

Exhibit 1025
Mullins Decl. Appendix B-1
(Rayman from WTS)

Canadian Journal of Microbiology

STEENBOCK LIBRARY
DEC 6 1979

Volume 25 • Number 11
November 1979

Volume 25 • numéro 11
novembre 1979

Journal canadien de microbiologie



National Research
Council Canada

Conseil national
de recherches Canada



Canadian Journal of Microbiology

Published by

THE NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL OF CANADA

Journal canadien de microbiologie

Publié par

LE CONSEIL NATIONAL DE RECHERCHES DU CANADA

A. HURST

Editors

D. J. KUSHNER

Directeurs scientifiques

K. G. JOHNSON

Assistant to the Editor

L. A. HAYES

Adjointe au directeur scientifique

Section Editors/Directeurs des sections

Morphology, Ultrastructure, General

H. D. MCCURDY

Morphologie, Ultrastructure, Généralité

Industrial and Applied Microbiology

A. H. W. HAUSCHILD

Microbiologie industrielle et appliquée

Infection and Immunity

G. M. WISEMAN

Infection et immunité

Microbial Ecology

R. R. COLWELL

Ecologie microbienne

Physiology

D. W. S. WESTLAKE

Physiologie

Virology, Genetics, Molecular Biology

V. N. IYER

Virologie, Génétique, Biologie moléculaire

Associate Editors/Directeurs scientifiques associés

J. B. ARMSTRONG

A.-M. GOUNOT

T. KANEDA

R. LACHAPELLE

K. RAYMAN

F. E. ASHTON

J. HARWIG

M. KAPOOR

B. H. MCNEIL

L. H. STEVENSON

M. A. CHERNESKY

J. M. INGRAM

W. W. KAY

C. MADHOSINGH

J. E. STEWART

J. J. CHILD

J. H. JONCAS

D. KLUEPFEL

J. L. PENNER

R. A. J. WARREN

C. W. FORSBERG

G. A. JONES

R. A. LACHANCE

M. QUEVILLON

A. J. WORT

G. M. GAUCHER

H. YAMAZAKI

PUBLISHING DEPARTMENT
at the National Research Council of Canada

SERVICE DE PUBLICATION
du Conseil national de recherches du Canada

Editor-in-chief

C. T. BISHOP

Directeur général

Assistant Editor-in-chief

P. A. REDHEAD

Directeur général adjoint

Manager

G. H. M. ADAMS

Directeur administratif

Publishing Supervisor

B. E. DREW

Préposé de la publication

Senior Publication Officer

S. J. STOCKWELL

Agent supérieur à la publication

Publication Officer

P. A. LALLA

Agent à la publication

Manuscripts for publication should be submitted to Dr. A. Hurst, Editor, Canadian Journal of Microbiology, Research Centre, Tunney's Pasture, Ottawa, Canada K1A 0L2 (613-995-9304). Authors are invited to submit names of persons who can critically evaluate the scientific content of their papers.

Correspondence concerning accepted manuscripts and corrected proofs should be sent to Research Journals, National Research Council of Canada, Ottawa, Canada K1A 0R6. Telephone enquiries should be directed to Dr. G. H. M. Adams (613-993-0536).

Reprints may be purchased at the time of publication (an order form is sent out with the galley proof). All orders should be sent to the Printing Department, University of Toronto Press, 5201 Dufferin Street, Downsview, Ontario M3H 5T8. Invoices relating to the reprints will be sent out by the Press (416-667-7767).

Instructions to authors are published once a year, in the first issue of each volume. Copies may be obtained from the Publishing Department.

© National Research Council of Canada 1979. World rights reserved.

The appearance of the code at the bottom of the first page of an article in this journal indicates the copyright owner's consent that copies of the article may be made for personal or internal use, or for the personal or internal use of specific clients. This consent is given on the condition, however, that the copier pay for copying beyond that permitted by law including Sections 107 and 108 of the U.S. Copyright Law. The per-copy fee for each article appears after the dollar sign in the code. The appropriate remittance in U.S. currency should be forwarded with a copy of the first page of the article to the Copyright Clearance Center, Inc., P.O. Box 765, Schenectady, NY, U.S.A. 12301. Copies of articles published prior to 1979 may be made under similar conditions.

The above permission does not extend to other kinds of copying, such as copying for general distribution, for advertising or promotional purposes, for creating new collective works, or for resale. For such copying, arrangements must be made with the publisher.

Change of address and undeliverable copies to be sent to
Administration, Canadian Journal of Microbiology,
National Research Council of Canada, Ottawa, Ont., Canada K1A 0R6

Manuscripts—Les auteurs doivent adresser leur manuscrits à Dr. A. Hurst, Directeur scientifique, Journal canadien de microbiologie, Centre de Recherches, Parc Tunney, Ottawa, Canada K1A 0L2 (613-995-9304). Les auteurs sont invités à présenter le nom de personnes capables de porter un jugement sur la valeur scientifique de leur article.

La correspondance ayant trait aux manuscrits acceptés et les épreuves corrigées doivent être envoyées aux Journaux de la recherche scientifique, Conseil national de recherches du Canada, Ottawa, Canada K1A 0R6. On peut obtenir des renseignements en téléphonant à G. H. M. Adams (613-993-0536).

Tirages à part—Les tirés à part peuvent être achetés au moment de la publication. Un bon de commande à cet effet accompagne les épreuves: il doit être retourné à: Printing Department, University of Toronto Press, 5201 Dufferin Street, Downsview, Ontario M3H 5T8, L'imprimeur se chargera de la facturation (416-667-7767).

Recommandations aux auteurs sont publiées une fois par année dans le premier numéro de chaque volume. On peut s'en procurer une copie, sur demande, aux Service de publication du journal.

© Conseil national de recherches du Canada 1979. Tous droits réservés.

Le code au bas de la première page d'un article signifie que le titulaire du droit d'auteur consent à ce que l'article soit reproduit pour usage personnel ou interne, ou pour l'usage personnel ou interne de clients bien précis. Ce consentement est donné à la condition, cependant, que le copieur paie toute reproduction dépassant le nombre permis par la loi, y compris les sections 107 et 108 de la Copyright Law des États-Unis. Le tarif par copie de chaque article est indiqué après le signe de dollar dans le code. Les versements appropriés (en dollars américains) sont envoyés en même temps qu'une copie de la première page de l'article au Copyright Clearance Center, Inc., P.O. Box 765, Schenectady, NY, U.S.A. 12301. Les reproductions d'articles publiés avant 1979 sont soumises aux mêmes conditions.

La présente permission ne s'applique pas à d'autres genres de reproduction, tels la reproduction pour distribution générale, pour fins de publicité ou de promotion, pour la création de nouveaux travaux collectifs, ou pour revente. Dans ces cas, il faut communiquer avec l'éditeur.

Faire parvenir changements d'adresse et journaux non livrés à
l'Administration, Journal canadien de microbiologie,
Conseil national de recherches du Canada, Ottawa (Ont.), Canada K1A 0R6

Canadian Journal of Microbiology

Volume 25 Number 11 November 1979

Journal canadien de microbiologie

Volume 25 numéro 11 novembre 1979

MORPHOLOGY, ULTRASTRUCTURE, GENERAL / MORPHOLOGIE, ULTRASTRUCTURE, GENERALITES

ARTICLES

Comparative studies of the mosquito-larval toxin of *Bacillus sphaericus* SSII-1 and 1593

Paula Myers, Allan A. Yousten,
and Elizabeth W. Davidson 1227

Effects of oxygen tension on the lipid composition of *Azotobacter chroococcum*

Edward B. Reczek and David N. Burton 1239

Influence of soil texture on survival and saprophytic activity of *Rhizoctonia solani* in soils

J. A. Lewis 1310

NOTE

Un nouveau serotype de *Salmonella* isole au Canada: *Salmonella sherbrooke* (16:d:1,6)

F. M. Gosselin, A. K. Basu,
T. M. Caprioli et S. S. Kasatiya 1328

INDUSTRIAL AND APPLIED MICROBIOLOGY / MICROBIOLOGIE INDUSTRIELLE ET APPLIQUEE

ARTICLES

A broth-disc technique for the assay of antibiotic synergism

Margaret Meyer and Louise Hofherr 1232

Effect of additions of liquid poultry manure on excretion of degradative enzymes by bacteria in forest soil and litter

Lester Hankin,
George R. Stephens, and David E. Hill 1258

Synthesis of a selective agar medium for *Yersinia enterocolitica*

D. A. Schiemann 1298

Polioviruses and other enteroviruses in urban sewage from Laval (Canada): presence of wild strains of poliovirus

P. Payment, Y. Larose, and M. Trudel 1305

ICMSF methods studies. XIII. An international comparative study of the MPN procedure and the Anderson-Baird-Parker direct plating method for the enumeration of *Escherichia coli* biotype I in raw meats

M. K. Rayman, G. A. Jarvis,
C. M. Davidson, S. Long, J. M. Allen,
T. Tong, P. Dodsworth, S. McLaughlin,
S. Greenberg, B. G. Shaw, H. J. Beckers,
S. Qvist, P. M. Nottingham, and
B. J. Stewart 1321

NOTE

Un nouveau serotype de *Salmonella* isole au Canada: *Salmonella sherbrooke* (16:d:1,6)

F. M. Gosselin, A. K. Basu,
T. M. Caprioli et S. S. Kasatiya 1328

INFECTION AND IMMUNITY / INFECTION ET IMMUNITE

ARTICLES

The binding of fluorescein-labelled staphylococcal alpha toxoid to erythrocytes

Gary M. Barei and Hugh B. Fackrell 1219

Release of β -glucuronidase from peritoneal macrophages of normal and endotoxin-tolerant mice

Stephen L. Snyder, Sharyn K. Eklund,
and Richard I. Walker 1245

Polioviruses and other enteroviruses in urban sewage from Laval (Canada): presence of wild strains of poliovirus

P. Payment, Y. Larose, and M. Trudel 1305

(Concluded on inside back cover) / (Lire la suite à la page 3 de la couverture)

Printed in Canada by / Imprimé au Canada par University of Toronto Press

MICROBIAL ECOLOGY / ECOLOGIE MICROBIENNE

ARTICLES

Differential toxicities of mercury to bacteria and bacteriophages in sea and in lake water

H. Babich and G. Stotzky 1252

Selective infection of maize roots by streptomycin-resistant *Azospirillum lipoferum* and other bacteria

Johanna Döbereiner
and Vera Lucia Divan Baldani 1264

Dissolved organic matter utilization and oxygen uptake in algal-bacterial microcosms

David L. Tison and A. J. Lingg 1315

PHYSIOLOGY / PHYSIOLOGIE

ARTICLES

Isolation of lignocellulose-decomposing actinomycetes and degradation of specifically ¹⁴C-labeled lignocelluloses by six selected *Streptomyces* strains

Mary Beth Phelan, Don L. Crawford,
and Anthony L. Pometto, III 1270

Effect of glycerol on carotenogenesis in the extreme halophile, *Halobacterium cutirubrum*

S. C. Kushwaha and M. Kates 1288

Studies of the biosynthesis of C₅₀ carotenoids in *Halobacterium cutirubrum*

S. C. Kushwaha and M. Kates 1292

Thiocyanate utilization by an *Arthrobacter*

P. M. Betts, D. F. Rinder, and J. R. Fleeker 1277

VIROLOGY, GENETICS, MOLECULAR BIOLOGY / VIROLOGIE, BIOLOGIE MOLECULAIRE, GENETIQUE

ARTICLE

Catabolite repression-resistant mutants of *Bacillus subtilis*

I. Takahashi 1283

Publication	1980 Annual Subscription Rates / Abonnements annuels 1980	Institutional / Collectif	Personal / Personnel
Semimonthly / Bimensuelle			
Canadian Journal of Botany / Journal canadien de botanique		\$ 95.00	\$48.00
Canadian Journal of Chemistry / Journal canadien de chimie		120.00	60.00
Monthly / Mensuelle			
Canadian Journal of Biochemistry / Journal canadien de biochimie		50.00	25.00
Canadian Journal of Earth Sciences / Journal canadien des sciences de la terre		75.00	38.00
Canadian Journal of Microbiology / Journal canadien de microbiologie		55.00	28.00
Canadian Journal of Physics / Journal canadien de physique		75.00	38.00
Canadian Journal of Physiology and Pharmacology / Journal canadien de physiologie et pharmacologie		50.00	25.00
Canadian Journal of Zoology / Journal canadien de zoologie		75.00	38.00
Quarterly / Trimestrielle			
Canadian Journal of Civil Engineering / Revue canadienne de génie civil		30.00	15.00
Canadian Journal of Forest Research / Journal canadien de la recherche forestière		30.00	15.00
Canadian Geotechnical Journal / Revue canadienne de géotechnique		30.00	15.00

Subscriptions, renewals, requests for single or back numbers, and all remittances should be sent to Administration (Canadian Journal of Microbiology), National Research Council of Canada, Ottawa, Canada K1A 0R6. Remittances should be made payable to the Receiver General for Canada, credit National Research Council of Canada.

Abonnements – Pour toutes les questions d'abonnements, paiements, demandes de vieux numéros du journal etc., on doit s'adresser à l'Administration (Journal canadien de microbiologie), Conseil national de recherches du Canada, Ottawa, Canada K1A 0R6. Les chèques et mandats seront formulés payables au Receveur Général du Canada au crédit du Conseil national de recherches du Canada.

The price of single numbers of current volumes of all journals is \$7.50.

Les numéros ordinaires de chaque revue coûtent \$7.50 pour l'année en cours.

National Beef Ex. 1025

Page 6 of 27

ICMSF methods studies. XIII. An international comparative study of the MPN procedure and the Anderson-Baird-Parker direct plating method for the enumeration of *Escherichia coli* biotype I in raw meats

M. K. RAYMAN¹

Bureau of Microbial Hazards, Health Protection Branch, Ottawa, Ont., Canada K1A 0L2

G. A. JARVIS

Food Statistics and Operational Planning, Health Protection Branch, Ottawa, Ont., Canada

C. M. DAVIDSON AND S. LONG

Canada Packers Ltd., Toronto, Ont., Canada

J. M. ALLEN

Dominion Stores, Toronto, Ont., Canada

T. TONG

Caravelle Foods, Mississauga, Ont., Canada

P. DODSWORTH

J. M. Schneider, Inc., Kitchener, Ont., Canada

S. McLAUGHLIN

Food and Drug Administration, Minneapolis, MN, U.S.A.

S. GREENBERG

Equity Meat Corp., Folcroft, PA, U.S.A.

B. G. SHAW

Meat Research Institute, Bristol, England

H. J. BECKERS

National Institute of Public Health, Bilthoven, The Netherlands

S. QVIST

Danish Meat Products Laboratory, Copenhagen, Denmark

P. M. NOTTINGHAM

The Meat Industry Research Institute of New Zealand, Hamilton, New Zealand

AND

B. J. STEWART

C.S.I.R.O., North Ryde, N.S.W., Australia

Accepted August 22, 1979

RAYMAN, M. K., G. A. JARVIS, C. M. DAVIDSON, S. LONG, J. M. ALLEN, T. TONG, P. DODSWORTH, S. McLAUGHLIN, S. GREENBERG, B. G. SHAW, H. J. BECKERS, S. QVIST, P. M. NOTTINGHAM, and B. J. STEWART. 1979. ICMSF methods studies. XIII. An international comparative study of the MPN procedure and the Anderson-Baird-Parker direct plating method for the enumeration of *Escherichia coli* biotype I in raw meats. *Can. J. Microbiol.* **25**: 1321-1327.

The most probable number (MPN) and a direct membrane-plating (DP) method were compared for enumeration of *Escherichia coli* biotype I in raw meats by 11 laboratories. The DP method yielded higher counts of *E. coli* than the MPN method for frozen samples but neither method consistently gave higher counts for non-frozen samples. The DP method was less variable and gave a higher rate of detection of low numbers of *E. coli* in frozen samples. Despite the inability of the DP method to enumerate *E. coli* biotype II and intermediate types, which comprise only 3-5% of the *Escherichia* strains (Ewing 1972), the method is preferable to the MPN method for enumerating *E. coli* in raw meats because of its lower variability, better recovery from frozen samples, rapidity, decreased requirement for media, and decreased costs for analysts' time.

¹Author to whom reprint requests should be addressed.

RAYMAN, M. K., G. A. JARVIS, C. M. DAVIDSON, S. LONG, J. M. ALLEN, T. TONG, P. DODSWORTH, S. McLAUGHLIN, S. GREENBERG, B. G. SHAW, H. J. BECKERS, S. QVIST, P. M. NOTTINGHAM, et B. J. STEWART. 1979. ICMSF methods studies. XIII. An international comparative study of the MPN procedure and the Anderson-Baird-Parker direct plating method for the enumeration of *Escherichia coli* biotype I in raw meats. *Can. J. Microbiol.* **25**: 1321-1327.

Onze laboratoires ont comparé la méthode du nombre le plus probable (MPN) et la méthode de l'ensemencement direct sur membrane (DP) pour la numération d'*Escherichia coli*, biotype I, dans les viandes crues. A partir d'échantillons congelés, la méthode DP donne des valeurs d'*E. coli* plus élevées que la méthode MPN, mais ni l'une ni l'autre ne donnent des décomptes régulièrement plus élevés à partir d'échantillons non-congelés. La méthode DP est moins variable et serait plus sensible, permettant de détecter à un taux plus élevé les faibles quantités d'*E. coli* dans les échantillons congelés. Malgré son incapacité à faire le décompte d'*E. coli* du biotype II ou de types intermédiaires, ce qui représente 3 à 5% des souches d'*Escherichia* (Ewing 1972), la méthode DP est préférable à la méthode MPN à cause de sa plus faible variabilité, son taux supérieur de récupération à partir d'échantillons congelés, sa rapidité, sa consommation réduite de milieux et à cause d'une réduction des coûts de temps de manipulation.

[Traduit par le journal]

Introduction

The International Commission on Microbiological Specifications for Foods (ICMSF) recommends two most probable number (MPN) methods for the enumeration of fecal coliforms and *E. coli* in foods (ICMSF 1978). In one of the methods used extensively in North America, presumptive coliforms are enumerated in lauryl sulfate tryptose broth at 35-37°C and fecal coliforms in EC broth at 44.5 ± 0.2°C (American Public Health Association 1970). The other, a European method, uses MacConkey broth at 35-37°C for enumeration of coliforms and brilliant green lactose broth at 44 ± 0.1°C for fecal coliforms (Guinée and Mossel 1963). Both methods take 3-4 days and if the fecal coliform organisms are to be identified, an additional 5-8 days would be required to conduct IMViC tests on the isolates (ICMSF 1978). The present concern about the enumeration of fecal coliforms, or more specifically *Escherichia coli* in foods, is the length of time and the amount of media and analysts' time required to complete the analyses. This concern has prompted the development of a number of rapid methods among which are direct plating on modified MacConkey agar (Hefferman and Cabelli 1967), and direct plating onto membranes overlying tryptone bile agar (Anderson and Baird-Parker 1975). Andrews and Presnell (1972) have also proposed a shortened MPN method known as the A1 test, which has recently been modified to include a resuscitation step (Hunt and Springer 1978; Andrews *et al.* 1979). Common to these methods, except the modified A1 test, is direct incubation at an elevated temperature of 44.0-44.5°C.

After review of the rapid methods for enumerating fecal coliforms and *E. coli* (the modified A1 test was not reviewed since it was only recently developed), the ICMSF selected as most promising the direct plating method of Anderson and Baird-Parker (1975) which is a modification of the method

of Delaney *et al.* (1962). The method yields results in 24-30 h, eliminates the use of costly multiple tubes of media, and reduces the requirement for analysts' time. The same is applicable to plating on modified MacConkey agar (Hefferman and Cabelli 1967), but this method has been shown to yield 10% lower counts than the North American MPN procedure (Varga *et al.* 1977).

In this paper we present the results of an ICMSF sponsored study in which 11 laboratories participated to compare the direct plating method of Anderson and Baird-Parker (1975) and the North American MPN method (American Public Health Association 1970) for enumerating *E. coli* in raw meats.

Materials and Methods

Samples

Raw red meats, poultry and pork, and washings and surface swabs of carcasses thereof were examined. All samples, frozen or non-frozen, were obtained in the country of the participating laboratory and were naturally contaminated.

Media and Membranes

All media were supplied gratis by Difco Laboratories Ltd., and cellulose acetate membranes were generously donated by Oxoid Ltd. Each participant received media and membranes from the same lot.

Enumeration Procedure

Two analysts in each laboratory simultaneously but independently carried out the analyses. To avoid sampling errors, solids were weighed and homogenized in 4 parts (v/w) of 0.1% peptone water by one analyst, and the homogenate (1:5) was divided between the two analysts. Samples were examined by the direct plating (DP) and most probable number (MPN) methods for enumerating *E. coli* biotype I. Biotypes of *E. coli* are defined in *Microorganisms in foods* (ICMSF 1978).

(a) DP Method

The method of Anderson and Baird-Parker (1975) was used. Cellulose-acetate membranes (85-mm diameter, 450-nm pore size, Oxoid Ltd.) were placed on predried surfaces of tryptone bile agar (TBA) contained in 90-mm Petri dishes; the membranes were gently flattened against the agar with a sterile glass spreader so that complete contact was made with the surface of the medium. Duplicate 1.0-mL volumes of the

dilutions of solid samples were evenly spread on the membranes, taking care that the inocula did not spill over the edges. When suspensions contained less than 10% meat, 0.5-mL volumes were plated to avoid spillage over the edges of the membranes. After absorption of the inocula (usually 20–30 min), the plates were incubated in the upright position in stacks of not more than three in a $44.5 \pm 0.5^\circ\text{C}$ water-jacketed or similarly accurate incubator for 24 h. It is important that this temperature range be maintained throughout the incubation period.

A resuscitation step was included for the plating of frozen samples. The appropriate inocula were first spread on the surface of membranes overlying tryptic soy agar (TSA), and the plates incubated at $35\text{--}37^\circ\text{C}$ in the upright position for 4 h. The membranes were then aseptically transferred from the TSA to TBA plates and the latter were incubated for 24 h at $44.5 \pm 0.5^\circ\text{C}$ as above. This modification has been reported to yield higher counts of *E. coli* in samples which have been subjected to conditions likely to cause stress in the organisms (Baird-Parker, personal communication; Rayman and Aris, unpublished results).

After incubation at 44.5°C , the membranes were lifted off the TBA, placed in clean covers of the Petri dishes, and stained for 10–15 min with 2.0 mL of 5% *p*-dimethylaminobenzaldehyde reagent (Anderson and Baird-Parker 1975). The membranes were then removed from the covers and dried under a low-pressure UV lamp or in sunlight (window glass does not interfere). The pink indole-positive colonies were enumerated as *E. coli*.

(b) MPN Method

The North American procedure for determination of coliform organisms of fecal origin (American Public Health Association 1970) was used. Since a maximum of 0.4 g of meat could be inoculated over two plates, the lower limit of detection by the DP method was 2.5 cells of *E. coli* biotype I per gram. To obtain comparable results, the lowest dilution used in the three-tube MPN method was 1:10 which yielded a minimum of three cells of *E. coli* per gram. Frozen and non-frozen samples were treated identically. One millilitre of decimal dilutions was transferred to each of three separate tubes containing inverted fermentation vials and 10 mL of lauryl sulfate tryptose broth (LST). These were incubated at $35\text{--}37^\circ\text{C}$ and examined for gas production at 24 and 48 h. From gas-positive LST tubes, transfers were made to tubes containing inverted fermentation vials and 10 mL of EC broth; the tubes were incubated at $44.5 \pm 0.5^\circ\text{C}$ for 24–48 h. Aliquots from the EC tubes showing gas production were then streaked onto plates of Levine eosin methylene blue agar and after incubation at $35\text{--}37^\circ\text{C}$ for 24 h, two typical colonies were picked and purified by streaking onto plates of nutrient agar. IMViC tests (ICMSF 1978) were run on the purified isolates. Only those colonies yielding + + – – IMViC reactions were used in determining the MPN of *E. coli*. The entire procedure took 9–11 days.

Statistical Methods

All statistical tests were chosen to accommodate the lack of independence of the four observations from each food sample, and the non-normality apparent in the data. For some procedures, it was necessary to edit the data for technical purposes. All such edits were kept to a minimum and were applied consistently over laboratories. These edits account for apparent sample-size discrepancies.

For each analyst, the Wilcoxin signed rank test (Hollander and Wolfe 1973) was used to test whether either method yielded consistently higher *E. coli* counts.

For each laboratory and method, variability in the data not attributable to variation in contamination levels from food sample to food sample, nor to consistent analyst differences, was calculated from $\log_{10}$ *E. coli* counts and presented as an estimate

of method variability. To test for differences between method variability within each laboratory, an approximate significance test was performed using the "jackknife" technique (Miller 1974) on the test statistic described by Snedecor and Cochran (1973).

An alternative measure of method variability was obtained by modifying the above procedure to include analyst differences as a source of "method" variation. Thus if consistent within-laboratory analyst differences were present, they would inflate this measure of variability accordingly.

Results and Discussion

Comparison of *E. coli* Counts by the MPN and DP Methods

A comparison of the two methods for enumerating *E. coli* is shown in Table 1. The MPN method yielded counts of *E. coli* lower than the DP method in a significant number of frozen samples examined in laboratories 3 and 5. This was also true in laboratories 7 and 10, but for one analyst only. In laboratories analyzing more than 10 contaminated frozen samples, all but laboratory 1 reported more samples yielding higher *E. coli* counts by the DP method, though not all differences in counts by the two methods were significant.

A different pattern was seen for non-frozen samples. In laboratory 8, the MPN method yielded counts of *E. coli* higher than the DP method in a significant number of samples examined, and in laboratory 4, similar results were obtained by one analyst. Apart from these observations, neither method was consistently favoured over the other for maximal enumeration of *E. coli*.

In both frozen and non-frozen samples, differences in *E. coli* counts by the two methods were small, usually less than a factor of 10. In 62.6% of the frozen samples, *E. coli* counts by the two methods were within 0.5 $\log_{10}$ cycle of each other and in 83.9% of these samples, the counts differed by no more than 1 $\log_{10}$ cycle (Fig. 1A). Similar results were obtained with non-frozen samples where 73.3 and 95.4% of the samples yielded counts by the two methods which differed by no more than 0.5 and 1 $\log_{10}$ cycle, respectively (Fig. 1B). For frozen samples, the skewing of the histogram to the left of zero confirmed the previous observation that in the majority of these samples, the DP method yielded higher counts of *E. coli*. In these samples, it is likely that the cells were damaged and the resuscitation step included in the DP method was responsible for the higher counts.

Variability in the MPN and DP Methods for Enumerating *E. coli*

The standard deviations of $\log_{10}$ *E. coli* counts for the two methods are listed in Table 2. For frozen foods, the DP method yielded counts which were significantly less variable than those of the MPN

TABLE 1. Comparison of $\log_{10}$ *E. coli* counts yielded by the MPN and DP methods

Laboratory	Analyst 1				Analyst 2			
	MPN > DP ^a	MPN < DP	Ties	No. samples	MPN > DP	MPN < DP	Ties	No. samples
Frozen samples								
1	9	3	0	12	7	5	0	12
2	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	1
3	6	19	2	27**	10	16	0	26*
4	1	0	0	1	2	1	0	3
5	5	42	0	47**	0	39	0	39**
6	12	15	0	27	9	16	0	25
7	3	11	0	14*	4	8	0	12
9	3	5	1	9	5	3	0	8
10	14	33	0	47*	— ^b	—	—	—
11	5	12	1	18	—	—	—	—
Non-frozen samples								
1	16	21	1	38	20	19	0	39
2	28	21	0	49	17	27	2	46
3	1	4	0	5	1	2	0	3
4	20	4	1	25**	16	15	0	31
7	10	10	1	21	8	14	0	22
8	16	4	0	20**	15	10	0	25*
9	20	14	1	35	19	15	0	34

^aMPN = most probable number method; DP = direct-plating method.

^bOnly one analyst performed tests in laboratories 10 and 11.

*Significantly different at 0.10 level.

**Significantly different at 0.05 level.

method in laboratories 3, 5, and 7. Similar results were obtained for non-frozen foods analyzed in laboratories 1, 2, 4, and 9. Overall, the DP method was less variable than the MPN method except in laboratory 6, though not all differences were

significant. The variability of the methods could not be compared in laboratories 10 and 11 because only one analyst performed the tests in these laboratories. Standard deviations were virtually unchanged when the variability due to consistent differences between analysts was included in the above calculations, indicating close agreement between analysts within laboratories (estimates not reported).




FIG. 1. Frequency distribution of $\log_{10}$ *E. coli* counts obtained by the MPN and DP methods. (A) Frozen samples; (B) non-frozen samples. Numbers at the top of the histograms represent percentages.

IMViC Tests

Only isolates from the MPN method were subjected to IMViC tests. As shown in Table 3, 96.6% of the indole-positive isolates gave IMViC reactions characteristic of *E. coli* biotype I. These figures compare favourably with those of Anderson and Baird-Parker (1975), who reported that 95.1% of 555 indole-positive colonies growing on membranes overlying TBA were *E. coli* biotype I. We did not run confirmatory tests on the indole-positive colonies growing on membranes because they are not a part of the DP method; the method assumes that production of indole at $44.5 \pm 0.5^\circ\text{C}$ on TBA is sufficient to identify the colonies as *E. coli*. Based on our results and those of Anderson and Baird-Parker (1975), this assumption is not entirely correct in that 3–5% of the indole-positive isolates were not *E. coli* biotype I. However, the

TABLE 2. Estimated standard deviations of log₁₀ *E. coli* counts yielded by the MPN and DP methods

Laboratory	No. samples	Standard deviation		<i>P</i> ^b
		MPN ^a	DP ^a	
Frozen samples				
1	12	0.173	0.114	0.117
2	1	—	—	—
3	22	0.310	0.173	0.009***
4	1	—	—	—
5	37	0.379	0.263	0.062*
6	23	0.221	0.288	0.36
7	11	0.446	0.170	0.003***
9	8	0.333	0.195	0.428
Non-frozen samples				
1	38	0.448	0.122	<0.0001***
2	46	0.332	0.187	0.015**
3	3	—	—	—
4	23	0.562	0.192	0.001***
7	18	0.329	0.229	0.381
8	19	0.439	0.243	0.234
9	34	0.472	0.164	0.0001***

^aSee footnote to Table 1.^bObserved level of significance of the test of the hypothesis that standard deviations of the two methods are equal.

*Significantly different at 0.10 level.

**Significantly different at 0.05 level.

***Significantly different at 0.01 level.

TABLE 3. Biotyping of indole-positive organisms isolated by the MPN method

Laboratory	No. indole-positive isolates	% <i>E. coli</i> biotype I	% not <i>E. coli</i> biotype I
1	645	99.1	0.9
2	560	99.6	0.4
3	519	97.7	2.3
4	349	96.0	4.0
5	260	79.6	20.4
6	163	100.0	0
7	— ^a	—	—
8	207	99.5	0.5
9	449	94.7	5.3
10	360	99.2	0.8
11	75	96.0	4.0
Overall	3487	96.6	3.4

^aIMViC reactions for isolates in this laboratory not reported.

time-saving advantage of the DP method greatly outweighs the disadvantage of including a small number of non-biotype I *E. coli* in the final count. A more serious disadvantage inherent in the method is its inability to enumerate *E. coli* incapable of producing indole. Fortunately, only 1% of all *E. coli* strains fall into this category (Ewing 1972). On the other hand, the DP method enumerates anaerogenic and late lactose-fermenting strains of *E. coli* biotype I which would be missed by the MPN

method; according to Ewing (1972), these organisms comprise as much as 10% of *Escherichia* strains.

Detection of *E. coli* Biotype I in Samples

Although both methods are quantitative, we calculated the number of samples found to be positive for *E. coli* biotype I by either method (Table 4). Of 868 positive samples, the MPN method detected 797 and the DP method 823. Both methods detected *E. coli* biotype I in 752 samples and either method was capable of enumerating low numbers. The organism was also detected in 45 samples by the MPN but not the DP method; of the 45 samples, 20 were frozen and 25 non-frozen, and only 3 samples contained greater than 50 *E. coli* per gram. Conversely, 71 samples yielded *E. coli* biotype I by the DP method alone, and 49 of these were frozen; only 6 of the 71 had counts exceeding 50 *E. coli* per gram. These results indicate that both methods, as used in this study, were capable of detecting *E. coli* biotype I when low numbers are present, but the DP method gave a higher rate of detection of low numbers in frozen samples.

Specific Comments on DP Method

Some useful observations were made on the DP method. Analysts were initially instructed to dry the stained membranes under a low-pressure UV lamp, in direct or in indirect sunlight. In one laboratory good differentiation of colonies on membranes dried under fluorescent lights was reported, while in three laboratories indirect sunlight was inadequate for developing the pink color of indole-positive colonies; it appears that best results were obtained when membranes were dried in direct sunlight or under a UV lamp. Some laboratories

TABLE 4. Number of samples found to contain *E. coli* biotype I by the MPN and DP methods

Method ^a	No. positive samples	No. positive samples containing <i>E. coli</i> biotype I per gram		
		> 50	10–50	< 10
MPN	797	406	203	188
DP	823	499	221	103
Both MPN and DP	1504 ^b	896 ^c	393 ^d	215 ^e
MPN only	45	3	6	36
DP only	71	6	25	40

^aSee footnote to Table 1; minimum number of *E. coli* biotype I detected by MPN method was 3.0 per gram, by DP method 2.5 per gram.^bComprising 752 samples by each method.^cComprising 403 and 493 samples by the MPN and DP methods, respectively.^dComprising 197 and 196 samples by the MPN and DP methods, respectively.^eComprising 152 and 63 samples by the MPN and DP methods, respectively.

also reported that optimal differentiation was obtained after 10–30 min of drying; after this time, the color of indole-positive colonies faded. Another minor problem encountered was the extension of the working day if the resuscitation step was required. To overcome this, one laboratory found that they could refrigerate the plates with membranes overnight and stain them the following day without loss in differentiation. This step would be useful in laboratories with fixed working hours. On the whole, no major adverse comments were made on the DP method which appears to be superior to the MPN method because of its lower variability, better recovery from frozen samples, rapidity, and decreased requirement for media and analysts' time.

Acknowledgements

We thank Drs. H. Pivnick and D. S. Clark for initiating this study and for reviewing the manuscript.

The technical assistance of the following persons is acknowledged: M. Taylor and D. McLeish of Canada Packers Ltd., M. Nafziger of J. M. Schneider Inc., D. Wagner of Food and Drug Administration, L. Bossick and F. Ferko of Equity Meat Corp., W. R. Hudson and C. D. Harding of the Meat Research Institute, P. D. Tips and W. M. Hogeboom of the National Institute of Public Health, W. Grebell and K. Friis of the Danish Meat Products Laboratory, L. M. Harris and J. C. L. Harrison of the Meat Industry Research Institute of New Zealand, and F. E. Watters of C.S.I.R.O.

We are grateful to Difco Laboratories for supplying all media free of charge and to Oxoid Ltd. for the generous gift of cellulose-acetate membranes. We are also thankful to the following companies and agencies for financial support to ICMSF and its methods-testing program: Amatil Ltd. (Australia); American Can Co. (U.S.A.); Arnotts Biscuits Ltd. (Australia); Bacon and Meat Manufacturers Assoc. (U.K.); Beatrice Foods Co. (U.S.A.); Beecham Group Ltd. (U.K.); Brooke-Bond Oxo Ltd. (U.K.); Brown and Polson Ltd. (U.K.); Burns Foods Ltd. (Canada); Cadbury Schweppes Ltd. (Australia); Campbell Soup Co. Ltd. (Canada); Canada Packers Ltd.; Carlo Erba Institute for Therapeutic Research (Italy); Central Alberta Dairy Pool (Canada); Centro Studi sull' Alimentazione Gino Alfonso Sada (Italy); Christie Brown and Co. Ltd. (Canada); Coca-Cola Co. (U.S.A.); C.P.C. International Inc. (U.S.A.); C.S.R. Ltd. (Australia); Del Monte Corp. (U.S.A.); Difco Laboratories (U.S.A.); Distillers Co. Ltd. (U.K.);

Findus Ltd. (Sweden); Geinoca Food Service Ltd. (Canada); General Foods Corporation (U.S.A.); General Foods Ltd. (Canada); Gerber Products Co. (U.S.A.); H. J. Heinz Co. Ltd. (U.K.); Horne and Pitfield Foods Ltd. (Canada); Infant Formula Council (U.S.A.); International Union of Biological Societies; I.T.T. Continental Baking Co. (U.S.A.); J. Sainsbury Ltd. (U.K.); Jannock Corp. Ltd. (Canada); John Labatt Ltd. (Canada); Kellogg/Salada Ltd. (Canada); Kraft Foods Ltd. (Australia); Langnese-Iglo GmbH (B.R.D.); Maizena Gesellschaft mbH (B.R.D.); Maple Leaf Mills Ltd. (Canada); Marks and Spencer Ltd. (U.K.); Mars Ltd. (U.K.); McCormick and Co. Inc. (U.S.A.); Milk Marketing Board (U.K.); National Fisheries Institute Inc. (U.S.A.); New Zealand Manufacturers' Federation; R.H.M. Research Ltd. (U.K.); R.J.R. Foods Inc. (U.S.A.); Reckitt and Colman Ltd. (U.K.); Ross Laboratories (U.S.A.); Spillers Ltd. (U.K.); Standard Brands Ltd. (Canada); Swift Canadian Co. Ltd. (Canada); Tate and Lyle Refineries Ltd. (U.K.); Terme de Crodo (Italy); Tesco Stores Ltd. (U.K.); The Borden Co. Ltd. (Canada); The J. Lyons Group of Companies (U.K.); The Pillsbury Co. (U.S.A.); The Quaker Oats Co. (U.S.A.); Thomas J. Lipton, Inc. (U.S.A.); Unigate Australia Ltd.; Unilever Ltd. (U.K.); Wattie Industries Ltd. (N.Z.); World Health Organization.

- AMERICAN PUBLIC HEALTH ASSOCIATION. 1970. Recommended procedures for the examination of seawater and shellfish. 4th ed. American Public Health Association, Inc., New York, NY.
- ANDERSON, J. M., and A. C. BAIRD-PARKER. 1975. A rapid and direct plate method for enumerating *Escherichia coli* biotype 1 in food. *J. Appl. Bacteriol.* **39**: 111–117.
- ANDREWS, W. H., A. P. DURAN, F. D. MCCLURE, and D. E. GENTILE. 1979. Use of two rapid A-1 methods for the recovery of fecal coliforms and *Escherichia coli* from selected food types. *J. Food Sci.* **44**: 289–293.
- ANDREWS, W. H., and M. W. PRESNELL. 1972. Rapid recovery of *Escherichia coli* from estuarine water. *Appl. Microbiol.* **23**: 521–523.
- DELANEY, J. E., J. A. MCCARTHY, and R. J. CRASSO. 1962. Measurement of *E. coli* Type 1 by the membrane filter. *Water Sewage Works*, **109**: 289–291.
- EWING, W. H. 1972. Differentiation of enterobacteriaceae by biochemical reactions. CDC Atlanta, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare.
- GUINÉE, P. A. M., and D. A. A. MOSSEL. 1963. The reliability of the test of McKenzie, Taylor and Gilbert for detection of faecal *Escherichia coli* strains of animal origin in foods. *Antonie van Leeuwenhoek; J. Microbiol. Serol.* **29**: 163–166.
- HEFFERMAN, W. P., and V. J. CABELLI. 1967. Modified MacConkey agar plate technique for fecal coliform determination. Shellfish and Sanitation Research Center, U.S. Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

- HOLLANDER, M., and D. WOLFE. 1973. Nonparametric Statistical Methods. John Wiley and Sons, New York, NY.
- HUNT, D. A., and J. SPRINGER. 1978. Microbiological Methods. Comparison of two rapid test procedures with the standard EC test for recovery of fecal coliform bacteria from shellfish-growing waters. J. Assoc. Off. Anal. Chem. **61**: 1317-1323.
- INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON MICROBIOLOGICAL SPECIFICATIONS FOR FOODS. 1978. Microorganisms in foods. 1. Their significance and methods of enumeration. 2nd ed. University of Toronto Press, Toronto, Ont.
- MILLER, R. G. 1974. The jackknife—a review. Biometrika, **61**: 1-15.
- SNEDECOR, G. W., and W. G. COCHRAN. 1973. Statistical Methods. 6th ed. The Iowa State University Press, Iowa. pp. 195-197.
- VARGA, S., R. E. DOBSON, and R. EARLE. 1977. Comparison of the elevated temperature plate count (ETPC) and MPN procedure to estimate the densities of fecal coliforms and *Escherichia coli* in soft-shell clams. J. Food Prot. **40**: 763-764.

Exhibit 1025
Mullins Decl. Appendix B-2
(Rayman from CSP)

ICMSF methods studies. XIII. An international comparative study of the MPN procedure and the Anderson-Baird-Parker direct plating method for the enumeration of *Escherichia coli* biotype I in raw meats

M. K. RAYMAN¹

Bureau of Microbial Hazards, Health Protection Branch, Ottawa, Ont., Canada K1A 0L2

G. A. JARVIS

Food Statistics and Operational Planning, Health Protection Branch, Ottawa, Ont., Canada

C. M. DAVIDSON AND S. LONG

Canada Packers Ltd., Toronto, Ont., Canada

J. M. ALLEN

Dominion Stores, Toronto, Ont., Canada

T. TONG

Caravelle Foods, Mississauga, Ont., Canada

P. DODSWORTH

J. M. Schneider, Inc., Kitchener, Ont., Canada

S. McLAUGHLIN

Food and Drug Administration, Minneapolis, MN, U.S.A.

S. GREENBERG

Equity Meat Corp., Folcroft, PA, U.S.A.

B. G. SHAW

Meat Research Institute, Bristol, England

H. J. BECKERS

National Institute of Public Health, Bilthoven, The Netherlands

S. QVIST

Danish Meat Products Laboratory, Copenhagen, Denmark

P. M. NOTTINGHAM

The Meat Industry Research Institute of New Zealand, Hamilton, New Zealand

AND

B. J. STEWART

C.S.I.R.O., North Ryde, N.S.W., Australia

Accepted August 22, 1979

RAYMAN, M. K., G. A. JARVIS, C. M. DAVIDSON, S. LONG, J. M. ALLEN, T. TONG, P. DODSWORTH, S. McLAUGHLIN, S. GREENBERG, B. G. SHAW, H. J. BECKERS, S. QVIST, P. M. NOTTINGHAM, and B. J. STEWART. 1979. ICMSF methods studies. XIII. An international comparative study of the MPN procedure and the Anderson-Baird-Parker direct plating method for the enumeration of *Escherichia coli* biotype I in raw meats. *Can. J. Microbiol.* **25**: 1321-1327.

The most probable number (MPN) and a direct membrane-plating (DP) method were compared for enumeration of *Escherichia coli* biotype I in raw meats by 11 laboratories. The DP method yielded higher counts of *E. coli* than the MPN method for frozen samples but neither method consistently gave higher counts for non-frozen samples. The DP method was less variable and gave a higher rate of detection of low numbers of *E. coli* in frozen samples. Despite the inability of the DP method to enumerate *E. coli* biotype II and intermediate types, which comprise only 3-5% of the *Escherichia* strains (Ewing 1972), the method is preferable to the MPN method for enumerating *E. coli* in raw meats because of its lower variability, better recovery from frozen samples, rapidity, decreased requirement for media, and decreased costs for analysts' time.

¹Author to whom reprint requests should be addressed.

RAYMAN, M. K., G. A. JARVIS, C. M. DAVIDSON, S. LONG, J. M. ALLEN, T. TONG, P. DODSWORTH, S. McLAUGHLIN, S. GREENBERG, B. G. SHAW, H. J. BECKERS, S. QVIST, P. M. NOTTINGHAM, et B. J. STEWART. 1979. ICMSF methods studies. XIII. An international comparative study of the MPN procedure and the Anderson-Baird-Parker direct plating method for the enumeration of *Escherichia coli* biotype I in raw meats. *Can. J. Microbiol.* 25: 1321-1327.

Onze laboratoires ont comparé la méthode du nombre le plus probable (MPN) et la méthode de l'ensemencement direct sur membrane (DP) pour la numération d'*Escherichia coli*, biotype I, dans les viandes crues. À partir d'échantillons congelés, la méthode DP donne des valeurs d'*E. coli* plus élevées que la méthode MPN, mais ni l'une ni l'autre ne donnent des décomptes régulièrement plus élevés à partir d'échantillons non-congelés. La méthode DP est moins variable et serait plus sensible, permettant de détecter à un taux plus élevé les faibles quantités d'*E. coli* dans les échantillons congelés. Malgré son incapacité à faire le décompte d'*E. coli* du biotype II ou de types intermédiaires, ce qui représente 3 à 5% des souches d'*Escherichia* (Ewing 1972), la méthode DP est préférable à la méthode MPN à cause de sa plus faible variabilité, son taux supérieur de récupération à partir d'échantillons congelés, sa rapidité, sa consommation réduite de milieux et à cause d'une réduction des coûts de temps de manipulation.

[Traduit par le journal]

Introduction

The International Commission on Microbiological Specifications for Foods (ICMSF) recommends two most probable number (MPN) methods for the enumeration of fecal coliforms and *E. coli* in foods (ICMSF 1978). In one of the methods used extensively in North America, presumptive coliforms are enumerated in lauryl sulfate tryptose broth at 35-37°C and fecal coliforms in EC broth at 44.5 ± 0.2°C (American Public Health Association 1970). The other, a European method, uses MacConkey broth at 35-37°C for enumeration of coliforms and brilliant green lactose broth at 44 ± 0.1°C for fecal coliforms (Guinée and Mossel 1963). Both methods take 3-4 days and if the fecal coliform organisms are to be identified, an additional 5-8 days would be required to conduct IMViC tests on the isolates (ICMSF 1978). The present concern about the enumeration of fecal coliforms, or more specifically *Escherichia coli* in foods, is the length of time and the amount of media and analysts' time required to complete the analyses. This concern has prompted the development of a number of rapid methods among which are direct plating on modified MacConkey agar (Hefferman and Cabelli 1967), and direct plating onto membranes overlying tryptone bile agar (Anderson and Baird-Parker 1975). Andrews and Presnell (1972) have also proposed a shortened MPN method known as the A1 test, which has recently been modified to include a resuscitation step (Hunt and Springer 1978; Andrews *et al.* 1979). Common to these methods, except the modified A1 test, is direct incubation at an elevated temperature of 44.0-44.5°C.

After review of the rapid methods for enumerating fecal coliforms and *E. coli* (the modified A1 test was not reviewed since it was only recently developed), the ICMSF selected as most promising the direct plating method of Anderson and Baird-Parker (1975) which is a modification of the method

of Delaney *et al.* (1962). The method yields results in 24-30 h, eliminates the use of costly multiple tubes of media, and reduces the requirement for analysts' time. The same is applicable to plating on modified MacConkey agar (Hefferman and Cabelli 1967), but this method has been shown to yield 10% lower counts than the North American MPN procedure (Varga *et al.* 1977).

In this paper we present the results of an ICMSF sponsored study in which 11 laboratories participated to compare the direct plating method of Anderson and Baird-Parker (1975) and the North American MPN method (American Public Health Association 1970) for enumerating *E. coli* in raw meats.

Materials and Methods

Samples

Raw red meats, poultry and pork, and washings and surface swabs of carcasses thereof were examined. All samples, frozen or non-frozen, were obtained in the country of the participating laboratory and were naturally contaminated.

Media and Membranes

All media were supplied gratis by Difco Laboratories Ltd., and cellulose acetate membranes were generously donated by Oxoid Ltd. Each participant received media and membranes from the same lot.

Enumeration Procedure

Two analysts in each laboratory simultaneously but independently carried out the analyses. To avoid sampling errors, solids were weighed and homogenized in 4 parts (v/w) of 0.1% peptone water by one analyst, and the homogenate (1:5) was divided between the two analysts. Samples were examined by the direct plating (DP) and most probable number (MPN) methods for enumerating *E. coli* biotype I. Biotypes of *E. coli* are defined in *Microorganisms in foods* (ICMSF 1978).

(a) DP Method

The method of Anderson and Baird-Parker (1975) was used. Cellulose-acetate membranes (85-mm diameter, 450-nm pore size, Oxoid Ltd.) were placed on predried surfaces of tryptone bile agar (TBA) contained in 90-mm Petri dishes; the membranes were gently flattened against the agar with a sterile glass spreader so that complete contact was made with the surface of the medium. Duplicate 1.0-mL volumes of the 1:5 and 1:10

dilutions of solid samples were evenly spread on the membranes, taking care that the inocula did not spill over the edges. When suspensions contained less than 10% meat, 0.5-mL volumes were plated to avoid spillage over the edges of the membranes. After absorption of the inocula (usually 20–30 min), the plates were incubated in the upright position in stacks of not more than three in a $44.5 \pm 0.5^\circ\text{C}$ water-jacketed or similarly accurate incubator for 24 h. It is important that this temperature range be maintained throughout the incubation period.

A resuscitation step was included for the plating of frozen samples. The appropriate inocula were first spread on the surface of membranes overlying tryptic soy agar (TSA), and the plates incubated at $35\text{--}37^\circ\text{C}$ in the upright position for 4 h. The membranes were then aseptically transferred from the TSA to TBA plates and the latter were incubated for 24 h at $44.5 \pm 0.5^\circ\text{C}$ as above. This modification has been reported to yield higher counts of *E. coli* in samples which have been subjected to conditions likely to cause stress in the organisms (Baird-Parker, personal communication; Rayman and Aris, unpublished results).

After incubation at 44.5°C , the membranes were lifted off the TBA, placed in clean covers of the Petri dishes, and stained for 10–15 min with 2.0 mL of 5% *p*-dimethylaminobenzaldehyde reagent (Anderson and Baird-Parker 1975). The membranes were then removed from the covers and dried under a low-pressure UV lamp or in sunlight (window glass does not interfere). The pink indole-positive colonies were enumerated as *E. coli*.

(b) MPN Method

The North American procedure for determination of coliform organisms of fecal origin (American Public Health Association 1970) was used. Since a maximum of 0.4 g of meat could be inoculated over two plates, the lower limit of detection by the DP method was 2.5 cells of *E. coli* biotype I per gram. To obtain comparable results, the lowest dilution used in the three-tube MPN method was 1:10 which yielded a minimum of three cells of *E. coli* per gram. Frozen and non-frozen samples were treated identically. One millilitre of decimal dilutions was transferred to each of three separate tubes containing inverted fermentation vials and 10 mL of lauryl sulfate tryptose broth (LST). These were incubated at $35\text{--}37^\circ\text{C}$ and examined for gas production at 24 and 48 h. From gas-positive LST tubes, transfers were made to tubes containing inverted fermentation vials and 10 mL of EC broth; the tubes were incubated at $44.5 \pm 0.5^\circ\text{C}$ for 24–48 h. Aliquots from the EC tubes showing gas production were then streaked onto plates of Levine eosin methylene blue agar and after incubation at $35\text{--}37^\circ\text{C}$ for 24 h, two typical colonies were picked and purified by streaking onto plates of nutrient agar. IMViC tests (ICMSF 1978) were run on the purified isolates. Only those colonies yielding $++--$ IMViC reactions were used in determining the MPN of *E. coli*. The entire procedure took 9–11 days.

Statistical Methods

All statistical tests were chosen to accommodate the lack of independence of the four observations from each food sample, and the non-normality apparent in the data. For some procedures, it was necessary to edit the data for technical purposes. All such edits were kept to a minimum and were applied consistently over laboratories. These edits account for apparent sample-size discrepancies.

For each analyst, the Wilcoxin signed rank test (Hollander and Wolfe 1973) was used to test whether either method yielded consistently higher *E. coli* counts.

For each laboratory and method, variability in the data not attributable to variation in contamination levels from food sample to food sample, nor to consistent analyst differences, was calculated from $\log_{10}$ *E. coli* counts and presented as an estimate

of method variability. To test for differences between method variability within each laboratory, an approximate significance test was performed using the "jackknife" technique (Miller 1974) on the test statistic described by Snedecor and Cochran (1973).

An alternative measure of method variability was obtained by modifying the above procedure to include analyst differences as a source of "method" variation. Thus if consistent within-laboratory analyst differences were present, they would inflate this measure of variability accordingly.

Results and Discussion

Comparison of *E. coli* Counts by the MPN and DP Methods

A comparison of the two methods for enumerating *E. coli* is shown in Table 1. The MPN method yielded counts of *E. coli* lower than the DP method in a significant number of frozen samples examined in laboratories 3 and 5. This was also true in laboratories 7 and 10, but for one analyst only. In laboratories analyzing more than 10 contaminated frozen samples, all but laboratory 1 reported more samples yielding higher *E. coli* counts by the DP method, though not all differences in counts by the two methods were significant.

A different pattern was seen for non-frozen samples. In laboratory 8, the MPN method yielded counts of *E. coli* higher than the DP method in a significant number of samples examined, and in laboratory 4, similar results were obtained by one analyst. Apart from these observations, neither method was consistently favoured over the other for maximal enumeration of *E. coli*.

In both frozen and non-frozen samples, differences in *E. coli* counts by the two methods were small, usually less than a factor of 10. In 62.6% of the frozen samples, *E. coli* counts by the two methods were within 0.5 $\log_{10}$ cycle of each other and in 83.9% of these samples, the counts differed by no more than 1 $\log_{10}$ cycle (Fig. 1A). Similar results were obtained with non-frozen samples where 73.3 and 95.4% of the samples yielded counts by the two methods which differed by no more than 0.5 and 1 $\log_{10}$ cycle, respectively (Fig. 1B). For frozen samples, the skewing of the histogram to the left of zero confirmed the previous observation that in the majority of these samples, the DP method yielded higher counts of *E. coli*. In these samples, it is likely that the cells were damaged and the resuscitation step included in the DP method was responsible for the higher counts.

Variability in the MPN and DP Methods for Enumerating *E. coli*

The standard deviations of $\log_{10}$ *E. coli* counts for the two methods are listed in Table 2. For frozen foods, the DP method yielded counts which were significantly less variable than those of the MPN

TABLE 1. Comparison of $\log_{10}$ *E. coli* counts yielded by the MPN and DP methods

Laboratory	Analyst 1				Analyst 2			
	MPN > DP ^a	MPN < DP	Ties	No. samples	MPN > DP	MPN < DP	Ties	No. samples
Frozen samples								
1	9	3	0	12	7	5	0	12
2	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	1
3	6	19	2	27**	10	16	0	26*
4	1	0	0	1	2	1	0	3
5	5	42	0	47**	0	39	0	39**
6	12	15	0	27	9	16	0	25
7	3	11	0	14*	4	8	0	12
9	3	5	1	9	5	3	0	8
10	14	33	0	47*	— ^b	—	—	—
11	5	12	1	18	—	—	—	—
Non-frozen samples								
1	16	21	1	38	20	19	0	39
2	28	21	0	49	17	27	2	46
3	1	4	0	5	1	2	0	3
4	20	4	1	25**	16	15	0	31
7	10	10	1	21	8	14	0	22
8	16	4	0	20**	15	10	0	25*
9	20	14	1	35	19	15	0	34

^aMPN = most probable number method; DP = direct-plating method.^bOnly one analyst performed tests in laboratories 10 and 11.

*Significantly different at 0.10 level.

**Significantly different at 0.05 level.

method in laboratories 3, 5, and 7. Similar results were obtained for non-frozen foods analyzed in laboratories 1, 2, 4, and 9. Overall, the DP method was less variable than the MPN method except in laboratory 6, though not all differences were

significant. The variability of the methods could not be compared in laboratories 10 and 11 because only one analyst performed the tests in these laboratories. Standard deviations were virtually unchanged when the variability due to consistent differences between analysts was included in the above calculations, indicating close agreement between analysts within laboratories (estimates not reported).

IMViC Tests

Only isolates from the MPN method were subjected to IMViC tests. As shown in Table 3, 96.6% of the indole-positive isolates gave IMViC reactions characteristic of *E. coli* biotype I. These figures compare favourably with those of Anderson and Baird-Parker (1975), who reported that 95.1% of 555 indole-positive colonies growing on membranes overlying TBA were *E. coli* biotype I. We did not run confirmatory tests on the indole-positive colonies growing on membranes because they are not a part of the DP method; the method assumes that production of indole at $44.5 \pm 0.5^\circ\text{C}$ on TBA is sufficient to identify the colonies as *E. coli*. Based on our results and those of Anderson and Baird-Parker (1975), this assumption is not entirely correct in that 3–5% of the indole-positive isolates were not *E. coli* biotype I. However, the




FIG. 1. Frequency distribution of $\log_{10}$ *E. coli* counts obtained by the MPN and DP methods. (A) Frozen samples; (B) non-frozen samples. Numbers at the top of the histograms represent percentages.

TABLE 2. Estimated standard deviations of $\log_{10}$ *E. coli* counts yielded by the MPN and DP methods

Laboratory	No. samples	Standard deviation		<i>P</i> ^b
		MPN ^a	DP ^a	
Frozen samples				
1	12	0.173	0.114	0.117
2	1	—	—	—
3	22	0.310	0.173	0.009***
4	1	—	—	—
5	37	0.379	0.263	0.062*
6	23	0.221	0.288	0.36
7	11	0.446	0.170	0.003***
9	8	0.333	0.195	0.428
Non-frozen samples				
1	38	0.448	0.122	< 0.0001***
2	46	0.332	0.187	0.015**
3	3	—	—	—
4	23	0.562	0.192	0.001***
7	18	0.329	0.229	0.381
8	19	0.439	0.243	0.234
9	34	0.472	0.164	0.0001***

^aSee footnote to Table 1.^bObserved level of significance of the test of the hypothesis that standard deviations of the two methods are equal.

*Significantly different at 0.10 level.

**Significantly different at 0.05 level.

***Significantly different at 0.01 level.

TABLE 3. Biotyping of indole-positive organisms isolated by the MPN method

Laboratory	No. indole-positive isolates	% <i>E. coli</i> biotype I	% not <i>E. coli</i> biotype I
1	645	99.1	0.9
2	560	99.6	0.4
3	519	97.7	2.3
4	349	96.0	4.0
5	260	79.6	20.4
6	163	100.0	0
7	— ^a	—	—
8	207	99.5	0.5
9	449	94.7	5.3
10	360	99.2	0.8
11	75	96.0	4.0
Overall	3487	96.6	3.4

^aIMViC reactions for isolates in this laboratory not reported.

time-saving advantage of the DP method greatly outweighs the disadvantage of including a small number of non-biotype I *E. coli* in the final count. A more serious disadvantage inherent in the method is its inability to enumerate *E. coli* incapable of producing indole. Fortunately, only 1% of all *E. coli* strains fall into this category (Ewing 1972). On the other hand, the DP method enumerates anaerogenic and late lactose-fermenting strains of *E. coli* biotype I which would be missed by the MPN

method; according to Ewing (1972), these organisms comprise as much as 10% of *Escherichia* strains.

Detection of *E. coli* Biotype I in Samples

Although both methods are quantitative, we calculated the number of samples found to be positive for *E. coli* biotype I by either method (Table 4). Of 868 positive samples, the MPN method detected 797 and the DP method 823. Both methods detected *E. coli* biotype I in 752 samples and either method was capable of enumerating low numbers. The organism was also detected in 45 samples by the MPN but not the DP method; of the 45 samples, 20 were frozen and 25 non-frozen, and only 3 samples contained greater than 50 *E. coli* per gram. Conversely, 71 samples yielded *E. coli* biotype I by the DP method alone, and 49 of these were frozen; only 6 of the 71 had counts exceeding 50 *E. coli* per gram. These results indicate that both methods, as used in this study, were capable of detecting *E. coli* biotype I when low numbers are present, but the DP method gave a higher rate of detection of low numbers in frozen samples.

Specific Comments on DP Method

Some useful observations were made on the DP method. Analysts were initially instructed to dry the stained membranes under a low-pressure UV lamp, in direct or in indirect sunlight. In one laboratory good differentiation of colonies on membranes dried under fluorescent lights was reported, while in three laboratories indirect sunlight was inadequate for developing the pink color of indole-positive colonies; it appears that best results were obtained when membranes were dried in direct sunlight or under a UV lamp. Some laboratories

TABLE 4. Number of samples found to contain *E. coli* biotype I by the MPN and DP methods

Method ^a	No. positive samples	No. positive samples containing <i>E. coli</i> biotype I per gram		
		> 50	10–50	< 10
MPN	797	406	203	188
DP	823	499	221	103
Both MPN and DP	1504 ^b	896 ^c	393 ^d	215 ^e
MPN only	45	3	6	36
DP only	71	6	25	40

^aSee footnote to Table 1; minimum number of *E. coli* biotype I detected by MPN method was 3.0 per gram, by DP method 2.5 per gram.^bComprising 752 samples by each method.^cComprising 403 and 493 samples by the MPN and DP methods, respectively.^dComprising 197 and 196 samples by the MPN and DP methods, respectively.^eComprising 152 and 63 samples by the MPN and DP methods, respectively.

also reported that optimal differentiation was obtained after 10–30 min of drying; after this time, the color of indole-positive colonies faded. Another minor problem encountered was the extension of the working day if the resuscitation step was required. To overcome this, one laboratory found that they could refrigerate the plates with membranes overnight and stain them the following day without loss in differentiation. This step would be useful in laboratories with fixed working hours. On the whole, no major adverse comments were made on the DP method which appears to be superior to the MPN method because of its lower variability, better recovery from frozen samples, rapidity, and decreased requirement for media and analysts' time.

Acknowledgements

We thank Drs. H. Pivnick and D. S. Clark for initiating this study and for reviewing the manuscript.

The technical assistance of the following persons is acknowledged: M. Taylor and D. McLeish of Canada Packers Ltd., M. Nafziger of J. M. Schneider Inc., D. Wagner of Food and Drug Administration, L. Bossick and F. Ferko of Equity Meat Corp., W. R. Hudson and C. D. Harding of the Meat Research Institute, P. D. Tips and W. M. Hogeboom of the National Institute of Public Health, W. Grebell and K. Friis of the Danish Meat Products Laboratory, L. M. Harris and J. C. L. Harrison of the Meat Industry Research Institute of New Zealand, and F. E. Watters of C.S.I.R.O.

We are grateful to Difco Laboratories for supplying all media free of charge and to Oxoid Ltd. for the generous gift of cellulose-acetate membranes. We are also thankful to the following companies and agencies for financial support to ICMSF and its methods-testing program: Amatil Ltd. (Australia); American Can Co. (U.S.A.); Arnotts Biscuits Ltd. (Australia); Bacon and Meat Manufacturers Assoc. (U.K.); Beatrice Foods Co. (U.S.A.); Beecham Group Ltd. (U.K.); Brooke-Bond Oxo Ltd. (U.K.); Brown and Polson Ltd. (U.K.); Burns Foods Ltd. (Canada); Cadbury Schweppes Ltd. (Australia); Campbell Soup Co. Ltd. (Canada); Canada Packers Ltd.; Carlo Erba Institute for Therapeutic Research (Italy); Central Alberta Dairy Pool (Canada); Centro Studi sull' Alimentazione Gino Alfonso Sada (Italy); Christie Brown and Co. Ltd. (Canada); Coca-Cola Co. (U.S.A.); C.P.C. International Inc. (U.S.A.); C.S.R. Ltd. (Australia); Del Monte Corp. (U.S.A.); Difco Laboratories (U.S.A.); Distillers Co. Ltd. (U.K.);

Findus Ltd. (Sweden); Geinoca Food Service Ltd. (Canada); General Foods Corporation (U.S.A.); General Foods Ltd. (Canada); Gerber Products Co. (U.S.A.); H. J. Heinz Co. Ltd. (U.K.); Horne and Pitfield Foods Ltd. (Canada); Infant Formula Council (U.S.A.); International Union of Biological Societies; I.T.T. Continental Baking Co. (U.S.A.); J. Sainsbury Ltd. (U.K.); Jannock Corp. Ltd. (Canada); John Labatt Ltd. (Canada); Kellogg/Salada Ltd. (Canada); Kraft Foods Ltd. (Australia); Langnese-Iglo GmbH (B.R.D.); Maizena Gesellschaft mbH (B.R.D.); Maple Leaf Mills Ltd. (Canada); Marks and Spencer Ltd. (U.K.); Mars Ltd. (U.K.); McCormick and Co. Inc. (U.S.A.); Milk Marketing Board (U.K.); National Fisheries Institute Inc. (U.S.A.); New Zealand Manufacturers' Federation; R.H.M. Research Ltd. (U.K.); R.J.R. Foods Inc. (U.S.A.); Reckitt and Colman Ltd. (U.K.); Ross Laboratories (U.S.A.); Spillers Ltd. (U.K.); Standard Brands Ltd. (Canada); Swift Canadian Co. Ltd. (Canada); Tate and Lyle Refineries Ltd. (U.K.); Terme de Crodo (Italy); Tesco Stores Ltd. (U.K.); The Borden Co. Ltd. (Canada); The J. Lyons Group of Companies (U.K.); The Pillsbury Co. (U.S.A.); The Quaker Oats Co. (U.S.A.); Thomas J. Lipton, Inc. (U.S.A.); Unigate Australia Ltd.; Unilever Ltd. (U.K.); Wattie Industries Ltd. (N.Z.); World Health Organization.

- AMERICAN PUBLIC HEALTH ASSOCIATION. 1970. Recommended procedures for the examination of seawater and shellfish. 4th ed. American Public Health Association, Inc., New York, NY.
- ANDERSON, J. M., and A. C. BAIRD-PARKER. 1975. A rapid and direct plate method for enumerating *Escherichia coli* biotype 1 in food. *J. Appl. Bacteriol.* **39**: 111–117.
- ANDREWS, W. H., A. P. DURAN, F. D. McCURE, and D. E. GENTILE. 1979. Use of two rapid A-1 methods for the recovery of fecal coliforms and *Escherichia coli* from selected food types. *J. Food Sci.* **44**: 289–293.
- ANDREWS, W. H., and M. W. PRESNELL. 1972. Rapid recovery of *Escherichia coli* from estuarine water. *Appl. Microbiol.* **23**: 521–523.
- DELANEY, J. E., J. A. MCCARTHY, and R. J. CRASSO. 1962. Measurement of *E. coli* Type 1 by the membrane filter. *Water Sewage Works*, **109**: 289–291.
- EWING, W. H. 1972. Differentiation of enterobacteriaceae by biochemical reactions. CDC Atlanta, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare.
- GUINÉE, P. A. M., and D. A. A. MOSSEL. 1963. The reliability of the test of McKenzie, Taylor and Gilbert for detection of faecal *Escherichia coli* strains of animal origin in foods. *Antonie van Leeuwenhoek; J. Microbiol. Serol.* **29**: 163–166.
- HEFFERMAN, W. P., and V. J. CABELLI. 1967. Modified MacConkey agar plate technique for fecal coliform determination. Shellfish and Sanitation Research Center, U.S. Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

- HOLLANDER, M., and D. WOLFE. 1973. Nonparametric Statistical Methods. John Wiley and Sons, New York, NY.
- HUNT, D. A., and J. SPRINGER. 1978. Microbiological Methods. Comparison of two rapid test procedures with the standard EC test for recovery of fecal coliform bacteria from shellfish-growing waters. J. Assoc. Off. Anal. Chem. **61**: 1317-1323.
- INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON MICROBIOLOGICAL SPECIFICATIONS FOR FOODS. 1978. Microorganisms in foods. 1. Their significance and methods of enumeration. 2nd ed. University of Toronto Press, Toronto, Ont.
- MILLER, R. G. 1974. The jackknife—a review. Biometrika, **61**: 1-15.
- SNEDECOR, G. W., and W. G. COCHRAN. 1973. Statistical Methods. 6th ed. The Iowa State University Press, Iowa, pp. 195-197.
- VARGA, S., R. E. DOBSON, and R. EARLE. 1977. Comparison of the elevated temperature plate count (ETPC) and MPN procedure to estimate the densities of fecal coliforms and *Escherichia coli* in soft-shell clams. J. Food Prot. **40**: 763-764.

Exhibit 1025
Mullins Decl. Appendix B-3
(WorldCat Entry for Rayman)

Screen capture completed by J L Mullins from WorldCat on November 19, 2023 at URL:

<https://search.worldcat.org/title/1011891207>



Items ▾

Search for books, articles, and more

Home

Libraries

Topics

Lists

About

For Librarians



Canadian journal of microbiology. Journal canadien de microbiologie

Author: [National Research Council Canada](#)

Journal, Magazine, English, 1973-

Edition: [View all formats and editions](#)

Publisher: National Research Council Canada, Ottawa, 1973-

Genre: Periodical

Physical Description: volumes : illustrations ; 26 cm

ISSN: 0008-4166

OCLC Number / Unique Identifier: 1011891207

Subjects: [Microbiologie](#)
[Microbiology](#)
[Periodical](#)
[microbiology](#)

Language Notes: Includes some text in French

 27 editions in 1,919 libraries

Featured libraries

All libraries

Showing 1,459 libraries near [Wisconsin, United States](#)

☐ Only public libraries



Academic

Marian University

Cardinal Meyer Library



[18 miles](#) from your current location.

45 South National Avenue, Fond du Lac, WI, 54935-4699, United States

Borrow 



Favorite Library



Academic

Nashotah House

Nashotah House Library, 2777 Mission Rd, Nashotah, WI, 53058, United States



[52 miles](#) from your current location.

Borrow 



Favorite Library



Academic

Madison Area Technical College Libraries

Madison College Libraries



[53 miles](#) from your current location.

1701 Wright Street, Madison, WI, 53704, United States

Borrow 



Favorite Library



Academic

University of Wisconsin - Madison General Library System

Memorial Library, 728 State Street, Madison, WI, 53706, United States



[58 miles](#) from your current location.

Borrow 



Favorite Library

Exhibit 1025
Mullins Decl. Appendix B-4
(OPAC Record for Rayman)

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-MADISON

LIBRARIES



LIBRARIES

SEARCH

ARTICLES

CATALOG



CATALOG SEARCH

Keywords



Books, music, movies, and more

[Search](#) > [Catalog](#) > Canadian journal of microbiology



Journals, Magazines, Newspapers

Canadian journal of microbiology

AVAILABLE AS

Online

Physical

Physical Locations

This item is also held by UW-Eau Claire, UW-La Crosse, UW-Milwaukee, and UW-Oshkosh



Multiple items exist. Use [↔ Available Issues / Request a Copy](#) to see what's on the shelf.

Steenbock Library

Today's hours:

Noon-11:30 p.m.

Journals

Shelved by title

In-library use only

Notes

Print subscription cancelled after v.52 (2006).

This Location Has

v.1(1954)-v.52(2006)

Supplements

v.41(1995)

✕ Publication Details

OTHER TITLE	Journal canadien de microbiologie
FORMAT	Journals, Magazines, Newspapers
LANGUAGES	English, French
CONTRIBUTORS	Canadian Society of Microbiologists National Research Council Canada National Research Council of Canada
PUBLICATION	Ottawa, Canada : National Research Council, [1954-]
PUBLICATION DATES	Vol. 1, no. 1 (Aug. 1954)-
PHYSICAL DETAILS	volumes : illustrations ; 26 cm
ISSNS	1480-3275, 0008-4166
OCLC	ocm01553149, ocm39927211

✕ Notes

Issues for Jan. 1973- have also French title: Journal canadien de microbiologie.
Biological & agricultural index
Abstract bulletin of the Institute of Paper Chemistry
Bibliography of agriculture
Biological abstracts
Chemical abstracts
Environment abstracts
Index medicus
International aerospace abstracts
Selected water resources abstracts
Available also on the Internet
Available on microfiche from: Toronto, Micromedia 197 - .
Available on microfiche from: Ann Arbor, Mich., Microfilms International.
Includes some text in French.