

ERNDIM Administration Office Manchester Centre for Genomic Medicine 6<sup>th</sup> Floor, St Mary's Hospital, Oxford Road, Manchester M13 9WL, United Kingdom. Tel: +44 161 276 6741 Fax: +44 161 850 1145 Email: admin@erndim.org

## Lysosomal Enzymes in fibroblasts

Scientific Advisor Dr Kees Schoonderwoerd Erasmus MC University Medical Center, P.O. Box 2040 3000 CA Rotterdam Netherlands Email: g.schoonderwoerd@erasmusmc.nl Scheme Organiser Dr. C.W. Weykamp Queen Beatrix Hospital MCA Laboratory P.O. Box 9005 NL – 7100 GG Winterswijk Netherlands Email: <u>c.w.weykamp@skbwinterswijk.nl</u>

## Annual Report 2014 Date of issue: 10 August 2015

## 1. Scheme Design

The scheme has been designed, planned and coordinated by Dr Kees Schoonderwoerd as Scientific Advisor and Dr Cas Weykamp as Scheme Organiser (sub-contractor on behalf of SKML); both appointed by and according to procedures laid down by the ERNDIM Board.

## 2. Samples

All EQA materials are lyophilised samples of human fibroblasts. All samples were obtained following local ethical and consent guidelines.

Sample	Disorder	Enzyme defect
LF1	MLD	Arylsulphatase A
LF2	Niemann Pick A/B	Sphingomyelinase
LF3	Hunter	Iduronate-2-sulphatase
LF4	Niemann Pick A/B	Sphingomyelinase
LF5	GM <sub>1</sub> (Morquio B)	beta-Galactosidase
LF6	Fabry	alpha-Galactosidase

Table 1: Samples for the 2014 scheme

## 3. Shipment

One shipment of 6 samples was sent out to the 76 laboratories, from 29 countries, which registered for the scheme.

## 4. Receipt of results

There were six submission deadlines from March to October 2014 at approximately 6 week intervals. Laboratories were asked to submit results for each EQA sample by the relevant submission deadline using the results website <u>www.erndimqa.nl</u>.

Laboratories were asked to report the total protein and the activities for 10 enzymes in absolute units and also as a percentage of their own laboratories control, see Table 2 for details. Laboratories could submit results for as many, or as few, of these 10 enzymes as they wished. Laboratories were also asked to select an 'interpretation' of the results from a dropdown list on the results website.

#### Table 2: Analytes to be measured

Analyte	Parameter 1	Parameter 2
Protein	mg/vial	
Arylsulphatase A	37 degr; nmol/17h/mg	37 degr; % mean control
alpha-Galactosidase	nmol/h/mg	% mean control
beta-Galactosidase	nmol/h/mg	% mean control
alpha-Glucosidase	nmol/h/mg	% mean control
beta-Glucosidase	nmol/h/mg	% mean control
beta-Hexosaminidase A	nmol/h/mg	% mean control
alpha-Iduronidase	nmol/h/mg	% mean control
Iduronate sulphatase	nmol/4h/mg	% mean control
Galactosylceramidase	nmol/17h/mg	% mean control
Sphingomyelinase	nmol/h/mg	% mean control

## 5. Scoring scheme

For each enzyme 2 criteria were scored: 1) diagnosis and 2) coefficient of variation (CV). A maximum of 2 points was awarded for each criterion. For the protein value a maximum of 2 points could be scored.

	Criteria		Score
Protein		CV<35%	2
	CV	35% <cv<60%< th=""><th>1</th></cv<60%<>	1
		CV>60%	0
Enzymes		Diagnosis correct	2
	Diagnosis	Diagnosis partially correct	1
		Diagnosis incorrect	0
		CV<35%	2
	CV	35% <cv<60%< th=""><th>1</th></cv<60%<>	1
		CV>60%	0

 Table 3: Scoring criteria

The maximum possible score for the scheme was 42 points (10 enzymes plus the protein value). Laboratories that participated fully in the scheme (i.e. submitted enough results for their performance to be assessed) but scored less than 60% of their maximum possible score were considered to be unsatisfactory performers in the scheme. For example if a laboratory submitted results for 8 analytes (protein & 7 enzymes) their maximum possible score would be 30 points so they would need to score 18 or more points to be a satisfactory performer. If 60% of a laboratory's maximum possible score was not a full integer the number of points for satisfactory performance was rounded down to the next full integer.

## 5.1. Diagnosis

The participants had to select an interpretation from the dropdown list on the results website.

**Diagnosis correct** indicated correct interpretation and correct measurement of enzyme activity level. In cases of control enzyme activity, the activity should be >15% of the mean control while in case of a patient enzyme activity, the activity should be <30% of the mean control.

**Diagnosis partially correct** indicated incorrect interpretation and correct enzyme activity level or correct interpretation and incorrect enzyme activity level.

Diagnosis incorrect indicated incorrect interpretation and incorrect enzyme activity level.



## 5.2. Coefficient of variation

Results submitted for samples LF2 and LF 4 were used to calculate the coefficient of variation (CV) according to the following formula.

CV = Activity LF4-activity LF2/mean

With only two samples (LF2 and LF4) it was not possible to calculate the standard deviation.

## 6. Results

Sixty-eight laboratories (89.5% of registered laboratories) submitted sufficient results for their performance to be assessed and a further 3 laboratories (3.9%) did not submit enough results for their performance to be assessed (partial submitters). One laboratory (1.3%) withdrew from the scheme and 4 laboratories (5.2%) did not submit any results.

Full details of each participating results are given in Appendix 1 but a brief summary is presented here:

- Over 70% of all laboratories submitted results for 7 or more enzymes, see Table 4.
- The proficiency per analyte is given in Table 5.
- Table 6 shows the percentage of the maximum possible score for the laboratories that submitted results.
- 64 laboratories that submitted results scored 60% or more of their maximum possible score and were classed as satisfactory performers.

Number of Enzymes for which results were submitted	Number of laboratories
0	4
1	2
2	1
3	3
4	5
5	2
6	4
7	11
8	9
9	10
10	24
Total number of labs	75

 Table 4: Number of enzymes for which laboratories submitted results





#### **Table 5:** Proficiency per analyte

Analyte	No of returns	Diagnosis (% <sup>1</sup> )	CV (% <sup>1</sup> )	Total Proficiency (% <sup>1</sup> )
Protein	71	n.a.	91	91
Arylsulfatase A	57	43	71	57
α-Galactosidase	62	86	81	83
β-Galactosidase	68	93	78	85
α-Glucosidase	48	90	76	83
β-Glucosidase	63	95	77	86
β-Hexosaminidase A	62	96	80	88
α-Iduronidase	53	92	79	85
Iduronate-2-sulphate sulphatase	41	85	70	77
Galactocerebrosidase	46	80	69	74
Sphingomyelinase	46	39	77	58

<sup>1</sup>= percentage of maximum possible score (for all laboratories that submitted results)

 Table 6: Percentage of maximum possible scores for laboratories that submitted results

%age of maximum possible score	No of submitting labs	%age of submitting labs			
0% – 9%	0	0%			
10% – 19%	0	0%			
20% – 29%	1	1.4%			
30% –39%	0	0			
40% – 49%	0	0%			
50% –59%	7	9.9%			
60% –69%	9	12.7%			
70% –79%	16	22.5%			
80% –89%	20	28.2%			
90% –99%	14	19.7%			
100%	4	5.60%			
Totals	71	100%			

Sample LF1 can be regarded as an educational sample, derived from a MLD patient with a high residual arylsulphatase A activity. Samples LF2 and LF4 will also be regarded as educational samples. They were derived from a Niemann-Pick A/B patient with a mutation in the substrate binding site. Therefore they were missed by the participants that used the artificial substrate without sphingomyelin and many participants did not interpret this as a patient.

38

7

6



	No of enzymes for	which:		No of enzymes for	which:
Lab No	results were submitted by lab	lab had satisfactory performance	Lab No	results were submitted by lab	lab had satisfactory performance
1	8	8	39	10	10
2	10	10	40	5	1
3	9	8	41	9	9
4	10	5	42	10	10
5	9	8	43	10	10
6	1	1	44	7	7
7	10	8	45	9	8
8	8	5	46	10	8
9	7	1	47	7	4
10	5	5	48	9	7
11	9	7	49	6	6
12	4	4	50	10	0
13	8	8	51	7	7
14	10	6	52	7	6
15	7	5	53	6	6
16	3	3	54	7	4
17	9	9	55	10	9
18	10	10	56	9	9
19	10	10	57	7	6
20	2	2	58	10	10
21	10	8	59	1	1
22	10	10	60	6	5
23	10	8	61	4	4
24	7	6	62	8	5
25	10	6	63	4	0
26	8	8	64	9	6
27	7	4	65	10	5
28	8	8	66	4	4
29	8	7	67	8	7
30	10	9	68	10	9
31	10	9	69	4	3
32	9	9	70	10	10
33	6	1	71	10	5
34	3	3			
35	3	2			
36	7	5			
37	10	10			

## **Table 7:** Number of enzymes for which submitting laboratories had satisfactory performance

## 7. Comments here on overall scheme performance

Overall all samples were correctly interpreted besides the educational samples.

## 8. Comparison to previous years

In 2013 arylsulfatase and iduronate-2-sulphate sulphatase activity measurements were not in the scheme, therefore no comparison can be made. For most enzymes there was no difference in the CV between 2013 and 2014 however there was a remarkable improvement in the number of participants with CV<35 for the analyte galactocerebrosidase.

		20 <sup>.</sup>	13			2	014	
	%age of labs with: No of %age of				e of labs	of labs with:		
Analyte	No data	CV<35	CV>35	labs	No data	CV<35	CV>35	labs
Protein/vial	8%	84%	8%	71	7%	83%	10%	71
Arylsulfatase A	-	-	-	-	14%	63%	23%	56
α-Galactosidase	7%	80%	13%	60	8%	73%	19%	64
β-Galactosidase	10%	62%	28%	69	12%	63%	25%	69
α-Glucosidase	9%	64%	27%	44	8%	68%	24%	49
β-Glucosidase	11%	64%	25%	64	11%	70%	19%	64
β-Hexosaminidase A	8%	67%	25%	61	13%	66%	21%	62
α-lduronidase	11%	59%	30%	53	4%	76%	20%	54
Iduronate-2-sulphate sulphatase	-	-	-	-	10%	61%	29%	43
Galactocerebrosidase	10%	46%	44%	39	7%	65%	28%	46
Sphingomyelinase	15%	58%	27%	41	9%	59%	17% (32%)	46

 Table 8: Comparison between CV data from 2013 and 2014

Kees Schoonderwoerd Scientific advisor Cas Weykamp Scheme Organiser

## **Appendix 1 (part 1):** Results per laboratory (see page 8 for key)

	Protein	/vial	Arylsulfatase A			α-G	idase	β-Galactosidase				
		Score			Score			Score	CV	CV Score		
Lab No	cv	CV	cv	CV	Diagnosis	CV	CV	Diagnosis		CV	Diagnosis	
1	3	2				3	2	1	7	2	2	
2	5	2	6;D-	2	0	10	2	2	12	2	2	
3	7	2	18	2	2	20	2	2	14	2	2	
4	9	2	181	0	0	63	0	2	112	0	2	
5	0	2	2	2	2	13	2	2	1	2	2	
6	-	1										
7	47	1	6	2	2	6	2	2	1	2	2	
8	8	2	165;D-D+	0	0	4	2	2	84	0	2	
9	64	0	D0;R0	1	2	80	0	1	39	1	2	
10	5	2	8	2	0	44	1	2	19	2	2	
11	17	2	26	2	1	5	2	2	119	0	2	
12	16	2	19	2	1				4	2	2	
13	19	2	7	2	2	1	2	2	23	2	2	
14	3	2	69	0	2	78	0	2	120	0	2	
15	4	2	10;D-	2	0	8	2	1	5	2	2	
16	-	1.5				-	1.5	2	R0	1.5	2	
17	-	1	R0;D+	1	2	-	1	2	R0	1	2	
18	9	2	9	2	0	3	2	2	23	2	2	
19	8	2	3	2	1	9	2	2	12	2	2	
20	14	2				20	2	2				
21	6	2	47	1	0	63	0	2	51	1	2	
22	60	0	1	2	0	2	2	2	2	2	2	
23	11	2	4;D-	2	1	31	2	2	33	2	2	
24	12	2	6;D-	2	0	26	2	2	14	2	2	
25	38	1	32	1	1	45	1	2	49;D+	1	0	
26	14	2	23	2	0	28	2	2	41	1	2	
27	15	2	R0;D-	0	0	64	0	1	12	2	2	
28	2	2				3	2	2	1	2	2	
29	45	1	58	1	1	11	2	2	45	1	2	
30	3	2	D0;R0	1	1	12	2	2	16	2	2	
31	15	2	33	2	2	14	2	2	36	1	2	
32	2	2	38;D-	1	0	14	2	2	100	2	2	
33	13	2	-03:0-	U	U	-	1	2	130	0	2	
34	10	2	106.01	0	0				12	2	2	
35	100	2	100,D+	0	0	0	2	0	21	2	2	
30	8	2	0	2	0	5	2	2	21	2	2	
37	13	2	12	2	2	5	2	<u> </u>	32	2	2	
39	10	2	12·D-	2	2	12	2	2	3	2	2	
40	46	1	R0	1	1	2	2	2	RO	2 1	2	
<u>40</u> <u>41</u>	13	2	2.0-	2	0	28	2	2	25	2	2	
47	5	2	9	2	1	14	2	2	1	2	2	
43	0	2	4	2	2	2	2	2	5	2	2	
44	5	2	135	0	1	4	2	2	10	2	2	
45	0	2	32	2	2	28·D-	2	1	2	2	2	
46	27	2	24	2	0	28:D-	2	1	15	2	2	
		_		_	-			1		_	ı —	



Lysosomal Enzymes in fibroblasts Scheme Annual Report 2014 (issued: 10 August 2015)



	Protein	/vial	Ary	se A	α-G	alactosi	dase	β-Galactosidase			
		Score			Score			Score	CV		Score
Lab No	CV	CV	CV	CV	Diagnosis	CV	CV	Diagnosis		CV	Diagnosis
47	18	2	31;D-;D+	2	0	28	2	2	13	2	2
48	30	2	37	1	0	43	1	1	13	2	2
49	-	1.5	R0;	1.5	2	-	1.5	2	R0	1.5	2
50	-	1	R0	1	1	-	1	1	R0;D0	1	2
51	0	2	1	2	1	4	2	2	5	2	2
52	5	2		0	0	24	2	2	27	2	2
53	5	2				12	2	2	7	2	2
54	10	2	65	0	0				71	0	2
55	14	2	10	1.5	1.5	38	1	1	2	1.5	1.5
56	5	2				6	2	1	21	2	2
57	16	2				21	2	1.5	19	2	1.5
58	19	2	33:D-	2	1	29	2	2	31	2	2
59	8	2				14	2	1			
60	29	2	15:D-	2	0				19	2	2
61	27	2							76;D-	0	0
62	0	2							1	2	2
63	17	2	15:D0	2	0	-	0	0	-	0	0
64	13	2				42	1	1	42	1	2
65	3	2	194;D-	0	1	63	0	2	52	1	2
66	19	2	19	2	1	13	2	2	5	2	2
67	27	2	8	2	2	0	2	2	2	2	2
68	6	2	10	2	1	27	2	2	33	2	2
69	6	2				8	2	1	19;D-	2	0
70	7	2	14	2	1	45	1	2	11	2	2
71	6	2	2:D-	2	1	31	2	2	57	1	2
Mean CV (±SD)	15.5 ±18.1%		39 ±55%			23 ±20%			28 ±32%		
% Diagnoses incorrect					2%			0%			4%

## <u>Key</u>

**green cells** = correct CV (<35), correct interpretation and correct enzyme level **red cells** =Incorrect measurement, CV (>35) or incorrect interpretation or enzyme level **blue cells** =not all samples measured

**D- =** enzyme activity patient sample > 30% control Fibroblast

**D+** = enzyme activity other samples < 20 % control Fibroblasts

**D0** = patient sample not measured

R0 = CV calculation not possible as one or both of LF2 and LF4 (duplicate samples) were not measured



# Appendix 1 (part 2): Results per laboratory (see page 8 for key)

	α·	Gluco	osidase	β-Glucosidase		β-Hexosaminidase A			α-Iduronidase			
			Score			Score			Score			Score
Lab No	CV	CV	Diagnosis	CV	CV	Diagnosis	CV	CV	Diagnosis	CV	CV	Diagnosis
1	-	0	0	8	2	2	32	2	2	-	0	0
2	41	1	2	3	2	2	4	2	2	11	2	2
3	2	2	2	67	0	2	5	2	2	3	2	2
4	1	2	2	88	0	2	9	2	2	28	2	2
5	2	2	2	3	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	2
6						-	-	1	2			
7	13	2	1	47	1	2	38	1	2	13	2	2
8	26	2	2	21	2	2	19	2	2			
9							-	2	2	86	0	2
10				22	2	2	53	1	2			
11	14	2	2	61	0	2	9	2	2			
12				3	2	2				24	2	2
13	12	2	2	21	2	2	7	2	2	28	2	2
14	33	2	2	3	2	2	6	2	2	45	1	2
15	59	1	2	6	2	2	15	2	2	5	2	2
16							-	1.5	2			
17	-	1	2	-	1	2	-	1	2	-	1	2
18	4	2	2	8	2	2	6	2	2	5	2	2
19	6	2	2	3	2	2	0	2	2	4	2	2
20												
21	8	2	2	21	2	2	16	2	2	85	0	2
22	2	2	2	24	2	2	-	2	2	8	2	2
23	39	1	2	94	0	2	22	2	2	102:D+	0	1
24	35	1	0	-	0	1	16	2	2	9	2	2
25	52	1	2	31	2	2	45;D+	1	1	36;D+	1	1
26				36	1	2	57	1	2	23	2	2
27				18	2	2	17	2	1	10	2	2
28				20	2	2	24	2	2	4	2	2
29	40	1	2	16	2	2	131	0	2	41	1	2
30	27	2	2	16	2	2	18	2	2	7	2	2
31	31	2	2	20	2	2	7	2	2	4	2	2
32	12	2	2	30	2	2	8	2	2	11	2	2
33	28	2	2	153	0	2						
34							9	2	2			
35				39	1	2						
36	-	1	2	32	2	2	12	2	2	61	0	2
37	24	2	2	18	2	2	6	2	2	7	2	2
38	30	2	2	8	2	2	2	2	2	4;D+	2	1
39	1	2	2	6	2	2	1	2	2	13	2	2
40		L		-	1	1	73	0	2			
41	12	2	2	43	1	2	36	1	2	7	2	2
42	0	2	2	0	2	2	10	2	2	2	2	2
43	1	2	2	6	2	2	14	2	2	4	2	2
44	73	0	2	-	2	2						
45	3	2	2	3	2	2	6	2	2	12	2	2
46	49	1	2	25;D+	2	1	7	2	2	20	2	2

## Lysosomal Enzymes in fibroblasts Scheme Annual Report 2014 (issued: 10 August 2015)



	α-	Gluco	osidase	β-	Gluco	sidase	β-Hex	cosam	inidase A	α-lduronidase		
			Score			Score			Score			Score
Lab No	CV	CV	Diagnosis	CV	CV	Diagnosis	CV	C۷	Diagnosis	CV	CV	Diagnosis
47	-	0	2	21	2	2				35;D+	2	0
48				91	0	2	7	2	2	12	2	2
49				-	1	2	-	1	2	-	1	2
50	D+	1	0	-	1	2	-	1	2	-	1	2
51	8	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	7	2	2
52				2	2	2	10	2	2	35	1	2
53	14	2	2	6	2	2						
54							100	0	2	4	2	1.5
55	9	1.5	1.5	8	1.5	1.5	15	1.5	1.5	20	1.5	1.5
56	3	2	2	6	2	2	55	1	2	57	1	2
57	36	1	1.5	32	2	1.5	45	1	1.5	29	2	1.5
58	13	2	2	22	2	2	38	1	2	57	1	2
59												
60				-	1	2	2	2	2	19	2	2
61				29	2	2	68	0	2			
62	5	2	2	3	2	2	-	0	0	2	2	2
63				-	0	0						
64	44	0	2	46	1	2	45	1	2	9	2	2
65	39	1	2	22	2	2	5	2	2	108	0	2
66							12	2	2			
67				14	2	2	57	1	2			
68	11	2	2	5	2	2	16	2	2	2	2	2
69				8	2	2	2	2	2			
70	48	1	2	35	1	2	4	2	2	43	1	2
71	70	0	0	84	0	2	26	2	2	32	2	2
Mean CV	24			26			23			24		
(ISU) % Diagnosos	±20%		2%	129%		1 5%	<b>120</b> %		2%	<b>12/%</b>		7%
incorrect			<b>2</b> /0			1.3 /0			∠ /0			1 /0



# Appendix 1 (part 3): Results per laboratory (see page 8 for key)

	Iduronate-2-sulphate sulphatase			Galactocerebrosidase			Sphingomyelinase Score		
Lah No	CV	CV	Diagnosis	CV	CV	Diagnosis	CV	CV	Diagnosis
	CV	CV	Diagnosis	CV	0	Diagnosis	CV	1	
2	2	2	2	- 10	2	0	-	2	0
2	2	2	2	10	2	2	1,0-	2	0
3	70	0	2	15	2	2		2	2
4	70	0	2	23	1	2	32,D-	2	0
5				100	0	۷	2,D-	2	0
0	4	2		40	~	0		2	0
1	4	2	2	12	2	0	0,0-	2	0
0				120	0	2	30;	1	2
9				1//	U	۷	200	0	2
10	20				0	4		4	
11	39	1	2	9	2	1	44	1	2
12									
13	19	2	2			-	101		
14	9:D+	2	0	2	2	2	121	2	2
15									
16									
17	-	1	2				R0	1	2
18	30	2	2	17	2	2	1	2	2
19	19	2	2	3	2	2	20	2	2
20	38	1	2						
21	35	1	2	10	2	2	4;D-	2	1
22	18	2	2	6	2	2	40;D-	1	0
23	15	2	2	16	2	2	14;D-	2	0
24									
25	36	1	2	87	0	2	19;D-	2	0
26	57	1	2	17	2	2			
27				6	2	2	30	2	0
28	19	2	2	30	2	2	2;D-	2	0
29	33	2	2						
30	11	2	2	38	1	1	-	0	2
31	36	1	0	61	0	2	16;D-	2	0
32	6	2	2	21	2	2			
33	158	0	2						
34				8	2	2			
35									
36									
37	10	2	2	3	2	2	23;D-	2	0
38							16;D-	2	0
39	4	2	2	9	2	2	80	2	2
40									
41	29	2	2	34	2	2			
42	5	2	2	5	2	2	4;D-	2	0
43	28	2	2	5	2	2	6:-	2	2
44				24	2	2	44:D-	1	1
45				16	2	2	9:D-	2	0
46	1	2	2	21	2	2	33·D-	2	0
-			1		_	-		_	

## Lysosomal Enzymes in fibroblasts Scheme Annual Report 2014 (issued: 10 August 2015)

## 

	Iduronate-2-sulphate sulphatase			Galactocerebrosidase			Sphingomyelinase		
	Score		Score		Score		Score		
Lab No	cv	CV	Diagnosis	CV	CV	Diagnosis	CV	CV	Diagnosis
47							100	1	2
48	9	2	2	31	2	1	5;D-	2	0
49									
50	-	1	2	-	1	0	-	1	0
51									
52							200	2	2
53	2	2	2				113	2	2
54	-	0	2	51	1	2	19	2	1.5
55	29	2	0	10	1.5	1.5	96;D-	0	1
56	118	0	2	2	2	2	1;D-	2	0
57							-	0	0
58	17	2	2	31	2	2	55;D-	1	0
59									
60				86	0	0			
61				-	1	2			
62	-	0	0	-	0	0	21	2	2
63									
64	29	2	2	94	0	0	7;D-	2	0
65	67	0	2	81	0	2	53;D-	1	0
66									
67	-	0	0	18	2	2	16;D-	2	0
68	37	1	2	6	2	1	21;D-	2	0
69									
70	28	2	2	42	1	0	45;D-	1	0
71	82	0	0	71	0	2	-	0	0
Mean CV (+SD)	31 +33%			37 +43%			21 +20%		
% Diagnoses incorrect	±0070		5%	<b>⊥+</b> ⊽ /0		17%	±£0 /0		61%