Peer reviewed version

Link to published version (if available):
10.1136/jclinpath-2017-204456

Link to publication record in Explore Bristol Research
PDF-document

University of Bristol - Explore Bristol Research
General rights

An evaluation of a coagulation system (Xprecia Stride™) for utilisation in anticoagulation management

Deborah McCahon, PhD [1&3]*

Andrea Roalfe, MSc [1]

David A Fitzmaurice, FRGCP [2]

[1] University of Birmingham, Institute of Applied Health Research, Birmingham, B15 2TT

[2] University of Warwick, Warwick Clinical Trials, Coventry, CV4 7AL

[3] University of Bristol, Social and Community Medicine, Bristol, BS8 2PS

* Corresponding author

Social and Community Medicine

Centre for Academic Primary care

Canynge Hall

39 Whatley Road

Bristol

BS8 2PS

Tel: +44 0117 93313901

deborah.mccahon@bristol.ac.uk

Key words – INR, Warfarin, Point of Care, evaluation, coagulometer

Abstract

Aim

To evaluate the reliability and performance of the Xprecia Stride coagulometer under the conditions which the coagulometer is most likely be utilised.

Methods

The performance of the Xprecia Stride coagulometer was compared with a local laboratory and the CoaguChek systems routinely used for INR estimation within one primary and one secondary care based anticoagulation clinic in Birmingham. Anticoagulation clinic personnel were trained to use the Xprecia Stride. Patients attending the clinics were eligible if aged 18 years or more and had received warfarin for at least 3 months. Consenting participants provided capillary blood samples for parallel testing on the Xprecia Stride and CoaguChek systems. At the secondary care clinic, a venous blood sample was also collected for laboratory INR estimation. INR results were compared using linear regression analysis and Bland Altman plots.

Results

A total of 102 laboratory and 205 parallel coagulometer INR tests were performed. Linear regression revealed strong correlation between the Xprecia Stride and the laboratory (r=0.83) and between the Xprecia Stride and CoaguChek systems (r=0.92). Within the therapeutic range agreement between the systems was very good with 87% of the Xprecia Stride and laboratory INR results and 93% of the Xprecia Stride and CoaguChek INR results being within 0.5 INR units of each other.

Conclusion

INRs tested using the Xprecia Stride system showed good agreement with the laboratory and CoaguChek systems. Findings indicate that in the hands of the intended users the Xprecia Stride is accurate, reliable and acceptable for use in a routine clinical setting.

Introduction

Community management of anticoagulation has increased due to expanding indications for warfarin therapy, particularly non rheumatic atrial fibrillation [1] and the introduction of reliable point of care (POC) devices for INR estimation. [2-6] POC devices are defined as portable coagulometers designed for use in close proximity to the patient, i.e. at the bedside or in the clinic, and are ideal for utilisation outside the laboratory within the community setting. Previous primary care based studies comparing INR estimation using POC testing systems appropriate for primary care with regional reference laboratories have showed consistency of results between systems. [7] Portable coagulometers have also been evaluated widely for use in patient self monitoring of warfarin therapy. [8-12].

The 2008 Centre for Evidence based Purchasing (CEP) guidelines recommend a number of technical, operational and economic considerations for POC devices monitoring oral anticoagulation and the British Committee for Standards in Haematology (BCSH) guidelines for POC testing also provide recommendations in terms of management, training, equipment selection and safety. [13, 14] The CEP guidelines provide a framework for the management of POC testing services and the guidance applies to both hospital and community services. The guidelines state that devices should have received a successful independent performance evaluation and that POC devices should generate results that are comparable to those of the local laboratory. An accredited External Quality Assessment (EQA) programme and Internal Quality Control (IQC) system must also be in place. They also state that anyone outside the laboratory setting undertaking POC testing should have training and annual competency assessment. The BCSH guidelines recommend an evaluation under the conditions most likely to be encountered in normal everyday use i.e. within the community and under less highly controlled conditions as seen in the laboratory.

The Xprecia Stride system is a new to market, Conformité Européenne (CE) marked, point of care coagulometer intended for use by healthcare professionals for the monitoring of warfarin therapy. It is a hand-held analyzer using a single-use test strip and electrochemical technology to measure the prothrombin time in capillary blood samples. Although independent Medicines and Healthcare products Regulatory Agency (MHRA) evaluation is no longer available, the manufacturers of the Xprecia Stride were keen to seek independent evaluation and expert review. (Table 1). The purpose of the current study was therefore to evaluate the reliability and performance of the Xprecia Stride under the conditions which the coagulometer is most likely be utilised. The primary objective was to determine the level of agreement of the INR results obtained using the Xprecia Stride with INR results obtained from a local laboratory system and a POC system routinely used in a primary and secondary care based anticoagulation clinic.

Methods

The evaluation was conducted over a period of 10 weeks during February and April 2016 in one primary care and one secondary care based anticoagulation clinic in Birmingham. The anticoagulation clinic personnel were all experienced in the use of POC devices for INR estimation. Eight clinic personnel were involved in the evaluation at the secondary care site and two at the primary care site. All clinic personnel received training in the evaluation protocol from members of the research team. Training in the use of the Xprecia Stride was provided by the POC Product Manager, Siemens Healthcare Limited who also supplied the clinics with two Xprecia Stride testing systems, test strips (batch number 400570) and Internal Quality Control (IQC) materials (batch number 509010). Training reflected the training usually given to intended users. Personnel from Siemens Healthcare Ltd were not involved in the conduct of the evaluation. Patients attending the anticoagulation clinics were eligible to participate if aged 18 years or more and had been receiving warfarin for at least 3 months. Patients were ineligible if they were housebound or pregnant. Patients registered at the primary care anticoagulation clinic received an invitation letter and participant information sheet through the post. Patients registered with the secondary care clinic were provided with a participant information sheet and invitation to participate when they attended their clinic. Eligibility was confirmed by a member of the research team and eligible patients provided written informed consent to participate. In the primary care setting, participants consented to collection of two samples of capillary blood using one finger stick. In the secondary care setting, participants consented to collection of two samples of capillary blood using one finger stick and a venous blood sample.

To meet the minimum requirements of verification of system accuracy, the protocol aimed to collect 100 samples at each site to obtain a spread of INR values throughout (i.e. 1.5-4.0) and above the therapeutic range (i.e. >4.1). It was not possible to obtain 100 samples at the primary care site due to a lower than anticipated attendance at the clinic. To enable collection of 200 capillary samples recruitment at the secondary care site continued until 100 venous and 200 capillary samples with INR results above 1.5 had been collected.

POC testing procedure

Capillary samples were obtained using the single-use lancing device routinely used in the clinic (Accu-Chek Safe-T-Pro Plus, Roche, Mannheim, Germany). POC testing was undertaken in parallel on the Xprecia stride system and the routinely used POC system using one finger stick and two drops of capillary blood. The capillary blood sample was applied to the two POC devices within 15 seconds of the finger stick being undertaken. The

order of the application of the capillary blood to the two machines was varied to ensure an equal distribution of samples across the two machines throughout the evaluation period. The order of blood application was dictated by the INR case report forms administered to the clinic personnel by the research team. In the event that either device failed to display an INR result, the finger stick procedure was repeated using a different finger/site if the patient was agreeable. The procedure was limited to two attempts so as not to overburden the patient. A third finger stick to obtain an INR reading on the routinely used POC device was allowed if necessary. Ethical approval was obtained from the West Midlands Black Country Research Ethics Committee Ref 15/WM/0382. Warfarin dose and recall for INR monitoring was based upon the INR result obtained on the routinely used POC system.

The POC device used within the primary care anticoagulation clinic was the CoaguChek XS Plus (Roche, Mannheim, Germany), the secondary care clinic used the CoaguChek XS Pro (Roche, Mannheim, Germany). The CoaguChek XS Pro has the additional ability to scan bar coded patient identification numbers and to connect a data management system through a handheld base unit. These CoaguChek systems are otherwise similar, utilising the same test materials (CoaguChek XS PT test, Roche) and principle of clot detection. Equivalence between INR results determined using these two systems has been previously demonstrated. [15]. Four batches of CoaguChek XS PT test strips were utilised at the secondary care site (batch numbers 294-030-11, 206-631-11, 206-632-12, and 206-465-12) and three batches at the primary care site (batch numbers 294-030-11, 203-359-11 and 205-138-11).

Venous testing procedure

At the secondary care site a 4 ml venous blood sample was taken immediately after the POC measurements in a siliconised glass citrated anticoagulated sample bottle (containing 0.109 molars of citrate, Vacutainer system). Tubes were inverted to ensure adequate mixing and kept at room temperature until being transported to the hospital laboratory. The laboratory system used was the ACL TOP 700, which uses the RecombiPlasTin reagent and routinely undergoes INR calibration for each new batch of reagent. The mean normal PT used for the laboratory INR calculation was derived from measurement of PT in 20 healthy, non-anticoagulated patients. A program of daily internal quality assurance using commercial and local plasmas is utilized. The laboratory is CPA (Clinical Pathology Accreditation) registered and regularly participates in UKNEQAS (UK National External Quality Assurance Service). The laboratory performs well within the UKNEQAS blood coagulation EQA scheme achieving results which are within consensus. INR measurement was undertaken within 6 hours of sample collection.

Internal Quality Control

Internal Quality Control (IQC) procedures were performed on each of the POC systems at the start of each clinic. IQC materials were supplied by the manufacturers with one level of IQC being performed on the CoaguChek systems and two levels of IQC being performed on the Xprecia Stride system in accordance with the instructions for use.

Data collection

Clinic personnel recorded the INR results obtained in parallel, strip batch numbers and details of error messages or repeated attempts on the INR case report form. All IQC results were recorded on the IQC case report forms. Technical issues encountered outside of INR testing were also recorded.

Analysis

Scatterplots and linear regression analysis were used to visually explore and assess the strength of the linear association between the INR measurements recorded by different methods. Agreement between the different methods was then formally assessed via Bland-Altman plots. The difference in INR was plotted against the mean INR along with the corresponding limits of agreement (mean ± 1.96 SD). The 95% confidence intervals of these limits were also displayed. The pre-defined clinically acceptable limits of agreement were ± 0.5 INR units. The percentage of samples with bias that occurred outside of these limits is reported with corresponding 95% confidence intervals. INR measurements were also classified into those 'in range' (i.e INR 2-4) and those 'out of range'. To assess the impact of setting, the rate of disagreement in classification of the INR (i.e. in range versus out of range) between the Xprecia Stride and CoaguChek systems used within the primary and secondary care settings was compared using binomial exact tests.

Results

Samples

Overall 205 blood samples were collected, 83 in primary care and 122 in the secondary care setting. A total of 102 venous blood samples were collected for laboratory INR estimation and 205 capillary blood tests were used in parallel for INR estimation on the Xprecia Stride and CoaguChek systems. INR results determined by the CoaguChek ranged from 1.3-6.5. INR results obtained on the Xprecia Stride ranged from 1.3->8.0. Laboratory determined INRs ranged from 1.5-6.6.

INR comparison

Xprecia Stride versus the Laboratory system

Regression analysis yielded an intercept of 0.03 units (95% CI -0.39 to 0.45, p=0.89) and a slope of 0.98 (95% CI 0.85 to 1.11, p<0.001). The correlation (r) between the Stride and laboratory INR testing systems was 0.83 (p<0.001) with R^2 of 69%. (Figure 1). These figures were obtained from the linear regression and include the outliers. Outliers were identified from visual inspection of the scattergrams. Following removal of outliers the correlation (r) between the Stride and laboratory INR testing system was 0.97 with R^2 94%.

The Bland-Altman difference plots of the Xprecia Stride and laboratory data revealed a mean difference (average bias) of -0.035 units with 95% limits of agreement between -1.46 to 1.40 and the percent of samples outside ±0.5 bias (within the INR range 1.5 to 4.0) of 12.8% (11/86, 95% CI 6.6% to 21.7%). (Figure 2) Following removal of 6 outliers (4 with laboratory results outside of the therapeutic range i.e <1.5 and >4.0), the mean bias was
 -0.14 units with 95% limits of agreement between -0.69 to 0.41 and the percent of samples outside ±0.5 bias within the INR range 1.5 to 4.0 of 10.7% (9/84, 95% CI 5.0% to 19.4%).

Xprecia Stride versus the CoaguChek POC systems

Regression analysis yielded an intercept of units -0.20 (95% CI -0.38 to -0.02, p=0.028) and a slope of 1.04 (95% CI 0.98 to 1.10 p<0.001). (Figure 3) The correlation between the Stride and CoaguChek INR testing systems was 0.92 with R^2 of 85%. Following removal of outliers the correlation (r) between the Stride and the CoaguChek systems was 0.94 with R^2 89%.

The Bland-Altman difference plots for the Xprecia Stride and CoaguChek systems revealed a mean difference (average bias) of -0.09 units with 95% limits of agreement between -0.95 to 0.77 and a 6.6 (12/183, 95% CI 3.4 to 11.2%) percent of samples outside ±0.5 bias within the INR range 1.5 to 4.0. Following removal of 2 outliers (1 with a CoaguChek result outside of the therapeutic range i.e <1.5 and >4.0), the mean bias was -0.12 units with 95% limits of

agreement between -0.81 to 0.57 and a percent of samples outside ±0.5 bias within the INR range 1.5 to 4.0 of 6.0% (11/182, 95% CI 3.1% to 10.6%).

Impact of setting

INR measurements were classified into those 'in range' (INR 2-4) and those 'out of range' (<2 and >4). (Table 2) No significant difference was observed in the rate of disagreement in INR classification between the Stride and CoaguChek systems used within the primary care setting compared with the secondary care setting (10.8% versus 12.3%, difference =1.5% (95% CI -8.0% to 10.9%, p=0.78).

Internal Quality Control

The IQC results for all three methods were within the allowable limits. The one level IQC for the CoaguChek took less time to prepare than the two level IQC for the Xprecia Stride (the reconstituted control solution for the CoaguChek being ready for use one minute after the addition of the diluent versus five minutes for the Stride). Time to perform one IQC test on either system was similar (CoaguChek; one level IQC; 4-5 minutes versus Stride, two level IQC, 8-10 minutes).

Technical difficulties

No mechanical problems were encountered with the POC devices during the evaluation. Error messages due to application of an inadequate capillary sample were observed on the POC systems on 8 of 208 (3.8%) occasions. The Stride displayed this error message on 4 of the 8 (50%) occasions and the CoaguChek displayed this error message on 4 of the 8 occasions (associated error rate for each system 1.9%).

Discussion

In the present study the performance of the Xprecia Stride system used within both a primary and secondary care setting by intended users was compared with a laboratory method and two CoaguChek POC systems for INR estimation. Linear regression revealed strong correlation between the Stride and the laboratory (r=0.83) and between the Stride and the CoaguChek systems (r=0.92). It is recognised that this correlation only measures the straight line of linear association between the two measurements and does not provide a meaningful measure of agreement. Bland-Altman was therefore used to investigate the mean differences in INR between the Stride, laboratory and CoaguChek testing systems.

Bland-Altman plots revealed good agreement within the therapeutic range between 1.5 and 4.0, with the Stride performing on average 0.03 INR units lower than the laboratory and 0.09 INR units lower than the CoaguChek. Although perfect agreement between the systems was not observed within the INR range 1.5 to 4.0, the overall variance in INR results was within acceptable limits with an analytical bias of more than 0.5 INR units being evident in fewer than 13% of samples. The overall agreement between the systems was therefore good with 87% (75/86) of the INR results from the Stride being within 0.5 INR units of the results obtained by the laboratory. Furthermore, despite the use of different batches of strips, CoaguChek systems and other user dependant variables within and between the anticoagulation clinics, 93% (171/183) of the Stride and CoaguChek INRs were within 0.5 INR units of each other. These results compare favourably with figures of 76%, 83%, 85% and 88% reported in previous studies comparing POC determined INR with laboratory determined INR. [16-19]

Findings suggest that the Stride system has a tendency to slightly overestimate the INR when measurements are above the therapeutic range (>4.0) and underestimate the INR when the INR is within or below the therapeutic range. Similar findings however are well documented in other studies comparing INRs determined using POC systems with laboratory methods. [20-22] As such the performance of any POC system for INR estimation above the therapeutic range when compared with another system has to be viewed in the context of the inherent inaccuracies of INR measurements. Furthermore this finding is unlikely to be of clinical importance as management of high INRs should be clinically guided. [23] The accuracy of the Stride in this respect is acceptable for use in everyday clinical practice. Use of the two level IQC is however recommended to assess day-to-day consistency and ensure proper functioning of the system and test strips.

Whilst no technical difficulties were reported during the evaluation, error messages indicating failed measurements were observed on both the Stride and CoaguChek systems leading to repeat testing. The overall rate of failed tests due to application of an inadequate sample

observed during the evaluation was however <4% and likely due to the per protocol requirement for parallel testing with application of one drop of capillary blood from one finger stick to two POC systems. As such these errors are less likely to occur when using the Stride in routine clinical practice where only one drop of capillary blood is required for INR estimation. The frequency and associated cost of repeat testing in routine clinical practice is likely therefore to be minimal.

This evaluation has a number of strengths. The study was performed under real–life conditions by intended users in a primary and secondary care setting and included comparison of INR results with an established hospital laboratory method. Furthermore, the analysis employed linear regression to examine the relationship between the INR results obtained via the different systems and Bland-Altman plots to assess the mean differences in INR and agreement over the therapeutic range.

A high number of parallel measurements (n=183) within the INR range 1.5 to 4.0 were undertaken on the Stride and CoaguChek, providing a precise estimation of accuracy. The estimation of accuracy of the Stride within the INR range 1.5 to 4.0 compared with the laboratory is however limited by a smaller number of samples (n=86) and as indicated by the wider confidence intervals around the estimates, is less precise.

Test strip batch to batch variation comparison was not within the scope of the current study. As such the findings of this evaluation are limited by the use of one of batch of test strips. Furthermore patients with conditions known to interfere with POC INR estimation such as antiphospholipid syndrome, anaemia and polycythaemia were not excluded from the evaluation. It is possible that samples from these patient groups were included and are responsible for the analytical bias of more than 1.4 INR units (i.e. above the upper limit of agreement) evident in the comparison of the Stride and laboratory determined INRs before the removal of the outlying INR results.

Conclusion

INRs tested using the Xprecia Stride system showed good agreement with the laboratory and CoaguChek systems for patients with INR results within the therapeutic range up to an INR 4.0. Findings suggest that the Xprecia Stride system is accurate, reliable and acceptable for INR estimation in everyday clinical practice in a primary and secondary care setting as long as correct procedures are followed.

Take home messages

- The Xprecia Stride system is a new to market, point of care (POC) coagulometer intended for use by healthcare professionals.

- The British Committee for Standards in Haematology (BCSH) guidelines for POC testing recommend an evaluation under the conditions most likely to be encountered in normal everyday practice.

- Within both a primary and secondary care setting, the overall agreement between the INRs determined by the Xprecia Stride, CoaguChek systems and the laboratory method was within acceptable limits.

- In the hands of the intended users the Xprecia Stride is appropriate for use in everyday clinical practice.

Licence for Publication

The Corresponding Author has the right to grant on behalf of all authors and does grant on behalf of all authors, an exclusive licence (or non exclusive for government employees) on a worldwide basis to the BMJ Publishing Group Ltd to permit this article (if accepted) to be published in JCP and any other BMJPGL products and sublicences such use and exploit all subsidiary rights, as set out in our licence
(http://group.bmj.com/products/journals/instructions-for-authors/licence-forms).

Reference List

(1) National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence. Atrial Fibrillation: the management of atrial fibrillation. https://www nice org uk/guidance/cg180?unlid=81235962120166782425 2014 [cited 2016 Jul 8];

(2) Murray ET, Fitzmaurice DA, Allan TF, Hobbs FD. A primary care evaluation of three near patient coagulometers. J Clin Pathol 1999 Nov;52(11):842-5.

(3) Hobbs FD, Fitzmaurice DA, Murray ET, Holder R, Rose PE, Roper JL. Is the international normalised ratio (INR) reliable? A trial of comparative measurements in hospital laboratory and primary care settings. J Clin Pathol 1999 Jul;52(7):494-7.

(4) Kapiotis S, Quehenberger P, Speiser W. Evaluation of the new method Coaguchek for the determination of prothrombin time from capillary blood: comparison with Thrombotest on KC-1. Thromb Res 1995 Mar 15;77(6):563-7.

(5) Sander KJ, Lewis SM, Cooper S, England JM. An evaluation of the Nycomed thrombotrak coagulation system. London. NHS procurement Directorate; 1989.

(6) Chitolie A, Mackie I, Machin S. Evaluation of the Thrombolytic Assessment System (TAS) Coagulometer. Medicines Device agency. London; 1995.

(7) Shiach C.R, Campbell B, poller L, Keown M, Chauhan N. Reliability of point of care prothrombin time testing in a community clinic: a randomised crossover comparison with hospital laboratory testing. Br J Haematol 2002; 119, 370-375.

(8) McCahon D, Murray ET, Jowett S, Sandhar HS, Holder RL, Hussain S, et al. Patient self management of oral anticoagulation in routine care in the UK. J Clin Pathol 2007 Nov;60(11):1263-7.

(9) Fitzmaurice DA, Gardiner C, Kitchen S, Mackie I, Murray ET, Machin SJ. An evidence-based review and guidelines for patient self-testing and management of oral anticoagulation. Br J Haematol 2005 Oct;131(2):156-65.

(10) Garcia-Alamino JM, Ward AM, onso-Coello P, Perera R, Bankhead C, Fitzmaurice D, et al. Self-monitoring and self-management of oral anticoagulation. Cochrane Database Syst Rev 2010;(4):CD003839.

(11) Gardiner C, Williams K, Longair I, Mackie IJ, Machin SJ, Cohen H. A randomised control trial of patient self-management of oral anticoagulation compared with patient self-testing. Br J Haematol 2006 Mar;132(5):598-603.

(12) Gardiner C, Williams K, Mackie IJ, Machin SJ, Cohen H. Patient self-testing is a reliable and acceptable alternative to laboratory INR monitoring. Br J Haematol 2005 Jan;128(2):242-7.

(13) CEP 07026. NHS Purchasing and Supply Agency. Buyers guide:Point of care coagulometers for monitoring oral anticoagulation. London :Centre for Evidence-based Purchasing; 2008.

(14) Briggs C, Kimber S, Green L. Where are we at with point-of-care testing in haematology? Br J Haematol 2012 Sep;158(6):679-90.

(15) Roche Diagnostics International Ltd. Accuracy and precision in oral anticoagulation monitoring. http://www cobas com/content/dam/cobas_com/pdf/product/CoaguChek-XS-Plus-Pro-systems/Accuracy-and-precision pdf 2014

(16) Sunderji R, Gin K, Shalansky K, Carter C, Chambers K, Davies C, et al. Clinical impact of point-of-care vs laboratory measurement of anticoagulation. Am J Clin Pathol 2005 Feb;123(2):184-8.

(17) Jackson SL, Bereznicki LR, Peterson GM, Marsden KA, Jupe DM, Tegg E, et al. Accuracy, reproducibility and clinical utility of the CoaguChek S portable international normalized ratio monitor in an outpatient anticoagulation clinic. Clin Lab Haematol 2004 Feb;26(1):49-55.

(18) Jackson SL, Bereznicki LR, Peterson GM, Marsden KA, Jupe DM, Vial JH, et al. Accuracy and clinical usefulness of the near-patient testing CoaguChek S international normalised ratio monitor in rural medical practice. Aust J Rural Health 2004 Aug;12(4):137-42.

(19) Jackson SL, Peterson GM, Bereznicki LR, Misan GM, Jupe DM, Vial JH. Improving the outcomes of anticoagulation in rural Australia: an evaluation of pharmacist-assisted monitoring of warfarin therapy. J Clin Pharm Ther 2005 Aug;30(4):345-53.

(20) Braun S, Watzke H, Hasenkam JM, Schwab M, Wolf T, Dovifat C, et al. Performance evaluation of the new CoaguChek XS system compared with the established CoaguChek system by patients experienced in INR-self management. Thromb Haemost 2007 Feb;97(2):310-4.

(21) Williams VK, Griffiths AB. Acceptability of CoaguChek S and CoaguChek XS generated international normalised ratios against a laboratory standard in a paediatric setting. Pathology 2007 Dec;39(6):575-9.

(22) Nam MH, Roh KH, Pak HN, Lee CK, Kim YH, Lee KN, et al. Evaluation of the Roche CoaguChek XS handheld coagulation analyzer in a cardiac outpatient clinic. Ann Clin Lab Sci 2008;38(1):37-40.

(23) Keeling D, Baglin T, Tait C, Watson H, Perry D, Baglin C, et al. Guidelines on oral anticoagulation with warfarin - fourth edition. Br J Haematol 2011 Aug;154(3):311-24.

Table 1 Description of the Xprecia Stride system

Feature	
Specimen collection	Test strip
Quantity of blood	6µl
Detection principle	Electrochemical detection of thrombin activity
Measurement time	<1.6 minutes (depending upon INR level)
Measurement range	0.8-8.0
Haematocrit	25%-50%
Type of blood	Capillary blood
Thromboplastin	Human recombinant, Dade® Innovin®
Electrical power supply	Disposable alkaline batteries/ Rechargeable nickel batteries
Memory store	640 test results, 300 Liquid Controls and 300 error messages
IQC	Control kit comprising 2 levels of IQC supplied by manufacturer
EQA programmes	Currently WEQAS. UKNEQAS will introduce an EQA programme 1/04/17
Calibration	Batch specific barcode on strip vial

Table 2. Comparison of INR measurements

Primary care setting				
	Coaguchek			
Xprecia Stride	<2	2-4	>4	Total
<2	11	8	0	19
2-4	0	60	1	61
>4	0	0	3	3
Total	11	68	4	83
Secondary care setting				
	Coaguchek			
Xprecia Stride	<2	2-4	>4	Total
<2	19	9	0	28
2-4	1	73	3	77
>4	0	2	15	17
Total	20	84	18	122
	Laboratory			
Xprecia Stride	<2	2-4	>4	Total
<2	11	7	0	18
2-4	0	66	2	68
>4	0	**3**	13	16
Total	11	76	15	102

Figure 1 Scatterplot of INR measured by Xprecia Stride versus Laboratory in a
secondary care setting (including outliers).

Figure 2. Bland-Altman plot of difference in INR (Xprecia Stride minus Laboratory measurement) against the mean of the two measurements (including outliers).

Figure 3. Scatterplot of INR measured by Xprecia Stride versus CoaguChek in primary and secondary care settings (including outliers).

Figure 4. Bland-Altman plot of the difference in INR (Xprecia Stride minus Coaguchek measurement) against the mean of the two measurements (including outliers).