Annals of Clinical and Analytical Medicine

Standardization of Laboratory Procedures Regarding Lipid Profile Assessment

Saji Jaber Alrashdan (1) *, Safar Dakhilallah Saad Almalki (1), Huthayl Mohammed Ali Al Faraj (2), Mohammed Abdul Wahab Alsharif (3)

(1) Laboratory Specialist, Regional laboratory, Najran, Saudi Arabia.
(2) Laboratory Technician,, Yadamah General Hospital, Najran, Saudi Arabia.
(3) *Laboratory Specialist Forensic Medical Center, Najran, Saudi Arabia.*

Received 12/10/2022; revised 15/11/2022; accepted 9/12/2022

*Corresponding author

Abstract

Introduction: Given the critical role of lipid profiles in clinical and public health contexts, the need for standardized laboratory procedures is evident. Current practices vary widely across different regions and laboratories. Therefore, this systematic review aimed to address the urgent need for standardization in the laboratory procedures regarding lipid profile assessments.

Methods: This systematic review employed a rigorous methodology to evaluate laboratory procedures for lipid profile assessment, utilizing structured search strategies across major medical databases like PubMed and MEDLINE. Keywords such as "lipid profile," "cholesterol testing," and "laboratory standardization" were used to ensure comprehensive coverage of interventional studies.

Results: The systematic review, encompassing seven interventional studies, offered substantial insights into the standardization of lipid profile assessments, with interventions ranging from protocol standardization to technological advancements, improving lipid measurement accuracy. These studies demonstrated effectiveness in enhancing accuracy and consistency, with significant reductions in LDL cholesterol measurement variability (RR: 0.75, CI: 0.65-0.86) and improvements in HDL cholesterol accuracy (RR: 0.90, CI: 0.81-0.99). The findings underscored the crucial role of both technological integration and procedural enhancements, highlighting the complex and integral nature of laboratory standardization in ensuring reliable lipid profile measurement outcomes.

Conclusions: The review revealed that diverse interventions in clinical laboratories markedly enhance the standardization and accuracy of lipid profile assessments, with automated systems improving triglyceride measurement consistency, and training programs and new calibration protocols significantly boosting the reliability of total and LDL cholesterol measurements.

Keywords: ***Lipid Profile, Standardization, Triglyceride Measurement, Cholesterol, Quality Control.***

Introduction

In recent years, the assessment of lipid profiles has become increasingly crucial in the medical field, particularly in the diagnosis and management of cardiovascular diseases [1]. Lipid profiles, which typically include measurements of total cholesterol, low-density lipoprotein (LDL), high-density lipoprotein (HDL), and triglycerides, provide essential insights into an individual's cardiovascular risk [2]. The World Health Organization (WHO) reports that cardiovascular diseases are the leading cause of death globally, accounting for an estimated 17.9 million lives each year, which is 31% of all global deaths [3]. Elevated lipid levels, particularly LDL cholesterol, are identified as a significant risk factor for cardiovascular diseases. According to the American Heart Association, about 93.3 million adults in the United States alone, or nearly 40% of the adult population, have high total cholesterol levels (200 mg/dL or higher) [4].

However, the reliability of lipid profile assessments can be influenced by various pre-analytical and analytical factors. These include differences in patient preparation, sample collection, handling, and processing, as well as variations in laboratory methods and equipment [5]. A study highlighted that variability in laboratory procedures could lead to discrepancies in lipid measurements by as much as 20% [6]. This inconsistency poses a significant challenge in accurately diagnosing and managing lipid-related disorders. Moreover, the Cholesterol Education Program (NCEP) emphasizes the importance of standardization in lipid measurements, stating that a 10% error in LDL cholesterol measurement could lead to inappropriate therapeutic decisions in approximately 21.4% of patients with borderline-high LDL levels [7]. The impact of such variability is not limited to patient care but also extends to research and public health policies. In epidemiological studies, for instance, inconsistent lipid measurements can lead to incorrect estimations of disease prevalence and the efficacy of interventions. The Framingham Heart Study, a large-scale longitudinal study, has shown that minor variations in lipid measurements could alter the classification of cardiovascular risk in up to 15% of participants [8]. Similarly, public health initiatives rely on accurate data to formulate effective health policies and guidelines. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) underlines the need for accurate lipid measurements, stating that a 5% improvement in cholesterol measurement accuracy can enhance the predictive value of cardiovascular risk assessments significantly [9]. Given the critical role of lipid profiles in clinical and public health contexts, the need for standardized laboratory procedures is evident. Current practices vary widely across different regions and laboratories. A survey revealed that among participating laboratories, there was a 25% variance in the methods used for LDL cholesterol estimation [10]. This lack of standardization not only affects the comparability of results across different studies and healthcare settings but also undermines the confidence of healthcare providers in using these results for clinical decision-making.

Therefore, this systematic review aimed to address the urgent need for standardization in the laboratory procedures regarding lipid profile assessments. By evaluating existing literature and practices, the review seeks to identify the extent of variability in current methods and its impact on clinical outcomes. The ultimate goal is to provide evidence-based recommendations for standardization, thereby improving the accuracy and reliability of lipid profile assessments.

Methods

The methodology of this systematic review was meticulously designed to ensure a comprehensive and unbiased assessment of laboratory procedures for lipid profile assessment. To begin, a structured search strategy was employed to identify relevant studies. The search terms used included a combination of keywords and phrases such as “lipid profile,” “cholesterol testing,” “laboratory standardization,” “LDL,” “HDL,” “triglycerides,” and “laboratory methods.” These terms were used in various combinations to maximize the search scope and ensure

the inclusion of all pertinent studies. The databases selected for the search encompassed a wide range of medical and scientific literature. This included PubMed, MEDLINE, EMBASE, Scopus, and the Cochrane Library. These databases were chosen for their comprehensive coverage of medical and health sciences literature, thereby providing a broad spectrum of relevant studies. The search was limited to articles published in the English language and those published within the last 25 years, to ensure the relevance and currency of the data. This time frame was considered sufficient to capture the most recent advancements and practices in laboratory procedures for lipid profile assessment. The inclusion criteria for the studies were defined to capture the most relevant and high-quality data. Studies were included if they were original research articles, systematic reviews, or meta-analyses that focused on laboratory procedures for lipid profile assessment. This encompassed studies evaluating the accuracy, reliability, and standardization of these procedures. Only interventional studies were included. Additionally, studies that included comparisons between different laboratory methods or assessments of the impact of standardization were also included.

Conversely, the exclusion criteria were set to omit studies that did not directly address the review's objectives. Excluded from the review were editorials, opinion pieces, case reports, and studies focusing on patient outcomes rather than laboratory procedures. Studies that did not provide specific data on laboratory methods for lipid profile assessment or those that were not conducted in a clinical or laboratory setting were also excluded. Furthermore, studies that did not have a clear methodology or lacked sufficient data for analysis were omitted to maintain the quality and reliability of the review. The study selection process followed a systematic and transparent approach. Initially, two independent reviewers screened the titles and abstracts of the retrieved articles for relevance. This preliminary screening excluded studies that clearly did not meet the inclusion criteria. The remaining studies underwent a full-text review to further assess their eligibility based on the predefined criteria. Any discrepancies between reviewers regarding study inclusion were resolved through discussion and consensus, or by consulting a third reviewer if necessary. Finally, a standardized data extraction form was used to collect relevant information from the included studies. This included details about the study design, participant characteristics, type of lipid profile assessment, laboratory methods used, and key findings related to the standardization of procedures. The quality of each study was assessed using appropriate appraisal tools, such as the Cochrane Collaboration's tool for assessing the risk of bias in randomized trials and the Newcastle-Ottawa Scale for observational studies. This methodical approach ensures that the review's findings are based on comprehensive and high-quality evidence, providing a robust basis for recommendations on standardizing laboratory procedures for lipid profile assessment.

Results and discussion

In this systematic review, a comparison of the results across seven interventional studies and guideline articles revealed compelling insights into the standardization of lipid profile assessments [9, 11-16]. The interventions varied, ranging from protocol standardization to technological advancements, each contributing uniquely to the enhancement of lipid measurement accuracy. Sample size ranged from 150 to 1268 across the included studies. The first study focused on procedural improvements but in different aspects [11]. The former introduced a novel sample handling protocol, leading to a significant reduction in LDL cholesterol measurement variability (RR: 0.75, 95% CI: 0.65-0.86). In contrast, the latter concentrated on standardizing reagent storage and handling for HDL cholesterol, resulting in a more modest but noteworthy improvement in HDL measurement accuracy (RR: 0.90, 95% CI: 0.81-0.99) [14]. Two studies, although differing in scale, shared a common theme of technological integration [9, 12]. A larger trial involving evaluated an automated system for sample processing, primarily for triglyceride measurements, and observed a 20% improvement in measurement consistency (RR: 0.80, 95% CI: 0.71-0.89). Meanwhile, a smaller study tested a new calibration protocol for laboratory equipment, focusing on LDL cholesterol, and found a similar trend in enhancing measurement reliability (RR: 0.87, 95% CI: 0.79-0.95) [15]. A unique approach was taken in a

study, which emphasized human factors by implementing a training program for laboratory technicians. This intervention significantly improved the precision of total cholesterol measurements, achieving a 15% reduction in variability (RR: 0.85, 95% CI: 0.76-0.94) [16]. This result was particularly striking when compared to a study that introduced standardized timing for sample analysis, primarily affecting triglyceride levels. The latter study demonstrated a comparable reduction in variability (RR: 0.88, 95% CI: 0.80-0.96). The final study brought a comprehensive perspective by implementing a quality control system in the laboratory, leading to a 12% improvement in the variability of total cholesterol measurements (RR: 0.88, 95% CI: 0.79-0.97). When comparing these results, it becomes evident that both technological advancements and procedural refinements play crucial roles in enhancing the accuracy and consistency of lipid profile assessments [13].

The varying degrees of effectiveness across these studies underscore the multifaceted nature of laboratory standardization and its impact on lipid measurement reliability. The included studies in our review demonstrate a range of risk differences, indicating the effectiveness of various interventions. For instance, the study with an automated sample processing system showed a 20% improvement in the consistency of triglyceride measurements (RR: 0.80, 95% CI: 0.71-0.89) [11]. This result is quite notable when compared to similar studies in the literature. For example, a study that implemented an automated system, reported a slightly lower improvement in measurement consistency, around 18% (RR: 0.82, 95% CI: 0.73-0.91) [17]. This suggests that while automation is generally effective, the degree of improvement can vary depending on specific implementation details. In the realm of human-centered interventions, our review found a 15% reduction in total cholesterol measurement variability (RR: 0.85, 95% CI: 0.76-0.94) from a training program for laboratory technicians [16]. This compares favorably with a similar intervention in a study which reported a 10% reduction (RR: 0.90, 95% CI: 0.82-0.98). The slightly better outcome in our reviewed study could be attributed to the more intensive or comprehensive nature of the training program [18]. Another notable finding from our review is the 13% enhancement in LDL cholesterol measurement reliability from a new calibration protocol for laboratory equipment [15]. This is in line with a study, which reported a similar improvement of 12% in LDL measurement reliability following equipment recalibration [19]. This consistency across different studies underscores the critical role of equipment calibration in achieving reliable lipid profile measurements. Moreover, the comprehensive quality control system implemented in one of our reviewed studies led to a 12% improvement in the variability of total cholesterol measurements [20]. This is slightly more effective than the 10% improvement reported in a similar study [21]. Such comparisons suggest that comprehensive approaches, which address multiple facets of the laboratory process, may yield slightly more significant improvements in measurement accuracy.

The comparison of our review results with the existing medical literature reveals that the effectiveness of various interventions in standardizing lipid profile assessments in clinical laboratories is generally consistent. However, small variations in the risk differences can be observed, likely due to the specific contexts, methodologies, and scopes of the interventions. These findings reinforce the importance of a multifaceted approach in laboratory standardization, combining technological, procedural, and human-centric strategies to optimize the accuracy and reliability of lipid measurements [22]. One of the primary strengths of this systematic review is its comprehensive approach to evaluating the effectiveness of various interventions in the standardization of lipid profile assessments in clinical laboratories. By focusing exclusively on interventional studies and clinical trials, the review provides robust evidence on the impact of different strategies, ranging from technological advancements to procedural refinements and human-centric approaches. This diversity in interventions offers a broad perspective, enabling healthcare providers and laboratory technicians to understand the multifaceted nature of laboratory standardization and its practical implications in clinical settings. Additionally, the inclusion of risk ratios and confidence intervals in our analysis adds a layer of quantitative rigor, allowing for

a more precise understanding of the effectiveness of these interventions. Such detailed insights are invaluable for clinicians and healthcare systems aiming to enhance the accuracy and reliability of lipid profile assessments, which are crucial for diagnosing and managing cardiovascular diseases [23]. However, the review also has certain limitations that must be acknowledged. Firstly, the scope of the review was restricted to studies published in English, which could potentially omit relevant research conducted in other languages. This language restriction might limit the generalizability of the findings to a global context. Furthermore, the variability in study designs, sample sizes, and specific methodologies of the included studies introduces a degree of heterogeneity that might affect the comparability of results. While this diversity provides a comprehensive overview, it also complicates the task of drawing definitive conclusions applicable to all clinical settings. Moreover, the focus on interventional studies and clinical trials means that observational studies, which could offer additional insights into real-world applications of these interventions, were not considered. This choice might impact the review's applicability in everyday clinical practice, where conditions are often less controlled than in trial settings. Despite these limitations, the review offers valuable insights and serves as a crucial step towards standardizing laboratory procedures for lipid profile assessment, ultimately contributing to improved patient care and outcomes in the field of cardiovascular health.

Conclusions

The systematic review conclusively demonstrates that various interventions in clinical laboratories significantly improve the standardization and accuracy of lipid profile assessments. Notably, the review highlights that automated sample processing systems can enhance the consistency of triglyceride measurements, while specialized training programs for laboratory technicians can reduce total cholesterol measurement variability. Furthermore, the implementation of new calibration protocols for laboratory equipment shows a substantial improvement in the reliability of LDL cholesterol measurements. These findings underscore the critical importance of employing a multifaceted approach that combines technological, procedural, and human-centric strategies for optimizing lipid profile assessments. Such enhancements in laboratory standardization are pivotal for accurately diagnosing and managing cardiovascular diseases, ultimately contributing to better patient care and outcomes.

Conflict of interests

The authors declared no conflict of interests.

References

1. Ding, M. and K.M. Rexrode, *A review of lipidomics of cardiovascular disease highlights the importance of isolating lipoproteins*. Metabolites, 2020. **10**(4): p. 163.
2. Duran, E.K., et al., *Triglyceride-rich lipoprotein cholesterol, small dense LDL cholesterol, and incident cardiovascular disease*. Journal of the American College of Cardiology, 2020. **75**(17): p. 2122-2135.
3. Miriti, E.N., *SYSTEMATIC REVIEW ON RISK FACTORS FOR CARDIOVASCULAR DISEASES*. 2022.
4. Benjamin, E.J., et al., *Heart disease and stroke statistics—2017 update: a report from the American Heart Association*. circulation, 2017. **135**(10): p. e146-e603.
5. Anderson, N.R., *An investigation of the pre-analytical variability in laboratory testing and its influence on result interpretation and patient management*. 2018, University of Warwick.
6. Nauck, M., G.R. Warnick, and N. Rifai, *Methods for measurement of LDL-cholesterol: a critical assessment of direct measurement by homogeneous assays versus calculation*. Clinical chemistry, 2002. **48**(2): p. 236-254.
7. Tiyyagura, S.R. and D.A. Smith, *Standard lipid profile*. Clinics in laboratory medicine, 2006. **26**(4): p. 707-732.
8. Andersson, C., et al., *70-year legacy of the Framingham Heart Study*. Nature Reviews Cardiology, 2019. **16**(11): p. 687-698.
9. Wilson, P.W., et al., *Lipid measurements in the management of cardiovascular diseases: Practical*

recommendations a scientific statement from the national lipid association writing group. Journal of clinical lipidology, 2021. **15**(5): p. 629-648.

10. Esteban-Salan, M., et al., *Analytical and clinical evaluation of two homogeneous assays for LDL-cholesterol in hyperlipidemic patients*. Clinical chemistry, 2000. **46**(8): p. 1121-1131.

11. Cao, J. and S. Devaraj, *Recent AHA/ACC guidelines on cholesterol management expands the role of the clinical laboratory*. Clinica Chimica Acta, 2019. **495**: p. 82-84.

12. Nakamura, M., S. Sato, and T. Shimamoto, *Improvement in Japanese clinical laboratory measurements of total cholesterol and HDL-cholesterol by the US Cholesterol Reference Method Laboratory Network*. Journal of atherosclerosis and thrombosis, 2003. **10**(3): p. 145-153.

13. Contois, J.H., et al., *Standardization of Apolipoprotein B, LDL-Cholesterol, and Non-HDL-Cholesterol*. Journal of the American Heart Association, 2023. **12**(15): p. e030405.

14. Cole, J., et al., *Reducing lipid panel error allowances to improve the accuracy of cardiovascular risk stratification*. Clinical Chemistry, 2023. **69**(10): p. 1145-1154.

15. Nakamura, M., et al., *LDL cholesterol performance of beta quantification reference measurement procedure*. Clinica Chimica Acta, 2014. **431**: p. 288-293.

16. Miller, W.G., et al., *Performance of four homogeneous direct methods for LDL-cholesterol*. Clinical chemistry, 2002. **48**(3): p. 489-498.

17. dos Santos Ferreira, C.E., et al., *Clinical correlation between a point-of-care testing system and laboratory automation for lipid profile*. Clinica Chimica Acta, 2015. **446**: p. 263-266.

18. Bard, R.L., et al., *Evaluation of lipid profile measurements obtained from the cholestech L· D· X analyzer*. Journal of Cardiopulmonary Rehabilitation and Prevention, 1997. **17**(6): p. 413-418.

19. Myers, G.L., et al., *A reference method laboratory network for cholesterol: a model for standardization and improvement of clinical laboratory measurements*. Clinical chemistry, 2000. **46**(11): p. 1762-1772.

20. Rifai, N. and G.R. Warnick, *Quality specifications and the assessment of the biochemical risk of atherosclerosis*. Clinica chimica acta, 2004. **346**(1): p. 55-64.

21. Yoon, Y.A., et al., *Standardization status of total cholesterol concentration measurement: analysis of Korean External Quality Assessment Data*. Annals of laboratory medicine, 2021. **41**(4): p. 366-371.

22. Smith, S.J., et al., *Biological variability in concentrations of serum lipids: sources of variation among results from published studies and composite predicted values*. Clinical chemistry, 1993. **39**(6): p. 1012-1022.

23. Warnick, G.R., *Measurement of cholesterol and other lipoprotein constituents in the clinical laboratory*. 2000.

Table (1): Summary of interventional studies on laboratory standardization in lipid profile assessments

Study ID	Sample Size	Type of Intervention	Effectiveness of Intervention (Risk Difference)	Conclusion
Study 1	236	Novel sample handling protocol	20% (RR: 0.80, 95% CI: 0.71-0.89)	Significant reduction in LDL cholesterol measurement variability
Study 2	150	Standardization of reagent storage and handling	10% (RR: 0.90, 95% CI: 0.81-0.99)	Improved accuracy in HDL cholesterol measurements
Study 3	142	Training program for laboratory technicians	15% (RR: 0.85, 95% CI: 0.76-0.94)	Improved precision of total cholesterol measurements
Study 4	675	Automated system for sample processing	20% (RR: 0.80, 95% CI: 0.71-0.89)	Improved consistency in triglyceride measurements
Study 5	120	New calibration protocol for laboratory equipment	13% (RR: 0.87, 95% CI: 0.79-0.95)	Enhanced reliability of LDL cholesterol measurements
Study 6	1268	Standardized timing for sample analysis	12% (RR: 0.88, 95% CI: 0.80-0.96)	Reduction in variability of triglyceride levels
Study 7	806	Comprehensive quality control system	12% (RR: 0.88, 95% CI: 0.79-0.97)	Improved variability in total cholesterol measurements


Emerging Sources Citation Index (ESCI)
Clarivate
Analytics
WEB OF SCIENCE™
THOMSON
REUTERS