

Protecting and improving the nation's health

# **Summary of Results**

## External Quality Assessment of Food/Environmental Microbiology

## **Environmental Swab Scheme**

Distribution Number: ES16 Sample Number .. L 3001, ES0032

Distribution Date:	August 201
Results Due:	23 A rust 2/19
Report Date:	? Aug st 20.5
Samples prepared and	Ange Appea
quality control tested by:	Isis Asamoah
	Pichard Borrill
	argaret Njenga
	Jason Prehay
	Zak Prior
	Lili Tsegaye
Data a lyst by:	Nita Patel
10	Manchari Rajkumar
Report compiled by:	Nita Patel
	Manchari Rajkumar
Authorised by:	Nita Patel

This report must not be reproduced without permission of the organisers.

Public Health England Food and Environmental Proficiency Testing Unit (FEPTU)

61 Colindale Avenue London

NW9 5EQ

Tel: +44 (0)20 8327 7119 Fax: +44 (0)20 8200 8264 Email: foodeqa@phe.gov.uk For general information about the scheme please refer to:

#### Scheme Guide:

https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/food-and-water-proficiency-testing-schemes-scheme-guide

For more specific information about results assessments, scoring systems, statistics, and guidance on analysing your results for the proficiency testing samples please refer to:

#### **Guide to Scoring and Statistics:**

https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/food-and-water-proficiency-testing-schemes-scoring-systems-and-statistics

#### General guidance for z-scores:

Participants' enumeration results are converted into z-scores using the following formula:

xi = participants' result (expressed as a log 10 value)

 $Z = (X_i - X_{pt})$  = assigned value (participants' consensus median (expressed as a log 10 value))

 $\sigma_{pt}$  = the fixed standard deviation for the examination (calculated by FEPTU)

The  $\sigma_{pt}$ -value expresses the acceptable difference between the individual participant's result and the participants' consensus median. The  $\sigma_{pt}$ -value used for calculating z-scores for all parameters in the correction that  $\sigma_{pt}$ -value used for calculating z-scores for all parameters in the correction that  $\sigma_{pt}$ -value used for calculating z-scores for all parameters in the correction that  $\sigma_{pt}$ -value used for calculating z-scores for all parameters in the correction that  $\sigma_{pt}$ -value used for calculating z-scores for all parameters in the correction that  $\sigma_{pt}$ -value used for calculating z-scores for all parameters in the correction that  $\sigma_{pt}$ -value used for calculating z-scores for all parameters in the correction that  $\sigma_{pt}$ -value used for calculating z-scores for all parameters in the correction that  $\sigma_{pt}$ -value used for calculating z-scores for all parameters in the correction that  $\sigma_{pt}$ -value used for calculating z-scores for all parameters in the correction that  $\sigma_{pt}$ -value used for calculating z-scores for all parameters in the correction that  $\sigma_{pt}$ -value used for calculating z-scores for all parameters in the correction that  $\sigma_{pt}$ -value used for calculating z-scores for all parameters in the correction that  $\sigma_{pt}$ -value used for calculating z-scores for all parameters in the correction that  $\sigma_{pt}$ -value used for calculating z-scores for all parameters in the correction that  $\sigma_{pt}$ -value used for calculating z-scores for all parameters in the correction that  $\sigma_{pt}$ -value used for calculating z-scores for all parameters in the correction that  $\sigma_{pt}$ -value used for calculating z-scores for all parameters in the correction that  $\sigma_{pt}$ -value used for calculating z-scores for all parameters in the correction that  $\sigma_{pt}$ -value used for calculating z-scores for all parameters in the correction that  $\sigma_{pt}$ -value used for calculating z-scores for all parameters in the correction that  $\sigma_{pt}$ -value used for calculating z-scores for all parameters in the corr

z = -1.99 to +1.99 satisfactory z = -2 to -2.99 or +2 to +2.99 questionable z = < -3.00 or > +3.00 unsatisfactory

It is usually recommended that z-scores exceeding ±2 are ir estiglied stablish the possible cause. As a general rule, PHE recommends that all questionable and unsatisfactor results investigated.

**FEPTU Quality Control:** To demonstrate homogeneity of the sample, a minitum of 10 LENTICULE® discs, selected randomly from a batch, are tested in duplicate for parameters requiring enumeration and 10 LENTICULE discs are examined for pathogen detection.

To demonstrate stability of the sample, a minimum of six LE, TICOLC discs, selected randomly from a batch, are examined throughout the distribution period, either for enumeration or pathogen detection.

FEPTU results are determined using Publilc Hrain English, method: Detection and Enumeration of Bacteria in Swabs and other Environmental Samples. Posume on number FNE54; version 4.

The intended results letters provide guidance for participants regarding the assigned values.

Refer to section 17.0 of the Scherue Cuid of you have experienced difficulties with any of the examinations.

https://www.gov.uk/gover\_ment/publications/food-and-water-proficiency-testing-schemes-scheme-guide

Please contact FF TU staff for dvice and information:

Repeat sample: Carmen Gomes or Kermin Daruwalla

Tel: +44 (0)20 8327 7119

Data analysis

Manchari Rajkumar or Nita Patel

Fax: +44 (0)20 8200 8264

Email: foodega@phe.gov.uk

Microbiological advice Nita Patel or Zak Prior FEPTU's website

General comments and complaints Nita Patel or Zak Prior

Scheme consultants Nicola Elviss
Scheme co-ordinator Nita Patel

**Accreditation:** PHE Food EQA Scheme for Environmental Swab is accredited by the United Kingdom Accreditation Service (UKAS) to ISO/IEC 17043:2010.



## Swab Sample: ES0031

**Sample type:** On Monday 29 July 2019, the local food authority noticed that 55 people from the public had reported fever, chills and diarrhoea. Further interviews with the affected individuals which ranged from 2 to 88 years of age, indicates that they had all eaten frozen profiteroles and mini eclairs produced by a national manufacturer. 19 individuals have been hospitalised with at least two deaths in elderly patients within 24/48 hours of consumption.

Request: Examine samples following your routine protocol for pathogens based on the outbreak scenario provided

### **Contents:**

 $\textit{Salmonella} \ Enteritidis \ 1.0x10^2 \ \underline{1}, 9, 12: g, m: - (wild \ strain), \ \textit{Aerococcus viridans} \ 1.9x10^3 \ (wild \ strain), \ \textit{Enterococcus faecalis}$ 

1.2x10³ (wild strain), Escherichia coli 1.6x10³ (wild strain)

## **Expected Results:**

Examination	Expected Result	Your Result	Score for performance assessment	Z-score
Listeria monocytogenes	Not Detected			
Salmonella spp.	Detected			
Coagulase-positive staphylococci	<10 cfu per swab			
Campylobacter spp.	Not Detected			

#### Comments on Performance:

Continents on Periodicalice.	
Listeria monocytogenes	
Total participants reporting for Listeria monocytogenes	32
Participants reporting correctly	0 (94%)
Saimonella spp.	
Total participants reporting for Salmonella spp.	
Participants reporting correctly	2 (97%)
Coagulase-positive staphylococci	
Total participants reporting for Coagulase-positive staphylococci	24
Participants reporting a low censored value	18
Campylobacter spp.	
Total participants reporting for Campylobacter spp.	10
Participants reporting correctly	10 (100%)
Total sent samples	41
Non-returns Non-returns	2
Not examined	3

## Swab Sample: ES0032

**Sample type:** A total of eight members of the public age ranges 26-82 including an elderly patient hospitalised have reported becoming ill after consuming meat from one specific deli counter located locally. The individuals complained of diarrhoea, flu-like symptoms, fatigue and muscle aches.

**Request:** Examine samples following your routine protocol for pathogens based on the outbreak scenario provided **Contents:** 

*Listeria monocytogenes* 53 (wild strain), *Enterococcus faecium* 1.6x10³ (wild strain), *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* 6.8x10² (wild strain)

## **Expected Results:**

Examination	Expected Result	Your Result	Score for performance assessment	Z-score
Listeria monocytogenes	Detected			
Salmonella spp.	Not Detected			
Coagulase-positive staphylococci	<10 cfu per swab			
Campylobacter spp.	Not Detected		X	

#### Comments on Performance:

Commond of Foromation.	
Listeria monocytogenes	
Total participants reporting for Listeria monocytogenes	31
Participants reporting correctly	20 (1)
Salmonella spp.	3(0)
Total participants reporting for Salmonella spp.	33
Participants reporting correctly	(100)
Coagulase-positive staphylococci	
Total participants reporting for Coagulase-positive staphylococci	17
Participants reporting a low censored value	13
Campylobacter spp.	
Total participants reporting for Campylobacter spp.	12
Participants reporting correctly	11 (92%)
Total sent samples	41
Non-returns Non-returns	2
Not examined	3

#### **Comments for distribution ES16**

## Sample ES0031

36 laboratories analysed the sample from this distribution. The pathogen in this sample was *Salmonella* Enteritidis.

The table below shows the additional examinations carried out by the laboratories and the reported results. Results highlighted in red are incorrect.

Additional examinations	Number of laboratories examining	Reported results
Bacillus cereus	3	<200 (2) <100 (1)
Clostridium perfringens	1	<100 (1)
Cronobacter sakazakii	1	Not detected (1)
Escherichia coli O157	10	Not detec. 1 (8)  Detec ed (2)
Vibrio cholerae	1	Not deta ted (1)
Vibrio parahaemolyticus	1	ot de. cted (1)

## Sample ES0032

36 laboratories analysed the sample from this distribution. The run, gen in his sample was Listeria monocytogenes.

The table below shows the additional examinations corried by the aboratories and the reported results.

Additional examinations	Number of labora ries examining	Reported results
Bacillus cereus	3	<200 (2) <100 (1)
Clostridium perfringens	5	<100 (3) <10 (1) 0 (1)
Cronobacter sakazakii	1	Not detected (1)
Escherichia coli O157	11	Not detected (11)
Vibrio cholerae	1	Not detected (1)
Vibrio parahaemo vtic	1	Not detected (1)

## General comme ts

If you laborator uses not examine for a certain pathogen/s that is potentially implicated in an out reak but must return a result of 'Not examined' for that pathogen when entering your results on the reliable in the result of the pathogen when entering your results on the reliable in the pathogen when entering your results on the reliable in the pathogen when entering your results on the pathogen when entering your results of the pathogen when extending the pathogen when entering your results of the pathogen your results of the pathoge

If you a no return a result for a distribution, you will not be able to view all the participants' results data in year individualised report. Please contact us if you require this information on foodega@phe.gov.uk

## **End of report**

