

From the meeting
“Le Proteine: dal Laboratorio alla Clinica”
“Proteins: from the Laboratory to the Clinic”
X Edition - Castrocaro, 24th – 26th October, 2001
Organised by CEFAR – European Centre for Formation and Research in Health Science and Biotechnology
Patron: SIBioC – Italian Association of Clinical Biochemistry and Clinical Molecular Biology

Multi-Centre Evaluation of Routine Commercial Methods for the Detection of Bence Jones Proteins in Urine – 2001 Results

Presented by: Walter Tizzanini, Analysis Laboratory, Azienda Policlinico, Modena

“Forlì” Inter-Regional Study Commission on “Bence Jones Proteins and Free Light Chains”
Scientific Secretary: **Gualtiero Pallotti**, Ospedale Pierantoni, Forlì

SIBioC – AIPAC – SIME Joint Commission, Liguria Sections, on “Bence Jones Proteins and Free Light Chains”

Scientific Secretary: **Liliana Burlando** – ex Ospedale Galliera – Genoa
Giovanna Zaninetta – Ospedale S. Martino - Genoa

“Lazio” Study Commission on “Bence Jones Proteins and Free Light Chains”
Scientific Secretary: **Maria Teresa Muratore**, Ospedale Civile, Viterbo

“Toscana-Umbria” Study Commission on “Bence Jones Proteins and Free Light Chains”
Scientific Secretary: **Enzida Piazza**, Ospedale Careggi, Florence

Organisation and Co-ordination:

Leonardo Massaro and Rita Scaringi, New Scientific Company S.r.l., Via Dante 35, 20032 Cormano, (MI).

Index

- [Participants](#)
- [Non standard Abbreviations](#)
- [Key words](#)
- [Summary](#)
- [Introduction](#)
- [Method of Work](#)
- [General Objectives and Strategies](#)
- [Desired Characteristics for Methods and Protocols](#)
- [Objectives of the Multi-Centre Experimentation](#)
- [Sample and Methods](#)
- [Stability of the Dilution Distributed](#)
- [Results and Discussion](#)
- [Conclusion](#)
- [Bibliography](#)
- [Tables](#)

Non standard abbreviations

BJP	(Bence Jones Proteins) Proteine di Bence Jones
BJ	Bence Jones
FLC	(Free Light Chains) Catene Leggere Libere
FRK	(Free Light Chains kappa) Catene Leggere Libere kappa
FRL	(Free Light Chains lambda) Catene Leggere Libere lambda
FLC-pc	(policlonal-Free Light Chains) Catene Leggere Libere policlonali
LC(b&f)	(Light Chains bound & free) Catene Leggere Totali libere & legate
IFE	Immunofissazione

Key Words

Bence Jones Protein, Kappa Free Light Chains, Lambda Free Light Chains, Free Light Chains

*Participants:**"Forlì" InterRegional Study Commission on "Bence Jones Proteins and Free Light Chains"*Participants in the work of the 16th June 2000 meeting:

Ospedale Civile	Asola	Scipiotti C
Ospedale di Bentivoglio	Bentivoglio (BO)	Milanesi MG, Turra F
Ospedale Bellaria	Bologna	Martelli M, Zannini R
Ospedale Maggiore	Bologna	Cucci A
Ospedale Civile	Bra (CN)	Testa G, Valle S
Spedali Civili – Lab. Immunologia	Brescia	Quinzanini M
Ospedale di Faenza	Faenza	Gollini C
Ospedale Santa Croce	Fano	Sadori R
Ospedale Careggi	Florence	Piazza E
Ospedale Pierantoni	Forlì	Mambelli C, Pezzi L
Ospedale Civile	Fossombrone (PS)	Del Prete E
Ospedale Policlinico	Modena	Tizzanini W, Guidetti F
Ospedale Civile	Monselice (PD)	Mingardo S
Ospedale Destra Secchia	Pieve di Coriano (MN)	Tirelli F, Zanni R
Ospedale San Salvatore	Pesaro	Acetoso M
Ospedale Civile	Piacenza	Croci E
Ospedale del Ceppo	Pistoia	Valenti D, Lucherini M
Ospedale Santa Maria degli Angeli	Pordenone	Ferrai MG
Ospedale Santa Maria delle Croci	Ravenna	Gardini G
Ospedale Infermi	Rimini	Argento A, Conti C
Ospedale Civile	Viterbo	Muratore MT

SIBioC – AIPAC – SIMEL Joint Commission, Liguria Sections, on "Bence Jones Proteins and Free Light Chains"

Participants in the work of the 22nd June 2000 meeting:

Ospedale S. Martino	Genoa	Zaninetta G, Milone S
Ospedale Galliera	Genoa	Campanella A, Romano R
Ospedale Evangelico	Genoa	Baiardi C, Intra E
Ist.to Giannina Gaslini	Genoa	Famularo L, Mangraviti S
Ospedale S. Carlo	Genoa Voltri	Barbaro GB, Patrone C
Ospedale Civile	Lavagna	Venturini M, Albalustri G, Marrè V, Musso M
Ospedale San Paolo	Savona	Minetti F, Parodi EF

"Lazio" Study Commission on "Bence Jones Proteins and Free Light Chains"

Participants in the work of the 10th April 2001 meeting:

Istituto Dermatologico Villa Paola	Capranica P. (RM)	Lo Monaco
Ospedale Civile	Civita Castellana (VT)	Ceccarelli P
Ospedale Civile	Montefiascone (VT)	Brutti A, Flais D, Montanaro
Ospedale Civile	Rieti	Ursicino N, Zepponi E
Ospedale S.Camillo	Rome	Gubbiotti A, Lenci G
Ospedale Sandro Pertini	Rome	Lenci G
Ospedale S.Giovanni	Rome	Ruggeri M
Policlinico Umberto I	Rome	Ciarla MV, Carlizzi G
Ospedale S.Anna	Ronciglione (VT)	Petruzzi S
Ospedale Civile	Sora (FR)	Busi Rizzi C
Ospedale Civile	Viterbo	Muratore MT

"Toscana-Umbria" Study Commission on "Bence Jones Proteins and Free Light Chains"

Participants in the work of the 24th May 2001 meeting:

Ospedale Civile	Abbadia S.Salvatore SI	Piccini L
Ospedale S.Donato	Arezzo	Guidelli M, Panichi F
Ospedale Civile	Borgo S.Lorenzo FI	Rosichini
Ospedale Civile	Castel del Piano GR	Giacalone G
Ospedale Civile	Città di Castello PG	Mari , Sabini D
Ospedale Serristori	Figline Valdarno FI	Pani , Righi
Ospedale Careggi	Florence	Chiarugi , Messeri G, Piazza E
Istituto Ricerche Cliniche M. Fanfani	Florence	Fuzi
Ospedale S.M.Nuova	Florence	Biliotti G, Casprini P, Spadolini MP
Ospedale Civile della Misericordia	Grosseto	Capirci G, Rechichi
Ospedale ASL 6	Livorno	Leoni
Ospedale Civile	Lucca	Donati , Savarino A
Ospedale del Ceppo	Pistoia	Valenti D
Ospedale Civile Elbano	Porto Ferraio LI	Barracchia A
Ospedale S.Maria	Terni	Caffarelli
Usl 7 zona Valdichiana	Cianciano SI	Scapellato C
Ospedale Tarrabacci	Viareggio	Bartoli , Galleni , Polvani

Summary

The objective of the study groups is to verify the possibility of making uniform the evaluation, interpretation and reporting of Bence Jones Proteins (BJP) and, more generally, of Free Light Chains (FLC) in urine.

It has emerged from the "Forlì" Group's previous work (1) and the subsequent multi-centre evaluation carried out over the last few years both by the "Forlì" and the "Liguria" Groups that for the detection of BJP the following are unreliable:

- the stick for the dosage of Total Proteins in urine
- the dosage of Total Proteins in urine.

The comprehensive results obtained by the multi-methodological multi-centre evaluation of three scaled dilutions of two urine samples are presented, one with BJP lambda and one with BJP kappa, which were carried out by the "Forlì" and "Liguria" Study Groups in 2000 (25 Laboratories). For both samples, the concentration of BJP in the dilutions distributed is between approx. 2 mg/dl and 0.3 mg/dl. These results have been integrated with those obtained during 2001 by the "Lazio" and "Toscana-Umbria" Groups (27 Laboratories) on two of the aforementioned dilutions, that is those of higher concentration.

The results show us that the best performances were obtained on Nephelometry/Turbimetry with reagent for the Free Light Chains, immediately followed by that with reagent for Total Light Chains (Bound & Free); ImmunoFixation and Electrophoresis, which produced some negative results even on "A1" samples with BJP concentration of about 2 mg/dl, are clearly well behind. From the evaluation, two dilutions of the BJP-kappa Lavagna sample and two of the BJP-lambda Bellaria sample were defined as "reference samples", at least in "positive/negative" terms. For both samples, the BJP concentration of the two proposed pre-packed dilutions was estimated at approx. 2 mg/dl and 0.5 mg/dl.

Introduction

At present, research into Free Light Chains (FLC) is for the detection of Bence Jones Proteins (BJP), that is Monoclonal Free Light Chains in urine, whilst Polyclonal Free Light Chains (PFLC) are considered to be of secondary importance, unless one specifically intends carrying out their determination as tubular proteinuria index. In this case, the choice method would seem to be the direct quantitative determination with ImmunoPrecipitation in Liquid Phase (IPL), turbimetry or nephelometry, using the specific FLC reagents.

An adequate standardisation of methods, protocols, references, checks and reporting – all of which are quite rightly felt by the operators as absolutely essential, together with the opportunity to compare concrete experiences on the subject – does not appear to match the importance of BJP (and FLC) research.

This need, along with the opportunity to compare concrete experiences, is strongly felt by operators in the sector.

New Scientific Company (NSC) has collated these needs, taking care of the organisational part of the study groups as they are set up.

The "Forlì" Group has held ten meetings since 1993 with an average of 30 Laboratories from Emilia-Romagna and other regions; the "Liguria" Group, with an average of 10 Laboratories has had four meetings since 1997. The "Lazio" and "Toscana-Umbria" Groups have recently joined them.

Method of Work

The study groups periodically hold round-table and open debate "co-ordination meetings".

At these meetings the results of previous work are examined and discussed, and the work for the subsequent meeting is set out.

General Objectives and Strategies

The objective of the study groups is to assess the possibility of making uniform:

- evaluation,
- interpretation and
- reporting

of Bence Jones Proteins (BJP) and, more generally, of Free Light Chains (FLC) in urine.

It would in fact be hoped that a sample resulted at least "BJP-positive" or "BJP-negative" in all the Laboratories regardless of method or protocol; that is, from the screening and second stage methods utilised.

The strategy adopted is that of comparing the different and manifold dimensional, structural and organisational operating experiences in the daily routines, starting with the verification of the "real characteristics" of the methods practicable.

With this aim, it was decided to evaluate the "sensitivity" and the "precision" of the individual methods and to then include them in the strategy for the detection of BJP.

Evaluation of the "precision" is not only preliminary to the possibility of an eventual quantitative determination but is also essential for the correct evaluation of the "sensitivity".

For an initial verification, we used the elementary but linear procedure, made up of dilutions of samples with a significant quantity of BJP and only traces of other proteins.

This enables the evaluation and comparison of "sensitivity and precision" of the methods in detecting "abnormality of the sample" without any consideration of the absolute concentration of the BJP.

This approach was thought to be an indispensable starting point despite not being complete due to the heterogeneity of the BJP and FLC:

- The BJP amongst themselves are antigenically diverse even for the same type, and this can determine variations in results in the techniques of ImmunoPrecipitation in Liquid Phase (IPL) (Nephelometry, Turbidimetry) and ImmunoFixation (IFE), whilst it does not influence Electrophoresis (EF).
- Polyclonal Free Light Chains (PLFC) will be highlighted with less sensitivity on EF and IFE compared to an equal quantity of BJP since for the distribution on a wider surface compared to the narrow band typical of BJP, the PFLC will have a lower concentration per surface unit.

Desired Characteristics for Methods and Protocols

The “**perfectly effective**” method and protocol for BJP and FLC should be characterised by:

- a) **no “false negative” – Sensitivity and Precision**
This is the principal and the absolutely vital characteristic for which maximum intra and inter-laboratory reproducibility is consequently required: the “sensitivity” and “precision” of each method should be defined.
- b) *no “false positive” – Specificness of the Positivity Marker*
Efficacy gradually decreases while the number of “false positives” increases.
- c) Good quantitative information
As well as “precision”, “accuracy” should also be evaluated.
The value of this element depends on the degree of need for absolute quantitative determination.

Objectives of the Multi-Centre Experimentation

This experimentation means verifying, on the “reference samples” as defined in the previous Multicentre 1999 (2), the efficacy of the methods in use in the participating Laboratories in terms of “sensitivity” and “precision”.

Evaluation of “accuracy” and of “general efficacy” will be the subject of future experimentation already programmed for 2001-2002.

Samples and Methods

The Samples were obtained by diluting the original urine pre-selected for the experimentation, so as to have the approximate concentrations of BJP agreed upon by the participants.

New Scientific Company dealt with preparation of the samples and their distribution to participants.

The dilutions were put in PBS and distributed in 5 ml bottles, clearly labelled with the conventional name of the sample, the type of BJP present and the dilution.

Result charts were included with the identified samples. This table shows the samples and dilutions tested.

Sample	BJP kappa (Lavagna) (2)			BJP lambda (Bellaria)		
	<i>AI</i>	<i>A</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>AI</i>	<i>A</i>	<i>B</i>
<i>Dilution</i>						
Indicative Concentration(1) mg/dl	1,8	0,7	0,3	1,8	0,7	0,2

N.B.

- 1) The indicative concentration is shown here for clarity; it was obtained subsequently, and is the average of the measurements obtained with the quantitative methods.
- 2) On IFE the Lavagna BJ-kappa sample highlights polyclonal FLC as well as BJP.
- 3) The “B” samples were only tested by the “Forli” and “Liguria” Groups; the “Lazio” and “Toscana-Umbria” Groups were not included in the Multi-centre, as they were retained excessively low.

Question

If the samples had arrived at the participating laboratories with the request for “Detection of Bence Jones Protein”, what would have been the result?

Operating Procedure

The samples were analysed by the participating laboratories with both screening and second stage methods in use for the detection of BJP routine. Some laboratories carried out more repeats in various analysis sessions.

Expected Result

All the samples should have shown a positive result for the type of BJP indicated on the sample identification label.

Positive Result

The “abnormality signal” typical of each method was regarded as a “positive result”.

Stability of the Dilutions Distributed

The time between preparation of the dilutions distributed and the laboratory testing was very varied.

The stability of the dilutions distributed was thus controlled, determining the FLC by the manual immunoturbidimetric method with specific anti FLC reagent.

Both the “B” kappa and lambda samples deteriorated somewhat and then stabilised, whereas the others showed no appreciable variations during the observation period.

Stability was, furthermore, confirmed by inter-laboratory reproducibility of the nephelometric and turbidimetric determinations.

Results and Discussion

Samples from **52 Hospital Laboratories** were analysed, and all in all **over 2000 determinations** were carried out.

It had emerged that, from previous multicentre evaluation work (1) & (2) for the detection of BJP, few methods are reliable, and the following should not **currently** be used.:

- The dosage of Total Proteins in urine
 - The stick for the dosage of Total Proteins in urine
- Therefore, these methods were not adopted by the participating Laboratories.

Summary and Comparison of the Methods

[Table 1](#) shows a synthetic overall comparison of the results on the six samples with five techniques used by the different Laboratories.

The samples were analysed by 52 Laboratories who altogether carried out over 2,000 tests (many Laboratories did, in fact, check intra-laboratory repeatability with several repeats) and, with the various techniques, 750 “final results” were attained.

The overall comparison of the techniques demonstrates that the best performances were on Nephelometry/Turbidimetry with reagent for the Light Chains immediately followed by that with reagent for Total Light Chains (B&F); Immunofixation and Electrophoresis, which also gave some negative results on the “A1” samples with BJP concentration of approx. 2 mg/dl, clearly stand out.

Electrophoresis (EF)

[Table 2](#) shows the results of various commercial electrophoretic methods.

The colloidal gold used by one laboratory did not produce better results than the other methods with “traditional” dye, which re-confirms (1) that the commercial version of this dye does not give the performance of the “homemade” one described in literature (3).

If the sensitivity of EF is virtually as expected to be, the lack of inter-laboratory reproducibility even within the same method should, on the other hand, be underlined, as is demonstrated on both samples, including dilution “A1” (≈ 1.8 mg/dl), with Hydrigel for both black and violet dye. This shows that the method worked to the limit of its analytical sensitivity and that on the samples of higher concentration the results would be homogeneous. However this does not alter the fact that on at least two samples examined, out of 7 laboratories using the same method – Violet Hydrigel – 3 resulted BJ positive and 4 BJ negative.

This factor may not be surprising where the number of variables affecting the electrophoretic technique is not considered: gel hydration, environment temperature, humidity and ventilation, sample quantity actually applied and actually absorbed by the gel, “age” of the migration buffer and dye, migration times, voltage,

amperage, staining times and quality of de-staining etc. It thus follows that electrophoresis, amongst its many qualities, does not have and cannot have that of good repeatability.

Immunofixation (IFE)

The IFE results with anti Total Light Chain (Free & Bound) and anti Free Light Chain antisera are in [Table 3](#).

Considerations on the IFE reproducibility, even within the same method, are similar to those for Electrophoresis, which is, in any case, the first step for IFE. We should add the other variables connected to ImmunoPrecipitation, which are: antiserum quality, incubation period, washing, etc.

As regards sensitivity, compared to EF, IFE did not show the significant improvement which would have been expected; neither was there a notable difference between the use of anti Total Light Chain and anti Free Light Chain antisera.

Nephelometry/Turbidimetry with anti Total Light Chain (TLC) Reagents

The qualitative results, in positive/negative terms, are shown in [Table 4](#) and in overall quantitative terms in [Table 5](#).

The Dade-Behring nephelometer produced very good results both for sensitivity – with only 6 negative results on all the samples examined – and for precision, with acceptable inter-laboratory imprecision.

The Beckman nephelometer showed less sensitivity, on account of the minimum measurement limit set by the manufacturer.

The results from the two manufacturers’ instruments seemingly vary by a factor of 3.33. Therefore, the Beckman results were divided by this factor so as to give the data better comparability to that of the nephelometry and turbidimetry with anti Free Light Chain reagent.

Nephelometry/Turbidimetry with anti Free Light Chain (FLC) Reagents

The qualitative results, in positive/negative terms, are given in [Table 4](#) and in overall quantitative terms in [Table 5](#).

On the Dade-Behring BNA/BNII nephelometers and on Beckman’s Immage, the method “notched up” 100% with no negative on a total of **152 results** and as many as **724 repeats**.

The APS nephelometer result with turbidimetry on Cobas was also quite good.

From the quantitative point of view, precision was quite good on the whole, considering the rather low values of the samples.

Conclusions

Methods

In order to obtain better reproducibility on Electrophoresis and Immunofixation, at least for the same commercial method, an improved standardisation of methods would be required, alongside the collaboration of the manufacturers.

Regarding the Total Light Chain nephelometry, Beckman would need to adapt sensitivity and agree, with Dade-Behring, to uniformity in expressing the result, with the elimination of the 3.33 factor.

The use of EF and IFE with the materials and methods on the market for routine as the only method for the detection of BJP is somewhat perplexing, given the results obtained and the insufficient reproducibility demonstrated on the low concentrations, yet which appear to be of clinical importance.

With the current situation, the use of a protocol for the detection of BJP would seem appropriate, made up of: a nephelometric/turbidimetric method for Total or Free Light Chains, and Immunofixation (or also, in the majority of cases, Electrophoresis only); the first would ensure sensitivity, reproducibility and automation and the second, always to be used as confirmation of the first, would ensure specificity in identifying monoclonality. The ideal answer would be to carry out both method types simultaneously and, in the case of discrepancy, to carry out further opportune tests; this would cost both time and money however.

On the basis of the results of this work, the hypothesis of a “two-part” protocol – nephelometry as first level method and IFE on the positive samples – could be the best choice, provided that it is demonstrated with experimentation by both methods on a significant number of samples that nephelometry is comparable to IFE in detecting BJ-positive subjects.

Reference Samples

From the multicentre evaluation it was possible to choose the two highest concentrations of samples utilised as “reference samples” in “positive/negative” terms.

For both samples, the concentration of BJP in the two dilutions was estimated at approx. 2 mg/dl e 0.5 mg/dl.

The aforementioned “reference samples” are available from New Scientific Company.

Bibliography

- 1) Pallotti G. et al.
Valutazione multicentrica di metodi e protocolli per le Catene Leggere Libere e Proteine di Bence Jones in urine – Primi risultati
Biochimica Clinica, 19, 1995, pp 410-425
- 2) Pallotti G. et al.
Valutazione multicentrica di metodi commerciali di routine per la ricerca delle Proteine di Bence Jones in urine – Primi risultati
Presentato al Corso CEFAR “Le Proteine: dal Laboratorio alla Clinica” Desenzano, 13 ottobre 1999
Disponibile presso: New Scientific Company – Via Dante, 35 – I 20032 Cormano (MI)
Tel +39 02 6152021, Fax +39 02 6152154, e-mail: nsцит@newscientific.com
- 3) Aguzzi F; Gasparro C; Bergami MR; Merlini M
High-sensitivity electrophoretic method for the detection of Bence Jones protein and for the study of proteinuria in unconcentrated urines
Ann Clin Biochem 1993 May;30 (Pt 3):287-92

Tables

Table 1

Some laboratories used more than one method and/or several repetitions for each method

Overall comparison of the methods

Qualitative results expressed in no. of Laboratories which carried out each method

Method	Electrophoresis	Immunofixation (IFE)		Nephelometry - Turbidimetry		Totals						
		As LC (B&F)	As FLC	LC (B&F)	FLC							
Laboratories	26	39	28	23	32	25						
No. of Tests	240	344	316	389	750	2039						
Sample kappa												
Dil. A1	pos	7	28	16	23	32	106					
1.9 mg/dl	neg	19	73%	11	28%	12	43%	0	0%	0	0%	42
Dil. A	pos	1	17	9	13	31	71					
0.6 mg/dl	neg	25	96%	22	56%	19	68%	10	43%	1	3%	77
Dil. B	pos	0	3	2	3	20	28					
0.3 mg/dl	neg	13	100%	15	83%	14	88%	6	67%	3	13%	51
Totals	pos	8	48	27	39	83	205					
	neg	57	88%	48	50%	45	63%	16	29%	4	5%	170
Sample lambda												
Dil. A1	pos	8	30	23	22	32	115					
1.7 mg/dl	neg	18	69%	9	23%	5	18%	1	4%	0	0%	33
Dil. A	pos	1	13	11	18	31	74					
0.6 mg/dl	neg	25	96%	26	67%	17	61%	5	22%	1	3%	74
Dil. B	pos	0	2	1	5	20	28					
0.2 mg/dl	neg	13	100%	16	89%	15	94%	4	44%	3	13%	51
Totals	pos	9	45	35	45	83	217					
	neg	56	86%	51	53%	37	51%	10	18%	4	5%	158
Overall	pos	17	93	62	84	166	422					
Totals	neg	113	87%	99	52%	82	57%	26	24%	8	5%	328
	test	130	192	144	110	174	750					

Abbreviations As = antiserum
LT(B&F) = (Total) Light Chains (Bound&Free)
FLC = Free Light Chains

Some Laboratories carried out several repetitions

Electrophoresis

Results expressed in no. of Laboratories

Method	Acetate	Paragon SPE	Hydragel	Hydragel	Acetate Cell	Rep Helena	Capillary	Totals
Dye	red	blue	black	violet	gold	blue		
Laboratories	2	3	10	7	1	2	1	26
No. of tests	10	22	106	58	18	22	4	240
Sample kappa								
Dil. A1 pos	0	2	1	3	0	1	0	7
1.9 mg/dl neg	2	1	9	4	1	1	1	19
Dil. A pos	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
0.6 mg/dl neg	2	2	10	7	1	2	1	25
Dil. B pos	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0.3 mg/dl neg	1	2	3	5	1	1	0	13
Totals pos	0	3	1	3	0	1	0	8
Totals neg	5	5	22	16	3	4	2	57
Sample lambda								
Dil. A1 pos	0	2	1	3	1	1	0	8
1.7 mg/dl neg	2	1	9	4	0	1	1	18
Dil. A pos	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
0.6 mg/dl neg	2	2	10	7	1	2	1	25
Dil. B pos	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0.2 mg/dl neg	1	2	3	5	1	1	0	13
Totals pos	0	3	1	3	1	1	0	9
Totals neg	5	5	22	16	2	4	2	56
Overall pos	0	6	2	6	1	2	0	17
Overall Totals neg	10	10	44	32	5	8	4	113
								130

Table 3

Some Laboratories carried out several repetitions

Immunofixation

Results expressed in no. of Laboratories

System	As (Total) Light Chains (bound&free) (LC(b&f))							As Free Light Chains (FLC)							Totals
	Beckman Paragon Protur Beckman	Helena Immuno Fix Helena	Helena Auto IFE Helena	Helena Auto IFE Sebia	Sebia Hydragel Sebia	Acetate gold Dasit	Totals	Beckman Paragon N S C	Helena Immuno Fix Helena	Helena Auto IFE Helena	Helena Auto IFE N S C	Sebia Hydragel Sebia	Sebia Hydragel N S C	Acetate gold Dasit	
Laboratories	9	2	4	1	22	1	39	2	2	2	2	17	2	1	28
No. of Tests	80	10	40	18	192	4	344	42	22	22	30	180	16	4	316
Sample kappa															
Dil. A1 pos	8	1	3	1	14	1	28	2	0	1	2	8	2	1	16
1.9 mg/dl neg	1	1	1	0	8	0	11	0	2	1	0	9	0	0	12
Dil. A pos	4	0	1	1	10	1	17	2	0	0	1	5	0	1	9
0.6 mg/dl neg	5	2	3	0	12	0	22	0	2	2	1	12	2	0	19
Dil. B pos	1	0	0	1	1	0	3	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	2
0.3 mg/dl neg	6	1	1	0	7	0	15	2	1	1	1	8	1	0	14
Totals pos	13	1	4	3	25	2	48	4	0	1	4	14	2	2	27
Totals neg	12	4	5	0	27	0	48	2	5	4	2	29	3	0	45
Sample lambda															
Dil. A1 pos	8	1	3	1	16	1	30	2	1	1	2	14	2	1	23
1.7 mg/dl neg	1	1	1	0	6	0	9	0	1	1	0	3	0	0	5
Dil. A pos	3	0	0	0	9	1	13	2	0	1	1	5	1	1	11
0.6 mg/dl neg	6	2	4	1	13	0	26	0	2	1	1	12	1	0	17
Dil. B pos	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
0.2 mg/dl neg	6	1	1	1	7	0	16	2	1	1	2	8	1	0	15
Totals pos	12	1	3	1	26	2	45	4	1	2	3	20	3	2	35
Totals neg	13	4	6	2	26	0	51	2	4	3	3	23	2	0	37
Overall pos	25	2	7	4	51	4	93	8	1	3	7	34	5	4	62
Overall Totals neg	25	8	11	2	53	0	99	4	9	7	5	52	5	0	82
test							192								144

Table 4

Nephelometry and Turbidimetry Light Chains ⁽¹⁾ - Unconcentrated Sample

Some Laboratories carried out several repetitions

Qualitative Results expressed in no. of Laboratories

Instrument Reagent	Reagent (Total) Light Chains (bound&free)					Reagent Free Light Chains (FLC)				
	BNA/BNII <i>Behring</i>	Immage <i>Beckman</i>	APS <i>Beckman</i>	Cobas Mira <i>Dako</i>	Totals	BNA/BNII <i>N S C</i>	Immage <i>N S C</i>	APS <i>N S C</i>	Cobas Mira <i>N S C</i>	Totals
Laboratories No. of Tests	17 278	3 70	2 11	1 30	23 389	22 628	6 96	3 20	1 6	32 750
Sample kappa										
Dil. A1	pos 17	3	2	1	23	22	6	3	1	32
1.9 mg/dl	neg 0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dil. A	pos 12	0	0	1	13	22	6	2	1	31
0.6 mg/dl	neg 5	3	2	0	10	0	0	1	0	1
Dil. B	pos 3	0	0	0	3	14	6	0	0	20
0.3 mg/dl	neg 1	2	2	1	6	0	0	2	1	3
Totals	pos 32	3	2	2	39	58	18	5	2	83
	neg 6	5	4	1	16	0	0	3	1	4
Sample lambda										
Dil. A1	pos 17	2	2	1	22	22	6	3	1	32
1.7 mg/dl	neg 0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Dil. A	pos 17	0	0	1	18	22	6	2	1	31
0.6 mg/dl	neg 0	3	2	0	5	0	0	1	0	1
Dil. B	pos 4	0	0	1	5	14	6	0	0	20
0.2 mg/dl	neg 0	2	2	0	4	0	0	2	1	3
Totals	pos 38	2	2	3	45	58	18	5	2	83
	neg 0	6	4	0	10	0	0	3	1	4
Overall	pos 70	5	4	5	84	116	36	10	4	166
Totals	neg 6	11	8	1	26	0	0	6	2	8
					110					174

Note (1) This method is considered by Laboratories as a "first level test" in BJP research protocol. Positive samples are followed by EF and/or IFE. Lack of intra-laboratory repeatability in terms of positive/negative: none.

Table 5

Nephelometry and Turbidimetry Light Chains ⁽¹⁾ - Unconcentrated Sample

Some Laboratories carried out up to 10 repeats on 10 different days

Quantitative Results - Average and CV inter-laboratory

Instrument Reagent	Reagent (Total) Light Chains (bound&free)								Reagent Free Light Chains (FLC)																						
	Overall tests: 389																Overall tests: 746														
	BNA/BNII <i>Behring</i>		Immage ⁽²⁾ <i>Beckman</i>		APS ⁽²⁾ <i>Beckman</i>		Cobas Mira <i>Dako</i>		BNA/BNII <i>N S C</i>		Immage <i>N S C</i>		APS <i>N S C</i>		Cobas Mira <i>N S C</i>																
Laboratories No. of Tests	9	8	3		2		1		6	16	6		2		1																
	278		70		11		30		628		96		16		6																
Samples	Media mg/dl	CV	Media mg/dl	CV	Media mg/dl	CV	Media mg/dl	CV	Media mg/dl	CV	Media mg/dl	CV	Media mg/dl	CV	Media mg/dl	CV															
kappa																															
Dil. A1	1,52	31%	1,53	19%	2,01	4%	1,51	n.c.	1,84	16%	2,09	9%	n.s.	n.c.	2,36	n.c.															
Dil. A	0,79	13%	0,61	n.c.	< 0,55	n.c.	0,66	n.c.	0,73	22%	0,62	20%	n.s.	n.c.	0,93	n.c.															
Dil. B	0,80	n.c.	< 0,55	n.c.	< 0,55	n.c.	<	n.c.	0,34	28%	0,32	29%	n.s.	n.c.	neg	n.c.															
lambda																															
Dil. A1	1,97	12%	1,65	12%	1,84	18%	4,87	n.c.	1,75	5%	1,79	6%	n.s.	n.c.	1,96	n.c.															
Dil. A	0,92	13%	< 1,5	n.c.	< 1,5	n.c.	1,22	n.c.	0,67	17%	0,57	13%	n.s.	n.c.	0,72	n.c.															
Dil. B	0,40	3%	< 1,5	n.c.	< 1,5	n.c.	0,25	n.c.	0,18	42%	0,20	28%	n.s.	n.c.	neg	n.c.															

Legend: n.c. = not calculable; n.s. = not significant

(1) - This method is considered by Laboratories as a "first level test" in BJP research protocol. Positive samples are followed by EF and/or IFE

(2) - The instrument results are divided by a factor of 3.33