



CERTIFICATION

AOAC Research Institute *Performance Tested Methods*SM

Certificate No.
040702

The AOAC Research Institute hereby certifies the method known as:

BAX[®] System Real-Time PCR Assay for *Campylobacter jejuni, coli, and lari*

manufactured by

**Hygiena
2 Boulden Circle
New Castle, DE 19720
USA**

This method has been evaluated in the AOAC Research Institute *Performance Tested Methods*SM Program and found to perform as stated in the applicability of the method. This certificate indicates an AOAC Research Institute Certification Mark License Agreement has been executed which authorizes the manufacturer to display the AOAC Research Institute *Performance Tested Methods*SM certification mark on the above-mentioned method for the period below. Renewal may be granted by the Expiration Date under the rules stated in the licensing agreement.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Scott Coates".

Scott Coates, Senior Director
Signature for AOAC Research Institute

Issue Date	December 19, 2023
Expiration Date	December 31, 2024

4AUTHORS

ORIGINAL VALIDATION: F. Morgan Wallace, Tim Dambaugh, George Tice, Bridget Andaloro, Dawn Fallon, Eugene Davis, and Siqun Wang
MODIFICATION JULY 2013: Steve Hoelzer, F. Morgan Wallace, Lois Fleck, Deana DiCosimo, Jacqueline Harris, Bridget Andaloro, Andrew Farnum, Eugene Davis, and Jeff Rohrbeck

SUBMITTING COMPANY

DuPont
 ESL Building 400
 Route 141 & Henry Clay Road
 Wilmington, DE 19880-0400

CURRENT SPONSOR

Hygiena
 2 Boulden Circle
 New Castle, DE 19720
 USA

METHOD NAME

BAX® System Real-Time PCR Assay for *Campylobacter jejuni*, *coli*, and *lari*
 Formerly DuPont™ BAX® System Real-Time PCR Assay for *Campylobacter jejuni*, *coli*, and *lari*

CATALOG NUMBERS

BAX® System Assay KIT2018 (D12683449)

INDEPENDENT LABORATORY

Cherney Microbiological Services
 1110 Huron Road
 Green Bay, WI 54311 USA

APPLICABILITY OF METHOD

Target organism – *Campylobacter jejuni*, *C. coli*, and *C. lari*.

Matrixes – Ready-to-eat turkey product (25 g), chicken carcass rinses (30 mL)

Performance claims – Sensitivity equivalent to the reference ISO culture-based method and specificity ≥ 99%.

REFERENCE METHOD

International Organization for Standardization (ISO) (2006) ISO FDIS 10272-1: Microbiology of food and animal feeding stuffs - Horizontal method for detection and enumeration of *Campylobacter* spp. Part 1: Detection method (4)

ORIGINAL CERTIFICATION DATE

April 16, 2007

CERTIFICATION RENEWAL RECORD

Renewed Annually through December 2024.

METHOD MODIFICATION RECORD

1. July 2013
2. March 2017 Level 1
3. January 2018 Level 1
4. May 2019 Level 1
5. December 2019 Level 1
6. December 2021 Level 1
7. December 2023 Level 1

SUMMARY OF MODIFICATION

1. Addition of Thermal Block for automated sample lysis.
2. Name change from DuPont Nutrition & Health to Qualicon Diagnostics LLC., a Hygiena company.
3. Editorial updates to inserts, manuals, and labels for Hygiena.
4. Editorial updates to inserts and corporate address update.
5. Editorial/clerical changes.
6. Editorial/clerical changes.
7. Editorial/clerical changes.

Under this AOAC Performance Tested MethodsSM License Number, 040702 this method is distributed by:
NONE

Under this AOAC Performance Tested MethodsSM License Number, 040702 this method is distributed as:
NONE

PRINCIPLE OF THE METHOD (1)

The BAX® system uses the Polymerase Chain Reaction (PCR) to amplify specific DNA fragments, which are stable and unaffected by growth conditions [2]. Each fragment is a genetic sequence that is unique to the targeted organism, thus providing a highly reliable indicator that the organism is present. The BAX system simplifies the PCR process by combining the requisite PCR reagents into a stable, dry, manufactured tablet already packaged inside the PCR tubes. After hydrating these tablets with prepared samples, the tubes remain sealed to reduce the potential for contamination.

In a typical PCR application, sample DNA is combined with DNA polymerase, nucleotides and primers that are specific for a given nucleotide sequence. The mixture then undergoes a series of timed heating and cooling cycles. Heating denatures the DNA, separating it into single strands. As the mixture cools, the primers recognize and anneal (bind) to the targeted DNA sequence. DNA polymerase then uses nucleotides to extend the primers, thus creating two copies of the targeted fragment (amplification). Repeating cycles of denaturing, annealing and extending produces an exponential increase in the number of target DNA fragments, creating millions of copies in a very short time. If the target sequence is not present, no detectable amplification takes place [3]. Inhibitors to PCR are present in some food matrixes. In particular, phenolic compounds found in some spices and other plant-based materials such as high purity cocoa can cause the PCR reaction to shut down. Because of this, each BAX reagent tablet is formulated with a low level target DNA and associated primers. This Internal Positive Control (INPC) must be shown to amplify in the absence of a specific pathogen target amplification product for the BAX instrument to report a negative result. In the absence of any target or INPC associated product, the instrument reports an indeterminate result.

The BAX system PCR tablets used in real-time assays also contain multi-dye probes. Intact probes are short oligonucleotides with quencher dye at one end that absorbs the signal from fluorescent reporter dye at the opposite end. During PCR cooling cycles, probes bind to a specific area within the targeted fragment. During extension, DNA polymerase encounters the probe in its path and breaks the probe apart. This releases the reporter dye, resulting in increased fluorescent signal [3]. The BAX system Q7 instrument uses multiple filters to measure signal at the end of each cycle and report results for each target in less than 90 minutes.

DISCUSSION OF THE VALIDATION STUDY (1)

Results from the method comparison studies demonstrate BAX system performance that is statistically indistinguishable from the ISO FSIS 10272-1 (2006) reference method for detection of *Campylobacter* in sliced vacuum packaged turkey and chicken rinses. Several discordant results were found in the chicken rinses. It is likely that these results were due to sampling error (failure to have any target cells in the sub-sample of rinse inoculated in either the test or reference enrichment). All BAX positive samples were found to culture confirm, with the exception of the BAX enrichment from the external laboratory study, even if their paired reference enrichment sample was negative for the presence of *Campylobacter*. The one sample which did not confirm was positive at both BAX time points, had high levels of presumptive *Campylobacter* by direct plating, and the paired ISO enrichment from the sample was demonstrated to contain *Campylobacter*. The inclusivity/exclusivity study showed 100% agreement with expected results for the test panel.

Lot-to-lot and stability studies showed consistent performance. The ruggedness study demonstrated that the BAX system was not sensitive to changes in factors most likely to adversely impact assay performance including lysis and protease inactivation temperatures, lysis sample volume, and PCR sample volume. Initial ruggedness testing revealed that incubation only slightly above the originally suggested incubation temperature of 42±2°C gave inconsistent results at the high incubation temperature abuse condition of 45°C. In order to reduce the risk of similar issues as users run the assay, and to highlight the sensitivity of this portion of the assay, the suggested incubation range was tightened to 42±1°C. Incubations at 44°C gave consistently positive results. The BAX System User Guide was edited to reflect this change in temperature tolerance.

Table 5. Real-Time BAX *Campylobacter* PCR Assay Inclusivity (1)

Strain #	Genus / Species	Source	BAX Result	Strain #	Genus / Species	Source	BAX Result
TD4604	<i>C. coli</i>	Avian	POS	TD6529	<i>C. coli</i>	Avian	POS
TD4631	<i>C. coli</i>	Avian	POS	TD6531	<i>C. coli</i>	Avian	POS
TD4923	<i>C. coli</i>	Avian	POS	TD6539	<i>C. coli</i>	Avian	POS
TD4928	<i>C. jejuni</i>	Avian	POS	TD6540	<i>C. coli</i>	Avian	POS
TD4937	<i>C. jejuni</i>	Avian	POS	TD6551	<i>C. jejuni</i>	Avian	POS
TD4960	<i>C. jejuni</i>	Avian	POS	TD6553	<i>C. jejuni</i>	Avian	POS
TD6295	<i>C. jejuni</i>	Avian	POS	TD6555	<i>C. jejuni</i>	Avian	POS
TD6296	<i>C. jejuni</i>	Avian	POS	TD6557	<i>C. jejuni</i>	Avian	POS
TD6297	<i>C. jejuni</i>	Avian	POS	TD6560	<i>C. jejuni</i>	Avian	POS
TD6300	<i>C. jejuni</i>	Avian	POS	TD6561	<i>C. jejuni</i>	Avian	POS
TD6301	<i>C. jejuni</i>	Avian	POS	TD6562	<i>C. lari</i>	Avian	POS
TD6308	<i>C. coli</i>	Avian	POS	TD6563	<i>C. lari</i>	Avian	POS
TD6311	<i>C. coli</i>	Avian	POS	TD6564	<i>C. lari</i>	Avian	POS
TD6312	<i>C. coli</i>	Avian	POS	TD6566	<i>C. lari</i>	Avian	POS
TD6321	<i>C. coli</i>	Avian	POS	TD6567	<i>C. lari</i>	Avian	POS
TD6423	<i>C. lari</i>	Avian	POS	TD6568	<i>C. lari</i>	Avian	POS
TD6424	<i>C. lari</i>	Avian	POS	TD6569	<i>C. lari</i>	Avian	POS
TD6425	<i>C. lari</i>	Avian	POS	TD6570	<i>C. lari</i>	Avian	POS
TD6481	<i>C. lari</i>	Clinical	POS	TD6571	<i>C. lari</i>	Avian	POS
TD6483	<i>C. lari</i>	Clinical	POS	TD6577	<i>C. lari</i>	Avian	POS
TD6484	<i>C. lari</i>	Clinical	POS	TD6622	<i>C. lari</i>	Avian	POS
TD6485	<i>C. lari</i>	Clinical	POS	TD7012	<i>C. jejuni</i>	Avian	POS
TD6486	<i>C. lari</i>	Clinical	POS	TD7018	<i>C. jejuni</i>	Avian	POS
TD6525	<i>C. coli</i>	Avian	POS	TD7019	<i>C. jejuni</i>	Avian	POS
TD6526	<i>C. coli</i>	Avian	POS	TD7023	<i>C. coli</i>	Avian	POS
TD6527	<i>C. coli</i>	Avian	POS	TD7026	<i>C. jejuni</i>	Avian	POS

All from DuPont Qualicon Culture Collection

Table 6. Real-Time BAX *Campylobacter* PCR Assay exclusivity (1)

	Genus / Species	Source	BAX Result	ID #	Genus / Species	Source	BAX Result
DD 2901	<i>Bacillus cereus</i>	Cream cake	NEG	TD 6537	<i>Campylobacter fetus</i> <i>venerealis</i>	Unknown	NEG
ATCC 25408	<i>Citrobacter diversus</i>	Human clinical	NEG	ATCC BAA-1059	<i>Campylobacter</i> <i>upsaliensis</i>	human	NEG
ATCC 33379	<i>Edwardsiella</i> <i>hoshinae</i>	Avian	NEG	ATCC 33562	<i>Campylobacter sputorum</i>	Bovine	NEG
DD 10549	<i>Enterococcus</i> <i>cecorum</i>	Avian	NEG	ATCC 51210	<i>Campylobacter</i> <i>helveticus</i>	Feline	NEG
ATCC 35038	<i>Enterococcus</i> <i>gallinarum</i>	Avain	NEG	ATCC 43264	<i>Campylobacter mucosalis</i>	Porcine	NEG
DD 10674	<i>Enterococcus</i> <i>saccharolyticus</i>	Straw bedding - Avain	NEG	DD 6832	<i>Shigella sonnei</i>	Unknown	NEG
DD 1722	<i>Escherichia coli</i> O127:HNM	PSU E. coli Reference Laboratory	NEG	ATCC 43952	<i>Staphylococcus arlettae</i>	Avian	NEG
ATCC 33821	<i>Escherichia vulnaris</i>	Human clinical	NEG	ATCC 35539	<i>Staphylococcus</i> <i>gallinarum</i>	Avain	NEG
DD 6523	<i>Klebsiella oxytoca</i>	Ground beef	NEG	ATCC 9610	<i>Yersinia enterocolitica</i>	Human clinical	NEG
ATCC 33403	<i>Kurthia zopfii</i>	Avain	NEG	DD 2992	<i>Salmonella ser. Lille</i>		NEG
ATCC 19111	<i>Listeria</i> <i>monocytogenes</i>	Avain	NEG	DD 1261	<i>Salmonella ser. Newport</i>	Avain	NEG
DD 3064	<i>Morganella</i> <i>morganii</i>	Environmental swab	NEG	ATCC 49616	<i>Acrobacter butzleri</i>	Human clinical	NEG
DD 6121	<i>Proteus mirabilis</i>	Avain	NEG	TD 6513	<i>Arcobacter butzleri</i>	Unknown	NEG
ATCC 27853	<i>Pseudomonas</i> <i>aeruginosa</i>	Human clinical	NEG	TD 7030	<i>Arcobacter cryaerophilus</i>	Unknown	NEG
ATCC 43972	<i>Salmonella enterica</i> salame	Unknown	NEG	TD 7011	<i>Campylobacter fetus</i> <i>fetus</i>	Unknown	NEG
DD 1550	<i>Salmonella ser.</i> Abaetetuba	Unknown	NEG	TD 7013	<i>Campylobacter fetus</i> <i>fetus</i>	Unknown	NEG
DD 3017	<i>Salmonella ser.</i> Dublin	Unknown	NEG	ATCC 13076	<i>Salmonella ser.</i> Enteritidis	Unknown	NEG
TD 6536	<i>Campylobacter</i> <i>fetus venerealis</i>	Unknown	NEG	DD 626	<i>Lactobacillus viridescens</i>	Cured meat	NEG
DD 659	<i>Lactobacillus lactis</i>	Unknown	NEG	DD 687	<i>Lactobacillus carnis</i>	Vacuum pack lamb	NEG

Table 1a. Internal Study of Vacuum Packaged Sliced Turkey (25 g) Samples Tested with BAX System Compared with the ISO 10272-1:2006(E) Reference Method (1)											
Enrichment Time	Method	Total	CFU / 25g inoculated	MPN / 25g ¹	BAX Assay Positive	Culture Confirmed ²	Sensitivity %	False Neg %	False Pos %	Specificity %	Chi Square Test vs Reference
24 hr	BAX	20	7.6	0.4	9	10	90	10	0	100	0.1
		5	0		0	0		0	0		
48 hr	BAX	20	7.6	0.4	10	10	100	0	0	100	0.4
		5	0		0	0		0	0		
	ISO	20	7.6	0.4		8	100	0	0	100	
		5	0			0		0	0		
24 hr	BAX	20	76	52.5	20	20	100	0	0	100	0
		5	0		0	0		0	0		
48 hr	BAX	20	76	52.5	20	20	100	0	0	100	0
		5	0		0	0		0	0		
	ISO	20	76	52.5		20	0	0	0	100	
		5	0			0		0	0		

¹ A 3-tube MPN (with 100, 10, and 1, and 0.1 g test portions) was conducted using the reference method beginning 2 days post inoculation and run concurrently with the study enrichments

² BAX® enrichments were confirmed using the ISO reference method plating media and subsequent ISO isolate confirmatory tests. Culture confirmed results are from 48 hr of liquid enrichment.

False negative rate is calculated as BAX (-) Ref (+) BAX enrichment samples / Tot Ref (+) samples

False positive rate is calculated as BAX (+) Ref (-) / Tot Ref (-) samples

Sensitivity is calculated as 100% – false negative rate = 100%

Specificity is calculated as 100% – false positive rate = 100%

Table 2a. Internal Study of Naturally Contaminated Chicken Carcass Rinses Tested with BAX System Compared with the ISO 10272-1:2006(E) Reference Method (1)							
Method	Total	Presump.Pos /Confirmed	Sensitivity %	False Neg %	False Pos %	Specificity %	Chi Square Test Method vs Culture
24 hr BAX vs culture from BAX enrichment	20	16/17	94	6	0	100	0
48 hr BAX vs culture from BAX enrichment	20	17/17	100	0	0	100	0.3
ISO	20	16	100	0	0	100	

DISCUSSION OF MODIFICATION APPROVED JULY 2013 (5)

The results of the method comparison between the digital DuPont™ Thermal Block and the analog heating/cooling blocks are provided in Table 3 below. For all sample types and BAX System assays evaluated, the results for samples processed with the DuPont Thermal Block and the original heating/cooling blocks demonstrated no significant statistical difference as indicated by POD analysis (the 95% confidence interval of the dPOD included 0 in all cases). For additional figures illustrating the target responses of the individual BAX System assays, see Appendix B.

All 544 samples inoculated with high levels of the target organism returned positive results with the BAX System using both sample preparation methods, and all 544 samples tested as unspiked negative controls returned negative results with the BAX System using both sample preparation methods with the exception of the non-inoculated poultry rinse samples that gave positive results for *Campylobacter jejuni*, while giving negative results for the target *C. coli* that was spiked into the test samples. For samples inoculated with low levels of target organism, the two preparation methods returned identical results for 530 of the 544 samples tested. The results for the 14 samples that returned different results between the two methods are summarized in Table 3. Because the low-spike samples were tested at levels near the limit of detection for the BAX System assays, some discrepancy between the two methods is expected based on factors such as the distribution of the target organism within the sample.

Analysis of target response in cases where a fractional response was not generated, while demonstrating significant differences from a statistical standpoint in some cases, were not indicative of any difference that would likely be significant in a practical sense. All average differences were less than 10% for melt curve based target peak height, or target peak area to target plus internal control peak areas (for the Yeast and Mold assay) and all average C_t differences were less than 1 for all real time assay.

Because the difference in results between the two methods demonstrated no significant statistical difference as indicated by the POD analysis, these differences are found to be acceptable in this study for demonstrating equivalency between the two methods.

Table 3. BAX System Results – DuPont™ Thermal Block vs. Analog Heating/Cooling Blocks (5)

BAX System Assay	Sample Type	Spike Level	Test Portions	Heating/Cooling Blocks			DuPont Thermal Block			dPOD _{TB} ^d	95% CI ^e	
				X ^a	POD ₂₈ ^b	95% CI ^e	X ^a	POD _{TB} ^c	95% CI ^e			
Real-time <i>Campylobacter jejuni/coli/lari</i>	Chicken rinses	High	17	17	1	0.82, 1.0	17	1	0.82, 1.0	0	-0.18, 0.18	
		Low	17	17	1	0.82, 1.0	17	1	0.82, 1.0	0	-0.18, 0.18	
		Control	17	0	0	0, 0.19	0	0	0, 0.19	0	-0.18, 0.18	
	Processed turkey	High	17	17	1	0.82, 1.0	17	1	0.82, 1.0	0	-0.18, 0.18	
		Low	17	17	1	0.82, 1.00	17	1	0.82, 1.0	0	-0.18, 0.18	
		Control	17	0	0	0, 0.19	0	0	0, 0.19	0	-0.18, 0.18	
			High	17	17	1	0.82, 1.0	17	1	0.82, 1.0	0	-0.18, 0.18

REFERENCES CITED

- Wallace, Morgan, Dambaugh, Tim, Tice, George, Andaloro, Bridget, Fallon, Dawn, Davis, Eugene, and Wang, Siqun., Evaluation of the DuPont™ Bax® System Real-Time PCR Assay for Detection of *Campylobacter jejuni, coli, and lari*, AOAC Performance Tested MethodsSM certification number 040702.
- Innis, MA, and Gelfand, DH (1989) *PCR Protocols: A Guide to Methods and Applications*, Academic Press, Burlington, MA.
- Livak, K.J., Flood, S.J.A., Marmaro, J., and Mullah, K.B., inventors Perkin-Elmer Corporation (Foster City, CA), assignee. (1999) Hybridization assay using self-quenching fluorescence probe. United States patent 5,876,930.
- International Organization for Standardization (ISO) (2006) ISO FDIS 10272-1: Microbiology of food and animal feeding stuffs - Horizontal method for detection and enumeration of *Campylobacter* spp. Part 1: Detection method.
- Hoelzer, S., Wallace, F.M., Fleck, L, DiCosimo, D., Harris, J., Andaloro, B., Farnum, A., Davis, E., and Rohrbeck, J., Evaluation of the DuPont™ Thermal Block for Automated Sample Lysis with the BAX® System Method (Minor Modification), AOAC Performance Tested MethodsSM certification number 040702. Approved July 2013.