

Evaluation of the repeatability and reproducibility of a suite of qPCR-based microbial source tracking methods

Darcy L. Ebentier¹, Kaitlyn T. Hanley^{1,2}, Yiping Cao³, Brian D. Badgley⁴, Alexandria B. Boehm⁵, Jared S. Ervin^{6,7}, Kelly D. Goodwin^{8,12}, Michele Gourmelon⁹, John F. Griffith³, Patricia A. Holden^{6,7}, Catherine A. Kelty¹⁰, Solen Lozach⁹, Charles McGee¹¹, Lindsay A. Peed¹⁰, Meredith Raith³, Hodon Ryu¹⁰, Michael J. Sadowsky⁴, Elizabeth A. Scott³, Jorge Santo Domingo¹⁰, Alexander Schriewer², Christopher D. Sinigalliano⁸, Orin C. Shanks¹⁰, Laurie C. Van De Werfhorst^{6,7}, Dan Wang⁵, Stefan Wuertz^{2,12}, Jennifer A. Jay¹

¹Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, University of California Los Angeles, 5732 Boelter Hall, Los Angeles, CA 90095, USA

²Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, University of California Davis, One Shields Ave, Davis, CA 95616, USA

³Southern California Coastal Water Research Project Authority, 3535 Harbor Blvd Suite 110, Costa Mesa, CA 92626, USA

⁴BioTechnology Institute and Department for Soil, Water and Climate, University of Minnesota, St. Paul, MN 55108, USA

⁵Environmental and Water Studies, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305, USA

⁶Bren School of Environmental Science and Management, University of California, Santa Barbara, CA 93106-5131, USA

⁷Earth Research Institute, University of California, Santa Barbara, CA 93106-3060, USA

⁸NOAA Atlantic Oceanographic & Meteorological Laboratory, 4301 Rickenbacker Cswy, Miami, FL 33149, USA

⁹Laboratoire de Microbiologie, MIC/LNR, Département Ressources Biologiques et Environnement, Université d'Environnement, Microbiologie et Phycotoxines, Ifremer, ZI Pointe du diable, Plouzane, France

¹⁰US EPA, National Risk Management Research Laboratory, Cincinnati, OH 45268, USA

¹¹Orange County Sanitation District, 10844 Ellis Ave, Fountain Valley, CA 92708, USA

¹²Singapore Centre on Environmental Life Sciences Engineering, School of Biological Sciences, and School of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Nanyang Technological University, 60 Nanyang Drive, Singapore

ABSTRACT

Many PCR-based methods for microbial source tracking (MST) have been developed and validated within individual research laboratories. Inter-laboratory validation of these methods, however, has been minimal, and the effects of protocol standardization regimes have not been thoroughly evaluated. Knowledge of factors influencing PCR in different laboratories is vital to future technology transfer for use of MST methods as a tool for water quality management. In this study, a blinded set of 64 filters (containing 32 duplicate samples generated from 12 composite fecal sources) were analyzed by three to five core laboratories with a suite of PCR-based methods utilizing standardized reagents and protocols. Repeatability (intra-laboratory variability) and reproducibility (inter-laboratory variability) of observed results were assessed. When standardized methodologies were used, intra- and inter-laboratory %CVs were generally low (median %CV 0.1e3.3% and 1.9 e7.1%, respectively) and comparable to those observed in similar inter-laboratory validation studies performed on other methods of quantifying fecal indicator bacteria (FIB) in environmental samples. ANOVA of %CV values found three human-associated methods (BsteriF1, BacHum, and HF183Taqman) to be similarly reproducible ($p > 0.05$) and significantly more reproducible ($p < 0.05$) than HumM2. This was attributed to the increased variability associated with low target concentrations detected by HumM2 (approximately 1×10^2 log₁₀copies/filter

lower) compared to other human-associated methods. Cow-associated methods (BacCow and CowM2) were similarly reproducible ($p > 0.05$). When using standardized protocols, variance component analysis indicated sample type (fecal source and concentration) to be the major contributor to total variability with that from replicate filters and inter-laboratory analysis to be within the same order of magnitude but larger than inherent intra-laboratory variability. However, when reagents and protocols were not standardized, inter-laboratory %CV generally increased with a corresponding decline in reproducibility. Overall, these findings verify the repeatability and reproducibility of these MST methods and highlight the need for standardization of protocols and consumables prior to implementation of larger scale MST studies involving multiple laboratories.

Due to distribution restrictions, the full-text version of this article is available by request only.

Please contact pubrequest@sccwrp.org to request a copy.