

**Wiley Series on Pharmaceutical Science and Biotechnology:
Practices, Applications, and Methods**

Mike S. Lee, Series Editor

PATIENT CENTRIC BLOOD SAMPLING AND QUANTITATIVE ANALYSIS

EDITED BY
NEIL SPOONER, EMILY EHRENFELD,
JOE SIPLE, AND MIKE S. LEE



WILEY

Patient Centric Blood Sampling and Quantitative Bioanalysis

Wiley Series on Pharmaceutical Science and Biotechnology: Practices, Applications, and Methods

Series Editor:

Mike S. Lee

New Objective

Mike S. Lee (ed.) • *Integrated Strategies for Drug Discovery Using Mass Spectrometry*

Birendra Pramanik, Mike S. Lee, and Guodong Chen (eds.) • *Characterization of Impurities and Degradants Using Mass Spectrometry*

Mike S. Lee and Mingshe Zhu (eds.) • *Mass Spectrometry in Drug Metabolism and Disposition: Basic Principles and Applications*

Mike S. Lee (ed.) • *Mass Spectrometry Handbook*

Wenkui Li and Mike S. Lee (eds.) • *Dried Blood Spots—Applications and Techniques*

Ayman F. El-Kattan (ed.) • *Oral Bioavailability Assessment: Basics and Strategies for Drug Discovery and Development*

Mike S. Lee and Qin Ji (eds.) • *Protein Analysis using Mass Spectrometry: Accelerating Protein Biotherapeutics from Lab to Patient*

Naidong Wng and Wenying Jian (eds.) • *Targeted Biomarker Quantitation by LC-MS*

Wenkui Li, Wenying Jian, and Yunlin Fu (eds.) • *Sample Preparation in LC-MS Bioanalysis*

Neil Spooner, Emily Ehrenfeld, Joe Siple, and Mike S. Lee (eds.) • *Patient Centric Blood Sampling and Quantitative Bioanalysis: From Ligand Binding to LC-MS*

Patient Centric Blood Sampling and Quantitative Bioanalysis

Edited by

*Neil Spooner
Spooners Bioanalytical Solutions
Hertford, UK*

*Emily Ehrenfeld
New Objective
Cambridge, MA, USA*

*Joe Siple
New Objective
Cambridge, MA, USA*

*Mike S. Lee
New Objective
Cambridge, MA, USA*

WILEY

Copyright © 2024 by John Wiley & Sons, Inc. All rights reserved.

Published by John Wiley & Sons, Inc., Hoboken, New Jersey.

Published simultaneously in Canada.

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, scanning, or otherwise, except as permitted under Section 107 or 108 of the 1976 United States Copyright Act, without either the prior written permission of the Publisher, or authorization through payment of the appropriate per-copy fee to the Copyright Clearance Center, Inc., 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, MA 01923, (978) 750-8400, fax (978) 750-4470, or on the web at www.copyright.com. Requests to the Publisher for permission should be addressed to the Permissions Department, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 111 River Street, Hoboken, NJ 07030, (201) 748-6011, fax (201) 748-6008, or online at <http://www.wiley.com/go/permission>.

Trademarks: Wiley and the Wiley logo are trademarks or registered trademarks of John Wiley & Sons, Inc. and/or its affiliates in the United States and other countries and may not be used without written permission. All other trademarks are the property of their respective owners. John Wiley & Sons, Inc. is not associated with any product or vendor mentioned in this book.

Limit of Liability/Disclaimer of Warranty: While the publisher and author have used their best efforts in preparing this book, they make no representations or warranties with respect to the accuracy or completeness of the contents of this book and specifically disclaim any implied warranties of merchantability or fitness for a particular purpose. No warranty may be created or extended by sales representatives or written sales materials. The advice and strategies contained herein may not be suitable for your situation. You should consult with a professional where appropriate. Further, readers should be aware that websites listed in this work may have changed or disappeared between when this work was written and when it is read. Neither the publisher nor authors shall be liable for any loss of profit or any other commercial damages, including but not limited to special, incidental, consequential, or other damages.

For general information on our other products and services or for technical support, please contact our Customer Care Department within the United States at (800) 762-2974, outside the United States at (317) 572-3993 or fax (317) 572-4002.

Wiley also publishes its books in a variety of electronic formats. Some content that appears in print may not be available in electronic formats. For more information about Wiley products, visit our web site at www.wiley.com.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data applied for
Hardback ISBN 9781119615552

Cover Design: Wiley

Cover Image: © Choun JC/Shutterstock

Set in 9.5/12.5pt STIXTwoText by Straive, Pondicherry, India

Contents

List of Contributors *xiii*

Foreword *xvii*

Preface *xix*

1 Patient Centric Healthcare – What’s Stopping Us? 1

Jenny Royle and Rachel Jones

- 1.1 The Evolution of Future Health Systems 1
- 1.2 Exploring the Barriers to Home Sampling 3
 - 1.2.1 Barrier One—The Discord Between Innovation and Practice 4
 - 1.2.2 Barrier Two—Ethical and Operational Considerations 5
 - 1.2.3 Barrier Three—Where Does the Liability Sit? 7
 - 1.2.4 Barrier Four—Addressing the Technology Challenge 8
 - 1.2.5 Barrier Five—The Human Touch 9
 - 1.2.6 Barrier Six—Trust in Data Security 10
 - 1.2.7 Barrier 7—Adherence to Service Change 11
- 1.3 Conclusion: The Changing Role of Home Sampling 12
- References 13

2 Tips for Successful Quantitative Assay Development Using Mitra Blood Sampling with Volumetric Absorptive Microsampling 17

James Rudge

- 2.1 What is Volumetric Absorptive Microsampling? 17
- 2.2 Tip 1—Ensure the Use of a Correct Sampling Procedure to Prevent Volume-Related Biases 18
- 2.3 Tip 2—Working with Wet Whole Blood 19
 - 2.3.1 Is Your Choice of Assay Biologically Relevant in Blood? 19
 - 2.3.2 Working with Blood as a Matrix 20
 - 2.3.3 Allowing Analytes to Equilibrate *Ex Vivo* 21

- 2.3.4 Bridging Between Venous Capillary Blood and the Role of Anticoagulants 22
- 2.4 Tip 3—Working with Dried Whole Blood 24
- 2.4.1 Dried Blood Spot Cards 24
- 2.4.2 Volumetric Hematocrit Bias—Blood Viscosity 25
- 2.4.3 Dried Blood is a Complicated Matrix 26
- 2.4.4 Working with “Aged” Blood 26
- 2.4.5 Temporal Extraction Bias or Degradation? 27
- 2.5 Tip 4—Optimizing Extraction Efficiencies from VAMS 29
- 2.5.1 Measuring Percentage Recovery from Mitra Samplers 30
- 2.5.2 Extraction Conditions—Where to Start 31
- 2.5.2.1 Consulting the Literature and Matching Physicochemical Properties 31
- 2.5.2.2 Adapting Published DBS Methods 32
- 2.5.2.3 Converting from a Wet (Whole Blood or Plasma) Method 32
- 2.5.2.4 Starting from a Blank Canvas—What to Consider? 33
- 2.5.2.5 Choice of Matrix 35
- 2.5.3 Aqueous Extraction Conditions 36
- 2.5.4 Organic Extraction Conditions 37
- 2.5.5 Generic Extraction Conditions 39
- 2.6 Conclusions 40
- References 41

3 Preanalytical Considerations for Implementation of Microsampling Solutions 49

Bradley B. Collier, Peyton K. Miesse, and Russell P. Grant

- 3.1 Introduction 49
- 3.2 Sample Matrices 50
- 3.2.1 Venous Sample 51
- 3.2.2 Capillary Blood 54
- 3.2.3 Material Selection 62
- 3.2.4 Dried Samples 62
- 3.2.5 Conclusions 63
- 3.3 Alternate Sample Acceptance Criteria 63
- 3.4 Collection 65
- 3.4.1 Device and Kit Components 66
- 3.4.2 Training and Preparation 67
- 3.4.3 Wound Generation 68
- 3.4.4 Collecting Sample 70
- 3.4.5 Post Collection Processing 72
- 3.4.6 Conclusions 72

3.5	Transportation and Sample Stability	73
3.5.1	Specimen Matrix and Separation	73
3.5.2	Storage Condition	74
3.5.3	Measurement Technique	77
3.5.4	Hematocrit Effects	79
3.5.5	Conclusions	79
3.6	Preanalytical Processing	80
3.6.1	Separation of Plasma and Serum	80
3.6.2	Sample Dilution	81
3.6.3	Conclusions	82
3.7	Overall Conclusions	82
	References	83
4	Collection and Bioanalysis of Quantitative Microsamples: Technological Innovations and Practical Implications	93
	<i>Regina V. Oliveira, Marc Yves Chalom, and Carlos Roberto V. Kiffer</i>	
4.1	Introduction	93
4.2	Practical Implications in Clinical Settings	94
4.2.1	Clinical Development	95
4.2.2	Clinical Analyses	96
4.3	Microsampling Devices—A Patient-Centered Approach	99
4.3.1	Collection Devices for Microsampling Analysis	99
4.3.1.1	Blood Sampling Techniques	102
4.3.1.2	Other Biological Matrices	124
4.4	New Development Areas	124
4.4.1	Automated Sample Collectors	124
4.4.2	Microfluidic Point-of-Care Devices	127
4.5	Summary of Currently Available Patient Centric Sampling Technologies	127
4.6	Microsampling Analysis by LC-MS—Analytical Considerations	127
4.6.1	Basic Principles of Liquid Chromatography (LC) and Mass Spectrometry (MS) for Bioanalysis of Microsamples	128
4.6.1.1	Microspray Ionization Sources	129
4.6.1.2	Microflow Liquid Chromatography	131
4.6.1.3	Microchip-Based LC	138
4.7	Conclusions	138
	References	140

- 5 Automation in Microsampling: At Your Fingertips? 153**
Sigrid Deprez, Liesl Heughebaert, Nick Verougstraete, Veronique Stove, Alain G. Verstraete, and Christophe P. Stove
- 5.1 Introduction 153
- 5.1.1 Identifying the Current Bottlenecks for Routine Implementation of Microsampling in Clinical Practice 153
- 5.1.2 The Importance of Analytical Automation for Different Application Fields 157
- 5.2 Automation of Dried Blood Microsampling Analysis Coupled to (LC-) MS/MS: What's Available? 159
- 5.2.1 Amenability of DBS Samples for Automation 159
- 5.2.2 Commercially Available Automated DBS Extraction Instruments 162
- 5.2.2.1 Automated Extraction of DBS: Workflow 162
- 5.2.2.2 Extraction Process 163
- 5.2.2.3 Extract Processing Strategy 164
- 5.2.2.4 Internal Standard Application 165
- 5.2.3 Points of Attention During Method Validation 166
- 5.2.3.1 Matrix Effects and Recovery 166
- 5.2.3.2 The Hct Effect 168
- 5.2.3.3 Calibration Curve and Dilution Integrity 169
- 5.2.4 Cross-Validation of Automated DBS Procedures 170
- 5.2.5 Current Applications of Automated Online DBS Extraction 173
- 5.2.6 Approaches for Automating Analysis with Other Microsampling Devices 181
- 5.2.7 Alternative Approaches for the Analysis of DBS Samples 183
- 5.2.7.1 Direct Analysis of DBS 183
- 5.2.7.2 Coupling DBS Analysis to Automated Immuno-Analyzers 184
- 5.3 Integration Into a Clinical Laboratory 185
- 5.3.1 Requirements, Challenges, and Advantages of Implementation 185
- 5.3.2 Cost-Effectiveness of Implementation of (Automated) DBS Analysis 187
- 5.4 Conclusions and Future Perspectives 192
- Acknowledgments 192
- References 193
- 6 Over 50 Years of Population-Based Dried Blood Spot Sampling of Newborns; Assuring Quality Testing and Lessons Learned 205**
Amy M. Gaviglio, Kristina Mercer, Konstantinos Petritis, Carla D. Cuthbert, and Suzanne K. Cordovado
- 6.1 Overview of Population-Based Newborn Screening 205
- 6.2 Public Perceptions of NBS 208
- 6.3 Characteristics of the DBS Matrix and Its Utility in NBS 209

- 6.3.1 Recovery of Biochemical and Molecular Analytes from DBS for NBS 210
- 6.3.2 Evaluation of Lot-to-Lot Variability in NBS Collection Devices 211
- 6.3.3 Effect of Hematocrit on DBS Homogeneity, Data Analysis, and Results 212
- 6.3.4 DBS Specimen Collection Transport and Safe Handling 213
- 6.3.5 DBS Analyte Stability and Storage 216
- 6.3.6 Known Interferences with DBS use for NBS 221
- 6.3.7 History of NSQAP—40 Years of Quality Assurance 222
- 6.4 Methods Used in NBS 232
 - 6.4.1 Origins of NBS and Expansion of Biochemical Testing 232
 - 6.4.2 Origins of Molecular DBS Testing and Expansion in NBS 238
 - 6.4.3 How the Expansion of Genomics may Impact NBS 241
 - 6.4.4 Expansion of DBS Utility, Including Direct Patient Use 244
- 6.5 Conclusion 245
 - Acknowledgments 246
 - Conflicts of Interest 246
 - References 246

7 Considerations for Implementation of Microsampling in Pediatric Clinical Research and Patient Care 263

Ganesh S. Moorthy, Christina Vedar, and Athena F. Zuppa

- 7.1 Introduction 263
- 7.2 Considerations for Implementation 264
 - 7.2.1 Benefits 264
 - 7.2.1.1 Clinical Research 266
 - 7.2.1.2 Clinical Care 267
 - 7.2.2 Challenges 268
 - 7.2.2.1 Clinical Research 269
 - 7.2.2.2 Clinical Care 270
 - 7.2.3 Laboratory Challenges and Considerations 271
 - 7.2.4 Survey Results on Feasibility 273
- 7.3 Conclusion 274
 - References 274

8 Simplification of Home Urine Sampling for Measurement of 2,8-Dihydroxyadenine in Patients with Adenine Phosphoribosyltransferase Deficiency 277

Unnur A. Thorsteinsdottir, Hrafnhildur L. Runolfsson, Vidar O. Edvardsson, Runolfur Palsson, and Margret Thorsteinsdottir

- 8.1 Introduction 277

- 8.1.1 Adenine Phosphoribosyltransferase Deficiency 278
- 8.1.2 Diagnosis of Adenine Phosphoribosyltransferase Deficiency 280
- 8.2 Methods 281
 - 8.2.1 Sample Collection 281
 - 8.2.2 Preparation of Urine Samples for Analysis 281
 - 8.2.3 The UPLC-MS/MS Urinary 2,8-Dihydroxyadenine Assay 282
- 8.3 Results 283
 - 8.3.1 Assay Development and Optimization 283
 - 8.3.2 Comparison of First-Morning Void Urine Specimens and 24-hr Urine Collections for Assessment of 2,8-Dihydroxyadenine Excretion 288
- 8.4 Discussion 290
- 8.5 Conclusions and Future Directions 291
 - References 292

9 Utilization of Patient Centric Sampling in Clinical Blood Sample Collection and Protein Biomarker Analysis 297

Jinming Xing, Joseph Loureiro, Dmitri Mikhailov, and Arkady I. Gusev

- 9.1 Introduction 297
 - 9.1.1 Challenges with the Current Clinical Trial Model 297
 - 9.1.2 Clinical Trial Conduct Faced Unprecedented Challenges Brought by COVID-19 298
- 9.2 Current Patient Centric Sampling Landscape 299
- 9.3 Clinical Proteome Profiling Technologies for Testing Patient Centric Microsampling Devices 300
 - 9.3.1 Biomarker and Profiling Can Be Used to Benchmark Patient Centric Sampling Technologies 300
 - 9.3.2 Orthogonal Analysis Cultivates Confidence for Biomarker Test with Patient Centric Sampling 302
- 9.4 Clinical Sample Collection with Tap Device: A Clinical Case Study 303
 - 9.4.1 Clinical Study with TAP Device 303
 - 9.4.2 User Experience, TAP Device Performance, and Sample Hemolysis 306
 - 9.4.3 SomaScan Blood Proteome Profiling Landscape 308
 - 9.4.4 Orthogonal Confirmation Provided by Quantitative Immunoassay 313
 - 9.4.5 Extending Protein Biomarkers Tested by Quantitative Immunoassay Beyond the Zone of Highest Concordance (Negative Controls) 314
- 9.5 Discussion 318
 - 9.5.1 Utility of Patient Centric Sampling for Clinical Proteome Sample Collection 318

- 9.5.2 Considerations for Patient Centric Sampling Implementation in Clinical Trials 320
- 9.5.3 Future Outlook for Patient Centric Sampling 322
- Acknowledgements 323
- References 323

- 10 Enabling Patient Centric Sampling Through Partnership: A Case Study 327**
- Christopher Bailey, Cecilia Arfvidsson, Stephanie Cape, Paul Severin, Silvia Alonso Rodriguez, Robert Nelson, and Catherine E. Albrecht*
- 10.1 Introduction 327
- 10.1.1 The Partnership 327
- 10.1.2 AstraZeneca’s Evolving PCS Approach 328
- 10.1.3 Why Change? 328
- 10.1.4 Patient Choice 329
- 10.1.5 The Challenges—Why Isn’t PCS Already the Norm? 329
- 10.2 Pre-Study Considerations 331
- 10.2.1 Early Engagement 331
- 10.2.2 Feasibility Assessment 332
- 10.3 The Case Study 332
- 10.3.1 Background 332
- 10.3.2 Scientific Considerations 335
- 10.3.3 Regulatory Agency Expectations Bridging 338
- 10.3.4 Study Operations Considerations 338
- 10.3.5 Route of Drug Administration and Potential for Sample Contamination 340
- 10.3.6 Sample Handling 341
- 10.3.7 Training and Patient Recruitment Challenges 342
- 10.3.8 Other Logistical, Data Protection, and Compliance Considerations 342
- 10.3.9 Study Participant Engagement 343
- 10.4 Summary 344
- References 347

- 11 Perspectives on Adopting Patient Centric Sampling for Pediatric Trials 351**
- Enaksha Wickremsinhe*
- 11.1 Overview and Why 351
- 11.1.1 Regulations and Legislation 351
- 11.1.2 Who are Pediatric Patients? 352
- 11.2 Challenges and Current Status 353
- 11.2.1 Conducting Pediatric Studies 353

11.2.2	Ethics, Consent, and Assent	353
11.2.3	Patient/Parent Burden	354
11.2.4	Blood Sampling	354
11.2.5	Blood Volume Limits	355
11.3	Solutions: How Do We Get This Done	356
11.3.1	Microsampling	356
11.3.2	Patient Centric Sampling	357
11.3.3	Pediatric PCS Devices/Techniques	358
11.3.4	COVID-19 Era	359
11.3.5	Training	359
11.4	Summary	359
	References	360
	Index	363

List of Contributors

Catherine E. Albrecht

Labcorp Drug Development
Geneva, Switzerland
catherine.albrecht@labcorp.com

Cecilia Arfvidsson

Integrated Bioanalysis, Clinical
Pharmacology and Safety Sciences,
Biopharmaceuticals, R&D,
AstraZeneca, Gothenburg,
Sweden
Cecilia.Arfvidsson@astrazeneca.com

Christopher Bailey

Integrated Bioanalysis, Clinical
Pharmacology and Safety Sciences,
Biopharmaceuticals, R&D,
AstraZeneca, Cambridge, UK
christopher.bailey@astrazeneca.com

Stephanie Cape

Labcorp Drug Development
Madison, WI, USA
Stephanie.Cape@Labcorp.com

Marc Yves Chalom

Sens Representações Comerciais
Sao Paulo, Sao Paulo, Brazil
mychalom@yahoo.com.br

Bradley B. Collier

Laboratory Corporation of America
Holdings (LabCorp), Center for
Esoteric Testing, Burlington, NC, USA
collib7@labcorp.com

Suzanne K. Cordovado

Centers for Disease Control and
Prevention
Atlanta, GA, USA
snc4@cdc.gov

Carla D. Cuthbert

Centers for Disease Control and
Prevention
Atlanta, GA, USA
ijz6@cdc.gov

Sigrid Deprez

Laboratory of Toxicology
Faculty of Pharmaceutical Sciences
Ghent University, Ghent, Belgium.
sigrid.deprez@ugent.be

Vidar O. Edvardsson

Children's Medical Center
Landspítali–The National University
Hospital of Iceland, Reykjavik, Iceland
Faculty of Medicine, School of Health
Sciences, University of Iceland
Reykjavík, Iceland
vidare@landspitali.is

Amy M. Gaviglio

4ES Corporation
San Antonio, TX, USA
pxd9@cdc.gov

Russell P. Grant

Laboratory Corporation of America
Holdings (LabCorp), Center for
Esoteric Testing, Burlington, NC, USA
grantr@labcorp.com

Arkady I. Gusev

Biomarker Development
Novartis Institutes of BioMedical
Research, Inc.
Cambridge, MA, USA
arkady.gusev@novartis.com

Liesl Heughebaert

Laboratory of Toxicology
Faculty of Pharmaceutical Sciences
Ghent University, Ghent, Belgium
liesl.heughebaert@ugent.be

Rachel Jones

Cheshire, UK
Rachel@10g.co.uk

Carlos Roberto V. Kiffer

Laboratório Especialista de
Microbiologia Clínica
Disciplina de Infectologia
Escola Paulista de Medicina
Universidade Federal de São Paulo
(UNIFESP), Sao Paulo
Sao Paulo, Brazil
carlos.rv.kiffer@gmail.com

Joseph Loureiro

Disease Area X
Novartis Institutes of Biomedical
Research, Inc.
Cambridge, MA, USA
joseph.loureiro@novartis.com

Kristina Mercer

Centers for Disease Control and
Prevention
Atlanta, GA, USA
pxd9@cdc.gov

Peyton K. Miesse

Laboratory Corporation of America
Holdings (LabCorp), Center for
Esoteric Testing, Burlington, NC, USA
pmiesse12@gmail.com

Dmitri Mikhailov

Biomarker Development
Novartis Institutes of BioMedical
Research, Inc.
Cambridge, MA, USA
dmitri.mikhailov@novartis.com

Ganesh S. Moorthy

Childrens Hospital of Philadelphia,
Perelman School of Medicine,
University of Pennsylvania, 3400
Civic Center Boulevard, Building 421,
Philadelphia, PA 19104, USA
ganeshsmoorthy@gmail.com

Robert Nelson

Labcorp Drug Development
Geneva, Switzerland
Robert.Nelson@Labcorp.com

Regina V. Oliveira

Núcleo de Pesquisa em Cromatografia
(Separare)
Departamento de Química
Universidade Federal de São Carlos
Sao Carlos, Sao Paulo, Brazil
oliveirav1@gmail.com

Runolfur Palsson

Internal Medicine Services
Landspítali—The National University
Hospital of Iceland
Reykjavik, Iceland

Faculty of Medicine
School of Health Sciences
University of Iceland
Reykjavík, Iceland
runolfur@landspitali.is

Konstantinos Petritis

Centers for Disease Control and
Prevention
Atlanta, GA, USA
nmo3@cdc.gov

Silvia Alonso Rodriguez

Translational Science and
Experimental Medicine Early R&I
Biopharmaceuticals R&D
AstraZeneca, Cambridge, UK
silvia.alonsorodriguez@
astrazeneca.com

Jenny Royle

MediPaCe Limited
London, UK
Jenny@medipace.com

James Rudge

Trajan Scientific and Medical
Crownhill Business Centre
Milton Keynes, UK
jrudge@trajanscimed.com

Hrafnhildur L. Runolfsdottir

Internal Medicine Services
Landspítali—The National University
Hospital of Iceland
Reykjavik, Iceland
hrafnh@landspitali.is

Paul Severin

Labcorp Drug Development
Madison, WI, USA
Paul.Severin@Labcorp.com

Christophe P. Stove

Laboratory of Toxicology
Faculty of Pharmaceutical Sciences
Ghent University, Ghent, Belgium
christophe.stove@ugent.be

Veronique Stove

Department of Laboratory Medicine
Ghent University Hospital
Ghent, Belgium

Department of Diagnostic Sciences
Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences
Ghent University, Ghent, Belgium
veronique.stove@uzgent.be

Unnur A. Thorsteinsdottir

Faculty of Pharmaceutical Sciences
School of Health Sciences
University of Iceland
Reykjavik, Iceland
uth15@hi.is

Margret Thorsteinsdottir

Faculty of Pharmaceutical Sciences
School of Health Sciences
University of Iceland
Reykjavik, Iceland

ArcticMass, Reykjavik, Iceland
margreth@hi.is

Christina Vedar

Childrens Hospital of Philadelphia,
Perelman School of Medicine,
University of Pennsylvania, 3400
Civic Center Boulevard, Building 421,
Philadelphia, PA 19104, USA
cvedar@gmail.com

Nick Verougstraete

Laboratory of Toxicology
Faculty of Pharmaceutical Sciences
Ghent University, Ghent, Belgium

Department of Laboratory Medicine
Ghent University Hospital
Ghent, Belgium
nick.verougstraete@uzgent.be

Alain G. Verstraete

Department of Laboratory Medicine
Ghent University Hospital
Ghent, Belgium

Department of Diagnostic Sciences
Faculty of Medicine and Health
Sciences
Ghent University, Ghent, Belgium
alain.verstraete@ugent.be

Enaksha Wickremsinhe

Lilly Research Laboratories
Eli Lilly and Company
Indianapolis, IN, USA
enaksha@lilly.com

Jinming Xing

Biomarker Development, Novartis
Institutes for BioMedical Research,
Inc., Cambridge, MA, USA
jinming.xing@pfizer.com

Athena F. Zuppa

Childrens Hospital of Philadelphia,
Perelman School of Medicine,
University of Pennsylvania,
Philadelphia, PA, USA
zuppa@email.chop.edu

Foreword

Many of the contributors to this book were authoring their chapters whilst living through a global pandemic, which has changed healthcare and health politics forever, and this book could not have been written at a better time.

Sitting here today, we are facing unprecedented change in international health systems—with spiralling costs, increasing cultural and national disparity in healthcare delivery and acceptance, ageing populations, and infrastructures that are decades old. The world around healthcare is moving at a faster pace than the institution can cope with. In today's world mobile phones and technology are now commonplace in many households. Telehealth and virtual consultancies are, in some cases, gradually replacing traditional face-to-face appointments. And people are starting to accept wellness and prevention as ways that they themselves can tackle the onset of disease.

The boundaries of healthcare are finally beginning to change from the clinic walls and reach out into people's lives. Not only does this result in a healthcare system that is more accessible, but it also brings the possibility of healthcare being culturally tailored for populations and delivered in more sensitive and acceptable ways. Of reaching, and supporting, the most vulnerable in our society.

At the center of this reform is the ability to test and monitor for known illnesses outside of the clinic itself. Patient-centric sampling involves the patient or caregiver taking small amounts of body fluid—blood or saliva as examples—in the comfort of a person's home. Recent technological advances have made this possible, making user friendly, simple, safe, and even painless devices available. These are then packaged as directed and then either posted or collected and sent to a central laboratory for processing. The implementation of this approach, however, is fraught with challenges that need to be overcome before it can be fully integrated as the standard approach that healthcare reaches for first. From the learnings of the pandemic we have real life examples where patient-centric sampling has been successfully implemented within and across countries.

This book shines a light on the whole approach. It presents a balanced look across all aspects—the challenges, technological requirements, assays, processes, delivery ... all the way through to the human behavior and ways to integrate into the norm. It discusses everything we have learnt from the long and rich microsampling history and how this can be used to deliver for the rapidly changing expectations and requirements of future populations and healthcare services. It outlines the unique challenges and opportunities presented through use of patient-centric sampling in the clinical trials that are so essential for developing new medicines.

Every one of the authors in this book wrote their chapters to help others. They represent a diverse background of expertise and share their experiences, insights, and case studies with astonishing honesty, openness, and integrity. This partnership between people is unified by a belief in the welfare of others. It gives a unique insight into the systematic changes that must be undertaken to allow the full potential of patient-centric care to be realized. Throughout, these insights are supported and enhanced by the author's real-life case studies and experiences of using this approach in practice.

It is hoped that by sharing this, you will be the next to add to this wave of change—to join the innovators and make a difference. If we all do this, then together we can play our part in ensuring healthcare becomes accessible and acceptable to those who need it most, the patients.

*Jenny Royle
Matthew Barfield*

Preface

There is an increasingly broad understanding that the collection of biological samples for the quantitative determination of analytes for healthcare and the support of clinical trials needs to be performed in a manner that puts the needs of the patient at the center. The technologies to enable high quality samples to be collected in a location such as the home, pharmacist, local doctor's surgery, or other locations that are convenient to the patient, rather than at a centralized clinical center, are now readily available. Furthermore, the clamour for this change has gained momentum during the recent COVID-19 pandemic, where all of us were reluctant to go to clinical facilities. Despite this, change is always difficult, particularly for something as well established as the processes for the collection and analysis of blood samples. Thankfully, there is an increasing body of leaders, represented by the authors of the chapters in this book, who realize the benefits of these solutions and understand that by working together across inter- and intra-organizational boundaries we can break down the barriers to their routine adoption and bring benefits to the patient.

A previous book in this series, *Dried Blood Spots*, edited by Wenkui Li and Mike Lee, set the benchmark for our understanding of the benefits of these patient-centric sampling technologies and how they can be implemented in a number of scenarios. This book builds upon those strong foundations, to bring us up to date with how this exciting and fast-moving field has developed. The authors, who are looking to enable the routine use of these technologies for the benefit of their fellow humans, generously share their observations, experiences, concerns, and visions of the future. As such, this book is another benchmark in the continuing change that is healthcare and analytical science. We can say with certainty that there is further change to come in this field and as such we look forward to working as a community to facilitate these important and inevitable changes.

The editors sincerely thank all the distinguished authors for the provision of their wonderful chapters and for their patience and persistence with this project

through the difficult events of the pandemic. It has definitely been worth the wait! We also wish to thank the editorial staff at John Wiley & Sons for their unwavering and patient support to this project that is a small part of the phenomenal series edited by Mike Lee.

Neil Spooner
Emily Ehrenfeld
Joe Siple
Mike S. Lee

1

Patient Centric Healthcare – What’s Stopping Us?

Jenny Royle¹ and Rachel Jones²

¹ MediPaCe Limited, London, UK

² Cheshire, UK

1.1 The Evolution of Future Health Systems

The primary aim of healthcare systems around the globe is to improve the well-being of populations, with the World Health Organization defining health as “A state of complete physical, mental and social well-being and not merely the absence of disease or infirmity” (World Health Organisation, 2020). Healthcare is not merely treatments for diseases, it is instead a way to support people to achieve the highest attainable mental and physical and social well-being for themselves. But traditional healthcare systems are not set up in this way, and rather than focusing on integrating all the holistic elements required for promotion of health in an individual, they are orientated toward the treatment of disease and malaise after things have already deteriorated in a person’s well-being.

The difference between absence of disease and total well-being is subtle but fundamental. Supporting well-being involves encouraging people to live a healthy lifestyle (both physically and mentally) and providing the tools, systems, and education for each person to aim for the best possible version of themselves often via self-care principles—whether or not they are sick at the current time.

Other factors that have further impacted the tension between the treatment versus a self-care model of health have emerged during the COVID-19 pandemic during 2020, which forced upon us innovations and technologies that were once confined to pilot status. These were mobilized during the 2020 pandemic out of necessity in order to meet the restriction in face-to-face services required to prevent transmission of the virus between people. Many of these rapid accelerations,

Patient Centric Blood Sampling and Quantitative Bioanalysis, First Edition.

Edited by Neil Spooner, Emily Ehrenfeld, Joe Siple, and Mike S. Lee.

© 2024 John Wiley & Sons, Inc. Published 2024 by John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

particularly in relation to telehealth visits and remote monitoring, are here to stay because, once pushed to try a new approach, it has been found to be efficient and a positive experience for many (Jones et al., 2020; Norman et al., 2020; Wosik et al., 2020). An area that is a fundamental component of this wave of change is the process of microsampling at home.

For the uninitiated, microsampling involves the taking of small droplet amounts of body fluid—blood or saliva as examples—in the comfort of a person's home. The samples themselves are taken by the patient or with assistance from a caregiver and are then stored and packaged as directed (for example by drying on a specialized sample tip or card and sealing into the envelope provided). These are then either posted or collected and sent to a central laboratory for processing, thus negating the need for a patient to visit an outpatient clinic or local surgery (Bateman, 2020). The laboratory assay must be validated and provide sufficient accuracy to support accurate clinical decision-making. This onset of a remote, patient centric approach to sampling brings with it the chance to fundamentally challenge and change the healthcare delivery model. Sampling and appointments can be decentralized, and most routine supportive care can be virtual. This does not mean the end of the hospital or GP visit, but it does mean that the approach used can be fitted to the requirements of the individuals involved and the healthcare decisions that need to be made. Remote sampling and consultations are more time efficient (Ballester et al., 2018; Prasad et al., 2020; Russo et al., 2016) and this means that not only can they be scheduled around peoples' daily lives better but also any face-to-face appointments can be prioritized for people where in-person consultation is truly needed. For overstretched front-line staff and health systems, this is likely to be a very attractive proposition.

Research has also shown that dried blood spot sampling versus conventional blood sampling conferred cost savings across the ecosystem in renal transplant and hemato-oncology patients (Martial et al., 2016). In this study, switching to home sampling was associated with a societal cost reduction of 43% for hemato-oncology patients and 61% for nephrology patients per blood draw. From a healthcare perspective, costs reduced by 7% for hemato-oncology patients and by 21% for nephrology patients due to the replacement of office-based tests with home-based sampling.

So the evidence suggests that virtual care provides a mostly positive patient experience and is more efficient for the health service. Could this also help reduce the number of people not “turning up” for medical appointment (if the consultation comes to them)? Research has shown that the high levels of “no shows” to hospital appointments have a large impact on the organizational structure and cost to a health provider (Dantas et al., 2018; Jefferson et al., 2019; Mohammadi et al., 2018). Although no research has been carried out on this to date, it is possible that the efficient use of home sampling could reduce this “appointment missing,” and this more optimized supportive care for patients could offer

additional benefits on the downstream impacts to service. Another potential benefit of home sampling could be the time freed up for those more in need of face-to-face contact and better decisions on how to balance the two approaches. There are benefits and limitations to both home-based and in clinic approaches—for example, home care approaches which are decentralized have been shown to give better individualized, immediate care, but along with this, the responsibility for monitoring is largely delegated to technical devices, patients, and their families (Oudshoorn, 2009). Face-to-face appointments in the clinic have been shown to be preferred over telemedicine in specific circumstances such as when patients have low self-management ability and/or depending on the purpose of the consultation (e.g. initial discussions about terminal disease, which may have additional, unspoken support needs; Chudner et al., 2019; Derkson et al., 2020). Designing an integrated approach based on the person's needs may be most beneficial for all. For example, in 2019, Jiang and colleagues found that correctly timing a face-to-face consultation increased a patient's ability to accurately find information digitally and administer self-care post consultation. Integrated approaches also bring the potential to save more face-to-face consultation time for personalized conversations and supportive care, leaving more simple tests and interventions to be carried out at home.

The authors suggest the use of home blood sampling may have positive impacts on a person's overall well-being by allowing intrusive interventions to be carried out within a familiar home environment. A survey was taken of 39 adult kidney transplant patients who underwent both traditional venepuncture and microsampling approaches for monitoring of their condition and the current blood sampling burden was quantified using two measures: anxiety and travel requirements (Scuderi et al., 2020). A third of participants ($n = 13$) reported blood test anxiety and 44% ($n = 17$) spent more than an hour just to travel to the required phlebotomy site for standard of care. Preference between the two approaches was also explored: 85% ($n = 33$) preferred microsampling approaches and 95% ($n = 37$) expressed an interest in collecting their microsample themselves at home. This demonstrates a clear patient preference and willingness to give microsampling a go for monitoring post-transplantation recovery progress.

1.2 Exploring the Barriers to Home Sampling

Given the efficiencies and benefits of home-based care, why is not remote patient centric microsampling more rapidly adopted everywhere? The answers may rest with people and the hurdles involved in fundamentally changing established care pathways and healthcare cultures in which people are already working at maximum capacity to deliver what they know, let alone try something new.

The scientific and technological aspects of patient centric microsampling have accelerated in the past 5 years and are driving the field of healthcare in the home; this chapter aims to focus on many of the key concerns that have been heard through working in the clinic, with patients, and developing technologies. The aim is that by starting a discussion around each of these concerns and by proposing potential solutions, developers and leaders of the future will be able to co-create the approaches with the relevant end users and speed up the realization of benefits that these sampling processes can bring.

1.2.1 Barrier One—The Discord Between Innovation and Practice

Recent events of the pandemic in 2020 have shown us that all healthcare systems run at a finite capacity. To implement change, the very same people who rely on established approaches have to, instead, adopt and implement something brand new, while maintaining their high standard of care in challenging times.

The expertise behind the development of highly sensitive microsampling technology has, up until now, been mostly confined to pharmaceutical companies and private laboratories and was generally not widespread in the labs of front-facing healthcare institutions. Furthermore, existing health systems required to implement microsampling systems are built on the fundamental principle of *primum non nocere* (first, do no harm). Sampling and test results are usually only a small part of a clinical pathway, with many healthcare professionals defaulting to the established pathway approaches and more familiar and trusted in-clinic sampling techniques are automatically selected. This involves the deployment of personnel, for example phlebotomists and nurses in a system that, despite being pushed to its limits, is proven to accurately deliver support to clinical decisions. Convenience to patient and family is sometimes seen as of secondary importance, and any potential increase in decision speed is currently unproven with empirical evidence in the standard front-line healthcare systems. It is now commonly recognized that human decision-making usually relies on a System one (fast, reactive, emotional, and habitual) and System two (slower, higher energy, puzzling out a new challenge) approach (Kahneman, 2003). The vast majority of times, human decisions are ultimately based upon responsive, heuristic, and/or emotions, rather than calculated logic—especially when the individual has many years of experience. It is possible, therefore, that emotional rather than rationale drivers may be slowing the uptake of home sampling—for example—trust. For this established and routine model to be replaced, evidence would need to be gathered that the new pathway provides significant improvement in timeliness and physical and/or mental patient well-being. Importantly, overall cost savings for the healthcare system as a whole (primary, secondary, and social care) across the different healthcare models would also need to be demonstrated. Technological advances have the potential to

change elements far beyond use of the device itself—reaching into roles, medic–nurse–patient–carer relationships, behaviors, and healthcare culture and there is understandable caution from front-line decision-makers who are upholding the principle of “do no harm” and have little time to assess the overall healthcare value–benefit versus risk offered by home sampling.

A solution to these problems has been proposed through novel patient centric co-creation and delivery of technology clinical trials that design new or enhanced care pathways with those involved in their routine implementation and then test them empirically in a clinical trial setting. Not only does this mean that the full consequences and potential benefits of an innovation (such as home sampling) that may ripple across the care pathway are considered, but that the proposed ways of leveraging the positives are created by those using the current approach. The subsequent quantitative and qualitative testing of the whole pathway then also provides the empirical evidence as to the impact on people’s well-being, ability to deliver the care, and cost. With this approach, barriers preventing uptake are reduced through the intervention design and the drive for change is supported by the robust evidence that healthcare demands (Royle et al., 2021).

1.2.2 Barrier Two—Ethical and Operational Considerations

The ethics involved in home sampling within a new care pathway needs to be thoroughly considered, documented, and discussed with end users before it is put into practice. For example, if the novel innovation is a home sampling test kit then, as well as taking the sample, patients need to accept that they are responsible for taking it. Patients need to store and use the sample kit correctly, dispose of elements in a safe way, and post the sample off in a timely manner. People need to understand why this is necessary and how the data collected from the kit will be communicated to them and what it means—in lay terms. Seamless services are now the norm, but on the odd occasion of a faulty/lost kit, patients should understand how to take action and the provider resolve the problem immediately, so as to maintain both patient and physician confidence in the new system.

There are many areas of healthcare where patients and their families already take responsibility for their own treatment and healthcare. For example, many diabetic patients monitor their own glucose levels and titrate their insulin dose and timings, colorectal cancer screening requires people to send samples for assessment (the affectionately called “poo in the post” screen), all the way through to women taking the responsibility with regard to adherence to the contraceptive pill. The idea that people can take a blood microsample and post it off to a lab should not seem that unusual, and it is logical to assume it will be accepted easily. However, there are very important elements at play in each of these examples. For each, there is a clear and direct benefit for the patient themselves and no “easy”

alternative. Each has also been standard of practice for many years and has therefore become the accepted social norm in many societies—it has long been expected and accepted that diabetic patients and their families monitor their daily treatment and therefore from the point of diagnosis patients inevitably have to accept this role.

For new point of care and home sampling approaches, this “norm” does not exist for both physicians and patients. Even if it makes it slightly easier, the “accepted” and “expected” more traditional approach from all perspectives is for their doctor, nurse, or a trained phlebotomist to undertake sampling. A patient given the opportunity to take on the sampling themselves may, in some cases, compare their minimal professional experience with that of their authority figures. In addition to this, when the microsamples are being used to monitor a specific health condition of themselves or those they love—the consequences of unknowingly getting it wrong become even more worrying.

None of these challenges are insurmountable, but steps should be put in place to develop the care pathway with those involved to ensure that each step—even if it is not one directly related to the mechanics of sampling itself, is considered. In this case, there are several clear elements that can easily help to overcome barriers:

Helpful tips for successful adoption	Description
Making it as pleasant and easy as possible	Simple, quick action. Painless if possible. But also consider the timing and routine. Linking in with habits helps people to remember and make it more “normal” to undertake. Try to avoid additional steps such as intricate assembly or the need to refrigerate.
Recommendation by an authority figure	Conviction that this is the best approach to take, being conveyed and supported by their physician and other trusted healthcare anchors a patient may have.
Building up self-efficacy (i.e., someone’s belief that they can successfully do what is needed—in most cases, take the sample)	Time for training and questions built into the process. Having a trusted contact point for help if needed. Share support from peers—other patients who have successfully adopted the system and are willing to volunteer as “champions.”
Seeing that it matters—their actions have tangible value	Knowing that the results are to be evaluated and will not be lost (and getting confirmation that they have been looked at).
Having a feeling of control and reducing anxiety	Having an action plan for patients that covers all the main predictable things that may happen (e.g., knowing what to do if the system malfunctions or the sample collection goes wrong). Provide patients with support and help to understand and evaluate findings and what these mean for them.

1.2.3 Barrier Three—Where Does the Liability Sit?

Healthcare workers are always cognizant of their legal and ethical responsibilities to protect the patients they care for and to do this to the best of their ability. But in the case of home sampling, the process is moved out of their control because it is no longer being undertaken by professional healthcare colleagues but by the patient or caregiver themselves. How can professionals deliver to these legal responsibilities if they are not personally carrying out or delegating the sampling to their colleagues that have certificates of training? Where does the final legal liability lie, for example if poor or inadequate sampling results in the wrong decision? This area of law and liability is infrequently discussed, but is one to consider as home sampling and other such services become more prevalent in treatment and care pathways. The Royal College of Nursing in the UK states that “*To discharge the legal duty of care, health care practitioners must act in accordance with the relevant **standard** of care.*” Where the “standard of care” is deemed to be that undertaken by other professionals in a similar situation as a benchmark (Royal College of Nursing, 2020).

Although the legal and ethical requirements which constitute a duty of care to patients may vary across countries, it is important that those who provide and initiate the services of home blood sampling consider their duty of care to patients who may be embarking on a shared or self-care journey. Considerations such as the assessment of the patient and their support network to understand their “health literacy” and capabilities to carry out their tests is an important first step. In addition, a willingness of physicians and nurses to adopt a collaborative shared care approach with patients where support is offered and is gradually decreased as the competence of the patient in this area increases should be evident, in the form of health coaching. In the earlier days of such a culture change, to help build physician–patient trust, this could even mean supplementing the home testing within clinic standard tests at the start of treatment. This would endure until both parties can be confident that the home tests are useful indicators and can be routinely relied on (with in clinic sampling then being for emergency second check only).

Further, the authors believe that the proffering of documented, lay-friendly information coupled with peer support would all allow the physician or nurse to comfortably discharge their duty of care to the patient and caregivers. Indeed, the convenience and possible enhanced quality of life that patients may benefit from is testimony to the ethically robust patient centric decision made within the shared care team.

The authors suggest that standardized protocols for the deployment of home-centered care and sampling would serve to provide guidance, share best practice, and alleviate concerns of healthcare professionals (HCPs). Such a standardized approach in shared care decision-making is discussed by a working party (Elwyn

et al., 2012) with *choice, option, and decision* “talks” described as a robust process to ensure a shared care collaboration between HCPs and patients. Such a model could be developed with a focus on home sampling so that any specific operational aspects can be incorporated and standardized.

Similarly, many patients and families who may be comfortable with the more paternalistic relationship they share with their physician may suddenly see this responsibility of self-sampling as a burden, rather than a release from yet another outpatient visit. This may suggest the need to further support more vulnerable communities if home sampling is to become the norm. In practice, many of these concerns can be addressed early at the point of service design and importantly, in collaboration with all parties, so that appropriate support interventions may be put in place. Indeed, it has been suggested that shared care should evolve such that both physician and patients expect and make room for time to discuss shared options and engage in reflective thinking asking “what if clinicians felt just as comfortable asking questions as providing answers? What if patients were allowed more time on their own to reflect on what their clinician explained?” (Pieterse et al., 2019). If home sampling and other shared and self-care measures are to continue to grow and be deployed in a seamless fashion, then clearly behaviors of all parties may need to evolve.

1.2.4 Barrier Four—Addressing the Technology Challenge

As microsampling becomes more prevalent in care pathways, it is likely to be linked to an increasing number of point of care devices for patients and their families to use themselves. As discussed earlier, with a clear partnership and action plans between the patient/patient’s family and their physician comes a huge opportunity for timely action and proactive healthcare. However, it also brings technological challenges, since many patients may be overwhelmed by new technology or instructions that are not available in lay language. Should results be provided via a mobile device, many more mature or vulnerable patients may struggle to “play their part” within the system which could lead to enhanced anxiety and a feeling of exclusion, plus the obvious loss of healthcare data. These challenges are surprisingly not confined to patient populations, since previous unpublished work conducted by the authors highlighted the challenges faced by nursing staff when confronted with a novel Bluetooth device to monitor salbutamol inhaler use in patients with chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD). This eventually led to both patient and nurse confusion when using the device and consequently an associated reduction in adherence.

We also need to consider the *inclusivity* of such new microsampling interventions in the home, since in every country there is a proportion of the population that are not native speakers and may rely upon family, friends, and HCPs for