Evaluation of a Chemiluminescence Method for Measuring Alkaline Phosphatase Activity in Whole Milk of Multiple Species and Bovine Dairy Drinks: Interlaboratory Study

ROBERT S. SALTER and JOHN FITCHEN

Charm Sciences Inc., 659 Andover St, Lawrence, MA 01843

Collaborators: B. Bain; M. Bella; S. Bergman; A.C. Biotelle; M. Bulthaus; F. Butterworth; P. Collins; R. Davag; D. Farrington; W. Gaunt; M. Greenwood; B. Hickey; E. High; F. Irvine; L. Lupi; G. Martin; L. Maturin; G. Mode; M. Nicholas; F. O'Grady; L. Pearce; R. Reddy; R. Robertson; J. Schwartz; S. Shelley

Alkaline phosphatase (ALP) is a ubiquitous enzyme in milk with time-temperature destruction similar to that of certain pathogens destroyed in pasteurization. Measurement of ALP to indicate proper pasteurization is a common practice. Recently the public health level for ALP was decreased to 350 mU/L, a level below the sensitivity of older colorimetric ALP methods. This study was conducted within the structure of the International Dairy Federation and the International Organization for Standardization to evaluate the reproducibility of the chemiluminescence method (Charm PasLite) for ALP at 50, 100, 350, and 500 mU/L in whole milk of multiple species to meet new regulations in the United States and proposed regulations in the European Union (EU). Fifteen laboratories from 8 countries evaluated bovine, goat, sheep, and buffalo milk, bovine skim milk, 20% fat cream, and 2% fat chocolate milk. At ALP levels of 350 and 500 mU/L, the average relative standard deviation for repeatability (RSDr) was 7.5%, and the average relative standard deviation of reproducibility was (RSD_R) 15%. For ALP at 100 and 50 mU/L, the average RSD_r values were 10.5 and 12.6%, respectively, and the average RSD_R values were 18 and 25%, respectively. The limit of detection was 20 mU/L. Results are comparable to those obtained with other enzymatic photo-activated system methods such as the fluorometric method. Results indicate that the method is suitable for measuring ALP in the milk of multiple species and in dairy drinks at U.S. and proposed EU levels.

kaline phosphatase (ALP) is an enzyme in milk that has been used as a marker for the effectiveness of time-temperature pasteurization for more than 50 years (1). The legislation in many countries still requires the use of the Aschenburg-Mueller and Sharer colorimetric methods both for phosphatase detection and as standards that industry is required to use for pasteurization (2, 3). These methods detect as little as 0.1% raw milk in pasteurized products. Since 1990, 2 instrument-based methods that use enzyme substrates, enzyme photo-activated systems (EPAS), to produce fluorescence (FluorophosTM Test, Advanced Instruments, Norwood, MA) and luminescence (Charm ALP-PasLiteTM Charm Sciences Inc., Lawrence, MA) signals have been developed to improve the speed, precision, and detection of phosphatase (4-6). These instrumental methods provide measurements in milliunits per liter (mU/L) and have been shown to detect <0.3% raw milk in various dairy drinks (4; E. Zomer, Charm Sciences, Inc., unpublished collaborative study, 1996). In 2003, the U.S. Pasteurized Milk Ordinance (PMO) specification for pasteurization was revised to "350 mU/L using instrument based methods" by the National Conference on Interstate Milk Shipments (7, 8). References to colorimetric methods were deleted because these methods were not considered sufficiently sensitive to detect subregulatory levels and were problematic for some matrixes (9). Similarly, the European Union (EU) Laboratory Workshop has recommended that the EU adopt a 350 mU/L public health level and a 100 mU/L internal investigation level that are proposed to be effective in 2006 (10). These lower specifications have led to collaborative studies within the International Dairy Federation (IDF) and the International Organization for Standardization (ISO) to determine the precision and accuracy of the EPAS methods at these lower action levels (11; R. Salter, Charm Sciences Inc., IDF, unpublished data, 2003 and 2004).

This paper reports the results of the 2005 interlaboratory study of the chemiluminescence (Charm ALP-Paslite) method for measuring ALP in cow, goat, sheep, and buffalo milk as well as in 20% fat cream, 2% fat chocolate milk, and skim milk from cows. The study was conducted in 15 laboratories in 8 countries. Data were incorporated into the pending

Received September 26, 2005. Accepted by SG November 28, 2005. Corresponding author's e-mail: bobs@charm.com

| | | | | | | Spike level, r | mU/L | | | |
|------|-----------------|-----------------|----------|----------|----------|----------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| | Neg | ative | | 50 | 1 | 00 | 3 | 50 | 50 | 00 |
| Lab. | Sample A | Sample B | Sample A | Sample B | Sample A | Sample B | Sample A | Sample B | Sample A | Sample B |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 53 | 52 | 117 | 116 | 456 | 327 | 634 | 516 |
| 2 | 22 | 33 | 70 | 64 | 125 | 115 | 358 | 307 | 487 | 471 |
| 3 | 14 | 17 | 66 | 71 | 115 | 122 | 398 | 357 | 518 | 476 |
| 4 | 35 | 41 | 34 | 43 | 86 | 130 | 251 | 258 | 341 | 370 |
| 5 | 6 | 2 | 46 | 45 | 89 | 119 | 391 | 257 | 378 | 413 |
| 6 | 22 | 20 | 60 | 55 | 100 | 109 | 333 | 278 | 356 | 393 |
| 7 | 4 | 6 | 44 | 47 | 83 | 92 | 279 | 248 | 414 | 378 |
| 8 | 15 | 14 | 51 | 53 | 98 | 105 | 289 | 245 | 421 | 391 |
| 9 | 34 | 35 | 83 | 77 | 147 | 124 | 388 | 324 | 533 | 494 |
| 10 | 0 | 0 | 49 | 67 | 103 | 109 | 361 | 377 | 543 | 460 |
| 11 | 0 | 5 | 36 | 32 | 102 | 124 | 332 | 284 | 424 | 455 |
| 12 | 8 | 10 | 62 | 51 | 78 | 85 | 310 | 252 | 365 | 401 |
| 13 | 54 ^a | 34 ^a | 83 | 71 | 128 | 107 | 411 | 376 | 510 | 559 |
| 14 | 17 | 26 | 79 | 71 | 109 | 125 | 338 | 318 | 462 | 451 |
| 15 | 23 | 15 | 68 | 59 | 126 | 104 | 363 | 297 | 449 | 456 |

Table 1. ALP levels (mU/L) determined by 15 laboratories in cow whole milk spiked at 4 levels

^a Cochran straggler.

ISO-22160/IDF-209 standard "Milk and Milk-Based Drinks—Determination of Alkaline Phosphatase Activity—Enzyme Photo-Activated System (EPAS) Method."

Interlaboratory Study

Preparation of Samples

In a first round of testing, raw cow, goat, and buffalo milks were heated to 95 C and held at that temperature for 5 min to produce ALP-free milk. Sheep milk required 63 C for 40 min to produce an ALP-free milk with no protein precipitation. Milks were cooled to 4 C on ice, and antibiotics were added as preservatives to final concentrations: 100 ppb cephapirin, 1000 ppb gentamicin, and 15 ppm proclyn 3000. Drinks were split and spiked with various amounts of species-specific raw milk to produce ALP concentrations of 50, 100, 350, and 500 mU/L. Bulk samples were tested for ALP level and homogeneity by using the PasLite method and then divided into 5 mL portions and stored under nitrogen in stoppered amber bottles and along with a set of ALP-negative samples. Portions (90 mL) of negative sample were also stored under nitrogen in stoppered 100 mL glass bottles for use as negative milk samples during method calibration. Duplicates at each level, i.e., 0, 50, 100, 350, and 500 mU/L, were randomly selected, labeled, and sent under refrigeration at <4 C to the 15 participating laboratories.

In a second round of testing, ultra high temperature (UHT) light cream (20% fat), UHT 2% fat chocolate milk, and UHT skim milk were heated to 95 C for 5 min to ensure the absence of ALP activity. The samples were preserved and spiked with raw cow milk, aliquots were taken, and duplicates were randomly selected and sent under refrigeration to the participating laboratories.

| Table 2. P | Precision data | calculated for | the determination | of ALP in | l cow whole milk |
|------------|----------------|----------------|-------------------|-----------|------------------|
|------------|----------------|----------------|-------------------|-----------|------------------|

| Target ALP level, mU/L | Average ALP level, mU/L | s _r | RSD _r , % | r | s _R | RSD _R , % | R |
|------------------------|-------------------------|----------------|----------------------|-------|----------------|----------------------|-------|
| 0 | 17 | 5.1 | 29.6 | 14.1 | 14.6 | 85.5 | 40.8 |
| 50 | 58 | 5.7 | 9.8 | 16.0 | 14.4 | 24.8 | 40.3 |
| 100 | 110 | 13.5 | 12.3 | 37.8 | 16.4 | 14.9 | 45.9 |
| 350 | 325 | 45.0 | 13.8 | 126.1 | 55.9 | 17.2 | 156.6 |
| 500 | 451 | 34.1 | 7.6 | 95.4 | 69.5 | 15.4 | 194.7 |

| | | | | | | Spike level | , mU/L | | | |
|-----|----------|----------|----------|----------|------------------|------------------|----------|----------|------------------|------------------|
| | Neg | ative | : | 50 | 10 | 0 | 3 | 50 | 500 | |
| Lab | Sample A | Sample B | Sample A | Sample B | Sample A | Sample B | Sample A | Sample B | Sample A | Sample B |
| 1 | 8 | 7 | 54 | 47 | 139 | 123 | 453 | 409 | 542 | 526 |
| 2 | 3 | 4 | 36 | 32 | 53 | 75 | 296 | 338 | 437 | 431 |
| 3 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 34 | 87 | 88 | 349 | 343 | 534 | 484 |
| 4 | 0 | 3 | 41 | 55 | 104 | 113 | 420 | 411 | 576 | 577 |
| 5 | 0 | 0 | 27 | 31 | 101 | 92 | 326 | 296 | 456 | 437 |
| 6 | 14 | 17 | 57 | 51 | 111 ^a | 168 ^a | 325 | 356 | 475 | 561 |
| 7 | 2 | 4 | 20 | 30 | 60 | 57 | 241 | 217 | 328 ^b | 321 ^b |
| 8 | 2 | 3 | 39 | 31 | 91 | 87 | 351 | 333 | 501 | 476 |
| 9 | 1 | 0 | 26 | 33 | 108 | 100 | 360 | 317 | 524 | 518 |
| 10 | 27 | 21 | 47 | 54 | 102 | 110 | 364 | 333 | 495 | 507 |
| 11 | 2 | 9 | 40 | 42 | 92 | 94 | 327 | 319 | 493 | 488 |
| 12 | 2 | 1 | 35 | 45 | 92 | 99 | 373 | 359 | 495 | 521 |
| 13 | 4 | 2 | 38 | 36 | 79 | 82 | 280 | 302 | 415 | 442 |
| 14 | 8 | 5 | 39 | 40 | 90 | 92 | 321 | 365 | 528 | 499 |
| 15 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 32 | 74 | 101 | 364 | 351 | 532 | 466 |

Table 3. ALP levels (mU/L) determined by 15 laboratories in goat whole milk spiked at 4 levels

^a Cochran outlier.

^b Grubbs straggler.

Trial Design and Sample Delivery

Samples were prepared and sent on the same day. Each participant was sent duplicates of each ALP level, scrambled with blind coded numbers. Samples were sent in coolers refrigerated with enough block ice to last 7 days. Because the laboratories were inexperienced in using the chemiluminescence method, they received luminometer equipment and prestudy practice samples before the study. Five laboratories in the United States, 3 in the United Kingdom, 2 in Israel, and 1 each in Canada, Ireland, France, Australia, and New Zealand participated. The refrigerated samples were received by all laboratories within 5 days in good condition. The samples were stored under refrigeration and analyzed within 1 month of receipt. Cow milk samples preserved with antibiotic cocktail had previously been shown

to have stable ALP readings for months at 4 C and 2 weeks at 37 C in preliminary experiments.

Experimental

The procedure followed was the 2005 revised draft of the international standard IDF-22160/IDF-209. Identical negative samples were supplied for use in each laboratory to prepare the calibrators and calibrate the luminometer. All laboratories used the negative sample that was supplied for calibration, and they received identical samples for testing.

Data and Statistical Analysis

A single analysis of each sample was performed by the same technician. Sample results and any observations were reported by fax and e-mail. Data were decoded and collated

| Tabl | e 4. | Precision data | calculated for the | e determination o | f ALP in goat whole milk |
|------|------|----------------|--------------------|-------------------|--------------------------|
|------|------|----------------|--------------------|-------------------|--------------------------|

| Target ALP level, mU/L | Average ALP level, mU/L | s _r | RSD _r , % | r | s _R | RSD _R , % | R |
|------------------------|-------------------------|----------------|----------------------|------|----------------|----------------------|-------|
| 0 | 5 | 2.0 | 41.1 | 5.7 | 6.8 | 136.7 | 19.0 |
| 50 | 39 | 4.8 | 12.4 | 13.5 | 9.3 | 24.1 | 26.1 |
| 100 | 92 | 8.1 | 8.8 | 22.8 | 19.0 | 20.6 | 53.1 |
| 350 | 340 | 20.2 | 5.9 | 56.6 | 49.5 | 14.6 | 138.6 |
| 500 | 486 | 24.5 | 5.0 | 68.6 | 61.4 | 12.6 | 171.9 |
| | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | Spike lev | el, mU/L | | | |
|------|----------------|----------------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| | Nega | ative | į | 50 | 1 | 00 | 3 | 50 | 50 | 00 |
| Lab. | Sample A | Sample B | Sample A | Sample B | Sample A | Sample B | Sample A | Sample B | Sample A | Sample B |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 29 | 85 | 52 | 398 | 436 | 532 | 498 |
| 2 | 0 | 0 | 50 | 43 | 106 | 99 | 406 | 354 | 495 | 495 |
| 3 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 26 | 46 | 49 | 278 | 233 | 394 | 386 |
| 4 | | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | |
| 5 | 0 | 0 | 67 | 55 | 101 | 84 | 413 | 342 | 514 | 584 |
| 6 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 33 | 65 | 71 | 273 | 282 | 398 | 397 |
| 7 | | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | |
| 8 | 4 | 3 | 75 | 64 | 96 | 113 | 374 | 421 | 563 | 553 |
| 9 | 8 ^a | 8 ^a | 70 | 71 | 101 | 111 | 400 | 461 | 661 | 616 |
| 10 | | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | — | |
| 11 | 0 | 0 | 35 | 39 | 67 | 77 | 308 | 281 | 468 | 395 |
| 12 | 0 | 0 | 66 | 49 | 84 | 105 | 349 | 368 | 487 | 461 |
| 13 | 0 | 0 | 31 | 19 | 63 | 59 | 272 | 292 | 451 | 398 |
| 14 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 23 | 57 | 53 | 256 | 218 | 399 | 391 |
| 15 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 42 | 94 | 92 | 319 | 308 | 446 | 420 |

Table 5. ALP levels (mU/L) determined by 12 laboratories in sheep whole milk spiked at 4 levels

^a Grubbs straggler.

for statistical analysis by following ISO 5725-2 (12). This consisted of calculating the mean value for each duplicate pair and the differences between the duplicates. The Cochran outlier test was applied to exclude outlying pair differences, and the Grubbs individual and pair outlier test was applied to exclude outlying means. After outlier exclusion, calculations were repeated until there were no further outliers. Outliers were excluded from further statistical analysis, but stragglers were included. Precision values [standard deviation for repeatability (S_r), relative standard deviation for repeatability $(RSD_r),$ repeatability (r), standard deviation for reproducibility (S_R) , relative standard deviations for reproducibility (RSD_R), and reproducibility (R)] were calculated for each test material from the remaining data.

Results and Discussion

Refrigerated samples were chosen for study. Prior prestudy and 2004 collaborative studies used freeze-dried rehydrated samples that may have introduced additional rehydration variation to precision values. Samples were microbiologically preserved with antibiotic cocktail shown not to interfere with ALP determination. This preservation extended the shelf-life of samples to accommodate multiple shipping days, customs clearance, and the laboratory testing schedule. The ALP level of 350 mU/L represented the public health action level of the U.S. PMO and that proposed for the EU (7, 10). The level of 500 mU/L level was selected for historical purposes for comparison with other ALP method studies (4, 11). The 100 mU/L level

Table 6. Precision data calculated for the determination of ALP in sheep whole milk

| | | | • | | | |
|-------------------------|--|---|--|--|---|---|
| Average ALP level, mU/L | s _r | RSD _r , % | r | s _R | RSD _R , % | R |
| 1 | 0.2 | 21.3 | 0.6 | 2.4 | 254.5 | 6.8 |
| 43 | 6.4 | 15.0 | 18.0 | 18.3 | 42.7 | 51.3 |
| 80 | 10.1 | 12.5 | 28.2 | 21.9 | 27.2 | 61.2 |
| 335 | 29.1 | 8.7 | 81.4 | 69.4 | 20.7 | 194.2 |
| 475 | 27.2 | 5.7 | 76.3 | 80.3 | 16.9 | 225.0 |
| | Average ALP level, mU/L 1 43 80 335 475 | Average ALP level, mU/L sr 1 0.2 43 6.4 80 10.1 335 29.1 475 27.2 | Average ALP level, mU/L sr RSDr, % 1 0.2 21.3 43 6.4 15.0 80 10.1 12.5 335 29.1 8.7 475 27.2 5.7 | Average ALP level, mU/L sr RSDr, % r 1 0.2 21.3 0.6 43 6.4 15.0 18.0 80 10.1 12.5 28.2 335 29.1 8.7 81.4 475 27.2 5.7 76.3 | Average ALP level, mU/L sr RSDr, % r sR 1 0.2 21.3 0.6 2.4 43 6.4 15.0 18.0 18.3 80 10.1 12.5 28.2 21.9 335 29.1 8.7 81.4 69.4 475 27.2 5.7 76.3 80.3 | Average ALP level, mU/L sr RSDr, % r sR RSDR, % 1 0.2 21.3 0.6 2.4 254.5 43 6.4 15.0 18.0 18.3 42.7 80 10.1 12.5 28.2 21.9 27.2 335 29.1 8.7 81.4 69.4 20.7 475 27.2 5.7 76.3 80.3 16.9 |

| | | | | | | Spike lev | el, mU/L | | | |
|------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|----------|----------|------------------|------------------|
| | Neg | ative | Ę | 50 | | 00 | 3 | 50 | 50 | 00 |
| Lab. | Sample A | Sample B | Sample A | Sample B | Sample A | Sample B | Sample A | Sample B | Sample A | Sample B |
| 1 | 0 | 1 | 50 | 51 | 90 | 85 | 382 | 335 | 604 | 465 |
| 2 | 0 | 1 | 54 | 60 | 93 | 89 | 352 | 340 | 619 | 556 |
| 3 | 0 | 0 | 46 | 46 | 97 | 85 | 364 | 337 | 576 ^a | 805 ^a |
| 4 | 0 | 0 | 47 | 50 | 101 | 100 | 332 | 318 | 561 | 586 |
| 5 | 4 | 4 | 51 | 41 | 96 | 78 | 298 | 254 | 468 | 474 |
| 6 | 1 | 1 | 53 | 39 | 104 | 85 | 372 | 332 | 531 | 485 |
| 7 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 37 | 72 | 74 | 278 | 254 | 464 | 440 |
| 8 | 3 | 2 | 55 | 57 | 102 | 93 | 388 | 369 | 609 | 525 |
| 9 | 0 | 0 | 49 | 57 | 84 | 82 | 330 | 321 | 449 | 460 |
| 10 | 0 | 0 | 44 | 50 | 113 | 102 | 361 | 354 | 497 | 530 |
| 11 | 1 | 0 | 65 | 56 | 104 | 99 | 367 | 348 | 582 | 578 |
| 12 | 0 | 0 | 45 | 44 | 69 | 92 | 335 | 318 | 500 | 544 |
| 13 | 0 | 1 | 44 | 49 | 88 | 85 | 330 | 324 | 527 | 513 |
| 14 | 0 | 0 | 39 | 39 | 81 | 76 | 284 | 266 | 434 | 416 |
| 15 | 3 | 1 | 48 | 53 | 92 | 88 | 343 | 325 | 571 | 490 |

Table 7. ALP levels (mU/L) determined by 15 laboratories in buffalo whole milk spiked at 4 levels

^a Cochran straggler.

represented the investigational level for dairy drinks in proposed EU legislation, and 50 mU/L was half that level.

The data from the interlaboratory study are shown in Tables 1–19. Tables 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, and 13 show the data for each sample tested in each laboratory for cow milk, goat milk, sheep milk, buffalo milk, cow skim milk, 2% chocolate (cow) milk, and 20% fat cream (cow), respectively. Stragglers were included in the statistical analysis, and outlier data were excluded from the precision calculations. Tables 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, and 14 show the calculated precision data for each matrix. Laboratory 4 was not able to participate in the second round of testing, and thus 14 laboratories reported cream, skim milk, and chocolate drink data. Laboratories 4 and 10 reported clumped and viscous sheep milk samples and could not test this matrix. Laboratory 7 also reported the poor quality of the sheep milk sample and outlier negative ALP values for all but

the highest spiking levels. Laboratories 5, 6, 8, and 13 reported clumped sheep milk, but they performed the determinations and reported statistically valid data.

The mean values determined for the samples and the overall mean value for each spiking level are shown in Table 15. The overall mean value for the 350 mU/L target spiking level was 323 mU/L, and the overall mean value for the 500 mU/L target spiking level was 457 mU/L. Tables 16 and 17 summarize the RSD_r and RSD_R values (S_r and S_R values for the 5 mU/L level) by matrix. The overall mean RSD_r values for the 323 and 457 mU/L levels were between 7 and 8%. It is not clear why the RSD_r for the 323 mU/L level in cow milk was higher than the RSD_r for the 457 mU/L level in cow milk; however, this does not appear to be a matrix-related effect, because the RSD_r values for the highest and the lower ALP levels in cow milk are similar to the

| Average ALP level, mU/L | S _r | RSD _r , % | r | s _R | RSD _R , % | R |
|----------------------------|---|---|--|---|---|---|
| 1 | 0.5 | 71.4 | 1.5 | 1.2 | 161.8 | 3.5 |
| 48 | 4.4 | 9.2 | 12.5 | 7.3 | 15.1 | 20.5 |
| 90 | 7.5 | 8.3 | 21.0 | 10.7 | 11.9 | 30.0 |
| 330 | 17.5 | 5.3 | 49.1 | 36.0 | 10.9 | 100.7 |
| 529 | 56.7 | 10.7 | 158.7 | 77.7 | 14.7 | 217.6 |
| | Average ALP level, mU/L 1 48 90 330 529 | Average ALP level, mU/L Sr 1 0.5 48 4.4 90 7.5 330 17.5 529 56.7 | Average ALP level, mU/LsrRSDr, %10.571.4484.49.2907.58.333017.55.352956.710.7 | Average ALP level, mU/LsrRSDr, %r10.571.41.5484.49.212.5907.58.321.033017.55.349.152956.710.7158.7 | Average ALP level, mU/LsrRSDr, %rsR10.571.41.51.2484.49.212.57.3907.58.321.010.733017.55.349.136.052956.710.7158.777.7 | Average ALP level, mU/LsrRSDr, %rsRRSDR, %10.571.41.51.2161.8484.49.212.57.315.1907.58.321.010.711.933017.55.349.136.010.952956.710.7158.777.714.7 |

Table 8. Precision data calculated for the determination of ALP in buffalo whole milk

| | | | | | | Spike lev | vel, mU/L | | | |
|-----|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| | Neg | ative | | 50 | 1 | 00 | 3 | 50 | 50 | 00 |
| Lab | Sample A | Sample B | Sample A | Sample B | Sample A | Sample B | Sample A | Sample B | Sample A | Sample B |
| 1 | 1 | 0 | 60 | 56 | 121 | 115 | 313 ^a | 413 ^a | 473 | 391 |
| 2 | 23 ^a | 18 ^a | 186 ^a | 46 ^a | 85 ^a | 141 ^a | 263 | 248 | 340 | 351 |
| 3 | 0 | 2 | 53 | 52 | 91 | 93 | 276 | 270 | 328 | 342 |
| 5 | 1 | 3 | 44 | 48 | 86 | 85 | 306 | 292 | 322 | 341 |
| 6 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 39 | 89 | 77 | 249 | 239 | 331 | 316 |
| 7 | 0 | 0 | 56 | 56 | 102 | 99 | 284 | 249 | 371 | 356 |
| 8 | 1 | 2 | 60 | 60 | 105 | 113 | 329 | 317 | 402 | 394 |
| 9 | 1 | 0 | 41 | 57 | 102 | 94 | 288 | 258 | 242 ^b | 365 ^b |
| 10 | 0 | 0 | 42 | 41 | 89 | 80 | 332 | 298 | 413 | 403 |
| 11 | 0 | 0 | 56 | 60 | 105 | 115 | 312 | 296 | 388 | 426 |
| 12 | 0 | 0 | 57 | 53 | 86 | 91 | 277 | 267 | 384 | 391 |
| 13 | 0 | 0 | 54 | 51 | 102 | 106 | 286 | 277 | 358 | 335 |
| 14 | 0 | 1 | 64 | 59 | 121 | 130 | 313 | 343 | 396 | 406 |
| 15 | 4 | 0 | 55 | 66 | 101 | 108 | 306 | 320 | 383 | 433 |

Table 9. ALP levels (mU/L) determined by 14 laboratories in cow skim milk spiked at 4 levels

^a Cochran outlier or Grubbs outlier.

^b Cochran straggler.

corresponding overall mean RSD_r values. The overall mean RSD_R values for the 2 highest ALP levels were about 15%. Higher RSD_r values were determined for the chocolate and sheep milk, which could be matrix effects because they are above the mean values calculated for most ALP levels. The higher RSD_R value for cow milk is a result of the elevated RSD_r value previously discussed.

The overall mean RSD_r of 10.5% and the overall mean RSD_R of 18.1% for the 100 mU/L level are greater than the corresponding values for the higher ALP levels. This trend is consistent with results reported for other methods (11). Similarly, the overall mean RSD_r increased to 12.6%, and the overall mean RSD_R increased to 24.6% for an ALP level of 51 mU/L. Again, higher values were obtained for the sheep and chocolate milk matrixes, suggesting a matrix effect. In the case of the chocolate milk, this effect could be due to the inherent properties of the dairy matrix, but in the case of the

sheep milk, it may be due to an anomaly caused by observed quality issues related to the study sample and may overstate the precision values for sheep milk. The overall mean values for r and R decrease by 3% if the mean values for sheep and chocolate milk are excluded in the calculations.

For negative samples, standard deviations (SDs) for repeatability and reproducibility in Tables 16 and 17 are shown as absolute values rather than %RSD values. This was done because as the mU/L value for ALP approaches zero, the expression of precision as %RSD becomes erroneous. The overall mean ALP level for negative samples was 4.7 mU/L, and the mean S_R value was 4.9. This indicates that the method limit of detection (LOD) is approximately 20 mU/L (mean + 3SD), and the method limit of quantitation (LOQ) is about 55 mU/L (mean + 10SD), where SD = the standard deviation. Results for the negative sample of cow milk were erratic in different laboratories, and results for several samples were above

Table 10. Precision data calculated for the determination of ALP in cow skim milk

| Target ALP level, mU/L | Average ALP level, mU/L | s _r | RSD _r , % | r | s _R | RSD _R , % | R |
|------------------------|-------------------------|----------------|----------------------|------|----------------|----------------------|-------|
| | | | | | | | |
| 0 | 1 | 1.0 | 168.6 | 2.9 | 1.1 | 172.6 | 3.0 |
| 50 | 53 | 4.3 | 8.2 | 12.1 | 8.1 | 15.3 | 22.7 |
| 100 | 100 | 5.1 | 5.1 | 14.3 | 13.8 | 13.8 | 38.6 |
| 350 | 288 | 14.6 | 5.1 | 40.8 | 28.9 | 10.0 | 81.0 |
| 500 | 371 | 31.5 | 8.5 | 88.2 | 45.6 | 12.3 | 127.8 |

| | | | | | | Spike lev | el, mU/L | | | | |
|-----|-----------------|------------------------------------|-----------------|------------------|-------------------|-----------|-------------------|------------------|-------------------|------------------|--|
| | Negative 50 | | | 100 | 3 | 50 | 500 | | | | |
| Lab | Sample A | Imple A Sample B Sample A Sample B | | Sample A | Sample A Sample B | | Sample A Sample B | | Sample A Sample B | | |
| 1 | 9 | 0 | 69 | 77 | 132 | 122 | 367 | 332 | 579 | 462 | |
| 2 | 63 ^a | 0 ^a | 51 ^b | 100 ^b | 131 | 203 | 269 | 268 | 436 | 369 | |
| 3 | 0 | 0 | 27 | 49 | 97 | 112 | 314 | 338 | 427 | 455 | |
| 5 | 1 | 0 | 89 | 56 | 132 | 133 | 295 | 295 | 209 | 260 | |
| 6 | 0 | 0 | 38 | 33 | 132 | 63 | 172 ^a | 328 ^a | 273 ^b | 479 ^b | |
| 7 | 1 | 10 | 52 | 57 | 114 | 114 | 302 | 280 | 397 | 394 | |
| 8 | 0 | 0 | 27 | 31 | 92 | 105 | 294 | 249 | 413 | 431 | |
| 9 | 0 | 0 | 76 | c | 135 | 190 | 447 | 376 | 579 | 537 | |
| 10 | 0 | 5 | 47 | 43 | 100 | 102 | 310 | 320 | 469 | 379 | |
| 11 | 4 | 11 | 56 | 58 | 125 | 131 | 374 | 347 | 497 | 470 | |
| 12 | 5 | 10 | 50 | 48 | 104 | 103 | 289 | 280 | 323 | 364 | |
| 13 | 0 | 1 | 38 | 38 | 93 | 102 | 266 | 253 | 391 | 348 | |
| 14 | 0 | 5 | 43 | 52 | 81 | 67 | 249 | 292 | 364 | 391 | |
| 15 | 0 | 0 | 48 | 57 | 127 | 123 | 289 | 286 | 434 | 392 | |

Table 11. ALP levels (mU/L) determined by 14 laboratories in 2% fat flavored (chocolate) cow milk spiked at 4 levels

^a Cochran outlier.

^b Cochran straggler.

^c — = No value reported because of laboratory accident.

the method LOD. The mean was also significantly higher than the mean values obtained for other negative samples from the other matrixes. Plausible explanations include differences in sample handling, laboratory effects, or a contamination of the negative samples of cow milk that occurred when aliquots of the sample were taken. The mean ALP level and the S_R may be overstated because of this anomaly, but there is no evidence to exclude the determined values.

The absolute difference between 2 single test results, obtained by using the method to analyze identical test materials within laboratories using the same equipment and in different laboratories with different analysts using different equipment, is expected to be 5%. The absolute values and the %RSD values reported in Tables 16 and 17 are similar and

consistent with the results reported for the fluorometric EPAS method for ALP determination at similar study levels (11). The repeatability of the determination indicates suitable uncertainty for detection at the 100 and 350 mU/L levels because the values are generally less than half the determined value. The overall r and R values for the method may be overstated by 3% because of the influence of matrix effects in the analysis of chocolate and sheep milks.

Conclusions

The results of the interlaboratory study provide useful applied information for incorporation into the ISO-22160/IDF-209 standard for ALP determination using

| Target APL level, mU/L | Average ALP level, mU/L | s _r | RSD _r , % | r | s _R | RSD _R , % | R |
|------------------------|-------------------------|----------------|----------------------|-------|----------------|----------------------|-------|
| 0 | 2 | 3.3 | 139.6 | 9.3 | 3.7 | 157.2 | 10.5 |
| 50 | 53 | 12.8 | 24.2 | 36.0 | 18.3 | 34.5 | 51.2 |
| 100 | 117 | 22.2 | 19.0 | 62.2 | 30.2 | 25.9 | 84.5 |
| 350 | 307 | 21.7 | 7.1 | 60.9 | 47.0 | 15.3 | 131.5 |
| 500 | 412 | 53.8 | 13.1 | 150.6 | 87.2 | 21.2 | 244.3 |

Table 12. Precision data calculated for the determination of ALP in 2% fat flavored (chocolate) cow milk

| | Negative | | 50 | | 10 | 100 | | 350 | | 500 | |
|-----|----------------|-----------------|-----------------|----------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|------------------|------------------|--|
| Lab | Sample A | Sample B | Sample A | Sample B | Sample A | Sample B | Sample A | Sample B | Sample A | Sample B | |
| 1 | 5 | 7 | 72 | 68 | 118 | 115 | 359 | 347 | 479 | 503 | |
| 2 | 0 ^a | 16 ^a | 53 | 66 | 100 | 127 | 373 | 344 | 509 | 478 | |
| 3 | 1 | 0 | 65 | 60 | 106 | 115 | 393 | 385 | 433 ^a | 682 ^a | |
| 5 | 4 | 4 | 65 | 65 | 105 | 110 | 347 | 359 | 439 | 476 | |
| 6 | 19 | 15 | 76 | 56 | 123 | 104 | 317 | 260 | 444 | 438 | |
| 7 | 3 | 8 | 41 | 41 | 79 | 81 | 223 | 253 | 326 | 327 | |
| 8 | 7 | 3 | 59 | 62 | 106 | 101 | 337 | 363 | 461 | 475 | |
| 9 | 5 | 5 | 70 | 62 | 123 | 119 | 326 | 334 | 593 | 569 | |
| 10 | 0 | 0 | 55 | 51 | 98 | 99 | 317 | 310 | 453 | 457 | |
| 11 | 7 | 4 | 89 ^a | 5 ^a | 138 | 118 | 351 | 365 | 564 | 523 | |
| 12 | 10 | 7 | 58 | 58 | 108 | 111 | 325 | 341 | 456 | 427 | |
| 13 | 7 | 9 | 61 | 54 | 120 | 106 | 326 | 327 | 471 | 450 | |
| 14 | 3 | 4 | 57 | 65 | 108 | 109 | 333 | 343 | 454 | 471 | |
| 15 | 12 | 13 | 79 | 75 | 131 | 127 | 391 | 377 | 534 | 564 | |

Table 13. ALP levels (mU/L) determined by 14 laboratories in 20% fat cream (cow) spiked at 4 levels

^a Cochran outlier.

the chemiluminescence EPAS method. Both the fluorescence and chemiluminescence EPAS methods have similar repeatability and reproducibility values in analyses of whole milk of multiple species that are applicable to lower ALP threshold levels for public safety that have been adopted in the United States and are being proposed in the EU. Additional lower control thresholds are feasible at 50 and 100 mU/L.

Acknowledgments

This study was part of an IDF/ISO Joint Action Team on Heat Treatments work project. Charm Sciences Inc. supplied the test kits, prepared the coded samples, and supplied the equipment. We express gratitude for the work and participation of the following collaborators and their laboratories: Marina Nicolas and Anne-Cecile Biotelle, Agence Française de Sécurité Sanitaire des Aliments (AFSSA), Paris, France

Mary Bulthaus, Dairy Quality Control Institute (DQCI), Mounds View, MN

Revinder Reddy and Larry Maturin, Food and Drug Administration-Laboratory Quality Assurance Team (FDA-LQAT), Summit Argo, IL

Paul Collins, Bernadette Hickey, and Fionnuala O'Grady, Department of Agriculture and Food, Dairy Science Laboratory, Dublin 2, Ireland

Lindsay Pearce and Ros Robertson, Food Assurance Group (Microbiology), Fonterra Co-operative Group Ltd, Palmerston North, New Zealand

Fred Butterworth and M. Bella, Canadian Food Inspection Agency, Calgary, Alberta, Canada

Eileen High, Tennessee Department of Agriculture Technical Service, Nashville, TN

Table 14. Precision data calculated for the determination of ALP in 20% fat cream (cow)

| Target ALP level, mU/L | Average ALP level, mU/L | S _r | RSD _r , % | r | s _R | RSD _R , % | R |
|------------------------|-------------------------|----------------|----------------------|------|----------------|----------------------|-------|
| 0 | 6 | 1.8 | 29.2 | 5.1 | 4.8 | 76.4 | 13.3 |
| 50 | 61 | 5.6 | 9.2 | 15.8 | 9.5 | 15.5 | 26.6 |
| 100 | 111 | 8.2 | 7.4 | 22.9 | 13.6 | 12.2 | 38.0 |
| 350 | 337 | 15.7 | 4.7 | 43.9 | 40.2 | 11.9 | 112.5 |
| 500 | 475 | 17.4 | 3.7 | 48.8 | 64.1 | 13.5 | 179.4 |

| | | Spike level, mU/L | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------|----------|-------------------|-------|-------|-------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Matrix | Negative | 50 | 100 | 350 | 500 | | | | | |
| Cow milk | 17 | 58 | 110 | 325 | 451 | | | | | |
| Goat milk | 5 | 39 | 92 | 340 | 486 | | | | | |
| Sheep milk | 1 | 43 | 80 | 335 | 475 | | | | | |
| Buffalo milk | 1 | 48 | 90 | 330 | 529 | | | | | |
| Skim milk (cow) | 1 | 53 | 100 | 288 | 371 | | | | | |
| Cream, 20% fat | 6 | 61 | 111 | 337 | 475 | | | | | |
| Flavored milk | 2 | 53 | 117 | 307 | 412 | | | | | |
| Mean | 4.7 | 50.7 | 100.0 | 323.2 | 456.8 | | | | | |

Table 15. Mean ALP levels (mU/L) determined in samples spiked at 4 levels

Table 16. Intralaboratory repeatability reported as the RSD_r value for each matrix at each spiking level (except for the 5 mU/L level^a)

| | RSD _r , % at | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------|--------------------------|---------|----------|----------|----------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Matrix | 5 mU/L (S _r) | 51 mU/L | 100 mU/L | 323 mU/L | 457 mU/L | | | | | | |
| Cow milk | 5.1 | 9.8 | 12.3 | 13.8 | 7.6 | | | | | | |
| Goat milk | 2.0 | 12.4 | 8.8 | 5.9 | 5.0 | | | | | | |
| Sheep milk | 0.2 | 15.0 | 12.5 | 8.7 | 5.7 | | | | | | |
| Buffalo milk | 0.5 | 9.2 | 8.3 | 5.3 | 10.7 | | | | | | |
| Skim milk (cow) | 1.0 | 8.2 | 5.1 | 5.1 | 8.5 | | | | | | |
| Cream, 20% fat | 1.8 | 9.2 | 7.4 | 4.7 | 3.7 | | | | | | |
| Flavored milk | 3.3 | 24.2 | 19.0 | 7.1 | 13.1 | | | | | | |
| Mean | 2.0 | 12.6 | 10.5 | 7.2 | 7.8 | | | | | | |

^a Reported as S_r values.

| Table 17. | Interlaboratory reproducibility reported as the RSD _R value for each matrix at each spiking level (except f | or |
|------------|--|----|
| the 5 mU/L | . level ^a) | |

| | RSD _R , % at | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------|--------------------------|---------|----------|----------|----------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Matrix | 5 mU/L (S _r) | 51 mU/L | 100 mU/L | 323 mU/L | 457 mU/L | | | | | | | |
| Cow milk | 14.6 | 24.8 | 14.9 | 17.2 | 15.4 | | | | | | | |
| Goat milk | 6.8 | 24.1 | 20.6 | 14.6 | 12.6 | | | | | | | |
| Sheep milk | 2.4 | 42.7 | 27.2 | 20.7 | 16.9 | | | | | | | |
| Buffalo milk | 1.2 | 15.1 | 11.9 | 10.9 | 14.7 | | | | | | | |
| Skim milk (cow) | 1.1 | 15.3 | 13.8 | 10.0 | 12.3 | | | | | | | |
| Cream, 20% fat | 4.8 | 15.5 | 12.2 | 11.9 | 13.5 | | | | | | | |
| Flavored milk | 3.7 | 34.5 | 25.9 | 15.3 | 21.2 | | | | | | | |
| Mean | 4.9 | 24.6 | 18.1 | 14.4 | 15.2 | | | | | | | |

^a Reported as S_R values.

| | ALP target level, mU/L | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------|------------------------|------|------|-------|-------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Matrix | Negative | 50 | 100 | 350 | 500 | | | | | | |
| Cow milk | 14.1 | 16.0 | 37.8 | 126.1 | 95.4 | | | | | | |
| Goat milk | 5.7 | 13.5 | 22.8 | 56.6 | 68.6 | | | | | | |
| Sheep milk | 0.6 | 18.0 | 28.2 | 81.4 | 76.3 | | | | | | |
| Buffalo milk | 1.5 | 12.5 | 21.0 | 49.1 | 158.7 | | | | | | |
| Skim milk (cow) | 2.9 | 12.1 | 14.3 | 40.8 | 88.2 | | | | | | |
| Cream, 20% fat | 5.1 | 15.8 | 22.9 | 43.9 | 48.8 | | | | | | |
| Flavored milk | 9.3 | 36.0 | 62.2 | 60.9 | 150.6 | | | | | | |
| Mean | 5.6 | 17.7 | 29.9 | 65.5 | 98.1 | | | | | | |

| Table | 18. | Absolute repeatabilit | y ranges | (r |) of | he chemiluminescence method | foi | r the matrixes s | tudied |
|-------|-----|-----------------------|----------|----|------|-----------------------------|-----|------------------|--------|
| | | | | | | | | | |

Table 19. Absolute reproducibility ranges (R) of the chemiluminescence method for the matrixes studied

| | ALP target level, mU/L | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------|------------------------|------|------|-------|-------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Matrix | Negative | 50 | 100 | 350 | 500 | | | | | |
| Cow milk | 40.8 | 40.3 | 45.9 | 156.6 | 194.7 | | | | | |
| Goat milk | 19.0 | 26.1 | 53.1 | 138.6 | 171.9 | | | | | |
| Sheep milk | 6.8 | 51.3 | 61.2 | 194.2 | 225.0 | | | | | |
| Buffalo milk | 3.5 | 20.5 | 30.0 | 100.7 | 217.6 | | | | | |
| Skim milk (cow) | 3.0 | 22.7 | 38.6 | 81.0 | 127.8 | | | | | |
| Cream, 20% fat | 13.3 | 26.6 | 38.0 | 112.5 | 179.4 | | | | | |
| Flavored milk | 10.5 | 51.2 | 84.5 | 131.5 | 244.3 | | | | | |
| Mean | 13.8 | 34.1 | 50.2 | 130.7 | 194.4 | | | | | |

Derek Farrington and Steve Shelley, Direct Laboratories, Wolverhampton, UK

Ronnie Davag and Shura Bergman, Tnuva Dairy, Rehovot, Israel

Lilach Lupi, Tnuva Dairy, Tel Yosef, Israel

Melody Greenwood and Bill Bain, Wessex Environmental Microbiology Service (WEMS) Health Protection Agency (HPA), Southampton General Hospital, Southampton, UK

Fred Irvine and Greg Martin, Dairy Technical Services, Victoria 3031, Australia

Wayne Gaunt, Quality Management Limited, Bury, Lancashire, UK

Gina Mode, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Madison, WI Janine Schwartz, Charm Sciences Inc., Lawrence, MA

References

- (1) Kay, H.D. (1935) J. Dairy Res. 6, 191-203
- (2) Aschaffenburg, R., & Mullen, J.E.C. (1945) J. Dairy Res. 16, 58–67
- (3) Scharer, H. (1938) J. Dairy Sci. 21, 21-34
- (4) Rocco, R.M. (1990) J. Assoc. Off. Anal. Chem. 73, 843-849

- (5) Standard Methods for the Examination of Dairy Practices (2004) 17th Ed., M.H. Wehr & J.F. Frank (Eds), American Public Health Association, Washington, DC, Chap. 14, pp 341–362
- (6) Bruce, J. (2001) J. Dairy Ind. Int. 66, 28-29
- (7) U.S. Food and Drug Administration (2003 Rev.), *Pasteurized Milk Ordinance*, Milk Safety Branch (HFS-626), College Park, MD
- (8) Index of Memoranda of Conference Actions, IMSa-44 Actions of the 2003 National Conference on Interstate Milk Shipments (NCIMS), http://www.cfsan.fda.gov/~ear/ ims-a-in.html
- (9) Grant, I.R., Ball, H.J., & Rowe, M.T (2002) *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* 20, 2428–2435
- (10) Report of the 5th Workshop of the National Reference Laboratories on Milk and Milk Products—Alkaline Phosphatase Determination (2002) Oct. 24–25, Maisons-Alfort, France
- (11) Harding, F., & Garry, E. (2005) J. Food Prot. 68, 1047–1053
- (12) International Organization for Standardization (1994) ISO 5725-2: Accuracy (Trueness and Precision) of Measurement Methods and Results, ISO, Brussels, Belgium