



### "Uncertainty in Micro Lab"







**โดย รศ.ดร.ประเวทย์ ตุ้ยเต็มวงศ**์ <u>ศูนย์ความปลอดภั</u>ยอาหาร มหาวิทยาลัยเทคโนโลยีพระจอมเกล้าธนบุรี

#### October 29, 2020



## Why are pathogens hard to detect:

- Typically not evenly distributed
- Low levels
- Often injured when found in the product
- May be inhibited by food matrix
- Example: high amounts of fat may inhibit PCR assays;
- spices, salt, acidulants can affect isolation and detection

## Positive samples out of sampled lot

 Zero tolerance vs rate of contamination in sampled lot Food Safety and Inspection Service: *E. coli* O157:H7 Contamination in a N60 Sampled Lot



### • Distribution of *E. coli* contamination in ground beef





Food Safety and Inspection Service:

### **Probability of occurence**

- Sample collection
- Sample preparation
- Enrichment for the pathogen
- Screening of the Pathogen
- Confirmation of the Pathogen



## Steps in detection methods

- Fit for the intended purpose of the analysis?
- Optimized and experimentally validated for sensitive detection of pathogens?
- Laboratory complying to the validated method protocol?

## **Consideration for testing methods**

- Test portion appropriate to meet the need?
- Enrichment-based with the intent to detect the lowest possible numbers of stressed pathogen cells?
- Food matrix been validated for the method used?
- Confirmation procedures appropriate for determining
   Intrue negative samples?

# Assessing fitness for purpose

- Laboratory sample preparation => "test portion" "analytical unit" or "analytical portion"
- – Definition: the part of the "sample" that is actually tested by the laboratory
- The test portion determines the theoretical (i.e., best possible) sensitivity of the test
- – e.g., 1 cell/test portion
- – 25-gram test portion: detecting 0.04 cells/gram is possible
- 325-gram test portion: detecting 0.003 cells/gram is possible
   Test portion

- Test portion is incubated 8-48 hours in a culture broth Why?
- Contamination levels are too low for detection without enrichment
- Must grow to high levels so very small volumes have enough pathogen present for later detection steps
- Different pathogens require different enrichment media (broth)
- – One vs. two-stage enrichment
- Primary enrichment vs. secondary enrichment
- – Resuscitation vs. selective growth

# Enrichment

- Resuscitation (lag phase) can require 2-3 hours before logphase growth begins
  - Some samples support slower growth
- Enrichment broth tempered to warm temperature prior to incubation?

Particularly critical for large test portions or shorter incubation periods

## **Proper enrichment ??**

### Pathogen growth during enrichment

- Different screening tests require different levels of enriched pathogen
- Shorter incubation periods (<15 hours) may warrant additional scrutiny of laboratory compliance to the validated protocol
- Has enrichment/screening combination been validated for a larger test portion?
- Particular concern for large test portions incubated for shorter periods
- e.g., 375-gram test portion incubated for 8 hours
   Proposed incubations <8 hours may warrant</li>
  OPHS review

#### **Pathogen Growth During Enrichment**



Food Safety and Inspection Service:

**Enrichment Period** 

#### Food Safety and Inspection Service:

#### **Role of Enrichment**



- Non-culture confirmation (e.g., PCR)
- Culture confirmation (e.g., FSIS confirmation)
- – Plating the enrichment on selective and differential agar media
- Immunomagnetic separation (IMS) necessary prior to plating for E. coli O157:H7 and non-O157 STECs
- Suspect colonies = "presumptive positive"
- – Purification and confirmatory identification tests including:
- Biochemical (e.g., identifies "E. coli")
- Serological (e.g., identifies "O157" and "H7")
- Genetic (e.g., identifies "stx" = Shiga toxin genes)

# **Confirmatory testing**



#### Food Safety and Inspection Service:

#### **Value of Validation**

- Determines performance characteristics of the method in comparison to a gold standard (reference) method (*e.g.*, usually FSIS or FDA method)
- Independent evaluation provides credibility
- Rigor varies (multilab vs. single lab, # tests, etc)
- Still must consider fitness for purpose and how the method is applied
  - e.g., some AOAC-validated methods are not consistent with FSIS goals or Compliance Guidelines

### Testing Method Validation

Food Safety and Inspection Service:

### **Testing Method Specifications**

- <u>Sensitivity</u>: probability that truly positive samples are detected as positive by analytical test
  - 100 false negative rate
- <u>Specificity</u>: probability that truly negative samples detected as negative by analytical test
  - 100 false positive rate
- <u>Level of detection (LOD)</u>: lowest level of contamination reliably detected by analytical test
  - LOD expressed as ratio of organisms to quantity tested material (*e.g.*, CFU per gram, MPN per mL, CFU per square-ft) but definitions vary (e.g., LOD95, POD)

### 1. personnel

- 2. equipment
- 3. Diluents and media
- 4. Incubation
- 5. Primary sampling
- 6. Analytical or test sample
- 7. Examining culture and recording data
- 8. Quality monitoring

## **Recommendations to min uncertainty**

British Standards Institute, the International Standards Organisation (ISO), Codex Alimentarius, the International Dairy Federation (IDF), the Nordic Committee for Microbiological Standardisation (NMKL) and AOAC International

seeking to define and to provide measurements of uncertainty associated with methods used for the examination of foods for pathogenic and other micro-organisms.

- NMKL Procedure No. 8, 4th Ed., 2004: Measurement of uncertainty in quantitative microbiological examination of foods
- NMKL Procedure No. 32, 2017 Verification of microbiological methods
- ISO/NP 19036:2016. Microbiology of the food chain Guidelines for the estimations of measurement uncertainty for quantitative determinations
- Eurachem AOAC Europe Workshop 29 May 2017

### References