STRECK

The Objective Case for Third-Party Quality Controls in Flow Cytometry

A framework for understanding the risks that third-party QC addresses in flow cytometric testing workflows

The case for third-party quality controls in flow cytometry

In flow cytometry, the reliability of a reported immunophenotype, cell enumeration, or measurable residual disease result depends entirely on the integrity of every step that produced it. From specimen preparation through antibody staining, lysing, acquisition, and gating, each stage of the analytical pathway is a potential point of failure — a degraded fluorochrome conjugate, an under-lysed specimen, a miscounted rare population — and each failure may affect the reliability of laboratory results used in clinical decision-making.[1]

Quality control materials exist to catch those failures before they reach reported results. But not all QC materials are equally capable of doing so. Bead-based instrument QC — the fluorescent microsphere sets run at daily startup to check optical alignment, laser output, and PMT voltage — verifies that the cytometer itself is performing correctly. It was never designed to, and cannot, evaluate whether the biological workflow around the instrument — pipetting, staining, lysing, and gating — is behaving the same way it did yesterday. When a laboratory's only routine QC is an instrument bead check, an entire class of failure has no witness.[2][3]

A flow cytometry reagent manufacturer's internally developed control — a cell line or stabilized cell preparation stained with the same antibody clones, fluorochrome conjugates, and reagent lots used in patient testing — compounds the problem: it shares formulation origins, raw material inputs, and often a production supply chain with the assay it is meant to challenge. The structural risk lies in that shared origin, not in the commercial arrangement under which a control is ultimately distributed. A systematic defect — a degraded tandem-dye lot, a shifted antibody titer — can potentially go undetected by a co-formulated control run in parallel, rendering the QC cycle silent precisely when it should be loudest.[3]

Third-party quality controls resolve both problems by design. Manufactured by a separate entity with a distinct supply chain, formulated without shared inputs from the assay or instrument under evaluation, and processed identically to a patient specimen — through pipetting, lysing, staining, acquisition, and gating — they provide both the structural objectivity and the full-process coverage that bead-based instrument QC and manufacturer-supplied controls are constitutionally unable to offer. The International Council for Standardization in Hematology and International Clinical Cytometry Society's joint validation guidelines are explicit on this point: a stabilized sample used as a full process control is what ensures staining, lysing, acquisition, and analysis remain consistent day to day, while a fresh donor sample — even one drawn independently — cannot reveal the same drift.[2]

The case extends beyond structural bias and process coverage. Third-party controls also solve for the performance uncertainty introduced at every antibody or reagent lot transition and instrument service event, the absence of any validated daily control for rare-event assays such as measurable residual disease and PNH clone testing, the operator technique variability that instrument diagnostics cannot detect, the supply fragility of patient-derived and rare-antigen QC materials, and the regulatory exposure created by RUO materials operating inside IVD flow cytometry workflows.[4][5]

When laboratories implement third-party QC programs aligned with current accreditation requirements — ISO 15189:2022, CLSI H62, the CAP Flow Cytometry Checklist (FLO.23737, FLO.23800), and CLIA regulations at 42 CFR § 493.1256 — they are not simply satisfying a compliance checkbox. They are closing the structural gap between a QC program that produces results and one that protects patients.[3][6]

The 13 risks cataloged below represent the full spectrum of where quality assurance breaks down when objective, third-party controls are absent from the flow cytometry laboratory — and how each risk is resolved when they are present. Each risk row is annotated with its supporting citation.

13 risks addressed by third-party flow cytometry quality controls

Risk	Why it matters	How third-party QC resolves it
STRUCTURAL BIAS IN THE TESTING SYSTEM		
1 **BIAS** Co-sourced antibody conjugates and control cell substrate [3]	When quality control material is formulated using the same antibody clones, fluorochrome conjugates, or reagent lots as the flow cytometry assay under evaluation, it cannot function as a true independent challenge. A systematic defect in a shared conjugate lot — a degraded tandem dye, a shifted antibody-to-fluorochrome ratio — will express identically in both the assay and its control, rendering the QC cycle analytically inert against that class of failure. This risk is specific to controls derived from the reagent manufacturer's own production chain; it does not apply to controls manufactured by an independent third party to their own specifications, even when distributed under an original equipment manufacturer (OEM) label.	A control formulated by an independent manufacturer — using its own cell substrate, its own conjugation process, and its own quality system — carries no structural relationship to the assay's failure modes, regardless of how it is commercially distributed. The objectivity that matters is formulation independence, not label independence. When the control's inputs, processes, and QA infrastructure are structurally separate from those of the assay, it can detect what a co-formulated control is constitutionally unable to see.
2 **BIAS** Concomitant tandem-dye degradation across calibration beads and control [3]	Tandem fluorochromes are inherently unstable, degrading with light exposure, temperature, and time in ways that alter both fluorescence intensity and spectral profile. When compensation beads and QC control material are matched to the same fluorochrome lot pool as the assay reagents, degradation of that lot affects the calibration reference and the challenge material concurrently. The resulting co-drift produces results that appear stable within acceptance criteria while true analytical performance — and true compensation accuracy — gradually decline. Because the reference standard and the measured system drift together, this loss of accuracy may remain undetected.	An independently sourced, independently dated control maintains a fixed analytical reference point decoupled from the assay's own reagent and fluorochrome lot cycle. Tandem-dye or compensation drift registers as a measurable deviation from the control's established baseline — surfacing the shift before it propagates to reported immunophenotyping, enumeration, or MRD results.
3 **BIAS** Inherent commercial conflict in manufacturer-supplied flow QC [3][6]	Independent and manufacturer-supplied control strategies represent different approaches to quality monitoring: the control's primary function — detecting assay or instrument failure — is in direct tension with the manufacturer's commercial interest in demonstrating product performance. Objectivity cannot be credibly claimed when the evaluator and the evaluated share the same origin.	When the control manufacturer has no economic stake in the assay's or instrument's pass rate, objectivity is structurally enforced rather than asserted. The control's sole design criterion is sensitivity to failure — unconstrained by any downstream interest in the result it produces.

Risk	Why it matters	How third-party QC resolves it
DIRECT IMPACT ON PATIENT RESULTS		
4 **PATIENT SAFETY** Bead-based instrument QC blind to biological workflow failures [2][3]	Fluorescent microsphere sets confirm that the cytometer's optics, lasers, fluidics, and PMT voltages are performing to specification — and nothing more. They do not touch a pipette, encounter lysing reagent, or pass through the gating logic a technologist actually applies. A 2019 FDA recall of a widely used clinical flow cytometer illustrates the consequence: an elevated electronic-abort event ratio between beads and cell populations produced falsely high absolute counts with no instrument alert, and the manufacturer identified potential clinical impact spanning prophylactic therapy decisions for HIV patients, care decisions for immunosuppressed patients, transplant engraftment assessment, and use of leukoreduced blood products for transfusion. Instrument-level QC, run correctly and passing every day, would not have caught this.	A stabilized cellular control processed identically to a patient specimen — through pipetting, lysing, staining, acquisition, and gating — exercises the complete analytic process that bead QC is structurally unable to reach. The joint ICSH/ICCS validation guidelines describe this explicitly as a "full process control," distinct in purpose and design from instrument setup beads, and identify it as the mechanism that surfaces day-to-day and batch-to-batch drift in staining, lysing, acquisition, and analysis before it reaches a reported result.
5 **PATIENT SAFETY** Routine QC as a leading indicator of proficiency testing risk [1][3]	Proficiency testing evaluates laboratory performance at discrete, low-frequency intervals — typically weeks to months after an analytical problem first manifests. A flow cytometry laboratory relying on PT as its primary performance signal for CD34 enumeration, CD4 subset analysis, or MRD detection operates with a structural lag between failure onset and detection, during which reported results continue to inform transplant readiness assessments, ART initiation decisions, and relapse risk stratification.	A continuous third-party QC program run each day of patient testing generates a high-frequency internal performance signal that precedes any external audit finding. Analytical issues identified and resolved through routine QC do not persist to the proficiency testing cycle — the laboratory arrives at external evaluation having already corrected what would otherwise become a finding.
ANALYTICAL PROCESS COVERAGE		
6 **PROCESS INTEGRITY** Compensation and spectral unmixing drift undetected by single-stain instrument controls [3]	Accurate fluorescence separation — whether by compensation matrix on conventional cytometers or spectral unmixing on spectral platforms — depends on the reference spectral signature matching the sample's actual staining conditions. Tandem-dye degradation, antibody lot variability, and reagent-to-reagent differences in conjugation can all shift a fluorochrome's true spectral signature away from the reference used to build the unmixing matrix, producing unmixing errors that surface as false-positive or false-negative populations rather than as an instrument alarm. Single-stain compensation controls confirm that a spectral signature was captured; they do not confirm that the signature still matches the patient sample being run weeks or months later.	A third-party control with a defined, lot-specific expected range — run alongside the patient sample rather than only at panel setup — provides an ongoing check against reference drift, flagging a shift in spectral behavior at the point it would otherwise misclassify a positive or negative population.
7 **PROCESS INTEGRITY** Unverified performance equivalence across antibody and reagent lot transitions [3]	Each new antibody or reagent lot constitutes an uncontrolled performance variable unless bracketed by a documented equivalence assessment. CAP's Flow Cytometry Checklist requires evaluation of new antibody and cocktail lots for positive and negative reactivity before or concurrently with placing them into service — but the evaluation method and acceptance criteria are left to the laboratory, and a comparison run only against patient samples or normal donor material provides no fixed, lot-independent reference point.	Bridging runs with a third-party control at every lot transition generates a prospective, documented performance record with a defined expected range that does not shift with the lot being evaluated. Equivalence is established through data rather than assumed through manufacturer claims, and any performance divergence is identified at the point of introduction, before patient specimens are processed under the new lot.
8 **PROCESS INTEGRITY** Absence of a verified performance baseline following instrument service events [3]	Following a service event, software update, laser replacement, or instrument relocation, there is no validated method for confirming restored analytical performance without an external reference standard. Rerunning bead-based alignment checks confirms that the optical system meets specification; it does not confirm that the full stained-cell workflow — staining chemistry, lysing, gating logic — returns the same result it produced before the service event.	A third-party control with defined lot-specific expected performance provides the fixed external standard against which post-service requalification of the complete workflow is objectively assessed — answering the question bead alignment checks structurally cannot: has the laboratory's flow cytometry system, taken as a whole, returned to a verified analytical baseline?

Risk	Why it matters	How third-party QC resolves it
PERSONNEL AND COMPETENCY DOCUMENTATION		
9 **OPERATIONS** Pre-analytical operator technique variability below the detection threshold of instrument-based controls [2][3]	Pipetting imprecision, inconsistent lysing time, and variable staining incubation occur upstream of any step a bead-based or auto-loaded control can observe. A control that bypasses manual sample handling by design — as instrument setup beads do — is constitutively blind to the failure modes most frequently associated with operator-introduced error, including technique drift a laboratory director cannot see in an instrument log.	A control processed identically to a clinical specimen — from initial handling through staining, lysing, and introduction to the analytical system — exercises the human element of the workflow alongside the instrumental one. Technique-dependent failures produce a control result that deviates from expectation, creating a mechanism for identifying operator-specific performance issues that instrument diagnostics alone cannot surface.
10 **OPERATIONS** Competency documentation lacking audit-defensible traceability [3]	Accreditation frameworks require documented, individualized competency assessments tied to specific assays and time periods. Residual patient specimens and internally developed materials lack the lot consistency, defined expected performance ranges, and chain-of-custody documentation required to make competency records defensible under CAP, CLIA, or ISO 15189 audit scrutiny.	A commercially manufactured third-party control with lot-specific certificates of analysis, documented stability data, and defined expected ranges provides the consistent, traceable reference required to help support and produce high quality competency records. Each operator's performance is evaluated against the same fixed analytical standard — not a variable reference that changes with every use.
SUPPLY CONTINUITY AND MATERIAL INTEGRITY		
11 **OPERATIONS** No validated daily control for rare-event assays leaves low-frequency detection unmonitored [5]	Measurable residual disease testing and high-sensitivity PNH clone detection depend on identifying abnormal populations that may represent a small fraction of a percent of total events. For at least one major rare-event application, published guidance states plainly that no daily quality control exists for the assay procedure — leaving the laboratory to rely on retrospective review of patient result patterns rather than a same-day, run-level check that the assay can still resolve the low-frequency populations it is designed to detect. PNH testing compounds the challenge because it is inherently a "detect-the-absence" assay: a reagent or gating shift that reduces sensitivity produces no positive signal to flag the error.	A third-party control formulated with defined, low-frequency target populations at clinically relevant concentrations exercises the full rare-event detection pathway — staining, acquisition, and gating — each day of testing, providing the run-level sentinel that patient-result review alone cannot.
12 **OPERATIONS** Patient-derived and rare-antigen QC materials subject to prevalence-dependent supply failure and unverified traceability [3][4]	Laboratories using residual patient specimens or in-house reference material for rare flow antigens (CD1a, CD30, CD103) or low-prevalence cell populations are operationally dependent on a supply variable they do not control — case mix, referral patterns, and disease prevalence all fluctuate, and the specimens most valuable for QC are precisely the ones least likely to be available when needed. Materials developed internally further place the laboratory in the position of characterizing, validating, and documenting its own reference material — producing records under the same quality system being evaluated, a circularity accreditation inspectors are trained to identify and question.	A commercially manufactured third-party control at defined, clinically relevant concentrations — including rare and abnormal populations — is available independent of patient case mix, referral volume, or testing site geography, and carries its own lot-specific performance data, stability documentation, and certificate of analysis produced under a separate, audited quality system. The laboratory inherits a complete, defensible traceability record rather than generating one internally or waiting for a qualifying specimen to arrive.
REGULATORY AND ACCREDITATION COMPLIANCE		
13 **REGULATORY** QC program design misaligned with current accreditation guidance [3][6]	CLIA regulations at 42 CFR § 493.1256 require control procedures that monitor the accuracy and precision of the complete analytic process — language a bead-only instrument check cannot, by definition, satisfy on its own. ISO 15189:2022 explicitly recommends that laboratories consider third-party IQC material as an alternative or addition to reagent- or instrument-manufacturer-supplied controls, and CLSI H62 and the CAP Flow Cytometry Checklist (FLO.23737, FLO.23800) build discipline-specific detail on top of that same foundation. Programs built solely on instrument setup beads or manufacturer-supplied cellular controls may satisfy earlier interpretations of these standards while falling short of current expectations — a gap that frequently surfaces only during inspection cycles.	A third-party control used in accordance with current accreditation guidance — and meeting the process-control function those frameworks describe — helps support alignment with accreditation frameworks: CLIA, ISO 15189:2022, CLSI H62, and the CAP checklist without requiring interpretive argument. Compliance is demonstrated by doing precisely what the standards recommend.

Supporting literature

No single publication documents every dimension of the case for third-party flow cytometry quality controls. The evidence instead forms a chain — each publication contributing a specific, peer-reviewed link that together establish the full argument: laboratory errors cause patient harm → bead-based instrument QC and manufacturer-supplied controls structurally fail to monitor the complete analytic process → international standardization bodies define the stabilized cellular process control as the resolution → documented instrument recalls confirm the failure mode is real, not theoretical → independent sourcing and full-process commutability are the scientific requirements that define effective flow cytometry QC.

All citations are peer-reviewed publications indexed on PubMed or PubMed Central, or official U.S. FDA recall records. Citation numbers in [n] throughout this document correspond to the numbered references below.

[1]	**van Moll C, Egberts T, Wagner C, Zwaan L, ten Berg M.** *The Nature, Causes, and Clinical Impact of Errors in the Clinical Laboratory Testing Process Leading to Diagnostic Error: A Voluntary Incident Report Analysis.* Journal of Patient Safety. 2023;19(8):573–579. doi: 10.1097/PTS.0000000000001166 **Use in this document**: Documents that analytical-phase errors in clinical laboratory testing produce severe clinical impact and lead to diagnostic errors — including delayed or wrong diagnoses — in a majority of affected cases. Establishes the direct patient harm pathway that flow cytometry QC is designed to interrupt.
[2]	**U.S. Food and Drug Administration, Center for Devices and Radiological Health.** *Class 2 Device Recall: BD FACSLyric Flow Cytometer.* .Recall Number Z-0069-2020, Recall Event ID 83603; 510(k) K170974; initiated by firm August 19, 2019; terminated April 12, 2024. **Use in this document**: Documents a real flow cytometer recall in which an elevated electronic-abort event ratio produced falsely high absolute counts with no instrument alert, with FDA-listed potential clinical impact on HIV prophylactic therapy decisions, immunosuppressed patient care, specimen engraftment assessment, and transfusion of leukoreduced blood products. The flow cytometry case study establishing that instrument-level QC can pass while a workflow-level failure reaches reported results.
[3]	**Barnett D, Louzao R, Gambell P, De J, Oldaker T, Hedley BD; International Council for Standardization in Haematology (ICSH); International Clinical Cytometry Society (ICCS). Validation of Cell-based Fluorescence Assays: Practice Guidelines from the ICSH and ICCS – Part IV – Postanalytic Considerations.** *Validation of Cell-based Fluorescence Assays: Practice Guidelines from the ICSH and ICCS – Part IV – Postanalytic Considerations.* Cytometry Part B: Clinical Cytometry. 2013;84B(5):309–314. doi: 10.1002/cyto.b.21107 **Use in this document**: Authoritative joint peer-reviewed guidance from the two leading international flow cytometry standardization bodies, explicitly distinguishing bead-based instrument QC — which monitors compensation, fluidics, laser, and PMT voltages — from a stabilized sample used as a "full process control" that ensures staining, lysing, acquisition, and analysis remain consistent day to day, and cautioning that a fresh donor sample cannot substitute because it will not reveal drift. The structural keystone of this document's central argument.
[4]	**Bergeron M, Daneau G, Ding T, Sitoe NE, Westerman LE, Stokx J, Jani IV, Coetzee LM, Scott L, De Weggheleire A, Boel L, Stevens WS, Glencross DK, Peter TF.** *Performance of the PointCare NOW system for CD4 counting in HIV patients based on five independent evaluations.* PLoS One. 2012;7(8):e41166. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0041166 **Use in this document**: Independent five-site evaluation against reference flow cytometry documenting a mean +35.0% platform-specific bias in CD4 absolute count enumeration — greater still (+51.3%) below the 350 cells/µL clinical decision threshold — such that only 47% of patients who qualified for antiretroviral therapy under reference testing would have been identified as eligible using the biased platform's results. Illustrates the magnitude of platform-specific bias that an unverified enumeration method can carry into a treatment-eligibility decision.
[5]	**Oldaker TA, Wallace PK, Barnett D. Flow cytometry quality requirements for monitoring of minimal disease in plasma cell myeloma.** *Cytometry Part B: Clinical Cytometry.* 2016;90(1):40–46. doi: 10.1002/cyto.b.21273 **Use in this document**: Cited by the CAP Flow Cytometry Checklist as a supporting reference for rare-event assay quality requirements; documents that no daily quality control exists for the plasma cell myeloma MRD assay procedure and recommends a full process control assessed on Levey-Jennings charts across staining, lysing, acquisition, and analysis.
[6]	**Plebani M.** *Internal quality control and external quality assurance: a great past opens the way to a bright future. Advances in Laboratory Medicine.* 2022;3(3):215–217. doi: 10.1515/almed-2022-0075 **Use in this document**: Written by the most-cited author in laboratory medicine quality, this article specifically identifies third-party source and commutability to patient sera as the key advancements in internal quality control — enabling result comparability across time, methods, and test versions.

Streck CD-Chex flow cytometry quality controls are third-party manufactured, IVD-labeled, and instrument-agnostic across major flow cytometry platforms — designed to address each of the risks identified above across the full sample-to-result flow cytometry workflow.

STRECK

streck.com