

	New Method	Current Method	EPA Method
1. Title and Description <i>List & attach SOPs for new and current.</i>	Lachat 31-114-27-2-A ODU SIF_L_0 SOP Adaptation of EPA 366.0	Skalar 563-051-041294 ODU SI-8 SOP Adaptation of EPA 366.0	EPA 366.0
2. Procedural differences	Flow injection technology measuring at same wavelength as EPA method (660 nm); analysis heated to 37°C	Segmented flow measuring at alternate wavelength (810 nm)	Segmented flow method
3. Concentrations of calibration standards	0.0234 – 2.337 mg Si/L 8 point calibration prepared by autodilutor	0.0234 – 1.1686 mg Si/L 5 point calibration	0.03 – 6.0 mg Si/L Minimum of 5 point calibration
4. Initial Precision & Recovery	100 ± 10% allowed	100 ± 10% allowed	100 ± 10% allowed
5. Calibration Verification <i>-Initial Cal Verification Result -Ongoing Cal Verification Res</i>	Initially and then every 10 – 20 samples with recovery 100 ± 10%	Initially and then every 10 – 20 samples with recovery 100 ± 10%	100 ± 10% allowed
6. Method Detection Limit	0.0014 mg/L	0.0007 mg/L	0.0012 mg/L
7. Reporting Limit (Practical Quantitation Limit)	0.0234 mg/L	0.0234 mg/L	0.03 mg/L (lowest std.)
8. Correlation coefficient of calibration curve	≥ 0.9980	≥ 0.9980	≥ 0.995
9. Sample matrix and concentration range for each (<i>fresh and saline waters are separate matrices</i>)	Instrument performs at full range whether fresh or saline (0 – 35 ppt)	Sample matrix is matched to average salinity of cruise	Designed for estuarine and coastal waters with recommendation to match matrix salinity to samples
10. Paired t-test results <i>(per each matrix) A two-sided t-test with p-value of 0.01</i>	Not applicable		Not quoted in method.
11. Wilcoxin Signed-Rank test (<i>if paired differences are not normally distributed</i>)	For this comparison study between the two methods: S=-1969;P<0.0001		Not quoted in method.
12. Other Statistics	Shapario –Wilk's: W=0.76 P<0.0001 Kolmogorov-Smirnov: D=0.22,P<0.01	Shapario –Wilk's: W=0.73 P<0.0001 Kolmogorov-Smirnov: D=0.22,P<0.01	N/A
13. Certified reference material results <i>with certified values</i>	No CRM available but QCS 98.63% recovery in Type I H ₂ O and 99.55% in ASW	No CRM available but QCS 101.94% recovery in ASW	Not Quoted but must be in range of 90 – 110 %
14. PT sample and results (<i>USGS, ERA, CBP blind audit, etc.</i>)	PT sample WP12-4-128 from RT Corp. November 2012: Acceptable Result. TV=62.9 mgSiO ₂ /L IV=63.58 mgSiO ₂ /L	Currently running RT Corp. PT semiannually. PT sample WP12-4-128 from RT Corp. November 2012: Acceptable Result. TV=62.9 mgSiO ₂ /L IV=61.93 mgSiO ₂ /L	N/A

15. Method blank results	Required ≤ 0.0234 mg Si/L	Required ≤ 0.0234 mg Si/L	Required ≤ 0.0012 mg/L (MDL)
16. Instrument blank (if comparing instruments)	Mean -0.0031 mg/L Std. Dev. 0.0041	Mean 0.0018 mg/L Std. Dev. 0.0005	N/A
17. Spiked sample results (Sample conc. and % recovery of each spike)	CBP Required $100 \pm 20\%$ Study recoveries mean 99.85% 12 spikes	CBP Required $100 \pm 20\%$ Study recoveries mean 99.84% 12 spikes	$100 \pm 10\%$
18. Duplicate sample results (Rep 1, Rep 2 values and RPDs)	RPD $\leq 20\%$ Study mean 0.41% 12 sets of dups	RPD $\leq 20\%$ Study mean 2.82% 12 sets of dups	Not specified.
19. Raw Data sample pairs (Submit Excel file or equivalent)	See file SIF Comparison.xlsx	See file SIF Comparison.xlsx	N/A
20. Analyte carry-over	Demonstrated in study that there is no carry-over.	Can experience carry-over when samples are high	Carry-over should be less than 2%.