REPORT NO. 1117

Cryptosporidium and *Giardia*

(Round 42)

Proficiency Testing Program

January 2019

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

PTA wishes to gratefully acknowledge the technical assistance provided for this program by J Smith. This assistance included providing input into the design of the program and the technical commentary for the report. Further appreciation is extended to Ms B Ferrari of the School of Biotechnology and Bimolecular Sciences, University of New South Wales, for the supply of QC mud and to Ms C Devoy and the staff at BTF Pty Ltd for sample preparation, distribution and homogeneity testing.

PO Box 7507, SILVERWATER NSW 2128, Australia

CONTENTS

		PAGE(S)
1.	**FOREWORD**	**1**
2.	**FEATURES OF THE PROGRAM**	**1**
3.	**DESIGN OF THE PROGRAM**	**2**
	TABLE A: Round 42 Sample Design	2
	Sample preparation	2
	Confounding materials	3
	Quality assurance of QC Mud	3
4.	**FORMAT OF APPENDICES**	**3**
5.	**FALSE RESULTS**	**4**
6.	**LOW/HIGH RECOVERIES**	**4**
7.	**PTA AND TECHNICAL ADVISER'S COMMENTS**	**4**
	Percentage Recovery Rate	4
	Impact of Matrix	5
	Impact of Reference Count	5
	Confirmation	6
	Figure 1A: Comparison of total average recovery rates for *Cryptosporidium*	7
	Figure 1B: Comparison of total average recovery rates for *Giardia*	7
	Figure 2A: Reference Counts vs % Recovery for *Cryptosporidium*	8
	Figure 2B: Added Matrix vs % Recovery for *Cryptosporidium*	8
	Figure 2C: Reference Count/Matrix vs % Recovery for *Cryptosporidium*	8
	Figure 3A: Reference Counts vs % Recovery for *Giardia*	9
	Figure 3B: Added Matrix vs % Recovery for *Giardia*	9
	Figure 3C: Reference Count/Matrix vs % Recovery for *Giardia*	9
	Measurement Uncertainty (MU) Estimation	10
	TABLE B: *Cryptosporidium* and *Giardia* Round 42 Recovery - Measurement Uncertainty	10
	TABLE C: Comparison of *Cryptosporidium* Oocyst Levels for Each Round	11
	TABLE D: Comparison of *Giardia* Cyst Levels for Each Round	12
	Method Commentary	12
	TABLE E: Recovery and recovery variability by bulk water concentration method	13
	Overall Laboratory Performance	14
	Measurement Uncertainty (MU)	15
	TABLE F: Overall Laboratory Performance	16
	Conclusions	20
8.	**REFERENCES**	**21**
APPENDIX A		
	Summary of Results	A1.1
	Summary of Percentage Recovery Rates and Charts	A1.4
APPENDIX B		
	Homogeneity Testing and Trip Control	B1.1
	TABLE G: Relative Standard Deviation for Various Sample Doses (Round 42)	B1.2
	Trip Control	B1.3
APPENDIX C		
	Instructions to Participants	C1.1
	Results Sheet	C1.3
GLOSSARY		

1. FOREWORD

This report summarises the results of the forty-second round of a planned series of proficiency testing rounds involving the analysis of water samples for the detection and enumeration of *Cryptosporidium* and *Giardia*. This program is accredited to ISO/IEC 17043:2010 "*Conformity assessment - General requirements for proficiency testing"* by International Accreditation New Zealand (IANZ).

The proficiency round was conducted in October 2018 by Proficiency Testing Australia (PTA). The Technical Adviser was J Smith. The Program Coordinator was Mrs Y Christie. This report was authorised by Mrs K Cividin, PTA Quality Manager.

The program aim was to assess laboratories' ability to competently detect and report levels of *Cryptosporidium* and *Giardia* (oo)cysts in water.

2. FEATURES OF THE PROGRAM

(a) A total of five laboratories (three from Australia and two from New Zealand) received samples, of which all returned results for inclusion in the report.

(b) Participating laboratories were requested to report both total and confirmed count results. Participants were also requested to calculate and report an estimate of measurement uncertainty (MU) for each reported result.

(c) Results as reported by participants are presented in Appendix A.

(d) In addition to the samples, laboratories were provided with the *Instructions to Participants* and a *Results Sheet* (see Appendix C). Laboratories were instructed to perform the tests according to their routine methods (method most frequently employed). Laboratories were reminded that PTA is aware of the internal positive control ColorSeed™, developed by BTF Pty Ltd. Although PTA can see the advantage of ColorSeed™ as an internal positive control, participants were instructed to note that it is not acceptable for laboratories to adjust results obtained with the PTA proficiency testing samples on the basis of recoveries obtained using ColorSeed™. An exception to this would be if the respective laboratory's routine practice/standard operating procedure routinely uses ColorSeed™ as a true internal standard, i.e. addition to *every* sample, *and* correction of observed count using internal standard recovery during routine sample reporting.

(e) The samples for Round 42 were produced in line with EasySeed™ batch number 647, which are certified reference samples. The preparation of these certified reference samples is considered to have satisfied the homogeneity testing requirements (see Appendix B).

(e) Each laboratory was randomly allocated a unique code number for the round to ensure confidentiality of results. Reference to each laboratory in this report is by code number.

3. DESIGN OF THE PROGRAM

Participants were requested to provide quantitative results for the presence of *Cryptosporidium* and *Giardia* in five water concentrate samples. Sample design is presented below.

TABLE A: Round 42 Sample Design

Sample	***Cryptosporidium*** **(Count)**	***Giardia*** **(Count)**	***Amount of QC mud added***
A	110	170	50 µL
B	0	50	150 µL
C	90	0	250 µL
D	160	140	500 µL
E	50	90	150 µL
F (Trip control)	110	170	50 µL

Notes for Table A:
1. QC mud was added to samples to simulate an environmental sample.
2. One nominated laboratory (Code 4) was provided with F, as trip control.

All samples were added to Milli-Q™ water to make a final volume of approximately 3.5 mL.

Sample preparation

BTF Pty Ltd, NSW, prepared different water concentrate samples for this program, using PTA in-house method *PTPM 11.1 Sample Preparation – Cryptosporidium and Giardia (Version No. 6)*.

Seed samples were prepared on 11 October 2018. Seed samples were dispensed in IsoFlow™ and the sterilisation method was gamma irradiation.

Cryptosporidium parvum (Iowa strain) oocysts were of bovine origin, excreted on 29 September 2018. Oocysts were purified by discontinuous sucrose and caesium chloride gradient centrifugation.

Giardia lamblia (H3 strain) cysts were obtained from experimentally-infected gerbils and were excreted on 24 September 2018. Cysts were purified by sucrose and Percoll™ density gradient centrifugation, followed by water washes.

The seed samples were prepared using flow cytometry and an automated dispensing method. *Cryptosporidium* and *Giardia* (suspended in IsoFlow™ solution) were dispensed into 4 mL tubes.

Seed samples were then sealed, labelled and exposed to a controlled dose of gamma irradiation. The *Cryptosporidium* oocysts were also heat treated to prevent excystation. Quality Control was performed on the seed samples.

On 11 October each of the seed samples were spiked with QC mud (see 'Confounding materials' below) and then made up to approximately 3.5 mL with Milli-Q™ water to produce the water concentrate samples sent to participants on 29 October 2018.

Participating laboratories were asked to add each of the water concentrate samples to 10 L of water of their choice prior to analysis. The laboratories were also instructed to take care to ensure that the water used did not contain any cysts or oocysts and could, for example, use reverse osmosis or membrane filtered (suggested pore size ≤ 45 µm) water.

Confounding materials

QC Mud was added to selected water concentrate samples at a concentration of 50, 150, 250 or 500 µL per water concentrate sample (see Table A).

Quality assurance of QC Mud

To ensure the QC Mud did not contain *Cryptosporidium* oocysts or *Giardia* cysts, QC Mud samples were analysed prior to addition to proficiency samples (2 ml packed pellet analysed by IMS-IFA in 0.5 mL aliquots), and particulates characterised and quantified using microscopic particulate analysis (USEPA 1996.)

4. FORMAT OF APPENDICES

Appendix A (A1.1 - A1.3) contains the total count and confirmed count results reported by participating laboratories for each of the five water concentrate samples. Percentage recovery rates and charts are also presented (A1.4 - A1.9). Please note that recovery rates are calculated using total counts only.

Appendix B contains details of homogeneity testing, quality control and trip control results (B1.1 - B1.3). Appendix C contains the *Instructions to Participants* and the *Results Sheet* (C1.1 – C1.3).

5. FALSE RESULTS

Results were examined for false positive and false negative results with all testing methods pooled. No false results were reported for *Cryptosporidium* or *Giardia*.

6. LOW/HIGH RECOVERIES

The acceptable range set for this program is a recovery between 10-110%. This has been determined to be an appropriate acceptability range by technical experts in this area of testing. The results were examined for low/high recoveries (recovery rates that lie outside the acceptable range of 10-110%) with all testing methods pooled.

No results were outside the acceptable recovery range for *Cryptosporidium* or *Giardia*.

7. PTA AND TECHNICAL ADVISER'S COMMENTS

A total of 50 Total Count results were received for this program.

Percentage Recovery Rate

- Pooled data indicated a higher range of recoveries (within the acceptable recovery rate limit range of 10% - 110%) for *Giardia* (35-79%) compared to *Cryptosporidium* (31-65%). This sample pattern was observed when reviewing respective ranges observed in round 41 (*Cryptosporidium* [15-84%]; *Giardia* [18-118%]).

  Overall results are typical of recoveries obtained using the methods employed.

- Recovery range: Pooled round 42 laboratory data indicated a smaller range of recoveries for both *Cryptosporidium* (31-65%) and for *Giardia* (35-79%) compared to round 41 (15-84% *Cryptosporidium,* 18-118% *Giardia*).

- Recovery variability**:**

  -*Intra-sample*: The greatest recovery variability for *Cryptosporidium* occurred for sample A (50 µL matrix, 110 *Cryptosporidium* oocysts; MU = 93%). The greatest recovery variability for *Giardia* occurred for sample B (150 µL matrix, 50 *Giardia* cysts; MU = 72%). The lowest recovery variability for *Cryptosporidium* occurred for sample C (250 µL matrix, 90 *Cryptosporidium* oocysts; MU = 46%), while lowest recovery variability for *Giardia* occurred for sample D (500 µL matrix, 140 *Giardia* oocysts; MU = 45%).

-*Intra-laboratory*: Laboratory code 4 had the greatest *Cryptosporidium* and *Giardia* recovery variability (48%, 41% RSD, respectively). This variability was substantially higher than the other participating laboratories. Laboratory codes 2 and 3 had the least *Cryptosporidium* recovery variability (6%, 8% RSD respectively), whilst Laboratory codes 1 and 2 had the least *Giardia* recovery variability (8%, 13% RSD respectively).

- Recovery medians: Median recoveries were generally similar to those reported for other proficiency schemes and published literature (43-50% *Cryptosporidium*; 56-62% *Giardia*).

- Recovery maxima: Maximum recoveries were lower for *Cryptosporidium* (61-68%) and similar for *Giardia* (63-91%) compared to those in PTA round 41 (*Cryptosporidium* 75-84%; *Giardia* 75-86%).

- Recovery minima: Minimum recoveries were similar, but more variable for *Cryptosporidium* (18-46%) and *Giardia* (19-45%) than those in PTA round 41 (*Cryptosporidium* 15-30%; *Giardia* 18-27%).

- Control Samples: Counts of trip control samples (F_T) were lower than those of the sample kept on premises (F_{NoT}) for *Cryptosporidium* and *Giardia* (B1.3). However, considering typical measurement uncertainties associated with analysis of these measurands, the difference in recovery for *Giardia* was not significantly different (F_{NoT} and F_T; B1.3). Control sample recoveries were also generally lower than their respective samples analysed by participant laboratories in terms of (oo)cysts per unit matrix; A for *Cryptosporidium* (controls 16-31%; participant laboratories median 43%) and A for *Giardia* (controls 24-38%; participant laboratories median 56%).

Impact of Matrix

- Considering test measurement uncertainty, median and average recoveries of *Cryptosporidium* and *Giardia* were generally similar regardless of matrix amount (A1.1, A1.3).

- Similar to rounds 39, 40, and 41 lower mean *Cryptosporidium* recoveries were *generally* associated with lower matrix material levels (Fig. 2B). Lower matrix levels were generally associated with higher *Giardia* recoveries in rounds 39-40, but this effect was minimal in the present and previous rounds (Fig. 3B).

Impact of Reference Count

- Lower mean *Cryptosporidium* reference counts (with the exception of sample E) and *Giardia* reference counts (with the exception of sample E) were generally associated with higher recoveries (Fig. 2A).

- With the exception of sample C, higher reference count *per-unit-matrix* had negligible impact on *Cryptosporidium* mean oocyst recoveries (Fig. 2C).

- With the exception of sample E, higher reference counts produced higher (*Giardia*) mean (oo)cyst recoveries (Fig. 3A), while reference count *per-unit-matrix* had negligible impact in recoveries (Fig. 3C).

Confirmation

- Percent confirmed (DAPI[+]) *Cryptosporidium* oocysts in F_T and F_{NoT} samples (79% and 89% respectively) were lower than those of rounds 40 and 41 (ca. 98%). Percentages of DAPI(+) *Giardia* cysts in F_T and F_{NoT} samples (75% and 83%, respectively) were also generally lower than those of rounds 40 and 41 (80%-97%).

Total average *Cryptosporidium* recovery rate (47.5%) has decreased compared to the previous round. Figure 1A shows the average percent recovery rate for *Cryptosporidium* for each round (refer to notes below).

Figure 1A: Comparison of total average recovery rates for *Cryptosporidium*



Total average *Giardia* recovery rate (57.3%) has increased compared to the previous round. The graph below displays this (refer to notes below figure).

Figure 1B: Comparison of total average recovery rates for *Giardia*



Notes to Average Recovery Rates Graphs:

1. The vertical bars in the graphs represent 95% confidence intervals.
2. All rounds up to Round 37, except rounds 1, 2, 3 and 8, contain QC mud (see table on pages 11 through to 14). For Round 5, one sample (Sample type 4); for Round 14, one sample (Sample C); for Round 15, one sample (Sample D); and for Round 34, one sample (Sample C) out of the five samples analysed by each laboratory did not contain QC mud. Round 42 contained QC mud only.
3. From Rounds 14-21, average recovery rates are calculated on confirmed counts only. For rounds excluding Rounds 14-21, participants reported either total or confirmed counts, and therefore the average recovery rates presented in this table prior to Round 14 may include both total and confirmed counts. From Round 22 onwards, only total counts are presented.
4. Regarding Round 37, selected samples contained QC mud or Drinking Water Plant Filter Backwash (DWPFBW).
5. Rounds 38 - 41 samples contained DWPFBW only.

Figure 2A: Reference Count vs % Recovery for *Cryptosporidium*



Figure 2B: Added Matrix vs % Recovery for *Cryptosporidium*



Figure 2C: Reference Count/Matrix vs % Recovery for *Cryptosporidum*



1. The blue diamonds represent the mean recoveries for each sample.
2. The horizontal bars (error bars) represent measurement uncertainties.

Figure 3A: Reference Count vs % Recovery for *Giardia*



Figure 3B: Added Matrix vs % Recovery for *Giardia*



Figure 3C: Reference Count/Matrix vs % Recovery for *Giardia*



1. The blue diamonds represent the mean recoveries for each sample.
2. The horizontal bars (error bars) represent measurement uncertainties.

Measurement Uncertainty (MU) Estimation

Results including MU calculations are presented as relative % recoveries, as seen in Table B below. This table and comments are provided for information purposes only, and do not affect the evaluation of participants' results.

TABLE B: *Cryptosporidium* and *Giardia* Round 42 Recovery - Measurement Uncertainty

SAMPLE	ORGANISM	MEDIAN RECOVERY (%)	STANDARD DEVIATION	RELATIVE STANDARD DEVIATION (RSD - %)	✦MEASUREMENT UNCERTAINTY (RSD - %)	REFERENCE COUNT
A	*Giardia*	56	19	34	68	170
	Cryptosporidium	43	20	47	93	110
B	*Giardia*	58	21	36	72	50
	Cryptosporidium					
C	*Giardia*					
	Cryptosporidium	48	11	23	46	90
D	*Giardia*	62	14	23	45	140
	Cryptosporidium	50	17	34	68	160
E	*Giardia*	57	18	32	63	90
	Cryptosporidium	44	18	41	82	50

Notes for Table B:

1. ✦ = All measurement uncertainty values are at the 95% level of confidence.
2. Sample B did not include *Cryptosporidium*.
3. Sample C did not contain *Giardia.*

The table below shows *Cryptosporidium* oocyst levels for each round.

TABLE C: Comparison of *Cryptosporidium* Oocyst Levels for Each Round

Round	*Cryptosporidium* levels (Counts)	Round	*Cryptosporidium* levels (Counts)
1	50-200	22	50-300
2	50-200	23	50-250
3	50-300	24	50-200
4	110	25	50-250
5	50-200	26	50-200
6	25-75	27	50-200
7	50-100	28	50-250
8	65-140	29	50-140
9	125	30	80-135
10	110-235	31	70-140
11	50-200	32	50-130
12	110-235	33	50-170
13	90-205	34	50-130
14	55-135	35	50-120
15	55-135	36	50-130
16	55-120	37	50-120
17	90-310	38	50-110
18	50-300	39	50-110
19	50-300	40	90-180
20	50-200	41	70-160
21	100-200	42	50-160

The table below shows *Giardia* cyst levels for each round.

TABLE D: Comparison of *Giardia* Cyst Levels for Each Round

Round	*Giardia* levels (Counts)	Round	*Giardia* levels (Counts)
1	50-200	22	50-250
2	50-200	23	50-300
3	50	24	50-200
4	40	25	50-250
5	50-200	26	50-250
6	75-120	27	50-200
7	50	28	50-200
8	65-140	29	50-150
9	55	30	85-150
10	70-85	31	50-140
11	50-200	32	50-170
12	110-125	33	50-130
13	90-145	34	50-170
14	55-200	35	50-120
15	55-200	36	50-170
16	120-255	37	60-120
17	135-310	38	60-170
18	150-300	39	60-170
19	150-300	40	60-160
20	50-120	41	50-140
21	90-200	42	50-170

Method Commentary

Analysis of Results by Method Groups

In order for methods to be grouped for analysis, PTA requires at least 11 sets of results from the same method group. As there were less than 11 results submitted for each method, reliable conclusions cannot be drawn from analysing grouped methods on this occasion. Therefore, results from all method groups have been pooled for analysis.

With respect to the bulk water concentration method, all laboratories indicated the use of filtration. Three laboratories chose the cartridge method for filtration, whilst the other two laboratories used flat-bed. All laboratories used IMS as their purification method and immunofluorescence microscopy as their presumptive ID and total count enumeration method. All five laboratories reported the use of DAPI staining for confirmation, of which one also indicated the additional use of DIC and FITC microscopy.

Laboratory code 4 had the lowest mean *Cryptosporidium* and *Giardia* recoveries. This laboratory also had the highest variability for the analysis of both *Cryptosporidium* and *Giardia* of all participating laboratories (Tables A1.4 and A1.7). This laboratory used cartridge filtration for bulk water concentration, IMS for purification, microscopy for enumeration and DAPI for confirmation.

TABLE E: Recovery and recovery variability by bulk water concentration method

Bulk Water Concentration Method	**Mean *Cryptosporidium* Recovery (%) and Variability (RSD)**	**Mean *Giardia* Recovery and Variability (RSD)**	**Number of laboratories using method**
Cartridge Filtration	31-65% (6-48%)	35-54% (13-41%)	3
Flat Bed Filtration	35-60% (7-35%)	65-79% (8-14%)	2

Laboratory code 2 obtained generally lower confirmation of *Cryptosporidium* oocysts, while laboratory code 5 obtained consistently lower confirmation of *Giardia* cysts than other laboratories (A1.6, A1.9). These laboratories both used DAPI for confirmation. Laboratory code 5 used flat bed filtration, whilst laboratory code 2 used cartridge filtration for bulk water concentration.
Laboratory codes 1 and 4 did not report confirmed counts.

Overall Laboratory Performance

Overall the pooled average recoveries of *Cryptosporidium* oocysts decreased while those for *Giardia* cysts increased when compared to the previous round (41).

Performance was satisfactory for all sample doses and matrix amounts with results for all samples inside the acceptable recovery rate limit (10% - 110%).

Laboratory code 4 obtained the lowest recovery and highest recovery variability of both *Cryptosporidium* oocysts and *Giardia* cysts than other laboratories (tables A1.4, A1.7, respectively). This laboratory used cartridge filtration for bulk water concentration. This laboratory should investigate potential causal factors, including failure to concentrate from bulk water and/or disperse (oo)cysts from matrix materials prior to IMS; and/or failure to add, capture or dissociate *Cryptosporidium* IMS beads; and/or status of associated reagents.

Laboratory codes 1 and 4 failed to report confirmed counts of both *Cryptosporidium* and *Giardia* respectively. These laboratories are reminded that participants must report both *total* and *confirmed* counts on the PTA *Results Sheet* as indicated in the *instructions to participants* (item 7.)

Laboratory code 5 obtained low (66-77%) *Giardia* confirmation percentages compared to other laboratories for samples A, B and E (table A1.9.) The laboratory may want to review confirmation procedures including DAPI staining procedures in light of relative performance and potentially investigate corrective action(s) of low relative confirmation during sample analysis. Some laboratories experience issues with low percentages of DAPI stained cysts and oocysts. Several methods suggest use of heat and/or acid for dissociation of oocysts from IMS beads, as well as permeabilisation for subsequent DAPI staining. Laboratory code 5 may find the following publication of interest if such techniques to optimise DAPI staining are not already employed: Ware, MW, Wymer, L, Lindquist, and Schaefer, FW. (2003).

Measurement Uncertainty (MU)

Laboratory code 1 did not provided sufficient information (*n* not reported) for relative MU assessment. This laboratory also reported atypically low MU values for both measurands (5-10%) compared to other laboratories (30-50%.) Estimated uncertainties of measurement between laboratories other than laboratory 1 were not atypical for these measurands.

The highest reported variability (43.4% MAD) was associated with generally low-moderate dose and low matrix combination (110 *Cryptosporidium* oocysts, 50 µL matrix, sample A). The range of variability in recoveries for *Cryptosporidium* (21.7-43.4%) was also larger than that for *Giardia* (22.6-35.5%)

TABLE F: Overall Laboratory Performance

Round	Sample Type	Percentage false positive and false negative results reported	Number of laboratories reporting false results	Percentage low/high recovery results reported	Number of laboratories reporting low/high percentage recovery rates
1	10 Litres - tap water	11.0%	6	11.0%	7
2	10 Litres - tap water	6.7%	1	7.8%	3
3	10 Litres -Milli-Q water	3.8%	3	4.7%	3
4	10 Litres - RO water + QC mud + confounding organisms	10.3%	3	11.8%	4
5	10 Litres - RO water + QC mud*	7.0%	4	11.0%	5
6	10 Litres - RO water + QC mud	8.3%	4	8.3%	5
7	Concentrate samples - QC mud - Labs. add to 10 Litres distilled water	8.2%	4	6.4%	5
8	10 Litres - RO water	1.2%	1	1.2%	1
9	10 Litres - RO water + QC mud	2.7%	1	7.3%	4
10	Concentrate samples - QC mud - Labs. add to 10 Litres distilled water & 10 Litres - RO water + QC mud	2.3%	1	3.5%	2

Round	Sample Type	Percentage false positive and false negative results reported	Number of laboratories reporting false results	Percentage low/high recovery results reported	Number of laboratories reporting low/high percentage recovery rates
11	10 Litres - RO water + QC mud	0.0%	0	6.8%	4
12	10 Litres - RO water + QC mud	5.5%	2	17.5%	6
13	10 Litres - RO water + QC mud	0.0%	0	10.0%	4
14	10 Litres - RO water + QC mud*	2.6%	1	2.6%	1
15	Concentrate samples - QC mud* - Labs. add to 10 Litres distilled water	1.3%	1	5.0%	2
16	Concentrate samples - QC mud - Labs. add to 10 Litres distilled water	0.0%	0	3.3%	2
17	Concentrate samples - QC mud - Labs. add to 10 Litres distilled water	1.5%	1	2.9%	1
18	Concentrate samples - QC mud - Labs. add to 10 Litres water	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
19	Concentrate samples - QC mud - Labs. add to 10 Litres water	6.0%	1	11.4%	1
20	Concentrate samples - QC mud - Labs. add to 10 Litres water	10.0%	4	7.1%	3

Round	Sample Type	Percentage false positive and false negative results reported	Number of laboratories reporting false results	Percentage low/high recovery results reported	Number of laboratories reporting low/high percentage recovery rates
21	Concentrate samples - QC mud - Labs. add to 10 Litres water	5.4%	1	10.7%	2
22	Concentrate samples - QC mud - Labs. add to 10 Litres water	1.4%	1	1.4%	1
23	Concentrate samples - QC mud - Labs. add to 10 Litres water	0.0%	0	1.7%	1
24	Concentrate samples - QC mud - Labs. add to 10 Litres water	1.4%	1	0.0%	0
25	Concentrate samples - QC mud - Labs. add to 10 Litres water	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
26	Concentrate samples - QC mud - Labs. add to 10 Litres water	1.4%	1	4.3%	2
27	Concentrate samples - QC mud - Labs. add to 10 Litres water	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
28	Concentrate samples - QC mud - Labs. add to 10 Litres water	0.0%	0	3.3%	1

Round	Sample Type	Percentage false positive and false negative results reported	Number of laboratories reporting false results	Percentage low/high recovery results reported	Number of laboratories reporting low/high percentage recovery rates
29	Concentrate samples - QC mud - Labs. add to 10 Litres water	10.0%	2	18.8%	3
30	Concentrate samples - QC mud - Labs. add to 10 Litres water	2.5%	1	3.75%	3
31	Concentrate samples - QC mud - Labs. add to 10 Litres water	0.0%	0	1.4%	1
32	Concentrate samples - QC mud - Labs. add to 10 Litres water	0.0%	0	3.5%	1
33	Concentrate samples - QC mud - Labs. add to 10 Litres water	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
34	Concentrate samples - QC mud - Labs. add to 10 Litres water	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
35	Concentrate samples - QC mud - Labs. add to 10 Litres water	3.3%	1	0.0%	0
36	Concentrate samples - QC mud - Labs. add to 10 Litres water	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
37	Concentrate samples - QC mud - Labs. add to 10 Litres water	10%	2	9.38%	3

Round	Sample Type	Percentage false positive and false negative results reported	Number of laboratories reporting false results	Percentage low/high recovery results reported	Number of laboratories reporting low/high percentage recovery rates
38	Concentrate samples - QC mud - Labs. add to 10 Litres water	1.25%	1	7.81%	5
39	Concentrate samples - DWPFBW - Labs. add to 10 Litres water	1.11%	1	0.0%	0
40	Concentrate samples - DWPFBW - Labs. add to 10 Litres water	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
41	Concentrate samples - DWPFBW - Labs. add to 10 Litres water	6.06%	4	1.51%	1
42	Concentrate samples - DWPFBW - Labs. add to 10 Litres water	0.0%	0	0.0%	0

Notes for Table F:
1. RO = reverse osmosis.
2. * = For Round 5, QC mud was only added to Sample types 1, 2, 3 and 5. For Round 14, QC mud was only added to Samples A, B, D and E. For Round 15, QC mud was only added to Samples A, B, C and E. For Round 34, QC mud was only added to Samples A, B, D and E.
3. For Round 35, a combination of QC mud or Drinking Water Plant Filter Backwash (DWPFBW) was added to samples.
4. Rounds 38 - 41 samples contained DWPFBW only.
5. Round 42 samples contained QC Mud only.

Conclusions

This round saw the *Cryptosporidium* recovery rates decrease, whilst the *Giardia* recovery rates increased in comparison to the previous round.

All laboratories reported recoveries in the acceptable range for each of the two respective measurands (*Cryptosporidium* and *Giardia*).

Participants are reminded to report confirmed counts. Participants are also reminded to report the *n* value for relative MU assessment.

8. REFERENCES

[1] *Guide to Proficiency Testing Australia,* 2016 (this document can be found on the PTA website, www.pta.asn.au).

[2] *Evaluation of an alternative IMS dissociation procedure for use with Method 1622: detection of Cryptosporidium in water*. Ware, MW, Wymer, L, Lindquist, and Schaefer, FW (2003).

[3] USEPA (1996) *Microscopic particulate analysis (MPA) for filtration plant optimization.* EPA 910-R-96-001.

APPENDIX A

Summary of Results

Results *Cryptosporidium* (total counts)

REFERENCE COUNTS	110	0	90	160	50	
QC Mud per vial	50µL	150µL	250 µL	500µL	150µL	
Lab Code No.	**Sample A**	**Sample B**	**Sample C**	**Sample D**	**Sample E**	**Method Codes**
Code 1 - Total Count	20	-	42	65	17	
Confirmed Count	-	-	-	-	-	2, 6, 7, 8, 9
MU	19-21	-	39-45	61-69	16-18	
Code 2 - Total Count	75	-	61	98	31	
Confirmed Count	69	-	58	91	28	3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10
MU	±36 n=6	-	±37 n=7	±51 n=8	±49 n=9	
Code 3 - Total Count	46	0	43	80	22	
Confirmed Count	46	0	43	80	22	3, 7, 8, 9
MU	29-74 n=27	-	27-69 n=27	50-128 n=27	14-35 n=27	
Code 4 - Total Count	47	0	41	30	9	
Confirmed Count	-	-	-	-	-	3, 7, 8, 9
MU	8% n=78	8% n=78	8% n=78	8% n=78	8% n=78	
Code 5 - Total Count	61	0	38	64	19	
Confirmed Count	60	0	38	58	19	2, 7, 8, 9
MU	61 ± 39 (95%CI n=800)	-	38 ± 25 (95%CI n=800)	64 ± 41 (95%CI n=800)	19 ± 13 (95%CI n=800)	

Note:1. A "-" indicates that no result was returned for this sample/test.

Summary Statistics for *Cryptosporidium* (total counts)

	Sample A	Sample B	Sample C	Sample D	Sample E
No. of Results	5	3	5	5	5
Minimum	20	0	38	30	9
Maximum	75	0	61	98	31
Average	50	0	45	67	20
Median	47.0	0.0	42.0	65.0	19.0
SD	20.4	0.0	9.1	25.1	8.0
Median Absolute Deviation (%)	43.4	NA	21.7	38.6	42.1

Method Codes

Analysis	Method used to obtain results	Code
Concentration	Filtration (Sponge)	1
	Filtration (Flat Bed)	2
	Filtration (Cartridge)	3
	Filtration (Tangential Flow)	4
	Flocculation	5
	Centrifugation	6
Purification	IMS	7
Enumeration	Immunofluorescence Microscopy	8
Confirmation	DAPI Staining	9
	DIC Microscopy	10
Methods not defined	-	11

Results *Giardia* (total counts)

REFERENCE COUNTS	**170**	**50**	**0**	**140**	**90**	
QC Mud	**50µL**	**150µL**	**250 µL**	**500µL**	**150µL**	
Lab Code No.	**Sample A**	**Sample B**	**Sample C**	**Sample D**	**Sample E**	**Method Codes**
Code 1 - Total Count	107	35	-	95	53	
Confirmed Count	-	-	-	-	-	2, 6, 7, 8, 9
MU	98-117	32-38	-	86-104	48-58	
Code 2 - Total Count	96	29	-	61	51	
Confirmed Count	92	27	-	58	49	3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10
MU	±53 n=6	±50 n=7	-	±49 n=8	±45 n=9	
Code 3 - Total Count	76	25	0	87	50	
Confirmed Count	76	25	0	87	50	3, 7, 8, 9
MU	40-144 n=27	13-47 n=27	-	46-165 n=27	26-95 n=27	
Code 4 - Total Count	77	14	0	69	17	
Confirmed Count	-	-	-	-	-	3, 7, 8, 9
MU	12% n=78	12% n=78	12% n=78	12% n=78	12% n=78	
Code 5 - Total Count	154	41	0	110	57	
Confirmed Count	111	27	0	100	44	2, 7, 8, 9
MU	154 ± 84 (95%CI n=800)	41 ± 23 (95%CI n=800)	-	110 ± 60 (95%CI n=800)	57 ± 31 (95%CI n=800)	

Note:
1. A "-" indicates that no result was returned for this sample/test.

Summary Statistics for *Giardia* (total counts)

	Sample A	Sample B	Sample C	Sample D	Sample E
No. of Results	5	5	3	5	5
Minimum	76	14	0	61	17
Maximum	154	41	0	110	57
Average	102	29	0	84	46
Median	96.0	29.0	0.0	87.0	51.0
SD	31.9	10.3	0.0	19.7	16.2
Median Absolute Deviation (%)	33.2	35.5	NA	22.6	31.8

Method Codes

Analysis	Method used to obtain results	Code
Concentration	Filtration (Sponge)	1
	Filtration (Flat Bed)	2
	Filtration (Cartridge)	3
	Filtration (Tangential Flow)	4
	Flocculation	5
	Centrifugation	6
Purification	IMS	7
Enumeration	Immunofluorescence Microscopy	8
Confirmation	DAPI Staining	9
	DIC Microscopy	10
Methods not defined	-	11

Summary of Percentage Recovery Rates and Charts

Recovery Results for *Cryptosporidium* (%)

Calculated as a % of TOTAL Counts / Reference Counts

Reference Counts	110	90	160	50	Lab Average	Lab SD	Lab %RSD
QC Mud	50 µL	250 µL	500 µL	150 µL			
Code No.	Sample A	Sample C	Sample D	Sample E			
1	18%	47%	41%	34%	35%	12%	35%
2	68%	68%	61%	62%	65%	4%	6%
3	42%	48%	50%	44%	46%	4%	8%
4	43%	46%	19%	18%	31%	15%	48%
5	63%	64%	57%	56%	60%	4%	7%
No. of Results	5	5	5	5			
Minimum	18%	46%	19%	18%			
Maximum	68%	68%	61%	62%			
Average	47%	54%	46%	43%			
Median	43%	48%	50%	44%			

Notes:

1. The acceptable percentage recovery rate range is 10-110%.
2. The median is provided for information only. It is the middle result. It is a measure of the centre of the data and is similar to the mean (or average), however, is less subject to outlier results.
3. "-" refers to no result returned.

Results *Cryptosporidium* **(% Recovery Rate)**



Note:

1. *Cryptosporidium* reference count included in brackets alongside corresponding sample name.

Confirmed Results for *Cryptosporidium* (%)

Calculated as a % of Confirmed Counts / Total Counts

Reference Counts	110	90	160	50	
QC Mud	50 µL	250 µL	500 µL	150 µL	Lab Average
Code No.	Sample A	Sample C	Sample D	Sample E	
1	-	-	-	-	
2	92%	95%	93%	90%	93%
3	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
4	-	-	-	-	
5	98%	100%	91%	100%	97%
No. of Results	3	3	3	3	
Minimum	92%	95%	91%	90%	
Maximum	100%	100%	100%	100%	
Average	97%	98%	94%	97%	
Median	98%	100%	93%	100%	

Note:

1. "-" refers to no result returned.

Recovery Results for *Giardia* (%)

Calculated as a % of TOTAL Counts / Reference Counts

Reference Counts	170	50	140	90	Lab Average	Lab SD	Lab %RSD
QC Mud	50 µL	150 µL	500 µL	150 µL			
Code No.	Sample A	Sample B	Sample D	Sample E			
1	63%	70%	68%	59%	65%	5%	8%
2	56%	58%	44%	57%	54%	7%	13%
3	45%	50%	62%	56%	53%	7%	14%
4	45%	28%	49%	19%	35%	14%	41%
5	91%	82%	79%	63%	79%	11%	14%
No. of Results	5	5	5	5			
Minimum	45%	28%	44%	19%			
Maximum	91%	82%	79%	63%			
Average	60%	58%	60%	51%			
Median	56%	58%	62%	57%			

Notes:

1. The acceptable percentage recovery rate range is 10-110%.
2. The median is provided for information only. It is the middle result. It is a measure of the centre of the data and is similar to the mean (or average), however, is less subject to outlier results.
3. "-" refers to no result returned.

Results *Giardia* (% Recovery Rate)



Note: 1. *Giardia* reference count included in brackets alongside corresponding sample name.

A1.9

Confirmed Results for *Giardia* (%)

Calculated as a % of Confirmed Counts / Total Counts

Reference Counts	170	50	140	90	
QC Mud	50 µL	150 µL	500 µL	150 µL	Lab Average
Code No.	Sample A	Sample B	Sample D	Sample E	
1	-	-	-	-	
2	96%	93%	95%	96%	95%
3	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
4	-	-	-	-	
5	72%	66%	91%	77%	77%
No. of Results	3	3	3	3	
Minimum	72%	66%	91%	77%	
Maximum	100%	100%	100%	100%	
Average	89%	86%	95%	91%	
Median	96%	93%	95%	96%	

Note:

1. "-" refers to no result returned.

APPENDIX B

Homogeneity Testing
and
Trip Control

Homogeneity Testing and Trip Control

BTF Pty Ltd provided counts for *Cryptosporidium* and *Giardia* on eight dispensed proficiency testing samples to examine homogeneity, to ensure the samples were suitable for use in this program. This procedure involved addition of FITC-labelled antibodies to the test tubes containing respective dispensed proficiency testing sample doses (no matrix material added) and analysis using flow cytometry (Bennett *et al*., 1999. A comparison of enumeration techniques for *Cryptosporidium parvum* oocysts. *Journal of Parasitology*. 85(6):1165-1168).

Results for Sample A (110 *Cryptosporidium*, 170 *Giardia*)

Sample No.	*Cryptosporidium* Counts	*Giardia* Counts
1	107	169
2	109	171
3	110	167
No. of Results	3	3

Results for Sample D (160 *Cryptosporidium*, 140 *Giardia*)

Sample No.	*Cryptosporidium* Counts	*Giardia* Counts
1	159	138
2	159	139
3	157	138
No. of Results	3	3

Results for Sample E (50 *Cryptosporidium*, 90 *Giardia*)

Sample No.	*Cryptosporidium* Counts	*Giardia* Counts
1	51	88
2	49	88
No. of Results	2	2

From the analysis of these results, it was concluded that the samples were sufficiently homogenous. Further, the samples were produced in line with EasySeed batch number 647, which are certified reference samples. The preparation of these certified reference samples is considered to have satisfied the homogeneity testing requirements.

An estimate of uncertainty, expressed as Relative Standard Deviation (RSD), for each organism for the *Cryptosporidium* and *Giardia* proficiency testing program was calculated for each dose within the sample set. These are presented in the table below:

TABLE G: Relative Standard Deviation for Various Sample Doses (Round 42)

ORGANISM	DOSE	RSD (%)	MU as RSD (Absolute)	Resultant dose with absolute uncertainty
Cryptosporidium	50	1	2	50 ± 2
Cryptosporidium	90	1	2	90 ± 2
Cryptosporidium	110	1.5	3	110 ± 3
Cryptosporidium	160	2	3	160 ± 3
Giardia	50	2	2	50 ± 2
Giardia	90	2	4	90 ± 4
Giardia	140	1	2	140 ± 3
Giardia	170	1	2	170 ± 4

2

Notes for Table G:

1. Historical QC data and homogeneity testing data have been used to calculate the information in the above table.
2. All measurement uncertainty estimates are at the 95% level of confidence.
3. All numbers have been rounded to whole numbers. Although it may appear that the "MU as RSD is always 2 x RSD%" rule has been ignored, the rule itself ignores the impact of the continuous data used to calculate each value (the impact of rounding up/down).

Trip Control

Water concentrate sample F, spiked with 110 *Cryptosporidium* oocysts and 170 *Giardia* cysts was used as the trip control.

BTF Pty Ltd retained a 3.5 mL water concentrate samples F (F_{NoT}), on their premises after preparation. Sample F (F_{NoT}) was added to 10 L of distilled water, concentrated and analysed on 21 November 2018.

One nominated laboratory (Code 4) was provided with a 3.5 mL water concentrate samples F (F_T) and was requested to return the sample immediately upon receipt. Sample F (F_T) was subsequently added to 10 L of distilled water and analysed by BTF Pty Ltd on 21 November 2018. Trip control samples were concentrated using membrane filtration, and then analysed using the Dynal IMS system and epifluorescence microscopy.

Results for Control Samples F_{NoT}, F_T

Date Analysed	*Crypto.* Counts	No. DAPI positive	*Giardia* Counts	No. DAPI positive
21 November 2018 (Sample kept on premises)	34	79%	65	75%
21 November 2018 (Sample sent to laboratory and returned)	18	89%	41	83%
Actual counts	**110**		**170**	
F_{NoT} % Recovery Rate	31%		38%	
F_T % Recovery Rate	16%		24%	

The trip controls sent to the laboratory indicated sample stability during transport. Percentage recovery rates for trip control samples lie within the acceptable range of 10% - 110%.

APPENDIX C

Instructions to Participants

and

Results Sheet

Proficiency Testing Australia

Proficiency Testing Program

Cryptosporidium and *Giardia* Round 42

INSTRUCTIONS TO PARTICIPANTS

To ensure results from this program can be properly analysed, participants are asked to carefully adhere to the following instructions.

1. For this round each participant will be supplied with a sample set consisting of five, 3.5 mL bulk-water-concentrate samples. Each sample contains reverse osmosis water that may contain matrix material/s (added to simulate an environmental water sample). Samples *may* have been spiked with *Cryptosporidium* oocysts and/or *Giardia* cysts at various concentrations.
   Your laboratory may receive an additional 3.5 mL bulk-water-concentrate sample that will be utilised as the proficiency-testing program *Trip Control*. If you receive this sample (labelled "PTA Sample F"), please refer to the included associated covering letter for further instructions.

2. On receipt at your facility, samples must be stored at 1-8ºC. The date and time of sample receipt must be recorded on the *Results Sheet.*

3. Mix the 3.5 mL tube containing the bulk-water-concentrate sample by inversion, then immediately place the bottom of the tube on a vortex mixer and mix such that the vortex extends to the bottom of the tube. Add each of the 3.5 mL bulk-water-concentrates to individual, respective 10 L bulk water samples of your choice, taking care not to mix-up the order of the sample vials in relation to their respective 10 L water samples. Ensure the bulk water used for dilution does not contain any *Giardia* cysts or *Cryptosporidium* oocysts. For example, use reverse osmosis or membrane-filtered (suggested pore size ≤ 45 µm) water. Ensure the bulk-water-concentrate sample vial is effectively rinsed and the concentrate thoroughly dispersed throughout the 10 L bulk water. The following rinse procedure is recommended to ensure optimal sample transfer:

   i) Carefully add the contents of the proficiency testing sample (bulk-water-concentrate) tube to respective 10 L water samples.

   ii) Add 3 mL 0.05% (v/v) Tween® 20* to the empty sample tube, recap and vortex for 20 sec. Empty contents into the 10 L water sample.

   iii) Add 3 mL reagent grade water to the empty sample vial, recap and vortex for 20 sec. Empty contents into 10 L water sample.

   iv) Repeat steps ii-iii.

   *Laureth-12 Envirocheck® elution buffer or other Tween®-containing solutions for rinsing filters may alternatively be used to rinse bulk-water-concentrate sample tubes.

4. A Senior QA/QC Officer (or similar) must sign the *Results Sheet* declaration to confirm your facility has diluted the bulk-water-concentrate samples to 10 L.

5. Laboratories must then proceed to analyse the 10 L samples using their **routine test method** (that most frequently employed). Samples are to be tested in the respective order on the *Results Sheet*. One hundred percent (100%) of each sample supplied must be analysed. Participants are advised that analytical methods used will be noted in the *Final Report*. To allow for confidential treatment of results in the *Final Report*, your facility

has been allocated a laboratory code number, which appears on your *Results Sheet.*

6. PTA is aware of the internal positive control reference material ColorSeed™. Although PTA understands the advantage of this material as an internal positive control, laboratories should note that it is not acceptable for laboratories to adjust results obtained with the PTA proficiency testing samples on the basis of recoveries obtained using ColorSeed™ unless the respective laboratory routine practice/standard operating procedure uses ColorSeed™ as a true internal standard, i.e. addition to *every* sample, *and* correction of observed count using internal standard recovery during routine sample reporting.

7. Record the results for each sample on the *Results Sheet* provided. Participants must report both *Total* and *Confirmed* Counts on the PTA *Results Sheet* and specify the method(s) used for confirmation. **Please be advised** that PTA uses *Total Counts* (rather than *Confirmed Counts*) in data analysis. Participants must not report non-numerical or non-discreet non-whole number values (i.e. less than/greater than values, presence/absence, detected/not detected, decimal places such as 0.5 or 55.4 etc.) on the PTA *Results Sheet*. Actual counts observed under the microscope must be reported. Participants must not use conversion (recovery) factors derived from quality control to adjust raw data unless a true internal standard is employed for every routine sample as described in (6) above. If such internal standard correction is used, this must be indicated.

8. Participants are requested to calculate and report an estimate of measurement uncertainty (MU) for each reported *Total Count* result. All MU estimates must be reported in discreet units as a 95% confidence interval (coverage factor k ≈ 2). Estimates must be reported as either relative (% RSD – e.g. +/- 10% [oo/cysts] at 95% CI) or absolute (e.g. +/- 10 [oo/cysts] at 95% CI) and include the number (*n*) of determinations used to generate the respective MU estimate.

9. Commence testing as soon as possible after samples are received. IMPORTANT: All participants must return completed *Results Sheets* no later than **Friday 16 November 2018** to:

Yvette Christie
Proficiency Testing Australia
PO Box 7507
SILVERWATER NSW 2128

phone: +61 2 9736 8397
fax: +61 2 9743 6664
email: yvette.christie@pta.asn.au

PTA would like to thank you for participating in this *Cryptosporidium* and *Giardia* proficiency-testing program.

Proficiency Testing Australia

Cryptosporidium and *Giardia* Round 42 - Proficiency Testing Program

Results Sheet

Laboratory Code:

Date / Time of Sample Receipt: _____

Condition of Samples Upon Receipt: _____

Sample	*Cryptosporidium* Counts			*Giardia* Counts			Date & time of testing
	Total Count	**MU and **n***	***Confirmed Count***	***Total Count***	**MU and **n***	***Confirmed Count***	
A							
B							
C							
D							
E							

****n*** – number of determinations used to generate MU estimate.

Methods used:

Concentration (e.g. Flocculation) _____

Filtration Type (please tick): Sponge ☐ Flat Bed ☐ Cartridge ☐ Sponge ☐ +Other ☐
+Describe_____

Purification (e.g. IMS) _____

Enumeration (e.g. Microscopy) _____

Confirmation method(s) (e.g. DAPI, DIC) _____

Please be advised that methods used to obtain results will be noted in the final report.

Print Name: _____ **Date:** _____

Signed: _____ _____**(Analyst/s)**

I confirm that the concentrate was added to 10 L of water prior to analysis.

Print Name: _____ **Date:** _____

Signed: _____ **(Senior QA/QC Officer or similar)**

Return no later than **Friday 16 November 2018** to:

Yvette Christie
Proficiency Testing Australia, PO Box 7507, Silverwater NSW 2128
Email: yvette.christie@pta.asn.au Phone: +61 2 9736 8397 Fax: +61 2 9743 6664

GLOSSARY

Trip Control	A sample used to monitor the effect(s) of sample set transport. Sent to a nominated laboratory and returned.
Seed Sample	Sample containing *Cryptosporidium* oocysts and/or *Giardia* cysts in various doses, prior to dispensing into the PTA sample container.
Water Concentrate Sample	Final proficiency testing sample, containing *Cryptosporidium* oocysts and/or *Giardia* cysts, DWPFBW and Milli-Q^{TM} water.
IMS	Immunomagnetic separation
DAPI	4',6-diamidino-2-phenylindole
DIC	Differential Interference Contrast (Microscopy)
IFA	Immunofluorescent Antibody
FITC	Fluorescein isothiocyanate

---------- End of report ---------