**SupplementaL Figure legends:**

**Supplemental Figure 1:** Sex and age-related changes in the reference values

**Supplemental Figure 2:** BMI-related changes in the reference values

**Supplemental Figure 3:** Correlation of test results for the panel of 40 sera with the assigned values.

**Supplemental Figure 4:** Comparison of RIs derived by parametric (P) and nonparametric (NP) methods with or without latent abnormal value exclusion (LAVE) methods for all the 33 analytes.

**SupplementaL table legends:**

**Supplemental table 1**: Average Coefficient of variation (CV) computed for all the 33 analytes analyzed over 5 batches for each of mini-panel (MP1-5). Analytes with superscript letter ‘a’ were analyzed using Unicel DxC 800 where those with ‘b’ were analyzed using Immage 800 analyzers. IFCC P5P methods were not used for the measurment of ALT and AST.

**Supplemental table 2:** The complete Indian RI data derived by parametric and non-parametric method with 90% CI and with / without LAVE method.

**Supplemental table 3:** Comparison of association among nutritional markers across 6 countries. Spearman correlation coefficients (rS) were computed all pairwise among reference values of 6 nutritional markers, which were used in the LAVE method as reference tests. Correlation matrix (CM) was made for each of six countries that participated in the IFCC global study on reference values. In reference to CM of India at the top panel, rS of each country greater than that of India was marked by red font, while rS smaller than that of India was marked by blue font. The average (Ave) rS were shown at the right most column of each CM.