SCCWRP Annual Report 2013

Performance of viruses and bacteriophages for fecal source determination in a multilaboratory, comparative study

Valerie J. Harwood¹, Alexandria B. Boehm², Lauren M. Sassoubre², Kannappan Vijayavel^{3,12}, Jill R. Stewart⁴, Theng-Theng Fong⁵, Marie-Paule Caprais⁶, Reagan R. Converse⁷, David Diston⁸, James Ebdon⁹, Jed A. Fuhrman¹⁰, Michele Gourmelon⁶, Jennifer Gentry- Shields⁴, John F. Griffith¹¹, Donna R. Kashian¹², Rachel T. Noble¹³, Huw Taylor⁹ and Melanie Wicki⁸

ABSTRACT

An inter-laboratory study of the accuracy of microbial source tracking (MST) methods was conducted using challenge fecal and sewage samples that were spiked into artificial freshwater and provided as unknowns (blind test samples) to the laboratories. The results of the Source Identification Protocol Project (SIPP) are presented in a series of papers that cover 41 MST methods. This contribution details the results of the virus and bacteriophage methods targeting human fecal or sewage contamination. Human viruses used as source identifiers included adenoviruses (HAdV), enteroviruses (EV), norovirus Groups I and II (NoVI and NoVII), and polyomaviruses (HPvVs). Bacteriophages were also employed, including somatic coliphages and F-specific RNA bacteriophages (FRNAPH) as general indicators of fecal contamination. Bacteriophage methods targeting human fecal sources included genotyping of FRNAPH isolates and plaque formation on bacterial hosts Enterococcus faecium MB-55, Bacteroides HB-73 and GB-124. The use of small sample volumes (≤50 ml) resulted in relatively insensitive theoretical limits of detection (10 - 50 gene copies or plaques 50 ml⁻¹) which, coupled with low virus concentrations in samples, resulted in high false-negative rates, low sensitivity, and low negative predictive values. On the other hand, the specificity of the human virus methods was generally close to 100% and positive predictive values were ~40 to 70% with the exception of NoVs, which were not detected. The bacteriophage methods were generally much less specific toward human sewage than virus methods, although FRNAPH II genotyping was relatively successful, with 18% sensitivity and 85%

¹University of South Florida, Department of Integrative Biology, Tampa FL

²Stanford University, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Environmental and Water Studies, Stanford, CA

³Ottawa County Health Department, Environmental Health Division, Holland MI

⁴University of North Carolina, Gillings School of Global Public Health, Department of Environmental Sciences and Engineering, Chapel Hill, NC

⁵Clancy Environmental Consultants, a Tetra Tech company. St Albans, VT

⁶IFREMER, Département Ressources Biologiques et Environnement, Unité Environnement, Microbiologie et Phycotoxines, Laboratoire de Microbiologie, MIC/LNR, Plouzané, France

⁷Oak Ridge Institute for Science and Education, Oak Ridge, TN

⁸Federal Office of Public Health, Bern, Switzerland

⁹University of Brighton, School of Environment & Technology, Environment & Public Health Research Unit, Brighton UK

¹⁰University of Southern California, Department of Biological Sciences, Los Angeles, CA

¹¹Southern California Coastal Water Research Project, Costa Mesa, CA

¹²Wayne State University, Department of Biological Sciences, Detroit, MI

¹³University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Institute of Marine Sciences, Morehead City, NC

specificity. While the specificity of the human virus methods engenders great confidence in a positive result, better concentration methods and larger sample volumes must be utilized for greater accuracy of negative results, i.e., the prediction that a human contamination source is absent.

Full Text

http://ftp.sccwrp.org/pub/download/DOCUMENTS/AnnualReports/2013AnnualReport/ar13_501_521.pdf