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Islets Autoantibody Standardization Program (IASP)

- IASP aims at improving and standardizing the measurement of autoantibodies predictive of type 1 diabetes
How?

• IASP supports the harmonization of antibody testing across laboratories by
  • improving methods,
  • providing technical support,
  • information and training

• IASP organizes interlaboratory assay comparisons workshops

• IASP provides reference materials for the development of new measurement technologies
A IASP “perspective” on world events ........ a timeline
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BUT ....... lots of people contributed to the standardization of islet autoantibody assays.
Some major contributions are not reflected well in the authorship of workshop papers: first example

This is the outcome of an AI prompt:

Draw Bottazzolo as an Italian navigator with a caravel and landing on immunostained pancreatic islets.

The outcomes is ....... Ok, let’s move on
Second example:

George Eisenbarth
Small name in the graph, big impact in reality.
He was incredibly supportive.
It’s thanks to him that for many years the workshop repository was full of samples
IASP interlaboratory assay comparison workshops

• Every ~1.5 years

• ~150 coded sera are sent to participating laboratories (50 new onset T1D and 100 blood donor sera)

• Labs test the sera in blind using assay format of choice
Assay results are returned to the organizing committee for central analysis of assay performance

• Dave Pittman at UF non only organizes the “building” and distribution of sample sets
• He receives hundreds of submitted assay reports
• Collate the data together and create a single large dataset using macros and .....  
• ..... a lot of sweat! Labs can be very creative in the way they modify our standardized reporting excel files
We then move to R for summary tables, additional statistics, graphs. Our analyses “documentation” is in R markdown notebooks.

- The concept is inspired by the principles of reproducible science.
- The goal is to document everything we do for future reference.
How many labs participate in IASP workshops?
It varies, over the last few years we hover around 30
First IASP perspective on large scale screenings

• IF the T1D autoantibody screening is going to be performed by a much larger number of labs then ......

• Changes are required either for the resources allocated to the workshop or to its format (likely both)
Another IASP perspective: how representative the participating labs are of all labs doing T1D testing?

• In truth they are not that many, and are mostly research labs
• Several are **very experienced** (~1/3 participated in all workshops!!?!?!!)
• Some labs also do routine diagnostics BUT ..... the vast majority of routine labs measuring autoAbs out there in the big world never/ever participated in workshops
• It is doubtful that the performance of these labs is truly representative of that in the “wild”, most diagnostics labs at best test very few quality control samples each year
Second IASP perspective on large scale screenings

• Sera included in the workshop are not from at-risk individuals or children from the general population

• Serum samples are obtained by venipuncture while current screenings are based on capillary blood samples

• A bit of caution is needed in extrapolating the performance of assays in the IASP setting to that in a population screening
Back to the workshops: submitted assays number is much higher, on average more than a 100.
Type of submitted assays/formats changed over time: ICA assays were once dominant and then “crashed”
IAA assays tell a different story: prolonged predominance of the Radio Binding Assay (RBA) format

In recent years different formats are finding their pace:
ECL, LIPS, ADAP, CLIA (in chronological order :-(
IASP perspective: many different assays/formats for T1D autoantibodies were submitted over time ...... AND FAILED
We still need IASP workshops.

• Even in the year 2023 !

• Only one of the two submitted CLIA IAA assays worked!

• It’s very useful for the community that even poor assays are submitted to the workshop

• We need to know/understand what works and what doesn’t.

The black line corresponds to the median ROC curve calculated across all IAA assays submitted to the workshop. The dashed line is the identity line.
GADA assays show a somewhat similar trajectory with RBA dominating for many years.
However, beginning with bridge-ELISA assays in 2003 several non-radioisotopic assay formats matched or exceeded RBA performance: Bridge-ELISA, LIPS, ECL, ADAP
There is more to the workshop: substudies

1986 IAA calibration
1987 ICA calibration; reference serum
1997 WHO reference ICA, GADA, IA-2A
2007 pilot ZnT8A; IA-2β; IAA titer and affinity
2012 NH2 truncated GAD65
2018 LIPS training: ECL training
The IASP perspective on reference standards for T1D autoAbs: not quite there yet 😞

What we hoped for
• Following the 2000 workshop it was recommended the introduction of common WHO units for GADA and IA-2A.

What happened
• Most labs still use “local” units
• Reference standards are missing for IAA and ZnT8A
It’s worth to keep in mind that there is no easy workaround for the production of T1D autoAb standards.

Assays measuring host antibodies are best classified as quasi-quantitative.

Why Quasi-Quantitative?

- “Due to the lack of similarity between the standard samples and test samples.”
- “The reference standards may not accurately reflect the antibody affinities, proportions and other conditions in the test sample.”
- “The analytes in test samples are not similar amongst themselves.”
- “Since the lack of similarity implies non-parallelism, the analytical results determined from dose interpolation (calibration) from the standard curve in the absence of parallelism will represent an inexact approximation.”

Back to workshops: assay concordance, an example for GADA
• Each row correspond to one GADA assay
• Assay are grouped by assay format
On the x axis we have all the samples grouped according to type.
Each column is one sample

- **GADA positive score = orange**
- **GADA negative score = grey**
Finally, the barplot shows the percentage of assays calling each sample GADA positive.
IASP2023 GADA assays: barplot and tilemap of positive scores assigned to each sample by participant laboratories
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• Overall, high degree of concordance
• Discordant T1D samples have relatively lower Ab levels
• But on a very large scale the absolute number of discordant samples won’t be negligible
• One blood donor was found GADA positive by 34/36 of the assays
• We know very little about this sample
• How many samples like this might be out there in the general population ?!? ¯\_(ツ)_/¯
Are commercial kits “cleaner” and more reproducible? The workshop tells a more nuanced story: the IA-2A case
• Some IA-2A assays show a noise issue
• Again, when many different labs are testing on very large scale the number of discordant «false» positive samples can add up quickly
IASP perspective on multiplexed assays for screening

- **Bridge-ELISA 3-Screen**: 3 GADA/IA-2A/ZnT8A
- **Multiplexed ADAP**: 3 GADA/IA-2A/ZnT8A/IAA
- **LIPS 3-Screen**: 2 GADA/IA-2A/ZnT8A
- **Bridge-ELISA-FAST 2-Screen**: 1 GADA/IA-2A
- **Bridge-ELISA 2-Screen**: 1 GADA/IA-2A
- **Multiplexed ECL**: 1 GADA/IA-2A/ZnT8A/IAA
- **PAL 3-Screen**: 1 GADA/IA-2A/ZnT8A
- **CLIA-2 Screen**: 1 GADA/IA-2A

Pie charts showing:
- **non-radioactive** n=13
- **in-house** n=4
- **commercial** n=9
Several multiplexed assays achieved a very high performance in discriminating case from control in IASP2023.
The same blood donor was found positive in 11/13 assays.

Multiplexed assays concordance was very high! But they were not totally spared from the issue we saw before for GADA.

IASP2023 multiplexed assays: barplot and tilemap of positive scores assigned to each sample by participant laboratories.
Another IASP perspective: assays might need thresholds adjustments for the new task of large-scale screening

Observation

- Thresholds are often based on relatively “small” training sample sets
- Commercial assays were developed by obviously very proficient lab for each specific format

Interpretation?

- A priori the chance to call false positives in the IASP T1D case cohort is low
- Labs/developers tend to adopt thresholds that identify also very weakly positive sera as Ab+ in the IASP case cohort
- The risk is that control samples with similar, low level of binding might be not so rare after all in the general population
Summary 1

• IASP is a successful program that is still helping the field of T1D autoantibody to identify good assays and assay formats

• Current non-radioisotopic multiplexed assays aimed at screening have shown great performance ........ in IASP workshops

• Warning: only one of them (bridge-ELISA) has been applied in large-scale screening of capillary blood samples
• If the IASP core function of inter-assay comparison is expected to be extended to many more labs, then more resources (samples!) would be required

• IASP support the development and adoption of a new generation of standards for T1D autoantibodies and is considering strategies to help achieve that goal

• Changes/addition to the workshop format are under consideration to perform the assessment of limit of detection and reproducibility particularly for multiplexed assays, and to evaluate the impact of sample matrix on assay performance
Obviously, the previous timeline was a joke .......... we don’t really care about what happened before antibody workshops!
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