



**Biotin interference in cardiac troponin immunoassay -
where the wild things are?**

Journal:	<i>Clinical Chemistry and Laboratory Medicine</i>
Manuscript ID	CCLM.2020.0936
Manuscript Type:	Editorial
Date Submitted by the Author:	17-Jun-2020
Complete List of Authors:	Collinson, P.; Ground Floor Jenner Wing, Clinical Blood Sciences
Abstract:	

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3 Editorial
4
5
6
7

8 Biotin interference in cardiac troponin immunoassay - where the wild things are?
9
10

11
12 Professor Paul Collinson, Departments of Clinical Blood Sciences and Cardiology, St
13 George's University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust and St George's University of London,
14 Cranmer Terrace London SW17 0QT, UK
15
16
17
18

19
20 Tel 0208 725 5934

Fax 0208 725 5838

21
22
23 Email: paul.collinson@stgeorges.nhs.uk; paul.collinson@ntlworld.com
24
25
26
27

28 Running title Biotin interference troponin
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 Keywords
39

40 cardiac troponin T
41
42
43

44 biotin
45
46
47

48 immunoassay interference
49
50

51 acute coronary syndromes
52
53

54 Correspondence to: Professor Paul Collinson. Department of Clinical Blood Sciences, St
55 George's University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, Cranmer Terrace, London SW17
56 0QT, UK.
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6 Interference in analysis, in particular in immunoassay, remains a perpetual headache for the
7 laboratory and potential pitfall for the clinician. Interference has been documented for all
8 types of immunoassay and includes analyte independent interferences (pre-analytical or
9 analytical) and analyte dependent interferences [1]. Interference from drugs is fortunately rare
10 but does occur.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

20 Troponin measurement now defines myocardial infarction[2]. Treatment strategies for
21 patients with non-ST elevation myocardial infarction (NSTEMI) are predicated by troponin
22 measurement[3]. The development of high sensitivity troponin assays, defined as those with
23 imprecision less than 10% at the 99th percentile and able to measure at least 50% of a
24 reference population[4], has further changed the way cardiac biomarkers are used. Rapid
25 diagnostic algorithms able to rule out NSTEMI by measurement of a single sample on
26 hospital admission or following serial measurement over 1-2 hours have been developed and
27 extensively validated. Such strategies have been endorsed by the UK health technology
28 assessment programme ([5]guidance soon to be updated) and by The European Society of
29 Cardiology[3]. They depend on the ability to measure very low values of troponin reliably
30 and that repeat measurements have low imprecision. There was therefore alarm when it was
31 reported that there was a risk of false negative troponin results in patients taking biotin
32 supplementation. [https://www.fda.gov/medical-devices/safety-communications/fda-warns-
33 biotin-may-interfere-lab-tests-fda-safety-
34 communication#:~:text=The%20FDA%20has%20received%20a,would%20interfere%20with
35 %20lab%20tests.](https://www.fda.gov/medical-devices/safety-communications/fda-warns-biotin-may-interfere-lab-tests-fda-safety-communication#:~:text=The%20FDA%20has%20received%20a,would%20interfere%20with%20lab%20tests.)
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

The majority of discussions following improvement in troponin assay sensitivity and the

1
2
3 introduction of high sensitivity assays has been around “false positive” results. Much of this
4
5 has been ill informed, with troponin elevation outside the spectrum of acute coronary
6
7 syndromes (ACS) being labelled as “false positive” and given labels such as “troponinitis”.
8
9 Much of this confusion is due over requesting of troponin in patients who do not have ACS
10
11 or even suspicion of ACS with requests made “just in case”[6]. Although true false positive
12
13 troponin results can occur they are very rare and have the same causes as in other
14
15 immunoassays, although there are false positives unique to troponin assays. Troponin
16
17 elevations outside ACS indicate myocardial injury and are associated with a worse prognosis,
18
19 whatever the cause[7;8]. The main role of clinical testing for troponin is exclusion of
20
21 myocardial infarction and of significant myocardial injury from any cause. In this regard,
22
23 high sensitivity troponin assays are clinically excellent and this exquisite sensitivity is the
24
25 basis of rule out algorithms. No troponin elevation means an excellent prognosis and safe
26
27 discharge from hospital, with minimal hospital stay. This is an important attribute in the
28
29 times of Covid 19. The documentation of a potential cause of false negative results is
30
31 therefore worrying.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 Streptavidin-biotin based assays have the potential for immunoassay interference. This was
41
42 first documented in 1996[9]. However the likelihood of encountering high levels of biotin
43
44 outside of specific treatment regimens was considered unlikely[10]. Such interventions would
45
46 also be expected to be documented as part of the drug chart. However, the current enthusiasm
47
48 for biotin supplementation to improve hair and nails (with accompanying celebrity
49
50 endorsement) means that a large number of people are taking biotin supplements, with a
51
52 typical starting dose of 10 mg, for which there is little evidence of benefit[11]. Analytical
53
54 interference has been demonstrated at the 10 mg level of supplementation [12] although the
55
56 interference is variable between assay type and formulation [13].
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 Is this a real problem? An earlier study from the Mayo clinic suggested that 7.4% of
6 patients attending the Emergency Department had biotin concentrations exceeding 10 µg/L.
7
8 [14]. This group subsequently estimated a clinical risk of 0.8% for the ED population. There
9
10 have been other publications which have examined the rate of biotin elevation. These have
11
12 variously estimated the proportion exceeding 10 µg/L as 0.8% (ED population)[15] and 0.2%
13
14 (routine laboratory requests)[16].
15
16
17
18
19
20

21 In this issue of the journal Mumma [17] and colleagues report a novel approach to assessing
22 the risk of biotin interference. They combine estimation of prevalence of significant elevation
23 with risk modelling in two different cohorts of patients. In the first cohort they used patients
24 enrolled in a clinical study of suspected ACS and measured biotin levels in residual samples.
25
26 In the second cohort they used randomly selected samples submitted for routine analysis to a
27
28 US laboratory. In both cohorts they obtain the prevalence of an elevated biotin (defined as
29
30 exceeding 20 µg/L). They then undertake a modelling exercise to determine the likelihood
31
32 that an elevated biotin would result in misclassification of a patient with acute myocardial
33
34 infarction (AMI) based on misclassification at the 99th percentile. In the second cohort they
35
36 additionally attempt to model the potential impact of elevated biotin resulting in interference
37
38 with a single sample rule out strategy by lowering the troponin below the rule out decision
39
40 threshold. In the ACS population, the percentage of patients with biotin > 20 µg/L was
41
42 0.13%. In the laboratory population it was 0.74%. In the ACS population the risk of
43
44 misclassification of AMI (based on the 99th percentile) was 0.026%. For the general
45
46 laboratory population the derived risk for misclassification of AMI was 0.025% and for the
47
48 single sample rule out strategy it was 0.063%. How should these findings be interpreted in
49
50 relation to the current literature in this field? The first problem is the prevalence of elevated
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 biotin. The second is the question of the assay version, interference threshold selected, and
4
5 the pharmacokinetics of biotin ingestion.
6
7
8
9

10 Biotin measurements are not standardised. In the original Mayo clinic publication
11
12 measurement was by liquid chromatography tandem-mass spectrometry (LC-MS/MS)[14].
13
14 This technique was also used by two of the other groups documenting values above 10
15
16 $\mu\text{g/L}$ [15;16]. The authors have used a research immunoassay which detects total serum
17
18 biotin. The argument for this is that it detects all biotin species including metabolites, so is
19
20 more likely to detect the levels at which interference will occur. Although the assay is
21
22 calibrated against LC-MS/MS biotin measurements the slope of the graph is not 1.0
23
24 suggesting under recovery, which is slightly surprising for an assay that measures total biotin
25
26 (including other forms of biotin) rather than biotin alone.
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 The question of assay version, interference threshold, and the effect of biotin ingestion is
34
35 much more complicated. Evaluation of the fifth generation troponin T assay reported no
36
37 interference was observed with biotin concentrations up to 20 $\mu\text{g/L}$ [18]. In examining the
38
39 impact of biotin interference it was reported that concentrations of 15.6 $\mu\text{g/L}$ or greater
40
41 would generate significant interference[13]. The choice of 20 $\mu\text{g/L}$ as the interference
42
43 threshold might therefore be somewhat optimistic as it is derived from spiking experiments.
44
45 In a volunteer study, five normal individuals ingested a supplement containing 10 mg biotin
46
47 per day, a commonly available dose. The post ingestion levels of biotin detected would have
48
49 been expected to generate a significant fall in measured troponin values[19]. This study also
50
51 showed the variability in dose response between individuals following biotin ingestion. A
52
53 further complicating factor is that the spiking experiments in vitro may not mimic the
54
55 biological effect of biotin ingestion (alone or as a multivitamin preparation) with interference
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 by biotin metabolites and other tablet constituents in addition to that of biotin alone. To add a
4
5 further level of complexity, it is possible that measured biotin levels do not necessarily reflect
6
7 the value that generates assay interference when biotin is taken as a supplement.
8
9

10
11
12 What may we conclude? The differences between the studies using LC MS/MS may
13
14 represent different populations with Americans tending to take more biotin containing
15
16 supplements. Comparing the prevalence in the two US studies, there are different methods for
17
18 biotin measurement in different populations and a different cut-off has been used. The risk of
19
20 interference in the assay would therefore seem to be between a pessimistic 0.8% and an
21
22 optimistic 0.063-0.025% and is driven by the estimate of the percentage above the
23
24 interference threshold. Based on UK figures for chest pain admissions this would mean
25
26 between 3600 and 28 missed cases annually. The authors make the point that the risk of a
27
28 false negative from biotin assay interference is lower than the risks involved with rapid rule
29
30 out strategies. These have an estimated misdiagnosis rate of ~0.5%[20], which is deemed
31
32 clinically acceptable. This is a valid point and it is reassuring that the number of cases missed
33
34 may well be small. It is also the case that rapid rule out protocols will become the norm hence
35
36 there is only a single sample on admission and repeat sampling with physiological biotin fall
37
38 will not apply. Although strategies have been suggested to mitigate risk in practice this will
39
40 be difficult to implement in the context of rapid diagnostic strategies [21, 22].
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 Biotin interference remains an avoidable cause of false negative results. In medicine risks are
50
51 frequently additive and often multiplicative. And in clinical medicine, Murphy's law applies
52
53 with depressing frequency. It is therefore encouraging that a more recent formulation of the
54
55 cardiac troponin T assay with a much higher biotin interference threshold has been produced.
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 **Research funding:** None declared.
4
5

6 **Author contributions:** The author has accepted responsibility for the entire content of this manuscript
7
8 and approved its submission.
9

10
11 **Competing interests:** The Author states no conflict of interest.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

20 References

21
22
23
24
25

- 26 1. Ward G, Simpson A, Boscato L, Hickman PE. The investigation of interferences in
27 immunoassay. *Clin Biochem* 2017; 50:1306-11.
28
- 29 2. Thygesen K, Alpert JS, Jaffe AS et al. Fourth universal definition of myocardial
30 infarction (2018). *Eur Heart J* 2019; 40:237-69.
31
- 32 3. Roffi M, Patrono C, Collet JP et al. 2015 ESC Guidelines for the management of
33 acute coronary syndromes in patients presenting without persistent ST-segment
34 elevation: Task Force for the Management of Acute Coronary Syndromes in Patients
35 Presenting without Persistent ST-Segment Elevation of the European Society of
36 Cardiology (ESC). *Eur Heart J* 2016; 37:267-315.
37
- 38 4. Apple FS, Collinson PO. Analytical Characteristics of High-Sensitivity Cardiac
39 Troponin Assays. *Clin Chem* 2012; 58:54-61.
40
- 41 5. Diagnostic Guidance 15 [DG15] Diagnostics Assesment Committee National Institute
42 for Helrth and Care Excellence. Myocardial infarction (acute): Early rule out using
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 high-sensitivity troponin tests (Elecsys Troponin T high-sensitive, ARCHITECT
4 STAT High Sensitive Troponin-I and AccuTnI+3 assays). NICE . 2014. Ref Type:
5 Electronic Citation.
6
7
8
9
10 6. Shah ASV, Sandoval Y, Noaman A et al. Patient selection for high sensitivity cardiac
11 troponin testing and diagnosis of myocardial infarction: prospective cohort study.
12 BMJ 2017; 359:j4788.
13
14
15
16
17
18 7. Etaher A, Chew D, Redfern J et al. Suspected ACS Patients Presenting With
19 Myocardial Damage or a Type 2 Myocardial Infarction Have a Similar Late Mortality
20 to Patients With a Type 1 Myocardial Infarction: A Report From the Australian and
21 New Zealand 2012 SNAPSHOT ACS Study. Heart Lung Circ 2017; 26:1051-8.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28 8. Campbell AR, Rodriguez AJ, Larson DM et al. Resource utilization and outcome
29 among patients with selective versus nonselective troponin testing. Am Heart J 2018;
30 199:68-74.
31
32
33
34
35
36 9. Henry JG, Sobki S, Arafat N. Interference by biotin therapy on measurement of TSH
37 and FT4 by enzyme immunoassay on Boehringer Mannheim ES700 analyser. Ann
38 Clin Biochem 1996; 33 (Pt 2):162-3.
39
40
41
42
43
44 10. Elston MS, Sehgal S, Du TS, Yarnley T, Conaglen JV. Factitious Graves' Disease
45 Due to Biotin Immunoassay Interference-A Case and Review of the Literature. J Clin
46 Endocrinol Metab 2016; 101:3251-5.
47
48
49
50
51
52 11. Lipner SR. Rethinking biotin therapy for hair, nail, and skin disorders. J Am Acad
53 Dermatol 2018; 78:1236-8.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 12. Li D, Radulescu A, Shrestha RT et al. Association of Biotin Ingestion With
4
5 Performance of Hormone and Nonhormone Assays in Healthy Adults. *JAMA* 2017;
6
7 318:1150-60.
8
9
- 10
11 13. Trambas C, Lu Z, Yen T, Sikaris K. Characterization of the scope and magnitude of
12
13 biotin interference in susceptible Roche Elecsys competitive and sandwich
14
15 immunoassays. *Ann Clin Biochem* 2018; 55:205-15.
16
17
- 18
19 14. Katzman BM, Lueke AJ, Donato LJ, Jaffe AS, Baumann NA. Prevalence of biotin
20
21 supplement usage in outpatients and plasma biotin concentrations in patients
22
23 presenting to the emergency department. *Clin Biochem* 2018; 60:11-6.
24
25
- 26
27 15. Trambas CM, Liu KC, Luu H et al. Further assessment of the prevalence of biotin
28
29 supplementation and its impact on risk. *Clin Biochem* 2019; 65:64-5.
30
31
- 32
33 16. Ijpelaar A, Beijers A, van DH, van den Ouweland JMW. Prevalence of detectable
34
35 biotin in The Netherlands in relation to risk on immunoassay interference. *Clin*
36
37 *Biochem* 2020.
38
39
- 40
41 17. Mumma B, Diercks D, Twerenbold R, Valcour A, Ziegler A, Schützenmeister A, et al.
42
43 Clinical risk assessment of biotin interference with a high-sensitivity cardiac troponin T
44
45 assay. *Clin Chem Lab Med*. In press.
46
47
- 48
49 18. Fitzgerald RL, Hollander JE, Peacock WF et al. Analytical performance evaluation of
50
51 the Elecsys(R) Troponin T Gen 5 STAT assay. *Clin Chim Acta* 2019; 495:522-8.
52
53
- 54
55 19. Frame IJ, Joshi PH, Mwangi C et al. Susceptibility of Cardiac Troponin Assays to
56
57 Biotin Interference. *Am J Clin Pathol* 2019; 151:486-93.
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 20. Shah AS, Anand A, Sandoval Y et al. High-sensitivity cardiac troponin I at
4 presentation in patients with suspected acute coronary syndrome: a cohort study.
5
6 Lancet 2015.
7
8
9
10
11 21. Bowen R, Benavides R, Colon-Franco JM et al. Best practices in mitigating the risk
12 of biotin interference with laboratory testing. Clin Biochem 2019; 74:1-11.
13
14
15
16 22. Mrosewski I, Urbank M, Stauch T, Switkowski R. Interference From High-Dose
17 Biotin Intake in Immunoassays for Potentially Time-Critical Analytes by Roche:
18 Evaluation of a Countermeasure for Worst-Case Scenarios. Arch Pathol Lab Med
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60