I'm not a bot

Hplc peak integration guidelines

Types of peak integration in hplc. Hplc shoulder peak integration guidelines. Hplc integration guidelines.

Chromatography Data Systems (CDS) have faced significant scrutiny from the FDA since the Able Laboratories fraud case in 2005. The focus of inspections has shifted from testing and data management practices to ensuring peak integration and handling out-of-specification results. As companies adapt their processes, regulatory emphasis has moved towards integrated controls and compliant data integrity. A key area of interest is peak integration, which has been explored in previous articles. To start our discussion, we need to understand the relevant GMP regulations and guidance documents. The US FDA requires laboratories to establish scientifically sound specifications, standards, and test procedures for ensuring product quality (21 CFR 211.160(b)). This regulation emphasizes the importance of scientific soundness in laboratory practices. In contrast, EU GMP Part 2 (ICH Q7) has a similar requirement for active pharmaceutical ingredients, but with some differences. Laboratory records must include complete data from all tests necessary to assure compliance with established specifications and standards, including examinations and assays. However, interpreting the meaning of "complete data" can be challenging, particularly in cases where raw data is involved. To navigate these complexities, it's essential to understand the regulatory requirements for laboratory controls and records. By doing so, we can develop compliant approaches to peak integration and ensure the integrity of our data systems. FDA's Pre-Approval Inspections (PAI), Compliance Program Guide (CPG) 7346.832 was updated in September 2019. The new version highlights specific areas for inspectors to focus on during data integrity audits, including manipulation of analytical procedures, missing or unreliable data, and unexplained gaps in chromatographic sequences. The revised CPG emphasizes the importance of peak integration, referencing ICH M10 section 3.3.6. Chromatogram integration and reintegration should be described in a study plan, protocol, or SOP, with any deviations discussed in the Bioanalytical Report. The report should also include the reasons for reintegration and original/reintegrated chromatograms. A burden has been removed from FDA requirements, replacing preapproval of manual integrations with control via a plan or procedure. This change emphasizes the need for robust analytical procedures, as discussed earlier. The article presents a selection of FDA 483 observations and warning letter citations highlighting key problems in chromatographic peak integration failures, including integrating into compliance, failure to retain integration parameters, and lack of procedure for manual integration. In my opinion, the FDA's requirement for an integrated procedure on manual integration is misguided. To avoid issues, we need a structured and compliant procedure with a scientific approach to peak integration in its entirety. A holistic approach, encompassing a standard operating procedure (SOP) for all chromatographic integration methods, including manual integration as a crucial subset, is essential. The SOP should detail banned practices like peak skimming or enhancement, which can be found in articles by McDowall, Newton, and Longden, among others. The purpose of the SOP isn't to explain peak integration principles, which are covered in books and tutorials by CDS suppliers. A suggested peak integration workflow is presented in Figure 1, and we'll discuss its various aspects throughout this article. Figure 1: Suggested Peak Integration Workflow We need to understand why manual peak integration is necessary. The reason lies in situations where a computerized data system (CDS) cannot correctly integrate peaks due to factors like rising or falling baselines, slowly eluting peaks, poor method development and validation, complex sample matrices, or mixtures of similar analytes. This can lead to a significant manual integration workload. A Suggested Peak Integration Workflow: Firstly, all peak integration should be conducted using automatic integration in the first instance. There are no exceptions. If the peak integration is acceptable, reportable results can be calculated and reviewed. However, if it's not acceptable, we reach the first decision point: Is manual integration allowed for this analysis? If not, a laboratory investigation triggers. The issue with citations on the lack of a manual integration procedure in Table I lies in the absence of a definition for "manual integration." Manual integration, a technique used in chromatography, refers to the manual repositioning of peak baselines with scientific justification. This approach involves adjusting peak detection thresholds or retention time windows to ensure consistent and accurate peak identification and measurement (4). The definition provided earlier is unacceptable due to its wordiness, repetition, and use of contentious terminology like "overrule." Instead, a simpler and more concise definition could be: "The manual repositioning of peak baselines with scientific justification for their positioning." This revised definition acknowledges the role of CDS software while emphasizing the importance of scientific justification. In regulated laboratories, the question remains whether manual integration should be banned. Experienced analysts understand that chromatographic analysis can be affected by various factors like temperature, humidity, and column history (4). To ensure consistent output, it is essential to adapt or optimize peak detection thresholds or retention time windows. However, banning manual integration could lead to three undesirable outcomes: laboratories accepting poor and inconsistent integration, analysts finding workarounds, or spending hours developing complex methods. In reality, there is no straightforward answer. The nature of the analysis, laboratory type, and the need for validation and performance understanding all play a role. For instance, biologicals, macromolecules, and chiral separations may require broader peaks and consideration of sample matrix impacts on resolution (4). Ultimately, the decision to ban or permit manual integration should be based on a thorough evaluation of these factors. Note: The rewritten text maintains the original meaning while avoiding wordiness, repetition, and contentious terminology. Integration should only occur near detection limits with consideration for analyte and matrix complexities. The question is, what can be scientifically justified? Misuse of peak processing parameters has led to falsified results. To manage this, consider the following workflow: If manual integration is not permitted, a laboratory investigation may be necessary. Methods for excluding manual integration include measuring active pharmaceutical ingredients, registered methods for finished products, and stability-indicating methods. Manual integration must be prohibited in certain circumstances, such as symmetrical peaks with acceptable baseline fitting or enhancing/shaving peak areas to meet SST criteria. The ideal outcome is consistent, scientifically defensible manual integration. Avoid situations where integration is inconsistent or inappropriate. The distinction between manual integration (placing baselines) and manual intervention (changing integration parameters without baseline placement) is crucial. Manual intervention can be justified if peaks have slipped out of a retention window, requiring changes to peak windows without altering area values. These changes must be recorded in the CDS application to ensure rational justification. This approach avoids initiating a laboratory investigation. A suggested peak integration workflow involves determining whether manual integration is permitted for an analytical procedure. If not, a laboratory investigation may be necessary. The methods that can exclude manual integration include measuring active pharmaceutical ingredients, registered methods for finished products, and stability-indicating methods. When it comes to integrating data files in chromatography, labs have options that can impact the quality and reliability of their results. There are three main approaches: automatically adjusting parameters for all injections, manually tweaking settings but not placing baselines, or manually repositioning baselines on individual chromatograms. The first two methods allow for adjustments without manual intervention, making them preferred choices that are easier to justify scientifically. However, the third approach requires a more hands-on approach by analysts and involves reintegration of peaks. This latter method is considered a last resort due to its potential for introducing human error. The choice between these options can have significant implications on data integrity and the overall efficiency of the analysis process. Automatic integration methods are generally faster and produce consistent results, reducing regulatory scrutiny and enabling labs to complete analyses quicker. In contrast, manual integration methods can be time-consuming and require more resources. Ultimately, labs must develop robust procedures that ensure reliable separations and accurate peak integration, as incorrect data can have far-reaching consequences. Manual intervention must be permitted under certain circumstances. System suitability tests and injections can help ensure compliance with regulatory standards. If any of these checks fail, the analysis should stop immediately until assay criteria are met. This includes reviewing sample results only after acceptance criteria have been met, as doing so could be seen as "integrating into compliance" to invalidate testing that doesn't meet expectations. The FDA has received warnings for laboratories engaging in this behavior. The use of an "inhibit integration" function is currently a contentious issue, with some audits and inspections ruling it out entirely. However, this approach can be justified if done scientifically, especially when dealing with baseline perturbations or extraneous peaks that may affect the accuracy of the results. In certain situations, such as when using system peaks in the middle of a chromatogram, it is crucial to carefully document and justify these decisions in method development and validation reports. System evaluation injections or equilibration checks should be used to ensure a chromatographic system is ready for analysis without wasting valuable samples. This process involves injecting a reference standard solution, typically SST, to determine if the system is fully equilibrated. Key points include: * Documenting the ability to use system evaluation injections in applicable SOPs or analytical procedures * Establishing a minimum column equilibration time to prevent excessive system readiness injections * Using system evaluation injections prepared from suitable reference standards for evaluating chromatographic system readiness * Maintaining records of solution preparation and ideally using test mixtures that mimic separation characteristics but are easily distinguishable from real samples In cases where the system continues to malfunction, an investigation is needed to identify and remediate the cause. This may involve requalifying instruments or conducting maintenance, such as pump seal replacement. System evaluation injections should be included in instrument log book entries along with any investigation and remediation work on the instrument. Ideally, all work, including system evaluation injections, should be stored together for easy reference and connection to official laboratory work. Management must understand that sufficient time is required to develop and validate methods, especially pharmacopoeial ones which often need adjustments. Rule one emphasizes the importance of this process. Never use default integration parameters; instead, configure specific integrations for each method. This ensures all peaks are properly defined, including any system peaks, without relying on generic methods that may necessitate manual integration. Such practices can lead to excessive manual work in identifying and calculating peak values. When faced with a complex chromatogram or sample matrix, always opt for automatic integration as the primary approach. Manual integration should only be used when scientifically justified, as it can significantly slow down the process. However, its use is still subject to regulatory scrutiny. Understanding how Chromatographic Data Systems (CDS) work and how they generate numbers requires basic training in peak integration principles. The erosion of skills due to industry changes makes this understanding crucial for ensuring accurate results. Use your analytical mind – think critically! Even with perfect-seeming separations, verify the placement of peaks and their shapes using zoom and overlay functions on CDS software. This diligence is particularly important for accurate review and regulation compliance. Peak integration's regulatory significance will likely increase in the future due to emerging signal processing techniques like deconvolution, peak area extraction by iterative curve fitting, model-free approaches, direct resolution enhancement through Power Law or even derivative peaks resolution, as discussed in a recent LCGC Europe supplement. Control of peak integration is crucial in regulated laboratories to ensure compliance with regulatory requirements. Good chromatography and analytical procedures are essential for achieving good peak integration. The bottom line is whether the laboratory has control over its analytical procedure and peak integration. A compilation of FDA warning letters and reports on chromatography data systems integrity was examined. Sources included McDowall's works (R.D McDowall, Validation of Chromatography Data Systems: Ensuring Data Integrity) and FDA documents like the Warning Letter Unimark Remedies and FDA 483 Observations: Kashiv BioSciences. The focus shifted to peak integration and data analysis in LCsolution, with emphasis on proper baseline correction lines and peak detection settings. In cases where peaks are not integrated correctly due to noise, verifying peak integration parameters is recommended. Adjusting width and slope settings can also help eliminate unwanted peaks. It was suggested that setting these parameters when developing a method ensures consistent peak integration for all data measured under the same conditions. The standard integration parameters are not suitable for this case, but using a time-programmed approach in LCsolution might provide the desired results. Figures A-D demonstrate how different methods of integrating peaks in the same chromatogram can significantly impact area values. In Figure A, an incorrect baseline correction line is drawn from a negative peak, leading to exaggerated area calculations. By specifying the [Negative Peak Reject] in the time program, as shown in Figure B, this issue is resolved. Additionally, changing the [Drift] setting allows for either vertical or baseline partitioning, affecting how peaks are integrated and the resulting area values. When forced tailing is employed, peak integration behaves differently, as seen in Figure D. It's essential to consider peak integration parameters during method development and ideally use consistent settings across similar analytical conditions. However, in some cases, manual peak integration may be necessary for individual sets of data, allowing for greater control over the baseline correction line.