

Biospecimen Reporting for Improved Study Quality (BRISQ)

Helen M. Moore, PhD¹; Andrea B. Kelly, PhD²; Scott D. Jewell, PhD³; Lisa M. McShane, PhD⁴; Douglas P. Clark, MD⁵; Renata Greenspan, MD⁶; Daniel F. Hayes, MD⁷; Pierre Hainaut, PhD, MS⁸; Paula Kim⁹; Elizabeth A. Mansfield, PhD¹⁰; Olga Potapova, PhD¹¹; Peter Riegman, PhD¹²; Yaffa Rubinstein, PhD¹³; Edward Seijo, MS¹⁴; Stella Somiari, PhD¹⁵; Peter Watson, MB, BChir¹⁶; Heinz-Ulrich Weier, PhD¹⁷; Claire Zhu, PhD¹⁸; and Jim Vaught, PhD¹

Human biospecimens are subjected to collection, processing, and storage that can significantly alter their molecular composition and consistency. These biospecimen preanalytical factors, in turn, influence experimental outcomes and the ability to reproduce scientific results. Currently, the extent and type of information specific to the biospecimen preanalytical conditions reported in scientific publications and regulatory submissions varies widely. To improve the quality of research that uses human tissues, it is crucial that information on the handling of biospecimens be reported in a thorough, accurate, and standardized manner. The Biospecimen Reporting for Improved Study Quality (BRISQ) recommendations outlined herein are intended to apply to any study in which human biospecimens are used. The purpose of reporting these details is to supply others, from researchers to regulators, with more consistent and standardized information to better evaluate, interpret, compare, and reproduce the experimental results. The BRISQ guidelines are proposed as an important and timely resource tool to strengthen communication and publications on biospecimen-related research and to help reassure patient contributors and the advocacy community that their contributions are valued and respected. *Cancer (Cancer Cytopathol) 2011;119:92-101. Published 2011 by the American Cancer Society.**

KEY WORDS: BRISQ, best practices, biobank, biospecimen, human, quality, research, guidelines.

Corresponding author: Douglas P. Clark, MD, The Johns Hopkins Hospital, 600 N. Wolfe Street, PATH 406, Baltimore, MD 21287-6940; Fax: (410) 614-9556; dclark@jhmi.edu

¹Office of Biorepositories and Biospecimen Research, National Cancer Institute, Bethesda, Maryland; ²Rose Li and Associates, Inc, Bethesda, Maryland; ³Program for Biospecimen Science, Van Andel Research Institute, Grand Rapids, Michigan; ⁴Biometric Research Branch, Division of Cancer Treatment and Diagnosis, National Cancer Institute, Bethesda, Maryland; ⁵Department of Pathology, Johns Hopkins Hospital, Baltimore, Maryland; ⁶US Military Cancer Institute, Henry M. Jackson Foundation for the Advancement of Military Medicine, Rockville, Maryland; ⁷University of Michigan Comprehensive Cancer Center, Ann Arbor, Michigan; ⁸International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC), World Health Organization, Lyon, France; ⁹Paula Kim, Inc, Translating Research Across Communities (TRAC), Solana Beach, California; ¹⁰Center for Devices and Radiological Health, US Food and Drug Administration, US Department of Health and Human Services, Silver Spring, Maryland; ¹¹Cureline, Inc, South San Francisco, California; ¹²Erasmus MC Tissue Bank, Department of Pathology, Rotterdam, Netherlands; ¹³Office of Rare Diseases Research, National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, Maryland; ¹⁴H. Lee Moffitt Cancer Center & Research Institute, Tampa, Florida; ¹⁵Windber Research Institute, Windber, Pennsylvania; ¹⁶Vancouver Island Center, British Columbia Cancer Agency, Victoria, British Columbia, Canada; ¹⁷Life Sciences Division, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, US Department of Energy, Berkeley, California; ¹⁸Division of Cancer Prevention, National Cancer Institute, Bethesda, Maryland

This article is being published simultaneously in *Biopreservation and Biobanking* by Mary Ann Liebert, Inc. Publishers; *Journal of Proteome Research* by American Chemical Society Publications; and *Cancer Cytopathology* by Wiley-Blackwell, on behalf of the American Cancer Society.

The content of this article does not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the Department of Health and Human Services, nor does mention of trade names, commercial products, or organizations imply endorsement by the US Government.

*This is a US government work and, as such, is in the public domain in the United States of America.

Received: January 21, 2011; **Accepted:** January 31, 2011

Published online March 22, 2011 in Wiley Online Library (wileyonlinelibrary.com)

DOI: 10.1002/cncy.20147, wileyonlinelibrary.com

Human biospecimens provide the basis for research that leads to better understanding of human disease biology and discovery of new treatments tailored to individual patients with cancer or other diseases. These biological materials are subjected to several different collection, processing, and storage factors that can significantly alter their molecular composition and consistency. These preanalytical factors, in turn, influence experimental outcomes and the ability to reproduce scientific results.¹⁻⁶ Currently, the extent and type of information specific to the biospecimen preanalytical conditions reported in scientific publications and regulatory submissions varies widely. To improve the quality of research that uses human tissues, it is crucial that information on the handling of biospecimens be reported in a thorough, accurate, and standardized manner.

The purpose of this article is to make recommendations for the reporting of data elements for human biospecimens, defined as solid tissues and bodily fluids, used in biomedical studies. Cell lines and biospecimen derivatives such as nucleic acids or proteins, although crucial for biomedical research, are not intended to fall within the scope of these recommendations. The Biospecimen Reporting for Improved Study Quality (BRISQ) recommendations are intended to apply to any study in which human biospecimens are used. These include biomedical applications such as translational science, biomarker discovery, clinical trials, technology development, and diagnostic-assay and therapeutics development. The recommended data elements would be reported by an author in a journal publication, by a company in a regulatory submission, or by a biorepository distributing biospecimens. It is intended that the list and the elements within it will be interpreted, modified, and applied according to the context of the study being reported. It is also recognized that information corresponding to all data elements may not be available, but at least for some categories (described below), the known or unknown status of these elements should be documented.

The list of data elements discussed includes general information for consistent documentation of classes of biospecimens and factors that could influence the integrity, quality, and/or molecular composition of biospecimens. Reporting the details enumerated in the BRISQ list does not guarantee biospecimen quality and should not be seen as a

substitute for empirical quality evaluations. The purpose of reporting these details is to supply others, from researchers to regulatory agencies, with more consistent and standardized information to better evaluate, interpret, compare, and reproduce the experimental results. To maintain consistency with federal regulations on research involving human subjects, information that could enable individual identification of research participants should be withheld.

The BRISQ list has been constructed as an initial step toward defining reporting recommendations. The list will likely evolve as more is learned about the factors that influence biospecimen quality and composition, and in turn their effects on biospecimen analysis. It is envisioned that future iterations of the BRISQ recommendations might include changes to the list of elements and the relative weight thereof in accordance with evidence-based scientific and medical findings and technological developments.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

A half-day workshop, Development of Biospecimen Reporting Criteria for Publications, was held at the National Cancer Institute (NCI) 2009 Biospecimen Research Network Symposium (<http://biospecimens.cancer.gov/meeting/brnsymposium>) to initiate a discussion on biospecimen reporting recommendations. Workshop attendees included individuals with a broad range of expertise: laboratory scientists, clinicians, pathologists, statisticians, patient advocates, biobankers, journal editors, leaders of relevant professional societies, and other stakeholders. The attendees noted that reporting guidelines covering many aspects of biomedical studies already exist, particularly guidelines relevant to experimental design and data reporting. (The EQUATOR project [<http://www.equator-network.org/>] provides an extensive listing of guidelines for health research).

It was proposed that the BRISQ recommendations apply to all studies that use human biospecimens and, thus, complement existing guidelines by filling a niche concerning reporting of biospecimen characteristics and preanalytical variables.

The attendees further proposed that the BRISQ recommendations should broadly encompass solid tissues and bodily fluids, rather than including separate lists for these biospecimen types. It was also agreed that a committee to develop biospecimen reporting recommendations



FIGURE 1. The lifecycle of the biospecimen is illustrated. The preanalytical phase of the lifecycle of the biospecimen includes each stage from patient to distribution. Preanalytical variables are addressed in the BRISQ list.

should be formed to take the effort forward. Many of the individuals and disciplines participating in the workshop were included when the BRISQ committee was subsequently formed.

Formulation of the recommendations was based on consideration of what biospecimen information could enable a science reviewer to fully evaluate or replicate a reported study. The preliminary list included the most commonly available data elements. The committee considered the characteristics of the biospecimens themselves as well as numerous preanalytical factors. Types of data elements include the tissue type and the pathology of the sample; patient characteristics that may influence the biospecimens, such as vital and disease states; and the collection and handling of the biospecimens, eg, their stabilization, shipping, and storage conditions.

The preliminary list of recommendations was refined by consulting the NCI Biospecimen Research Database (<http://brd.nci.nih.gov>), an online resource compiling peer-reviewed articles that address biospecimen science. The Biospecimen Research Database's terminology that was deemed relevant to curating scientific literature was incorporated into the initial BRISQ list. This terminology served as a starting point for discussion at monthly teleconferences by the BRISQ committee.

RESULTS

The committee composed a list of data elements that represent factors believed to often influence biospecimen quality and, thus, should be considered for reporting, *if known or applicable*, for the particular study; for example, some list elements will be more applicable to biospecimens collected for a disease-specific study than those collected for a population-based biospecimen resource. For clarity, these elements are organized according to the life-

cycle of the biospecimen (Fig. 1), which spans the period immediately before its removal from the patient through its use in a scientific analysis.

Many reporting elements were discussed, but only some were approved by consensus for inclusion in the guidelines. The committee was mindful that certain information, although important to report, might not have direct relevance to the biology or condition of the biospecimen and, therefore, would not be under the purview of the BRISQ recommendations. The committee attempted to carefully balance scientific interest in having access to extensive data about biospecimen collection, processing, and storage against practical challenges in obtaining such detailed information. Each reporting element included in the guidelines is backed by evidence that the factor could have an effect on the structural integrity and molecular characteristics of the biospecimen or on the ability to perform certain assays on the biospecimen and obtain reliable results. Whereas the committee recognized that collection of data on biospecimens can increase the operational costs to collect and use biospecimens, cost was not factored into the exclusion of data elements that were or should be considered necessary.

The elements in the BRISQ list are prioritized into 3 tiers according to the relative importance of their being reported. The first tier, "Items recommended to report," includes information such as the organ(s) or the anatomical site from which the biospecimens were derived and the manner in which the biospecimens were collected, stabilized, and preserved. For quick reference, these items are summarized in Table 1. Reporting these items need not be onerous. For example, Beatty et al⁷ included most BRISQ Tier 1 items in the following excerpts:

FNA [fine-needle aspiration] specimens were obtained from 55 surgically removed specimens of breast cancer within 1 hour of resection, before tissue fixation. The aspirates were obtained using a 22-

Table 1. Quick-Reference BRISQ Summary/Checklist: Tier 1 Items to Report If Known and Applicable

Data Elements	Examples
Biospecimen type <i>Solid tissue, whole blood, or another product derived from a human being</i>	Serum, Urine
Anatomical site <i>Organ of origin or site of blood draw</i>	Liver, Antecubital area of the arm
Disease status of patients <i>Controls or individuals with the disease of interest</i>	Diabetic, Healthy control
Clinical characteristics of patients <i>Available medical information known or believed to be pertinent to the condition of the biospecimens</i>	Pre-menopausal breast cancer patients
Vital State of patients <i>Alive or deceased patient when biospecimens were obtained</i>	Postmortem
Clinical diagnosis of patients <i>Patient clinical diagnoses (determined by medical history, physical examination, and analyses of the biospecimen) pertinent to the study</i>	Breast cancer
Pathology diagnosis <i>Patient pathology diagnoses (determined by macro and/or microscopic evaluation of the biospecimen at the time of diagnosis and/or prior to research use) pertinent to the study</i>	Her2-negative intraductal carcinoma
Collection mechanism <i>How the biospecimens were obtained</i>	Fine needle aspiration, Pre-operative blood draw
Type of stabilization <i>The initial process by which biospecimens were stabilized during collection</i>	Heparin, On ice
Type of long-term preservation <i>The process by which the biospecimens were sustained after collection</i>	Formalin fixation, freezing
Constitution of preservative <i>The make-up of any formulation used to maintain the biospecimens in a non-reactive state</i>	10% neutral-buffered formalin, 10 USP Heparin Units/mL
Storage temperature <i>The temperature or range thereof at which the biospecimens were kept until distribution/analysis.</i>	–80 °C, 20 to 25 °C
Storage duration <i>The time or range thereof between biospecimen acquisition and distribution or analysis.</i>	8 days, 5 to 7 years
Shipping temperature <i>The temperature or range thereof at which biospecimens were kept during shipment or relocation.</i>	–170 °C to –190 °C
Composition assessment & selection <i>Parameters used to choose biospecimens for the study</i>	Minimum 80% tumour nuclei & maximum 50% necrosis

to 25-gauge needle and spread directly on slides and fixed in ethanol or formalin or placed in CytoLyt for preparation of ThinPrep slides according to the manufacturer's protocol. Corresponding FFPE [formalin-fixed, paraffin-embedded] tissue specimens were fixed in 10% neutral buffered formalin for 18 to 24 hours according to routine procedures and embedded in paraffin.

All FNA cytologic slides were air dried and stored at room temperature before FISH analysis.

“Items beneficial to report” form the second tier. These are data elements an evaluator may find helpful to know but may be slightly less crucial to the scientific contribution or less likely to be annotated, such as the time from biospecimen excision/acquisition to stabilization. “Additional items to report” compose the third tier. These include information about conditions that may be useful

to know concerning the biospecimens but are not known to be as likely to influence research results or are unlikely to be available to researchers, such as environmental factors to which patients were exposed or the type of storage container in which the biospecimens were kept.

The full BRISQ list featured in Table 2 includes each item and its definition along with additional columns that were designed for an author or reviewer to track where the listed items are reported for a particular study. To the right of the “Item Descriptions” is a column assigning each item a unique Roman-numeral/letter/number identification code. The far right column provides space to note where each item may be found in a manuscript or application. The far left “Apply-to” column indicates whether the BRISQ item is applicable to *All* biospecimen types or is

Table 2. BRISQ Information to Consider Reporting in Publications That Employ Human Biospecimens**Biospecimen Reporting for Improved Study Quality (BRISQ): Items to Consider Reporting if Known and Applicable**

Apply to	Tier #	Item Description	Item #	Location
I. Pre-acquisition				
All	Tier 1	Biospecimen type. Solid tissue, whole blood, serum/plasma, isolated cells, urine, secretions, or another product derived from a human being.	I.a.	_____
All	Tier 1	Anatomical or collection site. In standard terminology, organ(s) of origin or site of blood draw.	I.a.1.	_____
All	Tier 1	Biospecimen disease status. From controls or individuals with the disease of interest; in the case of solid tissue, whether it is from disease site or normal adjacent (not involved but from the same anatomical site as a disease specimen in the same patient).	I.a.2.	_____
All	Tier 1	Clinical characteristics of patients. In standard terminology, available medical information known or believed to be pertinent to the condition of the biospecimens.	I.b.	_____
All	Tier 1	Vital state. Alive or deceased when biospecimens were obtained	I.b.1	_____
All	Tier 3	<i>Disease state.</i> Patient condition relative to disease and treatment, if known (eg, during- or post-therapy; acute, chronic, or terminal stage).	I.b.1.1.	_____
All	Tier 3	<i>Cause of death.</i> For postmortem biospecimens, the cause of death and other diseases present at the time of death.	I.b.1.2.	_____
All	Tier 3	<i>Agonal state.</i> The patients' physical condition immediately preceding death (eg, prolonged degeneration or relatively healthy)	I.b.1.3.	_____
All	Tier 1	Diagnosis. Patient diagnoses pertinent to the study being conducted, using an accepted system of standards (eg, the Systemized Nomenclature of Medicine or the International Classification of Diseases). Please note that clinical and pathology diagnoses are not always the same.	I.b.2.	_____
All	Tier 1	Clinical. Patient clinical diagnoses (determined by medical history, physical examination, and analyses of a biospecimen) pertinent to the study being conducted.	I.b.2.1.	_____
All	Tier 1	Pathology. Patient pathology diagnoses (determined by macro and/or microscopic evaluation of a biospecimen at the time of diagnosis and/or prior to research use) pertinent to the study being conducted.	I.b.2.2.	_____
All	Tier 2	Time between diagnosis and sampling. The time or range of time between disease diagnosis and sample acquisition.	I.b.2.3	_____
All	Tier 3	Exposures. Neoadjuvant therapy, other current or past medical treatments or environmental factors that might influence the condition of the biospecimen (eg, chemo-and radiation therapy, blood thinner, smoking status).	I.b.3.	_____
All	Tier 3	Reproductive status. The hormonal or reproductive state of the patients (eg, pregnant, pre-pubescent, post-menopausal).	I.b.4.	_____
All	Tier 2	Patient demographic information. Demographic information that might be relevant to the condition of the biospecimens (eg, age range, gender).	I.c.	_____
All	Tier 2	Accrual scheme. Whether the biospecimens were obtained for the study being conducted or for a generalized collection such as a population-based biospecimen resource (i.e. retrospective or prospective procurement); whether any standard operating procedures (SOPs) were employed and whether these SOPs are available to others upon request. Reference any clinical trials relevant to the accrual scheme.	I.d.	_____
All	Tier 2	Nature of the biobanking institution(s). The biobanking context in which the biospecimens were obtained (eg, as part of an internal collection or a biospecimen-acquisition network); include name, location, and primary contact details such as email address or Web site and reference to any pertinent SOPs.	I.e.	_____
II. Acquisition				
All	Tier 1	Collection mechanism and parameters. How the biospecimens were obtained (eg, fine needle aspiration, pre-operative blood draw).	II.a.	_____
Tissue	Tier 3	Time from cessation of blood flow in vivo to biospecimen excision/acquisition. The time or range of times that the biospecimens were ischemic in the body.	II.b.	_____

(Continued)

Table 2. (Continued)

Biospecimen Reporting for Improved Study Quality (BRISQ): Items to Consider Reporting if Known and Applicable

Apply to	Tier #	Item Description	Item #	Location
All	Tier 2	<u>Time from biospecimen excision/acquisition to stabilization.</u> The time or time-range between when the biospecimens were obtained (eg, blood drawn or tumor surgically removed) and when they were stabilized. <i>For postmortem biospecimens</i> , list the postmortem interval range (i.e. the time from death to stabilization of the biospecimen).	II.c.	_____
All	Tier 2	<u>Temperature between biospecimen excision/acquisition and stabilization.</u> The temperature or range thereof at which biospecimens were kept between when biospecimens were obtained (eg, blood drawn or tumor surgically removed) and when they were stabilized. <i>For postmortem biospecimens</i> , the temperature at which the cadaver was stored during the postmortem interval.	II.d.	_____
Fluid	Tier 2	<u>Collection container.</u> The kind of tube into which biospecimens were captured as they left the body.	II.e.	_____
III. Stabilization/Preservation				
All	Tier 1	<u>Mechanism of stabilization.</u> The initial process by which biospecimens were stabilized during collection [eg, snap or controlled-rate freezing, fixation, additive (heparin, citrate, or EDTA), none].	III.a.	_____
All	Tier 1	<u>Type of long-term preservation.</u> The process by which the biospecimens were sustained after collection (eg, freezing and at which temperature; formalin fixation, paraffin embedding; additive; none). Please note, this might or might not differ from the mechanism of stabilization.	III.b.	_____
All	Tier 1	<u>Constitution and concentration of fixative/preservation solution.</u> The make-up of any formulation employed to maintain the biospecimens in a non-reactive state (eg, 10 percent neutral-buffered formalin or 10 USP Heparin Units/mL).	III.b.1.	_____
Tissue	Tier 2	<u>Time in fixative/preservation solution.</u> The time or range thereof that biospecimens were exposed to the preservation medium.	III.b.2.	_____
Tissue	Tier 2	<u>Temperature during time in preservation solution.</u> The temperature of the medium during the preservation process.	III.b.3.	_____
Fluid	Tier 2	<u>Aliquot volume.</u> The amount in each liquid biospecimen sample.	III.c.	_____
Tissue	Tier 2	<u>Specimen size.</u> The approximate size or weight of solid biospecimen samples processed (eg, cubes approximately 0.5 cm on a side, 0.5 gram).	III.d.	_____
IV. Storage/Transport				
		<u>Storage parameters.</u> The conditions under which the biospecimens were maintained until analysis.		
All	Tier 1	<u>Storage temperature.</u> The temperature or range thereof at which the biospecimens were maintained until distribution or analysis.	IV.a.1.	_____
All	Tier 1	<u>Storage duration.</u> The time or range thereof between biospecimen acquisition and distribution or analysis.	IV.a.2.	_____
All	Tier 2	<u>Storage details.</u> Other conditions under which specimens were maintained during storage (eg, to minimize oxidation).	IV.a.3.	_____
All	Tier 3	<u>Type of storage container.</u> The vessel in which biospecimens were kept.	IV.a.4.	_____
All	Tier 3	<u>Type of slide.</u> The microscope slides to which biospecimens were affixed.	IV.a.5.	_____
		<u>Shipping parameters.</u> The conditions to which biospecimens were exposed during each shipment or inventory management.		
All	Tier 1	<u>Shipping temperature(s).</u> The temperature or range thereof at which biospecimens were maintained during each shipment or relocation.	IV.b.1.	_____
All	Tier 2	<u>Shipping duration.</u> The time, estimate, or range thereof that the biospecimens spent in shipment each time they were transported.	IV.b.2.	_____
All	Tier 3	<u>Type of transport container.</u> The type of vessel (eg, pre-manufactured shipping container, polystyrene box) and the packing material in which the biospecimens were transported.	IV.b.3.	_____
All	Tier 3	<u>Shipping parameters.</u> Other conditions under which the biospecimens were transported (eg, vacuum sealing, desiccant, packing material). Please note any deviations from standard operating procedures that might influence the condition of the biospecimens (eg, shipping anomalies that exposed paraffin blocks to high temperatures). <u>Freeze-thaw parameters.</u> The conditions to which biospecimens were subjected during any thaw events.	IV.b.4.	_____

(Continued)

Table 2. (Continued)

Biospecimen Reporting for Improved Study Quality (BRISQ): Items to Consider Reporting if Known and Applicable

Apply to	Tier #	Item Description	Item #	Location
Fluid	Tier 2	<u>Number of freeze-thaw cycles.</u> The number, estimate, or range thereof of thaw-refreeze events to which biospecimens were subjected prior to analysis.	IV.c.1.	_____
Fluid	Tier 3	<u>Duration of thaw events.</u> The amount of time or range thereof the biospecimens spent thawed prior to the final thaw before processing.	IV.c.2.	_____
Fluid	Tier 3	<u>Time from last thaw to processing.</u> The time or range of times between unfreezing and analysis.	IV.c.3.	_____
All	Tier 3	<u>Temperature between last thaw and processing.</u> The temperature at which biospecimens were kept between unfreezing and analysis.	IV.c.4.	_____

V. Quality Assurance Measures Relevant to the Extracted Product and Processing Prior to Analyte Extraction and Evaluation

All	Tier 1	Composition assessment and selection. Any parameters that were used to evaluate and/or choose biospecimens for inclusion in the study.	V.a.	_____
All	Tier 2	Gross and microscopic review. The anatomical characteristics of the biospecimens in the study and the relevant qualifications of the individual performing the review (eg, anatomist, pathologist, hematologist, microbiologist, or researcher).	V.a.1.	_____
Tissue	Tier 2	<u>Proximity to primary pathology of interest.</u> Whether the biospecimen was taken from a region adjacent to or distal from another region of interest, such as a tumor or area of necrosis. Give approximate distances if known.	V.a.2.	_____
All	Tier 2	<u>Method of enrichment for relevant component(s).</u> The method by which pertinent portions of the biospecimen were separated from the rest of the biospecimen (eg, laser-capture microdissection of tissue, block selection for region of lesion, centrifugation of blood).	V.a.3.	_____
All	Tier 2	<u>Details of enrichment for relevant component(s).</u> The parameters used to separate pertinent portions of the biospecimen from the rest of the biospecimen, if applicable (eg, centrifugation speed and temperature).	V.a.4.	_____
Tissue	Tier 3	<u>Embedding reagent/medium.</u> Any formulation used to enclose the biospecimens (eg, paraffin).	V.b.	_____
All	Tier 2	<u>Quality assurance measures.</u> Any methods used to assess the quality of the biospecimens relevant to the biomolecular analyte, when these methods were employed (eg, prior to long-term storage or immediately before experimental analysis), and the results (eg, RNA integrity number, hemolysis assessment).	V.c.	_____

Bold: Tier 1–Recommended to report.

Plain: Tier 2–Beneficial to report.

Italics: Tier 3–Additional items to report.

more appropriate for solid *Tissue* biospecimens or *Fluid* biospecimens (such as blood, urine, or other fluids). For example, item III.b, “Type of long-term preservation,” is pertinent to all types of biospecimens; item III.b.2, “Time in fixative/preservative solution,” is more relevant to solid tissue than to fluid biospecimens; and item III.c, “Aliquot volume,” applies more often to fluid than to solid tissue biospecimens.

When reporting elements of the BRISQ list, standard operating procedures specifying many of the pertinent details, such as blood-collection protocols, may be provided or referenced; any referenced documents should be publicly available. It is preferable that most Tier 1 items

relevant to the biospecimen and particular scientific study be reported directly in the intended publication rather than be cited from another document. Detailed descriptions that are too lengthy to be accommodated should be made available as supplementary materials online. Whether the laboratory performing the study was operating under any formal certification or accreditation should be stated when applicable to the study being reported.

The BRISQ committee discussed whether to request information on whether the biorepository and/or researcher had obtained ethical clearance to collect the biospecimens and perform the study. Clearance from an institutional review board or similar body is important to report

in publications, and its reporting is generally required by journals. However, it is not immediately pertinent to the structural integrity and molecular characteristics of the biospecimen and, thus, is not included in the BRISQ recommendations. Similarly, accurate biospecimen-tracking mechanisms are essential to biobanking but are not immediately pertinent to the condition of the biospecimen and, thus, are also not included in the BRISQ data-elements list.

Surgical parameters, such as type of anesthesia, or receipt of blood, or other intraoperative infusates, were recognized to be of potential significance to the condition of the biospecimens. However, these data often are not known. When it is available, information on anesthesia and intraoperative treatments that may influence the condition of the biospecimens should be reported. These elements were not included in the BRISQ list because, currently, such information is rarely available or not required to be recorded as part of biospecimen collection. If or when surgical parameters are determined to be critical through systematic biospecimen research studies, these elements will be integrated into future recommendations.

Several preservation parameters known to influence the condition of biospecimens and the results of analyses have been included in the list of recommendations. Researchers should state the rationale for the chosen preservation parameters. For example, if the type and temperature of the biospecimen preservative were selected to optimize stability, extraction, and analysis of a particular analyte, then this should be mentioned.

The BRISQ committee recognized the need for greater specificity in the reported anatomic and histologic details concerning solid tissue biospecimens. The committee agreed that the level of detail with which pathology characteristics are reported should be enough to sufficiently address the scientific research question. These characteristics include not only the tissue site of the biospecimen and the relation of the biospecimen to the pertinent clinical diagnosis within the tissue site but also the composition and pathology within the biospecimen where relevant.

The BRISQ committee included members of the National Cancer Institute (NCI) Office of Biorepositories and Biospecimen research (OBRR), participants from the OBRR Biospecimen Research Network Symposium, and members of the International Society for Biological and Environmental Repositories (ISBER), as well as the committees responsible for the REporting recommendations for tumor

MARKer prognostic studies (REMARK),⁸ and STrengthening the REporting of OBservational studies in Epidemiology (STROBE)⁹ guidelines. Essential harmonization with similar efforts underway by these groups is ongoing.

DISCUSSION

An adage in the business community states, “That which is measured improves. That which is measured and reported improves exponentially.” The BRISQ reporting recommendations represent the product of extensive discussion and input from researchers with varied types of expertise and from many stakeholders, all of whom share the common goal of improving biospecimen reporting and, by extension, fields in which biospecimens are used. The committee believes that by providing details concerning preanalytical factors that could affect assay results, investigators will further improve the quality of biomedical studies, including research for developing cancer biomarkers for screening, early detection, and treatment.

Adoption of the BRISQ recommendations is expected to help authors, reviewers, editors, and regulatory officials evaluate whether sufficient information on the biospecimens has been provided to enable assessment of the influence of preanalytical biospecimen factors on study results. If reported, this information will allow improved evaluation, interpretation, comparison, and reproduction of the results from studies that use human biospecimens. Although items in any Tier may not be available or in Tiers 2 or 3 may not be considered significant to report, increased awareness of their potential influence on biospecimen studies may lead to improved tracking and reporting in the future.

The BRISQ recommendations may be implemented by anyone who reports on studies involving biospecimens. Reviewers, editors, and regulatory officials could also use the list as a tool for evaluating whether sufficient biospecimen information has been included in a manuscript or application. In addition, the recommendations could be used by investigators requesting biospecimens from a biospecimen resource: essential items on the list may be checked off to indicate that they are required annotations for the desired samples. Elements of BRISQ that document preanalytical variables for tissue biospecimens could be economically captured by using a reporting system such as the STandard PREanalytical Code, or SPREC,

which was recently published by the ISBER Working Group on Biospecimen Science.¹⁰

BRISQ reporting items will not necessarily be applicable to every study, and authors and reviewers are urged to use their judgment to decide which factors are essential. It is not always possible for investigators to ascertain every recommended element for every biospecimen, even for Tier 1 items, but unknown elements relevant to the study being reported should be fully acknowledged with a discussion of possible implications that the missing information might have on the study conclusions. Unknown or unreported Tier 1 data elements should not be considered a reason for automatic dismissal of a report or conditional for the award of a grant. The final decision on acceptability of missing Tier 1 information should be specific to the study context.

When consulting the BRISQ list, researchers should evaluate the importance of each item in the context of the study and adjust their reporting accordingly. An item such as “method of enrichment for relevant components,” listed here as Tier 2 could, for example, in the context of a study comparing the efficacy of various enrichment methods, be essential to report and, thus, should be considered Tier 1 for that study. The converse may also be true when, for example, an item listed here as Tier 2, such as “temperature between acquisition and stabilization,” is less pertinent to the study at hand—perhaps because the time at this temperature was negligible—and should be considered Tier 3.

It is hoped that consideration of the BRISQ recommendations will sensitize the biobanking and research communities and their funding agencies to the importance of tracking preanalytical variables, leading to more judicious selection and handling of experimental human specimens and thus improved study quality. Anecdotally, recommendations such as REMARK seem to have had the effect of spurring researchers to consider the recommendations in advance of conducting their investigations, with the result that researchers may take greater care in the design, conduct, and analysis of their studies. The BRISQ committee envisions a similar trajectory for preanalytical biospecimen data elements. Thus, not only might overall quality of publications improve, but the quality of human-biospecimen-dependent investigation in general might improve over time with the formation and adoption of publication recommendations. It is

anticipated that biospecimen resources might use these recommendations to improve on their existing standard operating procedures and annotation thereof. Such improvements could include the acquisition of additional relevant biospecimen data based on the BRISQ recommendations and the release of all such data to researchers as a standard procedure. In this way, biospecimen resources could become major players in the universal application of these recommendations.

Patient contribution of biospecimens for research is a voluntary, generous action aimed at advancing scientific discovery and progress. The research team, pathologist, and biorepository systems, as the stewards of these biospecimens, have a responsibility to be vigilant and persistent in using methods and practices that protect and preserve the highest possible quality biospecimen and its associated data. The BRISQ guidelines are proposed as an important and timely resource to strengthen communication and publications around biospecimen-related research and to reassure patient contributors and the advocacy community that the contributions are valued and respected. Researchers are further encouraged to strengthen public outreach and education around the use and potential of human biospecimens¹¹ and the biorepository community as these are emerging and potentially misunderstood areas.

FUNDING SOURCES

This project has been funded in whole or in part with federal funds from the National Cancer Institute, National Institutes of Health, under Contract No. HHSN261200800001E.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST DISCLOSURES

The authors made no disclosures.

REFERENCES

1. Srinivasan M, Sedmak D, Jewell S. Effect of fixatives and tissue processing on the content and integrity of nucleic acids. *Am J Pathol*. 2002;161:1961-1971.
2. Moore HM, Compton CC, Lim MD, Vaught J, Christiansen KN, Alper J. 2009 Biospecimen research network symposium: advancing cancer research through biospecimen science. *Cancer Res*. 2009;69:6770-6772.
3. Apweiler R, Aslanidis C, Deufel T, et al. Approaching clinical proteomics: current state and future fields of application in cellular proteomics. *Cytometry A*. 2009;75: 816-832.

4. Apweiler R, Aslanidis C, Deufel T, et al. Approaching clinical proteomics: current state and future fields of application in fluid proteomics. *Clin Chem Lab Med*. 2009;47:724-744.
5. Espina V, Mueller C, Edmiston K, Sciro M, Petricoin EF, Liotta LA. Tissue is alive: New technologies are needed to address the problems of protein biomarker pre-analytical variability. *Proteomics Clin Appl*. 2009;3:874-882.
6. Ransohoff DF, Gourlay ML. Sources of bias in specimens for research about molecular markers for cancer. *J Clin Oncol*. 2010;28:698-704.
7. Beatty BG, Bryant R, Wang W, et al. HER-2/neu detection in fine-needle aspirates of breast cancer: fluorescence in situ hybridization and immunocytochemical analysis. *Am J Clin Pathol*. 2004;122:246-255.
8. McShane LM, Altman DG, Sauerbrei W, Taube SE, Gion M, Clark GM; Statistics Subcommittee of the NCI-EORTC Working Group on Cancer Diagnostics. Reporting recommendations for tumor marker prognostic studies (REMARK). *J Natl Cancer Inst*. 2005;97:1180-1184.
9. von Elm E, Altman DG, Egger M, Pocock SJ, Gotsche PC, Vandenbroucke JP; STROBE Initiative. The Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) statement: guidelines for reporting observational studies. *J Clin Epidemiol*. 2008;61:344-349.
10. Betsou F, Lehmann S, Ashton G; International Society for Biological and Environmental Repositories (ISBER) Working Group on Biospecimen Science. Standard preanalytical coding for biospecimens: defining the sample PREanalytical code. *Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev*. 2010;19:1004-1011.
11. Secko DM, Preto N, Niemeyer S, Burgess MM. Informed consent in biobank research: a deliberative approach to the debate. *Soc Sci Med*. 2009;68:781-789.