |
| 40 | Insufficient data to calculate (<2 laboratory values in this range) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 60 | 59 | -1.32\% | 59 | -1.43\% | 57 | -5.50\% | 58 | -3.45\% |
| 80 | 83 | 3.40\% | 84 | 5.61\% | 81 | 1.66\% | 79 | -1.34\% |
| 100 | 106 | 6.23\% | 110 | 9.83\% | 106 | 5.96\% | 100 | -0.08\% |
| Average bias |  | 2.77\% |  | 4.67\% |  | 0.71\% |  | -1.62\% |


| Triglycerides |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| vs Integra | AU5400 | CCPA V1 | CCPA V2 | CCPA FS | LDX FS |  |
| N | 21 | 21 | 21 | 21 | 21 |  |
| slope | 1.02 | 0.87 | 0.92 | 0.96 | 0.99 |  |
| intercept | 3.2 | 16.7 | 10.3 | 13.7 | 8.9 |  |
| R | 0.997 | 0.949 | 0.966 | 0.931 | 0.942 |  |
| vs AU5400 |  | CCPA V1 | CCPA V2 | CCPA FS | LDX FS |  |
| slope |  | 0.83 | 0.88 | 0.92 | 0.94 |  |
| intercept |  | 15.8 | 8.9 | 12.9 | 8.1 |  |
| R |  | 0.943 | 0.964 | 0.926 | 0.937 |  |


| Clinical Application |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Integra | AU5400 | \% diff | CCPA V1 | \% diff | CCPA V2 | \% diff | CCPA FS | \% diff | LDX FS | \% diff |
| 100 | 105 | 5.41\% | 104 | 3.58\% | 102 | 1.96\% | 110 | 9.93\% | 108 | 7.85\% |
| 150 | 157 | 4.35\% | 147 | -1.99\% | 148 | -1.49\% | 158 | 5.36\% | 157 | 4.87\% |
| 200 | Insufficient data to calculate (<2 laboratory values in this range) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 250 | Insufficient data to calculate (<2 laboratory values in this range) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average bias |  | 4.88\% |  | 0.80\% |  | 0.23\% |  | 7.64\% |  | 6.36\% |


| Clinical Application |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AU5400 | CCPA V1 | \% diff | CCPA V2 | \% diff | CCPA FS | \% diff | LDX FS | \% diff |
| 100 | 99 | -1.18\% | 97 | -3.02\% | 105 | 4.60\% | 102 | 2.44\% |
| 150 | 140 | -6.44\% | 141 | -5.99\% | 150 | 0.29\% | 150 | -0.27\% |
| 200 | Insufficient data to calculate (<2 laboratory values in this range) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 250 | Insufficient data to calculate (<2 laboratory values in this range) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average bias |  | -3.81\% |  | -4.51\% |  | 2.45\% |  | 1.08\% |

## Linear Regression Analyses




## Linear Regression Analyses, continued




## Linear Regression, continued




## Precision Analyses

| Sample 19 | TC | HDL | TRIG | Sample 20 | TC | HDL | TRIG | Sample 9 | TC | HDL | TRIG |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 207 | 88 | 54 | 1 | 119 | 52 | 64 | 1 | 252 | 76 | 149 |
| 2 | 192 | 91 | 61 | 2 | 121 | 51 | 65 | 2 | 253 | 69 | 152 |
| 3 | 201 | 92 | 65 | 3 | 124 | 52 | 64 | 3 | 235 | 76 | 146 |
| 4 | 211 | 93 | 65 | 4 | 119 | 52 | 68 | 4 | 241 | 71 | 141 |
| 5 | 195 | 92 | 74 | 5 | 115 | 48 | 63 | 5 | 252 | 75 | 138 |
| 6 | 199 | 85 | 69 | 6 | 119 | 51 | 63 | 6 | 244 | 67 | 140 |
| 7 | 189 | 87 | 68 | 7 | 116 | 52 | 60 | 7 | 247 | 66 | 145 |
| 8 | 198 | 85 | 67 | 8 | 113 | 55 | 64 | 8 | 241 | 72 | 153 |
| 9 | 211 | 89 | 62 | 9 | 122 | 53 | 56 | 9 | 251 | 72 | 131 |
| 10 | 191 | 86 | 64 | 10 | 112 | 53 | 65 | 10 | 246 | 71 | 134 |
| n | 10 | 10 | 10 | n | 10 | 10 | 10 | n | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| Average | 199 | 89 | 65 | Average | 118 | 52 | 63 | Average | 246 | 72 | 143 |
| SD | 8 | 3 | 5 | SD | 4 | 2 | 3 | SD | 6 | 4 | 7 |
| CV (\%) | 4.04 | 3.43 | 8.23 | CV (\%) | 3.32 | 3.45 | 5.10 | CV (\%) | 2.43 | 4.90 | 5.18 |

$\begin{array}{lllllll}\text { Average CV: } & \text { TC } & 3.26 & \text { HDL } & 3.93 & \text { TRIG } 6.17\end{array}$

| Sample 1 | GLU | Sample 7 | GLU | Sample 14 | GLU |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 62 | 1 | 90 | 1 | 71 |
| 2 | 66 | 2 | 89 | 2 | 73 |
| 3 | 66 | 3 | 87 | 3 | 70 |
| 4 | 67 | 4 | 87 | 4 | 69 |
| 5 | 66 | 5 | 88 | 5 | 68 |
| 6 | 64 | 6 | 90 | 6 | 62 |
| 7 | 58 | 7 | 84 | 7 | 68 |
| 8 | 58 | 8 | 87 | 8 | 67 |
| 9 | 58 | 9 | 87 | 9 | 64 |
| 10 | 64 | 10 | 87 | 10 | 69 |
| n | 10 | n | 10 | n | 10 |
| Average | 63 | Average | 88 | Average | 68 |
| SD | 4 | SD | 2 | SD | 3 |
| CV (\%) | 5.83 | CV (\%) | 2.03 | CV (\%) | 4.72 |

## Average CV:

GLU
4.19

Precision Serial Numbers

| Sample | 19 | 20 | 9 | 1 | 7 | 14 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Serial \# | 3025593 | 3025536 | 3025508 | 3025593 | 3025536 | 3025508 |

## Risk Classification

Each result was categorized based on Framingham risk categories for each of the analytes (top table below). From these analyses, a clinical agreement table was compiled (bottom table below) applying strict limits to quantify "Agreement." This means that a sample yielding Total Cholesterol results of 199 and $200 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{dL}$ on the four test systems was rated as a one (1) category difference despite the clinical insignificance of the discrepancy. These results are shown as the number of values where there is clinical agreement (Agree), a one category difference (1 Cat Diff) or a two category difference (2 Cat Diff) between the CardioChek PA and the reference laboratory result. In no instance was a 2 Category Difference observed in this clinical evaluation for Total Cholesterol, HDL Cholesterol, Triglycerides, or Glucose.

| Risk Classification |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Categories Compared | Total Cholesterol (mg/dL) |  |  | HDL Cholesterol (mg/dL) |  | Triglycerides (mg/dL) |  |  | Glucose (mg/dL) |  |
|  | <200 | 200-240 | >240 | <40 | $\geq 40$ | <150 | 150-200 | >200 | <126 | $\geq 126$ |


| Risk Classification Agreement Between Methods Integra |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total Cholesterol |  |  | HDL Cholesterol |  | Triglycerides |  |  | Glucose |  |
|  | Agree | $\begin{gathered} \text { 1-Cat } \\ \text { Diff } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2 Cat } \\ \text { Diff } \end{gathered}$ | Agree | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { 1 Cat } \\ \text { Diff } \end{gathered}$ | Agree | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { 1 Cat } \\ \text { Diff } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2 Cat } \\ \text { Diff } \end{gathered}$ | Agree | $\begin{gathered} \text { 1-Cat } \\ \text { Diff } \end{gathered}$ |
| AU5400 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 20 | 1 | 0 | 21 | 0 |
| CCPA V1 | 19 | 2 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 15 | 1 | 0 | 21 | 0 |
| CCPA V2 | 18 | 3 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 0 |
| CCPA FS | 18 | 3 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 0 |
| LDX FS | 21 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 15 | 1 | 0 | 21 | 0 |


| Risk Classification Agreement Between Methods Integra |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total Cholesterol |  |  | HDL Cholesterol |  | Triglycerides |  |  | Glucose |  |
|  | Agree | 1 Cat Diff | $\underset{\text { Diff }}{2 \text { Cat }}$ | Agree | 1 Cat Diff | Agree | 1 Cat Diff | $\begin{gathered} 2 \text { Cat } \\ \text { Diff } \end{gathered}$ | Agree | 1 Cat Diff |
| CCPA V1 | 19 | 2 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 14 | 2 | 0 | 21 | 0 |
| CCPA V2 | 18 | 3 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 16 | 1 | 0 | 21 | 0 |
| CCPA FS | 18 | 3 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 18 | 1 | 0 | 21 | 0 |
| LDX FS | 21 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 0 |

Raw Data Tables
Total Cholesterol

| Sample \# | Integra | AU5400 | CCPA V1 | CCPA V2 | CCPA FS | LDX FS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | 175 | 180 | 188 | 200 | 176 | 176 |
| $\mathbf{2}$ | 158 | 157 | 156 | 162 | 141 | 156 |
| $\mathbf{3}$ | 283 | 282 | 275 | 287 | 269 | 265 |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | 145 | 144 | 153 | 146 | 138 | 140 |
| $\mathbf{5}$ | 161 | 162 | 154 | 159 | 142 | 161 |
| $\mathbf{6}$ | 148 | 149 | 155 | 154 | 141 | 149 |
| $\mathbf{7}$ | 199 | 199 | 225 | 212 | 192 | 193 |
| $\mathbf{8}$ | 214 | 218 | 225 | 220 | 221 | 223 |
| $\mathbf{9}$ | 230 | 232 | 246 | 229 | 249 | 214 |
| $\mathbf{1 0}$ | 223 | 220 | 224 | 229 | 218 | 230 |
| $\mathbf{1 1}$ | 128 | 131 | 122 | 117 | 124 | 132 |
| $\mathbf{1 2}$ | 152 | 154 | 154 | 160 | 151 | 156 |
| $\mathbf{1 3}$ | 152 | 152 | 147 | 156 | 146 | 156 |
| $\mathbf{1 4}$ | 142 | 142 | 126 | 128 | 142 | 142 |
| $\mathbf{1 5}$ | 245 | 246 | 240 | 248 | 235 | 247 |
| $\mathbf{1 6}$ | 227 | 225 | 237 | 245 | 215 | 215 |
| $\mathbf{1 7}$ | 165 | 164 | 170 | 160 | 157 | 158 |
| $\mathbf{1 8}$ | 191 | 188 | 177 | 191 | 186 | 188 |
| $\mathbf{1 9}$ | 193 | 193 | 192 | 189 | 203 | 190 |
| $\mathbf{2 0}$ | 128 | 130 | 120 | 115 | 120 | 123 |
| $\mathbf{2 1}$ | 153 | 153 | 138 | 151 | 142 | 161 |

Raw Data Tables
HDL Cholesterol

| Sample \# | Integra | AU5400 | CCPA V1 | CCPA V2 | CCPA FS | LDX FS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | 75 | 77 | 77 | 81 | 71 | 80 |
| $\mathbf{2}$ | 59 | 61 | 58 | 55 | 51 | 52 |
| $\mathbf{3}$ | 59 | 63 | 60 | 59 | 59 | 60 |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | 40 | 45 | 44 | 40 | 41 | 42 |
| $\mathbf{5}$ | 66 | 68 | 70 | 64 | 61 | 64 |
| $\mathbf{6}$ | 60 | 61 | 57 | 53 | 56 | 59 |
| $\mathbf{7}$ | 66 | 65 | 68 | 66 | 70 | 64 |
| $\mathbf{8}$ | 59 | 62 | 61 | 61 | 59 | 69 |
| $\mathbf{9}$ | 63 | 66 | 72 | 68 | 72 | 58 |
| $\mathbf{1 0}$ | 120 | 123 | $>100$ | $>100$ | $>100$ | $>100$ |
| $\mathbf{1 1}$ | 61 | 63 | 62 | 62 | 58 | 55 |
| $\mathbf{1 2}$ | 49 | 52 | 56 | 55 | 47 | 53 |
| $\mathbf{1 3}$ | 47 | 48 | 49 | 49 | 44 | 47 |
| $\mathbf{1 4}$ | 49 | 52 | 49 | 55 | 43 | 47 |
| $\mathbf{1 5}$ | 109 | 113 | $>100$ | $>100$ | $>100$ | $>100$ |
| $\mathbf{1 6}$ | 81 | 81 | 90 | 91 | 83 | 83 |
| $\mathbf{1 7}$ | 71 | 72 | 72 | 67 | 60 | 64 |
| $\mathbf{1 8}$ | 55 | 55 | 47 | 54 | 57 | 55 |
| $\mathbf{1 9}$ | 86 | 82 | 84 | 96 | 98 | 82 |
| $\mathbf{2 0}$ | 50 | 52 | 49 | 49 | 49 | 48 |
| $\mathbf{2 1}$ | 60 | 61 | 54 | 57 | 55 | 67 |

Raw Data Tables
Triglycerides

| Sample \# | Integra | AU5400 | CCPA V1 | CCPA V2 | CCPA FS | LDX FS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | 65 | 68 | 66 | 65 | 61 | 70 |
| $\mathbf{2}$ | 57 | 58 | 64 | 61 | 84 | 82 |
| $\mathbf{3}$ | 84 | 89 | 93 | 77 | 128 | 115 |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | 142 | 150 | 119 | 126 | 144 | 154 |
| $\mathbf{5}$ | 50 | 53 | 54 | 57 | 66 | 55 |
| $\mathbf{6}$ | 40 | 44 | 53 | $<50$ | 51 | $<45$ |
| $\mathbf{7}$ | 66 | 71 | 73 | 70 | 74 | 67 |
| $\mathbf{8}$ | 94 | 100 | 96 | 105 | 106 | 113 |
| $\mathbf{9}$ | 136 | 143 | 153 | 146 | 148 | 132 |
| $\mathbf{1 0}$ | 48 | 55 | 59 | 58 | 65 | 56 |
| $\mathbf{1 1}$ | 36 | 43 | $<50$ | $<50$ | $<50$ | $<45$ |
| $\mathbf{1 2}$ | 83 | 90 | 95 | 94 | 89 | 85 |
| $\mathbf{1 3}$ | 73 | 75 | 85 | 76 | 79 | 78 |
| $\mathbf{1 4}$ | 83 | 83 | 97 | 92 | 94 | 87 |
| $\mathbf{1 5}$ | 62 | 69 | 70 | 69 | 61 | 66 |
| $\mathbf{1 6}$ | 92 | 98 | 96 | 98 | 92 | 96 |
| $\mathbf{1 7}$ | 41 | 42 | $<50$ | $<50$ | 51 | $<45$ |
| $\mathbf{1 8}$ | 46 | 51 | $<50$ | 50 | 55 | $<45$ |
| $\mathbf{1 9}$ | 67 | 71 | 73 | 63 | 82 | 78 |
| $\mathbf{2 0}$ | 58 | 62 | $<50$ | 65 | 65 | 55 |
| $\mathbf{2 1}$ | 28 | 35 | $<50$ | $<50$ | $<50$ | $<45$ |

Raw Data Tables
Glucose

| Sample \# | Integra | AU5400 | CCPA V1 | CCPA V2 | CCPA FS | LDX FS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | 81 | 83 | 81 | 78 | 80 | 84 |
| $\mathbf{2}$ | 90 | 86 | 92 | 85 | 79 | 82 |
| $\mathbf{3}$ | 90 | 88 | 85 | 87 | 82 | 85 |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | 99 | 101 | 99 | 103 | 107 | 95 |
| $\mathbf{5}$ | 85 | 84 | 85 | 85 | 83 | 79 |
| $\mathbf{6}$ | 80 | 81 | 83 | 78 | 94 | 90 |
| $\mathbf{7}$ | 97 | 94 | 100 | 99 | 101 | 100 |
| $\mathbf{8}$ | 82 | 85 | 84 | 84 | 82 | 80 |
| $\mathbf{9}$ | 98 | 97 | 98 | 103 | 106 | 91 |
| $\mathbf{1 0}$ | 74 | 75 | 74 | 68 | 74 | 72 |
| $\mathbf{1 1}$ | 86 | 88 | 90 | 89 | 93 | 78 |
| $\mathbf{1 2}$ | 82 | 90 | 84 | 77 | 82 | 75 |
| $\mathbf{1 3}$ | 91 | 90 | 94 | 95 | 95 | 87 |
| $\mathbf{1 4}$ | 78 | 75 | 73 | 76 | 80 | 87 |
| $\mathbf{1 5}$ | 84 | 82 | 78 | 76 | 70 | 73 |
| $\mathbf{1 6}$ | 87 | 87 | 89 | 80 | 84 | 82 |
| $\mathbf{1 7}$ | 83 | 88 | 75 | 74 | 69 | 67 |
| $\mathbf{1 8}$ | 88 | 88 | 80 | 86 | 81 | 82 |
| $\mathbf{1 9}$ | 85 | 84 | 80 | 88 | 88 | 89 |
| $\mathbf{2 0}$ | 84 | 87 | 85 | 89 | 80 | 73 |
| $\mathbf{2 1}$ | 78 | 80 | 70 | 74 | 76 | 71 |

## Overview of Evaluation and Analyses

## Evaluation Site

Spectrum Health Systems, Indianapolis, IN

## Third Party Comparisons (X-axis)

Beckman Coulter AU5400 (Quest): Serum
Roche Integra (PTS): Serum

## Reagents Used

PTS Panels ${ }^{\circledR}$ Lipid Panel Test Strips - Lot: P311
PTS Panels ${ }^{\circledR}$ Glucose Test Strips - Lot: U209

## POCT Evaluation Instruments ( Y -axis)

CardioChek Analyzers:
3 CardioChek ${ }^{(1)}$ PA analyzers, Version 2.62
Alere Cholestech LDX analyzer, No. 40 \& 13

## Data Analyses Performed

All analyses are completed by creating a 2-way table for each analyte, then generating the correlation statistics for the comparison of the results to the Beckman Coulter AU5400 and Roche Integra. These data can then be evaluated graphically and for clinical interpretation.

## Regression Statistics Summary

## Statistical Definitions

Slope: The slope of a line in the plane containing the $x$ - and $y$-axes is generally represented by the letter $m$, and is defined as the change in the $y$ coordinate divided by the corresponding change in the $x$ coordinate, between two distinct points on the line. (A perfect slope is " 1 ")

Intercept: Where a straight line crosses the $y$-axis of a graph. (A perfect intercept is " 0 ")
R Value: A statistic that gives a measure of how closely two variables are related, also known as the correlation coefficient. It represents the extent to which variations in one variable are related to variations in another or "goodness of fit."

## Comparison Key Aspects

Any method comparison must be approached with a clear understanding of variables that affect the test results. The known variation of chemistry analytical systems must always be considered when evaluating observed bias. Such variation is not only evident between POCT and laboratory systems but also between laboratory systems. Even in the most closely aligned systems, two methods may "correlate" but rarely "match." Identity is not a prerequisite for acceptance, but rather an understanding of the bias at clinical decision limits for the analyte in question and the clinical consequences of these biases. The critical evaluation criterion is the placement of a given patient into appropriate risk categories by each system. In these analyses, a point-by-point comparison was made for each patient evaluating the risk classification category for each result.

